

**DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday, February 14, 2013**

**MEETING MINUTES**

The Monroe County Development Review Committee conducted a meeting on **Thursday, February 14, 2013**, beginning at 10:30 a.m. at the Marathon Government Center, 2nd floor, 2798 Overseas Highway, Marathon, Florida.

**CALL TO ORDER**

**ROLL CALL** by Gail Creech

**DRC MEMBERS**

Townsley Schwab, Senior Director of Planning and Environmental Resources	Present
Mike Roberts, Sr. Administrator, Environmental Resources	Present
Joe Haberman, Planning & Development Review Manager	Present

**STAFF**

Mayte Santamaria, Assistant Planning Director	Present
Steve Williams, Assistant County Attorney	Present
Mitch Harvey, Comprehensive Plan Manager	Present
Patricia Smith, Transportation Planning Manager	Present
Rich Jones, Senior Administrator, Marine Resources	Present
Rey Ortiz, Planning & Biological Plans Examiner Supervisor	Present
Tiffany Stankiewicz, Development Administrator	Present
Emily Schemper, Senior Planner	Present
Gail Creech, Planning Commission Coordinator	Present

**CHANGES TO THE AGENDA**

There were no changes to the agenda.

**MINUTES FOR APPROVAL**

There were no minutes for approval.

**MEETING**

Ms. Sonneborn introduced John Abbott, Division Director of Environmental Services for Keith & Schnars, as well as Debbie Love, who was present by telephone. Ms. Santamaria announced for the public that agendas and extra copies of the comp plan amendments were available on the tables for their use.

**Conservation and Coastal Management Element**

Page 1, Ms. Sonneborn stated there have been some slight changes, as well as taking away the 9J5 references and replacing it with 163. Ms. Kelsick from Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) commented that because Policy 201.1.2 was deleted because of Senate Bill

503 that was passed, one way around that is to require basically the criteria from the permit within the comp plan. Ms. Kelsick will send staff language in that regard. Mr. Roberts stated the last phrase of the goal “to ensure that air quality is maintained at the highest levels” is not necessary or, if it is, it should be put at the beginning of the sentence. Ms. Santamaria clarified for Mr. Roberts the statutory definition of “development order” was used in Policy 201.1.3

Page 2, Ms. Sonneborn stated this is a new goal. Some names of the agencies have been added and changed and there have been some deletions. Mr. Abbott explained most of the deletions had to do with the fact that at the time this was written the water quality protection program plan had not been written, and now that the plan is in existence a lot of this could be deleted.

Page 3, 4 and 5, Ms. Sonneborn stated this is a continuation of the deletion. There were no comments.

Page 6, Ms. Sonneborn stated this was an objective that has now been turned into a policy continuing under the objective on the previous pages. Mr. Roberts commented whether MPDS-type discharges should be included in this policy. Mr. Abbott clarified there is another policy for MPDS.

Page 7, Ms. Sonneborn stated this is an objective that has been turned into a continuation of the policies. Mr. Jones questioned the meaning of “opening of dead end canals” and suggested Rhonda Haag or Kevin Madok may want to comment to improve that language.

Page 8, Ms. Sonneborn stated Page 8 contains the objective and Page 9 contains the policies under this because Objective 202.4 on Page 9 was removed. Mr. Jones noted that Rebecca Jetton from DEO asked for clarity on the regulations in Objective 202.4. Mr. Jones cited the National Marine Sanctuary’s No Discharge Zone. Mr. Jones proposed the language “Monroe County shall support existing vessel discharge regulations, including the No Discharge Zone regulations of the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary” because they are not the only ones with regulations.

Page 9, Ms. Sonneborn again explained these policies are associated with the objective just discussed. Mr. Jones commented that Policy 202.4.1 looks like it is intended for vessels that are not at anchor, but are at marinas, even though it does not say that in the first part of the policy. Mr. Jones believes this policy indicates no live-boards can be at anchor anywhere in the Keys. Mr. Jones suggested including the language “docked vessels.” Ms. Kelsick agreed with using the language “docking facility” or “moored to land” to encompass them all. Mr. Williams pointed out that even the definition of “vessel” was changed by a decision out of a Supreme Court case in Palm Beach County and some changes may need to be made because of that. Ms. Sonneborn will coordinate with Erin Deady in this regard. Mr. Jones then commented that the County has a definition of “live-aboard” in the general code which is very different than the State’s relatively new definition and there is no definition in the glossary. Mr. Jones suggested a determination be made whether the State’s definition overrides the County’s. Mr. Williams noted that the U.S. Supreme Court definition of “vessel” and “floating structure” will override what the State statute says and a determination still needs to be made regarding which definition of “live-aboard” should be used. Mr. Jones commented that the word “live-aboard” can be taken

out, but the intent is if sewage is generated on a vessel, that sewage needs to be taken care of properly. Mr. Roberts agreed that Policy 202.4.1 applies only to non-anchored vessels at marinas. Mr. Jones encouraged staff to focus on the intent of the policy. Mr. Jones then commented that Policy 202.4.2 needs to add language to state that pump-out stations will be installed before getting a permit. Ms. Sonneborn will reword the policy to include that. Ms. Schemper suggested in Policy 202.4.1(2) stating “with at least ten slips or one live-aboard.” Mr. Jones proposed “ten or more slips or one live-aboard.” Mr. Jones then noted that Ms. Jetton had questioned how the County would ensure these marinas put in pump-outs. Mr. Jones recommended that staff draft some language to include a time in which to implement and determine what the infraction or violation would be. Harry Delashmutt suggested using the State’s Clean Marina Program as an example, which requires the marinas to self-certify on an annual basis. Naja Girard agreed that Policy 202.4.1 should be written to apply to anchored vessels. Ms. Girard suggested making these terms easily found in the glossary would be helpful.

Page 10, Mr. Jones noted that at the very top of Page 10 the sentence should state “shall be identified through the Marina Facility Survey or other best available data sources” because that survey is not complete. Mr. Roberts pointed out that the timing established in Policy 202.4.2 ½ is not consistent and it should be one year from notification. Mr. Jones then suggested in Policy 202.4.2 ½ on Page 9 the term “permit” should be replaced with “allow.”

Page 11, Mr. Jones stated he believes Policy 202.4.4 is intended to be applied towards mooring fields only, but it is not clear. Mr. Jones suggested adding “mooring fields” at the beginning of the policy. Mr. Jones commented it is unclear what Number 2 under Policy 202.4.4 means and it should be deleted. Mr. Jones noted that sanitation requirements, Number 3, can only be regulated by the Coast Guard and it should be deleted. Mr. Jones suggested using “best management practices” (BMPs) in Number 4 as opposed to “requirements.” Ms. Santamaria clarified that the specifics will be in the code and the comp plan guides what will be there. Mr. Jones will work on more specific language for this Policy 202.4.4 as opposed to deleting anything. Mr. Roberts noted that there are a lot of date-certain requirements in Policy 202.4.4 that may need to be reevaluated. Mr. Jones suggested the language “Monroe County shall consider developing a plan” in Policy 202.4.5. Ms. Santamaria recommended saying “Monroe County shall evaluate the need to develop a plan for providing pump-out facilities in County-owned locations.” Ms. Schemper proposed “pump-out facilities in County-owned facilities.” Mr. Delashmutt interjected the possibility of evaluating the locations of existing future public and private pump-out services. Mr. Jones pointed out that Policy 202.4.5 is about the County looking into the possible need to put pump-out facilities at County-owned facilities. Ms. Sonneborn noted that Policy 202.4.5 may require further edits.

Page 12, Ms. Sonneborn stated this page deletes most of the policies under Objective 202.5. Mr. Abbott clarified it is being replaced with a reference to the Clean Marina Program. Mr. Jones commented that it is unclear what procedures the County would develop based on encouraging a marina to use the BMPs by the State. Mr. Jones suggested deleting this objective and policy because there is nothing left in the objective that is worthwhile and it is not very integrated and the policy does not support the objective very well. Ms. Sonneborn clarified that this objective and related policies were revised to include only those related to water quality, permitting inspection and enforcement was deleted, and policies relating to pump-out facilities and live-

aboard were moved to Objective 202.4. Ms. Schemper pointed out that the pattern of the objectives under the goal is to reduce pollutant discharges into surface waters, but Objective 202.5.1 is so general that it does not say anything in addition to the other ones. Ms. Santamaria suggested this policy regarding BMPs can be moved to another location where it still talks about surface water. Ms. Kelsick suggested adding marinas that are redeveloping or expanding to Policy 202.5.1. Mr. Delashmutt strongly encouraged staff to provide this stand-alone policy for the Clean Marina Program because it is an incentive for marinas to get on the bandwagon with the BMPs.

Page 14, there were no comments.

Page 15, Ms. Sonneborn stated this is a deletion of Objective 202.7. There were no comments.

Page 16, Ms. Sonneborn stated this is an objective that deals with maintaining land development regulations and policies controlling pollutant discharges in surface water from dredge and fill activities. Ms. Kelsick suggested a definition of “public navigation channels” should be added. Ms. Girard requested a definition of “maintenance dredging” be added in the glossary.

Page 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25, Ms. Sonneborn stated these pages are deletions of objectives and policies. Ms. Santamaria commented the County is currently doing a canal study and Rhonda Haag may have comments on keeping portions of Page 24. Ms. Kelsick noted that Ms. Jetton does not want Policy 202.11.3 on Page 21 deleted and would rather have it revised to indicate continual coordination on mosquito spraying because it could affect water quality. Mr. Abbott pointed out that mosquito control objectives and policies were taken out because they were largely captured already in the sanctuary management plan.

Page 26, Ms. Sonneborn stated this relates to regional water management practices on the mainland. There were no comments.

Page 27, Ms. Sonneborn stated this page is just a continuation of those policies. There were no comments.

Page 28, Ms. Sonneborn stated this is a new goal and changes made here were for more clarification. Ms. Santamaria suggested deleting “As set forth in the Land Development Code” and begin the sentence “The open space requirement for mangroves shall be 100 percent.” Mr. Roberts asked Objective 203.1 be clarified by stating “Monroe County shall protect its mangrove wetlands by continuing to implement regulations,” and Policy 203.1.1 to read “the open space requirement for mangrove wetlands shall be 100 percent.”

Page 29, there were no comments.

Page 30, Ms. Sonneborn stated Objective 203.2 added “maintaining those regulations.” Mr. Jones suggested adding “shall not apply to public mooring fields” in Policy 203.2.1 because the County does not allow slips in private marinas over seagrass.

Page 31, Ms. Schemper recommended deleting “shall” from the middle of the top paragraph since it is not a County program and state “This program promotes user education related to.”

Page 32, Ms. Schemper pointed out the inconsistency of referring to “coral reefs” in the objective and “coral reef” in Policy 203.2.4. Ms. Sonneborn will change it to “coral reefs” in Policy 203.3.4.

Page 33, Ms. Sonneborn noted the colon should be removed after “Plan” in Number 3 and replaced by a period. Mr. Roberts believes specific actions should be included in the policy document as opposed to the blanket reference to a climate action plan for the reef system in Policy 203.3.5

Page 34, Ms. Santamaria requested the date be changed to July 2015 in Policy 203.4.1.

Page 35, Ms. Schemper suggested taking out the beginning of the second sentence in Policy 203.4.8 to read “promoting aquaculture which augments fisheries, limits stress on fisheries, and/or replaces depleted stock in the Florida Keys.”

Page 36, Mr. Jones suggested taking out “best management practices” in Policy 203.5.1 and replacing it with “recommendations and options.” Mr. Jones then suggested striking “which shall rate potential marina sites” from Policy 203.5.3

Page 37, Mr. Jones stated the County does not have a boater education program as stated in Policy 203.5.6. Ms. Sonneborn suggested replacing the word “maintain” with “support.”

Page 38, Mr. Jones commented he does not know of the Citizens Advisory Council for boating management mentioned in Policy 203.5.9. Ms. Santamaria stated staff has done searches for this committee and has not gotten any response and then suggested deleting this policy.

Pages 39 and 40, Ms. Sonneborn states these pages are a complete deletion. There were no comments.

Page 41, Ms. Kelsick commented that since the ADID policies in this element were deleted maybe there should be policies replacing them saying what KEYWEP is and how the County uses it. Mr. Roberts stated the references to KEYWEP are still in the comp plan. Mr. Roberts suggested using “may” in Objective 204.1 as opposed to “shall.” Ms. Santamaria noted that the term “may” does not work for an objective. Mr. Roberts then suggested Policy 204.1.1 should state “may” as opposed to “shall.”

Page 42, Mr. Roberts recommended the language “a wetlands restoration program” instead of “the wetlands restoration program” in Policy 204.1.2.

Page 43, Ms. Sonneborn stated this page is a complete deletion. There were no comments.

Page 44, Mr. Roberts suggested fixing the format of Number 2 of Policy 204.2.2 as well as including “or boat ramp.” Mr. Roberts then suggested removing the comma after “manmade” in

this same Number 2. Ms. Kelsick asked to add the word “undisturbed” in front of wetlands at the very beginning of the second Policy 204.2.1. Mr. Roberts agreed.

Page 45, Ms. Sonneborn noted the need to fix the formatting for Number 3. There were no comments.

Page 46, Ms. Santamaria pointed out to Ms. Kelsick that Policy 204.2.7 references KEYWEP. Ms. Kelsick noted that Ms. Jetton wanted to know if a definition for KEYWEP will be included in the Land Development Code. Ms. Santamaria explained it is defined within its own section.

Page 47, there were no comments.

Page 48, Ms. Sonneborn stated most of this page was deleted. Mr. Abbott clarified that a lot of this got consolidated with Objective 204.2 on Page 44. Ms. Santamaria asked to have all of the text put at the beginning when text is spread out. Ms. Schemper questioned “Penalty reviews” at the top of Page 47. Mr. Abbott clarified “reviews” should be “revenues.” Mr. Ortiz commented that Policy 204.2.11 does not flow. Ms. Sonneborn proposed “The County shall enforce its regulations pertaining to illegal dumping.”

Pages 49 and 50, there were no comments.

Page 51, Mr. Roberts commented there is no Tier III-A on Big Pine or No Name Key, so the reference to III-A needs to be deleted from Policy 205.1.1 Number 2. Ms. Stankiewicz pointed out the language in Number 3 that lands outside of Big Pine/No Name that are not designated Tier I shall be designated Tier III. Mr. Roberts replied these are tier policies that are not being changed at this time. Ms. Santamaria clarified at this time Volume A amendments are being processed and once all amendments have been reviewed and found effective staff will consider changing the comp plan relative to that because staff does not want to have competing appeals. This will also be looked at later in Goal 106 of the Future Land Use element. Naja Girard then commented that the enumerated criteria under Policy 205.1.1 do not include a mechanism for the public to bring staff information or to see a database of that information. Mr. Roberts replied there is no database that includes known sightings and known locations. Mr. Roberts explained that such a database could be problematic because as soon as the location of a threatened, endangered or rare species is identified in a public resource collectors have access to that information and will go and remove that species. Mr. Delashmutt asked if there is an effective mechanism to deal with habitat errors on GIS maps. Mr. Roberts replied the County does not have a policy or procedure for formal revision of the habitat data, but does have a policy that the County will look at those habitat layers and update them in conjunction with the EAR.

Pages 52, 53 and 54, there were no comments.

Page 55, Mr. Roberts noted Policy 205.2.9(2) states “when the there” and “the” needs to be deleted. Mr. Roberts then commented in that same sentence where it says “planting are on the” needs to be revised to say “planting area on the.” Ms. Kelsick asked why the Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI) is not referenced in Policy 205.2.8 or 295.2.9. Mr. Roberts explained there is nothing regulatory behind the FNAI. Ms. Kelsick asked what the “FWS” in Policy

205.2.8 Number 3 on Page 55 referred to. Mr. Roberts stated that reference should be the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Mr. Delashmutt suggested Policy 205.2.9 should read “avoid or minimize impacts on.” Mr. Roberts asked Ms. Sonneborn to research whether Policy 205.2.9 should end with “on the following plants” or “to the following plants.”

Page 56, Mr. Roberts asked to flag the reference to the 1985 habitat classification aerial photographs and the 1985 maps in Policy 205.2.12 because staff needs to determine whether or not to continue to keep this dated reference in place. Ms. Santamaria pointed out that the last sentence of the same policy is there because boundaries change and areas grow and shrink and staff does not want to be locked into a 1985 boundary. Mr. Roberts feels that using 1985 as a baseline should only be used to look for a loss to document.

Page 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64 and 65, there were no comments. Ms. Santamaria mentioned the beach/berm policies have been moved to another section.

Page 66, Ms. Sonneborn stated Goal 207 is a new goal. Ms. Girard commented the Policy 207.1.1 includes suitable habitat, but not information about actual use by actual threatened and endangered species. Mr. Roberts suggested adding “any endangered/threatened or protected species which is known to occur or for which potential suitable habitat.” Ms. Girard asked if staff has a bird rookery list as mentioned in Policy 207.1.2. Mr. Roberts explained that the County does not have a list and the deletion of the reference to the Protected Animal Species Map in Policy 207.1.2 leaves it flexible to allow this policy to apply if staff knows about or can find out about any bird rookery. Ms. Girard again commented that a mechanism for the public to bring information to staff would be a nice addition. Mr. Delashmutt pointed out that there is no mechanism or LDRs to protect species during development. Mr. Roberts responded the County has not been able to gain traction to include a mechanism for regulating state-listed species. Mr. Roberts explained the County uses habitat as a surrogate for the species throughout the code, the idea being if habitat is preserved, the species will be preserved.

Page 66, 67 and 68, there were no comments.

Pages 69, 70, 71 and 72, Ms. Sonneborn stated these pages have been deleted. Ms. Kelsick asked why the policies regarding the predation by free-roaming pets were deleted. Mr. Roberts explained a lot of it was deleted because of the dual coverage in the HCP and/or the species assessment guides, and some of it was deleted because the County does not have an Animal Control Department and some of these policies refer to that.

Pages 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79 and 80, there were no comments.

Page 81, Ms. Sonneborn stated the objective and Policy 207.9 starts out at the top of the page and picks back up again at the bottom of the page. Mr. Roberts commented that the intent of the policies on Page 81 was to delete the “by January 4, 1998” the County would develop the listed maps, not to delete protecting those nesting sites for those particular species. Mr. Roberts will review this page for clarification. Ms. Girard pointed out that Policy 207.9.7 calls for a list of bird rookeries and urged staff to make that list.

Page 82, there were no comments.

Page 83, Ms. Santamaria commented that Policy 207.10.3 referring to ROGO looks out of place. Ms. Sonneborn will look into that. Mr. Delashmutt wondered if Objective 207.10 should also include the habitat of the swallowtail butterfly. Mr. Roberts responded that is covered through the species assessment guides and through the biological opinion with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and through habitat protection. Larval support and nectaring plants are part of the species assessment guides. Mr. Delashmutt then questioned why only one habitat is mentioned in Policy 207.10.6. Mr. Roberts stated this is a carryover policy from the original comp plan and was not updated. Mr. Delashmutt suggested removing the one listed species and inserting “suitable species that support habitat for the swallowtail.” Ms. Santamaria proposed mirroring the next policy on Page 84 where it does not reference habitat species.

Page 84, there were no comments.

Page 85, Mr. Roberts commented the County currently does not do what is proposed in Policy 207.11.1 and suggested revising the language to state as available the County will provide that or will coordinate with U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and other natural resource agencies in the Keys to monitor populations. Ms. Santamaria suggested “Monroe County shall continue to request data from the periodic population counts of the Stock Island tree snail from U.S. Fish & Wildlife and other resource agencies” or “coordinate with to obtain.” Mr. Roberts pointed out to Ms. Kelsick the mention of coordination with mosquito control in Policy 207.11.2. Ms. Santamaria noted “FWS” should be changed to “USFWS” to be consistent throughout.

Page 86, there were no comments.

Page 87, Ms. Sonneborn stated this is a complete deletion. There were no comments.

Page 88, Ms. Kelsick commented that “DNR” in Policy 207.13.3 should be changed to “FDEP.”

Page 89 and 90, Mr. Roberts commented the “within one year” language in Objective 208.2 is unrealistic. Ms. Santamaria stated staff will look into that further.

Page 91, there was no comment.

Page 92, Ms. Schemper proposed for Policy 208.2.9 “No permit renewals for resource interaction shall be issued for uses that are nonconforming to the current Land Development Code.”

Pages 93 and 94, there were no comments.

Page 95, Ms. Sonneborn stated a lot of this is new. There were no comments.

Page 96, there were no comments.

Page 97, Mr. Harvey pointed out that Policy 209.11 relates to offshore islands and does not relate to the objective above it. Ms. Santamaria questioned whether an objective is missing on this page. Ms. Sonneborn will look into that.

Page 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105 and 106, there were no comments.

Page 107, Mr. Delashmatt asked if this would be the place in the comp plan that the County would include things that relate to conserving water rather than encouraging participation with FKAA. Ms. Santamaria explained that in the Future Land Use element new point scores have been proposed within ROGO for that type of use.

Page 108, there were no comments.

Page 109, Mr. Jones commented Objective 212.2 describes water dependent use not based on the definition of “water dependent use” in the glossary and questioned how a body of water is a use. Ms. Sonneborn will coordinate with Mr. Haberman to clean this up.

Page 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117 and 118, there were no comments.

Page 119, Mr. Jones commented that the surveys mentioned in Policy 212.4.2 have already been done. Ms. Santamaria proposed the language “shall maintain a survey” or “shall maintain a list of data.” Mr. Jones agreed.

Pages 120, 121 and 122, there were no comments.

Page 123, Mr. Jones commented the last sentence of Policy 212.5.5 should say “shall not apply to public mooring fields.”

Page 124, Mr. Jones commented the language of Policy 212.5.7 needs to be worked on and he will do that.

Pages 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135 and 136, there were no comments.

Page 137, Ms. Santamaria asked why Policy 215.2.3 was being deleted. Mr. Abbott explained this is the CBRS policy that got moved to another place. Mr. Harvey pointed out that Policy 215.1.1 on Page 135 still references 9J5. Ms. Kelsick noted on that same policy the Policy 301.1.1 referenced is just for a County road and suggested adding Policy 301.1.2, which also includes U.S. 1. Mr. Harvey asked why Number 6 of Policy 215.1.1 was being eliminated. Ms. Santamaria explained that was a typo. Ms. Sonneborn will put that back in.

Page 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147 and 148, there were no comments.

Page 149, Ms. Kelsick questioned why Policy 217.3.1 was deleted. Ms. Santamaria explained CHHA was never mapped previously and the definitions changed many times. A map has been

recently developed, but staff is not proposing negative points because it includes the entire county except along the right-of-way of U.S. 1.

Page 150, Ms. Sonneborn explained the double underlined without the strike-through means that language was deleted somewhere else and moved here. Mr. Abbott noted one of the two paragraphs needs to be deleted.

Page 151, Ms. Santamaria stated staff will look at this page and as NROGO exemptions are revised, the policies here will be revised accordingly.

Page 152, there were no comments.

A lunch recess was held from 12:53 p.m. to 2:01 p.m.

### **Recreation and Open Space Element**

Page 1, Ms. Santamaria noted in Policy 1201.1.1 “level of service” was changed to “recreational guidelines” and pointed out that the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) requested the level of service be changed, but remain in this item. Ms. Sonneborn will check into that. Ms. Love explained the reason this was changed was to get the conversation started about whether or not the level of service would be maintained and the numbers came from the technical document. Ms. Smith recommended crossing out “the basis for determining” on the third line of Policy 1201.1.1 and replacing it with “a guide for determining recreational needs.” Ms. Smith noted that some places in the document “Recreational Guidelines” sounds like guidelines and other places sounds like a regulatory requirement. Mr. Schwab pointed out that Objective 1201.1 refers to “advisory Recreational Guidelines” and switches to “Recreational Guidelines” further down. Ms. Love will change that to say “level of service and advisory Recreational Guidelines.” Ms. Smith then commented that this element seems to be geared more towards plants and animals than it is towards people and that the Recreation and Parks Advisory Committee is not outlined in this element or whether they are included in reviewing any of those guidelines. Ms. Santamaria replied that committee has reviewed the guidelines, but they are not addressed in the comp plan as a specific entity.

Page 2, Ms. Santamaria reiterated her comment to check for “level of service” versus “guidelines.” Ms. Schemper pointed out that Christine Hurley had requested to get rid of Policy 1201.1.5 at an earlier meeting.

Page 3, Ms. Smith asked to include a definition for ROSPA.

Page 4, there were no comments.

Page 5, Mr. Schwab commented that “federal” should be added to Policy 1201.2.6 as a funding source. Ms. Love will double-check the different sources.

Page 6, Ms. Sonneborn stated this page is blank.

Page 7, Ms. Smith commented that “park site plans” are referred to on Pages 7 and 8 and she believes a master plan is required for each park facility. Ms. Love explained it was requested during the EAR process to distinguish between the master plan and the actual site plan for each individual park. Mr. Schwab stated staff will look further into this. Mr. Harvey pointed out that the Monroe County Parks and Recreation master plan has never been adopted and is outdated.

Page 8, Ms. Smith reiterated her comments regarding the term “site plans” being used. Ms. Smith further commented that this page read like the Conservation element and should include what the recreational uses are going to be, where the people should be, not just the trees and water. Ms. Love replied that would be something to put in a park site plan or park master plan, not the comp plan. Ms. Santamaria asked Ms. Smith to work on language to submit in that regard.

Page 9, there were no comments.

Pages 10 and 11, Ms. Sonneborn states these pages are a full deletion. There were no comments.

Page 12, Mr. Schwab asked to have “handicapped and disabled” replaced in the first paragraph. Ms. Love suggested updating that to say “ADA compliant.” Mr. Schwab suggested “accessible facilities.”

Page 13, Mr. Schwab commented there is a “-“ at the beginning of the second sentence of Policy 1201.7.3 Mr. Schwab then commented the second sentence of that policy does not flow as well as it could by referring to “such groups.” Mr. Schwab will check into the “County design guidelines” referred to in Policy 1201.7.3

Page 14, Ms. Sonneborn stated this policy is blank.

Page 15, Ms. Smith asked why the original Policy 1201.8.2 was deleted. Ms. Sonneborn will look into the backup on that. Ms. Smith suggested the language can be generalized to say “Monroe County shall continue to coordinate with state and federal entities for the potential use of state and federal lands.”

Page 16, Ms. Smith noted that “Keys” should be added after “Florida” and before “Scenic” in Policy 1201.8.5.

Page 17, Ms. Smith was unclear as to Policy 1201.10.1. Ms. Love explained it continues on to the next page. Suggestions were made how to make the revisions easier to read.

Page 18, Mr. Schwab noted that “master plan” is used at the top of the page.

Page 19, there were no comments.

Page 20, Ms. Schemper pointed out that sometimes “maintenance plan” is used and sometimes the “maintenance master plan” is used. Ms. Love will double-check the title in the technical document and make it consistent.

Page 21, Mr. Schwab commented Objective 1201.12 should read “open spaces” as opposed to “open space.” Ms. Smith reiterated that it sounds like that should be in the Conservation element, not the Recreation element.

### **Intergovernmental Coordination Element**

Page 1, there were no comments.

Page 2, Ms. Santamaria noted that “May 2014” needs to be revised in Policy 1301.1.6.

Page 3, there were no comments.

Page 4, Ms. Santamaria noted the reference to May 1<sup>st</sup>, 2015 at the top of the page and the reference to May 2014 at the bottom of the page need to be revised to whatever staff determines it should be. Ms. Schemper pointed out that she saw a reference to May 2015 in the lat section. Ms. Sonneborn will do a word search to correct these.

Page 5, Mr. Schwab commented this page is difficult to read. Ms. Sonneborn stated the spacing is off with the track changes, but once it is all accepted it will be easier to follow.

Pages 6, 7 and 8, there were no comments.

Page 9, Ms. Smith suggested adding “and the Florida Department of Transportation” after FEDP in Policy 1301.4.11, as well as deleting “the designated corridor management entity.”

Page 10, Ms. Kelsick commented that the Department of Economic Opportunity and NAS-Key West should be added to Objective 1301.5. Ms. Santamaria agreed.

Page 11, there were no comments.

Page 12, Ms. Sonneborn stated this is a full deletion. There were no comments.

Page 13, Mr. Roberts questioned whether Monroe County is actually involved currently in what Objective 1301.7 states. Mr. Harvey replied this needs to be discussed as part of the County’s ten-year water supply in the Potable Water element. Mr. Schwab clarified that Monroe County does orchestrate this process. Mr. Roberts noted that “U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service” should be included in Policies 1301.7.3 and 1301.7.4.

Page 14, Mr. Jones commented that the Citizens Advisory Council is mentioned again in Policy 1301.7.7. Ms. Santamaria suggested deleting that council from the policy. Mr. Jones then commented that Policy 1301.7.7 should state “coordinate its boating impacts management activities with those of the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary” as opposed to “National Marine Sanctuary Management Plan.” Mr. Roberts suggested the second sentence in Policy 203.6.2 should not contain the word “shall” because the County cannot dictate what somebody else’s program is going to do. Ms. Sonneborn recommended the language “this program includes management strategies.”

Page 15, Ms. Santamaria noted the reference to the May 2014 date under Policy 1301.7.9.

Page 16, there were no comments.

Page 17, Ms. Santamaria questioned whether the Florida Keys Interagency Committee exists. Ms. Sonneborn replied that was contained in the previous plan. Ms. Santamaria proposed “Monroe County shall continue to solicit comments from” and offer comments to the list of agencies here.

Page 18, there were no comments.

Page 19, Ms. Sonneborn noted the need for the revision of the May 2014 date.

Page 20, Ms. Sonneborn stated this page is a deletion. There were no comments.

Page 21, there were no comments.

Page 22, Ms. Sonneborn stated this page is all deleted.

Page 23, Ms. Santamaria noted the May 2014 date in Policy 1303.1.4. Ms. Schemper suggested for the second sentence in Policy 13013.1.4 changing “Major Conditional Use application” to “Major Conditional Use permit” and deleting the word “applications” after “Future Land Use Map Amendment.”

### **Introduction**

Page 1, Mr. Jones commented that the second paragraph limits the Florida Keys to Monroe County, but they extend into Miami-Dade County, and suggested clarifying in the comp plan it is the Monroe County Florida Keys. Mr. Williams agreed it should be described as the Monroe County Florida Keys. Ms. Sonneborn proposed “the Florida Keys, that are within Monroe County, are a chain of islands that are connected.” Mr. Schwab agreed. Mr. Roberts suggested “The significant environment” in the third paragraph should be changed to “The sensitive environment.”

Page 2, there were no comments.

Page 3, Mr. Roberts commented that the first full paragraph seems awkward. Ms. Santamaria stated it is verbatim from the Florida Administrative Rule.

Page 4, Ms. Love stated this is verbatim from the Rule as well. Mr. Williams noted this page includes dates that have already expired. Ms. Santamaria explained it just appears in the introduction, not in a policy or anything else.

Page 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9, there were no comments.

Page General, Mr. Roberts commented that the reference to “DCA” in Policy 5 needs to be changed to “DEO.” Mr. Haberman pointed out that the policies under General are misnumbered.

### **Ports, Aviation and Related Facilities Element**

Pages 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10, there were no comments.

Page 11, Mr. Harvey commented that Policies 502.1.1 and 502.1.2 are almost the same and should possibly be combined. Ms. Santamaria stated the intent of these policies got lost and these are mirrored in the Livable CommuniKeys Plans for the area originally mentioned in the policies. Ms. Santamaria said staff will work on these policies. Mr. Roberts noted that the last sentence of Policy 502.1.3 states “and assisting private business whenever possible.” Mr. Roberts questioned in what context the County would assist. Ms. Santamaria suggested deleting that last clause and end the sentence at “sources.” Ms. Santamaria clarified the County’s one port is Safe Harbor on Stock Island. Ms. Santamaria confirmed for Mr. Roberts that Policy 502.1.5 is still valid.

Page 12, Ms. Sonneborn noted the need to fix the date in Policy 502.1.6.

Page 13, there were no comments.

Page 14, Ms. Sonneborn explained Policy 502.3.2 is highlighted to indicate Keith & Schnars is waiting on some pending word back from staff. Ms. Santamaria stated Kevin Wilson is currently looking into this.

Page 15, there were no comments.

Pages 16 and 17, Ms. Sonneborn stated these pages are full deletions. There were no comments.

### **Capital Improvement Element**

Page 1, Mr. Harvey commented the word “ranked” should be eliminated from Policy 1401.12 because the County does not rank priorities.

Page 2, there were no comments.

Page 3, Mr. Harvey suggested deleting the date January 4, 1997 in Policy 1401.2.1 and “shall adopt” should be changed to “shall maintain.” Ms. Santamaria recommended deleting Policy 1401.2.1 because the objective above already says that the County will limit expenditures and it describes the situations where funds could be expended. Mr. Roberts commented that sea level rise and climate change needs to be incorporated into the Capital Improvement element. Ms. Sonneborn stated once the Energy section is finalized it will be incorporated.

Page 4, there were no comments.

Page 5, Ms. Santamaria mentioned that Policy 301.1.2 should be referenced along with Policy 301.1.1 under Policy 1401.4.1.

Page 6 and 7, there were no comments.

Page 8, Mr. Harvey recommended “Concurrency Management Report” should be replaced by “Facilities Capacity Report” in Subsection 3 of Policy 1401.4.9.

Page 9, Ms. Santamaria suggested “will not exceed either the segment or overall reserve capacity” be deleted in Subsection 5 and replaced with “will not exceed the level of service for U.S. 1 as determined by.” Ms. Love commented that the Park section needs to be reviewed since level of service is being maintained. Mr. Roberts commented that under Subsection 4 the language needs to be modified to state if a permit is required from South Florida Water Management District it must be obtained prior to the concurrency determination or their drainage plans must be consistent with Monroe County storm water management requirements. Ms. Sonneborn noted she will work further with staff on that.

Pages 10 and 11, there were no comments.

Page 12, Ms. Schemper questioned the use of “Land Development Review.” Mr. Haberman suggested changing that to “development review.”

#### **Cultural Resources Element**

Ms. Sonneborn explained the Cultural Resources Element was deleted in its entirety. Ms. Love pointed out that the BOCC during the EAR process agreed this particular element should be deleted.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Development Review Committee meeting was adjourned at 3:16 p.m.