

PALM BEACH COUNTY  
CITIZENS TASK FORCE

Thursday, March 20, 2003  
1:35 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.  
100 South Australian Avenue  
West Palm Beach, Florida

Reporting:

Shirley King  
Notary Public

ATTENDEES

Wesley Blackman, Chair  
Joanne Davis  
David Carpenter  
Isabella Fink  
Bruce Kaleita  
Carmela Starace  
Frank Palen  
Barbara Noble  
Mark Williams  
Steve Bruh  
Wayne Larry Fish

Aimee Carlson, Senior Planner, Zoning Division  
Lenny Berger, Esquire, Assistant County Attorney  
Bill Whiteford, Director Zoning Division  
Barbara Alterman, Executive Director PZ&B  
Alex Hansen, Planning Division  
Michael Dyett, Consultant (Via Videoconference)

## INDEX

<u>Item</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Call to Order/Convene as the CTF	
2	Roll Call	
3	Additions, substitutions and deletions	
4	ULDC Amendments (Via Videoconference)	
5	Staff Comments	
6	Adjourn	
	7	Certificate page

## PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: We're going to go ahead and start the meeting.

This is the Citizens Task Force, March 20, 2003. The time now is one thirty-five and the secretary is going to call the roll.

MS. SMITH: Joanne Davis.

MS. DAVIS: Here.

MS. SMITH: David Carpenter.

(No response.)

MS. SMITH: Rick Burns.

(No response.)

MS. SMITH: Karl Kahlert.

(No response.)

MS. SMITH: Barb Noble.

MS. NOBLE: Here.

MS. SMITH: Isabella Fink.

MS. FINK: Here.

MS. SMITH: Steve Dechert.

(No response.)

MS. SMITH: Dee Primm.

(No response.)

MS. SMITH: Bruce Kaleita.

MR. KALEITA: Here.

MS. SMITH: Ron Last.

(No response.)

MS. SMITH: D.J. Snapp.

(No response.)

MS. SMITH: Wes Blackman.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Here.

MS. SMITH: Rosa Durando.

(No response.)

MS. SMITH: Stella Rossi.

(No response.)

MS. SMITH: Carmela Starace.

MS. STARACE: Here.

MS. SMITH: Maury Jacobson.

(No response.)

MS. SMITH: Wayne Fish.

MR. FISH: Here.

MS. SMITH: Bill Cauble.

(No response.)

MS. SMITH: Steve Bruh.

MS. BRUH: Yes.

MS. SMITH: Kent Wilmering.

(No response.)

MS. SMITH: Frank Palen.

MR. PALEN: Here.

MS. SMITH: The following have asked for excused for today's date, Karl Kahlert, Stephen Dechert, Ron Last, Maury Jacobson, Bill Cauble. And as you can see, anybody

else who did not say, here, did not imply that they would not be here.

I also have for the previous meeting, March, 13th, the following people did ask for excused: Bruce Kaleita, Rosa Durando, Carmela Starace and Maury Jacobson and Bill Cauble.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: I think we took action at the last meeting regarding the excused absences.

D.J. Snapp I know is in court and that would also be an excused absence. And besides Karl, Steve, Maury and D.J., is there anyone who did not call -- or indicated that they would be here? That's who we're concerned with.

MS. SMITH: Kent Wilmering -- I did not know about D.J. Snapp -- David Carpenter.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: So Kent Wilmering and David Carpenter will be unexcused.

(Additions, Substitutions & Deletions.)

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: All right. Moving on to additions, substitutions, deletions. Do we have any?

MS. CARLSON: There are none.

(Motion to adopt agenda.)

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Motion to adopt the agenda?

MS. STARACE: Move.

MR. BRUH: Second.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Motion and a second.

Discussion?

(No response.)

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

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Those against, same sign.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Motion passes.

(Excused absences.)

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Excused absences. We have unexcused, Kent Wilmering and Bruce -- I'm sorry -- and Dave Carpenter.

Is there a motion to, I guess, declare them as unexcused absences? Yes, Mark.

MR. WILLIAMS: My name wasn't called, so I'd like to go on record that I am here.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Are you an alternate for someone?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, for Ron Last.

MS. SMITH: I apologize. For Ron Last.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: So is there a motion to indicate that Kent and Dave are unexcused?

MR. KALEITA: Do we have to do that? I don't know that really we have to do that. If they haven't asked for it, I don't know why we have to do it.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: It's on the agenda.

MS. STARACE: Can we vote on the people who are excused, in that order?

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: We can do it that way, too. Those would be Karl Kahlert, Steve Dechert, Maury Jacobson, D.J. Snapp and Ron Last.

Is there a motion?

MS. STARACE: Motion.

MS. DAVIS: Second.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Those in favor, aye.

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Those against, same sign.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Motion passes.

(ULDC Amendments.)

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Moving on to the ULDC Amendments -- I think we have a phone connection.

MS. CARLSON: Yes, we do.

(Time is 1:38 p.m.)

MS. CARLSON: Michael?

MR. DYETT: Hello.

MS. CARLSON: I apologize for our technical problems. They have cut the lines to this building. So we were hoping to do videoconferencing and that happened about twelve o'clock that they cut the line.

We have Michael on the phone. Michael may be referring to graphics. We've tried to place them in the room. All of these graphics were also contained in the draft you got as well.

And what we were hoping to do is do more of a preview to these concepts. These are new concepts for Palm Beach County; they're the Traditional Development Districts. They're based in the new urbanizing ideal which is being advocated for certain types of development in certain areas in the County. Some areas require you to use this option; other areas it's an optional development type.

And Michael is going to walk us through the three main types. There is the Traditional Neighborhood, which is the mixed-use residential concept; there is the Traditional Marketplace, which is the mixed-use commercial concept; and when you put a combination of these two districts together, you form a new town, which is called the Traditional Town Development District.

In our Code today, we have a Traditional Neighborhood Development District which is very, very large. It's written for the Old Town of Wellington. It was never used. It's that 1280 acre minimum and only allowed in the Urban/Suburban Tier, which, as we all know, there is no such land that would meet that requirement.

We have equated the Traditional Neighborhood that's in the Code today to a Traditional Town and we've created an entirely new Traditional Neighborhood District, which is a much smaller, more neighborhood-oriented neighborhood in scale concept.

The Traditional Marketplace, again, something that's totally new, it's akin to the main street in an old downtown. This concept is required. It is a mandatory type of commercial for new commercial in the Ag. Reserve. The Comp. Plan does give us a lot of guidance for this, in terms of location. There are only two intersections that can use this option. It's anticipated that perhaps these options may be applied in the Sector Plan.

Some of you might want to ask questions about, why are we doing this when there's not enough land left? It's to give us some options later on. But we cannot today guess as to where it might be applied in the Sector Plan, or when. That's a different process. That's something the Planning Division is working on.

And the Traditional Town, again, it's when you mix up the two combined. One of the things that I think you're going to want to focus on today is, how much do you need? Do you need two neighborhoods and one marketplace to make a town? Three neighborhoods? What's the minimum acreage? That type of thing.

There are some unanswered questions right now that Staff is still working on; questions related to the demand that would dictate the size of these developments, particularly in the Ag. Reserve. We are actively working on this and that's why we're taking

more of the approach of giving you a prelude today and not asking for any action, because we're still working on that. There's also questions about the form and whether or not all of what's required can fit on the minimum acreage; it's only 10 acres and we have a prohibition against structured parking, for example, in the Ag. Reserve. Can we fit everything on 10 acres? We are working on that as well. We're doing some sketches and trying to do some model site plans. We should have that done in the next month or so. We'll be back in April and actually asking you to take final action at that time.

With that said, I'm going to turn it over to Michael. And, Michael, if you will do me a favor, if you need me to refer to any graphics, let me know and I will try to point them out. We do have them all facing everyone.

MR. DYETT: Thank you very much. I actually can now see everyone on my screen, so that's good news. It's a pleasure and an honor to be able to talk with you all about what we've been doing on the Traditional Development.

Should I stay on the phone, Aimee?

MS. CARLSON: I don't know. I would stay on the phone.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: It's working, so don't mess with success here.

MR. DYETT: Okay, great.

What we're going to try to do is to talk through all of the elements of Traditional Development and give you a preview of where our thinking has evolved. We've tried to respond to the comments that we heard from the individual subcommittees, and we also had some very good advice from a peer review session.

As Aimee said, the overall idea is to have compact, mixed-use development in a pedestrian friendly environment that would allow for a range of housing types, interconnected streets, but within the Traditional Development Districts and between these districts and this other land use.

Another important idea is that you strive to create neighborhood identities and focus, so that the County is not just approving subdivisions, but actually creating a strong sense of place.

Regulations are set up as building blocks, with an emphasis on housing type and other building types, not density. The Use Regulations use the same approach that you now have for the Planned Development District and there are no separate zones for separate density. We also have incentive. And in keeping with the idea of making these truly compact, we will not require buffers, landscape buffers, between the district, only around the Traditional Development District.

In the Marketplace there's a little bit finer grain guidance for what we call primary and secondary frontages, so that you're creating a sense of main street. The neighborhoods are really, I think, enabling this creation of individual communities that will be linked by bike lanes, sidewalks and streets. And then the Marketplaces will have human scale building elements.

We added and made a number of changes in response to the comments we received from Aimee based on your subcommittees' work. And the idea is to really have more flexibility and incentives for doing this type of development; for example, the idea of having drive-through facilities on minor streets has now been put in, and having gas service stations and convenience sales on the perimeter. We also heard of concerns about multifamily housing in the rural and Exurban Urban Tiers and so we made the regulation so that that provision could be eliminated as well.

The connectivity concept is the theme that we heard throughout the Future Land Use element as being very important, so you wouldn't have a sense of use of cul-de-sacs or dead-end streets under these Traditional Development Districts, nor would you really have

gated residential communities, although we did add the idea of a gated residential alley. All of the new developments would be served by alleys, except for the single family blocks, where that's the only use. The scale of landscaping, parking, is all intended to be human and oriented toward this pedestrian environment.

A new idea is to allow the on-street parking to count toward your overall parking requirement, and this will just make more economic sense, and also allow for off-site parking within walking distance of the uses. We have new ideas for bicycle parking and limits on the amount of paving so that there could be landscaping within the parking areas themselves.

We heard about concerns with the original approach to signage, which was to just focus on wall signs, projecting signs and canopy signs. And the draft now would allow for some freestanding signs in the Traditional Development District.

I'd like to take a minute now and just highlight some of the ideas that underscored our thinking about the Traditional Neighborhoods and then the Traditional Marketplaces and put it all together as a Traditional Town.

As Aimee said, the original approach 10 years ago to Traditional Neighborhoods was to take a much larger area. We've started from the opposite perspective. What is a good building block for a neighborhood? We have a 40-acre minimum and an in-fill court for the Urban/Suburban Tier. That number could be reduced to 25 acres. As you put the neighborhoods together, and if you have more than four, you then come in under the Traditional Town rule. But I think that the building block of the 40 acres makes a lot more economic sense. And all the streets in these neighborhoods, again, connect within the neighborhood and to adjacent neighborhoods.

There's some building standards in the Code. And we show in the tables how these compare with existing standards. And they're fairly consistent as well with the ideas that we're seeing in Jupiter and Albacoa and in some of the other Traditional Neighborhoods around the United States that are being built. In fact, we did a survey of what Traditional Neighborhood ordinances have been working. And I think Aimee has a copy of that for those who are interested.

Within each neighborhood, the focal point is the neighborhood center that would be 1 to 5 acres in size. And that would be the -- you know, the place where you come to shop, visit, meet your neighbors. And there would be the floor area limitation, but we would exempt the food store and allow up to 40,000 square feet, which is the size that Wal-Mart and some of these other major food store companies are setting for their neighborhood food store.

In this -- or adjacent to this neighborhood would be civic uses and parks and open space. And we did hear some comments from the CTF members about the need for amenities in these plazas, so we did a little research and added a requirement for pedestrian seating and some additional amenities. So these are really usable spaces and attractive centerpieces for this new development. We've also increased the potential height. Generally it will be 35 feet, but we would allow additional height in the core as an economic incentive.

The neighborhoods -- within the neighborhoods themselves, you can see the sketches envision that the garages are set back from the front of the buildings, either attached to the home or acceptable off the alley. There was a question about whether the setback from the front facade is too much; it would be 20 feet under this draft. What that means is then the car is really pulled out of the front setback area. So as you would look down a street, you might see some visitor parking, but generally wouldn't see parked cars in all the front setback areas. And I think that additional setback rule does make some

sense.

In the neighborhood commercial areas, we are trying to get the buildings oriented to the street, with the parking in the side and in the rear, and have covered walkways. In the rural areas, the rural design standards would apply. I think that there's enough flexibility here to make the Traditional Neighborhood Development option attractive.

I'd like to turn now to the Traditional Marketplace, which is really the way to have the community shopping center component configured as around the main street, to make it both inward looking and pedestrian friendly, but also outward looking.

There's a minimum size of 10 acres that Aimee mentioned is being studied and there would be minimum standards for floor area, intensity of development, which is the floor area ratio, and along the main streets you'd set limits for the size of individual tenants. But a major tenant could be in back of these liner spaces that would be along the main street. So I think that the combination of standards provides the mix that a major retail developer could put together and have a successful project, like City Place.

The hierarchy of streets, the main street where you have a much more focused pedestrian orientation, and the minor street, where there would be more gaps between buildings, access to the parking, also make sense. The ordinances would envision some limitations on the overall block size. And these are limitations that we're seeing used throughout the country. An extreme example of very small blocks is Portland, Oregon, where they're 200 feet by 200 feet. And it's a very, very livable, viable, vibrant shopping area. The rules of thumb are in the order of 400 to 500 feet, which the Code is certainly consistent with that rule, and it really opens up the whole marketplace. The additional height was added, and that was in response to some concerns.

The specific rules we have for the Agricultural Reserve, as Aimee mentioned, are being studied separately.

(David Carpenter arrives at 1:58 p.m.)

**MR. DYETT:** But I think the basic concept of having a development area and then a preserve area really is a strong one and can work well.

I mentioned that the third building block is the Traditional Town, which is brought in when you have more than four neighborhoods. And you're trying to, in the Traditional Town, keep the connection to the rest of the road system and within the -- and between the traditional neighborhood work not require buffers, which is a cost savings. But also allow, as another incentive, that a portion of the land in the Traditional Town could be used for a residential PUD or an office MUPD. And this could give an additional economic incentive.

The connectivity, I mentioned, would limit the use of cul-de-sacs and dead-end streets and have these other uses, if someone did a residential PUD or an office MUPD, both of which would be limited to a small percentage of the total, are contributing as well to the idea of this central space, the office -- the open space parks and plazas.

Throughout the drafts and the revisions we've been making, we've been trying to always think about how can we make these regulations more flexible? Have we put in incentives that would make them attractive for development? Have we provided exemptions for the in-fill location so this can be a viable option on some under-utilized sites within the Urban/Suburban Tier? And have standards that reflect the market reality of Palm Beach County.

So that's the briefing in a nutshell. And I think if there are specific questions, that might be a better use of our time, to talk about concerns you may have as we continue to refine these regulations, or if I have not been clear about certain concepts.

**CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN:** Thank you, Michael. We have a lot of people assembled here and I'm sure they have a lot of questions. And we also have people that were part of

the subcommittee that reviewed this, both the Rural and the PDD Committee. I don't know if any member of those committees wants to make some additional comments or they may have questions. That might be where to start. And then we can take questions from the CTF. And then if we have time, we can also open it up to the general public, the many professionals that are here from the development community.

(Time is 2:00 p.m.)

MS. STARACE: I'm just curious, and my question really is to Joanne.

Joanne, do you know of any agricultural areas that are going to allow this kind of development?

MS. DAVIS: I don't know if "allow" is the right word. I think it's more like "want".

I'm not sure that -- that the Exurban area and Agricultural Reserve can be approached in the same way even. I know that Rita Miller was in a few of the subcommittee meetings and she expressed a lot of concerns about that form of development inside the Exurban area. I think that they do need some commercial in there. I don't know if that may need some more refinement to better suit the community or what, but I know she did bring a lot of concerns. One of her main concerns, too, is the parking issues and retaining the original canopy of trees and pervious parking and things like that. And I know yesterday we were at the subcommittee meeting and I was conducting a debate about, what does rural mean and what does rural design mean? And we came to the conclusion, that what the County Commission may be calling rural here is actually boutique rural in their minds. And having lived and grown up here all my life -- I was born here -- all my life, there are places that should not be boutique rural, they should be rural; and I think Loxahatchee is one of them. And I think portions of the acreage, and I think even in the second planning area, some of that should stay rural.

MS. CARLSON: Let me just address that a little bit, too. Keep in mind right now that the Ag. Reserve does say, that for new commercial, it needs to be in the TMD form. Michael's draft does allow the TMD and the TND, both the neighborhood and the marketplace, to be applied in the rural areas. However, I think it's premature to decide where or how it would be applied. That's going to be decided as part of the Sector Planning process, which is scheduled to do some sort of presentation and basically lay out what the goals are this summer.

MS. DAVIS: In the Ag. Reserve, when the Ag. Reserve truly was agricultural -- and not now. It's sort of like part of it is suburbia and part of it is still agricultural -- the marketplace in the Ag. Reserve was basically the little frame structure at Four Points, where there was no paved parking, there was no landscape, everybody just pulled up in their pickup truck, grabbed a sandwich or a soda and went on down the road. That was rural. That was real, real rural. And those kind of places, well, you know what it is now; it's a huge mega gas station, mini-mart thing. And that's not rural.

MS. STARACE: Answered my question.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: That was a good question.

I'm open to ideas on how to handle this, in terms of format. We do have Michael here -- and I assume you can hear us, Michael?

MR. DYETT: Yes, I can.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: We've all had some time to review this. I know I would have rather had more time just to squeeze everything in, but I think we have a general understanding.

One of my questions is -- and maybe it would help having a diagram or a map of the County showing the Tiers, where these would be. I think that would help us visualize a little more than conceptually where these are going. That was a question that kept rolling over in

my mind, is where are these things going to be and how are they going to relate to our existing development pattern, and should the emphasis be in many areas just on in-fill? Because I think a lot of the perception here is that we're already a built-out county. And unless we're going to make rural areas unrural, as Joanne was talking about, I think the real question is, where are these going?

MS. STARACE: I think you hit a nail on the head there, too. Because we were talking, Lenny and I, and I could see this and so could he, like in a lot of the eastern communities where they're revitalizing their downtown areas and all. I mean, this I can see in my mind's eye. But out west, you know, I could see -- like in Royal Palm I was telling him, we're looking to do something like this mixed-use inside the Boulevard, and that's the only piece we have left, and maybe something like this. But when you go further west, I don't see this too viable. But like Aimee said, that's something that --

I just wanted to ask a question about parking on the street and including parking on the street as part of the parking area. They do that in New York and Brooklyn now and that's why nobody can park anywhere. I just thought I'd let you know that. Because you park on the street to go to the store and now the person that comes home can't park to go to their apartment upstairs or whatever. So parking on the street, be careful what you wish for, you may get it.

MR. DYETT: What we're trying to do in the Traditional Marketplace is to give the developer a little more flexibility in how they respond to a parking standard. And we've seen a lot of these new projects, where they may have some angled parking or parallel parking in front of the stores and it is a good viable option, because all -- that way the customers can see the fronts of the stores, those who find the space, and they're not all required to go back to an interior lot or in the Urban/Suburban area and do a structure. But your question is important.

MS. STARACE: This is strictly for parking.

MR. DYETT: The key is to set the standard so that there would be enough spaces when you add up all of the parking. In the older eastern cities, they didn't have enough off-street parking, so everyone is competing for the on-street space.

MS. STARACE: Okay.

MS. CARLSON: I'm going to turn our attention to the map real quickly. Can everybody see it?

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Yes.

MS. CARLSON: The purple color is the Rural Tier and the light yellow, that is basically the acreage and Palm Beach Country Estates, is the Exurban Tier. Everybody knows where the Ag. Reserve is. And the two intersections that are eligible for this concept would be the intersection of Boynton and Lyons, which is not shown on the map -- it's between State Road 7 and the Turnpike -- and the intersection of Atlantic and Lyons. The Plan says that TMD's must be located there and must be located within a quarter-mile radius of those two intersections. The Urban/Suburban Tier corresponds to our old urban service area, and that's the big, thick black line, and both of these concepts apply there. The darker orange that's on the map is the Revitalization and Redevelopment Overlay. Those of you who have heard of the CTCRC (ph) efforts that the County is doing with redeveloping communities, that's what the orange is, also would apply. Doesn't necessarily correspond to the reference to in-fill in here. We're still working on defining in-fill and getting a better handle on it. The Planning Division is working on an in-fill study to identify in-fill areas and do some critical development that will help with that.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: And is it true that the darker orange is within many of the municipalities?

MS. CARLSON: Yes. I'm glad you brought that up. There is a lot of overlap between the dark orange and the city areas.

(At 2:09 p.m. Barbara Alterman arrived.)

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: What does that mean in terms of actual application of this? Is our cooperative effort with the municipality or what?

MS. CARLSON: We have no regulatory authority over those areas. However, the Board has been trying to encourage annexation in those areas and working on providing the services to make those areas a little bit more attractive to the cities to annex. A lot of these areas are missing water, sewer, they've got dirt roads, they don't have a lot of amenities, and that's a big part of the CTRC (ph) as well.

MR. DYETT: I think the standards that we're trying to have here, with more of an urban focus and without the buffering requirements, creates an incentive for reuse, redevelopment and revitalization that I think would fit in with the standards that municipalities have for their urban areas as well.

We did spend a lot of time reading each of the community zoning regulations, both for this effort and for the landscaping and sign's effort, to try to have this seamless transition.

MS. STARACE: I don't know how to separate this, Aimee. But like Lantana, Riviera Beach, a lot of them are going to be doing the revitalization, which they should because it's going to be a shot in the arm for their communities and it will really be great, then comes the traffic. And, you know, we're supposedly -- what's out there now we all know is a whole different vision of traffic. We're going to start maybe looking at traffic according to population, rather than according to the Beaver counts that we got from the University and all that.

I mean, I don't know how you -- is this just a concept you want us to do today? Otherwise I'm having trouble separating in my mind what's actually going to be able to happen and what isn't. I don't want to mix the two. Is concept more today?

MS. CARLSON: As part of what we're hoping that you could do today, I think we're recognizing that there are outstanding questions -- you know, you see a lot of industry here and I don't know if they're going to speak and relay some of their concerns today or not -- but we're still doing our research to try to answer those questions. We wanted to come forward and introduce the concept. I'm not asking you to give us the detail. Think of it kind of how we handled the Article 1 previously, where we'll come back next month with the detailed questions.

But certainly, if there's anything that any of you see that you really want to address, you want us to call back and work with Michael, please let us know so that we can use the intermediate time to address that.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Bruce.

MR. KALEITA: Bruce Kaleita, for the record.

Being an industry representative, I'm reminded of an article I read I believe April of last year in the National Association of Home Builders Builder Magazine. The article concerned a survey nationwide of Traditional Neighborhood Developments and whether or not they had been financially successful, Number 1; and Number 2, whether or not they had been mandated by local regulations or voluntarily developed by an individual or group of builders.

And the upshot of what I heard was, that while there were a few outstanding examples of voluntarily constructed Traditional Neighborhood Developments that had been successful financially, that the level of success was far less for those which had been mandated by local regulation.

The concern I have here is, I believe I just heard Staff a few minutes ago say, that as far as the Ag. Reserve is concerned, are we mandating Traditional Neighborhood Development?

MS. CARLSON: We're not mandating Traditional Neighborhood. We're mandating Traditional Marketplace, the commercial.

MR. KALEITA: Are we mandating TND anywhere in Palm Beach County?

MS. CARLSON: Not at this time.

MR. KALEITA: So it is only a development option someone may request? It's one of a number of districts to which one could rezone, but it's not mandatory?

MS. CARLSON: That is correct.

MR. KALEITA: Is that expected to remain the same? Because, you know, today's good suggestion becomes tomorrow's mandate.

And the concern I have is, I have fifty thousand people that are working in my industry in this County. And their concern is, they want a product people will buy, not a product that the Commission likes. It's nice when you can have both, but you cannot always have both. I've also felt, that the fact that something works in one place, does not mean it will necessarily work in every place. And I offer you as an example of a downtown that is perfect is the one in Albacoa, which nobody seems to go to.

So the only thought I have is, how mandatory is any of this? And if it isn't mandatory, I don't know that we need to worry about it much, because whether it is good or not will be determined by those who elect to use it. But if it is or has a likelihood of becoming mandatory, we better take a really good look at this stuff. Because I can tell you that there are projects across the nation that were mandated that do not work and are now abandoned and in various stages of construction, or the prices have gone so high that only the wealthy can afford to live there.

In fact -- without attending to ramble incessantly, although rambling nonetheless -- let me comment that my wife and I -- I have this habit, having been in design professions before I became a lawyer -- we were in the Orlando area and decided to visit Celebration. And we went there and we actually found that we could not afford to live in Celebration, which struck us as odd, since this was apparently a throwback to better times, or at least an attempt to retreat to better times. But they had to have been in times when everybody was rich, because the least expensive house we found in Celebration I think was \$465,000. But it had the politically correct separate garage -- which by the way my wife loathed, because the trip to carry groceries from the vehicle to the kitchen was quadrupled, as compared to our own residence, which is custom built and which has a grand total of a 25-foot distance between groceries in the trunk and the kitchen.

And I'm suggesting that it is an issue of whether or not anybody can afford to have this perfect future. And if it's not mandatory, I don't mind if it fails because of these characteristics. But the moment it's in danger of becoming mandatory, and if that fails, it takes the industry down with it, and I'm concerned about that. I would like it made abundantly clear that these are options only and you don't have to do it.

MS. CARLSON: The fact that it's mandatory in the Ag. Reserve, the mixed-use, the TMD -- we've been calling them the T-developments here at the Staff level. It is the mixed-use commercial. That's mandatory. That's set in the Plan. That was done as part of the Master Plan. I really don't think that's up for debate right now, whether we would change that or not.

One of the basic tenets behind the Tier System is the preservation of choice and the recognition of different areas across the County, different concepts, that they want to apply and encourage. This development option of TND and the Traditional Town is being

considered as part of the Sector Plan. But, again, that's premature right now, to decide whether it's going to be mandated in the Sector Plan or not.

One of the things that Michael has done in his draft, to try to give more choices, be responsive to industry and the development community, is in the Traditional Town, over a certain size -- I believe it's been lowered down to 200 acres -- you can include a PUD as a development option, you can include an MUPD. So as part of putting together your town, you can have a PUD pod that could be dated and address some of that segment of the population who is interested in that lifestyle. So that's important to remember.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Michael are you still there, 'cause we've lost you on the screen?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Michael, can you hear us?

MR. DYETT: Yes, I can.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: And did you hear those comments, Aimee's comments she just made?

MR. DYETT: I did. And I think they're important -- it's an important perspective.

And as Aimee said, we're trying to view this as a set of development options in the toolbox, with the exception of where the Board has already made certain decisions in terms of the Ag. Reserve. So in comparison with some of the other more traditional -- the other building blocks, the other districts, we're trying to see how these could be incentives and where they have been successful. And I have talked with some of the Planning directors around the County as well and there are some people that have made this work. But we were trying to have this as a flexible tool that could fit in and implement the planning concept.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: I think it might be important, Carmela earlier brought up the issue of transportation and why are we doing this in relation to our existing -- and how are we doing it in relation to our existing transportation network and the differing offerings we have in terms of mass transit and just regular single occupancy vehicle transportation. Can you address some of that?

MR. DYETT: By having mixed-use and by having opportunities for walking and bicycling to destinations, you're internalizing certain trips that would otherwise go outside the community.

I sometimes like to think of a neighborhood as the range of a 10-year-old boy or girl on their bicycle. And if a development is aided if it has cul-de-sacs without -- as long blocks without any mid-block connections, then people are more likely to use their cars to visit neighbors or to do the drop-off and pick-up at the schools. By also introducing the corner store and the smaller scale neighborhood center into these neighborhoods, you are reducing the overall burden on the arterial and highway system, because the trips for shopping can be shorter and can be linked with a chance to pick up a thing -- pick up your dumpster or stop at the post office or the library.

This idea of mixed-use, of going back to some of the traditional city building concepts, I think does work and is a very attractive option to keep the overall traffic impact down. The traffic concurrency requirement would still hold, so there would be that additional level of review required for these developments, as well as for others. But what we found is, the actual trip generation rates are lower if you were mixing what we called the four D's, density, diversity, design and destinations. If those ideas are part of your overall planning, the trip rates are less than single purpose subdivisions, where all the activity requires an automobile.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Okay. Carmela.

MS. STARACE: Density breeds better transportation system; we know that. But what I'm --

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: In proximity.

MS. STARACE: Right. And I'm questioning if that is what even the County Commissioners want, though, out west. And I don't think it is.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: And I think both you and Bruce are asking, really, the same questions; how palatable is that kind of lifestyle in this marketplace?

MS. STARACE: Well, he's asking another question that scared me when I got the answer. I thought we were working on concept and I thought the only mandatory thing, like Joanne said, was commercial, 'cause, yeah, everybody needs commercial. But when you start saying that maybe some of this stuff that I'm looking at and maybe trying to develop is going to come and hit me in the butt because it's going to be mandatory, that is a scary situation. You know, I'm like fixing my own poison. I don't want to do that either. So I wouldn't never want to have that thrown at me. That's scary.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Joanne.

MS. DAVIS: What I wonder, though, and you mentioned it before, is that we're facing a county that's very near build-out. And at some point, it will be shoved down our throats, a more compact development style, and I don't think that it's too early to begin pushing in that direction. Because if you don't, whatever remaining large tracts of land that we have left, and there are a few, they won't be developed that way and we will waste yet more land than we've already wasted. So I think that mandatory maybe is strong, but I think strongly encouraged. Better compact development forms really should be where we're headed anyway.

MS. CARLSON: And we actually, back in 2001 -- as you know, we've been working on this project for a while and we've had various steps. And I think we've talked before about using this concept of reverse engineering, where we agree on the picture and we had all the prototypes that are up there and we took those to the Board. The consultant then -- we have a different consultant now -- had posed the question about maybe making these concepts mandatory. And the answer that came out of the Board really was, they're good, we want to encourage them, but we're not ready to go there yet; they were not ready to do that. And they want to see how they work, test the waters. Certainly if people want to use them and want to do mixed-use in this County, it's going to be encouraged. We have members sitting here in the audience today that have proposed a mixed-use project going through that Comp. Plan amendment process. It's not one of these. It's the mixed-use, MXP, that exist in the Code today, but it has some similar principles to these developments.

MS. DAVIS: What I wonder, too, Aimee, is that, shouldn't we at the Staff level, Planning Department and so forth, be really taking a hard look at maybe there are areas that should be strongly encouraged for that development form and just really sort of work with the developers that want to do that and perhaps, you know, provide incentives or something to put that right there? But at this point in time, we don't even know where we want it. I mean, we know we want it east, but there may be other areas, too.

MS. CARLSON: The Plan does contain guidance. It's important for us to remember that a lot of what we're doing over the next couple of months is guided in the Plan, it's rooted in the Plan, it's part of the Tier System. And mixed-use and sustainable communities, the urbanism principle, pedestrian friendly environment, all of those sort of things are encouraged in the Plan. The Board's gone on record, there was a 50-member task force that came to consensus about encouraging that, so it is being encouraged. And I think, as part of the in-fill study that I mentioned earlier, that perhaps will get to some of the

incentives. We just need to give a little bit of time to have that study be completed right now.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Steve, you had a question.

MR. BRUH: Just kind of dovetail on what Bruce said. I certainly think that mixed-use is a great concept. But I wonder what's the -- this is a question for Michael -- what was the basis for the study parameters for economic viability of these kind of set-ups? You know, there's limited amount of commercial space within this neighborhood development. What is the -- what were those parameters or what kind of economic viability was shown on those?

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: That's a question for Michael?

MR. DYETT: Yeah. Well, we've been working with the Planning Department on trying to think about what the right mix of uses are. As Aimee said, there is a separate demand study, a real estate market demand study, that the Department is going to be doing to be checking to see whether these -- the demand is there and how it could be accommodated.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Yeah, Bruce.

MR. KALEITA: One very, very profound impact -- and I go back to Celebration again -- that that project had on me when I was there, was the downtown in Celebration was extremely quiet, there wasn't anybody around; and Number 2, that it was in the middle of the development; meaning, that its only commercial function, or, if you will, its market area was the development itself. The problem that I saw with that was it didn't work. Celebration was out in the middle of a virtual nowhere. Nobody would regard their downtown as a destination, certainly not buried as it was in the center of all the Traditional Neighborhood Development. And I hate to say it, but I think that if you're going to have mixed commercial development -- or mixed residential and commercial development, we ought to give people the option of putting it on the outside of their project.

MR. DYETT: In fact, on page 24 of the draft, we picked up the idea that you just mentioned -- and that came out of the peer review session as well -- is, should the Code mandate a central location. And I think the point you made is very important. And that led to some changes in the Code language that are on page 24, in terms of the neighborhood center idea.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: That's his page 24.

MS. CARLSON: Our page 38 by our hand-numbered document.

MR. KALEITA: So we're going to allow commercial, then, to be where the public expects to find it; putting it on the outside isn't seen as a Planning sin, a departure from some venerated, but perhaps nonfunctional concept?

MR. DYETT: That's our suggestion as we've been listening to these comments.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Barbara.

MS. NOBLE: Yes, Michael, I was taking a look at the grid of new urban and zoning ordinances and the successful areas where they've had successful developments of this type. I'm just wondering, did you also take a look at some of the areas that had attempted this and perhaps had not been so viable?

I'm familiar with a Rouse Development in Voorhees, New Jersey, called Town Center. And to also piggyback on what Bruce was just saying, part of that was built in the garden part of the garden state. It was the first type of sprawl into a farmland community. They built that concept and it's struggled and been unsuccessful for probably a number of reasons. But also because most of the people that live in that area, they are stopping on the way home from their businesses, where there is more easily accessibility to commercial development, and they're doing their shopping outside, as opposed to once they return home then needing to access pedestrian ways or bicycles to go into the center of downtown, as Bruce mentioned.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Isabella.

MS. FINK: About 60 years ago I lived in a little town that you're describing. It was called Greenbelt; about five miles outside of D.C. And it was built by Roosevelt's chief planner. There are five Greenbelt towns in the Country. This was one of them. It was an absolutely self-contained town. There were made rules where there was automobile traffic or a bus to the outside world, but every road was safe. There were overpasses over every road so children could walk to school, people could walk to the center of town, where there was the co-op grocery, the police department, the fire department, a drycleaner, a drug store, everything was contained, the medical center. Everything was in one spot. But that was an age when people walked. We walked everywhere with the baby buggies. And there was an area behind each block of homes where there was over parking, off-street parking.

No automobiles were allowed to be parked near the houses. People carried stuff from downtown. I would come home from shopping downtown Washington and I carried; I lugged all my purchases. Nobody thought of it in those days. Of course I was 60 years younger and I'm almost 86 now. But still, that concept was done on purpose. It was a self-contained community. Didn't have to go out anywhere except to go to work downtown and come back again.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Bruce.

MR. DYETT: And it's still a great community.

MS. FINK: Thank you. It was wonderful.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Bruce.

MR. KALEITA: I commend -- I'm sorry, this is John we're talking to?

BOARD MEMBERS: Michael.

MR. KALEITA: Michael, thanks a lot for what you did on page 24. Can't we do this, though, can't we allow non-central locations in any of these developments? Why is it only allowed on an in-fill site, if in fact it is only on an in-fill site? Can't we just presume that the same market forces will be at work on an in-fill as on an out-fill site? In other words, if people shop on the way home and if people shop at the big plazas and the collections of stores, then why not allow that to be true everywhere? And that way we'll get, let's say, Traditional Neighborhood Developments which are built next to each other which pool their commercial together and create a larger commercial area that serves a bigger market area and it's more likely to be successful.

MR. DYETT: I think you've touched on a good point. And that was the idea of looking at the Traditional Neighborhoods that would come in where you'd have two or three or four, you think of them in the context of then the Traditional Town and where does it make more sense to have the commercial needs for the groups of neighborhoods. And that's a land planning -- that's a case-by-case effort.

I think the flexibility you've noted is I think important to have in the Traditional Town section of this Code. Now that's something we'll take a look at and see if we can make sure it's there.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Okay. David.

MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, I just wanted to comment about what we were talking about, about putting the commercial on an extraneous parcel that has access from the outside.

Remember way back in our Planned Development Districts, like in a PUD, initially the commercial was on the outside, if you remember all the PUD's that were passed in past years, but are approved and built. The commercial's on the outside and you drove -- the commercial's accessible to everybody and the residents drove past that and the rest of it was gated, say like the polo development down in Boca and others like it.

But the Commission has gone now to, like in the Planned Unit Development, of only wanting that commercial to serve the neighborhood and you have an internal requirement for the commercial location rather than being on the perimeter. So, I mean, proposing it on the outside like we're doing I think has a lot of merit as far as the survival of the commercial, but it's not the way the Commission's been heading. They've been wanting the commercial to be more internalized. I mean, I agree with the external location, but I'm just saying that's not where the history of the commercial's brought us. Because the Commission disliked the commercial because it was, in their opinion, on the outside created just for the commercial and didn't want additional commercial on major roads.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Joanne.

MS. DAVIS: One thing that just sort of occurred to me about the debate between whether you put it internal to the development or you put it external so everybody can use it who drives by it, is there's a simple design element that you have to think of, and that is, how big is the community that it'll be serving? What types of needs does that community need? And how convenient is the commercial to that community? And if it's adjacent to another community that might also benefit by the commercial, then that's design consideration that could be incorporated. But just to arbitrarily say, well, we're thinking it might need to go more towards the outside, that might not work for that new development and it might make that new development unsuccessful from a livability standpoint and a marketability standpoint. What about the folks that are way at the end of the block or at the end of the development that cannot, because it's been placed arbitrarily to serve other people, that they can't walk or their kids can't ride their bike up to the corner store anymore so you've defeated the whole purpose of commercial within that neighborhood area?

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: I think it's interesting, too, and what I picked up from the material is, that this really can be looked at as a building block, where four Traditional Neighborhood Developments actually make up a town development. So within the Traditional Neighborhood Developments, if you have commercial on the outside, that's fine for those individual neighborhoods. But then when you put them together as a block, a big square, suddenly all the commercial's inside.

MR. KALEITA: If I could --

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Yeah.

MR. KALEITA: -- I have had the privilege of representing some retailers who actually know exactly where they want their commercial space to be. And I've had them looking for sites where they work with me or they work with somebody else that they represent and they really do want to be where we're saying they want to be. And I think the ordinance should simply give the freedom for the land developer to create the commercial that is intended in part to serve what he builds in a place where he knows the people that are going to lease or buy that space want to be, and if that doesn't dis-serve the public health, safety and welfare. And if there's somebody who lives at the end of the street, way, way from the commercial -- I submit to you that that is my wife and I, as an example. We moved there precisely because we didn't want to be anywhere near the commercial. And I think that we want to have our developers have the option of building that kind of housing for people that want to live there. The guy's that want to walk to the commercial, let them buy a unit near the commercial.

And my view is, therefore, this is a 20-year-old issue in this County. It's not a 25-year-old issue. And I think the wisdom is, that you let them place it where it makes the most sense and you understand the marketplace dictates where that will be. And that we don't really have regulatory -- just so long as commercial is attractive, we build. We don't have a regulatory interest in it being 600 feet away. And I would submit that the ordinance

be amended while it's in CTF, to allow that degree of freedom.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: So, Bruce, would you say that along with commercial being put where it should be put according to the creative wellspring from a developer, would that include parking in front of commercial?

MR. KALEITA: Well, let me say this: The public premises that were sought to be achieved by what you could call internalizing commercial can be achieved by other means. And they are, for example, allowing entrances to that commercial from the residential, whose trips are captured directly without going out onto the arterials. That can be accomplished by good design. And I think what we simply need to do is to allow people to put that commercial where it makes sense. And if we want to say, look, the neighborhood's going to have some special access to that, make sure, if you can, that it doesn't require people to make a long trip to get to it, if we can come up with a design criteria that gives the Traditional Neighborhood Development some special access to that, I think that's fine. I think it can be done with a "single, tree-lined" boulevard that has some multifamily along it, for example. But to put it in the middle of every development as a matter of presumption, we're going to have blight in those commercial centers in no time at all. And I think if we got in our cars and we drove around Palm Beach County, we'd find developments that that has happened to.

And I guess I would make a motion that we not require in this Code that in any Traditional Development that a commercial pod be centralized.

MS. STARACE: Second.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: There's a motion and a second.

Discussion on the motion. Michael, do you have anything to say regarding that, in terms of discussion?

MR. DYETT: Well, I didn't know you were going to be making decisions. But I think the idea of allowing flexibility in relation to the overall site planning and establishing criteria is certainly an option. And we were trying to get at that when we had the flexibility that we put in here. I think when it's a completely greenfield location, which is some of the ideas that are trying to be tested now in the Sector Planning process, there would be a natural inclination that I think the commercial development would be supporting to try and find locations that make the most economic sense or the most central locations for the market that they're serving. So I think having some flexibility would make this ordinance more attractive, balanced with the idea, though, that you're trying to still get mixed-use and to create centers and places where you're grouping activities, you're grouping the schools, the parks and plazas, and having some focal point so it's not just approving subdivisions.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Any other Board member discussion on the motion -- Staff.

MS. CARLSON: I just want to echo what Michael said and just alert everyone to the fact that we did take this concept, along with the sign and draft Code that you'll be reviewing next week, to the Board in a workshop setting in February. And a lot of the questions or comments that you're raising today were discussed at the Board level. And I think what the Board's direction to Staff was, is to offer flexibility and allow the design community and the development community to have choices and be creative and not overly restrict the design by having too much regulation; however on the other side, having enough regulation that we get the form that we're trying to achieve. And I don't think in some cases we want to be wide open. There's going to be certain areas where we do prescribe what occurs.

On one other point, one of the things that we have tried to learn from is the Albacoa example. And Albacoa was going to have the commercial that was going to have the

residential access and the cross-access. And the Town of Jupiter and their council has struggled with a lot of angry residents showing up, it was on the master plan, it had red. Everybody knew there was going to be commercial and, boy, when they came out to do the site plan, they had some difficulties there. And the Board is aware of that and they're trying to balance that too and say, okay, are we going to put the commercial -- does it make sense to go here? Let's make sure everybody knows, we all agree it's going to go here, so that a year from now after a project is approved, they're not having that sort of debate downtown again.

MS. STARACE: Welcome to my world, Aimee.

MS. CARLSON: The other thing about Albacoa was that it's kind of hard for a developer to go in and do a development like that simultaneously, because you've got a "chicken and the egg" thing going on and you need somebody to support the commercial. And once you have the residents, then the residents suddenly have a political voice and they're going to squawk if they feel like squawking. And it's going to come down to political will and how the Commission votes on different projects.

MS. STARACE: And I hadn't finished. When I say, welcome to my world, there are two things that dictate what is going -- and unfortunately, Joanne, I know you don't want to hear this -- but there are two things that really dictates what happens: One of them is the person that moves in wherever it is and the other one is the market dictates if it can be sold. Those are the two things that are going to dictate. You don't have to mandate anything.

And I can tell you, I mean, you know Lyons Road, many of the roads that were projected to hold development. So that development came, then the roads are taken off the project. And, I mean, I would traffic exempt all these things and that still won't help, because it's going to be dictated by the people who move in. And they don't care what picture you gave them, they don't care what you sent to them. They want what they want and it's politics and it's market and that's what's going to drive it.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: We do have a motion and a second on the floor and we should probably just dispense with that if everyone's comfortable now. Discussion on the motion, anymore?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Those in favor, aye.

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Those against, same sign.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Motion passes.

General discussion? Questions?

MR. KALEITA: I have a question. I know that there has been in the past some suggestion that these development types might be an opportunity to foster more affordable housing. Is there anything -- if we still have Mike on the phone, maybe he can tell us whether there's anything in this multi-page handout on either incentives for or mandating affordable housing or if that has been left out?

MR. CARPENTER: Affordable housing, that's two hundred forty thousand?

MS. STARACE: Depending on where you live.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Michael, are you still there?

MR. DYETT: We've explored this idea and talked with County Staff and thought that it made more sense, because there's a separate affordable housing program, to not try to have this particular set of zoning regulations, which really deal with physical form and arrangement, take on the affordable housing issue as well. We saw affordable housing

programs as working with and complementing these efforts, but we didn't integrate them into this. In the same way, we didn't include specific, separate densities for affordable projects, because that will be addressed separately by other parts of the Code. Aimee may want to expand on that.

MS. CARLSON: The only other thing to add is -- and this was discussed a lot at the subcommittee level.

In an effort to help address affordability and make some units a little bit more affordable, the TND's are eligible for a density bonus. It remains to be seen how that falls out as we go through the process, but they get a density bonus. That's actually in the Plan and in the Code right now. And we do have, as Alex is reminding me, throughout the Code, as part of this process, opening up the secondary units, accessory units. Right now it's pretty tight who can use them, the elderly or someone who's below a certain income level or someone who is, I guess, physically challenged we're saying. As long as it's an accessory apartment that's accessory to an owner occupied unit, it's okay. So that's a big change, too. I know sometimes the industry and the builders are not talking about affordable apartments; they're talking about affordable home ownership. We're trying to do both, having the affordable apartments through the accessory apartments, also the live-work concept in the TMD allows some of that, too, and then using the density bonus to allow you to get more units on there, lowering the cost by that.

MS. STARACE: We were talking, saying that cities, according to that map anyway, are going to be the ones doing this. And I know in some of the cities -- in my city I don't have to worry. I'm almost built-out anyway -- but in some of the cities we do have, you know, an understanding or an interlocal agreement with developers that says they have to take at least 10 percent of what they develop into consideration for something like that, so I would want to make sure that that is part of the design.

MR. KALEITA: Allow me to express my opposition to that concept on behalf of the residential construction industry.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Any other comments?

MS. STARACE: I just want to say, I just came from New York and I have a cousin and she makes forty-eight thousand a year because she's on social security and she's on a pension. And in New York they put up a building right on the Hudson River -- it's gorgeous -- she pays \$750 for that apartment, two bedrooms. Well, 80 percent of those buildings, they pay twenty-five hundred a month. They put 20 percent of that building aside for middle class, or whatever you want to call it, lower middle class people. And I'll tell you something, doing it that way, the building is staying very well. The maintenance is done well. Everything is done well because you're not breeding just one type of building in an area, where if it's only affordable, it has no --

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Right. And those affordable units are indistinguishable from the other 80 percent.

MS. FINK: We have that on Lyons and Glades, the Carolina Apartments.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Joanne, you have something?

MS. DAVIS: Looking at the affordable -- and I'm going to put affordable in quotes, because there almost is no affordable housing here.

The whole idea of affordable is silly as far as how it's based in this County on median income. I mean, you have people who are making \$3 million a year in investment income and you have people who are making \$19,000 a year. And so it's so skewed that it makes no sense at all until we come up with, really, a realistic definition of what affordable is here.

I make decent money and I can't go and buy one of the houses that some of these guys are building. There's no way I can.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: I think it might be good, we have some people who are not on the Task Force, just to get some of their comments in.

Dave.

MR. CARPENTER: I'm all for affordable housing. I think it's a separate issue and I don't really think it should be part of this TND ordinance.

MS. DAVIS: It might not be part of the ordinance, but what I would like for this committee and the County Commission and everybody who's interested in housing in this area, this region, is that we need to start talking about it. We need to start finding a way to do it. And the builders are asking for some kind of easing up of perhaps the length of the permitting process, some of the details in the permitting process, some of the requirements by -- the way that TND's are set up right now, they're not going to be affordable; they will not. And I think that needs to be addressed. And I think perhaps some inclusionary zoning needs to be looked at elsewhere in the Code.

MS. CARLSON: There's two sort of things you're talking about here. One is the bigger picture of how to deal with the affordable housing. How do we define what's affordable? That's not for us to do. That's for a whole separate Board. There's actually members here that are sitting on that Board that the Commissioners have convened and I think we need to let them do that.

What this Board can do is look at some of the regulations and the requirements for the TND and what sort of flexibility and maybe incentives through the permitting process, that type of thing. Let's try to separate the bigger picture and what we can do with the details here.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Please, you have the floor.

MR. MARTELL: Thank you. Danny Martell with the Gold Coast Builders Association. Just a couple of comments. First of all, the concept is wonderful. This is something that the National Association of Home Builders of Florida Home Builders Association and the Gold Coast Builders Association is looking for. That there is a niche in the market for this, it's not the complete market. And as Michael said earlier, that this reflects the market reality of Palm Beach County, it does, but it does not. In the sense that the devil's in the details. And there are lots of devils here we're seeing.

Again, the affordability argument came up. I like to call it the attainability argument. There really isn't an attainability factor here. The design criterias are in some instances quite onerous for a developer; for instance, foot candles are required I believe in the TND's or TMD's. If we just go to the regular FPL standards, then we will probably find more affordability there. Less pavement. We don't have to pave every single thing within one of these districts. There are alternative materials to paving we could look at to reduce the cost of developing these things. And then it goes on and on and on. And I really do believe that we need more time to identify the problems that create the attainability problems, because these things will not be sold. They cannot be built. A developer from Gold Coast will not use this concept because of the price tag that comes along with it.

In addition, the inclusionary zoning argument, the percentage that Carmela brought up, that additionally will kill a project like this. That cannot be included as a mandatory element. An option, yes. Mandatory, absolutely not. Again, it will not be built.

Finally, I think I heard Michael earlier mention that there is a multifamily elimination entirely. Is that correct, Michael?

MR. DYETT: Well, some of the committee members -- there was some concern about requiring a minimum number of multifamily units in the rural and Exurban Tiers. And we suggested, in response to that concern, that the minimum percentage requirement could be eliminated in the rural and Exurban Tier, unless it was mandated specifically by

the Comp. Plan or a Sector Area Plan. So we heard a concern about the multifamily in the rural and Exurban Tier and suggested a way to respond to that, and it's my page 24. It's that same page we talked about earlier. And there's two footnotes that were included here to add additional flexibility on Table X.3-1.

MR. MARTELL: I appreciate that. You frightened me a little bit when you said "no more multifamily".

I guess to complete my comments, to make this work, we've heard it numerous times today, flexibility, flexibility, flexibility, for the developer --  
(Wayne Larry Fish left the room at 2:57 p.m.).

MR. MARTELL: -- and I think we'll get more results and see this in the County.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Thank you.

Anyone else from the non-board part of the assemblage here, you in the audience?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Carmela.

MS. STARACE: Wesley, I'm just curious. What corners -- I'm still struggling on what corners or what streets, you know, are you going to put these things? Where are they going?

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: We have to bring it down to reality here, I think.

MS. CARLSON: Let's look at the map.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: I think it's interesting, too, I remember Andres Duany, when he first came out with the new urbanism, held up a piece of paper and said all the regulations for this new development form can be put on this one piece of paper, and it was what he kept saying throughout his whole presentation about this.

MS. STARACE: I was just curious what they were on the map.

MS. CARLSON: And actually, that concept about how much regulation do you need for this came up at the peer review. Andres' wife sat on our peer review panel and they're now up to two pages. But they had a two-page document and said, you have the 50-page document, do you really need all of it? And that's what we're coming back to. That's where we're hoping you can focus and help us. What do we need to do? Let's do the minimum necessary to make sure we get the form and not be overly restrictive and make it encouraging so that people are actually going to do it.

Let me point out for Carmela here, Ag. Reserve down here, Lyons Road, if you were to extend it, it goes between the Turnpike and State Road 7. TMD, the Traditional Marketplace, the mixed-use commercial, can go here, Boynton and Lyons, or Atlantic and Lyons.

The Master Plan in the Comp. Plan says, if you want to do commercial in the Ag. Reserve, you must do it in this form of development. There is no other option in the Ag. Reserve.

MS. STARACE: So that's mandatory.

MS. CARLSON: A quarter-mile radius between those two.

Essentially everywhere else in the County, Urban/Suburban Tier, Exurban Tier, which is basically the acreage and Palm Beach Country Estates, the Rural Tier, Jupiter Farms, Dear Run, Loxahatchee Groves, all of those places, optional; it's not mandatory. The Plan is encouraging it in the Urban/Suburban Tier, it's encouraging this type of development, the sustainability, the new urbanism, the principles of liveable community. There's a whole page at the beginning of the Plan that talks about this stuff. It's encouraged. But so far at this point, the only place it's mandatory is the Ag. Reserve. The Sector Plan may change that, but we don't know that yet. And we shouldn't be worrying about what-if's right now.

MR. KALEITA: I've got a suggestion in terms of shrinking the regulations back down to one page.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Give us two pages.

MR. KALEITA: The hand-numbered page 42 goes into microdesigning the house that goes on -- or in a Traditional Development District and it actually regulates the garage so narrowly that it literally ends up being virtually the same garage which filled my wife with distaste in Celebration. And I don't know what cognizable public or interest there is, for example, in forcing garages to be located in the rear half of the lot, unless you are filled with nostalgia for the 1920's when in fact that's where they were placed. And I don't know why they have to be five feet off the rear property line, I don't know why they have to be recessed 20 feet from the front of the house and all of this stuff, unless there is some nostalgia about this which is so irresistible that the regulators must have this.

But I would suggest that this kind of regulation is the kind of overregulation and micro-regulation that the public will resent and the builders will not build. Here's why: My wife paced off the distance from the Celebration garage to the kitchen and she decided there was no way she was willing, "A," to walk that far, and with groceries, "B," with small children in tow, and "C," pulling anything on a cart or anything like that.

(Frank Palen leaves room at 3:00 p.m.)

MR. KALEITA: And I suspect that the architects know a whole lot better how to design the connection between the garage and the house than the County Commission does and that this kind of micro-regulation needs to come out, quite literally.

MS. DAVIS: May I make a request?

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: First of all, I'd like to note that we have lost a quorum so now this is really just for our information. Frank Palen and Wayne Fish left.

Joanne.

MS. DAVIS: I request that we be provided with the two-page, so that we can look at that and see -- just get a feel for where they're coming from on this. Because it could be that we might be able to simplify this thing down a little bit.

I also was curious as to -- Bruce keeps bringing up Celebration. Well, frankly, Celebration is Disney World, so it's a whole different ball game.

And, you know, some of the whole discussion about new urban development, I think the principle of it is to sort of model it after some of the older, successful developments. And I'd like to just kind of remind ourselves of those that are in existence right here in Palm Beach County and look at how successful some of them are and maybe take some cues from perhaps City of Delray Beach, what's their block size? What are the block sizes in Palm Beach? Palm Beach is a great little town.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Lake Worth isn't bad either.

MS. DAVIS: What are the block sizes? What makes those -- what are some of our local areas that have this urbanist, not new urbanist, old urbanist, sort of character to them? What are the building heights? What are the lot sizes? What are the block sizes? You know, those sorts of things.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: We do have an established urban form here.

MS. DAVIS: Yes, we do, we sure do. And the real estate values are right up there and they're also affordable places in those areas.

MS. STARACE: Aimee, at the risk of being oversimplified, okay, but I see, again, all this happening, like you said, in Lake Worth, in Riviera Beach, all the eastern part. I know there are people in this room today who have places in the acreage who would be very happy if you let them develop some of these things right now, but they're never going to be allowed to develop them.

MS. DAVIS: I don't know if that's true, Carmela.

MS. STARACE: They're not going to be able to develop a traditional -- maybe a commercial, yes. But they're not going to be able to develop a Traditional Neighborhood Development. The density is not going to be allowed. I mean, come on. They've just tried to do a commercial industrial thing and they were turned down. Some of this stuff, I wish it would happen, but it ain't going to happen. It ain't going to happen.

MR. KALEITA: Can I make a motion -- can I make a suggestion, that we ask Staff to take a look at -- and maybe I'm impressed by my own example -- but the typed page 28, hand-lettered page 42, whether there are elements of this ordinance draft which are too restrictive and which really aren't necessary and which could be deleted. And I'm not sure we need to be telling people where their garage has to be. And we may actually discourage people from using this design alternative, because the public doesn't want to have to walk that far with the groceries and that sort of thing. Can we look through this for items like the one in Paragraph F on hand-lettered page 42 and identify those which we may see as being over-regulation which could be deleted in order to simplify this?

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Michael, do you have a comment on that, as it relates to that specific requirement?

MR. DYETT: There are ways to simplify how the garage is handled, a couple of the subcommittee comments, and we've seen this I think in Albacoa in Jupiter, where you just want an offset of five feet.

One thing that's important is, we've reduced the front setback to 15 feet. So if you get the garage door setback 20 feet, then the garage will overhang -- the car parked in front of the door won't overhang the sidewalk. I don't think that's inconsistent with what Bruce was talking about, but it would get the garage door to be less dominant as a strong visual or physical element, so that is one rule.

The setback at the rear property line relates to the idea of turning movements from alleys, that you can bring the car in on the alley right-of-way and you have the proper movement. I don't think if you were silent on that issue, most developers and site planners would still wind up, as they talk with public work, with some setbacks, because they do need the curb radius.

So I do think there may be a couple of things that could offer additional flexibility, but while still maintaining the overall objective of trying to have neighborhoods that create more of a liveable feeling to them. And that still would allow the attached garage and the easy access to the kitchen.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Michael, what do you think about the broader issue of simplification and --

MR. DYETT: I think it is a little misleading to go back to Mr. Duany's story. His current Smart Code on the web, I think, is more like 30 or 40 pages. The TMD section we have is about eight, but it does have pictures and tables, which makes it a little easier to read.

The second thing is that most of the earlier discussions about simplification have completely ignored all the questions of how you deal with land uses, because they just looked at how a subdivision is laid out and never dealt with the question of drive-through uses or how retail or office or these other uses are dealt with. And the County has got a tradition of dealing with uses, I think, quite effectively and efficiently and we can't just throw that out altogether. Having clear direction and clear standards on Use Regulations is an important part of Zoning.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Okay. Dave, you had a question.

MR. CARPENTER: Yes. I just wanted to, while we're on this, the right-of-way

section, which is on page 12 or our hand-numbered page 26, the Exurban Rural Section, if you will, just looking at this and, I mean, when you look at something like this, it makes a pretty picture and so forth, but say for my past experience of working with the equestrian community, we found out that they would never ride their horses close to a roadway like this or close to people. I find it interesting that there's a utility easement, which is now part of right-of-way. And I just feel like these, just the beginning of general comments, these sections are just huge and I don't really see -- I mean, we're creating things that are never going to be used I feel like. And this isn't 104 foot right-of-way. I think that's a normal section.

MR. DYETT: The Board looked at the sections I think -- Aimee, correct me if I'm wrong -- about a year ago, a year and a half ago, and the County Staff is continuing to work with them. And we got some very good comments, observations from the peer review session we just had with some national experts. So I think that your comments will help, thinking these sections aren't yet cast in concrete.

Is that correct, Aimee?

MS. CARLSON: Yeah, that's correct. And actually, today the Board has received the latest version of the cross-section. We have taken the six or seven that we've had before and we've tried to condense them down. And what goes along with it is a chart. It's stamped draft; it's a work in progress. And we've tried to take a different approach. Rather than saying here's a cross-section and you need to use this cross-section and this is the only cross-section you can use for this type of development, we've tried to say, what are the elements that make a good street for this development? What do we want to see? And offer the developer and the public more choice. So there's certain elements that would become required, other elements become option. Maybe for the TMD's, as people are vying to get that designation through the context by providing more elements, they get higher points, that type of thing. And we've been working with the rest of the County Staff, various agencies, trying to be responsive to the subcommittee comments and trying to simplify this and reduce down the width.

MR. CARPENTER: So we're saying this thing that I just pointed out is not any longer a consideration?

MS. CARLSON: Well, the equestrian path is still under consideration. It's still something that we see as an element that's important to the Rural and Exurban Tier.

MR. CARPENTER: Do you remember when we had the equestrian people in here?

MS. CARLSON: You're absolutely right, the issue about where it goes and how far it needs to be separated from the cars and the pedestrians is something that we've been gabbling with. And what we tried to do is put it as close as we think the path can go so that the horses would be comfortable on there. Because if we do the opposite and provide more separation, then we'd be putting the path down on the private property.

And, yes, we remember the State Road 80 discussion three years ago at the CTF about not putting that sort of stuff on private property. And I can still probably quote what Bruce said about it. We've tried to be balancing that.

MR. CARPENTER: Why are we putting the equestrian in the section when they say they're not going to ride -- just to have it in a picture or what?

MS. CARLSON: They're not saying that. The community is actually asking for this. And if you go out in the acreage, there is an active campaign to designate these pathways. You can now ride your horse from the acreage to basically out near Pahokee through horse trails going through publicly owned land and on trails along areas. It relates to the Tier System. It relates to the character which is driving a lot of this discussion --

MR. CARPENTER: I don't know where these trails are located that the Lone Ranger

rides on, or whoever it is, but we had the equestrian people in here and they said they would not ride their horses near a roadway or people. And so you've got them in here anyway.

MS. CARLSON: There are some segments of the equestrian community that say that. There are other segments that say that they will. I think the key is, how much separation do you need? And there's not a magic number. We did some research to try to see is there a number and there really isn't.

We have taken these cross-sections and showed them to the rural subcommittee. There are members of that subcommittee that I think are representative of the equestrian interests and they've been okay with the location as is. But obviously work in progress can be refined through this CTF meeting.

MR. CARPENTER: While I'm talking about the sections, why is the utility easement part of a right-of-way section?

MS. CARLSON: Again, you're seeing an older draft that is no longer shown as part of the right-of-way. You no longer see a utility easement as part of the right-of-way. It's designated now as a utility corridor. It was just a mistake.

MR. KALEITA: I would like to comment that these light standards, which are intended to be less -- will end up becoming mandatory if we don't get the note that was voted upon by this committee handed to everyone whose catch is that the light standards are not intended to be mandatory.

MR. CARPENTER: You mean it doesn't have to be 900 foot candles all along the horse path?

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Aimee, you had something else to add?

MS. CARLSON: Yes, thank you.

I wanted to respond to what Joanne had brought up about some of the questions about what is the appropriate block length and research. Michael has provided us with some of that information today with Appendix A. In looking at some of that, Staff has also provided the two subcommittees that worked on this draft with a big, thick book that's about an inch and a half thick that describes all sorts of new urbanism communities and what's working, what's not working. We did a brief survey. If you want us to provide the volumes of information, I'll be happy to. I was just trying to cut down on what we send out to you. So let us know about that.

And then also, related to the Duany Small Code, what is important to note with that, even they do advocate fewer pages for their Code. Their projects, Sea Side, Windsor, you name it, have pattern books that have every bit as much detail as we're showing in here, and far greater detail. Albacoa has a pattern book. Palm Beach County, when we started this project, we debated about pattern books and at the Staff level the decision was made not to go that route, because it would be a lot of work for us to develop a pattern book and we would be overly describing it and regulating all sorts of information. We also thought about, from the other end, if you do a TND, you have to bring in a pattern book for Staff to review. We thought that wouldn't go over, too, because you're asking for essentially what ends up being a one-inch thick document with everything from the color of the roof tile to the type of window you can put in and how tall your doors can be and what sort of visibility your doors need to have for houses. We didn't think we wanted to do that, so we decided not to.

But I think Duany is able to achieve some of the form and some of the predictability that his communities are known for by using this pattern book and we're trying to strike a balance in not going that far.

MS. DAVIS: And in regard to the volumes and volumes of information, I don't want you guys to go that far. But the only thing is, I don't think there's going to be another West

Palm Beach created anywhere in Palm Beach County; I just don't think it's going to happen. So why don't we pick a couple of communities, Lake Worth and Delray Beach, and that's -- and I don't know if there's a smaller one. Those are sort of medium size. If there's a smaller one that fits the urban form, then one more and that's it.

MS. STARACE: Riviera Beach.

MS. DAVIS: Riviera is, but Riviera it's like -- it's very different. It doesn't really even have an urban form.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Mark.

MR. WILLIAMS: I'm looking at some of the technical aspects of these road sections. As an alternate on CTF, I haven't been at the other subcommittee meetings, so some of these things may have already been discussed.

Your typical street sections --

MR. CARPENTER: What page are you on?

MR. WILLIAMS: Like 25, 26. I presume there was a subcommittee with regard to the street sections and landscaping?

MS. CARLSON: Yes.

MR. WILLIAMS: Was there anybody from Engineering Services and County Utilities helping out with those subcommittees?

MS. CARLSON: Yes.

MR. WILLIAMS: So they provided their input with regards to fitting everything in these sections.

I'm just finishing up a project in the Gardens that had alleys, side street parking, very similar to this. And one of the items that I see on page 30 and 42 that you might want to revisit with the regular members in the subcommittees is the alleys. Residential, I think we have a 12-foot right-of-way with 10-foot radiuses. I don't know that the Fire Marshal or Fire Department would be conducive to that access way, whether they have looked at these and provided any input. But the trucks and the trash trucks can't do a 10-foot radius in a 12-foot street. There's also some mention in this other handout about utilities in the alley with a 12-foot width. You might get one utility back there. If it's FPL and they have transformers, they won't go in there, because you don't put transformers in the pavement. It would have to be like sewer or water. So that width limits utilities. The section we just finished is a 20-foot section with 16 foot of pavement and we were able to put some of the water and utilities on the side and sewer up the middle. So if you have alleys, you can utilize those for some utilities, as well as out front with the side street parking.

Page 42 I think it is, we have a setback in the alley to the garage -- I think this has already been mentioned -- five foot with a 12-foot alley and a five-foot setback to your garage. Your car cannot make that turn. So that five-foot minimum either eliminated or pushed back far enough so you can actually turn your vehicle in the garage without clipping the corner.

But I think probably one of the most important things is the Fire Marshal, about that width and the turning radiuses, because we did struggle with that in Gardens, which is a different fire district. But hopefully Ron and the subcommittees will address some of these things, or already have.

MS. CARLSON: We have worked -- when I say, we, at the Staff level, Planning, Zoning, Land Development, Traffic, Roadway Production, Utilities, Fire Rescue, at times Legal, we've all been working on these cross-sections. And the ones that are in the packet, those are older versions. We have not provided Michael with the newer versions. The newer versions are simplified.

And I think the way to describe it, because the Board, as Michael mentioned earlier,

the Board did say, we like this type of street, we want this type of street for this type of development. Staff, you go forth and you make it, so you figure out how to work on it. And we've all had to compromise. I don't know that anybody is going to say that there's not things that they wished that the cross-section provided for; perhaps for a little more space for utilities. But we've all agreed we can live with these cross-sections and they would be approved when you go through the development.

I also want to mention we've worked with the private utilities, Bell South, Adelphia and FP&L. There's been a lot of work going in to getting us to the point where we could say, these cross-sections, if someone applied, they would be approved, you wouldn't get held up by all sorts of comments going, where are your street trees going to go or your lines can't go there, that kind of thing.

MR. WILLIAMS: Is trash collection with residential and commercial going to be in the front or the back?

MS. CARLSON: The trash collection is suppose to be in the rear for the commercial. And we really didn't address it for the residential, so that is something that we need to look at.

MR. WILLIAMS: Solid Waste is not going to go in those alleys 'cause they can't make the turns.

What you also find is, if people use their garages for cars, then you'll be all right. But if they don't, then you've got people parked on the side. And that's more of an enforcement issue than anything else.

But Fire Rescue's okay with the alleys being that narrow or they're okay fighting fires from the front?

MS. CARLSON: Fire Rescue is going to fight from the front, yes. And they were very clear about where the hydrants needed to be and what we needed to address and that we needed to address some space beyond street parking for the trucks to get by.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Good.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Okay, any other discussion, questions? Just facilitating things here. We're not actually meeting at this point.

MR. KALEITA: Did we have a consensus that we would like Staff to identify microdesigning elements that could be perhaps either made more simple or simply eliminated in order to downsize this a little bit? Could we have a consensus? I know we can't vote, but can we have a consensus?

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: I think we communicated the need to simplify. And I don't think it needs to be as draconian as the two-page Duany plan, but just make some kind of effort to simplify.

MR. KALEITA: So there is a consensus.

(At 3:25 p.m. Mark Williams leaving.)

MS. CARLSON: And we are continuing to summarize the subcommittee comments and I think the subcommittee is addressing that. It might be a little bit unfair to ask Staff to identify areas that we should eliminate from the draft, but the subcommittee has provided good comments on that.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Michael, do you have anything else to add? We're getting some people leaving right now and we're paying for your time.

MR. DYETT: Just to give you a preview of next week and in response to Danny's comments from Gold Coast Builders about some of the pavement and landscape provisions. The ideas that have been emerging with the work on both landscape provisions and the sign provisions is to have the ability to have these alternative landscape plans that would offer, I think, the flexibility that he was talking about. So when you do have

a chance to look at those other drafts, that flexibility will also be helpful in the Traditional Development District.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Anything else regarding anything else we've talked about?

MR. DYETT: I appreciate all the comments and I look forward to meeting all of you in person.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: That'll be next week, right.

MR. DYETT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Great. Anything else of Michael before he goes?

(No response.)

(Time is 3:25 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Staff, do you want to wrap up kind of telling what's coming up in terms of next week.

MS. CARLSON: Next week we will be discussing landscaping and signage. Those packets are going to go out today. We also have, and we've provided handouts last week for you, we do have public meetings that you're welcome to attend. We have the signage meeting next Wednesday at 7 p.m., we have a landscaping meeting Thursday morning, we also have an Ag. Reserve property owners meeting to address TND's Wednesday at 2 p.m. We will be trying to give you some sort of verbal update on the comments that we receive from those public meetings at the CTF meeting. I don't anticipate having anything in writing, giving that it's the night before.

And then we are going to continue to work on the testing, take the comments that you've provided today, look at the subcommittee comments on this draft, and we will be bringing this draft back for final action in April, probably mid to late April at this point.

MR. CARPENTER: Where is the design standard related to the alley?

MR. KALEITA: It's in the text, I think.

MS. CARLSON: No, there's actually a drawing.

MR. KALEITA: There's a drawing, I think, that's in the text.

Can I make a comment here. I missed last week's meeting, but two out of the last three meetings we have had to wait to get a quorum -- and I am in part responsible for that today -- and yet we're ending early in two of the last three meetings. And I don't know what happened at the last meeting, whether we ended early or not. Did we?

MS. CARLSON: About this time.

MR. KALEITA: May I inquire then as to whether we do in fact have a rationale for starting at an hour when we know we may have difficulty in getting a quorum, if in fact we are then recessing before five o'clock anyway?

MS. CARLSON: If you recall, David Carpenter made a motion -- and we have been following this -- that if we anticipate that it will not take four hours for discussion, we will convene at two o'clock to try to give that flexibility. We know we're asking you to do a lot to be here every week, we know we're asking you to do a lot to be here at one o'clock, and we appreciate the efforts. However, I really think as we move forward, it will be beneficial for keeping us on schedule to stay at one o'clock.

MR. KALEITA: I understand your position, but let me ask you this: When did the meeting start last Thursday?

MS. CARLSON: Last Thursday was one o'clock.

MR. KALEITA: It started at one o'clock? You had a quorum at one?

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: Actually, it was two o'clock.

MS. CARLSON: We did push it back.

MR. KALEITA: Unless there is a desperate crying need to start at one, is there any

reason why we can't start at one-thirty, unless there is a desperate crying need to start at one?

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: We actually had a quorum today at one-thirty. We didn't have one before. So that might be the natural time.

MR. KALEITA: Why can't we just try that? It looks to me that's how the world is behaving anyway. We're not going to alter its behavior by insisting on something that's not happening. And if I could, I'd like to suggest that we start at one-thirty next time and see if it works.

MR. CARPENTER: I made a motion last meeting, last week, that -- it was my motion that we meet this week at two o'clock. And I apologize for showing up at two, because the meeting -- the two o'clock time was approved and then we left after that, and so I had assumed the meeting this week was going to be at two o'clock.

But I don't think one o'clock is a good time and I can't remember anytime it running past five o'clock when we started at two o'clock. It's been few and far between that. I can think of just a handful of times. I don't think one o'clock works.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: I remember the motion before last week's motion --

MR. CARPENTER: One o'clock doesn't work.

MR. KALEITA: Can we start at one-thirty? Let's try that. Well, actually, you all like starting at one-thirty anyway so why don't you just officially start.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: We just have to make sure we get the word out accurately and in time to everyone.

MR. KALEITA: Is that a yes?

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: We can't take action so we're just directing Staff.

MR. KALEITA: That's not something we have to vote on. That's a scheduling thing.

MS. CARLSON: Staff understands.

CHAIRMAN BLACKMAN: We've been adjourned now.

(Meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE

STATE OF FLORIDA                    )

COUNTY OF PALM BEACH            )

I, SHIRLEY D. KING, 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 CITIZENS TASK FORCE.

I FURTHER CERTIFY 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 April, 2003.

\_\_\_\_\_  
SHIRLEY D. KING,  
Professional Reporter  
Notary Public, State of Florida