

**PALM BEACH COUNTY
CITIZENS TASK FORCE**

Thursday, June 26, 2003

2:17 p.m. – 4:20 p.m.

100 South Australian Avenue

West Palm Beach, Florida

Reporting:

Rita Hazel

Notary Public

ATTENDEES

Wesley Blackman, Vice Chair

David Carpenter

Maury Jacobson

Frank Palen

Bruce Kaleita

Wayne Fish

Barbara Noble

Steven Bruh

Ron Last

Rosa Durando

Barbara Katz

Charles Omeilia

Jon MacGillis, Zoning Administrator

Bill Whiteford, Zoning Director

Lenny Berger, Esquire, Assistant County Attorney

Barbara Alterman, Executive Director PZ&B

Carrie Rechenmacher, Senior Planner

Barbara Pinkston-Taylor, Principal Site Planner

Isaac Hoyos, Principal Planner

INDEX

<u>Item</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Roll Call	4
2	Additions, Subtractions, Deletions	6
3	Adopt Agenda	6

4	Excused Absences	6
5	Approve Minutes	7
6	ULDC Amendments	8
7	Article 1 Chapter B	8
8	Article 2	20
9	Article 17	23
10	Article 3 Chapter A	78

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Today is June 26, 2003. The time now is 17
after 2 and the secretary will now call the roll.

MS. BILKA: Joanne Davis.

(No response.)

MS. BILKA: Susan Daniels.

(No response.)

MS. BILKA: David Carpenter.

MR. CARPENTER: Here.

MS. BILKA: Barbara Noble.

MS. NOBLE: Here.

MS. BILKA: Barbara Katz.

MS. KATZ: Here.

MS. BILKA: Stephen Dechert.

(No response.)

MS. BILKA: Bruce Kaleita.

MR. KALEITA: Here.

MS. BILKA: Ron Last.

MR. LAST: Here.

MS. BILKA: D.J. Snapp.

(No response.)

MS. BILKA: Wesley Blackman.

MR. BLACKMAN: Here.

MS. BILKA: Rosa Durando.

MS. DURANDO: Here.

MS. BILKA: Carmela Starace.

(No response.)

MS. BILKA: Maury Jacobson.

(No response.)

MS. BILKA: Larry Fish.

(No response.)

MS. BILKA: Steven Bruh.

MR. BRUH: Here.

MS. BILKA: Frank Palen.

MR. PALEN: Here.

MADAM SECRETARY: And a note that Joanne Davis called this morning and said she would not attend. Also Susan Daniels is not available to attend as well.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Charles Omeilia is representing Carmela, okay. Moving on, additions, substitutions or deletions. Any changes, staff? I know that we had the errata package arrive at 2:00 today, anything else?

MR. MACGILLIS: We can go in order.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Motion to adopt the agenda?

MR. BRUH: So moved.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Motion, second?

MR. FISH: Second.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Seeing none, those in favor, aye.

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Those against, same sign.

MR. KALEITA: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Yes.

MR. KALEITA: I would like to add myself to Item A-4, that I am requesting an excused early departure and that I have an important meeting. I will be leaving at 3:30.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Ron Last also contacted me about the meeting and he has to leave at 3:30 also. I think we're at 11 now. If Maury comes in, we'll be at 12 so we maybe okay. But we'll just hover around the forum.

MR. WHITEFORD: Let's get it on the record that Larry is not here.

MR. KALEITA: Larry Fish has arrived.

(Larry Fish arrived at 2:20.)

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Okay. Excused absences, could we have a motion to excuse those who have indicated that they would not be here?

MS. NOBLE: So moved.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Second, discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Seeing none, those in favor, aye.

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Those against, same sign, motion passes.

There are two sets of minutes, one from May 15th and one from May 22nd. We can accrue those together, motion, second?

MS. NOBLE: Just another question, on some of the opening pages it lists attendees, but then when you look through the body of the document, there are other individuals that are represented as speaking, but might not be on the attendance list. So just to double-check them, the Commissioners on the May 22nd meeting.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: A good point. Anything else? We have no motion. Do we have a second? Those in favor, say aye.

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Those against, same sign.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Motion passes. I'd like to note that Maury Jacobson is here.

(Maury Jacobson arrived at 2:25 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Moving on, Under ULDC Amendments, Article 1, Chapter B, Zoning Director Interpretations. I will just go to staff for an explanation.

MR. MACGILLIS: First off Chapter B is currently Article 2 in the Unified Land Development Code. It's simply been reformatted. It now becomes Chapter B in Article 1, in which the CTF has already given us preliminary approval on it two months ago. If you haven't seen this entire article, all we are doing is inserting the Zoning Interpretation into Article 1, which has to do with interpreting the code and rules of construction, nonconformities and the like. So we felt it was appropriate to put it in that article up front.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: So there are no, if you would, individual changes to—

MR. MACGILLIS: No changes other than reformatting. So it is consistent with the rest of the format.

MR. BRUH: Is this the Chapter B thing?

MR. MACGILLIS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Discussions?

MR. KALEITA: I'm sorry. I have to admit that I don't know where – on Page 2 Line 30 through 35? I was not aware that Lines 30 through 35, on Page 2 of this were in here and I would like to point out that they are entirely inconsistent with the law of Equitable Estoppel, which holds and relies upon the opinion of the Director of the department, which administers a portion of the code, as being interpreted. It is binding on the County if you rely upon it.

This is inconsistent with that and I object to Section 2. If you want to know that the staff and not the director, I think, that's fine. That's consistent with the case law, but if you say that you can't rely on anything that anybody in the

County says, I object to that on a legal grounds and it's also kind of -- I would suggest that the County not adopt this if you can't rely on anything the county says.

MR. BERGER: I like that. Actually, this is -- well, first, we've never made an Estoppel clause. That's the province of the courts. Certainly if there is an equitable issue out there, that's what the Court will do. This language is actually, has been borrowed from the Florida Administrative Code and is essentially and it's found there buried somewhere in the Administrative Code sections, which again, like in this large section here is a part that plays out a process for getting an additional opinion that you can rely upon. And it simply says, if you don't get it that, don't believe us, in so many words.

MR. KALEITA: I'd like this to say that. This says don't believe us anyway, no matter what I say. I have much more respect for my Government than that. And I want to believe you and I feel we should say in here, if you get an interpretation by the Director of any particular department as to regulations under his administration, that you are entitled to rely on it. Otherwise, I can tell you something, in my view, the County is going to think that you guys are a bunch of Indians givers.

MR. BERGER: How about if we say except this, you know -- I think what we would probably do is relate it to Section 1. And if you do it under Section 1, you can rely on it, otherwise, this language folds. Does that sound reasonable, something along those lines?

MR. CARPENTER: That's what I was going to bring up.

MR. BERGER: That's what the intent of this was to say, if you follow the procedures here, you have an opinion you can bank on.

MR. CAPRENTER: Looking at zoning in Section 2, just looking at it. It's not an opinion for the Zoning Director like you would get, you know, in a meeting with a Director or a letter from the Director. I think this is – so if it relates to Section 1 then it ought to.

MR. KALEITA: That's not out of Section 1. Section 1 you can rely on. The rest of this you can't.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Frank.

MR. PALEN: To the extent by law, we can rely on it to the extent provided by law.

MR. BERGER: That's fair.

MR. PALEN: It might have been the separation is more apparent here because of the way it's now been codified also, which maybe why this – because before it was probably one gigantic section in the sub-paragraphs, but that's fine. We can do that.

MR. KALEITA: So we don't have to change the caption of that to, "Don't believe anything we say." For a while I was going to suggest the staff's assistance in representation.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Anything else? Steve had a comment, Steven.

MR. BRUH: I guess I have a couple of questions. These are how to's. How did we get to this stage in life? To me one is, why is there a fee for requesting an interpretation?

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Staff, do you have an answer for that? Why is there a fee for interpretation?

MR. MACGILLIS: It's a \$35.00 minimal fee for the –I mean, there is a considerable amount of research that goes into that. Sometimes it's 20 hours of research.

MR. KALEITA: I think I can answer that. There's a reason why. Several years back, the County PZB commissioned a study to determine whether there were additional revenue sources as yet untapped, which could lead to offsetting some of the budget shortfalls, which we would be experiencing. This was one of the resources and the consulting recommended it and that's why it was done.

MR. WHITEFORD: It's \$35.00.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: That is the formal application form.

MR. BRUH: It takes \$35.00. Why if something that is so complex, that takes you so long to get the information together for a determination, is so much. You have the right to ask the question when it wasn't clear what was before them. Why should they have to pay for it? Isn't that your job?

MR. WHITEFORD: Most of the time people get a verbal response and the response isn't the one that they like or disagree with. So they will purposely write a letter asking for a written response with the intent to appeal it.

MR. BRUH: Shouldn't that be your duty to do that without getting an additional fee for it?

MR. KALEITA: Steve, just hire clients that have 35 bucks.

MR. WHITEFORD: If that's the case, I'll spot you the money next time.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: It's actually a way to get a different answer than what the Director is giving you.

MR. KALEITA: It's more than that. It's a lot more than that. I'll give you an example. One of my clients, some time ago, owned a very large apartment complex. And they were selling the property to somebody else and the next guy wound up needing an Estopple letter that showed that certain circumstances were true. So it was applied for and done. This was several years back. And they had to file a document upon it and they spent 10 million dollars.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: David.

MR. CARPENTER: A lot of people, I know a lot of my clients that I deal with get letters from Bill want verification of stuff that's apparent on the zoning map. Seeing a piece of property, they looked at it, but they want a letter from the Zoning Director, from the bank or whom ever to show that the design is in place. So a lot of times it's a verification of something that's apparent.

MR. WHITEFORD: Well, it is quite a bit of work. We probably write a dozen of those letters a day. And we call those something different. We call them Zoning Confirmation Letters. They are not actually codified. It's a service we provide to the public.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Any other questions on Chapter B? Steve, do you have something?

MR. BRUH: Why should you have to wait 20 working days after the issuance of a written interpretation before you can appeal?

MR. KALEITA: That's \$12,000 a month of revenue there. We don't want to botch that.

MR. BRUH: That's Line 8 of 2.

MR. WHITEFORD: You have 20 days to initiate. Once you get the interpretation you have a 20-day period to actually appeal it.

MR. MACGILLIS: And that's so it doesn't go on and somebody can come back a year after the fact after things could change on the interpretation as it was originally rendered.

MR. WHITEFORD: That could be reworded.

MR. MACGILLIS: Yes. It could be reworded.

MR. BRUH: So I have to wait 20 working days after the issuance so I can make an appeal?

MR. MACGILLIS: Actually, at the bottom of Page1, Rendering of Interpretation, the County has 15 working days to respond. And then 20 days to

—

MR. KALEITA: Why don't we add the word, "within"?

MR. BRUH: That's it for me.

MR. MACGILLIS: All right, "within."

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Yes, Frank.

MR. PALEN: A couple of questions. On the authority to issue interpretations in Part A, gives the right exclusively to the Executive Director. I think it should be, "his or her designee." That 's what it says; "the interpretation of this Code shall be made by the Executive Director," not the designee.

MR WHITEFORD: That's actually covered in -- what section is that?

MR. MACGILLIS: Article 2.

MR. WHITEFORD: In Article 2 of the Code there is a description of everybody's position and who they are and what their duties are. And one of the things it says under the Executive Director of PZ&B, it says in that section for their designee. Meaning, for all intents and purposes the whole Code. So where you see the Executive Board, the Executive Director, in most cases it includes for their designee.

MR PALEN: I think you should have this provision put in here. This is on giving it authority of the Executive Director. You got a contradiction with the pension. Also on the bottom of Line 54 Page 1, this is like someone took a flow chart and just sort of describing the flow that people have. This appears to say that before they can render a decision, the County Attorney must be consulted. That should be the options, but this is peremptory. Within 15 working days the interpretation shall review and evaluate your request. The official shall consult with the County and then tender an interpretation. So no opinion can be issued without a consultation of the County first is the way I'm reading this.

MR. BERGER: That's a good answer.

MR. PALEN: It seems to me if you're going to set up a system that indicates that the County Attorney have been checked and has been consulted on, you have to check it off on each one of these. Otherwise, your opinion is defective. I don't think that's the intent but —

MR. BERGER: If we say, “may consult with the County Attorney,” that would probably be better.

MR. PALEN: Yes, I think so. To do whatever is necessary to come up with a coherent interpretation.

MR. KALEITA: Look up words in the dictionary.

MR. PALEN: The general point is I think this whole document needs to be read as literature at some point. We’ve got these piles and mounds of paper coming at us. Someone needs to sit down here at the end and read it and work out the continuity for the language and to make, not substance changes, but start lopping out whatever is necessary. See how the sections work together. So that’s just a general comment.

MR. KALEITA: Well, Article 2 in particular has a tone of bad grammar and stuff like that. Bill, never for a moment would I think you wrote up any of that.

MR. WHITEFORD: Grammar check.

MR. PALEN: Bill Goosmen told me that the 1973 code was written while he was sitting around a pool and sipping on whatever he used to sip on those days. In reading the code, this is like six times longer than the 1973 code, but maybe the same philosophy should be followed.

MR. WHITEFORD: Actually, we’re trying to set up density quality control procedures over the next couple of weeks before you get to LDRC Meeting to go through the docket with a fine toothcomb, to catch those glitches.

MR. KALEITA: I’ve got one of those with me today.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: David.

MR. CARPENTER: I just want to ask Frank; back in the days when you did the codes, what were you sipping?

MR. PALEN: You mean what was I smoking. That's a claim you can make after I left. The ULDC is not my responsibility.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Any other discussions, questions of staff on Chapter B? If not, is there anyone in the public that wishes to address this item? Seeing no member of the public, back to the task foreseer. What is our pleasure? We suggested some changes. Could you incorporate those into a motion? Any other discussion or a motion here on this item? The wheels are turning.

MR. KALEITA: I'd like to move the approval of Chapter B, Section 1 and 2 as amended.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Is there a second?

MR. JACOBSON: I second that.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Is there a discussion on the motion?

MR. PALEN: Does that include the changes that have been suggested?

MR. KALEITA: I am aware that it would include the changes on Page 1 Line 54, adding the word, "May". That includes the change in Page 2, Line 8 add the word, "within" in front of the number 20 and it would include revisions in Line 30 to clarify that the member of Staff other than the Director are authorize to render an interpretation as provided for in Section 1 comma. So that it's very clear that you've got to talk to the top dog if you want to rely on what's said.

MR. BERGER: And to the extent by law.

MR. KALEITA: And if I didn't mention the fact that it's made to consult the County Attorney, then that's certainly part of my motion.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Are we clear on those changes?

MR. BERGER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: There's been a motion, second for discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Seeing none, those in favor, aye.

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Those against, same sign, motion passes.

Moving on to Article 2, Development Review Process.

MR. MACGILLIS: Barbara is going to present this. This was on last week's agenda. We started to go over it and sort of got tied up in the DRO Provisions. So Staff at that last meeting presented to you how we consolidated in the first chapter all the common stuff to the processes that currently is under every public hearing processed. All the application requirements, the public hearing notices and stuff were redundant. So we've eliminated that. We created the general chapter. There were not a lot of changes to the actual substance of all the variances, both the Public Hearing and Administrative Processes other than what Barbara is going to go over here now, which is just general.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Okay. Barbara, please.

MS. PINKSTON-TAYLOR: I think Jon kind of summarized everything for the most part. But as he indicated, there are some things that were required in each of the different procedures. So instead of having under Class B Conditional

Use, everything that you have to do, those things were compiled into the general article. They were common to everything. Everything else that had its specific requirements, they stayed under those specific headings.

So you have Conditional Uses, you would have variances. Those things that were specific to those things remained there. The sheet that you have there, the orange sheet that says, Summary Changes, just kind of highlights pretty much the type of changes that were made. The majority of the things that were done were done for clarification. We have – because the section was a little bit chopped up before, there were things that maybe were in one section that read differently from something that was someplace else. So there may have been words that were tweaked or changed to make everything consistent so it would read properly.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Usually, at least in our last meeting, the orange sheet indicated an errata sheet. Meaning that it was different from what we received in our packet. Is that the case here?

MR. MACGILLIS: That's correct.

MS. PINKSTON-TAYLOR: There was not any new language other than the DRO, other than the keeping for clarification. And I know that was discussed at the last meeting. For the most part that's pretty much it. No new responsibilities for anybody else. Procedures are pretty much the same. No new review process. So we didn't add any brand new sections other than the things that were compiled and broken down just to make it read a little bit more easily.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: And no adjustment of review processes for different types of land development projects. Like no re-stratification saying, that one group will go somewhere else.

MS. PINKSTON-TAYLOR: No.

MR. WHITEFORD: I think a good example of one of the easiest things to say would be that in the current code in the old ZC describes both Class A Conditional Uses and Class B Conditional Uses almost identically. Except that Class B just goes to the Zoning Commission and Class A goes to the Zoning Commission and BCC. What we did was we took everything that was identical, combined it into the general sections and just point out the differences in the two in this rewrite. And that's the example of what we did in the reformatting.

MR. MACGILLIS: Just on last note, on Page 57, actually, Concurrency, which used to be it's own article in the Code Adequate Public Facility, is actually now combined in this article as its own, Chapter F.

MS. PINKSTON-TAYLOR: And so is monitoring.

MR. MACGILLIS: Yes and monitoring.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Any questions for Staff regarding Article 2?

MR. JACOBSON: I move it acceptance Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Is there a second?

MR. CARPENTER: Second.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Second, David. Is there anyone from the public here to address this item? None. Any discussion on the motion? We've got a motion to approve, this. Seeing none, those in favor, aye.

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Those against, same sign, motion passes.

MR. MACGILLIS: That's including the changes?

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Including the changes in the errata sheet.

Okay. Moving on to Article 17, Decision Making Bodies.

MR. KALEITIA: If you notice, Bill Whiteford appears to be stoned here, so I congratulate him on that. It makes for a more reasonable compromise on this issue.

MR. WHITEFORD: I think we're getting those.

MR. MACGILLIS: Just in case, if you didn't bring your packet back from last, Staff apologizes for not getting it out sooner. We were working up to the last minute on the language. We'll hand you a complete packet of this article.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: This is Article 17 and this is the one we had a great deal of discussion last week about regarding this Task Force.

MR. KALEITA: We haven't rewritten that language yet, have we?

MR. MACGILLIS: Yes.

MR. KALEITA: We have?

MR. MACGILLIS: Actually, if you turn to Page 12, the new package that was just handed out, Page 12 CTF.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Do you want to review the changes then, someone on the Staff's side? I see a number of changes, but can you go into the rationale behind choosing this number and not another.

MR. WHITEFORD: Yes. I'm on Page 12 and I have a little cheat sheet myself. We heard your comments, obviously. We took it back. We met with Barbara and we tried to come back with an alternative that would hopefully address both your issues and our own issues.

Obviously, we're interested in full representation from the full development community and all aspects of the community. And hopefully this proposal will retain that and actually embellish it some because this provision does recognize the creation of the subcommittees that we've used to successfully in the past. And we'd like to do so again in the future in the event that there were not representation on the CTF by specific interest groups are not of sufficient depth as in those interest groups so again, the complication of the creation of those subcommittees to get that specialized information as the need arises. The combination of the subcommittees with the new board make-up, we hope and we are suggesting to you, will hopefully cover all those bases that we discussed at our last meeting, including that fraud representation from the industries in addition to addressing some of those issues as we, the Staff, brought to your attention.

Suggestion is to go to a 14-member board much like Lenny would be. A situation where the Board of County Commissioners each appoint two members. Of that 14, 11 are from specific industries. And the specific industries are essentially represented today by CTF. The other three are At Large positions. It can be made up of representations out of other businesses. Possibly could end up with a duplicate industry or could end up with a Citizens At Large. You could

end up with folks who are not identified on this list. Whatever was deemed to be appropriate when that selection is made with a 14-member board, you'll be looking at a quorum of eight in order to have a meeting. And I think that's relatively some of the numbers I was hearing last time. I heard numbers last time. They were between 14 and 25 at the last meeting.

MR. KALEITA: Mr. Chair.

CHARIMAN BLACKMAN: Bruce.

MR. KALEITA: I would like to suggest -- I know my organization does not want to see a generic listing of occupations from which this list was drawn, but rather to preserve the existing list of organizations which have a right to nominate the persons that can be approved by the Commission. It seems to me that to depart from that is to perhaps knowingly alienate 12 separate organizations which have served for 30 years on this board with distinction.

I know that tonight I will ask my board of directors to vote on this. I know that my organization was one of the founding fathers or the mothers, if you will, of this group and they didn't want to be listed in this list and I don't see why we have to fix it if it isn't broken. Why can't we just keep the 12 organizations that were originally in the 1973 organization participating in this board? That's my first concern.

The second concern I have is that I don't think you can say that no two members of the CTF shall represent the same occupation or business and at the same time list commercial builders and residential builders. Because in the

language of your own ordinance you have relied the very clause or made use of the very clause this paragraph ends with. So I have that problem.

The third problem is, actually this is great typing, good typing, and I'm just kidding. I don't mean to sound overly critical. But the third problem I have is with a 14-member board. Everybody that is here, you're going to have a split vote. It has always been a most wise course to follow, to have an odd number of members. So, if you have a full board there, you don't get a 7 to 7 vote. And, my view is there --

MR. CARPENTER: Only 11 will vote?

MR. PALEN: Only 11 can vote.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: With three At Large alternate positions, so if one of the regular 11 is not here, one of the at large alternates should be, but all 14 would be expected to attend.

MR. KALEITA: You don't see anything where it says either of the other three can't vote?

MS. DURANDO: No.

MR. WHITEFORD: Can I cast the deciding vote?

MR. KALEITA: It seems to me that all 14 are going to have the right to vote.

MS. DURANDO: He's right.

MR. KALEITA: So it's an 11-member board?

MS. ALTERMAN: We have it confused here. We need to straighten that out. At one point it says at large members. At another place it says they're alternates so we need to -- right.

SPEAKER: Right.

MR. KALEITA: Let me say this too. If I were the director I don't know how I could more quickly alienate a large group of politically collected organizations than to do this. It seems to me that if you throw the Sierra Club, the Audubon Society, the Thousand Friends of Florida, the Save The Everglades Coalition, everybody in the Audubon Society and everybody else off the board and instead, you have generics and environmentals, you have alienated several of those environmental organizations. In turn it seems to me if you take the position of the commissioners and now try to appoint persons that have nothing to do with any of the associated general contractors or the Homeowners Contracting Association then you have alienated those two organizations. And it is likewise for the others and I don't know of any justification to reward all those organizations for 30 years of volunteering with the act of throwing them off the board. It seems to me there is a reason for that original ordinance being the way it was and if it ain't broke we don't fix it.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Barbara Alterman and then we will have Rosa. Let's have Barbara respond to this.

MS. ALTERMAN: First of all Bruce, I appreciate the comments. I did speak to Goldcoast before we did this. I just wanted you to know I did speak to your Board of Directors and some of your Executive Directors. They are aware of

what we are doing. In fact, it was their recommendation that we include a commercial builder and a residential builder because they felt there was a difference between the interest, between the residential and a commercial builder. I have to admit that it was an informal conversation, it was not formal. So, I don't want you to bring it back to them and tell them that I represented that they absolutely agreed with this. It was their suggestion though. So that's one thing.

Obviously, it is not our intent to alienate anyone. I think that you all know this staff well enough and maybe you don't know me, but we don't alienate people. That is not our intent. Our intent is to get --

MR. KALEITA: I didn't say intended. I said this would alienate people.

MS. ALTERMAN: Well, It doesn't have to. It doesn't have to alienate anybody because this leaves the decision about appointees to the board. And, we all know that when there are openings on any committee, that people go to board and say I'd like to serve on this board or they say I have a representative in my organization or whatever it is and that leaves the board the ability to make those appointments based upon the expertise, that I think we all agree is necessary in order to make decisions on this board.

So, I don't think anyone, and it could very well be that every one of you becomes an appointee of the Board of County Commissioners representing certain expertise and certain fields. So, again, I think what we're doing is simply two-fold making sure we have the expertise and if you'll notice some of it has been changed. It puts the emphasis in the future and to some extent it is going

to be on redevelopment and infill. We were concerned that we needed somebody with some sort of expertise in that area that we don't necessarily have and that we didn't know of any organization that was specifically devoted to infill and redevelopment kinds of issues.

But, there must be some people out there who certainly know those who have expertise. And, to exclude them because they're not a member of an organization would not be appropriate either when we're looking for that. Continue to have municipal representatives, continue to have a builder, the builders whoever they may be. Again, I think that we're looking to get the expertise, to give this board again the commissioners the decision making ability and all of you and your organizations the ability to say we believe this would be a good representative on your CTF committee.

MR. KALEITA: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Rosa, do you want to add to that and we'll get back to you.

MS. DURANDA: You're making me very nervous. You want to; as I understand it, reduce every single person that has served and some for 20 years or more, to reduce them to be dependent on an appointment of a county commissioner and the support of the others. I think this totally wrong.

Now through the sixties and the beginning of the seventies, there was a very active Citizens Task Force and it was very well represented by every single facet of the industry. And, it was never too much of a problem getting a quorum. And, after lengthy lobbying, I guess lack of another word, we impressed,

although I attended and was aboard then and was president of the local Audubon Society. We attended most of the meetings. And, as a public attendee we could say something, but we had no vote.

After much lobbying and much persuasion, the environmental seat was formally designated as an environmental seat. And that person and I have done it many times, although the last few years I have not been asked to supply a letter of support from other Palm Beach County environmental organizations designating someone, and it was me, because nobody else really wanted to do it and I'm perverted that way. So, here I am, and you're going to make me now try to suck up to a county commissioner, none of whom would support me, especially my own. We have an environmental seat and it should be at the discretion of the environmental organizations. I would think probably that any other construction organization, if they are nominated to serve representing the industry on this board, it shouldn't hinge on the board of county commissioner's approval. It should be in acceptance and that's it.

So, as far as someone saying this is Sierra, this is that and the other, no, no, no. It's only ever been our Audubon Chapter and I remember definitely when that happened. And, I was still coming to meetings before that happened and I'm not going to give up and rollover. Land Use Advisory Board is totally political and when the board changed, I knew I was going to be out of there and that was it. Never mind 15 years of service, you're gone and I was. But, Citizens Task Force and the Palm Beach County Beaches and Shores, both of them were

constructed that they would be specifically an environmental scene. And supported by any other environmental organization in this County and that's it.

MR. KALEITA: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Barbara's going to respond to this.

MS. ALTERMAN: There isn't -- wait, let me -- if I may finish. There is an environmental seat, Rosa. It's the Natural Resource Management. If it doesn't say environmental, maybe we need to reword it, but I think that was the intent. So there is a seat here. That hasn't changed.

MR. DURANDA: I don't have to be nominated by a county commissioner.

MS. ALTERMAN: Your groups would get together, if they feel it's appropriate and say to the County Commissioner, yeah this is the person.

MS. DURANDA: I thought it was a --

MS. ALTERMAN: That's the way the process works generally. There are nominations to the Board. The board makes decisions based upon the names that are submitted to them, to appoint members that's the way the process works -

MR. KALEITA: No. That's the way it's currently required to work. That's not how this ordinance says it would work. I beg to differ. This ordinance says something completely different.

MS. ALTERMAN: What does this ordinance say that is contradictory to what I'm saying?

MR. KALEITA: It gives total discretion to the County Commission to appoint any builder it wants, any environmentalist it wants. any anything it wants and it will.

MS. ALTERMAN: Of course, however, where did they get those nominations from?

MR. KALEITA: They sit down and figured out earlier who they wanted to give the capital to.

MS. ALTERMAN: Yeah, exactly right. I think you have little trust in our elected officials.

MR. KALEITA: Mr. Chair, may I?

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Yeah. Bruce, just try and keep an even keel.

MR. KALEITA: I've got an even keel here. It's just when I hear things that are blatantly false, it's my obligation to point it out. Let me say that I called my organization. I talked to my Governmental Affairs Director, he told me point blank, that it is the organization's position that it has a seat on the Citizens Task Force, that it wishes to retain that seat on the Citizens Task Force and that it feels that anything it ever said to the contrary does not represent the position of Goldcoast Builders Association.

MS. ALTERMAN: I did say that it was an informal discussion. You heard me say that.

MR. KALEITA: That's hearsay.

MS. ALTERMAN: Pardon me?

MR. KALEITA: Hearsay.

MS. ALTERMAN: No, it's not.

MR. KALEITA: The organizations representative of the CNA, the organizations represented authorized by the State, Goldcoast intends to retain its position on the board, as does the Associated General Contractors. Anything to the contrary you heard from somebody is not the position of either one of those organizations.

MS. ALTERMAN: I did not say it was the position. I said it was an informal discussion with the Executive Director and other people who were at lunch. You want to check the date we had lunch with him? Please, Bruce, don't say that I'm misrepresenting things. We was sitting at lunch, I said this was coming up, I mentioned it to them. I said, I just want to let you know. And if you want to check the conversation --

MR. KALEITA: But --

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: To be fair to Barbara, she did say it was an informal discussion, David.

MR. CARPENTER: Let me get back to some other points in here. It's related to the 11 members and three At Large. The intent is to be 11 members with three alternates is that really the intent, Barbara?

MS. ALTERMAN: I think that was our intent, and if you have input into that we certainly would appreciate that.

MR. CARPENTER: That would give me an odd number as far as the vote. My question is related to the alternate member. It doesn't say in here that the alternate member, if there is a member that leaves the Board, becomes a full

member. It just seems like the alternate member is an alternate member forever, if you will. I don't think any alternate member, I don't think it's fair to appoint an alternate member, without, you know, moving them if there's a vacancy, to move them up, rather than saying you just stay an alternate member. They're never going to show up to a meeting or anything. So, perhaps we should say in there the alternate member moves up to the regular member's position when somebody leaves.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: That would help encourage attendance of all 14. Maury.

MR. JACOBSON: I want Barbara to hear what I have to say.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: She can hear. Go ahead Maury.

MR. JACOBSON: Barbara, I'm probably the longest running member of this group. My dear Rosa, this thing started in the early seventies, not in the sixties

MS. DURANDA: But I used to attend.

MR. JACOBSON: I know, I remember you well. Even I was young then.

MR. WHITEFORD: You're getting your decades mixed up.

MR. JACOBSON: At any rate, I'm not here to be argumentative with you, but I just can't quite understand. I'm really trying to understand what you intend to gain. First of all, this premises with the three alternates, to me, it's a bloody shame. It's a crime. Because they are going to come and attend a meeting, they can't do a damn thing with what they have to say other than speak up, they haven't got a right of vote. And, I believe in the right of vote.

People attend the meetings, they give their times, should not only have the right to express themselves verbally, but to be able to express themselves by the vote. And, there are two of us here that I know, that are elective people in Palm Beach County. So, I appreciate the right of people to vote on an issue they feel strongly about. What I'm finding great difficulty with is what are you really trying to accomplish? I really don't know what you're going to gain by going from this. Really, you're going from 19 to 14 is what you are doing here.

MS. ALTERMAN: Actually, we're going from 38 to 14.

MR. JACOBSON: My dear, there hasn't been 38 people ever attending this thing the years I have been here. I mean, that for me is really ridiculous. For some people, I know, to have come as alternates and some of them are not here today. They come and sometimes stop coming because there's no sense in them being here unless they know they participate. They can participate and vote and that to me is almost true. Everybody here has given of their time and dedication. Faith, by the way, is the only one I know that is second in longevity to myself on this committee. But really and truly all of us here are dedicated, every one of us.

Bruce talks in the way he does because he's passionate about it, but he's passionate about everything. He's really a lover at heart. And, I say this with great respect sometimes. But, any rate, I just don't quite understand what you intend to really gain by this move. So you're really going from 28 to 38 or 36, big deal.

You know, there are some things here that have to be done. And, I don't believe that this is -- maybe we really have to take this issue and go to our Commissioners and talk to them about viciously and reality. And, I'd like to see some reality. I see reality around this table, and it's an open forum at all times. And, what I like about it is that people can come here and express themselves and people at the table listen. And, they try to express themselves by vote and by thought to do something constructive for the County. So, I just can't quite understand where you're going with this thing. I'm saying you in a big arena. It's nothing personal about this thing.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Dave's going to have the floor next.

MR. WHITEFORD: I'd just like to add that we had a discussion at the last meeting that I thought was on the productive vain here maintaining pretty much the number of regular members, but drastically reducing the number of alternates and having them maybe three At Large alternates that would just attend every meeting, and if, one of those 19 couldn't show then they would fill the shoes and help establish a quorum.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: David.

MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, let's see, I was just trying to think I've been on this board for 23 years. And just to give you a little perspective this has come around twice before where the CTF, where there was a proposal during the code re-write to reduce the numbers of, you know, the people on the board, and so forth. And at one point, the proposal was to merge the Citizens Task Force and the Land Use Advisory Board. And, you know, the beginning of that process

when I went in the meeting with them, they was saying, you know, we're going to take over the Citizens Task Force and all you guys are going to be gone and then blah, blah, blah, blah. And, as we got going through the meeting, I got to thinking well you know we got what I thought was more representative people on our board that knew a lot about development that maybe we ought to take over the Land Use Advisory Board.

So, when that came around then that was the last meeting. But, what's going to happen is we have the proposal in here to reduce the number is that, however, this may go forward, you know, we're not going to totally agree with it. But, what is going to have to happen the organizations are going to need to get with the Commissioners if they want to stay on as such and let them know they want to stay on and attend the commission meeting. Because what has happened in the past is the Commissioners, with the people in attendance there have backed down from taking their organizations off of the board. I don't know if that's going to happen this time, but I'm just telling you that it has happened in the past, that they had these proposals and at the meeting backed down when the industry was there.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Okay. Bruce and then Larry.

MR. KALEITA: Just one short statement. I have been requested to express Carmela Starace and the Municipal League's position on this. And, she has in fact given me her written proxy for that. She has stated the municipal league wishes to retain it's seat on this board and that it represents all

municipalities not one municipality. And that it has its own deliberate process to develop positions on issues that come before this meeting.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Charlie is here as her alternate. Larry.

MR. FISH: I'm personally offended by the rewrite on the qualifications because my profession is not even listed there. I guess I'm off the Board.

MS. ALTERMAN: What's his profession? What's your profession?

MR WHITEFORED: Surveying.

MS. DURANDA: There's always been a surveyor.

MR. FISH: There's always been a surveyor on the CTF for a long, long time. My organization's going to oppose this at the commission level. I can tell you that.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Okay, Ron.

MR. LAST: One quick question, I know you had the informal conversation with the Goldcoast Homebuilders. Did you also have a conversation with the Florida Engineering Society, because we did our executive board meeting last night and we did talk about board appointees and we would definitely oppose this re-write and do want to retain our seat on the board.

MR. CARPENTER: You're going to be there at the meeting.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Charlie.

MR. OMEILIA: I heard what he said, but as far as I know, the Board of Directors of the league has not taken an attitude on that at least they haven't taken a vote on it. But, if I understand what you're saying here, there's going to be a municipal representative and we don't know who that's going to be

recommended by to the County Commissioner. So, it could be somebody from Brevard County maybe or some other county or city. But, I think the league is going to object to this very strongly.

My understanding what it says, it says that these appointments are not going to be coming as a recommendation from any organization. Is that right? And, I don't understand why you want to do that. If you want to, for instance, I've had a little experience on appointing people to boards and watching what happens on zoning commissions and what not like that. The number one thing I see you're going to have a real problem with administratively, at least anyway, is it says the Board Members shall have engineering. And I don't know how you're going to do that.

MR. JACOBSON: Say that again Charlie I didn't get that.

MR. OMEILIA: It says the Board member shall have all these expertise.

MR. JACOBSON: Oh, I see.

MR. OMEILIA: And, I've seen boards where you've tried that and it doesn't come out. It doesn't work. Because it takes you six or eight months to get an appointee for a vacancy, trying to fit somebody or go out and solicit people to do this. And that's one of the problems with not having the recommendation coming from these different organizations whatever they are. I think that we, if you take a vote on this today, I'm going to vote negative. Because we hadn't taken an attitude on it and my personal attitude is this isn't going to work. It's not going to work at all.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Okay.

MR. OMEILIA: Another big item on here, the function as I've see it, in my short term here. I've only been an alternate for a year. I've only sat here a couple of times as a voting member, but the thing that amazes me in this thing is that the Board as it's comprised today, the alternate represents the same organization that the principal is. It appears to me that the way this is going to be setup, you can have people swapping over. Your municipal representative may be gone and the alternate maybe an engineer and then he may not represent that particular classification. So, I think that another administrative point is that Bill may have a problem with is no two members of the CTF shall represent the same occupation and business. That's going to be tough. I mean, we've got attorneys who are contractors.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: People wear many hats.

MR. OMEILIA: Yeah, sure. I mean I'm an engineer. You mean I can't be a municipal representative.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Good point, Frank.

MR. PALEN: De ja vue all over again. When I was a Zoning Director, we had the same discussion as I recall.

MS. ALTERMAN: Tell me about that Frank. You don't have to remind me.

MR. PALEN: The policy is there is a philosophical difference about the basis of representation on the board. I think, representation by organizations in which the board merely is confirming whether it had some standards for example is saying I was fit to serve on the Board. But, the membership is determined by the representative, by the organizations or its open ended for the Board to

choose from an array of people who have presented their credentials to the Board. And that really goes to the philosophy of the way the board is to be structured and that's the decision the Board of County Commissioners has to make. It's certainly going to get some advice I have a feeling in the way it ought to be structured.

And either way I think the question is whether the make-up of the Board is representative, and representative of what. That's part of the question. What's the function of the Citizens Task Force? Now, of course, for sometime I've been urging a name change because I believe in truth in advertising and this is not a Citizens Task Force, it's really a Land Development Regulation Advisory Board. And I think that name should be changed so people could know what we're supposed to be doing. The board should have a set of bylaws. It should have a mission statement and finding exactly what it's supposed to do and from that you can find what kind of advisory assistance that you need.

For example, the position that I'm serving in is already At Large it doesn't need to be here. Much as I enjoy being here, I think it would add to some history here in terms of the way the board expanded over the years by adding members. At one time there was a new industrial person was added and so they said we need to have a labor union person on the other side, and then something happened and then they needed a balance so they added a citizen at large number. So it kept getting bigger and bigger. I don't think there should be any commitment to 19 or whatever the current number is. I think it should be reduced to some extent. Now, how you reduce it, when we get it down that'll

take 11. I thought seven was too small for the range of issues that come before the board.

The ULDC is much broader in scope than the 1973 zoning code was. We had 15 or so members when I was Zoning Director, but we only looked at the zoning code. We didn't look at all the other issues. There weren't any environmental codes. A whole range of things have been added. Having a reasonably large number of people to consult who have a range of experience to advise the County Commission on these issues I think is important. I don't have a strong position one way or the other. I can see both sides in terms of how you can appoint folks to the board. I guess at the moment I'm kind of leaning towards having the organizations nominate. If it's quite clear why they're being nominated, why they're being selected and what their role is expected to be and what their duties are, I think folks who have been serving on this board have been exemplary to a large extent in representing the interests of their professions on the board.

So, from a technical matter, if you have a board that's appointed on the basis of technical expertise or some kind of credential and you have alternatives who are not, and the alternates who "move up" to positions on the board over a period of time you could eliminate all the credentialed members of the board. So there's a problem with the logic of how an alternate would work, that needs to be examined, especially if they stay floating alternates and never get a chance to be on the board. I think that someone mentioned what's the incentive to be an

alternate on the board. There's a chronological contradiction that needs to be resolved.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Rosa.

MR. DURANDA: Yes. The alternate is usually in other advisory boards or something. The alternate is proposed by the person who is the appointee and it gets approved automatically. And that alternate is very well versed in why the major point is there. In other words, they have a degree of expertise. The reason that they stay alternates is because their reward will be in heaven usually. And it's not the vote necessarily except being human you go and miss a meeting once in awhile. It may be a family problem or maybe a conflict you have to do. The alternate is certainly well qualified and it's my understanding and that same situation existed in Beaches and Shores. The alternate only serves one member.

The alternate for instance, my alternate, whether it be Beaches and Shores or this group would not be able to represent the engineers or Goldcoast or anyone else. They wouldn't, I mean, philosophically their expertise is in one field. And that's what they would vote in support of. I also think it's the responsibility barring a certain heartache you know if you can make a meeting and I've informed when I get all these wonderful calls, oh yeah, I can be at that meeting. Gee, no you're in conflict. It should be my responsibility and it is. I call my alternate can you make it that day. I absolutely can't. And tell them what our last discussion was, and the backup, you can get the backup. That's it. That's

not violating the Sunshine Law. I don't tell them how to vote. But, their heart, mind and expertise is solely focused on one thing.

Again, not Goldcoast, or not engineers or not surveyors. It's the alternates for one position, my position. And I would think -- I don't see why every member shouldn't have an alternate that they have selected and it gets final rubber stamped by the Commissioners. But they or their organization should have selected the alternate. Because you want someone who is going to vote in your place to only be thinking about how your organization would want you to vote. That's why you're here. You're supporting your mother organization. You may do the right thing or the wrong thing, but that's an interpretation that's very suggestive.

But, I think that each member here should have the ability to select their own alternate and be responsible for saying I can't make the meeting next week or next month. Can you go? And they can get in touch with Zoning or Beaches and Shores or whoever it is and get the backup and maybe a briefing of what has transpired in the past, what's that all about. That's it. You can't have the same alternates possibly voting for different organizations.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Barbara.

MS. NOBLE: Thank you. I think unfortunately bringing this item forward at this time, after this past year and the given amount of work that so many of the people seated here at the table, many of them three times a week, in addition to these regularly scheduled CTF meeting is unfortunately where a lot of the bad taste is coming from also. Now that the code revisions almost done you're going

to throw the baby out with the bath water so to speak. Perhaps, if Frank had made some excellent suggestions maybe with there being At Large seats, if perhaps a formal inquiry had been made to the representative agencies that really comprise this board, you might have been surprised to find one or two that may have chosen to relinquish if you had -- because you've got plenty of time to be thinking about this, it's not just like you all came up with it in the last week to 10 days. So, perhaps if you have an idea of why you want to be reorganizing and you would have inquired officially, then there also wouldn't be this displeasure or distaste.

I can certainly understand and I'm sympathetic to the alternate, the burdens of having so many alternates for staff, and having to produce so much written material. Though now I'm hearing some interesting comments from all the board members on the particulars of what makes a good alternate. However, I do understand that burden. I think when we left last week it was a very explosive, starting to be an explosive discussion, it relatively became, you know, benign when we looked at perhaps keeping the 19 members and having a fewer number of alternates.

Perhaps, if you could shave a couple off the 19 and at large or maybe another, you're bringing your numbers down a little bit, but still not alienating the bodies that are representative. I, too, don't support a broad member body that would be all appointed by commissioners by the board.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Barbara, did you want to respond?

MS. ALTERMAN: Actually what I just wanted to do is, kind of add another thought to it. Because, I certainly hear what all of you are saying. Probably the reason that we didn't bring this up sooner was because the process that was going on was an important process. Certainly, recognized what every one of you does. I mean, there's no question about your devotion and the time you spent and everything else. And, I think maybe that was why we felt this was a good time, if we're going to make a change after you've had the input, you've given all of your expertise into the code. You've been doing this for years, no question about it most of you. I remember David, when I think, just started when you were, what was it, the Engineering whatever it was –

MR. CARPENTER: Subdivision.

MS. ALTERMAN: Subdivision, whatever it was.

MR. CARPENTER: Subdivision Committee.

MS. ALTERMAN; That's right. I would hope that nobody would take this personally. It certainly isn't meant to be anything personal. It's simply a matter of how do we make a manageable committee like all the other committees and boards in this county? I mean, this is the largest appointed body that we have in this county. Most of them are certain 7 members. LUAB is 14. You came back last week and said, wait that's too small, 7 is too small. I think staff sat down and we said, that's probably right. We need more expertise on here than 7 members. And, that is why we're trying to expand it.

Again, it's very silly, I think it is a philosophical issue. And, Bill just mentioned something to me, and I started thinking about it, unless someone is a

member of one of these groups, if they have expertise that might be important to it, they can't get appointed if they are not a member of the group. And, that's fine I mean I'm a member of the Bar, and I think everybody should be a member of the Bar, but if I'm not and I have a certain expertise does that mean because I'm not I can't get appointed to a group that needs that expertise. I think that's somewhat of a balance.

MS. NOBLE: But this discussion has come through a Commissioners seat though.

MS. ALTERMAN: But if we're going to whittle this down, who are we going to eliminate, and it maybe -- where do you eliminate?

MS. NOBLE: One other thought, I'm sorry, I forgot to mention. What has been so refreshing for me is that to see the varying industries and agencies that sit on this board that don't get along so well in every other arena actually come together here and bring a good consensus for what moves forward. I didn't want to let that go by without mentioning it.

MS. ALTERMAN: Why would that change? We're looking for the same expertise.

MR KALEITA: Can I comment on that?

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Bruce and then Larry.

MR. KALEITA: We came up with a resolution of this last week, which we all felt it worked. There was a request of staff to do that scheme. What has come back to us is not what we asked staff to do, but something different. It was very apparent last week, a week ago today, that the organizations which hold

seats on this committee wanted to remain on the committee. It is also, I think apparent from last week that they will make a stink with the Commission if they are not allowed to because if it ain't broke don't fix it.

Finally, we had recommended last week and I believe it might have been my motion, that we retain the organizations and we create a couple of additional seats so that the public has access to the board. And that those could be both regular seats and alternates. And that we would substantially reduce the alternates down to that number, which it could be shown was necessary to obtain quorums in the previous meetings, which we thought might be three or four. That would get rid of; let's say if we had 12 organizations which I think we now have, Craig Curby has seven of the 12 seats on this board. So, if we add too many members, you know, maybe it's the County's own fault. But, we could lower the number of alternates and that's what I think we decided to do. And, we actually asked Bill to check into how many times we had not had a quorum, but what number of members we lacked one and that would help input into the number of alternates we would have.

In that fashion, we are not looking for deserving and contributing organizations from this group. And collectively we took AGC and GCBA, just for example, that's 75 to 100,000 workers that are represented here which is why they are on this board. And, if we talk about the environmental organizations, I can say this with pride, everyone regarding an environmental in the last year has been voted in favor of by Rosa and others who represent the environmental groups. So, this is a place that works. This is a place where people who have

specific organizations can come together and reach agreement about things and present to the Commission a balanced measure of which one considered, doesn't have a packed chamber full of many people. And, my view is the motion we made should, again, be made today. And I believe that was that we keep the CTF organizations as they are currently constituted on the board. That we reduce the number of alternates from 19, an unruly number in anyone's estimate, down to three or four. And that, if we wish to add a few seats for the general public at large so that others who want to participate can be involved that we could, and so long as we end up with an odd number of regular members and a necessary number of alternates.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: I don't recall at the last meeting actually making a formal motion. We did end up in a discussion.

MR. KALEITA: I think we did.

MR. BLACKMAN: Okay.

MR. KALEITA: I made a motion to rescind it.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: It was clear it was the direction we were headed.

MR. CARPENTER: I can agree with what you said Bruce, except I don't agree with creating additional seats. I think we've got enough seats.

MR. KALEITA: Wait a minute. I'm saying reduce the membership down to the organizations, then give the Commissioners some time frames so that they can make up those that want to do the process, but don't want to have to draw the lines in these organizations to do it. So that would be 12 organizations

unless I'm mistaken, plus let's say four additional seats for the public at large for the Commission to do what it wishes with. And then have –

MR. CARPENTER: Four Commission appointments.

MR. KALEITA: Well, four full County Commission appointments not seven, giving every Commission an appointee, four seats that are filled by the Commission.

MR. CARPENTER: That'll never work.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Larry, did you want to say something?

MR. FISH: Yes. First of all, as I stated last week, I think the quorum argument is a bogus argument. And, I'm going to repeat this, again, you guys have worked us tremendously hard. And, I think we've missed one or two quorums this year, when we're having three to five meetings a month. That's a bogus issue and I'm going to stand in front of the Commission and say that, first of all.

And second of all, I think it is an insult to some of these people that have worked this hard what their position is going to be. I've been on here for 14 years. I replaced the alternate from my organization that was on here for a long time before that. He is my alternate now. He wants to be off because he's retired now. But, I think that's offensive. I think, you know, to eliminate people who worked hard and make this a rubber stamp committee is what you're trying to do and we're going to go to the Commission and fight you over it. That's all I've got to say.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Anyone else. Do we have a motion?

MR. KALEITA: I'd like to renew my motion from last month's meeting, which is to retain the organizations that presently hold seats and to reduce the number of alternates on this committee. Since staff doesn't know how many there should be, I'll suggest five. That will give us 12 regular members and five alternates. And, if at the commission level they go well, no, no, no, we want to have a big board again, they can add seats At Large should they choose. Thereby, increasing our membership. And I'm looking for a second for that motion. Again, the highlights of it is, keep the organizations, which I believe are 12 seats --

MR. PALEN: How many organizations are -- how many numbers are actually appointed by a specific organization?

MR. WHITEFORD: 12.

MR. PALEN: Nominated organizations?

MR. WHITEFORD: Maybe it's 11.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: And the difference between that would be the number of County Commissioners they want.

MS. KATZ: And you have a condo association member too.

MR. WHITEFORD: I think that's included in there, that's the 11.

MS. KATZ: Plus the citizen At Large.

MR. WHITEFORD: It's 7 districts, 11 organizations, 1 At Large.

MR. KALEITA: I'm suggesting the 11 organizations remain to the Commission. Add that number of seats that it considers necessary in order for it to fulfill it's political mandates. And that we have only, let's say, five alternates.

And that would then leave us with the commission to determine the total memberships of what organizations that have given so handsomely of their time and energy retaining their seats.

MR. FISH: I would second that motion. I would like to discuss that motion further.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: That's fine, motion and second, discussion on the motion by Larry.

MR. FISH: I'd like to take the five alternates and make them combined like, engineering and surveying and one other profession to have an alternate that's elected by the City. And one or two of them can and be a valuable member to back up one of the ones that could n't be here, either one of them that couldn't be here. You could do it with the planners. You could do it with the governmental people. You could do that with the builders and the real estate people. All of them could combine alternates. You could do it with the environmental as well. But, I was going to propose that one of them be environmental anyway.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Rosa, discussion on the motion.

MS. DURANDA: I was going to say you're hitting on it, but I would like it clarified before we vote. What would the grounds rule be as to what five alternates would be so blessed with that designation. How would you do the ground rules to determine who the five would be?

MR. WHITEFORD: Let me throw something else. Could it be that one of those 11 members from these organizations, could they appoint a proxy for a

meeting and not need a formal alternate, but still have a position or their organization has a position at the meeting just by a letter of proxy?

MR. KALEITA: I think I could answer that, although Lenny may want to instead. I believe adopted Robert's Rules of Orders and that they do provide for proxy votes.

MR. BERGER: The only other thing we need to check is the -- I don't remember if it's an ordinance or resolution now, that it has general policies that the Board has adopted, across the board for it's advisory bodies. There's also at the very least an Attorney General Opinion whose found on the idea, I guess, the best way to put it, the only opinion I can remember was they frowned on the idea of having proxy votes done unless there was some dire health reason, if I remember this correctly, which is not the clearest of all instructions.

But, if it's something, if you end up doing something like that, I guess just from a policy, and I don't know if it's a legal problem with it outright, but from a policy standpoint, I think, it's really important that it's not something that's abused because continuity is the most important quality that we've got here.

MR. KALEITA: We've had two lacks of a quorum so far this year is what I can recollect.

MR. BERGER: One or two.

MR. KALEITA: One of two, it's not going to get abused.

MR. BERGER: As long as it's not, I mean, I don't know that anybody wants to be in a position where an organization has, you know, a small army of interchangeable members across the board because that doesn't serve

anybody's purpose.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Nobody wants to do that. I would say that our alternate system right now is not working. Because I know my alternate as much as I would like to is not interested in actually what comes out with the board. So we have to, you know, change that person out. But, there's a lot of mechanics that I've seen sometimes don't happen in all these organizations. Yes, Frank.

MR. PALEN: I want a name change.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: We have a motion and a second on the floor. This is discussion of the motion.

MR. FISH: I'm trying to get the amended motion. I think we should get a copy of the list of the members. We could probably form a coalition between a couple of organizations and say, we'll put an alternate there, this one we'll put an alternate there, you end up with five alternates and you cover all the professions.

MR. KALEITA: Why has this thing come back to us? With something like we originally asked for, which we are again asking for today, and come up with some language that accommodates, if possible, the suggestions for alternates. But I think it's clear that if staff wants to present more of this before us today, it isn't what we want and we will all show up and oppose it. And I will tell the organizations to lobby the individual Commissioners. So I don't know. If they didn't originate this idea, they're not going to appreciate getting lobbied by professions coming up because they're going to say what are you doing this for.

So, I'm not sure what staff has to gain by this and I suppose I have equity in the comment made earlier in that regard. I would like to decide this question

because I have to go to my board meeting now where I'm going to tell them and they are going to, what.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: We're at the bewitching hour here, it's 3:30, and two people are leaving. I'm sure we want to vote before that.

MR. CARPENTER: I just want to make comment before we vote. I don't think the proposal really changes much. Because of the fact when we've taken a stance here, and we said 11 commission appointments and the board, the commission is thinking they're making appointments. Here we're saying, no, we're retaining all of the organizations and taking away commission appointments. I don't think philosophically that's a good proposal.

And, the second thing I don't like about it is the fact that, say for example, you know, we have different people that are representing professions. What if the opening comes up in say the Audubon Society, and then an engineer and surveyor, you know, maybe they are not interested in representing the Audubon Society as coming up from an alternate. So, I don't know how an alternate is going to fill a seat.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: I think that is yet to be determined there is to be some analysis of the bodies that would make up the alternates and see if there's some sharing that one person could actually represent different fields.

MR. KALEITA: Could we repeat the motion because I have to get going.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Yeah. Why don't we do that and then we'll take a vote.

MR. KALEITA: The motion is to retain the 11 organizations, which

presently hold seats, which somehow even though they got on the ballot, managed to get together with the CTF and reach agreements and stuff. And to let the Commission, should wish, and add additional seats that are At Large, commissioner appointees, nonorganizational if it wishes, but they have five alternates. From the five, or is five too few, 11 plus 5 is 16, which is, that's okay, when you only have an 11-member board.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Stick with five.

MR. KALEITA: So five. So the motion, which I believe was seconded, was to have the 11 organizations remain on the board, if the commission wants to add more for political reasons it can do so. We have five alternates so they're always assured of having a quorum rather. And staff would determine a means by which the alternates can be somewhat technically proficient in serving on the board for a representative. We'd like that brought back for our next meeting for consideration.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: I think we're clear on the motion, any other discussion on the motion.

MS. KATZ: I have to say, oops, sorry about that, I'm new to the board, but I have to say something about it. I will support your 11 organizations. I was very impressed when I downloaded what the make-up of this committee was. I think it's great. I see nothing wrong with it.

The problem is probably the people who don't show up. I would like to know why they're not coming. That's your problem. It's not even the number of alternates because if you get enough of your regular members to come, you'll

have your quorum. But your motion is for eliminating me, and maybe somebody else in here.

MR. FISH: We haven't eliminated everybody.

MS. KATZ: Yes, you have. You only have your 11 organizations.

MR. KALEITA: No, no, no. That's not true. Let me explain again.

MS. KATZ: Is it the way it's constituted now?

MR. KALEITA: I'm saying keep the language we have now.

MS. KATZ: Okay,

MR. KALEITA: The AFL-CIO, CIO-FL, blah, blah, blah, whatever, all of that, and if the commission wants additional seats beyond those 11 and the 5 alternates, it may create them. But, we're saying by all means Commissioners if it is politically desirable to add some seats back in, but we are still reducing the number of alternates from 19 to 5.

MS. KATZ: Yes, but you only have 11 organizations that if you count this list there's 11. You've eliminated the 7 districts. You've eliminated the –

MS. ALTERMAN: No,

MS. KATZ: Yes. Excuse me, but I believe he has. He's put in 5 alternates. Alternates are not regular members of a committee.

MR. KALEITA: No, no, no, no. I'm saying if the Commission wants more seats than the 11, we are not opposed to it.

MS. KATZ: Yeah, but I wouldn't fall into one of the 11 member category.

MR. KALEITA: Why not, who are you?

MS. KATZ: I guess, I'm At Large, or a condo association. Wait, ask him

where I'm on that list.

MR. WHITEFORD: Barbara is an appointment by Commissioner Newell.

MR. KALEITA: Right. And, if the Commissioners want to have those appointments by golly let them do it.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: And that's part of the motion?

MR. KALEITA: That's the motion.

MS. DURANDO: So, you don't represent an organization? You were appointed by a Commissioner.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Okay, Barbara –

MS. KATZ: Yeah, but he goes, he said, If they want, why don't leave it in that they would have their appointments, each one?

MR. KALEITA: Because then we're up to a larger membership, which I thought they wanted to abolish.

MS. KATZ: Yeah, but we may be the ones who are showing up. I don't know what you're talking about. This is only my second meeting.

MS. ALTERMAN: We're going to have to take our chances.

MS. KATZ: I have a 100% attendance here. You may have to take your chances, but you guys are here so I can't vote for that.

CHAIRMAN BLACKKMAN: We assume that the Commissioners are going to want some kind of representation of themselves on this task force or whatever it's going to be named.

MS. KATZ: I'm willing to support you, but I can't vote myself out.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: I think Barbara Alterman has something to add

here and it may help with the votes.

MS. ALTERMAN: I just have one point of clarification. And, I know there's probably some history to some of these organizations. For instance, the AFL-CIO, is there some strong feeling that, that -- I don't know if there's a representative here from there or not. I don't understand what the basis of that, their expertise in land development is.

MS. NOBLE: Did you ever ask them? You never contacted them to ask them.

MR. WHITEFORD: They've fallen off the face of the earth.

MS. ALTERMAN: They don't even have a representative here.

MS. DURANDO: But what's his name, McCain?

MR. WHITEFORD: Cauble.

MS. DURANDO: What's his name?

MR. WHITEFROD: Bill Cauble. Mr. Cauble is a very nice man, as you all would remember, but I don't especially recall him adding a lot to very many of the discussions.

MR. KALEITA: Well, would you like, how about we do this, maybe we should have contact the organizations between now and next week. And between now and next week have the text on the organizations revised so that it reads the way it used to, throw the draft back to us, together with input from the organizations whose opinion we do not yet know. And then take all of that and put it together in a final ordinance at next week's meeting, if in fact, we have one next week.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Let's back up and vote on the motion on the floor.

MR. FISH: Withdrawn.

MR. KALEITA: I'm not withdrawing anything. I do think the motion on the floor does work and then the question can be posed to the commission as to whether they want to put back onto a board which used to have too many members, the members it added some six years ago. For those not members that long, the commission was the one that swelled the ranks of the CTF to 19 by appointing seven At Large representatives now. Now, we said, okay, that's fine, that's what the commission wants. Apparently, staff wants a different outcome. Let staff and commission work that out, but we don't want to throw the babies out that have been here in this bath water for so many years.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Let's change the water, please.

MR. KALEITA: It's old bath water.

MR. KALEITA: Does somebody want to pose a question?

MR. JACOBSON: Mr. Chairman, of all the gall I've ever heard in my life, the one who abused this committee issue, debated you more than anybody wants to limit the bait. Now, that is known as gall and if there weren't any women in here, I'd tell you what it's really called, they called it in the Army years ago.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Okay. Let's just take care of this motion and we would call for a vote here. Any more discussion?

MS. KATZ: Well, I'd just want to state, I support your 11 organizations, but I cannot vote for it because you've eliminated me.

MS. DURANDO: You've eliminated the options.

MS. KATZ: Right.

MR. CARPENTER: I'm a commission appointment for one and I'll be voting no. Basically, because I don't think that it really changes the membership issue. I think it's a shuffle that doesn't make any sense.

MR. KALEITA: I'll withdraw my motion and it's in place. I will substitute this motion that all of the organizations that presently hold seats on board be retained, that all of the commission appointees who presently hold seats on the board be retained. That gives us an 18-member board, though, doesn't it?

MR. WHITEFORD: 19.

MR. KALEITA: 19, but that we only have 5 alternates. So that we have reduced the alternate burden on the staff, but not the membership burden because it has proven too difficult.

MR. JACOBSON: I will second that motion, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Okay. There's a motion and a second. The previous motion has been withdrawn. Discussion on the new motion? Yes, Rosa.

MS. DURANDO: Under discussion, I don't want to elevate it to an amended motion, but I would like it on record that the five alternates will be chosen after discussion amongst the board members.

MR. KALEITA: No, let me say this. Staff is going to come back to us with language on the alternates that I'll add my motion, to my motion that staff will come back to us with an acceptable alternative as to how they qualify alternates.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: I think we need to analyze that a little bit.

MR. KALEITA: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Yes, Charles.

MR. OMEILIA: What's your intent, Bruce, on who recommends the alternates?

MR. KALEITA: Well, I think that we have to have staff come back to us with that. But, of course, the source of appointments is always the commission.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Okay, question answered.

MR. KALEITA: We could have At Large alternates, too.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Any other discussion on the motion. Seeing none, do you think we need a roll call on this?

MR. KALEITA: Yes, we should.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Secretary, if you would just run down the list.

MS. KATZ: David, we're voting that we're still here, right?

MR. CARPENTER: Yeah.

MS. KATZ: Okay. I'm making sure.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Okay. This is the vote on the motion.

MS. BILKA: David Carpenter.

MR. CARPENTER: Yes.

MS. BILKA: Barbara Noble.

MS. NOBLE: Yes.

MS. BILKA: Bruce Kaleita.

MR. KALEITA: Yes.

MS. BILKA: Ron Last.

MR. LAST: Yes.

MS. BILKA: Wes Blackman.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Yes.

MS. BILKA: Rosa Durando.

MS. DURANDO: Yes.

MS. BILKA: Charles Omeilia.

MR. OMEILIA: Yes.

MS. BILKA: Maury Jacobson.

MR. JACOBSON: Yes.

MS. BILKA: Wayne Larry Fish.

MR. FISH: Yes.

MS. BILKA: Steven Bruh.

MR. BRUH: Yes.

MS. BILKA: Frank Palen.

MR. PALEN: Yes.

MS. BILKA: Barbara Katz.

MS. KATZ: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Okay, motion passes unanimously.

MR. KALEITA: I have 12 votes.

MS. KATZ: Excuse me, could I make a request. Is it possible to get a list of who is really on this committee because I don't have a clue, or anyone else who wants one I think should have one too.

MR. CARPENTER: Just to let everybody know before you go, that doesn't mean that it's going to be adopted this way.

MR. KALEITA: We understand that.

MR. CARPENTER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: We've expressed our opinion. Bruce Kaleita and Ron Last has to leave at this point. So we still have a quorum. We're keeping the quorum by one number. So is there any other discussion either on the Citizens Task Force item.

MS. ALTERMAN: I think we need to bring up another issue while we're talking about it.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Go ahead.

MS. ALTERMAN: The fact of the matter is there has been a lot of discussion from board members about the duplicity of review of certain sections of the ULDC. For instance, there is an Environmental Committee that reviews all the environmental sections of the code. There's a Traffic Performance Standards that reviews traffic. There's an Impact Fees Board that reviews impact fees changes. And, then once they review it, it comes back here and gets reviewed again.

And, I need to point out to you that, that is one of the things that we're providing for in the revisions here that the CTF would review all provisions of the code not otherwise reviewed by other appointed boards. You would retain your authority as the LDRC for consistency with comp plans, but those sections that are reviewed by other appointed boards would not be reviewed by you again.

MR. CARPENTER: Such as the sections of traffic standards you mean?

MS. ALTERMAN: Correct. It has already been reviewed by another independent board. The feeling is there should not be a second review because it might be inconsistent. They are the ones that are the experts in that area. The environmental board is an expert in it's area. Impact fee, whatever that committee is that reviews all the impact fees has expertise in that area to come back here, and perhaps get differing opinions, I guess, was not felt to be a good idea. So, I just want to raise that and make sure you're aware of that.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: And that's in the draft we have before us?

MS. ALTERMAN: The draft that's before you.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: I would have concerns especially as it relates to the traffic performance standards that this –

MR. MACGILLIS: Page 12, B1, second line, it says, "and other", it should read advisory.

MR. JACOBSON: What line was that? Could you speak a little louder, please?

MR. MACGILLIS: Page 12, B1, Line 2, it should read advisory board.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Yeah, David.

MR. CARPENTER: When the traffic performance standards came here, I mean, when we looked at them, I never looked at it to review the technical aspects of that, but just to see if it read right or if it worked right with the other ordinances and other things in the code, if it was worded or whatever, where it was contrary to other sections. I think that's where, you know, we were looking

at it, not really to figure out whether or not the traffic engineers had the right number of daily trips and all this other kind of stuff that they have on there. But, I mean, I can go along with whatever the staff or board wants to do if they think that's the appropriate thing to do. But I mean as far as the technical aspects of it, I don't think we ever thought we were preempting the traffic engineers.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Frank.

MR. PALEN: I think prior to Barbara's comment, this board's authority is delegated from the Board of County Commissioners. They can establish any kind of jurisdiction they wish. And, it's their decision if they prefer to have their counsel from a technical or a separate technical advisory board and not have to go through this process. I think that's their obligation. They should establish that, whenever they create their authorizing resolution or legislation creating what the advisory board for traffic requirements, if any in that resolution it should state that here's the process and we're not going to route it through. Maybe something should be that this board would review anything illegal to ULDC, unless the Board of County Commissioners explicitly devise otherwise.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: I would just say that I think that the end results would lose something in that process because the Traffic Performance Standards Group Committee is working independent of us or I guess under the auspices of the engineering department. We see what they produce and we come up with a great deal of questions that are of philosophical nature that we're trying to get addressed and trying to get a handle on.

I think staff is preparing a list of items that we've identified before, that we

have concerns that perhaps not being looked at, at the Traffic Performance Standards Committee level. And, it's something that we want to engage them in the dialogue about. And, without being part of the process, and being part of the flow for the eventual approval of those elements to the ULDC we miss that whole chance for dialogue. We're fighting for it now, but then we will be completely in oblivion if we weren't in the flow. I don't feel strongly about the other areas, but I think traffic being such and I hate to use the word driving force for development in this nation, that I think we can't help but review that sort of thing.

MS. ALTERMAN: Just as far as traffic is concerned, I don't you know how many advisory boards it goes through. I think that part of the problem is, it goes through multiple. It goes through the League of Cities, it goes through the Traffic Performance Standards Board, it goes to –

MS. DURANDO: MPO.

MS. ALTERMAN: MPO. I mean it's just, how many, I think, is the question. How many reviews does any kind of technical work need.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Charlie.

MR. OMEILIA: Well, you know, I think that, if we address this we need to know what the mission statement is for this board. I've always thought, even before I got appointed as an alternate, I thought this board was sort of, maybe I'm wrong, somebody ought to tell me what the mission statement is. I've always thought this board was kind of an oversight board to overlook the impact of all these other boards and all these other things on the general development of the

county. And, I think, if you start eliminating certain things, you're not going to get that overview.

It all depends on what the mission statement is for this committee. But I've always felt that the CTF was an oversight committee, not necessarily a highly technical committee, just one that says, and that's what happened with the TPS, that's why it came out the way you said. If you take a look at it, it's not necessarily the technical end of it because all they are is a technical board. They're not an impact board. They never consider what happens if they do this, what happens down the road a piece. All they consider is technically are we going to contract it the way it ought to be done and where it is. So, I think before you go ahead, I have one short cursory review idea that I was going to bring it up before we got off of it, but, you're really limiting the overview that this board is going to have if you go ahead with it.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Maury and then Steve. Thank you.

MR. JACOBSON: Charlie, you have the feelings I have about this issue. And as far as mentioning all these organizations, Barbara that you did in terms of review, that's the right of it. That's part of the process. That's not that they're a reviewing board, they can come back and make some recommendations. But, they don't really come up and tell you that's what it is. It's a reviewing type of thing more than anything else. And, I don't see anything wrong, particularly with roads, it's a very delicate problem. And in my town we have a real problem going on with it. And it should be reviewed by as many people as possible.

And, you know, it's interesting for me who is a great believer in the free enterprise system to talk about government work, government control, government input on issues such as this. And, there are a whole bunch of them. And, the truth is, Charlie, I think we're a safety valve, an overview. I should put it, I really do. And I agree with you. By the way, Charlie and I have been colleagues for many years. Although, I think I'm older than you.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Steve.

MR. BRUH: I somewhat echo the thoughts of Charlie and Maury. The interest and objectives of those different boards are not quite the same as we perceive them within the context of the Land Development Code and not necessarily just within the context of its own particular specialization, rather that be impact fees or roads. I think it is important to review it within the context of all the different things that it may affect within the Land Development Code.

I think that's what this board does efficiently. It brings up a lot of issues to those other groups and we, in other words, are just in that spectrum. So, I think we do, I do, and by the way, we certainly don't want to take on anymore work than we have. It would be nice to get rid of some of it, but I'm not so sure we don't start having things that don't really work within the context of the Unified Land Development Code.

MR. OMEILIA: Excuse me, has there been any direction from, any feeling from the County Commission as to the mission of this board, the intent of this board?

MS. ALTERMAN: Remember you, most of you go back further than I do, but it was a long time, at least before the Unified Land Development Code, that you only looked at the narrow, basically the zoning issues, where traffic wasn't a part of it. Am I right?

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Sure.

MS. ALTERMAN: And before the code got unified exactly. So, this committee didn't review all of those peripheral or all those things anyway. And, it's only because the code got unified that somehow it came under the preview of the Citizens Task Force. So, that was kind of how it happened. Whether it was an intended consequence, I don't know. It may have been intended. Maybe it wasn't. I can't tell you. I can't answer that.

MR. OMEILIA: That's one of my points is unification. If we've gone along with the project to unify the code, it looks to me like the CTF ought to be unified to overview the whole code, the whole thing, rather than chopping off points.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Yes, Barbara.

MS. KATZ: There is a purpose. I downloaded the same page, and it says to review provisions of the Palm Beach County zoning, landscaping and signage codes and subdivisions regulations and make recommendations to the BCC. Maybe that really has to be revised.

MS. ALTERMAN: I guess that's our mission.

MS. KATZ: That's your mission. That's the mission, it's purpose. And, it may not be what you really want it to be.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: I think that's the short hand version.

MS. KATZ: Well, this is what was on the website.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: You're looking at four elements of the 1973 code revision.

MS. KATZ: Then it's time to update this.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Those were the three codes that were created in 1973, but this is a different code now.

MR. OMEILIA: A lot of them have been added since then, the TPS for instance.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Right.

MR. OMEILIA: The TPS, that's a real critical thing. Somebody really needs to overlook because they're the first one to tell you, or at least they told the League of Cities time and again, we're a technical committee that sets standards. And, you know, they don't change their standards just because it's going to kill somebody. I mean, they're going to tell you this is the way it ought to be from an engineering standpoint, and this is the best way to do it. And, then you've got to go figure out how it's going to affect everybody else and the road and whatever.

MR. PALEN: Again, the board of county commissioners needs to define, it creates these boards, these advisory panels, and with staff's advice has to define what their missions are. There seems to be some overlap that needs to be clarified. I don't have any, from a legal point of view, I don't think I have any problem with the Board of County Commissioners limiting the jurisdiction of this panel, assigning us responsibilities, they can assign it anyway they choose. I don't think it's going to – we're just the adherent authority by any of these

advisory boards. They can eliminate the panel and go on their own advice, if they choose to. But, I would reword this language in here.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Is there anything else?

MR. PALEN: I'd like to get on to the renaming of the board.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: We can talk about that, but is there in Article 17 else that we need to discuss? We can put to death the item regarding the renaming of this task force, but I'm wondering if our time is more efficiently spent if we're hanging onto a forum by one member addressing the other articles, if we're hung up on this one.

MR. PALEN: Before we'd go on, I want to make a motion to change the name of the Citizens Task Force to the Land Development Regulation Advisory Board.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Okay, that's a motion.

MR. FISH: There is truth in advertising.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: What is the acronym?

MR. CARPENTER: I got one suggestion that we perhaps come up with some names that we can think about for a week. Because, I mean, this is been the name of this group for a long time and I don't know, if I'm just ready to jump on the first thing. Maybe, if we can come up with some names and several different ones or whatever what the people want.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: That could be our homework assignment. And if you have ideas you could e-mail them to staff.

MS. NOBLE: Our new name is going to be fired.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Or reduced.

MR. FISH: Yeah, reduced.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Okay. We need to vote on the motion or do we have homework?

MR. PALEN: I'll withdraw the motion and think about it and come back next week.

MR. JACOBSON: That's a good idea.

MR. OMEILIA: When you think about the name Citizens Task Force, that creates right in your mind what it is. It's an overview board of citizens that look at the general effects of what happens with land development, every aspect of land development.

MR. PALEN: More of an advisory board for specialized interest groups that only a few of us are citizens. A little bit misleading.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Sometimes we're the canary in the coalmine too, Larry.

MR. FISH: There was quite a bit of concern about 2B1. I think I'd like to make a motion that staff reconsider that language and bring something back to us next week.

MR. CARPENTER: Second.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: There's a motion and second to direct staff to reconsider the language in section 2B1, on page 12.

MR. WHITEFORD: At this point, there's not a meeting scheduled for next month. You've already acted on at least a portion of this Article. That was

before the comments came up regarding putting your attention to this particular section. We would incorporate whatever motion you take and bring it forward at our next meeting when that's scheduled.

MR. FISH: I'll make a specific motion.

MR. WHITEFORD: Okay.

MR. FISH: I want to delete, "which or not otherwise reviewed by another adjustment board established by the BCC for that purpose."

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: So in between the commas there?

MR FISH: That's fine.

MR. JACOBSON: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Okay, motion and second, discussion on the motion. Seeing none, those in favor, aye.

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Those against, same sign.

MR. LAST: No.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: One no. Motion passes. Any other direction we want to give staff regarding this Article or do we want to approve this with our exceptions?

MR. JACOBSON: We ought to give them a raise that's all. I'm sure they'd like that.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: I guess my question is are we okay with the other sections of this Article and do we want to act on these.

MR. PALEN: What did we do at the last meeting?

MR. MACGILLIS: I don't think there was a motion.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: I think we withheld action on this.

MR. FISH: There was a motion, but then it was pulled, withdrawn because we decided it had to come back.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Are there any more innovations?

MR. WHITEFORD: None that we're going to bring your attention to, no. Actually, no, there aren't any. That really covers the damages.

MR. KATZ: Excuse me, could I just ask one question.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Sure.

MS. KATZ: This list that you gave us. What does it mean when it says retired. Does that mean they're off the committee. They're not going to come anymore. Is that what it means?

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: That's what I think it looks like.

MR. WHITEFORD: They're vacant. That's correct.

MS. KATZ: So am I still an alternate, or do I become a member because he retired.

MR. WHITEFORD: I'll have to -- we have to look into it.

MS. KATZ: You can come back and let me know?

MR. WHITEFORD: We'll have to look at the paperwork that when the board took the action.

MS. KATZ: Okay. I see a couple of these positions are empty. Both of them are retired.

MR. WHITEFORD: There are current vacancies, yes.

MS. KATZ: You'll never get them as part of the quorum. So maybe those things have to be reduced. Okay, I just wondered what retired was.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Barbara, you need to say something.

MR. ALTERMAN: Just in terms of when we bring this back to you understand and I think Barbara certainly made a good point, Barbara Noble, always makes a good point, that we probably, particularly some of these organizations where they don't have appointments and we thought maybe we probably do need to contact them maybe they aren't even interested. And, so, if we're going to do that perhaps what we can do is bring this back to you at the time we bring back the whole package for the LDRC review and that way we don't have to hold another meeting just for this.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Okay. Yes.

MR. FISH: I don't think we really object if organized labor does not want a member anymore. We don't object to eliminating anyone.

MS. ALTERMAN: I understand and that's a very good point.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Okay. Do we want to take a motion on the entire Article, all with the exception of the section on the CTF.

MR. PALEN: Just as a point of clarification. These sections affect other boards and I'm assuming that staff has, to the extent that these boards have, contacted those boards. For example the Historic Preservation Board and that, that board has no problem with any changes, if there are any being made.

MR. MACGILLIS: There's none to that board. But, any agency outside of zoning's control over that board we coordinated with that. And in that case would

have been Planning and they have no changes. Any of these other agencies that were changes, we contacted that agency's rep.

MR. PALEN: On that basis I feel comfortable voting on moving this section Chapter A, except for the issue of Citizen Task Force.

MR. OMEILIA: Second.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Motion and second, discussion, Lenny do you have something to add or no.

MR. BERGER: A is just the Board of County commissioners, so you better say Article 17, except for the citizen task force.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Excuse me, Article 17, except for the Citizen Task Force. Okay, and that's there, do you know what the motion is. Okay, discussion on the motion. Seeing none, those in favor, aye

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Those against, same sign, motion passes. Now we'll go on to something easy. Article 3, Chapter A, General and Zoning Maps.

MR. MACGILLIS: This you already approved and seen last week. We put it in the back-up material. You need to have this so you can review the article form. This just establishes the Zoning Districts. We went over this last week as far as the pyramid system of the Zoning District. And we acted on that.

MS. DURANDO: We had some problems, didn't we?

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Not enough that we didn't solve them apparently.

MR. MACGILLIS: We just got preliminary approval on that. That was just put in there questions when you were looking at Article 4, which is all our use regulations, and also if you turn to the first part which is Chapter A, which establishes and supplementary standards.

Changes were made to the matrix to respond to the consolidation of the zoning district. Staff had to sit down after certain zoning districts were taken out of the chart because, even those districts they never used, but were similar to other districts.

After combing them, we had to go through all the uses in the matrix to find out that we were eliminating a use that could have been permitted to the zoning district at one time. If you'd like, Carrie is here, Terry worked really closely on this Article. This Article we worked on. We had to compare the use matrix to the supplementary standards which is the next big part of your packet, which it should be Section 3, which is all the supplementary standards for those uses which corresponds to the matrix. On the matrix, on the far hand right there's a small number there, on this matrix.

MS. KATZ: Where.

MR. MACGILLIS: It should be Chapter A.

MR. BRUH: Article 4?

MR. MACGILLIS: Yeah.

MS. DURANDO: We ain't still on Article 3?

MR. MACGILLIS: No, Article 4.

MS. DURANDO: Are we going to discuss 3 at all?

MR. MACGILLIS: Article 3 was just put in your backup material. You already approved that last week.

MS. DURANDO: I thought we had a couple of requests. And, what's in the packet I had several questions on. It was some rewording on the preserve area. That it wasn't designed around, you know, that discussion we had, that the development was not going to be designed around it. That you were going to make it clear that it wasn't a hole in the donut situation. Or that the preserve could suffice for landscaping in anyway, that it would be detected. It was supposedly some pretty definitive wording. And, what do you mean by open space and what the constraints were.

MR. WHITEFORD: What Rosa is bringing up is not, doesn't have anything to do with the standard zoning district, this packet. What Rosa is bringing up is our discussion regarding the rural planned developments. If you had recall, we had a handout. We had a discussion about planned developments and the rural residential land use categories. Boning up some of the language, actually, I'm not sure it's here, that may have been at the subcommittee meeting we had, but boning up the language and emphasizing that rural planned developments are designed around preserves and areas set aside and that sort of thing.

And we went back and did improve that language with an environmental analysis that required all rural planned developments and designations of those locations first. And then when we say developed around them is predicated upon that environmental analysis.

MS. DURANDO: Could I ask some questions now that are in order on this Article please?

MR. WHITEFORD: But that discussion we had, had nothing to do with this.

MS. DURANDO: Now I have some discussion on this that I just want it clarified.

CHAIRMAN BLACKKMAN: We are in the process of losing our quorum now so you can ask your questions.

MS. DURANDO: I mean, I can't accept this as it is, without being enlightened a little bit. On overlays is it appropriate now to discuss?

MR. WHITEFORD: It's up to us. We did talk about this at our last full CTF meeting. If you want me to answer some general questions real quick, I'll be glad to.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: We can't take official action now because we've lost our quorum. We're at 9.

MR. BRUH: But you can ask her questions.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Go ahead.

MS. DURANDO: On overlay district, it came up for discussion on sector planning, one of the commissioners said is Okeechobee Boulevard an overlay? Well, no, it isn't. You have lost lake and so on. Can you answer why Okeechobee Boulevard would never have been considered as an overlay district. It's just kind of a mess right now and it's going to be a worse mess.

MR. WHITEFORD: I've got no idea why Okeechobee Boulevard is —

MS. DURANDO: Okay. Can you tell me –

MR. WHITEFORD: But I will tell you this, overlays are generally created by a goal or objective stated in the comprehensive plan. That's why we put them in the code.

MS. DURANDO: Okay. Why was the sugar cane growers cooperative of overlay.

MR. WHITEFORD: An objective in the plan.

MS. DURANDO: The whole, and in the next thing, it has standard districts. You have AP, which the EAA, that would include that. Why would it be a specific overlay as opposed to Mr. FanHooves holdings are any other sugar cane growers.

MR. WHITEFORD: I'm not sure of your question, Rosa.

MS. DURANDO: Why is it in there as an overlay district?

MR. WHITEFORD: It's an objective in the plan and in fact, it's one of the newer overlays. This overlay was –

MR. DURANDO: Why though, why?

MR. WHITEFORD: To protect the sugar cane –

MS. DURANDO: You've already got it protected in the agricultural production, the EAA.

MR. WHITEFORD: I'm not sure what the EAA is.

MS. DURANDO: Sure you do. The Everglades Agricultural Area, 600,000 acres that's protected.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: We have someone from planning that might help address this. This is a little off point A and it really didn't change as a result of the rewrite that we're going through here.

So, I just want to, I'm giving you some breath here to ask this question, but then we might have to cut you off that's all I'm saying. And, we have someone from planning that maybe can give us an answer.

MR. HOYOS: The Sugar Corp., overlay was created to protect the cover encroachment on the incompatible uses. It was approved by the board a couple of years ago, if any of you remember. It was approved, just for the Sugar Corp. It doesn't address anything else but the Sugar Corp. which is located in the urban area of the City of Belle Glade and just to protect that particular sugar cane from encroachment on the incompatible uses.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Just for the record, we need his name and I know you're from planning.

MR. HOYOS: Yes sir. My name is Isaac Hoyos, Principal Planner with the Planning Division.

MS. DURANDO: Could I ask you why, is either of these areas, you don't list the Wellfield Protection Ordinance.

MR. HOYOS: It should yes.

MS. DURANDO: It's certainly more than sugar cane. The Wellfield Protection Ordinance should have some kind of –

MR. WHITEFORD: It's under tapo, tapo is an overlay.

MS. DURANDO: The turnpike.

MR. WHITEFORD: The turnpike.

MS. DURANDO: But it doesn't protect the Wellfields. Not at all.

MR. WHITEFORD: It's a whole separate ordinance. It's not an overlay.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Rosa, you might want to stay after and talk to either of the representatives from Planning. We're trying to get through as much material as we can.

MS. DURANDO: I know I don't like to see this glossed over when I –

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Well, if you have specific questions about it realize it's not changing as a result of what we're doing. It's just becoming apparent because we're looking at it now, but it is not changing. Okay. So shall we go on with Article -- does it make sense to go on, we do not have a quorum. We can't act on this.

MR. WHITEFORD: We always appreciate your input. If you have the time, we're willing to take the time. We'd love to get a jump on things. So, certainly if you have comments, we'd love to hear them.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: This is when I start visualizing bars on these windows. I would much rather be somewhere else. But, I can sit in this chair and grow roots.

MR. OMEILIA: I'm going to have to leave right away.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: See, they're dropping like flies. Steve.

MR. OMEILIA: I've got a council meeting tonight.

MR. BRUH: He's got to go. When we pass on these things, on these documents, we give you this preliminary approval, where are we going with that?

For instance, I read through some of this, okay and it's lots of typos, it's lot of – you've still got Section 6.14, and I'm not going to talk about because obviously it needs to be changed. There's lots of things in there that are inconsistent and don't really work. So, I keep going to back myself saying what are we doing.

MR. WHITEFORD: That quality review that Frank brought up initially that we talked about is something that we're going through essentially locking ourselves into a room with bars and reading through the documents and ensuring those links are there and those corrections are made and those typos fixed.

It's going to be a lot of work for us to go through and do that, but in order to get it to that perfect stage for these types of meetings, it would have pushed us back a little bit. And, hopefully, you can trust us a little bit that we'll fix the typos and the cross references and the references to the correct table that say, star, star, star. I mean, we're going to fill that in once we figure all the orders to the tables. It's hard to do that at this stage. For the LDRC meeting though you will have a ---

MR. BRUH: My concern is that you're going to come back one day with this Article again and said you've reviewed it already and we're just letting it, this is it for final approval.

MR. WHITEFORD: No.

MR. BRUH: Yeah, you say no now, but.

MR. WHITEFORD: What are you saying?

MR. BRUH: How much time have we got? When we get that final document, how much are we going to have to review it? Let me put it that way.

MR. WHITEFORD: Our schedule is to, any changes that are made to this document that are substantive nature between now and the LDRC meeting are going to be presented to you in an errata before the LDRC meeting. You will have that.

Those types of corrections, the table labeling, we weren't necessarily going to highlight this level of detail that would be very, very tedious. But, we're anticipating to give you at least a few weeks to review the document in total, after your final CTF meeting with the preliminary before.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: There's some items specifically that we said, okay, we understand we can't address at this time and we kind of turned it over to staff to do some more homework and expect those to be brought back. I don't know if anyone of us individually has kept a list other than relying on staff to do that. So, we want to make sure that those are addressed when it all comes back. I think that's the fear that Steve is expressing.

MR. WHITEFORD: Well there's obviously some turnover in staff. So, if there's anything that you recall that maybe you have informed Aimee and Jon and I weren't present that maybe needs to be restated. We're hoping all that information was turned over to us, but there's a possibility that it may not have been. Certainly everything that's been said, that we've been keeping track of, it will be brought back to you.

MR. MACGILLIS: We are, staff is going to be going through all the minutes, the verbatim minutes, from the meetings that either Bill or I were at. We can go through it and address all those concerns. Maybe it'll all come up in the

verbatim minutes.

MR. WHITEFORD: I'm not going to read all the minutes. I've been keeping a list. I know what your issues are. I'm going to address them. Reading through the minutes and the documents would kill us.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: We just hope that's an exhausted list because I know we've identified a number of things we expect to see back and does not approve with what's in the notebook cover on it. Yes, Larry.

MR. FISH: Bill, remember when we go through DRC we have to give you the Mylar. And we have to make changes on the Mylar so it works both ways. We're just trying to make sure that, that happens. Give us the Mylar at the end.

MR. WHITEFORD: And for the last hearing, there are certain things that we're going to bring back to you. And, be sure that we're going to bring back to you in the strike out and underline so that you can very clearly see the changes that are made. Not just between now and the LDRC meeting, which hopefully, will be limited, but anything that you see to date, even in a preliminary format so that you're comfortable with the changes with the current code and the new code that you're essentially adopting.

MR. FISH: One other comment and question. When, you have the capability to hot link the sections that are referred to?

MR. WHITEFORD: Yes.

MR. FISH: Okay. That's a good way to cross check your changes. And you get all the names of the sections in, cross-link everything and make sure it works. You should cross link it, pull up that section and make sure that refers to

the right section.

MR. WHITEFORD: Yes, and we will, except that technically speaking, it's a little more complicated than that because you have a paper version of the code, you have a HCLM version of the code and that type.

MR. FISH: I understand.

MR. WHITEFORD: And we have a PDF version. So we're trying to get it all limited to just one electronic version, which when you print it, it will look just like a paper copy. We're not at that stage yet.

MR. FISH: You can also put it right on the internet and from there put the hot links on it and that's a good way to check to make sure that you've made that.

MR. WHITEFORD: Exactly. That's our vision for the interactive code, that's one of the highlights of it, that you can do that, but until we hit that stage where it's put on the, loaded, uploaded and we start playing around with it. It's just a tail end of this whole process.

MR. FISH: I understand, but that's another quality check before it goes onto the internet.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Frank, do you have something to say.

MR. PALEN: At some point these drafts should stop and this is the version we're using and that goes on, if you're going to be making changes, the statutory change approach would be appreciated I think at that point. All those little picky, technical section changes, and all that, I don't think anybody's really interested in those, but changing the text somewhat.

MR. WHITEFORD: Even if we're changing, you know, grammar that we think changes the meaning of something or a comma, we're talking about the code, you put a comma here, it means that, you put a comma, it means that. We're going to bring that back to you. If we're correcting the grammar, we're not going to bring it back to you highlighted. It will be part of your final package at the LDRC. If there's any doubt in our mind that it will have an impact or not, or change the meaning or not, you're going to see it highlighted.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: B.J. wasn't here today, but he had a very good issue with how we're treating non-conformities in the code, especially in all our major thoroughfares and rights-of-way and that kind of thing. And, he's not here to express it, but I don't know if work has been done in that area to really address that, but that was definitely a direction given by staff. And, if he appears at the meeting, which I hope he will, at the time the whole thing comes back to us. He will be looking for that.

MR. WHITEFORD: When we're done, I'll read it and we'll call him.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Okay. What is our pleasure? I know what my pleasure is. I think we're ready to strike camp. We're ready to go.

MR. WHITEFORD: What we didn't get to then obviously, the use regulations Don described the changes that we made.

MS. NOBLE: Jon, may I ask what page that was on. Sorry to –

MR. WHITEFORD: The loose pages.

MS. NOBLE: The loose part.

MR. WHITEFORD: I can tell you that B&C, Communication Towers, and Excavation, there are no changes those.

MR. BERGER: It didn't get on here.

MR. FISH: The big loose section.

MR. MACGILLIS: It's not something you guys are going to –

MS. KATZ: Which one is it?

MR. BERGER: Article 4, Chapter B, Section R will be gone. Yeah, we can't do that anymore.

MR. FISH: We told you when you wanted to put it in there that it was going to be taken out.

MS. KATZ: What page?

MR. BERGER: Page three.

MR. WHITEFORD: For the LDRC, this is a hot topic of communication towers. That's one of those things that if there's no opportunity to address it during this amendment to the code, it would probably fall into your first round.

MR. FISH: I'm going to volunteer. I have substantial expertise in the communication towers. If you need my help, I'll be willing to help.

MR. WHITEFORD: Excavation very quickly is just a no change. It's just consolidation of our current excavation, current excavation regulations.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: When is our next meeting?

MS. DURANDO: How come you leave out the Corps. They need permits for any of these things from the Army Corps of Engineers.

MR. WHITEFORD: Any permits required by any other entity outside the County are required by those rules and regulations and don't need to be reiterated in the LDC.

MS. DURANDO: That leads to problems. You know that. You said development was up. It happened in Bellagio. They went ahead with the County program for water management permit and never got a Corp permit. They had a cease and desist put on them and a major fine after they excavated 17 acres. And they're not the only ones. It happens all the time. It happened in Homeland, didn't it? The Army Corps prosecuted it. If people are warned, they can maybe get the permit ahead of time.

MR. BRUH: You'll be giving the County an awful hard burden. They may not even know whose jurisdiction something might be under.

MS. DURANDO: Anytime you get a shovel on the ground and dig up something, you need a Corp permit.

MR. BRUH: Well, and there may be other permits that you don't know about and often that happens. I don't believe there's any way to avoid that in the development industry.

MS. DURANDO: Because they list some of them and they don't list all of them.

MR. WHITEFORD: Well, as a matter of fact, I think part of the problem is that if you start to list some, then you have to list them all. So we rather not list any. You know sometimes it's unavoidable, but, just because it's not in this code or it's in this code doesn't negate the requirement that is in it. And, also, the

developer it's incumbent him to know what permits are necessary.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: When is our next meeting?

MR. WHITEFORD: You don't have one scheduled at the moment.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: We're still going to be meeting in July. I will not be here the first week and part of the second week of July.

MR. WHITEFORD: We were looking at the end of July actually for your LDRC meeting, but we gave Bob that back. We had internal discussions about this quality review and the length of time that we're going to need to go through this document and dot the "i's" and cross the "t's" and so that may end up getting bumped back to August sometime. But, what we want to give you is a perfect document.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Okay.

MR. BRUH: With lots of time to read it.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: You might want to send a notice out to the membership because I think the impression is that, at least my impression was that we're going to go, boom, boom, boom every week here for a while. So, if we're not going to meet for awhile it would be nice to put these people on notice so they can free up their Thursdays.

MR. MACGILLIS: We'll probably need one more meeting to clean up this stuff. Next week and then we would be done with all the preliminary stuff and staff can go off and start doing it's quality review.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Then I think just a summary of the schedule of where we are now and what you're expecting to be good.

MS. DURANDO: Are we going to meet on the 3rd, July 3rd?

MR. WHITEFORD: We'll have another meeting a week from today. It will be to pick up where you left off today.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Article 4 and Article 18.

MR. FISH: I think you should postpone it one week after that.

MS. KATZ: All right. Excuse me, but the calendar that was mailed to shows a full committee meeting July 3rd and then another one July 31st and nothing in between. Is this accurate?

MR. MACGILLIS: We reserved those anticipating we could run over on this stuff, seeing much material it was, but we did reserve the rooms for the two meetings.

MS. KATZ: So is there a meeting next week, the 3rd?

MR. MACGILLIS: We would like one. We'll do the quorum call and if we get one, we'll have it next week. If not, we'll follow the next week after. We'd like to get it done next week though.

Okay. You can just leave your material here. We're going to send you out the holiday stuff for what's left, for what we didn't cover here today. So, you want to leave whatever you have and we'll have to send you new stuff for what we didn't cover here today.

MS. DURANDO: It's going to be a new Article 4.

MR. MACGILLIS: We're going to just send you clean material out and then bring the errata sheet into it. You'll have a clean document for the next meeting. I'm going to leave all my stuff here. If you want, you can take the stuff.

we've already finished today, you can take that. All we're going to put on the next meeting is what we did not finish here today.

MS. DURANDO: That's Article 4 and Article 18?

MR. MACGILLIS: Right.

CERTIFICATE

STATE OF FLORIDA)

COUNTY OF PALM BEACH)

I **Rita Hazel**, Professional Court Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Florida at Large:

DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled and numbered cause was heard as hereinabove set out' that I was authorized to and did report the proceedings and evidence adduced and offered in said hearing and that the foregoing and annexed pages comprise a true and complete transcription of the **PALM BEACH COUNTY CITIZENS TASK FORCE.**

I FURTHER CCERTIFY that I am neither a relative nor employee of any of the parties or their counsel, nor financially interested in the action.

Witness my hand and official seal in Palm Beach County, Florida,
this _____ day of _____, 2003

RITA HAZEL
Professional Reporter
Notary Public, State of Florida