

Largo, Florida, April 6, 2016

A meeting of the Pinellas County Charter Review Commission (CRC) (as created by Chapter 80-590, Laws of Florida) was held at the County Extension Services Center, Largo, Florida, on this date with the following members in attendance:

James Olliver, Chairman  
Thomas Steck, Vice-Chairman  
Larry Ahern, State Representative  
Sandra L. Bradbury, City of Pinellas Park Mayor  
Ken Burke, Clerk of the Circuit Court and Comptroller (late arrival, via telephone conference call)  
Janet C. Long, County Commissioner  
Johnny Bardine  
Keisha Bell  
Ashley Caron  
Barclay Harless  
Todd Pressman  
Joshua Shulman

Not Present  
James Sewell

Also Present  
Wade Vose, Vose Law Firm, General Counsel  
Diane Meiller-Cook, Diane Meiller & Associates, Inc. (DM&A), Facilitator  
Flo Sena, DM&A  
Mary Scott Hardwick, Pinellas County Intergovernmental Liaison  
Other Interested Individuals  
Christopher Bartlett, Board Reporter, Deputy Clerk  
(Minutes by Helen Groves)

## AGENDA

1. Call to Order (CRC Chairman)
2. Public Comment on Items on this Agenda (CRC Chairman)
3. Approval of Minutes – March 16, 2016 Meeting (CRC Chairman)
4. Charter Amendment Topics
  - a. Greater Representation for Unincorporated Areas (Shulman)
    - i. BCC Meeting Monthly on Issues Involving Unincorporated Areas

- ii. Appointment to Boards
  - iii. Citizens Committee
  - b. BCC Size: Is Seven Members Still Appropriate? (Shulman)
  - c. Redistricting (Harless, Shulman)
  - d. Procurements Involving Large Dollar Contracts (Pressman)
  - e. Amendments via Citizen Petition (DM&A)
  - f. Nonconforming Properties (Steck)
  - g. Last Call for Topics (DM&A)
- 5. Facilitation Team Report and Direction (DM&A)
    - a. Draft Recommendations for Final Report
  - 6. Dates/Time/Locations (CRC Chairman)
  - 7. Review of Action Items (CRC Chairman)
  - 8. Adjournment (CRC Chairman)

### CALL TO ORDER AND OPENING COMMENTS

Chairman Olliver called the meeting to order at 3:30 P.M., welcomed those in attendance, and thanked Pinellas County staff for the successful transition to the new meeting place.

### PUBLIC COMMENT

#### John Shaw, St. Petersburg - Citizen Petitions

Number of citizens in Pinellas County has increased significantly since item was placed in Charter. The requirement that 10 percent of the electors must sign a petition before it may be put on the ballot places an onerous burden on citizens and discourages citizen involvement.

#### Marcus Harrison, Palm Harbor (Unincorporated Area) – Greater Representation for Unincorporated Area

Unincorporated areas equal almost 30 percent of the population, greater than the largest municipality, yet there is no feedback from the community regarding use of Penny for Pinellas tax monies and other matters.

Concurred with Mr. Shaw regarding citizen petitions.

#### J. B. Pruitt, Clearwater – (1) Term Limits, (2) Composition of CRC, and (3) Citizen Petitions and Participation

Expressed concern that CRC did not listen to citizens regarding term limits.

CRC Boards should be randomly selected and members should not be politically connected.

Concurred with Messrs. Shaw and Harrison regarding citizen petitions.

In response to queries by the Chairman, Mr. Shulman confirmed that he had conferred with Mr. Harrison regarding the representation item, which he will present later in the meeting.

MINUTES OF MARCH 16, 2016 MEETING – APPROVED

Upon presentation by Chairman Olliver, Commissioner Long moved, seconded by Mayor Bradbury and carried unanimously, that the minutes of the meeting of March 16, 2016 be approved.

\* \* \* \*

Clerk Burke entered the meeting via telephone conference call at 3:42 P.M.

\* \* \* \*

CHARTER AMENDMENT TOPICS

GREATER REPRESENTATION FOR UNINCORPORATED AREAS – DENIED AS CHARTER AMENDMENT;  
LANGUAGE RE FIVE PROPOSALS TO BE CRAFTED FOR WHITE PAPER

Ms. Meiller-Cook, with input by Chairman Olliver and Messrs. Shulman and Harless, reviewed the item, noting that Mr. Shulman has assembled some specific options, which have been filed and made a part of the record, originating from the original proposal made by Mr. Harless.

Noting that Clerk Burke expressed interest in moving the item forward, Mr. Shulman provided background information, relating that the 2010 Census showed that 30 percent of Pinellas County residents reside in an unincorporated area; that, collectively, the unincorporated areas represent the largest “city” in the county; that the BCC serves as the local municipal government as well as the County government for the incorporated areas; and that the unincorporated areas do not enjoy the same level of planning, advocacy, and access to government and government services as residents who reside in a properly designated municipality.

Mr. Shulman reviewed the five proposals, noting that each is independent, although two or more could be combined; that the proposals address concerns expressed by the public; and that he is not advocating for any specific proposal.

1. Create two Citizen Advisory Boards (North and South Pinellas) comprised of three members residing in the respective unincorporated areas to deal with governance issues, project priorities, and advocacy before the BCC.
2. Increase the number of County Commissioners to nine members. The two additional members would be elected solely by residents in the unincorporated areas and would be required to reside in the respective unincorporated area.

April 6, 2016

3. Ask the Legislature to create an elected body(ies) administered in the same way as the Fire Control Districts to represent the unincorporated areas.
4. Require that discretionary monies in the County budget from funding sources such as Penny for Pinellas, tourism bed taxes, and Special Funds be allocated proportionally to the unincorporated areas. For example, if there is \$1 million available, 30 percent, or \$300,000, would have to go to projects within the unincorporated boundaries.
5. Require the BCC to set aside time at regular intervals organized in such a way as to solely address the concerns of the unincorporated residents.

In response to query by Mr. Pressman, Mr. Harless, with input by Mr. Shulman, clarified that the citizen committee proposed in No. 3 would be structured similar to the Fire Services Districts and would probably need to be adopted by a Special Act of the Legislature; whereupon, he requested that Commissioner Long explain how the BCC currently addresses issues in the unincorporated areas.

Commissioner Long discussed how County government operates, and related that many functions and responsibilities of the BCC are countywide, such as the Waste Treatment Facility; whereupon, she cautioned that the CRC should be wary of tinkering with the system without a full understanding of how it works. Chairman Olliver expressed concern that people living in the unincorporated areas seem to feel disconnected and unrepresented, noting that Mr. Harrison specifically mentioned that they are not getting their fair share of Penny money; whereupon, Commissioner Long indicated that the BCC tries to make everyone happy, but there are more needs than resources; and that it would be almost irresponsible to govern based on population rather than need. She stated that Mr. Harrison appears before the BCC with the same concerns and has had personal one-on-one meetings with the County Administrator and the budget director, noting they have discussed with him the many millions of dollars that have been poured into North County.

During discussion, Mayor Bradbury referred to the Public Library Cooperative and related how it serves both the unincorporated areas and the municipalities, and Commissioner Long cited East Lake Recreation as an example of the BCC responding to the needs of the unincorporated areas; whereupon, Mayor Bradbury commented that the proposed citizen committees would soon become obsolete, as only the Tierra Verde, Palm Harbor, and Lealman areas are not subject to annexation.

Representative Ahern related that the state is reluctant to create Special Districts unless there is a compelling interest; and that the item does not seem to rise to the level of amending the Charter,

April 6, 2016

as there seems to already be coverage in the unincorporated areas; whereupon, he suggested that the item be added to the white paper, and Mr. Bardine concurred, adding that proposals Nos. 1 and 5 seem to be compatible and easily implemented.

Clerk Burke commented that the BCC seems to be supporting the unincorporated areas, but communication should be improved so citizens are aware of projects such as the Palm Harbor and Seminole recreation facilities and the work in Lealman and Tarpon Springs, and Ms. Caron and Mr. Shulman concurred.

Thereupon, Clerk Burke moved, seconded by Mr. Bardine, that the CRC not take action on the Representation for Unincorporated Areas item, and instead add it to the white paper.

During discussion, Mr. Shulman indicated that his purpose is to ensure the public has a chance to bring ideas forward; and that this is an opportunity to solidify a process for the unincorporated areas to have the ability to advocate in a coordinated way. Mr. Steck stated that while he recognizes the work the BCC has done in the unincorporated areas, the concerns have been voiced persistently; that enough information has not been provided to warrant delegating the item to the white paper; and that he would prefer deferring it to the next meeting.

Mr. Harless related that he does not feel that the issue rises to the level of a Charter Amendment, but would support moving it to the white paper, noting that he is curious whether some of the boards and committees already require a member from the unincorporated area, and Mayor Bradbury and Commissioner Long cited the Pinellas Planning Council, the Metropolitan Planning Organization, and the Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority as examples of citizen advisory groups; whereupon, Commissioner Long cautioned that fiscal issues must be considered, as citizens do not want their taxes raised.

In response to query by Attorney Vose, Clerk Burke stated for the record that his motion is separate from item No. 4-b, "BCC Size: Is Seven Members Still Appropriate?"

Chairman Olliver indicated that while it may not be spelled out in Clerk Burke's motion, the intent is to use Mr. Shulman's recommendations to provide the unincorporated areas a voice equal to the cities' on issues relating to financing and other matters.

In response to the Chairman's call for citizens wishing to be heard, Mr. Harrison reiterated his concerns, noting that most of the conversation centered around countywide programs, with which he has no issue, instead of the unincorporated areas. He agreed that money is spent in

April 6, 2016

North County, but claimed that the citizens have no say in how it is spent; and stated that North County needs additional land for parks and recreation, as intended in the original Penny.

Thereupon, Chairman Olliver stated that the motion is to not approve the item as a Charter Amendment, but to use the five proposals to craft language for the white paper section of the final report. Upon call for the vote, the motion carried 10 to 2, with Messrs. Shulman and Steck casting the dissenting votes.

BCC SIZE: IS SEVEN MEMBERS STILL APPROPRIATE? – PROPOSAL TO INCREASE NUMBER OF COMMISSIONERS DENIED; DISCUSSION RE WHITE PAPER TO BE ON NEXT MONTH'S AGENDA

Mr. Shulman indicated that the proposal addresses the issue of citizen representation in the unincorporated area; and that he recommends increasing the number of County Commissioners from seven to nine, with the stipulation that the two new members must reside in an unincorporated area of the county, and discussion ensued.

Attorney Vose confirmed that there is no legal limitation on the number of commissioners allowed in a Charter county. Mr. Harless related that his research shows that seven commissioners seems to be appropriate according to the population figures; and in response to query by Mr. Shulman, stated that he does not know if the percentage of citizens residing in unincorporated areas in Pinellas is comparable to other counties. Commissioner Long commented that the County has three at-large members, and again expressed her fiduciary concerns. Clerk Burke expressed surprise that expanding the number of commissioners is even on the agenda, and in response to his queries, Chairman Olliver and Ms. Meiller-Cook indicated that it was brought up in the context of representation for the unincorporated citizens; whereupon, Clerk Burke stated that it would cost approximately half a million dollars to add two new commissioners; that he is very attuned to the citizens and has not heard anyone advocate for more commissioners; and that it seems to be a case of solving a problem that does not exist.

Upon the Chairman's call for a motion, Mr. Shulman moved that the number of commissioners be increased from seven to nine, and that the new members must live in the unincorporated areas.

Mr. Steck offered to second the motion with the caveat that Mr. Shulman accept a friendly amendment to remove the mandate to reside in the unincorporated area. Mr. Shulman refused, stating that the restriction is the basis of the motion; whereupon, Mr. Steck withdrew his second; and Chairman Olliver stated that the motion died for lack of a second.

In response to Chairman Olliver's assumption that the item would be added to the white paper, Mr. Pressman expressed concern that something the group did not support would be moved

April 6, 2016

forward in any way. Commissioner Long concurred, stating that the CRC agreed that legitimate support is needed to move an item forward, and the support does not exist; and that she would not support moving the item forward without knowing the fiscal impact.

Attorney Vose advised that the members should decide whether the white paper would only document for the record the issues discussed or would be a list of items that the CRC supports but does not think rise to the level of a Charter amendment. Mr. Pressman indicated that the integrity of the record would be compromised if it appears that the group supports this item; and Commissioner Long concurred and expressed concern that the white paper might not be taken seriously; whereupon, Ms. Caron referred to an earlier conversation in which it was suggested that the white paper show recommendations from the CRC and a “gray” paper be created showing items discussed but not approved.

Representative Ahern commented that the Term Limits item failed for lack of a second and it would be inappropriate to add it to the white paper, noting that it will be covered in the minutes. Mayor Bradbury stated that only items recommended by the Commission should be put in the white paper; and that the report to the County Commission should clearly indicate it was not recommended by the members. Following discussion and at the suggestion of Mr. Pressman, Chairman Olliver noted a consensus to add a discussion about the white paper to next month’s agenda, and no objections were noted.

REDISTRICTING - APPROVED WITH FRIENDLY AMENDMENT RE DISTRICT ATTRIBUTES

Mr. Harless indicated that at the last meeting, the Commission voted 11 to 2 to take the political power of drawing the boundaries for the County Commission seats away from the Planning Department and the County Commission and give it to a panel of citizens. He indicated that there are two unresolved issues: the role County staff will play in assisting the new Citizens Redistricting Board and confirmation from the Supervisor of Elections that she or a designee will serve on the panel; whereupon, he reviewed the redistricting proposal and the recommendation outlined in the agenda packet, which has been filed and made a part of the record.

Thereupon, Mr. Harless moved, seconded by Mr. Shulman, that the redistricting proposal and recommendations be approved.

During discussion, Representative Ahern commented that he sees no compelling interest from the citizens; that he is not aware of a problem; and that he does not support the motion. Mayor Bradbury indicated that she runs as a non-partisan candidate and is concerned that the political parties would become involved; and that she does not support the motion.

April 6, 2016

Responding to the comments of Representative Ahern, Mr. Harless stated that the goal of the CRC is to examine the core function of government and how it works; that gerrymandering happens and is as old as Time; that a movement is happening throughout the country prohibiting people holding offices from drawing their own seats, both for ethical reasons and for good government; and that by having a citizen board, a greater voice would be given to communities.

Mr. Harless reviewed the redistricting that occurred in 2000 and discussed the six Attributes for the districts shown on Page 5 of the agenda memorandum:

1. Not to favor or disfavor a political party or incumbent.
2. Not to deny racial and ethnic minorities the equal opportunity to elect representatives of their choice.
3. Must be contiguous and within three percent of equal population.
4. Make use of existing municipal boundaries where feasible.
5. Maintain similar communities of interest.
6. Give consideration to keeping unincorporated areas together where possible.

Answering Mayor Bradbury's concerns that the process would become politicalized, Mr. Harless stated that Attribute No.1 should prevent politicalization; and that he is confident the BCC would not consider the political leanings of the citizens they appoint; whereupon, Mayor Bradbury pointed out that currently County staff, not the Commissioners, draw the seats, but the Commissioners would appoint the panel. During discussion, Mr. Harless stated that the Planning Department does not operate under guidelines, but only considers population; whereupon, he reiterated that the proposal would solve two problems: take redistricting out of the hands of those who benefit directly, and provide guidelines for drawing the individual districts.

Commissioner Long stated that meetings were held throughout the county during the 2000 redistricting when the number of commissioners was being increased. She referenced a recent countywide citizen survey, and related that it showed the citizens overwhelmingly approve the way the County is being governed, noting that she has asked the BCC Chairman to provide a copy of the survey to the Commission. Chairman Olliver alluded to an offer for the County Administrator to appear before the CRC to review the survey findings, and related that he had not considered it to be the best use of the members' time to have him for today's discussion.

April 6, 2016

Mayor Bradbury expressed concern regarding Attribute No. 3, the requirement that a district must be within three percent of equal population and use existing municipal boundaries; whereupon, Mr. Harless pointed out that the words *where feasible* would allow flexibility.

Clerk Burke commented that there seems to be two issues, and in response to his query, Attorney Vose reviewed the Florida Constitution as it relates to County Commissioners drawing the districts. The Clerk pointed out that there seems to be a misconception that Pinellas County staff is empowered to draw the districts and recommend them to the BCC, noting that is not the case; whereupon, he indicated that he supports creating a separate entity.

Mr. Harless stated that he would be open to friendly or unfriendly amendments and would prefer the CRC vote on separate aspects of the proposal rather than reject it in its entirety. Chairman Olliver indicated that he is leaning toward voting no, as he is concerned about the proposals being binding rather than advisory; and Mr. Steck suggested that rather than creating a new entity, an amendment could be crafted giving the responsibility for drawing the lines to County staff, rather than the BCC; whereupon, Mr. Harless related that while he would be open to making the proposals advisory rather than binding, he would prefer there be a separate entity.

Thereupon, Chairman Olliver stated that the motion on the floor is to approve the entire proposal with the four components shown in the backup: (1) Appointment of the Board, (2) Binding Proposals, (3) Timeframe for Work, and (4) Guidelines for Districts. Clerk Burke pointed out that there does not appear to be enough support to approve the motion as submitted, and in response to his comments, Chairman Olliver reiterated that the members approved the concept of a separate entity at the last meeting.

Clerk Burke offered a friendly amendment, seconded by Commissioner Long, that the new redistricting panel's work product be a recommendation to the BCC rather than a binding document; whereupon, Mr. Harless accepted the friendly amendment and indicated that the wording of the proposal would be changed to reflect the amendment.

\* \* \* \*

At this time, 5:17 P.M., Mayor Bradbury left the meeting.

\* \* \* \*

Thereupon, Chairman Olliver displayed the Redistricting Proposal and its components and indicated that component No. 1, *Appointment of the Board*, would remain the same, and no objections were noted.

April 6, 2016

Chairman Olliver indicated that component No. 2, *Binding Proposals*, would be changed to *Advisory Proposals*, or some similar language, and the explanatory language would be crafted by Mr. Harless, and no objections were noted.

Chairman Olliver indicated that component No. 3, *Timeframe for Work*, would remain the same and, following discussion, no objections were noted.

Chairman Olliver indicated that several members had concerns regarding the six Attributes listed under component No. 4, *Guidelines for Districts: Should General Recommendations and Guidelines be Included?* and opened the floor for suggestions. Representative Ahern asked that No. 5, *Maintain Similar Communities of Interest*, be removed. Clerk Burke commented that the Attributes should be factors to be considered, but not binding; whereupon, Mr. Harless suggested that the first three Attributes be considered firm, and the last three not binding.

Thereupon, Clerk Burke moved, seconded by Mr. Steck, that Attributes Nos. 1 through 3 be binding and Nos. 4 through 6 be advisory. Mr. Harless accepted the friendly amendment, and discussion ensued.

Upon the Chairman's call for citizens wishing to be heard, Mr. Harrison indicated that he supports the proposal, but would prefer that it be binding on the BCC.

In response to query by Mr. Pressman, Mr. Harless confirmed that the maps drawn by the new Citizens Redistricting Board would be advisory to the BCC, not binding.

Upon call for the vote, the motion with the friendly amendment carried, with Mr. Pressman dissenting. In response to query by Clerk Burke, Chairman Olliver confirmed that the item is approved; whereupon, he stated for the record that Mayor Bradbury had to leave the meeting, but had requested that she be shown as dissenting.

PROCUREMENTS INVOLVING LARGE DOLLAR CONTRACTS – DENIED; MAY BE REOPENED IF EXPECTED CHANGE NOT MADE

---

Noting that the CRC has already discussed the item several times, Mr. Pressman requested that the Charter be amended to address the procurement process used for contracts involving large sums of money by allowing more public input. During discussion, Commissioner Long acknowledged that she provides updates to staff and the Commissioners, as she is the Commissioner appointee and considers it her fiduciary responsibility. She stated that the BCC adopted the ordinance in order to keep the procurement process pure; that the ordinance does not

April 6, 2016

prohibit lobbyists from speaking before the Board, but does prohibit them from speaking to the members individually before staff has presented its recommendation; and that the County Commission, not staff, selects the vendor.

In response to query by Mr. Steck, Commissioner Long indicated that the County Attorney had conceded earlier that Mr. Pressman has a point, but that after reviewing the documents and the current procurement process, he and the County Administrator are very comfortable with the current ordinance; that it is considered “best practice” throughout the state; and that Hillsborough County is considering replicating the Pinellas ordinance, as Pinellas seems free of the “hanky-panky” that plagues Hillsborough. Mr. Pressman indicated that at one time, the County allowed for a great deal of communication, but the pendulum has swung too far in the other direction; and that contrary to what the Commissioner said, staff very effectively filters the information provided to the Board. Representative Ahern concurred, noting that sometimes government finds it easier to stay with the status quo; whereupon, he opined that information is power when it comes to how the contracts are awarded.

During discussion, Ms. Caron opined that the topic is not a Charter issue; and Mr. Harless indicated that this seems to be an ongoing battle between lobbyists and bureaucrats, and described how lobbying is handled by the state.

In response to query by the Chairman, Commissioner Long indicated that she and the County Attorney are discussing a change that would allow lobbyists to address the Board as a whole during the procurement process, but not the members individually. Chairman Olliver agreed that a compromise is needed, and asked if a Charter amendment is needed or if the Commissioner thinks the plan she is discussing with the County Attorney will materialize. Commissioner Long provided more information about the current procedure, and indicated that the procurement staff reports to the County Administrator, not to the BCC; and that the BCC does not take the process lightly, noting that a \$250,000 cap limits the amount the County Administrator can authorize without coming before the Board. In response to query by Mr. Steck, Commissioner Long acknowledged that the change is not yet in writing; whereupon, Mr. Steck suggested that the matter be deferred until the next meeting when the County Attorney can attend.

Upon the Chairman’s call for a motion, Mr. Pressman moved, seconded by Representative Ahern, that the item be approved. Chairman Olliver summarized the proposal, indicating that it would break the cone of silence and allow lobbyists to communicate directly with the individual elected officials prior to the recommendation of staff and review by the full Board.

April 6, 2016

Mr. Steck moved to table the item, stating that if the CRC votes the item down and the County Attorney does not make the change, it cannot be brought up again; whereupon, Chairman Olliver indicated that the motion to table dies for lack of a second.

In response to query by Chairman Olliver, Mr. Pressman confirmed that the aforementioned \$250,000 figure should be inserted into his proposal.

Upon the Chairman's call for citizens wishing to be heard, Mr. Harrison indicated that he supports the cone of silence, but would recommend that there be a point in the process that would allow lobbyists a chance to provide information to the Board before staff makes its formal recommendation, which is usually approved.

Upon call for the vote, the motion failed by a vote of 3 to 8, with Clerk Burke, Commissioner Long, Chairman Olliver, Ms. Bell, and Messrs. Bardine, Harless, Shulman, and Steck dissenting.

Thereupon, noting that it would be contrary to the CRC's usual process, Chairman Olliver stated that in the spirit of today's conversation and in respect of what Mr. Steck was trying to accomplish by seeking to table the item, the topic would be pursued if the County Attorney has not made the aforementioned change before the final report, and no objections were noted.

AMENDMENTS VIA CITIZEN PETITION - DEFERRED TO NEXT MEETING

Ms. Meiller-Cook indicated that this Charter amendment item came via public input; that it addresses Section 6.02 of the Pinellas County Charter; and that it would change the requirement to get a Charter initiative on the ballot from the current 10 percent of registered voters to five percent.

\* \* \* \*

In response to the Chairman's request, Mr. Harless moved, seconded by Mr. Shulman and carried unanimously, that the meeting be extended by 30 minutes.

\* \* \* \*

Attorney Vose reviewed a chart showing the number of signatures required by other Florida Counties, and in response to queries by Representative Ahern and Mr. Steck, discussed whether the lesser standard encourages more citizen petitions, noting that most initiatives reviewed were not frivolous. He indicated that there are 631,000 registered voters in Pinellas County, and a five

April 6, 2016

percent requirement would be 31,500 signatures; and that the Charter does not provide for an ordinance by the initiative process.

Representative Ahern stated that since the CRC only meets every eight years, a need exists to change the Charter to make it easier for citizens to put an initiative on the ballot, both by changing the number of registered voters required to sign a petition and the number of days allowed to gather signatures.

Thereupon, Mr. Steck moved, seconded by Representative Ahern, that the proposal be moved forward, with the exact percentage to be decided at a future meeting.

During discussion and in response to queries by Clerk Burke, Attorney Vose provided information about the process; whereupon, Representative Ahern stated that it is an important opportunity for the CRC to provide a way for the people to influence the Charter process.

Mr. Steck indicated that he would be open to friendly amendments. Chairman Olliver, with input by Representative Ahern, offered a friendly amendment to lower the signature requirement to eight percent and to extend the time allowed to gather the signatures from 180 to 240 days. Mr. Steck accepted the friendly amendment, and discussion ensued; whereupon, Commissioner Long called the question.

Clerk Burke stated that this seems to be a change in procedure, as an item is usually not introduced and voted on at the same meeting; and that he needs to consult with the other Constitutional Officers; whereupon, he moved to table the item, seconded by Commissioner Long and carried unanimously.

Thereupon, Chairman Olliver informed the public that the item would be on the next agenda.

NON-CONFORMING PROPERTIES

Mr. Steck reported that the item is still being reviewed.

\* \* \* \*

At this time, 6:15 P.M., Ms. Caron and Messrs. Pressman and Bardine left the meeting.

\* \* \* \*

April 6, 2016

LAST CALL FOR TOPICS (DM&A)

No one responded to the Chairman's call for new topics; whereupon, he officially closed the floor for new topics to be introduced.

FACILITATION TEAM REPORT AND DIRECTION

DRAFT RECOMMENDATION FOR FINAL REPORT

Chairman Olliver directed that the facilitation team report be moved to the next meeting, and requested that the members review the draft language for the report.

DATES/TIME/LOCATIONS

Chairman Olliver stated that the next meeting would be held at this location on April 20, noting that probably all of the scheduled meetings would need to be held; whereupon, he directed that Ms. Hardwick follow through with the preparations for the public hearings, and no objections were noted.

REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS

Ms. Meiller-Cook and Attorney Vose agreed to provide information about citizen petitions that may have failed because of the signature number requirement and/or time allowed to gather signatures and a list of the items proposed by citizen petitions in Brevard County.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion by Mr. Harless, seconded by Mr. Shulman and carried unanimously, the meeting was adjourned at 6:18 P.M.