

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MEETING OF THE
COLLIER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Naples, Florida
November 6, 2025

LET IT BE REMEMBERED that the Collier County Planning Commission, in and for the County of Collier, having conducted business herein, met on this date at 9:00 a.m., in REGULAR SESSION in Building "F" of the Government Complex, East Naples, Florida, with the following members present:

Joe Schmitt, Chairman
Chuck Schumacher, Vice Chairman (present when indicated)
Paul Shea, Secretary
Randy Sparrazza
Michael Petscher
Michelle L. McLeod
Charles "Chap" Colucci
Amy Lockhart, Collier County School Board Representative

ALSO PRESENT:
Raymond V. Bellows, Zoning Manager
Mike Bosi, Planning and Zoning Director
Heidi Ashton-Cicko, Managing Assistant County Attorney
Courtney DeSilva, County Attorney's Office
Ailyn Padron, Management Analyst I
James Sabo, Planner III

PROCEEDINGS

MR. BOSI: Chair, you have a live mic.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Thank you. And good morning. And welcome, all, to the November 6th, 2025, Collier County Planning Commission.

I ask that we please rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(The Pledge of Allegiance was recited in unison.)

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And I asked Commissioner Shea if he would take the roll, please.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Commissioner Schmitt?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I am here.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Commissioner Schumacher?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: He is going to be late. He's called in. Maybe he'll be here by 10:15?

MR. BOSI: 10:15, 10:30.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: 10:30.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Well, Commissioner Shea is here.

Commissioner Sparrazza?

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Present.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Commissioner Colucci?

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Here.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Commissioner McLeod?

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Here.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Commissioner Petscher?

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Present.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Ms. Lockhart?

MS. LOCKHART: Here.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Sir, we have a quorum.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Excellent.

And with that, our next meeting is November 20th at 9 a.m. Are there any -- commissioners planning to be absent?

I will not be here, but we will have a quorum, it looks like. So thank you.

Approval of minutes. We have two sets of minutes, the October 2nd, 2025, and October 16th -- or correction, October 2nd, 2026, and the -- no, sorry -- October 2nd, 2025, minutes and the October 16, 2025, minutes. So we can vote on each of those separately. Do I hear a motion for October 2nd? Are there any changes or notes, or make a motion to approve?

COMMISSIONER SHEA: So moved.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Any seconds?

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: All in favor, say aye.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Any opposed, like sign.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: It passes unanimously.

Okay. The October 16th minutes. Motion?

COMMISSIONER SHEA: I move we approve as submitted.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Second.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: All in favor, say aye.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Any opposed, like sign.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: It passes unanimously.

Ray, are there any addenda to the agenda?

MR. BELLOWS: We have no changes to the agenda.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. Good.

And BCC report.

MR. BELLOWS: Yes. On October 28th, the Board of County Commissioners heard on the regular agenda The Retreat PUD amendment. That was approved 5-0 subject to Planning Commission recommendations.

Then the rezone from C-3 to RMF-16 on the North Trail, formerly known as Mercato West, that was approved -- oh, that was continued to the December 9th meeting. I think the commissioners wanted to --

MR. BOSI: Mike Bosi, Planning and Zoning director.

Commissioner Hall asked the applicant if he could continue the meeting to the December 9th. He wanted to convene a meeting with some adjoining neighbors who were in opposition who had some concerns about the height to see if they could find a compromise on what was being proposed.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I don't recall -- we didn't have anybody --

MR. BOSI: We didn't have any -- there was no opposition at the -- at the Planning Commission, but there was three people who spoke at it -- at the Board of County Commissioners, and Commissioner Hall wanted to see if they could find some further compromise in terms of location of the building, relationship to the height being proposed, I believe, was the issue.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: All right.

MR. BELLOWS: And we also had the 8928 Collier Boulevard RPUD and companion GMP amendment. That was approved 5-0 by the Board. And there was an LDC amendment that was approved on the summary agenda that had to deal with advertising notice -- public notice. That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. Thank you. And I have no -- nothing to report, and we have nothing on the consent agenda.

***So we'll proceed to the public hearings. And that first hearing -- that one -- that was -- the first public hearing is the PL20240005691. That's the Estates Regional Transportation Planning Facility, northeast corner of Immokalee Road and 47th Avenue. And I'm not going to read the rest of it. It's in your agenda. So we'll go through the disclosures.

MS. LOCKHART: Staff materials, and I met with Wayne Arnold and, of course, our CCPS staff.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Staff materials only.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Staff materials only.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I discussed with Wayne Arnold.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Staff materials only.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Staff materials only.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Staff materials and spoke with Norm Trebilcock.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And, yes, I did speak -- thank you. I spoke with Norm Trebilcock as well. He has since submitted a letter in -- to amend in opposition to some of the issues, so I did speak to Norm as well. Thank you for reminding me.

And with that, any persons wishing to speak on this matter, please rise to be sworn in.

THE COURT REPORTER: Do you swear or affirm the testimony you will give will be the truth,

the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

(The speakers were duly sworn and indicated in the affirmative.)

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: With that, I turn it over to the petitioner.

MR. ARNOLD: Good morning, Chairman and Planning Commission members. I'm Wayne Arnold, certified planner with Grady Minor & Associates here representing Collier County Public Schools.

So our team today, we have Marc Rouleau, who's standing next to me; and we have Adrian Roman, who many of you probably know, too, who's also with the facility at the school district. Jim Banks is our traffic engineer. He couldn't be here in person, but he is available on Zoom if you should have any questions of him; and then Marco Espinar, Environmental Consultants, sitting back here if you have any specific questions related to the environmental aspects of the project.

So the property is located on 47th Avenue Northeast on the west side of Immokalee Road. This is north of Oil Well Road, and it's immediately north of an existing FP&L substation. It's about 28 acres in total. It's zoned Estates. It's part of the Golden Gate Estates Master Plan, and that master plan contemplates these type of ancillary uses, as they're deemed to be in the Land Development Code, as uses by conditional use.

So we're requesting an Estates transportation facility for the school district, and that will be a facility that houses maintenance activities and their bus depo, in essence, for the school. The school district's owned the property for a long time. Originally thought the need might be for an elementary school, but since the advent of our villages, each of those villages will likely have their own elementary school, reducing the need. But they have a really big need for a transportation facility in this part of the county because it is growing. They need to transport students. Right now a lot of these operations are, on an interim basis, being run out of Palmetto Ridge High School, which is not ideal, or they're being serviced from the transportation facility that's part of Barron Collier High School near the public schools' main campus.

So we're here to bring forward a conditional use which would allow us to have these maintenance operations and the bus parking. And so we've got a site plan in front of you that we modified after we held our neighborhood information meeting. Mr. Trebilcock, who you've received comments from, was in attendance at that meeting.

And in that instance, we went back to staff and convinced staff if we could move our access on Immokalee Road to the north to that location, it would be far enough away from a planned signal at 47th -- not our 47th. There's another 47th that's not contiguous -- or not perpendicular to this 47th. It's south of the FP&L substation. So by moving it to that location to the north of the site, we have an opportunity to possibly get a timed signal at some point in the future.

And we also relocated the access point on 47th so that it's immediately across from the Florida Power & Light substation. That would eliminate any traffic moving west through parts that are developed with residential.

So all the bus traffic will come in off of the access on Immokalee Road, and all the bus parking will be located in that location more proximate to Immokalee Road.

We originally were planning two maintenance buildings, and probably now we'll have two, but one large building and one smaller maintenance building, and then we put all the employee parking in this location.

So we do have a residence to the west, and in that case we've allowed for open space to be between us and them. It's a little over a couple hundred feet wide. We also have a small preserve that Marco has been out there with the Water Management District, and it's an old remnant wetland. But if you go back to the aerial, you can see that a lot of the site, when you really zoom in on it, has been utilized as an ATV park for a lot of the nearby residents. So the quality of vegetation is not very good.

So here --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Is that what all the tracks were in and out of that?

MR. ARNOLD: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: It's just --

MR. ARNOLD: Just from use of off-road vehicles.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: No authorized. Just people out there on ATVs.

MR. ARNOLD: Correct, yeah.

So this, we've put the site plan on an aerial so you can see that the driveway connection is across from the Florida Power & Light facility on 47th, and there's no conflict on Immokalee Road. Lands to the north are owned by the State, and they're part of a preserve, and land to the immediate south is the FP&L substation. And to the northeast up here was the Immokalee Road Rural Village that you-all approved a couple of years ago that's going to be developed into somewhere between 2,000 and 4,000 homes.

This is part of our site plan notes that we have to put on the facility: 60,000 square feet, we think, for maintenance activities. That would be for the maintenance building, some training facilities for drivers, et cetera. Two hundred buses is what we're proposing for the main parking lot, and then, of course, the drivers.

We have conditions of approval. And you received input from Norm Trebilcock on some proposed changes that he was suggesting. We, the school district, and myself, evaluated those conditions, and we are able to make some modifications, but we don't agree with Mr. Trebilcock's proposed changes as they were written.

The -- and I can go through them. Mike -- I gave Mike a copy. And we can put it on the visualizer, and I can go through some of those changes that we're willing and can make to address, I think, the general concerns that Norm had raised.

But, for instance, we thought that the language on the lighting was too specific. We can agree that they're cutoff fixtures and no glare, and we've added some language that is consistent with the operational standards that the school district uses, but we didn't agree for the BUG rating, because I can't -- I've been involved in a lot of projects, and I don't recall being involved in any that had that specificity for lighting condition.

We typically deal with these -- and you'll see on the County's fleet facility that's the last item on your agenda. We have a similar condition that talks about it; no glare, et cetera. There's not a specific standard for the lighting, because I think, as we've all found out, there used to be a standard in the Golden Gate Master Plan that limited lighting to a certain style, and that became antiquated. The fixture types weren't even available any longer because the technology's changed. But anyway, I'll get to that.

So on the screen, starting with the first condition, you know, what I've underlined is what we're willing to modify. So we've agreed that the shrubs and hedges that would go in would be 48 inches at the time of planting and then maintained at a minimum of 72 inches. So six feet high minimum. As Norm had requested the language, it said maintained at 72 inches, but I think, you know, maintaining it at exactly six feet is probably not ideal, and maintaining it somewhere at least 72 inches would be better for everyone associated with it.

We added language that no barbed wire or razor wire would be utilized for security fencing. We do not agree that the chain-link fencing, if used, would be black vinyl coated. The black vinyl coating is a standard that's not used anywhere for any school facility, and the fact that the landscaping is going to be obscuring the fencing, whatever gets planted there, seems unnecessary and costly to the school district.

So going on down to the lighting condition that we discussed, what we had said, "All parking lot lighting shall be shielded in a design so that no light spillage occurs off site," and we've added language that says, "During periods of low daylight and bus operations, parking lot and roadway lights would be on. These lights will be off during all other times," which means when the drivers show up at 5 o'clock in the morning, the lights may be on for those conditions, but when the buses terminate their services during the day at 7 p.m. on a regular basis, the lights go off, and all they have is security lighting that remains. And they have to have security video cameras and things, so there needs to be an ambient level of lighting that those operate under, but we don't need the parking lot lighting to be on during those hours. So it's really a very limited window of nighttime hours or dark hours that those lights would even be on, and we think this addresses that concern without having to go through a BUG rating for the lighting.

Mike, if you could turn the page for me, that would be great.

So one of the other conditions that we had was the utilization of the access. So the condition that

we already proposed allowed only the drivers to utilize the 47th access. No bus traffic on 47th at all except if there was an emergency at our entrance and we had to get buses in and out, then we would use it as an emergency situation.

So what we've added, language to address Norm's concern is that the 47th Avenue access shall be located only across from the Florida Power & Light substation property. So it gives us flexibility to move it along that line when we get to final design, but we can't locate it farther west than we had originally proposed it to be.

So we think those have addressed much of Norm's expressed concerns without exactly accepting his language, and we hope that you can consider our language and agree with it.

Just a few pictures. I mean, the FP&L substation across the street from us, so that's our most nearest neighbor. And I just thought, if you haven't been out to see it, that's what our neighbor is.

So, again, we're consistent with the Golden Gate Master Plan.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: You have to go back to the presentation, Mike.

MR. ARNOLD: Oh, I'm sorry. There you go.

So this is a couple of street-view images of the Florida Power & Light substation that's across the street from the facility, just to give you some context of where we are and what we're doing.

In conclusion, as I stated, we're consistent with the Golden Gate Master Plan. Staff was in agreement with our proposed conditions, and they're in your resolution of approval as we had drafted them. Hopefully staff can support the revisions that we've addressed with you now.

We think we've responded to the neighborhood feedback we received at the neighborhood information meeting by relocating the access point and limiting that traffic to the drivers only. And then we think that, without a doubt, that we'll be compatible with the neighborhood given the conditions that we've offered.

So with that, that's our conclusion. If you have any questions for me or facilities from the school district, we're here to answer those questions.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I see no comments. There's -- oh, Mike.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Yeah. I've got a couple questions. So you're not doing any modifications to Immokalee Road as far as turning lanes, medians, nothing like that, to get into the place?

MR. ARNOLD: We will be making those changes.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Oh, I didn't see that in your presentation.

MR. ARNOLD: It's not one of the conditions, but when we do the analysis at the time of engineering plan review, we will be putting in a turn lane, a left-turn lane on Immokalee Road. There probably will be a right-turn lane as well. And I didn't really highlight it, but we are reserving 50 feet of right-of-way for future improvements to Immokalee Road for the County.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Okay. And you mentioned that you -- you -- maybe I caught this wrong, but you moved the driveway on Immokalee Road a little further north so you could put a traffic signal there because it's so close to the one that's going in at 47th. So if I'm correct, there will be one at 47th, one here, and one at the Immokalee Road Rural Villages, within 500 feet of each other.

MR. ARNOLD: Well, the one --

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Am I wrong?

MR. ARNOLD: -- if you've driven out Immokalee Road -- the charter schools, if you've seen them, they have intermediate operational. So during release hours, the light becomes active, but otherwise it's just a flashing signal. We think that's likely what would happen at this facility. If it's warranted. I mean, there's no guarantee we get a signal. And the Rural Village, they haven't established their exact location for access yet. That's likely to be much farther than the southern boundary line.

And then as I mentioned -- and I don't know that I have a good exhibit to show you that, but on an aerial photograph and our location -- so 47th Avenue, you can see is here, but it's also here on the south side of Florida Power & Light.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: No. I'm familiar with the area, so that's why I'm saying there will be one at 47th -- this other 47th Avenue, one at your bus location, and then one another 500 feet at the Jones Mining -- or Immokalee Road Rural Villages.

MR. ARNOLD: Potentially, yeah. One of the things I wanted to show you, our original site plan that we submitted for the conditional use showed two access points on 47th, one for maintenance activities, one for the drivers on a separate parking lot. All the parking, the maintenance buildings, you know, all that has been reconfigured, so now we've a single access point here for drivers only and no other access to 47th, and then here was the access point that I referenced that's now been moved to that location.

So those were positive changes that I think staff liked, and we hope that addressed some of the neighbor concerns. But this was -- the northern access point was -- had come about from discussions with Trinity Scott, Mike Sawyer, and their staff about, you know, trying to move our access point as far away from their future signal at 47th as we could.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Those are the only questions I have.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. I see no other questions. Anything else from the petitioner?

MR. ARNOLD: No. Just -- we'll come back up when needed.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Thank you, Wayne.

Staff, please.

MR. BOSI: Mike Bosi, Planning and Zoning director.

Staff has reviewed the application regarding the proposed facility against the Golden Gate Area Master Plan, as well as the Land Development Code.

We do recognize the need from the school district's perspective of having a facility much closer to the eastern -- to the eastern area of the county with the growth expected over the next 20 to 25 years to be predominantly within that growth corridor. So this type of facility will have, most certainly, a beneficial end result in terms of the traffic and the vehicle miles traveled required to be able to service the bus -- the bus facilities and storage as well, providing for a location to provide for a number of buses that service the schools within the eastern portion to be located in much closer proximity.

So for those reasons, you know, we are very supportive of the petition, as well as the enhanced buffering that is being provided for within the facility to make sure that it doesn't provide a visual disruption to the Rural Estates and the character of the Rural Estates.

What I would say to Mr. Petscher, when they go to the SDP from the operational analysis, Transportation department will evaluate, you know, their request. Whether they will need a turn lane, it will be determined at that time as well. But the larger question related to where the lights will be arranged for, they will most certainly make those evaluations based upon the additional loads that this will place upon Immokalee Road. But they also have the overriding understanding that Immokalee Road needs to be as free-flowing as possible. So where they will eventually sign off on the lights, I don't think the 500 feet spacing would provide enough, you know, criteria for them. So those will all be evaluated as we get a little bit more further specificity in terms of the exact loads and the specifics.

And on a sidenote, I wouldn't hold your breath in terms of when the Immokalee Road Rural Village is every going to be developed. They had their GMP approved. They withdrew the PUD that was going to implement it, and now they are continuing to mine that facility.

I would expect over the next five to 10 years that that will continue to be probably a mining operation before they contemplate the transition to something different. And when they have the lighting for that, that will be adjusted by whatever lights are decided related to this facility as well. For those reasons, staff is supporting the application.

We did have some late commentary that came in from Mr. Trebilcock, and we're willing to work -- you know, we will work with the Planning Commission as to what we think is appropriate in terms of the requests that have been provided for, just to provide for the extra compatibility and protection for the surrounding properties.

With that, any questions staff could answer?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. I have questions, but I had staff go first before the public speaker, because I just wanted to get your presentation. And I am going to -- you already talked about it. Mr. Trebilcock has already submitted comments, so we may come back to staff to address some of those.

But -- so with that, Michelle, do you have a question?

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Yeah. Just out of curiosity, on Page 6 of the staff report, it explains two sections of the Florida Statute 163, and it says, "Applicant must receive a credit for the anticipated road impact fees. The applicant calculated their proportionate share, and it does not exceed the impact fees anticipated to be collects" -- or collected. Can you explain that; how does that work?

MR. BOSI: When you have a proposal, each -- each -- each application has to pay their impact fees, and that's related to our concurrency management system and the impact that they're going to have within the roadway.

The road -- those impact fees are calculated against what the proportionate share for any improvements that provided -- that are going to be required, and that's evaluated to see whether they are going to have a bill or whether they've satisfied the requirement for what the required improvements will be needed. So what that's saying is that the impact fees that are being provided will satisfy the operational improvements that are going to be needed for the project.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Oh, okay. Because when it talked about a credit, I was wondering how are they getting credited for an impact fee.

MR. BOSI: They would be credited by the operational improvements that are required. The overall cost of that is evaluated against what their impact fees were, and if it was above what their impact were going to be provided for, then they have a credit --

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: I see.

MR. BOSI: -- because they paid more than what they would have been required from a proportionate share factor.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay. And so that means they already paid the impact fee?

MR. BOSI: No. The operational improvements that are -- that are anticipated for this project, the actual physical work that's going to be done is evaluated against what their impact fee charge is going to be and when that --

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay.

MR. BOSI: -- when the cost of that operational improvement is above what the impact fee is, then they would get a credit for that.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay. All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Michelle, they typically pay the impact fees at the first development order. It may be at site plan level, but typically it's at building permit when they get assessed impact fees.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Well, I was just confused with the credit. It's like if you know exactly what the impact is going to be, just charge them. When does the reevaluation happen to determine whether a credit is applied?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Normally before they pay the impact fees, because they already know what the cost is going to be for the -- for the -- let's say there's improvements to the intersection. They're going to know what those costs are and probably undertake those at the -- at the development order approval, typically at the site plan level, and then -- and then the impact fees are assessed normally at building permit. And then they'll do a -- they'll get a credit for what they paid out of pocket versus what they would have had to pay at impact fees.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay. Okay.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: We can get into more detail than that, but...

With that, are there any public speakers?

MR. SABO: Mr. Chairman, one public speaker, Norman Trebilcock.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Oh, I'm sorry. Mr. Shea. Yes, hold off. I have one. Mr. Shea. Commissioner Shea, go ahead, please.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: I guess I didn't realize the school district paid impact fees.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Right. And that was the other thing, yeah.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: I guess they do, right?

MR. BOSI: County government pays impact fees. We all pay impact fees. If we have a facility that's going to impact our roadways, any end user is required to pay for their share of the impact. So yes.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Is this a two-phase construction? Originally the previous one said it

was going to be two-phase. Is this all going to be built in one phase, the revised drawing?

MR. ARNOLD: Again, Wayne Arnold. It's very likely that -- that's obviously the old plan, but the -- that was the new plan, sorry.

It's still very likely that they'll phase in their 200 buses. They may not build all of it. Originally it was designed to build about 30,000 square feet of maintenance and then about 100 buses. I think it just depends on when they get out there and decide that maybe it's prudent to go ahead and build a parking lot at one time instead of twice.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. Thank you. With that, staff, please, are there any -- Charles, sorry.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: I have one more question as part of my ongoing education. What kind of operational efficiencies offset impact fees?

MR. BOSI: A turn lane. Putting in a turn lane is one of the -- or the aspects that is required. Intersection improvements, as the commissioner -- or as the Chair has recognized. Sometimes if a light -- if they are required to put in a light, then that -- those are the type of things that would be evaluated, the cost to put in against what their impact fees charge would have been.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Donating of right-of-way.

MR. BOSI: Yeah. The right-of-way that they mentioned, that's another one.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Donating the land that they own.

MR. BOSI: There's a value to that 50-foot that they provide -- the 50-foot right-of-way along their property on Immokalee Road, that has a monetary value. That's part of that calculation as well.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: With that, now we'll go to public speaker, please.

MR. SABO: Mr. Chairman, same guy, Norman Trebilcock.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Same guy. Normally Norm is on the petitioner side so -- but now he has joined the dark side.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: This could jeopardize future business.

MR. TREBILCOCK: I believe we're all on the same side.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. Oh, good comeback.

MR. TREBILCOCK: Okay. Troy, are you able to put up my presentation, or do I have to grab it somehow? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And I trust Mr. Banks is on the -- he's on Zoom in case there's comments from transportation?

MR. SABO: Yes, that's correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I know Jim and Norm are good friends, so we're not going to get into a food fight, so...

MR. TREBILCOCK: And I'm requesting, if I could, additional time.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yes, go ahead.

MR. TREBILCOCK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yeah, that's fine. Because I want you to go through this.

MR. TREBILCOCK: And all the people stacked up behind me, you should be okay, right?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yes.

MR. TREBILCOCK: Yes, sir. Thank you.

Good morning. My name is Norman Trebilcock, and I'm a professional engineer, certified planner, professional traffic operations engineer with over 35 years of local experience. My firm, Trebilcock Consulting Solutions, focuses on transportation and site/streetlighting permitting design and permitting for the public and private sectors here in Collier County in Southwest Florida, around here.

I'm here today representing myself as a residential property owner directly across the street from this proposed facility on 47th Avenue Northeast. My wife, Lisa, and I have owned this lot since 2008.

When we purchased the lot over 17 years ago, we knew Collier County Public Schools owned the land across the street, and I thought the possibility of an elementary school there would be a benefit.

From the NIM meeting in January, I gained an understanding of why things changed for Collier

County Public Schools, especially when the FP&L substation was constructed a few years ago at the corner of 47th Avenue Northeast and Immokalee Road.

Collier County Public Schools proposed transportation facility is important for Collier County as well as our community, and I understand better the rationale now for choosing this site.

I believe we should support this facility, though my personal expectations of a vibrant elementary school across the street will not be met. I believe that this conditional use should have appropriate added measures, conditions of approval to help protect the residential neighborhood given the change that this use will introduce.

They held a NIM in January of this year and did listen to input and made some important changes to the proposal, which is appreciated. I believe additional improvements to their plans are needed to achieve compatibility with the surrounding residential neighborhood.

I have coordinated with their agent as well as Growth Management staff and have provided added language to the conditions, which you all have seen, and I understand Wayne has provided some good additional items as well. But I just want to cover for you maybe the rationale and understanding of why the landscaping, fencing, lighting, traffic analysis, and access design deserve these conditions that are being recommended. And so that's what I'll cover here.

So first, in the conditions of approval, they added language. This deals with -- the first one, the 1A, landscape buffer, is planting in it at a higher height and really allowing it to grow at a higher height. Wayne's suggested language is fine, it is, you know, to just have it at a minimum 72 inches, I think, you know, that's good. That's exactly what we're looking for is to have a good buffering in front of folks' front yards, so that's great.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. Norm, I'm going to stop you there, because Wayne's language said planted at 40 inches. You're asking for 60.

MR. TREBILCOCK: I'm okay --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay.

MR. TREBILCOCK: -- you know.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Because that's about a year.

MR. TREBILCOCK: I'm not Mr. Landscape, so -- you know, so I'll trust that and the input from the landscape, Mark Templeton and Wayne. So I'm good. As long as we're moving towards that 72-inch minimum, I think what Wayne had is actually a better idea, a minimum of 72.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay.

MR. TREBILCOCK: So I think that's good.

Then as far as these other ones, the only thing I would say is to, likewise, allow all of these to grow a minimum of 72-inch for the buffer along -- let me see -- along Immokalee Road. See, normally, the County, when we do a D buffer, we do 24 inches and maintain at 72-inch because the thought is is to maintain lines of sight, which is certainly important.

And what I'm suggesting here is -- because you do have residents across the street over there, too -- is let's allow these to grow up higher but then just maintain lines of sight at access points, okay? And I'll show you, the County has these, like, sight triangles and stuff like that. And, again, this is something similar that you-all approved for the U-Haul thing where -- along Myrtle where you guys had them go with a higher buffer, and that -- that's a public right-of-way as well. So this is not, you know, an unusual request or anything there.

And again, so the -- at the westernmost buffer adjacent to that residential property owner is just to allow them, if they do do a hedge, to just maintain it at a minimum of 72 inches. Again, just to screen it so we're not looking at this gorgeous thing, you know. So that's it there.

So, again, Wayne's language, I think, is good to go with the exception I would ask that we have minimum maintenance of 72 inches at the other buffers and respect the lines of sight.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yeah. Let's -- we'll pause at each one of these because we're going to -- commissioners want to ask Wayne. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Sure. Wayne, are you okay with that final request at the western end to have a minimum of 72?

MR. ARNOLD: Well, the western buffer is proposed to either be located at the property line or adjacent to our parking field. It probably makes more sense at the parking field, but we can maintain that opacity at 72 inches. I don't think that's an issue at all; likewise on Immokalee Road.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Great. So we're happy with what Norm has just reviewed and what Wayne wants to do, right?

MR. TREBILCOCK: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: We're all playing good in the sandbox, okay.

MR. TREBILCOCK: Yes.

MR. ARNOLD: I would say maybe subject to modification of Norm's language, but I think the concept, we're there.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: All right. And I'll leave that up to staff as we go through each of these. We're not saying we're going to adopt the language as specified by Norm, but between the two, you'll come up with the suitable language when this goes prior to -- prior to going before the Board, or we'll make that in our stipulation when we vote, and then we'll trust that staff will make the correct wording and modification.

MR. BOSI: We will modify as directed by the Board -- or by the Planning Commission in terms of the modifications that are arrived upon.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: I think a simple conclusion is when we have Mr. Trebilcock and the -- not plaintiff. Plaintiff?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Applicant.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: -- applicant agreeing with what we've already somewhat reviewed, we'll all be happy.

MR. BOSI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: So that's the goal. Thank you.

MR. TREBILCOCK: Thank you.

And this is just examples just kind of illustrating these points for you-all.

When this FP&L facility came in, obviously that was a different hit, as we know, and that really catalyzed the school to change what they're doing.

Just -- and they put in a buffer. They put in a nice wall and stuff like that. But you'll see that this adjacent neighbor, that buffer really wasn't sufficient. He put in his own buffer, and that's really what we're trying to help take care of here is let's put in what makes sense. Especially it's hard to do it in your front yards of residence. That's why it's best to have the -- for lack of a better word -- the offender on the other side put in the proper buffer to begin with, and that's what you can see here where this guy -- he put this in himself, you know. I mean, you know, he's already tagged with his big, old, you know, industrial facility, and then he's putting in a buffer to protect himself, and that's what the guys would have to do here, and we really want to prevent that from having to happen.

The thing on the fencing, what Wayne's suggesting is fine. The only exception I would just say is the fencing shall be screened by landscape, and that's normal. The County requires it anyways when you put up hedges and stuff.

You know, the fact of the matter is the black vinyl -- you know, and I do understand why the County does do the metal fencing on all the schools and stuff because it really gives you a mental sense of security and things like that.

You know, I was joking to Chairman Schmitt yesterday that, you know, we don't want this to look like an army installation, you know, but in a way, at the schools you kind of do that. So I do understand why they do what they do.

But I saw this differently, but I understand, you know, it would save 10 bucks a foot on, you know, 4,000 feet of fence. You know, that's some money that they can save. So that's fine as long as it's properly screened and stuff. That's the key thing there, okay, and no barbed wire and Concertina wire.

And, again, this is their facility. This is the example I'm looking at, the one off of Rattlesnake,

and you can see --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: But that one on Rattlesnake's been there probably 20 years or more?

MR. TREBILCOCK: Yes. We can always improve. And so that's the key thing. This is the example I'm saying, hey, this is our standard bearer. This is where 100 buses come in and out every day. By the way, this picture was taken at -- Sunday morning at 6 a.m., and lights were on, okay. So -- but you can see the barbed wire, so it would be great to change that, and that's what they're agreeing to, so that's awesome.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Let me ask --

MR. TREBILCOCK: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: -- Norm.

Amy, of course, represents the school district. Is anybody else from the school district here?

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: We've got two guys.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Oh, okay. Thank you.

What are your security requirements? If you could come to the podium. Because I understand the barbed wire and, of course, the concern that we don't want -- first of all, we don't want any -- what do you want to call it -- people trying to get in there and do something whatever -- nefarious to the school buses.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Hoodlums.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Hoodlums, there you go. Thank you. I was being kind.

But what are your security requirements? The facility Norm just showed does have barbed wire on top, but this doesn't need -- you don't need barbed wire.

MR. ROULEAU: My name is Marc Rouleau, chief facilities officer with Collier County Public Schools. Good morning. Our facilities do not have barbed wire requirements. That is a very old facility, installed more than two decades ago.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yeah.

MR. ROULEAU: Probably needs to come down because it doesn't really give a neighborly appearance to it. And I will look into that, taking down that barbed wire.

Other security requirements, we are required to have security cameras on and around our facilities, so we need some ambient light, enough lighting to be able to see. Our security cameras don't have night vision.

So parking lot and roadway lighting, generally that goes off after busing operation. This older facility, to the best of my knowledge, doesn't have timed circuits where those lights come on and off as they should.

Other security requirements, our facilities are locked. Gates are locked. We have to have a visual clearance through our fences, two to three feet so, you know, people on the campus, whether transportation, administration, or a school facility, we can see through our fence line.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Do you have 24/7 security on site?

MR. ROULEAU: 24/7 in the sense that our security cameras are on 24/7.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Oh, just security cameras.

MR. ROULEAU: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: But no night watchmen or anything like that?

MR. ROULEAU: So some of our campuses have Youth Relations Bureau deputies and other law enforcement that live on our campuses.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yeah.

MR. ROULEAU: We provide them space for a portable home, and part of the agreement for them living on our property is to patrol the property. So some of our properties do have deputies --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Oh, I understand the schools. But, I mean, this site would not be --

MR. ROULEAU: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: -- have a security on site?

MR. ROULEAU: No, sir. There would not be a patrol.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. Thanks. Let me -- last thought. What is your thoughts about

the vinyl fence? I mean, it looks nicer, but it's probably 20 percent increase in cost.

MR. ROULEAU: No. There is an increase in cost. One of my concerns is precedent setting. So we don't stop building facilities today. I'm going to be building facilities for the long-term future. So I'll be building more elementary, middle, and high schools. And if we start adopting vinyl fencing, that's -- it's an additional cost to the taxpayer.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yeah.

MR. ROULEAU: Galvanized fencing serves the same purpose. When it's shielded with vegetation, it's less visible.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yeah, okay. I would -- I would agree. I mean, the vinyl fencing is nice, but the -- if it's screened properly, hopefully you won't see the fence. You'll just have the screening. Norm?

Thanks.

MR. ROULEAU: Yes, sir.

MR. TREBILCOCK: Yes, sir. And I'm good. I understand that.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yeah. Okay.

MR. TREBILCOCK: And then -- but -- okay. So very nice. Thank you.

This is just a view. Wayne provided that, too, just so you see that FP&L did put up, you know, a large wall and buffer screen and stuff.

With the lighting -- you know, this is an important issue, I believe. And so site parking lot lighting, the emitted color temperature shall be 3,000 Kelvin or less. All site lighting fixtures shall be Dark Sky compliant such that with a BUG rating -- backlight, uplight, and glare. That's how we rate fixtures. That's how the industry rates fixtures. That's the standard of the industry for rating fixtures, that we use -- any commercial fixture will have a BUG rating on it associated.

And so when you have an uplight with the U value equal to zero, that means it is Dark Sky compliant, that all the light is emitted downward. So it's a very clear standard. It's not -- there's nothing nebulous or anything like that as far as that goes. And this isn't unusual. You-all implement this in projects we have, and I can show you a couple examples of that.

The other thing is just, again, in the mounting heights west of the FP&L substation, i.e., in front of the residences where the parking lot for the employees is is to have that at a lower mounting height, a 15-foot mounting height. Again, it's more of a normal standard, and that way it's less obtrusive and seen.

And then the lights east of the residential where the buses are go up to a 25-foot mounting height. That way they're high above the buses, and they can emit the light properly there. So I'm very understanding of that.

And again, these -- for example, this one where you can see off to the right here -- here -- where we had -- we called it out. This is a PUD back in 2021, and ironically, Wayne Arnold was the presenter for this as well. But the BUG light, we had the BUG rating where the U equals zero. It's a very established criteria, and we also had height limitations near the neighborhood to go with a 15-foot and then bounce it up to 25 feet there.

Likewise, a more recent one, too, 2023. This here -- this is in -- near an Estates area, and all of the lights were set at a 15-foot mounting height with a 3,000 Kelvin color temperature for all the lights, again, because we're near a residential neighborhood.

Lighting is something I do. I did do the lighting also for some of the charter schools recently, Naples Charter Academy and also Mason Classical Academy that's underway. Both of those are public schools. I did those with 3,000 Kelvin color temperature, because we're kind of near some residential areas there, and I also followed them at 15-foot mounting height near the residential folks and then bounced it up higher when we got further away there.

So this is not something that is so unusual or strange. It's really something that if you allow my input on it, this is the input I provide regarding lighting. It's to be a good neighbor. And you can't say it otherwise. And so if these lights are on 24/7 for security, it won't be as obtrusive. And it's a reasonable, rational standard to follow. And you guys have good examples for doing this.

Again, this is -- you know -- you know, this is what we see. This is the example we have today,

you know. And what we want to do is avoid this kind of stuff. This is not a good neighbor, it's not. No matter what we say and what we want to do, this is not a good neighbor. And it's -- it's not as horrible here because, you know, this is an arterial roadway, and you don't have single-families right across the street and stuff, so I get it. You know, I'm a supporter of the schools bigtime.

So in my mind, it's important, and you guys have good examples of implementing that lighting stuff.

Here with the TIS, I'm good to go. I talked to Wayne. I talked to Jim. You know, and what Mike said is in the operational studies, they'll use -- you know, again, I'm Mr. Anal -- I mean, I'm Mr. TIS, so what we do want to do, like when I -- when we design churches and stuff, we do the peak-hour generator, we will look at, for the sizing of turn lanes, what that Sunday service is even though, for capacity and stuff, we look at the p.m. peak hour during the week 4 to 6 p.m., but that wouldn't be the peak hour of this facility.

We want to look at peak hour of this facility so that the turn lanes on Immokalee Road are sufficiently long. And they've committed to doing that. And I'm fine. We don't have to put all the specifics in here. I'm just kind of explaining myself a whole bunch. But as long as they commit to using the proper peak hour, and County staff does a great job of reviewing traffic studies, because I get beat over the head all the time on it. So they do a good job.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Commissioner Sparrazza.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Thank you.

Can we back up just one quick moment and, as Chairman described, going through each of these, Mr. Arnold, are you okay with the two different lamp heights, the 15-foot and 25-foot as Norm has suggested?

MR. ARNOLD: The easy answer is no, we're not. We don't know what the heights are going to be yet because the lighting hasn't been designed. And as Norm mentioned, when you get into the design, it really drives -- you know, when you go Dark Sky compliant, what I hate to do is, if we're already going to be Dark Sky compliant, to then have to agree to lower heights. Because we're going to have vegetation there. We have landscaping. As I said, the lighting is going to be on for no more than hours per day in the darkest of conditions, and we don't know that we need the 15-foot lighting height.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Is that --

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Is that something that we can have the three of you, Norm, staff, and you and your petitioner, to -- we can't agree to it now, as you said, and that's great, but have continuing meetings so that you don't come up with something, staff -- well, staff has to approve it. But just everybody continuing to communicate and understand what's great for the neighborhood, what's great for your client, and staff. That's -- I'm just looking for everybody to continue to communicate.

MR. ARNOLD: I'm positive that we'll have more dialogue with Mr. Trebilcock between now and the Board meeting. And I've known Norm for a long time, and it's -- you know, we want to be good neighbors. We think our conditions will allow us to be the good neighbor that Norm wants without being as specific as he's requesting at this time.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Okay. And, Mike.

MR. BOSI: I was just going to suggest I think the Planning Commission should arrive upon what you think is appropriate, and the applicant and Norm can have conversations. And if they arrive upon a remedy, if -- if at the end of this hearing they do still have a difference which -- in the light pole height, whatever the case may be, if they find resolution, we can most certainly -- we can most certainly highlight that within our executive summary. Also, if it -- if they're able to do so and if it turns out there's no other opposition and they find agreement, we can actually put this on a summary agenda item. We can move it to a summary agenda item.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: I'm just concerned that none of us are lighting experts, and we don't know what the requirements are going to be with their final design of the SDP, what things are going to look like. I'm not sure any of us could say, no, we're going to request 25 and 15 feet, because we don't know what's going to take place. So I'm not sure it's proper for us to come up with that suggestion

now, or am I not understanding you correctly?

MR. BOSI: No, I think it's -- if you think if, in close proximity to residential properties, a lower light pole is appropriate, I would say that that's what you should recommend.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: I see.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: I'm going to be stuck on that, to be honest with you, because this is right next to residential -- in a residential neighborhood. Also, it's next door to a state-run conservation land. So, yeah, I'm going to be stuck on this 15-foot and 25-foot, and also in the Rural Estates in the area. I drive by this every day, so...

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Michelle.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Yeah. Wayne, I have a question for you. Can you address Norm's concern about seeing the lights on on a Sunday?

MR. ARNOLD: I think Mr. Rouleau mentioned that, that that's an older facility that doesn't have timed fixtures. So those lights are probably just on a very generalized timer. And I'll let Marc address that in more detail.

MR. ROULEAU: Good morning. The facility was built about 1997, so we did not include circuits to control the lighting on and off. But this facility, it's going to be a state-of-the-art facility. It will be integrated with our building management system, so we'll have a lot of latitude to control the lighting.

The bus operations, out of 180 days out of the year, you know, where we have 180 school days, typically start about 4:30 a.m. and end at 7 p.m. You may have nighttime events that support football games and sports events throughout the year. And so buses may come in and out Wednesday, Tuesdays during those instances. But the intent is to keep the lights on when they're needed and off when they're not needed.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay. And then can you explain -- I'm sorry for not understanding -- Wayne's explanation of why you can't do the 15 and 25? Can you explain that?

MR. ROULEAU: Yeah. So we have not gotten far enough along in the design process to have a photometric study performed that would tell us light spread, light elevation, the number of poles to support that lighting, the height of those poles. My concern is, one, will this require a high density of poles where I've got poles in parking lots? I'm dealing with buses. They're huge. So I don't want to have so many poles that now I have driving obstacles.

The second thing is the light quality. Most of our on-campus lighting is more than 3,000 Kelvin. It provides greater visibility. I don't -- you know, I don't want to have reduced quality of lighting visibility because of the Kelvin's change. So not -- going -- you know, doing something different than what we've done at our -- on our campuses, elementary, middle, high school, and transportation facilities is a bit concerning.

And again, I've got more facilities to build, so if we start doing something a little bit different, my high school's going to say, "We like that lighting on the transportation site. Why is this not equitable? Why are they different than us? Are they better than us?"

So these are all things that I've got to think about when we contemplate changes in lighting. I'm not necessarily against a 30-foot elevation. I only know what I know, and I -- the thing I don't know is the density of light poles that I'm going to have on that property.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Michelle, in simple terms, the shorter the pole, the possibility of more light poles.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Guaranteed more light poles.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: For the spread of light.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: You've got a 90-degree angle.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And other than probably Paul and myself and a few others, Mr. Kelvin goes way back to our thermo days, right?

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay. So since Norm is an expert in lighting, can you counter -- or not counter that, but can you address that?

MR. TREBILCOCK: I would welcome something like this for me as a designer because I know exactly what to do. I'm putting the lower poles where the cars are, the higher poles where the buses are, so it addresses that kind of issue. And it's very specific. I know what to do and where to do it and -- but where we're hugged up -- when you see their site plan, where you're hugged up against the residential area where all those cars are parked there, these will be lower, and it's right in front of the residences.

This is really an appropriate level. You know, it's going to be more poles, yes. You're -- you know, we're kicking this neighborhood in the stomach coming in here with this industrial-type use, okay. It's different. Two hundred buses is different than six school buses in an elementary school, okay.

So that's the key. And this -- I love these standards. And this is actually what I did when we're looking at -- near, like, the Mason Academy where I knew I was near a residential area. I went down to 15-foot mounting height, and then I went higher in areas where I knew I was okay. Again, that's the Ascend project. Everything is 15-foot mounting height because, again, you've got to respect the residences.

And to say that you're going to is not really totally accurate, because they say, "Okay, we'll turn the lights off, but we need some security lighting after hours," okay. There's going to be lights on all times. I don't -- with this standard, lights can be on all the time, and we're good to go.

The color temperature is just a visual. You can still get the same foot-candles with the lower color temperature as you can with the white lights. It's just less offensive.

When FP&L does change-outs, like, when they go from the higher pressure sodium to LEDs in residential areas, they'll either go 4,000 K or 3,000. Whenever they do 4,000 K, they get a lot of complaints from people because, again, there's disturbance, disruption.

I mean, here, this is a parking lot. Let's respect the neighborhood. Lower it, lower the color temperature. It's appropriate, especially in the natural areas as well. It would be -- it's really appropriate.

Setting the examples -- setting a good example is never a bad idea in my mind, okay. So I don't see it as a problem. Quite frankly, if they would want, I'll design this thing for them, you know, for free. I don't mind that, but I know that -- but -- because I did the Mason Academy. That's a public charter school in 3,000 K. I did Naples Classical Academy. It's a public charter school in 3,000 K lights as well, okay. So I don't think it's inappropriate to set these very definitive standards. And it's consistent with what you-all have done on other projects as well. I'm not -- I'm not off here. I'm a little bit Don Quixote, but I'm not off the reservation, I don't believe.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Chair, I consider that a very convincing argument, and so I'm leaning in that direction.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yeah. Chap, do you have a comment?

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Yeah, Norm has proposed a number of conditions of approval. This is one. I'd be prone to leaving it up to staff, the petitioner, and Norm to reconcile with the exception of this light pole height. And it would seem to me that this commission's conclusion on this should be to accept the condition of approval that Norm's recommending. That's the way I feel about it.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. I feel the same way. I'm fine with the language as written. And I -- it's unfortunate for the school board, but they need to design it based on these specifications. I fully support the 15-foot near the residential and near the preserve area.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: But the other conditions of approval, are you --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Well, we'll go through those, but this one in particular I'm fully supportive. I think the definitive 3,000 K is very clear and very specific, and it provides the criteria very definitive for the applicant to comply with.

Next one, Norm, please.

MR. TREBILCOCK: Yes, sir, on the access, what Wayne has suggested is fine, just not putting the access in front of the school. That's good to go as well.

And this is just kind of to show you-all examples. This is from the right-of-way manual, an excerpt. When you have industrial commercial, multifamily, the cross -- the street in the east -- the horizontal direction would be, say, Immokalee Road, and so our first access just needs to be at least 180 feet away per county standard.

The FP&L facility has 550 feet of frontage here. So it could be tucked back. I mean, the further away it can be put from the residential, the better off, because, you know, they're talking about folks coming in 4:30, 5:00 in the morning, and so if we could kind of keep that coming in and out, you know, closer to Immokalee. But I respect Immokalee Road, though, so that's why we want to be a minimum.

And then this is just the example to the right of the lines-of-sight thing, just to kind of show you that they would cut the hedges down lower there, because Mike Sawyer brought up that as a good point there.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Ooh, I have a question about that.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Michelle.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: So I see a sidewalk. Is this -- what street is the sidewalk on?

MR. TREBILCOCK: Oh, I'm sorry. These are just -- I'm sorry. These are just generic examples from the right-of-way manual. I don't believe there's any proposed sidewalks at all because it's not --

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: On Immokalee.

MR. TREBILCOCK: -- in the -- you know, in the Estates we don't have that. So, yeah.

So I'll just kind of wrap up. So I do have a little lighting device here if you want to look at it or not. It's got the 5,000 K, 3,000, and stuff like that. Just don't look directly into it, or it will blind you for the rest of the day, but -- there's differences. And, again, the devil's in the details in this stuff, so --

Okay. In conclusion, I believe these are helpful additions to the project to achieve compatibility, and they are reasonable. Please note that the adjacent FP&L substation is a more passive use, essentially zero trips daily, and it is walled and buffered.

Still, the adjacent neighbor to the FP&L station had to install a hedge screen outside of the facility. And so what we want to do is really proactively address that in this condition, which, again, Mr. Arnold, I think, has done that with the conditions he's proposed, updated.

That FP&L facility doesn't have any active lighting. I checked it out. There's no lights on there. I mean, they can probably bring them up in an emergency, although if the power's out they can't, but that's ironic. But they would there, so that's understood, but they don't do it as a practice. So there is a big difference there.

The proposed lighting needs to be more compatible with the adjacent residential neighborhood which we can better achieve with these recommendations on fixture height and color temperature. These added lighting and landscape requirements are consistent with past practices this Planning Commission has recommended to achieve better compatibility with residential and other uses.

Additionally, other municipalities have color temperature requirements, such as City of Naples and Village of Estero, as well as in my practice of recommending them. As I mentioned, the Ascend project, Randall Curve, Naples Classical, and Mason Classical Academy as well. To codify this is important, and I believe it's a reasonable best practice to do.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. With that, do we have any more public speakers?

MR. SABO: Mr. Chairman, we do not.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. Then with that, can I ask the applicant to wrap up, please.

MR. ARNOLD: Sure.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Because I'm going to, then, go through the stipulations.

MR. ARNOLD: So I think we've obviously gone through our proposed recommended conditions with some of the tweaks that we had on the visualizer. I think just to summarize generally what those were, maintaining at a minimum 72 inches in height for those hedges was something that we had said we would do. Making sure that the chain-link fence, if utilized, would be obscured with the landscape materials, so it would be on the outside of the fence. That's something we would agree to do.

The other changes -- I think Norm indicated he was fine with our suggested changes. I think the only one we're really stuck on is the 15-foot and 25-foot and the 3,000 Kelvin lighting standard. And, you know, at this moment, we would agree to disagree, and you know, we'll continue to maybe deal with some additional facilities people, and Marc's asked to address you again on that, so...

MR. ROULEAU: Collier County Public Schools exists to be a good neighbor to our neighbors.

We are the keystone of this county. We're essential to its function, and by being a good neighbor, if we have to accept this gentleman's requirements, we will --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. And --

MR. ROULEAU: -- with respect to lighting.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Mr. Trebilcock, could I ask you to come up again, please. Because I just want you -- get your concurrence, since you raised all these.

MR. TREBILCOCK: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Basically, what was stated on the record, other than our stipulation for lighting, everything else that was negotiated between you two you're comfortable with?

MR. TREBILCOCK: Yes, sir. The only thing I did want to clarify on the fencing --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yes.

MR. TREBILCOCK: -- I think Wayne had written down here no barbed wire or razor wire.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Correct.

MR. TREBILCOCK: I just want to make sure. Okay. I missed that. Perfect.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: That's, yeah, razor wire or barbed wire.

MR. TREBILCOCK: Yes, sir. Yeah. No, I'm thankful.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: We don't want to look like a prison or military installation.

MR. TREBILCOCK: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: All right. With that, Ms. Lockhart.

MS. LOCKHART: I just had a comment and just to reiterate what Mr. Rouleau said. You know, we're here to be a good neighbor. I also wanted to emphasize that, you know, we are -- we are -- our capacity is at issue with the lighting. More -- we would be efficient and better -- better partners with the community if we spend our dollars more critically, and that would mean providing as much capacity on that site with still being a good neighbor.

And I think the assurance that it's going to be night -- night sensitive, then I think -- and controlled that way and that there will be a study to evaluate the impacts, and I think that should be a stipulation that they do the study, which they will automatically do anyway, but that can determine where the appropriate lighting to be. And I'm sure they would determine with the parking lot, you know, the regular car parking lot that there might -- it could be useful to do lower lighting.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay.

MS. LOCKHART: But I think we just need to kind of leave it up -- you know, express my feelings on it to leave it up to those particular studies for that particular site. A school in this site where the capacity is measured by the parking spaces for the buses is -- would require different considerations for lighting and placement of lighting.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. Thank you. With that, I close the public hearing, but I'm going to now open it to commissioners for any comments.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: I'll go.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Seeing none, do we have a motion?

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: No. I'm stuck on the -- I'm just going to be stuck on the 15-foot and the 25-foot and the 3,000 K. I think this is a standard that was set forth at the Randall Curve, which is -- which is the most adjacent facility to this besides the FPL facility. I think this is the Rural Estates. It's backed up to a state-owned preserve. It's in a residential neighborhood, so I can't recommend approval unless that's a stipulation.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: So your -- you're going to make a motion based on retaining the language?

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: As proposed by Mr. Trebilcock?

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And subject to the other minor changes we made in regards to the maintaining 72 inches, no razor wire, barbed wire, and the other comments we made in regards to the maintaining the vegetation.

The only other thing I didn't -- we're clear on the TIS, correct? Yes. Okay. I got a nod from Mr. Trebilcock.

MR. ARNOLD: I think -- other than the hedge height and making sure the screening is on the outside of the fence, I think -- and making those minor adjustments to our proposed text, it sounds like you're going to recommend adopting Norm's recommended change on the lighting. But, I mean --

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: That was just my --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: If that's the -- would you make a motion?

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: If someone wants to -- I can make that motion, but I wouldn't support the project without this. That's what I'm saying.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yeah. So if you make a motion with that stipulation, then you can recommend --

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: -- approval subject to that stipulation.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: I'll make a motion subject to that stipulation.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: As stated then in regards to the --

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: And all the other ones that --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I believe -- and I'll make a comment as well before we hear a second. I think with -- that criteria, it can easily be worked out with the applicant and the engineering team. And honestly, if there is an obstruction or an extra pole that creates a problem, that can be discussed with Mr. Trebilcock. There could be some negotiation when this goes through site plan approval. But it's nothing that's going to be draconian or excessive on the school board in regards to that stipulation, so I would support it as well. But do I hear a second? Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Quick question maybe for the school board. Is 25-foot height lampposts in the bus area norm -- normal?

MR. ROULEAU: That is -- it is normal, but -- but 15-foot height, if that's what's needed in the car parking area, we will meet that. We're agreeing to what he is asking in terms of lighting requirements.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: The fifteen's going to be in the car parking.
(Simultaneous crosstalk.)

MR. ROULEAU: So 15 car parking, 25 -- or I thought it was 30.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Twenty-five in the bus.

MR. ROULEAU: Twenty-five in the bus.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Okay. And that's your normal height?

MR. ROULEAU: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: I'm just thinking, as was discussed, if you lower it, you need more poles. Now you've got these 45-foot buses not being able to maneuver easily as before. But it sounds like we have an agreement.

MR. ROULEAU: We do have an agreement, yes.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Great. Let's move forward on it.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: So if they're agreeing to everything, then I'm just going to recommend approval.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: So that -- based on that, that's Mike's recommendation. And do we have a second?

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Second.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Mr. Shea -- Commissioner Shea second. All in favor, say aye, subject to the items as discussed and modification. I trust that staff will follow up and finalize it.

MR. BOSI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Subject to that.

MR. ARNOLD: Before you vote, could I just ask for one clarification?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yes.

MR. ARNOLD: Because in rereviewing Norm's language, it doesn't really agree exactly with what he said at the podium. Could we just make it more clear and somehow modify this text that the employee parking would have the 15-foot lighting, and the bus parking area could be 25?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Yeah.

MR. ARNOLD: Okay. I think that would be more clear rather than saying "east of," because east of the estates residential area is not as well defined to me as saying that, you know, the employee versus bus.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: So the motion maker, that you agree with that modification?

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Yeah, correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. And second, you agree with the --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. All in favor, say any.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Any opposed, like sign.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: It passes unanimously. And I trust staff will finalize this.

Look, we've got 10 after. Should we start the next one?

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Yeah, why don't we start it.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Start it and finish it.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. I was going to get Marco to come up just because he's sitting back there, and I wanted to make sure you could bill them for all the hours.

MR. ARNOLD: Thank you all.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Good seeing you.

***All right. With that, then, we're going to go -- we're going to go to the second item then, and we'll proceed to 9B. 9B is PL20240000441. That's the Grizzly Ranch Communications Tower. And this is a 140-foot monopole.

And then we'll -- I turn it over to our -- first of all, any disclosures.

MS. LOCKHART: Staff materials only.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Staff materials only.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Staff materials only.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Myself, staff materials only.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Staff materials only.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Staff materials only.

Mike?

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Staff materials only.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: All right. With that, I open to the petitioner, please.

MS. JAHN: Good morning, Commissioners. I'm Mattaniah Jahn, 935 Main Street, Suite C4, Safety Harbor, Florida 34695. It's a pleasure to be before you again today.

I have -- we did not take an oath at the beginning, so I don't know if the clerk wants to administer an oath for my witnesses.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Oh, okay. That's a good point.

Yeah, all -- okay. Please rise -- all those wishing to speak, please rise and be sworn in.

THE COURT REPORTER: Do you swear or affirm the testimony you will give will be the truth,

the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

(The speakers were duly sworn and indicated in the affirmative.)

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Thank you.

MS. JAHN: All right. Thank you.

I also have with me Bill Compton with Verizon Wireless should you have any questions on Verizon's RF need. They are the collocating anchor tenant for this communication tower and the reason that this is before you on the dais today. He has taken an oath as well.

I come before you today with staff recommendation of approval for a conditional use to allow the construction of a 140-foot-tall monopole style communication tower upon Parcel 39720441004.

And this property is located at the far eastern end of 43rd Avenue Northeast at the edge of the Estates, and it's partially cleared land with agricultural oriented buildings upon it.

I normally would say that in all the maps I show you up will be north. On my plan sheets, north is to the left in those situations, but all my other plan -- all my other maps and sheets, up is north, and I'll do my best to call that out as we go along.

So just to help give some bearings for where we are, the first green line that I applied is Oil Well Road. And you can see that going on the left-hand side from Immokalee Road out heading off, ultimately, towards Ave Maria towards the east. You can see on the eastern side an area that has large ponds, and that is the SkySail RLSA village, and then you have pastures off to the east, and that's the future Big Cypress -- Town of Big Cypress Rivergrass Village.

I've highlighted Immokalee Road off to the west, and now I've highlighted Everglades Boulevard. And obviously, the Estates is an area that has come into the buildout of this national infrastructure project that we call the cellular grid a little bit later than some of our other communities in the state of Florida.

So there have been a number of projects that have been coming along. Oh, and this last green line that I am applying is the Big Cypress Parkway right-of-way. This is a roadway that will be a north/south arterial that is in your Long-Range Transportation Plan. The way that you acquired that right-of-way was as part of the overall development agreements for Rivergrass and the Town of Big Cypress. As that -- as Rivergrass Village builds out, the roadway will join up with that.

So just to show some of the cellular network, of course, you approved a PUD amendment for a tower on your water treatment plant over by the fairgrounds. As we move east, last year before you came the communication tower for Everglades Boulevard. And what's currently proposed is the Grizzly Ranch communication tower, which has the yellow arrow. So as you can see -- and I'll be going into this eventually -- is that communication towers are all inherently local. They cover small areas. And I'll show maps for that. So, essentially, the grid is building out eastward as you -- the network is building out eastward as you continue developing.

The parent parcel is the one with the yellow arrow. It is -- to the south of it is SkySail. Of course, to the north is 43rd Avenue Northeast. So to the north of this particular property are ranchette lot -- ranchettes on Estate lots. I've been asked what are ranchettes in the past. That's where you have property with a little bit of land for things like out-structures. So you might have a couple of acres and such. That's what I -- that's how I describe ranchettes.

To the south, of course, is SkySail. To the east is the right-of-way of Big Cypress Parkway, and then the Rivergrass Village. To the west is a house owned by the landlord on an adjoining lot, and then you have additional residential lots with ranchettes as you move west or left into the Estates. And this just shows a closer aerial.

And here's the parent parcel. And again, you can see that it's partially cleared land, mostly cleared. This will be on the eastern side of the property, and you can see that there's supporting buildings on the property.

This is the zoning map just showing that it is Estates zoned. And then, of course, here you have your Future Land Use Map showing the Estates future land use.

All right. In this map, north is on the left, so up is east in this particular situation. Yes, and I apologize. It just has to do with the layout of the property.

So you can see 43rd Avenue Northeast, and it terminates at its eastern end here. The driveway

continues on the eastern side of the property, comes around, and towards the south end, basically trying to get -- push pretty much as far away as you can from the existing residential while still being in the area to serve -- is the monopole. And you can see a square. That's the equipment compound. That's a -- that's a fenced-in area with an 8-foot architecturally finished masonry fence with a 15-foot landscape buffer around the outside. The circle on that is the monopole itself.

This is Sheet Z-4. This is the exact same plan sheet that I showed you except without the aerial. Again, north is to the left.

So the monopole provides the Land Development Code's required 100 percent tower height separations from all Estates and residential zoned land. So to the north, we have 563 feet of setbacks, so four times the required separation of 140 feet; to the east, our nearest residential land is on the other side of the Big Cypress Parkway right-of-way, so 1.5 times tower height; to the south, 350 feet, or two and a half times your code's required standard; and to the west we have 477 feet.

One up. My apologies. I misspoke. To the west, we have 200 feet.

Residential structure separation, to the west -- the nearest structure to the west is a property owned by the landlord. I don't know if you can see the mouse here. That is your nearest residential structure that is currently existing. That's 237 feet away. To the northwest, the first off-site residential structure, you have 500 -- or I'm sorry -- 515 feet, and to the north/northwest, you have 757 feet.

So even disregarding the landlord's structure here, just looking at neighboring properties, you're looking at 3.6 times your code's required separation and 5.7 sometimes, just talking about spirit of separation.

So the monopole will meet the Land Development Code's required setbacks for Estates zoning. This will be designed to the latest Florida Building Code, and it will be designed with 73-foot fall-zone radius. And what that means is that in the unlikely event of structure failure, the monopole will fold over upon itself and be contained within the parent parcel. It would do -- does anybody have a question at this time?

(No response.)

MS. JAHN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I see none.

MS. JAHN: Okay. All right. So the base is that 50-foot-by-50-foot equipment compound. There is space for up to three carriers. Verizon will be the anchor carrier. And, of course, that compound will be enclosed by the 8-foot-tall architecturally finished masonry fence and the 15-foot-wide landscape buffer.

And these are just numbers that -- these are the multipliers that I was talking through starting with distance to residential structures, which is talking in the spirit of your code and then talking distance to residential property lines, which is the -- which is the written standard of your code.

This is Sheet Z-6. It just shows the compound area. You can -- again, north is to the left. And you can see Verizon's equipment pad is immediately to the west or below that monopole, and then you can see there's two additional. So Verizon's equipment pad, and then you can see two additional collocation spaces.

This is an elevation showing the -- from on file showing the monopole, and Verizon will be located at the top. This is the minimum height necessary for Verizon to achieve its RF objectives. This monopole's actually shorter than other monopoles that Verizon has -- the most recent structure that Verizon is collocating upon. In the Estates, the next one to the west that is the handoff to this, is a 180-foot-tall structure.

This will be completely dark at night. It has been reviewed by the FAA and the Lee County Mosquito Control District. No lighting will be required. It will have a dull gray finish during the day.

As I stated before, this is designed to be shared; that's an important factor under your Land Development Code, because it prevents duplication of communication towers, so you don't end up with a Verizon tower followed by an AT&T tower followed by a T-Mobile tower, like you might see up in, say, Atlanta where they started buildout back in the '90s.

This is just an example of fall-zone technology in action here. Another example I usually pull

from my memory is the lamppost along King's Highway on I-75 when Charley came through in 2004. All those lampposts were folded over at the same height. They had fall-zone technology to prevent them from blocking the travel lanes.

But here you can see, in this case, this is a much older structure. It is a lattice style communication tower, and there Hurricane Matthew, I believe, made it fail. And it's still in one piece. It's just folded over.

All right. This is an example of a monopole style communication tower. It's the single support pole. There's external antennas up top. That way they're spaced for the antennas. This structure will actually be a four sector. There will be four sides to the antennas up top because there's so many -- there's so many areas that Verizon needs to be able to serve and so many users in the area.

Walking through my photo simulations, these are all based on a balloon test. So a balloon was flown to the height of the communication tower, and then they model based off of that.

So my first one is at the driveway for the parent property. So that's 43rd Avenue Northeast looking south. On the left-hand side you can see the balloon. On the right-hand side, you can see where the monopole would be. And as you can see, the base of the monopole is obstructed by vegetation in the background. Vegetation in the mid-ground, like these pine trees, would be able to block it completely. You're viewing it in open spaces in the view shed.

Moving on to 4634 43rd Avenue Northeast, looking southeast, you can see the balloon peeking through, but you can see the majority of the monopole is buffered. Also, keep in mind as you move closer to those trees in the background, just like you see up front, those trees are relatively larger than the structure and buffer more of it.

Location 3 is 4556 43rd Avenue Northeast, looking southeast, and the monopole is not visible. 4646 45th Street Northeast, so the next block north, looking south, and the monopole is not visible.

Moving back to 4556 43rd Avenue Northeast, you do have visibility of the monopole poking above the tree line. But as you can see, there's extensive buffering.

And then coming back to 4634 43rd Avenue Northeast, looking southeast, you can see the monopole peeks between the trees, but again, extensive buffering.

And then, finally, this is from Oil Well Road looking north, and the monopole is hanging out right over where my mouse is. You have the balloon and the monopole. This over here is actually an excavator.

All right. So this is the RF package on file. You would have seen it in all the documents that came through. And basically, what's going on is this is a project for Verizon that is extending the network, so what we would consider urban infill, right, and it's also concurrency. Both staying current with the way that we use our communication devices, because we use them in more places than we used to, and preparing for additional -- to be braced for additional usage as more homes come online. So it's pulling duties for today and preparing for the future.

At this point I would normally go through -- I normally go through a conversation about the history of communication towers and cell phones. And, you know, in the beginning my father used to, instead of -- instead of payphones to call my mother and stuff. You know, the John Ringling Bridge in Sarasota will be broken.

Nowadays, even this computer is a cell phone. So we connect to the cellular network for all sorts of reasons. Of course, voice communication, those 911 calls, the calls to families and friends, but also, you know, if you make a Zoom connection or you're doing work online or whatnot, you're making a connection likely over the wireless network.

This is just a layout of the existing Verizon communication towers that are coming either online or coming online in the area. And you can see that there are collocations down off of Immokalee Road, down by the Publix and then up where it turns east. And those are 5.8 and 5.3 miles away. Those are very far distances for a suburban area like -- like the Estates. And, of course, your next towers to the east are in Ave Maria at 4.5 miles away, and then east of Ave Maria at 7 miles away. Verizon's newest addition -- yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Commissioner Sparrazza, you have a question?

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Yes, I do.

If you would, do you have examples with these existing sites -- I guess we can call them A B, C, and D -- of the proximity to homes as compared to your proposed site; in other words, on your previous examples you said it was 1.4 and 3.4 X from the minimum distance. Well, there is that one prominent home just to the west of your proposed lot. That's going to be the closest home other than the landlord. And I think that was 1.4 distance away from the base of the pole. Do you have other examples like, oh, yes, Location A and D and even B and C are all within that proximity of a home.

MS. JAHN: Yeah. So I can pull up information on A and D. I know that Z is, you know, similar proximity with less vegetation in between existing -- between the proposed tower site and the neighboring uses.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: I'm more concerned with the EMI for the neighbors versus visual. I mean, visual's important, yes, but EMI is way more not enough people recognize. So that's why I'm wondering at whatever your distance was for your neighbor to the west, is that a standard that you have at other locations here within Collier County, or is this like, it's really close but it, quote, "meets the specifications."

MS. JAHN: Yeah. So various -- thinking back to other towers that I've zoned in Collier County, okay, this is right within range. Once upon a time, you had a two-and-a-half-times tower height separation, and we would occasionally ask for relief from that. But, you know, when you think of things like, say, Green Boulevard or there's another one down by LaMorada where that's a shorter distance, you know, it's a range based upon the built-out environment.

I would be remiss just to say that the scope of review on things like EMI is very limited because the federal government has taken that up to them. Basically, the Telecom Act of 1996 does call us down at our lowly level here with zoning to focus on things like compatibility with neighboring properties, as long as I provide testimony that Verizon maintains their facilities within compliance with the FCC safety guidelines. And I do have Mr. Compton here, and he's willing to provide that.

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: Yeah. I did push my button to try to interject here for a moment. And Mattaniah is correct on the electrical magnetic fields. We're not allowed to consider that per the federal act.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: I'll keep my comments to myself.

If I make this very simple, is this home closer to this tower than many or any other homes in the neighborhood? Would this be the closest home you have to a tower or, "Oh, no, sir. We have many locations where homes are even closer"? That's what I'm looking for.

MS. JAHN: In the county you do have sites where homes are closer. In the state you have locations where homes are much closer.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Okay. Can I ask the audience, by any chance, is the owner of this property or properties, are they here?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Okay. Thank you.

MS. JAHN: Understood. If I may, I am going to put a copy of the Telecom Act into the record just for my malpractice insurance purposes.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: We've been through this before with --

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: I just wondered the proximity of that particular home, which looks like a sizable home, this close, but if the owner or the -- anyone from that neighborhood is not here, then --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Some studies say that you have more when you have the phone up to your ear than you do at any other time. So, I mean, there's -- it's been controversial before. We've had public speakers speak --

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Testify both ways.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: -- against this before. I don't know if we will today, but we'll find out. Okay. Please proceed. And once you wrap up, before we move any further, we're probably

going to take a break, but go ahead.

MS. JAHN: Absolutely. So also just to follow up, we did hold our neighborhood information meeting. Verizon appeared -- Verizon actually brought an RF engineer to that because, you know, these are things that do, you know, concern people, even though we can't look at them, and they were -- they discussed extensively how their network works, why it's here, and what steps they take for safety, so hopefully that is helpful.

All right. So this is the -- this is the search ring for the Grizzly Ranch site. It's the red area. And the reason that it is structured like this is they're trying to catch the Estates -- they're trying to serve the Estates to the north. They're trying to also soak up SkySail so that way it doesn't bog down the cellular network and then also so that it works with the neighboring communication tower that's being built on Everglades Boulevard North.

Communication towers work just like these lights above your head. You have to have them distributed throughout the room, otherwise you'll end up with dark spots where you may have some light but you can't read. If you put them too close together, they're essentially talking over each other and causing each other to work less effectively.

This is the current coverage for Verizon at the time of application. So you can see those Immokalee Road communication towers up to the north and to the west. You can see Ave Maria off to the east. It doesn't have any green on it that's reliable service in our LTE and 5G bands, so the technology that modern phones are working on.

This one over here's actually a flagpole, so it's a perfect example of why we don't do flagpoles anymore. You can't fit the antennas in there. And if you do -- like, if you put equipment in there like radios, you actually overheat them because they need active cooling.

The yellow dot, of course, is the Everglades Boulevard communication tower, and the blue dot is the Grizzly Ranch communication tower. And you can see that while red is some signal, when you don't have -- where you just have no color, you have no signal whatsoever.

And then here's the proposed coverage showing both the Everglades communication tower that was approved last year and the Grizzly Ranch monopole. And the way this is set up is that there is a -- there's four sectors on this site. So it's pointing to the northeast, the north, the southeast, the southwest, and then you have an entire set of antennas pointing up into the Estates. And you can see how craggily that is. That's actually a testament to how much tree coverage the Estates has, which helps provide buffering and break up the view shed. On the flip side, it also means that it reduces the effectiveness, and especially when you're looking at a communication tower that's 40 feet shorter than, say, the Oil Well Road off to the west.

This is just the -- this is just an excerpt of your wellfield map. We are to the north of Oil Well Road, so we're not impacting any wellfields for the County.

We did very have -- we did do the one-mile notice radius on our neighborhood information meeting. We had 13 people attended it. Of course, we had extensive conversations. The -- Verizon also had representatives there.

Also going down through my housekeeping, traffic generated from the communication tower is typically one trip per carrier per month typically in a pickup-truck-sized vehicle, so it's very minimal.

We do have a NEPA on file, so National Environmental Policy Act, report as well as the biological assessment. There will be no impact to native -- to endangered species or native habitats. We heard about the FAA and the Lee [sic] County Mosquito Control.

And I just would like to touch on 911 call statistics. In 2021, 84 percent of all of Collier County's 911 call statistics came from wireless devices.

In 2021, 89 percent of Orange County, so the Orlando areas, 911 calls came from wireless devices, and that just shows how much we rely upon wireless communications in our everyday life.

(Commissioner Schumacher is now present in the boardroom.)

MS. JAHN: So we are -- with that, we are agreeable to staff's proposed conditions of approval, and we adopt those along with your staff's expert analysis into our presentation. I won't take and try to duplicate that and drag your morning on.

We would respectfully request that you recommend approval to the Board of Adjustment [sic], and we are available for any questions that you may have.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Michelle, do you have a question now? And then we'll proceed with a break.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: I've got several, so I can wait till after the break. I can wait till after the break.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: With that, we're going to take a break, but please note that Commissioner Schumacher has joined us just in time for the break.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: My apologies. My apologies. My paid job got in the way of my free job.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yes. So let's take a break. We'll reconvene at -- well, it's -- let's make it 11 o'clock.

(A recess was had from 10:39 a.m. to 10:58 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: If I could ask everybody to take their seat, please, and the petitioner be ready.

Commissioner McLeod, do you have any -- you have more questions?

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: I do. I have several here, so I'll try to be fast. And maybe I had missed this in the packet of information, but who's paying for this tower?

MS. JAHN: So the -- ultimately Verizon's paying for the tower in that they're renting it. Valore is the company that will own and operate the tower.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: And does Verizon have a say as to who goes on this tower?

MS. JAHN: No. Verizon's say is that they tell Valore we need a tower that can hold these antennas at this height and this area. After that, what happens below is all up to Valore.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: I ask that question because let's say AT&T now wants to connect with this pole. I was wondering if there was, like, a competitive advantage here where they -- Verizon could say no and then determine who they want. That's not possible?

MS. JAHN: That is correct. Back in the '90s, that was something, but your code's actually written to require that communication towers be shared, and we've provided an affidavit that it will be shared.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: And we had approved another Verizon tower on Weber Boulevard. I think it was higher than this. And you're asking for 140 feet, and you showed the distance as to how much coverage. Why aren't you going higher to expand the coverage in the Estates where it's wanted?

MS. JAHN: Yes. Mattaniah Jahn, again.

That's partly just a mix of -- we don't want to be asking for relief from your code. So we want to meet your code. We also want to, you know, show sensitivity to the existing built environment. So you look at that east/west, there could be some more room to be had there, and I'm sure Verizon would love to have additional height, but it's really just an attempt to try to make a very good fit there.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: And how many households will this potentially serve, then?

MS. JAHN: Your -- I would need to do the math.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Well, it said 2,500 in the estimated --

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: I thought it was 2,500.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: But that's just total in the villages and towns coming in.

MS. JAHN: Yeah. I'm just trying to think in terms of existing Estates houses because you are reaching, oh -- I am easily reaching upwards of a mile. Just talking in terms of Estates houses, you're talking the better part of a thousand. I can -- and then you add in SkySail and Rivergrass that will add to that. Let me see if I have that data handy.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Oh, that's okay. So a thousand. And is that an average amount of households that can be benefited from a pole like this?

MS. JAHN: Yes. So it really depends on the buildout in the area. With the Estates, you have a

healthy amount of density, so...

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: And then any future plans to -- with regards to these other red areas, the unreliable coverage areas?

MS. JAHN: Yes. So obviously, I can't speak for Verizon's specific future planning and keep my bar license, but I can tell you that all the carriers are -- including Verizon are looking to build in the Estates further. And I imagine you'll see projects come back along Everglades Boulevard because that's your next location where you can -- you can legally do this.

So I imagine you would see communication towers over the upcoming years building up to the north and south along Everglades Boulevard.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay. All right, great. Thank you. Thank you.

MS. JAHN: If I may, for Board Member Sparrazza, I did look up those other towers. So, of course, we are a 140-foot-tall monopole 515 feet away from the nearest house that's not owned by the landlord, right? D is a 200-foot lattice. That's the one that's open with the crossers, and it's 595. So it's -- you've got a taller tower that's not much further away. A is 181-foot lattice, which is still 42 feet taller than what we're looking at. It is a lattice style, and it's showing 263 feet from the nearest house.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Okay. Thank you very much for that research. I appreciate it.

MS. JAHN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And is that all you have for now?

MS. JAHN: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: We'll give you time for rebuttal after the -- any of the public speakers. Are there any registered speakers, please?

Ma'am, you're raising your hand. Did you -- did you fill out a form?

MR. SABO: Mr. Chairman, we have --

MS. LABUSKES: I did.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And you were sworn in?

MS. LABUSKES: Yes, I was.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. First public speaker.

MR. SABO: Mr. Chairman, we have three. The first is Garrett FX Beyrent.

MR. BEYRENT: For the record, Garrett FX Beyrent. I'm representing my son, Maximilian X. Beyrent.

And right now Mattaniah has a tower site on his property. It's a lease agreement. And I just want to tell you something. They've got to spend a lot of money to put these towers up. And they're basically leases, and they need to use them. And I support this tower as well as any other tower that come before this board, because it's tough to do this. They spend a tremendous amount, millions of dollars, putting up towers that they may not even be able to use. I mean, thank you.

Thank you, Mattaniah, for educating me.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Thank you.

Next speaker, please.

MR. SABO: Mr. Chairman, next speaker is Barbara Labuskes.

MS. LABUSKES: Good morning. My name is Barbara Labuskes. I live at 4046 Aquila Place in SkySail, which on your map is in red as an unreliable service.

My husband and I have actually reviewed Verizon and what they do from a safety perspective as it relates to EMI. We are in support of the tower. I know many people say, "Not in my backyard," but I would actually encourage that there be planning more in advance before you have the significant amount of inflow of residents without the stability of a service -- of a service.

I can be in third-world countries on dirt roads and actually have reliable service. I never expected living in Naples, Florida, to not have reliable service. It was not something that I had actually even looked at before moving here. And so while, yes, we do support this, we would actually encourage you to get a little bit more forward thinking and better planning and have them come on board much sooner.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Oh, I appreciate the comment as far as -- but we depend on the applicant to coming to us.

MS. LABUSKES: I completely -- I do, I completely understand that.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And I do appreciate your comment. I was in Helmand Province, the middle of Afghanistan, and I could get on a cell phone. But I sit in my home in -- over in -- almost near Marco Island, and I get cut off. Regularly, I drop. It just amazes me.

MS. LABUSKES: I was south at -- yes, I was south of Bangalore getting ready to go on a safari, and I could easily accept a phone call from my mother. I cannot accept a phone call from my mother in the kitchen here in SkySail, so...

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I understand completely.

MS. LABUSKES: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yes.

MR. BOSI: Mike Bosi, Planning and Zoning director.

And it's one of the conversations I've had with some of the towns and villages. I think that they really do an adequate job of predetermining cell tower locations within their preplanning of the community. And as the -- as she just mentioned, if we have these preplanned designations already set and they're developed -- or the implementation, the construction of them would be coordinated with the construction of the houses so when the demand is there, the facilities would be available. So it's one of the things the next SRA that you have, you may want to ask them, "What are you doing in terms of wireless communication within your facility to make sure that your residents have adequate cell coverage?"

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Well, you know, that's important --

MR. BOSI: Yes, yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: -- because -- and we don't consider that.

MR. BOSI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: It's a good point, because many -- and I would guess that the petitioner could answer that question. A lot of people, that's their primary communication now. I have VOIP just because I have internet, and I do use the VOIP. But, in essence, I mean, it's all the same system whether my -- device or on VOIP, which is technically a landline. But that seems to be the prominent communication system today. In fact, most people probably just have their cell phones.

MR. BOSI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: All right.

Next public speaker, please.

MR. SABO: No further public speakers on this item.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: All right. With that, I turn it over to staff, please.

MR. BOSI: Mike Bosi, Planning and Zoning director.

As indicated by the applicant as well as within your staff report, staff is supporting the conditional use. We believe the conditions that have been imposed provide protections to the surrounding area, and we recognize that the future of Big Cypress Parkway will be a heavy traveled area eventually, as SkySail and as -- as Rivergrass and the Town of Big Cypress develop within this area, so it will have long-term benefits from a communication standpoint as -- and a safety standpoint. And for those reasons staff is recommending approval, and any questions you may have.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. With that, Michelle, do you have a question?

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Yes. I just -- Mike, this -- I had read it requires a supermajority vote for approval. Why is that a requirement?

MR. BOSI: That's for a conditional use, because they are uses that are deemed appropriate but need potential conditions for compatibility reasons. The supermajority requirement is -- is needed for approval.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: So the previous petition that we heard for a conditional use, was that a supermajority?

MR. BOSI: Correct. Now, that's --

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Why was this one --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: That's for the Board of County Commissioners.

MR. BOSI: That's for the Board of County Commissioners. All the -- all the Planning Commission needs for a recommendation, because the Board -- the Planning Commission doesn't make a decision. You make a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners. You'll need a simple majority for a recommendation. The Board -- the supermajority is a voting requirement for the --

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Commissioners.

MR. BOSI: -- yeah, the five members -- the commissioners. They need four affirmative votes for them to adopt a conditional use.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay. I just wonder why it was called out in this particular petition. We've never seen that before.

MR. BOSI: And my staff was just trying to be -- I think be informative.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay.

MR. BOSI: But we'll try to be a little bit more consistent in that regard.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. I see no other questions. I close the public hearing.

I open it for discussion by the commissioners. Any comments or concerns, questions of the applicant?

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: I just had one.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Oh, excuse me. I'm sorry. Chuck, I've got to go back. Before we open -- close the public hearing, I'll reopen the public hearing if the petitioner has any closing comments or rebuttals, which I doubt there are any rebuttals because I didn't see any objections.

MS. JAHN: This is Mattaniah Jahn. I do not have any rebuttals. I draw your attention back to your own citizens. Also, in the pre-application packet from way long time ago, you would find buried in there an indication from public safety that they are also supportive of this project because their vehicles require Internet connections in the Estates.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay.

MS. JAHN: That's all I have. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. Thank you.

Now I close the public hearing. I open it for discussion. Commissioners? Chuck.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Mike, this is your district.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Do we need it?

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Oh, 100 percent. I think that the Estates zoning pretty much has almost no cell signal all on Everglades Boulevard. I know several residents who have emailed the commissioners trying to push this as an agenda item. So this is 100 percent needed.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: I'd make a motion to approve as presented.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And do I hear a second?

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And I hear a second. All in favor, say aye.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Any opposed, by like sign.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: It passes unanimously.

Thank you.

MS. JAHN: Thank you for your time this morning.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And I don't know if Mr. Arnold is here. He went to get coffee. I told him we'd be probably done at 12 -- 11:30 because I was going to move his item up.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: I can give him a call and see.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yeah. See if he's there. I'll move his item up.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Thank you. We would appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: While we're doing that, let me just highlight the AUIR for my other commission -- fellow commissioners.

How many of us have been here through AUIRs?

Oh, wow. So we've been through this. And in the past, the Annual Update and Inventory Report and the CIE, which the accompanying Capital Improvement Element were typically required annually and be forwarded to the State. I think Collier County is probably one of about three counties that actually do it.

MR. BOSI: We're the only one.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Maybe the only one. In the past, even when I was on staff, sometimes we would go through the AUIR. We'd spend two days on the AUIR.

I told Mike we're going to go through this. I will certainly entertain any of your questions. I know this thing back and forward, but it is a really decent document. But many of the staff -- how many are here for the AUIR back here? We've got all sorts of staff here, yes.

And I would ask the staff that -- certainly we can do this by exception of -- if they would like to give a brief presentation in regards to this level of service -- and what's important for us commissioners is this highlights the level of service, and it defines capability to support continued growth and development.

So we're open to your questions. I'm not going to hamstring you in any way, shape, or form. If we want to spend all afternoon, we can certainly do that.

But Mike is going to start with a brief presentation, especially for the new commissioners, that they understand what Category A and Category B and understand what that -- what is being presented. I'll go through each of the items as presented in the -- in your papers that were submitted. And I've got it by page number of the actual AUIR. So we'll go through each item, and then we'll entertain any questions.

But I think it's important for you to understand, especially for Category A, those items -- transportation seems to be an important one. Water/sewer and trash tend to be the three most critical. EMS has been in the past.

And so with that, we will entertain any thoughts. But again, I was going to -- I was going to go with Mr. Arnold first if he's here, and then we'll go to AUIR.

Go ahead, Paul.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Could you just explain what you think our role is. Obviously, we don't have enough time to look through the hundreds of projects. Some of them are unfunded, and then we don't know which ones won't get done depending on whether the unfunded needs are met. So what is our role?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Well --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Is that what you were going to do, Mike?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: That's a good question. Our role is -- our role, by state statute, is the local planning authority. We're the LPA. And the LPA is a -- typically, as we are citizens who are appointed into a position to review growth and development, and that growth and development is contingent upon adequate public services. And we can go through, what, 13 or 14 different public services, even up to schools, parks and rec, Collier -- solid waste, water collection, all those types of things where we -- the County and the Board of County Commissioners, through staff recommendation, recommends levels of service.

And then coupled with that is the CIE. We usually do not go through the CIE only -- and if there is an identified shortfall.

Our job to is to recommend to the commissioners approval or disapproval of the AUIR. And in

the past, there's been recommendations for a moratoria on development. There's been other things that have happened. And we, as a local planning authority, have the capability to do that. We can make --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: But we don't -- we don't comment on transportation, for instance. Half of what -- the plan that we're studying is not funded.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: And the same with the stormwater. So what are we approving, the plan or the plan with half the money not there?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Well, yes. The latter is what we're approving. We're approving the level of service, but the Board has to decide where they're going to make up the shortfall. That's a -- that's a budgetary decision.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: So we're not approving projects?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: We are not approving projects.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Okay. That's important.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: We are approving the level of service based on staff's proposal. We're approving it based on identified Capital Improvement Element, but that CIE identifies a shortfall. Now, it forces the commissioners into one of two things. They either lower the level of service or they identify sources of revenue, which may be raising the ad valorem.

But go ahead, Mike.

MR. BOSI: And to make this a little bit easier is when you're reviewing the CIE, when you're reviewing the transportation plans or the utility plans or any one of the plans, the first two years -- the projects that are in the first two years, those are going. Those are -- we've got identified revenue for. It's the -- it's the three, four -- it's the three, four, and five that are maybe not as solid, especially when you have facilities like stormwater or transportation, those are the two ones that have deficiencies within the -- within the total cost.

Well, those projects that are in Year 4 or 5, those are in jeopardy of maybe being idled at 4 and 5 until the money and the revenue is identified for how it's going to go through. And the reason that I can give you a little bit of comfort is certainty you're going to see it again next year. So the projects that you saw last year get -- are advanced a year. Sometimes they don't get advanced a year because the funding's not necessarily there, but it's always those first -- those first two years are the most important years in terms of when you're seeing those projects.

And another thing that the AUIR does for the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners is that it gives them the comfort to know that for the purposes of concurrency, we're one of the only counties in the state of Florida where you're required -- when you seek your development order, your SDP or your plat, that they -- we have a checkbook concurrency. We make sure that your demands can be met by the infrastructure capacity that's available.

Well, when -- all the projects you're hearing over the next year, you know that for the next two years we've got the identified capacity necessary to handle those projects. So it allows you to review projects and know that the capacity is going to be there available for when those -- when those projects seek their development orders, or at that time transportation, utilities, or one of the infrastructure providers, if they do have a deficiency and have an issue, they will bring that to the attention during the actual public hearing.

So it does -- it sets the stage to allow us to make sure that we can approve projects and those capacities are going to be available for those projects they're going to be seeking.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And with that -- we'll go into that a little bit deeper in the AUIR. I'm going to defer that.

I would ask my commissioners if we could move the 9D and the 9E. Can I hear a motion if we change the -- amend the agenda to move --

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: So moved.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: All in favor, say aye.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: ***Okay. With that, Wayne, we're going to go to 9D, which is PL20250001788. That's the County Barn Fleet Facility expansion rezone and the Companion Item PL20250001789. That's the Collier County -- or County Barn Fleet Facility Expansion conditional use.

So with that, I turn it over -- oh, please -- anybody wishing to speak on this matter, please rise to be sworn in.

THE COURT REPORTER: Do you swear or affirm the testimony you will give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

(The speakers were duly sworn and indicated in the affirmative.)

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And disclosures, please. Amy?

MS. LOCKHART: Staff materials only.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Staff materials only.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Staff materials only.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I spoke to Mr. Arnold about this.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Staff materials only.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Staff materials only.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Staff materials only.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Staff materials only.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: All right. Excellent.

So, Mr. Arnold, it's all yours.

MR. ARNOLD: Hello, again. Wayne Arnold for the record.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And I apologize, I told you it would be 11:30, but...

MR. ARNOLD: That's okay. I like to be early.

Anyway, again, I'm Wayne Arnold, and I'm here representing Collier County as a sub-consultant to WSP Engineering. This is Tiffany Davies with WSP. She's the head project manager for the project.

We have several representatives from the County here. Claudia Roncoroni is here. Sean Williams from the Sheriff's Office. And Jim Banks, again, is our traffic consultant.

This project is rezone with companion conditional use for a little over five acres that the County acquired just north of its existing what we call the County Barn maintenance facility for Fleet.

The site's occupied by Sheriff's Office Procurement Services as well as some maintenance activities and then existing maintenance facilities for the County.

So this five acres would be rezoned to "P" public use, consistent with the "P" public use zoning that exists on the existing facilities site.

The conditional use is required now, was not back when County Barn was originally developed. But for heavier maintenance facilities, you're required to go through a conditional use, so we are here.

Property is zoned Estates. Changing that to "P" public use. This is not part of the Estates master plan. It's in the urban area. It's just one of those small kind of pocket areas that had long-term Estates zoning. So we're asking for Conditional Use 8 for major maintenance and service facilities.

So WSP led the facilities planning for this site. This was an original concept plan, one of several, but that we landed on for the project, that shows the existing improvements and how it would relate to the proposed improvements on the new additional five acres. And you can see that they've got things labeled like a turf shop with the deck and deck parking above it. There's another covered parking area perhaps in the middle of the site shown here. Parking areas with vehicle service and charging for EMS vehicles. The County's emergency operations mobile unit that needs charging, things like that. And then new fuel island that would be installed that would service both the existing and the new facility.

We took that concept plan and turned it into this conditional-use site plan that shows you the larger building, again, where the maintenance activities would occur. Part of that may be enclosed. Part of it may be open. Designing it so that it would have service deck parking above it. And again, a parking deck in the middle with potentially parking above, and that would take County vehicles and put them out of harm's way during a storm event.

Fuel island, again, here, and probably the one major feature that I would point out is another access. There's the 30-foot access easement that runs across the site and goes across the Islamic Center property that we propose to utilize as an ingress and egress, because the Sheriff's Office really wants more security than they currently have on their site. So this would give them an opportunity to segregate the sites at a gated entry point that would be controlled for them. And we, of course, would put a gated entry there as well.

An aerial photograph showing you the existing and how it relates to the surrounding facilities. We had our neighborhood information meeting, and nobody attended. So we had no contact as far as I know with the Islamic Center, nobody from the County.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Wayne, could I ask you a question real quick, sir?

MR. ARNOLD: Of course.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: The gated access on that proposed access gate, why not move it up to the entry point?

MR. ARNOLD: They do have --

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: You have a double filled access there?

MR. ARNOLD: -- controlled access there. The front part of the facility -- and I could let Sean from the Sheriff's Office answer more specifically, but their procurement office is the front part of the site. The maintenance facilities are to the rear.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: I was talking about access easement. Move the gate up to the road.

MR. ARNOLD: Oh, here? Well, we were going to put it on the property we own.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Okay. Not in the easement?

MR. ARNOLD: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. ARNOLD: So like you heard previously, for the conditional use for the school district, we have five proposed conditions. One is lighting, and this one has conditions that have -- not the 3,000 Kelvin, but these are -- it references the BUG lighting standard as well as Dark Sky compliance. Vehicle maintenance activities would occur only in the covered buildings.

The activities would be permitted normally between 6 a.m. and 8 p.m. except during, obviously, if there's an emergency, county vehicles maybe coming in and out at all times for fuel and things like that.

The rezoning is limited to the site plan that I've shown you. And then we have a peak-hour trip generation rate that was established, but that's only for the standalone five acres. It does not apply to the existing fleet facility.

So it's pretty straightforward. And like I said, as far as we know, that we've had no objectors. I did see one member, I think, of the public stand, so we do have at least one public comment, but I'd be happy to answer any questions that you have.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I see -- okay. Commissioner Shea.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Will there be any restrictions on the new access in terms of is that going to be more of an emergency or become a routine entrance?

MR. ARNOLD: It would become an entrance point. At least according to our current design and plans, it would become a true second access to the facility, and that would allow us to segregate some of the Sheriff's Office operation from the general facilities maintenance facility.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: So will you pave the -- that road?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes, it would be paved.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. Questions? Is that it, Mr. Arnold?

MR. ARNOLD: I think that's all for now, unless you have other questions, or we'll respond to the

public.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Do we have any registered speakers?

MR. SABO: Yes, Mr. Chair. One registered speaker, Kim Todd. She requested to use the visualizer.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay.

MS. TODD: Good morning, and thank you for allowing me to speak today.

My name is Kim Todd. I'm the managing member of Cope Lane Properties, and we own 14.32 acres directly to the north of this proposed facility. So the entire northern 5-acre line of the facility is going to be abutted to my property.

We were approved over 10 years ago for a 41-home subdivision, and it's single-family homes. And the -- we're currently in for permit for the infrastructure and for the planning permits, and -- but it has already been approved for the 41 homes. And we're hoping to start developing this property in the 2026 and 2027 year.

The goal is to have a community for, like, the working class, like the middle to middle upper working class, like, for the Sheriff, the people that are in the Sheriff's Department, the County workers, the nurses, teachers, people like that, because everybody thinks about the low income, and then we've got the luxury, but the middle class, the middle working class, you know, has been -- missed out.

So that was my dream for this subdivision is for these kind of people to be able to live there. This 30-foot easement that we're talking about for access is -- and the facility is going to actually affect 14 of these 41 homes directly, and then it looks like it's probably going to affect all of them in some way or another. My concern is -- I've got a lot of concerns. One is the traffic that's going to be affecting the backyards of these people that are going to have pools, that most people do have pools, and it's going to affect just their quality of life.

And then the other part is that -- going through the Islamic Center, which is going to be the western half of the -- well, the part leading towards the west, towards County Barn Road, that 30-foot-wide easement, that's going to -- to me, it looks like it's just going to be a wide-open road, so it's going to feel like we're going to be right on the back of a service station, and you know, like a -- with 64 homes --

When we had this property -- excuse me. When we had this property, we knew that that easement was there, but we expected it to be for, like, two homes, you know, because it's Estates, so typically you have one home for two and a half acres. And, you know, so we thought maybe two at the most.

So we weren't worried about that easement, but now I'm concerned about it just being a wide-open easement in the backyards of all these people now.

And I'm also worried about the noise and the lights from 6 a.m. to 8 p.m. and the smell of diesel and just the loudness of torque wrenches and stuff like that, as you all know.

And then also the 30-foot-tall buildings with parking. You know, it says maximum 30-foot tall. But I mean, that just totally invades the privacy of these people because alls you can do is just look in everybody's backyards. And I just -- I'm just sick over it.

And I know how bad they need this, probably, but I'm just -- we need this subdivision, too. So I just wanted you to understand what is being affected right here, and just let you know we oppose it 100 percent, myself, as the property owner, and then for the future 41 homeowners that will be there.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Any questions?

Go ahead, please.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: What is the name of your community?

MS. TODD: It's called Coastal Reserve. It's permitted as Cope Lane Properties or Cope Reserve.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay. Yeah, we see Cope Lane RPUD, undeveloped residential community. Approved for 43 single-family homes. Okay.

MS. TODD: Yeah. And we're going to build 41. I have the permit number if you need to look at that, so -- okay.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. Thank you.

Any other public speakers, please?

MR. SAN FILIPPO: I have no more registered public speakers.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: With that, staff?

MR. BOSI: Staff has reviewed the rezoning request against the Growth Management Plan and find it compliant, as this is urban residential, and the rezone to public would be supported by the GMP at this location.

The conditional use, we think the buffering and the compatibility measures that have been provided by the -- by the applicant and their team is adequate to provide for compatibility with adjoining properties. Based upon that, staff is recommending approval, and any questions that you may have...

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yeah, I do. I have some questions, and I know we've got some others.

But I'm going to ask the applicant, Wayne, any issues with the -- this is -- the neighboring property to the north now, did any of this come up during the NIM, or have any of these folks been discussing with you in regards to compatibility or issues with noise, light, or anything else in regards to your development and the neighboring property to the north?

MR. ARNOLD: No. That's the first public comment that we've had. We had no attendees at our neighborhood information meeting.

I would point out -- and I did work on the Cope Reserve project. It was one of our company projects. But the area -- if I can bring that back up, I'll just point to it on the screen.

So we have sited our preserve all along our northern boundary, and we went back and forth a little bit with staff on that because we have preserves to the east that are part of Falling Waters, but we wrapped the preserve around on the north boundary knowing that there was a single-family community there.

There's also going to be some security fencing in place for the project, don't know yet. The County's own facility today has a concrete material that's a wood-slat-looking concrete type fence around its facility.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: So that would be -- that will be a masonry fence of some sort --

MR. ARNOLD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: -- concrete slab fence?

MR. ARNOLD: That's what we're intending, yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Six foot -- five foot, six foot, what --

MS. DAVIES: Tiffany Davies with WSP.

The existing facility has an 8-foot-tall concrete fence around it, and it's anticipated that it would be contiguous to wrap around this one as well.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: So the fence will actually be going from -- it will be the fence, then the buffer.

MS. DAVIES: The intent right now, the fence is closer to the drive, the asphalt area.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yes.

MS. DAVIES: So it might be directly along the asphalt pavement and then the buffer on the outside of that.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay.

MS. DAVIES: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Commissioner Sparrazza.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Thank you.

Wayne, is there -- is there buffering of some sort on the north side of your access?

MR. ARNOLD: That I don't know. We have not designed what that is. I mean, the fire department's going to require that it's going to be at least a 20-foot-wide drive aisle. And so, you know, we have 10 feet. I don't know if all of that can be buffer or not or if the wall can be extended there. It's not our property.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Yeah, I wouldn't expect a wall, but even a visual buffer of some sort. I recognize you need -- you're 20-foot-wide for the big trucks -- for the big fire trucks.

But, Mike, did you have a --

MR. BOSI: And Wayne made the point that I wanted to that remember that after -- west of the County's property, that easement is owned by the Islamic Center. So any conditions on those, we could not put a condition upon that property because this is -- that property is not part of this rezoning.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Okay. Can I make a suggestion, maybe not a requirement, but that -- to be a good neighbor, as we learned this morning, if there is a way to help ease in some fashion the visual aesthetics of that driveway, that the County and the applicant would at least review it?

MR. ARNOLD: I think that's a fair comment, that we could certainly work with the Islamic Center in our road design to see if we can accommodate some physical buffer in that location.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Great. Thank you very much for that.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Commissioner Shea.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: On the north side, Wayne, how wide is that -- is that a buffer you're showing or preserve --

MR. ARNOLD: It is. It's part of our --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: -- where you're leaving it natural or --

MR. ARNOLD: It's part of our preserve, and I think that total area -- Tiffany, I don't remember, but is 30 feet total, the buffer and preserve, in that area?

MS. DAVIES: Can you toggle back to the layout sheet? I think if you go one more. It's called out on there.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: So what does it mean that it's a preserve? You're not planting anything in this? You're leaving it the way it is?

MR. ARNOLD: Well, we'll have to remove exotics, keep that in mind. But for a County preserve, it gets put into a dedicated county preservation area. So we can't disturb it further once cleared of vegetation, and we have to replant supplemental plantings, perhaps. But we can't go in and --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: So when you show a 30-foot --

MR. ARNOLD: It's a 20-foot buffer.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Twenty-foot buffer. Does that include the preserve, or does that --

MR. ARNOLD: It does.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: The preserve?

MR. ARNOLD: It's both in that -- on that concept plan. And again, keep in mind, it's a concept. It might be greater than 20 feet once we actually get to the real design for this, but today it's a 20-foot planned preserve and buffer.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: A question for your client: The smell of diesel would drive me crazy. Is there some experience with the existing fuel station? Have you been getting any complaints? It just seems like you're going to get the odor.

MR. DeLONY: Brian DeLony, Facilities director.

I mean, if you go -- if you look at this map right now, you can see that the existing fuel station is right -- is right here, with residential back right here. This was just recently built, you know, while this facility existed. There's been no complaints to my knowledge of diesel smell at that location.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Brian, there's -- but there's -- in the new facility -- I don't see anything shown. Is there a diesel dispensal (phonetic)?

MR. DeLONY: Right here.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. Right there. Okay.

MR. DeLONY: It's right adjacent to where the existing ones are.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: It's adjacent to the existing one, okay.

MR. DeLONY: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Thanks.

Commissioner Schumacher.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Commissioner Shea actually kind of covered what I was thinking --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: All right.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: -- because the buffer that's there with the native plants and

trees, as long as they stay within -- because I'm sure those trees at this point are probably 30 feet -- 30 to 40 feet tall. And living on a street where a building is constructed that didn't have to go through zoning and they completely cleared the whole site, it's a nightmare, because you're looking at just dirt and light and building, whereas this going in, you're leaving those native trees that are there that are going to be of substantial height. So even if there is a community that goes in next door, you do have somewhat of a buffer against the light that's going to be coming across.

How tall were the light poles that are proposed for this project?

MR. ARNOLD: I don't think we --

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Haven't gotten that far? No? Okay.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Can you make them 15 feet?

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: I was going to -- I was going to say 11 feet, that's it.

No, that was the only thing I wanted to confirm is that when we do go in for the site plan and development, that that buffer stays at a native height so, therefore, it will create more of a buffer for the neighbors next door when they do go in.

MR. ARNOLD: And again, I think with the wall condition of extending that concrete wall, I think that's going to be, you know, probably the best visual buffer you can obtain.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Commissioner Colucci?

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Yes. So I heard correctly that 8-foot wall is now going to be on the north side, correct?

MR. ARNOLD: It will be along the --

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: I mean, you're going to extend it up and over?

MR. ARNOLD: It will be on three sides of our property, the north, west, and east side of the property so that the site is fully secured.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: No. Up and over.

MR. ARNOLD: So it's going to extend from here.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Yep.

MR. ARNOLD: It will extend up here, and then across --

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Thank you.

MR. ARNOLD: -- and then back down.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: That's what I thought. Thank you.

MR. ARNOLD: Yep.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. Commissioner Mc -- Michelle, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Wayne, I'm having a hard time visualizing this. So if I am on the Copeland --

MR. ARNOLD: Cope Lane.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: -- Cope Lane side what am I seeing exactly? Because I want to address her concern.

MR. ARNOLD: Correct.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: You know, if I had a house, sitting at the pool, what am I looking at?

MR. ARNOLD: So if you're at pool level and you've got an 8-foot wall and then a 20-foot at least buffer preserve, you're not going to see anything, would be my opinion. Our buildings will be restricted to 30 feet because we have to build to the most restrictive standard of the adjacent zoning, which is an estate-zoned property at the Islamic Center, which has a 30-foot height maximum. Our setbacks are all based on Estates zoning.

So we think we're fine. I mean, the County, if they build the second level, I mean, I assume we could probably put some sort of parapet extension so that if there's an issue with that, like glare, that that could be taken care of, but I'll defer to the engineer.

MS. DAVIES: Yes, that would be something we could look at. As of right now, it's just going to be an open roof and a possible future phase, like Wayne was mentioning, might be open on the top to park cars and additional vehicles for Fleet facilities on, and so I'm sure there could be some sort of conditions

along the exterior of that roof level to prevent headlights or anything shining onto the neighbors.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: And then the part -- the road or the easement in front of the Islamic Center, those houses that will be looking at that, what are they seeing? Are they going to see these vehicles driving in and out?

MR. ARNOLD: Well, I think that's a possibility, to be honest, because I don't -- you know, we don't control the underlying fee simple of that property. So we would have to work with the Islamic Center to see if we could gain any ability to put some barrier there. I just don't have a definitive answer for you, Michelle.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Yeah, but -- okay. So when they bought their property, they didn't think that that 30-foot easement was going to be a roadway.

MR. ARNOLD: Well, this easement was dedicated as a public -- to the general public for utilities and roadway purposes.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Right. But I mean, like, I have an easement on my -- nobody uses it. This is going to be heavily used.

MR. ARNOLD: Well, the Islamic Center could have used it. I don't know -- they used an access point that was planned as part of their original conditional use, but that easement was there for their use and enjoyment as well.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: I don't know. I'm struggling with that. I wouldn't want to see that.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Is that easement -- so what's shown there is the easement. The vegetation will come down. Is that just going to be -- is it going to be gravel? Dirt? Paved?

MR. ARNOLD: I'm sure we will pave it. It will have to be stabilized to carry EMS vehicles and things like that.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Stabilized. But that's got to be coordinated with the Islamic Center?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes, it would. But this was -- the easement was dedicated in 1980.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yeah.

MR. ARNOLD: And it was dedicated -- all property owners abutting the lands described and allowed for Florida Power & Light, Public Utilities, nonexclusive easement, and right to construct, maintain, and use a roadway for purposes of ingress and egress, so...

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: But again --

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: It's always been that way.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Again, it's an easement that -- some easements are never used. This is going to be heavily used. And did the Cope Lane know this?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Michelle, it's in the record. It's an easement.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: No. It's in the record that it's an easement.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Right.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Nowhere does it say before they bought their property, before they planned this, that it's going to be used for, like, a road.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: He just read the language.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: It's in the easement. Wayne just -- Mr. Arnold just read it. It says --

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: But again, like, easements around me it says, yeah, you need -- it will have to be accessed by Florida Power & Light and Comcast and things like that, but sometimes they're never used.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: And sometimes --

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Of course an easement's going to say what it could potentially be used for but not this.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Go ahead, Mike.

MR. BOSI: That easement was placed because that parcel was bifurcated. They had a vacant lot in the back. They knew that lot was going to be -- was going to be developed. They had to have an

understanding that the majority of the rezones within this area, as they were one of them, rezoning Estates to residential or some other use. So there was an understanding that that was going to be an access easement. What you're, I think, saying is they couldn't have anticipated the intensity.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Right.

MR. BOSI: Now, I think they could have if they saw a vacant lot adjacent to an existing maintenance facility, County facility, that they would have to have considered a probability there could be an opportunity for the County to expand their facility one parcel to the north. Now, I can't speak to that.

I would also say that they have the ability to add their own wall around their own property if they feel that this was going to infringe -- this is going to infringe upon their ability to sell -- to sell homes.

We have placed the wall requirement with the preserve area to provide compatibility upon the property that we own. What we don't have is the ability to add those type of things on property we do not own. It's been designated for an access easement. And I hear what you're saying, but they had to anticipate that it was going to be utilized for an access easement when they -- when they did purchase their property.

MR. ARNOLD: And if you notice, when the County improved County Barn Road fairly recently, they put a stub-out into that area. So I think there was an anticipation that the easement was going to be utilized in some fashion.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: The part about asking them to build a wall, if she is telling us intentionally what this is going to be used for, affordable housing, I mean, all of those additional -- what?

MR. BOSI: The PUD does not require affordable housing.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: No, but she said that she's building affordable.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: No, she didn't.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: So adding to the cost of --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: No, it's not affordable housing. Correct the record. It was pretty much the gap in between affordable housing and what I would call -- it's going to be market-rate housing but at a level geared towards, as was stated on the record, sheriffs, schoolteachers and whatever, but -- so we're really talking about market housing.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay. Because she used the word "affordable housing."

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: No.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I don't think she did.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Oh. I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: No.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: That's what I thought I heard.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: No.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: I would just ask that, you know, as we move forward with this, perhaps, you know, working with the Islamic Center, buffering it. That's my ask.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Wayne, quick question: If Collier didn't purchase this, somebody else did, it would be, quote, "landlocked," or a flag lot they used to call them in my day. That access road would be the only egress in.

MR. ARNOLD: That's correct. It is the only form of access to that parcel today.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: If it wasn't being used by Collier?

MR. ARNOLD: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Okay. And as you stated, it was on the record since '88, I believe, right?

MR. ARNOLD: 1980.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: '80, okay.

Then, if I may, a suggestion: A simple hedgerow not on the Collier property, or on the property that's being proposed, but in the backyards of your homes, a beautiful 5-foot -- is it Calusa? -- Calusa 5-foot hedge way in the back, inexpensive to do, would aesthetically help your cause and allow this to go through with very minimal resistance. So just a comment.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Commissioner Schumacher.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: I would say just retain the already mature trees that are along that property line depending on -- you've got a 30-foot easement, as we just heard. Fire's probably going to want 20, which is going to leave you five feet on either side. I would just -- and I don't know how possible it is, but if we're looking forward to other -- if we're looking forward to other communities which -- I mean, it is what it is. It's an easement that was there. The easement reads that -- Wayne, did that easement read that anybody that abuts that easement has access to it? Because if that's the case, then the Cope Lane properties would have access to that easement as well, correct?

MR. ARNOLD: Yeah. The way it reads, it says "abutting properties."

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: So they have access to that as well, which they might use during construction. You never know. But that's the only recommendation I would make. As long as the native trees stay along that line, if you're in your pool looking at a 5-foot wall and 40-foot-tall trees, pine trees, you're not looking at a parking structure. You're just looking at native vegetation.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. Mike?

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: The only thing I have is in relation to the light. This isn't, like, a 24-hour facility, this maintenance facility, correct?

MR. ARNOLD: No, it's not. I mean, during emergencies, it very well could be because --

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Absolutely. So if we could just have timed lights that turn off at night, that -- I think that would solve issues.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I thought you had that.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Security.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: They've got some security in there.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: They're going to have security.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Not like every light on, but...

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Mr. DeLony.

MR. DeLONY: Brian DeLony, Facilities director.

So, I mean, one of the security measures, of course, for any of our assets would be to maintain lighting out there. Now, the intensity of that lighting could be adjusted, but we would at least want some lighting out there 24/7 to keep people from out there, you know...

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Hoodlums.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay.

MR. ARNOLD: And we do -- just so you recall, we do have a lighting condition. That's one of our proposed conditions with staff's help to write that. I'll go back to it if --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yeah. I thought that was in the conditions, yes.

MR. ARNOLD: It is. It's the first condition that talks about Dark Sky compliant, and it's 25-foot height mounting standard.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yes.

MR. ARNOLD: Which that would allow for the larger vehicles that do need maintenance there to circulate on the site.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay.

MR. ARNOLD: And then just so you recall, just going to your point on the hours of operation, it's general hours of operation are 6 a.m. to 8 p.m. That's our general hours of operation. And then all maintenance activities occur inside except for testing, if they have to take a car and drive it around the parking lot, but the maintenance of the vehicle occurs inside.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. Are there any other registered public speakers, since we're still on public speakers?

MR. SABO: No, there are not.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: All right. With that, staff presentation, please.

MR. BOSI: As I mentioned, the rezoning has been found compliant with the GMP. The conditions of approval, the measures for compatibility that have been suggested by the applicant have been reviewed by staff, and we feel that they provide the protections to the adjoining properties as presented. Staff is recommending approval of the petition.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. With that, Mr. Arnold, are there any rebuttal or closing comments before I close the public hearing?

MR. ARNOLD: No. I think we agree with staff that I think we've given a good effort here to make us a compatible use, and the conditions, we think, will ensure that. I wish we could control the access easement, but we do not, so...

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. With that, I close the public hearing, and I open it to any comments or concerns or discussion from my board members.

Seeing none.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Are we going to vote on these together?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yes. We have to -- we vote on these together, both items. One is, of course, the conditional use, and the other is the -- well, yeah, I'm sorry. Let me go back to where they are. One is the rezone and the other is the conditional use, the companion item.

So with that, I turn to any of the commissioners who would like to make a recommendation or make any comments.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: I make a motion to approve PL20250001788 for the rezone and its companion for a conditional use, PL20250001789.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And with that -- with the conditions as stipulated?

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: With conditions as stipulated by staff.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Do I hear a second?

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: All in favor, say aye.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Any opposed, like sign.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Hearing none, it passes unanimously.

Thank you.

MR. ARNOLD: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: ***Okay. We'll proceed, then, with the AUIR. We took a break -- probably do this for about 30 minutes and take another break probably for lunch.

Are you good, Terri, for now?

THE COURT REPORTER: (Nods head.)

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yeah. All right.

The AUIR -- note this is legislative in nature. It is not quasi-judicial, so there's no swearing in or no disclosure.

So with that, we'll proceed with Mr. Bosi to educate us on the AUIR and the CIE. And the first test is you have to know what the acronym means.

(Ray Bellows left the boardroom for the remainder of the meeting.)

MR. BOSI: Thanks again. Mike Bosi, Planning and Zoning director.

This is the 2025 AUIR/CIE. And just for a little bit of historic context, I started working on my first AUIR in 2007. So we've -- I've been through this a number of times. And then, like I said, it's an annual -- it's an annual update, so it's a reoccurring -- it's a reoccurring event that we have every year to make sure that we're going to be able to meet the demands that the development industry is requesting of the government and the infrastructure providers and the service providers.

What is an AUIR? It's the annual one-year snapshot in time of projected needs and required capital improvements over the next five years based upon projected population increases against BCC

adopted levels-of-service standards. It should be noted that this snapshot changes as changes in demands evolve.

One of the reasons I put that -- we put that statement is during high inflationary times, the costs of the projects that are being provided for within your AUIR may be allocated at a cost of, say, \$10 million, but when the projects roll around, if they're in Year 2 or Year 3, sometimes that project cost, based upon inflationary pressures, doesn't always end up at that \$10 million.

So it is what we are experiencing, and at the time the best snapshot we can is expecting what the demand is going to be and what -- the cost associated with any one individual project, as well as population. The amount of population received in a county -- I'll have a slide about that. You'll see it's pretty consistent, but it can fluctuate from year to year and based upon events.

And then what's included in the AUIR? We have two categories. Category A is your concurrency facilities, the roads, drainage or stormwater, potable water, wastewater, solid waste, parks and recreation, as well as schools, and they're all tied to the Capital Improvement Element. The Capital Improvement Element is what we send to the State of Florida to show for -- over the five- and the 10-year period that we're maintaining the levels of service that are adopted.

And then we have Category B facilities. They're jails; law enforcement; libraries; EMS, emergency management service; and government buildings.

Now, those facilities are not subject to the checkbook concurrency. The Category A facilities, if you have a project that comes in, wants a new plat or an SDP for a new shopping plaza, we have to make sure that the roads, drainage, potable water, wastewater, solid waste, parks and rec, schools, they're all available to handle those individual demands. B doesn't -- isn't subject to your checkbook concurrency, so they're not applied at the time of DO, but as part of the AUIR, we make sure that levels of service are being maintained moving into the future so the decision-makers could know that the non-concurrency facilities will be available in the capacity needed to handle the extra demand that those projects will require, and then concurrency.

Facilities that serve [sic] necessary to maintain the adopted levels of service that are available when the impacts of development occur -- and contained within the CIE policies and the Land Development Code policies.

The Chair had mentioned that, you know, this was one of the -- one of one counties that we actually do an AUIR. We're one of the few counties that still do a CIE. There was a time back in the aughts where our facilities had to be financially feasible by the State of Florida, meaning that our Category A facilities couldn't have unfunded projects. Those unfunded projects would have to be removed, or it would have to be -- funding to be provided for or identified. That has gone away.

In 2011, the Community Planning Act modified the restrictions -- or the requirements for counties on how they go about doing not only Growth Management Planning but facilities planning, and that was one of the fiscal requirements that went away.

But we still do that. We still require that. So when you have a development that comes before you, we give you -- at the time of rezoning, we give you a courtesy concurrency evaluation. We'll let the Planning Commission know if there's any capacity issues, but it's actually applied when they seek the DO -- or the development order.

And then there's population requirements, and we receive our population from the University of Florida Bureau of Economic and Business Research, BEBR, and we utilize the medium-range projection, and that has to do with where we're at in the buildout of the county.

Back in the -- 2000 to 2010, all the way up till I believe it was, like, 2013 is when we made the switch. We used to have the high population numbers because of the rate of growth that the county was experiencing was higher. And I inserted the -- some of the presentations that I make to homeowners' associations, town halls. The '90s was the time of the greatest intensity of growth that we had. We -- it was almost 100,000 people, and it was close to 67 percent increase within our population.

We have slowed down tremendously in that regard, and -- but we also -- the -- as you see at the bottom, the seasonal population, not only do we utilize our permanent population, but everyone knows January, February, and March we have a very high seasonal population, so we increased the population

that we utilized for infrastructure purposes by 20 percent to handle the additional demand that we know we're going to experience in January, February, and March.

And I know sometimes in March a lot of the population says our infrastructure cannot handle the traffic, and we are strained at that period of time. But I always invite those seasonal folks to come down and visit me, stay at my house July, August, and September. There's no capacity -- there's no capacity problems within our road system, there's no capacity [sic] within our restaurant systems, or within our retail systems as well, or our beaches. They're easy to go to, and there's pretty much capacity available if you need it. But we make sure that when we have the highest demand that we can -- we can maintain the infrastructure and handle the demand that's being placed upon it.

This gives you an example of what I was talking about. On the left, the far left, is the AUIR year, and then that was the base projection for that year, the population, and then the five years following that what was expected.

And you can see 2019, it was right about 1.92. The teens, we were right about 2, 2 percent to 1.9 percent. Every year was -- it was like clockwork. That's what we were dealing with. This past -- these past seven years, you're starting to see a different growth reality within the County. As the County continues to build out closer within our urbanized area, you're seeing the developments that are being heavily trafficked, the ones that are receiving the newer population, those are building out at a slower rate.

And a good example would be Ave Maria. Ave Maria was entitled in 2004 or 2005. From a residential standpoint, it's just -- it's past the halfway point, but from a commercial, industrial, institutional standpoint square footage available, it probably -- it probably has 80 to 85 percent of development still in front of it. And those towns and villages out in the east have that same -- that same schedule. They're -- their absorption rate is a little bit longer than what it was -- than what we had experience with in the urbanized area.

But as you can see, starting in 2019, if you look on the very right-hand side, that's your annualized percentage of growth. We're at 1.92, 1.9, 1.77, 1.51, 1.45, 1.47, and then 1.44. You see we are slowing down in terms of how we are -- you know, our numbers.

Now, I will say the law -- the laws of larger numbers dictates that that's always as we add more people, and if we have a constant population, that number's going to continue to go down.

So what it said -- but it does say that the rate of growth that we're experiencing is not explosive. It's not explosive. As much as our population may want to counter that, the numbers don't dictate that it is. It has been remarkably steady, remarkably steady, for the 20 years -- well, for the last 15 years, we have been under 2 percent growth rate. We've never exceeded that.

And from an infrastructure-providing standpoint, that's a good thing because it's a constant that we have been able to rely upon and be able to meet the standards that we need -- we need to make. And anybody who has a question, as I'm giving, just please coordinate with the Chair, and if he wants it, I will -- we can answer it.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Mike, if I may, I want to take a minor exception to what you said.

MR. BOSI: Sure.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: You kind of rounded it out by saying larger numbers don't -- or play into that role, because as we know, as the population grew from 2019 to 2025, if it stayed at 2 percent, you would see more and more people coming. The percentage is dropping because every year we're adding a few more to that base number. And if you take a quick average, it's 6- or 7,000 a year, right?

MR. BOSI: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: So it's not that the percentage has -- well, I shouldn't say that. The percentage is going down, but the amount of heartbeats that come into Collier County, 5-, 6-, 7,000 a year for the last probably 15 years. So that's important to note.

The one quick question I have, BEBR, when we talk about even 2025, 413,000, that's what -- and I ask you, is that homeowners that own property here --

MR. BOSI: No.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: -- front doors?

MR. BOSI: It's renters, owners. It's all population.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Well, a renter is renting from an owner, right?

MR. BOSI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: But the owner could have an investment property and still be down here in another piece of -- another property. So it's -- it's a compilation of what we think is here every day either during season or for --

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Right. And that was kind of my first part. And I apologize for going in the weeds here.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yeah, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Is that -- that's heartbeats that live here, but they may not be here year-round. You could have someone that owns here but is only a snowbird.

MR. BOSI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: You know, the people on Gulf Shore, right? They're here three weeks a year, thank God, but they're counted in that 413-.

MR. BOSI: If they spend less than six months here, they are not; they're our seasonal population. They're included as part of that 20 percent markup that we do for our seasonal population.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: But how do you know that?

MR. BOSI: We don't know that in the -- for each individual lot. They know that based upon water usage --

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Okay.

MR. BOSI: -- by road usage, upon occupancy, upon where their primary residence is located, where there -- or a second residence is provided for.

So we don't go down to each individual -- we don't go down to each individual dwelling unit. We know there's somewhere around 245,000 dwelling units within the county. And there's -- there's general metrics that basically monitor how those -- the groupings of that -- those dwelling units are provided for.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Yeah. Water usage is a great way to indicate who's in a home or not.

MR. BOSI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: The 413-, then, is what you believe a number here year-round, plus 20 percent?

MR. BOSI: Plus 20 percent. Yeah, so you're talking -- when you're at the -- you're at 500,000 when you get to your seasonal population. Your seasonal population is about 525-, 530,000.

Another interesting factor, if you look at the population from 2021 and then you look at 2022, you said, "Wow, we lost 6,000 units." You know what happened during that year? We recalibrated our population based upon the census, based upon the 2020 census. That's a portion as well, another -- and another metric that helps recalibrate and reset what our population numbers are.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Okay.

MR. BOSI: So you get really down into the weeds on this.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Yeah. I'll stop.

MR. BOSI: But for general purposes of what we're trying to do -- in terms of making sure we have the capacity to handle the demand. So when we -- we have our permanent population, our seasonal population, and then we have our metric numbers. And I'll get into that in just a little bit as well.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: So to summarize, 413- people -- 413,000 are here year-round --

MR. BOSI: Yep.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: -- other than vacation --

MR. BOSI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: -- and another 80- to 100 grand are coming in for three to five months?

MR. BOSI: Yeah, about 100,000 is our seasonal population.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Before you move on, I had a question with regards to that, too. The two slides back where you do show 20 percent projection of seasonal population, like, in the City of Naples, we -- our calculation was, like, 100 percent of the population increases during season. So these -- this 20 percent, you know -- this is actual 20 percent? It's not based on the level of services that you're calculating, too.

MR. BOSI: No, it is based upon the increase of water usage.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay.

MR. BOSI: The increase of road count -- trip -- the utilization numbers that are demanded upon our infrastructures, we monitor those from a daily basis, from a weekly basis, and monthly basis so we know when the highest months of demand are and what that percentage of demand, and 20 percent is the number that we feel comfortable with.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Yeah. That's not very much.

MR. BOSI: No. You've got to remember, it's seasonal -- Naples is a much more seasonal environment.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Yeah, but everybody's complaining about the traffic on Immokalee and Vanderbilt and --

MR. BOSI: Because all those people have to drive to Naples to work and service those individuals.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Yeah, but those are year-rounders.

MR. BOSI: Yeah, those are year-rounders that have to come and attend to the seasonal population homesteads --

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay.

MR. BOSI: -- and things like that. I mean, that's just -- it's how this economy works.

How much do we build? It's just new population against your level-of-service standard, and that equals your capital improvement. For this process, for this five-year period, we have 29,700 people coming in.

Our level-of-service standard for libraries, .33 square feet per person. You multiple the number of people you expect, 29,700, versus the .33 square feet per person, we need 9,801 square feet of libraries to handle that demand. Simplified, but that's how it is.

We expect -- so if we don't have that capacity in our library system, we're going to need to plan and make sure that we provide for that 908,001 [sic] square foot of additional library space. Luckily we've got space in our libraries, so we're not having to propose a new library facility, but that's how it's made up. And it's that -- it's that straightforward.

Some of the other -- some of the other infrastructure providers are a little bit more sophisticated. Road and bridge, multiple times a year they're going to do traffic counts.

It looks like you have a question.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: I do have a question. Based on the future, do you recalculate these things? For instance, maybe libraries are not going to be a thing of the future.

MR. BOSI: That's one of the things that we are constantly -- that's one of the jobs that you have as well is levels of service. So you look at levels of services. Do we need the same amount of levels-of-service square footage within our libraries when we used to -- libraries used to be full of books. Now books are contained in the cloud. Not all of them, but a good portion of the new -- of the new material that they -- are e-books. And so the amount of space required for libraries is something that we are currently evaluating. Our library system is currently evaluating how is it that we need -- our space to best utilize to serve the needs of the community and what are those -- what's the -- what is the spacing requirements moving forward based upon those changing preferences and changing needs?

And I expect within the next year or two, the next two years, you're going to have some discussions with our library system about that changing nature and the changing component of who -- what services are being demanded and how they envision, you know, some of the transition from traditional books, hard copy books, to e-books and the amount of space that that frees up, because your traditional libraries were shelves and shelves and shelves of books. But if you're half and half now with

e-books to your traditional library -- your traditional books, you don't need all those shelves and shelves, so you can repurpose your square footage for a different utilization.

This is the sell that certain components are much more sophisticated in terms of how they get to that overall what is the need. Road and Bridge, traffic count, collected multiple times a year, as well as the trip bank capacity. And what's that trip bank capacity? Every one of the PUDs that we have approved -- good example, Cope Lane that we were just talking about, you know that was approved in 2011. That's close to 15 years ago. They're just now coming around to being developed.

So we don't forget about the amount of -- 43 units. So that's not a lot of traffic, but that traffic gets banked within Mr. Sawyer's checkbook as background traffic that gets accounted for that we have to make sure that, when it does come online, that we've got at least some preparation and cushion built into our system to be able to anticipate it.

Wastewater -- yes.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Oh. And then are we also accounting for all the projected additional density bonuses that we're approving and will be approving?

MR. BOSI: Every single one that you approve -- we don't try to be prospective [sic] to try to figure out how many we're going to approve. The ones that get approved get banked into the system. The ones that are prospective, they don't -- until they become a reality, they become approved, we don't bank them, because we could never anticipate how long or when they're going to be -- would be proposed, or there would be no way for us to even know when those projects will be coming back until they're actually approved by the -- approved by the Board of County Commissioners.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And, Michelle, just to make things even more complicated, there are some large developments that have vested rights, meaning -- I'll take Fiddler's Creek. Let's say that's a six -- that's a, yeah, 6,000-unit development. We're probably at 3,100, but they're vested for the other 3,000, and that's in Mike's bank as cars on the road right now. So when people go through the interchange and say, "Well, it's crowded," yeah. "Well, you can't -- you can't build any more units," but there are -- some people already had vested rights, and that's all part of the checkbook accounts as well.

Go ahead, Mike.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: But I'm just -- I'm thinking of traffic. So we're accounting for this population growth, but then we're starting to approve all these density bonuses like -- that -- its like putting the cart before the horse. No?

MR. BOSI: No. Those density bonuses that are approved are part of any one project, they're -- they get -- our checkbook concurrency is -- you need a courtesy review. Our Transportation Department will say to the -- will say -- let us know, is there capacity in the system? They're not applying the concurrency, but they will -- they will say, okay, they've got a density bonus that's X number of additional cars, X number of trips. Here's the road network that's going to be affected by those trips. Do we have capacity?

They'll let that applicant know there's capacity there or -- "Oh, you may have a problem within, say, the segment of road on Livingston Road." And at that point in time, then they start talking about what's the proportionate share requirement of that project to be able to pay their contribution to fix the overall improvement to give the capacity that's needed.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Commissioner Shea.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: So when does it get into Mike's checkbook? When we approve the zoning or the Growth Management amendment or when the Site Development Plan comes in?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Site Plan.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: That's important because --
(Simultaneous crosstalk.)

MR. BOSI: When you approve the zoning, they give you background, they put it in the background. They don't give the full impact of it. When the DO is approved, when the plat or the SDP, that's when it's fully withinto [sic] the system and it's fully integrated withinto [sic] the system.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: But it will be accounted for when -- once it's approved by us and the

commissioners.

MR. BOSI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Even though it may be 10 years before it's there.

MR. BOSI: Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Okay.

MR. BOSI: Wastewater, historic --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Commissioner Colucci.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Mike, I'm going to use round numbers.

MR. BOSI: Sure.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: And if you wonder where they come from, I'll tell you.

MR. BOSI: Sure.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: At a minimum, we have to service right now 400,000 people at a minimum. At a maximum, call it 500,000. Do you agree with those rough numbers?

MR. BOSI: Agreed, agreed.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: The difference between 4- and 5- is pretty significant in terms of what you need. So do you -- what do we base our infrastructure recommendation on, 400,000 or 500,000, or something in between, or how do we do it?

MR. BOSI: The 500,000.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: So we base it on the 500,000. Well, that's good.

MR. BOSI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: That's realistic.

MR. BOSI: We have to -- the worst-case scenario is the 500,000. That's the highest demand. We have to make sure that we can handle the highest demand.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Okay. That's good. I mean, that's good planning.

MR. BOSI: Because the next section, I was going to talk about wastewater in terms of they use historical demand population projections, as well as reserved capacity. There was a time before I started -- I started in 2002, and it was right -- I think right -- maybe a year before there was an issue of lack of capacity within wastewater system, within wastewater site. And that -- that experience has the utility, and it had -- the Board of County Commissioners said, to make sure -- to the utility, make sure that you give yourself even a little extra cushion to make sure that you can handle the demand, because if that swing set isn't available for the person to utilize when they want to utilize it, they can handle it. If the toilet's not able to handle the additional demand, we have an issue, and that's unacceptable. So that's one of the things. We always make sure we can handle what we expect on the upper limit, not the low limit.

Stormwater is based upon your basin studies related to the water management plan, and then your solid waste is your landfill disposal capacity, which is the level of service.

Talking about the CIE for this upcoming transmittal, for 2006 [sic] to 2030, you've got over -- just over three billion -- billion dollars' worth of improvements within our Concurrency Management System being proposed, and we have about \$712 million that is currently short.

Stormwater is -- stormwater is an area that has been talked about for a long time in terms of identifying dedicated funding sources. Stormwater utility fees have been proposed at one point in time within the County. We've never gotten there. We do know and this Board of County Commissioners knows that it is one of the areas that a funding source -- a dedicated funding source is necessary, and there is probably some talk in the next couple of years of some additional ways to identify additional revenue to be able to handle those. And for as much as we are guilty of having impact fees set too high for transportation, we still have a \$407 million deficit in terms of the overall need for that.

And to give you a little bit of concert [sic] -- so that's -- it's about half of the cost of the current CIE. That's why I say the focus of where our revenue and revenue availability, it always has to be within that first one- or two-year period, because if it's within the first one- or two-year period, they can say from a capacity standpoint, when they go to the checkbook concurrency, they get to count that because it's in those -- the first or second year, and we have dedicated revenue for. It's for the Year 3, 4, and 5 that the revenue sources become a little bit more murky in terms of being available.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Commissioner Sparrazza.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Thank you.

Mike, I think last year we were at -- can you back up one?

MR. BOSI: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Thanks.

I think last year we were at 840, 844 million, something like that.

MR. BOSI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: We're going in the right direction, but I'll -- I'll make this very easy and simple, and I certainly don't mean that sarcastically. What is the County staff and the BCC doing to try to reduce this even more? I know you just said, you know, what are we going to do? We've got to generate more or reduce service, or whatever the case is.

But it's a little scary that 22 percent, whatever, is not funded for in the next five years. We look out five. We know we have it funded for the first two, but that's only because we're stealing from the piggy bank now to pay for '26 and -- Year 2026 and Year 2027. But we can't keep stealing from the piggy bank.

And after reviewing some, not all -- and I apologize, everything that was in the AUIR, it just kept coming back to me that, for the capital improvements, we're at 407-, and for basically stormwater alone, we're at almost 305-.

Does the BCC and the County have a plan that they could share with us? And last year it was, "Well, they were thinking about it a year ago." Well, as my joke goes, last -- this year is last year's next year. What is being done, do you know; can you share?

MR. BOSI: Well, right now there's nothing that has been proposed that will directly address this deficiency other than there has been some discussion, but not public discussion, that the surtax -- the penny surtax that was -- I believe it was 2019, that it was -- '18, 2000, that it was approved.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: And then went away in '23, right?

MR. BOSI: They hit the necessary -- they hit the identified maximum amount, and they and we --

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Rescinded.

MR. BOSI: -- ended the program. The problem was, the anticipated -- the 500- or \$600,000 that we set as the limit, the expectation in the number of projects that that was going to be able to accommodate got cut in half, and it got cut in half because of the cost -- the inflationary period that we had of 2021, '22, and '23, and the projects -- the price tags of the projects, they weren't going up on a yearly basis. They were going up on a monthly basis in terms of what the overall cost was.

And anyone from the private development side will tell you, that is a -- was a real reality of the cost of projects continuing to spiral.

Now, that has stabilized somewhat, but I believe that that discussion is going to be needed by our Board of County Commissioners at some point in time because we cannot -- because it was specifically for infrastructure-related projects, and we need another dedicated source of revenue to be able to satisfy the fiscal needs of the County and the future expansion projects that are associated with it. But that is -- that's a policy discussion that the Board of County Commissioners is going to have to engage in at some point in time.

And just to throw a little more fuel on the fire, Mr. DeLony, the director of Facilities, is engaging right now in a process of identifying the full maintenance needs of this county, because this county's getting to a point where some of our older buildings are hitting the useful life, meaning that they need replaced. Well, not only will we need the replacement, but the continuing maintenance of the existing facilities we have needs to be identified.

So Mr. DeLony, within the next year, is going to be bringing a maintenance needs allocation plan to the Board of County Commissioners to identify some additional revenue needs that this county is going to --

So if I'm painting a dire or a darker perspective, there is some revenue constraints that this county is experiencing, and we will have to be creative, and we will have to identify some other means to be able

to address the full needs of this county from an infrastructure and from a maintenance standpoint that is going to be very tough questions for this Board of County Commissioners to have to exercise.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Commissioner Shea.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Oh, excuse me. I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Given where the shortfalls are -- and again, this isn't the County Commission here. I'm just curious. It would seem to me the only way to close the gap is either cut projects or increase the sales tax. What else is there?

MR. BOSI: The millage.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Huh?

MR. BOSI: Millage rate.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Millage rate.

MR. BOSI: The millage rate could be increased.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Okay. That's property taxes?

MR. BOSI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: But isn't most of that property -- isn't most of the property tax now dedicated to schools?

MR. BOSI: I believe close to half of what we pay in property taxes, or your millage rate, will be dedicated to schools. So, yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Your tax shows different items.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: You have your county tax, your school tax. They're all categorized on your --

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: All right. So you have your projects, sales tax, or property taxes, that's --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yeah, or they kick the can down the road, and they don't do the work. Deferred maintenance.

COMMISSIONER COLUCCI: That's a bad option.

MR. BOSI: And the last thing, the legislature has made it even difficult because infra -- or impact fees and how we calculate impact fees are continually influenced by actions taken by the legislature that has made the amount and the ability of impact fees that we receive diminished even at the rates that we currently have.

So those -- those are issues that this Board of County Commissioners are going to have to tackle as we move forward. We can say that the revenue that we needed for the majority of our CIE, absent transportation and stormwater, have been identified.

Stormwater has been a long, long underfunded issue that we continue to try to find ways to find those revenue streams. We haven't been as successful, I think, as anyone would have hoped that we had been. But moving forward, it's something that we know that every hurricane season when we experience these storms, is only -- it kind of highlights the need for that stormwater management improvements in the various areas that we have.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Commissioner Shea.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Just a comment, and I hope we take it seriously. I've been in the infrastructure business for over 50 years. Look around the country with the older cities that are way behind us, they do their maintenance on an emergency basis --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Right.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: -- which is far more expensive. We're getting at the point, as you just mentioned, that our facilities are reaching the end of their useful life.

The stormwater really jumps out at me. We've got to find a -- because that is basically maintenance-oriented. There's not a lot of huge capital projects other than gates here and things like that. They're really maintenance items. We need to get on top of that.

That scarce me. I don't want to be one of those D-rated infrastructure communities. I want to be

an A-rated, which I think -- I don't know if we're A, but we're rated pretty good. But the stormwater just amazes me how far behind. We've kicked that can down the road every year for I don't know how long. So just for the record, we need to get on that maintenance side of it, reinforcing what you just said.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Part of the problem with stormwater, all of the newer developments have stormwater management, and they pay for it. Either they have -- they have property CDDs or HOAs. And they've all gone through the ERP process, and they have basically paid for their stormwater.

Most of the stormwater shortfalls are in the older communities in the county back prior to any type of ERP, Environmental Resource Permit, stormwater runoff, those kind of things.

So the difficulty with the stormwater issue is you're asking for the entire community to pay for shortfalls of the older community -- older residential areas that didn't go through that type of permitting process. And most of the -- a lot of the -- you look at any of the large developments in this county, the PUDs that have gone through -- and we have, like I said, the CDDs, they've already paid for it. So it's -- it's a real tough -- tough issue.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Are impact fees supposed to cover capital expenditures? Because I don't see how impact fees help the -- and I look at the stormwater as basically a maintenance, not a capital.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Impact fees pay for the incremental difference in growth. You can --

MR. BOSI: It has to be related --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: It can be used for capital investments.

MR. BOSI: -- to new growth.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: So if you don't add any infrastructure --

MR. BOSI: There's no impact fees that are associated with those older communities. So the impact fees that come have to be associated with the -- with growth-related expansion. It can't go back and cure issues --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Right.

MR. BOSI: -- and that's the -- that's the issue. The Naples Manors of the world, their stormwater system just wasn't designed --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yeah. The only thing you can do is go back and form an MSTBU or some other type of taxing incremental, and that's a political third rail.

MR. BOSI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: But what I'm -- the operating part of the stormwater system is the bulk of the cost. I don't see how -- what does the impact fee cover; any additions to the Capital Improvements issue?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Well, we don't have an impact fee for stormwater.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Well, that's -- but even if you did, because most of it is annual operating type expenses versus major capital, unlike water or wastewater where you have a big project that comes along, and you can see where that is going.

I've been here 10 years. What am I contributing to the maintenance of the stormwater system? Nothing. Even if I -- even if I paid the impact fee, I've -- that's -- I haven't covered the operation and maintenance.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: There's some maintenance performed by the County on county stormwater, and that comes out of your ad valorem.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: It does? Okay.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: It's part of the -- it's part of the annual budget.

MR. BOSI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: But if there's any capital improvements -- and we've done it in the past, the Lely expansion, other type of stormwater projects that have basically been funded out of the County ad valorem.

MR. BOSI: Yeah. As you mentioned, the Lely Area Stormwater Improvement Project was one of the largest stormwater projects that we put forward, and it was -- it was basically funded from a millage rate.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yeah. And some of it they go for state grants and federal grants.

MR. BOSI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: There's those capabilities.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: So last year, what were the 360- and the 304- on that slide for stormwater? What were those numbers last year in the AUIR?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Most of that was for these older communities to upgrade their stormwater programs.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: I know, but what was the number? Instead of 350- --

MR. BOSI: Around \$300,000.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: And how much of it was unfunded? Same percentage?

MR. BOSI: It's about the same split. It's -- because we haven't -- we haven't found a revenue source to address it, it's almost the same as last year.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Okay. Okay.

MR. BOSI: It's almost the same as it was last year.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Well, I'm going to keep beating you on it, because I can see if we don't take care of the infrastructure, we're going to get hit with a big bill in the future.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Mike, how many more slides? Because we're going to take a break for lunch and --

MR. BOSI: Two.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. BOSI: Here's the major -- transportation major projects. Airport Road between Vanderbilt Beach Road and Immokalee Road, 2026. Just about \$21 million for construction and mitigation.

Collier Boulevard between Green and City Gate North, 2026, close to 300- -- or \$30 million for construction.

Vanderbilt Beach Road, that's the extension from 16th to Everglades, 2026, 26.5 million for construction.

Randall/Immokalee Road intersection improvements, 2027. That's 17.5 [sic].

Also in 2027, Veterans Memorial Phase 2. That's up -- just north of Immokalee Road. Veterans Memorial runs east/west. It terminates. That's going to be extended all the way to Old 41. That is moving forward in 2027, about 17 million.

Everglades Boulevard between Golden Gate Boulevard and Oil Well Road, 2026/2027 is right-of-way. 2028 is \$144 million in mitigation and construction.

Immokalee/Livingston flyover is 2028. That's close to \$800 million, construction and mitigation.

Oil Well Road, Everglades to Oil Well Grade, 2026, is 2 million for design and 68 million for construction and mitigation.

And finally, Goodlette Road, VBR to Immokalee Road expansion, 2028, about \$27 million.

And then the major --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: And can we ask you a question on that table?

MR. BOSI: Yeah, sure.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Can you go back to it, please. Thank you. The first date, 2026, 20 million, what does that mean? In 2026, we're going to be under construction?

MR. BOSI: It is scheduled for construction in 2026. Mitigation and construction is what it -- is planned to start sometime in Fiscal Year 2026.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Can you go to Everglades Boulevard, 144 million. 2026/2027, and then the right-of-way you don't get until the following year. Why would -- I'm not sure what that means. You get your right-of-way after you start construction?

MR. BOSI: Of course not. I'm not -- so Everglades Boulevard, 2026/2027, the right-of-way is the first thing that gets done, and then 2028 --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Oh, I'm reading the table wrong.

MR. BOSI: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Oh, sorry. So the 144-, though, that's the value of the project, which

could be a 3- to 5-year project?

MR. BOSI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: And you don't start a project until you have guaranteed funding, right?

MR. BOSI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Okay. Thank you. Sorry.

MR. BOSI: No worries. No worries.

And finally, the three major -- Public Utility major projects, potable water, a 10-million-gallon-per-day increase; northeast county regional water treatment plant anticipated to be online in 2031; wastewater, additional capacity to be added to the south county water reclamation facility.

And when we have -- we have Utilities and Transportation Planning here to get into any more of the specifics if you have on the questions.

And then finally, wastewater, there's the northeast water interim service area, adding additional capacity; 1.25 million gallons added in 2025, and 6.3 -- or 6 million gallons daily added in 2031.

And with that, what we're asking you today, at the end of today, just recommend -- recommend to the Board of County Commissioners accept and recommend approval of the attached document as the 2025 Annual Update and Inventory Report and to accept the approval of the Category A and B facilities relative to projects and revenue sources with Category A set to be included within your annual CIE.

So basically, approval of the 2025 annual update is what we're asking for at the end of the -- at the end of the presentation.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. Thanks. What we're going to do, we'll take a 30-minute break and -- for lunch.

MR. BOSI: And Chris Johnson from our OMB office would -- could address a little bit more on the financial side.

MR. JOHNSON: Just with the questions you guys had from stormwater, I can give you a couple quick answers on that.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Well, we'll cover each separately when we go through the AUIR.

MR. JOHNSON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: So if there's any questions, we're going to cover them after lunch.

MR. JOHNSON: Sounds good.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I know there's going to be questions, and I'd just prefer to address them as we go down the list. I know the staff is ready to answer questions, but, Mike -- Mike just gave an overview just so everybody understands, and we'll go through each of the elements, if you have any questions specifically. I would ask staff, if you've got a -- any comments or brief concerns or -- you just want to, quote, educate us a bit, and state your concerns, we'll go through each one of them, and then we'll proceed with the approval.

We can do a deep dive if you want to drill down into the real concerns, but I leave that up to you.

And with that, we'll take a -- we'll reconvene at -- well, let's say, 10 after 1. That gives you 30 minutes. Thank you.

(A luncheon recess was had from 12:38 p.m. to 1:09 p.m.)

(Commissioner Colucci left the boardroom for the remainder of the meeting.)

MR. BOSI: Chair, you have a live mic.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: All right. Good afternoon, and welcome back from your short lunch break. And we're going to start going through the AUIR.

I would ask my fellow commissioners -- I'm just going to toggle through as it's presented. Basically on page -- let's see, 1-3-3-5, so 1335 is -- actually starts Road and Bridge, and it's actually Page 1 of the AUIR.

So with that, this is arterial -- arterial and collector roads and bridge facilities. So are there any questions from our commissioners in regards to road? I think this would be a good time to, again, ask your questions in regards to concurrency and in regards to any planned development.

So with that, I'll turn it over to staff.

MR. BOSI: Staff is here for any questions that you have.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Yeah. I can start with traffic on Attachment C. It's the same one I usually go off on every year.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: It's the one with all the colors on it.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: It's 1343 of your packet. I believe that's the one you want, Attachment C.

MS. LANTZ: Okay. I think -- Lorraine Lantz, Transportation Planning. I think Attachment C is up on the screen; is that correct?

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Thank you. Let's look -- let's go right to Vanderbilt. The plug [sic] in Vanderbilt from 951 to Logan Boulevard is showing a decrease, correct, and then you --

MS. LANTZ: So -- correct. This is showing year over year, so from last year to this year.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: But then directly after Logan to basically what would be Oakes you're showing an increase. Because I drive that road every day. And I don't know where this count came from, 951 to Logan, but there's not that many cars turning off to create -- or turning on to create an increase in between those two, because 951 to Logan is just as busy as the rest of it.

So, like, is the data collected at different times, or is it just all on X date we do all three sections -- or break it down?

MS. LANTZ: So let me -- I'll break it down for you, okay?

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Thank you.

MS. LANTZ: So we take data collections of road segments four times a year on many segments. Some segments we do annually. Some are quarters. But I can tell you -- I don't know exactly how many counts on that particular section, but what we do is we take those sections, then we look at the p.m. peak and peak direction, or usually the peak direction would be, you know, in the evenings, eastbound type of thing, or northbound, depending on the road.

Then we take those. We look at the actual counts -- and I can go through, if it might help, how to read the AUIR, if that would help, on how we kind of put that together. If I can get that part of my presentation. I'll keep talking.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: No, it would be helpful, because, like, a lot of times when we're reviewing these requests when they come in, the traffic study on the County side will indicate, like, a service level of an F. So we're putting more cars on the road. So it would be helpful to see how we -- how we kind of combine these.

MS. LANTZ: Okay. So as you're looking at the AUIR -- this is basically the spreadsheet. It's an Excel spreadsheet. So look at the levels of service. So that service volume is, as I said, peak hour/peak direction to determine the capacity of the road. So we look at the Highway Safety Manual, we look at approved documentation of how much capacity that road can handle. Then we look at the background traffic, which is the traffic counts. They're taken quarterly or annually, depending on what the road is, and that looks at the actual traffic on the road, so actual traffic, you know, the cars going on the road.

And then we look at what Mike had explained a little bit, the trip bank, which is anything that has come in, you see Mike Sawyer come up and say, the trip -- the trip cap -- or the trip cap is a certain number. That's what you see.

Then when they come back for their Site Development Plan or their PPL, their plot, then they say, which exact segment of which road is going to have a certain amount of trips? And we take those numbers, and that's what's put into the AUIR for trip bank.

And then we do a calculation, the service volume minus the actual number of trips on the road and the trip bank, and that gives us the remaining capacity. And then it's a formula; is it a Level of Service A, is it a Level of Service D or E? What is that level of service, and what year we're expecting it to be deficient.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Got it.

MS. LANTZ: And so that -- all of that, all of those numbers are what went into the map that you were showing on the attachments.

Now, that attachment that you were looking at is just year over year. So maybe something

happened. Maybe there were some -- an accident on that particular day that we were taking the trip. Something could have skewed it, and that's why we take it over four -- four times over the year and look at the numbers.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Got it.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: What's the level of service based on?

MS. LANTZ: So our level --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Is it the same for every road? So many --

MS. LANTZ: So let me go back. So our level of service is the -- our acceptable -- the standard levels of service are either D or E for Collier County. A Level of Service D would be a road that has not reached their full buildout. So if the road could be expanded to six lanes but it's only at four lanes, that would be a Level of Service D. That would be the standard because we could expand it.

A Level of Service E is a road that's already reached capacity for expansion, for road widening --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: How do you define capacity is maybe --

MS. LANTZ: -- for road widening.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: -- the question? The question I -- how do you define capacity, then? How do you know what the capacity is on a segment of the road with all the lights and all the intersections and --

MS. LANTZ: I went the wrong way, sorry. So as I said, it would be the service volume that the -- or that the road can handle. So they can handle a certain amount of trips in the -- on that road minus what's already -- what's on the road today in the cars minus -- or, you know, added the trip bank as a number, and then that is the remaining level of capacity.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: So how do you know what it can handle?

MS. LANTZ: So the --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Is there a textbook or --

MS. LANTZ: -- service volume that the road can handle?

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Yeah.

MS. LANTZ: So every road has a service volume based off of the service manuals and FDOT standards and what a road --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Okay. So there's standards for it?

MS. LANTZ: Yes. There are, yes.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Would a level of service, let's say, exaggerated here, I-75, if you're going below 60 miles an hour, there's a hiccup because the speed limit is at 70. Sixty miles an hour, you're two car lengths ahead, whatever, or behind each car, right? For whatever reason, that level of service is not adequate, is -- I'm trying to picture it in my mind. How do you know you're below a level of service? Is that kind of, Paul, what you were thinking of?

COMMISSIONER SHEA: No. I'm just wondering how they established what it was, because it's got to be different for every road based on the next intersection and, you know, based on the --

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Right. I mean, if you're driving down Radio Road and you're doing 20 miles an hour and the speed limit's 45, and everybody around you is doing 20 miles an hour and there's not an accident, are you below the level of service?

MS. LANTZ: So I think you're --

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: You're not able to --

MS. LANTZ: -- looking at delay, maybe, and you're looking at -- also looking at capacity. So the road capacity of how many -- how many cars bumper to bumper can fit on the road segment, that's -- that is the volume -- the service volume, right. If they're all just driving slow, more could fit there, maybe, maybe not. I'm not -- I think you're -- delay versus what's bumper-to-bumper traffic.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: She's saying speed is not a factor in capacity.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: I was told it was in my -- when I grew up. No, never mind. Okay.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: So if I could just -- on that, so if we take that section of road -- because if you go to Attachment G in the AUIR, we can see all of our deficiencies existing and the

anticipated existing -- or anticipated deficiency using -- using Vanderbilt from, let's say, Logan to --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Collier.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: -- Livingston -- let's go Livingston to Logan. How do you make improvements on that road? Because we can't -- you've got --

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Landlocked.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Yeah. You've got communities on the right. You've got villages on the left. How do we improve that, I guess, is the best way to put it. Because we've got another apartment complex coming online that's on that -- on that road as well.

MS. LANTZ: I'm not sure if you want me to go to Attachment G or just speak. So if the road is widened to capacity, right, if we can't widen --

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: It can't go -- it can't go any wider.

MS. LANTZ: -- the road, there's other opportunities for the signals to be timed correct -- or to be timed differently, for maybe median openings to be expanded. There are other operational things that we can do to fix the roads or to look at --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Mike, I think if you show -- go to H1. I believe that shows all the --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Yes, yeah.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: -- all the roads that are deemed deficient. H1, yeah.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: And when do we start working on those timing -- is it, like, a trial period? Like, "Hey, we'll adjust the light here X time to X time and see if that helps move the flow"?

MS. LANTZ: So when we look at the AUIR -- and it's a planning tool, right? So we look at the AUIR. We look at what's failing. And then in black, you can see all the projects that we actually have a construction project -- a capacity project on. So there's VBR extension. There's a lot of different things. Mike went through some of them, and there's different timings for how those projects are going through our budget; you know, whether they're being designed or constructed, things of that nature.

So we look at what's being done, and we look at is there a road, or does -- the facility that's being done, will that have an opportunity to affect the network? Will that help relieve? So will Vanderbilt Beach Road extension help relieve the red that we're seeing on Immokalee?

And we feel it will. It will help, right. And once -- once it becomes fully operational, we can see how much it helped and if we still need to do something else on Immokalee.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Okay. Because it's just going to shift it down to Vanderbilt. But Vanderbilt's already shown as deficiencies, so that's why I was trying to figure out, like, is that something you start doing with the timing of the lights now, like, to see ways to make it work during those peak hours or --

MS. LANTZ: So we would look at -- again, we would look at what's -- what are the concerns and what are the problems and then how we could fix it, what could be done. We do a lot of studies in Transportation Planning, so we're looking at -- we understand Golden Gate Parkway is going to have -- is having some problems, you know, it's yellow into orange. So we're conducting a survey -- a study right now to see how we can fix it.

So we would have that study in place, being done, funded so that we could -- those recommendations that the Board of County Commissioners would approve would then be something that's funded in the next couple of years. So after the study is done, maybe a couple of years later we would have the opportunity to do the design and then -- or right-of-way construction.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: So if we're seeing a deficiency now, we have to do a study before we do anything; is that what you're kind of --

MS. LANTZ: For major-capacity projects.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: For major-capacity projects. But for those that are already built out at capacity, that's something where internally you start saying, "Well, let's try to time the lights a little bit longer."

MS. LANTZ: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: That's -- all right. Great. Thank you. That's --

MS. LANTZ: But, again, that would be more of an operational thing that we would do.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Okay.

MS. LANTZ: You know, if we're starting to see a problem, we would work with traffic operations to fix that if we could do that quicker.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Got it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Michelle.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Yeah. I think I need a big-picture understanding of this, right -- and our role in this. Right now we have overcapacity on a lot of different roads. What is attributing to that? Are we approving too big of projects? Are we building projects before the roads are -- like, how do we help manage all this?

MS. LANTZ: So I think -- I think the County is still growing, so we are still doing infrastructure. You know, there's certain budgets. Again, we have to fit with what we can afford to build, so we look at what's the most important if we have to -- if we have to choose, you know, the scopes or things of that nature.

I think part of what needs to happen -- and I think that transportation and land-use go hand in hand, and a lot of -- I think there's been a push for affordable housing, because if people live where they work, they're not going to have as -- they'll still have a trip on the road, right, because we're not -- they're not shifting to the CAT bus system, right? But that trip on the road will be shorter. And if they're -- the trips on the road are shorter, the network capacity will start to see the benefit. And it's -- it's the whole picture that has to work together.

MR. BOSI: And Mike Bosi again.

And as Lorraine was saying, when you have a high-density project maybe that has affordable housing that's in front of you and you have NIMBY-ism opposition to it, you have to remember that that project is being designed to take a very small percentage of the 62,000 people that every day have to report to this county. They came from outside of the county, so they've got to travel far distances within your county to get to wherever their work destination is, and they have to travel far distances in the evening during the peak-hour session to get -- to get out of the county.

So those high-density projects that are going to bring more traffic, theoretically, they're going to hopefully potentially -- those 30 percent that are allocated to the affordable housing or the income-restricted housing will be available for people who no longer have to live in Lee County, drive all the way through, through our county, long distances in our county to get to their work spot and leave again. So that traffic could be removed from the system, and then that 14 -- or the 10 miles that they're driving is reduced to maybe three miles. So therefore, it is a net savings of 14 to 15 miles per day in that trip regard.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay. So besides that, besides supporting affordable housing in activity centers and things like that, what else can we do to help relieve overcapacities on roadways? Is that the -- I mean, there's got to be other things.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Convert them to one way. From here on out, Vanderbilt's one way that way.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Let's build a wall.

MR. BOSI: Require that -- require multiple entrances and exits in non-gated communities. I mean, that's -- well, the biggest -- one of the biggest issues that we have within this county is gated communities.

Think about Pelican Marsh. Pelican Marsh has a whole section of land; you can't even drive through it. You can't drive through it. There's no -- there's no way to get from -- to Goodlette-Frank to Airport Road north of -- north of Vanderbilt because Pelican Marsh blocks off a whole section of road. That's replicated in most of our gated communities. The public's aren't -- the public's not allowed to go through those; therefore, we only have -- look at our system. We have five or six east -- or north/south connectors. We only have -- we have five or six east/west connectors. All those roads have to be six-lane divided highways to handle the most capacity because we don't have the local road system. The City of

Naples is blessed --

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Right.

MR. BOSI: -- with having been developed before the gated community became an advent, and the interconnectivity of the City of Naples is a benefit that everyone gets to enjoy because there's multiple ways to get around that town. There's not multiple ways to get around this town.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: That's super interesting. Yeah. It's something to look --

MR. BOSI: That's the cause and effect.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Right, because then the --

MR. BOSI: We can't -- we can't open up those gated communities because of, one, the individuals aren't going to accept it, and it's an arrangement we've -- we've allowed for. We can't -- we can't disallow that. But those -- that is the biggest problem towards mobility within this county is the lack of interconnectivity between projects and the lack of interconnectivity within our system.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: So moving forward, can we look at that and potentially make it -- yeah.

MR. BOSI: We can most certainly suggest additional access points. One of the things -- the greatest -- Pine Ridge -- Pine Ridge Road and Airport Road, think of the benefit, think about -- that's a -- that's a very highly trafficked, congested intersection. Think of if each one of those quadrants -- and you've got four quadrants within those intersections. If each one of those quadrants had a Naples Boulevard like the one quadrant does, like the northwest quadrant does, the north -- that gives you a cut-through to be able to eliminate having to go through that, have shops and businesses and employments off of that.

If we had that design within each one of our activity centers, the mobility of this county would be greatly improved, but we've never -- we've always tried to promote better interconnectivity. We've never required better interconnectivity.

So there's some large structural problems that make transportation very difficult within this town that capacity is not going to be able to address.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Wow.

MR. BOSI: There are things we can do, but there are limitations.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Mike.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: I have a question. What about the half interchanges, and if there is -- if it is going to come or -- what's the date of a half interchange on Everglades and 75 as well as Vanderbilt and 75?

MS. LANTZ: So the --

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Or is this a myth that everybody just talks about?

MS. LANTZ: So the interchange at I-75 and Everglades, that is in the Metropolitan Planning Organization's Long-Range Transportation Plan. So everything has to start in the long-range plan, and then we, as Transportation Planning for Collier County, have to be consistent with that. City of Naples, Everglades, Marco, they all have to be consistent with the long-range plan.

So that project is in the long-range plan. There's a lot of requirements to having a new interchange. There's -- starting with we have to do an interchange justification report to FDOT, Florida Department of Transportation, and Federal Highway Administration. They have to agree that there needs to be an interchange there, located there, and then we would have to design, you know, fund it, that sort of thing. But it is in the long-range plan.

And the Metropolitan Planning Organization, the MPO, is looking to adopt their 2050 LRTP, and it is in there as a project, but that's long range, right? The baby step would be having to do an interchange justification report.

And FDOT -- we already did an interchange justification report approximately 10 to 15 years ago, and FDOT and federal highway did not approve it, so they did not -- they did not see the benefit at that time.

MR. BOSI: And I would say the more likelihood of the interconnection in that area is not on Everglades Boulevard. You approved a cell tower -- or you recommended approval of a cell tower along

the parkway that's going to provide for the interconnection to I-75. That's Big Cypress. The RLSA, the towns and the preplanning -- villages and towns, that road allocation has been provided for from -- from the Town of Big Cypress down to 75. That's eventually, I believe, where you're going to find an interchange that's going to have a much better benefit because the volume will be much higher.

Everglades City, with all those -- all the ingress/egress points of those driveways is tough and problematic from friction points. Big Cypress is going to be designed as a limited access highway that's going to eventually probably provide for allowance of the populations of the Big Cypresses or the Ave Marias, of the Rivergrasses, of the SkySails to be able to access 75, and that's the anticipated connector to 75. But, yeah, that's another area that we're going to -- we're eventually going to have to provide for.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Because there's one right now just on 29, right? That's just an ingress heading west, or can you head east on that?

MR. BOSI: I think it's full.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: I think it's both.

MS. LANTZ: It's an emergency access only, so it's key emergency vehicles. It does not have --

MR. BOSI: That's Everglades. He asked about 29.

MS. LANTZ: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Twenty-nine.

MS. LANTZ: East and west.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: East and west.

MR. BOSI: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Mike, going back to requesting additional access points in new developments, can your team look at that and make those recommendations when you provide staff reports to us?

MR. BOSI: Um-hmm, yes.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Is somebody on?

MS. LANTZ: I just want to -- I don't know if they're trying to get the audio, I just wanted to make sure, it's in the vicinity of Vanderbilt -- sorry -- of Everglades in the long-range plan. So it -- again, it would be with the IJR, the interchange justification, as to where that location would be.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Is that the same for the Vanderbilt -- there was discussion about it. I don't know if it was --

MS. LANTZ: There has been discussion about it. FDOT, Florida Department of Transportation, did -- or is currently doing a long-range master plan for I-75 from Golden Gate Parkway north up into Lee County. I don't believe they've finished it yet, but they are looking at the potential for a partial interchange at Vanderbilt Beach Road.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Just like a north only since that's --

MS. LANTZ: Correct. It would only be partial. It would only be, like, the on-ramps or something.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: An on-ramp for the future fire station that's going in.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. Any other questions for Transportation?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Thank you.

All right. Next item is stormwater management, canals and structures. And I show it on Page 23 of the report. So it's further down. I think we may have some questions on stormwater since we were discussing it. So we'll have staff.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: 1358.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: We want to hit staff with some questions, please.

MR. HAYDEN: Good afternoon. Peter Hayden, Stormwater Capital.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Peter, I think the first thing is, do you want to cover -- Commissioner Shea was talking about the shortfalls, and I think our only concern is the criticality of that. Go ahead.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Commissioners.

For the record, Christopher Johnson, the director of Corporate Financial Management Services. I just want to address the shortfall in stormwater that you saw.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yes.

MR. JOHNSON: The Board has taken action at the last meeting to move forward with studying the potential for a stormwater utility and/or the surtax that Mr. Bosi talked about. In addition, they approved a line of credit in the interim for \$65 million.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay.

MR. JOHNSON: So that's kind of the short-term plan and the long-term plan. Any questions on that?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: No. I'm good.

MR. JOHNSON: All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Peter?

MR. HAYDEN: Yep.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Anybody have any questions on stormwater?

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: I think it's going to be simple today.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Any words of wisdom for us? It's dry.

MR. HAYDEN: No. I mean, I guess the one comment, just -- I know the big PUDs. You know, you talked about it earlier.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yep.

MR. HAYDEN: You know, there's a pre and post as far as water in and water out. But ultimately, water does go out, and I just want to make sure I kind of made at least that point, because we do take on water from Planned Unit Developments. I mean, with our secondary systems and then, ultimately, we work with the South Florida Water Management with the primary systems. We do take water, you know, from those systems, and we do -- like, I understand, we do have a lot of older communities that we're working in, but we are working on flowways and capacity issues that, you know --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Peter, whatever happened to the Belle Meade project?

MR. HAYDEN: So we're still looking, actually, south of that right now.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: You had a consultant from the Orlando area. I can't remember who that was --

MR. HAYDEN: Yep, a while back.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: -- did some preliminary work, and they were going to move water down --

MR. HAYDEN: Right, from basically north of 75.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: North of I-75, move it down through across 41.

MR. HAYDEN: Right, which at that time it wasn't permissible as far as through Army Corps and the Water Management. We're still working with Water Management trying to divert some of that coming down from the Golden Gate Main Canal; take a lot of that freshwater out of the -- you know, going into the ocean, you know. So we still have another study south of that because there's more development coming south, as Mike knows. 6L Farms.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yes.

MR. HAYDEN: Fritchey Road you just looked at.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yep.

MR. HAYDEN: So actually, we've got a whole new capital project, Lake Park flowway, which we're looking at now. So we're actually trying to get ahead of some of these bigger developments in the future establishing more flowways so we can actually have better pathways for the water to go.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Well, when the Six L Farm comes in, that's going to be, what, a 6,000-acre development. I mean, that --

MR. HAYDEN: Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I hate to say it, but that's an opportunity to bend on their arm a bit --

MR. HAYDEN: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: -- to fix some of the problems down there --

MR. HAYDEN: Correct, and that's why I brought it up.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: -- because Six L -- Six L's self-contained and, of course, they do -- they had their own subitive [sic] use permits. They were -- but now we're going to be certainly going well beyond --

MR. HAYDEN: Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: -- capability. And then -- and I think -- I say it for this panel here, because that -- eventually we're going to see that. That's going to come in. It's a huge project. I think 6,000 acres?

MR. BOSI: Yes.

MR. HAYDEN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And I'll say that for water/sewer as well. They're going to have to squeeze their arm for probably 50, 60, 70 acres for a water/sewer plant down there as well.

MR. HAYDEN: Correct. That's why we're trying -- like I said, Lake Park is just south of that, so we're trying to get that flowway established now, which is kind of north of where you're at.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I trust that staff will be looking at that when it comes through for review and it will be in the recommendations coming to us.

MR. HAYDEN: Yep.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Because it's -- that's going to be the only way we're going to solve some of the problems there as you head east.

MR. HAYDEN: Right.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Because anything beyond that is not going to be developed.

MR. HAYDEN: No.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: That's pretty much --

MR. HAYDEN: Basically, I mean, that's going to be the last piece down there.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Peter, thanks.

MR. HAYDEN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Oh, I had a question.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Oh, go ahead. We've got more.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Again, another bigger picture here. How do we plan for the future and avoid new developments going septic instead of tying into sewer? Is that Utilities?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: That's water/sewer.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: My apologies.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I can tell you there's no new developments that come in septic. The only septic you have right now, of course, is in the Estates.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Estates. Well, there's still some off of Goodlette.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: There is, actually.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: But those -- but any new development -- I don't think -- in the years I've been here, we never allowed new development to go on septic.

MR. HAYDEN: So we are working with -- and just to answer part of your question, west of Goodlette, kind of north of the high school and over 41, the City of Naples, actually, has an area there. We're working jointly with them, the County and the City. And, actually, that's one of our projects coming up here, '27/'28, actually going from septic to sewer. City's taking the sewer. We're going back in -- because the road's going to be torn up to do the sewer. Once that's done, we'll update the stormwater roadway.

So that -- we are, you know, slowly, you know, working those older neighbor -- and then Golden Gate City, ultimately, and that's kind of a utility partial question. But we're working there now, working on outfalls for stormwater, getting ahead as that -- as that next community's going to be another one that's going to be a big one.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Because I thought that there was a petition that came before us that went septic or -- it was new. They were putting a septic tank in because it wasn't anywhere near a

line to connect to sewer.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: That may have -- that was one that was a lot split or some other --

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Something like that.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: But it was a -- it was an Estate lot.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Right.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: The other one we required was when they expanded the --

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Right.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: -- whatever, the mental -- or the drug facility, but we required them to connect to water/sewer.

MR. BOSI: Hope Home.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: I had a -- I had a question on culverts, because I remember either last one or the year before we were talking about culverts maintenance was an issue in stormwater where -- where are we at with that? I remember there was, like, a proposed tax at that point in time to help with it that was on your impervious land on your lot and then -- where are we at on -- when it comes to, like, culvert and --

MR. HAYDEN: As far as maintenance on existing culverts out there?

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Yeah. Is that the homeowner's responsibility, but if they don't maintain it, it just kind of sits, right?

MR. HAYDEN: Correct. And, actually, we still -- with our maintenance group -- I'm the capital side. Marshall Miller on the maintenance side, we actually work on, you know, re-grading swales and redoing those. But, yeah, ultimately that culvert that's under that driveway for that residential, that's their responsibility.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Their responsibility.

MR. HAYDEN: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Anybody else?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Peter, thank you.

Next, we'll move to potable water systems, County water and sewer, Page 1375, and that's actually Page 40 of the AUIR.

And this is usually a pretty -- pretty interesting topic because growth is going to turn out water and put water back into the system used. And if it doesn't work, we can't -- we can't issue permits. I mean, that's as simple as that.

Go ahead, please.

MR. STOLTS: Anthony Stolts, supervisor/project manager, Collier County Public Utilities. I'm here if you have any questions.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: I have a question.

MR. STOLTS: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: When you say 172 million in commercial paper, what does that mean? I understand bonds. And is that just you have a bank line of credit that you can draw on for 172 million? Okay.

MR. JOHNSON: Again, for the record, Chris Johnson.

Yes. That's a -- that's a -- basically think of it as, like, a HELOC. It's a line of credit that we can draw on. It allows us to cash flow the projects in the interim.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: But you're using -- you've got it -- well, going along with that, I guess the question is a lot of it comes from rate. Do you see -- simple question, do you see rates going up in the water/wastewater in the next few years and at what rate?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: They've been going up.

MR. JOHNSON: They have been, and they're going to be in the process of doing another rate study, so that will determine that.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: But the rate study is tied into the capital project needs, too.

MR. JOHNSON: Correct, correct.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Yeah. Okay.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I think it's just so you can see the water/sewer, probably look at Page 1380. It's the chart -- it just shows -- it just shows --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Plenty of capacity.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: -- the -- this is water -- available water and the required. So we're still maintaining well above.

MR. STOLTS: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Capability is still there. And then you're expanding, what, northeast -- north?

MR. STOLTS: Yeah. We've got the northeast facility --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Northeast facility, yeah.

And then lay out your -- stake out your land when we come in for those 6,000 acres there on U.S. 41.

MR. STOLTS: We are watching that one closely.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yeah. That's like -- what do you need, about 80 acres for plant?

MR. STOLTS: Probably more than that.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: A hundred?

MR. STOLTS: Yeah. We're requesting more than that.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Water and sewer?

MR. STOLTS: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And that will serve -- will that take some of the -- I mean, we're talking probably 10, 20 years down the road.

MR. STOLTS: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: But will that begin to pick up some of the load off of the south plant and transfer it out to that plant once it's built?

MR. STOLTS: We are actually in the process of doing a study on the south service area including the southeast to determine exactly how that's going to play out.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Oh, wow. Okay, great. Now we've just got to figure out how to pay for it.

MR. STOLTS: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Mr. DeLony keeping you busy?

MR. STOLTS: Absolutely, sir.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I hope so.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Chair, I have a question.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: So I know there's been a lot of talk about this subject, plans of converting septic to sewer in the Estates. Like Peter said, the City came up with a plan and -- or, you know, partnering together the County and the City, and we've, you know, found grant monies and all this kind of stuff to help all of those individuals on septic going sewer. Is there a plan for the Estates? What's the future goal?

MR. STOLTS: Golden Gate City, in particular, we have a Golden Gate City master plan that is underway right now that's being developed for that area.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Oh, wow. Okay. And then you're going to special assess everybody, or how does that work?

MR. STOLTS: That's to be determined. This is just identifying potential funding sources and laying out how it would be phased.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: And how big is the City?

MR. STOLTS: Golden Gate City?

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Um-hmm.

MR. STOLTS: I don't know off the top of my head.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: It's about one square mile.

MR. BOSI: One square mile, yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: About one square mile.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Oh, so --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And the cost is going to be huge, huge.

MR. STOLTS: Yes, it will be.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Oh, but there's monies to help with that?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: We hope.

MR. BOSI: The benefit of Golden Gate City is got a higher -- a relatively -- it's one of the higher, denser just straight zoning -- straight zoning developments. So there are -- the proportionate share of the households, the economies of scales allow for a little bit better of the number of users that would have to share the total cost of what that transition is going to be.

The Estates are a much different problem, a much different issue.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yeah, the Estates, distance issue. Here you've got a large -- a large -- one square mile. You've got a huge density, and you can deal with it. And trust -- believe -- it has to be dealt with. It's just a matter of cost.

MR. STOLTS: Yeah. How?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Paul, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: We rely heavily on bonds on the wastewater side. So the debt service is up on the cost side of it. There's not a heck of a lot of it, but we're going to be floating a lot more bonds. I'm guessing we have a good bond rating and --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Oh, yeah.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: -- we don't have a capacity limit that we're bumping up against?

MR. JOHNSON: Again, Chris Johnson, the director of Corporate Financial and Management Services.

Yes, we have a AAA debt rating in the utility, so we're not -- and we're not bumping up against our limit at this point.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Thank you.

MR. JOHNSON: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: All right. Next, the wastewater, I think, same thing, anybody have any questions? And then if not -- do you do solid waste, too?

COMMISSIONER SHEA: No.

MR. STOLTS: That would be Kari.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Kari.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Kari's here. She only has good news.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Kari, I remember when we were talking about the possibility of the landfill closing, and then all of a sudden --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Before her time.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Wow, that was, like -- I go back to Jim Mudd days now, so it -- and then we -- what we did with recycling has been amazing in this county.

MS. HODGSON: Absolutely. Kari Hodgson, director of Solid Waste, for the record.

And thank you for your support and commitment to the recycling programs and services in Collier County. We are second in the state this year and have been top five for the past five years out of 67 counties. That's pretty phenomenal.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Weren't we No. 3 last year? So we moved up.

MS. HODGSON: That's right.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Yeah, baby.

MS. HODGSON: I've got to take on Palm Beach. That's my problem child.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Kari, in the recycling, though, how much -- at least educational-wise, how much is going in the recycling that really shouldn't?

MS. HODGSON: That's a great question. I get asked that often, so wonderful question.

We have a 20 percent contamination rate for our residential recycling. That means our residents

are well educated, they care, and they're doing recycling right. We are audited by our contractors on our recycling rate. So that is a true supported number where they take trucks and audit them every quarter. The national average is 40 percent, so we're doing significantly well.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Really? We're at 20? The national's 40.

MS. HODGSON: Yes. I can proudly say as your Solid Waste director that we set the bar when it comes to recycling programs and solid waste management in Southwest Florida.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And I -- I have to attribute it to your leadership.

MS. HODGSON: Thank you. They are amazing, and the people that also are the boots on the ground, the educators out there with the public, and the public and their participation as well, and business leaders, too, all participant in the program.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Let's talk Styrofoam.

MS. HODGSON: Sure. Bring it to any recycling center free of charge. Drop it off --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Drop it off --

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: But it's only a certain type. It's the little, tiny round bubble type.

MS. HODGSON: Anything but peanuts. Anything but peanuts we can pretty much recycle to keep it easy for the messaging for the public.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: And you can take peanuts to Publix. They take them, yeah.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: So no plans for expansion other than what we're operating right now at the landfill?

MS. HODGSON: Sure. The landfill's current capacity is -- meets concurrence with your level of service for the AUIR. On March 4th, 2025, there convened a solid waste long-term workshop with the Board of County Commissioners. We will be bringing back the cost feasibility of different expansions.

The current landfill capacity already has an expansion vertically to go from its current elevation of 100 feet up to 200 feet. That's where your life of the landfill exists.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: That's the 35 years --

MS. HODGSON: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: -- remaining life.

MS. HODGSON: Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: That's -- you know, it's amazing, because I go back 2003/4 time frame, and we were -- actually at that time thought we were going to have to -- we were going to reach capacity, and so it's amazing what's taken place.

MS. HODGSON: Significant. Great job by my predecessor and leaders, yep.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Oh, yeah.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: I have a question.

MS. HODGSON: Sure.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: To the background on what happened a couple years ago -- because I remember it was, like, 2018. The City was -- the City of Naples was thinking of using a different recycling center, going to Fort Myers because something was happening here in Collier County. Can you refresh my memory on that?

MS. HODGSON: So the way the collection system works in Collier County is that we have interlocal agreements to collect garbage from City of Marco and City of Everglades. City of Naples does provide their own garbage and recycling services.

For disposal of waste, everything comes to the landfill and/or transfer station. So we do service the whole entire unincorporated and incorporated for disposal.

Recycling is up to Lee -- I'm sorry, City of Naples where they want to take it. So they -- I don't know where they're taking it right now, but they're probably going to go wherever it's the cheapest rate for them.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Right, exactly, because was -- taking it to Collier County -- to our fac -- like, where do you take it? Where --

MS. HODGSON: So it's lumped into our collection agreements, so that's why it's not a part of it. We don't collect in the City of Naples.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: But what do you do with your recyclable items? Yeah.

MS. HODGSON: What happens to the recycling in Collier County as far as everywhere except City of Naples is that it goes to a transfer station here in town, and then it's trucked to Pembroke Pines, and -- where it is sorted and then sold by commodity value.

A brand new 75 -- I want to say \$75 million facility will be opening in January 2026 that has much more higher robotic technology, so the evolution or enhancements to the technology, we're seeing that some on the recycling side as well, so that's nice to see.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: And where is that facility?

MS. HODGSON: It's in Pembroke Pines.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: It's on the other coast.

MS. HODGSON: Correct.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: I just did have a question about out in the Estates, a little known fact, you use people's driveways to turn around the trucks versus the end of the streets because the people at the end of the streets will put up reflectors or block the ability, which I would think is an easement --

MS. HODGSON: So there's --

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: -- for those trucks to turn around.

MS. HODGSON: Sure. So what's the question? I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: The question is how come -- if we've got -- if the County has easements for stormwater, we've got easements for all these other things, how come we don't have an easement for waste management to have their trucks turn around at the end of a dead-end street?

MS. HODGSON: So we have agreements with certain private homeowners to turn around in their driveways. Other streets have been enhanced to allow for turnaround, and that's part of our capital program for where we need to install turnarounds, we can do that.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Where are we behind on the driveways?

MS. HODGSON: We have about 200 left.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: And how many years out are those?

MS. HODGSON: Right now I don't have an answer for that, but I can get it back to you.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Okay. Please do.

MS. HODGSON: Sure.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Any other questions for Kari?

(No response.)

MS. HODGSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Parks and Rec. Any questions from Parks and Rec?

MR. BOSI: And what I can let the Planning Commission know, there's no acreage planned from regional or community parks over the next five years. The levels of service are being satisfied, so...

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And I'm sure Jaime will -- any questions for Jaime? But the Board seems to address these issues, and we did solve the problem at Splash and -- whatever it's called, Splash and Dash.

MS. COOK: Jaime Cook, development review director. Sun-N-Fun, yes, there are still some capital project improvements going on there, but it is reopened.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And the Board did approve a -- is that the tourist tax that's going to pay for the expansion of the park, the sports park?

MS. COOK: I believe that is their intent. They will have to draft the referendum language and put it on the ballot next year.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay.

MS. COOK: But it would be -- it would be a tourist tax for Paradise Coast.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: In addition to the tourist -- okay.

MS. COOK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: All right. Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: I had a question.

When does Phase 2 start at Big Cypress Corkscrew Swamp park out --

MS. COOK: I'm going to ask Facilities Management to answer that question because they've been leading that project.

MR. DeLONY: Brian DeLony, Facilities Management director. So there's multiple phases of Phase 2. We've considered Phase 2 has already started, which started at the additional roadway there on the other side of the high school and that, actually, lit intersection is part of the Phase 2 project. It's going to be continuing to Phase 2C, which is just going out to solicitation now. We expect it to be out for solicitation for eight months before construction starts.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Sounds good. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Any other questions for Parks and Rec?

MS. COOK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: All right.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: I will say one thing --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: -- because I pretty much live at Veterans Park --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: -- with baseball. So I always like to highlight people when they're doing something right. And every single staff member at Veteran's is doing a phenomenal job, so...

MS. COOK: Thank you. We appreciate hearing that.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: It's hard to not -- you deal with the negative all the time. I just want to highlight those folks at Veteran's that they do a phenomenal job.

MS. COOK: Thank you. I will pass that along to them. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. Well, we've already talked a lot about the CIE, so -- that was Item 8. I don't know if anybody has any questions on the CIE.

We'll go to jails and correctional facilities. These are your Category B items. And anybody have any questions on jails?

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: I was just going to question -- I know last year we had talked about the mental health aspect, and we had a -- we had a deficiency in beds for dealing with some of the mental health side, so I was just going to ask a follow-up on that side.

MR. WILLIAMS: Sure. For the record, Sean Williams, Central Services Director for the Sheriff's Office.

That is -- in the AUIR, there's no expanded request for -- or -- for corrections in the expanded requests, but there is a note in there that we are going to look at that as part of a master plan with Facilities Management. That is still -- that is still a desire of the Sheriff's Office to look at that and renovate part of the Naples Jail Center, yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And my compliments to the Sheriff's Office for keeping, most of the time, vagrants off the street. We still have some problems of people standing at corners, but it pretty much is not like other parts of the state of Florida. You guys do a great job.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: They really do.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yeah.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Especially out -- especially where I live on 7th and 951, every deputy I've talked to out there at 7-Eleven, standup guys. They do a phenomenal job.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: School resource officers at Oak Ridge and the guys at Gulf Coast High School all do a great job.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And I trust there's been no issue with cooperating with the federal agencies on -- which is not a popular topic in many other parts of the country, but our Sheriff's department is well integrated in those efforts, I understand, so...

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, sir. That -- the immigration thing hasn't impacted us too much.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. Good.

MR. WILLIAMS: We have a little bit of increase in bed counts but not too much.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Bed count. But no issue right now?

MR. WILLIAMS: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. I'm still looking at the numbers. Thank you.

Anybody with questions?

MR. WILLIAMS: Do you want me to stay for law enforcement as well?

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yes. Go ahead. Law enforcement, please.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. No new -- no new requests for law enforcement. I believe the level-of-service standard is same as last year; am I correct, Mike?

MR. BOSI: Correct.

MR. WILLIAMS: And we continue on with the forensics building that's currently being under construction that was surplus funded, and we still have the same requests moving forward, and then the five years, which is two substations in the five-year plan.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: You might be seeing some applications from New York City coming down here pretty soon.

MR. WILLIAMS: We welcome them. We welcome them. We're always looking for good help, sir.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: How many open regs do you have for officers?

MR. WILLIAMS: I don't have that number, handy, sir, but I know that the Sheriff is -- and the command staff are always wanting to hire.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Good.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Amy, I skipped schools. Are you our school person?

MS. LOCKHART: I'm our school person. I'm available for any questions.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Any questions of the schools?

MS. LOCKHART: I can just generally say that in our current five-year plan, we have -- of course, we opened up Bear Creek Elementary School that's on Immokalee Road between the two charter schools, Naples Charter and -- it changed -- Innovative something academy. I'm sorry. It used to be Collier Charter Academy.

And we are opening up a new school in Ave Maria, an elementary school, and it will be within the Ave Maria. There will -- it will open in '26/'27, and we're working out an attendance boundary at this time.

It will generally receive -- relieve Estates Elementary School. At this time, Estates Elementary School is overcrowded.

And we're trying to craft an attendance boundary that will accommodate all of Ave Maria once it's built out, so we're kind of keeping that in mind.

And we have -- we have -- we have a level-of-service standard, and as a Type A provider, we meet -- we look at our capacities at our schools and make sure that within a five-year period of time that we're meeting -- keeping under those levels of service.

We have a definite capacity for each of our schools, so -- and it's a student capacity. It's not like -- like the fire department would have a capacity. This is completely different. It's, like, how many students can be held in an instructional space and how many instructional spaces are there and what types?

So we have a capacity that, then, we measure the level of service on. Elementary schools are

95 percent, and middle schools and high schools are 100 percent.

So we -- and we do have -- I think it was asked of me if we have a 10- and 20-year plan. We do have a -- this is our capital plan, and it's available online, and it details out the capacities and the five-year enrollment forecast for each school, and then we evaluate what we'll need for over the next five years.

MR. MILLER: Pull that mike down. We're not -- we're getting, like, every other word.

MS. LOCKHART: Oh, I'm sorry. Sure.

Okay. And we -- I'm sorry. We do a five-year analysis of the needs that we'll have, and then we compare it with the County's overall long-range population projections and correlate what we'll need with their expectations of growth, what we'll need in the 10- and 20-year plan.

We're required to turn in what's -- what's called a facilities work plan, a five-year component, a 10-year component, and a 20-year component to the state every year. In our 10-year, which we don't submit here, but in our 10-year that we submit to the State, we have a middle and a high school, and those we're going to be evaluating this year to see if they should enter into our new five-year plan.

And in our 20-year, we have an elementary, middle, and high school. And all of those, we have the sites for at this point. So we're very, very lucky that we have -- we have been pretty assertive in our land acquisition, so very good.

And in also with -- from agreements that we make with developers but also earlier on when I first started with the school district, we were in a land-buying mode at that point, so we had a lot of sites that we banked.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: So, Amy, we've come a long way. You and I both have been raised down here. Back in the day, there was only one high school, Naples High, and now look where we are.

MS. LOCKHART: Yeah. Amazing. Now we have -- we have -- it will be 33 elementary schools when Ave Maria's built, we have nine middle schools, and eight high schools.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Eight high schools. I didn't know that.

Amy, thank you.

Any other questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. Next, we'll go to libraries. And don't touch my library, because when a book comes out that I want to read -- and I'm all nonfiction, of course. My wife does it for me because she's -- it's her library card. She goes on there and requests it. You guys are amazing because it hasn't even come out yet, and I'm putting in the request to read it. You buy it and then I'm on the list to read them. So I'm old school. I still like to sit and read the book. So my compliments to the library.

MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. For the record, Tanya Williams, library director. And you're not the only one; 65 percent of our circulation is actually still physical materials.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Five?

MS. WILLIAMS: Sixty-five percent.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Sixty-five. And you guys are really amazing at -- if I identify a book that comes out, and within weeks, purchasing it, one copy up to 10 copies.

Now, how long do you keep those? I mean, where do they go after -- if they -- you know, like it comes off the best-seller list and it's gone?

MS. WILLIAMS: So what we do is we do -- we do buy multiple copies, especially for best sellers. We preorder them. So as the publisher releases them, we have them within days on our shelves. Once season is over and once a book has finished its life cycle as a best seller, then we will ensure that we have at least one copy available --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Oh, okay.

MS. WILLIAMS: -- either in each individual library or at least for County as a whole. So we do maintain those titles. So if you want to read John Grisham from the beginning all the way to the end, then generally we can accommodate that request.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: I've two more requests in. I'm waiting for -- I just finished one yesterday. My wife says, go get a job, and I'm reading a book instead. So it is good.

MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you, sir. We appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: But you guys -- most of them are either the library on 41 or -- pretty much on 41 out there at Lely, so great job.

Anybody else have any questions, libraries?

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Don't take away my library.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: I know. Were you here earlier when I was like, well, what if --

MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, ma'am, I was.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: I'm so sorry. I meant, like, way down the line.

MS. WILLIAMS: It's okay. We get that question all the time. You would be surprised --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: It was the same question 20 years ago. We anticipated that we would eventually -- 20 years ago we discussed the same question, and we thought maybe that it would disappear, but still people --

MS. WILLIAMS: No. Libraries have been here since the days of Alexandria, so, you know, I think we're still going to stick around in some shape, form, or fashion.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Sixty-five percent, that's --

MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, sir, 65 percent is still printed material.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: But if you have a best seller, do you do e-books as well or --

MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, we do.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: You do, okay.

MS. WILLIAMS: Yep.

MS. LOCKHART: So you can really reach more people with being on e-books and actually having hard copies. So that's really great, yes.

MS. WILLIAMS: Correct, correct. Especially with the best sellers, and we've talked for most of the day about seasonal population. That's -- you know, we get a lot of our circulation during season, and patrons, depending upon -- you know, if you're on an airline, you may want it on a reader because it's easier to pack than, say, a book. If you're just at home, whatever, you may want a book. So we still have our tried-and-true book readers, they have to have the physical copy in their hand, and then people have migrated to electronics. So it all depends, and we try to balance that need. Okay.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Any other questions? I mean, we're still --

MS. WILLIAMS: We're still good.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And patron -- I can't even say the word -- people visiting, how's that?

MS. WILLIAMS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Patronizing. Patronage.

MS. WILLIAMS: We are slowly recovering -- still recovering from the pandemic. That did kind of really ramp up the use of electronic resources. So we're finding, you know, people kind of slowly getting back into their old habits, and, of course, in regards from a younger perspective, story time for young children is just growing by leaps and bounds, and that's who I really want to reach are the future.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay. I have a question, because -- because there are --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Ladies first.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: We are deficient in, statistically, childcare centers. Has the library ever through of, like, somehow filling that need?

MS. WILLIAMS: Generally I'm going to say no, because we -- because our resources are limited, we do rely on the General Fund for the bulk of our budget, we don't want to replicate services that are available in our communities. Our Parks and Recreation has for a long time filled the gap for early VPK. So that just hasn't been an area that the public library has wanted to branch out into.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Okay. Interesting.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Paul?

COMMISSIONER SHEA: This is more informational. My wife did a fundraiser in the neighborhood to get books to go down to the hospital for the cards. And it was overwhelming. Do you take -- I mean, there's some great books out there that people need to get rid of. Would the library accept

that?

MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, sir, we do.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Okay.

MS. WILLIAMS: We accept donations on a regular basis. I think last year alone we accepted almost 10,000 donations. Now, obviously --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: We probably had a thousand.

MS. WILLIAMS: Yeah. Obviously, we can't use all of them. Unfortunately, the 1968 version of Encyclopedia Britannica is of no use, and we do actually recycle --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: I wanted to write that off. It's a classic.

MS. WILLIAMS: Yeah. Recycle that.

(Simultaneous crosstalk.)

MS. WILLIAMS: But books that are gently used or in excellent condition, and we use them as replacement copies, or we'll use them to add to our collection. So, yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Thank you. Any other questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Thank you, again --

MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: -- library.

And government buildings, and that includes Emergency Medical Services. So, Brian, are you up with government services and medical EMS?

I guess, did you say 62,000 employees, if we cut it in half, does he get to reduce the --

MR. BOSI: You'd probably cripple -- you'd probably cripple this economy if you cut it in half.

MR. DeLONY: Brian DeLony, Facilities director. I do have government buildings.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yes. Anybody, question-wise, with government buildings? I know there was a question last year concerning this building, in fact.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: It was cheaper to tear it down than to --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Cheaper to tear it down and build a new one.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: -- repair it.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: They're spending the money.

MR. DeLONY: I mean, we did do architectural and structural analysis on the building. I mean, based on the foundation and when this was built, you know, back in the late '70s and slowly added onto over the several years up into the '80s, the original building was only a four-story building, and then we built two more floors, and then we built two more floors.

I mean, a Facilities recommendation would be to build a new building that's much harder, because you can't go in and replace a foundation to a building.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Any questions of government --

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Is that on the table for discussion?

MR. DeLONY: There's been discussion on it. There's no funding currently for it.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Brian, you also oversee all of the leased facilities as well that we -- government offices like the Clerk and --

MR. DeLONY: So the different leased facilities, like the Clerk is -- most of the Clerk's facilities are actually in Collier County owned facilities. There is some stuff, like, in the Tax Collector, they're in leased facilities. And it depends on the lease on what we do or what we don't do as Facilities for them.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. But no issues that we have to concern ourselves with?

MR. DeLONY: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: All right. Thank you, Brian.

EMS has always been a big topic with our past chair. I really don't have any questions on EMS. It's always -- the biggest concern is level of service and response time.

Michelle, do you have a question?

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: No.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Anybody -- any concerns about EMS? I mean --

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Numbers look good.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Numbers, as far as growth and projection -- what's -- at one time you were still on U.S. 41. The site on Fiddler's Creek was going to become a EMS station. Is that still being programmed?

MR. GASTINEAU: Bruce Gastineau for Collier County EMS. I'm the chief.

There is a piece of property on the site of 951 and 41. I believe that now is --

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yes.

MR. GASTINEAU: -- with Greater Naples Fire Department. We did have a piece of property south on 41 on the right-hand side, and now we've sold that, and we're going to collocate with Greater Naples on the north side.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay.

MR. GASTINEAU: So what we've done is we've done a new plan now. Instead of building across the street with -- from another fire station, because their land is expensive, stations are expensive, we have now agreed to start collocating in each other's stations.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Anything you see we need to be concerned about from our perspective in -- as the land-use planners?

MR. GASTINEAU: Not at this time.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. Any questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Thank you. Sorry you had to sit here all day for this.

MR. GASTINEAU: That's okay. Have a wonderful day.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: And I think that's it, Mike, for the CIE. We just need a motion to approve and forward it to the Board with a recommendation of approval with any comments or suggestions that we have as a board. So I open it up to my fellow commissioners. Any comments?

COMMISSIONER SHEA: The only comment I have is to reiterate the one I had before is let's not -- let's not short our maintenance responsibilities at the expense of future major capital expenditures.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Yeah. I mean, the biggest -- deferred maintenance. They just keep on kicking it down the road, yeah.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Exactly, exactly.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Brian has addressed a lot. I mean, that's his biggest concern is they're addressing deferred maintenance. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: I know I've spoke about this before, and, Mike, you've actually pretty much tried to answer it. But at what point will there be a plan in place to say how we're going to come up with \$712 million over the next -- I believe it's only out five years, correct?

MR. BOSI: Correct. And I think what Mr. Johnson had said is they have already been directed to start to evaluate the parameters of the surtax.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Correct, but that was, like, 63 million.

MR. JOHNSON: No. That -- the 63 million was the commercial paper approved for stormwater at the last board meeting.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Oh, I apologize. I'm sorry.

MR. JOHNSON: So the overall funding for that program, the Board has directed us to look at two options: The stormwater utility option and potential surtax option. Keep in mind, surtax could also be used for other infrastructure like roads.

I will also say that roads does have a dedicated -- part of its funding is dedicated with gas tax. We just actually -- our only bond on that just matured this summer. So again, we took out a commercial line of paper on that for about \$50 million to get some of this started, and we'll look at financing options for that funding source as well in the future.

So the plans are being worked through. You're kind of seeing them in their infancy right now.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Okay. Because the capital improvement is 407-, and the

stormwater is 304-

MR. JOHNSON: Correct. So depending on the funding sources that are identified -- again, there's the ability to leverage that with a financial instrument or do -- or do as we do currently with stormwater, which is a pay-as-you-go funding element.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Okay. All right. Thank you.

MR. JOHNSON: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: With that, staff, do you have any closing comments or recommendations before we turn it -- open it up for comments for approval?

MR. BOSI: No recommendations other than the Board of County Commissioners is acutely aware of the revenue shortfall. And I know they are working with the County Manager's Office to identify individual solutions.

I don't believe that they've had conclusions to those discussions, so I can't give you the specific plan. But I know that those conversations between Ms. Patterson and the Board of County Commissioners are ongoing consistently. And I think just by her presence here, she's letting you know that this is something that she's definitely directly concerned with and taking an active role within to make sure that we get a solution, at least a plan that we can get behind.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. With that, any recommendations? Do I hear a motion to approve and forward to the Board with any specific recommendations?

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Motion to approve as presented to the Board.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: As presented. And a second?

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Second.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: With a recommendation.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Noting one item is Paul's comments in regards to --

MR. BOSI: To deferred maintenance, yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: -- the deferred maintenance.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: But also with a recommendation, I think, that they work really hard at getting at those unfunded projects rather than having to decide. Because it sure looks like, at least on the transportation side, we need every bit of them, and I'm guessing on the stormwater side as well.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Sure.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Okay. We have a motion and a second. I'll call the question. I'll call -- all in favor, say aye.

COMMISSIONER SHEA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHUMACHER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SPARRAZZA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER PETSCHER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER McLEOD: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: Any opposed, like sign.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCHMITT: That passes unanimously. I say "aye" as well, so it passes unanimously. Thank you.

And with that, we are adjourned. Thank you.

November 6, 2025

There being no further business for the good Of the County, the meeting was adjourned by order of the Chair at 2:16 p.m.

COLLIER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Joseph K. Schmitt

JOE SCHMITT, CHAIRMAN

These minutes approved by the Board on 11/6/2025, as presented X or a as corrected _____.

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED ON BEHALF OF FORT MYERS COURT REPORTING BY
TERRI L. LEWIS, RPR, FPR-C, COURT REPORTER AND NOTARY PUBLIC.