

**STATE OF FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY**

SAKATA SEED CORPORATION,
SAKATA AMERICA HOLDINGS, INC.,
AND LINDA S. NELSON,

Petitioners,

DOAH CASE NO.: 19-3848GM
DEO CASE NO.: 20-094
DEO FINAL ORDER NO.: 20-037

v.

LEE COUNTY, FLORIDA, A POLITICAL
SUBDIVISION OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA,

Respondent,

and

MCIN BELL, LLC,

Intervenor.

FILED
2020 SEP 14 PM 2:03
DIVISION OF
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

FINAL ORDER

This matter was considered by the Division of Community Development within the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity (“Department”) following the receipt of a recommended order (“Recommended Order”) issued by an Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) assigned to the matter by the Division of Administrative Hearings (“DOAH”).

Background

This is a proceeding to determine whether amendment CPA2018-10014 (the “Plan Amendment”) to the Lee County Comprehensive Plan (“Plan”) is “in compliance,” as defined in section 163.3184(1)(b), Florida Statutes (2019).¹ The Plan Amendment was adopted by Ordinance

¹ References to the *Florida Statutes* are to the 2019 version, which was in effect on the date the Ordinance was adopted.

on June 19, 2019. The changes by the Plan Amendment relevant to this proceeding amended certain policies and maps in the Plan as they relate to limerock mining in the Density Reduction/Groundwater Resource (DR/GR) area in the southeast portion of the county.

On July 18, 2019, Sakata Seed Corporation, Sakata America Holdings, Inc., and Linda S. Nelson (“Petitioners”), filed a petition for an administrative hearing, challenging whether the Plan Amendment is “in compliance,” as defined in section 163.3184(1)(b), Florida Statutes. Petitioners allege that the Plan Amendment is unsupported by relevant and appropriate data, as required by section 163.3177(1)(f), Florida Statutes and is internally inconsistent with the County’s Comprehensive Plan, in violation of section 163.3177(2), Florida Statutes.

The case was scheduled for final hearing on October 22 and 23, 2019 in Fort Myers, Florida. MCIN Bell, LLC (“Intervenor”) was granted leave to intervene on September 11, 2019. The hearing commenced as scheduled on October 22 and 23, with the final day of the hearing being continued and subsequently held on December 16, 2019.

The ALJ issued the Recommended Order on June 16, 2020, recommending the Department issue a final order determining the Plan Amendment to be found in compliance. A copy of the Recommended Order is attached hereto as Exhibit “A.” No exceptions to the Recommended Order were filed with the Department.

Role of the Department

Petitioner’s challenge was filed pursuant to sections 120.569, 120.57(1), and 163.3184, Florida Statutes. The ALJ held a hearing and issued the Recommended Order, finding the Plan Amendment in compliance, and submitted the Recommended Order to the Department. The Department may determine that the Plan Amendment is in compliance and enter a final order to that effect or determine that the Plan Amendment is not in compliance and refer the Recommended

Order and the Department's determination to the Administration Commission for final agency action. § 163.3184(5)(e), Fla. Stat.

The Department has received a record consisting of copies of the parties' pleadings, the documentary evidence introduced at the final hearing, and a five-volume transcript of the proceedings of the final hearing. The Department has reviewed the record and issues this Final Order in accordance with sections 120.57(1)(k)-(l) and 163.3184, Florida Statutes.

If the Department rejects or modifies a conclusion of law or interpretation of an administrative rule, then the Department must state with particularity its reasons for such rejection or modification. § 120.57(1)(l), Fla. Stat. If the Department rejects or modifies a finding of fact, then the Department must state with particularity that the finding was not based upon competent substantial evidence or that the proceedings on which the finding was based did not comply with essential requirements of law. *Id.*

Standard of Review

Findings of Fact

Section 120.57(1)(l), Florida Statutes, prescribes that in its issuance of a final order, the Department may not reject or modify the findings of fact of the ALJ "unless the agency first determines from a review of the entire record, and states with particularity in the order, that the findings of fact were not based upon competent substantial evidence or that the proceedings on which the findings were based did not comply with essential requirements of law." Evidence is competent if it is admissible under the pertinent legal rules of evidence. *Scholastic Book Fairs, Inc. v. Unemplmt. App. Comm'n*, 671 So. 2d 287, 290 n.3 (Fla. 5th DCA 1996). Evidence is substantial if there is "some (more than a mere iota or scintilla) real, material, pertinent, and relevant evidence (as distinguished from ethereal, metaphysical, speculative or merely theoretical

evidence or hypothetical possibilities) having definite probative value (that is, ‘tending to prove’) as to each essential element” of the claim. *Id.* The Department is “not authorized to weigh the evidence presented, judge credibility of witnesses, or otherwise interpret the evidence to fit its desired ultimate conclusion.” *Heifetz v. Dep’t of Bus. Reg.*, 475 So. 2d 1277, 1281 (Fla. 1st DCA 1985). “If the ALJ’s findings of fact are supported by competent, substantial evidence, the agency cannot reject them even to make alternate findings that are also supported by competent, substantial evidence.” *Lantz v. Smith*, 106 So. 3d 518, 521 (Fla. 1st DCA 2013). The Department may reject findings of fact if the proceedings on which the findings were based did not comply with the essential requirements of law. *See* § 120.57(1)(l), Fla. Stat., and *Dept. of Corrections v. Bradley*, 510 So. 2d 1122, 1123 (Fla. 1st DCA 1987). In this context, Florida’s First District Court of Appeal has characterized a failure “to comply with the essential requirements of the law” as “a procedural irregularity.” *Beckett v. Dep’t of Fin. Servs.*, 982 So. 2d 94, 102 (Fla. 1st DCA 2008) (ruling that the agency erred by concluding that the ALJ had failed to comply with the essential requirements of the law “[b]ecause there has been no suggestion of a procedural irregularity”).

Conclusions of Law

Section 120.57(1)(l), Florida Statutes, authorizes the Department to reject or modify a conclusion of law over which the agency has substantive jurisdiction. § 120.57(1)(l), Fla. Stat.; *Barfield v. Dep’t of Health*, 805 So. 2d 1008, 1010 (Fla. 1st DCA 2001). If the Department rejects or modifies any of the ALJ’s conclusions of law, then the Department must state with particularity its reasons for rejecting or modifying the conclusion, and must make a finding that its substituted conclusion of law is as or more reasonable than that which was rejected or modified. § 120.57(1)(l), Fla. Stat. The Department is not permitted to reject or modify a finding that is substantially one of fact simply by treating the finding as a legal conclusion. *See Abrams v. Seminole Cnty. Sch. Bd.*,

73 So. 3d 285, 294 (Fla. 5th DCA 2011). Additionally, a rejection or modification of a conclusion of law may not form a basis for rejection or modification of a finding of fact. § 120.57(1)(1), Fla. Stat.

Adoption of the Recommended Order


The Department has reviewed the Recommended Order and concludes that all findings of fact therein were based upon competent substantial evidence in the record. The Department finds that the proceedings on which the findings of fact were based complied with the essential requirements of law.

The Department has reviewed the ALJ's conclusions of law and finds that all conclusions of law within the Department's substantive jurisdiction are reasonable. The Department does not have any substitute conclusions of law that would be as or more reasonable than the ALJ's conclusions of law.

ORDER

Based on the foregoing, the Department determines that the Lee County Comprehensive Plan Amendment, adopted by CPA2018-10014 on June 19, 2019, is "in compliance," as defined in section 163.3184(1)(b), Florida Statutes. The Department adopts and incorporates the Recommended Order in its entirety in this Final Order.

Dated this 10th day of September, 2020.


Mario Rubio, Director
Division of Community Development
Florida Department of Economic Opportunity

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

THIS FINAL ORDER CONSTITUTES FINAL AGENCY ACTION UNDER CHAPTER 120, FLORIDA STATUTES. A PARTY WHO IS ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY FINAL AGENCY ACTION IS ENTITLED TO JUDICIAL REVIEW IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 120.68, FLORIDA STATUTES, AND FLORIDA RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE 9.030(B)(1)(C) AND 9.110.

TO INITIATE JUDICIAL REVIEW OF THIS FINAL AGENCY ACTION, A NOTICE OF APPEAL MUST BE FILED WITH THE APPROPRIATE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL WITHIN THIRTY (30) CALENDAR DAYS AFTER THE DATE THE FINAL AGENCY ACTION WAS FILED BY THE AGENCY CLERK. THE NOTICE OF APPEAL MUST BE ACCOMPANIED BY THE FILING FEE SPECIFIED IN SECTION 35.22, FLORIDA STATUTES. A COPY OF THE NOTICE OF APPEAL MUST ALSO BE FILED WITH THE DEPARTMENT'S AGENCY CLERK, 107 EAST MADISON STREET, CALDWELL BUILDING, MSC 110, TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-4128, AGENCY.CLERK@DEO.MYFLORIDA.COM. A DOCUMENT IS FILED WHEN IT IS RECEIVED. THE NOTICE OF APPEAL MUST BE SUBSTANTIALLY IN THE FORM PRESCRIBED BY FLORIDA RULE OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE 9.900(A).

AN ADVERSELY AFFECTED PARTY WAIVES THE RIGHT TO JUDICIAL REVIEW IF THE NOTICE OF APPEAL IS NOT TIMELY FILED WITH BOTH THE DEPARTMENT'S AGENCY CLERK AND THE APPROPRIATE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL.

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the original of the foregoing Final Order has been filed with the undersigned Agency Clerk, and that true and correct copies have been furnished to the following persons by the methods indicated this 10th day of September, 2020.



Agency Clerk
Florida Department of Economic Opportunity
107 East Madison Street, MSC 110
Tallahassee, FL 32399-4128

By U.S. Mail

The Honorable Francine M. Ffolkes
Administrative Law Judge
Division of Administrative Hearings
The DeSoto Building
1230 Apalachee Parkway
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-3060

By U.S. Mail:

Matthew Donald Uhle, Esquire
Law Office of Matthew D. Uhle, LLC
1617 Hendry Street, Suite 411
Fort Myers, Florida 33901

Richard W. Wesch, Esquire
Mark A. Trank, Esquire
Michael D. Jacob, Esquire
Lee County Attorney's Office
2115 Second Street, 6th Floor
Post Office Box 398
Fort Myers, Florida 33902-0398

Russell P. Schropp, Esquire
Richard B. Akin, Esquire
Henderson, Franklin, Starnes And Holt, P.A.
Post Office Box 280
Fort Myers, Florida 33902