



## Minutes

### Regular Meeting of the St. Johns County

### Land Acquisition and Management Program Conservation Board

Tuesday, June 13, 2023 at 1:30 pm

The regularly scheduled public meeting of the St. Johns County Land Acquisition and Management Program Conservation Board was held on Tuesday, June 13, 2023 at 1:30pm in the County Auditorium at the St. Johns County Administrative Complex located at 500 San Sebastian View, St. Augustine, Florida.

**Members Present:** Michael Adams, Wayne Flowers, Elizabeth Guthrie (Chair), JB Miller (Vice Chair), Travis Minch, Shorty Robbins, Jimmy Watson

**Members Absent:** Hawley Smith III, Irene Kaufman

**Commission Member:** Absent

**Staff Present:** Ryan Mauch, Hali Barkley, Jan Brewer, Kyrsten Gage

**Public Attendees:** Ed Slavin, Charles Lebanowski, Stephen Glidden, Jen Lomberg, Nicole Crosby

- 
- Call meeting to order at 1:30pm
  - General public comment for items not on the agenda

(02:43)

Public Speakers:

**Stephen Glidden** (10690 CR 13 N, Picolata, FL 32092) Spoke on the 457 acres of land that has been offered, by his family, to the Board of County Commissioners for purchase consideration by the county.

**Ed Slavin** (PO Box 3084, St Augustine FL) Mentioned he wanted to comment on the last minutes. Said that Commissioner Dean had asked the LAMP board to consider the National Park and Seashore and that this was not undertaken by the LAMP board.

LAMP Member

**Guthrie:** Advised the speaker that the LAMP Board does not take public comment on minutes.

(09:45)

- **Motion by Flowers, seconded by Miller, carries 7/0, to approve meeting minutes from the April 11, 2023 meeting.**

(11:02)

- **Motion by Adams, seconded by Robbins, carries 7/0, to approve the current agenda items for this meeting.**

## AGENDA ITEMS:

(11:30)

### 1. Finalization of LAMP process outline by the Chair

**Guthrie:** Advised that during the April meeting the Board reviewed an outline process for the evaluation of the properties that come before the LAMP Board. Invited comments and questions with relation to this proposed process.

**Minch:** Mentioned that this process was excellent. Would have preferred to have the process documented earlier, as to how the LAMP Board is to work, to be effective. Likes the design and that it establishes a very efficient process. At the time of the desk review, there are a number of inclusions, such as location map and aerial map. Would like to see a future land use map added to this.

Would appreciate having the property info sheet that is provided with each property to be more consistent and standardized so it is more relevant to the Board. Provided an example of protected species. Would like the Board to be more proactive rather than reactive. We know we have legal protections and federal level protections for protected species. Would like to concentrate on those species that are in decline or on the cusp of becoming protected, and don't have protections yet. Focus more on the habitat so that these species don't end up as protected regulated species. Would like this included on the property information sheet.

**Guthrie:** Advised that adding a future land map would be easy to accommodate. With regard to protected species, we could broaden that to include species of concern or potentially listed species.

**Miller:** While adding future land use suggested we add zoning.

**Guthrie:** We do have zoning on the property information sheet. So that one is covered.

**Robbins:** We have number four (4) in the final assessment as being other departments. Would like to know if there is consideration to have them included a little earlier in the process before our first evaluation meeting.

**Guthrie:** We can obtain staff feedback earlier in the process. We were trying not to over burden them. This is good feedback. We can make these modifications as this is a work in progress.

#### Public Comment:

**Ed Slavin** (PO Box 3084, St Augustine Fl) Mentioned that the LAMP process memo was not on the LAMP website. Questioned as to who in the County will provide information, analysis and data to the LAMP board about historic structures, and historic resources. Mentioned that the prior qualified liaison person is no longer working for the County. Questioned as to why an independent Clerk is not transcribing the minutes to ensure there is no conflict of interest.

#### LAMP Members:

**Minch:** Suggested the LAMP board also consider any Management Plan aspect of a property that is going to be placed in front of the BCC. Believes the ordinance says the LAMP Board needs to have a Management Plan. If so, we can then slide that process into Step Five (5).

**Guthrie:** Explained the conceptual management plan is part of the final assessment. Advised she has spoken with staff about a basic template, so we can work towards having this. It would include the recommended potential uses for the property. We would run into a timing issue if we are unable to address those things during that final assessment.

**Miller:** Would like to amend Mr. Flowers original motion on the desk review to include an archeological probability map. Recommended adding the probability map, and a notation from Staff, that there is a documented Florida Master Site on the title.

**Staff (Mauch):** Suggestion would be to add the archeological probability map and any type of notation from Staff that there is a documented Florida Master Site on the parcel.

(26:55 to 29:30)

- **Motion amended by Miller, seconded by Adams, carries 7/0, to include an archeological probability map in addition to an indication as to whether there may be a positive Florida Master Site file and to include the various amendments.**

**Minch:** Asked Staff if there is an efficient way to move the information to the Board without having to request it from the State.

**Staff (Mauch):** When we are first compiling the property data sheets, we can also add that information. There will be some sensitive information, and archeological sites that are identified. We like to keep those sensitive. However we will document if there is a Florida Master Site file associated with that site.

**Robbins:** For the properties that we are looking at today, there is one that has a probability map. So it appears Staff are already undertaking this. I agree with adding this to the check list.

**Guthrie:** As this motion carries, we will be making these amendments and uploading the new process onto the website. This will allow everyone to be aware as to how the LAMP board are evaluating properties. Thanked everyone on the Board for their feedback and co-operation in approving this process.

**Guthrie:** This begins one of three initial assessments under the new process. We will be discussing if they meet the objectives of the LAMP program. If so, they will be added to our August agenda where we will have our final ranking and evaluation. The purpose of this meeting is that we have two primary objectives. The first is to determine if the property meets LAMP program goals. If so, it will be added to the August agenda. We will then have a discussion where Board members can each ask questions or request additional information that they would like to know about the properties, in advance of our August meeting. If the Board determines that the property does not meet program goals, the owner will be notified of the reasons why the property was denied and will have an opportunity to resubmit at a future meeting. Otherwise it will be removed from our program list. If the property is re-evaluated and denied for a second time it will also be removed from the LAMP program list.

(31:35)

## **2. 1535 and 1600 Brinkhoff Rd, (Bacon) properties discussion and evaluation**

**Staff (Mauch):** Presented in overhead maps, 1535 Brinkhoff Road on the East and 1600 Brinkhoff Road on the West side.

East side is not part of a PUD. It is currently Open Rural zoning. Has existing features as residential use. Has a few scattered trees. The property is uplands.

West side is part of the PUD to the South. It is called Treaty Oaks PUD. It is currently zoned multi-family use. It is currently vacant and forested. In December of 2022, Staff was notified by members of the community that there was some work occurring on the property. Staff responded by visiting and did stop the work as there was some tree removal occurring without a permit. Since then nothing additional has occurred on the property. Currently on the West side there are some jurisdictional wetlands that have been identified and flagged in the field. They have been included in the plan. Both properties have had a few applications submitted to the County. One is currently in review for the Western property for a multi-family use and commercial use. On the East side there was a commercial plan that was submitted that has since been recently closed by the County. That property does not have any active applications at this time.

The property on the West does have some open comments, based on Staff review. The area to the South and West is part of a recorded conservation easement, and part of that Treaty Oaks PUD.

**Guthrie:** Our first task is to assess if we agree this property meets LAMP program goals.

**Flowers:** Asked Staff how this property came to the County for assessment.

**Staff (Mauch):** A couple of months ago the owner submitted an application to the LAMP Board.

**Minch:** Understands that the property has a Residential C future land use, and it looks to be mostly an infill site. This is one that we should not waste too much time on. Suggest there are better properties for the LAMP Board to focus on. Let it build out to the future land use map, as it has been designated.

**Robbins:** As this property is in close proximity to the Treaty Park, has any discussion been had with Parks and Recreation to potential expansion.

**Staff (Mauch):** Advised that Staff has not had that discussion with Parks and Recreation.

**Adams:** If we decided this property is not suitable. What happens to it? Is there to be further evaluation?

**Guthrie:** If we as a Board decide this property does not meet program goals, the owner would be advised and they would be able to resubmit. The reason why we started with this initial assessment was to save time, knowing that at our next meeting, if we approve these we would get more in depth on the ranking and the criteria from there.

**Minch:** The LAMP program for the County is one tool in a tool box. Questions if the LAMP program is suitable for this property. Mentioned that site planning, zoning tools, land development programs are more appropriate to apply to this particular property.

(41:20 to 46:19)

- **Motion by Minch, seconded by Adams, carries (5/2 dissent Guthrie, Miller) to remove 1535 and 1600 Brinkhoff Rd, (Bacon) properties from the list of LAMP Board considerations, as it does not meet the LAMP goals.**

Public comment:

**Ed Slavin** (PO Box 3084, St Augustine Fl) Agrees with Mr. Travis Minch's motion.

**Nicole Crosby** (1169 Neck Road). Requesting the appraised value, the asking price and the acreage of this property. Only learning about this property for the first time.

**Charles Lebanowski** ( 1748 N Cappero ) Agrees with Mr. Travis Minch. This property does not fit with the LAMP program. Referred to the overheads where there was a building on one of the lots. County would incur additional costs to have it removed.

LAMP Members:

**Flowers:** Mentioned he does not disagree with the motion. Yet there maybe future circumstances where it may fit with the program.

**Robbins:** Mentioned how close this property is to Treaty Park and how Parks and Recreation are undertaking a lot of work there. Would not like to say a categorical "no" to this property without first hearing feed back from Parks and Recreation. However the property has a lot of zeros, based on the price verses the appraised value.

**Miller:** Asked staff to check with Parks and Recreation if they have an interest in this property.

**Staff (Mauch):** Agreed that Staff can follow up with that department.

(47:15)

### **3. 605 Faver Dykes Rd, (Laquidara) property discussion and evaluation**

**Staff (Mauch):** Provided a brief overview of this property, with overhead maps, for the LAMP Board to consider. The property is located off Faver Dykes Road, adjacent to other residential properties. It is currently on the banks of Pellicer Creek that is an aquatic reserve., that is an outstanding water body identified by the state. There appears to be some dirt road access to the property. Yet this may need to be hardened by the County to make it more accessible by the public. The property is currently vacant other than an RV. There also appears to be a floating dock. There is a well and electric servicing the property. It is a fairly steep sloped property from Pellicer Creek up to where you access the property. Only one application has been made. A confirmation letter was written by the owner, to Growth Management, regarding zoning and allowed uses back in 2022. They wanted to building a house on the land with an attached garage. Staff provided a response to that. With regard to the Land Development Code, the environmental side of things there is a 25 foot upland buffer required. There is potential for gopher tortoise on it. It is a flatwoods system there. Fairly high and dry as you walk northward on the property. The wetland is a “salt” marsh of estimated .3 acres and .9 acres is the flatwoods. There is a known Florida Master Site file in the area. As far as this property there was none identified.

(51:24)

LAMP Members:

**Robbins:** Visited the aerial photos for this application and its proximity to Faver Dykes Park and it is close to the Florida Agriculture Museum. So there is connectivity from this property to other publicly owned properties.

**Guthrie:** Added that this property is also adjacent to the GTMNERR boundary and Princess Place Conservation Area in Flagler County.

**Minch:** Would put this property into the category of the previous application. With the land use zoning, coupled with the environmental regulations that are on the books, coupled with the 25 foot upland buffer, are probably sufficient to ensure that any impact of development would be very minor. It has a Rural Silviculture land use, and an Open Rural zoning. They are proposing to do a single family house. Whoever decides to build out there will value the scenery and the trees. Therefore would not put this property into the category of not being appropriate for land acquisition by the County through the LAMP program.

**Adams:** What could be a functional use of this land if it was acquired by the County through our LAMP program?

**Staff (Mauch):** This would depend on many factors as we have different departments involved. It would depend on the future horizons of the County, and future funding, and how it plays into their overall plan. This particular property does not fit into any future plans for the County. That is up to the LAMP board to decide as it funnels into your conceptual management plan. Also to place into your recommendations to the BCC eventually, to have that discussion.

**Adams:** Requested to see the acquisition price that showed a listed price of \$349,000.

**Miller:** They don't make water front property anymore. This makes it very valuable from a recreational point of view and protection. So would agree this property is something to be considered, kept on the LAMP Board list, and evaluated further.

**Robbins:** Even if this property does not have good access to it, it has uplands right on the river. Would like to keep this on the LAMP list, and managing our flood plain.

**Guthrie:** Mentioned that there are enough open questions about potential future use, adjacent properties. Thinks this property merits additional evaluation.

(57:18 to 1:07:06)

**Motion by Miller, seconded by Robbins, carries 5/2 (dissent Minch, Watson) to move 605 Faver Dykes Rd, (Laquidara) property forward for future discussion and evaluation.**

Public comment:

**Ed Slavin** (PO Box 3084, St Augustine Fl) Agrees with Mr. Travis Minch. Does NOT think the property is consistent with the LAMP criteria. Wanted to know if there had been any ex parte communication, from the family that owns this property, with any of the Board members present. Raised the issue of needing full disclosure of potential conflicts of interest. Questioned as to why there is no lawyer present at the LAMP Board meeting similar to other County Board meetings.

**Jen Lomberk** (291 Cubbedge Road) Executive director of River Keeper at Matanzas River Keeper. SUPPORTS in keeping this property for further evaluation, as it matches a lot of criteria in the LAMP evaluation process.

LAMP Members:

**Minch:** Asked Staff to find out how much of this property would be taken up by a 300 foot buffer.

**Staff (Mauch):** This property is about 200 to 300 feet, more or less from the creek to the Northern end of the property.

**Minch:** A Land Development Code change to 300 feet, would render this property useless to the property owner by taking away their property rights. This is more a discussion for the BCC than the Lamp Board. What I would reiterate in my earlier discussion is that there are times that the LAMP program is the appropriate tool to apply. There are times when a different tool should be applied. If the criteria that the property has water access, or the property has sensitive areas, and therefore justifies additional review each time, the two step process that we have in place, no longer applies. It no longer works because you could justify a second review literally on every property based on some environmental criteria or some merits. Wants this to be an efficient process. LAMP is going to have some fantastic properties to consider. The preference is to move on quickly from those properties that are not as suited for the LAMP program. Recommend LAMP members continue to work with County Commission to work on the Land Development Code so those tools are appropriate and are protecting the waterways that we all desire. Does not want to get into a situation where LAMP is considering every single property because it has some environmental criteria that we think is important.

Public Comment:

**Nicole Crosby** (1169 Neck Road.) SUPPORTS in keeping this property for further evaluation. Yet is respectful of Mr. Minch's comment that there are better properties for this Board to consider. This property may fall by the wayside. Concerned about striking it from the list at this early stage.

LAMP Members:

**Watson:** Questioned what will happen, between when we consider this property now, and when we move it forward, if we decided today to do that?

**Guthrie:** If We decide to move this property forward, our next steps would be to have a discussion about the questions that each of the Board members have, and additional information that we would like to see, before we make a formal ranking at our next meeting. This gives us two meetings and gives us time to get additional information. If we move this property ahead, we will see this property again in August with some additional information and hopefully have some questions answered.

(1:07:20)

**4. 4250 Popolee Rd. (Woodward) property discussion and evaluation**

**Staff (Mauch):** Submitted to Staff on April 17, 2023. This property is mostly a wetland. It is mixed hardwoods. Located on St Johns River. Survey was submitted by the applicant. 3.4 Acres in total. Market value is \$101,400. List price is \$850,000. Located at the end of Popolee Road. Reason for the applicant to submit this property is potentially have a public use for a dock and a viewing platform out on the river. One of the challenges will be potentially be providing some parking. Forested vacant property.

(1:10:30)

LAMP Member:

**Minch:** This property meets the program goals. The County could acquire this property, so the local residents surrounding it would have waterfront access to the river, and hence enhance their quality of life. Enhancing the value of these neighborhoods, now they have proximity to a park. Would argue that the enhancement of the values of the other properties would more than pay for the cost of the acquisition. This is a smart acquisition. Recommend we place this at the top of the list of all the properties we have seen. This is not an area where you place a car. It is more neighborhood oriented, where residents walk the streets there. They arrive by bike or scooter, not necessarily parking cars. It is a neighborhood amenity. It is not designed to pull regional traffic. It is designed to enhance the lives of the surrounding residents.

Public Comment:

**Ed Slavin** (PO Box 3084, St Augustine Fl) Supports the motion. Property similar to a park in St Augustine South. Preferably a passive park, not where people are bringing in motor boats.

**Charles Lebanowski** ( 1748 N Cappero) SUPPORTS the motion to acquire. Provided an overhead map of the property on his laptop showing a dock, on the land that belongs to the applicant. This dock was placed there by the next door neighbor. Hence, the County may have some legal issues in acquiring this property.

**Nicole Crosby** (1169 Neck Road) SUPPORTS the acquisition of this property. When this comes for a second review, would like to know if there is any existing public access going half a mile to the north and half a mile to the south of this property. If there is no other public access to the river close by, it would make this property even more valuable.

LAMP Members:

**Adams:** Would like to go back to public comment about the dock that is located on this property. The adjacent property owner appears to have a dock going through the northern tip of the property. They may have crossed over the property line.

**Flowers:** Mr. Labanowski's comment was very appropriate. Advised he will be voting to pass this on. Yet the big question is going to be where is the mean high water line on this property. The upland property owner may believe that the mean high water line extends up to his property line. Which would mean he would have the right to build a dock. The question I would have for additional information is, how wet is this property? The idea of it being a pocket park, is questionable if it is completely wet. Questioned how people would walk across this property to get out to the water. There is value in preservation, as this is part of our charge. Yet will have a lot of questions down the road.

**Gutherie:** Asked Staff if a survey was undertaken.

**Staff (Mauch):** A land survey was submitted by the applicant dated 2008. That may have been before the dock was constructed at the Northern tip.

**Flowers:** A boundary survey doesn't necessarily establish a mean high water line.

**Guthrie:** Explained the comment was regard to the dock encroachment. Has witnessed this before where it appears in the aerial it is an encroachment and once a survey is done it comes back that it is, or maybe isn't. This is something we need to look into.

**Adams:** On the survey we have, it looks like some access. There is a dotted line going into St. Johns River.

**Miller:** The legal description in the upper left of the survey does mention an easement. It is very possible that dock is not on this property. A boundary survey would determine that.

**Guthrie:** This property is within the goals of the LAMP program. Yet there are a lot of questions around physical access, future access, and future uses of the property. Questions that could be answered after this meeting.

(1:20:27)

**Motion by Minch and seconded by Watson, carries 7/0, to advance 4250 Popolee Rd. (Woodward) property to a second review.**

**Robbins:** Requested a larger visual map of the area of each of these properties to better identify what is in each area. A context map would be helpful.

(1:22:18)

- **Board Member Reports**

**Guthrie:** Thanked everyone for their attendance.

**Adams:** Mentioned that at this meeting it appears smaller property parcels seem to have a better chance to be considered, rather than larger parcels. Mentioned also that out at Fort Picolata he came across a 3 acre property. He contacted the property owner who is interested in the conservation of the property. In the process of obtaining the Interest Sheet. Encouraged by parcels this small. The concept of "pocket" parks would work well for Fort Picolata. The main feature would be the cultural resources of the historical features of the Fort. Will actively pursue that.

**Miller:** Mentioned the Florida Forever NE Florida Blueway Project. Found that the DEP has \$6 million to purchase within this corridor. If anybody thinks that is of value, then he would actively pursue Blueway projects to add to the LAMP list for consideration.

**Robbins:** The budget, as of today, is yet to be submitted to the Governor. It needs to be in the next couple of days, to fit into the 15 day window. As it stands now there is \$100 million dollars in Florida Forever and \$15 million in FTC. If the funding is there we will apply for it.

**Minch:** Raised the issue of generating more public support. Suggest posting a sign on a property that is being considered for acquisition by the LAMP board. Also posting a meeting date so we can attract more interest and attendance at LAMP meetings.

Asked about the status of the 5 properties that had been submitted to BCC for their consideration.

Enquired about the status of letter being sent to the BCC regarding an increase in funding. Would have preferred to have seen the letter before it was sent to the BCC, and making a vote in favor of it. Yet is in support of requesting an increase in funding for the LAMP program.

Asked about a Template that needs to be completed for each property.

Questioned if information on each of the properties, that the LAMP Board is considering, be made available to the public prior to the meeting.

Suggested advertising the LAMP program on Facebook, Twitter and Next Door to encourage community participation. (Questions and suggestions were addressed by Staff under Staff Reports.)

**Watson:** Questioned if this Board had a budget, and if it was authorized to commit public funds?



(Questions were answered by Staff under Staff Reports.)

**Flowers:** Thanked other members for seeking out properties that are within the LAMP program goals.

• **Staff Reports (Mauch):**

- Appraisals are in for 3 of the 4 properties. Checked with the County Real Estate department today. Negotiations with property owners are still continuing. Property would be set for a BCC agenda, and then a purchase and sale agreement would be signed through the County Real Estate Department, as long as the property is within the LAMP’s program budget.
- A letter was drafted, and signed by Ms. Guthrie, and then sent to the BCC about two weeks ago regarding the increase in funding.
- A template is filled out by Staff on each property prior to the property’s acquisition.
- The LAMP Agenda, and property information, can be made available on the current Public available site. It is an FTP site that the County has with the link that is provided to the LAMP Board members. We can provide this link upon request by the Public.
- LAMP Board has a budget that is administered by the Board of County Commissioners. It currently has \$1.5 million and will roll over to \$2million for the fiscal year of 2024. Currently we have some expenditures for the appraisals of the properties. This is just under \$20,000. The appraisals are undertaken by Contractors under the County Real Estate Department. Funding for any expenses incurred by the LAMP board has to be approved by the BCC.
- First Coast Energy, 600 SR 13 North property is not available as a willing seller. There is also a commercial application that has been submitted to date. It is the Retail Center at Jullington Creek and is currently under review by County Staff.
- In preparing the Conceptual Management Plan, there has been some discussion already at this meeting. It needs to be ready prior to finalization of any property acquisition that would be submitted to the BCC.
- The properties that are for consideration to the BCC and having the appraisals completed are:  
 McCullough Creek Property  
 CR 13 North Picolata Forest Group Property  
 Anastasia Lakes Property  
 CR 13 South, in the Riverdale area

(1:37:30)

**Motion by Adams, seconded by Robbins, carries 7/0, to adjourn the meeting.**

- Meeting Adjourned at 3:08 pm.

Minutes approved on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2023.

---

Elizabeth Guthrie, Chair  
 Land Acquisition and Management Program

---

Clerk, Growth Management

\*For more detailed Minutes, please visit the St. Johns County GTV video recording:

<http://www.sjcfcl.us/GTV/WatchGTV.aspx>