1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Roll Call
3. Public Comment On Consent Agenda Items
4. Agenda
5. Consent Agenda
   D. Minutes – June 15, 2012
   E. Hazards Analysis Grant Agreement
   F. Town of Jupiter Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-1ESR
   G. City of Lake Worth Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-1ESR
   H. Town of Loxahatchee Groves Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-1ESR
   I. Martin County Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-3ESR
   J. Palm Beach County Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-2ESR
   K. City of Port St. Lucie Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-5ESR
   L. City of Vero Beach Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-1ESR
   M. City of Vero Beach Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-2ESR
   N. Intergovernmental Coordination and Review Log
7. Everglades Restoration Strategies – Presentation by Melissa L. Meeker, Executive Director of South Florida Water Management District
8. “All Aboard Florida” Passenger Rail Proposal Update – Presentation by Jose Gonzalez, Vice President, Flagler Development
10. Council Work Program Update
11. Seven50 Southeast Florida Prosperity Plan Update – Presentation by Marcela Camblor-Cutsaimanis, Project Director, Southeast Florida Regional Partnership
12. Announcements
13. Council Member Information Exchange
14. Staff Comment
15. Chairman’s Comment
16. Adjournment

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

Special Needs: Participants with special needs can be accommodated by calling the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council at least 5 working days prior to the Meeting. We can be reached by phone at (772)221-4060, by fax at (772)221-4067, or by email at admin@tcrpc.org. If you are hearing impaired, please contact us using the Florida Relay Service, 1 (800) 955-8771 (TDD) or 1 (800) 955-8770 (Voice).
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MEMORANDUM

To:        Council Members
From:      Staff
Date:      September 21, 2012 Council Meeting

Attached are the following financial statements for May 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
May 31, 2012

**Current Assets:**
- Cash Bank - Checking $880,800
- Fixed Asset Replacement Budget (FARB) 20,500
- State Board of Administration - Investment Fund 4,922
- Petty Cash 200
- Postage Meter Funds 800
- Due From Other Governmental Units 183,696
- Due From TCEF 25,000
- Deposits as Security 394

**Total Current Assets:** $1,116,312

**Fixed Assets:**
- Office Furniture & Fixtures $152,784
- Autos 53,534
- Building 1,826,210
- Land 500,000

**Total Fixed Assets:** $2,532,528

**Less: Depreciation:** $386,903

**TOTAL ASSETS:** $3,261,937

**Liabilities:**
- Loan Payable $24,732
- Accounts Payable 12,972
- Benefits Payable 67,832
- Unearned Revenues 22,819

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

**Total Liabilities and Fund Balances:**
- General Reserves $1,049,481
- Legal Reserves 50,000
- Revolving Loan Reserves 0
- General Funds -1,755,293
- Fixed Assets 2,145,624

**Total Liabilities and Fund Balances:** $3,261,937
# TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

## REVENUE REPORT

For the Eight Month period ending May 31, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Revenue</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>18,079</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>6,610</td>
<td>6,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Radiological Training/FOG</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Storm Surge Lake Okeechobee</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte County Exercise Evaluator</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Stormwater Depth Analysis</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL TOD Guidebook</td>
<td>99,941</td>
<td>66,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>156,660</td>
<td>114,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMEP - Training</td>
<td>36,238</td>
<td>11,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMEP Planning</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>2,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA-Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>2,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA-ARRA-Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>75,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA - Assessment</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>5,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA Public Market - Riviera Beach</td>
<td>20,204</td>
<td>27,718</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>79,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Energy Resiliency Strategy</td>
<td>44,650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDOT - Land Use &amp; Transportation</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>5,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Communities Initiative</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>104,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Economic Develp. Admin. - Planning 2011</td>
<td>81,250</td>
<td>26,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>1,263,842</td>
<td>357,507</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>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLC - TPO Public Involvement Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</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 Implementetion</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB-MPO Planning</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>25,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward Boulevard Gateway Project</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD King Power Plant Site</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>24,500</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>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>543,060</td>
<td>159,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Deeds</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>86,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>2,121</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>89,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,846,341</td>
<td>1,505,152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

BUDGET REPORT

For the Eight Month period ending May 31, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>931,576</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>608,106</td>
<td>76,033</td>
<td>323,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>403,836</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>230,952</td>
<td>26,920</td>
<td>172,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Expenses</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4,487</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>2,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7,685</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>14,315</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>30,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6,249</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>23,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies &amp; Expenses</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33,375</td>
<td>11,507</td>
<td>46,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27,430</td>
<td>2,024</td>
<td>52,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone &amp; Fax</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10,183</td>
<td>1,727</td>
<td>9,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3,932</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>5,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42,392</td>
<td>2,267</td>
<td>37,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues &amp; Memberships</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>25,972</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>7,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training - HMEP</td>
<td>20,400</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6,808</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library &amp; Publications</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Advertising</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Fees</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>31,624</td>
<td>8,401</td>
<td>8,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Fees</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3,930</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>8,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note Principal</td>
<td>73,761</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>49,029</td>
<td>6,266</td>
<td>24,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note Interest</td>
<td>66,318</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>44,357</td>
<td>5,407</td>
<td>21,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>1,946,891</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1,151,469</td>
<td>144,062</td>
<td>795,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>884,450</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>404,216</td>
<td>40,237</td>
<td>480,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants - Pass Through</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>36,260</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(36,260)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>2,831,341</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1,591,944</td>
<td>184,299</td>
<td>1,239,397</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>Totals</td>
<td>2,846,341</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1,591,944</td>
<td>184,299</td>
<td>1,254,397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: September 21, 2012 Council Meeting

Attached are the following financial statements for June 30, 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
June 30, 2012

Current Assets:
- Cash Bank - Checking $761,794
- Fixed Asset Replacement Budget (FARB) 20,500
- State Board of Administration - Investment Fund 4,922
- Petty Cash 200
- Postage Meter Funds 800
- Due From Other Governmental Units 495,462
- Due From TCEF 25,000
- Deposits as Security 394

Total Current Assets $1,309,071

Fixed Assets:
- Office Furniture & Fixtures $152,420
- Autos 53,534
- Building 1,826,210
- Land 500,000

Total Fixed Assets $2,532,164
Less: Depreciation $391,335
Net Fixed Assets $2,140,830

TOTAL ASSETS $3,449,901

Liabilities:
- Loan Payable $18,625
- Accounts Payable 104,507
- Benefits Payable 69,774
- Unearned Revenues 22,819

Total Liabilities $214,825

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

Total Long Term Liabilities $1,859,595

Fund Balances:
- General Reserves $1,049,481
- Legal Reserves 50,000
- Revolving Loan Reserves 0
- General Funds -1,649,904
- Fixed Assets 2,140,829

Total Fund Balances $1,590,406

TOTAL LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES $3,449,901
# Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council

## Revenue Report

For the Nine Month period ending June 30, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Revenue</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>35,647</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>6,610</td>
<td>6,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Radiological Training/FOG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Storm Surge Lake Okeechobee</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte County Exercise Evaluator</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Stormwater Depth Analysis</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL TOD Guidebook</td>
<td>99,941</td>
<td>125,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>156,660</td>
<td>198,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMEP - Training</td>
<td>26,258</td>
<td>26,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMEP Planning</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA-Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>10,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA-ARRA-Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>100,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA - Assessment</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>17,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA Public Market - Riviera Beach</td>
<td>20,204</td>
<td>31,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Vulnerability Analysis</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>60,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Disaster Re-Development Plan</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>131,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Energy Resiliency Strategy</td>
<td>44,650</td>
<td>3,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDOT - Land Use &amp; Transportation</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>12,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Communities Initiative</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>151,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>1,263,842</td>
<td>600,073</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>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLC - TPO Public Involvement Plan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of WPB TOD Connector Charette</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter TOD Public Outreach</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riviera Beach Master Plan Implementatation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training, Exercise, Pledge Workshop, Region 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB-MPO Planning</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>45,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward Boulevard Gateway Project</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD King Power Plant Site</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>24,500</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>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>543,000</td>
<td>221,265</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>61,237</td>
<td>61,237</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>93,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>2,144</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>96,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,846,341</td>
<td>1,901,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Subject to modifications
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>931,576</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>683,587</td>
<td>75,481</td>
<td>247,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>403,836</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>260,701</td>
<td>29,749</td>
<td>143,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Expenses</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4,805</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>2,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7,936</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>14,064</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>30,000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6,924</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>23,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies &amp; Expenses</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40,679</td>
<td>7,304</td>
<td>39,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27,468</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone &amp; Fax</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11,353</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>8,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4,287</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>4,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45,338</td>
<td>2,946</td>
<td>34,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues &amp; Memberships</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>29,972</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training - HMEP</td>
<td>20,400</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14,742</td>
<td>7,934</td>
<td>5,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library &amp; Publications</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Advertising</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Fees</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>31,694</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Fees</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4,498</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>7,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note Principal</td>
<td>73,761</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55,136</td>
<td>6,107</td>
<td>18,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note Interest</td>
<td>66,318</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>49,923</td>
<td>5,566</td>
<td>16,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,946,891</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,289,989</strong></td>
<td><strong>138,521</strong></td>
<td><strong>656,902</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>884,450</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>559,023</td>
<td>154,807</td>
<td>325,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants - Pass Through</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>39,900</td>
<td>3,640</td>
<td>(39,900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,831,341</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,888,912</strong></td>
<td><strong>296,967</strong></td>
<td><strong>942,429</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>2,846,341</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,888,912</strong></td>
<td><strong>296,967</strong></td>
<td><strong>957,429</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members

From: Staff

Date: September 21, 2012 Council Meeting


Attached are the following financial statements for July 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
July 31, 2012

Current Assets:
- Cash Bank - Checking $579,306
- Fixed Asset Replacement Budget (FARB) 20,500
- State Board of Administration - Investment Fund 4,922
- Petty Cash 200
- Postage Meter Funds 800
- Due From Other Governmental Units 408,284
- Due From TCEF 25,000
- Deposits as Security 394

$1,039,406

Fixed Assets:
- Office Furniture & Fixtures $156,184
- Autos 53,534
- Building 1,826,210
- Land 500,000

$2,535,928

Less: Depreciation $396,235

$2,139,693

TOTAL ASSETS $3,179,099

Liabilities:
- Loan Payable $12,320
- Accounts Payable 13,409
- Benefits Payable 68,262
- Unearned Revenues 22,819

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

$1,760,579

Fund Balances:
- General Reserves $1,049,481
- Legal Reserves 50,000
- Revolving Loan Reserves 0
- General Funds -1,820,654
- Fixed Assets 2,139,692

$1,418,520

TOTAL LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES $3,179,099
## TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

### REVENUE REPORT

For the Ten Month period ending July 31, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEM - SARA - Title III for 2011-2012</td>
<td>30,682</td>
<td>35,647</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>6,610</td>
<td>6,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Radiological Training/FOG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Storm Surge Lake Okeechobee</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte County Exercise Evaluator</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evacuation Model Training</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Stormwater Depth Analysis</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL. TOD Guidebook</td>
<td>99,941</td>
<td>125,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>156,660</td>
<td>199,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMEP - Training</td>
<td>36,238</td>
<td>26,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMEP Planning</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA-Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>10,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA-ARRA-Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>102,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA - Assessment</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>17,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA Public Market - Riviera Beach</td>
<td>20,204</td>
<td>31,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Vulnerability Analysis</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>60,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Disaster Re-Development Plan</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>131,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Energy Resiliency Strategy</td>
<td>44,650</td>
<td>3,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDOT - Land Use &amp; Transportation</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>12,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Communities Initiative</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>183,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>1,263,842</td>
<td>634,449</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>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLC - TPO Public Involvement Plan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,000</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 Implemention Training</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training, Exercise, Planning Workshop, Region 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB-MPO Planning</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>45,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward Boulevard Gateway Project</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD King Power Plant Site</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>24,500</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>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>543,000</td>
<td>221,265</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>93,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>2,151</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>96,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,846,341</td>
<td>1,936,783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

### BUDGET REPORT

For the Ten Month period ending July 31, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational Budget</th>
<th>Percentage Used</th>
<th>Year To Date</th>
<th>Current This Period</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>931,576</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>755,174</td>
<td>71,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>403,836</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>287,328</td>
<td>26,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Expenses</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5,267</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>17,961</td>
<td>10,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance-Brownfields</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10,957</td>
<td>4,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies &amp; Expenses</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>64,591</td>
<td>23,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29,980</td>
<td>2,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone &amp; Fax</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13,434</td>
<td>2,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>49,098</td>
<td>3,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues &amp; Memberships</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>25,972</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training - HMEP</td>
<td>20,400</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14,742</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library &amp; Publications</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Advertising</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Fees</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>36,262</td>
<td>4,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Fees</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4,996</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note Principal</td>
<td>73,761</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>61,441</td>
<td>6,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note Interest</td>
<td>66,318</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>55,292</td>
<td>5,368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal** 1,946,891 75 1,451,825 161,836 495,066

| Consultants | 884,450 | 69 | 605,860 | 46,838 | 278,590 |
| Consultant - Pass Through | 0 | -100 | 39,900 | 0 | (39,900) |

**Subtotal** 2,831,341 74 2,097,586 208,674 733,755

| Capital Outlay | 10,000 | 38 | 3,763   | 3,763   | 6,237   |
| Capital Outlay - Building | 5,000 | 0 | 0       | 0       | 5,000   |

**Totals** 2,846,341 74 2,101,349 212,437 744,992
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members

From: Staff

Date: September 21, 2012 Council Meeting

Subject: Minutes – June 15, 2012

Introduction

The Minutes of the June 15, 2012 Council meeting were posted to Council’s website on September 7, 2012 at http://www.tcrpc.org.

Recommendation

Council should approve the Minutes of the June 15, 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 O’Bryan

St. Lucie County: Commissioner Mowery
Mayor Faiella

Martin County: Commissioner Hayes
Commissioner Smith
Commissioner Fielding, Alternate
Commissioner Krauskopf

Palm Beach County: Commissioner Taylor
Commissioner Marcus
Commissioner Burdick
Councilwoman Webster
Councilman Lowe
Mayor Golonka
Mayor Ferreri
Vice Mayor Brinkman
Vice Mayor Norris (Alternate)
Mayor DuBois (Alternate)

Gubernatorial Appointees: Kevin Foley
Bill Hall
Reece Parrish
Peter Sachs
Robert Stork

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

Council Staff: Michael Busha
Kim DeLaney
Anthea Gianniotes
Sandy Gippert
Liz Gulick
Stephanie Heidt
Dana Little
Peter Merritt
The Executive Director announced a quorum was present.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

None.

AGENDA AND CONSENT AGENDA

Commissioner O’Bryan noted that Agenda Item 5D, Minutes – March 16, 2012, needed to be amended to indicate Mayor Cadden from the Town of Indian River Shores was in attendance at the March meeting.

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

Remaining items on the Consent Agenda were: 5A, Financial Report – February 29, 2012; 5B, Financial Report – March 31, 2012; 5C, Financial Report – April 30, 2012; 5E, City of Fort Pierce Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-1ESR; 5F, Indian River County Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-2ESR; 5G, Palm Beach County Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-1ESR; 5H, City of Palm Beach Gardens Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-1ESR; 5I, City of Port St. Lucie Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-3ESR; 5J, City of Port St. Lucie Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-4ER; 5K, Wellington Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 12-3ESR; 5L, Intergovernmental Coordination and Review Log; 5M, Repeal of Council’s Rules: 29k-2.006 Preapplication Conference and 29K-3.001 Intergovernmental Coordination and Review Process; and 5N, Glades Regional Master Plan: Community Challenge Planning Grant – Authorization to Execute Agreement Between Palm Beach County and the Council.

PROPOSED BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012-2013

Commissioner O’Bryan stated the proposed budget reflects a twenty four percent reduction compared to the previous budget. He also noted there was an amendment approved at the March Council meeting for the current budget that reflects additional contracts staff has procured. He stated the currently proposed balanced budget does not contain any increases in salaries or county dues. He reported Commissioner Solari had asked the Committee to consider reducing the county dues by ten percent. He indicated that because the dues have been frozen for the last six years, and it is the middle of the current fiscal year, the Committee decided to wait until the end of the fiscal year to analyze the finances at that time with respect to Commissioner Solari’s request. He moved approval of the proposed budget. Commissioner Marcus seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.
Commissioner O’Bryan noted that, at the request of Chairman Foley, staff will be cutting checks once a month, as opposed to the current bimonthly schedule. He stated that if a check is required before the monthly scheduled check run, then Commissioner Smith has offered to be available to sign checks. Commissioner O’Bryan noted that in order to add Commissioner Smith as a signatory to Council’s checking account, the bank requires a Council motion. Mayor Ferreri moved approval of adding Commissioner Smith as a signatory on the Council checking account. Commissioner Marcus seconded the motion.

Councilwoman Webster asked if only one signature was required. Commissioner O’Bryan indicated two signatures are required, and this motion is being made to allow Commissioner Smith to be added to the list of approved signatories on the account. A vote on the motion passed unanimously.

MARTIN COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 12-2ESR

Staff presented an overview of the Martin County proposed amendments, which included text amendments to the Future Land Use, Housing, Sanitary Sewer Services, Potable Water Services, Drainage and Natural Groundwater Aquifer Recharge, and Coastal Management Elements. The amendment package also included one future land use map amendment. The future land use map amendment is for a parcel known as the Extreme Sports Park, a 111-acre parcel located on the north side of Bridge Road between I-95 and Florida’s Turnpike. The proposed amendment would expand an Expressway Oriented Transient Commercial Service Center land use overlay by around 77.1 acres to include the entire 111-acres of the subject parcel. Additionally, the proposed text amendment adds a sub-area policy to the Comprehensive Plan to allow the development of “a commercial amusement that includes a cable-driven water ski/wake board lake, an indoor/outdoor skate park, an RV park, retail sales facility and related uses that support these activities” on the site.

Staff indicated that the future land use amendment and text amendments related to the Extreme Sports Park are not consistent with the vision described in the South Martin County Charrette Report. Additionally, the Strategic Regional Policy Plan (SRPP) generally promotes infill and includes goals, strategies, and policies to redirect development patterns to towns, cities, and existing urban areas as the venue for future growth. While the proposed commercial amusement use is not necessarily appropriate for infill in urban areas, it is an appropriate use as a special district on the edge of an urban area, similar to an industrial or workplace district that is well-connected to, but on the edge of, an existing town or city. For these reasons, the draft report concluded the proposed amendments are inconsistent with the SRPP.

Commissioner Smith asked what the hatched area was in the 1994 Charrette Master Plan. Staff indicated this was for an educational village. The plan was designed so that if there was an intervention in the countryside, the plan would provide more management, focus and stability. Commissioner Smith stated he wanted to note that the 1994 plan envisioned two villages in this area of the County.

Councilwoman Webster stated there did not appear to be much public input. Staff noted that there had been substantial public comment to both Council and the County, which is contained in the application package. Commissioner Smith clarified that the highway transient oriented commercial is not supplanted by this amendment. He stated the commercial uses remain on all four corners, this amendment will just add an additional component.
Commissioner Marcus asked if it was staff’s recommendation that the County update their plan to determine what is currently appropriate for the area. Staff indicated there has been substantial development interest recently in this area, so this does present an excellent opportunity to update the plan. Vice Mayor Brinkman asked if the charrette was done before the current transient-oriented designation was applied to the intersection. Staff indicated the overlay was in place in 1985 at the time of the writing of the comprehensive plan, and the charrette master plan was developed in 1994. Vice Mayor Brinkman asked how water and sewer were planned for the commercial node. Staff indicated there is a policy that requires the uses be serviced by package plants. Commissioner Fielding noted that this request had not received outstanding support of the community.

Under public comment, Donna Melzer, representing the Martin County Conservation Alliance as well as herself, concurred with the staff report recommendation of inconsistency. She stated that the Martin County comprehensive plan does currently allow partial highway or commercial uses of any kind at this interchange; however, overlay restrictions prohibit such uses unless the connecting road is a major arterial, which Bridge Road is not. Further, those restrictions require a setback of 1,320 feet from a highway exchange for road safety, which is not available at this site. She stated in 2007 there was litigation, and the legal department was quite clear that this corner did not qualify for the commercial at that time because the major arterial designation was not there. In addition to the regional charrette done in 1994, she noted that in 1998 Martin County was designated as one of the Department of Community Affairs Sustainable Communities, and funding was provided to have consultants conduct meetings with more than 700 residents in attendance. It was determined at that time the area should remain agricultural. With respect to the package plants, she said it is important to note that when there was the consideration to have package plants, it was envisioned to serve small acreage, not what would be required to serve what is currently being proposed. She stated the urban service boundary needs to remain where it is and urban utilities should remain inside the urban boundaries.

Commissioner Marcus moved approval of the staff recommendation. Commissioner Hayes stated that although the vote was not unanimous, this proposed amendment had the support of the Martin County Board of County Commissioners. He stated he believes Martin County has been successful in having both a rural and urban section of the County, and strives to preserve the urban service boundaries. He stated this proposal does not change anything, and does not allow any additional authority or privileges. He stated he believes the proposed water park is an appropriate rural use for this property. With respect to the package plant size, he stated only 10 acres are going to be used to accommodate the water park, while the rest of the property contains the water reservoir, cypress domes and wetlands. He made a substitute motion to approve all of the proposed comprehensive plan amendments. Councilmember Hall seconded the substitute motion.

Under discussion, Commissioner Marcus asked if Martin County staff recommended denial of the proposed amendments. Staff indicated the County staff did recommend denial. Commissioner Marcus noted that 1000 Friends of Florida also recommended denial and that the County conduct more data and analysis. She stated she believes there needs to be a more comprehensive approach if this is going to be done, and that although this may seem small, these things can get really big. Councilmember Hall stated he seconded the substitute motion because he believes this will not have adverse effects on the character of the community and this is a legitimate use for this piece of property, which already allows for some commercial.
Mayor Golonka stated her concern with this, and the recent development of regional impact applications in the vicinity, is that she is not really sure what Martin County has in mind for this area. She stated that although there does not need to be a study each time there is a minor request, this is a very significant area for the County with the potential for many extrajurisdictional impacts. She said it would benefit the County to have greater scrutiny and updated studies in this area. She stated a project that has an amusement park that includes cable-driven water skis, a wake board lake, an indoor/outdoor skate park, an RV park, and retail sales facilities and related uses does not sound like rural development.

Commissioner Hayes stated with respect to the County staff’s denial of the amendment, staff is charged with interpreting the existing comprehensive plan, and under the existing plan staff should recommend denial as they are not policy makers. He stated that if it is the policy of Martin County to maintain a rural countryside and an urban area, and he believes what is being proposed is an appropriate rural use.

Commissioner Smith raised concerns that development within Martin County, whether it is inside or outside the urban service boundary, tends to receive criticism from Council. Commissioner Smith stated that he believes it is almost impossible for the County to do any long-range planning because anytime the County tries to come up with a plan there are groups that will challenge or sue the County. He noted the County has expended significant public funds in efforts to build consensus, but the plans have not worked for a variety of reasons. For this project, he stated a majority of the County Commission had already voted in favor of the amendment.

Commissioner Hayes noted he is an ardent supporter of having a separate countryside and an urban area in Martin County. He stated that his proposal is not for a huge amusement park, but a small, intimate use of 10 acres that only a small portion of the population would use. He stated this is an extraordinary opportunity for Martin County that will have minimal impact on the flavor and feel of Martin County. He stated it is the job of the County Commissioners, as policy makers, to look at the facts and make common sense decisions based on the people who elected them to make those decisions.

Commissioner Taylor stated she agreed with Commissioner Hayes that we need to learn to look at things objectively. She asked if the recommendation of denial would be perpetual, or could the application be amended and brought back for consideration. Staff indicated that the recommendation is that this is inconsistent for the area and not envisioned in the County plan. However, that would not preclude the County from developing a plan for these types of uses. Commissioner Taylor asked Commissioner Smith if he supported the amendment. He indicated he voted for the amendment.

Commissioner Taylor asked about the history of planning in the area, specifically looking for differentiation between what is planned in the proposed amendment, versus what had been planned in the past for the area. Commissioner Smith indicated the County had initiated several efforts with the public to focus on a future plan for this area of the County; however, many had been unsuccessful. He stated the most extensive plan was the one in 1994, which was likely the only one that developed a concept on paper. He stated that if a plan like that were brought before the County Commission today, it would likely receive significant opposition from groups in the community and likely would not be supported. So if we are basing this decision on the guidance of a 1994 plan
Commissioner Smith suggested the two have nothing to do with each other, because the former plan probably would not be accepted today.

Mayor Ferreri discussed the three I-95 nodes that are assigned transient commercial uses before I-95 was even open. In reviewing the conditions today, he noted the other two could be considered sprawl, with the subject interchange being the last of the pristine three. He stated there is an opportunity at this site, with four wedges of land and well-constructed barriers between the interstate systems. Potential environmental lands and wetlands there are likely degraded due to stormwater discharge from the roadways. He raised concern regarding the overlay for the entire interchange, questioning what Martin County really wants to see for the area. Mayor Ferreri further noted that when traveling north from Palm Beach County, this is the first pristine area and the rural character is one of the welcoming features of Martin County. The idea of fast food restaurants and motels there is not consistent with that experience. He stated there is an opportunity to do something unique at that interchange, and it does make sense to relook at the 1994 plan to determine if that is really what Martin County wants in this area.

Vice Mayor Brinkman indicated she would be supporting the substitute motion because she believes this is an insignificant change and she does not believe the County should be forced to do a study, or amend the previous study, when there is no guarantee of what will be requested in the future. Mr. Saberson clarified that the substitute motion on the floor was to approve the entire amendment package.

Commissioner Marcus stated she is concerned that if this project is approved there will be a precedent set for future proposals. She stated the County needs to take a current look at the area and possibly add some additional uses to give flexibility to what can be approved in the area. Commissioner Fielding stated his concern is that this is a violation of the rules the County has in place with respect to the urban service boundaries. He said the rules are good because they limit the amount of impacts and installation of capital facilities throughout the County, allowing for more efficient planning for the incremental growth of the various utilities and service needs. He stated it was not fair to allow such land use changes when there are property owners who have been diligent in maintaining and paying taxes on their properties and observe the rules.

Chairman Foley stated that two thirds of Council is elected officials, and part of that responsibility is to make changes or exceptions to the rules if it is appropriate. He stated that if only a small number of residents will utilize the water park, then it will be not be profitable. He stated that although this is, in his opinion, probably an absolute perfect use for this location, this could allow for other projects the citizens do not want in the area. He stated he would like to see an update of the study, but asked how long this would take. Staff indicated the 1994 study was a nine-month long process.

Commissioner Krauskopf stated he would support Commissioner Marcus’ original motion. He stated both Council and County staff have put a lot of work into their recommendations, and he would support that through the original motion. Commissioner O’Bryan stated this project, although small, does not fit into the current plan and could be a precedent setting change for the area. He said that instead of overriding the plan, the plan should be adjusted if this is the direction the County decides to pursue. He also stated that he believes rural should be things such as organic farms, cattle ranches and five-acre ranchettes, not a lot of lights, activities, noise, extreme water and RV parks, and retail. He stated he would not be supporting the substitute motion.
Chairman Foley called for a vote on the substitute motion. Staff clarified the substitute motion is to find all the proposed amendments to be consistent with the SRPP. The substitute motion carried by a vote of eleven to seven.

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY TEN YEAR POWER PLANT SITE PLAN, 2012-2021

Staff summarized the Florida Power & Light Ten Year Power Plant Site Plan and noted that the draft report concludes that the plan is inconsistent with Strategic Regional Policy Plan Goal 9.1, decreased vulnerability of the region to fuel price increases and supply interruptions; and Strategy 9.1.1, reduce the Region’s reliance on fossil fuels. The draft report urges FPL and the State of Florida to continue developing new programs to: 1) reduce the reliance on fossil fuels as future energy sources; 2) increase conservation activities to offset the need to construct new power plants; and 3) increase the reliance on renewable energy sources to produce electricity.

Commissioner Marcus moved approval of the staff recommendation to approve the report and authorize its transmittal to the Florida Public Service Commission. Commissioner Krauskopf seconded the motion.

Commissioner Marcus asked why the Riviera Beach plant is listed again under projection of future resources. Staff indicated because the new Riviera Beach Energy Center is currently under construction. Commissioner Taylor asked if water usage had been considered in the plan. Staff noted that although the plan does not specifically look at water usage, that is a consideration for Florida Power and Light when purchasing land for new facilities. Water use is permitted by the water management districts and the Department of Environmental Protection at the time of the site certification. Chairman Foley noted that the water is returned to the surrounding areas after use. Staff indicated that photovoltaic facilities do not use water.

Mayor DuBois stated that in order to not have disruption of service from renewable energy, there must be a combination of several different sources such as wind, solar, hydroelectric and geothermal. He indicated of all these, he believes solar is the most appropriate for Florida. He noted that the combination of the three major upgrades essentially equals the output of the new West County Energy Center. Staff indicated that there is a concern that we are becoming too reliant on natural gas, which is a concern due to the possibility of supply interruptions, because there are a limited number of natural gas pipe lines entering Florida. Staff noted that we currently have some of the lowest electric bills in the country because the cost of natural gas is currently low. If the price of natural gas goes up in the future, our electric costs will go up. Staff indicated that because of the concerns with natural gas, the recommendation in the draft report is to increase renewable sources for a more balanced supply network. Staff pointed out that Florida Power and Light Company is supporting Florida Atlantic University’s research in generating electricity from ocean currents, and other renewable opportunities. Florida Power and Light is positioned for greater reliance on renewable energy if the state approves a renewable portfolio standard.

Mayor Ferreri stated he would like to see stronger language to address not just renewables but conservation efforts as well. Commissioner Marcus stated she would include strengthening the language of the recommendation as part of her motion.
Commissioner Smith stated that Florida Power & Light Company is a significant contributor to the local economy, citing their $300 million investment in the Indiantown facility. He said he appreciates their presence in our region and the investments they have made.

With respect to the Cities of Vero Beach and Lake Worth, Vice Mayor Brinkman asked if Florida Power & Light Company is their power supplier, or if there is a consideration to eventually take over these facilities. Nick Blount with Florida Power & Light stated that because nothing has been finalized and there are ongoing discussion with these municipalities, the plan does not include in its projections the load requirements for these two cities. Also, he said he often is asked why the state legislature must be involved in making the decision on whether or not Florida Power & Light can move ahead with renewable energy. He indicated the Florida Public Service Commission requires them to generate power at the lowest cost, and the cost of some of the renewable energy efforts is more expensive than natural gas. Therefore, the legislature must intervene and give approval that recognizes that although it may cost more to use renewable energy, it is the right thing to do from an environmental standpoint.

A vote on the motion passed unanimously. At this point in the meeting Chairman Foley turned the gavel over to Vice Chairman O’Bryan.

“ALL ABOARD FLORIDA” PASSENGER RAIL PROPOSAL – PRESENTATION BY RAFAEL RODON, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, FLAGLER DEVELOPMENT/FLORIDA EAST COAST INDUSTRIES

Rafael Rodon, Executive Vice President of Flagler Development, presented to Council an overview of the “All Aboard Florida” passenger rail proposal recently announced by Florida East Coast Industries. The proposal represents a private initiative to introduce intercity passenger rail service between southeast Florida and central Florida with four stations: downtown Miami, downtown Fort Lauderdale, downtown West Palm Beach, and Orlando, with a potential connection to the SunRail commuter rail system that is currently under construction. Additionally, it has been suggested that the service could ultimately be extended to provide service to Tampa and Jacksonville.

Commissioner Marcus asked if there had been an attempt to coordinate with the local governments to be part of the local transit network of buses and shuttles that is currently in place. Mr. Rodon stated that they have met with transit officials in Tampa and Fort Lauderdale and there is a possibility of adding a station in Fort Lauderdale where there is currently a bus facility.

Commissioner Marcus asked if the property they need would have to be vacant in order to put in the required platforms. Mr. Rodon stated it is not necessary, but it does make it easier to plan and construct the necessary station and platform, and provide the required right-of-way if the property is vacant.

Commissioner Marcus asked if the double-tracking will be along the entire corridor. Mr. Rodon stated they will be restoring double-tracking along the entire corridor. Commissioner Marcus invited Mr. Rodon to present at the North County Intergovernmental meeting in September. He stated he would be happy to make a presentation.

Commissioner Taylor asked if the current station in West Palm Beach could be a possible station. Mr. Rodon indicated two potential station locations have been identified in West Palm Beach, one
on Okeechobee Road near City Place and the other at the governmental center. The current station is not under consideration. Vice Chairman O’Bryan asked how much of the financing is in place. Mr. Rodon replied only that which has already been spent.

Mayor Ferreri noted he recently took the train to Tampa, but had to drive back in the car because there is only service once a day by Amtrak. He asked if there was going to be any coordination with Amtrak to provide interconnectivity or shared service in terms of timing and number of trips. Mr. Rodon stated the double tracks will provide for Amtrak in the future along the FEC corridor. He noted that this service is different. It will be for reserved seats on a high speed train. He said the intent is to complement and provide an alternative to existing and even future modes of rail service.

Mayor Golonka asked when the company could conclude the project is financially feasible. Mr. Rodon stated they are very close. With respect to financing, he stated there are ongoing discussions with potential investors as they fine-tune the ridership study. He noted that the study is done for the diversion ridership, which represents the current passengers that would use the service simply by virtue of its existence. The other part of the study is the induced ridership. These two components combine to produce the total ridership.

Mayor Golonka asked what type of signal and safety upgrades are being contemplated. Mr. Rodon indicated the upgrades are all about safety. He stated Flagler Development/Florida East Coast Industries is re-working some of the curves, because the flatter the curve is, the safer it is for the train to travel at accelerated speeds. Mayor Golonka asked if the crossing gates would be upgraded. Mr. Rodon indicated this was part of the billion dollar upgrade.

Mayor Golonka asked if the schedule to be operational by 2014 included the 40 miles of rail in Orlando. Mr. Rodon responded that Flagler Development/Florida East Coast Industries already has 200 miles of right-of-way, so work can begin quickly in the existing corridor. Assuming the Orlando connection is in an existing right-of-way, such as State Road 528, that could help accelerate the project. He stated the goal is to have the project completed by 2014, but if portions of the project slow down, it could be 2015.

Councilmember Sachs asked if there has been any coordination with the three airports in Miami, Fort Lauderdale, and West Palm Beach for extended public transit. Mr. Rodon indicated the only potential direct access airport will be Orlando International. He stated that Fort Lauderdale airport would be easy to add, because the service will go right by there, but they are hesitant to add locations because that will increase the travel time. He stated there will be a Metrorail connection between the Miami train station and the airport.

Councilmember Sachs asked if this could be used as a commuter line, possibly an alternative to Tri-Rail. Mr. Rodon stated this could be done, but since this service is based on reserved seats, this could become cost prohibitive. Councilmember Sachs asked how much a ticket would cost. Mr. Rodon indicated the cost will be established when they are done analyzing the ridership. He stated priority pricing will be given to the Miami to Orlando route, and then the other stations will be priced according to ridership. He noted this is a for-profit, privately operated service. Councilmember Sachs asked if there will be first class service. Mr. Rodon indicated there would be business and coach class and services such as WiFi and dining would be available.
Commissioner Smith asked if there will be service from Miami to Jacksonville. Mr. Rodon indicated not yet. Councilmember Parrish asked if there were any projections with respect to stations between West Palm Beach and Orlando. Mr. Rodon indicated not at the present time.

Mayor Golonka asked if double-tracking was a prerequisite to make this effective. Mr. Rodon stated the service would still work if there is a section here or there that is not double-tracked, noting the Stuart Bridge will remain a single track section. Mayor Golonka asked if other bridges would be double-tracked. Mr. Rodon stated they intend to double-track all other bridges. Commissioner Burdick asked if there will be increased noise, such as night horns. Mr. Rodon noted that the service will only run from 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. With respect to the bridge double-tracking, Commissioner Smith stated he believed there was width capacity to double-track the Stuart bridge. Mr. Rodon stated the Stuart bridge is to remain single tracked for engineering and permitting reasons. Vice Chairman O’Bryan thanked Mr. Rodon for his presentation.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CITY OF DELRAY BEACH DOWNTOWN MASTER PLAN – PRESENTATION BY DIANE COLONNA, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AND FORMER MAYOR JEFF PERLMAN

Diane Colonna, Executive Director of the Community Redevelopment Agency for the City of Delray Beach, gave a presentation to Council with respect to the Downtown Delray Beach Master Plan. The plan is a result of a 2001 charrette organized by Council that involved participation of over 200 citizens, and subsequent months of design work and meetings with technical consultants, representatives from the Florida Department of Transportation, property owners and other interested stakeholders. The Master Plan incorporated planning principles and architectural design, as well as the vision of the community, to address not only physical improvements, but social issues and concerns regarding growth and redevelopment. Ten years after the March 19, 2002 adoption of the plan, most of the elements have been implemented and two major projects will be starting construction this summer. Ms. Colonna expressed her appreciation to Council staff for their work during the design process and continued support.

Mayor Golonka commended Ms. Colonna and the City for sticking with their plan, which she called a great model and great example for the region.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Staff requested the July and August meetings be canceled. Mayor Ferreri moved to cancel the July and August meetings. Councilmember Sachs seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Marcela Camblor-Cutsaimanis, Project Director for the Southeast Florida Regional Partnership, updated Council on the Seven50 - Southeast Florida’s Prosperity Plan. She noted an upcoming kick-off summit for the plan on June 27, 2012 at the Old School Square in the City of Delray Beach. She stated an official invitation will be sent to all Councilmembers. She thanked the City of Delray Beach for its generous donation of the space for this summit. Speakers include Neal Peirce from Citistates Group, Allison DeFoor from the Fiorentino Group, Bob Burchell from Rutgers University, as well as several consultants. The event will be very interactive with work groups and polling opportunities for attendees. She noted that Tri-Rail is also partnering to provide advertisement of the event as well as free transportation for attendees. Ms. Camblor-Cutsaimanis
urged Councilmembers to go to www.Seven50.org to get more information on the summit as well as the progress of the plan.

Mayor Ferreri commended Ms. Camblor-Cutsaimanis for the tremendous job she has done to bring the project into focus after several false starts and numerous obstacles. He encouraged everyone to attend the summit.

Ms. Camblor-Cutsaimanis noted that Commissioner Fielding has been instrumental in coordinating the staff and partners in Martin County by having meetings prior to the summit to ensure the County is well-represented in the plan. She offered to assist others in this same type of effort.

COUNCIL MEMBER INFORMATION EXCHANGE

None.

STAFF COMMENT

None.

CHAIRMAN’S COMMENT

None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Vice Chairman O’Bryan adjourned the meeting at 12:15 p.m. This signature is to attest that the undersigned is the Secretary or a designated nominee of the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council, and that the information provided herein is the true and correct Minutes of the June 15, 2012 meeting of the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council.

___________________________________________
Date                                           Signature
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: September 21, 2012 Council Meeting
Subject: Hazards Analysis Grant Agreement

Introduction

The Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA), SARA Title III of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, and the Florida Hazardous Materials Emergency Response and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1988, Chapter 252, Part II, Florida Statutes provides the Florida Division of Emergency Management (FDEM) the authority to strengthen interagency coordination and technical assistance with respect to hazardous materials planning and prevention. EPCRA is administered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and implemented by the FDEM. The purpose of this law is to encourage emergency planning efforts at the state and local levels and to increase the public’s access to information about the potential chemical hazards that exist in their community. As part of this Act, the FDEM annually provides hazardous materials grant funding to counties. This annual funding is distributed under the Hazardous Materials Planning and Prevention Program.

Background

Hazards Analysis Grants are administered by the FDEM. The data collected is used by Local Emergency Planning Committees to develop hazardous materials emergency plans to use in responding to and recovering from a release or spill of hazardous or toxic substances. These plans are reviewed and approved by the State Emergency Response Commission (SERC). All of the chemical data collected, as well as plans, are available to the general public upon request.

The Hazards Analyses program provides county emergency management and fire rescue agencies and departments with site specific facility information for those facilities that report to the SERC regarding specific Extremely Hazardous Substances designated by the EPA in quantities at or above the Threshold Planning Quantity present on site. Under the agreement, each facility that houses these chemicals is subject to an on-site visit to ensure accuracy of the hazards analysis. The analysis must include facility information, historical accident record, hazard identification, chemical identities, a vulnerability analysis, and a risk analysis (probability of release). Once this information is gathered and formatted into a database, mapping the facility within the vicinity of critical facilities and infrastructure will be completed. Upon the FDEM
approval, completed analyses and information will be provided to facilities, response agencies and the appropriate County emergency management offices.

Conclusion

St. Lucie County has requested that Council staff prepare facility hazards analyses on behalf of the County. A completed analysis will be submitted to the Florida Division of Emergency Management for review and approval. The Scope of Work for the contract agreement is included as Attachment A.

For Fiscal Year 2012-2013, Council is to receive the amount of $7,086.00 for the completion of the St. Lucie County Hazards Analyses.

Recommendation

Authorize the Chairman to execute the grant agreement and the Executive Director to execute any minor grant modifications.

Attachment
Attachment A

SCOPE OF WORK - SCHEDULE OF DELIVERABLES -
SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS

Purpose

To update the hazards analysis for all facilities listed in Attachment B, which have reported to the State Emergency Response Commission the presence of those specific Extremely Hazardous Substances designated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in quantities at or above the Threshold Planning Quantity. The data collected under this Agreement will be used to comply with the planning requirements of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, Title III, "Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986" and the Florida Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act, Florida Statutes, Chapter 252, Part II.

Requirements

A. The Recipient shall submit a list of facilities within the geographical boundaries of the County listed on Attachment B that are suspected of not reporting to the State Emergency Response Commission the presence of Extremely Hazardous Substances in quantities at or above the Threshold Planning Quantity, as designated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

B. The completed hazards analysis shall comply with the site-specific hazards analysis criteria outlined in this Attachment for each facility listed in Attachment B. The primary guidance documents are Attachment D (Hazards Analysis Contract Checklist and CAMEO Guide) to this Agreement and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s "Technical Guidance for Hazards Analysis" at; http://www.epa.gov/emergencies/docs/chem/tech.pdf. All hazards analyses shall be consistent with the provisions of these documents. Any variation from the procedures outlined in this document must be requested in writing, submitted in advance and approved by the Division.

C. Conduct an on-site visit at each Attachment B facility to ensure accuracy of the hazards analysis. Each applicable facility’s hazards analysis information shall be entered into the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s CAMEO®m version 2.3 (download from): http://www.epa.gov/emergencies/content/cameo/index.htm. Each facility hazards analysis shall include, but is not limited to, the following items:

1. Facility Information

   (a) Provide the Facility name (per Attachment B)

   (b) Facility physical address (no Post Office Box).

   (c) Facility Identification

      (1) Provide the State Emergency Response Commission Code identification number (per Attachment B) in the Department field on the Facilities page in CAMEO.

      (2) Provide the geographic coordinates (latitude and longitude in decimal/degrees).

   (d) Facility Emergency Coordinator

      Provide the name, title and telephone number (daytime and 24-hour) of the designated facility emergency coordinator.
(e) Transportation Routes

List the main route(s) used to transport chemicals to the facility (from the County line to the facility).

(f) Evacuation Routes

Based on wind direction from the North, South, East and West, identify the route(s) from the facility to exit the Vulnerable Zone(s).

(g) Historical Accident Record

Describe any past releases or incidents that have occurred at the facility. Include date, time, chemical name, quantity and number of persons injured or killed (this information is available from the facility). If it is determined that a facility does not have a historical accident record, that shall be noted.

2. Hazard Identification

(a) Chemical identities

For each Extremely Hazardous Substance present at the facility at any time up to one year prior to the site visit provide the proper chemical name, Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) number and natural physical state (according to exhibit C of the Technical Guidance for Hazards Analysis).

(b) Maximum quantity on-site

Express in exact pounds (not range codes) the maximum quantity of each Extremely Hazardous Substance the facility has on-site.

(c) Amount in largest container or interconnected containers

Express in pounds the amount of each Extremely Hazardous Substance stored in the largest container or interconnected containers (this is the release amount used to determine the Vulnerable Zone).

(d) Type and design of storage container or vessel

Indicate the type of storage container of each Extremely Hazardous Substance (i.e., drum, cylinder, tank etc.).

(e) Nature of the hazard

Describe the type of hazard (i.e., fire, explosion) and health effects (acute and chronic).

3. Vulnerability Analysis

(a) Extent of the Vulnerable Zone

For each Extremely Hazardous Substance present at a facility, provide the estimated geographical area (vulnerable zone) that may cause
irreversible acute health effects or death to human populations following an accidental release.

(b) Facility Population

Provide the maximum number of employees present at the facility at any given time (MUST BE AT LEAST ONE).

(c) Critical Facilities

Identify each critical facility by name and maximum expected occupancy within each vulnerable zone (schools, day cares, public safety facilities, hospitals, etc.). If there are no critical facilities within the vulnerable zone, that shall be noted.

(d) Estimate Total Exposed Population

Provide an estimate of the total exposed population within each vulnerable zone (facility employees + general population + critical facilities).

4. Risk Analysis (the three ratings [Risk Assessment] at the bottom of the CAMEOfm Scenario Page will meet the four requirements below)

(a) Probability of release

Rate the probability of release as Low, Moderate, or High based on observations at the facility. Considerations should include history of previous incidents and current conditions and controls at the facility.

(b) Severity of consequences of human injury

Rate the severity of consequences if an actual release were to occur.

(c) Severity of consequences of damage to property

Rate the potential damage to the facility, nearby buildings and infrastructure if an actual release were to occur.

(d) Severity of consequences of environmental exposure

Rate the potential damage to the surrounding environmentally sensitive areas, natural habitat and wildlife if an actual release were to occur.

D. Supporting documentation shall be submitted to the Division which lists the facilities for which a hazards analysis was not completed. In addition to the facility name and the State Emergency Response Commission Code identification number, supporting documentation should indicate:

1. Facility has closed or is no longer in business.

2. Facility is not physically located in the County (indicate appropriate County location, if known).
3. If the facility no longer has Extremely Hazardous Substances on-site or is below the Threshold Planning Quantity, notify the facility representative of the requirement to submit to the State Emergency Request Commission a;

(a) Statement of Determination (Attachment H), or

(b) Letter identifying the date and reason (closed, replaced with less hazardous substance) the Extremely Hazardous Substance is no longer present or below threshold.

E. On-Site Visits

1. Conduct a detailed on-site visit, within the period of this Agreement, of all the facilities listed in Attachment B, to confirm the accuracy and completeness of information in the hazards analysis.

2. Submit a completed Hazards Analysis Site Visit Certification Form (Attachment E) to the Division with the State Emergency Response Commission Code number included in the file naming convention (SERC12345SV). Add the site visit certification form to the Site Plan Tab of the Cameo Facilities Page for each facility visited or contacted.

(a) On-Site visit exception for sulfuric acid

(1) For facilities listed on Attachment B that report the presence of only sulfuric acid, an initial on-site visit is required and an on-site visit form (Attachment E) signed and dated by the facility representative and the Recipient shall be submitted to the Division.

(2) In Agreements subsequent to the initial on-site visit, the Recipient shall contact the facility representative by email or telephone to verify the presence of all extremely hazardous substances. The on-site visit form shall be signed by the Recipient and identify the date the Recipient contacted the facility representative. Another on-site visit is not required in subsequent Agreements, unless, the facility reports the presence of another extremely hazardous substance.

(3) If a facility representative reports the presence of an extremely hazardous substance other than sulfuric acid in Agreements subsequent to the period of Agreement in which the initial site visit was conducted, the Recipient shall conduct an on-site visit and submit a completed on-site visit form (Attachment E) to the Division.

3. For each facility that a hazard analysis is conducted, submit a site plan to the Division with the State Emergency Response Commission Code number included in the file naming convention (SERC12345SP). Add the site plan to the Site Plan Tab of the Cameo Facilities Page. The site plan shall include:

(a) Location of major building(s)

(b) Name and location of extremely hazardous substance(s). If multiple extremely hazardous substances are co-located, noting EHS is acceptable.

(c) Name and location of street(s)
(d) Identify pertinent access and egress point(s)

F. Ensure that the Hazards Analysis information is reflected in the County Local Mitigation Strategy.

Scope and Schedule of Deliverables

**Deliverable 1:**

On or before November 1, 2012, the Recipient shall submit fifty (50) percent of the completed hazards analyses for facilities listed on Attachment B to the Division for review and approval.

**Deliverable 2:**

On or before February 1, 2013, the Recipient shall submit the final fifty (50) percent of the completed hazards analyses for facilities listed on Attachment B to the Division for review and approval.

**Deliverable 3:**

A. On or before May 15, 2013, the Recipient shall provide the Division one (1) copy (in CAMEO format) of each approved hazards analysis. A complete copy of each approved hazards analysis shall be sent to the emergency management director(s) of the county (counties) listed on Attachment B and a copy of the transmittal document shall be submitted to the Division.

B. On or before May 15, 2013, the Recipient shall notify all Attachment B facilities and applicable first responder agencies of the availability of the hazards analyses information, and make that information available upon request and submit proof of said notifications to the Division.

C. Participate in any technical assistance training session that may be required by the Division.

**Schedule of Payments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable #1</td>
<td>45% of the Agreement Amount $3,188.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable #2</td>
<td>45% of the Agreement Amount $3,188.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable #3</td>
<td>10% of the Agreement Amount $ 708.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each payment shall be made upon satisfactory completion of the deliverable above and upon receipt of an acceptable Financial Invoice (Attachment C).
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: September 21, 2012 Council Meeting
Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Review
Draft Amendment to the Town of Jupiter 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 Jupiter is proposing one text amendment to the Future Land Use Element of the comprehensive plan.

Evaluation

The proposed amendment is to revise Policy 1.17.1 of the Future Land Use Element to change “clinical research hospital” to “clinical research” as a permitted use on properties designated within the Bioscience Research Protection Overlay. The intent of the proposed amendment is to promote and allow the broader clinical research use on properties in the Town assigned with the Overlay. The change would allow clinical research associated with medical offices to be permitted.
Extrajurisdictional Impacts

The proposed amendment was provided by the Town of Jupiter to the Palm Beach County Intergovernmental Plan Amendment Review Committee (IPARC) and was circulated by the IPARC Clearinghouse Coordinator on June 14, 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 amendment is not in conflict or inconsistent with the SRPP.

Recommendation

Council should approve this report and authorize its transmittal to the Town of Jupiter and the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity.
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: September 21, 2012 Council Meeting
Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Review
Draft Amendments to the City of Lake Worth 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 Lake Worth is proposing text amendments to the Data, Inventory & Analysis section and Future Land Use Element, and several changes to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) of the City’s comprehensive plan.

Evaluation

The City is proposing amendments to the comprehensive plan in order to incorporate new language to support pending changes to the City’s Land Development Regulations. Proposed amendments to the Data, Inventory & Analysis section include the addition of 9 new definitions and edits to two existing definitions. Proposed amendments to the Future Land Use Element include:

- Changes to height restrictions, density/intensity restrictions, and allowable mix percentages of the thirteen land use classifications included in the plan;
- A new Table 1 summarizing the regulatory significance of the thirteen land use classifications included in the plan;
• Revised description of the land use classifications and creation of new classifications, including Mixed Use East, Mixed Use West, Artisanal Mixed Use, and Conservation;
• Revised or new locational strategy for each of the land use classifications included in the plan; and
• Minor revisions and updates to several objectives and policies that include removing dates, changing references to timeframes, referring to the new and revised land use classification, and deleting references to the strategic master plan, which was never formally adopted by the City.

Proposed amendments to the FLUM amend the boundaries to most land use classifications, remove the Mixed Use and General Commercial classifications, and add the Mixed Use East, Mixed Use West, Artisanal Mixed Use, and Conservation classifications. Changes in acreages are illustrated in the attached exhibits and summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Acres</th>
<th>Proposed Acres</th>
<th>Change In Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>1177.2</td>
<td>1150.8</td>
<td>-26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>313.1</td>
<td>299.0</td>
<td>-14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>133.5</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>-62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>175.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-175.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td>201.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-201.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use - East</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>318.5</td>
<td>+318.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use - West</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102.2</td>
<td>+102.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Mixed Use</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>+4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Oriented Development</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>+24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisanal Mixed Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>+46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>274.2</td>
<td>212.9</td>
<td>-61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>223.2</td>
<td>220.4</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Public Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td>332.9</td>
<td>272.3</td>
<td>-60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>141.6</td>
<td>+141.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach and Casino</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Extrajurisdictional Impacts**

The proposed amendments were provided by the City of Lake Worth to the Palm Beach County Intergovernmental Plan Amendment Review Committee (IPARC) and were circulated by the IPARC Clearinghouse Coordinator on May 14, 2012. No extrajurisdictional impacts have been identified.

**Effects on Significant Regional Resources and Facilities**

The amendment package did not provide an analysis of the change in number of residential units or square footage of development allowable under the existing and proposed plans. However, the City staff has indicated that the net effect of the proposed amendments is to reduce the allowable density and intensity of development in the City. This assessment is reasonable considering the significant reduction in high density residential acreage, increase in Conservation acreage, and
new building height and floor area ratio restrictions in the proposed amendments. 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 City 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>Existing Table 1, Summary of Land Use Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Proposed Table 1, Summary of Land Use Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Existing Future Land Use Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Proposed Future Land Use Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Existing Land Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Proposed Land Uses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Exhibit 2
### Existing Table 1, Summary of Land Use Regulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land-Use</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Height/new construction</th>
<th>Density/Intensity</th>
<th>Allowable-Mix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-2.83 Maximum-30’ (not exceeding two-stories)</td>
<td>ISR not to exceed 76%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Single-Family</td>
<td>SF-7</td>
<td>1-127.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-1.5-3 Max-30’ (not exceeding two-stories)</td>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Medium-Density</td>
<td>SF-14</td>
<td>2-315.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-4 Max-40’ (not exceeding 3-stories)</td>
<td>1-4 up to 7 du/dw net acre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. High-Density</td>
<td>SF-20</td>
<td>3-433.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-5 Max-60’ (not exceeding 3-stories)</td>
<td>3.7-1 to 20 du/dw net acre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-6 Max-85’ (not exceeding 3-stories)</td>
<td>4.8-10 to 30 du/dw net acre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF-40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-7 Max-100’ (not exceeding 3-stories)</td>
<td>5-18.6 to 40 du/dw net acre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use (MU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building heights shall not exceed 30’ or not to exceed 65’ with public benefits</td>
<td>ISR not to exceed 75%</td>
<td>Non-Residential-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. R/G/MB-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>125.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>And building footprint shall not exceed 65% with public benefits</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>65% Residential-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. R/F-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum 30’ (not exceeding two-stories)-40’ with public benefits</td>
<td>ISR not to exceed 75%</td>
<td>Non-Residential-65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. R/O-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And building footprint shall not exceed 65%</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>65% Residential-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. R/O-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum 30’ (not exceeding two-stories)-40’ with public benefits</td>
<td>ISR not to exceed 75%</td>
<td>Non-Residential-55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. DT-ED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And building footprint shall not exceed 65%</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>65% Residential-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Enterprise-Central Business District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum 30’ (not exceeding two-stories)-40’ with public benefits</td>
<td>ISR not to exceed 75%</td>
<td>Non-Residential-55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. MU-DH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And building footprint shall not exceed 65%</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>65% Residential-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial (GC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum 30’ (not exceeding two-stories)-40’ with public benefits</td>
<td>ISR not to exceed 75%</td>
<td>Non-Residential-65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And building footprint shall not exceed 65%</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>65% Residential-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. C/GTE-CSU</td>
<td></td>
<td>201.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum 30’ (not exceeding two-stories)-40’ with public benefits</td>
<td>ISR not to exceed 75%</td>
<td>Non-Residential-55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MU-DH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And building footprint shall not exceed 65%</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>65% Residential-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. DT-D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum 30’ (not exceeding two-stories)-40’ with public benefits</td>
<td>ISR not to exceed 75%</td>
<td>Non-Residential-65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. DT-W</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>And building footprint shall not exceed 65%</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>65% Residential-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Mixed-Use (DMU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum 30’ (not exceeding two-stories)-40’ with public benefits</td>
<td>ISR not to exceed 75%</td>
<td>Non-Residential-65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. DT-E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And building footprint shall not exceed 65%</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>65% Residential-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. DT-C</td>
<td>POD-W</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum 40’ (not exceeding 3-stories)</td>
<td>ISR not to exceed 75%</td>
<td>Non-Residential-65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. DT-W</td>
<td>TOD-E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And building footprint shall not exceed 65%</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>65% Residential-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit-Oriented Development (TOD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum 40’ (not exceeding 3-stories)</td>
<td>ISR not to exceed 75%</td>
<td>Non-Residential-65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (I) in the LWPOC</td>
<td>LTI</td>
<td>201.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>And building footprint shall not exceed 65%</td>
<td>ISR not to exceed 75%</td>
<td>Non-Residential-65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LHTI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And building footprint shall not exceed 65%</td>
<td>ISR not to exceed 75%</td>
<td>Non-Residential-65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (I) outside the LWPOC</td>
<td>LTHI</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum 40’ (not exceeding 3-stories)</td>
<td>ISR not to exceed 75%</td>
<td>Non-Residential-65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LHTI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And building footprint shall not exceed 65%</td>
<td>ISR not to exceed 75%</td>
<td>Non-Residential-65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (P)</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>223.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum-height is 65’</td>
<td>ISR not to exceed 75%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Recreation and Open Space (PROS)</td>
<td>PROS</td>
<td>332.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum-height is 65’</td>
<td>F.A.R. not to exceed 0.1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach and Casino (BAC)</td>
<td>BAC</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum-height is 65’</td>
<td>F.A.R. not to exceed 0.1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Footnote 1: Public Benefit: Public Benefit will consist of libraries, cultural centers, affordable housing, public parks, recreation, open space, public parking, LEED®-Certified implementation (e.g., solar, wind, water conservation or power generation), mass transportation, shelter, or other use that the public will benefit from deemed suitable and compatible with the land use of the site.

Footnote 2: Allowable Mix: A site specific policy will be included with the proposed Future Land Use Map amendment that establishes the density and intensity for the proposed development.

Footnote 3: Density Intensity: ISR not applicable to properties along Dixie Highway regarding redevelopment of existing properties and such redevelopment will be encouraged as long as renovations do not impact existing footprints or compromise Historic fabric. New development regulations will apply if either component is compromised.

Footnote 4: Building Height: The vertical distance measured from the minimum required floor or base flood elevation of eighteen (18) inches above the crown of the road, whichever is less, to: (a) the highest point of a flat roof; (b) the deck line of mansard roof; (c) at the highest peak of an eave or ridge for gable, hip, and gambrel roofs; or (d) the highest peak.

For clarification, new construction constructed in the Residential Land-use Categories: Single Family and Medium Density Residential (SF-4, SF-TF-14, MF-20), shall have a maximum height of 25 feet habitable space and up to 30 feet to the highest peak of the roof. Residential Land-use Category: High Density Residential (MF-30 and MF-40), shall have a maximum height of 35 feet habitable space and up to 40 feet to the highest peak of the roof.

Mixed Use (MU) shall have a maximum height of 25 feet habitable space and up to 30 feet to the highest peak of the roof. FOR Public Benefits, building shall have a maximum height of 35 feet habitable space and up to 40 to the highest peak of the roof.

General Commercial (GC) shall have a maximum height of 25 feet habitable space and up to 30 feet to the highest peak of the roof. FOR Public Benefits, building shall have a maximum height of 35 feet habitable space and up to 40 feet to the highest peak of the roof.

Downtown Mixed Use shall have a maximum height of 25 feet habitable space and up to 30 feet to the highest peak of the roof. FOR Public Benefits, building shall have a maximum height of 35 feet habitable space and up to 40 feet to the highest peak of the roof.

-transit-oriented development (TOD) shall have a maximum height of 35 feet habitable space and up to 40 feet to the highest peak of the roof.

For all districts, the highest peak of roof includes roof appurtenances.

Applicant utilizing the extra five feet must design roof per Major Thoroughfare Guidelines and/or Historic Guidelines.

Footnote 5: The proposed height is only applicable to new construction. New construction refers to structures and improvements that did not exist prior to the adoption of the EAR-Based Amendment (October 20, 2009). Structures and improvements that existed at that date may be rebuilt to their existing height, setbacks, ISR or footprint at the option of the owner and consistent with the Florida Building Code. Heights approved by development orders that have not expired at the adoption of this Amendment shall continue to be allowed until construction is complete or expiration of the development order.

Footnote 6: Compatibility Language—Must meet compatibility language as defined in the LDR
**Exhibit 3**

**Proposed Table 1, Summary of Land Use Regulations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Density allowed by Zoning</th>
<th>Building Height</th>
<th>Height w/Community Benefit</th>
<th>Allowable Mix of Uses per District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential (SFR) 35' Max.</td>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>7 du/acre</td>
<td>30 feet (max 2 stories)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH-7</td>
<td>7 du/acre</td>
<td>15 feet</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>20 du/acre</td>
<td>30 feet (max 2 stories)</td>
<td>plus 5 feet (max 3 stories)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential (MDR) 35' Max.</td>
<td>SE/TE-14</td>
<td>14 du/acre</td>
<td>30 feet (max 2 stories)</td>
<td>plus 5 feet (max 3 stories)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF-20</td>
<td>20 du/acre</td>
<td>30 feet (max 2 stories)</td>
<td>plus 5 feet (max 3 stories)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>20 du/acre</td>
<td>30 feet (max 2 stories)</td>
<td>plus 5 feet (max 3 stories)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential (HDR) 35' Max.</td>
<td>MF-30</td>
<td>30 du/acre</td>
<td>30 feet (max 2 stories)</td>
<td>plus 5 feet (max 3 stories)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF-40</td>
<td>40 du/acre</td>
<td>30 feet (max 2 stories)</td>
<td>plus 5 feet (max 3 stories)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>20 du/acre</td>
<td>30 feet (max 2 stories)</td>
<td>plus 5 feet (max 3 stories)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use East (MU-E) 45' Max.</td>
<td>MU-DH</td>
<td>20 du/acre</td>
<td>30 feet (max 2 stories)</td>
<td>plus 15 feet (max 4 stories)</td>
<td>25% residential/75% non-res.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU-FH</td>
<td>20 du/acre</td>
<td>30 feet (max 2 stories)</td>
<td>plus 5 feet (max 3 stories)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU-E</td>
<td>30 du/acre</td>
<td>30 feet (max 2 stories)</td>
<td>plus 15 feet (max 4 stories)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use West (MU-W) 65' Max.</td>
<td>MU-W</td>
<td>30 du/acre</td>
<td>30 feet (max 2 stories)</td>
<td>plus 35 feet (max 6 stories)</td>
<td>25% residential/75% non-res.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>40 du/acre</td>
<td>30 feet (max 2 stories)</td>
<td>plus 35 feet (max 6 stories - east of FH)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Mixed Use (DMU) 45’– 65’ Max.</td>
<td>MU-E</td>
<td>30 du/acre</td>
<td>30 feet (max 2 stories)</td>
<td>plus 5 feet (max 3 stories)</td>
<td>25% residential/75% non-res.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF-20</td>
<td>20 du/acre</td>
<td>30 feet (max 2 stories)</td>
<td>plus 5 feet (max 3 stories)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF-30</td>
<td>30 du/acre</td>
<td>30 feet (max 2 stories)</td>
<td>plus 5 feet (max 3 stories)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit-Oriented Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) 45’– 65’ Max.</td>
<td>TOD-E</td>
<td>40 du/acre</td>
<td>30 feet (max 2 stories)</td>
<td>plus 35 feet (max 6 stories - train station)</td>
<td>75% residential/25% non-res.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD-W</td>
<td>40 du/acre</td>
<td>30 feet (max 2 stories)</td>
<td>plus 35 feet (max 6 stories - train station)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>7 du/acre</td>
<td>30 feet (max 2 stories)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF-30</td>
<td>30 du/acre</td>
<td>30 feet (max 2 stories)</td>
<td>plus 5 feet (max 3 stories)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU-DH</td>
<td>20 du/acre</td>
<td>30 feet (max 2 stories)</td>
<td>plus 5 feet (max 3 stories)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>20 du/acre</td>
<td>30 feet (max 2 stories)</td>
<td>plus 5 feet (max 3 stories)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisanal Mixed Use (AMU) 35’ Max.</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>20 du/acre</td>
<td>30 feet (max 2 stories)</td>
<td>plus 5 feet (max 3 stories)</td>
<td>25% residential/75% non-res.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (I) 45’ Max.</td>
<td>IPOC</td>
<td>30 du/acre</td>
<td>30 feet (max 2 stories)</td>
<td>plus 15 feet (max 4 stories)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (P) 65’ Max.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>65 feet</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Recreation and Open Space (PROS) 35’ Max.</td>
<td>PROS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>35 feet</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation (CON) 35’ Max.</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>35 feet</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach and Casino (BAC) 45’ Max.</td>
<td>BAC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>45 feet</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 4
Existing Future Land Use Map

Notes:
1. The parcel outline information shown was obtained from the Palm Beach County Property Appraiser’s U.S. Department January 2011.
2. The City of Lake Worth Zoning Boundary shown was updated on February 2, 2012.
3. This current Future Land Use Map was adopted October 20, 2009 with the Comp Plan Ordinance 2008-25.
4. This map is for informational purposes and may not have been prepared for the purpose of legal engineering or surveying purposes.
5. The City of Lake Worth Land Use Map is based on data provided by the Palm Beach County Property Appraiser’s Office. These products have been produced by the City of Lake Worth for the sole purposes of geographic information. No warranty is made by the City of Lake Worth regarding specific accuracy or completeness.
Exhibit 5
Proposed Future Land Use Map
Exhibit 6
Existing Land Uses

City of Lake Worth Existing Land Use

Single Family Residential (SFR)
Acres: 1177.2

Medium Density Residential (MDR)
Acres: 313.1
High Density Residential (HDR)
Acres: 133.5

Mixed Use (MU)
Acres: 175.1

General Commercial (GC)
Acres: 201.1
Downtown Mixed Use (DMU)
Acres: 54.0

Transit Oriented Development (TOD)
Acres: 38.0

Industrial (I)
Acres: 274.2
Public (P)
Acres: 223.2

Public Recreation and Open Space (PROS)
Acres: 332.9

Beach and Casino (BAC)
Acres: 19.9
Exhibit 7
Proposed Land Uses

City of Lake Worth
Proposed Future Land Use

Single Family Residential (SFR)
Acres: 1150.8

Medium Density Residential (MDR)
Acres: 299.0
High Density Residential (HDR)
Acres: 71.3

Mixed Use - East (MU-E)
Acres: 318.5

Mixed Use – West (MU-W)
Acres: 102.2
Downtown Mixed Use (DMU)

Acres: 58.2

Transit Oriented Development (TOD)

Acres: 62.7

Artisanal Mixed Use (AMU)

Acres: 46.5
Industrial (I)
Acres: 212.9

Public (P)
Acres: 220.4

Public, Public Recreation and Open Space (PROS)
Acres: 272.3
Beach and Casino (BAC)
Acres: 19.9

Conservation (CON)
Acres: 141.6
MEMORANDUM

To:       Council Members
From:     Staff
Date:     September 21, 2012 Council Meeting
Subject:  Local Government Comprehensive Plan Review
          Draft Amendments to the Town of Loxahatchee Groves 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 Loxahatchee Groves is proposing an amendment to the Future Land Use Map and text amendments to the Future Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Evaluation

Amendment 12-1 is a proposed amendment to: 1) revoke the Multiple Land Use (MLU) designation previously assigned to the 96.73 acre “Simon Property” parcel located at the northwest corner of Southern Boulevard and “B” Road; 2) allow a 75-acre “Palm Beach State College” portion of the Simon Property to revert to the previous designation of Rural Residential 5 (RR5); 3) assign a Commercial Low (CL) designation to the remaining 21.73 acre “Loxahatchee Groves Commons” portion of the Simon Property; and 4) rescind Future Land Use Element Special Policy 1.15.1, which regulated the land uses and development intensity on the Simon Property as follows:

Commercial Low (CL) – maximum of 21.0 acres/91,476 square feet of retail commercial space; Commercial Low Office – maximum of 21.0 acres/130,000 square feet of office commercial space; and Rural Residential 5 – minimum of 55.0 acres/maximum of 19 residential units.
Concurrent with Amendment 12-1, the Town is also proposing Amendment 12-2 to incorporate a new Special Policy 1.15.4 within the Future Land Use Element to govern the future development of the college campus on the 75 acre Palm Beach State College portion of the Simon Property. Special Policy 1.15.4 specifies applicable regulations, identifies the necessary elements to be included in the Master Site Development Plan, and requires the submittal of a Campus Master Plan for the Palm Beach State College property.

The Town’s staff report indicates that RR5 future land use category allows public schools. Therefore, it is appropriate to change the portion of the Simon Property targeted for the college campus to that designation. The staff report also indicates the proposed amendment will result in a net reduction of roadway trips.

**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 April 7, 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>Adjacent Existing Land Uses Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Future Land Use Map – Proposed Amendment 12-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Future Land Use Map – Proposed Amendment 12-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 1
General Location Map

Loxahatchee Groves
Adjacent Existing Land Uses

North - Collecting Canal and Collecting Canal Road (approximate 80 foot right-of-way). Seven properties are located to the north of these infrastructure features, ranging in size from 1.11 to 10.0 acres. Five of the seven properties are five acres in size, and five properties contain a single-family residence. Two of the properties contain active agricultural uses.

West - "A" Road Canal. To its west is the 66.5 acre Guest property, consisting of active agricultural uses.

South - Southern Boulevard and the C-51 Canal (approximate combined 450 foot right-of-way). The Landings PUD, within the Village of Wellington, is located further south, beyond the C-51 Canal right-of-way.
Exhibit 3
Future Land Use Map – Proposed Amendment 12-1
Exhibit 4
Future Land Use Map – Proposed Amendment 12-2
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: September 21, 2012 Council Meeting
Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Review
Draft Amendments to the Martin County Comprehensive Plan
Amendment No. 12-3ESR

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

Martin County is proposing text changes to the Future Land Use Element and one amendment to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) of the comprehensive plan.

Evaluation

The proposed amendments are to revoke the FLUM change and text changes to the Future Land Use Element previously adopted in 2010 for the St. Lucie Partners property. The St. Lucie Partners parcel is 3,902 acres located on both sides of Kanner Highway near the intersection of Bridge Road and Kanner Highway in western Martin County. The proposed amendments will revert the land use on the property from Agricultural Ranchette to its original Agricultural designation, and remove text changes in the Future Land Use Element that were adopted to place restrictions on development of the site.

The previously adopted amendments are being revoked because the terms of a Development Agreement between Martin County and St. Lucie Partners could not be met. According to the Development Agreement, a perpetual conservation easement over 2,542 acres of conservation
land was to be donated to Martin County and South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) within 180 days of the effective date of the agreement. For various reasons, the conveyance of the conservation easement was not accomplished.

The text to be deleted in the Future Land Use Element limited development on the site to 600 single family residential units. The proposed amendments will reduce this amount to a maximum of 192 residential units under the original Agricultural designation. The overall effect of the proposed amendments will be to reduce the demand on essential services and reduce impacts to regional resources and facilities.

**Extrajurisdictional Impacts**

Under the informal agreement facilitated by the TCRPC, local governments in the northern three counties of the region are to provide copies of amendment materials to other local governments that have expressed an interest in receiving such materials. On September 4, 2012, TCRPC requested comments from these local governments regarding any conflicts with the proposed amendments. As of the date of the preparation of this report, no objections to the proposed amendments have been received from other local governments.

**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 Martin County 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aerial Map – Subject Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Future Land Use Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Proposed Future Land Use Map</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members

From: Staff

Date: September 21, 2012 Council Meeting

Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Review
   Draft Amendments to the Palm Beach County 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

Palm Beach County is proposing text amendments to the Historic Preservation and Introduction & Administration Elements, a modification to the Future Land Use Atlas (FLUA) Regulations, one FLUA amendment, and several transportation-related amendments.

Evaluation

A. Text and Map Series Amendments

1. Historic Preservation Element Updates

   The County is proposing amendments to revise the Historic Preservation and Introduction & Administration Elements in order to make general updates and make the following changes:

   • Revise the Introduction to explain the role of cultural resources, their relevance to the County, and the economic benefit they provide;
2. Commercial Low Single Tenant

The County is proposing an amendment to modify the FLUA Regulations to exempt a 64.48 acre parcel of land known as the Sluggett Property from the development restrictions established for the Commercial Low (CL) future land use (FLU) designation, and consequently from the single tenant limitation set forth in the Unified Land Development Code (ULDC). The property is located at the northwest corner of Southern Boulevard (SR 80) and Seminole Pratt Whitney Road. This amendment will put into place the mechanism that will allow this site to be exempt from the neighborhood oriented single tenant limit for this specific property’s CL future land use designation. Subsequent to this proposed amendment, this exemption will be further implemented by an amendment to the ULDC to exempt the Sluggett property from the 65,000 square foot single tenant limit.

The Board of County Commissioners has recognized that the Sluggett Property’s location on the corner of a major arterial, its configuration, large acreage, and existing allowance for over 280,000 square feet of commercial development make it unique within the Rural Tier and suitable for single tenants to be larger than 65,000 square feet. The proposed change is to add a policy to the FLUA regulations to exempt the Sluggett Property, to exceed the maximum single tenant limitation in the ULDC. This amendment would allow this site to develop with a larger single tenant than is currently allowed by the ULDC under the CL future land use designation. The added text is underlined:

**Exurban and Rural Tier:** In the Exurban and Rural Tiers, CL uses shall be restricted as necessary to further Objectives 1.3 and 1.4, to preserve and protect the rural residential lifestyle and comply with the provisions of the ULDC. Due to the unique location at the intersection of an arterial and SIS Roadway and to its size that is greater than 64 contiguous acres, the commercial development of the parcel located at the northwest corner of Southern Boulevard and Seminole Pratt Whitney Road and identified in the legal description in Ordinance 2010-030 (LGA 2010-012) shall be exempt from the neighborhood oriented commercial activity restrictions in the Commercial Low FLU only for the maximum square footage limitation for single tenants in the CL future land use designation as implemented by the ULDC.
B. Future Land Use Atlas Amendment

1. Hungryland Slough Natural Area Addition

The proposed amendment is to change the future land use designation of properties purchased by the County’s Environmental Resources Management Department for addition to the Hungryland Slough Natural Area. The properties are located south of Bee-Line Highway, and south and east of Pratt Whitney Road. The amendment will change the designation of 1,669.43 acres (1,264 parcels) from Rural Residential 10, which allows one dwelling unit per 10 acres, to Conservation. The subject parcels consist of vacant, undeveloped land occupied primarily by native vegetation. The parcels were purchased for the purpose of conserving, restoring and protecting environmentally sensitive lands. These parcels will be managed by the Department of Environmental Resources Management as part of the Hungryland Slough Natural Area.

C. Transportation Related Amendments

1. Congress Avenue Thoroughfare Right of Way Identification Map (TIM) and the Future 2020 Roadway at Number of Lanes Map (2020 Map)

The proposed amendment is to modify the Future 2020 Roadway at Number of Lanes Map for consistency with the Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) 2035 Cost Feasible Plan. The amendment will also modify the Congress Avenue Thoroughfare Right of Way Identification Map as follows:

- Congress Avenue Extension from Park Lane to the Richard Road/Alternate A1A intersection, to reduce the right-of-way from 80 feet to 66 feet on the TIM; and
- Congress Avenue Extension from Park Lane to Alternate A1A, to reduce the number of lanes from 4 to 2 lanes on the 2020 Number of Lanes Map.

The County staff report indicates that the reduction in laneage and right-of-way for the proposed Congress Avenue Extension will help minimize impacts on adjacent properties and the environment along the preferred alignment for the roadway.

2. Transportation Map Updates

The County is proposing to revise the Map Series and policies to reflect legislative action in 2011 that changed the requirements for comprehensive plans and the comprehensive plan map series. The proposed amendment includes the following changes:

- Delete the following six maps that are no longer required by statute: Future 2020 Roadway System and Major Parking Facilities Map TE 2.1; Future 2020 Maintenance Responsibility of Roads Map TE 4.1; Future 2020 Major Public Transit Generators and Attractors Map TE 5.1; Future 2020 Bicycle Facilities Map TE 10.1; Future 2020 Pedestrian Facilities Map TE 11.1; and Future 2020 Transportation Facilities Critical to Coastal Evacuation Map 12.1;
• Revise and provide updated information to the following three maps: Future 2020 Airport Locations Map TE 7.1; Future 2020 County Airport Clear Zones Map TE 8.1; and Future 2020 Other Airport Clear Zones Map 9.1; and
• Update one policy in the Future Land Use Element and one policy in the Intergovernmental Coordination Element to reflect the removal of the 2020 Bicycle Facilities map and incorporate references to the MPO Master Comprehensive Bicycle Plan.

The County staff report indicates the maps to be deleted were previously required to satisfy Rule 9J-5 requirements, but the maps are no longer needed due to legislative changes and the repeal of Rule 9J-5. The report also indicates where the information on the deleted maps is available in other locations. In addition, the report has identified existing Policies and Objectives that address the statutory requirements related to the deleted map subject areas, including: major public transit generators and attractors; bicycle facilities; pedestrian facilities; and coastal evacuation. Regarding coastal evacuation, the staff report points out that Palm Beach County Division of Emergency Management offers detailed hurricane evacuation routes.

3. Wellington Medical Arts District (MAD) Constrained Roadway at Lower Level of Service (CRALLS)

This proposed amendment will modify several provisions of the MAD CRALLS at the request of Wellington, and will modify the Transportation Concurrency Exception Area and CRALLS Map TE 15.1 to reflect these changes.

The MAD CRALLS was adopted on October 25, 2010. The request for the CRALLS was initiated by Wellington for the purposes of meeting concurrency for Wellington’s proposed MAD. The MAD is made up of nine separate properties, consisting of approximately 210 acres, which includes the existing Wellington Regional Medical Center. This site is located near the intersection of two major highways in central Palm Beach County: SR 7/US 441 and Forest Hill Boulevard. Wellington’s overall intent for the District is to create an integrated campus consisting of a hospital; medical and professional offices; professional and technical medical education facilities; medically-oriented activities such as research and development laboratories and manufacturing facilities; residential opportunities for students and employees; residential congregate living facilities; and commercial, retail and hotel uses to support the overall campus.

The proposed amendment is to modify or eliminate several conditions of the approved MAD CRALLS to reflect recent State legislative action and the current economic conditions. The proposed changes include the following:

• Eliminate two links (SR 80 and Lyons Road) from the list of CRALLS;
• Remove dorms from the dwelling unit count and include in the University/Medical/Technical College; include restaurants within the retail square footage to clarify the list of permitted uses based upon the traffic analysis submitted for the original CRALLS;
• Extend time for executing a development agreement until January 1, 2014 and eliminate a requirement to allocate uses by parcel;
• Eliminate a requirement for Florida Department of Transportation variance for Strategic Intermodal System roadways;
• Revise a condition to ensure that the additional fees are used within the western communities (west of the Florida Turnpike);
• Eliminate a sentence requiring requests for vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian interconnectivity to be submitted directly to Black Diamond and Polo Lakes developments "if no development order amendments have been requested 6 months after the CRALLS effective date." Also change “provides” to “propose” when discussing future connectivity to both developments and the District;
• Modify the terms for Wellington to enter into a partnership agreement with South Florida Commuter Services to develop and implement a ridesharing program;
• Change the threshold required for appointment of a transportation coordinator from a percentage of building area to a trip threshold to be consistent with other conditions and eliminate the Car Sharing Program requirement;
• Modify the terms under which proportionate share payments will be made for certain roadway improvements; and
• Revise a condition to provide a trip generation threshold for the total development program of the District.

Extrajurisdictional Impacts

The proposed amendments were provided by Palm Beach County to the Palm Beach County Intergovernmental Plan Amendment Review Committee (IPARC) and were circulated by the IPARC Clearinghouse Coordinator on May 20, 2012. No extrajurisdictional impacts have been identified.

Effects on Significant Regional Resources and Facilities

The proposed amendments for the MAD CRALLS have the potential to impact the regional roadway network, including SR 80, an SIS facility. The intent of the MAD is consistent with Regional Goal 3.6, Diversification of the year-round economy and establishment of an economic climate that will allow the Region to compete effectively in the global economy. However, SRPP Regional Strategy 8.1.1 is to provide levels of public services necessary to achieve a high quality of life, cost effectively; and Policy 8.1.1.1 is that all development should take place concurrent with or after the provision of necessary infrastructure and services. The SRPP also indicates that support for requests for lower levels of service and establishment of transportation concurrency areas should be in areas where it can be demonstrated that levels of mobility and convenience will be maintained or increased through other modes of transportation or land use corrections (SRPP Policy 7.1.4.4).

In order to minimize the potential for impacts to the SR 80 Corridor, Council supports a request from the Florida Department of Transportation for a new policy that commits to working with stakeholders to complete a SR 80 Corridor Management Plan. The primary goal of the SR 80
Corridor Management Plan is to determine an acceptable and comprehensive transportation plan to serve existing and future travel demand along the SR 80 corridor.

Conclusion

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

Recommendation

Council should approve this report and authorize its transmittal to Palm Beach County 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 – Palm Beach County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Commercial Low Single Tenant Amendment – Location Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hungryland Slough Natural Area – Future Land Use Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Congress Avenue Extension TIM &amp; 2020 Map Amendment Location Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Correspondence from the Florida Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 2
Commercial Low Single Tenant Amendment – Location Map
Exhibit 3
Hungryland Slough Natural Area – Future Land Use Map
Exhibit 5

Florida Department of Transportation
3400 West Commercial Boulevard
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33309

August 30, 2012

Mr. Lorenzo Aghemo
Planning Director
Palm Beach County
2300 North Jog Road
West Palm Beach, FL 33411-2741

Dear Mr. Aghemo:

SUBJECT: Palm Beach County 12-2ESR Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments

The Department has reviewed the proposed Palm Beach County Comprehensive Plan amendments. In accordance with subsection 163.3184(3)(b), Florida Statutes, the focus of our review was on major transportation issues, particularly adverse impacts to the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS).

We have concerns regarding the proposed amendment to modify the Wellington Medical Arts District (MAD) Constrained Roadways at Lower Level of Service (CRALLS). This CRALLS affects over five miles of State Road (SR) 80, a SIS corridor extending from eastern Palm Beach County to the west coast of Florida. The CRALLS also affects segments of SR 7 and Okeechobee Boulevard, and the SR 7/SR 80 and SR 7/Forest Hill Boulevard intersections. SR 7, Okeechobee Boulevard, and Forest Hill Boulevard are part of the Regional Roadway Network identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan for the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council and the Regional Transportation Network designated by the Southeast Florida Transportation Council (SEFTC). SEFTC includes the Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO).

One of the proposed modifications to the Wellington MAD CRALLS is removal of the condition not allowing utilization of the CRALLS volumes for affected segments of SR 80 without a variance or a written determination from the Department that such waiver or variance is not necessary. Local governments are no longer required to adopt LOS standards established by the Department for purposes of implementing concurrency. In turn, they are no longer required to seek variances to obtain relief from application of LOS standards established by the Department. Local governments that retain transportation concurrency, however, are required to consult with the Department when proposed comprehensive plan amendments affect facilities on the SIS.

A reliance on piecemeal CRALLS mitigation measures will not produce the long-term, system-oriented solution for access and mobility needed to make the MAD and other such districts or projects in central Palm Beach County successful. No additional widening projects for the segments of SR 80 affected by the Wellington MAD CRALLS are planned. The ability of SR 80 to serve its function of providing intradistrict and inter-regional mobility is being compromised. Additional concerns are fairness to other properties in the area required to meet the “traditional” adopted LOS standards and the potential for additional CRALLS affecting SR 80 and other transportation facilities in the area, including site-specific ones such as the Wellington MAD CRALLS.

www.dot.state.fl.us
As mitigation and to avoid any additional CRALLS affecting SR 80, the Department recommends replacing the variance condition with a comprehensive plan policy requiring the County to develop and help implement a corridor management (or mobility) plan for central Palm Beach County centered on SR 80. The area covered by the plan should, at a minimum, encompass the area shown on the attached map. The plan should be developed with public and private partners, including municipalities in the area, the Palm Beach MPO, Palm Tran and the Department, and address congestion and other transportation issues from a long-term, system-oriented perspective. It should be developed in coordination with development of the 2040 long range transportation plan for the Palm Beach MPO, due in late 2014, and the 2040 regional transportation plan for SEFTC. The planning process would afford an opportunity for meaningful consultation with the Department.

The plan should set out the strategies that need to be implemented for SR 80 and regionally significant transportation facilities to serve their functions and for communities to achieve their mobility, economic development, and other goals. It also should specify how and when the strategies will be implemented. Examples of potential strategies are creating parallel facilities, improving roadways and roadway network connectivity, enhancing transit service, supporting safe and convenient movement of bicyclists and pedestrians, improving interconnectivity between developments, minimizing travel flow interruptions on regionally significant facilities with access management, undertaking transportation system management and operations (TSM&O) projects, maximizing the use of transportation demand management, and ensuring there is alignment between transportation and land use.

The Department appreciates the opportunity to participate in the review process. We remain committed to working with the County and other partners in pursuing mobility solutions. If you have any comments or questions about this letter, please contact Andrew Riddle at (954) 777-4605.

Sincerely,

Gerry O'Reilly, P.E.
Director of Transportation Development
District Four

cc:     James Stansbury, DEO
        Peter Merritt, TCRPC
        Tim Stillings, Wellington
        Randy Whitfield, Palm Beach MPO
        Kathy Neill, FDOT Central Office
        Maria Cahill, FDOT Central Office
        Nancy Ziegler, FDOT District Four
        Lois Bush, FDOT District Four
        Karen Kiselewski, Renaissance Planning Group
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members

From: Staff

Date: September 21, 2012 Council Meeting

Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Review
Draft Amendment to the City of Port St. Lucie Comprehensive Plan
Amendment No. 12-5ESR

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 is proposing one text amendment to the Future Land Use Element of the City’s comprehensive plan.

Evaluation

The proposed amendment is to revise Policy 1.2.2.3 of the Future Land Use Element to increase the maximum building height for schools and multi-family buildings from 35 feet to 65 feet within the residential sub-category of the New Community Development District (NCD) future land use classification. The maximum building height for residential and other uses will remain at 35 feet.

The NCD is a mixed land use future land use classification for large scale developments of regional impact (DRI). The NCD category applies to the Tradition, Western Grove, Southern Grove, Wilson Groves, and Riverland/Kennedy DRIs. An NCD District can be broken into seven land use sub-categories: Residential, Neighborhood/Village Commercial Areas, Town Center, Resort, Employment Center, Regional Business Center, and Mixed-Use. This amendment only
applies to the Residential sub-category within an NCD District. The purpose of the amendment is to accommodate development at greater densities to reduce costs associated with development of multi-family housing and educational facilities. The proposed amendment will not increase the overall intensity of development in the previously approved DRIs.

Extrajurisdictional Impacts

Under the informal agreement facilitated by the TCRPC, local governments in the northern three counties of the region are to provide copies of amendment materials to other local governments and agencies that have expressed an interest in receiving such materials. On August 8, 2012, the TCRPC requested comments from these local governments and organizations regarding any conflicts with the proposed amendment. As of the date of the preparation of this report, no objections to the proposed amendment have been received from other local governments or agencies.

Effects on Significant Regional Resources and Facilities

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

Conclusion

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

Recommendation

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

To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: September 21, 2012 Council Meeting
Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Review
Draft Amendment to the City of Vero Beach 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 Vero Beach is proposing one text amendment to the Land Use Element of the City Comprehensive Plan.

Evaluation

The City is proposing a text amendment to the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan to modify the Appropriate Uses of the Government/Institutional/Public Use (GU) land use classification in Table 8.1, Land Use Classifications. The proposed additional language to Table 1.8 is shown in underlined text:

Appropriate Uses

Governmental facilities including administrative buildings, cultural facilities, operations and service facilities, and correctional institutions. Also, public and private educational facilities, hospitals, and transportation terminals, including small-scale recreational activities compatible with and subordinate to an existing governmental utility.
The proposed text amendment is being made to allow non-traditional options for siting recreational activities, primarily to be operated by not-for-profit organizations that provide recreational activities to the public. This will allow more efficient use of underutilized public lands and buildings, and serve an important public interest in providing further opportunities for public recreation uses.

**Extrajurisdictional Impacts**

Under the informal agreement facilitated by the TCRPC, local governments in the northern three counties of the region are to provide copies of amendment materials to other local governments and agencies that have expressed an interest in receiving such materials. On July 2, 2012, the TCRPC requested comments from these local governments regarding any conflicts with the proposed amendment. As of the date of the preparation of this report, no objections to the proposed amendment have been received.

**Effects on Significant Regional Resources and Facilities**

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

**Conclusion**

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

**Recommendation**

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

To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: September 21, 2012 Council Meeting
Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Review
draft amendment to the City of Vero Beach 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

The City of Vero Beach is proposing one text amendment to the Land Use Element of the comprehensive plan.

Evaluation

The proposed amendment includes adding airport land use compatibility criteria to the objectives and policies of the Land Use Element. The new text (underlined), which includes Objective 11 and Policies 11.1 through 11.10, is proposed to read as follows:

1.4.1.0. Land Use Compatibility with operations of the Vero Beach Municipal Airport

Objective 11:
The City shall regulate the use of lands in order to ensure that future uses are compatible with Vero Beach Municipal Airport operations in order to promote public health, safety, and general welfare.
Policies:

11.1 The City Planning and Development Department shall coordinate with the Vero Beach Municipal Airport and the airport master plan to review amendments to the future land use map or zoning map that may be proposed within the airport noise impact zone as defined in Chapter 68, Airport Zoning, of the Vero Beach Code.

11.2 The City Planning and Development Department shall coordinate with the Vero Beach Municipal Airport by providing copies for review and comment of proposed development permit applications, including change of uses that are located within the airport noise impact zone as defined in Chapter 68, Airport Zoning, of the Vero Beach Code.

11.3 In accordance with Federal Aviation Administration advisories and Chapter 333, Florida Statutes, Airport Zoning, the City shall prohibit proposed incompatible land uses, activities, or construction within the airport runway protection zone as defined in Chapter 68, Airport Zoning, of the Vero Beach Code. Examples of incompatible land uses are uses that could lead to the congregation of people, the attraction of birds, the emission of light, glare, or smoke, or the construction of tall structures.

11.4 The City shall prohibit proposed residential uses and educational facilities, with the exception of aviation school facilities, that are inside the 65 decibel Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) noise contour, as adopted in the most recent Vero Beach Municipal Airport FAR Part 150 Noise Study, in accordance with Federal Aviation Administration guidance and Chapter 333, Florida Statutes, Airport Zoning.

11.5 The City shall prohibit proposed land uses such as sanitary landfills or other hazardous wildlife attractants at either end of a runway within five (5) statute miles between the farthest edge of the airport operations area and the hazardous wildlife attractant if the attractant could cause wildlife movement into or across the approach or departure airspace, in accordance with Federal Aviation Administration recommendations.

11.6 The City shall prohibit proposed construction of educational facilities of a public or private school at either end of an airport runway within an area which extends five (5) miles in a direct line along the centerline of the runway, and which has a width measuring one-half the length of the runway, in accordance with Chapter 333, Florida Statutes, Airport Zoning.

11.7 The City shall periodically review and update as necessary existing land development regulations in accordance with federal and state laws.
11.8 The Vero Beach Municipal Airport shall continue to use and improve upon its noise abatement approach and departure procedures as outlined in the most recent Part 150 Noise Study, Noise Compatibility Plan.

11.9 The City shall require prior to substantial improvements or new residential construction in the airport noise impact zone, as defined in Chapter 68, Airport Zoning, of the Vero Beach Code, that the property owner(s) shall either grant an avigation easement to the City of Vero Beach or provide soundproofing sufficient to achieve an outdoor to indoor noise level reduction of 25 decibels.

11.10 The City Planning and Development Department and Airport shall coordinate with Indian River County Community Development Department to review amendments to the future land use map, zoning map, or development that may be proposed within the airport noise impact zone as defined in Chapter 68, Airport Zoning, of the Vero Beach Code.

The proposed amendment should ensure compatibility of future land uses surrounding the Vero Beach Municipal Airport.

Extrajurisdictional Impacts

Under the informal agreement facilitated by the TCRPC, local governments in the northern three counties of the region are to provide copies of amendment materials to other local governments and agencies that have expressed an interest in receiving such materials. On August 29, 2012, the TCRPC requested comments from these local governments regarding any conflicts with the proposed amendment. As of the date of the preparation of this report, no objections to the proposed amendment have been received.

Effects on Significant Regional Resources and Facilities

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

Conclusion

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

Recommendation

Council should approve this report and authorize its transmittal to the City of Vero Beach and the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity.
MEMORANDUM

To:       Council Members
From:     Staff
Date:     September 21, 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 three 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-IR-07-01</td>
<td>Application for Rural Development Business Grant</td>
<td>City of Fellsmere</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Agriculture – Rural Development</td>
<td>$1,609,463</td>
<td>$1,609,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-PB-08-01</td>
<td>Palm Beach County Action Plan for FY 2012-2013</td>
<td>Palm Beach County</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>$7,515,588</td>
<td>$7,540,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-MC-08-02</td>
<td>Operating Expense Assistance</td>
<td>Martin County</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>$84,545</td>
<td>$169,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$9,209,596</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,319,141</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation

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

Attachments
Founded in 1911, the City of Fellsmere is located in north central Indian River County, four miles west of I-95 on CR 512. The area is rural in nature and primarily agricultural with citrus groves, sugar cane production, and aquaculture.

The City of Fellsmere is applying for a grant from the U.S. Department of Agriculture to fund activities that will enhance, improve, and bring into compliance with the City’s Land Development Code (LDC) the City’s Municipal Complex and surrounding recreation area. It is anticipated the proposed project will be completed no later than the Spring of 2013.

The project area is located at the southern boundary of the traditional “Old Town” in Historical Fellsmere, which is within the modern City limits. The Municipal Complex is the former Fellsmere Public School, which is one of three sites within the City that are listed as National Historic Register Properties. The school has been recently refurbished and is now being utilized for municipal services.

The project area contains public/institutional, and recreation land uses and is bordered mostly by low to medium density properties as well as some commercial properties.

A summary of the proposed improvements includes:

**Additional Parking:** additional parking is proposed to be compliant with the City’s LDC. The additional parking will include 55 stabilized, un-paved spaces for use by the adjacent recreational facilities.

**Stormwater Control:** with the expansion of the additional parking, proposed sidewalks and paving of the roads, the LDC requires an expansion of the stormwater control system.

**Pedestrian Accessibility:** to address the safety and welfare of the public, the City is proposing improvements and handicap accessibility that will provide paved access from the parking areas and site uses around the proposed project area.
**Landscaping:** The proposed project includes parking area landscaping and open space landscaping as required by the LDC. Additionally, the City is proposing landscaping around the stormwater holding pond as buffering and beautification.

**Street Paving:** The project includes paving improvements to streets and intersections around the properties. These improvements are associated with pedestrian crossings, intersection controls, and roadway repairs.

The Paving, Grading and Drainage Plan, and the Landscaping Plan are attached.

**Funding Agency:** U.S. Department of Agriculture – Rural Development

**Requested Funding:** $1,609,463

**Recommendations:** The application is consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan. It furthers Regional Goal 3.1, revitalization and maintenance of complete cities, towns, and villages; and Regional Goal 8.1, public facilities which provide a high quality of life.

**Agencies Contacted:** Indian River County
Town of Indian River Shores
Town of Orchid
City of Sebastian
City of Vero Beach
TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION AND REVIEW LOG

TCRPC Number: 12-PB-08-01

Applicant: Palm Beach County

Project Description: Palm Beach County Action Plan for FY 2012-2013

The Palm Beach County Department of Economic Sustainability has prepared the Action Plan (AP) for the County which covers the period of October 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013. The AP is prepared for the Palm Beach County entitlement jurisdiction, which includes all of the unincorporated County, and thirty participating municipalities. This AP serves to meet the annual planning and application requirements for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnerships, and Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Programs.

Planned objectives and outcomes address housing, homelessness, non-homeless special needs, provision of suitable living environments, and expansion of economic opportunities. Following are Palm Beach County’s allocations under the various programs for FY 2012-2013:

**CDBG Program:** It is estimated that 94.2% of applicable funding will be targeted to benefit low- and moderate-income persons. The County proposes to set aside 10% of the grant to fund the CDBG Economic Development Program; allocate 15% of the grant to fund public service activities, and allocate 20% to fund program planning and administration. Additionally, funds will provide for public facilities and improvements, infrastructure, housing rehabilitation and demolition, program implementation and fair housing. The allocation is $5,393,765, with program income estimated at $25,000, for a total of $5,418,765 available for distribution for the year.

**HOME Program:** Funds will be used for Community Housing Development Organization administered activities, operating expenses, individual development accounts, developer rental program, and program administration. The allocation for this program is $1,590,204 for the year.

**ESG Program:** Funds will be provided to agencies that offer services related to homeless prevention, rapid re-housing, and emergency shelters. As required by the regulations, 40% of the funding is to be used for homeless prevention, and rapid re-housing activities. The estimated allocation is $531,619 for the year.
Funding Agency: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

Estimated Funding: $5,418,765  CDBG Program  
1,590,204  HOME Program  
531,619  ESG Program  
$7,540,588  Total

Recommendations: The proposed plan is consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan. It furthers Regional Goal 2.1 – an adequate supply of safe and affordable housing to meet the needs of the very low, low, and moderate income residents of the Region; and Regional Goal 8.1 - public facilities which provide a high quality of life.

Agencies Contacted: All Palm Beach County Municipalities
Martin County is requesting funding to continue the operation of the Indiantown Bus Route. This route provides public transportation services Monday through Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. The route consists of regular stops to health care, educational, public services and shopping facilities within the Indiantown area. The route includes a daily stop in the City of Stuart which offers riders diverse retail opportunities not available in the Indiantown area. The County has entered into a contract with MV Transportation (MV), a for-profit company, to manage and operate the County’s public transportation service. MV is the lessee of the County vehicle to be used under this program. The County charges $1.00 per year for use of the vehicle by MV to operate the Indiantown Bus Route. In return, MV maintains the vehicle per guidelines set forth by the County, adhering to all applicable federal and state laws.

Funding Agency: Federal Transit Administration

Estimated Funding: $ 84,545 Federal
                     84,545 Local
                     $169,090 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 Martin County Municipalities
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members  
From: Staff  
Date: September 21, 2012 Council Meeting  
Subject: Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy 2012-2017

Introduction

As a federally-designated Economic Development District that receives economic development grant funding from the U.S. Economic Development Administration (EDA), Council is required to meet periodic grant requirements. One of these requirements is the preparation of a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS). The CEDS is intended to guide the economic growth of the Treasure Coast Region. The CEDS analyzes the regional economy and serves as a guide for establishing regional goals and objectives, developing and implementing a regional plan of action, and identifying investment priorities and funding sources.

A CEDS is required to qualify for EDA assistance under its public works, economic adjustment, and most planning programs, and is a prerequisite for designation by EDA as an economic development district. In December of 1998 Council prepared its first CEDS in order to obtain designation as an Economic Development District. In 2000, Council produced its second planning strategy – “Treasure Coast 2010.” In 2004, Council published “Go Treasure Coast.” In 2007, Council released Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy 2007-2012. The attached document is the fifth version of the CEDS plan. Importantly, it has been developed in cooperation and collaboration with other economic development planning efforts going on simultaneously statewide. This includes the planning efforts of other regional planning councils, the State of Florida, the workforce development boards, and other statewide economic development stakeholders including Florida’s 2012-2017 Statewide Strategic Plan for Economic Development, Seven50, and the Florida Eight.

Background

The draft CEDS document developed by Council staff and Council’s CEDS Committee over the past year meets all of the requirements of EDA and incorporates a number of regionally significant vital projects to implement the plan’s goals and objectives. The CEDS consists of two parts, a Strategy Report and a Technical Appendix. The Strategy Report is included in the attachment. The detailed Technical Appendix is available on Council’s website, www.tcrpc.org. On September 13, 2012, Council’s CEDS Committee reviewed and recommended adoption of the CEDS by Council and transmittal of the draft CEDS to EDA in Atlanta.
Recommendation

Council should approve the attached Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy 2012-2017 and instruct staff to transmit the document to the U.S. Economic Development Administration.

Attachment
COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY
2012-2017

TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

SEPTEMBER 2012

This document was prepared under a financial assistance award (04-83-06494) from the U.S. Economic Development Administration

Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
421 SW Camden Ave.
Stuart, Florida 34994
772-221-4060
Email: admin@tcrpc.org
Website: www.tcrpc.org
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PREFACE

THE TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL, in partnership with its local governments, businesses, nonprofit and community leadership, has developed this Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS). It is intended for use a guide or business plan for regional and local collaboration on economic development initiatives and to help the Region achieve long-term economic sustainability and regional competitiveness.

The year-long CEDS strategy development process began with an in-depth economic analysis of the Region. This was followed by several months of stakeholder meetings to identify the salient strengths and weaknesses in the Region’s economy and opportunities and threats that needed to be addressed to move forward. The net result of this planning process was not only the preparation of this regional economic development strategy, but the creation of an important regional collaborative mechanism to engage the Region’s leadership.

The partners that have helped to create this strategy document recognize the Region’s long-term sustainability and quality of life are tied into the larger global economy and the Region’s economy must be focused on expanding economic diversity, enhancing innovation, and aligning educational opportunities with workforce needs. This became evident as the community’s leadership recognized how the Region’s most dynamic industrial sectors – agriculture, tourism, construction, emerging life science, marine industries, and research and development clusters are affected not only by local economic conditions, but national and international economic trends as well. The deleveraging effects of the Great Recession have significantly dampened per capita income, construction and small business lending and workforce employment opportunities to the detriment of the Region’s economic growth prospects. Simply put, the Region needs to lay new foundations for a more globally competitive and diverse economy that produces the high demand goods and services the world wants.
The Torrey Pines Institute for Molecular Studies headquarters in Port St. Lucie, Florida.
Source: www.mannresearchcenter.com
INTRODUCTION TO THE REGION

The Treasure Coast Region is well known for its beautiful Atlantic beaches and its high quality of life. From Boca Raton in the south, the Region stretches 110 miles north to the Sebastian Inlet, and from the Atlantic Ocean west to Lake Okeechobee. While recognized for its upscale communities along the ocean, the Region’s population is primarily located in historic mainland cities such as Boca Raton, Delray Beach, West Palm Beach, Riviera Beach, Stuart, Fort Pierce, and Vero Beach, and in rapidly growing “suburban” communities such as Port St. Lucie, Jupiter, Palm Beach Gardens, Wellington and Sebastian.

Although the Region houses a permanent population of 1.9 million and devotes over one million acres to agricultural uses, it also contains a significant number of important natural resources. Examples include the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge, Lake Okeechobee, Loxahatchee National Wild and Scenic River, the J.W. Corbett Wildlife Management Area, Indian River Lagoon, Lake Worth Lagoon, St. Lucie River, Savannas (the largest remaining coastal freshwater wetland on the Atlantic Coast) and St. John’s Marsh.

Robust population growth in the 1990s and the mid 2000s was the primary engine of regional economic growth. During the period of 1990 to 2006, the Region’s average annual rate of population growth was 2.5 percent, outpacing statewide growth of about 2.1 percent and significantly outpacing national growth of about 1.1 percent. Equally important was the pace of employment growth which mirrored the rate of population growth, averaging 2.5 percent per year. The Region’s engine fueled heavily by tourism, agriculture, and the development of new communities to meet the needs of a rapidly expanding population coupled with increasing consumer demand for goods and services seemed a trend that would continue apace for quite some time.

During this period of rapid population and employment growth, the Region’s leadership took important steps to define and enhance emerging industry clusters such as aerospace/engineering, aquaculture and marine-related industries. Significantly, in November 2003, Governor Jeb Bush signed into law a historic piece of legislation that laid the framework for the Scripps Research Institute to expand its world-renowned scientific research and endeavors into Florida. Scripps Florida, which began operations in Jupiter in 2005, became an important milestone on the road to putting Florida and the Treasure Coast Region at the forefront of biomedical research and development. Since the advent of Scripps, life science research institutes such as Torrey Pines Institute for Molecular Studies, Max Planck Florida Institute and the Vaccine and Gene Therapy Institute of Florida have significantly influenced and lead the growth and development of the life sciences cluster in the Treasure Coast Region.

When TCRPC released its Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy 2007-2012 population and employment growth rates were expected to trend moderately lower than the high-growth rate period of the previous ten years, landing somewhere around 2.0 percent. That CEDS noted “…This level of population growth should translate into healthy growth in the Region’s local cluster industries such as retail trade, professional and business services and education and health services…”

By the time the national recession officially began in December 2007, the relative strength of the Region’s economy began to show softness as reflected by increases in the year over year unemployment rate in all four of the Region’s counties and a decline for the first time since the year 2000 in the median sales price for existing single family homes. By 2010, the Region’s unemployment rate stood at 12.2% with St. Lucie
and Indian River Counties experiencing the highest rates of unemployment at 14.1% and 14.0% respectively.

Against the backdrop of the Great Recession and looking ahead over the next five years (2012 to 2017), this CEDS Plan attempts to gauge the existing health of the Region’s economy and suggest strategies for its future improvement. The analysis of data presented in the plan, along with findings from in-depth discussions about regional strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats reveals a Region with a unique set of attributes – its industry clusters, cities and towns and related quality of life/place, climate, geography, talent, diversity and cultural, financial, and intellectual resources; its growth prospects and its innovative capacity.

All of these attributes can be effectively harnessed to put the Region on the path to economic sustainability provided the Region’s collective leadership makes strategic investments and policy decisions to improve the Region’s economic base, its educational foundations, its infrastructure network and most importantly, its skill base. The CEDS suggests a comprehensive regional economic development strategy to make improvements in all of these areas.

Select Economic Development Attributes of the Treasure Coast Region

- Is comprised of many different communities with a good quality and sense of place;
- Is one of North America’s most dynamic economic regions;
- Rewards innovation by starting, growing and attracting entrepreneurial firms;
- Is Florida’s leading center for scientific research and development;
- Provides economic opportunities to its residents;
- Values its open spaces and unique natural environments;
- Has communities that are diverse, safe and prosperous;
- Has world renowned natural ecosystems and resources; and
- Has a robust and relatively new network of infrastructure.

Source: The Scripps Research Institute website
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose of the Report

This CEDS plan highlights the Region’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges and provides a set of guiding principles for community leaders and decision-makers to set common economic development goals and priorities for action. It also provides a framework for residents, businesses and community leaders to better understand the dynamic relationship between economic prosperity and quality of life, which together help create a more sustainable economy.

The CEDS plan is divided into two major sections: Strategy Report and Technical Appendices. The Strategy Report section presents the Vision for the Region’s Economy, the Region’s Economic Goals, Objectives and Strategies to implement the Vision, and Strategic Economic Development Projects, Programs and Activities designed to implement the CEDS plan. The Technical Appendices provide a detailed background of the economic development situation of the Region, including a discussion of the existing economy, population, environment, workforce development, infrastructure and industry cluster conditions.

Vision

The CEDS suggests a comprehensive regional economic development strategy that is founded upon the following vision for the Region:

The Treasure Coast Region is committed to creating a globally competitive regional economy with increased economic opportunity for all residents through support of high-quality job growth, improved educational opportunities, a sustainable, high quality natural environment, better regional collaboration, and creation of more livable communities.

Key Goals

The CEDS plan contains the following seven Economic Development Goals designed to help overcome the economic challenges identified in the CEDS plan and capitalize on the economic attributes and opportunities of the Region:

- A highly skilled and educated workforce;
- An innovative and sustainable regional economy supported by the growth of established and emerging industry clusters;
- Physical infrastructure which encourages sustainable business growth and a diverse economy;
- An entrepreneurial culture that fosters and supports the creation of new business ventures;
- Increased regional collaboration in support of the Region’s vision;
- Improved community planning and urban design to create more livable communities; and
- A healthy, sustainable natural environment and natural resource supply.
DEO/CEDS Connection

The development of this CEDS plan was guided, supported and coordinated in parallel with the development of the State of Florida’s five-year statewide strategic plan. The Florida Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) Division of Strategic Business Development, as outlined in Florida Statutes, 20.60, is required to create a five-year statewide strategic plan designed to help guide the future of Florida’s economy. DEO is developing the strategic plan in close coordination with Enterprise Florida, Workforce Florida, local governments, local and regional economic development organizations, the business community, educational institutions as well as other local, state and federal entities. The framework adopted for the state planning effort is the Six Pillars of Florida’s Future Economy developed by the Florida Chamber Foundation. The Six Pillars identifies the critical factors determining Florida’s future: (1) Talent Supply & Education, (2) Innovation & Economic Development, (3) Infrastructure & Growth Leadership, (4) Business Climate & Competitiveness, (5) Civic & Governance Systems and (6) Quality of Life & Quality Places.

The State’s Plan and the Region’s CEDS Plan share this Six Pillars framework. This CEDS Plan, for example, categorizes key CEDS strategies under each of the Six Pillars and compares them with similar DEO or statewide strategies. A concerted effort was made by the eleven RPCs to align their CEDS goals and strategies with those of DEO as a way to accomplish statewide goals consistently through the regional CEDS plans and other actions of the RPCs. This comparison and policy alignment can be found in the one-page “At-A-Glance” CEDS Plan, included in the next page.

Strategic Projects, Programs and Activities

This section of the CEDS plan outlines a series of regional projects, programs, and activities designed to implement the CEDS plan and ultimately, the desired vision for the Region’s future. The projects are classified as either “Suggested or Vital Projects.” Vital Projects address the Region’s greatest needs and/or enhance the Region’s competitiveness. Suggested projects are longer-term economic development projects that may be initiated after implementation of the Vital Projects. The following is a sample of Vital Projects:

FEC/Amtrak Intercity Passenger Rail Service:
The FEC/Amtrak project will restore passenger rail service on the FEC rail corridor between Jacksonville and West Palm Beach, where Amtrak service will be routed through a new FEC/CSX rail connection to the CSX rail corridor, and service will continue south on the CSX into Miami International Airport.
**Vision**
The Treasure Coast Region is committed to creating a globally competitive regional economy with increased economic opportunity for all residents through support of high-quality job growth, improved educational opportunities, a sustainable, high-quality natural environment, better regional collaboration, and creation of more livable communities.

**Goals**
- A highly skilled and educated workforce.
- An innovative and sustainable regional economy supported by the growth of established and emerging industry clusters.
- Physical infrastructure which encourages sustainable business growth and a diverse economy.
- An entrepreneurial culture that fosters and supports the creation of new business ventures.
- Increased regional collaboration in support of the Region’s vision.
- Improved community planning and urban design to create more livable communities.
- A healthy, sustainable natural environment and natural resource supply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area-Specific Strategies</th>
<th>Talent Supply &amp; Education</th>
<th>Innovation &amp; Economic Development</th>
<th>Infrastructure &amp; Growth Leadership</th>
<th>Business Climate &amp; Competitiveness</th>
<th>Civic &amp; Governance Systems</th>
<th>Quality of Life &amp; Quality Places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CEDS Strategies</strong></td>
<td>Cultivate education/business partnerships to encourage and develop education/training support programs that will benefit existing and new businesses and employees. Coordinate with local school boards, community colleges, universities and workforce development boards on educational curriculum, career technical offerings, and workforce development activities.</td>
<td>Identify locations for and encourage the development of industry clusters in the Region. Encourage and support industry cluster research and development activities.</td>
<td>Work with local governments to maintain and improve the region’s physical infrastructure to support the needs of established and emerging industry clusters. Assist local governments in upgrading or expanding their infrastructure facilities by identifying potential funding sources and supporting funding applications.</td>
<td>Educate the public about entrepreneurship and its benefits to the Region. Increase availability of financing to entrepreneurs and small and minority-owned businesses.</td>
<td>Provide local governments with high-quality research and information about economic development principles, especially their costs and benefits, to help them make the best-informed decisions possible. Work with the Region’s economic development organizations to develop a coordinated communications and marketing campaign that effectively promotes the Treasure Coast entrepreneurs.</td>
<td>Create and sustain diverse, affordable, vibrant, transit-supportive, and safe communities that attract a creative class of workers, businesses, residents, and visitors. Encourage the creation, expansion, and protection of the region’s natural environment, cultural and historic amenities for residents, businesses and visitors alike.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEO Strategies</strong></td>
<td>Connect and align education and workforce development programs to develop and retain Florida’s current and future talent supply chain and meet employer needs.</td>
<td>Strengthen Florida’s leadership in expanding and emerging industry clusters and help transition established clusters to serve new markets.</td>
<td>Coordinate decision-making and investments for economic development, land use, infrastructure, water, energy, natural resources, workforce and community development at the statewide, regional and local levels.</td>
<td>Enumerate, regional and local agencies provide collaborative, seamless, consistent and timely customer service to businesses.</td>
<td>Support and sustain statewide and regional partnerships to accomplish Florida’s economic and quality of life goals.</td>
<td>Create and sustain vibrant, healthy communities that attract workers, businesses, residents and visitors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lake Worth Park of Commerce: The City of Lake Worth is seeking funding to help fully develop a 314 acre site into an operational industrial park adjacent to major transportation routes including I-95 and CSX rail, Palm Beach International Airport, Florida Turnpike, Port of Palm Beach and FEC rail.

Regional Cluster Industry Study and Development Strategy: This project proposes to establish a bottom-up regional industry cluster study and development strategy to enhance the growth and development of regional industry clusters with high-wage job growth prospects.

Intermodal Logistics Center(s): This project or projects envisions infrastructure improvements to support the development of one or more intermodal logistics centers in the Region to ease intermodal freight movement by finding alternatives to the increasingly congested South Florida highway and rail corridors.

Integrating the CEDS with State, Regional and Local Economic Development Efforts

This CEDS planning effort is aligned with and is being conducted in concert with statewide, regional and local economic development planning efforts as follows:

Florida's 2012-2017 Statewide Strategic Plan for Economic Development

Earlier this year (February and March) DEO held regional forums across the state in conjunction with all eleven regional planning councils to gather insights related to the creation of Florida’s 2012-2017 Statewide Strategic Plan for Economic Development. The purpose of the forums was to review and prioritize goals, objectives and strategies for implementation by state government that would assist Florida’s regions with economic development and job creation. The Treasure Coast regional forum was held on March 5, 2012 in Stuart and had participation from over 115 people representing local governments, local and regional economic development organizations, community economic development entities, workforce development boards, the business community, educational institutions and others attended the event. TCRPC staff presented participants an overview of the 2012 CEDS Plan at the event. An important function of the regional forums was to closely integrate and align the CEDS plan with the State’s economic development efforts and initiatives.
Palm Beach County Six Pillars Community Strategic Plan

Led by the Economic Council of Palm Beach County and its partners, Palm Beach County community leaders used the Six Pillars framework to guide their local economic development dialogue. Significantly, Palm Beach County was recognized by the Florida Chamber of Commerce and Florida Chamber Foundation as the first large urban county in the State of Florida to be designated a Six Pillars community.

A series of community workshops (February 17, March 30-31, June 21, and August 10 and 31, 2011) were utilized to build consensus among hundreds of participants. Volunteers with expertise and commitment aligned to one of the Six Pillars have actively participated in Local Task Forces. TCRPC staff was actively involved in this planning effort. The Plan was unveiled on October 19, 2011.

Florida’s Research Coast

The Florida’s Research Coast comprises the four county region of Indian River, Martin, Okeechobee and St. Lucie counties. This regional initiative was established in 1998 and includes the following partners: Indian River Chamber of Commerce, Business Development Board of Martin County, Okeechobee Main Street, Economic Development Council of St. Lucie County and Workforce Solutions. Florida’s Research Coast is a 501(c) 6 non-profit, business-driven, public-private partnership committed to keeping the four county region be economically competitive through business, education and governmental collaboration.

Representatives from Florida’s Research Coast are integral members of the TCRPC CEDS Committee. They provided valuable input in the preparation of this CEDS plan, and will continue to provide guidance for regional economic development policy.

Local Government Economic Development Planning and Policy

Each of the Treasure Coast Region’s northern counties – Martin, St. Lucie and Indian River, maintain and regularly update, with TCRPC input, the Economic Elements of their respective Comprehensive Plans. Moreover, in the lead up to the preparation of this CEDS plan, TCRPC staff met with their county economic development counterparts to learn about and discuss current and future economic policy and program initiatives for each county. These ongoing discussions were critical in the formation of the Regional Vision, CEDS Goals, Objectives and Strategies and the CEDS Strategic Projects, Programs and Activities that will help to implement the CEDS plan. For example, in July, 2012, TCRPC sent out a solicitation to all of the local governments and economic development organizations. The solicitation informed all the Region’s local governments that the CEDS rewrite was underway and that TCRPC was requesting local governments to submit their priority economic development projects into the CEDS plan. Many of the projects in the Strategic Projects, Programs and Activities were included in the CEDS based upon this valuable local input. There is close alignment of economic development policy at the local and regional level as illustrated below:
**Martin County:** A principal goal in Martin County’s Economic Element of its Comprehensive Growth Management Plan is to promote balanced, orderly sustainable economic growth by creating and promoting an economic environment that will enhance prosperity for all communities and citizens of Martin County.

**St. Lucie County:** A key economic development goal of St. Lucie County is to support economic development in St. Lucie County as part of an overall strategy for sustainability and quality of life.

**Indian River County:** The Economic Development Element of Indian River County’s Comprehensive Plan has one goal: “It is the goal of Indian River County to have balanced and orderly economic growth.” Supporting objectives include creating the conditions for diversified economic growth, maintaining a trained labor force and collaborating to facilitate economic development.

**Seven50**

Seven50 ("seven counties, 50 years") is a comprehensive planning effort to build consensus around long- and short-term regional strategies for establishing a more prosperous and desirable future for the seven counties in the Southeast Florida Region (Monroe, Miami-Dade, Broward, Palm Beach, Martin, St. Lucie, and Indian River). This investment plan is being developed to help ensure stronger, more diverse communities, create jobs and a more resilient economy, establish short- and long-term regional infrastructure needs, and protect the fragile ecosystem in what is quickly becoming one of the world’s most important mega-regions.

Seven50 has been made possible by a grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and is jointly led by South Florida and Treasure Coast Regional Planning Councils and the Southeast Florida Regional Partnership, a unique collaboration of more than 200 public, private, and civic stakeholders. Seven50 is mapping a strategy to prioritize and focus future local, state, and federal investment and policies. The overarching purpose of the plan is the best-possible quality of life for the more than six million residents of the region. The plan is being devised through a series of public summits, workshops, online outreach and high-impact studies led by the region and the nation’s top thinkers. For more information, visit www.Seven50.org.
The Florida Eight

The Florida Eight initiative provides regional teams with a variety of facilitation services and resources to build their regional capacity for economic development, talent development, job retention and international business opportunities. Through Workforce Florida’s investment—and consistent with its mission to strengthen the state’s business climate through talent development—this initiative provides research, marketing and other resources to up to eight regional teams as they establish and implement business development plans.

The Southeast Regional Business Team (covering the seven county region extending from Monroe to Indian River counties) has convened stakeholder meetings since August 2011 to the present to identify the largest “Old Economy” barriers to regional competitiveness and build a strategic action plan to remove them. The identified focus areas are:

The identified focus areas are:
• Access to Capital
• Logistics and Transportation Infrastructure
• Licensing and Permitting/Transactions in the Public Sector
• International Diversification

Glades Region Master Plan – Palm Beach County

In late 2011, the Palm Beach County Board of County Commissioners was awarded a $1,980,504 grant under the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD) Community Challenge Planning Grant Program. The County will use the funds to develop a master plan for the entirety of the Glades Region of western Palm Beach County. The Glades Region Master Plan will examine ways to provide more transportation choices and equitable/affordable housing, enhance economic competitiveness, support existing communities, coordinate policy, and leverage investments to help enhance communities and neighborhoods in this Region. TCRPC is a key partner with Palm Beach County in this major planning effort.
The Treasure Coast Region faces important challenges. As it slowly emerges from the negative effects of the economic downturn and national recession – it needs to turn into a dynamic economy. The current economy, long focused on tourism, agriculture and construction, must now respond to the global challenge and compete in an increasingly interconnected world. The current depression in the residential construction and tourism sectors, however temporary it may be, highlights the importance of developing a diverse and dynamic economy to promote Regional economic sustainability. If the Region’s leaders are truly concerned about transforming the Region’s economy into one that is sustainable and recession-proof, – then regional collaboration and commitment is essential.
• CEDS Goals and Objectives
• Community and Private Sector Participation
• Strategic Projects, Programs, and Activities
• Action Plan
CEDS GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The following Vision and seven Economic Development Goals are designed to help overcome the economic challenges identified in the CEDS plan and capitalize on the economic attributes and opportunities of the Region:

**Vision**

The Treasure Coast Region is committed to creating a globally competitive regional economy with increased economic opportunity for all residents through support of high-quality job growth, improved educational opportunities, a sustainable, high quality natural environment, better regional collaboration, and creation of more livable communities.

1. Talent Supply & Education - Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal One:</th>
<th>A highly skilled and educated workforce.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective One:</strong></td>
<td>Create an additional 5,000 jobs in the target industries due to business retention and expansion as measured by the data collection system by January 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective Two:</strong></td>
<td>Raise the Region’s average annual wage to that of the nation by January 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective Three:</strong></td>
<td>Recruit 2,500 new jobs in the target industries by January 2017 at a sustainable annual wage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementing Strategies**

**Strategy One:** Cultivate education/business partnerships to encourage and develop education/training support programs that will benefit existing and new businesses and employees.

**Strategy Two:** Coordinate with local school boards, community colleges, universities and workforce development boards on educational curriculum, career technical offerings, and workforce development activities.

**Strategy Three:** Support and promote the development of a new four-year educational institution in the Treasure Coast District.

**Strategy Four:** Support local school boards, community colleges, universities workforce development boards and non-profit organizations by forecasting regional educational needs.

**Strategy Five:** Promote the provision of adequate workforce housing throughout the Region to alleviate long commutes to industrial and commercial job sites.
2. Innovation & Economic Development - Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal One:</th>
<th>An innovative and sustainable regional economy supported by the growth of established and emerging industry clusters.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Objective One: Increase the relative specialization of two or more of the Region’s emerging cluster industries such as Defense & Security and Transportation Equipment Manufacturing to allow these industries to transition from “Emerging” to “Star” cluster status by January 2017.

Implementing Strategies

Strategy One: Identify locations for and encourage the development of industry clusters in the Region.

Strategy Two: Encourage and support industry cluster research and development activities.

Strategy Three: Research, develop and disseminate information that will facilitate economic development efforts.

3. Infrastructure & Growth Leadership - Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal One:</th>
<th>Physical infrastructure which encourages sustainable business growth and a diverse economy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Objective One: Improve methods for including economic development criteria into regional infrastructure evaluation programs.

Objective Two: Complete grant applications for strategic regional physical infrastructure improvements.

Implementing Strategies

Strategy One: Work with local governments to maintain and improve the region’s physical infrastructure to support the needs of established and emerging industry clusters.

Strategy Two: Assist local governments in upgrading or expanding their infrastructure facilities by identifying potential funding sources and supporting funding applications.

Strategy Three: Coordinate with local governments and local and regional utility providers in determining the need for advanced infrastructure facilities and identification of potential funding sources.

Strategy Four: Identify industrial and commercial sites in the Region that have adequate infrastructure capacity for future development.
Strategy Five: Coordinate with local economic development organizations to develop new inventories of commercial and industrial sites with adequate infrastructure.

4. Business Climate & Competitiveness - Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal One: An entrepreneurial culture that fosters and supports the creation of new business ventures.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective One:</strong> Grow and support the development of one hundred (100) high-valued entrepreneurial businesses within the Region’s targeted industries by January 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective Two:</strong> Gather and maintain annual baseline data on the key economic indicators of the Region’s industry clusters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective Three:</strong> Increase the Region’s high-tech employment share of total employment from approximately 3.6 percent to 5.0 percent by January 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementing Strategies

**Strategy One:** Educate the public about entrepreneurship and its benefits to the Region.

**Strategy Two:** Increase availability of financing to entrepreneurs and small and minority-owned businesses.

**Strategy Three:** Better connect venture capital and angel capital networks across the Region with Treasure Coast entrepreneurs.

5. Civic & Governance Systems - Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal One: Increased regional collaboration in support of the Region’s vision.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective One:</strong> Create a public outreach mechanism to effectively communicate and disseminate the Region’s Vision by the end of 2012.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementing Strategies

**Strategy One:** Provide local governments with high-quality research and information about economic development principles, especially their costs and benefits, to help them make the best-informed decisions possible.

**Strategy Two:** Work with the Region’s economic development organizations to develop a coordinated communications and marketing campaign that effectively promotes the Treasure Coast Region for business expansion and recruitment.
6. Quality of Life & Quality Places - Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal One:</th>
<th>Improved community planning and urban design to create more livable communities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal Two:</td>
<td>A healthy, sustainable natural environment and natural resource supply.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective One: Improve methods for including economic development criteria into regional infrastructure evaluation programs.

Implementing Strategies

Strategy One: Create and sustain diverse, affordable, vibrant, transit-supportive, and safe communities that attract a creative class of workers, businesses, residents and visitors.

Strategy Two: Encourage the creation, expansion and protection of the Region’s natural environment, cultural and historic amenities for residents, businesses and visitors alike.
Get your project plugged in before it's too late.

August 3rd is the deadline to include your priority economic development project in the regional economic development plan - 2012 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) for funding consideration under U.S. Economic Development Administration (EDA) grant programs:

- Public Works
- Local Technical Assistance
- Economic Adjustment
- Trade Adjustment

Currently, the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) is rewriting its 5-year CEDS plan and is looking for projects that are market drivers, target business clusters and enhance regional competitiveness.

Economic development projects that are submitted to the TCRPC will be included in the CEDS - a prerequisite for EDA funding. Sample EDA projects previously funded in the Region include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>EDA Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Glades Utility Authority</td>
<td>Palm Beach County</td>
<td>$5,200,000</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>VCB Horse</td>
<td>St. Lucie County</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>William Field</td>
<td>Martin County</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You can submit your priority economic development projects in writing or online at [www.tcrpc.org/cedsplan](http://www.tcrpc.org/cedsplan). Please contact Greg Vaday at (772) 221-4050 or gvdaday@tcrpc.org at TCRPC for more information.
COMMUNITY AND PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION

This CEDS was developed by a standing committee comprised of public and private sector organizations, business leaders and individuals from throughout the Treasure Coast Region committed to helping develop a sustainable regional economy. The year-long CEDS strategy development process began with an in-depth economic analysis of the Region. This was followed by several months of meetings to identify the salient strengths and weaknesses in the Region’s economy and opportunities and threats that needed to be addressed to move forward. In August, 2012 the public was invited to review and submit comments on the draft CEDS. Local governments in the Region were also notified the CEDS was available for review and comment.

Implementation of the CEDS over the next five years depends on the cooperation and collaboration of many public and private sectors partners. The strategic projects, programs and activities that follow in the next section were selected for inclusion in this CEDS because they:

- Advance innovation and entrepreneurship;
- Have a high degree of public commitment;
- Help to diversify the regional economy;
- Support the development of existing and emerging traded clusters;
- Reshape the workforce to meet the needs of future industry clusters;
- Are identified as priority projects in local government economic development plans;
- Enhance long-term sustainability;
- Have regional economic impacts; and
- Address a critical need(s) to move the Region forward.
STRATEGIC PROJECTS, PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

This section of the report outlines a series of regional projects, programs, and activities designed to implement the CEDS plan and ultimately, the desired vision for the Region’s future. The following regionally significant projects are classified as either “Suggested or Vital Projects.” Vital projects address the Region’s greatest needs and/or enhance the Region’s competitiveness. Vital Projects are not priority ranked at this time. Suggested projects are longer-term economic development projects that may be initiated after implementation of the Vital projects.

Vital Projects

Project: South Florida Intermodal Logistics Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar(s) Addressed</th>
<th>Talent Supply and Education</th>
<th>Innovation and Economic Development</th>
<th>Infrastructure and Growth Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Project/Program Location</td>
<td>Project/Program Cost</td>
<td>Anticipated Start Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach County Board of County Commissioners</td>
<td>Unincorporated Western Palm Beach County</td>
<td>$ TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description

Recently, the Port of Palm Beach and Florida Crystals Corporation have agreed in principle to collaborate on the development, construction and operation of a “South Florida Intermodal Logistics Center” on 850 acres of land owned by Florida Crystals Corporation off U.S. 27, just north of South Bay in unincorporated western Palm Beach County. The project would be a distribution center where freight from South Florida ports could be taken by road and rail – then stored and routed to final destinations.

The Intermodal Logistics Center would ease intermodal freight movement by shifting westward from the increasingly congested South Florida highway and rail corridors. A freight system could be linked to the region’s seaports which are constrained with limited expansion opportunities. The 850 acre site has been approved at the Land Use designation level by Palm Beach County and the State Department of Economic Opportunity but the project still needs to obtain zoning and other development approvals, including permits.

Public-private partnerships to jointly develop and/or operate facilities have been the most successful. This project addresses a growth forecast of Florida international trade estimated to reach 2.5 million metric tons by 2025. Potential project partners would include Palm Beach County, Florida Crystals Corporation, FDOT/MPO, private railroad companies, Business Development Board of Palm Beach County, the City of Belle Glade, the City of South Bay, the City of Pahokee and regional public private stakeholders, including South Florida Sea Ports. The Inland Port feasibility study was completed in July 2007. EDA funds could be used for architecture/engineering site design, development pro-forma and/or infrastructure improvements.

Outcomes

- Estimated number of jobs created or retained – up to 20,000
- Estimated amount of private sector investment generated - $TBD
- Estimated amount of public sector investment generated - $TBD
- Funding Sources -TBD
Project: Florida Inland Port

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar(s) Addressed</th>
<th>Talent Supply and Education</th>
<th>Innovation and Economic Development</th>
<th>Infrastructure and Growth Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Project/Program Location</td>
<td>Project/Program Cost</td>
<td>Anticipated Start Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Inland Port</td>
<td>St. Lucie County</td>
<td>$ TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description

Florida Inland Port, formerly known as Treasure Coast Intermodal Campus has brought together a team of experts to conduct market, regulatory and construction feasibility assessments and help plan and design the development of a major cargo distribution center on 4,000 acres of land in western St. Lucie County. The project would have a 30-year development timeframe. EDA funds could be used for architecture/engineering site design, development pro-forma and/or infrastructure improvements.

Outcomes

- Estimated number of jobs created or retained - 12,000 to 36,000
- Estimated amount of private sector investment generated - $TBD
- Estimated amount of public sector investment generated - $TBD
- Funding Sources - TBD

Project: The Treasure Coast Research & Education Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar(s) Addressed</th>
<th>Talent Supply and Education</th>
<th>Innovation and Economic Development</th>
<th>Infrastructure and Growth Leadership</th>
<th>Business Climate and Competitiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Project/Program Location</td>
<td>Project/Program Cost</td>
<td>Anticipated Start Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie County</td>
<td>St. Lucie County</td>
<td>$ 3.6 Million</td>
<td>2013/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description

This project entails the construction of required infrastructure for phase one of the Research Park. Components of the project include: installation of a 12" water main service loop for water supply and fire protection; installation of a gravity sewer collection system utilizing a common lift station; construction of roadside swales, catch basins and culverts for stormwater conveyance; improvements to Pruitt Research Center Road including pedestrian facilities, lighting, and native plants; and the construction of a new road called "Exploration Parkway" that will run north from Pruitt Research Road through the Core Campus. This project will enable the Research Park to have adequate facilities for the generation of private sector jobs and investments, attract private sector capital, support technology based development, accelerate new development, and enhance the region's ability to capitalize on opportunities presented by free trade.

Outcomes

- Estimated number of jobs created or retained - TBD
- Estimated amount of private sector investment generated - TBD
- Estimated amount of public sector investment generated - TBD
- Funding Sources - State, Local, EDA
Project: Public Market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar(s) Addressed</th>
<th>Talent Supply and Education</th>
<th>Innovation and Economic Development</th>
<th>Infrastructure and Growth Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Project/Program Location</td>
<td>Project/Program Cost</td>
<td>Anticipated Start Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Riviera Beach</td>
<td>Marina District</td>
<td>$ 15 Million</td>
<td>2013/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description

The Riviera Beach Community Development Corporation, Inc. ("RBCDC") is seeking grant funding to develop a 40,000 to 50,000 square foot public market project to be located in Riviera Beach. The development of this project, within the boundaries of the City’s Community Redevelopment Area ("CRA"), and Marina District, and situated next to a designated food desert, will serve as an important catalyst for urban redevelopment, private sector investment and job creation to occur. More importantly, the project addresses social, environmental and community barriers to community economic development that have plagued the community redevelopment area including: Disinvestment, Crime, Marginal business development, Vacant and abandoned buildings, Lack of employment opportunities, and Lack of access to fresh foods.

EDA funds could be used for architecture/engineering site design, development pro-forma and/or infrastructure improvements.

Outcomes

- Estimated number of jobs created or retained – 450
- Estimated amount of private sector investment generated - $ TBD
- Estimated amount of public sector investment generated - $ TBD
- Funding Sources - EDA, State and Local

Project: Regional Seed Capital Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar(s) Addressed</th>
<th>Innovation and Economic Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure and Growth Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Climate and Competitiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Project/Program Location</th>
<th>Project/Program Cost</th>
<th>Anticipated Start Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCRPC</td>
<td>Treasure Coast Region</td>
<td>$ 3 Million</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description

In 2003, the Regional Planning Council established the Treasure Coast Enterprise Fund (TCEF), a small business lending program to provide access to capital to support small business development in the Treasure Coast Region. The program provides small business loans of up to $35,000 to emerging and established businesses that are expanding and creating jobs. TCEF is seeking funding to meet the financial/technical assistance needs of growing early-stage entrepreneurial businesses and proposes to establish an initial seed capital fund of approximately $3 million. This funding would provide financing for seed-stage and early-stage companies to cover a portion of the initial costs associated with bringing new products or services to market.

Outcomes

- Estimated number of jobs created or retained – 100
- Estimated amount of private sector investment generated - $6 Million
- Estimated amount of public sector investment generated - $ TBD
- Funding Sources - TBD
**Project: Lake Worth Park of Commerce**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar(s) Addressed</th>
<th>Innovation and Economic Development</th>
<th>Infrastructure and Growth Leadership</th>
<th>Business Climate and Competitiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Project/Program Location</td>
<td>Project/Program Cost</td>
<td>Anticipated Start Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lake Worth</td>
<td>Lake Worth Park of Commerce</td>
<td>$4.3 Million</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

The City of Lake Worth is seeking funding to help fully develop a 314 acre site into an operational industrial park adjacent to major transportation routes including I-95 and CSX rail, PBIA, Florida Turnpike, Port of Palm Beach and FEC rail. An Infrastructure Needs Assessment and Preliminary Engineering Study for the Project was completed (November 2010) by Camp Dresser & Mckee, Inc. In FY 2012, monies were allocated to contract engineering design services for the completion of Phase 1 (out of 3 phases). An RFP has been issued and will be reviewed through a competitive bid process mid-2012. In order to complete Phase 1, grant dollars would be used for the physical infrastructure improvements including: transportation and streets (including right-of-way acquisition); storm water collection systems; potable water distribution system; sanitary sewer collection system; electric power distribution system; and telecommunications upgrades.

**Outcomes**

- Estimated number of jobs created or retained - TBD
- Estimated amount of private sector investment generated -$ TBD
- Estimated amount of public sector investment generated -$ TBD
- Funding Sources -TBD

**Project: Research Park at Florida Atlantic University - Jupiter**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar(s) Addressed</th>
<th>Talent Supply and Education</th>
<th>Innovation and Economic Development</th>
<th>Infrastructure and Growth Leadership</th>
<th>Business Climate and Competitiveness</th>
<th>Civiv and Governance Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Project/Program Location</td>
<td>Project/Program Cost</td>
<td>Anticipated Start Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Jupiter and Research Park at Florida Atlantic University</td>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td>$15 Million</td>
<td>2013/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

The Florida Atlantic Research and Development Authority (FARDA), an independent non-taxing special district organized under Florida Statutes Chapter 159, Part V, and Endeavour Sustainable Investments (ESi) propose to collaborate on the establishment of a new research and development park in close proximity to the research assets of Scripps Florida, Max Planck Florida Institute and Florida Atlantic University (FAU) in northern Palm Beach County. The aim of the project is to capture economic and creative energy emerging from the research institutes that can be translated into sustainable economic development in the life science industry for South Florida.
In the first phase of the project, ESI will acquire land in proximity to FAU, and develop a 40,000 sf building in which it will locate companies it has invested in. A second building will follow when feasible. The second phase of the project involves FARDA, which uses the brand name Research Park at Florida Atlantic University, assuming outstanding debt on the land and building and taking title to both. The Research Park will then own and operate the research park with ESI’s collaboration and with the understanding that ESI will continue to place its investment companies in the Research Park to contribute to the overall economic development strategy of this region.

Outcomes

- Estimated number of jobs created or retained - TBD
- Estimated amount of private sector investment generated - $ TBD
- Estimated amount of public sector investment generated - $ TBD
- Funding Sources - TBD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar(s) Addressed</th>
<th>Talent Supply and Education</th>
<th>Innovation and Economic Development</th>
<th>Infrastructure and Growth Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Project/Program Location</td>
<td>Project/Program Cost</td>
<td>Anticipated Start Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fellsmere</td>
<td>CR 512 approximately 0.5 miles west of 86th Street</td>
<td>$ 700,000</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description

This project would help to expand the Fellsmere agricultural industry cluster by developing an access road pair to provide access to a new agricultural business consisting of a commercial scale, state-of-the-art aquaculture program harvesting Grade 10 prawns, cobia, oysters, and sea asparagus in addition to algae and methane production and livestock feed byproducts. The access road pair will also open nearly 600 acres of land to additional industrial development by providing access and requisite utilities. The new business will also contain a research and development consortium comprising Florida Organic Aquaculture in partnership with Harbor Branch, Florida Institute of Technology and Texas Tech University. The project is located in a Qualified Census Tract and a Brownfield Area. The access road pair will consist of approximately 3,600 lf of roadway providing access to the site of the new business that will develop 100 acres of underperforming lands. Approximately 52 permanent full-time jobs will be created.

Outcomes

- Estimated number of jobs created or retained - 52
- Estimated amount of private sector investment generated - $ TBD
- Estimated amount of public sector investment generated - $ TBD
- Funding Sources - TBD
Project: Regional Provision of Natural Gas Fueling Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar(s) Addressed</th>
<th>Talent Supply and Education</th>
<th>Innovation and Economic Development</th>
<th>Infrastructure and Growth Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Project/Program Location</td>
<td>Project/Program Cost</td>
<td>Anticipated Start Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional partnership TBD</td>
<td>I-95 Corridor throughout the Region</td>
<td>$2.5 Million per fueling station</td>
<td>2013-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description

The United States has a proven supply of over 100 years of natural gas. Technologies exist for a competitive conversion of vehicular fuel source from gasoline and diesel to natural gas. This project will implement natural gas fueling stations or pumps within existing stations along the entire I-95 corridor to allow both the general public and the transport industry an alternative fuel source that is proven to be more cost efficient and less harmful to the environment. Major firms within the transport industry and the natural gas industry have already begun the conversion of fleets to natural gas in heavily traveled corridors and provide a willing private partner in the implementation of the project.

Outcomes

- Estimated number of jobs created or retained - 5 per station
- Estimated amount of private sector investment generated - $1.5 Million per station
- Estimated amount of public sector investment generated - $1.0 Million per station
- Funding Sources - Private, Local, State, EDA

Project: Regional Cluster Industry Study and Development Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar(s) Addressed</th>
<th>Talent Supply and Education</th>
<th>Innovation and Economic Development</th>
<th>Business Climate and Competitiveness</th>
<th>Civic and Governance Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Project/Program Location</td>
<td>Project/Program Cost</td>
<td>Anticipated Start Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRPC</td>
<td>Treasure Coast Region</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description

This project proposes to establish a bottom-up regional industry cluster study and development strategy to enhance the growth and development of regional industry clusters with high-wage job growth prospects. The study would first collect and establish detailed baseline data on cluster growth and dynamics. Second, the study would use survey methodology to conduct a qualitative assessment of issues and trends facing key regional emerging and star clusters including Defense & Security; Information Technology & Telecommunications; Transportation & Logistics; Life Sciences and Manufacturing Supercsport. Lastly, the study would provide policy and action recommendations to promote the growth and development of industry clusters that would most effectively produce significant job growth prospects given existing regional resources, talent and innovation.

Outcomes

- Estimated number of jobs created or retained - TBD
- Estimated amount of private sector investment generated - TBD
- Estimated amount of public sector investment generated - TBD
- Funding Sources - Private, Local, State, EDA
Suggested Projects

**Project: Pahokee Plaza Brownfield Redevelopment Site**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar(s) Addressed</th>
<th>Innovation and Economic Development</th>
<th>Business Climate and Competitiveness</th>
<th>Quality of Life and Quality Places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Project/Program Location</td>
<td>Project/Program Cost</td>
<td>Anticipated Start Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pahokee</td>
<td>Lake Okeechobee Southeastern area, surrounding 4 municipalities</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

The TCRPC has been working with the City of Pahokee to advance the redevelopment of a formerly abandoned commercial plaza in the City limits. The project site has been remediated through a cleanup subgrant provided by the Treasure Coast Brownfields Program funded by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Additionally, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection has issued a Site Rehabilitation Completion Order. The City of Pahokee is seeking to redevelop the property for commercial and job creation purposes.

**Outcomes**

- Estimated number of jobs created or retained - TBD
- Estimated amount of private sector investment generated - $ TBD
- Estimated amount of public sector investment generated - $ TBD
- Funding Sources - Private, TCRPC (Brownfields Program), Local, EDA

**Project: Port of Ft. Pierce**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar(s) Addressed</th>
<th>Innovation and Economic Development</th>
<th>Infrastructure and Growth Leadership</th>
<th>Business Climate and Competitiveness</th>
<th>Quality of Life and Quality Places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Project/Program Location</td>
<td>Project/Program Cost</td>
<td>Anticipated Start Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie County Port Authority</td>
<td>Treasure Coast Region</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

The Florida Ports Council in its newly released *Charting a Course for Economic Success: The Five-Year Florida Seaport Mission Plan 2012 to 2016* suggests that while St. Lucie County continues to explore the strategic options for the Port, the Port is focused on advancing its mission statement, “Broaden and strengthen the economic base of the regional community by providing adequate infrastructure and development processes for mixed-use Port development.” TCRPC will continue to monitor developments at the Port and will provide assistance as appropriate to advance the Port’s mission statement.

**Outcomes**

- Estimated number of jobs created or retained - TBD
- Estimated amount of private sector investment generated - $ TBD
- Estimated amount of public sector investment generated - $ TBD
- Funding Sources - State, Local, EDA
Project: Fellsmere Corporate Research Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar(s) Addressed</th>
<th>Innovation and Economic Development</th>
<th>Infrastructure and Growth Leadership</th>
<th>Business Climate and Competitiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Project/Program Location</td>
<td>Project/Program Cost</td>
<td>Anticipated Start Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fellsmere</td>
<td>Fellsmere</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description

This project is not active at this time, but may become active at a future time should necessary and sufficient conditions prevail.

Outcomes

- Estimated number of jobs created or retained - TBD
- Estimated amount of private sector investment generated - $ TBD
- Estimated amount of public sector investment generated - $ TBD
- Funding Sources - Local, State, EDA

Project: Regional Aviation Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar(s) Addressed</th>
<th>Innovation and Economic Development</th>
<th>Infrastructure and Growth Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Project/Program Location</td>
<td>Project/Program Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sebastian</td>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description

This project is not active at this time, but may become active at a future time should necessary and sufficient conditions prevail.

Outcomes

- Estimated number of jobs created or retained - TBD
- Estimated amount of private sector investment generated - $ TBD
- Estimated amount of public sector investment generated - $ TBD
- Funding Sources - TBD
Project: Martin County Fiber Optic Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar(s) Addressed</th>
<th>Talent Supply and Education</th>
<th>Innovation and Economic Development</th>
<th>Infrastructure and Growth Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Project/Program Location</td>
<td>Project/Program Cost</td>
<td>Anticipated Start Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin County</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description

This project has essentially been completed but the project slot will be kept open to accommodate potential projects in the Region to enhance and continue to build-out the regional broadband network.

Outcomes

- Estimated number of jobs created or retained - TBD
- Estimated amount of private sector investment generated - $ TBD
- Estimated amount of public sector investment generated - $ TBD
- Funding Sources - TBD

Project: I-95 Interchange/Overpass at 69th Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar(s) Addressed</th>
<th>Innovation and Economic Development</th>
<th>Infrastructure and Growth Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Project/Program Location</td>
<td>Project/Program Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fellsmere</td>
<td>I-95 Interchange/Overpass at 69th Avenue - Fellsmere</td>
<td>$25 Million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description

The future land use envisioned within Fellsmere on the 24,000 acres of land straddling I-95 envisions new sustainable mixed use communities and regional employment activity centers. Primary access to these lands via a new I-95 interchange/overpass at 66th Avenue is set forth in the Indian River County’s Long Range Transportation Plan. Private investment is expected as part of this project through the mandatory impact fees that would be forthcoming from the development. The impetus for this interchange/overpass will be a major employment generator to be located within an employment activity center.

Outcomes

- Estimated number of jobs created or retained - 250
- Estimated amount of private sector investment generated - $ 15 Million
- Estimated amount of public sector investment generated - $ 10 Million
- Funding Sources - Private, Local, State, EDA

---

9 For the past decade, Martin County’s telecommunications network which connected schools and other public facilities relied on leased lines from the local cable company for its backbone. Prior to the end of the lease with the cable company in 2010, the cable provider indicated its costs to provide continued access to its network to the County would increase significantly. Faced with the prospect of rapidly escalating costs the County, through its Information Technology Department embarked on a plan to build its own telecommunications network. The Community Broadband Network (CBN) was completed in 2011 at a cost of about $4.14 million and runs approximately 154 miles throughout the county. In addition to serving the County facilities and the school district, the towns of Jupiter Island, Sewell’s Point, the City of Stuart, and Martin Health Systems take full advantage of the CBN’s capabilities.
## Project: All Aboard Florida

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar(s) Addressed</th>
<th>Innovation and Economic Development</th>
<th>Infrastructure and Growth Leadership</th>
<th>Business Climate and Competitiveness</th>
<th>Civic and Governance Systems</th>
<th>Quality of Life and Quality Places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Project/Program Location</th>
<th>Project/Program Cost</th>
<th>Anticipated Start Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida East Coast Industries, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1 Billion</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

Florida East Coast Industries (FECI) is developing a privately owned, operated and maintained intercity passenger rail service that will give business and leisure passengers a new convenient, environmentally friendly and cost-effective way to travel between South Florida and Orlando. The new route will feature passenger service in the existing FEC rail corridor between Miami and Cocoa and the creation of new tracks into Orlando. 200 of 230 miles of Right-of-Way are already in place and have been in service as an operating railroad for over a century. This allows for passenger service between South Florida and Orlando to be up and running in 2014. FECI would own, operate and manage the passenger rail line. Florida’s taxpayers will have no ongoing construction or operating risks.

**Outcomes**

- Estimated number of jobs created or retained - TBD
- Estimated amount of private sector investment generated - $ 1 Billion
- Estimated amount of public sector investment generated - $ TBD
- Funding Sources - TBD

## Project: FEC/Amtrak Intercity Passenger Rail Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar(s) Addressed</th>
<th>Innovation and Economic Development</th>
<th>Infrastructure and Growth Leadership</th>
<th>Business Climate and Competitiveness</th>
<th>Civic and Governance Systems</th>
<th>Quality of Life and Quality Places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Project/Program Location</th>
<th>Project/Program Cost</th>
<th>Anticipated Start Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Florida’s East Coast</td>
<td>$ 250 Million</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

The FEC/Amtrak project will restore passenger rail service on the FEC rail corridor between Jacksonville and West Palm Beach, where Amtrak service will be routed through a new FEC/CSX rail connection to the CSX rail corridor, and service will continue south on the CSX into Miami International Airport. Eight new stations are proposed in St. Augustine, Daytona Beach, Titusville, Cocoa, Melbourne, Vero Beach, Fort Pierce, and Stuart. The project will create a new mobility option for the 8.3 million residents residing Florida's east coast counties, and interconnect major activity hubs including historic downtowns, entertainment destinations, Florida's airports/seaports, and educational facilities.
Outcomes

- Estimated number of jobs created or retained - TBD
- Estimated amount of private sector investment generated - $ TBD
- Estimated amount of public sector investment generated - $ TBD
- Funding Sources - TBD

Project: Southeast Florida Commuter Rail Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar(s) Addressed</th>
<th>Innovation and Economic Development</th>
<th>Infrastructure and Growth Leadership</th>
<th>Business Climate and Competitiveness</th>
<th>Civic and Governance Systems</th>
<th>Quality of Life and Quality Places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Project/Program Location</td>
<td>Project/Program Cost</td>
<td>Anticipated Start Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Palm Beach, Broward and Miami-Dade Counties</td>
<td>$ TBD</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description

This project involves the introduction of commuter rail service on an 85-mile portion of the FEC rail corridor, complementing the existing Tri-Rail commuter service, and providing expanded mobility and economic development in Palm Beach, Broward, and Miami-Dade counties. The service will create a new efficient transit connection through the hearts of 28 densely-populated municipalities, improve north-south mobility, encourage stronger east-west connections, promote redevelopment and revitalization, and enhance freight movement.

Reinstating passenger service in the FEC corridor will provide an efficient option to driving on congested streets and highways and a much-needed integrated transportation link essential for smart growth management, sustainability and a vital economy.

Once fully implemented, commuter rail on the FEC, integrated with other transit projects in southeast Florida, has the potential to generate tens of thousands of jobs and billions in short- and long-term economic impacts through construction, operations, maintenance and Transit Oriented Development (TOD). As in other areas around the country, TOD realized over time will expand the regional tax base and contribute to the financial stability of communities along the corridor.

Outcomes

- Estimated number of jobs created or retained - TBD
- Estimated amount of private sector investment generated - $ TBD
- Estimated amount of public sector investment generated - $ TBD
- Funding Sources - TBD
### Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vital Projects Action Plan Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** TCRPC
Introduction

Last October, Governor Rick Scott directed Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) Secretary Herschel T. Vinyard Jr., and South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) Executive Director Melissa L. Meeker to work collaboratively with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to expand water quality improvement projects and achieve the ultra-low state water quality standard established for the Everglades.

Months of scientific and technical discussions led to the development of a comprehensive plan, the Everglades Restoration Strategies, which the FDEP will enforce through state-issued permits and consent orders. The plan calls for the District to construct approximately 6,500 acres of additional state-of-the-art stormwater treatment areas and nearly 110,000 acre-feet of associated water storage. Many core project components will be designed, constructed and operational within six years.

This plan to improve water quality builds upon Florida’s $1.8 billion investment in Everglades water quality improvements to ensure achievement of the 10 part per billion ambient water quality standard for phosphorus in the Everglades Protection Area. The schedule for implementing new projects balances economic realities with engineering, permitting, science and construction limitations. The plan proposes to utilize a combination of state and district revenues to complete the projects.

Ms. Meeker became Executive Director of the SFWMD in June of 2011. Previously, she served as Deputy Secretary for Water Policy and Ecosystem Projects for the FDEP. Her record of public service with FDEP also includes appointment to the Environmental Regulation Commission and leading FDEP’s Southeast Regulatory District. She served on the SFWMD Governing Board from 2007-2009, and in 2004 as Chair of the Governor’s Commission for a Sustainable South Florida.

Recommendation

For informational purposes only.
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: September 21, 2012 Council Meeting
Subject: “All Aboard Florida” Passenger Rail Proposal Update - Presentation by Jose Gonzalez, Vice President, Flagler Development

Introduction

The purpose of this item is to provide an update on the “All Aboard Florida” passenger rail proposal currently being developed by Flagler Development/Florida East Coast Industries (Flagler). The proposal represents a private initiative to introduce intercity passenger rail service between Southeast Florida and Central Florida with four stations: downtown Miami, downtown Fort Lauderdale, downtown West Palm Beach, and Orlando. The proposal also includes a potential connection to the SunRail commuter rail system that is currently under construction. Flagler has suggested that ultimately the service could be extended to provide service to Tampa and Jacksonville.

According to discussions with representatives of Flagler, the company has determined the project appears to be financially feasible. Accordingly, Flagler is currently advancing plans for preliminary engineering and station locations. Additional evaluation is also underway regarding ridership, project costs, financing, and related issues. The company has noted the “All Aboard Florida” service would not conflict with any currently proposed passenger rail initiatives on the corridor, including the proposed Amtrak/FEC Corridor service as well as future commuter rail service from Palm Beach to Miami-Dade county.

Recommendation

For informational purposes only.
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: September 21, 2012 Council Meeting
Subject: The Good Government Initiative: A Regional Approach – Presentation by Katy Sorenson, President and CEO, the Good Government Initiative at the University of Miami

Introduction

The mission of the Good Government Initiative (GGI) is to cultivate leaders of excellence in South Florida through the development and training of elected officials as well as those aspiring to run for office, and to engage the community in its governance through outreach and education.

Background

The GGI at the University of Miami is a program to educate elected officials at the state and local level on the important issues of governance. Each year, from late August to November, GGI offers a certificate program for elected officials who receive more than 60 hours of training in government operations in South Florida. The inaugural class was completed in December of 2011. The Initiative also sponsors a series of Community Conversations to bring together elected officials and the public to consider issues important to governance in our community. Additionally, GGI periodically offers an all-day workshop for citizens who are considering running for office.

Katy Sorenson, President and CEO, will give a more detailed overview of GGI. Ms. Sorenson served on the Miami-Dade Board of County Commissioners, was on the executive committee of the South Florida Regional Planning Council, was Chair of the South Florida Regional Transportation Organization, and served on the Board of Directors of the Florida Association of Counties.

Recommendation

For informational purposes only.
TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members

From: Staff

Date: September 21, 2012 Council Meeting

Subject: Council Work Program Update

Introduction

Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council has many responsibilities providing regional coordination, technical assistance, and promoting communication among local governments, state, federal, and non-governmental agencies and citizens. Council meetings often focus on several of these activities, including local government comprehensive plan amendment reviews, the Intergovernmental Coordination and Review Log, and the Development of Regional Impact process. However, Council is involved in many other planning activities that are not featured regularly at Council meetings. These include special planning projects and initiatives that represent the largest part of Council’s annual work program and budget, and are the result of requests from local governments and other agencies. The purpose of this report is to present an update on the special planning projects and initiatives currently in Council’s work program.

Background

Council’s work program is continuously changing as older projects are completed and new projects are added. The attached document provides a summary of Council’s special planning projects. Thirty-one projects are featured, including 7 recently completed projects, 17 current projects, and 7 future projects. At future Council meetings staff will showcase individual projects that are relevant and useful to Treasure Coast local governments. This will also help to keep Council informed on the progress of these projects.

Recommendation

For informational purposes only.

Attachment
Recently Completed Projects

**Treasure Coast Brownfields Program**
In September 2009, the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) received funding from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to provide a Revolving Loan Fund to assist funding cleanup planning and remediation activities in communities in the Region. The purpose of the program is to render these contaminated sites usable again for development. Cleanup projects were undertaken with three project partners – Palm Beach County and the cities of Pahokee and Fort Pierce at the following brownfield sites:

- Pahokee Plaza – 843 U.S. Highway 441, Pahokee, FL
- Former Pike Utilities Site – 4220 Charleston Street, Lake Worth, FL
- H.D. King Site – 301 North Indian River Drive, Fort Pierce, FL

Under the terms of the grant, TCRPC provided direct subgrants to each of its local government partners to conduct cleanup activities. Cleanup activities under this grant have been completed at all project sites. Additionally, all three project sites were formally designated as brownfield sites under the Florida Brownfields Redevelopment Program by their respective local governing bodies. This designation provides for further redevelopment incentives under the State program. The work schedule for this project was from October 2009 to September 2012.

**St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) – Public Involvement Plan**
The St. Lucie TPO is required to develop and update its Public Involvement Plan to ensure adequate public awareness and interaction in transportation planning activities. TCRPC co-authored the Martin-St. Lucie 2035 Regional Long-Range Transportation Plan Update in 2011 with the Martin Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and St. Lucie TPO. The work schedule for this project was from March 2011 to May 2012.

**Treasure Coast Regional Evacuation Study Depth Analysis Atlas**
This Atlas was prepared as part of the Statewide Regional Evacuation Study Program. The Study is a cooperative effort of Florida Division of Emergency Management (FDEM), the Florida Regional Planning Councils, and the county emergency management agencies. The Atlas is an additional volume to the original Hurricane Evacuation Study completed for the region in 2010 by TCRPC. The purpose of this Atlas is to provide maps that depict storm surge flood depths from hurricanes of five different intensities for the Treasure Coast Region. Factors used in development of the maps included storm intensity and forward speed, astronomical tides, surge depths, and wave heights. The work schedule for this project was from October 2011 to May 2012.

**County Post-Disaster Redevelopment Plan (PDRP)**
Martin County partnered with TCRPC to develop the County’s first PDRP funded by the State Homeland Security Grant Program through the FDEM. These plans define long-term recovery
policies, post-disaster mitigation strategies and operational procedures for redevelopment. Primary areas addressed include: economic redevelopment, housing and community redevelopment, health and human services, infrastructure and public facilities, and environmental issues. Issues addressed within the plan include; vulnerabilities, fiscal and regulatory policies, social and economic impacts and infrastructure capacities. Council and the County worked in cooperation with public, private, and non-profit stakeholders through a series of consensus building discussions over a 12-month period to produce the PDRP. The work schedule for this project was from October 2011 to June 2012.

**Treasure Coast Regional Vulnerability Analysis**
Council was awarded the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program funds through the Federal Emergency Management Agency to develop a Regional Vulnerability Analysis. This analysis examined vulnerabilities with potential regional impacts. Hazards examined included: high winds from tropical storms and hurricanes, tidal and inland flooding, storm surge, sea level rise and coastal erosion, and wildfires. The work schedule for this project was from July 2011 to June 2012.

**Chemical Facility Hazards Analyses**
Council partnered with St. Lucie County and the FDEM to provide technical assistance to St. Lucie County by conducting site visits and compliance assistance to Extremely Hazardous Substances (EHS) storage facilities. Staff monitored quantities of chemicals, and developed a risk and vulnerability analyses for each facility for the County Fire Rescue District and Division of Emergency Management. The database is used to develop hazardous material emergency plans to respond and recover from release or spill of toxic substances. The work schedule for this project was from July 2011 to June 2012.

**Radiological Field Operations Guide and Training**
Council worked with the FDEM to facilitate radiological emergency planning and training for State Emergency Response Team personnel. There are thirty counties included in the training that are classified as risk, host or ingestion pathway counties within the impacted distance of nuclear power plants. Council staff provided support to county and regional nuclear power plant exercises through evaluation and logistical support. In addition, staff updated the Florida Field Operations Guide for First Responders for radiological detection and response. The work schedule for this project was from February 2011 to January 2012.

**Current Projects**

**Seven50 – Southeast Florida Prosperity Plan**
Seven50 (“seven counties, 50 years”) is a comprehensive planning effort to build consensus around long- and short-term regional strategies for establishing a more prosperous and desirable future for the seven counties in the Southeast Florida Region (Monroe, Miami-Dade, Broward, Palm Beach, Martin, St. Lucie, and Indian River). This investment plan is being developed to help ensure stronger, more diverse communities, create jobs and a more resilient economy, establish short- and long-term regional infrastructure needs, and protect the fragile ecosystem in what is quickly becoming one of the world’s most important mega-regions. Seven50 has been made possible by a grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and is jointly led by South Florida and Treasure Coast Regional Planning Councils and the Southeast
Florida Regional Partnership, a unique collaboration of more than 200 public, private, and civic stakeholders. Seven50 is mapping a strategy to prioritize and focus future local, state, and federal investment and policies. The overarching purpose of the plan is the best-possible quality of life for the more than six million residents of the region. The plan is being devised through a series of public summits, workshops, online outreach and high-impact studies led by the region and the nation’s top thinkers. The work schedule for this project is from October 2010 to February 2014. For more information, visit www.Seven50.org.

Statewide Energy Resiliency Strategy
The U.S. Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration has awarded Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council (TBRPC) funding to prepare a Statewide Energy Resiliency Strategy. TBRPC has contracted with TCRPC and other regional planning councils in the state to conduct analysis and collect information in their respective planning areas. The project involves running economic impact scenarios on the effects of diversifying our energy portfolio and examines ways to become less reliant on imported oil. Information gathered will be used to develop strategies to improve energy resiliency and create domestic energy jobs. The work schedule for this project is from December 2011 to February 2013.

Treasure Coast Brownfields Program
In September 2011, Council received a $1,000,000 Brownfields Coalition Assessment Grant from the EPA to conduct community-wide assessments across the region at brownfield sites potentially contaminated with hazardous substances and petroleum. Coalition grant partners consist of TCRPC, Palm Beach County, City of West Palm Beach and City of Fort Pierce. Environmental assessment activities have been initiated and are planned to be undertaken on priority redevelopment sites identified by the respective coalition grant partners as having the best outlook for the creation of mixed-use development, commercial redevelopment and provision of open space. The work schedule for this project is from October 2011 to September 2014.

Partnership Planning Program - Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy
In July 2011, the U.S. Economic Development Administration provided TCRPC a Partnership Planning Program grant to undertake regional economic development planning in the Treasure Coast Region. The central focus of this funded planning effort is the development of a plan, the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS). The CEDS is designed to guide the economic growth of the region and is the result of an ongoing, participatory planning process that addresses the economic problems and potential of the region. The strategy reflects local economic development needs and priorities and recommends a regional approach to achieving sustainable economic development. Implementation of the CEDS over the next five years depends on the cooperation and collaboration of many public and private sectors partners. The strategic projects, programs, and activities identified to be undertaken in the CEDS were selected because they:

- Advance innovation and entrepreneurship;
- Have a high degree of public commitment;
- Help to diversify the regional economy;
- Support the development of existing and emerging traded clusters;
• Reshape the workforce to meet the needs of future industry clusters;
• Are identified as priority projects in local government economic development plans;
• Enhance long-term sustainability;
• Have regional economic impacts; and
• Address a critical need(s) to move the Region forward.

The work schedule for this project is from January 2011 to December 2013.

Florida Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Guidebook
This project is a collaborative effort with Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to develop a state guidebook to help communities in Florida interested in advancing transit-oriented development opportunities in their local jurisdictions. The guidebook builds on a previous effort, A Framework for TOD in Florida, which developed benchmarks related to density, intensity, and physical characteristics necessary to achieve a successful TOD. This project has four components: 1) the creation of an online TOD database (completed); 2) an evaluation of a cross-section of Florida communities as their readiness to support TOD (completed); 3) the creation of model land use policies and a model land development code; and 4) a training program for local governments interested in being educated about supporting TODs. The foundation of the project is to provide resources for local governments within the region and across the state. The work schedule for this project is from March 2010 to December 2012.

Broward Boulevard Gateway Implementation Master Plan
The Broward Boulevard Gateway Implementation Project is an effort to improve all aspects of Broward Boulevard into downtown Fort Lauderdale as they relate to coordinating transit projects, improving the pedestrian environment, illustrating potential redevelopment scenarios on the corridor, and analyzing physical and policy impediments to redevelopment. This project puts an emphasis on public involvement with many different opportunities provided for citizens to participate. This is a multi-agency effort that includes: the City of Fort Lauderdale; Fort Lauderdale Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA); the Broward MPO; the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA); FDOT; Broward County; Broward County Transit; the South Florida Regional Planning Council; and the TCRPC. The work schedule for this project is from February 2012 to December 2012.

Riviera Beach - Continuing Services Agreement
Council staff has been working closely with the City of Riviera Beach and the Riviera Beach CRA to update the CRA plan, Comprehensive Plan, Land Development Regulations, and to refine the Marine District South Master Plan. This continuing services agreement enables Council staff to assist the CRA, with any requests pertaining to the revitalization of the CRA areas beyond the scope of previous agreements. The work schedule for this project is from June 2012 and is ongoing.

Riviera Beach - Broadway Corridor Master Plan
Council is working with the City of Riviera Beach, the Riviera Beach CRA and others to produce a detailed redevelopment plan for Broadway, Avenue E, and the Marine District North in Riviera Beach. These areas are bounded by 11th Street to the south and Blue Heron Boulevard to the north including areas east of Broadway, north of Bicentennial Park, referred to as Marine
Land Use/Planning Assistance to Palm Beach MPO
As part of Council’s long-term relationship with the Palm Beach MPO, Council provides continuing services including land use planning, design, facilitation, project evaluation, transit-oriented development, economic analysis, and related tasks. Council staff serves as a member of the MPO’s Technical Advisory Committee and routinely participates in the MPO’s Citizen’s Advisory Committee and Bicycle/Greenways/Pedestrian Advisory Committee. In addition to continuing services for land use/transportation as requested, Council assistance is secured through task orders for specific projects. Examples of these projects include:

- **Evaluation of Passenger Rail Planning Efforts in Southeast Florida** (described separately)
- **Regional Greenways and Trails Plan** (described separately)
- **20th Street Corridor Plan in Boca Raton.** This work involves: 1) development of land use/transportation plan to identify mobility improvements for 20th Street corridor between Florida Atlantic University’s main campus and SE Federal Highway; 2) includes bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities; 3) land use analyses; and 4) conceptual plans for infill development and redevelopment.
- **Boynton Beach – Model TOD Policies and Regulations.** The effort involves: 1) analysis of TOD opportunities at existing Tri-Rail station and planned FEC Corridor station near Boynton Beach Boulevard; 2) review of current comprehensive plan and land development regulations; 3) development of conceptual plan for transit-supportive pattern of infill and redevelopment; and 4) development of proposed amendments to comprehensive plan and land development regulations based upon conceptual plan.
- **TOD Economic Development Program.** This program involves: 1) identification, mapping, and evaluation of vacant and underutilized sites proximate to Tri-Rail stations; 2) conceptual station area planning; 3) evaluation of relevant local government regulations; and 4) GIS map development.
- **Coordination with Southeast Florida Transportation Council (SEFTC).** SEFTC is the formal transportation planning entity designated by Florida Statutes and comprised of the chair or designee of the Palm Beach, Broward, and Miami-Dade MPO governing boards. SEFTC serves as a formal forum for policy consideration and communication to carry out regional initiatives agreed upon by the MPOs in the three counties, including the development and implementation of the regional long-range transportation plan.

The work schedule for this project is from July 2009 to June 2013, with an option to be extended through 2015.

**Regional Greenways and Trails Plan**
The Regional Greenways and Trails Project involves a multi-agency, multi-disciplinary planning effort to develop a comprehensive plan of greenways, trails, bicycle facilities,
saltwater/freshwater paddling trails in the seven-county Southeast Florida region. Developed in GIS, the Plan will also integrate locations of park/recreational facilities, conservation areas, sites for eco-tourism and heritage tourism, and select locations of cultural, educational, and historic significance. A Greenways and Trails Working Group, comprised of local governments, agencies, organizations, and the private sector, will help in formation of the plan, prioritization of facilities, and implementation. Opportunity linkages to the north, west, and south into other counties will be identified. The plan is designed to be integrated into the plans of the MPOs, local governments, agencies, and Seven50 Plan. The work schedule for this project is from June 2010 to December 2012.

**Evaluation of Passenger Rail Programs in Southeast Florida**

The SEFTC, which is comprised of the MPO chairs of the Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach MPOs, requested that Council conduct an evaluation of two passenger rail planning efforts in southeast Florida: 1) the South Florida East Coast Corridor Study, led by the FDOT, which is a long-term planning effort to develop a comprehensive master plan for premium transit in Southeast Florida; and 2) the “Fast Start” proposal for Tri-Rail Coastal Service, introduced by the SFRTA, which is a short-term implementation concept to introduce Tri-Rail commuter service on the FEC rail corridor in the three counties in a five-year timeframe. The project includes in-depth interviews with both agencies, a comparison of project approaches with national passenger rail examples, and a report with recommendations for the region to advance. The project includes development of an educational presentation regarding passenger rail planning, funding, and development. Report recommendations were unanimously adopted by SEFTC in July 2012, and the recommendations are scheduled for presentation to the MPOs in September and October 2012. The work schedule for this project is from January 2012 to October 2012.

**Continuing Assistance to SFRTA**

As part of Council’s long-term relationship with the SFRTA, Council provides varied forms of assistance as requested, including land use, planning, education, public outreach, project evaluation and development, mapping, meeting facilitation, intergovernmental coordination, and other forms of assistance as requested. Work includes participation on SFRTA Planning Technical and Advisory Committee. Sample project areas under this agreement are noted below:

- **Tri-Rail Station Signage Project.** This effort includes development of iconic signage prototypes to identify Tri-Rail stations, with drawings and conceptual plans.
- **Coordination with Florida Housing Finance Corporation regarding financing of TODs.** This includes: 1) educational programs with agency staff and board of directors; 2) survey and field tour of TOD opportunities in southeast Florida; and 3) review of agency funding criteria.
- **Station TOD Development Program.** This work includes meetings with local government staff, developers, and others as requested regarding opportunities for infill development and redevelopment to advance transit-supportive conditions around Tri-Rail stations.
- **Pedestrian/Bicycle Station Access Plan.** This work includes: 1) identification of existing pedestrian and bicycle network within half-mile of TOD station area
surrounding existing Tri-Rail stations; 2) field work and photography to confirm GIS map data; and 3) identification and prioritization of gaps in network.

The work schedule for this project is from 2010 to 2015.

**South Florida East Coast Corridor Study (SFECC)**
Council is providing FDOT station planning, evaluation and assistance as part of a larger planning effort to develop a long-term strategy for passenger rail development with multiple implementation phases. The intended outcome of the study is the selection of a System Master Plan by the three MPOs to establish a long-term (20+ years) transportation strategy, which is proposed to be built in cost-effective segments phased in over time, and a “Locally Preferred Alternative” to represent the short-term project for which federal funds could be pursued initially. Council’s assistance is focused on the identification of station locations along with their planning, evaluation, and adoption by local governments in relevant local planning and regulatory documents. This work includes interagency meetings with local government, agencies, and property owners; development and review of conceptual station plans; review of local regulatory documents; and participation in the project’s Station Area Planning Work Group. The work schedule for this project is from June 2010 to June 2013.

**County Post-Disaster Redevelopment Plans**
Council is currently developing the first PDRP for Indian River and St. Lucie Counties. This project is funded by the State Homeland Security Grant Program through the FDEM. These plans define long-term recovery policies, post-disaster mitigation strategies and operational procedures for redevelopment. Primary areas addressed include: economic redevelopment, housing and community redevelopment, health and human services, infrastructure and public facilities, and environmental issues. Issues addressed within the plan include; vulnerabilities, fiscal and regulatory policies, social and economic impacts and infrastructure capacities. Council and the Counties are working in cooperation with public, private, and non-profit stakeholders through a series of consensus building discussions to complete the PDRPs. The work schedule for this project is from October 2011 to June 2013.

**Chemical Facility Hazards Analyses**
Council has partnered with St. Lucie County and the FDEM to provide technical assistance to St. Lucie County by conducting site visits and compliance assistance to Extremely Hazardous Substances (EHS) storage facilities. Staff monitors quantities of chemicals, and develops a risk and vulnerability analyses for each facility for the County Fire Rescue District and Division of Emergency Management. The database is used to develop hazardous material emergency plans to respond and recover from release or spill of toxic substances. The work schedule for this project is from July 2012 to June 2013.

**Regional Hazardous Materials Commodity Flow Study**
The U.S. Department of Transportation in partnership with the FDEM provides funding to further the mission of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act regarding hazardous materials storage and transport. The District 10 Local Emergency Planning Committee is staffed by TCRPC. The Committee membership is made up by the region’s fire rescue, law enforcement, chemical facility owners/operators, health, safety and emergency
management agency personnel. Each year the Committee and staff conduct a regional planning project that enhances efforts to plan for response to hazardous materials incidents. The Hazardous Materials Commodity Flow Study project analyzes the instances of hazardous materials that are transported on major roadways within the region. Data is gathered on placards displayed on transport vehicles to determine the percentage of various chemical materials traversing the region. The work schedule for this project is from September 2011 to October 2013.

**Functional Needs Support Services Strategy**
The FDEM is encouraging the inclusion of the new guidelines set forth by the Department of Homeland Security/Federal Emergency Management Agency and the American Red Cross that defines Functional Needs Support Services for access and independent function of persons staying in public shelters during a disaster. Martin County is working with TCRPC to develop a strategy defining roles and responsibilities for County departments and agencies and memorandums of understanding with potential providers of resources of durable medical equipment to shelters for patrons with access and functional needs. This strategy will complement the Martin County Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan as an annex to Emergency Support Function #6 – Mass Care. The work schedule for this project is from September 2012 to December 2012.

**Future Projects**

**Glades Region Master Plan**
In February 2012, Palm Beach County signed a Cooperative Agreement with the HUD to develop a Master Plan for the Glades Region of western Palm Beach County. The Glades Region Master Plan will be a guiding document identifying the types and mix of land uses and infrastructure needed to serve planned development/redevelopment incorporating the “Livability Principles” of HUD, the U.S. Department of Transportation and the EPA partnership. Council’s role is to work with a diverse team including Palm Beach County Engineering, Palm Tran, Planning, Zoning and Building, and Water Utilities departments; Workforce Alliance; the Cities of South Bay, Belle Glade and Pahokee and the surrounding unincorporated areas; and other interested community, business and non-profit or ganizations to study and recommend ways to improve mobility, quality of life and economic sustainability of the Glades Region. The project will consider new and emerging economic development opportunities for the Glades Region and articulate those opportunities in an implementable plan. Development of the project will also include significant and meaningful public participation throughout the process. The work schedule for this project is expected to be from October 2012 to October 2014.

**Lake Worth – Dixie Corridor Master Plan**
Council staff has a long working relationship with the City of Lake Worth and the Lake Worth CRA. In fact, the 2008 Lake Worth TOD Master Plan, developed by Council staff in conjunction with the CRA, was included in the successful 2009 CRA application for NSP-2 grant funding which yielded $23 million dollars for neighborhood revitalization. The CRA has requested Council staff to consider a proposal to review the current conditions of Dixie Highway, identify impediments to redevelopment, and make proposals for preferred
redevelopment and policy changes. The work schedule for this project is expected to begin in spring 2013.

**Stuart Beach/Jensen Beach Park – Beach Restaurant Design Process**
Martin County is considering a public design process for gathering ideas for the rehab-redevelopment of the existing County-owned, beachfront restaurants and beach rental facilities at Jensen Beach and Stuart Beach. The current facilities are in need of repair and do not take full advantage of that location’s potential as the only oceanside restaurants in Martin County. Council staff has been asked to develop a proposal that includes a public involvement process to explore programmatic and logistical components of the future facilities. Conceptual designs and construction cost estimates will be produced during this process to provide direction in a future Request for Proposals. The work schedule for this project is expected to begin in fall 2012.

**Waterways Plan for Martin and St. Lucie Counties**
In this work effort, Council will lead a multi-agency, multi-disciplinary effort to plan, evaluate, and develop a Waterways Plan for Martin and St. Lucie Counties. Key partners in this effort will include the Martin County MPO, St. Lucie TPO, Florida Inland Navigational District, local governments, agencies, and the private sector. The two counties contain extensive waterways, including the Intracoastal Waterway, St. Lucie River, and significant canals such as the St. Lucie Canal, which provides a connection to Lake Okeechobee. These facilities, along with creeks and tributaries, provide waterway connections for residents, business owners, visitors, and marine life. The plan will address a range of issues, including transportation, land use, economics, natural systems, resource protection, public access, and parks and recreation. The process will include facilitation of a project steering committee, which will assist with due diligence and help with community-wide education throughout the process. The planning effort is modeled after Council’s prior work to develop the Intracoastal Waterway Plan for Palm Beach County, which was the first of its kind in Florida. The work schedule for this project is expected to be from November 2012 to June 2014.

**Post-Disaster Redevelopment Implementation Strategy**
Council will be working with Palm Beach County Emergency Management to implement certain sections of the PDRP developed in 2005. Council staff will prepare and deliver briefings to County departments and agencies required to engage the PDRP during recovery, administer applicable training on PDRP procedures and policies, and develop and conduct a table top exercise to test the current plan and familiarize County personnel on the Plan. This project is funded by the State Homeland Security Grant Program through the FDEM. The current plan defines long-term recovery policies, post-disaster mitigation strategies and operational procedures for redevelopment. The work schedule for this project is expected to be from October 2012 to June 2013.

**Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness Exercise**
This annual grant with the FDEM and the Department of Transportation is conducted in two components, planning and training. The planning portion includes, regional hazardous materials response team needs assessment surveys, hazardous facility summaries, community workshops and facility outreach to those facilities maintaining annual chemical reporting to the State of Florida. The training portion of the grant includes providing courses to public sector first
responders in awareness, operations and technician level hazardous materials training. The work schedule for this project is expected to be from September 2012 to October 2013.

**Architectural Design Guidelines for the Riviera Beach CRA**

Council will develop architectural design guidelines to support the vision of the Riviera Beach Citizens’ Master Plan and Marine District and Broadway corridor development plans. The guidelines will establish an architectural harmony throughout the districts and corridor, illustrate building frontage treatments that encourage the greatest pedestrian activity, and support the regional architecture of south Florida and the Palm Beaches. The guidelines will address:

1. Building articulation (achieving appropriate mass and scale);
2. Building composition (base, middle, top);
3. Building frontages (activating the street);
4. Building fenestration (relationship between windows and walls, proportions of opening, finishes, etc.);
5. Special treatments (context-sensitive applications); and
6. Specific articulation of an architectural theme for Marine District South.

The guidelines will also include a description of defined architectural styles appropriate for the region and illustrate their defining features, as well as a procedural (application requirements and review process) framework in which to encourage and implement the Architectural Design Guidelines. The work schedule for this project is from January 2013 to April 2013.
MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members
From: Staff
Date: September 21, 2012 Council Meeting

Subject: Seven50 Southeast Florida Prosperity Plan Update – Presentation by Marcela Camblor-Cutsaimanis, Project Director, Southeast Florida Regional Partnership

Introduction

The Southeast Florida Regional Partnership, in association with the South Florida and Treasure Coast Regional Planning Councils, is proceeding with the creation of the Seven50 Southeast Florida Prosperity Plan (Seven50).

The goal of Seven50 is to create an investment plan to grow a more prosperous, resilient and desirable future for the seven counties in the Southeast Florida Region (Monroe, Miami-Dade, Broward, Palm Beach, Martin, St. Lucie and Indian River) over the next 50 years and beyond. Seven50 seeks to establish a comprehensive regional plan, identifying critical projects and infrastructure to improve sustainability and to 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 is working to develop Seven50 fulfilling the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD) approved work plan. Accomplishments to date include:

- An opening summit attended by close to 600 people.
- A joint transportation model for the entire seven-county Region.
- Initial discussion and preliminary acceptance regarding expansion of the Southeast Florida Climate Compact to Martin, St. Lucie and Indian River counties.
- Partnerships with Southeast Florida’s Life Sciences Corridor.
- A seven-county expansive data warehouse.
- HUD’s required Regional Assessment of Housing Impediments completed (the only mandatory element required by HUD).
- Initial data collection and national research completed.
Seven50: A Community-Based Plan

In order to gather extensive community input, the Partnership created six work groups tasked with identifying regional opportunities and challenges and recommending potential goals, objectives, and strategies in each of these areas:

1. Education, Workforce, and Economic Development
2. Development Patterns (Housing, Transportation, Healthy Communities)
3. Environment, Natural Resources, and Agriculture
4. Climate Resilience
5. Community Assets and Culture
6. Inclusive Regional Leadership & Equity

Participation in each of these work groups is voluntary. The findings and recommendations of the work groups will be integrated through the work of the overall Partnership and the Executive Committee.

An initial regional meeting of the work groups was held during the opening summit on June 27, 2012. A series of additional work group meetings will be held in each county on the following dates:

- October 11, 2012       Monroe County
- October 24, 2012       Martin County
- October 25, 2012       Indian River County
- October 26, 2012       Broward County
- November 14, 2012      St. Lucie County
- November 16, 2012      Palm Beach County
- TBD                    Miami-Dade County

A second summit to be held on January 24, 2013 at the Miami-Dade College Wolfson Center in Downtown Miami will follow the work group meetings.

Recommendation

For informational purposes only.
## COMMUNICATION PACKAGE

### September 2012

### Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRI Status Report – September 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Hobe Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article from The Florida Housing Coalition – Riviera Beach Heights in Bloom, Community Dissolved to Community Involved, July 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</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:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>4,300 DU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>650,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Research, Office, Education</td>
<td>3,900,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>180 Rooms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>
Riviera Beach Heights in Bloom
Community Dissolved to Community Involved

The 2001 CRA Redevelopment Plan—Inlet Harbor Plan—was an aggressive and unsustainable plan that relied on eminent domain and existing market conditions for success. With the demise of eminent domain in Florida for redevelopment/private purposes and the bursting of the housing market bubble, it was clear that the Inlet Harbor Plan had to be recast. This led to a successful and well attended (over 200 residents) Public Charrette process in 2007. This week long charrette, facilitated by the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council, resulted in the City of Riviera Beach Community Redevelopment Plan, adopted July 20, 2011. This plan calls for a holistic and focused redevelopment process, while remaining accountable to the resident’s wishes and vision expressed during the charrette. The redevelopment plan examines the 858 acres of the redevelopment area not as one monolithic swath, but more appropriately, in redevelopment priority areas.

With each area having its own unique redevelopment needs, this allows for much more focused efforts and the ability to accomplish more with fewer resources. In 2010, the Riviera Beach Heights neighborhood, as the largest neighborhood in the CRA, was designated as a redevelopment priority area. The Riviera Beach CRA is comprised of 858 acres. The redevelopment of waterfront properties at the Atlantic Ocean (Ocean Mall) and Intracoastal Waterway (Municipal Marina) have long been our focus. The residents in the CRA have complained that the Agency lacks a neighborhood development strategy at the same level of priority it has planned for waterfront development. The Riviera Beach Heights Neighborhood Revitalization Study changes this outlook. In response, the CRA facilitated several community meetings as well as engaged consultants—Song + Associates and Land Developers Consortium—to lead the creation of a RBH Implementation Plan.

This bold plan was supported by several key actions taken by the CRA:

1. Adoption of the plan and its immediate and future strategies for redevelopment;
2. Creation of a CHDO-eligible, community development corporation; and
3. Allocation of more than $3 million in cash and in-kind support for the new nonprofit.

The Planning Study recognized that Riviera Beach Heights is a hodgepodge of disconnected parts in an
area that drives significant regional economic benefit to the County except for this adjacent neighborhood. These benefits have not sparked any economic vitality in Riviera Beach Heights where residents have long felt ignored. The neighborhood is one of the poorest areas in the City evidenced by high rates of unemployment and residents living below poverty rates. Yet, this same community is surrounded by 5,000 jobs at the Port of Palm Beach and the nearby industrial park area. The adverse impact of foreclosures and high rates of rental properties have made the neighborhood undesirable in key blocks and these factors serve to destabilize the neighborhood.

**Impact on the Community**

The Plan is designed to have an immediate and measurable impact to the community:

1. **Empower Residents:** By forming the CDC to meet community accountability guidelines under HUD, residents have been empowered to manage change and hold the CRA and their neighbors accountable.

2. **Create Beautiful Transitions into the Neighborhood:** The Port and FEC railroad, which borders the neighborhood, gives the community a rust-belt appearance. By working together, the CRA and Port will create a beautiful transition from the Port into the neighborhood. We plan to extend a Tri-Rail stop (commuter rail between Palm Beach, Broward and Dade counties) in this neighborhood with plans for a transit oriented development.

3. **Create a Dramatic Neighborhood Design:** Working with FDOT, the CRA will leverage the multi-million dollar SR 710 expansion with infrastructure investments for streets, sidewalks and other amenities. In working with the County, the CRA will embark upon an aggressive neighborhood revitalization and stabilization program to attract homeowners and eliminate blighted conditions. Riviera Beach is not an “entitlement city” and thus redevelopment funds from HUD must come through the county.

4. **Create and Sustain a Vital Neighborhood Business District:** A welcoming environment will attract thousands of cars along Old Dixie Hwy to stop & shop to support businesses in this neighborhood. The CRA proposes to invest into a micro-loan fund to attract new businesses and help bolster existing businesses.

---

**Annetta Jenkins** is the Neighborhood Development Director for the Riviera Beach CRA and formerly the Assistant Director for Miami-Dade County Department of Housing and Community Development and the Executive Director for South Florida LISC.

**Tocarra Nicole Thomas** is a Planner for the Riviera Beach Community Redevelopment Agency’s Neighborhood Development Services Department.