

CAPTIONING
AUGUST 31, 2011
CELLULAR COMMUNICATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

******This is not an official, verbatim transcript of the
***following meeting. It should be used for informational
***purposes only. This document has not been edited;
***therefore, there may be additions, deletions, or words
that did not translate.

>> GOOD EVENING, AND WELCOME TO THE AUGUST 31 MEETING OF
OUR CELLULAR COMMUNICATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

WE ARE GOING TO PROCEED WITHOUT A QUORUM AT THIS POINT, AND
OUR SUGGESTION IS WE WILL ACT AND WE WILL -- HOW SHALL WE
SAY IT? -- WE WILL ASK FOR APPROVAL FROM THOSE WHO ARE
HERE.

WE WILL ASK FOR APPROVAL FROM THOSE WHO ARE HERE, THEN WHEN
OUR TENTH PERSON ARRIVES, WE CAN COME BACK AND TAKE THE
OFFICIAL VOTE.

SO BEGINNING WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM JULY 13,
I HOPE YOU'VE ALL HAD A CHANCE TO READ THOSE ONLINE.

WE NOW WILL ASK THAT IF THERE ARE ANY -- AGAIN, OPERATING
OUTSIDE THE STRICT VOTING PROCEDURE -- IF THERE ARE ANY
ADDITIONS, DELETIONS, OR CORRECTIONS TO THESE MINUTES,
WOULD YOU PLEASE IDENTIFY THEM, AND REMEMBER TO SAY YOUR
NAME, AS DAVID JUST SAID.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: LAURA BELFLOWER.

I HAD A FEW CORRECTIONS.

MOST OF THEM ARE JUST FORMATTING.

BUT ON THE FIRST PAGE IN THE PARAGRAPH THAT SAYS THE NEXT ORDER OF BUSINESS, THERE'S A REFERENCE TO GUYED TOWERS, SPELLED "GUIDE."

THE ACTUAL TERM IS "GUYED."

>> THANK YOU.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: THE NEXT QUESTION I HAVE IS ON PAGE 3, THE SECOND PARAGRAPH, THE LAST TWO SENTENCES, WHICH READ, "AS CURRENTLY STATED, A TOWER COULD BE PLACED ADJACENT TO AN APARTMENT BUILDING.

IT WAS NOTED THAT APARTMENT BUILDINGS ARE NOT CONSIDERED RESIDENTIAL ZONING."

I THINK THAT'S AN ERROR.

I DON'T BELIEVE IT WAS EVER STATED THAT APARTMENT BUILDINGS ARE NOT RESIDENTIAL ZONING, BECAUSE THEY ARE RESIDENTIAL ZONING.

SO THE SETBACK THAT WAS REFERENCED, THAT THIS PARAGRAPH IS REFERENCING, WOULD REQUIRE A SETBACK FROM APARTMENT BUILDINGS.

I KNOW THAT THERE WAS A DISCUSSION ABOUT APARTMENT BUILDINGS, BUT I DON'T REMEMBER THAT THERE WAS A DISCUSSION OR A STATEMENT THAT APARTMENT BUILDINGS ARE NOT RESIDENTIAL ZONING.

AND IF THERE WAS, IT WAS AN INCORRECT STATEMENT, SO I DON'T

KNOW HOW WE CORRECT THAT UNLESS WE JUST STRIKE THE LAST SENTENCE.

>> THIS IS THE SECOND FULL PARAGRAPH AS CURRENTLY STATED?

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: THE PARAGRAPH BEGINS A REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION WAS REQUESTED ON THE ISSUE TO BE VOTED ON, THEN IT'S THE LAST TWO SENTENCE OF THAT PARAGRAPH, AS CURRENTLY STATED, THE TOWER COULD BE PLACED ADJACENT TO AN APARTMENT BUILDING.

>> ARE THERE ANY OBJECTIONS TO US STRIKING THAT LAST SENTENCE FROM ANYONE PRESENT HERE?

>> SHOULDN'T THE MINUTES REFLECT WHAT THE PERSON TAKING THE MINUTES HEARD?

I MEAN, AND THEN IF WE HAVE A CLARIFICATION OR IF LAURA HAS A CLARIFICATION, THEN SHE COULD MAKE IT DURING THIS MEETING, BUT I MEAN, IF THIS IS WHAT HAPPENED, THESE WOULD BE, ACTUALLY, THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: I DON'T THINK THAT THE LAST SENTENCE WAS WHAT HAPPENED.

I DON'T THINK THAT WAS SAID.

>>MICHAEL ROTHENBURG: MIKE ROTHENBURG.

I THINK I RECALL, LAURA, THAT STATEMENT WAS MADE --

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: ABOUT APARTMENT BUILDINGS, THAT THE TOWER COULD BE NEAR APARTMENT BUILDINGS.

THE SECOND TO THE LAST SENTENCE, AS CURRENTLY STATED, THE

TOWER COULD BE PLACED ADJACENT TO AN APARTMENT BUILDING,
THAT WAS SAID.

IT'S THE LAST SENTENCE, IT WAS NOTED THAT APARTMENT
BUILDINGS ARE NOT CONSIDERED RESIDENTIAL ZONING.

I DON'T BELIEVE THAT WAS SAID, OR IT WASN'T SAID IN THAT
WAY.

I DON'T THINK -- WHOEVER MAY HAVE SAID SOMETHING SIMILAR,
IF THAT'S WHAT THEY SAID, I DON'T THINK THAT'S WHAT THEY
MEANT TO SAY BECAUSE I DON'T THINK ANYBODY BELIEVES THAT AN
APARTMENT BUILDING IS NOT RESIDENTIAL ZONING.

>> SO CARRY, DO YOU OBJECT TO US DELETING THAT LAST
SENTENCE?

>>CARRIE GRIMAIL: NO, I GUESS NOT.

>> ALL RIGHT.

LET'S PLAN TO DELETE THAT LAST SENTENCE.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: THE NEXT CHANGE IS A FORMATTING CHANGE
ON --

>> IS THERE A PROBLEM?

>> NO, I AM TRYING TO FIGURE OUT IF -- [OFF MICROPHONE]

>> BILL COOK.

I AGREE WITH CARRIE, THE MINUTES ARE THE MINUTES.

IF THAT WAS THE STATEMENT THAT WAS MADE, TO GO BACK AND SAY
THAT WASN'T WHAT WAS SAID SEEMS AN ODD TOYING WITH
DOCUMENTATION OF WHAT'S TRANSPIRED.

NOW, I THINK LAURA'S PROBABLY CORRECT, SO IF WE NEED TO ADD

A --

>> WE COULD AMEND IT.

>>BILL COOK: A SUB-PARENTHETICAL NOTE THAT SAYS WHILE THE ABOVE STATEMENT WAS MADE, SUBSEQUENTLY, WE BELIEVE IT IS ACTUALLY NOT CORRECT, SO THAT THAT INFORMATION IS THERE AND NOTED, AND WE KNOW THAT IT'S BEEN CORRECTED FOR THE RECORD. BUT WE STILL SHOULD RECOGNIZE THAT THAT STATEMENT WAS MADE, I THINK.

OTHERWISE IT'S AS IF THE UTTERANCE NEVER OCCURRED.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: LAURA BELFLOWER AGAIN.

>> I THINK THAT'S WHAT'S BEING DEBATED, DID IT OCCUR.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: LAURA BELFLOWER, AGAIN, FOR THE RECORD. IS IT POSSIBLE THAT WE ASK STAFF TO GO BACK AND LISTEN TO THE RECORD?

BECAUSE I HAVE FOUND SOME INCONSISTENCY WITH THE CAPTIONING AND WITH THE TAPE, SO IT MAY HAVE BEEN PUT ON THE CAPTIONING, BUT IF YOU LISTEN TO THE TAPE AND FIND OUT WHETHER THAT SENTENCE WAS SAID, AND IF IT WAS SAID THAT WAY, AND IF IT WAS, THEN PUT IN THE PARENTHETICAL THAT YOU WERE TALKING ABOUT CORRECTING, THAT THAT STATEMENT WAS IN ERROR.

>> THIS WILL BE INTERESTING, IN LIGHT OF THE NEXT --

[LAUGHTER]

>> OKAY.

SO THE CURRENT RECOMMENDATION -- I DON'T KNOW, STAFF, IS THAT SOMETHING YOU COULD DO?

OKAY.

SO THE CURRENT RECOMMENDATION IS THAT WE ARE GOING TO ASK THE STAFF TO GO BACK TO SEE IF WE CAN VERIFY THAT THAT WAS ACTUALLY SAID, AND IF IT WAS ACTUALLY SAID, THEN WE WILL ADD AN AMENDMENT SAYING THIS IS INCORRECT.

>> JUST WITH THE NOTATION OF TONIGHT'S DATE.

>> OKAY.

ANYTHING ELSE THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO OFFER AS AN AMENDMENT, CORRECTION?

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: YES.

THIS IS LAURA BELFLOWER AGAIN.

ON PAGE 4, IT'S JUST A FORMATTING CHANGE.

THE OLD PARAGRAPH 4, THE NEW 4 AND THE NEW 5 NEED TO BE PULLED BACK TO BE IN ALIGNMENT WITH PARAGRAPH 3.

AND THE SAME ON PAGE 5, NUMBER 2 NEEDS TO BE PUT AS A NEW PARAGRAPH UNDER THE SAME INDENTATION AS NUMBER 1.

ON PAGE 6, THE VERY LAST SENTENCE -- WELL, I ASSUME IT PRINTED OUT THE SAME ON EVERYBODY ELSE'S -- IT'S NUMBER 4.

THERE ARE NO EXISTING STRUCTURES OF SUFFICIENT HEIGHT.

THAT NEEDS TO BE UNDERLINED BECAUSE THAT'S NEW LANGUAGE.

IT'S NOT CURRENTLY IN THE CODE.

IT DIDN'T COME ACROSS AS BEING UNDERLINED.

ON PAGE 7, THERE IS ALSO AN ERROR, GIVEN THE DISCUSSION WE JUST HAD ABOUT WHAT WAS ACTUALLY PRESENTED VERSUS WHAT IT SHOULD HAVE BEEN, THIS IS THE WAY IT WAS PRESENTED, BUT IT'S AN ERROR, BUT I GUESS WE COULD CORRECT THAT WHEN WE TALK ABOUT THE FINAL REPORT BECAUSE THIS LANGUAGE ABOUT WHAT THE NEW LANGUAGE WOULD BE, THERE WAS JUST A PROVISION OF EXISTING LANGUAGE THAT NEEDED TO BE STRUCK OUT THAT GOT LEFT OUT OF THE VERSION, BUT WE CAN CORRECT THAT, I GUESS, IN THE FINAL REPORT BECAUSE THIS LANGUAGE IS ADDRESSED IN HERE.

AND THE PARAGRAPH IN THE MIDDLE THAT SAYS HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY MAY OBTAIN THE SERVICES OF AN OUTSIDE EXPERT -- THIS IS STILL ON PAGE 7 -- IT SHOULD BE COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPHS 1 THROUGH 5, AS OPPOSED TO PARAGRAPHS 1 THROUGH 4.

I THINK WE CORRECTED THAT AT THE MEETING.

AND THAT'S IT.

>> MOTION TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES AS CORRECTED.

>> I MAKE A MOTION.

SO MOVE.

>> SECOND?

>> SECOND.

>> ALL THOSE IN FAVOR.

[CHORUS OF AYES]

OPPOSED?

>> WE ARE GOING TO SUGGEST THIS IS OFFICIALLY ON THE RECORD AS A VOTE SINCE WE HAVE OUR TENTH MEMBER HERE.

>> 11th.

[LAUGHTER]

>> ALL RIGHT.

THANK YOU.

AT THE LAST MEETING, THERE WAS, AS IS NOTED IN THE MINUTES WE JUST APPROVED, THERE WAS A CONTROVERSY OVER KEVIN BAUMANN'S REPORT ON HOW IT WAS NOTED IN THE MINUTES, AND WE, AT THAT POINT, ACCEPTED THE MINUTES WITH THE PROVISIO THAT I WOULD GO BACK AND CHECK THE RECORD.

SO I DID GO BACK AND CHECK THE CLOSED CAPTIONING RECORD.

SO AT THAT POINT -- AND THE NEXT DOCUMENT YOU HAVE REFLECTS WHAT IS SAID THERE.

AFTER NUMBER 7 IN THE ORIGINAL, THEY THE MINUTES WENT AHEAD AND LISTED SEVEN OR EIGHT CAUSES THAT KEVIN BAUMANN SPOKE OF.

THE PARTICULAR ISSUE, THE MOST GLARING ONE, WAS A STATEMENT THAT MONOPOLES WOULD ONLY FALL 50% WHEN, INDEED, IT WAS A GUYED TOWER HE WAS ALLUDING TO, AND THAT IS ACCURATELY WHAT WAS SAID.

THERE WERE OTHER STATEMENTS ABOUT A MONOPOLE.

ONE IN HIS EXPERIENCE HAD FALLEN AT 80%.

THEY COULD, HYPOTHETICALLY, FALL AT 100%.

IF YOU GO BACK -- AND I HAVE DONE THAT -- EXCERPT THOSE THREE OR FOUR PAGES, THERE ARE SO MANY THINGS KIND OF CLOUDY ABOUT -- AND I DON'T REPLICATE IT FOR YOU HERE -- THERE ARE SO MANY DIFFERENCES ABOUT THE LIST OF THINGS THAT BAUMANN GAVE THEM, THAT MY SUGGESTION IS WE SIMPLY CHANGE NUMBER 7 TO SAY THIS IS SOMETHING THAT MR. BAUMANN TALKED ABOUT AND NOT LIST THE THINGS HE DISCUSSED IN A RANDOM ORDER BECAUSE HE DIDN'T SAY THESE ARE STATISTICALLY THE MOST IMPORTANT OR MOST FREQUENT.

HE JUST TALKED ABOUT HIS OWN EXPERIENCES AND POSSIBLE CAUSES, WHETHER AIRPLANES COULD HIT THEM OR NOT.

SO I GUESS I'M ASKING YOU TO ACCEPT MY WORD.

HAVING STUDIED THE RECORD, IT WOULD MAKE A LOT OF TROUBLE TO MAKE IT ACCURATE, IF WE COULD OMIT THAT LIST TRYING TO SUMMARIZE THE CAUSES AND SAY NUMBER 7, THESE ARE SOME OF THE THINGS HE TALKED ABOUT, CAUSES OF CELL TOWER COLLAPSE. THOSE ARE THE CHANGES I WOULD RECOMMEND TO THE JUNE 15 MINUTES.

>> DISCUSSION?

>> SO MOVE.

>>LEE VAUGHAN: LEE VAUGHAN.

>> YOU SECOND IT?

>>LEE VAUGHAN: I AM NOT SECONDED, NO.

>> IS THERE A SECOND TO HAVE A DISCUSSION ON THIS
RECOMMENDATION?

>> I THOUGHT YOU ASKED FOR DISCUSSION.

>> I DID, BUT LAURA CAUGHT US.

>> I'LL SECOND.

>> ALL RIGHT.

THANK YOU.

DISCUSSION.

>>LEE VAUGHAN: CAN YOU GO BACK OVER THE REASON YOU WANT TO
REMOVE THOSE ITEMS?

I'M NOT SURE THAT'S CLEAR.

>> THERE ARE SO MANY SUBTLE INCONSISTENCIES AND ACCURACIES
OF WHAT IS STATED THERE IN TERMS OF WHAT BAUMANN PRESENTED,
BASICALLY, A DISCUSSION.

HE DID NOT PRESENT ANY KIND OF FACTUAL EXPERTISE, STUDIES
THAT IDENTIFIED THE MOST COMMON CAUSES.

THAT'S THE WAY THEY ARE RECORDED IN THAT STATEMENT.

SO IN OTHER WORDS, THERE ARE SO MANY INACCURACIES IN THE
ORIGINAL STATEMENT THAT I COULD, IF YOU'D LIKE, REWRITE
THEM, BUT IT SEEMED TO BE EASIER JUST TO NOT LIST THAT
INFORMATION.

THE RECORD IS STILL THERE OF WHAT HE SAID.

THIS IS JUST ANOTHER THING HE DISCUSSED WERE SOME OF THE CAUSES.

IF YOU'D LIKE FOR ME TO --

>> CAN I ASK A QUESTION?

SO WE ARE NOT ELIMINATING THE RECORD.

IT'S JUST WE ARE ELIMINATING THAT FROM THE MINUTES?

>> RIGHT.

>> VERY MUCH LIKE IN ITEM NUMBER 1, YOU TALK ABOUT STANDARDS FOR CELL TOWERS, THERE ARE NUMEROUS ONES, AND SAME THING HERE.

WE ARE TALKING ABOUT NUMEROUS CAUSES.

THAT SEEMS SUFFICIENT.

>> WHAT HE SAID IS STILL WHAT HE SAID, AND THERE'S STILL A RECORD OF IT.

HOWEVER, WE ARE NOT TRYING TO SUMMARIZE IT IN THE MINUTES. IN OTHER WORDS, RELEVANT TO THE DISCUSSION WE JUST HAD, THERE ARE SO MANY THINGS NOT SAID IN THE MINUTES THAT TO INSIST THAT EVERYTHING BE REPLICATED WOULD BE IMPOSSIBLE.

>> AND I JUST WANT TO COMMENT THAT THE RECORD THAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT FOR WHATEVER PURPOSES OF THE RECORD IS NOT ACTUALLY THE CLOSED CAPTIONING.

IT'S THE RECORDING.

BECAUSE I WAS LOOKING FOR A PARTICULAR ITEM THAT WAS DISCUSSED, AND THE CAPTIONING WAS COMPLETELY DIFFERENT FROM

WHAT THE ACTUAL TAPE SAID.

SO I MEAN, I UNDERSTAND WE'RE GIVING THE CAPTIONING PEOPLE A VERY HARD TIME IN DOING THEIR JOB, BUT IN THAT PARTICULAR INSTANCE, I DON'T KNOW EXACTLY WHY, BUT ONE PART THAT I LOOKED AT, THE CAPTIONING DID NOT MATCH THE AUDIO.

SO I WOULD WANT TO POINT OUT THAT IF ANYBODY DID WANT TO TALK ABOUT WHAT WAS ACTUALLY SAID, THE RECORD IS THE AUDIO TAPE AND NOT THE CAPTIONING.

>> THANK YOU.

>> POINT TAKEN.

I THINK FOR THESE PURPOSES IT WAS ACCURATE ENOUGH TO SHOW -

-

[OVERLAPPING SPEAKERS]

>> ALL RIGHT.

SO CAN I MAKE A MOTION THAT WE --

>> WE HAVE A MOTION.

ALL WE NEED TO DO IS VOTE IF EVERYBODY -- ALL IN FAVOR OF ACCEPTING THE CHANGE TO NUMBER 7 AND ELIMINATING THE SUMMARY OF CAUSES DISCUSSED BY KEVIN BAUMANN, SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

[CHORUS OF AYES]

OPPOSED?

THANK YOU.

SO THAT'S A CHANGE THAT WE'LL MAKE TO THOSE MINUTES.

>> AMENDED.

>> NOW, TO TONIGHT'S AGENDA.

IN OUR REVIEW OF LAST MEETING, ABOUT WHICH WE FELT VERY SUCCESSFUL AND POSITIVE, AND THE PREPARATION OF THE FINAL REPORT WITH STAFF OF COUNTY ADMINISTRATION, WE HAD NOTED WITH SOME REGRET THAT WE DIDN'T GET TO THE SET OF ISSUES ABOUT THE REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESS, SPECIFICALLY THOSE THAT WE NOTED IN OUR LAST MEETING, WAIVERS AND VARIANCES, WHICH WE VOTED TO UNANIMOUSLY RECOMMEND THAT THE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS CONTINUE TO SCRUTINIZE THAT PROCESS.

WITH THAT IMPETUS, WE RECEIVED APPROVAL TO SPEND SOME TIME TONIGHT DISCUSSING THAT.

HOWEVER WE GET AND THE EXTENT TO WHICH WE CAN MAKE MEANINGFUL CHANGE OR SIMPLY IDENTIFY THE ISSUES THAT WE THINK SHOULD BE LOOKED AT MIGHT BE PRODUCTIVE.

SO THAT IS THE REASON FOR THE CHANGE OF AGENDA AND THE SUBSEQUENT CHANGE OF THE MEETING NIGHT SO THAT MR. MOREDA COULD BE WITH US.

SO THAT'S THE REASON FOR THE ADDITION OF VARIANCES AND WAIVERS AS A DISCUSSION ITEM FOR THE COMMITTEE TONIGHT AND WHY IT APPEARS ON YOUR AGENDA.

A SUBSEQUENT ISSUE HERE IS THAT BILL MAY NOT BE ABLE TO BE WITH US FOR THE ENTIRE MEETING, AND IT MIGHT BE PRODUCTIVE TO REVERSE THE ORDER AND DEAL WITH THE FINAL REPORT AS IT

IS, AT LEAST, CURRENTLY DRAFTED AND DEAL WITH THAT AND MOVE THAT UP ON THE AGENDA AS A FIRST ITEM.

SO THOSE ARE -- THAT'S WHERE WE'RE AT.

>> AND THE REASON WE WANT TO DO THAT, WE'VE CONSULTED WITH OUR ATTORNEY, AND IF WE CANNOT ACCEPT VOTES BY EMAIL SUBSEQUENT TO THIS MEETING, SO IF WE WANT TO HAVE THE REPORT OFFICIALLY ON THE RECORD, WE NEED TO HAVE EVERYBODY WHO IS HERE RIGHT NOW VOTE.

>> WELL, I GUESS THAT IS NOT -- SINCE WE NOW HAVE 11, BILL COULD LEAVE AND WE WOULD STILL HAVE A QUORUM, SO WE COULD KEEP IT IN THIS ORDER IF WE SO CHOSE.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: EXCEPT BILL WOULDN'T BE ABLE TO VOTE.

>>BILL COOK: I'D APPRECIATE THE INDULGENCE OF THE COMMITTEE IF WE CAN CHANGE IT, UNLESS PEOPLE HAVE A PROBLEM WITH MOVING THE ORDER.

>> WOULD YOU LIKE TO MOVE TO ACCEPT THE REPORT THIS EVENING AND MOVE THE FINAL -- THE DRAFT OF THE FINAL REPORT TO THE FIRST ITEM?

>> I MOVE -- I MOVE THAT WE -- I MOVE THAT WE MOVE --

[LAUGHTER] -- ITEM NUMBER 6 TO -- TO BE THE FIRST THING THAT WE DISCUSS.

>> OKAY.

THANK YOU.

>> IS THERE A SECOND?

>> SECOND.

>> ALL THOSE IN FAVOR OF THE AGENDA AS AMENDED, SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

[CHORUS OF AYES]

OPPOSED, NAY.

OUR AGENDA IS AMENDED.

>> SO IF YOU LOOK TOWARD THE BOTTOM OF YOUR STACK, YOU WILL SEE A COPY OF THE FINAL REPORT THAT YOU WERE SENT BY EMAIL. AND I'VE INCLUDED ALSO A COPY OF THE STATEMENT OF GOALS, AREAS OF CONCERN, AND POSSIBLE OUTCOMES, WHICH TALKS ABOUT MINORITY REPORTS AND THOSE KINDS OF ISSUES, JUST FOR OUR REFERENCE.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: LAURA BELFLOWER.

THE CORRECTION OF THE ERROR THAT I TALKED ABOUT EARLIER WOULD NEED TO BE MADE, AND MINE DOESN'T HAVE PAGE NUMBERS ON IT, BUT IT IS AT THE -- IT'S THE LANGUAGE THAT IS PART OF RESOLUTION NUMBER 3.

>> IT'S ON THE THIRD PAGE.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: IT'S THE LAST PART OF IT RIGHT BEFORE YOU GET TO RESOLUTION NUMBER 4, THE PARAGRAPH THAT READS, "DOCUMENTATION SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO THE ADMINISTRATOR AT THE TIME ..." THAT'S THE WAY THE PARAGRAPH STARTS OUT. WHEN YOU GET DOWN IN THE FOURTH LINE, THERE WAS SOME LANGUAGE AFTER THE WORD "PROPOSED," SOME LANGUAGE THAT WAS

ADDED, BUT WHAT WE DIDN'T HAVE WAS THE LANGUAGE THAT WAS DELETED.

SO READING THAT PORTION OF THE SENTENCE, THE PORTION THAT BEGINS, "OUTLINING THE REASONS AS TO WHY THE PROPOSED ..." AND THEN IT CURRENTLY READS, "WCSS IS NEEDED," THAT NEEDS TO BE STRUCK THROUGH.

WE NEED TO PUT IT IN THERE AND THEN STRIKE IT THROUGH AS LANGUAGE WE WANT TO REMOVE, AND THEN WCA WAS ADDED.

SO BASICALLY, WHAT WE TOOK OUT WAS THAT THE WCSS IS NEEDED AND ADDED THE WCA CANNOT BE LOCATED ON AN EXISTING OR APPROVED STRUCTURE.

SO IT DOESN'T CHANGE -- AND THIS WAS MY FAULT BECAUSE IN MY DRAFT THAT I HAD PREPARED, I TOOK THE LANGUAGE OUT AND DIDN'T MARK IT AS STRUCK THROUGH.

>> SO IN ORDER TO INCLUDE THAT STRUCK LANGUAGE BETWEEN PROPOSED AND WCA, WE NEED TO INSERT --

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: WCSS IS NEEDED.

>> WCSS IS NEEDED.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: THEN YOU WOULD STRIKE THAT OUT.

>> WITH A LINE THROUGH IT.

AND THEN NO PUNCTUATION BEFORE WCA?

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: NO, BUT WCA IS NOW UNDERLINED BECAUSE IT IS NEW LANGUAGE.

>> OKAY.

[INDISCERNIBLE] -- THE REASONS AS TO WHY THE PROPOSED WCSS IS NEEDED -- OH, I SEE, THAT IS STRUCK OUT SO WE DON'T NEED ANY FURTHER.

AND THE CHANGE TO WCA CANNOT BE LOCATED ON AN EXISTING APPROVED STRUCTURE.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: I BELIEVE THAT WAS THE INTENT.

IT WAS TAKING AWAY THE QUESTION OF NEED, WHICH IS A PROBLEM UNDER STATE LAW, AND ADDRESSING WHETHER OR NOT THE ANTENNAS CAN BE COLLOCATED ON AN EXISTING STRUCTURE, WHICH WAS THE POINT.

IT JUST SHOWS THE CHANGE.

>> ANYTHING ELSE?

>>DENISE VERRILL: DENISE VERRILL.

I HAD SOMETHING, AN ISSUE WITH THAT PARAGRAPH AS WELL.

I THOUGHT WE HAD INCLUDED SOME MORE DIRECT LANGUAGE ABOUT WHAT APPROPRIATE MATERIAL MIGHT BE AND THE CHANGE OF THE RADIO FREQUENCY ENGINEER AND/OR STRUCTURAL ENGINEER BECAUSE ONE CANNOT -- BECAUSE A RADIO FREQUENCY ENGINEER CAN'T SPEAK TO A STRUCTURAL PROBLEM AS WELL AS A STRUCTURAL ENGINEER CAN SPEAK TO A RADIO -- SO WHAT MATERIALS NEED TO BE -- YOU KNOW, WHAT EXACTLY THE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE AND HOW THEY WILL BE FOLLOWED.

>> SO WHAT IS YOUR RECOMMENDATION HERE?

ARE YOU ASKING FOR CLARIFICATION OR YOU WANT A CHANGE?

>>DENISE VERRILL: NO, I'D LIKE TO HAVE EVIDENCE THAT WHAT TOWERS WERE CONTACTED, WHAT OWNERS, WHAT -- HOW MANY CARRIERS ARE ON EACH.

BECAUSE THEY JUST COME WITH MAPS, AND THE NICE LITTLE BUBBLES AND CIRCLES AND HOW IT'S GOING TO LOOK BEFORE AND AFTER, AND YOU DON'T KNOW, YOU KNOW, HOW THEY CAME UP WITH THIS.

AND WHEN YOU -- OFTEN YOU GO TO OTHER SOURCES FOR INFORMATION, YOU GET VERY DIFFERENT MAPS.

SO I'D LIKE TO HAVE MORE SPECIFIC REQUESTS FOR APPROPRIATE SUPPORT MATERIAL.

>> SO IF WE WANTED TO INCLUDE THAT LANGUAGE, WHAT SPECIFICALLY ARE YOU ASKING FOR?

YOU SAID MAPS?

CAN YOU GIVE US SPECIFIC THINGS?

>> LAURA?

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: LAURA BELFLOWER.

I AM CONFUSED BECAUSE I THINK I HEARD TWO POINTS.

ONE IS THE RADIO FREQUENCY ENGINEER CAN ONLY CERTIFY WHAT THEY DO, BUT THAT, I THINK, IS ADDRESSED BY A SIGNED STATEMENT FROM APPROPRIATE ACCREDITED EXPERTS.

SO THAT SAYS IF YOU ARE A STRUCTURAL ENGINEER, YOU CAN'T BE TALKING ABOUT RF ISSUES BECAUSE YOU ARE NOT THE APPROPRIATE EXPERT FOR THAT.

IN TERMS OF THE -- WHAT CONSTITUTES APPROPRIATE SUPPORT MATERIAL, I THINK THAT WOULD DEPEND ON WHICH ONE OF THE FACTORS THEY ARE SAYING THAT THEY ARE USING, AND IT WOULD BE -- THE STAFF IS GOING TO HAVE TO SAY YOU HAVEN'T PROVEN THAT YOU CAN'T GO ON AN EXISTING TOWER BECAUSE YOU HAVEN'T SHOWN US -- OR THE COUNTY'S MAP SHOWS THESE, AND WHAT DID YOU DO WITH THESE?

>> THAT WAS THE PROBLEM WHEN WE HAD THE LANGUAGE WITH NEED IS THAT WE JUST HAD A STATEMENT, A BLANKET STATEMENT OF THE TOWERS ARE NEEDED, AND THERE WAS NO REAL QUANTIFICATION OF NEED OR WHO WAS CONTACTED OR WHAT TIMELINE WAS FOLLOWED OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT, SO THAT WHEN YOU GO TO HEARINGS TO PROTEST THE TOWERS, THEY SAY WELL, WE CONTACTED EVERYONE, BUT THERE'S NO SUPPORT MATERIAL.

AND WHEN YOU SPEAK TO COUNTY STAFF, THEN STAFF OFTEN SAYS WELL, WE LOOKED INTO THAT.

THEY GAVE US THE LETTER, BUT THERE'S NO SUPPORT MATERIAL.

SO I'D LIKE TO HAVE LANGUAGE IN THERE ABOUT WHAT EXACTLY IS REQUIRED SO THAT THERE'S NO AMBIGUITY ABOUT IT AT THE HEARINGS, AND THEN YOU'RE WELL BEHIND THE EIGHT BALL.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: LAURA BELFLOWER AGAIN.

I THINK THERE ARE TWO PROBLEMS WITH THAT.

ONE IS I DON'T THINK IT'S POSSIBLE TO LIST WHAT THOSE MATERIALS WOULD BE.

AT MOST, IT WOULD BE THINGS THAT INCLUDE, AND YOU CAN'T MAKE SURE THAT THEY ARE GOING TO INCLUDE THE ONES -- WHAT YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT REALLY IS A COMPLETENESS PROBLEM, AND IF YOU GET NOTICE OF AN APPLICATION AND YOU GO AND YOU LOOK AT THE FILE OF THE APPLICATION AND THEY HAVEN'T PROVIDED THE MATERIAL IN THE FILE, THEN THAT'S WHEN YOU CONTACT THE STAFF AND SAY THIS APPLICATION ISN'T COMPLETE.

IT SHOULDN'T BE BEING PROCESSED.

WHERE IS THE INFORMATION THAT IS TO SUPPORT THIS?

AND -- OR YOU SAY AT THE HEARING WE CAN'T HAVE THIS HEARING ON THIS BECAUSE THE APPLICATION IS NOT COMPLETE OR WHATEVER.

I MEAN, THAT -- THAT ISN'T TRUE IN ANY KIND OF APPLICATION.

IF THE APPLICANT HASN'T SUBMITTED THE MATERIAL THAT THEY ARE REQUIRED TO SUBMIT AND STAFF LET'S THEM GET AWAY WITH IT, YOU ALL ARE GOING TO HAVE TO CALL THEM ON IT.

THAT'S JUST --

>>BILL COOK: BILL COOK.

I THINK THE PROBLEM THAT DENISE MAY BE ALLUDING TO IS THAT THE -- THIS MAKES IT VERY STAFF DEPENDENT, AND SOMETIMES YOU TRUST STAFF AND SOMETIMES YOU DON'T.

SOMETIMES STAFF DOES A GOOD JOB AND SOMETIMES THEY ARE OVERWHELMED.

THE PROBLEM IS -- BECAUSE IN THE AMBIGUITYNESS -- I'M NOT

SURE IF THAT'S A WORD -- OF THIS PARAGRAPH ALLOWS THEM
SIMPLY TO SUBMIT A LETTER THAT SAYS WE TALKED TO ALL THE
OTHER TOWER COMPANIES, AND THEY SAY THEY CAN'T TAKE ANOTHER
CELL SITE ON THEIR TOWERS.

DOES THAT MEET THE THRESHOLD?

IS THAT ACCEPTABLE?

I DON'T THINK SO BECAUSE ALREADY THE LAW -- THE FEDERAL LAW
HAS BEEN EVISCERATED IN THIS STATE TO SIMPLY SAY RATHER
THAN PROVING NEED TO SIMPLY WRITE A LETTER THAT SAYS WE
HAVE NEED.

REALLY?

AND THAT'S WHAT THEY DO.

SO HERE I COULD SEE A TOWER BUILDER SIMPLY PROVIDING A
LETTER THAT SAYS WE CAN'T COLLOCATE ON OTHER TOWERS.

WE'VE TALKED TO COMPANIES, AND IT ISN'T AVAILABLE.

WHERE'S THE PROOF?

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: LAURA BELFLOWER AGAIN.

I THINK THE ISSUE YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT IS A PROBLEM WITH
ANY APPLICATION WITH ANY KIND OF DEVELOPMENT.

>>BILL COOK: BUT I AM NOT TALKING ABOUT ANY APPLICATION.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO LIST EVERY SINGLE
DOCUMENT, AND EVERY SINGLE ONE WOULD NOT BE APPLICABLE,
DEPENDING ON THE REASON THAT YOU ARE SAYING.

IF YOU ARE SAYING THERE ARE NO STRUCTURES AROUND THERE,

HERE'S WHAT WE DID TO DOCUMENT THAT, VERSUS THERE IS A STRUCTURE THERE, BUT IT'S NOT STRUCTURAL SOUND.

THOSE ARE COMPLETELY DIFFERENT GROUPS OF INFORMATION.

AND NOT -- NUMBER ONE, I DON'T THINK IT'S POSSIBLE.

I DON'T THINK IT'S NECESSARY.

I THINK IT IS A MATTER OF IF YOU FEEL THAT THE INFORMATION IS NOT BEING PROVIDED IN THESE APPLICATIONS OR ANY OTHER KIND OF APPLICATIONS, THAT'S A POINT TO RAISE AT HEARINGS AND AN ISSUE TO RAISE WITH STAFF.

BUT AS A SECOND POINT OF ORDER, I DON'T BELIEVE THAT WE ARE IN A POSITION -- I THINK THAT THE VOTE ON THIS AS IT'S INDICATED AT THE END OF THIS REPORT IS WE WEREN'T GOING TO GO BACK AND START SUBSTANTIVELY REDISCUSSING THESE.

IF WE ARE GOING TO START REDISCUSSING THINGS, I WANT TO GO BACK TO THE SETBACKS AND REDISCUSS THEM.

SO I DON'T KNOW THAT -- I DON'T KNOW THAT IT'S NECESSARY.

I DON'T KNOW THAT THERE'S LANGUAGE YOU COULD PUT THAT REALLY WOULD HELP WITH THE ISSUE THAT YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT.

AND I'M NOT SURE --

>> WHAT IF WE JUST ADDED DETAILED DOCUMENTATION, IF WE CHOOSE TO DO THAT, SOMETHING, JUST A WORD OR TWO, WHERE YOU WOULD GET SPECIFIC DOCUMENTS?

>> IT DOESN'T NEED TO NECESSARILY BE WITHIN THE CODE, I

GUESS, BUT THAT STAFF IS AWARE OF WHAT TYPE OF DOCUMENTATION NEED AND THAT IT IS GENERALLY AGREED ON THAT EVERY TOWER WITHIN WHATEVER RANGE, A MILE, OR TWO, BE CONTACTED SO THAT -- AND THE STATUS OF EVERY TOWER EXAMINED AND NOT THAT -- BECAUSE THERE ARE SO MANY SINGLE-CARRIER TOWERS OUT THERE.

AND AT THIS TIME, THERE IS NO -- NOTHING IN THE CODE THAT SAYS THAT THEY NEED TO COLLOCATE.

THEY ONLY -- YOU KNOW, THIS APPROPRIATE SUPPORT MATERIAL. SO I KNOW THAT YOU HAD COVERED IT IN THE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOCC, BUT I DON'T KNOW IF WE CAN DO ANYTHING STRONGER THAN THAT.

>>MICHAEL ROTHENBURG: MIKE ROTHENBURG.

THERE IS A COMMENT, ON ABOUT THE SECOND PAGE, OR UNDERNEATH RESOLUTION 3, TITLED COLLOCATION AND EXPERT REVIEW, WHERE THE COMMENTS MADE THAT HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY LAND USE ENCOURAGES COLLOCATION.

WHEREAS IN THE OPINIONS OF AT LEAST SOME CCAC MEMBERS, THE COUNTY DOES NOT DO ENOUGH TO MONITOR AND ENFORCE THIS PROVISION.

AND THEN IF YOU TAKE THAT AND ALSO LOOK AT THE REQUIREMENTS FOR STRUCTURAL -- AVAILABILITY OF STRUCTURES, THAT WOULD, I THINK, TEND TO LEND ITSELF TOWARDS AT LEAST ADDRESSING THE FACT OF HOW THE SYSTEM WOULD WORK VERSUS THE STRUCTURES

THAT ARE AVAILABLE, AND THE ENGINEERING BEYOND THAT IS PAST MY EXPERTISE.

AND I'M NOT SURE WHAT WE GET OUT OF IT, BUT I THINK IF ANYTHING IN THIS WHOLE PROCESS, STAFF HAS CERTAINLY BEEN KIND OF ENLIGHTENED TO SOME OF THE CONCERNS THAT HAVE ARISEN AS WELL.

SO IF ANYTHING, I'D JUST LIKE TO HIGHLIGHT THAT ISSUE THAT DENISE BRINGS UP, THAT WE'D LIKE TO SEE THAT THERE'S FAR MORE TECHNICAL RATIONALES FOR PLACEMENT OF THE TOWER.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: LAURA BELFLOWER.

AND I THINK TO THAT POINT IS THE NEXT PARAGRAPH THAT WE'VE ADDED THAT A COUNTY CAN BRING IN AN OUTSIDE EXPERT TO REVIEW THOSE SPECIFIC POINTS.

SO IF THERE IS AN EXPERT REVIEWING THIS AND THE EXPERT IS GOING TO HAVE TO LOOK AT THE MATERIAL, AND IF THE MATERIAL IS NOT SUFFICIENT FOR THE EXPERT TO REVIEW IT, THEN THE EXPERT IS GOING TO ASK FOR SOME ADDITIONAL MATERIAL TO BE ABLE TO SUBSTANTIATE THAT.

SO IN ADDITION TO STAFF, YOU NOW HAVE THE OPTION OF AN EXPERT BEING BROUGHT IN.

>> FROM PERSONAL EXPERIENCE, HAVING BEEN AT THE HEARINGS, I'VE BEEN TOLD THAT WE ARE ON EVERY TOWER IN THE AREA AND THEN FIND OUT LATER THAT THAT WAS NOT TRUE, BUT IT WAS STILL NOT ABLE TO BE QUALIFIED AT THE HEARING.

>> ONE THING THAT OCCURS RIGHT NOW IS I DON'T THINK THERE'S A RADIO FREQUENCY ENGINEER ON STAFF THAT REVIEWS IT FOR THAT.

I THINK THEY HAVE TO TAKE THE DOCUMENTATION AND BY ADDING THIS IN THE CODE, THE PARAGRAPH LAURA DISCUSSED, BY OPENING THIS UP TO AN OUTSIDE EXPERT, THEY NOW HAVE THAT CAPABILITY, WHICH THEY DIDN'T HAVE IN THE PAST.

>>LISA WILLIAMS: REAL QUICK, LISA WILLIAMS.

DENISE, I AGREE WITH YOU.

DO YOU THINK THERE SHOULD BE A REQUIRED FORM?

INSTEAD OF HANDING IN A LETTER, DO YOU THINK THERE SHOULD BE AN ADDITIONAL FORM?

>>DENISE VERRILL: I'M NOT SURE.

>>LISA WILLIAMS: I THINK -- I WOULD LIKE TO LOOK AT DOCUMENTATION, OH, THEY DID CONTACT THIS PERSON, THEY DID CONTACT THIS LOCATION, THEY DID CONTACT THIS LOCATION, SO THERE'S MORE CLARITY ON WHO THEY CONTACTED.

>>BILL COOK: BILL COOK.

A POINT OF CLARIFICATION GOING BACK TO WHAT MS. BELFLOWER SAID, BECAUSE I WASN'T AT THE LAST MEETING.

IS IT, IN FACT, THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THIS DOCUMENT, THE INTERIM FINAL REPORT, THE VOTE TONIGHT IS SUPPOSED TO BE AS THE REPORT EXISTS, THAT WE'RE REALLY NOT -- ARE WE STRAYING TOO FAR AFIELD BY DISCUSSING CHANGES TO IT?

OR SHOULD WE -- >> THAT'S WHAT I WAS GETTING READY TO
VERIFY.

AS I UNDERSTOOD THE WAY THAT YOU PREFACED IT, DENISE, IS
YOU FELT LIKE SOMETHING HAD BEEN LEFT OUT.

HOWEVER, IF THERE IS NO ISSUE THAT THIS WAS, IN FACT, THE
RESOLUTION THAT WE PASSED, THEN THAT'S A SEPARATE KETTLE OF
FISH, SO TO SPEAK.

>>DENISE VERRILL: OKAY.

THAT'S FINE.

JUST IN READING THE DRAFT, AT THE END, AND TRYING TO VIEW
IT FROM A CITIZEN'S PERSPECTIVE, IF I WAS TO GO AGAINST
GOLIATH AGAIN, THAT I WOULD STILL HAVE A LOT OF THE ISSUES
THAT I HAD PRIOR TO THE REWORDING OF THE CODE.

THAT'S WHERE I THOUGHT THAT WE WERE STILL NOT STACKING IT
EVEN FOR CITIZENS AS WELL AS FOR BUSINESS, BECAUSE A
CITIZEN DOES HAVE, YOU KNOW, A TREMENDOUS DISADVANTAGE.

>> JUST A THOUGHT.

AND THIS COMES PURELY FROM EXPERIENCE IN OTHER DISCIPLINES,
LOCAL GOVERNMENT, ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS, THAT PERHAPS
WOULD PROVIDE YOU SOME SOLACE IN THIS PARTICULAR
DISCUSSION.

WHAT YOU REALLY HAVE HERE IS A REGULATORY STATEMENT MADE IN
THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE THAT ESTABLISHES, ARGUABLY, A
STANDARD THAT HAS TO BE APPLIED DURING A PROCEEDING.

AND DURING THE PROCEEDING, THERE IS A REQUIREMENT WHEN YOU LOOK AT THIS THAT APPROPRIATE SUPPORT MATERIAL -- AND APPROPRIATE SUPPORT MATERIAL, IF I WAS INVOLVED IN A PROCEEDING OF THIS NATURE, WOULD BE MATERIAL THAT IS LEGALLY SUPPORTABLE AND RECOGNIZED AS EXPERT MATERIAL ADDRESSING THE ISSUES.

SO IT WOULD SEEM -- JUST A THOUGHT.

IT WOULD SEEM THAT THE POINT YOU ARE MAKING IS A LEGITIMATE ONE.

YOU WANT TO MAKE SURE AS TO WHATEVER POINTS ARE BEING MADE DURING A HEARING THAT THEY ARE ADEQUATELY SUPPORTED.

AND I WOULD SAY THAT AS AN ATTORNEY WHO HAS REPRESENTED FOLKS IN OTHER MATTERS, NEVER IN A MATTER LIKE THIS, BUT IN FRONT OF A LOT OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS, YOU HAVE A STATEMENT IN HERE THAT ALLOWS YOU TO SAY THAT PARTICULAR STATEMENT THAT WE JUST HEARD IS NOT ADEQUATE SUPPORT MATERIAL, AND HERE'S THE RATIONALE.

AND THAT THEN BECOMES PART OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD, AND GOES TO THE SUPPORTABILITY OF ANY DECISION ANYBODY REACHES.

IT WOULD SEEM, PERHAPS, THERE IS A, FOR LACK OF A BETTER PHRASE, A JURISDICTIONAL BASIS FOR A CONCERN YOU MAY HAVE, AND IT CAN GO STRAIGHT TO THIS SECTION AND ARGUE THAT INFORMATION ISN'T SUPPORTABLE.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: THE APPLICANT HAS GOT TO MEET THEIR BURDEN.

>> AND THE APPLICANT HAS NOT MET THEIR BURDEN, AND YOU HAVE A RATIONALE TO STAND IN FRONT OF ANYONE, A HEARING OFFICER, BOARD, WHATEVER, AND SAY LOOK, HERE'S THE STANDARD.

SO IT MAY WELL BE THAT WHAT YOU ARE CONCERNED ABOUT MIGHT BE ADDRESSED HERE.

AND FINALLY, A THOUGHT MIGHT BE THAT IF THESE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE PROVISIONS ARE ADOPTED, THEN AT SOME POINT, PERHAPS, AN ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORTING DOCUMENT COULD BE PULLED TOGETHER THAT WOULD PROVIDE SOME SUGGESTIONS ABOUT WHAT THIS [INAUDIBLE] WOULD BE.

BUT I THINK THERE IS A BASIS HERE, ESPECIALLY WHEN YOU LOOK AT IT FROM A PERSPECTIVE OF HAVING A DECISION ON WHATEVER SIDE IT IS THAT IS LEGALLY SUPPORTABLE.

THE CONCEPT OF COMPETENT, SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE, WHICH IS ONE OF THE STANDARDS AGAINST WHICH SOMETHING LIKE THIS WOULD BE MEASURED, COMES BACK TO THE CODE AND SAYS, WELL, WHAT'S THE ISSUE?

THE ISSUE IS THAT THE [INDISCERNIBLE] DA-DA-DA-DA-DA, THAT STATED THIS.

WELL, COMPETENT, SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE IS CERTAINLY SOMETHING YOU CAN RAISE DURING THE HEARING, AND YOU'VE GOT

THE OPEN DOOR FOR IT HERE.

IT'S JUST A THOUGHT.

IT MAY BE THAT YOUR POINT WORKS, THAT YOUR POINT CAN BE MADE WITHIN THIS LANGUAGE.

>> HERE IS A PROCEDURAL ISSUE.

WE HAVE SET A PRECEDENT HERE BY GOING BACK TO LOOK AT MINUTES TO SAY WE DON'T WANT TO GO BACK AND CHANGE WHAT OCCURRED IN OUR APPROVAL PROCESS, AND I THINK THAT MIGHT BE AN INTERESTING THING FOR US TO CONSIDER THIS EVENING.

THIS IS A DOCUMENT THAT CAME OUT OF THAT MEETING.

THIS IS WHAT -- THIS IS WHAT WE WERE AGREEING ON THAT NIGHT.

IT DOESN'T MEAN THAT WE CANNOT HAVE SUBSEQUENT NARRATIVE, PERHAPS, THAT ADDRESSES SOME OF THOSE THINGS, BUT WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO DO IS TO ASK US TO FORMALLY RECEIVE THIS DOCUMENT, SO THAT WOULD BE A MOTION -- IT'S MOVED AND SECONDED.

AND THEN OUR EXPECTATION IS WE WANT TO CHECK IT FOR THE CORRECTNESS OF WHAT WE DID WHEN WE CREATED THE DOCUMENT.

THEN I THINK THERE'S AN OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE ANY KIND OF ADDENDUM THAT WE WANT TO IT.

IS THAT --

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: LAURA BELFLOWER.

I WOULD DISAGREE THAT THE COMMITTEE CAN PROVIDE AN

ADDENDUM.

I DON'T KNOW ABOUT THE WISDOM OF ADDING ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
BECAUSE WE MADE AN AWFUL LOT OF ADDITIONAL COMMENTS.

BUT PERHAPS THAT WOULD BE SOMETHING THAT WOULD BE IN A
MEMBER REPORT.

IF DENISE FEELS STRONGLY ENOUGH ABOUT THAT POINT, THEN SHE
CAN SAY IN HER -- HER INDIVIDUAL MEMBER REPORT THAT I'M
STILL CONCERNED THAT THIS LANGUAGE ISN'T STRONG ENOUGH TO
ADDRESS THIS SITUATION.

>> THAT'S EVEN BETTER.

I AGREE.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: I JUST THINK AS A COMMITTEE WE ARE --
SLIPPERY SLOPE HERE.

>> I AGREE.

>> I AGREE.

>> I PERSONALLY AGREE.

>> SO MAY I RECEIVE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THIS REPORT?

>> DOES ANYONE ELSE HAVE ANY ISSUES WITH THE ACCURACY OF
THE REPORT?

>> WE WILL CONTINUE THE DISCUSSION.

I JUST WANT TO GO AHEAD AND GET THE REPORT ON THE RECORD AS
BEING OFFICIALLY MOVED.

>> I PUT A MOTION ON THE FLOOR THAT WE ACCEPT THE REPORT.

>> THANK YOU.

IS THERE A SECOND?

>> SECOND.

>> OKAY.

NOW WE ARE STILL IN DISCUSSION.

>> ARE THERE OTHER ISSUES WITH THE ACCURACY OF THE REPORT?

>>LEE VAUGHAN: SO THIS IS LEE VAUGHAN.

JUST TO ADDRESS DENISE'S -- PERHAPS -- I AM JUST LOOKING AT
THE PARAGRAPH AGAIN.

THE PAGES AREN'T NUMBERED.

IT'S THAT PARAGRAPH BEFORE RESOLUTION NUMBER 4 WE WERE JUST
DISCUSSING, IT STARTS, EXPERTS, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED
TO, A RADIO FREQUENCY ENGINEER AND/OR STRUCTURAL ENGINEER.

I THINK THAT MAY BE PART OF WHAT HAS CLOUDED GETTING A
SPECIFIC ENGINEER RELATED TO THE FIELD OR A SPECIFIC EXPERT
RELATED TO THE FIELD OR TO MAKE THE ASSESSMENT ON EXISTING
TOWER STRUCTURES.

SO PERHAPS IF IT WERE REWORDED AS FOLLOWS: EXPERTS,
INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO A RADIO FREQUENCY ENGINEER, A
STRUCTURAL ENGINEER, OR OTHER APPROPRIATE EXPERT OUTLINING
THE REASONS AS TO WHY THE PROPOSED -- SO THEN YOU'VE AT
LEAST LISTED THE POTENTIAL FOR HAVING THREE DIFFERENT TYPES
OF EXPERTS, THE RADIO FREQUENCY ENGINEER OR A STRUCTURAL
ENGINEER IF IT'S A STRUCTURAL ISSUE THAT A TOWER CAN'T HOLD
AN ADDITIONAL ANTENNA, OR OTHER APPROPRIATE EXPERT, IF THE

REASON IS NEITHER THE RADIO FREQUENCY PROBLEM OR THE
STRUCTURE PROBLEM.

SO JUST OFFERING THAT UP AS AN EDIT, POTENTIALLY, DENISE,
IF YOU WANTED TO USE THAT IN YOUR FOLLOW-UP COMMENTARY AS
AN ADDENDUM TO THE REPORT.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: LAURA BELFLOWER.

IT SAYS INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, SO YOU COULD HAVE AS
MANY IN THE LIST AS YOU WANTED TO, AND YOU COULD EVEN
ACTUALLY TAKE OUT ANY LIST AND JUST SAY APPROPRIATE
ACCREDITED EXPERTS, BECAUSE THEY HAVE TO BE EXPERTS, AND
THEY HAVE TO BE ACCREDITED EXPERTS, AND THAT WOULD DO THE
SAME THING.

I THINK THIS WORDING IS IN HERE BECAUSE THIS IS WHAT'S IN
THE CODE RIGHT NOW, AND WE WERE TRYING TO MAKE AS FEW
CHANGES AS POSSIBLE AND STILL CONVEY THE ISSUE AND THE
POINT WE WERE TRYING TO MAKE.

>>BILL COOK: BILL COOK.

ACTUALLY, I THINK, LAURA, THAT THE CHANGE YOU ARE PROPOSING
WOULD BE DIFFERENT BECAUSE THIS SAYS INCLUDES BUT NOT
LIMITED TO, SO INCLUDING MEANS THEY NEED TO BE INCLUDED.
YOU ARE NOT LIMITED TO THEM, BUT THEY HAVE TO BE INCLUDED.
IF YOU WERE TO SAY JUST ACCREDITED EXPERTS, THAT COULD BE
ANYTHING.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: NO, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO DOES

NOT MEAN THAT YOU HAVE TO HAVE A STRUCTURAL ENGINEER AND AN
RF ENGINEER AND ANYBODY ELSE THAT YOU WANT TO.

IT MEANS THAT YOUR LIST OF APPROPRIATE ACCREDITED EXPERTS
WOULD INCLUDE --

>> OKAY, I SEE WHAT YOU ARE SAYING.

>> SO THESE ARE POSSIBILITIES.

THESE ARE EXAMPLES BASICALLY IS WHAT I AM SAYING.

>> BUT IF MR. VAUGHAN'S WORDING IS NOT OBJECTIONABLE, IT
PROVIDES, I THINK, CLARITY.

I'M NOT SURE SOMEONE USED THE PHRASE AND/OR IN THE MEETING
LAST, DON'T KNOW WHETHER THAT WAS JUST EXPEDIENCY IN THE
CODE OR WHETHER IT WOULD JUST MAKE MORE SENSE AND IT'S
EASIER TO READ WHEN YOU SAY ENGINEER, STRUCTURAL ENGINEER,
OR OTHER.

I DON'T SEE THE COST.

OR THE ISSUE SURROUNDING THAT CHANGE.

>> AND IT WON'T BE A CHANGE TO THIS OFFICIAL DOCUMENT;
CORRECT?

WE'VE ACCEPTED THE REPORT AS WRITTEN.

THIS IS JUST RECOMMENDATIONS TO DENISE, POTENTIALLY, OR
ANYONE.

>> NOT THAT I DISAGREE ON THIS POINT.

IT'S GOING TO GET CONFUSED IN SOME OF THE REWORDING HERE.
THIS IS THE WAY WE VOTED ON IT LAST TIME.

>> I BELIEVE THIS IS ACCURATE.

AND I GUESS JUST AS A LAY OUTSIDER, NONEXPERT, I THINK THE READING OF THE LANGUAGE IS INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO MEANS HERE ARE TWO EXAMPLES, BUT IT'S NOT LIMITED TO THOSE. SO IT ESSENTIALLY SAYS WHAT LEE SAID, WHICH IS SOME OTHER IS POSSIBLE IN THIS LANGUAGE.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: SO ANYBODY CAN SAY IN THEIR MEMBER REPORT ANYTHING THEY WANT TO, SO IF SOMEBODY WANTS TO SUGGEST ALTERNATIVE LANGUAGE --

>> OUR SCOPE RIGHT NOW IS TO VERIFY WHAT WE VOTED ON LAST TIME IS WHAT'S IN THIS REPORT; CORRECT?

>> THAT IS WHAT WE ARE ASKED.

>> NOT TO CHANGE --

>> OR SOME OTHER THING YOU THINK NEEDS TO BE REPORTED THAT'S NOT IN THE FORMAT OF THIS REPORT.

>>TOM WELLER: TOM WELLER.

I JUST WANT TO COMMENT THAT I DON'T AGREE WITH THE LAST INTERPRETATION.

THE WAY I READ IT, IT SAYS YOU HAVE TO HAVE AT LEAST TWO EXPERTS, AND AT LEAST ONE OF THEM HAS TO BE A STRUCTURAL OR RF ENGINEER.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: LAURA BELFLOWER.

I WOULD DISAGREE FROM A STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION STANDPOINT. THAT'S VERY, VERY COMMON LANGUAGE TO SAY A THING, INCLUDING

BUT NOT LIMITED TO, AND THOSE ARE EXAMPLES THAT ARE LISTED.

IF ANYBODY INTERPRETS IT DIFFERENTLY THAN THAT, I THINK THERE'S A GOOD DEAL OF CASE LAW AND STATUTORY -- I DON'T THINK THAT WAS THE INTENT.

>> IF IT SAYS WHICH MAY INCLUDE OR ARE NOT LIMITED TO, WE ARE DONE; RIGHT?

>> YEAH.

>> CAN WE JUST PUT A PARENTHETICAL THAT THERE WAS DISCUSSION ABOUT THE EXACT LANGUAGE, AND THIS IS ALL -- IF THE BOARD ACCEPTS ANY OF THIS, THEN IT'S ALL GOING TO BE HASHED OUT AGAIN, AND WE ARE GOING TO HAVE PLENTY OF OPPORTUNITIES TO GET THE EXACT LANGUAGE.

>> WE COULD ACCEPT A MOTION TO PUT IN PARENTHESES A SUGGESTED CHANGE IN THE LANGUAGE --

>> AFTER YOUR MOTION PASSED 12-1, MAYBE AT THE END OF THAT --

>> ON AUGUST 31, THERE WAS DISCUSSION ABOUT WHAT THAT CLAUSE MEANT.

>> TWO THINGS.

WE TALK ABOUT THE VERBIAGE THERE.

>> ARE YOU HAPPY WITH MY SUGGESTION, WHICH SAYS WHICH MAY INCLUDE BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO A RADIO FREQUENCY ENGINEER AND/OR STRUCTURAL ENGINEER?

>> IS THAT OKAY, DENISE?

>>DENISE VERRILL: THAT WOULD BE OKAY.

I WAS REALLY MORE CONCERNED ABOUT APPROPRIATE SUPPORT MATERIAL, AND I JUST WANTED TO BRING IT UP AS A POINT.

>> MOTION?

>> WELL, THE EDITORIAL NOTE -- YOU WANT TO HAVE A VOTE ON THE EDITORIAL NOTE?

>> JUST AS A FACT, THERE HAVE BEEN SEVERAL HEARINGS WHERE ENGINEER -- PEOPLE HAVE STATED THAT THEY'RE AN ENGINEER, AND THEY ARE NOT ENGINEERS, AND THERE ARE PEOPLE WHO HAVE GIVEN TESTIMONY ON VARYING SCOPES OUT OF THEIR PRACTICE. THAT'S WHY I HAD THE CONCERN ABOUT THE LANGUAGE.

>> LAURA BELFLOWER.

I THINK THAT'S CORRECTED BY TAKING OUT THE REFERENCE TO NEED BECAUSE THAT CONFUSED THE ISSUE SO TOTALLY.

I MEAN, RF ENGINEERS REALLY SHOULDN'T BE INVOLVED IN THIS TO VERY LARGE DEGREE.

IT REALLY IS A STRUCTURAL ISSUE, WHETHER OR NOT THERE IS A STRUCTURE THERE AND YOU CAN GO ON IT.

SO I THINK A LARGE PART OF THE PROBLEM IS NOBODY KNEW WHAT IT MEANT TO PROVE A NEED, AND NOW THAT WE'VE FIXED THAT, HOPEFULLY -- HOPEFULLY -- HOPEFULLY THINGS WILL BE BETTER IN THAT REGARD.

>> OKAY.

>> OKAY.

EVEN THOUGH I SAID THERE'S NO SUCH THING AS A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT, I THINK THIS IS A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT.

CAN WE ACCEPT THIS AS A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT?

AND WE'LL PUT IT IN AS AN EDITORIAL NOTE.

>> COULD YOU READ THE AMENDMENT AGAIN, PLEASE?

>> EDITORIAL NOTE.

AND DAVID, DID YOU WRITE DOWN THE EXACT LANGUAGE?

>> AT THE AUGUST 31 MEETING, WCA EXPRESSED CONCERN ABOUT THE LANGUAGE OF THAT SENTENCE AND PROPOSED THE FOLLOWING, THAT IT READ EXPERTS INCLUDING -- WHICH MAY INCLUDE BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO RADIO FREQUENCY ENGINEER AND/OR STRUCTURAL ENGINEER.

HAPPY?

OKAY.

>> OKAY.

ALL RIGHT.

WE'LL LET THAT GO AS CONSENSUS THEN.

ALL RIGHT.

OTHER ITEMS THAT --

>> ONCE AGAIN, NOT THINGS THAT WE WISH TO RENEGOTIATE, BUT THAT WE WISH TO HAVE IN OUR FINAL REPORT.

>> CLARIFY.

>> WE HAVE A MOTION AND A SECOND TO ACCEPT THIS AS OUR FINAL REPORT AND FORWARD AS PREPARED WITH THE FRIENDLY

AMENDMENT TO COUNTY ADMINISTRATION.

>> I MOVE THAT WE ACCEPT THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "INTERIM
FINAL REPORT."

>> IT'S ALREADY BEEN MOVED AND SECONDED.

WE ARE READY --

>> ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

[CHORUS OF AYES]

>> ALL THOSE OPPOSED, NAY.

WE HAVE AN ACCEPTED REPORT.

WITH EDITORIAL NOTES.

>> OKAY.

IN YOUR MATERIALS BEFORE YOU, YOU HAVE A COPY OF RELEVANT
PORTIONS OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE.

THE FLOW CHARTS THAT MR. GRADY PREPARED OR HELPED TO
PREPARE OUTLINING THE AREAS IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS
WHERE VARIANCES AND WAIVERS TAKE PLACE.

WE ASKED JOE MOREDA IF HE WOULD TALK TO US FOR A FEW
MINUTES ABOUT AREAS THAT HE FELT WE SHOULD ADDRESS
PRODUCTIVELY AND TO BE AVAILABLE TO ANSWER QUESTIONS IF YOU
HAVE THEM CONCERNING VARIANCES AND WAIVERS.

>>JOE MOREDA: GOOD AFTERNOON.

JOE MOREDA, DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT, FOR THE
RECORD.

I WASN'T REAL CLEAR EXACTLY ON WHAT THE COMMITTEE WAS

LOOKING FOR, AND I OBVIOUSLY DON'T WANT TO TAKE EVERYONE BACKWARDS SINCE THIS IS THE LAST MEETING, BUT WHAT I WAS PLANNING ON DOING IS JUST TALKING FOR A FEW MINUTES ABOUT THE TYPE OF THINGS THAT STAFF ITSELF HAS SOME CONCERNS OR HAVE HAD CONCERNS WITH REGARDING ORDINANCE OVER TIME.

PART OF THE PROBLEM THAT WE'VE HAD AND WE WANT IT AVOID IN ANY FUTURE REVISIT TO THE ORDINANCE IS BEING CAUGHT IN A TUG-OF-WAR BETWEEN THE APPLICANT AND FOLKS THAT ARE OPPOSING AN APPLICATION BECAUSE WE'RE NOT REALLY SURE WHAT THE STANDARD MEANS.

AND THAT'S WHY WHAT WE WOULD LIKE TO SEE IS MORE CLARITY WHEN WE DO REVISIT THE ISSUE IN TERMS OF WHAT MAY BE REQUIRED, HOW MAYBE WE WOULD DEFINE NEED, AND THEN ALSO TO LOOK INTO WHAT TYPE OF EXPERTS, YOU KNOW, MAY BE NEEDED TO DETERMINE THAT BECAUSE A LOT OF THESE AREAS REQUIRE TECHNICAL EXPERTISE THAT PEOPLE WHO ARE ZONING PLANNERS DON'T HAVE, AND THAT'S BEEN A SOURCE OF FRUSTRATION FOR OUR STAFF AS WELL, AND I THINK TO SOME DEGREE IT INVITES FOLKS TO A PUBLIC HEARING, AND REALLY, NO ONE THERE EXCEPT FOR THE APPLICANT HAS THE GROUP OF PEOPLE THAT ARE CAPABLE OF REALLY SPEAKING TO THE ISSUES THAT NEED TO BE SPOKEN TO. SO I THINK THAT'S BREEDED SOME FRUSTRATION IN THE PROCESS, AND YOU KNOW, I THINK THAT THE COMMITTEE'S TOUCHED ON THAT. AND YOU KNOW, WE CAN DEAL WITH THAT BASED ON, YOU KNOW, THE

RECOMMENDATIONS THAT ARE GOING TO EMERGE FROM THE COMMITTEE.

ALSO, IN TERMS OF ADMINISTRATIVE DISCRETION, THERE'S BEEN A LOT OF TALK ABOUT WAIVERS AND VARIANCES AND SO FORTH, AND ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE'VE STRUGGLED WITH IN TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE IS THE FACT IN ONE PROCESS, THE VARIANCE STANDARD IS DIFFERENT THAN IT IS IN ANOTHER PROCESS.

IN AN ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW, THE VARIANCE STANDARD IS SUBJECT TO SIX CRITERIA WHICH ARE TYPICALLY FOUND IN MOST VARIANCE APPLICATIONS ACROSS THE NATION; WHEREAS, IF YOU ARE IN A SPECIAL USE PROCESS, THE VARIANCE CRITERIA IS SUBJECT TO MEETING THE INTENT OF A PUBLIC PURPOSE IN AN ALTERNATIVE WAY.

WE THINK WE KNOW THE REASON THAT'S IN THERE IS BECAUSE PROSPECTIVE APPLICATIONS SOMETIMES IT'S DIFFICULT TO MEET THE SIX CRITERIA WHICH ARE ESSENTIALLY BUILT AROUND IF YOU HAVE A SELF-IMPOSED HARDSHIP, THEN YOU SHOULDN'T BE APPROVED FOR A VARIANCE.

SO I THINK THERE'S AN ALTERNATIVE IN THERE BECAUSE IN A PROSPECTIVE APPLICATION, THERE MAY BE A WAY TO STILL SPEAK TO THAT AND WITHOUT HAVING TO MEET THAT TEST OF NOT HAVING TO PROVE YOU ARE A SELF-IMPOSED HARDSHIP.

SO THAT'S ONE OF THE AREAS THAT WE MAY BE LOOKING TO -- I DON'T KNOW IF CLARIFY IS THE RIGHT WORD, BUT MAKE THE

STANDARD CONSISTENT.

ANOTHER ONE OF THE AREAS STAFF HAS STRUGGLED WITH IS THE AREA OF ADMINISTRATIVE DISCRETION, AND TO THE EXTENT THAT THE INCENTIVES CAN STILL BE MAINTAINED TO ENCOURAGE PEOPLE TO COLLOCATE OR ENCOURAGE APPLICANTS TO COLLOCATE, WE WOULD LIKE TO TRY TO CLARIFY THE SCOPE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR'S ABILITY TO REDUCE REQUIREMENTS LIKE SETBACK AND HEIGHT BECAUSE THAT'S NOT REALLY SOMETHING WE WANT TO BE IN THE MIDDLE OF, OR AT LEAST WE DON'T WANT TO BE IN THE MIDDLE OF IT WHEN A CASE HAS BEEN THROUGH A PUBLIC HEARING AND CERTAIN STANDARDS HAVE BEEN SET IN TERMS OF HEIGHT OR SETBACK OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT, AND THEN SOMEBODY MAY WANT TO COLLOCATE, MAKE AN ADJUSTMENT TO THAT.

WE'VE HAD PEOPLE COME IN AND ASK US TO EXCEED THE HEIGHT THAT HAD BEEN APPROVED IN CONDITIONS VIS-A-VIS A PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS, AND WE JUST FEEL THAT DOING SOMETHING LIKE THAT WOULD UNDERMINE THAT PROCESS, WHICH IS WHY WE HAVEN'T DONE IT.

BUT THE ORDINANCE ISN'T TOTALLY CLEAR, AND AT THE END OF THE DAY, WHAT WE WOULD LIKE IS FOR EVERYBODY TO UNDERSTAND THE EXPECTATIONS, BOTH ON THE APPLICANT'S SIDE AS WELL AS ON THE CITIZENS' SIDE AND AS WELL AS ON THE STAFF SIDE IN TERMS OF WHAT WE ARE SUPPOSED TO REVIEW BECAUSE IN A LOT OF CASES, WHEN THE LANGUAGE IS TO THE SATISFACTION OF, WELL,

THAT CAN BE PRETTY BROAD, AND YOU KNOW, IN CASES WHERE THE HIRING OF AN EXPERT IS IN THE MIDDLE OF A PROCESS, I MEAN, THAT CAN BE PROBLEMATIC AS WELL BECAUSE, YOU KNOW, IN SOME CASES, IT MAY NOT SEEM LIKE IT'S PROBLEMATIC, THEN YOU GET AN EXPERT INVOLVED IN THE MIDDLE OF THE CASE THAT'S DELAYING THE CASE, IT SEEMS LIKE THE STANDARDS FOR HOW EXPERT REVIEWS WOULD BE BROUGHT IN, WHAT THE SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS ARE, YOU KNOW, WHAT THE TEST IS SHOULD BE AS CLEAR AS IT COULD BE UP FRONT SO EVERYBODY KIND OF KNOWS THE PLAYING FIELD BEFORE THEY GET INTO IT.

AND YOU KNOW, THAT'S KIND OF WHAT WE'VE BEEN CAUGHT UP IN A LOT IS IT SEEMS LIKE SOME OF THE RULES ARE AMBIGUOUS, AND I THINK THE COMMITTEE HAS TAKEN A LOT OF STEPS IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION TO GET CLARITY TO THAT.

SO THOSE ARE THE AREAS WE PRIMARILY HAD SOME PROBLEMS IN THE PAST WHERE WE WOULD BE SEEKING TO EITHER PROVIDE CLARIFICATION, YOU KNOW, CLARIFY THE SCOPE OF OUR ABILITY, OR CLARIFY THE PLAYING RULES IN TERMS OF WHAT THE SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS ARE AND WHAT THE TEST OF REVIEW IS.

AND I THINK EVERYBODY'S KIND OF SAYING THE SAME THING HERE, TO A CERTAIN DEGREE.

SO YOU KNOW, IT'S BEEN A GOOD EXERCISE TO GO THROUGH.

AND HAVING SAID THAT, UNLESS YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, THAT'S WHAT WE REALLY CAME PREPARED TO SAY.

>> THANK YOU, JOE.

ARE THERE QUESTIONS, COMMENTS?

CARRIE.

>>CARRIE GRIMAIL: CARRIE GRIMAIL.

JOE, IS THERE -- SO IT SOUNDED LIKE YOU WOULD AGREE WITH DENISE THAT THERE NEEDS TO BE MORE SPECIFICS AND LESS AMBIGUITY.

IS THERE A PROCESS THAT YOUR STAFF GOES THROUGH WHERE IF YOU FEEL LIKE, YOU KNOW, SOMETHING'S LACKING, LIKE WHAT WE WERE TALKING ABOUT, THAT STAFF CAN BRING UP RECOMMENDATIONS?

BECAUSE I DON'T KNOW IF WE ARE GOING TO HAVE TIME TO DO THIS.

FIRST OF ALL, I DON'T THINK WE CAN DO IT AS PART OF THE FINAL REPORT.

IS THERE A PROCESS THAT STAFF GOES THROUGH WHERE YOU TRY AND TIGHTEN UP AND CLARIFY THE LANGUAGE?

OR IS THAT -- THAT HAS TO GO TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS?

>>JOE MOREDA: THAT WOULD HAVE TO GO TO THE BOARD AS PART OF A LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE TEXT AMENDMENT.

THAT'S THE ONLY WAY WE CAN CHANGE ANY LANGUAGE IN THE CODE.

I THINK, YOU KNOW, THE RECOMMENDATIONS THAT COME OUT OF THIS WILL HAVE SUFFICIENT INFORMATION FROM YOU, AND ALSO

WE'LL BE ABLE TO PROVIDE INPUT IF WE DO GET INTO A CODE AMENDMENT PROCESS AND I THINK WE GET A GOOD FEELING OF WHAT THE THRUST OF THE CONCERNS ARE FROM WHAT WE'VE BEEN HEARING HERE AND ALSO FROM WHAT WE READ IN THE REPORT.

SO I THINK THERE WILL BE AMPLE OPPORTUNITY, IF THE DIRECTION TO US IS TO CHANGE THE ORDINANCE, TO GET THOSE ISSUES SORTED OUT AND VETTED APPROPRIATELY.

>>DENISE VERRILL: DENISE VERRILL.

DID YOU HAVE ANY STANDARD RECOMMENDATIONS OR REQUIREMENT RECOMMENDATIONS THAT WOULD MAKE IT EASIER ON STAFF?

>>JOE MOREDA: I THINK IT'S -- I THINK WE WOULD PREVIOUSLY TO GET THE REPORT AND REVIEW THE REPORT AND THEN, YOU KNOW, HAVE A LITTLE BIT MORE INPUT AND TIME TO KIND OF GO THROUGH AND COME THROUGH WITH A RECOMMENDATION IF THAT'S WHAT THE DIRECTION TO US IS.

BUT I THINK IT'S PRIMARILY GETTING TO A POINT WHERE THE APPLICANT UNDERSTAND WHAT IS THEY HAVE TO SUBMIT, WHAT THE STAFF HAS TO REVIEW BECAUSE I THINK A LOT OF TIMES WHAT WE GET CAUGHT UP IN IS PEOPLE WILL OPPOSE THE APPLICATION AND CRITICIZE THE AMOUNT OF INFORMATION THAT'S IN THE FILE.

I HAVE TO TELL YOU IN SOME OF THOSE FILES, THE INFORMATION IS A LITTLE BIT THIN.

BUT THEN AGAIN, IF YOU LOOK AT THE STANDARDS, THERE'S NO WAY SOMEONE THAT'S A ZONING PLANNER COULD REALLY DETERMINE

WHETHER OR NOT THERE'S, YOU KNOW, SUFFICIENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR COLLOCATION, HOW THOSE OPPORTUNITIES ARE EVEN FACTORED AGAINST WHAT THE ECONOMICS MAY BE.

I DON'T KNOW, MAYBE, IF THERE'S A SITE OUT THERE THAT THERE IS COLLOCATION OPPORTUNITIES FOR, THEY MAY BE PRICING THEMSELVES OUT OR THERE COULD BE SOME STRUCTURAL ISSUE.

THERE ARE JUST SO MANY DIFFERENT VARIABLES INVOLVED THAT IT'S NOT SOMETHING A STAFF PERSON COULD REVIEW.

I AM NOT EVEN TOTALLY CLEAR HOW THE INDUSTRY WOULD GO AHEAD AND WORK THROUGH THAT.

I THINK LAURA HAS SPOKEN TO SOME OF THAT TODAY.

BUT I THINK IT JUST -- WHEN WE GET THE KEY POINTS THAT YOU WANT US TO LOOK AT, WE KNOW THE AREAS WHERE WE'VE BEEN STRUGGLING WITH, AND WE WOULD HAVE TO CONTINUE TO STUDY THAT AND WORK THROUGH IT AND SEE WHAT TYPE OF RECOMMENDATIONS WE COULD COME UP WITH THAT COULD BE HARD AND FAST, YOU KNOW, IN TERMS OF SO SOMEONE WOULD KNOW THE PLAYING FIELD WHEN THEY WALKED IN.

>> IN TERMS OF PROCESS, IT SEEMS TO ME AS LONG AS WE HAVE A QUORUM HERE TONIGHT THAT ANYTHING WE WISHED TO ADD IN TERMS OF SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS OR EXPRESSIONS OF CONCERN CAN BE ADDED TO THE FINAL REPORT OR ATTACHED TO THE FINAL REPORT.

>>MICHAEL ROTHENBURG: MIKE ROTHENBURG.

WITH REGARDS TO THE WHOLE PROCESS ALL RIGHT INITIAL ACTIVITIES IS LITERALLY AFTER THE APPLICANT HAS SUBMITTED THEIR INFORMATION, IT'S PLACING THE SIGN.

I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE CURRENT HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY STANDARDS IS, BUT I KNOW IN THE CITY OF TAMPA, AND I THINK IN SOME OF THE COUNTY THINGS I'VE SEEN, PLACEMENT OF A SIGN INDICATES THERE IS A LAND USE HEARING, A REQUEST FOR A VARIANCE, OR SOME SUCH THING.

AND THIS DOESN'T ADDRESS NECESSARILY THE WCSS PORTION OF THE ZONING CODE, BUT IT WOULD SEEM THAT IN GENERAL, THE ABILITY TO PUT MORE INFORMATION ON THOSE PUBLIC NOTICE SIGNS COULD BE OF GREAT VALUE TO THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITY. SIMPLY BECAUSE YOU NOTICE A WAIVER TO 6.12.29, DA-DA-DA, DOESN'T PROVIDE A LOT OF INFORMATION, AND FOR ALL YOU KNOW, MS. SMITH'S WANTING TO ADD A CARPORT TO HER HOUSE OR SOMETHING.

JUST AS A GENERAL OVERALL COMMENT, IT WOULD SEEM LIKE MORE INFORMATION WOULD BE BETTER FROM THE CITIZENS' PERSPECTIVE.

>>JOE MOREDA: ON THE SIGN ITSELF?

>>MICHAEL ROTHENBURG: YES.

>> AND TO LEAVE ON, SO TO ADD TO THAT POINT AS WELL, NOT ONLY THE AMOUNT OF INFORMATION, BUT THE POSTING OF THE SIGNS AS WELL.

WE'VE HAD SOME INSTANCES WHERE SIGNS ARE -- IT ALMOST

APPEARS THAT THEY ARE INTENTIONALLY MOVED ALONG A HEDGE, AROUND A CORNER, AND OFF OF THE MAIN FLOW OF TRAFFIC, AND IT'S NOT JUST LIKE SOMEBODY WAS HAVING A BAD DAY AND THEY ENDED UP TAKING A WRONG TURN AND DRIVING DOWN A SIDE STREET AND PUT UP A SIGN JUST ON THE SIDE STREET BECAUSE THEY WEREN'T PAYING ATTENTION TO TRAFFIC.

SOME OF THOSE THINGS ARE BECAUSE THEY ARE -- I THINK THEY APPEAR TO HAVE ALMOST LIKE THERE'S SOMETHING TRYING TO BE HIDDEN, LIKE TRYING TO BE OUT OF THE PUBLIC PATH, WHERE IT WILL BE ISOLATED AND NOT ATTRACT THE ATTENTION, POTENTIALLY, OF THE NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS OR WHAT -- LIKE MIKE WAS SAYING -- WHAT WAS INCLUDED IN THE ACTUAL HEARING ITSELF.

ONE OTHER THING I'D LIKE TO ADD, TOO, IS IN OUR OWN PERSONAL EXPERIENCE, ON BUCHANAN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, NORTH SIDE OF TAMPA, WE ALSO HAD SOME DIFFICULTY UNDERSTANDING HOW THE DEFINITION OF CAMOUFLAGE WAS INTERPRETED, THAT IT WAS A COMPLETE BLOCK OF THE ENTIRE VIEWING AREA AROUND THE TOWER BETWEEN OUR HOME AND THE TOWER THAT WAS 143 FEET AWAY FROM OUR HOME.

AND SO WHEN IT ASKS -- OR IN THE REGULATION, WHERE IT REQUIRES THAT CAMOUFLAGE -- AND I THINK THEY HAVE SOME SPECIFIC WORDING WITHIN THE DOCUMENTATION -- THAT THREE-QUARTERS OF THE AREA THAT WAS SUPPOSED TO HAVE BEEN

CAMOUFLAGED DOES NOT HAVE ANY COVERAGE, ANY CAMOUFLAGE, ANY SHADING, ANYTHING AT ALL BETWEEN THE TOWER AND BETWEEN THE LOCAL RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY --

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: I THINK YOU ARE TALKING SCREENING VERSUS CAMOUFLAGE.

>> SO NOT THE TOWER ITSELF, SO IT WOULD BE SCREENING, IF THAT'S THE CORRECT TERM.

YEAH.

>> THE VERTICAL SCREEN ON THE GROUND?

>> CORRECT.

>>JOE MOREDA: YOU ARE SAYING THE SCREENING WAS NEVER INSTALLED?

>> WELL, THERE WAS NO SCREENING IN PLACE.

THE WAY THAT THE INTERPRETATION READ FROM THE COUNTY WAS THAT THERE WAS AN ADEQUATE SCREENING ACROSS THE BACK OF ALL RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY THAT WOULD ISOLATE THE WCSS AWAY FROM RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY WHEN, IN FACT, THREE-QUARTERS OF THE BACK OF OUR RESIDENTIAL -- OF OUR -- SPECIFICALLY OUR PERSONAL RESIDENTIAL YARD HAS NO SCREENING, NO FOLIAGE, NO TREES, NO ANYTHING, SO I THINK JUST PERHAPS INTERPRETING THE REGULATIONS AND MAKING CLEAR STATEMENTS THAT ARE -- YOU KNOW, THAT ARE AS FACTUAL AS POSSIBLE.

>>JOE MOREDA: I CAN TELL YOU THE WAY THE CODE WORKS IS IF THERE IS AN EXISTING SCREEN THERE, IF THERE IS A SCREEN

REQUIRED, YOU WOULDN'T HAVE TO DUPLICATE IT.

I DON'T KNOW WHAT FACTS EXIST FOR THAT PARTICULAR APPLICATION, BUT THAT'S GENERALLY THE WAY IT'S SUPPOSED TO WORK.

IN TERMS OF THE NOTICE, FOLKS MOVING SIGNS, YOU KNOW, I DON'T KNOW IF FOLKS ARE MOVING SIGNS, BUT THE COUNTY POSTS SIGNS.

THERE'S BEEN A LOT OF CHANGES TO NOTICE OVER THE YEARS.

THE COUNTY POSTS THE SIGNS.

THERE'S ALSO MAILED NOTICE.

AND THE MAILED NOTICE WOULD BE -- IT'S BASED ON THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CATEGORY, AND IF IT'S A RURAL CATEGORY, IT WOULD BE TO EVERYONE WITHIN 500 FEET OF THAT TOWER'S HEIGHT.

IF IT'S IN AN URBAN COUNTY, IT WOULD BE WITHIN 300 FEET.

THERE'S ALSO ADVERTISEMENTS PUT IN, I BELIEVE, THREE NEWSPAPERS, AND FOLKS THAT ARE ON THE NEIGHBORHOOD REGISTRY WOULD ALSO GET AN AGENDA, AND THERE'S ALSO INTERNET -- WE'RE WORKING TOWARDS INTERNET ACCESS, I BELIEVE -- DO WE HAVE INTERNET ACCESS FOR THE ZHM HEARING YET?

WE ARE GOING TO BE POSTING THE CASES ON THE INTERNET AS WELL, NOT JUST TOWER CASES, BUT ALL THE CASES THAT GO TO THE ZONING HEARING MASTER.

SO WE'RE CONSTANTLY TRYING TO IMPROVE THE NOTICE.

TYPICALLY, MORE OF THE INFORMATION'S INCLUDED IN THE MAILED NOTICE.

YOU KNOW, WE CAN LOOK INTO SEEING IF THERE'S ANY WAY TO REVISE THE INFORMATION THAT'S ON THE SIGN ITSELF TO MAYBE USE MAYBE MORE COMMON TERMS, LIKE CELL TOWER INSTEAD OF WCSS BECAUSE, YOU KNOW, I WOULD IMAGINE MOST PEOPLE DON'T KNOW WHAT WCSS IS, SO I CAN UNDERSTAND THAT.

BUT ANYWAY.

ANYTHING ELSE?

DID I COVER EVERYTHING?

I'M TRYING TO REMEMBER ALL THE QUESTIONS.

>>LEE VAUGHAN: I BELIEVE YOU DID.

LEE VAUGHAN AGAIN.

I DO HAVE A QUESTION ABOUT THE NEIGHBORHOOD REGISTRY BECAUSE THERE WERE NEIGHBORHOODS THAT WERE NOTIFIED IN BRANDON FOR THAT TOWER ON THE NORTH SIDE OF TAMPA, AND SUPPOSEDLY IT'S WITHIN A CERTAIN RADIUS, I DON'T KNOW IF IT'S A MILE OF THE TOWER, THAT YOU GO TO ALL HOMEOWNER ASSOCIATIONS THAT ARE WITHIN A CERTAIN DESIGNATED DISTANCE. BUT BRANDON AND ANOTHER ONE OUT IN I THINK TOWN 'N COUNTRY AREA WERE NOTIFIED OF A TOWER AT BUCHANAN, BUT SOME OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS IN THE IMMEDIATE AREA WERE NOT NOTIFIED.

IT CAME DOWN TO THE FACT THAT THERE WAS A NEIGHBORHOOD

REGISTRY THAT TOOK SOME ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT IN THE APPLICATION PROCESS, AND VERY FEW NEIGHBORHOODS WERE ACTUALLY ON THIS MORE REMOTE OR HARD TO FIND OR HARDER TO APPLY AND HAVE YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD ON THAT ACTUAL REGISTRY, AND OUR NEIGHBORHOOD WAS ONE OF THEM.

WE THOUGHT WE WERE ON THE NEIGHBORHOOD REGISTRY BUT NEVER RECEIVED NOTIFICATION.

AND DENISE, I DON'T KNOW IF YOU KNOW MORE ABOUT THIS POTENTIALLY OR NOT.

I'M SPEAKING FROM A POINT OF LIMITED KNOWLEDGE, EXCEPT FOR THE FACT THAT IT WAS LITERALLY A PAIN IN THE NECK FOR US TO GET ADDED TO THAT NEIGHBORHOOD REGISTRY.

HAD WE BEEN ON IT, WHICH WE THOUGHT OUR VILLAGE WAS ON IT, WE WOULD HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED.

WE WEREN'T ON THE NEIGHBORHOOD REGISTRY THAT WAS HARDER TO GET TO AND HARDER TO QUALIFY FOR.

>> DO YOU KNOW OF THE TWO DIFFERENT REGISTRIES?

I AM FORGETTING THE NAME.

>>JOE MOREDA: OUR DEPARTMENT IS NOT DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD REGISTRATIONS.

THAT IS DONE THROUGH THE OFFICE OF NEIGHBORHOOD RELATIONS.

I BELIEVE THAT OFFICE IS ONE PERSON NOW.

I BELIEVE MOST OF THAT TEXT THAT ADMINISTERS ALL THE ADMINISTRATIVE LANGUAGE IS IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD BILL OF

RIGHTS.

IT MAY BE TWO TIERS, AND IT MAY BE BASED ON THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

I'M NOT SURE.

>>DENISE VERRILL: DENISE VERRILL.

THE NEIGHBORHOOD REGISTRY, THERE IS ONE ONLINE THAT YOU CAN CLICK AND REGISTER EASILY FOR, BUT THAT IS NOT THE ONE THAT ENABLES YOU TO GET ZONING NOTIFICATION.

THE ONE FOR ZONING NOTIFICATION, YOU HAVE TO DOWNLOAD THE PDF FILE AND PRINT IT OUT AND HAVE A CERTAIN NUMBER OF OFFICERS SIGN IT, WHATEVER, HAVE IT CERTIFIED, ALL THAT.

MOST PEOPLE DON'T REALIZE THAT THERE'S TWO DIFFERENT LISTS, AND THEY DON'T KNOW TO GO LOOKING FOR THAT PDF FILE.

SO THAT WAS THE DIFFICULTY WITH THE NEIGHBORHOOD REGISTRATION.

I, TOO, RAN INTO AN APPLICATION THAT A NEIGHBORHOOD WAS NOT -- A VERY ACTIVE ASSOCIATION, THOUGHT THEY WERE ON THE SAME -- ON THE RIGHT LIST, AND THEY WERE NOT.

>>JOE MOREDA: ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE ARE TRY TO GO DO IS USE TECHNOLOGY, YOU KNOW, OUTSIDE OF THE WHOLE NEIGHBORHOOD REGISTRY PROCESS IS ONE OF THE THINGS WE ARE TRYING TO DO IS GET THE WORD OUT THROUGH TECHNOLOGY A LITTLE BIT MORE EFFICIENTLY.

WE ARE GOING TO BE POSTING THE AGENDAS ON OUR WEBPAGE, AND

WE ARE IN THE PROCESS OF REDOING THE WEBPAGE, SO THAT SHOULD BE SOMEWHERE IN THE NEAR FUTURE.

THERE'S ALSO BEEN A SUGGESTION -- AND I AM NOT SURE WHERE WE ARE GOING TO GO WITH THIS, BUT THERE'S BEEN A SUGGESTION ABOUT USING A MEDIA -- MASS MEDIA OUTLET OR MASS MEDIA NOTICE, I BELIEVE THEY ARE CALLED, AND IT WOULD BASICALLY ADVISE PEOPLE ALMOST LIKE A NEWSPAPER ADVERTISEMENT THAT WE JUST FINISHED AN APPLICATION FILING CUTOFF, WHICH WOULD HAVE THE APPLICATIONS LISTED AND WOULD GIVE PEOPLE ADVANCE NOTICE OF WHAT MIGHT BE, YOU KNOW, GOING ON IN THAT PARTICULAR AGENDA, SO IT COULD BE REZONINGS OR CELL TOWER CASES, THERE COULD BE OTHER THINGS.

AND THAT WOULD GO OUT TO A PRETTY BROAD-BASED GROUP OF FOLKS BY INPUTTING IT AND SIMPLY CLICKING SEND.

SO WE ARE LOOKING FOR WAYS TO GET THE WORD OUT TO MORE PEOPLE EASIER AND EARLIER.

SO I THINK YOU CAN SEE -- YOU WILL SEE SOME ENHANCEMENTS IN THAT IN THE FUTURE, BUT I WOULD LIKE TO FIND OUT MORE ABOUT THAT, WHY THERE'S TWO DIFFERENT GROUPS LIKE THAT, MYSELF, BECAUSE THAT'S INTERESTING, WHERE THERE WOULD BE TWO LEVELS AND WHY IT WOULD BE SO DIFFICULT TO GET THAT INFORMATION, WHICH SHOULD BE RELATIVELY SIMPLE TO GET.

AND WE WANT PEOPLE TO GET THE INFORMATION BECAUSE WE TRY TO BE AS INCLUSIVE AS POSSIBLE.

SO WE CAN LOOK INTO THAT THANK AND SEE WHERE IT'S AT AND WHY IT'S THAT WAY.

ANYWAY.

>> ARE THERE OTHER TOPICS, CONCERNS, THAT THE COMMITTEE WOULD LIKE TO SHARE WITH JOE?

>>BILL COOK: JOE, BILL COOK.

QUESTION FOR CLARIFICATION, AND I'M SURE THERE'S OTHER PEOPLE ON THE TABLE THAT CAN EXPLAIN IT TO ME.

IS IT A REQUIREMENT -- BECAUSE YOU PROVIDE THE VARIANCE PROCESS FOR OTHER CONSTRUCTION AND THINGS -- THAT YOU -- WE HAVE TO ALLOW FOR VARIANCES TO BE PROVIDED FOR TOWERS? OR COULD YOU CIRCUMSCRIBE THEM SO THAT VARIANCES AREN'T ALLOWED?

>>JOE MOREDA: THERE ARE SOME THINGS IN THE CODE THAT YOU CAN'T VARY.

I THINK THAT, YOU KNOW, AT LEAST IN MY OPINION, YOU START TO GO DOWN A SLIPPERY SLOPE WHEN YOU GET INTO AN AREA WHERE YOU CAN'T GIVE SOMEONE A VARIANCE, IT'S PROHIBITED. BECAUSE THERE'S ALWAYS GOING TO BE A SITUATION OUT THERE THAT YOU JUST CAN'T ANTICIPATE, AND IT MAY MAKE SENSE IN SOME CASES.

I THINK WHAT IT REALLY BOILS DOWN TO IS HOW YOU APPLY THE VARIANCE CRITERIA.

IF IT'S BEING DONE APPROPRIATELY AND PROFESSIONALLY, THEN

YOU SHOULD GET AN OUTCOME THAT'S DESIRABLE.

YOU KNOW, IF IT'S NOT BEING APPLIED PROPERLY, THEN YOU MAY GET AN OUTCOME THAT IS NOT WHAT IT'S INTENDED BECAUSE THE CRITERIA ISN'T FOLLOWED.

BUT TO HAVE A CASE WHERE YOU CAN'T MOVE SOMETHING ONE FOOT OR SIX INCHES, YOU KNOW, THAT BECOMES DIFFICULT.

SOMETIMES THERE MAY BE A SIMPLE CONSTRUCTION ERROR OR THERE MAY BE A COUPLE FEET.

IT MAY NOT BE ANYTHING AT ALL.

JUST THEY NEED SOME RELIEF BECAUSE OF THAT SIMPLE ERROR THAT MAY NOT -- YOU CAN'T EVEN NOTICE IN THE FIELD.

IN A CASE LIKE THAT, I'M NOT SURE THAT WOULD BE NECESSARILY A BAD THING, BUT OBVIOUSLY, IF IT WERE BEING ABUSED, THEN THAT COULD BE A WHOLE DIFFERENT ISSUE.

BUT I THINK AS A MATTER OF COURSE, I WOULD RECOMMEND THAT A METHOD OF RELIEF ALWAYS BE INCLUDED, YOU KNOW, FOR THE MOST PART.

>> FOLLOW-UP, THEN, BECAUSE YOU, IN FACT, SAID THE WORDS, ABUSE.

IT WOULD APPEAR TO PEOPLE IN THE COMMUNITY THAT TIME AND TIME AGAIN THE VARIANCE PROCESS IS USED AS A WAY TO CIRCUMVENT WHAT HAS BEEN FAIRLY WELL BUT NOT 100% WELL THOUGHT OUT ZONING.

AND OVER AND OVER AGAIN, THE VARIANCES ARE GRANTED THAT

ARE -- THEY'RE NOT SMALL MATTERS OF ONE FOOT HERE OR THERE.
THEY ARE SIGNIFICANT SHIFTS THAT DIRECTLY IMPACT THE
COMMUNITY.

AND THE -- I CAN'T SPEAK FOR OTHER INDUSTRIES, BUT I KNOW
IN THE TOWER INDUSTRY, IT'S BEEN FAIRLY EGREGIOUS.

AND SO WE WOULD JUST LOOK FOR SOME WAY OR ADVICE OR PROCESS
OR PROCEDURE TO SOMEHOW MANAGE THAT AND KEEP THAT -- KEEP
VARIANCES FROM BECOMING A WAY TO BASICALLY EXPLODE AND
UNDERMINE THE CODE AS IT'S WRITTEN.

BECAUSE THAT'S -- AS YOU SAID, IF THEY ARE RIGHTLY
UNDERSTOOD AND WELL IMPLEMENTED, IT SHOULDN'T BE A PROBLEM.
YOU KNOW, IF THEY NEED, YOU KNOW, TWO EXTRA FEET OF
SOMETHING, I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM WITH TWO EXTRA FEET.
BUT WHEN IT'S DOUBLE OR WHATEVER IT MIGHT BE, AND IT'S A
SPECIAL -- THEN IT BECOMES A PROBLEM.

>> WHAT ABOUT DOING LIKE YOU CAN ONLY VARY IT 15% OR
SOMETHING LIKE THAT?

IS THERE CODE THAT THE COUNTY HAS THAT YOU DO SOMETHING
LIKE THAT, WHERE THERE'S A QUANTIFIABLE AMOUNT THAT YOU CAN
DO?

THEY CAN VARY IT, BUT NOT MORE THAN THAT?

>>JOE MOREDA: WE DO, BUT USUALLY THAT IS USED IN
SITUATIONS WHERE THE ADMINISTRATIVE IS VARYING A
REQUIREMENT, AND THAT'S USED TO LIMIT THE SCOPE OF

DISCRETION OF THE ADMINISTRATOR TO SAY, YOU KNOW, YOU CAN DO THIS ADMINISTRATIVELY UP TO 10%, AND BEYOND THAT, IT WOULD HAVE TO GO THROUGH A TYPICAL PROCESS WITH A PUBLIC HEARING AND GO TO, YOU KNOW, A HEARING OFFICER.

I SUPPOSE THERE'S A WAY TO DO THAT.

BUT LIKE EVERYTHING ELSE, IT WOULD BE AN ON BALANCE TYPE OF ANALYSIS WHEN YOU DECIDE TO CHANGE THE CODE IN THAT MANNER. FOR EXAMPLE, LIKE COLLOCATION.

THERE ARE SOME THINGS IN THE CODE THAT IF YOU JUST READ THEM AT FACE VALUE, IT LOOKS LIKE WE HAVE THE ABILITY TO DO ALL KINDS OF CRAZY STUFF, WAIVE SETBACKS, WAIVE HEIGHT, BUT THERE'S A REASON FOR THAT BECAUSE WE WOULD PREFER PEOPLE TO COLLOCATE ON AN EXISTING TOWER, YOU KNOW, AS OPPOSED TO BUILDING ANOTHER TOWER.

IF YOU HAVE AN AREA THAT'S ALREADY COMPROMISED VISUALLY AND YOU CAN -- AND YOU CAN KEEP SOMEONE ON THAT TOWER BY MAYBE ADDING ANOTHER TEN FEET TO IT SO YOU END UP WITH 210 FEET, IT MIGHT BE BETTER TO HAVE A BRAND-NEW TOWER SOMEWHERE ELSE.

>> I NEED TO INTERRUPT ANOTHER MOMENT.

ADAM, DO WE NEED A QUORUM TO DISBAND THIS COMMITTEE?

WE ARE GETTING READY TO LOSE OUR QUORUM IS THE REASON FOR THIS INTERRUPTION.

>>ADAM GORMLY: NO, YOU WON'T NEED A QUORUM TO DISBAN THIS

COMMITTEE.

THE DIRECTION I'VE GOTTEN IS THIS IS GOING TO BE THE LAST MEETING OF THIS COMMITTEE, AND I THINK AT THE CONCLUSION OF TODAY'S MEETING, ONCE THE MEETING ADJOURNS, THAT WILL CONCLUDE THE FUNCTIONS FOR WHICH THE COMMITTEE WAS FORMED, AND WILL BE DISBANDED, AND THE SUNSHINE LIMITATIONS WILL BE LIFTED.

>> THANK YOU.

SORRY.

>> [OFF MICROPHONE]

>> WE HAVE VOTED TO ADVANCE THE FINAL REPORT.

WE DID.

THANK YOU, BILL.

>> THANK YOU, BILL.

>>JOE MOREDA: JUST IN CLOSING, ONE OF THE OTHER THINGS WE HAD TALKED ABOUT AND MAYBE WE CAN LOOK AT IN THE FUTURE IS IS IF THERE'S ANY WAY TO ADVANCE THE ORDINANCE TO MAYBE INCENTIVIZE, YOU KNOW, MAYBE SOMEHOW MAKE IT EASIER TO PLACE TOWERS -- AND IT SORT OF DOES THIS ALREADY BECAUSE REALLY, THE ORDINANCE DOESN'T ONLY REGULATES THE STRUCTURE. IT DOESN'T REGULATE THE ANTENNA.

IF THERE'S ANY WAY TO ENCOURAGE THE NEW TOWERS TO GO IN AN AREA THAT'S ALREADY VISUALLY COMPROMISED, FOR EXAMPLE, IF THERE'S SOMEWHERE WITH EXISTING LIGHT STANDARDS, LIKE BIG

FIELD LIGHTS, SOMETHING LIKE THAT, MAYBE SMOKE STACKS, YOU KNOW, MAYBE THE ORDINANCE COULD BE INCENTIVIZED TO MAKE IT EASIER FOR SOMEONE TO GO THERE AND DISCOURAGE THEM FROM GOING IN OTHER AREAS.

I DON'T KNOW.

I DON'T REALLY KNOW HOW MUCH THE AREAS -- WE REALLY DON'T HAVE A LOT OF CELL TOWER ACTIVITY RELATIVE TO WHAT WE USED TO HAVE YEARS AGO.

I AM JUST WONDERING WITH THE CHANGES IN TECHNOLOGY AND THE SATURATION THAT MAY ALREADY BE OUT THERE IN TERMS OF HAVING AVAILABLE TOWER SPACE, I'M NOT SURE HOW MUCH WE'LL GET IN THE FUTURE.

MAYBE SOMEBODY IN HERE, LIKE LAURA OR SOMEBODY IN THE INDUSTRY WILL HAVE A BETTER ANSWER TO THAT THAN ME.

BUT REALLY, RELATIVELY SPEAKING, WE DON'T HAVE A LOT OF TOWER ACTIVITY LIKE WE USED TO.

SO IT MAY BE A LITTLE LATE TO CONSIDER SOMETHING LIKE THAT, BUT IF THERE'S A WAY TO DO THAT, THEN YOU COULD GET TOWERS IN AREAS THAT ARE ALREADY VISUALLY COMPROMISED.

I'M NOT SAYING ADDING TO THAT IS GOOD, BUT IT'S BETTER THAN INTRODUCING A TOWER IN AN AREA THAT DOESN'T HAVE THAT TYPE OF VISUAL --

>> MICHAEL.

>>MICHAEL ROTHENBURG: JOE, MIKE ROW THEN BURG.

YOU ALLUDED TO THIS, AND WE DISCUSSED IT BRIEFLY AT THE END OF THE LAST MEETING, AND THAT'S THE FACT THAT AN APPLICANT CAN COME IN FOR A VARIANCE AND, SAY, GET AN EXTRA 40 FEET OR SOMETHING, EXTRA HEIGHT ON A TOWER, AND AFTER THAT LONG-FOUGHT BATTLE, THEN THE APPLICANT CAN JUST GO TO THE ADMINISTRATOR AND GET THE 25-FOOT BUMP THAT IS ALLOWED BY THE ORDINANCE.

IT'S ONE I THINK REALLY OUGHT TO BE DONE BACKWARDS.

I THINK IF THEY WANT A VARIANCE TO 165 FEET, THAT'S WHAT YOU REQUEST.

IF YOU ARE ONLY BUILDING A 140-FOOT TOWER TODAY, THEN YOU CAN COME BACK IN AND ASK FOR THAT ADDITIONAL HEIGHT, BUT I THINK IT SHOULD BE GRANTED AS PART OF THE VARIANCE PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS BECAUSE, YOU KNOW, IT'S A HUGE DIFFERENTIAL.

FROM 100 FEET MAYBE IS A GIVEN, BUT THAT 40 FEET GOES THROUGH AN EXTENSIVE PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS, THEN ALL OF A SUDDEN THERE'S A 50% OR SO BUMP.

IT SEEMS LIKE IT'S -- WHILE I AGREE IT COULD ENCOURAGE COLLOCATION, COULD BE A VERY GOOD THING, IN SOME CASES, THAT'S THE PLAN TO START WITH, AND I THINK IT'S A MANIPULATION OF THAT PARTICULAR SECTION OF ORDINANCE THAT WE REALLY DIDN'T GET TO.

>>JOE MOREDA: IN CASES WHERE THERE'S A CONDITION IS WHEN

THESE APPLICANTS GO THROUGH THE SPECIAL USE PROCESS, THEY TYPICALLY EXIT WITH A CONDITION AND A SITE PLAN THAT SAYS THIS IS THE MAXIMUM HEIGHT.

IF SOMEBODY EXITS THAT PROCESS WITH A CONDITION THAT SAYS MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF 180 FEET, WE WON'T ALLOW THEM TO GO BEYOND THAT BECAUSE WE FEEL THAT THAT'S UNDERMINING THE HEARING PROCESS ITSELF.

NOW, THERE MAY BE OTHER CASES OUT THERE THAT MAY BE, YOU KNOW, AN ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL OR, YOU KNOW, IN A CASE -- I CAN'T THINK OF WHICH CASE THIS IS BECAUSE I HAVEN'T BEEN INVOLVED IN IT, BUT THERE MAY BE A CASE OUT THERE WHERE IT WOULD ALLOW THAT FLEXIBILITY BECAUSE THERE'S AN ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL IN PLACE, AND SOMEONE WANTS TO COLLOCATE.

WE HAVEN'T ALLOWED APPLICANTS TO GO PAST WHAT THEIR STATED HEIGHT -- CONDITION HEIGHT IS.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: LAURA BELFLOWER.

I THINK THAT'S AN IMPORTANT POINT.

THAT PROVISION WAS IN THERE TO ADDRESS EXISTING TOWERS, AND IT WAS PUT IN AT A TIME WHEN MOST OF THE TOWERS WERE EXISTING ONES BEFORE THE ORDINANCE WENT IN PLACE, SO IT ALLOWED THE REPLACEMENT OF OLDER TOWERS THAT WEREN'T DESIGNED FOR COLLOCATION TO ALLOW THEM TO INCREASE, AND AS JOE HAS INDICATED, IF A SPECIAL EXCEPTION WAS APPROVED, AND

IT SAYS THIS TOWER IS APPROVED FOR X NUMBER OF FEET, X NUMBER OF FEET IS ALL YOU ARE GOING TO GET UNLESS YOU GO BACK THROUGH THE PROCESS AGAIN.

SO THE BUMP YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT -- AND I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO MAKE A DIFFERENTIATION BETWEEN -- WELL, THAT'S THE WAY IT'S SUPPOSED TO WORK.

I AM NOT GOING TO SAY IT'S NEVER BEEN DONE THAT WAY.

I THINK THERE IS A DIFFERENTIAL BETWEEN A WAIVER AND VARIANCE, AND I AM USING THE TERM WAIVER IN THIS SENSE, WHERE IT'S NOT A VARIANCE IN THE SENSE THAT YOU'RE SAYING WE ARE GOING TO CHANGE THE REGULATIONS JUST FOR YOU.

IT'S A SITUATION WHERE IF YOU MEET IT, YOU GO THROUGH THIS PROCESS.

IF YOU DON'T MEET THAT BUT YOU MEET THESE OTHER CRITERIA, THEN YOU HAVE THIS OTHER OPTION.

SO IT'S AN ADDITIONAL LEVEL OF REVIEW CRITERIA I THINK IS THE WAY MOST OF THE WAIVERS ARE SET UP IN HERE.

AND I'M NOT SAYING THAT EVERY SINGLE WAIVER THAT IS IN HERE SHOULD BE IN HERE, GIVEN ESPECIALLY SOME OF THE CHANGES THAT HAVE BEEN MADE AND SOME OF THE WAY THE INDUSTRY HAS CHANGED AND ET CETERA, AND I THINK THAT WAS OUR ORIGINAL MOTION, THAT THEY NEED TO BE LOOKED AT AS A WHOLE.

SO WE ARE NOT REALLY TALKING ABOUT A VARIANCE PROCESS, WHICH IS THE SEVEN CRITERIA JOE WAS TALKING ABOUT.

IT'S A QUESTION OF WHAT CAN THE STAFF DO?

WHAT ADDITIONAL CRITERIA DO THEY HAVE TO JUDGE IT AGAINST?

ARE THOSE SUFFICIENT?

DOES IT GET BUMPED TO A LUHO LEVEL OR NOT?

THOSE KINDS OF ISSUES.

I THINK THAT'S SOMETHING STAFF HAS TO LOOK AT

COMPREHENSIVELY WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT COMMITTEE IS

SAYING HEY, WE HAVE THESE CONCERNS.

STAFF, WE WANT CLEAR RULES THAT YOU CAN ADMINISTER AND THAT

WE KNOW THE RULES, BOTH THE INDUSTRY AND THE OPPOSITION

KNOWS WHAT THE RULES ARE.

THAT'S WHAT MY UNDERSTANDING THE DIRECTIVE WE HAD GIVEN ON

THE MOTION WAS.

>>JOE MOREDA: I THINK THAT'S GOOD.

I THINK THAT'S WHERE WE WANT TO BE.

WE WANT TO UNDERSTAND AND FEEL COMFORTABLE WITH THE AMOUNT
OF DISCRETION WE HAVE.

WE DON'T WANT TO BE IN A PICKLE TRYING TO FIGURE OUT IS
THIS EXCEEDING OR UNDERMINING THE PROCESS OR EXCEEDING OUR
CAPACITY.

BUT I THINK THAT GETTING BACK TO, MICHAEL, YOUR COMMENT

ABOUT GETTING PAST THE TOWER, THE ONES THAT MAY HAVE BEEN

ALLOWED TO GO PAST THAT, I THINK WERE PROBABLY IN THE

CATEGORY THAT LAURA WAS SPEAKING OF BECAUSE THERE WERE A

LOT OF TOWERS THAT WERE EXISTING BEFORE WE ACTUALLY GOT INTO HAVING AN ORDINANCE, AND AGAIN, IF THAT'S THE CASE, WHERE SOMEBODY WANTS TO COME IN, MAYBE THE TOWER IS EXISTING, THERE WAS NO CONDITION, IT WAS BUILT AT 160, BUT THEY WANT TO GO TO 180, AND IT'S ALREADY AN AREA THAT'S -- THAT IS EXPECTED TO HAVE THAT TOWER, AT LEAST VISUALLY, PEOPLE ARE USED TO SEEING IT, FOR ANOTHER 20 FEET, YOU ARE AVOIDING A NEW TOWER IN AN AREA WHERE THERE IS NO TOWER. SO AT SOME POINT ALONG THE WAY, IT WAS DECIDED ON BALANCE THAT'S A BETTER WAY OF DEALING IT RATHER THAN TRYING TO ENCOURAGE PEOPLE TO GO OUT AND BUILD NEW TOWERS.

>> I THINK THAT'S PROBABLY THE CASE IN MOST PARTICULAR SITUATIONS.

THE ONE I WAS REFERRING TO WAS CIMINO ELEMENTARY, WHERE IT WAS VERY CONTROVERSIAL.

CERTAINLY AS MUCH AS YOU CAN POSSIBLY MINIMIZE THE IMPACT OR MINIMIZE THE OVERALL APPLICATION CONCERN, THAT WOULD BE THE INTENT OF THE APPLICANT.

BUT IN THAT CASE, AS SOON AS THE TOWER WAS BUILT, THE EXTRA 25 FEET CAME ON --

>> WAS THAT ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL?

>> IT WAS.

IT WAS.

THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT HAPPENED.

I REMEMBER THIS CASE, ACTUALLY, VERY WELL BECAUSE THERE WAS A VERY CONCERN AND UPSET GROUP OF PARENTS AND NEIGHBORS, AND WHAT HAPPENED WAS THEY PUT A SIGN UP THAT SAID THEY WERE GOING TO HAVE A PUBLIC HEARING BECAUSE THEY WANTED, LIKE, A 140-FOOT TOWER.

ALL THE NEIGHBORHOODS, PARENTS CAME OUT AND SAID WE ARE GOING TO COME, THEY GOT ORGANIZED, THEN WHOEVER APPLIED FOR IT SAID OH, WELL, NEVER MIND.

WE DON'T WANT THAT TOWER TO BE THAT HIGH.

SO THEY LOWERED IT TO A HEIGHT THAT DIDN'T REQUIRE A PUBLIC HEARING.

SO THEY DIDN'T HAVE THE PUBLIC HEARING.

THEN SIX MONTHS LATER, THEY APPLIED FOR THE EXTENSION AND GOT THE EXTENSION.

AND IT WAS APPROVED.

>>JOE MOREDA: I THINK THAT THAT MAY HAVE BEEN THE CASE THAT LED TO THE ORDINANCE GETTING CHANGED, AND I BELIEVE NOW, ON SCHOOL SITES -- EVERY SCHOOL SITE THAT SEEKS TO LOCATE A TOWER ON THERE HAS TO GO THROUGH A SPECIAL USE PUBLIC NOTICE HEARING.

I BELIEVE THAT AT ONE TIME IT USED TO BE A PUBLIC HEARING, AND THEN THE ORDINANCE WAS CHANGED TO CREATE A CATEGORY WHERE THEY COULD BE ADMINISTRATIVE, AND THEN YOU KNOW, I THINK CIMINO MIGHT HAVE BEEN THE FIRST AND ONLY CASE THAT

DID THAT.

THEN BECAUSE OF ALL THE INTEREST IN THAT CASE, THE
ORDINANCE WAS THEN REVISITED AND CHANGED AGAIN.

AT LEAST IN TERMS OF INPUT, I THINK THAT WOULD REQUIRE A
PUBLIC HEARING IF IT WERE DONE TODAY, AND OBVIOUSLY, IN
THAT PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS, IF THERE WAS A HEIGHT
ESTABLISHED, WE WOULD NOT ALLOW ADDITIONAL HEIGHT WITHOUT
GOING BACK TO THE PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS TO REVISE THAT
CONDITION.

>>LEE VAUGHAN: LEE VAUGHAN.

A COUPLE OF POINTS OF CLARIFICATION.

IN THE APPLICATION -- A COUPLE OF POINTS I WAS REFERRING TO
EARLIER.

IN THE APPLICATION, IT SAID THERE WAS A COMPLETE LINE OF
TREES ALL THE WAY ACROSS THE BACK OF THE LOCAL RESIDENCE TO
THAT TOWER, AND THERE WASN'T.

THERE WAS ONLY ABOUT A 25% LINE OF TREES ACROSS OUR
PARTICULAR BACK YARD OF OUR FENCE.

SO I WOULD JUST -- IF YOU REQUIRE A SITE VISIT, A MANDATORY
SITE VISIT, WE THINK THAT MAYBE WHAT HAPPENED WAS SOMEBODY
TOOK A LOOK AT THE AERIAL VIEW AND THE SHADOWING FROM THOSE
TREES, MADE IT LOOK LIKE THEY WERE ALL THE WAY ACROSS, BUT
IT LOOKED LIKE NOBODY HAD COME OUT AND DID A PHYSICAL
INSPECTION.

>>JOE MOREDA: WHEN YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT THE APPLICATION, WAS THERE ANYTHING WAIVED AT THE PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS WITH RESPECT TO SCREEN?

BECAUSE TYPICALLY, WHERE THE SCREEN'S GOING TO BE REVIEWED -- REQUIRED, DETERMINED AMOUNT OF SCREENING, THEN REQUIRED AND INSPECTED, IS AT SITE DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION, AND YOU KNOW, IF SOMEBODY ATTESTS TO THAT, THEN THERE SHOULD BE SOMETHING IN THE FIELD THAT SOMEONE CAN REVIEW THAT WOULD ATTEST TO THE APPROPRIATE AMOUNT OF OPACITY AND HEIGHT AND EVERYTHING ELSE THAT'S REQUIRED IN THE SCREENING.

IF THAT WASN'T THERE, THEN THAT'S UNFORTUNATE BECAUSE WE CAN EVEN --

ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THIS CASE AT ALL?

IT GOT DENIED?

THE CASE GOT DENIED?

>> NO.

IT WAS -- IT WAS -- SO THE TOWER WAS DENIED.

IT WAS DENIED.

BUT IN THE ORIGINAL APPLICATION PROCESS, THE SCREENING WAS DETERMINED SUFFICIENT BECAUSE THERE WAS A REPORTED LINE OF TREES ACROSS THE ENTIRE BACK OF THE RESIDENCE WHICH DIDN'T EXIST.

>>JOE MOREDA: BUT THAT WOULD BE AT THE PUBLIC HEARING, MY

UNDERSTANDING THE WAY YOU ARE EXPLAINING IT.

THEY WOULD HAVE ASSERTED IT EXISTS.

BUT WHEN THEY GOT INTO PERMITTING, WHICH WOULD BE SITE DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION, THEN THAT'S WHERE THAT WOULD BE VERIFIED AND THE OPACITY AND HEIGHT CHECKED.

I'M NOT SAYING THAT THERE WASN'T A MISTAKE IN THAT CASE, BUT THAT'S THE WAY IT'S SUPPOSED TO WORK, UNLESS -- UNLESS THEY WERE MAKING A CLAIM THAT THEY WANTED TO GET THEIR APPLICATION OUT OF THE REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE SCREENING BECAUSE IT EXISTED ALREADY AND GET A SPECIFIC CONDITION TO STATE THAT.

TYPICALLY WHAT HAPPENS IS THESE CASES EXIT THE PROCESS AND HAVE TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE CODE, AND ONE OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE CODE IS YOU HAVE TO SCREEN AGAINST RESIDENTIAL, AND THIS IS THE TYPE OF SCREENING YOU HAVE TO PRODUCE, AND THIS IS THE TYPE OF BUFFERING YOU HAVE TO HAVE.

>>DENISE VERRILL: DENISE VERRILL.

THE SCREENING THAT IS IN THE CODE IS AROUND THE BASE STATION.

I THINK THAT WHAT LEE IS SPEAKING ABOUT IS NEIGHBORHOOD SCREENING.

I WAS INVOLVED IN AN INSTANCE WHERE THERE WAS TWO TREES, ONE BEING ON THE PROPERTY OF THE OPPONENT, AND THE OTHER

BEING ON THE SITE, AND THE STAFF DEEMED THAT WAS SUFFICIENT SCREENING FOR THE IMMEDIATE NEIGHBOR TO BE SHIELDED FROM THE -- FROM THE TOWER, THE TWO TREES.

ONE WAS HER TREE, SO SHE COULD NEVER -- IT WAS A VERY OLD TREE, SO IF IT EVER FELL OR SHE NEEDED TO REPLACE IT WITH A YOUNGER TREE, THEN THERE WOULD BE NO SCREENING, REALLY.

SO I GUESS WE'RE ASKING -- I THINK THIS WAS DONE EARLIER, THAT THERE WERE SUGGESTIONS TO INCREASE SCREENING AND THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THAT.

>>JOE MOREDA: WELL, I KNOW THAT THE TOP OF THIS TABLE IS SUPPOSED TO SAY A TEN-ACRE SITE, AND THERE'S A HALF-ACRE SITE, THE CELL PHONE IS, THE CELL TOWER SITE.

THEN THE BASE OF THAT AREA IS WHAT'S SCREENED.

I MEAN, BECAUSE TO DO -- THE ALTERNATIVE WOULD BE TO REQUIRE SOMEBODY TO SCREEN THE ENTIRE PROPERTY LINE OF TEN ACRES.

SO THERE GETS TO BE A BALANCING ACT THERE TO WHETHER OR NOT THERE'S AN APPROPRIATE NEXUS TO MAKE SOMEBODY SCREEN AROUND THE PERIMETER OF A TEN-ACRE SITE VERSUS THE BASE OF THE TOWER, WHICH IS REALLY WHERE THE VISUAL ELEMENT THAT WE'RE TRYING TO SCREEN EXISTS.

THAT'S THE WAY OUR CODE WORKS.

I MEAN, THERE'S AN OPPORTUNITY TO ALWAYS REVISIT AND CHANGE THAT, BUT YOU KNOW, THE ALTERNATIVE IS THAT THERE'S GOING

TO BE, YOU KNOW, AN EXTRAORDINARY AMOUNT OF SCREENING THAT MAY NOT ACHIEVE MUCH MORE THAN A SMALL AMOUNT OF SCREENING WOULD, AND THERE HAS TO BE AN ON-BALANCE DECISION THAT THAT'S THE APPROPRIATE RECOMMENDATION IN THOSE TYPES OF CASES.

>>DENISE VERRILL: DENISE VERRILL.

OUR EXPERIENCE IS THAT IN THE APPLICATIONS, THE APPLICANTS OFTEN MENTION SCREENING, AND THAT IT'S SUFFICIENT.

AND THEN THE CITIZENS' RESPONSE IS WELL, I GOT ONE TREE.

HOW IS THAT SUFFICIENT TO BLOCK A 160-FOOT TOWER?

SO THERE'S WHERE THE DISCREPANCY IS.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: THIS IS LAURA BELFLOWER, AND I THINK THAT'S EXACTLY THE ISSUE.

WHAT YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT IS WHAT THE APPLICANT IS TRYING TO PUT FORWARD AS TO JUSTIFICATION WHY THIS IS AESTHETICALLY APPROPRIATE AND WHY YOU DON'T NEED TO WORRY ABOUT IT, BECAUSE THERE'S TREES IN THE FOREGROUND, AS OPPOSED TO WHAT DOES THE CODE REQUIRE THAT THERE BE THERE, AND THERE'S TWO DIFFERENT THINGS.

I MEAN, THE SCREENING AROUND THE BASE OF THE TOWER IS ONE THING.

THE APPLICANT COMING IN AND SAYING THERE ARE TREES ACROSS THE WHOLE BACK HERE, AND THAT'S OUR JUSTIFICATION, THEY'RE NOT GOING TO BE ABLE TO SEE IT SO YOU DON'T NEED TO WORRY

ABOUT AESTHETICS, FOR JUST GETTING IT APPROVED, NOT FOR ANY KIND OF WAIVER OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT, THAT'S WHERE THE NEIGHBORS COME IN AND SAY NO, THERE'S NOT SCREENING ACROSS THE ENTIRE BACK OF IT.

SO WE WILL BE ABLE TO SEE IT, SO YOU CAN'T MAKE THAT ARGUMENT THAT IT'S AESTHETICALLY INVISIBLE TO US BECAUSE IT'S NOT.

NOW, THAT DOESN'T MEAN IT SHOULD AUTOMATICALLY BE DENIED BECAUSE THAT'S NOT A REQUIREMENT.

SO I THINK IT'S A QUESTION OF THE TRUTHFULNESS OR THE ACCURACY OF THE STATEMENTS THAT ARE BEING MADE BY THE APPLICANT, AND THAT'S A PROBLEM WITH ANY KIND OF APPLICATION IS SOMEBODY'S NOT GOING TO LAY IT OUT STRAIGHT, WHETHER YOU ARE FOR IT OR AGAINST IT, IF IT'S NOT GOING TO BE TRUTHFUL, THAT HAS TO BE VETTED OUT BEST IT CAN BE.

>>DENISE VERRILL: WELL, AND AGAIN, IT BRINGS US TO REASONABLE EVIDENCE OF, YOU KNOW --

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: COMPETENT, SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE.

>>DENISE VERRILL: THANK YOU.

I DON'T DO THIS ON A REGULAR BASIS.

>>LISA WILLIAMS: LISA WILLIAMS.

I HAVE THREE OR FOUR IDEAS.

INSTEAD OF PRESENTING IT NOW, HOW DO I GET MY INFORMATION TO YOU?

DO YOU WANT SOME EMAILS?

IS THAT WHAT OUR DECISION WAS GOING TO BE?

WE ARE GOING TO EMAIL OUR IDEAS?

DO YOU WANT US TO GET THEM TO YOU, TO THE COMMISSIONERS,
EVERYBODY?

WHAT DO YOU GUYS WANT US TO DO?

WE DON'T WANT TO OVERWHELM STAFF.

>>JOE MOREDA: ONCE THE COMMITTEE IS DISBANDED, I MEAN, YOU
ARE FREE TO ACT ON YOUR OWN HOWEVER YOU FEEL IS MOST
APPROPRIATE.

>> OVERWHELMING STAFF IS OKAY, IS THAT WHAT YOU ARE SAYING?

>>JOE MOREDA: YOU CAN OVERWHELM STAFF.

WE'RE USED TO THAT.

BUT IT'S ONE OF THOSE THINGS THAT WE WOULD REVIEW IT AS
PART OF THIS AS WELL.

I THINK A LOT OF WEIGHT IS GOING TO BE PLACED ON THE
REPORT, THOUGH, BECAUSE OBVIOUSLY, THERE'S BEEN A LOT OF
EMPHASIS AND TIME GIVEN TO THE LABOR THAT THIS COMMITTEE'S
PUT INTO THIS, AND SO I MEAN, THERE'S ALWAYS ROOM TO
CONSIDER ALTERNATIVE OPINIONS, BUT BY THE SAME TOKEN,
THERE'S BEEN A LOT OF TIME AND EFFORT PUT INTO THIS
COMMITTEE FOR THE PURPOSE OF MAKING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE
COUNTY ADMINISTRATION AND THE BOARD AS TO WHAT THE KEY
POINTS FOR EDITS TO THE ORDINANCE WOULD BE.

SO YEAH, I MEAN, YOU CAN -- YOU CAN SUBMIT YOUR -- YOU KNOW, YOUR IDEAS TO ME, TO STAFF, WHATEVER YOU FEEL IS APPROPRIATE, AND WE'LL TAKE A LOOK AT THEM ALONG WITH WHATEVER COMES OUT OF THE REPORT.

JUST SO YOU KNOW, BY THE WAY, TOO -- THIS DOESN'T NECESSARILY ANSWER THAT QUESTION, BUT THERE'S BEEN A LOT OF QUESTIONS ABOUT NOTICE.

THERE WAS ONE CHANGE WITH THE NOTICE IN CELL TOWERS A FEW YEARS AGO, AND IT ACTUALLY AFFECTED THE NOTICE REQUIREMENTS IN THE ENTIRE CODE BECAUSE THERE WAS A CELL TOWER THAT PEOPLE WERE UPSET ABOUT WHEN IT GOT CONSTRUCTED BECAUSE THEY DIDN'T KNOW IT WAS GOING TO BE THERE.

THE ISSUE WAS IT WAS NOTICED WHEN -- IT WAS NOTICED BEFORE PEOPLE MOVED INTO THE AREA, SO IT WAS NOTICED APPROPRIATELY, AND THAT TRIGGERED SOME CHANGE TO THE CODE. I THINK THAT AND ALSO THE CAMOUFLAGE CHANGES, YOU KNOW, WE USED TO GET A LOT OF COMPLAINTS ABOUT THE CELL TOWER ORDINANCE, ABOUT THE CELL TOWERS BEING UGLY.

I'LL BE HONEST WITH YOU, SINCE THE CAMOUFLAGE REQUIREMENTS WERE PUT IN PLACE, A LOT OF THAT SEEMED TO GO AWAY.

SO I MEAN, I'M NOT TRYING TO TOOT OUR OWN HORN OR ANYTHING, BUT YOU KNOW, IT SEEMED LIKE THEY WENT AWAY FOR A WHILE, AND THEN REALLY, WHEN THIS ALL KIND OF CAME BACK AND CAME TO A HEAD AGAIN WAS WHEN I BELIEVE IT WAS THE CIMINO

ELEMENTARY CASE CAME UP, AND I BELIEVE THERE MAY HAVE BEEN ANOTHER ONE IN THE CITY, COLEMAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT, AND IT SEEMED LIKE THEY WERE COMING TOGETHER ALL AT THE SAME TIME, AND THERE SEEMED TO BE A LOT OF MOMENTUM BUILDING ABOUT CHANGING THE ORDINANCE AGAIN. RECENTLY, THE TWO CHANGES WE HAD THAT PEOPLE SEEMED TO BE SATISFIED WITH WERE THE ONE I WAS TALKING TO ABOUT THE NOTICE, AND ALSO THE CAMOUFLAGE.

BUT I'VE SAID A LOT OF STUFF.

IF ANYBODY DOESN'T HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, I'M DONE.

IF YOU DO, I'LL STAY AS LONG AS YOU WANT.

>> JUST ONE MORE.

THIS IS KIND OF OFF.

I REMEMBER READING THAT THERE IS A TIME OR A -- I THINK IT'S WHAT?

45 DAYS THAT YOU GUYS HAVE TO PROCESS OR LOOK AT THIS, EACH TOWER?

DO YOU FEEL OVERWHELMED AND RUSHED, LIKE THAT'S NOT ENOUGH TIME?

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: IT'S 90 DAYS FOR TOWERS.

>> IS IT 90?

SO FROM THE DATE OF THE APPLICATION --

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: THE APPLICATION IS COMPLETE.

>> OH, COMPLETE, NOT FILED?

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: NOT FILED, BUT IT HAS TO BE FOUND COMPLETE, READY FOR PROCESSING.

>> WHEN IT'S ACTUALLY COMPLETE AND YOU HAVE ALL THE DOCUMENTATION, THAT STARTS THE CLOCK FOR 90 DAYS? IS THAT RIGHT?

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: 90 BUSINESS DAYS.

>>JOE MOREDA: WE HAVE TO INFORM THEM WITHIN 90 DAYS IF THE APPLICATION IS SUFFICIENT.

AFTER THAT, WE SHOULDN'T BE SENDING THEM NOTICES SAYING YOU NEED TO GIVE US THIS OR THAT'S INSUFFICIENT.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: IT'S 20 BUSINESS DAYS TO FIND IT COMPLETE, THEN THE FINAL DECISION HAS TO BE WITHIN 90 BUSINESS DAYS.

18 WEEKS.

>> OKAY.

SO 90 BUSINESS DAYS IS WHEN THEY HAVE TO MAKE A DECISION WHETHER THEY APPROVE IT OR DENY IT.

YOUR STAFF, IS THAT OVERWHELMING TO YOU TO HAVE THAT KIND OF A TIME RESTRAINT ON YOU AT ALL?

>>JOE MOREDA: THAT HASN'T BEEN AS MUCH A PROBLEM AS HAVING STANDARDS IN THE CODE THAT LAND USE PLANNERS ARE NOT CAPABLE OF, YOU KNOW, APPLYING.

>> MAYBE IT'S NOT CRYSTAL CLEAR FOR THEM.

>>JOE MOREDA: WELL, I MEAN --

>> PERSONAL OPINION?

>>JOE MOREDA: WHEN YOU GET INTO THINGS LIKE IF THERE'S STRUCTURAL CAPACITY, IF THERE'S AVAILABLE TOWERS FOR COLLOCATION, AND THEN, YOU KNOW, YOU HAVE ENGINEERS THAT ATTEST THAT THERE ISN'T, AND THEN FOLKS WANT TO CHALLENGE THAT, AND WE AS STAFF, HOW MUCH IS ENOUGH, AND HOW MUCH IS TOO LITTLE?

AND THAT'S WHAT I'M SAYING, WHERE WE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE MORE CLARIFICATION IN TERMS OF WHAT THE RULES ARE, THAT WAY EVERYBODY IS ON THE SAME PLAYING FIELD, AND WHETHER IT'S A GOOD IDEA OR A BAD IDEA.

WE MAY NOT ALWAYS AGREE, BUT WE KNOW WHAT THE SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS ARE.

WE KNOW WHAT'S GOING TO BE REVIEWED.

WHEN YOU COME LOOK AT THE FILE, YOU CAN LOOK AT IT, SEE WHERE WE'RE AT, AND YOU CAN AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH IT, BUT YOU KNOW IT'S SUFFICIENT AND MEETS THE MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS, AT LEAST, FOR SUBMITTAL.

RIGHT NOW, THAT DOESN'T SEEM TO BE TOTALLY CLEAR.

SOMETIMES YOU SEE THESE ONE-PAGE -- EXCUSE ME -- ONE-SENTENCE LETTERS SAYING YEAH, THE TOWER IS NEEDED TO COMPLETE OUR SERVICE AREA.

SO THE GUT FEELING IS THAT'S NOT ENOUGH, BUT THEN WHAT IS? SO SOMEWHERE IN THE MIDDLE THERE, YOU KNOW, HOPEFULLY

THERE'S SOMETHING THAT WOULD BE SUFFICIENT.

>> OKAY.

THANKS.

>> JOE, THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PRESENTATION AND FOR ENTERTAINING OUR QUESTIONS.

I DO WANT TO PUT YOU ON THE SPOT BEFORE YOU LEAVE, AND THAT IS A RESOLUTION FOR -- WE ADVISE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS TO DIRECT STAFF TO LOOK AT THE QUESTION OF HOW THE PROVISIONS OF GOVERNING CELL TOWERS ARE WAIVED AND VARIED AND HOW VARIANCES ARE GRANTED RELATIVE TO HOW OTHER USES ARE TREATED; IN SHORT, TO SCRUTINIZE THE ISSUES OF WAIVERS/VARIANCES TO CELL PHONE TOWER REGULATIONS WHICH WE DISCUSSED.

OUR LAST ITEM ON THE AGENDA TODAY INCLUDES RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE WORK ON CELLULAR COMMUNICATIONS POLICY.

SO THERE IS A POSSIBILITY THAT THIS COMMITTEE MIGHT WANT TO SAY YES, WE DIRECT THE BOARD TO CONTINUE, DIRECT THE STAFF TO DO THIS.

MY QUESTION TO YOU IS DO YOU THINK AT THIS POINT YOU HAVE RECEIVED ENOUGH CITIZEN INPUT TO GO FORWARD ON THIS, OR DO YOU THINK THIS COMMITTEE MIGHT NEED TO RECOMMEND THAT YOU HAVE ACCESS TO FUTURE CITIZEN INPUT, HOWEVER IT COMES?

>>JOE MOREDA: I THINK THEY COULD RECOMMEND HOWEVER THEY SEE FIT AS PART OF THIS PROCESS.

THERE WILL BE -- IF WE CHANGE A CODE, THERE WILL BE A PUBLIC PROCESS BECAUSE TO EDIT THE CODE, THERE'S A WORKSHOP THAT'S REQUIRED AS PART OF OUR PROCESS WITH CITIZENS -- ONE WORKSHOP, BUT THERE'S A WORKSHOP REQUIRED TO HAVE THE CITIZENS AND INDUSTRY, AND THAT'S ALL BLENDED INTO ONE, AND THERE'S A WORKSHOP WITH THE BOARD THAT'S TYPICALLY BETWEEN STAFF AND THE BOARD, BUT SOMETIMES PEOPLE ATTEND.

AND THEN THERE'S A WORKSHOP WITH THE PLANNING COMMISSION.

THEN THERE'S A PUBLIC HEARING WITH THE BOARD.

THEN THERE'S A PUBLIC MEETING WITH THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR A CONSISTENCY FINDING WITH THE COMP PLAN.

THEN THERE'S A SECOND PUBLIC HEARING WITH THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS.

AT THE SECOND PUBLIC HEARING, THEN THE BOARD WOULD MAKE THE DECISION TO EITHER MOVE IT UP OR DOWN OR SEND IT BACK FOR FURTHER STUDY, WHATEVER THEY FELT IS APPROPRIATE.

SO I BELIEVE THAT THERE WILL BE, YOU KNOW, SUFFICIENT AVENUES FOR INPUT IF THIS DOES REACH THE CODE AMENDMENT PROCESS.

I DON'T WANT TO INFLUENCE THE COMMITTEE ONE WAY OR THE OTHER WHETHER OR NOT THEY SHOULD MAKE A RECOMMENDATION IF THERE SHOULD BE MORE PUBLIC INPUT.

I MEAN, THE MORE INPUT, THE MORE INCLUSION THERE IS, I

MEAN, I THINK THE BETTER CHANCE YOU HAVE FOR SUCCESS.

YOU KNOW, AS LONG AS PEOPLE ARE WILLING TO, YOU KNOW, GIVE UP A LITTLE TO GET A LITTLE.

I MEAN, OBVIOUSLY, IF EVERYBODY IS GOING TO, YOU KNOW, RETREAT, YOU KNOW, ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE LINE AND JUST, YOU KNOW, TRY TO MOVE WHATEVER THEIR OWN PARTICULAR AGENDA IS, THEN THAT'S GOING TO BE A PROBLEM, BUT I DON'T THINK THAT'S GOING TO NECESSARILY BE THE CASE.

I MEAN, I'VE SEEN, YOU KNOW, PEOPLE IN HERE COMPROMISE ON THINGS AS WELL, AND I BELIEVE THERE'S -- OBVIOUSLY, PEOPLE HAVE COMPETING INTERESTS IN HERE, BUT THEY WERE STILL ABLE TO COME UP WITH SOME COMPROMISE.

SO I DON'T KNOW HOW YOU WANT TO HANDLE THAT.

THE MORE INPUT WE GET, THE BETTER.

AND YOU KNOW, ESPECIALLY IF IT'S A TYPE OF INPUT WHERE PEOPLE ARE TRULY TRYING TO MAKE SOMETHING BETTER WITHIN OUR ABILITY TO DO THAT LEGALLY AS OPPOSED TO JUST GETTING ON A POLAR SIDE AND SAYING I'M NOT GOING TO DO ANYTHING BUT WHAT OUR AGENDA SUGGESTS SHOULD BE DONE.

SO THAT MAY GIVE YOU MORE OF AN ANSWER THAN YOU WANT.

>> I WANT TO ACKNOWLEDGE HOW MUCH WORK THIS HAS BEEN FOR JOE AND HOW MUCH HE'S DONE THAT YOU HAVE NOT SEEN FOR ALMOST A YEAR, AND IT SOUNDS LIKE THIS PROCESS YOU SKETCHED OUT, IT'S ONLY BEGINNING IN TERMS OF THE AMOUNT OF WORK YOU

WILL GO DO, SO THANK YOU FOR THAT.

>>JOE MOREDA: THANK YOU, AND YOU KNOW, I THINK THAT THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR, MIKE MERRILL, SHOWED A LOT OF SENSITIVITY TO THE ISSUE IN CRAFTING THE COMMITTEE, AND I ALSO HAD A LOT OF HELP FROM BRIAN GRADY AND ADAM GORMLY IN LEGAL AND, YOU KNOW, ADAM ATTENDED ALL THESE AS WELL, SO I THINK IT'S BEEN A GOOD EFFORT, AND I REALLY COMMEND YOU ALL FOR THE TIME THAT YOU'VE PUT INTO THIS AND THE PASSION THAT YOU'VE SHOWN.

SO YOU KNOW, IT'S BEEN NICE WORKING WITH YOU ALL, AND I'M SURE WE'LL SEE A LOT MORE OF EACH OTHER.

>> THANK YOU, AND WE THANK ALL THE STAFF AS WELL.

THANK YOU.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: ABSOLUTELY.

>> THERE'S ONE ISSUE HERE RELEVANT TO CONTINUED CITIZEN INPUT --

>> AND DAVID.

>> THAT'S RIGHT.

RELEVANT TO CITIZEN INPUT.

ON THE STATEMENT, WHAT WE AGREED TO ORIGINALLY IN TERMS OF OUTCOMES FOR THE COMMITTEE, IF YOU LOOK AT THE LAST PAGE, WE ARGUED A BIT ON THE FIRST NIGHT WHETHER WE WANTED TO CALL THESE MINORITY NOTES, THEN SAID WE DIDN'T, THEN WE KEPT CALLING THEM THAT.

SO WE CHANGED IT TO REPORTS OF CONCERN.

WE LEFT THE POSSIBILITY THERE OF PEOPLE IN GROUPS DOING THAT SO LONG AS THEY OBEYED THE SUNSHINE RULES.

THAT'S NOT HAPPENED.

HOWEVER, IT IS POSSIBLE FOR YOU, AS INDIVIDUALS, TO MAKE YOUR EXPRESSIONS OF CONCERN FOR ONE OR ANOTHER AREA, MORE STANDARDS, GREATER REVIEW, GREATER CLARITY, WHATEVER IT HAPPENS TO BE, THAT YOU FEEL THAT YOU WANT TO ATTACH TO THE FINAL REPORT.

SO IT SEEMS TO ME THAT IF -- WHAT IT SAYS HERE, THAT THE RULES WE AGREED TO, THEY WOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE, AND THAT IT WOULD CONTAIN YOUR NAME AND SIGNATURE, EVEN THOUGH THAT MAY NOT NECESSARILY BE REQUIRED.

SO IF YOU SUBMIT IN A REASONABLE AMOUNT OF TIME AN INDIVIDUAL REPORT -- IN OTHER WORDS, WHAT WOULD YOU LIKE TO EXPRESS ABOUT THE PROCESS AND ISSUES THAT WERE LEFT UNRESOLVED OR RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION, AS JOE SAID, I GUESS YOU CAN EMAIL HIM AT ANY TIME, BUT IF YOU WANT TO MAKE THAT PART OF THIS PACKAGE, I WOULD SAY WITHIN TEN DAYS.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: LAURA BELFLOWER.

IT SOUNDS LIKE -- ALMOST LIKE TWO POINTS.

LET ME ASK IT THAT WAY.

ONE IS THE MEMBER REPORT OR MINORITY REPORT, WHATEVER WE ARE CALLING IT.

I THINK MEMBER REPORT MIGHT BE MORE ACCURATE.

WHICH WOULD BE REFERENCING WHAT THE COMMITTEE HAS DONE AND THE EFFORTS OF THE COMMITTEE AND YOUR THOUGHTS ON THE -- THE INDIVIDUAL THOUGHTS ON WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN MORE, SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE DIFFERENTLY.

AND THEN THERE'S, AS INDIVIDUALS, CITIZENS SENDING THE COMMENTS ON OTHER CHANGES OR OTHER THOUGHTS OR OTHER IDEAS, ARE THOSE NOT TWO DIFFERENT THINGS?

BECAUSE IF ONE IS A REPORT THAT'S TO BE ATTACHED WITH A FINAL REPORT, THIS IS SAYING I, AS A MEMBER, HAVE THESE THOUGHTS ON WHAT THE COMMITTEE DID OR DIDN'T DO OR THESE THINGS I WISH WE HAD GOTTEN INTO, YES, MAYBE THEY'RE ARE AREAS WE TOUCHED ON BRIEFLY BUT DIDN'T GET INTO THAT REALLY SHOULD HAVE OR WHATEVER.

BUT IN TERMS OF THE THOUGHTS THAT MIGHT GO BEYOND WHAT THE COMMITTEE DID OR WHATEVER, WOULD THAT GO IN A MEMBER REPORT, OR WOULD THAT GO AS AN INDIVIDUAL EMAIL TO --

>> I SUPPOSE POTENTIALLY THEY ARE DIFFERENT THINGS, BUT NOT NECESSARILY DIFFERENT THINGS.

IN OTHER WORDS, THE SCOPE OF THE COMMITTEE WERE ALL OF THE ISSUES IN THE THREE AREAS OF CONCERN WE IDENTIFIED, WHICH I THINK PRETTY WELL EXHAUSTS THE TOPICS.

SO I'M -- THERE MAY BE SPECIFIC PROPOSALS OR ISSUES THAT WERE OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE COMMITTEE CONVERSATION, AND MAYBE THOSE ARE NOT APPROPRIATE, BUT I WOULD THINK YOUR DESCRIPTION OF EITHER REFLECTIONS ON THE PROCESS OF THE COMMITTEE, WHAT WE DID NOT ATTEND TO SUFFICIENTLY, OR PARTICULAR ISSUES THAT YOU FEEL SHOULD BE LOOKED AT IN GREATER DEPTH, WHICH TWO OR THREE HAVE BEEN EXPRESSED HERE TONIGHT, WOULD BE APPROPRIATE TO THE REPORT, TO AN INDIVIDUAL ATTACHMENT.

DOES THAT AGREE WITH YOUR UNDERSTANDING?

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: I'M JUST SAYING MAKING COMMENTS AS A COMMITTEE MEMBER VERSUS MAKING COMMENTS AS LAURA BELFLOWER, CITIZEN.

YOU KNOW?

>> WELL, AT THIS POINT, YOU WILL BE FORMER COMMITTEE MEMBER AND CITIZEN, BUT THE FORMER COMMITTEE GETS YOU ON THE REPORT.

BUT THE FACT I THINK IT'S AN INDIVIDUAL -- YOU KNOW, THE LANGUAGE WE HAVE IN OUR DOCUMENT IS REPORT OF CONCERN.

YOU SAID MEMBER REPORT.

I THINK MAYBE WHAT WE COULD TALK ABOUT IS WHAT WE OFFICIALLY WANT TO CALL THEM.

I THINK AT THIS POINT, BECAUSE WE'RE NOT IN THE SUNSHINE, AND BECAUSE YOU ARE NOT -- YOU ARE A CITIZEN AT THIS POINT,

I THINK ANYBODY CAN WRITE WHATEVER THEY WANT.

THAT WOULD BE WHAT I SAY.

AND THAT WE GIVE YOU A PAGE LIMIT OF TWO PAGES OR SOMETHING
LIKE THAT, AND THAT --

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: PLEASE DON'T DO THAT.

[LAUGHTER]

I HAVE MUCH MORE TO SAY THAN TWO PAGES.

>> THAT WE HAVE A PAGE LIMIT.

IT'S CLEARLY INCLUDED AS AN APPENDIX.

YOU KNOW, WE DID NOT HAVE -- I THINK ORIGINALLY WE WERE
TALKING ABOUT SHARING THIS AND ALL OF THAT.

WE WERE ASSUMING WE COULD DO IN THE SUNSHINE.

OBVIOUSLY, WE'VE RUN OUT OF TIME TO DO THAT.

SO MY RECOMMENDATION WOULD BE A REPORT, THREE PAGES LIMIT -
- AND IT'S OPTIONAL -- AND THAT -- TEN DAYS, IS THAT ENOUGH
TIME?

>> I GUESS IF YOU HAVE A LONGER DOCUMENT YOU WANT TO
SUBMIT, YOU CAN REFERENCE IT IN YOUR REPORT AND SUBMIT IT
AS A CONCERNED CITIZEN ANYTIME YOU WANT TO.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: I GUESS THE QUESTION IS WHAT IS THE
POINT OF THE REPORT?

AND AS CITIZENS, WE CAN ALL SAY WHATEVER WE WANT TO AND
SUBMIT IT, AND IT HAS THE WEIGHT OF A CITIZEN.

YOU KNOW?

AND AS COMMITTEE MEMBERS, WHERE WE'RE COMMENTING ON WHAT THE COMMITTEE DID OR DIDN'T DO, THE IDEA WAS -- AND A COUPLE OF THESE VOTES WERE 7-6 OR VERY -- OFF BY ONE VOTE. SO THEY DIDN'T REFLECT WHAT A GOOD PART OF THE COMMITTEE FELT.

SO TO HAVE AN ABILITY TO EXPRESS AT LEAST WHAT SOMEBODY IN THE MINORITY FELT THE COMMITTEE'S THOUGHTS WERE, IT'S DIFFERENT THAN EXPRESSING AS A CITIZEN.

WE ARE PROBABLY GOING TO BE GIVEN EQUAL WEIGHT, WHICH MAY BE NONE AT ALL.

>> I THINK THERE WAS SOME CONCERN WHEN WE TALKED ABOUT HAVING MINORITY REPORTS THAT THEY MIGHT NOT BE READ IF WE TACKLED THEM ON AT THE END OF THE REPORT, AND I THINK IF WE END UP WITH EVERYONE SUBMITTING 20 PAGES, THEY'RE NOT -- I SHOULDN'T PRESUME THAT THEY WOULDN'T BE -- I THINK THEY'RE MORE LIKELY TO BE READ IF WE HAVE A STANDARD LENGTH.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: I DON'T DISAGREE WITH THAT IN TERMS OF HAVING SOME SORT OF LIMIT, BUT I THINK WE ALSO OUGHT TO LIMIT IT IN TERMS OF THE COMMITTEE'S ACTIONS AND WHAT THE COMMITTEE DID OR DIDN'T DO AS OPPOSED TO GENERAL ADDITIONAL IDEAS BECAUSE THE WHOLE POINT IS TO --

>> I THINK IF YOU HAVE A RADICAL NEW PROPOSAL FOR PROCESS, THAT REALLY DOESN'T FALL UNDER THE SCOPE OF OUR CONVERSATION, I THINK THAT'S PROBABLY NOT APPROPRIATE.

I THINK I AM IN AGREEMENT WITH THE GIST OF WHAT YOU ARE SAYING.

HOWEVER, THE SCOPE OF WHAT THE COMMITTEE HAS CONSIDERED IS QUITE BROAD, AND IF THERE ARE PARTICULAR ISSUES THAT YOU FELT SHOULD BE LOOKED AT MORE IN DEPTH OR EXPRESSIONS OF CONCERN ABOUT VARIANCE AND WAIVERS AND STANDARDS OF DOCUMENTATION, THEN ONE SHOULD BE ABLE TO SAY THAT IN A PARAGRAPH AND ATTACH IT.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: DO WE HAVE A TIME FRAME?

>> WELL, DAVID HAS SUGGESTED TEN DAYS.

>>JOE MOREDA: I THINK -- I'M SORRY, I DON'T KNOW IF THIS IS APPROPRIATE TO SAY, BUT I FEEL LIKE I HAVE TO.

I THINK IF YOU GET TEN DISSENTING OPINIONS -- I DON'T KNOW IF THAT'S WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN -- I THINK IT STARTS TO CONFUSE THE WORK THAT THE COMMITTEE DID.

I THINK WHEN THE COMMITTEE WAS PUT TOGETHER, I THINK IT WAS PUT TOGETHER FOR FOLKS TO TRY TO FIND SOME TYPE OF COMMON GROUND THAT COULD BE FOUND.

IT DOESN'T MEAN IF YOU CAME IN WITH TEN ISSUES, ALL TEN WERE RESOLVED.

MAYBE TWO OR THREE OF THEM WERE.

BUT I THOUGHT THE PURPOSE OF THIS WAS TO FIND SOME COMMON GROUND.

IT SEEMS NOW TO DISBAN AND EVERYBODY FILE DISSENTING

OPINION, IT STARTS TO MAYBE CONFUSE THE MATTER A BIT AS TO WHAT WORK WAS DONE.

BUT THAT'S JUST FROM THE OUTSIDE LOOKING IN.

>> FIRST, I DON'T THINK THEY ARE DISSENTING OPINION, BUT I THINK YOU ARE RIGHT, MANY PEOPLE HAVE THE TRADITION OF MINORITY REPORTS BEING DISSENTING OPINIONS.

WE HAD REPORT OF CONCERN THAT ALSO INDICATES SOMETHING THAT, YOU KNOW, LAURA'S LANGUAGE, MEMBER REPORT IS A LITTLE, I THINK, MORE NEUTRAL.

BUT JOE HAS A POINT.

YOU KNOW, WE WORKED VERY HARD AS A GROUP, AND ARE WE CONCERNED THAT WE DILUTE WHAT WE'VE DONE IF WE ADD EXTRA PAGES?

I THINK THAT'S WHAT YOU WERE SAYING, JOE; RIGHT?

DO WE DILUTE OUR EFFECTIVENESS?

>>DENISE VERRILL: DENISE VERRILL.

I WOULD BE CONCERNED BECAUSE LAURA'S -- IF YOU WERE ONE OF THE SIX, NOT OF THE SEVEN, THEN YOUR CONCERN AS ONE OF THE SIX MIGHT BE VERY DIFFERENT FROM THE OTHER FIVE PEOPLE.

AND SO THE REASONS THAT -- YOUR REASONS MIGHT BE PARTICULAR TO YOU, WHERE THEIR REASONS MIGHT BE MORE GLOBAL.

BECAUSE I HEARD SEVERAL PEOPLE THAT DISSENTED THAT THEIR REASONS VARIED GREATLY.

AND SOME OF THEM JUST DIDN'T WANT TO PUT THAT SPECIFIC --

DEFINE THINGS THAT FINITE.

SO THAT'S WHY THEY DISSENTED, NOT BECAUSE THEY DISAGREED COMPLETELY.

SO I WOULD BE CONCERNED WITH THAT LAURA HAD A SPECIAL INTEREST.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: WELL, AND ANYBODY WHO DISSENTED OR WAS ON THE PREVAILING SIDE, IF THEY HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO DO A MEMBER REPORT, AND IF SOMEBODY WHO VOTED FOR THE MOTION, SAY ON THE SETBACK FROM RESIDENTIAL, AND THEY WERE FOR THE MOTION, AND THEY SAID THE REASONS I FELT THAT WE NEED TODAY DO IT, AND HERE ARE SOME MORE SPECIFIC EXAMPLES, OR HERE'S MORE ON THAT ISSUE OR TO FURTHER EXPLAIN WHAT MY PERSONAL VIEWS ON IT WERE OR WHATEVER -- I DON'T DISAGREE WITH JOE'S POINT THAT IF WE BURY -- ESPECIALLY THE BOARD -- IN PAPER, THEN IT'S NOT GOING TO HELP.

>> LISA WANTED TO JUMP IN.

>>LISA WILLIAMS: FINISH, DENISE.

>>DENISE VERRILL: THANK YOU.

MY CONCERN IS YOU ARE A CITIZEN, BUT YOU ARE ALSO AN INDUSTRY REPRESENTATIVE, SO WHEN YOU ARE STATING YOUR OPINION, YOU'RE STATING THAT OF THE INDUSTRY, REALLY, I FEEL.

SO THAT IS GOING TO HAVE TREMENDOUS MORE -- I THINK IT'S INFLUENTIAL MORE SO THAN --

>> LISA.

>>LISA WILLIAMS: PLEASE DON'T TAKE WHAT I SAY WRONG.

WE'RE NOT UNDER THE SUNSHINE; ARE WE?

>> WE'RE STILL UNDER THE SUNSHINE.

>> WE ARE ON TV.

>> [LAUGHTER]

>> CAN WE TALK IN THE LOBBY LATER?

JUST A PERSONAL OPINION.

JOE, I THINK YOU MADE A GOOD POINT.

I AM TRYING TO SAY THIS IN A NICE WAY.

LAURA, IF YOU WRITE FIVE PAGES, I AM GOING HAVE TO WRITE

FIVE PAGES, AND I DON'T REALLY WANT TO WRITE FIVE PAGES.

YOUR REASONS COULD PROBABLY BE THESE, THESE, I AM GOING TO

HAVE TO WRITE REASONS THIS, THIS, THIS, AND IT'S GOING TO

BE A TIT FOR TAT, AND I DON'T THINK THE COMMISSIONERS OR

STAFF WANT TO SIT DOWN AND READ THREE OR FIVE PAGES OF WHAT

WE TALKED ABOUT BEFORE.

YOUR POINTS WERE CRYSTAL CLEAR.

MY POINTS WERE CRYSTAL CLEAR.

I HAD PICTURES SHOWING TOWERS FALLING, BREAKING, THAT I

DIDN'T SHOW.

I'M SURE YOU'VE GOT OTHER INDUSTRY OPINION THAT YOU COULD

PROVIDE.

BUT LIKE I SAID, IT'S GOING TO CONTINUE ON, AND I THINK

IT'S GOING TO BE ONE SIDE AGAINST ANOTHER SIDE.

SO IF WE ARE GOING TO WRITE PAPERS, LET ME KNOW SO I CAN GET STARTED ON IT.

>> [INAUDIBLE]

-- WHOEVER READS THESE THINGS, IF THEY READ THEM, WILL BE ABLE TO LOOK AT A VOTE OF 7-6 AND RECOGNIZE PRETTY MUCH WHAT THE STORY IS, THEY KNOW WHO WE REPRESENT AS INDIVIDUALS.

THEREFORE, I THINK WE HAVE TO TRUST THE RECEIVERS OF THIS DOCUMENT.

IF PEOPLE -- WE SET AT THE BEGINNING THE IDEA THAT WE COULD REFLECT ON THE PROCESS OUR PARTICULAR ISSUES THAT WE FELT WERE NEGLECTED OR UNCLEAR AT THE END OF THAT, AND WE DON'T HAVE A QUORUM HERE TO REVERSE THAT PROCEDURE IN ANY CASE, SO THANK YOU FOR ALL THOSE DIFFERENT FACETS OF IT, BUT WHY DON'T WE JUST GO WITH THAT.

>>LEE VAUGHAN: SO IT'S LEE VAUGHAN, AND I TEND TO AGREE.

IF THERE IS SOME KIND OF REPORT AFTER THE FACT ON A VERY LIMITED BASIS, IT'S HIGHLY APPROPRIATE.

I APPRECIATE JOE'S OPINION THAT FROM AN OUTSIDER LOOKING IN THAT YOU ARE JUST GOING TO CONFUSE THINGS IF YOU'RE NOT CAREFUL.

>> ENTERTAIN A MOTION TO END THE MEETING AND DISBAN THE COMMITTEE.

>>LAURA BELFLOWER: DON'T NEED A MOTION.

WE CAN'T PASS A MOTION.

[LAUGHTER]

>> PERSONALLY, I'D LIKE TO SAY IT'S BEEN GREAT TO WORK WITH
YOU ALL.

I APPRECIATE MEETING YOU AND KNOWING YOU BETTER.

>> LIKEWISE.

>> DITTO.

THANK YOU FOR ALL OF YOUR TIME AND EFFORT.

WE REALLY APPRECIATE IT.

>> THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU.

>> ABSOLUTELY.