



**ENVIRONMENTALLY ENDANGERED LANDS (EEL) PROGRAM  
PROCEDURES COMMITTEE (PC) MEETING  
June 8, 2010  
Attendance List**

***PROCEDURES COMMITTEE MEMBERS***

Priscilla Griffith  
Pat Pasley  
Rocky Randels  
Diane Stees  
Amy Tidd  
Kim Zarillo

***EEL PROGRAM STAFF***

Laura Clark  
Mike Knight

***GUESTS***

Linda Mannier, District 3 Commission Office  
Anne Mayer, The Nature Conservancy  
Jim Rosasco, Citizen  
Paul Schmalzer, Selection and Management Committee  
Suzanne Valencia, Sierra Club

*Protecting and Preserving Biological Diversity  
Through Responsible Stewardship of Brevard County's Natural Resources*

*June 8, 2010  
Approved August 10, 2010*



## ENVIRONMENTALLY ENDANGERED LANDS (EEL) PROGRAM PROCEDURES COMMITTEE (PC)

June 8, 2010  
Meeting Minutes

### CALL TO ORDER:

Rocky Randels, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 2:04 PM.

### PUBLIC COMMENT:

None.

### MINUTES:

#### March 16, 2010 PC Minutes

Comments which were received during the April 27, 2010 joint meeting between the Procedures Committee (PC) and Selection and Management Committee (SMC) were incorporated into the original draft minutes in tracked changes format and were redistributed via e-mail on May 18, 2010. The updated March 16, 2010 PC minutes were presented for approval.

Rocky asked if there were any additional comments to the March 16, 2010 PC minutes.

Pat Pasley provided clarification that Linda Mannier's name had been misspelled on the attendance page. The attendance record will be corrected.

#### **MOTION ONE**

**Amy Tidd moved to approve the March 20, 2010 PC minutes as amended.**

**Diane Stees seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried unanimously.**

#### April 27, 2010 SMC/PC Minutes

These minutes were approved as amended by the SMC on June 3, 2010. The amended minutes are being presented to the PC with SMC amendments highlighted in yellow as draft #2 for review and approval by the PC.

The group reviewed the SMC revisions and Rocky asked if there were any additional comments to the April 27, 2010 SMC/PC minutes.

Diane Stees provided the following comments:

- Page 4, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph - "The group determined that the group who would review the applications..." Change to: "The group determined that the committee who would review the applications..."
- Page 15, end of meeting time – Change to: 5:04 PM.
- Bulleted criteria listed as number four (4) and then six (6), was actually number five (5) in the LAM. Change to: "Original Criteria number five (5)".
- Page 11, 2<sup>nd</sup> italicized paragraph – "In section of draft LAM Sale Document". Change "document" to "language".

- Page 14, 2<sup>nd</sup> Additional Discussion, 2<sup>nd</sup> line – “Kim stated...of what the Board wanted and that felt there were many opportunities...” Change to “Kim stated...of what the Board wanted and that she felt there were many opportunities...”
- Page 14, last Additional Discussion, 2<sup>nd</sup> line – “Mike commented that his inquiry...” Refers to inquiry of Commissioner Infantini. Change to “Mike commented that her inquiry...”

#### Additional Discussion

The group discussed page 11, paragraph 7, which begins “Paul suggested consideration of review...” Clarification was provided that there had previously been a request to remove the following language: “In some cases, internal exchanges of real property assets among Brevard County government departments might only require County Manager Approval”.

Mike Knight explained that language relating to exchanges of land being authorized by the County Manager instead of the Board had been removed at the request of the committee, but he had added it back in a different part of the document.

Kim Zarillo stated she would be more comfortable receiving documents that hadn’t been changed around from their original form, unless the changes came from the committees.

Paul Schmalzer clarified that his intent had been to have the language removed from the document, not moved to another location.

Diane stated that the PC had expressed their support for having the language removed.

Mike stated that he would clarify why he had move the language around when the PC discussed the land sale language a little later in the meeting.

Paul stated that if there was another issue with having the words removed, it could be discussed.

Kim requested confirmation that the copy of the February 8, 2007 memo from Rocky to the Commissioners, which staff had attached to the April 27, 2010 SMC/PC minutes would be removed from the minutes as it was not part of the April 27, 2010 meeting discussion.

Mike confirmed that was correct.

Confirmation was also provided that there had been consideration of the need for a supermajority vote from the BOCC for land sale, but it had been determined that this would not be included.

#### **MOTION TWO**

**Kim Zarillo moved to approve the April 27, 2010 SMC/PC minutes draft #2 as amended.**

**Diane Stees seconded the motion.**

#### Additional Discussion

Rocky asked if there were any questions or comments.

No additional questions or comments were received.

**The motion carried unanimously.**

### Additional Discussion

Rocky asked if the group was ready to move to the items on the meeting's agenda.

Pat stated that she had been listening intently since she was appointed to the PC in January by Commissioner Infantini and she had been trying to understand the Program's procedures so she could respond to Commissioner Infantini's request for information based on the Commissioner's statement that the EEL Program was not following the established processes. She stated that although the EEL Program's Land Acquisition Manual (LAM) was a beautiful book, she found the layout of the headings and other information confusing. She stated that Commissioner Infantini had indicated that there was a flow chart, and that while she was looking for the flow chart, she came upon an Internal Audit from 2007. Pat read from the audit and mentioned that one of the paragraphs stated that the LAM was difficult to follow, so with that in mind, she sat down and started typing up LAM Chapters 3, 4, and 5 and gluing them to large sheets of paper in an effort to make the information easier to understand. She passed around copies of some of her work for the group to review and stated that she felt steps were missing from the processes.

Paul stated that there wasn't any information missing from the example she provided, and that he felt the LAM was a very thorough document. He clarified that information was listed in different parts of the book as a result of the establishment of State project areas or other circumstances. He stated that he wished to take issue with the statement that the SMC does not follow the procedures.

Pat stated that she did not want to argue that.

Rocky asked if Pat had included the revisions in her work. She said no, she had just done the work as an example.

Clarification was provided that the best way to obtain all current guidelines for the EEL Program's Land Acquisition Manual was by downloading the book from the Program's Web Site, and that when copies of the LAM are distributed revisions are stapled into the front cover.

Kim stated that from what she was hearing, she believed that Pat's concerns related to formatting.

Pat agreed. She suggested consideration of structuring the LAM with on separate pages which could be kept in a binder.

Mike confirmed that staff is already working towards that goal.

Pat emphasized that she thought the LAM was a beautiful book but that to her, it was so confusing you had to read the whole thing to know what you were doing. She said she became concerned after she read about the internal audit, because she feels the book is not put in a flow that people can understand, and she felt that's where you start running into County Commissioners saying the Program is not following process.

Priscilla Griffith stated that when the Procedures Committee created the LAM, they based it on the existing Land Acquisition Manual for Volusia County because Volusia already had an established conservation program. She added that there had never been any intent that it should not be reviewed or revised, but that the EEL Program staff has always been very busy because the Program has been so successful.

Mike stated that it did take a little while to understand the LAM, as the Program is required to follow County and State guidelines, but that staff was available to meet with Pat to discuss any

specific issues that she might not understand. He added that he is concerned when comments are made that processes aren't being followed, because staff have shown auditors that the guidelines are being followed on several occasions.

Pat stated that she disagreed with Mike. She said that if you have a manual that people can't follow, they can't follow the procedures, and what good is the manual if you have to sit down with someone to understand it?

Paul stated that he disagreed that the manual could not be followed and that it had worked fine for decades.

Mike stated that he disagreed that the manual could not be followed.

Paul stated that the SMC followed the original LAM beginning in 1990 and they followed the current version since 1997. He stated his opinion that the idea that the LAM is so complicated that it can't be followed is not true.

Pat stated her opinion that if everyone was replaced tomorrow, we'd have a manual that no one could follow, and although someone could sit down with staff, what good would the manual be?

Kim stated that she felt that Pat was offering constructive criticism and that she believed that confusion leads to misunderstanding. Kim said that we do want to have a manual that everyone can understand, and that she was considering Pat's comments as new business because she had not seen this topic as an item on the agenda. Kim commented that if everyone agreed, separate pages for each section of a notebook could be a good start and perhaps it would be beneficial to get an outside person, from FIT or other college to go over the LAM and review the formatting but the group needed to move on to do the business that had been requested by the Board.

Mike added that it was important to remember that the Committee had received requests from the Board related to SMC membership criteria and language for Land Sale.

Mike stated that he would contact Florida Tech to see if there might be a technical writing student who would be willing to assist with a possible reformatting of the LAM's layout. This topic will be added as an agenda item for the next meeting of the committees.

## **AGENDA ITEMS:**

### **SMC Membership and Appointment Process**

#### SMC Membership Appointment Process

Mike displayed the newest information in tracked changes on a projection screen and asked the group to confirm that it reflected the comments from April 27<sup>th</sup>. He stated he was also asked to put together a flow chart to represent the process, and the flow chart was included in the handouts for the meeting. He explained that he knew the Committee had requested that references to the appropriate LAM page and paragraph numbers be included in the flow charts, but that the current flow charts were very rough drafts and the references to the LAM would be included in later drafts.

Mike also explained that Kim had an issue that she wanted to discuss with the Committee, and he stated that Kim's information would be provided a little later in the meeting.

Mike asked for comments to the draft revision language on the projection screen.

Diane stated she felt it would be beneficial to review the information from the April 27<sup>th</sup> discussion to be sure they were fine with those changes and then move on to Kim's item.

The group concurred.

Mike stated that if language on the screen was struck through, it represents current LAM language which is being removed, and anything underlined represents new information, as he had stepped back to the manual as the baseline and the tracked changes represented all thought processes up to this point.

He explained that staff would be making changes to the draft language on the screen as they were suggested by the Committee, and the final information would be included as part of the meeting's minutes. Clarification was provided that the information being shown included comments received from the SMC on June 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Rocky suggested that the information be reviewed line by line and the group could move on when consensus was received for each line.

#### **LAM Page 2.17 6A**

Mike stated that the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph had to do with the Qualifying Committee concept. He informed the group that he had received confirmation from the Director of Human Resources that they were agreeable to participating in the Qualifying Committee.

New suggestions for possible additional revisions included:

- Pat asked if the letters Q and C related to the Qualifying Committee needed to be capitalized.
  - Clarification was provided that this was the formal name of the committee, so the answer is yes.
- Diane mentioned there were two periods between the first and second sentences.
  - Clarification was provided this will resolve when the tracked changes are processed.
- Diane suggested the following revisions to the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph: "Any member of the Procedures Committee ~~that who~~ is also a member of the Selection and Management Committee...~~will~~ shall refrain from voting..."
  - The group concurred.
- Diane suggested that consideration be given to clarifying that any member of the Procedures Committee who was also a member of the Selection and Management Committee should refrain from serving as the Procedures Committee representative or designee on the Qualifying Committee. A suggestion for the following revision was presented to add the following to the sentence referenced above: "...shall refrain from voting- or participating as a member of the qualifying committee."
  - The group concurred.

#### **LAM Page 2.17 6B**

- Clarification was provided that in section 2.17 6B, a typo which was shown in the existing LAM had previously been corrected as "...will choose members or ~~alternatives~~ alternates by drawing names..."
- No additional changes required.

#### **LAM Page 2.17-18 6C**

- No additional changes required.

## LAM Page 2.18 6D

- Clarification was provided that the SMC had noticed that the word “annually” had been suggested on April 27<sup>th</sup> to clarify revisions previously suggested to clarify the timeframe for the election of committee officers, and although it was not on the draft language presented to the SMC at their June 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting, they noticed the omission and it has been corrected.
- No additional changes required.

## Additional Discussion

### LAM Page 5-45 Step 14 A: Contract Development and EEL Staff Review

- Diane mentioned the need for the following change: “Per County Administrative Order AO-37.....”
- Clarification was provided that the language being presented included suggestions received from the SMC at their June 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting.
  - No additional changes were required.

## SMC Membership Criteria con't

### Flow Chart

Mike explained that the draft being presented on the projection screen and included in the meeting packet hand outs was a preliminary draft and he asked for comments from the group.

The following comments were received:

- Pat mentioned the need for references to the appropriate places in the LAM to be included in the flow chart.
- Public Comment – Suzanne Valencia asked if the candidates for openings on the SMC had been ranked in the past.
  - Mike confirmed that several different methods for ranking candidates had been used in the past, but there was no clear cut language in the LAM which clarified if this should be done. He stated that during the last round he had given anyone who met all the qualifications a ranking of 5 points and an additional point was given to anyone meeting the highly desirable background related to knowledge of State land acquisition programs.
- Public Comment – Suzanne Valencia requested clarification regarding how the applications being forwarded to the PC were being handled, as it appeared that her understanding of the current plan was not represented on the flow chart.
  - Paul suggested that the language in the flow chart should parallel what is written in the procedures.
  - The group concurred.
- Diane asked if it was anticipated that the charts would be included as part of the LAM and she mentioned the need for documents to be dated.
  - Kim restated her understanding that group was not discussing a rewrite of the LAM, just a formatting
  - Diane stated that perhaps the flow charts could be included for clarity.
  - Mike stated that it is anticipated that the charts may be included in the LAM if it is determined that a reformatting should occur.

### Additional Discussion

Kim asked if it might be possible for her to present her information to the committee regarding the selection of applicants for their consideration.

Rocky asked for clarification from the committee regarding their preference.

Diane stated she felt it would be appropriate to go back to the section on SMC Membership Criteria they just finished, while she reminded the group that the land sale language was also on the agenda.

Mike explained that he understood that the group might not be able to stay late, and he confirmed that the land sale language could be discussed at a future meeting, if necessary.

Kim explained that her concern with the current draft language was that there is no recognition or segregation of experience, so a person only needed to have the minimum qualifications. She stated it was her belief that experience, whether life experience, academic experience, or applied experience was valued and that she felt it would be helpful to have a ranking to clarify those who were more qualified than others, and then the more qualified group could move forward, or the priority of the ranking could move forward with the applications.

Kim explained that she had discussed the general idea with the SMC on June 3<sup>rd</sup> and that the SMC had expressed support for this consideration. She stated that draft language was included in the meeting packet for review and consideration and added that one other item that should be considered was the possible staggering of terms. She stated that theoretically, everyone on both committees could be replaced at one time and that this would be damaging due to the loss of continuity that would occur.

Rocky agreed that the staggering of terms was important to consider.

Kim stated as an overview that her suggestion was that anyone who met the minimum qualification would be assigned 100 points with 20% percentage points assigned for additional education or experience in the established areas.

Diane stated that she felt Kim's suggestion makes sense because the core of the qualification for the SMC is most important, so with all other things being equal, giving extra points for additional education or experience in the specified areas was a good idea because that core is the EEL Program's focus.

The group reviewed Kim's proposed language. The following was noted.

- Diane commented that having the qualifications indented made the document easier for her to read.
- **Page 2-17 6B**
  - Paul commented that the new draft language provided for a minimum of 6 years of professional experience as well as changing "on natural areas" to "in natural areas" and he suggested those two minor revisions
  - Diane suggested changing "20 percentage points" to "20 points".
- **Page 2-17 6C**
  - Diane suggested the following change: "...ranked order from highest to lowest to the Procedures Committee for review."

### Additional General Discussion on Kim's proposal

- A question was received as to whether or not there were a maximum number of points which could be obtained.
  - Kim stated there was no maximum.
- Rocky reminded the group that the SMC has not yet seen Kim's proposed language.
- Kim clarified that the Qualifying Committee would determine the rankings, and the Procedures Committee would confirm them, and she would let everyone know if she came up with anything new to add to the document.
- The group expressed their support for Kim's proposal at various times during the discussion.
- Mike confirmed the information would be included the next round of draft language for SMC Criteria.

### Flow Chart con't

The group continued their discussion on the SMC Criteria flow chart.

Diane suggested consideration of numbering the bubbles. She mentioned that there were a couple of things that were a little confusing, because it didn't clarify that the process started with a vacancy, and you don't just go to the alternates list and bypass the regular procedure.

Kim stated that information related to reappointments should be included in the flow chart and that it could be possible that the Board choose to reappoint some committee members, but not all of them.

Diane and Paul agreed.

Rocky emphasized the need to discuss staggering of terms. The group concurred.

Mike stated that he would come up with some mechanism to address the items mentioned above and then bring the flow chart back for additional review.

Rocky asked if it was the group's consent that they are accepting all that Kim has suggested to be incorporated into the proposed revisions.

Kim mentioned that the groups discussion included the 3 changes, as noted above.

Discussion ensued regarding the best way to capture the meeting's discussion. It was determined that a vote was needed for the April 27<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes, and the discussion on the flow chart and on Kim's proposal would be considered part of new business.

Confirmation was provided that the group had approved the April 27<sup>th</sup> minutes, as amended, earlier in the meeting.

Mike stated that he had already added any little tweaks to the document along the way, so his document could end up in the minutes as it was now, with the exception of including Kim's suggested language which would be added, if everyone was in approval.

Rocky said that he would be comfortable with that, except that the SMC still needed to review Kim's suggested language.

Confirmation was provided the SMC would have the opportunity to review it and that both committees had to approve any revised language before it could be sent to the Board for final approval.

### **MOTION THREE**

**Diane Stees moved to accept the language that the Committee just amended from the April 27, 2010 minutes, accept Kim's new language with 3 minor changes to the wording, thereby accepting the rewording of item 2-17 6A as discussed.**

**Rocky Randels seconded the motion.**

#### Additional Discussion

Mike provided clarification that the revisions to the flow chart will not be in the minutes because he hasn't actually done that work yet.

#### Public Comment

None.

**The motion carried unanimously.**

### **Land Sale Procedure**

This item was tabled due to time constraints.

#### Public Comment

Jim Rosasco, citizen, stated that he served as a volunteer on several County committees as an appointee of Commissioner Infantini, but that he was at the meeting as a concerned individual. He indicated that he has reviewed the internal audit report from 2007 regarding the LAM, which Pat had referred to, and he took great exception to someone saying that the manual says everything, because the audit had indicated there was a need for revision and it hadn't been done. He also expressed his feeling that transparency is important and you should not have to have an advanced degree or need to have someone sit down with you to explain a manual so you can find out what is going on with the Program.

#### Additional Discussion

Kim stated that it was her feeling that the LAM should be able to be understood by the general public and that although the manual had been prepared by unpaid volunteers, many years ago, they had never indicated that it should be cast in stone and never reviewed or updated.

Rocky stated that the EEL Program Manager has indicated staff will touch base with FIT to determine the possibility of a reformatting of the manual by a technical writer.

Priscilla stated that she was also supportive of transparency and that she did not feel that anyone was opposed to making the manual easier to understand.

Mike stated that he did not want folks to get the impression that there was an open audit finding, because the 2007 audit had been closed out by the audit review committee.

Pat asked for clarification regarding how the item was closed out.

Mike stated that staff will pull the final report and provide additional information at a future meeting.

## NEXT MEETING:

Date to be determined.

## ADJOURNED:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 PM.

## SUMMARY OF MEETING MOTIONS:

- Motion to approve the March 20, 2010 PC minutes as amended.
- Motion to approve the April 27, 2010 SMC/PC minutes as amended.
- Motion to accept the language that the Committee just amended from the April 27, 2010 SMC/PC minutes, accept Kim's new language with 3 minor changes to the wording, thereby accepting the rewording of item 2-17 6A as discussed.

## EEL Land Acquisition Manual Draft Revisions – SMC Membership Criteria

(Staff revisions based on the committee input at the June 8, 2010 PC meeting, included in June 8, 2010 meeting minutes)

On October 20, 2009, the County Commission directed EEL staff to *“broaden the criteria for the Selection and Management Committee to have at least one member associated with the Economic Development Commission or Tourism Development Council, with eco-tourism in mind.”*

On January 8, 2010, at the joint meeting of the EEL Procedures Committee and Selection and Management Committee, staff was requested to present a proposal for language revisions to the EEL Manuals at the next meeting. It was requested that staff's recommendations give consideration to the County Commission direction from October 20, and possible options related to the Board discussion related to the EEL Recreation and Education Advisory Committee (REAC) that occurred on November 10, 2009. It was also requested that staff present language revision options associated with SMC ranking process, as referenced in the staff memo from Don Lusk and Mike Knight dated January 7, 2010.

Three additional meetings were held on March 16, (PC), April 27, 2010 (SMC/PC), and June 8, 2010 (PC) the following document includes the most recent recommendations proposed by the Procedures Committee and Selection and Management Committee.

### **Existing Language and Suggested Revisions.**

Page 2-17, 6.a:

Existing Language and Suggested Revision:

*...The qualifications of all applicants or nominees responding to a call by the County Commissioners for EEL Selection and Management Committee volunteers shall be reviewed by ~~the EEL Program staff. A qualified list of applicants/nominees shall be established from the available pool of applicants/nominees.~~ **a Qualifying Committee consisting of the EEL Program Manager, the Chairman of the Procedures Committee, (or their designee), and the Director of Human Resources (or their designee).** Staff will present the **list of all applicants / nominees** to the Procedures Committee including identification of those applicants / nominees that have been determined by the Qualifying Committee to be qualified. Qualifications for EEL Selection and Management Committee members are outlined in this manual (page 2-1318). The Procedures Committee will review the list of applicants presented by staff and verify the final list of qualified applicants / nominees through a majority vote. County EEL staff will provide the list of ~~all~~ qualified applicants / nominees to the Board for review and ranking.*

*EEL Program Procedures Committee Meeting*

*June 8, 2010*

*Page 10 of 12*

*Approved August 10, 2010*

Any member of the Procedures Committee who is also a member of the Selection and Management Committee, or any Procedures Committee member who is applying for an open seat on the Selection and Management Committee shall refrain from voting on the final list of qualified applicants, or participating as a member of the Qualifying Committee.

Page 2-17, 6.b:

*“...Those nominees with the highest scores shall be appointed to the EEL Selection and Management Committee, those nominees with the second highest scores shall be appointed as alternates to the EEL Selection and Management Committee. In cases of tied scores, the Board Chairperson will choose members or ~~alternatives~~ alternates by drawing names of those with tied scores from a box.”*

Page 2-17, 6.c. ~~÷~~ Existing Language and Suggested Revision:

*“If replacement EEL Selection and Management Committee members are required, the Board has the option to choose from the existing pool of qualified alternates (as defined by 6.b. above) or the Board can request that staff prepare a public advertisement as a call for qualified citizen volunteers.....”*

Page 2-17, 6d:

Existing Language and Suggested Revision:

*“New appointments and reappointments of EEL Selection and Management Committee members (as outlined in a., b. and c. above) can occur at the discretion of the Board without additional review or new rankings. **by selecting from the most recent (not exceeding two (2) years) pool of qualified applicants / nominees.** Appointment procedures will ~~follow~~ **be consistent with** county policies for advisory board appointments, as specified in the Uniform Advisory Board Ordinance, Ordinance 95-31.”*

Page 2-18 (EEL SMC Member Criteria)

Five (5) criteria exist for SMC members. However, one additional “highly desirable” knowledge criteria (unnumbered) is identified, yet it is not clear as to whether or not it should be included as a “ranked” criteria, or if the knowledge is specific to conservation acquisition programs in particular, such as Florida Forever. In addition, the existing language suggests that the professional expertise may be substituted for the academic degree, but no evaluation criteria for the level of expertise was established.

Existing Language and Suggested Revision:

*“Membership shall consist of seven ~~(7)~~ members appointed by the Board for a minimum term of two years. The Board of County Commissioners shall strive to maintain a committee membership that possesses a diversity of demonstrated expertise or experience to enhance the land acquisition and management goals of the EEL Program. ~~A knowledge of other land acquisition programs in the State is highly desirable.~~ The Board may appoint members that do not reside in the respective Commissioner’s District. A Chair and ~~€~~Vice-Chair shall be elected **annually** by a majority vote of the EEL Selection and Management Committee.”*

*All EEL Selection and Management Committee members shall:*

- 1. Have a willingness to serve in a voluntary capacity.*
- 2. Be willing to make a long-term commitment to the EEL Selection and Management Committee.*
- 3. Have a graduate academic degree in biological or environmental sciences OR demonstrated professional expertise **(minimum six (6) years)** in a closely related conservation field such as ecosystem management, natural resources conservation, aquatic biology, field ecology, marine*

*EEL Program Procedures Committee Meeting*

*June 8, 2010*

*Page 11 of 12*

*Approved August 10, 2010*

biology, botany, geology, hydrology, fire ecology, natural areas management, human use and recreation ~~on~~in natural areas, science education, or natural area sanctuary design.

~~4. Have demonstrated concern for and have actively participated in environmental conservation.~~

**6.4. Have familiarity with ~~demonstrated knowledge of~~ Brevard County ecosystems. ~~and specific knowledge of habitat types and conservation land management techniques.~~**

Page 5-45, Step 14A, Contract Development and EEL Staff Review:

The following language will be added as #5: “5. *Per County Administrative Order AO-37, all land purchases that have a contract price of \$750,000 or more are reviewed by the County’s Land Acquisition Review Committee to ensure that the facts upon which the appraisals are based **are** accurate and that all information necessary for the Board’s consideration has been provided.*”