

From: lor3lor3@aol.com
Subject: Rev 9- Peer Review Scope of Work
Date: September 1, 2010 3:32:02 AM EDT
To: teedup1@aol.com, keithdallas@comcast.net, nfn16799@naples.net, josiegeoff@aol.com, hunter.hansen@hilton.com, iaizzo@comcast.net, jbaron@watersideshops.com, mikelevy@embarqmail.com, tedraia@yahoo.com, hobodory@comcast.net, jpcbac@comcast.net

Dear PBSB Board Members,

I think it is important that you be aware of the revisions on the Peer Review Scope of Work made by Mr. McAlpin before the document was presented to the full CAC for approval on August 12, 2010.

I have problem with Mr. McAlpin's practice of rewriting what has been approved by the CAC-Clam Bay Subcommittee, then present it to the full CAC for approval. I noticed on many occasions, he would further rewrite what has been approved by the CAC, and then present it to the BCC for approval. After a number of rewrites and changes, at the end, Mr. McAlpin receives final approval from BCC on exactly what he wants.

The July 29, 2010 – Rev. 8 of the Peer Review Scope of Work presented to Mr. Gary McAlpin by PBSB states:

3. The Pelican Bay Services Division will perform their own independent evaluation and submit their three top candidates for discussion. Coastal Zone Management/CAC will do the same. The six potential candidates will be jointly evaluated by a committee consisting of The Chairman of the Pelican Bay Services Division, the Vice Chair of the Pelican Bay Services Division, and the director/Manager of the Pelican Bay Services Division, the Chairman of the CAC, the Vice Chair of the CAC and the Director of the CZM. This group will select and recommend the final candidate.

4. The final selection must be approved by both the Pelican Bay Services Division board and the CZM/CAC. The final candidate will also be approved by the BCC.

On August 5, 2010, the CAC-Clam Bay Subcommittee made the following changes to the above July 29, 2010 - Rev 8 of the Peer Review Scope of Work (from Minutes of the Meeting)

6. Section Evaluation of Proposals - Page 3, item 4 – to read – "The final selection must be approved by both the Pelican Bay Services Division Board and the CZM/CAC, which with approval will not be unreasonably withheld. The final candidate will also be approved by the BCC."

However, Mr. McAlpin made the following changes to Rev 8 before presenting it the full CAC on August 12, 2010 as Rev 9.

Recommendations are sought as follows:

1. Recommend to the BCC that the peer review process as authorized by the BCC on 12/15/2009 be modified to include a peer review of the October 2009 PBS&J technical report and a technical collaboration of the modeling program with the PB Foundation.

2. Reallocate funding from what was originally approved to provide for \$4,500 for the PBS&J Peer review and \$25,000 for the technical collaboration of the modeling program with the PB Foundation.

3. Approve Revision 9 of the Peer Review scope of work with the PBS&J. The latest revision to the PBS&J peer review program is attached.

August 5, 2010 - Rev 9 (Please see the last page in the background materials included for today's PBS&J meeting.)

1.3__The Pelican Bay Services Division will perform their own independent evaluation and submit their three top candidates for discussion. Coastal Zone Management/CAC will do the same. The six potential candidates will be jointly evaluated by a committee consisting of The Chairman of the Pelican Bay Services Division, the Vice Chair of the Pelican Bay Services Division, and the director/Manager of the Pelican Bay Services Division, the Chairman of CAC, the Vice Chair of the CAC and the Director of the CZM. This group will select and recommend the final candidate.

1.4__The final selection must be approved by both the Pelican Bay Services Division board and the CZM/CAC, which approvals will not be unreasonably withheld. The final candidate will also be approved by the BCC. This sentence was changed to: "The final selection will be made by the BCC." I am unable to put a line through words. Therefore, it is presented this way. Please see Rev. 9 included in the background materials for today's meeting.

The above Rev 9 was presented to the full CAC on August 12, 2010 for approval.

My questions are:

1. Why did Mr. McAlpin insist on this language which was not made by PBS&J or the CAC-Clam Bay Subcommittee on August 5, 2010?
2. If the final selection is to be made by the BCC, what is the reason for PBS&J & CZM to spend so much time, effort, and money on this Joint Peer Review process? Is this exercise just for CZM to show the regulatory agencies that it has PB involvement and support?

Thank you for your kind attention.

Sincerely,

Linda Roth