Chairman Trias called the meeting to order at 9:30 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 O’Bryan
Commissioner Solari
Vice Mayor Fletcher (Alternate)

St. Lucie County: Commissioner Hutchinson (Alternate)
Mayor Faiella

Martin County: Commissioner Hayes
Commissioner Scott
Commissioner Luger (Alternate)

Palm Beach County: Commissioner Burdick
Mayor Ferreri
Mayor Golonka
Councilman Lowe
Mayor Pro Tem Brinkman (Alternate)
Vice Mayor Norris (Alternate)
Vice Mayor Pro Tem Andel (Alternate)
Mayor DuBois (Alternate)

Gubernatorial Appointees: Michael Davis
Kevin Foley
Bill Hall
Susan Hershey
Reece Parrish
Ramon Trias

Ex-Officios: Pam Mac’Kie, South Florida Water Management District
Ann Benedetti, St. Johns River Water Management District

Council Staff: Kate Boer
Michael Busha
Kim DeLane
Eloine del Valle
Sandy Gippert
Liz Gulick
Stephanie Heidt
Dana Little
Peter Merritt
Greg Vaday
Joan Young

Council Attorney: Roger Saberson

The Executive Director announced a quorum was present.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

None.

AGENDA

Chairman Trias requested the Agenda be reordered to move Agenda Item 10, South Florida Regional Transportation Authority Status Update before Agenda Item 9, Council Orientation Series -- Parking: How to Handle the Necessary Nemesis. Commissioner O’Bryan moved approval of the reordered Agenda. Mayor Ferreri seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Ferreri moved approval of the Consent Agenda. Councilmember Hershey seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Items on the Consent Agenda were: 5A, Audit Report - Fiscal Year 2010-2011; 5B, Financial Report – September 30, 2011; 5C, Minutes – October 21, 2011; 5D, Sections 120.74 and 120.745, Florida Statutes - Enhanced Biennial Rule Review; 5E, Interagency Subrecipient Award Agreement with Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council - Statewide Energy Resiliency Strategy; 5F, Resolution Recognizing Service of Lola Smith as Area Director, Atlanta Region, U.S. Economic Development Administration; 5G, Resolution Recognizing Designation of Hazardous Materials Awareness Week; 5H, Indian River County Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 11-2ESR; 5I, City of Port St. Lucie Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 11-2ESR; 5J, City of Stuart Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 11-1ESR; 5K, City of West Palm Beach Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 11-1ESR; and 5L, Intergovernmental Coordination and Review Log.

COUNCIL REORGANIZATION - MEMBERSHIP APPOINTMENTS AND ELECTION OF OFFICERS

In accordance with the rules and regulations of Council, Staff read the following names of the new Councilmembers for 2012 into the record and asked that the Chairman certify that they have been duly appointed.

PALM BEACH COUNTY

Regular Members: Commissioner Karen Marcus
Commissioner Paulette Burdick
Commissioner Priscilla A. Taylor
Regular Member
Alternates: Commissioner Jess R. Santamaria
Commissioner Steven L. Abrams
Commissioner Shelley Vana

Municipal Members: Councilwoman Martha Webster (Village of Royal Palm Beach)
Mayor Sam Ferreri (City of Greenacres)
Mayor Karen Golonka (Town of Jupiter)
Mayor Pro Tem Dr. Carmine Priore (Village of Wellington)
Councilmember Shelby Lowe (City of Riviera Beach)

Municipal Alternates: Mayor Pro Tem Joni Brinkman (Village of Palm Springs)
Vice Mayor David Norris (Village of North Palm Beach)
Mayor James DuBois (Town of Lake Park)
Commissioner Kimberly Mitchell (City of West Palm Beach)
Vice Mayor Pro Tem Ellen Andel (Town of Juno Beach)

INDIAN RIVER COUNTY

Regular Members: Commissioner Peter O’Bryan
Commissioner Bob Solari

Regular Member
Alternates: Commissioner Gary Wheeler
Commissioner Joseph Flescher

Municipal Members: Mayor Thomas Cadden (Town of Indian River Shores)
Councilmember Craig Fletcher (City of Vero Beach)

Municipal Alternates: Vice Mayor Bud Oatway (Town of Orchid)
Mayor Jim Hill (City of Sebastian)

MARTIN COUNTY

Regular Members: Commissioner Doug Smith
Commissioner Patrick Hayes

Regular Member
Alternates: Commissioner Ed Fielding
Commissioner Sarah Heard

Municipal Member: Not yet appointed (City of Stuart)

Municipal Alternate Commissioner Paul Luger (Town of Sewall’s Point)

ST. LUCIE COUNTY

Regular Members: Commissioner Chris Craft
Commissioner Tod Mowery

Regular Member
Alternates: Commissioner Frannie Hutchinson
Commissioner Christopher Dzadovsky

Municipal Members: Mayor JoAnn Faiella (City of Port St. Lucie)
Commissioner Thomas Perona (City of Fort Pierce)

Municipal Alternates: Councilwoman Shannon Martin (City of Port St. Lucie)
Commissioner Reginald Sessions (City of Fort Pierce)

GUBERNATORIAL APPOINTEES:
- Susan Hershey, Martin County
- Kevin J. Foley, Martin County
- Michael Davis, Palm Beach County
- Bill Hall, Palm Beach County
- Peter Sachs, Palm Beach County
- Vacant, Palm Beach County
- Robert Stork, Indian River County
- Reece Parrish, St. Lucie County
- Ramon Trias, St. Lucie County

Chairman Trias certified that, as chairman of the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council, the membership as read have all been duly appointed.

Mayor Ferreri stated the Nominating Committee met before the meeting and Committee’s recommendations for the 2012 Officers are: Councilmember Foley as Chairman, Commissioner Peter O’Bryan as Vice Chairman, and Councilwoman Martha Webster as Secretary/Treasurer.

Mayor Ferreri moved adoption of the recommendations of the Nominating Committee for the 2012 Council Officers. Commissioner Burdick seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

BUDGET/PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - ANNUAL REVIEW OF COUNCIL’S EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Mayor Ferreri stated the Committee met and agreed there will be no budget changes in the area of personnel pay or benefits, including the Executive Director, due to the uncertainty of the economy and our existing budget. He added the Executive Director will be bringing an amended budget to Council in March reflecting some increases in revenue due to some additional contracts. He noted that only five of 27 Council members completed and returned the Executive Director evaluations. He stated there were some low scores given on one evaluation, but no comments as to why or what needed improvement. He said without comments it is difficult for the Executive Director to know what improvements or changes Council may want him to address. He stated that the Committee would like to encourage the new Chairman to allow time at the January meeting for Councilmembers to receive and complete the evaluation forms. All Committee members agreed that the Executive Director’s job performance has been satisfactory and he is doing an excellent job, especially with the changes in the economy and the loss of state funding.

Mayor Ferreri then asked the Executive Director to give an update on a glitch bill being proposed by Senator Bennett that deals with growth management issues. Mr. Michael Busha stated the most troubling passage in the bill is related to the state’s abdication of funding for statutory duties of
regional planning councils. The proposed bill states that before any of the eleven regional planning
councils can accept grants or contracts with local, federal or state governments, the council has to
certify that it has enough money in its budget. He stated this effectively shifts the burden directly to
the counties and cities to fund regional planning council statutory responsibilities. He stated the
Florida Regional Councils Association is following this issue and he will provide updates when
available. He encouraged Councilmembers to contact their legislators on the proposed bill.
Councilmember Foley asked Mr. Busha to forward information and verbiage that can be included in
any correspondence with legislators.

Mayor Ferreri stated the recommendation of the Committee is to make no changes to the budget in
terms of salary and benefits for the executive director.

Councilmember Foley moved adoption of the recommendation of the Budget/Personnel Committee. Motion
Commissioner O’Bryan seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

SOUTHERN GROVE DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT
SUBSTANTIAL DEVIATION

Staff presented an overview of the Southern Grove Development of Regional Impact (DRI)
Substantial Deviation. The most significant changes in the proposed substantial deviation are related
to increasing the non-residential uses 111 percent, by adding 6,951,039 SF to the currently approved
6,236,704 SF of non-residential uses. The proposal is to provide large-scale employment and retail
opportunities in southwestern Port St. Lucie. The main change proposed on the Master
Development Plan is to increase the area of Mixed Use development in the southwestern portion of
the project site. Staff noted that the proposed changes to the Southern Grove DRI will place
additional demands on the regional transportation system. Staff stated that the draft assessment
report provides a series of recommendations to the City for mitigating impacts on the regional
roadway network and to ensure an adequate roadway network will be in place when needed to meet
demand and the City’s local concurrency requirements. Additionally, the assessment report contains
a series of advisory recommendations for the City of Port St. Lucie based on the goals, strategies,
and policies of the Strategic Regional Policy Plan.

Representing the owner and developer of the property, Mr. Wes McCurry, of Fishkind &
Associates, explained that the application is part of a larger vision for the property and the owner
has been working cooperatively with the City of Port St. Lucie for several years. He stated he
believes this property represents an opportunity like no other in the state for creation of a large scale
employment corridor. He noted that while this substantial deviation proposes a significant increase
in non-residential uses, there are no residential increases being requested. He said that as a result of
previous agreements between the City and the developers of this and surrounding properties, all of
the right-of-way within the Western Annexation Area roadway network has been conveyed to the
City and roughly $150 million of infrastructure has been put into the ground and is supported by a
special assessment district levied against this property. He thanked Council staff for their hard
work and said they are looking forward to addressing the comments and working through the issues
to adopt a final development order.

Commissioner Scott asked the name of the developer. Mr. McCurry stated the developer and owner
of the property is PSL Acquisitions.
Commissioner Hayes asked what the volume of discharge will be into the C-23 Canal that would ultimately affect Martin County and its estuaries. Staff stated they could not address the exact volume, but noted that the water management district had reviewed the substantial deviation and made no changes to the conditions of approval related to water.

Mr. Daniel Holbrook, Planning and Zoning Director for the City of Port St. Lucie, thanked Council and Council staff for their review. He asked Council to transmit the staff report to the City so negotiations can continue with the developer and the recommendations can be taken to the City Planning and Zoning Board and City Council.

Mayor Ferreri stated he is supportive of the concept of the employment center and the increase in square footage for the research, development and warehouse makes sense. However, he questioned the huge increase in retail and how much that is contributing to the traffic impacts. He stated that when you start proposing eight lanes of roads, especially east of I-95 where development has already occurred, the quality of life and the quality of the developed parcels diminishes. He also asked how the proposed changes will affect the educational component. Staff stated that with respect to schools, two sites have been dedicated on the property, per the existing agreement with the school board. Staff indicated several unsuccessful attempts were made to receive feedback from the school board on this application, so the assumption is they are satisfied. Staff could not quantify how much of the traffic impacts are related to the retail, but this proposal is attempting to capture a significant number of trips from the residential areas of the neighboring DRIs.

Councilmember Davis noted for the record that he was recusing himself from the discussion and vote on this item because his firm represents the City on the traffic engineering.

Mayor Ferreri asked if the other developments in the area are in the process of reducing their commercial retail. Mr. Holbrook indicated that the Wilson Groves DRI recently processed a Notice of Proposed Change to redistribute the commercial retail along the arterials. Mayor Ferreri agreed that clustering the commercial into what could be called a city center is a good idea, but not if the other developments are dispersing their commercial use. He stated that if there is no carrying capacity for more commercial, dispersing the commercial throughout the development will create areas that will become obsolete as newer retail areas are developed.

Commissioner Hayes stated he believes we cannot afford to continue to move forward with what he feels has been grossly understated water quality considerations. Chairman Trias noted that staff had indicated there is a review process that has been followed with respect to water.

Councilmember Foley noted that Council exists to discuss and analyze the regional impacts of proposals such as this. He stated he understood the City would like for us to quickly forward our recommendations, but he cautioned that it is Council’s responsibility to really drill down on the regional impacts, taking into account everything that has been approved in the area. He asked if staff is aware of any planned development immediately south in Martin County. Staff indicated there is a proposal to the immediate south for approximately five million square feet of workplace with no proposed residential use. Staff noted this is not a DRI and has already been approved by Martin County, but is still facing some legal hurdles.

Councilmember Foley pointed out that about 16 million square feet of non-residential uses and 38,000 residential units have been approved in the DRIs in the Western Annexation Area. He asked if there is a recommended ratio for these uses. Staff indicated that the proper balance of non-
residential square footage per residential unit is going to vary based on the type of non-residential use. Councilmember Hall indicated that if you look at just the retail component, the proposal to have 3,675,000 square feet of retail would result in about 164 square feet per person. He indicated that this is a concern because it is much higher than the 43 square feet per person suggested by a previous commercial needs study in Palm Beach County. Staff pointed out that the proposed project will serve regional retail needs for an area outside the proposed project. Staff noted that it is Council’s responsibility to identify all the impacts that could occur from the requested increase and make recommendations on how to mitigate those impacts. However, it is ultimately the decision of the City on what will be allowed and what conditions will be required.

Commissioner Burdick asked if the two school sites would be sufficient and questioned why the school board would not want to be part of the discussion. Staff indicated there is also a charter school being proposed, and since the residential will not change, and there are current agreements in place, this may be why the school board has not responded. Commissioner Burdick stated she did not believe the two school sites and the charter school would be sufficient for this area. Mr. McCurry stated that the number of school sites required in the conditions was based on population and student projections per household that were developed by the St. Lucie County School Board. Commissioner Burdick asked if those agreements were made before the class size reduction amendment was in place. Councilmember Hershey stated the agreements were made after the amendment.

Mayor Golonka asked if there is a condition that establishes a relationship between non-residential and residential in terms of phasing. Staff indicated there was no condition to address this. Mayor Golonka stated that linkage is very important, but understands the difficulty of doing that type of phased planning without knowing the aggregate balance of population that will be employed there.

Councilmember Hershey stated she believes the two schools and the charter school will be ample space for the students. She asked if the developer went through the proportionate share mitigation process. Mr. Holbrook indicated that as part of the annexation agreement when the property was initially annexed, each of the developments in the Western Annexation Area was required to set aside acreage to initially accommodate an elementary, junior high, and high school. The school board then revised that request to be K-8, so some changes were made. It was determined the area would have sufficient school sites to accommodate the population, and possibly some of the student population to the east of I-95.

Councilmember Foley cautioned that eliminating access points such as interchanges and crossovers on the future roadway map was not good planning. He said that taking vital links off the map could cause problems and could require retrofitting in the future.

Commissioner Solari stated he felt the discussion was deviating from the issues on the table, and said it was not fair to the applicant to raise other issues at this point. Chairman Trias stated that the current issue is the proposed increase in the non-residential uses and the impacts this will have.

Mayor Pro Tem Brinkman asked if there is sufficient right-of-way for the affected roadways east of I-95. She also questioned if consideration had been given to what would be required to handle the additional impacts of residents living east of I-95 traveling to jobs created in this development. With respect to the right-of-ways east of I-95, Ms. Maria Tejera, Council’s traffic consultant, stated the report only shows the roadway needs and she did not know if the right-of-way was there. Mayor
Pro Tem Brinkman asked if the City could decide if the developer did not have to meet concurrency requirements. Ms. Tejera indicated that could occur.

Chairman Trias asked staff to summarize the comments and recommendations presented during Council Member discussion. Staff stated the assessment report recommendation is to approve the draft report and recommendations for transmittal to the City. Staff also recommended the following comments from the Council discussion be included in a letter to the City that will accompany the assessment report: 1) maintaining the Western Annexation Traffic Study network; 2) define a relationship between the non-residential and residential development to create balance as the development progresses; 3) contact the school board to ensure the school needs are adequate; and 4) analyze the apparent excess of retail per person.

Councilmember Foley moved to approve the staff report and include the listed recommendations from Council discussion in correspondence to the City, with the addition of a recommendation addressing water quality. Commissioner Burdick seconded the motion.

Commissioner Hayes stated he would not be able to support the motion because he felt there was no consideration given to water quality and drainage associated with the additional increase in non-residential uses.

The motion passed with fifteen assenting, Commissioner Hayes and Mayor Ferreri dissenting, and Councilmember Davis abstaining.

SOUTH FLORIDA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY STATUS UPDATE - PRESENTATION BY BILL CROSS, MANAGER OF PLANNING AND ENGINEERING, AND JOE QUINTY, TRANSPORTATION PLANNING MANAGER, SOUTH FLORIDA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Mr. Bill Cross gave a presentation to Council which included an agency overview, an update on proposed legislation that will affect the agency, and discussion of the Fast Start Plan, which is a proposed public/private partnership between the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), FEC Railway, local governments, and South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA).

In his overview of the proposed FDOT legislation, Mr. Cross highlighted two key points: 1) altering the composition of the SFRTA Board from a nine-member board (containing three county commissioners, three county citizen representatives, and three gubernatorial appointees, one of which is an FDOT district secretary) to a seven-member board (containing three county commissioners and four gubernatorial appointees, one of which is an FDOT district secretary); and 2) restricting the operations of the SFRTA to Miami-Dade, Broward and Palm Beach counties and removing the option for agency expansion into adjacent counties with majority votes by the SFRTA board and subject county commission.

Mr. Cross asked Council to pass a resolution opposing FDOT’s proposed legislation on the highlighted points. Chairman Trias asked if this could be done at the January meeting to allow staff time to put together a report on the issue. Mr. Cross indicated the preference would be to have the resolution now, because the issue may have already been decided by the January meeting. Mayor Ferreri suggested that if Council were to agree, the Chairman could draft a strong letter in opposition to the legislation, and then Council could pass a resolution at the January meeting. Mr. Cross indicated that would be acceptable.
Mayor Ferreri made a motion to have the Chairman send a letter indicating Council’s opposition to
the proposed legislation. Councilman Lowe seconded the motion, which carried with Commissioner
Solari opposed.

Mr. Cross then presented an overview of the SFRTA’s Fast Start Plan, which proposes an expedited
approach to expand Tri-Rail, including new service on the FEC from Jupiter to Miami and
additional service on the FEC from Pompano Beach to Miami. Mr. Cross’ overview included a
comparison of this plan to FDOT’s South Florida East Coast Corridor Study.

Councilmember Davis asked if the proposed Fast Start Plan would result in a reduction of traffic on
I-95. Mr. Cross said the plan is about Florida’s future, and redeveloping our eastern downtowns
through investment in infrastructure, which in this case is the passenger rail. He indicated the intent
of the plan is to capture and support much of the transportation demand that will grow out of the
economic development to the east without putting the additional burden on I-95. He said the plan is
to provide and expand transportation choices in the future

Councilmember Davis noted that the plan calls for the elimination of federal review. He asked if
this would foreclose the option of federal funding in the future. Mr. Cross stated that the Fast Start
Plan would allow for an eighty percent benefit quickly by using state and local dollars to get the
first piece of the expanded service on the ground. Once that component is operational, the process
to obtain federal money could move forward and eventually bring in more money to expand and
build upon the service. Councilmember Davis asked if that meant the Fast Start Plan would proceed
without the federal funding and any additional services could be done after going through the
National Environmental Policy Act process to obtain federal dollars. Mr. Cross indicated that is
correct. He stated that is why SFRTA is asking for Council support to encourage FDOT and the
SFRTA to work together on this project, because the FDOT environmental review is already in
process. Mayor Ferreri suggested FDOT make a presentation to Council at the January meeting to
give more detail regarding their plans and the process that produced their locally preferred
alternative. Staff noted the regional planning council has been asked to assist in reviewing the two
proposals and help identify where there are comparable elements and differences between SFRTA’s
plan and FDOT’s locally preferred alternative.

Councilman Lowe offered his support of the Fast Start Plan, noting that most of Riviera Beach’s
planning has been centered around passenger rail to the north.

Mayor Golonka asked if the municipalities would be responsible for a local match to build the
stations under the Fast Start Plan. Mr. Cross indicated the current proposal would have the
municipalities participating in an annual fee that would go toward the operating cost, but the capital
costs of building the initial stations, infrastructure, and operating equipment would not be borne by
the individual cities. He said the initial stations would be fairly simplistic, but the SFRTA would
work with those local governments that want to develop a larger station and will fund the extra cost.
Mayor Golonka asked what the initial stations would provide. Mr. Cross indicated it was still too
early in the planning process for that much detail, but this would be addressed during their outreach
to the municipalities.

Mayor Golonka raised a question regarding equity along the two corridors. She noted cities with
existing Tri-Rail stations were not asked to contribute annually toward operating costs. However,
the current proposal appears more equitable in that cities receiving stations and service would
contribute a proportionate share toward operating costs. Mayor Golonka also noted that Federal funding for transit improvements is highly correlated to cities with increased density and development around station locations, which could penalize Jupiter where the density would not be as high as Federal standards would desire. Mayor Golonka asked for clarification on the identification of the 18 coastal stations in the plan. Mr. Cross indicated that due to capital costs, operating times and the amount of equipment needed, there was a limitation on the number of stations being proposed in the initial plan.

Mayor DuBois also questioned the SFRTA approach for identifying the initial 18 stations and how the agency would then define infill stations for northern Palm Beach County. He noted there were a number of pre-war towns designed around their former stations, with corresponding economic activity that deteriorated when the stations were removed. Mayor DuBois identified Lake Park as one of the relevant examples, and stated while station spacing for express service requires fewer stations, the SFRTA should develop a defined plan to identify future infill station locations that correspond to density, station area design, and urban development. Chairman Trias stated that the work the staff and the Council has done with respect to the different station locations has been helpful and he encouraged the SFRTA to continue working with them in terms of the actual site planning and design for the infill projects.

Vice Mayor Pro Tem Andel asked if there will be better coordination with the trains and the bus services at the major airports. Mr. Cross indicated this coordination is reviewed on an annual basis because it is critical to the ridership. He noted there are projects currently underway that will include segments to connect the downtowns, Tri-Rail, and the FEC service when it is implemented.

Councilmember Hershey proposed a motion to send a strong letter of support for the Fast Start Plan and consider at the January meeting a resolution directing FDOT and SFRTA to work together with the Miami-Dade, Broward and Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organizations to pursue SFRTA’s Fast Start Plan to introduce Tri-Rail Coastal Service. Councilman Lowe seconded the motion, which carried with Commissioner Solari opposed.

**COUNCIL ORIENTATION SERIES -- PARKING: HOW TO HANDLE THE NECESSARY NEMESIS**

This agenda item was deferred to the January meeting.

**COUNCIL’S EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM UPDATE**

This agenda item was deferred to the January meeting.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Staff noted the Second Annual Toys for Tots Christmas train which travels along the FEC Corridor between Jacksonville and Miami will be on December 10, 2011 with stops in St. Augustine, New Smyrna Beach, Cocoa, Fort Pierce, West Palm Beach, and Fort Lauderdale.
Staff congratulated Palm Beach County on receiving a $2 million Community Challenge Grant to do a Regional Master Plan in the Glades area. Staff noted Council may be involved in helping to develop the master plan.

Staff noted Councilmembers were provided a copy of the 2012 Meeting Schedule.

Staff congratulated Mayor Ferreri for being named the Sizzling Salsa Showdown winner at the Palms West Salsa Fest.

Staff presented outgoing Chairman Trias with a signed copy of “The Language of Towns and Cities” by Dhiru Thadani. Staff noted Chairman Trias has been a part of the Council since 1991 when he was a member of Council staff. Chairman Trias thanked Council and stated that he believes that the work Council does is very important and is making a difference. He thanked everyone for their support and service as Councilmembers.

COUNCIL MEMBER INFORMATION EXCHANGE

Commissioner Hayes wished everyone a safe and joy-filled holiday season. He recommended everyone read the book “That Used to Be Us: How America Fell Behind in the World It Invented and How We Can Come Back.”

Councilmember Davis provided Councilmembers with an opinion piece he had written with respect to proposed legislation called the Gulf Coast States RESTORE Act. He stated that this legislation will allow eighty percent of the fines that are levied against BP for the oil spill to be used for restoration purposes in the five gulf coast states. He said the alternative is the money will be automatically deposited in the Federal Treasury. He also noted there is strong bi-partisan support for this bill.

STAFF COMMENT

None.

CHAIRMAN’S COMMENT

None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chairman Trias adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m. 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 December 9, 2011 meeting of the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council.
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, or owner 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)
APPOMTED 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

1. __________, hereby disclose that on __________, 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 __________, 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 consulting firm, __________, represents __________ as their traffic engineer on __________.  

Dec. 9, 20__  ____________________________  __________________________
Date Filed 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.