

Meyers, Robert (COE)

JRC 07 46

From: Meyers, Robert (COE)
Sent: Thursday, March 15, 2007 4:39 PM
To: Meyers, Robert (COE)
Subject: Inquiry

I received a letter from Councilman Michael Pizzi, Town of Miami Lakes, dated March 13, 2007 and the purpose of the letter was to confirm a conversation that he and I had a few days earlier concerning the possible annexation of land adjacent to Miami Lakes. Councilman Pizzi mentioned that he has a client who is located in the area under consideration and I advised him that I saw no voting conflict if he participates in the discussion of annexing this land or voting on this item if is brought before the Town Council. Any benefit that might accrue to his client as a result of the annexation decision does not appear to directly or indirectly benefit Mr. Pizzi. If the Town decided to annex the area in question, all the businesses within the area, including the one that Mr. Pizzi represents would be affected in the same manner.

Robert Meyers
3/15/07

3/15/2007



Town Of Miami Lakes

6853 Main Street • Miami Lakes, Florida 33014
(305) 558-8244 / Fax (305) 558-8511
www.townofmiamilakes.com

COUNCILMEMBER
Michael Pizzi

March 13, 2007

**Mr. Robert Meyers, Executive Director
Miami-Dade County Commission on Ethics
and Public Trust
19 West Flagler Street, Suite 820
Miami, Florida 33130**

Dear Mr. Meyers:

This letter will memorialize our discussion regarding my efforts as a Miami Lakes Councilman to explore a legislative initiative to study the annexation of land adjacent to Miami Lakes as part of our long term goals.

As I noted in our conversation, I do represent client[s] in one area which possibly might be considered in the study for future annexation. I do not own any land, nor do I have any business partnerships, or any business interests, in any area under consideration for annexation. I receive no financial benefit whatever we do. This letter will simply confirm that in your opinion, the fact that I have a client that is located in an area under consideration for an annexation study poses no conflict of interest and no cause for concern.

Should annexation proceed in an area where I do have a business client, I am not aware that any clients that I represent would receive any benefit or detriment separate and apart from whatever benefit or detriment would be received by any other business or individual in the same area.

To reiterate, it is my understanding from our discussion that the fact that I have a business client that is one of many, many businesses in one of the areas under consideration for annexation, in and of itself, presents no conflict, and would not be a basis for me to recuse myself from engaging in any legislative duties and doing what I believe to be in the best interests of Miami Lakes.

I would further note that I have spearheaded annexation initiatives as a Miami Lakes Councilman since the inception of our Town. Irrespective of who benefits or who does not, the only consideration in those initiatives is whether or not it is in the best interests of the citizens of Miami Lakes to receive some benefit in terms of revenue and control of quality of life issues.

Very truly yours,

Michael A. Pizzi, Jr.
Councilman