



OCTOBER 7, 2010

THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, IN AND FOR WASHINGTON COUNTY, MET ON THE ABOVE DATE AT 9:00 A.M. AT THE WASHINGTON COUNTY ANNEX, BOARD MEETING ROOM, 1331 SOUTH BOULEVARD, CHIPLEY, FLORIDA WITH COMMISSIONERS PATE, HOWELL, STRICKLAND AND BROCK PRESENT. ATTORNEY HOLLEY, COUNTY MANAGER PITTS, CLERK LINDA COOK AND DEPUTY CLERK GLASGOW WERE ALSO IN ATTENDANCE.

THE PURPOSE OF THE MEETING WAS TO HOLD A JOINT MEETING WITH THE WASHINGTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION TO GO OVER THE ORC RESPONSES.

VICE CHAIRMAN HOWELL CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER, OFFERED PRAYER AND LED IN THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

MIKE DERUNTZ, COUNTY PLANNER, PROVIDED THE BOARD WITH A LISTING OF THE VARIOUS POINTS IDENTIFIED IN THE ORC REPORT AND THE MATERIALS OF ALL THE CHANGES REFLECTED BASED UPON THESE COMMENTS.

MR. DERUNTZ EXPLAINED WITHIN THE STATE OF FLORIDA, THERE ARE GROWTH MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES AND THOSE ARE IDENTIFIED IN CHAPTER 163 FS AND 9.J5 FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. THOSE GUIDELINES REQUIRE EACH JURISDICTION HAVE A GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLAN TO FOLLOW THE MINIMUM STANDARDS SET FORTH IN THOSE REGULATIONS ON THE STATE LEVEL. FROM THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, THEY ESTABLISH THEIR GOALS, OBJECTIONS AND POLICY AND THEY HAVE TEN OF THOSE. FROM THAT, THEY GET THEIR LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE; THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE IS THOSE STANDARDS THEY APPLY TO THE VARIOUS ZONING OR LAND USE DISTRICTS. ONE OF THE REQUIREMENTS IS THEY HAVE TO UPDATE THEIR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN; THIS IS CALLED AN EVALUATION AND APPRAISAL REPORT. HE SAID THE COUNTY STARTED THIS PROCESS IN 2008 AND WENT THROUGH THE PROCESS COMING UP WITH AN EAR. THE EAR WAS SENT TO FL-DCA. THE FIRST THING THEY DID WAS TO GO THROUGH A VISIONING PROCESS WHERE THEY HAD A LOT OF INPUT FROM THE COMMUNITY; THEY HAD SEVERAL MEETINGS AND FROM ALL THIS INPUT THEY GOT THE EAR. FROM THAT, THE FL-DCA REVIEWED IT AND SUBMITTED THEIR RESPONSES.

MR. DERUNTZ REPORTED FROM FL-DCA'S ORC REPORT, THERE WERE 12 OBJECTIONS, 32 COMMENTS AND 5 RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH WERE IDENTIFIED IN THE INFORMATION HE HAD PROVIDED. THESE OBJECTIONS WERE TALKING ABOUT WAS THE FUTURE LAND USE MAPS, PLANNING HORIZON, POPULATION, DATA ANALYSIS, ETC. HE WENT OVER THE OBJECTIONS OF FL-DCA:

1. PROVIDE THE INFRASTRUCTURE FACILITY PLANNING FOR A FIVE YEAR WINDOW; THIS IS A CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN. THEY NEED TO DO THIS AND INCORPORATE THE SCHOOL ELEMENT INTO IT. HE WILL BE PROVIDING THIS TO THE BOARD; THEY DON'T HAVE IT AT THE PRESENT TIME.
2. PROVIDE A CONSISTENT SET OF POPULATION PROJECTIONS; THE POPULATION PROJECTIONS HAVE BEEN REVISED. THEY ARE WORKING WITH THE WFRPC, ALLAN GRAY; GRAY HAS UPDATED THOSE TABLES AND THEY ARE ALL BASED ON THE SHIMBERG ANALYSIS, WHICH USES BEBR NUMBERS.

DUE TO MR. DERUNTZ HAVING DIFFICULTY WITH THE SLIDE PRESENTATION, ALLAN GRAY, WFRPC, INTRODUCED HIMSELF. HE ADDRESSED MS. WALLER, THE PLANNING COUNCIL AND THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS HAD CALLED ON WFRPC IN 2008 TO HELP THEM COMPLETE THE EAR. IT WAS COMPLETED ON TIME AND IT WAS A GOOD PROJECT; AS MR. DERUNTZ HAD MENTIONED, IT INCORPORATED THE VISIONING PROCESS. TWO YEARS LATER, MR. GRAY SAID WE ARE HERE WORKING ON THE OBJECTIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS FROM FL-DCA ON THE EAR BASED AMENDMENTS. A LOT OF WHAT THEY HAD TO DO FROM HIS END FOR THIS PARTICULAR PART BASICALLY ENCAPTURES WHAT HAPPENED IN THE FIRST FOUR BIG OBJECTIONS; THEY WERE ABLE TO CLEAN UP THE DATA THAT WAS ASSOCIATED WITH THEIR SUPPORT DOCUMENT. HE EXPLAINED THE COMP PLAN HAS THREE BIG MAJOR PARTS; MAP DOCUMENT, POLICY DOCUMENT AND A FOUNDATION DOCUMENT. THE FOUNDATION DOCUMENT IS THE SUPPORT DATA THAT IS UNDER THERE GIVING FINE NUMBERS TO THE POLICIES THE BOARD HAS ADOPTED. A LOT OF THE QUESTIONS FL-DCA HAD WERE REGARDING THE FOUNDATION DOCUMENT. FL-DCA HAD A GREAT DEAL OF ISSUES WITH THE DATA SUPPORTING A LOT OF GROWTH FOR THE COUNTY. IN 2008, THE COUNTY HAD ADOPTED BEBR MID-RANGE AS THE

COUNTY'S MEASURE FOR POPULATION GROWTH FOR THE ENTIRE COUNTY; THAT IS ALSO WHAT THE SHIMBERG CENTER USES. FL-DCA LIKES THE SHIMBERG CENTER BECAUSE THEY ARE TRIED AND TRUE TESTED AND THEY UNDERSTAND THE WAY THEIR METHODOLOGY WORKS. FL-DCA HAS ASKED THE BOARD TO INCORPORATE THE SHIMBERG CENTER NUMBERS IN THEIR HOUSING DOCUMENT AND THROUGHOUT THE DOCUMENT TO SHOW THE FUTURE GROWTH OF THE COUNTY. THIS HAS BEEN DONE AND IT BASICALLY INVOLVED THEM SWITCHING OUT WHO THEY SAID THE DATA CAME FROM AND SWITCHING SOME OF THE DATA IN THE TABLES.

MR. GRAY ADDRESSED FL-DCA ALSO TALKED ABOUT THE INCONSISTENCY OF PLANNING HORIZONS; THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN SUBMITTED TO FL-DCA DIDN'T HAVE THE RIGHT DATE. IT WAS STILL CALLED THE WASHINGTON COUNTY 2010 COMP PLAN; THAT IS NO WAY TO PLAN AS YOU DON'T PLAN FOUR MONTHS IN THE PAST. FL-DCA ASKED THEM TO HAVE A PLANNING HORIZON DATE; A LONG TERM AND A SHORT TERM. THE SHORT TERM IS A FIVE YEAR PLAN; THE FIVE YEAR PLANNING HORIZON IS REFLECTED IN WHAT MR. DERUNTZ WAS TALKING ABOUT WITH THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN. THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN SHOWS THE FIVE YEAR OUTLAY; SCHOOLS, ROAD BUILDINGS, DIFFERENT COMMUNITY FACILITIES THAT MAY BE COMING ON LINE WITHIN THE NEXT FIVE YEARS.

MR. GRAY EXPLAINED THE LONG TERM PLANNING HORIZON IS THE 2020 WITH A MINIMUM OF TEN YEARS ON IT. THE COUNTY IS OKAY RIGHT NOW TO CALL THEIR PLAN A 2015 AND A 2020 PLANNING HORIZON. WHAT THEY HAVE NOW, AND IT IS GOING TO BE REFLECTED ON EVERY SINGLE PAGE OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, IS A NEW DATE. ON THE FUTURE LAND USE MAPS, THEY HAVE A DATE ON IT TO DEFINE THE PLANNING HORIZON; IT HAS 2020 AS WELL AS ALL THE MAPS FOR CARYVILLE, WAUSAU, EBRO AND VERNON. THIS IS DONE IN THE PARENT DOCUMENT, SUPPORT DOCUMENT AND MAP DOCUMENT.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL QUESTIONED IF ANY MAJOR CHANGES HAVE BEEN MADE TO THE FUTURE LAND USE MAPS. MR. GRAY EXPLAINED MR. DERUNTZ HAD GIVEN HIM A HANDFUL OF ORDINANCES THE BOARD HAS BEEN ADOPTING

FOR LAND USE CHANGES OVER THE LAST TWO YEARS. MR. GRAY SAID HE ALSO DID SOME HOUSEKEEPING TO MAKE SURE THEY HAD ALL THE RIGHT STUFF THAT MS. WALLER MAY OR MAY NOT HAVE GIVEN HIM WHEN HE WAS WORKING WITH THEM IN 2008. HE UPDATED THE COUNTY'S FUTURE LAND USE MAP TO CURRENT STATUS SO EVERY ORDINANCE THE BOARD HAS ADOPTED IS REFLECTED. AGAIN THE COUNTY DON'T HAVE JURISDICTION IN THE CITY OF CHIPLEY FOR PLANNING PURPOSES; THEREFORE, THE CITY'S FUTURE LAND USE MAP IS NOT A PART OF THE COUNTY'S FUTURE LAND USE MAP NOR IS THE DATA IN IT KNOWN RIGHT NOW TO US. HE INCORPORATED NEW DATA FROM THE PROPERTY APPRAISER'S OFFICE AS THEY HAVE NEW PARCEL DATA THAT COMES OUT ANNUALLY.

MR. GRAY UPDATED THE BOARD ON OBJECTION 4-A WHICH ADDRESSED THE COUNTY NOT HAVING AN EXISTING LAND USE MAP THAT SHOWS HOW LAND USE IS OCCURRING IN THE COUNTY; HE SHOWED A MAP THAT DOES SHOW WHAT IS HAPPENING IN THE CITY OF CHIPLEY. HE EXPLAINED THE IMPORTANCE OF THE COUNTY ANALYZING EVEN MUNICIPALITIES THAT AREN'T IN THEIR PLANNING JURISDICTION FOR AMOUNTS OF LAND USE, COMMERCIAL AMOUNTS OF LAND USE, LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL, MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL, ETC. HE REFERRED TO THE EXISTING LAND USE MAP REFLECTING THE PROPERTY APPRAISER'S DATA ON WHAT FOLKS ARE BEING TAXED AND WHAT TAXES ARE BEING DRAWN OFF THAT LAND. THERE ARE A HANDFUL OF PARCELS THAT ARE YET TO BE DEFINED; THE MAP WILL BE UPDATED BY THE 21ST WHICH IS THE ADOPTION DATE FOR THE AMENDMENTS TO THE COMP PLAN.

MR. GRAY EXPLAINED THE DIFFERENT TYPE OF DOCUMENTS THE COUNTY HAS AS PART OF THEIR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN; A MAP DOCUMENT, A POLICY DOCUMENT AND A FOUNDATION DOCUMENT. THE CRUCIAL PIECE OF A FOUNDATION DOCUMENT IS THAT IS SUPPOSE TO BE CURRENT DATA GOING FROM HERE TODAY TO 2013, 2015; IT IS SUPPOSE TO BE A CURRENT REGISTER OF WHAT IS GOING ON FOR THE SCHOOL FACILITIES DATA, ALL THOSE KIND OF THINGS THAT ARE SUPPOSE TO BE UPDATED AT RANDOM INTERVALS BY THE PLANNING STAFF. THE PLANNING STAFF STORES NEW DATA IN THE FOUNDATION DOCUMENT; IT DOESN'T REQUIRE ADOPTION BY THE BOARD AS IT DOESN'T

REQUIRE THE ADOPTION OF AN ORDINANCE, PUBLIC HEARING, ETC. TO CHANGE WHAT IS IN THAT DOCUMENT. IT IS JUST A SUPPORT DOCUMENT. INITIALLY WASHINGTON COUNTY'S 2010 PLAN NEVER MADE A DISTINGUISHING STATEMENT BETWEEN THE FOUNDATION DOCUMENT AND THE POLICY DOCUMENT; TO FL-DCA, THE COUNTY WAS ADOPTING CENSUS BUREAU DATA, DATA FROM BEAVER AND THE FACT IS THAT STUFF IS A CHANGING ANIMAL. THERE IS NOW A STATEMENT OVER EACH OF THEIR ELEMENTS IN THE COMP PLAN STATING THIS IS SUPPORT DATA AND IT IS NOT ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE ALONG WITH THE GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES. THIS SEPARATES THE FOUNDATION DOCUMENT FROM THE POLICY DOCUMENT.

MR. DERUNTZ THEN CONTINUED WITH HIS SLIDE PRESENTATION. COMMISSIONER HOWELL QUESTIONED WHAT THE LARGE PURPLE AREA WHICH HE ASSUMED WAS IN THE SUNNY HILLS AREA REPRESENTED.

MR. DERUNTZ EXPLAINED THAT WAS THE SUNNY HILLS MIXED USE DISTRICT. MR. GRAY WENT OVER WHAT WAS REFLECTED ON THE EXISTING LAND USE MAP AND WHAT WAS REFLECTED ON THE FUTURE LAND USE MAP IN SUNNY HILLS. HE SHADED THE LANDS THAT WERE VACANT AND UNDER SINGLE OWNERSHIP IN A LIGHT PURPLE.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL EXPRESSED HIS CONCERN THERE WAS A LOT OF PURPLE ON ONE OF THE MAPS AND NOT SO MUCH ON THE OTHER ONE. MR. GRAY EXPLAINED IT IS STILL THERE; BUT, WHAT THEY CAN'T SEE IS THERE IS A BROAD SPECTRUM OF OWNERS.

MR. DERUNTZ ADDRESSED THE MAP ON THE LEFT IS A LAND USE DISTRICT CLASSIFICATION SUCH AS AG, COMMERCIAL, ETC; THE MAP ON THE RIGHT IS LOOKING AT WHAT IS ACTUALLY ON THE GROUND, EXISTING LAND USES.

MR. GRAY SAID HE COULD SKETCH THE MUNICIPAL BOUNDARIES; THEN THE EXISTING LAND USE MAP MIGHT HELP THEM SEE THE BOUNDARY OF THE SUNNY HILLS MIXED USE AREA.

MR. DERUNTZ UPDATED THE BOARD ON ANY CHANGES THAT OCCURRED OVER THE LAST SIX OR EIGHT YEARS WERE INCLUDED IN THESE NEW MAPS FOR THE INDIVIDUAL COMMUNITIES. THERE WERE MINERAL RESOURCE AREAS, WETLANDS MAPS, FLOOD HAZARD MAPS, RECREATIONAL, ETC., INCLUDED.

MR. DERUNTZ ADDRESSED OBJECTION 4 AND THE DISPARITY THAT WAS OCCURRING; IT IS BEING PROPOSED TO ADD A COUPLE OF POLICIES. THEY WILL BE LOOKING AT THIS AS THEY GET THESE MAPS, LOOK AT THEM AND BRING THEM UP TO REALITY. HE GAVE AN EXAMPLE OF THE EXISTING LAND USE MAP ON A SMALLER SECTION IN THE SE PORTION; WHERE SUNNY HILLS IS AT AND THE CORNER OF BAY AND JACKSON IN THE SE SECTION. HE SHOWED WHAT THE LAND USE MAP SHOWS AND THE DIFFERENCE; IT IS SHOWING ALL THE PROPERTIES THAT HAVE BEEN SUBDIVIDED. THE DIFFERENCE IN THE COLORS ON THE MAP WAS THEM BEING OCCUPIED AND UNOCCUPIED; WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE OTHER MAP IT IS SHOWING AGRICULTURE/SILVICULTURE. WHAT THAT MEANS IN REALITY FOR ALL THOSE PROPERTIES ARE THEY ARE ALL NON-CONFORMING PROPERTIES AND THAT IS NOT A GOOD THING. THIS IS WHAT IS HAPPENING ALL OVER THE COUNTY. WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE BIGGER MAPS, YOU CAN SEE HOW ALL THIS AG/SILVICULTURE PROPERTY IS AND YOU LOOK AT THE OTHER MAP AND THERE IS A LOT OF SPACES. WHEN SOMEBODY WANTS TO DO SOMETHING ON THOSE PROPERTIES, IT IS A NON CONFORMING USE AND THEY HAVE TO ADDRESS THIS. ONE OF THE THINGS THEY ARE GOING TO BE CHARGED TO DO IS LOOK AT THE WHOLE COUNTY AND MAKE DETERMINATIONS DO THEY WANT TO KEEP THE PROPERTIES AS AG/SILVICULTURE OR DO THEY WANT TO AMEND THE FUTURE LAND USE MAP TO SAY THAT SHOULD BE LOW RESIDENTIAL BECAUSE THAT IS WHAT THE MAJORITY OF IT HAS BEEN DEVELOPED FOR. IT HAS BEEN SUB-DIVIDED THAT WAY; BUT, THE MAPS HAVEN'T BEEN FOLLOWING THAT. THEY HAVEN'T BEEN UPDATING THEIR MAPS. HE SHOWED AN EXAMPLE OF WHAT IS BEING PROPOSED AND THE PLANNING COMMISSION IS SUPPORTIVE OF THIS; THAT AREA THAT HAS BEEN SUBDIVIDED THEY ARE GOING IN TO SAY INSTEAD OF IT BEING AG/SILVICULTURE, IT IS RESIDENTIAL THEN IT IS NOT NON-CONFORMING. THEY ARE PROPOSING THIS ONE SECTION OF THE COUNTY BE AMENDED TO THAT.

MR. DERUNTZ CONTINUED ADDRESSING VESTED LOTS; WHEN YOU SEE ALL THESE LOTS THAT WERE SUBDIVIDED AND WHEN THE ORIGINAL COMP PLAN AND THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE WAS ADOPTED, THEY SET THIS DATE OF 1991 AS THE STARTING POINT, ANYTHING BEFORE THAT WAS VESTED AND ANYTHING

AFTER THAT NEEDS TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE COMP PLAN AND THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE. THAT WASN'T SPELLED OUT IN THE COMP PLAN.

COMMISSIONER PATE SAID HE THOUGHT THE AREA ON THE MAP AROUND ORANGE HILL AND SOUTH OF GILBERTS MILL WAS DONE BEFORE THE COMP PLAN AND LAND USE MAP WAS DONE; THAT IS WHY IT IS SUCH A MESS.

MR. DERUNTZ SAID THEY SHOULDN'T PUT THEM IN SAYING THEY CAN'T DO ANYTHING IN THE FUTURE; LET THEM CONTINUE THEIR USE. IT IS NON-CONFORMING; THEY WANT TO TRY AND SAY YOU CAN'T DO ANYTHING ELSE. YOU CAN'T ADD ON. IF YOU ADD ON THAT IS INCREASING THE NON-CONFORMITY; WELL, THAT IS PUTTING THOSE PEOPLE IN A REALLY HARD POSITION.

COMMISSIONER PATE ASKED HOW WERE THEY GOING TO FIX THIS. MR. DERUNTZ SAID FIRST THEY IDENTIFY WHAT THE COMPATIBLE LAND CLASSIFICATION DISTRICT IS; IF MOST OF THE PROPERTY IS SUBDIVIDED INTO LOTS THAT WOULD MATCH LOW DENSITY, THEY IDENTIFY IT AS A LOW DENSITY AREA. IF MOST OF THE PROPERTY IS UNDEVELOPED AND SUBDIVIDED, THEY PROBABLY WANT TO KEEP IT THAT. IF THE LOTS DON'T SUPPORT THE MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR HEALTH AND SAFETY, FOR SANITARY, ETC., THEY MAY HAVE TO GO THROUGH THE WHOLE COUNTY LIKE THAT; BUT, THIS ONE AREA THAT HAS BEEN BROUGHT TO THEIR ATTENTION, THEY ARE LOOKING AT REQUESTING THIS CHANGE BE MADE.

MR. DERUNTZ UPDATED THE BOARD ON OBJECTION 5; FL-DCA IDENTIFIED PREVIOUSLY THERE IS VARIOUS AGRICULTURE BUFFERING. THE COUNTY IDENTIFIED WHAT WAS ALREADY IDENTIFIED IN THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE AND PUT THOSE CRITERIA IN THERE WHICH IS A JUSTIFICATION FOR A VARIANCE.

MR. DERUNTZ ADDRESSED THE LOW DENISTY AROUND SPRINGS; THERE ARE CERTAIN THINGS THAT WERE ASKED TO BE DONE BECAUSE THEY HAD THE STATE STANDARDS THAT WERE REQUIRED. ONE OF THOSE THINGS WAS ABOUT SPRING SHEDS; PROTECTING THE GROUND WATER RESOURCES. HE STRESSED THIS BEING IMPORTANT; THEY DON'T WANT TO POLLUTE THAT BECAUSE IT IS OUR WATER AND THEY WANT TO MAKE SURE IT IS SAFE. FL-DCA IS



SAYING THE COUNTY NEEDS TO IDENTIFY GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES TO DO THAT. THEY HAVE DONE THAT BY ADDING THOSE IN THE LAND USE ELEMENT; THERE ARE OBJECTIVES 14-19 AND ALL OF THOSE IDENTIFY THE NEED, AND THESE STANDARDS WERE BASICALLY TRANSPOSED FROM OTHER AREAS THAT HAVE ADOPTED THESE STANDARDS THROUGH THE FL-DEP, TO ADOPT THE MINIMUM STANDARDS TO TRY AND PROTECT THESE WATER RESOURCES. THE COUNTY CAN ALWAYS INCREASE THE STANDARDS.

MR. DERUNTZ ADDRESSED OBJECTION 6 THAT HAS TO DO WITH THE AIRPORT IN BAY COUNTY. THEY ARE IDENTIFYING THE NEED TO GET AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH BAY COUNTY AND THEY ARE GOING TO DO IT BY 2012.

IN OBJECTION 7, MR. DERUNTZ SAID THEY WOULD BE LOOKING AT ENERGY CONSERVATION, REDUCING GREEN HOUSE GASES, ETC. FL-DCA IS TELLING EVERYBODY IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA, THEY NEED TO DEVELOP GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES TO ADDRESS THESE AREAS. THE COUNTY IS IDENTIFYING WHAT FL-DCA IS LOOKING FOR AND THEY ARE SLIDING IT IN SAYING THIS IS WHAT WE ARE GOING TO TRY TO ACCOMPLISH; THERE ARE SEVERAL AREAS THEY ARE DOING THIS, NOT ONLY IN THE FUTURE LAND USE ELEMENT. IT IS ALSO DONE IN THE CONSERVATION ELEMENT, TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT, ETC. THE OVERALL CONCEPT IS INSTEAD OF HAVING THE SHOTGUN APPROACH WHERE EVERYTHING IS GOING TO BE ALL OVER; THEY ARE GOING TO FOCUS OR CONCENTRATE THEIR COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES IN COMMERCIAL AREAS IN THE COMMUNITIES INSTEAD OF HAVING IT ALL OVER THE PLACE. THIS DOESN'T MEAN IT IS GOING TO ILLIMINATE ALL THE TYPES OF USES THAT COULD BE DONE IN AG/SILVICULTURE; BUT, THEY ARE GOING TO BE LOOKING AT THAT FURTHER.

MR. DERUNTZ SAID THEY ARE LOOKING AT THESE PROGRAMS AND GREENHOUSES AND AS HE MENTIONED EARLIER IT GOES INTO DIFFERENT AREAS; IN THE TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT, THEY ARE IDENTIFYING THOSE ADDITIONAL POLICIES. IN THE HOUSING ELEMENT, THEY HAVE INCLUDED OBJECTIVES 12 AND 14. IN THE CONSERVATIIN AREA, THEY ARE ADDING ADDITIONAL POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES.

MR. DERUNTZ EXPLAINED WHEN THEY GET TO OBJECTION 8, THEY WERE REFERENCING IN THE FUTURE LAND USE ELEMENT ABOUT THE KNIGHT OPTIONAL SECTOR PLAN; IN THERE, IT HAD THE WORDING "IS" AND IT HASN'T BEEN APPROVED. THEY MADE A CHANGE THERE.

MR. DERUNTZ TOLD THE BOARD HE WAS ADVISED YESTERDAY BY THE ATTORNEY ABOUT THE WELL ISSUE; THERE IS A TELECONFERENCE MEETING GOING ON WITH THE KNIGHT INTERESTS AND NWFWM. THERE ARE SOME NEGOTIATIONS THAT WILL BE HAPPENING AND THEY WILL LET US KNOW FURTHER.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN WAS PRESENT AT THE MEETING AT 9:40 A.M.

COMMISSIONER BROCK REFERRED TO THE AIRPORT ISSUE BEING FINALIZED IN 2012. HE QUESTIONED WHAT THIS WAS.

MR. DERUNTZ EXPLAINED THERE IS AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WHERE THE COUNTY IS GOING TO SAY THEY ARE GOING TO FOLLOW MINIMUM CLEARANCE AND HEIGHT STANDARDS SO IT WON'T INTERFERE WITH THE AIR TRAFFIC. THEY ALREADY HAVE SOME OF THOSE STANDARDS EXISTING IN THE COMP PLAN; IT IS JUST SAYING THEY WILL CREATE A DOCUMENT. THERE WAS A DOCUMENT THAT WAS SUBMITTED ORIGINALLY SEVERAL YEARS AGO; HE HAS TALKED TO THE COUNTY ATTORNEY ABOUT THAT AGREEMENT AND IT HAS NOT BEEN RATIFIED OR APPROVED BY THE BOARD. THIS IS SOMETHING THEY NEED TO DO AND THEY HAVE A COUPLE OF YEARS TO DO THAT.

COMMISSIONER BROCK ASKED IF THAT COULD POSSIBLY BE SOMETHING CONCERNING NOISE LEVEL, WILD LIFE, BIRDS. MR. DERUNTZ SAID ABSOLUTELY. THEY DON'T WANT TO APPROVE A LAND USE IN THE FLIGHT ZONE THAT WOULD ATTRACT A LOT OF BIRDS. HE GAVE EXAMPLES THEY DON'T WANT TO APPROVE A LANDFILL IN THE FLIGHT ZONE AREA OR ANY TALL STRUCTURES IN THAT AREA; THEY ALSO DON'T WANT TO HAVE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE FLIGHT PATH BECAUSE OF THE NOISE.

COMMISSIONER BROCK ASKED WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY IS IT TO CONTROL THE BIRD ISSUE IF THERE IS A PROBLEM. MR. DERUNTZ SAID THE COUNTY CAN DO WHAT THEY CAN WITHIN THEIR LIMITATIONS; ONE OF THE THINGS IS DON'T LOCATE LANDFILLS IN THAT FLIGHT PATH. IF IT IS EXISTING AG/SILVICULTURE, OPEN SPACE, THAT IS JUST NATURAL; YOU HAVE BIRDS

FLYING THROUGH THERE. BUT, AN ATTRACTED NUISANCE THAT BRINGS BIRDS IN IS WHAT THEY WANT TO TRY TO ELIMINATE.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND ADDRESSED BAY COUNTY HAS A LANDFILL ACROSS FROM BOZEMAN SCHOOL ON HIGHWAY 77 AND ASKED HOW FAR IS THAT FROM THE AIRPORT. MR. DERUNTZ STATED HE WAS NOT SURE; BUT, HE WOULD FIND OUT.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL EXPLAINED THAT WAS NOT A GARBAGE LANDFILL; THAT IS JUST A DEBRIS LANDFILL HE THOUGHT AND HE DIDN'T FEEL THEY WOULD GET THE BIRD ATTRACTION THERE LIKE AT A GARBAGE LANDFILL.

TED EVERETT QUESTIONED HOW CLOSE THE ACTUAL FLIGHT AREA COMES TO EBRO. MR. DERUNTZ ADVISED THERE IS A FLIGHT PATH THAT GOES RIGHT THROUGH EBRO.

TED QUESTIONED IF THAT WOULD BE TAKEN UP ON THESE MAPS. MR. DERUNTZ SAID ACTUALLY WHERE IT GOES THROUGH EBRO IS FARTHER AWAY; IT IS OUTSIDE THAT DISTANCE WHERE THEY ARE NOT GOING TO HAVE THAT ELEVATION PROBLEM. BUT, YOU MIGHT HAVE THAT NOISE ISSUE.

MR. GRAY SHOWED WHERE THE AIRPORT WAS ON THE MAPS STATING EBRO WAS THE CLOSEST MUNICIPALITY TO THE AIRPORT; AS THE CROW FLIES, HE ESTIMATED IT WAS GOING TO BE EIGHT MILES BETWEEN THE END OF THE RUNWAY. COMMISSIONER HOWELL ADDRESSED THE ACTUAL FLIGHT LINE COMES VERY CLOSE TO EBRO.

MR. DERUNTZ SHOWED THE DIFFERENT AIRPORTS ON THE MAPS AND WHERE THE CLEAR ZONE TOUCHES; THE STUDY THE AIRPORT GAVE THE COUNTY SHOWS IT ALMOST DISECTS EBRO.

TED QUESTIONED IF THE AIRPORT COULD ASK FOR AN ENLARGEMENT OF THAT ZONE ONCE THEY START INTERNATIONAL FLIGHTS OR IS THIS GOING TO BE PERMANENT.

MR. GRAY THOUGHT THE EQUIPMENT IS THE SAME KIND OF EQUIPMENT COMING IN RIGHT NOW AT BAY COUNTY INTERNATIONAL AND HE WOULDN'T THINK THERE WOULD BE ANY DIFFERENCE. HE THINKS THE ONLY TIME THIS WILL COME INTO PLAY IS CELL TOWERS AND RADIO TOWERS WITH THE DISTANCE BEING TALKED ABOUT. IT IS GOING TO BE THE GRANTING OF

A CELL TOWER ON SOMEONE'S LAND, MAYBE THAT IS AN AG USE IN THE CITY OF EBRO; BUT, THE AGREEMENTS NEED TO BE THERE.

COMMISSIONER PATE REFERRED TO WFRPC MEETING SEVEN OR EIGHT YEARS AGO AT THE PANAMA CITY BEACH AREA; THAT IS WHEN THEY WERE TALKING ABOUT LOCATING THE NEW AIRPORT OVER THERE. THEY HAD SOME FLIGHT PATTERNS THEN BECAUSE THEIR CONCERN WAS THE FLIGHT PATTERNS AT THE AIRPORT DIDN'T CRISSCROSS WITH TYNDALL AND EGLIN. HE DON'T REMEMBER ANY MENTION OF GARBAGE DUMPS AND BIRDS AT THAT PARTICULAR MEETING.

MR. DERUNTZ EXPLAINED THAT CRITERIA IS ESTABLISHED IN THE STATUTES UNDER FL-DOT. THE COUNTY HAS BASICALLY ADOPTED THIS ALREADY.

MR. DERUNTZ ADDRESSED OBJECTION 10 HAVING TO DO WITH ROADS AND IDENTIFYING OUR ROAD SYSTEMS. THEY ARE IDENTIFYING WHAT THE EXISTING ROAD SYSTEMS ARE, THE NUMBER OF LANES THEY HAVE, FUTURE ROADS AND LANES, EXISTING EVACUATION ROUTES, FUTURE EVACUATION ROUTES, PEAK HOURS, TRANSPORTATION LEVELS, EXISTING FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF THE ROADWAY SYSTEM, FUTURE FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF THE ROADWAY SYSTEMS, THE MAINTENANCE CLASSIFICATIONS AND THE LEVELS OF SERVICE, AMOUNT OF TRAFFIC ON THE ROADS, ETC. HE ADDRESSED JERRY BROCK, 911 COORDINATOR, IS WORKING WITH HIM ON GETTING A MAP OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICT, IDENTIFYING THE SCHOOLS, THE A ZONE AND B ZONE.

MR. DERUNTZ ADDRESSED OBJECTION 11; THEY ARE LOOKING AT THE SCHOOL DISTRICT AND IN THEIR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN, THEY HAVE ADOPTED THIS AS THE MOST RECENT ADOPTION LEVEL FOR THE SCHOOLS, THEIR TEN YEAR WORK PLAN.

MR. DERUNTZ ADDRESSED OBJECTION 14 GOES INTO THE CONSERVATION ELEMENT.

MR. GRAY EXPLAINED IF YOU CONTINUE TO HAVE LAND USE CHANGES IN THE COUNTY AND GO TO PUT THOSE LARGE SCALE AMENDMENTS THROUGH REVIEW OF THE FL-DCA, THEY ARE GOING TO HAVE THIS COMPLAINT EVERY TIME. THE COUNTY ADOPTED THE PSFE SAYING THE COUNTY SHALL UPDATE

BY REFERENCE, NAME, DATE AND AUTHOR THE MOST RECENT SCHOOL BOARD'S FIVE YEAR FACILITIES PLAN. IT IS SOME OF THE HOUSEKEEPING THE BOARD IS GOING TO HAVE TO DO FOR THE CIP AND FOR THE PSFE. FL-DCA SAYS THE SUPPORT DATA ONLY SUPPORTS IT AND DON'T ADOPT IT; SOME PIECES THEY MAKE YOU ADOPT AND THIS IS ONE OF THEM, THE FIVE YEAR DISTRICT PLAN THE SCHOOL BOARD ADOPTS.

MR. DERUNTZ WENT THROUGH THE COMMENTS; THEY ADDRESSED IN THE COMPREHENSIVE IMPROVEMENT ELEMENT, POLICY 1.9 ABOUT PEDESTRIAN AND BIKE PATHS. POLICY 11.5 THEY WERE CITING THE STATE STATUTES REQUIREMENTS THAT WAS OMITTED PREVIOUSLY. THERE WERE SOME WHERE THE NUMBERS WERE INCORRECT OR THERE WAS AN ASTERICK THAT WASN'T SHOWING. ONE OF THE THINGS THEY TALKED ABOUT WAS THE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL, AG AND RESIDENTIAL CLASSIFICATION. WHAT IS BEING PROPOSED IS THEY STRIKE OUT THE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL USES AS ALLOWABLE IN AG/SILVICULTURE AND ALSO IN LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL AREAS. THEY WERE RECOMMENDING A SPECIAL EXCEPTION IN A LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL. THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATION IS TO DEVELOP TWO NEW POLICIES AND THEY WILL BE PROVIDING THOSE BEFORE THEY FINISH ADOPTING THIS; THE POLICY FOR DEVELOPING WHAT A HOME OCCUPATION IS AND COMPATIBLE USES IN AG/SILVICULTURE, LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL. WHAT THEY HAVE PRESENTLY IN THE CODE IS A LISTING OF MULTIPLE USES IDENTIFIED AS NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL. HE EXPLAINED NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL IS LIKE WHEN YOU LIVE IN A SUBURBAN OR URBAN AREA OR CITY, THEY HAVE A NEIGHBORHOOD; WHAT KIND OF ACTIVITY CAN GO ON IN THAT NEIGHBORHOOD THAT WOULD BE PERMITTABLE. THERE WAS A WHOLE LIST OF ACTIVITIES LISTED IN THE AG/SILVICULTURE AREA; INDOOR RECREATION, GYMNASIUM, SPAS, COMMUNITY CENTERS, LODGES, TRADE SCHOOLS, MARTIAL ARTS, DEVELOPED EDUCATION CENTERS, FUNERAL HOMES, MORTUARIES, MEAT MARKETS, BAKERIES, FARM AND GARDEN SUPPLIES, BUILDING SUPPLIES, VEHICLE PARTS AND ACCESSORIES, RETAIL SALES, GROCERY STORES, SUPERMARKETS, HOME OCCUPATIONS, CATERING, TAILORING, BLUE PRINTS, LAUNDRIES, DRY CLEANERS, MECHANICS, RESTAURANTS, DRIVING RANGE, SMALL SCALE RETAIL

PLANTS, VETERNARIANS, HOSPITALS, BOWLING ALLIES, DEPARTMENT STORES, GROCERY STORES, FLEA MARKETS, TRADE SHOPS, SHEET METAL, ROOFING, UPHOLSTERY, ELECTRICAL, PLUMBING, VENETIAN BLINDS, ETC. AGAIN, THEY ARE GOING BACK TO THOSE TWO ELEMENTS FL-DCA IS WANTING THEM TO DO; IDENTIFY PROTECTING THEIR GROUNDWATER, TRYING TO HAVE ENERGY CONSERVATION AND IF YOU HAVE ALL THOSE USES GOING ALL THROUGH THE COUNTY, THEY ARE SAYING HOLD BACK ON THAT HAPPENING. BUT, ESTABLISH A POLICY WHERE PEOPLE COULD HAVE SOME TYPE OF ACTIVITY THAT IS RELATED TO THEIR HOME AS A HOME OCCUPATION OR A RELATED USE AS AN AGRICULTURE ACTIVITY. THIS WHOLE ASSORTMENT OF THINGS IS FINE IN A SUBDIVISION; BUT, MAYBE THEY OUGHT TO HAVE THIS AS A SPECIAL EXCEPTION. NOT TO SAY A PERSON CAN'T DO THIS; BUT, LET THE PEOPLE AROUND THEM BE AWARE THEY ARE DOING IT AND MITIGATE IF THERE ARE SOME TYPE OF ISSUES. THE PLANNING COMMISSION IS PROPOSING THAT CHANGE AND ADDING THIS NEW POLICY AND ALSO ANOTHER POLICY ESTALISHING AN ESTATE RULE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT. THIS CAME UP WHEN THEY GET INTO THE MINIMUM LOT SIZES; IN THE COMP PLAN IT SAYS, THE MINIMUM AREA IN THE AG/SILVICULTURE IS ONE UNIT PER TEN ACRES. WHEN IT GETS INTO THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, IT TALKS ABOUT YOU CAN SUBDIVIDE IF IT IS LESS THAN 4.5 ACRES OR IF YOU GO DOWN TO 1 ACRE LOT SIZE OR IT COULD GO SMALLER IF THEY HAVE WATER AND SEWER. THAT IS ALL FINE; BUT, WHEN YOU GO AND SEE WHAT IS HAPPENING, YOU ARE HAVING ALL KINDS OF THINGS THAT ARE GOING ON THAT HAS HAPPENED IN THE PAST OF LANDS BEING SUBDIVIDED AND NOT FOLLOWING WHAT THE COMP PLAN HAS PROPOSED THE COUNTY SHOULD BE DEVELOPED BY AND PROTECTING OUR AG LANDS, PROVIDING THE NECESSARY INFRASTRUCTURE FOR THE COUNTY. BY ESTABLISHING AN ESTATES RULE, IT WILL BRIDGE THAT AREA BETWEEN THE AG, WHICH IS THIS LARGE ONE UNIT PER TEN ACRES WHERE THEY CAN HAVE A FUNCTIONAL AGRICULTURE ACTIVITY, AND LOW RESIDENTIAL, WHICH YOU ARE LOOKING AT SUBDIVISIONS. IT WAS SUGGESTED THEY GO TO CREATING AN ESTATES RULE SO THEY WOULD HAVE THEIR 4.5 ACRE LOTS TO THE 10 ACRE LOT SIZES TO GIVE PERSONS THE OPPORTUNITY TO SUBDIVIDE BUT TO HAVE A LARGER LOT

AREA THAT WOULD BE COMPATIBLE TO THE AG TYPE USE.

COMMISSIONER HOLMAN REFERRED TO A DEVELOPMENT THAT STARTED ON BRICKYARD ROAD AND FOR SOME REASON IT CAME TO A HALT; BUT, THE PROBLEM NOW IS THERE IS A DRAINAGE ISSUE. THERE IS A HOUSE AND A RETENTION POND OR HOLDING POND NEXT TO IT; THE DEVELOPER HAS NOT WENT IN THERE TO TRY AND CORRECT THE DRAINAGE ISSUE. THE WAY THEY CUT THE PROPERTY TO DEVELOP IT IS ALL THE WATER IS COMING TO THE RETENTION POND AND COMING TO THE COUNTY DITCH AND IT IS FLOODING THE NEIGHBOR OUT. ON KENT ROAD AND GILBERTS MILL ROAD, THEY HAD A DEVELOPMENT THAT TRIED TO BE STARTED THERE AND THE COUNTY DIDN'T HAVE ANYTHING IN THE COMP PLAN OR LAND DEVELOPMENT TO PREVENT THEM FROM DOING IT. COMMISSIONER HOLMAN SAID THERE ARE DRAINAGE ISSUES AND THERE IS STORM WATER COMING OFF THIS PROPERTY WHICH WOULD AFFECT THE COUNTY ROADS AND THE SURROUNDING LAND OWNERS WAS GOING TO HAVE TO TAKE MORE WATER ON THEM. IN THE COUNTY'S POLICY, IN THESE SMALL DEVELOPMENTS, THEY HAVE A 25 TO 30 ACRE PLOT SOMEBODY WANTS TO DEVELOP, PUT TRAILORS ON, HOUSES, ETC. HE ASKED IF THERE WAS ANYTHING WITHIN THEIR LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE AND THEIR COMP PLAN TO HAVE THESE DEVELOPERS MAKE SURE THE STORM WATER AND WATER COMING OFF THESE DEVELOPMENTS ARE CONTROLLED AND WILL NOT PUT A BURDEN ON THE COUNTY OR THE SURROUNDING LAND OWNERS. HE SAID ON KENT MILL AND GILBERTS MILL, THE LANDOWNER NEXT TO THE PROPERTY TRYING TO BE DEVELOPED, IF THE COUNTY DOESN'T MAKE THE DEVELOPER CONTROL THE WATER COMING OFF THE PROPERTY THAT IS COMING ON TO THIS PERSON'S PROPERTY. THE COUNTY DOESN'T HAVE AN EASEMENT OR ANYTHING TO PROTECT THEMSELVES; THIS OTHER LANDOWNER CAN VERY WELL SAY THEY DON'T WANT THIS OTHER WATER ON THEM AND THERE IS NOTHING THE COUNTY CAN DO ABOUT IT. HE WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE BOARD NOT ALLOW THINGS OF THIS NATURE TAKE PLACE.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL ADVISED IT IS ALREADY IN THE POLICY NOW YOU CAN'T PUT WATER ON SOMEBODY ELSE THAT IS NOT ALREADY GOING THERE.

COMMISSIONER HOLMAN SAID HE UNDERSTANDS THAT; BUT, HE IS SAYING THESE SMALL DEVELOPERS BE MADE TO CONTROL THE WATER THAT IS COMING

OFF THEIR DEVELOPMENT. COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID THAT IS WHY THE DEVELOPER HAS THE RETENTION POND THERE ON BRICKYARD ROAD; IF IT IS NOT FUNCTIONING PROPERLY, IT IS UP TO THE COUNTY TO MAKE IT FUNCTION PROPERLY.

COMMISSIONER HOLMAN SAID SO FAR, IT HAS NOT FUNCTIONED PROPERLY.

MS. TONYA PIPPIN, WCPC, STATED IT WOULD BE UP TO THE DEVELOPER TO MAKE SURE IT IS IN COMPLIANCE.

MR. DERUNTZ EXPLAINED THIS IS A CODE ENFORCEMENT ISSUE. ONE OF THE THINGS THAT CAN BE DONE IS MODIFYING THE LDC AS IT IDENTIFIES SUBDIVISION DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS. IT IS THE DEVELOPER'S RESPONSIBILITY. ONE OF THE THINGS HE SEES AS MISSING THAT IS APPLICABLE IN OTHER AREAS IS THE COUNTY REQUIRE BONDING, MONIES FOR PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS SET ASIDE. THE WAY IT IS SET UP THEY DON'T HAVE TO DO THAT IF THEY ARE DEVELOPING THEIR PROPERTY; WHEN IT IS ALL DONE THOSE IMPROVEMENTS ARE IN. THEY HAVE THE SITUATION THEN FROM WHEN IT STARTS TO WHAT IS NOW; THERE ARE ALL THESE ISSUES THAT COME UP THAT COULD BE A CODE ENFORCEMENT ISSUE. BUT, IF YOU HAD A PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF THE COST OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE OR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE LAND IN SOME TYPE OF A BOND, THE COUNTY COULD GO BACK TO THEM AND SAY THEY ARE GOING TO HAVE TO ACT ON THEIR LETTER OF CREDIT BECAUSE THERE IS A PROBLEM AND THEY AREN'T DOING ANYTHING.

COMMISSIONER HOLMAN REFERRED TO IN THE PAST, THERE HAVE BEEN COMMISSIONERS THAT HAVE CUT THINGS SHORT WITH THE DEVELOPER; THEY HAVE ALLOWED THINGS AND SAID HIGHVIEW ACRES IS A PRIME EXAMPLE ON ORANGE HILL ACROSS FROM MOONSEED. NOW THE COUNTY IS HAVING TO DEAL WITH THIS AND IT IS COSTING THEM THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS TO TRY AND MAINTAIN AND FIX THAT PLACE BECAUSE THE BOARD AT THAT TIME DIDN'T MAKE THAT DEVELOPER DO WHAT THEY NEEDED TO DO. THIS IS WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THIS BOARD SITS HERE THEY APPROVE POLICY; BUT, YET THEY DON'T ENFORCE THAT POLICY.

MR. JIM TOWN SAID ONE OF THE STEPS THAT COULD BE USED TO HELP SOLVE THIS PROBLEM IS DEVELOPER'S AGREEMENTS THAT WHEN THE PLANNING



COMMISSION GOES THROUGH ALL THE MESSY DETAILS OF THE THING, THEY ACTUALLY REDUCE IT TO A WRITTEN CONTRACT AND BOTH PARTIES SIGN IT AND SAY WHAT THEY ARE GOING TO DO. THE COMP PLAN, LAND USE PLAN, GOALS OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES ARE ALL CONCEPTUAL AND DON'T GET DOWN TO THE LEVEL OF WHAT HAPPENS IF THE WATER DON'T GO TO THE RIGHT POND. WHERE YOU COVER THAT IN A LOT OF AREAS IS A DEVELOPERS AGREEMENT AND IT IS A CONTRACT; THE DEVELOPER SAYS IF YOU APPROVE MY PLAT, I WILL DEVELOP TO THOSE STANDARDS AND I WILL MAKE SURE THESE OTHER THINGS HAPPEN TOO. HISTORICALLY WE HAVE NEVER USED DEVELOPERS AGREEMENTS FOR MUCH OF ANYTHING EXCEPT STORMWATER DRAINAGE IN SOME CASES. BUT, IT CAN BE USED AS A VERY BROAD TOOL.

MR. DERUNTZ STATED THAT WAS ALL IN THE LDC UNDER THE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS.

ROGER HAGAN REFERRED TO IT BEING SAID THE RETENTION POND WAS THE DEVELOPER'S RESPONSIBILITY; IF THE DEVELOPER RECORDED THE PLAT AND GAVE IT TO THE COUNTY, IT WOULDN'T BE HIS RESPONSIBILITY WHEN THE COUNTY ACCEPTED THE PLAT. HE DIDN'T THINK HIGHVIEW WAS A PLATTED SUBDIVISION; BUT, IF THEY BUILT THOSE ROADS, PUT THE RETENTION AREAS IN. HE REFERRED TO DELTONA NOT OWNING THOSE RETENTION AREAS IN SUNNY HILLS; THAT BELONGS TO WASHINGTON COUNTY; IT WAS RECORDED AND DEDICATED TO WASHINGTON COUNTY.

COMMISSIONER HOLMAN ADDRESSED HIM SAYING THE COUNTY ACCEPTED HIGHVIEW ACRES AND SHOULD NOT HAVE ACCEPTED IT UNTIL IT WAS DONE THE RIGHT WAY AND PROPERLY.

MR. HAGAN EXPLAINED PART OF THAT WAS DONE BEFORE THE LDC; WASHINGTON COUNTY DIDN'T HAVE SUBDIVISION CODES OR A COMP PLAN UNTIL SOME TIME IN THE 1980'S. IN 1985 IT WAS UPDATED AGAIN AND UPDATED PERIODICALLY SINCE THEN. THE COUNTY HAD A ROAD PLAN AND SAID IF A PERSON WOULD PUSH THAT RIGHT-OF-WAY AND PUSH IT OUT, THEY WOULD TAKE IT BECAUSE THEIR ROADS WERE AS GOOD AS THE COUNTY'S. IN SOME PLACES, THE COUNTY ACCEPTED ROADS AND IN SOME PLACES THEY ACCEPTED SUBDIVISIONS. THERE WAS A PERIOD OF TIME WHERE THE COUNTY HAD ROAD

STANDARDS THAT SAID ONCE THE COUNTY ACCEPTS THE SUBDIVISION, THEY STILL HAD TO COME BACK AND BUILD THE ROADS TO STANDARDS. THE COUNTY, IF THEY WOULD DO A CONSISTENT POLICY, THE DEVELOPER CAN BUILD MORE OF WHAT THEY WANT; BUT, THERE IS A HISTORY OF SOME THINGS THEY NEED TO DO. HE AGREED A LOT OF THINGS THE COUNTY DID A COMMISSIONER WOULD SAY THEY THOUGHT THEY OUGHT TO TAKE THE ROAD AND THE COUNTY WOULD TAKE IT. STORMWATER WAS NOT AN ISSUE BACK IN THOSE DAYS. THOSE ARE SOME THINGS HE THOUGHT A GOOD COMP PLAN IF ENFORCED WOULD HELP THE COUNTY DO. BUT, PEOPLE USE TO HAVE TO PUT UP A BOND FOR INFRASTRUCTURE.

MR. GRAY SAID, GOING FORWARD, THE COUNTY PAYS DUES TO WFRPC AND ONE OF THE SERVICES THEY OFFER IS MEDIATION. SHOULD THE COUNTY DECIDE THEY ARE IN A PINCH, THEY COULD USE THEIR RESOURCE THEY HAVE ON HAND WHICH IS THE WFRPC. WFRPC WOULD BE HAPPY TO DO THE MEDIATION FOR CONFLICTS LIKE THIS. HOWEVER, A LOT OF THIS IS PICKED UP WHEN THE LARGE SCALE AMENDMENT OCCURS; IS STORM WATER ADDRESSED OR IS AFFORDABLE HOUSING ADDRESSED, ETC. IF THEY HAVE DONE WHAT THEY HAVE DONE TO THIS COUNTY IN THE PAST AND THEY DON'T SEE IT REFLECTED ON THE FUTURE LAND USE MAP, IT DIDN'T GO THROUGHT THAT PROCESS. THAT IS THE GREAT THING WHEN THEY SEND ALL THESE THINGS TO THE VARIOUS AGENCIES FOR REVIEW, IT GETS PICKED UP. THE MECHANISM FOR PICKING IT UP IS THE LARGE SCALE AND SMALL SCALE AMENDMENT PROCESS.

JIM ACKERMAN, WCPC, STATED THE WCPC DOES WORK CLOSELY WITH THE COUNTY ENGINEER; THEY DO GET ADVICE FROM THE ENGINEER ON STORM DRAINS, HIGHWAYS AND ROADS. IT IS NOT LIKE THEY ARE NOT GETTING INPUT.

COMMISSIONER PATE ADDRESSED THE TWO PROJECTS TALKED ABOUT, ONE WAS NEXT TO A SUBDIVISION WITH SMALL LOTS AND THE OTHER ONE WAS OUT IN THE COUNTRY AND THAT ONE PROBABLY SHOULD HAVE NEVER BEEN REDUCED TO ONE ACRE LOTS.

MR. DERUNTZ SAID HOPEFULLY THEY CAN REMEMBER THE ISSUES THEY HAVE HAD PROBLEMS WITH IN THE PAST AND DON'T REPEAT THEM.

MR. DERUNTZ CONTINUED WITH THE COMMENTS; COMMENT 5, THERE WAS

SOME LANGUAGE THAT WAS LEFT OUT THAT WAS INCLUDED. COMMENT 6 THEY WERE LOOKING AT A CHANGE THEY HAD TO INCORPORATE; A REFERENCE FOR THE FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. COMMENT 7 THEY WERE LOOKING AT ADDING ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE WHERE THEY WOULD BE LOOKING AT THIS EVERY SEVEN YEARS AND GOING THROUGH THE EAR PROCESS. COMMENT 8 FL-DCA HAD AN ISSUE ABOUT BEING CALLED AN AICUZ; UNTIL BAY COUNTY CHANGES WHAT THEY CALL THEMSELVES, THE COUNTY NEEDS TO FOLLOW WHAT THEY ARE DOING. COMMENT 9 IS HAVING TO DO WITH WHEN THEY TRANSMIT IT, THEY NEED TO DO IT ELECTRONICALLY AND PAPER; IT WASN'T ALL DONE PROPERLY AND IT WILL BE DONE PROPERLY IN THE FUTURE.

MR. DERUNTZ CONTINUED GOING OVER THE COMMENTS. COMMENT 10 THEY WERE GOING TO TAKE OUT THE WORD "VAN." COMMENT 11 THEY WERE LOOKING AT THE POINT ABOUT GETTING AM TRACK BACK ON THE RAIL AND CONTINUE WORKING WITH THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE. COMMENT 12 ADDING OBJECTIVE 16, 1-4 ABOUT ELKCAM BOULEVARD; OBJECTIVE 12 THEY TALKED ABOUT SELF AMENDING AND THAT IS WHAT MR. GRAY WAS TALKING ABOUT. OBJECTIVE 14, THERE WERE NUMEROUS REFERENCES THAT WERE IMPROPERLY CITED; THIS HAS BEEN CORRECTED. UNDER THE HOUSING ELEMENT, A LOT OF THE TABLES HAVE VARIOUS TYPOS AND THEY MADE ALL THE NECESSARY CHANGES. THE SAME FOR COMMENTS 17, 18 AND 19.

ON COMMENT 20, THEY WERE UPDATING THE INFRASTRUCTURE TO SAY THE NEW CHANGES OR MOST RECENT CHANGES THEY HAVE DONE IN THE SANITARY, SEWER PLAN. COMMENT 21, THEY WERE ADDING THE PROPER REFERENCE TO THE FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE AND THE DATES OF THE MANUAL FOR BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICE WAS IMPROPERLY CITED. COMMENT 22, THEY WERE LOOKING AT SUNNY HILLS AND THIS IS AN ISSUE THAT THEY BROUGHT UP AND THE COUNTY NEEDS TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT. THE WCPC IS PROPOSING TO ADDING AN OBJECTIVE 5 HERE, POLICY 5-1, 5-2 AND 5-3 IS PROMOTING THE EXPANSION OF SEWERS. HE POINTED OUT ON THE BLOW UP OF THE MAP OF SUNNY HILLS, THE RED SPOTS ARE THE LOTS OWNED BY THE COUNTY, THE GREEN AREAS ARE CONSERVATION, THE AREAS BLUE ARE SUNNY HILLS PROPERTIES, THE IMPROVED PROPERTIES IS PROPERTIES SUNNY HILLS DID

IMPROVEMENTS ON AND THE REST ARE THE LOTS IN SUNNY HILLS. ONLY A PORTION OF THAT HAS SANITARY SEWERS ON IT; THERE WOULD BE NO WAY THE BOARD WOULD APPROVE ANYTHING LIKE THIS TODAY BECAUSE THE LOTS ARE TOO SMALL, THEY DON'T HAVE SANITARY SEWERS AND WATER TO PROVIDE FOR ALL THIS. EVERY ONE OF THOSE LOTS, IF THEY ARE NOT ON SANITARY SEWERS OR IN THE AQUA UTILITIES DISTRICT AS FAR AS SANITARY SEWERS, THEY ARE ON SEPTIC TANKS AND WELLS AND DO NOT MEET THE MINIMUM LOT AREA FOR SEPTIC TANKS AND WELLS. THERE IS A PROBLEM THAT IS EXISTING AND IT IS A BOMB THAT COULD POTENTIALLY BLOW UP BECAUSE IT IS GOING TO BE CONTAMINATING THE ECONFINA SPRING SHED. THIS IS AT THE VERY TOP OF THAT SPRING SHED AND YOU HAVE ALL THAT SEPTIC WASTE THAT IS GOING TO BE INFILTRATING AND GETTING INTO THAT WATER SOURCE. THE WCPC IS PROPOSING TO PROMOTE THE EXPANSION OF THE SANITARY SEWER AND MAY LOOK AT HAVING THIS ENHANCED SANITARY SEPTIC TANK STANDARDS AND IT SHOULD BE REFERENCED AS PERFORMANCE BASED TREATMENT SYSTEM AS DEFINED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH. ALSO HAVE SEPARATION AND ELEVATION STANDARDS. ON #3, IN THE PAST THE COUNTY HAS HAD PROPERTY THAT HAS BEEN ACQUIRED THROUGH BACK TAXES AND HAVE RESOLD THAT, GOT THE MONEY AND DID SOMETHING WITH IT. IF THEY KNOW THE DENSITY IS A PROBLEM AND POTENTIALLY, THEY COULD BE BY THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS PROPERTY CONTAMINATING THIS WATER SOURCE, DO THEY WANT TO CONTINUE THAT. HE DOESN'T THINK THEY SHOULD DO THAT. WCPC IS PROPOSING THERE BE A CRITERIA, WHEN THEY HAVE THESE PROPERTIES, THEY LOOK AT KEEPING THESE PROPERTIES IF THE PROPERTIES HAVE WETLAND CHARACTERISTICS, THE PROPERTIES ADJOINS WATER BODIES, THE PROPERTIES ADJOINS A CREEK OR A STEEPHEAD RAVINE OR IT ADJOINS OTHER COUNTY PROPERTIES. IF IT DOES JOIN OTHER COUNTY PROPERTIES BY ASSEMBLING THOSE PROPERTIES, THEY MAY BE ABLE TO DO SOMETHING AS FAR AS ENHANCING STORM WATER MANAGEMENT OR IMPROVEMENTS THAT CAN HELP MITIGATE SOME OF THE PROBLEMS THIS SUBDIVISION IS CREATING OUT THERE. IF THE PROPERTIES DON'T MEET ANY OF THESE CRITERIA, PUT THEM ON THE BLOCK TO RESALE THEM FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT. THIS IS TRYING TO ADDRESS THE CONCERN FL-DCA

HAS CITED FOR SUNNY HILLS.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN CALLED FOR A TEN MINUTE RECESS.

PURSUANT TO A RECESS, COMMISSIONER BROCK ASKED ON THE REQUIREMENT OF A MINIMUM SEPARATION OF 30' BETWEEN ALL SEPTIC TANKS FROM ALL WETLANDS AND REQUESTED MR. DERUNTZ CLARIFY THIS.

MR. DERUNTZ EXPLAINED THE SEPTIC SYSTEM INCLUDES THE DRAINFIELDS AND THE SEPTIC TANK; YOU DON'T WANT TO HAVE THAT RIGHT NEXT TO A WETLANDS AREA BECAUSE THE AFFLUENTS THAT COME OUT OF THE DRAIN FIELD WOULD GO RIGHT INTO THERE. YOU WANT TO HAVE SOME SEPARATION AND THE STANDARD OF 30' IS ALREADY IN THE COUNTY'S COMP PLAN; THEY ARE NOT RECREATING ANYTHING HERE.

COMMISSIONER BROCK QUESTIONED LAKES. MR. DERUNTZ SAID THAT IS A WATER BODY TOO AND THEY DON'T WANT TO HAVE THAT BECAUSE THE AFFLUENT CAN GO RIGHT INTO A WATER BODY.

COMMISSIONER BROCK ASKED THE WAY IT IS NOW A PERSON CAN PUT A SEPTIC TANK WITHIN 30' OF A LAKE.

MR. DERUNTZ SAID NO YOU CAN'T. COMMISSIONER BROCK ASKED FOR CLARIFICATION ON WHAT THE SETBACK IS FOR THE SEPTIC TANK.

COMMISSIONER BROCK WAS TOLD THE SETBACK WAS 75' ON AN OPEN BODY OF WATER BY STATE CODE. MR. DERUNTZ SAID BY THAT, THEY WON'T BE IMPACTING THE WATER BODIES.

COMMISSIONER BROCK ADDRESSED HE WAS LOOKING AT THIS BECAUSE THEY WERE TALKING ABOUT THE KNIGHTS SECTOR PLAN; THERE IS 37 LAKES IN THERE AND HE WAS LOOKING AT THE FUTURE OF THOSE LAKES.

MR. DERUNTZ SAID, IN WORKING WITH THE PEOPLE FOR THE KNIGHT FAMILY, ONE OF THE THINGS THEY ARE HOPING TO DO IS HAVE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEMS FOR THEIR WHOLE DEVELOPMENT. IT IS NOT GOING TO BE WHERE THEY HAVE A LARGE SANITARY SYSTEM IN DIFFERENT AREAS AND HAVE THEIR SEPARATE LITTLE COMMUNITIES. THE COUNTY WILL DEAL WITH THAT WHEN IT OCCURS. THE KNIGHT TRUST DOESN'T WANT IT TO IMPACT ANY OF THE QUALITY OF WATER THERE; THEY ARE VERY SENSITIVE TO THAT.

COMMISSIONER BROCK AGREED; BUT, ONCE HE BUYS A LOT THERE, IT

BELONGS TO HIM. IF THE LAW SAYS HE CAN PUT A SEPTIC TANK WITHIN SO MANY FEET, WHY CAN'T HE. MR. DERUNTZ TOLD HIM HE COULD.

COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID THAT WOULD TAKE KNIGHT TRUST OUT OF IT. MR. DERUNTZ SAID IT WOULDN'T; KNIGHT TRUST WOULD FOLLOW WHAT THE MINIMUM STANDARDS ARE.

COMMISSIONER BROCK QUESTIONED IF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN NAMED THE SPRINGS FOR THE WATER SHED LIKE THE CHOCTOWHATCHEE RIVER.

MR. DERUNTZ STATED THEY DO HAVE A LISTING OF SPRINGS AND THEY WILL BE ADDING THIS TO THE COMP PLAN. THERE IS SOMETHING LIKE 80 PLUS SPRINGS AND THE CHOCTOWHATCHEE, ECONFINA AND HOLMES THE STATE KNOWS ABOUT AND THERE IS A BUNCH THE STATE DON'T EVEN KNOW ABOUT.

COMMISSIONER BROCK ASKED THEM TO REMEMBER EVERY CROSS DRAIN GOES TO HOLMES CREEK IN GENERAL ON THE WEST SIDE OF THE COUNTY OR THE CHOCTOWHATCHEE RIVER. THE CROSS DRAINS ARE FEEDER ROUTES TO THE CREEKS AND THE RIVERS.

MR. DERUNTZ CONTINUED ADDRESSING THE COMMENTS; THE CHANGES AND REFERENCES TO THE STUDIES BY NFWMD ABOUT OPEN SPACE. COMMENT 28 THEY ARE ADDING POLICY 9-6 REFERENCING THE NFWMD. COMMENT 29 ADDING POLICY 6-17 REFERENCING A LIME STONE PERMIT; THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS A LIME STONE PERMIT. THEY HAVE TAKEN THAT WORDING OUT AND ADDED THE LANGUAGE THAT ALL STATE PERMITS NECESSARY FOR OPERATING ANY MINE HAVING BEEN ISSUED.

ON COMMENT 30, MR. DERUNTZ SAID THEY DONE POLICY 6-16; THEY WERE LOOKING AT TAKING OUT THE FL-DEP. THIS AGAIN HAS TO DO WITH THE MINING AND BECAUSE THEY DON'T ISSUE OR DEAL WITH THE RECLAMATION PLANS, THEY ARE MAKING THAT CORRECTION. ON COMMENT 31, PUBLIC PARTICIPATION, THEY ARE PROVIDING THE PROPER REFERENCE. COMMENT 32 PUBLIC SCHOOLS FACILITIES ELEMENT WAS TALKING ABOUT THE SCHOOL IMPACT FEES AND THE SCHOOLS HAVE CHOSEN NOT TO IMPOSE THOSE FEES. IF THEY GO INTO RECOMMENDATIONS, MR. DERUNTZ STATED THEY REFER TO THE STATE STATUTES AND THIS GOAL 9 DEALS WITH NATURAL SYSTEMS AND

RECREATION LANDS AND THEIR GOALS, ETC. AS IT APPLIED TO THE CONSERVATION ELEMENT. THEY HAVE ADDED POLICY 2.6 AND 2.7 REFLECTING THE SAME WORDING THAT IS IN THE STATE STATUTES. THE SAME THING OCCURRING WITH GOAL #11 DEALING WITH ENERGY; THEY ADDED THOSE CRITERIA IN THE STATE STATUTES. UNDER GOAL 15 LAND USE POLICIES, THEY ADDED THE LANGUAGE FL-DCA IS LOOKING FOR. UNDER GOAL 17, IT DEALT WITH PUBLIC FACILITIES AS IT APPLIED TO THE CONSERVATION ELEMENT AND IT IS TAKING OUT SOME WORDING AND MODIFYING THAT TO REFLECT WHAT THOSE IN POLICY B-8 REFLECTED. THE TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT AND PUBLIC SCHOOL ELEMENT BASICALLY DEALT WITH THE SAME POLICY; BUT, FOR EACH OF THOSE PARTICULAR ELEMENTS THEY HAVE ADDED 8-10 THROUGH 8-14.

COMMISSIONER BROCK QUESTIONED ON THE RECREATION ELEMENT, IS IT ON DEVELOPMENT, IS IT STILL IN THE POLICY ANYTHING, A LAKE OVER 20 ACRES, THE COUNTY GETS ACCESS OF ONE ACRE. MR. DERUNTZ SAID "YES."

MR. DERUNTZ MENTIONED THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT HAS BEEN REVISED AND THE BOARD HAS A COPY OF IT. THE PLANNING COMMISSION IS RECOMMENDING ITS APPROVAL. THIS IS SOMETHING THAT IS NEW AND IT HAS BEEN REVISED.

MR. TOWN UPDATED THE BOARD ON THE BASIC CHANGES BEING TIED INTO WHERE IN THE ORIGINAL DRAFT THEY HAD A LOT OF THE SUPPORT DATA AND INFORMATION; THAT HAS ALL COME OUT SO THE NEW DOCUMENT IS GEARED TO THE GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES. THEY HAVE LOOKED AT, IN WORKING WITH THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE AND SEVERAL COUNTIES ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ELEMENTS, OF A WAY TO, IN WASHINGTON COUNTY, GET ONE SET OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA, PLANS, POLICIES, ETC., SO THAT THEY CAN GO FORWARD IN A UNIFIED BASIS SO IT DOESN'T MATTER WHERE IN THE COUNTY AN OPPORTUNITY MIGHT PRESENT ITSELF TO GET THE BUY IN FROM MUNICIPALITIES AND THE OTHERS THAT INTEREST. RATHER THAN SPECIFY A DETAILED PLAN AT THIS POINT, THEY SET A GOAL AND SAID THEY REALLY WANT TO SPEND A YEAR, COME BACK TO THE COUNTY COMMISSION WITH A PLAN THAT WILL DO A FEW SIMPLE THINGS:

1. IT WILL FIX THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT WHICH

RESIDES WITH THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS.

2. IT WILL PROVIDE FOR THOSE SERVICES ON AN ORGANIZED BASIS; HISTORICALLY THE CHAMBER AND OTHERS HAVE DONE CERTAIN THINGS TO BRING OPPORTUNITY TO THE COUNTY AND THEY REALLY ARE CONVINCED THEY NEED AN EVERYDAY EFFORT TOWARD THAT. WHAT THEY HAVE DONE IS CREATED THIS ONE YEAR PLANNING WHERE THEY WILL GET PEOPLE FROM THE MUNICIPALITIES, CHAMBER, TDC, BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, PLANNING COMMISSION AS A WORKING GROUP TO COME UP WITH HOW TO IMPLEMENT THE CONCEPT. WHAT THE BOARD IS APPROVING IN THIS PLAN IS A PLAN TO MAKE A PLAN THAT WILL BE ALL INCLUSIVE WITH EVERYBODY IN THE COUNTY WHO HAS SOME INTEREST IN CREATING JOBS AND MAKING THIS A BETTER PLACE TO LIVE AND ENHANCING THE TAX BASE. WHAT THAT PLAN MAY LOOK LIKE A YEAR FROM NOW, MR. TOWN SAID HE DIDN'T KNOW; HE HAS SOME IDEAS ON SOME THINGS THAT WOULD BE GOOD BUT IT NEEDS TO EVOLVE THE WAY WASHINGTON COUNTY WANTS TO DO IT AND NOT NECESSARILY THE WAY LEON COUNTY DID IT. THEY ARE ASKING FOR ONE YEAR TO PULL THIS TOGETHER, COME BACK TO THE BOARD AND SAY HERE IS THE WAY WE THINK WE CAN GO FORWARD FOR THE NEXT FIVE OR TEN YEARS.

MR. DERUNTZ ADDRESSED FUTURE COUNTY COMMITMENTS:

1. THEY ARE GOING TO BE UPDATING THE EXISTING LAND USE MAP
2. THEY ARE GOING TO BE UPDATING THEIR FUTURE LAND USE MAP
3. THEY WILL HAVE PUBLIC HEARINGS, INPUT FROM THE CITIZENS, NOTIFICATIONS, ETC. ON THIS.
4. THERE WILL BE SOME APPOINTMENTS OF COMMITTEES ON THESE REVISIONS: A CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE, A CITIZEN WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AN ECONOMIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND AN ENERGY CONSERVATION COMMITTEE.

THEY WILL ENGAGE THE PUBLIC IN THESE THINGS AS PART OF THEIR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO MAKE IT WORK CLOSER TO WHAT THEY WANT THE COUNTY TO BECOME, TO ENHANCE WHAT THEY HAVE. THEY HAVE SOME WONDERFUL THINGS HERE IN THE COUNTY; THEY HAVE FANTASTIC WATER, UNBELIEVABLE RESOURCES OF ABUNDANT AGRICULTURAL LANDS THAT HAS A



GREAT CAPACITY FOR GROWING PRODUCTS AND FOOD SUPPLIES, THEY WANT TO IMPROVE THEIR COMMUNITIES AND TOWNS AND MAKE THEM SUSTAINABLE SO PEOPLE CAN HAVE JOBS AND PROVIDE SERVICES. WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE NORTH/SOUTH CORRIDORS AND EAST/WEST CORRIDORS, THE INTERSTATE, HWY 79, 77, THEY HAVE GREAT POTENTIAL OF DEVELOPMENT OF THEIR EXISTING COMMUNITIES; BUT, IN ADOPTING THESE CHANGES, THEY ARE GOING TO BE MAKING STEPS TOWARD THAT IN FOLLOWING THE STATE STANDARDS.

MR. DERUNTZ SAID THE LAST PART IS REVISING THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE. AS THEY TALKED ABOUT IN THE BEGINNING, THIS DOCUMENT, THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, IS SETTING UP THOSE POLICIES; IT IS THE LDC THAT PUTS THE REGULATIONS IN PLACE. PART OF THE CONTRACT THEY HAVE WITH THE WFRPC IS A SMALL PART DEALING WITH UPDATING THE COMP PLAN AND A LARGE PART DEALING WITH UPDATING THE LDC; MR. GRAY IS GOING TO BE WORKING WITH THAT. AS SOON AS FL-DCA APPROVES THIS, THEY WILL START MAKING THE CHANGES TO THE LDC.

MR. DERUNTZ STATED THE WFRPC IS RECOMMENDING APPROVAL; HE IS WORKING WITH A PLANNER AT FL-DCA AND SHE IS REVIEWING THESE DOCUMENTS. THERE MAY BE A LITTLE WORD SMITHING; BUT, THE FOUNDATION IS NOT CHANGING. BY DOING A LITTLE TWEAKING, HOPEFULLY, HE WILL HAVE THIS DONE IN A COUPLE OF DAYS. THE BOARD WILL HAVE THE COMPLETE DOCUMENT IN THEIR HAND FOR THEIR MEETING ON THE 21ST OF OCTOBER.

MR. GRAY STATED THE BOARD WILL HAVE A COMPLETE DOCUMENT IN THEIR HANDS ON OCTOBER 14TH, WHICH THEY WILL BE AVAILABLE TO REVIEW AND IT WILL ALSO BE AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC REVIEW. THE CONVERSATIONS THEY ARE HAVING WITH FL-DCA ARE A COURTESY LEVEL; FL-DCA IS HAVING A GOOD CHANCE TO SEE THINGS AHEAD OF TIME WHICH SHOULD STREAMLINE THE APPROVAL PROCESS WHICH IS A TECHNIQUE HE HAS BEEN USING FOR YEARS.

MR. GRAY EXPLAINED THE DISCUSSIONS HE AND MR. DERUNTZ HAVE HAD WITH SUZANNE LEX, FL-DCA, HAVE BEEN INSTRUMENTAL IN POINTING THEM IN THE DIRECTION WHERE THERE NEEDS TO BE CORRECTIONS, THINGS THAT ARE DATA DOCUMENTS, NOT A POLICY, ETC.

MR. GRAY REITERATED WHAT WAS ON THE FIRST SLIDE MR. DERUNTZ,

IT STATED THE CONTINUING OF LEGALITY; THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN IS THE GUIDING DOCUMENT IN THE COUNTY, THE DOCUMENT THE COUNTY ADOPTS, THE GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES THEY ADOPT AND IT IS THEIR LDC THAT SUPPORTS THAT COMP PLAN. THE LDC EXISTS SO LONG AS IT DOES NOT CONFLICT WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN. THE COMP PLAN HAS TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE AND THE FLORIDA STATUTES. WHENEVER YOU SEE A CORRECT THIS AND MAKE IT CONSISTENT WITH FS, ETC., THAT MEANS THE COMP PLAN HAS TO COINCIDE WITH THE STATE STATUTE. THE STATE STATUTE SHALL NOT CONFLICT WITH THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES. BASICALLY, THIS WHOLE THING GOES FROM TALKING ABOUT HOW YOU CAN PUT A SWALE OR A DITCH ALL THE WAY TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES AND ANYONE THAT FILES A COMPLAINT AGAINST THIS IS BASICALLY SAYING THIS IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL. THE WAY THEY HAVE BEEN LOOKING AT THE COUNTY, IT WOULD APPEAR THEY HAVE BEEN LOOKING AT A LOT OF THINGS THAT CONFLICT WITH THE COMP PLAN. WHEN YOU SEE A PLATTED SUBDIVISION AND YOU LOOK ON THE FUTURE LAND USE MAP AND IT IS GREEN, THERE IS A MISTAKE THERE; SOMETHING IS INCONSISTENT. THIS JUST MEANS A MISTAKE HAS BEEN MADE AND SOME HOMEWORK HAS TO BE DONE. A LOT OF HOMEWORK AND THE CLEANING UP THEY HAVE TO DO WILL COME FORTH IN THE NEXT FEW MONTHS; IT IS NOT GOING TO BE JUST A REVAMPING OF THE WAY THE FUTURE LAND USE MAP LOOKS. THEY ARE GOING TO BE LOOKING AT THE LAND USE CODE; THEY ARE GOING TO BE LOOKING AT THE DOCUMENT THAT IS SUPPOSE TO BE SUPPORTING THAT COMP PLAN AND FINDING OUT IF THERE IS A DISCONNECT, CONFLICT OR SOMETHING MISSING. THEY WILL HOPEFULLY BE CORRECTING THIS AND THIS IS GOING TO BE THE COUNTY'S LDC; THIS IS THE COUNTY'S COMP PLAN, FUTURE LAND USE MAP AND LDC. THE GOAL IS TO GET THE NOTICE OF INTENT GOING FROM FL-DCA.

COMMISSIONER BROCK QUESTIONED WHY ISN'T THERE MUCH IN CONSERVATION; IS ANYBODY INVOLVED, DO THEY SEE ABOUT IT OR IS IT JUST LET GO, NOBODY CARES. HE REFERRED TO MR. GRAY MAKING THE STATEMENT THERE ISN'T MUCH IN CONSERVATION.

MR. GRAY DISAGREED AND SAID IF WASHINGTON COUNTY LOOKS AT THEIR COUNTY COMPARED TO OTHER COUNTIES, THEY HAVE A WHOLE LOT MORE CONSERVATION THAN ANYBODY ELSE. WHAT THEY CAN DO IS MAKE A RELATIVE COMPARISON BY LOOKING AT THE FUTURE LAND USE MAP; ON THIS MAP, FOR EXAMPLE, IT MIGHT SAY THERE ARE 7,000 ACRES OF CONSERVATION LAND BUT THEY REALLY ONLY HAVE 2800. THEY COULD SEE THIS DISPARITY AND QUESTION WHAT THEY COULD DO. THE BOARD WILL SEE ON THE 21ST TABLES THAT WILL COMPARE WHAT IS ON THE FUTURE LAND USE MAP TO WHAT THEY HAVE SHOWN ON THE EXISTING LAND USE MAP, MINUS CHIPLEY.

MR. GRAY REITERATED THE COUNTY IS DOING FANTASTIC ON CONSERVATION LAND; THEY HAVE HELPFUL FUNDING SOURCES LIKE NWFWMDC HELPING THEM. ALL THE LAND THEY SEE IN THE DARK GREEN ON THE EXISTING LAND USE MAP LINES RIGHT UP WITH WHAT IS IN CONSERVATION WITH THE FUTURE LAND USE MAP. HE DOESN'T THINK THEY WOULD HAVE THAT IF THEY DIDN'T HAVE THE SURFACE OF WATER AND SENSITIVITIES.

COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID RIGHT NOW WASHINGTON COUNTY IS PROBABLY ONE OF THE TOP COUNTIES IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA; THEY ARE VERY BLESSED AND HE WANTS TO PROTECT THEIR WATER SHEDS AND WATERWAYS. THEY HAVE PEOPLE FROM OTHER STATES COMING TO THE COUNTY TO USE THEIR RECREATION. HE WANTS TO SEE THE WATER SHED PROTECTED.

JIM ACKERMAN, WCPC, SAID THE WCPC OR THE STAFF HAS THE OPTION TO HAVE A DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE; THE COMMITTEE COULD ADDRESS ALL THE THINGS THAT COMMISSIONER HOLMAN BROUGHT OUT AND WORK WITH MR. DERUNTZ ON IT SO BEFORE IT COMES TO THE WCPC, THEY HAVE HAD THE CHANCE TO GO TO ALL THE ENTITIES COMMISSIONER HOLMAN BROUGHT IN TODAY. COMMISSIONER HOLMAN THOUGHT IT WOULD BE A GOOD IDEA TO HAVE A DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE.

MR. DERUNTZ EXPRESSED HIS APPRECIATION FOR THE BOARDS AND PLANNING COMMISSION'S ATTENTION AND THE QUESTIONS THEY HAVE ASKED. THE GOAL IS TO BRING THE COUNTY INTO COMPLIANCE; ONCE IT IS IN COMPLIANCE, POTENTIAL DEVELOPERS CAN COME IN HERE, GO THROUGH THE PROCESS OF REQUESTING LAND DEVELOPMENT LAND USE CHANGES AND GO THROUGH THAT

PROCESS. RIGHT NOW, THEY CAN'T DO THAT BECAUSE THE COUNTY IS NOT IN COMPLIANCE. THAT IS A PROBLEM.

MR. DERUNTZ ADDRESSED THERE BEING A WORKSHOP SCHEDULED FOR OCTOBER 14TH; IF THE BOARD FEELS THEY SHOULD HAVE THE WORKSHOP, THEY WILL. BUT, IF NOT, IF THERE IS SOME QUESTIONS, MAYBE THEY COULD CONTINUE TO ASK THEM ON OCTOBER 21ST.

THE BOARD'S CONSENSUS AND THE WCPC'S CONSENSUS WAS NOT TO HAVE ANOTHER WORKSHOP ON OCTOBER 14TH.

AS CHAIRMAN OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION, TONYA PIPPIN COMMENDED MIKE DERUNTZ AND STATED SHE WAS SO THANKFUL HE CAME TO WASHINGTON COUNTY TOWARDS THE END OF THIS TWO TO THREE YEAR PROCESS OF UPDATING THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN. SHE FELT HE HAD DONE AN EXTRAORDINARY JOB. SHE THANKED ALLAN GRAY AND JIM TOWN ALSO FOR BEING HERE TO HELP UPDATE THE COMP PLAN AND OTHER PEOPLE IN THE COMMUNITY AND CERTAINLY SCOTT HENDERSON FOR ALL HIS COMMENTS. SHE ADDRESSED THE WCPC HAS BEEN WORKING ON THIS FOR A WHILE AND SHE FEELS GOOD ABOUT THE DIRECTION THEY ARE MOVING IN.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN THANKED EVERYONE WHO HAS BEEN WORKING ON THIS.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL THANKED THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND MR. DERUNTZ FOR WHAT THEY DO AND ANYONE ELSE WHO HAD ANYTHING TO DO WITH COMPILING THIS INFORMATION.

MS. PIPPIN REFERRED TO MR. DERUNTZ HAVING MENTIONED ONCE THESE EAR-BASED AMENDMENTS TO THE COMP PLAN ARE APPROVED, THEY WILL BE UPDATING THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE AND THAT GOES BACK TO SOME OF THE COMMENTS MADE ABOUT STRENGTHENING THE SUB-DIVISION REGULATIONS. SHE FEELS THEY HAVE A LONG WAY TO GO ON THAT AND THAT CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED THROUGH THE DEVELOPER'S AGREEMENT MR. TOWN SPOKE ABOUT IN ADDITION TO THE BONDING, IRREVOCABLE LETTER OF CREDIT, ETC. SHE ADDRESSED THEM HAVING HAD NUMEROUS INCIDENCES WHERE THE DEVELOPER WILL COME IN AND SAY ONE THING AND DO ANOTHER AND THEY DON'T HAVE THAT LEGAL DOCUMENT IN PLACE. IN HER OPINION THE DEVELOPER'S AGREEMENT IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT. ANOTHER THING THE BOARD JUST

PASSED, THE NEIGHBORHOOD INFORMATION MEETING, IS GOING TO HELP RESOLVE ISSUES WITH THE NEIGHBORS BEFORE IT COMES TO THE WCPC.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL AGREED THE NEIGHBORHOOD INFORMATION MEETING WOULD EITHER RESOLVE THE ISSUE OR ALERT THE NEIGHBORS OF THE ISSUE BEFORE IT GOES BEFORE THE WCPC.

MS. PIPPIN ADDRESSED THE NEIGHBORHOOD INFORMATION MEETING WILL ALSO HELP THE DEVELOPER KNOW WHAT TO EXPECT AND THEY CAN CHANGE THEIR PLAN LIKEWISE.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL REFERRED TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD INFORMATION MEETING WILL PROVIDE INFORMATION TO THE COMMUNITY THAT MAYBE THEY ARE NOT GETTING NOW.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN CALLED FOR A RECESS PRIOR TO GOING INTO THE NEXT WORKSHOP MEETING.

PURSUANT TO A RECESS, CHAIRMAN HOLMAN CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER.

ROGER HAGAN, EOC DIRECTOR, UPDATED THE BOARD ON THEM HAVING ENTERED INTO A THREE YEAR CONTRACT WITH DSI ABOUT FOUR MONTHS AGO TO DO SOME CERTAIN PLANNING THINGS FOR SOME HOMELAND SECURITY MONIES. ONE OF THOSE THINGS WAS SEVEN COOPS; FEASIBLY THEY CAN'T COMPLETE THAT. HOWEVER, MR. HAGAN SAID HE HAD BEEN ABLE TO COMPLETE FOUR OTHER ELEMENTS INCLUDING THE LMS THAT MR. DERUNTZ WOULD NOT HAVE THE TIME TO WORK ON AND THEY HAVE BEEN THROUGH THAT PROCESS THIS YEAR AND IT HAS TO BE ADOPTED BY THE END OF THE YEAR, INCLUDING THE EOC PLANNING WORKSHOP, LOCAL MITIGATION STRATEGY AND THE TASK AUTHORIZATION AMENDMENT. HE EXPLAINED THE BOARD HAD AUTHORIZED HIM TO SIGN THE TASK AUTHORIZATION; BUT, DUE TO THIS BEING AN AMENDMENT, HE WANTED TO BRING IT BACK AND LET THE BOARD KNOW THEY ARE SUBSTITUTING ONE WORK PRODUCT FOR ANOTHER AND IT GOES TO MEETING THEIR SCOPE OF WORK FOR THEIR ANNUAL CONTRACT WITH DEM. HE REQUESTED THE BOARD APPROVE THIS AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN IT; THE MONEY DOESN'T CHANGE. IT IS ALL HOMELAND SECURITY MONEY.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL OFFERED A MOTION, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER

STRICKLAND AND CARRIED TO APPROVE THE AMENDED TASK AUTHORIZATION SCOPE OF WORK WITH DSI, LLC. AS REQUESTED BY MR. HAGAN.

EMORY PITTS, COUNTY MANAGER, UPDATED THE BOARD ON IT HAVING BEEN BROUGHT TO THEIR ATTENTION AFTER THEY APPROVED THE MSBU ASSESSMENT ROLL, THERE WERE SOME OMISSIONS IN IT; THERE WERE SOME PROPERTIES LEFT OFF THE ROLL. HE THOUGHT THERE WAS ACTUALLY SOME COUNTY PROPERTIES THAT WERE ON THE ROLL THAT HAD NEVER BEEN REMOVED. HE ASKED THE BOARD TO APPROVE THE AMENDED REVISED MSBU TAX ROLL TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE TAX COLLECTOR'S OFFICE.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL QUESTIONED THE BOARD IS CREATING THE MSBU TAX ROLL AND WHY ISN'T THE TAX COLLECTOR AND THE PROPERTY APPRAISER GETTING TOGETHER AND SUBMIT THAT ROLL TO THE BOARD FOR APPROVAL. THEY ARE THE ONES THAT KNOW ABOUT THIS BETTER THAN ANYBODY ELSE. HE DOESN'T UNDERSTAND WHY THE BOARD HAS TO DO THE MSBU TAX ROLL.

MR. PITTS SAID, EVEN THOUGH THE BOARD IS SUBMITTING THE MSBU ROLL TO THE TAX COLLECTOR AND CERTIFYING THE ROLL, MS. MCENTYRE TELLS HIM SHE FEELS UNCOMFORTABLE WITH THEM DOING THE ROLL AND THEN PRESENTING THAT ROLL TO THE STATE.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL ADDRESSED MS. MCENTYRE CERTIFIES THE ROLL FOR THE ENTIRE COUNTY AND QUESTIONED AGAIN WHY SHE CAN'T CERTIFY THE MSBU ROLL. HE ASKED MR. PITTS TO FIND OUT WHY MS. MCENTYRE FEELS COMFORTABLE IN CERTIFYING THE COUNTY ROLL; BUT, NOT THE MSBU TAX ROLL.

DUE TO THIS AMENDMENT TO THE MSBU TAX ROLL NEEDING TO BE DONE TODAY, COMMISSIONER HOWELL OFFERED A MOTION, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER PATE AND CARRIED TO APPROVE OF THE AMENDED MSBU ASSESSMENT ROLL.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN ASKED ATTORNEY HOLLEY IF HE HAD LOOKED AT THE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT AND WHAT WAS HIS OPINION OR RECOMMENDATION ON IT.

ATTORNEY HOLLEY SAID HE ONLY HAD ONE OBJECTION TO IT, THE SAME ONE HE HAD TOLD THEM BEFORE. IT SHOULD BE ACTED ON BY THE BOARD THAT IS SEATED AFTER THE ELECTION; NOT THIS BOARD.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL ASKED WHY IS THAT. ATTORNEY HOLLEY SAID BECAUSE THAT IS THE WAY IT IS SUPPOSE TO BE DONE.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND STATED IT WASN'T LIKE THAT SIX YEARS AGO. ATTORNEY HOLLEY SAID PART OF THIS BOARD IS NOT GOING TO BE HERE; BUT, YET THEY ARE APPROVING IT. THEY ALREADY KNOW ONE OF THE BOARD MEMBERS WON'T BE HERE AFTER THE ELECTION AND THERE MAY BE MORE. THE APPROPRIATE WAY TO DO THE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT IS WHEN THE BOARD COMES ON AND IS SEATED AFTER THE ELECTION.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL ASKED IF THE BOARD IS BREAKING ANY LAWS BY APPROVING THE AGREEMENT NOW. ATTORNEY HOLLEY SAID "NO, IT IS JUST BAD POLICY."

COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID HE DIDN'T KNOW THAT THEY HAVE A POLICY.

ATTORNEY HOLLEY SAID IT WAS NOT THE FAIR THING TO DO AND IT IS NOT THE BEST THING FOR THEM TO DO. HE HASN'T TRIED TO GO THROUGH TO DETERMINE IF THE MONEY IS OKAY; THAT IS SOMETHING THE BOARD WILL DO. THAT IS THE ONLY OBJECTION HE HAS AND THEY CAN DO WHAT THEY WANT.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN SAID BACK IN 2004 WHEN THERE WAS AN AGREEMENT WROTE UP FOR MR. HERBERT, HE THOUGHT ATTORNEY HOLLEY STATED BACK THEN THE BIGGEST OBJECTION HE HAD BACK THEN WAS THE SEVERANCE PAY. WHY THEN WAS ATTORNEY HOLLEY NOT IN DISAGREEMENT WITH THEM PASSING THAT AGREEMENT BEFORE THE NEW BOARD CAME ON.

ATTORNEY HOLLEY SAID HE WASN'T AWARE THEY DID; THEY MAY HAVE BUT HE WASN'T AWARE OF IT. CHAIRMAN HOLMAN SAID HE WAS JUST GOING BY THE MINUTES.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID HIS THINKING IS THIS BOARD APPOINTED

THE ADMINISTRATOR AND THEY SHOULD BE THE ONE TO APPROVE HIS CONTRACT; NOT SOME NEW BOARD THAT COMES IN HERE THAT DOESN'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT IT.

ATTORNEY HOLLEY SAID THERE IS A POSSIBILITY, DEPENDING ON HOW THE ELECTION TURNS OUT, THERE COULD BE A MAJORITY THAT IS AGAINST THE COUNTY MANAGER. IF THAT IS THE CASE, THEY ARE PROBABLY GOING TO UNDO IT.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN SAID THAT HAS BEEN MADE KNOWN TO FACT THAT WAS GOING TO HAPPEN. IT HAS ALREADY BEEN STATED IF CERTAIN ONES GO INTO OFFICE, MR. PITTS WOULDN'T HAVE A JOB. BUT, HE WON'T GO THERE WITH THAT. HE THEN ASKED EACH OF THE BOARD MEMBERS IF THEY HAD LOOKED OVER THE AGREEMENT; EACH REPLIED THEY HAD WITH COMMISSIONER BROCK SAYING HE WOULD LIKE TO ASK THE ATTORNEY A QUESTION.

COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID ACCORDING TO THE WAY HE READS THE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT, IT IS TWO YEARS AND AUTOMATICALLY RENEWS FOR ANOTHER TWO YEARS, SO ACTUALLY WHAT THEY ARE LOOKING AT IS A FOUR YEAR CONTRACT.

ATTORNEY HOLLEY ADVISED THE CONTRACT PROVIDES FOR THAT. COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID ONLY IF THE BOARD RENEWS THE CONTRACT AT THE END OF TWO YEARS.

ATTORNEY HOLLEY SAID HE THOUGHT IT WAS AUTOMATICALLY RENEWED UNLESS MR. PITTS DOES SOMETHING WRONG ISN'T IT.

COMMISSIONER BROCK REITERATED IT IS A FOUR YEAR CONTRACT. COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID THE BOARD CAN DECIDE TO LET MR. PITTS GO ANY-TIME THEY WANT TO.

COMMISSIONER PATE SAID AND AFTER THEY EVALUATE HIM.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL ADDRESSED THERE BEING A COUPLE OF LITTLE ADDITIONS TO THE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT AND IT PROVIDES FOR A MID TERM EVALUATION AT THE END OF TWELVE MONTHS; ALSO ON PAGE 6 SOME LANGUAGE WAS ADDED AS FOR AS VIOLATION OF STATE STATUTES, ETC. MR. PITTS WOULD BE SUSPENDED WITH OR WITHOUT PAY AT THE BOARD'S DISCRETION.

TODD ABBOTT QUESTIONED WHAT THE CONSEQUENCES WOULD BE IF THE



CONTRACT TERMINATED EARLY. COMMISSIONER HOWELL STATED THE BOARD WOULD HAVE TO PAY MR. PITTS HIS SEVERANCE PAY.

MR. ABBOTT QUESTIONED HOW LONG WAS THE SEVERANCE. COMMISSIONER HOWELL STATED IT WAS FOR THREE MONTHS, WHICH IS THE STANDARD FOR MOST COUNTY MANAGERS.

MR. ABBOTT ASKED IF THAT WAS WITH OR WITHOUT CAUSE. COMMISSIONER HOWELL STATED WITH CAUSE, MR. PITTS WOULDN'T GET ANYTHING.

COMMISSIONER PATE SAID THAT IS DIFFERENT THAN WHAT THE PREVIOUS ADMINISTRATOR HAD; HE GOT NINETY DAYS REGARDLESS OF HOW HE LEFT HERE.

CHAIRMAN HOLMAN ASKED MR. ABBOTT TO COME TO THE PODIUM AND STATE HIS NAME SO DEPUTY CLERK GLASGOW CAN GET IT ALL ON RECORD.

MR. ABBOTT, AS A CITIZEN, SAID THE QUESTION HE WOULD HAVE AND COMMISSIONER HOWELL STATED, THERE DEFINITELY IS GOING TO BE ONE NEW BOARD MEMBER UP THERE AND THEY DON'T KNOW WHO THAT IS GOING TO BE AT THIS TIME; BUT, THERE WILL BE A NEW BOARD WORKING WITH THE COUNTY MANAGER. HE THOUGHT WITH THAT NEW BOARD WORKING WITH THE COUNTY MANAGER MAYBE PERHAPS THEY SHOULD WAIT UNTIL NEXT MONTH AT THE RESTRUCTURING BOARD MEETING TO APPROVE THE CONTRACT. HE PERSONALLY HAS NO PROBLEM WITH EMORY; HE IS NOT EXACTLY SURE WHAT IS IN THE WHOLE CONTRACT. THAT HAS BEEN THE HISTORY OF THE COUNTY COMMISSION TO WAIT UNTIL THE RESTRUCTURING OF THE BOARD.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND SAID HE IS THE ONLY ONE SITTING ON THE BOARD TODAY THAT WAS HERE IN 2004 WHEN COMMISSIONER BROCK WAS HERE. THE DAY OF THE ELECTION, WHEN HE BEAT MR. HALL, THEY HAD A SPECIAL MEETING AND THAT IS WHEN THEY DID THE CONTRACT. THE SAME THING, PEOPLE SAID WELL WHEN YOU ALL GET IN THERE, YOU ALL ARE GOING TO DO SOMETHING TO PETE. THEY DIDN'T DO ANYTHING. THERE IS A LOT OF STUFF PEOPLE DON'T KNOW ABOUT PETE; HE IS A GOOD MAN AND HE WON'T SAY ANYTHING BAD ABOUT HIM NOR ABOUT MR. HALL OR THE REST OF THE BOARD THAT HAS BEEN UP HERE IN THE PAST. MR. PETE, WHEN EMORY CAME ON, CAME TO THE BOARD MEMBERS AND SAID HE IS MAKING MORE MONEY THAN I AM AND

I AM SEEING OVER HIM AS A BOSS; I NEED A PAY RAISE. COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND SAID TO CORRECT HIM IF HE IS WRONG; BUT, PETE GOT ABOUT A \$20,000 PAY RAISE. EVERYBODY LIKED MR. PETE.

COMMISSIONER BROCK ASKED WHO GOT A \$20,000 PAY RAISE. COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND INFORMED HIM MR. PETE DID.

MR. ABBOTT SAID FROM OVER WHAT HE WAS MAKING TO NOW TO WHEN HE LEFT, WHEN THE NEW BUILDING INSPECTOR CAME ON PETE GOT A \$20,000 A YEAR RAISE. THAT IS WHEN THE PAY STRUCTURE FOR THAT JOB CHANGED. COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND SAID THAT WAS RIGHT.

COMMISSIONER BROCK QUESTIONED WHAT WAS EMORY MAKING AND SAID CLOSE TO \$70,000 TOO; HE WAS THERE WITH PETE, JUST A LITTLE UNDER PETE.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND SAID PETE WAS MAKING AROUND \$49,000. MR. PITTS SAID HE DIDN'T KNOW WHAT PETE WAS MAKING; HE KNOWS HIS CONTRACT IN 2004 WAS FOR \$49,000 BUT HE DON'T KNOW WHAT HE WAS MAKING CURRENTLY. IT WAS PROBABLY 2006-2007 WHEN PETE GOT THAT RAISE. DEPUTY CLERK GLASGOW SAID SHE THOUGHT PETE WAS MAKING A LITTLE OVER \$70,000 A YEAR.

MR. PITTS SAID EVERYBODY GOT A RAISE BUT HIM HE THOUGHT; HE WAS JUST HIRED ON AND HE DIDN'T GET THAT RAISE.

ATTORNEY HOLLEY REFERRED TO THE BOARD BRINGING UP ONE YEAR HERE; HE HAS BEEN HERE 39 YEARS AND IT HAS ALWAYS BEEN ACTED ON BY THE BOARD SEATED AFTER THE ELECTION.

COMMISSIONER PATE SAID "NO SIR." COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND SAID IT WASN'T LIKE THAT. ATTORNEY HOLLEY SAID THE GREATEST MAJORITY OF THE TIME, THAT IS THE WAY IT WAS DONE.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID THAT IS WHEN THEY RENEW; WHEN THEY REORGANIZE AND RENEW THE ADMINISTRATOR'S AGREEMENT. THIS ADMINISTRATOR DOESN'T HAVE AN AGREEMENT AT ALL. THAT IS WHY HE SAYS HE NEEDS AN AGREEMENT TODAY.

COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID, IF FOR SOME REASON THE BOARD REMOVES MR. PITTS, THE CONTRACT SAYS THEY HAVE TO GIVE HIM HIS JOB BACK. THIS

CONTRACT IS ALL THE EMPLOYEE'S CONTRACT AND NO COUNTY PROTECTION IN THIS CONTRACT WHATSOEVER.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL ASKED COMMISSIONER BROCK WHICH PART OF THE CONTRACT WAS HE CONCERNED ABOUT. COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID ALL OF IT.

COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID HE WOULD HAVE FIGURED THE COUNTY ATTORNEY WOULD HAVE BEEN INVOLVED WITH DRAWING UP THIS CONTRACT. COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID THE ATTORNEY HAS SEEN IT AND READ IT AND HAS JUST GIVEN HIS COMMENTS ABOUT IT.

COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID "YES, SOMEBODY MADE IT AND GIVE IT TO HIM."

COMMISSIONER HOLMAN ASKED WHY WASN'T THE ATTORNEY INVOLVED WITH THE AGREEMENT WITH PETE. COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID HE WAS.

COMMISSIONER HOLMAN SAID THE ATTORNEY WASN'T INVOLVED ACCORDING TO THE MINUTES; MR. HALL DONE IT. COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID MR. HALL.

COMMISSIONER HOLMAN ASKED COMMISSIONER BROCK IF HE WANTED HIM TO READ THE MINUTES ON PETE'S CONTRACT. COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID HE DIDN'T KNOW NOTHING ABOUT THE CONTRACT. HE CAN TELL THE PEOPLE WHY AN ADMINISTRATOR HAS A CONTRACT. ROGER DALE CAN VERIFY EXACTLY WHY. HE NEVER HAD A CONTRACT AND MR. HERBERT NEVER REALLY HAD A CONTRACT UNTIL, AS MR. STRICKLAND STATED, THERE WAS A MEETING WITH SOME COMMISSIONERS, COMMISSIONERS RUNNING, HE AIN'T GOING TO CALL THEIR NAMES, A PRIVATE MEETING, THE PRESS WAS THERE AND THE PRESS CAME BACK, RIGHT OVER THERE, AND STATED THAT CERTAIN PEOPLE, THEY WERE GOING TO FIRE MR. HERBERT, MR. HOLLEY, MR. HARCUS. A LITTLE GROUP; IT WAS STATED RIGHT IN HERE. COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID DONNIE WAS EXACTLY RIGHT, AT THE SPUR OF THE MOMENT WAS WHEN A CONTRACT STARTED FOR ADMINISTRATOR IN WASHINGTON COUNTY. BECAUSE A LITTLE GROUP KNOWINGLY BEFORE THE PRESS STATED WHAT THEY WAS GOING TO DO. THAT IS HOW ALL THIS CAME ABOUT. AS MR. HOLLEY SAID, IT HAS ALWAYS BEEN THE PRACTICE ON REORGANIZATION FOR THE NEW BOARD, THE ATTORNEY, THE ADMINISTRATOR, EVERYTHING IN THE REORGANIZATION BECAUSE THAT BOARD HAS GOT TO WORK WITH THEM FOR THE NEXT FOUR YEARS.

MR. ABBOTT SAID, WITH THAT BEING SAID, THE GOAL FOR ANY CONTRACT WITH ANY ORGANIZATION, COMPANY, STATE, FEDERAL, MUNICIPALITIES AND THE EMPLOYEE IS TO PROTECT EACH OTHER. THE COUNTY HAS GOT TO HAVE PROTECTION AND IN THIS CASE, THE COUNTY MANAGER WOULD NEED PROTECTION. DO WE NEED A CONTRACT TO HAVE THAT PROTECTION. IT IS JUST A THOUGHT.

COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID "NO."

MR. PITTS ASKED COULD HE SPEAK TO THAT QUESTION AND THE CHAIRMAN TOLD HIM TO GO AHEAD.

MR. PITTS SAID HE CERTAINLY WOULD LIKE TO HAVE A CONTRACT JUST AS MR. BROCK HAS STATED, IN THE PAST THERE WAS A MEETING, A GROUP OF PEOPLE GOT TOGETHER, COMMISSIONERS AND POSSIBLE COMMISSIONERS, AND STATED THE FACT THEY WOULD GET RID OF THE COUNTY MANAGER. HE DON'T THINK THIS TODAY IS ANY DIFFERENT THAN IT WAS BACK THEN. SOME OF THE CANDIDATES RIGHT NOW FOR COUNTY COMMISSIONER IS OUT THERE CAMPAIGNING ON THAT THEY ARE GOING TO FIRE THE COUNTY MANAGER AS SOON AS THEY ARE ELECTED. HE IS NOT GOING TO NAME THE ONES THAT WERE DOING IT; THERE IS A SETTING MEMBER OF THIS BOARD DOING THE SAME THING TELLING PEOPLE IF HE GETS THE RIGHT PEOPLE IN THE COUNTY MANAGER IS GONE. BACK IN 2004, IT IS HIS UNDERSTANDING READING THESE MINUTES HE HAS GIVEN THE BOARD, MR. HOLLEY HAD ABSOLUTELY NO OBJECTIONS TO THE CONTRACT; THAT CONTRACT WAS GIVEN TO HOLLEY, HOLLEY STATED IN THE MINUTES, FIFTEEN MINUTES PRIOR TO THE MEETING. HOLLEY HAD READ OVER IT AND WAS WILLING TO GO OVER IT WITH ANYBODY THAT WANTED TO AND DISCUSS IT WITH THEM. HOLLEY NEVER OBJECTED TO NOT WRITING THAT CONTRACT NOR NOT KNOWING ANYTHING ABOUT THE CONTRACT. HE IS TALKING ABOUT THE CONTRACT FOR MR. HERBERT THAT WAS VOTED ON ACTUALLY AFTER THE ELECTION IN 2004; MR. BROCK WAS A LAME DUCK AND SO WAS MR. HALL A LAME DUCK AT THAT TIME. THEY HAD ALREADY BEEN DEFEATED. THEY CALLED A SPECIAL MEETING ON NOVEMBER 12, 2004 AND VOTED TO GIVE MR. HERBERT A CONTRACT AND THAT CONTRACT, THE ORIGINAL CONTRACT INCLUDED A 24 MONTH SEVERANCE PAY AND THEY ACTUALLY CUT IT DOWN TO ONE YEAR IN THAT MEETING. HE WOULD LOVE TO HAVE THAT ONE YEAR

TODAY; HE WOULD LOVE TO BE GIVEN WHAT MR. HERBERT HAD.

COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID EMORY HIT IT RIGHT ON THE NAIL HEAD. IT WAS CUT DOWN TO ONE YEAR; WHY. MR. PITTS TOLD COMMISSIONER BROCK HE WAS TALKING ABOUT THE SEVERANCE PAY; IF YOU FIRED THE MAN, YOU PAID HIM FOR A YEAR AND HE WOULD LOVE TO HAVE THAT TODAY.

COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID HE THOUGHT YOU WILL FIND A NEW SETTING BOARD CAN ONLY ISSUE A ONE YEAR ANNUAL CONTRACT. MR. PITTS SAID IF THE BOARD WOULD GIVE HIM THAT ONE YEAR CONTRACT WITH A ONE YEAR SEVERANCE PAY, HE AND COMMISSIONER BROCK WOULD BE HAPPY.

MR. ABBOTT SAID IF HE WAS IN THE POSITION EMORY IS SITTING IN, HE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW, THE SAME AS EMORY WOULD, HE HAD SOME SORT OF PROTECTION. BUT, HE THINKS THE STATE AND FEDERAL LAWS HAS GOT A LOT OF PROTECTION ON HOW YOU TREAT EMPLOYEES, MANAGERS, ETC. HE IS NOT SAYING A CONTRACT IS GOOD OR BAD; HE DOESN'T KNOW WHAT THAT CONSISTS OF BUT HIS WHOLE STATEMENT IS THEY DEFINITELY ARE GOING TO HAVE ONE NEW COUNTY COMMISSIONER, POSSIBLY TWO OR POSSIBLY NOT, AND THAT WILL BE THE BOARD THAT IS GOING TO BE CARRYING OUT THE CONTRACT WITH THE COUNTY MANAGER. THAT IS HIS ONLY FEELINGS ON IT. HE PERSONALLY HAS NO PROBLEMS WITH EMORY; HE APPRECIATES WHAT HE HAS DONE FOR THE COUNTY IN A LOT OF AREAS AND HE DOESN'T HAVE ANYTHING BAD TO SAY ABOUT THE MAN PERSONALLY WITH ALL HIS HEART AND HE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW THAT HE IS PROTECTED. BUT, HE THINKS THE STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS EMPLOYEE PROTECTION FOR WHATEVER POSITION YOU ARE IN. HE ALSO EMPLOYS AT THE PRESENT MOMENT 32 EMPLOYEES AND THERE ARE CERTAIN THINGS YOU CAN AND CAN'T DO WITH THE EMPLOYEES.

COMMISSIONER HOLMAN READ BOARD MINUTES, NOVEMBER 12, 2004: COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID THE ADMINISTRATOR CONTRACT WAS A FAIR CONTRACT FOR THE COUNTY AND FOR THE ADMINISTRATOR. HE ALSO WENT ON TO SAY IN REFERENCE TO OTHER COUNTIES HAVING A CONTRACT WITH THEIR ADMINISTRATOR.

COMMISSIONER HOLMAN SAID COMMISSIONER BROCK WAS IN FAVOR OF THE CONTRACT BACK THEN. COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID HE WAS IN FAVOR OF

THE CONTRACT OF HOW IT GOT HERE. HE IS LIKE MR. ABBOTT; WHY SHOULD WE EVEN HAVE A CONTRACT, WHY DO WE NEED ONE REALLY.

COMMISSIONER HOLMAN QUESTIONED COMMISSIONER BROCK WHY DIDN'T HE BRING THIS UP WHEN HE WAS IN OFFICE BACK THEN WHEN PETE HAD A CONTRACT TO BE BROUGHT UP. WHY DIDN'T HE MAKE ALL THEM COMMENTS THEN.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR SERVES AT THE PLEASURE OF THIS BOARD; THEY CAN FIRE HIM TOMORROW IF THEY WANT TO. ALL THIS CONTRACT DOES IS GIVE HIM SOME PROTECTION WITH THAT SEVERANCE PAY.

COMMISSIONER HOLMAN SAID IF ON NOVEMBER 18TH WHEN THE NEW BOARD COMES ON, EVER WHO IT IS, IF THE RIGHT ONES GO IN MR. BROCK IS WANTING TO GO IN, MR. PITTS, FROM WHAT HE UNDERSTANDS IS NOT GOING TO HAVE A JOB. AFTER NOVEMBER 18TH, IF THAT DOES'T TAKE PLACE WITHIN THE YEAR THAT THE NEW BOARD IS ON, HE WILL COME BACK AND APOLOGIZE FOR THE STATEMENT HE JUST MADE.

COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID HE WANTED TO SAY ONE THING AND HE IS THEN GOING TO BE THROUGH AND HE IS GOING TO SPEAK ON BEHALF OF THE PEOPLE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY. "THEY IS A MAN THAT JUST LEFT THIS OFFICE, WELL QUALIFIED FOR THAT POSITION; HE WASN'T EVEN OFFERED THAT POSITION. THEY HAVE A LOT OF PEOPLE WELL QUALIFIED FOR THAT POSITION IN THIS COUNTY AND THAT IS WHY HE WAS A FIRM BELIEVER IT SHOULD HAVE BEEN ADVERTISED. THE HIGHEST POSITION IN THE COUNTY; RUN THE COUNTY. HE SEES SEVERAL OFFICES IN HERE, FIVE OR SIX THAT IS JUST IN A SHORT PERIOD OF TIME, THAT HAS BEEN FILLED AT THE ANNEX, OUT OF COUNTY PEOPLE. HE ASKED IF THEY HAD ANYBODY IN WASHINGTON COUNTY QUALIFIED TO HAVE A JOB UP HERE. THERE IS SOME GOOD PEOPLE IN THIS COUNTY WELL QUALIFIED FOR THAT POSITION AND HE JUST THINKS THEY SHOULD HAVE BEEN GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY FOR THE POSITION AND THEY WEREN'T AND THAT IS ALL HE HAS TO SAY."

NAN THOMPSON QUESTIONED THE BOARD ON THEM APPOINTING MR. PITTS IN MARCH AND ASKED IF HE HAD DONE A GOOD JOB FOR THIS COUNTY.

COMMISSIONER PATE SAID "YES." COMMISSIONER HOLMAN SAID HE HAD NO COMPLAINTS. COMMISSIONER PATE SAID MR. PITTS HAD SAVED THE COUNTY \$60,000 A YEAR; COMMISSIONER BROCK SAID "NO."

MS. THOMPSON SAID SHE WAS NOT TALKING ABOUT WHAT MR. PITTS MAY HAVE SAVED. SHE IS TALKING ABOUT WHAT HE HAS DONE FOR THE COUNTY SINCE THE BOARD PUT HIM IN THAT POSITION.

COMMISSIONER PATE SAID HE HAS DONE WHAT HE SHOULD BE DOING. COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID THAT IS WHY WE ARE HERE TODAY.

MS. THOMPSON TOLD COMMISSIONER BROCK HE DOESN'T SPEAK FOR EVERYONE IN THE COUNTY. COMMISSIONER BROCK AGREED HE DON'T; HE IS TRYING TO SPEAK FOR THE PEOPLE AND THE EMPLOYEES OF THIS COUNTY AND THERE IS A \$15,000 RAISE IN THE CONTRACT.

MS. THOMPSON SAID THIS IS NOT A RAISE. COMMISSIONER BROCK ASKED WHAT ABOUT THE OTHER EMPLOYEES IN THIS COUNTY STATING THEY HAVEN'T HAD A RAISE IN FOUR YEARS.

MS. THOMPSON AGREED ALL THE EMPLOYEES NEED A RAISE; BUT, HER QUESTION IS WHEN SHE OFFERED A POSITION FOR THE BOARD TO GIVE THESE EMPLOYEES EVEN A PENNY RAISE, HE COULDN'T EVEN GIVE UP HIS GAS MONEY BUT YET HE IS GOING TO COMPLAIN BECAUSE THIS MAN WHO IS DOING HIS JOB AND DOING A GOOD JOB AND BECAUSE OF THE FACT THERE IS A PERSONALITY CONFLICT, HE WISHED TO REMOVE HIM. MR. PITTS HAS SERVED THIS COUNTY FOR SEVERAL MONTHS; HE HAS DONE A GOOD JOB AND SHE THINKS THIS BOARD AS IT SITS, WHETHER THERE IS TWO NEW PEOPLE OR ONE NEW PERSON, SHOULD APPROVE THIS MAN AND LET HIM CONTINUE ON TO SERVE THIS COUNTY. THAT IS ONE PERSON'S, A COUNTY RESIDENT'S OPINION.

COMMISSIONER HOLMAN SAID HE WAS GOING TO REFRAIN FROM VOTING; HE THINKS THERE IS ENOUGH VOTES HERE TO PASS THE AGREEMENT. HE ASKED WHAT THE PLEASURE OF THE BOARD WAS.

COMMISSIONER PATE ASKED COMMISSIONER HOLMAN WHY HE WAS REFRAINING FROM VOTING; HE IS STILL A SITTING COMMISSIONER. HE MAY BE A LAME DUCK; BUT, TWO OF THEM THAT PUT THIS THING IN ALREADY KNEW THEY WERE A LAME DUCK. COMMISSIONER PATE SAID HE WASN'T A LAME DUCK YET; AND

HE DOESN'T INTEND TO BE A LAME DUCK UNTIL AFTER THE NUMBERS ON NOVEMBER 2ND.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID THE ONLY THING HE HAS A PROBLEM WITH THE CONTRACT, HE HAS STATED THIS BEFORE, THE CHANGES THAT HAVE BEEN MADE HE IS HAPPY WITH EXCEPT FOR THE \$85,000 SALARY. HE DOESN'T THINK THEY SHOULD DO THAT. HE HAS SAID THIS AND SHARED THIS WITH MR. PITTS UPFRONT; THEY HAVE ASKED OTHER EMPLOYEES TO DO THINGS AND HAVE NOT GIVEN THEM A RAISE. IN FACT THIS BOARD HAS SAID THEY WERE NOT GOING TO GIVE A RAISE TO SOMEBODY THAT GETS EXTRA DUTIES. HE UNDERSTANDS MR. PITTS IS A REGISTERED BUILDING OFFICIAL AND HE SHOULD BE COMPENSATED FOR THAT PROBABLY; BUT, BECAUSE THEY HAVE NOT DONE THAT FOR OTHER EMPLOYEES IN THE COUNTY, HE IS NOT IN FAVOR OF THAT. BUT, THE REST OF THE AGREEMENT HE IS HAPPY WITH TODAY.

COMMISSIONER PATE ASKED MR. PITTS IF HE WOULD TAKE A LESSER SALARY AND IF SO, WHAT WOULD HE ACCEPT. MR. PITTS STATED HE WAS OPEN TO NEGOTIATIONS AND WANTED TO SAY, HE WOULD LIKE FOR THE AUDIENCE TO UNDERSTAND AS HE KNOWS OR FEELS SURE THE BOARD UNDERSTANDS, HE IS REFERRED TO OFTEN AS A BUILDING INSPECTOR AND HE IS NOT INSULTED BY THAT. BUT, HE IS A STATE CERTIFIED BUILDING OFFICIAL; THERE IS A DIFFERENCE AND HE WOULD LIKE FOR THE AUDIENCE TO UNDERSTAND THE DIFFERENCE. A BUILDING INSPECTOR CAN NOT COME AND WORK FOR WASHINGTON COUNTY UNLESS THERE IS A BUILDING OFFICIAL ON BOARD. IT REQUIRES A BUILDING OFFICIAL TO OVERSEE A BUILDING DEPARTMENT FOR THE COUNTY TO HAVE A BUILDING DEPARTMENT. THAT WAS THE INTENT OF THE \$15,000 A YEAR FOR HIM TO SERVE AS BUILDING OFFICIAL FOR THE COUNTY. HE STILL REVIEWS PLANS, SIGNS CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY, OVERSEES THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT MORE SO THAN IF HE WERE AN ADMINISTRATOR IF THERE WAS A BUILDING OFFICIAL IN THAT POSITION. HE JUST WANTED THE PEOPLE TO UNDERSTAND THERE IS A DIFFERENCE. YOU CAN'T HIRE A LICENSED BUILDING INSPECTOR TO RUN THAT BUILDING DEPARTMENT; IT HAS TO BE A LICENSED BUILDING OFFICIAL.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND SAID \$15,000 IS CHEAP FOR USING MR. PITTS



NAME AND USING HIS LICENSE. MR. PITTS SAID IF THE COUNTY WERE TO LOSE THAT BUILDING INSPECTOR NEXT WEEK, HE WOULD HAVE TO FALL RIGHT BACK INTO THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT AND START HANDLING THE DAY TO DAY AFFAIRS OF THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT UNTIL THEY CAN HIRE ANOTHER BUILDING INSPECTOR. EVIDENTLY THEY ARE NOT EASY TO HIRE. THEY DID ADVERTISE FOR ONE AND THEY HAD TWO APPLICANTS AND ONE OF THOSE TWO WAS NOT QUALIFIED.

COMMISSIONER BROCK ASKED HOW COME; HE HAD WORKED BEFORE.

MR. ALBERT DAVIS ASKED IF THE BUILDING INSPECTOR THEY HAVE NOW HAS A LICENSE. MR. PITTS SAID THE BUILDING INSPECTOR PROBABLY HAS AT LEAST TEN LICENSES; HE IS A VERY QUALIFIED MAN.

MR. DAVIS SAID IF HE HAS THAT, WHY DO THEY NEED; HE THEN ASKED IF THE INSPECTOR WAS A BUILDING OFFICIAL.

MR. PITTS SAID THE INSPECTOR IS CURRENTLY A BUILDING OFFICIAL; BUT, HE CAN TELL THE BOARD HE WON'T STAY HERE FOR THE AMOUNT OF SALARY HE IS MAKING. WHEN ANOTHER JOB COMES OPEN, HE WILL BE GONE. HE ACTUALLY WAS MAKING \$100,000 A YEAR AT HIS PREVIOUS JOB.

COMMISSIONER BROCK ASKED IF THE INSPECTOR LEFT THE \$100,000 A YEAR JOB FOR \$15 AN HOUR UP HERE. MR. PITTS SAID "NO, HE HAD ALREADY LEFT HIS OTHER JOB FOR A PRIVATE BUSINESS."

COMMISSIONER HOWELL ASKED MR. PITTS IF HE WOULD CONSIDER A SALARY OF \$78,500. MR. PITTS ASKED HOW HE ARRIVED AT THAT FIGURE.

COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID IT WAS PRETTY SIMPLE TO HIM; HE DID THE MATH AND DIVIDED IT BY TWO.

MR. PITTS SAID HE WOULD CONSIDER THE \$78,500; BUT, STATED TOO HE DOESN'T CONSIDER THIS AS A RAISE. HE HAS TAKEN OTHER ASSIGNED DUTIES AND WILL CONSTANTLY TAKE OTHER ASSIGNED DUTIES; HE DOESN'T HAVE A PROBLEM WITH THAT.

COMMISSIONER PATE ASKED MR. PITTS WHEN HE TOOK OVER AS COUNTY MANAGER WAS HE SURPRISED TO KNOW THAT PETE HERBERT WAS THE DEPARTMENT HEAD OF PUBLIC WORKS; EVERYBODY ALWAYS THOUGHT THE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS RUN IT, SOME DID. IT IS A LIASON; NOT TO BE OVER THE DAY TO

DAY OPERATIONS.

MR. PITTS SAID HE ACTUALLY REALIZED BY THE ORGANIZATIONAL CHART, WHO WAS IN CHARGE OF PUBLIC WORKS. COMMISSIONER PATE SAID SO IT WAS NOT JUST ONE HAT MR. PITTS ASSUMED. MR. PITTS SAID "NO SIR."

COMMISSIONER HOWELL OFFERED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT FOR MR. EMORY PITTS WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE SALARY AND MAKE IT \$78,500.

COMMISSIONER BROCK ASKED HOW MUCH RAISE THAT WAS. COMMISSIONER PATE STATED IT IS NOT A RAISE. COMMISSIONER HOWELL AND MR. PITTS SAID IT WOULD BE ROUGHLY \$8,000 MORE THAN MR. PITTS IS CURRENTLY GETTING.

COMMISSIONER PATE SAID BUT THAT \$30,000 THEY COULD HAVE GIVE UP OR THE BOARD COULD HAVE GIVE UP WOULD HAVE WENT A LOT FURTHER.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND SECONDED THE MOTION FOR DISCUSSION.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND ASKED WHAT IF MR. PITTS DON'T TAKE THE \$78,500 SALARY. COMMISSIONER HOWELL SAID IF HE DON'T TAKE THE \$78,500, THE COUNTY DON'T HAVE AN AGREEMENT.

COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND ASKED MR. PITTS IF HE WOULD AGREE TO TAKE THE AGREEMENT WITH A \$78,500 SALARY. MR. PITTS AGREED TO TAKE THE \$78,500 SALARY.

ON A ROLL CALL VOTE, THE MOTION CARRIED TO APPROVE THE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT WITH MR. PITTS WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE SALARY AND MAKE THE SALARY \$78,500. COMMISSIONER PATE SAID "YES" AND HE KNOWS HE IS GOING TO TAKE A BEATING; BUT, IT IS NOT A RAISE. GET THAT STRAIGHT FOLKS. WHEN HE DOES A SET OF PLANS, HE HAS TO HAVE SOMEBODY. THERE WAS LAUGHING FROM THE AUDIENCE. COMMISSIONER PATE TOLD THEM TO LAUGH ALL THEY WANTED TO; IT IS PROFESSIONALISM. WHEN HE DOES A SET OF PLANS, HE HAS TO HAVE SOMEBODY TO SIGN AND SEAL THEM AND THEY CHARGE HIM TO DO IT.

COMMISSIONER BROCK VOTED NO ON THE MOTION.

COMMISSIONER BROCK OFFERED A MOTION TO ADJOURN, COMMISSIONER STRICKLAND SECONDED THE MOTION.

