Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR)-based Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Taylor County, Florida

Data & Analysis

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

Pursuant to Section 163.3191, Florida Statutes, Taylor County submitted its EAR in 2007, as well as a revised EAR in 2008, to the Department of Community Affairs (DCA). DCA found the 2008 EAR in compliance.

Taylor County has prepared Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR)-based Comprehensive Plan Amendments to implement the findings of the 2008 EAR and the County's Vision 2060 Plan. The planning horizon of the Comprehensive Plan has been amended from 2015 to 2035. In response to the County's current status as a Rural Area of Critical Economic Concern (RACEC) and to implement the Taylor County Development Authority's (TCDA) Economic Development Plan, a new Economic Development Element has been prepared and will be adopted into the Comprehensive Plan.

This document contains the **Data & Analysis** necessary to support Taylor County's EAR-based amendments for the 2035 planning horizon.

II. Relationship to Taylor County Vision 2060 Plan

The Taylor County Vision 2060 Plan was adopted by the Taylor County Board of County Commissioners in September 2008 and found in compliance by DCA in May 2009. The Vision 2060 Plan is adopted as an optional component of the Taylor County Comprehensive Plan pursuant to Section 163.3177(11), Florida Statutes.

The EAR-based amendments contained herein implement the recommendations of the Vision 2060 Plan.

The Future Land Use Element has been amended to include Objectives and Policies for the use of Vision 2060 Plan land use categories. A Comprehensive Plan Amendment is required to change additional land to the optional Vision 2060 Plan land use categories.

The 2015 Future Land Use Map is amended to include the land necessary to support the projected 2035 population. The Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) medium range population projections have been used.

III. New Planning Areas

New Objective I.18 and Policies of the Future Land Use Element describes new master Urban Planning Areas and Rural Planning Areas. The Urban and Rural Planning Areas are depicted on the 2035 Future Land Use Map.

The purpose and intent of establishing the Planning Areas is to implement the Vision 2060 Plan, catalyze economic growth, stimulate job creation, and advance the Taylor County Economic Development Plan. In addition to those land use rights currently permitted by the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map, the EAR-based Amendments add new development rights anticipated by the implementation of the Taylor County Economic Development Plan and Vision 2060 Plan. These additional development rights have been distributed into the ten (10) Urban Planning Areas and three (3) Rural Planning Areas. The Development Program for each Planning Area shall be consistent with Table III-1: Planning Areas, which describes the anticipated urban form at buildout.

The total dwelling unit count for the Urban and Rural Planning Areas includes a combination of existing development rights presently allocated on the 2015 Future Land Use Map as well as new growth projected by the Bureau for Economic and Business Research (BEBR) for 2035. Please see Section IV: 2035 Population Projection Analysis for additional detail regarding the 2035 population projection methodology.

All Planning Areas require Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review and approval. An Application for Master Development Approval (AMDA) and subsequent Applications for Incremental Development Approval (AIDA) may be submitted, pursuant to Sec. 380.06(21)(b), Florida Statutes.

Table III-1: Planning Areas	
Planning Area 1	
Planning Area Type: Urban	
Land Use Category: Coastal Village	
Total Acres	7,942 acres
Maximum Residential Units	4,658 units
Maximum Non-Residential SF (Office /Retail/ Hotel/Medical/ Recreation)	920,000SF
Maximum Industrial SF	125,000 SF
Planning Area 2/3	
Planning Area Type: Urban	
Land Use Category: Coastal Village	
Total Acres	2,225 acres
Maximum Residential Units	2,285 units
Maximum Non-Residential SF (Office /Retail/ Hotel/Medical/ Recreation)	244,000 SF
Maximum Industrial SF	0 SF
Planning Area 4/5/6	
Planning Area Type: Urban	

Land Use Category: Coastal Village	
Total Acres	2,821 acres
Maximum Residential Units	2,401 units
Maximum Non-Residential SF (Office /Retail/ Hotel/Medical/ Recreation)	440,000 SF
Maximum Industrial SF	0 SF
Planning Area 7	
Planning Area Type: Urban	
Land Use Category: Coastal Village	
Total Acres	3,781 acres
Maximum Residential Units	5,050 units
Maximum Non-Residential SF (Office /Retail/ Hotel/Medical/ Recreation)	846,000 SF
Maximum Industrial SF	125,000 SF
Planning Area 8	
Planning Area Type: Urban	
Land Use Category: Coastal Village	
Total Acres	1,499 acres
Maximum Residential Units	419 units
Maximum Non-Residential SF (Office /Retail/ Hotel/Medical/ Recreation)	47,000 SF
Maximum Industrial SF	0 SF
Planning Area 11	
Planning Area Type: Urban	
Land Use Category: Regional Employment Center	
Total Acres	2,946 acres
Maximum Residential Units	0 units
Maximum Non-Residential SF (Office /Retail/ Hotel/Medical/ Recreation)	120,000 SF
Maximum Industrial SF (1)	600,000 SF
Planning Area 12	
Planning Area Type: Urban	
Land Use Category: Regional Employment Center	
Total Acres	3,525 acres
Maximum Residential Units	0 units
Maximum Non-Residential SF (Office /Retail/ Hotel/Medical/ Recreation)	200,000 SF
Maximum Industrial SF (1)	1,000,000 SF
Planning Area 13	
Planning Area Type: Urban	
Land Use Category: Suburban Village	
Total Acres	282 acres
Maximum Residential Units	910 units
Maximum Non-Residential SF (Office /Retail/ Hotel/Medical/ Recreation)	20,000 SF
Maximum Industrial SF	0 SF
Planning Area 14	
Planning Area Type: Rural	

Land Use Category: Conservation Community	
Total Acres	1,890 acres
Maximum Residential Units	1,066 units
Maximum Non-Residential SF (Office /Retail/ Hotel/Medical/ Recreation)	126,000 SF
Maximum Industrial SF	0 SF
Planning Area 15	
Planning Area Type: Urban	
Land Use Category: Suburban Village	
Total Acres	2,886 acres
Maximum Residential Units	2,780 units
Maximum Non-Residential SF (Office /Retail/ Hotel/Medical/ Recreation)	306,000 SF
Maximum Industrial SF	0 SF
Planning Area 16	
Planning Area Type: Urban	
Land Use Category: Regional Employment Center	
Total Acres	5,120 acres
Maximum Residential Units	4,004 units
Maximum Non-Residential SF (Office /Retail/ Hotel/Medical/ Recreation)	1,649,000 SF
Maximum Industrial SF (1)	400,000 SF
Planning Area 18	
Planning Area Type: Rural	
Land Use Category: Regional Employment Center	
Total Acres	8,092 acres
Maximum Residential Units (unless consistent with FLU Policy I.17.4)	0 units
Maximum Non-Residential SF (Office /Retail/ Hotel/Medical/ Recreation)	0 SF
Maximum Industrial SF (1)	3,000,000 SF
Planning Area 19	
Planning Area Type: Rural	
Land Use Category: Rural Village	
Total Acres	2,280 acres
Maximum Residential Units	2,100 units
Maximum Non-Residential SF (Office /Retail/ Hotel/Medical/ Recreation)	236,000 SF
Maximum Industrial SF	0 SF

Note: (1) Unless consistent with Policy I.19.4

Residential and Non-Residential Linkage

Future Land Use Element Policy I.19.5 describes linkage requirements to ensure that Planning Areas of 4,000 residential units or greater do not develop without complementary non-residential services. According to *"The Supermarket as a Neighborhood Building Block: Redefining the notion of an anchor"* by Mark Hinshaw, FAICP, and Brian Vanneman (Planning: the magazine of the American Planning Association. Volume 76, Number 3. March 2010), *"a contemporary market requires the support of 8,000 to 10,000 people (or around 4,000 households)."*

Therefore, 4,000 residential units were used as the base for the Planning Area linkage requirements because it provides enough residential density and critical mass to support non-residential services. Planning Areas 1, 7, and 16 contain greater than 4,000 units, and will provide "community center" non-residential services to serve the smaller Planning Areas.

"Dollars and Cents of Shopping Centers: 2000", published by the Urban Land Institute, defines three types of shopping centers:

1. Convenience Center: Provides for the sale of personal services and convenience goods. Typical gross leasable area of up to 30,000 square feet. Instead of being anchored by a supermarket, a convenience center is usually anchored by some other type of personal/convenience service such as a minimarket.
2. Neighborhood Center: Provides for the sale of convenience goods (food, drugs, and sundries) and personal services for the day-to-day living needs of the immediate neighborhood. It may range in size from 30,000 to 100,000 square feet, and may contain a supermarket
3. Community Center: Provides for the convenience goods and personal services offered by the neighborhood center, and a wider range of soft lines (apparel) and hard lines (hardware and appliances). The Community Center may be built around a supermarket, junior department store, variety store, super drugstore, or discount department store as a major tenant. It may range from 100,000 to 500,000 square feet, with a typical size of 150,000 square feet.

Hinshaw and Vanneman conclude that 4,000 households are sufficient to support a typical 45,000 square foot supermarket and another 50,000 to 80,000 square feet of shops and services, comparable to Neighborhood- or Community Center scale development. This equates to approximately 24 to 31 square feet of retail per household at buildout.

Future Land Use Element Table I-3: Linkage Requirements requires at least 30 square feet of retail when 75% of households are approved, falling within this range. Taylor County believes that this minimum level of retail development is appropriate for the larger Planning Areas, given the County's current status as a Rural Area of Critical Economic Concern. All Planning Areas may include additional non-residential development, up to the maximum amount described in Future Land Use Element Table I-2: Planning Areas.

IV. 2035 Population Projection Analysis

The following narrative describes the process used to derive the 2035 Future Land Use Map residential allocation. A summary of calculations is provided in **Table IV.6: 2035 Comprehensive Plan Need Analysis Summary** at the end of this section.

2035 Population Projections
Medium range population projections from the Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) at the University of Florida were used for the Taylor County EAR-based amendments. The new planning horizon has been set as 2035.

Using *Projections of Florida Population by County, 2008 – 2035*, it was determined that Taylor County's unincorporated population for 2008 is 16,367. The 2035 Taylor County unincorporated population is projected to be 21,165, or an addition of 4,798 persons.

Table IV.1: BEBR Medium Range Population Projections

	2000	2008	2030	2035	Growth 2008 - 2035
City of Perry	6,847	6,832	8,511	8,835	2,003
Unincorporated Taylor County	12,409	16,367	20,389	21,165	**4,798**
TOTAL	19,256	23,199	28,900	30,000	6,801

Sources: 2008 Estimates of Population, UF-BEBR (Apr. 2009)
Projections of Florida Population by County (PS 153 – March 2009)
Florida Economic Advisors, LLC.

In addition to the **4,798** additional persons projected by BEBR, several additional factors were used to allocate new residential use to the FLUM. These factors include the following:

- Persons per Household
- Seasonal Housing Multiplier
- Residential Multiplier
- Density Transfer Sending and Receiving Areas

Persons per Household
An average of **2.4 persons per household** was assumed for the new 2035 population. The average household size for Taylor County has been steadily decreasing, reflecting nationwide trends toward smaller household sizes. Taylor County's average household size was 2.51 in 2000. According to ESRI, a nationally recognized provider of economic and demographic projections, the average household size decreased in 2008 to 2.46, a 2 percent overall reduction or an average annual reduction of 0.25 percent. By 2013, projections place the new average size at 2.44, another average annual reduction of 0.1 percent. Assuming that the household size continues to decrease at the same rate as between 2008 and 2013, by 2035, the average household size will be 2.40.

Therefore, the **4,798** new people projected by BEBR 2035 results in **1,999 new primary dwelling units**.

Seasonal Housing Multiplier
As a coastal county with abundant recreational opportunities, Taylor County's share of seasonal homes compared to primary occupied homes has increased since 1990.

Table IV.2: Seasonal Housing Multiplier

	1990	2000	Growth (1990 – 2000)	Percentage	Ratio
Primary Units	7,335	8,157	822	47.3%	1.0
Seasonal Units	573	1,489	916	52.7%	1.11
TOTAL	7,908	9,646	1,738	100.0%	n/a

Sources: US Census Bureau Summary Tape File (STF3) 1990 and 2000
Florida Economic Advisors, LLC

Therefore, the ratio of Seasonal Units to Primary Units is 1.11 Seasonal Units for every 1.0 Primary Unit.

Using this ratio, the 1,999 new primary dwelling units from 2035 BEBR growth result in **2,219 new seasonal dwelling units**. The sum of primary and seasonal dwelling units in unincorporated Taylor County is therefore **4,218 new units**.

Residential Multiplier
An overall residential multiplier of 2.0 for urban areas has been applied to the Taylor County 2035 FLUM.

The 2.0 residential multiplier is appropriate given the County's status as a Rural Area of Critical Economic Concern (RACEC) and it's efforts to develop and implement the Vision 2060 Plan, as well as the need and efforts to induce quality economic development through adoption of the Taylor County Economic Development Plan and inclusion of a corresponding Economic Development Element with the EAR-based amendments.

Applying the 2.0 residential multiplier to the 4,218 new dwelling units (combined primary and seasonal) results in a **Demand for 8,436 new dwelling units for 2035.**

2035 Future Land Use Map Allocation
The County's Vision 2060 Plan, Economic Development Plan and new Economic Development Element represent the community's plan and progress towards improving the quality of life for Taylor County residents and businesses. While past growth has not outpaced BEBR projections, the County intends to shed its designation as a Rural Area of Critical Economic Concern through a comprehensive economic development strategy that supports the growth of existing businesses, targets new industries, and provides "shovel-ready" sites for business development. Analogue examples, such as Flagler County, Hernando County, and Citrus County, have demonstrated that catalytic events can cause

actual growth to greatly exceed projected population, particularly when the methodology uses past trends to project into the future.

The County has determined that **25,759 new residential units** are needed to implement the Vision 2060 Plan, through 2035, and overall economic development strategy. Of that total, approximately **22,507** units are allocated for the **ten (10)** Urban Planning Areas designated on the 2035 Future Land Use Map for these EAR-based Amendments. Rural Planning Areas use clustered or transferred development rights from the 2015 Future Land Use Map, and therefore are not included in the 2035 Population Projection Analysis.

The remaining 3,252 new units are available for landowners to propose future Amendments to the 2035 Future Land Use Map.

No land use rights or land use classifications from the 2015 Future Land Use Map were changed on the 2035 Future Land Use Map, with the exception of the addition of the new Planning Areas, consistent with the optional Vision 2060 Plan.

It should be noted that population projections are not static, and that further analysis by BEBR could result in a greater projected population for 2035. This could result in more than 3,252 new units being available to landowners for use in future Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.

Of the **25,759** total units needed to implement the County's Vision 2060 Plan and economic development objectives, there are **9,989 existing residential units,** as designated on the 2015 Future Land Use Map, within the **ten (10)** new Urban Planning Areas identified on the 2035 Future Land Use Map. This credit results as a need for **15,770 additional new units** in order to implement the County's economic development strategy.

The following sections describe the process to meet this need through the addition of the 2035 projected population and clustering and/or transfer of existing density allocated on the 2015 Future Land Use Map.

Vacant Units (Supply)
According to the 2008 EAR, there are **1,626 vacant acres** within the Designated Urban Development Area.

Table IV.3: Location of Vacant Residential Land

	Parcel Count	Acreage	Percent of Acreage
Unincorporated County, not including Designated Urban Development Area	2,160	6,886	74%
City of Perry	1,015	780	8%
Designated Urban Development Area	1,538	1,626	18%
TOTAL	4,713	9,292	100%

Source: 2008 Evaluation and Appraisal Report (based on 2007 Taylor County Property Appraiser Data)

The maximum permitted density for this land use category (Mixed Use: Urban Development) is two (2) units per acre. Therefore, there are **3,252 vacant units** currently allocated on the 2015 Future Land Use Map. When the vacant units are subtracted from the 4,218 total new primary and seasonal units of the 2035 population projections, a total of **966 existing unused units resulting from growth may be used as credit** towards the remaining **15,770 additional new units** required by the County's economic development strategy. This unused unit credit for growth results in a need for **14,804 additional new units** to implement the County's economic development strategy.

Subtracting the **8,436 new dwelling units projected for 2035** (including the seasonal housing and 2.0 residential multipliers) from the **14,804 additional new units needed** results in a **deficit of 6,367 units** from the total **25,759** units needed for the County. In order to obtain these **6,367** units, density from existing entitlements on the 2015 Future Land Use Map will be transferred to a density transfer receiving Planning Area.

Agriculture-Transfer:

The 2035 Future Land Use Map contains residential unit allocation beyond what is provided for using the BEBR 2035 Medium Range Projection, Seasonal Housing Multiplier and Residential Multiplier. In order to make up the 6,367 unit deficit needed for Urban Planning Areas, existing land use rights will be transferred from adjacent lands ("density transfer sending area") to the Urban Planning Areas of the 2035 Future Land Use Map ("density transfer receiving area"), consistent with new Objectives I.18 and I.19 of the Future Land Use Element. The density transfer sending area land use has been changed to "Agriculture Transfer" on the 2035 Future Land Use Map. Agriculture-Transfer (A-T) permits the same uses as the existing Agriculture-1 and Agriculture-2 land use classifications, with the exception of residential use.

In order to support the 6,367 unit deficit needed for the Urban Planning Areas, 56,257 acres of Agriculture-Transfer area is designated on the 2035 Future Land Use Map, as described in Table IV.4 below.

In addition, 26,230 acres of Agriculture-Transfer area is designated on the 2035 Future Land Use Map to support 2,623 units needed for the Rural Planning Areas. The total Agriculture-Transfer acreage designated on the 2035 Future Land Use Map to support the Urban Planning Areas and Rural Planning Areas of the 2035 Future Land Use Map is 82,797 acres, as described in Table IV.4. The total number of Agriculture-Transfer units in the "bank" is 8,990 units, consisting of 6,367 units designated for Urban Planning Areas and 2,623 units designated for Rural Planning Areas. The assignment of the Agriculture-Transfer units from the "bank" to individual Planning Areas is described in Table IV.5: Distribution of Agriculture-Transfer Units.

Table IV.4: Agriculture-Transfer		
Agriculture-Transfer for Urban Planning Areas	**Acres**	**Units**
Agriculture-2 (1unit/ 10acres)	49,460	4,946
Agriculture: Rural Residential (1 unit/ 5acres)	7,107	1,421
Subtotal Urban	**56,567**	**6,367**
Agriculture-Transfer for Rural Planning Areas	**Acres**	**Units**
Agriculture-2 (1unit/ 10acres)	26,230	2,623
Agriculture: Rural Residential (1 unit/ 5acres)	0	0
Subtotal Rural	**26,230**	**2,623**
Total Agriculture Transfer for Urban and Rural Planning Areas	**82,797**	**8,990**

Table IV.5: Distribution of Agriculture-Transfer Units describes how Agriculture-Transfer units are assigned from the "bank" to individual Urban and Rural Planning Areas on the 2035 Future Land Use Map. New units from the 2035 Growth described previously are also assigned to the Planning Areas. The total residential units listed for each Planning Area is consistent with the maximum permitted by Future Land Use Element Policy I.19.3.

Table IV.5: Distribution of Agriculture-Transfer Units				
Urban Planning Area	**Existing Units (1)**	**New Units from Growth**	**Units from Agriculture-Transfer**	**Total**
1	2,864	1,001	793	4,658
2,3	223	750	1,313	2,285
4,5,6	282	750	1,369	2,401
7	4,503	500	47	5,050
8	201	100	118	419
11 (2)	285	0	-285	0
12 (2)	372	0	-372	0
13	56	500	354	910
15	562	500	1,718	2,780
16	641	2,050	1,313	4,004
SUBTOTAL	9,989 (3)	6,151	6,367 (4)	22,507 (5)
New Urban Units not allocated on 2035 FLUM	966 (6)	2,286	n/a	3,252 (7)
TOTAL		8,436 (8)	n/a	25,758 (9)
Rural Planning Area	**Existing Units (1)**	**Units from Growth**	**Units from Agriculture-Transfer**	**Total**
14	245	n/a	821	1,066
19	298	n/a	1802	2,100
SUBTOTAL	543	0	2,623 (10)	3,166

Table Notes:

(1): From Table IV.7: Existing Land Use from 2015 Future Land Use Map
(2): No residential use proposed for Planning Areas 11 and 12 (Regional Employment Center). Existing units are transferred into Agriculture-Transfer bank
(3) See Table IV.6: 2035 Comprehensive Plan Need Analysis Summary, line i
(4) See Table IV.4: Agriculture-Transfer
(5) See Table IV.6: 2035 Comprehensive Plan Need Analysis Summary, footnote (1)
(6) See Table IV.6: 2035 Comprehensive Plan Need Analysis Summary, line l
(7) See Table IV.6: 2035 Comprehensive Plan Need Analysis Summary, line n
(8) See Table IV.6: 2035 Comprehensive Plan Need Analysis Summary, line g
(9) See Table IV.6: 2035 Comprehensive Plan Need Analysis Summary, line h
(10) See Table IV.4: Agriculture-Transfer

Agriculture-Transfer sending areas for urban development shall be located in close proximity to the Urban Planning Areas that receive the transferred units. Whenever possible, the Agriculture-Transfer sending areas shall be contiguous to the Urban Planning Areas to create a greenbelt and define the limits of development. Agriculture-Transfer sending areas shall contain a mixture of uplands and wetlands to support wildlife mobility.

Agriculture-Transfer sending areas for rural development need not be contiguous to the Rural Planning Areas that are to receive the transferred units. If not contiguous, lands that provide wildlife habitat; buffer wetlands, rivers, and surface water; or contain a mixture of uplands and wetlands shall be given high priority for selection as Agriculture-Transfer sending area.

Table IV.6: 2035 Comprehensive Plan Need Analysis Summary			
a	BEBR Medium Population Forecast 2035 for Unincorporated Taylor County	21,165	persons
b	2008 Population	16,367	persons
c	New Population 2035 (a – b)	4,798	persons
d	New Units @ 2.4 persons per Unit (c / 2.4)	1,999	units
e	New Seasonal Units @ 1.11 (d * 1.11)	2,219	units
f	Total New Unincorporated Units (d + e)	4,218	units
g	Residential Multiplier @ 2.0 (f * 2.0)	8,436	units
h	Total Units Needed on 2035 Plan Amendment	25,759	units (1)
i	Existing Unit Credits Based on 2015 FLUM for Urban Planning Areas in 2035 FLUM	9,989	units
j	Differential: Additional Units Needed (h – i)	15,770	units
k	Unused Units on 2015 FLUM (1,626 vacant acres x 2 Units /ac)	3,252	units
l	Differential: Credit from Unused Units (f – k)	966	units
m	Differential: Additional Units Needed After Credit (j – l)	14,804	units
n	Existing Units Needed from Agriculture-Transfer (m – g)	6,367	units
o	Acres of Agriculture-Transfer required to Support Urban Planning Areas on 2035 FLUM (6,367 units @ 1 Unit / 5 acres or 1 Unit / 10 Acres	56,567	acres (2)
p	Acres of Agriculture-Transfer required to support Rural Planning Areas on 2035 FLUM (2,623 Units @ 1 Unit / 10 acres)	26,230	acres (2)
q	Total Acreage Required for Density Clustering or Transfer for Urban and Rural Planning Areas on 2035 FLUM (o + p)	82,797	acres (2)

Notes:
(1) Line "h" includes 22,507 dwelling units allocated in the ten (10) Urban Planning Areas on the 2035 Future Land Use Map for these EAR-based Amendments. In addition, up to 3,252 dwelling units are available for future Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, but are not allocated on the 2035 Future Land Use Map of these EAR-based Amendments. The total number of units of the 2035 Need Analysis is 25,759 units.

(2) Acreages are conceptual and have not been surveyed. Refined acreages will be provided at the time of application for Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review.

Changes to the Future Land Use Map

The following tables describe the existing land uses identified on the 2015 Future Land Use Map and the proposed land uses for the 2035 Future Land Use Map. Only land within the ten (10) Urban Planning Areas and three (3) Rural Planning Areas is proposed for reclassification on the 2035 Future Land Use Map.

TABLE IV.7: Existing Land Use from 2015 Future Land Use Map

PA #	MU/ UD Acres	MU/ UD Units (1)	Ag-1 Acres	Ag-1 Units (2)	Ag-2 Acres	Ag-2 Units (3)	Ag-Rural Res. Acres	Ag-Rural Res. Units (4)	MU-Rural Res. Acres	MU-Rural Res. Units (5)	Ind. Acres	Public Acres	Total Acres	Total Existing Units
1	148	1,771	0	0	7,009	701	0	0	785	392	0	0	**7,942**	**2,864**
2,3	0	0	0	0	2,225	223	0	0	0	0	0	0	**2,225**	**223**
4,5,6	0	0	0	0	2,821	282	0	0	0	0	0	0	**2,821**	**282**
7	339	4,071	0	0	3,222	322	0	0	219	110	0	0	**3,781**	**4,503**
8	0	0	0	0	992	99	506	101	1	0	0	0	**1,499**	**201**
11	0	0	452	23	2,360	236	133	27	0	0	0	0	**2,946**	**285**
12	0	0	0	0	3,182	318	268	54	0	0	75	0	**3,525**	**372**
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	282	56	0	0	0	0	**282**	**56**
14	0	0	0	0	1,332	133	545	109	5	2	8	0	**1,890**	**245**
15	0	0	0	0	1,646	165	742	148	498	249	0	0	**2,886**	**562**
16	0	0	0	0	4,479	448	362	72	242	121	38	0	**5,120**	**641**
18	0	0	0	0	24	2	7,813	1,563	0	0	172	83	**8,092**	**1,565**
19	0	0	0	0	1,579	158	701	140	0	0	0	0	**2,280**	**298**

TOTALS

	MU/ UD Acres	MU/ UD Units	Ag-1 Acres	Ag-1 Units	Ag-2 Acres	Ag-2 Units	Ag-Rural Res. Acres	Ag-Rural Res. Units	MU-Rural Res. Acres	MU-Rural Res. Units	Ind. Acres	Public Acres	Total Acres	Total Existing Units
	487	**5,842**	**452**	**23**	**30,873**	**3,087**	**11,351**	**2,270**	**1,750**	**875**	**293**	**83**	**45,289**	**12,097**

Table Notes:

(1): Mixed Use Urban Development: Maximum density 12 units per acre (when consistent with Coastal Management Element Policy IX.6.5)
(2): Agriculture 1: Maximum density 1 unit per 20 acres
(3): Agriculture 2: Maximum density of 1 unit per 10 acres
(4): Agriculture Rural Residential: Maximum density of 1 unit per 5 acres
(5): Mixed Use Rural Residential: Maximum density 1 unit per 2 acres

Table IV.8: Comparison between 2015 and 2035 Future Land Use Maps

	Gross Acres (1)	Dwelling Units
Existing 2015 FLUM	(45,289)	(12,097)
Proposed 2035 FLUM	45,289	22,507 (2)
NET CHANGE	0	10,410

Notes:
(1): Acreages are conceptual and have not been surveyed. Refined acreages will be provided at the time of application for Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review.

(2): The total dwelling unit count for the Urban and Rural Planning Areas includes a combination of existing development rights presently allocated on the 2015 Future Land Use Map as well as new growth projected by the Bureau for Economic and Business Research (BEBR) for 2035, as summarized in Table IV.5. 3,252 additional units are available for landowners and have not been allocated on the 2035 Future Land Use Map.

The net change of 10,410 dwelling units allocated for the 2035 Future Land Use Map will be accommodated through a combination, existing development rights currently allocated on the 2015 Future Land Use Map, including density transfer, and the 2035 BEBR projections, as summarized in Table IV.5: 2035 Comprehensive Plan Need Analysis Summary.

V. Indicators of Sprawl

Rule 9J-5.006(5)(g), Florida Administrative Code, describes the primary indicators of urban sprawl and the criteria by which the Department of Community Affairs reviews a Comprehensive Plan or Comprehensive Plan Amendment to determine if it encourages the proliferation of urban sprawl. The proposed EAR-based amendments do not encourage the proliferation of urban sprawl, but instead provides a compact form of development for the County, as described below:

Indicator of Sprawl #1. Promotes, allows or designates for development substantial areas of the jurisdiction to develop as low-intensity, low-density, or single-use development or uses in excess of demonstrated need.

The proposed amendment does not promote, allow or designate low-intensity, low density, or single-use development. The new Land Use Categories encourage development at greater densities and intensities than currently permitted in the Taylor County Comprehensive Plan. The proposed amendment implements the compact development patterns described in the Vision 2060 Plan. All new Villages within the Urban Planning Areas require a mixture of land uses, including residential, commercial/office, and civic/institutional.

Indicator of Sprawl #2. Promotes, allows or designates significant amounts of urban development to occur in rural areas at substantial distances from existing urban areas while leaping over undeveloped lands which are available and suitable for development.

The proposed amendment does not promote, allow, or designated significant amounts of urban development to occur in rural areas or substantial distances from existing urban areas. The proposed Urban Planning Areas are located proximate to the existing communities of Keaton Beach, Steinhatchee, and the City of Perry, consistent with development patterns described in the Vision 2060 Plan. All Urban Planning Areas are located within the Urban Services Areas of the Vision 2060 Plan, or the area designated for services, including water and wastewater.

The Rural Planning Areas will clustered or transfer existing development rights into small-scale Rural Villages or Conservation Communities to limit the overall development footprint and provide large and interconnected open space systems.

Indicator of Sprawl #3. Promotes, allows or designates urban development in radial, strip, isolated or ribbon patterns generally emanating from existing urban developments.

The proposed amendment does not promote, allow, or designate radial, strip, isolated or ribbon development patterns emanating from existing developments. Instead, the proposed Planning Areas are compact in form,

with a defined edge to differentiate and buffer urban from rural lands.

Indicator of Sprawl #4. As a result of premature or poorly planned conversion of rural land to other uses, fails adequately to protect and conserve natural resources, such as wetlands, floodplains, native vegetation, environmentally sensitive areas, natural groundwater aquifer recharge areas, lakes, rivers, shorelines, beaches, bays, estuarine systems, and other significant natural systems.

The proposed amendment does not result in premature or poorly planned converstion of rural land to other uses or fail to adequately protect and conserve natural resources. The Urban Planning Areas are located within an Urban Service Area, as designated on the Vision 2060 Plan. This is the area that was determined suitable and logical for urban development by the community during the Vision 2060 planning process. The Rural Planning Areas is located within the Rural Services Area and represents low-intensity land use. All Planning Areas are designed to respect natural drainage patterns, including juridictional wetlands, buffers, and surface waters, leaving large connected wetland systems, wildlife habitat and migration corridors intact. To the greatest extent possible, existing forestry roads are used to minimize additional habitat disturbance and wetland impacts. When existing roads are not available, connectivity is achieved by the shortest distance possible while minimizing habitat distance and wetland impacts.

All Urban and Rural Planning Areas on the 2035 Future Land Use Map are outside of the Coastal High Hazard Area, which furthers Goal 8 (Coastal and Marine Resources), Goal 9 (Natural Systems and Recreational Lands), and Goal 15 (Land Use) of the State Comprehensive Plan.

Indicator of Sprawl #5. Fails adequately to protect adjacent agricultural areas and activities, including silviculture, and including active agricultural and silvicultural activities as well as passive agricultural activities and dormant, unique and prime farmlands and soils.

The proposed amendment does not fail to adequately project adjacent agricultural areas and activities, including silviculture. The Urban Planning Areas are located within the Urban Services Area, which is designated for urban development by the Vision 2060 Plan. The remaining development within the Rural Services Area must cluster or transfer development, which increases the amount of connected open space. All density transfer sending areas retain agricultural rights, including silviculture, ranching, and passive recreation.

Indicator of Sprawl #6. Fails to maximize use of existing public facilities and services.

The proposed amendment does not fail to maximize use of existing public facilities and services. It has not been determined if the proposed Urban Planning Areas will be served by an expansion of existing utility providers, including the Taylor Coastal Water and Sewer District or the Big Bend Water

Authority, or if new infrastruture will be funded and built by a future developer. The provision of utilities will be determined at the time of application for a Development of Regional Impact (DRI).

Indicator of Sprawl #7. Fails to maximize use of future public facilities and services.

The proposed amendment will not fail to maximize use of future public facilities and services. The compact nature of the Urban Planning Areas will result in a more efficient provision of future public infrastructure than otherwise permitted by the the low density land use rights currently designated in the 2015 Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, the cost of providing and maintaining future public facilities and services will be reduced because distances between utility demand is minimized.

Indicator of Sprawl #8. Allows for land use patterns or timing which disproportionately increase the cost in time, money and energy, of providing and maintaining facilities and services, including roads, potable water, sanitary sewer, stormwater management, law enforcement, education, health care, fire and emergency response, and general government.

The proposed amendment does not allow for land use patterns or timing which disproportionately increases the cost in time, money, and energy of providing and maintaining public facilities and services. The compact nature of the proposed Amendment will result in a more efficient provision of public facilities and services, including roads, potable water, sanitary sewer, stormwater management, law enforcement, education, health care, fire and emergency response, and government services. The policies for the mixed-use villages require an interconnected street network and provide multiple ingress and egress points, rather than a a series of disconnected neighborhoods with single entrances. This can reduce fire and emergency response time, even if one entrance is not accessible. All Planning Areas require a mix of land uses, including civic and institutional uses, such as eduction, law enforcement or fire and emergency response, and commercial and office services, including health care. The compact nature of the mixed use villages will result in cost savings resulting from short distances between residents and public services.

Indicator of Sprawl #9. Fails to provide a clear separation between rural and urban uses.

The proposed amendment does not fail to provide a clear separation between rural and urban uses. The Urban Planning Areas are located within the two Urban Service Area boundaries, which designate lands suitable for urban development, consistent with the Vision 2060 Plan. Services and infrastructure, including potable water and wastewater, are to be provided within the Urban Services Areas. All lands in Taylor County that are not within an Urban Service Area are within the Rural Services Area, an area with limited infrastructure and services.

Indicator of Sprawl #10. Discourages or inhibits infill development or the redevelopment of existing neighborhoods and communities.

The proposed amendment does not discourage or inhibit infill development or the redevelopment of existing neighborhoods and communities. The close proximity of the Urban Planning Areas to the existing communities of Keaton Beach, Steinhatchee, and the City of Perry may catalyze additional growth adjacent to these communities or as infill.

Indicator of Sprawl #11. Fails to encourage an attractive and functional mix of uses.

The proposed amendment does not fail to encourage an attractive and functional mix of uses. The Future Land Use Element includes new Policies that require a mixture of land uses, including residential, commercial, office, and institutional/civic for all Villages. The proposed Amendment is based upon design principles of Traditional Neighborhood Design, which promote walking and the provision of an attractive and functional public realm, as well as a functional mixture of well integrated land uses.

Indicator of Sprawl #12. Results in poor accessibility among linked or related land uses.

The proposed amendment does not result in poor accessibility among linked or related land uses. The Urban and Rural Planning Areas of the proposed Amendment feature an interconnected street network and provide multiple ingress and egress points, rather than a a series of disconnected neighborhoods with single entrances. This helps to promote non-vehicular trips. The majority of residential units are located within a ¾ mile walk from the focal point of a neighborhood or village, providing a short walking distance to goods and services for residents.

Indicator of Sprawl #13. Results in the loss of significant amounts of functional open space.

The proposed amendment does not result in the loss of significant amounts of functional open space. The Urban and Rural Planning Areas are carefully sited and designed to respect the natural contours, drainage patterns, and vegetation of the land. Whenever possible, large continuous corridors and areas of open space are to be preserved in their natural state to allow for uninterrupted wildlife migration and habitat. Density transfer sending areas used to transfer or cluster existing development rights will provide additional open space while maintaining existing agricultural rights, including silviculture and passive recreational uses.

VI. Environmental Suitability Analysis

Site Suitability for Planning Areas
MSCW scientists have spent a total of 18 days in and around the 2035 Future Land Use Map Urban and Rural Planning Areas assessing the community types, wetland boundaries, wetland quality and general hydrology, and utilization by protected and non-protected species. These assessments were conducted via meandering pedestrian and vehicular transects on July 7-9, 2008, July 14-17, 2008, July 28-31, 2008, September 16, 2008, December 15-19, 2008, and January 23, 2009. Evidence of protected plant and wildlife species (including direct observation, vocalization, tracks, or scat) was noted, as well as any habitats that could potentially be utilized by state or federally-protected species.

The placement of the Planning Areas has been predicated on minimizing impacts to wetlands and valuable protected species habitats, while creating compact and interconnected connected development patterns. The areas proposed for development were sited using a combination of the following criteria:

1. The site should allow for the avoidance or minimization of impacts to high- and medium-quality wetlands;
2. The site should protect or add to the preservation of natural undisturbed habitats or allow for the protection of special habitats; and
3. The site should minimize impacts to water quality or water quantity (flow patterns).

These criteria helped guide the current configuration and placement of the Urban and Rural Planning Areas. Important medium- and high-quality wetlands have largely been avoided and in some cases these wetlands were included within the Planning Areas so as to provide additional protection via onsite preservation. Road crossings have been proposed only through low-quality wetlands or along existing forestry roads. Valuable habitats, such as springs or major creeks, will be avoided or are sufficiently buffered from areas of development.

In addition, existing publicly available data was evaluated during the creation of the proposed Taylor County 2035 Future Land Use Map Planning Areas ("Planning Areas") to evaluate suitability for future development activities.

- Wetlands;
- Protected Species;
- Soils;
- Regionally Significant Resources; and
- Floodplains.

Additional environmental data and analysis for each Planning Area will be required and evaluated at the time of each subsequent Development of Regional Impact (DRI) application. Future Land Use Element Policy I.19.2 requires *"All Planning Areas that exceed applicable thresholds shall require Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review and approval."*

There are 13 total proposed Planning Areas, encompassing approximately 45,288 total acres. A 2004 aerial photograph composite of Taylor County and the proposed Planning Areas is provided in **Map E-1**.

Wetlands (Map E-2 series)
MSCW, Inc. (MSCW) scientists mapped the approximate boundaries of all onsite vegetative communities within the Planning Areas using a combination of the following methods:

1. Interpretation of aerial photography (2004, 2005 and 2006);
2. Utilization of National Wetlands Inventory (NWI);
3. Utilization of Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) data; and
4. Limited ground-truthing activities.

Based on these delineation procedures, a total of approximately 9,857 acres of wetlands and 27 acres of man-made surface waters (borrow pits and upland-cut ditches) are located within the Planning Areas (**Maps E-2A through E-2K**). Overall, the wetlands represent approximately 21.8% of the total acreage within the Planning Areas. Man-made surface waters represent less than 0.1% of the total acreage within the Planning Areas. Table VI.1 lists the estimated percent coverage of wetlands and man-made surface waters by Planning Area. The percent coverage of wetlands and surface waters varies for each Planning Area. The estimated percent coverage of wetlands ranges from 5.4% in Planning Area 19 to 37.0% in Planning Area 14. More detailed ground-truthing will be required at the time of Development of Regional Impact application.

Table VI.1: Planning Area Wetland Acreage

PLANNING AREA #	Planning Area Acreage	TOTAL Surface Waters	TOTAL Wetlands	Percent Wetlands (%)	Percent Uplands (%)
1	7,942	16	2,723	34.3	65.7
2/3	2,225		489	22.0	78.0
4/5/6	2,821		502	17.8	82.2
7	3,781		593	15.7	84.3
8	1,499		163	10.8	89.2
11	2,946		910	30.9	69.1
12	3,525		1,291	36.6	63.4
13	282		17	6.1	93.9
14	1,890		699	37.0	63.0
15	2,886		807	28.0	72.0
16	5,120	11	960	18.8	81.2
18	8,092		563	7.0	93.0
19	2,280		122	5.4	94.6
Planning Areas TOTAL	45,289	27	9,838	21.7	78.3

All Planning Areas contain a lower percentage of wetlands than the County-wide average of approximately 42.8% wetlands (consisting of 285,423 acres of wetlands per National Wetlands Inventory data and 666,880 total acres)

The Planning Area boundaries were designed to maximize the available uplands within each area. Although four (4) of the Planning Areas contain over 30% coverage of wetlands, a good portion of these wetlands would be considered low to very low quality. The percentage of low-quality wetlands in these areas ranges from 12% in Planning Area 11 to 20% in Planning Area 14. MSCW scientists preliminarily estimated the quality of the wetlands based on state criteria. Each wetland will be analyzed in more detail during the SRWMD ERP permitting process. In addition, all wetlands will be subject to federal, state and county regulations at the time development is proposed, including avoidance and minimization, buffers, and mitigation.

Protected Species (Map E-3)

Due to the transitory nature of wildlife species and the modification of protected species management plans and regulations over time, it is premature to conduct detailed surveys for protected species and their habitats at this time. Species-specific surveys for protected, rare, and/or threatened species (pursuant to FWC or USFWS criteria) will be conducted for each Planning Area at time of Development of Regional Impact application to assess potential adverse effects on these species, as well as determine specific mitigation measures, should they be required. Each development must meet the federal and state rules and regulations as they apply to protected species at the time of development.

Multiple sources were used to guide the development and placement of the Planning Areas to minimize potential adverse effects on protected, rare, or endangered species. These sources included: the NCFRPC's Regionally Significant Resources maps, NWI maps, soils maps (hydric soils), the FWC's black bear range maps, and the Critical Lands and Waters Identification Project (CLIP) maps. These sources are designed to be used on a regional scale and are not to be used for the identification of individual habitats or species occurrences. CLIP includes a disclaimer on all their maps noting that the data were developed for state and regional conservation planning purposes and are not intended, nor sufficient, to be the basis for local government comprehensive plans, environmental resource or agency permitting decisions. All of these sources provide a starting point for analyzing a site's potential for regional resources, but cannot be used without ground-truthing.

Publicly available data sources were reviewed to determine the occurrence or potential for occurrence of wildlife protected by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) and plant species protected by the USFWS and Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (FDACS).

The following paragraphs describe the results of the searches of each of these databases.

Bald Eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*)

The FWC Eagle Nest Locator database (http://myfwc.com/eagle/ eaglenests/) and available GIS data were reviewed to determine the location of all known bald eagle nests in Taylor County. According to this online database, there is one (1) known eagle nest located adjacent to the Planning Areas (see **Map E-3**). According to the FWC data, eagle nest TA001 is located approximately 530 feet from the southwest boundary of Planning Area 1. Guidance from the USFWS, dated June 5, 2006, dictates that projects within 660 feet of a bald eagle nest tree will need USFWS review. The USFWS and FWC recommend biological monitoring of the nesting territory if new development activities are proposed to occur within 660 feet of the nest tree during the nesting season (October 1 - May 15). However, a permit is not required for any activity that is: 1) conducted at any time more than 660 feet from an eagle nest; 2) temporary (regardless of distance) and conducted outside of the nest season; and 3) conducted consistent with the FWC Eagle Management Guidelines.

Wading Bird Colonies

Waterbird breeding colonies were identified using FWC's Florida Waterbird Colony Locator (http://www.myfwc.com/waders) and available GIS data (**Map E-3**). According to these data, the closest known breeding colony (#605117) is located in Dixie County, approximately 2 miles southeast of Planning Area 1. However, this colony was recorded as inactive/unoccupied during the last survey in 1999. The closest active (as of the 1999 survey) breeding colony to any of the Planning Areas is more than 16 miles northeast of Planning Area 11. The closest active (as of the 1999 survey) breeding colony to Planning area 1 is approximately 25 miles to the northeast.

Wood Stork (*Mycteria americana*)

The USFWS has identified core foraging areas (CFA) around all known wood stork colonies. The loss of wetlands within a CFA may reduce foraging opportunities for wood storks. These CFA's are considered important for the reproductive success of wood storks. For wood stork colonies in the northern region of Florida, the CFA includes a 13 mile radius around the colony. The USFWS's GIS database indicates that there are no known wood stork colonies within 13 miles of any Planning Areas (**Map E-3**). In fact, the closest known colony is located approximately 18 miles north of Planning Area 12. The closest known colony to Planning Area 1 is located approximately 37 miles to the southeast.

Florida Natural Areas Inventory

The Florida Natural Areas Inventory's (FNAI) element occurrence data was reviewed for any element occurrence records in or around the Planning Areas. Based on habitat preferences and known geographic ranges, it is probable for protected wildlife species to occur within the Planning Areas.

Probability of Protected Species

The following paragraphs describe protected species that have a probability of occurring onsite based on the existing habitat types found within the Planning Areas and documentation of these species occurring in Taylor County.

Gopher Tortoise (*Gopherus polyphemus*)

The gopher tortoise was recently up-listed from a Species of Special Concern to Threatened by the FWC. The gopher tortoise is not listed by the USFWS in Florida. Many of the Planning Areas do contain suitable habitat for the gopher tortoise. At the time of Development of Regional Impact application, a gopher tortoise census (in accordance with the guidelines set forth by the FWC) will be conducted to determine the density of gopher tortoises within these areas. Any gopher tortoises identified within the proposed development plan will have to be permitted for relocation to either an onsite or offsite recipient site. The FWC requires that a census be no more than 90 days old when applying for a relocation permit.

Florida black bear (*Ursus americanus floridanus*)

The Florida black bear is listed as Threatened by the FWC and is not listed by the USFWS. The black bear is an opportunistic mammal whose home range can be 11 sq. mi. for females and up to 66 sq. mi. for males. They require large areas of forest or cover, especially for denning. According to the FWC data, the northwest regions of Taylor County are included in the black bear's primary range while the costal regions are included in the black bear's secondary range. To minimize the adverse affects on their population, no Planning Areas were placed in the core of the black bear's primary range.

Sherman's fox squirrel (*Sciurus niger shermani*)

Sherman's fox squirrels are listed as a Species of Special Concern (SSC) by the FWC and are not listed by the USFWS. These squirrels prefer sandhills, pine flatwoods, and other open habitats scattered with pines and oaks. They depend on a variety of oak trees and longleaf pines as a source of food and/or nesting resources. The Sherman's fox squirrel has been eliminated from much of its former habitat as a result of conversion to pine plantation, rows crops and development. If fox squirrels or their nests are found on-site at the time of Development of Regional Impact application, coordination with FWC will be conducted and a Habitat Management Plan created, if required. However, should fox squirrels be found to utilize the area, large amounts of uplands will be available in the post-development condition.

Florida sandhill crane (*Grus canadensis pratensis*)

The Florida sandhill crane is listed as Threatened by the FWC and is not listed by the USFWS. Sandhill cranes are known to prefer nesting in pickerelweed or maidencane marshes, habitats which have a probable occurrence within the Planning Areas. If nesting sites are detected at the time of Development of Regional Impact application, coordination with FWC will be initiated and the appropriate buffers will be provided, if required.

Southeastern American kestrel (*Falco sparverius paulus*)

The Southeastern American kestrel is listed as Threatened by the FWC and is not listed by the USFWS. It is a resident subspecies that is primarily distinguished from the non-protected migrating subspecies by its presence in Florida between April and August, when the migrating subspecies would not be present. The kestrel typically uses open, grassy plains for foraging and snags or utility poles for nesting. There are limited open spaces within the Planning Areas that would be considered suitable foraging habitat for the kestrel. If a resident population of kestrels is found at the time of Development of Regional Impact application, coordination with FWC will be conducted and a Habitat Management Plan will be created, if required.

Wading Birds

The Planning Areas provide potential suitable nesting and foraging habitat for several species of protected wading birds. These species include the limpkin (*Aramus guarauana*), little blue heron (*Egretta caerulea*), snowy egret (*Egretta thula*), tricolored heron (*Egretta tricolor*), and white ibis (*Eudocimus albus*). Each of these wading birds is listed as a SSC by the FWC and is not listed by the USFWS. Wading birds often frequent open water bodies, ditches, canals, and forested and herbaceous wetlands. Relatively little impact to the onsite wetlands is proposed and any impact will be mitigated for according to the regulatory agency guidelines to insure wading birds and their habitat are not negatively impacted. Large amounts of suitable nesting and foraging habitat will be preserved in the post-development condition should these protected wading birds be found to utilize the Planning Areas.

American alligator (*Alligator mississippiensis*)

The American alligator is listed as a SSC by the FWC and is not listed by the USFWS. If alligators are found to utilize the Planning Areas, the onsite reservoirs, ponds and preserved wetlands will provide ample suitable habitat in the post-development condition.

Commensal species that are known to inhabit gopher tortoise burrows include the gopher frog (*Rana capito*), Florida mouse (*Podomys floridanus*), Florida pine snake (*Pituophis melanoleucus mugitus*) and the eastern indigo snake (*Drymarchon corais couperi*). The gopher frog, Florida mouse, and the Florida pine snake are listed as a SSC by the FWC and are not listed by the USFWS. The eastern indigo snake is listed as Threatened by the FWC and the USFWS. Due to the presence of gopher tortoise burrows and the viability of habitats to support them, there is a probable occurrence of these commensal species onsite. If gopher tortoise burrows are proposed to be impacted, the necessary FWC permits (which also cover commensal species) will be acquired at the time of Development of Regional Impact application.

Plant Species

There are listed plant species that have a probable occurrence within the Planning Areas based on habitat preference and known geographic range. Pursuant to Section 9 (Prohibited Acts) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, impacts to listed (protected) plant species will not require a permit unless they occur on federal lands or

on property not owned by the person removing the plants. Therefore, under the current rules, as long as the entity removing the plants is the property owner, no permitting or coordination related to the removal of protected plant species should be required on this site, unless sale of the plants is involved. In addition, large amounts of upland and wetland habitats will be preserved in the post-development condition to help ensure the continued survival of these and other protected species.

Soils (Map E-4)
Existing USDA National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) data was used to create the General Soils Map (**Map E-4**). This map groups the soils into three categories: "hydric", "with hydric inclusions", or "non-hydric". The three categories are described as follows:

- Hydric: 50% or greater hydric soil components
- With Hydric Inclusions: 1% to 49% hydric soil components
- Non-Hydric: 0% hydric soil components

Hydric soil component percentages are based on the Hydric Soils of Florida Handbook (Fourth Edition, March 2007). Specific soil types and associations for each Planning Area will be provided at the time of Development of Regional Impact application.

Regionally Significant Resources (Map E-5)
Regionally Significant Resources designated by the North Central Florida Regional Planning Council (NCFRPC) Regional Policy Plan were identified and considered when designating the Planning Areas. The following regionally significant resources are depicted on **Map E-5,** using existing GIS data provided by the NCFRPC:

- Public lands;
- Big Bend Salt Marsh;
- Big Bend Seagrasses Aquatic Preserve;
- Freshwater wetlands
- Aucilla River Sinks area;
- Major river corridors; and
- 1st and 2nd magnitude springs.

The Planning Areas were designed to avoid and minimize impacts to regionally significant resources. Any Planning Area located adjacent to public lands will be developed with land uses compatible with the land management activities of those public lands. For example, developments adjacent to areas with periodic prescribed burning will not include incompatible land uses within the smoke-sensitive areas; such as elementary schools, hospitals, or retirement homes. All developments will be subject to review by the County.

The Coastal Planning Areas will be designed to have no adverse affect on the Big Bend Seagrasses Aquatic Preserve. These developments are buffered from the Aquatic Preserve by the Big Bend Wildlife Management Areas and the Big Bend Salt Marshes, and will be

designed to meet all local, state or federal water quality standards. In addition, as mandated through the SRWMD permitting process, expanded upland buffers may be required for wetlands adjacent to Outstanding Florida Waters and more stringent stormwater criteria will be required for developments that drain into impaired or protected water bodies.

Floodplains (Maps E-2 Series)

The 100 year floodplain limits for each planning area as referenced from the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) are depicted on **Figures E-2A – E-2K**. The Community Panels (#12123C) corresponding to the proposed Planning Areas are as follows: 210D, 217D, 219D, 220D, 228D, 236D, 354D, 356D, 357D, 358D, 359D, 361D, 362D, 365D, 366D, 367D, 370D, 376D, 378D, 382D, 384D, 386D, 403D, 405D, 480D, 485D, 515D, 520D, 577D, 579D, 585D, 595D, 605D, 615D, 705D, 706D, 707D, 708D, 709D, 726D and 728D. The effective date for the referenced FIRM panels is May 4, 2009. As shown on Figures E-2A – E-2K , the Planning Areas may contain FEMA Zones A, AE, X and VE. The FEMA flood zone definitions are:

Zone X – areas outside the 500 year floodplain
Zone AE – areas of 100 year flood limits which have a base flood elevation determined
Zone A - areas of 100 year flood limits which do not have a base flood elevation determined
Zone VE – areas within the coastal flood zone with velocity hazard (wave action)

Table VI.2 provides an acreage breakdown for each Planning Area and associated flood zones:

Table VI.2: Floodplain Analysis by Planning Area

PLANNING AREA #	Planning Area Acreage	X	A	AE	VE	TOTAL 100 Yr. Flood	Percent 100 Yr. Flood (%)
1	7,942	4,298	4,298	106		3,481	43.8
2/3	2,225	1,669	1,669			556	25.0
4/5/6	2,821	2,188	2,188			633	22.4
7	3,781	2,924	2,924	87	11	807	21.3
8	1,499	1,194	1,194			305	20.4
11	2,946	919	2003	11		2,014	68.4
12	3,525	1,317	1,317	6		2,207	62.6
13	282	234	234	4		48	16.9
14	1,890	608	608			1,282	67.8
15	2,886	1,332	1,332	602		1,487	51.5
16	5,120	2,983	2,983	748		2,137	41.7
18	8,092	5,731	5,731	164		2,361	29.2
19	2,280	1,765	1,765	323		515	22.6
TOTAL	45,289	27,162	27,162	2,051	11	17,833	39.4

Only Planning Area #7 extends into the FEMA Zone VE. Based upon the Taylor County land development code, the VE Zone also coincides with the Coastal High Hazard area (CHHA). These areas are subject to high velocity wave action from storms or seismic sources. The land development code contains special construction requirements for buildings and structures within the CHHA. No residential structures will be permitted within the CHHA limits. No other Planning Area boundaries encroach into the limits of the Coastal High Hazard Area

In addition to the aforementioned flood zones, FEMA has mapped floodway limits. Per FEMA the floodway is the channel of a stream or river, plus any adjacent floodplain areas that must be kept free of encroachment so that the 100 year floodplain can be carried without substantial increases in flood heights. Minimum Federal standards limit such increases to 1.0 foot, provided that hazardous velocities are not produced. Portions of Planning Areas #12, 13 and 15 contain floodway limits. These floodway limits are within the Zone AE areas shown in the table above. The project related floodway limits correspond to Rocky Creek (Planning Area 12 and 13) and Spring Creek (Planning Area 15). Encroachments within the floodway limits will be primarily limited to roadway crossings. All roadway crossings will be designed to provide sufficient conveyance capacity to meet jurisdictional criteria.

Encroachment within the floodplain will require compensating flood storage volume in accordance with Taylor County and the Suwannee River Water Management District criteria (SRWMD). SRWMD criteria states that the proposed project will not create an increase in flood hazards by reducing surface water storage volumes and that there must be no reduction of floodway conveyance within the project area. Taylor County criteria (LDC Sec. 42-652(5)) specifies that there will be no increase in flood levels as a result of encroachments within the floodway limits. The proposed development will be designed to exceed performance criteria established by the governing regulatory agencies. Each future Development of Regional Impact application will contain an assessment of floodplain impacts for that particular Planning Area(s), when site specific development footprints have been established.

Selection of Agriculture-Transfer area

Approximately 82,797 acres of existing agricultural land has been designated as Agriculture-Transfer land use on the Future Land Use Map, as described in Section IV of the Data and Analysis and Future Land Use Element Objective I.18. Agriculture Transfer lands will maintain their current use as Agriculture-2 or Agriculture Rural Residential land use, including but not limited to silviculture, with the exception that the existing development rights have been removed and placed in a "bank" (described in Table IV.4 of this Data & Analysis), resulting in zero density within the Agriculture-Transfer lands. In conjunction with a DRI application, development rights from a specific legally described Agriculture-Transfer area will be assigned to a specific Planning Area, as described in Future Land Use Element Policy I.18.4.

The location and configuration of Agriculture-Transfer land was established using the following criteria. Agriculture-Transfer lands must be located in close proximity to the Urban Planning Areas that are to receive transferred residential units, as described in Future Land Use Element Policy I.18.5. This provides a defined edge to urban development, designed to prevent the proliferation of urban sprawl, supporting both the County's Vision 2060 Plan and state requirements.

Agriculture-Transfer lands are located on the property of a single landowner, and are therefore limited by real property ownership boundaries. However, this single ownership will minimize the fragmentation of uplands, wetlands and wildlife travel corridors that typically occurs when multiple landowners own and develop property. The Agriculture-Transfer areas will help ensure the long-term viability of silviculture, forestry, and agriculture, all major economic components of Taylor County's tax base. In addition, the designation of these large, contiguous tracts will also support the viability of hunting, a traditional cultural activity in Taylor County.

By locating the Agriculture-Transfer areas adjacent to the Urban Planning Areas, the land pattern results in large, contiguous corridors available for wildlife migration, which will include a mosaic of wetlands, uplands, surface waters (inland shallow lake systems), and riparian corridors. Where practicable, certain Agriculture-Transfer lands are located immediately adjacent to and buffer state-owned conservation lands and riverine systems that drain to the Gulf of Mexico.

A portion of the Agriculture-Transfer area is not adjacent to Planning Areas, but serves as a continuous linkage of non-developable land, connecting the Agriculture-Transfer lands associated with the Coastal Villages to the Agriculture-Transfer lands associated with Perry. This supports the Vision 2060 Plan, which envisioned a clear separation between two distinct development "centers": the Perry urban area and the Coastal urban area. By locating non-developable Agriculture-Transfer land between the two "centers", the County ensures that these development centers cannot be linked together, preventing the proliferation of linear urban sprawl.

Summary

The Urban and Rural Planning Areas do not have adverse impacts on public lands, including those along the Gulf of Mexico. For example, the Big Bend Wildlife Refuge adjacent to Planning Area 18 includes uplands along its perimeter which act as buffers between the preserved wetlands and the proposed Planning Area. In addition, Future Land Use Element Policy I.17.4 requires that Planning Area 18 provide a minimum average 100-foot buffer when adjacent to state-owned lands. In addition, development within the Planning Areas can be buffered by uplands that are currently in silviculture but which also serve as buffers to protect the public lands.

The gopher tortoise (*Gopherus polyphemus*) (burrows) and bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) (observed flying overhead) were the only protected wildlife species documented during the field assessments. No eagle nests were observed or are documented within the Urban and Rural Planning Area boundaries. No dens, nests, rookeries, burrows, etc. were found for

any other protected wildlife species. Detailed surveys will be conducted within the Urban and Rural Planning Areas in conjunction with a Development of Regional Impact (DRI) application and prior to development activities. A management plan will be established for protected species found with each area. Therefore, the proposed developments should have minimal impact on protected wildlife species.

Due to sustainable practices such as development clustering, impact minimization, utilization of large open spaces, and the construction of stormwater management facilities that meet or exceed the Suwannee River Water Management District performance criteria, large quality upland and wetland habitats will be preserved. These high development standards will allow this region to continue to be utilized by protected wildlife and plant species.

VII. Public Facilities Analysis

The Public Facilities Analysis for the 2035 EAR Based Amendments is based upon the maximum development program for the Urban and Rural Planning Areas described by Section III of this Data and Analysis and Future Land Use Element Policy I.19.3, and not the total acreage of new proposed Future Land Use on the new 2035 Future Land Use Map.

Five Year Public Facilities Analysis
The projected growth in Taylor County in the first five years of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan (years 2010 to 2015) is anticipated to occur in Planning Area 1, north of Steinhatchee. Up to 1,000 units are projected for this planning period. This projection represents an optimistic "best case scenario", vastly improved market conditions, and successful implementation of the County's Economic Development Plan. In contrast, only eight (8) total building permits were applied for in the year 2009. In addition, the approval of the Planning Area 1 Development of Regional Impact is not anticipated to occur until 2011 or 2012, and the timing of the first Phase of Development will depend on market conditions.

Because of the current low volume of traffic on the County's roadway network (generally operating at LOS A), this growth is not anticipated to result in adverse impacts to the adopted Level of Service (LOS) standards. For more information regarding projected traffic and resulting impacts on LOS operations, please see the **Traffic Circulation Element Data & Analysis Short-Range (2015) projections**.

At this time, it is not known if the Planning Area 1 community will be served by an expansion of the existing Steinhatchee Water Association, Inc (Big Bend Water Authority) or by construction of a new private sub-regional water and wastewater facility. The feasibility of both approaches will be evaluated at the time of Development of Regional Impact application. In either event, an executed Development Agreement will ensure financial feasibility of the required public facility improvements.

All improvements required to maintain adopted LOS standards resulting from impacts created by private development shall be the financial responsibility of the private development, and not that of Taylor County. An executed Development Agreement shall serve as the legal instrument to guarantee financial feasibility of all needed improvements, including. When identified, these public facility improvements shall be added to the County's 5-year Schedule of Capital Improvements and sent to the Department of Community Affairs for compliance review on an annual basis.

Therefore, no capital improvements have been programmed into the County's 5-Year Schedule of Capital Improvements for these EAR-based Amendments. However, a long term list of capital improvements needed to maintain adopted Level of Service standards at buildout (year 2035) is provided below:

The Long Term Public Facilities Analysis is consistent and compatible with all Elements of the Taylor County Comprehensive Plan, including adopted Level of Service (LOS) standards.

Potable Water

The Urban and Rural Planning Areas of the 2035 Future Land Use Map are primarily proximate to service districts of the existing utility providers within Taylor County, but do not currently receive potable water or wastewater services. Based on the available capacity of the existing facilities, location of the Urban and Rural Planning Areas and the anticipated flows from the proposed development, the future communities will be served by one or more privately or Community Development District (District) funded water treatment facilities, or in combination with expansion of an existing system. These water treatment facilities may be operated and maintained by a private or District entity. Ultimately, in a later development phase, they may be owned and operated by a public entity. The central water distribution system for the new developed areas will initially be privately funded as well, with the potential of trunk line systems being funded by a District. The potable water facilities and infrastructure will be designed and constructed to maintain the Level of Service Standard adopted by Taylor County and approved by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.

There are three potable water providers in Taylor County, each permitted by the Suwannee River Water Management District (SRWMD).

Name	**Permit #**	**Avg Daily Withdrawal**	**Max Daily Withdrawal**	**Permit Expiration**
Taylor Coastal Utilities (Taylor Coastal Water & Sewer District)	2-83-00183	0.1285 MGD	0.36 MGD	9/1/2015
Steinhatchee Water Association, Inc. (Big Bend Water Authority)	2-84-00851-M	0.272 MGD	0.544 MGD	6/14/09 *
City of Perry	84-0837R	2.5 MGD	4.536 MGD	4/14/2029

* Steinhatchee renewal permit currently under review by SRWMD

Because all of these facilities are at or near capacity, it is anticipated that potable water supply to serve the proposed new development proposed for 2035 will be provided through new facilities funded by developers. An executed development agreement will be used to ensure financial feasibility of these capital improvements.

The Level of Service (LOS) standard adopted by Taylor County for potable water use is 100 gallons per capita per day. The estimated potable water demand rates for each of the proposed Planning Areas are shown on Table VII.1: Potable Water Demands. The water demand rate used for residential units is 240 gallons per day (GPD), consistent with the 2035 population calculations (2.4 persons per household). The total projected potable water average daily demand for maximum build out of the Urban and Rural Planning Areas development program is 8.2 million gallons per day (MGD). Each Planning Area will be required to undergo Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review. Potable water supply

sources will be identified during the Application for Master Development Approval (AMDA) phase. Specific providers and facilities will be identified with each Application for Incremental Development Approval (AIDA) and adopted into the County's financially feasible Five Year Schedule of Capital Improvements.

Currently the SRWMD does not have an available 20-year Regional Water Supply Plan, and therefore Taylor County was not required to adopt a 10-year Water Supply Facilities Work Plan. However, an updated regional water supply plan for the Upper Santa Fe River Basin is in progress and is a collaborative effort with the St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD). The results of this study will be available in the summer of 2010. It is not currently known if a new 20-Year Regional Water Supply Plan will be required at the conclusion of this study. SRWMD has not identified any areas within Taylor County which are currently under consumptive use permitting restrictions. Please see the letter dated May 10, 2010 from the SRWMD for further detail.

The new development in the Urban and Rural Planning Areas will use water conservation strategies to reduce the amount of potable water consumed. Reclaimed water will be used for irrigation for the Urban and Rural Planning Areas where available. It is anticipated that the potable consumption may be reduced for single family residential by approximately 50% through the use of reclaimed water for irrigation. This estimated reduction was obtained by referencing the potable demand rates published in the Growth Management Plan for the City of Orlando. The City's potable water provider, Orlando Utilities Commission (OUC), has performed field studies to obtain demand rates for projects utilizing reclaimed water for irrigation. The City of Orlando potable demand rates for single family residential land use is reduced from 325 gallons per day (GPD) to 160 GPD for developments which irrigate with reclaimed water. It should also be noted that stormwater reuse may be used as well as another supply source for irrigation to the proposed development.

Wastewater

The Urban and Rural Planning Areas of the 2035 Future Land Use Map are proximate to service districts of the existing utility providers within Taylor County, but do not currently receive potable water or wastewater services. Based on the available capacity of the existing facilities, physical location of the Urban and Rural Planning Areas and the anticipated flows from the proposed development, the proposed development will be served by one or more private or District funded wastewater treatment facilities, or in combination with an expansion of an existing system. These wastewater treatment facilities may be operated and maintained by a private, District or ultimately a public entity. The central sanitary sewer collection system for the new Urban Planning Areas will initially be privately funded as well, with the potential of trunk line systems funded by the District. The wastewater facilities and infrastructure will be designed and constructed to maintain the Level of Service adopted by Taylor County and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.

The Level of Service (LOS) standard adopted by Taylor County for wastewater use is 100 gallons per capita per day. The estimated wastewater demand rates for each of the proposed development are shown on Table VII.2: Wastewater Demands. The wastewater demand rate used for residential units is 240 GPD consistent with the 2035 population calculations

(2.4 persons per household). The projected wastewater average daily demand for maximum build out of the Urban and Rural Planning Areas development program is 7.8 million gallons per day (MGD).

There are three existing public wastewater treatment facilities in Taylor County, each permitted by Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP).

Facility	Permit #	Plant Capacity - Annual Avg Daily Flow	Permit Expiration
Taylor Coastal Water & Sewer District / Taylor Coastal WWTF	FL325864	0.08 MGD	12/11/2013
Big Bend Water Authority / Steinhatchee WWTF No. 1	FL011824	0.095 MGD	3/15/2014
City of Perry / City of Perry WWTF	FL0026387	1.25 MGD	7/9/2012

Because all of these facilities are at or near capacity, it is anticipated that potable water supply to serve the proposed new development proposed for 2035 will be provided through new facilities funded by developers and/or Districts. An executed development agreement will be used to ensure financial feasibility of these capital improvements.

Public Utility Facilities and Service Needs

At build-out for the 2035 Future Land Use Map, the potable water, wastewater and irrigation water needs for the proposed development will consist of:

- 7.8 MGD capacity for combined regional, and/or sub-regional or wastewater treatment facilities.
- 8.2 MGD capacity for combined regional and sub-regional potable water treatment facilities.
- Wastewater collection and distribution systems
- Potable water distribution systems
- Irrigation water distribution systems
- Possible stormwater treatment facilities for irrigation water

As discussed in the previous sections, the public utility infrastructure facilities necessary to serve the proposed development within the planning areas will be constructed by one or more privately funded water and wastewater utility districts. These utility districts may either be entirely new or in combination with expansions of the existing Taylor Coastal Water & Sewer District, Big Bend Water Authority and the City of Perry systems. These wastewater treatment facilities may be operated and maintained by a private, District, or public entity.

It is anticipated that sub-regional potable water, wastewater and irrigation water facilities may be constructed to serve individual planning areas initially, if not served by an expansion to

one of the existing utilities. Individual planning areas may be connected to future regional and sub-regional facilities as they are constructed and development phasing coincides with capacities of the facilities. For example, a new utility district can be created and sub-regional water and wastewater treatment facilities constructed to serve a first phase development program for Planning Area 1. This district can be expanded to serve future phases and Planning Areas 2/3, or further expanded to serve Planning Areas 4/5/6, 7 and 8. All of the Coastal Planning Areas are within 15 miles of each other which is not an unusual distance for water and wastewater collection and distribution systems. Alternately, one or both of the existing Taylor Coastal Water & Sewer District and Big Bend Water Authority facilities could be expanded to serve all of the Coastal Planning Areas. Similarly, the Central Planning areas surrounding Perry could be either served initially by a sub-regional facility or the City of Perry and ultimately by a regional facility.

Insert NEW TABLE POTABLE WATER

Insert NEW TABLE WASTE WATER

Drainage
The stormwater management facilities will be designed to meet or exceed the drainage criteria as established by the Suwannee River Water Management District (SRWMD), Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) and Taylor County. The stormwater facilities will be designed to meet or exceed the applicable criteria for attenuation, water quality treatment and environmental considerations specific to each new development area. Construction, operation and maintenance of stormwater management facilities will be the financial responsibility of the developer. The design and siting of specific drainage facilities will occur at the time of application for Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review.

Solid Waste
The Urban and Rural Planning Areas depicted on the 2035 Future Land Use Map are not currently within an existing solid waste collection service area. The County does not currently own or operate solid waste disposal site that accepts residential, commercial, or industrial solid waste. The closest facility is the Aucilla Area Solid Waste Facility near Greenville in Madison County.

A service contract that meets or exceeds the adopted Level of Service (LOS) standard for solid waste (0.78 tons per capita per year) will be executed at the time of Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review and approval for each Urban and Rural Planning Area.

Public Schools
The increased population allocated on the 2035 Future Land Use Map result in a need for new Elementary, Middle, and High Schools in Taylor County. Using the single family residential Student Generation Rates of the Public School Facilities Element Data & Analysis, there is a need for the following new facilities to support the 25,672 new units anticipated in the Planning Areas.

Table VII.3: Schools Required for 2035 Population

Type	Single Family Unit Student Generation Rate	Total Students	Typical School Size	Number of Schools Needed
Elementary	0.053	1,361	800	1.7
Middle	0.074	1,900	900	2.1
High	0.043	1,104	1,000	1.1
TOTALS	0.17	4,365	n/a	n/a

The location, number, and commitment of new school facilities and lands will be made at the time of application for Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review, and will be consistent with the Public School Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan. Whenever possible, schools will be provided as a focal point or center to a neighborhood within a Planning Area to encourage walking and efficiency in school bus transportation.

Parks and Recreation

The following facilities are needed to maintain the County's adopted Level of Service Standards for recreation at the 2035 buildout year. The County does not maintain an inventory of available recreational facilities throughout the County (capacity availability), therefore it is assumed that new development

The location of recreational facilities for specific Urban and Rural Planning Areas will be established at the time of Development of Regional Impact (DRI) application:

Table VII.4			
Activity	**Level of Service Standard**	**2035 Buildout Population**	**2035 Facilities Need**
RESOURCE BASED RECREATION ACTIVITY/FACILITY			
Parks with Facilities	5 Acres per 5,000 residents	54,017	54 acres of parks
Swimming(non pool)	1 access point at a beach, spring, river, lake or pond for every 25,000 persons to be served.	54,017	2 swimming access points
Fishing (non-boat)	1 access point for every 10,000 persons to be served.	54,017	5 fishing access points
Fishing (boat)	1 boat ramp for every 5,000 persons to be served.	54,017	11 fishing boat ramps
Camping (Recreational Vehicle and/or Tent)	1 acre of campground within a 25 mile radius of the County boundaries for every 25,000 persons to be served	54,017	2 acres of campground
Picnicking	1 picnic table for every 500 persons to be served.	54,017	108 picnic tables
Hiking	1 mile of available hiking trail within a 25 mile radius of County boundaries for every 10,000 persons to be served	54,017	5 miles of hiking trail
Nature Study	7 acres of managed conservation are within 25 miles of the County boundaries for every 10,000 persons to be served	54,017	38 acres of managed conservation area
ACTIVITY BASED RECREATION ACTIVITY/FACILITY			
Activity	**Level of Service Standard**	**2035 Buildout Population**	**2035 Facilities Need**
Football/Soccer	1 multi-purpose playing field for every 15,000 persons to be served	54,017	4 multi-purpose playing fields
Baseball/Softball	1 baseball/softball field for every 6,000 persons to be served.	54,017	9 baseball/ softball fields
Tennis	1 tennis court for every 7,500 persons to be served.	54,017	7 tennis courts

Traffic Circulation and Roads

See "Traffic Circulation Element Data & Analysis" under separate cover.