

COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA
May 17, 2018
9:00am – 11:00am

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 INVOCATION
2 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
3 ROLL CALL
4 PUBLIC COMMENTS
5 AGENDA
6 MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 15 AND MARCH 15, 2018 MEETINGS
7 REGIONAL IMPACT
   a) Babcock Ranch NOPC
8 CONSENT AGENDA
   a) City of Cape Coral Comp Plan Amendment DEO 18-1ESR
   b) City of Fort Myers Comp Plan Amendment DEO 18-1ESR
   c) City of Bonita Springs Comp Plan Amendment DEO 18-1ESR
   d) Sarasota County Comp Plan Amendment DEO 18-1ESR
   e) Sarasota County Comp Plan Amendment DEO 18-2ESR
   f) Charlotte County Comp Plan Amendment DEO 18-2ESR
   g) City of Punta Gorda Comp Plan Amendment DEO 18-1ESR
   h) Hendry County Comp Plan Amendment DEO 18-1ESR
   i) Summit Church DRI
9 PRESENTATIONS
   a) Charlotte Harbor National Estuary Program
   b) Immokalee Foundation-Workforce Initiative
10 DIRECTOR’S REPORT
   a) Budget Amendments
   b) February and March 2018 Financials
   c) Promise Zone Update- Federal SECD Programs
   d) Disaster Recovery Coordinator Update
11 STAFF SUMMARIES
   a) Grant Activity Sheet (Information Only)

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COMMITTEE REPORTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12| **a)** Budget & Finance Committee - Mr. Don McCormick  
    | **b)** Economic Development Committee  
    | **c)** Promise Zone Steering Committee  
    | **d)** Estero Bay Agency on Bay Management Committee – Mr. James Beever  
    | **e)** Executive Committee – Chair Thomas Perry  
    | **f)** Legislative Affairs Committee  
    | **g)** Quality of Life & Safety Committee – Commissioner Willie Shaw  
    | **h)** Regional Transportation Committee – Ms. Margaret Wuerstle  
    | **i)** Council Relevancy & Restructuring Committee  
    | **j)** Water Quality and Water Resources Management - Vice Mayor Mick Denham |
|   | **NEW BUSINESS**                      |
|   | **a)** Intercoastal Waterways         |
|   | **STATE AGENCIES COMMENTS/REPORTS**   |
|   | **COUNCIL LEGAL CONSULTANT’S COMMENTS** |
|   | **COUNCIL MEMBERS’ COMMENTS**         |
|   | **ADJOURN**                           |

**NEXT SWFRPC MEETING DATE: JUNE 21, 2018**

**THERE WILL BE AN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING AT 8:15 AND A LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE MEETING AT 8:30, IMMEDIATELY PRECEEDING THE COUNCIL MEETING**

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chair</td>
<td>Commissioner Willie Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Commissioner Donna Storter-Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Mr. Donald McCormick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHARLOTTE COUNTY
- Commissioner Joe Tiseo, Charlotte BCC
- Commissioner Ken Doherty, Charlotte BCC
- Vice-Mayor Gary Wein, City of Punta Gorda
- Mr. Donald McCormick, Governor Appointee
- Ms. Suzanne Graham, Governor Appointee

### COLLIER COUNTY
- Commissioner Bill McDaniel, Collier BCC
- Commissioner Penny Taylor, Collier BCC
- Councilman Reg Buxton, City of Naples
- Mr. Robert "Bob" Mulhere, Governor Appointee (City of Marco Island Vacancy)

### GLADES COUNTY
- Commissioner Donna Storter-Long, Glades BCC
- Commissioner Donald Strenth, Glades BCC
- Councilwoman Pat Lucas, City of Moore Haven
- Mr. Thomas Perry, Governor Appointee

### HENDRY COUNTY
- Commissioner Emma Byrd, Hendry BCC
- Commissioner Mitchell Wills, Hendry BCC
- Vice-Mayor Michael Atkinson, City of Clewiston
- Commissioner Julie Wilkins, City of LaBelle
- Mr. Mel Karau, Governor Appointee

### LEE COUNTY
- Commissioner Brian Hamman, Lee BCC
- Commissioner Cecil Pendergrass, Lee BCC
- Councilman Fred Burson, City of Fort Myers
- Councilmember Anita Cereceda, Town of Fort Myers Beach
- Vice-Mayor Mick Denham, City of Sanibel
- Councilman Greg DeWitt, City of Bonita Springs
- Ms. Laura Holquist, Governor Appointee (Governor Appointee Vacancy)

### SARASOTA COUNTY
- Commissioner Mike Moran, Sarasota BCC
- Commissioner Charles Hines, Sarasota BCC
- Commissioner Willie Shaw, City of Sarasota
- Councilmember Mitzie Fiedler, City of Venice Beach
- Mr. Felipe Colon, Governor Appointee (Governor Appointee Vacancy)

### EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jon Iglehart, FDEP</td>
<td>(FDOT Vacancy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Flood, SFWMD</td>
<td>Dennis Ragosta, SWFWMD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STAFF

- Margaret Wuerste, Executive Director
- Beth Nightingale, Legal Consultant

- Aidan Bandy
- James Beever
- Rebekah Harp
- Charles Kammerer
- Sean McCabe
- Elly McKuen
- Timothy Walker

---

Updated 5/9/2018
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
BEHR - 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
FEBRUARY 15, 2018 MEETING

The meeting of the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council was held on February 15, 2018 at the offices of the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council-1400 Colonial Boulevard, Suite #1 in Fort Myers, Florida. Chair Perry called the meeting to order at 9:03 AM. Commissioner Shaw then led an invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Ms. Margaret Wuerstle 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
Glades County: Commissioner Donna Storter-Long, Commissioner Donald Strenth, Mr. Thomas Perry
Hendry County: Commissioner Mitchell Wills, Mr. Mel Karau
Lee County: Commissioner Brian Hamman, Commissioner Cecil Pendergrass, Councilmember Jessica Cosden, Councilman Fred Burson, Vice-Mayor Mick Denham,
Sarasota County: Commissioner Charles Hines, Commissioner Willie Shaw, Councilmember Mitzie Fielder
Ex-Officio: Mr. Phil Flood–SFWMD, Mr. Jon Iglehart–FDEP

MEMBERS ABSENT

Charlotte County: Vice-Mayor Gary Wein, Ms. Suzanne Graham
Collier County: Commissioner Penny Taylor, Councilman Reg Buxton, Mr. Bob Mulhere
Glades County: Councilwoman Pat Lucas,
Hendry County: Commissioner Emma Byrd, Commissioner Julie Wilkins, Vice-Mayor Michael Atkinson,
Lee County: Councilman Greg DeWitt, Councilwoman Anita Cereceda, Ms. Laura Holquist
Sarasota County: Commissioner Michael Moran, Mr. Felipe Colón
Ex-Officio: 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 February 15, 2017 agenda.

AGENDA ITEM #6
MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 14, 2017 MEETING

A motion was made by Mr. McCormick to approve the minutes of the December 14, 2017 meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Vice-Mayor Denham and passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM #7
REGIONAL IMPACT

AGENDA ITEMS #7(a)
Palmer Ranch Increment XXVI DO

Mr. Dan Trescott presented the item.

A motion was made by Commissioner Shaw to approve the Palmer Ranch Increment XXVI DO as presented. The motion was seconded by Vice-Mayor Denham and passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEMS #7(b)
Palmer Ranch Increment XXVII DO

Mr. Trescott presented the item.

A motion was made by Commissioner Shaw to approve the Palmer Ranch Increment XXVII DO as presented. The motion was seconded by Vice-Mayor Denham and passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEMS #7(c)
City Gate NOPC

Mr. Trescott presented the item. Vice-Mayor Denham asked about traffic and stormwater impacts. Commissioner McDaniel added that there are significant traffic mitigation improvements being made in association with this NOPC. Mr. Trescott explained that the trip generation estimates for
the NOPC are less than the originally approved DRI. Mr. Flood added that the WMD has reviewed the project.

A motion was made by Commissioner McDaniel to approve the City Gate NOPC as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hamman and passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEMS #7(d)
Marco Shores/Fiddler’s Creek NOPC

Mr. Trescott presented the item. Vice-Mayor Denham asked how the wastewater treatment would be handled. The applicant answered that the development is covered by Collier County central water and sewer. The development also uses spray irrigation.

A motion was made by Commissioner McDaniel to approve the Marco Shores/Fiddler’s Creek NOPC as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hamman and passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEMS #7(e)
Riverwood Master and Increments I and II NOPC

Mr. Trescott presented the item. Commissioner Pendergrass asked if the development has already occurred. Mr. Trescott explained that the DRI is essentially built out except for a commercial area. Vice-Mayor Denham added that the issue in the past with this DRI was river contamination. Mr. Trescott explained that this is low density development and they have all their water permits.

A motion was made by Commissioner Hamman to approve the Riverwood Master and Increments I and II NOPC as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Shaw and passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM #8
CONSENT AGENDA

A motion was made by Commissioner Hamman to approve the consent agenda as presented. The motion was seconded by Vice-Mayor Denham and passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM #9
DIRECTOR’S REPORT

AGENDA ITEMS #9(c)
Council Committee Appointments

Ms. Wuerstle asked that the Council members review the council committee membership lists and let her know if they want to be added or removed from a committee.
AGENDA ITEMS #9(a)
Sanibel Affordable Housing Presentation

Vice-Mayor Denham introduced Mr. Richard Johnson and Ms. Melissa Rice from Sanibel’s workforce housing program. Sanibel has been running a workforce housing program for 38 years, making it the longest running affordable housing program in the State.

Mr. Johnson and Ms. Rice proceeded to give their presentation. Chair Perry asked if there is a waiting list to enter the program and if CHR (Community Housing and Resources) seeks out applicants. Ms. Rice explained that there are about 25 people on a waiting list right now and they accept new applications every day. They determine priority through a points system. The average time that someone lives in these properties is 5-6 years and people leave for a wide variety of reasons. There are residents who improve their economic circumstances enough that they no longer qualify for the program.

Commissioner McDaniel asked how support was garnered for the program from the residents of the community and neighboring communities. Vice-Mayor Denham explained that the relationship with CHR was lukewarm in the beginning and has grown substantially over the years. The Sanibel City Council is very proud of the program and they have buy-in from the business community. Mr. Johnson added that most of the land used by the program was donated by the City. Ms. Rice explained that transparency is important to gain the trust and support of the community. Vice-Mayor Denham stressed that the program requires a strong commitment from the community.

Councilwoman Fiedler asked for the program’s annual budget. Ms. Rice responded that the budget is $1.1 million. Councilman Burson asked what the income qualification were. Ms. Rice explained that they use the HUD guideline for Lee County, which is currently $59,600 for a family of four. Commissioner Hamman stressed the importance of changing the negative perception of the young workforce. Mr. Johnson explained that they have made it a priority to educate people on the need for workforce housing to try to change those negative perceptions. They understand that there will always be a small group of people who will never support the program and they focus on the people in the middle, who just need more information on the program. Councilwoman Holly Smith from Sanibel added that they have zoning exemptions on density to benefit this program. They have 88 properties in the program and are looking to expand to 104.

AGENDA ITEMS #9(b)
ACT Human Trafficking Presentation

Ms. Wuerstle introduced Ms. Gina Malone, VISTA volunteer with ACT (Abuse Counseling and Treatment), to continue her presentation from last meeting. Ms. Malone gave the presentation.

Ms. Nightingale asked if ACT has been able to present in schools. Ms. Malone has received a lot of pushback from schools. ACT has only presented in schools that have reached out to them. Schoolboards have allowed for school staff to be trained by ACT. Ms. Malone has reached out the schoolboards.
Commissioner Pendergrass, as a former law enforcement professional, detailed how trafficking has been a problem in the region for decades. Commissioner Wills added that the schools are much more willing to allow these discussions within the school if a student reaches out first. Commissioner Hamman explained that a State law has been passed that allows human trafficking hotline signage to be posted in places where human trafficking may be occurring, but local governments need to pass it locally to take effect. It has been passed in Lee County. Ms. Malone added that these victims don’t usually identify as human trafficking victims.

Ms. Wuerstle continued with the director’s report. She had a conference call with EDA the previous day and EDA asked for two projects from SWFL for the disaster relief fund. This is not an application. The intent is for EDA to get an understanding of what priority projects each region has and what the cost of those projects will be. She asked that the Council send her whatever projects they may have before EDA’s 5:00 pm deadline. Commissioner McDaniel asked how long Ms. Wuerstle knew about this. Ms. Wuerstle reiterated that she just found out the previous day. She added that only a 20% match is required for the disaster relief fund rather than EDA’s usual 1:1 match or 50% of the total project cost.

AGENDA ITEM #10
STAFF SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM #10(a)
Grant Activity Sheet

This item was for informational purposes only.

AGENDA ITEM #11
COMMITTEE REPORTS

AGENDA ITEM #11(a)
Budget & Finance Committee

Ms. Wuerstle explained that the November and December financials are strong. However, the RPC has over $230,000 in receivables and some governments are behind on their assessments. Money has been taken out of the reserves to use as operating funds. Those funds will be replenished once the assessments are paid. Mr. McCormick and Commissioner Storter-Long asked that the Councilmembers stay up-to-date on their assessments.

Commissioner Pendergrass asked when the planning will begin for next year’s budget. Mr. McCormick answered that it will probably be June or July. Commissioner McDaniel brought up the need for the RPC to show its relevance. Chair Perry stated that he is working towards that. Commissioner Hamman agrees with Commissioner McDaniel and he would be happy to discuss Lee County’s position with the Council. Chair Perry stated that he wants to have this conversation when they have gathered more information. Commissioner McDaniel asked that Chair Perry not take the relevancy discussion personally as past members have. He added that he sees that there has been an evolution coming along, staff is willing to adapt, and the leadership is in place.
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

Chair Perry explained the Executive Committee met this morning and discussed topics already discussed earlier in the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM #11(f)
Legislative Affairs Committee

No report was given at this time.

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

Commissioner Shaw applauded the presentations given today.

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 believes there has been a tremendous step forward in water quality last year, including the EAA Reservoir. This will result in a 20% reduction in outflow to the estuary. The C43 funding will move forward as well.
AGENDA ITEM #12
NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business brought to the Council.

AGENDA ITEM #13
STATE AGENCIES COMMENTS/REPORTS

Mr. Flood announced that the timeframe has been moved forward on the reservoir south of Lake Okeechobee in Palm Beach County. Lake discharge to the Caloosahatchee River will be reduced by 30%. The legislature was very happy with the WMD’s efforts. The final report will be given to the Corps of Engineers by the end of March.

Mr. Iglehart reminded everyone that FDEP holds workshops on the first Wednesday of every month. The March workshop is on tanks.

AGENDA ITEM #14
COUNCIL LEGAL CONSULTANT’S COMMENTS

No comments were made at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #15
COUNCIL MEMBER’S COMMENTS

Chair Perry thanked Councilmember Fielder for attending her first meeting and Commissioner Hamman for attending his first meeting back after an absence from the Council.

Commissioner Doherty recommended that one of the next two Council meetings be largely devoted to discussing the future of the SWFRPC. Commissioner Hines agreed with Commissioner Doherty stated he and Commissioner Moran would attend that meeting in person.

Commissioner Pendergrass asked about a news article regarding two employees resigning from the SWFRP. Chair Perry explained that two employees attended an annual HazMat Conference in Daytona Beach. Something happened, no one is sure exactly what, but everyone is safe. Both employees resigned, and both refuse to answer questions about what happened. It was called a personal safety matter for one employee. He is concerned for that employee and believes the best way to proceed is to respect that person’s privacy. Chair Perry clarified that both employees chose to resign. One of the employees was already in the process of selling their house and moving out of State.

Commissioner McDaniel asked when the next Transportation Committee Meeting will occur. He also wants to know who the contact person is for the Promise Zone and would like a monthly update on the Promise Zone. He would like to see more being done on infrastructure. He also asked about the contract term of the executive director. Chair Perry stated that an evaluation form on the executive director’s performance will be sent out. The Executive Committee will review to responses and come back to the Council with a recommendation next month.
Commissioner Pendergrass announced that the SWFL Regional County summit will be held at RSW next month.

Commissioner Hamman asked if the HazMat Conference was funded by taxpayer dollars. Chair Perry explained that the HazMat program is paid for by a State grant. Commissioner Hamman asked if any of that money was misappropriated. Chair Perry responded that there are no financial improprieties that they are aware of. Chair Perry added that the executive director has been very proactive throughout this process.

Councilmember Cosden asked why the committees seem to meet so infrequently. Mr. Perry responded that the committees meet whenever an issue arises that sparks their interest. Ms. Wuerstle added that committees could be added or removed as necessary and it’s usually the committee chairman’s responsibility to schedule meetings for that committee. Mr. Beever added that the Estero Bay Agency on Bay Management is the exception. That committee meets every month provided they have a quorum.

Mr. McCormick stated that new blood is needed to represent the RPC on the CHNEP and requested that any interested Councilmember ask him about the program.

Commissioner Storter-Long stated that the Corp of Engineers made a presentation to Glades County that might be of interest to the Council. She also discussed funding of the SERT program with Senator Rubio. She challenged everyone to bring up the relevancy issue with their County or City and bring it back to the Council. She does not believe it needs to take up an entire meeting.

**AGENDA ITEM #16
ADJOURNMENT**

The next meeting will be on March 15, 2018. The meeting adjourned at 11:12 a.m.

____________________________________________
Commissioner Donna Storter-Long, Secretary

**The meeting was duly advertised in the February 1, 2018 issue of the FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE REGISTER, Volume 44, Number 22.**
MINUTES OF THE
SOUTHWEST FLORIDA REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
MARCH 15, 2018 MEETING

The meeting of the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council was held on March 15, 2018 at
the offices of the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council–1400 Colonial Boulevard, Suite #1
in Fort Myers, Florida. Chair Perry called the meeting to order at 9:05 AM. Commissioner
McDaniel then led an invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Ms. Margaret Wuerstle conducted
the roll call and noted that a quorum was not present. A quorum was reached later in the meeting.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Charlotte County: Commissioner Ken Doherty, Commissioner Joe Tiseo,
Vice-Mayor Gary Wein, Mr. Don McCormick

Collier County: Commissioner Bill McDaniel, Mr. Bob Mulhere

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

Hendry County: Commissioner Mitchell Wills, Commissioner Emma Byrd,

Lee County: Commissioner Brian Hamman, Commissioner Cecil Pendergrass,
Councilman Fred Burson, Vice-Mayor Mick Denham,
Councilman Greg DeWitt,

Sarasota County: Councilmember Mitzie Fielder

Ex-Officio: Mr. Phil Flood-SFWMD, Mr. Jon Iglehart-FDEP,
Mr. James Golden- SWFWMD, Ms. Sarah Catala, FDOT

MEMBERS ABSENT

Charlotte County: Ms. Suzanne Graham

Collier County: Commissioner Penny Taylor, Councilman Reg Buxton

Glades County: Councilwoman Pat Lucas

Hendry County: Commissioner Julie Wilkins, Vice-Mayor Michael Atkinson,
Mr. Mel Karau

Lee County: Councilmember Jessica Cosden, Councilwoman Anita Cereceda,
Ms. Laura Holquist
Sarasota County: Commissioner Charles Hines, Commissioner Michael Moran, Commissioner Willie Shaw, Mr. Felipe Colón
Ex-Officio: None

AGENDA ITEM #4
PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Cheryl Cook stated that she sat on the RPC board for four years from 2012-2016. She now hosts a radio show called “Can We Talk?” on WKDW. She offered to have RPC board members on the show for PR. She plans to attend meetings to gather information on the RPC’s efforts.

Mr. David Urich stated that he is a charter member of the Responsible Growth Management Coalition. He explained that the RPC is one of the most valuable operations that the region has. He was concerned at several the things he has heard regarding the RPC lately, including the lack of quorum at this point in the meeting. He encouraged the Council to look at what it is doing and why it should continue. He stressed the importance of cross county line planning. He said that he spoke to Mr. Jim Beever recently and was encouraged by that conversation.

Chair Perry responded that the Council is working on a plan to increase its relevancy.

AGENDA ITEM #5
AGENDA

There were no changes made to the March 15, 2018 agenda.

AGENDA ITEM #9
DIRECTOR’S REPORT

AGENDA ITEMS #9(b)
Disaster Recovery Coordinator

Ms. Wuerstle summarized the three Economic Resiliency Workshops that were held in SWFL last month. These meetings were hosted by EDA and many other federal agencies were in attendance. She explained that EDA also funded a disaster recovery coordinator to work out of the RPC for the next two years. She stated that Ms. Elly McKuen had been hired to fill that position. Ms. McKuen gave a presentation on how she plans to run this program. After the presentation, Ms. Wuerstle announced that the NOFA (Notice of Funding Availability) for the EDA disaster recovery funds should be released in the next 30 days. EDA has expressed interest in several of the projects that were submitted by the SWFRPC. Ms. Wuerstle offered the RPC’s assistance to any municipality that wants to apply. HUD funds will also be coming soon and will fund project areas that EDA won’t, such as affordable housing. Mr. Iglehart explained that he has been working with several of the municipalities to develop FDEPS’s infrastructure project.
AGENDA ITEMS #9(c)  
Promise Zone Update-Immokalee Foundation Presentation

Ms. Wuerstle announced that the VISTA Program has offered to fund 50% of the salary for a full-time Promise Zone and VISTA coordinator. The funding will cover $25,000 in salary and $5,000 in VISTA travel. Mr. Aidan Bandy has been appointed to the Promise Zone coordinator position. Ms. Wuerstle has also submitted the VISTA application for the new year. SWFL has been awarded 10 VISTAs. She then introduced Ms. Ruby Castillo, a VISTA volunteer for the Immokalee Foundation. Ms. Castillo gave a presentation on the Foundation and their efforts in education.

Commissioner McDaniel asked for more information on the qualifications to be a mentor. Ms. Castillo responded that the largest barrier to be a mentor is having the necessary time available. Commissioner McDaniel asked to be sent a list of what the Foundation’s specific needs are and asked what the typical time requirement is. Ms. Castillo responded that its 30 minutes per week. Vice-Mayor Wein explained that his wife is a part of a similar program in Charlotte County for 458 homeless students. He explained that a key issue is the lack of access to electronic devices and internet. Punta Gorda has refurbished and donated devices to this program. He was also pleased to see that this program focuses on vocational education. Charlotte County has a shortage of HVAC technicians at the airport. Ms. Castillo added that the Foundation just had a meeting where they tried to increase their focus on vocational education and combat the stigma that comes with it.

Ms. Wuerstle announced that the SWFRPC has applied for the Opportunity Zone program. Their proposal includes a contiguous area in the region that included parts of Charlotte, Collier, Glades, Hendry, and Lee Counties (including the entire Promise Zone area). The proposal that was written by Mr. C.J. Kammerer was passed out to the members present.

Several members joined the meeting during the presentations and the Council reached their quorum requirement at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #6  
MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 15, 2018 MEETING

The minutes if the February 15, 2018 meeting will be presented in the April Council packet.

AGENDA ITEM #7  
REGIONAL IMPACT

AGENDA ITEMS #7(a)  
Murdock Center Increment I NOPC

Mr. Dan Trescott presented the item.

A motion was made by Mr. Mulhere to approve the Murdock Center Increment I NOPC as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Doherty 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 Commissioner Hamman and passed unanimously.

Ms. Wuerstle proposed a resolution that would assign the Glades-Hendry Transportation Disadvantaged program to the Heartland TPO (Transportation Planning Organization). Ms. Nicole Gwinnett, who recently left the RPC managed that program and the TPO, which covers Glades and Hendry among other rural counties, did not exist when the program was given to the RPC.

A motion was made by Mr. Mulhere to approve the sign the resolution as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McDaniel and passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM #10  
STAFF SUMMARIES

AGENDA ITEM #10(a)  
Grant Activity Sheet

This item was for informational purposes only.

AGENDA ITEMS #9(a)  
Council Committee Appointments

Chair Perry presented the updated Committee membership list. Ms. Wuerstle added that Mr. Flood would like to be added to the Legislative Committee. She also explained that Ms. Martha Simons is currently representing the RPC on the Estero Bay Agency on Bay Management, however she is no longer serving on the Council. Councilman Burson would like to serve on that Committee. Chair Perry recommended that Councilman Burson be appointed to that seat and Commissioner Hamman seconded the recommendation.

A motion was made by Vice-Mayor Wein to appoint the Committee members as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McDaniel for discussion.

Mr. McCormick was added to the Relevancy Committee. Mr. Mulhere pointed out that the importance of the Legislative Committee rises and falls depending on what’s happening. He suggested that the Executive Committee could also be added to the Legislative Committee, since they already meet regularly. Chair Perry agreed. The Legislative Committee drafts the Council’s legislative priorities and makes recommendations to the Council. Mr. McCormick explained that the Committee chose not to take any positions during the current legislative cycle. Chair Perry explained that the nomination of Councilman Burson to the Agency on Bay Management will be voted on in a separate motion. Chair Perry added that anyone can still be added to a Committee at any point during the year.
The Council voted unanimously to approve Committee membership as amended.

A motion was made by Commissioner Hamman to approve Councilman Burson as the Council’s representative on the Estero Bay Agency on Bay Management. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mulhere for discussion.

Commissioner Storter-Long asked where this would leave Ms. Simons. Chair Perry explained that the ABM has citizen members and Ms. Simon could serve under that capacity.

The Council voted unanimously to appoint Councilman Burson to the Estero Bay Agency on Bay Management.

AGENDA ITEM #11
COMMITTEE REPORTS

AGENDA ITEM #11(a)
Budget & Finance Committee

Mr. McCormick reported that the RPC is on track and revenues are moving in the correct direction.

A motion was made by Vice-Mayor Wein to approve January 2018 financials as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hamman and passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM #11(b)
Economic Development Committee

No report was given at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #11(c)
Energy & Climate Committee

No report was given at this time.

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

No report was given at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #11(e)
Executive Committee

Chair Perry explained the Executive Committee asked for evaluations of the Executive Director. The responses were mostly positive, with a few constructive criticisms. He reviewed the positives and negatives with the Executive Director and she was receptive to what he said. The Executive Committee recommends that she continue employment for the next year at the same rate of pay and using her most recent contract.
A motion was made by Vice-Mayor Denham to approve the recommendations of the Executive Committee as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mulhere for discussion.

Chair Perry added that he has already seen the Executive Director address some of the shortcomings that were in the evaluations. He does not see any of the comments as severely negative, but as constructive criticisms.

Vice-Mayor Denham asked for a status update on the process of redefining the RPC. Chair Perry answered that there currently is not a definitive schedule, but he is trying to have that discussion in the first half of the year. He wants to make sure that there is as much participation in that meeting as possible. Vice-Mayor Denham thinks this should be a priority. Chair Perry stated that he has given Ms. Wuerstle direction on presentations for that meeting.

Mr. Mulhere noted that with 6.5 employees, the SWFRPC has the fewest employees of any RPC, has one of the lowest budgets, but covers the fourth largest geographical area. These need to be considerations when the Council begins to redefine itself. Ms. Wuerstle explained that she used to create a work plan that would be presented to the Council along with the budget that identified the Council’s focus for the upcoming year. After three years of doing that, she was told to only present the budget. She believes bringing the work plan back would help with the relevancy issue. Mr. Mulhere and Commissioner Hamman agreed.

The Council voted unanimously to approve the recommendations of the Executive Committee as presented

AGENDA ITEM #11(f)  
Legislative Affairs Committee

Mr. Flood asked about the DRI legislation that passed. Ms. Wuerstle explained that it took away almost all the DRI review from the Council and possibly the comprehensive plan amendments as well.

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

No report was given at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #11(h)  
Regional Transportation Committee

Ms. Wuerstle explained that she was in Tallahassee the previous week and met with FDOT. They are working on the US-27 corridor plan and have asked the RPC to work with them in identifying issues. They are in the data gathering phase. She stated that widening US-27 through Clewiston was in their work plan. Ms. Sarah Catala with FDOT wasn’t sure what plan Ms. Wuerstle was referring to and clarified that there is no widening imminent for US-27. They would do a feasibility and corridor study before any plans are made to widen a SIS road. FDOT has simply identified that
there will be a capacity need for US-27 from SR-80 to Palm Beach County in the future. Ms. Wuerstle thanked Ms. Catala for the clarification.

Councilman Burson asked if the capacity issues with US-27 had anything to do with FedEx possibly coming to AirGlades. Chair Perry responded that there has been no official or unofficial talk of FedEx coming to AirGlades. Councilman Burson added that federal aviation approved lengthening the runway. Chair Perry confirmed that this had occurred to alleviate traffic from Miami International, specifically perishable imports.

Commissioner Pendergrass asked to hear Hendry County’s thoughts on US-27. Ms. Catala explained that Hendry County is part of the Heartland TPO and the County’s plans are made through that organization. She spoke to the TPO about US-27 today and they have not had any issues so far. She stressed the difference between identifying a need and planning for construction. If anything were to happen with US-27, that process would include significant public involvement. Commissioner Wills added US-27 could not be widened through Clewiston without destroying buildings. The County welcomed the increased traffic that the AirGlades improvements would provide because it will open opportunities for businesses and infrastructure. He stated that US-27 was not one of their pressing concerns right now.

Vice-Mayor Denham asked what the relationship is between the RPC and the MPOs and if the RPCs involvement was redundant to the MPOs. Ms. Wuerstle explained that FDOT asked to meet with her and they are only in the fact-finding phase. The RPC was involved partially because they completed a downtown revitalization plan for Clewiston through DEO. She does not know if the TPO is working on the non-transportation planning issues that the RPC could speak to. Commissioner McDaniel explained that he asked Ms. Wuerstle to focus on regional transportation, including a regional transportation map. This is an important regional issue and it is important for everyone to know what their neighboring counties and municipalities are planning. Mr. Mulhere clarified that planning is a broad term. The MPOs, TPOs, and FDOT focus on the transportation planning and the RPC could provide expertise on the other areas of planning.

Mr. Tim Walker gave an update on the regional transportation map, including the addition of a regional future land use map. The Council commended Mr. Walker on his excellent work. Mr. Mulhere encouraged everyone to share the link with people outside of this Council.

**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

No report was given at this time.
AGENDA ITEM #12
NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business brought to the Council.

AGENDA ITEM #13
STATE AGENCIES COMMENTS/REPORTS

Mr. Iglehart announced that next month’s FDEP workshop (April 11) will be an environmental business expo.

Mr. Flood stated that this was a good legislative session for water projects. Projects included a septic-to-sewer project in Glades County, a $2 million nitrogen sewage treatment project in Sanibel, a roughly $750,000 creek project in Fort Myers, and a septic-to-sewer project in Charlotte County. There was $293 million in funding for Everglades projects as well. Vice-Mayor Denham stated that the SFWMD has done an outstanding job. Mr. Flood offered to give a presentation at a future Council meeting. Mr. McCormick asked if any of these projects will be impacted by the $400 million diversion into school resources. Mr. Flood responded that these projects have made it into the budget and the Governor’s desk.

AGENDA ITEM #14
COUNCIL LEGAL CONSULTANT’S COMMENTS

No comments were made at this time.

AGENDA ITEM #15
COUNCIL MEMBER’S COMMENTS

Commissioner McDaniel asked if the information regarding the various disaster recovery funds has been sent to county and city staff. Ms. Wuerstle responded that she has not yet because the NOFAs have not been released yet. Commissioner McDaniel also announced that Collier County has been awarded a $13 million TIGER grant for Immokalee’s complete streets program.

AGENDA ITEM #16
ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting will be on April 19, 2018. The meeting adjourned at 10:46 a.m.

Commissioner Donna Storter-Long, Secretary

The meeting was duly advertised in the March 2, 2018 issue of the FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE REGISTER, Volume 44, Number 43.
Regional Impact
GROWTH MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
Funding for the reviews that Council will see today was funded through local jurisdiction dues and Applicant Fees.
Babcock Ranch
• The original Master Development Order (MDO) Resolution 2007-196 was approved by the Charlotte County Board of County Commissioners on December 13, 2007 (Attachment I Location Map).

• The existing BRC development is approved for 17,870 residential dwelling units; 1.4 million square feet of retail uses; 3.5 million square feet of office uses; 650,000 square feet of industrial uses; 600 hotel rooms; 177 hospital beds, 418 units of assisted living facilities, 54 golf holes, and ancillary facilities such as the educational service center, schools, and university research facilities, libraries, places of worship, regional and community park sites, and the necessary utility infrastructure. Buildout was approved to May 8, 2043.

• The original Increment 1 Development Order (IDO) was approved by the Charlotte County Board of County Commissioners on December 15, 2009.
• The existing BRC Increment 1 land area is 4,048 acres (see Attachment II Location Map) and has approved two phases totaling 2,500 residential dwelling units (1,500 single family and 1,000 multifamily units); 126,000 square feet of retail uses; 322,500 square feet of office uses; 90,000 square feet of industrial uses; 100 hotel rooms; and associated accessory and ancillary facilities.

• To date, Increment 1 Development Order (IDO) is the only approved Increment within the BRC development site. Development of the first phase on Increment 1 has started in 2015 with construction of the town center and residential home sites. The current buildout is November 3, 2026.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE MDO and IDO

MDO
• 1. Revise Map H Master Development Plan (see Attachment III):
  • a. Expand the boundaries of the North Area of Increment 1 to 1,453± acres to allow for the addition of solar and energy storage facilities.
b. Convert the 25-acre Educational Services site shown in Increment 1 South Area to Mixed-Use/Residential/Commercial.

c. Remove the 71 Acre Higher Education / University Land Use Designation from Increment 1.

d. Add Note 5 to Map H – Master Development Plan to include a condition limiting the nonresidential land uses to a maximum of 6,000,000 square feet for both the Lee and Charlotte portions of the Babcock Ranch Community Mater Development of Regional Impact.

e. Add Note 6 indicating the solar and energy storage facilities are permitted in all of the Increment 1 North Area, except in areas with a recorded conservation easement.

f. Reflect the extension of the expiration date and buildout date of this Development Order per the Governor’s Executive Orders.

IDO

1. Revise the Legal Description and Sketch for Increment 1 North Area to expand the North Area of Increment 1 to include a 1,453± acres to allow for additional solar and energy storage facilities to be developed in the increment.
• 2. Modify the Education Condition 2 to acknowledge the sign agreement between the Developer and the Charlotte County School District.

• 3. Revise Exhibit C to include Assisted Living Facilities in the Equivalency Matrix.

• 4. Revise Map H Increment I Master Development Plan (see Attachment IV):
  • a. to expand the boundaries of Increment 1 North Area to 1,453± acres.
  • b. revise the Development Intensity table inset to include 100 Assisted Living Facility units by converting 15,000 square-feet of office uses based on the Equivalency matrix included as Exhibit C.
  • c. to convert the 25±-acre Educational Services Center site in the Increment 1 South Area to Mixed Use/Residential/Commercial as outlined in the proposed revision to the Master Development Order.
  • d. to remove the 71± Acre Higher Education Facility Land Use Designation from Increment 1 as outlined in the proposed revision to the Master Development Order.

• 5. Revise Map H-1 Increment 1 South Area Development Plan to reflect the changes to Increment 1 described above (see Attachment V).

• 6. Revise Map H-3 Increment 1 North Area Development Plan to reflect the changes to Increment 1 described above (see Attachment VI).
• 7. Amend Exhibit E to allow for 100 Assisted Living Facility units to be permitted in Increment 1 by reduce the permitted office intensity by 15,000 sq. ft. based on the conversions outlined in the equivalency matrix.
• 8. Revise the Master Drainage Plan to reflect the changes to Increment 1 described above.
• 9. Revise the Master Internal Circulation Plan to reflect the changes to Increment 1 described above.
• 10. Revise the Increment 1 North Area Primary Greenway Map and Trails Plan to reflect the changes to Increment 1 described above (see Attachment VII).
• 11. Reflect the extension of the expiration date and buildout date of this Development Order per the Governor’s Executive Orders.

REGIONAL STAFF ANALYSIS

• Since there are no more substantial deviations the issue is whether the change creates additional regional impact not previous reviewed by the SWFRPC. State agency review of the changes had no objections. Charlotte County also had no objections and has determined the proposed changes are consistent with goals, objectives, and policies set forth in the County’s Comprehensive Plan.
REGIONAL RESOURCES AND FACILITIES IMPACT

• There are no regional resources or facilities impacts create by the changes.

CHARACTER, MAGNITUDE AND LOCATION

• There are no changes in magnitude or location of the DRI associated with the changes. However, the character of the DRI has changed by the addition of more solar power on site creating a distinction of being a solar powered town.

MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES

• No new multi-jurisdictional issues will occur from these changes.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE PROPOSED MDO AND IDO AMENDMENT

• The county staff report provided an acceptable draft development order necessary to rebut the presumption that no additional regional impacts will occur from the changes.
• **RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Notify Charlotte County, the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity, and the applicant that the proposed changes do not create additional regional impacts.
Agenda

Item

Babcock Ranch NOPC

7a
BACKGROUND

The Babcock Ranch Community (BRC) Development of Regional Impact (DRI) is an approved mixed-use development located in southeastern Charlotte County, north of CR 78, south of CR 74, and immediately east of SR 31, and contains approximately 13,630 acres (see Attachment I Location Map). The original Master Development Order (MDO) Resolution 2007-196 was approved by the Charlotte County Board of County Commissioners on December 13, 2007. The existing BRC development is approved for 17,870 residential dwelling units; 1.4 million square feet of retail uses; 3.5 million square feet of office uses; 650,000 square feet of industrial uses; 600 hotel rooms; 177 hospital beds, 418 units of assisted living facilities, 54 golf holes, and ancillary facilities such as the educational service center, schools, and university research facilities, libraries, places of worship, regional and community park sites, and the necessary utility infrastructure. Buildout was approved to May 8, 2043.

The original Increment 1 Development Order (IDO) was approved by the Charlotte County Board of County Commissioners on December 15, 2009. The existing BRC Increment 1 land area is 4,048 acres (see Attachment II Location Map) and has approved two phases totaling 2,500 residential dwelling units (1,500 single family and 1,000 multifamily units); 126,000 square feet of retail uses; 322,500 square feet of office uses; 90,000 square feet of industrial uses; 100 hotel rooms; and associated accessory and ancillary facilities. To date, Increment 1 Development Order (IDO) is the only approved Increment within the BRC development site. Development of the first phase on Increment 1 has started in 2015 with construction of the town center and residential home sites. The current buildout is November 3, 2026.

PREVIOUS CHANGES TO THE MDO and IDO

MDO

1. On June 17, 2008, the Charlotte County Board of County Commissioners (CCBOCC) approved Resolution 2008-063 to reflect the settlement agreement entered into by DCA and Babcock Property Holdings.

2. On December 15, 2009, the CCBOCC approved Resolution 2009-283 to insure consistency between the MDO and IDO, to revise transportation conditions and to revise Map H.

3. On December 13, 2011, the CCBOCC approved Resolution 2011-485 to increase office and decrease retail square footages, and update Exhibit F as a result of the initial Master Traffic Study.

4. On April 24, 2012, the CCBOCC approved Resolution 2012-024 to allow for the statutory and executive order extensions of all commencement, phase, build out and expiration dates.

5. On January 28, 2014 the CCBOCC approved Resolution 2014-047 to update the antiquated
Affordable Housing programs that no longer exist and to allow analyses of Affordable Housing needs upon development of the 1.5 million square feet of non-residential development approved in the development and provide for mitigation of the identified need as it occurs.

6. On July 25, 2017 the CCBOCC approved Resolution 2017-187 to clarify density for Villages/Hamlets and Town Center, modify stormwater, transportation, wastewater management and water supply conditions, reflect previously approved extension of the Master DRI Development Order expiration date, update Exhibit B – Master Concept Plan – Map H, to add 46± acres to the Increment 1, South area, of which 25 acres is proposed for Educational Services, modify Exhibit D to clarify types, acreages, and time frames for commencement of operations of public facilities, and other minor amendments to Map H include refinements to conceptual road layouts and development areas.

IDO

1. On December 14, 2010, the CCBOCC approved Resolution 2010-112 to replace Exhibit L with the Babcock Ranch Community Increment 1 Phase One Master Roadway Improvement Agreement.

2. On April 24, 2012, the CCBOCC approved Resolution 2012-024 to allow for the statutory and executive order extensions of all commencement, phase, build out and expiration dates.

3. On January 28, 2014, the CCBOCC approved Resolution 2014-048 to increase the acreage of Increment 1 by approximately 992 acres in order to increase flexibility in community planning alternatives for the subject site. No development levels were changed. Also, affordable housing conditions were revised to provide consistency with the MDO requirements and changes were made to Development Order Buildout and Expiration dates to reflect the extensions as provided by law and to reflect permits that have been issued.

4. On July 25, 2017 the CCBOCC approved Resolution 2017-188 to clarify for Villages/Hamlets and Town Center, add golf course and age-restricted communities to land use types, clarify that Increment 1, Phases 1 and 2, are combined into one phase, modify wastewater management, water supply and education conditions, and extend the previously approved buildout and expiration extensions.

Amend Exhibit C to add Age restricted community category to the Increment 1 equivalency matrix, modify Exhibit D to clarify types, acreages, and timeframes for commencement of operations of public facilities, amend Exhibit E consistent with the permitted Land Use Exchange, simultaneous increase residential units and civic/government and decrease hotel rooms, retail, office and industrial and amend Map H-1 and H-2 to reflect these changes.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE MDO and IDO

In March 2018 the applicant Babcock Property Holdings, LLC submitted a Notice of Proposed Change (NOPC) for the MDO and the IDO as listed below.
**MDO**

1. Revise Map H Master Development Plan (see Attachment III):

   a. Expand the boundaries of the North Area of Increment 1 to 1,453± acres to allow for the addition of solar and energy storage facilities. The boundary for Increment 1 North Area has been expanded by 1,010± acres to allow for the addition of solar and energy storage facilities in the North Area.

   b. Convert the 25-acre Educational Services site shown in Increment 1 South Area to mixed-Use/Residential/Commercial. The developer is working with the Charlotte County School District to determine the most appropriate location for the Educational Services site. Rather than show the shifting location for the site, the 25-acre Educational Services site has been removed from Map H. The final location of the Educational Services site will be shown in the future. The developer is committed to addressing school concurrency with the Charlotte County School Board and Charlotte County based on the School Site Dedication Agreement between BPH and the Charlotte County Public School District.

   c. Remove the 71 Acre Higher Education / University Land Use Designation from Increment 1. The final location for the higher education facility has not been determined at this time. The application will continue to work with the appropriate parties to finalize this location. Rather than show a location that continues to shift, the land use designation has been removed. The land use designation will be provided in the future, consistent with the commitments made to date.

   d. Add Note 5 to Map H – Master Development Plan to include a condition limiting the nonresidential land uses to a maximum of 6,000,000 square feet for both the Lee and Charlotte portions of the Babcock Ranch Community Mater Development of Regional Impact. Note 5 has been added to Map H to include a condition limiting non-residential land uses to a maximum of 6,000,000 square-feet for the portions of Babcock Ranch in Lee and Charlotte Counties.

   e. Add Note 6 indicating the solar and energy storage facilities are permitted in all of the Increment 1 North Area, except in areas with a recorded conservation easement.

   f. Reflect the extension of the expiration date and buildout date of this Development Order per the Governor’s Executive Orders.

**IDO**

1. Revise the Legal Description and Sketch for Increment 1 North Area to expand the North Area of Increment 1 to include a 1,453± acres to allow for additional solar and energy storage facilities to be developed in the increment. The boundary for Increment 1 North Area has been expanded by 1,010 acres to allow for the addition of solar and energy storage facilities in the North Area.

2. Modify the Education Condition 2 to acknowledge the sign agreement between the Developer and the Charlotte County School District.
3. Revise Exhibit C to include Assisted Living Facilities in the Equivalency Matrix.

4. Revise Map H Increment I Master Development Plan (see Attachment IV):
   a. to expand the boundaries of Increment 1 North Area to 1,453± acres.
   b. revise the Development Intensity table inset to include 100 Assisted Living Facility units by converting 15,000 square-feet of office uses based on the Equivalency matrix included as Exhibit C.
   c. to convert the 25±-acre Educational Services Center site in the Increment 1 South Area to Mixed Use/Residential/Commercial as outlined in the proposed revision to the Master Development Order.
   d. to remove the 71± Acre Higher Education Facility Land Use Designation from Increment 1 as outlined in the proposed revision to the Master Development Order.

5. Revise Map H-1 Increment 1 South Area Development Plan to reflect the changes to Increment 1 described above (see Attachment V).

6. Revise Map H-3 Increment 1 North Area Development Plan to reflect the changes to Increment 1 described above (see Attachment VI).

7. Amend Exhibit E to allow for 100 Assisted Living Facility units to be permitted in Increment 1 by reduce the permitted office intensity by 15,000 sq. ft. based on the conversions outlined in the equivalency matrix. Babcock Property Holdings, LLC proposes to convert 15,000 square-feet of general office to 100 Assisted Living Facility units based on the equivalency matrix included in Exhibit C. The office reduction and the new Age Restricted Residential units will be in the Town Center area of Increment 1. Based on the equivalency matrix no additional trips will be generated as a result of the conversion.

8. Revise the Master Drainage Plan to reflect the changes to Increment 1 described above.

9. Revise the Master Internal Circulation Plan to reflect the changes to Increment 1 described above.

10. Revise the Increment 1 North Area Primary Greenway Map and Trails Plan to reflect the changes to Increment 1 described above (see Attachment VII).

11. Reflect the extension of the expiration date and buildout date of this Development Order per the Governor’s Executive Orders.

**REGIONAL STAFF ANALYSIS**

Based on Florida Statute Section 380.06(19)(a) (2017), “any proposed change to a previously approved development which creates a reasonable likelihood of additional regional impact, or any type of regional impact created by the change not previously reviewed by the regional planning
agency, shall constitute a substantial deviation and shall cause the proposed change to be subject to further development-of-regional-impact review.” However, since there are no more substantial deviations the issue is whether the change creates additional regional impact not previous reviewed by the SWFRPC. State agency review of the changes had no objections. Charlotte County also had no objections and has determined the proposed changes are consistent with goals, objectives, and policies set forth in the County’s Comprehensive Plan.

**REGIONAL RESOURCES AND FACILITIES IMPACT**

There are no regional resources or facilities impacts create by the changes.

**CHARACTER, MAGNITUDE AND LOCATION**

There are no changes in magnitude or location of the DRI associated with the changes. However, the character of the DRI has changed by the addition of more solar power on site creating a distinction of being a solar powered town.

**MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES**

No new multi-jurisdictional issues will occur from these changes.

**ACCEPTANCE OF THE PROPOSED MDO AND IDO AMENDMENT**

The county staff report provided an acceptable draft development order necessary to rebut the presumption that no additional regional impacts will occur from the changes.

**RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:**

1. Notify Charlotte County, the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity, and the applicant that the proposed changes does not create additional regional impacts.

2. Request that Charlotte County provide SWFRPC staff with copies of any development order amendments related to the proposed changes.

May 17, 2018
LEGEND

Prepared by: EES 03/09/18

DRI Land Use Summary

- Greenway / Flowway / Agriculture (± 6,000 ac)
- Conservation Easement Corridor (± 320 ac)
- Future Conservation Area / Agriculture
- Solar Array (± 443 ac)
- Regional / Community Park (369 ac)
- Major Park (includes existing Regional / Community Park. Location subject to change)
- North Babcock Area (± 276 ac)
- 9 Mile Park, Includes Four Star Inn Lodge, Environmental Education Center, Riding Stables and Equestrian Facility, and a General Store.
- South Babcock Area (± 82 ac)
- Higher Education / University (± 71 ac)
- Educational Services Center (± 95 ac)
- Mixed-Use/Residential Commercial (MURC) (± 5,382 ac)
- Mining Operation (± 835 ac)
- Utility Site (± 90 ac)
- S.R. 31 300’ R.O.W. (± 127 ac)
- Primary Roadway
- Conceptual Trail System
- Limited Transportation, Pedestrian, and Utility Corridor
- Town Center
- Increment Boundary
- Fire / EMS / Sheriff / Communication Tower
- Babcock Ranch Community
- DRI Boundary (± 13,631 ac)
- Babcock Ranch Preserve

DRI DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA

1. Development of the subject property shall not exceed 17,876 dwelling units, 3,995,000 square feet of non-residential use, including commercial/retail/office space, light industrial, government/government space and institutional/confinement space, 24,000 acres of open space, 7,500 acres of water, 4,000 acres of wetlands, 6,000 acres of wetlands, 7,000 acres of wildlife habitat, 17,876 acres of farmland, 17,876 acres of agricultural land, 17,876 acres of conservation easement, and 17,876 acres of conservation easement corridor.

2. No development shall be permitted throughout the Babcock Ranch Community.

3. There shall be a minimum of 100 feet (± 30 m) between the subject property and the public roads.

4. Open Space/Conservation Easements shall be available for subsequent incremental subdivisions, and recorded in the public records following the initial permitting.

5. When combined with non-residential development in the Lee County Babcock mixed use planned development Babcock Ranch, non-residential development shall not exceed the total acreage proposed in the subject property development plan.

6. Solar arrays and related facilities are permitted in all of Increment 1 North Area, except in the Positive Greenway, Conservation Greenway, and Conservation Easement Corridor.

VARIABLE DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA

1. The following items will be defined during subsequent incremental rezone and/or final permitting:
   a. The acres of all proposed use.
   b. The height and location of all non-residential uses, including commercial/retail/office space, light industrial, government/government space and institutional/confinement space.
   c. The final location and location of all public facilities (i.e., schools, emergency services buildings, etc.).
   d. The internal road alignment and circulation.
   e. The configuration and detail associated with the agricultural areas.
   f. The final location, alignment, and use of the conceptual trail system
   g. The location of vehicular access to public streets, including existing permanent entry ways, to external public roads.
   h. The limited transportation, pedestrian, and utility corridor between the northern most mixed use residential/commercial area and North Babcock Area.

2. The existing road right-of-way, including areas currently planned or permitted, will be allowed to continue, consistent with existing permits for those areas. Additional road right-of-way may be allowed consistent with the development plan, but must be approved through the DRI monitoring process or through subsequent DRI rezone.

3. The boundaries of the area shown as "State Road Right-of-Way at Conceptual" (WARC) including Babcock Center, are conceptual in nature, and may be modified through the subsequent incremental rezone process. Specific uses in support of "mixed use" or "residential" will be included, but not breaching the existing permitted uses. Any changes in the rezone review and through subsequent permitting consistent with local land development regulations.

4. Golf course construction is allowed in MURC.

Babcock Ranch Community Map H - Master Development Plan
April 2018

Stantec Consulting Services Inc.
6900 Professional Parkway East
Sarasota, FL 34240
941.907.6900
tel 941.907.6911
fax

Disclaimer: Stantec assumes no responsibility for data supplied in electronic format. The recipient accepts full responsibility for verifying the accuracy and completeness of the data. The recipient releases Stantec, its officers, employees, consultants and agents, from any and all claims arising in any way from the content or provision of the data.
Exhibit B-1
Babcock Ranch Community
Map H Increment 1 Master Development Plan
March 2018

LEGEND

- Potable Well Locations
- Babcock Ranch Community DPI Boundary
- Increment 1 South Area Boundary
- Increment 1 North Area Boundary
- Increment 1 Utility Easement Area Boundary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boundary</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Area</td>
<td>3,621 ac</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Area</td>
<td>1,453 ac</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Easement</td>
<td>21 ac</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,095 ac</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD/5,095 = TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disclaimer: Stantec assumes no responsibility for data supplied in electronic format. The recipient accepts full responsibility for verifying the accuracy and completeness of the data. The recipient releases Stantec, its officers, employees, consultants and agents, from any and all claims arising in any way from the content or provision of the data.
Western 300' of this area will ultimately be part of the SR-31 expansion.

Town Center

**LEGEND**

- Babcock Ranch Community DRI Boundary
- Increment 1 South Boundary, ±3621 ac
- Active Greenway, ±361 ac
- Observation Greenway, ±369 ac
- Open Space, ±136 ac
- Lake, ±563 ac
- Mixed Use / Residential / Commercial, ±1689 ac
- Utility, ±90 ac
- Educational Service Center, ±35 ac
- Internal Roadway Circulation System, ±123 ac
- Parcel Access
- Fire / EMS / Sheriff Communication Tower

**INCREMENTS 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (Gen/Med.)</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic/Govt/Church</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted Living Facility</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional units and square footage will be added to the increment in the future through an amendment to this increment.

Disclaimer: Stantec assumes no responsibility for data supplied in electronic format. The recipient accepts full responsibility for verifying the accuracy and completeness of the data. The recipient releases Stantec, its officers, employees, consultants and agents, from any and all claims arising in any way from the content or provision of the data.
Exhibit B-4
Babcock Ranch Community
Map H-3 Increment 1 North Area Master Plan
March 2018

LEGEND

- Active Greenway (± 1137 ac)
- 302 Acre Conservation Easement Corridor (± 3 ac)
- North Babcock Area (± 289 ac)
- S.R. 31 300’ R.O.W. (± 6 ac)
- Increment Boundary, ±1453 ac
- Babcock Ranch Community DRI Boundary

Disclaimer: Stantec assumes no responsibility for data supplied in electronic format. The recipient assumes full responsibility for verifying the accuracy and completeness of the data. The recipient releases Stantec, its officers, employees, consultants and agents from any and all claims arising in any way from the content or provision of the data.
**Exhibit B-4**

**Babcock Ranch Community**

Map H-3 Increment 1 North Area Master Plan

April 2018

---

**LEGEND**

- Greenway:
  - Active Greenway (± 1034 ac)
  - Corridor Greenway (± 3 ac)
  - Observation Greenway (± 46 ac)
  - Passive Greenway (± 34 ac)
  - North Babcock Area (± 289
  - S.R. 31 300' R.O.W. (± 6 ac)
- Increment Boundary, ±1453 ac
- Babcock Ranch Community DRI Boundary

---

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

Agenda Item #8(a) – City of Cape Coral Comp Plan Amendment DEO 18-1ESR
City of Cape Coral DEO 18-1ESR amends the City’s Future Land Use Map to amend 82.69 acres of property to the Multi-Family Residential (MF) future land use map classification. The site is located in the north-central portion of the City that is receiving centralized utilities through the North 2 Utility Expansion Program. The change is comprised of an amendment from Single-Family Residential to MF for 82.69 acres.

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 Cape Coral.

Agenda Item #8(b) – City of Fort Myers Comp Plan Amendment DEO 18-1ESR
City of Fort Myers DEO 18-1ESR contains an amendment to the Future Land Use Map adding the Future Land Use designation Midtown. Also, the package includes a text revision to Future Land Use Policies wherein:

The maximum base density (not including bonus allocations) is proposed to be increased for the Downtown District Future Land Use Category in Policy 1.7 from 35 dwelling units per acre to 70 dwelling units per acre. The standard allowable intensity [quantified as floor area ratio (FAR)] for the Downtown District has been reduced from 18 FAR to 8 FAR. However, the existing Policy applied FAR to residential and non-residential uses. It is proposed that FAR will now only apply to non-residential uses.

The Midtown Future Land Use is a new Future Land Use Category proposed in Future Land Use Policy 1.8 with a maximum base density (not including bonus allocations) of 70 dwelling units per acre and a maximum non-residential FAR of 8. The Future Land Use Map is proposed to be amended to depict the Midtown Future Land designated areas. Currently, this area has Future Land Use Category designations of Downtown, Traditional Community, and Corridor Commercial.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Staff finds this amendment package regionally significant with regards to magnitude and consistent with the SRPP. Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and the City of Fort Myers.
Agenda Item #8(c) – City of Bonita Springs Comp Plan Amendment DEO 18-1ESR
City of Bonita Springs DEO 18-1ESR proposes to amend Policy 1.1.11a.5 of the Old 41 Town Center Mixed-Use Redevelopment Area Overlay to allow densities, intensities, and range of uses to be blended with a unified planned development zoning district. The intent of the Overlay is to permit mixed-use redevelopment through residential, commercial, cultural and community, hospitality, industrial, recreational and governmental center uses that are focused around the aesthetic and recreational value of the Imperial River and that are supported by "walk-to-town" neighborhoods.

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 Bonita Springs.

Agenda Item #8(d) – Sarasota County Comp Plan Amendment DEO 18-1ESR
Sarasota County DEO 18-1ESR is a privately-initiated Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPA) relating to the incorporation of Ibis Street, from State Road 72 (Clark Road) to Future North-South Roadway A into Sarasota County’s Future Thoroughfare Plan Maps and Tables. The intent of CPA No. 2017-F is to provide for the roadway network needed to support future development within the Sarasota 2050 South Village, as delineated on Map 8-7: RMA-3 Village/Open Space.

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 Sarasota County.

Agenda Item #8(e) – Sarasota County Comp Plan Amendment DEO 18-2ESR
Sarasota County DEO 18-2ESR is a privately-initiated Comprehensive Plan Amendment relating to 2050 Villages, revising Future Land Use (FLU) Policy VOS1. to delete “contiguous” from the policy footnote related to the requirement of subsequent Village Centers. This would allow the elimination of the required Village Center in Grand Lakes. The commercial and service needs of the development’s residents can be met by the Village Center (approved for 300,000 square feet of non-residential uses) in LT Ranch Village, which will be located approximately 2.5 miles to the east. This revision would not impede on the overall intent of the policy.

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 Sarasota County.
Agenda Item #8(f) – Charlotte County Comp Plan Amendment DEO 18-2ESR
Charlotte County DEO 18-2ESR is a request to amend Coastal Planning (CST) Policy 1.4.7: Manatee Protection Plan to reflect that the Board of County Commissioners accepted the Manatee Protection Plan on February 14, 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 Charlotte County.

Agenda Item #8(g) – City of Punta Gorda Comp Plan Amendment DEO 18-1ESR
This amendment is for the purpose of applying the City’s Future Land Use Designations to vacant undeveloped properties that were annexed into the incorporated City limits. These properties are located within an area that was previously annexed in 2014 and underwent a Comprehensive Plan revision (DEO 14-1ESR).

The property locations can be seen in Attachment III and combine for approximately 13.78+ acres. The properties will be given a Highway Commercial Center (HCC) FLU Designation. This designation is consistent with the surrounding properties. There is no proposed development within this area at this time. When development is proposed all levels of service impacts to solid waste, sanitary sewer, drainage, potable water and water supply, traffic circulation, schools and recreation will be addressed.

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 Punta Gorda.

Agenda Item #8(h) – Hendry County Comp Plan Amendment DEO 18-1ESR
The applicant, Long Hammock Grove Inc. is requesting to amend the Hendry County Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map (FLUM) to change the future land use designation for the subject property from Agriculture (AG) Future Land Use Category (FLUC) to Multi-Use Development (MUD) FLUC. The subject property is located on US 27 and consists of 233.34+ acres in Hendry County with an additional 60.51+ acres in Glades County. The current use on the entire property is agriculture (sugarcane farming). The proposed MUD FLUC allows existing agricultural uses to continue, recreational facilities, residential, commercial, and industrial uses. The Glades County application proposes to redesignate the 60.51+ acres to Industrial. The applicant has stated that the Glades County property may be used for stormwater management. County staff is coordinating with Glades County in the review of the applications.

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 Hendry County.
Agenda Item #8(i) – Summit Church DO Rescission

The Summit Church (aka University Baptist Church) Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review development order was approved by the Lee County Board of County Commissioners on April 3, 2006. This DRI review project is located in unincorporated southcentral Lee County just south of the southern entrance road to Florida Gulf Coast University (see Location Map). Normally, a stand-alone church would not be reviewed as a DRI, however, because of a Lee County Comprehensive Plan requirement associated with the approval of Florida Gulf Coast University, Policy 18.2.2 required “all property within the University Village shall undergo a DRI review”. Therefore, the DRI review for regional impacts was on the 10.3-acre site, 61,500 square feet depicted in three church structures, a 1.55-acre storm water management lake, and parking areas. This project has no regional impacts other than related to vegetation and wildlife. To be consistent with how other DRIs in the University Village have been reviewed it was necessary to impose regional conditions related to habitat impacts to Florida panthers, wetlands and indigenous vegetation on this site. To date 26,641 SF has been constructed. The applicant seeks to develop an additional 11,600 square foot worship hall in a proposed single story building adjacent to and adjoining to its existing 26,641 square foot two-story building.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Notify Lee County, the Florida Department of Economic Development and the applicant the proposed application is acceptable and will be in compliance with Chapter 380.115 FS.
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Cape Coral DEO 18-1ESR
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8a
LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS
CITY OF CAPE CORAL

The Council staff has reviewed the proposed evaluation and appraisal based amendments to the City of Cape Coral Comprehensive Plan (DEO 18-1ESR). 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 18-1ESR</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 Cape Coral
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 CAPE CORAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (DEO 18-1ESR)

RECEIVED: FEBRUARY 23, 2018

Summary of Proposed Amendment
City of Cape Coral DEO 18-1ESR amends the City's Future Land Use Map to amend 82.69 acres of property to the Multi-Family Residential (MF) future land use map classification. The site is located in the north-central portion of the City that is receiving centralized utilities through the North 2 Utility Expansion Program. The change is comprised of an amendment from Single-Family Residential to MF for 82.69 acres.

A PDP to permit MF development was established on site in 2007 and has been extended through 2022. The property’s FLU was amended by City of Cape Coral from SM to SF in 2017. This amendment would make the property consistent with the PDP and help address the shortfall of multi-family housing in Cape Coral. A 2016 study concluded that the City would need to add approximately 1,500 multi-family units per year for the next 5 years to make up for the shortfall. The amendment would result in a net gain of 960 dwelling units. The traffic analysis showed a net gain of +51 AM peak hour trips and +40 PM peak hour trips. All roadways meet or surpass the minimum acceptable Level of Service Standards and capacity is available for this amendment.

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 Cape Coral.
MAPS

City of Cape Coral

DEO 18-1ESR

Growth Management Plan

Comprehensive Plan Amendment
PROPOSED FUTURE LAND USE MAP
500' Proximity Boundary

Case No. LU17-0011

LEGEND
- 500' Proximity Boundary
- Subject Property

Future Land Use
- SF
- SM
- CAC
- PF
- MF
- LEE COUNTY FLU

JANUARY 30TH, 2017

This map is not a survey and should not be used in place of a survey. While every effort is made to accurately depict the mapped area, errors and omissions may occur. Therefore, the City of Cape Coral cannot be held liable for incidents that may occur. Please contact the Department of Community Development with any questions regarding this map product.
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Fort Myers DEO 18-1ESR
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LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS
CITY OF FORT MYERS

The Council staff has reviewed the proposed evaluation and appraisal based amendments to the City of Fort Myers Comprehensive Plan (DEO 18-1ESR). These amendments were developed under the Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act. A synopsis of the requirements of the Act and Council responsibilities is provided as Attachment I. Comments are provided in Attachment II. Site location maps can be reviewed in Attachment III.

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

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

A summary of the results of the review follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Consistent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| DEO 18-1ESR        | No       | Yes       | No        | (1) Regionally Significant  
(2) Consistent with SRPP |

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Regional Planning Council Review**

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

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

**NOTE:** THE ABOVE IS A SIMPLIFIED VERSION OF THE LAW. REFER TO THE STATUTE (CH. 163, FS) FOR DETAILS.
CITY OF FORT MYERS COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (DEO 18-1ESR)

RECEIVED: FEBRUARY 22, 2018

Summary of Proposed Amendment
City of Fort Myers DEO 18-1ESR contains an amendment to the Future Land Use Map adding the Future Land Use designation Midtown. Also, the package includes a text revision to Future Land Use Policies wherein:

The maximum base density (not including bonus allocations) is proposed to be increased for the Downtown District Future Land Use Category in Policy 1.7 from 35 dwelling units per acre to 70 dwelling units per acre. The standard allowable intensity [quantified as floor area ratio (FAR)] for the Downtown District has been reduced from 18 FAR to 8 FAR. However, the existing Policy applied FAR to residential and non-residential uses. It is proposed that FAR will now only apply to non-residential uses.

The Midtown Future Land Use is a new Future Land Use Category proposed in Future Land Use Policy 1.8 with a maximum base density (not including bonus allocations) of 70 dwelling units per acre and a maximum non-residential FAR of 8. The Future Land Use Map is proposed to be amended to depict the Midtown Future Land designated areas. Currently, this area has Future Land Use Category designations of Downtown, Traditional Community, and Corridor Commercial.

Density and intensity limits are no longer included in the Comprehensive Plan for the individual zoning districts. The Land Development Regulations will specify the standard density and intensity ranges for each zoning district.

Bonus density will no longer be allocated based on the criteria in existing Future Land Use Action 1.7.7. The remaining items in renumbered Policy 1.7.5 will become requirements for all new developments, which will be implemented in the Land Development Regulations.

Bonus density, bonus intensity, and bonus height, will now be allocated according to proposed Future Land Use Policy 1.9. A maximum bonus of 30% above the standard density, intensity, and height will be allowed in the Downtown District and Midtown South District for properties which are greater than one-half acre. A maximum bonus of 40% above the standard density, intensity, and height will be allowed in the Downtown District and Midtown South District for properties which are one-half acre or less. Developments approved for bonus density, intensity, or height will be subject to a bonus incentive requirement, the standards and procedures for which shall be outlined in the Land Development Regulations. The aggregate maximum number of bonus dwelling units available within the Downtown and Midtown Future Land Use designations shall be based on surplus utility capacity which is available in the phase of the proposed development according to new Map F.

A study has been conducted to determine the amount of surplus utility capacity which is currently available past build-out at the proposed base densities. With the current utility infrastructure, it
has been determined that the system can accommodate additional capacity past the proposed base density as follows, within each phase area, as depicted on proposed Map F. Surplus capacity is expressed in equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) which can be converted to residential dwelling units or office/commercial space.

- Phase Area 1: 827 Surplus EDUs
- Phase Area 2: 1,500 Surplus EDUs
- Phase Area 3A: 400 Surplus EDUs
- Phase Area 3B: 326 Surplus EDUs
- Phase Area 4: 802 Surplus EDUs

Proposed Future Land Use Policy 1.10 provides for residential neighborhood protection by limiting building heights to 6 stories for new development and redevelopment adjacent to properties zoned Urban General. Bonus height cannot be approved in violation of this Policy.

**Regional Impacts**
The amendment package is regionally significant in regard to magnitude. The maximum number of potential dwelling units added to the City by this amendment is greater than the 3,000 unit threshold used to determine regional significance for Lee County. However, the amendment package does not produce any significant regional impacts that would be inconsistent with the SRPP or Comprehensive Plan of any other local government within the region. These amendments will help continue the strong revitalization efforts in Fort Myers. Staff has no objections to this amendment package.

Comments by DEO, FDOT, and SFWMD are attached. None of these agencies raised any objections to these amendments.

**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 regionally significant and consistent with the SRPP. Staff has no objections to this amendment package.

**Recommended Action**
Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and the City of Fort Myers.
Dear Mr. LaRue:

The South Florida Water Management District (District) has completed its review of the proposed amendment package from the City of Fort Myers (City). The package includes text amendments addressing changes to the density and intensity of use in the Downtown Redevelopment District and adds the Midtown land use designation. The proposed changes do not appear to adversely impact the water resources within the South Florida Water Management District; however, the District offers the following technical guidance regarding Regional Water Supply Planning:

- When amendment #18-1ESR has been adopted, the City should update the Water Supply Facilities Work Plan to be consistent with the changes in the Comprehensive Plan. The update should include the impacts of potential development on the City’s water supply.

- The City is required to revise its Water Supply Facilities Work Plan (Work Plan) within 18 months after approval of the Lower West Coast (LWC) Water Supply Plan Update by the District’s Governing Board. The District’s Governing Board approved the LWC Water Supply Plan Update on December 11, 2017. Therefore, the City’s Work Plan needs to be updated and adopted by June 14, 2019. The Work Plan must cover at least a 10-year planning period, include updated water demand projections, identify alternative and traditional water supply projects, and describe conservation and reuse activities needed to meet the projected future demands. Planning tools are available on the District’s website for your use and District Staff are available to provide technical assistance to update the Work Plan, including reviewing draft Work Plans prior to formal plan amendment submittal. The planning tools are located at this link: https://www.sfwmd.gov/our-work/water-supply/work-plans.

The District offers its technical assistance to the City in developing sound, sustainable solutions to meet the City’s future water supply needs and to protect the region’s water resources. Please forward a copy of the adopted amendments to the District. Please contact me if you need assistance or additional information.

Sincerely,

Deb Oblaczynski
Policy & Planning Analyst
Water Supply Implementation Unit
South Florida Water Management District
3301 Gun Club Road
West Palm Beach, FL 33406
(561) 682-2544 or mailto:doblaczy@sfwmd.gov
March 19, 2018

James G. LaRue, AICP, Planning Consultant  
LaRue Planning & Management Services, Inc.  
1375 Jackson Street, Suite 206  
Fort Myers, FL 33901

Mr. Robert Gardner  
Community Development Director  
City of Fort Myers  
1825 Hendry Street  
Fort Myers, FL 33901

RE: Fort Myers 18-1ESR Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment (Expedited State Review Process) – FDOT Technical Assistance Comments

Dear Mr. LaRue/Mr. Gardner:

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), District One, has reviewed the Fort Myers 18-1ESR Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPA), which was transmitted under the Expedited State Review process by the City Council in accordance with the requirements of Florida Statutes (F.S.) Chapter 163. FDOT offers Fort Myers the following technical assistance comments.

The CPA proposes to amend the Fort Myers Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use (FLU) Map to add a Midtown FLU designation. The CPA also includes the following text amendments, as summarized below:

- Reduce the maximum base intensity for the Downtown District Future Land Use Category in Policy 1.7 from the standard allowable intensity floor area ratio (FAR) of 18 to eight FAR. Policy 1.7 also includes language to state that the FAR only applies to non-residential uses.
- Add the new Midtown FLU Category as Policy 1.8, with a maximum base density (not including bonus allocations) of 70 dwelling units (DUs) per acre and a maximum non-residential FAR of eight. Currently, this area has FLU category designations of 131-acres of Downtown (D/T), 71.24-acres of Traditional Community (T/C), 11.88-acres of Industrial, and 34.83-acres of Corridor Commercial (C/C). FDOT is not able to prepare a trip generation comparison at this time, because the currently adopted FLU categories require specific mixes of
uses based on zoning categories under each Policy. For example, the D/T FLU category includes zoning categories that include Urban Core, Urban Center, Urban General, Civic, Civic Recreational, Intensive Commercial, Light Industrial and Single-Family Residential (per FLU Standards 1.7.2.1 thru 1.7.2.8). Each zoning category requires different mixes of uses.

- Add new FLU Policy 1.9 to establish a bonus incentive program for additional density, intensity and height within the Downtown District and Midtown South District. Actions 1.9.1 thru 1.9.3 provides for an additional 30% bonus on parcels greater than one-half acre; an additional 40% bonus on parcels less than one-half acre; and additional bonuses which can be approved through standards and procedures outlined in the land development regulations.

- Add new FLU Policy 1.10 to establish a neighborhood protection such that residential neighborhoods shall have protection from development and redevelopment which is not in harmony or compatible with the character of the existing community.

In general, the new policies in the Comprehensive Plan reduces non-residential intensities in the Downtown FLU and introduces new residential density and intensity for the new Midtown FLU category. FDOT notes that it is not possible to assess the impacts on State and Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) transportation facilities until a project is planned. As a result, FDOT offers the following technical assistance comments.

**FDOT Technical Assistance Comment #1:**
Per the CPA package, amendments to the Transportation and Concurrency Elements are not included in this amendment package. They are being addressed separately and are currently being drafted by the City’s consultant with staff input.

When preparing the amendments to the Transportation and Concurrency Elements, FDOT encourages the City to develop strategies that support a multi-modal network to promote non-vehicular uses, including pedestrian, bicycle and transit, comprehensively within the Downtown and new Midtown areas. Additionally, FDOT is available to provide technical assistance to the City during planning phases of new and redeveloped property in the new and modified FLU categories, in an effort to preserve the regional transportation network and ensure mobility for current and future area residents.

**FDOT Technical Assistance Comment #2:**
FDOT, also notes that land uses/development patterns drive the development of transportation systems along with their safe and efficient operation. In an effort to decrease overall passenger vehicle trips on the roadway network, and in line with the intent of this CPA, FDOT supports the planning and development of well-planned communities that promote the use of multimodal alternatives that aid in mitigating potential transportation impacts, promote safety and economic development, and improve quality of life for all residents in the City of Fort Myers. This can be achieved by employing multimodal alternatives that encourage compact and dense

www.dot.state.fl.us
developments that provide multimodal connectivity between existing and future development areas.

FDOT offers several initiatives to assist the City of Fort Myers in creating quality developments while protecting future mobility on the regional roadway network, including “Complete Streets”\(^1\), modern roundabouts\(^2\), and a commitment to bicycle and pedestrian safety\(^3\). FDOT welcomes the opportunity to partner with, and provide technical assistance to the City to create developments that 1) support multimodal transportation facilities for all users, and 2) that are in support of the principles that guide healthy community design, while utilizing complete streets concepts and strategies.

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

Sincerely,

Sarah Catala
SIS/Growth Management Coordinator
FDOT District One

CC: Mr. Ray Eubanks, Florida Department of Economic Opportunity

---

\(^1\) http://www.flcompletestreets.com/
\(^2\) http://www.dot.state.fl.us/rddesign/Roundabouts/Default.shtm
\(^3\) http://www.alerttodayflorida.com/
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March 23, 2018

The Honorable Randall P. Henderson
Mayor, City of Fort Myers
2200 Second Street
Fort Myers, Florida 33901

Dear Mayor Henderson:

The Department of Economic Opportunity has completed its review of the proposed comprehensive plan amendment for the City of Fort Myers (Amendment No. 18-1ESR) which was received on February 21, 2018. We have reviewed the proposed amendment pursuant to the expedited state review process in Sections 163.3184(2) and (3), Florida Statutes (F.S.), and identified no comments related to important state resources and facilities within the Department’s authorized scope of review that will be adversely impacted by the amendment if adopted.

The City is reminded that pursuant to Section 163.3184(3)(b), F.S., other reviewing agencies have the authority to provide comments directly to the City. If other reviewing agencies provide comments, we recommend the City consider appropriate changes to the amendment based on those comments. If unresolved, such reviewing agency comments could form the basis for a challenge to the amendment after adoption.

The City should act by choosing to adopt, adopt with changes, or not adopt the proposed amendment. For your assistance, we have enclosed the procedures for adoption and transmittal of the comprehensive plan amendment. Also, please note that Section 163.3184(3)(c)1, F.S., provides that if the second public hearing is not held within 180 days of your receipt of agency comments, the amendment shall be deemed withdrawn unless extended by agreement with notice to the Department and any affected party that provided comment on the amendment.
If you have any questions concerning this review, please contact Diana Elsner, Planning Analyst, by telephone at (850) 717-8489 or by email at diana.elsner@deo.myflorida.com.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James D. Stansbury, Chief
Bureau of Community Planning and Growth

JDS/de

Enclosure(s): Procedures for Adoption

cc: James G. LaRue, AICP, Planning Consultant, LaRue Planning & Management Services
    Margaret Wuerstle, AICP, Executive Director, Southwest Regional Planning Council
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City of Fort Myers
DEO 18-1ESR

Growth Management Plan
Comprehensive Plan Amendment
City of Fort Myers
Future Land Use Map A
Adopted Date: August 2nd 2010
Ordinance 3562
Effective Date: October 26th 2010
The surplus EDUs indicated for each Utility System Phase are cumulative maximums for each phase. Available EDUs on a site specific basis are subject to the infrastructure in the immediate vicinity serving the specific site, on a sub-phase level. These more specific sub-phase capacities are identified and depicted in the *Downtown and Midtown Fort Myers Utility Capacity Analysis* (January 2017), as may updated from time to time, on file with the Community Development Department.
Bonita Springs DEO 18-1ESR
LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS
CITY OF BONITA SPRINGS

The Council staff has reviewed the proposed evaluation and appraisal based amendments to the City of Bonita Springs Comprehensive Plan (DEO 18-1ESR). 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 18-1ESR</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(1) Not Regionally Significant (2) Consistent with SRPP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NOTE: THE ABOVE IS A SIMPLIFIED VERSION OF THE LAW. REFER TO THE STATUTE (CH. 163, FS) FOR DETAILS.
CITY OF BONITA SPRINGS COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (DEO 18-1ESR)

RECEIVED: MARCH 30, 2018

Summary of Proposed Amendment
City of Bonita Springs DEO 18-1ESR proposes to amend Policy 1.11a.5 of the Old 41 Town Center Mixed-Use Redevelopment Area Overlay to allow densities, intensities, and range of uses to be blended with a unified planned development zoning district. The intent of the Overlay is to permit mixed-use redevelopment through residential, commercial, cultural and community, hospitality, industrial, recreational and governmental center uses that are focused around the aesthetic and recreational value of the Imperial River and that are supported by "walk-to-town" neighborhoods.

The current Overlay was adopted in 2006 based on the 2005 Old 41 Corridor Redevelopment Master Plan Study prepared by the RMPK Group, which resulted in the Old 41 Town Center Mixed-Use Redevelopment Area Overlay comprehensive plan policy and associated overlay map. The RMPK Group also prepared the Old 41 Corridor Redevelopment Master Plan Town Center Concept Plan, which was used as the supporting data and analysis for creating Policy 1.11: "Old 41“ Town Center Mixed-Use Redevelopment Overlay Area. The text of Policy 1.11a lists permitted land uses and their associated intensities/densities by Sub Area based on the areas shown on the Old 41 Corridor Redevelopment Master Plan. The underlying Future Land Use Map designation for the Overlay area is depicted on the Future Land Use Map in the Comprehensive Plan.

The applicant is proposing a project with three mixed use buildings (one with a private amenity) and two multi-family residential buildings, which are located in the Mixed Use 6B, Commercial 3A and Multi-Family 4 Sub Areas of the Overlay. Two of the mixed-use buildings are located in the Commercial and Multi-Family Sub Area of the Overlay, which do not allow for residential uses for integration into a mixed-use development. The underlying Future Land Use Map of these same properties are located in the General Commercial and Medium Density Multi-family residential categories. The General Commercial category allows for single use commercial, vertical mixed use, and single-use residential (multi-family). The Medium Density Multi-family category allows for a variety of residential dwelling unit types and commercial uses within a mixed-use project.

The Old 41 Corridor Redevelopment Master Plan Town Center Concept Plan Map and Policy 1.11 do not allow for residential uses in the Commercial Sub Area nor commercial uses in the Multi-Family Sub Areas of the Overlay. While the applicant is requesting for vertical mixed-use buildings in these two Sub Areas, the uses are not permitted; therefore, an amendment to the comprehensive plan is required. The applicant has filed this request to provide greater design flexibility as a tool for the City to evaluate unique projects that meet the overall intent of the overlay.

The proposed language provides the opportunity for blending of density, intensity, and uses within a unified planned development. A planned development rezoning application is required. Each application
request will be evaluated in accordance with the Land Development Code. No increase in density or intensity is proposed as part of this request. The property must meet the following criteria:

- Be located within the Town Center
- File a unified rezoning application request to a planned development
- All property must be contiguous

**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 Bonita Springs.
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LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS
SARASOTA COUNTY

The Council staff has reviewed the proposed evaluation and appraisal based amendments to the Sarasota County Comprehensive Plan (DEO 18-1ESR). 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 18-1ESR</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(1) Not Regionally Significant (2) Consistent with SRPP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and Sarasota County
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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.
SARASOTA COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (DEO 18-1ESR)

DATE RECEIVED: MARCH 8, 2018

Summary of Proposed Amendment
Sarasota County DEO 18-1ESR is a privately-initiated Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPA) relating to the incorporation of Ibis Street, from State Road 72 (Clark Road) to Future North-South Roadway A into Sarasota County’s Future Thoroughfare Plan Maps and Tables.

The intent of CPA No. 2017-F is to provide for the roadway network needed to support future development within the Sarasota 2050 South Village, as delineated on Map 8-7: RMA-3 Village/Open Space.

Table 1 shows the level of congestion summary using the Sarasota/Manatee Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) congestion criteria. The congestion condition is computed using the ratio of Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) of the roadway segment and the level of service standard capacity. This ratio is called the volume to capacity (v/c) ratio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Congestion</th>
<th>v/c Ratio</th>
<th>Typical Improvements</th>
<th>Number of Segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scenario 1 No Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Congested</td>
<td>Less than 0.85</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline Congested</td>
<td>0.85 – 1.04</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested</td>
<td>1.05 – 1.20</td>
<td>Operational and minor improvements</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely Congested</td>
<td>Greater than 1.20</td>
<td>Major capacity improvements</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Data: Kimley-Horn Traffic Impact Analysis, October 2017, Table 3, page 9

The addition of Ibis Street from Clark Road to North-South Roadway A will result in two fewer severely congested roadway segments within the study area. The congested roadway segments will increase from five (5) to six (6) and the borderline congested roadway segments will increase from four (4) to six (6). The number of roadway segments not congested remain unchanged.

The total vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in the entire study area is reduced by 2,520, a decrease of only 0.12%. However, the connectivity being provided allows for volume shifts within the study area, which helps alleviate some of the severely congested roadway segments.

In summary, County staff recommends approval of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment to add Ibis Street to Sarasota County’s Future Thoroughfare Plan based on the following from the review of the submitted traffic impact study:
• The addition of proposed Ibis Street is expected to reduce the projected capacity deficient roadways in the area;
• The addition of proposed Ibis Street provides significant connectivity to the County’s roadway network east of I-75;
• With upcoming development south of Clark Road and east of I-75, the addition of proposed Ibis Street provides a needed additional north-south roadway to the Thoroughfare Plan; and
• The addition of the proposed Ibis Street allows for funding for roadway and mobility improvements along Ibis Street.

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 the amendment is not regionally significant.

Recommended Action
Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and Sarasota County.
March 22, 2018

Vivian Roe
Planner
Sarasota County Planning and Development Services
1660 Ringling Boulevard, 1st Floor
Sarasota, Florida 34236

RE: Sarasota County 18-1ESR Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment (Expedited State Review Process) – FDOT Technical Assistance Comments

Dear Ms. Roe:

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), District One, has reviewed the Sarasota County 18-1ESR Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPA), locally known as CPA No. 2017-F. The CPA proposal package was transmitted under the Expedited State Review process by the Board of County Commissioners, in accordance with the requirements of Florida Statutes Chapter 163. FDOT offers the following technical assistance comments.

**CPA No. 2017-F/Resolution No. 2018-034:**
CPA No. 2017-F is a proposed text amendment to the Sarasota County Comprehensive Plan to add Ibis Street (from SR 72/ Clark Road to Future North-South Roadway A) to the Future Thoroughfare Plan Maps and Tables. The intent of the proposed CPA is to provide for the roadway network needed to support future development within the Sarasota 2050 South Village. The South Village is generally located east of I-75 and south of Clark Road, and is also delineated on Map 8-7 of the Future Land Use (FLU) Element. The amendment includes revising the following maps and table in the County Comprehensive Plan:

- **FLU Element:**
  - Map 10-8: 2040 Future Thoroughfare Plan (Class Descriptions)
  - Map 10-9: 2040 Future Thoroughfare Plan (Number of Lanes)

- **Mobility Element:**
  - Map 10-3a: Mobility Plan Corridor – North County
  - Map 10-3b: Mobility Plan Corridor – Central County
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• Table 10-5, 2040 Future Thoroughfare Plan Roads

According to the information provided in the staff report, and based on the review of the "Traffic Impact Analysis" included in Appendix C (dated October 2017), the analysis provided in Table "3", and the County transportation models for the 2040 "No-Build" and "Build" conditions, the proposed extension of Ibis Street from SR 72/Clark Road to Future North-South Roadway A is expected to:

- Reduce the number of projected capacity deficient roadways in the area;
- Provide significant connectivity to the County’s roadway network east of I-75; and
- Provide a needed additional north-south roadway to the Thoroughfare Plan with upcoming development south of Clark Road and east of I-75.

Additionally, adding the roadway to the Thoroughfare Plan allows for funding for roadway and mobility improvements along Ibis Street.

**FDOT Technical Assistance Comment #1:**
Based on the information provided in the staff report, the addition of Ibis Street from SR 72/Clark Road to Future North-South Roadway A is expected to improve the overall traffic operations of the area, and provide a grided transportation network to the nearby State and Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) facilities. FDOT supports a connected transportation network, and looks forward to working with the County as this project moves forward into the design and construction stages.

**As the proposed extension project advances, FDOT requests to be included as a review agency in future traffic studies and discussions, to ensure that the future traffic diversions do not adversely impact the traffic operations along nearby State and SIS transportation facilities, including I-75, SR 72/Clark Road, SR 758/Bee Ridge Road and SR 681.**

Thank you for providing FDOT with the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed amendment. If you have any questions or need to discuss these comments further, please contact me at (863) 519 - 2562 or Deborah.Chesna@dot.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Deborah Chesna
Complete Streets/Growth Management Coordinator
FDOT District One

**CC:** Mr. Ray Eubanks, Florida Department of Economic Opportunity
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Sarasota County DEO 18-2ESR
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LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS
SARASOTA COUNTY

The Council staff has reviewed the proposed evaluation and appraisal based amendments to the Sarasota County Comprehensive Plan (DEO 18-2ESR). These amendments were developed under the Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act. A synopsis of the requirements of the Act and Council responsibilities is provided as Attachment I. Comments are provided in Attachment II. Site location maps can be reviewed in Attachment III.

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

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

A summary of the results of the review follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Consistent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEO 18-2ESR</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(1) Not Regionally Significant (2) Consistent with SRPP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

04/2018
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.
SARASOTA COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (DEO 18-2ESR)

DATE RECEIVED: MARCH 27, 2018

Summary of Proposed Amendment
Sarasota County DEO 18-2ESR is a privately-initiated Comprehensive Plan Amendment relating to 2050 Villages, revising Future Land Use (FLU) Policy VOS1. to delete “contiguous” from the policy footnote related to the requirement of subsequent Village Centers. This would allow the elimination of the required Village Center in Grand Lakes. The commercial and service needs of the development’s residents can be met by the Village Center (approved for 300,000 square feet of non-residential uses) in LT Ranch Village, which will be located approximately 2.5 miles to the east. This revision would not impede on the overall intent of the policy.

In the 2015 Phase 3 Comprehensive Plan Update, Policy VOS 1.2a was amended to add the footnote (below) after Figure VOS-1, regarding non-residential needs for each additional Village after an initial Village Master Development Plan has been approved.

> After an initial Village Master Development Plan has been approved for a Village Area (North, Central, South), the gross leasable square footage may be reduced or eliminated and the minimum land area percentages adjusted for each additional contiguous Village Master Development Plan within that Village Area where it is demonstrated that the non-residential needs of the Village will be served within that Village Area in a manner consistent with the purposes of this chapter.

The analysis for the 2015 amendment recognized that smaller subsequent Villages may not be of sufficient size to support their own non-residential uses (Village Center), and that the initial, larger Village could provide sufficient non-residential services to support the entire Village area. As the justification from the Applicant states, LT Ranch is providing a Village Center (approximate 300,000 square feet of non-residential uses), which would support Grand Lakes and its residents.

The Applicant’s issue with the 2015 amendment language is that the word, “contiguous” was included in the footnote. The proposed Grand Lakes Village is not contiguous or adjacent to LT Ranch; it is located less than 2 miles to the west, but within the same South Village Area. The Applicant is requesting to delete the word, “contiguous” from the policy footnote. This revision which would not impede on the intent of Policy VOS 1.2a’s footnote. Planning staff has no objections to the proposed revision.

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 the amendment is not regionally significant.

Recommended Action
Approve staff comments. Authorize staff to forward comments to the Department of Economic Opportunity and Sarasota County.
MAPS

Sarasota County

DEO 18-2ESR

Growth Management Plan

Comprehensive Plan Amendment
STAFF REPORT

SARASOTA COUNTY COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING

DOCC, CPA2017-B, & RZ 17-07

DEVELOPMENT OF CRITICAL CONCERN (DOCC), COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (CPA) 2017-B, & REZONE PETITION NO. 17-07

MARCH 14, 2018
Agenda

Item

Charlotte County DEO 18-2ESR
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 18-2ESR). 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 18-2ESR</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(1) Not regionally significant (\text{(2) Consistent with SRPP})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

4/2018
COMMUNITY PLANNING ACT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NOTE: THE ABOVE IS A SIMPLIFIED VERSION OF THE LAW. REFER TO THE STATUTE (CH. 163, FS) FOR DETAILS.
CHARLOTTE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (DEO 18-2ESR)

Summary of Proposed Amendment
Charlotte County DEO 18-2ESR is a request to amend Coastal Planning (CST) Policy 1.4.7: Manatee Protection Plan to reflect that the Board of County Commissioners accepted the Manatee Protection Plan on February 14, 2017.

On February 14, 2017, the Board of County Commissioners accepted the Manatee Protection Plan (MPP), which was developed in coordination with and approved by the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Service. According to "Action Item" established under 8.1 Implementation Action, 8.1.1 Adoption and Permitting of MPP, the County will incorporate the MPP and a corresponding amendment to Coastal Element (CST) Policy 1.4.7: Manatee Protection Plan within 6-month after acceptance of MPP. On September 18, 2017, South Florida Ecological Services Office issued a letter which states that "the Service submits this letter in support of the Charlotte County MPP. We appreciate County's interest and commitment to protecting manatees and their habitat and we look forward to working with your staff and FWC on the successful implementation of the MPP". Therefore, Staff from Charlotte County Community Services is requesting to amend CST Policy 1.4.7: Manatee Protection Plan as follows to fulfill "Action Item":

CST Policy 1.4.7: Manatee Protection Plan (MPP)

The County accepts shall continue to work with the appropriate State and Federal agencies to develop the Manatee Protection Plan (MPP) which has been developed in coordination with and approved by the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The MPP has been determined to balance the need for manatee protection and the need for recreational and commercial uses and was accepted by the Board of County Commissioners on February 14, 2017.

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.
City of Punta Gorda DEO 18-1ESR
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LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS
CITY OF PUNTA GORDA

The Council staff has reviewed the proposed evaluation and appraisal based amendments to the City of Punta Gorda Comprehensive Plan (DEO 18-1ESR). 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 18-1ESR</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 Punta Gorda.
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 PUNTA GORDA COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (DEO 18-1ESR)

RECEIVED: MARCH 23, 2018

Summary of Proposed Amendment
This amendment is for the purpose of applying the City’s Future Land Use Designations to vacant undeveloped properties that were annexed into the incorporated City limits. These properties are located within an area that was previously annexed in 2014 and underwent a Comprehensive Plan revision (DEO 14-1ESR).

The property locations can be seen in Attachment III and combine for approximately 13.78+ acres. The properties will be given a Highway Commercial Center (HCC) FLU Designation. This designation is consistent with the surrounding properties. There is no proposed development within this area at this time. When development is proposed all levels of service impacts to solid waste, sanitary sewer, drainage, potable water and water supply, traffic circulation, schools and recreation will be addressed.

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 Punta Gorda.
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Hendry County DEO 18-1ESR
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LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS
HENDRY COUNTY

The Council staff has reviewed the proposed evaluation and appraisal based amendments to the Hendry County Comprehensive Plan (DEO 18-1ESR). These amendments were developed under the Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act. A synopsis of the requirements of the Act and Council responsibilities is provided as Attachment I. Comments are provided in Attachment II. Site location maps can be reviewed in Attachment III.

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

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

A summary of the results of the review follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Consistent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| DEO 18-1ESR        | 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 Hendry County

04/2018
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

The applicant, Long Hammock Grove Inc. is requesting to amend the Hendry County Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map (FLUM) to change the future land use designation for the subject property from Agriculture (AG) Future Land Use Category (FLUC) to Multi-Use Development (MUD) FLUC. The subject property is located on US 27 and consists of 233.34+ acres in Hendry County with an additional 60.51+ acres in Glades County. The current use on the entire property is agriculture (sugarcane farming). The proposed MUD FLUC allows existing agricultural uses to continue, recreational facilities, residential, commercial, and industrial uses. The Glades County application proposes to redesignate the 60.51+ acres to Industrial. The applicant has stated that the Glades County property may be used for stormwater management. County staff is coordinating with Glades County in the review of the applications.

The applicant has stated that there is no intent to develop residential due to the proximity to the Airglades Airport. Since we cannot condition a map amendment, any future development will be assessed through a Planned Unit Development (PUD). Impacts and or any restrictions resulting from the proximity to the airport will be addressed at that time.

The subject properties are located within an emerging growth corridor. 1.5+ miles to the east is approximately 1,900+ acres already designated as MUD FLUC. Further east is the City of Clewiston. To the South is the Airglades Airport, which is pursuing expansion plans, and the Airport Industrial Planned Development property. Approximately 2.5 miles to the west is the intersection of S.R. 80 and US 27. Based on the surrounding land uses, the proposed redesignation to the MUD FLUC is consistent with existing and planned development. The MUD requires a PUD rezoning which will further ensure the environmental, historical, floodplain, stormwater, water supply and all other public facilities will be addressed in accordance with all local, state and federal requirements.

In order to assess the potential economic impact, a comparison of what the property taxes were in 2016 vs. an estimate of Ad Valorem taxes based on the sample land use distribution labeled “Example Land Use Distribution Sketch”, was provided. The actual 2016 Ad Valorem Taxes were $4,103.51 and the potential taxes are estimated at $73,468.63. Based on the potential property taxes, this amendment would have a positive impact on the County and would further the County’s goals of economic diversity, creating new jobs and increasing the County’s tax base.

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 significant 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 Hendry County.
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SUMMIT CHURCH DRI DEVELOPMENT ORDER RESCISSION
IN LEE COUNTY

Background

The Summit Church (aka University Baptist Church) Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review
development order was approved by the Lee County Board of County Commissioners on April 3, 2006. This DRI review project is located in unincorporated southcentral Lee County just south of the southern entrance road to Florida Gulf Coast University (see Location Map). Normally, a stand-alone church would not be reviewed as a DRI, however, because of a Lee County Comprehensive Plan requirement associated with the approval of Florida Gulf Coast University, Policy 18.2.2 required “all property within the University Village shall undergo a DRI review”. Therefore, the DRI review for regional impacts was on the 10.3-acre site, 61,500 square feet depicted in three church structures, a 1.55-acre storm water management lake, and parking areas. This project has no regional impacts other than related to vegetation and wildlife. To be consistent with how other DRIs in the University Village have been reviewed it was necessary to impose regional conditions related to habitat impacts to Florida panthers, wetlands and indigenous vegetation on this site. To date 26,641 SF has been constructed. The applicant seeks to develop an additional 11,600 square foot worship hall in a proposed single story building adjacent to and adjoining to its existing 26,641 square foot two-story building.

Previous Changes

On August 21, 2007, the Lee County Board of Commissioners extended the phase, build out, and termination dates of the Summit Baptist Church DRI by three years in response to the legislature's amendment to Section 380.06(19)(c), F.S., pursuant to House Bill 7203. The extended buildout date of December 31, 2-13 has expired and the termination date is 2019.

Proposed Rescission

On March 15, 2018 the Rescission Application was submitted under the provisions of Florida Statutes Section 380.115 (Vested rights and duties; effect of size reduction, changes in statewide guidelines and standards).

“A development that has received a development-of-regional-impact development order pursuant to s. 380.06 but is no longer required to undergo development-of-regional-impact review by operation of law may elect to rescind the development order pursuant to the following procedures: (2) If requested by the developer or landowner, the development-of-regional-impact development order shall be rescinded by the local government having jurisdiction upon a showing that all required mitigation related to the amount of development that existed on the date of rescission has been completed or will be completed under an existing permit or equivalent authorization issued by a governmental agency as defined in s. 380.031(6), if such permit or authorization is subject to enforcement through administrative or judicial remedies.”

On January 22, 2014, the Lee County Board of Commissioners adopted the University Community DRI Requirement Ordinance (Lee County Ordinance 14-03) eliminating the mandatory review of development in the University Community Land Use Category, unless otherwise required by law. The existing and proposed development do not require DRI review in accordance with the amended Lee County Comprehensive Plan Policy 18.2.2 and the applicant seeks the rescission of Zoning Resolution Z-05-098 approving the DRI.
Staff Review

The Applicant has fully performed the required wildlife mitigation off-site within the Panther Island Mitigation Bank and has mitigated the impact of development on vegetation by maintaining 1.5 acres of the site as indigenous plant communities. The applicant has provided an Affidavit of Compliance stating, “compliance of all applicable local regulations and required mitigation”. Therefore, based the criteria for rescission in Chapter 380.115 (2) FS as stated above, the rescission of this development order is acceptable.

Acceptance of Proposed Rescission Resolution Language

The proposed resolution is acceptable.

RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. Notify Lee County, the Florida Department of Economic Development and the applicant the proposed rescission application is acceptable and will be in compliance with Chapter 380.115 FS.
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EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT: May 17, 2018

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
      • February and March Financials
      • Budget Amendments

2. Resource Development and Capacity Building

   • Post-Disaster Coordinator Update- Ellie McKuen
   • Promise Zone Update – Aiden Bandy
   • Regional Transportation Update
   • FRCA Monthly Report - attached

3. Third Quarter FY 2017-2018 (April 1, 2018 - June 30, 2018)

   • 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
     ✓ EDA- Disaster Coordinator; $250,000
     ✓ Brownfields grant $600,000
   • Grants Under Development
   • Grants Pending: $538,572 approximately
     ✓ DEO Grant Opioid Resource Guide $40,000
     ✓ DEO Grant Affordable Housing Directory of Providers & Resources $40,000
     ✓ DEO Grant AG Food Safety Plans $30,000
     ✓ DEO Grant for Web Interactive Map for Hurricane evacuation and Storm Surge $35,000
     ✓ EDA Agriculture Sustainability Implementation Plan $250,000
     ✓ Evaluation of landscape wetlands Connectivity in Charlotte Harbor Watershed $143,572
MONTHLY ACTIVITY REPORT: April 2018

RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT/CAPACITY BUILDING and OUTREACH

- Organized and distributed the March 2018 Florida Regional Councils Association (FRCA) Newsletter, **FRCA Forward**. Began collecting articles and formatting the April 2018 Newsletter. Continued to update the FRCA Facebook page.

- Continued to work with the Florida Association of Counties regarding the maintenance and enhancement of the FRCA website and newsletter. Continued to update and maintain the email listserv for the more than 2,500 individuals who receive **FRCA Forward**.

- To enhance partnerships and strengthen the relationship between regional planning councils and their state and federal partners, participated in or attended the following meetings and shared information:
  - IFAS Coordination Meeting, April 4th
  - FDOT Workshop on F.S. 333 – Airport Zoning Regulations, April 24th

- Facilitated the Economic Development Planner and Disaster Recovery Coordinator Conference Call with the Economic Development Administration, April 13th

- Worked with the Department of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Environmental Protection to submit two presentation ideas which were selected for the American Planning Association Florida Annual Conference being held in West Palm Beach, September 11 – 14, 2018.

ASSOCIATION MANAGEMENT

- Participated in the March 8 - 9, 2018, Executive Directors Advisory Council (EDAC) and Partners Meetings held in Tallahassee. Prepared for the May 10th EDAC meeting being held by conference call including developing agendas and distributing meeting materials.

- Coordinated FRCA participation with the upcoming annual conferences:
  - National Association of Regional Councils
  - Florida Association of Counties
  - Florida League of Cities
  - American Planning Association, Florida Chapter

- Updated and enhanced the FRCA website.

- Distributed grant opportunities and information of interest from state and national organizations.
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## APPROVED BUDGET AMENDMENTS

### Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Adopted FY 2017 Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>$309,106</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secured Federal/State Grants</td>
<td>220,074</td>
<td>323,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Development Unsecured Grants/Contracts</td>
<td>354,171 (298,266) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secured Contractual</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>80,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRI/NOPCs/Other Reviews</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest/Misc</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Balance from Audit YE 9/30/16 (FY15/16)</strong></td>
<td>$811,779</td>
<td><strong>811,779</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income (Revenue)</strong></td>
<td>$1,746,030</td>
<td>$105,691</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures (Expenses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>SWFRPC General Fund</th>
<th>SWFRPC Special Revenue</th>
<th>Proposed Budget Amendment FY2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$440,748</td>
<td>$362,595</td>
<td>$503,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA</td>
<td></td>
<td>33,717</td>
<td>38,526</td>
<td>$38,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,687</td>
<td>$3,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers Compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,687</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td></td>
<td>48,915</td>
<td>52,278</td>
<td>$52,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Insurance (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td>64,433</td>
<td>84,846</td>
<td>$84,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$591,500</td>
<td>$320,345</td>
<td>$682,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants (C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant/Consulting - Contractual (D)</td>
<td>106,200 (47,602)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37,049</td>
<td>$37,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>3,687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental (E)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,695</td>
<td>6,695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,722</td>
<td>12,026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair/Maint. (Tech/Equip)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing/Reproduction</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities (Elec/Internet)</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,900</td>
<td>24,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Service Charges</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Related Expenses (G)</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,184</td>
<td>25,487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues and Memberships (H)</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,095</td>
<td>25,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings/Events</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay-Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease Long Term</td>
<td></td>
<td>45,930</td>
<td>45,930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Balance from Audit YE 9/30/16 (FY15/16)</strong></td>
<td>$811,779</td>
<td>$811,779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational Expense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,154,530</td>
<td>$1,014,312</td>
<td>$1,168,781</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fringe/Indirect Allocation

- **Fringe/Indirect Allocation:**

  - **Utilized Reserve:**
    - Total Operational Expenses: $1,154,530
    - Net Income/Loss: $(0)

### Net Income/Loss

- **Net Income/Loss:**
  - Proposed Changes: $(0)
  - SWFRPC General Fund: $1,154,530
  - SWFRPC Special Revenue: $1,014,312

### Proposed Budget

- **Proposed Budget:**
  - Adopted FY 2016 Budget: $730,335
  - SWFRPC General Fund: $730,335
  - SWFRPC Special Revenue: $(0)
  - Proposed Budget Amendment FY2017: $730,335

---

*Program Development (Unsecured Grants/Contracts) was determined based on three previous years budgets which brought in at least $354,171 in additional revenue after the budget was adopted. To date, the SWFRPC has exceeded the $354,171 program development by securing funding of $403,957 as of March 2018.

**Fund Balance from Audit YE 9/30/16 (FY15/16) - included in this fund is the investments, operating funds and net of all assets and liabilities as of 9/30/16.

***The Fund Balance - End of Year $811,779 - is a snapshot as of 9/30/16 per audit report.

The balance will increase over time as interest accrues.
February and March 2018 Financials
2017 - 2018 Workplan & Budget Financial Snapshot
Feb-18

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, and EPA
Federal Grants billed Semi Annually: Economic Development
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 ($48,480) Unaudited
# SWFRPC

Detail of Reserve  
As of FEBRUARY 28, 2018

### 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>$105,812</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>$128,270</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>$512,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government Surplus Trust Fund Investment Pool (Fund A)</td>
<td>$138,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Investments</strong></td>
<td><strong>$651,159</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Reserves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Reserves</td>
<td><strong>$779,430</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SWFRPC INCOME STATEMENT
COMPARED WITH BUDGET
FOR THE ONE MONTH ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUES</th>
<th>LOCAL ASSESSMENTS</th>
<th>FEDERAL / STATE GRANTS</th>
<th>MISC. GRANTS / CONTRACTS/CONTRACTUAL</th>
<th>DRIS/NOPCS/MONITORING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Month</td>
<td>Year to Date A</td>
<td>FY 2017-2018 Approved Budget B</td>
<td>% Of Budget Year to Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLOTTE COUNTY</td>
<td>$ - $25,568</td>
<td>$38,351</td>
<td>67% $12,783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLIER COUNTY</td>
<td>- $52,530</td>
<td>$105,061</td>
<td>50% $52,531</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLADES COUNTY</td>
<td>- $1,958</td>
<td>$3,914</td>
<td>50% $1,956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HENDRY COUNTY</td>
<td>- $5,756</td>
<td>$11,511</td>
<td>50% $5,755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE COUNTY</td>
<td>- $55,906</td>
<td>$83,858</td>
<td>67% $27,952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF CAPE CORAL</td>
<td>- $25,572</td>
<td>$51,142</td>
<td>50% $25,570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF FORT MYERS</td>
<td>- $11,416</td>
<td>$22,832</td>
<td>50% $11,416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWN OF FORT MYERS BEACH INC</td>
<td>- $942</td>
<td>$1,883</td>
<td>50% $941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BONITA SPRINGS</td>
<td>- $7,258</td>
<td>$14,516</td>
<td>50% $7,258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF SANIBEL</td>
<td>- $988</td>
<td>$1,977</td>
<td>50% $989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARASOTA COUNTY</td>
<td>- $29,965</td>
<td>$29,965</td>
<td>100% -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LOCAL ASSESSMENTS</strong></td>
<td>$ - $217,859</td>
<td>$365,010</td>
<td>60% $147,151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD Glades/Hendry 17/18</td>
<td>- $7,587</td>
<td>$32,020</td>
<td>24% 24,433</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM - Collier Hazard Analysis 17/18</td>
<td>- $9,380</td>
<td>$8,054</td>
<td>116% (1,326)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Mitigation Strategy - EPA</td>
<td>- $27,500</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>25% 82,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promise Zone</td>
<td>- $1,476</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>N/A 1,476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Planning 17/19</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0% 70,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FEDERAL / STATE GRANTS</strong></td>
<td>$ - $45,943</td>
<td>$220,074</td>
<td>21% $177,084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLADES SQG</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>$3,900</td>
<td>0% 3,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHERO</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>0% 6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MISC. GRANTS/CONTRACTS</strong></td>
<td>$ - $9,900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0% $9,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRI MONITORING FEES</td>
<td>250 $1,500</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>- $1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRIS/NOPCS INCOME</td>
<td>14,500 $24,880</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>71% $10,120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$14,750 $26,380</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>75% $11,620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Development (Unsecured Grants/Contract)</td>
<td>FY 2017-2018 Approved Budget</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Program Development (Unsecured Grants/Contract)</em></td>
<td>$354,171</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM - LEPC 17/18</td>
<td>20,995</td>
<td>20,995</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM - HMEP 16/17</td>
<td>23,680</td>
<td>23,680</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonita Springs Flooding</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO Agricultural Sustainability</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td>$74,676</td>
<td>$74,676</td>
<td>$354,171</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER REVENUE SOURCES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABM SPONSORSHIPS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELA TEGA SPONSORSHIPS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Income</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST INCOME - Money Market</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund A Investment Income</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OTHER REVENUE SOURCES</strong></td>
<td>$307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| TOTAL REVENUES | $89,733 | $367,224 | $1,801,934 | $352,429 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALARIES EXPENSE</td>
<td>$34,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA EXPENSE</td>
<td>2,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETIREMENT EXPENSE</td>
<td>5,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSE</td>
<td>6,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKERS COMP. EXPENSE</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEMPLOYMENT COMP. EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PERSONNEL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>$49,940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATIONAL EXPENSES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSULTANTS</td>
<td>$21,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANT/CONSULTING EXPENSE</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDIT SERVICES EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL EXPENSE</td>
<td>4,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE EXPENSE</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTAGE / SHIPPING EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT RENTAL EXPENSE</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE EXPENSE</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPAIR/MAINT. EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINTING/REPRODUCTION EXPENSE</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Current Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITIES (Elec, Internet)</td>
<td>1,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVERTISING/LEGAL NOTICES EXP</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER MISC. EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK SERVICE CHARGES</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES EXPENSE</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER RELATED EXPENSE</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUES AND MEMBERSHIP</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLICATION EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROF. DEVELOP.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEETINGS/EVENTS EXPENSE</td>
<td>4,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL OUTLAY - OPERATIONS</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEASE LONG TERM</td>
<td>3,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCOLLECTABLE RECEIVABLES</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUND BALANCE</td>
<td>$38,062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Allocation for Fringe/Indirect (Captured by Grants)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OPERATIONAL EXP.</td>
<td>$1,154,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CASH OUTLAY</td>
<td>$88,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET INCOME (LOSS)</td>
<td>$1,731</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Assets</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash - Florida Prime</td>
<td>$138,642.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash - FineMark Oper.</td>
<td>105,812.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash - FineMark MM</td>
<td>512,517.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>130,897.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Current Assets: $888,068.83

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property and Equipment</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property, Furniture &amp; Equip</td>
<td>237,172.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated Depreciation</td>
<td>(197,201.57)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Property and Equipment: $39,970.74

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Assets</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount t.b.p. for L.T.L.-Leave</td>
<td>40,634.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSA Deposit</td>
<td>2,881.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Deposits</td>
<td>3,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amt t.b.p. for L.T.Debt-OPEB</td>
<td>65,074.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Other Assets: $112,089.73

Total Assets: $1,040,129.30

### LIABILITIES AND CAPITAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Liabilities</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>$113.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred NorthPoint NOPC_5328</td>
<td>662.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Pelican Marsh_5329</td>
<td>468.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Commons NOPC_5337</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred PR Parcel 9E DRI_5342</td>
<td>19,169.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Pine Air NOPC_5343</td>
<td>1,437.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred PR XXVII DRI_5344</td>
<td>14,861.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred PR XXVI DRI_5345</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Deep Lagoon NOPC_5346</td>
<td>1,842.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Fiddlers NOPC_5347</td>
<td>1,235.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred City Gate NOPC_5348</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Palmer Ranch 28_5349</td>
<td>9,896.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Riverwood NOPC_5350</td>
<td>4,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Murdock Center_5351</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA Taxes Payable</td>
<td>12.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal W/H Tax Payable</td>
<td>(118.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United way Payable</td>
<td>(220.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Compensation Payable</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSA Payable</td>
<td>(638.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEPC Contingency Fund</td>
<td>305.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Current Liabilities: 79,328.20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-Term Liabilities</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Annual Leave</td>
<td>40,634.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Debt - OPEB</td>
<td>65,074.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Long-Term Liabilities: 105,708.44

Total Liabilities: 185,036.64

Unaudited - For Management Purposes Only
## SWRPC Balance Sheet
February 28, 2018

### Capital
- Fund Balance-Unassigned: $349,601.05
- Fund Balance-Assigned: $514,000.00
- FB-Non-Spendable/Fixed Assets: $39,970.74
- Net Income: $(48,479.13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital</td>
<td>$855,092.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Liabilities &amp; Capital</td>
<td>$1,040,129.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unaudited - For Management Purposes Only*
2017 - 2018 Workplan & Budget Financial Snapshot
Mar-18

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, and EPA
Federal Grants billed Semi Annually: Economic Development
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 ($23,157) Unaudited
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash and Cash Equivalents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FineMark Operating Funds</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>71,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Fiscal Year Carryover</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>22,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash and Cash Equivalents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 93,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FineMark Money Market</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>512,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government Surplus Trust Fund Investment Pool (Fund A)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>138,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Investments</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>651,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Reserves</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>745,053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SWFRPC Income Statement Compared with Budget

**For the One Month Ending March 31, 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>$</td>
<td>$25,568</td>
<td>$38,351</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>$12,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier County</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$52,530</td>
<td>$105,061</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$52,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glades County</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,958</td>
<td>$3,914</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$1,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendry County</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,756</td>
<td>$11,511</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$5,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee County</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$55,906</td>
<td>$83,858</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>$27,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cape Coral</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$25,572</td>
<td>$51,142</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$25,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Myers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$11,416</td>
<td>$22,832</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$11,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Fort Myers Beach Inc</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$942</td>
<td>$1,883</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonita Springs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$7,258</td>
<td>$14,516</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$7,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sanibel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$988</td>
<td>$1,977</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota County</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$29,965</td>
<td>$29,965</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LOCAL ASSESSMENTS</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$217,859</td>
<td>$365,010</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$147,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL/STATE GRANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM - LEPC 17/18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$20,995</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>$59,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM - HMEP 16/17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$23,680</td>
<td>$23,871</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>$191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM - HMEP 17/18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$60,349</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$11,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD Glades/Hendry 17/18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$7,857</td>
<td>$12,235</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>$10,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM - Collier Hazard Analysis 17/18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$9,830</td>
<td>$20,844</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>$11,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Mitigation Strategy - EPA</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promise Zone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,476</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>(1,476)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO Agricultural Sustainability</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Recovery Coordinator</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Community Service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Planning 17/19</td>
<td>36,158</td>
<td>$36,158</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>$33,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FEDERAL/STATE GRANTS</strong></td>
<td>$68,658</td>
<td>$169,277</td>
<td>$543,431</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>$254,610</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>$4,500</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonita Springs Flooding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonita Springs Affordable Housing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHERO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MISC. GRANTS/CONTRACTS</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$90,500</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>$70,500</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>$1,500</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRIS/NOPCS INCOME</td>
<td>15,139</td>
<td>40,019</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>(5,019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$15,139</td>
<td>$41,519</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>119%</td>
<td>($3,519)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Month</td>
<td>Year to Date</td>
<td>FY 2017-2018 Approved Budget</td>
<td>% Of Budget Year to Date</td>
<td>Budget Remaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Development (Unsecured Grants/Contract)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Program Development (Unsecured</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER REVENUE SOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABM SPONSORSHIPS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELA TEGA SPONSORSHIPS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST INCOME - Money Market</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund A Investment Income</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OTHER REVENUE SOURCES</strong></td>
<td>$ 341</td>
<td>$ 2,708</td>
<td>$ 6,000</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>$ 7,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 811,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>$ 84,138</td>
<td>$ 451,362</td>
<td>$ 1,851,720</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 475,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALARIES EXPENSE</td>
<td>$ 37,963</td>
<td>$ 221,394</td>
<td>$ 440,748</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>219,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA EXPENSE</td>
<td>2,874</td>
<td>16,750</td>
<td>33,717</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETIREMENT EXPENSE</td>
<td>4,011</td>
<td>19,937</td>
<td>48,915</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>28,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSE</td>
<td>6,961</td>
<td>34,223</td>
<td>64,433</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>30,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKERS COMP. EXPENSE</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>1,452</td>
<td>3,687</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>2,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEMPLOYMENT COMP. EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PERSONNEL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>$ 52,050</td>
<td>$ 293,755</td>
<td>$ 591,500</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>297,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATIONAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULTANTS</td>
<td>$ 2,178</td>
<td>$ 39,277</td>
<td>$ 106,200</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>66,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANT/CONSULTING EXPENSE</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>37,075</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDIT SERVICES EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL EXPENSE</td>
<td>2,861</td>
<td>25,144</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>126%</td>
<td>(5,144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE EXPENSE</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>2,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTAGE / SHIPPING EXPENSE</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT RENTAL EXPENSE</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>2,948</td>
<td>6,695</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE EXPENSE</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>8,019</td>
<td>10,722</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>2,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPAIR/MAINT. EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINTING/REPRODUCTION EXPENSE</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1,366</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITIES (Elec, Internet)</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>9,238</td>
<td>24,900</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>15,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVERTISING/LEGAL NOTICES EXP</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER MISCE. EXPENSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Current Month</td>
<td>Year to Date</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>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>155</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>2,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER RELATED EXPENSE</td>
<td>12,633</td>
<td>23,303</td>
<td>24,184</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUES AND MEMBERSHIP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>25,095</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24,267</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>1,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEETINGS/EVENTS EXPENSE</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5,156</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>844</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>3,859</td>
<td>22,785</td>
<td>45,930</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCOLLECTABLE RECEIVABLES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUND BALANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$811,779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATIONAL EXP.</strong></td>
<td>$26,055</td>
<td>$180,764</td>
<td>$1,154,530</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>199,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OPERATIONAL EXP.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,154,530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CASH OUTLAY</strong></td>
<td>$78,105</td>
<td>$474,519</td>
<td>$1,746,030</td>
<td>$496,807</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET INCOME (LOSS)</strong></td>
<td>$6,033</td>
<td>$(23,157)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SWFRPC Balance Sheet
March 31, 2018

### ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Assets</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash - Florida Prime</td>
<td>$138,852.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash - FineMark Oper.</td>
<td>71,095.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash - FineMark MM</td>
<td>512,647.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>181,535.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>904,330.94</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property and Equipment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property, Furniture &amp; Equip</td>
<td>237,172.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated Depreciation</td>
<td>(197,201.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Property and Equipment</strong></td>
<td><strong>39,970.74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Assets</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount t.b.p. for L.T.L.-Leave</td>
<td>40,634.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSA Deposit</td>
<td>2,881.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Deposits</td>
<td>3,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amt t.b.p. for L.T.Debt-OPEB</td>
<td>65,074.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>112,089.73</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Total Assets**                     | **$1,056,391.41** |

### LIABILITIES AND CAPITAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Liabilities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>$113.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred NorthPoint NOPC_5328</td>
<td>662.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Commons NOPC_5337</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Pine Air NOPC_5343</td>
<td>1,437.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred PR XXVII DRI_5344</td>
<td>14,861.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred PR XXVI DRI_5345</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Deep Lagoon NOPC_5346</td>
<td>1,842.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Fiddlers NOPC_5347</td>
<td>1,235.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred City Gate NOPC_5348</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Palmer Ranch 28_5349</td>
<td>29,896.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Riverwood NOPC_5350</td>
<td>4,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Murdock Center_5351</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Summit Church_5353</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred BRC NOPC Incr 1_5354</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA Taxes Payable</td>
<td>176.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal W/H Tax Payable</td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United way Payable</td>
<td>(132.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Compensation Payable</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSA Payable</td>
<td>(708.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEPC Contingency Fund</td>
<td>305.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Liabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>81,491.13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-Term Liabilities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Annual Leave</td>
<td>40,634.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Debt - OPEB</td>
<td>65,074.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Long-Term Liabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>105,708.44</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Total Liabilities**                | **187,199.57** |

Unaudited - For Management Purposes Only
**SWFRPC**  
**Balance Sheet**  
**March 31, 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance-Unassigned</td>
<td>338,378.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance-Assigned</td>
<td>514,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB-Non-Spendable/Fixed Assets</td>
<td>39,970.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
<td>(23,156.94)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Capital                          | 869,191.84 |
| Total Liabilities & Capital            | $ 1,056,391.41 |

*Unaudited - For Management Purposes Only*
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Today’s Discussion

- Federal disaster recovery appropriations
- Coordinator’s workplan
Federal Disaster Recovery Supplemental Appropriations

- House Report 1892 – Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018*
  - Became law – February 9, 2018
  - Allocates (among other items) disaster recovery funds
    - Approximately $35 Billion**
    - Includes Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, Maria as well as wildfires
      - Florida’s allocation currently under consideration

* Does not include FEMA allocations
** Does not include law enforcement, NASA, armed services, ACOE, TSA, ICE, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
<th>Spending Deadlines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$3.5 billion</td>
<td>Crops, trees, bushes and vine losses up to 85% for those that did not have insurance 2017/2018; building and facilities; emergency conservation program; watershed/flood prevention operations; rehabilitation of Section 515 rental housing; rural water/waste disposal</td>
<td>Varies from 9/30/2019 to 12/31/2019 or until expended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Services</td>
<td>$7.6 million</td>
<td>Building and Facilities</td>
<td>Until expended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce - EDA</td>
<td>$600 million</td>
<td>Flood mitigation, disaster relief, long term recovery, restoration of infrastructure</td>
<td>Until expended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services Administration</td>
<td>$15 million</td>
<td>Tenant improvements for tenants in damaged U.S. courthouses</td>
<td>Until expended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Administration</td>
<td>$1.6 billion</td>
<td>Disaster loans</td>
<td>Until expended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>$13.2 million</td>
<td>Hazardous substance superfund (additional to existing program); leaking underground storage tanks</td>
<td>Until expended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$444.5 million</td>
<td>Public transportation emergency relief program (MPO/State); airport and airway trust fund for facilities, equipment and operations</td>
<td>Until expended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>$28 billion</td>
<td>Long term recovery - restoration of infrastructure and housing, economic revitalization; 33% allocated to those states affected by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria. Sent directly to the states</td>
<td>Not identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Eligible Activities</td>
<td>Eligible Applicants</td>
<td>Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)</td>
<td>Expenses related to crops, trees, bushes and vine losses</td>
<td>Uninsured growers</td>
<td>Press release - May 1, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
US Department of Agriculture

- $2.36 billion nationwide
- Florida’s appropriation
  - $340 million
  - 2017 Wildfires and Hurricanes Indemnity Program (WHIP)
- Eligibility Criteria
  - Apply prior to July 16
  - Anticipated reimbursement by fall

Key components

- Crops, trees, bushes or vine must be in presidential or secretarial designation in 2017
  - Other counties if documentation can be provide
- Individual basis with or without insurance
- If funded, must acquire insurance for future crops for following 2-year period
- Eligibilities range from $125,000 to $900,000
  - Evaluated by USDA
EDA – Disaster Recovery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Disaster Investment Priorities</th>
<th>Eligible Activities</th>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Administration</td>
<td>Recovery/Resilience; Infrastructure; Workforce Development and Manufacturing; Exports and Foreign Direct Investments (FDI)*</td>
<td>Planning/Design; Construction; Infrastructure</td>
<td>Job creation, retention or expansion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Foreign Direct Investment is the investment (at least $1 million) by a foreign country in physical assets in the US.
### EDA – Disaster Recovery
#### Regional Allocation

- **Federal allocation - $600,000,000**
  - Regional allocation - $147,362,000
  - Region IV-Atlanta – Alabama, **Georgia**, Kentucky, **Mississippi**, North Carolina, **Florida**, **Tennessee**, **South Carolina**

- **Long term rebuilding/redevelopment strategies**
  - Regionally oriented
  - Coordinated/collaborative economic development

- **Funding will follow criteria developed under EDA’s Economic Adjustment Assistance (EAA)**

- **Fosters economic growth and resiliency through implementation projects**
  - Infrastructure improvements (site acquisition, site preparation, construction, rehabilitation, facilities equipping)
  - Business/infrastructure financing, i.e., revolving loan funds, loan guarantees
  - Market industry research/analysis
  - Technical assistance
  - Public services
  - Training

*States with presidential declared emergency declarations*
EDA – Disaster Recovery Regional Allocation

- No submittal deadline
  - Funding on rolling basis subject to availability of funds
- Two-phase submittal process
  - Phase 1 – Proposal phase
    - Must provide nexus between project scope of work and disaster recovery/resilience efforts
      - EDA will notify applicant within 30 days to proceed with Phase 2
- Phase 2 – Complete application
  - One-page project description - more complete nexus between project including the intended project outcomes that fulfill communities specific to post-disaster needs; and
  - Budget narrative – itemized values to support the project, along with match descriptions
  - Disaster nexus – Directly tie the project to the disaster. Identify the project outcomes that fulfill the community’s specific post-disaster needs
EDA – Disaster Recovery Regional Allocation

- Match requirement
  - Ranges between 0 to 50 percent
    - EDA review on case-by-case basis
    - Lower match requirement requires sufficient justification to EDA
    - Follows criteria outlined in 13 CFR 301.4, Subpart D (Investment Rates and Matching Share Requirements)
# HUD CDBG - Disaster Recovery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Eligible Activities</th>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
<th>Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Urban Development – CDBG-DR</td>
<td>Housing, Economic Revitalization,</td>
<td>Low/Moderate Income persons or areas</td>
<td><strong>Administered by state</strong>: can be used as match to other federal programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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HUD CDBG – Disaster Recovery
Florida Allocation - $616 million

- $493 million ‘HUD identified most impacted and distressed’ areas
  - Brevard County
  - Broward County
  - Collier County
  - Duval County
  - Lee County
  - Miami-Dade County
  - Monroe County
  - Orange County
  - Polk County
  - Volusia County
  - 32068 (Clay County)
  - 32091 (Bradford County)
  - 32136 (Flagler County)
  - 34266 (Desoto County)

- $123 million ‘State identified most impacted and distressed’ areas
  - Areas identified in the State’s Action Plan
    - Draft plan due end of April
    - Will be sent to HUD mid May
      - HUD has 45 days for approval
      - Anticipated implementation
        - Fall 2018
HUD CDBG – Disaster Recovery

Funding priorities

- Housing Programs
  - Workforce Affordable Rental
    - New construction
    - Low Income Housing Tax Credits
    - Small rental complex-50 units or less
    - Land acquisition for workforce rental projects
  - Repair/replacement of units
  - Voluntary home buyout
  - Replacement units from buyout program

- Program Administration
  - Workforce rental programs
  - Florida Housing Finance Corporation
  - Repair/replacement, Buyouts and replacement units from buyouts
  - Administered by Department of Economic Opportunity
HUD CDBG – Disaster Recovery

- Funding priorities
- Economic Revitalization
  - Workforce recovery training
    - Needed workforce training to support long term recovery jobs
    - Construction focused training
  - Business recovery grant
    - Cost of replacing equipment/inventory
    - Not allowed to repay SBA loans
    - Must document impacts from storm

- Business assistance to new Floridians from Puerto Rico
- Devastation from Maria relocated residents
- Public assistance for new businesses and entrepreneurs, may include:
  - Business plan guidance
  - Specific regional market information
  - Accounting and legal assistance
  - Licensing and permitting guidance
  - Seminars and other forms of assistance
HUD CDBG – Disaster Recovery

- Infrastructure Repair and Mitigation Program
  - $791 million additional allocation – Portion of
    - Balance to continue unmet housing and economic revitalization needs
  - Notice from Federal Register
Coordinator’s Workplan – March to Current

Meetings/Emails/Telephone Contacts (Since March)
- Local, state, federal agencies
  - Glades County
  - Cape Coral
- CareerSource (2 meetings)
- Small Business Development Center
- Promise Zone Task Forces
- Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy Task Force
- Non-Profits
  - Shelter for Abused Women and Children
  - One-by-One Leadership
  - Charlotte Harbor National Estuary Program

Senator Rubio Workshop
- April 26, Immokalee
- Guadalupe Center
- FEMA, Social Security, RCMA

Consolidated the local needs assessment by agency

Began draft Regional Disaster Resource Guide

Began formatting webpage

Reviewed federal register for funding appropriations
Coordinator’s Workplan - Continuous

- Continue to focus on meetings:
  - Chambers of Commerce
    - May 10 – Greater Fort Myers Chamber
  - Counties
    - Hendry – May 18
  - Business owners
  - Economic development offices
    - Collier County pending
    - Lee County pending
  - Tourism development councils
  - Metropolitan Planning Organizations
  - Emergency Managers
    - May 9 - Lee County

- Continue data collection
- New/continuing funding sources
- Continue drafting Disaster Recovery Resource Guide
Disaster Recovery

Questions??
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Grant Activity Sheet
(Information Only)
<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/De nied</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 Amt-RPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>DEO - US Economic Development Administration</td>
<td>C.J. Kammerer</td>
<td>Regional Sustainability Implementation Study for SWFL Small to Mid-Sized Estuaries</td>
<td>5/8/2018</td>
<td>$258,182.00</td>
<td>$113,182.00</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td>$51,637.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>EPA - US Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>Jim Beever</td>
<td>WPDPG - CHNJP Wetland Connectivity</td>
<td>5/8/2018</td>
<td>$204,120.00</td>
<td>$145,246.00</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>FDEP - FL Dept. of Environmental Protection</td>
<td>Jim Beever</td>
<td>Ecosystem Services - Aquatic Preserves Valuation</td>
<td>5/1/2018</td>
<td>$90,000.00</td>
<td>$90,000.00</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>DEM - FL Dept. of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>Sean McCabe</td>
<td>Food Safety Plans for SWFL Small-Mid-Sized Growers</td>
<td>5/7/2018</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>DEM - FL Dept. of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>Tim Walker</td>
<td>Storm Surge Evac Routes &amp; Shelters Interactive GIS Web Map</td>
<td>5/7/2018</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>DEM - FL Dept. of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>Affordable Housing Directory of Resources</td>
<td>5/7/2018</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>EPA - US Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>C.J. Kammerer</td>
<td>Brownfields Assessment</td>
<td>11/16/2017</td>
<td>$600,000.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>USDA - US Dept. of Agriculture</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>Rural Promise Zone Designation</td>
<td>5/1/2016</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>EDA - US Economic Development Administration</td>
<td>C.J. Kammerer</td>
<td>SWFL Disaster Recovery Coordinator</td>
<td>10/31/2017</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>1/1/2018</td>
<td>12/31/2019</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Glades County</td>
<td>Tim Walker</td>
<td>Glades County SQG 2017-2022</td>
<td>6/6/2017</td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
<td>6/6/2017</td>
<td>6/6/2022</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Emergency Management</td>
<td>Sean McCabe</td>
<td>FY17-18 LEPC Agreement</td>
<td>7/1/2017</td>
<td>7/18/2017</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td>7/1/2017</td>
<td>6/30/2018</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Emergency Management</td>
<td>Sean McCabe</td>
<td>FY17-18 HMEP Agreement</td>
<td>10/1/2017</td>
<td>$65,161.00</td>
<td>$65,161.00</td>
<td>10/1/2017</td>
<td>9/30/2018</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>Regional Strategy for Agriculture Sustainability</td>
<td>6/30/2017</td>
<td>8/17/2017</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Emergency Management</td>
<td>Tim Walker</td>
<td>FY17-18 Collier_Lee Hazard Analysis</td>
<td>7/19/2017</td>
<td>9/3/2017</td>
<td>$20,844.00</td>
<td>$20,844.00</td>
<td>7/1/2017</td>
<td>6/30/2018</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>City of Bonita Springs</td>
<td>Jim Beever</td>
<td>City of Bonita Springs Flood Reduction Project</td>
<td>10/4/2017</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>10/4/2017</td>
<td>12/31/2017</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>EDA - 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>9/30/2018</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>EDA - US Economic Development Administration</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>FY17-19 EDA Planning Grant</td>
<td>1/1/2017</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>$90,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>SFRPC</td>
<td>C.J. Kammerer</td>
<td>Train the Trainers</td>
<td>1/1/2017</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Sarasota County</td>
<td>Jim Beever</td>
<td>Sarasota Climate Change Adaptation Plan</td>
<td>10/1/2016</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>10/1/2016</td>
<td>5/30/2017</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>City of Cape Coral</td>
<td>Jim Beever</td>
<td>Cape Coral Climate Change Resiliency Strategy</td>
<td>1/1/2017</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>6/30/2017</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>DEO - Labelle Tourism Marketing</td>
<td>10/1/2016</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>1/1/2017</td>
<td>5/30/2017</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Emergency Management</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>FY16-17 HMEP Grant</td>
<td>10/1/2016</td>
<td>10/1/2016</td>
<td>$60,349.00</td>
<td>$60,349.00</td>
<td>10/1/2016</td>
<td>12/31/2017</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Hendry County</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>Clewiston RGBD Grant TA</td>
<td>3/31/2017</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>Completed</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/De nied</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4006</td>
<td>USDA - US Dept. of Agriculture</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>City of Clewiston - Utilities Relocation – Grant Writing Services</td>
<td>9/8/2017</td>
<td>9/13/2017</td>
<td>8/10/2017</td>
<td>8/10/2017</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>8/10/2017</td>
<td>9/13/2017</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3525-12</td>
<td>Glades County</td>
<td>Tim Walker</td>
<td>Glades County Small Quantity Generators (SQG)</td>
<td>5/17/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,900.00</td>
<td>$3,900.00</td>
<td>5/17/2012</td>
<td>5/16/2017</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3414</td>
<td>EDA - US Economic Development Administration</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>EDA Planning Grant</td>
<td>1/22/2013</td>
<td>12/18/2013</td>
<td>4/18/2014</td>
<td>4/21/14</td>
<td>$270,000.00</td>
<td>$189,000.00</td>
<td>1/1/2014</td>
<td>12/31/2016</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$81,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3177</td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Emergency Management</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>FY16-17 LEPC Agreement</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
<td>4/6/2016</td>
<td>7/1/2016</td>
<td>$59,000.00</td>
<td>$59,000.00</td>
<td>7/1/2016</td>
<td>6/30/2017</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3399</td>
<td>CTD - FL Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>FY16-17 TD Planning Agreement</td>
<td>5/19/2016</td>
<td>7/1/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>$38,575.00</td>
<td>$38,575.00</td>
<td>7/1/2016</td>
<td>6/30/2017</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3721</td>
<td>DEM - FL Div. of Emergency Management</td>
<td>Tim Walker</td>
<td>Collier County Hazard Analysis - FY16-17</td>
<td>5/1/2015</td>
<td>11/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>1/1/2016</td>
<td>7/30/2016</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3302</td>
<td>DEO - FL Dept. of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>DEO - City of Fort Myers - MLK Corridor</td>
<td>5/1/2015</td>
<td>5/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>1/1/2016</td>
<td>7/30/2016</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3534</td>
<td>City of Bonita Springs</td>
<td>Jim Beever</td>
<td>City of Bonita Springs - Spring Creek Restoration Plan</td>
<td>7/1/2014</td>
<td>7/1/2014</td>
<td>8/11/2014</td>
<td>8/11/2014</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>8/11/2014</td>
<td>0.00</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></td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>0.00</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></td>
<td>$140,000.00</td>
<td>7/1/2013</td>
<td>1/1/2016</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3673</td>
<td>EPA - US Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>Jim Beever</td>
<td>A Unified Conservation Easement Mapping and Database for the State of Florida</td>
<td>4/15/2013</td>
<td>4/8/2013</td>
<td>6/3/2013</td>
<td>$294,496.00</td>
<td>10/1/2013</td>
<td>9/30/2015</td>
<td>145,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</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>5/16/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>$38,573.00</td>
<td>7/1/2014</td>
<td>6/30/2015</td>
<td>0.00</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>6/25/2015</td>
<td>6/26/2015</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>6/15/2016</td>
<td>0.00</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>2/4/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,000.00</td>
<td>10/1/2014</td>
<td>9/30/2015</td>
<td>0.00</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>9/29/2015</td>
<td>$234,071.00</td>
<td>$174,071.00</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td>9/30/2016</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$60,000.00</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>5/5/2015</td>
<td>6/11/2015</td>
<td>6/11/2015</td>
<td>$48,000.00</td>
<td>$48,000.00</td>
<td>7/1/2015</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>0.00</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>$38,573.00</td>
<td>7/1/2015</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></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>9/11/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td>12/15/2015</td>
<td>0.00</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</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td>9/30/2015</td>
<td>9/28/2015</td>
<td>$58,422.00</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td>9/30/2016</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></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>1/2/2015</td>
<td>1/2/2015</td>
<td>12/4/2015</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>0.00</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>2/11/2016</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>2/1/2016</td>
<td>3/31/2016</td>
<td>Completed</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>$3,000.00</td>
<td>3/22/2016</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>3/23/2016</td>
<td>3/31/2016</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3301</td>
<td>DEO - FL Dept. of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>Clewiston Mainstreet Revitalization</td>
<td>12/8/2015</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>12/14/2015</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3303</td>
<td>DEO - FL Dept. of Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>DEO - MPO Rail Study</td>
<td>10/7/2015</td>
<td>$39,000.00</td>
<td>10/7/2015</td>
<td>$39,000.00</td>
<td>5/31/2016</td>
<td>Completed</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>2/11/2016</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>2/11/2016</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3520</td>
<td>TBPRC - Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council</td>
<td>Rebekah Harp</td>
<td>2016 Disaster Planning Guide</td>
<td>2/11/2016</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>2/11/2016</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>4/30/2016</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></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>2/11/2016</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>2/11/2016</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>5/1/2016</td>
<td>5/30/2016</td>
<td>Completed</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>2/11/2016</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>2/11/2016</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>4/18/2016</td>
<td>5/30/2016</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6200</td>
<td>Bloomberg Philanthropies</td>
<td>Margaret Wuerstle</td>
<td>Bloomburg - City of Bonita Springs Mitigation</td>
<td>10/20/2017</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>10/19/2017</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>No</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>3/31/2014</td>
<td>$599,549.00</td>
<td>3/31/2014</td>
<td>$298,605.00</td>
<td>10/1/2014</td>
<td>9/30/2017</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>USDA - US Dept. of Agriculture</td>
<td>Rebekah Harp</td>
<td>Mote Marine Programming</td>
<td>8/31/2012</td>
<td>$270,000.00</td>
<td>8/31/2012</td>
<td>$189,000.00</td>
<td>1/1/2014</td>
<td>12/31/2016</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>$81,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>USDA - US Dept. of Agriculture</td>
<td>Nichole Gwinnett</td>
<td>Opportunity Buy Program Coordinator</td>
<td>4/23/2013</td>
<td>$99,667.00</td>
<td>4/23/2013</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>11/1/2013</td>
<td>10/31/2015</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>$53,621.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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