Florida Regional Councils Association – Monthly Activity Report: March 2014

Florida Organic Aquaculture Ribbon Cutting Celebration Information

Report dated March 20, 2014 from the U.S. Department of Transportation – Federal Rail Administration, On-Site Engineering Field Report – Part 1, All Aboard Florida

Letter dated March 24, 2014 from Mayor Troy A. McDonald, City of Stuart, to Congressman Patrick Murphy regarding “All Aboard Florida” Passenger Rail Service on the Florida East Coast

Letter dated March 25, 2014 from Mayor Linda Hudson, City of Fort Pierce, to Congressman Patrick Murphy, regarding All Aboard Florida

Letter dated March 25, 2014 from Mayor William G. Thiess, Town of St. Lucie Village, to Congressman Patrick Murphy regarding All Aboard Florida

Letter dated March 26, 2014 from Andrew D. Lukasik, Town Manager, Town of Jupiter, to Congressman Patrick Murphy regarding All Aboard Florida Project

Press release dated March 31, 2014 from Florida Chamber Foundation: Florida Regional Councils Association Unveils New Economic Scorecard Website Utilizing Six Pillars Metrics

Email dated April 2, 2014 from Marcela Camblor-Cutsaimanis, Project Director, Sustainable Communities Initiative, Southeast Florida Regional Partnership, regarding International Agreement Between The Southeast Florida Marine Industry and Barcelona Cluster Nautic

Letter dated April 2, 2014 from Jon Ward, City of West Palm Beach Community Redevelopment Agency, regarding Support Letter for Transit Village, LLC

Letter dated April 2, 2014 from Mayor Jeri Muoio, City of West Palm Beach, regarding Brownfields Site Rehabilitation Agreement – Transit Village, LLC

TCPalm April 3, 2014 Article: State Senate passes budget including $10 million for All Aboard Florida quiet zones

Letter dated April 10, 2014 from U.S. Congresswoman Lois Frankel and Congressman Patrick E. Murphy to Secretary of Transportation Anthony Foxx regarding All Aboard Florida

Letter dated April 10, 2014 from Commissioner Bob Solari to Russell Roberts, Vice President, Florida East Coast Industries, regarding All Aboard Florida

Letter dated April 10, 2014 from U.S. Congressman Bill Posey to Secretary of Transportation Anthony Foxx regarding All Aboard Florida

Resolution adopted by City of Sebastian regarding All Aboard Florida

Unemployment Summary – Treasure Coast Region – March 28, 2014

Overview of the CareerSource Research Coast Region – March 28, 2014

Overview of CareerSource Palm Beach County Region – March 28, 2014
OUTREACH

- Met with Bill Killingsworth, Director of the Division of Community Development for the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity, and Sherri Martin, Rural Coordinator Supervisor for the Division, to determine the eligibility of regional planning councils under Section 288.018, F.S. (Regional Rural Development Grants), which may be possible, provided grant proposals increase local economic capacity and are not regional planning council project specific.
- Met with Gail Stafford, Compliance Administrator at the Florida Energy Office, to explore a collaborative partnership between the Office and the regional planning councils on a grant application to the U.S. Economic Development Administration.
- Met with Jason Hight, Biological Administrator at the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, to reinforce collaboration with the agency.
- Spoke to Nick Wiley, Executive Director of the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, to remind him that regional planning councils can help the Commission reach out to local governments as needed.
- Spoke to Jeff Hendry, Director of the Florida Institute of Government and North Florida Economic Development Partnership (NFEDP), to confirm that the NFEDP’s Economic Development Academy included a component that explained the role of regional planning councils as federally designated economic development districts and provided Mr. Hendry with appropriate educational materials.
- Continued to work with representatives from the Florida Chamber Foundation to create on-line regional scorecards for each council, which were beta tested during the last week of March and officially unveiled on March 31, 2014 (see http://floridarpcscorecard.com/), along with a press release from the Florida Chamber Foundation, which was provided to each of the councils and may be tailored for us in their respective regions.

RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT/CAPACITY BUILDING

- To enhance partnerships and strengthen the relationship between regional planning councils and their state and federal partners, attended meetings of the Small County Coalition; Florida Transportation Commission; Florida Defense Support Task Force; and, Rural Economic Development Initiative; and participated in Enterprise Florida’s monthly conference call for its economic development partners.
- As FRCA’s newly appointed representative to the participating industry support organizations that assist Emergency Support Function 18 (Business, Industry, and
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Economic Stabilization), attended a coordination meeting at the State Emergency Operations Center and reviewed and provided comments on revisions to the Emergency Support Function 18 Standard Operating Guidelines and the Emergency Support Function 18 Appendix in the Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan.

- Prepared and submitted to the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity a performance report, which evaluated the progress regional planning councils have made toward implementation of the State Strategic Plan for Economic Development.
- Distributed funding announcements from the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity; U.S. Center for Disease Control and Prevention; U.S. Department of Agriculture; U.S. Department of Commerce; U.S. Department of Homeland Security; and, U.S. Economic Development Administration.

LEGISLATIVE SUPPORT

- Revised FRCA’s legislative talking points to provide further guidance to those who may have the opportunity to meet with their legislative representatives or the Governor.
- Issued a March Legislative Highlights report and four bill tracking summaries.
- Reviewed newly filed bills for the 2014 Legislative Session and monitored legislative committee meetings held during the month.

ADMINISTRATIVE

- Participated in two conference calls with FRCA President Patty Asseff (Commissioner, City of Hollywood) along with Jim Murley (SFRPC) and Brian Teeple (NEFRC) to determine how to best demonstrate progress being made on implementation of the FRCA Strategic Assessment Retreat recommendations.
- With feedback from each of the regional planning councils, created a short term action plan that demonstrated progress on the FRCA Strategic Assessment Retreat recommendations pertaining to the creation of Gubernatorial Advisory Committees and improving communication among the councils and between the councils, their stakeholders, and the press.
- Prepared the February FRCA meeting summaries; participated in the March FRCA meetings; identified and confirmed presenters for the April FRCA meetings; and, addressed any required meeting logistics.
- Began making preparations for the June FRCA meetings, which will be held in conjunction with the Florida Association of Counties Annual Conference, including securing meeting space and a booth in the Exhibit Hall.
Please join us for our...

RIBBON CUTTING CELEBRATION

Where: Florida Organic Aquaculture
15369 CR-512 Fellsmere, FL 32948
When: Wednesday, May 7th 2014 - 10:30am
RSVP: http://whoozin.com/WYX-9CW-XETH
or call (561) 741-3000

BIG SHRIMP
Florida Organic Aquaculture's tasty shrimp are grown under strict water quality controls. They are the highest "sushi grade" delivered fresh, never frozen with a light, nutty and slightly buttery flavor.

BIG BUILDINGS
Encompassing 180,000 sq. ft. (or 4.13 acres), our first full size production building will house 4.5 million gallons of water for our happy healthy shrimp! The construction of our second production building is right around the corner!

BIG IMPACT
What does big shrimp being grown in big buildings mean for Fellsmere, and the surrounding areas? Quite simply, jobs. The economic impact, job creation and educational opportunities we have already created are significant!

Like Us On facebook

www.FLAquaculture.com
www.facebook.com/HappyHealthyShrimp
ON-SITE ENGINEERING FIELD REPORT – Part 1

All Aboard Florida

Background:

FRA Headquarters, in conjunction with the Region 3 office, assisted in the diagnostic safety review of the Florida East Coast (FEC) Railway grade crossings between Miami-Dade to St. Lucie counties. This is due to High Speed Passenger Rail service being planned between Miami and Orlando, known as “All Aboard Florida”. Beginning February 4, 2014 and ending on March 7, 2014, a total of 263 public and private grade crossings were assessed. Participants included officials from Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), FEC, All Aboard Florida (AAF); including local city and county officials at some locations.

For the purposes of this report, Part 1 represents the diagnostic review taken place from Miami-Dade to St. Lucie Counties. Part 2 designates the diagnostic review from Indian River County to Cocoa Beach, which is expected to occur in mid-to-late June 2014. There are approximately 90 grade crossings in Part 2. The segment between Cocoa Beach and Orlando will be designed for 125 MPH, however, AAF will not be traversing over any at-grade crossings along that rail corridor.

Scope:

Crossing locations between Miami to north of West Palm Beach are being designed for a maximum authorized speed of 79 MPH. The 110 MPH segment begins/ends at 30th Street in West Palm Beach (milepost 297.40), and continues through the Private Road Crossing in Indrio (milepost 233.90). Within the 110 MPH segment, train speeds are lowered to conventional rail limits where civil constraints exist; such as curves or draw bridges, which are noted on the accompanying field design plans.

Currently the design plans are at 30%. The next reiteration will be at 90%. Therefore, the decisions for the grade crossing signaling equipment and warning devices will be determined fairly soon.

The existing crossing signaling equipment contain a mix of signal cases and relay houses, equipped with either Phase Motion Detectors (PMD-1) or HXP 3R2’s highway crossing processors.
Each crossing location will eventually consist of relay houses equipped with GE Transportation’s ElectroLogIXS XP4 for constant warning time as part of this project. For 110 MPH, the crossing circuits beyond the 79 MPH standard will utilize a GE device linked through the PTC system for the advanced crossing starts. The technology will diagnose a health check to determine whether or not all roadway/pedestrian gates are in the down position.

Results:

Of the 263 grade crossings in Part 1, there are 57 crossing locations affected for Sealed Corridor treatments within the 110 MPH territory. Officials from All Aboard Florida passenger rail project (herein the “Project”) have openly expressed that the proposed 110 MPH segment will NOT incorporate the “Sealed Corridor” concept as outlined in FRA’s Highway-Rail Grade Crossing Guidelines for High-Speed Passenger Rail, Version 1.0 (November 2009). They stated that since these are “guidelines, not regulations” as quoted on page iii, in which they are not obligated to incorporate any of the described crossing treatments as illustrated in the document. The Project estimates that in doing so would incur an additional financial burden of about $47 mill.

In my professional opinion, I respectfully disagree with the Project’s approach in that they are not exercising appropriate safety practices and reasonable care when designing for High Speed Passenger Rail service. I explained to the entire diagnostic team how important it was to adopt the principles of the Sealed Corridor approach. However, it was clearly evident that the Project was not pursuing such concept.

As a result, the Project has directed their signaling engineering consultants to design crossings to ONLY accommodate for the additional track while complying with the MUTCD - but not to incorporate any of the Sealed Corridor treatments. Furthermore, since there is a completely different philosophical view towards safety between the Project and I, the accompanying marked-up design plans and field notes are notably different from the Project’s design plans; particularly along the 110 MPH segment. The Project has been maintaining a running log noting my Sealed Corridor recommendations.

Officials from FDOT’s Rail Office are not taking a position, one way or the other, at this time.
Safety Recommendations:

The following are recommendations made to the Project based upon my on-site field assessments during the diagnostic safety review:

A. Pedestrian gates – there are certain locations along the corridor in which sidewalks are present on both sides of the railroad right-of-way, but do not follow through. Some of these sidewalks do not comply with today’s ADA’s standards, however pedestrian travel is evident due to the worn foot path on the surface, and general witnessing of usage. Typically the roadway gate covers the entrance side of the adjacent sidewalk, but there are no pedestrian gates on the opposite quadrants. The Project stated if there is no agreement with the city or county for the service and maintenance of a pedestrian gate assembly, they will not install them.

Trespassing is an epidemic along this corridor. Rather than encourage it, it is recommended per my field notes at those particular locations to equip sidewalk approaches with a visual and gated barrier. This is to provide safe passage of pedestrians through a very active rail line and prevents those from walking into an open railway corridor; or directing them onto the street – irrespective if there is an agreement or not.

B. Vehicle Presence Detection – for those public and private crossings between 80-110 MPH in Part 1 to be equipped with a Vehicle Presence Detection (“VPD”) system. The entire FEC corridor is equipped with Cab Signaling control. Presence detection will serve as a long term obstacle system, where the presence of a vehicle within the crossing area for a fixed length of time would be reported as an alarm through the remote monitoring system, irrespective of the approach of a train. Subsequently, for those 3-Quadrant and 4-Quadrant gated grade crossings between 80-110 MPH (as identified further below), it is recommended that either through the activation of a loop detector and/or a vertical exit gate (indicating a roadway vehicle is occupying the crossing) that a vehicle is detected by the train as a “feedback loop” of information; resulting in a loss of cab-signals, thus placing the train in an automatic speed restriction.

Motor vehicles stalled, or trapped on a crossing due to queuing, present a derailment hazard; and in multiple track territory or where freight equipment is standing on adjacent sidings or industry tracks, derailments can result in catastrophic secondary collisions. Therefore, presence detection providing feedback to the train control system to high speed...
trains traveling along this FEC corridor be active in order to minimize the possibility of derailments as well.

Recommending a VPD system is due to the following safety reasons:
1. Field observations with vehicular traffic stopping on tracks
2. Safety concerns expressed by city, county and FDOT officials
3. Several crossings with reduced or no vehicle clearance at roadway T-intersections
4. Vehicles yielding to oncoming traffic while on tracks at non-signalized T-intersections
5. Motorists / Commercial Vehicles queuing over tracks due to 4-way stop intersection, and vehicles entering adjacent driveways and parking lots
6. The multiple track surfaces enables motorists to make U-turns or cut thru’s easier
7. Severely skewed crossings
8. Acute-angled crossings with main gates perpendicular to the vehicular roadway

C. Sealed Corridor Treatments - the following grade crossing locations are the recommended Sealed Corridor Treatments required by the Project to install:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>City/Town</th>
<th>Milepost</th>
<th>DOT #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30th Street</td>
<td>West Palm Beach</td>
<td>297.40</td>
<td>272 406 J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inlet Blvd.</td>
<td>Rivera Beach</td>
<td>295.45</td>
<td>272 400 T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagler Street</td>
<td>Rivera Beach</td>
<td>295.15</td>
<td>272 399 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Beach Road</td>
<td>Lake Park</td>
<td>293.75</td>
<td>272 389 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Ave</td>
<td>Lake Park</td>
<td>293.30</td>
<td>272 387 G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Road</td>
<td>Palm Beach Gardens</td>
<td>292.20</td>
<td>272 385 T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse Drive</td>
<td>Palm Beach Gardens</td>
<td>291.70</td>
<td>272 384 L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCA Blvd.</td>
<td>Palm Beach Gardens</td>
<td>290.30</td>
<td>272 382 X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Small Road</td>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td>286.20</td>
<td>273 020 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toney Penna Dr. *</td>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td>284.20</td>
<td>272 378 H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gleason Street</td>
<td>Hobe Sound</td>
<td>274.50</td>
<td>272 367 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Road</td>
<td>Hobe Sound</td>
<td>274.10</td>
<td>272 366 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pettway Street</td>
<td>Hobe Sound</td>
<td>272.70</td>
<td>272 365 G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossrip Street</td>
<td>Salerno</td>
<td>271.40</td>
<td>272 362 L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osprey Street</td>
<td>Salerno</td>
<td>270.90</td>
<td>272 934 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cove Road</td>
<td>Salerno</td>
<td>267.14</td>
<td>272 359 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward Street</td>
<td>Salerno</td>
<td>266.80</td>
<td>272 358 W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salerno Road</td>
<td>Salerno</td>
<td>266.60</td>
<td>272 357 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaward Street **</td>
<td>Salerno</td>
<td>266.50</td>
<td>272 356 H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Name</td>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>Milepost</td>
<td>DOT #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Road</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>263.30</td>
<td>272 353 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR A1A</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>262.50</td>
<td>272 350 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Street</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>262.30</td>
<td>272 349 X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmetto Drive</td>
<td>Rio</td>
<td>257.40</td>
<td>272 342 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenson Beach Blvd.</td>
<td>Rio</td>
<td>256.80</td>
<td>272 340 L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitchford Land***</td>
<td>Rio</td>
<td>256.20</td>
<td>272 338 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyline Drive</td>
<td>Rio</td>
<td>255.50</td>
<td>272 337 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Line Road</td>
<td>Rio</td>
<td>255.30</td>
<td>272 336 W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton Road</td>
<td>Walton</td>
<td>252.50</td>
<td>272 332 U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway Road</td>
<td>Walton</td>
<td>246.30</td>
<td>272 331 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah Road</td>
<td>Fort Pierce</td>
<td>243.80</td>
<td>272 330 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Bch. Causeway</td>
<td>Indrio</td>
<td>239.80</td>
<td>272 218 U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimoner Ln. ***</td>
<td>Indrio</td>
<td>239.50</td>
<td>272 217 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarmac Road***</td>
<td>Indrio</td>
<td>239.20</td>
<td>272 215 Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie Lane</td>
<td>Indrio</td>
<td>238.80</td>
<td>272 214 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamberlain Blvd.</td>
<td>Indrio</td>
<td>238.40</td>
<td>272 213 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Road</td>
<td>Indrio</td>
<td>237.80</td>
<td>272 211 W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torpey Road</td>
<td>Indrio</td>
<td>237.10</td>
<td>272 210 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouse Road</td>
<td>Indrio</td>
<td>236.70</td>
<td>272 209 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Street</td>
<td>Indrio</td>
<td>236.10</td>
<td>272 208 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcox Road</td>
<td>Indrio</td>
<td>235.60</td>
<td>272 207 G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Branch Rd</td>
<td>Indrio</td>
<td>235.10</td>
<td>272 206 A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - Last crossing location (northbound) for proposed Tri-Rail service  
** - Recommend to be CLOSED  
*** - Private Crossing

### 100-foot Non-traversable Medians * (7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>City/Town</th>
<th>Milepost</th>
<th>DOT #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36th Street</td>
<td>West Palm Beach</td>
<td>297.10</td>
<td>272 405 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45th Street</td>
<td>West Palm Beach</td>
<td>296.65</td>
<td>272 403 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49th Street</td>
<td>West Palm Beach</td>
<td>296.30</td>
<td>272 240 G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Line Road</td>
<td>Hobe Sound</td>
<td>280.90</td>
<td>272 372 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Road</td>
<td>Hobe Sound</td>
<td>277.70</td>
<td>272 370 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR A1A **</td>
<td>Salerno</td>
<td>268.65</td>
<td>272 360 X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue A</td>
<td>Fort Pierce</td>
<td>241.30</td>
<td>272 238 F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Please note: if for any reason the Project and the respective municipality cannot agree on the median treatment, then those location(s) be equipped with exit gates.  
** Medians to be at least 150-feet each approach due to severe roadway skew.
### Three-Quadrant Gates (due to a median present on the opposite side) 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>City/Town</th>
<th>Milepost</th>
<th>DOT #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue Heron Blvd.</td>
<td>Rivera Beach</td>
<td>294.90</td>
<td>272 390 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns Road</td>
<td>Palm Beach Gardens</td>
<td>290.80</td>
<td>272 383 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood Road</td>
<td>Palm Beach Gardens</td>
<td>288.50</td>
<td>272 380 J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Ross Road</td>
<td>Palm Beach Gardens</td>
<td>287.20</td>
<td>272 379 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiantown Road</td>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td>283.60</td>
<td>272 377 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Avenue</td>
<td>Fort Pierce</td>
<td>241.50</td>
<td>272 239 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Private (6 locations within 110 MPH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>City/Town</th>
<th>Milepost</th>
<th>DOT #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miracle Way *</td>
<td>Rio</td>
<td>257.10</td>
<td>272 341 T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitchford Lnd **</td>
<td>Rio</td>
<td>256.20</td>
<td>272 338 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimone Ln **</td>
<td>Indrio</td>
<td>239.50</td>
<td>272 217 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarmac Road **</td>
<td>Indrio</td>
<td>239.20</td>
<td>272 215 Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Road *</td>
<td>Indrio</td>
<td>234.50</td>
<td>272 205 T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Road *</td>
<td>Indrio</td>
<td>233.90</td>
<td>272 204 L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - Recommend locked gate with procedures seeking permission from R.R. dispatch to cross.
** - Recommend the Project to equip with Four-Quadrant Gates (including VPD)

### Closed (17) Please note: Officials from the city or county are not taking a position, one way or the other, at this time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>City/Town</th>
<th>Milepost</th>
<th>DOT #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>179th Street</td>
<td>Aventura</td>
<td>353.60</td>
<td>272 602 R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141st Street *</td>
<td>North Miami Beach</td>
<td>356.12</td>
<td>272 609 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Street</td>
<td>Hallandale</td>
<td>350.30</td>
<td>272 591 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe Street</td>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>349.03</td>
<td>272 588 X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore Street</td>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>348.52</td>
<td>272 585 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield Street</td>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>348.07</td>
<td>272 582 G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dania Blvd *</td>
<td>Dania Beach</td>
<td>345.94</td>
<td>272 574 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Street *</td>
<td>Dania Beach</td>
<td>345.81</td>
<td>272 573 H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd Street</td>
<td>Fort Lauderdale</td>
<td>342.96</td>
<td>272 566 X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Street</td>
<td>Fort Lauderdale</td>
<td>341.80</td>
<td>272 661 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Street *</td>
<td>Fort Lauderdale</td>
<td>341.56</td>
<td>272 559 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Street *</td>
<td>Fort Lauderdale</td>
<td>341.45</td>
<td>272 558 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Street</td>
<td>Pompano Beach</td>
<td>333.31</td>
<td>272 534 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Street</td>
<td>Deerfield Beach</td>
<td>327.41</td>
<td>272 513 Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Street</td>
<td>Deerfield Beach</td>
<td>326.81</td>
<td>272 511 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Street</td>
<td>West Palm Beach</td>
<td>303.18</td>
<td>272 450 W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaward Street **</td>
<td>Salerno</td>
<td>266.50</td>
<td>272 356 H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - or possible one-way
** - only crossing to be closed along 110 MPH segment
Conclusion:

Based upon my professional background and experience in regards to grade crossing safety, I strongly recommend officials from All Aboard Florida to adhere to the principles as outlined in the FRA’s guidelines for Emerging High-Speed Rail (80-110 MPH). In doing so incorporates the optimum safety practices in the engineering and design of their crossing locations for the following reasons:

I. The operating dynamics are significantly changing within the existing environment of the grade crossings, along with an already an active freight operation that will include:
   - The addition of 16 round-trip trains (32 total) at 110 MPH
   - The eventual inclusion of Tri-rail Commuter Rail service, which will add 74 trains.
   - Changing from single track to multiple track configurations.

II. Densely settled neighborhoods with congested roadways

III. As many as 5 traffic lanes in the oncoming direction at T-intersections

In summary, as the travelling public begins to assimilate to a substantial increase in railroad operations – by incorporating enhanced railroad signaling technology and increased active highway warning devices are paramount to ensuring safety awareness as both entities interact with one another. Therefore, equipping crossing locations with the recommended actions, as outlined above in this report, will dramatically reduce potential safety hazards and catastrophic events.

Report Respectfully Submitted By:

Frank A. Frey, Gen. Engineer-HSR
Federal Railroad Administration | U.S. DOT
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
BTS-13 | W53-447
Washington, DC 20590
(202) 493-0130
iPhone (202) 738-2195
frank.frey@dot.gov

March 20, 2014
March 24, 2014

The Honorable Patrick E. Murphy
1517 Longworth House Office Building
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Subject: “All Aboard Florida” Passenger Rail Service on the Florida East Coast

Dear Representative Murphy:

Your upcoming meeting with Secretary Anthony Foxx regarding passenger rail service may be critical to the Treasure Coast of Florida. The Stuart City Commission fully understands the All Aboard Florida project is a substantial undertaking for a private company, even with additional public funding, and we support the effort to restore passenger train service to the east coast of Florida. Passenger rail service on the east coast of Florida has been sought by the City and many other local governments ever since the Florida East Coast Railway abandoned passenger service in 1968.

The City of Stuart has worked with the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council for almost fifteen years to obtain Amtrak passenger rail service for Stuart. The City of Stuart remains very interested in having Amtrak service.

Nonetheless, today we also have substantial and significant maritime interests in our community. Within the past few years, the City has approved, or been responsible for developing approximately 500 new deep water boats slips and mooring balls within a few hundred feet of the FEC trestle bridge across the St. Lucie River. These slips have created the genesis of a “Stuart Harbor” development. The slips also serve sport-fishing, cruising, and “live-aboard” communities, but they are also important to commercial boat operators, and to the maritime industries which support all of the boating communities. With the advent of 32 new passenger trains crossing the St. Lucie River, each of which will require the trestle bridge to close, we view this with some trepidation, particularly because All Aboard Florida (AAF) and FECI have been largely silent as to the preparations they are making regarding their own right of way, and the ultimate effects of the train service.

One suggestion that has recently evolved, and which seems to have some merit, is to explore the shifting by FECI of freight to the CSX tracks west of the Treasure Coast. This requires a negotiation between CSX and FECI, and perhaps intervention, by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA).
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A second issue for Stuart and Martin County is the possible intervention of the US Coast Guard regarding the potential damage to navigation by the increase in train traffic. As we understand it, maritime traffic has legal priority over all other traffic... train or roadway, on the federal Okeechobee Waterway. We have been searching for ways to make passenger train traffic “easier” for the boating community, and one of the ways may be to require a bridge attendant to be physically located at the St. Lucie River crossing to assure that the bridge is rotated down and up in a timely manner, and as rapidly as can safely be done.

A third issue for Stuart is the desire for a station, and the ultimate need for passenger service in Stuart. The City has long made the point to FECI that since the AAF trains would be slowing down to about 25-30 mph to cross the trestle and negotiate the sharp curves just north of the River, they might as well stop. We believe that FECI understands the logic of this, but we still have not heard anything from them regarding this matter. We understand their stated position of wanting to get the project “up and running” first, but Stuart wants to be the very first of the second tier of stations. We also believe that not every train needs to stop in Stuart, and that 2 or 3 each way per day will suffice, in the beginning. However, a difficulty with a station platform is the need to provide for two (2) different boarding heights (AAF and Amtrak trains are different). I suppose we are looking at some sort of hydraulic leveling (if such exists).

Fourth is the issue of the crossing gates and structures required by the FRA for “Positive Train Control” which we understand will be required based upon the travel speeds. We also acknowledge those improvements needed for “Quiet Zones” may be different, even though many cities, including Stuart, would like to have, but don’t want to fund them. As we understand it, the FRA could require a high enough level of safety at each railroad crossing so that “Quiet Zone” improvements would be achieved, but at the expense of AAF.

Fifth is the increased cost of maintenance of the roadway crossings. Historically, every 8-10 years, FEC has made major renovations and restorations to their roadway crossings. The cost of this maintenance work is borne by the jurisdiction which controls the road right of way (usually a city or county). Typically, the cost is around $20k to $25k per crossing. With double tracking, we anticipate those costs to almost double. This is being done, with no new funding source to pay for the maintenance. It is a classic “unfunded mandate,” even though it comes from a private corporation, not a state or federal government.

Sixth is the issue of “leased” parking and landscape within the FEC Right of Way. Many cities, including Stuart have leases with FECI... or really Flagler Realty, which are unilaterally terminable by Flagler upon 30 days’ notice. As you can imagine, this is not
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nearly enough time for a city to react or to provide alternate parking or even to relocate expensive landscape which was provided to the FEC at no cost to them. However, without active participation and information from AAF and FECI, it is impossible to plan this out properly. It would be appropriate for Flagler Realty to make every reasonable effort to accommodate existing governmental uses of the railroad right of way by local jurisdictions. Again, some intervention into this process by FRA would be welcome.

If Secretary Foxx will direct the FRA to be aware of these issues and to condition some of its grant-funding or permitting, based upon rectifying some or all of these issues, we would have achieved most of our near term goals in dealing with AAF.

In the long run, complete grade separation of road and rail crossings, and an elevated, double-tracked bridge over the St. Lucie River, will be critical to achieving the operating speeds and safety required for successful passenger train operations along the east coast of Florida.

As always, thank you for your kind attention to our concerns.

Sincerely,

TROY A. MCDONALD  
Mayor

cc: Senator Bill Nelson  
Senator Mario Rubio  
Governor Rick Scott  
Senator Don Gaetz, President of the Florida Senate  
Senator Joe Negron, FL Senate District 32  
Representative Will Weatherford, Speaker, Florida House of Representatives  
Representative Gayle Harrell, FL House District 83  
Representative MaryLynn Magar, FL House District 82  
Representative Debbie Mayfield, FL House District 54  
Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council  
Martin County Board of County Commissioners  
Mayor, Town of Sewall’s Point  
Mayor, Town of Jupiter Island  
Mayor, Town of Ocean Breeze Park
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Summary Points

1. City of Stuart supports All Aboard Florida and Amtrak service, but not their adverse impacts.
2. Maritime interests are paramount to the City of Stuart, because we are a coastal boating community with an inlet to the Atlantic Ocean, and are crisscrossed by the federal Okeechobee Waterway and the federal Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway.
3. The US Coast Guard should be made aware of the environmental and maritime navigation impacts of the future AAF rail traffic.
4. It may be possible to relocate some or all of the existing or future FEC freight rail traffic from the FEC tracks to the inland CSX tracks, without causing an adverse impact on other cities.
5. A passenger rail station in Stuart makes sense from an economic and logistical standpoint for AAF, since the AAF trains must slow down to cross the St. Lucie River on the existing trestle bridge. It makes sense from the City’s perspective as a means of transit to Miami and Orlando, and as a smaller destination along the way.
6. The platform heights needed for AAF and Amtrak are different, and this should be resolved, prior to purchase of train sets by AAF.
7. Roadway crossings constructed by AAF (at their expense) should include enough safety measures to qualify them as “Quiet Zones” under FRA guidelines.
8. Additional future maintenance costs for double-tracking of roadway crossings should not be borne solely by local jurisdictions.
9. Properties leased from Flagler Realty by local jurisdictions should be given every reasonable opportunity to remain, or provided an adequate lead-time for termination.
10. Ultimately, grade separation of roads and rails is critical to the success of passenger rail service along the east coast of Florida.
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The Honorable Patrick Murphy
1517 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman Murphy:

All Aboard Florida is poised to be an economic boon to Florida because it will provide incoming Miami, Fort Lauderdale, West Palm Beach and Orlando air passengers with access to those cities by rail. Unfortunately, those passengers will bypass the towns in Martin, St. Lucie and Indian River Counties, while creating detrimental effects on the quality of life, the safety and the economy of the Treasure Coast’s three counties.

All Aboard Florida is of major concern to the citizens of Fort Pierce because:

1. The safety of pedestrians and vehicles will be threatened by a high-speed train traveling over seven crossings, as well as through property owned by residents and businesses living and working along the Indian River Lagoon.

2. Thirty two high speed trains a day will continuously affect the historic neighborhoods of Fort Pierce with the noise of the trains speeding on the tracks, as well as the train whistles. Historic neighborhoods, such as Edgartown, Rivers Edge and Downtown Fort Pierce, contain historic buildings, some 100 years old, which have been restored and lovingly maintained.

3. The citizens of Fort Pierce, along with government agencies, have spent millions revitalizing buildings in our downtown area, such as the Sunrise Theatre and Historic City Hall. More recently, the City of Fort Pierce and the Federal Emergency Management Association (FEMA) invested $30 million to rebuild our City Marina and to protect the waterfront from future major hurricane damage. The high speed trains will impede ingress and egress to the downtown area, which is now alive with tourists and residents on a regular basis.
4. All Aboard Florida runs parallel and quite close to the environmentally sensitive Indian River Lagoon, the most diverse estuary in North America. The frequent high speed trains, along with an anticipated increase in freight traffic, would significantly reduce economic and recreational opportunities for our community.

5. All Aboard Florida high speed rail quiet zones at our Orange Avenue and Avenue A crossings will reduce the size of our $12 million parking garage, and render it effectively useless.

6. Businesses along the Florida Turnpike and Interstate 95 will be adversely affected, as more people travel on high speed rail rather than drive back and forth between Miami to Orlando.

It is uncertain how much money will be required from the City of Fort Pierce to upgrade and maintain crossings, as well as corridor improvements, but I can assure you that it will be unaffordable for our taxpayers. We have severe reservations in our ability to keep our citizens safe, when faced with the prospect of these extreme expenditures.

We ask for your assistance in helping federal officials understand the potential and certain harm that will come to our city and its residents should All Aboard Florida not fund crossing upgrades for quiet zones and fail to take into account the harm we anticipate to our quality of life. We would be willing to explore ways that the area may benefit directly to offset and/or mitigate the impacts of All Aboard Florida.

Sincerely,

Linda Hudson, Mayor

LHjdcr

c: Members of the City Commission
Robert J. Bradshaw, City Manager
March 25, 2014

Congressman Patrick Murphy
1517 Longworth House Office building
18th District, Florida
Washington, DC 20515
(Via email)

RE: All Aboard Florida

Dear Congressman Murphy:

As the Mayor of the Town of St. Lucie Village, Florida, I am responding to your recent request for input regarding St. Lucie Village concerns about anticipated impacts the All Aboard Florida high speed rail project will have on our community.

The Village is a small (population 600), historic, residential community in an area north of Fort Pierce that was first settled in 1843. The oldest existing home in the Village was built in 1875, 19 years before Henry Flagler built the railroad through our area. The oldest part of the Village is a National Register Historic District, with more than 30 contributing homes and structures. We have managed to co-exist with the railroad for 120 years, but the all Aboard Florida project has the potential to drastically change that.

St. Lucie Village is bisected by a Florida East Coast (FEC) right of way and rail line, with residential development on both sides of the tracks. There are six railroad crossings in the approximate 2.5-mile length of the Village, four of which offer the only means of access to and from the neighborhoods they serve. Our understanding is that there are currently 30 freight trains which traverse the FEC line daily, and that the All Aboard Florida project anticipates an additional set of rails and up to an additional 32 passenger trains per day moving through our town at 110 miles per hour. The grade crossing plans for the project show a third “center siding” track through almost the entire length of the Village, where the two-mile long freight trains will be diverted to at greatly reduced speed or come to a stop to let the faster passenger trains pass.

The All Aboard Florida project raises concerns as to cost, safety, noise, traffic delays at crossings, and decreasing property values. We are told that construction is anticipated to begin in 2014 and should be completed within two years, so these are immediate concerns. The fact of the matter is that the Village does not have the staff or financial wherewithal to address these concerns and we are hopeful for assistance or guidance on these issues:

Designated as a Historic District on National Register of Historic Places on Dec. 1, 1989
1. **Cost of Crossing Upgrades:** St. Lucie Village, like many governments, pays for periodic crossing maintenance; and, for this municipality, it is a major expense. We have been told by All Aboard Florida that our maintenance obligation would not include installing new facilities related to the all Aboard Florida Project, but we are very concerned that our future crossing maintenance costs will be increased significantly. Railroad crossing maintenance is already one of the largest single items in the Village annual budget.

2. **Safety:** Given that the FEC corridor traverses existing residential, commercial and mixed use districts and will carry significantly increased traffic at very high speeds, we are concerned about safety along the corridor and who will be responsible for paying for safety features such as quad gates and pedestrian crossings. We gather that high speed rail crossings require additional and more frequent safety inspections and have concerns that some of those costs will become the responsibility of the Village.

3. **Noise:** The significant increase in traffic through our community and the requirements for sounding horns or other warning signals will greatly increase the noise pollution throughout the Village. We have been told that the Village would be responsible for upgrading crossings from improvements to be made by All Aboard Florida to those required for quiet zones. Though we have not received specific costs for these additional improvements, the numbers we have seen in other locations are well beyond the financial means of St. Lucie Village.

4. **Traffic Delays at Crossings:** Locating a third, center siding track throughout the Village will greatly increase the traffic delays at the six crossings within the Village. Freight trains will have to slow down to a near stop or actually stop to allow the faster passenger trains to pass. They will then have to get back up to speed to clear the crossings. With the average length of these freight trains being two miles, location of the center siding throughout the length of the Village will greatly increase traffic delays at all of our crossings. In addition to being an inconvenience to our residents, there could be life safety issues with regard to access by fire, medical, and law enforcement emergency vehicles. The frequency of these crossing delays could increase significantly with the anticipated increase in freight traffic associated with widening of the Panama Canal. There are traffic safety issues as well. The crossing plans provided by All Aboard Florida show the crossing gates to be within 10 feet of the north-bound travel lane of Old Dixie Highway, which parallels the FEC right-of-way throughout the entire length of the Village. When the crossing arms go down, there will no longer be space for vehicles to pull into the side streets and wait for the trains to pass. They will have to stop in the travel lanes of Old Dixie Highway, likely for an extended time when a freight train is on the center siding. This has the potential to create an unsafe condition on heavily-travelled Old Dixie Highway.

5. **Property Values:** The Village residents have expressed serious concerns regarding the project's negative impact on the value of their homes. An additional rail line with a center siding and the increased train traffic, noise and crossing delays throughout our
small, primarily residential community will doubtless have a negative effect on property values.

6. **Recreational Resources:** The 70-acre Village Heritage Park is immediately adjacent to and east of the rail lines. The park is used for both recreation and for preservation of environmental resources, and is unique in containing a number of diverse ecological communities and threatened and endangered species.

7. **Cultural Resources:** St. Lucie Village’s historic Fort Capron site and the above-mentioned National Register Historic District are in very close proximity to the railway.

As far as we can tell, the All Aboard Florida project will result in no direct benefits for the Town of St. Lucie Village. There are no plans for a train stop in our vicinity and it appears unlikely that we will see one in our lifetimes. The project has no direct financial benefits for our town, and we have not seen any evidence that there will be indirect financial benefits. On the contrary, it appears that the Village will incur very significant costs in increased crossing maintenance and for facilities to mitigate noise impacts. Simply stated, it appears that All Aboard Florida is using 19th century planning for a 21st century transportation project. Prudent planning would put a high speed rail connecting Orlando and South Florida with no stops between Orlando and West Palm Beach further west and not through the downtown of every coastal city and town between Cocoa and West Palm Beach.

These are just some very basic concerns the Town of St. Lucie Village has with the All Aboard Florida project, and they are concerns shared with all of our neighboring Florida coastal communities. The St. Lucie Village Board of Aldermen sincerely appreciates your request to hear our concerns regarding this project and we are grateful for any assistance you can provide in addressing these concerns.

Sincerely,

William G. Thiess, Mayor

cc: Senator Bill Nelson  
Senator Marco Rubio  
Village Board of Aldermen  
Diane C. Ormo, Clerk  
Richard V. Neili, Jr., Esquire
March 26, 2014

Representative Patrick Murphy
18th District, Florida
1517 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

RE: All Aboard Florida Project

Dear Representative Murphy:

Thank you for the opportunity to share the Town of Jupiter’s concerns with you regarding the All Aboard Florida (AAF) Project as proposed by Florida East Coast Industries (FECI).

In general, the Jupiter Town Council has looked favorably on passenger rail services as a means to facilitate regional transportation and enhance the ability to promote business development and job creation, provided that public safety and other adverse impacts are adequately mitigated by the design and construction of required infrastructure improvements and the implementation of appropriate operational practices. The Council has not taken a formal position on AAF to date, but is now planning to do so. The Town has been in the process of obtaining factual information and considering the benefits of AAF to the state as well as the adverse impacts on the Town specifically.

While once generally supportive of AAF in concept, emerging information has led to concerns that Jupiter citizens and businesses are being asked to accept negative impacts with limited, if any, benefit to community. The effort to obtain information has been hampered by the AAF’s inability, or perhaps reluctance, to provide precise information on issues of importance.

Specifically, the Town Council has raised a variety of concerns regarding the AAF Project including safety at the bridge and road crossings, provisions for enhanced pedestrian and bicycle rail crossings and the responsibility for the costs associated with making necessary infrastructure enhancements. At a minimum, FECI needs to address the following:

**Safety Enhancements:**
To date, funding sources and the standards for safety improvements have not been finalized. This is a significant concern, because it indicates to us that public safety is not being given the appropriate priority by AAF and those advocating on their behalf. We understand that, in some locations in Town, train speeds could reach or exceed 110 MPH. The obviously creates concerns for the safety of pedestrians and vehicular traffic.

In order to best prevent vehicular and/or pedestrian conflicts, the FECI should be required to
install the highest degree of safety improvements at and between crossings with no funding to be provided by Jupiter. Improvements should be to a level that would qualify them for designations as Quiet Zones.

Further, we understand that the areas in which the trains will exceed 110 MPH will be required to have the highest level of safety measures installed to establish a “sealed corridor”. While the Town is supportive of the “sealing” concept, the Town, and other municipalities, need to understand what “sealing” will entail, what infrastructure will be used, the aesthetic impacts on the community or how this relates to the establishment of the Quiet Zones.

Additionally, with the corridor being sealed between crossings, it is imperative that improvements at the few locations in Town include adequate pedestrian features. These are critical safety improvements as residents within the surrounding neighborhoods have obviously been crossing the corridor as evidenced by the worn pathways across the FEC right of way.

**Loxahatchee River Bridge:**
The height of the Loxahatchee River Bridge is very low -- about 6’ at high tide. Basically, all boats require an open bridge to navigate through the area. The length of time the bridge will be down to allow additional train traffic is a significant concern. Currently, there are conflicts between the bridge downtime provided by AAF and that which is anecdotally reported by members of the community. This may be leading to a lack of urgency on AAF’s part as there doesn’t seem to be recognition of the length of time the bridge is down as experienced by local boaters and the dangers of attempting to queue boats up at a location with strong currents.

The Loxahatchee River Bridge, while perhaps having some useful remaining life for the primary structure, is antiquated and requires modernization. The operating mechanisms seem to be beyond useful life due to the frequency of mechanical breakdowns that have been occurring. A new bridge design should be pursued that include components and an operational plan that will mitigate the impact on boating traffic on the Loxahatchee River as existing plans and anticipated closing cycles will create hazardous conditions for marine traffic.

The bridge’s “cranky” (as described by nearby residents) mechanical mechanisms also seem to be causing an increasing amount of events where the bridge is stuck open causing freight trains to back up and block roadway crossings for excessive amounts of time. The status quo reliability of the bridge’s mechanical mechanisms is simply not acceptable.

**Volume of Train Traffic:**
Passenger rail service will involve shorter train lengths and faster speeds which will have less impact on vehicular traffic movement throughout Town than the existing freight trains on a per train event basis. However, having passenger rail (an additional 32 trains per day) combined with existing freight will undoubtedly increase the negative impacts on traffic flow and the delivery of public safety services throughout Town. Because of this, the Town urges the reallocation of freight trains away from the coastal route and onto the CSX’s, or other inland route, to reduce traffic impacts and bridge closures. The Town remains very concerned about the lack of attention paid to this strategy throughout the AAF discussion to date. This is a strategy that must be pursued.

While there exist several benefits to having passenger rail service on the existing FEC corridor, there are too many questions about safety, impacts on mobility and costs to Jupiter taxpayers that have not been adequately addressed by All Aboard Florida. As it stands today, it is likely that the Town of Jupiter may be one of the most adversely impacted communities along the entire corridor. While passenger rail, when properly implemented, may someday provide future benefits to the Town, failure to adequately address the preceding concerns will ultimately lead to opposition from the Town against the project.
On behalf of the Mayor and members of the Jupiter Town Council, I want to thank you once again for the opportunity to share the Town’s concerns about the proposed All Aboard Florida project with you.

Sincerely,

Andrew D. Lukasik
Town Manager
Florida Regional Councils Association Unveils New Economic Scorecard Website Utilizing Six Pillars Metrics

TALLAHASSEE, FL (March 31, 2014) — Florida’s Regional Planning Councils received a new suite of economic development tools recently, as the Florida Regional Councils Association launched a new website on regional metrics. Each of Florida’s eleven regional planning councils will now be able to compare statistics ranging from high school graduation rates and trade imports to employment by industry and relative housing prices.

“This new website enables Florida’s Regional Planning Councils—as federally designated Economic Development Districts—to see our Comprehensive Economic Development Strategies in action,” said Brian Teeple, Chair of the Florida Regional Councils Association Executive Directors Advisory Committee. “It’s our responsibility to be good stewards of economic growth across Florida and by partnering with the Florida Chamber Foundation and aligning our metrics to the Six Pillars we’re able to show where we are making progress in each region and where we need to close gaps.”

Regional Planning Councils and their state, regional and local partners are now able to view measurable results in 21 separate metrics that align to the Six Pillars framework developed by the Florida Chamber Foundation’s Six Pillars Plan. The original plan was developed in 2010 to secure Florida’s future into the year 2030 and beyond. The aggregate data allows regional and statewide comparisons. Each regional planning council became an official Six Pillars Community last year and began developing their future strategies to strengthen economic opportunities.

“Our partnership with the Florida Regional Councils Association is pivotal to our mission of statewide solutions,” said Tony Carvajal, Executive Vice President with the Florida Chamber Foundation. “The ability of each Regional Planning Council to evaluate their trends and data within their own region will help serve their own strategic planning efforts moving forward. We are excited that we can continue to secure Florida’s future alongside this important group.”

Website: [http://floridapcscorecard.com/](http://floridapcscorecard.com/)


###

The Florida Chamber Foundation is the business-led, solutions development and research organization working in partnership with state business leaders to secure Florida’s future. The Foundation’s “Six Pillars” serve as a visioning platform for developing the first-ever, long-term strategic plan for the state. The Foundation’s work focuses on: 1) Talent Supply and Education, 2) Innovation and Economic Development, 3) Infrastructure and Growth Leadership, 4) Business Climate and Competitiveness, 5) Civic and Governance Systems, and 6) Quality of Life and Quality Places. Founded in 1968, the Foundation is a voice for improving the state’s pro-business climate to enable Florida to grow and prosper. For more information, visit [www.FloridaChamber.com](http://www.FloridaChamber.com).

136 South Bronough Street Tallahassee, FL 32301
Regional Metrics

**Business Climate & Competitiveness**
Average Annual Unemployment Rate
Average Annual Wages by Industry
Average Annual Wages by Sector

**Civic & Governance Systems**
Registered 501(c)3 Organization, Public and Private Foundation Charities
Voter Participation

**Infrastructure & Growth Leadership**
Population Counts, Estimates and Projections
Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled
Annual Building Permits

**Innovation & Economic Development**
Gross Domestic Products
Tourism Development Tax Collections
Trade Exports
Trade Imports

**Quality of Life & Quality of Place**
Real Personal Per Capita Income
Relative Housing Price
Percent of Persons Living in Poverty

**Talent Supply & Education**
Average Wages per Job
High School Graduation Rates
8th Grade Math Performance
Dear Executive Committee Members,

Congratulations! Seven50 efforts have successfully secured an international collaboration agreement for our Region’s Marine Industry! (attached)

Seven50 set the stage for implementation to be carried out by many, and in multiple forms: coalitions, partnerships, cooperation agreements and other joint ventures. The first international agreement stemming from this historic effort you have led was officially signed this morning.

The Marine Industries Association of South Florida (MIASF) and the Barcelona Cluster Nautic (BCN) entered today into an international agreement to advance the role of the marine industry at the local, regional, national and international levels. This effort represents a tremendous opportunity to increase our region’s economic diversity, positively impact high-wage job creation and strengthen our regions’ global competitiveness.

Carlos Vidueira, the region’s Marine Industry representative for the Executive Committee, spearheaded this task. He was responsible for making initial contact and all communications and negotiations that resulted in a very promising partnership. He did a fantastic job. Thank you Carlos! The Agreement was prepared with your staff’s assistance and signed by the Executive Directors of the MIASF and BCN. Delegations of both industries and local elected officials from the regions of Barcelona and Catalonia were in attendance for the official signing event.

Also in attendance, and most importantly, endorsing this agreement were Barcelona’s Mayor Xavier Trias, Miami Dade Mayor Carlos Gimenez, Broward Commissioner Suzanne Gunzburger, Palm Beach County Commissioner Priscilla Taylor and Martin County
Commissioner Ed Fielding. Thank you all for your support today. A special thank you for driving to Miami during rush hour...

There was ample press coverage. Please see attached a clip of this morning Miami Herald’s announcement and a “home-made” video clip of the signing ceremony.  
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SJCFIG_FCoM&feature=youtu.be

The event was covered by channels 24 and 25, Univision, WPBF-TV (ABC-Palm Beach), Florida Trend, Daily Business Review, Miami Herald and the Sun Sentinel. Check the news tonight!

Congratulations again and look forward to your support and engagement with the marine industry in the future.

Sincerely,

MARCELA CAMBLOR-CUTSAIMANIS, AICP
Project Director
Sustainable Communities Initiative
Southeast Florida Regional Partnership
SFRPC: (954)985-4416
TCRPC: (772) 221-4060
Cell: (772) 708-1108
The Miami Herald

Pact to expand marine trade in South Florida and Spain

By Evan S. Benn
April 1, 2014

Civic leaders from South Florida and Spain will sign a goodwill agreement Wednesday in Miami-Dade County Mayor Carlos Gimenez’s office to support international marine trade.

The agreement between the Marine Industries Association of South Florida and the Barcelona Cluster Nautic seeks to bring businesses, high-paying jobs and other economic opportunities to the two regions.

The pact was a result of Seven50, a public-private collaboration to create prosperity over the next half century in Southeast Florida, from Monroe to Indian River counties. The name stands for seven counties, 50 years.
AGREEMENT FOR COLLABORATION
by and between

Marine Industries Association of South Florida (MIASF)
and
The Barcelona Cluster Nautic

This Inter-Regional Agreement (hereon “the Agreement”) made and entered into this 2nd day of April, 2014 by and between the Marine Industries Association of South Florida (MIASF), a not-for-profit corporation located in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, United States of America, and the Barcelona Cluster Nautic, a not-for-profit corporation, located in Barcelona, Spain. Both Associations hereon “the Marine Associations” when referred to jointly.

PURPOSE:

The MIASF is a trade association representing the interests of marine businesses in the counties of Miami-Dade, Broward and Palm Beach in the State of Florida. The Barcelona Cluster Nautic is a trade association representing the interests of marine businesses in the provinces of Barcelona, Tarragona, and Girona in the autonomous community of Catalonia. The purpose of this Agreement between MIASF and Barcelona Cluster Nautic is to increase the economic benefits to the Barcelona and South Florida regions by advancing the role of the marine industry at the local, regional, national and international level.

To enhance economic prosperity in the Southeast Florida and Barcelona regions, the Marine Associations seek to increase global competitiveness and enhance their respective roles as important global centers of marine industry activities.

It is the Marine Associations’ intent to increase business and marine industry ties, expend international reach, offer new and innovative alternatives to handle global operations, increase share in the marine industry market and develop a platform of collaboration to facilitate training and education programs aimed at increased job creation and opportunity.

Both Associations:

a) Recognize the importance of mutual collaboration and the contributions of the marine industry to their respective local and regional economies;

b) Share a desire to develop mutually strengthening and enriching international exchange;

c) Wish to promote a close collaboration between their respective members in the areas related to international promotion, best practices, professionalism, and regulatory advocacy;

d) Seek to define training and exchange programs to improve the skills of the labor force, as well as prepare for the knowledge-based jobs of the future;
e) Desire to participate in effective and coordinated campaigns of international promotion;

f) Recognize the need to share experiences and practices related to the mixed use of land resources that allows for the successful coexistence of the nautical industry within urban areas;

g) Want to increase the industry's recognition as well as expand its central role in each region's economy, education and job base as outlined in South Florida's Seven50: Southeast Florida Prosperity Plan and urban waterfronts in the Catalonia region.

GENERAL PROVISIONS:

1. All research, exchange and other collaborative activities conducted pursuant to this Agreement shall be conducted in accordance with the laws and regulations appropriate to each institution. In the case of MIASF, these are the laws of the United States of America, the State of Florida, and the business standards of the South Florida Marine Industry. In the case of Barcelona Cluster Nautic, these are the laws of the Kingdom of Spain and the autonomous community of Catalonia.

2. This Agreement shall take effect when executed by both parties and shall be for a term of three (3) years. The Agreement shall be automatically renewed for successive three (3) year terms unless terminated as provided herein. The agreement may be terminated by either party upon no less than ninety (90) days written notice to the other party. This agreement may be modified by written agreement of both parties at any time. Nothing within this agreement shall create any financial obligation or cause any hardship to either party.

3. As specific projects in education, research, exchange and collaboration are developed, each will require a written Memorandum of Understanding which will set forth the terms and conditions of the project(s) and cooperation. These Memoranda or Contracts must be approved and signed by the appropriate officials at each association prior to taking effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties hereto have executed two copies of this instrument, each of which shall be considered an original.

Phil Purcell                      Date                      Toni Tió
Executive Director              President                Toni Tibe
Marine Industries Association of South Florida
Barcelona Cluster Nautic
TO: Mayor Mucci
FROM: Jon Ward
DATE: April 2, 2014
SUBJECT: Support Letter for Transit Village, LLC
CC: Barry Lazarus

Mr. Greg Vaday, Economic Development Coordinator for the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) has asked for the City’s assistance in providing Transit Village, LLC (Michael Masanoff) with a letter of support required by the State of Florida Brownfields Redevelopment Program when applying for assistance. Based on the relationship and support we have had from TCRPC, I would like to accommodate his request.

The letter serves to confirm that the City of West Palm Beach and Transit Village, LLC are working cooperatively toward developing the future land usage and redevelopment program for Transit Village’s West Palm Beach Intermodal Transfer Facility/The Wedge Brownfields Redevelopment project located at 150 Clearwater Drive in West Palm Beach.

The letter does not obligate the City or CRA to assist Transit Village, LLC with funding or resources and states that all development will be in accordance with the City of West Palm Beach’s current Land Development Regulations and normal permitting processes as required by federal, state and City agencies.
April 2, 2014

Mr. Art Torvela, Brownfields Coordinator
FDEP Southeast District
400 North Congress Avenue, 3rd Floor
West Palm Beach, Florida 33401

Subject: Brownfield Site Rehabilitation Agreement - Transit Village, LLC

Dear Mr. Torvela:

As required by the State of Florida Brownfields Redevelopment Program, this letter serves to confirm that the City of West Palm Beach and Transit Village, LLC are working cooperatively toward developing the future land usage and redevelopment program for Transit Village’s West Palm Beach Intermodal Transfer Facility/The Wedge Brownfields Redevelopment project located at 150 Clearwater Drive in West Palm Beach.

This letter is intended to meet the minimum requirements contained in paragraph 4 of the Brownfield Site Rehabilitation Agreement regarding the real property as described in Attachment A (“Brownfield Site”). Transit Village LLC is proposing to develop a mixed-use transit oriented development surrounding the West Palm Beach Intermodal Transit Center that will include 1.3 million square feet of Class A office, residential, hotel, retail, civic/educational uses and a green amenity deck on the parking garage. The property, as legally defined in Attachment A, shall be redeveloped in accordance with the City of West Palm Beach’s current Land Development Regulations and the Florida Brownfields Redevelopment Program and will be the subject of normal permitting processes as required by federal, state and City agencies.

Thank you for your continued cooperation on this important Brownfields project. If you have any questions concerning this letter please contact me.

Sincerely,

Jeri Muoio
Mayor

“An Equal Opportunity Employer”
State Senate passes budget including $10 million for All Aboard Florida quiet zones

By Isadora Rangel

Thursday, April 3, 2014

TALLAHASSEE — The state Senate wants to give $10 million to help local governments pay for quiet zones at All Aboard Florida high-speed train crossings.

The Senate approved its budget Thursday along with an amendment filed by state Sen. Andy Gardiner, R-Orlando, that would allow the Florida Department of Transportation to create a grant program to pay for up to 50 percent of the local cost of quiet zones. That money could be used in combination with federal grants and possibly money from the train company. The company, however, has been reluctant to pitch in.

The FDOT grant has not been added to the House budget, which was approved Wednesday. Both legislative chambers will negotiate the state’s spending plan in the coming weeks. Once they reach an agreement, Gov. Rick Scott can sign or veto each request for money included in the budget.

Senate Budget Chief Joe Negron, R-Stuart, said he has heard Treasure Coast officials’ calls for help paying for the quiet zones. Those improvements include secure crossing gates and concrete median strips that prevent motorists from cutting across the tracks, thereby eliminating the need for trains to blow their horns when approaching train crossings.

The Senate amendment also states the FDOT would have to approve the quiet zones before funding them. The agency would monitor crossing incidents and have the right to revoke the quiet zone if a significant deterioration in safety results from its implementation.

All Aboard Florida trains are expected to start running next year and are not scheduled to stop on the Treasure Coast. An estimated 16 passenger trains will be making two daily trips with stops in Miami, Fort Lauderdale, West Palm Beach and Orlando. That means 32 trips between 6 a.m. and 9 p.m., in addition to the seven existing freight trains that make roundtrips through the Treasure Coast every 24 hours.

“I was hopeful the Legislature would be able to recognize communities need some relief,” said St. Lucie County Commissioner Tod Mowery.
Mowery said he has met with Negron to ask for help to pay for quiet zones, which can cost $150,000 to $250,000 per crossing.

There are 27 grade crossings planned in Martin County, 24 in St. Lucie County and 32 in Indian River County, All Aboard Florida estimates show.

The train company, a subsidiary of Florida East Coast Industries, has agreed to provide safety improvements for the crossings. But making them "quiet" is deemed a quality-of-life decision for each city or county and the company is not required to pitch in.

Negron said he wants All Aboard to foot some of the quiet zone costs but wants to see how much the state and local government can pitch in first.

He also said many of his constituents have told him they want to stop the trains from going through the area and will show up at public hearings mandated by the federal government to oppose the project. He said those people could see state funding of quiet zones as an endorsement of the train.

For complete Shaping Our Future team coverage of All Aboard Florida, click here.

Scripps Treasure Coast Newspapers, Naples Daily News and Tampa Tribune journalists are in Tallahassee reporting throughout the legislative session in a collaborative capital bureau.
April 10, 2014

Anthony Foxx
Secretary of Transportation
U.S. Department of Transportation
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Washington, D.C. 20590

Dear Secretary Foxx:

Thank you for meeting with us to discuss our constituents’ concerns regarding Florida East Coast Industries’ All Aboard Florida (AAF) passenger rail project. While we wait for information to understand any positive economic benefits of AAF, we have serious concerns with the potential detrimental impacts on existing businesses and the quality-of-life of residents in South Florida and the Treasure Coast. We strongly believe it is essential that the Department of Transportation appropriately weight AAF’s benefits to its private owners with the safety, economy, and livability of the communities it travels through.

While AAF may boost tourism and business in Florida’s biggest cities, it also may delay emergency vehicles, create traffic jams, raise noise pollution, and block waterways along hundreds of miles of tracks. In addition, AAF may force Florida towns and cities on already-tight budgets to foot the bill for quiet crossings and future maintenance.

We urge the Department to require AAF to completely address the above concerns before considering approving AAF’s application for a Railroad Rehabilitation & Improvement Financing (RRIF) loan. Specifically, we request that the Department require that Florida East Coast Industries (FECI) work with neighboring municipalities, counties, the state, the federal government, and other businesses to:

1) Install safety equipment necessary to meet maximum FRA safety guidelines along the FECI line and at grade crossings;

2) Share financial responsibility for quiet zones and ongoing maintenance at grade crossings in Palm Beach County and the Treasure Coast;

3) Share financial responsibility for bridge upgrades to speed the raising and lowering of drawbridges, and widen bridge pilings to allow two-way boat traffic to pass;
4) Structure the new AAF train schedule to avoid significantly delaying emergency vehicles at grade crossings, worsening surrounding road traffic, and unduly congesting our waterways by blocking maritime traffic at drawbridges;

5) Move freight traffic from the FECI railroad to the adjacent CSX line before AAF passenger service begins to balance the number of trains on the FECI line and to prevent the time that waterways and roads are blocked;

6) Demonstrate that AAF’s passenger service is a financially sound investment in and of itself, and that AAF will be able to make timely debt payments on the potential federal loan after operating and maintenance expenses;

7) Publish publicly an economic impact study describing the positive and negative effects to commerce, property values, tax revenues, real estate sales, and tourism; and

8) Provide the expected ridership levels from foreign travelers, interstate travelers coming from outside the Miami-Dade/Broward/Palm Beach tri-county area, and travelers within the tri-county area.

We understand that AAF will be providing you with its plans to address these matters, and we hope you will make this information publicly available as you receive it. Thank you once again for taking the time to discuss the concerns of South Florida and Treasure Coast residents. We look forward to working with you to address these issues.

Sincerely,

Lois Frankel
MEMBER OF CONGRESS

Patrick E. Murphy
MEMBER OF CONGRESS
Russell Roberts, Vice President
Florida East Coast Industries
8427 South Park Circle, Suite 140
Orlando, FL 32819

Dear Mr. Roberts:

On Sunday April 6th, I had a meeting with Mr. Matt Mohler concerning All Aboard Florida. At that meeting, I pointed out one of the problems at this time was the lack of clear information about the proposed All Aboard Florida passenger rail service, its plans and its finances. At the moment, there is a lot of speculation, with none of the type of information necessary for an elected official to fulfill his fiduciary duty to his constituents, for a project that will draw so heavily on government resources and which, given the information available to date, will have such a negative impact on our communities.

It is my understanding the purpose of our meeting today is to open up a dialogue that will give elected officials in Indian River County the type and quality of information necessary for good decision-making. It is my belief, all the questions below are fair and reasonable, given the type of community support All Aboard Florida is requesting from Indian River County.

Important to note is at my initial meeting with an All Aboard Florida representative, I was told this was to be a private project, on private property, with no government support. As the project unfolds, the reality is, at least based on the scarcity of information available; this proposed project is seeking substantial government support on the Federal, State, and local levels.

Additionally, at that initial meeting, no mention of the negative impacts the project would have were provided. Granted, I should have realized, and probably looked harder at the negatives of the project, but All Aboard Florida should have, if it were interested in being a good corporate citizen, been more forthcoming. “Buyer Beware” is not an appropriate position to take with a project like All Aboard Florida.
Russell Roberts, Vice President
April 10, 2014
Page Two

It did not help All Aboard Florida when Mr. Gonzalez, at the March 21\textsuperscript{st} meeting of the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council, was unresponsive to almost all of the substantive questions put to him. On the one hand, he said All Aboard Florida had a lot of studies to show the benefits of All Aboard Florida to our region. On the other hand, he refused to share the studies because All Aboard Florida was a private company. The reality is All Aboard Florida and a set of companies owned or managed by Fortress Investment Group, LLC, are asking for significant assistance from the governments and the communities through which the All Aboard passenger trains will travel.

I say all this because our community is now solidly against this project. If it is the goal of All Aboard Florida to gain our community's support or at least decrease the opposition to the project, I believe it will necessary for All Aboard Florida to be forthcoming with as much information as possible.

To help facilitate this process, I have the following list of questions, which I believe will help us begin an appropriate dialogue. Providing full and complete answers to as many of the questions as possible will be very much appreciated by everyone, not only in Indian River County and in the Treasure Coast region.

Corporate Structure:

1. There is a lot of misinformation with regards to the various companies that are affiliated with Fortress Investment Group, LLC. This has only fueled the public's apprehension and distrust of All Aboard Florida. Therefore, please provide the following information:

   a. A clear corporate organization chart, which will allow one to trace All Aboard Florida – Operations, LLC, to what I understand is its ultimate owner, Fortress Investment Group, LLC. On the chart please show any related Fortress Companies, which are necessary for the ultimate success of the All Aboard Florida passenger rail project.

   b. A list of all companies now owned, directly and indirectly, by Florida East Coast Industries, LLC.

   c. A list of all companies now owned, directly and indirectly, by Florida East Coast Rail, LLC

   d. A list of all companies now owned, directly and indirectly, by Florida East Coast Holding Corporation.

   e. What entity owns Florida East Coast Rail, LLC?

   f. What entity owns Florida East Coast Industries, LLC?
2. Please provide any and all documentation that shows All Aboard Florida – Operations, LLC’s authority and/or right to develop and operate a passenger train on the existing tracks in Indian River County.

3. Attached is a copy of a proposed “Crossing Agreement” between Florida East Coast Railway, LLC, and Indian River County. Please tell us why it was sent? What is its purpose?

4. What is All Aboard Florida, TOD, LLC? What is its purpose?

5. What is All Aboard Florida New Sixth Street, LLC? What is its purpose?

6. What is All Aboard Florida Operations LLC? What is its purpose?

7. What is All Aboard Florida – Stations, LLC? What is its purpose?

8. If there are any other All Aboard Florida companies, please give their legal names, a description of the company and its purpose.

Engineering:

1. As far as railroad-crossing improvements are concerned, exactly what constitutes a Quiet Zone? Indian River County has heard some, or all of the following improvements, may need to be constructed before a Quiet Zone can be implemented . . .

   --- 4-quadrant gates
   --- Concrete median extensions
   --- advance warning signs
   --- Barrier-style fencing along rail corridor

2. Does the level of Quiet Zone improvements change with the train speed? In other words, do higher train speeds necessitate a higher level of Quiet Zone improvements, i.e. 0-79 mph, 79-110 mph, 110+?

3. Existing railroad gates and train sensors are connected to nearby traffic signals at most crossings, and offer advance warning times for as little as 20 seconds before the train reaches the crossing. Will the All Aboard Florida trains be set up in the same manner?

4. What are the actual rail crossing improvements you have planned in Martin, St. Lucie, and Indian River Counties and what are your best cost estimates for these crossings?
Financial and Economic:

1. Mr. Gonzalez, at the March 21st meeting of the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council referred to “studies,” which indicated the All Aboard Florida passenger rail service would have benefits for our region. Please provide copies of all “studies” related to the proposed All Aboard Florida passenger rail service.

2. Please provide the most recent audited financial statements for All Aboard Florida Operations and Florida East Coast Industries, LLC.

3. Please list all loans related to the All Aboard Florida passenger rail service being sought or already received, from any government entity, the name of the entity and the amount of the loan and the proposed interest rate of the loan.

4. Please list any other form of economic assistance the All Aboard passenger rail service has received or is seeking, the name of the government agency providing the support and your best estimate of the dollar value of the support.

I understand this request is asking for a lot of information, but I would expect at this stage of the project, almost all of the information requested is readily available to you and mostly, a matter of compilation. If it would assist you in getting the information to me, electronic copies of the available information would be fine. Please simply send the information to bsolari@ircgov.com.

Thank you very much for your time and assistance with this. I look forward to working with you as we develop the body of information necessary for me to fulfill my fiduciary duty to my constituents and for our community to fully understand the pros and cons of the proposed All Aboard Florida passenger rail service.

Sincerely,

Bob

Bob Solari
District 5

BS:mlp
Thank you for participating on today’s call with us. It was great to speak with both of you.
As requested, here is the draft letter agreement in MS Word.
Please advise if we may help in any other way.
Regards,
Margie

Margarita Martinez Miguez | Florida East Coast Industries, Inc.
305.520.2458 | mmmiguez@feci.com | www.feci.com
VIA FEDEX

Re: Agreement between Florida East Coast Railway, L.L.C. ("FECR") and ______________ (the "Licensee") with regard to the Crossings located at ______________, as amended to date (the "Crossing Agreement")

Dear ______________:

This letter shall serve to memorialize the agreement reached between Licensee, FECR and All Aboard Florida – Operations LLC ("AAF") relating to the Crossing Agreement in existence that governs one or more Crossings (as such Crossings are more particularly defined in the Crossing Agreement) and terms relating to the construction, maintenance and safety of such Crossings. Specifically, and without modification to any other term, obligation or condition set forth in the Crossing Agreement, Licensee, FECR and AAF hereby agree to the following terms and conditions, in exchange for good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged by the parties:

AAF is developing an intercity passenger rail service from Miami to Orlando (the "Project").

AAF shall incur the necessary and reasonable capital investments to complete the initial installation of crossing improvements to the extent required for the Project to comply with currently applicable laws regarding safety at public crossings and commence passenger rail service (the "Initial Development Cost"). It is acknowledged and agreed, however, that the AAF’s commitment to cover the Initial Development Cost for the installation of crossings improvements for the Project shall not encompass the cost of any other improvements to the Crossings, including any improvements required or desired by Licensee such as those related to the establishment of quiet zones. The Initial Development Cost expressly excludes any and all costs related to such other improvements.

In consideration of the foregoing, Licensee confirms the following:

- The Crossings, as improved for the Project, shall continue to be governed by the Crossing Agreement.
- The Licensee shall not be responsible for the Initial Development Cost, but shall be liable for any and all other costs due under the Crossing Agreement with respect to the Crossings as improved.
- AAF is an intended third-party beneficiary of the Crossing Agreement, with the right to enforce the terms and conditions thereof.
- Except as expressly provided herein with regard to the planned improvements to the Crossing, the Initial Development Cost and AAF’s beneficiary status, all of the terms, conditions, covenants, agreements and understandings contained in the Crossing Agreement shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect, and the same are hereby
expressly ratified and confirmed by the Licensee. This includes, without limitation, the Licensee’s continuing obligations related to construction, maintenance, safety, future changes and upgrades to the Crossings and the reimbursement of costs, all of which would continue to be governed by the Crossing Agreement.

If these terms are acceptable, please sign this letter in the space provided at the end of this signature page and return that signed document to us. To facilitate this process, it is agreed that this letter will be executed in counterparts, each of which will be deemed to be an original copy of this letter and all of which, when taken together, will be deemed to constitute one and the same agreement. It is also agreed that signed counterparts may be transmitted electronically (as an Adobe PDF file) or by facsimile, and that delivery in that way shall have the same force and effect as the delivery of original signatures. Also, this letter will be construed in accordance with the laws of the State of Florida, without regard to conflict of laws principles. Please understand, however, that the terms of this letter and any offer presented herein will expire and shall be null and void on the date that is 60 days of the date hereof if it has not been executed and returned to us by then. Further, if the Project is not complete by _____, the terms of this letter and any offer presented herein will expire and will be null and void.

We do hope to hear from you soon and look forward to working together. If you should have any questions, please contact our team at your convenience.

Sincerely,
Florida East Coast Railway, L.L.C.

By: __________________________

Print Name: __________________

Print Title: ____________________

All Aboard Florida – Operations LLC

By: __________________________

Print Name: __________________

Print Title: ____________________

AGREED, ACKNOWLEDGED
AND CONFIRMED:

______________________________________

By: __________________________

Print Name: __________________

Print Title: ____________________

Cc: Robert Ledoux, FECR
Margarita Martinez Miguez, AAF
RESOLUTION NO. 2014-033

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, FLORIDA, URGING ALL POTENTIAL DONOR AGENCIES TO REQUIRE ALL ABOARD FLORIDA TO PAY FOR ALL COSTS OF ALL ABOARD FLORIDA, AND THAT ANY GOVERNMENTAL ASSISTANCE SHALL BE PROVIDED AT NO LESS THAN MARKET RATES; AND DIRECTING CERTIFIED COPIES OF THIS RESOLUTION TO BE PROVIDED TO ANY APPLICABLE DONOR AGENCIES.

WHEREAS, All Aboard Florida, a subsidiary of Florida East Coast Industries, is proposing to provide passenger rail service between Miami and Orlando that will run through populated areas of Indian River County, including Vero Beach, Sebastian, and the communities of Gifford, Roseland, Wabasso and Winter Beach; and

WHEREAS, at first, such passenger rail service was touted as being provided by a private company, using solely private resources; and

WHEREAS, it is now understood that the passenger rail service is being proposed to be funded by a Railroad Rehabilitation & Improvement Financing (RRIF) Program loan of up to potentially $1.5 billion from the Federal Rail Administration an agency of the United States federal government; and

WHEREAS, it is now also understood that the State of Florida is proposing to spend $215 million for a new rail station at the Orlando International Airport which will benefit All Aboard Florida; and

WHEREAS, there are a total of 32 railroad crossings within Indian River County and 352 rail crossings in the region, and local governments, such as Indian River County, will bear the maintenance costs of upgraded railroad crossings and the costs of installing and maintaining any quiet zones; and

WHEREAS, instead of being a passenger rail service provided by a private company, using solely private resources, it is now clear that a significant portion of the financial burden of this passenger rail service is actually going to be borne by the taxpayers through assistance from the federal, state and local governments; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of Indian River County implores any donor agency, including the Federal Rail Administration and any other federal agency and the State of Florida and its agencies, to require All Aboard Florida to pay for the costs of All Aboard Florida, including quiet zones and corridor improvements, and that there shall be no governmental assistance, be it in the form of loans, infrastructure or right-of-way at less than
RESOLUTION NO. 2014-033

market rates, as such support would put the risk of the passenger rail service on the backs of the taxpayers.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, FLORIDA, THAT:

Section 1. The above “WHEREAS” clauses are true and correct, and are hereby adopted as findings of the Board.

Section 2. The Board of County Commissioners of Indian River County urges any donor agency, including the Federal Rail Administration and any other federal agency and the State of Florida and its agencies, to require All Aboard Florida to pay for the costs of All Aboard Florida, including quiet zones and corridor improvements, and that there shall be no governmental assistance, be it in the form of loans, infrastructure or right-of-way at less than market rates, as such support would put the risk of the passenger rail service on the backs of the taxpayers.

Section 3. A certified copy of this resolution shall be provided to the Governor Rick Scott, the Federal Rail Administration and any other state, local or federal agency which intends to offer support for All Aboard Florida.

The foregoing resolution was moved for adoption by Commissioner Solari, and seconded by Commissioner Davis, and, upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

Chairman Peter D. O’Bryan
Vice Chairman Wesley S. Davis
Commissioner Joseph E. Flescher
Commissioner Bob Solari
Commissioner Tim Zorc

Aye
Aye
Aye
Aye
Aye

The Chairman thereupon declared the resolution duly passed and adopted this 8th day of April, 2014.

ATTEST: Jeffrey R. Smith, Clerk of Court and Comptroller
By: Deputy Clerk

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, FLORIDA

By: Peter D. O’Bryan, Chairman

BCC approval date: April 8, 2014

Approved as to form and legal sufficiency:

By: Dylan Reingold, County Attorney
Secretary Anthony Foxx  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
1200 New Jersey Ave, SE  
Washington, DC 20590

Dear Secretary Foxx,

Having represented the residents of Florida’s Space and Treasure Coasts for many years through my service on local boards, city council, the State Legislature and now the U.S. House of Representatives, I know how important it is to listen to the advice and concerns of local community residents and local leaders that I have the privilege of representing.

I recently received the following correspondence from the Indian River County Commission expressing their views regarding the proposed All Aboard Florida. I would request that you give their request, as elected officials, every consideration.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Bill Posey  
Member of Congress

CC: Administrator Joseph C. Szabo, Federal Railroad Administration
April 8, 2014

Joseph C. Szabo, Administrator
Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20590

RE: Request for Extended Comment Period for All Aboard Florida High Speed Rail EIS

Dear Mr. Szabo:

Please be advised that on April 1, 2014, the Board of County Commissioners of Indian River County unanimously voted to formally request additional time in excess of the normal 45-day period to review and comment on the initial (draft) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the West Palm Beach to Orlando segment of the All Aboard Florida High Speed Rail proposal.

While acknowledging that federal policy allows up to an additional 45 days to review the draft EIS (for a total of 90 review days), the Board of County Commissioners requested a total of 180 review days. This period was specifically requested because of the length of the segment, complexity of project issues, and overwhelming number of public comments and concerns expressed by the citizens of Indian River County. Should the Federal Rail Administration be unable to grant a 180-day review period, the County would like to request 45 additional days. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Stan Boling, Community Development Director

Cc: Peter O’Bryan, Chairman, Board of County Commissioners
    Joseph A. Baird, County Administrator
    Dylan Reingold, County Attorney
    Secretary Ananth Prasad, Florida Department of Transportation
    Secretary Anthony Foxx, United States Department of Transportation
Senator Joe Negron  
412 Senate Office Building  
404 South Monroe Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1100

Re: All Aboard Florida – Delay Funding for Quiet Zones

Dear Senator Negron,

The Board of County Commissioners of Indian River County is concerned that the State of Florida will be funding the proposed All Aboard Florida project which will be negatively impacting the citizens of Indian River County, St. Lucie County and Martin County without giving the public a better opportunity to understand the issue.

At this time very little information has been made available to the residents and elected officials of Indian River County about the project. Because so little information has been made available there is a great deal of speculation about the finances of the project, the financial burden that it will place on taxpayers at the Federal, State and local levels and most importantly the damage that the project may do to the health and safety of our communities.

Given this, the Board of County Commissioners is asking that you remove any funding for quiet zones from this year’s budget. This will give our communities the time to understand the project and hopefully get the information that they need to have a rational basis to either give or withhold their support for this project.

We believe that this delay, necessary for elected officials to perform their due diligence is the right thing in a free society such as ours. In what is supposed to be an open and transparent society our residents and elected officials should have all available information available to them, before elected officials at any level provide any support for what we were initially told was to be a private project paid for with private funds.

1801 27th Street, Building A  
Vero Beach, FL 32960  
(772) 226-1490
Again, because of the complexity of the issue, the Indian River County Board of County Commissioners respectfully requests the State of Florida strike any potential funding for the Quiet Zones from the current budget to allow time for the public to fully understand the ramifications of this proposal.

We are looking forward to your support on this issue.

Sincerely,

Peter D. O'Bryan
Chairman, District 4

PDO:mlp
RESOLUTION NO. 2014-033

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, FLORIDA, URGING ALL POTENTIAL DONOR AGENCIES TO REQUIRE ALL ABOARD FLORIDA TO PAY FOR ALL COSTS OF ALL ABOARD FLORIDA, AND THAT ANY GOVERNMENTAL ASSISTANCE SHALL BE PROVIDED AT NO LESS THAN MARKET RATES; AND DIRECTING CERTIFIED COPIES OF THIS RESOLUTION TO BE PROVIDED TO ANY APPLICABLE DONOR AGENCIES.

WHEREAS, All Aboard Florida, a subsidiary of Florida East Coast Industries, is proposing to provide passenger rail service between Miami and Orlando that will run through populated areas of Indian River County, including Vero Beach, Sebastian, and the communities of Gifford, Roseland, Wabasso and Winter Beach; and

WHEREAS, at first, such passenger rail service was touted as being provided by a private company, using solely private resources; and

WHEREAS, it is now understood that the passenger rail service is being proposed to be funded by a Railroad Rehabilitation & Improvement Financing (RRIF) Program loan of up to potentially $1.5 billion from the Federal Rail Administration, an agency of the United States federal government; and

WHEREAS, it is now also understood that the State of Florida is proposing to spend $215 million for a new rail station at the Orlando International Airport, which will benefit All Aboard Florida; and

WHEREAS, there are a total of 32 railroad crossings within Indian River County and 352 rail crossings in the region, and local governments, such as Indian River County, will bear the maintenance costs of upgraded railroad crossings and the costs of installing and maintaining any quiet zones; and

WHEREAS, instead of being a passenger rail service provided by a private company, using solely private resources, it is now clear that a significant portion of the financial burden of this passenger rail service is actually going to be borne by the taxpayers through assistance from the federal, state and local governments; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of Indian River County implores any donor agency, including the Federal Rail Administration and any other federal agency and the State of Florida and its agencies, to require All Aboard Florida to pay for the costs of All Aboard Florida, including quiet zones and corridor improvements, and that there shall be no governmental assistance, be it in the form of loans, infrastructure or right-of-way, at less than
RESOLUTION NO. 2014- 033

market rates, as such support would put the risk of the passenger rail service on the backs of the taxpayers,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, FLORIDA, THAT:

Section 1. The above "WHEREAS" clauses are true and correct, and are hereby adopted as findings of the Board.

Section 2. The Board of County Commissioners of Indian River County urges any donor agency, including the Federal Rail Administration and any other federal agency and the State of Florida and its agencies, to require All Aboard Florida to pay for the costs of All Aboard Florida, including quiet zones and corridor improvements, and that there shall be no governmental assistance, be it in the form of loans, infrastructure or right-of-way at less than market rates, as such support would put the risk of the passenger rail service on the backs of the taxpayers.

Section 3. A certified copy of this resolution shall be provided to the Governor Rick Scott, the Federal Rail Administration and any other state, local or federal agency which intends to offer support for All Aboard Florida.

The foregoing resolution was moved for adoption by Commissioner Solari, and seconded by Commissioner Davis, and, upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

Chairman Peter D. O'Bryan ______________________ Aye
Vice Chairman Wesley S. Davis ______________________ Aye
Commissioner Joseph E. Fleischer ________________ Aye
Commissioner Bob Solari ________________ Aye
Commissioner Tim Zorc ________________ Aye

The Chairman thereupon declared the resolution duly passed and adopted this 8th day of April, 2014.

ATTEST: Jeffrey R. Smith, Clerk of Court and Comptroller
By: __________________________
  Deputy Clerk

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, FLORIDA

By: __________________________
  Peter D. O'Bryan, Chairman

BCC approval date: April 8, 2014

Approved as to form and legal sufficiency:

By: __________________________
  Dylan Reingold, County Attorney
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RESOLUTION NO. R-14-08

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SEBASTIAN, INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, FLORIDA, REQUESTING THAT THE STATE OF FLORIDA AND THE FEDERAL RAIL ADMINISTRATION REQUIRE ALL ABOARD FLORIDA TO FUND, WITH NO GOVERNMENTAL ASSISTANCE, ALL COSTS RELATED TO THE ALL ABOARD FLORIDA PROJECT, AND TO TAKE ALL NECESSARY STEPS TO PRESERVE AND ENHANCE THE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR VISITORS, RESIDENTS, AND BUSINESSES WITHIN THE CITY OF SEBASTIAN; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the City of Sebastian acknowledges the efforts of Florida East Coast Industries to construct a high speed passenger rail system, called All Aboard Florida, from Miami to Orlando along current and additional FEC tracks; and

WHEREAS, a minimum of five railroad crossings are located in Sebastian; and

WHEREAS, the All Aboard Florida Project will increase railroad traffic and train noise; and

WHEREAS, thousands of people who reside in close proximity to these crossings would be significantly affected by traffic, noise and possible safety aspects of increased railroad traffic; and

WHEREAS, All Aboard Florida trains are proposed to travel in close proximity to the City’s designated Historic District, which contains both residential and commercial historical structures, many of which have been restored at great expense, with some listed on the state and/or national historic register; and

WHEREAS, ingress to and egress from Sebastian Highlands to the Community Redevelopment Riverfront District, which the citizens and the government have spent millions of dollars to redevelop, will be severely impacted by increased railroad traffic; and

WHEREAS, the FECI tracks run close to the environmentally sensitive Indian River Lagoon, which is the essence of the Treasure Coast and the most diverse estuary in North America, and reduction in waterfront access due to railroad traffic would significantly reduce economic and recreational opportunities for our community; and

WHEREAS, quiet zones are needed at all affected railroad crossings in order to mitigate the impacts of increased railroad traffic and railroad noise and to protect the health, safety, and the quality of life of all City of Sebastian residents, businesses, and visitors; and

WHEREAS, the preservation of the quality of life of the City will, at the very least, depend on All Aboard Florida improving the rail crossings to maximize safety and minimize noise and disruption; and

WHEREAS, the State of Florida has expressed a commitment to the success of All Aboard Florida, and may not have recognized the potential major disruption that it may bring to the City of Sebastian without direct passenger rail benefits; and

WHEREAS, businesses along the Interstates will lose revenue as a result of redirecting travelers from roadways to railways; and
WHEREAS, the cost of upgrading the infrastructure at crossings to meet maximum safety requirements would be beyond the funding ability of the City of Sebastian; and

WHEREAS, the City of Sebastian requires financial assistance for infrastructure improvements and other road and traffic related construction, to keep our citizens safe, and our jurisdictions solvent.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SEBASTIAN, FLORIDA, as follows:

Section 1. The City of Sebastian formally requests that any donor agency, including the Federal Rail Administration, other Federal agencies, the State of Florida, and any State agencies, to require All Aboard Florida to privately fund all costs of All Aboard Florida, including all quiet zone/corridor improvements or terminal connections, without any governmental assistance, be it in the form of loans or infrastructure and right-of-way improvements at less than market rates, as such support would put the risk of All Aboard Florida on the backs of taxpayers.

Section 2. The City of Sebastian encourages the State to consider financial assistance to those local businesses that will lose revenue as a result of the shift of travelers away from the roadways to railways if All Aboard Florida is permitted to operate.

Section 3. The City of Sebastian encourages the Governor and State Legislators to do all within their power to urge FFCI to explore extending direct benefits of passenger rail service to the City of Sebastian, and explore partnerships from which the area may benefit directly to offset and/or mitigate the impacts if All Aboard Florida is permitted to operate.

Section 4. The City of Sebastian strongly recommends that the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Board convene regularly scheduled meetings with FDOT District 4 and local environmental impact experts to prepare for and respond to the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) draft and final product.

Section 5. The City of Sebastian fully supports and endorses the recommendations and findings contained in the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council Memorandum, Subject: All Aboard Florida Update, dated March 21, 2014.

The foregoing Resolution was moved for adoption by ______________________, seconded by ______________________, and upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

Mayor Bob McPartlan        __________
Vice Mayor Jim Hill         __________
Council Member Jerome Adams __________
Council Member Andrea Coy   __________
Council Member Richard Gillmor __________

The Mayor thereupon declared this Resolution duly passed and adopted this _____ day of ____________ 2014.
CITY OF SEBASTIAN, FLORIDA

By: ________________________________
Bob McPartlan, Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
Sally A. Maio, MMC
City Clerk

Approved as to Form and Content for
Reliance by the City of Sebastian Only:

______________________________
Robert A. Ginsburg, City Attorney
Unemployment Summary - Treasure Coast Region  
March 28, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Unemployment falls to 6.7 in February, down from 8.2 in previous year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 18,000 new jobs year over year from February 2013 to February 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Job gains primarily in professional and business services, and education and health services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• This unemployment summary is derived from statistical reports - Overview of the CareerSource Research Coast Region (Indian River, Martin, Okeechobee and St. Lucie counties) and Overview of CareerSource Palm Beach County Region prepared by the two workforce development boards in the Treasure Coast Region. Their respective reports follow this regional summary.

• The unemployment rate for the Treasure Coast Region was 6.7 percent in February 2014, down 1.5 percentage points from the February 2013 rate of 8.2 percent. The Region’s unemployment rate was 0.4 percentage points higher than the state’s unemployment rate of 6.3 percent and 0.3 percentage points lower than the national unemployment rate of 7.0 percent. Out of a labor force of 918,466, there were 61,864 unemployed residents in the Treasure Coast Region.

• The Treasure Coast Region contains three metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs), the Port St. Lucie MSA (Martin and St. Lucie counties), the Sebastian-Vero Beach MSA (Indian River County) and the West Palm Beach-Boca Raton-Boynton Beach MSA (Palm Beach County). In February 2014, nonagricultural employment in the combined metropolitan areas of the Region was 728,700, an increase of 18,000 jobs over the previous year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Area</th>
<th>February 2014</th>
<th>January 2014</th>
<th>February 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian River</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasure Coast Region</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Florida Department of Economic Opportunity, Local Area Unemployment Statistics. *

*Not seasonally adjusted.*

- In the combined metropolitan areas, job gains were primarily in the professional and business services industry (+7,500), education and health services (+3,800) and construction (+2,300).

- Industries that lost jobs over the year were financial services (-900 jobs) and wholesale trade (-200 jobs).

- Out of the twenty two metropolitan areas of the state, the Port St. Lucie metro area had the highest over the year growth in education and health services employment (+5.1 percent).

- Across all of the metro areas in Florida, the Sebastian-Vero Beach metro area had the highest over the year growth in other services employment (+8.0 percent).

- Employment growth in the West Palm Beach-Boca Raton-Boynton Beach Metropolitan Division was strongest in the construction industry, which increased 7.6 percent over the year.
Overview of the CareerSource Research Coast Region
Not Seasonally Adjusted
March 28, 2014

- The unemployment rate in the CareerSource Research Coast region (Indian River, Martin, Okeechobee, and St. Lucie counties) was 7.7 percent in February 2014. The February 2014 rate was 1.5 percentage points below the region’s rate a year ago, but 1.4 percentage points above the February 2014 state rate of 6.3 percent. From a labor force of 277,404 there were 21,316 unemployed residents in the region.

- Unemployment rates in the counties that make up the CareerSource Research Coast region were: 8.3 percent in St. Lucie County; 7.7 percent in Indian River County; 7.4 percent in Okeechobee County; and 6.5 percent in Martin County.

- The CareerSource Research Coast region contains two metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs); the Port St. Lucie MSA (Martin and St. Lucie counties) and the Sebastian-Vero Beach MSA (Indian River County). Okeechobee County is not included in an MSA. In February 2014, nonagricultural employment in the combined CareerSource Research Coast metro areas was 175,500, an increase of 4,000 jobs over the previous year.

- In the combined, CareerSource Research Coast metro area, seven of 10 industries gained jobs over the year. Leisure and hospitality and education and health services (+1,000 jobs each) gained the most jobs; followed by professional and business services (+800 jobs); trade; transportation, and utilities (+700 jobs); mining, logging, and construction (+400 jobs); other services (+200 jobs); and government (+100 jobs). The industries losing jobs were manufacturing and financial activities (-100 jobs each). Information was unchanged over the year.

Port St. Lucie Metro Area

- The majority of the nonagricultural employment in the CareerSource Research Coast region was in the Port St. Lucie metro area. This metro area accounted for 129,000 jobs in February 2014, an increase of 3,200 jobs from February 2013 (+2.5 percent). The area had a +3.0 percent increase in the number of jobs over the same period.

- Six industries gained jobs in the Port St. Lucie metro area over the year. Education and health services (+1,100 jobs) gained the most jobs, followed by professional and business services (+900 jobs); trade, transportation, and utilities (+400 jobs); and mining, logging, and construction and government (+200 jobs each). The industries losing jobs were manufacturing (-200 jobs); and financial activities (-100 jobs). Other services and information were unchanged over the year.

- Out of the 22 metro areas in the state, the Port St. Lucie metro area had the highest over the year growth rate in education and health services employment (+5.1 percent). Employment growth in professional and business services (+5.3 percent), education and health services (+5.1 percent), leisure and hospitality (+4.2 percent), and government (+1.0 percent) was faster in the metro area than in the state.

Sebastian-Vero Beach metro area

- Nonagricultural employment was 46,500 in the Sebastian-Vero Beach metro area in February 2014, an increase of 800 jobs from the previous year (+1.8 percent). The area had a +2.0 percent increase in the number of jobs over the same period.

- Five industries gained jobs over the year including: Leisure and hospitality and trade, transportation, and utilities (+300 jobs each); other services and mining, logging, and construction (+200 jobs each); and manufacturing (+100 jobs). The industries losing jobs were government, professional and business services, and education and health services (-100 each). Financial activities and information were unchanged over the year.

- Across all of the metro areas in Florida, the Sebastian-Vero Beach metro area had the highest over the year growth rate in other services employment (+8.0 percent). Employment in other services (+8.0 percent), manufacturing (+5.9 percent), and leisure and hospitality (+4.4 percent) grew faster in the metro area than in the state.

Note: All data are subject to revision.
### Unemployment Rates (%)
(not seasonally adjusted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Feb-14</th>
<th>Jan-14</th>
<th>Feb-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CareerSource Research Coast</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River County</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin County</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okeechobee County</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie County</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nonagricultural Employment by Industry
(not seasonally adjusted)

#### Metropoli Statistical Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Feb-14</th>
<th>Feb-13</th>
<th>change (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>129,000</td>
<td>125,800</td>
<td>2,200 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, Logging, and Construction</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>200 (2.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>-200 (-5.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation, and Utilities</td>
<td>28,200</td>
<td>27,800</td>
<td>400 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>-400 (-7.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>18,800</td>
<td>700 (3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing, and Utilities</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>100 (2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>-700 (-30.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>-100 (-2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Business Services</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>400 (2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Health Services</td>
<td>22,200</td>
<td>21,600</td>
<td>600 (2.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and Hospitality</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>1,100 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td>19,400</td>
<td>200 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Port St. Lucie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Feb-14</th>
<th>Feb-13</th>
<th>change (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>46,500</td>
<td>45,700</td>
<td>800 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, Logging, and Construction</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>200 (7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>100 (5.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation, and Utilities</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>9,300</td>
<td>300 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>300 (3.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing, and Utilities</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Business Services</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>-100 (-2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Health Services</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>9,300</td>
<td>-100 (-1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and Hospitality</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>300 (4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>200 (8.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>-100 (-1.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sebastian-Vero Beach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Feb-14</th>
<th>Feb-13</th>
<th>change (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>7,242,500</td>
<td>7,519,600</td>
<td>222,900 (3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, Logging, and Construction</td>
<td>392,600</td>
<td>354,200</td>
<td>38,400 (10.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>328,100</td>
<td>318,100</td>
<td>10,000 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation, and Utilities</td>
<td>1,023,300</td>
<td>985,600</td>
<td>37,700 (3.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>251,000</td>
<td>244,500</td>
<td>6,500 (2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>135,100</td>
<td>133,100</td>
<td>2,000 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing, and Utilities</td>
<td>517,800</td>
<td>506,000</td>
<td>11,800 (2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>1,448,300</td>
<td>1,099,900</td>
<td>45,400 (4.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>1,146,100</td>
<td>1,125,900</td>
<td>20,200 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Business Services</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Health Services</td>
<td>1,063,800</td>
<td>1,027,900</td>
<td>35,900 (3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and Hospitality</td>
<td>1,099,200</td>
<td>1,010,100</td>
<td>-89,100 (-0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>change (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CareerSource Research Coast</td>
<td>668,576</td>
<td>666,809</td>
<td>1,767 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River County</td>
<td>139,586</td>
<td>139,446</td>
<td>140 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin County</td>
<td>340,077</td>
<td>347,203</td>
<td>724 (0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okeechobee County</td>
<td>39,762</td>
<td>39,656</td>
<td>106 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie County</td>
<td>281,151</td>
<td>280,535</td>
<td>616 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>19,159,543</td>
<td>19,074,434</td>
<td>85,109 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average Annual Wage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>change (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CareerSource Research Coast</td>
<td>$36,766</td>
<td>$36,075</td>
<td>$691 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River County</td>
<td>$37,177</td>
<td>$35,315</td>
<td>$1,862 (5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin County</td>
<td>$39,430</td>
<td>$28,539</td>
<td>$120 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okeechobee County</td>
<td>$52,167</td>
<td>$51,436</td>
<td>$731 (2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie County</td>
<td>$34,904</td>
<td>$34,504</td>
<td>$400 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$43,213</td>
<td>$42,312</td>
<td>$901 (2.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All data are subject to revision.
Overview of CareerSource Palm Beach County Region
Not Seasonally Adjusted
March 28, 2014

- The unemployment rate in Palm Beach County was 6.4 percent in February 2014, down 1.4 percentage points from the February 2013 rate of 7.8 percent. Palm Beach County’s unemployment rate was 0.1 percentage point higher than the state’s unemployment rate of 6.3 percent and 0.6 percentage point lower than the national unemployment rate of 7.0 percent. Out of a labor force of 659,352, there were 41,910 unemployed Palm Beach County residents.

- In February 2014, nonagricultural employment in the West Palm Beach-Boca Raton-Boynton Beach Metropolitan Division was 553,200, up 2.6 percent over the year. Statewide employment increased 3.0 percent over the same time period.

- The West Palm Beach-Boca Raton-Boynton Beach Metropolitan Division gained 14,000 nonagricultural jobs over the year. Job gains were primarily in the professional and business services industry (+6,700 jobs) and the education and health services industry (+2,800 jobs). Other industries gaining jobs were construction (+1,900 jobs); trade, transportation, and utilities (+1,500 jobs); government (+1,000 jobs); leisure and hospitality (+800 jobs); and information (+200 jobs).

- Industries that lost jobs over the year were financial activities (-800 jobs) and other services (-100 jobs). Employment in manufacturing was unchanged.

- Employment growth in the West Palm Beach-Boca Raton-Boynton Beach Metropolitan Division was strongest in the construction industry, which increased 7.6 percent over the year.

- The West Palm Beach-Boca Raton-Boynton Beach Metropolitan Division was among the top five metro areas in the state for gains over the year in professional and business services; education and health services; government; construction; and information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unemployment Rates (%)</th>
<th>Feb-14</th>
<th>Jun-14</th>
<th>Sep-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CareerSource Palm Beach County</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonagricultural Employment by Industry (not seasonally adjusted)</th>
<th>Feb-14</th>
<th>Feb-13</th>
<th>change</th>
<th>percent change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>532,200</td>
<td>531,200</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and Logging</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>25,100</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation, and Utilities</td>
<td>103,100</td>
<td>101,900</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>22,300</td>
<td>21,100</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>71,400</td>
<td>70,400</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing, and Utilities</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>36,600</td>
<td>37,400</td>
<td>-800</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Business Services</td>
<td>101,500</td>
<td>94,800</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Health Services</td>
<td>87,700</td>
<td>86,900</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and Hospitality</td>
<td>78,100</td>
<td>78,300</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>26,200</td>
<td>28,300</td>
<td>-1,100</td>
<td>-3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>63,500</td>
<td>62,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>7,432,500</td>
<td>7,319,600</td>
<td>222,900</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and Logging</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>396,800</td>
<td>398,500</td>
<td>-1,700</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>328,100</td>
<td>328,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation, and Utilities</td>
<td>1,399,800</td>
<td>1,350,200</td>
<td>49,600</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>325,800</td>
<td>328,100</td>
<td>-2,300</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>1,022,300</td>
<td>985,600</td>
<td>36,700</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing, and Utilities</td>
<td>235,800</td>
<td>244,500</td>
<td>-8,700</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>135,100</td>
<td>133,100</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>517,800</td>
<td>516,000</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Business Services</td>
<td>1,149,300</td>
<td>1,099,900</td>
<td>49,400</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Health Services</td>
<td>1,146,100</td>
<td>1,123,500</td>
<td>22,600</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and Hospitality</td>
<td>1,065,900</td>
<td>1,037,500</td>
<td>28,400</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>1,006,000</td>
<td>1,034,000</td>
<td>-28,000</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>1,099,200</td>
<td>1,109,100</td>
<td>-9,900</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>change</th>
<th>percent change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CareerSource Palm Beach County</td>
<td>1,345,632</td>
<td>1,335,615</td>
<td>10,017</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>19,259,043</td>
<td>19,274,434</td>
<td>155,390</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Annual Wage</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>change</th>
<th>percent change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CareerSource Palm Beach County</td>
<td>$47,777</td>
<td>$46,329</td>
<td>$1,448</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$43,213</td>
<td>$42,312</td>
<td>$901</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All data are subject to revision.