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Plan Amendments Received/Reviewed

Since the last regular Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) meeting held on March 20, 2009, Council has reviewed the following amendments to local government comprehensive plans:

- 10 Future Land Use Map amendments.
- 153 text amendments.
- Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) amendments from Lantana and Tequesta. These EAR amendments generally include revisions to all elements of the local government’s comprehensive plan.
- Water Supply Facility amendments to Golf, Palm Springs, Sewall’s Point, and South Bay Plans.
- The adopted comprehensive plan for the Town of Loxahatchee Groves.
- New Public Education Facility Element for the City of Fort Pierce.

The amendments are from 8 different local governments.

DCA Findings on Compliance

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>DCA Reference No.</th>
<th>Notice Date</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Palm Beach</td>
<td>08-1ER</td>
<td>March 10, 2009</td>
<td>In Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Springs</td>
<td>09-1</td>
<td>March 12, 2009</td>
<td>In Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypoluxo</td>
<td>09-1ER</td>
<td>March 13, 2009</td>
<td>In Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manalapan</td>
<td>09-RWSP1</td>
<td>March 13, 2009</td>
<td>In Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Springs</td>
<td>09-CIE1</td>
<td>March 17, 2009</td>
<td>In Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td>09-CIE1</td>
<td>March 22, 2009</td>
<td>In Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Worth</td>
<td>06-2</td>
<td>March 25, 2009</td>
<td>In Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie County</td>
<td>08-RWSP1</td>
<td>March 26, 2009</td>
<td>In Compliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adopted Amendments

Informational reports on the following adopted amendments can be found on the Council website (www.terpc.org) under the Agenda for this Council Meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>DCA Reference No.</th>
<th>Notice of Intent Scheduled/Issued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>09-RWSP1</td>
<td>April 9, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tequesta</td>
<td>09-1ER</td>
<td>April 10, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Springs</td>
<td>09-RWSP1</td>
<td>April 14, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loxahatchee Groves</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>April 15, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Springs</td>
<td>09-1</td>
<td>April 17, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>DCA No.</td>
<td>Receipt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td>04-D1</td>
<td>10/17/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Palm Beach</td>
<td>04-2</td>
<td>09/17/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Worth</td>
<td>05-1</td>
<td>11/19/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay</td>
<td>05-1</td>
<td>04/13/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Worth</td>
<td>06-1</td>
<td>11/14/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach County</td>
<td>06D-1</td>
<td>06/05/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Pierce</td>
<td>06PTF1</td>
<td>06/21/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boca Raton</td>
<td>06-2</td>
<td>09/05/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin County</td>
<td>07D2</td>
<td>03/30/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briny Breezes</td>
<td>07-1</td>
<td>04/30/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin County</td>
<td>07E2</td>
<td>05/25/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Pierce</td>
<td>08-1</td>
<td>03/07/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin County</td>
<td>08-D2</td>
<td>04/15/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Springs</td>
<td>09RWSP1</td>
<td>08/04/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>08-1</td>
<td>08/07/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Beach</td>
<td>08RWSP-1</td>
<td>08/15/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lantana</td>
<td>08RWSP-1</td>
<td>08/25/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellsmere</td>
<td>08-2</td>
<td>08/27/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach Gardens</td>
<td>08-2</td>
<td>08/29/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Ridge</td>
<td>09-1ER</td>
<td>09/09/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>08-1ER</td>
<td>09/18/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loxahatchee Groves</td>
<td>Comp Plan</td>
<td>09/24/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>08-RWSP1</td>
<td>10/01/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>08RWSP1</td>
<td>10/06/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Palm Beach</td>
<td>08-2ER</td>
<td>10/06/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie County</td>
<td>09-1</td>
<td>10/31/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tequesta</td>
<td>09-1ER</td>
<td>10/30/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Worth</td>
<td>09-1ER</td>
<td>11/12/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Park</td>
<td>09RWSP-1</td>
<td>12/01/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangonia Park</td>
<td>09-1ER</td>
<td>12/01/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloud Lake</td>
<td>09RWSP-1</td>
<td>11/26/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haverhill</td>
<td>09-1ER</td>
<td>10/23/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf Stream</td>
<td>09-1ER</td>
<td>11/03/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach Gardens</td>
<td>09-RWSP1</td>
<td>12/01/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River County</td>
<td>09-1</td>
<td>12/22/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin County</td>
<td>09D1</td>
<td>12/22/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>09-1ER</td>
<td>12/16/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>DCA No.</td>
<td>Receipt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delray Beach</td>
<td>09-1</td>
<td>12/18/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td>09-1</td>
<td>12/22/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port St. Lucie</td>
<td>09-1</td>
<td>01/09/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port St. Lucie</td>
<td>09-2</td>
<td>01/21/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boynton Beach</td>
<td>09-1</td>
<td>01/29/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Clarke Shores</td>
<td>09-1ER</td>
<td>01/30/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Worth</td>
<td>09RWSP-1</td>
<td>02/10/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lantana</td>
<td>09-1ER</td>
<td>03/02/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Pierce</td>
<td>09PEFE1</td>
<td>03/12/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewall’s Point</td>
<td>09RWSP-1</td>
<td>03/16/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay</td>
<td>09RWSP-1</td>
<td>03/23/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT
STATUS REPORT
April 2009

PROJECT NAME: Briger/Scripps Florida Phase II DRI

LOCATION: South of Donald Ross Road, north of Hood Road and east and west of Interstate 95 and east of Florida’s Turnpike in Palm Beach Gardens, Florida

JURISDICTION: Palm Beach Gardens

SIZE: 682 acres

USES: Biotech Research and Development 1,600,000 sq. ft.
Biotechnological/biomedical, pharmaceutical, 2,400,000 sq. ft.
ancillary office space and other related uses
Dwelling Units 2,700
Commercial Space 500,000 sq. ft.

STATUS: Preapplication meeting held on June 24, 2008.
Expedited Permitting meeting held on October 29, 2008.
First sufficiency review and comments due out by February 27, 2009.
Application for Development Approval found insufficient on February 27, 2009.
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 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.
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.
Letter received from the applicant dated January 11, 2008 requesting that the application status be stayed until such a time
as a Comprehensive Plan overlay for the western communities has been formally acted upon by Palm Beach County. Council
agreed to a 6-month extension to the review process from February 14, 2008 in order to evaluate the County's progress in
approving the overlay.
Council sent a letter to the applicant on March 19, 2009 withdrawing their Development of Regional Impact
Application for Development Approval.
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.


The DO was rendered to Council and the Department of Community Affairs on April 17, 2008. The DCA determined that the DO was not rendered properly because it did not include a copy of Map H, the master development plan.


Council sent a letter to the Department of Community Affairs on December 23, 2008 stating that the Development Order rendered on December 12, 2008 adequately addressed all regional issues raised in Council’s DRI Assessment Report approved on June 20, 2008.
PROJECT NAME: Provences

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.


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.

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


Council sent a letter to the applicant on April 2, 2009 withdrawing their Development of Regional Impact Application for Development Approval.
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.
Letter received on July 8, 2008 asking for an extension to submit the Application for Development Approval. The extension was extended until January 30, 2009.
Council sent a letter to the applicant on March 19, 2009 withdrawing their Development of Regional Impact Application for Development Approval.
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

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.
March 18, 2009

Mr. Gary Wheeler
421 SW Camden Ave.
Stuart, Florida 34994

Dear Mr. Wheeler:

Thank you for contacting me about the economic stimulus package. I appreciate hearing your views.

The American people are hurting. They are losing their homes, their jobs, their businesses and their life savings. Economists across the political spectrum agree that the government needs to take bold and immediate action to stimulate the economy and curb the risk of a protracted economic recession.

I believe that the government has to do something to get us out of this economic tailspin; doing nothing isn’t an option. I voted for the economic stimulus package because I believe it is narrowly targeted to spend and invest in ways that will get the economy moving again. It invests in our infrastructure, creating badly needed jobs, and provides critical tax relief to businesses and middle-class Americans. It also shores up unemployment benefits and food stamps, provides aid to seniors and disabled veterans, and invests in our children through 21st Century education. The bill improves access to health care and promotes energy independence.

I believe the stimulus will preserve and create millions of good-paying jobs, help States like Florida manage budget shortfalls, and advance our infrastructure to meet modern demands. Congress passed the bill on February 13, and President Obama has now signed it into law. Please visit the website Recovery.gov for further information on the stimulus package.

Unfortunately, there has been a lot of misinformation and inaccurate reporting on this legislation. The stimulus bill does nothing to "socialize" medicine. In fact, it does three things that really help people. First, it lowers the cost of insurance for people who lose their jobs. Second, it gives more money to States to cover medical care for low-income Americans and the uninsured through the Medicaid program. And third, it provides Federal funding for the development and use of electronic health records to help doctors and hospitals be more efficient.

Based on what I hear from folks across Florida, it’s clear that we need to fix the problems caused by this economic crisis. But we must take care with taxpayer money. Last year I voted against spending $700 billion to bail out Wall Street because the bill lacked meaningful relief for homeowners facing foreclosure and didn’t include adequate protections for American taxpayers. I remain committed to reducing wasteful spending and improving transparency in Federal funding. And once we have returned to prosperity, I remain equally committed to tackling our burgeoning Federal deficit.

I appreciate your comments as they help me serve you better in the Senate, and I look forward to hearing from you should you have any future concerns.

Sincerely,

Bill Nelson

P.S. From time to time, I compile electronic news briefs highlighting key issues and hot topics of particular importance to Floridians. If you'd like to receive these e-briefs, visit my Web site and sign up for them at http://billnelson.senate.gov/news/ebriefs.cfm
Correspondence received from
Commissioner Charles Grande, St. Lucie County
Relating to Senate Bills 360 and 2026

Pages 15-31
March 24, 2009

Mr. Chris Holley
Executive Director
Florida Association of Counties
PO Box 549
Tallahassee, Florida 32302-0549

Re: Senate Bills 360 & 2026

Dear Mr. Holley:

Please accept this letter of concern and objection to provisions contained within Senate Bills 360 and 2026 as they now stand. As the elected representatives of St. Lucie County, we are deeply troubled about the potential consequences of the proposed legislation.

Specifically, regarding SB 360, we have the following concerns:

1. The bill appears to provide an exemption to transportation concurrency for “dense urban areas,” that may shift the burden of paying for much needed roadway infrastructure onto residents of the unincorporated county. Property owners inside these urban areas would be permitted to proceed with development. The traffic generated by these developments could then create concurrency issues for property owners outside these areas. The property owners, residents and governmental entities which are not exempt from transportation concurrency would bear the burden of addressing the increased traffic.

2. Similar to item 1, we are deeply concerned about the elimination of the DRI process for dense urban areas. The DRI process allows adjacent jurisdictions input on large projects. The potential elimination of the process without a clear and meaningful alternative is very troubling. This is of special concern in St. Lucie County and on the Treasure Coast where the cities may qualify as dense urban areas but the unincorporated counties do not. Clearly, the impact of DRI-level development on the lower-density areas adjacent to dense urban areas needs to be more thoroughly considered and addressed.

3. Language in the bill creates a mandated exemption from concurrency for “projects having special part-time demand.” Previously, these projects were encouraged to be exempted but left that determination up to local government.
Mandating that exemption is a further usurping of local authority and control over development.

Regarding SB 2060, we have the following concerns:

1. The bill proposes a two-year extension to all projects with an expiration date between Oct 1 of last year and 10/1/10. Further, no new requirements may be imposed on the extended project within that time frame. In addition, the ability of the Board to consider new or revised conditions of approval on older projects requesting extensions such as better protection of existing native habitat or traffic mitigation would be prohibited.

2. Artificially extending the life of projects that are no longer viable, and/or preventing the County from imposing additional conditions for extensions, will tie up valuable capacity for roads, schools, utilities and other essential services for years. Some of these projects, especially residential projects, may prevent the development of much needed commercial and industrial projects. Under this proposal, projects would get the extension whether the Board even supported extending the project or not. This is a serious preemption of local authority and may have a serious unintended consequence of leaving significant residential development “on the books”.

3. The extension is retroactive such that any new requirements placed on extensions the Board has made since 10/1/08 could be reversed. This could potentially include the revocation of conservation easements and traffic impact mitigation payments placed on projects recently granted extensions.

4. The final part of the bill would prohibit the County from adopting any new, more stringent permitting or regulations during the 2-year life of the legislation. This includes important updates and improvements to the St. Lucie County Land Development Code that our staff and citizens have been working on for several years. While the proposed code revisions do not necessarily all increase regulation, some undoubtedly will. Any increased regulation is done at the request of our local citizenry to improve the quality of development in our County.

5. Given the proposed limitation on new regulations, elected officials would likely be very cautious about approving applications for new development as well since safeguards provided by conditions of approval unique to each project could not be considered.

In total, many of the provisions in the proposed bills are also so vague and leave open to interpretation their ultimate impact so much, that local governments will end up wasting additional energy wondering how to implement them.
While we appreciate the Legislature’s attempt to jump start the economy, relaxing Growth Management regulation is not the way to do that. It is not Growth Management or environmental regulations that have created this economic downturn. Rather, it is the massive oversupply of housing and development that occurred within the existing regulatory framework that is at the root of the problem. Moreover, the legislature’s ongoing attempts to undercut and diminish the ability of local government to manage its own growth are a serious imposition on home rule.

We sincerely request that you consider our concerns and amend or withdraw the bills accordingly.

Sincerely,

Paula Lewis, Chair
St. Lucie County Board of County Commissioners

C: Board of County Commissioners
  Faye W. Outlaw, MPA, County Administrator
  Dan McIntyre, County Attorney
  Lee Ann Lowery, Assistant County Attorney
  Mark Satterlee, Growth Management Director
March 24, 2009

Mr. Chris Holley
Executive Director
Florida Association of Counties
P. O. Box 549
Tallahassee, Florida 32302-0549

RE: State of Florida Department of Community Affairs

Dear Mr. Holley:

Enclosed is a copy of Resolution No. 09-110 adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of St. Lucie County, Florida, on March 24, 2009. As indicated, the Board opposes efforts to reduce funding or the role of the State of Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA).

The Board strongly encourages the Florida Association of Counties (FAC) to also strongly oppose any efforts to weaken the State’s growth management legislation. The Board encourages the State to promote economic development in conjunction with the State’s growth management laws.

Sincerely,

Paula A. Lewis
Chair

PAL/caf
Enclosure
Copy to: Board of County Commissioners
County Administrator
County Attorney
RESOLUTION NO. 09-110

A RESOLUTION UPHOLDING THE STATES 1985 GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of St. Lucie County, Florida, has made the following determinations:

1. The Florida Legislature passed the landmark Growth Management Act of 1985, which set the State of Florida as the leader in growth management laws.

2. The mission of the State of Florida Department of Community Affairs is to ensure that new growth complies with the state’s vital growth management laws.

3. The Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council’s mission is to encourage and enable local units of government and citizenry to assemble and cooperate with one another and with representatives in major economic interests, to promote health, safety, and general welfare of the citizenry, and to plan for future development of the Region that will keep it competitive and afford a high quality of life.

4. This Board believes that a strong Department of Community Affairs is essential to effective growth management and economic development strategy in this State and, thereby, essential to the well-being of the taxpayers and citizens of St. Lucie County, Florida.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of St. Lucie County, Florida:
1. This Board does hereby oppose any attempt to reduce status, role, or funding for the Department of Community Affairs and Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council. This Board also opposes any attempt to relegate the Department of Community Affairs from a Department Status to a Division Status.

2. The County Administrator is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the members of the St. Lucie County Legislative Delegation.

After motion and second the vote on this resolution was as follows:

Chair Paula A. Lewis AYE
Vice-Chair Charles Grande AYE
Commissioner Doug Coward AYE
Commissioner Chris Dzadovsky AYE
Commissioner Chris Craft AYE

PASSED AND DULY ADOPTED this 24th day of March, 2009.

ATTEST:

[Signature]
DEPUTY CLERK

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
ST. LUCIE COUNTY, FLORIDA

BY: [Signature]
CHAIR

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL FORM AND CORRECTNESS:

[Signature]
Ass't. COUNTY ATTORNEY
March 24, 2009

Senator JD Alexander
151 First Street South, Ste. B
Winter Haven, Florida 33880

RE: Resolution No. 09-108 and Resolution No. 09-109

Dear Senator Alexander:

At the March 24, 2009, Board of County Commissioners’ meeting, the St. Lucie County Board of County Commissioners approved Resolution No. 09-108, "Opposing Senate Bill 360", and Resolution No. 09-109, "Opposing Senate Bill 2026".

On behalf of the Board of County Commissioners, I have attached copies of both Resolutions.

Sincerely,

Faye W. Outlaw, MPA
County Administrator

FWO/cac

c: Board of County Commissioners
   Lee Ann Lowery, Assistant County Administrator
   Dan McIntyre, County Attorney
   Marie Gouin, Management and Budget Director

Attachments
March 24, 2009

Senator Ken Pruitt
1850 SW Fountainview Boulevard
Suite 200
Port St. Lucie, Florida 34986

RE: Resolution No. 09-108 and Resolution No. 09-109

Dear Senator Pruitt:

At the March 24, 2009, Board of County Commissioners' meeting, the St. Lucie County Board of County Commissioners approved Resolution No. 09-108, "Opposing Senate Bill 360", and Resolution No. 09-109, "Opposing Senate Bill 2026".

On behalf of the Board of County Commissioners, I have attached copies of both Resolutions.

Sincerely,

Faye W. Outlaw, MPA
County Administrator

FWO/cac

C: Board of County Commissioners
Lee Ann Lowery, Assistant County Administrator
Dan McIntyre, County Attorney
Marie Gouin, Management and Budget Director

Attachments
March 24, 2009

Senator Mike Haridopolos  
3270 Suntree Boulevard, Ste. 122  
Melbourne, Florida 32940

RE: Resolution No. 09-108 and Resolution No. 09-109

Dear Senator Haridopolos:

At the March 24, 2009, Board of County Commissioners' meeting, the St. Lucie County Board of County Commissioners approved Resolution No. 09-108, "Opposing Senate Bill 360", and Resolution No. 09-109, "Opposing Senate Bill 2026".

On behalf of the Board of County Commissioners, I have attached copies of both Resolutions.

Sincerely,

Faye W. Outlaw, MPA  
County Administrator

FWO/cac

c:  Board of County Commissioners  
Lee Ann Lowery, Assistant County Administrator  
Dan McIntyre, County Attorney  
Marie Gouin, Management and Budget Director

Attachments
March 24, 2009

Representative Debbie Mayfield
1053 26th Place
P. O. Box 2380
Vero Beach, Florida 32960-2380

RE: Resolution No. 09-108 and Resolution No. 09-109

Dear Representative Mayfield:

At the March 24, 2009, Board of County Commissioners' meeting, the St. Lucie County Board of County Commissioners approved Resolution No. 09-108, "Opposing Senate Bill 360", and Resolution No. 09-109, "Opposing Senate Bill 2026".

On behalf of the Board of County Commissioners, I have attached copies of both Resolutions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Faye W. Outlaw, MPA
County Administrator

FWO/cac

c: Board of County Commissioners
Lee Ann Lowery, Assistant County Administrator
Dan McIntyre, County Attorney
Marie Gouin, Management and Budget Director

Attachments
March 24, 2009

Representative William Snyder
2400 South Federal Highway, Suite 250
Stuart, Florida 34994-4590

RE: Resolution No. 09-108 and Resolution No. 09-109

Dear Representative Snyder:

At the March 24, 2009, Board of County Commissioners' meeting, the St. Lucie County Board of County Commissioners approved Resolution No. 09-108, "Opposing Senate Bill 360", and Resolution No. 09-109, "Opposing Senate Bill 2026".

On behalf of the Board of County Commissioners, I have attached copies of both Resolutions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Faye W. Outlaw, MPA
County Administrator

FWO/cac

c:  Board of County Commissioners
     Lee Ann Lowery, Assistant County Administrator
     Dan McIntyre, County Attorney
     Marie Gouin, Management and Budget Director

Attachments
March 24, 2009

Representative Kevin Greenstein Rader
7593 Boynton Beach Boulevard, Suite 100
Delray Beach, Florida 33437-6161

RE: Resolution No. 09-108 and Resolution No. 09-109

Dear Representative Rader:

At the March 24, 2009, Board of County Commissioners' meeting, the St. Lucie County Board of County Commissioners approved Resolution No. 09-108, "Opposing Senate Bill 360", and Resolution No. 09-109, "Opposing Senate Bill 2026".

On behalf of the Board of County Commissioners, I have attached copies of both Resolutions.

Sincerely,

Faye W. Outlaw, MPA
County Administrator

FWO/cac

c:   Board of County Commissioners
      Lee Ann Lowery, Assistant County Administrator
      Dan McIntyre, County Attorney
      Marie Gouin, Management and Budget Director

Attachments
March 24, 2009

Representative Adam Metterman
121 SW Port St. Lucie Boulevard
Building B
Port St. Lucie, Florida 34984

RE: Resolution No. 09-108 and Resolution No. 09-109

Dear Representative Metterman:

At the March 24, 2009, Board of County Commissioners’ meeting, the St. Lucie County Board of County Commissioners approved Resolution No. 09-108, "Opposing Senate Bill 360", and Resolution No. 09-109, "Opposing Senate Bill 2026".

On behalf of the Board of County Commissioners, I have attached copies of both Resolutions.

Sincerely,

Faye W. Outlaw, MPA
County Administrator

FWO/cac

c:  Board of County Commissioners
     Lee Ann Lowery, Assistant County Administrator
     Dan McIntyre, County Attorney
     Marie Gouin, Management and Budget Director

Attachments
RESOLUTION NO. 09-108

A RESOLUTION OPPOSING SENATE BILL 360

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of St. Lucie County, Florida, has made the following determinations:

1. The Community Affairs Committee has introduced Senate Bill 360.

2. The St. Lucie County Board of County Commissioners believes it is in the best interest of the citizens of St. Lucie County to oppose Senate Bill 360 for the following reasons:

   Specifically, the Board does not support the exemption for dense urban areas from the Development of Regional Impact (DRI) process. The Development of Regional Impact process allows adjacent jurisdictions the opportunity to provide input on large projects and to properly address extra jurisdictional impacts. The potential elimination of the DRI process without a clear and meaningful alternative shifts the cost to existing taxpayers and voters. This is of special concern where the cities may qualify as dense urban areas but unincorporated counties do not qualify.

   In addition, this Board does not believe that these attempts to reduce growth management and environmental regulations will stimulate the economy or promote a more sustainable future for Florida.

   Furthermore, any perceived short term benefit will be far outweighed by costs and impacts to local taxpayers and will jeopardize future economic development opportunities.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of St. Lucie County, Florida:

1. This Board does hereby oppose Senate Bill 360 for the reasons indicated in the above described.

2. The County Administrator is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the members of the St. Lucie County Legislative Delegation.

After motion and second the vote on this resolution was as follows:

Chair Paula A. Lewis AYE
Vice-Chair Charles Grande AYE
Commissioner Doug Coward AYE
Commissioner Chris Dzadovsky AYE
Commissioner Chris Craft AYE

PASSED AND DULY ADOPTED this 24th day of March, 2009.

ATTEST:

[Signature]
DEPUTY CLERK

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
ST. LUCIE COUNTY, FLORIDA

BY: [Signature]
CHAIR

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL FORM AND CORRECTNESS:

[Signature]
Asst. COUNTY ATTORNEY
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RESOLUTION NO. 09-109

A RESOLUTION OPPOSING SENATE BILL 2026

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of St. Lucie County, Florida, has made the following determinations:

1. Senator Altman has introduced Senate Bill 2026.
2. The St. Lucie County Board of County Commissioners believes it is in the best interests of the citizens of St. Lucie County to oppose Senate Bill 2026 for the following reasons:

   A. Senate Bill 2026 would provide a two-year extension to all projects with an expiration date between October 1, 2008 and October 1, 2010; restrict counties from imposing any new requirements on the extended project within that time frame; and restrict counties from considering new or revised conditions of approval on older projects requesting extensions.

   B. Senate Bill 2026 extends the life of projects that are no longer viable and prevents counties from imposing additional conditions for extensions whether the Board supports extending the project or not.

   C. The extension is retroactive, whereby any new requirements placed on extensions by the Board of County Commissioners since October 1, 2008 could actually be reversed.

   D. Senate Bill 2026 usurps local authority of growth management and hinders the necessary updating and improvements to local governments’ land development code.

   E. The attempts to reduce growth management and environmental regulations will not stimulate the economy.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of St. Lucie County, Florida:
1. This Board does hereby oppose Senate Bill 2026 for the reasons indicated in the above described.

2. The County Administrator is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the members of the St. Lucie County Legislative Delegation.

After motion and second the vote on this resolution was as follows:

Chair Paula A. Lewis       AYE
Vice-Chair Charles Grande   AYE
Commissioner Doug Coward   AYE
Commissioner Chris Dzadovsky AYE
Commissioner Chris Craft    AYE

PASSED AND DULY ADOPTED this 24th day of March, 2009.

ATTEST:                       BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
                            ST. LUCIE COUNTY, FLORIDA
                                  BY:
                                  CHAIR

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL FORM AND CORRECTNESS:

COUNTY ATTORNEY
Mr. Vaday,

On behalf of the staff and crew of WTCE-TV 21, I would like to thank you for your participation and support of our show “Joy In Our Town”. I truly feel that our viewers will gain a wealth of knowledge from the information you provided on the topic of Economic Stability.

Depending on your television service provider and location, you may find us on Comcast cable channel 10, in Ft. Pierce and Vero Beach; Comcast cable channel 14, in Port St. Lucie and Martin County; UHF antenna channel 21 from Melbourne to West Palm; or digital antenna (DTV) channel 38 in Ft. Pierce. The scheduled airtimes for your show are as follows:

- 1:00pm Friday, April 24th
- 3:30am Saturday, April 25th
- 11:30am Monday, April 27th
- 3:30am Tuesday, April 28th
- 3:30am Thursday, April 30th

Thank you very much, we appreciate your donation of time and expertise and hope that we may call on you again in the future.

Sincerely,

Steve Devlin
Public Affairs Director
WTCE-TV 21, WTCE-DT 38
March 26, 2009

Michael J. Busha  
Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council  
421 S. W. Camden Avenue  
Stuart, FL 34994

Dear Executive Director Busha:

Thank you for writing Governor Charlie Crist regarding the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council's recent resolution requesting that the Florida Legislature establish a dedicated funding source to support expansion of the regional transit system by the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority; providing an effective date. The Governor appreciated receiving resolution No. 2009-03 and asked me to respond on his behalf.

The Governor realizes how vital it is that state and local leaders, like you and your colleagues, continue to put the best interests of their citizens forward. Your continued efforts and dedication to Florida are greatly appreciated.

Again, thank you for taking the time to write to Governor Crist. Your thoughts are very important to him.

Sincerely,

Aundra Bryant  
Office of Policy and Budget  
Executive Office of the Governor
April 1, 2009

Honorable Gov. Charlie Crist
Plaza Level 05, The Capitol
400 South Monroe Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0001

Dear Governor Crist:

As a Council Member of the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council, we have been made aware that the draft budget for the State is recommending a $1.2 million cut from the 2008-2009 allocation. This 61% reduction has necessitated using our local government dues to support the state-mandated functions of the Council, and reducing the Council’s staff by 20% to perform the same functions.

The Regional Planning Council is an important organization to the government entities in Indian River County and the Treasure Coast Region. We respectfully ask that you reconsider the funding level to at least that of the FY 2009-2009 level of $2.6 million.

If you should have any questions regarding this letter, please do not hesitate to contact me at (772) 231-1771. Thank you for your time and attention to issues that are important to Florida municipalities.

Sincerely,

William H. Ahrens
Vice Mayor
Town of Indian River Shores

/la

cc: Michael Busha, Executive Director, Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
States Wear Blinders On The True Costs of Sprawl

By Mary Newsom

For Release Sunday, March 1, 2009
Citwire.net

Across the U.S., civil engineers are practically giddy—well, they’re as giddy as civil engineers are ever going to be.

“For the first time in my career,” says Wayne Klotz, a Texan who is president of the American Society of Civil Engineers, “infrastructure is a hot topic.”

Pennsylvania Gov. Ed Rendell, president of the National Governors’ Association, has for a year been trying to spotlight the nation’s serious infrastructure needs—although (don’t tell Klotz) Rendell himself concedes the topic lacks a certain sexiness.

But these days, recession-pummeled Americans are following the federal stimulus package almost as avidly as, in happier times, they obsessed over Anna Nicole Smith or Laci Peterson. They’re arguing whether stimulus money should go to the arts, or to repair and expand infrastructure, such as fixing bridges, boosting transit or finishing urban loop roads.

It’s about time people noticed those public works projects.


“We continue to use the ‘patch-and-pray’ system,” Klotz said. Yet every $1 spent for maintaining infrastructure saves $16 in repair costs when something breaks, he pointed out.

But is the welcome public attention also spotlighting one of the reasons our infrastructure spending is so high—the vast sums required by suburban sprawl? In fast-growing North Carolina, at least, it isn’t.

Amid plenty of talk at that two-day conference about huge needs and inadequate money, about transit funding and open space preservation, one topic went all but unmentioned: Sprawl and its costs.

You’d think more of the leaders in this fast-sprawling state would be paying attention, because huge sums are at stake. For instance:

- The outerbelt highway for Charlotte, the state’s largest city, will have cost at least $1.2 billion in state and federal funds by the time it’s finished, some 30 years after it was
begun. Yet uncontrolled development along its route induced congestion almost as soon as each section opened.

- State transportation officials project a $65 billion gap over the next 20 years between transportation revenues and transportation needs.
- Charlotte officials estimate it will cost $7.4 million per mile in state and local money to upgrade old farm-to-market roads now carrying suburbanites to and from home, work and shopping.

While there's plenty of head-scratching about how to find the money, state policymakers are bafflingly silent about the dollars wasted by spread-out, low-density, meek-as-sizarizing suburban sprawl—and how much the state needs to reel it in.

Part of the problem is a simplistic yet potent belief that “growth is good,” and any new development is a net revenue gain. That idea is “fool’s gold,” ex-developer Rand Wentworth, president of the national Land Trust Alliance, told the forum. Typical suburban development costs $1.15 in services for every $1 in revenue it brings in, he said.

Another piece of the problem is that in North Carolina, state government types pretend growth is a local issue. They practically stick their fingers in their ears and shout “La, la, la, I can’t hear you!” when state growth policy comes up.

Yet the state has plenty of skin in this game. Consider state road money. The state spent millions in past decades to build so-called “bypass” highways around many of its town and cities. Then local decisions lined those byways with big-box stores, fast-food joints and strip shopping centers. Now, because developers have strip-mined the “bypass” highways, the state wants to build expensive “bypass-the-bypass” highways.

In another example, state-maintained roads through cities and towns tend to be major thoroughfares, lined with subdivisions and shopping centers. They carry exponentially more traffic than if the cities had adopted common-sense requirements for connected street grids, and had banned cul-de-sacs and gated subdivisions, which funnel traffic onto those quickly clogged thoroughfares. Then the state must pay for more lanes, wider intersections and other costly “improvements.” Why isn’t the state looking at its expenditures and telling the cities to stop this idiocy?

An intriguing study from Charlotte’s city staff illustrates another of sprawl’s hidden costs, with city taxpayers in this instance footing the bill: Fire station costs are sharply lower in older parts of town where streets connect. The study analyzed eight stations and found the annualized per-household life-cycle cost almost five times greater in disconnected, cul-de-sac-laden suburbia. That’s because fire stations in neighborhoods with traditional street grids can serve more square miles, since they can reach more homes within acceptable response times.

It’s heartening to hear President Obama declare we’re past “building sprawl forever,” that there has to be a smarter way to design communities. Now, we just need more officials at all levels of government to heed his words.

Mary Newsom is an associate editor, op-ed columnist and blogger at The Charlotte Observer. Her e-mail is Mnewsom@CharlotteObserver.com.