



NEFRC Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee

Thursday, February 7, 2008

MINUTES

The NEFRC Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee meeting was held on Thursday, February 7, 2008 at 9:00 a.m., at Northeast Florida Regional Council, Jacksonville, Florida. Chairman Boyle called the meeting to order with the following members:

PRESENT

Commissioner Boyle (Chair)
Councilman Bue
Vice Mayor Crichlow
Ms. Dungey
Commissioner Harris
Mayor King
Vice-Mayor Lawson-Brown (arrived late)
Mayor Leeper
Mr. Register
Commissioner Rutledge (President)
Mr. Spaeth
Commissioner Stevenson
Ms. Vallencourt
Mr. Williams
Mr. Sample for Ms. Burnette (Ex-officio)
Mr. Parks (Ex-officio)
Mr. Green for Mr. Strong (Ex-officio)

EXCUSED

Councilman Clark
Commissioner Manuel

ABSENT

Mr. Maxwell

Others: Doug Davis, Tiffany Gillem, James Richardson, B. O'Connor, Don Fullerton, Lad Hawkins, Dave Evads, Dianne Wiles, John Bigelow, Barbara Leis, Mick Cuthbertson, Ed Benson, Chip Seymour, Steve Fitzgibbons, Susan McDonald, Michael Stewart, Anna Shea, Bill Killingsworth, Carolyn Mathis, Tom Ingram and Adam Mengel, and others.

Staff Present: Ed Lehman, Brian Teeple, Guy Parola, Ameera Sayeed, Valerie Evans, Anna Shepherd, Margo Moehring, Charles McCool, Jeff Alexander, Michael Hill, Sharon Forde, and others.

*Approval of Minutes

Chairman Boyle called for a motion on the January 3, 2008, meeting minutes. Mr. Register made a motion to approve, it was seconded by Ms. Vallencourt. Commissioner Harris observed that the motion for the City of Fernandina Beach's item on page six is incorrect and should be changed from 'Crescent City' to the City of Fernandina Beach; Motion carried.

Old Business

Water Star Policy – Mr. Lehman stated that an overview of the Water Star program was provided in December 2007. Staff was instructed to bring to the Committee and Board policy recommendations regarding how the Council can address the program. Mr. Lehman stated that the SRPP currently has adequate goals and policies to require water conservation as an infrastructure need that is addressed in the review of Comprehensive Plans and Development of Regional Impacts (DRI). Staff recommends that future Council DRI recommendation reports require all DRI development to meet or exceed the minimum

requirements of the Florida Water Star program. Staff further recommends that all local governments ensure that their comprehensive plans include goals, objectives and policies related to water conservation that address requirements for new development to meet or exceed the minimum requirements of the Florida Water Star program.

Councilman Bue inquired if these policies will be integrated into the Water Management Districts' (WMD) approval of developments. Mr. Lehman stated that these policies will provide this Board and Committee guidance on how DRIs and comprehensive plans are reviewed. It won't be a policy that the WMD will address at all. As it pertains to DRIs, it will be addressed through DRI recommendation reports, which are already occurring but will be a little more stringent. As it pertains to the Comprehensive Plan Amendments, it will be addressed through the Evaluation Appraisal and Review (EAR) based amendments. This Board will be reviewing all the EAR based amendments over the next few years and will ensure that they have water conservation and strategies incorporated in them that meet or exceed the water star policy standards.

Councilman Bue further inquired where the WMD stands in all of this. Mr. Sample stated that the WMD is developing the Water Star Program, which is a guide for the WMD and not a policy to be enforced. The WMD will be working in conjunction with the Council in reviewing comprehensive plans to ensure that water conservation is addressed.

Ms. Dungey inquired who branded the Water Star program. Mr. Parola stated that it was the St. Johns River Water Management District.

Chairman Boyle called for a motion on the Water Star Policy Recommendation. Commissioner Stevenson made a motion to approve, it was seconded by Councilman Bue; Motion carried.

New Business

Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review

Mr. Lehman stated there were 28 Comprehensive Plan Amendments reviewed during the month of November. Seven (7) Transmitted Amendments and three (3) Adopted Amendments are brought before the Committee; the other 18 are small scale and have been reviewed by staff.

City of St. Augustine Beach Transmitted Amendment (08PEFE-1) – Ms. Evans provided an overview of the transmitted amendment. She stated that as mandated in 2005 by the legislature, this amendment creates a public school facilities element in the City's Comprehensive Plan. It also amends the Intergovernmental Coordination Element (ICE) and Capital Improvements Element (CIE) as required by statute to include policies for coordination of land use decisions with the St. Johns County School District. It also incorporates a financially feasible school district facilities work plan. Staff recommends that the Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee and the Council approve this report for transmittal to the Department of Community Affairs (DCA).

Chairman Boyle called for a motion on the City of St. Augustine Beach's Transmitted Amendment 08PEFE-1. Commissioner Stevenson made a motion to approve, it was seconded by Mayor King; Motion carried.

Town of Orange Park Transmitted Amendment (08PEFE-1) – Mr. Parola provided an overview of the transmitted amendment, which contains a new public school facilities element and text amendments to the text of both the ICE and the CIE. Staff comments that there seemed to be some slight inconsistencies internal to the Comprehensive Plan; there also appears to be a section of Rule 9J-5.025(3)(c)2 that is missing in the Town's transmitted element; and the background data analysis conducted by Clay County was not submitted with the amendment. It is staff's suggestion that these be addressed and included in the adoption package. Staff recommends that the Planning and Growth

Management Policy Committee and the Council approve this report for transmittal to the DCA with staff's comments.

Chairman Boyle called for a motion on the Town of Orange Park's Transmitted Amendment 08PEFE-1. Ms. Vallencourt made a motion to approve, it was seconded by Commissioner Harris; Motion carried.

City of Bunnell Transmitted Amendment (08PEFE-1) – Mr. Parola provided an overview of the transmitted amendment, which contains a new public school facilities element and text amendments to the text of both the ICE and the CIE. Staff recommends that the Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee approve this report for transmittal to the DCA. After further review of this amendment, staff would like to strike its comment as it appears the City has already addressed this. Staff recommends that the Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee and the Council approve this report without staff's comments for transmittal to the DCA.

Chairman Boyle called for a motion on the City of Bunnell's Transmitted Amendment 08PEFE-1. Councilman Bue made a motion to approve, it was seconded by Vice Mayor Crichlow; Motion carried.

Clay County Transmitted Amendment (08PEFE-1) – Mr. Parola provided an overview of the transmitted amendment, which contains a new public school facilities element and text amendments to the text of both the ICE and the CIE. Staff recommends that the Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee and the Council approve this report for transmittal to the DCA.

Chairman Boyle called for a motion on the Clay County's Transmitted Amendment 08PEFE-1. Councilman Bue made a motion to approve, it was seconded by Commissioner Harris; Motion carried.

City of Palm Coast Transmitted Amendment (08PEFE-1) – Mr. Parola provided an overview of the transmitted amendment, which contains a new public school facilities element and text amendments to the text of both the ICE and the CIE. Staff recommends that the Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee and the Council approve this report for transmittal to the DCA.

Chairman Boyle called for a motion on the City of Palm Coast Transmitted Amendment 08PEFE-1. Ms. Vallencourt made a motion to approve, it was seconded by Ms. Dungey; Motion carried.

City of St. Augustine Transmitted Amendment (08PEFE-1) – Mr. Parola provided an overview of the transmitted amendment, which contains a new public school facilities element and text amendments to the text of both the ICE and the CIE. Staff comments that the concurrency service area maps doesn't appear to be contained in the support documentation within the adopted portions of this amendment; therefore, staff suggests that they be included as adopted figures within the amendment packet. Staff recommends that the Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee and the Council approve this report with staff's comments for transmittal to the DCA.

Chairman Boyle called for a motion on the City of St. Augustine's Transmitted Amendment 08PEFE-1. Mr. Register made a motion to approve, it was seconded by Mr. Williams; Motion carried.

City of Jacksonville Transmitted Amendment (08-1A) – Mr. Lehman stated that the City of Jacksonville packet was divided into 08-1A and 08-1B even though it is all City of Jacksonville 08-1. This is because the items under 08-1A falls under the pilot program and the comments relating to this will go back to the City of Jacksonville. The items under 08-1B are reviewed the regular way with those comments going back to DCA. Mr. Lehman stated that amendment 08-1A contains ten Future Land Use Map (FLUM) changes and two sets of text amendments. The first amendment is a proposal to change four acres from

Medium Density Residential to Neighborhood Commercial with a proposed development potential of 4,997 square foot convenience store with gas pumps. The second is a proposal to change 37.61 acres from Low Density Residential to Community/General Commercial. The current development potential is 263 single-family residential dwelling units and the proposed development potential is 573,403 square feet of commercial space. The City staff's approval includes a limitation of 350,000 square feet of Commercial/Retail uses, which reduces the potential of development below the DRI threshold for retail development. The third is a proposal to change 12.79 acres from Agricultural (iii) to Light Industrial. The current development potential is one single-family dwelling unit, the proposed development potential is 15,000 square feet of light industrial as defined by the limitations proposed by City staff. The fourth amendment proposes to change 64 acres from Agricultural(ii) to Light Industrial. The current development potential is one single-family dwelling unit, the proposed development potential is 793,000 square feet of light industrial as defined by the limitations proposed by City staff. The fifth amendment is a proposal to change 8.24 acres from Medium Density Residential to Light Industrial. The current development potential is 123 multi-family dwelling units and the proposed development potential is 100,000 square feet of light industrial as defined by the limitations proposed by City staff. The sixth amendment is a proposal to change 12.4 acres from Light Industrial and Residential-Professional-Institutional to Community/General Commercial. The current development potential is 113,256 square feet of light industrial and 30,492 square feet of office or 30 multi-family dwelling units, the proposed development potential is 240 multi-family dwelling units as defined by the limitations proposed by City Staff.

Chairman Boyle inquired if this change is a part of the DRI that is already located in this area or just located next to the DRI. Mr. Lehman indicated that it is not a part of the DRI. Chairman Boyle indicated that Duval Road traffic will increase due to this change. He then inquired about the level of service on this roadway. Mr. Lehman stated the Duval Road has been recently widened by the developer of the mall and is operating acceptably. It is believed to be able to handle the increased traffic from this land use change. Chairman Boyle also expressed concerns that U.S. 17 is not operating acceptably.

Mr. Lehman continued with the seventh amendment, which is a proposed change of 8.22 acres from Low Density Residential to Residential-Professional-Institutional. The current development potential is 57 single-family dwelling units, the proposed development potential is 164 multi-family dwelling units as defined by limitations proposed by City staff. The eighth proposed amendment is to change 287 acres from Low Density Residential and Rural Residential to Light Industrial. The current development potential is 2,009 single-family dwelling units, the proposed development potential is 2,200,000 square feet of light industrial. Staff comments that this parcel has 85.9 acres of wetland that will be designated as Light Industrial and suggests that the City consider designating the wetland areas as Conservation. The ninth amendment is a proposal to change 14.53 acres from Low Density Residential to Light Industrial. The current development potential is 101 single-family dwelling units, the proposed development potential is 125,000 square feet of light industrial and 20,000 square feet of commercial as defined by City staff's proposed limitations. The final FLUM amendment is a proposal to change 995.05 acres from Low Density Residential, Light Industrial, Agriculture (iii), Agriculture (iv), and Community/General Commercial to Multi-Use. The proposal is to designate this area as a Regional Activity Center (RAC), which is defined in Rule 28-24.014(10)(a), Florida Administrative Code. Mr. Lehman added that the RAC doubles the thresholds for DRIs. The proposed FLUM development is established by new Policy 14.3.15 as 130 hotel rooms, 799,000 square feet of commercial, 6,000,000 square feet of light industrial, 564,000 square feet of heavy industrial, 525 multi-family dwelling units, and 399,000 square feet of office use. Staff has two comments that are provided as alternative language proposed by the applicant/developer, which are consistent with the overall intent of staff's recommendation. This language was provided to the Committee as a separate handout that reads, "Development of a project of this magnitude in this location will have significant impact on I-95, particularly at the interchange with Pecan Park Road. Staff notes that traffic from the Timucuan DRI will also impact this interchange. Designation of this area as a Regional Activity Center will allow for DRI-size development without the benefit of DRI review. This FLUM amendment should not be adopted unless it is demonstrated that the I-95/Pecan Park interchange will operate acceptably with traffic from development to occur as a result of the RAC designation, or

improvements are added to the City's CIE at the time of adoption which will cause the interchange to operate acceptably."

Chairman Boyle asked for a definition of a RAC for those new to this process like himself. Mr. Lehman stated that the RAC was created in 380.06(2)(e), Florida Statute. He added that the Avenues Walk is one such RAC, located across from the Avenues Mall. Mr. Teeple stated that like so many amendments to the DRI law since its inception in 1973, this is a result of a particular project in another part of the state. It was a 'get out of jail free' concept, which passed legislature and has been utilized a few times in the City of Jacksonville since then. It essentially allows a DRI developer to avoid the process.

Mr. Spaeth inquired if the Regional Council had any oversight in the RAC. Mr. Teeple stated that they are processed as a comprehensive plan amendment. He further added that what staff has done in this case is say, 'Because the language in the legislation says that you have to have adequate public facilities that are tied to your CIE, don't adopt this unless you can go back and show us that in fact it's going to be operating correctly or contingently, that there is an improvement in the CIE that takes care of the problem.'

Mr. Spaeth inquired if the City has the obligation to come back to the Council for approval. Mr. Teeple stated that they do.

Commissioner Stevenson inquired what staff's thought was on the impact on the hurricane evacuation response time. Mr. Lehman stated that the types of uses being proposed probably won't have an effect as most of what they are doing is mostly light industrial. The amount of potential residential based on what is proposed will actually go down and have a negative impact on hurricane evacuation. Commissioner Stevenson stated that the bigger issue would be what it does to the day-to-day traffic. Mr. Lehman stated that he is more concerned with the day-to-day peak hour traffic operations, particularly with the trucks. Commissioner Stevenson noted that this will be a traffic magnet and there are traffic concerns.

Mr. Parks commented that the Department of Transportation (DOT) does have a problem with this amendment. Basically, this will generate approximately 54,000 trips on Pecan Park Road between I-95 and U.S. 17. U.S. 17 is currently a two lane road and the I-95 interchange will require major modifications to make it work. He mentioned that the Timucuan DRI is doing an interchange modification report as a part of their DRI, but there is no funding for it. He adds that there needs to be good traffic analysis to show where the traffic is going, who will be responsible for the improvements and how much of a mitigation plan will be part of this RAC. Mr. Parks stated that DOT's main concern is that many trips on Pecan Park Road will create a bottleneck on both ends.

Chairman Boyle agreed with Mr. Parks' comments and stated that those are his concerns as well. He noted that Pecan Park Road is a two lane road that will be dumping traffic onto U.S. 17, which is also a two lane road. He stated that the idea of doing a RAC basically to skirt some of the requirements of a DRI concerns him.

Ms. Dungey inquired if staff's comments, with the new language, still address Mr. Park's concern? Mr. Lehman stated that he doesn't believe it addresses U.S. 17, which may be something to consider as well; but believes it addresses the concerns on the Pecan Park Road interchange. He added that this is designed as a rural interchange that will need improvements, but at this stage, it is not clear what those improvements are.

Mr. Spaeth inquired of Mr. Teeple how the RAC worked out in the past? Mr. Teeple stated that once the Council reviews them as a comprehensive plan amendment and make recommendations, that's the end of the Council's involvement. Mr. Lehman added that it is difficult to say as some are just beginning and some aren't built out as yet. An example of transportation improvements can be seen when you travel down Philips Highway and look to your right, there is an interchange being built at Philips and Southside

that is actually being funded by the RAC developer there. It is believed that the City has done a good job of having the developer of RACs pay for their infrastructure. So there are some land use controls, but they don't address extra-jurisdictional impacts. There might not be any from this particular one.

Susan McDonald, the applicant, commented that the currently approved land use designations for this site would allow the development of the site without any FLUM amendment to create a certain number of impacts. What they are proposing does not increase any more impacts than is already approved by the current land use designations. She further stated that applying for the RAC allows for more scrutiny and this will allow all these issues to be addressed. The reason for doing a RAC is to master plan a development without selling off individual pieces, which on their own would create the same number of impacts. The revised language would allow the review of U.S. 17 and therefore is broader than the previous recommendation.

Mr. Teeple added that irrespective of a comparison of what currently end uses would allow versus this proposal, the statute says, 'Contained adequate existing public facilities' as defined in Chapter 9J-5, Florida Administrative Code, or committed public facilities as identified in the CIE of local government comprehensive plan. Therefore, for the purposes of meeting the statutory requirements, it's not 'we could have done this, but we're doing this and the impacts are the same; therefore, everything is fine.'

Mr. Green stated that staff's recommendation regarding the reuse water available to 100 percent of the project site should remain and not as the applicant has reworded it.

Ms. Dungey stated that she does not recall making the use of reuse water a condition of development. She recalls addressing it when available, but doesn't recall ever stopping a project based on it not being available. She inquired if this has ever been done before. Mr. Lehman stated that he's not aware of this happening with non-DRIs. He further added that the developer's recommendation, which staff concurs with and Mr. Green does not, reads, 'This FLUM should not be adopted unless reuse water is provided to the project site when it is available. The City's staff report states that distribution for non-potable water may be needed, but it is unclear on whether it will be required.' Mr. Lehman stated that while staff's language is stronger and probably more preferable, the reason staff agrees with the reworded version is because Regional Policy 4.2.1 states that, 'Utilization of reuse water wherever possible based upon the economic, ecological and technological factors involved.' He pointed out that as the Regional Policy says 'wherever possible,' it makes it hard to strengthen the policy at this time; therefore, staff agrees with the alternate language.

Mr. Teeple mentioned a proposal currently in central Florida to utilize the St. Johns River, which many of the local governments in northeast Florida and north Florida in general have a problem with and have articulated through various resolutions. Unfortunately, northeast Florida does not hold the moral high ground when it comes to reuse. Central Florida has done a much better job of reusing their water than North Florida. He added that the facts show that North Florida is way behind central Florida in reuse utilization.

Mr. Lehman continued with the text amendments. The first text amendment is a proposal to amend the Future Land Use Element (FLUE) to add Objective 4.4 and related policies. Policy 4.4.1 states that an asterisk may be placed on the Annotated Future Land Use Map, with text included related to development on the specific site. This is to address DCA's concerns that sometimes the cities were not analyzing the maximum amount of development. Policy 1.2.25 adds assumptions for maximum development. The City is also amending the FLUE to identify standards for the location of Urban Villages. New Policy 2.10.3 identifies those standards.

Mr. Lehman stated that the next text amendment is the one that has generated a lot of community interest; therefore, staff recommends that the Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee takes action on the items addressed to this point before moving on to the next text amendment.

Chairman Boyle inquired if all Committee members are clear on what they are about to do.

Commissioner Stevenson inquired, as it pertains to item #2, will the City take proportionate share for this amendment. Mr. Lehman stated that this is required by state law and that the City would have to address it through their concurrency management system.

Ms. Dungey commented that this amendment is making a lot of changes from residential to industrial, which creates much needed jobs and she endorses it.

Ms. Dungey made a motion to approve the report for 08-1A to include the change in language recommended by the developer and supported by staff, up to and including the first text amendment. It was seconded by Ms. Vallencourt; Motion carried

Mr. Lehman continued with the second proposed text change to Policy 8.1.4 of the Transportation Element of the City's comprehensive plan. This change is to allow for the expansion of the Craig airport runways. He stated that the City's Policy 8.1.4 prohibits the expansion of runways at Craig field. The proposed changes would allow the extension of runways from 4,000 to 5,600 feet. Sections have been added to Policy 8.1.4 to address this proposed change including noise monitoring, noise disclosure boundary, capping at 5,600 feet with no other runway extension to be allowed, thickening to prohibit heavier planes from landing there, a weight limit of 60,000 lbs., a blast fence sound barrier, no fixed base operators from midnight to 4:00 a.m., prior approval requirement on equipment that exceeds its standards, capacity of surrounding infrastructure will not be increased, 11 acres in the northeast corner of Monument Road will be maintained as a conservation easement, airport will continue to meet with the City as an advisory committee on a quarterly basis, continue to implement all concessions and mitigation efforts, and any future amendment to this policy shall require a two third approval by the City Council. Mr. Lehman summarized the policy change as, 'Our plan says we're not going to do it; We're going to do it this time, but next time we do it it will require two thirds approval by City Council.' He further stated that he spoke with a lot of citizens and thanked them for their input as they were very helpful in his review of this amendment. Mr. Lehman stated that staff has a comment and a recommendation. He stated that the mailed out information is different than what is currently before the Committee as the recommendation, based on discussions with DOT, was done this morning and placed in the Committee's notebooks. The first comment is that the City of Jacksonville Planning staff recommended approval of this amendment, with the Planning Commission recommending denial. However, staff believes that the expansion of the runway will not result in additional regional and extra-jurisdictional impacts. In addition, SRPP Policy 5.1.13 states, 'Maximum use of existing aviation facilities and their physical resources will be considered before resources are committed to the development of new facilities,' which seems to lend support for the expansion of this runway. However, SRPP Policy 5.1.11 states, 'The airport facility improvement shall be in accordance with the DOT Aviation Systems Plan and consistent with the Continuing Florida Aviation Systems Planning Process.' SRPP Policy 5.1.14 states, 'Support the continued development and expansions of public general aviation airports, which are consistent with DOT Aviation Systems Plans and the CFASPP.' Mr. Lehman stated that DOT is unable to confirm at this time if there is consistency with the CFASPP or not because they want to provide more information to their central office. The DOT would like to defer making a recommendation on that consistency until the adoption stage. Staff believes that as long as there is a recommendation, it can be readdressed at the adoption stage based on the input received from DOT. Clearly there are two policies in our SRPP that address the need to be consistent with the CFASPP. Staff is not able to make the determination of consistency of this recommendation from the City of Jacksonville to extend the runway with the Regional Policy Plan.

Mr. Parks stated that they've had less than a week to review this recommendation. The DOT's central office's concerns were based on restrictions that might have implications on other airports around the state; therefore, they don't want to make any official statements as yet. He further stated that strictly as a transportation facility, they don't have any problems with the extension of the runway as far as safety and better service and those types of activities. However, they do realize that this is a community issue. It does serve as a general aviation reliever to JIA. DOT does have some concerns regarding some of their

restrictions on operation as far as things such as the hours of operations. Mr. Parks stated that they only need a few more days to put their comments together.

Chairman Boyle asked what the results would be if the Committee did not approve for transmission. Mr. Lehman stated that it has already been transmitted; therefore, the actions today is to transmit comments to the City of Jacksonville for their consideration in adopting this comprehensive plan amendment. Under the pilot program, our comments doesn't go to DCA, they got to the City of Jacksonville. DCA's role is to provide comments to the City of Jacksonville.

Mr. Teeple commented that due to timing this Committee might want to consider deferring this to the full council, which would allow the speakers to speak without interruption.

Chairman Boyle recommended that the Committee postpone additional action on this item until the full Board meets in approximately five to ten minutes to allow speakers the same amount of time to address the full Board, who will ultimately make the decision anyway.

Ms. Vallencourt made a motion to postpone the public speakers on this item until the full Board convenes, it was seconded by Commissioner Stevenson; Motion carried.

Mr. Lehman added that, in the interest of time, staff recommends that the Committee defer the City of Jacksonville Transmitted Amendment 08-1B, the City of Bunnell Adopted Amendment 07-2 and the City of Flagler Beach Adopted Amendment 08-1 to the full Board. However, the Committee can hear the Town of Baldwin 08PEFE-1.

Chairman Boyle asked for a motion to defer the City of Jacksonville Transmitted Amendment 08-1B, the City of Bunnell Adopted Amendment 07-2 and the City of Flagler Beach Adopted Amendment 08-1 to the full Board. Mr. Spaeth made the motion, it was seconded my Mayor Leeper; Motion carried.

City of Baldwin Adopted Amendment (08PEFE-1) – Ms. Shepherd provided an overview of the adopted amendment. She mentioned that the transmitted amendment was reviewed by the Council its September 2007 meeting and approved for transmittal to DCA. The Town has addressed the objections, recommendations and comments letter from DCA and held public hearings in December 2007 and January 2008 to adopt this amendment. Staff has no comments or concerns regarding this amendment and respectfully recommends that the Committee and Council find the Town of Baldwin Adopted Amendment consistent with the Northeast Florida Strategic Regional Policy Plan.

Chairman Boyle called for a motion on the Town of Baldwin's Adopted Amendment 08PEFE-1. Mr. Register made a motion to find it consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan, it was seconded by Mayor King; Motion carried.

Intergovernmental Coordination and Review Report

Mr. Lehman stated that this item is for information only, no action is required.

Development of Regional Impact (DRI)

Mr. Lehman stated that the DRI report is for information only, no action is required. He added that the Cedar Creek DRI in Baker County has submitted their third sufficiency response. Staff anticipates bringing this item before the Committee and Board in either April or May. There are a number of issues that still needs to be addressed before it comes before the Committee and Council. Staff is working with the applicant to address those issues.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Next Meeting Date

The next meeting will be held Thursday, March 6, 2008, at 9:00 a.m. at the Northeast Florida Regional Council.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.