TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
AGENDA
January 20, 2012 – 9:30 a.m.
Wolf High Technology Center
Indian River State College - Chastain Campus
2400 SE Salerno Road
Stuart, FL 34997

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Roll Call
3. Public Comment On Consent Agenda Items
4. Agenda
5. Consent Agenda
   C. Minutes – December 9, 2011
   D. Town of Orchid Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-1ER
   E. Village of Palm Springs Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-1ESR
   F. City of Port St. Lucie Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-1ESR
   G. Village of Tequesta Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-1ESR
6. Committee Appointments - 2012
8. Resolution Opposing Legislation Regarding Changes to South Florida Regional Transportation Authority
9. Resolution Encouraging Interagency Cooperation between South Florida Regional Transportation Authority and Florida Department of Transportation for Passenger Rail Service
10. South Florida East Coast Corridor Study Preferred Local Alternative - Presentation by the Florida Department of Transportation
12. Council Orientation Series -- Parking: How to Handle the Necessary Nemesis
13. Announcements
14. Council Member Information Exchange
15. Staff Comment
16. Chairman’s Comment
17. Adjournment

Agenda items are available on our website at http://www.tcrpc.org
Phone: (772) 221-4060 • Fax: (772) 221-4067 • E-mail: admin@tcrpc.org

Special Needs: Participants with special needs can be accommodated by calling the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council at least 2 working days prior to the Meeting. We can be reached by phone at (772)221-4060, by fax at (772)221-4067, or by email at admin@tcrpc.org.
TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES

INDIAN RIVER COUNTY
COMMISSIONER PETER O’BRYAN
Alternate – Commissioner Gary Wheeler
COMMISSIONER BOB SOLARI
Alternate – Commissioner Joseph Flescher
MAYOR THOMAS CADDEN, Town of Indian River Shores
Alternate – Vice Mayor Bud Oatway, Town of Orchid
VICE MAYOR CRAIG FLETCHER, City of Vero Beach
Alternate – Mayor Jim Hill, City of Sebastian

ST. LUCIE COUNTY
COMMISSIONER CHRIS CRAFT
Alternate – Commissioner Frannie Hutchinson
COMMISSIONER TOD MOWERY
Alternate – Commissioner Chris Dzadovsky
MAYOR JOANN FAEILLA, City of Port St. Lucie
Alternate – Councilwoman Shannon Martin, City of Port St. Lucie
COMMISSIONER THOMAS PERONA, City of Fort Pierce
Alternate – Commissioner Reginald Sessions, City of Fort Pierce

MARTIN COUNTY
COMMISSIONER DOUG SMITH
Alternate – Commissioner Ed Fielding
COMMISSIONER PATRICK HAYES
Alternate – Commissioner Sarah Heard
COMMISSIONER JEFFREY KRAUSKOPF, City of Stuart
Alternate – Commissioner Paul Luger, Town of Sewall’s Point

PALM BEACH COUNTY
COMMISSIONER KAREN MARCUS
Alternate – Commissioner Jess Santamaria
COMMISSIONER FRISCILLA TAYLOR
Alternate – Shelley Vana
COMMISSIONER PAULETTE BURDICK
Alternate – Commissioner Steven L. Abrams
COUNCILWOMAN MARTHA WEBSTER, Village of Royal Palm Beach
Alternate – Mayor Pro Tem Joni Brinkman, Village of Palm Springs
MAYOR SAMUEL FERRERI, City of Greenacres
Alternate – Vice Mayor David Norris, Village of North Palm Beach
MAYOR KAREN GOLONKA, Town of Jupiter
Alternate – Mayor James DuBois, Town of Lake Park
MAYOR PRO TEM DR. CARMINE PRIORE, Village of Wellington
Alternate – Commissioner Kimberly Mitchell, City of West Palm Beach
COUNCILMAN SHELBY LOWE, City of Riviera Beach
Alternate – Vice Mayor Pro Tem Ellen Andel, Town of Juno Beach

GUBERNATORIAL APPOINTEES
SUSAN HERSHEY, Martin County
KEVIN J. FOLEY, Martin County
MICHAEL DAVIS, Palm Beach County
BILL HALL, Palm Beach County
PETER SACHS, Palm Beach County
Vacant, Palm Beach County
ROBERT STORK, Indian River County
REECE PARRISH, St. Lucie County
RAMON TRIAS, St. Lucie County

EX-OFFICIOS
ANN BENEDETTI, SJRWMD
PAM MAC’KIE, SFWMD
MARY MURPHY, FDEP, Alternate
LOIS BUSH, FDOT, Alternate
LYNDA KOMPELIEN WESTIN, SRTA
Vacant, Enterprise Florida, Inc.
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: January 20, 2012 Council Meeting

Attached are the following financial statements for October 31, 2011:

- Balance Sheet
- Revenue Report
- Budget Report

Recommendation

Council should review and accept this report and direct that it be filed.

Attachments
TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

BALANCE SHEET

October 31, 2011

Current Assets:
- Cash Bank - Checking $1,405,302
- Fixed Asset Replacement Budget (FARB) 20,500
- State Board of Administration - Investment Fund 5,749
- Petty Cash 200
- Postage Meter Funds 800
- Due From Other Governmental Units 377,160
- Due From TCEF 25,000
- Deposits as Security 1,394

$1,836,105

Fixed Assets:
- Office Furniture & Fixtures $154,397
- Autos 53,534
- Building 1,826,210
- Land 500,000

$2,534,141

Less: Depreciation $348,949

$2,185,192

TOTAL ASSETS

$4,021,298

Liabilities:
- Loan Payable $67,632
- Accounts Payable 6,903
- Benefits Payable 65,236
- Unearned Revenues 34,183

Long Term Liabilities:
- Loan Payable 1,643,770

$1,817,724

Fund Balances:
- General Reserves $1,049,481
- Legal Reserves 50,000
- Revolving Loan Reserves 0
- General Funds -1,081,099
- Fixed Assets 2,185,192

$2,203,574

TOTAL LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES

$4,021,298
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Revenue Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA - SARA - Title III for 2011-2012</td>
<td>30,682</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA - SARA - Title III for 2012-2013</td>
<td>10,227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLC Hazards Analysis 2010-2011</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Radiological Training/FOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDOT Land Use/Transportation Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL TOD Guidebook</td>
<td>99,941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>145,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMEP - Training</td>
<td>36,238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMEP Planning</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA-Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA-ARRA-Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA - Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA Public Market - Riviera Beach</td>
<td>20,204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Vulnerability Analysis</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Disaster Re-Development Plan</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Communities Initiative</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>762,942</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So. FL Reg. Transportation Authority</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLC - TPO Public Involvement Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of WPB TOD Connector Charrette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter TOD Public Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riviera Beach Master Plan Implementat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB-MPO Planning</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD King Power Plant Site</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glades Utility Authority</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riviera Beach CRA Public Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>243,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Dues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach County</td>
<td>553,834</td>
<td>553,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin County</td>
<td>61,337</td>
<td>61,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie County</td>
<td>111,505</td>
<td>111,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River County</td>
<td>58,163</td>
<td>58,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>784,839</td>
<td>784,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRI Fees</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>8,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Other Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>98,000</td>
<td>8,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,034,631</td>
<td>793,717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

#### BUDGET REPORT

For the One Month period ending October 31, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Operational Budget</th>
<th>Percentage Used</th>
<th>Year To Date</th>
<th>Current This Period</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>944,166</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55,521</td>
<td>55,521</td>
<td>888,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>372,479</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33,046</td>
<td>33,046</td>
<td>339,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Expenses</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>6,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3,641</td>
<td>3,641</td>
<td>18,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance-Brownfields</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>20,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies &amp; Expenses</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,892</td>
<td>1,892</td>
<td>44,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,355</td>
<td>3,355</td>
<td>33,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone &amp; Fax</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>17,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>8,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5,144</td>
<td>5,144</td>
<td>50,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues &amp; Memberships</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>23,777</td>
<td>23,777</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>5,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training - HMEP</td>
<td>20,400</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>18,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library &amp; Publications</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Advertising</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Fees</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4,007</td>
<td>4,007</td>
<td>27,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Fees</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>11,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note Principal</td>
<td>73,761</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6,129</td>
<td>6,129</td>
<td>67,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note Interest</td>
<td>66,318</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5,544</td>
<td>5,544</td>
<td>60,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>1,794,124</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>147,209</td>
<td>147,209</td>
<td>1,646,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>225,507</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14,116</td>
<td>14,116</td>
<td>211,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants - Pass Through</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>2,019,631</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>161,325</td>
<td>161,325</td>
<td>1,858,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay - Building</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>2,034,631</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>161,325</td>
<td>161,325</td>
<td>1,873,306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: January 20, 2012 Council Meeting

Attached are the following financial statements for November 30, 2011:

- Balance Sheet
- Revenue Report
- Budget Report

Recommendation

Council should review and accept this report and direct that it be filed.

Attachments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Bank - Checking</td>
<td>$1,390,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Asset Replacement Budget (FARB)</td>
<td>20,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board of Administration - Investment Fund</td>
<td>5,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage Meter Funds</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due From Other Governmental Units</td>
<td>283,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due From TCEF</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits as Security</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Assets</strong></td>
<td>$1,726,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed Assets</strong></td>
<td>$2,534,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Furniture &amp; Fixtures</td>
<td>$154,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autos</td>
<td>53,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1,826,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Depreciation</td>
<td>$358,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>$3,902,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Payable</td>
<td>$61,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>23,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits Payable</td>
<td>69,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unearned Revenues</td>
<td>71,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Payable</td>
<td>1,643,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities and Fund Balances</strong></td>
<td>$3,902,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Reserves</td>
<td>$1,049,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Reserves</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolving Loan Reserves</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Funds</td>
<td>-1,242,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Assets</td>
<td>2,175,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities and Fund Balances</strong></td>
<td>$3,902,159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

REVENUE REPORT

For the Two Month period ending November 30, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCA - SARA - Title III for 2011-2012</td>
<td>30,682</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA - SARA - Title III for 2012-2013</td>
<td>10,227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLC Hazards Analysis 2010-2011</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Radiological Training/FOG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDOT Land Use/Transportation Planning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL TOD Guidebook</td>
<td>99,941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>145,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMEP - Training</td>
<td>36,238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMEP Planning</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA-Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA-ARRA-Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>9,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA - Assessment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA Public Market - Riviera Beach</td>
<td>20,204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Vulnerability Analysis</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Disaster Re-Development Plan</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Communities Initiative</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Economic Develop. Admin. - Planning 2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>762,942</td>
<td>9,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So. FL Reg. Transportation Authority</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLC - TPO Public Involvement Plan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of WPB TOD Connector Charrette</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter TOD Public Outreach</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riviera Beach Master Plan Implementation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB-MPO Planning</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD King Power Plant Site</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glades Utility Authority</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riviera Beach CRA Public Market</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>243,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Dues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach County</td>
<td>553,834</td>
<td>553,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin County</td>
<td>61,337</td>
<td>61,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie County</td>
<td>111,505</td>
<td>111,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River County</td>
<td>58,163</td>
<td>58,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>784,839</td>
<td>784,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRI Fees</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>11,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Other Revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>98,000</td>
<td>11,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,034,631</td>
<td>815,783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

BUDGET REPORT

For the Two Month period ending November 30, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational Budget</th>
<th>Percentage Used</th>
<th>Year To Date</th>
<th>Current This Period</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>944,166</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>132,039</td>
<td>76,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>372,479</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59,258</td>
<td>26,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Expenses</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6,177</td>
<td>2,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance-Brownfields</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies &amp; Expenses</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6,289</td>
<td>4,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6,640</td>
<td>3,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,735</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone &amp; Fax</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12,540</td>
<td>7,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>23,777</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues &amp; Memberships</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training - HMEP</td>
<td>20,400</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library &amp; Publications</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Advertising</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7,371</td>
<td>3,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Fees</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Fees</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12,093</td>
<td>5,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note Principal</td>
<td>73,761</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11,254</td>
<td>5,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note Interest</td>
<td>66,318</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>284,854</td>
<td>137,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>1,794,124</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>284,854</td>
<td>137,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>225,507</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65,935</td>
<td>51,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants - Pass Through</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>2,019,631</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>350,789</td>
<td>189,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay - Building</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>2,034,631</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>350,789</td>
<td>189,464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: January 20, 2012 Council Meeting
Subject: Minutes – December 9, 2011

Introduction

The Minutes of the December 9, 2011 Council meeting were posted to Council’s website on January 13, 2012 at http://www.tcrpc.org.

Recommendation

Council should approve the Minutes of the December 9, 2011 Council meeting.
Chairman Trias called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. and welcomed everyone to the meeting. He led the pledge of allegiance and requested roll call.

The following members and alternates were present:

Indian River County: Commissioner O’Bryan
Commissioner Solari
Vice Mayor Fletcher (Alternate)

St. Lucie County: Commissioner Hutchinson (Alternate)
Mayor Faiella

Martin County: Commissioner Hayes
Commissioner Scott
Commissioner Luger (Alternate)

Palm Beach County: Commissioner Burdick
Mayor Ferreri
Mayor Golonka
Councilman Lowe
Mayor Pro Tem Brinkman (Alternate)
Vice Mayor Norris (Alternate)
Vice Mayor Pro Tem Andel (Alternate)
Mayor DuBois (Alternate)

Gubernatorial Appointees: Michael Davis
Kevin Foley
Bill Hall
Susan Hershey
Reece Parrish
Ramon Trias

Ex-Officios: Pam Mac’Kie, South Florida Water Management District
Ann Benedetti, St. Johns River Water Management District

Council Staff: Kate Boer
Michael Busha
Kim DeLaney
Eloine del Valle
Sandy Gippert
Liz Gulick
Stephanie Heidt
Dana Little
Peter Merritt
Greg Vaday
The Executive Director announced a quorum was present.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

None.

AGENDA

Chairman Trias requested the Agenda be reordered to move Agenda Item 10, South Florida Regional Transportation Authority Status Update before Agenda Item 9, Council Orientation Series -- Parking: How to Handle the Necessary Nemesis. Commissioner O’Bryan moved approval of the reordered Agenda. Mayor Ferreri seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Ferreri moved approval of the Consent Agenda. Councilmember Hershey seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Items on the Consent Agenda were: 5A, Audit Report - Fiscal Year 2010-2011; 5B, Financial Report – September 30, 2011; 5C, Minutes – October 21, 2011; 5D, Sections 120.74 and 120.745, Florida Statutes - Enhanced Biennial Rule Review; 5E, Interagency Subrecipient Award Agreement with Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council - Statewide Energy Resiliency Strategy; 5F, Resolution Recognizing Service of Lola Smith as Area Director, Atlanta Region, U.S. Economic Development Administration; 5G, Resolution Recognizing Designation of Hazardous Materials Awareness Week; 5H, Indian River County Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 11-2ESR; 5I, City of Port St. Lucie Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 11-2ESR; 5J, City of Stuart Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 11-1ESR; 5K, City of West Palm Beach Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 11-1ESR; and 5L, Intergovernmental Coordination and Review Log.

COUNCIL REORGANIZATION - MEMBERSHIP APPOINTMENTS AND ELECTION OF OFFICERS

In accordance with the rules and regulations of Council, Staff read the following names of the new Councilmembers for 2012 into the record and asked that the Chairman certify that they have been duly appointed.

PALM BEACH COUNTY

Regular Members:  
Commissioner Karen Marcus  
Commissioner Paulette Burdick  
Commissioner Priscilla A. Taylor
Regular Member
Alternates: Commissioner Jess R. Santamaria
Commissioner Steven L. Abrams
Commissioner Shelley Vana

Municipal Members: Councilwoman Martha Webster (Village of Royal Palm Beach)
Mayor Sam Ferreri (City of Greenacres)
Mayor Karen Golonka (Town of Jupiter)
Mayor Pro Tem Dr. Carmine Priore (Village of Wellington)
Councilmember Shelby Lowe (City of Riviera Beach)

Municipal Alternates: Mayor Pro Tem Joni Brinkman (Village of Palm Springs)
Vice Mayor David Norris (Village of North Palm Beach)
Mayor James DuBois (Town of Lake Park)
Commissioner Kimberly Mitchell (City of West Palm Beach)
Vice Mayor Pro Tem Ellen Andel (Town of Juno Beach)

**INDIAN RIVER COUNTY**

Regular Members: Commissioner Peter O’Bryan
Commissioner Bob Solari

Regular Member
Alternates: Commissioner Gary Wheeler
Commissioner Joseph Flescher

Municipal Members: Mayor Thomas Cadden (Town of Indian River Shores)
Councilmember Craig Fletcher (City of Vero Beach)

Municipal Alternates: Vice Mayor Bud Oatway (Town of Orchid)
Mayor Jim Hill (City of Sebastian)

**MARTIN COUNTY**

Regular Members: Commissioner Doug Smith
Commissioner Patrick Hayes

Regular Member
Alternates: Commissioner Ed Fielding
Commissioner Sarah Heard

Municipal Member: Not yet appointed (City of Stuart)

Municipal Alternate: Commissioner Paul Luger (Town of Sewall’s Point)

**ST. LUCIE COUNTY**

Regular Members: Commissioner Chris Craft
Commissioner Tod Mowery
Regular Member
Alternates: Commissioner Frannie Hutchinson
Commissioner Christopher Dzadovsky

Municipal Members: Mayor JoAnn Faiella (City of Port St. Lucie)
Commissioner Thomas Perona (City of Fort Pierce)

Municipal Alternates: Councilwoman Shannon Martin (City of Port St. Lucie)
Commissioner Reginald Sessions (City of Fort Pierce)

GUBERNATORIAL APPOINTEES: Susan Hershey, Martin County
Kevin J. Foley, Martin County
Michael Davis, Palm Beach County
Bill Hall, Palm Beach County
Peter Sachs, Palm Beach County
Vacant, Palm Beach County
Robert Stork, Indian River County
Reece Parrish, St. Lucie County
Ramon Trias, St. Lucie County

Chairman Trias certified that, as chairman of the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council, the membership as read have all been duly appointed.

Mayor Ferreri stated the Nominating Committee met before the meeting and Committee’s recommendations for the 2012 Officers are: Councilmember Foley as Chairman, Commissioner Peter O’Bryan as Vice Chairman, and Councilwoman Martha Webster as Secretary/Treasurer.

Mayor Ferreri moved adoption of the recommendations of the Nominating Committee for the 2012 Council Officers. Commissioner Burdick seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

**Motion**

**BUDGET/PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - ANNUAL REVIEW OF COUNCIL’S EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

Mayor Ferreri stated the Committee met and agreed there will be no budget changes in the area of personnel pay or benefits, including the Executive Director, due to the uncertainty of the economy and our existing budget. He added the Executive Director will be bringing an amended budget to Council in March reflecting some increases in revenue due to some additional contracts. He noted that only five of 27 Council members completed and returned the Executive Director evaluations. He stated there were some low scores given on one evaluation, but no comments as to why or what needed improvement. He said without comments it is difficult for the Executive Director to know what improvements or changes Council may want him to address. He stated that the Committee would like to encourage the new Chairman to allow time at the January meeting for Councilmembers to receive and complete the evaluation forms. All Committee members agreed that the Executive Director’s job performance has been satisfactory and he is doing an excellent job, especially with the changes in the economy and the loss of state funding.

Mayor Ferreri then asked the Executive Director to give an update on a glitch bill being proposed by Senator Bennett that deals with growth management issues. Mr. Michael Busha stated the most
troubling passage in the bill is related to the state’s abdication of funding for statutory duties of regional planning councils. The proposed bill states that before any of the eleven regional planning councils can accept grants or contracts with local, federal or state governments, the council has to certify that it has enough money in its budget. He stated this effectively shifts the burden directly to the counties and cities to fund regional planning council statutory responsibilities. He stated the Florida Regional Councils Association is following this issue and he will provide updates when available. He encouraged Councilmembers to contact their legislators on the proposed bill. Councilmember Foley asked Mr. Busha to forward information and verbiage that can be included in any correspondence with legislators.

Mayor Ferreri stated the recommendation of the Committee is to make no changes to the budget in terms of salary and benefits for the executive director.

Councilmember Foley moved adoption of the recommendation of the Budget/Personnel Committee. Commissioner O’Bryan seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

SOUTHERN GROVE DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT SUBSTANTIAL DEVIATION

Staff presented an overview of the Southern Grove Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Substantial Deviation. The most significant changes in the proposed substantial deviation are related to increasing the non-residential uses 111 percent, by adding 6,951,039 SF to the currently approved 6,236,704 SF of non-residential uses. The proposal is to provide large-scale employment and retail opportunities in southwestern Port St. Lucie. The main change proposed on the Master Development Plan is to increase the area of Mixed Use development in the southwestern portion of the project site. Staff noted that the proposed changes to the Southern Grove DRI will place additional demands on the regional transportation system. Staff stated that the draft assessment report provides a series of recommendations to the City for mitigating impacts on the regional roadway network and to ensure an adequate roadway network will be in place when needed to meet demand and the City’s local concurrency requirements. Additionally, the assessment report contains a series of advisory recommendations for the City of Port St. Lucie based on the goals, strategies, and policies of the Strategic Regional Policy Plan.

Representing the owner and developer of the property, Mr. Wes McCurry, of Fishkind & Associates, explained that the application is part of a larger vision for the property and the owner has been working cooperatively with the City of Port St. Lucie for several years. He stated he believes this property represents an opportunity like no other in the state for creation of a large scale employment corridor. He noted that while this substantial deviation proposes a significant increase in non-residential uses, there are no residential increases being requested. He said that as a result of previous agreements between the City and the developers of this and surrounding properties, all of the right-of-way within the Western Annexation Area roadway network has been conveyed to the City and roughly $150 million of infrastructure has been put into the ground and is supported by a special assessment district levied against this property. He thanked Council staff for their hard work and said they are looking forward to addressing the comments and working through the issues to adopt a final development order.

Commissioner Scott asked the name of the developer. Mr. McCurry stated the developer and owner of the property is PSL Acquisitions.
Commissioner Hayes asked what the volume of discharge will be into the C-23 Canal that would ultimately affect Martin County and its estuaries. Staff stated they could not address the exact volume, but noted that the water management district had reviewed the substantial deviation and made no changes to the conditions of approval related to water.

Mr. Daniel Holbrook, Planning and Zoning Director for the City of Port St. Lucie, thanked Council and Council staff for their review. He asked Council to transmit the staff report to the City so negotiations can continue with the developer and the recommendations can be taken to the City Planning and Zoning Board and City Council.

Mayor Ferreri stated he is supportive of the concept of the employment center and the increase in square footage for the research, development and warehouse makes sense. However, he questioned the huge increase in retail and how much that is contributing to the traffic impacts. He stated that when you start proposing eight lanes of roads, especially east of I-95 where development has already occurred, the quality of life and the quality of the developed parcels diminishes. He also asked how the proposed changes will affect the educational component. Staff stated that with respect to schools, two sites have been dedicated on the property, per the existing agreement with the school board. Staff indicated several unsuccessful attempts were made to receive feedback from the school board on this application, so the assumption is they are satisfied. Staff could not quantify how much of the traffic impacts are related to the retail, but this proposal is attempting to capture a significant number of trips from the residential areas of the neighboring DRIs.

Councilmember Davis noted for the record that he was recusing himself from the discussion and vote on this item because his firm represents the City on the traffic engineering.

Mayor Ferreri asked if the other developments in the area are in the process of reducing their commercial retail. Mr. Holbrook indicated that the Wilson Groves DRI recently processed a Notice of Proposed Change to redistribute the commercial retail along the arterials. Mayor Ferreri agreed that clustering the commercial into what could be called a city center is a good idea, but not if the other developments are dispersing their commercial use. He stated that if there is no carrying capacity for more commercial, dispersing the commercial throughout the development will create areas that will become obsolete as newer retail areas are developed.

Commissioner Hayes stated he believes we cannot afford to continue to move forward with what he feels has been grossly understated water quality considerations. Chairman Trias noted that staff had indicated there is a review process that has been followed with respect to water.

Councilmember Foley noted that Council exists to discuss and analyze the regional impacts of proposals such as this. He stated he understood the City would like for us to quickly forward our recommendations, but he cautioned that it is Council’s responsibility to really drill down on the regional impacts, taking into account everything that has been approved in the area. He asked if staff is aware of any planned development immediately south in Martin County. Staff indicated there is a proposal to the immediate south for approximately five million square feet of workplace with no proposed residential use. Staff noted this is not a DRI and has already been approved by Martin County, but is still facing some legal hurdles.
Councilmember Foley pointed out that about 16 million square feet of non-residential uses and 38,000 residential units have been approved in the DRIs in the Western Annexation Area. He asked if there is a recommended ratio for these uses. Staff indicated that the proper balance of non-residential square footage per residential unit is going to vary based on the type of non-residential use. Councilmember Hall indicated that if you look at just the retail component, the proposal to have 3,675,000 square feet of retail would result in about 164 square feet per person. He indicated that this is a concern because it is much higher than the 43 square feet per person suggested by a previous commercial needs study in Palm Beach County. Staff pointed out that the proposed project will serve regional retail needs for an area outside the proposed project. Staff noted that it is Council’s responsibility to identify all the impacts that could occur from the requested increase and make recommendations on how to mitigate those impacts. However, it is ultimately the decision of the City on what will be allowed and what conditions will be required.

Commissioner Burdick asked if the two school sites would be sufficient and questioned why the school board would not want to be part of the discussion. Staff indicated there is also a charter school being proposed, and since the residential will not change, and there are current agreements in place, this may be why the school board has not responded. Commissioner Burdick stated she did not believe the two school sites and the charter school would be sufficient for this area. Mr. McCurry stated that the number of school sites required in the conditions was based on population and student projections per household that were developed by the St. Lucie County School Board. Commissioner Burdick asked if those agreements were made before the class size reduction amendment was in place. Councilmember Hershey stated the agreements were made after the amendment.

Mayor Golonka asked if there is a condition that establishes a relationship between non-residential and residential in terms of phasing. Staff indicated there was no condition to address this. Mayor Golonka stated that linkage is very important, but understands the difficulty of doing that type of phased planning without knowing the aggregate balance of population that will be employed there.

Councilmember Hershey stated she believes the two schools and the charter school will be ample space for the students. She asked if the developer went through the proportionate share mitigation process. Mr. Holbrook indicated that as part of the annexation agreement when the property was initially annexed, each of the developments in the Western Annexation Area was required to set aside acreage to initially accommodate an elementary, junior high, and high school. The school board then revised that request to be K-8, so some changes were made. It was determined the area would have sufficient school sites to accommodate the population, and possibly some of the student population to the east of I-95.

Councilmember Foley cautioned that eliminating access points such as interchanges and crossovers on the future roadway map was not good planning. He said that taking vital links off the map could cause problems and could require retrofitting in the future.

Commissioner Solari stated he felt the discussion was deviating from the issues on the table, and said it was not fair to the applicant to raise other issues at this point. Chairman Trias stated that the current issue is the proposed increase in the non-residential uses and the impacts this will have.

Mayor Pro Tem Brinkman asked if there is sufficient right-of-way for the affected roadways east of I-95. She also questioned if consideration had been given to what would be required to handle the
additional impacts of residents living east of I-95 traveling to jobs created in this development. With respect to the right-of-ways east of I-95, Ms. Maria Tejera, Council’s traffic consultant, stated the report only shows the roadway needs and she did not know if the right-of-way was there. Mayor Pro Tem Brinkman asked if the City could decide if the developer did not have to meet concurrency requirements. Ms. Tejera indicated that could occur.

Chairman Trias asked staff to summarize the comments and recommendations presented during Council Member discussion. Staff stated the assessment report recommendation is to approve the draft report and recommendations for transmittal to the City. Staff also recommended the following comments from the Council discussion be included in a letter to the City that will accompany the assessment report: 1) maintaining the Western Annexation Traffic Study network; 2) define a relationship between the non-residential and residential development to create balance as the development progresses; 3) contact the school board to ensure the school needs are adequate; and 4) analyze the apparent excess of retail per person.

Councilmember Foley moved to approve the staff report and include the listed recommendations from Council discussion in correspondence to the City, with the addition of a recommendation addressing water quality. Commissioner Burdick seconded the motion.

Commissioner Hayes stated he would not be able to support the motion because he felt there was no consideration given to water quality and drainage associated with the additional increase in non-residential uses.

The motion passed with fifteen assenting, Commissioner Hayes and Mayor Ferreri dissenting, and Councilmember Davis abstaining.

SOUTH FLORIDA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY STATUS UPDATE - PRESENTATION BY BILL CROSS, MANAGER OF PLANNING AND ENGINEERING, AND JOE QUINTY, TRANSPORTATION PLANNING MANAGER, SOUTH FLORIDA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Mr. Bill Cross gave a presentation to Council which included an agency overview, an update on proposed legislation that will affect the agency, and discussion of the Fast Start Plan, which is a proposed public/private partnership between the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), FEC Railway, local governments, and South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA).

In his overview of the proposed FDOT legislation, Mr. Cross highlighted two key points: 1) altering the composition of the SFRTA Board from a nine-member board (containing three county commissioners, three county citizen representatives, and three gubernatorial appointees, one of which is an FDOT district secretary) to a seven-member board (containing three county commissioners and four gubernatorial appointees, one of which is an FDOT district secretary); and 2) restricting the operations of the SFRTA to Miami-Dade, Broward and Palm Beach counties and removing the option for agency expansion into adjacent counties with majority votes by the SFRTA board and subject county commission.

Mr. Cross asked Council to pass a resolution opposing FDOT’s proposed legislation on the highlighted points. Chairman Trias asked if this could be done at the January meeting to allow staff time to put together a report on the issue. Mr. Cross indicated the preference would be to have the
resolution now, because the issue may have already been decided by the January meeting. Mayor Ferreri suggested that if Council were to agree, the Chairman could draft a strong letter in opposition to the legislation, and then Council could pass a resolution at the January meeting. Mr. Cross indicated that would be acceptable.

Mayor Ferreri made a motion to have the Chairman send a letter indicating Council’s opposition to the proposed legislation. Councilman Lowe seconded the motion, which carried with Commissioner Solari opposed.

Mr. Cross then presented an overview of the SFRTA’s Fast Start Plan, which proposes an expedited approach to expand Tri-Rail, including new service on the FEC from Jupiter to Miami and additional service on the FEC from Pompano Beach to Miami. Mr. Cross’ overview included a comparison of this plan to FDOT’s South Florida East Coast Corridor Study.

Councilmember Davis asked if the proposed Fast Start Plan would result in a reduction of traffic on I-95. Mr. Cross said the plan is about Florida’s future, and redeveloping our eastern downtowns through investment in infrastructure, which in this case is the passenger rail. He indicated the intent of the plan is to capture and support much of the transportation demand that will grow out of the economic development to the east without putting the additional burden on I-95. He said the plan is to provide and expand transportation choices in the future.

Councilmember Davis noted that the plan calls for the elimination of federal review. He asked if this would foreclose the option of federal funding in the future. Mr. Cross stated that the Fast Start Plan would allow for an eighty percent benefit quickly by using state and local dollars to get the first piece of the expanded service on the ground. Once that component is operational, the process to obtain federal money could move forward and eventually bring in more money to expand and build upon the service. Councilmember Davis asked if that meant the Fast Start Plan would proceed without the federal funding and any additional services could be done after going through the National Environmental Policy Act process to obtain federal dollars. Mr. Cross indicated that is correct. He stated that is why SFRTA is asking for Council support to encourage FDOT and the SFRTA to work together on this project, because the FDOT environmental review is already in process. Mayor Ferreri suggested FDOT make a presentation to Council at the January meeting to give more detail regarding their plans and the process that produced their locally preferred alternative. Staff noted the regional planning council has been asked to assist in reviewing the two proposals and help identify where there are comparable elements and differences between SFRTA’s plan and FDOT’s locally preferred alternative.

Councilman Lowe offered his support of the Fast Start Plan, noting that most of Riviera Beach’s planning has been centered around passenger rail to the north.

Mayor Golonka asked if the municipalities would be responsible for a local match to build the stations under the Fast Start Plan. Mr. Cross indicated the current proposal would have the municipalities participating in an annual fee that would go toward the operating cost, but the capital costs of building the initial stations, infrastructure, and operating equipment would not be borne by the individual cities. He said the initial stations would be fairly simplistic, but the SFRTA would work with those local governments that want to develop a larger station and will fund the extra cost. Mayor Golonka asked what the initial stations would provide. Mr. Cross indicated it was still too
early in the planning process for that much detail, but this would be addressed during their outreach to the municipalities.

Mayor Golonka raised a question regarding equity along the two corridors. She noted cities with existing Tri-Rail stations were not asked to contribute annually toward operating costs. However, the current proposal appears more equitable in that cities receiving stations and service would contribute a proportionate share toward operating costs. Mayor Golonka also noted that Federal funding for transit improvements is highly correlated to cities with increased density and development around station locations, which could penalize Jupiter where the density would not be as high as Federal standards would desire. Mayor Golonka asked for clarification on the identification of the 18 coastal stations in the plan. Mr. Cross indicated that due to capital costs, operating times and the amount of equipment needed, there was a limitation on the number of stations being proposed in the initial plan.

Mayor DuBois also questioned the SFRTA approach for identifying the initial 18 stations and how the agency would then define infill stations for northern Palm Beach County. He noted there were a number of pre-war towns designed around their former stations, with corresponding economic activity that deteriorated when the stations were removed. Mayor DuBois identified Lake Park as one of the relevant examples, and stated while station spacing for express service requires fewer stations, the SFRTA should develop a defined plan to identify future infill station locations that correspond to density, station area design, and urban development. Chairman Trias stated that the work the staff and the Council has done with respect to the different station locations has been helpful and he encouraged the SFRTA to continue working with them in terms of the actual site planning and design for the infill projects.

Vice Mayor Pro Tem Andel asked if there will be better coordination with the trains and the bus services at the major airports. Mr. Cross indicated this coordination is reviewed on an annual basis because it is critical to the ridership. He noted there are projects currently underway that will include segments to connect the downtowns, Tri-Rail, and the FEC service when it is implemented.

Councilmember Hershey proposed a motion to send a strong letter of support for the Fast Start Plan and consider at the January meeting a resolution directing FDOT and SFRTA to work together with the Miami-Dade, Broward and Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organizations to pursue SFRTA’s Fast Start Plan to introduce Tri-Rail Coastal Service. Councilman Lowe seconded the motion, which carried with Commissioner Solari opposed.

COUNCIL ORIENTATION SERIES – PARKING: HOW TO HANDLE THE NECESSARY NEMESIS

This agenda item was deferred to the January meeting.

COUNCIL’S EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM UPDATE

This agenda item was deferred to the January meeting.
ANNOUNCEMENTS

Staff noted the Second Annual Toys for Tots Christmas train which travels along the FEC Corridor between Jacksonville and Miami will be on December 10, 2011 with stops in St. Augustine, New Smyrna Beach, Cocoa, Fort Pierce, West Palm Beach, and Fort Lauderdale.

Staff congratulated Palm Beach County on receiving a $2 million Community Challenge Grant to do a Regional Master Plan in the Glades area. Staff noted Council may be involved in helping to develop the master plan.

Staff noted Councilmembers were provided a copy of the 2012 Meeting Schedule.

Staff congratulated Mayor Ferreri for being named the Sizzling Salsa Showdown winner at the Palms West Salsa Fest.

Staff presented outgoing Chairman Trias with a signed copy of “The Language of Towns and Cities” by Dhiru Thadani. Staff noted Chairman Trias has been a part of the Council since 1991 when he was a member of Council staff. Chairman Trias thanked Council and stated that he believes that the work Council does is very important and is making a difference. He thanked everyone for their support and service as Councilmembers.

COUNCIL MEMBER INFORMATION EXCHANGE

Commissioner Hayes wished everyone a safe and joy-filled holiday season. He recommended everyone read the book “That Used to Be Us: How America Fell Behind in the World It Invented and How We Can Come Back.”

Councilmember Davis provided Councilmembers with an opinion piece he had written with respect to proposed legislation called the Gulf Coast States RESTORE Act. He stated that this legislation will allow eighty percent of the fines that are levied against BP for the oil spill to be used for restoration purposes in the five gulf coast states. He said the alternative is the money will be automatically deposited in the Federal Treasury. He also noted there is strong bi-partisan support for this bill.

STAFF COMMENT

None.

CHAIRMAN’S COMMENT

None.
ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chairman Trias adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m. This signature is to attest that the undersigned is the Secretary or a designated nominee of the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council, and that the information provided herein is the true and correct Minutes of the December 9, 2011 meeting of the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council.

___________________________ ___________________________________________
Date      Signature
FORM 8B  MEMORANDUM OF VOTING CONFLICT FOR COUNTY, MUNICIPAL, AND OTHER LOCAL PUBLIC OFFICERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME</th>
<th>NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Michael L.</td>
<td>TCRPC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAILING ADDRESS</th>
<th>THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH SERVE IS A UNIT OF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>202 Greenwood Dr</td>
<td>CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPB, FL</td>
<td>COUNTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnstown</td>
<td>NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My POSITION:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED</th>
<th>WHO MUST FILE FORM 8B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec 7, 2011</td>
<td>This form is for use by any person serving at the county, city, or other local level of government on an appointed or elected board, council, commission, authority, or committee. It applies equally to members of advisory and non-advisory bodies who are presented with a voting conflict of interest under Section 112.3143, Florida Statutes. Your responsibilities under the law when faced with voting on a measure in which you have a conflict of interest will vary greatly depending on whether you hold an elective or appointive position. For this reason, please pay close attention to the instructions on this form before completing the reverse side and filing the form.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHO MUST FILE FORM 8B

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 112.3143, FLORIDA STATUTES

A person holding elective or appointive county, municipal, or other local public office MUST ABSTAIN from voting on a measure which injures to him or her special private gain or loss. Each elected or appointed local officer also is prohibited from knowingly voting on a measure which injures to the special gain or loss of a principal (other than a government agency) by whom he or she is retained (including the parent organization or subsidiary of a corporate principal by which he or she is retained); to the special private gain or loss of a relative; or to the special private gain or loss of a business associate. Commissioners of community redevelopment agencies under Sec. 163.356 or 163.357, F.S., and officers of independent special tax districts elected on a one- or two-year, one-vote basis are not prohibited from voting in that capacity.

For purposes of this law, a "relative" includes only the officer's father, mother, son, daughter, husband, wife, brother, sister, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, and daughter-in-law. A "business associate" means any person or entity engaged in or carrying on a business enterprise with the officer as a partner, joint venturer, coowner of property, or corporate shareholder (where the shares of the corporation are not listed on any national or regional stock exchange).

ELECTED OFFICERS:

In addition to abstaining from voting in the situations described above, you must disclose the conflict:

PRIOR TO THE VOTE BEING TAKEN by publicly stating to the assembly the nature of your interest in the measure on which you are abstaining from voting; and

WITHIN 15 DAYS AFTER THE VOTE OCCURS by completing and filing this form with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who should incorporate the form in the minutes.

APPOINTED OFFICERS:

Although you must abstain from voting in the situations described above, you otherwise may participate in these matters. However, you must disclose the nature of the conflict before making any attempt to influence the decision, whether orally or in writing and whether made by you or at your direction.

IF YOU INTEND TO MAKE ANY ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION PRIOR TO THE MEETING AT WHICH THE VOTE WILL BE TAKEN:

- You must complete and file this form (before making any attempt to influence the decision) with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who will incorporate the form in the minutes. (Continued on other side)
APPOINTED OFFICERS (continued)

- A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency.
- The form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

IF YOU MAKE NO ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION EXCEPT BY DISCUSSION AT THE MEETING:

- You must disclose orally the nature of your conflict in the measure before participating.
- You must complete the form and file it within 15 days after the vote occurs with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who must incorporate the form in the minutes. A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency, and the form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

---

DISCLOSURE OF LOCAL OFFICER’S INTEREST

I, ____________________________, hereby disclose that on ______________, 20__:

(a) A measure came or will come before my agency which (check one)

- inured to my special private gain or loss;
- inured to the special gain or loss of my business associate, ____________________________;
- inured to the special gain or loss of my relative, ____________________________;
- inured to the special gain or loss of ____________________________ by whom I am retained; or
- inured to the special gain or loss of ____________________________, which is the parent organization or subsidiary of a principal which has retained me.

(b) The measure before my agency and the nature of my conflicting interest in the measure is as follows:

My consulting firm, Kwesst Schwab, P.A., represents the City of Fort St. Lucie as their traffic engineer on the Southern Green Dev. ORI, Item B.

Dec 9, 20__

Date Filed

______________________________

Signature

---

NOTICE: UNDER PROVISIONS OF FLORIDA STATUTES §112.317, A FAILURE TO MAKE ANY REQUIRED DISCLOSURE CONSTITUTES GROUNDS FOR AND MAY BE PUNISHED BY ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING: IMPEACHMENT, REMOVAL OR SUSPENSION FROM OFFICE OR EMPLOYMENT, DEMOTION, REDUCTION IN SALARY, REPRIMAND, OR A CIVIL PENALTY NOT TO EXCEED $10,000.
To: Council Members  
From: Staff  
Date: January 20, 2012 Council Meeting  
Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Review  
Draft Amendments to the Town of Orchid Comprehensive Plan  
Amendment No. 12-1ER

Introduction

The Community Planning Act, Chapter 163, Florida Statutes, requires that the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) review local government comprehensive plan amendments prior to their adoption. TCRPC comments are limited to adverse effects on regional resources and facilities identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan (SRPP) and extrajurisdictional impacts that would be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan of any local government within the Region. TCRPC must provide any comments to the local government within 30 days of the receipt of the proposed amendments and must also send a copy of any comments to the State Land Planning Agency.

Background

The Town of Orchid is proposing text amendments to all elements of the Town Comprehensive Plan.

Evaluation

The proposed amendments are pursuant to an Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) adopted by the Town on June 22, 2010 and found sufficient by the Department of Community Affairs on November 23, 2010.

During the EAR process, annexation was the only major issue identified. Since 1988, the Town has not considered any possible annexations. However, while participating in the Interlocal Service Boundary Agreement process with the County and other municipalities within the County, the Town has begun to consider potential future annexation. The Town has included in the proposed amendments policies that will guide future annexations to be consistent with the Town’s unique character.
Other proposed changes include:

1. several modifications to the Goals, Objectives and Policies of all the elements within the comprehensive plan to delete references to deadline dates and indicate, where applicable, the implementation of several Town policies, procedures and plans;

2. deletion of outdated references to agencies and plans that no longer exist; and

3. the addition of an objective and supporting policies to ensure adequate water supplies are in place and available to serve new development.

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 and agencies that have expressed an interest in receiving such materials. On December 6, 2011, the TCRPC requested comments from these local governments and organizations regarding any conflicts with the proposed amendments. As of the date of the preparation of this report, no correspondence has been received.

Effects on Significant Regional Resources and Facilities

No adverse effects on significant regional resources and facilities have been identified.

Conclusion

The proposed amendments are not in conflict or inconsistent with the SRPP.

Recommendation

Council should approve this report and authorize its transmittal to the Town of Orchid and the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity.
To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: January 20, 2012 Council Meeting
Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Review
Draft Amendments to the Village of Palm Springs Comprehensive Plan
Amendment No. 12-1ESR

Introduction

The Community Planning Act, Chapter 163, Florida Statutes, requires that the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) review local government comprehensive plan amendments prior to their adoption. TCRPC comments are limited to adverse effects on regional resources and facilities identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan (SRPP) and extrajurisdictional impacts that would be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan of any local government within the Region. TCRPC must provide any comments to the local government within 30 days of the receipt of the proposed amendments and must also send a copy of any comments to the State Land Planning Agency.

Background

The Village of Palm Springs is proposing two Future Land Use Map (FLUM) amendments to the Village Comprehensive Plan.

Evaluation

The amendments are being proposed to assign the Village’s land use designation to two properties that have been annexed from Palm Beach County. Following is a summary of the amendments:

1. Marlboro Court

   This 12.59-acre property, located west of Donald Road between Park Lane and Dale Road, was annexed by the Village on June 9, 2011. The property is currently developed as a mobile home park. No change in use is being proposed at this time. The Village is proposing to assign a land use designation of Medium Density Residential, which allows 5.81 to 10.0 units per acre. The property is located within Palm Beach County’s Urban...
Redevelopment Area and currently has a Palm Beach County land use designation of High Residential, which allows 8 units per acre.

2. Syms Plaza

This 10.64-acre property, located southeast of Military Trail and Forest Hill Boulevard, was annexed by the Village on December 11, 2008. The property is currently developed as a commercial strip center. The Village is proposing to assign a land use designation of Commercial. The property is located within Palm Beach County’s Urban Redevelopment Area and currently has a Palm Beach County land use designation of Urban Center.

Extrajurisdictional Impacts

The proposed amendments were provided by the Village to the Palm Beach County Intergovernmental Plan Amendment Review Committee (IPARC) and were circulated by the IPARC Clearinghouse Coordinator on October 16, 2011. No extrajurisdictional impacts have been identified.

Effects on Significant Regional Resources and Facilities

No adverse effects on significant regional resources and facilities have been identified.

Conclusion

The proposed amendments are not in conflict or inconsistent with the SRPP.

Recommendation

Council should approve this report and authorize its transmittal to the Village of Palm Springs and the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity.

Attachments
List of Exhibits

Exhibit

1. General Location Map
2. Village Future Land Use Map
3. Proposed Future Land Use Map - Marlboro Court
4. Proposed Future Land Use Map - Syms Plaza
Exhibit 2

VILLAGE OF PALM SPRINGS
2019 FUTURE LAND USE MAP

Syms Plaza
Marlboro Court
Exhibit 3
Proposed Future Land Use Map - Marlboro Court
Exhibit 4
Proposed Future Land Use Map - Syms Plaza
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members

From: Staff

Date: January 20, 2012 Council Meeting

Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Review
Draft Amendment to the City of Port St. Lucie Comprehensive Plan
Amendment No. 12-1ESR

Introduction

The Community Planning Act, Chapter 163, Florida Statutes, requires that the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) review local government comprehensive plan amendments prior to their adoption. TCRPC comments are limited to adverse effects on regional resources and facilities identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan (SRPP) and extrajurisdictional impacts that would be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan of any local government within the Region. TCRPC must provide any comments to the local government within 30 days of the receipt of the proposed amendments and must also send a copy of any comments to the State Land Planning Agency.

Background

The City of Port St. Lucie is proposing one Future Land Use Map (FLUM) amendment to the City Comprehensive Plan.

Evaluation

The proposed amendment is to change the FLUM designation of a 46.94-acre parcel, also known as the Peacock Property, from Commercial General, Medium Density Residential, and Open Space Conservation to Residential Golf Course (RGC). The RGC land designation allows a maximum of 5 dwelling units per acre and a minimum of one 18-hole golf course.

Concurrent with this proposed comprehensive plan amendment, the applicant has submitted a Notice of Proposed Change (NOPC) to incorporate the subject property into the Verano Development of Regional Impact (DRI). The DRI amendment and this FLUM amendment will be considered by the City of Port St. Lucie at the same meeting.
The subject parcel is currently vacant and contains approximately 25.6 acres of high quality native upland vegetation, which is primarily pine flatwoods with cabbage palm and oak hammocks. The applicant has agreed to comply with the 25 percent upland preservation requirement of the City of Port St. Lucie through a donation of natural lands to the City. Language for this donation will be included in the revised development order to be adopted as part of the Verano DRI NOPC.

**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 and agencies that have expressed an interest in receiving such materials. On December 14, 2011, the TCRPC requested comments from these local governments and organizations regarding any conflicts with the proposed amendments. As of the date of the preparation of this report, no objections to the proposed amendment have been received.

**Effects on Significant Regional Resources and Facilities**

No adverse effects on significant regional resources and facilities have been identified.

**Conclusion**

The proposed amendment is not in conflict or inconsistent with the SRPP.

**Recommendation**

Council should approve this report and authorize its transmittal to the City of Port St. Lucie and the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity.

**Attachments**
List of Exhibits

Exhibit

1  General Location Map
2  Current Future Land Use Map
3  Proposed Future Land Use Map
4  Adjacent Major Developments Map
Exhibit 1
General Location Map
City of Port St. Lucie
Proposed
Future Land Use Map
Peacock Parcel
City of Port Saint Lucie, FL
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members                             AGENDA ITEM 5G
From: Staff                                    
Date: January 20, 2012 Council Meeting

Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Review
Draft Amendment to the Village of Tequesta Comprehensive Plan
Amendment No. 12-1ESR

Introduction

The Community Planning Act, Chapter 163, Florida Statutes, requires that the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) review local government comprehensive plan amendments prior to their adoption. TCRPC comments are limited to adverse effects on regional resources and facilities identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan (SRPP) and extrajurisdictional impacts that would be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan of any local government within the Region. TCRPC must provide any comments to the local government within 30 days of the receipt of the proposed amendments and must also send a copy of any comments to the State Land Planning Agency.

Background

The Village of Tequesta is proposing a text amendment to the Future Land Use Element (FLUE) of the Comprehensive Plan.

Evaluation

The text amendment to Policy 1.7.4 of the Comprehensive Plan is being proposed to address specific recommendations by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The amendment will provide consistency between the FLUE and the Village’s Code of Ordinances with respect to flood damage prevention. The proposed change is to comply with the current National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). Additionally, FEMA has advised the Village that the NFIP uses the term “lowest floor” instead of “finished floor.” The proposed changes are shown in underline and strike through as follows:

Policy 1.7.4. A minimum lowest floor elevation above mean sea level (MSL) for all new construction, additions and substantial improvements to existing structures shall be 8.5 ft mean sea level, or 18 inches above the crown of
any road, street, cul-de-sac or highway, or meet the requirements of the Code of
Ordinance pertaining to flood hazard areas, whichever is most stringent.

Extrajurisdictional Impacts

The proposed amendment was provided by the Village to the Palm Beach County
Intergovernmental Plan Amendment Review Committee (IPARC) and was circulated by the
IPARC Clearinghouse Coordinator on November 8, 2011. No extrajurisdictional impacts have
been identified.

Effects on Significant Regional Resources and Facilities

No adverse effects on significant regional resources and facilities have been identified.

Conclusion

The proposed amendment is not in conflict or inconsistent with the SRPP.

Recommendation

Council should approve this report and authorize its transmittal to the Village of Tequesta and
the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity.
To: Council Members

From: Staff

Date: January 20, 2012 Council Meeting

Subject: Committee Appointments – 2012

Background

In accordance with Section 12 of the Interlocal Agreement creating the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council, the Council Chairman shall establish and maintain such committees as deemed necessary to carry out the purposes and objectives of the Council. Committees shall be created or discontinued by the Chairman subject to approval of the Council.

The Interlocal Agreement goes on to indicate that all Committees and Chairmen thereof shall be appointed by the Council Chairman with the approval of a majority of the Council, except that, between regular meetings when the need arises, the Chairman alone (without any additional authorization other than this rule) may fill vacancies, and/or appoint temporary committee members or chairmen.

Chairman Foley has proposed committees and recommended committee members for the year 2012 as shown on the attached page. In addition, the Chair welcomes volunteers or recommendations for additional committee members at the January Council meeting.

Recommendation

Council should approve the committees and committee appointments as proposed by the Chairman.

Attachment
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS - 2012

**BUDGET/PERSONNEL COMMITTEE**

Commissioner Bob Solari (Indian River County)
Councilmember Reece Parrish (St. Lucie County)
Commissioner Doug Smith (Martin County)
Commissioner Peter O’Bryan (Indian River County)
Mayor Samuel Ferreri (Palm Beach County)

**FRCA POLICY BOARD MEMBERS**

**Members:**
Mayor Samuel Ferreri (Palm Beach County)
Commissioner Doug Smith (Martin County)
Councilmember Kevin J. Foley (Martin County)

**Alternates:**
Councilmember Ramon Trias (St. Lucie County)
Councilmember Bill Hall (Palm Beach County)
Commissioner Peter O’Bryan (Indian River County)

**NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

Commissioner Kevin J. Foley (Martin County)
Commissioner Peter O’Bryan (Indian River County)
Mayor Samuel Ferreri (Palm Beach County)
Councilmember Ramon Trias (St. Lucie County)
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members

From: Staff

Date: January 20, 2012 Council Meeting

Subject: Resolution Supporting House of Representatives Bill H.R. 3096 - Resources and Ecosystems Sustainability, Tourist Opportunities, and Revived Economies of the Gulf Coast States Act of 2011

Introduction

At the December 9, 2011 Council meeting, Councilmember Michael Davis provided information on a bill, H.R. 3096, which is currently being considered by the U.S. House of Representatives. H.R. 3096 is the Resources and Ecosystems Sustainability, Tourist Opportunities, and Revived Economies of the Gulf Coast States Act of 2011 (RESTORE the Gulf Coast Act). The bill would create legislation to establish the Gulf Coast Restoration Trust Fund and invest the fines from the 2010 Deepwater Horizon oil spill in restoration of the Gulf Coast. Unless the bill is passed, the fines will be deposited in the Federal Treasury, rather than used to restore the Gulf Coast.

The RESTORE the Gulf Coast Act would dedicate 80 percent of the estimated $5-21 billion in Clean Water Act fines from the 4.9 million barrel oil spill to restoring the Gulf Coast. In each year the funds are available, 35 percent of the total would be allocated to the five Gulf Coast states, 60 percent to the Gulf Coast Ecosystem Restoration Council, and 5 percent to a Gulf Coast research, science, and technology program.

The expected penalties from the Deepwater Horizon oil spill could initiate a long-term investment in ecosystem restoration. This would benefit the marine construction industry at numerous locations in Florida and the Gulf Coast states. Investing in coastal restoration would help many businesses, especially those involved in planning and engineering, construction, tourism, and equipment manufacturing. Passage of the RESTORE the Gulf Coast Act would be beneficial for the economy and environment of Florida and the Gulf Coast states.

The Library of Congress website indicates the latest major action on H.R. 3096 was on December 7, 2011 when committee hearings were held.

Recommendation

Council should approve the attached resolution and authorize its transmittal to the members of Congress representing the Treasure Coast Region.

Attachment
RESOLUTION #12-01


WHEREAS, the U.S. House of Representatives is considering the bill, H.R. 3096, the Resources and Ecosystems Sustainability, Tourist Opportunities, and Revived Economies of the Gulf Coast States Act of 2011 (RESTORE the Gulf Coast Act); and

WHEREAS, H.R. 3096 would invest the fines from the 2010 Deepwater Horizon oil spill in restoration of the Gulf Coast; and

WHEREAS, budget constraints in recent years have resulted in reduced funding for environmental restoration projects throughout Florida and the Gulf Coast states; and

WHEREAS, the expected penalties from the Deepwater Horizon oil spill could initiate a long-term investment in ecosystem restoration, which would help businesses involved in planning and engineering, construction, tourism, and equipment manufacturing at numerous locations in Florida and the Gulf Coast states; and

WHEREAS, passing the RESTORE the Gulf Coast Act will help to improve the quality of Florida’s environment, which will help increase tourism, add to the tax base and increase business throughout the state; and

WHEREAS, passing the RESTORE the Gulf Coast Act is consistent with the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council Strategic Regional Policy Plan goals, strategies, and policies promoting an improved economy and protection of beachfront and environmentally sensitive coastal and marine resources;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL SUPPORTS H.R. 3096, AND ENCOURAGES CONGRESS TO APPROVE THE RESOURCES AND ECOSYSTEMS SUSTAINABILITY, TOURIST OPPORTUNITIES, AND REVIVED ECONOMIES OF THE GULF COAST STATES ACT OF 2011.

DULY ADOPTED by the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council this 20th day of January 2012.

______________________________ ______________________________
Kevin J. Foley     Michael J. Busha
Chairman     Executive Director
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members

From: Staff

Date: January 20, 2012 Council Meeting

Subject: Resolution Opposing Legislation Regarding Changes to South Florida Regional Transportation Authority

Introduction

In 2003, the Florida Legislature reconstituted the former three-county “Tri-Rail Commuter Rail Authority” as the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA). As described in Section 343.53(2), Florida Statutes, the governing board of the SFRTA is comprised of nine members:

- three county commissioners (one each from Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach counties);
- three county commission appointees (one citizen appointee from each county who must reside in that county, “to represent the business and civic interests of the community”);
- one District Secretary of the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) for either District IV or VI (or their designee); and
- two gubernatorial appointees (who are residents and qualified electors in the two counties that are not the residence of the FDOT District Secretary appointee).

This governance structure creates a balance in favor of the three counties in which the SFRTA operates.

The authority’s service area is defined as the “tri-county area of Broward, Miami-Dade, and Palm Beach Counties” (§ 343.54(1)(a)). If so desired by the SFRTA governing board and county commission of an adjacent (contiguous) county and confirmed by resolution of those entities, the authority may expand its service area into a contiguous county. This creates the opportunity for the SFRTA to expand into other Treasure Coast counties, if expansion is desired by those counties and the SFRTA board, without requesting legislative permission.

At the December 9, 2011 Council meeting, SFRTA representatives informed Council of the authority’s concerns regarding proposed transportation legislation that would affect the SFRTA. An excerpt of the proposed legislation is included as Exhibit A. The proposed legislation would modify the SFRTA’s governance structure to eliminate the three citizen appointees; increase the
gubernatorial appointees to three; and retain the FDOT secretary appointee. Therefore, the proposed SFRTA board structure would be comprised of three local representatives (the three county commission appointees) and four gubernatorial/state representatives, thereby shifting the balance of power on the board from local to state control. The three subject counties would continue to be required to fund the authority per statutory obligation.

The legislation also proposes to eliminate the authority’s ability to expand into a contiguous county with affirmative votes of the SFRTA board and subject county. As a result, any expansion of the authority would require additional legislative action, which could negatively impact transit options for the Treasure Coast counties. As requested by the SFRTA at the December 9 meeting, Council directed staff to prepare a resolution opposing the proposed transportation legislation for consideration at the January Council meeting.

Recommendation

Council should approve the attached resolution expressing Council’s opposition to proposed transportation legislation that would change the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority governance structure and eliminate the authority’s ability to expand into adjacent counties, and authorize its transmittal to the Treasure Coast Legislative Delegation and other interested parties.

Attachments
RESOLUTION #12-02

A RESOLUTION OF THE TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL REPRESENTING THE LOCAL GOVERNMENTS OF INDIAN RIVER, MARTIN, PALM BEACH, AND ST. LUCIE COUNTIES, FLORIDA EXPRESSING OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED TRANSPORTATION LEGISLATION MODIFICATIONS TO THE SOUTH FLORIDA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY GOVERNING BOARD AND ELIMINATING THE ABILITY FOR THE AUTHORITY TO EXPAND WITH LOCAL APPROVALS

WHEREAS, the membership of the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) consists of elected officials from Palm Beach, Martin, St. Lucie, and Indian River Counties and municipalities within those counties as well as and private sector representatives appointed by the Governor; and

WHEREAS, the TCRPC has consistently supported the operation of the Tri-Rail commuter rail service in southeast Florida for its benefits to mobility, economic sustainability, and quality of life; and

WHEREAS, the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA) was created by the Legislature in 2003 to absorb the responsibilities of the former Tri-Rail Commuter Rail Authority and operate transit service in Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach Counties; and

WHEREAS, the SFRTA is governed by a locally controlled board that includes six local appointees (one county commissioner from each of the three counties and one citizen appointee from each of the three said counties) and three gubernatorial representatives (two gubernatorial citizen appointees and one Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) district secretary); and

WHEREAS, the six local and three state appointees that comprise the SFRTA board enable local control for the authority; and

WHEREAS, transportation legislation has been filed for consideration in the 2012 Legislative Session that would modify the SFRTA board to a seven-member board with three county commissioners and four state representatives (including three gubernatorial appointees and an FDOT district secretary from southeast Florida), thereby shifting the balance of power on the board from local representatives to state representatives while continuing to require the authority be funded by the three counties within which it operates; and

WHEREAS, current state statutes allow the SFRTA to expand its area of operations into an adjacent, contiguous county with resolutions of approval from the SFRTA board and subject adjacent, contiguous county, should expansion be desired; and

WHEREAS, the transportation legislation that has been filed for consideration in the 2012 Legislative Session would also eliminate the statutory permission for the authority to expand with local resolutions of support, thereby requiring additional legislative action for the authority to expand, should expansion be desired;
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF THE TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL THAT:

SECTION 1. The Council opposes that portion of the transportation legislation that has been filed for consideration in the 2012 Legislative Session that would modify the SFRTA board structure from a nine-member board with local control to a seven-member board with state control.

SECTION 2. The Council opposes that portion of the transportation legislation that has been filed for consideration in the 2012 Legislative Session that would eliminate the ability for the SFRTA to expand into an adjacent, contiguous county with affirmative resolutions of the SFRTA board and subject county, should expansion be desired.

SECTION 3. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its passage and adoption.

DULY ADOPTED by the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council this 20th day of January 2012.

________________________________________  ______________________________
Kevin J. Foley                             Michael J. Busha
Chairman                                  Executive Director
A bill to be entitled
An act relating to the Department of Transportation;
amending s. 20.23, F.S.; removing obsolete language
relating to authority of district secretaries to
appoint district directors; authorizing the department
to maintain specified training programs for employees
and prospective employees; authorizing incremental
increases to base salary for successful completion of
training phases; amending s. 73.071, F.S., relating to
eminent domain; granting the department and other
condemning authorities standing to apply to the
appropriate local governmental entity for zoning
changes, variances, and waivers to mitigate severance
damages; amending s. 206.41, F.S., relating to payment
of a tax on fuel under specified provisions; revising
application of a restriction on the use of
agricultural equipment to qualify for a refund of the
tax; providing that the restriction does not apply to
citrus harvesting equipment or citrus fruit loaders;
amending s. 282.0041, F.S., relating to enterprise
information technology services management under the
Agency for Enterprise Information Technology; revising
the definition of the term "agency" to exclude the
Office of Toll Operations of the turnpike enterprise;
amending s. 282.0055, F.S.; exempting the Office of
Toll Operations from specified provisions for
enterprise information technology services; amending
s. 282.201, F.S.; removing the toll offices from
not paid at the time of purchase or fabrication shall be
immediately due and payable to the Department of Revenue,
together with the appropriate interest and penalty, computed
from the date of purchase, in the manner prescribed by chapter
212.

(e) If a contractor fails to apply for a high-speed rail
system exemption permit, or if a contractor initially determined
by the department authority to not qualify for exemption is
subsequently determined to be eligible, the contractor shall
receive the benefit of the exemption in this subsection through
a refund of previously paid taxes for transactions that
otherwise would have been exempt. A refund may not be made for
such taxes without the issuance of a certification by the
department authority that the contractor was authorized to make
purchases tax-exempt and a determination by the Department of
Revenue that the purchases qualified for the exemption.

(f) The department authority may adopt rules governing the
application process for exemption of a contractor as an
authorized agent of the department authority.

(g) The Department of Revenue may adopt rules governing
the issuance and form of high-speed rail system exemption
permits, the audit of contractors and subcontractors using such
permits, the recapture of taxes on nonqualified purchases, and
the manner and form of refund applications.

Section 54. Subsection (3) of section 343.52, Florida
Statutes, is amended to read:

343.52 Definitions.—As used in this part, the term:

(3) "Area served" means Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm
Beach Counties. However, this area may be expanded by mutual
consent of the authority and the board of county commissioners
representing the proposed expansion area.
Section 55. Section 343.53, Florida Statutes, is amended
to read:

343.53 South Florida Regional Transportation Authority.—
(1) There is created and established a body politic and
corporate, an agency of the state, to be known as the "South
Florida Regional Transportation Authority," hereinafter referred
to as the "authority."

(2) The governing board of the authority shall consist of
seven nine voting members, as follows:
(a) The county commissions of Miami-Dade, Broward, and
Palm Beach Counties shall each elect a commissioner as that
commission's representative on the board. The commissioner must
be a member of the county commission when elected and for the
full extent of his or her term.
(b) The county commissions of Miami-Dade, Broward, and
Palm Beach Counties shall each appoint a citizen member to the
board who is not a member of the county commission but who is a
resident of the county from which he or she is appointed and a
qualified elector of that county. Insofar as practicable, the
citizen member shall represent the business and civic interests
of the community.
(b)-(e) The secretary of the Department of Transportation
shall appoint one of the district secretaries, or his or her
designee, for the districts within which the area served by the
South Florida Regional Transportation Authority is located.
(d) If the authority's service area is expanded pursuant to s. 343.54(5), the county containing the new service area shall have three members appointed to the board as follows:

1. The county commission of the county shall elect a commissioner as that commission's representative on the board. The commissioner must be a member of the county commission when elected and for the full extent of his or her term.

2. The county commission of the county shall appoint a citizen member to the board who is not a member of the county commission but who is a resident and a qualified elector of that county. Insofar as is practicable, the citizen member shall represent the business and civic interests of the community.

3. The Governor shall appoint a citizen member to the board who is not a member of the county commission but who is a resident and a qualified elector of that county.

(e) The Governor shall appoint two members to the board who are residents and qualified electors in the area served by the authority but who are not residents of the same county and also not residents of the county in which the district secretary who was appointed pursuant to paragraph (e) is a resident.

Members of the governing board of the authority shall be appointed to serve 4-year staggered terms, except that the terms of the appointees of the Governor shall be concurrent.

The terms of the board members currently serving on the authority that is being succeeded by this act shall expire July 30, 2003, at which time the terms of the members appointed pursuant to subsection (2) shall commence. The Governor shall
make his or her appointments to the board within 30 days after

(4) A vacancy during a term shall be filled by the
respective appointing authority in the same manner as the
original appointment and only for the balance of the unexpired
term.

(5) The members of the authority shall serve without
compensation, but are entitled to reimbursement for travel
expenses actually incurred in their duties as provided by law.

Section 56. Subsection (6) is added to section 373.413,
Florida Statutes, to read:

373.413 Permits for construction or alteration.—

(6) It is the intent of the Legislature that the governing
board or department exercise flexibility in the permitting of
stormwater management systems associated with the construction
or alteration of systems serving state transportation projects
and facilities. Because of the unique limitations of linear
facilities, the governing board or department shall balance the
expenditure of public funds for stormwater treatment for state
transportation projects and facilities with the benefits to the
public in providing the most cost efficient and effective method
of achieving the treatment objectives. In consideration thereof,
the governing board or department shall allow alternatives to
onsite treatment, including, but not limited to, regional
stormwater treatment systems. The Department of Transportation
shall be responsible for treating stormwater generated from
state transportation projects but shall not be responsible for
the abatement of pollutants and flows entering its stormwater
MEMORANDUM

To:   Council Members
From:   Staff
Date:   January 20, 2012 Council Meeting
Subject: Resolution Encouraging Interagency Cooperation between South Florida Regional Transportation Authority and Florida Department of Transportation for Passenger Rail Service

Introduction

The reintroduction of passenger rail service on the Florida East Coast (FEC) rail corridor has been a long-standing Council priority for more than two decades. Since 2005, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), along with the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA), metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), regional planning councils (RPCs), and others have been working together on a comprehensive master plan for premium transit service in southeast Florida. FDOT has served as the lead agency to manage the South Florida East Coast Corridor Study (SFECC), which is envisioned as a long-term, multi-phase approach to expand the transit system in Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach counties. The SFECC study is being developed in compliance with federal transit funding protocols to enable Florida to pursue federal funding for the project if available. While this approach has enabled the State to keep its funding options open, it also requires a lengthy project development process, thereby delaying project-related decision-making as well as potential project initiation.

At the December 9, 2011 Council meeting, the SFRTA presented a different perspective on the SFECC passenger rail planning process, expressing strong SFRTA concerns due to the agency’s exclusion from the SFECC planning process since mid-2011. The SFRTA also presented an alternative approach to reintroduce passenger service, termed the “Fast Start” proposal, which suggests an accelerated process, funded without federal participation and avoiding the federal process, that could enable passenger service to begin within three-to-five years. The “Fast Start” proposal includes new passenger rail service on the FEC rail corridor from Jupiter to downtown Miami, as well as a redirection of some Tri-Rail service onto the FEC corridor south of Pompano. These services would be introduced as a single “first phase” of a more comprehensive system to be developed collaboratively over time.

As part of the SFRTA presentation, Council was requested to urge FDOT and the SFRTA to work collaboratively with all parties to develop a common approach to reintroduce passenger rail service on the FEC corridor. Other parties would include the MPOs, RPCs, FEC railroad, and
others as appropriate. Council directed staff to prepare the attached resolution expressing this sentiment for consideration at the January 20, 2012 Council meeting.

Recommendation

Council should approve the attached resolution and authorize its transmittal to the Florida Department of Transportation, South Florida Regional Transportation Authority, and other interested parties.

Attachment
RESOLUTION #12-03

A RESOLUTION OF THE TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL REPRESENTING THE LOCAL GOVERNMENTS OF INDIAN RIVER, MARTIN, PALM BEACH, AND ST. LUCIE COUNTIES, FLORIDA ENCOURAGING THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND THE SOUTH FLORIDA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY TO WORK COLLABORATIVELY WITH REGIONAL PARTNERS, TO ADVANCE A COMMON PASSENGER RAIL INITIATIVE ON THE FLORIDA EAST COAST RAIL CORRIDOR

WHEREAS, the membership of the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council consists of elected officials from Palm Beach, Martin, St. Lucie, and Indian River counties and municipalities within those counties as well as and private sector representatives appointed by Governor Crist; and

WHEREAS, the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council has identified certain regional transportation projects and transit improvements as critical to the Region’s economy and quality of life; and

WHEREAS, the reintroduction of passenger rail service on the Florida East Coast (FEC) rail corridor has long been identified as one of the critical transit improvements to improve the Region’s economy, sustainability, and quality of life; and

WHEREAS, the reintroduction of passenger rail service on the FEC rail corridor in southeast Florida, including Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach counties, is considered a potential first step towards reintroducing passenger rail throughout the entire Treasure Coast Region; and

WHEREAS, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has managed the South Florida East Coast Corridor Study (SFECC) since 2005 as a collaborative effort among agency partners to develop a comprehensive premium transit plan for southeast Florida, including new passenger rail service on the FEC rail corridor; and

WHEREAS, the collaborative agency partners to develop the SFECC Study have included FDOT (Districts IV and VI); the three metropolitan planning organizations in Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach counties; the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA); the South Florida and Treasure Coast Regional Planning Councils; and other agencies and organizations; and

WHEREAS, the SFRTA has indicated it has been excluded from SFECC Study discussions and planning and has introduced the “Fast Start” proposal to reintroduce passenger rail service on the FEC rail corridor on an accelerated schedule and without federal financial participation and process; and

WHEREAS, the FEC railroad is owned and operated by a private entity who must be included in collaborative planning regarding the reintroduction of passenger rail service on said rail corridor; and
WHEREAS, there would be greater efficiency and likely success if all collaborative partners were working together on a common plan to reintroduce passenger rail on the FEC rail corridor;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF THE TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL THAT:

SECTION 1. The Council supports the reintroduction of passenger rail service on the FEC rail corridor.

SECTION 2. The Council encourages the FDOT and SFRTA to work collaboratively with other regional partners, including the three metropolitan planning organizations, the South Florida and Treasure Coast Regional Planning Councils, the FEC railroad, and others as appropriate, to develop a common plan to reintroduce passenger rail service on the FEC rail corridor as quickly and efficiently as possible.

SECTION 3. This resolution shall become effective immediately upon its passage and adoption.

DULY ADOPTED by the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council this 20th day of January 2012.

______________________________ ______________________________
Kevin J. Foley     Michael J. Busha
Chairman     Executive Director
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: January 20, 2012 Council Meeting
Subject: Status Update Regarding South Florida East Coast Corridor Study - Presentation by the Florida Department of Transportation

Introduction

As requested by Council at its December 9, 2011 meeting, the purpose of this item is to provide an update regarding the status of the South Florida East Coast Corridor Study (SFECC). Managed by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) since 2005, the SFECC Study is a multi-agency analysis designed to produce a comprehensive premium transit plan for southeast Florida (including Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach counties). FDOT’s partners in the study include the three metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority, and the South Florida and Treasure Coast Regional Planning Councils. The scope of the study addresses both the 85-mile segment of the Florida East Coast (FEC) rail corridor as well as the 72-mile segment of the CSX rail corridor where Tri-Rail currently operates.

The SFECC Study is nearing completion of its second phase of analysis, with the identification of a “locally preferred alternative” (LPA) anticipated in the Summer of 2012. The considerable size of the project study area has generated discussion regarding the “segmentation” of the project into “minimum operable segments” which would be phased over time. The identification of these segments and their recommended prioritization are core components of the LPA. After approval of the LPA by each of the three MPOs, FDOT may begin to advance one or multiple segments of the project towards initial operations of the new passenger rail service.

Mr. Jaime Lopez of FDOT’s project consulting team will present a project update to Council.

Recommendation

For informational purposes only.
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members                                   AGENDA ITEM 11
From: Staff                                           
Date: January 20, 2012 Council Meeting 

Subject: Council’s Emergency Preparedness Program Update

Introduction

The Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council is often asked to enter into agreements with the Florida Division of Emergency Management (FDEM) and the region’s counties to conduct special projects, continue reoccurring agreements, provide technical assistance, and to develop new planning and training initiatives for emergency preparedness. The Council’s Emergency Preparedness Program spans several subject matter areas where planning, training and exercises are engaged to better prepare the region’s communities to mitigate and respond to disasters and the impacts that follow.

The program backbone is the District 10 Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC), one of eleven in the State of Florida. The LEPC is a Subcommittee to the Council guided by the Florida State Emergency Response Commission. The LEPC is supported through an annual agreement with the FDEM to provide ongoing technical assistance to the region regarding the Emergency Preparedness Community Right-To-Know Act (1986) for Hazardous Materials. The majority of Council’s Emergency Preparedness Program activities engage the LEPC membership through planning, training and exercises.

The LEPC is complemented by several programs and projects. This presentation is intended to brief the Council on the following program areas and projects that staff currently manages for the 2011-2012 period:

- Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness Program
- Regional Hazards Analyses
- Regional Vulnerability Analyses
- Radiological Training and Planning Agreement (Statewide)
- State Homeland Security Grant Program
- Post-Disaster Redevelopment Planning

Recommendation

For informational purposes only.
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members

From: Staff

Date: January 20, 2012 Council Meeting

Subject: Council Orientation Series -- Parking: How to Handle the Necessary Nemesis

Introduction

Council staff has developed a presentation series on Sustainable Neighborhood Planning for the Region. These presentations are based upon Council’s adopted Strategic Regional Policy Plan and will explore the many components of sustainable planning and design at the regional and neighborhood scale.

At this meeting, staff will present the tenth installment in the series entitled **Parking: How to Handle the Necessary Nemesis**. By providing a “toolbox” of planning techniques and research, staff hopes to equip Council with additional insight and knowledge on how to promote sustainable growth in the Region.

Additional Reading and Information

- **The Death and Life of Great American Cities**
  Jane Jacobs
  Random House, 1961

- **Suburban Nation**
  Andres Duany, Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, and Jeff Speck
  North Point Press, 2000

- **The New Civic Art, Elements of Town Planning**
  Andres Duany, Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, Robert Alminana
  Rizzoli International Publications, Inc., 2003

Recommendation

For informational purposes only.

Attachment
The Strategic Regional Policy Plan and Planning for the Treasure Coast: The Region, Corridor, District and Neighborhood

A Series Dedicated to Education and Dialogue on Regional Planning and Urban Design for the Treasure Coast Region

June 19, 2009
- OVERVIEW: The Strategic Regional Policy Plan, Regional Planning and Urban Design: Components for Building a Healthy Region

July 17, 2009
- The Neighborhood: Building Blocks of a Region

October 16, 2009
- The District and Corridor: Centers and Edges

July 16, 2010
- Streets, Blocks, and Alleyways: Interconnectivity and Detailing the Street

September 17, 2010
- Public Open Spaces: Creating Memorable Infrastructure

October 15, 2010
- Civic and Public Buildings: Placement and Priority

December 10, 2010
- Mix of Uses: Vertical and Proximal Relationships

June 17, 2011
- Mix of Housing: The Integration of Varying Building Types and Price Points

October 21, 2011
- Building Typologies: Form, Density, Height, and Discipline

January 20, 2012
- Parking: How to Handle the Necessary Nemesis

March 16, 2012
- The Countryside: The Region’s Natural Infrastructure

April 20, 2012
- Regional Planning and Urban Design: An Odd, But Essential Couple
Plan Amendment Status Report

DRI Status Report – January 2012
- Capron Lakes (formerly known as Indrio)
- Harmony
- Hobe Grove
- Southern Grove Substantial Deviation
- Visions at Indrio

Letter dated November 28, 2011 from the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority - TIGGER III Grant Award

Letter Dated December 8, 2011 from Department of Economic Opportunity thanking staff for time and effort at the first statewide stakeholders’ meeting to create Florida’s 5-year economic development strategy plan on November 29, 2011

Letters dated December 8, 2011 from Palm Beach County League of Cities, Inc. thanking staff members for their participation at a meeting of the General Membership

Letter dated December 8, 2011 from the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority - Section 5309 Bus and Bus Facilities Livability Initiative grant award

Letter dated December 16, 2011 from Commissioner Paul Luger, Town of Sewall’s Point - SB 842

Letter dated January 3, 2012 from Mayor Pro Tem Dr. Priore resigning from Council

Article from December 2011 floridatrend.com - Alternative Energy, Airing It Out

Article from January 6, 2012 tcpalm.com - School district cooperation evident in creation of Treasure Coast virtual school
To: Council Members  

From: Staff  

Date: January 20, 2012 Council Meeting  

Subject: Plan Amendment Status Report  

Plan Amendments Received/Reviewed  

Since the last regular Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council meeting held on December 9, 2011 Council has reviewed:  

- 3 Future Land Use Map amendments  
- 1 text amendment  
- EAR-Related amendments to the Town of Orchid Comprehensive Plan. EAR amendments are generally to all elements of the comprehensive plan.  

The amendments are from four different local governments.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Amendment No.</th>
<th>Receipt</th>
<th>Review Expiration</th>
<th>Council Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town of Orchid</td>
<td>12-1ER</td>
<td>11/14/11</td>
<td>12/13/11</td>
<td>1/20/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Palm Springs</td>
<td>12-1ESR</td>
<td>11/29/11</td>
<td>12/28/11</td>
<td>1/20/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Port St. Lucie</td>
<td>12-1ESR</td>
<td>12/8/11</td>
<td>1/6/12</td>
<td>1/20/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Tequesta</td>
<td>12-1ESR</td>
<td>12/15/11</td>
<td>1/13/12</td>
<td>1/20/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 (DU)
- Retail: 200,000 SF
- Office: 200,000 SF

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.
PROJECT NAME: Harmony

APPLICANT: Harmony Ranch Development Company

JURISDICTION: Martin County

SIZE: 2,701 acres

LOCATION: Located at the intersection of Pratt-Whitney Road (CR 711) and Bridge Road (CR 708)

POPULATION: 8,128

EMPLOYMENT: 7,149

USES: Residential 4,000 DU
Corporate Headquarter Space 1,390,000 SF
Economic Opportunity Space 500,000 SF
Community Retail Center 100,000 SF
Service Commercial 75,000 SF

STATUS: Preapplication meeting held on May 17, 2011. Application for Development Approval submitted on June 3, 2011 and found insufficient on July 15, 2011. Submittal of the sufficiency response was received on October 14, 2011 and found insufficient on November 10, 2011.

BUILDOUT DATE: 2033

PHASES: 4 phases as described in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Residential (DU)</th>
<th>Corporate Headquarter Space (SF)</th>
<th>Economic Opportunity Space (SF)</th>
<th>Community Retail Center (SF)</th>
<th>Service Commercial (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2014-2018</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>690,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2019-2023</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2024-2028</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2029-2033</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2014-2033</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,390,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT NAME: **Hobe Grove**

APPLICANT: Becker B-14 Grove, Ltd.

JURISDICTION: Martin County

SIZE: 2,823 acres

LOCATION: Adjacent to the west side of the Florida Turnpike south of Bridge Road (CR 708)

POPULATION: 9,604

EMPLOYMENT: 10,500

USES:
- Residential: 4,300 DU
- Town Center: 650,000 SF
- Mixed Use Research, Office, Education: 3,900,000 SF
- Hotel: 180 Rooms

STATUS: Preapplication meeting held on February 16, 2011.
Application for Development Approval submitted on May 27, 2011 and found insufficient on June 24, 2011.
Submittal of the sufficiency response was received on August 19, 2011 and found insufficient on September 15, 2011.
Letter received from the applicant on January 5, 2012 requesting a time extension to submit a response to questions contained in Council’s Determination of Informational Sufficiency dated September 15, 2011.
Letter sent to the applicant on January 10, 2012 agreeing to extend the time for response to December 1, 2012.

BUILDOUT DATE: 2031

PHASES: 4 phases as described in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Residential (DU)</th>
<th>Town Center (SF)</th>
<th>Mixed Use Research, Office, Education (SF)</th>
<th>Hotel (Rooms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2012-2016</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>1,290,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2017-2021</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>975,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2022-2026</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>975,000</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2027-2031</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>660,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2012-2031</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>3,900,000</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT NAME: Southern Grove Substantial Deviation

LOCATION: West of Interstate 95, north of the C-23 Canal and south of Tradition Parkway

JURISDICTION: City of Port St. Lucie

SIZE: 3,606 acres

USES: The project is currently approved for 7,388 residential units, 1,999,404 sq. ft. of industrial/warehouse, 2,073,238 sq. ft. of office, 2,164,61 sq. ft. of retail, 500 hotel rooms and ancillary uses, such as schools, recreation and open space and infrastructure.

The proposed modifications will increase the nonresidential land use as follows:

USES:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Retail</td>
<td>3,675,075 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>2,430,728 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
<td>2,498,602 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>4,583,338 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Rooms</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Beds</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATUS: Preapplication meeting held on March 24, 2009. Application for Development Approval Substantial Deviation was submitted on September 21, 2009 and found insufficient on October 20, 2009. Letter received on February 19, 2010 from the Applicant asking for a 90-day extension to reply to the sufficiency. The extension was extended until May 21, 2010. Submittal of the sufficiency response was received on July 7, 2010 and found insufficient on August 4, 2010. Submittal of the sufficiency response was received on June 30, 2011 and found insufficient on July 29, 2011. Submittal of the sufficiency response was received on September 23, 2011 and was found to have completed the sufficiency process on October 21, 2011. Assessment Report adopted by Council on December 9, 2011 and submitted to the City of Port St. Lucie on December 15, 2011.
PROJECT NAME: **Visions at Indrio**

LOCATION: SE Corner of I-95 and Indrio Road

JURISDICTION: St. Lucie County

SIZE: 780 acres

USES:
- Residential 2,605 DU
- Retail, Service 750,000 SF
- Office 250,000 SF
- Hotel 240 Rooms

STATUS:
- Preapplication meeting held on June 16, 2004.
- Application for Development Approval was submitted on August 20, 2004 and found insufficient on October 18, 2004.
- Supplemental information to the Application for Development Approval submitted on December 28, 2004 and found insufficient on January 21, 2005.
- Letter received on May 19, 2005 asking for an extension to the 120 day sufficiency response period.
- Letter received on November 14, 2005 asking for an extension to December 16, 2005.
- Letter received on November 7, 2005 asking for an extension to May 19, 2006.
- Letter received on May 3, 2006 asking for an extension to July 19, 2006.
- Application for Development Approval was found to have completed the required sufficiency process on August 25, 2006.
- Letter received on October 17, 2006 requesting an extension to the 90-day public hearing.
- Letter received on May 30, 2007 requesting the 90-day public hearing requirement be waived until such time as the related comprehensive plan amendment issues are resolved and the developer and the County can agree to public hearing dates.
November 28, 2011

Mr. Michael J. Busha
Executive Director
Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
421 SW Camden Avenue
Stuart, FL 34994

Re: South Florida Regional Transportation Authority TIGGER III Grant Award

Dear Mr. Busha:

On behalf of the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA), I wish to thank you for your kind support of SFRTA’s grant application to the Federal Transit Administration’s TIGGER III (Transit Investment in Greenhouse Gas and Energy Reduction) Grant Program for construction of Tri-Rail’s first green, LEED certified sustainable station at Pompano Beach.

I am pleased to inform you that your voice of support was heard, and the SFRTA was awarded $5.7 million for construction of the project. Construction is anticipated to begin by July of 2012.

Local support was critical for success in this highly competitive grant program. The project was awarded the second highest dollar amount in the nation, and was one of 46 project selected from a pool of 266 project applications representing more than $1 billion in funding requests from transit providers across the country.

SFRTA values its relationship with its local partners. We will continue to expand and explore new ways to collaborate on our mutual goal of providing enhanced mobility and transportation choice to the region.

The grant application and project flyer are attached for your information. More information is available on our web site at http://www.sftra.fl.gov/planning.html under planning projects.

Again, thank you for your kind support of this project.

Sincerely,

Joseph Giulietti
Executive Director

cc: SFRTA Governing Board
Pompano Beach Green Station Demonstration Project

BACKGROUND

Tri-Rail’s Pompano Beach Station, in Broward County, contains many outdated features that are in need of improvement. The South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA) has identified several station upgrades that are necessary to maintain a satisfactory level of service for Tri-Rail passengers and users of connecting transit services. In addition, park-and-ride capacity at this station is rapidly reaching saturation levels, as utilization nearly doubled between 2008 and 2008.

DESCRIPTION

SFRTA is seeking to build a prototype “green” transit station which will enhance safety, provide additional passenger amenities, and improve vehicular circulation. The project consists of numerous environmentally friendly features, and sustainable construction methods will be used. It is hoped that Silver LEED Certification will be achieved. In addition to promoting sustainable transportation, the green project features will result in lower SFRTA operating and maintenance costs at the Pompano Beach Station.

STUDY BENEFITS:

- Installation of solar panels on new platform canopies and bridge
- Charging station for electric vehicles
- Bicycle lockers
- Lighting upgrades, using LED fixtures
- Pedestrian bridge over tracks
- New, longer platform canopies
- Covered area for bus transfers
- Redesigned park-and-ride lot

STUDY BENEFITS:

- Increased passenger shelter from the sun and inclement weather
- Provides sustainable transportation options
- Reduced station operating and maintenance costs
- Increased park-and-ride capacity
- Improved circulation and access

For More Information, Please Contact:

William L. Cross, P.E.
Manager, Planning and Engineering
954-788-7316
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RTA SOUTH FLORIDA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
August 9, 2011

Mr. Walter Kulyk, P.E.
Director, Office of Mobility Innovation
Federal Transit Administration
1200 New Jersey Ave. SE
Washington, DC  20003

RE: Applications for TIGGER Discretionary Grant Program

The South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA) is pleased to submit and respectfully requests your consideration of the following application for TIGGER Discretionary Grant Program funding for the Pompano Beach Green Station Demonstration Project.

This project combines the benefits of many energy saving innovations and strategies into one new station construction project. These strategies include reaching LEED Silver status, installing solar panels on the station and parking lot canopies, providing bicycle lockers, using LED lighting fixtures, and creating charging stations for electric vehicles. The result will be a station that is 100% solar powered, a 50% reduction in station area energy demand, and substantially reduced heat island effects. This station will serve as a model for energy efficient local, regional, and national new station construction.

Investment in these projects will provide long-term benefits to the South Florida region because it supports State of Florida climate change and green building initiatives, reduces South Florida’s energy usage, improves transit station amenities, and helps meet the economic, social, and environmental initiatives of our region.

SFRTA has given thoughtful consideration in preparing this proposal and we appreciate the consideration by the US Department of Transportation for federal funding.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Joseph Giulietti
Executive Director
Applicant and Proposal Profile
(TIGGER)

Section I. Applicant Information

Organization Legal Name: South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA)

Is this a Consolidated Proposal?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

If so, Select the State DOT

Provide the Consolidated Proposal Title

Total amount of consolidated proposal:

Section II. Project Information (this section repeats, per project)

About the Project

Project Title: Tri-Rail's Pompano Beach Green Station Demonstration Project

Grant Purpose: ☐ Energy Reduction  ☐ Greenhouse Gas  ☐ Both

Name of entity to implement project: SFRTA, William L. Cross, P.E. Manager of Planning and Capital Development, 800 NW 33rd Street, Pompano Beach, FL 33064. (o) 954-788-7916, (f) 954-942-3325, e-mail: crossw@sfrrta.fl.gov

FRA Recipient ID Number: 5454

Applicant Eligibility: ☐ State  ☐ Indian Tribe  ☐ Public Transportation Agency

Population Served: ☒ Urbanized over 200,000  ☐ Urbanized 50,000 - 200,000  ☐ Rural

Description of areas served:
SFRTA operates Tri-Rail, a commuter rail service, with eighteen (18) stations along a 72-mile corridor in Southeast Florida, covering Palm Beach, Broward and Miami-Dade Counties (see Exhibit A for Tri-Rail Service Area Map). Tri-Rail’s service area (Southeast Florida) is located in the Miami-Ft. Lauderdale-Pompano Beach Florida Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). This MSA has a population of more than 5.5 million people. All Tri-Rail stations connect to bus transit systems and local shuttles.
In Miami-Dade, Broward and Palm Beach Counties, and to the Metrorail, a heavy-rail system in Miami-Dade County. SFRTA also provides and supports shuttle bus services to enhance connection to and from most Tri-Rail stations. Tri-Rail's Pompano Beach station is located at 3491 NW 8th Avenue, Pompano Beach, FL 33064, Broward County, Florida. SFRTA's main office is conveniently located directly across from the station.

Description of Services Provided:

Tri-Rail, one of the fastest growing commuter rail systems in the nation, provides service to the Southeast Florida region at peak-hour service of 20 to 30-minute intervals with fifty (50) trains per day on weekdays, with an average of 14,000 trips per day, and sixteen (16) trains per day on weekends and holidays. Tri-Rail's shuttles also provide connection from most stations to nearby employment centers and other destinations, such as airports, hospitals, museums, education centers, and libraries. The Pompano Beach station currently serves about 18,000 passengers monthly. Most passengers at this station go to and arrive from the Metrorail Transfer Station, the Miami Airport Station, and the West Palm Beach Station. Passengers at this station can connect to a Tri-Rail shuttle, which provides access to several office parks, a regional wastewater treatment facility, and several retail plazas. Connection to county bus route #34 of Broward County Transit also takes place at this station. This route connects passengers to several malls and shopping plazas, a county park, and two (2) medical centers.

Is this a capital project as defined under 49 U.S.C. 5302(b)(1)?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Will this project Reduce energy user and/or greenhouse gas emissions for the transit agency?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Project Executive Summary:

The Pompano Beach Green Station Demonstration is an innovative demonstration project that will showcase Tri-Rail's first green, LEED certified, sustainable station, which will generate more than 100% of the station's energy demand through solar panels. Currently, standard Tri-Rail stations have no energy efficient features, which result in high maintenance and operating costs. SFRTA recognizes the need to make green, energy efficient upgrades to stations rather than continuing to follow the standard.

The proposed green station will have platform canopies that will be partially covered with photo-voltaic panels (solar panels), and which will generate about 80% of the energy required for the station and parking lots. The east parking lot will also have several canopies to provide shaded parking, and to serve as more surface area for solar panels. The solar panels will be connected to the electric grid, with a smart meter that will store surplus energy generated to be drawn at night. Other green, energy efficient features of the project include 100% Low Emitting Diodes (LED) lighting, machine-room-less (MRL) elevators, and specifications for materials, mechanical equipment and finishes which are green and environmentally safe.

The proposed energy consumption of the project is compared to an existing Tri-Rail station with a passenger bridge and continuous platform canopies (baseline station). The total energy consumption for the proposed green station and parking lots was calculated to determine the minimum amount of solar energy that must be generated from the solar panels on the canopies.

The total project cost is estimated at $12,836,028.86. SFRTA is financially committed to fund 55% of the project, requesting only 45% to be funded by TIGGER, $5,713,549.25. Energy consumption savings were calculated to be over $56,000 per year. The useful life of the solar canopies is 25 years, which results in a useful life savings of up to $1.4 million. The return on the investment for the project is 41.8%, and this number does not reflect any additional savings SFRTA may receive by generating surplus solar energy.

In conclusion, implementation of this demonstration project will result in a significant reduction in energy consumption, which is consistent with FTA's livability and environmental sustainability goals to support green building. Tri-Rail's Pompano Beach Green Station will be the first transit station for commuter rail in the State of Florida and may be the first one nationally to be 100% supported by solar energy, and will become SFRTA's green station prototype for future improvements at all Tri-Rail stations.
Brief Abstract of project:

The Pompano Beach Green Station Demonstration is an innovative demonstration project that will showcase Tri-Rail's first green, LEED certified, sustainable station, which will generate more than 100% of the station's energy demand through solar panels. Currently, standard Tri-Rail stations have no energy efficient features, which result in high maintenance and operating costs. SFRTA recognizes the need to make green, energy efficient upgrades to stations rather than the continuing to follow the standard.

The new passenger station will have photo-voltaic panels (solar panels), which will generate energy required for the station and parking lots. The solar panels will be connected to the electric grid, with a smart meter that will store surplus energy generated to be used at night. Other green, energy efficient features of the project include 100% Low Emitting Diodes (LED) lighting, machine-room-less (MRL) elevators, and specifications for materials, mechanical equipment and finishes which are green and environmentally safe.

The total area of solar panels to be installed will result in a surplus of solar energy production. Therefore, Tri-Rail's Pompano Beach Green Station will be the first transit station for commuter rail in the State of Florida and may be the first one nationally to be 100% supported by solar energy, and will become SFRTA's green station prototype for future improvements at all Tri-Rail stations.

The following are the three (3) main objectives for this project:

Objective 1: Demonstrate and showcase the benefits of solar energy generation in a high visibility location.

The project will demonstrate the feasibility of installing solar panels over platform canopies and parking areas to support 100% of the energy demand of the station and parking lots. It will also demonstrate to Tri-Rail passengers and the general public all the available technologies and initiatives that exist to have a sustainable and environmentally friendly transit station. One of the long-term benefits of this project is that the installation of the solar panels will be relatively easy to retrofit at other stations and parking lots in the Tri-Rail system. In addition, monitoring, reporting and marketing efforts will highlight the positive benefits of solar power generation, revenue generation, shaded parking and reduced heat gain in pavement.

Objective 2: Demonstrate and showcase the benefits of green, sustainable construction.

The project has been registered under the LEED system to achieve Silver LEED Certification by the US Green Building Council. The project design criteria indicates the requirement to implement green, sustainable amenities in addition to solar energy generation, such as LED lights, energy efficient elevators, charging stations for electric vehicles, and water efficient landscape. The project will also serve as an educational tool for students in the area to visit, learn and study how a green, sustainable, energy efficient transit station works. As a result, SFRTA will utilize this project as a prototype for all Tri-Rail stations in the region.

Objective 3: Assess the potential to generate a new source of operating funds.

The project will allow SFRTA to investigate different methods for financial compensation and cooperation among public and private entities. For example, public and private entities have approached SFRTA with interest in providing electric vehicles to sit at the Pompano Beach Station, which can be rented by passengers for carpooling. Another example is the ability to create a surplus amount of solar energy, which can be stored and used as a credit at other stations or SFRTA-owned buildings.

In summary, this project has the potential of creating many long-term benefits, including elimination of electric power expenses, reduction of maintenance cost, adaptation to climate change, and promotion of green building practices.

Description of the project Scope:

The Pompano Beach Green Station Demonstration project includes construction of a new, green and sustainable passenger transit station to replace the existing, and reconstruction of an existing parking lot to be more environmentally friendly and energy efficient. Currently, a standard Tri-Rail station has standard upgrades encompassing two (2) 25-foot-by-400-foot platforms with a full length canopy and a pedestrian overpass. Station and parking lots have high pressure sodium (HPS) light fixtures. The elevators are hydraulic, and landscape meets the minimum requirements to keep
maintenance cost down. There are no back-up generators in case of a power outage and not all bus waiting areas have canopies.

Baseline Project:
The proposed project is compared to a Baseline Project. Energy consumption data has been collected for a minimum of twelve months for the existing parking lots at the Pompano Beach station, as well as energy consumption at a standard station. The combination of the energy consumption of the two (2) existing parking lots plus the energy consumption of a standard station, are used as the Baseline Project. The Baseline Project is the equivalent estimate of energy consumption for the proposed project if it were to have standard improvements.

Existing Station:
The existing Pompano Beach Station has two (2) 15-foot by 400-foot platforms, several platform shelters, no shelters for bus waiting area, and all Metal Halide (MH) and HPS light fixtures. The station requires an upgrade to current station standards, but SFRTA recognizes the opportunity and need to make these upgrades green and energy efficient, or above the current standards. In addition, the opportunity to generate solar energy to support the station will reduce operating costs.

Proposed Green Station:
The new passenger station will have two (2) 25-foot by 425-foot platform with a full length canopy and a pedestrian overpass. The platform canopies will support photovoltaic panels (solar panels), which will generate about 80% of the energy required for the station and parking lots. The solar panels will be connected to the electric grid, with a smart meter that will allow surplus energy generated to be stored during the day, and drawn at night. Lighting in the platform and platform building will be 100% Low Emitting Diodes (LED). Two elevators that connect the platforms to the pedestrian overpass will be machine-room-less (MRL) and consume 50% less energy than the standard hydraulic elevators that exist in standard Tri-Rail stations. Specifications for materials, mechanical equipment and finishes require the use of green, environmentally safe products.

The existing station is served by two (2) parking lots; one on the east and one to the west of the station. The west parking lot is fairly new, but lighting is not energy efficient. SFRTA is currently working to replace the light fixtures on the west parking lot with LED fixtures. The east parking lot is older, has inefficient vehicular circulation and pedestrian amenities. The plan proposes to reconstruct the entire east parking lot to provide a separate bus lane for passenger drop-off/pick-up with a full length canopy; a designated taxi/cab-rail waiting area with shelters: more parking spaces; 100% LED lighting; bike racks and bike lockers; preferred parking and charging stations for energy efficient vehicles; several canopies to provide shaded parking to reduce heat gain; solar panels on the parking canopies to meet 100% of the station and parking lots energy demand with solar energy; and a back-up generator that will be used for power outages.

Project Type: ☒ Facility
☐ Vehicle
☐ Energy Production
☒ Transit Stop or Station
☐ Transit Vehicle
☐ Other

If Other, Specify:

Transportation Modes used in the project:
☒ Regional Rail/Commuter Rail
☐ Heavy Rail/Metro/Subway
☐ Light Rail on Private ROW (Fenced)
☐ Light Rail on shared Track (Freight)
☒ Streetcars/Light Rail in streets/Circular Bus
☒ Local/Limited Bus
☐ Bus Rapid Transit
☐ Express Bus/Coach
☐ Ferry

Fuels/Energies utilized in the project:
☐ Diesel
☐ Bio-Fuels
☐ CNG
☐ Hydrogen from Electricity
☐ Hydrogen from other fuel
☐ Electricity
☒ Solar/wind (for propulsion)
☐ Gasoline
☐ Geothermal

Electric Drive Elements Utilized in project:
☐ Electric drive Accessories (Bus)
☐ No-Idle Auto/Start/Stop Engine
☐ Regenerative Braking (Rail)
☐ On-board Energy storage (Rail)
☐ Wayside Energy storage (Rail)
☐ Hybrid Locomotive
☐ Fuel cells, Turbines, External Combustion Engine
☐ No drive belts
☒ N/A

Place of Performance

Primary Address of Proposed project:

Street: 3491 NW 8th Avenue

City: Pompano Beach

State: Florida

Zip Code: 33064

Additional Info (Including Other Locations Served by Project):

Project is located north of NW 33 Street, between Andrews Avenue and NW 8th Avenue.
SFRTA’s main office is conveniently located directly across from the station.
Technical, Legal and Financial Capacity

Description of Technical Capacity to Implement Project:

SFRTA has the technical capacity to implement this project, and it has previously been successful with other large scale projects. With competent staff in all departments of the agency, and the support of professional consultants, SFRTA recently completed the Fort Lauderdale Airport Station Parking Garage, a $5.3 Million project, on time (6 months early) and under budget ($4 Million less than estimated). Similar to the Pompano Beach Green Station Demonstration project, the parking garage implemented green, energy efficient construction, such as LED lighting and MRL elevators.

Another example is SFRTA's large scale Segment 5 Double Tracking project for the South Florida Rail Corridor, which was completed in 2007. In addition to agency staff present during these projects, the SFRTA has in place several General Planning Consultant (GPC), and General Engineering Consultant (GEC) contracts that assisted in these major construction efforts. These consultants have the background and technical experience to support the design and implementation of this project for SFRTA.

Further, this combination of teamwork and experience will allow this project to be accomplished within the timeframe and budget estimated. SFRTA's procurement and finance departments have also won many awards of excellence from their respective statewide industry organizations.

There are no outstanding legal, technical, or financial issues with SFRTA that would make this a high risk project to implement quickly. SFRTA is in fundable status, and is able to participate in this grant program.

Description of Legal Capacity to Implement Project:

SFRTA's two in house attorneys routinely work with the entire SFRTA staff to implement many complex, large scale projects, ranging from locomotive procurements to small and large scale construction projects. SFRTA's legal counsel know the goals and objectives of the Agency, and are involved in every phase of a project, from inception to completion. The Pompano Beach Station and parking lots are currently owned by SFRTA; therefore no real estate is to be acquired for project implementation.

Description of Financial Capacity to Implement Project:

SFRTA is financially committed to implement this project, which has a total budget of $12,836,028.86. SFRTA has entered into a Joint Partnership Agreement (JPA) with the Florida Department of Transportation, which provides up to $3,561,249.80 to fund this project. SFRTA's adopted capital budget includes a matching amount of $3,561,249.80. This totals $7,122,479.61 or 55% of the project cost. Therefore, this TIGGGER proposal requests FTA for an amount of $5,713,549.25 or 45% of the total project cost.

SFRTA has adequate financial systems in place, and has controls in place, as evidenced by the SFRTA financial audit, available at the following link: http://www.sfta.fll.gov/docs/overview/2010_CAFR.pdf.

In addition, financially this project makes sense by looking at the return on investment (ROI).

Total Proposed Green Station Projected Cost = $ 10,075.23 for Maintenance & operation, no energy cost
Total Baseline Project Energy Cost = $66,794.60 for estimated energy consumption, maintenance & operation
Project yearly savings = $ 56,719.37
Useful Life Savings = 25 years x $56,719.37 = $ 1,417,984.22
Solar Panels Cost = $1,000,000.00 For min. area required for 100% energy demand
Project's Useful Life Savings as a % of Agency Annual Consumption = 138%
Rate of Return on Investment = 41.8% = ($1,417,984.22 - $1,000,000.00)/$1,000,000.00
It is important to point out that SFRTA's Operating budget heavily relies on Federal, State and County assistance. Therefore it makes significant economic sense to invest the capital on a project that will reduce the operational and maintenance cost in the future, regardless of the ROI.

Return on investment (ROI) for this project could be further increased due to more intangible considerations not factored into the calculations. For example, the maintenance cost reduction that will result from installing an MRL elevator rather than a hydraulic is unknown at this time. Another factor is that the metal/rust maintenance reduction that will result due to more durable material specifications. There is also the potential surplus energy credits, and revenue increase that will result from more passengers using the station due to the improved amenities.

So to make an immediate calculation, the ROI was based only on the known energy cost savings. Energy savings have a direct relation to the solar panels; therefore, the ROI calculated for this proposal is based on energy savings over the cost of solar panels that provide 100% of the energy demand.

**Project Management**

Description of Project Management Plan:

As an FTA Grantee, SFRTA has previously prepared several PMP's for project implementation. The following is a section of the PMP that will be implemented for this project. The complete PMP has been attached to this application.

Specific SFRTA Responsibilities:
The SFRTA organization consists of a Board of Directors, an Executive Office, a Deputy Executive Director, and nine departments: Executive, Finance and IT, Procurement, Engineering and Construction, Marketing, Operations, Planning and Capital Development, Human Resources, and Legal. The Executive Department has the overall responsibility for oversight of all Departments and conclusion of the Agency's visions and missions. All Department Heads report to the Executive Director and his Deputy.

- The Finance and IT Department is responsible for providing administrative support for other departments. Areas of support include accounting, revenue, finance, risk management, business planning, information technology, management of budgets and grants accounting.
- The Procurement Department is responsible for contract administration assistance and procurement of materials, equipment, fabricated products, construction, and services in accordance with approved requisitions and specifications.
- The Engineering and Construction Department is responsible for executing all capital projects. Its duties include project management and control; monitoring safety compliance; environmental compliance; value engineering; and quality assurance/quality control.
- The Marketing Department is responsible for the development of media related marketing and customer information in order to encourage increased ridership.
- The Operations Department is responsible for ensuring the safe, on-time and courteous delivery of commuter rail service.
- The Planning and Capital Development Department is responsible for Federal, State, and local transportation funding. It is also responsible for meeting the short and long-range planning goals of SFRTA, and for all real estate acquisitions necessary to support SFRTA operations.
- The Human Resources Department reports directly to the Executive Director and is responsible for recruitment and employment of personnel and the implementation and management of SFRTA Employee Benefits Program. The Department is also responsible for the daily administration of personnel policies and procedures, as well as SFRTA training and employee development programs.
- The General Counsel, retained by the Board, provides legal representation for SFRTA. In any legal action taken by or against SFRTA, the General Counsel appears and participates in the case and on behalf of the Board, officer, or employee.

Describe any proposed deviations from FTA Circular 5010 Grants Management:

This project does not contain any deviations from FTA Circular 5010.
Does the project Require a waiver of any federal requirements?
- Yes  No
If so, Explain:

**Project Scalability**

Is the Project Scalable?
- Yes  No
If Yes, specify minimum funds necessary: 
Provide Explanation:

N/A

**Project Useful Life**

Expected useful life of project (years)? 25
Explanation of useful life claim:
The most important pieces of investment in this project are the solar panels, because they provide for 100% of the energy demand. The solar systems are installed on a structural canopy, and based on information published by the U.S. Department of Energy, a PV panel system has a useful life of about 25 to 30 years. Therefore, the expected lifecycle used for this investment is 25 years.

**Project Calculations**
Enter the estimated energy savings and greenhouse gas reduction figures below by using the provided calculator sheets to generate estimates. (Note that updating the expected useful life, annual saving/reduction estimate or a value in a calculator sheet will overwrite any manually entered estimates entered into the associated calculated field(s)).

- Project Annual Energy Savings (Million BTU): 800.13
- Project Annual Greenhouse Gas Reductions (tons CO2e)*: 
- Project Lifetime Energy Savings (Million BTU): 20,003.25
- Project Lifetime Energy Savings as a percent of Total Agency Annual Energy Use: 137.612
- Project Lifetime GHG Emission Reductions (tons CO2e)*: 20,003

Justification for claims of Energy: Detailed Calculations for energy savings have been prepared and are attached to
Greenhouse gas or other claims made in project proposal:

This supplemental form. It is recommended that these calculations are reviewed to further understand our savings claims. Existing energy consumption data was collected for a period of twelve (12) months, starting April 1, 2010 to March 31, 2011. All energy consumption calculations include accounts owned by, or directly paid by the SFRTA, such as stations, parking lots, and other structures. All data collected was based on invoices and records maintained by SFRTA.

The proposed project is compared to the Baseline Project, which consumes 234,367 kWh. The proposed project will consume 115,807 kWh annually which will be supplied by solar energy. Based on our data gathered the total square footage available for solar panels to be installed on the platform canopies can provide up to 80% (320 kWh) daily. Solar panels installed on the parking canopies will provide the remaining 20% (60 kWh) of the daily energy consumption.

Total annual energy consumption for proposed green station system is 0 kWh, since energy demand will be supplied by solar power.

Total annual energy savings due to project implementation is 234,367 kWh. The annual operations and energy cost savings for the project equals $56,719.37. See summary below:

Since the project's Average useful life = 25 years
Total project useful life energy savings = $8,859,175 kWh
Total Existing Agency Annually Energy Consumption = 5,034,192 kWh
Total Baseline Project Energy Cost = $66,794.00 for estimated energy consumption, maintenance & operation
Total Proposed Green Station Projected Cost = $10,075.23 for Maintenance & operation, no energy cost
Total project useful life cost savings = $56,719.37 x 25 years = $1,417,984.22
Savings as a % Agency Energy Reduction = 138%

Describe or identify any unique, significant, or innovative approaches to reducing energy consumption or greenhouse gas emissions:

Installing solar panels on canopies to meet the station's energy demand, and generating surplus energy is an innovative way to reduce energy consumption and operating costs at stations and other agency owned buildings. Tri-Rail's Pompano Beach Green Station will be the first transit station for commuter rail in the State of Florida and may be the first in the nation to be 100% supported by solar energy. Implementation of Tri-Rail's Pompano Beach Green Station Demonstration project is an important step toward reducing energy consumption.

This project may be easily retrofitted using existing real estate, such as canopy surface area, or other building roof areas to install solar panels. Also implementing green, energy efficient features reduces the station's overall energy demand and the amount of energy that must be generated by the solar panels. This reduced energy demand results in further decreasing operating and maintenance costs.

This project is unique because it is located in an area that received a Sustainable Communities Initiative Grant in 2010, to create a seven County regional vision plan for Southeast Florida. This project fits in with the sustainability concepts that have been suggested to be part of that vision.

The educational approaches provided are also unique to this project. An on-going task for this project is the marketing effort that will bring focus and attention from passengers, students and other agencies in the area. Ideally, schools, universities and colleges in the region will use the Pompano Beach Green Station to learn and study the environmental and fiscal benefits of solar energy.

Describe the National Applicability of SFRTA will implement these improvements as a demonstration project which will be
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the project: implemented at other Tri-Rail stations system wide. This project will also serve as a demonstration project to other transit agencies, regionally or nationally, because it can be replicated or used for retrofit in their own systems. For example, intermodal centers can install solar panels on existing passenger canopies or on new parking canopies on existing parking lots. Solar canopies can be adopted as part of standard design guidelines for future new facilities.

Installing solar panels on canopies at existing and new parking lots can be used for credits under the LEED® rating systems, and is consistent with FTA’s livability and environmental sustainability goals to support green building. Therefore, this project has national applicability and it is an example of energy savings. Other recipients of Sustainable Communities Initiative Grants could easily use this as a model project in their region.

Project Readiness

Project can be implemented within:

- 3 Months  □ 6 Months  □ 9 Months  ○ 12 Months  □ 12+ Months

Environmental work for construction projects requiring Environmental Assessment (EA), Environmental Impact Statements (EIS), or documented Categorical Exclusion (CE) has been completed?

- ○ Yes  □ No

Will be Completed in:

- □ 3 Months  □ 6 Months  □ 9 Months  □ 12 Months  □ 12+ Months

Implementation plans are ready, including initial design of facilities projects:

- ○ Yes  □ No

Is the Project Proposal listed in the TIP/STIP?

- ○ Yes  □ No

Is the TIP/STIP approved?

- ○ Yes  □ No

TIP/STIP can be amended (evidenced by MPO/State endorsement):

- ○ Yes  □ No


Project can be obligated and begin implementation quickly, if selected:

- ○ Yes  □ No

Description of project readiness:

The advanced progress of the design plans, procurement documents, approvals, and limited environmental analysis make this project ready to implement. Plans have been advanced to 75% completion, not including the canopies on the parking lot. All other green, energy efficient features and solar panel systems that cover 80% of the energy consumption are included in the current 75% design. Procurement documents have also been drafted, and are to be completed by February 2012.

Project approvals are also in process. Site plan approval process has already started with the City of Pompano Beach Planning & Zoning Department, and approval is expected by October 2011. Water and sanitary sewer plans and permit application have been submitted to Broward County Water & Wastewater Services for review.
In addition, there is no environmental assessment required for the implementation of this project, since facilities are existing, and no land acquisition necessary. A Categorical Exclusion has already been developed for this project. SFRTA is committed to funding up to $7,122,479.61, or 55% of the cost.

Description of project management capacity to complete proposed project:

SFRTA has the staff and consultant team necessary to implement this project. Coordinated efforts of the Planning, Engineering, Operations, Legal, Procurement, and Finance Departments have lead to successful project completions. SFRTA has recently completed the procurement of rebuilt locomotives and rolling stock. SFRTA was also successful in completing design, procurement, and construction of Tri-Rail’s first parking garage at the Fort Lauderdale Airport Station. The three-level parking garage incorporated green, sustainable construction aspects, which resulted in a decrease in energy consumption for this particular station. Smaller projects, such as LED Lighting for Parking Lots at Tri-Rail’s Cypress Creek and Lake Worth Stations were also successfully completed, and have reduce energy consumption at those stations.

SFRTA is also experienced in managing Federal Programs, such as the Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom programs, as the Designated Recipient for the region. In addition, SFRTA has been a Florida Department of Transportation and FTA partner in a demonstration project for Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) passenger rail locomotives.

In addition, SFRTA will comply with FTA’s Project Management Plan (PMP) and reporting requirements for this project. As an FTA grantee, SFRTA has previously prepared and implemented PMP’s that vary in detail by the size of the project, and Quarterly reports for the FTA. The proposed project will have a web-based tracker for solar energy generation. The ability to collect information on the results for one year following the project’s implementation will be easily accomplished. The agency is currently required to report quarterly to FTA, FDOT and Department of Homeland Security on all projects receiving grant funding. All required information (energy savings and quarterly reports) is provided by the Project Manager to the Grants Administrator and reported directly to the funding agency.

### Project Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Federal Amount</th>
<th>Local Match</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>976,553.66</td>
<td>976,553.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>308,840.5</td>
<td>308,840.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of Procurement package</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>123,536.2</td>
<td>123,536.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,632,607.5</td>
<td>4,632,607.5</td>
<td>9,265,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>308,840.5</td>
<td>308,840.5</td>
<td>617,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, Engineering &amp; Inspections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>463,260.75</td>
<td>463,260.75</td>
<td>926,521.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagging</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>308,840.5</td>
<td>308,840.5</td>
<td>617,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,713,549.25</td>
<td>12,836,028.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe Project Budget Justification:

The total project cost is estimated at $12,836,028.86. SFRTA respectfully requests a total amount of $5,713,549.25, or 45% of the total project cost to be funded by TIGGER. As previously mentioned, SFRTA has entered into a JPA with the Florida Department of Transportation, which provides up to one half of the remaining 55% of the project cost. SFRTA’s adopted capital budget includes the balance of the required funds. This project can be obligated to meet the timeline required by the TIGGER program.

A detailed cost estimate was developed by one of our General Planning Consultant team during the 30% design.
development. This cost was carefully reviewed to ensure that it corresponds with the scope and material quantities. In addition, local industry standards were used to estimate soft cost components, such as design completion, permits, and labor.

The project has been approved and included in the Broward MPO TIP/STIP. Letters of support from the Broward County MPO and other State and Local representatives also provided as an attachment. This project is consistent with the Agency’s Transit Development Plan (TDP).

### Project Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline Item Description</th>
<th>Timeline Item Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Design (10 months)</td>
<td>4/21/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting (4 months)</td>
<td>8/8/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement (3.5 months)</td>
<td>1/12/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (12 months)</td>
<td>5/1/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management (ongoing)</td>
<td>4/21/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, Engineering &amp; Inspections (12 months)</td>
<td>5/1/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Station Opening</td>
<td>5/20/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>5/20/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Congressional Districts (Place of Performance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congressional District</th>
<th>Congressional Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FL-019</td>
<td>Deutch, Ted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL-022</td>
<td>West, Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL-023</td>
<td>Hastings, Alcee L.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 8, 2011

Michael Busha
Executive Director
Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
421 SW Camden Ave
Stuart, FL 34994

Dear Michael,

Thank you for your time and effort on 29 November 2011 at the first statewide stakeholders’ meeting to create Florida’s 5-year economic development strategic plan. The session at Collaborative Labs was a great success. Together, we made strides toward developing recommendations for 2017 vision and goals for Florida’s economy, and prioritizing possible economic development strategies.

While considerable progress was made, there remains much work to do. The next phase of this strategic planning effort will involve regional engagement meetings from January through March 2012 to gather additional input from the public, local communities, and regional entities. The Department of Economic Opportunity will take the lead in organizing these meetings.

I applaud all you have accomplished so far. Your continued support is critical to the success of this plan. Please encourage your colleagues to get involved in this important effort by visiting www.floridajobs.org.

Sincerely yours,

Doug Darling
Executive Director

cc: Gray Swoope, Secretary of Commerce
    and President, Enterprise Florida, Inc.
December 8, 2011

Gregory Vaday, Economic Development Coordinator
Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
421 SW Cuscaden Avenue
Stuart, FL 34994

Dear Mr. Vaday,

On behalf of the Palm Beach County League of Cities, I thank you for joining us in Mangonia Park to speak to our General Membership. We appreciate you joining us the day before a holiday to share information important to our elected officials, who are always looking for ways to improve their communities. Staying up-to-date on development issues is vital to our members.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Richard Radcliffe
Executive Director

www.leagueofcities.org | richard@pbcgov.org
Richard Radcliffe, Executive Director
(561) 355-44841 (Fax) 355-6545
P.O. Box 1589, Governmental Center, West Palm Beach, FL 33402
Office: Governmental Center, 301 North Olive Ave., Suite 1002.17, West Palm Beach, FL 33401
December 8, 2011

Kim Delaney, Strategic Development Director
Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
421 SW Camden Avenue
Stuart, FL 34994

Dear Ms. Delaney,

On behalf of the Palm Beach County League of Cities, I thank you for joining us in Mangonia Park to facilitate the presentation to our General Membership. We appreciate you joining us the day before a holiday to share information important to our elected officials, who are always looking for ways to improve their communities. The information presented by the team is very useful to our members.

Sincerely,

Richard Radcliffe
Executive Director
December 8, 2011

Mr. Michael J. Busha
Executive Director
Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
421 SW Camden Avenue
Stuart, FL 34994

Re: Section 5309 Bus and Bus Facilities Livability Initiative grant award

Dear Mr. Busha:

The South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA) would like to thank you for your recent support of our Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5309 Bus and Bus Facilities Livability Initiative grant application for an Alternative Fuel Shuttle Bus Fleet Procurement.

We are pleased to inform you that your support made a difference. SFRTA is fortunate to have been awarded $4,556,000 for this project. The competition was intense with 839 project applications received, representing $4.9 billion in funding requests from transit providers across the country.

SFRTA is keeping the momentum going, and is initiating implementation activities. We look forward to the many benefits the project will provide, including lower operating costs and reduced fuel consumption and carbon emissions for the region.

As a resident of South Florida, you appreciate the outstanding quality of life that residents here enjoy. We appreciate your continued partnership in providing South Florida with a world class transportation system for both residents and visitors alike.

The grant application and project flyer are attached for your information. More information is available on our web site at http://www.sfcta.fl.gov/planning.html under planning projects.

Again, thank you for your kind support.

Sincerely,

Joseph Giulietti
Executive Director

Attachments

cc: SFRTA Governing Board
Lynda Westin, SFRTA
SFRTA Alternative Fuel Shuttle Bus Fleet Procurement

BACKGROUND

Tri-Rail shuttle bus routes connect commuters with key destinations in the South Florida region. These shuttles directly link Tri-Rail with airports, hospitals, colleges/universities, and other major employment centers. SFRTA/Tri-Rail shuttle ridership has grown tremendously in recent years, as employers and commuters have identified the benefits of having increased transportation choices.

The procurement of an alternative fuel shuttle bus fleet is a direct result of continuing coordination with the Florida Department of Transportation District IV office. FDOT funded an SFRTA shuttle bus study which identified shuttle bus operating efficiencies and was the impetus for exploring fleet procurement options.

DESCRIPTION

In these challenging financial times, SFRTA is seeking new opportunities to lower its operating costs. SFRTA currently uses private operators with a "turnkey" contract for its shuttle services. However, significant operational savings could be realized if SFRTA owned the shuttle buses that are used by its contracted operators. As a result, SFRTA seeks to purchase new alternative fuel vehicles for its shuttle service. In addition to lowering operating costs, the new alternative fuel shuttles would result in the reduction of fuel consumption and carbon emissions.

SFRTA hopes to procure

- Fifteen (15) 23 foot Low Floor Cutaway Alternative Fuel Busses
- Five (5) 35 foot Eldorado EZ-Rider II Alternative Fuel Busses

It is anticipated that large busses will be used on routes with higher ridership and routes with additional luggage storage needs.

For More Information, Please Contact:
William L. Cross, P.E.
Manager, Planning and Engineering
954-788-7916

BENEFITS

- Reduced Operating Costs
- Reduced Fuel Consumption
- Reduced Carbon Emissions
- Increased Reliability

JULY 2011
SECTION 5309 BUS AND BUS FACILITIES LIVABILITY INITIATIVE GRANT PROGRAM

Alternative Fuel Shuttle Bus Fleet Procurement

Submitted By:
South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA)
800 NW 33rd Street
Pompano Beach, FL 33064

Contact:
William L. Cross, P.E.
Manager of Planning and Capital Development
South Florida Regional Transportation Authority
800 NW 33rd Street
Pompano Beach, FL 33064
Phone: (954) 768-7916
Fax: (954) 942-3325
E-mail: crosswl@sfrta.fl.gov
July 28, 2011

Mr. Peter M. Rogoff, Administrator
Federal Transit Administration
1990 K Street NW, Suite 510
Washington, DC 20006

Re: Section 5309 Bus and Bus Facilities Livability Initiative Grant Program

The South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA) is pleased to submit and respectfully requests your consideration of this application for the Section 5309 Bus and Bus Facilities Livability Initiative Grant Program for the Alternative Fuel Shuttle Bus Fleet Procurement Project.

In developing the grant proposal, SFRTA was guided by four basic principles:

- Contributing to the livability and environmental and energy sustainability of the South Florida Region;
- Optimal efficiency and condition of the SFRTA shuttle bus fleet;
- Continued connectivity of people between modes of transportation; and
- Implementation of the SFRTA shuttle bus fleet management plan, a collaborative effort between SFRTA and the Florida Department of Transportation.

This proposal from SFRTA will help both the South Florida Region and the nation emerge from the current economic recession positioned for strong and sustainable future growth. I am extremely pleased to note the strong and broad support for these proposals as evidenced by the letters of support from the Congressional Delegation; State Legislature; County and Municipal Officials; area Metropolitan Planning Organizations, the two Regional Planning Councils, and the newly formed Southeast Florida Regional Partnership, recipient of a Sustainable Communities Initiative grant in 2010.

SFRTA has given thoughtful consideration in preparing these proposals and we appreciate the consideration by the US Department of Transportation for federal funding.

Sincerely,

Joseph Giulietti
Executive Director
**Applicant and Proposal Profile**

(Bus and Bus Facilities Program)

**Section I. Applicant Information**

Organization Legal Name: South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA)

FTA Recipient ID Number: 5454

Applicant Eligibility: 
- State
- Indian Tribe
- Direct recipient of 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program

Population served: 
- Urbanized over 200,000
- Urbanized 50,000 - 200,000
- Rural

Description of services provided:

The SFRTA operates Tri-Rail, a commuter rail service, with 18 stations along the 72 mile South Florida Rail Corridor serving Palm Beach, Broward, and Miami-Dade counties in the South Florida region. Tri-Rail currently has an average weekday daily ridership of over 13,000 and operates seven days a week with 50 weekday trains. Tri-Rail currently operates 11 shuttle bus routes (24 total vehicles including spares) serving Tri-Rail stations in the South Florida region.

Description of areas served:

Tri-Rail shuttle bus routes connect commuters with key destinations in the South Florida region. These shuttles directly link Tri-Rail with airports, hospitals, colleges/universities, and other major employment centers. SFRTA/Tri-Rail shuttle ridership has grown tremendously in recent years, as employers and commuters have identified the benefits of having increased transportation choices.

**Section II. Evaluation Criteria** *(This section repeats, per project)*

**Eligibility Information**

**Proposal Title:** SFRTA Alternative Fuel Shuttle Bus Fleet Procurement

Project Type:
- Purchase of replacement or rehabilitation of bases and vans
- Replacement or the modernization of bus maintenance, service, or administrative facilities
- Purchases of vehicles for service expansion
Planning and Local / Region Prioritization

Is this project in STIP or TIP?  □ Yes  ☑ No  □ N/A

Planning and Local Prioritization Justification:

In order to improve SFRTA operational efficiencies and to provide more environmentally friendly transportation options, the SFRTA is applying for this grant to replace the existing diesel shuttle bus fleet, which is currently owned by SFRTA's shuttle bus contractor, with new alternative fuel buses owned by SFRTA.

The project has received many strong letters of support from local transportation and planning organizations (attached), and among these are letters from local Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs). The MPOs indicated that the local Transportation Improvement Plans (TIPs) could be amended to include this project prior to grant award as specified in the NOFA. The project is not currently identified in the MPOs long range plans. The local match source will be SFRTA capital funds.

In developing the project, there was extensive regional coordination with Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) District IV office, local transit operators and planning organizations. FDOT funded two SFRTA shuttle bus studies which identified shuttle bus operating efficiencies and were the impetus for exploring fleet procurement options and potential operational cost savings associated with a new contract. The new contract would include an option to free issue buses to the service provider in order to reduce the hourly operating rate. Both shuttle bus studies were presented at the SFRTA Planning Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC) which consists of members from the three county transit agencies, the three MPOs, the two FDOT Districts, and the two Regional Planning Councils (RPCs). This forum was used to receive feedback and comments which helped guide the study and the ensuing service plan.

In summary, these studies included extensive coordination with all regional partner transportation agencies in an effort to complement all modes of transportation.

This project is also consistent with the Southeast Florida Partnership's regional planning efforts. The partnership was awarded a $4.25 million Sustainable Communities Initiative grant to create a regional blueprint for growth in the seven county southeast Florida region. This project is located in the region served by the Sustainable Communities Initiative grant, and thus is eligible for special consideration during this grant evaluation. The attached signed documentation has been provided by the South Florida Regional Planning Council stating the project's compliance with the DOT-HUD-EPA Partnership for Sustainable Communities six livability principles. (1) The project will provide more transportation choices and provide a greener alternative to the automobile with the purchase of alternative fuel buses. These new modern style buses will be more appealing to the daily commuter and help promote transit usage, as well as walking and biking, which will reduce roadway congestion and parking demand. (2) The project will promote equitable, affordable housing by connecting areas of low income households with a more efficient and economically viable alternative form of transportation. (3) The project will enhance economic competitiveness by providing more transportation choices, which has shown to be an significant decision factor when companies are considering establishing headquarters or relocation in a
Readiness Justification

Project Can Be Implemented Within:

☐ 3 Months  ☑ 6 Months  ☐ 12 Months  ☐ 18 Months

Project Can Be Obligated Within:

☐ 3 Months  ☑ 6 Months  ☐ 12 Months  ☐ 18 Months

Project Readiness Justification:

*** Note: Applicant should address all elements listed as part of the evaluation criteria in the Notice Of Funding Availability (NOFA).***

The procurement of an alternative fuel shuttle bus fleet is a direct result of continuing coordination with the MPOs and FDOT District IV office. FDOT funded an SFRTA shuttle bus study which identified shuttle bus operating efficiencies through SFRTA owned shuttles and was the impetus for exploring fleet procurement options. The SFRTA shuttle bus studies led directly to SFRTA efforts to procure an alternative fuel shuttle bus fleet.

Since the project does not involve construction, environmental documentation is not necessary prior to implementation. Project implementation plans and schedule have been completed based on prior experience with major procurement including rail cars and locomotives and are detailed in the project timeline section of this application for the alternative fuel fleet procurement.

As mentioned above, the MPOs expressed support for the project and will be able to work with SFRTA to amend the local TIPs to include the project.

The SFRTA has matching funding available for the purchase of alternative fuel busses.

There are two parts to this project, and SFRTA has the capacity to implement both quickly. The first task is to issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a new shuttle bus service contract to be in place when the current contract expires. The new shuttle bus contract will include an option for free issuing busses in exchange for a reduced hourly rate. The current service contract does not have a free issue option, therefore, the contractor is responsible for procuring busses and factors capital depreciation in the hourly operational rate.

The second task is to procure the alternative fuel fleet. SFRTA is fortunate that a State of Florida program can expedite purchase of the alternative fuel shuttle bus fleet. The SFRTA anticipates procuring the alternative fuel busses through the Transit Research Inspection Procurement Service Program (TRIPS), a competitively bid contract currently in place and managed by the Florida Department of Transportation. SFRTA's procurement department is familiar with purchasing through State of Florida contracts, and can work quickly to make the procurement happen.

The local project support and existing procurement framework will ensure that this project is implemented quickly.

Technical, Legal and Financial Capacity

Description of Technical Capacity to Implement Project:

*** Note: Applicant should address all elements listed as part of the evaluation criteria in the Notice Of Funding Availability (NOFA).***

SFRTA Procurement, finance, legal, and operations staff are well qualified to implement the proposed shuttle bus fleet procurement, request for proposals process, as well as the oversight of the ongoing operations of the shuttle bus program.

Pursuant to FTA Implementation Plan documentation and reporting requirements, if awarded this grant, the SFRTA will
develop an implementation plan for the proposed project. The implementation plan will detail SFRTA's approach as the Project Management Oversight Contractor (PMOC) including the following key elements including the manner, quantity of the services, products, deliverables, etc. It will also demonstrate the readiness to perform oversight activities that meet FTA requirements associated with this project.

SFRTA’s procurement and finance departments have won many awards of excellence from their respective statewide industry organizations.

SFRTA’s two in-house attorneys routinely work with the entire SFRTA staff to implement many complex, large scale projects including vehicle procurements.

SFRTA Operations staff are the in-house experts on running SFRTA shuttle buses, with years of experience running bus operations for county transit agencies. All SFRTA departments are used to working together on large scale projects, as evidenced by the completion of the South Florida Rail Corridor Double Tracking project and the extensive rail car and locomotive procurements that are currently under way.

There are no outstanding legal, technical, or financial issues with SFRTA that would make this a high risk project to implement quickly.

SFRTA has adequate financial systems in place, and has controls in place, as evidenced by the attached financial audit.

Description of Legal Capacity to Implement Project:
*** Note: Applicant should address all elements listed as part of the evaluation criteria in the Notice Of Funding Availability (NOFA).

SFRTA has a Legal department made up of two full-time attorneys. SFRTA's legal staff knows the goals and objectives of the Agency, and are involved in every phase of a project; from inception to completion. Legal staff will be part of the team working through the RFP process for a new shuttle bus service contract as well as the purchase of vehicles available on the State of Florida's TRIPS contract. SFRTA's legal team is involved in all major SFRTA procurements, reviewing RFP language, participating in the contractor selection process, and reviewing all contractual language.

Description of Financial Capacity to Implement Project:
*** Note: Applicant should address all elements listed as part of the evaluation criteria in the Notice Of Funding Availability (NOFA).

As stated in the matching funds section, the local capital outlay will come from SFRTA capital funds. SFRTA has funds available to cover the local match.

SFRTA’s Finance Department manages the Agency’s grants, budgets, revenue collection, and accounting. The department has over ten (10) full-time employees, who work closely with the project managers in the agency. SFRTA’s audit is attached, and has won industry awards in the past.

Ongoing operations of the current Tri-Rail shuttle bus system is funded by a combination of sources including the SFRTA, FDOT, local agencies, and private developer contributions. During a special session held by the Florida State Legislature in December 2009, a dedicated funding source was established to maintain the current level of operation at the SFRTA for at least the next 15 years. Current levels of funding from each source are expected to continue for the foreseeable future.

Are there any outstanding Technical, Legal, or Financial issues with respect to FTA Funding?
☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, explain:

N/A

SF424 Supplemental Form - Bus and Bus Facilities Program
Demonstration of Need

Description of asset to be replaced or rehabilitated in age or mileage (if applicable):

N/A

Demonstration of Need:

*** Note: Applicant should address all elements listed as part of the evaluation criteria in the Notice Of Funding Availability (NOFA).

SFRTA’s Tri-Rail passengers are greatly served by existing SFRTA shuttle routes, which specifically time their routes to the arrival and departure of the Tri-Rail trains.

SFRTA, like all state and local governments, is feeling the need to explore any operational efficiencies. Due to the collapse of South Florida property values, the local government revenues and budgets have been reduced drastically. This has impacted the ability of South Florida counties to contribute to Tri-Rail, as annual county contributions have been scaled back to the statutory minimum. Fortunately, the State of Florida held a special legislative session in December 2009 and found recurring funding to fill this operating gap. The new Governor and winter 2011 legislative session have made it clear that all agencies associated with the state need to evaluate service efficiencies to reduce annual operating expenses. The state legislature recently has made cuts to government spending a top priority.

In these challenging financial times, SFRTA is seeking new opportunities to lower its operating costs. SFRTA currently uses private operators with a “turnkey” contract for its shuttle services. However, significant operational savings could be realized if SFRTA owned the shuttle buses that are used by its contracted operators. As a result, SFRTA seeks to purchase new alternative fuel vehicles for its shuttle service. In addition to lowering operating costs, the new alternative fuel shuttles would result in the reduction of fuel consumption and carbon emissions.

Despite this difficult financial picture, there is a the need to invest to properly serve the projected growth in population and transit use in South Florida. Even though population growth projections are more modest than in the past, South Florida is still attracting domestic and international residents. This only exacerbates the current backlog in roadway level of service and is expected to further worsen traffic congestion. There is a clear need for transit improvements to preserve the quality of life and support the regional economy.

Project Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Federal Amount</th>
<th>Total Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Fuel 35' EZ-Rider Busses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>448,000</td>
<td>2,240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Fuel 23' Low Floor Cutaway Busses</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>154,400</td>
<td>2,316,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Amount:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,556,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Matching Funds Information

Matching Funds Amount: 1139000

Source of Matching Funds:
The local capital outlay will come from SFRTA Capital Funds.

Supporting Documentation of Local Match:
The most recent independent auditors report can be found in the SFRTA Comprehensive Annual Financial Report at the following link: http://www.sfrta.fl.gov/docs/overview/2010_CAFR.pdf

Project Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline Item Description</th>
<th>Timeline Item Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Assumes Grant Awarded 9/1/11) Issue RFP for new shuttle bus service contract</td>
<td>12/1/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFRTA Board approves new shuttle bus service contract</td>
<td>4/1/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate bus procurement</td>
<td>5/1/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New alternative-fuel buses begin operating</td>
<td>10/1/2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Congressional Districts (Place of Performance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congressional District</th>
<th>Congressional Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FL-017</td>
<td>Wilson, Frederica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL-018</td>
<td>Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL-019</td>
<td>Deutch, Ted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL-021</td>
<td>Diaz-Balart, Mario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL-022</td>
<td>West, Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL-023</td>
<td>Hastings, Alcee L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL-016</td>
<td>Rooney, Tom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL-025</td>
<td>Rivera, David</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 16, 2011

VIA EMAIL TO Bennett.mike.web@flsenate.gov

Senator Michael S. Bennett
Wildwood Professional Park
3653 Cortez Road, Ste. 90
West Bradenton, FL 34210

RE: SB 842 Section 30, (8) and (20) of 186.505, F.S.

Dear Senator:

I recently attended a Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council Meeting on December 9, 2011 and heard some disturbing news regarding the above proposed Senate Bill. It appears that the proposed language shifts the responsibility to the local government and makes this an unfunded mandate for local governments to perform statewide statutory functions. This conclusion is reached based on the fact that the State no longer funds Regional Planning Council’s to perform State statutory functions.

Additionally, it appears the language in Subsection 20 unnecessarily interferes with Council’s ability to conduct its local governments for planning services and technical assistance.

It is my belief this language should be removed so that we are not shifting burdens to local governments who already have a difficult time with their budgets. Furthermore, the language should be redacted to allow the Regional Planning Council’s ability to do their job as outlined in their mission statements unencumbered and without the interference of the additional burdens outlined in this bill. Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Paul L. Luger, Commissioner
Town of Sewalls Point

PLI/mtc

cc:  Mike Buscha (mbuscha@terrec.org)
Jacqui Thurlow-Lippisch (jthurlowlippisch@comcast.net)
Paul Schoppe (pschoppe@comcast.net)
Pam Buscha (mpbusha@bellsouth.net)
Tom Bausch (webmaster@pate.net)
January 3, 2012

Mr. Michael Busha, Executive Director
Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
421 SW Camden Avenue
Stuart, Florida 34994

Dear Mr. Busha:

It is with regret that I must inform you that the January 20th meeting of the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) will be my last meeting of record. Unfortunately, after sixteen years of public service, I will be leaving office in March due to term limits.

It has been my great pleasure to serve on the TCRPC. I am extremely proud of the work that we've done and all that has been accomplished. You have been a great executive director, and I'm pleased to have had such a good working relationship with you.

Please accept my very best wishes for your continuing success.

Sincerely,

Dr. Carmine A. Priore
Mayor pro tem
Wellington
**Southeast**

**ALTERNATIVE ENERGY**

**Airing It Out**

*Wind Capital Group hopes to obtain building permits in a few months for a wind plant in western Palm Beach County, the first in the Southeast U.S. "In the state of Florida, this is going to be some of the best wind you're going to find," says program director Robin Satz in Jupiter. Federal Energy Department resource maps show mainland Florida's wind energy potential is mediocre with the exception of east of Lake Okeechobee. Meanwhile, however, concerns over the turbine's impact on wildlife raise the question of whether any Florida location will be viable for wind generation. The company has commissioned a 50-week study of birds and bats to plan a layout that would minimize the impact on wildlife. The industry reports that on average turbines kill three birds per year per megawatt, far fewer than deaths caused by cats, transmission lines or crashes into buildings and cars, Satz says. But environmentalists say the study isn't long enough to capture fluctuating bird migratory patterns. The area is critical habitat for native avian species and migrating birds, which stay over land as long as possible. Bird populations from Latin America to Canada could be affected, they say. "The impact is going to be very negative," says Drew Martin, conservation chair for the local Sierra Club chapter. Similar concerns led environmentalists to oppose FPL's plan for wind generators near its nuclear plant on Hutchinson Island in St. Lucie County. FPL put those plans on hold and now is evaluating sites in western St. Lucie. Wind supporters, Martin says, may have to look offshore. "Of course, we support renewable energy. The important thing is they be sited appropriately," says Julie Wraithmell, wildlife policy director for Audubon of Florida, which wants a three-year study. "Florida has some very unique concerns, and as a result, it's important we do our due diligence before alighting these things. Once they're up, the damage is done."*

**Harvesting the Wind**

*Wind Capital Group's St. Louis is targeting Palm Beach County for a wind farm. The firm's 60 to 100 turbines—with 40 to 50 stories high—will produce 150 megawatts, enough to power 35,000 to 40,000 homes.*

**Where:** 13,000 acres of leased farmland in the Everglades Agricultural Area

**Power:** Combined generation of 150 megawatts, enough to power 35,000 to 40,000 homes

**Jobs:** 250 to 300 at peak construction; 12 to 15 to operate the turbines

**Cost:** $300 million

**Players**

- Architectural design and consulting firm Gresham, Smith and Partners appointed Luis A. Cane, a specialist in healthcare projects, senior vice president in charge of its Fort Lauderdale office.
- Cross Match Technologies of Palm Beach Gardens hired Mike Estrade, a former vice president for corporate human resources at Office Depot, to head human resources as a vice president.
- FAU microbiologist Nwadiuko Esiobu was named a Jefferson Science Fellow and will spend the academic year in Washington, D.C., one of 13 U.S. scientists selected to advance their fields and guide government policy. She will serve as a lead science adviser in the Secretary of State's Global Food Security Initiative, focusing on sustainable agricultural output in Africa.
Ray of Hope

Northwest Florida is anticipating a burst of economic energy after National Solar Power selected Gadsden County for its first solar farm, a $1.5-billion venture to convert sunshine into electricity.

The Melbourne-based company claims the 400-megawatt solar project will be the largest in the Southeast, with at least 20 solar farms on 200-acre sites, built at a cost of $70 million each, primarily on timber or agricultural land. The project will create enough electricity to power 22,000 homes and is expected to create 400 jobs during the five-year construction and up to 120 permanent jobs once the project is complete.

Gadsden County was chosen over three competing Florida sites and others in Georgia and North Carolina. National Solar Power CEO James Scrivener cited climate, community and regional support and potential for economic growth as reasons for choosing Gadsden. Also a key factor was Tallahassee Community College’s plan to create a solar energy educational and training center at its Gadsden campus, which will include a 2-megawatt solar farm (enough to power about 150 homes) built by National Solar.

The company has power supply agreements with eight Southeastern utilities, most located in Florida, and has a contract agreement with Progress Energy to supply more than 400 megawatts from both the Gadsden and future sites, Scrivener says. The company has tentative agreements so far with three timber companies on Gadsden County land deals and has talked with some 30 U.S. funding sources about debt or equity financing. Construction could begin in early 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSA</th>
<th>Construction jobs loss</th>
<th>Percentage decline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panama City</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensacola</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Walton Beach</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Florida Department of Economic Opportunity
Note:information could include manufacturing, building, retail, education, etc., equipment. Some sources are relatively low. Some sources are in the community. Numbers are occasionally adjusted.

"Now that we have a site, we can begin engaging with finance partners in due diligence. There will be both ownership partners as well as backers.”

— James Scrivener
Editorial: School district cooperation evident in creation of Treasure Coast virtual school

Online courses for students in region must demonstrate quality and value

Staff Reports
Friday, January 6, 2012

Creation of a Web-based regional school to allow students to take online courses taught by local teachers represents a welcome milestone for cooperation among the school districts of the Treasure Coast.

Discussion on the potential for a virtual school to serve students in Martin, St. Lucie, Indian River and Okeechobee counties began last summer and school officials believe the joint project could be up and running as early as August.

St. Lucie County is leading the effort through its unique partnership with Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, the world’s largest publisher of educational materials. Indian River State College is partnering with the school districts to assist with curriculum development.

Since the 2008-2010 school year, all Florida school districts have been required to offer online courses for students. A new state law also requires that students, beginning with this year’s high school freshman class, take at least one online course as part of graduation requirements.

Those online courses generally are provided by the Florida Virtual School and Florida Connections Academy, both approved by the state. Students take the courses at no cost and their respective school districts pay the tuition fees.

Treasure Coast educators want to develop a locally produced virtual school program that would use and pay local teachers, not online teachers from out of the area.

St. Lucie County Schools Superintendent Michael Lannon said: “This is something that all four districts have talked about wanting to be able to do and now it’s becoming a reality. We wanted to be able to put greater quality control, greater educational value for our boys and girls and to keep resources within the region so the money’s going to local gas stations and restaurants.”

The concept is fine. But, it’s value has yet to be assured.
It makes little sense to reinvent the wheel. Duplicating courses offered through contracts with existing Web-based programs would not seem reasonable unless the locally produced courses are at least of the same quality as already available and at a lower local cost. Creating online courses not already available, such as for particular foreign languages might also be valuable if there is sufficient student interest in such courses. Lannon also said there may be a guidance component added to the Treasure Coast virtual school that may be lacking in existing programs.

Beyond expanding online educational opportunities, the key to the Treasure Coast virtual school must be quality and value.

This is a bold, innovative and ambitious effort being undertaken by the school districts. There is cause for optimism the effort will be successful.

In addition, the cooperative effort being demonstrated sets an example for other collaborative projects to improve education throughout the region.

And even further, the effort sets an example for other governmental bodies throughout the Treasure Coast to consider to improve services and programs for their constituents on a regional basis.