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Update of Flood Hazard Information for Coastal Communities in East Coast Central Florida Continues

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Regional Office in Atlanta is performing a coastal flood risk study for the East Coast Central Florida Study Area (Brevard, Indian River, Martin, and St. Lucie Counties) to provide people living and working in coastal communities in these counties with a more accurate picture of their flood hazard and associated risk.

This project began in October 2011. Since that time, the FEMA-led Project Team has held technically focused outreach meetings to share interim results from the coastal analyses with community floodplain administrators (FPAs) and other interested community officials at key milestones. FEMA will work with the FPAs and other community officials to schedule another set of outreach meetings, called Flood Risk Review Meetings, by late summer 2016. Information on past and future meetings is provided in a Fact Sheet titled “Coastal Flood Risk Study Meetings,” which is accessible through the East Coast Central Florida Study Area page on the FEMA Region IV Coastal Analysis and Mapping Web Portal.

To learn more about the methodology being applied and the progress of the coastal flood risk study, visit the dedicated page cited above and other portions of the Web Portal, which is accessible through www.southeastcoastalmaps.com. The Web Portal provides an extensive array of useful information and resources for community officials, residents, and other stakeholders in flood prone coastal areas.

When the study is completed, FEMA will make updated digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs), Flood Insurance Study (FIS) reports, and associated products available to community officials, residents, and other stakeholders. The process for making these important products available also is discussed in the “Coastal Flood Risk Study Meetings” Fact Sheet.

When completed, community officials will be able to use the FIRMs, FIS reports, and other flood hazard information to improve local planning activities. Builders and developers will be able to use the information to make decisions on where to build and how proper construction can reduce flood risk. Insurance agents, insurance companies, real estate agents, and lending institutions will use the information for insurance rating purposes and to help residents better understand how flood hazards affect their property. Property owners and renters will be able to use the flood hazard information to help make better financial decisions about protecting their homes and businesses.
Coastal Flood Risk Study Meetings

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Region IV Office in Atlanta has undertaken a multiyear coastal flood risk study effort to better identify, quantify, and communicate the coastal flood hazards and associated risks in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, and North and South Carolina and to produce updated Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs). This effort is being undertaken as part of the FEMA Risk Mapping, Assessment, and Planning (Risk MAP) program. This Fact Sheet describes how FEMA engages and coordinates with community Chief Executive Officers (CEOs), Floodplain Administrators (FPAs), and other officials, as well as a variety of other stakeholders, throughout the lifecycle of a Risk MAP coastal flood risk study. Specifically, it covers meetings that are held during most coastal flood risk studies.

Overview of the Coastal Flood Risk Study Process

The coastal flood risk study process for most study areas will include the five phases shown in Figure 1 on page 2 and summarized below. Through these phases, FEMA works with communities to identify, study, and map their flood hazards. Mitigation actions are identified, planned, and implemented throughout the study lifecycle.

Phase 1 – Kickoff and Discovery Meetings

During the Discovery Phase, or Phase 1, FEMA meets with coastal communities, State representatives, and other key stakeholders to share data, collaboratively determine needs, and identify the best path forward. As shown in Figure 1, Phase 1 activities can include data collection and stakeholder coordination; a kickoff meeting; Discovery Meeting(s); and the creation and distribution of a Discovery Map, Discovery Report, and Project Charter.

Phases 2 and 3 – Technical Outreach Meetings

During Phases 2 and 3, the Project Team conducts technical outreach meetings with community FPAs and other technical staff.

• During Technical Update Meetings, the Project Team presents an overview of the coastal study methodology, the planned production schedule, and results of the study to date. Discussions during these meetings focus on technical topics, such as storm surge model development, identification and classification of storm parameters, and storm validation.

• During Storm Surge Analysis Update Meetings, the Project Team summarizes activities to date, reviews the results of the storm surge and stillwater analysis portion of the study, explains how the storm surge and stillwater analyses may be used to update the information shown on the effective FIRMs and Flood Insurance Study (FIS) reports, and describes the other components that will be used in conjunction with the storm surge to create the updated FIRMs and FIS reports.

Coastal Flood Risk Study Process Emphasizes Coordination and Engagement with Community Officials and Other Stakeholders

As with other Risk MAP program projects, coastal flood risk studies include close coordination with, and engagement of, community officials. The project’s risk communication and community engagement elements during the five phases of a study include multiple formal and informal meetings with community officials, residents, and other stakeholders.

Key Coastal Mapping Terms

The following are presented on preliminary and final versions of the updated digital Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) panels for coastal communities.

• Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) - An area subject to flooding by the 1-percent-annual-chance flood.

• Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) - An SFHA, labeled Zone VE on the FIRM, that represents the area exposed to wave heights of 3 feet or greater. The CHHA is sometimes referred to as a high-hazard zone.

• Limit of Moderate Wave Action (LMWA) - The boundary line for the 1.5-foot wave. Post-disaster assessments and laboratory research have shown that waves as small as 1.5 feet can cause significant structural damage in these areas of moderate coastal flood hazard.

• Coastal A Zone - An SFHA, labeled Zone AE on the FIRM, that represents the area subject to wave heights that are greater than or equal to 1.5 feet but are less than 3 feet. The LMWA forms the landward boundary of the Coastal A Zone.

• Primary Frontal Dune (PFD) - A continuous or nearly continuous mound or ridge of sand with relatively steep seaward and landward slopes immediately landward and adjacent to the beach. The PFD is subject to erosion and overtopping from high tides and waves during major coastal storms.
During Phase 3, the Project Team also performs overland wave modeling and develops draft work maps showing the initial Base (1-percent-annual-chance) Flood Elevations (BFEs), Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHAs), other flood insurance risk zones, the Primary Frontal Dune, and the Limit of Moderate Wave Action. (See “Key Coastal Mapping Terms” in the right-side call-out box on page 1 for additional information.)

Toward the end of Phase 3, the Project Team holds Flood Risk Review Meeting(s), during which community FPAs and other technical stakeholders can discuss the results of the overland wave modeling and view digital versions of the draft work maps showing the initial BFEs, SFHAs, and other flood risk zones.

During the Flood Risk Review Meetings, the Project Team also provides attendees with a graphic depiction of the changes in the SFHA that have occurred since the effective FIRM was published. This Flood Risk product is referred to as the Changes Since Last FIRM (CSLF). The CSLF makes it easy for users to see where the SFHAs have expanded or contracted.

During these meetings, the Project Team also solicits feedback on the work maps from attendees and shares its planned schedule for providing Preliminary versions of the updated FIRM and the FIS report to the community and the public during Phase 4. The FIS report documents the results of the coastal flood risk study in text and tabular form.
Phase 4 – Consultation Coordination Officer Meetings and Flood Risk Open Houses

- At the beginning of Phase 4, the Project Team provides the Preliminary FIRM and FIS report to community officials for review before they are made available to the public.
- After a brief review period, the Project Team meets with community CEOs, FPAs, and other officials to explain changes made to the FIRM, to answer questions about the information shown, and to obtain any other feedback regarding the coastal flood risk study.
- Once community officials’ concerns have been addressed, the Project Team schedules Consultation Coordination Officer (CCO) Meeting(s), during which community officials and key stakeholders focus on the release of the Preliminary version of the FIRM and FIS report and the process for reviewing and adopting the FIRM before it becomes effective.
- Following the CCO Meeting(s), community officials host Flood Risk Open House(s) for the public, supported by FEMA and other Project Team members.
- During the Flood Risk Open House(s), property owners and other residents have an opportunity to review the Preliminary FIRM panels, FIS report materials, and CSLF.
- Open House attendees also have an opportunity to learn more about the appeal and compliance periods and the map adoption process and to ask questions about flood insurance and other mechanisms for reducing the flood risk to their homes, businesses, and families.

Phase 5 – Appeal/Compliance Periods and Resilience Meetings

- At the beginning of Phase 5, FEMA initiates a 90-day appeal period, during which the community and citizens may appeal or comment on the proposed flood hazard information shown on the Preliminary FIRM and/or FIS report.
- To support an appeal, the community or individual must submit scientific or technical data that proves the flood hazard information is shown in error. Because all appeals and comments are submitted to FEMA by the community, residents with any concerns about the flood hazard information should contact community officials.
- At the end of the 90-day appeal period, after addressing all appeals and comments, FEMA issues Letters of Final Determination (LFDs) to affected communities. LFDs establish that the flood hazard information is final and initiate 6-month compliance periods. During the compliance periods, affected communities must adopt the FIRM and update their floodplain management ordinances to comply with Federal and State standards.
- During the compliance period, the Project Team holds one last set of meetings with community officials and other stakeholders. These meetings, referred to as Resilience Meetings, are held to identify and discuss in-progress and potential mitigation actions, including those documented in local Hazard Mitigation Plans.
- Additional flood risk products are presented during the Resilience Meetings to help attendees make more informed decisions. These products include Coastal Flood Risk Reports, Coastal Flood Risk Databases, Coastal Increased Inundation Areas, and Coastal Depth Grids. (See Figure 2.)

Flood depths illustrate the Town of Islands’ severity of flood risk from coastal flooding, including wave action. The depth reflects the difference between the wave crest elevation and the ground for the 1-percent-annual-chance (base) flood. Dark blue colors show deeper flood conditions; lighter blue colors show shallow flood conditions.

Figure 2. Sample Coastal Depth Grid
- The FIRM and FIS report become effective at the end of the 6-month compliance period. After that time, flood insurance is required for properties that are shown on the FIRM in an SFHA and that have a mortgage with a federally regulated or insured lender.
The final FIRM is available at the local community map repository and online through the FEMA Flood Map Service Center website: http://msc.fema.gov/portal.

Mitigation Planning and Activities

- A key component of the FEMA Risk MAP program is its focus on helping communities identify ways to reduce flood risks.
- Resources that could assist community officials, residents, and other stakeholders with identifying options available for future mitigation projects are discussed in a FEMA publication titled Integrating Hazard Mitigation Into Local Planning: Case Studies and Tools for Community Officials.

Additional hazard mitigation planning resources are accessible through www.fema.gov/hazard-mitigation-planning-resources.

For More Information

To learn more about the coastal flood risk study process, please visit the FEMA Region IV Coastal Analysis and Mapping Web Portal: www.southeastcoastalmaps.com/. General questions regarding an in-progress coastal flood risk study can be addressed to the FEMA staff listed below.

- Mark A. Vieira, Coastal Study Project Manager, mark.vieira@fema.dhs.gov
- Christina Lindemer, Coastal Flood Risk Study Lead, christina.lindemer@fema.dhs.gov
- Henrietta Williams, State Outreach Lead for Florida and Mississippi, henrietta.williams@fema.dhs.gov
- Lynne Keating, State Outreach Lead for Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, lynne.keating@fema.dhs.gov

Questions regarding coastal flood risk studies can also be posed to State and local community representatives. Contact information for FEMA, State, and local community representatives is available through the Coastal Study Contacts page on the Region IV Coastal Analysis and Mapping Web Portal: www.southeastcoastalmaps.com/Pages/coastal_contacts.aspx.
April 10, 2016

Mr. Michael J. Busa
Executive Director
Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
421 SW Camden Avenue
Stuart, FL 34994
mbusha@torpc.org

Dear Mike,

I can only imagine the gift of having Kim available day in and day out to
tackle the region’s biggest projects. Who else could be like her,
knowledgeable, competent, willing? She has the dedication of a master and
an athlete’s agility. Do her feet ever touch the ground? I am enlisted by her
passion, and far from alone in this.

The few weeks at work with Kim in quest of the elusive SUN Trail $42
million were a tutorial in leadership and collaboration.

That our East Coast Greenway Southeast Region coalition did not win the
prize was zero the fault of Kim. Her work could have captured the entire
$125 million of SUN Trail money had that been on the table.

But we missed the prize because the Greenways and Trails Council played
it shrewd – which is to say, safe. It chose to fund a link that will extend the
state’s flagship trail, the Coast-to-Coast Connector, with a rural loop that
can be fully programmed within five years, and so demonstrate that the
Legislature’s first SUN Trail investments would justify potentially far greater
sums. Council was unwilling to risk the future in a region that, despite the marvel of Kim and colleagues having knit it together, bore the risks of inter-urban complexity.

Kim’s captaincy has endowed a unified six counties with the promise of continued collaboration. We look forward to continued engagement with Kim and TCRPC. Trails and their contribution to multi-modal transportation will advance more quickly than ever. Our coalition will make the most of Kim’s gifts.

Deeply grateful to you and TCRPC, Mike.

/s/ Herbert L. Hiller  
Southeast Region Program Consultant  
East Coast Greenway Alliance  
Herbhiller12@gmail.com  
321 N. Clara Avenue  
DeLand, FL 32720  
(386) 547-0395

Cc: Dennis Markatos-Soriano  
   Eric Weis  
   Paul Haydt  
   W. Dale Allen
April 11, 2016

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

Dear Mike,

The East Coast Greenway Alliance is indebted to the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council for having assigned Kim DeLaney to captain the six-county ECG Southeast Regional Trail to its extraordinary readiness for SUN Trail funding.

Word from Herb Hiller is that our region was already so invested in its system that the Greenways and Trails Council may have decided the six counties could continue on their own. We regret that the funds did not go to the most populous region under funding consideration, where the trail-transit connection would have generated greatest transportation efficiency, the most jobs, and the greatest economic impact.

On the upside, the ECBA can only thank TCRPC's trails leadership that extends back through the eight years of staffing we have enjoyed in Florida. Herb reminds me of Kim's early work on ECG coalition building, the attention to trails in the Seven50 Southeast Florida Prosperity Plan, and the more recent completion of the seven-county mapping program led by TCRPC and the Palm Beach County MPO.

Kim's extraordinary efforts in the SUN Trail process will resonate with and motivate us for a long time. Thank you for your organization's excellent leadership. We look forward to ongoing collaboration between the ECGA and TCRPC.

Sincerely,

Dennis Markatos-Soriano
Executive Director, East Coast Greenway Alliance

cc: Herb Hiller, ECGA Southeast Regional Greenway Consultant
Mike Busha

From: J. Kevin Lawler <cowboyjkl@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 15, 2016 3:33 PM
To: dillie@tcrpc.org
Cc: mbusha@tcrpc.org; paularyan1@comcast.net
Subject: Thank You

Dana,

Thank you for your leadership and professional design expertise in the Dixie Corridor Redesign Initiative.

It started as a truly collaborative effort between the historic neighborhoods, the Norton and PRAU, and the merchants. It ended as a solo performance of peerless professionalism and exceptional dedication. But for you and the staff of TCRPC, it would not have reached the full baton pass to the City, memorialized last evening by the Commission's unanimous vote to proceed with the request for funding.

Kudos and thank you.

J. Kevin Lawler
cowboyjkl@aol.com
March 17, 2016

Dr. Kim DeLaney  
Director, Strategic Development and Policy  
Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council  
421 SW Camden Avenue  
Stuart, FL 34994  

RE: Technical Advisory Committee Appointment

Dear Dr. DeLaney:

At the March 17, 2016 meeting, the Metropolitan Planning Organization Board approved your appointment as member to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

We look forward to your continued valuable participation on this Committee.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Nick Uhren, P.E.  
Executive Director

NU/ja

cc: Mr. Michael J. Busha, AICP, TCRPC  
Mr. Michael Davis, Chairman, TCRPC
$500M bill would buy land south of Lake Okeechobee to curb discharges to St. Lucie River

By Bartholomew Sullivan, bartholomew.sullivan@tcpalm.com
March 18, 2016

WASHINGTON — In what’s intended as a long-term solution to the damaging discharges of pollution-laden waters from Lake Okeechobee to the St. Lucie and Caloosahatchee rivers, U.S. Rep. Curt Clawson wants the Interior Department to buy land south of the lake for water storage.

The Bonita Springs Republican introduced the Everglades Land...
Acquisition Act Friday. If enacted, it would set aside $500 million for the Interior Department to buy the land in the Everglades Agriculture Area in Palm Beach County after a study, also authorized in the bill, determined the right location. The Interior Department would conduct the study.

"We've been looking at this for a long time," Clawson said. "We wanted to see what the state was going to do before we decided what we should try to do in D.C. New money to buy land is an uphill fight but we can't give up."

Clawson said many people assume the land available for storage purposes is owned by the sugar industry, but he said there are other options.

"Let's let the experts make the call on that," he said.

**NEED DEM SUPPORT**

Clawson is part of a bipartisan effort to expedite repairs to the Herbert Hoover Dike around the lake in what he refers to a "short-term relief" from the damaging discharges. U.S. Reps. Alcee Hastings, D-Fort Lauderdale, and Patrick Murphy, D-Jupiter, were original co-sponsors of Clawson's bill to do that, introduced earlier this month.

However, the Army Corps has said a stronger dike won't automatically allow for putting more water in the lake and discharging less excess to the St. Lucie River and Indian River Lagoon.

Getting money to buy storage acreage will be harder than getting the money to expedite the dike repairs, Clawson said.

"Nowadays, in Washington, everything's an uphill fight, but (with) bills about conservation and about water cleanliness, I think we will have good luck finding Democratic support," he said. "The more realistic one, first, is the dam bill, but we also needed to send the message that the puzzle is not complete until we start spending more money on flow and filtration south and less money on storage of water which just turns nasty over time anyway."

Murphy will review Clawson's proposal, spokeswoman Erin Moffett Hale
said.

"(Murphy) shares the goal of moving more clean water south of Lake Okeechobee to provide relief to our local waterways," she said. "By fighting to fully fund CERP projects, authorize CEPP, and calling on the state to use Amendment 1 dollars on land acquisition and conservation as 75 percent of Florida voters intended, we are on the path to do just that. Congressman Murphy looks forward to reviewing congressman Clawson's proposal."

Reducing and then eliminating the flows into the rivers is the ultimate goal and it's a good investment for taxpayers, Clawson said.

"It's better for the water. It's better for the ecology. It's better for the Everglades. It's better for the Caloosahatchee and better for the taxpayer," he said. "We feel like the best way to get closer to Mother Nature's original design ... is to get a flow way with filtration and move more water south."

WHO DECIDES?

Everglades Foundation CEO Eric Eikenberg said the "specific parcel of land" will be determined by the state under the terms of the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan signed into law by President Bill Clinton 15 years ago. A 1999 feasibility report by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the South Florida Water Management District calls for a reservoir in the Everglades Agricultural Area in Palm Beach County, he noted.

That report envisioned three, 20,000-acre "compartments," each six feet deep.

Eikenberg said almost $3 billion has been invested in manmade wetlands to clean up polluted water south of Lake Okeechobee and a groundbreaking for another 2.6 miles of bridges along the Tamiami Trail to help water flow south is schedule for April 22.

"When we talk about reducing the amount of water that's being dumped down the Caloosahatchee and St. Lucie rivers, overall restoration is
reconnecting Lake Okeechobee to Florida Bay down in the Keys," he said. "And in order to create a new outlet to send water south you have to have storage ... and Mr. Clawson's bill deals with storage."

Unlike the dike repair bill, the land purchase bill hasn't attracted any co-sponsors but that's not unusual for a bill just introduced.

Sen. Marco Rubio "continues to support solutions for water management throughout the state and to help preserve the Florida Everglades," spokeswoman Kristen Morell said. "He led the successful effort to deauthorize the Ten Mile Creek water reservoir so it can be utilized by the state and is pushing to get the Central Everglades Planning Project finally approved in the Senate's upcoming water resources bill. He understands the importance of moving water south to the Everglades and is looking over congressman Clawson's newly introduced bill."

U.S. Rep. Bill Posey, R-Rockledge, also "will take a close look" at Clawson's proposal, spokesman George Cecala said.

"Certainly, fixing this problem is an important priority for our state and local communities," Cecala said.

Sen. Bill Nelson, D-Fla., was traveling Friday and could not be reached for comment, but spokesman Ryan Brown said Nelson "supports buying more land South of Lake Okeechobee."

Bartholomew Sullivan, a veteran Washington reporter, heads Treasure Coast Newspapers' D.C. news bureau.
Unemployment Summary - Treasure Coast Region
April 15, 2016

Highlights

- Unemployment in the region fell to 4.7 percent in March, down from 5.1 percent in March of the previous year.

- 19,000 new nonagricultural jobs year over year from March 2015 to March 2016.

- Job gains primarily in education and health services; professional and business services; trade, transportation and utilities; government; and financial activities.

- 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 (Palm Beach County) 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 4.7 percent in March 2016, down 0.4 percentage points from the March 2015 rate of 5.1 percent. The Region’s unemployment rate was the same as the state’s unemployment rate of 4.7 percent and 0.4 percentage points lower than the national unemployment rate of 5.1 percent. Out of a labor force of 964,775 there were 44,886 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 March 2016, nonagricultural employment in the combined metropolitan areas of the Region was 791,000 an increase of 19,000 jobs over the previous year.
### Unemployment Rates*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Area</th>
<th>March 2016</th>
<th>February 2016</th>
<th>March 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian River County</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin County</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach County</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie County</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasure Coast Region</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.6</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 education and health services (+5,400); professional and business services (+3,800); trade, transportation and utilities (+2,600); government (+2,400); and financial activities (+2,200).

- Industries that lost jobs over the year were manufacturing (-200) and mining, logging and construction (-100).

**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 141,100 jobs in March 2016, an increase of 3,500 jobs from March 2015 (+2.5 percent).

**Sebastian-Vero Beach Metro Area:**

The Sebastian-Vero Beach MSA had the third fastest annual job growth rate compared to all the metro areas in the state in education and health services (+5.3 percent) in March 2016.

**West Palm Beach-Boca Raton-Boynton Beach Metropolitan Division:**

The unemployment rate in the CareerSource Palm Beach County region (Palm Beach County) was 4.5 percent in March 2016. This rate was 0.3 percentage point lower than the region's year ago rate of 4.8 percent. The region's March 2016 unemployment rate was 0.2 percentage point lower than the state rate of 4.7 percent.
Overview of the CareerSource Research Coast Region  
Not Seasonally Adjusted  
April 15, 2016

- The unemployment rate in the CareerSource Research Coast region (Indian River, Martin, and St. Lucie counties) was 5.1 percent in March 2016. This rate was 0.7 percentage point lower than the region’s year ago rate of 5.8 percent. Out of a labor force of 264,938 there were 13,525 unemployed residents in the region.

- Martin County had the lowest unemployment rate (4.6 percent) in the CareerSource Research Coast region followed by St. Lucie County (5.2 percent), and Indian River County (5.5 percent).

- 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). In March 2016, nonagricultural employment in the combined CareerSource Research Coast metro areas was 191,500, an increase of 4,900 jobs (+2.6 percent) over the previous year.

- In the combined CareerSource Research Coast metro areas, the major industries that gained jobs over the year were: education and health services (+1,800 jobs); leisure and hospitality (+1,400 jobs); mining, logging, and construction (+500 jobs); government (+500 jobs); professional and business services (+400 jobs); trade, transportation, and utilities; and other services (+400 jobs each); and information (+100 jobs). The manufacturing (-500 jobs); and financial activities (-100 jobs) industries lost jobs over the year.

Port St. Lucie metro areas

- 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 141,100 jobs in March 2016, an increase of 3,500 jobs from March 2015 (+2.5 percent).

- The Port St. Lucie MSA had the fastest annual job growth rate compared to all the metro areas in the state in information (+8.3 percent) in March 2016.

- The Port St. Lucie MSA had the second fastest annual job growth rate compared to all the metro areas in the state in government (+2.6 percent) in March 2016.

Note: All data are subject to revision.  
• Annual employment growth in information (+8.3 percent); leisure and hospitality (+5.3 percent); education and health services (+5.3 percent); other services (+3.9 percent); and government (+2.6 percent) was faster in the metro area than statewide.

• The industries gaining in jobs over the year were: education and health services (+1,300 jobs); leisure and hospitality (+1,000 jobs); government (+500 jobs); mining, logging, and construction (+300 jobs); professional and business services (+300 jobs); other services (+300 jobs); trade, transportation, and utilities (+100 jobs); and information (+100 jobs). The manufacturing (-300 jobs); financial activities (-100 jobs) industries lost jobs over the year.

Sebastian-Vero Beach metro area

• Nonagricultural employment was 50,400 in the Sebastian-Vero Beach metro area in March 2016, an increase of 1,400 jobs (+2.9 percent) from the previous year.

• The Sebastian-Vero Beach MSA had the third fastest annual job growth rate compared to all the metro areas in the state in education and health services (+5.3 percent) in March 2016.

• Mining, logging, and construction (+6.3 percent); education and health services (+5.3 percent); leisure and hospitality (+5.1 percent); other services (+3.7 percent); and trade, transportation, and utilities (+3.0 percent) grew faster in the metro area than in the state.

• The major industries that gained jobs over the year were: education and health services (+500 jobs); leisure and hospitality (+400 jobs); trade, transportation, and utilities (+300 jobs); mining, logging, and construction (+200 jobs); professional and business services and other services (+100 jobs each). Manufacturing lost 200 jobs over the year. Information; financial activities; and government were unchanged over the year.

Note: All data are subject to revision.
### Unemployment Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Mar-16</th>
<th>Feb-16</th>
<th>Mar-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CareerSource Research Coast</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River County</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin County</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie County</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nonagricultural Employment by Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Mar-16</th>
<th>Mar-15</th>
<th>change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>142,500</td>
<td>137,600</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, Logging and Construction</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation, and Utilities</td>
<td>30,800</td>
<td>29,800</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing, and Utilities</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Business Services</td>
<td>16,300</td>
<td>16,300</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Health Services</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and Hospitality</td>
<td>18,700</td>
<td>18,700</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>20,100</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nonagricultural Employment by Industry (Florida)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Mar-16</th>
<th>Mar-15</th>
<th>change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>1,322,900</td>
<td>8,064,700</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, Logging and Construction</td>
<td>144,700</td>
<td>144,200</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>188,600</td>
<td>186,600</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation, and Utilities</td>
<td>414,600</td>
<td>414,600</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>110,300</td>
<td>109,900</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>120,200</td>
<td>119,900</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing, and Utilities</td>
<td>426,600</td>
<td>426,600</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>121,100</td>
<td>120,900</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>230,300</td>
<td>230,300</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Business Services</td>
<td>250,700</td>
<td>245,100</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Health Services</td>
<td>208,300</td>
<td>208,300</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and Hospitality</td>
<td>168,300</td>
<td>168,300</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>106,300</td>
<td>106,300</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Note

All data are subject to revision.
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- The unemployment rate in the CareerSource Palm Beach County region (Palm Beach County) was 4.5 percent in March 2016. This rate was 0.3 percentage point lower than the region’s year ago rate of 4.8 percent. The region’s March 2016 unemployment rate was 0.2 percentage point lower than the state rate of 4.7 percent. Out of a labor force of 699,837 there were 31,361 unemployed residents in the region.

- In March 2016 nonagricultural employment in the West Palm Bch-Boca Raton-Delray Bch Metro Division was 599,500, an increase of 14,100 jobs (+2.4 percent) over the year.

- The West Palm Bch-Boca Raton-Delray Bch Metro Division had the fastest annual job growth rate compared to all the metro areas in the state in financial activities (+5.9 percent) in March 2016.

- The West Palm Bch-Boca Raton-Delray Bch Metro Division had the first fastest annual job growth rate compared to all the metro areas in the state in government (+3.0 percent) in March 2016.

- The financial activities (+5.9 percent); government (+3.0 percent); information (+1.0 percent); and education and health services (+3.9 percent) industries grew faster in the metro area than statewide over the year.

- The industries gaining in jobs over the year were: education and health services (+3,660 jobs); professional and business services (+3,400 jobs); financial activities (+2,300 jobs); trade, transportation, and utilities (+2,200 jobs); government (+1,900 jobs); other services (+600 jobs); manufacturing (+300 jobs); leisure and hospitality (+300 jobs); and information (+100 jobs).

Note: All data are subject to revision.  
## Unemployment Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Mar-16</th>
<th>Feb-16</th>
<th>Mar-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach County</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Nonagricultural Employment by Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Metropolitan Division</th>
<th>Florida</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>595,400</td>
<td>8,312,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and Logging</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5,790,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>28,900</td>
<td>441,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>17,610</td>
<td>348,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation, and Utilities</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>1,797,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>24,050</td>
<td>399,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>79,200</td>
<td>1,094,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing, and Utilities</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>274,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>134,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>41,200</td>
<td>548,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Business Services</td>
<td>107,600</td>
<td>1,252,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Health Services</td>
<td>96,800</td>
<td>1,236,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and Hospitality</td>
<td>85,500</td>
<td>1,185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>92,800</td>
<td>1,134,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>64,300</td>
<td>1,134,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach County</td>
<td>1,378,417</td>
<td>1,369,228</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>19,815,183</td>
<td>19,567,369</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Average Annual Wage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach County</td>
<td>$47,850</td>
<td>$46,218</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$44,810</td>
<td>$43,633</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All data are subject to revision.