

## Minutes

### Regular Meeting of the Captiva Erosion Prevention District

Tween Waters Inn, 15951 Captiva Drive, Captiva, Florida 33924  
March 7, 2012 @ Noon

Commissioners Present: Jim Boyle (Chair); Doris Holzheimer (Vice Chair); Harry Kaiser (Secretary); Dave Jensen (Treasurer); Mike Mullins (Commissioner)

Staff Present: Kathleen Rooker, CEPD Administrator; JoAnn Paul-Young, CEPD Accountant; John Bralove, CEPD Assistant to the Administrator

#### 1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Boyle at 12:00 p.m.

#### 2. Roll Call

The roll was called and the results are outlined above.

#### 3. Approval of January and February Meeting Minutes

Mr. Kaiser moved and Mr. Jensen seconded a motion to dispense with the reading of the minutes from the January 6, 2012 Regular Board Meeting, the January 12, 2012 Board Briefing Meeting, the January 26, 2012 Board Briefing Meeting, the February 9, 2012 Board Briefing Meeting, and the February 23, 2012 Board Briefing Meeting. The motion passed without dissent. Mr. Mullins pointed out that there still needed to be a motion to approve these minutes. Mr. Kaiser moved and Mr. Jensen seconded a motion to approve the minutes outlined in the first motion. The motion passed without dissent.

#### 4. Public to be Heard

Chairman Boyle called upon Lee County Commissioner John Manning, who was in the audience, for comments. Mr. Manning said in reference the new Interlocal Agreement between the County and Captiva that it is getting closer and he wants to keep that momentum going. He said that the parties need to continue to work together, that there are still a few outstanding issues involving Sanibel, but he is optimistic that everyone is closer to constructing an ILA where everyone wants it to be. He added that Steve Boutelle, Lee County Division of Natural Resources, who was also in the audience, could provide details.

Mr. Mullins thanked Mr. Manning for his continued attendance at the CEPD Board Meetings. Mr. Boyle said that the last time Mr. Manning and he met in Mr. Manning's office; there were 3 open policy items. The first was the cancellation clause, which he reported has now been slightly modified with a trigger point. Mr. Boyle said that if Federal funds become available that adding at the end of the cancellation sentence "up to 30 days prior to the time the District would have to upfront the money to the government" be considered. He asked Mr. Boutelle to redo this at his end. Mr. Boutelle said the intent of the clause was to be able to regroup if something

catastrophic or out of the ordinary happened. He said that the language just outlined was suitable.

Mr. Mullins pointed out that Mr. Boyle is discussing the ILA with the County on behalf of the Board but that under the Sunshine Laws, no one individual can go in and negotiate for the Board. Mr. Mullins talked about how historically CEPD used to do assessments and then it changed in the late 90's where it went to the TDC. CEPD still needs to evaluate this; under CEPD's enabling legislation, the District still has the right to assess. Because of the bond issuance, CEPD needs to know further in advance so that alternatives such as assessment can be reviewed. He said that there still may need to be further discussion on this issue.

The second issue, Mr. Boyle said, is funding. The County's view is still to utilize the formula, which is largely based on parking spaces, and was the best method for this back in the 70's. He said using the formula, assuming the scenario where nourishment is done on Captiva only, the total project cost is \$18 million, the Army Corps funds \$4 million, and the state funds \$4 million, there is \$10 million to be paid by Lee County and Captiva. Mr. Boyle suggested the County and CEPD split to remaining \$10 million equally rather than use the formula which is outdated.

The third issue that is still open is that the County wants approval of a detailed scope of work for each task as the project goes on. Mr. Boyle said this could be an impediment from a manpower point of view. He said that CEPD submits the scopes of work to DEP and they have regulatory authority, not Lee County. Mr. Boutelle said that the County's intent is not regulatory; they simply want to make sure that the County knows specifically on what it is being asked to cost share. Commissioner Manning agreed that the County was not interested or staffed for regulatory approval. Mr. Boyle suggested that he and Mr. Boutelle can work on the language to reflect the intent and then that hurdle will be overcome.

Mr. Mullins asked to return to the formula issue. He said he liked Mr. Boyle's attempt to simplify the approach. He commented that if a formula were used, it should not parallel the state's formula because in that formula, South Seas Island Resort property is not included. Mr. Boyle added that South Seas is a significant part of the island (38%). Mr. Mullins said the CEPD does not want to be facing a decision where South Seas would be excluded from CEPD's nourishment.

Mr. Boyle said the last open policy issue was the schedule for disbursement of funding. The County will provide money up front if the Corps of Engineers provides funding. If CEPD is forced to go without Corps funding, bills will have to be submitted after the project is over. Mr. Mullins asked whether it is still the state's policy to provide the money up front. Ms. Rooker said that it takes a special request but that CEPD has been able to get it in the past. Mr. Boyle said that the one problem is timing; the state's budget does not begin until July 1 and the COE may want money around July to August 2012 or perhaps earlier. Mr. Mullins asked what the County's logic is in light of the fact that if CEPD does not get COE funding, there would be a greater need to get money up front. Mr. Boutelle said that the County does not pay for things until it has them. He explained that the County is not asking to wait until the end of the project. As soon as CEPD gets an invoice, he said, send it to the County so that it can be concurrently processed. He said that the County just wants a level of comfort so that it knows that the work is complete.

Chairman Boyle asked Commissioner Manning whether he had anything to report on Blind Pass. In response, Mr. Boutelle provided background information. He said that the County had just received numbers from the Ft. Myers Beach dredging contractor both for work on the seaward and interior side and needs to look at them. He said that they also wanted to take a look at the obligation that the County shares with CEPD for by-passing sand onto northern Sanibel. The County feels that it would be reasonable to count any dredging on the next BP maintenance against that by-passing obligation. But because of the regulatory process, the only place the sand can be placed is a couple thousand feet south of the conceptual template specified in the interlocal agreement. Mr. Boutelle said that Sanibel was asked about this placement and their opinion was that, primarily because of erosion they are seeing further north in the template, they did not think that this would be appropriate. Sanibel would like to see sand included with the Captiva project as the interlocal agreement for by-passing specifies instead of or in addition to.

Mr. Boutelle said the County is examining the implications of this but it makes the date of Easter as when this dredging would start a bit more indefinite because of the obligation to Sanibel. He said that it is going to cost the County more money if it were to put more sand in close proximity to the Pass. Mr. Boutelle continued that the price being proposed by using the Ft. Myers Beach dredger is a fabulous one, but that in light of the fact that it will cost the County more money, perhaps it would be better to wait until 2014 or 2015. It is a balancing act. He said that if the dredging were done right now, there is no benefit to CEPD, and Sanibel has indicated that it doesn't benefit them in terms of the agreement. So the County would be on its own from a financial standpoint and still have the obligations for nourishment projects. He said staff will have to crunch some numbers. After a question from Mr. Kaiser, Mr. Boutelle stated that it would be easier to dredge the pass now than if it were closed. Mr. Boutelle concluded that two items were going to be worked on: the County will need to look at the scope of work in the interlocal agreements to deal with the by-passing and placement of sand on northern Sanibel; and the County Commissioners will be presented with something a few weeks down the road, they will be given the pricing for the Blind Pass change order, staff will outline for them the pro's and con's, and the County will be ready to go if the Commissioners decide to approve this. If this were to happen, construction could indeed start after Easter.

Mr. Boyle asked Mr. Boutelle whether the estimate of sand volume to be removed is still about 90,000 cubic yards at \$6.00 per yard. Mr. Boutelle responded that the volume might be a little more depending on how much of the interior is done. If it just the exterior, it is about 90,000 cubic yards at \$6.25. If the interior is done, it could be as high as 125,000 cubic yards. If the interior were done, the unit pricing would be the same but there would be an extra \$100,000 to bring in more pipe. Mr. Manning commented that the price is so attractive because there would not be mobilization costs. Mr. Boutelle estimated that the mobilization cost savings would be the difference of what it cost the last time, \$2.4 million, and the \$850,000 that is estimated it would cost if it were done now.

Mr. Mullins asked when that mobilization savings would go away, and Mr. Boutelle responded that it would be when the dredger needs to move his equipment to another job. He said that right now he thought that it was secure for at least another 60 to 90 days. Mr. Manning commented that the faster the work is done the better. Mr. Mullis asked rather than lose this opportunity, what needs to be done to make this happen now? Mr. Boutelle said it would be a cost/benefit situation. He said that everyone recognizes the benefit but that it is necessary to

make sure that it is a good value considering what else the County has to fund. The other element is that the County must take a look at what its additional financial obligation will be to nourish Sanibel. Mr. Manning said that he thought that number was closer to 75,000 cubic yards compared to the 48,000 to 50,000 that CEPD might be thinking. Mr. Boutelle thought that the Sanibel staff is confirming the fill volumes from Blind Pass. Mr. Boyle said the timing is critical; if this work is not done now, then CEPD will need to start talking to the COE about paying them to put down the 50,000 to 75,000 cubic yards during the Captiva nourishment project. Mr. Manning said that there will be a decision one way or the other by the County Commissioners within 3-4 week. He will be putting in on the agenda for them to take action and although he still thinks his recommendation is to go ahead now, he still has an obligation to do a little more homework regarding the additional costs.

Mr. Mullins asked Kevin Ruane, Mayor of Sanibel, who was in the audience, whether Sanibel were on board with the dredging plan. Mr. Ruane affirmed that they were and added that communications between the parties needed to improve.

Mr. Boutelle mentioned that temporary markers had been installed in the interior channel because of the shoaling and that the County will continue to watch it. Mr. Mullins brought up the issue of fishing off the Blind Pass Bridge being an "attractive nuisance." Sometimes the crowd on the bridge forces pedestrians on to the road. He also mentioned the mess that accumulates on the bridge from trash and fish guts. He thanked Sanibel for periodically cleaning the sidewalk on the bridge and suggested that the addition of trash cans might help.

#### **5. Financial Report**

Treasurer Jensen reported that the new account with Bank of the Islands that was authorized by the Board has been opened. He said that CEPD is now able to access all accounts on line. He referenced the six pages of financial documents in the agenda materials and said that there was nothing of note to report on the latest financial numbers.

#### **6. Old Business**

##### **a) Legislative Update**

Chairman Boyle provided an update on state funding. He said the CEPD project had been included in bills in both the state Senate and House, they were submitted to the conference committee to reconcile the Senate and House versions, and that the committee had reconciled them and funding is now in the official budget. The amount is \$4.5 million for the Captiva project. There is a 72-hour waiting period before the budget is sent to the Governor for approval. It was noted that the Governor has the right of line item veto.

Regarding Federal funding from the Army Corps of Engineers, Mr. Boyle said that in mid-February, the CEPD project was deleted from the Corps' work plan when the administration shifted emphasis to projects related to commerce and industry. When CEPD heard about this, the District contacted Representative Mack and Senator Nelson and involved CEPD's lobbyist Debbie Flack and Charlie Dudley of Floridian Partners, the lobbyist for South Seas Island Resort. Consequently, Mr. Boyle reported, the Corps is re-evaluating their funding in light of some of its listed projects not being ready. He said the idea is that those funds not being used are shifted, that he is cautiously optimistic, and the issue could be resolved within a week or two. He said that the amount of money involved is approximately \$4 million. He added that the erroneous report broadcast by NBC 2 that the money had already been approved required that CEPD be

patient and somewhat low-key. Mr. Mullins reminded the Commissioners and the audience that the amount of funding and the cost of the project continually change as does the project schedule itself.

**b) Renourishment Schedule**

Chairman Boyle reported that for budgetary reasons the Army Corps of Engineers would like to see a contract awarded no later than September 1, 2012. If everything else comes together, the project could commence on or around October 1, 2012 and be completed by Christmas. Mr. Mullins asked about a written timeline. Mr. Boyle responded there isn't one that he is comfortable in releasing at this time because things keep moving. He said that once CEPD knows that the Army Corps has a date, the Commissioners will have a flow sheet that contains both the administrative side and the technical side. Mr. Mullins vehemently disagreed with this approach. He said that CEPD has long talked about the fact that if we fail to plan, we plan to fail. There should have been a timeline. He thought that this was a weak excuse for not properly planning. Mr. Mullins said he thought Mr. Boyle had de-emphasized it, but Mr. Mullins thought there is a huge lack in CEPD's administrative staff. He said that we are remiss in not having that plan.

Mr. Boyle said that CEPD had asked for some resource help from Bob Gray of Partners in Progress and Mr. Gray put forward a document that Mr. Boyle had looked at and which was not right. That is the reason why there is nothing here today. Mr. Mullins disputed this. Mr. Mullins said that Mr. Gray had proposed a resource and that Mr. Mullins had asked for a resource a while ago to supplement a weakness in the office staff that we have today. Mr. Boyle said that when he asked Mr. Gray for the document, Mr. Gray never said he needed a resource. Mr. Boyle said that Mr. Gray is that resource. Mr. Mullins said Mr. Gray spent months finding somebody that Mr. Boyle shot down in January. Mr. Boyle responded that the person who was put forth at the January meeting was not shot down by him; every commissioner at the meeting, of which there were four, said not to move forward. Mr. Kaiser confirmed this. Mr. Mullins said that in hindsight he found out that the facts were misrepresented to the Board relative to the candidate. He said that CEPD still has this need. He asked what progress has been made? He said that CEPD cannot be successful in this project unless it has a project planning person who knows project management software. Rejecting the candidate in January does not eliminate the need. He said we still have this opening, a project is coming up, and we have no way of keeping track of it. As a Board we have a responsibility to put somebody on board and this is not a good excuse to say that we still do not have a plan.

Mr. Jensen said he is totally missing where CEPD is not handling the efforts in getting a project going and asked for specifics from Mr. Mullins. Mr. Mullins responded that all the areas related to the project need to be put into a critical path and that relying on, for example, the Army Corps, only covers a part of the project. If all the steps are not put into a larger critical path, there is a likelihood that something will drop through the cracks and we will fail on some of those things. He said that CEPD has adequate money to put the proper resources on the job, but we obviously do not have an understanding and a concurrence. If we are still asking the kinds of questions that Mr. Jensen is asking, then we don't really know how to manage a project and we are remiss in our duties. Mr. Mullins continued that right now, if we got Federal money to do a project in the fall, we are in big trouble relative to being successful at it or we will miss the opportunity to collaborate with Collier County or we will have to pay CP&E a lot more money by bringing in one of their more expensive engineers than if CEPD were to have someone

on staff. Mr. Jensen said he disagreed with Mr. Mullins. Mr. Kaiser asked does CEPD need Partners in Progress when Mr. Mullins thinks the need is for someone who can help CEPD with the project here and can run with it.

Mr. Jensen suggested that Commissioners stop talking about the extra person. The issue, he said, is whether there is a plan, and he stated that CEPD has a plan and asked Ms. Rooker to comment. Mr. Boyle said that he asked Ms. Rooker not to bring the plan that Bob Gray had sent because there is something wrong in his program. He said that Ms. Rooker has a combined administrative and technical timeline but the issue is that there is a problem with somebody's software and the problem is being looked into. He continued by addressing Mr. Mullins and saying that he wholeheartedly disagrees with the allegation that CEPD is not planning

Mr. Mullins commented that in managing large projects, CEPD should not rely on "if we think we have a plan therefore there is a plan." Commissioners should see the plan, see the interdependencies, comment on it, review it, and if something does go wrong on one of the tasks, it is changed. Mr. Mullins said that he does not think Ms. Rooker has the expertise for project management and shouldn't have to have it. Mr. Jensen asked Mr. Mullins why he thought Ms. Rooker does not have the expertise and Mr. Mullins responded by saying that it has been several years and there is no plan. Mr. Jensen said that Mr. Mullins was just told that there is a plan, there are some problems with it, his question has been answered, and he is belaboring the subject.

Mr. Mullins said that over the past few months a number of ideas and contingencies, all great ideas, have been talked about but they do not come into fruition unless they get into a plan. He added that CEPD does not even have right now a drop dead date regarding the Army Corps and that date needs to be in a master plan. He still had not seen that. Ms. Holzheimer said Commissioners talked about this issue last week at the Briefing Meeting, at which Mr. Mullins was not present, and it was the desire of the Corps to reach a decision regarding using the Corps so as to put this to rest. Mr. Mullins commented that good intentions are not enough. He said that it is a complex project, we cannot have slipshod planning, it has to be in concrete, in writing, and we all have to see it and question it and understand it and know how we play a role in it. Ms. Holzheimer said CEPD has a start of a plan but that she did not know CEPD had something from Bob Gray. Ms. Rooker said that all the dates that have been talked about, when to make a decision about the Corps, when to go to the bank, when to send the Corps money, when to advertise for bids, when to mobilize, and when to open the bids were all contained in the spreadsheet that the Commissioners were sent several months ago. Mr. Mullins said that indeed CEPD does have some of the points in the plan. Ms. Rooker said she thought it was about 90% of them. Mr. Mullins said that he saw that plan and remarked at the time that he did not think it was 90%. Ms. Rooker said that combined with the technical engineering portion, it was 95%. She said that there would be some situations that come up which will need to be added. Mr. Mullins said that the talking is at cross-purposes here because he does not think everyone understands the level of detail that is needed in a plan to make a project successful. If there is not a sufficient level of detail, then there is no plan. He said that if CEPD cannot get that level of detail, then he thinks this year is at great risk and even next year could be at risk. Mr. Mullins said that he does not think the CEPD Board is meeting its fiduciary responsibility toward the taxpayers.

**c) Comprehensive and Emergency Plan Updates**

Mr. Boyle reported that CP&E engineer Steve Keehn will have updates at the April meeting and as soon as they are transmitted, Ms. Rooker will send electronic copies to the Board so they will have time to review them prior to the April meeting.

**d) Approval of December Meeting Minutes**

Chairman Boyle said that there were Briefing Meeting Minutes from December that had not been approved at January 2012 Board Meeting because Commissioner Jensen was out of the country and there were different views about what had happened at one of those meetings. Mr. Boyle called upon Mr. Jensen to comment on the December Briefing Meeting Minutes. Mr. Jensen said that the minutes as contained in the Agenda Materials reflect the meetings' proceedings as he remembers them. Mr. Jensen moved and Mr. Kaiser seconded motion to approve the Briefing Minutes of December 8, 2011 and December 15, 2012 as written. Mr. Mullins requested that his dissenting opinion be recorded in the minutes. Mr. Boyle concurred with Mr. Mullins' request to include his copy of opinion as part of the record. The motion passed 4 to 1, with Mr. Mullins dissenting.

Mr. Mullins mentioned that had the request he made some months ago for recordings of Board Briefings been met, there would not have been this problem. Mr. Boyle reminded the Commissioners that this issue had been discussed at the January 2012 meeting and that from then on, all meetings will be recorded. Prior to that, CEPD's Rules of Procedure did not require recording of the Briefing Meetings.

**e) Partners in Progress Term Sheet**

Mr. Boyle mentioned that the current Partners in Progress (PIP) contract expires on May 31, 2012 and that at the January 2012 meeting, the Board had requested PIP to propose terms to extend the contract to December 31, 2013 with an option to extend another year through December 2014. He called for questions. Mr. Mullins asked if an additional person is proposed in this contract. Mr. Boyle said it was not. He added that per the January 2012 meeting discussion, CEPD needs someone with a technical bent and business background. It might be that the Board searches for this person, or it looks to CP&E or someone else. Mr. Mullins asked Mr. Boyle whether he had decided that he did not want to use PIP to do the search. Mr. Boyle said yes. Mr. Mullins asked whether anything had been done since the January meeting to find those alternative skills. Mr. Boyle said no because he did not think there was a common view on the Board as to what CEPD needs, what skill set is needed, pay rate, part-time or full time, and other things. Mr. Mullins commented that it is March and there may be a project going on in the fall, there was prior agreement on the need, all the nuances of the need have not been spelled out, and when do we plan to do that? Mr. Boyle responded that the discussion needs to happen as to whether CEPD needs someone. Ms. Holzheimer agreed that there is not agreement among the Board members.

Mr. Mullins said that he vehemently disagrees. The candidate proposed in January was shot down, and now two months later, nothing has been done to clarify that need. CEPD needs to find someone who understands project planning, there is a critical date as to when that person is needed, and he thinks that date has passed if CEPD is going to be successful. Mr. Boyle said that he favor the direction Mr. Kaiser's direction is leaning - that the person needs to be a technical person who is computer literate, and asked if Mr. Jensen had a view. Mr. Jensen said

that he has yet to see the need to increase staff unless he is missing something. Mr. Mullins responded respectfully that he thinks Mr. Jensen is missing a lot and explained a situation where there was a huge gap: a resolution for nourishment was passed in 2002 and yet nothing was done until 2004. Mr. Mullins said that the history of this Board has been to delegate the responsibilities to the Administrator and if there is not detailed planning, something major will be overlooked. Mr. Mullins criticized the CEPD Board's lack of planning for the 2004 renourishment which resulted in a further year's delay to 2005. Mr. Jensen responded that Hurricane Charley in August 2004 was the real reason for the delay and not a lack of planning. Mr. Jensen said that he still had not heard anything as to why CEPD should spend more money for additional staffing. Mr. Mullins responded by saying that the old way of having one Administrator in the office and outsourcing everything cost CEPD a bundle and yielded much poorer results relative to what was gotten out of the County. CEPD saved money by adding the extra resources and has had better results in the past 3 years when outside functions were brought into the office. To continue that, Mr. Mullins said, requires that CEPD has the extra resources. Mr. Mullins said he did not care whether CEPD hired somebody or outsourced it to a company that specializes in project management.

Mr. Kaiser commented that Ms. Rooker does a lot of that right now. Mr. Mullins said that some of the tasks Mr. Rooker does she is great at. Mr. Kaiser then agreed that if you can cut more of the outside people and save money by bringing in somebody else for less money, it makes sense to him. Mr. Mullins replied that the approach has been to spend more money on administration and less on professionals.

Mr. Boyle asked that the discussion return to the PIP contract. He said that Mr. Gray is proposing a 7.6% increase in the first year and another increase in the second year. Ms. Holzheimer asked about changing the strategic planning from a quarterly to an annual process. She said that she had not seen anything and did not know that right now it is quarterly. She said that CEPD has certainly not seen anything quarterly. Mr. Boyle said that the conversation he had with Mr. Gray in Decembers was that the strategic plan was done and needed to be looked at periodically. Ms. Holzheimer said she had not seen the strategic plan for this year.

Mr. Jensen said he did not understand Item #2. Ms. Holzheimer gave her explanation. Mr. Mullins said that it modifies the list of administrative processes in the original contract, includes standard operating procedures that were previously developed, and that somebody should look at the original versus the new set to see whether Mr. Gray had reduced or increased the scope of work. Mr. Mullins commented that the SOP's developed had not been discussed by the entire Board or approved. Mr. Boyle asked Ms. Holzheimer to compare the old contract's scope of work to the new one being proposed in the next month. Mr. Mullins asked Ms. Rooker if she had read them. Ms. Rooker responded that everything she does is in the SOP's and many more. Mr. Mullins said that if the many things more is not reflected in the scope of services, than PIP is not obligated to do them. Ms. Rooker responded by saying that the overall umbrella is that she does what is in the best interests of the District to run it in an exemplary manner even if it is not written down. Mr. Mullins suggested that language be found to reflect this.

The issue of project and administrative services and whether these costs were in the contract was discussed. Mr. Mullins explained how money is allocated between project and administrative costs. Mr. Boyle said that the proposal is for \$206,000, and how it is split

between administrative and project is simply an accounting allocation. Mr. Mullins said that definitely the project portion does not include an additional person.

Mr. Jensen said he would like to hear from Mr. Gray how he justifies a 7.6% increase. Mr. Mullins said that it is just as important to find out what CEPD is entitled to and if there are a lot more things for which Mr. Gray is responsible than are in the contract, then they need to be addressed in the scope of services. Mr. Boyle said that CEPD should ask Mr. Gray to come to the April Board Meeting. Mr. Mullins said that CEPD should have some briefing meetings before then. Mr. Mullins said that if CEPD does not conclude the negotiation of a new contract with PIP, CEPD should get an extension. Mr. Mullins moved and Mr. Jensen seconded a motion to ask PIP to extend the current contract for a three to six month period to allow additional time to negotiate a new contract and cover the District in case there is a new project in the fall. The motion passed without dissent.

## **7. New Business**

### **a) John Manning, Chairman, Lee County Board of Commissioners**

This Agenda Item was discussed during Agenda Item #4.

### **b) Recommendation of Qualifications Committee for Engineering Services**

Ms. Holzheimer reported that 7 Requests for Qualifications were sent out and 2 firms responded: Coastal Planning & Engineering and Applied Technology & Management. She said that both firms were scored based on their proposals and references and briefly went over the attributes of each firm. Based on this review, she recommended that CEPD continue to work with CP&E and use ATM as back-up. Ms. Rooker added her comments. Ms. Holzheimer said she intends to write letters to both firms informing them that they have been qualified. Ms. Holzheimer moved and Mr. Mullins seconded a motion to qualify Coastal Planning & Engineering and Applied Technology & Management. The motion passed without dissent.

### **c) December Meeting Date**

Commissioner Holzheimer requested the Board consider the possibility of changing the December 2012 meeting date from December 12 to December 5 because of scheduling problems. Mr. Mullins said if the date were changed, he would not be able to make the December 5<sup>th</sup> meeting. Mr. Mullins said that CEPD should clarify its reimbursement policy to pay commissioners for out-of-pocket travel expenses for exceptional circumstances. Mr. Boyle disagreed, saying that he ran for the position knowing the burdens this might put upon individual commissioners. It was decided that the date would not be changed and those commissioners who might not be able to attend could participate via telephone.

## **8. Report of the Administrator**

### **a) Welcome to Captiva Sign**

Ms. Rooker reported that CEPD is awaiting approval from the County Division of Parks and Recreation Sign Committee for approval and permitting. Mr. Kaiser, who has worked with Ms. Rooker on this project, added comments regarding the design of the sign and landscaping around it. An artist's rendition of the sign will be presented at the next Board meeting. Mr. Jensen asked whether the wording of the sign had been determined. Mr. Kaiser responded that the wording had been determined: it would say "Welcome to Captiva" and have CEPD's logo. He said the design will include the ability to hang a smaller sign below the large one if required.

**b) CEPD Web Site**

Ms. Rooker announced that the new CEPD web site is up and operational as of this morning and urged Commissioners to look at it. Mr. Mullins asked about whether there is a back-up if it fails. Mr. Bralove will talk to the Web Site Administrator, Caroline Semerjian, about this.

**9. Commissioner Comments**

Mr. Mullins emphasized his earlier comments that CEPD needs to improve its communications, especially as they relate to emails and documents in view of the problems he has been having and that these are public records. He also urged that the District move from the Google email application as represented by "mycepd@gmail.com" to an application that uses "name@mycepd.com." Mr. Boyle commented that when he talked to Bob Gray, they agreed that this would be the next step. Ms. Holzheimer expressed concern over having to change to a new email and would like to be able to forward emails to the new address. She requested that she be given adequate advanced notice of the changeover so that she can plan accordingly. Mr. Mullins asked that a process be put into place to make sure that what is moved indeed gets moved over. Mr. Mullins said he would like to see a plan to do this and also recommended that staff use a group email to make sure all commissioners are copied in an email.

Mr. Jensen commented on the alleged lack of communication with the City of Sanibel and how, at least regarding the interlocal agreement, CEPD had not heard back from them. Mr. Boyle said he would have a discussion with Mayor Ruane about the communications issue. He also said that after discussion with Steve Boutelle, he had agreed not to get involved with Sanibel at this point to allow the County to have their discussions with Sanibel first. This is the reason he did not respond to Mr. Ruane's claims directly.

Mr. Mullins said that the District needs a reconciliation process to make sure that what is backed up is an exact duplicate of the original files.

**Adjourn**

Chairman Boyle adjourned the meeting at 2:59 pm.