

**MINUTES OF THE
TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
JULY 16, 2010**

Chairman Ferreri called the meeting to order at 9:45 a.m. and welcomed everyone to the meeting. He led the pledge of allegiance and requested roll call.

The following members and alternates were present:

Indian River County:	Commissioner Solari Vice Mayor Sabin Abell
St. Lucie County:	Commissioner Grande Commissioner Craft Mayor Christensen
Martin County:	Commissioner Smith Commissioner Hayes
Palm Beach County:	Commissioner Vana Mayor Ferreri Commissioner Brown Councilmember Brinkman Mayor Golonka Mayor Pro Tem Dr. Priore Councilman Fred Pinto (Alternate)
Gubernatorial Appointees:	Eduardo Balbis Reece Parrish Richard Oujevolk Ramon Trias Michael Davis Bill Hall
Ex-Officios:	Jim Carnes, SFWMD Ann Benedetti, SJRWMD
Council Staff:	Marlene Brunot Michael Busha Kim DeLaney Anthea Gianniotis Sandy Gippert Liz Gulick Wynsum Hatton Stephanie Heidt Terry Hess Dana Little Peter Merritt Greg Vaday

Council Attorney: Roger Saberson

The Executive Director announced a quorum was present.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Alexandria Larson stated the reference to sanitary sewer in the Indian River County comprehensive plan amendments was a joke. She stated that expanding the urban service boundary was ridiculous. She stated she did not agree with the comment in the Town of Jupiter amendments that the median income is going up. She expressed there are problems with the Indian River Lagoon and Lake Okeechobee and stated she did not believe the comment that there is no shortage of water in St. Lucie Village. She commented on the scenic trail built around Lake Okeechobee that would need to be rebuilt and using eminent domain. She expressed her concern with respect to the dispersement being used in the Gulf of Mexico on the oil spill.

Sharon Waite noted the Business Development Board in Palm Beach County gets one million dollars a year. She questioned the validity of the comment that the median family income is up in the County. She stated that with respect to affordable housing the planners and developers get as much as they want and the cost is borne by the taxpayers. She stated she does not trust any of the information as she believes it is unqualified.

AGENDA AND CONSENT AGENDA

Commissioner Smith moved approval of the Agenda and Consent Agenda with the removal of 5E, St. Lucie County Comprehensive Plan Amendments DCA Ref# 10-1ER for discussion. Commissioner Grande seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Motion

Items remaining on the Consent Agenda were: 5A, Financial Report – May 31, 2010; 5B, Minutes – June 18, 2010; 5C, Indian River County Comprehensive Plan Amendments DCA Ref# 10-2ER; 5D, Jupiter Comprehensive Plan Amendments DCA Ref# 10-1; 5F, St. Lucie Village Comprehensive Plan Amendments DCA Ref# 10-1; 5G, St. Lucie Village Comprehensive Plan Amendments DCA Ref# 10RWSP-1; 5H, Stuart Comprehensive Plan Amendments DCA Ref# 10-2ER; and 5I, Intergovernmental Coordination and Review Log.

ST. LUCIE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS DCA REF# 10-1ER

Staff noted modifications that were made to the draft report to include correspondence received from the City of Port St. Lucie with respect to the proposed amendments.

Councilmember Hall stated he had general comments on the consent agenda items. He stated he believes that the provisions in the Housing Element of the St. Lucie Village Comprehensive Plan amendments are more of a social agenda, and should not be included in the comprehensive plan of a local government. With reference to plan policies for the Coastal Management Element that prohibit all development activities which would endanger the continued existence of a listed species, he believes this is a tool of denial and a planning tool which takes away property rights. He stated Council should provide comments to these types of issues and not just give carte blanche approval to amendments.

Mayor Golonka moved approval of the staff recommendation with the modifications requested by staff. Councilmember Balbis seconded the motion, which carried unanimously. **Motion**

**PORT ST. LUCIE COMPREHENSIVE
PLAN AMENDMENTS DCA REF# 10-2**

Staff made a presentation on the proposed amendments which include three future land use map amendments and text amendments to three elements and one sub-element of the City Comprehensive Plan. Staff noted the report and all the comments/recommendations deal with a Future Land Use amendment for a 7,000 acre property which is being annexed by the City concurrent with the Future Land Use Amendment. The applicant is requesting a mix of designations which include Heavy Industrial, Utility and Open Space Conservation. The text amendments, which contain some limitation and conditions on development, will amend the Future Land Use and Infrastructure Elements to extend the Urban Service Boundary to encompass the entire property. The proposed development for the site is called the Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus, which will be a large freight, multimodal distribution facility. The site had been rated as second best of four sites in the Request For Proposal process done by the Port of Palm Beach for an inland port project which the Port is no longer pursuing. Although this project is large, it is not subject to the Development of Regional Impact review process and the City is considering agency review and comments during the comprehensive plan amendment process. Staff reviewed several of the comments contained in the staff report that address transportation impacts, economic justification, impacts on native habitat and species, and extrajurisdictional impacts raised by St. Lucie County. The report recommends the City should do a planning study to determine if this is an optimal location for such a facility, whether local and extrajurisdictional impacts have been fully identified and can be mitigated, and a fiscal analysis to be done to determine impacts on the City. The staff report concludes Council should find the Future Land Use Map amendment for the intermodal campus and its associated text amendments consistent with the SRPP only if issues raised are adequately addressed as conditions of the amendments or in the annexation agreement.

Councilmember Davis indicated he had to recuse himself as his firm is the traffic consultant who reviewed the applicant's traffic analysis for the City.

Jim Karas, of VHB MillerSellen and representing the applicant, identified the project team of consultants working on the project. He also provided a list of comments to the staff report as a handout to Councilmembers. He noted that the project is still viable even though the Port of Palm Beach is no longer involved. He stated that the experts are predicting that the cargo coming to Florida by the year 2015 will double and this project will help capture some of that for economic development purposes in the region. He noted the Horizon 2060 plan is of statewide significance and he stated that is essentially driven by Latin American trade forecasts of increased trade with Latin America, and most importantly the widening and deepening of the Panama Canal. He stated the applicant prefers the term Inland Logistic Center to cargo hub. He stated this concept is more expansive and refers to a seamless integration of airport, seaport, ship, plane, rail and truck. These types of facilities are being developed around the United States and around the world and represent an efficiency of cargo movement that is both more economical and more friendly on the environment. He stated the forecast is for approximately 500 employees per million square feet of this type of development. He stated there will be a diverse mix of both blue collar and more sophisticated jobs that will be offered. He noted Destination 2030 forecasts the need for a future transit hub in the general vicinity of the project site. He provided graphics of the advantages of the

project for access to ports throughout the State. He also noted for Council he had a copy of the business plan for the site that could be viewed upon request. With respect to the transportation concerns in the staff report, he stated the applicant is working both with the City and their consultant and have been through several iterations of their traffic analysis and have agreed on a methodology. He stated he did not agree with the staff report that the traffic analysis may be inadequate with a need for additional analysis showing numerous road connections to the site. He stated there are currently industrial uses adjacent to the site noting a major high voltage corridor, and two active rock mines. He stated during the planning process they first looked at the environmental value of the property and then how to integrate the proper amount of stormwater management and the possibility of a public water supply using the mining lake to the north and also taking advantage of the C-23 Canal that would offer recharge, and rain harvesting opportunities. He additionally noted that there are sub area policies proposed that discuss the use of the most efficient energy and environmental design and construction methods and the potential for solar energy generation. He stated that the applicant is committed to provide transit to the site as it develops and this will be a marked advantage compared to the employee commuter patterns now in the Treasure Coast Region. In the interest of intergovernmental coordination and community building, he noted the applicant has met with the neighbors to the north, south, east, west, as well as business and environmental leaders in the community and they are looking forward to a partnership with the City with an eventual annexation.

Mayor Pro Tem Dr. Priore asked for clarification of what Council was approving. He stated he had no problem sending forward a comprehensive plan amendment review, but had concerns that this was also a review of an intermodal facility. Staff indicated the review was for the future land use map amendment from Agriculture to Heavy Industrial, Open Space Conservation and Utility as well as the associated text amendments which have some limitations and conditions on those future land use designations for the site. Staff noted it is the applicant's assertion that this is a good location for an intermodal facility and if the land use changes are made by the City it would allow for and provide for the property owners to develop an intermodal facility.

Councilmember Hall stated that normally in order to change a Future Land Use Map designation the applicant must show a change of conditions or a market demand for those types of services. He stated if a need cannot be shown, then there should not be a change. Staff indicated there is a recommendation contained in the report to require a detailed market and fiscal impact analysis as well as a study for locating the facility on this site.

Mayor Christensen noted the City did several annexations in 2004 and has decided not to move forward on future annexations unless there are several components within the request, one of which would be industrial lands. She stated the consensus of the City Council is that unless an applicant is going to provide something the City needs, then the application would not be approved. She stated this application was initially rejected by the City as it contained a residential component which was not needed. She stated the application now is for industrial uses, which are lacking in the City. She stated there are still concerns from both the City and those contained in the regional planning council report that need to be addressed before the City Council will move forward with final approval.

Daniel Holbrook, Planning and Zoning Director for the City of Port St. Lucie, noted the City staff has been going through the Evaluation and Appraisal Report for the past year. He stated one of the major issues for the City is the lack of industrial land, so this land use amendment is consistent with that goal of the City. He stated City staff acknowledges the comments which were provided in the

Council staff report and found them useful. He stated City staff has been meeting with surrounding neighbors to the property, the regional planning council staff and the Department of Community Affairs with respect to this land use request.

Mr. Karas noted an economic analysis done by the State that forecasts a demand of up to 80 million square feet for this type of use, which is twice the amount being proposed. He reiterated the applicant has done a business plan and an independent market analysis justifying the need.

Councilmember Oujevolk stated he would like to see a coordinated effort through the Sector Plan process that would address and re-establish what impacts this would have on the surrounding areas. He stated he has seen how this type of development will encompass much more than the 7,000 proposed acres.

Commissioner Hayes asked for clarification that this project would use half of all the need for this type of facility in the State. Mr. Karas noted that the economists' analysis stated that up to 80 million square feet of new demand was the potential need to support the new cargo in the South Florida area, which is generally defined to include the Lake Okeechobee Region.

Commissioner Hayes stated he would like to know the availability of heavy industrial for the City. He said he would also like to hear what the County experienced with this and the County's need for industrial. He stated when converting major agricultural areas such as these the opportunity for water treatment and storage, rain harvesting, and wind and solar opportunities needs to be a requirement of projects such as these that have major impacts on our quality of life and health.

Commissioner Grande asked Councilmembers to not assume the County is in favor of the project or that the County and City are working together on the annexation of this land.

Councilmember Trias asked why the applicant was annexing the land into the City. Mr. Karas indicated the applicant was under a tight timeframe for competing favorably in the Request For Proposal process issued by the Port of Palm Beach. He stated it was a deadline and a business decision to go with the annexation into the City. Councilmember Trias asked if they had received support from the County. Mr. Karas indicated there was support from several commissioners, but the board did not formally vote on the project.

Commissioner Craft indicated he was an early supporter of the project, but with conditions which deal with cleaning the water from the adjacent canals, LEED certification for any buildings on the property, and there were also discussions of dedicating a portion of the millage that the revenue generated from the taxes on that property to help out with transportation to more depressed areas. He stated he believes the applicant has done a good job of meeting those requirements and setting the bar much higher than anything else that has ever been presented in the community as far as this type of development. He stated he would like to have seen a site plan moving parallel with the approval of the land use change.

Councilmember Balbis stated there is a need for a facility of this type in the region, but he was concerned that by approving this project, Council will be granting this applicant a step up and there will not be a competitive process. He stated there needs to be a process for identifying the best location within the region for siting this type of facility.

Jonathan Ferguson, attorney for the applicant, noted with respect to justification of need, the studies performed by the State and independent agencies have shown there is a need for this type of facility. He stated there are fourteen recognized legal ports in the State and a public/private partnership can occur with any of those ports. He said the withdrawal of the Port of Palm Beach does not preclude the fact that this type of facility is needed and is irrelevant to the analysis of whether this is an appropriate land use change on this property.

Mayor Golonka asked if the applicant could develop under the current Heavy Industrial designation if they chose not to do the intermodal facility. Mr. Holbrook indicated there are additional sub element policies which are being proposed which limit the amount of development. It is basically about half of what they would currently be allowed if they were just going without any additional restrictive policies. Mr. Holbrook noted the City and applicant are still working on the annexation agreement which contains conditions that provide for improvements to infrastructure and additional safeguards to the City both on monitoring and capping the number of trips.

Mayor Golonka noted that it might be many years before some form of an intermodal hub could be developed and questioned if the applicant was intending to do nothing for a few years, or if there was a point when there might be consideration of another industrial use. Mr. Karas noted that the way the amendment is written there is a first phase in the first five years that caps development at 5.5 million square feet, or just under 7,000 trips. He stated this is a phased type of development anticipating a robust market demand in the short term with the opening of the Panama Canal. Mayor Golonka asked what would happen if there was no inland port. Mr. Karas indicated there could be a similar type of development such as rail and truck, and also options of manufacturing storage, cargo storage, cargo transfer, and assembly facilities.

Mayor Golonka noted that the role of the regional planning council was to consider what is best for the Treasure Coast Region and what would enhance the Region's economic future. She stated she was not interested in considering an inland port if it does not include the Port of Palm Beach. She asked for clarification on the negotiations with other ports. Mr. Karas stated that the applicants are in negotiations and discussions with many interested parties both in the State and internationally. Mayor Golonka pointed out from the staff report materials an editorial suggesting the State needs to play a larger role because of the concern with a number of private cargo hubs cropping up and the need to look at integration.

Commissioner Vana asked why the County had not initiated the land use change. Commissioner Craft stated the applicant had come to the County, but the County requested further information which could not be provided timely enough to meet their deadline. He stated the City was more comfortable moving forward being the sponsoring government and getting the answers to the questions later, because they had plenty of time to pull the plug on the project as it moved forward. Mr. Karas stated there is a provision in Florida law that states if a seaport wants to extend its facilities outside of the County it is located in it needs the consent of the local government. Commissioner Grande stated the applicant had gone to the City as the City was able to meet their timeframes and agreed to be the sponsoring government.

Commissioner Vana stated the location of the inland port was a very big decision and should be more than one City making a proposal to do an end-run around the County.

Chairman Ferreri stated the advantage of a City doing the annexation is that it can move more quickly than at the County level. He stated that this is a straight land use change, and the inland

port project will not happen until the port creates the need. He stated Council needed to determine if this current application for a heavy industrial land use was appropriate, and the discussion of the intermodal facility was just sales by the applicant. Mr. Holbrook indicated that if there had not been a deadline this most likely would have stayed in the unincorporated County because of the tax advantages.

Commissioner Vana stated she believes it is the responsibility of Council to look at the planning of projects such as these on a regional basis to determine where the project would be best located.

As a point of disclosure, Councilmember Brinkman stated her firm is retained by Florida Crystals, who will also be coming forward with a land use change. She questioned Council's attorney if there was a conflict. Mr. Saberson indicated he preferred to recommend that if there is any possible chance of a conflict, that she should recuse herself from voting. Councilmember Brinkman indicated she did not believe there was a conflict, because this is not a competition for an inland port designation, but a land use amendment for a private entity in a different county.

Mr. Saberson stated that although this is a land use amendment, the applicant is definitely and positively going to try to get this intermodal system up and running which may be what her client is also intending. Councilmember Brinkman stated she would recuse herself. Under discussion, she noted that this is only a land use amendment, and not an approval of this site for an inland port. She did note that since it is Council's responsibility to review these types of amendments regionally, if this is approved she is concerned how many more requests will come forward. Mr. Saberson noted that it was Council's statutory responsibility to evaluate amendment proposals for impacts on regional resources and facilities and extrajurisdictional impacts, and not consider future proposals that may never come forward.

Staff noted a proposed text amendment that states if the Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus does not move forward on this site by 2020, the City Council must do comprehensive plan amendments to create a new agricultural future land use classification and map amendment to revert the area proposed for Heavy Industrial to an agricultural classification. Staff noted this suggests the City is not just considering this an expansion of their industrial land use needs, but something more specific. Additionally, there is a potential for 12 million square feet of industrial use in the southwestern annexation area developments of regional impact immediately adjacent to this site which are not in any analysis because it is designated as New Community Development.

Commissioner Solari stated there was too much discussion regarding the inland port, and everyone needed to take into account that this is a land use amendment for a private sector project with a lot of risk on the part of the landowner, and many different things could happen to this project before this could become an intermodal port.

Councilmember Parrish asked to know the zoning to the east of Rangeline Road and if there was an impact study being done for that area. Mr. Holbrook stated the property does not have a City zoning designation, but does have a Future Land Use Designation of New Community Development, and a zoning designation of Agricultural, which is the County designation. Mr. Holbrook stated there have not been any studies, but there are sub area policies which were included to restrict development within a certain footprint and have a buffer from what was to be residential, which is established in the Wilson and Riverland Kennedy Developments of Regional Impact.

Councilmember Oujevolk questioned why this has not gone through the Sector Planning process. Staff indicated to do this the City would have to request the Department of Community Affairs to designate the area for a sector plan, which has not been done.

Councilmember Hall stated that if this were just a land use change, he would be very supportive, but it becomes more complicated as the development proposed does have more of a regional type impact and that needs to be considered. He stated there needs to be a separate meeting, regardless of the inland port, to determine the best location for a facility such as this in terms of traffic, housing, employment and other issues of concern.

Alexandria Larson stated listening to the comments of Councilmembers indicates the applicant has failed in their sales pitch. She stated there needs to be more review of this project, as the Port is a key player and without the widening and deepening of the port the cargo will not be coming to Palm Beach. She stated since the applicant is proposing only 620 acres of the 7,000 as open space conservation, then that is inconsistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan. She stated that there is no money to build the railroad to the project and asked who was to be responsible for building it. She said there are a lot of issues with using C-23 Canal as a run off.

Chairman Ferreri asked, in lieu of no development of regional impact review process, if Council could make recommendations to the local governments for conditions of approval. Staff indicated this had been done in the report as recommendations for the City to include in their text amendments and annexation agreement. Chairman Ferreri stated he believes the comments in the report need to be stronger. He also applauded the City for addressing the need for industrial in their Evaluation and Appraisal Report. He cautioned that Crosstown Parkway, which he stated is basically a residential reliever road, will become overcrowded with truck traffic.

Mayor Christensen noted that Crosstown Parkway is a six-lane divided parkway with meandering sidewalks, street lights, pedestrian lighting, and a well-landscaped median that extends west to I-95. She stated they are asking the developer to construct the segment to go west to Rangeline Road in the same fashion. She stated there are still concerns and discussion with respect to the transportation issues for this project.

Commissioner Smith stated the Panama Canal will be open in 2014 and the amount of freight that is anticipated coming to the southern hemisphere through the canal is astronomical in terms of what it means to the State. He stated there is a state-wide discussion going on with respect to how the State will address the next 50 years and how Florida will position itself in the economy and if the State will be a major transit hub or not. He stated this will create a tremendous amount of jobs. He noted Council is partnering with the South Florida Regional Planning Council to create a super region that will determine how we want South Florida to look and where the infrastructure dollars are going to be spent. He noted this was also done in the Central Florida Region from Orlando to Cocoa, and they were awarded \$1.2 billion for the high-speed rail program. He asked staff to arrange a meeting to collaborate with the South Florida Regional Planning Council and bring forward a lot of the information that is being discussed in the 2060 planning meetings. Staff noted Council is working with the South Florida Regional Planning Council to obtain funding through the Sustainable Communities Initiative grant that is administered by U.S. Housing and Urban Development.

Commissioner Smith noted that FEC has a rail line that runs adjacent to the subject property, so there would be no need to build the railroad as stated in previous public comment.

Commissioner Grande stated that although this is simply a Future Land Use change, and is not subject to the Development of Regional Impact process, he believes a project of this size does need careful review. He noted that since the Port of Palm Beach is no longer considering this to be an intermodal site, then the pace of the application does not need to be as fast.

Commissioner Vana stated she agreed with Commissioner Smith that there needs to be more cooperation on determining what is going to impact the region economically and to address funding from the Federal government. She stated she is not in favor of the project as there needs to be more review of where a project such as this is located. `

Chairman Ferreri asked for discussion to return to the current item and stated he was looking for Council direction through a motion.

Mayor Golonka noted the staff recommendation is to find the amendment to be consistent only with recommendations. She stated she did not agree with this, that if the amendments are inconsistent then the report should find them inconsistent. She made a motion to find the amendment P09-129 inconsistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan and the other two amendments to be consistent. Commissioner Vana seconded the motion.

Motion

Under discussion, Councilmember Oujevolk suggested significant elements of the Development of Regional Impact process should be required. Mr. Saberson indicated this could not be made mandatory. He stated the conditions proposed in the staff report would accomplish in essence the same purpose as if they were conditions of a Development of Regional Impact. Mayor Golonka stated these conditions will assist in making the amendment more consistent, but there are a lot of issues that had been raised by Councilmembers during discussion that need to be addressed.

Councilmember Hall asked if the proposed amendment is inconsistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan. Staff indicated it is inconsistent unless the conditions in the report are met. Councilmember Hall stated he would like to make a substitute motion finding the amendment inconsistent unless the conditions in the staff report are met. Additionally, he stated he would add language that a project of this magnitude be subject to a regional review process. Commissioner Smith seconded the substitute motion.

**Substitute
Motion**

Mayor Golonka stated it is fine to have conditions that will address some of the concerns, but the more conditions that are placed on a request, the more flawed the basic request. She suggested that the request needs to be changed, possibly with less Industrial.

Commissioner Grande asked if the substitute motion was to fail, would Council then consider the original motion. Chairman Ferreri indicated that would be the process. Councilmember Balbis asked for clarification of the substitute motion. Chairman Ferreri stated that the substitute motion was to find the proposed amendment to be inconsistent unless the conditions in the report are met and to also include language for a regional review of a project of this magnitude in the region.

Commissioner Smith stated the only point of the whole discussion and the sense of urgency that was missing is that in 2014 the Panama Canal opens and South Florida needs a series of these kinds of things occurring. He cautioned that the time to market is going to be very short in terms of the permitting time, and there needs to be a regional vision.

Commissioner Vana noted that this is only a nuance of the differences between the staff recommendation to find it Consistent if the conditions are met. Chairman Ferreri noted that there is also the inclusion of language to address the regional impact of projects such as these.

Upon taking a vote, the substitute motion passed by a vote of ten to seven.

ORIENTATION SERIES ON STREETS, BLOCKS AND ALLEYWAYS: INTERCONNECTIVITY AND DETAILING THE STREET

Staff made a presentation which is the fourth installment in the Orientation Series. These presentations are being made to present planning techniques and research to provide Councilmembers with additional insight and knowledge on how to promote sustainable growth in the region.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councilmember Trias asked for more information with respect to the comments on the Central Florida Plan. Staff indicated this would be done at a joint meeting between the Treasure Coast and the South Florida Regional Planning Councils on October 1, 2010. Staff indicated more information would be provided to Councilmembers regarding this joint meeting.

Chairman Ferreri noted that the August Council meeting was being canceled.

Commissioner Smith noted a conference call the previous day with Senator Altman, his staff and several elected officials from our region as well as Brevard County to discuss the Amtrak/FEC Corridor Project application that is due to be transmitted on August 6, 2010. He stated the conversation was positive although there is still the issue of liability to resolve. Staff noted this application is not for stimulus money, but is for regular appropriations. Staff also noted that the issue of liability is also for the Sunrail project and there will be meetings next week in Washington to work through that issue. Commissioner Smith stated that Commissioner Marcus had spoken with the Governor's office and the Governor is very supportive and is pushing the Florida Department of Transportation to ensure this happens. He asked the Chairman to send a letter of appreciation to the Secretary of the Department of Transportation for all their hard work on this application. Staff also noted an award the Department had recently received for their work on this project.

Chairman Ferreri stated this is a great opportunity to get rail and pedestrian service on the east coast where all the population is located. With respect to the 80/20 match, he asked if the 20 match had been identified.

Commissioner Smith noted that this is the highest match that we will see, noting the next cycle will be a 50/50 match. He noted again this is from existing funds already in the 2009 budget, not from stimulus money. With respect to the 20 percent match, staff indicated Council is working with the Florida Department of Transportation to identify existing improvement programs that will count toward the match. Two programs identified are the Miami Intermodal Center, which is the intermodal center at the Miami International Airport, and funding that the Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organization has already allocated to getting Tri-Rail north to Jupiter.

Chairman Ferreri noted this will re-energize the eastern Cities with the opportunity of providing access to airports, shopping, business, tourism for the state. Staff noted long distance trains on the corridor will be able to be programmed to service commuter routes.

COUNCIL MEMBER INFORMATION EXCHANGE

None.

STAFF COMMENT

At a Budget/Personnel Committee meeting it was determined it would be a significant cost savings to reduce the number of Council meetings to eight per year. Because of Council’s statutory review requirements for proposed comprehensive plan amendments, staff was asked to contact local governments to determine their comprehensive plan amendment schedules. Staff presented the findings to Council, which indicate the local government schedules would have reviews that need to be done every month. Chairman Ferreri asked staff to determine which months would be appropriate to not have meetings and contact the local governments with the meeting schedule.

Commissioner Grande asked if the Department of Community Affairs would consider extending the review time to 60 days. Staff indicated this has been requested several times in the past.

CHAIRMAN’S COMMENT

None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chairman Ferreri adjourned the meeting at 12:45 pm. This signature is to attest that the undersigned is the Secretary or a designated nominee of the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council, and that the information provided herein is the true and correct Minutes of the July 16, 2010 meeting of the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council.

Date

Signature

FORM 8B MEMORANDUM OF VOTING CONFLICT FOR COUNTY, MUNICIPAL, AND OTHER LOCAL PUBLIC OFFICERS

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME DAVIS, MICHAEL L.	NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE TCRPS
MAILING ADDRESS 202 Greenwood Dr	THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF: <i>State</i>
CITY WPB	<input type="checkbox"/> CITY <input type="checkbox"/> COUNTY <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER LOCAL AGENCY
COUNTY PB	NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION:
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED July 16, 2010	MY POSITION IS: <input type="checkbox"/> ELECTIVE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> APPOINTEE

WHO MUST FILE FORM 8B

This form is for use by any person serving at the county, city, or other local level of government on an appointed or elected board, council, commission, authority, or committee. It applies equally to members of advisory and non-advisory bodies who are presented with a voting conflict of interest under Section 112.3143, Florida Statutes.

Your responsibilities under the law when faced with voting on a measure in which you have a conflict of interest will vary greatly depending on whether you hold an elective or appointive position. For this reason, please pay close attention to the instructions on this form before completing the reverse side and filing the form.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 112.3143, FLORIDA STATUTES

A person holding elective or appointive county, municipal, or other local public office **MUST ABSTAIN** from voting on a measure which inures to his or her special private gain or loss. Each elected or appointed local officer also is prohibited from knowingly voting on a measure which inures to the special gain or loss of a principal (other than a government agency) by whom he or she is retained (including the parent organization or subsidiary of a corporate principal by which he or she is retained); to the special private gain or loss of a relative; or to the special private gain or loss of a business associate. Commissioners of community redevelopment agencies under Sec. 163.356 or 163.357, F.S., and officers of independent special tax districts elected on a one-acre, one-vote basis are not prohibited from voting in that capacity.

For purposes of this law, a "relative" includes only the officer's father, mother, son, daughter, husband, wife, brother, sister, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, and daughter-in-law. A "business associate" means any person or entity engaged in or carrying on a business enterprise with the officer as a partner, joint venturer, coowner of property, or corporate shareholder (where the shares of the corporation are not listed on any national or regional stock exchange).

* * * * *

ELECTED OFFICERS:

In addition to abstaining from voting in the situations described above, you must disclose the conflict:

PRIOR TO THE VOTE BEING TAKEN by publicly stating to the assembly the nature of your interest in the measure on which you are abstaining from voting; *and*

WITHIN 15 DAYS AFTER THE VOTE OCCURS by completing and filing this form with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who should incorporate the form in the minutes.

* * * * *

APPOINTED OFFICERS:

Although you must abstain from voting in the situations described above, you otherwise may participate in these matters. However, you must disclose the nature of the conflict before making any attempt to influence the decision, whether orally or in writing and whether made by you or at your direction.

IF YOU INTEND TO MAKE ANY ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION PRIOR TO THE MEETING AT WHICH THE VOTE WILL BE TAKEN:

- You must complete and file this form (before making any attempt to influence the decision) with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who will incorporate the form in the minutes. (Continued on other side)

APPOINTED OFFICERS (continued)

- A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency.
- The form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

IF YOU MAKE NO ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION EXCEPT BY DISCUSSION AT THE MEETING:

- You must disclose orally the nature of your conflict in the measure before participating.
- You must complete the form and file it within 15 days after the vote occurs with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who must incorporate the form in the minutes. A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency, and the form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

DISCLOSURE OF LOCAL OFFICER'S INTEREST

I, Michael Davis, hereby disclose that on July 16, 2010, 20 10:

(a) A measure came or will come before my agency which (check one)

- inured to my special private gain or loss;
- inured to the special gain or loss of my business associate, _____;
- inured to the special gain or loss of my relative, _____;
- inured to the special gain or loss of _____, by whom I am retained; or
- inured to the special gain or loss of _____, which is the parent organization or subsidiary of a principal which has retained me.

(b) The measure before my agency and the nature of my conflicting interest in the measure is as follows:

My fian, Keith's Schwens, P.A. represents the City of Port St. Lucie on item PG 9 - 129 as traffic consultant.

Date Filed

July 16, 2010

Signature

M. Davis

NOTICE: UNDER PROVISIONS OF FLORIDA STATUTES §112.317, A FAILURE TO MAKE ANY REQUIRED DISCLOSURE CONSTITUTES GROUNDS FOR AND MAY BE PUNISHED BY ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING: IMPEACHMENT, REMOVAL OR SUSPENSION FROM OFFICE OR EMPLOYMENT, DEMOTION, REDUCTION IN SALARY, REPRIMAND, OR A CIVIL PENALTY NOT TO EXCEED \$10,000.

APPOINTED OFFICERS (continued)

- A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency.
- The form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

IF YOU MAKE NO ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION EXCEPT BY DISCUSSION AT THE MEETING:

- You must disclose orally the nature of your conflict in the measure before participating.
- You must complete the form and file it within 15 days after the vote occurs with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who must incorporate the form in the minutes. A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency, and the form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

DISCLOSURE OF LOCAL OFFICER'S INTEREST

I, Joni Brinkman, hereby disclose that on 7-16-10, 20 :

(a) A measure came or will come before my agency which (check one)

- inured to my special private gain or loss;
- inured to the special gain or loss of my business associate, _____;
- inured to the special gain or loss of my relative, _____;
- inured to the special gain or loss of _____, by whom I am retained; or
- inured to the special gain or loss of Urban Design Kilday Studios, which is the parent organization or subsidiary of a principal which has retained me.

(b) The measure before my agency and the nature of my conflicting interest in the measure is as follows:

Item 6A - I'm employed by UDKS who is retained by Florida Crystals which ~~is~~ is also processing a WPA for an alternative "Inland Port/ILC" location in PBC.

7-16-10
Date Filed

Joni Brinkman
Signature

NOTICE: UNDER PROVISIONS OF FLORIDA STATUTES §112.317, A FAILURE TO MAKE ANY REQUIRED DISCLOSURE CONSTITUTES GROUNDS FOR AND MAY BE PUNISHED BY ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING: IMPEACHMENT, REMOVAL OR SUSPENSION FROM OFFICE OR EMPLOYMENT, DEMOTION, REDUCTION IN SALARY, REPRIMAND, OR A CIVIL PENALTY NOT TO EXCEED \$10,000.