



**DEPARTMENT OF
COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT**

Dave Tomek
Director

Robert Deatherage
Building

Mary Beth Salisbury
Community Resources

Joe Johnston
Customer Resources

Mahmoud Najda P.E.
Development Review

Kerry Godwin
Planning & Zoning

**Osceola
County**

1 Courthouse Square
Suite 1100
Kissimmee, FL 34741
PH: (407) 742-0200
Fax: (407) 742-0206
www.osceola.org

June 6, 2012

Lt. Col. Paul "Forrest" Neidhardt
U.S.A.F Detachment 1, 23rd Wing
Deployed Unit Complex
Avon Park AF Range

RE: CPA12-0001, Osceola County JLUS 2012
*Osceola County's Response to comments from APAFR Commander
PAUL E. NEIDHARDT, Lt Col, USAF Det 1, 23 WG/CC, received via
email on Monday June 4, 2012 at 9:25 AM.*

Dear Lt. Col. Neidhardt:

Thank you for sending your comments related to CPA12-0001 and the Osceola County JLUS 2012. We appreciate your input and expertise as we move through the process of implementing compatibility with military installations in Osceola County. Below we have included each of your comments as well as a detailed response to each. Most comments are answered by directing you to the data and analysis contained elsewhere in the JLUS, the Comprehensive Plan, or the LDC, but there are several where we've proposed modifications to our JLUS submittal. We look forward to meeting with you on Thursday, June 7, 2012 at 4PM to personally address each comment and make sure we continue to move in the right direction toward compatibility with the APAFR. It is our goal to find consensus at our meeting, then present your comments as well as our responses at the Planning Commission on Thursday. The changes will be reflected in the Board of County Commissioners documents for CPA12-0001, subject to confirmation at the Planning Commission meeting on Thursday evening.

COMMENT 1: I know Osceola's concerns with the original 2010 JLUS and wished to update/modify it for the particular environment of Osceola County. I know that a lot of folks worked on the 2010 JLUS including the range commander, representatives from the US Air Force, Navy, and the Florida National Guard, many state agencies and environmental agencies and was finally sanctioned through the DoD's Office of Economic Adjustment as part of their Compatible Use Program. I think it would be better to call this an Update or Supplement to the original 2010 JLUS vs a replacement.

RESPONSE: JLUS 2012 is not an amendment, but may be a supplement.
Osceola County did not adopt the 2010 JLUS, and as such, calling this an update would not be consistent with the County's actions; however, your suggestion of calling it a Supplement to the 2010 JLUS may be appropriate. Osceola County is adopting the data of the 2010 JLUS into the County's JLUS and the D&A of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, and the County acknowledges the 2010 JLUS in multiple areas of the Study. As such it is fitting to call this the Osceola County 2012 JLUS, supplementing the CFRPC JLUS 2010. We are proposing revisions to page 4 of our Board of County Commissioners Staff Report to include the reference to a supplement.



COMMENT 2: Although I know, based on the planning meetings, that the MBZ <115 (MIPA 3) areas were not going to be considered extremely important due to the low possibility of noise complaints, is there anyway to include this in TRN-10 just for the capability to reference it in the future if needed.

RESPONSE: Pursuant to Future Land Use Policy 1.10.7, Military blast noise up to 115 db is not applicable to use of land or transportation planning, therefore, should not be included on TRN Map 10. TRN Map 10 identifies Air Transportation facilities and Special Planning Areas as outlined in Transportation Element Policy 1.10.7 (see Policy text below). The policy requires coordination with airport authorities to ensure compatible land uses. This is specific to compatibility and coordination related to the use of land, or that have impacts on the Future Land Use Element and Transportation Element. Blast Noise up to 115 DB, as defined in the JLUS Recommendation #1, requires educational activities to be implemented by county as part of Recommendation #4C. This data will be shown on the maps in the JLUS D&A as well as those on our website, but it does not impact the use of land—it does not affect the current or future land uses of the properties, nor does it affect the long range transportation plans of the County—therefore it should not be shown on the Comprehensive Plan Map Series. While it is not relevant at this time, as conditions change as to the status of the base, then we can consider a future amendment and/or update to the JLUS 2012. Until such time as future need is identified, the MBZ-115 will be maintained in the JLUS 2012 in the Data and Analysis of the Comprehensive Plan and included by reference in FLUE Policy 1.7.4.

Policy 1.10.7: Coordination with airport authorities.

The County will coordinate with airport authorities to ensure that compatible land uses are adjacent to existing and future airports consistent with map TRN 10: Air Transportation Facilities and Special Planning Areas - 2025.

COMMENT 3: The 2012 JLUS references the need to change the lighting standards. Is there a standard that you want to follow? When you guys talked to the AF Safety folks, did they state that there is an AF lighting standard? Wouldn't it be good in the JLUS to define what standard (assuming there is one) will be followed?

RESPONSE: Lighting standards will be further addressed upon receipt of information from Captain Zachary Garrett, USAF Human Factors Expert.

The JLUS 2012 acknowledges that the current Osceola County Land Development Code (LDC) has lighting standards that do not allow off property glare and which meets the requirements for compatibility with base operations, but we saw an opportunity for improvement in our current code and are requiring as part of the JLUS 2012 that the County add lighting standards specific to subdivision street lighting in the MOAs, which could have lights that can look like a false horizon or other impacts on Night Vision Training. The recommendations are intended to further limit the lighting that can be permitted in the public right-of way within a subdivision, if one should be developed. Per comments from Growth Management Task Force (GMTF) on May 24, 2012, we have updated JLUS 2012 to state that subdivision lighting is not required, but if it is provided it will meet these more restrictive standards. The language added to the JLUS states, "This recommendation is not intended to require street lighting in subdivisions, but only to restrict the type of lighting should



street lighting be proposed." The opportunity for non-lighting furthers the intent for subdivision street lighting to be compatible with range operations.

When the JLUS 2012 Report was produced we had not received formal recommendations from Captain Zachary Garrett, USAF Human Factors Expert; therefore, we do not have specific lighting standards to include in our ongoing LDC updates, but we will continue to work with the Base Commander and Captain Zachary Garrett, USAF Human Factors Expert to implement additional standards into our code. In an effort to show our willingness to coordinate and ensure compatibility, the JLUS 2012 specifically identifies the Air Force Human Factors Expert as part of recommendation #2, in Section 2 of the JLUS 2012, regarding the lighting and ongoing Land Development Code (LDC) revisions. As part of our coordination we may include details for shielding, separation of light sources, and types of lighting to be included as restrictions for new subdivision street lighting proposed within the MOAs—this will promote compatibility with aircraft operations within the MOA's and night vision training areas. Our current recommendations in Section 3, #5 (page 20) identify Dark Sky as one of many examples for appropriate and compatible lighting—the Dark Sky standard is one of the most restrictive and widely accepted lighting standards in use today. Lighting requirements will be implemented through a comprehensive review of the county lighting standards and a formal LDC Amendment, which will include recommendations from the USAF Human Factors Expert and will be brought before the Planning Commission, where the Base Commander will have additional opportunity to provide comment. Your input, as well as that of the USAF Human Factors Expert (HFE) will be greatly appreciated at the time of our LDC Amendment. If the recommendations are received from the HFE prior to the adoption, our recommendation may be updated in our adoption documents, which are goaled to be completed in August 2012.

COMMENT 4: I didn't notice anything stating that Landfills were not compatible with the MOA's or restricted airspace.

RESPONSE: Landfills and Bird Aircraft Strike Hazards (BASH) are addressed in Section 3 of the JLUS. Conditional Use Site Standards have been added to Appendix D.

The 2010 JLUS Data identified Bird Aircraft Strike Hazards (BASH) as the predominate concern for landfill use. Currently there are none of these facilities within the MOAs. Additionally, the current LDC requires Landfills to undergo Conditional Use Approval, which includes siting requirements and a public hearing before the Planning Commission. Within Section 3, #11 of the JLUS 2012 (page 23), we have provided the following language, "In order to prevent Bird Aircraft Strike Hazards (BASH), landfills within the MOA's should continue to require a conditional use review. Should a landfill be proposed within a MOA, it should be reviewed closely to ensure bird control methods are explored, and that the most effective methods in preventing BASH are utilized. The APAFR Commander, as outlined in the LDC, will also have the opportunity to address any BASH or other potential new bird-attracting land uses brought forward for consideration." Your input, should a Landfill be proposed, will be greatly appreciated.

Additionally, we will revise the JLUS 2012 to include the Conditional Use Site Standards (CUSS) to Appendix D of the JLUS 2012, which includes the specific siting standards that must be followed for Landfills as well as other uses.



COMMENT 5: On page 20 at the top, it is stated "Osceola County has determined that providing additional recommendations for a perimeter buffer around the range boundary is not necessary.."

Although I might agree that today, this statement is true who knows what the future holds. I am not the expert in REPI funding and similar initiatives for base buffering, but it appears that this statement means Osceola County is not interested in this avenue of buffering and conservation.

RESPONSE: *Osceola County supports conservation buffers (see Recommendation #5), but the County is not physically adjacent to the base and unable to provide physical buffers (trees, fencing, shrubs, etc.).*

We believe our statement in the JLUS is about a locational issue, not about buffering and conservation. The language at the end of #8 Section 3 was intended to acknowledge that Osceola County is not physically adjacent to the base; therefore the County does not have the opportunity to provide physical barriers or tree buffers on the perimeter of the base. Through our JLUS 2012, the County acknowledges the existing land acquisition/conservation projects and surrounding agricultural uses as compatible and transitional uses between the Osceola County and the perimeter of the base. The County will continue to support the base's efforts and those of the immediately impacted communities to provided physical buffers. If through the appropriate federal process the base expands its boundaries to extend into Osceola County we will support their efforts to provide appropriate physical buffers. If at that time it becomes necessary to update our JLUS, we will gladly do so at that time. We believe that REPI and other state and federal land conservation programs identified in the JLUS 2010 are great ways to support military readiness and ensure military compatibility. Recommendation #5, Section 2 (pages 16-17) affirms Osceola County's commitment to encourage this avenue to support military readiness through environmental conservation.

COMMENT 6: There is a good amount of discussion on wind farms. The current operations at the range are not affected by wind farms, although if the F-16 used its radar more at our range it could impact them, based on the distance to the range. Honestly I don't know if Avon Park will ever see the F-35, but I do know that wind farms do impact some training opportunities for that airframe. A detailed study would need to be completed if one is proposed below the airspace. This should be included in the JLUS.

RESPONSE: *Wind farms, if any proposed, should be addressed on a case-by case basis through the current zoning and FAA review processes.*

If any wind farms are proposed in Osceola County they will have to meet the height standards outlined in the JLUS, which puts their maximum height at 100' below the floor of any MOA. Additionally, any wind turbine in excess of 200' would require FAA approval to ensure compatibility with any and all aviation operations, including that of the APAFR. If there are other specific impacts that a wind farm that is 100' below the height of the MOA might have on base operations, please provide that data, including the specific type of impact and associated studies and we can address the impact; otherwise, it is our conclusion that the limitations on height more than addresses any potential impacts on base operations. Additionally, depending on the location of a wind farm within the MOA, the use may have no impact on APAFR operations; therefore, it is more appropriate to address these on a case-by-case basis through the existing zoning and FAA processes, when or if one is submitted.



COMMENT 7: Can you please help me determine what is meant by Appendix D, para B #21 and Para C # 26. Are you saying that airfields are compatible under the airspace?

RESPONSE: *Class I and Class II landing fields, if any proposed, should be addressed on a case-by-case basis through the current zoning and FAA review processes. Conditional Use Site Standards have been added to Appendix D.*

Section 14.6 B(21) - Class I aircraft landing fields are defined as private landing field (small planes). These are common in the agricultural communities to facilitate crop dusters and other ranching activities. As such, these are allowed as a permitted use subject to Conditional Use Site Standards (CUSS) and require FAA Approval. FAA approval will further ensure compatibility with any and all aviation operations, including that of the APAFR. Depending on the location within the MOA, the use may have no impact on APAFR operations; therefore, it is more appropriate to address these on a case-by-case basis through the existing zoning and FAA processes, when or if one is submitted.

Section 14.6 C(26) - Class II aircraft landing fields are defined as small planes for public or private use. These can be slightly larger than the Class 1 landing field and therefore are allowed only as a Conditional Use, subject to Conditional Use Site Standards (CUSS), and require FAA Approval. FAA approval will further ensure compatibility with any and all aviation operations, including that of the APAFR. The Conditional Use process, as defined today, requires CUs to go before the Planning Commission for approval. The base commander will have opportunity to provide comment on an airfield via the Planning Commission process and through the FAA approval; therefore, if there are any concerns related to military operations they can be addressed at that time. Again, depending on the location within the MOA, the use may have no impact on APAFR operations; therefore, it is more appropriate to address these on a case-by-case basis through the existing zoning and FAA processes, when or if one is submitted.

Additionally, we will revise the JLUS 2012 to include the Conditional Use Site Standards (CUSS) to Appendix D of the JLUS 2012, which includes the specific siting standards for both Class I and Class II landing fields, as well as other uses.

We trust these responses should adequately address your concerns. Again, we look forward to meeting with you at 4:00 PM on Thursday to further discuss these comments and the County responses in an effort to ensure we are furthering the County's intent to provide compatibility with the Avon Park Air Force Range. If you find that we've not adequately addressed your concerns or if you have additional comments, please do not hesitate to call or send us an email so that we can ensure that we have appropriately addressed military compatibility in our Comprehensive Plan.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kerry Godwin".

Kerry Godwin, AICP, RLA

Planning & Zoning Manager, Osceola County Community Development