



Minutes
Regular Meeting of the St. Johns County
Land Acquisition and Management Program Conservation Board

Tuesday, October 10th, 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, October 10th, 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: Elizabeth Guthrie (Chair), Irene Kaufman, Travis Minch (Vice Chair), Shorty Robbins, Hawley Smith III, Jimmy R Watson, JB Miller

Members Absent: Michael D Adams, Wayne Flowers.

Commission Member: Absent

Staff Present: Ryan Mauch, Hali Barkley, Kyrsten Gage, Kealey West (Sr. Asst County Attorney)

Public Attendees: El Salvin, Chuck Labanowski, Pat Hamilton, Stephen Glidden, Brad Wester, Kristen White, ~~Irene Kaufman~~, Bruce Cathcart, Jen Lomberk.

-
- **Guthrie:** Called meeting to order at 1:30pm

(02:30)

- Public Speakers (items not on the agenda)
El Salvin (PO Box 3084, St Augustine) Voiced concern about the creation of a St Augustine National Park and Seashore and a request to present this concept. Raised concerns about the environmental crisis in St Johns County.
- Approval of meeting minutes from the August 8th 2023 meeting. Discussion occurred amongst the Board with regard to the minutes not being attributed to the correct speakers.

(15:20)

- **Motion to approved the minutes as amended by Robbins, seconded by Smith, carries 5/2 (dissent Minch; Kaufman).**

(16:08 to 21:11)

- **Motion by Robbins, and seconded by Miller, carries 5/2 (dissent Watson; Minch) to approve the Agenda.**
Various discussion occurred with the Board members with regard to Item 2 relating to LAMP Board Member Application recommendations. Questions were raised as to discussing these applications in public.

Staff (West): The Board policy requires that the LAMP Board make recommendations to the BCC with regard to membership. Although the BCC has the ultimate authority of appointing those members.

Minch: Mentioned he is not comfortable with the process as it preserves a majority and maintains a status quo. Advised he will be recusing himself from making recommendations.

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. LAMP Board 2024 Meeting Dates were presented as being second Tuesday of every other month. December 12th 2023; February 13th, 2024; April 9th 2024; June 11th 2024, August 13th 2024 and October 8th 2024.

(20:17)

Motion by Smith, seconded by Robbins, carries 7/0, to approved the LAMP Board meeting dates for the next year.

2. LAMP Board Member Application Recommendations

Guthrie: Explained that when the LAMP board was reinstated, that four (4) board members were given two-year terms and the other five (5) members given four-year terms to provide staggering. Four member's terms will be expiring 11/16/2023. Three (3) have applied to be reinstated for another four-year term. They are Mr. Flowers, who is absent today, Ms. Robbins, and Mr. Miller.

Further discussion occurred within Board members with regard to Mr. Flowers being recommended for another 2-year term.

Staff (West): Advised the Board that before they proceed to vote, there is a statutory requirement that all members of the Board or Commission must vote, unless there is a declared conflict of interest. There has to be a vote recorded from each person. Explained members cannot abstain or recuse them self, unless they declare a conflict. Advised that conflicts need to be announced before the vote and that the proper paperwork be filled out.

Minch: Advised he had a conflict of interest and wished to abstain from voting for all vacant LAMP board positions. ***Form 8B Memorandum of Voting Conflict, is attached to the 10/10/23 meeting minutes.**

Robbins: Mentioned that when the Board was created, there was a person from each district, and then four other at-large members. Asked if there was any way of knowing what district each member represents.

Staff (West): Mr. Adams; Ms. Guthrie; Ms. Kaufman; Mr. Smith and Mr. Watson were all appointed by the Commissioners. They were appointed to four-year terms. Each represent one of the County Commission Districts.

(26:08)

Motioned by Smith, seconded by Miller, carries 6/0, (Minch declared conflict) to recommend Mr. Flowers continued membership on the LAMP Board.

Further discussion occurred within Board members with regard to Mr. Miller being recommended for another 2-year term.

(31:30)

Motion by Robbins, seconded by Kaufman, carries 6/0, (Minch declared conflict) to recommend Mr. Miller continued membership on the LAMP Board.

Further discussion occurred within Board members with regard to Mr. Minch's seat that is currently available and that the Board received a list of applicants for the position.

Kaufman: Made a recommendation to put forward Nicole Crosby to be considered for the vacant seat.

Public Comment:

Chuck Labanowski (1748 N Cappero) supports the application for Nicole Crosby and recommends her for the position on the LAMP Board.

(33: 00)

Motion by Miller, seconded by Kaufman, carries 6/0 (Minch declared conflict) to recommend Ms. Crosby to become a member on the LAMP Board.

Further discussion occurred within Board members with regard to Ms. Robbins being recommended for another 2-year term and whether or not the recommendation should only be one person per seat. The question was asked if the BCC needs more than one application, should there not be an acceptance by the Commission of who the LAMP board submit.

Staff (West): One of two things would happen. The BCC, if they did not accept the recommendation of the LAMP Board, they could ask to come back and re-evaluate applications or re-notice it for additional applications. Or they could just appoint the person, based on the applications, that they would want to serve in that role.

(37:11)

Motion by Miller, seconded by Kaufman, carries 6/0, (Minch declared conflict) to recommend Ms. Robbins for continued membership on the LAMP Board.

Guthrie: Explained that the four (4) properties up for consideration will be the LAMP Board's initial evaluations. Today's discussion is to determine if the LAMP Board believes these properties meet LAMP program goals. If so, they will be added to a future LAMP board agenda, likely December 12 meeting, for further evaluation and ranking.

3. 7070 CR 16A Property Evaluation and Discussion

Staff (Mauch): Advised that the property was submitted by the current seller. It is a vacant residential property. Presented a series of aerials that show the property is Lot 9 located in a Planned Rural Development, that is the Bartram Downs PRD, located off SR 16A. It is in a residential subdivision with certain allowed uses. There are some conservation easements recorded. It has a recorded Plat that shows some conservation easement areas, and a development area. PRDs allow for additional farming and agricultural-type uses within

the lots themselves. There is a survey of the lot. There is a history with this property. There was a submittal for a residential clearance sheet. That was approved by the County. The property was partially cleared with that approval for a single family residential use. There has been no vertical development as yet on the site. The site plan has expired as it was only good for six months. Recently undated aerials show a small area that was cleared. The County also reviewed it in terms of Parks and Recreation. Their only concern was that it is adjacent to a vacant School District property to the East. The concern is, that if this were to become a park or similar use, that the parking would be taken over during school hours. Hence making it difficult for resident's use. This is in the Northwest Sector planning area.

Smith: Inquired if it would be high school students, while in session, who would be using the public space to park and then access the school.

Staff (Mauch): This property would be an adjacent park with a parking area there, adjacent to a potential school, that does tend to have potential to have additional overflow parking.

Minch: Questioned if the market value provided by the property appraiser of \$305,000 is correct and relevant. Asked if the property owner is asking \$699,900 for the property. Wants to know why the market value is listed on the property information sheet.

Smith: The market value number is an additional piece of information. It gives a basis to compare what the owner might be requesting. Here there is a discrepancy to consider, and why there is a big variable between the two. It is important to be able to undertake more of a financial analysis of the cost of the property. LAMP needs to understand what the general market price is. It is not a number we are married to. Just additional information on the property.

Staff (Mauch): It is a starting point. The evaluation form that you all have, has cost, as a certain line item. So that could be figured into it. The acquisition process is appraisal driven. That is the real number that the County uses in the acquisition process. Ultimately it has to be appraisal-driven.

Guthrie: In the case of this property we have the information from the property appraiser. It could be a very valuable indicator, not necessarily for the market value as listed, but for the recent transactions.

Further discussion within the Board and Staff occurred around approaching the School Board to gauge their interest, as they own the adjacent property. Filling out the evaluation matrix for this property was also discussed. Staff advised they had not received any comments from the public on this property.

(51:40)

Public Speakers:

Charles Labanowski (1748 N Cappero Drive, St Augustine) Suggested this property be offered to the School Board as they have the adjacent property. Instead of the LAMP board trying to do something with it.

Further discussion occurred within the Board with regard to County Parks and Recreation not having an interest, and that with it's location, would have management challenges. Members suggested that tabling this parcel until Staff can reach out to the School Board to find out if they have any interest.

Staff (Mauch): Advised that since this is located in an existing residential subdivision PRD, the ordinance sets forth the allowed uses on this property as single-family residential. If the County were to pursue acquisition, or the school board, a modification to that ordinance would be required for another type of use such as a passive park or similar.

(56:32 – 58:07)

Motion by Minch, seconded by Miller, carries 7/0, to deny moving the 7070 CR 16A property valuation forward to the next step in the evaluation process.

Board requested Staff to pass the 7070 CR 16A property information onto the School Board.

4. 5960 Don Manuel Road Property Evaluation and Discussion

Staff (Mauch): Presented the property information to the Board. The property is just north of SR 207, near CR 13 S and CR 13A S in the Hastings area. There is currently no road access. There is some residential property to the east. The property does align with other conservation areas, including the St. Johns River Water Management District Deep Conservation area to the West, as well as the County's Floyd Preservation tract to the North. This property does fall within the Florida Forever St. Johns River Blueway. Proposed use for consideration would be recommending it to be a preservation-type use, due to its lack of access and roadways.

Further discussion occurred within the Board with regard to property being adjacent to some existing conservation lands. That it also has the preserves to the North, and it is actually part of a much larger continuous corridor of connected lands. One of the potential benefits of this property is that it is very small and part of a much larger corridor.

Smith: Mentioned, that with the location, and factoring in the cost for it, and that it shared mutual interest, plus the connectivity, that this property seemed like the logical property to pursue.

(1:30:50)

Motion by Miller, seconded by Smith, carries 6/1 (dissent Minch) to move the 5960 Don Manuel Road property to secondary evaluation and discussion at a future meeting.

5. 8805 A1A South Property Evaluation and Discussion

Staff (Mauch): Presented an aerial view of where this vacant property is located. There was a demolition of an existing commercial restaurant that was there a couple years ago. In a beach type setting, on the Matanzas Inlet, overlooking the water. It is adjacent to the Fort Matanzas area along A1A South and surrounded by existing residential development. Presented an aerial map showing disturbed soil from the demolition and a handful of trees have grown up in the meantime. Mostly vacant property. There are existing properties to the North along the waterfront, which have contiguous ownership with residential property immediately to the West. You would need to obtain approval or authorization from that property owner in order to access into that waterway.

Smith: Asked for clarification on the water access and whether it is restricted.

Staff (Mauch): You would have to get approval from the property owners. They're existing platted lots. This is a unique set-up on this property. Parks and Recreation did review this. They state that the parcel does not provide direct beach access. Could possibly serve as overflow parking for fishing on the bridge. There are passive recreational uses existing in the vicinity. You have a parking area that is set up in the State right-of-way to the East, on the other side of A1A that is quite popular. This could be overflow parking for that as well as for the beach and the fishermen on the beach. It has become a popular area, especially on the weekends. If there are any buildings proposed, you would have to go through a South Anastasia Design Review Board and Development Review Committee process. That is post-acquisition for the County. It is in Flood zone AE 7. There is a very small area of the North East corner that is in VE flood zone. You could have some additional things like pavilions out there and other passive uses on the property.

(01:10:05)

Minch: Mentioned the property is unique. It is situated where the intercoastal comes to the ocean. Diversity of fish would make for a very exciting spot to fish. This parcel accentuates what the County is about. Recommended Staff communicate with the property owner to the West and work through the regulatory issues to make this a great location for the County.

Miller: Asked Staff if the North-South lots are shared, such as a 50 percent undivided interest?

Staff (Mauch): Not sure if riparian rights would come in. Mentioned that the Property Appraisers office shows those lots are all privately owned and not part of this property.

Guthrie: Agreed it is a very interesting property. Invited the landowner representative to speak on behalf of the property.

Public Speaker:

Kristen White (67 Salt Point) Broker Associate with Berkshire Hathaway. Presenting on behalf of the owners of the property, and is their listing agent. Mentioned that the owners have enjoyed the property for over 30 years and would like the property to benefit the public. In addition to the recreation and fishing, you have remarkable historic value that comes with the property with the view of Fort Matanzas. The property is a great way to introduce the County to travelers from the South driving up A1A. Can envision a place where there is a pavilion to fish and take in the water views with some historical markers. The community of Summer Haven is a historic community for Florida. This property has CHT zoning which permits those commercial and passive recreational uses.

(1:15:10)

Smith: Asked if Ms. White had been able to have conversations with the neighboring property owners to understand their hopes or impressions of what could be used there. Wondering about residential being next to a public space.

White: Prior to a being vacant, it was a very popular and busy restaurant with outdoor music and outdoor seating. It still has commercial zoning. So a restaurant is still an option for that property. The neighbors may prefer a park next door than another restaurant.

Miller: Mentioned this property is also along the A1A scenic byway.

Robbins: Does not know status of Summer Haven managed retreat funding. Last session, the state approved \$10 million for acquisition for properties that were threatened. That could be a potential for match funding.

(1:17:05)

Public Speakers:

Ed Slavin (PO Box 3084, St Augustine FL 32085) supports the acquisition of this property. Recommends a fishing pier, not a parking lot, and a monument to the massacre of 270 Frenchmen that was a historic event.

Nicole Crosby (1169 Neck Road, Ponte Vedra FL) Thanked Ms. Kaufman for her support and nomination to the LAMP board. Supports the acquisition of this property. Would like to know how quickly LAMP can find out if there might be matching funds to acquire this property.

(1:21:28)

Pat Hamilton (261 Owens Avenue, St Augustine, FL 32080) Real Estate Broker in Crescent Beach and Summer Haven and supports the acquisition of this property. There needs to be something very important located there, to justify the price. It is the biological corridor from the ocean to the Intracoastal. Told the story of a 12-foot anchor with chain that had risen up from the sand on the north side of the bridge back in the 1960's, as an example of the historic importance of this property. Some neighbors still have photos of the anchor. Recommended this property be protected.

Further discussion occurred between the Board members with regard to acquiring this property.

Kaufman: Mentioned it is an excellent opportunity for the County to acquire this property. Would not like to see a building on the land due to how a hurricane had destroyed the restaurant that was there. It is in a precarious location for a building. Yet an excellent opportunity for conservation land for the County.

Minch: Was excited to hear all the public support for this property. It gives the Board a better idea how to rank Public Support. Likes that people are surrounding it. Enjoyed hearing about the cultural resource component, in particular the direct view of the Matanzas Fort. Considers the market price is accurate.

(1:30-07)

Motion by Watson, seconded by Minch, carries 7/0, to move the 8805 A1A South Property to further evaluation to secondary evaluation and discussion at a future meeting.

6. 2202 Bishop Estates Road Property Evaluation and Discussion

Staff (Mauch): This application was submitted by Ms. Robbins via the owner. Roughly 70 acres in total. Presented an aerial where the property is located on Bishop Estates Road in the Julington Creek area. It is currently used for various agricultural uses. It is located just south of Durbin and Julington Creeks, the confluence of those two water bodies in northwest St. Johns County. It straddles the Julington Creek DRI/PUD along the East, West and Southern boundaries. There is a large 67 acre area that is the existing farm/agricultural use of the property. On the North side of Bishop Estates Road is a residential lot. It has one residential structure on the property. There is a canopy of oak and pine trees along the west-central area. Where you have the existing residential uses it is hardwood, mostly Oaks. Going to the East and North Eastern area you have natural pine flatwoods. Then it slopes off to Flora Branch creek along the northeastern edge.

There are not many County-owned parks or preserves in the region. The closest one is roughly a mile to the West that is an active recreation property. Ms. Robbins invited Staff to visit the site with the property owner. It is a unique property for the LAMP Board and the County to consider.

Robbins: Advised that the landowner Mr. Clark Bailey was there to answer any questions on the property. The family believes the property would be appraised at around \$20 million. The family had agreed to put up half of the appraised value as a match. Therefore the purchase price for the LAMP Board and the County would be \$10 million. There are several phases that the property could be split into for acquisition purposes. The Florida Communities Trust Acquisition (FCT) cycle opened today. This project does score really well for that. However each County and project can only ask for \$5 million. There is not much funding going on this year and FCT was only funded at \$15 million for the year for the entire state. If we were to put in an application for FCT acquisition, would recommend phasing it. Looking at the map, we have the large southern portion. Then the two parcels just south of Bishop Estates Road. The big open space and the smaller open space along Bishop Estates are both the same number. They count as one parcel. They would make a really good phase one. Then phase two could come in a year or so later. If we wanted to phase it that way and not pre-acquire it. The central parcel is residential and the two Julington Creek parcels would make a phase two.

The family is also willing to accept a payment plan over a number of years If we didn't get grant funding or the County chose not to pursue that. We do request a life estate for Sarah Bailey. She is 97.

As this property transitions from private to public, any funds generated would go back into the ranch for improvements. There are some private uses going on there right now. The boarders and people who store their horse trailers there would be partially phased out to a manageable size over the next few years. If the County decides to go with a lump sum acquisition on this, the Bailey family will establish an endowment to operate and fund improvements to the ranch. The Bailey family offers to support a non-profit partnership, as the County typically does not want to manage an operation of this size. We have an opportunity for the Bailey Family Foundation to come back and manage the property on behalf of the County. That would mean a continuation of live-on managers at the site, as it is where the horses and cattle are. We have an existing partnership there with a nonprofit equine therapy program.

There is a 20-foot-wide buffer all the way around the property. It belongs to the Julington Creek Plantation CDD. There is an agreement with the Bailey family management and the CDD. It is currently used as trails. Across the wooded parcel, below Bishop Estates Road, there is a ten-foot wide easement granted there. It is allowed use to go across the creek. If we wanted to do a boardwalk or kayak launch, it is navigable all the way up to Racetrack Road. There is a list of proposed improvements after funding to improve access. Right now it is one way in and one way out driveway.

If we do a Florida Communities Trust Grant, there has to be a dedicated walkover or some sort of approved transition across the street. They only do adjacent properties, and a street connection does not count as adjacent. There have been discussions with JEA about doing a solar power roof on a covered arena. We don't use much electricity out there. So we could possibly power the whole ranch with the solar project. There is an opportunity to manage the waste from the cattle area through an existing historic drainage ditch and existing pond and treatment opportunities. There are several septic tanks on the property. With the funding we would be able to connect to utilities.

Lots of opportunities with programming, such as the existing equine therapy horseback-riding lessons. Trail rides and a community therapeutic gardening program are already there. A retreat facility and some of the tiny home structures provide opportunities for short-term camping, artists and residents. Extension office, agricultural, internships on some of the arts, and the cattle and agricultural industries. There are two nearby historic sites. They are both on CDD property.

In full disclosure, Ms. Robbins advised LAMP that she lives on the property and has no financial interest in it.

Minch: Considered this to be an exciting property as it will bring a lot of benefit and value to the taxpayers. It offers water access at this location and a lot of land. Considers it maybe a little bigger than the LAMP program and longer-term than what the program is designed for, given all the other properties we are considering. The concessions that the property owner is making in terms of reducing its acquisition cost and offering some sort of financing, it sounds like it may be an option. Thinks the County should consider this property.

Miller: This property and the prior one on our agenda are the reasons we have the LAMP board.

Public Speakers:

Clark Bailey (2177 Bishop Estates Road) Owner, presenting on behalf of the Bailey family. Thanked the board members for serving today. Mentioned that his mother Ms. Sarah Bailey had previously served on the LAMP board many years ago.

There will be access to the waterfront on the creek lots and also access to Flora Branch. Would prefer to not have motorized water vehicles. Just canoes, kayaks and paddle boarding. There is a cove there for paddle boarding, so you don't get a lot of the wake action from the creek when there are ski boats out there.

The property is located half way between the Alpine Groves and Durbin Creek canoe ramps, and the Julington Creek canoe ramp in Duval County. It is a good stopping off point if you are on a canoe or kayaking trip. My family is willing to work with the County with regard to setting up the acquisition cost.

The property is located within an environmental corridor. There are a lot of other non-developed properties there. Lots of wildlife on the property such as deer, fox, bobcats, bald eagles and numerous birds and types of hawks, ospreys. The property currently offers a wide range of activities.

Would like to establish more native vegetation on the property. The property has an established grove of live oaks. Pine trees on the west side of the property is mainly slash pine. We would like to replace much of those with longleaf pine.

Once acquired by St. Johns County, the property could be self-funding for acquisition reimbursement and ongoing maintenance. Would like to make the property self-sustaining so there is no burden to the County. This property can generate enough use with concessions to run itself, with canoe and kayak rentals, horseback riding, community gardening, corporate outings, weddings, and birthday parties.

Nicole Crosby (1169 Neck Road, Ponte Vedra Fl) Considers the property a phenomenal opportunity for St Johns County. Mentioned the diversity of habitat, and that it is right there in the middle of one of our most

populous areas of the County. So many people would benefit from using it by having waterfront access, and all the activities that have been presented. Mentioned there might be potential for some fund raising from the local HOA's. Has seen how neighborhoods can really be motivated to fundraise, to try to save something like this property. One that is in close proximity to them.

Ed Slavin (PO Box 3084, St Augustine Fl 32085) Suggested the County call it the Sarah Bailey Park in tribute to the individual who has done so much for the environment of St. Johns County. Suggested a survey to ensure there is no contamination on the property. Suggested the County negotiate very carefully as we should not pay too high a price.

Robbins: Mentioned the opportunity with the County to acquire the property is a full circle with Sarah Bailey having been on the County Commission and member of the LAMP Board years ago. Clarified the negotiations for the value. Whatever the appraisal value comes back as, the family is willing to put up half of the value towards a match. The County could secure the property if the LAMP Board is successful in pursuing and receiving any future land acquisition grants.

(1:51:12 to 1:52:39)

Motion by Minch, seconded by Miller, carries 7/0, to move 2202 Bishop Estates Road property forward for further evaluation and discussion at a future meeting.

Staff Reports (Mauch):

Reminded Board members of the Sunshine Law. We cannot communicate between individuals outside of the Board meetings in emails. Advised members to send email communications to the Staff liaison and they will be disseminated to the group as a whole.

December meeting will be the LAMP recommendation Properties List. This is an important discussion topic.

Recommendation to add the following properties that the Board has already evaluated.

1. 4250 Popolee Road with the evaluation score.
2. 5960 Don Manuel
3. 8805 A1A South
4. 2202 Bishop Estates Road

Recommendation to remove two properties that are currently on the list as they are no longer available for purchase, per the St. Johns County Real Estate Department.

1. 600 SR 13 North
2. 4405 SR 206

BCC consent items updates:

On September 5, the BCC voted to direct Real Estate Staff to continue with the purchase and sale agreement on the Riverdale property on Atlantic Road off CR 13 South. Real Estate staff will continue with due diligence with the property owner. The conceptual management plan for that property has been revised per the August 8th LAMP Board meeting. The language was removed pertaining to wetland mitigation and potential trails for the property. The Conceptual management plan does contain potential for future passive recreational uses. That conceptual management plan is set for a BCC item agenda on October 17.

The Anastasia Lakes property that this Board had heard previously, the BCC approved the plan on September 19. That property is still in Real Estate for acquisition due diligence.

The CR 13 South McCullough Creek property is still in negotiation with the Real Estate department.

Minch: Asked staff if the County Commission approves the conceptual management plan before the LAMP Board approves the management plan.

Staff (Mauch): The LAMP ordinance says that the LAMP board shall review and monitor all conceptual management plans for these properties. Then all management plans shall be reviewed and approved by the BCC. These management plans get approved by the BCC before the acquisition occurs. LAMP is the recommendation Board that reviews the conceptual management plan before it goes to the BCC.

Further discussion occurred between board members about revisiting the conceptual management plan process as properties forward to the BCC.

Staff (Mauch): Advised that the revised conceptual management plan for CR 13 South Riverdale property was submitted to the BCC for consideration.

(2:04:58)

Board Reports:

Watson; Robbins; Smith; Kaufman: No reports

Miller: Requested that Staff provide maps with legends on them. When the State buys lands they always do environmental assessments, in particular looking at potential contaminations. Suggest the LAMP Board consider this. Gave an example of land that may have had past agricultural use.

Minch: Mentioned that the LAMP board had two separate ordinances.

One is to submit a list of properties to the BCC.

The other is to provide a recommendation for the purchase of a particular property. Suggested that the board refer to the January meeting of 2022 where the Board only submitted a list of properties to the BCC.

Concerned over due diligence undertaken with properties submitted to the BCC. Questioned who is ensuring, at a County level, that properties submitted are actually a good purchase by the time they get to the Real Estate division.

Minch: Voiced concern over the property owner who will be sandwiched between the two parcels on either side of the Riverdale CR 13 South property. Asked if staff had reached out to that property owner.

Recommended that a sign be posted on properties being considered by the LAMP board to gauge public opinion.

Guthrie: Mentioned the sign suggestion warrants a larger discussion amongst the board, and requires staff input on the abilities to make that happen and for the property owners' willingness to allow that to occur. Suggested this be discussed further at a future meeting.

Further discussion occurred amongst board members as to whether properties that scored 66 or over still get placed on the BCC annual LAMP recommendation list. Guthrie confirmed that it is the top five that go to the board by super majority.

Guthrie: Thanked Mr. Minch for his service to the board the past two years. Also congratulated board members Ms. Robbins, Mr. Miller and Mr. Flowers for their continued dedication to the Board.

(2:17:32)

Motion by Miller, carries 7/0, to adjourn the meeting.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:47 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.sjcfl.us/GTV/WatchGTV.aspx>

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

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE	
MAILING ADDRESS		THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF:	
CITY COUNTY		<input type="checkbox"/> CITY <input type="checkbox"/> COUNTY <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER LOCAL AGENCY	
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED		NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION:	
		MY POSITION IS: <input type="checkbox"/> ELECTIVE <input type="checkbox"/> APPOINTIVE	

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 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 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 would inure to his or her special private gain or loss. Each elected or appointed local officer also **MUST ABSTAIN** from knowingly voting on a measure which would inure to the special gain or loss of a principal (other than a government agency) by whom he or she is retained (including the parent, subsidiary, or sibling organization of a 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 (CRAs) 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 are not prohibited by Section 112.3143 from otherwise participating 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 page 2)

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, _____, hereby disclose that on _____, 20 ____ :

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

- 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 subsidiary, or sibling 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:

If disclosure of specific information would violate confidentiality or privilege pursuant to law or rules governing attorneys, a public officer, who is also an attorney, may comply with the disclosure requirements of this section by disclosing the nature of the interest in such a way as to provide the public with notice of the conflict.

Date Filed

Travis Minch
Signature

dotloop verified
 10/18/23 4:07 PM EDT
 PWLP-FWL7-ZTUE-CTKO

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.