

MEETING: BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS AND LEGISLATIVE DELEGATION

- I. **CALL TO ORDER:** December 13, 2001, at 10:20 a.m. in the McEaddy Conference Room, 12th Floor, Palm Beach County Governmental Center, West Palm Beach, Florida.

MEMBERS AND OFFICERS PRESENT

Chair Warren H. Newell
Vice-Chair Carol A. Roberts
Commissioner Burt Aaronson
Commissioner Addie L. Greene
Commissioner Mary McCarty
Commissioner Karen T. Marcus
Commissioner Tony Masilotti
County Administrator Robert Weisman
Chief Deputy County Attorney Gordon P. Selfridge
Recording Clerk Joseph Smith
Condensing Clerk Linda C. Hickman

LEGISLATIVE DELEGATION MEMBERS PRESENT

Chair Representative Jeff Atwater
Vice-Chair Representative Richard Machek - Absent
Representative Bill Andrews - Absent
Representative Susan Bucher – Absent
Senator Mandy Dawson
Representative Lois Frankel
Representative Anne Gannon
Senator Steve Geller – Absent
Representative James Harper, Jr.
Senator Ron Klein
Representative Connie Mack
Representative Joe Negron
Senator Ken Pruitt – Absent
Senator Tom Rossin
Senator Debby Sanderson
Representative Irving Slosberg

- II. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

- III. **WELCOMING COMMENTS:** Commissioner Warren H. Newell and Representative Jeff Atwater

- IV. **SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**

- V. **FLORIDA ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES (FAC) LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES, COMMISSIONER KAREN T. MARCUS**

Commissioner Marcus outlined FAC's legislative priorities for the upcoming session. She thanked everyone for their assistance during Session C which resulted in the counties not having to absorb medicaid costs. The priority issues were Article 5 funding, ensuring there were no other cost shifts to counties, and tax reform. She noted that FAC, the League of Cities, and the School Board Association would meet with Senator John McKay this month to hear his presentation on tax reform.

V.1. UNSCHEDULED ITEM

STATE HEALTH CARE FUNDING - DISCUSSED 12-13-2001

Representative Slosberg said that he was a member of the state's Health Care Appropriations Committee which had provided funding of \$48 million to Miami-Dade County, \$8 million to Broward County, \$9 million to Hillsboro County, and \$6 million to Orange County. Palm Beach County did not receive any funds, however, which prompted him to investigate. There were the Disproportionate Share (DSH) Program and the Upper Payment Limit (UPL) Program, whereby counties submitted dollars to the state and received 20-40 percent investment returns, various bonuses, plus the return of the funds they submitted. He stressed that Palm Beach County's Health Care District commissioners needed to become more informed on the funding programs available from the state.

Commissioner Roberts asked if documentation could be submitted to the Board of County Commissioners who would contact the Health Care District. Senator Klein explained that Broward County, Hillsboro County, Miami-Dade County, and Orange County participated in the UPL Program because they had public hospitals. Palm Beach County no longer had public hospitals. The program was going to change and there was an opportunity for the Legislative Delegation along with the county and the Health Care District to work together to ensure that the program was restructured so that the county could benefit from it. Commissioner Masilotti recommended that the Health Care District be included in the joint meetings with the Legislative Delegation.

VI. PALM BEACH COUNTY STATE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

VI.A. APPROPRIATIONS REQUESTS

VI.A.1.

LAKE WORTH LAGOON - DISCUSSED 12-13-2001

Palm Beach County Legislative Affairs Director Todd J. Bonlarron commented that the county obtained \$2.5 million last year for projects related to the Lake Worth Lagoon, and this year, the request was for \$5 million. Representative Atwater and Senator Pruitt supported those appropriations last year. Commissioner Newell reported that the City of West Palm Beach also sought funding for the lagoon last year. It was unclear in the beginning whether the city's funds were included in the \$2.5 million submitted to the county or if it was to be separate funding. Ultimately it came out of the \$2.5 million, which caused problems. He requested that all entities interested in seeking funds for the lagoon participate jointly.

VI.A.2.

WINSBERG FARMS WETLAND RESTORATION - DISCUSSED 12-13-2001

Mr. Bonlarron reported that the project was for groundwater recharge, increase of wildlife habitats, green space, and reduction of dependence on some of the deep injection wells. The request was for \$1.5 million in funding for this year. Money that was appropriated last year in the budget for the project was vetoed by the governor. Representative Gannon and Senator Klein had agreed to advocate the issue. South Florida Water Management District was a partner for the project.

VI. PALM BEACH COUNTY LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM - CONTINUED

VI.A.3.

BEACH AND INLET MANAGEMENT PROJECT APPROPRIATIONS - DISCUSSED 12-13-2001

Mr. Bonlarron said that the county had been very successful with the beach and inlet management projects. State lobbyist Kathleen Daley Montoya had been instrumental years ago in working with the state legislators to ensure that a dedicated funding source was in place for those projects. This year, the request was for \$455,300 in funding.

VI.A.4.

WASTE WATER PELLETIZATION FACILITY - DISCUSSED 12-13-2001

Mr. Bonlarron stated that the requested funding was \$640,000. Senator Atwater and Representative Pruitt were sponsoring the project.

VI.A.5.

LOXAHATCHEE RIVER INITIATIVE - DISCUSSED 12-13-2001

Mr. Bonlarron commented that the request was for \$4.125 million in funding. Representatives Atwater and Negron and Senator Pruitt had been working on the project.

VI.A.6.

LAKE REGION WATER TREATMENT PLANT - DISCUSSED 12-13-2001

Mr. Bonlarron said that the project was an effort to provide clean drinking water for the cities of Belle Glade, Pahokee, and South Bay. Commissioner Masilotti commented that the Environmental Protection Agency had guidelines that made it impossible for the antiquated facilities in the Glades area to work effectively. South Florida Water Management District had agreed to pay 50 percent up to \$500,000, for the feasibility study and design work costs for the project. The county anticipated matching those dollars. Mr. Masilotti said that assistance was needed from the state to build a new water treatment plant to service the Glades residents. Currently the drinking water in that area contained 19 times the legal limit for carcinogens. Mr. Bonlarron said that federal and state funding was necessary. No one from the Legislative Delegation had committed to sponsor the project.

VI.A.7.

LAKE OKEECHOBEE SCENIC TRAIL - DISCUSSED 12-13-2001

Mr. Bonlarron reported that the project was a carryover from last year. The funding request was for \$2.5 million. The Metropolitan Planning Organization had applied for a Transportation Outreach Program (TOP) grant for \$650,000 and the request was unapproved. Staff would continue to work with Representatives Harper and Macheck on the project.

VI. PALM BEACH COUNTY LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM - CONTINUED

VI.A.8.

WEST NILE PREVENTION AND MOSQUITO CONTROL - DISCUSSED 12-13-2001

Mr. Bonlarron commented that there had been problems throughout the state with the West Nile virus, which was borne by mosquitoes. Many smaller counties had problems funding mosquito eradication programs. The state had been cutting back over the years with funding for mosquito control. Staff was looking into funding through the Department of Health. Senator Sanderson had been working with staff on the project.

Commissioner Roberts said that spraying on a statewide basis was more feasible because the West Nile was a fatal disease. When the normal rainfall resumed, more mosquitoes would appear. Senator Sanderson said that she served on the Appropriations Committee for Health and Human Services, and the Department of Health was one of the five entities within their budget. She would bring the issue to the attention of the committee when they meet in January 2002.

VI.A.9.

TRUANCY INTERDICTION PROGRAM - DISCUSSED 12-13-2001

Mr. Bonlarron stated that Representative Negrón had worked very hard to help get this program into the state budget last year. Unfortunately, it was vetoed by the governor. Representative Negrón would sponsor the program this year. The governor's policy staff suggested that the most appropriate place to seek funding was from education. Mr. Bonlarron said that it should not make a difference whether funding came from education or criminal justice. Staff would seek the most appropriate funding source, he said. Senators Sanderson and Dawson had agreed to sponsor the program. Commissioner Roberts agreed to assist the senators with the program.

REORDER THE AGENDA

MOTION to reorder the agenda to consider item VII. Motion by Commissioner Masilotti, seconded by Commissioner Roberts and carried 7-0.

VII. COMMENTS/ADDITIONAL ISSUES

VII.A. LOCAL BILLS

VII.A.1.

PALM BEACH COUNTY SHERIFF/CAREER SERVICE BILL - APPROVED AS AMENDED WITH DIRECTION 12-13-2001

Representative Atwater reported that members of the Legislative Delegation had heard the outline of the bill during its earlier meeting. The delegation wanted to get board input on the issue.

VII. COMMENTS/ADDITIONAL ISSUES - CONTINUED

VII.A.1. - CONTINUED

During the discussion that ensued, it was brought out that:

- The bill for this year was different from last year's bill.
- The bill had a section on collective bargaining for law enforcement officers to allow them to have the same right to collectively bargain as the municipal officers.
- The state supreme court heard the issue in April 2000 but had not made a ruling on it.
- Another section in the bill was for a hearing review board. It was anticipated that this issue would become a model for law enforcement officers statewide.
- A way to select unbiased members for a hearing review board had been developed with the assistance of the sheriff's office.
- The decision of the hearing review board would be binding on the sheriff and the employee.
- The 20 members of the hearing review board would go through a training process, which was not done today.
- The municipalities used arbitration, which was very expensive. The hearing review board would be more cost effective.
- A hearing review board should reduce litigation.
- A staff person within the sheriff's office would be the chairperson for the hearing board.
- Commissioner Newell noted that previously, membership on the hearing review board was to be voluntary and without remuneration, but it had been changed so that members would serve on an on-duty basis.
- The hearing review board members were chosen from three pools, which consisted of administrative, corrections, and law enforcement personnel. The members would be retained for three years.
- The hearings would require five employees and would have minimal impact on day-to-day operations of the sheriff's office.
- Commissioner Newell asked for documentation to be submitted to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) on the annual number of hours to be utilized by the hearing review board for training and hearings.
- There would be no financial impact on the county for training of the hearing review board members.

VII. COMMENTS/ADDITIONAL ISSUES - CONTINUED

VII.A.1. - CONTINUED

- The options to a hearing review board were the current panel, which was deemed an unfair process, and arbitration, which was very expensive.
- A third-party hearing would be similar to arbitration; therefore, it was not included as an option.
- Commissioner Masilotti was concerned with employee turnover after spending money to train the hearing review board members.
- The turnover rate in the sheriff's office was very low.
- Efforts were made to ensure that the hearing review board would be diverse.
- Commissioner Roberts recommended that language be added on page 8 of the first line of the underlined section. She asked that "for each discipline" be inserted so that the sentence would read, "There shall be a fixed pool of 20 board members for each discipline and 6 alternate members mutually agreed upon by the Sheriff and any labor organization representing the employees of the office of the Sheriff."
- Commissioner McCarty requested that the bill contain language specifying that nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting the budget making authority and power of the BCC with respect to the appeal process.
- Commissioner McCarty noted Commissioner Newell's recommendation for an amendment requesting the good faith efforts of the sheriff and the Police Benevolent Association to work with the BCC to determine how to make the sheriff solely responsible for his budget, which would include the levying of taxes. Commissioner Newell recalled that the sheriff had committed during the budget hearing to do that.
- Commissioner Masilotti said that there had been discussions with Sheriff Edward W. Bieluch about the ability of the state to run a pilot program whereby the sheriff could have taxing authority. Mr. Masilotti questioned having a local bill to support that concept.
- Commissioner Newell noted that staff had researched the issue of levying tax for law enforcement. He asked staff to resubmit that information to the board.
- Chief Deputy County Attorney Selfridge commented that state law would prohibit local law concerning taxing authority for the sheriff. Prior research took into consideration the establishment of a municipal service taxing unit (MSTU).
- Commissioner Masilotti stated his desire for the sheriff to be able to levy taxes. Mr. Selfridge said that to accomplish that, the general law would have to be changed or the county could establish an MSTU for law enforcement, which would also be a part of the county's budget. Municipalities would have to agree to an MSTU in their area. He would further research the concept of an MSTU.

VII. COMMENTS/ADDITIONAL ISSUES - CONTINUED

VII.A.1. - CONTINUED

- Under Sheriff Kenneth R. Eggleston expressed concern that someone without law enforcement experience could run as a candidate, promise the voters that taxes would be reduced, and be elected. He did not want the issue of independent taxing authority for the sheriff to become entangled with the career service legislation.
- Commissioner Aaronson stressed that people would not jeopardize their safety to have reduced taxes. They would vote for the most qualified candidate for sheriff. The sheriff would get more money as an independent taxing authority than was received from the BCC.
- Senator Klein agreed that the concept of an independent taxing authority for the sheriff should be pursued. He did not recommend that it be included in the proposed bill.
- Commissioner McCarty suggested a local resolution noting the intent of the Legislative Delegation to work with the sheriff and the board to obtain independent taxing authority for the sheriff. The intent was for the sheriff to have taxing authority similar to the Health Care District.
- Mr. Selfridge noted an additional option, which would be the passage of a local act by the legislature creating a special independent taxing district that would be subject to approval by the residents in a referendum.
- Representative Atwater stated that Amendment 2 to the bill would read, "Nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting the budget making authority and power of the Palm Beach County Board of County Commissioners. Any contractual obligations entered into by the Sheriff's Office as a result of their right to collectively bargain shall not be used in any appeal or challenge by the sheriff against the yearly lump sum budget allocation approved by the Board of County Commissioners for the sheriff's total annual budget."
- Amendment 2 would not restrict the sheriff's right to appeal to the governor for the normal course of action. The amendment would restrict the sheriff from appealing as a result of collective bargaining.
- Mr. Eggleston contended that the sheriff previously had not been bound by such language, and it had never been an issue. The concern was that once a lump sum budget was approved for the sheriff and the sheriff deemed it necessary to give his employees a higher percentage raise than that approved for county employees, the board might decide to take back the allocated funding in an amount equal to the percentage increase given to the sheriff's employees.
- Sheriff Bieluch commented that the funds approved for his budget would be utilized as stipulated within the budget.

VII. COMMENTS/ADDITIONAL ISSUES - CONTINUED

VII.A.1. - CONTINUED

- The Legislative Delegation unanimously agreed upon Amendment 2 for the bill.
- Commissioner McCarty stated that during the collective bargaining process the sheriff would be negotiating with employees, but the county would have to pay the costs resulting from the negotiations. She recommended that language be added to the collective bargaining section to state that other than the cost of living adjustments, no other fiscal issues should be considered because the county would not be participating in negotiations.
- Amendment 1 to the bill stated that, "Deputy sheriffs in their status as public employees shall be entitled to all rights, privileges, and obligations granted by law, including their right to organize and collectively bargain for the purpose of promotional considerations and cost of living adjustments, pursuant to part II of Chapter 447, Florida Statutes."
- Commissioner McCarty said that the assurance had been that other than cost of living, there would be no fiscal impact as a result of collective bargaining because it was already covered in the career service bill.
- Police Benevolent Association President Ernie George asked that deputy sheriffs not be limited to collectively bargain for promotional considerations and cost of living adjustments. That would prohibit the county's deputies from negotiating like deputies in other counties.
- Commissioner Roberts suggested that Amendment 1 be deferred for discussion by the BCC at a future date.
- Mr. Atwater said the delegation would be meeting on a regular basis in Tallahassee and would consider any of the appropriations and local bills that the BCC wanted addressed.
- Commissioner McCarty asked the Legislative Delegation to proceed with the bill with the inclusion of Amendment 2. If there were a need for additional changes, the board would discuss them with the delegation next year.
- Commissioner Marcus said the Florida Association of Counties wanted to work with the Police Benevolent Association.

STAFF WAS DIRECTED TO:

- Submit documentation to the BCC on the annual number of hours to be utilized by the hearing review board for training and hearings.
- Insert "for each discipline" on page 8 of the first line of the underlined section, so that the sentence would read, "There shall be a fixed pool of 20 board members for each discipline and 6 alternate members mutually agreed upon by the Sheriff and any labor organization representing the employees of the office of the Sheriff."

VII. COMMENTS/ADDITIONAL ISSUES - CONTINUED

VII.A.1. - CONTINUED

- Add language to the collective bargaining section to state that other than the cost of living adjustments, no other fiscal issues should be considered because the county would not be participating in negotiations.
- Add language specifying that nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting the budget making authority and power of the BCC with respect to the appeal process.
- Submit information to the board after further research of the issue of levying tax for law enforcement.
- Draft a resolution noting the intent of the Legislative Delegation to work with the sheriff and the board to obtain independent taxing authority for the sheriff.

MOTION to approve the local bill with Amendment 2. Motion by Senator Sanderson, seconded by Senator Klein, and carried 9-2. Senator Dawson and Representative Frankel opposed. Representative Andrews, Representative Bucher, Senator Geller, Representative Machek, and Senator Pruitt absent.

Mr. Atwater said that the delegation would move forward with the bill as amended.

VII.A.2.

LOCAL OPTION SALES TAX - DISCUSSED 12-13-2001

Mr. Bonlarron reported that the local option sales tax bill was not a local bill but a general bill. It would require a change to general law. The bill provided for a local referendum for a local one-half cent option on sales tax within the boundaries of the largest city in any county with a population over 1 million people. The tax would be used for infrastructure, which included any capital expenditures or fixed capital on any construction/reconstruction or improvement of public facilities with an expectancy of five years or more. It excluded a sports stadium or arena. It also allowed for fire department vehicles, emergency medical services vehicles, and police department vehicles, with an expectancy of at least five years to be included. During the discussion that ensued, the following points were brought out:

- The delegation wanted to obtain local input although it was not a local bill.
- The bill would allow for a discretionary trust fund of up to 15 percent.
- Representative Macheck and Senator Klein were sponsoring the bill.
- Commissioner Roberts said she opposed the bill because it could hurt businesses within the municipalities. People who used the infrastructure should pay for it.

VII. COMMENTS/ADDITIONAL ISSUES - CONTINUED

VII.A.2. - CONTINUED

- Commissioner Masilotti said voters had the right to decide whether they wanted the tax.
- Commissioner Marcus said she would not support the bill because the City of West Palm Beach could accomplish having the tax without the proposed legislation by getting the other municipalities to agree to allow West Palm Beach to access the one-half cent. That would adversely impact the other municipalities' ability to also access the one-half cent sales tax. The Florida Association of Counties would oppose the bill because it hindered the ability to do a countywide sales tax. The League of Cities considered the bill as a way to access the counties' sales tax, which would cause a tremendous problem for county government.
- Commissioner Aaronson stated that tourism was greatly suffering and an additional one-half cent sales tax would be disastrous for area hotels.
- Commissioner McCarty stated that the bill would only have to do with the City of West Palm Beach and would not prohibit the other municipalities that met statutory requirements from pursuing the one-half cent sales tax. She did not oppose the bill as long as it did not impact the county's taxing authority.
- Commissioner Aaronson opposed the bill because the county had a vested interest in the convention center and other facilities within the City of West Palm Beach. The one-half cent sales tax would hurt the economy and could make a tremendous difference in the payoff of the \$80 million debt of the convention center.
- Representative Atwater said that the delegation would not vote on the bill today.
- The bill would affect cities in Broward County and Miami-Dade County.
- Mayor Joel T. Daves had met with the mayor of the City of Fort Lauderdale, who supported the bill, as well as some of the officials of the City of Miami.
- The City of West Palm Beach had met with individual legislators from Broward County and Miami-Dade County to get their support for the bill.
- Representative Macheck was presenting the bill to the Martin County Legislative Delegation today.
- Commissioner Newell suggested that the BCC discuss the bill and submit a position paper to the delegation.

(CLERK'S NOTE: For continuation of item VII, see page 14.)

VI. PALM BEACH COUNTY STATE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM - CONTINUED

VI.B. LEGISLATIVE REQUESTS

Representative Atwater asked the board to note which requests were priorities. Mr. Bonlarron stated that many of the requests were issues the board had previously discussed. Therefore, he would go over the larger issues that would be dealt with and a couple of the new issues that were proposed.

VI.B.10.

REAPPORTIONMENT - DISCUSSED 12-13-2001

Mr. Bonlarron said that the county would like to see the legislature draw more districts within the county.

VI.B.11.

UNFUNDED MANDATES AND COST SHIFTS - DISCUSSED 12-13-2001

Mr. Bonlarron said the issue of shifting costs from state responsibilities to the counties came up during the past two special sessions of the legislature, particularly in the area of medicaid and nursing home costs. There was not a lot of dialog between the state and the counties concerning what should actually occur and what the contribution levels and rates should be. The Florida Association of Counties (FAC) adamantly opposed the issue. The cost shifts were not imposed upon the counties in the past session. Mr. Bonlarron thanked Senator Sanderson and Representative Gannon, who worked on the Appropriations Conference Committee over the weekend to ensure that those unfunded mandates and cost shifts stayed out of the final bill. He also thanked the other members who supported the county's position on the issue. The ensuing discussion brought out that:

- FAC was scheduled to meet with the governor in January 2002 to discuss his budget and cost shifts to counties.
- Representative Gannon recommended that FAC confer with the leadership in the House of Representatives concerning the nursing home cost shift.
- Commissioner Marcus commented that if the local delegation would express to the legislative leadership that the cost shifts were unacceptable, the leadership might look elsewhere for funds for the programs.
- Commissioner Marcus recommended the formation of a group consisting of state and county representatives who would determine what issues should be funded by the state and what issues should be funded by the counties.
- Commissioner Aaronson stated that fairness was accomplished when state and counties negotiated the rules for funding issues.

Mr. Bonlarron said that staff had been working with members of the delegation on the issues. He recommended that the focus be on Implementation of Revision 7 and the Transportation Outreach Program.

VI. PALM BEACH COUNTY STATE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM - CONTINUED

VI.B.12.

IMPLEMENTATION OF REVISION 7 - DISCUSSED 12-13-2001

Mr. Bonlarron said that implementation of Revision 7 had been a high priority for the county for many years as well as the number 1 priority for the Florida Association of Counties. Revision 7 was the funding of the state court system. The concern was to ensure that implementation of Revision 7 continued to move forward in a timely manner in the next legislative session. The county paid approximately \$19 million for the court system, which staff believed was the state's responsibility.

VI.B.13.

TRAFFIC SAFETY PHOTO ENFORCEMENT - DISCUSSED 12-13-2001

Commissioner Roberts asked the delegation to look very closely into the issue.

VI.B.14.

PAWNBROKERING - DISCUSSED 12-13-2001

Commissioner Roberts asked the delegation to look very closely into the issue. Commissioner Newell stated that the pawnbrokering legislation was new and was supported by Value Pawn & Jewelry and not Cash America Pawn. The legislation required the owner and manager of a pawnbrokering service to be certified and to take a course on the state law.

VI.B.15.

REGULATION OF MOVING INDUSTRY - DISCUSSED 12-13-2001

Commissioner Roberts asked the delegation to look very closely into the issue.

VI.B.16.

CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS FOR VEHICLE-FOR-HIRE-DRIVERS - DISCUSSED 12-13-2001

Commissioner Roberts asked the delegation to look very closely into the issue.

VI.B.17.

INCREASE FINES FOR BOATERS WITHIN A 500-FOOT RANGE AROUND FISHING PIERS - DISCUSSED 12-13-2001

Commissioner Marcus said that boaters within a 500-foot range around fishing piers were becoming a safety issue. She said that a stronger deterrent would be to increase fines.

VI. PALM BEACH COUNTY STATE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM - CONTINUED

VI.B.18.

DERELICT VESSELS - DISCUSSED 12-13-2001

Commissioner Masilotti asked for assistance regarding the derelict vessels issue. He requested the ability to place a lien against the owners of boats that sink and are removed by the county.

VI.B.19.

BEACH PROJECT REIMBURSEMENT - NO DISCUSSION 12-13-2001

VI.B.20.

SHARED TITLE ON CONSERVATION LAND - NO DISCUSSION 12-13-2001

VI.B.21.

COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCIES - DISCUSSED 12-13-2001

Commissioner Roberts said the community redevelopment agencies bill would allow a governmental body to have more than one community redevelopment agency.

VI.B.22.

TRANSPORTATION OUTREACH PROGRAM - DISCUSSED 12-13-2001

Mr. Bonlarron said that for the second consecutive year, the Transportation Outreach Advisory Committee did not recommend projects for District 4. He thanked Representative Harper and Senator Dawson for their efforts during the last legislative session on trying to pass amendments to change the makeup of the advisory committee. The amendment would allow the committee to become more regional so that each district would have equitable representation. The same efforts would be applied for this year, he said. The delegation had sent a letter to the governor requesting that any project that was submitted for funding consideration under the Transportation Outreach Program (TOP) be considered on its individual merits and rated accordingly, even though it were not a recommended item on the TOP list.

Commissioner McCarty's queried the selection of the members of the Transportation Outreach Advisory Committee. Mr. Bonlarron said that the governor selected three members, the Speaker of the House of Representatives selected two, and the President of the Senate selected two. Mr. Atwater reported that the delegation had sent a letter together with the Broward County, Martin County, and St. Lucie County delegates requesting a visit with the governor to discuss the matter.

Representative Harper commended county staff and lobbyist for their advocacy and education efforts to the delegation regarding the Transportation Outreach Program. Commissioner McCarty suggested that the delegates and lobbyist look at the projects that had been awarded funding to see if any of them actually met the original intent of the program.

VII. COMMENTS/ADDITIONAL ISSUES

VII.A. See pages 4-10.

VII.B.

TIMELY SUBMISSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO THE BOARD -
DISCUSSED 12-13-2001

Commissioner Newell asked that any proposed legislation be submitted to the BCC early enough to allow for its proper review before a meeting.

VII.C.

ASSISTANCE FOR THE LEGISLATIVE DELEGATION - DISCUSSED 12-13-2001

Mr. Atwater commended county staff and lobbyist for their assistance to the Legislative Delegation.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The joint meeting was adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

ATTESTED:

APPROVED:

Clerk

Chair