

SOUTH FLORIDA REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

Minutes

October 5, 2009

The South Florida Regional Planning Council met this date at the Council Offices, 3440 Hollywood Boulevard, Suite 140, Hollywood, Florida. The Chair, Councilmember Walters, called the meeting to order at 10:35 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM ONE: Pledge of Allegiance

AGENDA ITEM TWO: Roll Call

Councilmember Patricia Asseff
Councilmember Margaret Bates
Councilmember Michael Blynn
Councilmember Heather Carruthers
Councilmember Suzanne Gunzburger
Councilmember Ilene Lieberman
Councilmember Morgan McPherson (via phone)
Councilmember George Neugent
Councilmember Marta Perez
Councilmember Jose Riesco
Councilmember Joseph Scuotto (via phone)
Councilmember Paul Wallace
Councilmember Sandra Walters

The following Ex-Officio members were present:

- Ms. Joan Goodrich, representing the Broward Alliance
- Mr. Tim Gray, representing the Florida Department of Environmental Protection
- Ms. Carole Morris on behalf of Elbert Waters, representing the South Florida Water Management District

The following Council member arrived after roll call:

- Councilmember Scott J. Brook

AGENDA ITEM THREE: Minutes of previous Meetings

Councilmember Carruthers asked if the letter submitted by the Monroe County Attorney, regarding Turkey Point and read during the September 14, 2009 Council meeting, was added to the record.

Mr. Samuel S. Goren, Legal Counsel, stated that it was entered into the record.

Councilmember Wallace asked if there was any action taken by Legal Counsel regarding the auditing contract.

Mr. Goren stated that the issue was addressed in a letter sent to the Council, dated September 23, 2009, and attached to Agenda Item #15, Correspondence and Attendance.

Councilmember Neugent moved to approve the Minutes from the previous meeting. Councilmember Lieberman seconded the motion, which carried by a unanimous vote.

AGENDA ITEM FOUR: Project Reviews

a) Intergovernmental Coordination and Review Report

Councilmember Lieberman moved to approve the Intergovernmental Coordination and Review Report. Councilmember Neugent seconded the motion, which carried by a unanimous vote.

AGENDA ITEM FIVE: Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Program

a) DRI Assessment Reports

1) Lauderhill City Center - City of Lauderhill

Chair Walters stated that Council staff would be giving a presentation on the project, then the applicant and local governments would be given a chance to comment.

Ms. Mary Jean Matthews, Council staff, gave a presentation summarizing the staff report on the Lauderhill City Center DRI.

Councilmember Brook arrived at the meeting.

Councilmember Neugent moved to approve the staff recommendation. Councilmember Lieberman seconded the motion with a comment.

Councilmember Lieberman stated that on page three of the Executive Summary one of the provisions requires the developer to have an on-site Employee Transit Coordinator. She asked how that would be monitored.

Ms. Dekle stated that monitoring generally falls to the local government that issues the Development Order (DO).

Councilmember Lieberman again asked how that would be monitored. She added that she felt that it was not a reasonable request, because there was no way to monitor that unless the developer submits weekly payroll stubs to the City of Lauderhill.

Ms. Dekle stated that was a good point.

Councilmember Lieberman stated that it should not be in the DO because of the monitoring issue. She stated that she was not under the impression that the developer was trying to get away with putting no parking on the site. If, down the road, more people are parking than are using transit, does the developer still need the Transit Coordinator; will the developer have to come back for a modification of the DO if it decided that a Transit Coordinator was not needed, she asked.

Ms. Dekle asked Ms. Matthews where the condition emanated from.

Ms. Matthews stated that it was also in the Westerra and Metropica DRIs.

Councilmember Lieberman stated that she missed it then, but this condition makes no sense, because of the monitoring issue. Her second question was regarding the same page of the summary, the applicant was being required to meet concurrency requirements for roadway impacts. She stated that she assumes that those are listed on page 71, which was basically the re-stripping of some roads, because Broward County, in that area, is in a transit concurrency mode. The County is using money paid into the transit concurrency, not roadway concurrency. She added that page 23 of the staff report lists proposed transportation improvements that are no where near the project site; one of which has been on the books for about 20 years. Councilmember Lieberman stated that she wanted to make sure that the only roadway impacts that are being considered are those listed on Table 21-F-9 on page 71. This project is located in a transit concurrency area and he would be expected to pay into mass transit.

Mr. Bob Cambric, Council staff, stated that there were not roadway improvements being contemplated for the developer to implement; it was re-stripping as listed on page 71.

Councilmember Lieberman then asked if an amendment could be made to say that the applicant will be required to meet the concurrency requirements to roadway impacts as outlined in Table 21-F-9. She added another change to remove the requirement that the developer have an on-site Employee Transit Coordinator.

Councilmember Neugent accepted the amendments to his previous motion.

Councilmember Wallace stated that the only thing that concerns him was the removal of something that sounds good strictly because it cannot be monitored. It may come back to haunt the Council one day.

Councilmember Lieberman explained this was a multi-phase project. The site plan and all of the phases are going to go through the City of Lauderhill. The City will be in a much better position than the Council to monitor this, which was why it should not be in the Council's DRI report.

Councilmember Carruthers stated that she had a question about finished floor elevations. The Flood Insurance Rate Map referenced in the report was effective as of 1992; that is 17 years old and this project isn't even going to be done until 2034. Is there a more updated perception of exactly what areas will be flood prone as the climate changes, she asked.

Ms. Dekle stated that a notation can be added suggesting that the City of Lauderhill use the best available data.

Councilmember Lieberman stated that she would accept that amendment to the motion.

Councilmember Asseff asked if the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) was ready to start on the revamp of the State Road 7/U.S. 441 Corridor. Has anything been done? The City of Hollywood portion has been pushed back until 2013, she stated.

Mr. Larry Hymowitz, FDOT District IV, stated that he did not have an answer to that question, but would be happy to follow up on that.

Councilmember Asseff stated that there was a collaborative with the Clean Cities program focused on locating alternative fuel stations along the 441 Corridor. She stated that it was something that should be considered in that area.

Mr. Chon Wong, FDOT District IV, stated that FDOT had a few concerns regarding the transportation related DO conditions as they are presented today. The concerns are laid out in a letter that was sent to the Council on October 2, 2009. FDOT is in full support of this transit oriented development (TOD). DRI regulations require that the applicant mitigate adverse traffic impacts on significantly affected roadways. This project is located right on State Road 7/U.S. 441 (SR 7); an already congested, six-lane roadway that will not be widened. The buses that run along this route are already at capacity. With the addition of this DRI and other regional activities along SR 7, the traffic congestion will only be worsened if no viable transit solution is provided. If the roads are not going to be widened, then we have to rely on transit and other tools to minimize congestion and provide mobility. Some of the concrete solutions are reducing bus headways and adding new bus capacity. The proposed, transportation related DO conditions, as presented today, do not include those concrete transit solutions. The FDOT is concerned that the DO has not provided adequate mitigation to address the DRI's adverse traffic impact on the roadway.

Councilmember Bates stated that the City of Lauderhill Commission definitely supported this project. It would be an advantage to the City and to Broward County.

Councilmember Lieberman stated that the Broward County Commission determines the addition of extra buses along SR 7. Senate Bill 360 (SB 360) grandparented in Broward County's traffic concurrency arrangement. The reason that Broward County asks for payments into transit concurrency is to reduce headway, which allows the addition of more buses.

Councilmember Wallace stated that FDOT is saying that without the new buses, this project doesn't work because of all of the adverse transportation impacts. This is a serious thing; maybe the Council should consider what is being said. It may be up to the County to add the buses, but FDOT is saying that without the buses this project has big transportation problems.

Councilmember Gunzburger stated that she agreed with Councilmember Wallace, but the way you do it is to word it to say that if Broward County passes it at its meeting, then it should be the burden of Broward County to include this with the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in its planning for the future.

Councilmember Lieberman referenced page two of the staff report, stating that the reason that the applicant is paying between \$2.4 and \$3.1 million in transit concurrency fees is to do exactly that.

Councilmember Asseff stated that she did not understand why there are no plans for including a transportation lane for buses anywhere along that corridor. When the SR 7 Corridor project began, there was going to be one lane just for bus transit. She stated that she still feels that this was necessary to keep these cars off the road. This was also a great opportunity for use of alternative fuel buses.

Councilmember Carruthers stated that the letter from FDOT shows that it thinks that the calculation of the number of buses required and the fee that should be paid is half of what it should be to actually meet the requirements.

Councilmember Lieberman stated that the County will be the deciding body; the number that is in here is even silly, because it is a math equation and it is simply based on what the developer is going to do.

Councilmember Carruthers then suggested that the estimated amount be removed from the conditions.

Councilmember Lieberman stated that the real issue is that above transit concurrency, the applicant is paying \$750,000 to fund traffic signal prioritization transponders; that needs to stay in. The traffic

concurrency amount will be based on the development plan. The dollar amount in 2020 will probably be different than what is in the Report right now. What should be left in there is the traffic signal fund, but the other will be based on the development plans.

Mr. Charles Siemon, representative for the applicant, stated that it was important to understand that this is a community redevelopment project in a Community Redevelopment Area (CRA), in a community of significant physical and other stress. They have been working on this since the early part of 2000. This project is in the CRA plan, and the City's Masterplan, and there was a Comprehensive Plan Amendment approved by Broward County. This is coming before the Council after three years of review and during one of the most difficult economic times. It is a 25-year incremental redevelopment project that starts with partial demolition, and revitalization of up to 400,000 of the existing 600,000 square feet. Phase Three will not happen unless transit is successful. The applicant fundamentally disagrees with FDOT. There has been a practice in the state under the DRI process to exact as much money as is possible. The significant and adverse trips at issue here are all in Broward County; there is not one significant and adverse trip in another county. By definition, DRIs are impacts on citizens of more than one county. These adverse trips only affect the Central Concurrency District. Unless there is a significant and adverse impact on a regional resource, you cannot, by law, go beyond the County's concurrency fee. SB 360 makes it very clear that the level of service and the mitigation for that service is the same mitigation program adopted by Broward County and it acknowledges that it is a good and desirable model. Every trip will be mitigated by the fee. Mr. Siemon stated that this was a 25-year project, and it may be 13 years before a trip is added to SR 7, because a portion of the existing development will be removed.

Councilmember Lieberman asked if it would be better to say that Broward County's transit concurrency assessment fee shall be applied as each phase comes in, transit assessment fees shall be applied as per Broward County. The problem is the number, because it could be much greater in the future.

Ms. Dekle stated that may be, and this has not been negotiated at this point. She stated that she did have some conversations with Broward County staff. Some of the issue here was that the information came in very late and staff tried to arrive at a number as a base. One of the conditions states that there will be an analysis of the impact at Phase Three; the recommendation this morning was to do it at each phase, or at Phase Two, then Three. This is at the Council's discretion. Staff has also been asked to work with the County on the standardized methodology that would capture an adequate amount of resources for projects of this sort.

Councilmember Lieberman stated that according to SB 360, Broward County's transit oriented concurrency is preserved. Depending on when the developer applies for each phase, the amount per trip could be much greater. She stated that she didn't look at the number as a concrete number, because she knew that each time the developer comes in for each phase, a fee will be assessed. That will be based on the transportation concurrency model.

Chair Walters stated that the best way would be to take away the semicolon and say "...to be assessed at each phase".

Councilmember Brook stated that he would like to make sure that the developer agrees to that on the record.

Chair Walters stated that it was not a change; it was just being more specific in this bulleted item.

Ms. Dekle stated that was correct; one of the benefits that the Chapter 380 process provides is that the applicant understands the envelope of liability when they are negotiating these conditions. That is one of

the reasons that there are specific numbers in the Report, so that there is a base. It does not take away the County's ability to assess as each phase is brought in.

Councilmember Brook suggested adding the words "at least".

Councilmember Wallace stated that the Council is setting precedence; it is saying that it does not trust FDOT's methodology in computing adverse impacts. He stated that the Council should remember that in the future.

Councilmember Lieberman stated that the trips are going to be computed as each phase comes in and the assessment will be based on the number of trips that each phase brings to the table.

Mr. Goren asked if Councilmember McPherson was still on the phone; there was no response. He then asked if Councilmember Scuotto was still on the phone.

Councilmember Scuotto stated that he was and had a question for Councilmember Lieberman.

Councilmember Scuotto asked if Councilmember Lieberman was also considering the old K-Mart and the old dairy projects and were those going to be tied into the transportation.

Councilmember Lieberman stated that they would all be tied in; the McArthur property is the prospective home for the Gospel Hall of Fame and will have transit oriented concurrency impacts as will the old K-Mart property. Every one of the developments on SR 7 will be part of the transit oriented concurrency assessment.

Mr. Goren stated that Councilmember Scuotto listened to the conversation and could vote on the agenda item.

The motion on the floor, made by Councilmember Neugent and seconded by Councilmember Lieberman, was to approve the staff recommendation with the following amendments:

- The amended Development Order Condition T.5. shall now read, "The Developer will provide transportation mitigation by paying Broward County's Transit Concurrency Assessment Fee, currently estimated to be at least \$2.4 - \$3.1 million, to be assessed at each phase of development."
- Development Order Condition T.8.d., regarding designation of an on-site Employee Transit Coordinator, shall be deleted.

The motion carried with a nay vote from Councilmember Wallace.

Ms. Dekle stated that there were scrivener's errors; she asked if staff was given permission to correct them.

The Council granted the permission.

Chair Walters informed the Council that Councilmember Scuotto was asked to participate via phone because he was sick.

b) Development Orders (DO)

None

c) DRI Status Report

Information only

AGENDA ITEM SIX: Proposed Local Government Comprehensive Plan/Amendment Reviews

a) Proposed Public Education Facilities Element (PEFE)/Capital Improvements Element (CIE) Updates Amendments

- City of Miami Springs

c) Town of Surfside

d) City of North Lauderdale

Councilmember Gunzburger moved to approve the staff recommendation on agenda items 6a, 6c, and 6d. Councilmember Blynn seconded the motion, which carried by a unanimous vote.

b) City of Miami

Councilmember Riesco moved to approve the staff recommendation. Councilmember Asseff seconded the motion, which carried by a unanimous vote.

AGENDA ITEM SEVEN: Adopted Local Government Comprehensive Plan/Amendment Reviews

a) Adopted Public Education Facilities Element (PEFE)/Capital Improvements Element (CIE) Updates Amendments

- City of Margate

b) City of Miami Springs

c) City of North Miami

d) Town of Golden Beach

e) City of Miami Springs

Councilmember Gunzburger moved to approve the staff recommendation on agenda items 7a, 7b, 7c, 7d, and 7e. Councilmember Asseff seconded the motion, which carried by a unanimous vote.

AGENDA ITEM EIGHT: Reports

a) Executive Committee Report

Chair Walters informed the Council that there are still a couple of vacancies that are awaiting appointments.

c) Executive Director's Report

1) Legislative Update

Ms. Dekle stated that the next two items were resolutions developed at the Council's direction. Staff will send these forward with the Chair's signature upon the Council's approval.

i) Resolution regarding Florida Senate Bill 360

Councilmember Lieberman moved to approve the Resolution regarding Florida Senate Bill 360. Councilmember Gunzburger seconded the motion, which carried by a unanimous vote.

Councilmember Brook suggested that the word "opposed" be bolded.

b) Financial Report

Councilmember Brook requested an explanation regarding the variance in the accounts receivable.

Ms. Dekle stated that the report shows what the Council received the prior month. The Council received payment for work that had been done.

Mr. Richard Ogburn, Council staff, stated that page three of the report shows the breakout of the change from month-to-month. The Council received pass-through dollars for State Road 7 in the previous month.

Councilmember Wallace asked if the Council was going to make it through the end of the year.

Ms. Dekle responded yes. The Council is in its new fiscal year.

Councilmember Gunzburger moved to approve the Financial Report. Councilmember Bates seconded the motion, which carried by a unanimous vote.

c) Executive Director's Report (continued)

1) Legislative Update

ii) Resolution requesting that the Florida Legislature establish a Dedicated Funding Source to support the expansion of the Regional Transit System by the SFRTA

Councilmember Gunzburger moved to approve the Resolution requesting that the Florida Legislature establish a Dedicated Funding Source to support the expansion of the Regional Transit System by the SFRTA. Councilmember Neugent seconded the motion.

Councilmember Lieberman stated that she thought that some of the language from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) letter to Joe Giuliatti would be incorporated. The reason to do this Resolution is because we have already been advised by the FTA that if the State doesn't honor its commitment, the Federal Government can require the funding partners to pay back the money they were given for this project. She stated that she would like to include that the reason that this is critical for the State to do that. A copy of the letter is attached, but the relevant parts are not incorporated in the Resolution.

Chair Walters asked whether the sixth whereas clause does that not cover one of the important points? The fifth whereas clause discusses what could happen if a dedicated funding source is not created. Those two clauses seem to discuss the issues that Councilmember Lieberman is concerned about.

Councilmember Lieberman stated that she was referencing what Ms. Isabel Cosio Carballo gave her this morning.

Ms. Dekle stated that she has one item to add, which was the Council's requests that the issue of a dedicated funding source for the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) to be considered on its own merits and the subject of a single-subject bill.

Councilmember Lieberman stated that two things needed to be added: that the Council requests a dedicated funding source or sources for the State's Regional Transportation Authorities to be considered on its own merit as the subject of a single-subject bill, and the failure to fund the SFRTA will have an impact on the State's ability to fund future rail projects.

Chair Walters stated that those issues were addressed in the whereas clauses.

Ms. Cosio Carballo, Council staff, stated that the concerns were raised in the seventh whereas clause, but she would be happy to change it if the Council does not find it sufficient.

Councilmember Lieberman stated that she did not find it sufficient. They are not focusing on anything but Sun-Rail and they fail to see that Sun-Rail is dead if they don't fund Tri-Rail.

Ms. Cosio Carballo stated that staff would include the letter from the FTA with the resolution.

Chair Walters stated that if the letter is going to be included, then it needs to be referenced specifically. She requested that a comma be added after "subject bill" and include, "because without this all future rail projects in the State of Florida are in Jeopardy".

Councilmember Wallace suggested that the Council delegate Councilmember Lieberman to make some official phone calls on the Council's behalf.

Councilmember Asseff added not only should we be focused on Tri-Rail, but the bullet train from Orlando to South Florida.

Councilmember Lieberman stated that if there is no funding for Tri-Rail, forget anything else. All of the money that the Federal Government advanced was predicated on the Agreement, and the Agreement required these funds so that they could have operating money once they double tracked.

Chair Walters stated that the Council has directed staff to write this Resolution, and it has indirectly addressed that with the clause that is being added, section four.

Mr. Jack Stevens, RTA, stated that those in Washington, D.C. have been very blatant that they are not happy. They took their taxpayer dollars and invested in us and now they are hearing, "what did that accomplish?" If you are not going to take care of this, then how are you going to deal with these other projects that you have on your wish list is another question being asked, he stated. The bottom line is South Florida, in particular, needs a lot of Federal money. He requested that the Council continue to support the RTA.

The Council unanimously approved the amended motion made by Councilmember Gunzburger and seconded by Councilmember Neugent.

2) Strategic Planning Session Draft Agenda

Chair Walters stated that this item would be moved to the end of the meeting.

d) Legal Counsel Report

Mr. Goren informed the Council that Councilmember Gunzburger had requested information regarding fees, costs and expenses; this was provided to the Executive Committee this morning. It is a list of fees paid for by the Council for work done for the Council in areas that include loan closings, foreclosures and other litigation aspects. Regarding the SB 360 litigation; it is kind of at a quagmire. A motion to dismiss was submitted and considered by a judge; there has also been discussion about the ripeness of the litigation.

e) Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) Status Report

Information only

AGENDA ITEM NINE: Revolving Loan Funds

a) SFRPC Revolving Loan Funds Status Report

Information only

b) Hurricane Wilma Bridge Loan Status Report

Information only

c) Eastward Ho! Brownfields Cleanup Revolving Loan Fund Status Report

Information only

d) Broward County Cultural Division Artist Micro-Credit Revolving Loan Fund Status Report

Information only

AGENDA ITEM TEN: Contracts

None

AGENDA ITEM ELEVEN: Highlights of Council Activities

Information only

AGENDA ITEM TWELVE: Special Projects

a) Statewide Regional Evacuation Study Program - Update

Chair Walters stated that she requested that the Council's report illustrate its concern about encouraging the State to expedite getting the Regional Evacuation Study Program done before next hurricane season in order to give local governments time to incorporate it into their emergency plans.

AGENDA ITEM THIRTEEN: Strategic Regional Policy Plan (SRPP)

None

AGENDA ITEM FOURTEEN: Regional Initiatives with Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council

None

AGENDA ITEM FIFTEEN: Other Matters for Consideration

a) Presentation – Overview of Proposed Hometown Democracy Amendment

Mr. Bob Cambric, Council staff, gave a brief presentation regarding the Hometown Democracy Amendment. He stated that it is now on the ballot as amendment number four. The amendment states that all amendments to comprehensive plans would have to go before voters as a referendum in order to be approved before an elected body with a city or a county could then adopt those changes into the Comprehensive Plan. There are some procedural questions outlined on page two of the staff report that the amendment does not address. Council staff has been in contact with the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) who is interested to see how these will be addressed. There is also a competing amendment by Floridians for Smart Growth, Inc., which is worded to say it will supersede Hometown Democracy, if passed. In detail, it states that a voter referendum can be done for a comprehensive plan if 10 percent of the voters in the community decide sign a petition. This amendment will create a new standard for how to get voters to sign up; a petition cannot be done on the street, the voter would have to go to the Supervisor of Elections, City Clerk or a similar election authority. The voters will then have to produce identification and proof of residence and also state whether or not they own a website. If the voter does own a website, they will then be asked if they are advertising for or against the amendment on their website. In addition, all signatories must sign the petition within 60 days of the first signature on the petition. As of right now they have 443,000 signatures and will need 676,811 by February 1, 2010, to get this amendment on the ballot.

Councilmember Asseff asked what the Council was going to do since it cannot use government monies to protest any of this. How would the Council be able to get the message out, she asked.

Mr. Goren stated that the Statute discusses spending public money to advocate for a specific venue. This Council has a tradition of free speech where it has, over the years adopted resolutions, such as it has done today. These essentially speak the mind of the Council; the cost is minimal. He stated that he is not convinced, from a legal perspective, that the Council has waived or given up its rights. The Council cannot spend public dollars advocating.

Councilmember Gunzburger stated that she and Councilmember Lieberman went out speaking on the second homestead amendment issue. When you go out to speak to the public, if you reach 10 percent, you are lucky. She stated that it would not stop public opinion pages in the newspaper; that is one-third of the public at best. How do you get to the public? One of the best ways is through social networking such as Facebook and Twitter, another is the blogs. These are the only free methods out there, but there is a high possibility that the public will be misinformed through these methods.

Councilmember Neugent asked what about public dollars that we get for mileage. Does that keep you from going and making personal appearances, speaking and advocating on behalf of an issue?

Mr. Goren stated that he was not trying to defer to Councilmember Lieberman, but she does have views on the subject. Each County, City Commission has their own views on the subject. Mayor Ortis, from the City of Pembroke Pines as well as former League President for the League of Cities, had a direct conversation with the maker of that Bill, who suggested that there was not supposed to be an inability to have public discussion or commentary; what it was aimed at was spending public tax dollars essentially

towards that end. It is a difficult question to answer he stated, because one could argue that everything that you do is funded by some level of tax dollars.

Councilmember Lieberman stated that the Federal court has stricken election communication from Florida Statute, because of the Broward County condominium case. The Elections Commission says that it can't enforce Janet Long and Charlie Justice's Bill.

Mr. Goren stated that the question that was asked of him was whether or not the Council could continue to exercise its free speech rights to advocate and educate without expense of public dollars.

Councilmember Lieberman stated that section of state law is gone; they went to Federal court, who was not at all constrained by the Legislature and election communication was stricken from the Statute.

Mr. Goren suggested that the Council continue the premise that it has traveled on, which is to adopt resolutions.

Councilmember Lieberman stated that the good news was that in a rare collaborative effort, the Bar, League of Cities, the Florida Association of Counties, and the School Board are coming together to file suit on this.

Chair Walters stated that the Council, then, has a legal opinion that the Council has the ability to draft a resolution on the amendment.

Mr. Goren stated that given the nature of recent Federal court decisions plus my interpretation of the Senate Bill as it was unintentionally meant to imply does not restrict the Council from having public commentary and having a resolution drafted.

Ms. Dekle stated that other Councils are discussing this issue also; their attorneys are weighing in. There will be a meeting of the directors where everyone will report out. Some of the Councils have already passed resolutions opposing the legislation. She stated that she would report back to the Council at the November Council meeting.

Councilmember Lieberman stated that one of the co-drafters came to speak at the last Policy Conference for the Florida Association of Counties. The fact that this amendment would apply to all future Comprehensive Plan amendments was raised to him. She stated that she asked him to imagine the size that the ballot would be in Broward, Miami-Dade or Palm Beach. His response was to add one item to the agenda "shall all changes to the Comprehensive Plan be approved?" Her response, she stated, that could be an issue if the voter likes most amendments, but not all. By the time he got up to speak, he realized that there would have to be separate items for each change.

Chair Walters suggested that this be discussed further at the planning session.

Councilmember Asseff stated that she would also like to see what the League of Cities comes up with.

b) FPL Proposed New Nuclear Plant – Turkey Point 6 and 7 Update

Councilmember Walters stated that the FPL item was presenting a revised calendar of comment deadlines for the State's process.

AGENDA ITEM SIXTEEN: Correspondence and Attendance Form

Information only

AGENDA ITEM SEVENTEEN: Councilmember Comments/Public Comments

None

AGENDA ITEM EIGHTEEN: Upcoming Meetings

- a) November 2nd, 10:30 a.m. (Council Offices, Hollywood)
- b) December 7th, 10:30 a.m. (Council Offices, Hollywood)
- c) January 4th, 10:30 a.m. (Council Offices, Hollywood)
- d) February 1st, 10:30 a.m. (Council Offices, Hollywood)

AGENDA ITEM NINETEEN: Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 p.m.

This signature is to attest that the undersigned is the Secretary of the SOUTH FLORIDA REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL, and that the information provided herein is the true and correct minutes for the October 5, 2009 meeting of the SOUTH FLORIDA REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL adopted the 2nd day of November 2009.

Katy Sorenson, Secretary

Date