The Board of County Commissioners held a Work Shop on February 24, 2015.

I. CALL TO ORDER 10:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Arrived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juril &quot;Buddy&quot; Mansfield</td>
<td>County Commissioner, District 1</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Selph</td>
<td>County Commissioner, District 2</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel Quave</td>
<td>County Commissioner, District 3</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elton Langford</td>
<td>County Commissioner, District 4</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Miller</td>
<td>County Commissioner, District 5</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandy Hines</td>
<td>County Administrator</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Cookingham</td>
<td>Planning Manager</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Hernandez</td>
<td>Compliance Director</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Taylor</td>
<td>Public Safety Chief</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauri Terry</td>
<td>Office Manager</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Thompson</td>
<td>Transcriptionist</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff Will Wise</td>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie Miller</td>
<td>Utilities Director</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Conn</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. DISCUSSION

**Development Processes, Impacts and Related Considerations**

Don Conn commented this is for the Board to discuss matters openly regarding growth in the county and the impacts. This is not to discuss Sonoma Reserve. He advised the Board to not allow discussion relating to this project.

Commissioner Miller commented that as he looks towards the future and what is potentially coming; he doesn't want to regret anything. He wants to communicate options. The law allows public comment but this is more for the Board to discuss matters. He would like development to be positive. Chairman Quave commented we need this Workshop but on the agenda tonight there is a Quasi Judicial matter and cannot consider anything regarding that matter. Please keep comments brief.

Mandy introduced Pat Steed with the Central Florida Regional Planning Council (CFRPC). She is very well versed in transportation, development and growth.

Pat Steed gave an overview of growth and traffic impacts. There has been significant growth in our region. DeSoto had 8.24% over a 10 year span which equates to .8% annually. Annual percentage change for Hardee County was .3%; Highlands County 1.3%; Okeechobee 1.1%; Polk County 2.4%; Glades County 2.2% and Hendry County .8%. These seven counties are all a part of the Heartland 2060 Initiative and all had a 2% growth rate.

During the peak in 2005-2007, the growth rate statewide was approximately 3% per year. Moving forward, the state forecast is approximately 1.5% per year. This will not be the same in every county. Miami- Dade County is growing at a more rapid pace.

We start looking at how growth occurs over time. The forecast of today and 2060 sees growth in all areas of our region and in DeSoto County. The areas in which DeSoto County has growth is east of Hwy. 70 and the southwest part of the county.

Employment growth is also a concern.

Comm. Miller questioned the areas of jobs.
Pat Steed continued with Example Residential Subdivision Development. All types of land develop over time. Our land has some unique characteristics. Low density residential development was discussed. When looking at land and what is developable, wetlands are considered and can only be minimally impacted. The wetland area are generally removed.

Commissioner Selph questioned mitigation re: wetlands. Pat commented it involves the quality of the wetlands and where they are located. It is very situational and quality of those wetlands driven as to what the mitigation for those are. There is no one answer. Chairman Quave asked for a number. Pat responded 1-1 or 1-20; it depends on the location and type of wetlands.

Commissioner Selph commented we are land locked and there have been many things developed on the coast that were not mitigated 1-20 or 1-10. The Rancher is not utilizing the wetlands other than the capture of water and should possibly be paying that owner for the capture. His point is he hopes it is not 1-5 or 1-8; higher numbers.

Chairman Quave questioned density and who designates? Pat commented the County and their Comprehensive Plan.

Flood plains or flood ways are also a concern that impact developable land. Plans have to allow for infrastructure of the site such as stormwater facilities as well as rights-of-way including easements for utilities. If you take the net density of 3.5 units per acre; of that are 143 acres that you can actually develop, there will be a potential of 501 dwelling units. If there is gross density that allows a clustering or transfer of density from other areas of the site that cannot be developed to the areas of the site that you can; then there is a possibility of 1698 dwelling units.

Chairman Quave questioned what are some of the agencies that control where the dwellings can be built and how many?

Pat replied the Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Regulations of the county are what determines the number of units. Regulations from other agencies are not what set the number of units.

Commissioner Miller commented regarding land use category. Our county is per gross acre.

Pat commented that max density is when the units are confined to a very small area.

Chairman Quave questioned how many years would it take to get to a maximum?

Pat commented it is rare for a residential development to occur all at one time. Further discussion ensued. Over time there is much more measured development. Further discussion ensued.

Subdivision approval process

Potential roadway impacts - 15,000 trips capacity; already 8,000 trips on roadway. Future years discussed. Traffic occurs over time and must be planned for.

Commissioner Mansfield questioned the decreased level of service on the roadway. He feels improvements should be done now so we don't reach the red. Pat commented it takes 7 or more years to get a major transportation project through the state plan.

Commissioner Miller commented if development exceeds the road, the cumulative number puts the condition in yellow or red; how do we deal with that situation?

Pat commented that you try to plan ahead of time so that they all come together at the same time.

Don Conn questioned when is it addressed? At what time will the Board be involved, and will they have the opportunity at some point to be involved in concurrency. Further discussion ensued.

Chairman Quave commented the concurrency plan allows for a certain number then it's prohibited until the road meets the requirements.

Tom Cookingham commented there are other ways to manage traffic; keep traffic moving and managing or preventing accidents; traffic management.

Commissioner Miller commented if a Developer comes in with a plan and the Board approves; at some point will there be another chance to look at improvements?

Pat commented yes, it will be metered and will be done through permits.

Tom Cookingham commented it will be platted, meeting concurrency, traffic study, impact level of
service. Further discussion ensued.
Chairman Quave questioned who sets up concurrency plans?
Commissioner Selph questioned the area above and below the area in question? Pat commented there will be a study done to include all roads that will be used involving the development.
Mandy Hines commented regarding the level of service. When traffic studies are done, they are not considered failing until they fall below the level of service. This is one or maybe more Workshops to discuss development.
Pat commented level of service is measured daily as well as other factors such as peak hours, seasonal and directional. Level of service is mostly based on suburban studies. Level of service "D" or better is a good level.
Commissioner Miller is concerned for immediate future; and read section of Comprehensive Plan. The LDR compliments the Comprehensive Plan. How do we deal with the cost factors that are coming? Look at all options.
Commissioner Selph commented regarding population and believes property rights come into consideration.
Further discussion ensued.
Chairman Quave would like to see a portion of services on the developer because they are causing the demand for these services. He feels it is better to have land set aside for development rather that randomly all over the place. He is not in favor of a sprawl but to pay for the infrastructure of police and other services will come from taxes.
Further discussion ensued regarding services in the far south part of the county.
Mr. Cookingham feels our Comprehensive Plan is outdated. We need Plan that fits the growth we would like to do.
Commissioner Langford commented he was elected just before the Comprehensive Plan was finished. At first there was density in every corner of the county. The density was based around utilities and feels that is where it should be. The Wastewater Treatment Plant is paid for and the land was a gift from a Developer because they wanted to develop here. Further discussion ensued regarding impact fees and how they are broken down. He feels the Developers need to take the burden and take it off the taxpayers.
Commissioner Mansfield commented the Comprehensive Plan and LDRs need to run in harmony and ours does not. He would like CFRPC look at the Comprehensive Plan and suggest changes. He feels the burden should be on the Developer and make sure everything is in place before things are built. Further comments ensued regarding infrastructure.
Commissioner Selph gave a scenario. Is there a legal issue?
Pat Steed explained proportionate share and proportionate share ordinances. Someone has to pay up front or pay the difference. There are mechanisms to put that in place and how to distribute the costs. There is always a piece not paid for that comes back to government. There can be a specific plan for DeSoto County.
Mandy Hines commented we have to be realistic on the distribution of the cost. There needs to be a balance that will still have an impact on all services.
Commissioner Langford commented CFRPC is very knowledgeable and would like them to review the County's Comp Plan.
Commissioner Miller commented that he appreciates Commissioner Langford's comments. It is all a growing experience and it is imperative we do the best we can with what is coming. Some things should have been done differently in the past. He was seeking guidance from fellow Board members. We need a vision to implement something that will soften the impact.
Chairman Quave would like to staff to look into concurrency and proportionate share.

Karen Gary commented Nocatee Elementary is at capacity. Feels we should work together and work
with Developers. She urged the Board to work with the School Board. Commissioner Miller commented she is a factor in the decisions. How would Dr. Gary address the issues at hand?

Further discussion ensued regarding students going to school in other counties. Dr. Gary commented there is funding available to build new schools. There is funding for each student and if that student goes to school in another county then those funds follow that student.

Joanna Drinkwater commented on the changes that are affecting her neighborhood. Further discussion ensued regarding the negative effects of the developments on her neighborhood. Look at problems to solve and big expenses.

Judy Thompson is concerned about King's Highway and feels it is a level D now. She feels it is a dangerous road and there are many accidents as it is. The increased traffic will destroy the roads. She asked the Board if it is possible to put a moratorium on development until the Comprehensive Plan is fixed? She questioned if concurrency helps manage growth?

Mr. Drinkwater (handout) discussed the impact of the FEMA flood zones. We must ensure that future growth and the PUD are compatible with the Deep Creek watershed. Flood insurance premiums will be more than doubled.

Bonnie Klott commented regarding an event that happened in 2011; automatic aide agreement. Fire code was changed to a 10 and resulted in fire insurance to increase. The proposed development will cause a need for increased services.

Joe Forte commented he lives in Charlotte County and his property borders DeSoto County. Feels there is not enough information given on engineered plans to make a decision. He suggested the Board ask for more detail before something is approved and have a Citizen Advisory Committee. He questioned Pat Steed regarding wet lands.

George Witkevitz advised more traffic study information regarding what is happening on Hwy 17. He believes more traffic is coming down Hwy 17 and ending up on CR 769. He also suggested for all future developments doing regional impacts. Look at the big picture and start with Sonoma tonight.

Lee Dunn commented this is the best meeting he has ever attended. Fair and balanced. When it comes to growth, there is opportunity. How much will the whole county benefit? Form a committee that could offer ideas for growth.

Kathy Pittman commented regarding development on Lakeside Drive and the damage done to the road. Further commented regarding a lawsuit due to long periods of emergency services and cannot get any help for emergencies. Big developments look for a return.

John Super commented the Board should look at the Comprehensive Plan and the zoning applications. Zoning is nonconforming. Further comments regarding density. LDRs do not reflect the Comp. Plan.

Commissioner Langford commented regarding Comprehensive Plan and people wanted to maximize use of their property.

Further discussion ensued.
Adjourned at 12:34 pm