Introduction

The Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act, Chapter 163, Florida Statutes, requires that the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) review local government comprehensive plan amendments prior to their adoption. Under the provisions of this law, the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) prepares an Objections, Recommendations, and Comments (ORC) Report on a proposed amendment only if requested to do so by the local government, the regional planning council, an affected person, or if an ORC Report is otherwise deemed necessary by the DCA. If an ORC Report is to be prepared, then the TCRPC must provide DCA with its findings of consistency or inconsistency with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan (SRPP), and provide any comments and recommendations for modification on the proposed amendments within 30 days of its receipt.

Background

The City of Port St. Lucie has proposed three amendments to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and text amendments to the Future Land Use, Infrastructure, and Economic Elements and Western Annexation Sub-Element of the City Comprehensive Plan. The City requested a formal review of the amendments by the DCA.

Evaluation

A. Future Land Use Map Amendments

The general location of the FLUM amendments is shown in Exhibit 2 and information pertaining to the amendments is contained in Table 1.
### Table 1

**Proposed Amendments to the Future Land Use Map**  
**City of Port St. Lucie Comprehensive Plan**  
**DCA Reference No. 10-2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment Number/Name</th>
<th>Approx. Acreage</th>
<th>Current FLUM Designation</th>
<th>Proposed FLUM Designation</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **P09-129** Kennedy Groves, Inc. Bay Hill Holdings, LLC, Southern Fruit Groves, LLP, and Mabel Groves | 7,139.3 | Agricultural-5 (County designation) | Heavy Industrial (appr. 5,336 acres)  
Utility (appr. 1,183 acres)  
Open Space Conservation (appr. 620 acres) | West of Range Line Road, north of the C-23 Canal and south of Glades Cut-Off Road. |
| **P10-005** Verano Development LLC/PSL Commercial Holdings LLC | 67.9 | General Commercial and Institutional | Residential Golf Course | Located within the Verano (previously PGA Village) Development of Regional Impact. |
| **P10-24** City of Port St. Lucie Tract C, First Replat of Lennard Square | 19.8 | Medium Density Residential | Open Space Conservation | Southeast quadrant of the intersection of Lennard Road and Mariposa Avenue. |
| **Total:** | **7,227.0** | | | |

**Key to FLUM Designations**

- **Agricultural-5** maximum of one dwelling unit per five acres
- **Residential Golf Course** maximum of five dwelling units per acre
- **Medium Density Residential** maximum of eleven dwelling units per acre

1. **P09-129** (Kennedy Groves, Inc. Bay Hill Holdings, LLC, Southern Fruit Groves, LLP, and Mabel Groves)

   The 7,139.3 acres in this proposed amendment are located in south central/southwestern St. Lucie County, immediately north of the Martin County Line. The property is west of Rangeline Road (CR 609), south and east of Glades Cut-Off Road (CR 709), and north of the C-23 Canal (see Exhibits 3 to 8). The property is owned by four different entities (see Attachment A and Exhibit 9).

   The property is currently used for agriculture and an approximately 1,000 acre rock mine (see Exhibit 10). The proposed use is to allow mining to continue and to develop an intermodal transportation center with associated uses such as rail and freight cargo warehousing, distribution, assembly and manufacturing. The property is currently within unincorporated St. Lucie County (see Exhibits 11 and 12) and has a FLUM designation of Agricultural (AG-5). The City indicates that the property is being annexed concurrent with the comprehensive plan amendments. An annexation agreement which will include
transportation and infrastructure conditions was still being negotiated at the time of this review.

As Attachment B indicates, a Heavy Industrial designation was initially requested. However, the applicant changed the requested FLUM designations at the transmittal hearing to a mix of Heavy Industrial, Utility and Open Space Conservation (OSC) (see Exhibits 13, 14, 15). The existing land uses and FLUM designations on surrounding properties include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agricultural and ranch lands</td>
<td>vacant lands within the Western Grove and Wilson Grove DRIs; a residential air park.</td>
<td>C-23 Canal</td>
<td>agricultural and ranch lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG-5</td>
<td>AG-5 and New Community Development (NCD)</td>
<td>Agricultural and Institutional (Martin County)</td>
<td>AG-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Related text changes (described below) are proposed to the Future Land Use and Infrastructure Elements. The total amount of development is to be limited by the text amendments. The FLUM is also to be revised to extend the City’s Urban Service Boundary to include the entire property. The City Utility Department indicates it has the capacity to serve the proposed development.

The amendment materials indicate that the proposal for an “intermodal campus” on this site originated with the proposal by the Port of Palm Beach to establish an inland port facility and distribution center. As part of a screening process which included a number of possible sites, the subject site, called the Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus, was ranked second by the Port of Palm Beach as a potential location for a new inland port.

It has been reported that the Port of Palm Beach is no longer considering moving forward with an inland port project (see Attachment C). However, the landowner indicated to the City that they intend to move forward with the site as the location of a cargo hub. If annexed into the City, this project would not be subject to Development of Regional Impact statutes. The City indicated that the multi-agency review of this project will now take place at the comprehensive plan stage.

In support of this amendment, the City indicated that the unique nature of the proposed development means that there are few locations at which it could be accommodated. In 2008, the City Council established growth and economic diversity as major goals. In 2009, the City adopted a resolution in support of consideration of location of port facilities on property known as the Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus. The 2010 City Evaluation and Appraisal Report identified job growth, economic diversification and sufficient land for industrial development as major community issues. During the application review process, the City requested a more detailed environmental analysis of the property and also expressed
concern that the traffic conditions proposed in the text amendments were too low for build
out of the property.

The accompanying text amendments (see Attachment D) include new policies in the Future
Land Use Element that establish an Industrial Intermodal Area (Policy 1.1.4.22), define the
purpose for the area and establish maximum intended uses, distribution and intensities
(Policy 1.1.4.23). Under this second policy, the maximum industrial area is 5,100 acres and
maximum development is 40 million square feet. Maximum vehicular trips are 69,723
“external trip ends”. Policy 1.1.4.23 also includes height limitations, requires a conceptual
master plan (a Preliminary Conceptual Site Plan and a Schematic Plan are included as
Exhibits 16, 17), requires buffering from existing and adjoining residential development and
includes a provision that would commit the City to assigning an Agricultural FLUM
designation to the property if the Intermodal Campus does not move forward by 2020.

2. P-10-005 (Verano Development LLC/PSL Commercial Holdings LLC)

The Verano (formerly PGA Village) Development of Regional Impact (DRI) is located north
of Crosstown Parkway, east of Rangeline Road, and south of Glades Cut Off Road. The DRI
includes a total area of ± 3,003 acres and was approved by the City on October 27, 2003.

This proposal would change the FLUM designation on two separate parcels totaling 67.9
acres (see Exhibits 20 to 23). Both properties are currently vacant. The current FLUM
designations are General Commercial on the smaller parcel (16.2 acres) and Institutional on
the larger parcel (51.7 acres). The proposed FLUM designation is Residential Golf Course
(RGC). As the exhibits indicate, both parcels are near the boundary of the DRI. The existing
land uses and FLUM designations on surrounding properties include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
<th>FLUM Designations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>RGC and NCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>RGC and NCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>vacant land</td>
<td>RGC and NCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>citrus grove</td>
<td>RGC and NCD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The amendment will provide a uniform designation on all Verano DRI lands lying south of
the C-24 Canal. Related text amendments will allow a mix of uses on lands designated as
RGC without requiring a comprehensive plan amendment. There are no proposed changes to
the maximum land use entitlements in the final development order issued for the Verano
DRI. The City acknowledged that changes are sometimes necessary to the original location
for uses identified in the master plan for the DRI. The City staff considers the proposed
amendment to be consistent with the comprehensive plan and anticipates no adverse impacts
to the surrounding area.
3. **P10-24** (City of Port St. Lucie Tract C, First Replat of Lennard Square)

This 19.8 acre City-owned property is located east of U.S. 1, near the intersection of Mariposa Avenue and Lennard Road (see Exhibits 24 to 26). The property is vacant, and consists primarily of undisturbed native vegetation. The current FLU M designation on the property is Medium Density Residential. The proposed FLUM designation is OSC.

The existing land uses and FLUM designations on surrounding properties include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
<th>FLUM Designations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>single family residential</td>
<td>Residential Low Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>church</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>single family residential</td>
<td>Residential Low Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>stormwater management area</td>
<td>General Commercial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City previously approved this property for a multi-family residential Planned Unit Development (PUD). However, the property was purchased through the Conservation Trust Fund Program in February, 2010. The property will be used as part of the 706 acres required as upland habitat preservation mitigation for the St. Lucie West DRI, to “replace” lands previously designated for mitigation but leased by the City for a paintball park. The City considers the Conservation designation to be compatible with all surrounding uses.

B. Text Amendments

1. **P10-006** (Verano Development, LLC - PSL Commercial Holdings, LLC)

   This amendment revises Policy 1.1.4.1(d) of the Future Land Use Element. The existing policy authorizes a RGC FLUM designation with a maximum residential density of 5 dwelling units per acre and allows up to 10 percent of the land area to be developed for a limited number of non-residential uses. The revised policy broadens the allowable non-residential uses to any of those permitted under the Commercial Limited or Commercial General FLUM designations. Uses allowed under the Institutional and Utility designations are also permitted. Proposed development must be as part of the concept plan of a PUD or master development plan of a DRI. The City indicates these proposed amendments will give land owners some additional flexibility.

2. **P10-012** (Horizon St. Lucie, LLC)

   This amendment revises the text of the Future Land Use and Economic Development Elements. The proposed changes to the Future Land Use Element are to policies regarding the New Community Development (NCD) Future Land Use Designation, and to policies in the Western Annexation Sub-Element. Many of the changes are to correct scrivener’s errors. The proposed amendment includes the following changes:
• Revise Policy 1.1.4.7 to change “residential areas” to “residential sub-districts” in reference to open space requirements and to add reference to Policy 1.2.5.1 which provides the definition of open space;
• Revise Policy 1.1.8.6 to allow telecommunication towers in the NCD land use category;
• Add new Policy 1.2.2.8 to provide a new sub-district, the Regional Business Center, and amend other policies to include references to the new sub-district;
• Revise Policy 1.1.4.10 to provide for a residential density of 35 du/acre and a height of 150 feet for the proposed Regional Business Center sub-district;
• Add new Policy 1.2.2.9 to define “Gross Leasable Area (GLA)” to be applied in the Regional Business Center sub-district;
• Revise Policy 1.2.2.10 to allow a maximum retail square footage of 20 percent of gross square feet for Employment Center sub-district instead of 100,000 square feet;
• Revise Policy 1.2.2.14 to allow agricultural activities on properties after they have been platted;
• Revise Policy 1.2.7.2 to require a written status report for an NCD District be provided every two years instead of every year.
• Revise the Western Annexation Sub-Element to update information about Developments of Regional Impact, to correct scrivener’s errors, and to add that a regional commercial center is anticipated within the next five years;
• Revise Policy 1.1.3.5 to indicate the City Manager may create a staff review task force to review specific projects;
• Add Policy 8.3.1.3 to list of industries targeted by the City; and
• Add Policy 8.3.1.4 to support and promote the “Jobs Corridor” along the west side of I-95 from the Crosstown Parkway Interchange to the south county line.

3. **P10-016 (ACR Acquisition, LLC)**

The City is proposing to amend the Future Land Use Element policies regarding the NCD Future Land Use Designation, and the policies establishing the Wilson Grove NCD District. Many of the changes are to correct scrivener’s errors. The amendment includes the following changes:

• Revise Policy 1.2.7.1 to require a written status report for an NCD District be provided every two years instead of every year;
• Revise Policy 1.2.11.1 to increase the maximum density of the Wilson Groves NCD District from 7,700 to 8,470 residential units, which is consistent with the number of residential units allowed by the conversion matrix of the Development Order for the Wilson Groves DRI;
• Revise Policy 1.2.11.2 to allow greater flexibility in the allocation of land uses in the Wilson Groves NCD;
• Revise Policy 1.2.11.3 to reduce the required number of acres of neighborhood and community parks from 90 to 40 in accordance with the Fourth Amendment to the Annexation Agreement dated November 16, 2009; and
• Revise Policy 1.2.11.5 to indicate that certain transportation conditions have been completed.

Extrajurisdictional Impacts

Under the informal agreement facilitated by the TCRPC, local governments in the northern three counties of the region are to provide copies of amendment materials to other local governments that have expressed an interest in receiving such materials. The City provided copies of the amendment materials to St. Lucie County, Martin County, the Cities of Fort Pierce and Stuart, the St. Lucie County School Board, the St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization, and the Martin Metropolitan Planning Organization. Council sent a memorandum to all these local governments and agencies on June 10, 2010 seeking comments regarding any impacts on existing plans or programs. On July 6, 2010 Council staff received a memorandum from St. Lucie County Planning and Development Services Department (see Attachment E) which raises a number of issues and makes comments on the proposed Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus amendment (P09-129). The staff memorandum from St. Lucie County indicates that:

1. the County supports the reversion to an Agricultural designation for these lands should development not commence by 2020;
2. the County is interested in participating in the development of an annexation boundary map and joint planning area with the City; as per the letter of understanding between the DCA and the City of Port St. Lucie dated September 9, 2009;
3. although the proposed project has a service capacity letter from the City Utility System Department, the lands lie outside the City utility service area. While the City is proposing an amendment to the service area map, a letter dated May 28, 2010 from the St. Lucie County Utilities Department indicates that the County is currently the only entity that may provide facilities to supply and distribute water to this site; and
4. the County has a number of concerns regarding the Traffic Analysis for the Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus. Those concerns are listed in a memo dated June 21, 2010 (see Attachment E).

Effects on Significant Regional Resources or Facilities

Analysis of the proposed amendments indicates there may be adverse effects on the regional roadway network.

Analysis of Consistency with Strategic Regional Policy Plan

FLUM Amendment P09-129

The SRPP anticipates that some non-agricultural uses may need to be accommodated in the countryside (e.g. landfills and resource recovery facilities, reservoir and water attenuation facilities, large industrial uses, power plants, etc.). SRPP Policy 1.1.2.3 indicates that a planning study should be required to evaluate development proposals in the countryside. These studies should address location, design and impacts.
A large freight, multi-modal distribution/industrial facility is a use that is not ordinarily anticipated in a local government comprehensive plan. Not only should the location and design of such a facility be carefully examined by the local government, but the impacts of the development must be anticipated as well. The scope of the proposed Treasure Coast Intermodal Facility site (over 5,336 acres or 8.3 square miles) for industrial and freight distribution uses is such that the extent of the impacts is difficult to determine. Yet, if the City adopts this amendment, it has a responsibility to see that both local and extraterritorial impacts are anticipated and facilities and services that are to be available concurrent with the need are provided.

Prior to the statutory amendments under SB 360 of 2009, the scope of the development proposed on this property would have required DRI review. However, because the City is designated as a dense urban land area, the development will not be subject to DRI review. In the amendment materials, the City staff indicated that the multi-agency review of this project would take place at the comprehensive plan stage. As a result of the uniqueness of the proposed development and the scope of the project, Council staff undertook a thorough analysis of materials submitted regarding economic justification, native habitat and species and of transportation impacts.

A. Economic Justification

BACKGROUND - The initial impetus for the development of an Intermodal Logistics Center at this location was the identified need by the Port of Palm Beach District for the development of a South Florida Intermodal Logistics Center (aka the “Inland Port”) – a port-related intermodal facility. The Port of Palm Beach defined the Intermodal Logistics Center as “…a physical site located away from traditional land, air and coastal borders with the vision to facilitate and process international trade through strategic investment in multi-modal transportation assets and by promoting value-added services as goods move through the supply chain.”

On July 10, 2009 the Port of Palm Beach District issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) from qualified private entities in connection with a public-private partnership for the development, design, construction, finance, management, operation and maintenance of a regional intermodal logistics center (aka South Florida Regional Intermodal Logistics Center). The decision to issue the RFP was prompted by, among other things, studies and reports that had demonstrated “…Florida’s seaports need to expand and improve waterside access, terminal capacity, landside access and market access in order to handle the projected increases in traffic and cargo throughput.” The Port of Palm Beach also cited in their RFP that “…it is projected that there will be a future demand for a minimum of 40,000,000 square feet of warehouse space. Estimates indicate that a minimum of 3,500 acres will be required to allow for adequate density for such warehouse space and to support an interchange hub and the road and rail expansions that will be necessary for the efficient operation of such warehouse space as a distribution center.”

The project, as conceived by the Port of Palm Beach, was to be a distribution hub of port cargo (sea, land and air) related intermodally to transfer, commodity packaging/handling, commodity distribution and storage in a location which would have reasonable access to the
Ports of Palm Beach, Port Everglades and Miami. The Port of Palm Beach anticipated the project would be located in or near the Lake Okeechobee region.

On October 5, 2009 the Port of Palm Beach District issued a press release to announce that it received four proposals from separate teams of developers in response to its RFP issued on July 10, 2009. The four proposals came from:

- Florida Crystals Corporation
- Hilliard Brothers of Florida, LTD/US Sugar Corporation
- Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus, LLC (Kennedy Groves, Inc., Mabel Groves, LLP, Southern Fruit Groves, LLP, Bay Holdings, LLC)
- Weekly Brothers Industrial Park

At its December 17, 2009 board meeting, the Port of Palm Beach ranked the proposals in the following order:

- Florida Crystals Corporation
- Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus, LLC
- Hilliard Brothers of Florida, LTD
- Weekly Brothers Industrial Park

The Port also took action to award the Florida Crystals Corporation site in western Palm Beach County the first rights to negotiate for the inland port facility. The Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus, LLC ranked second in its bid to have the inland port distribution center located on their property.

Since the Port of Palm Beach announced its intention to develop an inland port, a good deal of opposition to the inland port concept and proposed location was expressed. At a special meeting held on May 28, 2010 the Port of Palm Beach took action to officially abandon its plan to develop an “inland port” cargo distribution center.

Despite this action, Amendment P09-129 proposes to accommodate the development of an industrial intermodal area known as the Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus to serve the Treasure Coast and South Florida region market area. The proposed Industrial Intermodal Area is intended to enhance, diversify and sustain the employment base of the City by creating an area suitable for a wide range of industrial uses combined with and enhanced by intermodal capabilities. The amendment contemplates an initial intensity of development over the first five years of 5.5 million square feet with a mix of uses including an intermodal transfer facility and interchange hub and supporting uses and light to heavy industrial land uses such as warehousing, distribution, manufacturing and ancillary uses. The ultimate intensity at build-out is 40 million square feet.

As a point of reference, a number of advanced intermodal facilities – called integrated logistics centers (ILCs) such as the proposed Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus, have and are being developed to enhance economic development activity around a central intermodal facility in strategic locations across the US. “Integrated logistics centers” as defined in a
2006 study completed for CSX Real Property Inc.¹ are defined as “the hub of a specific area where all the activities relating to transport, logistics and goods distribution are carried out by various operators.” A typical ILC, as cited in the report, “…comprises, at a minimum, several warehouses and an intermodal terminal, where freight is conveyed from one mode of transportation to another (train-to-truck or truck-to-train, for instance). It often houses distribution, manufacturing and processing sites as well as repair buildings.”

The applicant states the Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus comprehensive plan amendment is justified for five main reasons, three of which are reviewed in more detail below:

1. Location: The property is optimally located for an industrial intermodal center, with multimodal transportation accessibility, and urban services readily available.
2. Need: There is documented need for economic development in St. Lucie County, a demonstrated market need for the proposed land use, and a readily available workforce to serve the need.
3. Regional Setting: The proposed land uses are consistent with applicable regional planning efforts and visions.

LOCATION - From a location standpoint, the applicant justifies the amendment on the basis the subject property is optimally located for an industrial intermodal center because it has multi-modal transportation accessibility. The “K” line of the Florida East Coast Railway (FEC) runs parallel to the Glades Cutoff Road boundary of the subject site. The K line serves a number of proximate existing industrial customers including Tropicana, Rinker, Allied Chemical and the Wal-Mart distribution center. The applicant contends “…The location of this large and contiguous property in the region, with ready access to rail and road which connect directly to the South Florida and other Florida sea ports, make it uniquely situated to serve the intended use. Smaller, scattered industrial use properties would not accommodate the synergy and economic efficiency of one centralized campus with direct rail access.”

One of the market analysis reports cited to justify the creation of an intermodal logistics center at the subject location is the Martin Associates report, Port of Palm Beach Inland Logistics Center Final Market Analysis. This report, in the section entitled ILC Distribution Center Potential, questions the development of an ILC in St. Lucie County. “…as more industrial warehouse space is absorbed in Miami-Dade and Broward counties and available parcels are depleted, the natural shift would likely move toward Palm Beach and Martin Counties to the north. One developer noted that Broward County is nearly “built-out” from an industrial development perspective…However, it is important to note that a number of speculative buildings were constructed in St. Lucie County in anticipation of a shift in DC [distribution center] operations to that region. CVS located in Vero Beach and Wal-Mart constructed a facility in Fort Pierce, but few have followed.”

The land use amendment, if approved, would add 4,778 gross acres of new developable land to the Treasure Coast Region. This new amount of developable land represents over 72

---

¹ Development of an Integrated Logistics Center in Winter Haven, Florida, January 2006, CSX Real Property Inc.
percent of the total existing vacant developable industrial land inventory (approximately 6,576 acres) in Martin, St. Lucie and Indian River Counties combined.

NEED - The Amendment cites a comprehensive feasibility analysis and a market analysis that were previously conducted to support the development of the Port of Palm Beach ILC as justification for the development of the Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus on 7,139 acres in unincorporated St. Lucie County. The studies cited in the Amendment note that the moderate development scenario projected an additional 22,849 jobs would be created by 2020 if the ILC was created. Notably, the Amendment specifically cites a market analysis study completed by Martin Associates in 2008 as a central underpinning to support the development of an ILC “…the market analysis indicates that by 2025 an additional 80 million square feet of warehousing and DC (distribution center) space will be needed that could effectively be served via an ILC in South Florida…” The first key finding of the market analysis report does indeed support the notion that upwards of 80 million square feet of additional distribution center space is needed to support the future growth in South Florida. However, the analysis also goes on to state that “…the types of facilities that will be most likely in demand are those in the 50,000 to 300,000 square foot range, and these sites will most likely serve as satellite DC’s to the larger sites that will be developed in Central and Northern Florida, where land prices/lease rates are less expensive…”

In the same market analysis, the authors state “…Developers indicate that the South Florida market, with respect to the import retail distribution market, attract accounts in the range of 50,000 – 300,000 square feet. The developers maintain that the larger 1 million square feet-plus facilities will continue to develop in Central and Northern Florida…Large retailers/wholesalers are more likely to use a South Florida location for “satellite” DC development, which is in the 50,000-300,000 square foot range…”

This assertion seems also to be independently supported by the report, Development of an Integrated Logistics Center in Winter Haven, Florida. That report indicates integrated logistics centers appeared fairly recently in the US and most ILCs have been built over the last decade. It notes that “…ILCs are generally located in areas of the country where there is a concentration of population density and strong demand for the movement, storage and distribution of large volumes of consumer products. As such, ILCs to date have been principally located in Texas, Illinois and California. The proposed ILC in Winter Haven would be the first in the Southeast…”

The proposed Winter Haven ILC is a 1,250 acre facility that is estimated at build-out to create 8,500 annual full-time jobs in Winter Haven and Polk County and be comprised of 3 million square feet of warehouse, 1.5 million square feet of industrial sites, and 0.5 million square feet of office space – significantly smaller than the Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus which has a proposed intensity at the five-year development mark of 5.5 million square feet and an ultimate intensity at build-out of 40 million square feet.

REGIONAL SETTING - The applicant asserts the proposed land uses are consistent with applicable regional planning efforts and visions.
If built, this project would provide positive benefits to the City of Port, St. Lucie, St. Lucie County and the Treasure Coast Region in terms of quality job creation, industrial diversification and enhanced transportation mobility. Moreover, many successful ILC projects have generated significant returns in economic development and activity and added large tax revenues for their respective state and local governments. To the extent the Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus would achieve these outcomes the amendment would be consistent with the goals, strategies and policies in the SRPP. For instance, Regional Goal 3.1 calls for an improved economy for the Region’s distressed communities. Related Policy 3.1.1.1 calls for the Region to attract investors to help broaden the economic base and strengthen the job market. As a potential economic development generator, the proposed ILC project could significantly improve the economic conditions in the region. The CSX study referred to earlier in this report cites a number of key factors for the successful development of an ILC, most notably “…To be successful, an ILC should be administered by a single and neutral legal entity.” The study suggests that a private/public partnership is the most widespread and efficient organizational structure for an ILC. It also suggests that the most successful ILC public/private partnerships are characterized by:

- Detailed joint planning;
- Financial sharing of costs; and
- Assistance by the public agency in seeking permitting, rezoning, highway access and other necessary site-related needs and approvals.

The amendment materials do not indicate that a public/private partnership will be formed to undertake the project, or that there has been agreement reached between the project development sponsors and the local jurisdiction on financial sharing of costs.

The applicant notes consistency with a number of regional planning efforts such as the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy 2007-2012 (CEDS). While the CEDS document recognizes the “Inland Port” as a desirable economic development project, all projects contained in the CEDS’s Strategic Projects, Programs and Activities section are location specific. The Inland Port was a specific project to be located in the Glades Region of Palm Beach County.

B. Native Habitat/Species

An environmental assessment for the proposed Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus indicates the subject property has approximately 1,903 acres of native uplands, which consist primarily of pine flatwoods. Some of the native uplands have been impacted by agricultural activities, feral hogs, exotic vegetation, and a lack of management. The assessment also indicates the site has about 635 acres of wetlands located outside of the utility easement and active mining boundaries. The wetlands include 551 acres dominated by native vegetation, and 84 acres are dominated by non-native vegetation. The native wetlands are located primarily within the native uplands, and the non-native wetlands are located primarily within the farmlands and near the mining areas on the property.
The environmental assessment also indicates that several species of protected wildlife have been observed on the property, including: crested caracara (listed as Threatened by both the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FFWCC) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)); Florida sandhill crane (listed as Threatened by the FFWCC); little blue heron (listed as a Species of Special Concern by the FFWCC); snowy egret (listed as a Species of Special Concern by the FFWCC); southeastern American kestrel (listed as Threatened by the FFWCC); wood stork (listed as Endangered by both the FFWCC and USFWS); Sherman’s fox squirrel (listed as a Species of Special Concern by the FFWCC); American alligator (listed as a Species of Special Concern by the FFWCC); and eastern indigo snake (listed as Threatened by both the FFWCC and USFWS).

The proposed future land use designations for the subject property indicate there will be 620 acres designated as OSC. The OSC designation includes several areas that contain native uplands and wetlands, as well as other areas designated as rangeland. The exact acreage of native uplands and wetlands proposed for protection in OSC is not provided in the amendment package. Also, the amendment package does not provide details about how wetland mitigation will be accomplished or what measures will be taken to protect listed species.

The proposed 620-acre OSC designation includes three core areas of native uplands and wetlands for preservation on the project site. This represents a good start for protecting natural resources of regional significance. However, the amendment application does not provide enough information to determine if the proposal is consistent with the goals, strategies and policies in the SRPP. For example, Policy 6.7.1.2 states as a minimum baseline measure for consistency with the SRPP, the Regional Planning Council will strive to achieve protection of 25 percent of upland natural communities in the evaluation of development plans. The OSC area includes an unspecified number of acres of native uplands, rangeland and wetlands, which makes it unclear if the amount of native uplands protected is consistent with Council’s policy.

Another area of concern is consistency with Regional Goal 6.8, protection of endangered and potentially endangered species. The application acknowledges that protection measures or mitigation may need to be implemented to address issues related to the protection of listed species. However, more detailed surveys are needed to determine if there are additional listed species on the property that will require protection, and what protection measures will need to be implemented to protect the listed species known to occur on the property. The application did not indicate if the OSC area was designed to address the protection needs of any of the listed species identified on the property.

C. Transportation Impacts

A traffic analysis was prepared as part of the original application for a General Industrial land use on the entire 7,189 acre property. The City staff report indicates that the City’s traffic consultant cautioned that the total maximum daily trips (69,723) at build out is low for industrial uses based on the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) trip generation rates; although the ITE does not have a separate category for an inland port/intermodal facility.
The traffic study depends on the accommodation of many trips by rail. The City’s traffic consultant cautioned that impacts to surrounding roadways could be significantly higher if rail does not become a component of the multi-modal configuration of traffic. The consultant also recommended a traffic monitoring system to ensure that actual trips do not exceed the maximum threshold established. St. Lucie County also has a number of concerns regarding the traffic analysis (see Attachment E).

Council staff’s review of the traffic analysis follows. The analysis evaluated conditions for both a short (2015) and long (2030) term. Build out of the site assumes:

- 9,250,000 square feet of Industrial Park;
- 9,250,000 square feet of Manufacturing;
- 611 acres of Intermodal Rail Yard; and
- 21,500,000 square feet of High-Cube Warehouse.

Because the number of employees was used rather than the amount of square footage to be developed for trip generation, it may be that trip generation is significantly underestimated. The analysis also assumes all roadways needed to accommodate the development will be in place by 2030. This is unlikely because market conditions have not allowed other nearby development to proceed as originally anticipated and roadway improvements called for in those development orders may be postponed. As a result, the existing roadway network may not be able to handle the traffic to be generated on the amendment site. In addition, if nearby residential development is delayed, employees at the amendment site would need to travel longer distances to work, increasing traffic impacts.

The analysis uses the “Needs Plan” from the 2030 Regional Long Range Transportation Plan. Instead, it should have used the “Cost Feasible Plan” to indicate impacts. In addition, service volumes used to evaluate traffic impacts may have been overestimated for several roadways and the reduction factor used to estimate traffic impacts within the City’s western annexation area may have been excessive for several roadway segments. As a result, traffic impacts may have been underestimated.

An analysis of the I-95/Becker Road interchange is not included in the study, so it could not be determined if the interchange can handle the additional traffic. During a meeting prior to the preparation of this report, representatives of the applicant indicated that impacts should not result in the need to expand the I-95 interchanges at Crosstown Parkway and Becker Road.

Because the magnitude of traffic impacts may have been underestimated, it is difficult to determine what improvements might be necessary by year 2030. Necessary improvements should be included in the Regional Long Range Transportation Plan and the City Comprehensive Plan. The following roadways may need additional laneage, right-of-way or surface improvements:

1. Becker Road from Range Line Road to I-95
2. I-95/Becker Road Interchange
3. Rangeline Road from Becker Road to Midway Road
4. Rangeline Road from Martin Highway to Becker Road
5. Glades Cut Off Road from the amendment site to Midway Road

Note: In a meeting with representatives of the land owners prior to the preparation of this report, the representatives indicated that traffic impacts had been re-evaluated and traffic volume projections had been increased.

Comments/Recommendations for Modification

FLUM Amendment P09-129

1. The City should carry out a planning study prior to the adoption of this amendment, consistent with SRPP Policy 1.1.2.3. While the City has indicated in the amendment materials that job growth and industrial development are consistent with the City policies and goals, a careful study and analysis regarding the optimal location for an intermodal freight campus/industrial park, and a complete analysis of the impacts of the proposed development on the City and adjoining jurisdictions has apparently not been done. Such a study, prepared by the City, should also include a fiscal impact analysis.

2. Beginning in 2003, the City of Port St. Lucie began a process that would lead to the annexation of thousands of acres west of I-95 and south of Midway Road. The City adopted a Western Annexation Area Planning Map (see Attachment F). Later, the Urban Land Institute was commissioned by the City to prepare a study of the area and make recommendations; and the City identified a roadway network to serve the entire area.

During the review of the comprehensive plan amendments for these new areas, Council requested that the City enter into a joint planning agreement with the County that would address such matters as future boundaries of the City, a buffer to mark the edge between the urban and rural uses, the possibility of utilizing transfer of development rights, the provision of infrastructure and services and other matters. A Joint Planning Agreement between the City and the County was executed in 2007. The Agreement includes a provision that commits the City to notify the County of proposed annexations.

Although the City did not adopt an annexation plan or a policy to limit annexations, a policy establishing a large buffer (250-1,000 feet) along Rangeline Road was adopted (see Attachment F). This buffer was to mark the end of urban development in the City and set it off from the agricultural uses in the unincorporated County. However, during 2006, the City elected to modify the policy to allow a much more narrow buffer in areas where native vegetation did not exist. The buffer zone could be totally waived in some cases. Council found the revised policy to alter the buffer zone to be inconsistent with the SRPP.

The City now proposes to extend its boundaries west of Rangeline Road and to change the Agricultural FLUM designation to allow the Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus project. In its memorandum of July 1, 2010, the County seeks participation in the development of an annexation boundary map and joint planning area. The City is strongly encouraged to initiate
the steps that will lead to further agreement on annexation, utility service areas, and other matters of mutual interest to the City and County.

3. There seems to be agreement among the agencies that have reviewed the traffic analysis (including the City’s traffic consultant) that methodologies utilized in the analysis resulted in an underestimation of transportation impacts. While the FDOT review of the proposed amendment should provide additional insight into the matter, it is recommended that the City require the traffic analysis to be modified so that the City can be completely informed of all potential impacts, both local and extrajurisdictional, prior to the execution of the annexation agreement and adoption of the comprehensive plan amendments.

4. Prior to the adoption of this amendment, the City should fully resolve the matter pertaining to jurisdiction regarding the provision of water and sewer services to the amendment site.

5. The City intends to execute an annexation agreement prior to finalizing the annexation of the land within FLUM amendment for P09-129. Council staff was provided with a draft of the annexation agreement prepared by the applicant for the amendment. The draft agreement indicates there will be a number of roadway capacity expansions and improvements that will be the responsibility of the landowners. However, there is no final annexation agreement.

6. The amendment materials do not make a convincing argument that this property is the best location for the proposed facility or that such a facility is economically feasible at this location. However, if the City determines that the proposed amendment should be approved, and in order to address important regional issues, Council recommends that the following conditions be included in the text amendment to accompany the FLUM amendment or in the annexation agreement:

   a. Require a detailed phased project development plan from the ILC developers to ensure consistency with SRPP Policy 3.5.1.1 which recommends improved multimodal transportation opportunities throughout the Region in order to provide better access to educational and workplace facilities.

   b. Require a detailed business plan with detailed financial projections, market analysis and marketing study from the ILC developers to ensure consistency with SRPP Policy 3.1.1.1, calling for efforts to attract investors to help broaden the economic base and strengthen the job market; Policy 3.6.1.3 which calls for the identification of locations for and encourages development of industry clusters that would benefit from being located near related industries in the Region; and Policy 3.6.2.4 which calls for encouraging a public/private partnership to build the necessary infrastructure that will support the expansion of clean industries, and will attract higher income industries to the area.

   c. Prepare a fiscal impact analysis of the development project to ensure consistency with SRPP Policy 3.4.2.4 which calls for local governments to provide concurrency assistance for infill, redevelopment and new economic development projects that meet preferred development form criteria.
d. Protect and maintain a minimum of 476 acres of native upland communities consisting of pine flatwoods in order to ensure consistency with SRPP Policy 6.7.1.2, which recommends protection of 25 percent of upland natural communities as a minimum baseline measure for consistency with the SRPP.

e. Prepare a Conservation Area Management Plan for the Conservation Areas, including upland buffers, wetlands, and mitigation areas in order to ensure consistency with SRPP Policy 6.7.1.10, which calls for the development and implementation of management plans for protected areas;

f. Preserve and enhance all good quality wetlands in order to ensure consistency with SRPP Policy 6.6.1.1, which calls for the protection of wetlands;

g. Provide wetland mitigation for all impacts to wetlands in order to ensure consistency with SRPP Policy 6.6.1.2, which calls for mitigation whenever any wetland or deepwater habitat is degraded or destroyed;

h. Provide a buffer zone of native upland edge vegetation around wetlands and deepwater habitats which are constructed or preserved on site in order to ensure consistency with SRPP Policy 6.6.1.3, which calls for upland buffers around wetlands and deepwater habitats;

i. Remove all nuisance and invasive exotic vegetation listed by the Florida Exotic Pest Plant Council from the project site in order to ensure consistency with SRPP Policy 6.7.1.4, which calls for the removal of nuisance and invasive exotic vegetation;

j. Perform a detailed survey of the property for endangered and potentially endangered species in order to ensure consistency with SRPP Policy 6.8.1.1, which calls for surveys to be complete by qualified ecologists prior to approval of land clearing activities;

k. Protect all endangered and potentially endangered species and all habitat of significant value to existing populations of endangered and threatened species in order to ensure consistency with SRPP Policy 6.8.1.2, which calls for the protection of listed species and their habitat;

l. Coordinate with the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on all measures to protect and avoid impacts to endangered and potentially endangered species in order to ensure consistency with SRPP Regional Goal 6.8, which calls for protection of endangered and potentially endangered species.

m. Design and construct a stormwater management system to retain the maximum volumes of water consistent with South Florida Water Management District
criteria for flood control in order to ensure consistency with SRPP Regional Goal 6.3, which calls for protection of water quality and quantity.

n. Coordinate with the South Florida Water Management District and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to maximize the use of the mining areas and other portions of the site for water storage and treatment that will benefit the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan in order to ensure consistency with Regional Goal 6.9, which calls for protection and sustainability of the Everglades Ecosystem.

o. Perform an archeological survey of the property and provide protection to any significant archaeological sites found in accordance with the recommendations from the Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources.

p. Require an analysis of impacts to the I-95 interchange at Crosstown Parkway, Becker Road and SR 714. If the analysis shows capacity expansions are necessary as a result of the proposed development on the site, require appropriate cost sharing for improvements.

q. Require the landowners to make necessary improvements to the following roadways in preparation to the impacts that are the result of the proposed development:

1. Becker Road.
2. Rangeline Road (in both Martin and St. Lucie Counties)
3. Glades Cut-Off Road
4. Crosstown Parkway

r. Require the landowner to pay for necessary interconnections from the property to the City and County roadway network (Rangeline Road and Glades Cut-Off Road) and for any additional connections outside the property that are necessitated solely as a result of the impacts from development of the property.

s. Require the internal roadway systems be designed and located to avoid fragmentation of native habitat consistent with Regional Strategy 7.1.1.

t. Require the final traffic impact analysis to include multijurisdictional impacts (to include Martin County) and improvements consistent with Regional Policy 7.1.2.9.

u. Require the landowner to plan for, site and construct a transit stop with ridership amenities including shelters, consistent with Regional Policy 7.1.4.2. The transit stop could be at the boundary of the property or within the property and its location and amenities should be jointly planned by the landowner, local government(s), St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization and transit service provider.
v. Require a cost estimate of the railway improvements or enhancements that would be necessary for connection to the FEC line (to the north) and CSX line to the south and an indication of the parties that will bear the costs for those rail infrastructure improvements.

Consistency with Strategic Regional Policy Plan

The contract agreement with the DCA requires the TCRPC to include a determination of consistency with the SRPP as part of the written report to be submitted to the DCA. The TCRPC finds the proposed amendments to be CONSISTENT with the SRPP. However, proposed FLUM amendment P09-129 and it’s associated text amendments would be considered to be INCONSISTENT with the SRPP unless the issues raised in the Comments/Recommendations for Modification section of this report are adequately addressed and the amendment is revised to incorporate the recommended conditions into the text of the adopted amendment or in the annexation agreement between the City and the landowner. Furthermore, Council recommends that a proposed freight distribution/industrial facility of this magnitude be subject to a regional review process which includes an analysis of the appropriate size, location and intensity of such uses.

Recommendation

The Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council should adopt the above comments and instruct staff to transmit the report to the Department of Community Affairs.
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Property Description and Location

The properties comprising approximately 7,139 acres in the application are located just north of the Martin County line, in the northeast quadrant of Township 37 South, Range 38 East, in unincorporated southwestern St. Lucie County, Florida. They are located in Sections 1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 33, 34, 35, 36, Township 37 South, Range 38 East, St. Lucie County Florida.

The site is bounded by Glades Cutoff Road (CR 709) on the west and north, by Range Line Road (CR 609) on the east, and by the St. Lucie/Martin County border and the C-23 Canal on the south. It is wholly contained within unincorporated St. Lucie County, and is immediately adjacent and contiguous to the western boundary of the City of Port St. Lucie.

The project properties are owned by four entities as follows:

Bayhill Holdings, LLC - 3,100.91 acres.
Kennedy Groves, Inc. - 1,943.46 acres
Southern Fruit Groves, LLLP - 1450.755 acres
Mabel Groves, LLLP - 644.002 acres
APPLICATION FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT

ADDENDUM

The original application requested Heavy Industrial future land use on the entire property. As transmitted, the proposed future land use in the Industrial Intermodal Area is:

Open Space Conservation – 620 acres
Utility – 1183 acres
Heavy Industrial – 5336 acres
Port of Palm Beach unties itself from proposed inland port

By JENNIFER SORENTRUE
Palm Beach Post Staff Writer

Updated: 7:13 p.m. Friday, May 28, 2010
Posted: 6:02 p.m. Friday, May 28, 2010

Palm Beach County port officials on Friday abandoned plans to build a large, ship-less cargo hub near Lake Okeechobee.

After pursuing the inland port project for more than four years, port commissioners voted unanimously to walk away from the project. "At this point it just didn't make a whole lot of sense," port Commission Chairman Blair Ciklin said. "...For now, it is going to lie dormant."

In December the commission decided to partner with Florida Crystals Corp. to build the transportation and warehousing complex on 318 acres next to the sugar giant's mill, south of the lake. The company was one of four applicants to submit plans for the project.

But the partnership was scuttled after the state's Department of Community Affairs and growth-management advocate 1000 Friends of Florida objected to the site. Environmentalists feared the location would interfere with Everglade restoration.

The port was considering a compromise site offered by Florida Crystals on 850 acres it owns near Belle Glade. The site has received support from environmental groups, including 1000 Friends.

But the port board on Friday decided that changes to the planned location meant it couldn't stick with a deal to partner with sugar giant Florida Crystals.

The board on Friday also wasn't willing to go with a competing industrial site near Port St. Lucie, which back in December finished second to Florida Crystals for the inland port project.

The Port St. Lucie backers have threatened legal action over getting snubbed.

"We are going to have to step back and look at our options," said Johnathan Ferguson, who represents the Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus near Port St. Lucie.

Both Florida Crystals and the Treasure Coast group have said they would press ahead with their development plans even without a deal with the Port of Palm Beach.

"When we first decided to get into this, the whole thing was the jobs," Ciklin said. "That is still going to happen."

County Commissioner Priscilla Taylor, who initially pushed the inland port idea during her days on the port board, said she was disappointed in Friday's setback and hoped that the Port of Palm Beach would eventually put the project back out to bid.

"I still feel that we need it in the western communities," Taylor said. "They need a stable industry that will provide jobs."

Sun Sentinel Staff Writer Andy Reid contributed to this story.

Where are the Glades jobs? Since port withdrew on inland site, state must step in.

By THE PALM BEACH POST

Posted: 7:18 p.m. Tuesday, June 8, 2010

The Port of Palm Beach's failure to deliver on its inland port concept means that the state must deliver on its promise of jobs for the Glades.

If the state doesn't act, the region could be doted with privately developed rail cargo hubs. The state's role would be to assure that one site linked by rail and highways to South Florida's major ports delivers thousands of jobs in the region that otherwise will suffer as U.S. Sugar cuts jobs after the sale of its land for Everglades restoration.

Port of Palm Beach commissioners gave up their fanciful project after the commission's chosen site, owned by sugar grower Florida Crystals, withdrew over environmental issues. Florida Crystals has vowed to build instead on a nearby site that wouldn't pose a risk to the environment.

But Florida Crystals is not alone in considering a private cargo hub. Landowners in western St. Lucie County, Hendry County and Glades County are in a race with Florida Crystals to line up national distributors and developers with the expertise to oversee the project. The result could be a hodgepodge of smaller cargo hubs and warehouse districts that fail to deliver the thousands of jobs envisioned with an inland port.

The state's contribution is to assure rail connections, which could free up eastern rail lines for passenger service and reduce highway traffic. The state also can make sure that jobs come to the region, either in western Palm Beach County where the cities struggle with 40 percent unemployment, or in Clewiston, the town U.S. Sugar built.

The state, not the Port of Palm Beach, is best positioned to assure the participation of all South Florida ports and to untangle transportation roadblocks. The need for jobs is urgent. What we need now is urgency from the state.

Find this article at:

The following is proposed for addition to the Port St. Lucie Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Element as a text amendment:

**Policy 1.1.4.22:** The Industrial Intermodal Area ("Area") is hereby established within the boundaries of the Future Land Use Map. The area generally includes property west of Rangeline Road, east of an agricultural canal and the high voltage power line easement, North of the Martin County line, and South of an existing rock mine access road and Glades Cutoff Road and contains a total of approximately 7140 acres.

**Policy 1.1.4.23:** The Industrial Intermodal Area ("Area") is intended to provide public benefits for the City of Port St. Lucie ("City") by establishing an area suited for the full range of industrial uses combined with and enhanced by intermodal capabilities. The intent of this Area is also to enhance, diversify, and sustain the employment base while promoting green development in the region through environmentally sustainable and energy efficient planning and design.

a. Development within the Area shall be consistent with the acreage and land uses delineated on the Future Land Use Map for Heavy Industrial, Utility, and Open Space Conservation categories. Within the Heavy Industrial category, all uses in the City's industrial land use categories are permitted and which are further described in Tables A.7 and A.8 below. Within the Utility land use category, limited use for recreational and open space activities is permitted.

b. Pursuant to Policy 1.1.4.11, the maximum intended uses, distribution and intensities at the buildout and 5-year periods are presented in Tables A.7 and A.8 below.
Table A.7- Distribution of Uses and Intensity Proposed (Overall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Maximum Square Footage</th>
<th>Maximum Acreage</th>
<th>Maximum Daily Vehicle Trips Allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermodal transfer facility and interchange hub, consisting of uses such as rail and switching yards, storage yards, secured warehousing, maintenance facilities, customs offices, administrative offices and security offices, and their supporting uses.</td>
<td>40 million</td>
<td>5100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light to heavy industrial land uses such as, but not limited to, warehousing, distribution, manufacturing and their supporting uses. Auxiliary and supporting uses, some of which may be similar to commercial uses, for the warehousing, distribution, manufacturing and trucking businesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional, conservation, recreation, utilities, rights-of-way, lakes, wetlands, and upland buffers. Twenty-five percent of total native upland habitat acreage shall be preserved on site.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40 million</strong></td>
<td><strong>7140</strong></td>
<td><strong>69,723</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum daily vehicular trips for combined uses</strong>^a,b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Total is exclusive of public utilities and public institutional uses.

^b Maximum daily trips were determined by the applicant's traffic analysis. The maximum amount of development allowed in the Industrial Intermodal Area equates to a maximum 69,723 external daily vehicular trip ends.
Table A. 8- Distribution of Uses and Intensity Proposed (5-Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Maximum Square Footage</th>
<th>Maximum Acreage</th>
<th>Maximum Daily Vehicle Trips Allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermodal transfer facility and interchange hub, consisting of uses such as rail and switching yards, storage yards, secured warehousing, maintenance facilities, customs offices, administrative offices and security offices, and their supporting uses.</td>
<td>0.12 million</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light to heavy industrial land uses such as, but not limited to, warehousing, distribution, manufacturing and their supporting uses. Auxiliary and supporting uses, some of which may be similar to commercial uses, for the warehousing, distribution, manufacturing and trucking businesses.</td>
<td>5.38 million</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional, conservation, recreation, utilities, rights-of-way, lakes, wetlands, and upland buffers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,541 a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>5.5 million a</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>Maximum daily vehicular trips for combined uses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Total is exclusive of public utilities and public institutional uses.

b Maximum daily trips were determined by the applicant’s traffic analysis. The maximum amount of development allowed in the Industrial Intermodal Area equates to a maximum 69,723 external daily vehicular trip ends.

c. Land uses within the Area shall also include the following, which shall be subject to a future land use map amendment:

1. Utility services including water and wastewater treatment and transmission facilities.
2. Regional stormwater attenuation facilities.
3. Institutional uses such as public safety, or other municipal, county or regional offices.
5. Conservation lands.

Additions to text are indicated by underline; deletions by strikeout.
d. Consistent with Policy 1.4.1.10, habitable structures shall not exceed 75 feet in height. Non-habitable structures that are an integral part of or necessary for the interchange hub operations may exceed 75 feet in height.

e. Permitted zoning categories within the Industrial Intermodal Area shall be Planned Unit Development (PUD). Each PUD shall be a minimum of 100 acres.

f. Conceptual master planning for the property shall proceed prior to or concurrent with the first PUD application filed with the City. The purpose of the conceptual master plan is to provide long-term guidance and direction for the property by showing the general location of features such as, but not limited to, roads and major ingress/egress points; utilities such as potable water, wastewater and reclaimed water infrastructure; stormwater facilities; institutional, conservation, or recreation sites; and other major facilities. The conceptual master plan shall demonstrate consistency with the City's Comprehensive Plan and the sub-area polices for the Area. A conceptual master plan shall be presented to the City's Planning & Zoning Board and the City Council for consideration and approval; provided however, that notwithstanding the foregoing, the conceptual master plan shall only be a generalized reference tool which is not regulatory but is a planning reference to provide long-range guidance for those lands considered for development approval. The conceptual master plan may be revised by the Developer as necessary to show approved and proposed development and the City and the Developer shall mutually agree on such process.

g. Each application for site plan approval shall include a development monitoring report which presents, at a minimum, the current status of conditions on the site resulting from the development of each prior site plan and data describing approved developable acres, acres developed, square footage built by type of building, traffic generation count, acres of preserved lands and wetlands, installation of utilities, and status of mining activities.

h. PUD zoning within the Area shall, to the extent feasible, achieve the following sustainability and environmental design goals:

1. Enhanced stormwater quality standards, reuse, and rain harvesting through the incorporation of applicable design techniques.

2. Incorporate design and development standards from programs such as the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design, Florida Green Building Council and other similar programs.

3. Utilize native vegetation and xeriscape techniques.

4. Consider the St. Lucie County Greenways and Trails Plan focusing on the C-23 canal corridor, or other regional habitat corridor planning.

5. Minimize vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions through incorporation of employee transit and demand management strategies.

Additions to text are indicated by underline; deletions by strikeout.
i. Consistent with Policy 1.1.4.3, active development of the Area shall be adequately buffered from the existing and adjoining residential development by means of:

1. A minimum 200 foot wide buffer area adjoining the residential properties existing at the time of policy adoption where no development is allowed except for security structures or facilities, if necessary and native vegetation shall be maintained to the extent it does not interfere with these uses.

   a. An additional minimum 100 foot wide buffer area adjoining the minimum 200 foot buffer area where no buildings are allowed except for security structures or facilities, if necessary. Utility and stormwater easements and attendant facilities, road rights of way and other access easements and other similar horizontal development may be placed within the 100 foot buffer area, and native vegetation shall be maintained to the extent it does not interfere with these uses.

2. A minimum 100 foot buffer from the Rangeline Road Right of Way adjacent to the New Community District (NCD), thereby providing a 250 foot buffer from the NCD in addition the to the NCD buffer provided in Policy 1.2.5.2.

i. If the Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus (inland port) does not move forward on this site by 2020, City staff shall bring forward to the City Council the following comprehensive plan amendments: a text amendment to create a new agricultural future land use classification and a map amendment to revert the area proposed for Heavy Industrial (HI) future land use to the proposed agricultural classification.
TO: Terry Hess, AICP, Deputy Director of the TCRPC

THROUGH: Mark Satterlee, AICP, PDS Director

FROM: Britton Wilson, Senior Long Range Planner
Planning Division

DATE: July 1, 2010

SUBJECT: Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus – Transmittal to DCA

This memo provides an outline of issues and comments that St. Lucie County has identified for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment initiated by the City of Port St. Lucie known as the Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus (TCIC). The traffic study provided by the applicant was also reviewed by County staff, Michael Brillhart, Business and Concurrency Manager, whose specific comments are also identified below.

Land Use:
As a general proposition, the County supports the creation of additional jobs in the community. The County does, however, have some concerns and comments on the proposal which are set out below. The demonstrated need for the proposed 5,336 acres of Industrial Heavy land use and 40 million square feet of industrial building space is questionable should this location not be chosen as the inland port. Moreover, an alternative demand to support the extensive buildout has not been identified. This issue has been addressed by the City of Port St. Lucie with the condition provided in draft Ordinance 10-39 subjecting commencement of the development to a deadline date of 2020. If the project has not moved forward by this time, the City Council will revert the land use classification back to agricultural. The County supports the reversion to agriculture stipulation in the ordinance for the future land use map amendment.

Annexation:
The proposed project is currently located in unincorporated St. Lucie County and is in the process of annexation. In the Letter of Understanding dated September 9, 2009 (enclosed) from the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) to the City of Port St. Lucie regarding the city’s Evaluation and Appraisal Report, DCA requested that the report evaluate and decide upon an annexation boundary map and joint planning areas. The city will soon be processing its EAR-based amendments and St. Lucie County would be interested in participating in the development of the annexation boundary map and joint planning areas.

Water/Sewer:
The proposed project has provided a service capacity letter for water and sewer from the City of Port St. Lucie Utility Systems Department. This project lies outside of the city’s utility service area and is
therefore proposing an amendment to the service area maps to include the industrial intermodal area. Currently the proposed project is located within the St. Lucie County Utility service boundary pursuant to Chapter 153, Part II, Florida Statutes, and an executed Standard Development Agreement will be required in order to determine infrastructure needs. An in-depth determination by the St. Lucie County Utilities Director has been mailed to the applicant's representative and a copy is enclosed.

Traffic:
The traffic study provided by the applicant was reviewed by County staff to ensure that adequate transportation facilities are in place to meet the level of service demands for the proposed 40 million square foot industrial complex and 600+ acre intermodal rail/container interchange hub. Staff has itemized twelve specific concerns that are listed in the attached memo.
September 9, 2009

Daniel Holbrook, AICP, Director
Planning and Zoning
City of Port St. Lucie
121 Southwest Port St. Lucie Boulevard
Port St. Lucie, Florida 34984-5099

Re: City of Port St. Lucie Evaluation and Appraisal Report
Letter of Understanding

Dear Mr. Holbrook:

The Department has reviewed your proposed Letter of Understanding dated June 9, 2009, outlining the major issues that will be the focus of the City’s Evaluation and Appraisal Report. We have also discussed the scope of work outlined in your letter with the state and regional agencies that will be reviewing the Evaluation and Appraisal Report when it is submitted. Based upon the comments received from these agencies, the Department is recommending that the scope of work be revised to address:

- the need for greater diversity of housing choices in all areas of the City, rather than just City-wide as stated in the third issue under Land Use and Development.

- rather than evaluate the “need to explore an annexation boundary map and joint planning areas”, the Evaluation and Appraisal Report should evaluate and decide upon an annexation boundary map and joint planning areas.

We hope that you will find these recommendations beneficial and that they will be incorporated into the City’s Evaluation and Appraisal Report scope of work. Please notify the Department, by return letter, of your acceptance of these additions. We very much appreciate the City’s cooperation and effort in working with the Department to ensure that the important issues identified in the City’s scope of work will be addressed in the Evaluation and Appraisal Report.
If you or your staff have any questions or if we can be of further assistance as the City proceeds with preparing its Evaluation and Appraisal Report, please contact Laura Regalado, Community Planner, at (850) 922-5315.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mike McDaniel, Chief
Office of Comprehensive Planning

cc: Wendy Evans, Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services
    Tracy Suber, Florida Department of Education
    Jim Quinn, Florida Department of Environmental Protection
    Susan Harp, Florida Department of State
    Mary Ann Poole, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
    Gerry O'Reilly, Florida Department of Transportation, District 4
    Jim Jackson, South Florida Water Management District
    Michael Busha, AICP, Executive Director, Treasure Coast Regional Planning
    Peter Jones, AICP, Planning Manager, St. Lucie County Growth Management
May 28, 2010

Jonathan A. Ferguson, Attorney
2366 S. Brock Smith Road
Ft. Pierce, FL 34945

RE: Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus

Dear Mr. Ferguson:

On August 12, 2009 St. Lucie County Utilities ("Utility") sent MSCW, Inc., an agent for the Land Owners, a letter of water and wastewater availability regarding property, previously known as Western Port St. Lucie Industrial Center. A portion of your clients properties, Kennedy Groves, Inc., Bay Hill Holdings, LLC, Southern Fruit Groves, LLLP, and Mabel Groves, LLLP ("Land Owners") were part of that proposed project. This follow-up letter is to confirm that your clients, the Land Owners of the planned Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus, understand that their property lies within the Utility's service area of the St. Lucie County Water and Sewer District, established pursuant to Chapter 153, Part II, Florida Statutes, and that an executed Standard Development Agreement will be required in order to determine infrastructure needs, any phasing requirements, and to reserve utility capacity to serve your client's property. As also noted, before utility service can be provided to the Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus property ("Property"), your client will need to obtain separate County Commission approval for the extension of utility services, as the Property is currently outside the County Urban Service Boundary.

It has come to our attention that a request has been made by yourself and MSCW, Inc., as agents for the Land Owners to the City of Port St. Lucie regarding the possibility of the City utility serving the Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus property. Per the Agreement of Transfer by and between St. Lucie County and the City of Port St. Lucie, dated June 28, 1994, in which the County transferred the former GDU utility system to the City ("GDU Transfer Agreement"), the City and the County agreed to utility service boundaries. The GDU Transfer Agreement, Exhibit "L" sets forth the limits of the City's utility service area as Range Line Road to the west and Midway Road to the north ("City Utility Boundary"). Accordingly, this Property is located within the Utility District utility service boundary and outside of the City's Utility Service Boundary.

In addition, the South Florida Water Management District excluded any future water supply for property outside the City's Utility Service Boundary from the City's Water Use
Permit, which would include this Property. In doing so, the District’s Office of Counsel determined:

Based on this review and a review of the applicable statutory provisions, it is clear that Saint Lucie County’s utility district has the legal right to serve the area in question and that the City of Port Saint Lucie does not have the legal right to serve the area. While the City may have recently indicated its desire to serve the area pursuant to Section 180.02(3), Florida Statutes, Saint Lucie County, as authorized in Chapter 153, Florida Statutes, established in June, 2004 a utility district to serve the area. When such a district is established by a county in an unincorporated area, Section 153.86, Florida Statutes, requires that the district consent to construction facilities to supply and distribute water in the area of the district’s jurisdiction by another entity. It has been represented to the SFWMD that the utility district has not so consented and the City has not advised that the District has consented. Consequently, at this time, the only entity that may provide facilities to supply and distribute water to this area is the county’s utility district.

Again, the Property is within St. Lucie County Utilities service area. Please call me at 772-462-1175 if you have any questions or require additional information.

Sincerely,

Laurie Waldie
Utility Director

cc: Faye W. Outlaw, MPA, County Administrator
Lee Ann Lowery, Assistant County Administrator
Dan McIntyre, County Attorney
Mark Satterlee, Planning & Development Services Director
Jesus Merejo, PSLU Director
James Anaston-Kavas, MSCW, Inc.
Preston Perrone, CFO, Kennedy Holdings, LLC
Richard Gonzalez, VP, Pinelock Management Corp.
Albo J. Antenucci, Jr., VP, Bayhill Holdings, LLC
At the request of staff from the City of Port St. Lucie, County staff has reviewed the draft Traffic Analysis for the Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus. One of the primary goals of this review is to ensure that adequate transportation facilities are in place to meet the level of service demands for this proposed 40 million square foot industrial complex and +600 acre intermodal rail/container interchange hub. This review considers the comments presented by Keith & Schnars, P.A. as well.

County staff offers the following:

1. Analysis should consider the "Needs Based" roadway network of the adopted St. Lucie TPO Year 2030 Regional Long Range Transportation Plan (RLRTP) as a means for determining adequate capacity and level of service on all regulated public roadways. The Cost Feasible Plan is primarily indicative of funding versus adequate capacity.

2. Staff is recommending that trip generation be based upon square footage as compared to number of employees as the number of employees can change either positive or negative during the build-out phase.

3. The applicant needs to identify the build-out year for this project as opposed to analyzing traffic on a short range (5 year) and long range (30 year) horizon. If the 30 year horizon represents the build-out, then the applicant should specify.

4. For concurrency purposes, staff recommends using "highest peak hour analysis" as opposed to using daily traffic conversion factors.

5. As noted by Keith & Schnars, staff is not recommending the use of double-counting adjustment factors in relationship to the adjacent Southwest Port St. Lucie Annexation Area.

6. The maximum service volume calculations for the Crosstown Parkway should be reduced with consideration for at-grade intersections with a service volume allowance for protected right-turn lanes.

7. County staff is recommending that more detailed analysis for the impacts upon Glades-Cutoff and Range-Line Roads be provided including the addition of background and committed trips together with an acceptable annual traffic growth factor. Depending upon the development
phasing schedule, 4 lane improvements to both facilities may be needed prior to Year 2020 as shown on the applicant provided Roadway Improvement Schedule.

8. The consultant needs to confirm as to whether the trip generation for the intermodal rail yard/container interchange is included as part of this analysis. If not, then this analysis must be included with the methodology deemed acceptable to the City and County.

9. Staff is asking the consultant to reconsider using a 75% internal capture for rail yard truck trips in consideration of the adjacent land uses within a 4-5 mile radius of influence.

10. As noted by Keith & Schnars, there appears to be an undetermined disparity between “employees per square footage” criteria between the Winter Haven site and this proposed site. This disparity needs to be resolved.

11. Adequate design safety consideration must be provided specific to the connection of the FEC and CSX rail lines together with grade crossing design at the junction of Range-Line at Glades-Cutoff Roads.

12. This traffic impact analysis shows Improvements to Midway Road at the Florida Turnpike by 2030. Initial analysis by the County discusses the need to improve this interchange in conjunction with construction improvements to Midway Road in this vicinity over the next five to 10 year horizon.
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The following is provided in response to the Draft Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council’s Staff Report on behalf of the comprehensive plan amendment applicants for the Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus project. First and foremost, the proposed amendment offers a unique and important opportunity to fill the well-established need for sustainable economic development and economic diversification in the Treasure Coast which is consistent with the Region’s vision.

More specifically, please consider the following discussion, corrections, or comments regarding the various portions of the staff report, organized sequentially with the report.

- (page 3) **Intended Use Broader than “Cargo Hub.”** - The owners’ intention is to proceed with the development of an Intermodal Transfer Facility’, also known as “Integrated Logistics Center” which are the industry terms more expansive than the staff report which states “cargo hub.” Such centers would accommodate activities ranging from cargo transfer to industrial activities including assembly and manufacturing. These uses are further defined in the land uses provided in Attachment D of the report known as Sub Area Policies- Intermodal Industrial Area.

- (pages 3-4, and 7) **Traffic Analysis Appropriate with Impact Caps** – Discussions with the City and their consultant have focused on the unique nature of such an intermodal facility and the favorable impact of rail to replace some road (truck) traffic. The applicant disagrees that traffic conditions are “too low”. Rather, the amendment establishes thresholds or “caps” which, if exceeded, will subject the area to new traffic mitigation requirements consistent with good planning. A revised traffic analysis report from the City’s consultant is expected to reflect this point, and address County concerns raised in Attachment E. The traffic analysis is the result of several iterations involving the applicant, city, and the city’s consultant with input from the FDOT; methodology and assumptions were reconciled in this process.

Traffic impacts discussed with adjacent local governments and neighboring property owners can be appropriately addressed through mitigation on the existing and future network of area roads and rail. Indeed this likely contributed to the designation of the area
as a “Future Freight Activity Center” in the Region’s Destination 2030 Plan when it was
adopted by the Joint St. Lucie and Martin County Metropolitan Planning Organization.

- (pages 7-12) Location, Size and Market Economics Justify the Amendment – While the
impetus for the project has been discussed mainly in connection with the Port of Palm
Beach’s (PPB) leadership in selecting a site and establishing a public-private partnership
with a land owner, the inland logistics center concept is largely market driven. PPB’s action
to cancel its sponsorship of a public- private partnership does not diminish the viability of
the project. In fact the subject property which is just 11 miles from Lake Okeechobee better
serves the South and Central Florida markets than the sites proposed in Palm Beach County
through available roads and rail. In a 120-mile radius it is situated to reach about 2 million
consumers more (or 18 percent) than the sites considered south of Lake Okeechobee, and the
largest population of distribution centers (who would be users of the TCIC). This
conclusion, an important analysis contained in the owners’ business plan, is an important
attribute as the owners attract other potential partners in the project (public or private).

The size of the project is called into question by the staff report, though economic studies
provided concluded that the future need for such facilities serving South Florida far exceeds
the 40 million square feet target anticipated for the subject site; while documented forecasts
for statewide retail distribution centers are even higher (between 90 and 250 million square
feet by the year 2025). For Florida to be able to capitalize on the anticipated new cargo
otherwise passing its shores, forecasts show a huge market demand envisioning numerous
such distribution and intermodal logistics centers including the Winter Haven project
referred in the staff report. While the staff report implies there is adequate inventory of
industrial lands in the region, the referenced properties are smaller and fragmented; do not
have rail access; and for the most part, they do not have the potential to become major
employment centers. The subject amendment promises new jobs by introducing a new
niche to help diversify the entire regional economy.

Conversely, should the market demand be robust the City has a tool contained in the
amendment to reasonably control the rate of growth for this proposed land use through the
Sub Area Policies in Attachment D. Specifically, the first 5-year phase is capped at 5.5
million square feet or 9541 daily vehicular trips, and the total project at buildout is capped
at 40 million square feet or 69,723 daily vehicular trips. The staff report fails to mention
the trip caps in addition to the square footage thresholds, meaning that the comprehensive
plan provision must be revisited once either of the thresholds is met.

- (p. 13 ) Transportation Assumptions and Information is Appropriate- The business plan
anticipates 5.5 million square feet of development in the first 5-year phase (which was a
criterion of the Port of Palm Beach’s project request), and 1.5 million square feet per year
absorption thereafter (making it a 30 year project). Hence the statement on page 14 that all
transportation improvements must be in place by 2030 is overly aggressive and speculative.
Future market demand will surely govern the pace of future development past the 5-year
first phase, so transportation improvements are expected to lag the 2030 date (more than
likely extending through 2040). Accordingly these thresholds are defined more by
development triggers than dates certain. A typo on page 13 should be corrected to show the
total acreage at 7,139 (not 7,189).

Whereas St. Lucie County and the TPO commented that the amendment should be based on
"the needs Plan" not the "cost feasible" plan, it is the applicant’s understanding from the
City’s consultant and from the TCRPC that the "cost feasible plan" was preferred for the
purposes of this analysis.
• (p. 13) Environmental Features Adequately Addressed for Comprehensive Plan Amendment - Protection of endangered species, and preservation of native habitat must comply with the City's comprehensive plan and development code policies calling for protection of 25 percent of native habitat. The designation of OSC lands in this amendment is estimated to comply with this threshold, while designation of additional lands would be accomplished following master and site planning required in the amendment. Additionally, species and habitat issues would be addressed during the environmental resource permit and other Federal, State and local permitting phases of project approvals, which is consistent with other projects of this size and scale.

• (p. 15-17) Comments/Modifications
  
  o The Business Plan requested is not a requirement of a comprehensive plan amendment application; however the project owners have composed such a plan to satisfy the Request for Proposals from the Port of Palm Beach (the required seven year financial feasibility study was based on market research, conceptual costs, and other third party research that was used to compile extensive financial analysis and feasibility studies covering the life of the project). In addition, portions of the Plan are referenced above in response to several section of the staff report. A copy of the Business Plan is available upon request or through the project’s website tcinlandport.com.

  o The applicant disagrees that the traffic analyses, which includes several iterations while working with the City and its consultant, underestimates impacts. As discussed and thoroughly documented in the analysis provided, the analysis and methodology are based on similar projects and land uses unique to inland logistics centers.

  o Water and sewer services may be provided by the City or the County, according to communications with both entities. The applicant is not in a position to resolve jurisdictional discussions between the City and the County.

  o A majority of the items raised in No. 6 are normally addressed at the permitting, master planning, and/or site planning stages of the development approval process. That is the appropriate timing to be able to determine the level of detail required versus the comprehensive plan amendment process.

  o The applicant expects to continue working with the City toward a final annexation agreement to resolve more specific commitments which will accommodate the desired land use.
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Source: Joint Martin and St. Lucie County MPO Regional Long Range Transportation Plan, “Destination 2030.”