



**ENVIRONMENTALLY ENDANGERED LANDS (EEL) PROGRAM
PROCEDURES COMMITTEE (PC) MEETING
March 16, 2010
Attendance List**

PROCEDURES COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Priscilla Griffith
Pat Pasley
Rocky Randels
Diane Stees
Amy Tidd

EEL PROGRAM STAFF

Laura Clark
Mike Knight

GUESTS

Ross Hinkle, Selection and Management Committee
Linda Mannier, District 3 Commission Office
Paul Schmalzer, Selection and Management Committee
Doug Sphar, REAC Committee Member

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

*March 16, 2010
Approved June 8, 2010*



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

March 16, 2010
Meeting Minutes

CALL TO ORDER:

Rocky Randels, Chairman called the meeting to order at 2:02 PM.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

None.

Additional Discussion

Mike Knight, EEL Program Manager, explained that a couple of members of the Selection and Management Committee (SMC) would be participating in the meeting, although this was not a formal joint meeting of the two committees.

He also informed the group that he was recently interviewed by Matt Reed for the *Today in Brevard* TV show and that this program would air on March 17th at 4:30 and 10:00 PM.

MINUTES:

The minutes from the January 8, 2010 joint meeting between the Procedures Committee (PC) and Selection and Management Committee (SMC) were presented for approval.

Clarification was provided that the SMC had reviewed these minutes at their March 2nd meeting, and that they had been approved with one revision, which was the removal of a tracked changes line of the left margin of page 11. Additional clarification was provided that if the PC voted to approve the minutes, the final step for approval would be complete and the minutes would be finalized and posted to the EEL Program's Web Site.

Rocky asked for comments to the January 8th SMC/PC minutes.

Priscilla Griffith noted the need for clarification of the language on page 1 of a January 7th memo to the Committees from Don Lusk, Director of Parks and Recreation (P&R) and Mike Knight. She suggested adding the word "language" after the word "confusing". The group agreed this would be appropriate.

Rocky asked for other comments on the January 8th SMC/PC minutes.

MOTION ONE

Priscilla Griffith moved to approve the January 8th SMC/PC minutes, as amended.

Amy Tidd seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEMS:

SMC Membership Criteria - Review and Ranking Process

Mike explained that during the Brevard County Commissioner's meeting on October 20, 2009, the Board appointed one new member to the Selection and Management Committee and also

requested the broadening of the language for the SMC membership criteria with a focus on eco-tourism. He stated that during the November 10th Commission meeting, a citizen had requested that the Board reconsider the October 20th SMC appointment as the new appointee had been determined by staff not to have the scientific qualifications required for membership on the SMC. The Board discussed the citizen's request. Consideration was also given to adding a representative from the Tourism Development Council to the EEL Program's Recreation and Education Advisory Committee (REAC). No change was made to the October 20th SMC appointment, and no other formal direction was given to staff related to broadening the language for the SMC membership criteria.

Mike stated that during the January 8th SMC/PC meeting, staff received direction from the Committees to provide draft language related to the Board's request, which could be used as a starting point for consideration and discussion. He explained that draft language for revisions to the EEL Program's Land Acquisition Manual (LAM), which contains the SMC membership criteria, had been prepared for review and consideration along with suggestions for clarifying the SMC applicant review and ranking process. This additional step was taken based on the PC's review of a memo from Don Lusk, the P&R Director at that time, and Mike Knight, as there was discussion by some Commissioners during the October 20th Board meeting which indicated that some members felt there was confusing language in the LAM related to how the review and ranking process should be carried out.

Mike stated that the draft language was only a starting point and the Committee should review it and provide suggestions for additional revisions, if needed.

He also stated that staff had also prepared a response to the concerns expressed by Sue Hann in her January 8, 2010 memo to the SMC and PC related to trails, and to her suggestions for revision to the membership criteria for the EEL Program's Recreation and Education Advisory Committee.

Rocky stated that he was supportive of clarifying any language in the LAM which might be confusing related to the review and ranking of SMC applicants.

Ross Hinkle, SMC member, asked for clarification of how applicants were reviewed and ranked for the October 20th appointment.

Mike explained that he had reviewed the applications personally, and that a few other staff had looked at them, but he had not asked for feedback from staff. He stated that he had gone through the list of qualifications as they are found in the LAM.

Mike added that one of the things that was noted was during some of the previous review and rankings, a system which assigned a number to years of experience for each item had been included by staff in the ranking process. However, there is no mechanism in the manual which authorized staff to do that, so he chose not to do follow that example and no one had received any additional points based on years of experience. In addition, there were times when only the applicants deemed to be qualified had been submitted to the Board, and there were times when all the candidates' names were submitted, with clarification being provided regarding who was qualified, and who wasn't.

Ross provided comment on the draft language for Page 2-17, 6.a. which suggested the qualifications of all SMC applicants should be reviewed by a qualifying committee consisting of the

EEL Program Manager, the Director of Parks and Recreation (P&R), and the Director of Human Resources (HR).

Ross explained that at the University, the Biology Department would not have the English Department review Biology candidates, and that with that makeup, in a worst case scenario, there might only be one person on the Applicant Review Committee with full knowledge of the criteria and what it really means. He stated he felt there may be a general misunderstanding of what the criteria represent, and that they were written to be specific so that the Program maintains the science credentials of the people who serve on the SMC.

Rocky stated that Ross's comments were good, and that the group needed to do the right thing because the process isn't broken; it has worked for 20 years. He stated that if revisions didn't make the Program better, then they shouldn't be done.

Ross stated that he hesitated to make this statement over and over again because of the possible perception of arrogance, but the SMC was designed to be made up of scientists who have specific training to meet the objectives of the EEL Program and that the Program has preservation of biodiversity as the top notch objective.

Rocky agreed that the primary objective of the EEL Program is the protection of biodiversity.

Ross stated that in dealing with the passive recreation component of the Program, most people who work in conservation biology utilize areas with some component of recreational use, so people on the SMC are familiar with some level of recreational use on conservation sites.

He added that some members of the SMC have backgrounds in biology education; some are professors, and some are not, but the point is, it is important to maintain the criteria for meeting the objective of the Referendum as it was developed by the Community, vetted through the Community, and passed by the Community, and that it is very important to be careful not to corrupt that criteria.

Diane Stees stated she understood why it was a good idea not to leave the review and determination of whether or not an applicant to the SMC met the membership criteria to a single person, but she felt that the P&R Director choice could be a concern and she suggested consideration of a citizen watch dog, like someone from the League of Women Voters, or someone from the PC.

Amy Tidd agreed that a representative from the PC might be a good choice.

Diane stated she felt it was important to include someone with knowledge of the history of the EEL Program and an understanding of what the EEL Program is about.

Mike stated his primary thought had been to increase the number of people doing the review, not necessarily to identify the specific individuals.

The group discussed possible pros and cons related to including the P&R Director as a member of the Qualifying Committee.

The group discussed the possible pros and cons related to including the Natural Resources Department Director as a member of the Qualifying Committee.

The group discussed possible pros and cons related to including a science based person who met the criteria for SMC membership to be included as a member of the Qualifying Committee.

The group discussed possible pros and cons related to including a biology based person from one of the universities as a member of the Qualifying Committee.

Ross stated he felt that having someone from HR on the Qualifying Committee would help ensure that consideration was given to Equal Employment Opportunities (EEO) and American's With Disabilities Act issues, while recognizing this was a volunteer appointment.

Amy Tidd suggested consideration of having an odd number of people on the Qualifying Committee in order to eliminate the possibility of having a tie vote.

Additional concerns were expressed regarding the possible issues that might arise if all the members of the Qualifying Committee had employment that was based on the Board's approval of their actions.

It was determined that member of the Procedures Committee would be a good choice as a member of the Qualifying Committee, and that they would also ensure the process was followed correctly.

Public Comment

Doug Sphar, from the REAC Committee, stated he felt that consideration should be given to narrowing down the number of members on the Committee and that if any ambiguity was removed, it would be more of a crank turning process, and couldn't be so easily fouled. He suggested consideration of the EEL Program Manager, HR Director, and an outside scientist.

Additional Discussion

The group held additional discussion regarding the pros, cons, and possible difficulties in choosing the criteria for including an outside scientist as a member of the Qualifying Committee.

Paul Schmalzer emphasized the need to keep the process and Program as apolitical as possible.

Priscilla Griffith and Amy Tidd expressed their agreement with Paul's statement.

The group discussed including a current, or former, SMC member as a member of the Qualifying Committee.

Rocky asked Pat Pasley, who was a recent PC appointment, for her thoughts.

Pat spoke of the importance of having members of the Qualifying Committee possess a true understanding of the SMC membership criteria and she stated that it did not seem to her that the process required fixing.

Ross stated that he felt the SMC had been extremely happy with the way that potential candidates were reviewed during the staff review and ranking, but they had not been happy with the way the candidates were selected by the Board because the criteria were not followed. He added that he agreed with the previous statements by others during the meeting that the process really was not broken.

Mike explained that there had been fundamental differences of opinion as to whether or not one of the applicants was, or was not qualified.

Mike stated that as staff, his response to the discussion was to offer a solution which expanded the number of people doing the review and ranking of applicants.

Ross suggested consideration of having the EEL Program Manager review and rank the applicants, as before, and then submitting the applications to the PC and the SMC to have them verify and provide comment.

Public Comment

Doug Sphar reminded the group that during the last staff ranking and submission of applications, a list of all the candidates had been provided to the Board, and he expressed his feeling that the names of people who were not qualified should not have been submitted to the Board for consideration. He stated that a situation had occurred where a person who was not qualified was appointed by the Board and that their name should never have been on the list to be considered as an appointee. He stated that the rules should be cleaned up so that the Board should only be presented with a list of well qualified candidates.

Additional Discussion

Mike provided clarification that even though all of the names of the people who had applied for the SMC opening had been submitted to the Board, the ranking sections for the two people who were determined not to meet the qualifications had been blocked out in addition to including information that indicated they were not qualified during staff's review. He added that the only other person who was determined to be not qualified by staff was a biologist from Florida Institute of Technology who had noted on her application that she had just recently moved to Brevard County, and was not yet knowledgeable of local habitats and ecosystems.

The group discussed adding the word "qualified" to Section 2-17 6a of the LAM: "...County EEL staff will provide the list of qualified applicants / nominees to the Board for review and ranking", and to the appropriate section on page 13. It was determined that this change would be beneficial.

Ross stated that he felt that the LAM included a typo in that area and that the revised version was the way it was always intended to be handled.

Priscilla, Diane and Amy stated that they agreed that the revised version which indicated that only a list of qualified applicants should be submitted to the Board for consideration was the original intent of the process.

Paul agreed.

Amy expressed concern that if the Program Manager was replaced with a person who did not have an environmental background, no one on the Qualifying Committee would have a science background.

Ross stated that was the reason he had suggested the PC and SMC make a statement to confirm whether or not they agreed with staff's review and ranking.

Mike stated that it could be perceived negatively if the SMC was involved the review of the applicants qualifications.

Ross said that he had not said that the SMC had to be included; he had just made that suggestion.

Rocky said that he felt that everyone agreed that the procedures, as established, had worked well for many years, and that it was his understanding that everyone was supportive of having only the qualified applicants forward to the Board.

The group agreed.

Additional discussion ensued.

It was determined that the following clarifications to the LAM regarding the review and ranking of SMC Membership appointments would be beneficial:

- A Qualifying Committee which includes the EEL Program Manager, Human Resources Director or designee, and the Procedures Committee Chairman or designee, will review all applicant/nominee applications for SMC membership and create a listing which clarifies the applicants/nominees who are qualified, and those who are not qualified.
- The listing and application packages will be forwarded to the entire Procedures Committee for review. The Procedures Committee will verify the list of qualified applicants through a majority vote at a Public Meeting for presentation to the Board of County Commissioners.
- Only qualified applicants will be sent to the Board for their review and ranking. (Two places in LAM.)
- If replacement EEL SMC members are required, the Board has the option, to choose from the existing pool of qualified alternates (as defined in 6b), as long as a review and ranking has occurred within the last two (2) years.

Clarification was provided that Priscilla, Diane, and Rocky had worked on the original Land Acquisition Manual at the beginning of the EEL Program's history.

Ross stated that if the Procedures Committee had any questions regarding the applications or someone's qualifications, the SMC would be available to answer any questions anyone might have.

Mike stated that revised, draft language would come back to the Committee for a motion.

Diane Stees stated that the Procedures Committee would talk later regarding the fact that there was non-compliance because they, as the Procedures Committee, are delegated with the authority for oversight of the Land Acquisition Manual and the Program rules. She said if you don't have rules, what do you have? Diane also said that Commissioners ignoring rules whenever they feel like it is not the way to govern, and is not an accountable government.

Priscilla stated that what had occurred was not a good example of the proper way a government should be run.

SMC Membership Criteria

The group reviewed staff's suggested draft revisions.

Mike stated the he had chosen to look at the reference to a "knowledge of other acquisition programs in the state is highly desirable" as an extra credit criteria and he had added that item as a 6th criteria so it could be ranked.

Paul stated that he thought that the intent had always been to refer to conservation acquisition programs.

Amy asked if adding the 6th item would rule out people who were otherwise qualified and expressed concern that if no one in the group had that particular experience, then none of the

applicants would be considered qualified.

The group discussed the pros and cons of including the item as a 6th criteria.

The group discussed consideration of changing “on natural areas” to “in natural areas”.

Public Comment

Doug Sphar asked for confirmation of whether or not an applicant in the last ranking had received extra credit for their expertise in this area.

Additional Discussion

Mike explained that was correct and that the person Doug was referencing had the highest score of any of the applicants.

Mike suggested consideration of review of criteria #4 “Have demonstrated concern for and have actively participated in environmental conservation”, because he felt it could be subjective.

Rocky stated that contributing \$10 to an environmental agency was technically demonstrating concern for, and actively participating, in environmental conservation.

The group agreed to remove criteria #4.

Ross suggested consideration of also removing #6: “Have familiarity with other land conservation acquisition programs”.

The group discussed clarification of criteria #3 related to the requirement for professional experience in the event that an applicant did not have the graduate academic degree in biological or environmental sciences listed in this section.

Diane asked the SMC members in attendance for their input regarding the minimum 6 year requirement listed in criteria #3, if the person didn't have one of the specifically required graduate degrees.

Ross and Paul stated they felt the 6 year minimum was reasonable.

The group discussed clarification regarding criteria #5.

It was determined that this criteria should be revised as follows:

- From: “Have familiarity with Brevard County ecosystems”
- To: “Have demonstrated knowledge of Brevard County ecosystems, and specific knowledge of habitat types and conservation land management techniques.”

Amy expressed concern that if the only score applicants received was a ranking of qualified, or unqualified, and everyone met the minimum qualifications, there would not be any clarification provided to the Board regarding who the most qualified applicants were.

Diane stated that she did not feel that they needed to add anyone from the Economic Development Commission (EDC) or Tourism Development Council (TDC) to the Selection and Management Committee, because it would be like adding a lawyer to a team of doctors and she suggested consideration of making them voting members of the Recreation and Education Advisory Committee (REAC). She emphasized that the group was going through the pains of making sure they got the right scientific expertise in the membership criteria, because a lot of what the SMC does is technical and they have to make decisions on land management, not just acquisition. She said that the Program needs to survive the political whims, because that's why it

was approved by the voters, and that she does not feel that non-scientists belong on the Selection and Management Committee.

Mike stated that staff would remove the suggested language relating to having an additional (8th) member on the SMC.

Priscilla reminded everyone that the original Land Acquisition Manual, and the original Selection and Management Committee were in place, and approved by the Board, before the passing of the referendum which established the Environmentally Endangered Lands Program.

Diane said that was why the second referendum had passed.

Priscilla agreed.

Amy said that the public understood and supported a science based program.

Diane agreed and stated that was why the referendum has passed again in 2004, with a 78% turnout and 70% of the vote in favor.

Paul stated he was not sure where the real estate appointee idea came from, because that was not in the language of the Board discussion that he recalled.

Mike stated that had been a result of his thought process regarding previous concerns that he has heard about the Program since he has become Program Manager, which related to appraisals and concerns about paying too much for land.

Paul stated that having a real estate person on the SMC would not change those perceptions as appraisal values are confidential until a contract agreement has been signed.

Mike said that he did not disagree.

Paul stated that there is already an extensive process in place to determine valuations through the appraisal process, the appraisal review process, and in the last couple of years, through the newly instituted County Land Acquisition Review Committee.

Mike confirmed that the Land Acquisition Review Committee, which consists of the EEL Program Manager, a representative from the County Attorney's office, Director of Planning and Zoning, Director of Natural Resources and a representative from the Clerk of Courts meets to review the appraisal valuation and highest and best use determination for any contract over \$750,000. He explained that this is happening at about the same time as the SMC final contract review, and before a contract goes to the BOCC for final approval.

Mike confirmed that the suggested information related to adding a real estate person to the SMC would be removed and that information regarding the Land Acquisition Review Committee would be added to the Land Acquisition Manual.

Public Comment

Doug Sphar stated that because the EEL Program has partnered with the State in some acquisitions, some sanctuaries are held to Florida Statutes, Chapter 259 which requires that properties be managed for the conservation purpose for which they were acquired and that this management requires scientific knowledge. He confirmed he was not supportive of having any one from the EDC, TDC or with a real estate background on the SMC.

Additional Discussion

The group discussed adding an EDC or TDC representative to the REAC Committee, instead of the SMC.

Ross stated that he felt that having a representative from the EDC or TDC would fall within the spirit of the management of these lands. He confirmed that the Sanctuary Management Manual subscribes to 10 Principles of Conservation and one of those principals is to encourage integration of natural resources in community discussion of economic development and quality of life. He added that it was not for the REAC committee to do that, but to encourage it, and he felt REAC can encourage and bring forward recommendations in that area.

Ross also explained that the SMC's role is to review suggestions for passive recreation and provide recommendations for which activities might be appropriate on individual sites. He also explained that all passive recreation activities are monitored for possible negative impacts to the conservation value of each site.

Confirmation was provided that EEL Program sites have been involved with the Space Coast Birding and Wildlife Festival for many years, and that several SMC members were involved in the organization of the original festival, while others have participated as tour guides during the many of the Festival's events, and that this is very significant to our local eco-tourism efforts.

Public Comment

Doug Sphar stated that the suggested process of having the District 1 Commissioner appoint an additional member to the REAC Committee would not be equitable in the long term.

Additional Discussion

It was determined that staff will provide draft language for adding an 11th member, related to the TDC, to the REAC Committee.

Mike will incorporate revisions and present a revised draft for review by the Committee.

Staff response to Sue Hann's January 8, 2010 Memo to SMC and PC.

Mike explained that he had gone through the letter which Sue Hann had presented to the SMC and PC during the January 8th meeting of the two committees to attempt to provide staff response to the issues.

Sue Hann Recommendation #1:

"Modification that would add a recreational expert to the EEL staff, who would be tasked with developing and implementing a recreational vision/plan for the Program."

Staff Response: "The County Commission has already approved several revisions to the EEL Sanctuary Management Manual that included adding a revised organization chart that reflects the current staffing structure. The restructuring of the Volunteer Coordinator position as the Public Use Coordinator is one of the changes that had been done several years ago. This position is currently held by Brad Manley.

The Pubic Use Coordinator job description currently states the following:

- 'Works directly with the regional land managers to develop countywide passive recreation plans for the Environmentally Endangered Lands Program sanctuary network, to include site assessments, recreation plans, time lines for development, permitting and implementation of development plans.'

EEL Program Procedures Committee Meeting

March 16, 2010

Page 9 of 13

Approved June 8, 2010

- ‘Manages the on-going maintenance and monitoring of passive recreation resources including: trail head parking areas, trails, kiosks, and trail signage.’
- ‘Manages the development, revisions and availability of public access information and access maps.’
- ‘Thorough knowledge of environmental land conservation principles and objectives as they relate to the development and management of passive recreation opportunities.’
- ‘Ability to design and implement recreational land use programs, environmental education programs and other related land management activities.’

Based on the existing structure and responsibilities of the EEL Public Use Coordinator, and the B.S. Degree in Outdoor Recreation held by the Program Manager, it is not necessary to expand recreational expertise any further.”

Additional Discussion

Mike stated that Brad Manley currently holds the position of EEL Program Public Use Coordinator, which he felt addressed the issues in the first recommendation, although since the Sanctuary Management Manual had not been updated to reflect the position, it was possible that Sue was not aware of that change to the staffing structure.

Mike also explained that Brad Manley is the staff liaison for the REAC Committee.

Paul stated that Brad reports activities of the REAC to the SMC during SMC meetings.

Sue Hann Recommendation #2:

“Modification that would require development of a section of the LAM regarding management plans that specifically address:

- Trails that exist prior to EEL acquisition.
- Firebreak construction and maintenance relative to trails.
- Trail networks that are desirable for passive recreational users.”

Staff Response:

“Staff is developing a set of internal guidelines for consideration by the REAC and Selection and Management Committee that will address the following:

- Trail assessments that consider historic trails and new trail locations in relation to site restoration and other management activities, including separation from fire breaks whenever feasible.
- Trail systems that enhance educational opportunities, encourage public visitation, and foster a strong community support for the long-term protection of the property.
- Greater focus on ADA accessibility opportunities on Category 1 and 2 sites.
- Assessment process that considers the primary ecological management priorities of the management staff to ensure that their time is not disproportionately consumed with trail maintenance activities.
- Partnerships with user groups that can assist with the development and maintenance of trail resources.

These guidelines could easily be incorporated into the next revision of the Sanctuary Management Manual.”

Additional Discussion

Mike stated that he felt that staff was definitely addressing this issue and that they understood the need for trail networks that are desirable for passive recreational users. He said that staff is in the process of having Sue and Murray determine if staff is addressing some of the concerns that they have had, and that in the future, information regarding the placement of fire breaks and planned restoration activities will be included during the REAC Public Access reviews.

Paul stated that he wanted to make a comment about trails that existed prior to EEL Program acquisition. He said that sometimes existing trails are very useful as part of the trail network, and that the trails at the Enchanted Forest were largely pre-existing, but that trails which existed prior to EEL acquisition were not designed, they were not engineered, and they were not placed to minimize environmental impact. He said that pre-existing trails were historic trails and roads, or were made by ATV, mountain bike, or other users who were doing things, quite often, in his opinion, without anybody's permission. He also said that you can't automatically say that because a trail was already there, it should remain, because the impacts may be significant over time.

Diane asked if existing trails were sometimes grandfathered in.

Ross stated that in some cases, they can be.

Public Comment

Doug Sphar stated that he has participated in many REAC meetings and that he thinks part of the problem is a lack of knowledge of burn management and burn regimes. He said that he takes care of trails on the Tosahatchee Wildlife Management Area, and they don't have firebreaks on trails there, but they have 28,000 acres. He explained that many of the EEL Program properties are smaller sites, surrounded by residential development, so they had to have smaller burn units for safety reasons. He said that when you put in a fire break, you fragment habitat, and when you put in a trail, you fragment habitat, all of which can cause too much fragmentation. He added that in his opinion, it might be possible, once heavy fuel loads were reduced, to combine some of the firebreak units and reduce the fragmentation. Doug confirmed that EEL Program staff have plans to attend a future REAC meeting to provide information on Prescribed Fire.

Additional Discussion

Mike said that the first test will be the Indian Mound Station Sanctuary. He agreed that it may be possible to enlarge the size of some of the fire units once management activities have been completed.

Mike stated that since Sue was not able to attend the meeting, he wanted to share that he and staff understand that from a user perspective, it is extremely frustrating to be able to ride on a trail one day, and then arrive at the site for another ride and find out that the trail has been suddenly turned into a mineral soil firebreak that is currently unusable as a mountain bike trail.

Ross emphasized the importance of reducing fuel loads before prescribed fires and he stated that hot fires can generate their own weather.

Mike explained that staff is developing a set of internal guidelines related to trail management that addresses the concerns that have been raised, and that at some point, the guidelines would be reviewed by the REAC and SMC.

Sue Hann Recommendation #3:

“Modification that would reconstitute the Recreation and Education Advisory Committee to have members with qualifications similar to the SMC, but with specific recreation, engineering, and other credentials that would provide a more “science-based” recreational input. Criteria should also include active recreational users of EEL properties.”

Staff Response:

“The current criteria for REAC members allows the opportunity for anyone with an interest or experience in the passive recreational activities identified in the Sanctuary Management Manual to serve on the committee. The current criteria does not restrict participation by active users of a sanctuary. Staff believes that the establishment of trail development and management guidelines as noted above, are an appropriate solution to the trail concerns currently being expressed.”

Additional Discussion

Mike said that he did not feel that a change to the criteria for REAC members was needed.

Several members of the group agreed.

Mike said that the topic could be discussed, if the Committee felt it would be beneficial.

Several members of the Committee stated that there was no need to continue discussion on this recommendation.

Sue Hann Recommendation #4:

“Modification that would have the REAC report to the Board of County Commissioners jointly with the SMC rather than advisory to the SMC.”

Staff Response:

“All management and recreation plans recommended for approval by the SMC to the Board have been supported by the REAC. It is understood that some REAC members have expressed concern that in the past, recreation plans were not presented along with the fire management and future restoration plans for the property. As a result, staff has taken steps to ensure that any future recreation plans coming before REAC will include fire line locations, and general information regarding habitat restoration locations.”

Additional Discussion

Amy Tidd stated she did not agree with this recommendation.

Mike stated that this recommendation was not consistent with the way the Resolution which established the REAC Committee was set up, and that the Citizen’s Advisory Group referenced in the original Sanctuary Management Manual also provided for that committee to report directly to the SMC.

Ross stated that Recommendation #4 would, in some cases, cause the BOCC to have to resolve a management or use issue, based on the SMC’s recommendation versus the REAC Committee recommendation and he did not think that would be a good situation.

Rocky agreed.

Mike provided clarification that with the exception of the paved trail issue at the Malabar Scrub Sanctuary (which was eventually approved), the SMC has approved all recommendations made

by the REAC Committee and that he felt the Board would much prefer to have the issues worked out outside of the Board Room.

Sue Hann Recommendation #5:

“Modification to require better coordination with the Space Coast TPO to ensure that regional trail planning and construction is a mission/value/goal of the EEL Program, rather than the EEL Program functioning somewhat like a recalcitrant permitting agency as is the current experience.”

Staff Response:

“Steps have been taken to ensure that the EEL Public Use Coordinator regularly participates in TPO meetings to ensure greater coordination and communication regarding regional trail connectivity to EEL sanctuary trail systems.”

Additional Discussion

Mike provided clarification that the EEL Program’s Public Access Coordinator has been regularly participating in the regional trail planning meetings and that arrangements have been made to ensure a representative from the EEL Program can attend in the event that Brad is unavailable.

Language for Sale of EEL Program Land

Mike explained that this item would be discussed at the next meeting, due to the current time constraints.

Diane suggested consideration of adding sub-titles to the steps which had been previously discussed.

Clarification was provided that the sale of the TICO property is the only land sale that has occurred in the history of the EEL Program.

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

Additional Discussion

Amy expressed her appreciation to staff and members of the SMC.

Ross stated that the responsibilities of the Procedures Committee are very important and that the SMC is available to assist the Committee if needed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:32 PM.

NEXT MEETING:

Staff will poll members to determine the next meeting date, which is expected to be in about 30 days.

ADJOURNED:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:32 PM.

SUMMARY OF MEETING MOTIONS:

- Motion to approve the January 8th SMC/PC minutes, as amended.