**Mission Statement:**
To work together across neighboring communities to consistently protect and improve the unique and relatively unspoiled character of the physical, economic and social worlds we share...for the benefit of our future generations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>INVOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ROLL CALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PUBLIC COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>AGENDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MINUTES OF THE MAY 19 AND JUNE 16, 2016 MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>DIRECTOR’S REPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>FY 16-17 Budget Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>DEM Letter Regarding Nichole Gwinnett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Tuition Reimbursement Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Florida Chamber Foundation Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>FRCA Monthly Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Legislative Priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>SRPP Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>CEDS Project List Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>STAFF SUMMARIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Grant Activity Sheet (Information Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CONSENT AGENDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Coordination and Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Lee County Comp Plan Amendment DEO 16-2ESR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Lee County Comp Plan Amendment DEO 16-3ESR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Lee County Comp Plan Amendment DEO 16-4ESR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Glades County Comp Plan Amendment DEO 16-1ESR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Sarasota County Comp Plan Amendment DEO 16-3ESR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>City of Bonita Springs Comp Plan Amendment DEO 16-1ESR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>City of Fort Myers Comp Plan Amendment DEO 16-1ESR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>City of North Port Comp Plan Amendment DEO 16-1ESR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>Charlotte County Comp Plan Amendment DEO 16-4ESR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two or more members of the Peace River Basin Management Advisory Committee and Charlotte Harbor National Estuary Program may be in attendance and may discuss matters that could come before the Peace River Basin Management Advisory Committee and Charlotte Harbor National Estuary Program, respectively, for consideration.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), any person requiring special accommodations to participate in this meeting should contact the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council 48 hours prior to the meeting by calling (239) 338-2550; if you are hearing or speech impaired call (800) 955-8770 Voice/(800) 955-8771 TDD.
Two or more members of the Peace River Basin Management Advisory Committee and Charlotte Harbor National Estuary Program may be in attendance and may discuss matters that could come before the Peace River Basin Management Advisory Committee and Charlotte Harbor National Estuary Program, respectively, for consideration.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), any person requiring special accommodations to participate in this meeting should contact the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council 48 hours prior to the meeting by calling (239) 338-2550; if you are hearing or speech impaired call (800) 955-8770 Voice/(800) 955-8771 TDD.
## OFFICERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charlotte County</th>
<th>Collier County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Tricia Duffy, Charlotte BCC</td>
<td>Commissioner Tim Nance, Collier BCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Ken Doherty, Charlotte BCC</td>
<td>Commissioner Penny Taylor, Collier BCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilman Gary Wein, City of Punta Gorda</td>
<td>Councilman Reg Buxton, City of Naples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Donald McCormick, Governor Appointee</td>
<td>(City of Marco Island Vacancy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Suzanne Graham, Governor Appointee</td>
<td>Mr. Robert “Bob Mulhere, Governor Appointee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilman Jim Burch, Vice-Chair</td>
<td>Mr. Alan D. Reynolds, Governor Appointee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glades County</th>
<th>Hendry County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Glades BCC Vacancy)</td>
<td>Commissioner Karson Turner, Hendry BCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Weston Pryor, Glades BCC</td>
<td>Commissioner Don Davis, Hendry BCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilwoman Pat Lucas, City of Moore Haven</td>
<td>Commissioner Sherida Ridgill, City of Clewiston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Thomas Perry, Governor Appointee</td>
<td>Commissioner Julie Wilkins, City of LaBelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Thomas Perry, Governor Appointee</td>
<td>Mr. Mel Karau, Governor Appointee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lee County</th>
<th>Sarasota County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Frank Mann, Lee BCC</td>
<td>Commissioner Carolyn Mason, Sarasota BCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Cecil Pendergrass, Lee BCC</td>
<td>Commissioner Charles Hines, Sarasota BCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilman Jim Burch, City of Cape Coral</td>
<td>Commissioner Rhonda DiFranco, City of North Port</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilman Forrest Banks, City of Fort Myers</td>
<td>Councilman Fred Fraize, City of Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilmember Anita Cereceda, Town of Fort Myers Beach</td>
<td>Mayor Willie Shaw, City of Sarasota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Mayor Mick Denham, City of Sanibel</td>
<td>Mr. Felipe Colon, Governor Appointee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilman Greg DeWitt, City of Bonita Springs</td>
<td>(Governor Appointee Vacancy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Laura Holquist, Governor Appointee</td>
<td>(Governor Appointee Vacancy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS

| Jon Iglehart, FDEP | Derek Burr, FDOT |
| Phil Flood, SFWMD | Tara Poulton, SWFWMD |

## STAFF

- Margaret Wuerste, Executive Director
- Beth Nightingale, Legal Consultant
- James Beever
- Rebekah Harp
- Timothy Walker
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SOUTHWEST FLORIDA REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL (SWFRPC) ACRONYMS

ABM - Agency for Bay Management - Estero Bay Agency on Bay Management

ADA - Application for Development Approval

ADA - Americans with Disabilities Act

AMDA - Application for Master Development Approval

BEBR - Bureau of Economic Business and Research at the University of Florida

BLID - Binding Letter of DRI Status

BLIM - Binding Letter of Modification to a DRI with Vested Rights

BLIVR - Binding Letter of Vested Rights Status

BPCC - Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinating Committee

CAC - Citizens Advisory Committee

CAO - City/County Administrator Officers

CDBG - Community Development Block Grant

CDC - Certified Development Corporation (a.k.a. RDC)

CEDS - Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (a.k.a. OEDP)

CHNEP - Charlotte Harbor National Estuary Program

CTC - Community Transportation Coordinator

CTD - Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged

CUTR - Center for Urban Transportation Research

DEO - Department of Economic Opportunity

DEP - Department of Environmental Protection
DO - Development Order
DOPA - Designated Official Planning Agency (i.e. MPO, RPC, County, etc.)
EDA - Economic Development Administration
EDC - Economic Development Coalition
EDD - Economic Development District
EPA – Environmental Protection Agency
FAC - Florida Association of Counties
FACTS - Florida Association of CTCs
FAR - Florida Administrative Register (formerly Florida Administrative Weekly)
FCTS - Florida Coordinated Transportation System
FDC&F - Florida Department of Children and Families (a.k.a. HRS)
FDEA - Florida Department of Elder Affairs
FDLES - Florida Department of Labor and Employment Security
FDOT - Florida Department of Transportation
FHREDI - Florida Heartland Rural Economic Development Initiative
FIAM – Fiscal Impact Analysis Model
FLC - Florida League of Cities
FQD - Florida Quality Development
FRCA - Florida Regional Planning Councils Association
FTA - Florida Transit Association
IC&R - Intergovernmental Coordination and Review
IFAS - Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences at the University of Florida
JLCB - Joint Local Coordinating Boards of Glades & Hendry Counties
JPA - Joint Participation Agreement
JSA - Joint Service Area of Glades & Hendry Counties
LCB - Local Coordinating Board for the Transportation Disadvantaged
LEPC - Local Emergency Planning Committee
MOA - Memorandum of Agreement
MPO - Metropolitan Planning Organization
MPOAC - Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council
MPOCAC - Metropolitan Planning Organization Citizens Advisory Committee
MPOTAC - Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Advisory Committee
NADO – National Association of Development Organizations
NARC - National Association of Regional Councils
NOPC - Notice of Proposed Change
OEDP - Overall Economic Development Program
PDA - Preliminary Development Agreement
REMI – Regional Economic Modeling Incorporated
RFB - Request for Bids
RFI – Request for Invitation
RFP - Request for Proposals
RPC - Regional Planning Council
SHIP - State Housing Initiatives Partnership
SRPP – Strategic Regional Policy Plan
TAC - Technical Advisory Committee
TDC - Transportation Disadvantaged Commission (a.k.a. CTD)
TDPN - Transportation Disadvantaged Planners Network
TDSP - Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan
USDA - US Department of Agriculture
WMD - Water Management District (SFWMD and SWFWMD)
Regional Planning Council
Functions and Programs

March 4, 2011

- **Economic Development Districts:** Regional planning councils are designated as Economic Development Districts by the U. S. Economic Development Administration. From January 2003 to August 2010, the U. S. Economic Development Administration invested $66 million in 60 projects in the State of Florida to create/retain 13,700 jobs and leverage $1 billion in private capital investment. Regional planning councils provide technical support to businesses and economic developers to promote regional job creation strategies.

- **Emergency Preparedness and Statewide Regional Evacuation:** Regional planning councils have special expertise in emergency planning and were the first in the nation to prepare a Statewide Regional Evacuation Study using a uniform report format and transportation evacuation modeling program. Regional planning councils have been preparing regional evacuation plans since 1981. Products in addition to evacuation studies include Post Disaster Redevelopment Plans, Hazard Mitigation Plans, Continuity of Operations Plans and Business Disaster Planning Kits.

- **Local Emergency Planning:** Local Emergency Planning Committees are staffed by regional planning councils and provide a direct relationship between the State and local businesses. Regional planning councils provide thousands of hours of training to local first responders annually. Local businesses have developed a trusted working relationship with regional planning council staff.

- **Homeland Security:** Regional planning council staff is a source of low cost, high quality planning and training experts that support counties and State agencies when developing a training course or exercise. Regional planning councils provide cost effective training to first responders, both public and private, in the areas of Hazardous Materials, Hazardous Waste, Incident Command, Disaster Response, Pre- and Post-Disaster Planning, Continuity of Operations and Governance. Several regional planning councils house Regional Domestic Security Task Force planners.

- **Multipurpose Regional Organizations:** Regional planning councils are Florida's only multipurpose regional entities that plan for and coordinate intergovernmental solutions on multi-jurisdictional issues, support regional economic development and provide assistance to local governments.

- **Problem Solving Forum:** Issues of major importance are often the subject of regional planning council-sponsored workshops. Regional planning councils have convened regional summits and workshops on issues such as workforce housing, response to hurricanes, visioning and job creation.

- **Implementation of Community Planning:** Regional planning councils develop and maintain Strategic Regional Policy Plans to guide growth and development focusing on economic development, emergency preparedness, transportation, affordable housing and resources of regional significance. In addition, regional planning councils provide coordination and review of various programs such as Local Government Comprehensive Plans, Developments of Regional Impact and Power Plant Ten-year Siting Plans. Regional planning council reviewers have the local knowledge to conduct reviews efficiently and provide State agencies reliable local insight.
Regional Planning Councils
Functions and Programs
March 4, 2011

- **Local Government Assistance:** Regional planning councils are also a significant source of cost effective, high quality planning experts for communities, providing technical assistance in areas such as: grant writing, mapping, community planning, plan review, procurement, dispute resolution, economic development, marketing, statistical analysis, and information technology. Several regional planning councils provide staff for transportation planning organizations, natural resource planning and emergency preparedness planning.

- **Return on Investment:** Every dollar invested by the State through annual appropriation in regional planning councils generates 11 dollars in local, federal and private direct investment to meet regional needs.

- **Quality Communities Generate Economic Development:** Businesses and individuals choose locations based on the quality of life they offer. Regional planning councils help regions compete nationally and globally for investment and skilled personnel.

- **Multidisciplinary Viewpoint:** Regional planning councils provide a comprehensive, multidisciplinary view of issues and a forum to address regional issues cooperatively. Potential impacts on the community from development activities are vetted to achieve win-win solutions as council members represent business, government and citizen interests.

- **Coordinators and Conveners:** Regional planning councils provide a forum for regional collaboration to solve problems and reduce costly inter-jurisdictional disputes.

- **Federal Consistency Review:** Regional planning councils provide required Federal Consistency Review, ensuring access to hundreds of millions of federal infrastructure and economic development investment dollars annually.

- **Economies of Scale:** Regional planning councils provide a cost-effective source of technical assistance to local governments, small businesses and non-profits.

- **Regional Approach:** Cost savings are realized in transportation, land use and infrastructure when addressed regionally. A regional approach promotes vibrant economies while reducing unproductive competition among local communities.

- **Sustainable Communities:** Federal funding is targeted to regions that can demonstrate they have a strong framework for regional cooperation.

- **Economic Data and Analysis:** Regional planning councils are equipped with state of the art econometric software and have the ability to provide objective economic analysis on policy and investment decisions.

- **Small Quantity Hazardous Waste Generators:** The Small Quantity Generator program ensures the proper handling and disposal of hazardous waste generated at the county level. Often smaller counties cannot afford to maintain a program without imposing large fees on local businesses. Many counties have lowered or eliminated fees, because regional planning council programs realize economies of scale, provide businesses a local contact regarding compliance questions and assistance and provide training and information regarding management of hazardous waste.

- **Regional Visioning and Strategic Planning:** Regional planning councils are conveners of regional visions that link economic development, infrastructure, environment, land use and transportation into long term investment plans. Strategic planning for communities and organizations defines actions critical to successful change and resource investments.

- **Geographic Information Systems and Data Clearinghouse:** Regional planning councils are leaders in geographic information systems mapping and data support systems. Many local governments rely on regional planning councils for these services.
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MINUTES OF THE
SOUTHWEST FLORIDA REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
MAY 19, 2016 MEETING

The meeting of the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council was held on May 19, 2016 at the offices of the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council – 1400 Colonial Boulevard, Suite #1 in Fort Myers, Florida. Chair McCormick called the meeting to order at 9:03 AM. Mayor Shaw then led an invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Nichole Gwinnett conducted the roll call and noted that a quorum was present.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Charlotte County: Commissioner Tricia Duffy, Commissioner Ken Doherty, Councilman Gary Wein, Mr. Don McCormick

Collier County: Commissioner Penny Taylor, Councilman Rex Buxton, Mr. Bob Mulhere

Glades County: Mr. Thomas Perry

Hendry County: Commissioner Karson Turner, Commissioner Julie Wilkins, Mr. Mel Karau

Lee County: Commissioner Frank Mann, Commissioner Cecil Pendergrass, Councilman Forrest Banks, Vice-Mayor Mick Denham, Councilman Greg DeWitt

Sarasota County: Commissioner Christine Robinson for Commissioner Carolyn Mason, Mayor Willie Shaw, Councilman Fred Fraize

Ex-Officio: Mr. Phil Flood – SFWMD, Mr. Jon Iglehart –FDEP, Ms. Derek Burr-FDOT

MEMBERS ABSENT

Charlotte County: Ms. Suzanne Graham

Collier County: Commissioner Tim Nance, Mr. Alan Reynolds

Glades County: Commissioner Weston Pryor, Councilwoman Pat Lucas, Commissioner Tim Stanley

Hendry County: Commissioner Don Davis, Commissioner Sherida Ridgdill

Lee County: Councilman Jim Burch, Mayor Anita Cereceda, Ms. Laura Holquist

Sarasota County: Commissioner Charles Hines, Vice-Mayor Rhonda DiFranco, Mr. Felipe Colón
Chair McCormick requested that the items under Agenda Item #10 Regional Impact be moved up to the beginning of the agenda.

By general consensus the items under Agenda Item #10 Regional Impact were moved up to become the first item for discussion.

AGENDA ITEM #10(a)
Palmer Ranch MDO NOPC

Mr. Trescott presented the item.

A motion was made by Mayor Shaw to approve staff’s recommendations as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mulhere and carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM #10(b)
The Commons NOPC

Mr. Trescott presented the item.

Vice-Mayor Denham asked how storm water would be managed for the site. Mr. Trescott stated that the storm water system is already in place and permitted in line with the South Florida Water Management District requirements. Mr. Mulhere highlighted a conservation tract along the Gordon River that was missing from the displayed map. Any future development will have to amend the existing storm water plan. Mr. Flood confirmed that the site was permitted by the SFWMD’s criteria.

Mr. Mulhere stated he would be abstaining from voting on the item due to conflict of interest.

A motion was made by Commissioner Duffy to approve staff’s recommendations as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Perry and carried with one abstention.

AGENDA ITEM #4
PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comment was made at this time.

Chair McCormick requested a motion to approve the amended agenda.
Motion was made by Commissioner Mann to approve the amended agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mulhere and carried unanimously.

**AGENDA ITEM #6**
**MINUTES OF THE MARCH 17, 2016 & APRIL 21, 2016 MEETINGS**

As noted, the minutes from the March 17, 2016 and April 21, 2016 meetings are to be presented at the June meeting.

**AGENDA ITEM #7**
**DIRECTOR’S REPORT**

Ms. Wuerstle presented the report, which included the April financials. She also reviewed the following:

**AGENDA ITEM #7(a)**
**Budget Amendments**

Ms. Wuerstle presented the proposed budget amendments.

**Motion was made by Mr. Mulhere to approve the budget amendments. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Duffy and carried unanimously.**

**AGENDA ITEM #7(b)**
**Audit**

Mr. Tuscan presented the FY 14-15 Audit. The audit ended with an “unmodified” opinion, which is the highest level of opinion.

Councilman Wein expressed concern with the impacts of an economic downturn on the cities’ and counties’ pension liability. Mr. Tuscan explained that these massive swings are supposed to be amortized under the new laws. FRS was 92% funded at the end of 2015.

Councilman Banks asked about the negative pension liability. Mr. Tuscan stated that it is $565,000. Mr. Mulhere clarified that this figure isn’t just the pension liability.

Councilman Fraize inquired about the Civil Retirement System and asked if there has been any discussion of moving into a 401k plan. Mr. Tuscan explained that this was discussed during the market crash. Commissioner Pendergrass suggested that new employees be placed into a 401k plan instead of FRS. He also inquired about the savings on utilities with the new location. Ms. Wuerstle explained that there will be savings and the amended budget will be presented at the June meeting.

Commissioner Wilkins pointed out a typo in the audit report.
Motion was made by Commissioner Doherty to approve the audit. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Mann and carried unanimously.

**AGENDA ITEM #7(c)**

**Proposed Agenda for SWFRPC Water Seminar (Workshop)**

Ms. Wuerstle introduced the draft agenda. Mr. Perry further explained the reasoning behind the agenda and that the symposium will explain the white paper, a list of acronyms, and the Integrated Delivery Schedule.

Vice-Mayor Denham explained why the speakers were chosen, that this would be more of a workshop, and no public comment would be taken. Vice-Mayor Denham stated that the goal is to collectively agree on a strategy and a message for the region. Commissioner Duffy believes this is a good start and requested that Dr. Brian LaPointe from Florida Atlantic University, Representative Matt Caldwell, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers be added as speakers. Commissioner Doherty agreed that the Army Corps should be added. Councilman Banks suggested the speakers list is too Sanibel heavy.

Commissioner Doherty agreed and suggested that the regulatory agencies such as the Water Management Districts, FDEP, and the Army Corps take lead on this symposium. Vice-Mayor Denham wanted to move forward with Lee County’s strategic plan. Commissioner Duffy believes that the purpose of the water workshop was to gather more information and clear up any misinformation. Commissioner Duffy did not agree with everything in the strategic plan and could not vote to approve it by Regional Planning Council.

Commissioner Robinson added that under State law, if any decisions are made then there must be public comment taken. Ms. Nightingale said she would look at this issue and report back. Mr. Perry added that the workshop would not result in a vote or a decision. A decision would have to be made at a subsequent meeting.

Commissioner Mann explained that the goal was to come to a consensus as an RPC. Commissioner Turner agreed with Commissioner Mann and suggested that the RPC decide on a short list of priorities. He also explained that excluding public comment was a time saving measure. Commissioner Doherty explained that he cannot vote on the strategic plan without comment and analysis from the previously mentioned regulatory agencies and the meeting may be longer than four hours. The choosing of the speakers was a collaborative effort between Vice-Mayor Denham and Mr. Perry. Councilman Wein added that the RPC needed to act with high quality and with consensus to showcase our relevancy.

Vice-Mayor Denham believed that the RPC needed to start with a baseline and then change and build on it. Chair McCormick sees the meeting as an incremental step.

Ms. Wuerstle wanted clarification on the scope of the meeting. Vice-Mayor Denham explained that this was to be for SWFRPC members and possibly members of nearby RPCs. Commissioner Mann and Vice-Mayor Denham agreed that no progress would be made if the meeting went beyond the RPC. Councilman Banks agreed with the plan that the Lee County Board of County Commissioners approved. Mr. Perry wanted everyone to leave the meeting with a clear
understanding of the issues and everything involved. Chair McCormick wanted a united message from the RPC so that we can all present the same message to State and Federal legislators. Commissioner Duffy stated that this meeting must contain public comment. She also adds that Charlotte and Sarasota Counties have different needs than Lee County. Vice-Mayor Denham clarified that the strategic plan is an approach and not a solution. Commissioner Duffy reiterated that she would like Dr. LaPointe to be a speaker and that this discussion needs to be neutral. Commissioner Mann states that in order to effectively lobby in DC, we need a united, consistent message.

A discussion ensued on when and where the meeting would take place. The meeting is now targeting for September 22 at the Charlotte Harbor Event Center, which was offered at no cost.

Commissioner Wilkins questioned whether it is a good idea to invite the public and tell them that they can’t participate. Mr. Mulhere suggested placing public comment at the end, providing public comment forms, and limiting public comment to a minute. Vice-Mayor Denham sees the public being very unruly and disruptive. Commissioner Robinson believes that it is not proper to take action without public comment. Mr. Iglehart explained that FDEP public comment is limited to three minutes.

Commissioner Duffy questioned whether this is a regional issue or just a Lee-Collier issue. Vice-Mayor Denham announced that he is backing out of this issue. Mr. Mulhere explained that this is clearly a regional issue. The issue involves at least four of our counties and we should all be concerned about water quality. Councilman Wein stated that the purpose of the RPC is to come together for issues such as this even though it may affect certain jurisdictions more than others.

Ms. Wuerstle will move forward with this information and redraft the agenda. Commissioner Wilkins and several other members thanked Vice-Mayor Denham for his work on this issue.

**AGENDA ITEM #8**
**STAFF SUMMARIES**

This item was for information purposes only.

**AGENDA ITEM #9**
**CONSENT AGENDA**

**AGENDA ITEM #9(f)**
**Village of Estero Comp Plan Amendment DEO 16-1ESR**

Ms. Burr addressed FDOT’s concerns on purchasing the rail corridor.

**AGENDA ITEM #9(d)**
**2016 Glades-Hendry TDSP Annual Update**

Commissioner Wilkins had a correction on the list of schools.
Motion was made by Mr. Mulhere to approve the consent agenda with a change to Item 9(d). The motion was seconded by Councilman Banks and carried unanimously.

**AGENDA ITEM #10**
**COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**AGENDA ITEM #11(a)**
**Budget & Finance Committee**

Ms. Wuerstle stated the financial statement and budget amendments were addressed under the Directors Comments.

**AGENDA ITEM #11(b)**
**Economic Development Committee**

Ms. Pellechio presented a report on the RPC’s status as an Economic Development District and the CEDS plan.

**AGENDA ITEM #11(c)**
**Energy & Climate Committee**

Ms. Pellechio presented on the SolSmart program.

Commissioner Duffy added an update on Babcock Ranch’s solar power efforts with FPL.

**AGENDA ITEM #11(d)**
**Estero Bay Agency on Bay Management (EBABM) Committee**

Mr. Beever presented an update on the EBABM and the resurgence of sea grass.

**AGENDA ITEM #11(e)**
**Executive Committee**

Chair McCormick stated he had no report at this time.

**AGENDA ITEM #11(f)**
**Legislative Affairs Committee**

No report was given at this time.

**AGENDA ITEM #11(g)**
**Quality of Life & Safety Committee**

Mayor Shaw mentioned that the 4th Annual SWFL Brownfield Symposium will take place on June 8-9 in Sarasota.
AGENDA ITEM #11(h)
Regional Transportation Committee

Councilman Banks gave the report on a potential regional transportation plan.

Commissioner Doherty stated that he had a similar discussion with Secretary Hattaway.

AGENDA ITEM #11(i)
Interlocal Agreement/Future of the SWFRPC Committee

Commissioner Mann requested an update.

Ms. Wuerstle presented the options for the assessments and explained the current status of the State statutes and interlocal agreements. She then asked for the cities and counties to take a position on which option they would prefer. County Manager Mr. Desjarlais believes that the Lee County BOCC has taken a position. They do not support the counties paying for the cities and would like the cities to pay. Commissioner Pendergrass would like to have these options discussed by the Lee County BOCC.

A conversation insured about the State statutes vs. the interlocal agreements. Commissioner Doherty asked for a letter including all of the options to be distributed to the counties and cities.

Mr. Loveland with the Lee County Community Development Dept. explained Lee County’s unique position in this matter. Commissioner Pendergrass has asked his county attorney to review the statutes and the bylaws. Ms. Wuerstle asked Lee County to determine which city they would like to have the free seat.

AGENDA ITEM #11(j)
Water Quality & Water Resources Management

No report was given at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #12
NEW BUSINESS

None

AGENDA ITEM #13
STATE AGENCIES COMMENTS/REPORTS

FDEP - Mr. Iglehart announced the Annual Brownfields Symposium will be held on June 8 & 9 in Sarasota.

FDOT - Ms. Burr announced that the diverging diamond in Sarasota is ongoing and will be completed in 2017.
SFWMD – Mr. Flood announced the SFWMD Governing Board will be meeting in Lee County on June 9.

SWFWMD – No report.

**AGENDA ITEM #14
COUNCIL ATTORNEY’S COMMENTS**

No report was given at this time.

**AGENDA ITEM #15
COUNCIL MEMBER’S COMMENTS**

Councilman Fraize wanted to emphasize the importance of the resurgence of sea grass.

Councilman Wein was also excited about the increase in sea grass levels.

Mayor Shaw also saw the meeting on sea grass to be very productive.

Commissioner Mann called out a News Press headline stating “fishing is better than ever”.

Vice-Mayor Denham announced that his grandson qualified for the final of the NCAA Golf Tournament

**AGENDA ITEM #15
ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m.

Mr. Tommy Perry, Secretary

The meeting was duly advertised in the May 4, 2016 issue of the FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE REGISTER, Volume 42, Number 87.
MINUTES OF THE
SOUTHWEST FLORIDA REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
JUNE 16, 2016 MEETING

The meeting of the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council was held on June 16, 2016 at the offices of the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council – 1400 Colonial Boulevard, Suite #1 in Fort Myers, Florida. Chair McCormick called the meeting to order at 9:10 AM. Mayor Shaw then led an invocation and Councilman Fraize led the Pledge of Allegiance. Margaret Wuerstle conducted the roll call and noted that that a quorum was not present at the time of roll call.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Charlotte County: Commissioner Tricia Duffy, Commissioner Ken Doherty, Councilman Gary Wein, Mr. Don McCormick

Collier County: Councilman Rex Buxton, Mr. Bob Mulhere, Mr. Alan Reynolds

Glades County: None

Hendry County: Commissioner Julie Wilkins

Lee County: Commissioner Frank Mann, Commissioner Cecil Pendergrass, Councilman Forrest Banks, Vice-Mayor Mick Denham, Councilman Greg DeWitt

Sarasota County: Commissioner Carolyn Mason, Commissioner Charles Hines, Mayor Willie Shaw, Vice-Mayor Rhonda DiFranco, Councilman Fred Fraize

Ex-Officio: Mr. Phil Flood – SFWMD, Ms. Tara Poulton – SWFWMD, Mr. Jon Iglehart -FDEP, Ms. Derek Burr– FDOT

MEMBERS ABSENT

Charlotte County: Ms. Suzanne Graham

Collier County: Commissioner Tim Nance, Commissioner Penny Taylor

Glades County: Commissioner Weston Pryor, Councilwoman Pat Lucas, Commissioner Tim Stanley, Mr. Thomas Perry

Hendry County: Commissioner Don Davis, Commissioner Sherida Ridgdill, Commissioner Karson Turner, Mr. Mel Karau

Lee County: Councilman Jim Burch, Mayor Anita Cereceda, Ms. Laura Holquist

Sarasota County: Mr. Felipe Colón

Ex-Officio: None
AGENDA ITEM #4
PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comment was made at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #5
AGENDA

Chair McCormick recommended that due to the lack of a quorum, Agenda Item #7 – Director’s Report will be moved up to the beginning of the agenda.

AGENDA ITEM #6
MINUTES OF THE MARCH 17, 2016 & APRIL 21, 2016 MEETINGS

No action could be taken on this item at the time due to lack of quorum.

AGENDA ITEM #7
DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Ms. Wuerstle presented the Directors Report.

Ms. Wuerstle asked that the council discuss the July and August meeting dates. Several local governments are in recess in July and the scheduled August date clashes with the Florida League of Cities meeting, so it may be difficult to obtain a quorum for these months. Mayor Shaw stated that he would be attending the League of Cities meeting. Commissioner Mann noted that Lee County is in recess for July. Chair McCormick recommended that the Council cancel the July and August meetings. Commissioner Mason added that Sarasota County is also in recess for sections of July and August. Mr. Mulhere noted that two months is a long time to go without taking action and the RPC may have decisions that need to be made during that time. He asked if the Executive Board could be granted the authority to make decisions during that time. Ms. Wuerstle added that the FY2016-17 budget would need to be approved in July or August if a quorum is not present to vote for this meeting. Councilman Wein recommended that we have a meeting at some point during this time. Chair McCormick asked if the July meeting should be moved up and Mr. Mulhere recommended July 14. The Council members stated whether or not they would be able to attend on July 14.

Mr. Stoltzfus provided a report on the Brownfield Symposium. Chair McCormick thanked Mayor Shaw for his hospitality in regards to the Brownfield Symposium. Mayor Shaw was very grateful that the City of Sarasota was selected to host the symposium and emphasized the importance of the event.

Ms. Wuerstle presented the May financials.
Ms. Wuerstle announced that the RPC was awarded the Federal Promise Zones Designation in Glades and Hendry Counties and Immokalee. Chair McCormick thanked Ms. Wuerstle and the RPC staff and noted that there were only two rural designations in the entire nation and that we were the only Regional Planning Council that was awarded the designation.

AGENDA ITEM #7(a)
Proposed FY2016-17 Budget

Ms. Wuerstle presented the proposed FY2016-17 budget.

At this time Vice-Mayor DiFranco, Vice-Mayor Denham, Commissioner Pendergrass joined the meeting and a quorum was reached. Action was taken on the following items:

Motion was made by Commissioner Wilkins to move the July meeting to July 14 and cancel the August meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mulhere and carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mr. Mulhere to approve the June agenda. The motion was seconded by Mayor Shaw and carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Councilman Fraize to approve the March and April 2016 minutes with two typo corrections. The motion was seconded by Councilman Wein and carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Commissioner Mann to approve the FY 2016-17 budget. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Doherty and carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM #8
STAFF SUMMARIES

This item was for information purposes only.

AGENDA ITEM #9
CONSENT AGENDA

Motion was made by Commissioner Doherty to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mulhere and carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM #10
REGIONAL IMPACT

AGENDA ITEM #10(a)
Palmer Ranch Increment XXIV and MDO NOPC

Mr. Trescott presented the item.
Councilman Fraize asked how shelters are addressed regarding SWFL’s development growth. Mr. Trescott stated that this DRI had hurricane evacuation addressed in the Master Development Order and this site is outside the Category 3 zone. Ms. Allred, who represents the applicant, noted that they coordinated with Sarasota County on shelter availability and it was determined that no additional shelters were needed. Councilman Wein explained that the State of Florida is very well prepared to deal with hurricanes.

Mr. Mulhere suggested scheduling a presentation from Mr. Trescott and Emergency Management directors from the region to provide an update on hurricane evacuation planning practices. He also noted that building codes are much stronger since Hurricane Andrew. Commissioner Wilkins added that gated communities such as this have community centers that could be used as shelters. Councilman Wein stated that this is an important topic and one that the RPC should concern itself with.

Commissioner Mann asked for clarification on Sarasota County’s limited certification process. Mr. Trescott explained that this was done to keep the RPC involved in the DRI process.

Mr. Reynolds abstained from the vote.

A motion was made by Mayor Shaw to approve staff’s recommendations as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mulhere and carried with one abstention.

AGENDA ITEM #10(b)
The Commons NOPC

Mr. Trescott presented the item. This NOPC was presented to the RPC in May, but there was an error on one of the maps. Mr. Mulhere explained the error in the map.

Mr. Mulhere abstained from the vote.

A motion was made by Commissioner Wilkins to approve staff’s recommendations as presented. The motion was seconded by Mayor Shaw and carried with one abstention.

AGENDA ITEM #11
COMMITTEE REPORTS

AGENDA ITEM #11(a)
Budget & Finance Committee

The financial statement was addressed under Directors Comments.

A motion was made by Mr. Mulhere to accept the May financials as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Doherty and carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM #11(b)
Economic Development Committee

No report was given at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #11(c)
Energy & Climate Committee

No report was given at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #11(d)
Estero Bay Agency on Bay Management (EBABM) Committee

Mr. Beever presented an update on the EBABM.

Commissioner Mann asked when the sea grass studies were conducted. Mr. Beever clarified that it took place in 2014 and does not include the heavy rains from earlier in 2016. He went on to explain the methodology of the study. Mr. Flood and Mr. Beever explained that it took so long for this data to be published because the results needed to be confirmed through physical inspections. Mr. Beever stated that the results are positive for our region as a whole, but sea grass is declining in some areas and it is difficult to determine sea grass levels in the Caloosahatchee. Mr. Flood confirmed that there was some increase in the Caloosahatchee. Commissioner Mann noted that this is the first study he remembers that shows positive results. Mr. Beever commended the local governments on their efforts to improve water quality. Chair McCormick thanked Vice-Mayor Denham for his work on fertilizer. Commissioner Doherty asked what the baseline data was for this research. Mr. Beaver stated that the earliest data is from 1953.

Councilman Fraize asked if there was a correlation between the rise in sea grass levels and the rise in oysters. Mr. Beaver stated that the oyster increases often occur in different areas than the sea grass increases.

AGENDA ITEM #11(e)
Executive Committee

No report was given at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #11(f)
Legislative Affairs Committee

No report was given at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #11(g)
Quality of Life & Safety Committee

Mayor Shaw gave thanks for the Brownfield Symposium.

AGENDA ITEM #11(h)
Regional Transportation Committee

No report was given at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #11(i)
Interlocal Agreement/Future of the SWFRPC Committee

No report was given at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #11(j)
Water Quality & Water Resources Management

Vice-Mayor Denham sent a report to Ms. Wuerstle, who sent it to the RPC members. Mr. Flood explained that this form was put together by the Florida League of Cities and looks at the 16 counties of the SFWMD.

AGENDA ITEM #12
NEW BUSINESS

None

AGENDA ITEM #13
STATE AGENCIES COMMENTS/REPORTS

SWFWMD – Ms. Poulton stated that the SWFWMD is prepping for their Annual Cooperative Funding Initiative. She also noted that their executive director is leaving.

FDEP – Mr. Iglehart announced that FDEP is doing a waste tire roundup to help prevent zika in Naples.

SFWMD – Mr. Flood announced the SFWMD is getting ready to kick off their water supply plan effort and the first workshop is in Bonita Springs on June 30.

FDOT –Ms. Burr announced that a position was taken on the rail corridor at the last Lee County MPO meeting. Projects must be 50% funded by the US DOT, 25% by FDOT, and 25% by local governments and must compete with all other projects. Commissioner Mann stated that this is still a long way off.

Commissioner Doherty shared part of a discussion with FDOT’s Secretary Hattaway regarding increased cooperation between the region’s MPOs and the importance of regional transportation.

AGENDA ITEM #14
COUNCIL ATTORNEY’S COMMENTS

Ms. Nightingale added some notes on the Promise Zones Designation: Since 2014 over $550 million in funding was provided to Promise Zone designees by the federal government. It’s still
possible that the government will provide tax incentives to companies that relocate within Promise Zones.

AGENDA ITEM #15
COUNCIL MEMBER’S COMMENTS

Councilman Fraize wanted to thank everyone for making his 48th wedding anniversary one to remember.

Councilman Wein wished everyone a happy and safe 4th of July.

Commissioner Mann asked what date was set for the Water Symposium. Mr. Stoltzfus stated that September 22 was the tentative date. Commissioner Mann gave an update on a positive trip that he had in Washington with the US Army Corp of Engineers and he invited them to present in Lee County. He explained that more federal money is coming down to SWFL than ever, contrary to popular opinion. He wants the Corp to educate the population before the rainy season begins. He recommended that our Water Symposium build off of the Corp’s presentation.

Commissioner Pendergrass asked that the interlocal agreement issue not be discussed in July. Council agreed that this discussion will not be had until all sides are fully represented.

Chair McCormick offered to speak for the RPC at any upcoming meetings and stressed the importance of the RPC’s role in SWFL.

Commissioner Wilkins wanted to thank the RPC staff on the DEO grant.

AGENDA ITEM #15
ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:26 a.m.

____________________________________________
Mr. Tommy Perry, Secretary

The meeting was duly advertised in the June 7, 2016 issue of the FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE REGISTER, Volume 42, Number 110.
Director’s Report
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT: 15, 2016

Mission Statement:
To work together across neighboring communities to consistently protect and improve the unique and relatively unspoiled character of the physical, economic and social worlds we share...for the benefit of our future generations.

1. Management / Operations

   a. Budget
      • 2016-2017 FY Budget AMENDMENT
   b. Operations
      • CEDS Annual Update
      • New Policy: Tuition Reimbursement Policy
      • Updates to the SWFRPC adopted By-Laws

2. Resource Development and Capacity Building

   • Florida Chamber Foundation meetings
   • Legislative Priorities: Promise Zone Recognition; Regional Transportation Plan;
   • Regional Economic Development Opportunity Map
   • FRCA Monthly Activity Report attached
   • Promise Zone Update
   • DEM letter regarding Nichole Gwinnett
   • Two scientific papers have been published with James W Beever III as an author.

3. Third Quarter FY 2015-2016 (April - June)

- Grants Awarded:
  - ✔ DEO grant Labelle Marketing Plan $20,000 Approved
  - ✔ The Promise Zone designation was approved for Hendry County, Glades County and Immokalee
  - ✔ EPA Wetland Mitigation Strategy, $220,000 (over 2 years)
  - ✔ HMEP, $60,349

- Grants Under Development
  - ✔ FHREDI - Regional Rural Development Grant - On Hold
  - ✔ EPA Environmental Education local grants program $91,000
  - ✔ NEA --Our Town Grant for City of Clewiston for placemaking
  - ✔ NEA-- Our Town Grant for Immokalee park
  - ✔ Kresge grant for Ft Myers MLK public art center piece
  - ✔ Kresge grant for City of Clewiston public art placemaking grant
  - ✔ NOAA Mangrove impacts and Restoration; $200,000

- Grants Pending:
  - ✔ Shirley Conroy Grant for Goodwheels $245,799
  - ✔ USDA Farmers Market Promotion Program $100,000 for Clewiston Feasibility Study
  - ✔ NEA, Artworks grant for a Regional Strategy for Enhancing Public Art, $75,000
  - ✔ DEP Cape Coal Climate Resiliency Plan, $15,000

- Pending Grants: approximately $435,799
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## FY 17 Proposed Budget

**OCTOBER 1, 2016 TO SEPTEMBER 30, 2017**

### Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>SWFRPC General Fund</th>
<th>SWFRPC Special Revenue</th>
<th>2017 Budget Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>$485,948</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$485,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secured Federal/State Grants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>96,934</td>
<td>96,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Program Development (Unsecured Grants/Contracts)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secured Contractual</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRIs/NOPCs/Other Reviews</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest/Misc</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Balance from Audit YE 9/30/15 (FY14/15)</strong></td>
<td>588,437</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>588,437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Income (Revenue)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>SWFRPC General Fund</th>
<th>SWFRPC Special Revenue</th>
<th>2017 Budget Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,080,385</td>
<td>$285,834</td>
<td>$1,366,219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

#### Direct:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>SWFRPC General Fund</th>
<th>SWFRPC Special Revenue</th>
<th>2017 Budget Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries (A)</td>
<td>$218,569</td>
<td>$207,472</td>
<td>$426,041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA</td>
<td>32,592</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32,592</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers Compensation</td>
<td>3,687</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>47,769</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47,769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Insurance (B)</td>
<td>63,090</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63,090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Personnel Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>SWFRPC General Fund</th>
<th>SWFRPC Special Revenue</th>
<th>2017 Budget Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$365,707</td>
<td>$207,472</td>
<td>$573,179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Operational Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>SWFRPC General Fund</th>
<th>SWFRPC Special Revenue</th>
<th>2017 Budget Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultants (C)</td>
<td>$33,100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$33,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant/Consulting - Contractual (D)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Fees</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>9,680</td>
<td>15,680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental (E)</td>
<td>7,190</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance (F)</td>
<td>10,566</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,566</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair/Maint. (Grounds/Bldg/Equip)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing/Reproduction</td>
<td>2,581</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,681</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities (Elec/Internet)</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Miscellaneous</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Service Charges</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Related Expenses (G)</td>
<td>21,671</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21,671</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues and Memberships (H)</td>
<td>25,310</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings/Events</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay-Operations</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay-Building</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease Long Term</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Balance from Audit YE 9/30/15 (FY14/15)</strong></td>
<td>588,437</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>588,437</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operational Expense**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>SWFRPC General Fund</th>
<th>SWFRPC Special Revenue</th>
<th>2017 Budget Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$795,305</td>
<td>$11,055</td>
<td>$806,360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fringe/Indirect Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>SWFRPC General Fund</th>
<th>SWFRPC Special Revenue</th>
<th>2017 Budget Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(67,307)</td>
<td>67,307</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Utilized Reserve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>SWFRPC General Fund</th>
<th>SWFRPC Special Revenue</th>
<th>2017 Budget Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13,320)</td>
<td>(13,320)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Operational Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>SWFRPC General Fund</th>
<th>SWFRPC Special Revenue</th>
<th>2017 Budget Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$714,678</td>
<td>$78,362</td>
<td>$793,040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Cash Outlays**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>SWFRPC General Fund</th>
<th>SWFRPC Special Revenue</th>
<th>2017 Budget Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,080,385</td>
<td>$285,834</td>
<td>$1,366,219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Income/Loss**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>SWFRPC General Fund</th>
<th>SWFRPC Special Revenue</th>
<th>2017 Budget Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*This amount was determined based on three previous years budgets which brought in at least $100,000 in additional revenue after the budget was adopted.

**Fund Balance from Audit YE 9/30/15 (FY14/15)** - included in this fund is the investments, operating funds and net of all assets and liabilities as of 9/30/15.
### REVENUE SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET REVENUES</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County/City Assessments</td>
<td>$485,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secured Federal/State Grants</td>
<td>96,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Development (Unsecured Grants/Contracts)</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secured Contractual</td>
<td>3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRIs/NOPCs/Other Reviews</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest/Misc</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$777,782</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CASH, CASH EQUIVALENTS, INVESTMENTS (as of May 30, 2016):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FineMark Bank - MM</td>
<td>$534,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Surplus - Fund A</td>
<td>135,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FineMark - Operating</td>
<td>88,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash, Cash Equivalents, Investments</strong></td>
<td><strong>$759,244</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pie chart shows the distribution of budget revenues and cash, cash equivalents, and investments.
## FY 17 REVENUE SOURCES

OCTOBER 1, 2016 TO SEPTEMBER 30, 2017

### GENERAL REVENUES

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest/Misc.</td>
<td>$ 6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>$ 485,948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 491,948</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SPECIAL REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federal/State Grants</th>
<th>Contractual</th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 96,934</td>
<td>$ 188,900</td>
<td><strong>$ 285,834</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Total Revenues**: $ 777,782
- **FY15 Fund Balance**: $ 588,437
- **Total Budget**: $ 1,366,219

### MEMBER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Population 2015 (BEBR Estimates)</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte County</td>
<td>167,141</td>
<td>$ 50,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier County</td>
<td>343,802</td>
<td>103,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glades County</td>
<td>12,853</td>
<td>3,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendry County</td>
<td>38,096</td>
<td>11,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee County (Unincorporated)</td>
<td>367,608</td>
<td>110,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cape Coral</td>
<td>166,508</td>
<td>49,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Myers</td>
<td>72,395</td>
<td>21,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Fort Myers Beach</td>
<td>6,264</td>
<td>1,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Bonita Springs</td>
<td>46,568</td>
<td>13,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sanibel</td>
<td>6,502</td>
<td>1,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota County</td>
<td>392,090</td>
<td>117,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assessments</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,619,827</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 485,948</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest/Misc.</td>
<td>$ 6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABM Sponsorship</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 491,948</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SPECIAL REVENUES FEDERAL/STATE GRANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Federal/State Grants</th>
<th>Contractual</th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEM - Title III</td>
<td>$ 44,250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 44,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL CTD-Glades/Hendry TD</td>
<td>28,880</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier Hazard Analysis</td>
<td>8,054</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>15,750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQG-Glades</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRI/NOPC Fees</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Development (Unsecured Grants/Contracts)</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total RPC Special Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 96,934</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 188,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 285,834</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessments based upon official Bureau of Business and Economic Research population estimates.

Assessments are estimated at 30 cents/capita as provided for in the Council's Interlocal Agreement, adopted November 8, 1973.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual FY 2012</th>
<th>Actual FY 2013</th>
<th>Actual FY 2014</th>
<th>Actual FY 2015</th>
<th>Budget FY 2016 Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>$ 459,517</td>
<td>$ 462,218</td>
<td>$ 469,411</td>
<td>$ 472,879</td>
<td>$ 477,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal/State/Local Funds/Contract.</td>
<td>1,890,422</td>
<td>1,839,113</td>
<td>1,581,167</td>
<td>399,968</td>
<td>557,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>190,067</td>
<td>90,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRIs/NOPCs/Monitoring</td>
<td>93,546</td>
<td>42,625</td>
<td>41,265</td>
<td>88,523</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest/Misc</td>
<td>9,565</td>
<td>24,732</td>
<td>39,057</td>
<td>4,347</td>
<td>6,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Income</td>
<td>28,750</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>542,977</td>
<td>708,484</td>
<td>748,896</td>
<td>588,437</td>
<td>588,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>$ 2,996,027</td>
<td>$ 3,105,922</td>
<td>$ 2,894,796</td>
<td>$ 1,745,471</td>
<td>$ 1,755,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries - Total</td>
<td>$ 1,165,861</td>
<td>$ 1,006,838</td>
<td>$ 982,363</td>
<td>$ 609,843</td>
<td>$ 519,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA/Workers Comp/Unemployment</td>
<td>101,321</td>
<td>83,783</td>
<td>76,524</td>
<td>49,691</td>
<td>43,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>60,395</td>
<td>63,019</td>
<td>101,994</td>
<td>63,714</td>
<td>60,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Insurance</td>
<td>127,272</td>
<td>118,764</td>
<td>136,255</td>
<td>98,290</td>
<td>79,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel Services</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,454,849</td>
<td>$ 1,272,403</td>
<td>$ 1,297,136</td>
<td>$ 821,538</td>
<td>$ 702,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Fees</td>
<td>59,430</td>
<td>87,014</td>
<td>35,525</td>
<td>57,588</td>
<td>54,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant/Consulting Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63,533</td>
<td>92,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEP Contractual</td>
<td>275,454</td>
<td>326,993</td>
<td>356,951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEP-Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO Contractual</td>
<td>89,523</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Fees</td>
<td>44,430</td>
<td>43,543</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>36,820</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>42,369</td>
<td>48,185</td>
<td>27,273</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>6,754</td>
<td>8,224</td>
<td>6,554</td>
<td>5,749</td>
<td>5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>30,524</td>
<td>19,925</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>3,173</td>
<td>4,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental</td>
<td>21,961</td>
<td>7,016</td>
<td>6,799</td>
<td>7,964</td>
<td>7,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>21,559</td>
<td>25,091</td>
<td>20,683</td>
<td>22,970</td>
<td>17,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair/Maint. (Grounds/Bldg/Equip)</td>
<td>15,668</td>
<td>17,497</td>
<td>19,499</td>
<td>10,311</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing/Reproduction</td>
<td>53,373</td>
<td>73,954</td>
<td>5,539</td>
<td>6,431</td>
<td>8,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities (Elec, water, garb)</td>
<td>22,572</td>
<td>22,226</td>
<td>23,470</td>
<td>20,889</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>10,018</td>
<td>3,218</td>
<td>2,827</td>
<td>7,766</td>
<td>2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Miscellaneous</td>
<td>9,897</td>
<td>3,979</td>
<td>4,923</td>
<td>5,162</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncollectable Receivables</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Service Charges</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>2,745</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>13,695</td>
<td>13,870</td>
<td>9,853</td>
<td>4,494</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Related Expenses</td>
<td>39,155</td>
<td>40,011</td>
<td>41,876</td>
<td>27,326</td>
<td>24,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>1,338</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad debt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues and Memberships</td>
<td>32,659</td>
<td>35,484</td>
<td>14,037</td>
<td>25,510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>37,486</td>
<td>3,225</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings/Events</td>
<td>22,333</td>
<td>20,580</td>
<td>3,065</td>
<td>26,771</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay-Operations</td>
<td>15,056</td>
<td>27,792</td>
<td>15,375</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay-Building</td>
<td>4,324</td>
<td>8,185</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Debt (Building Loan)</td>
<td>127,751</td>
<td>127,751</td>
<td>127,751</td>
<td>127,751</td>
<td>21,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease Long Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for Operations Expense</td>
<td>542,977</td>
<td>708,484</td>
<td>748,896</td>
<td>588,437</td>
<td>588,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash Outlays</strong></td>
<td>$ 2,972,919</td>
<td>$ 2,940,415</td>
<td>$ 2,854,384</td>
<td>$ 1,905,930</td>
<td>$ 1,755,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Income/(Loss)</strong></td>
<td>$ 23,109</td>
<td>$ 165,507</td>
<td>$ 40,412</td>
<td>(160,459)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SALARY EXPENSES

**TABLE (A)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION TITLE CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>CLASSIFICATION LEVEL</th>
<th>10/1/2015 SALARY RANGE</th>
<th>HOURLY RATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL SALARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>As determined by Council</td>
<td>$ 57.13</td>
<td>$ 118,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Counsel</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner IV (Environmental)</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>27.53 - 39.89</td>
<td>33.64</td>
<td>69,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner II</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>20.07 - 31.74</td>
<td>26.29</td>
<td>54,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner I</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>18.90 - 27.31</td>
<td>27.79</td>
<td>57,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner I</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>18.90 - 27.31</td>
<td>19.57</td>
<td>40,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS Manager</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>20.26 - 32.99</td>
<td>32.98</td>
<td>68,598</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $ 426,041
### HEALTH INSURANCE

#### TABLE (B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSURANCE TYPE</th>
<th>COVERAGE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Employee Only</td>
<td>$53,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental</td>
<td>Employee Only</td>
<td>2,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln: Life and Disability (Short &amp; Long Terms)</td>
<td>Employee Only</td>
<td>6,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSA</td>
<td>Employee Only</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$63,090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### HEALTH INSURANCE

#### CHART (B)

- Health: $53,103
- Dental: $2,609
- Lincoln: Life and Disability (Short & Long Terms): $6,778
- FSA: $600

![Health Insurance Chart](chart.png)
## CONSULTANT FEES
### TABLE (C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSULTANT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hughes Snell &amp; Co.</td>
<td>CPA Firm - Review of Financials, Budget and Audit assistance</td>
<td>$7,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trescott Planning Solutions, LLC</td>
<td>Planning Services</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGCU Public Media</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster &amp; Foster</td>
<td>Annual preparation of OPEB obligation (Audit requirement)</td>
<td>3,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>IT - support/consulting</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk of Courts</td>
<td>IT-support/consulting</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$33,100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CONSULTANT FEES
### CHART (C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSULTANT</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hughes Snell &amp; Co.</td>
<td>$7,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trescott Planning Solutions, LLC</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGCU Public Media</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster &amp; Foster</td>
<td>3,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk of Courts</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$33,100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CONTRACTUAL TABLE (D)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRANT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HMEP</td>
<td>Contract not received as of 6/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONTRACTUAL CHART (D)**

- $1
- $1
- $1
- $1
- $0
- $0
- $-

HMEP - Contract not received as of 6/2016
## EQUIPMENT RENTAL

### TABLE (E)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IKON Rioch copier</td>
<td>$5,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail Finance Postage Machine</td>
<td>$1,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culligan Water Water Cooler</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,190</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EQUIPMENT RENTAL CHART (E)

- **IKON**
  - Rioch copier: $5,038
- **Mail Finance**
  - Postage Machine: $1,852
- **Culligan Water**
  - Water Cooler: $300

---
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# INSURANCE

## TABLE (F)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PREMIUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Owners</td>
<td>General Liability - $2,000,000</td>
<td>$3,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director's &amp; Officers Liability</td>
<td>$1,000,000 each occurrence</td>
<td>4,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>Property Damage/ Uninsured Motorist</td>
<td>2,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>Employee dishonesty - $100,000</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$10,566</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## INSURANCE CHART (F)

- **General Liability** - $2,000,000: $3,434
- **Director's & Officers Liability** - $1,000,000 each occurrence: $4,550
- **Property Damage/ Uninsured Motorist**: $2,152
- **Employee dishonesty - $100,000**: $430
## COMPUTER RELATED

### TABLE (G)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LICENSES</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sage Peachtree (Accounting Software)</td>
<td>$2,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMI (Modeling Software)</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArcView (GIS)</td>
<td>8,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Quick</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Licenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,117</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardware &amp; Misc.</td>
<td>$2,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Connection - Clerk of Courts (Firewall)</td>
<td>1,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,671</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## COMPUTER RELATED

### CHART (G)

- **Total Licenses**: $18,117
- **Hardware & Misc.**: $2,527
- **Internet Connection - Clerk of Courts (Firewall)**: $1,027
## DUES & MEMBERSHIPS
### TABLE (H)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRCA</td>
<td>Florida Regional Council Association</td>
<td>$20,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULI</td>
<td>Urban Land Institute</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHREDI</td>
<td>Florida Heartland Regional Economic Development Initiative</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$23,715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRANT RELATED SUBSCRIPTIONS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEDC</td>
<td>Florida Economic Development Council</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEDC</td>
<td>IEDC</td>
<td>1,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Grant Related</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $25,310

### CHART (H)

![Dues & Memberships Chart](chart.png)
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DEM Letter Regarding Nichole Gwinnett
July 7, 2016

To whom it may concern:

This letter of reference is written on behalf of Ms. Nichole Gwinnett, Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council. Ms. Gwinnett was assigned Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC) coordinator for the Regional Council with very short notice, and under extremely difficult circumstances. At the time Nichole assumed her role as coordinator, the Southwest Regional Planning Council had lost all Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness training funds for failure to perform. During the three years prior to Ms. Gwinnett assuming staff responsibilities fewer than 50 responders had received training directly from HMEP grant funds. In April 2015 Nichole attended her first LEPC/SERC meeting. During the meeting she noted she had assumed responsibility for the HMEP grant as well as other functions of the LEPC coordinator and asked for assistance and guidance from her peers and the state.

Personal observations during the meeting and subsequent changes at the Council, made it immediately apparent the status quo was not an option. Ms. Gwinnett established a Training Sub-Committee within her LEPC membership. That committee identified training needs and provided them to Nichole who, in turn, submitted the requests to the State. This series of events jumpstarted the training program! What had been a slight trickle of training requests, blossomed into an avalanche of pent up desire for hazmat training classes. SWFRPC easily utilized all allocated funding for their area and then some during the first year of Nichole’s tenure. Since that inaugural day, the Council has been authorized to receive and distribute their training funds once again. Ms. Gwinnett was instrumental in restoring a program which had been all but lost to neglect. Additionally, she has spearheaded the development of a well-equipped training trailer for use in training first responders at reduced cost.

Ms. Gwinnett is the consummate team player. Through her diligent and dedicated efforts she has most definitely saved the HMEP training program at the RPC, and more importantly, was able to provide training which would have been lost. Nichole is to be congratulated for her unwavering efforts in support of the Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act, Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness program and overall dedication to southwest Florida first responders.

Sincerely,

Paul Wotherspoon  
Chief, Technological Hazards  
Senior Staff, State Emergency Response Commission  
Florida Division of Emergency Management
Tuition Reimbursement Policy
Tuition/Educational Expense Reimbursement Policy

SWFRPC supports employees who wish to continue their education to secure increased responsibility and growth within their professional careers. In keeping with this philosophy, SWFRPC has established a reimbursement program for expenses incurred through approved institutions of learning. If you are a full-time, regular employee and have completed at least twelve (12) consecutive months of continuous employment with SWFRPC, you are eligible for participation in this program provided that the courses are job-related.

SWFRPC will reimburse up to a maximum of $2000 per year incurred by an employee for continuing education through an accredited program that either offers growth in an area related to his or her current position or might lead to promotional opportunities. This education may include college credit courses, continuing education unit courses, seminars and certification tests. You must secure a passing grade of “B” or its equivalent or obtain a certification to receive any reimbursement. Expenses must be validated by receipts, and a copy of the final grade card or certification must be presented to show hours or certification received.

Payment may be made to the institution or reimbursed to the employee.

Employees who receive tuition/educational expense reimbursement agree to repay SWFRPC for all tuition/educational expense reimbursement if they do not continue to be employed by SWFRPC for a period of two years subsequent to the reimbursement. Employer shall first reduce any personal leave pay owed to employee and will advise the employee of any remaining amount owed to Employer. Nothing herein modifies the at will employment relationship between Employer and employees.

Procedures

To receive tuition reimbursement, employees should follow the procedures listed here:

- The employee must provide his or her manager with information about the course for which he or she would like to receive reimbursement.
- The pre-approval section of the tuition reimbursement form should be completed and all the appropriate signatures obtained prior to enrolling.
- After completion of the course, the employee should resubmit the original tuition reimbursement form with the reimbursement section filled out, including appropriate signatures, as well as receipts and evidence of a passing grade or certification attached.

REIMBURSEMENT FORM HERE
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF TUITION ASSISTANCE

I, ____________________________, understand and agree that in consideration of my employment by SWFRPC and the specialized education reimbursement policy that I will reimburse SWFRPC for all expenses relating to SWFRPC’s reimbursement of education expenses and such costs will be treated as a loan, subject to the following terms and conditions:

Value Reimbursement/ Resignation

In the event that I voluntarily resign from SWFRPC during the two (2) year period after reimbursement by SWFRPC of such educational expenses, I agree to repay all of the costs and expenses incurred by SWFRPC. I understand that Employer shall first reduce any personal leave pay owed to employee and will advise the employee of any remaining amount owed to Employer. I agree to repay to Employer any amount owed within one week of notification of the balance I owe after offset from personal leave pay.

Employment At-Will

This employment shall be on an at-will basis, and not for any definite employment term., i.e. either SWFRPC or I may terminate this employment relationship at any time, for any reason, with or without notice.

I understand and agree that this Memorandum of Agreement does not constitute a contract of employment and I understand that this Memorandum of Agreement does not grant me any rights, privileges or benefits from SWFRPC nor does it change my at-will status of employment.

I understand that this agreement does not alter any other terms or conditions of my employment with SWFRPC as set forth in its Employee’s Policy Manual.

_________________________________________________________________

Employee Signature and Date
Florida Chamber Foundation Meetings
Charles Kammerer

From: Mike Busha <mbusha@tcrpc.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2016 3:24 PM
To: Austin Mount; Chris Rietow; Hugh Harling; Isabel Carballo; Margaret Wuerstle; 'Patricia Steed'; 'Scott Koons'; Sean Sullivan; Teeple, Brian
Cc: 'Mike Busha'
Subject: FW: Florida Chamber Foundation: Attend the Florida 2030 Martin County Town Hall

FYI – this was sent from FCF to Michael. See below for hosting information.

Stephanie

From: Whitney Harris [mailto:wharris@flchamber.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2016 3:13 PM
To: Mr. Michael Busha
Subject: Florida Chamber Foundation: Attend the Florida 2030 Martin County Town Hall

Is Martin County Ready For The Future?

By 2030, six million additional residents will call Florida home, and two million more jobs will be needed. Is Martin County ready? To prepare for this continued growth, and secure our future success, we need a plan that develops high-wage jobs, diversifies the economy, ensures global competitiveness and creates vibrant communities.

- How do we capture the next generation of jobs and ensure prosperity?
- What are the priorities we should focus on to remain competitive?
- What trends, issues, or disruptions will drive our region’s future?

Through a series of interactive town hall events across Florida, the Florida Chamber Foundation’s two-year research program will engage business and community leaders in identifying key trends and factors that can drive their regional economy. The Chamber Foundation will be in Martin County on Thursday, August 25, 2016. Help write the next chapter of Martin County and the state of Florida by registering for this Florida 2030 Town Hall today.

[REGISTER]

For more information, contact Whitney Harris at wharris@flfoundation.org or (850) 521-1237.
Florida 2030 Martin County Town Hall hosted by Stuart/Martin County Chamber of Commerce and McCarthy, Summers, Bobko, Wood, Norman, Bass & Melby, P.A.
FRCA Monthly Reports
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AGENDA Item 9
Denise Imbler
FRCA Coordinator
(850) 509-4320

MONTHLY ACTIVITY REPORT: July/August 2016

RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT/CAPACITY BUILDING and OUTREACH

- Formatted and distributed the July and August Newsletters.
- To enhance partnerships and strengthen the relationship between regional planning councils and their state and federal partners, participated in or attended the following meetings:
  - Rural Economic Development Initiative (REDI) – July 15th
  - FDOT Safe Mobility for Life Coalition – July 19th and 20th
  - Future of Florida Forum Partners monthly conference call – July 25th
- Shared and researched potential funding opportunities regarding:
  - Countering Violent Extremism Grant
  - National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine Healthy Communities Grant
  - Department of Economic Opportunity assistance with peril of flood COMP plan requirements

ASSOCIATION MANAGEMENT

- Assisted with the development and collection of statewide project initiatives for the Legislative Committee.
- Completed the 4th quarter and end-of-year report for the Department of Economic Opportunity’s Strategic Plan for Economic Development Reporting Protocol
- Updated the FRCA Website to address regular maintenance issues and post meeting agendas, summaries and monthly newsletters.
- Prepared for and participated in the July 7 – 8, 2016 EDAC and Policy Board meetings.
- Finalized the logistics, secured speakers, developed agendas, and drafted meeting materials for the August 18 - 19, 2016 FRCA EDAC and Partners meetings.
- Finalized logistics and prepared hand-out materials for the Florida League of Cities Conference.
- Secured exhibit hall space and submitted graphics for the Florida American Planning Association Conference in Tampa.
- Secured a hotel room block and meeting location for the September, October and December FRCA EDAC, Partners and Policy Board meetings.
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Legislative Priorities
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1. Senate Sponsor: [Click here to enter text.]

2. Date of Request: [Click here to enter a date.]

3. Project/Program Description:

Regional Economic Development Opportunity Map: The project concept is to develop a regional interactive map to enable local leaders, developers and site selectors to quickly identify key locations for economic development. The map will include shovel ready sites as well as potential development sites along with pertinent information on each site. Potential development sites will include a description of what is needed to make the site shovel ready, thereby informing local Capital Improvement Plans. As improvements are made to sites, the map will be updated with current information. A toolbox will be created with information that will allow Southwest Florida’s 6 county region to collaborate using this tool. Funding is requested to develop a regional development opportunity map with relevant information such as: Identified clusters, Utility availability/capacity data, Preliminary soils report, Floodplain data, Wetlands identification, Site map & aerial depiction, if a brownfield: environmental status and/or reports, Information on area colleges, Information on top employers in each county, City and County demographics and Links to City and County websites. A toolbox will be created to allow this project to be replicated in other Florida counties.

4. Amount of Request:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Requested for Operations</th>
<th>Amount Requested for Fixed Capital Outlay</th>
<th>Total Amount of Requested State Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>[Click here to enter text.]</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Total Project Cost (if greater than Total Requested State Funds): $360,000

6. Type, Amount and Percent of Match:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and In-Kind</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Was the project previously funded by the State? No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year(s)</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Click here to enter text.]</td>
<td>[Click here to enter text.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Click here to enter text.]</td>
<td>[Click here to enter text.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Click here to enter text.]</td>
<td>[Click here to enter text.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Is future-year funding likely to be requested? No

9. Program Performance (if needed, include additional documentation):

a. How will requested funds be spent? Include supporting documentation.

The funds will be spent to develop a GIS map for Hendry, Glades, Charlotte, Lee, Collier and Sarasota counties that shows development opportunity sites. The map will include Identified clusters, Utility availability/capacity data, Preliminary soils report, Floodplain data, Wetlands identification, Site map & aerial depiction, if a brownfield: environmental status and/or reports, Information on area colleges, Information on top employers in the City, City and County demographics and Links to City and County websites. The map will be interactive to allow updating as new information is available and development occurs.

b. Identify expected program results and the expected benefit associated from the requested funds.
This project will improve the region’s competitiveness with site selectors by providing relevant information on key development projects and real estate opportunities, thereby improving the ability to attract more high-tech jobs. Additionally, the map will inform local Capital Improvement Plans, thereby, allowing strategic investment of limited funds to make shovel ready sites available. Furthermore, this project will develop a format and model to expand this concept on a state level. A Regional Economic Development Opportunity Map is a crucial element in attracting manufacturing and high-tech jobs to the Southwest Florida Region because site selectors look first at the region before narrowing their search to specific sites.

c. Who will benefit from receipt of State funds?

The Southwest Florida Region's 6 counties and 17 local governments will benefit from the State funds.

d. What specific measures will be used to document performance data for the project, if it receives funds?

1) Completion of the interactive map with the following information: shovel ready commercial and industrial sites with identified clusters, utility availability/capacity data, preliminary soils report, floodplain data, wetlands identification, site map & aerial depiction, if a brownfield: environmental status and/or reports, information on area colleges, information on top employers in the City, City and County demographics and Links to City and County websites. 2) A toolbox is created to allow this project to be replicated throughout the state with information on how to collaborate with the counties and cities using this tool. 3) Number of development sites identified in the Southwest Florida Region.

10. Requestor Contact information:

a. Name and Title: Don McCormick, Chairman

b. Organization: Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council

c. E-mail Address: Mwuerstle@swfrpc.org

d. Phone Number: 239-281-6978

11. Recipient Contact Information:

a. Organization: Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council

b. Municipality and County: Ft. Myers in Lee County

c. Organization type (check all that apply):

☐ For-profit Corporation
☐ Not-for-profit Corporation
☐ 501c3 entity
☒ Other (please specify) Governmental Agency

d. Contact Name and Title: Margaret Wuerstle, Executive Director

e. E-mail Address: mwuerstle@swfrpc.org

f. Phone Number: 239-281-6978
Budget Detail Request – Fiscal Year 2016-17
Your request will not be officially submitted unless all questions and applicable sub parts are answered.

1. Title of Project: Regional Economic Development Map
2. Date of Submission: ____________________________
3. House Member Sponsor(s): Representative

4. DETAILS OF AMOUNT REQUESTED:
   a. Has funding been provided in a previous state budget for this activity? ___Yes ___No
      (If answer to 4a is “NO” skip 4b and 4c and proceed to 4d)
   b. What is the most recent fiscal year the project was funded? ______
   c. Were the funds provided in the most recent fiscal year subsequently vetoed? ___Yes ______No
   d. Complete the following Project Request Worksheet to develop your request (Note that Column E will be the total of Recurring funds requested and Column F will be the total Nonrecurring funds requested, the sum of which is the Total of the Funds you are requesting in Column G):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY:</th>
<th>Input Prior Year Appropriation for this project for FY 2015-16 (If appropriated in FY 2015-16 enter the appropriated amount, even if vetoed.)</th>
<th>Develop New Funds Request for FY 2016-17 (If no new Recurring or Nonrecurring funding is requested, enter zeros.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Column:</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Description:</td>
<td>Prior Year Recurring Funds</td>
<td>Prior Year Nonrecurring Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Amounts:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   e. New Nonrecurring Funding Requested for FY 16-17 will be used for:
      □ Operating Expenses □ Fixed Capital Construction _X_ Other one-time costs
   f. New Recurring Funding Requested for FY 16-17 will be used for: N/A
      □ Operating Expenses □ Fixed Capital Construction □ Other one-time costs
5. Requester:
   a. Name: Don McCormick, Chairman
   b. Organization: Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council
   c. Email: mwuerstle@swfrpc.org
   d. Phone #: 239-281-6978

6. Organization or Name of Entity Receiving Funds:
   a. Name: Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council
   b. County (County where funds are to be expended): Lee County, Sarasota County, Charlotte County, Collier County, Hendry County and Glades County
   c. Service Area (Counties being served by the service(s) provided with funding): Lee County, Sarasota County, Charlotte County, Collier County, Hendry County and Glades County

7. Write a project description that will serve as a stand-alone summary of the project for legislative review. The description should summarize the entire project’s intended purpose, the purpose of the funds requested (if request is a sub-part of the entire project), and most importantly the detail on how the funds requested will be spent - for example how much will be spent on positions and associated salaries, specifics on capital costs, and detail of operational expenses. The summary must list what local, regional or statewide interests or areas are served. It should also document the need for the funds, the community support and expected results when applicable. Be sure to include the type and amount of services as well as the number of the specific target population that will be served (such as number of home health visits to X, # of elderly, # of school aged children to receive mentoring, # of violent crime victims to receive once a week counseling etc.)

   Project Concept: To develop a regional interactive map to enable local leaders, developers and site selectors to quickly identify key locations for economic development in Southwest Florida. The funds will be spent to develop an interactive GIS map for Hendry, Glades, Charlotte, Lee, Collier and Sarasota counties showing development opportunity sites. The map will include shovel ready sites as well as potential development sites along with pertinent information on each site. Potential development sites will include a description of what is needed to make the site shovel ready, thereby informing local Capital Improvement Plans. The map will include Identified clusters, Utility availability/capacity data, Preliminary soils report, Floodplain data, Wetlands identification, Site map & aerial depiction, if a brownfield: environmental status and/or reports, Information on area colleges, Information on top employers in the City, City and County demographics and Links to City and County websites. As improvements are made to sites, the map will be updated with current information. A toolbox will be created with information that will allow Southwest Florida's 6 county region to collaborate using this tool. The toolbox will also allow the project to be replicated in other...
counties throughout Florida. At a recent meeting, the Economic Development Directors from the six county region strongly supported the need for development of a Regional Economic Development Opportunity Map.

The Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council will provide a $60,000 match consisting of $30,000 cash and $30,000 in-kind services for a total project cost of $360,000. The funds will be used to hire consultants and for staff salaries to perform the necessary research, gather the data, development the map and toolbox.

8. Provide the total cost of the project for FY 2016-17 from all sources of funding: $360,000
   - Federal: ________________
   - State: ________________ (Excluding the requested Total Amount in #4d, Column G)
   - Local: ________________
   - Other: $60,000 ( $30,000 cash and $30,000 in-kind from the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council)

9. Is this a multi-year project requiring funding from the state for more than one year?  ___Yes  X No
1. Senate Sponsor: Click here to enter text.

2. Date of Request: 7/20/2016

3. Project/Program Description:

   **Project Concept:** State support of the Federal Promise Zone Designation for Hendry, Glades and Collier Counties by providing priority access to state funding in order to further the strategic plans of job creation, enhancement of economic activity, improvement of educational opportunities, crime reduction and improved community infrastructure. The area of Glades and Hendry Counties and Immokalee recently received designation as a Promise Zone as part of a highly competitive federal application process. Promise Zones are designated based on need and compelling achievable strategy plans. The Southwest Florida Promise Zone includes a 31.2% poverty rate and a 15.65% unemployment rate. A 100+ page application, including detailed action plans, partnerships, and goals, was submitted and the Southwest Florida Promise Zone is designated as one of only 4 rural promise zones nationwide. The Southwest Florida Promise Zone designation entitles the Promise Zone federal grant applications to extra points per application, giving the Promise Zone applicants a slight advantage due to their proven high need and dedication and ability to achieve results. The federal designation also devotes up to 5 Vista volunteers dedicated to implementing strategy plans.

4. Amount of Request: N/A

   **This request is for additional points on State grant applications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Requested for Operations</th>
<th>Amount Requested for Fixed Capital Outlay</th>
<th>Total Amount of Requested State Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Total Project Cost (if greater than Total Requested State Funds): $0

6. Type, Amount and Percent of Match: N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Was the project previously funded by the State? No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year(s)</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Is future-year funding likely to be requested? No

9. Program Performance (if needed, include additional documentation):
   a. How will requested funds be spent? Include supporting documentation.
      This is a request for extra points to be provided to Promise Zone designees' grant applications to the state.
   b. Identify expected program results and the expected benefit associated from the requested funds.
      Providing Promise Zone applicants a slight advantage given their proven high need and dedication and ability to achieve results would cause more state grants to be awarded to the Southwest Florida Promise Zone area. More funds from the state, coupled with federal
preference in grant applications and VISTA volunteer commitment will allow one of Florida's poorest, most in need geographic areas to most quickly make necessary improvements in the areas of job creation, enhanced economic activity, improved educational opportunities, crime reduction, and improved community infrastructure.

c. Who will benefit from receipt of State funds?

Citizens of Immokalee, Glades County and Hendry County will directly benefit. The larger region stands to benefit from the effects of a more prosperous neighboring area, including but not limited to economic development and a more skilled workforce. The state stands to benefit as the Promise Zone area attracts new businesses, creates jobs and improves educational opportunities.

d. What specific measures will be used to document performance data for the project, if it receives funds?

Number of state grants received; dollar value of state grants received.

10. Requestor Contact Information:

a. Name and Title:  
   Don McCormick, Chairman

b. Organization:  
   Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council

c. E-mail Address:  
   mwuerstle@swfrpc.org

d. Phone Number:  
   239-281-6978

11. Recipient Contact Information:

a. Organization:  
   Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council

b. Municipality and County:  
   Glades County, Hendry County, Immokalee

c. Organization type (check all that apply):
   ☒  Governmental Agency, but preferential points would be awarded to any partner within the Promise Zone which applies for funding to benefit implementation of the Strategy Plan
   ☐  For-profit Corporation
   ☐  Not-for-profit Corporation
   ☐  501c3 entity

d. Contact Name and Title:  
   Margaret Wuerstle, Executive Director

e. E-mail Address:  
   mwuerstle@swfrpc.org

f. Phone Number:  
   239-281-6978
Budget Detail Request – Fiscal Year 2016-17
Your request will not be officially submitted unless all questions and applicable sub parts are answered.

1. Title of Project: Preference to Promise Zone applications for State Funding
2. Date of Submission: ____________________________
3. House Member Sponsor(s): Representative _______

4. DETAILS OF AMOUNT REQUESTED:
   a. Has funding been provided in a previous state budget for this activity? ___ Yes ___ No
      If answer to 4a is “NO” skip 4b and 4c and proceed to 4d
   b. What is the most recent fiscal year the project was funded? _______
   c. Were the funds provided in the most recent fiscal year subsequently vetoed? ___Yes ___ No
   d. Complete the following Project Request Worksheet to develop your request (Note that Column E will be the total of Recurring funds requested and Column F will be the total Nonrecurring funds requested, the sum of which is the Total of the Funds you are requesting in Column G):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY:</th>
<th>Input Prior Year Appropriation for this project for FY 2015-16</th>
<th>Develop New Funds Request for FY 2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(If appropriated in FY 2015-16 enter the appropriated amount, even if vetoed.)</td>
<td>(If no new Recurring or Nonrecurring funding is requested, enter zeros.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column:</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Description:</td>
<td>Prior Year Recurring Funds</td>
<td>Prior Year Nonrecurring Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Amounts:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. New Nonrecurring Funding Requested for FY 16-17 will be used for: N/A
   □ Operating Expenses □ Fixed Capital Construction □ Other one-time costs
f. New Recurring Funding Requested for FY 16-17 will be used for: N/A
   □ Operating Expenses □ Fixed Capital Construction □ Other one-time costs
5. Requester:
   a. Name: Don McCormick, Chairman
   b. Organization: Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council
   c. Email: mwuerstle@swfrpc.org
   d. Phone #: 239-281-6978

6. Organization or Name of Entity Receiving Funds:
   a. Name: Southwest Florida Promise Zone and any partner which seeks funding to benefit Promise Zone
   b. County (County where funds are to be expended) Glades, Hendry, Collier
   c. Service Area (Counties being served by the service(s) provided with funding) Glades, Hendry, Collier

7. Write a project description that will serve as a stand-alone summary of the project for legislative review. The description should summarize the entire project’s intended purpose, the purpose of the funds requested (if request is a sub-part of the entire project), and most importantly the detail on how the funds requested will be spent - for example how much will be spent on positions and associated salaries, specifics on capital costs, and detail of operational expenses. The summary must list what local, regional or statewide interests or areas are served. It should also document the need for the funds, the community support and expected results when applicable. Be sure to include the type and amount of services as well as the number of the specific target population that will be served (such as number of home health visits to X, # of elderly, # of school aged children to receive mentoring, # of violent crime victims to receive once a week counseling etc.)

   **Project Concept:** State support of the Federal Promise Zone Designation for Hendry, Glades and Collier Counties by providing priority access to state funding in order to further the strategic plans of job creation, enhancement of economic activity, improvement of educational opportunities, crime reduction and improved community infrastructure. The area of Glades and Hendry Counties and Immokalee recently received designation as a Promise Zone as part of a highly competitive federal application process. Promise Zones are designated based on need and compelling achievable strategy plans. The Southwest Florida Promise Zone includes a 31.2% poverty rate and a 15.65% unemployment rate. A 100+ page application including detailed action plans, partnerships, and goals was submitted and the Southwest Florida Promise Zone is one of only 4 rural promise zones nationwide. The Southwest Florida Promise Zone designation entitles the Promise Zone federal grant applications to extra points per application, giving the Promise Zone applicants a slight advantage given their proven high need and dedication and established ability to achieve results. We are requesting that the State recognize the only Promise Zone in the State of Florida by providing extra points to State grant applications submitted by the Promise Zone partners. This request is not for State funding; This request is for extra points on State grant application for the Promise Zone partners.
8. Provide the total cost of the project for FY 2016-17 from all sources of funding:
   Federal: N/A
   State: N/A (Excluding the requested Total Amount in #4d, Column G)
   Local: N/A
   Other: N/A

9. Is this a multi-year project requiring funding from the state for more than one year?  ___Yes  X No --- This is a multi-year request for the application points. No funding is requested. The federal Promise Zone designation lasts for 10 years. A corresponding preference and recognition on the state level would help the Southwest Florida Promise Zone to achieve much needed improvements in the stated goals of job creation, enhanced economic activity, improved educational opportunities, crime reduction, and improved community infrastructure.
The Southwest Florida Regional Transportation Plan is proposed for funding because county long range transportation plans do not adequately address the interaction and interconnection between adjacent counties relating to needs and economic development. The Southwest Florida region includes 6 counties (Charlotte, Collier, Glades, Hendry, Lee and Sarasota), that are represented by five separate MPOs (Charlotte, Collier, Lee, and Sarasota/Manatee) and the Heartland TPO. Those counties and MPOs prepare long range transportation plans for their individual county and / or MPO. They generally do an excellent job of reflecting what their citizens’ desire in long range transportation plans for their specific and individual jurisdiction. However, the plans vary in how well they address the interaction and interconnection between adjacent counties and MPOs and the relationship between the individual county or MPO and the overall Southwest Florida region. While there has certainly been on-going coordination between counties and MPOs, until recently, this interaction and interconnection has not been formally addressed, except by the Florida DOT. While some jurisdictions have made significant efforts to reflect adjacent jurisdictions, the shortage of transportation funds makes this increasingly difficult. Today, with population growth, the expanding economy, and changes in technology, jurisdictional boundaries become blurred and the interactions and interconnections between jurisdictions become more significant. What happens in one county most often has a significant impact on adjacent counties or jurisdictions. In addition, many of the land use and transportation decisions made today will have a significant impact on future generations throughout the region. For these reasons, the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council recognizes that it is becoming increasingly important to develop a Regional Transportation Plan that addresses these interactions and interconnections among jurisdictions in Southwest Florida. The Regional Transportation Plan will build upon what has already been accomplished by those counties and MPOs in developing their long range transportation plans. The Regional Transportation Plan will not revisit or replace the jurisdiction’s or MPO’s LRTP, to revisit or replace Florida DOT transportation plans, nor usurp the authority of any jurisdiction in its land use and transportation planning endeavors. Rather, it will bring the various planning efforts and strategies together and mold them into a concise, cohesive, comprehensive regional document for the benefit of all those counties and MPOs. The document will address all modes of transportation – auto, truck, transit, para-transit, railroad, pedestrian, bicycle, air and water, plus intermodal facilities, ports and goods movement. It will consider land use, technology, economic opportunities, environmental features, and interactions between our region and other regions. The Plan will build upon prior planning efforts, such as: Regional Planning Council’s Strategic Regional Policy Plan, Local plans and strategies, MPO plans and strategies, State plans and strategies, Transit and para-transit plans, Aviation plans, Rail plans, Goods movement plans, Intermodal facilities plans, including ports, Tiger grant applications, Land use plans / development patterns. The document will be a significant driver in achieving: Regional vision regarding major transportation corridors, including east-west corridors, as well as north-south corridors; Regional vision regarding transit and para-transit; Regional vision regarding goods movement, Consistency with Regional Planning Council’s Strategic Regional Policy Plan; Extensive public information, involvement and outreach, including key State and local officials, stakeholders and community workshops, Consensus among local jurisdictions and MPOs on cross boundary issues,
A range of choices among alternative modes of travel, Sustainable communities, Preservation of open space, natural resources and the environment, Enhancement of economic and international trade opportunities, and Cost effectiveness. With significant regional growth projected, the document will enable the region to chart the course for accommodating this growth while fostering an innovative, prosperous and competitive economy; preserving a healthy and safe environment; and allowing all residents and visitors to share the benefits of vibrant, sustainable communities connected and supported by an efficient and well-maintained transportation network.

4. Amount of Request:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Requested for Operations</th>
<th>Amount Requested for Fixed Capital Outlay</th>
<th>Total Amount of Requested State Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Total Project Cost (if greater than Total Requested State Funds): $500,000

6. Type, Amount and Percent of Match:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Was the project previously funded by the State? No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year(s)</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Is future-year funding likely to be requested? No

9. Program Performance (if needed, include additional documentation):
   a. How will requested funds be spent? Include supporting documentation.

   Funding will be used to hire a qualified consultant to conduct interviews and work with staff to coordinate all existing documents. The consultant will analysis existing data and prepare a Regional Transportation Plan and map for each of the 23 jurisdictions in the 6 county region. The consultant will identify any areas of concern within the region and work with the counties to identify potential solutions.

   b. Identify expected program results and the expected benefit associated from the requested funds.

   This regional transportation planning effort will identify the vision for Southwest Florida, using the Regional Planning Council’s Strategic Regional Policy Plan as the foundation. With the region’s population expected to continue to grow, the document will chart the course for accommodating this growth while fostering an innovative, prosperous and competitive economy; preserving a healthy and safe environment; and allowing all residents and visitors to share the benefits of vibrant, sustainable communities connected and supported by an efficient and well-maintained transportation network.

   c. Who will benefit from receipt of State funds?

   The six counties and 17 municipalities within the Region, their residents, and visitors to Southwest Florida.

   d. What specific measures will be used to document performance data for the project, if it receives funds?
A Regional Transportation Plan and Map is completed and each of the 23 jurisdictions received a presentation on the project and a copy of the Plan. The information provided in the Plan is used to inform policies regarding land use and transportation as well as investment by all 23 jurisdictions in the region.

10. Requestor Contact Information:
   a. Name and Title: Don McCormick, Chairman
   b. Organization: Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council
   c. E-mail Address: mwuerstle@swfrpc.org
   d. Phone Number: 239-281-6978

11. Recipient Contact Information:
   a. Organization: Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council
   b. Municipality and County: 6 Counties of Charlotte, Collier, Glades, Hendry, Sarasota, Lee
   c. Organization type (check all that apply):
      - [ ] For-profit Corporation
      - [ ] Not-for-profit Corporation
      - [X] 501c3 entity
      - [ ] Other (please specify): Governmental Agency
   d. Contact Name and Title: Margaret Wuerstle, Executive Director
   e. E-mail Address: mwuerstle@swfrpc.org
   f. Phone Number: 239-281-6978
**Budget Detail Request – Fiscal Year 2016-17**

Your request will not be officially submitted unless all questions and applicable sub parts are answered.

1. Title of Project: **Southwest Florida Regional Transportation Plan**
2. Date of Submission: ________________
3. House Member Sponsor(s): Representative ________________

**4. DETAILS OF AMOUNT REQUESTED:**

a. Has funding been provided in a previous state budget for this activity?  ____Yes   ____No

   *If answer to 4a is “NO” skip 4b and 4c and proceed to 4d*

b. What is the most recent fiscal year the project was funded?  _____

c. Were the funds provided in the most recent fiscal year subsequently vetoed?  ____Yes   ____No

d. Complete the following Project Request Worksheet to develop your request (Note that Column E will be the total of Recurring funds requested and Column F will be the total Nonrecurring funds requested, the sum of which is the Total of the Funds you are requesting in Column G):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY:</th>
<th>Input Prior Year Appropriation for this project for FY 2015-16 (If appropriated in FY 2015-16 enter the appropriated amount, even if vetoed.)</th>
<th>Develop New Funds Request for FY 2016-17 (If no new Recurring or Nonrecurring funding is requested, enter zeros.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Column:</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Description:</td>
<td>Prior Year Recurring Funds</td>
<td>Prior Year Nonrecurring Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Amounts:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. New Nonrecurring Funding Requested for FY 16-17 will be used for:

   - □ Operating Expenses   - □ Fixed Capital Construction   - X Other one-time costs

f. New Recurring Funding Requested for FY 16-17 will be used for:

   - □ Operating Expenses   - □ Fixed Capital Construction   - □ Other one-time costs
5. Requester:
   a. Name: Don McCormick, Chairman
   b. Organization: Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council
   c. Email: mwuerstle@swfrpc.org
   d. Phone #: 239-281-6978

6. Organization or Name of Entity Receiving Funds:
   a. Name: Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council
   b. County (County where funds are to be expended) Charlotte, Collier, Glades, Hendry, Lee and Sarasota
   c. Service Area (Counties being served by the service(s) provided with funding) Charlotte, Collier, Glades, Hendry, Lee and Sarasota

7. Write a project description that will serve as a stand-alone summary of the project for legislative review. The description should summarize the entire project’s intended purpose, the purpose of the funds requested (if request is a sub-part of the entire project), and most importantly the detail on how the funds requested will be spent - for example how much will be spent on positions and associated salaries, specifics on capital costs, and detail of operational expenses. The summary must list what local, regional or statewide interests or areas are served. It should also document the need for the funds, the community support and expected results when applicable. Be sure to include the type and amount of services as well as the number of the specific target population that will be served (such as number of home health visits to X, # of elderly, # of school aged children to receive mentoring, # of violent crime victims to receive once a week counseling etc.)

Development of a Regional Transportation Plan that addresses interactions and interconnections among the 23 jurisdictions in Southwest Florida. The Regional Transportation document is intended to build upon what has already been accomplished by the counties and MPOs in developing their long range transportation plans. This will incorporate all of the jurisdictions transportation plans into one document to be used for economic development.

The Plan will address all modes of transportation – auto, truck, transit, para-transit, railroad, pedestrian, bicycle, air and water, plus intermodal facilities, ports and goods movement. It will consider land use, technology, economic opportunities, environmental features, and interactions between our region and other regions.

The Region is represented by four separate MPOs (Charlotte, Collier, Lee and Sarasota/Manatee) and the Heartland TPO. Those counties and MPOs prepare long range transportation plans for their individual county and / or MPO. They generally do an excellent job of reflecting what their citizens’ desire in long range transportation plans for their specific and individual jurisdiction. However, the plans vary in how well they address the interaction and interconnection between adjacent counties and MPOs and the relationship between the individual county or MPO and the overall Southwest Florida region. While there has certainly been on-going coordination between counties and MPOs, until recently, this interaction and interconnection has not been formally addressed, except by the Florida DOT. While some jurisdictions have made significant efforts to reflect adjacent jurisdictions, the shortage of transportation funds makes this increasingly difficult.
Today, with population growth, the expanding economy, and changes in technology, jurisdictional boundaries become blurred and the interactions and interconnections between jurisdictions become more significant. What happens in one county can have a significant impact on adjacent counties or jurisdictions. In addition, many of the land use and transportation decisions made today will have a significant impact on future generations throughout the region.

For these reasons, the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council believes that it is becoming increasingly important to develop a Regional Transportation Plan that addresses these interactions and interconnections among jurisdictions in Southwest Florida. The Regional Transportation Plan is intended to build upon what has already been accomplished by those counties and MPOs in developing their long range transportation plans.

It is not the intent of the Regional Transportation Plan to revisit or replace the jurisdiction's or MPO's LRTP, to revisit or replace Florida DOT transportation plans, or to usurp the authority of any jurisdiction in its land use and transportation planning endeavors. Rather, the intent is to bring the various planning efforts and strategies together and mold them into a concise, cohesive, comprehensive regional action plan, consistent with the future direction and vision for the region, and for the benefit of all those counties and MPOs.

This regional transportation planning effort will identify the vision for Southwest Florida, using the Regional Planning Council's Strategic Regional Policy Plan as the foundation. With the region's population expected to continue to grow, the Plan will chart the course for accommodating this growth while fostering an innovative, prosperous and competitive economy; preserving a healthy and safe environment; and allowing all residents and visitors to share the benefits of vibrant, sustainable communities connected and supported by an efficient and well-maintained transportation network.

The document will address all modes of transportation – auto, truck, transit, para-transit, railroad, pedestrian, bicycle, air and water, plus intermodal facilities, ports and goods movement. It will consider land use, technology, economic opportunities, environmental features, and interactions between our region and other regions.

The Plan will build upon prior planning efforts, such as:

- Regional Planning Council’s Strategic Regional Policy Plan
- Local plans and strategies
- MPO plans and strategies
- State plans and strategies
- Transit and para-transit plans
- Aviation plans
- Rail plans
- Goods movement plans
- Intermodal facilities plans, including ports
- Tiger grant applications
- Land use plans / development patterns

The document will be a significant driver in achieving:
- Regional vision regarding major transportation corridors, including east-west corridors, as well as north-south corridors.
- Regional vision regarding transit and para-transit.
- Regional vision regarding goods movement.
- Consistency with Regional Planning Council’s Strategic Regional Policy Plan.
- Extensive public information, involvement and outreach, including key State and local officials, stakeholders and community workshops.
- Consensus among local jurisdictions and MPOs on cross boundary issues.
- A range of choices among alternative modes of travel.
- Sustainable communities.
- Preservation of open space, natural resources and the environment.
- Enhancement of economic and international trade opportunities.
- Cost effectiveness.

8. Provide the total cost of the project for FY 2016-17 from all sources of funding: $550,000
   Federal: ________________
   State: ________________ (Excluding the requested Total Amount in #4d, Column G)
   Local: ________________
   Other: $50,000 Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council

9. Is this a multi-year project requiring funding from the state for more than one year?  ___Yes  X No
SRPP Revision
Explanatory notes:

1. The Rulemaking authority citation is incorrect - it should read 186.507, not 186.506 (186.506 is titled “Executive Office of the Governor; powers and duties”; 187.507 is titled “Strategic regional policy plans.”)

2. The “law implemented” section is not accurate – 120.53(1) concerns agency final orders, not comprehensive plans or administrative rules. It should be 187.507, Strategic regional policy plans, and possibly 186.508, Strategic regional policy plan adoption; consistency with state comprehensive plan.

Current rule:

291-6.002 Strategic Regional Policy Plan.

There is hereby adopted, for the Southwest Florida Region, the Strategic Regional Policy Plan for the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council, August 2001, which is incorporated herein by reference and copies of which are kept at the Council office at: 4980 Bayline Drive, 4th Floor, North Fort Myers, Florida 33917. Copies are also available at our website: www.swfrpc.org/publctns.htm.

VOLUME TWO: GOALS, STRATEGIES, AND ACTIONS.

Rulemaking Authority 186.508(1) FS. Law Implemented 120.53(1) FS. History–New 10-23-95, Amended 7-3-02.

Proposed revision:

291-6.002 Strategic Regional Policy Plan.

There is hereby adopted, The Strategic Regional Policy Plan (SRPP) for the Southwest Florida Region, the Strategic Regional Policy Plan for the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council, August 2001, which is incorporated herein by reference, and copies of which are kept at the Council office at: 4980 Bayline Drive, 4th Floor, North Fort Myers, Florida 33917 1400 Colonial Boulevard, Suite 1, Fort Myers, FL 33907. Copies are also available at our website: www.swfrpc.org/publctns.htm www.swfrpc.org.

VOLUME TWO: GOALS, STRATEGIES, AND ACTIONS.

Rulemaking Authority 186.508(1) 186.507(15) FS. Law Implemented 120.53(1) 186.507, 186.508 FS. History–New 10-23-95, Amended 7-3-02.
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## Quarterly Status Updates for Vital Projects Form

### CEDS Working Committee

**Name & organization:**

**Year & CEDS Committee Date:**

#### 2016 - September

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vital Project</th>
<th>Lead Organization</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments/Next Steps</th>
<th>Yes (Y)</th>
<th>No (N)</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Other Federal Agency(s)</th>
<th># of Jobs Created or Retained</th>
<th>Amount of private sector investment</th>
<th>Amount of public sector investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte County Incubator</td>
<td>Charlotte County</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
<td>On hold until further BCC Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murdock Village</td>
<td>Charlotte County</td>
<td>Pre-planning</td>
<td>DEO Grant received to update CRA Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of the Immokalee/Naples Business Development Center to include Incubators/Accelerators</td>
<td>Collier County</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>Incubator Accelerator Collier/Workforce/Culinary Commercial Kitchen (Imm), Food Science Lab. State funded $2,000,000 for the Naples Accelerator. Immokalee Business Center is in design review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Myers Riverfront Redevelopment Project</td>
<td>Fort Myers/CRA/ Lee County</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>In April, Fort Myers accept a $500k from Tampa-based Mainsail Lodging and Development. This project has changed hands a number of times. Hotel and Garage contract to be approved by City Council in September 2016. RFP has been released for Operational lease.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics Center (America Gateway Logistics - Phase 1)</td>
<td>Glades County</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>Developer onboard, PUD-2nd quarter EDA grant infrastructure / county Business Park. First tenant, a Love’s Travel Stop is under construction. County has awarded bid funded by $1,154,000 CDBG grant to extend infrastructure from business park to the travel center site with completion set for February 2017. Need $2 million to finalize road improvements in business park, including dog leg to connect to right out only lane on US 27 and connector to AGLC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,154,000</td>
<td>$ 1,154,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Material Handling Industry of America (MHIA) Training Center for Logistics/Manufacturing</td>
<td>Glades/Hendry Counties</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>Bring in infrastructure - Training. Part of the EDA grant application/County available Light Manufacturing Tenant. Building is substantially complete. Design to complete the first 3800 square feet of the working warehouse to accommodate a diesel mechanics class and a welding class as well as complete the loading docks and truck parking area behind the training center to accommodate a CDL training program to be offered by Suncoast Trucking Academy is ongoing, funded by a $1 million legislative appropriation in 2016. The county hopes to secure an additional $1m to finish capital construction of warehouse/classroom space, $600k for equipment for welding and diesel mechanics classes and $72,000 for office furnishings and furnishing for the student lounge area of the building.</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AirGlades Airport Development</td>
<td>Hendry County</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>S/0 - Developer 2400 Acre airport. March Comments (develop Ready to work the negotiation)</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Enterprise Diamond</td>
<td>Lee County/FGCU</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Workshops underway, Technology location is open</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm Mineral Springs</td>
<td>City of North Port</td>
<td>Pre-planning</td>
<td>Health and Wellness center (private) moving forward with 20,000 SF bldg. City</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Florida International Airport Improvements</td>
<td>Lee County Port Authority</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>LCPA continues to move forward with design and construction of many infrastructure improvements at RSW including a new Air Traffic Control Tower, roadway improvements, and non-aviation</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repositioning the talent delivery system in the Southwest Florida Region</td>
<td>SWF Workforce Development Board</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>Workforce Task Force through Horizon Council, Workforce Now Initiative</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a regional plan and identify place-making projects that improve the quality of life</td>
<td>SWFRPC</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>Our Creative Economy Concept. The SW Community Foundation funded the mapping of all public art assets in Lee County</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td>SWFRPC/MPOs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Council meeting 1/17/13 discussion, Council formed subcommittee Jan. 2014. Legislative appropriation is being pursued for the 2017 State budget</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Partner(s)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWFRPC/Economic Development Directors</td>
<td>Regional Economic Development Opportunity Map</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>A legislative appropriation is being pursued for the 2017 State budget</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SWFRPC/Economic Development Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWFRPC</td>
<td>Promise Zone</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>Federal Designation awarded to Hendry County, Glades County and Immokalee for their strategy. Organization of steering committee and task force committees underway with the identification of projects.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SWFRPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Port</td>
<td>West Villages</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>Master Planned Community for 23,000 residential units, 3 million SF of Commercial space, parks and recreational space. The first residential phase for 300 SF homes is under construction, The preserve is under construction and the first commercial strip in permitting.</td>
<td></td>
<td>North Port</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Completed Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Partner(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish partnerships for the creation of a Regional Economic Development Agency to promote centralized data and regional marketing efforts</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Regional EDO’s/FGCU</td>
<td>DEO Grant - website /data clearinghouse Marketing Plan</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>DEO $15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Pre-Machining Training</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>SWF Workforce Development Board/I-Tech/Immokalee</td>
<td>numerous meetings, machining curriculum, training, collaboration</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>DEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNC Training</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>SWF Workforce Development Board/I-Tech/Immokalee</td>
<td>Immokalee (ITECH Center) up and running</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create an Ad-Hoc Committee to evaluate and recommend legal &amp; regulatory reform to address government efficiency.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>SWFRPC</td>
<td>Report on SWFRPC website</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>DEO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Funding Agency</th>
<th>Grant Name</th>
<th>Project Mgr.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>App Due Date</th>
<th>Date Submitted</th>
<th>Date Awarded/Denied</th>
<th>Date Contract Signed</th>
<th>Project Total</th>
<th>RPC Amt</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Total Match Amt RPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>App in Progress</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>NOAA - National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration</td>
<td>NOAA RESTORE Act Science Program</td>
<td>Jim Beever</td>
<td>Mangrove Impacts and Restoration</td>
<td>9/27/2016</td>
<td>7/8/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 200,000.00</td>
<td>$ 200,000.00</td>
<td>10/1/2016</td>
<td>9/30/2017</td>
<td>Mapping, chapters in final report, location of mangrove heart attack areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App in Progress</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>NEA - National Endowment for the Arts</td>
<td>Our Town</td>
<td>Jason Stoltzfus</td>
<td>Fish-on-Parade</td>
<td>9/12/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TDB</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>EDA - Economic Development Administration</td>
<td>Intomakee Culinary Accelerator</td>
<td>Jennifer Pellechio</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/20/2016</td>
<td>5/19/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>NEA - National Endowment for the Arts</td>
<td>A Regional Strategy for Enhancing Public Art &amp; Cultural Venues</td>
<td>Jason Stoltzfus</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/28/2016</td>
<td>7/28/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>DOE - Department of Energy</td>
<td>SOLSMART</td>
<td>Jennifer Pellechio</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/18/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>USDA - US Dept. of Agriculture</td>
<td>Clowston Regional Farmers Market</td>
<td>Jason Stoltzfus</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/2016</td>
<td>5/12/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Products of this study will include a market analysis, site assessment, vendor outreach, site assessment, financial analysis, and a written plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>DEP-Department of Environmental Protection</td>
<td>City of Cape Coral Climate Change Resililiency Strategy</td>
<td>Jim Beever</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/6/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>The City of Cape Coral Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment and The City of Cape Coral Climate Change Resililiency Strategy (CCRS) Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded &amp; Ongoing</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>CTD - FL Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged</td>
<td>FY16-17 TD Planning Agreement</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/19/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,349</td>
<td>$60,349</td>
<td>10/1/2016</td>
<td>12/31/2017</td>
<td>TDSP Update, LCB, CTC Evaluation, Quarterly Reports, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded &amp; Ongoing</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>EPA - Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>Wetland Mitigation Strategy</td>
<td>Jim Beever</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/28/2016</td>
<td>6/15/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>10/1/2016</td>
<td>9/30/2018</td>
<td>Development of a regional improved model watershed scale master wetland mitigation strategy for restoration, protection and public projects.</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded &amp; Ongoing</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>FDEO - Florida Department of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>City of Labelle Tourism Marketing Brochure</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/2/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Design, create, and distribute a tourism marketing brochure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded &amp; Ongoing</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Emergency Management</td>
<td>FY16-17 LEPC Agreement</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
<td>4/8/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>7/1/2016</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Staff support to the LEPC, Plan Development and Exercise, Technical Assistance and Training Coordination/Planning.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Funding Agency</td>
<td>Grant Name</td>
<td>Project Mgr.</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>App Due Date</td>
<td>Date Submitted</td>
<td>Date Awarded/Denied</td>
<td>Date Contract Signed</td>
<td>Project Total</td>
<td>RPC Amt</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>Total Match Amt-RPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded &amp; Ongoing</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>CTD - FL Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>FY15-16 Glades-Hendry TD Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$38,573</td>
<td>$38,573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Update of TDSP, CTC Evaluation, Staff Support, LCB Quarterly Meetings, Committee Meetings, Update By-Laws and Grievance Procedures.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded &amp; Ongoing</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Emergency Management</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>FY15-16 HMEP Planning and Training Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$73,922</td>
<td>$73,922</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td>9/30/2016</td>
<td>HMEP related projects and trainings</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded &amp; Ongoing</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>EPA- Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>Jim Beever</td>
<td>Developing a Method to Use Ecosystem Services to Quantify Wetland Restoration Successes</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/17/2015</td>
<td>8/5/2015</td>
<td>9/15/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>$234,071</td>
<td>$174,071</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td>9/30/2016</td>
<td>Products of the study will include updated valuations of the ecosystem services provided by existing conservation lands in the CNHEP; an updated conservation lands mapping of the project study area; a documentation and quantification of the ecosystem services provided by each habitat type, etc.</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded &amp; Ongoing</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Emergency Management</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>FY15-16 LEPC Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/30/2015</td>
<td>8/11/2015</td>
<td>9/7/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>7/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff support to the LEPC, Plan Development and Exercise, Technical Assistance and Training Coordination/Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded &amp; Ongoing</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Glades County</td>
<td>Tim Walker</td>
<td>Glades County Small Quantity Generators (SQG)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/17/2012</td>
<td>8/17/2012</td>
<td>9/17/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,900</td>
<td>$3,900</td>
<td>8/17/2012</td>
<td>8/17/2017</td>
<td>The goal of the assessment, notification, and verification program is to inform Small Quantity Generators (SQGs) of their legal responsibilities, limit the illegal disposal of hazardous waste, and identify the location of waste operators for an update to State officials. Also, local knowledge of hazardous wastes is useful for land development planning, emergency protective services, health care and water quality management.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Funding Agency</td>
<td>Grant Name</td>
<td>Project Mgr.</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>App Due Date</td>
<td>Date Submitted</td>
<td>Date Awarded/Denied</td>
<td>Date Contract Signed</td>
<td>Project Total</td>
<td>RPC Amt</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>Total Match Amt-RPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded &amp; Ongoing</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>EDA - US Economic Development Administration</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>EDA Planning Grant</td>
<td>1/22/2013</td>
<td>12/18/2013</td>
<td>4/18/2014</td>
<td>4/21/14</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>$189,000</td>
<td>1/1/2014</td>
<td>12/31/2016</td>
<td>CEDS Plan, Annual Reports, CEDS Working Committee</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded &amp; Ongoing</td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>SFRPC - South Florida Regional Planning Council</td>
<td>C.J. Samsenker</td>
<td>Train the Trainers Grant</td>
<td>1/22/2016</td>
<td>1/22/2016</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>1/1/2016</td>
<td>3/31/2017</td>
<td>Trainers and Tools: Building Coastal Flood Hazard Resiliency in Florida's Regional Planning Council Communities</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded &amp; Ongoing</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Emergency Management</td>
<td>Tim Walker</td>
<td>Collier Hazard Analysis FY16-17</td>
<td>42552</td>
<td>$9,693</td>
<td>$9,693</td>
<td>6/16/2015</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Rural designation of a Promise Zone for Immokalee in Collier County, Glades County, and Hendry County</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded &amp; Ongoing</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>HUD-U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>Jason Stoltzfus</td>
<td>Promise Zone Designation 2016</td>
<td>2/23/2016</td>
<td>2/23/2016</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
<td>Rural designation of a Promise Zone for Immokalee in Collier County, Glades County, and Hendry County</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>USDA - US Dept. of Agriculture</td>
<td>Jason Stoltzfus</td>
<td>Immokalee Culinary Accelerator</td>
<td>3/29/2016</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Educational Program Curriculum, Community Preference Analysis and Visual Preference Assessment, Report results</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Funding Agency</td>
<td>Grant Name</td>
<td>Project Mgr.</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>App Due Date</td>
<td>Date Submitted</td>
<td>Date Awarded/Denied</td>
<td>Date Contract Signed</td>
<td>Project Total</td>
<td>RPC Amt</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>Total Match Amt-RPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>FDEO - Florida Department of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>Community Planning Technical Assistance Grant</td>
<td>Jennifer Pellechio</td>
<td>Murdock Villave Community Redevelopment Plan</td>
<td>5/2/2016</td>
<td>5/2/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A vision, market analysis and graphical representations of economic GIS maps that will be incorporated in the Murdock Village Community Redevelopment Plan and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>Northeast Florida Regional Council</td>
<td>Statewide Regional Evacuation Study Program</td>
<td>Tim Walker</td>
<td>Statewide Regional Evacuation Study Program Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,200</td>
<td>4/9/2016</td>
<td>6/30/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An updated summary document that includes key information on demographics, vulnerability and hazard risk, using a document template and map templates provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>City of Bonita Springs</td>
<td>Spring Creek Restoration Plan</td>
<td>Jim Beever</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Jan 2015</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>DEO - FL Dept. of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>Clewiston Main Street Revitalization Plan</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>6/16/2015</td>
<td>8/3/2015</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/31/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outreach materials, Public meetings, Develop community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>DEO - FL Dept. of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>Southwest Florida Rail Corridor Preservation Plan</td>
<td>Jennifer Pellechio</td>
<td>6/16/2015</td>
<td>8/3/2015</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/31/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan language, GIS maps of the rail corridor, Stakeholder meetings and public involvement activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>DOE - US Dept. of Energy</td>
<td>Solar Ready II</td>
<td>Rebekah Harp</td>
<td>3/22/2013</td>
<td>7/18/2013</td>
<td>$148,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>7/1/2013</td>
<td>1/1/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recruit local governments to review and adopt BMPs. Host stakeholder meetings and/or training programs, providing technical assistance to local governments as needed, and tracking any policy adoptions and local government feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Emergency Management</td>
<td>FY14-15 HMEP Planning Grant Modification</td>
<td>Nicholas Guinnatt</td>
<td>9/11/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td>12/13/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Funding Agency</td>
<td>Grant Name</td>
<td>Project Mgr.</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>App Due Date</td>
<td>Date Submitted</td>
<td>Date Awarded/Denied</td>
<td>Date Contract Signed</td>
<td>Project Total</td>
<td>RPC Amt</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>Total Match Amt-RPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Emergency Management</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>FY14-15 HMEP Planning</td>
<td>10/1/2014</td>
<td>7/1/2015</td>
<td>9/30/2015</td>
<td>Major Planning Project; travel coordination for LEPC Chairman; LEPC program coordination and quarterly reports.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>NADO- National Association of Development Organizations</td>
<td>Jennifer Pellechio</td>
<td>CEDS Resiliency Section Technical Assistance</td>
<td>0/16/2014</td>
<td>7/1/2014</td>
<td>6/30/2015</td>
<td>Update of TDSP, CTC Evaluation, Staff Support, LCB Quarterly Meetings, Committee Meetings, Update By-Laws and Grievance Procedures.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Funding Agency</td>
<td>Grant Name</td>
<td>Project Mgr.</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>App Due Date</td>
<td>Date Submitted</td>
<td>Date Awarded/Denie d</td>
<td>Date Contract Signed</td>
<td>Project Total</td>
<td>RPC Amt</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>Total Match Amt-RPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Emergency Management</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>Title III (LEPC) FY14-15</td>
<td>7/1/2014</td>
<td>9/24/2014</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>7/1/2014</td>
<td>6/30/2015</td>
<td>LEPC Program Coordination; attendance during four (4) local quarterly meetings; attendance during four (4) state quarterly meetings; quarterly reports; quarterly news articles/updates; annual report.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Emergency Management</td>
<td>Tim Walker</td>
<td>Collier Hazard Analysis</td>
<td>12/5/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,042</td>
<td>12/23/2014</td>
<td>6/15/2015</td>
<td>There are 4 deliverables stipulated with the contractual agreement.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>TBRPC - Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council</td>
<td>Rebekah Harp</td>
<td>Tampa Bay RPC Graphics and Publications</td>
<td>10/21/2014</td>
<td>10/21/2014</td>
<td>$8,042</td>
<td>10/21/2014</td>
<td>5/28/2015</td>
<td>As needed publication and graphic design, including FOR (Future of the Regions) award materials and annual report.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Visit Florida</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>Our Creative Economy: Video - Southwest Florida Regional Strategy for Public Art</td>
<td>2/18/2014</td>
<td>2/18/2014</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>7/1/2014</td>
<td>5/31/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Funding Agency</td>
<td>Grant Name</td>
<td>Project Mgr.</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>App Due Date</td>
<td>Date Submitted</td>
<td>Date Awarded/Denied</td>
<td>Date Contract Signed</td>
<td>Project Total</td>
<td>RPC Amt</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>Total Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>DEO - FL Dept. of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>Agriculture Tours to Promote Assets and Economic Development in the City of LaBelle</td>
<td>6/6/2014</td>
<td>5/7/2014</td>
<td>8/26/2014</td>
<td>12/1/2014</td>
<td>5/31/2015</td>
<td>City of LaBelle Agriculture Tour Plan</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Awarded</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>FDEO - Florida Department of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>Community Planning Technical Assistance Grant</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>Strategic Economic Opportunity Plan for the Southwest Florida Rail Corridor</td>
<td>5/2/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>$39,000</td>
<td>8/1/2015</td>
<td>steps for implementing the goals and objectives identified within the plan for protecting the corridor and bringing economic growth to the community.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Funding Agency</td>
<td>Grant Name</td>
<td>Project Mgr.</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>App Due Date</td>
<td>Date Submitted</td>
<td>Date Awarded/Denied</td>
<td>Date Contract Signed</td>
<td>Project Total</td>
<td>RPC Amt</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>Total Match Amt-RPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Awarded</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>FDEO - Florida Department of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>Community Planning Technical Assistance Grant</td>
<td>Jennifer Pellechio</td>
<td>City of Cape Coral Development Opportunity Map</td>
<td>5/2/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The creation of an economic development interactive opportunity map for the City of Cape Coral. The map will include shovel ready commercial and industrial sites with relevant information.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Awarded</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>FDEO - Florida Department of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>Community Planning Technical Assistance Grant</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>Economic Impact Study of Lake Okeechobee Discharges</td>
<td>5/2/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A report on the direct and indirect economic impact of Lake Okeechobee discharges on Lee County tourism and the impact on declines in Lee County residential property values and consumer</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Awarded</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>FDEO - Florida Department of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>Community Planning Technical Assistance Grant</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>City of Clewiston Downtown District Façade Program</td>
<td>5/2/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An inventory of all downtown structures, identification of key structures in need of façade improvements, development of criteria for selecting buildings for improvements, work with property owners to coordinate, design and implement renovations.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Awarded</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Aetna Foundation</td>
<td>Jason Stoltzus</td>
<td>Cultivating Healthy Communities</td>
<td>4/14/2016</td>
<td>4/13/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implement portions of the Clewiston Neighborhood Revitalization plan, including: street lighting, awnings, painting and landscaping.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Awarded</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>EPA- Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>Jennifer Pellechio</td>
<td>Brownfields 2016</td>
<td>12/18/2015</td>
<td>12/18/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 ASTM-AAI compliant Phase I ESAs, 1 Generic Quality Assurance Project Plan, 4 SQAPPs, 4 Phase II ESAs, 4</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Awarded</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>USDA - US Dept. of Agriculture</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>Farm to School</td>
<td>5/20/2015</td>
<td>5/20/2015</td>
<td>11/19/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Awarded</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>DEO - FL Dept. of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>Jennifer Pellechio</td>
<td>Growing Markets for Small Farmers</td>
<td>6/17/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify needs of local farmers, identify sellers for the market, Prudce a map and marketing materials, implement action plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Awarded</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>WallMart</td>
<td>C.J. Kammerer</td>
<td>GoodWheels</td>
<td>7/17/2015</td>
<td>7/16/2015</td>
<td>9/10/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Run transportation routes between Clewiston and Belle Glade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Awarded</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>DEO - FL Dept. of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>Jennifer Pellechio</td>
<td>SWF “Know Your Zone” Public Education Campaign</td>
<td>6/17/2015</td>
<td>6/7/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design a logo, Prepare education program and curriculum, introduce campaign and schedules, Create Disaster Planning Guide, Present to schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Funding Agency</td>
<td>Grant Name</td>
<td>Project Mgr.</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>App Due Date</td>
<td>Date Submitted</td>
<td>Date Awarded/Denied</td>
<td>Date Contract Signed</td>
<td>Project Total</td>
<td>RPC Amt</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>Total Match Amt RPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Awarded</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>DEO - FL Dept. of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>Jennifer Pellechio</td>
<td>Strategic Opportunity Plan for Immokalee</td>
<td>5/26/2015</td>
<td>6/17/2015</td>
<td>6/7/2015</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Task 1: Demographics &amp; Economic Study; Task 2: Community Vision &amp; Stakeholder Engagement; Task 3: Goal Development (with Steering Committee); Task 4: Implementation Guide and Strategic Action Plan (3 – 5 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Awarded</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>DEO - FL Dept. of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>Jennifer Pellechio</td>
<td>Hendry County Regional Laborshed/Workforce Assessment</td>
<td>6/17/2015</td>
<td>6/7/2015</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Hire consultant, Meeting with Hendry County, Draft Material for Hendry presentation, Final assessment and recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Awarded</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>EDA - US Economic Development Administration</td>
<td>Jennifer Pellechio</td>
<td>EDA- North Port</td>
<td>6/12/2015</td>
<td>6/12/2015</td>
<td>8/3/2015</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Awarded</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>NOAA - National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration</td>
<td>Jim Beever</td>
<td>Measuring and Forecasting Future Ecosystem Services in the CHNEP Study Area</td>
<td>3/17/2015</td>
<td>3/17/2015</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Products of the study will include updated valuations of the ecosystem services provided by existing conservation lands in the CHNEP; an updated conservation lands mapping of the project study area; a documentation and quantification of the ecosystem services provided by each habitat type, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Awarded</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Artplace America</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>ArtPlace - &quot;OUR CREATIVE ECONOMY&quot;</td>
<td>3/12/2015</td>
<td>3/11/2015</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Awarded</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>EPA - US Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>John Gibbons</td>
<td>Environmental Workforce Development Job Training</td>
<td>2/3/2015</td>
<td>2/3/2015</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>GSHA 29 CFR 1910.120 40-Hour HAZWOPER and other training.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Awarded</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>NEA - National Endowment for the Arts</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>Our Creative Economy - A Regional Strategy for Southwest Florida’s Public Art and Cultural Venues</td>
<td>1/15/2015</td>
<td>1/14/2015</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>• Asset Mapping • A Regional Strategy for Enhancing Public Art: A SWOT • Southwest Florida’s Public Art and Cultural Venues Field and Tour Guide</td>
<td>$113,472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Awarded</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>NACo - National Association of Counties</td>
<td>Jennifer Pellechio</td>
<td>NACo County Prosperity Summit</td>
<td>10/3/2014</td>
<td>10/3/2014</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Summit</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Awarded</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>EPA - US Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>Dottie Cook</td>
<td>Southwest Florida Brownfields Coalition</td>
<td>12/19/2014</td>
<td>12/19/2014</td>
<td>6/27/2015</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consent Agenda
Agenda Item #10(a) - Intergovernmental Coordination and Review
The attached report summarizes the project notifications received from various governmental and non-governmental agencies seeking federal assistance or permits for the period beginning June 1, 2016 and ending August 31, 2016.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Information purposes only.

Agenda Item #10(b) – Lee County Comp Plan Amendment (DEO 16-2ESR)
Lee County DEO 16-2ESR amends the Lee Plan to incorporate updates to four Lee Plan Maps. The maps proposed for amendments are Map 3E: Airports, Seaports, Railways and Waterways; Map 3J: Evacuation Routes; Map 5: Coastal High Hazard Area; and Map 10: General Soils Map. The existing and proposed maps are attached to this report. No new maps are proposed by this amendment. Only updates to existing maps that are already incorporated into the Lee Plan.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Staff recommends that this proposal be found not regionally significant

Agenda Item #10(c) – Lee County Comp Plan Amendment (DEO 16-3ESR)
Lee County DEO 16-3ESR amends the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) category of 299.01 acres of land from Industrial Development and Wetlands to Urban Community and Wetlands and amends Table 1(b), Year 2030 Allocations, to accommodate more residential development for the Urban Community FLUM category within the Gateway/Airport Planning Community. The subject site is currently 297.2 acres of Industrial Development and 1.8 acres of Wetlands.

The site is mostly surrounded by Industrial Development FLU category. Segments of the site are also adjacent to Rural, Open Lands, and Urban Community. Redesignation of these lands will allow up to 1,500 residential dwelling units and 450,000 square feet of commercial and general office uses.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Staff recommends that this proposal be found not regionally significant

Agenda Item #10(d) – Lee County Comp Plan Amendment (DEO 16-4ESR)
Lee County DEO 16-4ESR consists of two amendments, CPA2016-00001 and CPA2016-00004:

CPA2016-00001, Airport Development Schedule Update: Update Table 5(a), for the Southwest Florida International Airport, to consolidate future development into a single phase. Update Table 5(b), for the Page Field Airport, to consolidate future development into a single phase and add 25,000 square feet for
a multi-use hanger. Update the Lee Plan FLU and Transportation Elements to reflect these changes and make consistent throughout the Lee Plan.

CPA2016-00004, RSW Noise Zone Update: Update Lee Plan Map 1, Page 5 of 8 titles “Special Treatment Areas” (Airport Noise Zone Map) and related Policy 1.7.1 to be consistent with the 2013 Southwest Florida International Airport Part 150 Noise Study.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Staff recommends that this proposal be found not regionally significant

Agenda Item #10(e) – Glades County Comp Plan Amendment (DEO 16-1ESR)
Glades County DEO 16-1ESR proposes to change the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) designation of 70 acres of land from Residential to Agricultural/Residential. The surrounding land uses are Agricultural/Residential, Agricultural/Open, and Transition. The subject sites are zoned as Agricultural/Residential (AR) and Open Use Agriculture (OUA). These zoning designations are inconsistent with the Residential FLUM category. Amending the FLUM category to Agricultural/Residential would help fix this inconsistency in the Comprehensive Plan.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Staff recommends that this proposal be found not regionally significant

Agenda Item #10(f) – Sarasota County Comp Plan Amendment (DEO 16-3ESR)
Sarasota County DEO 16-3ESR is a major initiative of the County to holistically update its Comprehensive Plan by making it current with recent trends and making it an easier document for all to use. The entire Comprehensive Plan has been completely amended and reformatted. The Comprehensive Plan as proposed will now consist of two volumes, with the first volume being comprised of the adopted Sarasota County Comprehensive Plan (Goals, Objectives, Policies, and the County Primary Components), and the second volume comprised of the associated, but non-adopted, background and support information. Changes are made to the Environmental, Future Land Use, Housing, Mobility, and Economic Development Chapters.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Staff recommends that this proposal be found not regionally significant

Agenda Item #10(g) – City of Bonita Springs Comp Plan Amendment (DEO 16-1ESR)
City of Bonita Springs DEO 16-1ESR proposes to amend the Bonita Springs Comprehensive Plan to address potential future uses of the CSX / Seminole Gulf rail corridor through amendments adding a new objective and policies to the Future Land Use Element, adding new policies and a new map to the Transportation Element, and modifying policies in the Recreation/Open Space Element.

The Future Land Use Element adds policies that would support trails and public transportation on the rail corridor, promise to a separate FLUM designation for the rail corridor in the future, support
development around potential transit stations that emphasize walkability and connectivity, and authorize transit-oriented development (TOD) planning and identify best practices for station area planning. The Transportation Element adds a new map (Figure 10) that identifies the rail corridor along with policies that identify its significance to Bonita Springs and the region, as well as actions to support future uses of the rail corridor. The Recreation / Open Space Element is updated to reflect the rail corridor’s potential role for trails and bike paths.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Staff recommends that this proposal be found regionally significant in regards to character and consistent with the SRPP.

Agenda Item #10(h) – City of Fort Myers Comp Plan Amendment (DEO 16-1ESR)
City of Fort Myers DEO 16-1ESR requests to amend the Fort Myers Comprehensive Plan to address potential future uses of the CSX / Seminole Gulf rail corridor as the corridor passes through Fort Myers. These amendments would add policies, actions, and a new map to the Transportation Element and would add policies and actions to the Future Land Use Element.

The text amendments propose to designate the CSX / Seminole Gulf rail corridor as a Strategic Regional Transportation Corridor, recognize the regional nature of the corridor and jointly commit to efforts to protect it in its entirety, oppose any attempts to abandon the corridor, and support the MPO in enhancing freight capacity for the entire corridor, adding trails to select portions of the corridor, and add capability for commuter rails, light rail, or bus transit in Lee County and northern Collier County.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Staff recommends that this proposal be found regionally significant in regards to character and consistent with the SRPP.

Agenda Item #10(i) – City of North Port Comp Plan Amendment (DEO 16-1ESR)
City of North Port 16-1ESR is proposing an amendment to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM), changing land use designation on approximately 126.37 acres from “None” to “Village”. The amendment also includes an associated text amendment with Figure 13.1.n to include the subject property as part of the West Villages. The subject property was annexed into North Port in 2007 via Ordinance 2007-14. Subsequent to this, on May 22, 2008 the City of North Port and Sarasota County entered into a Joint Planning Agreement (JPA) regarding the future incorporation of the subject property into the West Villages Town Center. The parcel is surrounded by mostly Village FLUC with some Sarasota County land.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Staff recommends that this proposal be found not regionally significant.
Agenda Item #10(j) – Charlotte County Comp Plan Amendment (DEO 16-4ESR)
Charlotte County DEO 16-4ESR consists of two amendments:

PA-16-06-10-LS: This request is to revise Future Land Use (FLU) Appendix VI: Developments of Regional Impact by amending the Sandhill Development of Regional Impact (DRI) development rights and adding Equivalency Matrix to be consistent with the Sandhill DRI Development Order Resolution Number 2014-174.

PA-16-06-11-LS: This request is to rename "Revitalizing Neighborhoods Incentive Density" in the County’s Comprehensive Plan to "Incentive Density"; revise Future Land Use (FLU) Policy 1.2.16: Incentive Density (new name); add new FLU Policy 1.2.17: Incentive Density Usage.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Staff recommends that this proposal be found not regionally significant

Agenda Item #10(k) – City of Moore Haven Comp Plan Amendment (DEO 16-1ESR)
City of Moore Haven DEO 16-1ESR contains amendments to the text of the Infrastructure and Capital Improvements Elements of the Comprehensive Plan that adopt the 2016 Water Supply Facilities Work Plan Update. The minor changes to the specific Comprehensive Plan Elements reflect revised population and water demand data plus revisions to the Capital Improvements Element Schedule for the new five-year time period.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Staff recommends that this proposal be found not regionally significant
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9a
Project Review and Coordination Regional Clearinghouse Review

The attached report summarizes the project notifications received from various governmental and non-governmental agencies seeking federal assistance or permits for the period beginning July 1, 2016 and ending August 31, 2016.

The staff of the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council reviews various proposals, Notifications of Intent, Preapplications, permit applications, and Environmental Impact Statements for compliance with regional goals, objectives, and policies of the Regional Comprehensive Policy Plan. The staff reviews such items in accordance with the Florida Intergovernmental Coordination and Review Process (Chapter 29I-5, F.A.C.) and adopted regional clearinghouse procedures.

Council staff reviews projects under the following four designations:

- **Less Than Regionally Significant and Consistent** - no further review of the project can be expected from Council.

- **Less Than Regionally Significant and Inconsistent** - Council does not find the project to be of regional importance, but notes certain concerns as part of its continued monitoring for cumulative impacts within the noted goal areas.

- **Regionally Significant and Consistent** - Project is of regional importance and appears to be consistent with Regional goals, objectives and policies.

- **Regionally Significant and Inconsistent** - Project is of regional importance and appears not to be consistent with Regional goals, objectives, and policies. Council will oppose the project as submitted, but is willing to participate in any efforts to modify the project to mitigate the concerns.

The report includes the SWFRPC number, the applicant name, project description, location, funding or permitting agency, and the amount of federal funding, when applicable. It also includes the comments provided by staff to the applicant and to the State Clearinghouse (Office of Planning and Budgeting) in Tallahassee.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Information purposes only.

09/2016
### Review in Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SWFRPC #</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Funding Agent</th>
<th>Funding Amount</th>
<th>Council Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>USACOE, Jacksonville District - Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Herbert Hoover Dike Dam Safety Modification Study in Florida.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sarasota County</td>
<td>FDEP - Request for Minor Modification for Construction Access. The permitted construction access lies almost one mile north of the northern limit of FL for the 2016 project, significantly extending the shoreline area along which nesting marine turtles and relocated nests may be impacted by construction activities. To minimize impacts to resources the Permittee has requested a modification to add additional temporary construction access areas on the south end of Longboat Key.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sarasota County</td>
<td>FDEP - Permit Modification No. 0298107-007-JN &amp; Permit No. 0298107-004-JC - Longboat Pass Navigational Maintenance Dredging and Beach Nourishment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sarasota County</td>
<td>City of Sarasota and USACOE - Response to Request for Additional Information No. 2 - Big Sarasota Pass Dredging, Lido Key Beach Nourishment and Structures in Sarasota County.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWFRPC #</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Funding Agent</td>
<td>Funding Amount</td>
<td>Council Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hendry County</td>
<td>Hendry County - FY2015 Florida Small Cities CDBG, Housing Rehabilitation Category.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review in Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lee County DEO 16-2ESR
LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS
LEE COUNTY

The Council staff has reviewed the proposed evaluation and appraisal based amendments to the Lee County Comprehensive Plan (DEO 16-2ESR). These amendments were developed under the Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act. A synopsis of the requirements of the Act and Council responsibilities is provided as Attachment I. Comments are provided in Attachment II. Site location maps can be reviewed in Attachment III.

Staff review of the proposed amendments was based on whether they were likely to be of regional concern. This was determined through assessment of the following factors:

1. Location—in or near a regional resource or regional activity center, such that it impacts the regional resource or facility; on or within one mile of a county boundary; generally applied to sites of five acres or more; size alone is not necessarily a determinant of regional significance;
2. Magnitude—equal to or greater than the threshold for a Development of Regional Impact of the same type (a DRI-related amendment is considered regionally significant); and
3. Character—of a unique type or use, a use of regional significance, or a change in the local comprehensive plan that could be applied throughout the local jurisdiction; updates, editorial revisions, etc. are not regionally significant.

A summary of the results of the review follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Consistent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEO 16-2ESR</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(1) Not regionally significant (2) Consistent with SRPP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and Lee County

06/2016
COMMUNITY PLANNING ACT

Local Government Comprehensive Plans
The Act requires each municipal and county government to prepare a comprehensive plan that must include at least the following nine elements:

1. Future Land Use Element;
2. Traffic Circulation Element;
   A local government with all or part of its jurisdiction within the urbanized area of a Metropolitan Planning Organization shall prepare and adopt a transportation element to replace the traffic circulation; mass transit; and ports, aviation, and related facilities elements. [9J-5.019(1), FAC]
3. General Sanitary Sewer, Solid Waste, Drainage, and Potable Water and Natural Groundwater Aquifer Recharge Element;
4. Conservation Element;
5. Recreation and Open Space Element;
6. Housing Element;
7. Coastal Management Element for coastal jurisdictions;
8. Intergovernmental Coordination Element; and

The local government may add optional elements (e.g., community design, redevelopment, safety, historical and scenic preservation, and economic).

All local governments in Southwest Florida have adopted revised plans:
Charlotte County, Punta Gorda
Collier County, Everglades City, Marco Island, Naples
Glades County, Moore Haven
Hendry County, Clewiston, LaBelle
Lee County, Bonita Springs, Cape Coral, Fort Myers, Fort Myers Beach, Sanibel
Sarasota County, Longboat Key, North Port, Sarasota, Venice
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

A local government may amend its plan at any time during the calendar year. Six copies of the amendment are sent to the Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) for review. A copy is also sent to the Regional Planning Council, the Water Management District, the Florida Department of Transportation, and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.

The proposed amendments will be reviewed by DEO in two situations. In the first, there must be a written request to DEO. The request for review must be received within forty-five days after transmittal of the proposed amendment. Reviews can be requested by one of the following:

- the local government that transmits the amendment,
- the regional planning council, or
- an affected person.

In the second situation, DEO can decide to review the proposed amendment without a request. In that case, DEO must give notice within thirty days of transmittal.

Within five working days after deciding to conduct a review, DEO may forward copies to various reviewing agencies, including the Regional Planning Council.

**Regional Planning Council Review**

The Regional Planning Council must submit its comments in writing within thirty days of receipt of the proposed amendment from DEO. It must specify any objections and may make recommendations for changes. The review of the proposed amendment by the Regional Planning Council must be limited to "effects on regional resources or facilities identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan and extra-jurisdictional impacts which would be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan of the affected local government".

After receipt of comments from the Regional Planning Council and other reviewing agencies, DEO has thirty days to conduct its own review and determine compliance with state law. Within that thirty-day period, DEO transmits its written comments to the local government.

**NOTE:** THE ABOVE IS A SIMPLIFIED VERSION OF THE LAW. REFER TO THE STATUTE (CH. 163, FS) FOR DETAILS.
Summary of Proposed Amendment

Lee County DEO 16-2ESR amends the Lee Plan to incorporate updates to four Lee Plan Maps. The maps proposed for amendments are Map 3E: Airports, Seaports, Railways and Waterways; Map 3J: Evacuation Routes; Map 5: Coastal High Hazard Area; and Map 10: General Soils Map. The existing and proposed maps are attached to this report. No new maps are proposed by this amendment. Only updates to existing maps that are already incorporated into the Lee Plan.

On Map 3E, there are two changes to facilities. The first is the removal of the Port Boca Grande facility at the south end of Gasparilla Island. This property is no longer used as a major seaport and was recently changed from the Public Facilities to the Urban Community future land use category. It is currently in the process to be rezoned to a Residential Planned Development. The second change is based on the data provided by the Waterway Network. A waterway has been extended through San Carlos Bay to the east of Sanibel Island. In addition, the map is being updated to include city limits as well as to improve legibility.

Map 3J was last updated in the Lee Plan in 1995. The proposed map is based on the “Evacuation Transportation Analysis” performed by the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council in 2015 as part of the Florida Statewide Regional Evacuation Study Program. Updates to Map 3J reflect new transportation facilities or facilities which now have greater capacity. In addition, due to changes in the data from the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council, the proposed map no longer identifies “Recommended Traffic Control Points.” The map has also been updated to include city limits as well as to improve legibility.

The changes identified in Map 5 are largely due to improved modeling techniques and data collection such as the use of LIDAR. To better demonstrate the changes to the CHHA an additional map is attached that depicts the areas that have been added and the areas that will be removed from the CHHA. The additional map is for demonstrative purposes only and is not proposed to be adopted into the Lee Plan.

The data for Map 10 was compiled in 1983 but is still accurate since it is a generalized map rather than a precise depiction of soil types. The proposed map is in color versus the current black and white map and therefore much more legible and a great improvement. No other changes are proposed to Map 10.

The proposed amendment will keep the Lee Plan up to date by incorporating the latest data and studies in the proposed maps and contribute towards maintaining as high a level of accuracy in the Lee Plan as possible. In addition, the proposed maps will be more legible and easier to use than the current versions.
**Regional Impacts**
Council staff has reviewed the requested changes and finds that the requested Comprehensive Plan amendments do not directly produce any significant regional impacts that would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of any other local government within the region.

**Extra-Jurisdictional Impacts**
Council staff has reviewed the requested changes and finds that the requested Comprehensive Plan amendments do not directly produce any significant extra-jurisdictional impacts that would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of any other local government within the region.

**Conclusion**
No adverse effects on regional resources or facilities and no extra-jurisdictional impacts have been identified. Staff finds that this project is not regionally significant.

**Recommended Action**
Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and Lee County.
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1. INDIANA-PONPAHO
2. HALLANDALE-BOCA
3. NOKOMIS-BOCA-HAYAKA
4. OLDSMAR-HARBOR-HAYAKA
5. PINE-BOCA-YABASSO
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8. PECKISH-ESTERO-ILES
9. CAHIERAL-CAPITIVA-KESSON
10. MATLACHA

Note: This area indicates the KIP consists of more than one kind of soil. The KIP is for the benefit of the general area. Source: U.S.A. Soil Conservation Service.
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LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS
LEE COUNTY

The Council staff has reviewed the proposed evaluation and appraisal based amendments to the Lee County Comprehensive Plan (DEO 16-3ESR). These amendments were developed under the Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act. A synopsis of the requirements of the Act and Council responsibilities is provided as Attachment I. Comments are provided in Attachment II. Site location maps can be reviewed in Attachment III.

Staff review of the proposed amendments was based on whether they were likely to be of regional concern. This was determined through assessment of the following factors:

1. **Location**—in or near a regional resource or regional activity center, such that it impacts the regional resource or facility; on or within one mile of a county boundary; generally applied to sites of five acres or more; size alone is not necessarily a determinant of regional significance;
2. **Magnitude**—equal to or greater than the threshold for a Development of Regional Impact of the same type (a DRI-related amendment is considered regionally significant); and
3. **Character**—of a unique type or use, a use of regional significance, or a change in the local comprehensive plan that could be applied throughout the local jurisdiction; updates, editorial revisions, etc. are not regionally significant.

A summary of the results of the review follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Consistent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| DEO 16-3ESR        | No       | No        | No        | (1) Not regionally significant  
(2) Consistent with SRPP |

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and Lee County

07/2016
COMMUNITY PLANNING ACT

Local Government Comprehensive Plans
The Act requires each municipal and county government to prepare a comprehensive plan that must include at least the following nine elements:

1. Future Land Use Element;
2. Traffic Circulation Element;
   A local government with all or part of its jurisdiction within the urbanized area of a Metropolitan Planning Organization shall prepare and adopt a transportation element to replace the traffic circulation; mass transit; and ports, aviation, and related facilities elements. [9J-5.019(1), FAC]
3. General Sanitary Sewer, Solid Waste, Drainage, and Potable Water and Natural Groundwater Aquifer Recharge Element;
4. Conservation Element;
5. Recreation and Open Space Element;
6. Housing Element;
7. Coastal Management Element for coastal jurisdictions;
8. Intergovernmental Coordination Element; and

The local government may add optional elements (e.g., community design, redevelopment, safety, historical and scenic preservation, and economic).

All local governments in Southwest Florida have adopted revised plans:
- Charlotte County, Punta Gorda
- Collier County, Everglades City, Marco Island, Naples
- Glades County, Moore Haven
- Hendry County, Clewiston, LaBelle
- Lee County, Bonita Springs, Cape Coral, Fort Myers, Fort Myers Beach, Sanibel
- Sarasota County, Longboat Key, North Port, Sarasota, Venice
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

A local government may amend its plan at any time during the calendar year. Six copies of the amendment are sent to the Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) for review. A copy is also sent to the Regional Planning Council, the Water Management District, the Florida Department of Transportation, and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.

The proposed amendments will be reviewed by DEO in two situations. In the first, there must be a written request to DEO. The request for review must be received within forty-five days after transmittal of the proposed amendment. Reviews can be requested by one of the following:

- the local government that transmits the amendment,
- the regional planning council, or
- an affected person.

In the second situation, DEO can decide to review the proposed amendment without a request. In that case, DEO must give notice within thirty days of transmittal.

Within five working days after deciding to conduct a review, DEO may forward copies to various reviewing agencies, including the Regional Planning Council.

Regional Planning Council Review
The Regional Planning Council must submit its comments in writing within thirty days of receipt of the proposed amendment from DEO. It must specify any objections and may make recommendations for changes. The review of the proposed amendment by the Regional Planning Council must be limited to "effects on regional resources or facilities identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan and extra-jurisdictional impacts which would be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan of the affected local government".

After receipt of comments from the Regional Planning Council and other reviewing agencies, DEO has thirty days to conduct its own review and determine compliance with state law. Within that thirty-day period, DEO transmits its written comments to the local government.

NOTE: THE ABOVE IS A SIMPLIFIED VERSION OF THE LAW. REFER TO THE STATUTE (CH. 163, FS) FOR DETAILS.
Summary of Proposed Amendment

Lee County DEO 16-3ESR amends the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) category of 299.01 acres of land from Industrial Development and Wetlands to Urban Community and Wetlands and amends Table 1(b), Year 2030 Allocations, to accommodate more residential development for the Urban Community FLUM category within the Gateway/Airport Planning Community. The subject site is currently 297.2 acres of Industrial Development and 1.8 acres of Wetlands. The site is mostly surrounded by Industrial Development FLU category. Segments of the site are also adjacent to Rural, Open Lands, and Urban Community. Redesignation of these lands will allow up to 1,500 residential dwelling units and 450,000 square feet of commercial and general office uses.

The subject property is in a changing area within the County. The property was previously subject to airport noise zone restrictions that precluded new residential zoning and development, however, in 2007, the Noise Zones for the Southwest Florida International Airport were revised and the subject property is no longer subject to restrictions on residential development due to the noise zone. The revisions were based on changes that followed the actual noise contours. In 2012, the extension of Michael G. Rippe Parkway, aka Metro Parkway, in front of the subject property was completed. The "Metro Extension" changed the access and the visibility of the property. The property is no longer in an obscure location with limited access, but occupies a prominent frontage on this newly constructed north-south corridor. These changing conditions, along with the existing surrounding residential uses, have altered the development circumstances of the subject property and surrounding area along Metro Parkway and Alico Road.

Industrial uses have special locational and infrastructure requirements. The lands within the Industrial Development future land use category along Alico Road are uniquely situated within Lee County relative to nearby transportation networks. The location of the subject property meets the locational requirements and infrastructure needs of industrial developments. The Lee Plan allows for limited light industrial uses in other Future Urban Areas (including Urban Community) if, through the Planned Development rezoning process, compatibility with adjacent uses can be demonstrated. However this does not allow for heavier industrial uses or other development that may be deemed incompatible with residential or commercial uses. Within the Alico Corridor and the Industrial Future Land Use east of the subject property there are approximately 9.3 million SF of Industrial Uses approved without the subject property.

Redesignating these lands will add to the projected deficit of high school capacity as well increase the demand on the Three Oaks Waste Water Treatment Plant, which is expected to exceed its capacity by 2030 without additional capacity improvements. Lee County Utilities is currently conducting a study to identify options for treatment of wastewater flows that are projected to be generated within the Three Oaks WWTP service area.
Regional Impacts
Council staff has reviewed the requested changes and finds that the requested Comprehensive Plan amendments do not directly produce any significant regional impacts that would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of any other local government within the region.

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) also reviewed this amendment package and determined that the amendment would result in a net decrease in peak-hour trips. Staff agrees with the recommendations set forth in FDOT’s attached review of this project.

Extra-Jurisdictional Impacts
Council staff has reviewed the requested changes and finds that the requested Comprehensive Plan amendments do not directly produce any significant extra-jurisdictional impacts that would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of any other local government within the region.

Conclusion
No adverse effects on regional resources or facilities and no extra-jurisdictional impacts have been identified. FDOT’s recommendations should be followed. Staff finds that this project is not regionally significant.

Recommended Action
Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and Lee County.
Mr. Brandon Dunn  
Principal Planner  
Lee County Planning Division  
P.O. Box 398  
Fort Myers, Florida 33902-0398

RE: Lee County 16-3ESR Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment (Expedited State Review Process) – FDOT Comments and Recommendations

Dear Mr. Dunn:

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), District One, has reviewed the Lee County 16-3ESR, Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPA), known locally as CPA2015-03, Dusty Metro. This CPA was transmitted under the Expedited State Review process by the Board of County Commissioners in accordance with the requirements of Florida Statutes (F.S.) Chapter 163.

**CPA2015-03, Dusty Metro (Future Land Use Amendment):**  
CPA2015-03 is a proposed amendment to the Lee Plan, within the Gateway/Airport Planning Community. This Amendment proposes to redesignate 299± acres (located at the northwest corner of Alico Road and SR 739/Michael G. Rippe Parkway) from the Industrial Development and Wetlands future land use (FLU) categories to the Urban Community and Wetlands FLU categories, and to amend Table 1(b) of the Lee Plan, Year 2030 Allocations, to accommodate additional residential development for the Urban Community future land use category within the Gateway/Airport Planning Community. Residential uses were not initially contemplated within the Gateway/Airport Planning Community.
**Map Amendment:**
According to the Adopted FLU designations and based on the allowed development within the Gateway/Airport Planning Community, the currently adopted "Industrial Development" category would allow for 3,900,000 square feet of industrial uses, which would generate approximately 3,072 p.m. peak-hour trips. Based on the information provided in the staff report, the proposed "Urban Community" category would allow for 450,000 square feet of commercial and general office, and 1,500 residential units, which would generate approximately 2,724 p.m. peak-hour trips, resulting in a net decrease of 348 p.m. peak hour trips.

The following table summarizes the trip generation potential for the currently adopted and proposed land uses for the 299± acres, and the change in trips as a result of the proposed amendment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Land Use Code</th>
<th>Size of Development</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>Industrial Development</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>299.01</td>
<td>3,900,000 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>299.01</td>
<td>315,000 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested</td>
<td>General Office</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>299.01</td>
<td>135,000 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>299.01</td>
<td>1,500 DU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Trip generation based on the rates and/or equations obtained in the ITE Trip Generation Manual (9th Edition).

**Text Amendment:**
The proposed text amendment revises Table 1(b) of the LeePlan to reflect the proposed allocation of 300± acres from the Industrial FLU category to Urban Community within the Gateway/Airport Planning Community. According to the currently adopted Table 1(b) Year 2030 Allocation from the Adopted Lee Plan, the Gateway/Airport Planning Community allocates a total of 1,034 acres of unincorporated Residential, 1,100 acres of Commercial and 3,100 acres of Industrial FLUs.

The proposed change will reallocate 300± acres to account for the 299± acres as presented in the proposed FLU map amendment. The 300± acres will be reallocated as follows:
- 250 acres of new Urban Community
- 1,150 acres of Commercial (a 50 acre addition)
- 2,800 acres of Industrial (a 300 acre reduction)
In order to accommodate the proposed residential units as presented in the map amendment, per the recommendations from the Lee County staff report, a reduction in residential allocation from another FLU category and/or planning community would need to be approved.

Based on FDOT's planning level analysis, and consistent with Lee County Department of Transportation's (DOT) analysis (per a letter dated September 21, 2015) from Lee County DOT, the proposed map amendment results in a decrease in P.M. peak hour trips. While FDOT does not have comments relating to the Level of Service of SR 739, the Department does have comments pertaining to access and road impacts. These comments do not form the basis of an objection.

**FDOT Comment #1:**
Access to the property should be coordinated with FDOT's Fort Myers Operation Center (Permitting Department) as early as possible to determine the appropriate connection for any developmental project. Any access to SR 739 will be subject to FDOT permitting process as described in Rules 14-96 and 14-97 FAC.

**FDOT Comment #2:**
Please clarify if the subject area for the proposed Land Use category change is 299± acres or 300± acres. Additionally, please clarify if the total acreage proposed for allocation to unincorporated Residential is 1,023 acres or 1,034 acres. Unfortunately, the acreage varies through the transmittal package.

**FDOT Comment #3:**
FDOT supports the Lee County planning staff in their recommendation to provide an appropriate balance of allocated residential uses through a reduction in residential allocation from another FLU category and/or planning community to offset this increase.

**FDOT Comment #4:**
The proposed amendment site is expected to serve mixed land uses, including residential, commercial, and office. The land uses surrounding the proposed site are primarily residential, industrial, and commercial. In addition, the proposed site is adjacent to SR 739/Michael G. Rippe Parkway, just east of SR 45/US 41/Tamiami Trail (both State transportation facilities), and does not have a transit route along Alico Road or SR/739/Michael G. Rippe Parkway at this time.

In order to promote fewer single vehicle occupancy trips and lessen potential conflicts from the proposed mixed-use development and the surrounding uses, FDOT encourages the applicant to work with Lee County and Lee Tran staff during the development phase to establish a transit route and stop to serve this area.
FDOT Comment #5:
FDOT often receives complaints about traffic noise at residences that have been built within very close proximity of a state highway. Such homes often experience hourly equalized noise levels in excess of 66 decibels, the level at which FDOT considers feasibility and reasonableness of noise barriers. Under federal regulation and FDOT policy, FDOT only constructs noise barriers at pre-existing homes built/ permitted before the completion of the Project Development and Environment (PD&E) process for future planned highway widenings or for new roadways on new alignments. FDOT does not provide "retro-fit" noise barriers for new/future impacted residences along existing facilities.

Therefore, FDOT strongly encourages developers and permitting agencies to incorporate several proactive mitigative measures in design plans to reduce impacts of highway noise along existing state highways on residences that will be built in the future:

- Depending on traffic volumes and speeds, residences should ideally be set back at least 300-400 feet from the nearest travel lane of the existing/future planned arterial roadways, and greater distances (over 500 feet) from higher speed/higher volume limited access highways like Interstates.

- A solid masonry wall and/or earthen berm that is tall enough to break the line of sight between residences and noise sources (particularly large trucks with high exhaust pipes) is recommended. To reduce traffic noise to acceptable levels at residences, FDOT typically builds walls between 12 and 16 feet high along arterial highways and between 16 and 22 feet high along Interstate highways. Shorter 6- to 8-foot privacy walls as typically constructed by developers do not provide enough noise reduction to meet FDOT policy criteria.

- Vegetation that blocks views of the highway is not an effective noise abatement strategy unless it is tall dense forest hundreds of feet deep (that cannot be seen through). Landscape plantings provide an aesthetic/psychological barrier, but would not adequately replace a wall/berm described above for noise mitigation.

FDOT welcomes an opportunity to collaborate with Lee County to minimize potential future transportation impacts on State and SIS transportation facilities and offers several new initiatives that complement the goals expressed in the County's Comprehensive Plan,
such as “Complete Streets”, modern roundabouts, and a commitment to bicycle and pedestrian safety.

Thank you for providing FDOT with the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed amendment. If you have any questions please free to contact me at (239) 225-1981 or sarah.catala@dot.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,

Sarah Catala
SIS/Growth Management Coordinator
FDOT District One

CC: Mr. Ray Eubanks, Florida Department of Economic Opportunity
    Ms. Derek Burr, Florida Department of Transportation, Southwest Area Office

---

1 http://www.flcompletestreets.com/
2 http://www.dot.state.fl.us/rdesign/Roundabouts/Default.shtm
3 http://www.alerttodayflorida.com/
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LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS
LEE COUNTY

The Council staff has reviewed the proposed evaluation and appraisal based amendments to the Lee County Comprehensive Plan (DEO 16-4ESR). These amendments were developed under the Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act. A synopsis of the requirements of the Act and Council responsibilities is provided as Attachment I. Comments are provided in Attachment II. Site location maps can be reviewed in Attachment III.

Staff review of the proposed amendments was based on whether they were likely to be of regional concern. This was determined through assessment of the following factors:

1. **Location**—in or near a regional resource or regional activity center, such that it impacts the regional resource or facility; on or within one mile of a county boundary; generally applied to sites of five acres or more; size alone is not necessarily a determinant of regional significance;
2. **Magnitude**—equal to or greater than the threshold for a Development of Regional Impact of the same type (a DRI-related amendment is considered regionally significant); and
3. **Character**—of a unique type or use, a use of regional significance, or a change in the local comprehensive plan that could be applied throughout the local jurisdiction; updates, editorial revisions, etc. are not regionally significant.

A summary of the results of the review follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Consistent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| DEO 16-4ESR        | No       | No        | No        | (1) Not regionally significant  
|                    |          |           |           | (2) Consistent with SRPP |

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and Lee County

09/2016
Community Planning Act

Local Government Comprehensive Plans
The Act requires each municipal and county government to prepare a comprehensive plan that must include at least the following nine elements:

1. Future Land Use Element;
2. Traffic Circulation Element;
   A local government with all or part of its jurisdiction within the urbanized area of a Metropolitan Planning Organization shall prepare and adopt a transportation element to replace the traffic circulation; mass transit; and ports, aviation, and related facilities elements. [9J-5.019(1), FAC]
3. General Sanitary Sewer, Solid Waste, Drainage, and Potable Water and Natural Groundwater Aquifer Recharge Element;
4. Conservation Element;
5. Recreation and Open Space Element;
6. Housing Element;
7. Coastal Management Element for coastal jurisdictions;
8. Intergovernmental Coordination Element; and

The local government may add optional elements (e.g., community design, redevelopment, safety, historical and scenic preservation, and economic).

All local governments in Southwest Florida have adopted revised plans:
Charlotte County, Punta Gorda
Collier County, Everglades City, Marco Island, Naples
Glades County, Moore Haven
Hendry County, Clewiston, LaBelle
Lee County, Bonita Springs, Cape Coral, Fort Myers, Fort Myers Beach, Sanibel
Sarasota County, Longboat Key, North Port, Sarasota, Venice
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

A local government may amend its plan at any time during the calendar year. Six copies of the amendment are sent to the Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) for review. A copy is also sent to the Regional Planning Council, the Water Management District, the Florida Department of Transportation, and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.

The proposed amendments will be reviewed by DEO in two situations. In the first, there must be a written request to DEO. The request for review must be received within forty-five days after transmittal of the proposed amendment. Reviews can be requested by one of the following:

- the local government that transmits the amendment,
- the regional planning council, or
- an affected person.

In the second situation, DEO can decide to review the proposed amendment without a request. In that case, DEO must give notice within thirty days of transmittal.

Within five working days after deciding to conduct a review, DEO may forward copies to various reviewing agencies, including the Regional Planning Council.

**Regional Planning Council Review**

The Regional Planning Council must submit its comments in writing within thirty days of receipt of the proposed amendment from DEO. It must specify any objections and may make recommendations for changes. The review of the proposed amendment by the Regional Planning Council must be limited to "effects on regional resources or facilities identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan and extra-jurisdictional impacts which would be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan of the affected local government".

After receipt of comments from the Regional Planning Council and other reviewing agencies, DEO has thirty days to conduct its own review and determine compliance with state law. Within that thirty-day period, DEO transmits its written comments to the local government.

**NOTE:** THE ABOVE IS A SIMPLIFIED VERSION OF THE LAW. REFER TO THE STATUTE (CH. 163, FS) FOR DETAILS.
Summary of Proposed Amendment

Lee County DEO 16-4ESR consists of two amendments, CPA2016-00001 and CPA2016-00004:

CPA2016-00001, Airport Development Schedule Update: Update Table 5(a), for the Southwest Florida International Airport, to consolidate future development into a single phase. Update Table 5(b), for the Page Field Airport, to consolidate future development into a single phase and add 25,000 square feet for a multi-use hanger. Update the Lee Plan FLU and Transportation Elements to reflect these changes and make consistent throughout the Lee Plan.

The changes replace the existing development information to reflect 2016 conditions, consolidate each airport’s two phase schedule into one phase each. The proposed 25,000 square foot multi-use hangar will be used to support the economic feasibility and maximization of uses at the airport. The proposed amendments will keep the Lee Plan up to date by incorporating the latest development schedule data into Table 5(a) and Table 5(b), and by maintaining consistency with the Lee Plan Future Land Use and Transportation Elements.

CPA2016-00004, RSW Noise Zone Update: Update Lee Plan Map 1, Page 5 of 8 titles “Special Treatment Areas” (Airport Noise Zone Map) and related Policy 1.7.1 to be consistent with the 2013 Southwest Florida International Airport Part 150 Noise Study.

The changes in the proposed noise zones are the result of data gathered during the 2013 Part 150 Noise Study required by Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The existing noise zone map uses data from the Part 150 Study completed in 2006. The expansion of Noise Zone B, which does not permit any residential development, will not impact land designated for residential uses per the Lee Plan Future Land Use Map (FLUM).

Regional Impacts

Council staff has reviewed the requested changes and finds that the requested Comprehensive Plan amendments do not directly produce any significant regional impacts that would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of any other local government within the region.

Extra-Jurisdictional Impacts

Council staff has reviewed the requested changes and finds that the requested Comprehensive Plan amendments do not directly produce any significant extra-jurisdictional impacts that would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of any other local government within the region.

Conclusion

No adverse effects on regional resources or facilities and no extra-jurisdictional impacts have been identified. Staff finds that this project is not regionally significant.
Recommended Action
Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and Lee County.
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LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS
GLADES COUNTY

The Council staff has reviewed the proposed evaluation and appraisal based amendments to the Glades County Comprehensive Plan (DEO 16-1ESR). These amendments were developed under the Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act. A synopsis of the requirements of the Act and Council responsibilities is provided as Attachment I. Comments are provided in Attachment II. Site location maps can be reviewed in Attachment III.

Staff review of the proposed amendments was based on whether they were likely to be of regional concern. This was determined through assessment of the following factors:

1. **Location**—in or near a regional resource or regional activity center, such that it impacts the regional resource or facility; on or within one mile of a county boundary; generally applied to sites of five acres or more; size alone is not necessarily a determinant of regional significance;
2. **Magnitude**—equal to or greater than the threshold for a Development of Regional Impact of the same type (a DRI-related amendment is considered regionally significant); and
3. **Character**—of a unique type or use, a use of regional significance, or a change in the local comprehensive plan that could be applied throughout the local jurisdiction; updates, editorial revisions, etc. are not regionally significant.

A summary of the results of the review follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Consistent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEO 16-1ESR</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(1) Not Regionally Significant (2) Consistent with SRPP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and Glades County

07/2016
COMMUNITY PLANNING ACT

Local Government Comprehensive Plans
The Act requires each municipal and county government to prepare a comprehensive plan that must include at least the following nine elements:

1. Future Land Use Element;
2. Traffic Circulation Element;
   A local government with all or part of its jurisdiction within the urbanized area of a Metropolitan Planning Organization shall prepare and adopt a transportation element to replace the traffic circulation; mass transit; and ports, aviation, and related facilities elements. [9J-5.019(1), FAC]
3. General Sanitary Sewer, Solid Waste, Drainage, and Potable Water and Natural Groundwater Aquifer Recharge Element;
4. Conservation Element;
5. Recreation and Open Space Element;
6. Housing Element;
7. Coastal Management Element for coastal jurisdictions;
8. Intergovernmental Coordination Element; and

The local government may add optional elements (e.g., community design, redevelopment, safety, historical and scenic preservation, and economic).

All local governments in Southwest Florida have adopted revised plans:
Charlotte County, Punta Gorda
Collier County, Everglades City, Marco Island, Naples
Glades County, Moore Haven
Hendry County, Clewiston, LaBelle
Lee County, Bonita Springs, Cape Coral, Fort Myers, Fort Myers Beach, Sanibel
Sarasota County, Longboat Key, North Port, Sarasota, Venice
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

A local government may amend its plan at any time during the calendar year. Six copies of the amendment are sent to the Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) for review. A copy is also sent to the Regional Planning Council, the Water Management District, the Florida Department of Transportation, and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.

The proposed amendments will be reviewed by DEO in two situations. In the first, there must be a written request to DEO. The request for review must be received within forty-five days after transmittal of the proposed amendment. Reviews can be requested by one of the following:

- the local government that transmits the amendment,
- the regional planning council, or
- an affected person.

In the second situation, DEO can decide to review the proposed amendment without a request. In that case, DEO must give notice within thirty days of transmittal.

Within five working days after deciding to conduct a review, DEO may forward copies to various reviewing agencies, including the Regional Planning Council.

Regional Planning Council Review
The Regional Planning Council must submit its comments in writing within thirty days of receipt of the proposed amendment from DEO. It must specify any objections and may make recommendations for changes. The review of the proposed amendment by the Regional Planning Council must be limited to "effects on regional resources or facilities identified in the Strategic Regional Policy plan and extra-jurisdictional impacts which would be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan of the affected local government".

After receipt of comments from the Regional Planning Council and other reviewing agencies, DEO has thirty days to conduct its own review and determine compliance with state law. Within that thirty-day period, DEO transmits its written comments to the local government.

NOTE: THE ABOVE IS A SIMPLIFIED VERSION OF THE LAW. REFER TO THE STATUTE (CH. 163, FS) FOR DETAILS.
GLADES COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (DEO 16-1ESR)

RECEIVED: JULY 15, 2016

Summary of Proposed Amendment
Glades County DEO 16-1ESR proposes to change the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) designation of 70 acres of land from Residential to Agricultural/Residential. The surrounding land uses are Agricultural/Residential, Agricultural/Open, and Transition. The subject sites are zoned as Agricultural/Residential (AR) and Open Use Agriculture (OUA). These zoning designations are inconsistent with the Residential FLUM category. Amending the FLUM category to Agricultural/Residential would help fix this inconsistency in the Comprehensive Plan.

Glades County planning staff had proposed rezoning these sites to Residential General. It was the Board of County Commissioners’ decision at the December 2014 meeting that these properties be removed from the rezoning and that instead the FLUM be changed to correspond with the adjacent properties. There were concerns that the allowed density would be incompatible with the other development along Wayman Road. Should this amendment be approved, a Glades County staff initiated rezoning will be submitted to change the zoning designation of the sites owned by Peeples Family Ranch from OUA to AR. The parcels owned by CLSE are already zoned AR and will be consistent with the proposed FLUM designation.

Regional Impacts
Council staff has reviewed the requested changes and finds that the requested Comprehensive Plan amendments do not directly produce any significant regional impacts that would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of any other local government within the region.

Extra-Jurisdictional Impacts
Council staff has reviewed the requested changes and finds that the requested Comprehensive Plan amendments do not directly produce any significant extra-jurisdictional impacts that would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of any other local government within the region.

Conclusion
No adverse effects on regional resources or facilities and no extra-jurisdictional impacts have been identified. Staff finds that this project is not regionally significant.

Recommended Action
Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and Glades County.
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Sarasota County DEO 16-3ESR
LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS
SARASOTA COUNTY

The Council staff has reviewed the proposed evaluation and appraisal based amendments to the Sarasota County Comprehensive Plan (DEO 16-3ESR). These amendments were developed under the Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act. A synopsis of the requirements of the Act and Council responsibilities is provided as Attachment I. Comments are provided in Attachment II. Site location maps can be reviewed in Attachment III.

Staff review of the proposed amendments was based on whether they were likely to be of regional concern. This was determined through assessment of the following factors:

1. **Location**--in or near a regional resource or regional activity center, such that it impacts the regional resource or facility; on or within one mile of a county boundary; generally applied to sites of five acres or more; size alone is not necessarily a determinant of regional significance;
2. **Magnitude**--equal to or greater than the threshold for a Development of Regional Impact of the same type (a DRI-related amendment is considered regionally significant); and
3. **Character**--of a unique type or use, a use of regional significance, or a change in the local comprehensive plan that could be applied throughout the local jurisdiction; updates, editorial revisions, etc. are not regionally significant.

A summary of the results of the review follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Consistent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| DEO 16-3ESR        | No       | No        | No        | (1) Not Regionally Significant  
|                    |          |           |           | (2) Consistent with SRPP       |

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and Sarasota County

07/2016
COMMUNITY PLANNING ACT

Local Government Comprehensive Plans
The Act requires each municipal and county government to prepare a comprehensive plan that must include at least the following nine elements:

1. Future Land Use Element;
2. Traffic Circulation Element;
   A local government with all or part of its jurisdiction within the urbanized area of a Metropolitan Planning Organization shall prepare and adopt a transportation element to replace the traffic circulation; mass transit; and ports, aviation, and related facilities elements. [9J-5.019(1), FAC]
3. General Sanitary Sewer, Solid Waste, Drainage, and Potable Water and Natural Groundwater Aquifer Recharge Element;
4. Conservation Element;
5. Recreation and Open Space Element;
6. Housing Element;
7. Coastal Management Element for coastal jurisdictions;
8. Intergovernmental Coordination Element; and

The local government may add optional elements (e.g., community design, redevelopment, safety, historical and scenic preservation, and economic).

All local governments in Southwest Florida have adopted revised plans:
Charlotte County, Punta Gorda
Collier County, Everglades City, Marco Island, Naples
Glades County, Moore Haven
Hendry County, Clewiston, LaBelle
Lee County, Bonita Springs, Cape Coral, Fort Myers, Fort Myers Beach, Sanibel
Sarasota County, Longboat Key, North Port, Sarasota, Venice
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

A local government may amend its plan at any time during the calendar year. Six copies of the amendment are sent to the Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) for review. A copy is also sent to the Regional Planning Council, the Water Management District, the Florida Department of Transportation, and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.

The proposed amendments will be reviewed by DEO in two situations. In the first, there must be a written request to DEO. The request for review must be received within forty-five days after transmittal of the proposed amendment. Reviews can be requested by one of the following:

• the local government that transmits the amendment,
• the regional planning council, or
• an affected person.

In the second situation, DEO can decide to review the proposed amendment without a request. In that case, DEO must give notice within thirty days of transmittal.

Within five working days after deciding to conduct a review, DEO may forward copies to various reviewing agencies, including the Regional Planning Council.

Regional Planning Council Review
The Regional Planning Council must submit its comments in writing within thirty days of receipt of the proposed amendment from DEO. It must specify any objections and may make recommendations for changes. The review of the proposed amendment by the Regional Planning Council must be limited to "effects on regional resources or facilities identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan and extra-jurisdictional impacts which would be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan of the affected local government".

After receipt of comments from the Regional Planning Council and other reviewing agencies, DEO has thirty days to conduct its own review and determine compliance with state law. Within that thirty-day period, DEO transmits its written comments to the local government.

NOTE: THE ABOVE IS A SIMPLIFIED VERSION OF THE LAW. REFER TO THE STATUTE (CH. 163, FS) FOR DETAILS.
Summary of Proposed Amendment
Sarasota County DEO 16-3ESR is a major initiative of the County to holistically update its Comprehensive Plan by making it current with recent trends and making it an easier document for all to use. The entire Comprehensive Plan has been completely amended and reformatted. The Comprehensive Plan as proposed will now consist of two volumes, with the first volume being comprised of the adopted Sarasota County Comprehensive Plan (Goals, Objectives, Policies, and the County Primary Components), and the second volume comprised of the associated, but non-adopted, background and support information.

Common changes throughout the Plan include updating references to the Florida State Statutes, ordinances in the Florida Administrative Code, and local ordinances and agreements. Amendments to specific chapters of the plan include:

Chapter 1-Environmental: Policies that relate to sea level rise will be revisited by the County in October. Some of these policies are viewed as redundant to policies that are in the Coastal Disaster Management Chapter. Several of these policies are also required by County codes, thus the County feels they do not need to be re-addressed in the Comprehensive Plan.

Chapter 7-Future Land Use: This section amends affordable housing incentives via associated density increases. However these policies are subject to change again as the County’s Affordable Housing Major Initiative is currently underway and will be completed later this year. Under these amendments: the ceiling of an affordable housing density bonus will decrease from 400% of the upper limit within each range to 120%, the maximum dwelling units per acre decreases from 100 to 25, the minimum percentage of affordable housing units in mixed use developments with at least 13 dwelling units per acre is decreased from 50% to 15%, and the minimum percentage of affordable housing units for residential developments up to 25 units per acre is decreased from 50% to 30%.

Chapter 9-Housing: Language regarding the hardening of facilities against natural disasters and promoting resiliency against future vulnerabilities is deleted. This language is already a part of various requirements and guidelines, such as the Southern States Building Code.

Chapter 10-Mobility: Language concerning a North-South road from University Parkway to S.R. 72 is deleted. This language was out of date. A policy has been added that promotes an interlocal agreement with the Sarasota-Manatee Airport Authority.

Chapter 11-Economic Development: Several policies are added that support small businesses and economic development as a whole.

Regional Impacts
The policy changes related to sea level rise in the Environmental Chapter and to affordable housing in the Future Land Use Chapter will be revisited by the County later in 2016. Council staff has reviewed the
requested changes and finds that the requested Comprehensive Plan amendments do not directly produce any significant regional impacts that would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of any other local government within the region.

**Extra-Jurisdictional Impacts**
Council staff has reviewed the requested changes and finds that the requested Comprehensive Plan amendments do not directly produce any significant extra-jurisdictional impacts that would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of any other local government within the region.

**Conclusion**
No adverse effects on regional resources or facilities and no extra-jurisdictional impacts have been identified. Staff finds that this project is not regionally significant.

**Recommended Action**
Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and Sarasota County.
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City of Bonita Springs DEO 16-1ESR
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LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS
CITY OF BONITA SPRINGS

The Council staff has reviewed the proposed evaluation and appraisal based amendments to the City of Bonita Springs Comprehensive Plan (DEO 16-1ESR). These amendments were developed under the Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act. A synopsis of the requirements of the Act and Council responsibilities is provided as Attachment I. Comments are provided in Attachment II. Site location maps can be reviewed in Attachment III.

Staff review of the proposed amendments was based on whether they were likely to be of regional concern. This was determined through assessment of the following factors:

1. **Location**—in or near a regional resource or regional activity center, such that it impacts the regional resource or facility; on or within one mile of a county boundary; generally applied to sites of five acres or more; size alone is not necessarily a determinant of regional significance;
2. **Magnitude**—equal to or greater than the threshold for a Development of Regional Impact of the same type (a DRI-related amendment is considered regionally significant); and
3. **Character**—of a unique type or use, a use of regional significance, or a change in the local comprehensive plan that could be applied throughout the local jurisdiction; updates, editorial revisions, etc. are not regionally significant.

A summary of the results of the review follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Consistent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEO 16-1ESR</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(1) Regionally significant &lt;br&gt; (2) Consistent with SRPP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and the City of Bonita Springs.

8/2016
COMMUNITY PLANNING ACT

Local Government Comprehensive Plans
The Act requires each municipal and county government to prepare a comprehensive plan that must include at least the following nine elements:

1. Future Land Use Element;
2. Traffic Circulation Element;
   A local government with all or part of its jurisdiction within the urbanized area of a Metropolitan Planning Organization shall prepare and adopt a transportation element to replace the traffic circulation; mass transit; and ports, aviation, and related facilities elements. [9J-5.019(1), FAC]
3. General Sanitary Sewer, Solid Waste, Drainage, and Potable Water and Natural Groundwater Aquifer Recharge Element;
4. Conservation Element;
5. Recreation and Open Space Element;
6. Housing Element;
7. Coastal Management Element for coastal jurisdictions;
8. Intergovernmental Coordination Element; and

The local government may add optional elements (e.g., community design, redevelopment, safety, historical and scenic preservation, and economic).

All local governments in Southwest Florida have adopted revised plans:
  Charlotte County, Punta Gorda
  Collier County, Everglades City, Marco Island, Naples
  Glades County, Moore Haven
  Hendry County, Clewiston, LaBelle
  Lee County, Bonita Springs, Cape Coral, Fort Myers, Fort Myers Beach, Sanibel
  Sarasota County, Longboat Key, North Port, Sarasota, Venice
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

A local government may amend its plan at any time during the calendar year. Six copies of the amendment are sent to the Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) for review. A copy is also sent to the Regional Planning Council, the Water Management District, the Florida Department of Transportation, and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.

The proposed amendments will be reviewed by DEO in two situations. In the first, there must be a written request to DEO. The request for review must be received within forty-five days after transmittal of the proposed amendment. Reviews can be requested by one of the following:

- the local government that transmits the amendment,
- the regional planning council, or
- an affected person.

In the second situation, DEO can decide to review the proposed amendment without a request. In that case, DEO must give notice within thirty days of transmittal.

Within five working days after deciding to conduct a review, DEO may forward copies to various reviewing agencies, including the Regional Planning Council.

**Regional Planning Council Review**

The Regional Planning Council must submit its comments in writing within thirty days of receipt of the proposed amendment from DEO. It must specify any objections and may make recommendations for changes. The review of the proposed amendment by the Regional Planning Council must be limited to "effects on regional resources or facilities identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan and extra-jurisdictional impacts which would be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan of the affected local government".

After receipt of comments from the Regional Planning Council and other reviewing agencies, DEO has thirty days to conduct its own review and determine compliance with state law. Within that thirty-day period, DEO transmits its written comments to the local government.

**NOTE:** THE ABOVE IS A SIMPLIFIED VERSION OF THE LAW. REFER TO THE STATUTE (CH. 163, FS) FOR DETAILS.
CITY OF BONITA SPRINGS COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (DEO 16-1ESR)

RECEIVED: JULY 25, 2015

Summary of Proposed Amendment
City of Bonita Springs DEO 16-1ESR proposes to amend the Bonita Springs Comprehensive Plan to address potential future uses of the CSX / Seminole Gulf rail corridor through amendments adding a new objective and policies to the Future Land Use Element, adding new policies and a new map to the Transportation Element, and modifying policies in the Recreation/Open Space Element.

The existing CSX / Seminole Gulf railway corridor runs from Arcadia through DeSoto, Charlotte and Lee County, ending in far northern Collier County. The rail corridor is owned and controlled by two private entities: CSX and Seminole Gulf Railway. CSX owns the land within the right-of-way. Seminole Gulf Railway has a long-term lease to operate freight rail service and it owns and maintains the tracks. The CSX / Seminole Gulf railway corridor transverses the entire length of Bonita Springs. The tracks were primarily used for freight, but due to the economic downturn, decrease in demand, and poor condition of the tracks, freight service rarely occurs.

These amendments came about as a result of the Lee County MPO’s Rail Corridor Feasibility Study from 2013. The Future Land Use Element adds policies that would support trails and public transportation on the rail corridor, promise to a separate FLUM designation for the rail corridor in the future, support development around potential transit stations that emphasize walkability and connectivity, and authorize transit-oriented development (TOD) planning and identify best practices for station area planning. The Transportation Element adds a new map (Figure 10) that identifies the rail corridor along with policies that identify its significance to Bonita Springs and the region, as well as actions to support future uses of the rail corridor. The Recreation / Open Space Element is updated to reflect the rail corridor’s potential role for trails and bike paths.

Regional Impacts
Council staff has determined that this amendment is regionally significant in regards to character due to the regional nature of the railway corridor. Being a regional issue, staff recommends that the City coordinate with the other jurisdictions that the railway corridor passes through. The SWFRPC would be willing to assist the City of Bonita Springs in coordinating regional efforts regarding this effort.

Council staff has determined that the requested Comprehensive Plan amendments do not directly produce any significant regional impacts that would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of any other local government within the region.

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has also reviewed this amendment package. They identified that even if the City creates a separate FLUM designation for the railway corridor, the uses for the corridor will still be determined by CSX / Seminole Gulf. This new land use category would be would be self-amending. FDOT also views this as a regional issue and recommends that the City collaborate with the other jurisdictions within the corridor to establish a regional vision for the future of the corridor. The comments also call out issues in potential incompatibilities between freight uses. The
amendments encourage FDOT to purchase the rail corridor and FDOT provides funding strategies in their comments. The City of Bonita Springs has agreed to work with FDOT in modifying the amendments. FDOT’s comments are attached to this report.

**Extra-Jurisdictional Impacts**
The CSX / Seminole Gulf railway corridor runs through the City of Arcadia, DeSoto County, the City of Punta Gorda, Charlotte County, the City of Fort Myers, the City of Bonita Springs, the Village of Estero, Lee County, and Collier County. The success of this amendment depends on these other counties and municipalities also preserving the railway corridor. The Village of Estero has already adopted an amendment package that identified the corridor as a Strategic Regional Transportation Corridor. The City of Bonita Springs amendment package will produce no adverse effects on these jurisdictions.

**Conclusion**
The CSX / Seminole Gulf railway corridor is a regional transportation resource that runs through 4 counties and 5 municipalities. Due to the regional nature of this amendment, staff finds this amendment regionally significant in regards to character. Staff recommends that the City of Bonita Springs work with the other jurisdictions within the railway corridor, SWFRPC, and FDOT to ensure regional collaboration on this effort. No adverse effects on regional resources or facilities and no extra-jurisdictional impacts have been identified. This amendment is consistent with the SRPP.

**Recommendation**
Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and the City of Bonita Springs.
August 2, 2016

Jacqueline Toemmes Genson, AICP
Planning and Zoning Manager
City of Bonita Springs Community Development
9220 Bonita Beach Road, Suite 109
Bonita Springs, FL 34135

RE: Bonita Springs 16-1ESR Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments
(Expedited State Review Process) – FDOT Comments and Recommendations

Dear Ms. Genson:

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), District One, has reviewed the Bonita Springs 16-1ESR Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPA). The proposed CPA package was transmitted by the City Council in accordance with the requirements of Florida Statutes Chapter 163.

The 16-1ESR CPA proposes to amend the Bonita Springs Comprehensive Plan to address potential future uses of the CSX/Seminole Gulf rail corridor through amendments adding a new objective and policies to the Future Land Use Element, adding new policies and a new map to the Transportation Element, and modifying policies in the Recreation/Open Space Element. Following is a summary of the proposed amendments:

**Future Land Use (FLU) Element**
The FLU Element includes one new Objective and four new Policies:

- Objective 1.16 to support walkable development patterns around transit stations.
  - Policy 1.16.1 states that the CSX/Seminole Gulf rail corridor is suitable for additional transportation purposes such as hiking/biking/walking trails, commuter rail, light rail, or bus rapid transit.
  - Policy 1.16.2 states that the City will amend its FLU Map to designate the rail corridor into its own category, and that the allowable uses in this category would be determined by the entity owning or leasing the corridor provided the corridor remains in use for freight rail.
o Policy 1.16.3 states that the City supports transit-oriented development (TOD) around future transit stations for commuter rail, light rail, or bus rapid transit service.

o Policy 1.16.4 states that the City will consider a new land-use planning process for transit-oriented redevelopment around potential future transit stations along the CSX/Seminole Gulf rail corridor, including the Old 41 Town Center and near Strike Lane.

Transportation Element
The Transportation Element includes three new Policies and a new Figure 10 (CSX/Seminole Gulf Rail Corridor):

- Policy 1.6.5 states the following:
  o The CSX/Seminole Gulf rail corridor, as shown on Figure 10 of the Future Transportation Map Series, is hereby designated as a strategic regional transportation corridor. This designation has been recommended by the Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) as a means for cities and counties along the rail corridor to recognize the regional nature of this asset and jointly commit to efforts to protect it in its entirety. This designation includes the designation of the rail corridor as a “transportation corridor” pursuant to F.S. 337.273. The following actions will further this designation:
    a. The City encourages FDOT and other governmental agencies to acquire the real estate interests in the entire rail corridor from Arcadia to north Naples from its current owner, CSX Transportation Inc.
    b. The City will formally oppose any attempts at abandonment of the rail corridor before the U.S. Surface Transportation Board, and will support use of federal rails-to-trails authority to railbank the corridor, if abandonment ever succeeds, in order to preserve the corridor for possible future rail service.

- Policy 1.6.6 states that the City supports efforts of the Lee County MPO to enhance freight capability for the entire rail corridor, to allow hiking/biking/walking trails to be added to portions of the corridor, and to add capability for commuter rail, light rail, or bus rapid transit in Lee County and northern Collier County.

- Policy 1.6.7 states that FLU Policies 1.16.3 and 1.16.4 describe the City’s support for transit-oriented redevelopment around potential future stations for commuter rail, light rail, or bus rapid transit.

Recreation/Open Space (ROS) Element
The ROS Element modifies two existing Policies:

- Policy 1.2.8.1 states that the City will seek opportunities to connect its proposed trail system to the Lee County and Collier County systems, and that an important link would include the CSX/Seminole Gulf rail corridor to connect to the north and south.

- Policy 1.2.15 states that the City will investigate railroad and electric power rights-of-way for their potential inclusion in the system of public bike paths and other ancillary recreational uses, and that the new Policies under Objective 1.6 of the
Transportation Element describe the potential use of the CSX/Seminole Gulf rail corridor for hiking/biking/walking trails.

FDOT has several comments relating to consequences of the proposed amendment encouraging incompatible land uses along the rail corridor without establishing regional rail corridor oversight strategy.

**FDOT Comment #1:**
The preservation of the CSX/Seminole Gulf rail corridor is regional in nature, crossing multi-jurisdictional agencies. The policies do not address the overall vision for future growth along the rail corridor and how intergovernmental coordination will occur at the regional level to coordinate consistent policies for compatible land use changes along the rail corridor. FDOT recommends the City of Bonita Springs provide an overview of the vision and intent of the future rail corridor including the mechanism for coordinating policies for land use changes on a regional level with other encompassing multi-jurisdictional agencies.

**FDOT Comment #2:**
Policy 1.16.2 states the City will amend its Future Land Use Map to designate the rail corridor as its own category, but that the actual uses in the new category would be determined by the entity owning or leasing the corridor provided it remain as a freight rail. FDOT notes that this seems to indicate the new land use category would be self-amending because uses would be dependent upon the objectives of an owner or tenant of the corridor over time. Further, it is not clear how this policy supports Objective 1.16: *Support walkable development patterns around transit stations.* FDOT recommends the policy be removed or revised to contain standards relating to freight uses compatible with Transit Oriented Design (TOD).

**FDOT Comment #3:**
Freight uses are typically heavy industrial developments with high impact: noise, odor, glare, dust, that operate as market demands. Intermodal freight yards involve the transportation of freight in intermodal containers and use multiple modes of transportation (rail-to-truck, rail-to-ship, truck-to-rail). These uses should be appropriately located in areas where similar industrial uses are conducted with clear access to other strategic freight oriented modal components, such as I-75. Policy 1.6.6 states that the City supports the Lee County MPO to enhance freight capability for the entire rail corridor, yet there are no policies, which direct where freight uses will be located in comparison to TOD, which seems to be one of the goals of this amendment. FDOT recommends policies be provided to address potential incompatibilities between freight uses and TOD.

**FDOT Comment #4:**
Policy 1.6.5 designates the CSX/Seminole Gulf rail corridor (Figure 10 of the Future Transportation Map Series) as a “transportation corridor” pursuant to F.S. 337.273 (Transportation Corridors). Sub-section (6) of 337.273 F.S. recommends adoption of a transportation corridor management ordinance that would provide oversight and guidance.

www.dot.state.fl.us
for the rail corridor. In accordance with this sub-section, the transportation corridor management ordinance should “contain the criteria to manage the land uses within and adjacent to the transportation corridor, identification of permitted land uses within the designated corridor, a public notification process, a variance and appeal process, and an intergovernmental coordination process that provides for the coordinated management of transportation corridors that cross jurisdictional boundaries with the plans of adjacent jurisdictions.”

FDOT recommends the City collaborate with other jurisdictional agencies to establish a transportation corridor management ordinance.

**FDOT Comment #5:**
Policy 1.6.5 (a) encourages FDOT and other governmental agencies to acquire the real estate interests in the entire rail corridor from Arcadia to north Naples from its current owner, CSX Transportation Inc. The impetus to acquire the CSX/Seminole Gulf rail corridor is a result of recommendations from the Lee County MPO Rail Corridor Feasibility Study.

FDOT has stated that a regional project may potentially be considered for future acquisition of railroad right-of-way for non-commercial uses, if it qualifies for Federal funding and follows the financing model utilized for the City of Orlando SunRail project. The funding allocation includes the following:
- 50% U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration
- 25% Florida Department of Transportation
- 25% Local Government, including long-term operation and maintenance

Under this scenario, a regional entity, other than FDOT, would be responsible for the operation and maintenance of the rail corridor.

FDOT recommends Policy 1.6.5 be revised to adequately reflect the process and financial model for a regional rail corridor project.

Thank you for providing FDOT with the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed amendment. If you have any questions please free to contact me at (239) 225-1981 or sarah.catala@dot.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,

Sarah Catala
SIS/Growth Management Coordinator
FDOT District One

CC:  Mr. Ray Eubanks, Florida Department of Economic Opportunity
     Ms. Derek Burr, Florida Department of Transportation, Southwest Area Office

www.dot.state.fl.us
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City of Fort Myers DEO 16-1 ESR
LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS
CITY OF FORT MYERS

The Council staff has reviewed the proposed evaluation and appraisal based amendments to the City of Fort Myers Comprehensive Plan (DEO 16-1ESR). These amendments were developed under the Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act. A synopsis of the requirements of the Act and Council responsibilities is provided as Attachment I. Comments are provided in Attachment II. Site location maps can be reviewed in Attachment III.

Staff review of the proposed amendments was based on whether they were likely to be of regional concern. This was determined through assessment of the following factors:

1. Location--in or near a regional resource or regional activity center, such that it impacts the regional resource or facility; on or within one mile of a county boundary; generally applied to sites of five acres or more; size alone is not necessarily a determinant of regional significance;
2. Magnitude--equal to or greater than the threshold for a Development of Regional Impact of the same type (a DRI-related amendment is considered regionally significant); and
3. Character--of a unique type or use, a use of regional significance, or a change in the local comprehensive plan that could be applied throughout the local jurisdiction; updates, editorial revisions, etc. are not regionally significant.

A summary of the results of the review follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Consistent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| DEO 16-1ESR        | No       | No        | Yes       | (1) Regionally Significant 
|                    |          |           |           | (2) Consistent with SRPP |

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and the City of Fort Myers.

8/2016
COMMUNITY PLANNING ACT

Local Government Comprehensive Plans
The Act requires each municipal and county government to prepare a comprehensive plan that must include at least the following nine elements:

1. Future Land Use Element;
2. Traffic Circulation Element;
   A local government with all or part of its jurisdiction within the urbanized area of a Metropolitan Planning Organization shall prepare and adopt a transportation element to replace the traffic circulation; mass transit; and ports, aviation, and related facilities elements. [9J-5.019(1), FAC]
3. General Sanitary Sewer, Solid Waste, Drainage, and Potable Water and Natural Groundwater Aquifer Recharge Element;
4. Conservation Element;
5. Recreation and Open Space Element;
6. Housing Element;
7. Coastal Management Element for coastal jurisdictions;
8. Intergovernmental Coordination Element; and

The local government may add optional elements (e.g., community design, redevelopment, safety, historical and scenic preservation, and economic).

All local governments in Southwest Florida have adopted revised plans:
Charlotte County, Punta Gorda
Collier County, Everglades City, Marco Island, Naples
Glades County, Moore Haven
Hendry County, Clewiston, LaBelle
Lee County, Bonita Springs, Cape Coral, Fort Myers, Fort Myers Beach, Sanibel
Sarasota County, Longboat Key, North Port, Sarasota, Venice
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

A local government may amend its plan at any time during the calendar year. Six copies of the amendment are sent to the Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) for review. A copy is also sent to the Regional Planning Council, the Water Management District, the Florida Department of Transportation, and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.

The proposed amendments will be reviewed by DEO in two situations. In the first, there must be a written request to DEO. The request for review must be received within forty-five days after transmittal of the proposed amendment. Reviews can be requested by one of the following:

- the local government that transmits the amendment,
- the regional planning council, or
- an affected person.

In the second situation, DEO can decide to review the proposed amendment without a request. In that case, DEO must give notice within thirty days of transmittal.

Within five working days after deciding to conduct a review, DEO may forward copies to various reviewing agencies, including the Regional Planning Council.

Regional Planning Council Review
The Regional Planning Council must submit its comments in writing within thirty days of receipt of the proposed amendment from DEO. It must specify any objections and may make recommendations for changes. The review of the proposed amendment by the Regional Planning Council must be limited to "effects on regional resources or facilities identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan and extra-jurisdictional impacts which would be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan of the affected local government".

After receipt of comments from the Regional Planning Council and other reviewing agencies, DEO has thirty days to conduct its own review and determine compliance with state law. Within that thirty-day period, DEO transmits its written comments to the local government.

NOTE: THE ABOVE IS A SIMPLIFIED VERSION OF THE LAW. REFER TO THE STATUTE (CH. 163, FS) FOR DETAILS.
CITY OF FORT MYERS COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (DEO 16-1ESR)

RECEIVED: AUGUST 5, 2016

Summary of Proposed Amendment
City of Fort Myers DEO 16-1ESR requests to amend the Fort Myers Comprehensive Plan to address potential future uses of the CSX / Seminole Gulf rail corridor as the corridor passes through Fort Myers. These amendments would add policies, actions, and a new map to the Transportation Element and would add policies and actions to the Future Land Use Element.

In 2013, a Lee County Rail Corridor Feasibility Study analyzed the long-term desirability of additional public uses in the existing CSX / Seminole Gulf railway corridor. This corridor runs from Arcadia through DeSoto, Charlotte and Lee County, ending in far northern Collier County. The corridor bisects the cities of Fort Myers, Estero, and Bonita Springs. This feasibility study was prepared for the Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). The text amendments propose to:

- Designate the CSX / Seminole Gulf rail corridor as a Strategic Regional Transportation Corridor
- Recognize the regional nature of the corridor and jointly commit to efforts to protect it in its entirety
- Oppose any attempts to abandon the corridor
- Support the MPO in enhancing freight capacity for the entire corridor, adding trails to select portions of the corridor, and add capability for commuter rails, light rail, or bus transit in Lee County and northern Collier County
- Designate the rail corridor as a separate Future Land Use Category (FLUC) at the earliest opportunity
- Recommend that FDOT purchase the real estate interests in the entire rail corridor

Regional Impacts
Council staff has determined that this amendment is regionally significant in regards to character due to the regional nature of the railway corridor. Being a regional issue, staff recommends that the City coordinate with the other jurisdictions that the railway corridor passes through. The SWFRPC would be willing to assist the City of Fort Myers in coordinating regional efforts regarding this effort.

The amendments propose to eventually create a separate FLUC for the rail corridor. This category would be self-amending since CSX and Seminole Gulf currently have control of the corridor.

Council staff has determined that the requested Comprehensive Plan amendments do not directly produce any significant regional impacts that would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of any other local government within the region.

Extra-Jurisdictional Impacts
The CSX / Seminole Gulf railway corridor runs through the City of Arcadia, DeSoto County, the City of Punta Gorda, Charlotte County, the City of Fort Myers, the City of Bonita Springs, the Village of Estero,
Lee County, and Collier County. The success of this amendment depends on these other counties and municipalities also preserving the railway corridor. The Village of Estero has already adopted an amendment package that identified the corridor as a Strategic Regional Transportation Corridor and the City of Bonita Springs currently has amendments in the review stage. The City of Fort Myers amendment package will produce no adverse effects on these jurisdictions.

**Conclusion**
The CSX / Seminole Gulf railway corridor is a regional transportation resource that runs through 4 counties and 5 municipalities. Due to the regional nature of this amendment, staff finds this amendment regionally significant in regards to character. Staff recommends that the City of Fort Myers work with the other jurisdictions within the railway corridor, SWFRPC, and FDOT to ensure regional collaboration on this effort. No adverse effects on regional resources or facilities and no extra-jurisdictional impacts have been identified. This amendment is consistent with the SRPP.

**Recommended Action**
Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and the City of Fort Myers.
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LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS
CITY OF NORTH PORT

The Council staff has reviewed the proposed evaluation and appraisal based amendments to the City of North Port Comprehensive Plan (DEO 16-1ESR). These amendments were developed under the Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act. A synopsis of the requirements of the Act and Council responsibilities is provided as Attachment I. Comments are provided in Attachment II. Site location maps can be reviewed in Attachment III.

Staff review of the proposed amendments was based on whether they were likely to be of regional concern. This was determined through assessment of the following factors:

1. Location--in or near a regional resource or regional activity center, such that it impacts the regional resource or facility; on or within one mile of a county boundary; generally applied to sites of five acres or more; size alone is not necessarily a determinant of regional significance;
2. Magnitude--equal to or greater than the threshold for a Development of Regional Impact of the same type (a DRI-related amendment is considered regionally significant); and
3. Character--of a unique type or use, a use of regional significance, or a change in the local comprehensive plan that could be applied throughout the local jurisdiction; updates, editorial revisions, etc. are not regionally significant.

A summary of the results of the review follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Consistent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEO 16-1ESR</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(1) Not Regionally Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Consistent with SRPP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and the City of North Port.
COMMUNITY PLANNING ACT

Local Government Comprehensive Plans
The Act requires each municipal and county government to prepare a comprehensive plan that must include at least the following nine elements:

1. Future Land Use Element;
2. Traffic Circulation Element;
   A local government with all or part of its jurisdiction within the urbanized area of a Metropolitan Planning Organization shall prepare and adopt a transportation element to replace the traffic circulation; mass transit; and ports, aviation, and related facilities elements. [9J-5.019(1), FAC]
3. General Sanitary Sewer, Solid Waste, Drainage, and Potable Water and Natural Groundwater Aquifer Recharge Element;
4. Conservation Element;
5. Recreation and Open Space Element;
6. Housing Element;
7. Coastal Management Element for coastal jurisdictions;
8. Intergovernmental Coordination Element; and

The local government may add optional elements (e. g., community design, redevelopment, safety, historical and scenic preservation, and economic).

All local governments in Southwest Florida have adopted revised plans:
   Charlotte County, Punta Gorda
   Collier County, Everglades City, Marco Island, Naples
   Glades County, Moore Haven
   Hendry County, Clewiston, LaBelle
   Lee County, Bonita Springs, Cape Coral, Fort Myers, Fort Myers Beach, Sanibel
   Sarasota County, Longboat Key, North Port, Sarasota, Venice
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

A local government may amend its plan at any time during the calendar year. Six copies of the amendment are sent to the Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) for review. A copy is also sent to the Regional Planning Council, the Water Management District, the Florida Department of Transportation, and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.

The proposed amendments will be reviewed by DEO in two situations. In the first, there must be a written request to DEO. The request for review must be received within forty-five days after transmittal of the proposed amendment. Reviews can be requested by one of the following:

- the local government that transmits the amendment,
- the regional planning council, or
- an affected person.

In the second situation, DEO can decide to review the proposed amendment without a request. In that case, DEO must give notice within thirty days of transmittal.

Within five working days after deciding to conduct a review, DEO may forward copies to various reviewing agencies, including the Regional Planning Council.

Regional Planning Council Review
The Regional Planning Council must submit its comments in writing within thirty days of receipt of the proposed amendment from DEO. It must specify any objections and may make recommendations for changes. The review of the proposed amendment by the Regional Planning Council must be limited to "effects on regional resources or facilities identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan and extra-jurisdictional impacts which would be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan of the affected local government".

After receipt of comments from the Regional Planning Council and other reviewing agencies, DEO has thirty days to conduct its own review and determine compliance with state law. Within that thirty-day period, DEO transmits its written comments to the local government.

NOTE: THE ABOVE IS A SIMPLIFIED VERSION OF THE LAW. REFER TO THE STATUTE (CH. 163, FS) FOR DETAILS.
CITY OF NORTH PORT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (DEO 16-1ESR)

RECEIVED: AUGUST 1, 2016

Summary of Proposed Amendment
City of North Port 16-1ESR is proposing an amendment to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM), changing land use designation on approximately 126.37 acres from “None” to “Village”. The amendment also includes an associated text amendment with Figure 13.1.n to include the subject property as part of the West Villages. The subject property was annexed into North Port in 2007 via Ordinance 2007-14. Subsequent to this, on May 22, 2008 the City of North Port and Sarasota County entered into a Joint Planning Agreement (JPA) regarding the future incorporation of the subject property into the West Villages Town Center. The parcel is surrounded by mostly Village FLUC with some Sarasota County land.

While the Thomas Ranch area has been recently approved for 16,000 residential units, the additional land would enable the potential for an additional 400 residential units, based on the proposed Village zoning and corresponding to the amount mentioned in a 2008 Joint Planning Agreement between the City and the Sarasota County Hospital District (the former owners of the subject parcel.) The remaining Villages in the West Villages which have been removed from Figure 13.1.n are under separate ownership and have been approved for approximately 4,700 units. These Villages are also under separate utility agreements with the City of North Port.

Regional Impacts
Council staff has reviewed the requested changes and finds that the requested Comprehensive Plan amendments do not directly produce any significant regional impacts that would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of any other local government within the region.

Extra-Jurisdictional Impacts
Council staff has reviewed the requested changes and finds that the requested Comprehensive Plan amendments do not directly produce any significant extra-jurisdictional impacts that would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of any other local government within the region.

Conclusion
No adverse effects on regional resources or facilities and no extra-jurisdictional impacts have been identified. Staff finds that this project is not regionally significant.

Recommended Action
Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and the City of North Port.
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Location Map
CPAL-15-157 Costamar at West Villages Comprehensive Plan Amendment

Disclaimer: This map is for reference purposes only and is not to be construed as a legal document. Any reliance on the information contained herein is at the user’s risk. The City of North Port and its agents assume no responsibility for any use of the information contained herein or any loss resulting therefrom.
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June 7, 2016
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NOTE: THIS MAP CANNOT BE CORRECTLY INTERPRETED INDEPENDENTLY OF THE CITY OF NORTH PORT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AS ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE NO. 97-27, AS SAME MAY BE AMENDED FROM TIME TO TIME.
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LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS
CHARLOTTE COUNTY

The Council staff has reviewed the proposed evaluation and appraisal based amendments to the Charlotte County Comprehensive Plan (DEO 16-4ESR). These amendments were developed under the Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act. A synopsis of the requirements of the Act and Council responsibilities is provided as Attachment I. Comments are provided in Attachment II. Site location maps can be reviewed in Attachment III.

Staff review of the proposed amendments was based on whether they were likely to be of regional concern. This was determined through assessment of the following factors:

1. **Location**—in or near a regional resource or regional activity center, such that it impacts the regional resource or facility; on or within one mile of a county boundary; generally applied to sites of five acres or more; size alone is not necessarily a determinant of regional significance;
2. **Magnitude**—equal to or greater than the threshold for a Development of Regional Impact of the same type (a DRI-related amendment is considered regionally significant); and
3. **Character**—of a unique type or use, a use of regional significance, or a change in the local comprehensive plan that could be applied throughout the local jurisdiction; updates, editorial revisions, etc. are not regionally significant.

A summary of the results of the review follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Consistent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEO 16-4ESR</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(1) Not regionally significant (2) Consistent with SRPP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and Charlotte County.

8/2016
COMMUNITY PLANNING ACT

Local Government Comprehensive Plans
The Act requires each municipal and county government to prepare a comprehensive plan that must include at least the following nine elements:

1. Future Land Use Element;
2. Traffic Circulation Element;
   A local government with all or part of its jurisdiction within the urbanized area of a Metropolitan Planning Organization shall prepare and adopt a transportation element to replace the traffic circulation; mass transit; and ports, aviation, and related facilities elements. [9J-5.019(1), FAC]
3. General Sanitary Sewer, Solid Waste, Drainage, and Potable Water and Natural Groundwater Aquifer Recharge Element;
4. Conservation Element;
5. Recreation and Open Space Element;
6. Housing Element;
7. Coastal Management Element for coastal jurisdictions;
8. Intergovernmental Coordination Element; and

The local government may add optional elements (e.g., community design, redevelopment, safety, historical and scenic preservation, and economic).

All local governments in Southwest Florida have adopted revised plans:
Charlotte County, Punta Gorda
Collier County, Everglades City, Marco Island, Naples
Glades County, Moore Haven
Hendry County, Clewiston, LaBelle
Lee County, Bonita Springs, Cape Coral, Fort Myers, Fort Myers Beach, Sanibel
Sarasota County, Longboat Key, North Port, Sarasota, Venice
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

A local government may amend its plan at any time during the calendar year. Six copies of the amendment are sent to the Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) for review. A copy is also sent to the Regional Planning Council, the Water Management District, the Florida Department of Transportation, and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.

The proposed amendments will be reviewed by DEO in two situations. In the first, there must be a written request to DEO. The request for review must be received within forty-five days after transmittal of the proposed amendment. Reviews can be requested by one of the following:

- the local government that transmits the amendment,
- the regional planning council, or
- an affected person.

In the second situation, DEO can decide to review the proposed amendment without a request. In that case, DEO must give notice within thirty days of transmittal.

Within five working days after deciding to conduct a review, DEO may forward copies to various reviewing agencies, including the Regional Planning Council.

**Regional Planning Council Review**

The Regional Planning Council must submit its comments in writing within thirty days of receipt of the proposed amendment from DEO. It must specify any objections and may make recommendations for changes. The review of the proposed amendment by the Regional Planning Council must be limited to "effects on regional resources or facilities identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan and extra-jurisdictional impacts which would be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan of the affected local government".

After receipt of comments from the Regional Planning Council and other reviewing agencies, DEO has thirty days to conduct its own review and determine compliance with state law. Within that thirty-day period, DEO transmits its written comments to the local government.

**NOTE:** THE ABOVE IS A SIMPLIFIED VERSION OF THE LAW. REFER TO THE STATUTE (CH. 163, FS) FOR DETAILS.
CHARLOTTE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (DEO 16-4ESR)

RECEIVED: 8/10/2016

Summary of Proposed Amendment

Charlotte County DEO 16-4ESR consists of two local amendments: PA-16-06-10-LS and PA-16-06-11-LS:

PA-16-06-10-LS

This amendment proposes to revises Future Land Use Appendix VI: DRI by amending Sandhill development rights and adds an Equivalency Matrix to be consistent with Sandhill DO Resolution 2014-174. These changes have already been reviewed by the State and approved by the County under the DRI process in December 2014. This amendment will make the comprehensive plan consistent with the DRI Development Order. The development rights were changed to eliminate the 84.09 acre golf course and reduce open space by 5.84 acres and replace it with 47.64 acres of industrial park, 19.56 acres of assisted living area, 16.25 acres of residential, and 6.48 acres of commercial area. The Equivalency Matrix allows for increases or decreases in land uses which do not increase the number of external peak hour trips and do not reduce open space and conservation areas within the development.

EQUIVALENCY MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110: General Light Industrial</td>
<td>0.639 du/ksf</td>
<td>3.825 ksf/ksf</td>
<td>1.539 ksf/ksf</td>
<td>0.519 room/ksf</td>
<td>0.227 bed/ksf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220: Apartment Multi-family</td>
<td>1.565 ksf/du</td>
<td>5.984 ksf/du</td>
<td>2.403 ksf/du</td>
<td>1.613 ksf/du</td>
<td>0.968 room/du</td>
<td>0.365 bed/du</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820: Shopping Center</td>
<td>0.261 ksf/du</td>
<td>0.167 ksf/du</td>
<td>0.402 ksf/ksf</td>
<td>0.270 ksf/du</td>
<td>0.162 room/ksf</td>
<td>0.059 bed/ksf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710: Office Building</td>
<td>0.651 ksf/ksf</td>
<td>0.416 ksf/ksf</td>
<td>2.460 ksf/ksf</td>
<td>0.671 ksf/du</td>
<td>0.403 room/ksf</td>
<td>0.148 bed/ksf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210: Single Family Detached</td>
<td>0.970 ksf/du</td>
<td>0.620 ksf/du</td>
<td>3.710 ksf/du</td>
<td>1.450 ksf/du</td>
<td>0.600 room/du</td>
<td>0.220 bed/du</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310: Hotel</td>
<td>1.617 ksf/room</td>
<td>1.033 ksf/room</td>
<td>6.183 ksf/room</td>
<td>2.483 ksf/room</td>
<td>1.667 du/room</td>
<td>0.367 bed/room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250: Assisted Living</td>
<td>4.409 ksf/bed</td>
<td>2.818 ksf/bed</td>
<td>15.854 ksf/bed</td>
<td>6.773 ksf/bed</td>
<td>4.545 du/bed</td>
<td>2.727 room/bed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land Use to be Increased

1. Land use changes are based on the peak hour of trip generation, one hour between 4 and 5 PM
2. Equivalency factors are based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual 9th Edition, 2012 average rate for each land use
3. When increasing a land use, multiply by the value in the table. When decreasing a land use, divide by the value in the table

Examples:
Increase 50 single-family dwelling units by decreasing 15,500 SF of shopping center (60 x 0.270 = 16.2)
Increase 10,000 SF of office building by decreasing 15,300 SF of Light Industrial (10 x 1.539 = 15.39)
Decrease 3500 SF of shopping center by increasing 1971 SF of office (1971/3500 = 0.559)

Any conversion of residential dwelling units above the maximum approved by the original Sandhill DRI DO, which is 2,023 density units, shall be subject to the Transfer Density Units (TDU) provisions set forth in the County’s Comprehensive Plan.
The second amendment proposes to rename “Revitalizing Neighborhoods Incentive Density” (RAPID) to “Incentive Density”, revise FLU Policy 1.2.16: Incentive Density, and add a new FLU Policy 1.2.17: Incentive Density Usage. The County’s current incentive density program, RAPID, is currently restricted to the Revitalizing Neighborhoods. In order to address the deficiency of market-rate rental properties, low- and very low-income housing, and moderate-income/workforce housing, while, at the same time, meeting the intent of the Transfer of Density Units (TDU) program (which is that no new density can be transferred into the Coastal High Hazard Areas or west of the Myakka River and Charlotte Harbor), the County suggests using the RAPID densities to address this issue throughout the County. Therefore, the County is also proposing to rename “RAPID” density to “Incentive Density”, and to add a new policy that will allow the County to grant Incentive Density for all density increases above base density where the projects are designated for market-rate rental properties, low and very low-income housing, and moderate-income/workforce housing and non-age restricted. Simultaneously, the proposed policy will also set restrictions to make sure that such projects cannot be located within the Coastal High Hazard Area; and if such projects are located west of the Myakka River and Charlotte Harbor, the Incentive Density shall come from Managed Neighborhoods west of the Myakka River and Charlotte Harbor, and must also come from a similar or more restrictive FEMA Flood Zone.

This amendment also proposes to use RAPID density in the Sandhill Equivalency Matrix to increase residential units above the maximum approved by the County’s Comprehensive Plan and the Sandhill DRI Development Order. There are two other developments within the County that currently use either an adopted equivalency matrix or conversion table: Babcock Community and Murdock Village. The applicant’s request meets the intent of the County’s TDU program to assist and encourage compact, higher density, mixed-use development that is more sustainable and efficiently utilizes resources.

Regional Impacts
Council staff has reviewed the requested changes and finds that the requested Comprehensive Plan amendments do not directly produce any significant regional impacts that would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of any other local government within the region.

Extra-Jurisdictional Impacts
Council staff has reviewed the requested changes and finds that the requested Comprehensive Plan amendments do not directly produce any significant extra-jurisdictional impacts that would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of any other local government within the region.

Conclusion
No adverse effects on regional resources or facilities and no extra-jurisdictional impacts have been identified. Staff finds that this project is not regionally significant.

Recommendation
Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and Charlotte County.
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LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS
CITY OF MOORE HAVEN

The Council staff has reviewed the proposed evaluation and appraisal based amendments to the City of Moore Haven Comprehensive Plan (DEO 16-1ESR). These amendments were developed under the Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act. A synopsis of the requirements of the Act and Council responsibilities is provided as Attachment I. Comments are provided in Attachment II. Site location maps can be reviewed in Attachment III.

Staff review of the proposed amendments was based on whether they were likely to be of regional concern. This was determined through assessment of the following factors:

1. Location—in or near a regional resource or regional activity center, such that it impacts the regional resource or facility; on or within one mile of a county boundary; generally applied to sites of five acres or more; size alone is not necessarily a determinant of regional significance;
2. Magnitude—equal to or greater than the threshold for a Development of Regional Impact of the same type (a DRI-related amendment is considered regionally significant); and
3. Character—of a unique type or use, a use of regional significance, or a change in the local comprehensive plan that could be applied throughout the local jurisdiction; updates, editorial revisions, etc. are not regionally significant.

A summary of the results of the review follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Consistent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEO 16-1ESR</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(1) Not Regionally Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Consistent with SRPP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and the City of Moore Haven.
COMMUNITY PLANNING ACT

Local Government Comprehensive Plans
The Act requires each municipal and county government to prepare a comprehensive plan that must include at least the following nine elements:

1. Future Land Use Element;
2. Traffic Circulation Element;
   A local government with all or part of its jurisdiction within the urbanized area of a Metropolitan Planning Organization shall prepare and adopt a transportation element to replace the traffic circulation; mass transit; and ports, aviation, and related facilities elements. [9J-5.019(1), FAC]
3. General Sanitary Sewer, Solid Waste, Drainage, and Potable Water and Natural Groundwater Aquifer Recharge Element;
4. Conservation Element;
5. Recreation and Open Space Element;
6. Housing Element;
7. Coastal Management Element for coastal jurisdictions;
8. Intergovernmental Coordination Element; and

The local government may add optional elements (e.g., community design, redevelopment, safety, historical and scenic preservation, and economic).

All local governments in Southwest Florida have adopted revised plans:
Charlotte County, Punta Gorda
Collier County, Everglades City, Marco Island, Naples
Glades County, Moore Haven
Hendry County, Clewiston, LaBelle
Lee County, Bonita Springs, Cape Coral, Fort Myers, Fort Myers Beach, Sanibel
Sarasota County, Longboat Key, North Port, Sarasota, Venice
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

A local government may amend its plan at any time during the calendar year. Six copies of the amendment are sent to the Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) for review. A copy is also sent to the Regional Planning Council, the Water Management District, the Florida Department of Transportation, and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.

The proposed amendments will be reviewed by DEO in two situations. In the first, there must be a written request to DEO. The request for review must be received within forty-five days after transmittal of the proposed amendment. Reviews can be requested by one of the following:

- the local government that transmits the amendment,
- the regional planning council, or
- an affected person.

In the second situation, DEO can decide to review the proposed amendment without a request. In that case, DEO must give notice within thirty days of transmittal.

Within five working days after deciding to conduct a review, DEO may forward copies to various reviewing agencies, including the Regional Planning Council.

**Regional Planning Council Review**

The Regional Planning Council must submit its comments in writing within thirty days of receipt of the proposed amendment from DEO. It must specify any objections and may make recommendations for changes. The review of the proposed amendment by the Regional Planning Council must be limited to "effects on regional resources or facilities identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan and extra-jurisdictional impacts which would be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan of the affected local government".

After receipt of comments from the Regional Planning Council and other reviewing agencies, DEO has thirty days to conduct its own review and determine compliance with state law. Within that thirty-day period, DEO transmits its written comments to the local government.

**NOTE:** THE ABOVE IS A SIMPLIFIED VERSION OF THE LAW. REFER TO THE STATUTE (CH. 163, FS) FOR DETAILS.
CITY OF MOORE HAVEN COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (DEO 16-1ESR)

RECEIVED: AUGUST 11, 2016

Summary of Proposed Amendment
The proposed amendment package contains amendments to the text of the Infrastructure and Capital Improvements Elements of the Comprehensive Plan that adopt the 2016 Water Supply Facilities Work Plan Update. The Work Plan Update is consistent with the most recent Regional Water Supply Plan Update and is being adopted by reference in this Plan Amendment process. The minor changes to the specific Comprehensive Plan Elements reflect revised population and water demand data plus revisions to the Capital Improvements Element Schedule for the new five-year time period.

Regional Impacts
Council staff has reviewed the requested changes and finds that the requested Comprehensive Plan amendments do not directly produce any significant regional impacts that would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of any other local government within the region.

Extra-Jurisdictional Impacts
Council staff has reviewed the requested changes and finds that the requested Comprehensive Plan amendments do not directly produce any significant extra-jurisdictional impacts that would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of any other local government within the region.

Conclusion
No adverse effects on regional resources or facilities and no extra-jurisdictional impacts have been identified. Staff finds that this project is not regionally significant.

Recommended Action
Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and the City of Moore Haven.
MAPS

City of Moore Haven
DEO 16-1ESR

THERE ARE NO MAPS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS AMENDMENT

Growth Management Plan
Comprehensive Plan Amendment
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GROWTH MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
Funding for the reviews that Council will see today was funded through local jurisdiction dues and Applicant Fees.
Palmer Ranch Increment
XXIV DO and MDO
• On June 16, 2016 the Council recommended conditional approval of the Palmer Ranch Increment 24 Application for Incremental Development Approval (AIDA) and Master Development Order Amendment. The recommended conditions for issues related to water quality and drainage, native habitats, land use, transportation and water supply. A copy of the Council recommendations can be found as Attachment I.

• On August 23, 2016 the Board of Sarasota County Commissioners approved the Palmer Ranch Increment 24 Development Order (Ordinance 2016-038) and Master Development Order Amendment (Ordinance 2016-037). A copy of the development orders (see Attachment II) was rendered to the SWFRPC on August 31, 2016. The 45-day appeal period for the development order expires on October 15, 2016. Staff review of the attached development orders finds that it is consistent with all regional issues and recommendations identified within the Council’s Official Recommendations.

• **RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Accept the development orders as rendered.
Palmer Ranch Increment
XXV Pre-App App Checklist
On July 12, 2016 a Pre-Application meeting was held for the proposed Palmer Ranch Increment 25 DRI Application for Incremental Development Approval on Parcel 9E.

The development proposal is to construct 257 ± unit multifamily residential apartments on the eastern 20.95± acre portion of the total 28.72± acre site. 52% of the site will be open space consisting of storm water lakes and wetland preserves.

Pursuant to the amended Master Development Order, all parties agreed to require the applicant to answer all applicable regional and local information requirements in Attachment III of agenda item.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Approve the questionnaire checklist.
10a

Palmer Ranch Increment XXIV DO and MDO Final Review

10a

10a
Council Recommendations (Attachment I)

On June 16, 2016 the Council recommended conditional approval of the Palmer Ranch Increment 24 Application for Incremental Development Approval (AIDA) and Master Development Order Amendment. The recommended conditions for issues related to water quality and drainage, native habitats, land use, transportation and water supply. A copy of the Council recommendations can be found as Attachment I.

Sarasota County Development Orders (Attachment II and III)

On August 23, 2016 the Board of Sarasota County Commissioners approved the Palmer Ranch Increment 24 Development Order (Ordinance 2016-038) and Master Development Order Amendment (Ordinance 2016-037). A copy of the development orders (see Attachment II) was rendered to the SWFRPC on August 31, 2016. The 45-day appeal period for the development order expires on October 15, 2016. Staff review of the attached development orders finds that it is consistent with all regional issues and recommendations identified within the Council’s Official Recommendations.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Accept the development orders as rendered.

September 15, 2016
DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR PALMER RANCH INCREMENT XXIV AND MASTER DEVELOPMENT ORDER NOTICE OF PROPOSED CHANGE

BACKGROUND

The Palmer Ranch Increment XXIV DRI is planned as the twenty-four increment of the Palmer Ranch Master Development Plan. This increment is 227.5± acre area identified by Parcel 9C, to be added through a Notice of Proposed Change boundary amendment to the Palmer Ranch Master Development Order (see Attachment I, Site Location Map). The applicant is proposing a gated 500-unit development consisting of 350 single-family and 150 multi-family housing units, recreational amenities, access to the Legacy Trail, an amenity center, lakes/littoral (39.05 acres), preservation area (Uplands/ Mesic Hammock/Perimeter Buffers/Other Open Space (56.99 acres), and Wetlands/Restoration (8.88 acres) (See Attachment II, Development Plan). Most of the uplands on the subject parcel have been previously altered by agricultural activities and are dominated by improved pasture (see Attachment III, Aerial). The planned residential development on this property is consistent with the Sarasota County Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map, which designates this parcel as Moderate Density Residential. Water, reuse and wastewater services will be provided by Sarasota County Utilities Department. Construction for this increment is anticipated to commence in 2016 with buildout expected by 2023, subject to market conditions.

The Application for Master Development Order (AMDO) review process requires that Applications for Incremental Development Approval (AIDA) be submitted to approve specific land uses. Palmer Ranch DRI was originally approved by the Sarasota Board of County Commissioners on December 18, 1984 (Resolution No. 84-418). The existing Palmer Ranch properties are generally located east of U.S. 41, north of Preymore Street, south of Clark Road and west of I-75 (See Attachment I). The existing development is approved for the following entitlements: 11,550 residential dwelling units; 99+ acres of internal commercial, plus an additional square footage of commercial/office in Activity Centers; and 1,481,000 square feet of office, industrial, light manufacturing and warehouse development (Increment IV).

A MDO NOPC was approved by the SWFRPC at the May 2016 meeting to expand the boundaries of the Palmer Ranch Master Development of Regional Impact (DRI) by approximately 935 acres and add 2,250 residential units. To offset the additional 2,250 dwelling units proposed to be added into the DRI, 10.2 acres of MDO internal commercial entitlement (288,800 square feet) and 931,000 square feet of non-residential entitlement in Increment IV are to be eliminated from the DRI. The master development plans and development orders for both the Palmer Ranch MDO and Increment IV will be updated to reflect the additions of land and conversion of uses. The Sarasota County Commission hearing is scheduled for July 13, 2016. Once this MDO amendment is approved with the additional units, Increment 24 can be approved at the August 23 Commission meeting.
The Council staff usually provides a detailed assessment of all the regional and local issues within Appendix I and II of the regional report. However, because Sarasota County has received Limited DRI Certification under 380.065 F.S., Administrative Rule 28-10 and a "Memorandum of Understanding Regarding Sarasota County's Limited DRI Certification Program" between the Sarasota County and the SWFRPC signed on April 4, 1989, the Sarasota County staff assessment is approved by SWFRPC staff as the recommended SWFRPC Staff Assessment. No additional analysis and recommendations are being added to the regional issues by SWFRPC.

The regional recommendations below for the "Palmer Ranch Increment XXIV DRI Assessment" have been prepared by Sarasota County Planning staff and the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council staff as required by Chapter 380.06, Florida Statutes. A determination by Sarasota County and the applicant has been made not to reiterate word for word the applicable MDO conditions that applied to Increment XXIV but to reference within the Increment XXIV development order the applicable MDO conditions. The DRI assessment is largely based on information supplied in the AIDA and the Sarasota County Staff Assessment. Additional information was obtained by consulting official plans, and by reviewing reports related to specific issues in the impact assessment. Sarasota County's staff assessment and recommendations were integrated into various elements of the regional recommendations. The Southwest Florida Water Management District reviewed Water-related elements and Florida Department of Transportation reviewed transportation related issues with no specific recommendations for the DO.

Regarding consistency with the Regional Policy Plan Council staff has reviewed the Increment relative to the regional plan DRI review list and normally the plan consistency checklist is provided in this section. However, since the Regional Policy Plan checklist for the SWFRPC adopted Palmer Ranch Increment XXIII Assessment Report would be the same, in an effort to reduce paper work, refer to the Increment XXIII Assessment Report. Staff finds that without appropriate mitigation actions and conditions the project could have a net negative impact on the regional resources and infrastructure. The regional recommendations presented within this assessment are intended to neutralize the negative and questionable impacts.

The Council's staff assessment for Increment XXIV only contains regional issues. The recommendations for these issues are formal conditions to be included by the local government in any Development Order that has jurisdiction within a particular county.

The findings of this evaluation and the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council's recommendations are not intended to foreclose or abridge the legal responsibility of local government to act pursuant to applicable local laws and ordinances. Copies of any "Incremental Development Order" (an order granting, denying, or granting with conditions an Application of Development Approval) issued with regard to the proposed development should be transmitted to the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council and the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity.

**Application for Incremental Development Approval**

The Palmer Ranch Increment XXIV DRI is 227.5± acre area identified by Parcel 9C (see Attachment I, Site Location Map) and is being filed in conjunction with a Notice of Proposed Change (NOPC) to expand the boundaries of the Palmer Ranch MDO to incorporate the 227.5± acre subject parcel and an Application for Incremental Development Approval (AIDA) for Increment XXIV to the Palmer Ranch MDO. The applicant is proposing a gated 500-unit
development consisting of 350 single-family and 150 multi-family housing units, recreational amenities, access to the Legacy Trail, an amenity center, lakes/littoral (39.05 acres), preservation area (Uplands/ Mesic Hammock/Perimeter Buffers/Other Open Space (56.99 acres), and Wetlands/Restoration (8.88 acres) (See Attachment II, Development Plan).

**Land Use**

Palmer Ranch is approved for 11,550 residential dwelling units. According to Sarasota County, to date 11,162 dwelling units have been approved and/or built within 22 Increments. There is a concurrent NOPC to the Palmer Ranch MDO, NOPC No. 20 (reviewed and recommended for approval at the May 2016 SWFRPC meeting), which through the conversion of approved uses would increase the total allowable residential units to 14,150. The planned residential development on this property is consistent with the Sarasota County Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map, which designates this parcel as Moderate Density Residential. The designation of this site is also consistent with the Palmer Ranch Master Development Order (Resolution 2015-010, as amended). Additionally, adequate levels of service have been demonstrated. The applicant is proposing to mitigate any potential incompatibilities between land uses through Planned Unit Development provisions, as required by the Palmer Ranch Master Development Order. Construction for this increment is anticipated to commence in 2016 with buildout expected by 2023, subject to market conditions.

**Vegetation and Wildlife**

Most of the uplands on the subject parcel have been previously altered by agricultural activities and are dominated by improved pasture (see Attachment III, Aerial). The applicant proposes to preserve most of on-site wetlands and provide wetland mitigation for the impacted wetlands that have lost function and value in a manner consistent with Chapter 2 VII.2.F of the Comprehensive plan. The mesic hammock on site is being preserved in its entirety.

**Water Quality and Drainage**

The applicant has submitted a Conceptual On-Site Surface Water Management Plan Maps (Sheets G-1 & G-2) for the Palmer Ranch Increment XXIV Application for Rezoning Parcel 9C which defines how Stormwater requirements will be met.

**Transportation**

Per Resolution No. 89-98, the Palmer Ranch Development is governed by a 5-year Transportation Reanalysis that evaluates the total system-wide Palmer Ranch transportation impact on the study area roadway network. The approved 2014 Transportation Reanalysis (Resolution No. 2015-147) evaluated the transportation impact of +/-900 acre parcel south of the Palmer Ranch DRI at the time. This subject parcel is part of the +/-900 acre parcel that has already been evaluated. The 2014 Transportation Reanalysis demonstrated that apart from the extension of Bay Street from Pine Ranch East to Honore Avenue, no additional off-site capacity improvements were needed.

**Water Supply**

Development is required to connect to Sarasota County Public Utilities water, wastewater and reclaimed water systems in accordance with current County rules and regulations. All connections to the potable water distribution and wastewater collection systems are required to pay the established Water Facilities Capacity Fee, Wastewater Facilities Capacity Fee and Wastewater Deferred
Revenue Charges at the time of connection. Capacity can only be reserved through payment of those fees. All potable water, reclaimed water, and wastewater customers connected to the County’s system shall be responsible for the monthly water, reclaimed water, and wastewater charges according the most recently adopted Utility Rate Resolution.

Sarasota County Public Utilities has adequate capacity to serve the proposed development. No utility related comprehensive plan policy changes are required in support of this request. No new utility projects need to be added to the list of 5-year capital improvements or to the unfunded projects (Table 10-4 of the comprehensive plan). The development is responsible for providing all on-site and off-site infrastructure that will be needed to serve the project.

Recommended Increment XXIV Development Order Conditions

A. GENERAL

1. The Palmer Ranch Increment XXIV development shall occur in substantial accordance with the Palmer Ranch Master Development Order and Incremental Development Order Conditions.

2. All references made in the following Conditions for Development Approval pertaining to “Applicant”, shall also include any successors in interest of areas covered under this Development Order.

3. Access to the Palmer Ranch Increment XXIV project site by Sarasota County government agents and employees shall be granted for the purpose of monitoring the implementation of the Development Order.

4. Pursuant to Chapter 380.06(16), Florida Statutes, the applicant may be subject to credit for contributions, construction, expansion, or acquisition of public facilities, if the developer is also subject by local ordinances to impact fees or exactions to meet the same needs. The local government and the developer may enter into a capital contribution front-ending agreement to reimburse the developer for voluntary contributions in excess of the fair share.

B. LAND USE

1. All development shall occur in substantial accordance with the Master Development Plan date stamped April 5, 2016, and attached hereto as Exhibit C. This does not imply or confer any deviations from applicable zoning or land development regulations.

C. VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE

1. The wetlands and associated upland vegetative buffers shall be maintained in accordance with management guidelines contained within the Comprehensive Plan as a preserve and labeled a preserve on all plans as shown on Map F-2. All activities including but not limited to filling, excavating, well drilling, altering vegetation (including trimming of both trees and understory) and storing of materials shall be prohibited within preservation areas, unless written approval is first obtained from Environmental Permitting. Exception may be granted by Environmental Permitting to facilitate implementation of approved habitat management plans or the hand removal of nuisance/invasive vegetation.
2. Impacts to on-site wetlands resulting from unavoidable impacts necessitated by internal parcel roadway and infrastructure requirements or loss of defined environmental functions, may be allowed if deemed consistent with the LDR Environmental Technical Manual during site and development plan review.

3. The proposed wildlife corridor conservation area shall be consistent with Map F-4. A resource management plan for the proposed corridor shall be submitted to the Environmental Protection Division during the site and development plan submittal that details how the wildlife corridor will be maintained and the proposed corridor crossing minimized.

D. WATER QUALITY AND DRAINAGE

1. The Master Surface Water Management Plan shall be consistent with the Little Sarasota Bay Watershed Management Plan.

E. WATER SUPPLY

1. The Developer shall enter into a Standard Utility Agreement with Sarasota County prior to receiving Construction Authorization for any portion of development. The Standard Utility Agreement shall outline any County contribution for the oversize of potable water, wastewater collection or reclaimed water extensions. The development is required to extend a 12” reclaimed water system on Honore Ave along the full frontage of the parcel facing Honore and enter into an oversize agreement with the County for the upsize of the line. The development is required to extend the existing 12” water main located on Bay Street across the full frontage of the parcels southern boundary.

2. Prior to being granted Site Plan approval for the first phase of development, the owner shall submit a Utilities Master Plan and hydraulic models for the entire development signed and sealed by a registered professional engineer identifying the infrastructure required to connect the development to Sarasota County Public Utilities Water, Wastewater and Reclaimed Water systems. The Master Plan will include a Water Quality Plan that demonstrates how the potable water system expansion will maintain compliance with applicable drinking water quality standards; a Lift Station Optimization Plan evaluating system impacts for the entire development; an Irrigation Plan identifying the infrastructure required to supply the sites storage ponds with reclaimed water; and identification of any off-site improvements required.

Master Development Order Notice of Proposed Change

The boundaries of the Palmer Ranch Master DRI have been expanded seven times since its original approval:

• Resolution No. 91-170 (127.2 ± ac.)
• Resolution No. 99-179 (1.5 ± ac.)
• Resolution No. 2004-077 (38.6 ± ac)
• Resolution No. 2011-226 (38.4 ± ac.)
• Ordinance No. 2015-010 (103.193 ± ac.)
• Ordinance No. 2015-013 (223.945 ± ac.)
The NOPC to the Palmer Ranch MDO is an application to add approximately 227 acres (Parcel 9C) to Palmer Ranch for development and to update development order conditions and exhibits accordingly. There have been 18 previous amendments to the Palmer Ranch MDO. Stipulations of Settlement, Exhibit “J” of the MDO (Ordinance No. 2015-010), has a condition that restricts the issuance of a certificate of occupancy to any development on lands south of its current boundary prior to improvements being made to Bay Street, including the reconstruction of the existing roadway westward to U.S. 41. County Staff and the Applicant have been working outside of this NOPC to amend this settlement agreement to address Bay Street improvements.

The following Maps have been revised to reflect the proposed change.

- Habitat Preservation, Alteration and Mitigation Plan Series (Map F-2)
- Exhibit G: Wildlife Corridor Plan Series
- Master Pedestrian and Circulation Plan (Map I-2/MPCP)
- Conceptual Master Development Plan (Map H-2)

**Recommended Master Development Order Condition**

Update the Conceptual Master Development Plan (Map H-2) to incorporate Parcel 9C as Increment XXIV.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** The staff of the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council recommends Conditional Approval for the Palmer Ranch Increment XXIV DRI and Master Development Order boundary amendment to be further conditioned on a finding of Consistency with the Local Government Comprehensive Plan by the Sarasota County Board of County Commissioners.
**NOTES**

1. WETLAND LIMITS, MITIGATION AREAS, OPEN SPACE AND DEVELOPABLE AREAS MAY REQUIRE MODIFICATION TO BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH REGULATORY APPROVAL.
2. WETLAND BUFFERS MAY BE MODIFIED OR MAY RECEIVE MINOR ENCROACHMENTS SUBJECT TO REGULATORY APPROVAL.
3. MESIC HAMMOCK LIMITS MAY BE MODIFIED AS A RESULT OF FUTURE LAND PLANNING.
4. AN ENHANCED WATERCOURSE BUFFER WILL BE PROVIDED ALONG THE CHANNELIZED PORTION OF SOUTH CREEK IN COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION A OF THE SITE DEVELOPMENT DESIGN TECHNICAL MANUAL.
Palmer Ranch - Increment XXIV - Parcel 9C

Site Aerial Map

June 2015

Disclaimer: Stantec assumes no responsibility for data supplied in electronic format. The recipient accepts full responsibility for verifying the accuracy and completeness of the data. The recipient releases Stantec, its officers, employees, consultants and agents, from any and all claims arising in any way from the content or provision of the data.
ATTACHMENT II

ORDINANCE NO. 2016-037

AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNTY OF SARASOTA, FLORIDA, AMENDING THE MASTER DEVELOPMENT ORDER FOR THE PALMER RANCH DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT (DRI), ORIGINALLY ADOPTED BY SARASOTA COUNTY RESOLUTION NO. 84-418, AMENDED AND RESTATE BY 2015-010, AS AMENDED; PROVIDING FOR FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW; PROVIDING FOR INCORPORATION OF THE APPLICATION FOR A NOTICE OF PROPOSED CHANGE, AND ASSOCIATED DOCUMENTS INTO THE DEVELOPMENT ORDER; PROVIDING FOR APPROVAL OF THE AMENDMENT TO THE DEVELOPMENT ORDER FOR THE PALMER RANCH DRI; PROVIDING FOR NON-EXEMPTION FROM COUNTY REGULATIONS; PROVIDING FOR ENFORCEMENT; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR SERVICE AND RECORDING; PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF SARASOTA COUNTY, FLORIDA:

SECTION 1. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. The Board of County Commissioners of Sarasota County, Florida, hereinafter referred to as the “Board”, hereby makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law:

1.1 On December 18, 1984, the Board adopted Resolution No. 84-418 approving the original Palmer Ranch Development of Regional Impact (DRI) and issuing the Master Development Order for the DRI. The Palmer Ranch DRI has been expanded to approximately 6,733 acres, located west of Interstate 75 (I-75), south of Clark Road, east of U.S. 41, and north of Preymore Street, more particularly described in Exhibit A, attached hereto and made part hereof by reference.

1.2 The issuance of the Palmer Ranch Master Development Order (MDO) has occurred in accordance with Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law as specified in Resolution No. 84-418.

1.3 The Palmer Ranch MDO (Resolution No. 84-418 as amended) specifies information requirements to be submitted with each Application for Incremental Development Approval (AIDA) and identifies those issues which can result in denial of an AIDA in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 380-06(20)(b), Florida Statutes.

1.4 On July 9, 1991, the Board adopted Resolution No. 91-170 amending and restating the Master Development Order for Palmer Ranch, adopting the Eastside Environmental Analysis which amended the MDO for areas not yet approved under the AIDA process, and added Parcel U.
1.5 On April 21, 2015, the Board adopted Ordinance No. 2015-010 amending and restating the MDO for Palmer Ranch, revising Exhibits A through O to codify all previous amendments to the MDO since the adoption of Resolution No. 91-170, revising and updating Conditions of Approval (Exhibit B of Ordinance No. 91-170, as amended), and adding Parcel 9A as Increment XXII.

1.6 On September 28, 2015, Palmer Ranch Holdings, Ltd., through their authorized agent, James Paulmann (hereinafter referred to as the “Applicant”), submitted to Sarasota County a Notification of a Proposed Change (NOPC) to the Palmer Ranch Master Development Order, in accordance with Chapter 380.06, Florida Statutes.

1.7 Copies of the NOPC have been submitted to the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council (SWFRPC), and to the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO), pursuant to Subsection 380.06(19)(f)2, Florida Statutes.

1.8 The proposed changes to the Palmer Ranch Master Development Order pursuant to Chapter 380.06, Florida Statutes, include adding approximately 227 acres, Parcel 9C, to Conceptual Master Development Plan (Exhibit C of Ordinance No. 2015-010) as Increment XXIV.

1.9 The Report and Recommendation of the SWFRPC has been received and addressed.

1.10 The Sarasota County Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on the NOPC on, July 7, 2016, and received all pertinent evidence and testimony, and recommended approval of the NOPC.

1.11 Pursuant to Section 380.06 (11)(f)3, Florida Statutes, public notice for a hearing on said NOPC before the Board was duly published in the "Sarasota Herald-Tribune" on August 9, 2016, and was duly provided to the Florida DEO, the SWFRPC, and other persons designated by DEO rules.

1.12 The Board held a duly noticed public hearing on the NOPC on August 23, 2016.

1.13 The Board considered the Report and Recommendation of the SWFRPC and the proposed changes to the development are consistent with the Report and Recommendation.

1.14 The Board considered all matters relevant to the NOPC, including the Recommendations of the Sarasota County Planning Commission, and all pertinent evidence and testimony presented at the public hearing.

1.15 The proceedings herein relating to the Palmer Ranch MDO DRI NOPC have been conducted in compliance with the provisions of Chapter 380.06, Florida Statutes, and all conditions precedent to the granting of development approval required by Chapter 380.06, Florida Statutes, have occurred.

1.16 The proposed changes do not constitute a substantial deviation as they do not create a reasonable likelihood of additional regional impacts, or any type of regional impact not previously reviewed by the regional planning agency.
1.17 The proposed changes to the Palmer Ranch MDO DRI are consistent with the State Comprehensive Plan and will not interfere with the achievement of the objectives of any adopted State Land Development Plan applicable to this area.

1.18 The proposed changes to the Palmer Ranch MDO DRI are consistent with the Sarasota County Comprehensive Plan, and are not in conflict with other local land development regulations.

SECTION 2. **Incorporation of the Notice of Proposed Change (NOPC) and Associated Documents into the Development Order.**

2.1 The following documents are hereby incorporated in this Development Order by reference:

   I. The SWFRPC’s Official Recommendations - Development of Regional Impact Assessment for Palmer Ranch Master Development Order DRI.

2.2 The following information, commitments and impact mitigating provisions submitted by the Applicant are hereby incorporated in this Development Order by reference. Development permits are subject to the provisions contained in these documents:

   I. Palmer Ranch Application for Master Development Approval and Associated Documents – August 11, 1983;
   II. The Notification of Proposed Change (NOPC) Application and Associated Documents for the Palmer Ranch MDO – September 28, 2015; and

2.3 In construing and enforcing the provisions of the documents incorporated in this Development Order by Subsections 2.1 and 2.2 above, the following shall apply:

   a) The most recent response of the Applicant in the above referenced documents shall control over any previous response, wherever there is a conflict, otherwise the responses shall be considered cumulative.

   b) Any information, commitments or impact mitigating provisions in the above referenced documents which are inconsistent with the specific conditions set forth in this Ordinance and the exhibits hereto, shall be deemed superseded and inapplicable.

SECTION 3. **Approval of the Amendment to the Palmer Ranch Master Development Order (Ordinance No. 2015-010).**

3.1 The Board hereby approves the modifications to the Master Development Order for the Palmer Ranch DRI subject to Exhibit B, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, subject to the other provisions of the Development Order, Ordinance No. 2015-010, as amended.

3.2 The Sarasota County Planning Department is hereby designated as the local government department responsible for monitoring the development, enforcing and monitoring the terms of the Incremental Development Order and for receiving the biennial report required by Chapter 380.06, Florida Statutes.
3.3 Biennial Report Requirements:

The Applicant shall submit the Biennial report pursuant to the Development Order and the requirements of Chapter 380.06 (18), Florida Statutes, Chapter 9J-2.025 (7), Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), and the conditions of this Ordinance. This report shall be submitted with the consolidated Biennial Monitoring Report for the DRI until such time as all terms and conditions of this Development Order are satisfied, unless otherwise specified herein. The Applicant shall submit this monitoring report to the Sarasota County Planning Department, the SWFRPC, the DEO, and all affected permitting agencies required by law on form RPM-BSP-Biennial Report-1, as the same may be amended from time to time. The biennial monitoring report shall contain all information required by Rule 9J-2.025 (7) (a) through (k), F.A.C., as the same may be amended from time to time.

Upon notification that the biennial report has not been received by the SWFRPC, or the DEO, or upon non-receipt of the biennial report by Sarasota County, Sarasota County shall request in writing that the Applicant submit the report within thirty (30) days. Failure to submit the report after thirty (30) days of such written notice shall result in Sarasota County temporarily suspending this Development Order, and no new development permit applications shall be granted within the development until the requirements of this subsection are met.

3.4 Monitoring Reports Requirement:

The Applicant shall submit the following monitoring reports to the Sarasota County Planning Department at the same time that the biennial report is submitted, unless a different submission time is authorized by the Planning Department in writing. Failure to submit the report after 30 days shall result in Sarasota County temporarily suspending this Development Order, and no new development permit applications shall be granted within the development until the requirements of this section are met.

a) A status report on the Stormwater Management program. This shall include measures instituted regarding "Best Management Practices" for soil erosion and sedimentation controls, lawn maintenance procedures and stormwater management systems maintenance, pursuant to the requirements of appropriate Sarasota County departments.

b) A status report of the cumulative amount of development approved for the project pursuant to Conditions in the Development Order contained in Exhibit B.

3.5 The definitions presently contained in Chapter 380.06, Florida Statutes, shall control in the construction of this Development Order.

SECTION 4. Non-Exemption from County Regulations.

4.1 This Ordinance shall not be construed as an agreement on the part of Sarasota County to exempt the Applicant, its successors and assigns, from the operation of any Ordinance or regulation hereinafter adopted by Sarasota County for the purpose of the protection of the public health, welfare, and safety, which said Ordinance or regulation shall be generally and equally applicable throughout Sarasota County, and which said Ordinance or regulation protects
or promotes a vital public interest, and which said Ordinance or regulation does not substantially impair or prevent development as approved herein.

SECTION 5. Enforcement.

5.1 All conditions, restrictions, requirements, commitments and impact mitigating provisions contained or incorporated by reference in this Development Order may be enforced by Sarasota County by action at law or in equity, after notice to the Applicant and a reasonable opportunity to cure, and, in the event Sarasota County prevails in such action at law or in equity, it shall be awarded all its reasonable costs of investigation and enforcement, including County staff time and reasonable attorneys' fees incurred by or on behalf of Sarasota County.

5.2 In the event it is determined by the Board, after notice to the Applicant and a full hearing, that the Applicant has failed to comply with any conditions, restrictions, requirements or impact mitigating provisions contained or incorporated by reference in this Development Order, the Board may temporarily suspend this Development Order during which no development permit applications shall be granted within the development until compliance is achieved. Where such a failure has been finally determined, the Applicant shall be liable for all costs of investigating and enforcement, including County staff time and reasonable attorney's fees incurred by or on behalf of Sarasota County.

5.3 The rights and obligations of this Development Order shall run with the land. The Applicant is bound by the terms of this Development Order so long as it owns such property. This Development Order shall be binding upon and inure to the benefit of the Applicant and its assignees or successors in interest and Sarasota County and its successors. It is understood that any reference herein to any governmental agency shall be construed to mean any future instrumentality which may be created and designed as successor in interest thereto, or which otherwise possess any of the powers and duties of any referenced governmental agency in existence on the effective date of this Development Order.

5.4 In the event of a Development Order appeal or other legal challenge of this Development Order by DEO, the Applicant shall pay all reasonable costs and fees of County staff and attorneys relating to said appeal or legal challenge. Said costs and fees shall be based upon the Sarasota County Billable Fee System under Ordinance No. 85-91, as amended from time to time. Payment of all billings by the Applicant related to such fees and costs shall be paid within forty five (45) days of submittal of an invoice.


6.1 If any section, sentence, clause, phrase or word of this Development Order is for any reason held or declared to be invalid, inoperative, or void, such holding of invalidity shall not affect the remaining portions of this Development Order. It shall be construed to have been the intent to pass this Development Order, without such invalid or inoperative part herein, and the remainder, exclusive of such part or parts, shall be deemed and held to be valid as if such parts had not been included herein, unless to do so would frustrate the intent of this Development Order.
6.2 Nothing in Section 6.1 shall override the effect of an appeal pursuant to Section 380.07(2), Florida Statutes.

SECTION 7. Service and Recording.

7.1 The Planning and Development Services Department is hereby directed to record this Ordinance in the Official Records of the Clerk of the Circuit Court. All costs associated with the recording of this Ordinance shall be borne by the Applicant. This Ordinance shall be binding upon the Applicant, its successors and assigns and upon Sarasota County.

7.2 The Clerk to the Board of County Commissioners shall certify the date upon which a copy of this Ordinance are deposited in the U.S. Mail to DEO and electronic copies to the SWFRPC, and the Applicant.

VIA US MAIL

Ray Eubanks
Department of Economic Opportunity
Division of Community Development
MSC 160
107 East Madison Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

VIA E-MAIL

Margaret Wuerstle
Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council
Email: mwuerstle@swfrpc.org

Justin Powell
Palmer Ranch Holdings
Email: justin@pranch.com
SECTION 8. Effective Date.

8.1 This Development Order shall take effect upon adoption of this Ordinance and transmittal of the copies of said Development Order to the parties specified in Chapter 380.07 (2), Florida Statutes, the expiration of any applicable appeal period, or the resolution of any appeal, whichever is later.

PASSED AND DULY ADOPTED by the Board of County Commissioners of Sarasota County, Florida, this 23 of August, 2016.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF SARASOTA COUNTY, FLORIDA

By: [Signature]
Chairman

ATTEST:
KAREN E. RUSHING, Clerk of Circuit Court
and ex officio Clerk of the
Board of County Commissioners of
Sarasota County, Florida

By: [Signature]
Deputy Clerk
EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit A – Legal Description

Exhibit B – Conceptual Master Development Plan
EXHIBIT A – LEGAL DESCRIPTION

Section 14, Township 37, Range 18 East; LESS premises conveyed to Robert K. Altman and wife in O.R. Book 388, Page 261 of the Public Records of Sarasota County, Florida; and LESS that portion of said Section 14, lying Northerly and Westerly of the Southerly and Easterly right-of-way line of the “Loop Road” described in O.R. Book 1455, Page 961 of said Public Records.

The East Half of Section 15, Township 37 South, Range 18 East; LESS premises excepted from Parcel B recorded in O.R. Book 1168, Pages 1466 through 1481 of the Public Records of Sarasota County, Florida (see Page 1475); and LESS that portion of said Section 15 lying Northeasterly of the Southwesterly right-of-way line of the “Loop Road” described in O.R. Book 1455, Page 961 of said Public Records.

The North Half of the Southeast ¼ of Section 22, Township 37 South, Range 18 East; LESS premises conveyed to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints in O.R. Book 1137, Page 828, and O.R. Book 1137, Page 829 of the Public Records of Sarasota County, Florida; and LESS Ballentrae, a condominium recorded in Condominium Book 14, Page 26 through 26G of said Public Records; and LESS The Country Club of Sarasota recorded in Plat Book 24, Pages 16 through 16K of said Public Records.

Section 23, Township 37 South, Range 18 East; LESS The Country Club of Sarasota recorded in Plat Book 24, Pages 16 through 16K of the Public Records of Sarasota County, Florida; and LESS Lots 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 42, 43, 49, 50, 52, 53, 64, and 65 of Ridgewood Terrace Estates recorded in Plat Book 2, Page 3 of said Public Records.

Section 24, Township 37 South, Range 18 East; LESS the North Half of the North Half;

Section 25, Township 37 South, Range 18 East;

Section 26, Township 37 South, Range 18 East;

The East Half, the Northeast ¼ of the Northwest ¼ and that part of the Southeast ¼ of the Southwest ¼ lying Easterly of the Easterly right-of-way of State Road 45, all in Section 27, Township 27 South, Range 18 East;

That part of the East Half of Section 34, Township 37 South, Range 18 East, lying Easterly of the Easterly right-of-way line of State Road 45; LESS Lots 7, 8, and 9, Block 1, and Lots 4 and 5, Block 4 of Sarasota-Venice Company’s Subdivision of the East Half and the Northwest ¼ of Section 34, recorded in Plat Book A, Page 12 of the Public Records of Sarasota County, Florida;

Also that part of the Southwest ¼ of Section 34, Township 37 South, Range 18 East lying Easterly of the Easterly right-of-way line of State Road 45 and Southerly of the Southerly line of Lot 5, Block 4, Sarasota-Venice Company’s Subdivision of the East Half and the Northwest ¼ of Section 34, recorded in Plat Book A, Page 12 of the Public Records of Sarasota County, Florida.

Section 35, Township 37 South, Range 18 East; LESS premises conveyed to Albert Glueck and wife in O.R. Book 696, Page 247 of the Public Records of Sarasota County, Florida.

Section 36, Township 37 South, Range 18 East; LESS a tract of land lying in Section 22, 23, 26 and 27, all in Township 37 South, Range 18 East, Sarasota County, Florida described as follows:

Commence at a Smally, Wellford & Nalven concrete monument at the Southeast corner of the Southeast ¼ of said Section 22; thence S-89°28′12″-W along the Southerly line of said Southeast ¼ a distance of 197.56 feet to a Smally, Wellford & Nalven concrete monument at the Southeast corner of The Country Club of Sarasota recorded in Plat Book 24, Pages 16 through 16K of the Public Records of Sarasota County, Florida for the POINT OF BEGINNING (the following 6 calls are to concrete monuments along the lines of The Country Club of Sarasota; thence N-00°31′59″-W
a distance of 2039.04 feet; thence N-89°28'01"-E a distance of 100.00 feet; thence N-00°31'59"-W a distance of 250.00 feet; thence N-89°28'01"-E a distance of 583.77 feet; thence N-00°31'59"-W a distance of 600.49 feet; thence N-89°28'01"-E a distance of 4073.67 feet to the Easterly line of Ballantrae, a Condominium recorded in Condominium Book 14, Pages 26 through 26G of said Public Records; thence N-00°03'26"-E along said Easterly line a distance of 650.03 feet to a Smally, Wellford & Nalven concrete monument at the Southerly line of premises conveyed by Sarasota Realty Development Corporation to the County of Sarasota by Dedication Deed dated March 10, 1980 recorded in O.R. Book 1362, Page 1827 of said Public Records; said point being a point on a curve of which the radius point lies N-14°40'27"-W a radial distance of 660.00 feet; thence Northeastery along the arc through a central angle of 45°43'33" a distance of 526.72 feet to the PRC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 40°44'48" and a radius of 580.00 feet; thence Northeastely along the arc a distance of 412.48 feet to the PRC of a curve to the left having a central angle of 18°39'03" and a radius of 2120.00 feet; thence Northeastely along the arc a distance of 690.10 feet; thence N-51°41'46"-E a distance of 800.00 feet to the PC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 50°07'27" and a radius of 620.00 feet; thence Northeastely and Southeastely along the arc a distance of 542.40 feet; thence S-73°10'47"-E a distance of 847.98 feet to the PC of a curve to the left having a central angle of 27°09'55" and a radius of 760.00 feet; thence Southeastely and Northeastely along the arc a distance of 360.34 feet to the PRC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 84°09'28" and a radius of 25.00 feet; thence Northeastely and Southeastely along the arc a distance of 36.72 feet to the PRC of a curve to the left having a central angle of 48°24'45" and a radius of 1360.00 feet; thence Southeastely along the arc a distance of 1149.14 feet to the PRC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 57°49'16" and a radius of 1240.00 feet; thence Southeastely along the arc a distance of 1251.37 feet to a line which is 120.00 feet Southwesterly of and parallel with the Westerly right-of-way line of the Seaboard Coast Line Railway (100 feet wide) as conveyed by Adrian C. Honore to Seaboard Air Line Railway by Right-of-Way Deed dated November 5, 1910 recorded in Deed Book 23, Page 127 of the aforementioned Public Records; thence S-11°46'43"-E along said parallel line a distance of 647.48 feet to the PC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 13°05'14" and a radius of 1480.00 feet; thence Southeastely along the arc a distance of 338.06 feet to the PRC of a curve to the left having a central angle of 26°10'29" and a radius of 1600.00 feet; thence Southeastely along the arc a distance of 730.94 feet to the PRC of a curve to the left having a central angle of 13°05'14" and a radius of 1480.00 feet; thence Southeastely along the arc a distance of 338.06 feet to the aforementioned parallel line 120.00 feet Southwesterly of the Westerly right-of-way line of the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad; thence S-11°46'43"-E along said parallel line a distance of 953.36 feet to the PC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 96°45'34" and a radius of 840.00 feet; thence Southeastely and Southwesterly along the arc a distance of 1418.57 feet; thence S-84°58'51"-W a distance of 810.00 feet to the PC of a curve to the left having a central angle of 62°08'54" and a radius of 1660.00 feet; thence Southwesterly along the arc a distance of 1800.59 feet to the PRC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 85°30'13" and a radius of 25.00 feet; thence Southwesterly along the arc a distance of 37.31 feet to the PRC of a curve to the left having a central angle of 18°39'50" and a radius of 1000.00 feet to the PC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 38°37'29" and a radius of 1140.00 feet; thence Northwesterly along the arc a distance of 768.51 feet to the PRC of a curve to the left having a central angle of 38°37'29" and a radius of 1260.00 feet; thence Northwesterly along the arc a distance of 849.40 feet to a line which is 60.00 feet Northerly of and parallel with the Northerly line of the South Half of the Northwest ¼ of the aforementioned Section 27; thence S-89°40'21"-W along said parallel line a distance of 1338.53 feet to the Easterly line of Pine Tree Village, a condominium recorded in Condominium Book 17, Pages 44 through 44I of the aforementioned Public Records; thence N-00°04'58"-E along said Easterly line a distance of 1282.26 feet to the Southerly line of the Southwest ¼ of the aforementioned Section 22; thence N-89°28'39"-E along said Southerly line a distance of 1337.06 feet to a capped iron pipe found at the Southwest corner of the Southeast ¼ of said Section 22; thence N-89°28'12"-E along the Southerly line of said Southeast ¼ a distance of 2498.54 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

ALSO LESS:

Ord. 2016-037

A-2
A tract of land lying in Section 15, Township 37 South, Range 18 East, Sarasota County, Florida, described as follows:

Commence at the Northeast corner of the Southeast ¼ of said Section 15; thence N-89°36'31"-W along the Northerly line of said Southeast ¼ a distance of 45.00 feet; thence S-00°16'17"-W parallel with the Easterly line of said Southeast ¼ a distance of 1640.00 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING; thence continue S-00°16'17"-W along said parallel line a distance of 459.39 feet; thence continue N-89°47'05"-W a distance of 314.06 feet; thence N-89°11'16"-W a distance of 243.35 feet; thence N-89°10'38"-W a distance of 476.74 feet; thence N-00°59'23"-E a distance of 235.02 feet; thence N-44°43'10"-W a distance of 1027.98 feet; thence S-77°02'20"-W a distance of 184.18 feet; thence N-47°24'29"-W a distance of 145.72 feet; thence N-89°00'00"-W a distance of 310.00 feet to the Easterly line of premised excepted from Parcel B, recorded in Instrument dated April 11, 1977 in O.R. Book 1168, Pages 1466 through 1481 (see Page 1475); thence N-00°15'58"-E along said Easterly line a distance of 1244.44 feet; thence S-44°45'13"-E a distance of 234.53 feet; thence S-49°31'01"-E a distance of 301.04 feet to a point on a curve of which the radius point lies N-45°14'48"-E a radial distance of 2340.00 feet; thence Southeasterly along the arc through a central angle of 10°00'00" a distance of 408.41 feet; thence S-54°45'12"-E a distance of 232.70 feet to the PC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 21°33'12" and a radius of 1300.00 feet; thence Southeasterly along the arc a distance of 489.03 feet; thence S-33°12'00"-E a distance of 491.93 feet to the PC of a curve to the left having a central angle of 53°48'56" and a radius of 950.00 feet; thence Southeasterly along the arc a distance of 892.30 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING. Containing 41.457 acres.

ALSO LESS:

A tract of land lying in Sections 14 and 15, Township 37 South, Range 18 East, Sarasota County, Florida, described as follows:

Commence at the Northwest corner of the Southwest ¼ of said Section 14; thence S-89°36'06"-E along the Northerly line of said Southwest ¼ a distance of 75.00 feet; thence S-00°16'17"-W parallel with the Westerly line of said Southwest ¼ a distance of 1640.80 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING; thence continue S-00°16'17"-W along said parallel line a distance of 458.21 feet; thence N-89°47'05"-W a distance of 459.39 feet to a point on a curve of which the radius point lies N-02°59'03"-E a radial distance of 950.00 feet; thence Easterly along the arc through a central angle of 02°42'47" a distance of 44.98 feet; thence S-89°43'44"-E a distance of 75.03 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING. Containing 1.263 acres.

ALSO LESS:

A tract of land lying in Section 14, Township 37 South, Range 18 East, Sarasota County, Florida, described as follows:

Commence at the Northwest corner of the Southeast ¼ of said Section 14; thence S-89°36'06"-E along the Northerly line of said Southeast ¼ a distance of 50.00 feet; thence S-00°13'09"-W parallel with the Westerly line of said Southeast ¼ a distance of 77.36 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING; thence continue S-00°13'09"-W a distance of 606.70 feet to the PC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 56°48'21" and a radius of 950.00 feet; thence Southwesterly along the arc a distance of 941.88 feet; thence S-63°42'34"-E a distance of 292.83 feet; thence N-26°17'26"-E a distance of 390.00 feet; thence N-00°43'03"-W a distance of 121.02 feet; thence N-26°00'00"-E a distance of 670.00 feet; thence N-32°36'13"-W a distance of 542.32 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING. Containing 6.151 acres.

ALSO LESS:

A tract of land lying in Section 26, Township 37 South, Range 18 East, Sarasota County, Florida, described as follows:

A-3                   Ord. 2016-037
Commence at a Smally, Wellford & Nalven concrete monument at the Northwest corner of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 26; thence S-89°31'51"-E along the Northerly line of said Northwest Quarter a distance of 2420.00 feet to the Westerly right-of-way line of Seaboard Coast Line Railroad (100 feet) as conveyed by Adrian C. Honore to Seaboard Airline Railway by right-of-way deed dated November 5, 1910, recorded in Deed Book 23, Page 127 of the Public Records of Sarasota County, Florida; thence S-11°46'43"-E along said Westerly line a distance of 978.21 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING; thence continue S-11°46'43"-E along said Westerly line a distance of 1118.75 feet; thence S-38°52'35"-W a distance of 473.29 feet thence S-89°31'53"-W a distance of 1022.33 feet; thence N-49°43'17"-W a distance of 620.47 feet; thence N-11°46'43"-W a distance of 1108.80 feet to a Smally, Wellford & Nalven concrete monument set; thence N-84°58'51"-E a distance of 681.75 feet to a Smally, Wellford & Nalven concrete monument set at the PC of a curve to the left having a central angle of 33°31'37" and a radius of 960.00 feet; thence Northeasterly along the arc a distance of 561.75 feet to a Smally, Wellford & Nalven concrete monument set; thence S-70°20'53"-E a distance of 397.45 feet; thence S-56°46'43"-E a distance of 266.59 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING, Containing 61.500 acres.

Excepting from all of the above, right-of-way for S.R. 93, S.R. 681 and Seaboard Coast Line Railroad.

Containing 4284.29 acres, more or less.

AND

A tract of land in the Northeast ¼ of Section 15, Township 37 South, Range 18 East, Sarasota County, Florida, described as follows:

Commence at the Northeast ¼ of said Section 15; thence S-00°14'48"-W along the Westerly line of said Northeast ¼ a distance of 50.06 feet to the Southerly line of premises conveyed by Honore A. Palmer and wife to the State of Florida by Deed dated February, 1957, recorded in Deed Book 272 on Page 61 of the Public Records of Sarasota County, Florida (Southerly line of Clark Road – 100 feet wide); thence S-89°26'19"-E along said Southerly line a distance of 2664.84 feet to a concrete monument on the Westerly right-of-way line of McIntosh Road (48 feet wide) for the POINT OF BEGINNING; thence S-00°16'13"-W along said right-of-way line a distance of 532.67 feet; thence N-89°26'19"-W a distance of 1301.15 feet; thence N-00°14'48"-E a distance of 532.67 feet to the aforementioned Southerly line of Clark Road; thence S-89°26'19"-E along said Southerly line a distance of 1301.37 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING, Containing 15.91 acres.

AND

A tract of land lying in Section 15, Township 37 South, Range 18 East, Sarasota County, Florida, described as follows:

Commence at the Northeast corner of the Southeast ¼ of said Section 15; thence N-89°36'13"-W along the Northerly line of said Southeast ¼ a distance of 24.00 feet to the Westerly right-of-way line of McIntosh Road (48 feet wide) as shown on the Plat of Sarasota-Venice Company's Subdivision of Sections 14 and 15, Township 37 South, Range 18 East, recorded in Plat Book A on Page 10 of the Public Records of Sarasota County, Florida (Plat Book 2, Page 3 of Manatee County records) for the POINT OF BEGINNING; thence S-00°16'17"-W along said Westerly right-of-way line a distance of 1540.68 feet to a point on a curve of which the radius point lies N-01°53'13"-E a radial distance of 850.00 feet; thence Northwesterly along the arc through a central angle of 54°54'47" a distance of 814.65 feet; thence N-33°12'00"-W a distance of 491.93 feet to the PC of a curve to the left having a central angle of 21°33'12" and a radius of 1400.00 feet; thence Northwesterly along the arc a distance of 526.65 feet; thence N-54°45'12"-W a distance of 282.70 feet to the PC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 0°00'00" and a radius of 2240.00 feet; thence Northwesterly along the arc a distance of 390.95 feet; thence N-39°59'23"-W a distance of 301.26 feet to the centerline of an existing drainage ditch (the
following 6 calls are along said centerline; thence S-62°42'01"-E a distance of 271.71 feet; thence S-87°41'51"-E a distance of 194.60 feet; thence N-63°23'25"-E a distance of 410.11 feet; thence S-82°16'13"-E a distance of 114.19 feet; thence S-55°09'22"-E a distance of 299.11 feet; thence S-46°32'20"-E a distance of 200.53 feet to the aforementioned Northerly line of the Southeast ¼ of Section 15; thence S-89°16'13"-E along said Northerly line a distance of 739.20 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING. Containing 40.43 acres.

AND

A tract of land lying Sections 14 and 15, Township 37 South, Range 18 East, Sarasota County, Florida, described as follows:

Commence at the Northeast corner of the Southwest ¼ of said Section 14; thence S-89°36'06"-E along the Northerly line of said Southwest ¼ a distance of 775.98 feet to the Westerly right-of-way line of the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad (100 feet wide) as conveyed by Adrian C. Honore to Seaboard Air Line Railway by right-of-way deed dated November 5, 1910 recorded in Deed Book 23, Page 127 of the Public Records of Sarasota County, Florida; thence S-11°46'43"-E along said Westerly right-of-way line a distance of 1573.93 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING; thence N-89°43'44"-W a distance of 1104.59 feet to the PC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 56°31'43" and a radius of 850.00 feet; thence Northwesterly along the arc a distance of 838.62 feet; thence N-33°12'00"-W a distance of 491.923 feet to the PC of a curve to the left having a central angle of 21°33'12" and a radius of 1400.00 feet; thence Northwesterly along the arc a distance of 526.65 feet; thence N-54°45'12"-W a distance of 282.70 feet to the PC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 10°00'00" and a radius of 2240.00 feet; thence Northwesterly along the arc a distance of 390.95 feet; thence N-39°59'23"-W a distance of 301.26 feet to the centerline of an existing drainage ditch (the following 2 calls are along said centerline); thence N-62°42'01"-W a distance of 7.79 feet; thence N-77°48'05"-W a distance of 270.69 feet; thence S-44°45'13"-E a distance of 234.53 feet; thence S-49°31'01"-E a distance of 301.04 feet to a point on a curve of which the radius point lies N-45°14'48"-E a radial distance of 2340.00 feet; thence Southeasterly along said arc through a central angle of 10°00'00" a distance of 498.41 feet; thence S-54°45'12"-E a distance of 282.70 feet to the PC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 21°33'12" and a radius of 1300.00 feet; thence Southeasterly along the arc a distance of 489.03 feet; thence S-33°12'00"-E a distance of 491.93 feet to the PC of a curve to the left having a central angle of 56°31'43" and a radius of 950.00 feet; thence Southeasterly along the arc a distance of 937.28 feet; thence S-89°43'44"-E a distance of 1125.93 feet to the aforementioned Westerly right-of-way line of the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad; thence N-11°46'43"-W along said Westerly right-of-way line a distance of 102.25 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING. Containing 9.732 acres.

AND

A tract of land lying in Section 14, Township 37 South, Range 18 East, Sarasota County, Florida, described as follows:

Commence at the Northeast corner of the Northwest ¼ of said Section 14; thence S-00°13'09"-W along the Easterly line of said Northwest ¼ a distance of 50.55 feet to the Southerly right-of-way line of Clark Road (100 feet wide); thence N-89°25'37"-W along said Southerly right-of-way line a distance of 50.00 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING; thence S-00°13'09"-W parallel with the Easterly line of said Northwest ¼ a distance of 3320.29 feet to the PC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 90°03'07" and a radius of 850.00 feet; thence Southerly and Westerly along the arc a distance of 1335.95 feet; thence N-89°43'44"-W a distance of 571.37 feet to the Easterly line of premises conveyed by Adrian C. Honore to Seaboard Airline Railway by Right-of-Way Deed dated November 5, 1910, recorded in Deed Book 23 on Page 127 of the Public Records of Sarasota County, Florida; thence N-11°46'43"-W along said Easterly line a distance of 1549.14 feet to the Southerly right-of-way line of Savage Road (48 feet wide) as shown on the Plat of Sarasota-Venice Company's Subdivision of Sections 14 and 15, Township 37 South, Range 18 East, recorded in Plat Book A on Page 10 of the aforementioned Public Records (Plat Book 2,
Page 34 of Manatee County records); thence S-89°36’06”-E along said Southerly right-of-way line a distance of 1124.78 feet; thence N-00°13’55”-E along the Easterly line of Lots 10 and 3 of said Sarasota-Venice Company’s Subdivision a distance of 2661.80 feet to the aforementioned Southerly right-of-way line of Clark Road; thence S-89°25’37”-E along said Southerly right-of-way line a distance of 618.81 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING. Containing 89.24 acres.

AND

A tract of land lying in Section 14, Township 37 South, Range 18 East, Sarasota County, Florida, described as follows:

Commence at the Northeast corner of the Northwest ¼ of said Section 14; thence S-00°13’09”-W along the Easterly line of said Northwest ¼ a distance of 50.55 feet to the Southerly right-of-way line of Clark Road (100 feet wide) for the POINT OF BEGINNING; thence N-89°25’37”-W along said Southerly right-of-way line a distance of 50.00 feet; thence S-00°13’09”-W parallel with the Easterly line of said Northwest ¼ a distance of 3320.29 feet to the PC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 90°03’07” and a radius of 850.00 feet; thence Southerly and Westerly along the arc a distance of 1335.95 feet; thence N-89°43’44”-W a distance of 571.37 feet to the Easterly right-of-way line of the Seaboard Coast line Railroad (100 feet wide) as conveyed by Adrian C. Honore to Seaboard Air Line Railway by right-of-way deed dated November 5, 1910, recorded in Deed Book 23, Page 127 of the Public Records of Sarasota County, Florida; thence S-11°46’43”-E along said Easterly right-of-way line a distance of 102.25 feet; thence S-89°43’44”-E a distance of 550.02 feet to the PC of a curve to the left having a central angle of 90°03’07” and a radius of 950.00 feet; thence Easterly and Northerly along the arc a distance of 1493.12 feet; thence N-00°13’09”-E a distance of 3319.67 feet to the aforementioned Southerly right-of-way line of Clark Road; thence N-89°25’37”-W along said Southerly right-of-way line a distance of 50.00 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING. Containing 12.156 acres.

AND

A tract of land lying in Section 15, Township 37 South, Range 18 East, Sarasota County, Florida, described as follows:

Commence at the Northeast corner of the Southeast ¼ of said Section 15; thence N-89°36’13”-W along the Northerly line of said Southeast ¼ a distance of 48.00 feet; thence S-00°16’17”-W parallel with the Easterly line of said Southeast ¼ a distance of 1640.00 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING; thence continue S-00°16’17”-W along said parallel line a distance of 459.39 feet; thence N-89°47’05”-W a distance of 314.06 feet; thence N-49°41’16”-W a distance of 243.35 feet; thence N-89°10’38”-W a distance of 476.74 feet; thence N-00°59’23”-E a distance of 235.02 feet; thence N-44°43’10”-W a distance of 1027.98 feet; thence S-77°02’20”-W a distance of 184.18 feet; thence N-47°24’29”-W a distance of 145.72 feet; thence N-89°00’00”-W a distance of 310.00 feet to the Easterly line of premises excepted from Parcel B, recorded in Instrument dated April 11, 1977 in O.R. Book 1168, Pages 1466 through 1481 (see Page 1475); thence N-00°15’58”-E along said Easterly line a distance of 1244.44 feet; thence S-44°45’13”-E a distance of 234.53 feet; thence S-49°31’01”-E a distance of 301.04 feet to a point on a curve of which the radius point lies N-45°14’48”-E a radial distance of 2340.00 feet; thence Southeasterly along the arc through a central angle of 10°00’00” a distance of 408.41 feet; thence S-54°45’12”-E a distance of 282.70 feet to the PC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 21°33’12” and a radius of 1300.00 feet; thence Southeasterly along the arc a distance of 489.03 feet; thence S-33°12’00”-E a distance of 491.93 feet to the PC of a curve to the left having a central angle of 53°48’56” and a radius of 950.00 feet; thence Southeastery along the arc a distance of 892.30 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING. Containing 41.457 acres.

AND

A tract of land lying in Sections 14 and 15, Township 37 South, Range 18 East, Sarasota County, Florida, described as follows:

Ord. 2016-037

A-6
Commence at the Northwest corner of the Southwest ¼ of said Section 14; thence S-89°36'06"-E along the Northerly line of said Southwest ¼ a distance of 75.00 feet; thence S-00°16'17"-W parallel with the Westerly line of said Southwest ¼ a distance of 1640.00 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING; thence continue S-00°16'17"-W along said parallel line a distance of 458.21 feet; thence N-89°47'05"-W a distance of 120.09 feet; thence N-00°16'17"-E a distance of 459.39 feet to a point on a curve of which the radius point lies N-02°59'03"-E a radial distance of 950.00 feet; thence Easterly along the arc through a central angle of 02°42'47" a distance of 44.98 feet; thence S-89°43'44"-E a distance of 75.03 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING. Containing 1.263 acres.

AND

A tract of land lying in Section 14, Township 37 South, Range 18 East, Sarasota County, Florida, described as follows:

Commence at the Northwest corner of the Southeast ¼ of said Section 14; thence S-89°36'06"-E along the Northerly line of said Southeast ¼ a distance of 50.00 feet; thence S-00°13'09"-W parallel with the Westerly line of said Southeast ¼ a distance of 77.36 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING; thence continue S-00°13'09"-W a distance of 606.70 feet to the PC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 56°48'21" and a radius of 950.00 feet; thence Southwesterly along the arc a distance of 941.88 feet; thence S-63°42'34"-E a distance of 292.83 feet; thence N-26°17'26"-E a distance of 390.00 feet; thence N-00°43'03"-W a distance of 121.02 feet; thence N-26°00'00"-E a distance of 670.00 feet; thence N-32°36'13"-W a distance of 542.32 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING. Containing 6.151 acres.

AND

A tract of land lying in Sections 22, 23, 26, and 27 all in Township 37 South, Range 18 East, Sarasota County, Florida, described as follows:

Commence at a Smallly, Wellford & Naiven concrete monument at the Southeast corner of the Southeast ¼ of said Section 22; thence S-89°28'12"-W along the Southerly line of said Southeast ¼ a distance of 197.56 feet to a Smallly, Wellford, & Naiven concrete monument at the Southeast corner of The Country Club of Sarasota recorded in Plat Book 24, Pages 16 through 16K of the Public Records of Sarasota County, Florida for the POINT OF BEGINNING (the following 6 calls are to concrete monuments along the lines of The Country Club of Sarasota; thence N-00°31'59"-W a distance of 2039.04 feet; thence N-89°28'01"-E a distance of 100.00 feet; thence N-00°31'59"-W a distance of 250.00 feet; thence N-89°28'01"-E a distance of 583.77 feet; thence N-00°31'59"-W a distance of 600.49 feet; thence S-89°28'01"-W a distance of 4073.67 feet to the Easterly line of Ballantree, a Condominium recorded in Condominium Book 14, Pages 26 through 26G of said Public Records; thence N-00°03'26"-E along said Easterly line a distance of 650.00 feet to a Smallly, Wellford & Naiven concrete monument at the Southerly line of premises conveyed by Sarasota Realty Development Corporation to the County of Sarasota by Dedication Deed dated March 20, 1980 recorded in O.R. Book 1362, Page 1827 of said Public Records, said point being a point on a curve of which the radius point lies NS-14°40'27"-W a radial distance of 660.00 feet; thence Northeasterly along the arc through a central angle of 45°43'33" a distance of 526.72 feet to the PRC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 40°44'48" and a radius of 580.00 feet; thence Northeasterly along the arc a distance of 412.48 feet to the PRC of a curve to the left having a central angle of 18°39'03" and a radius of 2120.00 feet; thence Northeasterly along the arc a distance of 690.10 feet; thence S-51°41'46"-E a distance of 800.00 feet to the PC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 5°07'27" and a radius of 620.00 feet; thence Northeasterly and Southeasterly along the arc a distance of 542.40 feet; thence S-78°10'47"-E a distance of 847.98 feet to the PC of a curve to the left having a central angle of 27°09'55" and a radius of 760.00 feet; thence Southeasterly and Northeasterly along the arc a distance of 360.34 feet to the PRC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 84°09'28" and a radius of 25.00 feet; thence Northeasterly and Southeasterly along the arc a distance of 36.72 feet to the PRC of a curve to the left having a central angle of 48°24'45" and a radius of 1360.00 feet; thence
Southeasterly along the arc a distance of 1149.14 feet to the PRC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 57°49'16" and a radius of 1240.00 feet; thence Southeasterly along the arc a distance of 1251.37 feet to a line which is 120.00 feet Southwesterly of and parallel with the Westerly right-of-way line of the Seaboard Coast Line Railway (100 feet wide) as conveyed by Adrian C. Honore to Seaboard Air Line Railway by Right-of-Way Deed dated November 5, 1910, recorded in Deed Book 23, Page 127 of the aforementioned Public Records; thence S-11°46'43"-E along said parallel line a distance of 647.48 feet to the PC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 13°05'14" and a radius of 1480.00 feet; thence Southeasterly along the arc a distance of 338.06 feet to the aforementioned parallel line 120.00 feet Southwesterly of the Westerly right-of-way line of the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad; thence S-11°46'43"-E along said parallel line, a distance of 953.36 feet to the PC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 96°45'34" and a radius of 840.00 feet; thence Southeasterly and Southwesterly along the arc a distance of 1418.57 feet; thence S-84°58'51"-W a distance of 810.00 feet to the PC of a curve to the left having a central angle of 62°08'54" and a radius of 1660.00 feet; thence Southwesterly along the arc a distance of 1800.59 feet to the PRC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 85°30'13" and a radius of 25.00 feet; thence Southwesterly along the arc a distance of 37.31 feet to the PRC of a curve to the left having a central angle of 18°39'50" and a radius of 100.00 feet; thence Northwesterly along the arc a distance of 325.75 feet; thence S-89°40'21"-W a distance of 150.00 feet to the PC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 38°37'29" and a radius of 1140.00 feet; thence Northwesterly along the arc a distance of 768.51 feet to the PRC of a curve to the left having a central angle of 38°37'29" and a radius of 1260.00 feet; thence Northwesterly along the arc a distance of 849.40 feet to a line which is 60.00 feet Northwesterly and parallel with the Northerly line of the South Half of the Northwest ¼ of the aforementioned Section 27; thence S-89°40'21"-W along said parallel line a distance of 1339.53 feet to the Easterly line of Pine Tree Village, a Condominium recorded in Condominium Book 17, Pages 44 through 441 of the aforementioned Public Records; thence N-00°04'58"-E along said Easterly line a distance of 1282.26 feet to the Southerly line of the Southwest ¼ of the aforementioned Section 22; thence N-89°28'29"-E along said Southerly line a distance of 179.16 feet to a capped iron pipe found at the Southwest corner of the Southeast ¼ of said Section 22; thence N-89°28'12"-E along the Southerly line of said Southeast ¼ a distance of 2498.54 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING. Containing 494.662 acres.

AND

Begin at a concrete monument marking the Northeast corner of said plat of "The Country Club of Sarasota" thence S-00°57'33"-E, 600.49 feet to a concrete monument; thence S-89°02'27"-W, 583.77 feet to a concrete monument; thence S-00°57'33"-E, 250.00 feet to a concrete monument; thence S-89°02'27"-W, 100.00 feet to a concrete monument; thence N-00°55'44"-W, 850.49 feet to a concrete monument; thence N-89°02'27"-E, 683.32 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING. Containing 10.00 acres.

AND

Part of the Southwest ¼ of Section 14, Township 37 South, Range 18 East, Sarasota County, Florida described as follows:

Commence at a concrete monument found at the Northwest corner of the Southwest ¼ of said Section 14; thence S-00°16'16"-W along the Westerly line of the Southwest ¼ of said Section 14, a distance of 1540.84 feet; thence S-89°43'38"-E parallel with the Southerly line of the North ¼ of the Southwest ¼ of said Section 14 a distance of 75.00 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING; thence continue S-89°43'38"-E along said parallel line a distance of 1029.41 feet to the Westerly right-of-way line (100 feet wide) of the Seaboard Coastline Railroad, Deed Book 23, Page 127 of the Public Records of Sarasota County, Florida; thence N-11°46'30"-W along said Westerly right-of-way line a distance of 1536.97 feet to its intersection with a line which is 36 feet Southerly of and parallel with the Northerly line of the Southwest ¼ of said Section 14; thence N-89°36'07"-W along said parallel line a distance of 708.64 feet to its intersection with a line which is 75 feet
Easterly of and parallel with the Westerly line of the Southwest 1/4 of said Section 14; thence S-00°16'16"-W parallel with the Westerly line of the Southwest 1/4 of said Section 14 a distance of 1504.67 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING. Containing 30.00 acres.

AND

A tract of land lying in Section 26, Township 37 South, Range 18 East, Sarasota County, Florida, described as follow:

Commence at a Smally, Wellford and Nalven concrete monument at the Northwest corner of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 26; thence S-89°31'51"-E along the Northerly line of said Northwest Quarter a distance of 2420.00 feet to the Westerly right-of-way line of Seaboard Coast Line Railroad (100 feet wide) as conveyed by Adrian C. Honore to Seaboard Airline Railway by right-of-way deed dated November 5, 1910, recorded in Deed Book 23, Page 127 of the Public Records of Sarasota County, Florida; thence S-11°46'43"-E along said Westerly line a distance of 978.21 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING; thence continue S-11°46'43"-E along said Westerly line a distance of 1118.75 feet; thence S-38°52'35"-W a distance of 1022.33 feet; thence N-49°43'17"-W a distance of 620.47 feet; thence N-11°46'43"-W a distance of 1108.80 feet to a Smaly, Wellford & Nalven concrete monument set; thence N-84°58'51"-E a distance of 681.75 feet to a Smaly, Wellford & Nalven concrete monument set at the PC of a curve to the left having a central angle of 33°31'37" and a radius of 960.00 feet; thence Northeasterly along the arc a distance of 561.75 feet; thence Northeasterly along the arc a distance of 561.75 feet to a Smaly, Wellford & Nalven concrete monument set; thence S-70°20'53"-E a distance of 397.45 feet; thence S-56°46'43"-W a distance of 266.59 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING. Containing 61.500 acres.

AND

That portion of the East half of the East Half of Section 13, Township 37 South, Range 18 East; being more particularly described as follows:

Commence at the Southeast corner of said Section 13; thence S-88°55'38"-W along the Southerly line of said Section 13, a distance of 508.79 feet to the westerly line of State Road 93 (I-75) for the POINT OF BEGINNING; thence continue along said Southerly line S-88°55'38"-W a distance of 823.25 feet to the Westerly line of the East half of the East half of said Section 13; thence N-00°22'19"-E along said Westerly line, a distance of 2622.12 feet to the Northerly line of the Southeast 1/4 of said Section 13; thence continue N-00°25'26"-E along the westerly line of the East half of the East half of said Section 13, a distance of 676.52 feet; thence N-89°58'00"-E a distance of 853.52 feet to the aforementioned Westerly line of State Road 93 (I-75); (the following 3 calls are along said Westerly line); thence S-00°02'00"-E a distance of 569.58 feet; thence S-01°06'45"-W a distance of 2665.37 feet to the PC of a curve to the right having a central angle of 00°10'25" and a radius of 16240.22 feet; thence along the arc in a Southwesterly direction a distance of 49.20 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing 63.707 Acres.

ALSO

Section 24, Township 37 South, Range 18 East; being more particularly described as follows:

That portion of the North 1/2 of the Northeast 1/4 of Section 24, Township 37 South, Range 18 East, lying Westerly of the Westerly right-of-way line of State Road 93 (I-75).

Containing 63.497 Acres.

ALSO
West of I-75 and approximately 1000 feet south of Central Sarasota Parkway, being more particularly described as follows:

That part of Section 31, Township 37 South, Range 19E, Sarasota County, Florida, lying westerly of I-75.

Containing 38.4 Acres.

AND

A tract of land lying in Section 1, Township 38 South, Range 18 East and Section 6, Township 38 South, Range 19 East, both in Sarasota County, Florida, said tract described as follows:

BEGIN at northeast corner of said Section 1, also being the northwest corner of said Section 6 and the southeast corner of Section 36, Township 37 South, Range 18 East; thence S.39°29'05"E., along the north line of said Section 6, a distance of 1.196.94 feet to a point on the westerly right-of-way line of Interstate 75 (State Road 93, Section 17075-2407, variable width public right-of-way) as recorded in Road Plat Book 2, Page 54, Public Records of Sarasota County, Florida, also being the point of curvature of a non tangent curve to the right, having a radius of 22,788.31 feet and a central angle of 08°14'41"; thence southerly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 3,279.19 feet, said curve having a chord bearing and distance of S.16°09'16"E., 3,276.36 feet, to the point of tangency of said curve; thence continuing along said westerly right-of-way line, S.12°01'55"E., a distance of 75.61 feet to the point of curvature of a non tangent curve to the left, having a radius of 2,143.00 feet and a central angle of 23°50'25"; thence southwesterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 891.68 feet, said curve having a chord bearing and distance of S.44°20'49"W., 885.26 feet, to the point of tangency of said curve; thence S.32°25'36"W., a distance of 649.81 feet to a point on the westerly right-of-way line of Honore Avenue (at this point, a 120.00 foot wide public right-of-way) as recorded in Road Plat Book 4, Page 78, said Public Records and being a point of curvature of a non tangent curve to the right, having a radius of 821.00 feet and a central angle of 54°11'11"; thence along said westerly right-of-way line for the following seven (7) calls: (1) thence northwesterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 776.45 feet, said curve having a chord bearing and distance of N.48°06'32"W., 747.83 feet, to the point of tangency of said curve; (2) thence N.21°00'57"W., a distance of 735.83 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of 1,710.00 feet and a central angle of 40°39'59"; (3) thence northwesterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 1,213.69 feet to the point of tangency of said curve; (4) thence N.61°40'56"W., a distance of 1,740.18 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the right having a radius of 1,370.00 feet and a central angle of 61°55'56"; (5) thence northwesterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 1,480.86 feet to the end of said curve; (6) thence S.89°45'00"E., a distance of 15.00 feet; (7) thence N.00°15'18"E., a distance of 309.87 feet to a point on the north line of the Northeast 1/4 of said Section 1, said point also being on the westerly line of the Isles of Sarasota, Unit 1, as recorded in Plat Book 45, Page 21, said Public Records; thence along said westerly line and southerly line of said plat for the following seven (7) calls: (1) thence S.00°15'00"W., a distance of 118.39 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of 1,250.00 feet and a central angle of 45°10'46"; (2) thence southerly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 985.66 feet to the point of curvature of a non tangent curve to the left, having a radius of 276.07 feet and a central angle of 13°46'21"; (3) thence northerly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 66.36 feet, said curve having a chord bearing and distance of N.12°33'07"E., 66.20 feet, to the point of reverse curvature of a curve to the right having a radius of 110.00 feet and a central angle of 76°15'02"; (4) thence northeasterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 146.39 feet to the point of reverse curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of 50.00 feet and a central angle of 45°59'54"; (5) thence northeasterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 40.14 feet to the point of compound curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of 491.38 feet and a central angle of 16°37'27"; (6) thence northeasterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 142.57 feet to the point of reverse curvature of a curve to the right having a radius of 400.00 feet and a central angle of 28°22'55"; (7) thence northeasterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of
198.14 feet to the end of said curve; thence S.49°38'30"E., a distance of 100.27 feet to a point on the southerly line of Isles of Sarasota, Unit 2A, as recorded in Plat Book 45, Page 48, said Public Records; thence along said south line and the south line of Isles of Sarasota, Unit 2B, as recorded in Plat Book 46, Page 12, said Public Records for the following seventeen (17) calls; (1) thence N.88°47'04"E., a distance of 75.61 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the right having a radius of 105.00 feet and a central angle of 63°12'17"; (2) thence southeasterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 115.83 feet to the point of tangency of said curve; (3) thence S.28°00'39"E., a distance of 44.32 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of 150.00 feet and a central angle of 17°22'11"; (4) thence southeasterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 45.47 feet to the point of tangency of said curve; (5) thence S.45°22'50"E., a distance of 65.63 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of 150.00 feet and a central angle of 16°26'52"; (6) thence southeasterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 43.06 feet to the point of tangency of said curve; (7) thence S.61°49'43"E., a distance of 109.90 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of 50.00 feet and a central angle of 33°42'53"; (8) thence easterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 29.42 feet to the point of compound curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of 1,266.27 feet and a central angle of 15°51'00"; (9) thence easterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 350.29 feet to the point of tangency of said curve; (10) thence N.68°36'25"E., a distance of 277.55 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the right having a radius of 1,050.00 feet and a central angle of 10°17'50"; (11) thence easterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 188.71 feet to the point of tangency of said curve; (12) thence N.76°54'15"E., a distance of 95.26 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of 600.77 feet and a central angle of 23°05'51"; (13) thence northeasterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 242.19 feet to the point of compound curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of 100.00 feet and a central angle of 38°29'33"; (14) thence northeasterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 67.18 feet to the point of reverse curvature of a curve to the right having a radius of 580.42 feet and a central angle of 34°50'52"; (15) thence northeasterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 353.02 feet to the end of said curve; (16) thence N.08°47'16"W., a distance of 129.41 feet; (17) thence N.00°59'19"E., a distance of 33.63 feet to a point on the above mentioned north line of the Northeast 1/4 of said Section 1; thence S.89°45'18"E., along said north line, a distance of 190.02 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

Said tract contains 9,755.058 square feet or 223.9453 acres, more or less.

AND

A tract of land lying in Section 1, Township 38 South, Range 18 East and Section 6, Township 38 South, Range 19 East, both in Sarasota County, Florida, said tract described as follows:

BEGIN at northeast corner of said Section 1, also being the northwest corner of said Section 6 and the southeast corner of Section 36, Township 37 South, Range 18 East; thence S.89°29'05"E., along the north line of said Section 6, a distance of 1,196.94 feet to a point on the westerly right-of-way line of Interstate 75 (State Road 93, Section 17075-2407, variable width public right-of-way) as recorded in Road Plat Book 2, Page 54, Public Records of Sarasota County, Florida, also being the point of curvature of a non tangent curve to the right, having a radius of 22,788.31 feet and a central angle of 08°14'41"; thence southerly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 3,279.19 feet, said curve having a chord bearing and distance of S.16°09'16"E., 3,276.36 feet, to the point of tangency of said curve; thence continuing along said westerly right-of-way line, S.12°01'55"E., a distance of 75.61 feet to the point of curvature of a non tangent curve to the left, having a radius of 2,143.00 feet and a central angle of 23°50'25"; thence southwesterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 891.68 feet, said curve having a chord bearing and distance of S.44°20'49"W., 885.26 feet, to the point of tangency of said curve; thence S.32°25'36"W., a distance of 649.81 feet to a point on the westerly right-of-way line of Honore Avenue (at this point, a 120.00 foot wide public right-of-way) as recorded in Road Plat Book 4, Page 78, said Public Records and being a point of curvature of a non tangent curve to the right, having a radius of 821.00 feet and a central angle of 54°11'11"; thence along said westerly right-of-way.
line for the following seven (7) calls; (1) thence northwesterly along the arc of said curve, a
distance of 776.45 feet, said curve having a chord bearing and distance of N.48°06'32"W., 747.83
feet, to the point of tangency of said curve; (2) thence N.21°00'57"W., a distance of 735.83 feet
to the point of curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of 1,710.00 feet and a central
angle of 40°39'59"; (3) thence northwesterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 1,213.69
feet to the point of tangency of said curve; (4) thence N.61°40'56"W., a distance of 1,740.18 feet
to the point of curvature of a curve to the right having a radius of 1,370.00 feet and a central
angle of 61°55'56"; (5) thence northwesterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 1,480.86
feet to the end of said curve; (6) thence S.89°45'00"E., a distance of 15.00 feet; (7) thence
N.00°15'18"E., a distance of 309.87 feet to a point on the north line of the Northeast 1/4 of said
Section 1, said point also being on the westerly line of the Isles of Sarasota, Unit 1, as recorded in
Plat Book 45, Page 21, said Public Records; thence along said westerly line and southerly line of
said plat for the following seven (7) calls; (1) thence S.00°15'00"W., a distance of 118.39 feet to
the point of curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of 1,250.00 feet and a central angle
of 45°10'46"; (2) thence southerly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 985.66 feet to the
point of curvature of a non-tangent curve to the left, having a radius of 276.07 feet and a
central angle of 13°46'21"; (3) thence northerly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 66.36
feet, said curve having a chord bearing and distance of N.12°33'07"E., 66.20 feet, to the point of
reverse curvature of a curve to the right having a radius of 110.00 feet and a central angle of
76°15'02"; (4) thence northeasterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 146.39 feet to the
point of reverse curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of 50.00 feet and a central angle
of 45°55'54"; (5) thence northeasterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 40.14 feet to the
point of compound curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of 491.38 feet and a central
angle of 16°37'27"; (6) thence northeasterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 142.57 feet
to the point of reverse curvature of a curve to the right having a radius of 400.00 feet and a
central angle of 28°22'55"; (7) thence northeasterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of
198.14 feet to the end of said curve; thence S.49°38'30"E., a distance of 100.27 feet to a point on
the southerly line of Isles of Sarasota, Unit 2A, as recorded in Plat Book 45, Page 48, said Public
Records; thence along said south line and the south line of Isles of Sarasota, Unit 2B, as recorded
in Plat Book 46, Page 12, said Public Records for the following seventeen (17) calls; (1) thence
N.88°47'04"E., a distance of 75.61 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the right having a
radius of 105.00 feet and a central angle of 63°12'17"; (2) thence southeasterly along the arc of
said curve, a distance of 115.83 feet to the point of tangency of said curve; (3) thence
S.28°00'39"E., a distance of 44.32 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the left having a
radius of 150.00 feet and a central angle of 17°22'11"; (4) thence southeasterly along the arc of
said curve, a distance of 45.47 feet to the point of tangency of said curve; (5) thence
S.45°22'50"E., a distance of 65.63 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the left having a
radius of 150.00 feet and a central angle of 16°26'52"; (6) thence southeasterly along the arc of
said curve, a distance of 43.06 feet to the point of tangency of said curve; (7) thence
S.61°49'43"E., a distance of 109.90 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the left having a
radius of 50.00 feet and a central angle of 33°42'53"; (8) thence easterly along the arc of said
curve, a distance of 29.42 feet to the point of compound curvature of a curve to the left having a
radius of 1,266.27 feet and a central angle of 15°51'00"; (9) thence easterly along the arc of
said curve, a distance of 350.29 feet to the point of tangency of said curve; (10) thence
N.68°36'25"E., a distance of 277.55 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the right having a
radius of 1,050.00 feet and a central angle of 10°17'50"; (11) thence easterly along the arc of said
curve, a distance of 188.71 feet to the point of tangency of said curve; (12) thence N.78°54'15"E.,
a distance of 95.26 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of 600.77
feet and a central angle of 23°05'51"; (13) thence northeasterly along the arc of said curve, a
distance of 242.19 feet to the point of compound curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of
100.00 feet and a central angle of 38°29'33"; (14) thence northeasterly along the arc of said
curve, a distance of 67.18 feet to the point of reverse curvature of a curve to the right having a
radius of 580.42 feet and a central angle of 34°50'52"; (15) thence northeasterly along the arc of
said curve, a distance of 353.02 feet to the end of said curve; (16) thence N.08°47'18"W., a
distance of 129.41 feet; (17) thence N.00°59'19"E., a distance of 33.63 feet to a point on the
above mentioned north line of the Northeast 1/4 of said Section 1; thence S89°45'18"E., along said north line, a distance of 190.02 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

Said tract contains 9,755,058 square feet or 223.9453 acres, more or less.

(New Parcels)

AND

A Tract of land lying in the South 1/2 of Section 6, Township 38 South, Range 19 East, Sarasota County, Florida, and described as follows:

COMMENCE at the south 1/4 corner of said Section 6, said point being on the north line of Scherer Thaxton Preserve, thence N88°12'51"E., along the south line of the Southeast 1/4 of said Section 6, and the north line of said Preserve, a distance of 314.86 feet to its intersection with the easterly right-of-way line of Honore Avenue (120 foot Public right-of-way) as recorded in Road Plat Book 4, Page 78, in the Public Records of Sarasota County, Florida, for the POINT OF BEGINNING; thence northerly along said easterly right-of-way line for the following four (4) calls: (1) thence N12°26'02"W, a distance of 217.53 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of 941.00 feet and a central angle of 64°06'43"; (2) thence northwesterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 1,052.95 feet to the point of tangency of said curve; (3) thence N76°32'45"W, a distance of 545.02 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the right having a radius of 821.00 feet and a central angle of 01°20'37"; (4) thence westerly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 19.25 feet to the end of said curve; thence N32°25'36"E, a distance of 649.81 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the right having a radius of 2,143.00 feet and a central angle of 23°50'25"; thence northeasterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 891.68 feet to a point of the westerly right-of-way line of State Road 93 (Interstate 75, Section 17075-2406), variable width limited access highway) as recorded in Road Plat Book 2, Page 54, said Public Records; thence along said westerly right-of-way line for the following three (3) calls; (1) thence S12°01'55"E, a distance of 201.22 feet; (2) thence S10°53'10"E, a distance of 600.10 feet; (3) thence S12°01'55"E, a distance of 1,480.26 feet to a point on the south line of the Southeast 1/4 of said Section 6; thence S88°12'21"W along said south line, a distance of 135.59 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING. Said Tract contains 1,148,378 square feet or 26.3631 acres, more or less.

AND

A Tract of land lying in Section 1, Township 38 South, Range 18 East, and Section 6, Township 38 South, Range 19 East, both in Sarasota County, Florida, and described as follows:

BEGIN at the south 1/4 corner of said Section 6, also being the north line of Scherer Thaxton Preserve; thence N89°31'32"W along the south line of the Southwest 1/4 of said Section 6, and also said north line of Preserve, a distance of 2,247.68 feet to the southwest corner of said Section 6, also being the southeast corner of the above-mentioned Section 1, the northwest corner of said Scherer Thaxton Preserve and the northeast corner of Oscar Scherer State Park; thence along the north line of said Oscar Scherer State Park for the following two (2) calls: (1) thence N89°31'32"W along the south line of the Southeast 1/4 of said Section 1, a distance of 2,692.52 feet to the south 1/4 of said Section 1, a distance of 1,778.74 feet to its intersection with the east right-of-way line of Legacy Trail (100 foot wide public right-of-way, old railroad) as recorded in Official Records Instrument Number 2005008585, in the Public Records of Sarasota County, Florida, also being the northwest corner of Oscar Scherer State Park; thence N11°45'15"W along said east right-of-way line, a distance of 122.78 feet; thence S8°31'57"E, a distance of 281.07 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of 2,863.95 feet and a central angle of 05°32'54"; thence easterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 277.34 feet to the point of tangency of said curve; thence N84°55'09"E, a distance of 201.91 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the right having a radius of 3,641.32 feet and a central angle of 05°32'54"; thence easterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 1,453.69 feet; thence N0°28'31"E, a distance of 162.25 feet; thence N41°22'32"W a distance of 88.93 feet; thence N14°32'31"W a distance of
144.44 feet; thence N08°08'27"E a distance of 132.86 feet; thence N49°36'30"E a distance of 20.77 feet; thence N40°23'30"W a distance of 153.17 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of 305.00 feet and a central angle of 32°48'27"; thence northwesterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 174.64 feet to the point of reverse curvature of a curve to the right having a radius of 1,165.00 feet and a central angle of 05°38'44"; thence westerly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 114.79 feet to the end of said curve; thence N22°26'47"E, radial to the last state curve, a distance of 5.00 feet to the point of curvature of a non-tangent curve to the right, having a radius of 20.00 feet and a central angle of 57°05'24"; thence northwesterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 19.93 feet, said curve having a chord bearing and distance of N39°00'31"W, 19.22 feet, to the point of reverse curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of 127.00 feet and a central angle of 15°57'10"; thence northerly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 35.36 feet to the point of reverse curvature of a curve to the right having a radius of 20.00 feet and a central angle of 54°38'10"; thence northerly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 19.07 feet to the end of said curve; thence N28°20'52"E, non-tangent to the last stated curve, a distance of 34.91 feet; thence N61°39'08"W a distance of 222.07 feet; thence N42°01'36"E a distance of 223.50 feet to the point of curvature of a non-tangent curve to the left having a radius of 82.10 feet and a central angle of 46°51'54"; thence northeasterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 67.15 feet, said curve having a chord bearing and distance of N33°08'13"E, 65.30 feet, to the end of said curve; thence N03°55'09"E, non-tangent to the last stated curve, a distance of 44.27 feet to the point of curvature of a non-tangent curve to the left, having a radius of 59.78 feet and a central angle of 40°29'14"; thence northwesterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 35.18 feet, said curve having a chord bearing and distance of N46°04'24"W, 34.45 feet, to the point of reverse curvature of a curve to the right having a radius of 110.50 feet and a central angle of 50°44'28"; thence northwesterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 97.86 feet to the end of said curve; thence N17°43'43"W, non-tangent to the last stated curve, a distance of 148.88 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the right having a radius of 176.91 feet and a central angle of 22°56'00"; thence northerly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 70.81 feet to the end of said curve; thence N05°53'18"E, non-tangent to the last stated curve, a distance of 175.47 feet, to the point of curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of 339.86 feet and a central angle of 21°00'49"; thence northerly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 124.65 feet to the point of reverse curvature of a curve to the right having a radius of 193.99 feet and a central angle of 54°36'30"; thence northerly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 184.99 feet to the end of said curve; thence N13°59'25"E a distance of 54.44 feet; thence N32°38'04"E a distance of 224.77 feet; thence N35°59'52"E a distance of 120.73 feet; thence N27°26'12"E a distance of 87.66 feet; thence N25°32'07"E a distance of 113.53 feet; thence N21°42'42"E a distance of 325.00 feet; thence N08°29'42"E a distance of 261.03 feet; thence N07°35'46"E a distance of 129.29 feet; thence N24°53'05"W a distance of 80.60 feet; thence N13°47'52"W a distance of 58.97 feet; thence N04°30'37"E a distance of 34.61 feet to the point of curvature of a non-tangent curve to the right, having a radius of 76.29 feet and a central angle of 17°14'21"; thence northerly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 22.95 feet, said curve having chord bearing and a distance of N07°34'34"W, 22.87 feet, to the point of reverse curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of 61.71 feet and a central angle of 31°14'26"; thence northerly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 33.65 feet to the point of compound curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of 84.32 feet and a central angle of 10°02'38"; thence northerly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 14.78 feet to the point of compound curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of 69.66 feet and a central angle of 41°07'21"; thence northwesterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 50.00 feet to the end of said curve; thence S80°27'58"W, non-tangent to the last stated curve, a distance of 12.79 feet; thence N65°39'17"W a distance of 73.14 feet to the point of curvature of a non-tangent curve to the right, having a radius of 64.03 feet and a central angle of 70°07'17"; thence northwesterly along the arc of said curve a distance of 78.36 feet, said curve having a chord bearing and distance of N27°45'02"W, 73.56 feet, to the end of said curve; thence N10°50'59"W, non-tangent to the last stated curve, a distance of 142.66 feet; thence N00°57'35"E a distance of 29.01 feet; thence N11°11'32"W a distance of 8.27 feet; thence N89°45'07"W, a distance of 242.17 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the right having a radius of 122.80
feet and a central angle of 143°50'59"; thence northerly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 308.31 feet to the point of tangency of said curve; thence N54°05'52"E a distance of 146.40 feet to the point of curvature of non-tangent curve to the left, having a radius of 1,490.00 feet and a central angle of 27°10'03", said point being on the southwesterly right-of-way line of Honore Avenue (120 foot wide public right-of-way) as recorded in Road Plat Book 4, Page 78, in said Public Records; thence along said southwesterly right-of-way line for the following eight (8) calls; (1) thence southeasterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 706.50 feet, said curve having a chord bearing and distance of S48°05'54"E, 699.90 feet, to the point of tangency of said curve; (2) thence S61°40'56"E a distance of 1,740.18 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the right having a radius of 1,590.00 feet and a central angle of 40°39'59"; (3) thence southeasterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 1,128.52 feet to the point of tangency of said curve; (4) thence S21°00'57"E a distance of 753.83 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the left having a radius of 941.00 feet and a central angle of 55°31'49"; (5) thence southeasterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 912.00 feet to the point of tangency of said curve; (6) thence S76°32'45"E a distance of 545.02 feet to the point of curvature of a curve to the right having a radius of 821.00 feet and a central angle of 64°06'43"; (7) thence southeasterly along the arc of said curve, a distance of 918.67 feet to the point of tangency of said curve; (8) thence S12°26'02"E a distance of 194.97 feet to the intersection with the south line of the Southeast 1/4 of said Section 6; thence S88°12'51"W along said south line, a distance of 192.75 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING. Said tract contains 10,847,907 square feet of 249.0337 acres, more of less.

AND

A parcel of land lying in Sections 7, 17, and 18, Township 38 South, Ranch 19 East and Section 13, Township 38 South, Range 18 East, both in Sarasota County, Florida, the limits of which are as follows:

The approximate triangle within the above stated Sections having its easterly line of which is the easterly right-of-way of State Road 93 (Interstate 75), Section 17075-2406, variable width public limited access highway) as recorded in Road Plat Book 2, Page 36, in the Public Records of Sarasota County, Florida; the northwesterly line of which is the southeasterly right-of-way line of State Road 681 (Venice Connector), Section 17005-2501 (variable width pubic limited access right-of-way), as recorded in Road Plat Book 2, Page 52, said Public Records; the easterly line of which is the easterly right-of-way line of the Legacy Trail (100 foot wide public right-of-way) as recorded in Official Records Instrument Number 2005008585, said Public Records; the south line of which is the south lines of said Sections 13, 18, and 17, also being the north lines of Calusa Lakes, Units 1, 2, & 4, as recorded in Plat Book 35, Page 34, Plat Book 35, Page 7, and Plat Book 36, Page 24, respectively, in said Public Records.

AND

A PARCEL OF LAND LYING IN SECTION 1, TOWNSHIP 38 SOUTH, RANGE 18 EAST, SARASOTA COUNTY, FLORIDA AND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS;

COMMENCE AT NORTHWEST CORNER OF SECTION 1, TOWNSHIP 38 SOUTH, RANGE 18 EAST, SARASOTA COUNTY, FLORIDA, THE SAME BEING THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SECTION 2, TOWNSHIP 38 SOUTH, RANGE 18, SAID SARASOTA COUNTY, FLORIDA; THENCE SOUTH 89°50'47" WEST, ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID SECTION 2, A DISTANCE OF 268.11 FEET TO A POINT ON THE RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF AN EXISTING RAILROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY FORMERLY KNOWN AS SEABOARD AIR LINE RAILWAY CO., VENICE BRANCH RIGHT-OF-WAY (A 100 FOOT RIGHT-OF-WAY), THE SAME BEING A POINT ON THE BOUNDARY OF THOSE CERTAIN LANDS DESCRIBED IN QUIT-CLAIM DEED AND RECORDED IN OFFICIAL RECORDS INSTRUMENT NUMBER 2005008586 OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF SAID SARASOTA COUNTY, FLORIDA; THENCE SOUTH 11°46'59" EAST, ALONG SAID EXISTING EASTERN RIGHT-OF-WAY AND ALONG THE BOUNDARY OF LAST SAID LANDS, A DISTANCE OF 1,906.46 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING OF THE PARCEL OF LAND HEREIN DESCRIBED; THENCE NORTH 78°22'06" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 362.39 FEET TO A POINT ON A NON-TANGENTIAL CURVE; THENCE EASTERLY, 134.98 FEET ALONG
THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE NORTHERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 500.00 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 13°28’04” AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS NORTH 87°09’02” EAST, 134.57 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 11°46’59” EAST, A DISTANCE OF 120.11 FEET; THENCE NORTH 78°13’01” EAST, A DISTANCE OF 968.29 FEET; THENCE NORTH 61°25’03” EAST, A DISTANCE OF 705.86 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVATURE; THENCE EASTERLY, 68.39 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE SOUTHERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 146.00 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 26°43’20” AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS NORTH 74°46’43” EAST, 67.48 FEET TO A POINT OF REVERSE CURVATURE; THENCE EASTERLY, 293.17 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE NORTHERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 454.00 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 36°59’54” AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS NORTH 69°38’26” EAST, 288.10 FEET TO A POINT OF COMPOUND CURVATURE; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY, 126.31 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE NORTHWESTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 620.51 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 11°39’46” AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS NORTH 45°18’36” EAST, 126.09 FEET TO A POINT OF REVERSE CURVATURE; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY, 55.62 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE SOUTHEASTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 183.31 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 17°23’09” AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS NORTH 48°10’18” EAST, 55.41 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 73°25’10” EAST, A DISTANCE OF 134.93 FEET; THENCE NORTH 58°40’06” EAST, A DISTANCE OF 70.36 FEET TO A POINT ON THE WESTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF HONORE AVENUE (A VARIABLE WIDTH RIGHT-OF-WAY) AS DESCRIBED IN WARRANTY DEED RECORDED IN OFFICIAL RECORDS INSTRUMENT NUMBER 2014029026 OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF SAID SARASOTA COUNTY, FLORIDA, THE SAME BEING A POINT ON A NON-TANGENTIAL CURVE; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY, 52.87 FEET ALONG SAID WESTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE AND ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE NORTHEASTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 1,490.00 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 02°01’59” AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 33°29’53” EAST, 52.87 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 54°05’52” WEST, A DISTANCE OF 146.40 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVATURE; THENCE SOUTHERLY, 308.31 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE EASTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 122.80 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 143°50’59” AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 17°49’37” EAST, 233.48 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 89°45’07” EAST, A DISTANCE OF 242.17 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 55°44’03” EAST, A DISTANCE OF 102.75 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 11°13’32” EAST, A DISTANCE OF 8.27 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 00°57’35” WEST, A DISTANCE OF 29.01 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 10°30’39” EAST, A DISTANCE OF 142.66 FEET TO A POINT ON A NON-TANGENTIAL CURVE; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY, 78.36 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE NORTHEASTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 64.03 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 70°07’17” AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 27°45’02” EAST, 73.56 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 65°39’17” EAST, A DISTANCE OF 73.14 FEET; THENCE NORTH 80°27’58” EAST, A DISTANCE OF 12.79 FEET TO A POINT ON A NON-TANGENTIAL CURVE; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY, 50.00 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE SOUTHEASTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 69.66 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 41°07’21” AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 45°39’00” EAST, 48.93 FEET TO A POINT OF COMPOUND CURVATURE; THENCE SOUTHERLY, 14.78 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE WESTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 84.32 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 10°02’38” AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 20°04’01” EAST, 14.76 FEET TO A POINT OF COMPOUND CURVATURE; THENCE SOUTHERLY, 33.65 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE WESTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 61.71 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 31°14’26” AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 00°34’31” WEST, 33.23 FEET TO A POINT OF REVERSE CURVATURE; THENCE SOUTHERLY, 22.95 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE EASTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 76.29 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 17°14’21” AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 07°34’34” WEST, 22.87 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 04°30’37” WEST, A DISTANCE OF 34.81 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 13°47’52” EAST, A DISTANCE OF 58.97 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 24°53’05” EAST, A DISTANCE OF 80.60 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 07°35’46” WEST, A DISTANCE OF 129.29 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 08°24’02” WEST, A DISTANCE OF 261.03 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 21°42’42” WEST, A DISTANCE OF 325.00 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 25°32’07” WEST, A DISTANCE OF 113.53 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 27°26’12” WEST, A DISTANCE OF 87.66 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 35°59’52” WEST, A DISTANCE OF 120.73 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 32°38’04” WEST, A DISTANCE OF 224.77 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 46°23’47” WEST, A DISTANCE OF 54.44 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 13°59’25” WEST, A DISTANCE OF 24.13 FEET TO A POINT ON A NON-TANGENTIAL CURVE; THENCE SOUTHERLY, 184.89 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE EASTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 193.99 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 54°36’30” AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 12°10’44” WEST, 177.97 FEET TO A POINT OF REVERSE
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CURVATURE; THENCE SOUTHERLY, 124.65 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE WESTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 339.66 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 21°00'49" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 04°37'06" EAST, 123.95 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 05°53'18" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 175.47 FEET TO A POINT ON A NON-TANGENTIAL CURVE; THENCE SOUTHERLY, 70.81 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE EASTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 176.91 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 22°56'00" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 06°15'43" EAST, 70.34 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 17°43'43" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 148.88 FEET TO A POINT ON A NON-TANGENTIAL CURVE; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY, 97.86 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE NORTHEASTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 110.50 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 50°44'28" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 40°56'47" EAST, 94.69 FEET TO A POINT OF REVERSE CURVATURE; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY, 35.18 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE SOUTHWESTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 49.76 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 40°29'14" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 46°04'24" EAST, 34.45 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 03°55'09" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 44.27 FEET TO A POINT ON A NON-TANGENTIAL CURVE; THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY, 67.16 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE NORTHWESTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 82.10 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 46°51'54" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 33°08'13" WEST, 65.30 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 42°01'36" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 223.50 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 61°39'08" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 222.07 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 28°20'52" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 34.91 FEET TO A POINT ON A NON-TANGENTIAL CURVE; THENCE SOUTHERLY, 19.07 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE EASTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 20.00 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 64°38'10" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 00°54'06" WEST, 18.36 FEET TO A POINT OF REVERSE CURVATURE; THENCE SOUTHERLY, 35.36 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE WESTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 127.00 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 15°57'10" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 18°26'24" EAST, 35.25 FEET TO A POINT OF REVERSE CURVATURE; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY, 19.93 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE NORTHEASTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 20.00 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 57°05'24" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 39°00'31" EAST, 19.11 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 22°26'47" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 5.00 FEET TO A POINT ON A NON-TANGENTIAL CURVE; THENCE EASTERLY, 114.79 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE NORTHERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 1.165.00 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 05°38'44" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 70°22'35" EAST, 114.75 FEET TO A POINT OF REVERSE CURVATURE; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY, 174.64 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE SOUTHWESTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 305.00 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 32°48'27" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 56°47'44" EAST, 172.27 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 40°23'30" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 153.17 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 49°36'30" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 20.77 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 08°30'27" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 132.86 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 14°32'31" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 144.44 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 41°22'32" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 88.93 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 00°28'03" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 162.25 FEET; THENCE NORTH 89°31'57" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 1,453.69 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVATURE; THENCE WESTERLY, 352.62 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE SOUTHERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 3,641.32 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 05°32'54" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 87°41'36" WEST, 352.48 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 84°55'09" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 201.91 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVATURE; THENCE WESTERLY, 277.34 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE NORTHERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 2,863.95 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 05°32'54" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 87°41'36" WEST, 277.23 FEET; THENCE NORTH 89°31'57" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 275.76 FEET TO A POINT ON AFORESAID RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF AN EXISTING RAILROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY FORMERLY KNOWN AS SEABOARD AIR LINE RAILWAY CO., VENICE BRANCH RIGHT-OF-WAY (A 100 FOOT RIGHT-OF-WAY), THE SAME BEING A POINT ON THE BOUNDARY OF THOSE CERTAIN LANDS DESCRIBED IN QUIT-CLAIM DEED AND RECORDED IN OFFICIAL RECORDS INSTRUMENT NUMBER 2005008586 OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF SAID SARASOTA COUNTY, FLORIDA; THENCE NORTH 11°46'59" WEST, ALONG SAID EXISTING EASTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE AND ALONG THE BOUNDARY OF LAST SAID LANDS, A DISTANCE OF 3,546.40 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

CONTAINING 9,908.037 SQUARE FEET OR 227.457 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.
ATTACHMENT III

ORDINANCE NO. 2016-038

AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNTY OF SARASOTA, FLORIDA, APPROVING AN INCREMENTAL DEVELOPMENT ORDER FOR INCREMENT XXIV OF THE PALMER RANCH DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT; PROVIDING FOR FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW; PROVIDING FOR THE INCORPORATION OF THE APPLICATION FOR INCREMENTAL DEVELOPMENT APPROVAL (AIDA) AND ASSOCIATED DOCUMENTS INTO THE DEVELOPMENT ORDER; PROVIDING FOR APPROVAL OF THE PALMER RANCH INCREMENT XXIV DEVELOPMENT WITH CONDITIONS; PROVIDING FOR ORDINANCE TO BE DEEMED THE DEVELOPMENT ORDER; PROVIDING FOR BUILDOUT AND DEVELOPMENT ORDER TERMINATION DATES FOR PALMER RANCH INCREMENT XXIV; PROVIDING FOR NON-EXEMPTION FROM COUNTY REGULATIONS; PROVIDING FOR ENFORCEMENT; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR SERVICE AND RECORDING; PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

BE IT ORDEAED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF SARASOTA COUNTY, FLORIDA:

SECTION 1. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. The Board of County Commissioners of Sarasota County, Florida, hereinafter referred to as the “Board”, hereby makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law:

1.1 On September 28, 2015, Palmer Ranch Holdings, Ltd., through their authorized agent, James Paulmann (hereinafter referred to as the “Applicant”), submitted to Sarasota County an Application for Incremental Development Approval (AIDA) for Increment XXIV of the Palmer Ranch Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Master Development Order, in accordance with Chapter 380.06, Florida Statutes. Palmer Ranch Increment XXIV is an increment of the Palmer Ranch Development of Regional Impact approved pursuant to the provisions of a Master Development Order (MDO), Sarasota County Resolution No. 84-418, adopted December 18, 1984, amended and restated by Resolution No. 2015-010, as amended.

1.2 The Palmer Ranch Increment XXIV development consists of approximately 227 acres located on the southeast side of the Palmer Ranch DRI properties, more particularly described in Exhibit A, attached hereto and made a part hereof by reference.

1.3 The Palmer Ranch Increment XXIV development will be developed with 500 single family units on Parcel 9C. This property is generally located west of Honore Avenue, west of I-75, and South of Clark Road.
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1.4 Copies of the AIDA have been submitted to the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council (SWFRPC), and to the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO), pursuant to Subsection 380.06(19)(f)2, Florida Statutes.

1.5 The Report and Recommendation of the SWFRPC has been received and addressed.

1.6 The Sarasota County Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on the AIDA on July 7, 2016, and received all pertinent evidence and testimony, and recommended approval of the AIDA.

1.7 Pursuant to Section 380.06 (11)(f)3, Florida Statutes, public notice for a hearing on said NOPC before the Board was duly published in the "Sarasota Herald-Tribune" on August 9, 2016, and was duly provided to the Florida DEO, the SWFRPC, and other persons designated by DEO rules.

1.8 The Board held duly noticed public hearing on the AIDA on August 23, 2016.

1.9 The Board of County Commissioners of Sarasota County considered all matters relevant to the AIDA, including the recommendations of the Sarasota County Planning Commission, and all pertinent evidence and testimony presented at the public hearing.

1.10 The proceedings herein relating to the Palmer Ranch Increment XXIV have been conducted in compliance with the provisions of Chapter 380.06, Florida Statutes, the Master Development Order for the Palmer Ranch DRI, and all conditions precedent to the granting of development approval required by Chapter 380.06, Florida Statutes, have occurred.

1.11 The proposed development is not located in an Area of Critical State Concern designated pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 380.05, Florida Statutes.

1.12 The proposed development is consistent with the objectives of the adopted State Comprehensive Plan applicable to the area, pursuant to Chapter 380.06(14), Florida Statutes.

1.13 The proposed development is consistent with the adopted State Comprehensive Plan, pursuant to Chapter 380.06(14), Florida Statutes.

1.14 The proposed development, subject to the conditions imposed herein, is consistent with the Sarasota County Comprehensive Plan and the local land development regulations, pursuant to Chapter 380.06(14)(a), Florida Statutes.

1.15 The proposed development, subject to the conditions imposed herein, is consistent with the Report and Recommendations provided by the SWFRPC pursuant to Chapters 380.06(12) and 380.06(14)(b), Florida Statutes.

1.16 The proposed development is consistent with the Master Development Order for the Palmer Ranch Development of Regional Impact.

SECTION 2. Incorporation of the Application for Incremental Development Approval (AIDA) and Associated Documents into the Development Order.

2.1 The following documents are hereby incorporated in this Development Order by reference:

I. The SWFRPC’s Recommendations - Development of Regional Impact
2.2 The following information, commitments and impact mitigating provisions submitted by the Owner are hereby incorporated in this Development Order by reference. Development permits are subject to the provisions contained in these documents:

I. Palmer Ranch Application for Incremental Development Approval (Increment XIV) and Associated Documents – September 28, 2015;

II. Sufficiency Response for Palmer Ranch Increment XXI v – December 21, 2015

2.3 In construing and enforcing the provisions of the documents incorporated in this Development Order by Subsections 2.1 and 2.2 above, the following shall apply:

a) The most recent response of the Owner in the above referenced documents shall control over any previous response, wherever there is a conflict, otherwise the responses shall be considered cumulative.

b) Any information, commitments or impact mitigating provisions in the above referenced documents which are inconsistent with the specific conditions set forth in this Ordinance and exhibits hereto, shall be deemed superseded and inapplicable.

SECTION 3. APPROVAL OF THE PALMER RANCH INCREMENT XXIV DEVELOPMENT WITH CONDITIONS.

3.1 The AIDA for the Palmer Ranch Increment XXIV is hereby approved, subject to the conditions contained in Exhibit B through Exhibit F, which are attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, subject to the other provisions of this Incremental Development Order.

- Exhibit B – Development Order Conditions
- Exhibit C – Master Development Plan
- Exhibit D – Native Habitat Preservation, Alteration and Mitigation Plan
- Exhibit E – Wildlife Corridor Plan
- Exhibit F – Conceptual On-Site Surface Water Management Plan

3.2 Sarasota County Planning Services is hereby designated as the local government department responsible for monitoring the development, enforcing and monitoring the terms of this Incremental Development Order and for receiving the biennial report required by Chapter 380.06, Florida Statutes.

3.3 Biennial Report Requirements:

The Owner shall submit a biennial report pursuant to the MDO and the requirements of Chapter 380.06 (18), Florida Statutes, Chapter 9J-2.025 (7), Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), and the conditions of this Ordinance. This report shall be submitted with the consolidated Biennial Monitoring Report for the DRI until such time as all terms and conditions of this Incremental Development Order are satisfied, unless otherwise specified herein. The Owner shall submit this report to the Sarasota County Planning and Development Services Business Center, the SWFRPC, the DEO, and all affected permitting agencies required by law on form RPM-BSP-Annual Report-1, as the same may be amended from time to time. The biennial report shall contain all information required by Rule 9J-2.025 (7) (a) through (j), F.A.C., as the same may be amended from time to time.

Upon notification that the biennial report has not been received by the SWFRPC, or the DEO, or upon non-receipt of the biennial report by Sarasota County, Sarasota County shall
request in writing that the Owner submit the report within thirty (30) days. Failure to submit the report after thirty (30) days of such written notice shall result in Sarasota County temporarily suspending this Incremental Development Order, and no new development permit applications shall be granted within the development until the requirements of this subsection are met.

3.4 Monitoring Reports Requirement:

The Owner shall submit the following monitoring reports at the same time that the biennial report is submitted, unless a different submission time is authorized by the Growth Management Business Center in writing. Failure to submit the report within thirty (30) days after written notice from Sarasota County to the Owner shall result in Sarasota County temporarily suspending this Incremental Development Order, and no new development permit applications shall be granted within the development until the requirements of this section are met.

a) A status report on the stormwater management program. This report shall include measures instituted regarding "Best Management Practices" for soil erosion and sediment control, lawn and maintenance procedures, and retention/detention systems maintenance; and

b) A status report of the cumulative amount of development approved for the project pursuant to Conditions in the Development Order contained in Exhibit B.

3.5 The definitions presently contained in Chapter 380.06, Florida Statutes, shall control in the construction of this Development Order.

SECTION 4. **Ordinance to be Deemed the Development Order.**

4.1 This Ordinance shall be deemed the Incremental Development Order for Increment XXIV of the Palmer Ranch DRI required pursuant to Chapter 380.06, Florida Statutes.

SECTION 5. **Buildout and Development Order Termination Dates for Palmer Ranch Increment XXIV.**

5.1 The commencement date of Palmer Ranch Increment XXIV per Chapter 380.06(15) (c) 2, Florida Statutes is December 31, 2017.

5.2 The buildout date of Palmer Ranch Increment XXIV is December 31, 2023. This buildout date may be extended with Board of County Commissioners approval pursuant to Subsection 380.06(19), Florida Statutes, based upon the results of the 2019 Transportation Reanalysis, or subsequent reanalysis.

5.3 The termination date for the Palmer Ranch Increment XXIV Development Order shall be December 31, 2023.

SECTION 6. **Non-Exemption from County Regulations.**

6.1 This Ordinance shall not be construed as an agreement on the part of Sarasota County to exempt the Applicant, its successors and assigns, from the operation of any Ordinance or regulation hereinafter adopted by Sarasota County for the purpose of the protection of the public health, welfare, and safety, which said Ordinance or regulation shall be generally and
equally applicable throughout Sarasota County, and which said Ordinance or regulation protects or promotes a vital public interest, and which said Ordinance or regulation does not substantially impair or prevent development as approved herein.

SECTION 7. Enforcement.

7.1 All conditions, restrictions, requirements, commitments and impact mitigating provisions contained or incorporated by reference in this Incremental Development Order may be enforced by Sarasota County by action at law or in equity, after notice to the Owner and a reasonable opportunity to cure, and, in the event Sarasota County prevails in such action at law or in equity, it shall be awarded all its reasonable costs of investigation and enforcement, including County staff time and reasonable attorneys' fees incurred by or on behalf of Sarasota County.

7.2 In the event it is determined by the Board of County Commissioners, after notice to the Owner and a full hearing, that the Owner has failed to comply with any conditions, restrictions, requirements or impact mitigating provisions contained or incorporated by reference in this Development Order, the Board of County Commissioners may temporarily suspend this Incremental Development Order during which no development permit applications shall be granted within the development until compliance is achieved. Where such a failure has been finally determined, the Owner shall be liable for all costs of investigating and enforcement, including County staff time and reasonable attorney's fees incurred by or on behalf of Sarasota County.

7.3 The rights and obligations of this Incremental Development Order shall run with the land. The Owner is bound by the terms of this Incremental Development Order so long as it owns such property. This Incremental Development Order shall be binding upon and inure to the benefit of the Owner and its assignees or successors in interest and Sarasota County and its successors. It is understood that any reference herein to any governmental agency shall be construed to mean any future instrumentality which may be created and designed as successor in interest thereto, or which otherwise possess any of the powers and duties of any referenced governmental agency in existence on the effective date of this Incremental Development Order.

7.4 In the event of a Development Order appeal or other legal challenge of this Incremental Development Order by DEO, the Owner shall pay all reasonable costs and fees of County staff and attorneys relating to said appeal or legal challenge. Said costs and fees shall be based upon the Sarasota County Billable Fee System under Ordinance No. 85-91, as amended from time to time. Payment of all billings by the Owner related to such fees and costs shall be paid within forty five (45) days of submittal of an invoice.

SECTION 8. Severability.

8.1 If any section, sentence, clause, phrase or word of this Incremental Development Order is for any reason held or declared to be invalid, inoperative, or void, such holding of invalidity shall not affect the remaining portions of this Incremental Development Order. It shall be construed to have been the intent to pass this Incremental Development Order, without such invalid or inoperative part herein, and the remainder, exclusive of such part or parts, shall be deemed and held to be valid as if such parts had not been included herein, unless to do so would frustrate the intent of this Incremental Development Order.
8.2 Nothing in Section 8.1 shall override the effect of an appeal pursuant to Section 380.07(2), Florida Statutes.

SECTION 9. Service and Recording.

9.1 The Planning and Development Services Department is hereby directed to record this Ordinance in the Official Records of the Clerk of the Circuit Court. All costs associated with the recording of this Ordinance shall be borne by the Applicant. This Ordinance shall be binding upon the Applicant, its successors and assigns and upon Sarasota County.

9.2 The Clerk to the Board of County Commissioners shall certify the date upon which a copy of this Ordinance are deposited in the U.S. Mail to DEO and electronic copies to the SWFRPC, and the Applicant.

**VIA US MAIL**

Ray Eubanks  
Department of Economic Opportunity  
Division of Community Development  
MSC 160  
107 East Madison Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

**VIA E-MAIL**

Margaret Wuerstle  
Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council  
Email: mwuerstle@swfrpc.org

Justin Powell  
Palmer Ranch Holdings  
Email: justin@pranch.com
SECTION 10. **Effective Date.**

10.1 This Development Order shall take effect upon adoption of this Ordinance and transmittal of the copies of said Development Order to the parties specified in Chapter 380.07 (2), Florida Statutes, the expiration of any applicable appeal period, or the resolution of any appeal, whichever is later.

PASSED AND DULY ADOPTED by the Board of County Commissioners of Sarasota County, Florida, this **23** day of **August**, 2016.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF SARASOTA COUNTY, FLORIDA

By: [Signature]
Chairman

ATTEST:
KAREN E. RUSHING, Clerk of Circuit Court
and ex officio Clerk of the
Board of County Commissioners of
Sarasota County, Florida

By: [Signature]
Deputy Clerk
EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit A – Legal Description
Exhibit B – Development Order Conditions
Exhibit C – Conceptual Master Development Plan
Exhibit D – Native Habitat Preservation, Alteration, and Mitigation Plan
Exhibit E – Wildlife Corridor Plan
Exhibit F – Conceptual On-Site Surface Water Management Plan
EXHIBIT A – LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A PARCEL OF LAND LYING IN SECTION 1, TOWNSHIP 38 SOUTH, RANGE 18 EAST, SARASOTA COUNTY, FLORIDA AND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCE AT NORTHWEST CORNER OF SECTION 1, TOWNSHIP 38 SOUTH, RANGE 18 EAST, SARASOTA COUNTY, FLORIDA, THE SAME BEING THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SECTION 2, TOWNSHIP 38 SOUTH, RANGE 18 EAST, SAID SARASOTA COUNTY, FLORIDA; THEN SOUTHWEST 89°50'47" WEST, ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID SECTION 2, A DISTANCE OF 266.11 FEET TO A POINT ON THE RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF AN EXISTING RAILROAD; RIGHT-OF-WAY FORMERLY KNOWN AS SEABOARD AIR LINE RAILWAY CO., VENICE BRANCH RIGHT-OF-WAY (A 100 FOOT RIGHT-OF-WAY), THE SAME BEING A POINT ON THE BOUNDARY OF THOSE CERTAIN LANDS DESCRIBED IN QUIT-CLAIM DEED AND RECORDED IN OFFICIAL RECORDS INSTRUMENT NUMBER 2005008586 OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF SAID SARASOTA COUNTY, FLORIDA; THEN SOUTH 113°46'59" EAST, ALONG SAID EXISTING EASTERY RIGHT-OF-WAY AND ALONG THE BOUNDARY OF LAST SAID LANDS, A DISTANCE OF 1,906.46 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING OF THE PARCEL OF LAND HEREIN DESCRIBED; THEN NORTH 78°22'06" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 362.39 FEET TO A POINT ON A NON-TANGENTIAL CURVE; THEN EASTERY, 134.79 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE NORTHERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 500.00 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 15°28'04" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS NORTH 87°39'02" EAST, 134.79 FEET; THEN SOUTH 113°46'59" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 120.11 FEET; THEN NORTH 78°13'30" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 968.29 FEET; THEN NORTH 61°25'03" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 705.86 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVATURE; THEN EASTERY, 68.09 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE SOUTHERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 146.00 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 26°43'20" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS NORTH 74°46'43" EAST, 67.48 FEET TO A POINT OF REVERSE CURVATURE; THEN EASTERY, 293.17 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE NORTHERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 454.00 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 36°59'54" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS NORTH 69°38'26" EAST, 288.10 FEET TO A POINT OF COMPOUND CURVATURE; THEN NORTHEASTERLY, 126.31 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE NORTHWESERTLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 620.51 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 11°39'46" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS NORTH 45°18'36" EAST, 126.09 FEET TO A POINT OF REVERSE CURVATURE; THEN NORTHEASTERLY, 55.62 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE SOUTHEASTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 183.31 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 17°23'09" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS NORTH 48°10'18" EAST, 53.41 FEET; THEN SOUTH 73°25'10" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 134.93 FEET; THEN SOUTH 58°40'06" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 70.36 FEET TO A POINT ON THE WESTERY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF HONORE AVENUE (A VARIABLE WIDTH RIGHT-OF-WAY) AS DESCRIBED IN WARRANTY DEED RECORDED IN OFFICIAL RECORDS INSTRUMENT NUMBER 2014029026 OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF SAID SARASOTA COUNTY, FLORIDA, THE SAME BEING A POINT ON A NON-TANGENTIAL CURVE; THEN SOUTHEASTERLY, 52.87 FEET ALONG SAID WESTERY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE AND ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE NORTHEASTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 1,490.00 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 02°01'59" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 33°29'53" EAST, 52.87 FEET; THEN SOUTH 54°05'52" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 146.40 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVATURE; THEN SOUTHERLY, 308.31 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE EASTERY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 122.80 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 143°50'59" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 17°49'37" EAST, 233.48 FEET; THEN SOUTH 89°45'07" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 242.17 FEET; THEN SOUTH 55°44'03" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 102.75 FEET; THEN SOUTH 11°11'32" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 8.27 FEET; THEN SOUTH 00°57'35" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 29.01 FEET; THEN SOUTH 10°50'59" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 142.66 FEET TO A POINT ON A NON-TANGENTIAL CURVE; THEN SOUTHEASTERLY, 78.36 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE NORTHEASTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 64.03 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 70°07'17" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 27°45'02" EAST, 73.56 FEET; THEN SOUTH 65°39'17" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 73.14 FEET; THEN NORTH 80°27'58" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 12.79 FEET TO A POINT ON A NON-TANGENTIAL CURVE; THEN SOUTHEASTERLY, 50.00 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE SOUTHWESTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 69.66 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 41°07'21" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 45°33'00" EAST, 48.93 FEET TO A POINT OF COMPOUND CURVATURE; THEN SOUTHERLY, 14.78 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE WESTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 84.32 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 109°23'38" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 20°04'01" EAST, 14.75 FEET TO A POINT OF COMPOUND CURVATURE; THEN SOUTHERLY, 33.65 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE WESTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 61.71 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 31°42'26" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 02°34'31" WEST, 33.23 FEET TO A POINT OF REVERSE CURVATURE; THEN SOUTHERLY, 22.96 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE EASTERY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 76.29 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 17°14'21" AND
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BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 07°34'34" WEST, 22.87 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 04°30'37" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 34.81 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 13°47'52" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 58.97 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 24°53'05" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 80.60 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 07°35'46" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 129.29 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 08°24'02" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 261.03 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 21°42'42" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 325.00 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 25°32'07" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 113.53 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 27°26'12" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 87.66 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 35°59'52" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 120.73 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 32°38'04" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 224.77 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 46°23'47" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 54.44 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 13°59'25" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 24.13 FEET TO A POINT ON A NON-TANGENTIAL CURVE; THENCE SOUTHERLY, 184.89 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE EASTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 193.99 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 54°36'30" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 12°10'44" WEST, 177.97 FEET TO A POINT OF REVERSE CURVATURE; THENCE SOUTHERLY, 124.65 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE WES TERY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 339.86 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 21°00'49" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 04°37'05" EAST, 123.95 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 05°53'18" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 175.47 FEET TO A POINT ON A NON-TANGENTIAL CURVE; THENCE SOUTHERLY, 70.81 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE EASTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 110.50 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 50°44'28" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 40°54'47" EAST, 94.69 FEET TO A POINT OF REVERSE CURVATURE; THENCE SOUTHEASTERNLY, 35.18 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE SOUTHWESTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 49.78 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 40°29'14" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 46°04'24" EAST, 34.45 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 03°55'09" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 44.27 FEET TO A POINT ON A NON-TANGENTIAL CURVE; THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY, 67.16 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE NORTHWESTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 82.10 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 46°51'54" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 33°08'13" WEST, 65.30 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 42°01'36" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 223.50 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 51°39'08" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 222.07 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 28°20'52" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 34.91 FEET TO A POINT ON A NON-TANGENTIAL CURVE; THENCE SOUTHERLY, 19.07 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE EASTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 20.00 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 54°38'10" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 00°54'06" WEST, 18.36 FEET TO A POINT OF REVERSE CURVATURE; THENCE SOUTHERLY, 35.36 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE WESTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 127.00 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 15°57'10" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 18°26'24" EAST, 35.25 FEET TO A POINT OF REVERSE CURVATURE; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY, 19.93 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE NORTHEASTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 20.00 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 57°05'24" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 39°00'01" EAST, 19.11 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 22°26'47" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 5.00 FEET TO A POINT ON A NON-TANGENTIAL CURVE; THENCE EASTERLY, 114.79 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE SOUTHERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 1,165.00 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 09°38'44" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 70°22'35" EAST, 114.75 FEET TO A POINT OF REVERSE CURVATURE; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY, 174.64 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE SOUTHWESTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 305.00 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 32°48'27" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 56°47'44" EAST, 172.27 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 40°23'30" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 153.17 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 49°36'30" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 20.77 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 08°08'27" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 132.86 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 14°32'31" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 144.44 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 41°22'32" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 88.93 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 00°28'03" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 162.25 FEET; THENCE NORTH 89°31'57" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 1,453.69 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVATURE; THENCE WESTERLY, 352.62 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE SOUTHERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 3,641.32 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 05°32'54" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 87°41'36" WEST, 352.48 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 84°55'09" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 201.91 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVATURE; THENCE WESTERLY, 277.34 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CIRCULAR CURVE, CONCAVE NORTHERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 2,863.95 FEET, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 05°32'54" AND BEING SUBTENDED BY A CHORD THAT BEARS SOUTH 87°41'36" WEST, 277.23 FEET; THENCE NORTH 89°31'57" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 275.76 FEET TO A POINT ON A FORESAID RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF AN EXISTING RAILROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY FORMERLY KNOWN AS SEABOARD AIR LINE RAILWAY CO., VENICE BRANCH RIGHT-OF-WAY (A 100 FOOT RIGHT-OF-WAY), THE SAME BEING A POINT ON THE BOUNDARY OF THOSE CERTAIN LANDS DESCRIBED IN QUIT-CLAIM DEED AND RECORDED IN OFFICIAL RECORDS INSTRUMENT NUMBER 2005008586 OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF SAID SARASOTA COUNTY, FLORIDA; THENCE NORTH 11°46'59" WEST, ALONG SAID EXISTING EASTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE AND ALONG THE BOUNDARY OF LAST SAID LANDS, A DISTANCE OF 3,546.40 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

CONTAINING 9,908,037 SQUARE FEET OR 227.457 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.
EXHIBIT B – DEVELOPMENT ORDER CONDITIONS

Conditions of Approval of the Palmer Ranch Increment XXIV
Development of Regional Impact

A. GENERAL
1. The Palmer Ranch Increment XXIV development shall occur in substantial accordance with the Palmer Ranch Master Development Order and Incremental Development Order Conditions.
2. All references made in the following Conditions for Development Approval pertaining to “Applicant”, shall also include any successors in interest of areas covered under this Development Order.
3. Access to the Palmer Ranch Increment XXIV project site by Sarasota County government agents and employees shall be granted for the purpose of monitoring the implementation of the Development Order.
4. Pursuant to Chapter 380.06(16), Florida Statutes, the applicant may be subject to credit for contributions, construction, expansion, or acquisition of public facilities, if the developer is also subject by local ordinances to impact fees or exactions to meet the same needs. The local government and the developer may enter into a capital contribution front-ending agreement to reimburse the developer for voluntary contributions in excess of the fair share.

B. LAND USE
1. All development shall occur in substantial accordance with the Master Development Plan date stamped April 5, 2016, and attached hereto as Exhibit C. This does not imply or confer any deviations from applicable zoning or land development regulations.

C. VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE
1. The wetlands and associated upland vegetative buffers shall be maintained in accordance with management guidelines contained within the Comprehensive Plan as a preserve and labeled a preserve on all plans as shown on Map F-2. All activities including but not limited to filling, excavating, well drilling, altering vegetation (including trimming of both trees and understory) and storing of materials shall be prohibited within preservation areas, unless written approval is first obtained from Environmental Permitting. Exception may be granted by Environmental Permitting to facilitate implementation of approved habitat management plans or the hand removal of nuisance/invasive vegetation.
2. Impacts to on-site wetlands resulting from unavoidable impacts necessitated by internal parcel roadway and infrastructure requirements or loss of defined environmental functions, may be allowed if deemed consistent with the LDR Environmental Technical Manual during site and development plan review.
3. The proposed wildlife corridor conservation area shall be consistent with Map F-4. A resource management plan for the proposed corridor shall be submitted to the Environmental Protection Division during the site and development plan submittal that details how the wildlife corridor will be maintained and the proposed corridor crossing minimized.

D. WATER QUALITY AND DRAINAGE
1. The Master Surface Water Management Plan shall be consistent with the Little Sarasota Bay Watershed Management Plan.
E. **WATER SUPPLY**

1. The Developer shall enter into a Standard Utility Agreement with Sarasota County prior to receiving Construction Authorization for any portion of development. The Standard Utility Agreement shall outline any County contribution for the oversize of potable water, wastewater collection or reclaimed water extensions. The development is required to extend a 12" reclaimed water system on Honore Ave along the full frontage of the parcel facing Honore and enter into an oversize agreement with the County for the upsize of the line. The development is required to extend the existing 12" water main located on Bay Street across the full frontage of the parcels southern boundary.

2. Prior to being granted Site Plan approval for the first phase of development, the owner shall submit a Utilities Master Plan and hydraulic models for the entire development signed and sealed by a registered professional engineer identifying the infrastructure required to connect the development to Sarasota County Public Utilities Water, Wastewater and Reclaimed Water systems. The Master Plan will include a Water Quality Plan that demonstrates how the potable water system expansion will maintain compliance with applicable drinking water quality standards; a Lift Station Optimization Plan evaluating system impacts for the entire development; an Irrigation Plan identifying the infrastructure required to supply the sites storage ponds with reclaimed water; and identification of any off-site improvements required.
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- Potential Gated Vehicular Use Cross Connection
- Water Management Area
- Wetland (Preservation Area)
- Mesic Hammock (Preservation Area)
- Development Area
- Buffers and Open Space
- Potential Wetland Mitigation Area
- Wildfire Corridor
- Grand Trees (to remain)
- Tier "A" Watercourse Buffer
- Tier "B" Watercourse Buffer
- Tier "C" Expanded Environmental Corridor
- Potential Trail

NORTH

SCALE: 1" = 600'

NOTES:
1. Wetland limits, mitigation areas, open space and developable areas may require modification to be in compliance with regulatory approval.
2. Wetland buffers may be modified or may receive minor encroachments subject to regulatory approval.
3. Mesic hammock limits may be modified as a result of future land planning.
4. An enhanced watercourse buffer will be provided along the channelized portion of South Creek in compliance with Section 4 of the site development design technical manual.

LAND USE TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Area (AC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Development</td>
<td>122.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakes / Littoral Areas</td>
<td>39.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland Preservation / Mesic Hammock / Perimeter Buffers / Other Open Space</td>
<td>56.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Preservation / Restoration</td>
<td>8.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>227.42</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
1. Total number of residential units: 500
2. Open space provided 46% (104.9 AC)
3. Gross residential density: 2.20 DU/AC

Palmer Ranch Parcel 9A Increment XXII Zoning RSF-1 PUD

Future East Bay Street Extension

South Creek Crossing

Recipient Planning Services 4-5-16
This map and all data contained within are supplied as is with no warranty. Cardno Inc. expressly disclaims responsibility for damages or liability from any claims that may arise out of the use or misuse of this map. It is the sole responsibility of the user to determine if the data on this map meets the user's needs. This map was not created as survey data, but should it be used as such it is the user's responsibility to obtain any data, including any data referenced by law.

Map F-4. Wildlife Corridor Plan
Palmer Ranch Parcel 9C
Sarasota County, Florida

FUTURE EAST BAY ST. EXTENSION
OSCAR SCHERER STATE PARK

Wildlife Crossing
State Park
Wildlife Corridor

Sec 01
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FINAL CONFIGURATION OF THE SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SHALL BE CONTINGENT ON SARASOTA COUNTY AND SWFWMD.
Palmer Ranch Increment XXV Pre-Application Checklist
Background

On July 21, 2016, a Pre-Application meeting was held for the proposed Palmer Ranch Increment 25 DRI Application for Incremental Development Approval on Parcel 9E. The property is located west of Honore Avenue, south of the East Bay extension and north of the Scherer-Thaxton Preserve (see Attachment I). Attending this meeting was the applicant and their consultants, Sarasota County development review staff and SWFRPC staff.

Project Description

The development proposal is to construct 257 ± unit multifamily residential apartments on the eastern 20.95± acre portion of the total 28.72± acre site (see Attachment II). 52% of the site will be open space consisting of storm water lakes and wetland preserves.

Questions for Palmer Ranch Increment

Pursuant to the amended Master Development Order, all parties agreed to require the applicant to answer all applicable regional and local information requirements (see Attachment III). As required by the MDO a recent revised and updated transportation reanalysis included impacts from Increment 25.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approve the questionnaire checklist.
# PALMER RANCH MASTER DEVELOPMENT ORDER QUESTIONNAIRE
## CHECKLIST FOR DRI-AIDA SUBMISSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>Regionally Significant Y/N</th>
<th>Answer Required Y/N</th>
<th>Special Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Palmer Ranch Master Development Order (Ordinance No. 2015-010) Questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General DRI AIDA Information</strong></td>
<td>Part I &amp; Part II</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Submit Maps A, B, C.1. C.2, C.3, F.1, F.2, G.1, G.2, H.1 &amp; I.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Conditions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land/Soils</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare &amp; Endangered Species</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality &amp; Drainage</td>
<td>B. 1-4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Answer B. 1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Habitats</td>
<td>B. 1-3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Answer B. 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Housing</td>
<td>B. 2-3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Answer B. 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical &amp; Archeological</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreation &amp; Open Space</strong></td>
<td>B. 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Answer B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floodplain/Hurricane Evacuation</strong></td>
<td>B. 1-2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Answer B. 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td>B. 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Trip generation rates and site access issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wastewater</strong></td>
<td>B. 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Answer B. 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Supply</strong></td>
<td>B. 1-3 &amp; *B. 4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Answer B. 1-4 (B. 4 to be adopted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solid Waste</strong></td>
<td>B. 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Answer B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police</strong></td>
<td>B. 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Answer B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire Protection/Health Care</strong></td>
<td>B. 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Answer B.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPECIFIC DRI INFORMATION – ADA Questionnaire (Form DSP-BLWM-11-76 renumbered DEO-BCP ADA 1 on 10-01-11)**

**Applicant Information**

| Schools | A, B & C | Responses Part V, Q 27, |
GENERAL

B. ISSUES SUBJECT TO FURTHER REVIEW IN AIDA’S

1. In all appropriate AIDA’s, the Palmer Ranch shall respond to the following general questions as required in the Standardized Questionnaire for Developments of Regional Impact in Unincorporated Sarasota County:

   Part I
   
   A. Statement of Intent
   B. Applicant Information
   C. Development Information
   D. Permit Information
   E. Statement of Purpose

   Part II
   
   A. General DRI Information
   B. Maps
   C. General Project Description

WATER QUALITY & DRAINAGE

B. ISSUES SUBJECT TO FURTHER REVIEW IN AIDA’S

1. Concurrent with each AIDA submitted for any development parcel, the appropriate Watershed Management Plan shall be updated and submitted to Sarasota County. The Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council shall be provided with a copy of any updates.

2. Any subsequent Application for Incremental Development Approval (AIDA) for the Palmer Ranch shall include an environmental and surface water management plan for the increment documenting consistency with the Little Sarasota Bay Watershed Management Plan. This plan shall be reviewed and approved by appropriate county departments as determined at the time of submittal.

3. The Palmer Ranch shall adhere to the Little Sarasota Bay Watershed Management Plan and all applicable drainage basin models. The drainage basin models shall be updated to assess any future changes in land use within the applicable areas of the Palmer Ranch.
4. The Applicant shall be responsible for any corrective actions required for the maintenance of stormwater management systems which is not specifically the responsibility of Sarasota County.

NATIVE HABITATS

B. ISSUES SUBJECT TO FURTHER REVIEW IN AIDA'S

1. Wetland modifications/alterations on the east side shall be as shown on Map F2 (Exhibit F), unless otherwise approved by Sarasota County. The total area of wetland habitat preserve may be slightly reduced resulting from unavoidable impacts necessitated by internal parcel roadway and infrastructure requirements as identified in subsequent Applications for Incremental Development Approval (AIDA's). All alterations in wetlands which result in a loss of habitat shall be mitigated. The amount of mitigation needed to offset alterations that result in loss of wetland habitat shall be determined by the Uniform Mitigation Assessment Method (UMAM) Chapter 62-345 Florida Administrative Code. In instances where the UMAM requirements do not apply, mitigation shall be on a one-to-one basis for wet prairies and sloughs and a three-to-one basis for swamps and heads. All wetland mitigation shall be accomplished within the "Wetland Restoration/Rehydration Target Areas" shown on Map G2.I (Exhibit I).

Any future request to slightly reduce the total area of wetland habitat preserve shall be addressed as part of the appropriate Application for Incremental Approval (AIDA). The rationale for alteration and the alternatives that were investigated to either limit or eliminate the need for wetland alterations shall be provided by the Applicant as part of appropriate AIDA's. Specific details of any wetland alteration/modification and appropriate mitigation, monitoring and maintenance plans shall be submitted to Sarasota County for review and approval at the preliminary plan or site and development plan stage. These plans shall address the criteria contained in "The Environmental and Surface Water Management, Maintenance and Monitoring Manual for the Palmer Ranch." Said alterations and/or required mitigation shall be consistent with the Management Guidelines of the Environment Chapter of the Sarasota County Comprehensive Plan, County approved mitigation monitoring and maintenance plans, the intent of the MDO commitment of preserving both wetland habitats and mitigation areas, and subject to the review and approval by Sarasota County.

2. In accordance with the MDO commitments, all undisturbed wetlands, mitigation areas and required upland vegetative buffers shall be maintained as preservation areas, labeled preservation areas on all plans, and whenever practical, recorded as separate tracts on final plats. All preserve areas shall be maintained in compliance with resource management plans (including identification of responsible entity) submitted as part of appropriate AIDA's, subject to review and approval by the County.

3. Open space areas shall be depicted on the appropriate AIDA's to ensure that preservation, conservation/open space areas, wildlife corridors, wetland restoration, mitigation and littoral zone target areas are used first to fulfill open space requirements.
A breakdown of open space with an indication of where the proposed open space balance would be allocated in the future shall be submitted with each AIDA, thereby demonstrating compliance with this requirement. Any proposed reallocation of open space types shall a) not involve either designated preservation areas or lands within existing eagle primary protection zones, b) not create a net loss of open space, and c) be justified by the Applicant and approved by Sarasota County through the AIDA or subsequent amendment process. Any proposed modifications complying with these criteria shall not be deemed a substantial deviation pursuant to Chapter 380, Florida Statutes.

LAND USE/HOUSING

B. ISSUES SUBJECT TO FURTHER REVIEW IN AIDA’S

1. Estimate the population increases in each AIDA according to any phasing of development. Indicate the ultimate functional and resident population, and areas of population concentration in each AIDA area.

2. Provide the following demographic and housing information. If specific demographic information is not available, use County-wide data.
   a. Number of persons per household.
   b. Number of children per household.
   c. Number of elderly per household (Age 65 years and older).
   d. Total number of housing units to be built. Indicate type of housing (i.e., single family, duplex, cluster, multi-family), and tenure (i.e., owner occupied versus renter occupied).
   e. Anticipated first year of home sales.
   f. Projected final year of home sales.
   g. Projected number of sales per year by housing type and tenure.
   h. Estimated average sales price per year until build-out occurs.

RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE

B. ISSUES SUBJECT TO FURTHER REVIEW IN AIDA’S

1. Indicate the size, location (Map H-2), ownership and type of all proposed recreation and open space areas. The bicycle and pedestrian circulation systems shall be delineated on each subsequent Map H-2 or on an updated Map-1-2/ MPCP Master Pedestrian and Circulation Plan.
FLOODPLAIN/HURRICANE EVACUATION

B. ISSUES SUBJECT TO FURTHER REVIEW IN AIDA’S

1. If the area is subject to category 2 or 3 flooding, information shall be submitted concerning expected flooding levels, building elevations, and shelter plans, as well as any other information deemed necessary.

2. The Palmer Ranch shall consult with Sarasota County, prior to the site and development stage of each AIDA. Sarasota County Emergency Services will review each facility to be used as an emergency shelter, to determine whether it is adequate for a storm shelter. In addition, all evacuation routes shall be reviewed to determine their adequacy in the event of an emergency.

TRANSPORTATION

B. ISSUES SUBJECT TO FURTHER REVIEW IN AIDA’S

1. Palmer Ranch shall continue to provide reanalysis for the DRI pursuant to the requirements of the Settlement Stipulation described in Resolution No. 87-549 and consistent with the methodologies utilized in prior analyses adopted by Sarasota County Resolution Nos. 89-98 and 95-231, as described in the Stipulation of Settlement (Exhibit J). The review of subsequent Transportation issues in AIDA’s shall be limited to providing trip generation information demonstrating consistency with the Transportation reanalysis and demonstrating adequate site access.

WASTEWATER

B. ISSUES SUBJECT TO FURTHER REVIEW IN AIDA’S

1. The Palmer Ranch shall update all projected wastewater flows for each AIDA project.

2. Each AIDA shall include average daily flow in MGD of wastewater generated by each development at the end of each phase.

WATER SUPPLY

B. ISSUES SUBJECT TO FURTHER REVIEW IN AIDA’S

1. Potable Water - Each AIDA shall identify potable water needs and the most feasible sources to satisfy potable water demands.

2. Non-potable Water - Each AIDA shall have definitive land use plans which quantify the irrigation and other non-potable water demands and detail the non-potable water supply source to satisfy demands.

3. If any water wells exist, they shall be located during site investigations for each AIDA, at which time, proposed well locations and other information required for non-potable use shall also be delineated and presented in AIDA documents.
4. Parcels within each AIDA are required to connect to Sarasota County Public Utilities reclaimed water systems when reasonably available. In cases where a connection to reclaimed water is not readily available, then the development shall be constructed with the underground infrastructure needed to establish a reclaimed connection at a future date. Sarasota County’s Utility Director is authorized to determine the configuration of are claimed water connection or future reclaimed water connection, or waive this requirement in cases where the Utility Director deems the connection requirement impractical. (Draft Ordinance)

SOLID WASTE

B. ISSUES SUBJECT TO FURTHER REVIEW IN AIDA’S

1. The Palmer Ranch shall provide in each AIDA a letter from the Sarasota County Director of Solid Waste indicating the amount of current excess capacity to accommodate the additional refuse.

POLICE

B. ISSUES SUBJECT TO FURTHER REVIEW IN AIDA’S

1. The Palmer Ranch shall indicate the demand that will be generated by each AIDA for police services.

FIRE PROTECTION/HEALTH CARE

B. ISSUES SUBJECT TO FURTHER REVIEW IN AIDA’S

SPECIFIC DRI INFORMATION

In the appropriate AIDA’s the Palmer Ranch shall respond to the following questions as required in ADA Questionnaire (Form DSP-BLWM-11-76 Note: Renumbered DEO-BCP ADA 1, 10-01-11):

Question 42-27- Schools. (Responses A and B).

A. If the development contains residential units, estimate the number of school age children expected to reside in the development. Use class breakdowns appropriate to the area in which the development is located (specify on chart below):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Will school facilities or sites be dedicated or otherwise provided on the site?
C. Attach a letter from the appropriate school board, acknowledging receipt of the estimated school age population information in (A) above, and providing a statement of what capital improvement adjustments would be necessary to accommodate these students.
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Budget & Finance Committee
2015 - 2016 Workplan & Budget Financial Snapshot
Jun-16

Revenues
Local Assessments
Total Federal/State Grants
Misc. Grants/Contracts
Other Revenue Sources

Monthly Revenues

Notes: Local Assessments billed at the beginning of each quarter: October, January, April and July
Federal Grants (EPA) billed monthly: EPA: Ecosystems Services
State/Federal Grants billed quarterly: LEPC, HMEP, TD, and ED
Misc. Grants/Contracts billed by deliverable: SQG, Interagency PO'S
Other(DRI) billed /recorded monthly as cost reimbursement

Monthly Net Income (Loss)

YTD: Net Income $(-26,267) Unaudited
### Cash and Cash Equivalents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America Operating Funds</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FineMark Operating Funds</td>
<td>$29,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash and Cash Equivalents</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,245</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Investments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FineMark Money Market</td>
<td>$534,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government Surplus Trust Fund Investment Pool (Fund A)</td>
<td>$135,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Investments</strong></td>
<td><strong>$670,694</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Reserves**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$699,939</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SWFRPC Income Statement
### Compared with Budget
#### For the One Month Ending June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Month</th>
<th>Year to Date A</th>
<th>FY 2015-2016 Approved Budget B</th>
<th>FY 2015-2016 Amended Budget</th>
<th>% Of Budget Year to Date</th>
<th>Budget Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL ASSESSMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte County</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$37,005</td>
<td>$49,340</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>12,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier County</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$75,777</td>
<td>$101,035</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>25,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glades County</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,892</td>
<td>$3,856</td>
<td>75.01%</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendry County</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$8,526</td>
<td>$11,369</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>2,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee County</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$113,718</td>
<td>$157,647</td>
<td>72.13%</td>
<td>43,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Myers</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$15,623</td>
<td>$20,831</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>5,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Fort Myers Inc</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,407</td>
<td>$1,875</td>
<td>75.04%</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonita Springs</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$10,308</td>
<td>$13,746</td>
<td>74.99%</td>
<td>3,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sanibel</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,461</td>
<td>$1,947</td>
<td>75.04%</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota County</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$87,108</td>
<td>$116,142</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>29,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LOCAL ASSESSMENTS</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$353,825</td>
<td>$477,787</td>
<td>74.05%</td>
<td>$123,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL / STATE GRANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM-Title III - LEPC 15/16</td>
<td>$10,885</td>
<td>$35,481</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>73.92%</td>
<td>$12,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM-HMEP Planning 15/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,585</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>106.60%</td>
<td>(1,585)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL CTD - Glades/Hendry TD 15/16</td>
<td>12,343</td>
<td>$29,701</td>
<td>$38,573</td>
<td>$38,573</td>
<td>77.00%</td>
<td>8,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARC - SOLAR READY</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,031</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>183.85%</td>
<td>(5,031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM - Collier Hazards</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,693</td>
<td>$9,693</td>
<td>$9,693</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Planning</td>
<td>15,750</td>
<td>$47,250</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>15,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FED- MARC - SM3 Data Collection</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FED - MARC - Travel SRII</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$380</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>76.00%</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FED - EPA - Ecosystem Services</td>
<td>20,053</td>
<td>$75,178</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$174,071</td>
<td>43.19%</td>
<td>98,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE- DEM HMEP TRAINING MOD 14/15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$48,266</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$48,266</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE -DEO Transportation MPO Rail</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE-DEO MLK Revitalization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE-DEO Clewiston Main Street</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>120.00%</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM-HMEP Training 15/16</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FEDERAL / STATE GRANTS</strong></td>
<td>$64,031</td>
<td>$382,565</td>
<td>$187,266</td>
<td>$557,025</td>
<td>68.68%</td>
<td>$174,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISC. GRANTS / CONTRACTS/CONTRACTUAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Bonita Springs - Spring Creek</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISIT FLORIDA - MARKETING</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>125.00%</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLADES SQG</td>
<td>$3,900</td>
<td>$3,900</td>
<td>$3,900</td>
<td>$3,900</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Punta Gorda - Mangrove Loss</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>$32,250</td>
<td>$32,250</td>
<td>$32,250</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train the Trainers</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Bay Disaster Planning Guide</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier County EDC - Data Research</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwheels Tech Assistance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Month</td>
<td>Year to Date A</td>
<td>FY 2015-2016 Approved Budget B</td>
<td>FY 2015-2016 (May 2016) Amended Budget</td>
<td>% Of Budget Year to Date</td>
<td>2016 Budget Remaining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier County EDC - USDA Grant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MISC. GRANTS/CONTRACTS</td>
<td>$17,900</td>
<td>$56,600</td>
<td>$70,150</td>
<td>$90,600</td>
<td>62.47%</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRI MONITORING FEES</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$1,750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRIS/NOPCS INCOME</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>27,802</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>79.43%</td>
<td>7,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$3,085</td>
<td>$29,552</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>84.43%</td>
<td>$5,448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Program Development (Unsecured Grants/Contract) 100,000 -

**Rural Neighborhoods Mapping**
- 750 750 - N/A (750)

**2016 Brownfields Symposium**
- 870 $4,170 $- N/A (4,170)

**Charlotte County DEO TA Grant**
- 500 - - N/A (500)

**SWFEC PRIME Grant TA**
- 5,000 - - N/A (5,000)

**Collier EDA Grant TA**
- 5,000 - - N/A (5,000)

**TOTAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT**
$1,620 $15,420 $100,000 $- N/A (5,420)

**ABM SPONSORSHIPS**
- - - N/A N/A

**Misc. Income**
- - 6,011 - $4,872 123.38% (1,139)

**INTEREST INCOME - Money Market**
- 411 1,500 1,500 27.41% 1,089

**Fund A Investment Income**
- 416 - - N/A (416)

**TOTAL OTHER REVENUE SOURCES**
$- 6,838 1,500 $6,372 107.32% $673

**FUND BALANCE**
- - - 640,816 -

**Investments (4/21/16)**
- - - $670,290

**TOTAL REVENUES**
$86,636 $844,800 $1,512,519 $1,837,074 $333,124

**EXPENSES**

**PERSONNEL EXPENSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
<th>Previous Year</th>
<th>FY 2015-2016</th>
<th>FY 2015-2016 Amended Budget</th>
<th>% Of Budget</th>
<th>2016 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SALARIES EXPENSE</td>
<td>$47,105</td>
<td>$359,571</td>
<td>$487,098</td>
<td>$519,301</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>159,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA EXPENSE</td>
<td>3,539</td>
<td>26,335</td>
<td>37,263</td>
<td>39,727</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>13,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETIREMENT EXPENSE</td>
<td>4,556</td>
<td>45,026</td>
<td>35,084</td>
<td>60,084</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>15,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSE</td>
<td>3,749</td>
<td>47,944</td>
<td>79,799</td>
<td>79,799</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>31,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKERS COMP. EXPENSE</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>3,687</td>
<td>3,687</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEMPLOYMENT COMP. EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PERSONNEL EXPENSES</td>
<td>$59,153</td>
<td>$479,873</td>
<td>$642,931</td>
<td>$702,598</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>222,725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPERATIONAL EXPENSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
<th>Previous Year</th>
<th>FY 2015-2016</th>
<th>FY 2015-2016 Amended Budget</th>
<th>% Of Budget</th>
<th>2016 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSULTANTS</td>
<td>$11,382</td>
<td>$67,827</td>
<td>$33,100</td>
<td>$54,843</td>
<td>124%</td>
<td>(12,984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANT/CONSULTING EXPENSE</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>90,682</td>
<td>18,100</td>
<td>92,384</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>1,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Month</td>
<td>Year to Date</td>
<td>FY 2015-2016 Approved Budget</td>
<td>FY 2015-2016 (May 2016) Amended Budget</td>
<td>% Of Budget Year to Date</td>
<td>28% Budget Remaining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDIT SERVICES EXPENSE</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>31,100</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>104% (1,100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL EXPENSE</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>28,357</td>
<td>12,960</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>71% 11,643</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE EXPENSE</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>3,378</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>66% 1,722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTAGE / SHIPPING EXPENSE</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3,703</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>4,975</td>
<td>74% 1,272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT RENTAL EXPENSE</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>5,269</td>
<td>7,335</td>
<td>7,335</td>
<td>72% 2,066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE EXPENSE</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>13,706</td>
<td>23,207</td>
<td>17,207</td>
<td>80% 3,501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPAIR/MAINT. EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,907</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>58% 2,093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINTING/REPRODUCTION EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,533</td>
<td>2,580</td>
<td>8,571</td>
<td>53% 4,038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITIES (ELEC, INTERNET, WATER, GAR)</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>12,246</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>98% 254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVERTISING/LEGAL NOTICES EXP</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>44% 1,536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER MISC. EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>14% 864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK SERVICE CHARGES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,753</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>125% (53)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES EXPENSE</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>2,973</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>59% 2,027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER RELATED EXPENSE</td>
<td>3,790</td>
<td>18,279</td>
<td>22,969</td>
<td>24,319</td>
<td>75% 6,040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUES AND MEMBERSHIP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,885</td>
<td>25,510</td>
<td>25,510</td>
<td>27% 18,625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLICATION EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0% 200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROF. DEVELOP.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>55% 1,357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEETINGS/EVENTS EXPENSE</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>4,541</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>23% 15,459</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOVING EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42,418</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>100% 82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL OUTLAY EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,351</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>73% 1,649</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL OUTLAY - BUILDING</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0% 1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG TERM DEBT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21,292</td>
<td>128,000</td>
<td>21,292</td>
<td>100% 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEASE LONG TERM</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>67% 10,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCOLLECTABLE RECEIVABLES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND BALANCE</th>
<th>Investments (4/21/16)</th>
<th>$ 640,816</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational Exp.</td>
<td>$ 33,044</td>
<td>$ 391,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation for Fringe/Indirect (Captured by Grants)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilized Reserve</td>
<td>$ (135,714)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operational Exp.</td>
<td>$ 869,588</td>
<td>$ 1,134,476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Cash Outlay | $ 92,197 | $ 871,065 | $ 1,512,519 | $ 1,837,074 |

| Net Income (Loss) Before Other Income/(Expense) | $ (5,561) | $ (26,265) |
| Other Income/(Expense) | $ (4,099) | $ (287,272) |
| Net Income (Loss) After Other Income/(Expense) | $ (5,561) | $ (317,636) |
## ASSETS

### Current Assets
- Cash - FL Local Gov’t Pool $135,981.53
- Cash - FineMark Oper. 29,045.31
- Cash - FineMark MM 534,712.08
- Petty Cash 200.00
- Accounts Receivable 162,431.00

**Total Current Assets** 862,369.92

### Property and Equipment
- Property, Furniture & Equip 207,603.57
- Accumulated Depreciation (190,530.93)

**Total Property and Equipment** 17,072.64

### Other Assets
- Prepaid Expense (524.22)
- AR - Unbilled 12,667.96
- Amount t.b.p. for L.T.L.-Leave 45,923.44
- FSA Deposit 2,881.29
- Rental Deposits 3,500.00
- Amt t.b.p. for L.T.Debt-OPEP 63,441.00
- Amount t.b.p. for L.T.Debt (410.03)

**Total Other Assets** 127,479.44

**Total Assets** $1,006,922.00

## LIABILITIES AND CAPITAL

### Current Liabilities
- Accounts Payable $113.28
- Deferred Income - EPA_3675 55,376.75
- Deferred Palmer XXIV_4097 26,521.89
- Deferred NorthPoint NOPC_5328 662.23
- Deferred Pelican Marsh_5329 968.69
- Deferred Palmer Ranch MDO_NOPC 322.99
- Deferred Alico-3 Oaks_5334 1,167.69
- Deferred Commons NOPC_5337 1,500.00
- Deferred BRC Master NOPC_5338 1,899.11
- Deferred BRC Incr 1 NOPC_5339 1,918.14
- Deferred Tern Bay NOPC_5340 1,863.58
- Deferred PR-II CC NOPC_5341 2,000.00
- FICA Taxes Payable 1,603.05
- Retirement Fund Payable 6,176.29
- Federal W/H Tax Payable 1,054.53
- United way Payable (985.00)
- Deferred Compensation Payable (25.00)
- FSA Payable (370.00)
- LEPC Contingency Fund 305.25

**Total Current Liabilities** 102,073.47

### Long-Term Liabilities
- Accrued Annual Leave 45,923.44
- Long Term Debt - OPEB 63,441.00

**Total Long-Term Liabilities** 109,364.44

Unaudited - For Management Purposes Only
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Liabilities</td>
<td>211,437.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance-Unassigned</td>
<td>338,758.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance-Assigned</td>
<td>514,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB-Non-Spendable/Fixed Assets</td>
<td>260,362.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
<td>(317,636.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital</td>
<td>795,484.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Liabilities &amp; Capital</td>
<td>$ 1,006,922.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unaudited - For Management Purposes Only
2015 - 2016 Workplan & Budget Financial Snapshot
Jul-16

Revenues
Local Assessments
Total Federal/State Grants
Misc. Grants/Contracts
Other Revenue Sources

Monthly Revenues

Notes: Local Assessments billed at the beginning of each quarter: October, January, April and July
Federal Grants (EPA) billed monthly: EPA: Ecosystems Services
State/Federal Grants billed quarterly: LEPC, HMEP, TD, and ED
Misc. Grants/Contracts billed by deliverable: SQG, Interagency PO’S
Other(DRI) billed /recorded monthly as cost reimbursement

Monthly Net Income (Loss)

YTD: Net Income $75,186 Unaudited
### SWFRPC

**Detail of Reserve**

**As of JULY 31, 2016**

---

**Cash and Cash Equivalents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America Operating Funds</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FineMark Operating Funds</td>
<td>95,723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Cash and Cash Equivalents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$95,923</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Investments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FineMark Money Market</td>
<td>$534,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government Surplus Trust Fund Investment Pool (Fund A)</td>
<td>136,131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Investments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$670,975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Reserves**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$766,898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SWFRPC Income Statement

**Compared with Budget**

**For the One Month Ending July 31, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Month</th>
<th>Year to Date</th>
<th>FY 2015-2016 Approved Budget</th>
<th>FY 2015-2016 Amended Budget</th>
<th>% Of Budget Year to Date</th>
<th>Budget Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Assessments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte County</td>
<td>$12,335</td>
<td>$49,340</td>
<td>$49,340</td>
<td>$49,340</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier County</td>
<td>25,259</td>
<td>101,035</td>
<td>101,035</td>
<td>101,035</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glades County</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>3,856</td>
<td>3,856</td>
<td>3,856</td>
<td>100.01%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendry County</td>
<td>2,842</td>
<td>11,369</td>
<td>11,369</td>
<td>11,369</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee County</td>
<td>37,153</td>
<td>157,647</td>
<td>157,647</td>
<td>95.70%</td>
<td>6,776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Myers</td>
<td>5,208</td>
<td>20,831</td>
<td>20,831</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Fort Myers Beach Inc</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonita Springs</td>
<td>3,436</td>
<td>13,746</td>
<td>13,746</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sanibel</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>1,947</td>
<td>1,947</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota County</td>
<td>29,036</td>
<td>116,142</td>
<td>116,142</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Local Assessments</strong></td>
<td>$117,189</td>
<td>$471,012</td>
<td>$477,787</td>
<td>$477,787</td>
<td>98.58%</td>
<td>$6,776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Federal / State Grants**

|                      |               |              |                              |                              |                          |                  |
| DEM -Title III - LEPC 15/16 | $ - | $36,000 | $48,000 | $48,000 | 75.00% | $12,000 |
| DEM-HMEEP Planning 15/16 | 2,516         | 28,100       | 22,000                      | 24,000                       | 117.08%                  | (4,100) |
| FL CTD - Glades/Hendry TD 15/16 | - | 29,701 | 38,573 | 38,573 | 77.00% | 8,872 |
| MARC - SOLAR READY    | -             | 11,031       | 6,000                       | 6,000                        | 183.85%                  | (5,031) |
| DEM - Collier Hazards | -             | 9,693        | 9,693                      | 9,693                        | 100.00%                  | -                |
| Economic Development Planning | - | 47,250 | 63,000 | 63,000 | 75.00% | 15,750 |
| FED - MARC - SM3 Data Collection | - | 1,000 | - | 1,000 | 100.00% | - |
| FED - MARC - Travel SRII | - | 380 | - | 500 | 76.00% | 120 |
| FED - EPA - Ecosystem Services | 18,132 | 93,309 | - | 174,071 | 53.60% | 80,762 |
| STATE - DEM HMEEP TRAINING MOD 14/15 | - | 48,266 | - | 48,266 | 100.00% | - |
| STATE - DEO Transportation MPO Rail | - | 39,000 | - | 39,000 | 100.00% | - |
| STATE - DEO MLK Revitalization | - | 30,000 | - | 30,000 | 100.00% | - |
| STATE - DEO Clewiston Main Street | - | 30,000 | - | 25,000 | 120.00% | (5,000) |
| DEM - HMEEP Training 15/16 | - | 49,922 | - | 49,922 | 0.00% | 49,922 |
| **Total Federal / State Grants** | $20,647 | $403,731 | $187,266 | $557,025 | 72.48% | $153,294 |

**Misc. Grants / Contracts/Contractual**

<p>| | | | | | | |
|                      |               |              |                              |                              |                          |                  |
| City of Bonita Springs - Spring Creek | $30,000 | $30,000 | $30,000 | $30,000 | 100.00% | - |
| VISIT FLORIDA - MARKETING | - | 5,000 | 4,000 | 4,000 | 125.00% | (1,000) |
| GLADES SQG | - | 3,900 | 3,900 | 3,900 | 100.00% | - |
| City of Punta Gorda - Mangrove Loss | - | 28,250 | 32,250 | 32,250 | 87.60% | 4,000 |
| Train the Trainers | - | 5,000 | - | 10,000 | 50.00% | 5,000 |
| Tampa Bay Disaster Planning Guide | - | 4,000 | - | 4,000 | 100.00% | - |
| Collier County EDC - Data Research | - | 1,200 | - | 1,200 | 100.00% | - |
| Goodwheels Tech Assistance | - | 2,250 | - | 2,250 | 100.00% | - |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Month</th>
<th>Year to Date A</th>
<th>FY 2015-2016 Approved Budget B</th>
<th>FY 2015-2016 (May 2016) Amended Budget</th>
<th>% Of Budget Year to Date</th>
<th>% Budget Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collier County EDC - USDA Grant</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$82,600</td>
<td>$70,150</td>
<td>$90,600</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MISC. GRANTS/CONTRACTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRI/NOPCS/MONITORING</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$27,802</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>79.43%</td>
<td>$7,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRIS/NOPCS INCOME</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$29,802</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>85.15%</td>
<td>$5,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Development (Unsecured Grants/Contract)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$(750)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Neighborhoods Mapping</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Brownfields Symposium</td>
<td>2,718</td>
<td>6,888</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$(6,888)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte County DEO TA Grant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$(500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWFEC PRIME Grant TA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$(5,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier EDA Grant TA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$(5,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 SRESP Update</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$(14,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>$16,918</td>
<td>$32,338</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$(32,338)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER REVENUE SOURCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABM SPONSORSHIPS</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Income</td>
<td>$6,011</td>
<td>$4,872</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>123.38%</td>
<td>$(1,139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST INCOME - Money Market</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>41.15%</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund A Investment Income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$(491)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OTHER REVENUE SOURCES</td>
<td>$74</td>
<td>$7,119</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$6,372</td>
<td>111.73%</td>
<td>$392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$640,816</td>
<td>$588,437</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td>$185,078</td>
<td>$1,026,601</td>
<td>$1,512,519</td>
<td>$1,755,221</td>
<td></td>
<td>$141,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALARIES EXPENSE</td>
<td>$30,650</td>
<td>$390,221</td>
<td>$487,098</td>
<td>$519,301</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>129,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA EXPENSE</td>
<td>2,306</td>
<td>28,641</td>
<td>37,263</td>
<td>39,727</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>11,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETIREMENT EXPENSE</td>
<td>6,031</td>
<td>51,057</td>
<td>35,084</td>
<td>60,084</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>9,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSE</td>
<td>5,552</td>
<td>53,179</td>
<td>79,799</td>
<td>79,799</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>26,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKERS COMP. EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>3,687</td>
<td>3,687</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEMPLOYMENT COMP. EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PERSONNEL EXPENSES</td>
<td>$44,539</td>
<td>$524,095</td>
<td>$642,931</td>
<td>$702,598</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>178,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATIONAL EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULTANTS</td>
<td>$8,913</td>
<td>$76,739</td>
<td>$33,100</td>
<td>$54,843</td>
<td>140%</td>
<td>$(21,896)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>FY 2015-2016 Approved Budget</td>
<td>FY 2015-2016 Amended Budget</td>
<td>% of Budget Year to Date</td>
<td>% Budget Remaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANT/CONSULTING EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90,682</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDIT SERVICES EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31,100</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>(1,100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL EXPENSE</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>28,613</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>11,387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE EXPENSE</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>3,759</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTAGE / SHIPPING EXPENSE</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3,861</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT RENTAL EXPENSE</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>5,713</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE EXPENSE</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>14,270</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>2,937</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPAIR/MAINT. EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,907</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>2,093</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINTING/REPRODUCTION EXPENSE</td>
<td>1,481</td>
<td>6,014</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>2,558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITIES (ELEC, INTERNET, WATER, GAR)</td>
<td>2,486</td>
<td>14,732</td>
<td>118%</td>
<td>(2,232)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVERTISING/LEGAL NOTICES EXP</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER MISC. EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK SERVICE CHARGES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,755</td>
<td>125%</td>
<td>(555)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES EXPENSE</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>3,375</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER RELATED EXPENSE</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18,344</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>5,975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUES AND MEMBERSHIP</td>
<td>12,680</td>
<td>19,565</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>5,945</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLICATION EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROF. DEVELOP.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEETINGS/EVENTS EXPENSE</td>
<td>4,620</td>
<td>9,161</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>10,839</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOVING EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,418</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL OUTLAY EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,351</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>1,649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL OUTLAY - BUILDING</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG TERM DEBT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21,292</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEASE LONG TERM</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCOLLECTABLE RECEIVABLES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUND BALANCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 640,816</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 588,437</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATIONAL EXP.</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 36,129</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 427,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,05,302</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,052,623</strong></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td><strong>36,866</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALLOCATION FOR FRINGE/INDIRECT</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ -</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ (135,714)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UTILIZED RESERVE</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ -</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ -</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OPERATIONAL EXP.</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 869,588</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,052,623</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CASH OUTLAY</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 80,668</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 951,415</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,512,519</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,755,221</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET INCOME (LOSS) BEFORE OTHER EXP</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 104,410</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 75,186</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER INCOME/(EXPENSE)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ (4,099)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ (287,272)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET INCOME (LOSS) AFTER OTHER EXP</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 104,410</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ (216,184)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Balance Sheet

**July 31, 2016**

### ASSETS

#### Current Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash - FL Local Gov't Pool</td>
<td>$136,130.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash - FineMark Oper.</td>
<td>95,723.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash - FineMark MM</td>
<td>534,843.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>192,808.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Current Assets** 959,706.46

#### Property and Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property, Furniture &amp; Equip</td>
<td>207,603.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated Depreciation</td>
<td>(190,530.93)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Property and Equipment** 17,072.64

#### Other Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid Expense</td>
<td>(524.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR - Unbilled</td>
<td>12,667.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount t.b.p. for L.T.L.-Leave</td>
<td>45,923.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSA Deposit</td>
<td>2,881.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Deposits</td>
<td>3,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amt t.b.p. for L.T.Debt-OPEP</td>
<td>63,441.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount t.b.p. for L.T.Debt</td>
<td>(410.03)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Other Assets** 127,479.44

**Total Assets** $1,104,258.54

### LIABILITIES AND CAPITAL

#### Current Liabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liability</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>$113.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Income - EPA_3675</td>
<td>37,245.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Palmer XXIV_4097</td>
<td>26,521.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred NorthPoint NOPC_5328</td>
<td>662.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Pelican Marsh_5329</td>
<td>968.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Palmer Ranch MDO_NOPC</td>
<td>322.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Alico-3 Oaks_5334</td>
<td>1,167.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Commons NOPC_5337</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred BRC Master NOPC_5338</td>
<td>1,899.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred BRC Incr 1 NOPC_5339</td>
<td>1,918.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Tern Bay NOPC_5340</td>
<td>1,863.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred PR-II CC NOPC_5341</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred PR Parcel 9E DRI_5342</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA Taxes Payable</td>
<td>1,216.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Fund Payable</td>
<td>6,176.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal W/H Tax Payable</td>
<td>717.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United way Payable</td>
<td>(901.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Compensation Payable</td>
<td>(325.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSA Payable</td>
<td>(416.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEPC Contingency Fund</td>
<td>305.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Current Liabilities** 97,956.11

#### Long-Term Liabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liability</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Annual Leave</td>
<td>45,923.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Debt - OPEB</td>
<td>63,441.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Long-Term Liabilities** 109,364.44

*Unaudited - For Management Purposes Only*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Liabilities</td>
<td>207,320.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance-Unassigned</td>
<td>338,758.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance-Assigned</td>
<td>514,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB-Non-Spendable/Fixed Assets</td>
<td>260,362.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
<td>(216,182.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital</td>
<td>896,937.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Liabilities &amp; Capital</td>
<td>$1,104,258.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Estero Bay Agency on Bay Management

The regular meeting of the Estero Bay Agency on Bay Management was held on Monday, June 13, 2016 at the 9:30 AM at the SWFRPC offices. Minutes of the May 9, 2016 meeting were approved. Motion by Ms. Simons, Second by Mr. Cornell.

Dr. Lisa Beever presented on the CHNEP 2014 Seagrass Mapping with Focus on Estero Bay. Related links to information presented can be found at the SWFRPC web page for the EBABM at http://www.swfrpc.org/content/Natural_Resources/ABM/2014%20Seagrass%20mapping%20ABM.pdf.


In Old Business included the CREW Conservation 2020 land acquisition proposal; the planning for the Cela Tega and continued water quality issues form the Caloosahatchee River flows.

Emerging Issues included the Conservation 2020 referendum, golf course fertilizer management, the Frog Monitoring Network, and the location of the largest cypress tree in Lee County.

The Estero Bay Agency On Bay Management is planning a two day conference on Sea Level Rise and Climate Change Adaptations in the Estero Bay Region on the dates of December 12 & 13th, 2016 at the Cohen Center Ballroom, Florida Gulf Coast University, Fort Myers Florida. I would like to invite you, your co-workers and your students to submit abstracts for oral presentations and/or posters that identify information on climate change adaptation with an emphasis for Florida and special interest in southern subtropical Florida. We are also interested in innovative adaptation methods and systems from coastal communities world-wide. We are interested in both technical scientific and planning application presentations.

The verbal presentations are scheduled in sessions from 9 AM to 4 PM on December 12, 2016 and from 1 PM to 3 PM on December 13, 2016. The poster session will be on December 12, 2016 starting at 4 PM and merging into a dinner banquet with an invited speaker. Art relating to climate change, sea level, adaptation and the natural environment of south Florida will be displayed with substantial hors d'oeuvres and a cash bar at the conclusion of the meeting on the second day. The morning of December 13, 2016 is anticipated to be a Workshop Practicum on the Use of Public Participation Games and Consensus Based Citizen/Stakeholder Informed Climate Change Adaptation Planning for the Estero Bay Watershed.

It is envisioned that verbal presentations would have a duration of 15 to 20 minutes. However presentations of merit specifically to theme may have longer time frames. Abstracts should contain the title, all authors with the speaking author indicated with an asterisk, and contact e-mail addresses. The body of the abstract should be one paragraph with a length not to exceed 400 words. These will be published with the meeting program and accompany the on-line post conference web site of the recordings of the presentations. Abstracts are due on or before August 30, 2016.
Breakfast and lunch will be provided for participants including attendees who do not speak on both days. The dinner banquet will have a fee (yet to be determined) that will be waived for invited speakers. We are able to offer a limited amount of travel and lodging support to those who need it to participate as invited speakers.

This is fourth meeting of the continuing EBABM conference series known as Cela Tega (Cela Tega is the southwest Florida native (i.e.: Calusa) term for “A view from high ground”. We used it here to symbolize “overview”)

If you are interested please respond to me at jbeeveer@swfrpc.org and copy Dr. Nora Demers at ndemers@fgcu.edu

If you have any questions please contact me at jbeeveer@swfrpc.org, telephone number 239-938-1813 extension 224

Please feel free to share this conference information with colleagues and friends.

There were no public comments on items not on the agenda

The next Meeting Time and Place, for EBABM is Monday, August 8, 2016 – 9:30 a. m. The next Cela Tega Subcommittee Meeting is Monday July 11, 2016 - 1:30 PM.

Adjournment was at 11:21 A.M.

**Recommended Action: Information only.**
Estero Bay Agency on Bay Management

The regular meeting of the Estero Bay Agency on Bay Management was held on Monday, August 8, 2016 at the 9:30 AM at the SWFRPC offices. Minutes of the June 13, 2016 meeting were approved. Motion by Dr. Everham, Second by Dr. Beever.

Ms. Cathy Olson presented on the successes of the Lee County Conservation 20/20 program. Related links to information presented can be found at the SWFRPC web page for the EBABM at http://www.swfrpc.org/content/Natural_Resources/ABM/Monday.pdf

Ms. Marissa Carrozzo presented on Conservation 2020 Ballot Initiative Support. Related links to information presented can be found at the SWFRPC web page for the EBABM at http://www.swfrpc.org/content/Natural_Resources/ABM/EBABM%20Presentation_080816.pdf

In Old Business included the planning for the Cela Tega and continued water quality issues from the Caloosahatchee River flows.

Emerging Issues included the DRGR, the Old Corkscrew Plantation mine proposal, and the Troyer Brothers Mine proposal, the proposed Timber Creek project in the DRGR adjacent to SR 82, and the Bonita Grand Mine extension, the Koreshan State Park and the Estero Bay Buffer State Park Plan,

The Estero Bay Agency On Bay Management is planning a two day conference on Sea Level Rise and Climate Change Adaptations in the Estero Bay Region on the dates of December 12 & 13th, 2016 at the Cohen Center Ballroom, Florida Gulf Coast University, Fort Myers Florida. I would like to invite you, your co-workers and your students to submit abstracts for oral presentations and/or posters that identify information on climate change adaptation with an emphasis for Florida and special interest in southern subtropical Florida. We are also interested in innovative adaptation methods and systems from coastal communities world-wide. We are interested in both technical scientific and planning application presentations.

The verbal presentations are scheduled in sessions from 9 AM to 4 PM on December 12, 2016. and from 1 PM to 3 PM on December 13, 2016. The poster session will be on December 12, 2016 starting at 4 PM and merging into a dinner banquet with an invited speaker. Art relating to climate change, sea level, adaptation and the natural environment of south Florida will be displayed with substantial hors d'oeuvres and a cash bar at the conclusion of the meeting on the second day. The morning of December 13, 2016 is anticipated to be a Workshop Practicum on the Use of Public Participation Games and Consensus Based Citizen/Stakeholder Informed Climate Change Adaptation Planning for the Estero Bay Watershed.

It is envisioned that verbal presentations would have a duration of 15 to 20 minutes. However presentations of merit specifically to theme may have longer time frames. Abstracts should contain the title, all authors with the speaking author indicated with an asterisk, and contact e-mail addresses. The body of the abstract should be one paragraph with a length not to exceed 400 words. These will be published with the meeting program and accompany the on-line post
conference web site of the recordings of the presentations. Abstracts are due on or before August 30, 2016.

Breakfast and lunch will be provided for participants including attendees who do not speak on both days. The dinner banquet will have a fee (yet to be determined) that will be waived for invited speakers. We are able to offer a limited amount of travel and lodging support to those who need it to participate as invited speakers.

This is fourth meeting of the continuing EBABM conference series known as Cela Tega (Cela Tega is the southwest Florida native (i.e.: Calusa) term for “A view from high ground”. We used it here to symbolize “overview”)

If you are interested please respond to me at jbeever@swfrpc.org and copy Dr. Nora Demers at ndemers@fgcu.edu

If you have any questions please contact me at jbeever@swfrpc.org, telephone number 239-938-1813 extension 224

Please feel free to share this conference information with colleagues and friends.

There were no public comments on items not on the agenda

The next Meeting Time and Place, for EBABM is Monday, September 12, 2016 – 9:30 a. m. The Cela Tega Subcommittee Meeting was Monday August 29, 2016 - 1:30 PM.

Adjournment was at 11:55 A.M.

**Recommended Action: Information only.**
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Water Quality and Water Resources Management