

Brevard County Board of County Commissioners

*Commission Chambers, Building C
2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way
Viera, FL 32940*



Minutes

Tuesday, March 17, 2026

9:00 AM

Regular

Commission Chambers

Rollcall

Present: Commissioner District 1 Katie Delaney , Commissioner District 2 Tom Goodson, Commissioner District 3 Kim Adkinson, Commissioner District 4 Rob Feltner, and Commissioner District 5 Thad Altman

C. CALL TO ORDER

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Adkinson led the assembly in the Pledge of Allegiance.

D.1. Minutes for Approval: January 5, 2026 SOIRL Workshop

The Board approved the January 5, 2026, Save Our Indian River Lagoon (SOIRL) Workshop Meeting Minutes.

Result: APPROVED

Mover: Rob Feltner

Second: Katie Delaney

Ayes: Delaney, Adkinson, Feltner, and Altman

Absent: Goodson

Approval, Re: Permission for Commissioner Goodson to Participate by Telephone

The Board approved Commissioner Goodson to participate via telephone.

Result: APPROVED

Mover: Rob Feltner

Second: Katie Delaney

Ayes: Delaney, Goodson, Adkinson, Feltner, and Altman

E.1. Resolution acknowledging April as the Month of the Military Child - District 4

Commissioner Feltner read aloud, and the Board adopted Resolution No. 26-015, recognizing April as the Month of the Military Child.

Result: ADOPTED

Mover: Rob Feltner

Second: Katie Delaney

Ayes: Delaney, Goodson, Adkinson, Feltner, and Altman

A representative stated on behalf of AVET project and all of the brave men and women they serve, they want to say thanks very much for this proclamation which recognizes sacrifices of their military children as their parents fight for this great nation; as a military child himself, then a veteran, and now a proud parent of a veteran, he can tell the Commission firsthand and testify that the sacrifice never ends, it continues; in 1986, the Secretary of Defense, Casper Weinberger, declared April as the month of the military child; and this proclamation today is proof that Weinberger's legacy continues. He expressed his appreciation again on behalf of AVET project, all of the veterans, and all of the military children in Brevard County.

F.1. Approval Re: Transportation Impact Fee Technical Advisory Committee for Merritt Island/North Beaches District Project Fund Recommendations (District 2)

The Board approved the disbursement of \$964,000.00 in transportation impact fees, in accordance with the recommendations prepared by the Transportation Impact Fee Technical Advisory Committee of the Merritt Island/North Beaches District; and authorized the County Manager to execute all necessary budget amendments (BCRs) required for implementing these appropriations.

Result: APPROVED

Mover: Kim Adkinson

Seconded: Katie Delaney

F.2. Approval Re: Transportation Impact Fee Technical Advisory Committee for North Mainland Benefit District Project Fund Recommendations (Districts 1 & 2)

The Board approved the disbursement of \$2,117,209.00 in transportation impact fees, in accordance with the recommendations prepared by the Transportation Impact Fee Technical Advisory Committee of North Mainland Benefit District; and authorized the County Manager to execute all necessary budget amendments (BCRs) required for implementing these appropriations.

Result: APPROVED

Mover: Kim Adkinson

Seconded: Katie Delaney

F.3. Approval Re: Transportation Impact Fee Technical Advisory Committee for South Mainland Benefit District Project Fund Recommendations (District 3)

The Board approved the disbursement of \$500,000.00 in transportation impact fees, in accordance with the recommendations prepared by the Transportation Impact Fee Technical Advisory Committee of South Mainland Benefit District; and authorized the County Manager to execute all necessary budget amendments (BCRs) required for implementing these appropriations.

Result: APPROVED

Mover: Kim Adkinson

Seconded: Katie Delaney

F.5. Approval Re: State of Florida Department of Transportation - Joint Participation Agreement (FPN 457892-1-58-1) Glenridge Circle Connection with Via De La Reina - District 2

The Board adopted Resolution No. 26-018, authorizing the County Manager to execute the Joint Participation Agreement; authorized the County Manager to execute all other project-related documents and/or required changes contingent upon County Attorney, Risk Management, and Purchasing Services review and approval; and authorized the County Manager to execute all necessary budget amendments (BCRs).

Result: ADOPTED

Mover: Kim Adkinson

Seconded: Katie Delaney

F.7. Approval RE: Ratification of Change Order 5 for the Lift Station N-07 Replacement.

The Board ratified Change Order No. 5 for the Lift Station N-07 Replacement Project; and authorized the County Manager to execute, thereby increasing the total contract value to \$1,424,339.70.

Result: APPROVED

Mover: Kim Adkinson

Second: Katie Delaney

F.8. Approval of Task Order No.5 for Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. for RFQ-7-23-05-South Beaches Wastewater Treatment Plant - 6 MGD Conversion to Advanced Wastewater Treatment.

The Board approved Task Order No. 5; and authorized the County Manager to execute future contract task orders and task order amendments.

Result: APPROVED

Mover: Kim Adkinson

Second: Katie Delaney

F.9. Authorization, Re: Advertise Invitations to Bid for the replacement of a SCADA tower on County-owned property located at 10001 North Wickham Road, Melbourne, FL 32940, replacing the current tower, owned by the Federal Aviation Authority (FAA), which serves as a control point of the Brevard County SCADA system in the central area.

The Board authorized advertising Invitations to Bid (ITB) for the replacement of the SCADA tower on County-owned property located at 10001 North Wickham Road, Melbourne, FL 32940; include in the ITB an option for a wireless carrier to construct the tower for the County at their expense, including this option should include a 20-year colocation agreement with a rental abatement period to cover the cost of the tower, including a base fee and annual fee increase; authorized the revenue of that agreement, after abatement period, to be redirected to the Utility Services Department to continue supporting the SCADA network and the maintenance of the tower; and authorized the County Manager, or his designee, to execute the contract with the awarded vendor, its renewals, documents, administrative or budget actions, subject to approval by the County Attorney's Office, Risk Management, and Purchasing.

Result: APPROVED

Mover: Kim Adkinson

Second: Katie Delaney

F.11. Approval Re: Resolution and Lease for the H.S. Williams House (Lawndale) located at 1219 Rockledge Drive, Rockledge, Florida to the Preservation and Education Trust, Inc. (District 2)

The Board adopted Resolution No. 26-016, pursuant to Section 125.38, Florida Statutes, and Section 2-247, Brevard County Code of Ordinances, allowing the non-competitive lease of County property located at 1219 Rockledge Drive, Rockledge, Florida, known as the H.S. Williams House (Lawndale), to the Preservation and Education Trust, Inc. for public use; approved and authorized the Chair to execute the Lease Agreement with Preservation and Education Trust, Inc.; and authorized the Parks and Recreation Director to execute the renewal option, modifications, and any amendments, upon approval of the County Attorney's Office and Risk Management.

Result: ADOPTED

Mover: Kim Adkinson

Second: Katie Delaney

Ayes: Delaney, Goodson, Adkinson, Feltner, and Altman

F.12. Approval, Re: Letter of Recommendation to the Space Coast Transportation Planning Organization and Follow-up Memorandum of Agreement with Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged regarding Coordinated Transportation Services in Brevard County

The Board approved and authorized the Chair to sign a Letter to be submitted to the Space Coast Transportation Planning Organization recommending Space Coast Area Transit to continue as the Community Transportation Coordinator in Brevard County; and if selected, authorized the Chair to execute the memorandum of Agreement with the Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged, upon County Attorney and Risk Management approvals.

Result: APPROVED

Mover: Kim Adkinson

Seconded: Katie Delaney

F.13. Approval, Re: Authorizing Resolution, Grant Application, Use of Toll Revenue Credits, Execution of Follow-Up Grant Agreement for FY2026/FFY2021 with the Federal Transit Administration, Section 5307 Small Urbanized Areas under 200,000 population.

The Board approved the following actions for the FY 2026/FFY2021 Section 5307 Small Urbanized Areas under 200,000 population from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in the amount of \$712,014:

- Authorized the Chair to sign and adopted the Authorizing Resolution No. 26-017;
- Authorized the Chair to sign the Designation of Signature Authority, allowing staff to submit the grant electronically;
- Authorized the Chair to approve the use of Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Toll Revenue Credits;
- Authorized the Transit Services Director to execute any additional follow-up documentation, resolution, and amendments necessary to secure these funds; and
- Authorized the County Manager to execute any necessary budget change amendments (BCRs).

Result: ADOPTED

Mover: Kim Adkinson

Seconded: Katie Delaney

F.14. Approval, re: Annual Emergency Medical Services (EMS) County Trust Grant Funds for FY 2025-2026

The Board authorized the receipt and award of EMS County Grant Trust funds to eligible local emergency medical services providers that have submitted grant applications as identified in the Grant Award Matrix, and funding for this program is provided to Brevard County by the Florida Department of health; and additionally, authorized the County Manager as approval authority for all necessary budget amendments (BCRs) or other required administrative actions.

Result: APPROVED

Mover: Kim Adkinson

Seconded: Katie Delaney

F.15. Approval, re: New Agreement with Coastal Health Systems of Brevard, Inc. for Interfacility and Marchman/Baker Act Transport Services.

The Board approved and authorized the Chair to execute Agreement with Coastal Health Systems of Brevard, Inc. (CHSB) for the provision of non-emergency interfacility transport and

Marchman/Baker Act transport services; and authorized the County Manager, or his designee, to execute any subsequent renewals or amendments consistent with terms of the Agreement, and to approve any required budget amendments (BCRs) or other administrative documents.

Result: APPROVED

Mover: Kim Adkinson

Seconders: Katie Delaney

F.16. Authorization, RE: Municipal Review of Local Option Gas Tax (LOGT) Percentages Allocations

The Board directed the Clerk to mail a copy of the LOGT percentage allocations to each municipality for review; and approved recommendation of the Board to conduct the final reviews of the allocations at the May 5, 2026, Board meeting.

Result: APPROVED

Mover: Kim Adkinson

Seconders: Katie Delaney

F.17. Approval, Re: Revisions to Board Policy BCC-26, "Acquisition of Consultant Professional Services."

The Board approved revisions to Board Policy BCC-26, "Acquisition of Consultant Professional Services".

Result: APPROVED

Mover: Kim Adkinson

Seconders: Katie Delaney

F.18. Appointment(s) / Reappointment(s)

The Board appointed/reappointed Richard Mariani and Gabrielle Wills to the Historical Commission, with terms expiring December 31, 2027.

Result: APPROVED

Mover: Kim Adkinson

Seconders: Katie Delaney

F.19. Bill Folder

The Board acknowledged receipt of the Bill Folder

Result: APPROVED

Mover: Kim Adkinson

Seconders: Katie Delaney

F.20. Precinct Boundaries - Altered and Added (Chapter 101.001(1) F.S.)

The Board approved the revised precinct boundaries due to annexations by the Cities of Melbourne and West Melbourne; and approved the creation of Precinct 533 for Chaparral of Palm Bay Community Development District and Precinct 534 for Everlands Community Development District.

Result: APPROVED

Mover: Kim Adkinson

Seconders: Katie Delaney

F.4. Approval, re: Amend Contract with Accela Inc, to Include ePermitHub Digital Plan Room

Commissioner Delaney stated before the Board takes action on this, she would like to ask staff to provide an overview of the ePermitHub, including how it will streamline the planning review process, improve productivity, and reduce costs associated with manual handling of the digital signatures and large project files.

Billy Prasad, Planning and Development Director, explained this is a request to amend the existing Accela Contract that the Board authorized in 2024, which was to upgrade and modernize the County's implementation of Accela; this request is now to include ePermitHub in that software, which Accela has acquired in the interim between when the Board approved the Contract in 2024 and now; this would be used 100 percent for building permitting fee revenue; no General Fund allocation is necessary; there is also no associated fee increase necessary or anything like that; this will be done with the existing budget; and the same was true of the underlying Contract. He went on to say essentially, time is of the essence to all parties in the permitting world; accuracy is essential; it is staff's judgment that this software, this plugin to the County's software would vastly help on both of those fronts; ultimately, the County controls, through Accela, over three million records; staff deals with 33,000 new records annually; by record, he does not mean a single document; that is 33,000 different records, as in an overall record number, in Accela; it is kind of the backbone of Brevard County development as far as the Department's processes and things like that; and staff believes it will help staff truly modernize the platform and be a benefit for the public who wants their projects done as quickly and accurate as possible. He advised the builders who are in the same place and staff, who the Board knows they want to spend as much time on substantive building Code, rather than technical things like checking signatures; and this will allow them to spend their time on the things that are most impactful to everybody.

Commissioner Delaney asked if Mr. Prasad would go into a little bit about why the County is choosing this product versus other products.

Mr. Prasad replied they had initially looked at a few different plan review software's pre-Accela acquiring ePermitHub; the other competitors that were looked at, for a couple of different reasons they did not look at these as superior to this product; first, they did not integrate into Accela nearly as well; they also did not deal with the way the Florida Building Code implement digital signatures; that is truly critical for them again, if they were going to use this to generate efficiency; they want the program to be doing as much of that technical work; it has to understand, for lack of a better term, how Florida does those kinds of things, because the County has unique administrative requirements; and Accela has done a very good job it seems of implementing those to automate that. He advised they do have a representative from Accela here today if the Board has a question for him.

Commissioner Delaney remarked cool; and she asked basically, this is going to speed up the processes, make it more efficient, more accurate, and this is going to be the best bang for the County's buck as far as software goes.

Mr. Prasad responded he believes so, Commissioner.

Commissioner Delaney stated awesome.

The Board authorized staff to negotiate with Accela, Inc. to make necessary amendments to its contract (and related documents) with Accela, Inc., to integrate ePermitHub into the previously-authorized modernization project and licensing; authorized the County Manager to execute order forms, agreements, task orders, change orders, modifications, and amendments, provided that the cost is not to exceed the figures listed in the Fiscal Impact of this Agenda

Report; and authorized the County Manager to execute all necessary budget amendments (BCRs).

Result: APPROVED

Mover: Rob Feltner

Second: Katie Delaney

F.6. Approval Re: Standardization and Single Source of Detention Door Access Control System and Cell Door, Cell Door Frames and Locking Systems

Commissioner Delaney stated she pulled this Item because she figured this is not really a super routine thing; she just wanted to highlight that the County is making improvements to the jail to make sure it is a safer environment and whatnot; and she asked staff, if they did not mind, to give her a presentation.

Marc Bernath, Public Works Director, explained this is a standardization request and single source for detention door access control system and cell doors; under the County's previous Contract, staff did approximately 290-plus doors; these are high security doors that go back to a nerve center, so that this way the Sheriff's Department at remote locations can control, open, and close them; both the nerve center, as well as the doors, are owned by MTI Control Systems and MTS, which is Montgomery Technology Systems, is a subsidiary, and they have a proprietary system; and it is in the County's best interest to standardize this as the system for the jail, and then be able to do a change order to the Contract.

The Board approved the standardization and single source determination by Montgomery Technology, Inc. (MTI) control system, manufactured by MTI for the Detention Door Access Control System; approved the standardization and single source determination of Montgomery Technology Systems, LLC (MTS) as the integrator for the Detention Door Access Control System and Detention Cell Door, Cell Door Frames, Controllers, and Locking Systems; waived bidding procedures to procure MTI control system components and software and cell door, cell door frames, and locking systems and ancillary items compatible with the MTI control system; and authorized the County Manager to execute any contract-related documents, such as change orders, amendments, service agreements, or other administrative actions to initiate these single source procurements, subject to review and approval by the County Attorney's Office, Risk Management, and Purchasing Services.

Result: APPROVED

Mover: Katie Delaney

Second: Rob Feltner

F.10. Approval: Request the Board of County Commissioners approve a recommendation to provide \$5,908,640 in funding for Opioid Abatement services within Brevard County

Commissioner Delaney stated she pulled this Item from the Consent Agenda to provide a little bit more transparency before the Board takes action on this Item; she knows that this is a significant amount of money; she figured it is a great thing; the County is putting resources out there to help the serious need that it got through settlement funds; and she wanted to make sure the Board talked about it so people know that this is happening, and that the settlement money is moving and going towards organizations that are going to help with opioid addiction.

Juanita Jackson, Housing and Human Services Director, advised Item F.10. is requesting the Board to approve recommendations of the Together in Partnership (TIP) Recommendation Committee to provide \$5.9 million in funding to the opioid abatement services; Purchasing

Services released the opioid misuse abatement funding request, or RFA; Housing and Purchasing held a mandatory pre-proposal meeting after the closing date; and 21 applications moved forward to the TIP Recommendation Subcommittee on November 21st. She noted the TIP Recommendation Subcommittee voted to recommend funding to the following agencies: \$2 million to Circles of Care to provide jail-based medication assisted treatment for incarcerated adults with opioid use disorder to reduce opioid-related mortality, prevent or reduce overdose; \$1.7 million to Circles of Care also, to expand and enhance existing medication-assisted treatment services in Brevard County; \$780,000 to Specialized Treatment Education and Prevention Services (STEPS) to provide access to Brevard County indigent residents to participate in a drug court program, which will address those that are incarcerated and repeat offenders coming back; \$785,000 in STEPS Living Room Project, which will primarily target adult indigent Brevard County residents in need of access to care, increase access to behavioral health supports by providing wraparound services and linkages to care; and \$597,000 to Recovery Connection of Central Florida (RCCF) to serve individuals seeking assistance for themselves or families related to the use of opioids and other substances, focusing on individuals transitioning from treatment facilities.

Commissioner Delaney provided a slide to the Board of the requests the County has gotten; she stated she wanted to highlight this because it shows the serious need in the community; and she asked Ms. Jackson to go through a little bit of the process staff went through, and changes that are possible moving forward.

Ms. Jackson replied what one sees up on the screen are the 21 applications that were received; the Review Committee made the recommendation of three areas of concentration; the opioid settlement dollars can only be spent on approved uses through the State Abatement Program; the three areas of concentration were the support people in treatment and recovery, address the needs of criminal justice-involved persons, prevent misuse of opioids, and then all other areas of concentration, which is inclusive of again, those approved uses from the State; and after the Recommendation Committee put out those four areas, it went to the Review Committee, and then the Review Committee reviewed all 21 applications and made the recommendation of the four that is before the Board.

Commissioner Delaney asked if the Committee talked about doing stuff a little bit differently going forward.

Ms. Jackson responded yes, going forward it was discussed when they meet again the agencies that receive funding this round, they would be excluded the next round from applying for the opioid dollars, then the dollars can be spread out into those areas that did not receive funding this time.

Laura McCarthy commented in 2023, the President of the United States awarded her the Lifetime Achievement Award for volunteerism for over 5,000 hours in 2023 dedicated to volunteering her services specifically to this topic of opioid misuse; she has been serving the opioid misuse task force of Brevard County since 2018; she is an editor, one of many editors, of the original abatement plan that sat before the County that was done as a gift to the County by their organization because it was truly originally designed by State Statute to be developed by the County; she is also the founder of the Brevard Recovery Fest, which is an action item that came out of the task force in 2021 whose mission is to end the stigma of addictions and mental health in Brevard County; and they are the largest collaborative effort of providing a platform for all of their providers to showcase their services so people can survive. She continued by saying she has been watching this process from the beginning as a TIP member, and she is an at-large member of TIP; and she would like to read the following executive

summary of the events as outlined by one of their members who is unable to be here today. "Brevard County issued four separate RFAs, RFA 52601, 02, 03, 04, each targets a distinct priority. Those priorities were listed earlier. Applicants reasonably understood that each RFA represented a separate funding category and expected intracategory competition. Instead during the public scoring meeting, the County staff instructed the Recommendation Committee to treat all applications as a single pool and ranked uniformly and fund sequentially from the top down, with no discretion for category balance and no ability to reduce awards. As a result, two of the County's declared priority categories, prevention and treatment and recovery, received no funding, prevention or tentatively disappropriate and ineffectually treatment and recovery portion funding, defeating the very purpose of issuing separate RFAs." She pointed out State Statute 287 clearly states that if the County sets out four separate RFAs, they need to be scored, procured, and ranked according to four separate RFAs; the County did not do that; that is the process that they would ask that it get corrected the next time it is done; they do ask that the funds be released as they have been waiting over a year for these funds; and they are ready to spend that money.

Commissioner Delaney stated if there are a couple of groups that are receiving some of the money, she would like to hear what their plans are, what their organizations will be doing with the money; and she is not sure if the cards that were for questions only are available.

Commissioner Adkinson stated she would like to make a motion to approve.

Commissioner Feltner stated he will second the motion.

Commissioner Delaney noted obviously the County wants to disperse this money, so this was not meant to be negative; it was meant to bring light to this and have these organizations share what they are doing for the community; she reiterated it was not meant in any negative way; and she is surprised that the Board is not going to let the organizations share what good work they are about to do in the community.

The Board approved the recommendations of the Together in Partnership (TIP) Advisory Board Recommendations Subcommittee to provide \$5,908,640 in funding for Opioid Abatement Services in the areas of criminal justice involved persons, treatment, recovery, and prevention; authorized the County Manager to execute any contracts associated with Opioid Abatement Services upon approval of Risk Management, and the County Attorney's Office; authorized Housing and Human Services Director to execute any future amendment(s) or modifications(s) upon approval by the County Attorney, Purchasing Services, and Risk Management; and authorized the County Manager to execute all necessary budget amendments (BCRs).

Result: APPROVED

Mover: Kim Adkinson

Second: Rob Feltner

- F.5. Approval, Re: State of Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) - Joint Participation Agreement (FPN 457892-1-58-1) Glenridge Circle Connection with Via De La Reina (continued)

Chair Altman stated Gerald Jordan had a card on F.5.; and he asked if Mr. Jordan was still here and would like to speak. He expressed his apologies that he looked over that.

Mr. Jordan advised well, the Board approved it and they would just like to talk to the Public Works staff that is working just to see the details.

Chair Altman commented he can say a few words, he filled out a card.

Mr. Jordan, resident of Palmetto Subdivision and retired military, stated they would just like to get a point of contact in the Public Works Department just to go over the details of the plan to make sure they align with the request they originally gave to Commissioner Goodson at his office; they are thankful the Board is funding it and working out all of the issues behind this little project, because it will save lives; and hopefully, they will have a follow on project with FDOT to get them to change their minds on where to put that red light.

Commissioner Delaney asked if that is an easy answer that could be answered now.

Marc Bernath, Public Works Director, stated the project, there is about a 40-foot linear grass area between Glenridge View Circle and Via de la Reina; staff is in discussions with the District 2 Commissioner and FDOT in preparation for the North Courtenay Project; they are going to be connecting that with a roadway, do the appropriate drainage; this will enable residents that will be precluded from making a left-hand turn on North Courtenay once the divider project goes in will now have a way to do that; staff has coordinated this with FDOT; and in fact, FDOT is funding the project for the County to execute.

Commissioner Delaney asked if that answered Mr. Jordan's question.

Mr. Jordan replied partially, but now that he knows who it is, he will talk to Mr. Bernath afterwards; they do not have a problem with the funding, they appreciate it; they just have another little question about if they can make a left turn on Via de la Reina; it would call for moving the median out, which was their original request to Commissioner Goodson; but he does not want to stop the project as they have some motion moving forward; and he is not going to tit for tat for that little piece if that is not possible.

Commissioner Feltner advised he would urge Mr. Jordan to call FDOT, as they would be better to answer that when it comes to medians.

Mr. Jordan commented no, he is talking about the median located on Via de la Reina once they do this opening at Glenridge Circle and Via de la Reina.

Commissioner Feltner pointed out that may be part of the whole design part of the . . .

Mr. Jordan interjected by saying and that is why he said he did not want to bog down the details here, he just wanted to get a point of contact and to get back with the worker bees.

The Board adopted Resolution No. 26-018, authorizing the County Manager to execute the Joint Participation Agreement; authorized the County Manager to execute all other project-related documents and/or required changes contingent upon County Attorney, Risk Management, and Purchasing Services review and approval; and authorized the County Manager to execute all necessary budget amendments (BCRs).

Result: ADOPTED

Mover: Rob Feltner

Second: Katie Delaney

Ayes: Delaney, Goodson, Adkinson, Feltner, and Altman

G. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Rick Heffelfinger stated he actually was wanting to come up later on an Agenda Item that his Commission has that he has a strong passion about getting some visibility into the cost of some of the stuff the County does under Consent, because he does not know if anybody here has added it all up; he was shocked to find there is 27,000,674 worth of decisions that the Board just approved or made; some of that stuff, they do not care about as taxpayers because it comes from the State; but it is also kind of nice to know what does come from the State and where these things come from. He went on to say knowing those numbers may flag him to maybe dig into that a little more, which helps him to do that; and he does not know if the County has a total that is different than his.

Morris Richardson, County Attorney, interjected by saying if Mr. Heffelfinger is speaking to an Agenda Item, then he needs to be called up during the Agenda Item, not during Consent.

Mr. Heffelfinger pointed out he is not going to be able to be here later, he has a doctor's appointment; this is kind of a comment on all the stuff the Board just did on Consent, so the Agenda Item is F.1. through, if he wants to look at it that way; he also thinks he supports the Consent having values because it lets the taxpayer know, but he thinks it also would inspire the Commissioners, for just a quick look; he had to go to find out what the cost was, he had to dig through the Agenda Items on each one of the files to dig out; there was a specific column there called Fiscal Impact; to be able to see that and know that he wanted to come down or do some research would be extremely helpful to him; he thinks it also would, hopefully, elicit some discussions, questions, and concerns from the Board, because he saw Commissioner Delaney pull a few of those; and sometimes they feel like, and it does a good job to also illustrate the good things the County does for the community, like the opioid thing. He stated he thinks it is nice to know that that effort is being funded; he does not know what the total of the opioid funding was, but that is a big number; he would like to see that get used, so a lot of big items; he thinks it is a good idea for that item later; and he would just like to state his support since he may not be here for that.

H.1. Proposed ordinance amending Chapter 14, Article II, Brevard County Code, relating to dangerous dog investigations

Chair Altman called for a public hearing to consider an ordinance amending Chapter 14, Article II, Brevard County Code of Ordinances, to reflect the changes made to the Florida Statutes regarding dangerous dogs.

Morris Richardson, County Attorney, explained H.1. is an ordinance revising Chapter 14, Article II, of the Brevard County Code of Ordinances, to update the Code to reflect changes made by the legislature to Chapter 676 of the Florida Statutes regarding dangerous dogs; last year, the legislature passed the Pam Rock Act, named in honor of a mail carrier who was tragically mauled by dogs in 2022; the amendments provide for a definition of what is known as the Dunbar Bite Scale, which is used to determine the severity of dog bites; it requires for danger dogs to be implanted with a microchip; previously, there was an option for tattooing, it provides that dogs who have killed a human being, or made certain severe bite marks to a person, be confiscated by Animal Services and held pending the outcome of the investigation and hearing without provision for release, and for other updates to danger dog hearing procedures; additionally, the amendments provide for increased criminal penalties for the owners of dogs that attack an animal or human again after being declared dangerous; and once again, these are required changes to come into compliance and to be consistent with the changes made by the legislature to Chapter 767.

Chair Altman noted he remembers when this came before the legislature, he thinks it took a few years to pass, but it was a horrendous attack; and he thinks the State did a really good job

in trying to protect the public, and also allowing for local governments to be involved.

There being no comments or objections, the Board adopted Ordinance No. 26-03, amending Chapter 14, Article II, animal Control, of the Code of Ordinances of Brevard County, Florida; amending Sections 14-36, 14-49, 14-50 of the Code of Ordinances of Brevard County, Florida, relating to dangerous dog investigations; providing for inclusion in Code; providing for severability; and providing for an effective date.

Result: ADOPTED

Mover: Katie Delaney

Second: Rob Feltner

Ayes: Delaney, Goodson, Adkinson, Feltner, and Altman

J.1. Approval, Re: Contract for Sale and Purchase and Addendum 1 from Michael S. Terrel for the Wastewater Treatment and Water Treatment Facilities Relocation Project - District 3.

Marc Bernath, Public Works Director, stated J.1. is a contract for sale and purchase and addendum from Mr. Terrel; this is for the wastewater treatment plant off of Micco in District 3; the purchase would be \$5 million for 80 acres; and this is part of a larger project for the Utilities Department in which there are two other pieces of land that will be contemplated in subsequent actions.

The Board approved and authorized the Chair to execute the Contract for Sale and Purchase and Addendum 1 from Michael S. Terrel for the Wastewater Treatment and Water Facilities Relocation Project.

Result: APPROVED

Mover: Kim Adkinson

Second: Rob Feltner

Ayes: Delaney, Goodson, Adkinson, Feltner, and Altman

J.2. Board Direction: Allocation of Ad Valorem Revenue Related to the Parks and Recreation Department

Ian Golden, Parks and Recreation Director, stated Item J.2. is a request for the Board to provide staff direction regarding allocations of additional special district and Multiple Services Taxing Unit (MSTU) funds that were generated when the Board increased this past year's budget cycle; the Board has four options for each funding source . . .

Chair Altman interjected by asking Mr. Golden to pull the mic closer.

Mr. Golden went on to say the Board has four options for each funding source; Option 1 would allow for the projects that were cut in the previous year's budget cycle to be returned, as well as some additional projects that have been identified by the Department; Option 2 would allow for those projects to be returned, and then the additional revenue from those special districts to be offset with cuts to General Fund for reallocation by the Board; Option 3 would allow for a total reallocation of General Fund for all of those funding sources except the South Brevard Recreation District, which actually has less General Fund available than what is generated by that special district fund, so the Board would also have to allocate approximately \$1.6 million in that Option 3 for the South Brevard Recreation District; Option 4 would be any other direction that the Board provides; and he asked that the Board provide an option for each of the funding

sources.

Chair Altman advised he prefers Option 1 just for his vote, as the Board knows; and it is up to the Board to decide how it wants to allocate these dollars.

Commissioner Feltner commented he is just going to bring up that the County has had a goal in resurfacing roads; he thinks the County does a really good job of preservation mode; that is the cheaper way at this point in time is to preserve what it has and he thinks it had to cut some of that back in the last budget; if it can be restored, and he knows Marc Bernath, Public Works Director, may not have been ready with this, but he thinks to get the County to a number of miles that it has resurfaced in the prior years, it was somewhere in that \$3.5, \$3.8 million; and he asked if that sounded right. He noted that is where he would want to go restore that, so restoring money to the General Fund so that Public Works could resurface those roads.

Commissioner Adkinson stated her thoughts are along those lines as well; she likes Option 2 because the County gets to put the money into Parks, but it also gets to put some money back in the General Fund; she thinks roads are pretty significant; a million and a half that goes back to the General Fund could be used for something like that; she reiterated that is how she feels; and she likes Option 2 because it can sort of give a little bit to both.

Commissioner Feltner advised he would be willing to sort of split that Option if that is where the Board goes with the idea that that \$1.5 million going back to the General Fund that the County put it toward the road resurfacing.

Commissioner Adkinson noted she would be comfortable with that.

Commissioner Feltner stated he thinks that is the pragmatic thing to do.

Commissioner Delaney commented she would have to agree with that; and she thinks a couple of things that are important to her District, so she was leaning more towards Option 2 as well.

Commissioner Feltner asked if he made a motion for Option 2 with the \$1.504 . . .

Chair Altman interjected by saying before the Board does a motion, he would like to have more discussion; he knows Commissioner Goodson is on the phone and want to hear his input if he has a strong opinion.

Commissioner Goodson stated Chair, he could live with Option 2.

Chair Altman noted he chose Option 1; he felt the County has a lot of funding sources for roads, but parks are pretty limited to its General Fund; from a quality of life point of view, especially for kids, young people that parks have a high priority; but obviously, he is outvoted here he thinks.

Commissioner Feltner pointed out he was really just asking the question to clarify if he made the motion that the Board did Option 2, with the \$1,50,4410 to General Fund, going back to General Fund, that the Board in the same motion allocates that towards the resurfacing of the roads shortfall for this year.

Commissioner Delaney stated yes.

Commissioner Adkinson advised she would second that if Commissioner Feltner made the

motion.

The Board reviewed and discussed several options for allocation of Ad Valorem Revenue related to the Parks and Recreation Department; approved Option 2, allocating the Ad Valorem revenue sufficient to fund projects and equipment included in the Parks and Recreation Department's FY 2025-2026 requested budget, as detailed in Attachment B, reducing the corresponding area's General Fund transfers by the amount equal to the remaining funds; approved allocating \$1,504,410, from the General Fund to road surfacing; and authorized the County Manager to execute all necessary budget amendments (BCRs) or other administrative actions necessary to support the selected option.

Result: APPROVED

Mover: Rob Feltner

Second: Kim Adkinson

Ayes: Delaney, Goodson, Adkinson, Feltner, and Altman

J.3. Resolution authorizing the issuance of Non-Ad Valorem Refunding Revenue Bonds, Series 2026

Kathy Wall, Central Services Director, explained this Item is a request to refund the County's Local Option Fuel Tax Bond, Series 2016, with the issuance of Brevard County, Florida, Non-Ad Valorem Revenue Refunding Bonds, Series 2026, not exceeding \$50 million in aggregate principal and a present value savings of at least four percent, and delegate authority to the Chair to execute the resolution and various closing documents related to the issuance of Series 2026 Bonds; authorize the County Manager to approve all necessary budget amendments to implement this requested change; and it is estimated that under the current market conditions, the County will save approximately \$2.7 million in net present value savings in debt service, which the Public Works Department will realize a reduction in annual debt service payments of approximately \$262 million through the final maturity in 2037.

The Board adopted Resolution No. 26-019, authorizing the issuance of Brevard County Non-Ad Valorem Refunding Revenue Bonds, Series 2026, not exceeding \$50 million in aggregate principal amount and a present value savings of at least four percent; delegated authority to the Chair to execute the Resolution and various other closing documents relating to the issuance of the Series 2026 Bonds; and authorized the County Manager to approve all necessary budget amendments (BCRs) to implement this requested action.

Result: ADOPTED

Mover: Kim Adkinson

Second: Katie Delaney

Ayes: Delaney, Goodson, Adkinson, Feltner, and Altman

J.4. Legislative Intent and Permission to Advertise an Ordinance, re: the County's Optional Vessel Registration Fee

Commissioner Adkinson stated her staff made her some handouts that she wanted to share with the Commissioners; she and her staff have put a lot of work into this, so she kind of has a lot to say; Brevard is a water county, it has natural bodies of water everywhere; it has a really strong boating community; members of the boating community have approach her regarding concerns about the conditions and accessibility of Brevard's boating infrastructure, primarily boat ramps; the first purpose of this Item is to better understand the condition and potential improvements of the boating structure, as well as taking steps to address the matter; as it stands right now, the County has not done a boating-related study in almost 20 years; and

while the recommendations of the previous study might still be valid, it is important for the Board to make sure that the information is updated and reflects the County's current conditions. She continued by saying the study would allow for an objective review of current boat launch capacity, location, and condition relative to the demand and offer suggestions for improvements; these improvements would include launches, parking, boat ramp locations, and improving and adding boat ramp amenities; a more comprehensive understanding of the need, as well as the feasibility of the improvements, will allow the Board to make the best decision for the good of the community; the Brevard Boating Improvement Program (BBIP), which funding uses the County share of the vessel registration fee, currently has approximately \$1.9 million in reserves; and of this, \$195,000 is not committed. She mentioned some of these funds could be used to pay for the study, as long as the study is limited to the following things: providing, maintaining, or operating recreational channel markings, and other uniform waterway markers; public boat ramps, lifts, and hoists; marine railways, boat piers, docks, mooring buoys, and other public launch facilities; removing derelict vessels and debris that specifically impedes boat access, not including dredging; and removing vessels and floating structures deemed a hazard to public safety and health. She stated the second component of this item is legislative intent and permission to advertise an ordinance imposing the optional County vessel registration fee; there is no reason to do the study, figure out the problems, and identify the solutions if the County cannot pay to fix it; pursuant to Florida Statutes Section 328.66, this fee can be utilized for the patrol, regulation, and maintenance of lakes, rivers, waters, and for other boating-related projects located within the County; if imposed, this fee is estimated to generate over \$466,000 annually that could be added to the approximate \$166,000 that the BBIP currently receives; this will be recurring funds; this fee is added directly to the annual vessel registration costs, and varies depending on the vessel class; and the annual fee increase ranges from \$2.75 for vessels that are less than 12 feet to \$94.00 for vessels that are over 110 feet. She added if the Board looks at the chart, he or she will see that the largest class of boaters the County has, it has over 19,000 between 16 and 26 feet; their fee would increase by \$14.38 per year; the County would receive \$13.38, because the first dollar of the optional County fee goes to the Save the Manatee Fund; this increase will not affect those people who currently are exempt from the registration fee; once the results of the study are available, and the Parks advisory boards and Marine Advisory Council have had an opportunity to form their recommendations, the boating community will be able to review the benefits and voice their opinion on these user fees; and from the conversations that she has had, the general consensus is that the fee is acceptable if it means access to water and enjoying their boats will improve.

Commissioner Delaney noted she too has had people coming to her saying that they would like to see some improvements in some of the County's boat launch areas and whatnot; she thinks this is definitely a good idea, and she appreciates Commissioner Adkinson bringing this forward; she had a question about the study; and she asked if that is something the County staff could do, or does it have to go for a consultant for that.

Commissioner Adkinson stated the County Manager is probably the right person to ask about that.

Jim Liesenfelt, County Manager, replied based on what he has seen previously, he thinks the Board would want to get a consultant as it would be staff time to get it done; and the Board would want a neutral party handling it.

Commissioner Delaney inquired what the County Manager thinks a consultant would cost for a study like this.

Mr. Liesenfelt responded he thinks the discussion was \$50,000 to \$60,000, and there is money in the BBIP to be able to pay for that study; and it is an eligible expense out of those funds.

Commissioner Delaney asked if he knows how long that study will take.

Mr. Liesenfelt advised that he does not know, six or nine months, that is a bit of a swag.

Commissioner Adkinson commented she would hate it to be that long.

Mr. Liesenfelt stated that he does not have the answer, and that is why he is swaging it for the Board.

Chair Altman stated it is probably a good idea though, because of the old adage, measure twice, cut once; he commends Commissioner Adkinson for bringing this up; and it is fascinating, and he is interested, and the County only has five vessels over 110 feet.

Commissioner Adkinson noted she was surprised as well.

Chair Altman commented he would have thought the County would have had more, he understands this craft is interesting, so he is going to look at the five vessels over 100 feet; there are only five, so the current registration fee is \$193; and he asked if he is reading that correct.

Commissioner Adkinson advised they can get a discount if they have met certain things like equipment on their boats, she does not exactly understand it, so they would either be without the discount of \$193.

Chair Altman asked with this discount would be . . .

Commissioner Adkinson replied \$144.

Chair Altman stated the additional County optional fee would be \$94.

Commissioner Adkinson remarked exactly.

Chair Altman commented okay, good; and he asked if that is one of Commissioner Feltner's boats he has.

Commissioner Delaney asked if he was one of the five.

Commissioner Feltner responded he avoids boats; and in fact, he took a tour of a cruise ship just so he could say that he has done it. He noted he does not understand that the County needs to do a study for this or should do a study for this, but it did not do that for stormwater; and he voted against stormwater.

Mr. Liesenfelt stated he honestly does not have an answer for Commissioner Feltner, but it is two different funding sources, two different sets of regulations, would probably be the difference there.

Commissioner Feltner mentioned he thinks in prior years when the Board has increased stormwater fees, there was a corresponding study.

Mr. Liesenfelt pointed out there is an existing study for stormwater fees.

Commissioner Feltner expressed his appreciation for what Mr. Liesenfelt is trying to do, but he is not going to be there today.

Commissioner Adkinson stated she wanted to make a motion on the Item.

Chair Altman asked if there was a second the motion.

Commissioner Delaney stated she will second to get to discussion.

Chair Altman stated okay.

Commissioner Delaney asked Commissioner Feltner if he would mind sharing a little bit of his concerns.

Commissioner Feltner responded he thinks what was done with the stormwater, and that happened pretty quickly with getting rid of the design credit, that affected District 4 disproportionately, he means the disparity between what District 4 voters will pay in that is extreme compared to the other Districts; in that moment he realized what was happening and he voted against it; if one just thinks of this Zip Code by the way, it has stormwater retention everywhere; that is why those design credits exist, and that is why he voted against it; he does not think there was a corresponding study for those increases; and that is his thought.

Commissioner Delaney stated if she is hearing him, he is more opposed to the study, not so much opposed to the increase of the vessel registry.

Commissioner Feltner advised he is wondering why a study would be done for this, and he is not totally certain, or were certain, that one has to be done, but before raising the stormwater fees, there was not a study, he means as a technical matter.

Commissioner Adkinson asked if it is possible to not do the study, follow the guidelines of the old study from 20 years ago, or the recommendations of staff, because she is not necessarily stuck on the study.

Mr. Liesenfelt replied he is stalling a little; and the study is 20 years old.

Mr. Golden explained like Mr. Liesenfelt said, the study is quite old; and he does not know what the change in lands underneath the Parks and Recreation Department as assets have changed in those 20 years, so he does not know if there are other assets that have come into the Department that could be developed into the future, which would be part of what this study would be looking at.

Commissioner Adkinson mentioned she supposes also because of the fact that this County has changed so much, where people live, over 20 years; and it might be important to know who is using what where.

Commissioner Delaney asked she knows time is an issue, but is this something that staff has the expertise on.

Mr. Golden responded so, staff could potentially . . .

Commissioner Delaney interjected by saying between Natural Resource Management and all the others.

Mr. Golden stated staff could potentially look at usage rates; a lot of it will be anecdotal; they could look at the current inventory; again, some of the engineering is not done in-house; a lot of those design-type questions they go out and have engineering firms that do that for staff; and that being said, staff could probably get a rough idea of what is potentially developable; but he does not know if staff could come up with a good cost estimate.

Commissioner Delaney asked if Natural Resources Management would be able to help in that capacity.

Mr. Golden replied he thinks that would be a question for Virginia Barker, Natural Resources Management Director, but he would say that a lot of stuff that is allowed underneath this Statute is not something that, they do not build docks, they do not build ramps, at least he does not think they do.

Mr. Liesenfelt pointed out they are actually short a couple of engineers right now to get their own projects done; just a thought for the Board, it could proceed with legislative intent with the study, and staff will research; and if the study is not needed, staff can come back to the Board saying it does not need the study.

Commissioner Adkinson stated she likes that.

Mr. Liesenfelt stated then if the Commissioners would like to add to the Agenda Item to let staff obligate the unused funds for the BBIP to pay for the study; at least that motion would be in there, and then to get the BCR; staff will research and come back, if the Board agrees to it; and if the study is not needed, staff will bring it back saying it is not needed.

Commissioner Adkinson asked if someone can help her put that motion together with all of those bits and pieces.

Mr. Liesenfelt stated the Board is fine with legislative intent that would be had with the study; he reiterated if the study is not needed, staff will bring that back to the Board to let it know the study is not needed; and he is not an attorney, but the legislative intent should cover that.

Commissioner Adkinson advised she will make that amendment to her motion to add the County Manager's suggestion.

The Board authorized staff to research if a boating study is needed, and if not, bring that conclusion back to the Board; directed staff to prepare a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a boating infrastructure study, limited to the authorized uses of the Brevard Boating Improvement Program (BBIP) fund, to be brought back to the Board no later than the May 5, 2026, Regular meeting for approval; approved legislative intent and permission to advertise for an ordinance imposing the County optional vessel registration fee; directed the County Attorney's Office to draft said ordinance, to be brought back to the Board, along with the results of the study and after being heard by the Parks Advisory Board and the Marine Advisory Council; authorized staff to obligate the unused BBIP funds to pay for the study, if applicable; and authorized the County Manager to approve all necessary budget amendments (BCRs).

Result: APPROVED

Mover: Kim Adkinson

Seconders: Katie Delaney

Ayes: Delaney, Goodson, Adkinson, and Altman

Nay: Feltner

J.5. Speak Up Brevard - 2026 Citizen Efficiency and Effectiveness Recommendation (CEER) Submitter Presentations

Chair Altman asked if the Board came up with a procedure of how it would have these presentations.

Morris Richardson, County Attorney, explained the Board took action at a prior meeting to state that the Board would schedule a time certain to receive the CEERs and presentations from citizens, give citizens five minutes for each presentation, and declined to schedule a workshop to hear separately from the citizens on the CEERs, so that is the procedure; and he asked if the meeting date had been selected yet, he knows it was going to be in May.

Jim Liesenfelt, County Manager, responded it is in May, either the first or second meeting; staff will have the reports back to the Board; the deadline is, 90 days is May 1st; and staff will have it before then.

Attorney Richardson advised that is consistent with the Charter and the Board's adopted Policy that it receives the CEERs staff prepares analysis and recommendations on those; then the Board hears them and has to act on each CEER at the Board meeting.

Chair Altman asked if the Board has done that and . . .

Mr. Liesenfelt stated staff is currently going through all the CEER responses, so they are working on it.

Commissioner Delaney pointed out the reason she brought this forward was because she does not feel comfortable hearing from the citizens, and in that moment having to make an off-the-cuff decision; of course, if it is something of an emergency, the Board has to do that, but she does not feel this is an emergency; frankly, if this was against the rules, she would have thought Attorney Richardson or Mr. Liesenfelt would have said something between the briefings, conversations that were had, between all of these different things; all these people showed up here today; they have all of these cards; and not to hear this Item, would be such a disservice to the public in her opinion.

Commissioner Adkinson stated she wants to make sure she understands; if presenters do come up and present to the Board that it can only consider what they have written in the CEER, which is currently being looked at by staff; no matter what they may say here, it does not affect or change what they have written; and she asked if that is correct.

Attorney Richardson replied that is what the Charter and the Policy provides.

Commissioner Delaney asked if with the staff recommendations that they can respond based on what is written; and she stated the Board can make any decision it wants based on whatever it wants.

Attorney Richardson noted the Board has to take an action on the formal written recommendation that is submitted, the Charter compels that.

Commissioner Delaney noted it does not exclude the comments that commenters make.

Chair Altman asked how long the Charter language is; and he asked if Attorney Richardson could read that to the Board so it knows exactly, because unlike a lot of this, this is something that is set forth in Charter, the process in which the Board follows.

Attorney Richardson read, "The Board of County Commissioners shall develop procedures that will provide a mechanism for an individual or an organized group of individuals to submit a formal written recommendation for the enhancement of the effectiveness and efficiency of County government to the County Commission on an annual basis. The County Commission's procedure shall include the following provisions and annual filing date. The written recommendation shall be reviewed by the County Commission, and following the review, the County Commission shall vote to either accept the recommendation, accept the recommendation with revisions, or reject the recommendation, and the County Commission's final vote in consideration of the recommended recommendation shall occur no later than 120 days after the receipt of the written recommendation." He stated then the Board has adopted a Policy implementing those requirements; the Board can always act on citizens' requests that they make during Public Comment or through Commission offices; but this process was enacted specifically to provide a formal written recommendation mechanism, and for the Board to take action on those written recommendations.

Chair Altman advised the Board has a written procedure by which the Board has established that it follows; this is something over and beyond the procedure that the Board has; he is going to turn to the Board whether it wants to change its process and hear these recommendations; in fact, it will be hearing them twice; the Commission would hear them now, then it would have staff go through the written procedures, and then they would make recommendations; and he assumes the Board would have to hear them again under the Charter.

Attorney Richardson mentioned the Policy allows that under Sunshine they would be allowed to comment at the meeting that the Board considers it; but this Board decided very recently that it would receive presentations from the citizens at that meeting in May, and it would provide a time certain for that.

Commissioner Adkinson expressed her apologies to all of the people who came here thinking that he or she would present to the Board; but she would like to make a motion to table this to the May 5th meeting at 6:00 p.m. where everybody is going to get five minutes to actually do their presentation.

Commissioner Goodson stated he seconded the motion.

Chair Altman added the Board would have the benefit of reading the recommendations, as well as technical review from staff, so it would be in a much better position to make a decision; and it is not like the Board hears them and boom, it has to . . . it will see these well ahead of schedule.

Commissioner Adkinson noted and be prepared to ask questions.

Chair Altman stated he does have a technical question just in general.

Commissioner Feltner commented he has a technical question; and he asked if the Board has to vote at that meeting when the presentations happen, or could it have the presentations at the

first meeting and vote on the items at the second meeting if there is a concern that there is not enough time in that moment when people are presenting with enough time to think about it before a Commissioner votes, and to be voted on at that same meeting.

Attorney Richardson responded the Board can as long as it happens within 120 days under the Charter, and it would probably want to make it clear at the first meeting that it has closed the comment portion of the meeting, so that it does not, by having a second meeting, then have the same presentations again.

Commissioner Feltner stated he is not opposed to that if it makes it better for the Board, the amount of time between the presentation and the time that it is voting; he thinks the Board is going to have the information and the staff comments and everything by that meeting where the public has the time certain to come to speak to their item; he feels like he will be ready at that time; but if that is the pleasure of the Board to vote at a separate time, he is open to that as well.

Commissioner Delaney advised she thinks if it is the same day, that piece of it really does not matter; the thing for her is she really feels passionate that these presentations are made visible and public; like she said before when she was advocating for the workshop, some people are better communicators when they have an opportunity to speak versus writing something down; she was just trying to make this program as accessible and open to the public as possible, which is what the intention was; nowhere in the Charter does it say 'only' and that the Board cannot expand upon the inclusion of its citizens; and that argument is just outrageous to her.

Commissioner Feltner asked if he can say something on that real quick; he did not mean to interrupt Commissioner Delaney; and he thinks the Board is on the Item, and then because it has to take some action on it, and one sort of wants to amend it, he does not see why the Board cannot do that in that moment.

Attorney Richardson stated the Board can accept, accept with revisions, or reject a recommendation.

Commissioner Feltner stated in his mind it sounds like that in that moment . . .

Attorney Richardson interjected by saying but the Board must consider the written recommendation.

Commissioner Delaney pointed out but it does not say it cannot think about the oral presentations as well; there is nothing in there that says the County cannot make this program more open.

Commissioner Feltner noted he does not disagree with Commissioner Delaney.

Commissioner Delaney expressed her thanks to Commissioner Feltner.

Commissioner Feltner reiterated he does not disagree with her, and that is why he is saying that within that moment the Board can amend; when he suggested, he had a terrible cold he did not want to give the rest of the Board, and he was calling in on Zoom, he suggested the time certain so no matter what happens in the meeting, which is just an efficiency thing, so separate from a workshop, the Board, in short, is basically doing the workshop in a Commission meeting; the Board is all here and going to do it; and he thinks the Board agrees people can come up and they could have five minutes instead of three on each of their items.

Commissioner Delaney explained some of these things are pretty complex, so the idea to only have that few minutes to think through all of the things, is just why the Board would not want more opportunity to come to the best outcome.

Commissioner Adkinson mentioned the point of what she is saying is it is not efficient to hear them here and hear them again; primarily, for her opinion, is because she is not prepared right this second, she does not have good questions to ask, where when the Board hears the speakers on the 5th, she will have been able to prepare questions on their items, she would have already made it her business to go through it, see what staff's thoughts are, see what her thoughts are, and clarify it with the speakers while he or she is standing there in front of her; and right now, they will just be saying things twice.

Commissioner Delaney remarked right now, what the people could do is tell the Board their presentation; the Board can think it about it right now, think about it, write notes and have a few days to think about what their suggestions are, and have time to mull over it; the Board is not voting on anything with this; and this is just for the Commissioners to get a better idea of what the citizens are asking of the Board.

Chair Altman stated he thinks another issue is that the Board as a body had a lot of deliberation and discussion, and developed a very specific procedure; this flies in the face of that; and he asked if technically, any one of these individuals could have given his or her presentations during the public hearing part of the Board meeting.

Commissioner Delaney advised and they still can.

Chair Altman stated they still can if they sign up, so they do provide for that at the public meeting; it is not in the body of the formal; secondly, this is not part of the public hearing part of the Board's Agenda; he asked what the Board allows in terms of time for the card; and he inquired what the Board's procedure is.

Attorney Richardson responded this is a normal Agenda Item; the Board typically allows three minutes per card; in this case though, that is when people speak to the proposal that is on the Agenda; the proposal that is on the Agenda is that the Board receive presentations, so people could speak during this Item on whether or not the Board should receive presentations, but they could only give the presentations if the Board voted to give special dispensation to receive the presentations; and otherwise, they can speak during Public Comment about any Item that is not on the Agenda.

Chair Altman mentioned he thinks these would have been probably more appropriate on the Public . . .

Commissioner Feltner asked if he can ask one more question; and when they are doing presentations at the Board's time certain time and date, will they send that as a PowerPoint potentially that would go into the packet with all of the rest of CEER information, or how does that work.

Attorney Richardson replied they will have that ability, but that is up to them; and if they wish to do a PowerPoint presentation, they have to present it in advance of the meeting so it can be reviewed for propriety for presentation at a live meeting and broadcast.

Commissioner Delaney noted 24 hours is the Policy.

Attorney Richardson advised 24 hour minimum; and if it is 24 hours, it certainly will not be part of any packet.

Commissioner Feltner stated not for nothing, he thinks that would be beneficial for the Commissioners if, for anyone who is doing a CEER, that they send information early; there is nothing that precludes them from doing that now, they can send things to the Commissioners; he likes what he suggested before with the time certain; and everyone is going to know because he is not sure how many people are here today versus how many people submitted this year.

Commissioner Delaney advised 66.

Commissioner Feltner stated there are 66 people who submitted this year, he does not know how many people . . .

Commissioner Delaney interjected by saying well, CEERs, there were multiple.

Commissioner Adkinson advised 40 some people.

Commissioner Feltner stated 40 people submitted, 66 CEERs understood, but they are not all here today.

Commissioner Delaney stated correct.

Chair Altman asked when the Board has the formal CEER presentations, how much time is the Board allowing for those, or does it need to set that Policy.

Attorney Richardson replied the Board previously stated that it would be five minutes on each CEER.

Commissioner Delaney commented in the future if this happens again, she would appreciate the County Manager and County Attorney say something prior to a Board meeting; she thinks this is completely inappropriate, and this is part of their job; throwing one of their Commissioners under the bus is not part of their jobs; and she reiterated she would appreciate that in the future.

Chair Altman asked Commissioner Delaney to let him take the burden on that, they are not allowed to talk, but they are . . .

Commissioner Delaney advised they are professional, Attorney Richardson is a lawyer, Mr. Liesenfelt is a . . .

Chair Altman stated this is something that is more of a Board decision.

Commissioner Delaney stated no.

Chair Altman stated and . . .

Commissioner Delaney interrupted by saying because the Commissioners are going into the technicality of this decision; if it is a technical something, then she should have been apprised of that from Attorney Richardson or Mr. Liesenfelt; she is just going to say, if they are going to

throw Commissioner Delaney under the bus, then publicly she is going to say she does not appreciate this; and she would ask for a heads-up next time.

Chair Altman pointed out this is not a staff thing, it is purely a Commission deciding . . .

Commissioner Delaney interjected by saying nope, that is not according to the Commissioners arguments.

Chair Altman stated that is very important, something that is in its Charter.

The Board tabled receiving presentations from individuals who submitted CEERs as part of the 2026 Speak Up Brevard cycle, to the May 5, 2026, Regular Board meeting, time certain at 6:00 p.m.

Result: TABLED

Mover: Kim Adkinson

Second: Tom Goodson

Ayes: Goodson, Adkinson, Feltner, and Altman

Nay: Delaney

Commissioner Delaney advised if anyone who would still like to speak, he or she can sign up during the K portion of Public Comments.

Chair Altman noted the Board does want to hear from them and it wants to follow the procedure that the Board has established; and this would give the Board time to give the public due diligence.

J.6. Improving Agenda Transparency Through Financial Disclosure

Commissioner Delaney stated she is bringing this Item forward as follow-up to the Board's 2025 Citizens Efficiency and Effectiveness Recommendations (CEER), and as part of her ongoing commitment to improve transparency and how this Board conducts its business so that residents can get more easily informed on Board business; one of the concerns that residents have shared is that it can be difficult to follow how public funds are being allocated during its meetings, particularly when Items are included on the Consent Agenda where multiple items are approved together in a single vote, typically without much or any discussion; currently, the dollar amounts associated with those items are not generally read aloud into the record and they are not included in the printed Agenda descriptions that the citizens in the room often rely on when following the meeting; basically, when the residents come in, it could be their first meeting, they grab the Board's Agenda, and it tells them basically nothing, it gives just a short title; but besides that, one is not informed on what business the Board is doing. She noted before the Board discusses the proposed changes, she would ask staff to pull a couple of short clips from nearby municipalities to show how other governments handle this; she asked if staff will show the Titusville clip; and she provided the Board with a clip of a City of Titusville meeting. She stated she will not play the other clip she has, and there is more from the City of Cocoa; a lot of municipalities do things a little bit different here or there; she really likes the idea of putting it out for the record what business the County is conducting in the Consent Agenda; it would be nice if the dollar amounts associated with those Items could be read so all that information could be there; and she asked staff if they would not mind going to slide four. She went on by saying these are a couple of examples of the City of Titusville and the City of Cocoa and their agenda, what it looks like, it shows a short description, and it has a dollar amount in there so that when the residents are looking through the three or four-page agenda; all of the

pertinent information is right here; that way they do not have to do a deep dive of every item to see if they are needing to research certain items; that is already out there for the public so that they can see the dollar amount and the general idea of what the business of the Board is; one of the things that she was hoping for was that the Board could get, which is something Juanita Jackson, Housing and Human Services Director, did this time on Item F.10., is she had the dollar amount right in the title so that all of the people that are here today, when they picked up their Agenda on F.10., it says the \$5.9 million right there; and she just thought it was a small thing the Board could do to make government a little bit more accessible and transparent. She pointed out this is a little bit of a silly thing, but she asked staff to pull this, it is from the Florida Room, and it is the Board's values and its mission statement; right at the bottom it says the Board's values are honesty, accountability, quality, leadership, openness, and innovation; she thinks this is a small thing the Board could do that could help fulfill its values that it is putting out there; and with that, she would take any discussion, or if there is any Public Comment.

Commissioner Feltner advised he would like to maybe think about this more at the CEER workshop, time certain timeframe.

Commissioner Delaney pointed out it was a CEER last year.

Commissioner Feltner stated he understands, he has a couple of ideas himself; he is not opposed to the reading that they did; even reading the Consent and asking Commissioners if there is something he or she wants to pull, and then voting on the Item, he was the Chair here for a year, and for him to read F.1. just as the Chair to F.11. would probably have taken him all of three minutes; he probably has more thoughts beyond that around about the time of the CEER workshop; and that is all he has to say today.

Commissioner Delaney stated her last item the Board was just talking about how he or she could make a snap decision, and now it is being said that this has been on the Agenda, the Board has had it, and she does not know why the Board needs to drag this out as it is a simple ask. She asked if the Board could put the dollar amounts in the Agenda.

Commissioner Feltner noted he thinks Commissioner Delaney has a couple of things there, so the dollar amount in the title of the Agenda so that these pages that are printed for people in the back of the room; and he asked if that is part of it today.

Commissioner Delaney replied exactly.

Commissioner Feltner commented he is fine with that, he is not fighting Commissioner Delaney on that; and as far as reading the Consent before the Board votes on it, he does not have a problem with that, but he would like to think about it if the Board is going to talk about things at the CEER time certain anyway whether that is something the Chair ought to do as part of asking for a motion, or if that is something that the County Manager does.

Commissioner Delaney pointed out typically, the managers will do that; and some of the cities have the attorney do it; but she has not seen any board member read through it she does not think of the meetings she has seen; she would personally suggest that one of the staff members, either the County Manager or the County Attorney, read that into the record; and she reiterated it really is a simple ask.

Commissioner Feltner explained how about for today the Board will agree that it will put the dollar amounts as part of the title so that for the folks who are going to pick up an Agenda Packet that the County prints that they have that information; he could do that today; he would

like to think a little bit further about how the Board will read that in before it asks for a motion for Consent, before it asks to pull something if it is part of that process; but that is all that he is saying; and he would go with Commissioner Delaney to put the dollar amount in the title for the Agenda Packet.

Commissioner Delaney noted she appreciated that.

Commissioner Adkinson stated the dollar amount is there, for her still being fairly new, she feels like she has to read the whole Item before she understands sometimes what the dollar amount means; and she asked if by the County trying to make it more transparent if that might make it a bit more confusing just because one is getting a number, what is behind that number, and what the full story is.

Commissioner Feltner stated he thinks it is sentence dedicated to what the dollar amount is as part of the title, he thinks it is appropriate; but the County cannot print 600 pages for everybody every single meeting, as that is not something that can be done; he thinks a little common sense dictates that the Board put one complete sentence with the dollar amount and what the Item is; it is largely the Items that are there now; on the F Items, staff pretty much spells it out; to Commissioner Delaney's point, Ms. Jackson had it in there today for F.10.; that is just one sentence; and he does not think staff has to do anything more than that.

Chair Altman advised he has a lot of questions on this; he would like more time to consider it and look at what he would like to do, to look at the Board's Agenda and get a sense of what the impact would be; he will use an example, on Item J.3., and he read the Item; he noted first and foremost it is important to note that this information is public record, and is readily available to the public; under the staff analysis, which are done timely, days, or maybe a week ahead of the Agenda; this particular case there is an entire paragraph, not a long paragraph but talking about different types of bonds and different revenue sources, so there is a four or five-sentence paragraph that describes each one of the line items and how that affects; if the County were to take that same paragraph and put it in the Agenda Packet, he thinks it would make the Agenda confusing, long, it might have the effect of making it more difficult for somebody to look at a brief summary of what the County's order of business is in the course of a day; an Agenda pretty much there to a quick summary of what is happening in that; but putting that on the Agenda seems to defeat the purpose of an Agenda which should be pithy, concise, and easy to look at to give one with a sense of the order of business. He continued by saying if the County starts putting content in the Agenda, it is no longer an Agenda, it is more involved; and he would just like to have more time to look at it.

Commissioner Delaney mentioned she was not asking for a summary to be in the Agenda; all she is asking for is the dollar amount, she would be happy with even simplifying it to put it just on the Consent Agenda Items; and that is more of a, this is a definite what the dollars are going to be versus the J Items which can have some discretion based on Board decisions.

Chair Altman advised some of this requires a summary, and this is an Agenda Item because one does not know for sure what the dollar amount is going to be; and it is based on market conditions, and that is all.

Commissioner Delaney stated that what she was saying, just for the F Items, the Consent Items that are pretty much a done-deal, if the Board could put the dollar amounts on those because that is not subject to Board . . .

Chair Altman interjected by saying so Commissioner Delaney's suggestion only applies on

Consent.

Commissioner Feltner stated on the F Items, just like the Board does on any other Item where basically on a top line in the packet anyway, staff is saying the fiscal impact is say \$300,000, just that; if it is an option choice, then he thinks Commissioner Delaney would agree that . . . when they do that, the Board has to discuss it and it would not stay on Consent; that would be New Business, so typically any dollar amount that is on the Consent Agenda is just a fixed amount that it is believed will receive five votes; such as, all Commissioners agree that a sidewalk is going to be fixed for whatever that dollar amount is; that is the purpose of it; just that one line says what the fiscal impact is; he is okay with that; he does not think it adds that much; and it is already in the packet. He noted he will go with Commissioner Delaney on that Item today; and then the reading of the Agenda, he has a couple of more questions on it.

Commissioner Delaney asked if that piece could be tabled.

Commissioner Feltner mentioned during the CEER workshop he thinks that would be appropriate, so he is good with that if the Board wants to bring that part of the discussion up later; but adding the dollar amounts now, he is good with that today.

Chair Altman explained he has a question that sort of applies; under Commissioner Delaney's Agenda Item, it sounds like she is asking that each Consent Item would be read aloud by the County Manager prior to the Consent Agenda voting; the reason for a Consent Agenda is to enable the Board to get through a very lengthy Agenda with a lot of issues in a very quick and efficient way; there is a check and balance that any Commissioner can pull an Item from the Consent, and also any member of the public can fill out a card on the Consent; to him, that is going to add more time and would be redundant and unnecessary; and it flies in the face of an idea of a Consent of enabling the Board to go about the business efficiently; he knows Commissioner Delaney has looked at some cities; and he asked what the population is of Cocoa Beach, what 10,000 or 15,000.

Commissioner Delaney replied Titusville has 50,000, and Cocoa has around 30,000.

Chair Altman pointed out the County has 650,000.

Commissioner Delaney noted it is the same amount of Items for the most part.

Chair Altman stated that is just his input here on that.

Commissioner Feltner stated to just rephrase, he thinks the Board was talking about having that discussion of reading the Items aloud at the CEER workshop, so the Board will sort of table that discussion; but for today, he thinks what was tentatively being agreed to before going to the cards was that the dollar amount could be put in the Agenda title; he thinks that is not hard; and those are kind of two separate things that could consider after the cards are done.

Toni Shifalo stated she is with the historic Norwood House in Titusville; she often speaks before her city council on issues concerning her immediate neighborhood, and she finds many issues affects hers and many other neighborhoods, so she is there a lot; often issues are buried in what is called the consent agenda; and while there may be many reasons to find fault with how her town is ran, she can only applaud the way their agendas are presented. She went on to say since 2020, when she started attending council meetings regularly, the city manager or the attorney has read out loud for the record the consent agenda item-by-item with the associated dollar amounts; this information is also printed in the paper agenda printouts at the meeting,

and the agenda posted on the bulletin board outside city hall where one goes to pay their water bills; most importantly, it is easy to find and read on the published agendas online at the city website; perhaps the problem with the County Agenda lies with the Clerk of the Court who publishes the Agendas, but more likely this is something that can easily be fixed by the Commission itself directing the County Manager to include this information in the Agenda by reading this information in the Agenda, and by reading these Consent Agenda Items and the dollar amounts at the meeting for the public record; and after all, millions of dollars are spent in Consent Agenda Items. She pointed out for instance, today 27,674,000, of which only \$5 million were disclosed; with millions of dollars in the Consent Agenda Items, the public is entitled to know this, without a lot of research, digging, and clicking in the Agenda online; often the Agendas in Titusville are hundreds of pages long, and she does not think that each of their council members has time to study everything; transparency is easy to achieve if it is desired; and she asked the Board to direct Rachel Sadoff, Clerk of Courts, to put the dollar amounts in the Consent Agenda, and ask for this to be read in the public record at its meetings. She expressed her appreciation to the Board for allowing her to speak on this issue.

Jim Liesenfelt, County Manager, noted he has to defend the Clerk's Office; the County puts the Agenda out, not the Clerk; and he just wanted to put that on the record.

Ms. Shifalo expressed her apologies to Clerk Sadoff because she was looking online where they are all printed, all of the clicking and everything was so confusing to her, and she was not certain where that was coming from.

Tom Kennelly commented with regard to this Item, one looks at the Federal government, as they are so distant from the people; they really never get to see in their big Bills all of this nuance; he sat here watching the Board do the Consent Agenda, and he does see the \$5 million for the opioid stuff, and he goes, "Oh, that's pretty cool that, you know, we're investing in that sort of thing;" just him as Joe Average, he would like to scan down; if it was \$100,000 for a road, he believes County staff, he does not need to look at that; but the interesting stuff like the opioids, the County is doing stuff for people so that is pretty good; he agrees with what Commissioner Feltner suggested that the dollar amount get in there, and thanks to Commissioner Delaney for proposing it, and that would do him as a citizen a lot of good because when one is in business, he or she is looking at the big amounts, not the small amounts; the people are trusted on the small amounts, but one wants to question the big amounts; and he expressed his appreciation to the Board for listening.

Thomas Perez mentioned if his teeth start chattering, the Board will know why, as it is kind of cold in here; he is in support of transparency with the Consent Agenda, and clearly disclosing spending amounts, that would help to have citizen support; while these Agenda Items are characterized as routine or non-controversial, in practice, significant Board business is passed under the Consent Agenda amounting to millions of dollars in public spending that often receives little public visibility; right now, all Consent Items are passed together in a single vote; the individual Items are not read out loud into the record before the vote; the printed Agenda that residents pick up in person does not list the dollar amounts involved for each Item; to see the dollar amounts, residents must go online, click into each individual Agenda Item, and then dig into the background material; in plain language; and if one is sitting in the audience with only the paper Agenda in one's hand, he or she cannot tell how much money is being approved when the Board votes on the Consent Agenda. He continued by saying Titusville, as the Board heard, and other nearby cities already do this to make their spending decisions easier for the public to follow; the Titusville City Manager, Tom Abbate, as the Board saw, reads the consent agenda out loud and discloses the spending dollars; therefore, he asked the Board to change how Consent and Business Items are presented to the public, and to direct staff to update

Board Policy BCC-97 to match; the requested changes are straightforward for the Consent Agenda, each Consent Item, to be read aloud by the County Manager before the Consent vote, including the associated dollar amount where applicable; the dollar amount for each Item would be printed directly in the Agenda description, and also shown in the online title, not just buried in backup documents; for the Business Agenda, the Items are already discussed and voted on individually; and the dollar amount for each Item would be listed in the printed Agenda description and in the online title as well. He noted these changes would make it much easier for residents to know at a glance how much money is being allocated or spent before the Board votes on that Item; and it also aligns with the Brevard County's own stated values of honesty, openness, and accountability to citizens.

Elizabeth Baker stated there are a lot of good ideas in the Consent Agenda, and the County spent a lot of money today; she is absolutely with Commissioner Delaney, those dollar amounts should be there; the people really should have easily accessible information rather than digging into things, and having to click and open a file; it makes it really difficult especially for a lot of senior citizens or people with eyesight problems; the father of the Freedom of Information Act was Harold Cross, and he said that public business is the public's business; the people have a right to know; the way that she sees it for the public is that the more information that the Board can give to the public, she does not care if it is written 27 times, she does not care if one heard something 27 times, the more the Board can get something out of the public and get his or her understanding the more transparency it has and that is really all that can be asked; and they just want to know what is going on. She pointed out they want to have it as easily accessible to every single person; she is from Titusville; it kind of scares her a little bit when her city that has so many issues with transparency, is doing something a little better than anybody else; she reiterated it is a little scary; and she gives kudos to Titusville, but this Board can achieve that same goal as well.

Sarah Hodge remarked she is going to be speaking on behalf of her husband as well, his is on the Consent Agenda; and he had an operation that was supposed to be six weeks of recovery, it is now almost six months, and he is really not able to stand up and talk. She read, "Good morning, Commissioners. I am reading the following on behalf of my husband, Bill Hodge. I support the County in increasing the transparency of the Consent Agenda and County spending. Last year I submitted a Speak up Brevard submission on the importance of transparency in the Consent Agenda. I raised concerns because County business and spending decisions are quickly passed during County meetings without meeting attendees being fully-aware of the business item detail or how much in taxpayer funds are being spent for the Items that are approved collectively. The Consent Agenda is simply a brief Board action that occurs during meetings that attendees are often unaware and which often allocates and spends millions of dollars in public funds in just a few moments of time without reading the Items into the record. I support the Commissioners increasing the transparency of the Consent Agenda by instructing the County Manager to read the Consent Agenda out loud at each meeting prior to the vote and including the fiscal impact of each Item. I support the Commissioners instructing the County Manager to clearly disclose the financial impact of each Agenda Item in the title description to be easily viewed by taxpayers in both the online and the printed meeting Agendas. While background information is made available for those residents that have time to do online research before each meeting, I would like easier access and clearly disclosed spending without having to do online research. This makes the County business more accessible to those that have the technology and time limitations. The practice is done at other local meetings and can be done at the County, too. Please vote yes on this Item, direct the County Manager to take these reasonable actions and update the County Policy accordingly. Thank you." She stated that was from her husband, and this is hers because she has been fighting public records for 30-something odd years when Florida

TODAY had to pay \$30,000 for their public records, and they sued and got the money back, not from the County or the school, but this is her issue. She read, "My name is Sarah Hodge. This year I submitted three CEER requests. Easy access to public information is very important to me. I'd like to share three practical transparency improvements that could make County records easier for residents to access while also saving staff time responding to individual request. First, residents currently do not have online access to Brevard County's Administrative Orders, Ordinances, and Resolutions as individual adopted documents. If a resident wants to review one of those records, they have two options, either submit a public records request to the County staff or try to locate it organized online in the Municode, the County's online code library. While Municode is useful for reviewing laws organized by subject, it does not make it easy to locate individual Items by number or adoption date. Residents that wish to review individual Items encounter unnecessary barriers and require County staff time responding to individual requests for documents. A simple solution would be to provide a read-only public listing of these Items on the County website, allowing residents to access them by number, title, and adoption date. Brevard County staff already has online internal access to this requested content, but the public does not. Other Florida governments already provide this type of access, including the City of Panama City and Miami-Dade County. Second, Brevard County receives a large number of public records requests each year, nearly 2,000 requests were received in 2024. Over time, the County staff gained viable valuable insight into which records are requested most often. However, there is currently no routine process to review these requests to determine whether some information could simply be made easier to find on the County website. Establishing a quarterly or bi-annual review of public records requests could help identify opportunities to the post commonly requested information online and improve website navigation. Third, many County records are already available on the County's Legistar meeting calendar, which stores Commission meeting Agendas and supporting documents. Providing clearer guidance directing residents to the searchable resource could help people become informed on a large amount of County business and background documents. These suggestions align with Brevard County's mission and core values emphasizing openness, accountability, innovation, and effective communication with residents. Commissioners, please support these values. Thank you." She stated she is going to give a copy of this to the Clerk and to all of the Commissioners.

Chair Altman stated that is the last care, so he will bring this back to the Commission.

Commissioner Feltner asked if he could clarify one thing he said; he stated he said workshop earlier and he is, and he meant the CEER time certain portion of that County Commission meeting; and he just wanted to make that clear.

Chair Altman noted the Board is back on the Agenda Item at hand.

Commissioner Delaney stated she wanted to make a motion to approve the dollar amount to be put in the Consent Agenda, and to table the conversation about reading the Consent Agenda Item to the meeting where the CEER recommendations are done.

Chair Altman advised there is a motion and a second to put the dollar amount, and he asked in the case where there are multiple dollar amounts, or it is an estimated dollar amount, which dollar amount would be used.

Commissioner Delaney pointed out typically, with the Consent Agenda, there is not multiple dollar amounts, or esti . . . it is what it is.

Chair Altman commented it is for estimates, he is looking at one right now and it has an

estimate, and it depends on how a project is done, so it is not always cut in black and white.

Commissioner Delaney stated she would say whatever is in the Agenda Item, to use that dollar amount.

Chair Altman stated the motion fails 2:3, with Commissioners Goodson, Adkinson, and Altman voting Nay.

Result: DENIED

Mover: Katie Delaney

Second: Rob Feltner

Ayes: Delaney, and Feltner

Nay: Goodson, Adkinson, and Altman

Commissioner Delaney stated she wanted to make another motion to simply put the dollar amount in the Consent Agenda, just as in F.10.

Commissioner Feltner stated he would second the motion.

Chair Altman noted he is looking at F.10.

Commissioner Feltner explained that was the Juanita Item as it is actually known now.

Commissioner Adkinson inquired how that is different than the first, as she just wants to be clear.

Commissioner Delaney replied that was a joint motion for discussion about reading out loud at the next . . .

Commissioner Adkinson asked if that portion was tabled.

Commissioner Delaney responded no, that is done now unless there is Board direction that it would like to talk about that further.

Chair Altman mentioned the motion was dollar amount in the Agenda and to table for discussion at a later time with staff reading out loud; and the new motion is . . .

Commissioner Delaney interjected by saying this motion is only the dollar amount in the title, which is all.

Chair Altman stated putting the dollar amount in the title, and she used a good example of F.10.

Chair Altman stated the motion failed 2:3, with Commissioners Goodson, Adkinson, and Altman voting Nay. He advised for how he voted Nay, but maybe at a future time the Board could look at it.

Result: DENIED

Mover: Katie Delaney

Second: Rob Feltner

Ayes: Delaney, and Feltner

Nay: Goodson, Adkinson, and Altman

The Board discussed disclosure revisions to the handling of the Consent and Business Agenda at the Board of County Commission meetings and directing staff to revise Policy BCC-97, but took no action.

J.7. Citizen request, Re: Approval of letter to the Trust of Public Land

Vince Lamb commented he is here to speak that the Trust for Public Land and the Nature Conservancy have both come forward and offered their free assistance to Brevard County to help them pass the Save Our Indian River Lagoon (SOIRL) referendum as proposed for November; again, there is absolutely no cost; this type of service was used in 2016 and again in 2022; Virginia Barker, Natural Resources Management Director, had she been here and could state that she had good experiences with this assistance; the letter that is in the Board's package, unfortunately, does not include the Nature Conservancy, so the Nature Conservancy just came forward in the past week or so and stepped up to do this; and he has printed copies of the full letter. He continued by saying the reason he thinks this help is valuable is because of the uncertainty being faced at the current time, and leading up to November, he believes there is a lot of uncertainty that affects the voters; there is economic situations, there is a war going on, and there is uncertainty as to exactly what the State Legislature is going to do with this shift between property tax and sales tax; these two organizations over the years have been involved in hundreds of referendums like this; and they have a lot of good experience. He pointed out his experience with them in '26, '16, and '22 was they were quite helpful and he would welcome them to come back to the party; and he thinks this is straightforward, and he hopes the Board will decide to request their help.

Chair Altman explained he talked to Mr. Lamb about this letter; his first question was why Mr. Lamb needed the letter; this does not commit the Board in any way, shape, or form, any dollar amount, or any action, it does not reflect any endorsement of the data that is found or advocacy whatsoever, it is strictly acknowledging that the Board is not in opposition; from what he understands, Trust for Public Land, Nature Conservancy are 501c3 nonprofits, they are grant-funded, and this requirement they have placed upon them they start working on getting information on these types of things that the local government is not in opposition to them; it is more of a technicality to enable them; and he asked if he is reading that correct.

Mr. Lamb replied he thinks that is it; he thinks it is reasonable that they are going to extend their services that they understand a head of time that the Board is receptive to paying some attention; and apparently, that is what they explained to him, is that their grant funding, that the way they work, is basically they have to ask for this technical assistance request letter.

Chair Altman stated he wanted to get that question out because he figured it might come up while the Board was here, but that simply allows it to accept their technical assistance and information gathering, basically what they are doing . . .

Mr. Lamb interjected by saying they are working right now with nine other counties in Florida; this group out of Birmingham, Alabama, and Tallahassee is working with about 70 other counties around the southeast, so they have the finger on the pulse in a way that, they are pretty isolated when getting into questions about what should be done; his experience, he has three successful campaign assistance experiences with 2016, two really, that he also helped deliver Brevard County for Amendment 1 for the for the State; he has a little bit of experience, but he does not hold himself out to be a campaign expert; and he likes to have a campaign

expert to reach out to with the hard questions.

Commissioner Delaney stated she was wondering how they go about getting the public input and the recommendations regarding the program design.

Mr. Lamb advised they will conduct a highly-professional poll; they did this the past two times; the most important thing to him is they have got a lot of experience, and some of the questions will reach out asking what people think is the most important that one would expect from solar renewal; in 2016, he was kind of surprised that the public basically stood up for endangered wildlife that live in the Lagoon; when they were developing a campaign for why they should work and why they should do this; and they kind of tailored their response to the campaign, was going back to things that came out of that poll is what was important to the voters.

Commissioner Delaney stated the reason she asked that question is because people can make data say whatever they want it to say based on who they ask; to her it is really important when she thinks about polls and things like that, it is how they gathered the data, and that is the biggest thing for her that she looks at; and she has a strong wonder about that.

Mr. Lamb noted he does not know how familiar Commissioner Delaney is with that, with the Nature Conservancy and the Trust for Public Land, but they are really high-integrity organizations; he has sat through a lot of the development, the questions, and the approving of the questions for the polls in the past and there was nothing that indicated any bias; it was just a highly-professional, what the information is that they need, and how do they . . .

Commissioner Delaney interjected by saying she is not saying that about the questions; she is wondering where the questions go and how they determined what questions people get asked; and she asked if Mr. Lamb happens to know anything like that.

Commissioner Feltner advised he can say something on this if everybody prefers; he did speak with them, he had a Zoom call; when he was a graduate student he had to write papers on why polls are wrong; that was the thing, here are three articles and to tell them why they are wrong, get it in less than 10 pages for next week, and he is very much a critic of it for a lot of good reasons; one has caller ID in his or her hand all of the time and if he or she does not know the number, he or she does not pick up, so that makes polling, and such, hard; he spoke to them about that, that is something that they deal with every day, and they have other means of asking folks questions; and he thinks first of all, polling in political campaigns, just like what one sees on television where they asked 1,000 people across the country, which is ridiculous when there are 400 million people, 1,000 were asked, and they say likely voters. He mentioned when Gallup invented polling, most homes in 1936 had a phone; they would ask three questions, if one knows where his or her polling place is, when election day is, and who one would vote for; those three questions would determine a likely voter; when one hears that term 'likely voter', they came up with that; and it has changed vastly different now. He stated he would say that is still very hard; in fact, Gallup has even given up, they are not polling in Presidential elections anymore because they recognize that it is almost an impossible thing to do; but on the issue polling, especially when there is a big disparity between if they want this thing or maybe no they want this other thing that is in competition; there is a lot more support for the first item, and that is how they determine; it is not quite the same as candidate A, candidate B; this group he thinks is pretty objective; they are not in Brevard County, so they kind of do not have a stake in the campaign that is going to happen here, as they are genuine environmentalists, so that is their motive; they are really going to provide some guidance; whether one takes it and uses it and it turns into something next fall is the bigger question; and ultimately it will not be up to the Board. He pointed out this here today is sort of an invitation for them because if the Board said

no, he thinks they would not waste their time here because they have a lot of other projects; that was really the short of it when he talked with them; and he asked if that helped answer.

Commissioner Delaney stated she is just wondering about, maybe Commissioner Feltner can help with this because her concern is that it goes out to 300 or 3,000 people that are somehow linked with the lagoon versus 3,000 blind.

Commissioner Feltner noted that violates the first rule of polling which is, and again, if he goes back to his Gallup example, they randomly called numbers; they determined what a likely voter was because they had a random chance, everyone had an equal chance, mostly equal by virtue because they had a phone in their house, and had an equal chance of getting a phone call, which was the random part of it; then they determined who a likely voter was, they know when election day is, they know where their polling place is, and they intend to vote; in this case, let one say here is all the people who in the past said they support the Lagoon effort and they only polled them, that is not a poll; and it would be very clear, as one knows when he or she sees stuff like that, to her earlier point, lying with numbers. He stated he does not think that is what they are trying to do; and there is no education in that whatsoever.

Commissioner Delaney stated she guesses the work they are going to do is going to be used by whatever group is campaigning to say, "Look at all this data we have."

Commissioner Feltner noted or for the Commission to digest, too; they will provide that information to the Board to say, "Hey, this might not be something that you had considered, but through our", and he stated he does not mean to answer for Mr. Lamb, "but, through our surveys and feedback and however they glean all of that, we're hearing a lot of folks saying this;" and to Mr. Lamb's point, he was not expecting in '16 that a lot of folks said he or she was concerned about the wildlife in the river, endangered species, specifically in the river.

Mr. Lamb stated he would be happy to provide Commissioner Delaney with a Zoom or telephone contact with one of the leaders of this organization.

Commissioner Delaney stated that would be great.

Mr. Lamb stated she could have her personal guidance into it.

Commissioner Delaney expressed her appreciation to Mr. Lamb.

The Board approved the letter requesting technical advice and assistance from Trust for Public Land in connection with efforts to develop and sustain reliable, ongoing sources of funding for restoring the Indian River Lagoon.

Result: APPROVED

Mover: Katie Delaney

Seconder: Kim Adkinson

Ayes: Delaney, Goodson, Adkinson, Feltner, and Altman

K. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Tom Kennelly commented he really intended to speak on other topics during Public Comments, but he wants to come back to some of his Citizens Efficiency and Effectiveness Recommendations (CEER) recommendations; the Commissioners are up on the slide, he or she is one of those wizards, if looking real closely; the reason he thought J.5. was so important

is that they got a chance to preview with the Board, allow it to think about what their suggestions might be; he is just going to go through this rather quickly; he asked if he can have his time stopped because he needs to know if Commissioner Goodson is on Zoom or anything, or if he is only by phone, because he does not want to leave him out; does the Board think he is watching online; and can somebody ask him, as he does not know if it is his place to ask him.

Chair Altman asked if Commissioner Goodson is listening to the meeting and can he see the Board.

Commissioner Goodson replied yes.

Mr. Kennelly stated he did not want to exclude him; he did submit three CEER items, which has to do with Indian River Lagoon waters, water County he thinks he heard earlier; three are using the Canaveral lock to control drainage; some specific stuff is on Brookhill Drive, and something about using some backflow preventers; here is the persuasion reason why J.5. could have been important; the water is all of the way up across the road and in the houses along there; in October, they had a month of this; he suspects some of the other districts had this as well; and he does not think this was unique to them. He went on to say they are looking for some solutions here, and he suggested in the CEER that the Canaveral locks be used as a way to drain out some of this; in the upper left-hand corner, the St. Johns River Water Management District gives them the data; he drew the line; that is not their line, but that line that says flooding, that is his; that is when he thinks they get flooding; he is saying that as the Board has objective data to look at; he would be looking at the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) to work with the folks that operate the locks to coordinate opening and closing them; and this is not what he is talking about is anything to do with Save Our Indian River Lagoon (SOIRL), where they talked about flushing the Lagoon or bringing new water in. He mentioned he wants it open just long enough to resolve the flooding, then they close it; back in 2008, Tropical Storm Fay, they did open it, so there is a precedent; down on the bottom under yellow, it says they confirmed they will do it; they will open it in an emergency; in black on the right, this is AI; all knows that AI can be really good, or it can be bad; but it calculated if there was a three-inch difference between the Banana River and the ocean, they could flow about a million gallons per minute; that is a lot of water to move; and he does not know if he believes that yet, but he thought he would show that to the Board. He went on to say his second suggestion was, as the Board can see on the left-hand picture, that is a stormwater management drain for Brevard County that is back-flowing saltwater onto the street; he does not think this is the only place that has this in the County; he can measure it in the middle; on the right, the great folks at Public Works come up with a plan to fix it; raise the drain a little bit and still have it be a drain; and unfortunately, when SOIRL came along, that kind of went away because why tear up the road twice, as it makes perfect sense. He pointed out his CEER asked is, "Hey, make sure that SOIRL is working with Public Works to resolve a problem they already know about it;" he does not expect them to tear up the road today, that would be twice; going on to the final water backflow preventers; he asked if the Commissioners know what a backflow preventer is; he stated he just will not go through it; and that can be used throughout the County.

Jennifer Dustin remarked a traditional intersection has 32 points where vehicles can collide; a roundabout has just eight; that single design difference is why studies shown roundabouts can reduce fatal crashes by up to 90 percent; because of that dramatic safety improvement along with smoother traffic flow and lower pollution, she is recommending the County consider roundabouts where they make sense; according to the Federal Highway Administration, converting traditional intersections to roundabouts can reduce fatal crashes by about 90 percent, and injury crashes by about 75 percent; and overall collisions drop by roughly 37 percent. She went on to say these improvements occur because roundabouts fundamentally

change the geometry of traffic conflicts; instead of high-speed crossing movements that cause severe crashes, vehicles move through the intersection at slower speeds and yield to circulating traffic; roundabouts also improve traffic efficiency; instead of drivers sitting through red lights during low traffic periods, vehicles yield and keep moving, which can increase intersection capacity by 30 to 50 percent and significantly reduce delay; and they also provide measurable environmental benefits. She mentioned because vehicles are not repeatedly stopping and accelerating at signals, studies show roundabouts can reduce fuel consumption and emissions by 20 to 30 percent; pedestrian safety improves as well; with slower traffic speeds and refuge islands, roundabouts have been shown to reduce pedestrian crashes by about 40 percent; importantly for taxpayers, roundabouts eliminate the need for signal equipment, electricity, and ongoing signal maintenance, which reduces long-term operational costs for local governments; roundabouts are not appropriate at every intersection, but when applied strategically, they are one of the most effective tools available to improve roadway safety and traffic efficiency; she respectfully encourages the County to evaluate intersections where roundabouts could provide these benefits; roundabouts are not just a traffic design, they are a proven way to save lives, reduce congestion, and reduce unnecessary fuel waste for the community; and she expressed her appreciation to the Board for its time, consideration, and commitment to improving safety and mobility in the community.

Chair Altman asked how she spells her last name.

Ms. Dustin replied Dustin.

Chair Altman asked D-U-S-T-I-N, he could not read it. He stated he agrees with her, he loves roundabouts; he knows they are very controversial; but he appreciates . . .

Ms. Dustin interjected by saying everybody says nobody knows how to drive in a roundabout, but that is how one learns.

Chair Altman advised he receives a lot of calls about the roundabout.

Elizabeth Baker commented she spent a lot of time walking around in Brevard County; some people walk for exercise, but she tends to walk with a trash bag; over time after picking up trash for years, she has noticed a lot of patterns where litter collects, where dumpsters overflow, and where trash escapes into storm drains and eventually into the Indian River Lagoon; Brevard County is clearly growing, it is welcoming new residents, new development, and millions and millions of visitors every year; and tourism alone brings billions of dollars into the Space Coast economy. She continued by saying Brevard's cruise terminals, beaches, and rocket launches attract people from all over the world, and growth is definitely something to celebrate, but it also means more packaging, more disposable items, and more pressure on the County's waste systems; globally, aside from cigarette butts, the most commonly littered items are food wrappers, plastic bottle caps, plastic bags, disposable food packaging, and these lightweight materials easily escape from overflowing dumpsters and unsecured trash areas and end up in the roadways, storm drains, and waterways; litter is not just an environmental issue, it becomes a public safety issue, an infrastructure issue, and taxpayer issue; and it damages mowing equipment, clogs stormwater systems, harms wildlife, increases maintenance costs, and ultimately that falls on the County and on the people. She stated the good news is that Brevard County already has strong law addressing it; Chapter 94 of the County Code requires proper waste storage and litter-free properties; her proposal simply adds a preventative step that helps ensure those existing rules are followed; she is asking the Commission to consider a simple waste management confirmation for brick-and-mortar commercial properties and multi-family developments with shared trash systems in the unincorporated areas of Brevard

County; it could be a short one-page plan just confirming trash and recycling capacity, pickup schedules, dumpster placement, maintenance, and litter prevention practices; and in most cases, things already exist. She stated this proposal does not create new fees, new staff, or new departments; it simply confirms that waste systems are adequate before problems occur and they end up with Code Enforcement violations; it is cost-neutral, pro-business, and supportive of tourism because clean commercial spaces and well-managed properties protect the visitor experience and reduce infrastructure costs; importantly, they have to know, and everybody here knows, that growth works best when the systems that are there support it; and she is respectfully asking the Commission to consider directing staff to review the proposal and evaluate whether simple waste management confirmation could be incorporated into existing permitting or inspection processes.

Melissa Brandt stated she has been a Brevard County resident for 26 years, and 18 of those she has served as a public servant; recently, she has changed a bit, went to a non-profit organization, and she has been doing outreach the span of 72 miles in this County; formerly, she understands the responsibility of balancing many priorities across a County that spans so many miles; but at its core, one of the most important roles of local government is protecting the safety and well-being of the County's residents; when temperature drop, access to overnight shelters is not just a social concern, it is really a community safety issue; and on cold nights in Brevard, shelters quickly reach their capacity. She stated how she knows is she was at one in January in Titusville at Life Pointe Ministries; it was amazing to see the staff, the volunteers there on a Thursday night; she was doing outreach for substance abuse; but they open their doors as a common table to invite people in that do not have shelter to have a meal, a shower; they have organizations come out, provide phones, anything they can to homeless individuals; and that night, they flipped after dinner and they opened their doors to a cold night shelter, in which there were over 65 people there. She advised the people were from 70 years old to one; it was amazing to see families in need; it was heartbreaking, actually; what she wanted to ask is it should remind everyone how hard the faith-based organization and the small non-profits are working; the Brevard Homeless Coalition sent her this yesterday as she works as a member of the Continuum of Care; Life Pointe Ministries served 32 nights of which actually cold night shelters operated on 34 nights so far between January and February; Matthews Hope 20 Nights, Our Friends and Neighbors Providence Connects Church of the Nazarene 16 nights, and the Central Brevard Sharing Center 11 nights; and across these activations, an average of 215 individuals were sheltered per night through this coordinated community response. She asked if the County can open shelters, or direct staff to look at some partnership ideas; she knows point in time count is just a point in time, but what she sees out in this community and even at her workplace are people at their front doors in true need of help; and if the County could open shelters during cold weather and extreme heat, as Orange County does. She pointed out Orange County partners with a non-profit; they go in and run the shelters, they provide small case management, and sometimes can get people to the help they deserve; and she asked if Brevard County would help its citizens in need.

Joanne Maksym stated she provided prior to today's meeting her Speak up Brevard recommendation.

Chair Altman expressed his apologies as he has her card.

Ms. Maksym mentioned she recently noticed a posted sign identifying a future Spyglass Hill extension and I-95 overpass; she provided a picture on the overhead projector; she stated she previously submitted a request for an American Disabilities Act (ADA) accommodation to use a golf cart on certain sidewalks in the City of Rockledge, and that request was not approved; she understands that the City of Rockledge and Brevard County are two separate governments;

she is not here to challenge the City's decision; she is here to highlight that this limits safe, accessible access and creates a barrier between communities, for residents who rely on mobility accommodations; and what was intended to connect communities has instead created a barrier. She went on to say the community deserves clarity on this; this project has been identified for decades; it is currently projected between 2031 and 2050; 30 years is long enough; it is time to build connection instead of continuing division; she respectfully asks if staff could clarify the current status of the future Spyglass Hill extension and I-95 overpass reference on the posted signage; and she expressed her appreciation to the Board for its time and consideration.

Commissioner Feltner asked if it is The Viera Company that is doing that.

Jim Liesenfelt, County Manager, replied he knows The Viera Company owns part of the right-of-way.

Chair Altman advised he had a similar question because he was on the Regional Planning Council when the Development of Regional Impact (DRI) was approved, and he was on the Commission when the development and the DRI; he remembers the project is a part of the capital plan for . . .

Tad Calkins, Assistant County Manager, stated it is a requirement of the Regional Development Organization (RDO) for the regional development impact for Viera; he thinks it comes in in Phase 4; there is a traffic count associated with it; and he does not know what the particular number of units and for the traffic that they would have to make that improvement.

Commissioner Feltner asked what Ms. Maksym is hoping for from that overpass when it does eventually happen.

Ms. Maksym replied actually it would connect Viera East and Viera West, people would be able to walk, and/or people who have mobility devices, would be able to cross over I-95; and as of right now, there is no safe pathway to get over onto Viera West for the residents who live on Viera East, which she does, because they cannot go across Viera Boulevard.

Commissioner Feltner stated he thinks that Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) does not permit taking golf carts, like for example, over the Diamond Interchange; and he thinks one cannot even cross underneath I-95 on Wickham Road.

Ms. Maksym stated correct.

Commissioner Feltner noted he will ask FDOT this question for Ms. Maksym, and will follow up because if she is talking about a mobility device like a scooter, a personal mobility scooter.

Ms. Maksym advised she is actually talking about a golf cart that is considered a mobility device under the ADA accommodations for her family.

Commissioner Feltner stated he understands that golf carts, they have concerns when they are in traffic, especially that Diamond Interchange; and he will ask the question about ADA-style golf carts and get that for her from FDOT.

Ms. Maksym stated okay, and he is correct with Viera because one cannot go across either way, they have the barricades as well; in fact, she was coming here this morning, she actually saw a golf cart going through the Diamond; but she is not going to put her family at risk for that;

and under I-95 on Wickham, golf carts go that way, too.

Commissioner Feltner stated he thinks they go around bollards though, they have some things there to prevent them; and he thinks they are not supposed to go underneath I-95.

Ms. Maksym pointed out they do it all of the time.

Commissioner Feltner mentioned there are places where they are not supposed to be for sure.

Ms. Maksym stated correct; she is just trying to go about it the right way; when she got the golf cart years ago, she also noticed the signage; it has been on the books for 30 years, and another 30 more, that is 100 years in the planning; and the signs there.

Commissioner Feltner explained it may still change before they get it done, so he thinks she has the right to ask a question before they start putting concrete in the ground.

Ms. Maksym stated she thinks it would be a good overpass to unite both communities for people who live on Viera West if they want to come to Viera East, and Viera East to Viera West; people that have mobility issues, that they at least have a safe crossing over I-95; and it is a shame they could not make some type of access.

Commissioner Feltner commented he thinks Viera has been mindful of the golf carts over here with the tunnel that they put on the Pineda West extension; and he is not a golf cart person.

Commissioner Delaney asked and by the high school.

Commissioner Feltner replied affirmatively; he stated he is even trying to work out something with the schools where they can take golf carts into the back of the school rather than the front, and that is just simply trying to handle traffic in front of the school; there are pedestrians, golf carts, and cars, and if the County can get one of those three out of that loop and maybe go to a separate entrance; those are things that are continuing to be talked about; and he will find out from FDOT for her.

Ms. Maksym mentioned it kind of makes it difficult when one lives in Viera East, because if he or she goes to the right out of her development, she goes into the City of Rockledge; if she goes left, she is in her jurisdiction, which allows golf carts; and if one goes to the City of Rockledge they . . .

Commissioner Feltner interjected by saying yes.

Ms. Maksym stated she is not here to challenge the City.

Commissioner Feltner stated by the way, Viera was built with the idea that it is a golf cart friendly community; they have the multi-use trails that are wider; and in Rockledge it is an older neighborhood that does not have those wide sidewalks that a golf cart can travel on, and someone can still be walking and not be in conflict.

Ms. Maksym stated a section of Barnes and Murrell does have the extra-wide sidewalks; and now those were the only two sidewalks that she was requesting access to.

Chair Altman stated they do not allow golf carts to go on underpasses or overpasses, but if it is a street approved, street certified golf cart . . .

Commissioner Feltner interjected by saying if it is licensed, so that is the whole difference; if it has got the tag on it, so that is a low speed vehicle; otherwise, it is a golf cart; the Board has been through this over on the beach where the . . . being on A1A, crossing A1A, parking at the parks, all of those things have come up because one is not supposed to be on A1A or cross it with a golf cart; but if it has got the tag on it, then that is considered a low speed vehicle, he thinks 35 miles per hour is the limit on that; one does have to have a driver's license with a golf cart; he asked if the Board remembers the Legislature caught the Statute up a little bit; one has to at least have taken the written exam for a temporary permit before he or she can drive a golf cart, or if one is 18 if he or she does not have a license; and they are different distinctions. He advised he lives it every day.

Chair Altman pointed out for not being a golf cart guy, he knows golf carts.

Commissioner Feltner noted his parents had a golf cart; his dad had a mobility issue, as he was hurt as a young man; a scooter ended up being pretty good around his neighborhood; but the golf cart was funny; someone's car had to stay in the driveway for the golf cart to go into the garage and be charged; his parents fought over the golf cart until finally they got rid of it; and he remembers those days very vividly.

Commissioner Delaney stated the overpass that is going to be Spyglass, she grew up in Hammock Lakes, and they used to play in that area; and she asked if it is just going to be an overpass over I-95 and not going to be an exit.

Commissioner Feltner stated it is not an interchange as he understands; in fact, he thinks they were even at one time it would only have been two-lane; one would be eastbound and one westbound; and he asked if that sounded vaguely right.

Commissioner Delaney stated to reach out to The Viera Company; Eva from The Viera Company is just incredible; she cares deeply about what she does, and is just an awesome lady; and she does not know if staff could talk to them about even putting a golf cart path on that overpass or something, especially because it is so golf cart friendly.

Commissioner Feltner stated the only way they could probably get that done is if there are not cars there as well, if it was strictly pedestrian; Morris Richardson, County Attorney, gave him something that says LSVs can only be operated on streets where the posted speed limit is 35 or less, because they are limited at 35; he will follow up with Ms. Maksym; and he will have that information from the FDOT.

Ms. Maksym advised she is not requesting for it to be street legal.

Commissioner Feltner stated he understands.

Ms. Maksym stated two of three of her family members have a placard, so that accommodates their family.

Commissioner Feltner noted he is very sensitive to that.

L.1. Jim Liesenfelt, County Manager

Jim Liesenfelt, County Manager, stated he does not know if the Board knows, but Tom Shuler, President of Brevard Farm Bureau, passed away earlier this month; he was a leader in the agricultural community; he worked with him over the years; and he sends out condolences to

his wife, Lori, and the rest of his family.

L.3. Katie Delaney, Commissioner District 1

Commissioner Delaney stated she just has a short one today; she just wanted to give a shout-out to the fire department, Brevard County Fire Rescue; the County had some pretty serious fires a few weeks ago; they are just incredible; they saved structures; they are so professional; the Chief told her, and she does not know if this is in confidence or not, but she is going to brag on him anyway; the firefighters got some pizza that night for dinner, and the County's people went out to those houses that dealt with the fire that night and gave them some of their pizzas and whatnot; the County have some incredible people who work for Brevard County, and they care so deeply about the community; and she just wanted to thank them. She went on to say the Public Works Department, she cannot remember what day it was, but there was some torrential downpours in District 1 and some of the streets were flooding; they were very quick to go out there and double-check all of the drainage to make sure nothing was clogged; luckily, there was no water in houses this time; by the time they got there it had dissipated; she really appreciates the County Public Works maintenance guys, the North area guys, as they went out when it was not their normal work hours; and she just appreciates the care and concern for the community.

Upon consensus of the Board, the meeting adjourned at 11:39 a.m.

ATTEST:

RACHEL M. SADOFF, CLERK

THAD ALTMAN, CHAIRMAN

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

BREVARD COUNTY, FLORIDA