

PUBLIC WORKSHOP

DRAFT EVALUATION AND APPRAISAL REPORT

OCTOBER 20, 2008

1. **CALL TO ORDER**1

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**.....1

3. **PRESENTATIONS AND PUBLIC DISCUSSION**2

*REVIEW OF INDIAN RIVER COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN EVALUATION AND
APPRAISAL REPORT*2

INTRODUCTION.....2

FUTURE LAND USE ELEMENT3

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT10

CONSERVATION ELEMENT13

COASTAL MANAGEMENT ELEMENT14

POTABLE WATER SUB-ELEMENT16

HOUSING ELEMENT17

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ELEMENT18

4. **WRAP UP AND DIRECTION TO STAFF**20

5. **ADJOURNMENT**21

October 20, 2008

PUBLIC WORKSHOP OF THE INDIAN RIVER COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

The Board of County Commissioners of Indian River County, Florida, held a Public Workshop at the County Commission Chambers, 1801 27th Street, Vero Beach, Florida, on Monday, October 20, 2008, to review the Draft Evaluation and Appraisal Report. Present were Chairman Sandra L. Bowden, Vice Chairman Wesley S. Davis, Commissioners Joseph E. Flescher, Peter D. O'Bryan, and Gary C. Wheeler. Also present were County Administrator Joseph A. Baird, County Attorney William G. Collins II, and Deputy Clerk Athena Adams.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Bowden called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Bowden led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

3. PRESENTATIONS AND PUBLIC DISCUSSION

REVIEW OF INDIAN RIVER COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN EVALUATION AND APPRAISAL REPORT

INTRODUCTION

Community Development Director Bob Keating provided background and description on the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR), which he described as an on-going process that is mandated by the State, and is due on December 1, 2008. He announced that this is the first of two public Workshops, the second of which would be on Thursday, October 23, 2008, if all business is not addressed today.

Through a PowerPoint Presentation Director Keating outlined the Elements of the Comprehensive Plan that are being revised, noting that he would address seven of the fifteen elements, but would rather they be not addressed in complete detail. He detailed State law requirements for the EAR, which requires that the Local Planning agency (Planning & Zoning Commission) prepare the Report, and noted that staff has worked closely with them over the years. Staff has taken certain elements of the EAR to various County committees and has received valuable feedback. On October 9, 2008 the Local Planning Agency (PZC) reviewed the Report and recommended that the Board approve the EAR.

Director Keating outlined the EAR components, stating that each of the fifteen EAR components has the same format: the first two sections are an inventory or conditions at the time the Plan was last updated, and the third section is an analysis of those conditions. He said the most important parts of each of the EAR Elements are the evaluation of objectives, which outlines whether they were or were not met; reasons why they were not met; whether policies were implemented or not and why they were or were

not implemented. He discussed the goals, objectives and policies of the EAR and provided statistics for an overall objective, pointing out that there are 129 objectives for 2008, 96 of which were achieved, 17 partially achieved, and 16 were not achieved.

Staff determined and recommended that 14 of these objectives should be maintained; 109 should be revised; 6 should be deleted, and 6 new ones be added. Within this Element are 806 policies, 717 of which are implemented, 11 partially implemented, and 78 not implemented. Staff's proposal is to maintain 574 of those, revise 177, delete 55, and add 116 new ones. Director Keating disclosed that throughout the process, going to the various Committees and the PZC, staff has invited public comments on all the EAR elements and have received a lot of comments.

FUTURE LAND USE ELEMENT

Brian Freeman, Senior Planner, through a PowerPoint Presentation reviewed this Element and highlighted some of the existing conditions, as they are currently. On the matter of annexations in the County, over the past 10 years, nearly 24,000 acres of land were annexed into the City of Fellsmere, (over 37 square miles) and 832 acres (just over 1 square mile) by the other four (4) municipalities combined. He pointed out that looking at the reduction and build-out potential that has occurred since 1998, there has been a couple of contributing factors, like the annexations highlighted and that single family residential development occurs at densities that are below the maximums that are allowed by the Future Land Use (FLU) Map. He noted that the County is nearly 50% built-out with just over 55,000 residential units that are allowed by the Comprehensive Plan and FLU Map, and this includes areas inside and outside the Urban Service Boundary.

Looking at commercial lands, Mr. Freeman said there are 34 commercial and industrial nodes in the unincorporated County, and in 2007 those nodes were 43% developed, meaning there were 2,394 acres of developed commercial industrial lands out of a total of 5,538 acres. Based on that analysis, staff felt there were sufficient commercial and industrial, as well as, residential designated lands land within the County.

Mr. Freeman provided EAR analysis of the conditions, and outlined the Future Land Use objectives and policies. He also summarized the major issues which include retention of rural lands (natural and agricultural areas), the possibility of low density suburban sprawl, the disconnections between adjacent uses (sidewalks and streets), and the need to limit commercial strip development within the County. He presented the objectives and policies in the Future Land Use Element (FLUE) stating that there are a total of 20 objectives in this Element, and since 1998, 13 which were achieved, 2 are expected to be achieved by their respective target dates, 2 were partially achieved, and 3 were not likely to be achieved by their target dates.

There are a total of 141 Policies in this Element, of which 125 were implemented, 1 was partially implemented, and 15 were not implemented. Staff recommended that 113 policies be maintained as structured, 28 new policies be added, 22 of the existing policies be revised, and 6 of the existing policies be deleted. Other changes recommended were:

Objective 1: “Compact Low-Density Development” (has been achieved): staff recommends that this objective be revised to extend the target date to 2030. Within this objective are 45 policies, 39 are recommended to be maintained, 4 to be revised, 2 to be deleted, and proposed that 5 new ones be added.

He highlighted Policy 1.26 that is being recommended for deletion, stating that it is a policy that aims to promote mixed-use development within the County, but has been overall, ineffective; hence staff's recommendation for deletion of this policy, and that there be new policies established, which will be discussed under Objectives 5 and 18.

Looking at other existing policies being proposed for revision, Mr. Freeman highlighted Policies 1.34 and 1.35. Both relate to the County's New Town Policy that affects the agricultural areas of the County. The changes recommended are to increase the density within New Town areas from 1 to 2 units per acre and also to limit the overall number of New Towns that could be developed within the County. The last change recommended is that New Towns be prohibited in the Agricultural-3 areas, which is the westernmost portion of the County. He also highlighted other proposed changes to Objective 1.

Objective 4: "Efficient Mix of Uses to Reduce Traffic Demand" (it is anticipated staff will not achieve this objective): staff recommended a revision of the objective's target date to 2030 and to target within 10% of 2005 levels for per capita trips and minutes per trip. There are 4 existing policies in this Objective, and it is recommended that 1 be maintained, 3 be revised, and the 3 new policies being proposed, are to limit dead-end streets, increase inter-connections between adjacent developments where appropriate, and to promote the use of traffic calming measures where necessary. An increase in the construction of sidewalks, particularly in residential areas, was also recommended.

Objective 5: "Diversity of Development" (it is anticipated that the County will not achieve this Objective). Staff's recommendation: a revision of the objective's target date to 2010 and to target within 25% of the County's housing units in either multi-family or traditional neighborhood design projects. There are 8 existing policies in this

Objective; 5 are proposed to be maintained as structured, 3 to be revised, and 1 new policy has been proposed. Mr. Freeman highlighted the revision to Policy 5.8 which addresses agricultural planned developments, and presented staff's recommendation to revise this Policy to establish a minimum common open space requirement of at least 50% for agricultural PDs.

Objective 6: "Agricultural Protection" (this Objective was achieved): staff recommended a revision of the objective's target date to 2015 and to establish a new target of 110,000 acres of active agricultural lands for the year 2015. There are five policies in this Plan, three (3) of which are proposed to be maintained, two (2) to be revised, and an addition of six (6) new policies are proposed. He described the proposed new policies and staff's recommendation for each.

Objective 18: "Traditional Neighborhood Design (TND): staff recommended a revision of the objective's target date to 2020 with 10% of target to be maintained. It is not expected that this objective will be achieved. There are three (3) policies in this Objective, two (2) are proposed to be maintained, and one (1) to be revised, with a proposal to add one (1) new policy. He highlighted and described the policies to be maintained, revised, and the new addition.

Objective 9: this is a new policy to expand some corridor standards countywide, and to add a new policy that requires architectural design guidelines for certain types of residential single-family development within planned development projects. Another policy recommendation was to modify the buffer and open space requirements for single-family residential developments.

Commissioner O'Bryan, commenting on Objective 1 (Compact Low-Density Development) noted that our current density is 1.23 units per acre and the

recommendation was for 1.75 units per acre, and questioned how we would get there with our current buffer requirements, and how we would come up with the extra density.

Director Keating explained that this objective is oriented towards encouraging in-fill, and as long as we in-fill developments within the Urban Service Area instead of sprawling it outside, we would get higher density inside, not high, but higher.

Commissioner O'Bryan presented his views on the following Policies and Objectives:

- (1) Commenting on the revised Policies 1.34 and 1.35, which recommended that we double the density bonus from 1-unit to 2-units per acre, asked if the 2nd unit per acre could be tied and only via a TDR (Transfer of Development Rights) program. Under the new policy for industrial and commercial zoning, he asked if we could, at some point, create a biotech zoning that would be more appropriate for those types of spin-off businesses so that we can create a node and know that certain businesses would not be in there.
- (2) **Objective 4**, the inter-connections between adjacent neighborhoods, he knew that from an EMS point of view it was desirable to have traffic flow from neighborhood to neighborhood, and thought a lot of residents would be opposed if their neighborhoods become a shortcut between two roads.
- (3) **Objective 5**, "Diversity of Development," asked why not leave our current target for TNDs at 30% and keep working hard to achieve it instead of lowering the target.

- (4) **Objective 6**, he thought the policy/concept for bio-fuel processing plants was great and staff might want to limit that to AG-2 and AG-3 only and not have the conflict.
- (5) Under the Policy for construction of reservoirs, he asked if staff was talking about above ground reservoirs with dykes or just talking about calling a mining pit a reservoir. He saw a big difference and felt we needed to specify if we are talking about above ground or ground water.
- (6) **Objective 18.3**, “Traditional Neighborhood Design (TND)”, wanted to see more definitions in it, because he thought the current wording “To facilitate TND project east of I-95 the county shall allow portions of TND projects to be located outside of the urban service area.” needed to be clearly defined, as “parcel and portions” were too vague. He said, looking at how Liberty Park was done, where they took densities from the inside and transferred it to the outside, he did not think that was good planning. He would rather see the 60% tied into as-built on site; so that 60% or more of the project density has to be built inside the Urban Service Area (USA) and the less dense portions of the TND are outside the USA.

Vice Chairman Davis, based on comments from Commissioner O’Bryan regarding changes, asked for Director Keating’s opinion, from a planning perspective, because he did not know whether the Liberty Park project would have been able to stay in those ramifications had that actually been a part of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

Director Keating, responding to comments regarding the Liberty Park and the 60% inside the Urban Service Area, thought if it had been done with Liberty Park they would have had a poor design, and they would have had some of the higher density

development on the east side of 66th Avenue split off from the rest of the project. Regarding some of the other suggestions by Commissioner O'Bryan, Director Keating felt they could be done.

Commissioner Wheeler also talked about Liberty Park's design within the Urban Service Line (USL), as well as, expense of property in and outside the USL. With the New Town changing from 1 to 2 units per acre, and to transfer that density into the New Town, he asked how that would be done and the two units per acre would be determined. He also talked about traffic calming and asked what some of the ideas to create traffic calming were or what other traffic calming would be available. He questioned how they would define 50% for Agricultural Planned Developments and what that would include. Under Objective 6, he remarked that when looking at 8 lots of affidavits of exemption rather than 19, he felt there would still be a demand for ranchettes.

Chairman Bowden complimented staff on the wonderful job they have done without a consultant.

The Chairman opened the floor to public discussion.

Peter Robinson, Laurel Homes, referred to comments from Commissioner O'Bryan about eliminating the problems of dead-end streets, and believed that we need to create a defensible neighborhood, and one of the main ingredients to a defensible neighborhood was having dead-end streets. He alluded to crimes in neighborhoods where people have many avenues of escape, and recommended that the County allow people to live on cul-de-sacs and to allow people to have a protection for themselves.

Regarding the Affidavit of 8 versus 19 exemptions, Mr. Robinson said the original 19 came about because it was determined that that was right under two hundred (200) trips and these were on dirt roads. He believed that when we go to paved roads we kill the ranchettes economically. He thought we should focus on the issues of foreclosed homes, and vacant lots if we are going to do an evaluation, and that now was the time to look at our statistics and land use.

Commissioner Wheeler said he was one of the proponents to keep the 19 units affidavit of exemption versus 8 and spoke about people living on dirt roads who want the County or taxpayers to pick up additional cost or maintain those roads, which was a concern of his. Discussion ensued with Mr. Robinson regarding people living on private roads and whose responsibility it was to maintain those roads.

There were no other speakers and the Chairman closed the public input session.

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

Phil Matson of the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), through a PowerPoint presentation, outlined the objectives and goals of the Transportation Element, specifically Objectives 1, 2 and 9. He pointed out that they have achieved ten (10) of their thirteen (13) objectives; one was not achieved, and two were not yet due.

(Clerk's Note: Vice Chairman Davis exited the meeting at 2:35p.m.)

Mr. Matson disclosed that 57 of the 61 Policies in this Element were implemented, and they were recommending maintenance of most of these policies. However, they are recommending that sixteen (16) policies be revised and ten (10) be deleted. Mr. Matson further updated the Board on the following objectives:

Objective 1: “Adequate Transportation System”, Mr. Matson acknowledged that there are no existing roadway capacity deficiencies within the County. He noted that this objective has been achieved; recommended retaining this objective; and outlined the achievements pertaining to levels of service. Policy revision recommendations were: (1) review of impact fees every 3 years (not 2); and (2) impose all or part of the EMS Gas Tax by 2010.

Objective 2: “Safety”, Mr. Matson stated that this has not been achieved, but pointed out that the high relative crash-rate intersections would be less than the five that we had in 2001. Policy additions to this Objective were bike/pedestrian safety strategies, ITS, and engineering for an aging population.

Objective 9: “Adequate Transit Service”, Mr. Matson said between 2001 and 2006 the number of one-way passenger trips will increase annually by an average of 10%, from 167,000 to more than 270,000, and they have exceeded their highest expectations on this Objective. He described the advantages of bus level of service while comparing our current level of bus service, and recommended that the Objective should be changed to measure transit level of service indicators, including headways, hours of operation, and serving TD populations. New Policies under this Objective would include bus stop provision, city contributions, ITS (arrival Notification: Signal pre-emption, etc.). Two new Objectives would be system maintenance and preservation, and airport access, which are required by Rule 9J-5. They are looking to tighten up their policies on right-of-way acquisition/ eminent domain, among others.

Objective 10: “Land Use”, staff would look at the jobs housing balance issue. He then invited questions.

Commissioner O’Bryan, commenting on the TDMs, said he has had people asking if we could set up some parking rides out at I-95, SR 60, and CR 510.

Chairman Bowden invited comments from the public.

Peter Robinson, Laurel Homes, had questions regarding changing eminent domain (under Objective 9), and wanted to know what exactly had staff planned to do.

Attorney Collins explained how the process may be handled; mentioned laws to be followed; and cautioned against codifying procedures that needed some flexibility.

Mr. Robinson thought it was interesting, that in the first Land Development Report it was mentioned how trips are lengthened and people are taking longer trips, but in this Report it is mentioned that people are not driving as much, and we are not getting as much gas tax. He felt one of the weaknesses we have still today is we work with national standards. He also felt we needed to determine more about trips and what people are taking as trips, because we live a different lifestyle than many other areas. On the issue of traffic calming, he felt we needed to watch what we are doing, whether we were calming traffic or building congestion.

CONSERVATION ELEMENT

Roland DeBlois, Chief of Environmental Planning, provided a summary of the major issues, which included protection, improvement of water quality in the Indian River Lagoon and St. Sebastian River, protection of ground water quality and quantity, sustainability of natural systems, conservation of wildlife corridors / greenways, and management of conservation lands. He noted that there are twelve (12) Objectives in this Element, nine (9) of which have been achieved and three (3) were partially achieved. Under Policies implementation, eighty-three (83) policies were implemented and nine (9) were not.

Chief DeBlois pointed out that the Committee for a Sustainable Treasure Coast had their own recommendations, and staff was looking to adopt a policy to adopt some of those recommendations through that regional Committee, particularly related to various tools to conserve natural resources in the County. He thereafter presented staff's proposal for revised /new policies –commercial and miscellaneous uses.

Commissioner O'Bryan commenting on Objective 2 (surface water quality) and talk about a regular maintenance program for the onsite disposal systems, basically septic tanks, repeated the old adage, "if it's not broken, don't fix it", because he thought going into some regular required "pump out thing" might just be a cost to homeowners that is not justified. He felt we needed to make sure that a regular maintenance system is something that is doing good, not just creating additional cost to homeowners.

Under new policies, funding for hiring an additional management staff, Commissioner O'Bryan thought this was one year we have been very lacking in funding the maintenance and management of our conservation lands, and we needed to come up with a more dedicated funding source, so we have the manpower and the tools to

maintain these lands, to improve our conservation land management program, and to eliminate using it for mitigation.

Commissioner Wheeler agreed with Commissioner O'Bryan, but questioned if there has been a problem in this County with septic systems. Chief DeBlois said there has been a kind of regional concern about it, as far as documented failure and pollution from it, but was not aware of any particular problem areas. He promised to look into the matter.

Chairman Bowden did not think there was a problem with septic tanks and was not aware of any. She talked about the maintenance plan and programs of the conservation lands and wanted to make sure that, particularly, Lost Tree Islands do not turn into Disney World, meaning, they should not put villages there, but put the minimum, so people can see, years from now, what natural life and habitat exist there.

Peter Robinson reiterated comments about septic tanks, pointing out that there were areas where septic tanks do not work, and it was not really an issue.

COASTAL MANAGEMENT ELEMENT

Roland DeBlois, Chief of Environmental Planning, explained that under the State requirements, coastal counties are required to have a Coastal Management Element, and in Indian River County (where it applies) the coastal zone was based on the Indian River Lagoon watershed, which actually covers about half of the County. This Element overlaps with other Elements of the Plan, and particular focus was on coastal/marine resources protection, manatee protection, public access to coastal resources, limit on expenditures, and natural disaster planning. He presented a comparison from 1988 to

present, outlining the progress made, the objectives and policies fulfilled and implemented, the objectives for beaches and dunes, and the proposed new/revised policies for public access and miscellaneous.

Chief DeBlois noted that in this Element, there are fourteen (14) objectives, twelve (12) of which were achieved, and two (2) were not achieved. There were ninety-three (93) policies implemented, and seven (7) were not implemented. He focused on particular objectives, like beaches and dunes, and public access. He mentioned that a good portion of this Plan reflects policies and objectives that were adopted in the Manatee Protection and Boating Safety Comprehensive Management Plan.

Under **Objective 4**, Dunes and Beaches, there is an objective to conserve natural functions of beach and dune systems, and staff's position is that this has essentially been achieved with the implementation of the beach preservation plan, which includes the sea turtle habitat plan. Staff is looking at a new revised policy, to evaluate the current location of the County's dune stabilization setback line westward; and the State is exploring adopting a Florida Beaches Habitat Conservation Plan so that after natural disasters there would be a plan in place to deal with endangered species issues. Chief DeBlois stated that it has been proposed to require oceanfront development to hook up public sewer where available, and staff is proposing that the County require new developments to hook up to sewer if it is within a certain distance from existing lines where available.

Under **Objective 8**, Public Access, Chief DeBlois stated that we have an objective to, by 2010, increase public access by at least five access points in the County to natural resources, and we have achieved this over the past 10 years. Under new Policies, staff is looking at revisions to boat access and ramps, to establish a policy for the County to seek funds to construct a boat ramp at the Gifford dock road. Staff is also

looking at setting a specific timeframe for access improvements at the Captain Forrester Hammock Preserve, and to seek funding for the Archie Smith Fish House under the working waterfront program. The Marine Advisory Committee has recommended that we establish a policy with formal procedures on marine debris or derelict vessel removal procedures, including procedures to secure funding (e.g. FEMA)

There were no questions or comments from Commissioners or members of the public.

POTABLE WATER SUB-ELEMENT

Sasan Rohani, County's Long Range Planning Chief, outlined conditions for potable water from 1995-2006. He discussed design capacity, projected demand, policies implementation, new policies, objectives achievement, PW-sub-element objectives, water conservation, alternative water supply, brine disposal, and new policies under new Objective 9. Mr. Rohani disclosed that the capacity and demand of the County's Plants increased from 9.5 MGD to 12.07 and from 4.4 to 9.7 MGD respectively; and the number of private plants decreased from 29 to 3; the number of customers increased and they are providing more water to more of the subdivisions with undersized lots; the service area expanded; and they noticed that per capita water usage increased, which reasons he explained.

This Element has 7 Objectives, six (6) of which were achieved, and one was not achieved. The seven objectives are to be revised, and two new ones are to be added. There are 38 policies in the Element, 37 of which were implemented and one not implemented (Policy 4.7). It is proposed that 36 policies be maintained; two policies be revised, and 11 new ones to be added. Staff recommended a new Objective, that by 2018

at least 18 MGD of the demand comes from another source besides the Florida Aquifer; and to do that staff is recommending policies (under objective 8) that by 2010 the Utilities Department has to identify a viable alternative source; by 2012 obtain all necessary permits; by 2013 complete all construction plans; and to be built by 2015.

Under Objective 9, Brine Disposal, the recommended new policy is that by 2015 all reverse osmosis water treatment plant direct brine discharges into the Indian River Lagoon or into connecting tributaries to the Lagoon will be eliminated.

Mike Hotchkiss responded to questions from Attorney Collins who was curious about comments regarding brine discharge, deep well or marshes, as well as, ocean outfall, and whether there that was where the salt is; and whether that would work or not.

Commissioner O'Bryan, commenting on the new objectives for alternative water supply and brine disposal, thought the proposed timelines were quite aggressive, and needed to be approached more slowly.

There was no public input.

HOUSING ELEMENT

Sasan Rohani, Long Range Chief, provided background on this Element, which include the IRC 2005 cost burden, changes between 2000 to 2006 in median housing cost and income, workforce housing issues, housing affordable ratings, current AH strategies, housing price changes balancing ACT, new housing strategies, housing

programs (assisted units), policies implementation, objectives and achievements, and mix of dwelling unit types.

Under this Element there are ten (10) objectives, seven (7) of which have been achieved, two (2) partially achieved and one (1) was not achieved. Staff is recommending that nine (9) objectives be revised and one (1) be maintained. There are 51 Policies, with 46 implemented, 1 partially implemented and 4 not implemented. Staff is also recommending that 42 policies be maintained, 7 be revised, 2 be deleted and 11 new policies be added. Mr. Rohani then presented a summary of Objective 1 and explained why it was not achieved.

Commissioner O'Bryan, commenting on Objective 1, where the target was not met for owner occupied, and renters were paying less than the 30%, thought that instead of changing those percentages and lowering the bar, they could be looking at ways of how we could achieve those existing numbers. He felt it was our job not to just lower the bar but to find solutions. He recommended that we find a way to hit those original targets and get those numbers down.

There was no public input.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ELEMENT

Bill Schutt, Senior Planner, through a PowerPoint presentation, described the economic development conditions from 1995 to 2007. He explained what those conditions mean to the County, and described County target industries and incentives, as well as how the local incentives worked. Besides incentives, there are plans to develop the areas as a research coast (Research Coast Initiative). He reviewed the Element's

objectives and policies, policies implemented, the seven objectives for economic development, and presented recommended new policies and policy changes.

Mr. Schutt stated that from 1995 to 2007 the unemployment rate within the County has decreased from 9.7% to 5.5%, most recently due to the housing boom. During said timeframe, median household income and per capita income increased, but low wages remained, reflecting on the predominance of the service industries. Citrus acreage also decreased from 66,561 to 40,191; the number of citrus packing housing decreased from 20 to 12; and the number of hotels decreased from 44 to 31. He said the County has program incentives to attract target industries, and have used incentives to retain Piper Aircraft and nine other companies. There is also an initiative to develop the area as a research coast to attract/create life-signs and biotech and other similar industries, which include the Treasure Coast Counties, the Workforce Development Board of the Treasure Coast, and Okeechobee County, as well.

Under this Element, 4 objectives were achieved, 1 was anticipated to be achieved by target date, 1 was not achieved, and 1 is measurable. It is recommended that seven (7) objectives be revised and 1 new objective be added. There are 43 Policies to be maintained and six to be revised. It is recommended that 28 policies be maintained, 14 be revised, 7 be deleted, and 5 new ones be added.

Mr. Schutt elaborated on Objective 2, Diversified Economic Growth, which is anticipated to be achieved, and recommended that the target date range be revised to 2010 and 2015 and to target an increase of 1,000 jobs. Under Objective 4, Encourage Economic Development, which has been achieved, he recommended that it be revised to include a target date of 2015 and a target of having at least two additional industrial/ business/tech; and Parks with sufficient land and infrastructure to accommodate new or expanding businesses.

Staff's recommendations for new Policies and Policy Changes are to refine the target industry list, facilitate the development of large lot business/technology parks, and increase the County's average annual wage target to be more consistent with the State's.

Commissioner O'Bryan, on the idea of a research coast, liked the idea of having a biotech zoning; believed it gives credibility and could be used for marketing; and was something to consider.

Director Keating, in response to Commissioner O'Bryan's inquiry, said one of the proposed policy initiatives in this Element was to address the allowance of taller and bigger buildings, so at this point it was not specific and delineated; it would be "flushed out" next year when the Comprehensive Plan is amended.

There was no public input.

4. WRAP UP AND DIRECTION TO STAFF

Director Keating, in conclusion, announced that it would not be necessary to have the second Workshop that was scheduled for Thursday, because all the Elements were covered at this Session. He noted that staff has to have this Report delivered to the Department of Community Affairs by December 1, 2008, and consequently staff has scheduled the EAR Adoption Hearing to be held at the Board's regular Meeting of November 18, 2008.

Commissioner Flescher expressed appreciation for the time, effort, and consideration given to this issue.

Director Keating, at the request of Commissioner Flescher, reminded everyone that information on this issue was available on the County's website, and to provide input, individuals could call the Office of Community Development, write or e-mail comments via the County's website.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the Chairman declared the Workshop adjourned at 3:52 p.m.

ATTEST:

Jeffrey K. Barton, Clerk

Wesley S. Davis, Vice Chairman
For: Sandra L. Bowden, Chairman

Minutes Approved: _____