**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.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>INVOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>ROLL CALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>PUBLIC COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>AGENDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td>MINUTES OF THE JUNE 15, JULY 20, AND OCTOBER 19, 2017 MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td>REGIONAL IMPACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Palmer Ranch Increment XXVII Assessment Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Palmer Ranch Increment XXVIII Pre-App Checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td>CONSENT AGENDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Intergovernmental Coordination and Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Glades-Hendry LCB Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Lee County Comp Plan Amendment DEO 17-7ESR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) City of Venice Comp Plan Amendment DEO 17-1ESR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) City of Venice Comp Plan Amendment DEO 17-2ESR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) Charlotte County Comp Plan Amendment DEO 17-5ESR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g) City of Marco Island Comp Plan Amendment DEO 17-1ESR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td>DIRECTOR’S REPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td>STAFF SUMMARIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Grant Activity Sheet (Information Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td>COMMITTEE REPORTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Budget &amp; Finance Committee - <strong>Commissioner Willie Shaw</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Economic Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Energy &amp; Climate Committee – <strong>Mr. Don McCormick</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Estero Bay Agency on Bay Management Committee – <strong>Mr. James Beever</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) Legislative Affairs Committee – <strong>Mr. Don McCormick</strong></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.
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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.
• **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
JUNE 15, 2017 MEETING

The meeting of the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council was held on June 15, 2017 at the
offices of the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council–1400 Colonial Boulevard, Suite #1 in
Fort Myers, Florida. Vice-Chair Perry called the meeting to order at 9:02 AM. Commissioner
Doherty then led an invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Ms. Margaret Wuerstle conducted
the roll call and noted that a quorum not was present. A quorum was reached later in the meeting.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Charlotte County: Commissioner Ken Doherty, Commissioner Joe Tiseo,
Councilwoman Lynne Matthews, Ms. Suzanne Graham

Collier County: Mr. Bob Mulhere

Glades County: Commissioner Donald Strenth, Mr. Thomas Perry

Hendry County: Commissioner Mitchell Wills, Commissioner Julie Wilkins, Mr. Mel Karau

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

Sarasota County: Councilman Fred Fraize, Commissioner Debbie McDowell

Ex-Officio: Mr. Phil Flood–SFWMD, Ms. Megan Mills–FDEP, Mr. Stephen Walls–FDOT

MEMBERS ABSENT

Charlotte County: Mr. Don McCormick

Collier County: Commissioner Bill McDaniel, Commissioner Penny Taylor,
Councilman Reg Buxton,

Glades County: Commissioner Donna Storter-Long, Councilwoman Pat Lucas

Hendry County: Commissioner Karson Turner, Vice-Mayor Michael Atkinson,

Lee County: Councilwoman Anita Cereceda, Councilmember Jim Wilson,
Ms. Laura Holquist

Sarasota County: Commissioner Charles Hines, Commissioner Michael Moran,
Mayor Willie Shaw, Mr. Felipe Colón
Non-voting items were moved to the beginning of the meeting until a quorum could be reached.

Ms. Wuerstle explained that an official decision on the quorum could not be made today due to the notification requirements in the interlocal agreement and bylaws. She presented a draft resolution that would change the quorum requirement to one-third of the voting members with two of the six counties needing to be represented. She also brought up the issue of nonparticipating governor appointees and whether they should be considered members. Commissioner Tiseo explained that Charlotte County has had a similar problem with their committees and stated that something needs to be done about the Council’s quorum issues. Mr. Mulhere explained that it may not be up to the Council to decide if a governor appointee is active or not, but this issue should be brought to the governor’s appointment office. Mr. Perry added that the best course of action would be to ask these inactive governor appointees to resign. Commissioner McDowell recommended that more than two counties should need to be present to vote on regional issues. The current requirement is four out of six counties. Commissioner Doherty added that there is a discrepancy between the bylaws and the interlocal agreement.

Mr. Lee Ford of the 21st Century Collaboration, an economic community development committee, explained that he attended the meeting because of the news of Lee County pulling out of the RPC. The Collaboration works on the redevelopment of the Martin Luther King and Dunbar community and they have used the RPC a number of times for grant services. They are currently in the process of writing a market analysis grant. They want to know what impact Lee County’s decision would have on their ability to use the RPC for those redevelopment efforts.

Mr. Perry explained that Lee County gave a 12 month notice, so there will be no impact until that 12 month period is over. He believed that something will be worked out by that time to ensure that the Council’s work continues beyond that.

At this point in the meeting a quorum was reached.

A motion was made by Commissioner Doherty to approve the May 18, 2017 minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mulhere and passed unanimously.
Ms. Wuerstle presented the April 2017 financials. She explained that the financials are strong and the Council is in a better financial position than last year at this same point in time.

A motion was made by Mr. Mulhere to approve the April 2017 financials. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tiseo and passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM #7(a)
FY15-16 Audit

Mr. Jeff Tuscan presented the FY15-16 audit report. The SWFRPC was given an “unmodified” opinion, which is the highest level of opinion that an auditor can issue. A footnote was added that two counties planned on pulling out. This will be a consideration for future audits. Commissioner Doherty announced that Charlotte County has also given a 12 month notice to pull out of the RPC.

A motion was made by Vice Mayor Denham to approve the FY15-16 Audit. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tiseo and passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM #7(b)
FY 17-18 Proposed Budget

Ms. Wuerstle presented the FY 17-18 Proposed Budget. This budget was made with the knowledge that Sarasota County and Lee County will stop providing funding during the fiscal year. Charlotte County’s withdrawal has not been accounted for.

Vice-Mayor Denham asked what the budgeted DRI revenue was. Mr. Mulhere answered that it was $35,000, but he believes that the DRI revenue was higher during this current fiscal year. Ms. Wuerstle confirmed that DRI revenue was higher than $35,000, but she wanted to be conservative with the budget. Mr. Mulhere asked if the RPC received revenue for comprehensive plan amendment reviews. Ms. Wuerstle answered that those reviews are currently covered by part of the counties’ dues. However, the Council will have to discuss whether they want to charge for the reviews of the counties that have pulled out. Vice-Mayor Denham asked about the DRI requirements for the RPC. Mr. Mulhere answered that the RPC is required to review any amendments to existing DRIs including NOPCs, which the RPC receives money for. Ms. Wuerstle added that the region has close to 200 DRIs, with 54 active DRIs in Lee County. Vice-Mayor Denham asked about the authority the RPC has regarding DRIs. Mr. Mulhere answered that the RPC can only make recommendations and the local government does not have to follow those recommendations. He added that the applicant typically responds favorably to the RPC’s recommendation. Ignoring the recommendation also puts the applicant in a more difficult situation if there is a third party challenge.

A motion was made by Mr. Mulhere to approve the FY 17-18 Proposed Budget with an additional adjustment accounting for Charlotte County’s decision to withdraw funding from the RPC. The motion also included a recommendation that staff make proposals for fees
associated with the Council’s statutory obligations for counties that pull out of the RPC. The motion was seconded by Councilman Banks and passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM #7(c)
Attorney General’s Opinion

Mr. Perry stressed the importance of being factual when discussing this topic and not bring this to the point where the RPC is fighting with its member organizations. The Attorney General’s opinion is a step that the Council needs to take to be factual when having discussion with the counties. Mr. Mulhere agreed and added that there is nothing to be gained by creating controversy. He believed the RPC still serves a vital role in the region.

A motion was made by Mr. Mulhere to seek the attorney general’s opinion. The motion was seconded for discussion by Commissioner Wilkins.

Commissioner Wilkins added that this is not an aggressive action towards the counties that chose to pull out. This is about finding out the facts. Commissioner Doherty explained that the Attorney General’s opinion is not binding and may not change Charlotte County’s decision. Charlotte County wishes to redefine the RPC in a way that would add more value to the counties. He doesn’t think seeking the Attorney General’s opinion is worth the time or money. Commissioner Pendergrass was told that the RPC has no authority to go after a county for funding. Mr. Perry explained that he has no interest in suing the members of the Council. He agreed that the Council needs to work hard during this 12 month period to resolve these issues. Mr. Mulhere explained that the RPC has been having these relevancy discussions for years, starting with the economic downturn and the loss of the State funding. Commissioner Tiseo added that the language in the interlocal agreement regarding withdrawal is very loose and vague.

Vice-Mayor Denham asked what the membership status would be for the Counties that withdrew funding. Ms. Wuerstle clarified that Charlotte County is withdrawing funding, but wishes to work with the Council to redefine the RPC’s purpose, Sarasota County will be withdrawing funding and will no longer participate/vote, and she has not heard anything on Lee County’s position. Commissioner Mann explained that the AG’s opinion will answer these questions, but Lee County has four strong votes to no longer participate or pay dues. He is in favor of receiving the AG’s opinion, since it will do no harm.

The item was called to a vote by Mr. Perry. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Wuerstle announced that the DEO grant period was now open and proposals are due next week. The RPC would be available to help with any proposals and they are already working on 6 grants. She also announced that 4 additional VISTA volunteers have been awarded (one each for the City of LaBelle and Hendry County and 2 to work region-wide on the opioid epidemic).

AGENDA ITEM #7(e)
USDA Home Repair Community Outreach Meeting Flyer

This item was for information only.
AGENDA ITEM #7(f)
FRCA April 2017 Report

This item was for information only.

AGENDA ITEM #8
STAFF SUMMARIES

AGENDA ITEM #8(a)
Grant Activity Sheet

This item was for information only.

AGENDA ITEM #9
CONSENT AGENDA

A motion was made by Mr. Mulhere to approve the consent agenda as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Doherty. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Mann noted that he voted against the Lee County amendment during the Lee County BOCC meeting. However, he will follow the County’s majority decision and vote for approval for the Council.

AGENDA ITEM #10
REGIONAL IMPACT

AGENDA ITEM #10(a)
Charlotte County Comp Plan Amendment DEO 17-2ESR

Commissioner Doherty stated that Charlotte County does not agree with the Council staff’s recommendation and the County staff was available to present their case after the Council staff.

Mr. Kammerer and Mr. Beever presented the Council staff report. Mr. Beever explained that staff found a potential problem that could allow an entity to obtain a permit and not act upon it. Density could be moved under a TDU program, even if the permitted environmental resource was not removed. Council staff met with Charlotte County and Mr. Beever drafted alternate language that was not incorporated by Charlotte County. The Council staff report recommends using the Council staff’s suggested language.

Mr. Mulhere explained that once an ERP (Environmental Resource Permit) is issued, no impacts can occur without compliance by the ERP. Mr. Beever explained that this is legally true, but functionally it is acknowledged that this is not always the case. Compliance rates can be poor with ERPs. Mr. Beever pointed out that other entities including the Nature Conservancy of SWFL had recommended denial of this amendment as well.

Ms. Claire Jubb, Community Development Director of Charlotte County, presented the Charlotte County staff report. She explained that Charlotte County has a finite number of units that can be
transferred. She added that applying the Charlotte County Comprehensive Plan in its entirety addresses the issues that Council staff brought up. She also added that Charlotte County calculates gross acreage and not net acreage. DEO and DEP found no issues with the amendments. She explained that Council staff’s proposed language would cause more harm than the County’s language. She requested that the Council vote to approve the language as provided by Charlotte County.

Commissioner Tiseo reiterated that FDEP found no issue with Charlotte County’s language. Commissioner Doherty added that the Council staff’s proposed language makes no sense and would be more harmful. Mr. Mulhere further explained the ERP mitigation process.

A motion was made by Mr. Mulhere to approve Charlotte County staff’s recommendations as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wilkins.

Commissioner Pendergrass pointed out that the meeting had lost a quorum during the presentations. No vote was made at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #11
COMMITTEE REPORTS

AGENDA ITEM #11(a)
Budget & Finance Committee

This item was presented during the director’s report.

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

No report was given at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #11(e)
Executive Committee

Mr. Perry explained that the Committee briefly met to discuss the audit and came to the same conclusion as the Council. He complimented staff on their performance.
AGENDA ITEM #11(f)
Legislative Affairs Committee

No report was given at this time.

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

No report was given at this time.

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 and Water Resources Management

Vice-Mayor Denham reported that the modified SB 10 has been approved. However, two projects of significance to the region were vetoed.

AGENDA ITEM #12
NEW BUSINESS

None

AGENDA ITEM #13
STATE AGENCIES COMMENTS/REPORTS

Mr. Walls thanked everyone for their patience on Colonial Blvd. in Lee County. He hopes to have good news on that project soon. A public hearing was to be held today.

AGENDA ITEM #10(a)
Charlotte County Comp Plan Amendment DEO 17-2ESR

The meeting regained a quorum at this time.

A motion was made by Mr. Mulhere to approve Charlotte County staff’s recommendations as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wilkins. The motion carried 14-3.
AGENDA ITEM #14
COUNCIL LEGAL CONSULTANT’S COMMENTS

No report was given at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #15
COUNCIL MEMBER’S COMMENTS

Commissioner Tiseo explained that this vote and the quorum difficulties are discouraging. Commissioner McDowell and Vice-Mayor Denham agreed.

Councilman Fraize has been told that expanding County/City staff capabilities are responsible for the lack of perceived value in the RPC.

Commissioner Wilkins explained that a brochure prepared by the RPC for LaBelle contains errors and stated that the City did not get to approve it. Mr. Wuerstle explained that Ron Zimmerly, the City's point of contact for this project Manager reviewed it.

Mr. Mulhere suggested that voting items be moved to the beginning of the agenda so they can be voted on before losing a quorum.

Mr. Perry thanked everyone for coming and stated that he will work hard in his upcoming tenure as Chairman to address the Council’s issues.

A discussion was had regarding the need for a July meeting and whether a quorum could be reached. Commissioner Doherty suggested Committee meetings be held instead if a quorum cannot be reached. Mr. Perry believed the most important step is for staff to have a discussion with the counties. No final decision was made on the July Council meeting.

AGENDA ITEM #16
ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 11:03 a.m.

Mr. Thomas Perry, Vice-Chair

The meeting was duly advertised in the June 6, 2017 issue of the FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE REGISTER, Volume 43, Number 109.
MINUTES OF THE
SOUTHWEST FLORIDA REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
JULY 20, 2017 MEETING

The meeting of the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council was held on July 20, 2017 at the
offices of the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council–1400 Colonial Boulevard, Suite #1 in
Fort Myers, Florida. Chair Burch called the meeting to order at 9:03 AM. Commissioner Mann
then led an invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Ms. Margaret Wuerstle conducted the roll
call and noted that a quorum was not present.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Charlotte County:  Commissioner Ken Doherty, Mr. Don McCormick
Collier County:  Commissioner Bill McDaniel, Mr. Bob Mulhere
Glades County:  Commissioner Donna Storter-Long,
Hendry County:  Commissioner Karson Turner, Commissioner Julie Wilkins
Lee County:  Commissioner Frank Mann, Councilman Jim Burch,
            Councilman Forrest Banks, Vice-Mayor Mick Denham,
            Councilman Greg DeWitt
Sarasota County:  Commissioner Willie Shaw, Councilman Fred Fraize
Ex-Officio:  Ms. Jennifer Carpenter–FDEP, Ms. Sarah Catala–FDOT

MEMBERS ABSENT

Charlotte County:  Commissioner Joe Tiseo, Councilwoman Lynne Matthews,
            Ms. Suzanne Graham
Collier County:  Commissioner Penny Taylor, Councilman Reg Buxton
Glades County:  Commissioner Donald Strenth, Councilwoman Pat Lucas,
            Mr. Thomas Perry
Hendry County:  Commissioner Mitchell Wills, Vice-Mayor Michael Atkinson,
            Mr. Mel Karau
Lee County:  Commissioner Cecil Pendergrass, Councilwoman Anita Cereceda,
            Councilmember Jim Wilson, Ms. Laura Holquist
Sarasota County:  Commissioner Charles Hines, Commissioner Michael Moran,
            Mr. Felipe Colón
Ex-Officio: Mr. Phil Flood–SFWMD, Ms. Tara Poulton–SWFWMD

AGENDA ITEM #4
PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comments were made at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #5
AGENDA

There were no changes made to the July 20, 2017 agenda.

AGENDA ITEM #6
UPDATES

AGENDA ITEM #6(a)
Opioid Project-VISTA Volunteers

Mr. Stoltzfus stated that the RPC is now accepting applications for the two new VISTA positions for the region-wide opioid project. Ms. Nightingale passed out a form on the value of the VISTA volunteers and added that she will be distributing news releases to the Council to keep them updated on staff activities.

Ms. Wuerstle asked that the Promise Zone communities take all of the steps necessary to fill their VISTA positions before we lose them. Commissioner Wilkins and Mr. Stoltzfus discussed the progress and next steps for the City of LaBelle and Hendry County Economic Development Council to fill their VISTA positions. Commissioner McDaniel added that he will assist Council staff in getting Collier County to provide the Council with what they need.

Chair Burch stated that he believed there was a concerted effort to eliminate organizations like the RPCs and eliminate home rule for the cities. He also added that the opioid issue is absolutely relevant and we are losing an entire generation to the opioid epidemic. This is a topic that is more appropriate for the RPC to handle than the local governments due to the regional nature of the threat. Commissioner McDaniel believed that its three generations that have been lost to opioids.

AGENDA ITEM #6(b)
CEDS Schedule

Ms. Wuerstle announced that the 2017 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) update will go before the CEDS Committee next week for approval before it goes out for public comment. The RPC is the region’s federally designated Economic Development District. After the 30 day public comment period, it will be brought to the Council in September. Chair Burch asked that the Council be alerted when that 30 day period begins. Ms. Wuerstle added that it is important that the Council members check the vital projects list and make sure that it is accurate for their community.
AGENDA ITEM #6(c)
New Grants Submitted

Mr. Stoltzfus announced that five DEO grants were submitted in June. These were for Phase 2 of the MLK Corridor Plan, printing of the LaBelle Farm Tour Brochure, Economic Valuation of the CHNEP Coastal Counties, Promise Zone Broadband Study, and Regional Strategy for Agricultural Sustainability.

He also announced that the Florida Job Growth Grant Fund was recently announced. $85 million are available statewide for infrastructure and workforce training. Commissioner Wilkins asked for more clarification on the types of projects that will be funded. Mr. Stoltzfus answered that almost all of the projects funded are infrastructure and they prefer shovel-ready projects.

AGENDA ITEM #6(d)
Regional Transportation Map

Mr. Walker presented the latest version of the Regional Transportation Map that he created using FDOT data. He went through all of the various data layers that he has compiled for the map. Commissioner Wilkins noted that the Enterprise Zones should not be on the map as they expired at the end of 2016. Mr. Walker explained that this interactive map is not on the RPC’s website yet. He stated that he is working on adding it to the website and creating interactive pdfs. Chair Burch added that part of the value of the map is that the local governments will be able to add to it. This will be a strong marketing tool for the region.

Mr. Walker showed a layer that demonstrated a unified Future Land Use Map for the entire region. Mr. Mulhere asked about hurricane evacuation routes and funded transportation improvements. Mr. Walker answered that he has the hurricane evacuation data. Ms. Catala added that the transportation improvement data could come from FDOT or the MPOs. Commissioner Doherty believed that this is a great database and it can help prioritize project funding.

Commissioner Doherty and Chair Burch emphasized the importance of the regional nature of this map and database. Commissioner McDaniel applauded Council staff for their efforts. He wanted to see the map distributed to the county and municipality staffs for comments and agreed that the planned transportation improvements data would add even more value.

Councilman Banks asked if the Charlotte County Airport is still the designated disaster airport for the region. He also recommended that the interactive map be brought to the State representatives to show the value of the RPC. Chair Burch stressed the importance of keeping the data repository in one spot to keep the data up to date and consistent throughout the region. Ms. Carpenter added that FDEP has data on approved disaster debris management sites that may be useful to add to the map. Mr. Mulhere asked that the Council be made aware when the map becomes available online. Commissioner Wilkins stated that Mr. Walker did an excellent job and asked what the intermodal hubs layer consists of. Mr. Walker explained that the intermodal hub category consists of marinas, airports, and bus terminals.

Councilman Fraize asked if shelters could be included. Mr. Walker added that he and Mr. Kammerer are currently updating the Statewide Regional Evacuation Study Program (SRESP) which updates evacuation clearance times. That data will become available soon and include
evacuation routes and shelters. Mr. Mulhere explained that the hurricane evacuation process has changed in recent years.

**AGENDA ITEM #6(e)**  
**Climate Change Adaptation Plans**

Mr. Beever gave a presentation on two climate change adaptation plans he created for the City of Cape Coral and the Pelican Cove Community in Sarasota County. Mr. Beever specified that these studies were not funded by local assessments and he can find funding to do a study for any willing local government in the region. These plans also had a high level of public involvement. Mr. Beever showcased the effects that filter floating marsh floating islands can have on water quality and Commissioner McDaniel noted that these have worked to great effect in Naples.

Commissioner McDaniel asked how measurable and milestones are put in place for these plans. Mr. Beever outlined the measurables for the Punta Gorda adaptation plan. Commissioner McDaniel asked for the cost of one of these plans? Mr. Beever answered that his plans have cost between $20,000 and $50,000. Commissioner McDaniel explained that Collier County has been asked to hire Harvard graduates to study sea level rise, which would be a $300,000 expense. Commissioner Wilkins explained that the water quality and restoration elements of the plan are more relevant to Hendry County than climate change. She suggested that the RPC use water quality and restoration to sell this service rather than climate change. Mr. Beever added that he would also look at drought planning, hydrology balance, river quality, and Lake Shoreline in Hendry County. Chair Burch stated that climate change does exist and the RPC has been a leader in climate change planning. Mr. McCormick added that the City of Punta Gorda along with the Nature Conservancy of Southwest Florida have implemented biodegradable reef balls.

**AGENDA ITEM #7**  
**NEW BUSINESS**

**AGENDA ITEMS #7(a) and 7(b)**  
**Yelp System and Knox Box for Fire Departments**

Councilman Fraize asked what system the other counties use for fire departments entering gated communities. Commissioner McDaniel stated that Collier Counties leaves that decision to the individual fire departments. Councilman Fraize explained that this became an issue when the City of Venice had to cover for Charlotte County. Councilman DeWitt is the assistant chief of the Bonita Springs Fire Department and explained that Lee County uses the EVAC system. This system allows access for every fire department to any community and station in the county. The Council asked staff to survey each community and determine what system each is using.

**AGENDA ITEM #8**  
**DISCUSSION OF THE RELEVANCY AND FUTURE OF THE SWFRPC**

Chair Burch stated that this is a conversation that the Council has had several times over the years and the Council will not give up in its efforts to continue its existence. Ms. Wuerstle asked if the Council would like to hold a workshop to determine a future direction for the RPC. She also handed out a form for the Councilmembers to indicate which areas of work the Council should
focus on. Commissioner McDaniel asked how much longer the Council can sustain itself financially. Ms. Wuerstle predicted that the Council could survive through September 30, 2018. Commissioner McDaniel asked if that includes the possibility that Collier County could withdraw funding. Ms. Wuerstle will make those changes to the budget when official action is taken by Collier County.

Mr. Mulhere believes it would be a waste of resources to hold a workshop. A better alternative would be to meet with the Counties individually to see if the Council could make any changes to receive support. Commissioner McDaniel stressed the importance of the Promise Zone at the Collier County BOCC meeting. Commissioner Doherty suggested that Ms. Wuerstle meet individually with each County Manager/Administrator and one County Commissioner to discuss what changes they would like to see made by the RPC. He reiterated that Charlotte County wants to salvage the RPC, but changes need to be made. Chair Burch agreed that a workshop would not be an efficient way to address this issue and advised Ms. Wuerstle to follow Mr. Mulhere and Commissioner Doherty’s suggestions. Mr. McCormick stated that the RPC is still required by State Statutes and he does not believe that the Council has been effectively communicating with State Legislators. He further questioned where the counties and municipalities would get together with FDEP, FDOT and the WMDs and discuss important regional issues if the RPC were to go away.

Ms. Wuerstle announced that Hendry County had voted to stay in the RPC for the next year and the City of Bonita Springs intends to stay in the RPC. The Council is still awaiting the Attorney General’s opinion of Sarasota County’s decision to pull out. FRCA has stated that they may take up the declaratory judgment issue for all of the RPCs. Commissioner Turner believed that Hendry County would not have voted to stay in had he not spoken up at the meeting. He believes the Council should do everything they can to avoid litigation. Commissioner Doherty listed Home Rule issues, the National Flood Insurance Program, and Homestead as important issues for the Council to discuss rather than comprehensive plan amendments and DRI’s. Commissioner Wilkins sees communication as an issue. She does not know everything that the staff is doing.

Commissioner Mann believes that the Lee County Manager will not be swayed by a meeting given the 4-1 vote by the County Commission to leave the RPC. He still believes there is a role for a region entity for water quality and quantity and transportation, but that will be defined by the Florida Legislature. Ms. Wuerstle asked about Lee County’s plan for the State requirements once they pull out of the RPC. Commissioner Mann answered that the County does not care right now. Commissioner Mann called for more input from the State level on this issue. Commissioner Shaw agreed that this needs to be discussed at the State level.

Ms. Wuerstle reported that FRCA would like the SWFRPC to drop out of FRCA to avoid the negative publicity affecting the other RPCs. They have told the Association of Counties and League of Cities that this is a SWFRPC problem only. She stated that she was concerned that FRCA has a plan to divide up the SWF counties if the SWFRPC drops out of FRCA.

Vice-Mayor Denham asked if a conversation needs to happen between the municipalities and the counties about how they would communicate without the RPC. That conversation should not begin with the word “RPC”, but focus on communication between counties and cities.
AGENDA ITEM #9
STATE AGENCIES COMMENTS/REPORTS

Ms. Carpenter announced that FDEP has a new Secretary, Noah Valenstein, who believes in the importance of relationships with local governments. She asks that the local governments feel free to reach out to her or Mr. Iglehart with any concerns on issues so that they can be addressed collaboratively with FDEP.

Ms. Catala announced that FDOT also has a new Secretary, Michael Dew. Chris Smith, the Director of Transportation Development at District 1 has retired. He has been replaced by John Kubler. FDOT’s Unfunded Needs Plan has recently been adopted and she will be giving presentations on that plan soon. Updates to the Cost Feasible Plan will begin in August. The SIS Policy Plan is also undergoing updates.

Mr. Jim Kelter with FWC announced that they are having stakeholder meetings regarding burrowing owls and the new rules and regulations will be out in December.

AGENDA ITEM #10
COUNCIL LEGAL CONSULTANT’S COMMENTS

Ms. Nightingale explained that she had a discussion with the Executive Director of another RPC regarding the quorum requirements and they are considering repealing the bylaws to the extent that they are not required by State Law to give the Council more power to make changes internally. She has gone through the formal process of notifying the State of Florida of this intent. Commissioner Doherty added that the interlocal agreement grants more flexibility regarding to the quorum than the bylaws.

AGENDA ITEM #11
COUNCIL MEMBER’S COMMENTS

Commissioner Wilkins asked about the status of the August meeting. Chair Burch stated that the August meeting will be cancelled.

AGENDA ITEM #12
ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 11:25 a.m.

Mr. Thomas Perry, Vice-Chair

The meeting was duly advertised in the July 6, 2017 issue of the FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE REGISTER, Volume 43, Number 130.
Minutes by: C.J. Kammerer, SWFRPC

MINUTES OF THE
SOUTHWEST FLORIDA REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
OCTOBER 19, 2017 MEETING

The meeting of the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council was held on October 19, 2017 at the offices of the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council–1400 Colonial Boulevard, Suite #1 in Fort Myers, Florida. Chair Burch called the meeting to order at 9:08 AM. Commissioner Shaw then led an invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Ms. Nicole Gwinnett conducted the roll call and noted that a quorum was present.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Charlotte County: Commissioner Ken Doherty, Commissioner Joe Tiseo, Mr. Don McCormick

Collier County: Commissioner Bill McDaniel, Mr. Bob Mulhere

Glades County: Commissioner Donna Storter-Long, Mr. Thomas Perry

Hendry County: Commissioner Julie Wilkins, Mr. Mel Karau

Lee County: Commissioner Frank Mann, Commissioner Cecil Pendergrass, Councilman Jim Burch, Councilman Forrest Banks, Councilman Greg DeWitt

Sarasota County: Commissioner Charles Hines, Commissioner Michael Moran, Commissioner Willie Shaw, Councilman Fred Fraize

Ex-Officio: Ms. Sarah Catala–FDOT

MEMBERS ABSENT

Charlotte County: Councilwoman Lynne Matthews, Ms. Suzanne Graham

Collier County: Commissioner Penny Taylor, Councilman Reg Buxton

Glades County: Commissioner Donald Strenth, Councilwoman Pat Lucas,

Hendry County: Commissioner Karson Turner, Commissioner Mitchell Wills, Vice-Mayor Michael Atkinson,

Lee County: Vice-Mayor Mick Denham, Councilwoman Anita Cereceda, Ms. Laura Holquist

Sarasota County: Mr. Felipe Colón
AGENDA ITEM #4
PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comments were made at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #5
AGENDA

There were no changes made to the October 19, 2017 agenda.

AGENDA ITEM #7
REGIONAL IMPACT

AGENDA ITEMS #7(a)
Palmer Ranch Increment XXVI Staff Assessment

Mr. Dan Trescott presented the item.

A motion was made by Mr. Mulhere to approve the Palmer Ranch Increment XXVI Staff Assessment as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Shaw and passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM #8
CONSENT AGENDA

A motion was made by Mr. Mulhere to approve the consent agenda as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Perry and passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM #9
DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Ms. Wuerstle presented the Director’s Report.

AGENDA ITEM #10(a)
Budget and Finance Committee

Ms. Wuerstle presented the financials for May-August 2017. The August financials show a net income of approximately $121,000. She anticipates closing FY17 (ending September 30) with a net income of approximately $20,000.

A motion was made by Mr. Perry to approve the May-August 2017 financials as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McDaniel and passed unanimously.
Ms. Wuerstle also explained that the FY18 budget was approved with a $350,000 deficit. Council staff has received additional revenues through grants and contracts and that gap is now roughly $116,000 with other grants still to come. Chair Burch commended Ms. Wuerstle and the RPC staff for all of their hard work in closing the gap.

**AGENDA ITEM #8(a)**

**2017-2022 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS)**

Ms. Wuerstle presented the 2017-2022 CEDS for further discussion. She requested that the item be amended to incorporate four Charlotte County projects that were not able to be added by the time the Council packet was finalized.

A motion was made by Councilman Banks to approve the 2017-2022 CEDS with the Charlotte County projects amendment. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mulhere and passed unanimously.

**AGENDA ITEM #9(a) & 9(b)**

**Quorum Requirement Resolution and Bylaw Repeal Resolution**

Ms. Nightingale presented the two proposed resolutions. The Bylaw Repeal Resolution repealed portions of the SWFRPC bylaws that are not required by law. She added that half of the RPCs have taken this approach with their bylaws. This action would help solve some of the inconsistencies with the interlocal agreement. The Quorum Requirement Resolution would reduce the quorum requirement from a majority of members to one-third of members. It would also only require that two counties be present to have a quorum. Ms. Nightingale added that about half of the State’s RPCs require less than a majority for a quorum.

Commissioner Doherty asked if the resolution passed yesterday by the Lee County BOCC was distributed to the Council. Several of the Council members have seen it. However Ms. Wuerstle and the RPC staff had not seen it. Commissioner Doherty asked that this resolution be considered in the matter and asked Charlotte County to consider drafting a similar resolution. He also raised concerns about if the Council would be following the interlocal agreement requirements regarding these proposed resolutions. He encouraged the Council not to adopt these resolutions until these legal issues were resolved.

Commissioner Moran asked if the purpose of these resolutions was to deal with the quorum difficulties or to hinder the counties ability to withdraw from the RPC. Ms. Wuerstle explained that the intention was to simply reduce the quorum requirements to more easily attain a quorum in future meetings. The bylaws are not required to be in the State Administrative Code and removing them from the Administrative Code would give the RPC more flexibility in the future. Most of the RPCs have already done this. Chair Burch explained that the difficulty with a quorum is a by-product of being a regional entity as well as having certain governor appointees who never participate, but still count against the quorum. Mr. Mulhere stated that there are three governor appointees who have not attended a meeting in years. Most boards he has been on would remove members who do not participate over a certain period of time. Ms. Nightingale stated that these resolutions have nothing to do with limiting the counties’ ability to withdraw from the RPC. Commissioner Hines added that he supports Commissioners Doherty and he believed that the
proposed amendments will attack the counties’ ability to withdraw. Ms. Nightingale reiterated that this action is simply to help the Council reach a quorum and conduct business.

Commissioner Storter-Long suggested amending the quorum requirements to allow alternates such as planning directors or county managers. The requirements currently allow for other elected officials to be designated as alternates.

Commissioner Pendergrass added that he shares the concerns about these resolutions and believed that making these changes would discourage people from participating in the decision making process. He encouraged having members appoint alternates to alleviate the quorum difficulty. Commissioner Tiseo pointed out the specific change being proposed that might create the unintended difficulties that are being objected to. He suggested that the Council gain a full understanding of these consequences before voting to approve the resolutions.

A motion was made by Commissioner McDaniel to deny the two resolutions as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Pendergrass for discussion.

Mr. Perry suggested that staff look at these unintended consequences and bring the issue back in a future meeting. Councilman Banks supported the motion and added that the counties that voted to pull out need to continue attending for the Council to reach a quorum. Commissioner Hines responded by saying that the Sarasota County Commissioners are on the phone today. He explained that the reason Sarasota has not participated is that the Council agenda includes items that Sarasota County believes are beyond the RPCs statutory requirements. They are supportive of DRI reviews and amendments, but don’t think the County should participate in other issues, such as hurricane recovery.

The Council voted 9-5 in favor of the motion to deny the resolutions. However, the Council lost a quorum during the discussion. The motion did not pass.

Ms. Wuerstle announced that Chair Burch and Councilman Banks will be leaving the Council next month as they have not chosen to run for reelection. Mr. Perry will then become that new Chair and Commissioner Shaw will become the Vice-Chair. Chair Burch appointed Commissioner Doherty, Councilman Fraize, Councilman DeWitt, and Mr. McCormick to serve as the nominating committee for the Secretary and Treasurer positions.

AGENDA ITEM #9(c)
Economic Recovery Briefing Meeting

Ms. Wuerstle announced that there will be an Economic Recovery Briefing on November 1 at FGCU. She also added that she has coordinated calls between local governments with FEMA and the Army Corps of Engineers.

AGENDA ITEM #9(e)
SWFRPC Return on Investment

Ms. Wuerstle presented a return on investment spreadsheet that RPC staff calculated for the past 5 years. It included all grants, contracts, and DRIIs for each County. Every County in the region has a
positive ROI. Councilman Banks added that the City of Fort Myers received a $350,000 grant for police training that they would not have known about if it were not for Commissioner Shaw bringing the City of Sarasota PD to an RPC meeting. He adds that the City is way ahead on their investment in the RPC. Chair Burch stressed the value of these regional discussions and applauded RPC staff on their efforts in raising this money.

Ms. Wuerstle added that EDA has reached out to the RPC to ask them to write a grant for a Disaster Recovery Coordinator to work out of the RPC for $250,000 for the next 2 years. The Council also completed a FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation application for the City of Bonita Springs for $3.1 million for flooding. The City of Bonita Springs has also contracted the RPC for $50,000 to study their overall flooding issues.

AGENDA ITEM #9(6)
LEPC Presentation

Ms. Wuerstle introduced Cape Coral Fire Battalion Chief Matt Marshall to present on the Southwest Florida Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC). Battalion Chief Marshall explained that the LEPC is federally mandated and meets quarterly. He explained that it is highly likely that everyone in the room lives within one mile of a hazardous materials site. The LEPC is funded through the state HMEP grant for roughly $100,000 per year which includes funding for trainings for first responders. This grant is ultimately paid for by the hazardous materials transportation industry. RPC staff member, Nicole Gwinnett, in charge of this grant and making sure the funds are efficiently spent. He stressed that the RPC is a major player in training emergency responders in how to deal with hazardous materials. The LEPC also created a hazardous materials guideline. He clarified that the RPC receives this grant by State Statute and the region would not receive the money without the RPC.

AGENDA ITEM #6
MINUTES OF THE JUNE 15 AND JULY 20, 2017 MEETINGS

The Council has lost its quorum and was unable to vote on the minutes. They will be added to the next meeting agenda.

AGENDA ITEM #10
COMMITTEE REPORTS

AGENDA ITEM #10(a)
Budget & Finance Committee

The May-August 2017 financial were presented and approved during the Director’s Report.
AGENDA ITEM #10(b)
Economic Development Committee

No report was given at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #10(c)
Energy & Climate Committee

No report was given at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #10(d)
Estero Bay Agency on Bay Management (EBABM) Committee

No report was given at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #10(e)
Executive Committee

No report was given at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #10(f)
Legislative Affairs Committee

Ms. Wuerstle announced that FRCA sent her an un-submitted bill that would eliminate all State involvement in DRIIs and NOPCs. Mr. Trescott believed that the AMDAs would remain intact and the RPC will retain a role in incremental applications for Palmer Ranch and Babcock Ranch.

Commissioner McDaniel stated that the Council was ineffective in elevating Babcock Ranch’s effects on Lee County other than raising these issues with FDOT. Mr. Trescott responded by explaining that FDOT is still working with Lee County to review the cumulative traffic impacts and RPC encouraged this.

AGENDA ITEM #10(g)
Quality of Life & Safety Committee

No report was given at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #10(h)
Regional Transportation Committee

No report was given at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #10(i)
Interlocal Agreement/Future of the SWFRPC Committee

No report was given at this time.
AGENDA ITEM #10(j)
Water Quality and Water Resources Management

No report was given at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #11
NEW BUSINESS

Commissioner McDaniel asked for an update on the Promise Zone with Mr. Stoltzfus leaving the RPC. Ms. Wuerstle explained that the Promise Zone responsibilities have been split between herself, Ms. Gwinnett, and Mr. Kammerer. They are getting back on track after recovering from losing the Promise Zone Coordinators and recovering from the hurricane. Task force meetings were held earlier in the week and the decision was made to move these meetings to a quarterly basis. Commissioner McDaniel asked that the Promise Zone be made a recurring agenda item and expressed concern over having quarterly meetings as opposed to monthly meetings.

Commissioner McDaniel also recommended that the Regional Transportation Map be made a regular monthly agenda item as well. Mr. Tim Walker gave an interactive update on the transportation map. He added that he has added several of the layers that the Council suggested during the last update. He has also created a draft of the map that is live and available on the ArcGIS website. He is still working on adding more to the map, including the Future Land Use Map. Commissioners McDaniel and Wilkins complemented Mr. Walker on his outstanding work. Councilman Banks added that these maps may have the best chance at saving the RPC.

Mr. McCormick explained the RPC’s role in reducing the hazard of the SR 80 and SR 27 intersection. The SR 31 and SR 74 intersection is now facing a similar issue just north of Babcock Ranch. He asked that the Council advocate FDOT to address this. Commissioner McDaniel stated that he believed that FDOT has done an admirable job in the past few years with that intersection. Mr. Trescott agreed to bring the issue up with FDOT.

AGENDA ITEM #12
STATE AGENCIES COMMENTS/REPORTS

No representatives from the State Agencies were present.

AGENDA ITEM #13
COUNCIL LEGAL CONSULTANT’S COMMENTS

Ms. Nightingale stressed that at some point the issues with the bylaws needed to be addressed. If the bylaws were repealed, new internal policies would need to be put in place. It was never the intent of the RPC to remove the power of the Counties to withdraw. Chair Burch stressed the Counties and Cities to appoint alternated to the RPC. Ms. Nightingale added that the inconsistencies with the bylaws go back many years and other RPCs have taken the actions that were suggested today. Commissioner Wilkins suggested making the resolution a “repeal and replace” document. Commissioner McDaniel clarified that he had no ill will when making his
motion. He was only attempting to ensure no unintended impacts were created by passing the resolution.

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

Mr. Mulhere, Commissioner Pendergrass, Mr. Perry, Commissioner Shaw, Mr. McCormick, Commissioner Wilkins, Commissioner McDaniel, and Commissioner Storter-Long all thanked Chair Burch and Councilman Banks for all of their work with the RPC and their respective Cities over the years.

Commissioner Wilkins raised permanent housing as a major issue post-Irma. She referenced a housing program used in Hurricane Katrina aid that would be helpful.

Commissioner McDaniel explained that Habitat for Humanity can be used as a lender for Irma recovery.

Chair Burch thanked the RPC for setting up the Irma recovery call with FEMA and the US Army Corp of Engineers. He recommended that the RPC be used as a resource for disaster recovery.

Councilman Banks explained the great value in gathering elected officials, state representatives, and governor’s appointees from around the region to discuss major issues. He expressed disappointment in the Counties withdrawing and thinks the members get more than their money’s worth. He is going to fill out an application to become a governor’s appointee on the Council.

Chair Burch concurs with Councilman Banks on the value of the Council. He thanked that staff and empathized with their situation. He added that the region needs regional planning now more than ever given the growth that the region will be experiencing in the near future.

**AGENDA ITEM #15**
**ADJOURNMENT**

The next meeting will be on November 16. The meeting adjourned at 10:55 a.m.

____________________________________________
Mr. Thomas Perry, Vice-Chair

The meeting was duly advertised in the October 5, 2017 issue of the FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE REGISTER, Volume 43, Number 193.
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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.
The Palmer Ranch Increment XXVII DRI proposes a 149-unit planned residential development in 25 buildings on 39.0± acre area identified by Parcel B9 with a gross density of 3.8 units per acre. This increment also includes 82.0+ acre Parcel B10, containing the County-owned Culverhouse Nature Park. No changes or development is proposed on this parcel.

A total of 121.2 ± acres in the two parcels are to be added to the Palmer Ranch Master Development Order (see Attachment I, Site Location Map).

The residential development includes an amenity center (0.5 acres), lakes, and preservation/restoration areas (20 acres open space). Total open space provided within Parcel B9 will be approximately 51% (See Attachment II and III, Development Plans). Including the already preserved wetland and buffer areas within the Nature Park, the open space for the total increment is 83%.
• Residential construction to commence in 2018 with build-out expected within 2023, subject to market conditions.

• This Increment is currently undeveloped and has been used for grazing cattle (see Attachment IV Aerial).

**IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR INCREMENT XXVII**

**Land Use**

• The planned multi-family residential development on Parcel B9 is consistent with the Sarasota County Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map, which designates this parcel as Moderate Density Residential. Future Land Use Policy 1.2.14 permits Medium and High Density Residential development “... within Developments of Regional Impact, where such residential development may be approved as part of a Planned District (PD), and where such residential development may be approved as part of a Planned Unit Development (PUD), in accordance with the Sarasota County Zoning Regulations.”
Native Habitat Protection/Vegetation and Wildlife

• Native and preserved habitats on the subject parcel includes 9.6 acres of preserved wetlands in the central and southern portion of the property; their respective 30-ft upland buffers surrounding each wetland and 0.5 acres of woodland pasture containing many Sarasota County Grand Trees. A mitigation area (0.6 acres) for the project will occur along the southern portion of the property connecting to and expanding the existing preservation area (Attachment V, Map F-2).

• A portion of the DRI Wildlife Corridor Plan is located on Parcel B10, the County-owned and managed Culverhouse Nature Park.

• The wetland mitigation proposed will be a combination of wetland creation and enhancement of preserved wetlands with reduce habitat values.

• No listed plant species, significant plant community or listed species nesting sites are present within the project site.
• It is anticipated that wetland-dependent species, such as listed wading birds and American alligators, will benefit from habitat enhancement and management to occur in post-development wetlands.

• It is likely that gopher tortoises are on the site and if necessary relocation of gopher tortoises, commensals would be addressed and provided for in the existing FWC permit for Palmer Ranch.

**Water Quality and Drainage**

• This increment lies within the Catfish Creek Basin of the Little Sarasota watershed. Surface Water Management is proposed by treating the developable portions of Parcel B9 in stormwater ponds located at strategic locations.

• Sarasota County Land Development and Zoning regulations and the Palmer Ranch Master Development Order will be adhered to in management of all facilities, including stormwater, preserved wetlands and conservation areas.
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 impacts of Parcel B9 were accounted for in the Palmer Ranch 2015 MDO Traffic Analysis, approved in July 2016. As part of the 2015 MDO Traffic Analysis, 110 single-family dwelling units were assigned to Parcel B9. However, 149 dwelling units are proposed on Parcel B9, 39 dwelling units greater than what was assumed in the MDO Analysis.

- The 39 additional dwelling units results in a net increase of 15 AM peak-hour trips and 18 PM peak-hour trips.

- The analysis demonstrated that Sawyer Loop Road will continue operating within Sarasota County’s adopted level-of-service standards and no off-site transportation improvements are required as part of this project.
Urban Services

• This development can be served by existing urban services and facilities including water, sewer, solid waste, police, fire, and health care required to be addressed under this Increment.

• Development is required to connect to Sarasota County Public Utilities water, wastewater and reclaimed water systems in accordance with current County rules and regulations.

• The development is responsible for providing all on-site and off-site infrastructure that will be needed to serve the project.

RECOMMENDED INCREMENT XXVII DEVELOPMENT ORDER CONDITIONS

A. GENERAL

1. The Palmer Ranch Increment XXVII 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 XXVII 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 Applicant is also subject by local ordinances to impact fees or exactions to meet the same needs. The local government and the Applicant may enter into a capital contribution front-ending agreement to reimburse the Applicant 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 August 2, 2017, and attached hereto as Exhibit C (Attachment II). This does not imply or confer any deviations from applicable zoning or land development regulations.

C. **NATIVE HABITAT PROTECTION/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 Exhibit D (Attachment V). 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. A resource management plan that maintains the functions and values of the on-site preservation areas and is consistent with the Guiding Principles of the Comprehensive Plan and the Environmental Technical Manual shall be submitted to Environmental Protection Division with preliminary or site and development plans.

D. WATER QUALITY AND DRAINAGE

1. The Master Surface Water Management Plan shall be consistent with the Catfish Creek (Little Sarasota Bay Watershed) Basin Master Plan.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** The staff of the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council recommends Conditional Approval for the Palmer Ranch Increment XXVII DRI to be further conditioned on a finding of Consistency with the Local Government Comprehensive Plan by the Sarasota County Board of County Commissioners.
On December 7, 2017, a Pre-Application meeting was held for the proposed Palmer Ranch Increment 28 DRI Application for Incremental Development Approval.

The project is a proposed single-family development on the south 281.53± acres of the Palmer Ranch Parcel 660 parcel, located south of SR 681 and west of Honore Avenue (see Attachment I).

The contract purchaser, DiVosta Homes intends to develop the southern 289.4± acres of the Palmer Ranch Parcel 660 as a planned residential development consisting of 500 single-family homes, an amenity center and access to the Legacy Trail (see Attachment II).

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.
Agenda
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DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT
FOR PALMER RANCH INCREMENT XXVII

BACKGROUND

The Palmer Ranch Master Development of Regional Impact (DRI) is an approved 7,002-acre master planned development generally located west of I-75, south of Clark Road, east of US 41, and north of Bay Street in Sarasota County. Sarasota County originally approved the Palmer Ranch DRI on December 18, 1984 (Resolution No. 84-418) and amended and restated the DRI under Resolution No. 91-170, and again under Ordinance No. 2015-010. The Palmer Ranch DRI is approved for 1,450,000 square feet of commercial/office uses, 550,000 square feet of industrial uses (Palmer Park of Commerce), and 14,200 residential units. The Application for Master Development Order (AMDO) review process requires that Applications for Incremental Development Approval (AIDA) be submitted to approve specific land uses. To date 643,178 square feet of commercial, 164,002 square feet of industrial, and 13,379 residential dwelling units will be approved for construction in 26 Increments (see Attachment I).

The applicant, D.R. Horton for Increment XXVII is proposing a 149-unit planned residential development on 39.0± acre area identified by Parcel B9 with a gross density of 3.8 units per acre. This increment also includes 82.0 ± acre Parcel B10, containing the County-owned Culverhouse Nature Park. The properties are located south of Sawyer Loop Road and east of the Seminole Gulf Railway right-of-way (see Attachment I). The residential development includes an amenity center, lakes, and preservation/restoration areas. Total open space provided within Parcel B9 will be approximately 51% (See Attachment II and III, Development Plans).

Parcel B9 is currently undeveloped and has been used for grazing cattle (see Attachment IV Aerial and Attachment V Native Habitat Preservation Alteration & Mitigation Plan). The planned multi-family residential development on Parcel B9 is consistent with the Sarasota County Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map. The development can be served by existing urban services and facilities including water, sewer, solid waste, police, fire, and health care. Residential construction to commence in 2018 with build-out expected within 2021, subject to market conditions.

IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The Council staff usually provides a detailed assessment of all the regional and local issues within Appendix I and II of a DRI Assessment 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 XXVII 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 XXVII but to reference within the Increment XXVII 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 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 XXVII 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**

Increment XVII proposing a 149-unit planned residential development in 25 buildings on 39.0± acre area identified by Parcel B9 with a gross density of 3.8 units per acre. This increment also includes 82.0 + acre Parcel B10, containing the County-owned Culverhouse Nature Park. No changes or development is proposed on this parcel. The properties are located south of Sawyer Loop Road and east of the Seminole Gulf Railway right-of-way (see Attachment I). The residential development includes an amenity center (0.5 acres), lakes, and preservation/restoration areas (20 acres open space). Total open space provided within Parcel B9 will be approximately 51% (See Attachment II and III, Development Plans). Including the already preserved wetland and buffer areas within the Nature Park, the open space for the total increment is 83%.

**Land Use**

The planned multi-family residential development on Parcel B9 is consistent with the Sarasota County Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map, which designates this parcel as Moderate Density Residential. Future Land Use Policy 1.2.14 permits Medium and High Density Residential development “… within Developments of Regional Impact, where such residential development may be approved as part of a Planned District (PD), and where such residential development may be approved as part of a Planned Unit Development (PUD), in accordance with the Sarasota County Zoning Regulations.”
Native Habitat Protection/Vegetation and Wildlife

A primary principle of the environmental design and permitting of the Palmer Ranch DRI has been the creation of environmental/habitat corridors throughout the project to aggregate and maximize ecological functions and habitat values of preserved natural systems. A portion of the DRI Wildlife Corridor Plan located in Increment XXVII occurs on Parcel B10, the County-owned and managed Culverhouse Nature Park. A Resource Management Plan (RMP) for Palmer Ranch Increment XXVII as to Parcel B9 was prepared to address the long-term protection of native habitats consistent with Sarasota County requirements outlined in Section D of the Environmental Technical Manual and consistent with previous plans prepared for earlier increments on Palmer Ranch. Native and preserved habitats on the subject parcel includes 9.6 acres of preserved wetlands in the central and southern portion of the property; their respective 30-ft upland buffers surrounding each wetland and 0.5 acres of woodland pasture containing many Sarasota County Grand Trees. A mitigation area (0.6 acres) for the project will occur along the southern portion of the property connecting to and expanding the existing preservation area (Attachment V, Map F-2).

Proposed impacts to Wetlands 14, and 15 total 0.11 acres on Parcel B9. The impacts on low quality wetland areas are due to the entrance roadway to the site and the secondary emergency access point. The wetland mitigation proposed will be a combination of wetland enhancement and creation. The applicant proposes to fill ditches connecting the wetland during development, thereby restoring hydroperiods to reflect historic conditions more closely. Such restoration should quickly restore vegetative patterns to these areas and reduce competition from invasive non-native species, such as tropical soda apple (Solanum viarum). Also proposed is to directly reduce invasive nuisance vegetation within preserved wetlands and wetland buffers using targeted herbicides and hand clearing. No mesic hammock areas have been identified as existing on Parcel B9. The final acreage and configuration of each alteration area may be modified because of the regulatory agency review and approval during the permitting process.

No listed plant species or significant plant community is present within the project site. Also, no listed species nesting sites were found. It is anticipated that wetland-dependent species, such as listed wading birds and American alligators, will benefit from habitat enhancement and management to occur in post-development wetlands. It is likely that a few gopher tortoises are on the site and if necessary relocation of gopher tortoises or commensals would be addressed and provided for in the existing FWC permit for Palmer Ranch.

Water Quality and Stormwater

This increment lies within the Catfish Creek Basin of the Little Sarasota watershed. Surface Water Management is proposed by treating the developed portions of Parcel B9 in stormwater ponds located at strategic locations. Attenuation of the runoff will be achieved within the same pond system using control structures. Existing drainage patterns through the site and final point of discharge will be maintained in the proposed condition. Sarasota County Land Development and Zoning regulations and the Palmer Ranch Master Development Order will be adhered to in management of all facilities, including stormwater, preserved wetlands and conservation areas. Sarasota County during the Construction Plan review process may require additional information and modification.

Transportation

Transportation impacts on Palmer Ranch are analyzed on a Ranch-wide basis every five-year consistent with the MDO and 2015 Transportation Reanalysis reflecting the current transportation
The purpose of this study is to assess system-wide impacts created by the Palmer Ranch Development and to establish the timing of the construction of certain County thoroughfares identified in the MDO through Palmer Ranch.

The impacts of Parcel B9 were accounted for in the Palmer Ranch 2015 MDO Traffic Analysis, approved in July 2016. As part of the 2015 MDO Traffic Analysis, 110 single-family dwelling units were assigned to Parcel B9. However, 149 dwelling units are proposed on Parcel B9, 39 dwelling units greater than what was assumed in the MDO Analysis. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), Trip Generation Manual – the 9th Edition (2012) Land Use 230 (Residential Condominium/ Townhouse) was used to estimate the AM and PM peak hour trip generation potential. The 39 additional dwelling units results in a net increase of 15 AM peak-hour trips and 18 PM peak-hour trips.

An analysis of the entire 149-unit development was conducted to ensure that there are no adverse impacts from the proposed development. The analysis demonstrated that Sawyer Loop Road will continue operating within Sarasota County’s adopted level-of-service standards and no off-site transportation improvements are required as part of this project. As part of the development one full access point and one emergency access will be constructed onto Sawyer Loop Road. Both the permanent and emergency access connections are in compliance with the Sarasota County Access Management Technical Manual. Per Resolution No. 89-98.

**Urban Services**

This development can be served by existing urban services and facilities including water, sewer, solid waste, police, fire, and health care required to be addressed under this Increment. Specific provisions for service are approved under their respective sections of the AIDA and subsequent permitting, as required. Development is required to connect to Sarasota County Public Utilities water, wastewater and reclaimed water systems in accordance with current County rules and regulations. The development is responsible for providing all on-site and off-site infrastructure that will be needed to serve the project.

**Recommended Increment XXVII Development Order Conditions**

**A. GENERAL**

1. The Palmer Ranch Increment XXVII 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 XXVII 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 Applicant is also subject by local ordinances to impact fees or exactions to meet the same needs. The local government and the Applicant may enter into a capital contribution front-ending agreement to reimburse the Applicant 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 August 2, 2017, and attached hereto as Exhibit C (Attachment II). This does not imply or confer any deviations from applicable zoning or land development regulations.

C. **NATIVE HABITAT PROTECTION/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 (Attachment V). 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. A resource management plan that maintains the functions and values of the on-site preservation areas and is consistent with the Guiding Principles of the Comprehensive Plan and the Environmental Technical Manual shall be submitted to Environmental Protection Division with preliminary or site and development plans.

D. **WATER QUALITY AND DRAINAGE**

1. The Master Surface Water Management Plan shall be consistent with the Catfish Creek (Little Sarasota Bay Watershed) Basin Master Plan.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** The staff of the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council recommends Conditional Approval for the Palmer Ranch Increment XXVII DRI to be further conditioned on a finding of Consistency with the Local Government Comprehensive Plan by the Sarasota County Board of County Commissioners.
Increment Approved Projects

Increment I: Ordinance No. 84-419
Increment II: Ordinance No. 87-382, 16-092
Increment III: Ordinance No. 87-481
Increment IV: Ordinance No. 89-205
Increment V: Ordinance No. 89-100
Increment VI: Ordinance No. 93-21
Increment VII: Ordinance No. 95-27
Increment VIII: Ordinance No. 95-94
Increment IX: Ordinance No. 96-15
Increment X: Ordinance No. 97-028
Increment XI: Ordinance No. 97-113, 01-025
Increment XII: Ordinance No. 98-039
Increment XIII: Ordinance No. 98-081
Increment XIV: Ordinance No. 02-011
Increment XV: Ordinance No. 00-072
Increment XVI: Ordinance No. 03-029
Increment XVII: Ordinance No. 12-047
Increment XVIII: Ordinance No. 15-011
Increment XX: Ordinance No. 12-039
Increment XXI: Ordinance No. 15-014
Increment XXII: Ordinance No. 15-011
Increment XXIII: Ordinance No. 15-011
Increment XXIV: Ordinance No. 16-036
Increment XXV: Ordinance No. 17-011
Increment XII: Ordinance No. 98-039
Increment XVII: Ordinance No. 04-072
Increment XVIII: Ordinance No. 04-072
Increment XXIV: Ordinance No. 16-036
Increment XXV: Ordinance No. 17-011
Increment XII: Ordinance No. 98-039
Increment XVII: Ordinance No. 04-072
Increment XVIII: Ordinance No. 04-072
Increment XXIV: Ordinance No. 16-036
Increment XXV: Ordinance No. 17-011
Increment XII: Ordinance No. 98-039
Increment XVII: Ordinance No. 04-072
Increment XVIII: Ordinance No. 04-072
Increment XXIV: Ordinance No. 16-036
Increment XXV: Ordinance No. 17-011
Increment XII: Ordinance No. 98-039
Increment XVII: Ordinance No. 04-072
Increment XVIII: Ordinance No. 04-072
Increment XXIV: Ordinance No. 16-036
Increment XXV: Ordinance No. 17-011
LAND USE:
- GROSS AREA: 121.2 AC±
- RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT: 20.2 AC±
- LAKES: 4.4 AC±
- BUFFERS (OTHER OPEN SPACE): 74.6 AC±
- AMENITY CENTER: 0.5 AC±
- WETLAND & WETLAND BUFFERS: 34.2 AC±
- OPEN SPACE: 83%±
- TOTAL RESIDENTIAL UNITS: 149

LEGEND:
- WETLAND
- WETLAND IMPACT
- POTENTIAL MITIGATION AREA
- PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AREA
- AMENITY SITE
- LAKE
- LANDSCAPE BUFFERS AND OTHER OPEN SPACE

NOTE:
- LAKE SIZES AND LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE.
- FINAL GEOMETRY TO BE DETERMINED AT TIME OF CONSTRUCTION PLAN REVIEW.

WETLAND IMPACTS AND MITIGATION GEOMETRY IS SUBJECT TO AGENCY REVIEW AND APPROVAL.

PROJECT: PALMER RANCH – DRI INCREMENT XXVIII (PARCEL B9 & B10)
CLIENT: D.R. HORTON INC.

The Contractor shall verify and be responsible for all dimensions. DO NOT scale the drawing – any errors or omissions shall be reported to Stantec without delay. The Copyright in all designs and drawings are the property of Stantec. Reproduction or use for any purpose other than that authorized by Stantec is forbidden.

MATERIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>AS SHOWN</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>SHEET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/2&quot; = 1'-0&quot;</td>
<td>14 &amp; 23 37S 18E</td>
<td>7/8/2017</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DFH/89368

Stantec
6900 Professional Parkway East, Sarasota, FL 34240-8414
Phone 941-907-6900 • Fax 941-907-6910
Certificate of Authorization 027013 • www.stantec.com
LAND USE:
- Gross Area: 39.0 acres
- Existing Zoning: RE-1
- Proposed Zoning: RMA-1/PUD
- Proposed Use: 149 single-family Attached
- Dwelling Units/Acre: 3.8 units/acre
- Amenity Center: 0.5 acres
- Open Space: 20.0 acres
- Open Space: 51%

LEGEND:
- Wetland
- Wetland Impact
- Development Area (Roadway, LOTS)
- Amenity Site
- Potential Mitigation Area
- Grand Tree
- Access Locations

NOTE:
- Lake sizes and locations are approximate.
- Final geometry to be determined at time of construction plan review.
- Wetland impacts and mitigation geometry is subject to agency review and approval.
LEGEND:
- PRESERVED WETLAND
- WETLAND IMPACT
- PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AREA
- LAKE
- POTENTIAL MITIGATION AREA
- LANDSCAPE BUFFER AND
  OTHER OPEN SPACE
- CONSERVED AND PRESERVED
  NATIVE HABITATS
- GRAND TREE

NOTE:
A GRAND TREE PROTECTION PLAN WILL BE
PREPARED AS A PART OF THE CONSTRUCTION
PLAN SUBMITTAL.

MINOR MODIFICATION TO OPEN SPACE AND
DEVELOPMENT AREA MAY BE ALLOWED FOLLOWING
REGULATORY AGENCY REVIEW AND APPROVAL AND
FINAL LAND PLANNING.

WETLAND IMPACTS AND MITIGATION GEOMETRY IS
SUBJECT TO AGENCY REVIEW AND APPROVAL.
Agenda

Item

7b

Palmer Ranch Inc XXVIII
Pre-App Checklist
Background

On December 7, 2017, a Pre-Application meeting was held for the proposed Palmer Ranch Increment 28 DRI Application for Incremental Development Approval. The project is a proposed single-family development on the south 281.53± acres of the Palmer Ranch Parcel 660 parcel, located south of SR 681 and west of Honore Avenue (see Attachment I). Attending this meeting was the applicant and their consultants, Sarasota County development review staff and SWFRPC staff.

Project Description

The contract purchaser, DiVosta Homes intends to develop the southern 289.4± acres of the Palmer Ranch Parcel 660 as a planned residential development consisting of 500 single-family homes, an amenity center and access to the Legacy Trail (see Attachment II).

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 28.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approve the questionnaire checklist.
Palmer Ranch DRI
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## 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>Palmer Ranch Master Development Order (Ordinance No. 2015-010) Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subject to Further Review in AIDA’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General DRI AIDA Information</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>Specific Conditions 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>Y</td>
<td>Y</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation &amp; Open Space</td>
<td>B. 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Answer B. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain/Hurricane Evacuation</td>
<td>B. 1-2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Answer B. 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>B. 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Trip generation rates and site access issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>B. 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Answer B. 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>B. 1-3 &amp; *B. 4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Answer B. 1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>B. 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Answer B. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>B. 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Answer B. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection/Health Care</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.

3. 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.
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.
ENV Policy 4.5.20

Developments surrounding Oscar Scherer State Park, the Scherer-Thaxton Preserve, Myakka River State Park and Myakka State Forest shall avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts through special measures that address: water quality and quantity, light and noise pollution, strategies to buffer these lands, wildlife movement, and land management practices.
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Consent Agenda Summary

Agenda Item #8(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 September 1, 2017 and ending October 31, 2017.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approval of the administrative action on Clearinghouse Review items

Agenda Item #8(b) – Glades-Hendry LCB Membership
Pursuant to Chapter 427, Florida Statutes, Rule 41-2, Florida Administrative Code, and at the request of the respective counties, the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council is the Designated Official Planning Agency for the Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) Program in Glades County and in Hendry County, which is now a joint service area. As the Planning Agency, the Council is responsible for the appointment of members to serve on the Local Coordinating Board.

The individuals listed below have been recommended to serve on the Local Coordinating Board. The Certification form provided in Attachment A lists the full membership of the Joint Local Coordinating Board and highlights the new nominees’ name or other changes in bold. The Planning Agency must certify the Local Coordinating Board membership each fiscal year and any time the Local Coordinating Board membership changes.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
1. Appoint the following:
   A. Appoint Fareedah Laney as a representative of the Department of Education.
   B. Appoint Gregory Finer as the alternate for a Citizen Advocate in the County.
   C. Appoint Glenda Gonzalez as the alternate for AHCA.
   D. Make additional appointments that may be announced.
2. Authorize the Chairman to endorse the LCB certification form for the LCB provided in Attachment A.

Agenda Item #8(c) – Lee County Comp Plan Amendment (DEO 17-7ESR)
Lee County DEO 17-7ESR consists of three amendments:

CPA2016-00009, Verdana: Amend Map 17, Southwest DR/GR Residential Overlay, to designate a 1,460 +/- acre property along Corkscrew Road as an Environmentally Enhancement and Preservation Community; Maps 6 and 7 to include the property within the Future Potable Water and Sewer Service area; and Policy 33.3.4 to allow Tier 1 properties with access to Corkscrew Road to extend the Environmental Enhancement and Preservation Communities Overlay up to 2 miles south of Corkscrew Road and to change the time that agricultural uses must be ceased.

CPA2017-00003, Capital Improvements/Water Supply Mgt: Amend the Lee Plan to align provisions within LeePlan Goals 2, 4, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 60, 61, 62, 64, 66, 67, 76, 79, 82, 83, 84, 95, 115, and 117 with the Board of County Commissioners strategic policy priority of managing growth (provision of
adequate public facilities and services). The amendments will also reduce redundancies; align with state statutes; and, provide better organization of the Lee Plan.

CPA2017-00004, North Fort Myers Overlay Expansion: Amend Lee Plan Map 1, Page 6, to expand the Mixed Use Overlay on 56 properties, approximately 287.57 acres, located at the intersections of US 41 and Diplomat and Littleton Roads, and the intersections of North Tamiami Trail and Pine Island Road along North Key Drive in North Fort Myers.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Staff finds this amendment package not regionally significant and consistent with the SRPP. Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and Lee County.

Agenda Item #8(d) – City of Venice Comp Plan Amendment (DEO 17-1ESR)
The City of Venice is transmitting its "City of Venice Comprehensive Plan 2017-2027" replacing in its entirety, the previously adopted 2010 Comprehensive Plan. The Local Planning Agency held a duly advertised public hearing on May 3, 2017, at which time on a vote of 6-0 they recommended approval of the proposed amendments for transmittal to the City Council. The proposed Comprehensive Plan was heard by the City Council in transmittal hearings held on: June 12, 2017, June 23, 2017, August 30, 2017 and September 19, 2017. City Council, on a vote of 5-1, recommended for approval on first reading at the scheduled and advertised public transmittal hearing held on September 19, 2017.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Staff finds this amendment package not regionally significant and consistent with the SRPP. Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and the City of Venice.

Agenda Item #8(e) – City of Venice Comp Plan Amendment (DEO 17-2ESR)
The applicant is requesting approval of a text amendment to the City of Venice 2010 Comprehensive Plan to remove language that provides for the interconnection of N. Jackson Road from Border Road to Laurel Road. Currently, the northern half of N. Jackson Road is an unimproved dirt road. The applicant is the owner/developer of the project known as The Woods of Venice which is located immediately adjacent to the existing improved and unimproved portions of N. Jackson Road. The Border Road to Myakka River Neighborhood (JPA Area 3) identified in the Joint Planning and Interlocal Service Boundary Agreement (JP/ILSBA) includes language in Policy 18.8 that requires construction of the indicated interconnection. As the land being developed as The Woods of Venice includes the property from the northern end of the existing portion of N. Jackson Road that would be potentially included if the road was to be extended, the developer of The Woods of Venice project is requesting removal of the text in Policy 18.8 that requires this improvement.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Staff finds this amendment package not regionally significant and consistent with the SRPP. Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and the City of Venice.
Agenda Item #8(f) – Charlotte County Comp Plan Amendment (DEO 17-5ESR)

Charlotte County DEO 17-5ESR involves a large-scale text amendment to amend FLU Appendix IV: Revitalization Plans to include the Parkside Community Revitalization Plan (PCRP). The PCRP includes new policies regarding the future development and redevelopment of Parkside to accomplish three objectives: promoting a mix of residential and non-residential uses in the neighborhood allowing diverse age-groups to live, work and play; promoting an attractive neighborhood with a unique identity; and promoting multimodal transit options, with a focus on improving both internal and external connections in and around Parkside.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Staff finds this amendment package not regionally significant and consistent with the SRPP. Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and Charlotte County.

Agenda Item #8(g) – City of Marco Island Comp Plan Amendment (DEO 17-1ESR)

City of Marco Island DEO 17-1ESR consists of three amendments:

1. Amend Future Land Use Map to change the Land Use Designation of approximately 7.35 +/- acres from PUD to Community Facility at a property known as the Veterans’ Community Park located at 901 Park Ave., Marco Island, FL 34145 and make other related changes
2. Amend policy relating to density transfer programs

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Staff finds this amendment package not regionally significant and consistent with the SRPP. Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and the City of Marco Island.
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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 September 1, 2017 and ending October 31, 2017.

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 FDEP-State Clearinghouse in Tallahassee.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Approval of the administrative action on Clearinghouse Review items.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SWFRPC #</th>
<th>Name1</th>
<th>Name2</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Funding Agent</th>
<th>Funding Amount</th>
<th>Council Com</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-21</td>
<td>Richard Kolar</td>
<td>Charlotte County Transit</td>
<td>Charlotte County</td>
<td>Charlotte County Transit - FY15-16 Section 5339 Bus Replacement Project</td>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>$248,544.00</td>
<td>Regionally Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-22</td>
<td>Richard Kolar</td>
<td>Charlotte County Transit</td>
<td>Charlotte County</td>
<td>Charlotte County Transit - FY16-17 Section 5339 - 3 Replacement Bus Request. Requesting 3 Ford Transit Connect Vans 20; with seating for 11 and 2 wheelchair positions.</td>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>$240,753.00</td>
<td>Regionally Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-23</td>
<td>Chris Stahl</td>
<td>FDEP - State Clearinghouse</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>FY 2017 Economic Development Assistance Programs - Application submission and program requirements for EDA's Public Works and Economic Adjustment Assistance Programs - SWFRPC Disaster Recovery Coordinator Grant</td>
<td>US DOC - EDA</td>
<td>Regionally Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-24</td>
<td>Chris Stahl</td>
<td>FDEP - Florida State</td>
<td>Lee County</td>
<td>FEMA-FDEM -- City of Bonita Springs - Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program -- City of Bonita Springs Spring Creek Flood Mitigation Project</td>
<td>Regionally Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda

Item

8b

Glades-Hendry LCB Membership

8b
MEMBER APPOINTMENTS AND CERTIFICATION FOR THE GLADES AND HENDRY COUNTY JOINT LOCAL COORDINATING BOARD FOR THE TRANSPORTATION DISADVANTAGED

Pursuant to Chapter 427, Florida Statutes, Rule 41-2, *Florida Administrative Code*, and at the request of the respective counties, the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council is the Designated Official Planning Agency for the Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) Program in Glades County and in Hendry County, which is now a joint service area. As the Planning Agency, the Council is responsible for the appointment of members to serve on the Local Coordinating Board.

The individuals listed below have been recommended to serve on the Local Coordinating Board. The Certification form provided in Attachment A lists the full membership of the Joint Local Coordinating Board and highlights the new nominees' name or other changes in bold. The Planning Agency must certify the Local Coordinating Board membership each fiscal year and any time the Local Coordinating Board membership changes.

**Nominations and applications**

Council staff is pursuing nominees to fill existing vacancies on the Local Coordinating Board. Staff may provide additional nominations at the Board meeting. Staff has received assurances from the respective County Commissioners representing the Local Coordinating Board that the appointment process is satisfactory.

**About the Local Coordinating Board**

The Glades-Hendry Joint Local Coordinating Board typically meets quarterly to guide the functioning of the CTC, Good Wheels, Inc. The next LCB meeting will be held on **March 7, 2018 at 10:30 a.m.** at the RCMA-Krome Center in LaBelle.

The Local Coordinating Board is established to oversee the appointed Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC), in its role of coordinating the provision of transportation service. Some of the basic duties of the Board include:

1) Develop, review and approve the annual Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan (TDSP), including the Memorandum of Agreement, prior to its submittal to the Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged (CTD);
2) In cooperation with the CTC, the Board shall review and provide recommendations to the Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged on funding applications affecting the transportation disadvantaged;
3) Review the coordination strategies of service provision to the transportation disadvantaged in the designated service area;
4) Conduct the required annual evaluation of the CTC.
RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

1. Appoint the following:

   A. Appoint Fareedah Laney as a representative of the Department of Education.
   B. Appoint Gregory Finer as the alternate for a Citizen Advocate in the County.
   C. Appoint Glenda Gonzalez as the alternate for AHCA.
   D. Make additional appointments that may be announced.

2. Authorize the Chairman to endorse the LCB certification form for the LCB provided in Attachment A.
GLADES-HENDRY COUNTY JOINT LOCAL COORDINATING BOARD MEMBERSHIP CERTIFICATION

Planning Agency Name: Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council; 1400 Colonial Boulevard, Suite 1 in Fort Myers, FL 33907

Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council named above hereby certifies to the following:
1. The membership of the Glades-Hendry County Joint Local Coordinating Board, established pursuant to Rule 41-2.012(3), FAC, does in fact represent the appropriate parties as identified in the following list; and
2. The membership represents, to the maximum extent feasible, a cross section of the local community.

Signature: __________________________________________ Date: November 16, 2017
SWFRPC Chairperson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Glades-Hendry LCB has a Representative of:</th>
<th>Voting Member</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
<th>Alternate Member</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 The MPO or DOPA shall appoint one elected official to serve as the official Chairperson for all Coordinating Board meetings.</td>
<td>Donna Storter-Long (Chair)</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>Emma Byrd Mitchell Wills (Alternate)</td>
<td>November 2020 November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 A. A local representative of the Florida Department of Transportation (DOT)</td>
<td>Debi Stephens</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Pamela Barr</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 B. A local representative of the Florida Department of Children and Families (DCF)</td>
<td>Aaron Stitt</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>(Vacant)</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 C. A local representative of the Public Education Community which could include, but not be limited to, a representative of the District School Board, School Board Transportation Office, or Headstart Program in areas where the School District is responsible</td>
<td>Jim Brickel</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>(Vacant)</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 D. In areas where they exist, a local representative of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services or the Division of Blind Services, representing the Department of Education</td>
<td>Fareedah Laney</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>(Vacant)</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Glades-Hendry LCB has a Representative of:</td>
<td>Voting Member</td>
<td>Term Expires</td>
<td>Alternate Member</td>
<td>Term Expires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 E. A person recommended by the local Veterans Service Office, representing Veterans of the county</td>
<td>Philip Nall</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>(Vacant)</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 F. A person recognized by the Florida Association for Community Action representing the economically disadvantaged</td>
<td>Fred Richards</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>(Vacant)</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 G. A person over age 60 representing the Elderly in the county</td>
<td>Kristina Rodriguez</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Bill Iffland</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 H. A person with a disability representing the disabled in the county</td>
<td>(Vacant)</td>
<td>(Vacant)</td>
<td>(Vacant)</td>
<td>(Vacant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 I--1. [One of Two] Citizen Advocates in the County</td>
<td>Ron Stephens</td>
<td>May 2018</td>
<td>Gregory Finer</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 I--2. [One of two] Citizen Advocates this one must be a person who uses the transportation service(s) of the system as their primary means of transportation.</td>
<td>(Vacant)</td>
<td>(Vacant)</td>
<td>(Vacant)</td>
<td>(Vacant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 J. A local representative for children at risk</td>
<td>Vanessa Fischel</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Sherry Shupp</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 K. In areas where they exist, the Chairperson or designee of the local Mass Transit or Public Transit System’s Board, except in cases where they are also the Community Transportation Coordinator.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 L. A local representative of the Florida Department of Elder Affairs</td>
<td>Shelby Yelvington</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Rebecca MacKenzie</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 M. An experienced representative of the local private for profit transportation industry. In areas where such representative is not available, a local private non-profit representative will be appointed, except where said representative is also the Community Transportation Coordinator</td>
<td>(Vacant)</td>
<td>(Vacant)</td>
<td>(Vacant)</td>
<td>(Vacant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 N. A local representative of the Florida Agency for Health Care Administration</td>
<td>Joe Martinez</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Glenda Gonzalez</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 O. A representative of the Regional Workforce Development Board established in Chapter 445, Florida Statutes</td>
<td>Rebecca Meeler</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Suseth Cunningham</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Glades-Hendry LCB has a Representative of:</td>
<td>Voting Member</td>
<td>Term Expires</td>
<td>Alternate Member</td>
<td>Term Expires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. A representative of the local medical community, which may include, but not be limited to, kidney dialysis centers, long term care facilities, hospitals, local health department or other home and community based services, etc.</td>
<td>Mary Bartoshuk</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td>Nancy Acevedo</td>
<td>December 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Lee County DEO 17-7ESR

8c

8c
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 17-7ESR). 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 17-7ESR</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

11/2017
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 17-7ESR consists of three amendments:

**CPA2016-00009, Verdana:** Amend Map 17, Southwest DR/GR Residential Overlay, to designate a 1,460 +/- acre property along Corkscrew Road as an Environmentally Enhancement and Preservation Community; Maps 6 and 7 to include the property within the Future Potable Water and Sewer Service area; and Policy 33.3.4 to allow Tier 1 properties with access to Corkscrew Road to extend the Environmental Enhancement and Preservation Communities Overlay up to 2 miles south of Corkscrew Road and to change the time that agricultural uses must be ceased.

The property is approximately 1,460 acres, located 4 miles east of the intersection of Alico and Corkscrew Roads. The requested amendments would allow a low density residential development with a maximum of one dwelling unit per acre with accessory commercial development pending the property being rezoned. The project, if properly zoned, will add 875 acres (or 60% of the subject property) for open space and conservation/restoration to the already extensive public and private conservation land within Southeast Lee County and Collier County.

**CPA2017-00003, Capital Improvements/Water Supply Mgt:** Amend the Lee Plan to align provisions within Lee Plan Goals 2, 4, 53, 54, 55, 56, 67, 58, 60, 61, 62, 64, 66, 67, 76, 79, 82, 83, 84, 95, 115, and 117 with the Board of County Commissioners strategic policy priority of managing growth (provision of adequate public facilities and services). The amendments will also reduce redundancies; align with state statutes; and, provide better organization of the Lee Plan.

**Capital Improvement Element Changes:**
- Align capital improvement prioritization methods with those implemented by the BOCC.
- Prioritize investment in infrastructure that support infill and redevelopment is designated Future Urban Areas.
- Update level of service standards to reflect current state statutes and demand on public infrastructure and services.

**Water Supply Management Changes:**
- Establish hierarchy of water sources based on different uses.
  - Require that irrigation demands be met by reuse water, if available.
  - Require alternative design options if reuse water is not available.
  - Require implementation through the Land Development Code.
- Encourage expansion of reuse water infrastructure.

**CPA2017-00004, North Fort Myers Overlay Expansion:** Amend Lee Plan Map 1, Page 6, to expand the Mixed Use Overlay on 56 properties, approximately 287.57 acres, located at the intersections of US 41 and Diplomat and Littleton Roads, and the intersections of North Tamiami Trail and Pine Island Road along North Key Drive in North Fort Myers.
The amendment would add properties located in North Fort Myers to the Mixed Use Overlay. The overlay was designed to encourage mixed use development in areas of the county suitable for combination of commercial and residential uses. The Mixed Use Overlay incentivizes properties in conventional zoning districts to maximize their development potential by allowing density/intensity calculations to be based on both the residential and non-residential areas of developments.

**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
CITY OF VENICE

The Council staff has reviewed the proposed evaluation and appraisal based amendments to the City of Venice Comprehensive Plan (DEO 17-1ESR). 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.

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 17-1ESR</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 Venice.
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

COMMUNITY PLANNING ACT
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 VENICE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (DEO 17-1ESR)

Summary of Proposed Amendment
The City of Venice is transmitting its "City of Venice Comprehensive Plan 2017-2027" replacing in its entirety, the previously adopted 2010 Comprehensive Plan. The Local Planning Agency held a duly advertised public hearing on May 3, 2017, at which time on a vote of 6-0 they recommended approval of the proposed amendments for transmittal to the City Council. The proposed Comprehensive Plan was heard by the City Council in transmittal hearings held on: June 12, 2017, June 23, 2017, August 30, 2017 and September 19, 2017. City Council, on a vote of 5-1, recommended for approval on first reading at the scheduled and advertised public transmittal hearing held on September 19, 2017.

It is important to note that certain aspects of the 2010 Plan have been incorporated into the proposed 2017-2027 Plan including the entire Joint Planning Areas and Agreement with Sarasota County. Other aspects of the current plan have been carried forward and included in a "Transition Section (policies)" of the Land Use Element. Goals, Objectives and Policies (GOP) are replaced by Vision, Intent and Strategies (VIS). The VIS format achieves the same as the GOPs.

Planning Areas previously identified and adopted have been replaced by Neighborhoods. The City Council and the Planning Commission (LPA) desired to create a Plan that not only addressed the needs of the City as a whole but also provided area specific (additional) provisions for Neighborhoods. Neighborhoods were identified and analyzed based on their geographic location, composition, natural boundaries, and their "intent".

The City noted during the initial reviews that detailed land use analysis was not previously undertaken with the 2010 Plan and in order to identify the potential impacts of the 2010 Comprehensive Plan and the 2017-2027 Comprehensive Plan, a corresponding analysis was undertaken. The proposed Plan and its related strategies result in a more appropriate and realistic approach to the City's overall growth and development. As amended, the proposed Plan would reduce the maximum number of residential units from 50,566 to 39,735, and reduce the maximum non-residential development square feet from 94,159,557 to 76,000,657.

Peril of flood is addressed within the proposed Plan in both the Land Use and Open Space Elements. Specifically, the Land Use Element includes a section identified as "Coastal Management". The Open Space Element includes not only conservation related measures but also includes additional information, some similar, within Intent OS 1.9 Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) development and related Strategies OS 1.9.1 through OS 1.9.10. A copy of the CHHA Map is provided as Map LU-11 and LU-12 (CHHA with corresponding Land Use designations), and Map OS-1 and OS-2. Furthermore, where a CHHA is identified within the respective Neighborhood, the Neighborhood Map Series includes maps identifying the CHHA and Future Land uses.

Similar to recent discussions by Sarasota County and due to Hurricane Irma, the City will continue to work with Sarasota County, analyze hurricane evacuation data and information, and update the Comprehensive Plan accordingly. Sarasota County is the primary provider of shelter space within the community. This section of the proposed plan will likely be amended as discussions with Sarasota
County and surrounding municipalities commence to address appropriate changes as a result of Hurricane Irma.

**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 Venice.
City of Venice DEO 17-2ESR
LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS
CITY OF VENICE

The Council staff has reviewed the proposed evaluation and appraisal based amendments to the City of Venice Comprehensive Plan (DEO 17-2ESR). 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.

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 17-2ESR</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 Venice.
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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 VENICE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (DEO 17-2ESR)

Summary of Proposed Amendment
The applicant is requesting approval of a text amendment to the City of Venice 2010 Comprehensive Plan to remove language that provides for the interconnection of N. Jackson Road from Border Road to Laurel Road. Currently, the northern half of N. Jackson Road is an unimproved dirt road. The applicant is the owner/developer of the project known as The Woods of Venice which is located immediately adjacent to the existing improved and unimproved portions of N. Jackson Road. The Border Road to Myakka River Neighborhood (JPA Area 3) identified in the Joint Planning and Interlocal Service Boundary Agreement (JP/ILSBA) includes language in Policy 18.8 that requires construction of the indicated interconnection. As the land being developed as The Woods of Venice includes the property from the northern end of the existing portion of N. Jackson Road that would be potentially included if the road was to be extended, the developer of The Woods of Venice project is requesting removal of the text in Policy 18.8 that requires this improvement.

The proposed road is not identified in the Sarasota County Comprehensive Plan which is significant as Jackson Road is currently a county roadway. The connection of N. Jackson Road also does not appear on the MPO’s current Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) or the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The connector roadway has not been identified as a requirement to maintain the City’s level of service for transportation and therefore is not identified in the City’s Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) or Capital Improvement Schedule (CIS).

Actual developed density of the surrounding land versus potential density as provided for in the 2010 Comprehensive Plan has been greatly reduced. The approved number of dwelling units across approximately 680 acres to the west of the proposed connector between Border Road and Laurel Road has been reduced from 3,395 potential units to 1,613 approved units.

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 Venice.
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Charlotte County DEO 17-5ESR
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 17-5ESR). 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 17-5ESR        | 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 Charlotte County.

11/2017
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

Charlotte County DEO 17-5ESR involves a large-scale text amendment to amend FLU Appendix IV: Revitalization Plans to include the Parkside Community Revitalization Plan (PCRP). The PCRP includes new policies regarding the future development and redevelopment of Parkside to accomplish three objectives: promoting a mix of residential and non-residential uses in the neighborhood allowing diverse age-groups to live, work and play; promoting an attractive neighborhood with a unique identity; and promoting multimodal transit options, with a focus on improving both internal and external connections in and around Parkside.

FLUM Series Map #26B: Parkside Community Redevelopment Area is proposed to be added to FLU Appendix II: Future Land Use Map Series to better show the Parkside Community in detail, including the two sub-districts, the Parkside Core and the Parkside Neighborhood. The Parkside Core consists of the area between the Sunrise Waterway and the Elkcam Waterway, and north from U.S. 41 to Austin Avenue. This area contains all of the existing multi-family residential development within the Parkside Community, as well as most of the existing commercial and institutional uses, including the two hospitals, the Promenades Mall, and the Cultural Center of Charlotte County. The Parkside Neighborhood sub-district consists of the remaining area of the Parkside Community, and includes all of the existing single-family residential development, commercial development along U.S. 41, parks, and some institutional uses.

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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This map is a representation of compiled public information. It is believed to be an accurate and true depiction for the Charlotte County and its employees make no guaranties, implied or otherwise, to the accuracy, or completeness. We therefore do not...
LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS
CITY OF MARCO ISLAND

The Council staff has reviewed the proposed evaluation and appraisal based amendments to the City of Marco Island Comprehensive Plan (DEO 17-1ESR). 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 17-1ESR</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 Marco Island

11/2017
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 MARCO ISLAND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (DEO 17-1ESR)

RECEIVED: NOVEMBER 2, 2017

Summary of Proposed Amendment
City of Marco Island DEO 17-1ESR consists of three amendments:

1. Amend Future Land Use Map to change the Land Use Designation of approximately 7.35 +/- acres from PUD to Community Facility at a property known as the Veterans’ Community Park located at 901 Park Ave., Marco Island, FL 34145 and make other related changes
2. Amend policy relating to density transfer programs

Marco Island City Council has directed City staff and City attorney’s office to rezone property known as Veterans’ Community Park located at 901 Park Avenue, Marco Island from Elkcam Circle PUD to Community Facility for a park use. The total number of residential units would be reduced from 23,200 to 23,164. Additionally, City Council directed City staff and City attorney’s office to abolish density transfer programs. These two changes called for the City’s comprehensive plan amendments.

The City is seeking to eliminate FLU Policy 1.1.4.5 which states “The City shall not unduly restrict existing or future density transfer programs as long as the overall density of the Island is not increased.” Contingent on the repeal of that policy, the Ordinance repeals Section 38-76 of the City Code. This provision relates to the transfer of development rights within Marco Island and sets forth the program for doing so.

Section 38-76 has been in effect since 1998 and City staff has been unable to locate any transfer of development rights pursuant to this provision. Additionally, the program sets up a system by which densities could be increased in such a manner as to possibly exceed existing Comprehensive Plan density restrictions. This seems inconsistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

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 Marco Island.
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EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT: December 14, 2017

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
      • September Financials
      • October Financials
      • 2016-17 Year End Budget Amendments
   b. Nominating Committee for New Executive Board
   c. Promise Zone Update
      • Vista Volunteers
      • Berea Kentucky meeting
      • Opioid project

2. Resource Development and Capacity Building
   • ACT Human Trafficking Presentation
   • November 1, 2017  Economic Recovery Briefing: Rebuilding Economic Development in Your Community

   • Grants Awarded:
     ✓ DEO grant for $30,000: A Regional Strategy for Agriculture Sustainability
     ✓ Contract with Bonita Springs for Flood Reduction Plan; $50,000
     ✓ Contract with Bonita Springs for study on Affordable Housing; $30,000
   • Grants Under Development
     ✓ Clewiston DEO utility relocation
     ✓ Kresge - placemaking grant for Clewiston
   • Grants Pending: $1,988,696 approximately
     ✓ Farms to School grant ; $88,696
     ✓ Bloomberg; Bonita Springs Flood Reduction; $1,000,000
     ✓ EDA- Disaster Coordinator; $250,000
     ✓ SWF Community Foundation; MLK Public Art Center Piece:$50,000
     ✓ Brownfield grant, $600,000
### Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adopted FY 2017 Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
<th>SWFRPC General Fund</th>
<th>SWFRPC Special Revenue</th>
<th>Proposed Budget Amendment FY2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$485,948</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$485,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393,917</td>
<td>20,554</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$414,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63,500</td>
<td>20,554</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>9,981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>(801)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Balance from Audit YE 9/30/15 (FY14/15)</strong></td>
<td><strong>588,437</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>588,437</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income (Revenue)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,572,802</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,473</strong></td>
<td><strong>(801)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,274</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures (Expenses)

#### Direct:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Adopted FY 2017 Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
<th>SWFRPC General Fund</th>
<th>SWFRPC Special Revenue</th>
<th>Proposed Budget Amendment FY2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries (A)</td>
<td>$476,748</td>
<td>(68,680)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$408,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA</td>
<td>36,471</td>
<td>(6,293)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers Compensation</td>
<td>3,687</td>
<td>(1,547)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>47,715</td>
<td>(5,354)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Insurance (B)</td>
<td>63,090</td>
<td>(5,384)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$627,711</td>
<td>(87,258)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$540,453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Adopted FY 2017 Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
<th>SWFRPC General Fund</th>
<th>SWFRPC Special Revenue</th>
<th>Proposed Budget Amendment FY2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultants (C)</td>
<td>$108,600</td>
<td>35,868</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$144,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant/Consulting - Contractual (D)</td>
<td>37,049</td>
<td>7,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$44,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Fees</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>29,620</td>
<td>3,550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$33,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>(678)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>(97)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental (E)</td>
<td>7,190</td>
<td>(834)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance (F)</td>
<td>10,566</td>
<td>369</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair/Maint. (Grounds/Bldg/Equip)</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>(665)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing/Reproduction</td>
<td>4,146</td>
<td>816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities (Elec/Internet)</td>
<td>24,900</td>
<td>(7,549)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Miscellaneous</td>
<td>4,837</td>
<td>(4,651)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Service Charges</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>5,211</td>
<td>(1,795)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Related Expenses (G)</td>
<td>21,671</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues and Memberships (H)</td>
<td>25,310</td>
<td>(943)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings/Events</td>
<td>4,750</td>
<td>2,198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay-Operations</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay-Building</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease Long Term</td>
<td>43,750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Balance from Audit YE 9/30/15 (FY14/15)</strong></td>
<td><strong>588,437</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>588,437</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational Expense</strong></td>
<td>$958,412</td>
<td>(36,160)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$994,572</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fringe/Indirect Allocation

- **Utilized Reserve**: $13,321

#### Total:

| Total Operational Expenses              | $945,091               | 49,481            |                      |                        | $994,572                        |

| Total Cash Outlays                      | $1,572,802             | (37,777)          |                      |                        | $1,535,025                      |

**Net Income/Loss**: $-68,259

*Program Development (Unsecured Grants/Contracts) - additional funding secured in the amount of $16,339 from March - September 2017.

**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.

***The Fund Balance - End of Year $588,437 - is a snapshot as of 9/30/15 per audit report.

---

**Adopted FY 2016 Budget**

- Investments of $852,347

---

**Council Approved 1st Amendment**: 7/14/16

**Council Approved 2nd Amendment**: 3/16/17

**Council Proposed 3rd Amendment**: 11/16/17

---

The balance will increase over time as interest accrues.

---

**Note**

The council approved by resolution on 4/21/16 to include investments in the budget. Investments consist of Money Market and Government Pool.
## SWFRPC Income Statement
### Compared with Budget
### For the One Month Ending September 30, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Month</th>
<th>Year to Date</th>
<th>FY 2016-17 Approved Budget</th>
<th>FY 2016-17 (Dec 2017) 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>$50,142 $50,142 $50,142</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte County</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>103,141 103,141 103,141</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier County</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,856</td>
<td>3,856 3,856 3,856</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glades County</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,429</td>
<td>11,429 11,429 11,429</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendry County</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>110,282</td>
<td>110,282 110,282 110,282</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cape Coral</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49,952</td>
<td>49,952 49,952 49,952</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Myers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21,719</td>
<td>21,719 21,719 21,719</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Fort Myers Beach Inc</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,879</td>
<td>1,879 1,879 1,879</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonita Springs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,970</td>
<td>13,970 13,970 13,970</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sanibel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,951</td>
<td>1,951 1,951 1,951</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota County</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>117,627</td>
<td>117,627 117,627 117,627</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LOCAL ASSESSMENTS</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>485,948 485,948 485,948</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 16/17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59,676</td>
<td>44,250 59,676 $59,676</td>
<td>100% $100% $-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM -Title III - LEPC 17/18</td>
<td>16,039</td>
<td>16,039</td>
<td>16,039 16,039 $16,039</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM HMEP PT 16/17</td>
<td>12,050</td>
<td>27,834</td>
<td>60,349 27,834 $27,834</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD Glades/Hendry 16/17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29,703</td>
<td>28,880 29,703 $29,703</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD Glades/Hendry 17/18</td>
<td>10,781</td>
<td>10,781</td>
<td>10,781 10,781 $10,781</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM - Collier Hazard Analysis 16/17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,054</td>
<td>8,054 8,054 $8,054</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO Labelle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>20,000 30,000 $30,000</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem Services - EPA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36,634</td>
<td>36,634 36,634 $36,634</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Mitigation Strategy - EPA</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000 110,000 $110,000</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Planning 14/16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,750</td>
<td>15,750 15,750 $15,750</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Planning 17/19</td>
<td>52,500</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>70,000 70,000 $70,000</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FEDERAL / STATE GRANTS</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>118,870</td>
<td>414,471 393,917 414,471</td>
<td>105% $105% $105%</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Glades SQG</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>3,900 3,900 3,900</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Coral CCRS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>30,600 15,000 $15,000</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelican Cove CCAP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000 20,000 $20,000</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train the Trainers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000 5,000 $5,000</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangrove Loss</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000 1,000 $1,000</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clewiston RBDG TA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000 3,000 $3,000</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MISC. GRANTS / CONTRACTS</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>47,900 63,500 47,900</td>
<td>75% $75% $75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DRIS/NOPCS/MONITORING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRI Monitoring Fees</td>
<td>$ 250</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>- 2,950 $2,950</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRIS/NOPCS Income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42,031</td>
<td>35,000 42,031 $42,031</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$ 250</td>
<td>44,981</td>
<td>35,000 44,981 $44,981</td>
<td>100% $100% $100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Month</td>
<td>Year to Date</td>
<td>FY 2016-2017 Approved Budget</td>
<td>FY 2016-2017 (Dec 2017) Amended Budget</td>
<td>% Of Budget Year to Date</td>
<td>Budget Remaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Development (Unsecured Grants/Contract)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Program Development (Unsecured</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Brownfield Symposium</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,839</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,839</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 SRESP Update</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 16,339</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 16,339</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER REVENUE SOURCES</strong></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>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELA TEGA SPONSORSHIPS</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST INCOME - Money Market</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund A Investment Income</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OTHER REVENUE SOURCES</strong></td>
<td>$ 605</td>
<td>$ 5,199</td>
<td>$ 6,000</td>
<td>$ 5,199</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 588,437</td>
<td>$ 588,437</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>$ 123,625</td>
<td>$ 1,014,845</td>
<td>$ 1,572,802</td>
<td>$ 1,603,275</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONNEL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALARIES EXPENSE</td>
<td>$ 32,716</td>
<td>$ 408,068</td>
<td>$ 476,748</td>
<td>$ 408,068</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA EXPENSE</td>
<td>2,473</td>
<td>30,178</td>
<td>36,471</td>
<td>30,178</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETIREMENT EXPENSE</td>
<td>5,174</td>
<td>42,361</td>
<td>47,715</td>
<td>42,361</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSE</td>
<td>5,557</td>
<td>57,706</td>
<td>63,090</td>
<td>57,706</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKERS COMP. EXPENSE</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>3,687</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PERSONNEL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>$ 46,161</td>
<td>$ 540,453</td>
<td>$ 627,711</td>
<td>$ 540,453</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATIONAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULTANTS</td>
<td>$ 10,453</td>
<td>$ 144,468</td>
<td>$ 108,600</td>
<td>$ 144,468</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANT/CONSULTING EXPENSE</td>
<td>11,750</td>
<td>44,848</td>
<td>37,049</td>
<td>44,848</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDIT SERVICES EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL EXPENSE</td>
<td>1,911</td>
<td>33,170</td>
<td>29,620</td>
<td>33,170</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE EXPENSE</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>4,422</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>4,422</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTAGE / SHIPPING EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,628</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>1,628</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT RENTAL EXPENSE</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>6,356</td>
<td>7,190</td>
<td>6,356</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE EXPENSE</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>10,935</td>
<td>10,566</td>
<td>10,935</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPAIR/MAINT. EXPENSE</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINTING/REPRODUCTION EXPENSE</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5,037</td>
<td>4,146</td>
<td>5,037</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITIES (Elec, Internet)</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>17,351</td>
<td>24,900</td>
<td>17,351</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVERTISING/LEGAL NOTICES EXP</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>2,543</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>2,543</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>FY 2016-2017 Approved Budget</td>
<td>FY 2016-2017 (Dec 2017) 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>OTHER MISC. EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK SERVICE CHARGES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,416</td>
<td>3,416</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER RELATED EXPENSE</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>22,684</td>
<td>22,684</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUES AND MEMBERSHIP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,367</td>
<td>24,367</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLICATION EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROF. DEVELOP.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEETINGS/EVENTS EXPENSE</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>6,948</td>
<td>6,948</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL OUTLAY - OPERATIONS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL OUTLAY - BUILDING</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEASE LONG TERM</td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td>43,750</td>
<td>43,750</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCOLLECTABLE RECEIVABLES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUND BALANCE</td>
<td>$ 30,919</td>
<td>$ 406,132</td>
<td>$ 958,412</td>
<td>$ 406,132</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATIONAL EXP.</td>
<td>$ 30,919</td>
<td>$ 406,132</td>
<td>$ 958,412</td>
<td>$ 406,132</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOCATION FOR FRINGE/INDIRECT (CAPTURED BY GRANTS)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ (13,322)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILIZED RESERVE</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ (13,322)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OPERATIONAL EXP.</td>
<td>$ 945,090</td>
<td>$ 406,132</td>
<td>$ 1,572,802</td>
<td>$ 946,586</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CASH OUTLAY</td>
<td>$ 77,081</td>
<td>$ 946,585</td>
<td>$ 1,572,802</td>
<td>$ 946,586</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET INCOME (LOSS)</td>
<td>$ 46,544</td>
<td>$ 68,260</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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
State/Federal Grants billed quarterly: LEPC, HMEP, TD, EPA, 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 $68,260 Unaudited
# SWFRPC

## Detail of Reserve

**As of SEPTEMBER 30, 2017**

### 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>FineMark Operating Funds</td>
<td>$155,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Fiscal Year Carryover</td>
<td>$22,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash and Cash Equivalents</strong></td>
<td><strong>$177,708</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>$536,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government Surplus Trust Fund Investment Pool (Fund A)</td>
<td>$137,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Investments</strong></td>
<td><strong>$674,639</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Reserves**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>$852,347</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SWFRPC INCOME STATEMENT
### COMPARED WITH BUDGET
#### FOR THE ONE MONTH ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Month</th>
<th>Year to Date A</th>
<th>FY 2016-2017 Approved Budget B</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL ASSESSMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte County</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 50,142</td>
<td>$ 50,142</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier County</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 103,141</td>
<td>$ 103,141</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glades County</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 3,856</td>
<td>$ 3,856</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendry County</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 11,429</td>
<td>$ 11,429</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee County</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 110,282</td>
<td>$ 110,282</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cape Coral</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 49,952</td>
<td>$ 49,952</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Myers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 21,719</td>
<td>$ 21,719</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Fort Myers Beach Inc</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 1,879</td>
<td>$ 1,879</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonita Springs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 13,970</td>
<td>$ 13,970</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sanibel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 1,951</td>
<td>$ 1,951</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota County</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 117,627</td>
<td>$ 117,627</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LOCAL ASSESSMENTS</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 485,948</td>
<td>$ 485,948</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL / STATE GRANTS</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 414,471</td>
<td>$ 393,917</td>
<td>105%</td>
<td>$ (20,554)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM -Title III - LEPC 16/17</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 59,676</td>
<td>$ 44,250</td>
<td>135%</td>
<td>(15,426)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM -Title III - LEPC 17/18</td>
<td>16,039</td>
<td>16,039</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>32,515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM HMEP PT 16/17</td>
<td>12,050</td>
<td>27,834</td>
<td>60,349</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>(823)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD Glades/Hendry 16/17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29,703</td>
<td>28,880</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD Glades/Hendry 17/18</td>
<td>10,781</td>
<td>10,781</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM - Collier Hazard Analysis 16/17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,054</td>
<td>8,054</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO Labelle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>150%</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem Services - EPA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36,634</td>
<td>36,634</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Mitigation Strategy - EPA</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Planning 14/16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,750</td>
<td>15,750</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Planning 17/19</td>
<td>52,500</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FEDERAL / STATE GRANTS</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 118,870</td>
<td>$ 414,471</td>
<td>$ 393,917</td>
<td>105%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISC. GRANTS / CONTRACTS/CONTRACTUAL</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 63,500</td>
<td>$ 63,500</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$ 15,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glades SQG</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Coral CCRS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>30,600</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>15,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelican Cove CCAP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train the Trainers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangrove Loss</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clewiston RBDG TA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MISC. GRANTS/CONTRACTS</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 47,900</td>
<td>$ 63,500</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$ 15,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DRIS/NOPCS/MONITORING</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 2,950</td>
<td>$ 2,950</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>(7,031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRI Monitoring Fees</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>$ 250</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>(7,031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRIS/NOPCS Income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42,031</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>(7,031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 44,981</td>
<td>$ 35,000</td>
<td>129%</td>
<td>$ (4,081)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Program Development (Unsecured Grants/Contract)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Month</th>
<th>Year to Date A</th>
<th>FY 2016-2017 Approved Budget B</th>
<th>% Of Budget Year to Date</th>
<th>Budget Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017 Brownfield Symposium</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,839</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 SRESP Update</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td><strong>16,339</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,339</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## OTHER REVENUE SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Month</th>
<th>Year to Date A</th>
<th>FY 2016-2017 Approved Budget B</th>
<th>% Of Budget Year to Date</th>
<th>Budget Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABM SPONSORSHIPS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELA TEGA SPONSORSHIPS</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST INCOME - Money Market</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund A Investment Income</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OTHER REVENUE SOURCES</strong></td>
<td>$605</td>
<td>$5,199</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>$10,816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fund Balance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Month</th>
<th>Year to Date A</th>
<th>FY 2016-2017 Approved Budget B</th>
<th>% Of Budget Year to Date</th>
<th>Budget Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$588,437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL REVENUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Month</th>
<th>Year to Date A</th>
<th>FY 2016-2017 Approved Budget B</th>
<th>% Of Budget Year to Date</th>
<th>Budget Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$123,625</td>
<td>$1,014,845</td>
<td>$1,572,802</td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## EXPENSES

### PERSONNEL EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Month</th>
<th>Year to Date A</th>
<th>FY 2016-2017 Approved Budget B</th>
<th>% Of Budget Year to Date</th>
<th>Budget Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SALARIES EXPENSE</td>
<td>$32,716</td>
<td>$408,068</td>
<td>$476,748</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>68,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA EXPENSE</td>
<td>2,473</td>
<td>30,178</td>
<td>36,471</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETIREMENT EXPENSE</td>
<td>5,174</td>
<td>42,361</td>
<td>47,715</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>5,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSE</td>
<td>5,557</td>
<td>57,706</td>
<td>63,090</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>5,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKERS COMP. EXPENSE</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>3,687</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>1,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEMPLOYMENT COMP. EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PERSONNEL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>$46,161</td>
<td>$540,453</td>
<td>$627,711</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>$87,258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OPERATIONAL EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Month</th>
<th>Year to Date A</th>
<th>FY 2016-2017 Approved Budget B</th>
<th>% Of Budget Year to Date</th>
<th>Budget Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSULTANTS</td>
<td>$10,453</td>
<td>$144,468</td>
<td>$108,600</td>
<td>133%</td>
<td>(35,868)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANT/CONSULTING EXPENSE</td>
<td>11,750</td>
<td>44,848</td>
<td>37,049</td>
<td>121%</td>
<td>(7,799)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDIT SERVICES EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>128%</td>
<td>(7,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL EXPENSE</td>
<td>1,911</td>
<td>33,170</td>
<td>29,620</td>
<td>112%</td>
<td>(3,550)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE EXPENSE</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>4,422</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTAGE / SHIPPING EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,628</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT RENTAL EXPENSE</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>6,356</td>
<td>7,190</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE EXPENSE</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>10,935</td>
<td>10,566</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>(369)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPAIR/MAINT. EXPENSE</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINTING/REPRODUCTION EXPENSE</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5,037</td>
<td>4,146</td>
<td>121%</td>
<td>(891)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITIES (Elec, Internet)</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>17,351</td>
<td>24,900</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>7,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVERTISING/LEGAL NOTICES EXP</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>2,543</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>145%</td>
<td>(793)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Month</td>
<td>Year to Date A</td>
<td>FY 2016-2017 Approved Budget B</td>
<td>% Of Budget Year to Date</td>
<td>Budget Remaining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER MISC. EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>4,837</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK SERVICE CHARGES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,416</td>
<td>5,211</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>1,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER RELATED EXPENSE</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>22,684</td>
<td>21,671</td>
<td>105%</td>
<td>(1,013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUES AND MEMBERSHIP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,367</td>
<td>25,310</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLICATION EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROF. DEVELOP.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEETINGS/EVENTS EXPENSE</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>6,948</td>
<td>4,750</td>
<td>146%</td>
<td>(2,198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL OUTLAY - OPERATIONS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL OUTLAY - BUILDING</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEASE LONG TERM</td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td>43,750</td>
<td>43,750</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCOLLECTABLE RECEIVABLES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUND BALANCE

| OPERATIONAL EXP. | $30,919 | $406,132 | $958,412 | 42% | (36,157) |

ALLOCATION FOR FRINGE/INDIRECT (CAPTURED BY GRANTS) $ -

UTILIZED RESERVE $ (13,322)

TOTAL OPERATIONAL EXP. $ 945,090

TOTAL CASH OUTLAY $ 77,081 $ 946,585 $ 1,572,802 $ 51,101

NET INCOME (LOSS) $ 46,544 $ 68,260
## ASSETS

**Current Assets**
- Cash - Florida Prime $137,782.42
- Cash - FineMark Oper. 155,249.90
- Cash - FineMark MM 536,856.68
- Petty Cash 200.00
- Accounts Receivable 122,678.94

**Total Current Assets** 952,767.94

**Property and Equipment**
- Property, Furniture & Equip 237,172.31
- Accumulated Depreciation (197,201.57)

**Total Property and Equipment** 39,970.74

**Other Assets**
- Amount t.b.p. for L.T.L.-Leave 40,634.44
- FSA Deposit 2,881.29
- Rental Deposits 3,500.00
- Amt t.b.p. for L.T.Debt-OPEB 65,074.00

**Total Other Assets** 112,089.73

**Total Assets** $1,104,828.41

## LIABILITIES AND CAPITAL

**Current Liabilities**
- Accounts Payable $113.28
- Deferred NorthPoint NOPC_5328 662.23
- Deferred Pelican Marsh_5329 468.69
- Deferred Commons NOPC_5337 1,500.00
- Deferred PR Parcel 9E DRI_5342 19,169.99
- Deferred Pine Air NOPC_5343 1,437.12
- Deferred PR XXVII DRI_5344 25,000.00
- Deferred PR XXVI DRI_5345 25,000.00
- Deferred Deep Lagoon NOPC_5346 1,842.78
- Deferred Fiddlers NOPC_5347 1,874.23
- Deferred City Gate NOPC_5348 2,500.00
- FICA Taxes Payable 176.26
- Federal W/H Tax Payable (5.67)
- United way Payable (722.00)
- Deferred Compensation Payable (150.00)
- FSA Payable (79.22)
- LEPC Contingency Fund 305.25

**Total Current Liabilities** 79,092.94

**Long-Term Liabilities**
- Accrued Annual Leave 40,634.44
- Long Term Debt - OPEB 65,074.00

**Total Long-Term Liabilities** 105,708.44

**Total Liabilities** 184,801.38

**Capital**
- Fund Balance-Unassigned 297,796.79
- Fund Balance-Assigned 514,000.00

Unaudited - For Management Purposes Only
FB-Non-Spendable/Fixed Assets   39,970.74
Net Income                  68,259.50

Total Capital               920,027.03

Total Liabilities & Capital $ 1,104,828.41

Unaudited - For Management Purposes Only
2017 - 2018 Workplan & Budget Financial Snapshot
Oct-17

Revenues
Local Assessments
Total Federal/State Grants
Misc. Grants/Contracts
Other Revenue Sources

Notes: Local Assessments billed at the beginning of each quarter: October, January, April and July
State/Federal Grants billed quarterly: LEPC, HMEP, TD, EPA, 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 $66,427 Unaudited
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash and Cash Equivalents:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td>$ 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FineMark Operating Funds</td>
<td>165,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Fiscal Year Carryover</td>
<td>22,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash and Cash Equivalents</strong></td>
<td>$ 188,101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FineMark Money Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government Surplus Trust Fund Investment Pool (Fund A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Investments</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Reserves

$ 863,036
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Revenues</th>
<th>Current Month</th>
<th>Year to Date A</th>
<th>FY 2017-2018 Approved Budget B</th>
<th>% Of Budget Year to Date</th>
<th>Budget Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL ASSESSMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte County</td>
<td>$12,784</td>
<td>$12,784</td>
<td>$38,351</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>$25,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier County</td>
<td>26,265</td>
<td>26,265</td>
<td>105,061</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$78,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glades County</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>3,914</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$2,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendry County</td>
<td>2,878</td>
<td>2,878</td>
<td>11,511</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$8,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee County</td>
<td>27,953</td>
<td>27,953</td>
<td>83,858</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>$55,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cape Coral</td>
<td>12,786</td>
<td>12,786</td>
<td>51,142</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$38,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Myers</td>
<td>5,708</td>
<td>5,708</td>
<td>22,832</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$17,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Fort Myers Beach Inc</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>1,883</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$1,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonita Springs</td>
<td>3,629</td>
<td>3,629</td>
<td>14,516</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$10,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sanibel</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$1,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota County</td>
<td>29,965</td>
<td>29,965</td>
<td>29,965</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LOCAL ASSESSMENTS</strong></td>
<td>$123,912</td>
<td>$123,912</td>
<td>$365,010</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>$241,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL / STATE GRANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD Glades/Hendry 17/18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32,020</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>32,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM - Collier Hazard Analysis 17/18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,054</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Mitigation Strategy - EPA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Planning 17/19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FEDERAL / STATE GRANTS</strong></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$220,074</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$220,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISC. GRANTS / CONTRACTS/CONTRACTUAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glades SQG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHERO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MISC. GRANTS/contracts</strong></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$9,900</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$9,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DRIS/NOPCS/MONITORING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRI Monitoring Fees</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRIS/NOPCS Income</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>34,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$527</td>
<td>$527</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$34,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Month</td>
<td>Year to Date A</td>
<td>FY 2017-2018 Approved Budget</td>
<td>% Of Budget Year to Date</td>
<td>Budget Remaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Development (Unsecured Grants/Contract)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Program Development (Unsecured</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>354,171</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 354,171</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **OTHER REVENUE SOURCES** |              |                |                               |                          |                 |
| ABM SPONSORSHIPS         |              |                |                               | N/A                      |                 |
| CELA TEGA SPONSORSHIPS   |              |                |                               | N/A                      |                 |
| Misc. Income             | 846          | 846           | 6,000                         | 14%                      | 5,154           |
| INTEREST INCOME - Money Market | 137    | 137           |                               | N/A                      | 137             |
| Fund A Investment Income | 159          | 159           |                               | N/A                      | 159             |
| **TOTAL OTHER REVENUE SOURCES** | $ 1,142   | $ 1,142       | $ 6,000                       | 19%                      | $ 5,449          |

| **Fund Balance** | $ -         | $ -           | $ 811,779                     |                          |                 |

| **TOTAL REVENUES** | $ 125,581   | $ 125,581     | $ 1,801,934                   |                          | $ 511,495        |

| **EXPENSES** |              |                |                               |                          |                 |
| **PERSONNEL EXPENSES** |              |                |                               |                          |                 |
| SALARIES EXPENSE     | $ 34,008     | $ 34,008       | $ 440,748                     | 8%                       | 406,740          |
| FICA EXPENSE         | 2,568        | 2,568          | 33,717                        | 8%                       | 31,149           |
| RETIREMENT EXPENSE   | 3,904        | 3,904          | 48,915                        | 8%                       | 45,011           |
| HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSE | 3,762 | 3,762          | 64,433                        | 6%                       | 60,671           |
| WORKERS COMP. EXPENSE| 242          | 242            | 3,687                         | 7%                       | 3,445            |
| UNEMPLOYMENT COMP. EXPENSE | -     | -              |                               | N/A                      | 0               |
| **TOTAL PERSONNEL EXPENSES** | $ 44,484 | $ 44,484       | $ 591,500                     | 8%                       | 547,016          |

| **OPERATIONAL EXPENSES** |              |                |                               |                          |                 |
| CONSULTANTS             | $ 1,288      | $ 1,288        | 106,200                       | 1%                       | 104,913          |
| GRANT/CONSULTING EXPENSE|              |                |                               | N/A                      | N/A             |
| AUDIT SERVICES EXPENSE  |              |                |                               | N/A                      | N/A             |
| TRAVEL EXPENSE          | 2,715         | 2,715          | 20,000                        | 14%                      | 17,285           |
| TELEPHONE EXPENSE       | 466           | 466            | 4,600                         | 10%                      | 4,134            |
| POSTAGE / SHIPPING EXPENSE | 22        | 22             | 1,425                         | 2%                       | 1,403            |
| EQUIPMENT RENTAL EXPENSE| 784           | 784            | 6,695                         | 12%                      | 5,911            |
| INSURANCE EXPENSE       | 399           | 399            | 10,722                        | 4%                       | 10,324           |
| REPAIR/MAINT. EXPENSE   |              |                |                               | 0%                       | 1,000            |
| PRINTING/REPRODUCTION EXPENSE | 149   | 149            | 3,100                         | 5%                       | 2,951            |
| UTILITIES (Elec, Internet) | 2,347     | 2,347          | 24,900                        | 9%                       | 22,553           |
| ADVERTISING/LEGAL NOTICES EXP | -      | -              | 1,600                         | 0%                       | 1,600            |
| OTHER MISC. EXPENSE     |              |                |                               | 0%                       | 200              |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Current Month</th>
<th>Year to Date</th>
<th>FY 2017-2018 Approved Budget</th>
<th>% Of Budget Year to Date</th>
<th>Budget Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BANK SERVICE CHARGES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES EXPENSE</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER RELATED EXPENSE</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>24,184</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>23,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUES AND MEMBERSHIP</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>25,095</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLICATION EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROF. DEVELOP.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEETINGS/EVENTS EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL OUTLAY - OPERATIONS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEASE LONG TERM</td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td>45,930</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>42,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCOLLECTABLE RECEIVABLES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| FUND BALANCE                        | $ 811,779     |              |                              |                          |                  |

| OPERATIONAL EXP.                   | $ 14,670      | $ 14,670     | $ 1,154,530                  | 1%                       | $ 328,081        |

| ALLOCATION FOR FRINGE/INDIRECT (CAPTURED BY GRANTS) |

| TOTAL OPERATIONAL EXP.              | $ 1,154,530   |              |                              |                          |                  |

| TOTAL CASH OUTLAY                   | $ 59,154      | $ 59,154     | $ 1,746,030                  | $ 875,097                |

| NET INCOME (LOSS)                  | $ 66,427      | $ 66,427     |                              |                          |
ASSETS

Current Assets
Cash - Florida Prime $137,941.32
Cash - FineMark Oper. 165,643.23
Cash - FineMark MM 536,993.48
Petty Cash 200.00
Accounts Receivable 173,835.29
Total Current Assets 1,014,613.32

Property and Equipment
Property, Furniture & Equip 237,172.31
Accumulated Depreciation (197,201.57)
Total Property and Equipment 39,970.74

Other Assets
Amount t.b.p. for L.T.L.-Leave 40,634.44
FSA Deposit 2,881.29
Rental Deposits 3,500.00
Amt t.b.p. for L.T.Debt-OPEB 65,074.00
Total Other Assets 112,089.73

Total Assets $1,166,673.79

LIABILITIES AND CAPITAL

Current Liabilities
Accounts Payable $113.28
Deferred NorthPoint NOPC_5328 662.23
Deferred Pelican Marsh_5329 468.69
Deferred Commons NOPC_5337 1,500.00
Deferred PR Parcel 9E DRI_5342 19,169.99
Deferred Pine Air NOPC_5343 1,437.12
Deferred PR XXVII DRI_5344 24,861.64
Deferred PR XXVI DRI_5345 25,000.00
Deferred Deep Lagoon NOPC_5346 1,842.78
Deferred Fiddlers NOPC_5347 1,735.87
Deferred City Gate NOPC_5348 2,500.00
FICA Taxes Payable 176.37
Federal W/H Tax Payable (0.21)
United way Payable (630.00)
Deferred Compensation Payable 200.00
FSA Payable (79.18)
LEPC Contingency Fund 305.25

Total Current Liabilities 79,263.83

Long-Term Liabilities
Accrued Annual Leave 40,634.44
Long Term Debt - OPEB 65,074.00

Total Long-Term Liabilities 105,708.44

Total Liabilities 184,972.27

Capital
Fund Balance-Unassigned 361,303.69
Fund Balance-Assigned 514,000.00

Unaudited - For Management Purposes Only
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FB-Non-Spendable/Fixed Assets</td>
<td>39,970.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
<td>66,427.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital</td>
<td>981,701.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Liabilities &amp; Capital</td>
<td>$1,166,673.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Awarded</th>
<th>Job ID</th>
<th>Funding Agency</th>
<th>Project Manager</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>Status</th>
<th>Total Match</th>
<th>Total Match Amt-RPC</th>
<th>FY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3900</td>
<td>USDA - US Dept. of Agriculture</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>Rural Promise Zone Designation</td>
<td>5/1/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3392</td>
<td>CTD - FL Commission for</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>FY17-18 Glades-Hendry TD Planning Agreement</td>
<td>7/1/2017</td>
<td>7/1/2017</td>
<td>7/1/2017</td>
<td>7/1/2017</td>
<td>$39,929.00</td>
<td>$39,929.00</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$630,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3178</td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Economic</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>FY17-18 LEPC Agreement</td>
<td>7/1/2017</td>
<td>7/18/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$900,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3722</td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Emergency</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>Regional Strategy for Agriculture Sustainability</td>
<td>6/30/2017</td>
<td>8/17/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4212</td>
<td>City of Bonita Springs</td>
<td>Jim Beever</td>
<td>FY17-18  Collier_Lee Lee Hazard Analysis</td>
<td>7/19/2017</td>
<td>9/13/2017</td>
<td>7/1/2017</td>
<td>7/1/2017</td>
<td>$20,844.00</td>
<td>$20,844.00</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4211</td>
<td>EPA - US Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>Jim Beever</td>
<td>Master Wetland Mitigation Strategy</td>
<td>11/3/2016</td>
<td>11/3/2016</td>
<td>$220,000.00</td>
<td>$220,000.00</td>
<td>10/1/2016</td>
<td>10/1/2016</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3203</td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Economic</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>FY16-17 HMEP Grant</td>
<td>10/1/2016</td>
<td>10/1/2016</td>
<td>10/1/2016</td>
<td>10/1/2016</td>
<td>$60,349.00</td>
<td>$60,349.00</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$80,549.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3420</td>
<td>EDA - US Economic Development Administration</td>
<td>Tim Walker</td>
<td>FY17-18 EDA Planning Grant</td>
<td>1/1/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
<td>$210,000.00</td>
<td>1/1/2017</td>
<td>12/31/2019</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3730</td>
<td>SFRPC</td>
<td>Charles Kammerer</td>
<td>Train the Trainers</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>1/1/2016</td>
<td>3/31/2017</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4210</td>
<td>City of Cape Coral</td>
<td>Jim Beever</td>
<td>Sarasota Climate Change Adaptation Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>10/1/2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3304</td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Economic</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>FY16-17  HMEP Grant</td>
<td>10/1/2016</td>
<td>10/1/2016</td>
<td>10/1/2016</td>
<td>10/1/2016</td>
<td>$60,349.00</td>
<td>$60,349.00</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$80,549.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3399</td>
<td>USDA - US Dept. of Agriculture</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>Rural Promise Zone Designation</td>
<td>5/1/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3302</td>
<td>USDA - US Dept. of Agriculture</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>Rural Promise Zone Designation</td>
<td>5/31/2015</td>
<td>5/1/2015</td>
<td>11/17/2015</td>
<td>11/17/2015</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Awarded</td>
<td>Job ID</td>
<td>Funding Agency</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>App Due Date</td>
<td>DateSubmitted</td>
<td>Date Awarded/De nied</td>
<td>Date Contract Signed</td>
<td>Project Total RPC Amt</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Total Match Amt-RPC</td>
<td>FY</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>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3419</td>
<td>Charlotte County</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>DEO - Charlotte County</td>
<td>3/30/2016</td>
<td>3/30/2016</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3170</td>
<td>DOE - US Dept. of Energy</td>
<td>Rebekah Harp</td>
<td>Solar Ready II</td>
<td>3/22/2013</td>
<td>7/18/2013</td>
<td>$140,000.00</td>
<td>$90,000.00</td>
<td>7/1/2013</td>
<td>1/1/2016</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3397</td>
<td>CTD - FL Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>Glades-Hendry TD Planning Agreement FY2014-15</td>
<td>5/16/2014</td>
<td>$38,573.00</td>
<td>$38,573.00</td>
<td>7/1/2014</td>
<td>6/30/2015</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3725</td>
<td>Visit Florida</td>
<td>Tim Walker</td>
<td>OUR CREATIVE ECONOMY Marketing</td>
<td>2/9/2015</td>
<td>2/9/2015</td>
<td>6/26/2015</td>
<td>7/1/2015</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>6/15/2016</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3164</td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Emergency Management</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>FY14-15 HMEP Planning</td>
<td>2/4/2015</td>
<td>$22,000.00</td>
<td>$22,000.00</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td>9/30/2016</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3675</td>
<td>EPA - US Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>Jim Beever</td>
<td>Developing a Method to Use Ecosystem Services to Quantify Wetland Restoration Successes</td>
<td>5/15/2015</td>
<td>5/5/2015</td>
<td>9/29/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td>$234,071.00</td>
<td>$174,071.00</td>
<td>9/30/2016</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3171</td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Emergency Management</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>FY15-16 LEPC Agreement</td>
<td>6/30/2015</td>
<td>5/15/2015</td>
<td>6/11/2015</td>
<td>7/1/2015</td>
<td>$48,000.00</td>
<td>$48,000.00</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3398</td>
<td>CTD - FL Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>FY15-16 Glades-Hendry TD Agreement</td>
<td>6/30/2015</td>
<td>6/1/2015</td>
<td>7/1/2015</td>
<td>7/1/2015</td>
<td>$38,573.00</td>
<td>$38,753.00</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3202</td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Emergency Management</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>FY14-15 HMEP Planning Grant Modification</td>
<td>9/11/2015</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td>12/15/2015</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3173</td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Emergency Management</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>FY15-16 HMEP Training Contract</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td>9/30/2015</td>
<td>9/28/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td>$58,422.00</td>
<td>$58,422.00</td>
<td>9/30/2016</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3418</td>
<td>Collier County</td>
<td>Rebekah Harp</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Data Research</td>
<td>6/21/2016</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
<td>12/4/2015</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3176</td>
<td>DOE - US Dept. of Energy</td>
<td>Rebekah Harp</td>
<td>NARC - SM3 - 2016 Data Surveys</td>
<td>2/11/2016</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>2/1/2016</td>
<td>3/31/2016</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3005</td>
<td>Collier County</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>Collier County EDC - USDA Grant Application</td>
<td>3/15/2016</td>
<td>3/22/2016</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>3/23/2016</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3301</td>
<td>DOE - FL Dept. of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>Clewiston Mainstreet Revitalization</td>
<td>12/2/2015</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>12/14/2015</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3303</td>
<td>DOE - FL Dept. of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>DDO - MPO Rail Study</td>
<td>10/7/2015</td>
<td>$39,000.00</td>
<td>5/31/2016</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Awarded</td>
<td>Job ID</td>
<td>Funding Agency</td>
<td>Project Manager</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>Status</td>
<td>Total Match Amt-RPC</td>
<td>FY</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>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4003</td>
<td>Rural Neighborhoods</td>
<td>Tim Walker</td>
<td>Rural Neighborhoods Mapping</td>
<td>2016-06-01</td>
<td>2016-06-01</td>
<td>2016-06-01</td>
<td></td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>2016-06-30</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3520</td>
<td>TBRPC - Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council</td>
<td>Rebekah Harp</td>
<td>2016 Disaster Planning Guide</td>
<td>2016-07-01</td>
<td>2016-07-01</td>
<td>2016-07-01</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>2016-07-15</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3006</td>
<td>SWFEC - Southwest Florida Enterprise Center</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>SWFEC PRIME - Grant Application/Technical Assistance</td>
<td>2016-05-01</td>
<td>2016-05-01</td>
<td>2016-05-01</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>2016-05-30</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4001</td>
<td>Collier County</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>Collier County EDA TA</td>
<td>2016-05-01</td>
<td>2016-05-01</td>
<td>2016-05-01</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>2016-05-30</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td>EPA - US Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>FY17-18 Brownfields</td>
<td>2017-01-16</td>
<td>2017-01-16</td>
<td>2017-01-16</td>
<td></td>
<td>$600,000.00</td>
<td>$600,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td>EDA - US Economic Development Administration</td>
<td>Charles Kammerer</td>
<td>SWFL Disaster Recovery Coordinator</td>
<td>2017-01-31</td>
<td>2017-01-31</td>
<td>2017-01-31</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>2018-01-01</td>
<td>2018-12-31</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td>FEMA - Federal Emergency Management Agency</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>City of Bonita Springs - Spring Creek Flood Mitigation Project</td>
<td>2017-10-09</td>
<td>2017-10-09</td>
<td>2017-10-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bloomberg Philanthropies</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>Bloomberg - City of Bonita Springs Mitigation</td>
<td>2017-10-20</td>
<td>2017-10-20</td>
<td>2017-10-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000,000.00</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Emergency Management</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>FY17-18 HMFP Agreement</td>
<td>2017-10-01</td>
<td>2017-10-01</td>
<td>2017-10-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td>SWFL Community Foundation</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>Community Impact Grants - MLK Corridor</td>
<td>2017-12-02</td>
<td>2017-12-02</td>
<td>2017-12-02</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>USDA - US Dept. of Agriculture</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>Mobile Market: A Nutritional Oasis for Food Markets of SWFL</td>
<td>2017-03-31</td>
<td>2017-03-31</td>
<td>2017-03-31</td>
<td></td>
<td>$599,549.00</td>
<td>$298,605.00</td>
<td>2017-10-01</td>
<td>2017-09-30</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>EDA - US Economic Development Administration</td>
<td>Rebekah Harp</td>
<td>Mote Marine Programming</td>
<td>2017-08-31</td>
<td>2017-08-31</td>
<td>2017-08-31</td>
<td></td>
<td>$270,000.00</td>
<td>$189,000.00</td>
<td>2017-12-31</td>
<td>2017-12-31</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>$81,200.00</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>USDA - US Dept. of Agriculture</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>Opportunity Buy Program Coordinator</td>
<td>2017-04-23</td>
<td>2017-04-23</td>
<td>2017-04-23</td>
<td></td>
<td>$99,667.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>2017-10-11</td>
<td>2017-10-31</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>$53,621.00</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Estero Bay Agency on Bay Management

The September 11, 2017 and October 16, 2017 meetings of the Estero Bay Agency on Bay Management were not held due to the effects of Hurricane Irma on the Estero Bay system and the need for EBABM members to participate in recovery and clean-up efforts and meetings in the watershed.

The regular meeting of the Estero Bay Agency on Bay Management was held on Monday, November 13, 2017 at the 9:30 AM at the SWFRPC offices. The approved minutes of the August 14, 2017 meeting are attached.

There was presentation on the observed effects of Hurricane Irma on forests in the Estero Bay watershed. Another presentation was made on the City of Bonita Springs Flooding Reduction and Hydrologic Restoration Plan by Jim Beever. Both presentations will be posted at http://www.swfrpc.org/abm.html

Emerging Issues include the Old Corkscrew Plantation Project, San Carlos Park and Island Park flooding, Old Seaport Place project, and Romana on Bonita Beach Road.

The next IAS Subcommittee Meeting was Monday, November 27, 2017, 1:30 PM, SWFRPC

The next Meeting Time and Place, for EBABM is Monday, December 11, 2017 9:30 AM, SWFRPC.

Recommended Action: Information only.
MINUTES ESTERO BAY AGENCY ON BAY MANAGEMENT

Monday, August 14, 2017 – 9:30 AM.
SWFRPC Offices 1400 Colonial Boulevard, Suite 1 Fort Myers, Florida 33907

Call to Order – Mr. Daltry called the meeting to order at 9:35 AM.

Attendance- As usual attendance was taken from the sign in sheet:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Babcock</td>
<td>FMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Cangialosi</td>
<td>ECCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marisa Carrozzo</td>
<td>Conservancy of SWFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Ceilley</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Cornell</td>
<td>Audubon of Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Craig</td>
<td>Happehatchee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Cornell</td>
<td>Audubon of Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Daltry</td>
<td>ASWF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora Demers</td>
<td>Happehatchee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Win Everham</td>
<td>FGCU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Kreiger</td>
<td>Lee County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Pendergrass</td>
<td>Lee County Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Miller</td>
<td>LWV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Olsen</td>
<td>Lee County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Simons</td>
<td>City of Bonita Springs Alt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty Whitehead</td>
<td>Bonita Lion's Club Green Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>SWFRPC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff in Attendance: Jim Beever, Tim Walker

1) **Motion to Approve the Minutes** of the June, 12, 2017 meeting was made by Ms. Simons and seconded by Dr. Everham. Approved unanimously.

2) **Presentation on the Funding Issues for the SWFRPC 2018 and the Future for the EBABM**- There was presentation on the Funding Issues for the SWFRPC 2018 and the Future for the EBABM- by Executive Director Margaret Wuerstle, The current funding formula is 30 cent per capita per population. Sarasota, Lee, and Charlotte Counties have indicated they plan to no longer fund the SWFRPC in the 2018 fiscal year. Further funding strategies were discussed.

3) **Presentation on the Estuaries Report Card 2017 by the** Conservancy of SWFL by Ms. Marissa Carrozzo. A copy of the presentation will be posted at the EBABM web page at http://www.swfrpc.org/abm.html
4) **Old Business** included discussions on the Comprehensive Plan process in Lee County and other proposed developments in the DRGR.

5) **Announcements** included that the CREW hydrologic restoration is ahead of schedule. The Florida Storm Water Association conference tour of Lakes Park and 10-mile Canal.

6) The **next Meeting Time and Place**, for EBABM is September 11, 2017 9:30 AM, SWFRPC

7) The **next IAS and Workplan Implementation Subcommittee Meeting** is Monday, August 28, 2017, 1:30 PM, SWFRPC

8) **Adjournment** was at 11:30 A.M.
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A bill to be entitled
An act relating to a neonatal abstinence syndrome
pilot project; creating s. 409.9134, F.S.; defining
terms; requiring the Agency for Health Care
Administration, in consultation with the Department of
Children and Families, to establish a pilot project to
license one or more facilities in Medicaid Region 8 to
treat infants who suffer from neonatal abstinence
syndrome in certain circumstances; providing a start
and end date for the pilot project, subject to
appropriation; requiring the agency, in consultation
with the department, to adopt by rule minimum
licensure standards for facilities providing care
under this section; requiring certain criteria to be
included in licensure standards; authorizing the
agency to charge an initial licensure fee and a
biennial renewal fee; establishing minimum
requirements for a facility to obtain licensure and
participate in the pilot project; prohibiting a
facility licensed under this section from treating an
infant for longer than 6 months; requiring background
screening of certain facility personnel; subjecting
facilities licensed under this section to specific
licensing requirements; providing that facilities
licensed under this section are not required to obtain
a certificate of need; requiring the Department of
Health to contract with a state university to study
certain components of the pilot project and establish
certain baseline data for studies on the
neurodevelopmental outcomes of infants with neonatal abstinence syndrome; requiring the Department of Health to report results of the study to specified legislative officials by a certain date; requiring facilities licensed under this section, hospitals meeting certain criteria, and Medicaid managed medical assistance plans to provide financial and medical data to the university under certain conditions; providing an effective date.

Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

Section 1. Section 409.9134, Florida Statutes, is created to read:

409.9134 Pilot project for the treatment of infants with neonatal abstinence syndrome.—

(1) For purposes of this section, the term:
(a) "Infant" includes both a newborn and an infant, as those terms are defined in s. 383.145.
(b) "Neonatal abstinence syndrome" means the postnatal opioid withdrawal experienced by an infant who is exposed in utero to opioids or agents used to treat maternal opioid addiction.

(2) The Agency for Health Care Administration, in consultation with the department, shall establish a pilot project to license one or more facilities in Medicaid Region 8 to treat infants who suffer from neonatal abstinence syndrome, providing a community-based care option, rather than hospitalization, after an infant has been stabilized. Subject to
specific appropriation, the pilot project shall begin on July 1, 2018 and expire on June 30, 2020.

(3) The agency, in consultation with the department, shall adopt by rule minimum licensure standards for facilities licensed to provide care under this section.

(a) Licensure standards adopted by the agency must include, at a minimum:

1. Requirements for the physical plant and maintenance of facilities;
2. Compliance with local building and fire safety codes;
3. The number, training, and qualifications of essential personnel employed by and working under contract with the facility;
4. Staffing requirements intended to ensure adequate staffing to protect the safety of infants being treated in the facility;
5. Sanitation requirements for the facility;
6. Requirements for programs, basic services, and care provided to infants treated by the facility and their parents;
7. Requirements for the maintenance of medical records, data, and other relevant information related to infants treated by the facility; and
8. Requirements for application for initial licensure and licensure renewal.

(b) The agency may charge an initial licensure fee and a biennial renewal fee, each not to exceed $1,000.

(4) In order to obtain a license and participate in the pilot project a facility must, at a minimum:

(a) Be a private, not-for-profit Florida corporation;
(b) Be a Medicaid provider;
(c) Have an on-call medical director;
(d) Demonstrate an ability to provide 24-hour nursing and
nurturing care to infants with neonatal abstinence syndrome;
(e) Demonstrate an ability to provide for the medical needs
of an infant being treated within the facility, including, but
not limited to, pharmacotherapy and nutrition management;
(f) Maintain a transfer agreement with a nearby hospital
that is not more than a 30-minute drive from the licensed
facility;
(g) Demonstrate an ability to provide comfortable
residential-type accommodations for an eligible mother to
breastfeed her infant or to reside within the facility while her
infant is being treated at that facility, if not contraindicated
and if funding is available for residential services. The
facility may request at any time that the mother’s breast milk
be tested for contaminants or that the mother submit to a drug
test. The mother shall vacate the facility if she refuses to
allow her breast milk to be tested or to consent to a drug test
or if the facility determines that the mother poses a risk to
her infant;
(h) Be able to provide or make available parenting
education, breastfeeding education, counseling, and other
resources to the parents of infants being treated at the
facility including, if necessary, a referral for addiction
treatment services;
(i) Contract and coordinate with Medicaid managed medical
assistance plans as appropriate to ensure that services for both
the infant and the parent or the infant’s representative are
timely and unduplicated;

(j) Identify, and refer parents to, social service providers, such as Healthy Start, Early Steps, and Head Start programs, prior to discharge, if appropriate; and

(k) Adhere to all applicable standards established by the agency by rule pursuant to subsection (3).

(5) A facility licensed under this section may not accept an infant for treatment if the infant has a serious or life-threatening condition other than neonatal abstinence syndrome.

(6) A facility licensed under this section may not treat an infant for longer than 6 months.

(7) The agency shall require level 2 background screening for facility personnel as required in s. 408.809(1)(e) pursuant to chapter 435 and s. 408.809.

(8) Facilities licensed under this section are subject to the requirements of part II of chapter 408.

(9) Facilities licensed under this section are not required to obtain a certificate of need.

(10)(a) The Department of Health shall contract with a state university to study the risks, benefits, cost differentials, and the transition of infants to the social service providers identified in paragraph (4)(j) for the treatment of infants with neonatal abstinence syndrome in hospital settings and facilities licensed under the pilot project. By December 21, 2019, the Department of Health shall report to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives the study results and recommendations for the continuation or expansion of the pilot project.

(b) The contract must also require the establishment of
baseline data for longitudinal studies on the neurodevelopmental outcomes of infants with neonatal abstinence syndrome, and may require the evaluation of outcomes and length of stay in facilities for nonpharmacologic and pharmacologic treatment of neonatal abstinence syndrome.

(c) Facilities licensed under this section, licensed hospitals providing services for infants born with neonatal abstinence syndrome, and Medicaid medical assistance plans shall provide relevant financial and medical data consistent with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) and related regulations to the contracted university for research and studies authorized pursuant to this subsection.

Section 2. This act shall take effect upon becoming a law.
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STATE OF FLORIDA

PAM BONDI
ATTORNEY GENERAL.

November 30, 2017

Ms. Margarot Wuerstle
Executive Director
Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council
1400 Colonial Boulevard, Suite 1
Fort Myers, Florida 33907

Dear Ms. Wuerstle:

On behalf of the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council, you have asked for an opinion on the following question:

Must a county participate in its statutorily designated regional planning council, despite an interlocal agreement provision pertaining to procedures for terminating membership?

In sum:

Section 186.504, Florida Statutes, mandates county participation in its regional planning council; therefore, a county may not withdraw as a member county.

In 1973, the counties of Charlotte, Collier, Glades, Hendry, Lee, and Sarasota entered into an Interlocal Agreement creating the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council ("Interlocal Agreement") pursuant to section 163.01, Florida Statutes.¹ There is a withdrawal provision in the Interlocal Agreement that allows a member county to withdraw its membership by resolution.² You indicate that Sarasota, Lee, and Charlotte counties have each passed resolutions to withdraw from the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council within 12 months and to cease paying dues at that time.

¹ Found at http://www.swfrpc.org/content/SWFRPC_Interlocal_Agreement.pdf.
² Id. at 2.d., Effective Date, Duration, Termination and Withdrawal.
Ms. Margaret Wuerstle
Page Two

In 1980, the Florida Legislature enacted the Florida Regional Planning Council Act, Chapter 80-315, Laws of Florida, originally codified at sections 160.01 through 160.08, Florida Statutes, and now at sections 186.501 through 186.513, Florida Statutes. In section 160.01(4), Florida Statutes, the Legislature expressly stated that membership in a regional planning council was not mandatory: "(4) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to mandate local general-purpose government membership or participation in a regional planning council."

In 1984, however, the Legislature amended section 160.01(4), now 186.504(5), to mandate county membership:

Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to mandate municipal local general-purpose government membership or participation in a regional planning council. However, each county shall be a member of the regional planning council created within the comprehensive planning district encompassing the county. ³

In 2015, the Legislature expressly designated the composition of each regional planning council in section 186.512, Florida Statutes, assigning every county in Florida to a council:

(1) The territorial area of the state is subdivided into the following districts for the purpose of regional comprehensive planning. The name and geographic area of each respective district must accord with the following:

*   *   *

(h) Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council: Charlotte, Collier, Glades, Hendry, Lee, and Sarasota Counties. (e.s.)

Thus, the Legislature has created regional planning councils with mandatory county membership and has designated the particular council to which each county must belong. There is nothing in the Florida Regional Planning Council Act, sections 186.501 to 186.513, Florida Statutes, that allows a county to decline to participate in its council.⁴ Moreover, one of the statutory powers and duties of a regional planning

³ Ch. 84-267, Laws of Fla., § 11.
⁴ § 183.01(9)(b), Fla. Stat., provides, in part: "An interlocal agreement does not relieve a public agency of any obligation or responsibility imposed upon it by law[.]" As this office observed in Op. Atty Gen. Fla. 95-47 (1995), regarding whether a county could withdraw from the Withlacoochee Regional Planning Council if there were a provision in its interlocal agreement authorizing withdrawal: "In light of the
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council enumerated in § 186.505(12), Florida Statutes, is to “fix and collect membership dues, rents, or fees when appropriate.” Thus, a member county would be subject to any dues imposed by the regional planning council under this provision.

Your second question regarding whether a county may withdraw from the Interlocal Agreement and cease paying dues pursuant to that document is beyond the purview of this office to decide. This office is not the appropriate forum for determining rights and obligations under the agreement that may be in dispute under such circumstance.

It is my opinion that the counties of Sarasota, Lee, and Charlotte are mandatory members of the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council and may not refuse their statutory obligation to participate.

Sincerely,

Pam Bondi  
Attorney General

PB/tebg
Bonita Springs Flooding Study Interim Report

Please find a link below for the Interim report (1/3 of work completed) of the flooding study being conducted by Mr. Jim Beever with the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council. Should you have any comments regarding this work, please email Mr. Beever at:

jbeever@swfrpc.org

Flooding Study Link