1. Pledge of Allegiance

2. Roll Call

3. Public Comment On Consent Agenda Items

4. Agenda

5. Consent Agenda
   C. Minutes – January 20, 2012
   D. City of Boca Raton Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-1ESR
   E. Town of Gulf Stream Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-1ESR
   F. Wellington Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-1ESR
   G. Wellington Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-2ESR
   H. Intergovernmental Coordination and Review Log


7. Sustainable Communities Initiative Update – Presentation by Councilmember Ramon Trias

8. Update on the Evaluation of Southeast Florida Passenger Rail Proposals

9. Announcements

10. Council Member Information Exchange

11. Staff Comment

12. Chairman’s Comment

13. Adjournment

The next Council Meeting is scheduled for April 20, 2012.
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 FAIELLA, 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 Lugger, Town of Sewall’s Point

PALM BEACH COUNTY
COMMISSIONER KAREN MARCUS
Alternate – Commissioner Jess Santamaria
COMMISSIONER PRISCILLA 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
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
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, SFRTA
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: March 16, 2012 Council Meeting

Attached are the following financial statements for December 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
December 31, 2011

Current Assets:
- Cash Bank - Checking $1,314,632
- Fixed Asset Replacement Budget (FARB) 20,500
- State Board of Administration - Investment Fund 5,750
- Petty Cash 200
- Postage Meter Funds 800
- Due From Other Governmental Units 412,571
- Due From Treasure Coast Enterprise Fund 25,000
- Deposits as Security 394

$1,779,846

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

$2,534,141

Less: Depreciation $363,552

$2,170,589

TOTAL ASSETS $3,950,434

Liabilities:
- Loan Payable $55,501
- Accounts Payable 22,753
- Benefits Payable 72,235
- Unearned Revenues 59,364

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

$1,853,622

Fund Balances:
- General Reserves $1,049,481
- Legal Reserves 50,000
- Revolving Loan Reserves 0
- General Funds -1,173,258
- Fixed Assets 2,170,588

$2,096,811

TOTAL LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES $3,950,434
# TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

## REVENUE REPORT

For the Three Month period ending December 31, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Revenue Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM - SARA - Title III for 2011-2012</td>
<td>30,682</td>
<td>6,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM - 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>21,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDOT Land Use/Transportation Planning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL TOD Guidebook</td>
<td>99,941</td>
<td>66,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>145,850</td>
<td>98,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMEP - Training</td>
<td>36,238</td>
<td>3,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMEP Planning</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA-Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>1,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA-ARRA-Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>49,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA - Assessment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA Public Market - Riviera Beach</td>
<td>20,204</td>
<td>15,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Vulnerability Analysis</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>16,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Disaster Re-Development Plan</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>21,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Communities Initiative</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>42,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>762,942</td>
<td>166,825</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>25,000</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 Implementetation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB-MPO Planning</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>4,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD King Power Plant Site</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glades Utility Authority</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</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>67,256</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>26,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>80</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>26,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,034,631</td>
<td>1,143,425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

BUDGET REPORT

For the Three Month period ending December 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>22</td>
<td>209,223</td>
<td>77,184</td>
<td>734,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>372,479</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>88,228</td>
<td>28,970</td>
<td>284,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Expenses</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6,429</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>15,571</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>8</td>
<td>1,858</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>20,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies &amp; Expenses</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9,340</td>
<td>3,051</td>
<td>36,660</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>31</td>
<td>11,547</td>
<td>4,907</td>
<td>25,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone &amp; Fax</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3,341</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>14,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>7,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18,607</td>
<td>6,067</td>
<td>37,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues &amp; Memberships</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>24,572</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>(572)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</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>0</td>
<td>18,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library &amp; Publications</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Advertising</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Fees</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7,371</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Fees</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>10,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note Principal</td>
<td>73,761</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18,260</td>
<td>6,168</td>
<td>55,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note Interest</td>
<td>66,318</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16,760</td>
<td>5,506</td>
<td>49,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,794,124</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>433,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>149,046</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,360,224</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>225,507</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>143,608</td>
<td>77,673</td>
<td>81,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants - Pass Through</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>29,295</td>
<td>29,295</td>
<td>(29,295)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,019,631</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>606,802</strong></td>
<td><strong>256,013</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,412,829</strong></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><strong>2,034,631</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>606,802</strong></td>
<td><strong>256,013</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,427,829</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: March 16, 2012 Council Meeting

Attached are the following financial statements for January 31, 2012:

- 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

January 31, 2012

Current Assets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Bank - Checking</td>
<td>1,278,119</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>5,750</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>304,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due From Treasure Coast Enterprise Fund</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Deposits as Security                            | 394      | $1,635,177

Fixed Assets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>
| Land                | 500,000  | $2,534,141

Less: Depreciation $368,393 $2,165,748

TOTAL ASSETS $3,800,926

Liabilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liability</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loan Payable</td>
<td>49,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>9,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits Payable</td>
<td>68,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unearned Revenues</td>
<td>58,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Liabilities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Payable</td>
<td>1,643,770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fund Balances:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserve</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>-1,295,237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Fixed Assets          | 2,165,748| $1,969,992

TOTAL LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES $3,800,926
# REVENUE REPORT

For the Four Month period ending January 31, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Revenue Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEM - SARA - Title III for 2011-2012</td>
<td>30,682</td>
<td>6,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM - 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>21,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDOT Land Use/Transportation Planning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL TOD Guidebook</td>
<td>99,941</td>
<td>66,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>145,850</strong></td>
<td><strong>98,010</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HMEP - Training</td>
<td>36,238</td>
<td>3,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMEP Planning</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA-Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>1,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA-ARRA-Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>59,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA - Assessment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA Public Market - Riviera Beach</td>
<td>20,204</td>
<td>15,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Vulnerability Analysis</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>16,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Disaster Re-Development Plan</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>21,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Communities Initiative</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>56,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Economic Develop, Admin. - Planning 2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>762,942</strong></td>
<td><strong>190,597</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>So. FL Reg. Transportation Authority</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>25,000</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>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB-MPO Planning</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>4,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD King Power Plant Site</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glades Utility Authority</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riviera Beach CRA Public Market</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>243,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>67,256</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Dues</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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><strong>784,839</strong></td>
<td><strong>784,839</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRI Fees</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>27,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grants and Other Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>98,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,488</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2,034,631</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,168,190</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational Budget</td>
<td>Percentage Used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>944,166</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>372,479</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Expenses</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance-Brownfields</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies &amp; Expenses</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone &amp; Fax</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues &amp; Memberships</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training - HMEP</td>
<td>20,400</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library &amp; Publications</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Advertising</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Fees</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Fees</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note Principal</td>
<td>73,761</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note Interest</td>
<td>66,318</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,794,124</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>225,507</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants - Pass Through</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,019,631</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay - Building</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,034,631</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: March 16, 2012 Council Meeting
Subject: Minutes – January 20, 2012

Introduction

The Minutes of the January 20, 2012 Council meeting were posted to Council’s website on March 2, 2012 at http://www.tcrpc.org.

Recommendation

Council should approve the Minutes of the January 20, 2012 Council meeting.
Chairman Foley 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 Wheeler (Alternate) 
Vice Mayor Fletcher 

St. Lucie County: Commissioner Mowery 
Commissioner Perona 

Martin County: Commissioner Hayes 
Commissioner Smith 
Commissioner Krauskopf 

Palm Beach County: Commissioner Taylor 
Commissioner Marcus 
Councilwoman Webster 
Mayor Ferreri 
Mayor Golonka 
Mayor Pro Tem Dr. Priore 
Mayor Pro Tem Brinkman (Alternate) 
Vice Mayor Norris (Alternate) 
Vice Mayor Pro Tem Andel (Alternate) 
Mayor DuBois (Alternate) 

Gubernatorial Appointees: Kevin Foley 
Bill Hall 
Susan Hershey 
Reece Parrish 
Peter Sachs 
Robert Stork 
Ramon Trias 

Ex-Officios: Pam Mac’Kie, South Florida Water Management District 
Ann Benedetti, St. Johns River Water Management District 
Lois Bush, Department of Transportation (Alternate) 
Mary Murphy, Department of Environmental Protection (Alternate) 
Lynda Westin, South Florida Regional Transportation Authority 

Council Staff: Kate Boer 
Michael Busha 
Kim DeLaNey 
Eloine del Valle 
Anthea Gianniotis
The Executive Director announced a quorum was present.

**AGENDA AND CONSENT AGENDA**

Chairman Foley noted several requests for amending the Agenda. Staff listed the following changes:

- New Agenda Item 6 - Contract amendments and Council direction with respect to the cleanup loan to the West Palm Beach Community Redevelopment Agency.
- New Agenda Item 7 - an informational presentation regarding legislation dealing with online travel companies.
- Agenda Item 6 was renumbered as 8.
- Agenda Item 7 was renumbered as 9.
- Agenda Item 8 was renumbered as 11.
- Agenda Item 9 was renumbered as 12.
- Agenda Item 11 was renumbered as 13.
- Agenda Item 12 was renumbered as 14.

Mr. Saberson explained that to amend the agenda there needs to be good cause. With respect to new Agenda Item 6, Mr. Saberson noted that he required Council direction on the loan documents to the West Palm Beach Community Redevelopment Agency. With respect to new Agenda Item 7, information on the online travel companies is being presented because it will be addressed in the current legislative session.

Commissioner Smith moved approval of the amended Agenda and the Consent Agenda. **Motion** Commissioner Marcus seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Items on the Consent Agenda were: 5A, Financial Report – October 31, 2011; 5B, Financial Report - November 30, 2011; 5C, Minutes – December 9, 2011; 5D, Town of Orchid Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-1ER; 5E, Village of Palm Springs Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-1ESR; 5F, City of Port St. Lucie Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-1ESR; and 5G, Village of Tequesta Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-1ESR.

**PUBLIC COMMENT ON CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS**

None.
Mr. Saberson explained that Council had previously directed the Executive Director and Council Attorney to negotiate and execute loan closing documents for a Brownfields loan for $160,000 with the West Palm Beach Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) at the June 17, 2011 Council meeting. During the loan negotiation process, the CRA had made unacceptable modifications to the documents, executed them, and then returned them to Council. Mr. Saberson requested that Council adopt a motion to authorize the Executive Director to send a letter to the CRA declining the offer to make a loan in accordance with the terms set forth in the loan documents.

Commissioner Marcus moved approval to authorize the Executive Director to send the correspondence. Commissioner Smith seconded the motion for discussion.

Commissioner Smith asked if something could be done to modify the current documents, or if the process would need to be started again. Mr. Saberson indicated the returned loan documents would need to be re-executed and revised, but one last attempt could be made to see if an agreement could be reached. Commissioner Smith asked if Council could authorize the changes be done without having to bring the item before Council again. Mr. Saberson stated Council could approve to continue with the recommendation from the June 17, 2011 Council meeting to authorize the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and Executive Director, in consultation with Council’s attorney, to propose, execute, modify and deliver the loan closing documents and sub-grant documents in such form that they would be determined to effectuate the loan and sub-grant. He noted the sub-grant was for approximately $30,000 and has yet to be completed.

Chairman Foley stated he would instruct staff to try to negotiate with the CRA one more time to see if they agree with Mr. Saberson’s proposed modifications. Councilwoman Webster asked if there was a time limit on when the documents needed to be executed. She noted that it was Council’s responsibility to deny the loan if it was not acceptable. Mr. Saberson indicated that there is a stipulation in the grant agreement that if it is delayed too long then the loan cannot be completed. Chairman Foley called for a vote on the motion, which carried unanimously.

Commissioner Smith moved approval to authorize staff to re-negotiate the terms of the loan documents and, if acceptable, execute the loan closing documents. Commissioner Marcus seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Saberson noted that under the loan documents it is provided that in the event of a borrower defaulting on the loan, and Council pursues remedies against the borrower, the borrower must pay Council’s attorney’s fees. He stated that the CRA had deleted that language and put in a provision that states in the event of litigation between the parties that each party would pay their own fees. He stated these fees are separate and distinct from fees that would be payable under an indemnification clause. Commissioner Smith asked if it was standard to have each party pay their own attorney’s fees, and if that is how Council has done their contracts in the past. Mr. Saberson noted that this is the first loan of this type being issued, but it is standard in loan documents that the borrower pays all the attorney’s fees.
Chairman Foley asked if the CRA board was elected officials. Commissioner Mitchell indicated the board is comprised of the City Commission and the Mayor.

Councilwoman Hershey made a motion that the borrower should pay the fees in case of default. Commissioner Marcus seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Saberson stated there was also an issue with the indemnification on the loan documents. He stated the CRA had expressed concerns, which he has attempted to address, related to 1) sovereign immunity amounts, and 2) their liability to Council under the indemnification. He stated part of that indemnification is related to the contamination on the property and Council’s expectation was that it is the CRA’s contaminated property, not Council’s, and it is expected that, in the event of a lawsuit in which Council incurs damages and attorney’s fees, then the CRA would be responsible. Commissioner Smith indicated that he did not feel that it was necessary for Council approval on each item of the contract as he felt Mr. Saberson was capable of doing what was appropriate and in the best interest of Council. Chairman Foley concurred with this. He stated a motion could be made for this item, but felt Mr. Saberson would represent Council on all other issues without further authorization. Commissioner Marcus so moved. Mayor Ferreri seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

ONLINE TRAVEL COMPANIES AND THE TOURIST DEVELOPMENT TAX AND STATE SALES TAX – PRESENTATION BY ALBERT J. HADEED, FLAGLER COUNTY ATTORNEY

Staff noted this presentation had been provided at the Policy Board meeting of the Florida Regional Councils Association (FRCA) and staff wanted to bring the information to the attention of Council members. Mr. Hadeed presented a summary of proposed legislation to grant tax exemption or tax amnesty to online companies for local tourist development taxes (TDT) and the state’s sales tax on transient rentals. He provided a summary of the existing tourist development statutes, tax exemption impacts, pending and settled court claims to collect the TDT taxes, tax exemption revenue impacts, and the Florida House of Representatives floor vote on the exemption.

Councilmember Sachs asked for clarification of the amount of the taxes being charged to the consumer. Mr. Hadeed indicated the amount is not known because the online companies have refused to disclose this information. He said the companies are sending back the TDT tax, the state transient rental tax, and local option tax to the hotel to be remitted to the state. Councilmember Sachs asked if the customer is being charged more than that for the taxes and keeping the difference. Mr. Hadeed indicated that is the allegation and what the case in Texas attempted to prove, but there was a settlement before the records were released.

Councilmember Sachs asked what the arguments are in favor of the exemption. Mr. Hadeed stated there are essentially two arguments. One, that this is a new tax. The response to this is if it is a new tax, then why would there need to be an exemption. The second argument is the companies are claiming they are increasing tourism in Florida.

Councilmember Sachs asked how it will be determined what is owed and how it will be enforced. Mr. Hadeed indicated there would need to be audits of company records. Councilmember Sachs asked how this relates to online shopping that is not taxed. Mr. Hadeed stated that state law taxes lodging regardless of the source.
Commissioner Mitchell asked for clarification of how the Department of Revenue collection process works and what information they are collecting from the online companies. Mr. Hadeed indicated that no information is being provided by the online companies to the Department of Revenue. Commissioner Mitchell asked if the Florida Chamber of Commerce and Florida TaxWatch have provided opinions on the issue. Mr. Hadeed indicated that Florida TaxWatch created a task force to study ways of reducing governmental expenditures and ways for the state to address these problems. In 2010, the task force issued a report on how the state could save $3 billion. With respect to the state transient rental tax, it was estimated that there was $25 million dollars at risk from these types of transactions. He stated that the Florida Chamber of Commerce, along with the Walt Disney Company, has sided with the online travel companies.

Commissioner Wheeler stated he would like to know how many rooms would be sold if they were charged the additional tax. He asked who benefits from the sales tax, the government or the consumer. He indicated he would be more comfortable with the consumer keeping the money rather than giving it to the government. Mr. Hadeed stated that the allegations are that the company is collecting the taxes and keeping them. He stated there is no way of knowing the number of customers who chose to come to Florida because of the online companies.

Mayor Ferreri stated he had heard the presentation at the FRCA meeting and because he had made his reservations for both his lodging and rental car through an online company he had reviewed his bill. He stated that he saved $20 booking his room through the online company versus the hotel, and he was charged 8.5 percent for taxes and fees. He said the taxes are being collected, but it is not clear what the charges cover. With respect to the rental car, he saved $25 and paid less tax, but he questioned if that money was being taken away from the local airport. He asked if any of this information is being collected. Mr. Hadeed stated he did not know of anyone working on this unless there is a tax collector in a local jurisdiction auditing this, but that would be confidential. Mayor Ferreri stated he did not see this as a regional planning issue, but more of one for the local and county governments and school districts that are losing out on their local option taxes.

Councilmember Hall expressed his opinion that this was good information for the elected Councilmembers to take back to their proper governmental bodies for consideration, but he felt there should be no more Council discussion on the topic.

Councilmember Hershey noted there is collection of sales tax occurring. Mr. Hadeed stated only the applicable sales tax on the whole price paid to the hotelier was being submitted to the Department of Revenue. Councilmember Hershey noted that sales taxes are a major revenue stream for education. Mr. Hadeed confirmed this, stating his presentation had not even addressed the losses to the state and the impacts to other entities such as educational institutions.

Councilmember Stork agreed with Councilmember Hall that the discussion should end on this topic.

 Commissioner Marcus stated this was a good presentation and the Association of Counties is opposed to the exemption. She noted this was unsuccessful last year. She asked if the League of Cities was also opposed. Mr. Hadeed indicated yes.

Chairman Foley noted the purpose of the presentation was to provide information to the elected officials and thanked Mr. Hadeed for his presentation.
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS – 2012

Commissioner Marcus moved approval of the Committee Appointments. Councilmember Sachs seconded the motion, which carried unanimously. Chairman Foley thanked those who offered to serve and invited interested Councilmembers to volunteer for a committee.


Commissioner Marcus moved approval of the Resolution. Councilmember Trias seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

STATUS UPDATE REGARDING SOUTH FLORIDA EAST COAST CORRIDOR STUDY – PRESENTATION BY THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

At the request of Council, Mr. Michael Melendez, representing the Florida Department of Transportation, presented an update regarding the status of the South Florida East Coast Corridor Study (SFECC). 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 anticipated in the summer of 2012.

Commissioner Marcus stated that there are two proposals for passenger train service on the FEC system, the one just presented and the Fast Track Plan which was presented by the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority at the December Council meeting. She noted that at the Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) meeting the previous day, the board agreed to have a consultant see if they could bring both parties to the table and come to an agreement on what is the best plan of action. She stated that although everyone agrees that passenger service on the FEC system is the proper action, there are big differences between the two plans. Staff noted that all the MPOs, the Florida Department of Transportation and the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority have asked Council staff to be involved in facilitating these discussions. Mayor Ferreri noted that the deadline for an interim report to the MPO is April.

Mayor Golonka stated that she was very encouraged after hearing last month’s presentation. She stated that as a planner she recognized the need to do appropriate studies, obtain funding, and have an implementation plan, but she felt this had been going on for too long and she was encouraged that the project finally seemed to be progressing.

RESOLUTION OPPOSING LEGISLATION REGARDING CHANGES TO SOUTH FLORIDA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Commissioner Marcus moved approval of the Resolution. Councilmember Sachs seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.
Commissioner Marcus moved approval of the Resolution. Councilmember Sachs seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

COUNCIL’S EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM UPDATE

Staff presented an overview of Council’s Emergency Preparedness Program and projects. Topics covered included: planning, training and exercises to better prepare the region’s communities to mitigate and respond to disasters; an overview of the Local Emergency Planning Committee role and responsibilities to provide ongoing technical assistance to the region regarding the Emergency Preparedness Community Right-To-Know Act (1986) for hazardous materials; regional hazards analyses; regional vulnerability analyses; radiological training and planning agreement statewide; state homeland security grant program; and post-disaster redevelopment planning. Staff noted that the regional planning council provides services and a delivery system for local, state and federal programs.

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

Staff presented the tenth installment in the Orientation Series. These presentations are to provide information on planning techniques and research to give Council members additional insight and knowledge on how to promote sustainable growth in the region. Staff noted the Vero Beach Charter High School has offered to assist in making a video recording of the series. Over the next few weeks staff will be working with the High School to finish the video recordings and staff will advise Council members when and where the series will be available.

Chairman Foley encouraged all Council members to work with Council staff to supplement existing local staff, especially among the smaller municipalities, and use their expertise and experience.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Staff noted that after sixteen years of public service, and twelve years of service on Council, Dr. Carmine Priore will be termed out in March and no longer able to serve as a Council member. Staff thanked him for his years of service.

Commissioner Smith noted that there has been a lot of discussion around the state of merging organizations and functions. He asked staff to report at the March meeting on activities that have been occurring related to workforce boards, MPOs, and regional planning councils.

COUNCIL MEMBER INFORMATION EXCHANGE

None.
STAFF COMMENT

None.

CHAIRMAN’S COMMENT

None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chairman Foley adjourned the meeting at 11:30 a.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 January 20, 2012 meeting of the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council.

_________________________ __________________________________________
Date      Signature
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members

From: Staff

Date: March 16, 2012 Council Meeting

Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Review
Draft Amendments to the City of Boca Raton 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 Boca Raton is proposing one Future Land Use Map (FLUM) amendment to the comprehensive plan.

Evaluation

The proposed amendment is to change the FLUM designation from Residential (RM) to Recreation and Open Space (PR) on a 14.85-acre parcel located on State Road A-1-A about one mile south of Spanish River Boulevard. The Greater Boca Raton Beach & Park District owns the property, which is known as Ocean Strand. The site is currently vacant and undeveloped. The proposed amendment will lay the groundwork for public park uses to be placed on the site. This site is the last remaining piece of vacant property that stretches from the Intracoastal Waterway to the Atlantic Ocean on the barrier island in the City of Boca Raton.
Extrajurisdictional Impacts

The proposed amendment was provided by City staff to the Palm Beach County Intergovernmental Plan Amendment Review Committee (IPARC) and was circulated by the IPARC Clearinghouse Coordinator on November 11, 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 City of Boca Raton and the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity.

Attachments
# List of Exhibits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General Location Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Current Future Land Use Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Proposed Future Land Use Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aerial of Ocean Strand Property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 1
General Location Map
Exhibit 2
Current Future Land Use Map

FLUM Designations:

Residential
1.0 - RSU
3.5 - RL Low
9.5 - RM Medium
20 - RH High

Commercial
C - Commercial

Public and Private
PI - Institutional
PR - Recreation/Open Space

Industrial
IG - General
IL - Light
IM - Manufacturing

CBD
Central Business District

PM
Planned Mobility
Exhibit 3
Proposed Future Land Use Map

FLUM Designations:

- Residential: 1.0 - RSU, 3.5 - RL, 9.0 - RM Medium, 20 - RH High
- Commercial: C - Commercial
- Public and Private: PR - Recreation/Open Space, N - Conservation
- Industrial: IG - General, IL - Light
- CBD: Central Business District
- IM - Manufacturing
- Planned Mobility: PM

CCCL Line
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members                              AGENDA ITEM 5E
From: Staff
Date: March 16, 2012 Council Meeting
Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Review
         Draft Amendments to the Town of Gulf Stream 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 Town of Gulf Stream is proposing one Future Land Use Map (FLUM) amendment and a series of text amendments to several elements and sub-elements of the comprehensive plan.

Evaluation

A. FLUM Amendment

The Town is proposing an amendment to the FLUM to reflect the 2011 annexation of 16.6 acres located north of Sea Road, south of Little Club Road, and east and west of State Road A1A (North Ocean Boulevard). Currently, the property is assigned a Palm Beach County land use designation of High Residential-12, which allows up to 12 dwelling units per acre. The Town land use designation being proposed is Multi-Family Residential, which allows up to 5.7 dwelling units per acre. The annexation area includes 12 properties and a total of 102 existing multi-family dwelling units. The City of Boynton Beach will continue to provide water and waste water services to the developments within the annexation area.
The Town is proposing numerous text amendments to the comprehensive plan to strengthen concurrency requirements, address non-conforming densities within the Town, and ensure the plan is consistent with recent changes in the state’s growth management regulations. The proposed text amendments include the following changes:

- The Data and Analysis sections of the Future Land Use, Transportation, Housing, Sanitary Sewer Sub-Element, Solid Waste Sub-Element, Potable Water Sub-Element, Recreation and Open Space, Coastal Management, and Capital Improvements Elements have been updated to reflect the annexation of the 16.6 acres.
- The Future Land Use Element has been updated to: 1) confirm the Town’s Concurrency Management system; 2) require properties in the state master file to be identified during the permitting process; 3) ensure proposed development will not adversely alter the drainage of neighboring properties or visual aesthetics of the area; 4) eliminate wording regarding encouraging infill development and reducing urban sprawl; 5) include language that states material management areas shall be maintained in a safe and visually attractive manner; and 6) eliminate a policy that states the need for a study for the burying of power lines within the town.
- The Housing Element has been updated to include: 1) modifications to a policy with respect to consideration of drafting a local historic preservation ordinance and proposing guidelines or regulations; 2) elimination of the timeframe with respect to coordination with the Palm Beach County Intergovernmental Plan Amendment Review Committee; and 3) revisions to an objective to include references to the definition of “group home” and eliminate the timeframe.
- The Sanitary Sewer Sub-Element has been updated to include: 1) elimination of a timeframe for a study of potential funding sources for a centralized wastewater plant; and 2) correction of a typographical error regarding the Las Casitas project.
- The Coastal Management Element has been updated to include: 1) amendments to the Data and Analysis portion to reflect the latest definition of the Coastal High Hazard Area and the latest regulating maps; and 2) policy revisions to eliminate the timeframe for the creation of a historic preservation ordinance.
- The Intergovernmental Coordination Element has been updated to: 1) add the City of Boynton Beach to the list of municipalities included in the coordination of activities along State Road A1A; and 2) include the Cities of Boynton Beach and Delray Beach in the annual discussion regarding the provision of potable water to the Town.
- The Capital Improvements Element has been updated to: 1) revise dates for proposed improvements; 2) reflect changes in the parks and recreation level of service; and 3) create a new policy for the Town to consider resident-approved assessment as a means of funding for capital improvements.

Extrajurisdictional Impacts

The proposed amendments were provided by the Town to the Palm Beach County Intergovernmental Plan Amendment Review Committee (IPARC) and were circulated by the
IPARC Clearinghouse Coordinator on January 30, 2012. 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 Town and the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity.

Attachments
List of Exhibits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General Location Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vicinity Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Annexation Area Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Future Land Use Map</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 1
General Location Map

Gulf Stream
Exhibit 2
Vicinity Map
Exhibit 3
Annexation Area Map
Exhibit 4
Future Land Use Map
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members

From: Staff

Date: March 16, 2012 Council Meeting

Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Review
Draft Amendments to the Wellington 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

Wellington is proposing the Equestrian Village Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment, which consists of text amendments to the Land Use and Equestrian Preservation Elements of the comprehensive plan.

Evaluation

Wellington received a request from Equestrian Sports Partners, LLC for approval to develop a 5-story hotel with below grade parking garage, a separate 75,000 square foot (SF) commercial complex, and a commercial Equestrian Arena on a 59.5 acre parcel located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Pierson Road and South Shore Boulevard. The Equestrian Village parcel is located in the Wellington Planned Unit Development within the Equestrian Preservation Area. The future land use designation of the parcel is Commercial Recreation. The proposed 75,000 SF commercial complex consists of 20,000 SF of combined restaurants, 25,000 SF of retail, and 30,000 SF of offices. The following text amendments are requested to accommodate the proposed development:
1. Land Use Element

- Amend Policy 1.3.7 that limits building height to 35 feet in all land use categories to add the following exception: A hotel located within the Equestrian Preserve Area on a property having a Commercial Recreation land use designation in a planned development shall be limited to a maximum height of 58 feet.

- Amend Policy 1.3.14 for properties with a Commercial Recreation land use designation in the Equestrian Preserve Area to increase the maximum allowed building coverage from 10% to 15% and increase the maximum allowed floor area ratio from 0.10 to 0.15.

2. Equestrian Preservation Element

- Amend Objective 1.1.c to allow for the commercial uses supporting the equestrian industry which may include hotel, restaurant, retail, and office uses within the Equestrian Preserve Area. Any hotel, office or retail use may only be permitted on property with a Commercial Recreation land use designation and located in a planned development district provided the property has direct access to and is located at a major street intersection with an arterial road. A hotel must be integrated within a minimum 50 acre permanent Commercial Equestrian Arena and have a minimum 2,000 foot separation from another hotel.

Development of the Equestrian Village is proposed at the former site of the Palm Beach Polo Stadium parcel, which consisted of a polo stadium, polo fields, and equestrian support facilities. This is one of three equestrian venue locations in Wellington. The other two venue locations consist of the Palm Beach International Equestrian Center and the International Polo Club. The Wellington staff report indicates that these projects have all undergone recent improvements in response to the increased international interest, competition levels, expanded services and entertainment schedules that continue to draw an increased number of spectators. The requested Land Use and Equestrian Preservation Element amendments are in response to the commercial recreation activities often found and expected at competitive level stadiums and arenas.

Extrajurisdictional Impacts

The proposed amendment was provided by Wellington staff to the Palm Beach County Intergovernmental Plan Amendment Review Committee (IPARC) and was circulated by the IPARC Clearinghouse Coordinator on January 27, 2012. No extrajurisdictional impacts have been identified.

Effects on Significant Regional Resources and Facilities

Significant regional resources and facilities in the vicinity of the proposed project include Southern Boulevard, Forest Hill Boulevard, and State Road 7. Traffic analysis of the proposed Wellington Equestrian Village indicates the project is in compliance with both Palm Beach
County and Wellington traffic performance standards and there will not be a negative impact on regional roadways. 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. Many citizens have expressed concern with the proposed project related to the intensity of development, traffic and environmental impacts, and quality of life. Wellington should give careful consideration to these local concerns prior to taking final action on the proposed amendment.

Recommendation

Council should approve this report and authorize its transmittal to Wellington and the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity.
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Good Morning,

The Department of Economic Opportunity was asked by the Governor’s office to respond to citizen comments they received regarding the proposed Wellington 12-1ESR amendment. We stated in our response that we would forward their comments on to the other reviewing agencies.

I will send these comments in batches. You may have already received some of these. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Laura Regalado, Planning Analyst
Department of Economic Opportunity
Bureau of Community Planning
Caldwell Building
107 East Madison Street, MSC 160
Tallahassee, FL 32399
Laura.Regalado@deo.myflorida.com
(850) 717-8508
Fax: (850) 717-5822
Governor, please review the plans and disapprove the loss of this equestrian preserve in the Village of Wellington.

-- Save the Wellington Equestrian Preserve and Stop this massive commercial development
-- The Wellington Equestrian Preserve is an environmental and economic jewel - Please don't allow it to be exploited
-- Please consider the enormous traffic, environmental and quality of life impacts this commercial development will have on the residents in Wellington.
-- We are counting on your careful review and vigorous oversight - Please don't rubber stamp this development as our Village Council did
Stephanie Heidt

From: Governor Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@eog.myflorida.com>
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2012 4:00 PM
To: Regalado, Laura
Subject: FW: Wellington Florida Equestrian Village proposal

From: KETRVL@aol.com [mailto:KETRVL@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 2:48 PM
To: Governor Rick Scott
Subject: Wellington Florida Equestrian Village proposal

Governor Scott,

I live in Wellington, just outside of West Palm Beach. Today your office has received from our Village council a request to significantly change our town with a HUGE commercial development. Our Village Council as they always do with this developer, has rubber stamped this after hearing from hundreds of residents that are opposed to this development.

I strongly urge you and your staff to not do what they did. So Please take your time to do your due diligence in this matter. The council has used an outdated traffic study and have totally violated a program they themselves set up called the Wellington Equestrian Preserve.

This program was set up to avoid just this kind of situation within the preserve area. Now a local developer who has a long history of doing things now and saying he is sorry later, has proposed a huge commercial program within that reserve.

He has, over and over again, misled the council and this town on what kind of impact it will have. For example, they claim there will be no traffic impact with his new Dressage Horse Arena that seats 3500 people, plus the riders, handlers, trainers for the horses showing. This arena empties out onto a 2 lane road (one each direction currently, key word currently) or possibly (if they get another property owner to agree) a 4 lane road. BUT how is it possible that this will not impact those roads. They are not demanding any impact fees for future road improvements, that would fall on us, the taxpayers of this town.

They have in addition to that proposed a 5 story hotel, shops and other commercial ventures totalling over 400,000 sq. ft. (they claim in their mysterious way it is only 200,000, but the Hotel alone is over that).

The Environmental impact on our town will be tremendous, especially by adding 400 stalls and all that brings to the area.

The Village of Wellington Council has repeatedly given this developer a free ride on violations. For example, just last year, he re-routed a road leading to his venue without permits or permission from the homeowners that use this road every day. Not only did they not stop him, nor were any traffic studies done, but they never fined him for violating the law. I know if I had done this I would most assuredly been fined and sued.

This happens over and over again.

Our biggest complaint is, why the rush, why not do traffic studies that take into account the entire scope of his proposed development and not just empty land that is has been for many years. It has been used for Polo fields and since the Hurricanes a few years ago, there have been no buildings on it at all. Prior to that, there were Polo matches on Sunday and the traffic was horrible and that was before our town became as populated as it is today.
We have asked the council one thing, when are they going to stop and do what is right for our town and not just a few people. The impact to this town will be tremendous, and not in a good way. We moved here for the laid back lifestyle and the open spaces. That is what we were sold, not a HUGE commercial development in the middle of our town.

PLEASE stop this from going forward. Your office has the power NOW. If you approve it, there will just be another rubber stamp put on this and the developers will get what they want. For him it is all about building a Hotel/Condo/Timeshare because in his own words at the last meeting, he could not do this without that, so that says it all right there. It has nothing to do with doing something to enhance the sport of Dressage, he could build anything as long as he has the hotel part of it.

As a matter of fact he started building this new arena, a huge structure before he even had any approvals, and once again the city gave him those after the fact. And just a week ago, his structure was deemed unfit and was red tagged but amazingly, just 2 days later after all work was halted and they didn't even change anything it got a temporary approval, HOW DOES THAT HAPPEN.

All I can say is enough is enough, we all want business to succeed, but not at the expense of misleading people and hurting our taxpayers in the long run, so I am asking you to tell them to just slow down and get all the proper studies done and if then if everything comes out the way they want it, then we would have no choice, but that is highly unlikely.

Thank you for your time

Sincerely
Mark L. Elie
1698 Grantham Dr.
Wellington, FL. 33414
From: Bill Bower [mailto:bowerjr@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 4:14 PM
To: Governor Rick Scott
Subject: Wellington Equestrian Preserve

Dear Governor Scott,

Having just visited numerous representatives in Tallahassee last week regarding many issues I wanted to reach out to you to let you know we have a serious situation in Wellington, FL in which you could assist.

I am requesting that you do not approve the requested commercial development within the existing “Wellington Equestrian Preserve” as the preserve has been a long standing environmental and economic jewel.

Even though I am in the construction industry and we desperately need jobs, there is plenty of existing commercial property that could be developed within 5 to 10 minutes of the preserve.

I wish to thank you in advance for your consideration in this matter.

William M. Bower, Jr.

2189 Sunderland Ave.

Wellington, FL 33414
Governor Scott,

Please save our Wellington Equestrian Preserve from massive commercial development. We are counting on you to carefully review the plans set forth and to consider the overwhelming traffic and quality of life impact on the residents of Wellington. Please don’t allow our community to be exploited and destroy our environmentally sensitive area.

Respectfully,

Elizabeth Tremblay
Wellington Resident
Stephanie Heidt

From: Governor Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@eog.myflorida.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2012 3:43 PM
To: Regalado, Laura
Subject: FW: Opposition to the Equestrian Village Rule Changes in Wellington, fla

From: Smaretta@aol.com [mailto:Smaretta@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2012 2:26 PM
To: Governor Rick Scott
Cc: info@wellingtonalliance.com
Subject: Opposition to the Equestrian Village Rule Changes in Wellington, fla

My husband and I have been in Wellington since 1995. We bought property here just because it was designated Equestrian friendly and that no large commercial type development would infringe on our desire to live in an equestrian village.

Now, we have to face the possibility of a developer forever changing the landscape of Wellington. This is totally unacceptable. Not only will it change the way of life equestrians enjoy today, but it will change our lives forever. Once again, we will be faced with the proposition of being forced out of an equestrian area. We lived in Long Grove, Illinois before Wellington. We were forced out by development there. We found Wellington after a long search for an area where we thought we would not have to be afraid of commercialization of the land around us. This is not only a way of life change, but a safety issue for all of us that use the roads and land for not only riding horses but also horse drawn vehicles.

Please think this process out and contact the landowners in Wellington other than the developers to find out what is really happening here. We are depending on you to do the right thing and refuse to change the Equestrian Preserve Rules, by-laws and way of life.

Matt and Sherri Carli
14890 Palm Beach Point Boulevard
Wellington, Fla. 33414
(561) 761-9686
From: Marlene Solomon [mailto:marlene@ajcop.org]

Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2012 12:29 PM
To: Governor Rick Scott
Subject: Save the Wellington Equestrian Preserve

Dear Governor Scott:

I am writing to you today to share my concerns regarding the proposed commercial development of the Wellington Equestrian Preserve. The plans for this proposal are currently in Tallahassee for approval. We moved to Wellington sixteen years ago, and have seen massive development like the Wellington Mall and all of its outparcels, the expansion of roads, the expansion of the Wellington Regional Hospital, and the building of hundreds of new homes. All of these developments have had impact—mostly positive, some not so positive.

The proposal for massive commercial development at the crossroads of the Wellington Equestrian Preserve, would be disastrous to our peaceful, bucolic community.

The last project, “improvement” of Southshore Blvd. between Pierson Road and Lake Worth Road, was a disappointment of high order. For two years we put up with the construction of what we believed would be a widening of that major access route, only to find that upon completion, the road is still two lanes, with a bike lane, a couple of turn lanes, and a wide median. The road now has numerous (about every 6 feet for a mile and a half stretch) palm trees and other trees both on the median and on both sides of the street. If we should have a hurricane (even a small one) the chances of that road being seriously blocked by downed trees are very great. During rush hour (morning and evening) traffic backs up for two or three light cycles, at least. My equestrian friends complain that the road is now so narrow, it is extremely difficult to make the turns with their horse trailers. That is a done deal—but I am telling you this because this is precisely where they are proposing to build a five story condo hotel and shops—at the intersection of Southshore and Pierson Road!

Pierson Road is a two lane road that with entrances to the equestrian venues. I understand that it is in the Village Charter that Pierson Road cannot be widened, as it is part of the Equestrian Preserve. The impact of this massive commercial project on already congested vehicle and horse traffic and the environment will irrevocably erode the quality of life of all Wellington residents.

Please block the approval of this Wellington Development proposal and save our Wellington Equestrian Preserve.

Respectfully,

Marlene Solomon
Wellington, Florida
I’m writing to express my grave concern over a project proposed for Wellington that is now under your review. This project called “Equestrian Village” would destroy what was the state’s first Equestrian Preserve ever recognized through the comprehensive planning process. It would allow intense development of a 5-story condo/hotel and nearly 100,000 square feet of commercial space in an area set aside as an equestrian preserve.

The developer has told our local leaders that he must include the hotel and commercial space to pay for the competition facilities he proposes on the site. He is dangling the promise of jobs and loss of equestrian events to coerce our local elected leaders to approve what he wants. But they’re ignoring the fact that this one project could destroy everything around it. It is projected to bring 1 million more trips a day to an intersection that already is hazardous because it is the primary horse crossing in Wellington.

As a lifelong equestrian, Olympian and leader in the equestrian industry, I’m familiar with competition venues around the world. Ringside hotels and stores are not the elements of a successful venue or event. They are the elements of a developer trying to disguise a commercial project around nothing more than the equestrian theme.

Wellington’s Equestrian Preserve was a landmark in the state of Florida and recognized the unique treasure that exists in the community. Please carefully review this project. Don’t allow a rubber-stamp review as it got by our local leaders. Help us in the equestrian industry to truly preserve this industry in Wellington and throughout Florida.

Thank you,

Mason Phelps, Jr.
The information contained in this electronic mail transmission is intended only for the use of the recipient(s) named above. It may contain proprietary, confidential or privileged information of the sender. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, dissemination, distribution or copying of the information contained in this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply electronic mail and delete the original message and any copy of it from your computer system.
Dear governor Scott, Please I urge you to stop the development of our equestrian preserve in Wellington. This is a preserve and should be kept a preserve. I am a resident of Wellington and moved here as an equestrian because of the open green space that our community provides us. Now a greedy developer wants to develop a hotel and several hundred square feet of retail. He claims the horse show needs this development yet there is plenty of commercial space available for this sort of development in the area and no need to change the law protecting our preserve! I have seen communities that over developed and have lost their horse communities. Namely Bloomfield Michigan, Barrington Illinois, and Wayne Illinois! Also this will set a precedent for development of any space zoned commercial rec., which could be disastrous to every golf course in any town in Florida! The traffic and environmental effect of this massive project in this otherwise quiet area where now horses can safely hack through the neighborhood will be disastrous and dangerous to the public as well as the horses that are stabled in the area. The residents who already live and thrive on this corner will also be affected and their homes will now overlook parking lots manure pits and a noisy un necessary hotel and retail! Wellington as other communities in our area is full of vacant strip malls and retail commercial space. Why not revive these areas promote growth of our already developed space but PLEASE do not let our politicians who seem to be in bed with this developer change the law and develop what the law has already deemed a jewel that will never be replaced, THE EQUESTRIAN PRESERVE!

Thank you for your attention to this matter Dr. Michael Kohl resident

Sent from my iPad
From: Mary Sue Jacobs [mailto:marysue@destinyinter.com] 
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2012 12:15 PM 
To: Governor Rick Scott  
Subject: NO CHANGE TO WELLINGTON COMP PLAN PLEASE

Dear Governor Scott,

I am a Wellington Resident and I beg you to turn down the request to change the Wellington Comp Plan for the Hotel and extra Commercial in the new Equestrian Village. That intersection is extremely dangerous and many people, golf carts, mopeds and horses cross that already overused 2 lane area when the seasonal equestrians are here in the Winter already. We have had many people hit in that intersection and it is only a matter of time with all the congestion, before a child or horse is hit and we have a complete disaster. The owners already have a piece of land across the street that is appropriately zoned for the hotel, so there is absolutely no need to change the Comp plan to put a hotel where it really doesn't belong on the corner of Pierson. The Village of Wellington is dying and there are many, many businesses going out of business everyday from over commercialization. PLEASE do not add more commercial to this mix or you will be signing a death sentence for this town and the year round people trying desperately to make a living. 

Thank you,

Marysue Jacobs  
Broker 
Destiny International Properties of the PB Inc 
1641 Clydesdale Ave, Wellington FL 33414 
561-731-250-1
Dear Governor Scott,

I know you are receiving emails and phone calls about the Wellington Equestrian Preserve, so I will keep my email short. I share similar concerns about the proposed plan as many other residents. I am writing to you today to ask you to block the approval of the proposed commercial development of the Wellington Equestrian Preserve. The plans for this proposal are currently in Tallahassee for approval.

Thank you,
Kristi Bomar
3548 Moon Bay Cir.
Wellington, FL 33414
-----Original Message-----
From: Edward Marshall [mailto:bolaro@me.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2012 4:04 PM
To: Governor Rick Scott
Subject: Over development in Wellington...

Dear Governor Scott,

Please slow down the over development of the Equestrian Preserve in Wellington. The equestrian part is fine, but the commercial development does not need to be on the same protected property. In my opinion, this is too much, too soon in the wrong location. I think the super luxury hotel will be a bust in time...why ruin the Preserve. Please consider some alternatives.

Thank you.

E. Marshall

Wellington, Fl.
From: Joan Jacobs [mailto:jbJacobs33@gmail.com]  
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2012 5:11 PM  
To: Governor Rick Scott; ray.eubanks@deo.myflorida.com  
Subject: Wellington Equestrian Preserve

Dear Sirs,

I am writing to you on behalf of the Wellington Equestrian Preservation Alliance. A developer by the name of Mark Belissimo is weaving his ways through village politicians in order to build a huge hotel/condominium and commercial plaza on land that has been designated as equestrian preserve. The intersection he is proposing to build on is one of the busiest intersections in Wellington for horses, golf carts, cars, bikes and pedestrians. To build anything commercial on this sight would be a catastrophe, ruining what is left of an equestrian lifestyle that has been the heart of Wellington for decades. The public's overwhelming opposition in the form of ballots at the village council meetings, emails, and public outcry has done nothing to deter the Mayor of Wellington and some of his council members from rubber stamping this project right through. I've never seen anything like it. Why even go through the process? They've made a laughing stock out of the residents and have totally ignored all requests for more studies.

This proposal to develop green space will also set a precedent in Wellington for other commercial developers waiting in the wings to do the same. PLEASE, there is very little green space left between West Palm Beach and the Everglades. It is a unique preserve and not a foot of it should be spared. Once it's gone, it's gone FOREVER.

We all hope the future of Wellington is in our hands and not in those of a developer trying to make a quick buck.

Thank you for your time and your service.

Sincerely,

Joan Jacobs  
12500 Pierson Rd.  
Wellington, FL 33414
----Original Message-----
From: Laura DeMato [mailto:gilboa7@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2012 5:21 PM
To: Governor Rick Scott
Subject: Please stop the building in the Wellington preserve.

This is a wonderful family town that is now being destroyed by all the excessive building.
We have always had equestrian venues without the need to destroy the life we moved here
For. Please do not allow this over building to continue.

Laura DeMato
Sent from my iPad
Stephanie Heidt

From: Governor Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@eog.myflorida.com>
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2012 3:53 PM
To: Regalado, Laura
Subject: FW: Wellington Equestrian Preserve

-----Original Message-----
From: Neil Hirsch [mailto:neilshirsch@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2012 7:43 PM
To: Governor Rick Scott
Subject: Wellington Equestrian Preserve

Dear Governor Scott,

I have been a resident and a business owner in Wellington for the last fifteen years. Wellington is unique due to the open spaces and rural lifestyle we enjoy. The equestrian preserve was created to protect that lifestyle; to encroach on the preserve would be a terrible thing for this community. Please help save the equestrian preserve in Wellington.

Thank you
Neil S. Hirsch
12076 Polo Club Road
Wellington, FL 33414

Sent from my iPad
-----Original Message-----
From: Gmail [mailto:marcia.radosевич@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2012 7:03 AM
To: Governor Rick Scott
Subject: Wellington Equestrian Preserve

Dear Governor Scott,

The Wellington Equestrian Preserve is the reason Wellington has grown and prospered, adding millions of dollars to the tax coffers as property values have increased and equestrians from all over the world flock to Wellington. I am one of these transplants who has put millions of dollars into building my horse farm.

The Preserve is now threatened by developers who will unravel the zoning protections that keep the Preserve precious and unlike any other place in the country. If the developers are allowed to proceed, the Preserve will be ruined. It will become like thousands of other horse show venues across the country. And many of us will pack up and leave. Other towns, such as Aiken, South Carolina, have venerable horse traditions and are vying for us to relocate there. They will succeed if you don't preserve the Preserve.

Wellington Village Council has approved the developers' plans without adequate investigation into the traffic, noise and environmental problems the proposed development will cause. I believe the Council acted precipitously because they are relatively unsophisticated and are star struck by the developers' tales of increased prosperity for all.

I've followed your business career and know you are sophisticated and not vulnerable to tall tales from salesmen. Please exercise your talents, apply your experience and subject the development plans to rigorous and appropriate examination.

Thank you.

Marcia Radosевич
5121 Las Palmas Ave
Wellington FL
From: Governor Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@eog.myflorida.com>
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2012 3:53 PM
To: Regalado, Laura
Subject: FW: Equestrian Village in Wellington

From: Alec Majors [mailto:buckmajors@msn.com]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2012 7:15 AM
To: ray.eubanks@deo.myflorida.com; Governor Rick Scott
Subject: Equestrian Village in Wellington

Honorable Rick Scott & Department of Economic Opportunity,

Pleased be advised that the "Equestrian Village" project will bring hundreds of jobs and $10's of millions to our local economy. I have a small business that employs 10 persons and when Equestrian Village is built I will be adding two or three more. I am aware of probably ten other such businesses. And these jobs are in addition to those that will be generated on-site at this new world-class equestrian venue. And world-class is not an empty term. The covered arena is under construction and Rolex is just one global sponsor that is already on-board. There are people from throughout the United States, Europe and South America who are already investing in real estate and bringing their businesses to Wellington.

Our Village Council approved Equestrian Village after it was approved (unanimously) by our Equestrian Advisory Committee and Zoning Board.

Please do not be influenced by a small group that has used scare tactics and false information to incite people. They refer to Equestrian Village's covered equestrian arena, small boutique hotel and 75,000 sf of equestrian space as "massive" commercial development comparable to "the largest Wal-Mart". They've shamelessly exaggerated the traffic and other impacts from the project.

And now they claim their campaign of deceit is catching your attention (below). I hope not unless you have been completely informed about their efforts in which case I believe you will come to the correct conclusion.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

Alec Major

From: Info@wellingtonalliance.com
To: Info@wellingtonalliance.com
Subject: RE: Tallahassee! URGENT!
Date: Thu, 16 Feb 2012 13:56:46 -0700

Yesterday we sent you an urgent message to asking you to contact representatives in Tallahassee and stop the "Equestrian" Preserve development. For those of you who contacted the Governor THANK
YOU! Your voices are really making a difference. For those of you who have not yet contacted the Governor - WE REALLY NEED YOUR HELP.

The fight to save the Equestrian Preserve and protect Wellington neighborhoods has moved to Tallahassee. And the Alliance is fighting hard in Tallahassee every day to Save the Preserve from this massive commercial development.

These emails and letters from Wellington residents are getting the attention of the Governor and continued pressure will make a huge difference in our fight to Save the Preserve and protect our community.

If you have not already done so, PLEASE contact the Governor's Office and the Department of Economic Security in Tallahassee today. You can really make a difference.

The contact information you need is in the attached email.

THANK YOU!

-------- Original Message --------
Subject: Tallahassee! URGENT!
From: <info@wellingtonalliance.com>
Date: Wed, February 15, 2012 12:21 pm
To: info@wellingtonalliance.com

Dear Friends and supporters —

Plans for the "Equestrian" Village development are now in Tallahassee for state government review which means we have the opportunity to comment and to express our opposition to the development.

The plans are now in the hands of the Governor's Office and Florida's Department of Economic Security which have review and oversight authority on development plans such as these. They will review these plans for compliance and take into account impact on the community and environment before sending the issue back to the Village Council for a final vote. Public input at this stage is encouraged, welcomed and VERY IMPORTANT.

Your input can really make a difference and we need your help.

Please contact the Governor's Office and the Department of Economic Security TODAY! There is not a minute to waste.

Tell them in your own words . . .

-- Save the Wellington Equestrian Preserve and Stop this massive commercial development
-- The Wellington Equestrian Preserve is an environmental and economic jewel - Please don't allow it to be exploited
-- Please consider the enormous traffic, environmental and quality of life impacts this commercial development will have on teh residents in Wellington.
-- We are counting on your careful review and vigorous oversight - Please don't rubber stamp this development as our Village Council did

Also, please let us know how and when you contacted state government so we can track and amplify your messages to Tallahassee. You can blind copy us your emails or notify us of your letters or calls at info@wellingtonalliance.com

Please take time TODAY to email, call or write.
1. Office of The Governor
   The Florida Capitol
   Tallahassee, FL 32399-0001
   Phone: (850) 488-7146
   email: Rick.Scott@eog.myflorida.com

2. Department of Economic Opportunity

   Attn: Ray Eubanks, Plan Processing Administrator
   Division of Community Planning
   Caldwell Building
   107 E Madison-MSC 160
   Tallahassee, FL 32399
   Phone: (850) 717-8483
   email: ray.eubanks@deo.myflorida.com

   email: Rick.Scott@eog.myflorida.com
   KEEP UP THE FIGHT - THIS BATTLE IS FAR FROM OVER

THANK YOU!
From: Governor Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@eog.myflorida.com>
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2012 3:53 PM
To: Regalado, Laura
Subject: FW: wellington over-development

From: Ptauber106@aol.com [mailto:Ptauber106@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2012 7:33 AM
To: Governor Rick Scott
Subject: wellington over-development

Good morning,

I am of the belief that we have an opportunity to save our life-style from further development. The area in question is designated as the ‘wellington preserve’. Building hotels, condos, or additional businesses was not the intended use of this preserve area.

The additional traffic and noise this would create is not the intended use of this land.

Thank you for your help.

Peter Tauber
13676 Folkstone Ct.
Wellington, Fla. 33414
ptauber106@aol.com
Dear Governor Scott:

I would like to express my concerns, as a home owner, over the issue of the massive commercial development plan in the Equestrian Preserve of Wellington, Florida. Most home owners in the Wellington purchased properties just because of Wellington Equestrian. We were promised that the Village would preserve the Equestrian and would not allow any commercial developments that will exploit the Wellington Equestrian Preserve and our environment. The plans, if approved, will bring more traffic and damages our beautiful environment and quality of life.

PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THE VILLAGE COUNCIL TO PURSUIT THE ISSUE AND PUT A STOP TO THE PLAN FOR THE SAKE OF SAVING OUR BEAUTIFUL CITY AND PRESERVING THE QUALITY OF OUR LIVES. THE BIG DEVELOPERS CAN LOOK ELSEWHERE TO IMPLEMENT THEIR PLANS. WELLINGTON HAS BEEN DOING GREAT AND WE ALL DEMAND TO KEEP IT THE SAME WAY. WE SAY NO TO ALL AND ANY COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT THAT WOULD CHANGE THE FACE OF OUR EQUESTRIAN PRESERVE.

Thank you for listening to my concern and hope you do your best to save our Wellington Equestrian.

Sarah Moghadam

15850 Schweizer Ct.

Wellington, Fl 33414
Stephanie Heidt

From: Governor Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@eog.myflorida.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2012 11:53 AM
To: Regalado, Laura
Subject: RE: Wellington Equestrian Preserve

Thank you, Ms. Regalado. Your help is appreciated.

Rex

From: Regalado, Laura [mailto:Laura.Regalado@deo.myflorida.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2012 10:49 AM
To: Governor Rick Scott
Subject: RE: Wellington Equestrian Preserve

Ms. Chevalier,

Governor Scott thanks you for your email of February 17, 2012 regarding the proposed Wellington 12-IESR comprehensive plan amendment, and has asked the Department of Economic Opportunity to respond on his behalf. The Department received the amendment from Wellington on February 10, 2012, and is in the process of reviewing it to determine if important state resources and facilities within the Agency’s authorized scope of review will be adversely impacted. Other state and regional agencies have also received the amendment and are conducting a similar review from the perspective of their area of responsibility. Agency comments are due to Wellington by March 9, 2012.

Thank you for your comments. They will be taken into consideration as we conduct the review and will be shared with the other reviewing agencies. Please contact me if you have additional questions or concerns regarding this amendment.

Thank You,

Laura Regalado, Planning Analyst
Department of Economic Opportunity
Bureau of Community Planning
Caldwell Building
107 East Madison Street, MSC 160
Tallahassee, FL 32399
Laura.Regalado@deo.myflorida.com
(850) 717-8508
Fax: (850) 717-5822

From: Terri Chevalier [mailto:terri.chevalier@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2012 11:44 AM
To: Governor Rick Scott
Cc: ray.eubanks@deo.myflorida.com
Subject: Wellington Equestrian Preserve

To whom it may concern:

Please note that I and many others here in Wellington are very concerned about this proposed development in Wellington.

The traffic alone would be considerable for the surrounding communities.

I am also worried about the ridiculous height of the proposed hotel.

I am not totally against some improvements and some expansion but, not quite like this proposed development.

Please consider the surrounding areas which have ALWAYS been more of a residential area with horses.

Thanks for your consideration,

Terri Chevalier

Wellington resident
From: Lloyd Walton [mailto:lwalton56@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2012 12:08 PM
To: Governor Rick Scott
Subject: Wellington Equestrian Preserve Irresponsible Development

Dear Governor Scott,

I am a resident of Wellington Florida and have been for over 20 years.

I am absolutely opposed to the hotel and retail development project, laughingly know as the Equestrian Village, that is currently in review by the Department of Economic Opportunity. Please weigh in to tell Mr. Ray Eubanks to reject this request.

The Wellington community has been a great blend of average hard working citizens and the Equestrian community. Up to now the village council has responsibly protected the area know as the Equestrian Preserve, even developing a specific plan, which over laid the village master plan.

Now, most of our Village council is scrapping that responsibility in favor a a massive development project, which is not Equestrian related, will change the landscape of the area with a 5 story hotel (2 stories above current village code), and create a huge increase in traffic that the residents of Wellington do not want or need. Another perfect example of government not listening to the 99%.

Listen to the 99%, we have something to say.

Thank you

Lloyd Walton
1768 Harborside Circle
Wellington FL 33414
Stephanie Heidt

From: Governor Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@eog.myflorida.com>
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2012 3:53 PM
To: Regalado, Laura
Subject: FW: Wellington preserve

---

From: Granny Deedles [mailto:grannydeedles@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2012 12:12 PM
To: Governor Rick Scott
Subject: Wellington preserve

please don't allow the massive development take place and destroy what we moved here for.
  The community of Grand Isles
Stephanie Heidt

From: Governor Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@eog.myflorida.com>
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2012 3:52 PM
To: Regalado, Laura
Subject: FW: Wellington Equestrian Village

From: Corey Ryles [mailto:coreyryles@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2012 2:33 PM
To: Governor Rick Scott; ray.eubanks@deo.myflorida.com
Subject: Wellington Equestrian Village

Governor Scott --

Please please please do not allow this monstrosity known as the "Equestrian" Village in Wellington. It's a huge commercial development that was rammed through our City Council by a politically connected developer. It will have a huge impact on our environment and our quality of life.

The environmental impact on Wellington will be devastating. They plan to build 400 stables on the banks of a canal. Can you imagine the smell and the environmental impact of all that horse waste and urine. Most could be ending up right into our water supply. This is crazy!

This community needs you Governor - please help save us from this man made disaster

Thank you

Corey Ryles
From: Joanne MacLeod [mailto:bakermacl@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2012 2:08 PM
To: Governor Rick Scott
Cc: ray.eubanks@deo.myflorida.com
Subject: "Wellington Equestrian Preservation alliance"

Dear Governor Scott, Please do not let the "Equestrian Village" commerical development in Wellington, Florida go through. This massive development will ruin the quality of life in Wellington, & the horse community! The traffic will be horrendous! Wellington is already being over developed! Thank you, Joanne MacLeod
Governor Scott and Mr. Eubanks --

We have an environmental jewel here in our Village known as the Wellington Equestrian Preserve. It is a beautiful and one-of-a-kind place.

Recently, we were so sad to learn that a smooth talking developer used his considerable influence with our Mayor and town council and is now planning on paving this paradise and putting up hotel the size of a Walmart. Not only that, they are planning stores and restaurants and office space.

The traffic and noise and pollution will needlessly destroy our little piece of heaven on earth and disrupt thousands of lives.

We have done nothing to deserve this travesty. My neighbors and I are good stewards of the environment and care deeply about our community. I am pleading with you to exercise whatever authority you have to stop this nonsense and give us our neighborhoods back from the Mayor and his developer friends.

Please help us save this wonderful place for generations to come and stop this senseless development.

Thank you for your attention and consideration.

I am,
Rich Franzen
Wellington, FL
From: Len S [mailto:lschaffel@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2012 5:36 PM
To: Governor Rick Scott
Subject: Wellington Equestrian Preserve

Dear Governor Scott:

The Wellington Equestrian Preserve is an environmental and economic jewel - Please don't allow it to be exploited. I envision the enormous traffic, environmental and quality of life impacts this commercial development will have on the residents in Wellington.
I am counting on your careful review and vigorous oversight - Please don't rubber stamp this development!

Leonard Schaffel
11873 Donfin Dr
Wellington, FL 33414
From: Kathy Birmingham [mailto:kbirm@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2012 8:33 PM
To: Governor Rick Scott
Subject: Wellington's Equestrian Village

Dear Governor Scott,

I am writing to express my grave concern regarding the proposed Equestrian Village in Wellington FL. I am in favor of the dressage competition facility but my objection is to the hotel and commercial aspect of this development. This project is proposed at an already busy intersection in the Equestrian Preserve. This intersection is already almost too dangerous of an area to ride a horse and that is how many people and horses have gone from their properties to the horse show. There are other commercial areas in Wellington which would be more appropriate for a hotel and commercial development!

Many of us came to Wellington and purchased property due to the “horsey” environment. The Equestrian Preserve was designated to shield the entire area from becoming paved over and not conducive to horse ownership, safety and enjoyment. This development would change the complexion and lifestyle of Wellington in a negative way, increase traffic to an unacceptable level in addition to making it dangerous to ride horses in the area.

I strongly urge you to vote against this development!

Respectfully,
Kathleen Birmingham
From: AFS [mailto:afs@ckler.net]
Sent: Saturday, February 18, 2012 5:59 PM
To: Governor Rick Scott
Subject: In support of saving the Wellington Equestrian Preserve

To voice my deep concern,

Our family has been coming to Wellington to participate in the Winter Equestrian Festival for the last 10 years. We bought a home in Wellington because we loved this horse friendly community. We felt that the balance between the equestrian/agricultural and the commercial use of the Wellington Preserve was a healthy one.

Over the years and to our dismay we have watched this relaxed horse friendly village become a metropolis. The speed limit was once 35MPH to ensure the safety of horses and riders. The two or four lane roads easily supported the limited traffic, being only somewhat crowded on Sundays with spectators arriving to see the Grand Prix. Even the Polo games were relaxed and bucolic.

But the Village that was Wellington, an equestrian community, is now seriously overdeveloped. It is rapidly discomfitting the community that once supported it. The roads are no longer horse friendly. The volume and speed of traffic is now a hazard to horse and rider alike. The speed limit is now 40 or 45 mph. The main roads are now six to eight lanes wide and lined with strip developments, none of which are thriving. Equestrian spectator events are no longer limited to one day a week but are approaching a daily occurrence. The Winter Equestrian Festival has morphed into an ugly and dirty three ring circus!

The illegal structures built in the Wellington Equestrian Preserve are encroaching on the vital space that brought horse people from all over the country here. The Preserve is disappearing under covered stadiums, paved parking lots and concession edifices. Acre upon acre of Preserve land has been willfully and illegally converted to commercial use by greedy developers eager for short term profit. Human facilities such as turnout for the horses have given way to more stalls, pavement and buildings. What brought us here is being lost and soon the community will lose many and more of us.

It is a shame that such a well balanced economic and environmental zone is falling victim to unbridled economic greed enabled by local political corruption. We have learned over the last decades that environmental balances are fragile and can easily be destroyed, often irreversibly. The Wellington Equestrian Preserve is one such precariously balanced environment on the brink of ruin (both environmentally as well as economically.)

Wellington does not have the infrastructure to support further large commercial development of the WEP. It will need more fire fighting equipment and personnel, more police, more waste removal and more clean water. The existing roads will need to be wider to accommodate the increased volumes of traffic.

In the end the fiasco of building a bigger commercial equestrian facility will have the same result as building a new stadium for the Marlins. Who will realistically end up paying for the failure waiting to happen when all the horse people move on to Ocala or other more horse friendly environments?

Having tuned into the hearings in the Village of Wellington one night, I was astounded that no impact studies on vital issues such as traffic abatement, noise abatement and environmental impact to the rest of the preserve were presented. I had the impression that the developers were employing the rhetoric that they were not doing anything different from what has always done in the past. Continuous violations in the past should not make a precedent for the future.

Please review carefully what is being pushed through by a quasi PAC. They are corrupting the future of the Village of Wellington. Use your offices to judiciously gather and seriously review all the facts on the impact of this project which you are being asked (or bullied) to approve.
Stop the massive commercial development of our delicate ecosystem of WEP before it is too late.

Arthur F. Sackler
My husband and I do not want anymore expansion in the Wellington Equestrian Preserve. We do not want the traffic problems that will be caused by the impact of this huge undertaking of this commercial development. This development will impact all of the residents of Wellington. We are hoping that you can help to put a stop this.

Lisa and Ken Hubbard
I'm writing to express my grave concern over a project proposed for Wellington that is now under your review. This project called "Equestrian Village" would destroy what was the state's first Equestrian Preserve ever recognized through the comprehensive planning process. It would allow intense development of a 5-story condo/hotel and nearly 100,000 square feet of commercial space in an area set aside as an equestrian preserve.

The developer has told our local leaders that he must include the hotel and commercial space to pay for the competition facilities he proposes on the site. He is dangling the promise of jobs and loss of equestrian events to coerce our local elected leaders to approve what he wants. But they’re ignoring the fact that this one project could destroy everything around it. It is projected to bring 1 million more trips a day to an intersection that already is hazardous because it is the primary horse crossing in Wellington.

As a lifelong equestrian, Olympian and leader in the equestrian industry, I’m familiar with competition venues around the world. Ringside hotels and stores are not the elements of a successful venue or event. They are the elements of a developer trying to disguise a commercial project around nothing more than the equestrian theme.

Wellington’s Equestrian Preserve was a landmark in the state of Florida and recognized the unique treasure that exists in the community. Please carefully review this project. Don’t allow a rubber-stamp review as it got by our local leaders. Help us in the equestrian industry to truly preserve this industry in Wellington and throughout Florida.

Thank you,

Mason Phelps, Jr. and Ronald T. Neal
February 19, 2012

The Honorable Rick Scott
Governor
State of Florida

Mr. Ray Eubanks
Department of Economic Development

Gentlemen:

The beneficial economic impacts that Equestrian Village will create for Wellington and Florida are immense. The decision on this project is being anticipated internationally. Equestrian Village and therefore Wellington, Florida will become the global focal point of dressage. The state-of-the-art arena will be the premier dressage venue in the world. And with that comes the money that is spent by owners, riders, sponsors, grooms, trainers and many others who will be traveling to Wellington. This will bring jobs and income to people and residents.

Of great importance to the project is the hotel and its conference facilities. Combined with the covered arena it will diversify the equestrian industry and the equestrian season. For instance there are many organizations and groups from around the world who have wanted to hold equestrian conferences and trade shows in Wellington. But there are no facilities to accommodate them so they go to the Kentucky Horse Park or Spruce Meadows in Canada or elsewhere. Now they can spend their money here.

I hope you support Equestrian Village.

Fredric
Gentlemen:

Please do not allow the Wellington Equestrian Preserve, an environmental and economic jewel, be exploited.

This project if allowed to precede, will cause major traffic disruptions, lower real estate values, would bring more noise and dirty air. Further, it will disrupt actual equestrian activities, lengthen response times for police and fire and would fundamentally change the feel of our community.

Also, it will cause serve water shortages during our drought season. Knowing the equestrian business, the amount of water consumed, would be devastating to our community. It's bad enough, that we can not water our lawns and gardens when needed, let alone taking care of bathing and watering such a large amount of horses as proposed by this project.

I would like to know, why the Mayor of our city will not provide a public workshop so that the public can have some input and slow this project down so that we the taxpayer can decide for ourselves whether this project is worthy of it's stated value.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Yours truly,

Michael F. Tuccinardi
President
Wellington Home Owners Association
My wife and I are residents and voters in Wellington, Florida. We oppose the invasion of commercial development in the equestrian preserve area of our community. This area was legally established to develop and foster equestrian activities, which is what defines our community for the past 30 years. The developers are not equestrian oriented advocates, but they are in fact developers with financial motivations. They now own commercial property adjacent to this property where they could build their commercial elements.

Allowing this development would create Environmental and traffic congestion. In addition to the normal traffic flow, upwards of one thousand vehicles would be fed onto a two lane roadway which is already over burdened. Our quality of life would be diminished, and as persons who have been involved with horses for the past 50 years, we fear for the safety of horses and riders who would have to cross over these crowded roads. Hopefully your considered oversight will save our community.

Thank You: Carmen and Nan Paterniti
From: Governor Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@eog.myflorida.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2012 11:58 AM
To: Regalado, Laura
Subject: FW: Equestrian Village Deve.

From: JOHN M KAPSOs [mailto:kapsos@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2012 9:15 AM
To: Governor Rick Scott
Cc: ray.eubanks@deo.myflorida.com
Subject: Equestrian Village Deve.

Please do not go forward with this outrageous commercial development we need to help keep Wellington the way it was meant to be with the Trees and the GREEN not Hotels more shopping and more traffic. We have a Hotel which is more than we need and we sure have enough shopping centers. The Traffic is already overflowing. Enough. Let help keep Wellington Green.

Sincerely
Marilyn Kapsos
Stephanie Heidt

From: Governor Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@eog.myflorida.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2012 9:19 AM
To: Regalado, Laura
Subject: FW: Wellington Equestrian preserve

From: Ellen Rawlings [mailto:ekb1959@att.net]
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2012 2:57 PM
To: Governor Rick Scott
Subject: Wellington Equestrian preserve

I live in the preserve and have for 12 years there are bridle paths instead of sidewalks  IT IS A HORSE COMMUNITY

the proposed changes to our preserve are not suitable to our community. there will be major traffic problems as well as odor and fly problems which will impact all of Wellington not just the horse community

Please think long and hard about this proposal because you may never get this chance again to preserve a precious fragile environment that we have too little of left

much of the land being developed were polo fields which acted as flood plains during storms WHERE IS ALL THAT WATER GOING TO GO
Dear Sir,

I hope you have been deluged in mail about the "Equestrian" Village in Wellington, FL. and I hope you read it all and take it to heart as this issue is of vital importance to the survival of Wellington's horse show and polo industry. There is no reason to repeat what others have sent. I will be brief as possible.

If as the developer and compliant Village Council of Wellington are allowed to break the Equestrian Zoning Overlay District (EZOD)
the "Bill Of Rights" that has protected this preserve for many years, the equestrian preserve is lost to those whose sole purpose is to DEVELOP regardless of what is destroyed in the process. What will be destroyed by breaking the EZOD is one of the finest equestrian locations in the nation if not the world.

Several of the sub issues and I do mean sub issues are as follows:

1. No REAL traffic study has been done and this is deliberate as a REAL traffic study would show that the road/traffic NOT could take the increase in traffic that a 300,000 sq. ft. condo/hotel, retail five story building would generate.

2. No "needs" study has been done also deliberately.

3. No "compatibility" study with respect to the surrounding community has been done also deliberately.

4. No "environmental impact" study has been done also deliberately.

5. South Florida Water Management has not approved this development.

The list goes on and on. For these reasons and more I implore you to do something GOOD for our state of Florida. STOP THIS DEVELOPMENT !!!
Michael Whitlow
2361 Appaloosa Trail
Wellington, FL 33414

Full disclosure --- I am on the Village Equestrian Committee and The Equestrian Preservation Alliance
From: Robin Hummel-Johnson [mailto:robinjohnson@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2012 1:08 PM
To: Governor Rick Scott
Subject: Proposed "Equestrian Village", Wellington, FL 33414

2/20/2012

Office of the Governor
The Florida Capitol
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0001

February 18, 2012

To: Department of Economic Opportunity – Attn: Ray Eubanks, Plan Processing Administrator
   Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council – Attn: Terry L. Hess, AICP, Planning Director
   Department of State – Attn: Susan Harp, Historic Preservation Planner
   Department of Transportation, Dist. 4 – Attn: Gerry O’Reilly, Director of Production and Planning
   South Florida Water Management District – Attn: P.K. Sharma, Lead Planner

Dear Sirs and Madams;

I am writing to you today to voice my concerns regarding the proposed “Equestrian Village” development, within the Equestrian Preserve in Wellington, Florida.

My first and foremost concern is preserving the Equestrian Preserve long term. Which is why the preserve was created in the first place. Let me first of all state that I am not against development within the preserve which enhances and expands equestrian activities. I am all for that. I think the new dressage complex is a welcome, needed and long overdue addition. Equestrian activities have enhanced our community financially and physically for many years now. Expansion of Equestrian activities, especially those which may add more months of activity, will only help our business community.

If the current “equestrian season” has one downfall it is that it is only four months of the year, leaving our area businesses with a long span of reduced activity and income.

My concern is with the introduction of commercial interests (hotel/condo/convention center and extensive retail space) that far exceeds the needs of the equestrian events themselves. These all greatly stretch the intents and the limitations set down to preserve the “Equestrian Preserve”, if not totally ignore them. As we have seen all over the county, once variances are granted for one interest group or individual, they cannot be denied to others. Once the door is opened, few, if any areas have been successful in closing it again. Wellington and it’s equestrian activities are nearly unique in this country. Irreplaceable. Few places can boast of international competition, or of a period of events as diverse, well attended, and of the quality Wellington enjoys. This is worth preserving, and despite arguments to the contrary, preservation is not dependent upon more commercialization, more traffic or more dense housing. Quite to the contrary.

Wellington has ample area for commercial development outside of the preserve. Outside of the preserve the streets are capable of and appropriate for handling the additional traffic. Keeping the hotel/condo/convention center and retail
space out of the preserve would better serve the community. Right now more and more entertainment and retail activity is happening within the horse show grounds. This keeps more of the exhibitors and spectators on the horse show ground instead of inviting them back out into the community to shop, eat and find housing. Would it not be better to allow the higher prices for residential (houses, condos, apartments, and hotel rooms) rentals benefit the whole community. Rather than compromise the Equestrian Preserve, why not improve some of our deteriorating neighborhoods to accommodate the need for more housing. Would it not be of more benefit if the equestrian event people spent more time in the shops and restaurants of Wellington instead of being encouraged to never leave the “compound”?

The issue of additional traffic flow is of great concern. We are already having horses and the accompanying golf carts, scooters, etc. crossing busy roads. Of concern are horses crossing on asphalt or cement, which is quite slippery when wearing metal shoes (if and when a horse falls down on these surfaces it is very difficult for them to get back up due to the lack of traction). Nearly all of the horse paths are parallel to the roads and, although separated by a taller fence now, are still potentially dangerous especially at the crossings and intersections. Of concern are motorists who do not know that honking, barking dogs, and driving too close to horses can cause those animals to shy, bolt or panic. We already have a less than safe, but tolerable condition. Adding more traffic can only make it worse. Some of this problem is historic, due to the physical separation of venues. Let us not make it a lot worse by adding commercial traffic that can be kept on existing roads that are already capable of handling additional traffic.

Another concern is with how changes are happening. Roads have been changed in the dark of night and granted permits later. Work has proceeded without proper permits and inspections. There are numerous law suits and injunctions. Legitimate concerns are being dismissed as emotional. Most concerning is that every time I attend another meeting regarding the plans for the “Equestrian Village” the details are different. We are being asked to accept a development plan that keeps evolving. Sort of the greased pig problem.

I am asking you to please take into consideration what we are at risk of losing by allowing the introduction of the proposed commercial development within the Equestrian Preserve in Wellington.

Sincerely,

Robin Hummel-Johnson
14596 Belmont Trace
Wellington, Florida 33414
From: Barbara P. Richardson [mailto:BRichardson@shults.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2012 2:15 PM
To: Governor Rick Scott
Subject: FW: Equestrian Village - Wellington, Florida

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am opposed to the changes in our law that would be required for the Equestrian Village to be permitted. The subject site is in a preservation area known as the Equestrian Preserve Overlay District, and is governed by a special zoning ordinance known as the Equestrian Overlay Zoning District regulations. The stated purpose of the EOZD regulations, along with the Equestrian Element of the Village of Wellington’s Land Use Regulations, is to “protect, preserve and enhance” the rural character of the area and the equestrian lifestyle.

The Preserve consists of 9,000 acres which is bordered on the south and on the west by the Everglades, and on the north and east by residential and commercial areas. The EOZD regulations allow only two lane roads, so there are no four lane roads until you reach the boundaries on the north and east. There is also a large canal system throughout the Preserve for drainage. If you discount the roads and the canals, there are only 8,000 acres in the Preserve, and there is no way to expand or recreate that.

The Equestrian Village and the increased density sought by the developer is not at all compatible with the rural character of the Preserve. A close look at the EV plan will show that the equestrian use is secondary and minimum when compared to the proposed 5 story hotel (although the developer keeps calling it a condominium that will be put in a rental pool), the 75,000 square feet of retail space and the office space. I might add that hotels are not permitted by the EOZD regulations, and any commercial or retail use that is permitted is limited to those accessory to equestrian use, such as feed stores, tack stores, horse shoe supply shops, veterinary clinics, polo equipment shops.
might also add that Wellington is a very seasonal equestrian destination and there is already an over abundance of such equestrian accessory shops and vendors. The developer of the Equestrian Village would like to expand the types of shops that will be permitted by stretching the term “accessory to equestrian use” far beyond what was intended by the EOZD regulations. One example that was given was a dry cleaning store because equestrians have their show clothes dry cleaned. If that is true, then they could say that a grocery store such as Publix is also “accessory to equestrian use”. In this economy, there are already many vacant retail stores and office space in Wellington. We have a regional mall that is having a difficult time keeping stores and there are empty spaces in the mall and in its many outparcel strip centers. The last thing our Village needs is more vacant retail and office space.

Another concern is the increase in traffic that will necessarily result from the 5 story hotel (condo?) and other proposed uses of the Equestrian Village. As previously mentioned, only two lane roads are allowed in the Preserve. The traffic studies used by the developer are questionable at best and should be very carefully scrutinized. There is already a tremendous amount of traffic at the main intersection of South Shore Boulevard and Pierson Road during season and during peak hours, and what makes this a very special intersection is that many horses, riders, grooms, golf carts and scooters cross it to go to and from the barns to the existing show grounds. While the new equestrian use within Equestrian Village will most probably not generate additional horse traffic across this intersection, there will be many more tourists, visitors, pedestrians, cabs and cars that will make the intersection more dangerous than it already is. The developer has already talked about paving over a canal to create a turn lane. It won’t be long before there will be a need to make four lanes of traffic in this vicinity, which flies in the face of the two lane road mandate in the EOZD regulations.

Once the Comprehensive Plan is amended allow the increased building height and increase in density (there is no 5 story anything in Wellington, much less in the Preserve – the height and increased density are not compatible), the EOZD regulations will have to be amended to allow the hotel (condo?). This opens up a door for other parcels in the Preserve to be developed in similar fashion and thereby deteriorate what the EOZD regulations were enacted to protect. Our Village staff thought that hotel (condo?) development could be limited to this particular intersection by adding certain language to the EOZD regulations. However, I submit that such limitation could arguably be deemed legislation that benefits only one land owner, which as you know is prohibited by law. Thus, there will be other land owners wanting to make more intense commercial use within the Preserve and nothing to stop them. 8,000 acres really isn’t that much land.

It has been said that the Equestrian Village is necessary for the future of Wellington and for the equestrian community to grow. I strongly disagree and have heard many people say they would take their horses and their money elsewhere if the Preserve is compromised. The long term effect of this project on the entire Village of Wellington will be devastating.

A compromise has been suggested but to no avail. The developer has been asked to put the “hotel” across the street on commercial property they already own which is zoned for that type of use. The only deviation in law the developer would need was an increase in the height restriction. It has become apparent that the hotel is really a condominium, meant for sale at higher values on account of the view in order to make the equestrian use of the subject property feasible.

In closing, the height, increase in density, amount of commercial/retail/urban rather than rural use, and increase in traffic at a very delicate intersection make this project incompatible with the Preserve area that our government had been given the charge to protect, not change.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara P. Richardson
1335 Lake Breeze Drive
Wellington, FL 33414
IRS CIRCULAR 230 NOTICE: Pursuant to recently enacted U.S. Treasury Department Regulations, we are now required to advise you that, unless otherwise expressly indicated, any federal tax advice expressed above was neither written nor intended by the sender or this firm to be used and cannot be used by any taxpayer for the purpose of avoiding penalties that may be imposed under U.S. tax law. If any person uses or refers to any such tax advice in promoting, marketing or recommending a partnership or other entity, investment plan or arrangement to any taxpayer, then the advice should be considered to have been written to support the promotion or marketing by a person other than the sender or this firm of that transaction or matter, and such taxpayer should seek advice based on the taxpayer's particular circumstances from an independent tax advisor.

The information in this email transmission is privileged and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, nor the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination or copying of this transmission (including any attachments) is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender by email reply. Thank you.
To who it may concern;

As a long time resident of the Village of Wellington, I implore you to consider very carefully the Comprehensive Plan Amendment for the "Equestrian Village" which has come before you from our Village.

The Village of Wellington is very unique and has established an area known as the Equestrian Overlay Zoning District (EOZD). This area was created to "protect, preserve and enhance the equestrian lifestyle" that identifies the special and unique nature of our Village. There are certain restrictions that were created to maintain this area that are being challenged by a developer who is stating that he needs the hotel/condo and commercialization for his dressage facility to be successful. Although the plans change almost daily, it is more likely that the developer will build condos which he can sell instead of the alleged necessary accommodations he claims he must have for the Equestrian Village. For more then 30 years I have been a senior judge for the United States Equestrian Federation and the Canadian Equestrian Federation and know that the success or failure of a horse show is not dependent on the housing or retail opportunities offered at the venue. These amenities are appreciated, but are not mandatory to insure success of a horse show and are more often available in the surrounding areas bringing economic benefits to the communities in or near the venues. The changes that are being requested "forever" have an impact on our Village and change the EOZD and the character and uniqueness of what many people came to Wellington for. These changes include (but may not be limited to):

1. Increasing the intensity of the land
2. Increasing the density of the land
3. Increasing the height limits of the Village
4. Increasing the traffic
5. Impacting the environment
6. Impacting the ecology
7. Impacting the neighborhoods surrounding the area with noise, light and odor
8. Impacting the noise ordinances throughout the Village
9. Impacting the canals with waste

What has not been done are as follows:

1. The traffic studies that have been done were not done during times when the equestrian venue will be most attended. Only week days, Monday through Friday, were viewed leaving the weekends with no studies at all.
2. Proper compatibility studies were not conducted.
3. Surrounding community HOA documents were not taken into consideration.
4. Environmental studies were not conducted.
5. Ecological studies were not done.
6. Required approvals from abutting property has not been obtained.
7. Impact studies are lacking.
8. Feasibility studies are missing.
9. Economic impact on existing businesses has not been address,

and possibly more I am unaware of.

In general, this project has been fast tracked to accommodate the developer without adequate information or input from the community at large. There have not been any work shops to explain this project. This developer has had several controversial projects over the past several years that have provoked lawsuits which are still pending. "At Risk" permits have been issued and for years this developer has had more than 100 code violations in the Village which include safety violations, parking violations, noise violations, building violations, work without permits violations, hours of operation violations, failure to get certificates of occupancy, failure to get inspections and multiple stop orders. Some of these violations have resulted in serious injury and even death. The current administration has been looking the other way or "fast tracking" permits to aide this developer who has had preferential treatment not available to the average citizen. It should also be noted that this developer has also failed to get required SFWM approvals before doing the work which have resulted in violations and fines.

Please take your time and thoroughly investigate this project proposal before allowing this massive and unnecessary development to encroach on "THE EQUESTRIAN PRESERVE" that has become the most important economic engine to our Village. If we open the door to changes in the EOZD, we will most assuredly risk the demise of what is the "soul and character" of our precious Village of Wellington.

Respectfully,

Carol Coleman
From: Lucy Mitchell- Innes [mailto:lucy@miandn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2012 4:02 PM
To: Governor Rick Scott
Cc: ray.eubanks@deo.myflorida.com
Subject: Equestrian development, Wellington Florida

Dear Governor Scott,

I am writing as a seasonal resident and tax payer in Wellington, Florida to emphasize that I do not support the proposed development by Mark Bellissimo at Pierson and Southshore Blvd. The roads in this area are already overloaded with local, commuter and horse show traffic. The new dressage center (which is entirely appropriate for the venue) has already substantially increased the traffic in the area. A hotel/condominiums/conference center/retail space will further congest the area and seems unnecessary in this particular location. There is plenty of unfilled office and retail space elsewhere in Wellington.

I also want to be sure that Mr. Bellissimo is operating within the law when it comes to building permits etc. I believe this has not always been the case.

I am also extremely concerned about the implications for the water systems in this conservation area with further development.

My final question relates to the changes in the code that this will require from recreational to mixed use. My understanding is that a change in the code for this location will have a knock on effect for other recreationally zoned parcels in the town of Wellington. This would indeed be a shame. Please help keep Wellington as the equestrian preserve that it was created to be.

Yours sincerely,

Lucy Mitchell- Innes

Lucy Mitchell- Innes

MIA DN COMMUNICATIONS

3832 Fifth Ave, HP 501, New York, NY 10016

3832 Fifth Ave, 501, New York, NY 10016

212-347-7300

Fax: 212-744-7401

www.miandn.com
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: March 16, 2012 Council Meeting
Subject:  Local Government Comprehensive Plan Review
Draft Amendments to the Wellington Comprehensive Plan
Amendment No. 12-2ESR

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

Wellington is proposing text and map amendments to several elements in its comprehensive plan.

Evaluation

Wellington is proposing an amendment to change a condition of use related to the Office Commercial future land use designation for the Palomino Executive Park parcel. The subject property is located on the west side of State Road 7 approximately one mile north of the intersection of State Road 7 and Lake Worth Road. This 12.15-acre property is currently developed with three buildings. The Office Commercial future land use designation is subject to a special condition that limits development of the site to a maximum of 55,000 square feet (SF) of medical office and 55,000 SF of general office for a total of not more than 110,000 SF of office space. The proposed amendment is to modify the special condition to limit the development to 112,400 SF of professional/medical office uses with a maximum of 112,400 SF allowed for medical office use. The proposal to add 2,400 SF to the medical office square
footage is to accommodate the addition of radiation accelerator equipment to one of the existing buildings. This request will not change the future land use designation of Office Commercial.

Wellington is also proposing to amend the text of the Land Use, Transportation, Housing, Infrastructure, Conservation, Recreation and Open Spaces, Intergovernmental Coordination, Capital Improvement, Education, Public School Facilities, and Equestrian Elements of the comprehensive plan. The proposed text amendments include the following changes:

1. Various Elements:
   - Deletion of “Village” references and replacement with “Wellington.” The purpose of this change is to ensure consistency throughout the plan.
   - Deletion of references to Chapter 9J-5, Florida Administrative Code, which was repealed.

2. Public School Facilities Element:
   - Relocation of concurrency service area boundary tables to the Data and Analysis section of the comprehensive plan.

3. Capital Improvement Element:
   - The Palm Beach County School Board Capital Improvement tables have been updated and relocated to the Capital Improvement Element (CIE).
   - Language has been included that allows for the annual update of the CIE to be adopted by resolution.

4. Recreation and Open Space Element:
   - The Recreation and Open Space map was updated to identify the Marjory Stoneman Douglass Preserve, Scott’s Place and Wellington Rotary Peace Park.
   - Policy 1.2.3 was amended to be consistent with Policy 1.2.1 and Table 1.2.11, which refer to recommended levels of service for types of facilities.

5. Land Use Element:
   - The maximum building coverage for the Medical Commercial land use was deleted and the list of permitted uses within the category was expanded. The designating zoning district will regulate the allowed coverage.
   - Text has been added to make the plan consistent with the Residential Renaissance Overlay District, which was adopted by the Village on April 27, 2010 and allows a 20% increase in underlying density for projects that facilitate low and moderate income, and senior housing units within designated areas.
6. Transportation Element:

- Traffic Level of Service table wording was adjusted for consistency with same table located within the CIE.

**Extrajurisdictional Impacts**

The proposed amendment for the Palomino Executive Park parcel was provided by Wellington staff to the Palm Beach County Intergovernmental Plan Amendment Review Committee (IPARC) and was circulated by the IPARC clearinghouse coordinator on March 6, 2012. The remaining text amendments were circulated by the IPARC Clearinghouse Coordinator on November 11, 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 Wellington and the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity.

Attachments
List of Exhibits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General Location Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Location Map – Palomino Executive Park Parcel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 1
General Location Map

Wellington
Exhibit 2
Location Map – Palomino Executive Park Parcel
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: March 16, 2012 Council Meeting
Subject: Intergovernmental Coordination and Review Log

The Intergovernmental Coordination and Review process serves, in part, as an early warning system for the federal government to determine if a federally funded project is consistent with plans and ongoing community initiatives of local governments and the regional planning council. By coordinating with and requesting comments from affected local governments on applications, a duplication of efforts, funding and services can be avoided. This enables the tax dollars to be more effectively used to carry out local/regional initiatives in the region.

The attached Intergovernmental Coordination and Review Log presents thirteen applications for federal funding of projects or programs. The Review Log contains the applicant’s name, project location, project description, federal funding source, and the amount of funds requested, as well as designation of Notification of Intent if it is a preliminary application. Staff recommendations are provided on the consistency of funding applications with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCRPC Number</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Funding Agency</th>
<th>Federal Funding Requested</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-SL-01-01</td>
<td>Purchase of Vehicles</td>
<td>Council on Aging of St. Lucie, Inc.</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>$163,440</td>
<td>$204,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-PB-01-02</td>
<td>Purchase of Vehicles</td>
<td>Mae Volen Senior Center, Inc.</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-PB-01-03</td>
<td>Purchase of Vehicles</td>
<td>Jewish Residential &amp; Family Service, Inc.</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>$19,674</td>
<td>$24,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-IR-01-04</td>
<td>Purchase of Vehicles</td>
<td>Abilities Resource Center of Indian River County</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>$66,080</td>
<td>$82,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-MC-01-05</td>
<td>Purchase of Vehicles</td>
<td>The ARC of Martin County, Inc.</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>$88,014.40</td>
<td>$110,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-PB-01-06</td>
<td>Purchase of Vehicles</td>
<td>Palm Beach Habilitation Center, Inc.</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>$62,400</td>
<td>$78,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRPC Number</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Funding Agency</td>
<td>Federal Funding Requested</td>
<td>Total Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-FL-01-07</td>
<td>Purchase of Vehicle</td>
<td>Gulfstream Goodwill Industries, Inc.</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-PB-01-08</td>
<td>Purchase of Vehicles</td>
<td>City of Pahokee</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>$527,023</td>
<td>$658,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-PB-01-09</td>
<td>Purchase of Vehicle</td>
<td>Boca Raton Society for the Disabled</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>$78,400</td>
<td>$98,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-SL-01-10</td>
<td>Purchase of Vehicles</td>
<td>The Arc of St. Lucie County, Inc.</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>$125,348</td>
<td>$156,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-PB-01-11</td>
<td>Purchase of Vehicles</td>
<td>Seagull Industries for the Disabled, Inc.</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>$37,600</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-PB-01-12</td>
<td>Purchase of Vehicles</td>
<td>Jerome Golden Center for Behavioral Health, Inc.</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>$128,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-PB-01-13</td>
<td>Purchase of Vehicle</td>
<td>MACtown, Inc.</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>$33,920</td>
<td>$42,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,629,899.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,037,374</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation**

Council should approve the comments in the attached report and authorize their distribution.

**Attachments**
TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION AND REVIEW LOG

TCRPC Number: 12-SL-01-01

Applicant: Council on Aging of St. Lucie, Inc.

Project Description: Purchase of Vehicles

Council on Aging of St. Lucie, Inc. (COA) is a private not-for-profit agency incorporated in 1973 and is governed by a Board of Directors. Community Transit, the COA’s transportation program, employs 62 persons including administrative staff, dispatchers, schedulers and drivers. Community Transit’s mission is to provide cost effective, efficient transportation to the residents of St. Lucie County. Community Transit’s service area includes all of St. Lucie County, which is comprised of 573 square miles of both urbanized and rural areas. Annual trips for Fiscal Year 2010/2011 were 263,609. The agency provides six fixed routes throughout the County; one route along US 1 connects to Martin County; two routes service the Fort Pierce area; and three routes service the Port St. Lucie area.

The COA is requesting funding for replacement of two vehicles, two fareboxes and the cost for transferring cameras, radios and other equipment to the replacement vehicles. The replacement vehicles will be utilized to continue the existing level of service. The vehicles will be purchased through the TRIPS (Transit–Research–Inspection–Procurement Services) program which assists agencies in procuring vehicles at the lowest possible price.

Funding Agency: Federal Transit Administration

Estimated Funding: $163,440 Federal
20,430 State
20,430 Local
$204,300 Total

Recommendations: The application is consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan. It furthers Regional Goal 7.2 - Adequate mobility for the transportation disadvantaged.

Agencies Contacted: All St. Lucie County Local Governments
St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization
Martin Metropolitan Planning Organization
Good Morning Stephanie,

The City of Fort Pierce Planning Department supports the 5310 grant application to purchase 2 replacement vehicles! Thank you for providing us the opportunity to review and comment on these applications.

David Carlin, MPA  
Assistant Director of Planning  
City of Fort Pierce  
100 N US Highway 1  
Fort Pierce, Florida 34954  
dcarlin@city-ftpierce.com  
772-460-2200 Ext. 245  
772-708-6913 Cell  

**** LEGAL DISCLAIMER ****  
Mail is intended for work preparation purposes only. No legal definite promise.

Under Florida law, e-mail addresses are public records. If you do not want your e-mail address released in response to a public-records request, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing.

This document should only be read by those persons to whom it is addressed and is not intended to be relied upon by any person without subsequent written confirmation of its contents. Accordingly, The City of Fort Pierce disclaims all responsibility and accepts no liability (including in negligence) for the consequences for any person acting, or refraining from acting, on such information prior to the receipt by those persons of subsequent written confirmation.

If you have received this e-mail message in error, please notify us immediately by telephone. Please also destroy and delete the message from your computer.

Any form of reproduction, dissemination, copying, disclosure, modification, distribution and/or publication of this e-mail message is strictly prohibited.  
**** LEGAL DISCLAIMER (autocreated by IQSuite Trailer) ****
## TCRPC Number:
12-PB-01-02

### Applicant:
Mae Volen Senior Center, Inc.

### Project Description:
Purchase of Vehicles

The Mae Volen Senior Center, Inc. in Boca Raton is a private non-profit provider of transportation services to the elderly and disabled elderly in south Palm Beach County needing rides to destinations from Boca Raton to Lake Worth. The agency’s mission is to enhance the well-being of south Florida seniors, family caregivers, the disabled, and their families by educating and advocating on their behalf and by providing health care and supportive services that meet their physical, emotional, social and psychological needs. The agency has 96 employees, of which twenty-four are Transportation Department staff.

The routes are curb-to-curb, addressing the needs of seniors who are unable to walk to a bus stop or cannot afford taxi service. Routes include daily runs, Monday through Friday, from 7:30 am to 6:00 pm for food shopping, nutrition and kosher meal site locations, and all types of medical appointments as well as many other destinations. In order to continue the best possible service and to maintain maximum wheelchair tie-down capability, the agency is requesting funds that will be used to replace four 2005 Ford Buses with 22’ gas buses with wheelchair lifts.

### Funding Agency:
Federal Transit Administration

### Estimated Funding:
- **Federal**: $240,000
- **State**: $30,000
- **Local**: $30,000
- **Total**: $300,000

### Recommendations:
The application is consistent with the **Strategic Regional Policy Plan.** It furthers **Regional Goal 7.2** - Adequate mobility for the transportation disadvantaged.

### Agencies Contacted:
- Palm Beach County
- Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organization
- Palm Tran
- City of Boca Raton
- City of Boynton Beach
- Town of Briny Breezes
- City of Delray Beach
- Town of Golf
Town of Gulf Stream
Town of Highland Beach
Town of Hypoluxo
City of Lake Worth
Town of Lantana
Town of Manalapan
Town of Ocean Ridge
Town of South Palm Beach
TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION AND REVIEW LOG

TCRPC Number: 12-PB-01-03

Applicant: Jewish Residential & Family Service, Inc.

Project Description: Purchase of Vehicles

In 1995, the Jewish Residential & Family Service Inc. (JRFS) was established out of the need for residential living for adults with special needs living in Palm Beach County. The program goals and objectives of JRFS are to develop programs with the objective of inclusion of clients/residents in the general community. The JRFS serves individuals who have a variety of special needs and live in residential settings that include two group homes and a community independent living program.

JRFS seeks to continue providing the existing level of transportation services to its 35 adult disabled residents ranging in age from 25-68 years of age. Residents are transported in combined routes throughout the day as well as individualized routes. On a typical day, residents are transported as a group to employment, day programs, volunteer opportunities, grocery shopping, medical appointments and social activities. Transportation services are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week with standard operating hours from 6:30 am until 9:00 pm. JRFS is seeking funding to purchase a mid-size sedan to replace an older 2005 Ford Turtle Bus. The mid-size sedan will provide easy access for clients with disabilities, because it is low to the ground. This vehicle will also be used to transport individuals when necessary.

Funding Agency: Federal Transit Administration

Estimated Funding: $19,674 Federal
2,460 Applicant
2,459 State
$24,593 Total

Recommendations: The application is consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan. It furthers Regional Goal 7.2 - Adequate mobility for the transportation disadvantaged.

Agencies Contacted: All Palm Beach County Local Governments
Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organization
Palm Tran
Stephanie Heidt

From: JRunan <JRunan@townofhaverhill-fl.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2012 2:47 PM
To: sheidt@tcrpc.org
Subject: 12-PB-01-03 Jewish Residential & Family Services

Good Afternoon:

The Town of Haverhill has no objection to the above captioned application.

Please feel free to contact this office should you have any questions.

Janice C. Runan, CMC
Town Administrator
Town of Haverhill
4585 Charlotte Street
Haverhill, FL 33417
561-689-0370, ext. 24
561-689-4317 fax
jrunan@townofhaverhill-fl.gov

Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message. Florida has a very broad public records law. Written communications regarding Town of Haverhill business are public records available to the public upon request. Your e-mail communications are therefore subject to public disclosure.

Under Florida law, e-mail addresses are public records. If you do not want your e-mail address released in response to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing.
TCRPC Number: 12-IR-01-04

Applicant: Abilities Resource Center of Indian River County

Project Description: Purchase of Vehicles

The Abilities Resource Center of Indian River County (ARC) is a 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation founded by a group of local citizens. Presently, ARC has over 150 individuals with disabilities who are involved in support and services that include a daily vocational training program, transportation throughout the community, residential living programs, behavioral programs, community respite and programs that promote inclusion and partnership with local organizations, such as Indian River State College.

Funding is being requested to purchase two minivans that will each accommodate 1-2 wheelchair passengers and/or 3-6 walk-on passengers. The new minivans will enable an increased number of people with disabilities to continue to receive fixed route service to and from their vocational training and/or work programs, and medical appointments. The current service area is throughout Indian River County and extends to the northern part of St. Lucie County into Fort Pierce. There are plans for expansion into the southern part of Brevard County.

Funding Agency: Federal Transit Administration

Estimated Funding: $66,080 Federal
8,260 State
8,260 Local
$82,600 Total

Recommendations: The application is consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan. It furthers Regional Goal 7.2 - Adequate mobility for the transportation disadvantaged.

Agencies Contacted: All Indian River County Local Governments
Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization
St. Lucie County
St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization
City of Fort Pierce
TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION AND REVIEW LOG

TCRPC Number: 12-MC-01-05

Applicant: The ARC of Martin County, Inc.

Project Description: Purchase of Vehicles

The ARC of Martin County is the oldest and largest non-profit agency in the County. The organization’s mission is to empower children and adults with developmental and other disabilities to achieve their fullest potential. ARC’s goal is to meet the habilitative, educational, leisure and social needs of children and adults with developmental disabilities. Each year, the organization provides 250 children and adults a variety of educational, residential, vocational and supportive case management, health care, recreation/leisure, and advocacy services. Since most individuals served by the organization have severe functional skill deficits and/or severe behavioral conditions that preclude their ability to use public transportation, a related objective is to provide transportation to ensure access to available services. Currently, 269 individuals rely on ARC for transport to various services each year.

In order to continue the exiting level of service, the ARC is requesting funding to purchase two 10-passenger commuter vans and one 8-passenger minivan with wheelchair accessibility to replace vehicles that are scheduled to be retired in August of 2012. The requested funding will allow the ARC to continue transporting people with serious disabilities on demand 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Funding Agency: Federal Transit Administration

Estimated Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$88,014.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>11,001.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>11,001.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$110,018.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations: The application is consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan. It furthers Regional Goal 7.2 - Adequate mobility for the transportation disadvantaged.

Agencies Contacted: All Martin County Local Governments
Martin Metropolitan Planning Organization
St. Lucie County
St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization
Stephanie Heidt

From: O'Neil, Terry <donell@ci.stuart.fl.us>
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2012 2:16 PM
To: Stephanie Heidt
Cc: Nicoletti, Paul
Subject: RE: 6310 Grant Application - The ARC of Martin County - TCRPC# 12-MC-01-05

Dear Stephanie:

The City has no objection to the ARC's request for funding to purchase [10] ten passenger vans.

Thanks,

Terry

From: Stephanie Heidt [mailto:heidt@tcrpc.org]
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2012 1:44 PM
To: Beth Beltran; Mark Satterlee; Peter Buchwald; Lorenzo Aghemo; Randy Whitfield; Robert Keating; Phil Matson; Monica Graziani; Nikki van Vomm; Robert Kellogg; O'Neil, Terry; Wayne Bergman
Subject: 5310 Grant Application - The ARC of Martin County - TCRPC# 12-MC-01-05

The above referenced application has been submitted to this office which serves as the regional clearinghouse for review and comment on applications for federal funding which are exempt from State Clearinghouse review under Governor's Executive Order 95-359.

Florida's Intergovernmental Coordination and Review (ICR) procedures require that potentially affected local governments, agencies and organizations be given an opportunity for comments on applications in regard to:

a) consistency of the proposal with adopted plans and policies;
b) effect upon the natural, social or economic environment; and
c) duplication of ongoing projects or programs.

If you desire to comment on this application, please provide a copy of your comments to us by February 13, 2012 so we may take them into consideration in our review (see contact information below). Copies of all comments we receive in writing are forwarded along with the report approved by the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council to the applicant, to be attached to the proposal on submission to the funding agency. A brief summary of the application is attached. The full application is available upon request.

Stephanie Heidt
Administrative Coordinator/ICR Coordinator
Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
421 SW Camden Avenue
Stuart, Florida 34994
772.221.4060
heidt@tcrpc.org
TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION AND REVIEW LOG

TCRPC Number: 12-PB-01-06

Applicant: Palm Beach Habilitation Center, Inc.

Project Description: Purchase of Vehicles

The Palm Beach Habilitation Center, Inc. (the Center) is a private non-profit agency founded in 1959 that provides a wide variety of services to men and women who have developmental, physical and/or emotional disabilities. Current programs include on-campus employment and training, supported employment, work evaluation, competitive job placement, computer and food service training, case management services, support services including mobility training, community-based residential options including group homes and supported apartment living, retirement services, and recreation and community inclusion opportunities. The Center employs approximately 85 staff members and provides programs and services annually to over 700 people who have mental, physical and/or emotional disabilities.

Transportation services are provided from group homes to an adult day training program or supported employment placement and back, to all medical appointments, meetings, recreational activities and social events. Additionally, the Center participates in the Seniors in Transition and Retirement Services program; community employment programs at various work sites; and the Community Integration Program.

The Center is proposing to acquire two commuter passenger vans to expand and enhance the present services provided to program participants. One of the vans is required due to the addition of a new group home, which is expected to be completed in April, 2012. The other van is needed to facilitate and enhance the process of scheduling the transportation of work crews.

Funding Agency: Federal Transit Administration

Estimated Funding: $62,400 Federal
7,800 Applicant
7,800 State
$78,000 Total
Recommendations: The application is consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan. It furthers Regional Goal 7.2 - Adequate mobility for the transportation disadvantaged.

Agencies Contacted: Palm Beach County
Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organization
Palm Tran
TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION AND REVIEW LOG

TCRPC Number: 12-FL-01-07

Applicant: Gulfstream Goodwill Industries, Inc.

Project Description: Purchase of Vehicle

Gulfstream Goodwill Industries, Inc. (GGI) headquartered in West Palm Beach, is a community based non-profit organization that designs and delivers vocational and training programs to serve people with disabilities and other barriers to employment. In order to meet its mission, GGI provides outreach and recruitment, case management, vocational assessment, employment training, apprenticeship and internship, life skills training, job placement, job coaching, supported employment, traumatic brain injury rehabilitation, deaf services, benefits planning assistance and residential services. GGI currently operates four rehabilitation facilities with a staff of over 800 employees, and provides services for an average of 5,000 people per year in Palm Beach, Okeechobee, St. Lucie, Martin and Indian River counties.

GGI provides transportation services to 128 unduplicated elderly and disabled individuals who chose to attend GGI’s Adult Day Transitions programs and/or participate in supported employment opportunities. Participants, who range in age from 18-80, are picked up and dropped off at their homes and other locations throughout the service area. The service area is from North Central Martin County to Southern Indian River County, and from the east of Indian River Drive to the Okeechobee County line. GGI is requesting funding to replace one vehicle to enable the current level of service to be maintained.

Funding Agency: Federal Transit Administration

Estimated Funding: $60,000 Federal
7,500 Applicant
7,500 State
$75,000 Total

Recommendations: The application is consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan. It furthers Regional Goal 7.2 - Adequate mobility for the transportation disadvantaged.
Agencies Contacted:  
Martin County  
Martin Metropolitan Planning Organization  
St. Lucie County  
St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization  
Indian River County  
Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization
Subject to Modifications

DRAFT

TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION AND REVIEW LOG

TCRPC Number: 12-PB-01-08

Applicant: City of Pahokee

Project Description: Purchase of Vehicles

The City of Pahokee’s transportation program is within the City’s Parks and Recreation Department that has twenty-two employees, ten of which have a commercial driver’s license. Of those ten, two are Primary Operators for the City’s Senior Wellness Program. The Senior Wellness Program provides numerous activities and events for those individuals 55 and older. The goal is to improve the lifestyles and daily activities of the elderly by providing resources and services to meet their physical and emotional needs. Seniors in the program interact with other community-based care agencies.

The Senior Wellness Program is operational Monday, Wednesday and Friday. The bus operator picks the senior citizens up from their homes and transports them to the Wellness Center located at the Parks and Recreation Department. The program serves 35-50 senior citizens with trips to shopping, social activities, and outreach activities to churches, nursing homes and daycare centers.

The City is requesting funding to replace two older buses, purchase one additional bus, purchase equipment, and pay for installation licensing fees, which will allow expansion of the program days and hours of operation. Additionally, the City would like to expand services to neighboring communities. Currently, the City buses are able to accommodate approximately eight wheelchair positions. With the additional new buses, they City will be able to increase wheelchair positions by ten.

Funding Agency: Federal Transit Administration

Estimated Funding: $527,023 Federal
65,878 State
65,878 Local
$658,779 Total

Recommendations: The application is consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan. It furthers Regional Goal 7.2 - Adequate mobility for the transportation disadvantaged.
Agencies Contacted:  Palm Beach County
Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organization
Palm Tran
City of Belle Glade
City of South Bay
TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION AND REVIEW LOG

TCRPC Number: 12-PB-01-09

Applicant: Boca Raton Society for the Disabled

Project Description: Purchase of Vehicle

The Boca Raton Society for the Disabled, doing/business/as Twin Palms Center for the Disabled (Center), is a 501(c)(3) corporation that was founded in 1968. The Center serves twenty-four developmentally challenged adults, regardless of age, disability, religious affiliation, ethnicity, cultural make-up or ability to pay, from low income households in South Palm Beach. The Center’s goal is to encourage individual growth and development by teaching social, academic and daily living skills in a safe and supportive environment. The Center’s transportation program provides transportation from the Center to job training sites, community involvement activities including volunteering at other non-profit organizations, educational training seminars, educational field trips and recreational activities. The Center employs one part-time employee and two full-time employees with commercial driver’s licenses.

The Center is requesting funding to purchase a twenty-five passenger bus, which will replace their existing 14-passenger van. This will allow the Center to expand their transportation program to include more educational field trips, job training and educational training seminars for special needs/disabled persons and their families/caregivers. Currently, Palm Tran transportation services are being used for travel to and from job training sites and volunteer opportunities. The Center intends to help with the total transportation service in the special needs/disabled community.

Funding Agency: Federal Transit Administration

Estimated Funding: $78,400 Federal
9,800 Applicant
9,800 State
$98,000 Total

Recommendations: The application is consistent with the **Strategic Regional Policy Plan.** It furthers **Regional Goal 7.2 - Adequate mobility for the transportation disadvantaged.**
Agencies Contacted:  Palm Beach County
Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organization
Palm Tran
City of Boca Raton
City of Delray Beach
Town of Highland Beach
TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION AND REVIEW LOG

TCRPC Number: 12-SL-01-10

Applicant: The Arc of St. Lucie County, Inc.

Project Description: Purchase of Vehicles

The Arc of St. Lucie County, Inc. (Arc) provides a comprehensive array of services to developmentally disabled citizens in Indian River, St. Lucie, Martin and Okeechobee counties. Arc is staffed by 58 employees composed of professional and direct care staff and serves in excess of two hundred consumers in its various settings. The Arc is dedicated to enabling individuals with developmental disabilities to choose and realize their goals of where and how to live, learn, work, and play. Arc provides transportation services in an array of settings, ranging from respite, summer camp and after school programs, adult day training, vocational and employment programs, to supported living sites to group homes. In 2009, Arc initiated a ride-to-work program that expanded transportation services to individuals who are low income, physically and/or mentally challenged. The focus of the service is to improve access to employment-related opportunities by providing day, evening, and weekend transportation. Additionally, support services are provided on a 24-hour basis to Arc’s 30 clients in their residential program.

Arc is seeking funding for four replacement vehicles. The request includes a 12-passenger van, a 31-foot mini-bus equipped with wheelchair lift, a car and a fleet maintenance truck. By procuring the replacement vehicles, Arc will be able to maintain and improve transportation services in their residential, vocational/employment, day service and after school/summer camp programs.

Funding Agency: Federal Transit Administration

Estimated Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$125,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>15,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>15,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$156,684</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations: The application is consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan. It furthers Regional Goal 7.2 - Adequate mobility for the transportation disadvantaged.
Agencies Contacted:  All St. Lucie County Local Governments  
St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization  
Martin Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization
Seagull Industries for the Disabled, Inc., a private, non-profit social service agency, has been serving mentally retarded and developmentally challenged adults in Palm Beach County since 1979. Clients served are moderately to severely developmentally challenged, autistic, and/or victims of cerebral palsy. Many clients suffer from seizures and mobility disorders. Their mission is to provide vocational training, educational, residential and social programs that enable each student and adult to achieve the level of independence that his/her desire and capability permit. The agency services approximately 200 individuals daily. All of the agency’s clients and students are developmentally challenged and in need of specialized transportation since they are determined unable to manage public transportation on their own.

Seagull provides twelve routes related to the transportation of students and adults from their homes to their day programs. On average, the vans are on the road 2 to 2½ hours a day. Additionally, several of the vehicles are used evening and weekends for various social and recreational outings. Seagull is requesting funding to replace 2 twelve-passenger vans that have exceeded the four year/100,000 mile plateau.

Funding Agency: Federal Transit Administration

Estimated Funding: $37,600 Federal
4,700 Applicant
4,700 State
$47,000 Total

Recommendations: The application is consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan. It furthers Regional Goal 7.2 - Adequate mobility for the transportation disadvantaged.

Agencies Contacted: All Palm Beach County Local Governments
Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organization
Palm Tran
TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION AND REVIEW LOG

TCRPC Number: 12-PB-01-12

Applicant: Jerome Golden Center for Behavioral Health, Inc.

Project Description: Purchase of Vehicles

The Jerome Golden Center for Behavioral Health, Inc. (Center) is a private not-for-profit agency serving northern and western Palm Beach County for the past 43 years. The Center has over 380 employees county-wide. The Center’s mission is to help clients build resiliency, facilitate recovery, and achieve reintegration into the community by designing and delivering behavioral health care services.

The Center is a major service provider of both inpatient and outpatient psychiatric services. Services, conducted in facilities at fourteen locations include counseling, case management, residential, day treatment, and substance abuse treatment. Transportation is provided to those persons served who do not reside near a community mass transportation bus route and to those who are unable to access public transportation due to their mental illness. Without Center transportation, a large percentage of persons served would not come to the facility to follow their prescribed treatment plan. Those served are transported by staff from their residences to the Center for partial hospitalization, day treatment, basic living skills, psychiatric, case management, therapy, shopping, and social events. The Center utilizes a fixed route system from 7:00 am to 9:30 am and from 2:00 pm to 5:00 pm. Sixteen vehicles are operated on a daily basis to follow this system and transport approximately 200 persons to and from the programs. Additionally, Center vehicles are in constant use during times they are not scheduled on a route for usages ranging from home visits, doctor appointments, probation/parole appointments, and court hearings.

In order to continue the current level of service, the Center is requesting funding to replace an older 20-passenger bus and 2 passenger vans with one 23-passenger bus and one new van.

Funding Agency: Federal Transit Administration

Estimated Funding: $128,000 Federal
16,000 Applicant
16,000 State
$160,000 Total
Recommendations: The application is consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan. It furthers Regional Goal 7.2 - Adequate mobility for the transportation disadvantaged.

Agencies Contacted: All Palm Beach County Local Governments
Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organization
Palm Tran
TCRPC Number: 12-PB-01-13
Applicant: MACtown, Inc.
Project Description: Purchase of Vehicle

MACtown, Inc. is a non-profit organization dedicated to furthering the independence of people with developmental disabilities. The mission of MACtown is to foster a community in which people with disabilities receive the support and services they want and need; choose their own living environment; live in normal, decent and stable housing; have meaningful social and work relationships; and improve their lives by allowing them to reach their full potential as fully participating members of their community. MACtown operates four group homes in Miami-Dade County, and in January 2011 opened two group homes in Palm Beach County.

The individuals served by MACtown are developmentally disabled and have transportation needs on a daily basis. Most of the routes served are in Miami-Dade county. MACtown is requesting funding to purchase a 3 to 6-passenger minivan. The van will be used for transporting residents to medical appointments, small group outings, adult training and vocational programs, contracted work sites, and special events.

Funding Agency: Federal Transit Administration

Estimated Funding: $33,920 Federal
  4,240 Applicant
  4,240 State
  $42,400 Total

Recommendations: The application is consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan. It furthers Regional Goal 7.2 - Adequate mobility for the transportation disadvantaged.

Agencies Contacted: All Palm Beach County Local Governments
Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organization
Palm Tran
City of West Palm Beach
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members
From: Budget/Personnel Committee
Date: March 16, 2012 Council Meeting
Subject: Budget Amendment for Fiscal Year 2011-2012

Introduction

Members of the Budget/Personnel Committee met on Thursday, March 1, 2012, to discuss a proposed budget amendment for Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-2012. Committee members in attendance were Commissioner Bob Solari, Councilmember Reece Parrish, Commissioner Doug Smith, Commissioner Peter O’Bryan, Mayor Samuel Ferreri, and Councilmember Kevin J. Foley. Council staff members in attendance were Michael Busha, Peter Merritt, Sandra Gippert, and Liz Gulick.

Background

The proposed budget reflects a 40 percent increase from the original budget. Modifications to revenue and expenditures in the proposed budget are as a result of an increase of $811,710 in confirmed revenue from state, federal, and local contracts related to transportation, economic development, and emergency management.

A comparison of the current FY 2011-2012 and proposed FY 2011-2012 budget amendment is provided for both Revenues (see TABLE 1) and Expenditures (see TABLE 2). The narrative, which begins on page 6, summarizes each category for the proposed budget.

Recommendation

The Budget/Personnel Committee recommends Council approve the proposed budget amendment for Fiscal Year 2011-2012.

Attachments
### Acronym List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARRA</td>
<td>American Recovery and Reinvestment Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNU</td>
<td>Congress for the New Urbanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>Division of Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRI</td>
<td>Development of Regional Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARB</td>
<td>Fixed Asset Replacement Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDOT</td>
<td>Florida Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMEP</td>
<td>Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBC</td>
<td>Palm Beach County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARA</td>
<td>Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLC</td>
<td>St. Lucie County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRPC</td>
<td>Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD</td>
<td>Transit-Oriented Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>United States Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1
TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
PROPOSED BUDGET
FISCAL YEAR 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Adopted 2011-2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2011-2012</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM – SARA-Title III for 2011-12</td>
<td>30,682</td>
<td>30,682</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM – SARA-Title III for 2012-13</td>
<td>10,227</td>
<td>10,227</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL TOD Guidebook</td>
<td>99,941</td>
<td>99,941</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Storm Surge Lake Okeechobee</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte County Exercise Evaluator</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Stormwater Depth Analysis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLC – Hazards Analysis</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,610</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>145,850</strong></td>
<td><strong>156,660</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,810</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMEP-Training</td>
<td>36,238</td>
<td>36,238</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMEP-Planning</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Econ. Dev. Admin-Planning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81,250</td>
<td>81,250</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA – ARRA-Revolution Loan Fund</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA - Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA Brownfields Assessment Grant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA Public Market – Riviera Beach</td>
<td>20,204</td>
<td>20,204</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Vulnerability Analysis</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Disaster Re-Development Plan</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Energy Resiliency Strategy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44,650</td>
<td>44,650</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDOT – Land Use &amp; Transportation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Communities Initiative</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>762,942</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,263,842</strong></td>
<td><strong>500,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBC-MPO Planning</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S FL Reg Transportation Authority</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD King Power Plant Site</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glades Utility Authority</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward Boulevard Gateway Project</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>243,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>543,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>300,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>123</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject to modifications
TABLE 1 Cont’d

TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
PROPOSED BUDGET
FISCAL YEAR 2011-2012

REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Adopted 2011-2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2011-2012</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL DUES</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach County</td>
<td>553,834</td>
<td>553,834</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin County</td>
<td>61,337</td>
<td>61,337</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie County</td>
<td>111,505</td>
<td>111,505</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River County</td>
<td>58,163</td>
<td>58,163</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>784,839</strong></td>
<td><strong>784,839</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISCELLANEOUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRI Fees</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>98,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>98,000</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$2,034,631</td>
<td>$2,846,341</td>
<td>$811,710</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Frozen at 2006 Population Estimates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spending Category</th>
<th>Adopted 2011-2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2011-2012</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$944,166</td>
<td>$931,576</td>
<td>$(12,590)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>372,479</td>
<td>403,836</td>
<td>31,357</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Expenses</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownfields Insurance</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies &amp; Expenses</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone &amp; Fax</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues &amp; Memberships</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training - HMEP</td>
<td>20,400</td>
<td>20,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library &amp; Publications</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Advertising</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Fees</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Fees</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note Principal</td>
<td>73,761</td>
<td>73,761</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note Interest</td>
<td>66,318</td>
<td>66,318</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,794,124</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,946,891</strong></td>
<td><strong>152,767</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultants</strong></td>
<td>225,507</td>
<td>884,450</td>
<td>658,943</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,019,631</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,831,341</strong></td>
<td><strong>811,710</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Outlay</strong></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Outlay – Bldg. (FARB)</strong></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,034,631</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,846,341</strong></td>
<td><strong>$811,710</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1 summarizes and compares Council revenue as budgeted for Fiscal Year 2011-2012 with the proposed budget amendment for Fiscal Year 2011-2012. Following is a line-by-line discussion of revenues:

STATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$145,850</td>
<td>$156,660</td>
<td>$10,810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increase in revenue reflects three new contracts and one increased Emergency Management contract.

FEDERAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$762,942</td>
<td>$1,263,842</td>
<td>$500,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increase in revenue reflects three new multi-year contracts: U.S. Economic Development Administration Planning Grant, EPA Brownfields Assessment Grant, and a Statewide Energy Resiliency Strategy contract. Council also received additional funding from a previously approved contract with Florida Department of Transportation.

LOCAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$243,000</td>
<td>$543,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increase in revenue reflects the Broward Boulevard Gateway Project contract.

LOCAL DUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$784,839</td>
<td>$784,839</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No change. Dues were maintained at FY 2007-2008 levels.
### MISCELLANEOUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$98,000</td>
<td>$98,000</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No change. The miscellaneous category includes DRI revenues, interest, and publication sales.

### TOTAL REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,034,631</td>
<td>$2,846,341</td>
<td>$811,710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NARRATIVE ON EXPENDITURES

TABLE 2 summarizes and compares Council expenditures as budgeted for Fiscal Year 2011-2012 with the proposed budget amendment for FY 2011-2012. Following is a more detailed explanation of the proposed adjustments on expenditures:

**Salaries**

| Current ($944,166) | Proposed ($931,576) | Change $(12,590) |

Changes in Council staff include the reduction of one full time employee and the promotion of another to fill that position. Council’s original budget called for a 5 percent reduction in Council staff salary. Based on an increase in projected revenue, the salary of Council staff has been restored to the amount prior to the 5 percent reduction approved in the original FY 2011-2012 budget. The net effect of these changes is a 1 percent reduction in salaries.

**Benefits**

| Current ($372,479) | Proposed ($403,836) | Change $31,357 |

Benefit expenditures include employee health insurance, Social Security and Medicare costs, and retirement plan funding. Council’s original budget called for a 33 percent reduction in Council’s contribution to the employee retirement plan. Based on the change in staff and the increase in projected revenue, Council’s contribution to the employee retirement plan has been restored by the one third reduction approved in the original FY 2011-2012 budget.

**Occupancy Expenses**

| Current ($7,000) | Proposed ($7,000) | Change $0 |

No change. Included in this category is the archive of files and cost of meeting room space.

**Insurance**

| Current ($22,000) | Proposed ($22,000) | Change $0 |

No change. Included in this category are automobile, liability, property, equipment and workers’ compensation insurance.
Brownfields Insurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$ -0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No change. This category represents an insurance policy to cover potential liability associated with work performed and management associated with EPA Brownfields grants.

Equipment Rental & Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$ 8,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This category covers rental and maintenance of office equipment such as computers, printers, plotters, scanners, server, etc. Based on an increase in confirmed contracts, an increase in costs is anticipated in this category.

Office Supplies & Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This category includes expenses under $1,000 for items such as common office supply materials, computer software/upgrades, janitorial service, pest control, lawn service, office furniture, file cabinets, etc. Based on an increase in confirmed contracts, an increase in costs is anticipated in this category.

Graphics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$ 3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This category covers digital imaging, color printing and the enlargement of maps and drawings. Based on an increase in confirmed contracts, an increase in costs is anticipated in this category.

Copying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$37,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This category covers the costs related to copying and reproduction of all correspondence, publications and documents produced by Council as well as the monthly expense of leasing two copy machines. Based on an increase in confirmed contracts, an increase in costs is anticipated in this category.
Telephone & Fax

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$ 2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This category covers the cost of the computer line, cell phones, air cards, conference calls and the day-to-day phone costs. Based on an increase in confirmed contracts, an increase in costs is anticipated in this category.

Postage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$ -0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No change. This category covers the cost of renting a postage machine, postage, and express document shipping.

Travel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This category covers the cost of employee travel to meetings and off-site charrette locations. Based on an increase in confirmed contracts, an increase in costs is anticipated in this category.

Dues & Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This category covers Council’s membership and voting representation in the statewide organization of the Florida Regional Councils Association. Based on current expenditures, an increase is warranted in this category.
Conferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This category covers the cost of attending or hosting conferences. Attendance is often a contract requirement and is paid for out of contract funds. Travel and other expenses for these conferences are included in this category. Council and the City of West Palm Beach have been selected to host and help organize the 20th Anniversary Conference of the Congress for the New Urbanism (CNU). The CNU is the world’s leading organization promoting walkable neighborhood development, national energy independence, healthy communities initiatives, regional and town planning, and city redevelopment. Also, Council anticipates additional expenses related to conducting future summits and workshops to carry out its responsibility associated with Sustainable Communities Initiative and Statewide Energy Resiliency Strategy contracts. Due to Council’s participation in organizing, managing and attending these events, an increase is warranted in this category.

Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$ -0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No change. This category covers job-related courses and accredited seminars.

Training - HMEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$20,400</td>
<td>$20,400</td>
<td>$ -0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No change. This category includes funds for Council to conduct training courses for “first response” personnel on hazardous material accidents. This is required by the HMEP Training grant.

Library & Publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This category covers books and professional publications for Council and staff. Based on an increase in confirmed contracts, an increase in costs is anticipated in this category.
Legal Advertising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This category covers the cost of required advertising of regular and committee meetings in the Administrative Weekly. Based on an increase in confirmed contracts, an increase in costs is anticipated in this category.

Legal Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This category covers the cost of Council’s Attorney. Based on an increase in confirmed contracts, an increased involvement by Council’s Attorney is anticipated.

Audit Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$11,500</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No change. This category covers the cost of Council’s annual audit.

Utilities & Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No change. This category covers the cost of electric, water, sewer, and trash/recycling collection services.

Note Principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$73,761</td>
<td>$73,761</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No change. This category covers the cost of servicing the revenue note with TD Bank (AKA Mercantile), the proceeds of which were used by Council to build its office building in 2008.
**Note Interest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$66,318</td>
<td>$66,318</td>
<td>$  -0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No change. This category covers the cost of servicing the revenue note with TD Bank (AKA Mercantile), the proceeds of which were used by Council to build its office building in 2008.

**Consultants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$225,507</td>
<td>$884,450</td>
<td>$658,943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultants are retained to assist in completing some contractual responsibilities. Consultants are required to complete contract work dealing with transportation engineering and modeling, emergency preparedness and training, and urban design and town planning. Based on an increase in confirmed contracts, an increase in costs is anticipated in this category.

**Capital Outlay**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$   -0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No change. This category covers the cost of items over $1,000 that are depreciated over a period of three or five years.

**Capital Outlay-Building (FARB) Fixed Asset Replacement Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$   -0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No change. This category reflects funds to be set aside for major repairs/replacement costs for the building (e.g. air conditioner, roof, windows, etc.)

**Total Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,034,631</td>
<td>$2,846,341</td>
<td>$811,710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members                  AGENDA ITEM 7
From: Staff
Date: March 16, 2012 Council Meeting
Subject: Sustainable Communities Initiative Update
         Presentation by Councilmember Ramon Trias

Introduction

The Southeast Florida Regional Partnership is a joint effort of the South Florida and Treasure Coast Regional Planning Councils and over 200 public, private, and nonprofit/civic organizations within a seven-county area (Monroe, Miami-Dade, Broward, Palm Beach, Martin, St. Lucie and Indian River counties). Funding to support the Partnership in the amount of $4.25 million is from a Sustainable Communities Grant, which is the result of an unprecedented partnership between the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

Background

The purpose of this grant is to develop a Regional Vision and Blueprint for Economic Prosperity (RVB or “The Blueprint”) for the seven-county area. Work is currently being conducted to establish a comprehensive regional plan and identify critical projects and infrastructure to improve sustainability. These work products will be used as a guide to prioritize and focus future local, state and federal investment and policies. The overarching purpose of the resulting regional plan is to help communities become economically strong and environmentally sustainable.

Council’s role in the process is that of a sub-grantee or consultant. With Council’s assistance, the following tasks and grant mandates have been fulfilled to date:

- Negotiation of the HUD Agreement – Status completed.
- Organization of the Regional Partnership – Status completed.
- Creation of an Executive Committee – Status ongoing (expanding membership).
- Creation of an Organization Committee – Status completed.
- Creation of an Operations and Equity Subcommittee – Status completed.
• Expansion of Operations and Equity Subcommittee to include a Budget Subcommittee – Status completed.
• Development of a Detailed Work Plan. Status: Initially completed, currently undergoing revisions.
• Development of a Budget – Status initially completed, currently undergoing revisions.
• Hiring of Project Director – Status initially completed, currently seeking new director.
• Hiring of Program Manager – Status completed.
• Master Consultant Selection – Status completed.
• Review and Selection of Consortium Members - Status ongoing.
• Development of a Project Web Site – Status ongoing.
• Development of a Scenario Modeling Tool to determine “Virtual Present” and “Future Trend” Scenarios – Status ongoing.
• Development of a Regional Housing Assessment – Status ongoing.
• HUD Workshop – Status completed.

**Getting Involved - How to Actively Participate in the Partnership**

The Partnership has created seven work groups tasked with identifying regional opportunities and challenges and recommending potential goals, objectives, and strategies in each of the following areas:

• Economic Development
• Education
• Housing
• Transportation
• Water, Environment & Natural Resources
• Climate Resiliency
• Inclusive Regional Leadership

Participation in each of these work groups is voluntary. These work groups will serve as the initial structure for involving regional stakeholders and the public in developing the RVB. The findings and recommendations of the work groups will be integrated through the work of the overall Partnership and the Executive Committee.

Councilmember Ramon Trias, Chair of the Operations and Budget Subcommittee and member of the Executive Committee will present an update to Council.

**Recommendation**

For informational purposes only.
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members                           AGENDA ITEM 8
From: Council Staff
Date: March 16, 2012 Council Meeting
Subject: Update on the Evaluation of Southeast Florida Passenger Rail Proposals

Introduction

The purpose of this item is to provide an update regarding the evaluation of various approaches to reintroduce passenger rail on the Florida East Coast (FEC) rail corridor in southeast Florida. Council staff has been requested by the Southeast Florida Transportation Council (SEFTC) to evaluate two approaches for passenger rail service: (1) the South Florida East Coast Corridor Transit Analysis (SFECC Study), led by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), and (2) the “Fast Start” Proposal for Tri-Rail Coastal Service, led by the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA). This work would be funded through Council’s existing interagency agreement with the Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organization for planning and technical assistance. To assist in the technical details of the evaluation, including economic assumptions, ridership forecasts, and financial projections, SEFTC has also retained a technical team led by Kittleson and Associates, who will be working with Council staff on the analysis.

The SFECC Study is a large-scale, comprehensive analysis designed to produce a regional master plan for premium transit service in Palm Beach, Broward, and Miami-Dade counties over a twenty-year build-out timeframe. The scale of the 85-mile corridor, with high frequency transit service between key travel markets, represents a significant capital investment. Accordingly, the SFECC study anticipates the service will be broken down into segments, whereby service could begin on a portion of the corridor (e.g., Fort Lauderdale to Miami, Mangonia Park to Jupiter, etc.), with future phases to introduce service on other portions of the corridor over time. The study anticipates the need for federal funding to be matched with state and local funds to build the system. The terms and details of service operations, including financing, have not yet been determined.

In contrast, the SFRTA Fast Start proposal is designed for a three-to-five year implementation horizon whereby the agency would initiate service on the FEC corridor from Jupiter to Miami, as well as add additional Tri-Rail service south from Pompano Beach into downtown Miami, in a single phase. The SFRTA would operate the service and utilize train equipment the agency has already ordered in anticipation of service expansion. The proposal suggests state funding could
be secured for the capital costs, and local governments receiving new stations would contribute annually to offset operating costs.

For the evaluation of these two approaches, Council staff conducted initial meetings with each agency in February of 2012, and each agency has begun providing the necessary documents for evaluation. Coincidentally, the SFECC study team also convened a project steering committee meeting shortly after the kickoff meetings, which provided a constructive venue for all the regional transportation partners to discuss both projects. The inter-agency dialogue has been positive, and additional inter-agency working sessions on key project components have been well-attended and productive. These actions are consistent with Council’s Resolution 12-03, which requested improved collaboration among FDOT, SFRTA, and the other regional transportation partners in support of passenger rail service.

Staff anticipates completion of the due diligence initial review in April, and completion of the evaluation by June 2012. This timeframe corresponds to the SEFTC meetings scheduled for April 23 and June 23, 2012. Additional presentations before the Palm Beach, Broward, and Miami-Dade metropolitan planning organizations are anticipated as well.

**Recommendation**

For informational purposes only.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRI Status Report – March 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Capron Lakes (formerly known as Indrio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hobe Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Southern Grove Substantial Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Visions at Indrio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter dated January 17, 2012 from Mayor Harry Charlston, Town of Jupiter Island – Senate Bill 1180 and House Bill 979</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter dated February 6, 2012 from James A. Wolfe, Florida Department of Transportation – Florida East Coast Commuter Rail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter dated March 1, 2012 from Congressman Allen B. West, Congress of the United States – RESTORE the Gulf Coast Act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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. Submittal of the sufficiency response was received on February 1, 2012 and was found to have completed the sufficiency process on March 1, 2012. Letter received from the Applicant on March 8, 2012 requesting sufficiency process be reopened.

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USES</th>
<th>Change in Square Feet</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.
January 17, 2012

Via U.S. Mail & Email:  
Negron.joe.web@flsenate.gov  
William.snyder@myfloridahouse.gov

The Honorable Joe Negron  
The Florida Senate  
306 Senate Office Building  
404 South Monroe Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1100

The Honorable William D. Snyder  
The Florida House of Representatives  
412 House Office Building  
402 South Monroe Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1300

Re:  SB 1180 / HB 979

Dear Senator Negron and Representative Snyder:

I write to you on behalf of the Town Commission of the Town of Jupiter Island (the Town). I understand the House of Representatives and the Senate are considering legislation which, from the Town’s perspective, would remove a safeguard which current benefits the Town.

As the Town understands the above-referenced legislation, large scale development projects known as Developments of Regional Impact (DRI) could be exempted from the statutory review process which has been in place since 1972. As you know, a DRI, by definition is a project that is expected to impact more than one county. See Fla. Stat. Section 380.06(1). Given that definition, it is reasonable to assume that a proposed DRI would create impacts upon the municipalities which are within the county where the DRI is located. Of concern is that the legislation would allow counties to unilaterally exempt those projects which meet the threshold to be a DRI from the existing regional and state review processes which have traditionally provided municipalities and adjacent counties with a significant opportunity for intergovernmental coordination, and, more importantly cooperation.

If this legislation remains unchanged, a county may determine that a DRI which may have impacts on those local governments who participate in the Regional Planning Councils of the state, and yet the DRI would not be subject to Regional Planning Council review. Instead, the DRI would only be subject to a review by the state agency formerly known as the State Planning Agency. As a result of last year’s Community Planning Act, this agency’s review is
now limited to impacts on State interests, and not necessarily on the impacts it may create for other local governments. The Town believes that regional planning councils remain a valuable resource, and that the DRI process is important because it provides small communities, such as the Town with a forum to express concerns about large scale development which may not receive adequate review if this legislation is adopted as presented.

In closing, I ask that you both encourage your colleagues in the respective chambers to withdraw this legislation.

Very truly yours,

Harry Charlston, Mayor

cc: Town Commissioners
    Gene Rauth, Town Manager
    John C. Randolph, Town Attorney
    Michael Busha, TCRPC
February 6, 2012

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

Dear Mr. Busha:

I have reviewed your letter of January 17. You express a desire that all agency partners work together in the evaluation of bringing commuter rail to the Florida East Coast tracks in South Florida. We agree that the building of a strong coalition that works together is essential to moving this process forward.

The South Florida Regional Transportation Authority’s “Fast Start” plan has been developed without consultation with the partners that would be expected to carry it out. That process would have made apparent elements of the plan that cannot be achieved and costs that are under-represented. Presentation of the “Fast Start” plan has been very confusing for the public and has set back the formal plan development. We encourage the SFRTA to work with its partners within the South Florida East Coast Corridor (SFECC) Study. The SFECC study has the resources required to properly develop and analyze alternatives with a proper technical basis.

We look forward to continuing to work with the Council and with our other partners towards what you have so accurately expressed “an integrated, coordinated transportation network that improves mobility, expanded economic opportunity, and enhances the sustainability of Southeast Florida”.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James A. Wolfe, P.E.
District Secretary
District Four

cc: Kevin J. Foley, Chair, TCRPC
    James F. Murley, Executive Director, SFRPC
    Joseph Giulietti, Executive Director, SFRTA
Chairman Kevin Foley
Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
421 Southwest Camden Avenue
Stuart, FL 34994-2903

Dear Chairman Foley:

Thank you for contacting me regarding the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council Resolution #12-01, in support of the Resources and Ecosystems Sustainability, Tourist Opportunities, and Revived Economies of the Gulf Coast States Act of 2011 (RESTORE the Gulf Coast Act), H.R. 3096. I appreciate hearing from you and having the benefit of your views.

The RESTORE Act was introduced by Congressman Steve Scalise (R-LA) on October 5, 2011. H.R. 3096 has been referred to House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. You will be pleased to know that I am a cosponsor of this legislation.

The RESTORE Act seeks to facilitate the ecological and economic recovery of the Gulf Coast States (Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas), which were impacted by the sinking of the Transocean Deepwater Horizon mobile offshore drilling unit, and also the subsequent release of oil into the Gulf of Mexico.

To do so, the RESTORE Act establishes a trust fund entitled “The Gulf Coast Restoration Trust Fund (Trust Fund).” The Secretary of the Treasury will deposit 80 percent of all civil penalties paid by the parties responsible for Deepwater Horizon sinking under the Clean Water Act.

Each year, 35 percent of funds within the Trust Fund, will be available, in equal shares, for ecological and economic restoration, of the Gulf Coast ecosystem, for use by the Gulf Coast States. These funds are to be used as a resource for recovery.

These funds may be used for projects relating to coastal restoration, alleviation of damage to fish, wildlife, and natural resources, coastal State Parks and conservation management. The funds can also be put towards workforce development, job creation, and infrastructure projects to mitigate ecological and economic impacts. In addition, the funds may be used for programs promoting tourism, the consumption of locally produced seafood, and programs that promote education with regards to local natural resources. Also, infrastructure dealing with coastal flood protection, coastal wetland losses, and beach erosion would qualify for funding, as would limit administrative costs.

The RESTORE Act establishes a Gulf Coast Ecosystem Restoration Council charged with creating and executing a comprehensive recovery plan for the Gulf Coast. The council will also
establish a fishery and ecosystem endowment to ensure the long-term sustainability of the ecosystem, fish habitat and stock, and fishing industry in the Gulf of Mexico. This council will receive 69 percent of the funds in the Trust Fund.

H.R. 3096 will establish a Gulf Coast Ecosystem Restoration Science, Observation, Monitoring, and Technology Program to be carried out at centers of excellence. One center of excellence will be located in each of the five Gulf Coast states. These centers will be under the direction of the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

On April 20, 2010, the Transocean Deepwater Horizon mobile offshore drilling unit, located 40 miles off the coast of Louisiana, experienced an explosion, caught fire, and ultimately sank two days later on April 22, 2010. This left the oil well, which the unit had been drilling, open 5000 feet below the surface. Experts estimated that 4.9 million barrels (205.8 million gallons) of oil spilled into the Gulf of Mexico in five months.

The ruptured oil well was finally sealed on September 19, 2010. Approximately 665 miles of coastline were affected as the 397.7 million dollars worth of oil moved along the Gulf’s currents. As a result of the oil spill, the penalties to be collected by the federal government, under the Clean Water Act, are estimated to be between $5 billion and $20 billion dollars. These are the civil penalties which will be placed into the Trust Fund.

I strongly support an all-of-the-above energy approach that includes development of natural gas, clean coal, and American produced oil, as well as alternative energy sources such as wind, solar, hydropower, nuclear, geothermal and biomass. This plan will create new job opportunities in Florida, and throughout the country, while making us less dependent on foreign energy.

Offshore drilling is an important part of a comprehensive energy plan; however, it is critical that offshore oil and gas exploitation be conducted in a safe and responsible manner. A balanced regulatory structure, which does everything possible to avoid another disaster while ensuring this vital component of our energy portfolio can continue safely, will provide the best solution.

Now is the time to make America energy-independent by encouraging the indomitable spirit of American ingenuity and developing our full spectrum of energy resources. America must look at energy independence much the same as having a diversified investment portfolio built upon the solid foundation of proven methods in both energy extraction and economic development.

As this legislation works its way through the 112th Congress, I will give it my full consideration should it come to a vote.
Again, thank you for contacting me. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any further questions or concerns in the future.

Steadfast and Loyal,

[Signature]

Allen B. West
Member of Congress

AW/jb

cc: Vice Chairman, Honorable Peter O'Bryan, Commissioner
    Secretary/Treasurer Honorable Martha Webster, Councilwoman
    Executive Director, Michael J. Busha

Palm Beach County
The Honorable Karen Marcus
The Honorable Priscilla A. Taylor
The Honorable Paulette Burdick
The Honorable Martha Webster
The Honorable Samuel J. Ferreri
The Honorable Karen Golonka
The Honorable Shelby Lowe
The Honorable Jess Santamaria
The Honorable Shelley Vana
The Honorable Steven Abrams
The Honorable Joni Brinkman
The Honorable David Norris
The Honorable James DuBois
The Honorable Kimberly Mitchell
The Honorable Ellen Andel
Michael Davis
Bill Hall
Peter Sachs

St Lucie County
The Honorable Chris Craft
The Honorable Tod Mowery
The Honorable JoAnn Faiella
The Honorable Thomas Pernot
The Honorable Frannie Hutchinson
The Honorable Chris Dzadowsky
The Honorable Shannon Martin
The Honorable Reginald B. Sessions
Reece Parrish
Ramon Trias, AICP

Martin County
The Honorable Patrick Hayes
The Honorable Doug Smith
The Honorable Jeffrey Krauskopf
The Honorable Sarah Heard
The Honorable Ed Fielding
The Honorable Paul Luger
Susan J. Hershey

Indian River County
The Honorable Peter O'Bryan
The Honorable Bob Solari
The Honorable Thomas Cadden
The Honorable Craig Fletcher
The Honorable Gary Wheeler
The Honorable Joseph Flescher
The Honorable Bud Oatway
The Honorable Jim Hill
Robert Stork