



City of Naples

Workshop Meeting Feb. 26, 1986

City Council Chambers
735 Eighth Street South
Naples, Florida 33940

-SUBJECT-	Page
<u>DISCUSSION OF CONDUCT OF MEETINGS</u>	1
<u>DISCUSSION AND PRESENTATION BY THE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION CONCERNING GROWTH AND TRANSPORTATION NEEDS IN COLLIER COUNTY AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE CITY OF NAPLES</u>	1&2
<u>DISCUSSION OF GENERAL ITEMS AND CALENDAR OF MEETINGS FOR MARCH AND APRIL</u>	3



Mayor Putzell called the meeting to order and presided as Chairman.

ROLL CALL: Present: Edwin J. Putzell, Jr. ITEM 2
Mayor
Kim Anderson-McDonald
William E. Barnett
William F. Bledsoe
Alden R. Crawford, Jr.
Lyle S. Richardson
Councilmen

Absent: John T. Graver
Councilman

Also present:

Franklin C. Jones, City Manager	Christopher L. Holley, Community Services Director
David W. Rynders, City Attorney	Stewart K. Unangst, Purchasing Agent
Mark W. Wiltsie, Assistant City Manager	Ellen P. Weigand, Deputy Clerk
Roger J. Barry, Community Development Director	Steven R. Ball, Chief Planner
Gerald L. Gronvold, City Engineer	James L. Chaffee Utilities Director
Steven C. Brown, Personnel Director	Frank W. Hanley Finance Director
Paul C. Reble Police Chief	Paul A. Reneau, Equipment Management Director
George T. Smith Assistant Fire Chief	

See Supplemental Attendance list - Attachment #1

DISCUSSION OF CONDUCT OF MEETINGS.
Requested by Mayor Putzell.

ITEM 1

Mayor Putzell ruled that speakers who wished to address Council at Workshop meetings were to use the sign-in slips to register with the clerk. He also stated there would be a seven minute limitation with a warning after six minutes. He noted that several people spoke more than once at the last meeting and that he would not permit this in the future unless the speaker had something new to present. He also suggested that Council requests to have items from the consent agenda discussed separately. *It was the consensus of Council to follow this practice.

DISCUSSION AND PRESENTATION BY THE METROPOLITAN
PLANNING ORGANIZATION CONCERNING GROWTH AND
TRANSPORTATION NEEDS IN COLLIER COUNTY AND
THEIR IMPACT ON THE CITY OF NAPLES.
Requested by Councilman Richardson

ITEM 2

Mr. Richardson reviewed the developments now under construction and several that were in the planning stages and the impact they would have traffic in the Naples and Collier County. He distributed several pages of figures on projected growth (Attachment #2). He also emphasized "hot spots" on U.S. 41 within the City of Naples; i.e., from Pine Ridge Road to DeVoe Cadillac; the Coastland Boulevard intersection; the "Four Corners"; and the Gordon River bridges. He noted the presence of Jeff Perry, coordinator of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) at the County. Mr. Richardson reviewed Table 6 (Attachment #3) which showed population projections for the area. He pointed out that the City's percentage of population would become smaller as the surrounding areas continued to increase. A development planned by Collier Development, he said, would house more people than Pelican Bay. He displayed a map showing areas of projected

COUNCIL MEMBERS	M O T I O N	S E C O N D	VOTE		A B S E N T
			Y E S	N O	

* AS AMENDED - 04/02/86 - Mayor Putzell stated his ruling was to have Council approve requests for separate discussion of Consent Agenda items.

COUNCIL MEMBERS

O T E
I C O
O N Y
N D S
E N
S O T

DISCUSSION OF GENERAL ITEMS AND CALENDAR OF MEETINGS FOR MARCH AND APRIL. ITEM 3
Requested by City Manager

City Manager Jones distributed a suggested calendar of meetings (Attachment #6). He also noted that Finance Director Hanley would later in this meeting be reviewing for Council the background of how utility rates are established. It was the consensus of a majority of Council not to have a morning workshop meeting the day a Regular Meeting is scheduled for the evening. Mayor Putzell suggested scheduling the workshop on the Comprehensive Plan on March 26 and a discussion of the City-County Utility agreements on April 9. City Manager Jones said he may have to put on the March 19 Regular Meeting agenda a briefing of the wastewater treatment plant expansion project because a pending contract will be awarded for the effluent reuse system. He suggested a discussion of six-laning U.S. 41 at the March 26 workshop along with the Comprehensive Plan. In response to Mr. Bledsoe's query about discussion of long term objectives, City Manager Jones explained that the N.E.A.T. (Naples-Effective Administration through Teamwork) sessions covered team building and goal setting. Mr. Bledsoe again referred to discussion of the noise problem at the airport; and Mayor Putzell noted the Gordon Pass situation and the need for a long-term solution in that regard.

City Manager Jones advised Council that the staff was working on programs to overcome negative perceptions by the public concerning city government and invited Council members to make suggestions. Mr. Barnett mentioned a weekly sheet the City Manager's office had put out in the past. In response to a question from the Mayor, City Manager Jones said that the staff was intending to place a copy of the Council packet in the public library.

*** **

BREAK: Recessed - 10:22 a.m. Reconvened - 10:30 a.m.
The same members of Council were present.

*** **
Finance Director Hanley reviewed the information in his memo dated February 26, 1986 (Attachment #7) which outlined the water/sewer rates and methodology.

*** **

ADOURN: 10:58 a.m.

Edwin J. Putzell, Jr.

Janet Cason
City Clerk

Ellen P. Weigand
Deputy Clerk

These minutes of the Naples City Council approved APR 2 1986

Jeff Perry, Collier County Metropolitan Planning Organization Coordinator

Charles Andrews

Harry Rothchild

News Media

Brian Grinonneau, WNOG
Gary Arnold, WEVU TV-26

Carl Loveday, TV-9

Chuck Curry, Naples Daily News

Other interested citizens and visitors.

City Manager Jones distributed a suggested calendar of meetings (Attachment #6). He also noted that Finance Director Hanley would like to see this meeting be reviewed for Council. The City Manager of Collier County is not to have a meeting with the Mayor and Council on the day a regular meeting is scheduled for the afternoon. Mayor Patrick suggested scheduling the meeting on the morning of March 28 and a discussion of the project. Mr. Patrick also suggested scheduling the meeting on the afternoon of March 28 and a discussion of the project. Mr. Patrick also suggested scheduling the meeting on the morning of March 28 and a discussion of the project. Mr. Patrick also suggested scheduling the meeting on the afternoon of March 28 and a discussion of the project.

Finance Director Hanley reviewed the information in his memo dated February 26, 1988 (Attachment #7) which outlined the water/sewer rates and methodology.

RECORDED - 10:35 a.m. RECOVERED - 10:35 a.m.
The same members of Council were present.

APR 2 1988

These minutes of the Naples City Council approved

Mayor Patrick

Deputy Clerk

TABLE 7

PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS IN COLLIER COUNTY

PETITION NUMBER	NAME	COMMUNITY	LOCATION	SIZE (ACRES)	COMM'L	RV'S	NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS BY TYPE		
							IND	SF	MF
R-81-27	AMERICAN LUTHERN CHURCH	SN	16, T50-R26	6.00			12	14	26
R-82-11	AUDOBON COUNTRY CLUB	NN	5, 7, 8, T48-R25	486.00	15.30		31	644	675
R-81-18	BAREFOOT BEACH CONDO	NN	6, T48-R25	9.15				220	220
R-80-39	BAY FOREST	NN	8, T48-R25	124.00				697	697
R-75-44	BERKSHIRE LAKES (DRI-82-1)	GG	5, T50-R26&32-33/49-26	1093.00	42.50		335	4200	4535
R-84-12	BRIARWOOD	CN	31, T49-R26	210.00	16.00		395	205	600
*R-84-35	CHESHIRE ARMS APTS.	GG	GG UN 2, BK 70, LOTS 6-15	5.00				60	60
R-79-45	COLLIER PUD	EN	11, 12, 13-T50-R26	20.10	20.10			100	100
R-81-13	CRESCENT LAKES	CN	34, T49-R25	52.00	52.00			64	125
R-79-41	CRYSTAL LAKE	NN	25, T48-R25	38.00	3.60		61	184	184
R-84-21	CRYSTAL LAKE	EN	14, T50-R25	11.50					0
R-80-42	CYPRESS HEAD	RE	26, T48-R26	150.00	3.70	490	200	540	740
R-84-23	E NAPLES COMM PARK	NN	9, 10, T48-R25	200.00					
R-80-38	EAGLE CREEK	EN	24, T50-R25	41.00					
R-84-29	EASTRIDGE	SN	3, 4, T51-R26	284.00				740	740
R-81-28	EMERALD LAKES (R-82-27)	GG	4, T50-R26	83.70			78	340	418
R-82-18	FALLS OF NAPLES	NN	2, T49-R25	532.00			71	1333	1404
R-83-17	FORD TEST CENTER	CN	14, T49-R25	36.80	11.22	530.00		220	220
R-76-15	FOREST LAKE HOMES	RFP	22, 27, 34, T49-R28	530.00			182		182
R-81-17	FOXFIRE	CN	14, T49-R25	64.60			200	725	925
R-82-23	FP&L	EN	6, T50-R26	318.50					0
R-84-06	GOLDEN GATE VILLAS	RE	NW CNR SR951&15TH AV SW	12.00	12.00			288	288
R-83-04	GREEN BLVD.	GG	GG U 2, BLK. 16	18.00				912	912
R-83-14	GREEN HERON (DRI-83-1)	GG	GG U2, PT1&U4, PT1	83.45				1184	1184
R-81-16	GREEN TREE CENTER	GG	33, T49-R26	221.00	5.00			86	86
R-81-11	HAWAIIAN VILLAGE	NN	26, T48-R25	40.00	27.28			57	65
R-82-08	HAWK'S NEST	EN	LELY TROP. EST BLK 17	5.42			8	232	232
R-83-12	HERON LAKE	NN	8, T48-R25	41.00				292	292
R-80-20	HIDEWAY BEACH	GG	33, T49-R26	101.52			285	394	661
R-80-08	HOPKINS ENTRY LEVEL HF	MA	5, 6, 7, T52-R26	305.00			267	160	160
R-82-25	IMPERIAL LAKES	EN	N.G. TR. CO. L.F. LOT30	10.00				430	430
R-81-10	IMPERIAL WEST	NN	15, T48-R25	78.00				489	489
		NN	15, T48-R25	98.00					

PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS IN COLLIER COUNTY

PETITION NUMBER	NAME	COMMUNITY	LOCATION	SIZE (ACRES)	COMM'L	RV'S	NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS BY TYPE		
							IND	SF	HF
R-80-24	KING'S LAKE	EN	7, T50-R26	311.00	10.15		360	840	1200
R-82-16	KREHLING INDUSTRIES	NN	15, T48-R25	15.26		15.26	44	442	486
R-84-32	LAGO VERDE	EN	18, T50-R26	121.61				469	469
R-83-02	LAKE AVALON	EN	13, T50-R25	126.00	4.00		132	775	907
*R-84-48	LAKE SHORE	NN	2, T49-R25	194.00			499	499	499
R-77-19	LELY BAREFOOT BEACH	NN	5, 8, T48-R25	285.00			468	647	1115
R-74-13	LELY COUNTRY CLUB	SN	19, 20, 21-T50-R26	445.00					
R-81-30	LELY PALMS OF NAPLES	SN	21, T50-R26	23.50	HEALT CARE FAC		1000	9000	10000
*R-84-20	LELY RESORT (DRI-84-3C)	SN	21, 22, 27, 28, 33, 34, T50-R26	2628.50	114.00			109	109
R-79-20	LITTLE HICKORY BAY	NN	5, T48-R25	24.00				404	404
R-84-46	LOCH LOUISE (R-84-19)	SN	7, T50-R26	101.00			743	13757	14500
R-84-07	MARCO SHORES (DRI-84-1)	RFP	UN. 30/KEY MARCO	1857.00	70.60			1980	1980
R-80-40	MARCO SHORES COUNTRY CLUB	RFP	26, 27, 28, T51-R26	321.00	3.20			66	66
R-84-28	MICELI PUD	SN	29, T50-R26	8.70	2.80		20	394	414
R-78-34	MOORINGS PARK	CN	15, T49-R25	82.90			61	45	61
R-82-28	MOORINGS PARK ESTATES	CN	15, T49-R25	26.76				45	45
R-80-33	MYRTLE WOODS	SN	MYRTLE COVE BK A, L23-27	5.60	1.79		93	423	516
R-81-24	NAPLES BATH & TENNIS CLUB	CN	14, T49-R25	153.70				84	84
R-84-41	ORANGE BLOSSOM	NN	1, T49-R25	11.80				3816	3816
R-78-07	PARK SHORE UNITS 2 & 5	CN	16, T49-R25	244.00	7.10		185	2225	2410
*R-84-24	PARKLANDS (DRI-84-4C)	RE	E 1/2 8 & 9, T48-R26	965.40					
R-81-29	PAVILLION	NN	33, T48-R25	20.99	20.99				
R-84-16	PAVILLION (ADDITION)	NN	33, T48-R25	3.50	3.50				
R-76-31	PELICAN BAY	NN	32, 34-48-2564, 5, 8, 9-49-25	2104.00	99.00		600	9000	9600
*R-84-25	PINE AIR PUD/DRI	NN	11, T49-R25	148.90	148.90				
R-80-08	PINEBROOK LAKE	EN	N.G.T.CO.L.F.LOT104	10.00				160	160
R-81-02	POINT MARCO	MA	19, 20, T52-R26	29.90				176	176
R-83-29	PRINCESS PARK	NN	1, T49-R25	11.33	REC				
R-82-20	QUAIL 2	RE	20, T48-R26	194.34	39.50			388	388
R-82-29	RETREAT (CYPRESS LAKES)	NN	9, T48-R25	208.00				740	740
R-81-03	RIVERBEND	SN	9, T51-R26	29.00			346	78	78
R-78-20	RIVERIA GOLF ESTATES	SN	17, 18, T50-R26	93.90				171	171
R-82-06	SABAL LAKES	GG	4, T50-R26	42.90			23	579	602
R-82-03	SHADOWOOD	SN	16, T50-R26	175.30	10.30			336	336
R-79-46	SHERWOOD PARK	GG	34, T49-R26	79.50				96	96
R-81-25	SOUTHERN PROPERTIES	EN	1, T50-R25	9.60					

PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS IN COLLIER COUNTY

PETITION NUMBER	NAME	COMMUNITY	LOCATION	SIZE (ACRES)	COMM'L	RV'S	IND	SF	NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS BY TYPE			
									MF	TOTAL		
R-83-18	TOLLGATE (DRI-83-2C)	RE	35, T49-R26	70.00	70.00							
R-78-04	TRAIL DRIVE IN	NN	NAPLES PARK BK 1	5.00	5.00							
R-79-34	TREE TOPS	SN	32, T50-R26	19.30	4.13				115			115
R-80-10	VICTORIA FALLS (PATTISON)	SN	33, T50-R26	25.00					157			157
R-82-26	VILLAGE PLACE	NN	9, T48-R25	72.50					406			406
*R-84-11C	VINCENTIAN PUD	SN	32, T50-R26	30.70					180			180
	VINEYARDS (DRI-84-2) PART	NN	1/49-25&5, 6, 8/49-26	1925.00	73.30			3071	3907			6978
	VINEYARDS (DRI-84-2) PART	RE		666.70		43.00						235
R-76-22	WARREN BROTHERS	RFP	16, T49-R27	40.87					235			0
R-82-10	WATERGLADES	NN	8, T48-R25	20.00	20.00							650
R-83-03	WESTVIEW PLAZA	EN	1, T50-R25	148.26	2.50				650			377
R-82-33	WIGGINS BAY	NN	16, T48-R25	218.00	10.69			2	375			710
R-73-24	WILDERNESS	CN	22&27, T49-R25	60.00	3.00				90			90
R-80-41	WILDWOOD EST.	GG	4, T50-R26	14.60					749			749
R-81-22	WILLOUGHBY GARDENS	NN	24, T48-R25	320.00					600			600
R-81-08	WINDSTAR (FISHERMAN'S COV	EN	11, 14, 22, 23, T50-R25	48.70	12.00				451			451
R-80-03	WINTER PARK	EN	12, T50-R25	73.00					1290			1403
R-83-21	WOODFIELD LAKES	SN	3, T51-R26	82.60	21.20			113	321			321
*R-83-26	WOODLANDS (DRI-83-3)	RE	21, T48-R25	480.00					401			733
R-81-26	WORLD TENNIS CENTER	CN	13, T49-R25	480.00				332				
R-81-04	WYDNEMERE	CN	9, T51-R26	14.00								
R-81-14	YOUTH HAVEN	SN	17, T50-R26	15.00					60			60
R-81-23	SUMERWOOD	EN	1, T50-R25	20.00	20.00							
R-84-18	SUTHERLAND	RE	18, T49-R26	129.00 REC.								
R-83-24	SWAMP BUGGY DAYS	RFP	14, T50-R26	20.50					334			
R-83-31	TOLL PLAZA RV PARK	RFP	1, T50-R26									
TOTAL				21420.36	986.35	824 588.26	10217	72707				82924

DATE REVISED 2/25/85

*PROPOSED

TABLE 1

Urban Area

<u>Coastal Urban Area</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
Developed	29,680
Undeveloped	42,336
PUD'S	21,420
Estates	10,880
Sub Total	104,316
<u>Other Urban Area</u>	
Immokalee	17,600
Port of Islands	640
Copeland	640
Chokoloskee	170
Sub Total	19,050
Total	123,366

Coastal Urban Area

<u>Zoned and/or Developed Acreage (Green)</u>	29,300
	380*
	<u>29,680</u>
<u>Undeveloped Acreage Zoned A-2 (Orange)</u>	38,116
	4,220*
	<u>42,336</u>
<u>Acreage in PUD's (Yellow)</u>	21,420
<u>Acreage Zoned Estates (Blue)</u>	10,880

* Not shown on this Map. Located further east of S.R. 951, along U.S. 41

TABLE 2
 UNINCORPORATED COASTAL URBAN AREA
 JANUARY 1, 1985

	<u>NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS</u>			
	<u>ACREAGE</u>	<u>EXISTING</u>	<u>POTENTIAL</u>	
			<u>% BUILT</u>	
Zoned and/or Developed (Green)	29,680	49,678	99,362	49.9%
PUD's (Yellow)	21,420	4,545	82,924*	5.5%
Estates (Blue)	10,880	1,266	5,027	
Subtotal	61,980	55,489	187,313	25.2%
Undeveloped A-2 (Orange)	42,336		127,008**	
TOTAL	104,316	55,489	314,321	17.6%

* Includes 21,878 units in proposed PUD's that have not been approved.

** 25% of land area excluded for roads, water management and other uses then multiplied by an average density of 4 units per acre.

TABLE 6

COMPROJ

POPULATION PROJECTIONS PER COMMUNITY DISTRICT,
APRIL 1, 1984

COMMUNITY	1984		1985	1990	1995	2000
NORTH NAPLES	15371	HIGH	16815	22778	27893	33657
		MEDIUM	16051	20842	24531	28528
CENTRAL NAPLES	11806	HIGH	12915	17495	21424	25851
		MEDIUM	12328	16008	18841	21912
EAST NAPLES	12467	HIGH	13640	18477	22627	27303
		MEDIUM	13020	16907	19899	23142
SOUTH NAPLES	8348	HIGH	9132	12371	15149	18279
		MEDIUM	8717	11319	13323	15494
GOLDEN GATE	10167	HIGH	11122	15066	18450	22262
		MEDIUM	10616	13786	16226	18870
RURAL ESTATES	4244	HIGH	4643	6289	7701	9293
		MEDIUM	4432	5755	6773	7877
ROYAL FAKAPALM	3997	HIGH	4372	5923	7253	8752
		MEDIUM	4174	5420	6379	7418
CORKSCREW	2522	HIGH	2759	3737	4577	5522
		MEDIUM	2633	3420	4025	4681
IMMOKALEE	12388	HIGH	13552	18357	22480	27125
		MEDIUM	12936	16797	19770	22991
MARCO	8439	HIGH	9232	12505	15314	18478
		MEDIUM	8812	11443	13468	15663
BIG CYPRESS	320	HIGH	350	474	581	701
		MEDIUM	334	434	511	594
UNINCORPORATED	90071	HIGH	98531	133473	163449	197224
		MEDIUM	94053	122129	143745	167171
EVERGLADES CITY	534	HIGH	576	750	899	1067
		MEDIUM	554	694	803	920
CITY OF NAPLES	17920		18071	18555	19030	19487
SEASONAL OR MIGRATORY	922		922	922	922	922
COLLIER (TOTAL)	109447	HIGH	118100	153700	184300	218700
		MEDIUM	113600	142300	164500	188500

Note: These projections are based on the University of Florida, State and County estimates of April 1, 1984.

The 1984 population and housing unit counts for each community, the City of Naples and Everglades City were derived from a combination of U.S. Census figures and County data.

The high and medium rates of increase in Collier County's population as estimated by the University of Florida, were applied to the base populations of each community to obtain the projections.

Collier County Planning Department

MEMORANDUM

TO: Lyle S. Richardson, MPO Chairman
FROM: Jeff Perry, MPO Coordinator
DATE: February 25, 1986
SUBJECT: Transportation For The Disadvantaged

As you are aware, there presently exists a network of transportation providers that offer services to the elderly, handicapped, and economically disadvantaged.

In July 1983, the MPO adopted a County wide Transportation Disadvantaged Development Plan, and further designated Tri-County Senior Services as the Coordinated Provider. Since that time, the FDOT and Tri-County have been negotiating a Memorandum of Agreement that will implement the 5 year Transportation Disadvantaged plan in our area. The purposes of the plan is to coordinate all transportation activities currently being provided, and to improve the level of service being offered.

I am pleased to inform you that the FDOT District Office has informed me that they are nearing the completion of the Memorandum of Agreement process and hope to have an approved MOA for the MPO to review in the near future.

For your information and use I am attaching a list of provider agencies currently operating in our County.

JP/jf


TABLE 4
CURRENT TRANSPORTATION DISADVANTAGED OPERATIONS, COLLIER COUNTY

Agency	Vehicles	Time of Operation	Weekly Trips	Vehicle Trips	Service	Source of Funds
Aging and Adult Services (HRS)	1 pvt. car	Variable	N/A	N/A	D/R	HRS
Collier County Social Services	2 cars	9am-5pm	N/A	N/A	Fixed; D/R	Title III - B State Gen. Rev. Funds
Collier Health Services	3 9-passenger vans	Variable	6	300	D/R	Medical US Public Health Services
Help On Wheels	2 Sta. Wagons 2 14-pass. van 1 9-pass. van	9am-2pm	43 12	977	D/R	Private - Fees and Donations
Immokalee Neighbor Services	1 van	8am-5pm	N/A	N/A	Fixed; D/R	HRS (Developmental Services)
Training and Education	2 vans (leased)	8:15am-2:15pm	N/A	N/A	Fixed; D/R	HRS (Developmental Services)
Tri-County Senior Services	2 buses 1 sta. wagon 4 vans	Variable	110-120	N/A	D/R	Title III - B

SOURCE: Transportation Disadvantaged Transit Development Plan and Transportation Improvement Program for Collier County (SWFRPC-1981)



investment **properties** corporation



specializing in investment real estate

February 7, 1986

Mr. Bill Barnett
City Councilman
720 Goodlette Road
Naples, Florida 33940

Dear Bill,

This letter will confirm our recent conversation with relation to the Gordon River Bridge.

I am conscious of the fact that the State of Florida has this bridge fairly low on its priority list and with the disorientation of the Federal Government to raise taxes and at the same time a continued increase demands for tax funds, it is my feeling that we cannot expect a Gordon River Bridge to be funded by anybody besides those people who would benefit from such a bridge.

I would therefore recommend that the City and County, together, examine the feasibility of the following solution to an additional east-west thoroughfare:

- A) Remove the issue from the political realm and cause there to be created the Naples/Collier County Gordon River Bridge Authority. This would be an independent authority similar to the Airport Authority, which would have the right to issue Municipal Tax Free Bonds;
- B) A logical route would be from the east end of Central Avenue across the Gordon River, down eastbound on North Road, thence turning north over the easterly 200 feet of the Airport Property and thence with a flyover across Airport Road depositing traffic eastbound on Radio Road and with a cloverleaf to permit north and south Airport Road traffic. This would involve a bridge and causeway of approximately 2,800 feet, plus an expressway type road of approximately of 8,000 feet. Assuming 45 miles per hour as the average speed on this high speed expressway, this would place the intersection of Radio Road and Airport Road approximately 2 3/4 minutes from Goodlette and Central Avenue. It would place the entrance to the Airport Terminal approximately 7 seconds from Goodlette and Central. Of course the eastern end of the road could also tie in with Davis Boulevard with

Page two
 Bill Barnett
 February 7, 1986

the road running southbound, west of Airport Road and then flying over the intersection of Airport and Davis Boulevard, and dumping eastbound onto Davis Boulevard with a cloverleaf;

- C) Let us now examine the traffic at three DOT stations:
 Station 123 which is US 41, east of 10th Street;
 Station 4, US 41, east of Davis;
 Station 185, Goodlette Road, south of First Street.

We show the actual traffic counts at these three stations from 1980 through 1985, and have projected future traffic counts using the actual counts of 1980 through 1985 and a Hewlett-Packard Linear Regression Program for the projections of the future traffic. These projections have a regression coefficient ranging between .76 and .89, meaning that between 11% and 24% of the variance in traffic is caused by elements other than the mere passage of one year.

	<u>US41-E.of Davis Station 4</u>	<u>US41 & 10th St. Station 123</u>	<u>Goodlette Rd. Station 185</u>
1980	24,010	29,420	11,080
1981	24,020	29,330	13,700
1982	26,540	30,250	14,830
1983	24,820	28,160	13,070
1984	26,764	28,700	16,069
1985	28,759	25,483	19,029
1986	28,967	25,515	19,108
1987	29,858	25,514	20,410
1988	30,749	24,838	21,711
1989	31,640	24,162	23,012
1990	32,530	23,486	24,314

In analyzing these numbers, several things should be noticed:

- a) Station 123, which is located at 10th Street South, declined from 1984 to 1985; this most likely corresponds to an increase in traffic on Goodlette Road, which increased substantially between '84 and '85.
- b) We noticed that the traffic on Goodlette Road has almost doubled between 1980 and 1985. There does not exist a station that I have access to between Goodlette Road and Davis Boulevard. However we also notice that on Davis Boulevard there is a station, number 178, which ranges in values from 1980 to 1984, between 14,000 and 17,500

Page three
 Bill Barnett
 February 7, 1986


cars per day. Hence to calculate the probable traffic between Goodlette Road and Davis Boulevard, it would appear reasonable to expect that a substantial portion of that traffic on Davis Boulevard, Goodlette Road, and US 41 at 10th Street, should be combined such that the strip in question probably has 40,000 cars per day average;

- c) If we can assume that approximately 50% of the traffic between Goodlette Road and Davis Boulevard is actually heading for the intersection of Davis and Airport Road or Airport Road and Radio Road, and if we can assume that these people would pay 25¢ for a trip of less than three minutes to avoid the waiting and aggravation of the East Trail, then the following calculations would obtain:
- 1) Assume an 18 million dollar cost of construction;
 - 2) Assume an 8% interest rate and thirty (30) year schedule of repayment;
 - 3) This would require a debt service per year of \$1,598,894.
 - 4) Based on 20,000 cars per day and 25¢ toll per car, income would be generated in the amount of \$1,825,000.
 - 5) This would provide \$226,106. per year as being available for operating expenses;
 - 6) If we assume a 2% per year increase in traffic over a ten year period and if we assume a 4% inflation rate, then the tenth year cash flow would be as follows:
 - i) toll amount - 35¢ per trip;
 - ii) number of cars per day - 24,400 average;
 - iii) income per year - \$3,117,100.;
 - iv) debt service - \$1,598,894.;
 - v) positive cash flow - \$1,518,206.

You should be able to see from this that under very conservative assumptions, considering inflation and considering the ability of the toll bridge to produce substantial cash surpluses in future years, it would appear that at least the feasibility of such a toll bridge and independent Authority ought to be thoroughly examined.

I hope this analysis will provide you with sufficient information to examine it yourself and if you feel that the City of Naples and Collier County will benefit from such a toll bridge and Authority, you will bring it to the appropriate parties.

Sincerely,


 John T. Conroy, Jr., CCIM
 JTC/mp

CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP/REGULAR MEETING SCHEDULE
Spring 1986

DATE-----	MEETING TYPE-----	TOPIC(S)-----
February 26	Workshop (AM)	Growth, Utility Rates
March 5	Regular Meeting (AM)	
March 12	Workshop (AM)	Finance and Budget
March 19	Workshop (AM)	Comprehensive Plan and Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion
March 19	Regular Meeting (PM)	
March 26	Workshop (AM)	N.E.A.T.
April 2	Regular Meeting (AM)	
April 9	Workshop (AM)	N.E.A.T.
April 16	Workshop (AM)	N.E.A.T.
April 16	Regular Meeting (PM)	
April 23	Workshop (AM)	N.E.A.T.
April 30	Workshop (AM)	N.E.A.T.
May 7	Regular Meeting (AM)	
May 14	Workshop (AM)	
May 21	Workshop (AM)	
May 21	Regular Meeting (PM)	
May 28	Workshop (AM)	

John T. Conroy, Jr., COIM
JTC/MP



City of Naples

--- MEMO ---

TO: Honorable Mayor & Members of City Council
FROM: Frank W. Hanley, Finance Director
SUBJECT: WATER/SEWER RATES & METHODOLOGY
DATE: February 26, 1986

Background:

The City contracted with the accounting firm of Coopers and Lybrand in 1981 to perform a water and sewer rate study. Their task was to evaluate alternative rate structures and recommend a preferred rate structure. In addition they reviewed our systems development charges and trained the staff in implementing the adopted procedures.

The structure that was recommended and approved is a three part rate that allocates costs to billing, capital recovery, and variable or commodity costs. Billing costs are related to the number of customers in the system and are designed to recover the expenses associated with meter reading, postage, and billing. Variable costs or commodity costs are designed to recover expenses associated with providing water and sewer such as chemicals, electricity, and labor. Capital recovery costs are fixed and related to the cost of having the system in place and prepared to serve the customer.

Each year the budgeted numbers are run through this formula to determine what changes if any are needed in our rates. As pointed out earlier, billing costs are sensitive to postage and meter reading costs spread over our customer population while our variable costs are sensitive to consumption. Capital recovery costs, however, are determined primarily by debt service and non revenue offsets such as interest and remain fixed until new debt is issued or major capital improvements are made. During the past 18 months we have had two advance refunding debt issues and one new money issue. Our new money issue had a significant impact on our sewer capital recovery charges as was expected. Our refundings lowered our water capital recovery charges.

Having considered each of our refundings and our new money issues the engineers report in our official statement recommends a 10% increase in water and sewer revenues this year in order to maintain the financial needs of our system. I believe we can meet the systems needs with an increase of about 5%.

Analysis:

My evaluation of the systems needs are reflected in attachments "A" & "B". All our numbers were run through the formula and the adjustments are shown. For our water and sewer systems the current rates and the recommended rates follow:

WATER/SEWER RATES & METHODOLOGY
 February 26, 1986
 Page 2

WATER

	<u>Current</u>	<u>Recommended</u>
Billing	\$ 1.43	\$ 1.52
Per 1000 Gal	.78	.83
Capital Recovery		
5/8" & 3/4"	2.77	2.77
1" & 1½"	11.08	11.08
1½"	27.70	27.70
2"	41.55	41.55
3"	83.10	83.10
4"	110.80	110.80
6"	138.50	138.50

SEWER

	<u>Current</u>	<u>Recommended</u>
Billing	\$ 1.12	\$ 1.26
Per 1000 gal	1.04	1.12
Capital Recovery	12.95	12.95

Our sewer systems development charges must also be adjusted. We had the firm of Coopers & Lybrand review these charges recently in view of our new bond issue and these are the fees they have suggested we adopt. Attachment "C" presents the existing and the proposed rates for systems development fees.

Sewer Rate Calculation

Based on Budget Request
For FY 1986

	<u>Billing</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Commodity</u>
Data Processing	\$ 22,748	Capital recovery costs will remain the same	
Customer Service	32,984		
Debt Service Coverage			
CIP			
Revenue Generation			
Interest			
Systems Development			
Connections			
Inspections			
Wastewater Collection			\$ 487,589
Wastewater Treatment			1,199,336
Employee Services			20,371
Administrative Costs			<u>265,186</u>
			<u>\$1,972,482</u>
			<u>1,765,330</u> = 1

$$\frac{\$ 55,732}{7,314} = 7.61 \div 6 = 1.26$$

Water ERU's	29,504
Sewer ERU's	22,236
Sewer Customers	7,314

Ratio of sewer to water = $\frac{22,236}{29,504} = 75\%$

Billable gallons = 4,675,000,000
Less sold to County (752,045,000)

$$3,922,955,000 \times 75\% = 2,942,216 \times 75\% = 2,206,662 \times 80\% = 1,765,330$$

Water Rate Calculation
Based on Budget Request
For FY 1986

<u>Commodity</u>	<u>Billing</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Commodity</u>
Meter Readers	\$ 61,867	Capital	
Data Processing	25,143	recovery	
Customer Service	32,984	costs will	
		remain the	
		same	
County Revenue			\$ (310,000)
Water Distribution			622,437
Water Production			1,982,941
Administrative Costs			465,867
Employee Services			20,371
	\$119,994		\$2,781,616

5/8 & 3/4	\$ 2.77
1 & 1/4	11.08
1 1/2	27.70
2	41.55
3	83.10
4	110.80
6	138.50

$$\frac{119,994}{13,181} = 9.10 \div 6 = 1.52 \quad \frac{2,781,616}{3,382,685} = 83\%$$

Billable water = Estimated 85-86

	5,500,000,000 x 85% = 4,675,000,000
Less sold to County	(752,045,000)
Less Minimum	(540,270,000)
Billable Water FY 86	<u>3,382,685,000</u>

11-3.1(C)

Sewer System Development Charges

Current Rates

Single Family Residence	\$554.00
Multifamily Residence; per equivalent unit	554.00

Business and Institutional Rate Based on Meter Size

<u>Meter Size</u>	<u>Charge</u>
5/8"- 3/4"	\$ 554.00
1"	1,385.00
1 1/4"	2,216.00
1 1/2"	2,770.00
2"	5,540.00
3"	11,080.00
4"	16,620.00
6"	55,400.00
8"	96,950.00
10"	152,350.00
12"	263,150.00

Proposed Rates

Single Family Residence	\$638.00
Multifamily Residence; per equivalent unit	638.00

Business and Institutional Rates Based on Meter Size

<u>Meter Size</u>	<u>Charge</u>
5/8"-3/4"	\$ 638.00
1"	1,595.00
1 1/4"	2,552.00
1 1/2"	3,190.00
2"	6,380.00
3"	12,760.00
4"	19,140.00
6"	63,800.00
8"	111,650.00
10"	175,450.00
12"	303,050.00