

Deborah Thomas

From: Lewis, Sally A <Sally.Lewis@brevardfl.gov>
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2020 2:05 PM
To: CGroup
Cc: CNTYATY_Staff; CNTYMGR_Staff; Cheryl Duisberg; Deborah Thomas; Donna Scott; Kimberly Powell; Nicole Summers; Samantha McDaniel
Subject: Updated Add On agenda for 7/21/20
Attachments: Riverfront AgendaPages from 072120_Final Agenda Pkg3.pdf

Attached is the add on agenda (J.4) that was sent out on Friday. Two additional attachments have been added. This agenda is the Riverfront, LLC (Squid Lips) that was submitted by K. Rezanka.

Sally Lewis
County Manager's Office
2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way
Viera, Fl. 32940

Notè: Florida has a very broad public records law. This agency is a public entity and is subject to Chapter 119 of the Florida Statute concerning public records. Email Communicaitons are covered under such laws and may be subject to public disclosure

"Under Florida Law, email addresses are Public Records. If you do not want your e-mail address released in response to public record requests, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing."

Deborah Thomas

From: Lober, Bryan <Bryan.Lober@brevardfl.gov>
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2020 11:05 AM
To: Commissioner, D1; Commissioner Rita Pritchett; Commissioner, D2; Commissioner, D3; Commissioner John Tobia; Commissioner, D4; Commissioner Curt Smith; Commissioner, D5; Isnardi, Kristine
Cc: Kimberly Powell; Donna Scott; Deborah Thomas; Samantha McDaniel; Rebecca Lober; Donner, Mary Ellen; Liesenfelt, Jim; Abbate, Frank B; Esseeesse, Alexander; Wilson, Shannon L; Bentley, Eden; Van, Fritz; Maria Stahl (Maria.stahl@flhealth.gov); John Dittmore; jsparvero@wkmg.com; Dave Berman (dberman@floridatoday.com)
Subject: Memo re Mask Policy
Attachments: Memo re Mask Policy.pdf
Importance: High

Dear Fellow Commissioners:

Please see attached memorandum which does not solicit feedback from any Commissioner and Commissioners are specifically asked not to respond to it (or discuss it amongst one another outside of a duly noticed BoCC meeting) as doing so could and likely would constitute a violation of one or more provisions of Chapters 119 and/or 286, Fla. Stat. So that it may be made available to the public, a copy of this memo is being provided to the Clerk to the Board so that it may be included in the minutes for the Tuesday, July 21, 2020 BoCC meeting.

If you are a County Commissioner, please do not reply, reply all, or acknowledge receipt.

Thank you.

Kind regards,

Bryan

"Under Florida Law, email addresses are Public Records. If you do not want your e-mail address released in response to public record requests, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing."

Bryan A. Lober, Commissioner, District 2
2575 N. Courtenay Pkwy, Suite 200
Merritt Island, FL 32953

Telephone: (321) 454-6601
Fax: (321) 454-6602
www.brevardfl.gov
D2.commissioner@brevardfl.gov



July 20, 2020

Memo Discussing Issue Coming before BoCC on Tuesday, July 21, 2020

This memorandum does not solicit feedback from any Commissioner and Commissioners are specifically asked not to respond to it (or discuss it amongst one another outside of a duly noticed BoCC meeting) as doing so could and likely would constitute a violation of one or more provisions of Chapters 119 and/or 286, Fla. Stat. So that it may be made available to the public, a copy of this memo is being provided to the Clerk to the Board so that it may be included in the minutes for the Tuesday, July 21, 2020 BoCC meeting. Please see the attached County Attorney's Office Inter-Office Memo dated December 12, 2016 which indicates that communications of this variety are authorized under applicable law.

Please be advised that this is a memo pertaining to adding one or two additional requirements the application process for local businesses to qualify for grants under the program established to allow for direct financial relief (up to \$10,000 per business) to local small businesses and nonprofits approved by the BoCC on July 7, 2020.

At the June 30, 2020 BoCC meeting, I proposed a requirement to stem the tide of COVID-19 infections in Brevard County in order to avoid overwhelming our local healthcare systems. As you are aware, this proposal gained no traction amongst my fellow commissioners. Since that time, we have set record highs for infections and deaths and local hospitals across the county have, at varying times, completely exhausted ICU bed availability.

At least 50 have died, thus far, in Brevard County. To put things in perspective, consider the following: The 9/11 terrorist attacks killed a grand total of 2996 people (2977 victims & 19 hijackers). COVID-19 has killed approximately 606,000 people worldwide – over 200 times as many as killed by the 9/11 terrorist attacks. In the US, alone, the 143,000 who have died thus far, from COVID-19, amount to almost 50 times the death toll from 9/11. The 4981 COVID-19 deaths in Florida are over 50% higher than the total (not just Floridians killed) 9/11 death toll. In addition to the many dead, more and more reports suggest a tremendous number, who survive, face long-term or permanent injuries from this virus.

When your mother, sister, or daughter is placed on a ventilator and dies from this, you will likely stop pointing to the low - *I use the term "low" with unease* – percentage death rate so as to suggest that it is acceptable. While only a small percentage of the overall population has died due to this virus, any avoidable death is one too many.

District 2 Includes

Cocoa • Kennedy Space Center • Merritt Island • Port Canaveral • Cape Canaveral • Avon by the Sea • Cocoa Beach • Snug Harbor • Patrick AFB • Rockledge

It is my understanding, from the June 30 BoCC meeting, that my colleagues were able to see through the groundless medical guidance, bogus conspiracy theories and baseless legal claims made by those untrained laypersons who oppose a mask requirement.

It appears that my fellow commissioners simply did not wish to implement a government mandate despite such a measure being unquestionably constitutional and despite it being irrefutably scientifically proven to reduce the spread of airborne viruses and, by extension, guaranteed to reduce morbidity and mortality.

While I genuinely believe that our failure to act on June 30 resulted in and continues to result in numerous wholly avoidable infections - some of which almost certainly have caused and/or will cause deaths – it is not too late to do *something*.

What does this have to do with the direct financial relief program we established on July 7?

There is an alternative to mandating masks which, while less effective than a universal masking requirement, is likely to prevent numerous infections and reduce the spread.

Commissioner Tobia articulated, on July 7, his desire to return CARES Act funds back to the feds. While I disagreed (and still disagree) with his stance, it implicitly and correctly recognized that **businesses have no legal entitlement to CARES Act funding**. As such, we are free to condition the granting of any such funds upon any lawful criteria we wish.

At a dead minimum, we should require that businesses applying for CARES Act funding self-certify that they have prominently posted and will continue to post, at all entrances accessible to customers/consumers/clients/patients/patrons/etc., the placards made available by Brevard County to indicate whether the business does or does not require masks. While I believe this does not go far enough, it will serve to increase transparency by removing any ambiguity as to each business' policy.

What I would strongly recommend, instead, is that we condition the CARES Act funding, to businesses, on their prominently posting and maintaining the County provided placards indicating that masks are **required**. Businesses would be able to self-certify their compliance.

If a complaint is received, investigated and proven showing a business which received CARES Act funding from Brevard County has not posted and/or maintained the required signage, that business would be obligated to reimburse the County for the funds received and it would be disqualified from receiving future County-allocated funding.

As businesses are under no obligation to accept County-allocated CARES Act funds, they are under no obligation to post anything. This is not a mandate; it is a condition to receive funds to which no business is legally entitled. If a business does not wish to post the provided placards, that is their prerogative. They simply forfeit any financial assistance from the County.

Having spoken with Assistant County Manager Jim Liesenfelt, I understand that self-certification would be simple to incorporate into the existing draft of the County's CARES Act business funding application, which is presently anticipated to be released next week.

Based upon my many conversations with physicians (MDs and DOs) and epidemiologists, it is clear that a universal masking requirement would be the most prudent and effective course of action. That said, doing something which is likely to reduce the spread is better than sitting on our hands and watching people get infected, suffer, be intubated, suffer some more, and eventually die.



BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

County Attorney's Office
2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way
Building C, Room 308
Viera, Florida 32940

Inter-Office Memo

TO: Scott Knox
FROM: Alex Esseeesse
SUBJECT: Ability for commissioner to send out a memorandum or position statement to the other commissioners on an issue that will go before the Board
DATE: 12/8/16

Issue: A commissioner wants to prepare and circulate a written memorandum to the other members of the Board of County Commissioners that discusses an issue that will go before the Board. This memorandum will include the commissioner's stance/position on the matter and will likely recommend that a certain course of action be taken by the Board.

Question: Can a commissioner prepare and circulate a memorandum/position statement to other commissioners on an issue that will go before the Board without violating the Government in the Sunshine Law, Chapter 286, Florida Statutes?

Short Answer: Yes, but with caution. No discussions of the information/positions outlined in the memorandum can be discussed outside of a public meeting; the memorandum cannot solicit feedback from the other Board members; there cannot be any responses to the memorandum prior to the public meeting; and, because the memorandum is a public record, a copy must be made available to the public. Furthermore, the memorandum/statement cannot be used as a substitute for action at a public meeting and cannot be used to enable staff to act as an intermediary among the commissioners.¹

Analysis

The Government in the Sunshine Law was adopted, at least in part, to prohibit public business from being conducted in private. Put another way, "[o]ne purpose of the [G]overnment in the [S]unshine [L]aw was to prevent at nonpublic meetings the crystallization of secret decisions to a point just short of ceremonial acceptance."² In order to accomplish this goal, Florida law provides that

¹See, Op. Att'y Gen. Fla. 01-21 (2001).

²Palm Beach v. Gradison, 296 So.2d 473, 477 (Fla. 1974).

[a]ll meetings of any board or commission . . . of any agency or authority of any county, . . . except as otherwise provided in the Constitution, including meetings with or attended by any person elected to such board or commission, but who has not yet taken office, at which official acts are to be taken are declared to be public meetings open to the public at all times, and no resolution, rule, or formal action shall be considered binding except as taken or made at such meeting.³

Courts have found that, “[i]n order for there to be a violation of [Fla. Stat. § 286.011], a meeting between two or more public officials *must take place* which is violative of the statute’s spirit, intent, and purpose.”⁴ However, despite this assertion, it has been established that “the physical presence of two or more members is *not necessary* in order to find the Sunshine Law applicable.”⁵ In practice, this means that Fla. Stat. § 286.011 “should be construed so as to frustrate all evasive devices” used to circumvent the statute’s purposes of transparency and openness.⁶

Florida Attorney General Interpretations

The Florida Attorney General has issued a number of opinions on when and how official subject to the Government in the Sunshine Law can use memoranda to discuss their stances and/or suggest certain positions be taken on issues requiring official action before their respective boards. For example, in **AGO 2007-35**, the Florida Attorney General was tasked with determining whether city commissioners could exchange documents on issues that would come before the commission for official action. As mentioned above, “the courts and this office have found that there are instances where the physical presence of two or more members is not necessary in order to find the Sunshine Law applicable.”⁷ The Attorney General found that “a commissioner may send informational material to the other commissioners outside of a public meeting provided that there is no interaction between or response from the other commissioners.”⁸ Importantly,

[w]hile it is not a direct violation of the Sunshine Law for members to circulate their own written position statements to other council members so long as the council members avoid any discussion or debate among themselves on these statements, the members’ discussions and deliberations on matters coming before the commission must occur at a duly noticed [meeting] and . . . must not be used to circumvent the requirements of [Fla. Stat. § 286.011].

³Fla. Stat. § 286.011(1).

⁴Hough v. Stembbridge, 278 So.2d 288, 289 (Fla. 3rd DCA 1973) (*emphasis added*).

⁵Op. Att’y Gen. Fla. 96-35 (1996) (*emphasis added*).

⁶Gradison, 296 So.2d at 477; Op. Att’y Gen. Fla. 96-35 (1996).

⁷Op. Att’y Gen. Fla. 2007-35 (2007).

⁸*Id.*

Ultimately, the Attorney General found that a commissioner may send documents to other members of the commission on matters going before the commission for official action, “provided that there is no response from, or interaction related to such documents among, the commissioners prior to the public meeting.”⁹

In **AGO 01-21**, the Florida Attorney General was asked whether board members could prepare individual position statements on the same subject and exchange these memoranda to the other board members. In the situation outlined in AGO 01-21, board members “prepare[d] and circulate[d] statements meant to communicate a particular council member’s position on issues coming before the board,” but these statements did not solicit responses from the other members and were made available to the public.¹⁰ The Florida Attorney General’s Office found that “[w]hile [it] would strongly discourage such activity, it would appear that council members . . . may prepare and distribute their own position statements to other council members without violating the Government in the Sunshine Law so long as the council members avoid any discussion or debate among themselves on these statements.”¹¹ More specifically, the Florida Attorney General noted that such a practice would become “problematic” if and when “any such communication [was] a response to another commissioner’s statement” because it opened the door for board members to respond to one another outside of a duly noticed meeting, causing the requirements of Fla. Stat. § 286.011 to be circumvented.¹² Despite reaching such a conclusion, the preparation and distribution of such memoranda/statements amongst the commissioners would not be a “direct violation of the Government in the Sunshine Law.”¹³

The Florida Attorney General issued an opinion (**AGO 96-35**) that addressed the issue of whether a school board member could circulate a memorandum “expressing that member’s position on a matter that [would] come before the school board for action and urging the other board members to give the author’s position very serious consideration.”¹⁴ Importantly, “[t]he memorandum [did] not request other board members to respond prior to the meeting at which the topic will be brought up for action or discussion.”¹⁵ The Attorney General made it a point of identifying circumstances where the use of a memorandum would not be permitted. For example, a memorandum cannot request board members to respond with comments and/or to request the board members to “indicate his or her approval or disapproval” for certain views.¹⁶ Based on such a position, the Attorney General came to the conclusion that

if a school board member writes a memorandum to provide information to make a recommendation to other school board members on a particular subject, there is

⁹*Id.*

¹⁰Op. Att’y Gen. Fla. 01-21 (2001).

¹¹*Id.*

¹²*Id.*

¹³*Id.*

¹⁴Op. Att’y Gen. Fla. 96-35 (1996).

¹⁵*Id.*

¹⁶*See, Id.*

no violation of [Fla. Stat. § 286.011]. However, the use of a memorandum to solicit comment from other members of the board or commission or the circulation of responsive memoranda by other board members would violate the statute. Such action would be equivalent to private meetings discussing the public business through the use of memoranda without allowing an opportunity for public input.¹⁷

Another Florida Attorney General opinion (AGO 89-23) found that “[t]he use of a written report by one [city] commissioner to inform other commissioners of a subject which will be discussed at a public meeting does not violate Florida’s Government in the Sunshine Law if prior to the public meeting, there is no interaction related to the report among the commissioners.”¹⁸ Again, in that situation, the other commissioners were not requested to and did not provide any comments on the report prior to the public meeting. The Attorney General determined that the memorandum would be allowed as long as “[t]he circumstances . . . do not . . . involve the use of a report as a substitute for action at a public meeting, inasmuch as there is no interaction among the commissioners prior to the public meeting.” Furthermore, the memorandum cannot be used by other city officials, such as a city manager, “to act as intermediary among the commissioners” to ask “each commissioner to state his or her position on a specific matter which will foreseeably be considered by the commission at a public meeting in order to provide information to the members of the commission.”¹⁹

Conclusion

A County commissioner is permitted to prepare and circulate a memorandum on an issue to go before the Board. However, no discussions of the information/positions outlined in the memorandum can be discussed outside of a public meeting; the memorandum cannot solicit feedback from the other Board members; there cannot be any responses to the memorandum prior to the public meeting; and, because the memorandum is a public record, a copy must be made available to the public. Additionally, the memorandum/statement cannot be used as a substitute for action at a public meeting and cannot be used to enable staff to act as an intermediary among the commissioners.

¹⁷Op. Att’y Gen. Fla. 96-35.

¹⁸Op. Att’y Gen. Fla. 89-23 (1989).

¹⁹*Id.*

Deborah Thomas

From: Lober, Bryan <Bryan.Lober@brevardfl.gov>
Sent: Sunday, July 19, 2020 7:09 PM
To: Commissioner, D1; Commissioner Rita Pritchett; Commissioner, D2; Lober, Bryan; Commissioner, D3; Commissioner John Tobia; Commissioner, D4; Commissioner Curt Smith; Commissioner, D5; Isnardi, Kristine
Cc: Kimberly Powell; Donna Scott; Deborah Thomas; Samantha McDaniel; Rebecca Lober; Donner, Mary Ellen; Liesenfelt, Jim; Abbate, Frank B; Esseeesse, Alexander; Wilson, Shannon L; Bentley, Eden; Van, Fritz
Subject: Memo re Changes to AO-05
Attachments: Memo re Changes to AO-05.pdf

Dear Fellow Commissioners:

Please see attached memorandum which does not solicit feedback from any Commissioner and Commissioners are specifically asked not to respond to it (or discuss it amongst one another outside of a duly noticed BoCC meeting) as doing so could and likely would constitute a violation of one or more provisions of Chapters 119 and/or 286, Fla. Stat. So that it may be made available to the public, a copy of this memo is being provided to the Clerk to the Board so that it may be included in the minutes for the Tuesday, July 21, 2020 BoCC meeting.

Please do not reply, reply all, or acknowledge receipt.

Thank you.

Kind regards,

Bryan

"Under Florida Law, email addresses are Public Records. If you do not want your e-mail address released in response to public record requests, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing."



Bryan A. Lober, Commissioner, District 2
2575 N. Courtenay Pkwy, Suite 200
Merritt Island, FL 32953

Telephone: (321) 454-6601
Fax: (321) 454-6602
www.brevardfl.gov
D2.commissioner@brevardfl.gov

July 19, 2020

Memo Discussing Issue Coming before BoCC on Tuesday, July 21, 2020

This memorandum does not solicit feedback from any Commissioner and Commissioners are specifically asked not to respond to it (or discuss it amongst one another outside of a duly noticed BoCC meeting) as doing so could and likely would constitute a violation of one or more provisions of Chapters 119 and/or 286, Fla. Stat. So that it may be made available to the public, a copy of this memo is being provided to the Clerk to the Board so that it may be included in the minutes for the Tuesday, July 21, 2020 BoCC meeting. Please see the attached County Attorney's Office Inter-Office Memo dated December 12, 2016 which indicates that communications of this variety are authorized under applicable law.

Please be advised that this is a memo pertaining to amending AO-05 largely insofar as it pertains to background investigation checks for *recreation partner volunteer* positions. These modifications are proposed both to update obsolete content as well as to allow for a wider potential pool of volunteer applicants in the present climate of economic uncertainty.

For purposes of this document and the related proposal, a *recreation partner volunteer* is defined as "a volunteer serving with a group or organization which has a current recreation partner agreement with the board of county commissioners providing for nonexclusive use of a facility in order for the group or organization to provide recreation programs." Through the remainder of this document, *recreation partner volunteers* may be also referred to as applicants.

The only proposed modification which applies, universally, to AO-05 is that all references to "E-Facts" shall be updated to refer to "Brevard Electronic Court Application" (BECA) as E-Facts has been rendered obsolete and has been replaced with BECA. All remaining proposed modifications pertain only to *recreation partner volunteers*, as defined above. The following additional modifications shall be proposed at the BoCC meeting to be held on Tuesday, July 21, 2020.

Staff shall craft an exception to allow for Levels III (Low-Level Security), II (Moderate-Level Security) and I (High-Level Security) clearance for *recreation partner volunteers* with convictions for **nonviolent** misdemeanors and/or **nonviolent** felonies of the third degree with conviction dates at least 2500 days in the past. All terms of sentence, excluding financial obligations, must be completed in order to qualify for an exception.

Convictions for both second-degree and first-degree felonies (including those punishable by life felonies, life felonies, and capital felonies) shall automatically disqualify an applicant for an exception to existing policy.

District 2 Includes

Cocoa • Kennedy Space Center • Merritt Island • Port Canaveral • Cape Canaveral • Avon by the Sea • Cocoa Beach • Snug Harbor • Patrick AFB • Rockledge

To qualify for any such exception, the *recreation partner volunteer* would need to produce a letter from the chief law-enforcement officer of the municipality in which he or she resides or from the Brevard County Sheriff's Office (if the applicant resides in unincorporated Brevard County). The letter may not be delegated to any other law enforcement officer.

The letter must be dated within sixty (60) days preceding the application for *recreation partner volunteer* status and it must include the following language without any alterations: "I am familiar with [Name of Applicant] as well as [Name of Applicant]'s criminal history and the circumstances pertaining thereto. As chief law enforcement officer for [Name of Municipality or Brevard County], I believe that [Name of Applicant] does not pose any elevated risk of recidivism and I believe [Name of Applicant] to be law-abiding. As such, I believe an exception may be warranted to permit [Name of Applicant] to volunteer as a *recreation partner volunteer* with Brevard County." This statement must be on agency letterhead and bear the signature (electronic signature acceptable) of the chief law enforcement officer.

Alternatively, as a substitute for the required letter from the chief law enforcement officer, a letter, dated within 60 days preceding the application for *recreation partner volunteer* status, from a Circuit Judge, within the 18th Judicial Circuit shall be deemed acceptable in lieu of a letter from the chief law enforcement officer. Any such letter must include the following language without any alterations: "I am familiar with [Name of Applicant] as well as [Name of Applicant]'s criminal history and the circumstances pertaining thereto. As a duly elected or appointed Circuit Judge within the 18th Judicial Circuit, I believe that [Name of Applicant] does not pose any elevated risk of recidivism and I believe [Name of Applicant] to be law-abiding. As such, I believe an exception may be warranted to permit [Name of Applicant] to volunteer as a *recreation partner volunteer* with Brevard County." This statement must be on 18th Judicial Circuit letterhead and bear the signature (electronic signature acceptable) of the Circuit Judge. Such a letter may **not** originate from a County Court Judge temporarily presiding as a Circuit Judge.

Under no circumstances shall the aforementioned proposed exception serve to permit those with convictions involving, in any way, **drug-related** (including alcohol-related) felonies to operate vehicles and/or heavy equipment belonging to or used by Brevard County.

Under no circumstances shall the aforementioned proposed exception serve to permit those with convictions involving, in any way, whether misdemeanor or felony, **child abuse, neglect, or endangerment** to volunteer in any capacity which may require or involve direct and/or indirect supervision of juveniles.

Applicants seeking an exception must still meet all other criteria for *recreation partner volunteer* status.

At the BoCC meeting set to take place on Tuesday, July 21, 2020, it will be proposed that the BoCC authorize the Chair and County staff to make the necessary changes to implement the above proposed changes to AO-05.



BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

County Attorney's Office
2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way
Building C, Room 308
Viera, Florida 32940

Inter-Office Memo

TO: Scott Knox
FROM: Alex Esseeesse
SUBJECT: Ability for commissioner to send out a memorandum or position statement to the other commissioners on an issue that will go before the Board
DATE: 12/8/16

Issue: A commissioner wants to prepare and circulate a written memorandum to the other members of the Board of County Commissioners that discusses an issue that will go before the Board. This memorandum will include the commissioner's stance/position on the matter and will likely recommend that a certain course of action be taken by the Board.

Question: Can a commissioner prepare and circulate a memorandum/position statement to other commissioners on an issue that will go before the Board without violating the Government in the Sunshine Law, Chapter 286, Florida Statutes?

Short Answer: Yes, but with caution. No discussions of the information/positions outlined in the memorandum can be discussed outside of a public meeting; the memorandum cannot solicit feedback from the other Board members; there cannot be any responses to the memorandum prior to the public meeting; and, because the memorandum is a public record, a copy must be made available to the public. Furthermore, the memorandum/statement cannot be used as a substitute for action at a public meeting and cannot be used to enable staff to act as an intermediary among the commissioners.¹

Analysis

The Government in the Sunshine Law was adopted, at least in part, to prohibit public business from being conducted in private. Put another way, "[o]ne purpose of the [G]overnment in the [S]unshine [L]aw was to prevent at nonpublic meetings the crystallization of secret decisions to a point just short of ceremonial acceptance."² In order to accomplish this goal, Florida law provides that

¹See, Op. Att'y Gen. Fla. 01-21 (2001).

²Palm Beach v. Gradison, 296 So.2d 473, 477 (Fla. 1974).

[a]ll meetings of any board or commission . . . of any agency or authority of any county, . . . except as otherwise provided in the Constitution, including meetings with or attended by any person elected to such board or commission, but who has not yet taken office, at which official acts are to be taken are declared to be public meetings open to the public at all times, and no resolution, rule, or formal action shall be considered binding except as taken or made at such meeting.³

Courts have found that, “[i]n order for there to be a violation of [Fla. Stat. § 286.011], a meeting between two or more public officials *must take place* which is violative of the statute’s spirit, intent, and purpose.”⁴ However, despite this assertion, it has been established that “the physical presence of two or more members is *not necessary* in order to find the Sunshine Law applicable.”⁵ In practice, this means that Fla. Stat. § 286.011 “should be construed so as to frustrate all evasive devices” used to circumvent the statute’s purposes of transparency and openness.⁶

Florida Attorney General Interpretations

The Florida Attorney General has issued a number of opinions on when and how official subject to the Government in the Sunshine Law can use memoranda to discuss their stances and/or suggest certain positions be taken on issues requiring official action before their respective boards. For example, in **AGO 2007-35**, the Florida Attorney General was tasked with determining whether city commissioners could exchange documents on issues that would come before the commission for official action. As mentioned above, “the courts and this office have found that there are instances where the physical presence of two or more members is not necessary in order to find the Sunshine Law applicable.”⁷ The Attorney General found that “a commissioner may send informational material to the other commissioners outside of a public meeting provided that there is no interaction between or response from the other commissioners.”⁸ Importantly,

[w]hile it is not a direct violation of the Sunshine Law for members to circulate their own written position statements to other council members so long as the council members avoid any discussion or debate among themselves on these statements, the members’ discussions and deliberations on matters coming before the commission must occur at a duly noticed [meeting] and . . . must not be used to circumvent the requirements of [Fla. Stat. § 286.011].

³Fla. Stat. § 286.011(1).

⁴Hough v. Stembridge, 278 So.2d 288, 289 (Fla. 3rd DCA 1973) (*emphasis added*).

⁵Op. Att’y Gen. Fla. 96-35 (1996) (*emphasis added*).

⁶Gradison, 296 So.2d at 477; Op. Att’y Gen. Fla. 96-35 (1996).

⁷Op. Att’y Gen. Fla. 2007-35 (2007).

⁸*Id.*

Ultimately, the Attorney General found that a commissioner may send documents to other members of the commission on matters going before the commission for official action, “provided that there is no response from, or interaction related to such documents among, the commissioners prior to the public meeting.”⁹

In **AGO 01-21**, the Florida Attorney General was asked whether board members could prepare individual position statements on the same subject and exchange these memoranda to the other board members. In the situation outlined in AGO 01-21, board members “prepare[d] and circulate[d] statements meant to communicate a particular council member’s position on issues coming before the board,” but these statements did not solicit responses from the other members and were made available to the public.¹⁰ The Florida Attorney General’s Office found that “[w]hile [it] would strongly discourage such activity, it would appear that council members . . . may prepare and distribute their own position statements to other council members without violating the Government in the Sunshine Law so long as the council members avoid any discussion or debate among themselves on these statements.”¹¹ More specifically, the Florida Attorney General noted that such a practice would become “problematic” if and when “any such communication [was] a response to another commissioner’s statement” because it opened the door for board members to respond to one another outside of a duly noticed meeting, causing the requirements of Fla. Stat. § 286.011 to be circumvented.¹² Despite reaching such a conclusion, the preparation and distribution of such memoranda/statements amongst the commissioners would not be a “direct violation of the Government in the Sunshine Law.”¹³

The Florida Attorney General issued an opinion (**AGO 96-35**) that addressed the issue of whether a school board member could circulate a memorandum “expressing that member’s position on a matter that [would] come before the school board for action and urging the other board members to give the author’s position very serious consideration.”¹⁴ Importantly, “[t]he memorandum [did] not request other board members to respond prior to the meeting at which the topic will be brought up for action or discussion.”¹⁵ The Attorney General made it a point of identifying circumstances where the use of a memorandum would not be permitted. For example, a memorandum cannot request board members to respond with comments and/or to request the board members to “indicate his or her approval or disapproval” for certain views.¹⁶ Based on such a position, the Attorney General came to the conclusion that

if a school board member writes a memorandum to provide information to make a recommendation to other school board members on a particular subject, there is

⁹*Id.*

¹⁰Op. Att’y Gen. Fla. 01-21 (2001).

¹¹*Id.*

¹²*Id.*

¹³*Id.*

¹⁴Op. Att’y Gen. Fla. 96-35 (1996).

¹⁵*Id.*

¹⁶*See, Id.*

no violation of [Fla. Stat. § 286.011]. However, the use of a memorandum to solicit comment from other members of the board or commission or the circulation of responsive memoranda by other board members would violate the statute. Such action would be equivalent to private meetings discussing the public business through the use of memoranda without allowing an opportunity for public input.¹⁷

Another Florida Attorney General opinion (**AGO 89-23**) found that “[t]he use of a written report by one [city] commissioner to inform other commissioners of a subject which will be discussed at a public meeting does not violate Florida’s Government in the Sunshine Law if prior to the public meeting, there is no interaction related to the report among the commissioners.”¹⁸ Again, in that situation, the other commissioners were not requested to and did not provide any comments on the report prior to the public meeting. The Attorney General determined that the memorandum would be allowed as long as “[t]he circumstances . . . do not . . . involve the use of a report as a substitute for action at a public meeting, inasmuch as there is no interaction among the commissioners prior to the public meeting.” Furthermore, the memorandum cannot be used by other city officials, such as a city manager, “to act as intermediary among the commissioners” to ask “each commissioner to state his or her position on a specific matter which will foreseeably be considered by the commission at a public meeting in order to provide information to the members of the commission.”¹⁹

Conclusion

A County commissioner is permitted to prepare and circulate a memorandum on an issue to go before the Board. However, no discussions of the information/positions outlined in the memorandum can be discussed outside of a public meeting; the memorandum cannot solicit feedback from the other Board members; there cannot be any responses to the memorandum prior to the public meeting; and, because the memorandum is a public record, a copy must be made available to the public. Additionally, the memorandum/statement cannot be used as a substitute for action at a public meeting and cannot be used to enable staff to act as an intermediary among the commissioners.

¹⁷Op. Att’y Gen. Fla. 96-35.

¹⁸Op. Att’y Gen. Fla. 89-23 (1989).

¹⁹*Id.*

Deborah Thomas

From: Lewis, Sally A <Sally.Lewis@brevardfl.gov>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 12:50 PM
To: Advanced Agenda; CGroup; CNTYATY_Staff; CNTYMGR_Staff
Cc: Cheryl Duisberg; Deborah Thomas; Donna Scott; Kimberly Powell; Nicole Summers; Samantha McDaniel
Subject: July 21, 2020 Final Agenda

The final agenda and package are on the web page for your review.
Thank you,
Sally

Sally Lewis
County Manager's Office
2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way
Viera, FL 32940

Note: Florida has a very broad public records law. This agency is a public entity and is subject to Chapter 119 of the Florida Statute concerning public records. Email Communications are covered under such laws and may be subject to public disclosure

"Under Florida Law, email addresses are Public Records. If you do not want your e-mail address released in response to public record requests, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing."

Deborah Thomas

From: Lewis, Sally A <Sally.Lewis@brevardfl.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2020 3:50 PM
To: Advanced Agenda; CGroup; CNTYATY_Staff; CNTYMGR_Staff
Cc: Cheryl Duisberg; Deborah Thomas; Donna Scott; Kimberly Powell; Nicole Summers; Samantha McDaniel
Subject: Revision 2 of the July 21, 2020 Agenda

Agenda Item F.14 has been moved to Public Hearings H.4
Thank you,
Sally

Sally Lewis
County Manager's Office
2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way
Viera, FL 32940

Note: Florida has a very broad public records law. This agency is a public entity and is subject to Chapter 119 of the Florida Statute concerning public records. Email Communications are covered under such laws and may be subject to public disclosure

"Under Florida Law, email addresses are Public Records. If you do not want your e-mail address released in response to public record requests, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing."

Deborah Thomas

From: Lewis, Sally A <Sally.Lewis@brevardfl.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2020 2:28 PM
To: Advanced Agenda; CGroup; CNTYATY_Staff; CNTYMGR_Staff
Cc: Cheryl Duisberg; Deborah Thomas; Donna Scott; Kimberly Powell; Nicole Summers; Samantha McDaniel
Subject: FW: Revision 1 of the July 21, 2020 Full agenda

Please note that the Agenda Item below J.9 should Be F.9
Thank you

From: Lewis, Sally A
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2020 12:16 PM
To: Advanced Agenda <Advanced-Agenda@brevardfl.gov>; CGroup <CGroup@brevardfl.gov>; CNTYATY_Staff <CNTYATY_Staff@brevardfl.gov>; CNTYMGR_Staff <CNTYMGR_Staff@brevardcounty.us>
Cc: Cheryl. Duisberg (cheryl.Duisberg@brevardclerk.us) <cheryl.Duisberg@brevardclerk.us>; Deborah Thomas (deborah.thomas@brevardclerk.us) <deborah.thomas@brevardclerk.us>; Donna Scott <donna.scott@brevardclerk.us>; Kimberly Powell (kimberly.powell@brevardclerk.us) <kimberly.powell@brevardclerk.us>; Nicole Summers (nicole.summers@brevardclerk.us) <nicole.summers@brevardclerk.us>; Samantha McDaniel (samantha.mcdaniel@brevardclerk.us) <samantha.mcdaniel@brevardclerk.us>
Subject: Revision 1 of the July 21, 2020 Full agenda

Several minor changes have been made to the agenda for the July 21 2020 meeting.

- The Minutes for the May 5, 2020 meeting have been added for approval
- Agenda J.3 – a Scriveners error was corrected in the Subject
- Agenda J.9 – AO 29 was added
- Agenda F.13 – The first BCA was deleted

The updated agenda is on the Beach.
Thank you,
Sally

Sally Lewis
County Manager's Office
2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way
Viera, Fl. 32940

Note: Florida has a very broad public records law. This agency is a public entity and is subject to Chapter 119 of the Florida Statute concerning public records. Email Communicaitons are covered under such laws and may be subject to public disclosure

"Under Florida Law, email addresses are Public Records. If you do not want your e-mail address released in response to public record requests, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing."

Deborah Thomas

From: Lewis, Sally A <Sally.Lewis@brevardfl.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2020 12:16 PM
To: Advanced Agenda; CGroup; CNTYATY_Staff; CNTYMGR_Staff
Cc: Cheryl Duisberg; Deborah Thomas; Donna Scott; Kimberly Powell; Nicole Summers; Samantha McDaniel
Subject: Revision 1 of the July 21, 2020 Full agenda

Several minor changes have been made to the agenda for the July 21 2020 meeting.

- The Minutes for the May 5, 2020 meeting have been added for approval
- Agenda J.3 – a Scriveners error was corrected in the Subject
- Agenda J.9 – AO 29 was added
- Agenda F.13 – The first BCA was deleted

The updated agenda is on the Beach.

Thank you,
Sally

Sally Lewis
County Manager's Office
2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way
Viera, Fl. 32940

Note: Florida has a very broad public records law. This agency is a public entity and is subject to Chapter 119 of the Florida Statute concerning public records. Email Communications are covered under such laws and may be subject to public disclosure

"Under Florida Law, email addresses are Public Records. If you do not want your e-mail address released in response to public record requests, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing."

Deborah Thomas

From: Donna Scott
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2020 2:39 PM
To: Lewis, Sally A; Cheryl Duisberg; Deborah Thomas; Kimberly Powell; Nicole Summers; Samantha McDaniel
Subject: RE: Question for 7/21/20

None for this Agenda.

From: Lewis, Sally A <Sally.Lewis@brevardfl.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2020 2:36 PM
To: Cheryl Duisberg <Cheryl.Duisberg@brevardclerk.us>; Deborah Thomas <deborah.thomas@brevardclerk.us>; Donna Scott <donna.scott@brevardclerk.us>; Kimberly Powell <Kimberly.Powell@brevardclerk.us>; Nicole Summers <Nicole.Summers@brevardclerk.us>; Samantha McDaniel <Samantha.McDaniel@brevardclerk.us>
Subject: Question for 7/21/20

Are we going to have any minutes to add to the July 21, 2020 agenda?

Thanks

Sally

Sally Lewis
County Manager's Office
2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way
Viera, Fl. 32940

Note: Florida has a very broad public records law. This agency is a public entity and is subject to Chapter 119 of the Florida Statute concerning public records. Email Communications are covered under such laws and may be subject to public disclosure

"Under Florida Law, email addresses are Public Records. If you do not want your e-mail address released in response to public record requests, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing."

Deborah Thomas

From: Lewis, Sally A <Sally.Lewis@brevardfl.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2020 9:20 AM
To: Advanced Agenda; CGroup; CNTYATY_Staff; CNTYMGR_Staff
Cc: Cheryl Duisberg; Deborah Thomas; Donna Scott; Kimberly Powell; Nicole Summers; Samantha McDaniel
Subject: Advanced Agenda

Good Morning,

The advanced agenda for July 21, 2020 will be published this afternoon. Please make sure your agendas are entered and submitted for approval.

Thank you

Sally

Sally Lewis
County Manager's Office
2725 Judge Fran Jamieson Way
Viera, Fl. 32940

Note: Florida has a very broad public records law. This agency is a public entity and is subject to Chapter 119 of the Florida Statute concerning public records. Email Communications are covered under such laws and may be subject to public disclosure

"Under Florida Law, email addresses are Public Records. If you do not want your e-mail address released in response to public record requests, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing."