

COMMUNICATION PACKAGE

January 2008

Contents

	Page No.
Plan Amendment Status Report	1
DRI Status Report – January 2008	17
Leadership Florida 2007 Sunshine State Survey (Mason-Dixon Polling & Research)	24
– Floridians Say Taxes The State’s Most Important Issue	
– Call Property Taxes Least Fair & Most Stressful On Their Finances	
Leadership Florida 2007 Sunshine State Survey (Mason-Dixon Polling & Research)	33
– Floridians Continue To See Quality Of Life Slipping	
– One In Five Considering Leaving The State	
– Majority Feel Growth Not Being Effectively Managed	
Memorandum dated January 9, 2008 from Ray Sansom, Chairman, Policy and Budget Council, Florida House of Representatives – Fiscal Year 2008-2009 Budget	40
Upcoming Meetings	42

TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members

From: Staff

Date: January 18, 2008 Council Meeting

Subject: Plan Amendment Status Report

Plan Amendments Received/Reviewed

Since the last regular Council meeting on December 14, 2007, Council has received 10 Future Land Use Map Amendments and 152 text amendments to review. Council also received Evaluation and Appraisal Report related amendments, which generally include revisions to all elements of the comprehensive plan, from the Town of Manalapan. The amendments are from eight different local governments.

DCA Findings on Compliance

Since the last Status Report, Council has received the following Notices of Intent regarding compliance from the Florida Department of Community Affairs for local governments in the region.

Local Government	DCA Reference No.	Notice Date	Finding
Wellington	07-2	12/11/07	In Compliance
Stuart	07-1	12/14/07	In Compliance
Fellsmere	07-1	12/14/07	In Compliance
Boynton Beach	07-2	12/20/07	In Compliance
Indian River County	07-2	12/21/07	In Compliance
Palm Beach County	07-R1	01/02/08	In Compliance
Palm Beach County	07-R2	01/02/08	In Compliance
Delray Beach	07-2	01/09/08	In Compliance

Adopted Amendments

Attached are informational reports on the following adopted amendments:

Local Government	DCA Reference No.	Notice of Intent Scheduled/Issued
Boynton Beach	07-2	12/21/07
Indian River County	07-CIE1	01/14/08
Palm Beach County	07-2	01/28/08
Mangonia Park	07-1	02/01/08
Boca Raton	07-1	02/01/08

<i>Pending Amendment Status</i>		<i>Draft Review Phase</i>				<i>Adoption Phase</i>		
Local Government	DCA No.	Receipt	Review Expiration	Council Meeting	DCA ORC Issue Date	Adopted by Local Gov't	Received by TCRPC	Scheduled NOI Issuance
Jupiter	04-D1	10/17/03	11/19/03	11/21/03	12/19/03			
West Palm Beach	04-2	09/17/04	10/22/04	10/15/04	11/19/04			
Lake Worth	05-1	11/19/04	12/17/04	12/17/04	Waived			
Sebastian	05-1	01/31/05	03/09/05	03/18/05	04/18/05			
South Bay	05-1	04/13/05	05/15/05	05/20/05	Waived			
Lake Worth	06-1	11/14/05	12/14/05	12/16/05	01/13/06			
Lake Worth	06-2	02/23/06	04/07/06	03/17/06	05/05/06			
Palm Beach County	06D-1	06/05/06	07/06/06	08/18/06	08/04/06			
Fort Pierce	06PTF1	06/21/06	07/21/06	08/18/06	08/18/06			
Boca Raton	06-2	09/05/06	10/06/06	11/17/06	11/03/06			
Martin County	07D-1	01/22/07	02/19/07	03/16/07	03/21/07			
Martin County	07D2	03/30/07	05/05/07	05/18/07	05/24/07			
Briny Breezes	07-1	04/30/07	06/01/07	06/22/07	06/29/07			
Martin County	07E2	05/25/07	06/24/07	06/22/07	07/24/07			
Mangonia Park	07-1	05/29/07	07/01/07	07/20/07	07/31/07	12/11/07	12/17/07	02/01/08
Palm Beach County	07-2	08/03/07	09/05/07	09/21/07	10/05/07	11/26/07	12/11/07	01/28/08
Port St. Lucie	07RWSP1	08/24/07	09/26/07	09/21/07	10/26/07			
Stuart	07-2	09/04/07	09/30/07	10/19/07	10/30/07			
St. Lucie County	07-2	09/04/07	10/06/07	10/19/07	11/05/07			
Port St. Lucie	07D-1	09/10/07	10/10/07	10/19/07	11/09/07			
Boca Raton	07-1	09/28/07	10/31/07	10/19/07	10/30/07	12/11/07	12/20/07	02/01/08
Martin County	07-2	10/01/07	10/28/07	11/16/07				
Belle Glade	08-1ER	10/22/07	11/18/07	12/14/07	12/21/07			
Palm Springs	08-1	11/19/07	12/21/07	12/14/07				
Cloud Lake	08-1ER	11/20/07	12/21/07	12/14/07				
Indian River County	07-CIE1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	11/13/07	12/03/07	01/14/08
Manalapan	08-1ER	12/06/07	01/06/08	01/18/08				
Port St. Lucie	08-1	12/06/07	01/08/08	01/18/08				
Royal Palm Beach	08-1	12/10/07	01/12/08	01/18/08				

To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: January 18, 2008 Council Meeting
Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review
Adopted Amendments to the City of Boca Raton Comprehensive Plan
DCA Reference No. 07-1

Background

On December 11, 2007, the City of Boca Raton adopted two amendments the Future Land Use Map and text amendments to the Future Land Use, Housing and Transportation Elements of the City Comprehensive Plan. Council reviewed the proposed amendments at a regular meeting held on October 19, 2007.

On November 30, 2007, the Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) issued an Objections, Recommendations and Comments (ORC) Report on the proposed amendments.

Evaluation

A. Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) Report

The report approved by Council on October 19, 2007 included eight comments/recommendations for modification. The recommendations had to do with the policies and provisions to establish and implement a workforce housing program in the City.

B. DCA ORC Report

The DCA ORC Report of November 20, 2007, contained objections related to the following:

1. The absence of a potable water and transportation analysis based on the maximum potential development of the Future Land Use Map amendments through the year 2012.
2. The lack of transportation analysis to identify the improvements needed to achieve the established Level of Service standard for a segment of Northwest 2nd Avenue, and the incorporation of necessary improvements into the Five-Year Schedule of Capital Improvements.
3. The lack of meaningful and predictable standards to guide the development of workforce housing in a number of the proposed objectives and policies to the Future Land Use and Housing Elements.

C. City Response

1. To DCA ORC Report

The City's response to objections contained in the DCA ORC Report is summarized in the attached correspondence dated December 17, 2007.

2. To TCRPC Report

The City did not provide the Council with a response to the Council comments/recommendations.

Conclusion

For information only.

City of Boca Raton



CITY HALL • 201 WEST PALMETTO PARK ROAD • BOCA RATON, FLORIDA 33432-3795 • PHONE: (561) 393-7700
(FOR HEARING IMPAIRED) TDD: (561) 367-7046
SUNCOM: (561) 922-7700
INTERNET: www.ci.boca-raton.fl.us

December 17, 2007

Michael J. Busha
Executive Director
Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
301 East Ocean Boulevard,
Suite 300
Stuart, Florida 34994

RECEIVED

DEC 20 2007

TREASURE COAST
REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

Subject: Comprehensive Plan Amendments – SC-06-05 and UC-06-04/SC-07-01

Dear Mr. Busha:

The City of Boca Raton is transmitting the adopted comprehensive plan amendment package that includes a text amendment to the Housing and Future Land Use Elements, SC-06-05, and a Future Land Use Map Amendment, UC-06-04, with an associated text amendment to the Transportation Element, SC-07-01, of the Boca Raton Comprehensive Plan. The amendments comprise the City's single round of comprehensive plan amendments for 2007. A copy of the comprehensive plan amendment package has also been sent to the Palm Beach County Planning, Zoning and Building Department, Palm Beach County Intergovernmental Plan Amendment Review Committee (IPARC), Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council, South Florida Water Management District, Florida Department of Transportation, Florida Department of State, Florida Department of Environmental Protection and the Office of Educational Facilities of the Commissioner of Education (see attached).

Text amendment, SC-06-05, amends the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Housing and Future Land Use Elements of the Boca Raton Comprehensive Plan in order to provide policy language supportive of a new workforce housing program.

The adopted Future Land Use Map amendment, UC-06-04, is a comprehensive redevelopment project that involves a change to the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map from Open Space and Recreation (PR) to Residential Medium (RM) to provide for the redevelopment of a portion of the existing golf course into 211 residential townhouses; a change to the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map from PR to Residential High (RH), to provide for the renovation and expansion of the existing Inn, including the construction of 46 additional hotel rooms; and a text amendment to the Transportation Element of the Boca Raton Comprehensive Plan (SC-07-01) to provide policy language to support the establishment of an interim level-of-service standard for constrained roadways, including a segment of Northwest 2nd Avenue.

The proposed text amendment to the Transportation Element is considered interim as the City is embarking upon a Citywide Multimodal Transportation District (MMTD), which will take additional time to implement. Therefore, the City approved the subject text amendment to

establish an interim level-of-service standard in order to allow development and redevelopment to proceed in situations where multimodal techniques can be used to achieve the City's transportation goal.

Serving as the Local Planning Agency, the Planning and Zoning Board reviewed the proposed text amendment to the Future Land Use and Housing Elements on May 3, 2007. The proposed Future Land Use Map amendment and associated text amendment to the Transportation Element were reviewed on June 7, 2007. On September 11, 2007, the Boca Raton City Council conducted a public hearing and voted to approve the transmittal of the comprehensive plan amendment package to the Department of Community Affairs for state review. On Friday, November 30, 2007, the City received the Objections, Recommendations and Comments (ORC) Report.

With regard to the amendment to the Housing and Land Use Elements relating to the proposed Workforce Housing Program, the objection raised was to the perceived lack of meaningful and predictable standards to guide the development of workforce housing. Specifically, the additional information and/or data requested to support the proposed policies included the following:

1. To continue to identify housing opportunities for all income groups;
2. To develop a methodology to calculate the level of developer contribution to the affordable/workforce housing trust fund;
3. To establish an affordable/ workforce housing trust fund;
4. To include conversion factors as a part of the policy; and,
5. To change the wording of policies from "may" to "shall".

In response, staff has modified Ordinance No. 4992 to include the following modifications:

1. The wording related to serving all income groups previously proposed for deletion has been returned to the policy and staff has included a new policy identifying a workforce target range (Policy HO.1.9.6);
2. Staff has modified all applicable policies to include language that advises that the contribution level set will be based on a housing study performed by a qualified housing professional;
3. Staff has proposed a new policy that establishes a workforce housing trust fund and the policy describes how funds could be used (Policy HO.1.9.7);
4. Staff has proposed that Policy HO.1.9.3 (the industrial/commercial conversion policy) and LU.1.1.2.2.(density bonus under the Future Land Use Map designation) be amended to set the maximum Floor Area Ratio Conversion at 125% of the Future Land Use Map intensity; and

5. Regarding the matter of changing the wording from “may” to “shall”, City staff spoke with a member of DCA staff to obtain clarification on the intent of the preferred language. Subsequently, staff has modified Policy HO.1.9.0, to state that the city “shall” rather than “may” establish a workforce housing program.

In the instance of the proposed Ocean Breeze development, three (3) Objections were raised, all related to the requirement for additional analysis based on the maximum development potential of the requested Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map category. Specifically, additional analysis was requested demonstrating that the City’s ability to provide potable water and transportation capacity.

Regarding potable water capacity, the City has provided as an attachment, an analysis of our ability to serve Ocean Breeze through 2012, as requested. This analysis is based on our raw water consumptive use permit capacity and our potable water plant capacity. Our analysis demonstrates that the needs of Ocean Breeze and other anticipated development/redevelopment will be met well into the future.

With respect to transit capacity, the petitioner has updated his traffic report to comply with your agency’s analysis request.

Should you have any questions or require additional information, please call me at 561-393-7794, email address cannunziato@myboca.us or Jennifer H. Simon, AICP, Principal Planner, of my staff at 561-393-7798, fax 561-393-7784 and e-mail address jsimon@myboca.us.

Respectfully,



Carmen Annunziato, AICP
Planning and Zoning Director

Enclosure

- c: Leif J. Ahnell, C.P.A., C.G.F.O., City Manager (w/o enclosure)
 Jorge Camejo, AICP, Development Services Director (w/o enclosure)
 Jeffrey Evans, AICP, Planner, Broad and Cassel (w/enclosure)

To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: January 18, 2008 Council Meeting
Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review
Adopted Amendment to the City of Boynton Beach Comprehensive Plan
DCA Reference No. 07-2

Background

On November 20, 2007, the City of Boynton Beach adopted one amendment to the Future Land Use Map of the City Comprehensive Plan. Council reviewed the proposed amendment at a regular meeting held on October 19, 2007.

On October 18, 2007, the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) issued a letter in lieu of an Objections, Recommendations and Comments (ORC) Report on the proposed amendment. The letter indicated that the proposed amendment would not be formally reviewed and the preparation of an ORC Report would be waived.

Evaluation

A. Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council Report

The report approved by Council on October 19, 2007 included no comments or recommendations for modification to the proposed amendment. The amendment was found to be consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan. Council did not recommend a formal review of the proposed amendment.

B. DCA ORC Report

As indicated above, the DCA elected not to prepare an ORC Report.

Conclusion

The amendment was adopted by the City with no revisions.

For information only.

To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: January 18, 2008 Council Meeting
Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review
Adopted Amendments to the Indian River County Comprehensive Plan
DCA Reference No. 07-CIE1

Background

On November 13, 2007, Indian River County adopted amendments to the Capital Improvements Element of the County Comprehensive Plan. The amendments represent the annual revision and modification of the element as required in Chapter 163.3177(3)(b)(1), F.S. Pursuant to 163.3177(3)(b)(2), these amendments require only a single adoption hearing before the governing board, therefore these amendments were not previously reviewed by Council.

Evaluation

The adopted amendments occur throughout the Element. The County's proposed 5-Year Capital Improvements Program is included as required. A general summary of the amendments are included in the attached letter from the County to the DCA dated November 27, 2007.

Conclusion

For information only.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
1801 27th Street Vero Beach, FL 32960-3365

Telephone: (772) 567 - 8000



RECEIVED

DEC 9 9 2007

PLANNING
COMMUNITY AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT

November 27, 2007

Department of Community Affairs
Division of Community Planning
Bureau of Local Planning
Plan Processing Team
Attn: Mr. Ray Eubanks
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2100

**RE: Indian River County Comprehensive Plan Capital Improvements Element Annual Update
Indian River County Ordinance 2007-038 (Adopted November 13, 2007)**

Dear Mr. Eubanks:

Pursuant to Subsection 163.3187(1)(f), F.S., Subsection 163.3184, F.S., and Rule 9J-11.011, F.A.C., the Indian River County Board of County Commissioners, on November 13, 2007, conducted a public hearing, notice of which was advertised in a newspaper of general circulation in accordance with state requirements, and adopted the following ordinance modifying the Indian River County Comprehensive Plan Capital Improvements Element:

CPTA 2007-10-0114

Ordinance 2007-038: AN ORDINANCE OF INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, FLORIDA, AMENDING THE TEXT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN'S CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ELEMENT; AND PROVIDING SEVERABILITY AND EFFECTIVE DATE.

That ordinance was adopted as the County's required annual update to the Capital Improvements Element (CIE) and included the following modifications:

1. All tables, charts, graphs and associated text were updated.
2. Pages 2 through 19 – "Existing Revenue" figures were updated to include FY 2005/06 data.
3. Pages 19 through 22 – "County Expenditures" were updated to include FY 2005/06 data.
4. Pages 22 through 23 – "Existing Outstanding Debt" was updated to include a 2006 Environmental Lands Acquisition General Obligation bond and revised interest rates on previously issued bonds.

5. Pages 29 through 31 – A new subsection was included in the “Analysis” section to recognize “Changes to the Capital Improvements Program”.
6. Pages 34 through 37 - Projected revenues and expenditures were reduced to recognize the recent downturn in the housing market and downturn in building permit activity.
7. Pages 66 through 82 – Appendix A, “Five Year Schedule of Capital Improvements”, was revised.
 - a. A number of projects have either had their costs modified, have been deferred, or have had their time frame extended. None of the changes will impact concurrency reservations.
 - b. Due to the recent downturn in the housing market, several concurrency related transportation projects included in the Five Year Schedule of Capital Improvements are no longer necessary to maintain the County’s adopted transportation level of service. These projects have, therefore, been removed from the schedule.
 - c. New planned revenue sources are anticipated in years 4 and 5 of the Five Year Schedule of Capital Improvements. These planned revenues are reflected in the schedule.
8. Pages 81 to 82 – Appendix A of the CIE now includes a summary of revenues and expenditures, which shows that, in fact, the County’s Capital Improvements Program is financially feasible over a 5 year period.
9. Page 83 – Appendix B, Priority Transportation Capital Improvements Program, was updated to include state road projects relied upon for concurrency.

A summary of de minimis impact records has not been included in the CIE. This is because the County currently counts building permits for exempt residential units within its concurrency management system, subtracting the capacity that they utilize from available capacity within the concurrency management system.

Enclosed, for DCA’s compliance review, please find the following documents pertaining to the aforesaid amendment:

- Three copies of the staff report for the adopted amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, including support documents (1 hard copy and 2 CD’s with the document saved as a PDF).
- Three copies of the executed ordinance identifying the specific changes to the Comprehensive Plan (1 hard copy and 2 CD’s with the document saved as a PDF).
- Three copies of a strike through and underline version of the Capital Improvements Element showing changes made to the tables and charts that are not shown in the adopted ordinance as strike through and underline (1 hard copy and 2 CD’s with the document saved as a PDF).

- Three copies of the DCA Courtesy Information list for the comprehensive plan amendment (1 hard copy and 2 CD's with the document saved as a PDF).

One copy of each of the above referenced documents have been sent to the following agencies:

- The Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council;
- The Florida Department of Environmental Protection;
- The Florida Department of Transportation;
- The St. Johns River Water Management District;
- The Florida Department of State;
- The Florida Department of Education;
- The Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission; and
- The Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

The enclosed plan amendment meets all applicable state and regional requirements. Consistent with Rule 9J-11.011(5), F.A.C., DCA should publish the required Notice of Intent, pursuant to Subsection 163.3184(8)(b), F.S., in the **Vero Beach Press Journal**. Pursuant to Section 163.3184(8) c., F.S., DCA is required to provide a courtesy information statement regarding the Department's Notice of Intent to citizens who furnish their names and addresses at the local government's adoption hearing. Please find enclosed the courtesy information list containing the names and addresses of concerned citizens who spoke at the adoption hearing.

Since the County maintains a website and is therefore required, pursuant to section 163.3184(8)(c)2., F.S., to post a copy of the state's Notice of Intent on the website within five days after the receipt of the mailed copy of the agency's notice item, we request that DCA provide an electronic version of this notice by e-mailing it to Bill Schutt (bschutt@ircgov.com).

Should you need additional documentation, or should you have any questions, comments or concerns, please contact:

Bill Schutt, AICP, Senior Economic Development Planner
Indian River County
Community Development Department
1840 25th Street
Vero Beach, Florida 32960-3365
Telephone: (772) 226-1243
Facsimile: (772) 978-1806
E-mail: bschutt@ircgov.com

Sincerely,


Robert M. Keating, AICP
Community Development Director

Letter to Ray Eubanks from Robert M. Keating
November 27, 2007
Page 4 of 4

Enclosures

cc: Sandra L. Bowden, Chairman of the Indian River County Board of County Commissioners
Stan Boling, AICP, Planning Director
Sasan Rohani, AICP, Long Range Planning Chief
Bill Schutt, AICP, Senior Economic Development Planner
Jim Quinn, Florida Department of Environmental Protection (w/enclosure)
Terry L. Hess, AICP, Planning Director, Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (w/enclosure)
Gerry O'Reilly, Florida Department of Transportation (w/enclosure)
Wendy Evans, Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (w/enclosure)
Mary Ann Poole, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (w/enclosure)
Susan Harp, Florida Department of State (w/enclosure)
Jeff Cole, St. Johns River Water Management District (w/enclosure)
Stanley Goldstein, Florida Department of Education (w/enclosure)

To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: January 18, 2008 Council Meeting
Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review
Adopted Amendments to the Town of Mangonia Park Comprehensive Plan
DCA Reference No. 07-1

Background

On December 11, 2007, the Town of Mangonia Park adopted one amendment to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and text amendments to the Future Land Use, Transportation, Potable Water and Intergovernmental Coordination Elements of the Town Comprehensive Plan. Council reviewed the proposed amendments at a regular meeting held on July 20, 2007.

On July 31, 2007, the Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) issued an Objections, Recommendations and Comments (ORC) Report on the proposed amendments.

Evaluation

A. Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) Report

The report approved by Council on July 20, 2007 included five comments/recommendations for modification for consideration by the Town. The recommendations had to do with the provisions of the new Commercial Flex FLUM designation and the compatibility of the proposed use of the Jai Alai Fronton property with the Tri-Rail Station. Council found the redesignation of the Jai Alai property to a Commercial Flex FLUM designation to be INCONSISTENT with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan.

B. DCA ORC Report

The DCA ORC Report contained objections relating to the following:

1. The failure to identify the percentage distribution under the mix of uses and to establish intensity standards for the new Commercial Flex FLUM designation.
2. The failure to establish intensity standards for all non-residential FLUM designations within the bio-science overlay.

C. Town Response

1. DCA ORC Report

The Town has revised the proposed amendments in response to the DCA ORC Report. The changes which have not been previously reviewed are summarized in the Town letter to DCA dated December 14, 2007, and are as follows:

- a. A Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1.5 has been added as the maximum intensity for both commercial and industrial uses in the Future Land Use Element;
- b. The Recreation use description has been updated for internal consistency to reflect that the baseball diamond and restrooms have been completed in the Future Land Use Element;
- c. A Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1.4 has been added as the maximum intensity for commercial recreation uses in the Future Land Use Element;
- d. The Commercial Flex use description has been modified by limiting this use to the former "jai alai" site, and by providing the maximum allowed percentages of uses and intensity for each permitted Commercial Flex use in the Future Land Use Element;
- e. The Transportation and Utilities use description has been modified to state that this use includes the South Florida Rail Corridor, the Tri-Rail Station and the Town's water utility;
- f. The Future Land Use Element Goals, Objectives and Policies have been revised by adding a policy to limit Commercial Flex uses to the former "jai alai" site; by including a policy setting the maximum allowed percentages of uses and intensities for each permitted Commercial Flex use; by adding a policy to require further plan amendments in order to add a residential component to the Commercial Flex use; by expanding the policy regarding multi-modal transportation to require the roadways connecting the Tri-Rail station and 45th Street to contain sidewalks, bicycle lanes, appropriate lighting, directional signage and emergency call boxes; and by revising the policy regarding site buffers to clarify that all such buffers shall be compatible with pedestrian access to the Tri-Rail station.

2. TCRPC Report

The Town has not provided a response to the TCRPC comments/recommendations.

Conclusion

For information only.

To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: January 18, 2008 Council Meeting
Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review
Adopted Amendments to the Palm Beach County Comprehensive Plan
DCA Reference No. 07-2

Background

On November 26, 2007, Palm Beach County adopted three amendments to the Future Land Use Map and text amendments to the following elements of the Comprehensive Plan: Transportation, Utility, Conservation, Intergovernmental Coordination, Capital Improvements, Future Land Use, Introduction and Administration, Coastal Management and Recreation and Open Space. Council reviewed the proposed amendments at a regular meeting held on September 21, 2007.

On October 5, 2007, the Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) issued an Objections, Recommendations and Comments (ORC) Report on the proposed amendments.

Evaluation

A. Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council Report

The report approved by Council on September 21, 2007 contained no comments or recommendations for modification to the proposed amendments. The amendments were found to be consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan.

B. DCA ORC Report

The DCA ORC Report contained one objection regarding inconsistencies between the County's proposed Water Supply Work Plan and the South Florida Water Management District's Lower East Coast Regional Water Supply Plan regarding population and water supply needs.

C. County Response

The County has not adopted the amendments related to the Water Supply Work Plan.

Conclusion

For information only.

TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

**DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT
STATUS REPORT
January 2008**

PROJECT NAME: Capron Lakes (formerly known as Indrio)

LOCATION: Located northwest of the intersection of I-95 and Indrio Road in St. Lucie County

JURISDICTION: St. Lucie County

SIZE: 1,938 acres

USES:

Residential	3,100 Dwelling Units
Retail	200,000 sq. ft.
Office	200,000 sq. ft.

STATUS: Preapplication meeting held on March 30, 2005.
Application for Development for Approval submitted on November 18, 2005 and found insufficient on January 11, 2006.
Letter received on April 29, 2006 asking for an extension to August 9, 2006.
Supplemental information to the Application for Development Approval submitted on August 3, 2006 and found insufficient on September 12, 2006.
Supplemental information to the Application for Development Approval submitted on January 8, 2007 and found insufficient on February 7, 2007.
Supplemental information to the Application for Development Approval submitted on May 25, 2007.
Council's DRI Assessment Report scheduled for consideration at the September 21, 2007 Council meeting.
Assessment Report adopted by Council on September 21, 2007 and submitted to St. Lucie County on October 10, 2007.

PROJECT NAME: **Cloud Grove**

LOCATION: Located in unincorporated St. Lucie County, Florida, west of I-95 and north of and adjacent to the Florida Turnpike at Minute Maid Road

JURISDICTION: St. Lucie County

SIZE: 5,944 acres

USES: Residential 12,000 Dwelling Units
Office (sq. ft.) 1,000,000 sq. ft.
Retail/Service (sq. ft.) 950,000 sq. ft.
Light Industrial (sq. ft.) 1,000,000 sq. ft.

STATUS: Preapplication meeting held on December 19, 2005.
Application for Development Approval submitted on October 12, 2006 and found insufficient on November 17, 2006.
Letter received on March 2, 2007 from David L. Powell, Hopping, Green & Sams requesting a 4-month extension (July 18, 2007) to provide supplemental information to the ADA.
Supplemental information to the Application for Development Approval submitted on June 1, 2007 and found insufficient on July 6, 2007.
Supplemental information to the Application for Development Approval submitted on December 7, 2007.

PROJECT NAME: **Indian Trails Grove**

LOCATION: Located west of Seminole Pratt Whitney Road, and south of Northlake Boulevard

JURISDICTION: Unincorporated Palm Beach County

SIZE: 4,930 acres

USES: Residential 12,325 Dwelling Units
Retail 207,500 sq. ft.
Office 42,500 sq. ft.

STATUS: Preapplication meeting held on August 21, 2006.
Application for Development Approval submitted on February 16, 2007 and found insufficient on April 12, 2007.

PROJECT NAME: **Indiantown**

LOCATION: Located east of Allapattah Road (State Road 609) in Indiantown, Martin County

JURISDICTION: Martin County

SIZE: 804 acres

USES:	Residential	1,650 Dwelling Units
	Commercial	10,000 sq. ft.
	Office	20,000 sq. ft.

STATUS: Preapplication meeting held on March 21, 2005.
Application for Development Approval was submitted on September 23, 2005 and found insufficient on November 11, 2005.
Supplemental information to the Application for Development Approval submitted on March 3, 2006 and found insufficient on May 1, 2006.
Supplemental information to the Application for Development Approval submitted on July 11, 2006.
Application for Development Approval was found to have completed the required sufficiency process on August 25, 2006.
Letter received on November 3, 2006 requesting that consideration of Council's draft DRI assessment report be rescheduled to the December 15, 2006 Council meeting.
Council's DRI Assessment Report scheduled for consideration at the December 15, 2006 Council meeting.
Assessment Report adopted by Council on December 15, 2006 and submitted to Martin County on January 5, 2007.

PROJECT NAME: **Provinces**

LOCATION: Located within the unincorporated boundaries of St. Lucie County, generally to the northwest of the I-95/Midway Road Interchange.

JURISDICTION: Unincorporated St. Lucie County

SIZE: 735 acres

USES: Residential 4,443 Dwelling Units
Retail 1,435,706 sq. ft.
Office 1,000,000 sq. ft.

STATUS: Preapplication meeting held on January 11, 2005.
Application for Development Approval was submitted on January 27, 2006 and found insufficient on March 2, 2006.
Supplemental information to the Application for Development Approval submitted on June 23, 2006 and found insufficient on July 26, 2006.
Application for Development Approval was found to have completed the required sufficiency process on September 26, 2006.
Letter received on October 4, 2006 requesting the public hearing be delayed until the first week in April 2007.
Supplemental information to the Application for Development Approval submitted January 3, 2007.
Assessment Report adopted by Council on March 16, 2007 and submitted to St. Lucie County on April 2, 2007

PROJECT NAME: **Quillen**

LOCATION: Located in the northwest quadrant of the intersection of Warfield Boulevard (SR 710) and Allapattah Road (CR 609) in Indiantown, Martin County, Florida

JURISDICTION: Martin County

SIZE: 582 acres

USES: Residential 2,250 Dwelling Units
Retail 150,000 sq. ft.

STATUS: Preapplication meeting held on January 4, 2006.
Application for Development Approval was submitted on April 5, 2006 and found insufficient on May 5, 2006.
Letter received on September 5, 2006 asking for an additional 60-day extension to respond to the May 5, 2006 sufficiency.
Application for Development Approval was found to have completed the required sufficiency process on November 3, 2006.
Council's DRI Assessment Report scheduled for consideration at the December 15, 2006 Council meeting.
Assessment Report adopted by Council on December 15, 2006 and submitted to Martin County on January 5, 2007.

PROJECT NAME: **Stewart Mining Industries**

LOCATION: State Road 98. The property is located in the Everglades Agricultural Area.

JURISDICTION: Palm Beach County

SIZE: 5,420 acres

USES: Storage reservoirs as part of the surface water management system for the surrounding sugar cane farms owned by U.S. Sugar Corporation

STATUS: Preapplication meeting held on January 23, 2007.

PROJECT NAME: **Verde**

LOCATION: Northeast corner of Clint Moore Road and State Road 7 in Boca Raton, Florida

JURISDICTION: Unincorporated Palm Beach County

SIZE: 37.39 acres

USES: The proposed development is intended to include retail, office, residential, theatre and hotel uses.

STATUS: Preapplication meeting held on July 16, 2007.

PROJECT NAME: **Visions at Indrio**

LOCATION: SE Corner of I-95 and Indrio Road

JURISDICTION: St. Lucie County

SIZE: 780 acres

USES:

Residential	2605 Dwelling Units
Retail, Service	750,000 sq. ft.
Office	250,000 sq. ft.
Hotel	240 Rooms
School	K-8

STATUS:

Preapplication meeting held on June 16, 2004.
Application for Development Approval was submitted on August 20, 2004 and found insufficient on October 18, 2004
Supplemental information to the Application for Development Approval submitted on December 28, 2004 and found insufficient on January 21, 2005.
Letter received on May 19, 2005 asking for an extension to the 120 day sufficiency response period.
Letter received on November 14, 2005 asking for an extension to December 16, 2005.
Letter received on November 7, 2005 asking for an extension to May 19, 2006.
Letter received on May 3, 2006 asking for an extension to July 19, 2006
Application for Development Approval was found to have completed the required sufficiency process on August 25, 2006.
Letter received on October 17, 2006 requesting an extension to the 90-day public hearing.
Letter received on May 30, 2007 requesting the 90-day public hearing requirement be waived until such time as the related comprehensive plan amendment issues are resolved and the developer and the County can agree to public hearing dates.

LEADERSHIP FLORIDA 2007 SUNSHINE STATE SURVEY

**FLORIDIANS SAY TAXES THE STATE'S MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE
CALL PROPERTY TAXES LEAST FAIR & MOST STRESSFUL ON THEIR FINANCES**

When asked what was the most important issue facing the state, Florida adults (20%) named taxes and government spending more often than any other single issue – a significant change from just one year ago. In our 2006 survey, K-12 education was the top issue at 18%, followed by insurance rates at 13%, with taxes coming in fifth at just 8% (behind healthcare and growth management). Now, education comes in second at 15%, insurance is third at 10% and healthcare and growth are tied for fourth with 8% each. Those naming taxes have increased 12 percentage points in just one year, while every other issue has only shifted within the margin for error of the two polls.

QUESTION: In your opinion, what is the most important issue facing the State of Florida today? (NOT READ)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>NET</u>
Taxes/Government Spending	20%	8%	+12%
K-12 Education/Public Schools	15%	18%	-3%
Insurance Rates	10%	13%	-3%
Growth Management	8%	10%	-2%
Healthcare	8%	10%	-2%
Economy/Jobs	7%	6%	+1%
Environment/Oil Drilling	6%	5%	+1%
Crime/Drugs	5%	7%	-2%
Immigration	5%	5%	-
Cost of Housing	3%	1%	+2%
Water/Drainage Issues	3%	-	+3%
Traffic/Transportation	2%	1%	+1%
Moral Issues/Family Values	2%	1%	+1%
Higher Education	1%	4%	-3%
Social/Racial Issues	1%	1%	-
Other	1%	3%	-2%
None	-	-	-
Not Sure	2%	6%	-4%

Leadership Florida – 2007 Sunshine State Survey

Overall, 39% of adults named taxes as their first or second most important issue, outpacing education (31%), healthcare (21%) and insurance (18%).

QUESTION: In your opinion, what is the most important issue facing the State of Florida today? (NOT READ) What is the second most important?

	<u>1ST</u>	<u>2ND</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Taxes/Government Spending	20%	19%	39%
K-12 Education/Public Schools	15%	16%	31%
Insurance Rates	10%	8%	18%
Healthcare	8%	13%	21%
Growth Management	8%	7%	15%
Economy/Jobs	7%	8%	15%
Environment/Oil Drilling/Climate Change	6%	5%	11%
Crime/Drugs	5%	3%	8%
Immigration	5%	6%	11%
Cost of Housing	3%	1%	4%
Water/Drainage Issues	3%	1%	4%
Moral Issues/Family Values	2%	1%	3%
Traffic/Transportation	2%	2%	4%
Higher Education	1%	3%	4%
Social/Racial Issues	1%	1%	2%
Government Corruption	1%	1%	2%
Other	1%	1%	2%
None	-	-	-
Not Sure	2%	5%	7%

The tax issue resonates even stronger among registered voters (21%), Republicans (38%), those over the age of 50 (21%), homeowners (21%), men (22%) and those who earn more than \$50,000 per year (24%).

MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE FACING FLORIDA TODAY

	HOME OWNERS	<50	50+	DEMS	REPS	INDS	<50K	50K+	MEN	WOMEN
TAXES	21%	17%	21%	9%	38%	13%	17%	24%	22%	18%
EDUCATION	14%	21%	8%	22%	6%	15%	13%	19%	13%	16%
INSURANCE	11%	12%	8%	9%	10%	14%	6%	12%	8%	12%
HEALTHCARE	7%	6%	10%	13%	4%	8%	10%	7%	6%	10%
GROWTH	9%	8%	8%	8%	9%	8%	5%	8%	10%	6%

Leadership Florida – 2007 Sunshine State Survey

Results regarding government services and taxes have not changed significantly over the past year. While most feel state government (44%) and local government (44%) try to provide “about the right amount” of services, a significant number feel they are doing “too little.” At the state level, those feeling government is doing “too little” increased by 8-points (from 28% to 36%), but at the local level it increased only 2-points (from 30% to 32%).

QUESTION: Considering all the public services offered by all levels of government, do you feel state government in Florida tries to do:

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>REG VOTERS</u>
Far too much	5%	7%	5%
A little too much	7%	9%	6%
About the right amount	44%	48%	46%
Too little	36%	28%	34%
Not Sure (NOT READ)	9%	8%	9%

QUESTION: Considering all the public services offered by all levels of government, do you feel your local government tries to do:

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>REG VOTERS</u>
Far too much	7%	5%	7%
A little too much	10%	7%	9%
About the right amount	44%	49%	44%
Too little	32%	30%	32%
Not Sure (NOT READ)	7%	9%	7%

Those feeling government does “too little” is slightly higher among those who are registered to vote.

Leadership Florida – 2007 Sunshine State Survey

Results on state taxes are virtually unchanged over the past year, with little difference between all Florida adults and those who are registered to vote.

QUESTION: In terms of the overall quality of state services provided in Florida, do you feel your state taxes are:

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>REG VOTERS</u>
Much too high	21%	21%	20%
A little too high	20%	18%	21%
About right	47%	47%	47%
A little too low	4%	5%	4%
Much too low	-	-	-
Not Sure (NOT READ)	7%	9%	8%

There has been a slight increase in the number of those who indicated local taxes are “too high” – jumping from 45% to 48%. Among registered voters, 49% said local taxes are “too high” while 46% thought they are “about right” or “too low.”

QUESTION: In terms of the overall quality of local services provided in your county, do you feel your local taxes are:

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>REG VOTERS</u>
Much too high	26%	24%	26%
A little too high	22%	21%	23%
About right	43%	46%	42%
A little too low	4%	4%	4%
Much too low	-	-	-
Not Sure (NOT READ)	5%	6%	5%

Leadership Florida – 2007 Sunshine State Survey

When specifically asked which Florida government revenue source was the least fair, Floridians overwhelmingly said property taxes (46%). Among registered voters the response was even higher (48%).

QUESTION: Which one of the following Florida government revenue sources do you feel is the least fair? (ORDER ROTATED)

	<u>ALL ADULTS</u>	<u>REG VOTERS</u>
Property taxes	46%	48%
Gas tax	14%	14%
State sales tax	8%	8%
Liquor/Cigarette Excise taxes	6%	6%
Lottery	6%	6%
Corporate taxes	5%	5%
User fees	5%	4%
Hotel/Tourist taxes	3%	3%
Not Sure (NOT READ)	7%	6%

Those who most often cited property taxes were homeowners (52%), Republicans (53%) and those who earn more than \$50,000 (54%). The issue, however, cuts across party lines to a significant degree with 45% of Democrats and 47% of Independents calling it the least fair.

	HOME OWNER	DEMS	REPS	INDS	<\$50K	\$50K+
PROPERTY TAXES	52%	45%	53%	47%	31%	54%
GAS TAX	12%	14%	14%	14%	18%	14%
SALES TAX	7%	8%	8%	8%	13%	6%

Leadership Florida – 2007 Sunshine State Survey

Later in the survey, Floridians were asked what was the single greatest stress on their household finances, and most again answered property taxes (29%). Gas prices (22%) was a clear second, followed by home insurance (14%) and personal debt (12%). The percentage citing property taxes was slightly higher among registered voters (31%).

QUESTION : What would you say is putting the single greatest stress on your own household's finances? (NOT READ)

	<u>ALL ADULTS</u>	<u>REG VOTERS</u>
Property taxes	29%	31%
Gas prices	22%	23%
Home insurance	14%	14%
Personal debt (loan repayments, mortgages, etc.)	12%	10%
Health care costs	6%	6%
Child-raising costs (day care, tuition, clothes, etc.)	5%	5%
Rising rental rates	3%	3%
Prescription drugs	1%	1%
Alimony ; child support	1%	1%
Elder care costs	1%	1%
Car payments	-	1%
Other	3%	3%
Not Sure/Refused	2%	2%

Those most likely to say property taxes were homeowners (37%), and those who earn more than \$50,000 (36%). Voters across party lines also indicated financial stress from property taxes.

	HOME OWNER	DEMS	REPS	INDS	<\$50K	\$50K+
PROPERTY TAXES	37%	29%	33%	34%	19%	36%
GAS PRICES	22%	25%	22%	20%	23%	21%
HOME INSURANCE	17%	10%	17%	16%	10%	16%
PERSONAL DEBT	8%	10%	9%	10%	18%	9%

HOW THE POLL WAS CONDUCTED

This poll was conducted by Mason-Dixon Polling & Research, Inc. of Washington, D.C. from November 19 through November 30, 2007. A total of 1,200 resident Florida adults were interviewed statewide by telephone.

Those interviewed were selected by the random variation of the last four digits of telephone numbers. A cross-section of exchanges was utilized and quotas were assigned to reflect adult population by county.

The margin for error, according to standards customarily used by statisticians, is no more than plus or minus 2.1 percentage points. This means that there is a 95 percent probability that the "true" figure would fall within that range if all adults were surveyed. The margin for error is higher for any subgroup, such as a regional or gender grouping.

The survey also includes a sub-sample of 981 registered voters. The margin for error on results among registered voters is plus or minus 3.2%.

DEMOGRAPHICS

- Are you currently a registered to vote in Florida?

Yes	82%	(981)
No	18%	(219)

- What is your current official party voter registration? Are you registered as a:

Democrat	41%	(402)
Republican	38%	(374)
Independent or Other	20%	(198)
Not Sure/Refused (NOT READ)	1%	(7)

- What is your age?

18-34	252	(21%)
35-49	327	(27%)
50-64	324	(27%)
65+	292	(24%)
Refused	5	

- Do you own your home, rent your home or do you live with someone else?

Homeowner	920	(77%)
Renter	258	(22%)
Live free with someone else	17	(1%)
Refused	5	

- Which of the following best describes your racial/ethnic origin?

White or Anglo	868	(72%)
Black or African-American	132	(11%)
Hispanic or Latino	165	(14%)
Asian or Other	31	(3%)
Refused (NOT READ)	4	

Leadership Florida – 2007 Sunshine State Survey

- What is your annual household income before taxes?

Less than \$25,000	128	(11%)
\$25,000-\$34,999	124	(10%)
\$35,000-\$49,999	128	(11%)
\$50,000-\$74,999	206	(17%)
\$75,000-\$99,999	170	(14%)
\$100,000+	174	(15%)
Refused	270	(23%)

GENDER:

Male	567	(47%)
Female	633	(53%)

REGION:

Panhandle	100	(8%)
Northeast Florida	120	(10%)
Orlando/Daytona	220	(18%)
Tampa Bay Metro	220	(18%)
Southwest Florida	120	(10%)
Palm Beach/Treasure Coast	125	(10%)
Southeast Florida	295	(25%)

LEADERSHIP FLORIDA 2007 SUNSHINE STATE SURVEY

**FLORIDIANS CONTINUE TO SEE QUALITY OF LIFE SLIPPING
ONE IN FIVE CONSIDERING LEAVING THE STATE
MAJORITY FEEL GROWTH NOT BEING EFFECTIVELY MANAGED**

More Floridians continue to feel that the quality of life in the state over the past five years has gotten worse (43%) than feel it has gotten better (15%), with this year’s findings even worse than last year. Statewide, those saying things are getting worse outnumber those saying it is getting better by a margin of almost 3-1. In 2006, that ratio was only 2-1.

**(ASKED OF THOSE WHO HAVE LIVED IN FLORIDA MORE THAN 5 YEARS
n=1,106) QUESTION: Would you say as a place to live, FLORIDA is better now than it was five years ago or would you say it is worse or about the same?**

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>NET</u>
Better	15%	18%	-3%
Worse	43%	36%	+7%
Same	41%	45%	-4%
Not Sure	1%	1%	-

Looking ahead Floridians don’t expect that trend to change, with 37% feeling that Florida will become a worse place to live, while only 24% think it will get better. Residents were about equally divided about the future of their local community and more positive about their own neighborhoods. These results mirror findings from 2006.

QUESTION: Looking ahead to the next 5 years, do you think that ___ will become a better or worse place to live, or do you think it will stay about the same?

	<u>BETTER</u>	<u>WORSE</u>	<u>SAME</u>	<u>DK</u>
- The State of Florida				
2006	23%	37%	29%	10%
2007	24%	37%	32%	7%
- Your own community				
2006	31%	33%	31%	6%
2007	29%	37%	30%	3%
- Your own neighborhood				
2006	28%	20%	46%	5%
2007	27%	18%	53%	2%

Leadership Florida – 2007 Sunshine State Survey

While a majority of Floridians (62%) continue to say that they would tell a friend or relative to move to Florida, a significant 33% still say they would not make such a recommendation.

QUESTION: Would you tell a friend or relative to move to the state of Florida?

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2006</u>
Yes	62%	62%
No	33%	33%
Not Sure	5%	5%

Furthermore, 20% of Florida adults said they are seriously considering moving out of the state. Residents under the age of 50 were slightly more likely to be considering an out-of-state move.

QUESTION: Are you seriously considering moving out of the state of Florida?

	<u>ALL</u>	<u><50</u>	<u>50+</u>
Yes	20%	23%	18%
No	78%	74%	80%
Not Sure	2%	3%	2%

Floridians are equally split over the impact of more people moving into the state. Registered voters and those over the age of 50 are more likely to feel the negatives outweigh the positives.

QUESTION: Some people think that new people moving to Florida is a good thing for the state. Others believe that it is a bad thing. For you personally, do the positive aspects of growth outweigh the negatives, or the negatives outweigh the positives?

	<u>ALL</u>	<u>REG VOTERS</u>	<u><50</u>	<u>50+</u>
Positives outweigh Negatives	45%	43%	48%	42%
Negatives outweigh Positives	43%	44%	41%	44%
They balance out about equally (NOT READ)	7%	7%	6%	7%
Not Sure (NOT READ)	6%	6%	5%	7%

Leadership Florida – 2007 Sunshine State Survey

Floridians strongly oppose trading higher population densities in their neighborhoods to preserve open space in other parts of their community. Statewide, 68% were opposed, with that opposition coming across all groups and across the state.

QUESTION: Some Floridians support higher population density in their own neighborhood to preserve greenway and open spaces in other parts of their community. Other residents are opposed to increasing population densities because they feel it would cause problems, such as traffic congestion. Which of these views comes closest to your own view?

Support Higher Densities	23%
Oppose Higher Densities	68%
Not Sure	9%

HIGHER DENSITIES?	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	UNDECIDED
REGISTERED VOTERS	22%	69%	9%
DEMOCRATS	20%	71%	9%
REPUBLICANS	22%	68%	10%
INDEPENDENTS	27%	66%	7%
<50	25%	67%	8%
50+	21%	69%	9%
PANHANDLE	26%	68%	6%
NORTHEAST FLORIDA	24%	67%	9%
ORLANDO/DAYTONA	24%	70%	6%
TAMPA BAY METRO	21%	70%	9%
SOUTHWEST FLORIDA	27%	64%	9%
PALM BEACH/TREASURE COAST	22%	61%	18%
SOUTHEAST FLORIDA	21%	71%	9%

Leadership Florida – 2007 Sunshine State Survey

A majority of Floridians (52%) continue to say that their local government is not effectively managing growth in their community. This sentiment is also strong and consistent among all groups and across the state.

QUESTION: Do you feel your local government is effectively or not effectively managing growth in your community?

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2006</u>
Effectively	39%	38%
Not Effectively	52%	52%
Not Sure	9%	11%

LOCAL GOVT EFFECTIVELY MANAGING GROWTH?	YES	NO	NOT SURE
REGISTERED VOTERS	37%	55%	8%
DEMOCRATS	34%	57%	9%
REPUBLICANS	42%	50%	8%
INDEPENDENTS	33%	60%	7%
<50	42%	51%	7%
50+	36%	53%	11%
PANHANDLE	33%	56%	11%
NORTHEAST FLORIDA	42%	41%	17%
ORLANDO/DAYTONA	45%	48%	7%
TAMPA BAY METRO	43%	50%	7%
SOUTHWEST FLORIDA	42%	51%	7%
PALM BEACH/TREASURE COAST	34%	54%	11%
SOUTHEAST FLORIDA	31%	59%	10%

HOW THE POLL WAS CONDUCTED

This poll was conducted by Mason-Dixon Polling & Research, Inc. of Washington, D.C. from November 19 through November 30, 2007. A total of 1,200 resident Florida adults were interviewed statewide by telephone.

Those interviewed were selected by the random variation of the last four digits of telephone numbers. A cross-section of exchanges was utilized and quotas were assigned to reflect adult population by county.

The margin for error, according to standards customarily used by statisticians, is no more than plus or minus 2.1 percentage points. This means that there is a 95 percent probability that the "true" figure would fall within that range if all adults were surveyed. The margin for error is higher for any subgroup, such as a regional or gender grouping.

The survey also includes a sub-sample of 981 registered voters. The margin for error on results among registered voters is plus or minus 3.2%.

DEMOGRAPHICS

- How long have you lived in Florida?

<5 years	8%
5-9 years	14%
10-19 years	31%
20+ years	47%

- Are you currently a registered to vote in Florida?

Yes	82%	(981)
No	18%	(219)

- What is your current official party voter registration? Are you registered as a:

Democrat	41%	(402)
Republican	38%	(374)
Independent or Other	20%	(198)
Not Sure/Refused (NOT READ)	1%	(7)

- What is your age?

18-34	252	(21%)
35-49	327	(27%)
50-64	324	(27%)
65+	292	(24%)
Refused	5	

- Which of the following best describes your racial/ethnic origin?

White or Anglo	868	(72%)
Black or African-American	132	(11%)
Hispanic or Latino	165	(14%)
Asian or Other	31	(3%)
Refused (NOT READ)	4	

Leadership Florida – 2007 Sunshine State Survey

GENDER:

Male	567	(47%)
Female	633	(53%)

REGION:

Panhandle	100	(8%)
Northeast Florida	120	(10%)
Orlando/Daytona	220	(18%)
Tampa Bay Metro	220	(18%)
Southwest Florida	120	(10%)
Palm Beach/Treasure Coast	125	(10%)
Southeast Florida	295	(25%)



The Florida House of Representatives

MEMORANDUM

To: Members, Florida House of Representative
From: Ray Sansom, Chairman, Policy and Budget Council
Date: 01/09/2008
Re: Fiscal Year 2008-2009 Budget

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "RS", written over the "From:" line of the memorandum.

Dear fellow members:

Yesterday the House Policy and Budget Council met to begin work on preparing the Fiscal Year 2008-09 state budget. Information was presented to our council that I believe all House members should receive. I have summarized this information below and ask for your careful consideration

First, General Revenue collections continue to come in below the forecast, even though the forecast has been lowered for each of the last three estimating conferences. Since the most recent estimating conference in November 2007, we have collected almost \$100 million less than anticipated. Because of the possibility that this trend will continue, we were advised to hold between \$400 and \$600 million in reserve in anticipation of the forecast for Fiscal Year 2008-09 being lowered again in the new estimating conference. The reasons for this downturn in collections include a continued and longer than expected slowdown in the housing market, rising unemployment, high energy prices, turmoil in the credit market and the increasing probability there will be a national recession. Unlike recent downturns in the US economy, this time Florida seems to be worse off than the rest of the nation.

Second, we learned that the downturn in Florida's economy is likely to last through 2008 and into 2009, indicating that it would be unwise for us to spend one-time monies on recurring expenditures in hopes that this revenue downturn will be short-lived. The more appropriate course of action is to make reductions to the budget so that recurring expenditures do not exceed recurring revenues

Third, we received a presentation on the 2007 Debt Affordability Study. This annual study is required by Florida law in order to keep the members of the Legislature informed regarding the amount of debt which is being supported through state revenues. Unfortunately, the news is not good here as well. Due largely to the decline in revenue collections, state tax-supported debt for the coming fiscal year will exceed the statutory target debt ratio of 6 percent (the ratio of debt service on state tax-supported debt to revenue available). Thus, for the next three fiscal years, the state has no additional bonding capacity beyond already authorized programs if it wishes to stay below the target debt ratio

01/09/2008

Page 2

Finally, the council heard from the business community regarding the need to stimulate Florida's economy in order to return to more normal levels of economic activity in the state. It is important that we all consider innovative approaches for stimulating Florida's economy.

Based on the information our council received, I would like to suggest some guiding principles for the House as we prepare our budget for the upcoming fiscal year. These principles are as follows:

1. We will need to make recurring General Revenue reductions of approximately \$2 billion to our base budget. These reductions are necessary if we are going to provide modest levels of funding increases to pay for growth in education, health care, public safety, and the environment. Reductions can be achieved through elimination of non-essential programs, agency consolidations, and recurring redirections of revenue from trust funds to General Revenue. I am asking all House members to help identify budget reduction strategies

2. We should not attempt to balance our budget by using one-time (nonrecurring) monies for recurring purposes. Employing this strategy will only postpone and worsen the situation. Florida's economy will turn around, but it will take a couple of years for us to return to more normal levels of revenue growth. In the meantime, we must ensure that our recurring spending does not exceed recurring revenue collections.

3. We should not use additional bonding as a method to fund new or existing initiatives. Even with no additional bonding, our level of debt service will exceed the target debt ratio of 6 percent next year. In addition, new bonding programs create new long term revenue obligations for the state, something that we must avoid, particularly so that we can maintain a reasonable level of bonding capacity in case of state emergencies.

4. Finally, we should explore new and innovative ways to stimulate Florida's economy. I know all of you have good ideas on ways we can stimulate our economy. Think about approaches such as reforms to regulatory programs and tax incentives to stimulate Florida's economy

Thank you in advance for your assistance in preparing our FY 2008-09 state budget. I know that each of you is up to the challenges of crafting a budget that meets the state's critical needs, balancing spending to available recurring revenues with no additional state debt, and providing the stimuli we need to jumpstart Florida's dynamic economic engine.

Upcoming Meetings

January 28 1:30	Palm Beach County Legislative Delegation	Flagler Museum One Whitehall Way Palm Beach
January 30 10:00 a.m.	Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council Energy Committee Meeting	Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council Offices Ocean Boulevard Stuart
January 30 2:00 p.m.	Martin/St. Lucie Metropolitan/Transportation Planning Organization Joint Meeting	Martin County Commissioner Chambers Monterey Road Stuart
February 6 2:00 p.m.	St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization Board	Fort Pierce Commission Chambers 100 North U.S. 1 Fort Pierce
February 7 – 10:00am	District 10 Local Emergency Planning Committee	Wolf High-Technology Center IRCC Chastain Campus Stuart
February 12 1:00 p.m.	St. John's River Water Management District – Governing Board	Headquarters Reid Street Palatka
February 13 10:00 a.m.	Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization Board	Indian River County Administration Bldg Conference Room B1-501 Vero Beach
February 13 – 14	South Florida Water Management District – Governing Board	Osceola County
February 14 2:00 p.m.	Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy Committee	Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council Offices East Ocean Boulevard Stuart
February 14-15	Florida Regional Councils Association – Policy Board	Offices of Ronald L. Book, P.A. Monroe Street Tallahassee
February 15 9:30am	Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council Board	Wolf High-Technology Center IRCC Chastain Campus Stuart

* Meeting dates, times and/or locations are subject to change