

**MINUTES  
LAKE COUNTY  
LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY**

**NOVEMBER 21, 2005**

The Lake County Local Planning Agency met on MONDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 2005 at 9:00 a.m. in Room 233 on the second floor of the Round Administration Building in Tavares, Florida. The Lake County Local Planning Agency considers comprehensive planning issues including amendments to Lake County's Comprehensive Plan.

**Members Present:**

David Jordan	District 1
Ann Dupee	District 2
Nadine Foley, Vice-Chairman	District 5
Sean Parks	At-Large Representative
Keith Schue, Secretary	At-Large Representative
Barbara Newman, Chairman	At-Large Representative

**Members Absent:**

Michael F. Carey	District 3
Richard Dunkel	District 4
Becky Elswick	School Board Representative

**Staff Present:**

Amye King, AICP, Deputy Director, Growth Management Department  
Sanford A. Minkoff, County Attorney  
Shannon Suffron, Senior Planner, Comprehensive Planning Division  
Francis Franco, Senior GIS Analyst, Comprehensive Planning Division  
Thomas Wheeler, Planner, Comprehensive Planning Division  
Donna Bohrer, Office Associate III, Planning & Development Services Division

Barbara Newman, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and noted that a quorum was present. She confirmed that Proof of Publication was on file in the Comprehensive Planning Division and that the meeting had been noticed pursuant to the Sunshine Statute.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>AGENDA ITEM:</u>	<u>AGENDA DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
a	Conservation Element	3 and 10
a	Aquifer Recharge	10

Amye King, Deputy Director, Growth Management suggested discussing the Conservation Element first because staff from Renaissance Planning Group was present and that discussion be reserved on issues relating to the St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD) until their staff arrived.

### **Conservation Element**

Julie Salvo, AICP, Renaissance Planning Group introduced their sub-consultant Randall Consultants, represented by Tom Herbert and Linda Lampl. Ms. Salvo provided the LPA with copies of the 9J-5 requirements to ensure the Conservation Element met those requirements. She said there are four sections, Air, Water, Land and Human Systems in this element.

Nadine Foley noted that the Soil Conservation Service had been changed to Natural Resource Conservation Service. Keith Schue said some other names needed to be corrected.

In Objective 1, there was a consensus by the Local Planning Agency (LPA) on Mr. Schue's suggestion to include a reference to the Waste Energy facility.

In Policy 1.2, Mr. Schue suggested including the following "require a safe buffer distance from nearby uses, including but not limited to the following uses".

Chairman Newman said if a LPA member disagreed with any of the suggested changes they should speak up and make their position clear.

In Policy 1.4, Mr. Schue suggested using the phrase "State Best Management Practices (BMPs)" to make that statement more generic.

In Policy 1.6, Mr. Schue said air quality should be part of the Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review process and thought that reference could be removed.

In Policy 1.7, Mr. Schue thought "Future Land Use Element (FLUE)" should be used instead of "Future Land Use Map (FLUM)". He asked how the 30% tree canopy requirement was calculated in new developments. Mr. Jordan said the ultimate tree canopy size could be used. There was agreement to include that in the Land Development Regulations (LDRs). Ms. Foley suggested it be reviewed for consistency with the landscape ordinance.

In response to comments from Mr. Jordan, Ms. Salvo said the title of Policy 1.8 would be changed so it was less confusing.

Mr. Schue said the current policy referring to solid waste incineration and air quality had not been included in this draft. Ms. Foley said the reference should be more general because there is more than one energy conversion plant in the County. Ms. King said policy 7.10-9 in the current plan would be reviewed and rewritten to refer to all emission

points.

There was discussion by the LPA on how to proceed with the review of this element. Mr. Jordan said in deference to Mr. Schue's expertise in this area that he had no problem with proceeding to review Mr. Schue's comments. The LPA agreed with Mr. Jordan.

In Objective 2, Groundwater Protection, Mr. Schue suggested adding "spring systems". In 2.1.2, he thought in earlier discussions the LPA had preferred "protection of natural systems" instead of "safe". He suggested changing that to "while ensuring protection of groundwater dependent natural resources".

In Policy 2.1.3, the LPA agreed to strike the word "urban" so the landscape guidelines would be applicable to all development. In Policy 2.1.5, Mr. Schue suggested adding "protecting groundwater systems" at the end.

Sanford Minkoff, County Attorney, arrived.

Mr. Schue said he and Blanche Hardy had discussed defining "protective recharge areas" and using it instead of "high recharge". He said that change would apply in two places in 2.2. Mr. Jordan said it should be consistent. Ms. Foley agreed, and stated she would like to have protection extended into areas with 8-12" recharge. Mr. Schue said ten inches of recharge would be consistent with the Wekiva regulations.

Ms. King said St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD) staff had arrived. Doug Munch, Division Director for Groundwater Programs at SJRWMD introduced Geoffrey Sample, Intergovernmental Review and Don Boniol, Recharge Evaluation Mapping for SJRWMD. Mr. Munch explained terms such as significant, prime recharge and the amount of recharge that defines them. He said the number of inches referred to the amount of water that reached the aquifer, not the amount of rainfall. He said the recharge level would determine the size of the area affected by those policies. The lower number would capture more land and costs would rise in proportion to the amount of land protected. He thought the amount of land would be the deciding factor. There was discussion on various thresholds and soil types. Mr. Schue thought using the term "protective" with a specific definition would be appropriate. Ms. Foley agreed with 10", type A soils and the term protective and said it should be consistent throughout the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Schue thought policy in the current plan regarding a regulatory threshold for the higher quantity waste generator should be brought forward into the new plan.

Mr. Schue said the first sentence in Policy 2.2.2 was confusing and suggested changing the "or" to "and". He also suggested removing the word "or" everywhere in the sentence, so all those issues would be addressed in the LDRs.

In Policy 2.2.3, Mr. Schue thought the sentence beginning with "Landscape operations," would be more appropriately addressed as an aquifer recharge issue instead of policy on

Salt Water Intrusion. He suggested removing the specific reference to the Wekiva in the first sentence so the policy would address any area with salt water intrusion.

Blanche Hardy, Director of Environmental Services, arrived.

Mr. Schue suggested adding “protected and more effective aquifer recharge areas” to Policy 2.2.4 so the LPA is consistent with an earlier consensus. He also suggested deleting the text after “recharge areas” which eliminates the reference to the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR).

In order to be consistent, Mr. Schue said the term “protected” should be added in 2.2.5.

When the LPA asked for Ms. Hardy’s opinion on Policy 2.2, she said she didn’t think the County could usurp the Federal government’s authority to issue permits. Mr. Schue read the following policy from the current Plan “large quantity waste generators greater than a thousand kilograms per month shall be prohibited in designated prime recharge areas”. Sanford Minkoff, County Attorney, explained that a federal activity could not be prohibited, however, the County can restrict federal permits. Mr. Minkoff explained the County could have regulations more stringent than those of the Federal government and a Federal permit does not ensure local approval. Mr. Schue was concerned about removing that policy if it was supported by regulation in the LDRs. Mr. Minkoff said without a map of the recharge areas it would be difficult to write regulations. Tom Herbert said “calling it out” as an issue implies there is a problem. He said there might be land uses below that threshold, which would be undesirable in high recharge areas. Mr. Herbert said a more generic statement might be appropriate. Mr. Schue said one was included in the Aquifer Recharge Element. Mr. Herbert suggested relying on that element. There was a consensus to include this in another element.

Ms. Dupee asked about the reference to the Lake County Water Alliance in 2.1.2. Mr. Minkoff said it had been created by an interlocal agreement between the County and the municipalities. Mr. Schue suggested adding “Lake County as a participant in”.

Mr. Parks suggested inserting “overlay” before “zone” in 2.2.6. When he asked about time sensitive dates, Ms. King said the EAR would be due within three years. Mr. Jordan added that the LPA was to monitor the Comprehensive Plan.

In reference to Policy 2.2.5.1, Mr. Schue said septic issues were under review in areas with poor percolation rates and in high recharge and aquifer vulnerable areas. He suggested the following at the end of #1 “within environmentally sensitive areas, including but not limited to the Green Swamp Area of Critical State Concern (GSACSC) and the Wekiva Study Area”. Ms. Foley said this policy should be very general and the details should be included in the Sanitary Sewer Sub-element. There was agreement by the LPA to ending that sentence after “use of septic tank systems”.

Ms. Dupee left the meeting.

In item #2, Mr. Schue didn't think the County should have total responsibility, so he suggested the first sentence be changed to "with the local DOH, shall develop an inspection". There was a similar concern with item #3, and there was an agreement to remove "be responsible for". Mr. Schue said because there is no regional sewer utility, the phrase "as a dimension of its regional sewer utility" should be removed.

In policy 2.2.7, both Mr. Schue and Mr. Parks were concerned about the non-potable water preference list of uses. There was consensus with Ms. Foley's suggestion to remove the list because not all situations are the same.

In reference to Policy 2.2.8, Mr. Schue said the LPA had agreed to prohibit new drainage wells. Mr. Parks did not think untreated water should be put in water drainage wells. Ms. Hardy said the Water Management District (WMD) is promoting Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) as a viable water supply. Mr. Schue said this policy included stormwater. Mr. Herbert suggested writing policy to differentiate between pumping untreated stormwater into drainage wells and a conscientious program of aquifer storage and recovery. He was concerned an outright prohibition could prevent the utilization of future technology to enhance the water supply. Mr. Schue said he would support a statement about ASR, however, he did not agree with using drainage wells as part of stormwater management or other similar uses. Ms. Foley did not think untreated water should be put in the ground. There was agreement by the LPA with Mr. Parks' summary that there wouldn't be a prohibition on ASR but drainage wells can't be used for stormwater. Ms. Salvo summarized that the policy for drainage wells would be retained but it would begin with the prohibitive statement and she added that there would be separate policy for ASR.

There was discussion on the type of treatment that should be required before water is put into the ground. Mr. Parks said the State was working on minimum water treatment standards and he thought those standards should be adopted by the County.

There was discussion about the County prohibiting uses that were allowed by the State. Mr. Minkoff thought the County would have the authority to prohibit drainage wells based on land use. In response to a question from Mr. Parks, Mr. Minkoff said stormwater requirements in the LDRs could be used as they apply to approval of development. In those cases, even if Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) issued a permit it could be prohibited by the County as part of the development.

Mr. Schue asked about the sentence referring to a master plan for stormwater. There was agreement by the LPA to strike the last sentence beginning with "based on the findings."

Mr. Jordan said as he understood it, County regulations are the strongest when taken from a land use perspective and not a permitting one. Mr. Minkoff said he recommended using "discouraged" in the Comprehensive Plan instead of "prohibited". He said no variances are allowed to the Comprehensive Plan and he recommended against using "absolutes". Mr. Jordan commented that if a prohibition is in the LDRs it can be changed by ordinance or variance, instead of amending the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Hardy said

because this was a water quality issue it would be better to focus on the appropriate treatment. Mr. Schue and Mr. Parks discussed the rules being developed by the WMD regarding stormwater and drainage wells. There was discussion about using the term “discouraged” and the appropriate treatment level. Ms. Hardy reiterated her comment and said if water is properly treated, then does it make any difference that it is stormwater. Mr. Schue preferred using alternatives to ASR. He said he was uncomfortable with the history of injection wells, and thought they should be avoided. Mr. Parks summarized his understanding that they would use “strongly discourages” and add that the water must be treated. Mr. Jordan added that ASRs were to be a separate issue. Mr. Schue said the current plan prohibited injection wells, but now if changed it would be allowed with appropriate treatment. Mr. Minkoff said it says almost the same thing. Mr. Schue thought it should be prohibited in some areas of the County. It was decided to have this revised and reviewed at a later time. Mr. Herbert said several versions would be provided for discussion. He said the LPA could define surface water uses but water quality issues are decided by the WMD and the State. Mr. Herbert thought there should be an allowance for the possibility of technological changes but the State and WMD would have the final word on regulations and permitting. Mr. Schue suggested they retain the current prohibition and review the issue again during the EAR process. Ms. Foley thought something should be included regarding ASRs.

Ms. King said staff was requesting to postpone the new business until next workshop.

There was a five-minute break.

In 2.2.9, Mr. Schue suggested deleting “in high recharge areas” because it was redundant to the phrase “direct hydraulic connection”. In the second sentence, he suggested the word “requirement” in place of “guidelines”. Ms. Foley pointed out that the correct term for the aquifer was “Floridan”. In the next sentence Mr. Schue suggested deleting “Comprehensive Plan and” because that is what they are dealing with right now.

In 2.3, Mr. Schue said the correct title should be “Wekiva Parkway and Protection Act”.

In policy 3.2, Mr. Parks suggested adding “in coordination with Lake County Water Authority (LCWA)” or possibly including that in the Intergovernmental Coordination Element (ICE).

Mr. Schue thought 3.1 should be included in the Aquifer Recharge Element and the following policy “Assessment Procedure” should be 3.1. Mr. Parks suggested including “partnering with LCWA”. Mr. Schue also suggested including “rivers” with the “streams”.

When Mr. Schue asked about Policy 3.2.1, Ms Foley said the Lake County Division of Pollution Control no longer exists. They agreed that policy was archaic. Ms. Foley suggested referring to the sub-elements. Ms. King said the policy would be rewritten to be consistent with the Stormwater Sub-Element.

There were no comments on 3.2.3.

The LPA agreed with Mr. Schue's suggestion to add "and shoreline buffers" after "Maximum densities" in the second sentence of 3.2.4. Mr. Parks and Mr. Schue discussed higher levels of protection for surface water in certain areas of the County. Mr. Parks said in those areas he would like the post-development water quality to match the pre-development water quality. Ms. King said this issue was addressed in the Stormwater Element, however, staff can have language similar to 2.2 applied to surface water.

The Consultant said they would review the current Comprehensive Plan to see if Policy 1-2.6 referenced in 3.2.5 still exists. Ms. Foley thought the County had decided to follow the State's shoreline regulations. Mr. Minkoff said State regulations limiting the removal of shoreline vegetation are very strict. Ms. Foley said Policies 3.2.5 and 3.2.6 should relate to the way the County is handling it. Mr. Schue suggested higher standards would be appropriate for certain areas. Mr. Parks said the lakes targeted for clean up by the LCWA might be appropriate for higher standards. Ms. Foley said past problems were caused by not adhering to the rules and thought these policies should encourage following those regulations. Chairman Newman thought staff was going to bring this policy back again. Mr. Jordan said it would be good to encourage additional improvement in some situations even if they are not strictly in conformance with the rules. Mr. Schue agreed.

The LPA agreed that Policy 3.2.7 should include "mechanical aquatic control management practices shall be utilized when economically feasible".

There was agreement to delete 3.2.9 providing that issue was addressed in another element.

The LPA agreed to remove "urban" in the first sentence of 3.3.3 and in item #1.

Ms. King said that references to the Lake County Pollution Control Board would be removed because it had been discontinued.

Mr. Schue suggested referencing other policies in Policy 4.1.1, including the Protecting Florida Springs document published by DEP/DCA. Mr. Jordan suggested including BMPs. Mr. Minkoff didn't believe that DCA had created a state-wide standard at this time. Ms. King said published studies wouldn't need to be referenced. She said some of the BMP standards have been incorporated. There was agreement to include "in developing the LDRs (the Protecting Florida Springs document) that document should be considered".

Mr. Schue suggested substituting "regulate" in place of "monitor" in Policy 4.1.

In 4.2.2, Mr. Schue suggested deleting the last sentence, which begins with "The County's participation".

In 4.2.4, Mr. Schue suggested including a reference to the publication “Protecting Florida Springs”.

In 4.2.6, Mr. Schue said the portion of the last sentence beginning with “with special” should be deleted because it doesn’t relate the title of the policy. Ms. King said the term “Xeriscape” should also be deleted because the County does not have permission to use it. Ms. Foley suggested using the phrase “Florida Friendly”. Ms. Foley thought the policy should remain because this Objective relates to Springsheds. It was decided to leave it in.

It was agreed to substitute “protected” for “high” in Policy 4.3.1.

In 4.3.4, it was agreed to remove the “high recharge”.

In 4.3.5, Mr. Schue said the term should be hydrological.

In 4.4, Mr. Schue thought this section, which related to surface waters, did not belong in this objective titled “Springsheds and Springshed Protection Zones”.

After some discussion on 4.4.1, it was decided to substitute “surface waters” for “lakes”. Ms. King said this designation would be redundant because the State has a program. Mr. Parks suggested initiating a local designation for outstanding waterways. He thought some of the Harris Chain of Lakes should have a local designation. Ms. King didn’t think this issue was necessarily tied to water quality. She asked what purpose the LPA envisioned for this policy. Mr. Parks thought the program would increase awareness and have an educational benefit. Ms. King suggested including this in the economic or recreational elements. Ms. Foley suggested listing the Outstanding Florida Waterways, reference protected springs, refer to the Heritage River (St. Johns River) and include a statement of support for maintenance and improvement of water quality. She said the Blueways could be included but she thought that program was adequate at this time. Mr. Welstead said more water bodies could be nominated for the OFW. Ms. King said staff would discuss this and develop alternative ideas.

In Policy 4.4.2, Mr. Schue suggested “and its tributaries as an Outstanding Florida Waterways shall be placed on maps...”.

Mr. Schue said the correct title for Policies 4.4.3 and 4.4.4 was the “Wekiva Parkway and Protection Act”.

There was a lunch break.

There was discussion about a letter from the LPA to the municipalities to clarify it was the consensus of the LPA that Rural Land Series designations may be considered within the Joint Planning Areas (JPAs).

Ms. King suggested that Aquifer Recharge be discussed next.

Ms. Hardy provided copies of the Federal definition of environmentally sensitive land. She explained that the majority of the changes were organizational. She suggested the common paragraph at the beginning of each sub-element be stated once and then referenced. The last suggestion was to have a specific public facility sub-element for specially designated lands, such as the Wekiva and GSACSC. She explained this element would cover future changes or additions to specially designated lands and will remove the perception that the Wekiva is regulating the County. Mr. Schue thought this arrangement made it clear which policies were applicable everywhere and which applied only to specific areas.

Ms. Foley left the meeting at 1:30.

### **Aquifer Recharge**

Ms. Suffron read the goal and objectives of this element. There was discussion about using the phrase “all federal, state or local agencies” instead of enumerating each agency.

In Objective 1.4, Mr. Parks suggested referencing the Data, Inventory and Analysis (DIA) in place of “higher degree”. Mr. Schue said this related more to hazardous materials, and he suggested adding “to protect the County’s groundwater resources”. He thought a reference to the DIA be included in Objective 1.1. Ms. Hardy did not think the word “higher” was necessary and it was agreed to delete it.

### **Conservation**

Because of the consultant’s schedule, the LPA returned to the review of the Conservation Element.

Mr. Schue referenced Objectives 5 and 6, and said benchmarks for wetland buffers should be included. In 6.3, he said although some wetlands might be more important, all wetlands should have a minimum buffer in the Comprehensive Plan. He said greater detail could be in the LDRs. Ms. King said the County does not have staff to evaluate wetlands. Mr. Schue said unless a minimum buffer was included in the new plan, for a period of time the County would not have any wetland buffer protection. Ms. King suggested using the current language. Mr. Parks thought there should be a foundation for wetland buffer protection in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Herbert made several suggestions including making wetlands buffers an additional land use requirement, creating another section on regulated wetlands, and referencing the SJRWMD criteria for wetland buffers. Additional requirements could be included in the LDRs because wetlands would be a land use category. There was discussion on this issue. Ms. King said staff was in agreement with an earlier decision to create a wetlands overlay rather than creating another designation. Mr. Herbert thought wetland buffers should be “called out” so there would not be a dispute if people claimed the WMD permit was the only

requirement. Mr. Herbert suggested including a reference in this policy and cross-referencing it elsewhere. There was discussion about being legally defensible and about including a paragraph of intent.

In Objective 5, Mr. Parks said Floodplains should be defined. Ms. King said the County would like to have the floodplains re-evaluated. There was discussion about the different types of floodplain designations and which should be applied. It was decided to use the AE floodplain classification. Mr. Schue suggested, "Lake County shall work with agencies to obtain the best information on the delineation of floodplains." Mr. Herbert thought the State may fund more accurate floodplain mapping because of the hurricane flooding and the effect of development on the floodplains.

Mr. Schue said the current plan contained a reference to buffers to protect floodplains and the eco-systems associated with them. He wanted to include "provide for viable wildlife corridors 100 year floodplain should be protected where the 100 year floodplain connects significant isolated wetlands, environmentally sensitive areas". Mr. Herbert suggested creating Policy 5.2 to recognize the interaction between wetlands and the benefit to wildlife.

There was discussion to title Objective 6, "Comprehensive Protection" and to combine Objectives 6 and 7. Mr. Schue suggested adding "including but not limited to" in the policy titled "Enforce Wetland Regulations".

Mr. Schue thought additional content could be added to Objectives 8 and 9. He was concerned that the value of the Wekiva-Ocala wildlife corridor be recognized and protected. There was discussion between Mr. Herbert and Mr. Schue about the feasibility of a "call out" section for policies and regulations that will be forthcoming from DCA that relate to Special Public Facilities. Mr. Schue said he had referred to connectivity for wildlife corridors and other ecological concerns. Mr. Herbert suggested combining Objectives 8, 9, 10 and 11 into a special category.

Mr. Schue said Objective 7-7 titled Conserve Wildlife Populations and Habitats in the current Comprehensive Plan contained some valuable policies and he asked that those policies be reconsidered.

Mr. Schue said Objective 7-6, titled Conserve Natural Upland Communities in the current Comprehensive Plan contained policies to protect uplands and he suggested those policies be reviewed and considered for inclusion in the new plan. There was consensus by the LPA affirming Mr. Schue's suggestion.

Mr. Parks asked if the term "qualified ecologists" in policy 10.1.9 should be defined. Mr. Schue said additional expertise may be needed as the County implements more innovative policies. After some discussion, it was decided to require a biology-related degree.

Mr. Herbert said in some areas there are volunteer scientific committees to review

development projects and they act in an advisory capacity for the county commissioners, especially on larger projects. Ms. King said that suggestion would be investigated.

Michael Carey arrived at 2:30 and Sean Parks left at 2:45.

Ms. King said policy 12.2.1 would be reviewed by the consultant because the County Attorney was concerned about consistency and having prohibitions in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Schue thought mines should not be allowed in the Green Swamp or the Wekiva. Ms. Hardy agreed with language similar to “strongly discourage” because there could be new, unforeseen circumstances. Mr. Schue thought a prohibition in core conservation areas is appropriate. Mr. Jordan said in that case the prohibition would only apply to specific areas and if something compelling did come up perhaps a Comprehensive Plan Amendment would be warranted. Ms. King said perhaps staff from Water Resources would be better qualified to address the mining issues. They had opposed an extractive land use category earlier in this process. Ms. Hardy said the agreement she and Mr. Schue had reached on recharge areas could eliminate mining in 50% of the County. Ms. King said this would be reviewed and brought back. She also stated that the policies for the Green Swamp and the Wekiva would not be changed from the current plan.

There was a five-minute break.

In Policy 12.2.2, Ms. King said the phrase “shall continue to require within its mining ordinance” violated the County Attorney’s position that the LDRs not “rule” the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. King suggested “enforce local provisions” instead of referencing a particular ordinance by name. She said because the Comprehensive Plan is written first and then the LDRs, any reference in the Comprehensive Plan to those particular LDRs refers to something that does not yet exist. Mr. Carey thought the “enforce local provisions” was general enough to include ordinances. There was discussion on this issue and Ms. King suggested the consultants would review this policy and others in which the County Attorney was concerned that the LDRs would take precedence over the Comprehensive Plan.

There were no comments on Objective 13.

In response to Mr. Carey, Ms. King summarized the actions taken by the LPA and addressed Mr. Carey’s concerns regarding the possible economic impact of these policies.

Mr. Schue questioned the need for Objective 14 as a stand-alone objective. He thought the statement regarding “Master Builders Associations BuiltGreen” might be better addressed as a policy in Energy Conservation. The consultant said not all ‘green building’ was designed to conserve energy. There was discussion on how this was to be organized. Ms. King said staff suggested leaving this as presented because the County Commissioners had shown an interest in Green Building and Energy Conservation. Mr. Schue said 14.1.1 was more of a landscape concern. Mr. Schue suggested Objective 14.0

stand as is without any policy attached.

Mr. Schue suggested reviewing the policies under Objective 7-11 in the current plan to see if some of that should be included.

Ms. King said that 16.1 could be deleted because the County has a noise pollution ordinance. Ms. King said the Objective would be reworded to reflect the existing ordinance. Mr. Schue suggested “Lake County shall regulate maximum decibel levels allowable for noise made by devices and vehicles and activities”.

In Objective 17, Mr. Schue suggested including a reference to the Dark Skies initiative. He questioned what the document was referenced in Policy 17.2 Natural Resources Standards and why it was included under light pollution. It was decided to strike that policy and substitute the Dark Skies initiative.

There was agreement with Mr. Schue’s suggestion in Objective 18.0 that “providing for responsible growth” be changed to “providing for responsible development”.

There was discussion on 18.1.1, Ms. King said a land acquisition program had been passed by the voters.

In 18.1.2, Special Protection Areas, Mr. Schue suggested using “Wekiva Greenway” instead of the reference to the river corridor and adding Lake Wales Ridge.

In response to a question from Mr. Jordan, Ms. King explained how Greenprinting worked. Mr. Schue suggested using “Environmental Assessment” in place of “Greenprinting” which is a specific program of the Trust for Public Lands (TPL).

Mr. Schue thought 20.1 should reference BMP. The consultant said the intention was to support the Soil Conservation District programs, which could include BMPs. Staff will revise the wording.

Mr. Schue thought the last sentence in Policy 7-12.5 of the current plan “severe limitation shall be placed on septic systems upslope....” should be retained. Staff will review that policy and make a recommendation.

Mr. Carey commented that in order for the policies to be consistent, Policy 15.1 should be more “directive”.

The consultants said agency names in Objective 21.0 would be corrected.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

---

Donna R. Bohrer  
Office Associate III

---

Keith Schue  
Secretary