

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Planning and Zoning Board Regular Meeting January 2, 2024

The Planning and Zoning Board met in formal session Tuesday, January 2, 2024, at 1:00 p.m. in the Alcazar Room at City Hall. The meeting was called to order by Charles Pappas, Chairperson and the following were present:

1. Roll Call: Charles Pappas, Chairperson
Mike Davis
Jon DePreter
Carl Blow
Matthew Shaffer
Ashleigh Barnes

Absent Christine Tucker, Vice- Chairperson (Excused)

City Staff: Amy Skinner, Director, Planning & Building Department
Jacob Fredriksson, Planning & Building Planner
Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney
Michele Fudo, Recording Secretary

2. General Public hearings for Items Not on the Agenda

(None)

3. Approval of Minutes

MOTION

Mr. DePreter MOVED to APPROVED the November 7, 2023 minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Blow.

APPROVED by UNANIMOUS Voice Vote

MOTION

Mr. DePreter MOVED to APPROVED the December 5, 2023 minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Blow.

APPROVED by UNANIMOUS Voice Vote

4. Modification and Approval of Agenda

(None)

5. Variance

5. (a) 2023-0099 – James St. George – Applicant James St. George & Sonya Casey – Owners 144 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue

To approve a variance to the side yard setback requirement for an addition on a property with a Residential Single-Family-Two: RS-2 zoning designation.

Mr. Fredriksson read the staff report and said based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff finds that the Board can APPROVE the variance request to reduce the side yard setback requirement for non-conforming RS-2 lots of four (4) feet to three (3) feet six (6) inches at 144 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue / PID 211720-0000.

James St. George reviewed the application.

The Board provided their Ex Parte Communication.

28 certified notices were sent, 1 was returned in favor, 1 returned opposed and 1 had comments.

Public hearing was opened, however, there was no response.

The Board discussed:

Mr. Shaffer and Mr. Blow asked for clarification of the addition as it related to the variance.

Mr. St. George presented a rendering of the proposed addition and advised the Board that the addition was at the rear of the property. He said that because he was extending the existing structure, he needed to have the variance.

After further discussion the Board agreed that there was unanimous support.

MOTION

Mr. DePreter MOVED to APPROVE variance 2023-0099 as it met the criteria, it was a non-conforming lot, it was continuing the conformance further in the back and did not extend into the rear setback. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Shaffer.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: DePreter, Shaffer, Barnes, Blow, Davis, Pappas

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Use by Exception

6. (a) 2023-0098 – Kevin Carr – Applicant c/o Carr Property Group, LLC Carr Property Group, LLC – Owner 54 Carrera Street

To approve off-site parking for a property with a Residential General- One: RG-1 zoning designation within the Municipal

Parking Garage as a permitted use by exception.

Mr. Fredriksson read the staff report and said based on a review of Section 28-29, staff finds that the Board can APPROVE a use by exception request for three (3) parking spaces within the Municipal Parking Garage at 54 Carrera Street / PID 204080-0000 to satisfy the requirements of Sec. 28-151.

In the event this request is approved by the Board staff also recommends the following conditions:

1. Approval of this use by exception for three (3) parking spaces within the Municipal Parking Garage is contingent upon providing proof of parking pass renewal at the time of vacation rental registration.

2. When registering the short-term rentals at 54 Carrera Street, proof of purchase of a parking pass for the duration of the vacation rental registration period is to be paid in full and provided to the Code Enforcement Division.

Kevin Carr reviewed the application.

The Board provided their Ex Parte Communication.

20 certified notices were sent, 0 were returned in favor, 4 returned opposed and 4 had comments.

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response.

The Board discussed:

Mr. Blow commented that the application was very thorough. He pointed out the requests for parking within 400 feet that had been unsuccessful. He asked Ms. Lopez to confirm that there was no option to deny the use of parking in the garage.

Ms. Lopez confirmed that there had to be an alternative that could be offered to the applicant. She said that the code read that

you had to have parking on site and if you could prove that you could not offer the required parking on site the code gave alternatives that needed to be worked through.

Mr. Carr told the Board that he was required to provide 8 parking spaces and had five spaces on site. He added that the rental listing already included that they allowed one vehicle per unit.

Mr. Shaffer asked what the requirement from the staff was regarding the proof of purchase of the parking pass that needed to be yearlong. He said that having a parking pass did not guarantee a space at the Municipal Parking structure and felt this was not a viable solution.

MOTION

Mr. DePreter MOVED to APPROVE Use by Exception 2023-0098 as the applicant had documented very thoroughly the options available and had met the criteria. The Board recommended the following conditions 1). Approval of the Use by Exception for three parking spaces in the Municipal Parking Garage was contingent upon providing proof of parking pass renewal at the time of vacation rental registration, 2). When registering the short-term rentals at 54 Carrera, proof of purchase of a parking pass for the duration of the vacation rental registration period is to be paid in full and provided to the Code Enforcement Division, and 3). The advertisement must list the locations of the parking. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Blow

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: DePreter, Blow, Barnes, Davis, Pappas

NAYES: Shaffer

MOTION CARRIED

6. (b) 2023-0100 – Lisa Ferringo – Applicant Lisa Ferringo & James Johnson – Owner 56 Saragossa Street

To approve off-site parking for a property with a Residential General- One: RG-1 zoning designation within the Municipal Parking Garage as a permitted use by exception.

Mr. Fredriksson read the staff report and said based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff recommends that the Board CONTINUE the use by exception request for two (2) parking spaces within the Municipal Parking Garage at 56 Saragossa Street / PID 203670-0120 until an adequate amount of information is provided. Staff requests that the information to be provided by the applicant include the following:

1. Documentation of evidence in trying to obtain parking within 400 feet at a commercial parking lot,
2. A floor plan, and
3. A site plan.

The applicant was not present, and Mr. Fredriksson advised the Board that he had attempted to contact the applicant via email on December 18, 2023, and by phone call on December 27, 2023, but had had no response.

Mr. Pappas asked Ms. Lopez how to proceed given that the applicant was not present.

Ms. Lopez advised the Board that if the application had been noticed, and the applicant was aware of the date and time of the hearing, the Board could legally proceed with the hearing. She said that any decision concerning the application had to be made based on the facts before the Board, so a denial could not be granted because the applicant was not present. The hearing would follow the same procedure; however, the applicant would not be present to answer questions.

Mr. Shaffer asked if the Board was required to go forward.

Ms. Lopez answered and said that the Board was not required to go forward and advised that the Board could continue the application to a date certain or continue to a future date and readvertise the application.

Mr. Davis said that a denial would move the application to an appeal. He recommended a continuance to a date certain and readvertise the application.

Mr. Pappas reminded the Board that any denial would have to be based on facts, such as, did the applicant complete their due diligence or, was there proof that they could not fit the additional spaces on the property.

Following additional discussion, it was decided to continue the application to a future date and re-advertise.

MOTION

Mr. Davis MOVED to CONTINUE application 2023-0100 to a date uncertain for offsite parking at 56 Saragossa Street. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Shaffer

Mr. Blow confirmed that the applicant had paid a fee and would be charged another fee for the cost of the advertising.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Davis, Shaffer, Barnes, DePreter, Pappas

NAYES: Blow

MOTION CARRIED

7. Conservation Overlay Zone Development

7.(a) 2023-0095- Ryan Carter – Applicant c/o Carter Environmental Services Carter Bayly – Owner 97 Coquina Street
Continued from the December 5th Regular Meeting

To approve the construction of a bulkhead replacement within Conservation Overlay Zones 1 & 2.

Mr. Fredriksson read the staff report and said based on a review of Section 11-29, specifically the 17 criteria for Conservation Overlay Zone Development, staff finds that the Board should either DENY this application or CONTINUE this application until a detailed explanation of the impacts to Conservation Overlay Zone 1 are documented and a mitigation plan describing the proposals adherence to the City's no net loss of wetlands Comprehensive Plan policy at 97 Coquina Avenue / PID 223370-0000.

Ryan Carter reviewed the discussion from the previous meeting and offered to present copies of permits that were granted by the city.

Ex Parte Communication: none

Public hearing was opened.

Linda Winkle wanted to discuss the bulkhead replacement; she asked if the 18 inches waterward meant to the water's edge or moving towards the water. She presented pictures of the back of the lots in question. She asked what would happen to the dock when the new bulkhead was constructed and wanted to know where the bulkhead ended. She also mentioned the need to be careful of the mangroves. Ms. Winkle made a point of highlighting the weeping holes that appeared to direct the water onto the neighboring properties.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Carter presented his rebuttal and answered the questions that Ms. Winkle had.

Mr. Pappas asked the staff to explain what information had been communicated to the staff from the building code task force.

Mr. Fredriksson advised that there was no residential lot grading plan in place for new development, which required that there be documentation that any drainage would stay on the owner's property and would not impact neighboring properties.

Mr. Pappas asked if the grading plan would address this application.

Ms. Skinner clarified that the walls on the perimeters were issued as a fence or wall permit, and walls as a type of fencing could be built as high as eight feet. She said that a separate permit was issued by a building official that was a flood plain manager and could issue a flood plain management permit for the fill.

The Board discussed:

- Interdepartmental communication needed to be improved
- The issue with the fill on the property would not fall under the purview of the PZB
- The seventeen criteria are used to evaluate any application before the Board
- Verified application was for the replacement of the bulkhead on the property
- Needed clarification of impact within the Conservation Overlay Zone
- The city permit was issued on August 17, 2023
- There will be five or six feet of fill to connect the current grade to the top cap of the new bulkhead
- Additional fill required could be subject to the 17 criteria

Mr. DePreter asked if the existing bulkhead was located on the subject property. He also pointed out that a loss of wetlands was noted by staff.

Mr. Carter addressed the issue of the location of the bulkhead. He said that he had spoken to the owner/applicant and was advised that the owner/applicant was seeking an agreement with the owner of the adjacent property for a fee simple purchase of a small portion of the land or an agreement for an easement. He said that the state allowed for up to eighteen inches with no mitigation in reference to the wetlands.

Ms. Lopez asked Mr. Carter if he was sure that the infrastructure that he was asking to be permitted was on the clients' property. She asked if there was an agent's authorization from the other property owner.

Mr. Carter advised that the Department of Environmental Protection (D.E.P.) would not issue a permit until the applicant provided legal and equitable interest over the activity that they are seeking. He said that there was no agent's authorization in place currently.

Discussion continued:

- Bulkhead would be five feet tall
- The fill would match the five feet and cause an unnatural flow of drainage water off the property
- Natural drainage had been interrupted
- Flood plain had been altered in a negative way
- Applicant would need to provide a drainage plan showing that there was no adverse effect on stormwater

Ms. Barnes asked Ms. Lopez how the board should proceed.

Ms. Lopez advised that there was no way to proceed now, and it appeared that the applicant understood that, as there was no agent's authorization in place to proceed with the requested development.

Discussion continued:

- Thanked the public for presenting the board with the photos from the site
- Recognized due process for property owners
- Establish information needed for continuation
- The 17 criteria was quite broad
- Needed additional information connected to the applicant getting permits as it related to the drainage issue of stormwater
- The weepholes in the wall were quite large
- Criteria was based on site conditions
- Current specific conditions were created by the property owner

Mr. Carter requested a continuance to the March 5, 2024, meeting of the PZB.

MOTION

Mr. Shaffer MOVED that Conservation Overlay Zone Development application 2023-0095 at 97 Coquina Street, to approve the construction of a bulkhead replacement within Conservation Overlay Zones one and two be continued to March 5, 2024. The motion was SECONDED by Charles Pappas.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Shaffer, Pappas, Barnes, DePreter, Blow, Davis

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7.(b) 2023-0096- Ryan Carter – Applicant c/o Carter Environmental Services Carter Bayly – Owner 99 Coquina Street
Continued from the December 5th Regular Meeting

To approve the construction of a bulkhead replacement within Conservation Overlay Zones 1 & 2.

Mr. Fredriksson read the staff report and said based on a review of Section 11-29, specifically the 17 criteria for Conservation Overlay Zone Development, staff finds that the Board should either DENY this application or CONTINUE this application until a detailed explanation of the impacts to Conservation Overlay Zone 1 are documented and a mitigation plan describing the proposals adherence to the City's no net loss of wetlands Comprehensive Plan policy at 99 Coquina Avenue /PID 223370-0060.

The applicant requested a continuation to the March 5, 2024, PZB meeting after a brief discussion under item number 7a.

MOTION

Mr. DePreter MOVED to CONTINUE application 2023-0096 at the applicants request to the March 5, 2024, meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Davis

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: DePreter, Davis, Shaffer, Barnes, Blow, Pappas

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY¹

8. Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Rezoning

8.(a) 2023-0101 Todd DeClemente – Applicant c/o St. Joseph Academy Bishop Erik Pohlmeier- Owner c/o Diocese of St. Augustine
155 State Road 207 / PID 128640-0000
Sidney Street / PID 128450-0000
155 State Road 207 128460-0000
1200 S Whitney Street / PID 128590-0000
535 Thomas Street / PID 128660-0000
975 S Rodriguez Street / PID 128835-0000

To amend the current land use of Residential-D (St. Johns County) to Institutional (City of St. Augustine) and to rezone the approximately 39.8-acre property from Residential, Single family-three (RS-3) and Open Rural (OR) (St.

¹ Break 2:34 – 2:47

Johns County zoning designations) to Open Land (OL) (City of St. Augustine zoning designation).

Mr. Fredriksson read the staff report and said City staff does not make recommendations concerning comprehensive plan amendments or the rezoning of land. The Board is responsible for making a recommendation based on the following.

- (1) The need and justification for the change.
- (2) The relationship of the proposed amendment or rezoning to the city's general planning program and such comprehensive plans may from time to time be adopted by the city commission.
- (3) Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.

If the PZB chooses to make a recommendation to the City Commission regarding a proposed land use and compatible zoning district an individual motion is required for each recommendation.

Mike Davis recused himself from the application²

Ex Parte Communication: none

105 certified notices were sent, 2 were returned in favor, 3 returned opposed and 5 had comments.

Prior to public comment being opened, Mr. DePreter asked for clarification about the current resource officer at the school.

Mr. DeClemente told the Board that the officer at the school was part of an off-duty detail program, and he did not think that the relationship could continue without the school being in the city.

Ms. Lopez advised the Board that if there were on duty school resource officers from

the City of St. Augustine as there were in schools within the city limits, the city wanted to be sure that the officer would be an on-duty officer from the St. Augustine Police Department. She added that currently there was a jurisdictional issue as the school was in the county not the city and the city was seeking to formalize the relationship between the school and the city.

Public hearing was opened, however there was no response.

The Board discussed:

- Allowed for the officer to be an active City of St. Augustine officer
- Verified that the request was for rezoning the land
- Needed direction from the staff to understand why the request was before the Board.
- Clarified that the sheriff did not have the staff to cover this school with an officer, therefore for the city, in order to provide an officer at the school, needed to annex the property into the city
- Compared St. Johns County zoning to the city, density would affect adjacent property
- The City would not be required to perform maintenance for the roads
- City would be funding the resource officer at the school
- School had reimbursement agreement with the city

Mr. Pappas commented that all public services such as fire and police would be taxed by covering this school and adjacent properties that belong to the school. He asked what the need and the justification was for this request.

Ms. Lopez reminded the Board that their job was to determine if this was the correct comp plan designation and the correct zoning designation.

² Recusal form filed with original minutes.

Discussion continued:

- Annexation was the commission's decision
- Rezoning into the general planning and comprehensive plan
- Zoning category that the school would be going into was the most restrictive
- Determine that this was the correct zoning for the school
- City Commission had already reviewed the voluntary petition to be annexed

MOTION

Mr. DePreter MOVED to make a positive recommendation to the City Commission to APPROVE the comprehensive plan amendment 2023-0101 as Board discussion had shown that it met the criteria justification, relationship to our general planning and consistency with the comprehensive plan. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Blow.

Mr. Shaffer provided clarification that the motion was to amend the current land use from Residential - D (St. Johns County) to Institutional (City of St. Augustine).

Mr. Pappas added that conceptually he did not agree with the amendment, but the land use and zoning was acceptable.

Mr. Blow commented that most annexations were for economic reasons, this one was for different reasons. He added that there was no downside to this annexation request.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: DePreter, Blow, Shaffer, Barnes, Pappas

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION

Mr. DePreter MOVED to make a positive recommendation to the City Commission to APPROVE rezoning application 2023-0101 from county designation Residential Single-Family RS-3 and OR (St. Johns County) to Open Land (OL) City of St. Augustine Zoning. The Motion was SECONDED by Mr. Blow

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: DePreter, Blow, Shaffer, Barnes, Pappas

NAYES:

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Other Business

9.(a) Board discussion regarding boat lift size limits for commercial uses and an update on the City's floodplain management initiatives going into 2024.

Mr. Fredriksson presented a review of the discussion regarding the commercial boat lift sizes and an update on the city's flood plain management initiatives going into 2024. He said that the city had determined that there were two categories for boat lifts; one for marinas and one for docks. He said marinas were defined in the city zoning code and essentially anything that did not fit the definition as a marina was considered a private dock with a limit of 12,000 pounds and thirty-two feet in length. He said that staff was looking for direction on whether the Board wanted to modify the codes to allow for marinas or boatyards to accommodate larger boat sizes.

Mr. Pappas asked Mr. Carter to speak on the subject.

Mr. Carter began the discussion by stating that the existing code was put in place in 1999. He told the Board that the common size at that time was thirty-foot center consoles. He said the biggest center console was sixty-five-foot weighing in at 35,000 pounds, and trends are moving toward larger center consoles, and this would place them outside of the current code. He felt the city

needed to consider allowing for larger lift slips to keep up with industry. He reminded the Board that boats that could not be lifted would have to have bottom paint and that could be contrary to the environment.

Mr. Pappas was more concerned with commercial docks rather than residential boat docks and lifts.

Ms. Lopez asked for clarification of what type of marina, per city code or a larger commercial docking facility.

Mr. Blow thought that the current code was put in place because a large boat could have a negative effect on the vista and was designed for single family docks. He pointed out that keeping a boat in the water can add to the expense. He said that public access marinas as well as condos were offering the lift as opposed to in water storage.

Ms. Lopez stated current criteria said no profile or low-profile lifts, size and weight of the boat could not exceed thirty-two feet and 12,000 pounds, and no boat houses. She asked the Board if they wanted to keep those criteria for single family docks and create new criteria for large multifamily or commercial type marinas. She said that it could be listed under criteria number seventeen but separated as 17a and 17b. She explained that this would be a code revision so there would be an ordinance enacting the changes. She continued and said that when it was adopted, those who were coming in to get permitted under the seventeen criteria, if they were a commercial marina type or a multifamily dock, would have to meet the criteria of 17b.

Ms. Skinner advised the Board that any language that was developed as proposed would be brought back to PZB and the Board, as a planning agency, would make a recommendation to the City Commission.

Mr. Pappas felt there was consensus with the Board to leave the single family as- is and

create new criteria for the commercial dock or multifamily docking facilities.

Ms. Lopez verified that the Board was asking the planning staff to meet with stakeholders to come up with the preliminary criteria for 17B.

Mr. Pappas confirmed.

Mr. Fredriksson updated the Board on the city's plan management initiatives for the new year. He said that the new flood planning coordinator would come on staff on January 8, 2024, and their job would be to review and verify the new residential lot grading plan, which was now in effect. In addition, this person would conduct building permit review for all applications within the city flood zones, and they would be administering the flood mitigation assistance program which currently had sixty-one outstanding applicants. He told the Board that the topic of limiting fill on residential lots would be explored in conjunction with the city's new Resilient Shoreline ordinance, and the staff would be bringing a draft of the ordinance in late spring or early summer.

Mr. Blow inquired about the negotiations with the Florida Dept of Environmental Protection to exchange property along A1A to move the fire station to a new location and allow the city to provide sufficient right of way for traffic flow.

Ms. Lopez advised that Board that the state had denied the request and that the city manager was looking at all of the options available to improve safety in that area.

10. Adjournment

Having no further business, Mr. Pappas
adjourned the meeting at 3:39 P.M.³



Charles Pappas, Chairperson

³ Transcribed by Michele Fudo

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

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME DAVIS MICHAEL ALAN		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE PLANNING AND ZONING	
MAILING ADDRESS 23 PARK TERRACE DR		THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF:	
CITY ST. AUGUSTINE	COUNTY ST. JOHNS	☒ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☐ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY	
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED 1/2/24		NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE	
		MY POSITION IS: ☐ ELECTIVE ☒ 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, MICHAEL A. DAVIS, hereby disclose that on 1/2, 20 24:

(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:

I'M A MEMBER OF THE ST-JOSEPH ACADEMY
SCHOOL ADVISORY BOARD.

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.

1/2/2024
Date Filed

Michael A. Davis
Signature

NOTICE: UNDER PROVISIONS OF FLORIDA STATUTES §112.317, A FAILURE TO MAKE ANY REQUIRED DISCLOSURE CONSTITUTES GROUNDS FOR AND MAY BE PUNISHED BY ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING: IMPEACHMENT, REMOVAL OR SUSPENSION FROM OFFICE OR EMPLOYMENT, DEMOTION, REDUCTION IN SALARY, REPRIMAND, OR A CIVIL PENALTY NOT TO EXCEED \$10,000.