



**ENVIRONMENTALLY ENDANGERED LANDS (EEL) PROGRAM  
SELECTION & MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SMC)  
June 3, 2010  
Attendance List**

***SELECTION & MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEMBERS***

Mark Bush  
Randy Parkinson  
Dave Breininger  
Ross Hinkle  
Paul Schmalzer  
Sue Hann  
Kim Zarillo

***EEL PROGRAM STAFF***

Jenny Ashbury  
Laura Clark  
Xavier de Seguin Des Hons  
Mike Knight  
Brad Manley

***THE NATURE CONSERVANCY***

Keith Fountain  
Anne Mayer

***GUESTS***

Thomas Blue, Central Florida Animal Reserve  
Linda Mannier, D3 Commission Office  
Kendall Moore, Space Coast Strategies  
Kurt Bauerle, Harris, Harris, Bauerle, and Sharma  
Doug Sphar, REAC Committee

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

*June 3, 2010  
Approved August 10, 2010*



## ENVIRONMENTALLY ENDANGERED LANDS (EEL) PROGRAM SELECTION & MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SMC)

June 3, 2010  
Meeting Minutes

### CALL TO ORDER:

Randy Parkinson, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 1:05 PM.

### PUBLIC COMMENT:

Thomas Blue, President, Central Florida Animal Preserve, stated that their group has appeared before the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) recently, and they are looking for a new place to house their big cats. He explained that Commissioner Infantini had suggested that the EEL Program might have some land that was sitting idle which might be suitable for their needs, and that it was his understanding that the EEL Program holds a cattle lease on approximately 112 acres of property. He said that he felt that if their group could work in harmony with the EEL Program, their volunteers could be good custodians of a new site because they are already active at their present location. He stated that he understood that the EEL Program is mostly about indigenous species and endangered lands, which might not be compatible with exotics cats, but he wanted to at least speak to the SMC in the event that the Program did have idle land available which would be compatible with their group.

Randy asked what type of characteristics the site they wanted would need.

Thomas explained that he felt a variety of habitats could be acceptable, but the site would need to be high and dry, and that a site which was fairly open would be better for construction of the enclosures. He added that their ultimate goal was to have the facility open to the public, and include educational classrooms and a hospital. He also added that Commissioner Infantini had suggested a 30-40 year lease, if it was feasible.

Mark Bush stated he felt that an agreement with a zoo would be a better fit and he asked if the group had contacted a zoo.

Thomas stated they contacted Keith Winsten at the Brevard Zoo, but Keith had explained that their Reserve was not in keeping with the Zoo's model, and that the Zoo has an established program which was pretty well set.

Ross said that he didn't want Thomas to feel that he had any objections to what the Reserve was trying to do; he just didn't think that their mission was compatible with the mission of the EEL Program and that it was incompatible with placement on EEL property.

Sue Hann asked how much property the facility would require.

Thomas stated that 20 acres would be ideal, but they could probably get by with 10 or 15 acres.

Sue asked how big the cattle lease site is.

Mike explained that the 112 acre cattle lease had been continued as part of the arrangements for the Scottsmoor Flatwoods Sanctuary acquisition to allow for continuation of the existing use at the time of acquisition, as a temporary measure, to assist with control of exotic species until the Program begins restoration activities on that portion of the Sanctuary. He also explained that guidelines for grant monies from US Fish and Wildlife Service and received through The Nature Conservancy as partnership funding on the Scottsmoor Flatwoods Sanctuary properties, which were in place and approved by the Board as part of their final approval for acquisition of the land, require that any use of the land must be compatible with management for scrub habitat or the approximately \$1.9 million dollar grant will need to be repaid.

Paul Schmalzer agreed that the grant restrictions are one indication of incompatibility, but he believes that the Preserve is fundamentally incompatible with the referendum language which established the EEL Program. He stated that saving big cats is a fine thing, but it is not the mission of the EEL Program.

Kim Zarillo asked if Thomas has contacted Forever Florida.

Thomas said that he has, and he feels that Forever Florida would be ideal for his Reserve, but they had not gotten back to him yet.

Kim stated that she felt that Forever Florida would be more compatible with his group and that they are interested in developing relationships that are multi-educational.

Ross emphasized that he didn't want Thomas to feel that they had any objections to what the Reserve was trying to do; he just didn't think that their mission was compatible with the mission of the EEL Program.

Thomas said he understood.

Doug Sphar, REAC Committee member, stated that he does not believe the mission of the Reserve is compatible with the mission of the EEL Program. He added that it may be possible that the Reserve may require some type of zoological zoning as well, and he suggested consideration of identification and contact with cattle ranches that are going out of business.

Randy suggested that even if the Reserve was conceptually inconsistent with the goals of the EEL Program, it might be beneficial if Thomas developed a briefing sheet which contained information on the group's ideal acreage needs, infrastructure requirements and the Reserve's intentions, so that this information would be available when contacting potential partners. He asked if anyone else had any suggestions which might assist Thomas in his efforts.

Mike stated that sometimes the Program is contacted by willing sellers regarding land which the SMC determines is not appropriate for acquisition by the EEL Program. He explained that staff could forward information regarding existing and future properties in that fit this category to Thomas for his review.

Thomas indicated he could prepare a briefings sheet and forward it to staff so staff can review the listing and provide information on any site that might fit Thomas's criteria.

Sue Hann asked it if would be possible to break up a portion of the Sanctuary and pay back a pro-rated share of the grant funding.

Mike indicated this would not be possible as the properties were purchased as a collective 1,500 acres.

Paul said that restoration efforts were proceeding and going well on a large portion of the Sanctuary.

Mike agreed.

Xavier de Seguin des Hons, the EEL Program's North Region Land Manager confirmed that all of the Scottsmeer Flatwoods Sanctuary has received prescribed fire, except the pasture.

Randy asked Thomas if the group had answered all his questions.

Thomas indicated that they had, and that the SMC's response was similar to the information Mike had provided in his e-mail to Commissioner Infantini, but he had wanted to communicate with the SMC directly due to the time-sensitive nature of his issues. He expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to attend the meeting and to speak to the Committee.

## **MINUTES:**

The April 27, 2010 SMC minutes were presented for approval.

Randy asked for comments to the April 27, 2010 SMC minutes.

Paul stated that he had two minor corrections.

- Page 6, re: George Duncan, Trustee property. Change .31 acres to 0.31 acres
- Page 11, Change Gopher Tortoise, to Gopher tortoise

Randy asked if there were any other comments to the April 27, 2010 SMC minutes. No additional comments were received.

### **MOTION ONE**

**Ross Hinkle moved to approve the April 27, 2010 SMC minutes as amended.**

**Paul Schmalzer seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried unanimously.**

The April 27, 2010 SMC/PC minutes were presented for approval. Clarification was provided that the original draft of these minutes had been revised to include the starting point language that was the basis of the discussions at the beginning of each section. Confirmation was provided that the revised draft minutes would also need to be approved by the Procedures Committee (PC) before they could be finalized.

Randy asked for comments to the April 27, 2010 SMC/PC minutes.

Kim confirmed that Linda Mannier should be included as a guest on the Attendance page.

Paul provided comments on the April 27, 2010 SMC/PC minutes.

- Page 4, 4<sup>th</sup> par: Fix duplicate word. "Mike said that it was his understanding that the EEL Program Manager, the Procedures Committee Chair/designee and the Director of Human Resources/designee would review the applications to determine who was qualified ~~that and~~ that EEL Program staff would pass this information to the Procedures Committee for their review."
- Page 5, under Additional Discussion, 2<sup>nd</sup> par: Paul stated he felt that the current wording related to the PC's determination not to include a person with a real estate background as a member of the SMC did not reflect the discussion of March 16<sup>th</sup>. He provided suggested language for revision to the minutes. The suggested language was read aloud. "He

*EEL Program Selection and Management Committee Meeting*

*June 3, 2010*

*Page 3 of 13*

*Approved August 10, 2010*

confirmed that the PC had decided not to incorporate that suggestion, as the SMC deals with conservation value, not real estate as there is a detailed process in place to determine economic value through independent appraisals, appraisal reviews, and the Land Acquisition Review Committee. Appraisals are confidential until the final step of this process, and a person with a real estate background on the SMC would add nothing to the process.

#### Additional Discussion

Randy asked if the additional language was actually necessary and suggested consideration of ending the sentence after the word “suggestion”.

Mike stated that he was supportive of the suggested revisions because it helps provide clarification regarding the PC’s decision. He explained that there is a lack of understanding regarding the SMC’s involvement with real estate appraisal values and a lack of knowledge that one of the steps in the acquisition process, for all properties over \$750,000, is a review of the appraisals by the County’s Land Acquisition Review Committee, which includes a representative from the County Attorney’s Office, a representative from the Clerk of the Court and other Brevard County Departments, and that it is important to point that out.

- Page 8, SMM 3<sup>rd</sup> par: Fix confusing language. “During the discussion on April 27<sup>th</sup>, clarification was provided...”

#### Additional Discussion

The group agreed that the discussion being referred to happened on April 27<sup>th</sup> and because the minutes are dated April 27<sup>th</sup> the date was not needed. The sentence will be changed to “During the discussion, clarification was provided...”

#### Additional Discussion

Randy asked if there were any additional questions or comments on the minutes of the April 27, 2010 SMC/PC meeting.

Paul also commented that although no change was required to the minutes, the record should indicate that the Procedures Committee has previously addressed the historical concerns expressed by the Clerk of the Court, which were discussed by Procedures Committee member Pat Pasley at the request of Commissioner Infantini, during the April 27<sup>th</sup> SMC/PC meeting.

Mike stated that staff had pulled the historic information regarding one issue related to State rankings and that he has provided Pat with the response on the audit from that time. He also said that he couldn’t recall any reference to a possible issue with the particular portion of the Land Acquisition Manual which Pat had indicated was an additional historical concern and he had asked her to get with Commissioner Infantini for clarification. Mike added that once all the information is compiled it will be presented to the PC for their review.

Kim stated she had a note to ask Mike for an update on the records which staff had indicated they would locate, and she expressed her feeling that the current discussion did not require any revision to the April 27<sup>th</sup> SMC/PC minutes.

Paul agreed.

Ross stated that the April 27, 2010 SMC/PC meeting had been a long and complicated meeting and it was important that the information was represented accurately. He added that he was a little perplexed on the best way to provide documentation and asked if might be beneficial to

include the revised manual language prepared by staff as an attachment to the minutes in order to tie them to the minutes document.

Mike stated that he believed the dilemma was that it would not be appropriate to include the revised draft manual language as an attachment to the minutes because the draft manual language had not been updated by staff until after the meeting.

- The group determined that discussion had occurred during the April 27<sup>th</sup> SMC/PC meeting which indicated that staff should revise the draft manual language based on the discussion at the meeting and provide an updated version to both committees at their next meetings; this discussion needs to be included in the minutes at the end of the document.

## **MOTION TWO**

**Ross Hinkle moved to approve the April 27, 2010 SMC/PC minutes as amended.**

**Paul Schmalzer seconded the motion.**

### Additional Discussion

Randy asked if there were additional questions or comments to the minutes. No additional comments were received.

**The motion carried unanimously.**

### Additional Discussion

Mike explained that in the past, staff had been able to show the draft language on a display screen and changes had been made real time. Staff plans to follow that procedure in the future so that each set of new language can be presented for approval within the minutes which reflect the discussion that initiated the changes.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW:**

### CELP GRANT

Mike explained that staff had received new information from the State regarding the CELP Grant guidelines since the last meeting. Based on the new information they decided to go ahead and submit the most recent CELP Grant Application to the Board, in order to provide confirmation that the EEL Program is researching all funding options. He confirmed that clarification has been provided to TNC that negotiations should not be delayed just for the purpose of complying with the grant guidelines.

### Sams House Exhibits

Mike explained that the design meetings are expected to begin in the near future. It is anticipated a soft opening for the facility may be held prior to the completion of the exhibits with a grand opening being held after all the exhibits are complete. EEL Program staff are in discussions with citizens for assistance in having a presence on the site as the Central Region Staff only includes 3 employees. It is expected that citizens in the area may be forming a Friends Group to assist with this venture.

### Management Plan Updates

The Dicerandra Scrub Sanctuary and Helen and Alan Cruickshank Sanctuary Management Plans have been approved by the State.

Kim stated she recently had an exchange with Suzanne Kennedy who said that the Dicerandra Scrub Sanctuary is looking good as a result of the application of prescribed fire.

Mike provided clarification that while the Cruickshank Management Plan did receive approval from the State, ARC has temporarily delayed the Transportation Department's request for a ditch easement at the Cruickshank Sanctuary while they conduct additional review of the mitigation arrangements. It is anticipated this item will be on the ARC agenda for the August meeting.

### **SMC REPORTS:**

Dave Breininger explained that he has applied for a follow up grant to cover some of the monitoring for adaptive resource management modeling through the Brevard Zoo.

Ross noted he will be speaking to the Florida Native Plant Society Sea Rocket Chapter this month to discuss ecosystem services related to carbon sequestration which are provided by sanctuaries .

### **STAFF REPORTS:**

None. Staff will report on the recent REAC meeting next time.

### **THE NATURE CONSERVANCY:**

Keith Fountain reviewed TNC Report to the SMC for June 3, 2010:

#### Maytown Flatwoods

- Edward and James Dean: in appraisal
- George Duncan, Tr: in appraisal
- Charles Franklin: in appraisal
- Grant/Thompson: in appraisal
- Honey Hole Ranch, LLC: 3<sup>rd</sup> offer presented for fee simple purchase
- Lanco Partnership: in appraisal
- Richard Morse: in appraisal
- Turnbull Farms, LLLP, (contiguous 19.75 acres): in appraisal
- Urfer-Zwahlen, Susanna: in appraisal

#### North Indian River Lagoon

- Maggio, Patrick: about to commence negotiations
- Mason and Miler: about to commence negotiations
- Parrish III / Price: about to commence negotiations
- Reichman, Jason: about to commence negotiations
- Valdyke, Trustee: about to commence negotiations
- Xynidis, Steve: appraisals due June 7<sup>th</sup>

#### Rockledge

- Florida Power and Light: 3<sup>rd</sup> offer presented June 2<sup>nd</sup>
- Viera DRI Tract A: appraisal completed June 2<sup>nd</sup>

#### Jordan Boulevard

- Oakmont Preserve: in appraisal

#### Additional Discussion

#### Find Exchange

Paul asked for an update on the Florida Inland Navigational District (FIND) property exchange.

*EEL Program Selection and Management Committee Meeting*

*June 3, 2010*

*Page 6 of 13*

*Approved August 10, 2010*

Keith stated that a draft agreement has been prepared.

Jenny Ashbury, EEL Program Land Acquisition Coordinator explained that the County Attorney's office was reviewing the draft agreement, and once that is complete, the document will be returned to FIND through TNC.

Kim stated that the news on the progress of the FIND exchange was good to hear.

Mike stated that most of the issues relate to who was paying for the costs of the exchange.

Additional information will be provided when it is received.

#### Viera Conservation Area, Rockledge

Dave Breininger asked if there was any news regarding the Viera Conservation Area in Rockledge. He stated that it appears that there has been very little land management done on the scrub habitat and he expressed his concern regarding the declining scrub quality and future decline of Florida Scrub-Jay population that will result if the property is not managed properly.

Mike stated that at the present time, to his knowledge, there are no reports that the group responsible for management is not carrying out what they are required to do, and it is his opinion that no enforcement action will be taken until that occurs. He commented that there was a time that the Program had expressed an interest to the Viera CDD that the Program would be interested in taking over the ownership, but that is a process that would ultimately have to be approved the Board.

Paul stated that the SMC had expressed support for accepting the property as a donation and he asked for clarification of the Board's response.

Jenny Ashbury stated that the County Attorney's office had not recommended accepting the donation based on the Program's taking over someone else's mitigation responsibilities.

Mike stated that his supervisors had indicated that accepting the donation was not a recommendation they would feel comfortable taking to the Board.

Paul stated his concern was that the information that the donation was rejected at a staff level above the EEL Program Manager had not come back to the SMC for discussion. He stated that the SMC is an Advisory Committee to the Board of County Commissioners and there is no statement in the Land Acquisition Manual that the County Manager, or the County Attorney, have veto authority over the recommendation of the SMC.

Mike stated that the situation was more complicated than that. He explained that staff had not received information, like a Memorandum of Understanding, from the Viera group and that he would go back and research the details.

Jenny stated that she had requested information which stipulated what their management responsibilities were on 3 or 4 occasions, but the information has not been received.

Dave asked if she was speaking of the Homeowner's Association.

Jenny said yes.

Dave said that when the previous manager, (Viera Company) had the site, they had done a very good job of management, and that his concerns had begun when the current manager (Viera East Community Development District) had taken over. He explained that the recent, nationwide

*EEL Program Selection and Management Committee Meeting*

*June 3, 2010*

*Page 7 of 13*

*Approved August 10, 2010*

practice of having homeowner's groups being responsible for management of mitigated properties has been problematic everywhere because the homeowners don't always have the expertise required for proper management activity.

Paul stated that the SMC had projected years ago that if the site was turned over to a homeowner's association the habitat would decline and he emphasized that the Viera Conservation Area in Rockledge is key to the Florida Scrub Jay population in the central part of Brevard County.

Dave stated that the EEL Program's conservation areas to the north, and to the south of the Viera Conservation Area in Rockledge are totally dependent on this site. He stated that this site is property that the SMC had previously proposed for acquisition, and would have been willing to pay for. Dave requested that the issue be addressed.

Mike stated that the Viera East Community Development District had been very supportive of the area being donated to the EEL Program, but part of the issue is there are several subdivisions; they each have their own Homeowner's Associations.

#### Public Comment

Doug Sphar stated that it is his understanding that the Homeowner's Association has contracted with a private company to do the management, but the problem is that there are a few residents in the area who are very strong voiced, and who are not in favor of having the property managed in the manner that the scrub habitat it is supposed to managed. He stated that a few people want lots of trees and lots of vegetation because they want to be buffered from the business along US 1 and that it was his opinion that the homeowner's associations are being intimidated by a small group of people.

#### Additional Discussion

Dave stated that he personally knows some of the residents in the Viera area who really care about the conservation preserve and all they want is a buffer which can come from a line of trees.

Ross stated that this issue presents a dilemma in terms of the objectives of the EEL Program because of the importance in maintaining the overall conservation landscape in a manner that will ensure population viability.

Dave stated that even if he didn't care about biodiversity, the overgrown landscape contains tremendous fuel loads and he expressed concern regarding neighboring homes in the event of a wildfire.

Paul agreed that if the fuel loads continue to build up, a wildfire could cause a great deal of damage.

Mark Bush stated that concerns may be received regarding potential public access near neighboring homes if the site comes under public ownership.

Dave stated that staff has established the ability to work with sanctuary neighbors to ensure that their concerns are received and addressed. He added that it was possible that a formal trail system could be established that would not take the public near homes, which could be an improvement, because now there are no guidelines to let people know where they should or should not go.

Keith Fountain suggested consideration of reviewing the Management Plan, if one had been established, and he asked if there was an endowment for management of the property.

*EEL Program Selection and Management Committee Meeting*

*June 3, 2010*

*Page 8 of 13*

*Approved August 10, 2010*

Mike stated that the binding development agreement that was in place at the time indicated they would be responsible for funding the management of the site for Scrub Jay habitat, but it did not specify how much.

Randy suggested consideration of continued discussion at the next SMC meeting.

The group concurred.

Staff will research status and schedule additional discussion at the next SMC meeting.

## **AGENDA ITEMS:**

### **Parrish Holder Land Corp. Property and Roper Harding Titusville Partnership Properties**

Mike provided overview information on the updated willing seller applications on the Parrish Holder Land Corp. and Roper Harding Titusville Partnership Properties.

The Parrish Holder Land Corp. site is approximately 39 acres. It is located across the street and directly north of the western section of the Indian Mound Station Sanctuary and bordered by Holder Park on the north side.

The Roper Harding Titusville Partnership Properties property is adjacent to the west side of the Parrish Holder Land Corp. site, extending to Holder Road, near I-95 on its western border. The property to the north of this site has been developed and there is some development to the south.

Kendall Moore, Space Coast Strategies, and Kurt Bauerle, of Harris, Harris, Bauerle, and Sharma were in attendance at the meeting as representatives of the owners.

Kendall Moore stated that he felt that acquisition of these sites would provide a great opportunity for passive recreation to exist next to the activities held at Holder Park and he offered to answer any questions that anyone might have.

Randy stated he liked the idea of having an EEL Program site in close proximity to a Parks and Recreation area because he felt it would provide great opportunities for access and education for a user group that might otherwise not have the opportunity.

Kim agreed that the site could assist in providing access to the Indian Mound Station Sanctuary.

Ross stated that when the Indian Mound Station Sanctuary was acquired, there were very few opportunities for creating a conservation connection between the existing conservation areas on northern Merritt Island and the Indian River Lagoon, but that substantial progress has been made towards that goal with the acquisition of the Scottsmoor Flatwoods Sanctuary. He stated that in his perspective, consideration should be given to the amount of conservation value that would be added to the overall landscape scale if these properties were acquired and that he felt that the properties have decreased in value related to the need for an east-west connection to the existing conservation area.

### **Additional Discussion**

Paul mentioned that he did not see inholdings and outparcels to Fox Lake on the acquisition sheet that was distributed at the meeting and he asked about the status of the willing seller application for Mr. Moehle.

Mike confirmed that Mr. Moehle had been provided with a willing seller application for the property covered by the conservation easement, as that was the parcel he wanted to begin with, but the application had not been returned.

Paul stated that the inholdings and outparcels around the Fox Lake Sanctuary were important and he requested that they be followed up.

Mark stated that the group needed to think about priorities, and since the Program has been able to acquire a lot of land in the north, perhaps consideration should be given to the southern part of the county.

Keith stated that there were still some large landscapes in the south part of the county.

Jenny stated that they weren't on the sheet because the Program wasn't pursuing acquisition of those sites now.

Mike explained that 4 of the owners of the larger properties in the south part of the county have removed themselves from the Brevard Coastal Scrub Ecosystem project boundary and are no longer willing sellers.

Sue Hann said that there is a major transportation facility going in at that location.

Ross said that it could be time to re-evaluate the acquisition priorities.

Mike will add land acquisition prioritization to the next meeting agenda.

**Parrish Holder Land Corp. Property and Roper Harding Titusville Partnership Properties, con't**

It was determined that the SMC wanted to reaffirm their interest in acquisition of these properties, but did not want to order appraisals until a site visit could be completed and reviewed.

**Motion Three**

**Kim Zarillo moved to approve a 1<sup>st</sup> Majority Vote on the Parrish Holder Land Corp. and Roper Harding Titusville Partnership Properties with the caveat that there will be a site visit prior to the implementation of appraisals.**

**Paul Schmalzer seconded the motion.**

Additional Discussion

None.

**The motion carried unanimously.**

**Sanctuary Management Manual Revisions: REAC Membership and Resolution**

Mike explained that at the last Procedures Committee (PC) meeting, a conclusion was reached that authority for revisions relative to the make up of the Recreation and Education Advisory Committee (REAC) fell under the purview of the Selection and Management Committee, (SMC) not the PC because information on the REAC is included in the Sanctuary Management Manual, (SMM), not the Land Acquisition Manual, (LAM).

He also explained that in the future, staff will be providing draft language on screen via computer so that any revisions that might be required can be incorporated real time, and results of individual discussions will be included in each meeting's minutes, at the end of the discussion.

Mike said that the PC included new language which adds an additional voting member to the REAC Committee, instead of adding someone with an Economic Development or Tourism

*EEL Program Selection and Management Committee Meeting*

*June 3, 2010*

*Page 10 of 13*

*Approved August 10, 2010*

background to the SMC. The PC's suggested new language, which affects the SMM and the Resolution which formed the REAC, was provided to the SMC for their review and consideration.

During the discussion, it was determined that a formatting error existed in the layout of the REAC draft language and a suggestion was made for staff to revise the layout to present the information in a manner which reflected that any deletion of existing language be struck through, any new language be represented with an underline, and any new information received today from the SMC would be highlighted.

It was agreed that it would be beneficial to review the overall message of the PC's suggested language. Each of the changes was discussed.

- The REAC Committee will change from ten (10) to eleven (11) members.
- The REAC originally indicated that a representative from the EDC, or TDC should serve as non-voting sub-committee members, and the new language adds a representative from the TDC as a voting member.
- Currently each Commissioner appoints two (2) citizens to the REAC. New language includes provision for the Board Chairman to appoint the additional member. (Board Chairman will appoint 3 members)

#### Additional Discussion

- Clarification needs to be provided on the correct name for the Brevard County Tourist/ (Tourism?) Development Council/(Commission?)
- Language in the SMM should match the language in the Resolution when relating to the same topic.

#### Public Comment

Doug Sphar stated that there didn't seem to be a lot of strength in the language regarding the Board Chairman appointing one additional citizen to represent ecotourism through the TDC.

#### Additional Discussion

Mike stated that the intention was that TDC would make a recommendation and the Commissioner would appoint.

The group discussed this language. It was determined that the following language would be an improvement "Board Chairman will appoint one additional citizen, as recommended by the TDC for a total of three (3), to represent ecotourism."

Mike explained that the language would be reformatted and presented to the SMC at the next meeting. When the revisions for language regarding the REAC have been completed, the final language will be presented to the SMC for their approval. When the other LAM and SMM changes have been finalized, they will be submitted for approval to both the PC and the SMC. Once approved by the PC and SMC, all the revisions will be submitted to the Board for final approval.

#### **Land Acquisition Manual Revisions: SMC Appointment Process and Membership Criteria**

Mike explained that the next item on the agenda would be review of the SMC appointment process and membership criteria.

Paul Schmalzer suggested consideration of clarifying the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph of this history section to indicate that the March 16, 2010 meeting had been held by the PC and the April 27, 2010 meeting had been attended by both the PC and the SMC. Staff will incorporate this clarification.

The group reviewed the draft language related to the SMC Appointment Process and Membership Criteria.

Ross Hinkle said that he had reviewed the information and it appeared to accurately reflect his understanding of the intent of the SMC and PC comments.

Paul stated he had a couple of additional edits and there was one omission.

Mike stated that clarification would be provided regarding the origin of the suggestions to the language.

Mike explained that he has spoken with the Director of Human Resources and received confirmation that the Director, or designee, is willing to serve on the Qualifying Committee, if that is the Committee's wish.

Kim stated that she would like to bring up a new item related to the SMC qualification criteria. She explained that as she had been reviewing the draft language, she had not really seen any criteria, or mechanism, for ranking the applicants. As a result, if all applicants who met the minimum criteria were to move forward, someone with 10 years experience would be in the same category as someone with 1 year experience, and it seemed to her there ought to be some method so that experience should have some weight. She explained that she believed that it would be beneficial for there to be an additional criterion for experience, so that candidates with the extra experience and qualification would have a higher ranking.

Paul stated that as the language now reads, a candidate is considered to be qualified, or, not qualified.

Kim stated that she would be willing to draft language to provide for a fourth criterion which included the experience ranking for consideration by the PC. She added that she felt that adding this criterion would take some of the pressure off staff, because the SMC appointment process has become politicized.

The group discussed some of the challenges that ranking a criterion of this type might bring.

#### Public Comment

Doug Sphar asked if the suggestion was for a pre-ranking of the applicants before they were submitted to the Board.

#### Additional Discussion

Kim stated it was her opinion that the Committee should rank the qualified applicants and the applications the Board receives for review should be based on those rankings.

Kim said she understood that writing policy could be tedious, but that she would be willing to give it some additional thought and provide draft language for the PC's consideration at their June 8, 2010 meeting.

Paul explained that he had a few additional clarifications on the draft language including:

- Page 2-17 6D, re: SMC – Capitalize M in Management

- Page 2-18 SMC criteria – rearrange last sentence to indicate experience can be substituted for graduate degree, versus degree can be substituted for experience.
- It was previously determined that the election of officers should be done annually, but that clarification was omitted from the draft language.

Mark Bush expressed concern regarding the scheduling of the SMC reappointments as they all currently occur at the same time. The group agreed that this is something that should be addressed.

#### Additional Discussion

Paul commented that language regarding land sale and exchange appeared to have been removed and put back into the document in a different place.

Sue Hann stated that she would be voting no for a variety of reasons, but she was fine with continuing the discussion.

Randy asked if there was a need for the SMC to vote on any of the draft language which had been discussed.

Paul stated the group did not yet have final language on the revisions and explained that he had thought the discussion regarding land sale had been on the agenda.

Mike explained that a vote was not required at this time and he stated that it had originally been the staff's intention to have land sale on today's agenda, but an oversight had occurred and the item had been left off. He said that if anyone had comments they could send them to him and he would try to work them in advance.

Additional information on this item will be presented in the future.

#### Trail Management Guidelines

Tabled due to time constraints.

#### Scottsmoor Flatwoods Sanctuary Billboard Lease

Tabled due to time constraints.

#### **NEXT MEETING:**

The next meeting will be held on June 24, 2010.

#### **ADJOURNED:**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 PM.

#### **SUMMARY OF MEETING MOTIONS:**

- Motion to approve the April 27, 2010 SMC minutes as amended.
- Motion to approve the April 27, 2010 SMC/PC minutes as amended.
- Motion to approve a 1<sup>st</sup> Majority Vote on the Parrish Holder Land Corp. and Roper Harding Titusville Partnership Properties with the caveat that there will be a site visit prior to the implementation of appraisals.