
**EVALUATION AND APPRAISAL REPORT
OF THE
INDIAN RIVER COUNTY
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

2008

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION
ELEMENT**

INDIAN RIVER COUNTY
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
1801 27TH STREET
VERO BEACH, FLORIDA 32960
(772) 226-1237

Revised: November 14, 2008

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	3
CONDITIONS AT THE TIME OF LAST MAJOR PLAN UPDATE (1998)	3
EXISTING CONDITIONS (2006)	5
ANALYSIS	7
EVALUATION OF OBJECTIVES AND ASSESSMENT OF POLICIES	34
IDENTIFICATION OF FUTURE ACTIONS	43
ANTICIPATED AMENDMENTS	43

Attachments:

1. Primary Agencies Having Jurisdiction over Entire or Parts Of IRC
2. Public and Quasi-public Entities Providing Service Or Affecting IRC
3. Existing and Proposed Coordination Links
4. Existing Intergovernmental Coordination
5. Goal, Objectives, and Policies

Appendix A, Data

Appendix B, Analysis

Appendix C, Evaluating Achievement of Objectives

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this portion of the Evaluation and Appraisal Report is to assess the success or failure of the Intergovernmental Coordination Element of the Comprehensive Plan. This assessment must examine changes in intergovernmental coordination conditions within the county between 1996 and 2006, evaluate the achievement of objectives, and identify changes in state requirements affecting the intergovernmental coordination element. Based on this evaluation and appraisal, the intergovernmental coordination element may need to be updated and revised.

This assessment contains the following components:

- Intergovernmental coordination conditions at the time of last major update plan (1998)
- Existing intergovernmental coordination conditions (2006)
- Analysis of intergovernmental coordination conditions
- Major issues related to intergovernmental coordination.
- Evaluation of intergovernmental coordination element objective achievement
- Assessment of Intergovernmental Coordination Element policy implementation
- Identification of needed future actions
- Identification of anticipated amendments

CONDITIONS AT THE TIME OF LAST MAJOR PLAN UPDATE (1998)

A summary of the intergovernmental coordination conditions within the county in 1998 is provided in appendix "A". While the county's comprehensive plan was last updated on March 17, 1998, data used to prepare the 1998 plan update were mostly from 1996. These baseline data will be compared to existing conditions to identify changes in intergovernmental coordination conditions within the county between the last major plan update and the present.

In 1998, the county regularly coordinated with more than 56 other entities. An inventory of those entities is provided in attachments 1 and 2 (tables 11.1 and 11.2 of the intergovernmental coordination element). Table 11.3 (attachment 3) identifies 1998 coordination links with various agencies by comprehensive plan element. Overall 1998 coordination conditions in the county are identified in attachment 4.

In 1998, the county had several intergovernmental coordination agreements with municipalities, other counties, state agencies, and other entities. These agreements ranged from service provision agreements to resource protection agreements.

A principal means of intergovernmental coordination in 1998 was municipal representation on and participation in county committees. In 1998, the following county committees existed and had municipal representation.

- Affordable Housing Partnership Committee (AHPC)
- Land Acquisition Advisory Committee (LAAC)
- Council of Public Officials (COPO)
- Transportation Disadvantaged Local Coordinating Board (TDLCB)
- Engineering Utility Coordination Committee (EUCC)
- Economic Development Council (EDC)
- Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
- Conservation Lands Advisory Committee (CLAC)
- Beach and Shore Preservation Advisory Committee (BSPAC)
- Marine Advisory Narrows Watershed Action Committee (MANWAC)

At the time of the last major plan update, the county's intergovernmental coordination relationships with other governmental jurisdictions and agencies were good. The county also had good working relationships with the municipalities in the county. To promote intergovernmental coordination, most county committees in 1998 included representatives from municipalities and other appropriate agencies.

In 1995, there were no known inconsistencies between the county plan and the plans of municipalities and adjacent counties. Although there were at that time no formal coordination mechanisms regarding assessing the impact of development in one jurisdiction on other jurisdictions and coordinating levels of service, the county did have a memorandum of understanding with the school district regarding sharing information, providing infrastructure, and siting school facilities. In 1995, there were seven (7) enclave properties within the county totaling 208.39 acres.

In 1998, a principal means of coordination was through the review processes managed by the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) and the Department of Community Affairs (DCA). Through the TCRPC and DCA, the county reviewed other jurisdictions' comprehensive plans and comprehensive plan amendments, as well as Developments of Regional Impact (DRI). At that time, however, there was no formal coordination mechanism for review of non-DRI projects with extra-jurisdictional impacts. In 1998, the only available mechanism to resolve disputes was through the Regional Planning Council's dispute resolution process.

At the time of the last major plan update, the county coordinated with the St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD), the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), the Department of Community Affairs (DCA), and the U.S. Army Corp. of Engineers (ACOE). Coordination between the county and those agencies involved permitting, plan review, information exchange, and technical assistance.

There were no areas of critical state concern within Indian River County in 1998. At that time, however, the barrier island was included in the Hutchinson Island Resource Management area. As such, the county coordinated with DCA on the continued implementation of the Hutchinson Island

Resource Management Plan.

Coordination with state agencies was generally good in 1998, although coordination with some agencies was better than with others. Most coordination problems were minor, relating mostly to communication.

EXISTING CONDITIONS (2006)

Current intergovernmental coordination conditions are identified in Appendices "A" and "B" under the existing conditions section of the corresponding matrices. The information on existing intergovernmental coordination conditions will be compared to the data provided in the intergovernmental coordination element in 1998 to assess changes in intergovernmental coordination conditions within the county.

Overall, existing intergovernmental coordination conditions are similar to intergovernmental coordination conditions in 1998. At the local level, the county coordinates with five municipalities, 6 local water control districts, the school board, and 5 independent special districts. At the state level, the county coordinates with about 15 departments or agencies. At the regional level, the county coordinates with 5 entities. At the federal level, the county coordinates with at least 9 entities. A list of these entities is provided in attachments 1 and 2.

All agencies and governmental units that existed in 1998 still exist. With respect to transportation, interlocal coordination is provided through the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). Comprised of county commissioners and elected officials from municipalities within the county, as well as a representative from the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), the Indian River County MPO has a good working relationship with local governments, other agencies, and other MPOs.

Currently, the county has hundreds of intergovernmental coordination agreements with various entities which cover variety of subject matters. Despite these coordination mechanisms, the county has no formal agreements with municipalities or adjacent counties for review of planning related matters, for maintenance of adopted level of service standards, or for review of non-DRI projects with extra-jurisdictional impacts. At this time, there is no established local mechanism to resolve disputes that may arise, and the county utilizes the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council dispute resolution process.

Between 1995 and 2008, the municipalities in the county annexed more than 24,805 acres of unincorporated county lands. The following table indicates the amount of annexation undertaken by each municipality since 1998.

Annexations 1998-2008

Annexed To	Acreage
Fellsmere	23,972.82
Indian River Shores	28.61
Sebastian	615.73
Vero Beach	187.96
Grand Total	24,805.12

Since last major plan update, annexations by the City of Vero Beach, City of Sebastian, and the Town of Indian River Shores have been limited. Between 1998 and 2008, the Town of Indian River Shores annexed a 28.61 acre enclave property and the City of Vero Beach annexed 187.96 acres, while the City of Sebastian annexed more than 615.73 acres of unincorporated county land within the USA. Two of the properties annexed by the City of Sebastian were enclave properties totaling 136 acres. During the 1998-2008 timeframe, the City of Fellsmere annexed about 23,972.82 acres of unincorporated county land. Most of this land was outside of the county’s urban service area and designated as agricultural on the county’s future land use map. Currently, there are four (4) enclave properties within the county totaling 43.78 acres.

To address annexation issues, the county, in 2007, considered the possibility and the pros and cons of becoming a charter county. That initiative, however, is on hold at this time. Currently, the county is working with municipalities to develop an Interlocal Service Boundary Agreement (ISBA). Through this agreement, the municipalities will identify potential future annexation areas for the next 20 years. Also, the agreement will establish maximum density and height limitations which cannot be exceeded in annexed areas without unanimous consent of all parties to the agreement.

Since 1998, the county, municipalities, and school board have entered into interlocal agreements for imposing impact fees and for undertaking public school planning. In 2005, the Board of County Commissioners and the municipalities in the county signed an interlocal agreement to participate in a countywide impact fee program. That program involved establishing 8 new impact fees in addition to the then existing traffic impact fee. The new impact fees relate to emergency services facilities, correctional facilities, public buildings, law enforcement, library facilities, solid waste facilities, parks and recreational facilities, and public education facilities. Not all of these impact fees are applicable to the municipalities. As structured, the agreement provides for collection of fees, transfer of fees to the county, refund of fees as needed, update of fees, and other matters related to the administration of impact fees.

In 2003, the Board of County Commissioners, the school district, and the cities of Fellsmere, Sebastian, and Vero Beach signed an interlocal agreement for public school planning. This agreement provided for establishing several committees; coordinating and sharing information; coordinating school site selection and school facility modification; reviewing comprehensive plan amendments, rezonings, and development approvals; co-locating and sharing use of facilities; and addressing other school coordination issues. Subsequently, a new agreement was drafted and adopted in 2008.

There are several county committees which have countywide intergovernmental coordination functions. The following is a list of county committees which have countywide intergovernmental coordination responsibilities.

- Affordable Housing Advisory Committee (AHAC)
- Affordable Housing Partnership Committee (AHPC)
- Land Acquisition Advisory Committee (LAAC)
- Council of Public Officials (COPO)
- Transportation Disadvantaged Local Coordinating Board (TDLCB)
- Engineering Utility Coordination Committee (EUCC)
- Economic Development Council (EDC)
- Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
- Conservation Lands Advisory Committee (CLAC)
- Beach and Shore Preservation Advisory Committee (BSPAC)
- Marine Advisory Narrows Watershed Action Committee (MANWAC)

These committees enhance coordination among governments and governmental agencies by including representatives from municipalities as well as governmental agencies and by addressing countywide issues.

ANALYSIS

In planning for growth, the county coordinates with a number of other governments and governmental agencies which affect land development in Indian River County. Because of the number of governments and governmental agencies, extensive coordination is required.

Despite the effort required, the county has good working relationships with all local and state entities. As part of its intergovernmental coordination efforts, the county coordinates with the municipalities within the county on various issues, including service provision, inter-jurisdictional development impacts, rezonings and land use amendment notification. For most of those issues, however, there is no formal coordination mechanism, and there is no formal dispute resolution process.

Overall, intergovernmental coordination involves several different activities. These are: communication, inter-jurisdictional impact identification, impact mitigation, dispute resolution, overall cooperation, and others. Not all of these activities apply in every intergovernmental relationship.

Communication

At the local level, communication with municipalities and other local entities is good. Some of this communication occurs through existing county committees which meet on a regular basis, have a set structure, and maintain minutes. Other communication, however, is informal with no set mechanism.

Locally, county staff notifies appropriate municipal staff whenever a development project is proposed close to a municipal boundary. Municipalities, however, do not always notify county staff of proposed projects within their jurisdictions which could impact the county. Currently, notification of local governments is not formally required either by the county or adjacent municipalities. If each local government were required to inform adjacent governments of proposed projects, intergovernmental coordination could be enhanced.

Communication with some state agencies seems to be an issue. In some cases, local governments are not always kept apprised of changes in rules and regulations. This sometimes results in lack of a clear understanding of state regulations for both applicants and the county. Some of the issues related to general coordination with state agencies are:

- Number of agencies with which the county must coordinate
- Lack of communication between various offices of state agencies
- Duplication of efforts
- In some cases, lack of clear written guidelines
- In some cases, lack of formal procedures or agreements and lack of clear understanding of all responsibilities
- In some cases, delays in informing local governments of recent changes in regulations and criteria. Because of websites, this is now less of an issue, since new regulations and programs are being posted at websites and local governments are informed by e-mail messages

The county's current intergovernmental coordination element objectives and policies are designed to address these issues. So those objectives and policies with some revisions and additions should be maintained.

Extra-jurisdictional Impacts

Although the county has many written intergovernmental coordination agreements with municipalities and other entities, there are no formal agreements on planning related issues such as maintaining established level of service standards, addressing extra-jurisdictional development impacts, providing up front coordination on land use amendments, rezonings, and annexations, and establishing a dispute resolution process.

Formal intergovernmental coordination agreements could:

- clearly identify issues, responsibilities, and important resources and facilities
- define significant extra-jurisdictional impacts;
- establish quantitative, qualitative, and locational criteria to measure significant impacts
- develop measures to mitigate impacts, and
- establish a formal process to resolve disputes when issues arise.

There are advantages and disadvantages to having a formal intergovernmental coordination process. For a local government, it is easier and less time consuming if the local government approves all development projects, rezoning requests, and land use amendments within its jurisdiction without considering extra-jurisdictional impacts and without coordination with other jurisdictions. Since

actions of one local government often affect other governments, however, it is important for local governments to coordinate to ensure that one jurisdiction does not negatively affect another.

Coordination can be done informally on a case by case basis; however, this type of coordination is highly variable and largely depends on the people doing the coordination. At this time, most staff level coordination efforts are done informally.

On the other hand, a formal intergovernmental coordination process could clearly define what issues should be considered; identify which resources and facilities must be protected; identify which jurisdiction has the responsibility to notify others of development projects or land use amendment requests; specify which jurisdiction has review responsibility; and identify to what extent comments from other jurisdictions must be addressed. It is inherent that an additional intergovernmental coordination process would add to the time needed to review projects. Therefore, an efficient intergovernmental coordination process must define what is considered to be a significant impact and concentrate coordination efforts on those projects which create significant impacts, not all projects.

An effective and workable intergovernmental coordination process, must include a process to resolve disputes. This would be a mechanism by which local governments can solve their differences.

Due to anticipated future growth within the county, it would seem that issues and problems will become more complicated in nature. For that reason, the county's present policy to establish formal intergovernmental coordination agreements and procedures with adjacent counties and municipalities should be maintained. Currently, the county is working with municipalities within the county to draft and sign an Interlocal Service Boundary Agreement (ISBA).

Intergovernmental Coordination Relationships

The following series of tables identifies the county's intergovernmental coordination relationships by comprehensive plan element.

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

- Future Land Use Element**

APPLICABLE ENTITIES	MAY BE IMPACTED BY IRC	MAY IMPACT IRC	SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES	ACTIVITIES	PROCEDURAL ISSUES	EXISTING COORDINATION MECHANISM
MUNICIPALITIES	X	X	- LAND USE COMPATIBILITY - FACILITY/SERVICE IMPACTS - NATURAL RESOURCE IMPACTS	-REZONINGS -LAND USE AMENDMENTS -DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS -ANNEXATION	-NOTIFICATION OF PLAN CHANGES OR PROPOSED PROJECTS -IDENTIFYING EXPECTED IMPACTS -MITIGATING IMPACTS -DISPUTE RESOLUTION	-FORMAL PROCEDURE FOR LAND USE AMENDMENTS AND DRI PROJECTS; REVIEWED THROUGH TCRPC & DCA - INFORMAL FOR OTHER ACTIVITIES
ADJACENT COUNTIES	X	X	- LAND USE COMPATIBILITY - FACILITY/SERVICE IMPACTS - NATURAL RESOURCE IMPACTS	- REZONINGS - LAND USE AMENDMENTS - DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS	-NOTIFICATION OF PLAN CHANGES OR PROPOSED PROJECTS -IDENTIFYING EXPECTED IMPACTS -MITIGATING IMPACTS -DISPUTE RESOLUTION	- FORMAL PROCEDURE LAND USE AMENDMENTS AND DRI PROJECTS; REVIEW THROUGH TCRPC AND DCA - INFORMAL FOR OTHER ACTIVITIES
SJRWMD	X	X	- NATURAL RESOURCE IMPACTS - PROTECTION OF THE ST. JOHN RIVER UPPER BASIN	- DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS - ENVIRONMENTAL LAND PURCHASE	-NOTIFICATION OF PLAN CHANGES OR PROPOSED PROJECTS -IDENTIFYING EXPECTED IMPACTS -MITIGATING IMPACTS -COORDINATION RE: SJRWMD LAND PURCHASES - SJRWMD ENV. LAND	- INFORMAL

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

APPLICABLE ENTITIES	MAY BE IMPACTED BY IRC	MAY IMPACT IRC	SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES	ACTIVITIES	PROCEDURAL ISSUES	EXISTING COORDINATION MECHANISM
					PURCHASES -DISPUTE RESOLUTION	
DCA		X	- BALANCE BETWEEN COMMUNITY DESIRES AND STATE RULES AND REGULATIONS	- COMP PLAN AND COMP PLAN AMENDMENTS - DRI REVIEWS	- LENGTH OF TIME NEEDED TO PROCESS A COMP PLAN AMENDMENT - NUMBER OF AGENCIES THAT NEED TO BE COORDINATED WITH	- PROCEDURES SET IN THE FLORIDA STATUTES AND FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE - FORMAL COMP PLAN & DRI REVIEWS

With respect to land use, the county, like all general purpose local governments, establishes its future land use pattern by adopting a future land use plan map. This plan map may then be modified through amendments and implemented through rezoning actions and development project approvals. Another land use related activity is municipal annexation. While annexations may be done only by cities and towns, annexations affect the county by changing the governmental entity having jurisdiction over the property that is annexed. Annexation can increase development potential (increase density and intensity), create more demand for public facilities, and affect environmental resources.

As indicated in the above matrix, land use decisions by municipalities and adjacent counties may affect Indian River County. Similarly, land use decisions by Indian River County may affect municipalities in the county or adjacent counties. Usually, only land use decisions involving property close to a municipal/county or a county/county boundary have extra-jurisdictional impacts. Sometimes, these impacts are adverse, while other times impacts may be beneficial. Most often, extra-jurisdictional impacts are probably neutral.

Land use decisions can produce various types of impacts. Such impacts could include: land use incompatibilities (such as allowing industrial uses in one jurisdiction adjacent to residential uses in another jurisdiction); facility impacts (such as vehicle trips produced by a land use in one jurisdiction affecting roadways in a neighboring jurisdiction); natural resource impacts (such as a land use in one jurisdiction affecting an ecosystem either in a neighboring jurisdiction or shared between jurisdictions); and other types of impacts.

Because land use decisions can have extra-jurisdictional impacts, coordination among adjacent local governments on land use matters is important. Specifically, it is important that several activities occur with respect to land use projects which may have extra-jurisdictional

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

impacts. These activities include: notification of affected governments, identification of expected impacts, and development of measures to mitigate impacts. Finally, there should be a process to resolve disputes. An intergovernmental coordination process like the one stated in policy 3.9 of the county’s current Intergovernmental Coordination Element can address these issues.

- **Infrastructure Element**

The county's Infrastructure Element includes the following sub-elements: Sanitary Sewer, Potable Water, Solid Waste, Natural Groundwater Aquifer Recharge, and Drainage.

APPLICABLE ENTITIES	MAY BE IMPACTED BY IRC	MAY IMPACT IRC	SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES	ACTIVITIES	PROCEDURAL ISSUES	EXISTING COORDINATION MECHANISM
MUNICIPALITIES	X	X	- MAINTENANCE OF L.O.S. - PROVISION OF SERVICES	-ANNEXATIONS -PLAN AMENDMENTS -REZONINGS -PROJECT APPROVAL -SERVICE PROVISION	- IDENTIFICATION OF FACILITIES THAT MAY BE IMPACTED - NOTIFICATION OF PLAN CHANGES AND PROPOSED PROJECTS	- COMP PLAN AMENDMENTS & DRI PROJECTS; REVIEWED THROUGH TCRPC AND DCA - FORMAL AGREEMENT WITH CITY OF VERO BEACH, CITY OF SEBASTIAN, City of FELLSMERE, AND TOWN OF ORCHID FOR PROVISION OF SERVICES - OTHER INFORMAL COORDINATION
ADJACENT COUNTIES	X	X	- MAINTENANCE OF L.O.S. - AQUIFER RECHARGE AREAS	-PLAN AMENDMENTS -REZONINGS -PROJECT APPROVAL	- IDENTIFICATION OF FACILITIES THAT MAY BE IMPACTED - NOTIFICATION OF PLAN CHANGES AND PROPOSED PROJECTS	- LAND USE AMENDMENTS AND DRI PROJECTS; REVIEWED THROUGH TCRPC AND DCA - OTHER INFORMAL COORDINATION
WATER CONTROL	X	X	- NATURAL RESOURCE	- COORDINATION OF L.O.S.	-NOTIFICATION OF PLAN	-INFORMAL

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

APPLICABLE ENTITIES	MAY BE IMPACTED BY IRC	MAY IMPACT IRC	SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES	ACTIVITIES	PROCEDURAL ISSUES	EXISTING COORDINATION MECHANISM
DISTRICTS			IMPACTS - PROTECTION OF THE COUNTY RESIDENTS AND PROPERTIES		CHANGES AND PROPOSED PROJECTS	
SJRWMD		X	- NATURAL RESOURCE IMPACTS - PROTECTION OF THE COUNTY RESIDENTS AND PROPERTIES - WATER SUPPLY	- REVIEW AND COMMENTS ON PROPOSED PROJECTS FOR STORMWATER MANAGEMENT - WATER SUPPLY ASSESSMENT AND WATER SUPPLY PLAN	- NOTIFICATION OF PLAN CHANGES AND PROPOSED PROJECTS - PARTICIPATE WITH SJRWMD FOR ASSESSING WATER SUPPLY ASSESSMENT AND SOURCES	- PERMITTING - PROVIDE INFORMATION, REVIEW WORK PRODUCT
FDOT		X	- NATURAL RESOURCE IMPACTS - PROTECTION OF THE COUNTY RESIDENTS AND PROPERTIES	- REVIEW AND COMMENTS ON PROPOSED PROJECTS FOR STORMWATER MANAGEMENT	- NOTIFICATION OF PLAN CHANGES AND PROPOSED PROJECTS	- FORMAL PROCEDURE
DEP		X	- NATURAL RESOURCE IMPACTS - PROTECTION OF THE COUNTY RESIDENTS AND PROPERTIES	- REVIEW AND COMMENTS ON PROPOSED PROJECTS	- NOTIFICATION OF PLAN AMENDMENTS & PROJECTS	- PERMIT APPLICATION

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

With respect to infrastructure, actions by Indian River County could impact the municipalities within the county or adjacent counties. Similarly, actions by these other local governments could impact the county. At present, the county has intergovernmental coordination agreements with several municipalities to provide water and sewer service. Specifically, the county provides utility service to the City of Sebastian, City of Fellsmere, and the Town of Orchid. The City of Vero Beach provides utility service to the south barrier island and other unincorporated areas around the city limits. The county shall maintain these agreements with municipalities. For solid waste, there is a countywide solid waste disposal district that provides service to the entire county.

The county must participate with the SJRWMD in development and update of the district's water supply assessment and water supply plan. The county must also coordinate with SJRWMD to identify and obtain necessary permits for alternative water supply sources. The county is planning to increase water conservation activities such as expanding its water reuse facilities.

For drainage, coordination with water control districts is important since there are overlapping responsibilities. The county's relationship with the Indian River Farms Water Control District (IRFWCD) is particularly important, since the IRFWCD encompasses most of the urbanized area of the county. While the county has responsibility for protection of the Indian River Lagoon and its water quality, the Indian River Farm Water Control District outfalls in the lagoon, affecting the lagoon generally and the lagoon's water quality in particular.

The county has coordinated with the IRFWCD in several projects such as the Egret Marsh Stormwater Treatment Facility and Main Relief Canal Pollution Control System. The Egret Marsh facility consists of a set of pumps to remove and replace water from the Indian River Farms Water Control District (IRFWCD) canal system. Inbound water from the canal system will be piped to the headworks of the facility and then sheet flow over a large algal turf scrubber. Algae that grows on the scrubber will remove pollutants from the water and be harvested and composted on a weekly basis in the summer and less often in the cooler months. Water that has flowed over the scrubber will be routed sequentially through 3 polishing ponds (initial intermediate and final) and then pumped back into the canal system. The Indian River County's Main Relief Canal Pollution Central System Using Series Screening Methodology to continuously remove solids to 1/16th inch diameter from 300 mgd of canal water. The project is being paid for and constructed by Indian River County in the Indian River Farms Water Control District's right-of-way under an Interlocal Agreement between the county and the IRFWCD main relief canal pollution control system.

Indian River Farms is not the only water control district with which the county must coordinate, and drainage is not the only county/water control district intergovernmental coordination issue.

With the Fellsmere Farms Water Control District (FFWCD), an important issue is property access. Presently, there are many five and ten acre parcels, created in the 1920's by the FFWCD's plat of reclamation, that have access only through ditch roads within FFWCD's canal and road rights-of-way. These ditch roads are unpaved and unsafe. Consequently, there is a need for the county and FFWCD to coordinate to improve these roads.

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Overall, it is necessary that the county coordinate extensively with the water control districts. This coordination should involve addressing water quality and water quantity aspects of new development projects, cooperating with road and canal right-of-way usage, and jointly addressing long term stormwater management system improvements.

Land use decisions in one jurisdiction can produce various types of impacts on infrastructure components such as water, sewer, solid waste, drainage, and aquifer recharge in other jurisdictions. Such impacts could include: facility impacts (such as stormwater runoff from a project in one jurisdiction affecting drainage canals in another, development in one jurisdiction affecting water and sewer capacity and availability in another jurisdiction, or a drainage district's capacity or level of service standard limiting discharge rate for development projects in a jurisdiction); aquifer recharge area impacts (such as development in one jurisdiction reducing aquifer recharge and consequently affecting quantity and/or quality of groundwater in another area); and other types of impacts.

With respect to adjacent counties, the St. Johns River Water Management District, the Department of Transportation, and the Department of Environmental Protection, the principal relationships involve natural resource protection, and Floridan aquifer recharge area protection. Because land use decisions can have extra-jurisdictional impacts, coordination among adjacent local governments and special districts is important. Therefore, notification of affected governments, identification of expected impacts, establishment of ways to mitigate impacts, and development of a process to resolve disputes are important. Policy 3.9 of the current Intergovernmental Coordination Element for Joint Planning Areas (JPA) can address these issues.

• **Transportation**

APPLICABLE ENTITIES	MAY BE IMPACTED BY IRC	MAY IMPACT IRC	SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES	ACTIVITIES	PROCEDURAL ISSUES	COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES	EXISTING COORDINATION MECHANISM
MUNICIPALITIES	X	X	- MAINTENANCE OF L.O.S. - FACILITY/SERVICE IMPACTS - TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS	- PLAN AMENDMENTS - REZONINGS - PROJECT APPROVALS - CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMMING	- NOTIFICATION OF PLAN CHANGES AND PROPOSED PROJECTS - IDENTIFICATION OF EXPECTED IMPACTS	X	- MPO - FORMAL
ADJACENT COUNTIES	X	X	- MAINTENANCE OF L.O.S.	- PLAN AMENDMENTS - REZONINGS	- NOTIFICATION OF PLAN CHANGES AND PROPOSED	X	- FORMAL

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

APPLICABLE ENTITIES	MAY BE IMPACTED BY IRC	MAY IMPACT IRC	SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES	ACTIVITIES	PROCEDURAL ISSUES	COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES	EXISTING COORDINATION MECHANISM
			- FACILITY/SERVICE IMPACTS - ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS	- PROJECT APPROVALS - CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMMING	PROJECTS - IDENTIFICATION OF EXPECTED IMPACTS		
FDOT		X	- FUNDING - ACCESS MANAGEMENT - TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS - MAINTENANCE - SAFETY - LOS (SIS) - RR CROSSING	- MANAGEMENT - PERMITTING	- PROJECT SELECTION - REVIEW/PERMIT - CONSTRUCTION	X	- FORMAL
COMMISSION FOR TRANSPORTATION DISADVANTAGED		X	- FUNDING	- MONITORING	- ADMINISTRATION		- FORMAL
COMMUNITY TRANSPORTATION COORDINATOR (CTC)	X	X	PROVISION OF COORDINATED TRANSPORTATION SERVICES TO TRANSPORTATION DISADVANTAGED PERSONS	PROVISION OF TRANSIT AND PARATRANSIT SERVICES - REPORTING	- OPERATION - ADMINISTRATION		- FORMAL
FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION (FTA)		X	- FUNDING - MONITORING OF TRANSIT SERVICES	- MONITORING OF TRANSIT SERVICES - REPORTING	-ADMINISTRATION		- FORMAL - COORDINATION ALSO INCLUDES FDOT
FDOT	X	X	WORK PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	- PROVISION OF SERVICES - REPORTING	COUNTY (THROUGH MPO) PROVIDES LIST OF TRANSP. PRIORITIES THAT FDOT CONSIDERS IN MAKING FUNDING DECISIONS		- FORMAL

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

APPLICABLE ENTITIES	MAY BE IMPACTED BY IRC	MAY IMPACT IRC	SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES	ACTIVITIES	PROCEDURAL ISSUES	COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES	EXISTING COORDINATION MECHANISM
FDOT		X	- FUNDING - MONITORING OF TRANSIT SERVICES	- MONITORING OF TRANSIT SERVICES - REPORTING	- TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE -ADMINISTRATION		- FORMAL
TREASURE COAST TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL (TCTC)	x	x	- FUNDING - DESIGNATION OF REGIONAL ROADWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES	- PLAN AMENDMENTS - REGIONAL PROJECT PRIORITY LIST DEVELOPMENT	- ADMINISTRATION	X	- FORMAL

With respect to transportation, the county, municipalities, and adjacent counties can impact each other. Land use amendments, rezonings, and development project approvals in one jurisdiction can also affect transportation within the boundaries of other local governments.

Within the unincorporated area as well as within municipalities, land use decisions can produce various types of traffic impacts in other jurisdictions. Such impacts could include: facility impacts (such as traffic generated by a project in one jurisdiction affecting the roadway network of other jurisdictions); and other types of impacts.

For transportation, the major impact from development projects is on county roadways, specifically the major roadways that connect various jurisdictions. Upfront coordination is important to ensure that one jurisdiction does not increase traffic volumes in another jurisdiction to the extent that the volume of traffic produces an unacceptable level of service. Consequently, it is important that those governments affected by proposed projects and land use amendments in another jurisdiction be notified in advance of pending land use decisions. As part of that process, the amount of traffic generated and its distribution/assignment must be identified. It is also important to develop measures to mitigate impacts and establish a process to resolve disputes.

In 2006, a new entity for formalizing regional roadway prioritization, and for resolving any dispute that may arise from prioritization was created. This entity, known as the Treasure Coast Transportation Council (TCTC), is composed of elected officials from the three treasure coast MPOs. It meets bi-annually as a forum for developing regional transportation plans and for prioritizing regional transportation funding.

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

With respect to other state and federal agencies, the most important issue is funding availability for transportation improvements. Therefore, many of these agencies can impact the county. Transportation and transportation funding issues addressed in the Transportation Element of the comprehensive plan.

- Housing Element**

APPLICABLE ENTITIES	MAY BE IMPACTED BY IRC	MAY IMPACT IRC	SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES	ACTIVITIES	PROCEDURAL ISSUES	EXISTING COORDINATION MECHANISM
MUNICIPALITIES	X	X	-PROVISION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING	- PROVIDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS - PROVIDING LOANS TO VERY LOW, LOW, AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS	- PROVISION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN EACH JURISDICTION - CONTRIBUTION TO COUNTY'S HOUSING TRUST FUND	- LIMITED INFORMAL COORDINATION
ADJACENT COUNTIES	X	X	- PROVISION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING - MAINTAINING AFFORDABLE HOUSING STOCK	- PROVIDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS - PROVIDING LOANS TO VERY LOW, LOW, AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS	- INTERCOUNTY AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEMAND AND SUPPLY	FORMAL COORDINATION WITH ST. LUCIE COUNTY AND MARTIN COUNTY REGARDING HOME PROGRAM
HOUSING AUTHORITY	X	X	PROVISION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING	- RENTAL ASSISTANCE - REHABILITATION ASSISTANCE	- COORDINATION REGARDING SUBSIDIZED HOUSING	- INFORMAL
FHFC		X	- FUNDING FROM STATE HOUSING INITIATIVE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM - FUNDING FROM HURRICANE HOUSING RECOVERY PROGRAM	- REPORTING	-ADMINISTRATION	-FORMAL APPROVAL

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

APPLICABLE ENTITIES	MAY BE IMPACTED BY IRC	MAY IMPACT IRC	SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES	ACTIVITIES	PROCEDURAL ISSUES	EXISTING COORDINATION MECHANISM
			- OTHER FUNDING PROGRAMS (LIHTC, HOME, ETC.)			
DCA		X	- FUNDING	- COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) APPLICATION	-ADMINISTRATION	-FORMAL APPROVAL

With respect to the housing, the county, municipalities, and adjacent counties can impact each other. Overall, commercial, industrial, and residential developments create a need for service workers and consequently a need for affordable housing. Consistent with requirements of Sec. 9J-5.010, FAC, each jurisdiction has a responsibility to provide its fair share of affordable housing for very low, low, and moderate income households.

With respect to housing, the county must coordinate with municipalities and adjacent counties to identify affordable housing needs, to determine how these needs will be satisfied, and to develop measures to mitigate impacts when one jurisdiction carries the burden of providing affordable housing for the service workers of other jurisdictions. Finally, there should be a process to resolve disputes if a jurisdiction cannot provide sites for affordable housing. The county coordinated with St. Lucie County and Martin County to create a HOME program consortia to be eligible to receive the HOME program funding.

Coordination with state and federal agencies is important to obtain the funding needed to provide affordable housing within the county.

With increased housing costs, the provision of affordable housing for very low, low, and moderate income households, and workforce housing is an important issue. Housing issues, incentives, and strategies are addressed in the Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

• **Conservation and Coastal Management Elements**

APPLICABLE ENTITIES	MAY BE IMPACTED BY IRC	MAY IMPACT IRC	SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES	ACTIVITIES	PROCEDURAL ISSUES	EXISTING COORDINATION MECHANISM
MUNICIPALITIES	X	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PROTECTION OF ENVIRONMENTALLY SIGNIFICANT LANDS - WATER QUALITY OF I.R. LAGOON & ST. SEBASTIAN RIVER - HURRICANE EVACUATION - BEACH EROSION 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS - PLAN AMENDMENTS - REZONINGS - ENVIRONMENTAL LAND PURCHASES 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NOTIFICATION OF PLAN CHANGES OR PROPOSED PROJECTS - IDENTIFYING EXPECTED IMPACTS - MITIGATING IMPACTS - LIMITING INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS IN HIGH HAZARD AREAS 	INFORMAL
ADJACENT COUNTIES	X	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PROTECTION OF ENVIRONMENTALLY SIGNIFICANT LANDS - PROTECTION OF FLORIDAN AQUIFER RECHARGE AREA - HURRICANE EVACUATION 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS - PLAN AMENDMENTS - REZONINGS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NOTIFICATION OF PLAN CHANGES OR PROPOSED PROJECTS - IDENTIFYING EXPECTED IMPACTS - MITIGATING IMPACTS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -LIMITED -INFORMAL
DEP		X	- FUNDING	-MANATEE PLAN	- FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	FORMAL AGREEMENT
DEP			-BEACH EROSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -SAND PUMPING -ARTIFICIAL REEF 	-PROTECTION OF SHORES	PERMIT

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

APPLICABLE ENTITIES	MAY BE IMPACTED BY IRC	MAY IMPACT IRC	SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES	ACTIVITIES	PROCEDURAL ISSUES	EXISTING COORDINATION MECHANISM
DEP (CARL)		X	-ENVIRONMENTAL LANDS ACQUISITION COST SHARE	-PURCHASE OF ENVIRONMENTALLY SIGNIFICANT LANDS	-COST SHARE -MANAGEMENT	-MULTI-PARTY AGREEMENT
F.I.N.D.	X	X	-FUNDING -"SPOIL" MANAGEMENT	-IRL ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS	-FINANCIAL -REPORTING -MANAGEMENT	-FORMAL AGREEMENT (FUNDING) -INFORMAL (COORDINATION)
DCA/FLORIDA COMMUNITIES TRUST (FCT)		X	-ENVIRONMENTAL LANDS ACQUISITION COST-SHARE	- PURCHASE OF ENVIRONMENTALLY SIGNIFICANT LANDS	- COST-SHARING - REPORTING - MANAGEMENT	FORMAL AGREEMENT
FL. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE AND CONSUMER SERVICE		X	-WILDFIRE PROTECTION/ ECOLOGICAL BURN ASSISTANCE	- REPORTING	- WELFARE AND SAFETY OF THE COUNTY RESIDENCE AND PROTECTION PROPERTIES	PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE
SJRWMD		X	-ENVIRONMENTAL LANDS ACQUISITION/ MANAGEMENT PARTNERSHIP	- PURCHASE OF ENVIRONMENTALLY SIGNIFICANT LANDS	- FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATION	-MULTI-PARTY AGREEMENT
SJRWMD		X	-PROTECTION OF ST. JOHN UPPER RIVER BASIN	- PLAN AMENDMENTS - REZONINGS - DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS	- NOTIFICATION OF DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AND PLAN AMENDMENTS	INFORMAL
U.S. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE/SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE		X	- FUNDING -SOIL SURVEY DIGITIZING MAP	- PROVISION OF INFORMATION	-FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	FORMAL AGREEMENT
MARINE RESOURCE COUNCIL		X	-WATERSHED PROTECTION/ ENHANCEMENT	- MEETINGS	- ADVISORY COORDINATION	INFORMAL

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

APPLICABLE ENTITIES	MAY BE IMPACTED BY IRC	MAY IMPACT IRC	SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES	ACTIVITIES	PROCEDURAL ISSUES	EXISTING COORDINATION MECHANISM
SEBASTIAN INLET DISTRICT		X	-BEACH EROSION	- SAND MINING	- SEBASTIAN INLET DISTRICT'S NEEDED SAND PUMPING TO LESSEN THE EFFECT OF BEACH EROSION CAUSES BY DOWN DRIFT AS A RESULT OF SAND BUILD UP IN AND AROUND THE INLET	INFORMAL

With respect to conservation and coastal management, the county, municipalities, and adjacent counties can impact each other. Sometimes, these impacts are adverse, while other times they may be beneficial. Most often, extra-jurisdictional impacts are probably neutral. Generally, the county and municipalities need to coordinate with each other regarding mitigation, restoration, and management of natural resources as well as acquisition of environmentally important land.

In some cases, land use decisions can produce conservation related extra-jurisdictional impacts. Such impacts may include: natural resource impacts such as land use activity in one jurisdiction affecting environmentally significant lands, water quality, endangered species, and aquifer recharge areas in another jurisdiction and other types of impacts.

Because of these extra-jurisdictional impacts, coordination among jurisdictions is important. Therefore, notification of affected governments, identification of expected impacts, and development of measures to mitigate impacts are important. Finally, there should be a process to resolve disputes.

Coordination with state and federal agencies mainly involves funding or technical support.

Issues related to the conservation and coastal management are addressed in the comprehensive plan conservation element and coastal management element

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

• **Recreation and Open Space Element**

APPLICABLE ENTITIES	MAY BE IMPACTED BY IRC	MAY IMPACT IRC	SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES	ACTIVITIES	PROCEDURAL ISSUES	EXISTING COORDINATION MECHANISM
MUNICIPALITIES	X	X	- FUNDING FOR PARKS - PROVISION OF PARK AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES - PROVISION OF OPEN SPACE	- PROJECT APPROVAL - LAND USE AMENDMENTS - PROVISION OF PARK FACILITIES - PROVISION OF OPEN SPACE - PROVISION OF RECREATIONAL SERVICES	-JOINT AGREEMENT FOR MANAGEMENT - ADMINISTRATION	SOME FORMAL AGREEMENTS SOME INFORMAL COORDINATION
ADJACENT COUNTIES	X	X	- PROVISION OF PARK AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES	- PROJECT APPROVAL - LAND USE AMENDMENTS - PROVISION OF PARK FACILITIES - PROVISION OF OPEN SPACE	-FACILITIES AND SERVICES IN EACH COUNTY BEING USED BY OTHER COUNTY RESIDENTS	LIMITED/ INFORMAL
SEBASTIAN INLET	X	X	- MANAGEMENT OF SEBASTIAN INLET STATE PARK	- PROVISION OF RECREATIONAL SERVICES	-ADMINISTRATION	INFORMAL
DCA/FLORIDA COMMUNITIES TRUST (FCT)	X	X	-FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR ACQUISITION OF ENVIRONMENTALLY SIGNIFICANT LANDS	- PROVISION OF OPEN SPACE -ACQUISITION OF	-MANAGEMENT -ADMINISTRATION	FORMAL AGREEMENT

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

APPLICABLE ENTITIES	MAY BE IMPACTED BY IRC	MAY IMPACT IRC	SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES	ACTIVITIES	PROCEDURAL ISSUES	EXISTING COORDINATION MECHANISM
				ENVIRONMENTALLY SIGNIFICANT LANDS		
SJRWMD	X	X	ENVIRONMENTAL LANDS ACQUISITION/ MANAGEMENT PARTNERSHIP	- PROVISION OF OPEN SPACE - ACQUISITION OF ENVIRONMENTALLY SIGNIFICANT LANDS	-MANAGEMENT -ADMINISTRATION	MULTI-PARTY AGREEMENT
U.S. DEPT. OF INTERIOR/FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE	X	X	- PROTECTION PELICAN ISLAND WILDLIFE REFUGE - PROTECTION OF ENVIRONMENTALLY SIGNIFICANT LANDS - PROTECTION OF ENDANGERED SPECIES	- PROVISION OF OPEN SPACE	- REPORTING - NOTIFICATION OF PLAN CHANGES AND PROPOSED PROJECTS	FORMAL

With respect to recreation and open space, the county, municipalities, adjacent counties, and state agencies can impact each other. Such impacts could include: facility impacts, natural resource and open space impacts, and other types of impacts. The county and municipalities also share many facilities and responsibilities. The most important recreation and open space intergovernmental issue for the county and the municipalities within the county is the provision of recreational facilities and services on a countywide basis.

Because land use decisions can have extra-jurisdictional impacts, coordination among adjacent local governments on land use matters affecting recreational facilities and the provision of open space is important. Specifically, it is important to notify affected governments, identify expected impacts, develop measures to mitigate impacts, and establish a process to resolve disputes.

Coordination with most state agencies involves funding. Recreation and open space issues are addressed in the recreation and open space element of the county’s comprehensive plan.

• **Economic Development Element**

APPLICABLE ENTITIES	MAY BE IMPACTED BY IRC	MAY IMPACT IRC	SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES	ACTIVITIES	PROCEDURAL ISSUES	EXISTING COORDINATION MECHANISM
MUNICIPALITIES	X	X	-PROMOTION OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	- PROJECT APPROVAL - LAND USE AMENDMENTS	- PROVISION OF LOCAL INCENTIVES - PROVISION OF APPROPRIATE LAND USE AND ZONING FOR COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENTS - PROVISION OF SERVICES TO COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL BUSINESSES	- INFORMAL
ADJACENT COUNTIES	X	X	- PROMOTION OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	- PROJECT APPROVAL - LAND USE AMENDMENTS	- PROVISION OF REGIONAL ATTRACTION FOR INDUSTRIAL BUSINESSES	LIMITED/ INFORMAL
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION		X	- FUNDING -ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLANNING/STUDIES	- PREPARATION OF REPORTS AND PLANS	FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY PLAN, FISCAL IMPACT MODEL, INFORMATIONAL BROCHURE, ECONOMIC BASE STUDY AND UPDATE OF COMMERCIAL/ INDUSTRIAL DATA SOURCE	FORMAL
VERO BEACH/ INDIAN RIVER COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	X	X	- FUNDING - PROMOTION OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	- EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION - PREPARATION OF REPORTS	PROVISION OF FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FOR ENHANCEMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE COUNTY	- SOME FORMAL - SOME INFORMAL

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

In terms of economic development, land use decisions in one jurisdiction can affect other jurisdictions. Within Indian River County, the major economic development issues are promotion of economic development within the county, attraction of new businesses, expansion of existing businesses, and provision of adequate land with sufficient infrastructure to support commercial and industrial developments. These issues extend beyond the boundaries of individual local government jurisdictions. Therefore, it is necessary for the county to coordinate its economic development activities with the municipalities in the county as well as adjacent counties to achieve economic development objectives.

With respect to state and federal agencies, the most important economic development issue is funding to support economic development activities. With respect to the Vero Beach/Indian River County Chamber of Commerce, the County and the Chamber must closely coordinate their economic development activities to utilize resources efficiently and to eliminate duplication. All issues, incentives, and strategies related to economic development are addressed in the Economic Development Element of the county's comprehensive plan.

Intergovernmental Coordination Issues Since 1998

Since 1998, Indian River County has had to coordinate with a number of other governmental jurisdictions on a variety of issues. In some cases, this coordination has related to infrastructure provision/ expansion, cooperative activities, or construction projects. In other cases, this coordination has related to development project impacts, public construction policy impacts, and others.

Following is a brief summary of some of the county’s coordination issues/efforts with various governmental jurisdictions:

- **Municipalities**

The county has coordinated with municipalities on a regular basis regarding many issues including:

- Joint Meetings

In recent years, the Board of County Commissioners has had several joint meetings with municipalities to share information and discuss issues.

At the staff level, there have been various meetings between county staff and municipal staff regarding various issues. Some of the coordination issues discussed at these meetings have included impact fee ordinance implementation, school concurrency, level of service standards, roadway improvements, land use issues, and others. The county’s policy should be to continue its coordination activities with the municipalities in the county.

- Annexation

Annexation is one of the most important issues affecting the county and its municipalities. Since the last major plan update, municipalities have annexed more than 24,805 acres of county land. Because the annexation process actually changes governmental control over an area, its effects are significant. In the past, annexations have resulted in the creation of enclaves, which are islands of unincorporated area within municipalities. These areas are inefficient and uneconomical from a service provision standpoint.

Since the last major plan update, three (3) out of seven (7) former enclaves have been eliminated. The table below shows the number and acreage of enclave properties in 1995 and the number and acreage in 2006 as well as the percent annexed since the last major plan update.

	1995	2006	% of Enclaved Properties Annexed
# of enclave Parcels	7	4	43%
Acreage of Enclave Properties	208.39	43.78	79%

With its recent annexations, the City of Fellsmere created a new enclave which is 25.13 acres in size. This illustrates that, while state law is designed to prevent the establishment of new enclaves, inefficient annexations can still occur. Two major problems which can occur with annexations are: (1) developers circumventing county regulations through annexation and (2) county service/facility provision plans undermined by annexation.

For those reasons, coordination is important regarding annexation. Not only do municipalities need to set annexation criteria; they need to specify annexation areas and adopt annexation policies. Currently, the county and municipalities are working on an Interlocal Service Boundary Agreement (ISBA) to address issues such as annexation, density, height and others. If the ISBA is approved by all affected parties, the ISBA will address a number of these annexation issues.

-Joint Application for Land Acquisition Grants

In 1992, county voters approved issuance of a \$26,000,000.00 general obligation bond and, in 2004, a \$50,000,000.00 bond for acquisition of environmentally significant lands for the protection of water quality, open space and wildlife habitat. The county land acquisition committee, which has representatives from the county, municipalities, and special interest groups, identifies and ranks environmentally significant land within the county for purchase with those bond funds.

Since 1992, hundreds of acres of environmentally significant land have been purchased, utilizing bond funds matched with other funding sources. These lands are used for passive recreational activities throughout the county.

As part of this land acquisition process, the county has coordinated with municipalities on several acquisition projects by jointly applying for matching grants from state funding agencies for acquisition of environmentally significant lands within the municipal boundaries. Also, the county has partnered with municipalities to construct public access improvements to some conservation areas. In the future, the county's policy should be to continue coordinating with the municipalities in the county on conservation and land acquisition matters.

-Countywide Recreation System

In the past, the county coordinated with all municipalities within the county to try to establish a countywide recreation system. Due to political and fiscal constraints, a countywide recreation system has not been established. The county, however, has coordinated with separate municipalities to provide recreational facilities and services.

Specifically, the county has coordinated with the City of Fellsmere, City of Sebastian, and the City of Vero Beach to provide recreational facilities and services. In so doing, the county provided funds for the construction of capital improvements at the Barber Street sports complex in Sebastian and Fellsmere's ball park. Recreation related issues and initiatives are addressed in the Recreation and Open Space Element EAR.

-Beach Erosion

Since the mid-1990s, the county has managed a countywide shoreline protection program. One aspect of this program has been coordination with the City of Vero Beach for construction of a Prefabricated Erosion Protection (PEP) reef along a portion of the Vero Beach shoreline. The county has also coordinated with City of Vero Beach, Town of Indian River Shores, and the Town of Orchid on sand pumping projects to reduce beach erosion. In the future, the county's policy should be to continue its coordination with the municipalities on shoreline protection programs and activities.

-Road Improvements

Since 1998, the county has coordinated with municipalities to construct roadway improvements within municipal boundaries. These have included County Road 512 in Sebastian and Willow Street in Fellsmere.

The county also coordinated with the City of Vero Beach, FDOT, and St. Lucie County, regarding a study of S.R. A1A on the south barrier island.

On a regular basis, the county MPO coordinates with municipalities to construct roadway and sidewalk improvements within municipal boundaries. In the past, these have included the CR 512 widening project in Sebastian; the Aviation Boulevard intermodal project in Vero Beach; and the CR 512 sidewalk project in Fellsmere.

Recently, the MPO has also coordinated with Martin and St. Lucie counties to develop a Regional Long Range Transportation Plan, complete with objectives for regional transportation and a coordinated regional project priority list.

Finally, the MPO has coordinated with municipalities to develop a Congestion Management System (CMS) plan and implement CMS projects, including improvements to Miracle Mile; improvements at the Royal Palm/Indian River Boulevard intersection; and traffic signal synchronization countywide. The county's policy should be to continue its coordination with municipalities, adjacent counties, and FDOT on traffic coordination and roadway improvements.

-Transit System

In coordination with FDOT and the Federal Transit Administration, Indian River County is the designated recipient of federal and state public transportation grant funding. Through the county's transit operator, the Council on Aging, the county has coordinated with all municipalities to provide paratransit service and has provided fixed route service in Vero Beach, Sebastian, and Fellsmere.

-Utilities Provision

Currently, the county has agreements with the City of Sebastian and the Town of Orchid to provide utility services to those three jurisdictions. The county also has an agreement with the City of Fellsmere to provide emergency water service and wastewater treatment to the city.

In addition, the county has an agreement with the City of Vero Beach for the city to provide water and sewer services to portions of the unincorporated county, including the south barrier island and some mainland areas around the city.

-Planning Efforts

In the past, the county has coordinated with all municipalities within the county to prepare a Metropolitan Planning Organization Long-Range Transportation Plan, a Local Housing Assistance Program and plan, a Hurricane Housing Recovery program and plan, an Economic Development Plan, and other plans.

-Development Impacts

The county has coordinated with municipalities on assessing possible impacts from large development projects.

- **Sebastian Inlet Tax District**

Shoreline erosion problems south of the Sebastian Inlet are generally attributed to the Inlet's interruption of the natural downdrift movement of sand. In November, 2005, the Board of County Commissioners signed an interlocal agreement with the Sebastian Inlet Tax District to conduct a beach renourishment program in this area. Through that agreement, the county is responsible for implementing renourishment projects, while the district contributes funds and sand. The county's policy should be to continue its coordination with the Sebastian Inlet Tax District on beach nourishment programs and activities.

- **St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD)**

In the past, the county has coordinated with the SJRWMD for development and maintenance of park sites in the St. John's marsh.

In addition, the county and the SJRWMD have coordinated on protecting the St. Johns River Upper Basin as well as permitting stormwater management facilities associated with development projects. Also, the county is participating with the SJRWMD on an update of the district's water supply assessment and water supply plan. Related to that, the county also working with the SJRWMD to assess alternative water supply sources.

With respect to land acquisition, the county and the SJRWMD jointly acquired and jointly manage several parcels of environmental significant land. These include the Oslo riverfront property, the Flinn property, and the Schlitt property.

Recently, the county and the SJRWMD were involved in a dispute regarding the District's plan to dispose of district owned conservation land in the county. This conflict involved SJRWMD's efforts to resolve a lawsuit by a private landowner. As a means of resolving the lawsuit, the SJRWMD proposed to convey land purchased by the district for conservation purposes to the landowner plaintiff. In an effort to prevent the district from conveying conservation land to a private party, the county initiated legal action against the district. Eventually, the issue was resolved by the SJRWMD and the county entering into an agreement for protecting the subject property.

Although the county and the SJRWMD coordinate well in many areas, the proposed SJRWMD conveyance of conservation land to a private party indicates that the county and district occasionally have different objectives. For that reason, the county should adopt a policy to request that the legislature prohibit water management districts from conveying conservation lands to private parties.

- **Indian River Farms Water Control District (IRFWCD)**

The county coordinates with the IRFWCD on following issues:

- Construction of a main relief canal pollution control system
- Use of county roads within IRFWCD canal right-of-way
- Use of IRFWCD canal right-of-way for utilities such as water and sewer lines, communication cables, and others
- Permitting associated with development projects
- Enforcement of stormwater pollution regulations relating to erosion and sediment discharge into IRFWCD's canal system
- Use of canal right-of-way for the Egret Marsh Regional Stormwater Park's influent pumping station and discharge pipe

- **Fellsmere Farms Water Control District (FFWCD)**

In the past, the county has coordinated with the FFWCD on a number of issues, including use of the water control district's canal/road rights-of-way by adjacent property owners, and maintenance of these rights-of-way. These canal/road rights-of-way provide the only access to properties around the City of Fellsmere.

- **Others**

The county coordinates with a number of other jurisdictions and agencies on various intergovernmental issues. These include:

-Indian River County School District

In 1986, a memorandum of understanding was executed between the county and the school board regarding site selection and site plan review for school facilities. In 2003, the county, school board, City of Fellsmere, City of Vero Beach, and City of Sebastian signed a new interlocal agreement for public school planning. On an as needed basis, the county coordinates with the school board to identify lands proximate to residential developments for current and anticipated school sites. Also, the county and school board have jointly established school siting criteria for schools of different types and sizes.

Since schools are permitted in all of the county's residential and commercial land use and zoning districts, there is a substantial amount of land in close proximity to future residential developments which can be used for construction of new schools. Consistent with the adopted school interlocal agreement, the county and school board regularly share information regarding development patterns and the selection of school sites. Compatibility of schools with surrounding uses is addressed through a county/school board/municipality school planning technical advisory committee.

In 2006 and 2007, the county, municipalities, and school board coordinated with each other to update the school planning interlocal agreement, to establish school concurrency, and to prepare a public school facility element which must be incorporated in each jurisdiction's comprehensive plan. The county's policy should be to coordinate with Indian River County School District on school siting, school concurrency, and other school related activities.

-Indian River County Council on Aging

The county has an agreement with the Indian River County Council on Aging, Inc. (Community Transportation Coordinator) for the provision of transportation services to the transportation disadvantaged population as well as provision of mass transit services.

-Brevard County

The county has agreements with Brevard County relating to several issues. In recent years, the Board of County Commissioners met several times with Brevard County commissioners to share information and discuss issues.

-St. Lucie County

The county has agreements with St. Lucie County relating to several issues, including emergency services and the Treasure Coast Private Industry Council. In recent years, the Board of County

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Commissioners met several times with St. Lucie County commissioners to share information and discuss issues.

Major Intergovernmental Coordination Issues:

Currently, the most significant intergovernmental coordination issue affecting the county is annexation of county designated agricultural lands outside of the Urban Service Area (USA) by the City of Fellsmere.

In 1980, the City of Fellsmere consisted of 820 acres. Due to annexations along C.R. 512, the city's size increased to 1,111 acres by 1990. As a result of subsequent annexations, the size of the city is now 27,482 acres. In the future, there is potential for the city to annex thousands of additional acres.

Most of the lands that were annexed to the city had a county land use designation of AG -1 (up to 1 unit/5 acres) or AG-2 up to (1 unit/10 acres). After annexation to the city, these lands are usually designated at densities much higher than county densities for those lands. Consequently, the lands then have more development yield and have the potential to put more demand on the county's facilities and services. With all past, current, and future annexations, the City could potentially have more than 114,000 units and a population more than 231,000.

By annexing county agriculturally designated land, the City allows landowners to circumvent county regulations and undermine the county's service and facility provision plans. To maintain the integrity of the county's USA and county regulations as well as preventing changes of land use density after municipal annexations of land outside the USA, the county and municipalities are currently pursuing development of an Interlocal Service Boundary Agreement (ISBA).

Effect of Statutory and Rule Changes

Since last major plan update, section 163.3180 (13), F.S. has been revised to require intergovernmental coordination agreements between the school board and local governments for the purpose of establishing school concurrency requirements and for developing public school facilities element of the comprehensive plan. In Indian River County, the School Interlocal Agreement was approved by the school board and local governments prior to the March 1, 2008 deadline for adopting school concurrency. This agreement replaced a 2003 agreement between the school board, Indian River County, City of Fellsmere, City of Sebastian, and City of Vero Beach.

The Intergovernmental Coordination Element is consistent with the state comprehensive plan and adopted strategic regional policy plan.

EVALUATION OF OBJECTIVES AND ASSESSMENT OF POLICIES

The following is an evaluation of the achievement of the Intergovernmental Coordination Element's objectives. This evaluation shows that Objectives 1, 4, 5, and 6 were achieved, while objectives, 2 and 3 were partially achieved. The goal, objectives, and policies of the Intergovernmental Coordination Element are attached (attachment #5).

Under each objective, those policies associated with the objective were assessed to identify those that were implemented and those that were not implemented. Also, each policy was assessed to determine if it directly or indirectly contributed to meeting the corresponding objective. Finally, each policy was evaluated to determine if it needs to be maintained, revised, or deleted. Where a policy is proposed for revision or deletion, reasons for the proposed revision or deletion are provided.

- **OBJECTIVE 1 Coordination Among all Local Plans**

By 2005, there will be no inconsistencies or conflicts between the county's comprehensive plan, the plans of municipalities within the county, the plans of adjacent counties, the plans of the school board, and the plans of other units of local government providing services but not having regulatory authority over the use of land.

Measure: Number of inconsistencies between county comprehensive plan and other jurisdiction's plans. There are no known inconsistencies between the county plan and other jurisdictions' plans. As warranted, the county reviews and provides comments on proposed comprehensive plan amendments of the municipalities and adjacent counties. These comments are provided through the DCA and the TCRPC Comprehensive Plan review and comprehensive plan amendment review processes.

Objective 1 was achieved

This is an appropriate objective in that all local plans should be coordinated and be consistent; however, the objective should reflect the fact that consistency must be maintained on an on-going basis.

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

POLICY DESCRIPTION	ACTION/ACCOMPLISHMENT	WAS POLICY IMPLEMENTED?		DID THIS POLICY CONTRIBUTE TO MEETING THE OBJECTIVE?		WAS THE ORIGINAL POLICY APPROPRIATE?		SHOULD THIS POLICY BE MAINTAINED/ DELETED/ REVISED?
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
1.1) Utilize the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) and DCA review and comments for comp plan and plan amendment proposals	- The TCRPC and DCA review and comment processes are being utilized	X		X		X		Maintain
1.2) Continue to utilize the comprehensive plan Technical Advisory Committee and the Quad-County Council of Governments	- The Comp Plan Technical Advisory Committee is a staff level committee that meets as needed to discuss comp plan related matters and other issues - Quad County Council of Governments is not active anymore	Partially		X		X		Revise to delete Quad county council of governments
1.3) Maintain and expand computer network link between the county and municipalities	- Access available via internet and websites, however, it is not a complete computer network connection		X		X	X		Delete
1.4) Establish interlocal agreement with municipalities regarding review of rezoning and land use applications within 500 feet of corporate boundaries	- no formal agreement		X	X		X		Revise date; make it more specific (action oriented)
1.5) Utilize the TCRPC's mediation process	- TCRPC's mediation process utilized as needed	X		X		X		Maintain
1.6) Coordinate plan elements with plans of other governmental entities	- Coordinated	X		X		X		Revise – make it more specific (action oriented)
1.7) Review municipalities' and adjacent counties' proposed comp plan updates and EARS	- Reviewed other governments' plans, plan amendments, and EARS	X		X		X		Maintain
1.8) Clearly define all intergovernmental responsibilities	- There is no formal agreement defining all intergovernmental responsibilities -Interlocal agreements signed for school planning and impact fees	Partially		X		X		Revise date; make it more specific (action oriented)
1.9) Participate with Marine Resource Council and similar	- Participated	X		X		X		Revise date

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

POLICY DESCRIPTION	ACTION/ACCOMPLISHMENT	WAS POLICY IMPLEMENTED?		DID THIS POLICY CONTRIBUTE TO MEETING THE OBJECTIVE?		WAS THE ORIGINAL POLICY APPROPRIATE?		SHOULD THIS POLICY BE MAINTAINED/ DELETED/ REVISED?
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
agencies								
1.10) Pass resolution asking for elimination of the TCRPC	- No resolution		X		X		X	Delete
1.11) Coordinate with FWCD for canal ROW for access roads	- Coordinated	X		X		X		Revise date; make it more specific (action oriented)
1.12) Hold joint meetings of the board and elected officials of other jurisdictions	- BCC met with municipalities, school board, and surrounding counties	X		X		X		Maintain
1.13) Coordinate with municipalities and adjacent counties to identify conflict between plans	- Sent copy of the county plan and FLU map to other jurisdictions and requested copies of their plans	X		X		X		Revise date; make it more specific

All policies under objective 1, except for policies 1.3, 1.4 and 1.10, were partially or completely implemented. Those policies all contributed to meeting the objective. Policies 1.2, 1.4, 1.6, 1.8, 1.9, 1.11, 1.12 and 1.13 should be revised to change the date or to make them more specific.

Policies 1.3 and 1.10 should be deleted. As structured, Policy 1.3 calls for an expanded computer network between the county and municipalities. Such a network is no longer needed since the county and municipalities maintain websites that contain appropriate information. Although Policy 1.10 calls for the county to adopt a resolution asking for the elimination of the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council, no such resolution was adopted. Since it is now generally recognized that the TCRPC plays an important role in regional planning, coordination and DRI review, that policy should be deleted.

New Policy

A new policy should be added under objective 1. That policy should indicate that the county will request that the legislature prohibit the sale of conservation lands by water management districts.

Overall Assessment of Policies Under Objective 1

The policies under objective 1, with the revisions, addition, and deletions as proposed, are sufficient to achieve the objective. No other policies are needed.

▪ **OBJECTIVE 2 Coordination of Level of Service Standards**

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

By 2005, the county will have an adopted formal mechanism for coordination of adopted comprehensive plan level-of-service standards with municipalities, adjacent counties, the region, and the state.

Measure: Existence of an adopted formal coordination mechanism.

The county has coordinated with other jurisdictions, the region, the state, and other agencies to ensure that adopted level of service standards are maintained. While there is no formal adopted general coordination mechanism, there is, however, a formal agreement with the municipalities and the school district regarding impact fees and LOS associated with impact fees.

Objective 2 was partially achieved.

This is an appropriate objective; however, the objective’s target date should be revised.

POLICY DESCRIPTION	ACTION/ACCOMPLISHMENT	WAS POLICY IMPLEMENTED?		DID THIS POLICY CONTRIBUTE TO MEETING THE OBJECTIVE?		WAS THE ORIGINAL POLICY APPROPRIATE?		SHOULD THIS POLICY BE MAINTAINED/ DELETED/ REVISED?
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
2.1) Ensure that comprehensive plan remains consistent with state and regional plan	- County plan remained consistent with state and regional plan	X		X		X		Revise to make it more specific (action oriented)
2.2) Work with municipalities to establish countywide LOS standards for services not affected by local variation	- Coordinated with municipalities regarding LOS related to impact fees. No other countywide LOS		X	X		X		Delete
2.3) Coordinate with municipalities to ensure consistency of LOS	- Coordinated - no result	Partially		X		X		Revise to make it more specific (action oriented)
2.4) Utilize existing review and permitting process to coordinate LOS with state, regional and local entities	- Coordinated	X		X		X		Maintain

All policies under objective 2, except for policy 2.2 and 2.3, were implemented. As structured, all policies completely or partially contributed towards meeting the objective and should be maintained. Policies 2.1, and 2.3 should be revised to make them more specific. Policy 2.2 should be deleted since each jurisdiction has different needs and, therefore, different level of service standards.

New Policies

There are several new policies that should be added to this objective. One new policy should specify that the utilities department, in reviewing concurrency applications for new development projects, should indicate that concurrency is met only when adequate water supplies and potable water facility capacity are

available to accommodate the added demand of the new development. Another new policy should be added to indicate that the county shall not issue a building permit for any project in the county that must be served by the City of Vero Beach utilities department until the city notifies the county that adequate water supplies and potable water facility capacity are available to accommodate the project. A third new policy should be added to indicate that the county utilities department will participate with the SJRWMD in development of updates to SJRWMD’s Water Supply Assessment and District Water Supply Plan and in other water supply development-related initiatives undertaken by SJRWMD that affect the county.

Overall Assessment of Policies Under Objective 2

The policies under objective 2, with the revisions and additions as proposed, are sufficient to achieve the objective. No other policies are needed.

▪ **OBJECTIVE 3 Impact of Development in Other Jurisdictions**

By 2005, the county will have an established formal coordination mechanism with municipalities and adjacent counties to ensure that development in one jurisdiction does not adversely affect the adequacy of public facilities and services in other jurisdictions.

Measure: Existence of an established coordination mechanism.

The county has coordinated with other jurisdictions to assess the impact of development projects; however, there is no formal adopted coordination mechanism as of yet.

Objective 3 was partially achieved.

Objective 3 is an appropriate objective; however, it should be revised to change the target date.

POLICY DESCRIPTION	ACTION/ACCOMPLISHMENT	WAS POLICY IMPLEMENTED?		DID THIS POLICY CONTRIBUTE TO MEETING THE OBJECTIVE?		WAS THE ORIGINAL POLICY APPROPRIATE?		SHOULD THIS POLICY BE MAINTAINED/ DELETED/REVISED?
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
3.1) Maintain concurrency management system	- Maintained	X		X		X		Maintain
3.2) By 1999, Identify all facilities and services which can be affected by the plans and developments in other jurisdictions	- Facilities identified; however, more coordination needed	Partially		X		X		Revise date
3.3) By 2005, establish countywide concurrency management system	- Coordinated with municipalities; no outcome		X	Partially		X		Delete

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

POLICY DESCRIPTION	ACTION/ACCOMPLISHMENT	WAS POLICY IMPLEMENTED?		DID THIS POLICY CONTRIBUTE TO MEETING THE OBJECTIVE?		WAS THE ORIGINAL POLICY APPROPRIATE?		SHOULD THIS POLICY BE MAINTAINED/ DELETED/REVISED?
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
3.4) Maintain engineering utility coordination committee	- maintained	X		X		X		Maintain
3.5) Coordinate with municipalities for timing, location and capacity of public facilities	- No formal agreement; coordination has occurred through existing committees such as MPO for roads	Partially		X		X		Revise date
3.6) Notify TCRPC of projects likely to impact other local governments	TCRPC been notified	X		X		X		Revise date
3.7) Maintain LOS	- LOS Maintained in most facilities; however some traffic links are over capacity	X		X		X		Maintain
3.8) Send letter requesting legislation requiring state agencies to adhere to local plans	- Letter sent	X		X		X		Delete
3.9) Establish a formal coordination mechanism with municipalities and adjacent counties for Joint Planning Areas (JPA's)	- No formal coordination mechanism for JPA's		X		X	X		Revise date; make policy more specific (action oriented)

All policies under objective 3, except for policies 3.3 and 3.9, were implemented. As structured, these policies completely or partially contributed towards meeting the objective, and all except policies 3.3 and 3.8 should be maintained. Policy 3.3 should be deleted since there is no interest by the municipalities in establishing a countywide concurrency management system. Policy 3.8 also should be deleted since state agencies are exempt from county regulations, and the county cannot apply its regulations to any state agency.

Overall Assessment of Policies Under Objective 3

The policies under objective 3, with the revisions as proposed, are sufficient to achieve the objective. No other policies are needed.

▪ **OBJECTIVE 4 Coordination of Annexation Areas**

By 2010, the amount of enclave properties in the county will be reduced by fifty percent (50%).

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Measure: 50% reduction in acreage of enclave properties

Between 1998 and 2008, 3 out of 7 enclaves were annexed by the City of Sebastian and Town of Indian River Shores, decreasing the acreage of enclave properties from 208.39 acres to 43.78, a reduction of 79%. With the City of Fellsmere’s new annexations, however, a new enclave, which is 25.13 acres in size, was created.

Objective 4 was achieved

This is an appropriate objective; however, the objective’s target date should be revised.

POLICY DESCRIPTION	ACTION/ACCOMPLISHMENT	WAS POLICY IMPLEMENTED?		DID THIS POLICY CONTRIBUTE TO MEETING THE OBJECTIVE?		WAS THE ORIGINAL POLICY APPROPRIATE?		SHOULD THIS POLICY BE MAINTAINED/ DELETED/ REVISED?
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
4.1) Coordinate with municipalities for elimination of existing enclave areas	- Coordinated	Partially		X		X		Revise date Make policy more specific (action oriented)
4.2) Coordinate with municipalities to identify potential areas for annexation	- Coordinated	Partially		X		X		Revise date Make policy more specific (action oriented)
4.3) Coordinate with municipalities regarding future annexation not to create enclave areas	- Coordinated but City of Fellsmere created a new enclave	X			X	X		Maintain
4.4) Inventory parcels, owners and existing uses of enclaves	- Inventory is partially done	X			X	X		Revise date
4.5) Notify enclave land owners	- None		X		X	X		Revise date
4.6) Prepare annual enclave report	- None		X		X	X		Revise date

Policies 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 under objective 4 were partially implemented. Since inventory of existing enclave areas was not completed, Policies 4.5, and 4.6 were not implemented. All policies should be revised to change dates. Policies 4.1 and 4.2 should be revised to be more specific and indicate how the county will coordinate.

Overall Assessment of Policies Under Objective 4

The policies under objective 4, with the revisions as proposed, are sufficient to achieve the objective. No other policies are needed.

▪ **OBJECTIVE 5 Coordination with School Board**

By 2000, the county and the school board will have a formal process for sharing information, for coordinating plans and projects, for planning and providing infrastructure improvements, and for siting school facilities.

Measure: Formal intergovernmental coordination agreement

A formal coordination agreement between school board, IRC, and municipalities was signed in 2003; a new agreement was adopted in 2008.

Objective five was achieved

The objective should be modified to indicate that the county, the municipalities within the county and the school district will maintain a formal agreement for sharing information, for coordinating plans and projects, for implementing school concurrency, for planning infrastructure improvements, for siting school facilities, and for co-locating facilities.

POLICY DESCRIPTION	ACTION/ACCOMPLISHMENT	WAS POLICY IMPLEMENTED?		DID THIS POLICY CONTRIBUTE TO MEETING THE OBJECTIVE?		WAS THE ORIGINAL POLICY APPROPRIATE?		SHOULD THIS POLICY BE MAINTAINED/ DELETED/ REVISED?
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
5.1) Allow schools within residential and commercial districts	- LDRs permit schools in residential and commercial areas	X		X		X		Maintain
5.2) Designate sufficient lands within residential districts	- Sufficient lands designated in FLU Map	X		X		X		Maintain
5.3) Jointly assess school siting criteria	- done	X		X		X		Revise date
5.4) Notify school board of all proposed development projects	- Done	X		X		X		Maintain
5.5) Share data with school board	- Done	X		X		X		Maintain
5.6) Obtain school input on proposed	- Done	X		X		X		Maintain

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

POLICY DESCRIPTION	ACTION/ACCOMPLISHMENT	WAS POLICY IMPLEMENTED?		DID THIS POLICY CONTRIBUTE TO MEETING THE OBJECTIVE?		WAS THE ORIGINAL POLICY APPROPRIATE?		SHOULD THIS POLICY BE MAINTAINED/ DELETED/ REVISED?
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
sidewalk and road projects								
5.7) Review potential school sites	-Done	X		X		X		Revise date
5.8) Determine consistency of school sites with the comp plan	- Done	X		X		X		Maintain
5.9) Hold Joint meetings	- Done	X		X		X		Maintain
5.10) Maintain MOA	- Done (revised agreements signed in 2003 and 2007)	X				X		Revise language
5.11) Review site plans for school development projects	- Done	X		X		X		Maintain

All policies under objective 5 were implemented. Policies 5.3 and 5.7 should be revised to change their target dates. Policy 5.10 should be revised to reflect the current 2008 agreement.

Overall Assessment of Policies Under Objective 5

The policies under objective 5, with revisions as proposed, are sufficient to achieve the objective. No other policies are needed.

- **OBJECTIVE 6 Coordination of New Dredge Spoil Disposal Sites**

By 2000, the county will have a coordination mechanism with appropriate agencies for designation of new dredge spoil disposal sites within the county.

Measure: Existence of a coordination mechanism

County has coordinated with appropriate agencies to ensure that sufficient sites are designated for dredge spoil deposit.

Objective 6 was achieved

This objective should be revised to indicate that the county will maintain sufficient designated dredge spoil disposal sites.

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

POLICY DESCRIPTION	ACTION/ACCOMPLISHMENT	WAS POLICY IMPLEMENTED?		DID THIS POLICY CONTRIBUTE TO MEETING THE OBJECTIVE?		WAS THE ORIGINAL POLICY APPROPRIATE?		SHOULD THIS POLICY BE MAINTAINED/ DELETED/REVISED?
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
6.1) Coordinate with the navigation and inlet districts for dredge spoil disposal sites	- Done	X		X		X		Maintain
6.2) Utilize the dispute resolution process of the coastal resources interagency management committee	- Will utilize if needed	X		X		X		Maintain

The policies under objective 6 were implemented, contributed to meeting the objective, and should be maintained.

Overall Assessment of Policies Under Objective 6

The policies under objective 6 are sufficient to achieve the objective. No other policies are needed.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the Intergovernmental Coordination Element, with the revisions as proposed, are sufficient to meet the overall intent of the element.

IDENTIFICATION OF FUTURE ACTIONS

Within one year of submittal of the EAR (in 2009), the intergovernmental coordination element must be revised to reflect the intergovernmental coordination condition changes that have occurred since the time of plan adoption.

Specifically, the intergovernmental coordination element should be revised to incorporate current data, and to make the changes referenced above to the element's objectives and policies.

ANTICIPATED AMENDMENTS

Based upon the above analysis, amendments to the intergovernmental coordination element are needed to update the element's data and analysis section as well as its goals, objectives, and policies section. Following is the list of recommended updates to the Intergovernmental Coordination Element:

- Revise maps 11.2, 11.3, 11.5, and 11.6 to reflect the current municipal boundaries
- Revise Matrix C's date and contents
- Revised Tables 11.3, 11.4, and 11.5

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

- Revise text of the Intergovernmental Coordination Element as needed
- Delete objective 1's target date
- Delete Policies 1.3 and 1.10
- Revise policies 1.2, 1.4, 1.6, 1.8, 1.9, 1.11, and 1.13 to set new target dates
- Revise policies 1.4, 1.6, 1.8, 1.12, and 1.13 to make them more specific
- Add a new policy regarding limiting water management districts ability to surplus or sale conservation lands
- Revise objective 2's target date
- Delete Policy 2.2
- Revise policies 2.1, and 2.3 to make them more specific (action oriented)
- Add three new policies related to water supply assessment and the SJRWMD water supply plan
- Revise objective 3's target date
- Delete Policies 3.3 and 3.8
- Revise target dates for policies 3.2, 3.5, 3.6, and 3.9
- Revise objective 4's target date
- Revise target dates for policies 4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6
- Revise policies 4.1, and 4.2 to make them more specific (action oriented)
- Revise objective 5's target date; make objective more specific
- Revise target dates for policies 5.3 and 5.7
- Revise language of policy 5.10
- Revise objective 6's target date
- Delete Attachment 5, list of all intergovernmental coordination agreements

Attachment 1

Table 11.1

PRIMARY AGENCIES HAVING JURISDICTION OVER
ENTIRE OR PARTS OF INDIAN RIVER COUNTY

LOCAL WATER CONTROL DISTRICTS

1. Indian River Farms Water Control District
2. Sebastian River Water Control District
3. St. Johns River Water Control District
4. Fellsmere Water Control District
5. Vero Lakes Water Control District
6. Delta Farms Water Control District

INDIAN RIVER COUNTY FIRE DISTRICTS

7. Indian River County Emergency Management Services District
8. Indian River Shores Fire District

SCHOOL DISTRICTS OF INDIAN RIVER COUNTY

9. School District of Indian River County

MUNICIPALITIES OF INDIAN RIVER COUNTY

10. City of Fellsmere
11. Town of Indian River Shores
12. Town of Orchid
13. City of Sebastian
14. City of Vero Beach

STATE AND REGIONAL AGENCIES

15. St. Johns River Water Management District
16. Florida Department of Transportation

COUNTY AGENCIES (Independent Special District)

17. Sebastian Inlet
18. Mosquito Control District
19. Hospital Maintenance District
20. Florida Inland Navigation District
21. Indian River Soil and Water Conservation District

Source: Indian River County Planning Division

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Attachment 2 TABLE 11.2 PUBLIC AND QUASI-PUBLIC ENTITIES PROVIDING SERVICES OR AFFECTING IRC

Adjacent Counties

1. St. Lucie County
2. Okeechobee County
3. Osceola County
4. Brevard County

Regional Organizations

5. Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
6. Quad-County Council of Governments
7. Florida Power and Light
8. Southern Bell
9. Marine Resources Council

State Entities

10. Department of Community Affairs
11. Department of Environmental Protection
12. Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services
13. Executive Office of the Governor
14. State Legislators
15. Department of Environmental Health
16. Department of Children and Families
17. Department of Citrus
18. Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission
19. Department of Corrections
20. Department of Commerce
21. Department of State, Division or Library Service
22. Division of Forestry
23. Department of General Services
24. Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicle Division

Federal Entities

25. Environmental Protection Agency
26. U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service
27. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
28. Federal Emergency Management Agency
29. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
30. Federal Aviation Administration
31. U.S. Geological Service
32. U.S. Department of Agriculture (Farmers Home Administration)
33. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

Other

34. Indian River County Housing Authority
35. Florida Marine Patrol

Source: Indian River County Planning Division

Attachment 3
Table 11.3
EXISTING AND PROPOSED COORDINATION LINKS
INDIAN RIVER COUNTY

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ELEMENTS									
COORD. ENTITY	LAND USE	TRANSPOR-TATION	HOUSING	INFRASTR	CONSERV DEV.	COASTAL	REC	ECON	CIE
MUNICIPALITY									
Vero Beach	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Indian River	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Orchid	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sebastian	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Fellsmere	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
ADJACENT COUNTY									
St. Lucie	X	X		X	X	X			
Okeechobee	X	X			X				
Osceola	X	X			X				
Brevard	X	X		X	X	X			
REGIONAL									
TCRPC	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
SJRWMD	X	X		X	X	X	X		X
Quad-Co. County	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Natural Resources Council	X			X	X	X			
LOCAL									
School Board	X	X	X	X		X	X		
Fire District	X	X		X				X	X
Mos. Con. Dist.			X		X	X			X
Housing Authority			X						
STATE									
DOT	X	X		X				X	X
DEP	X			X	X	X	X	X	
DCA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ELEMENTS									
COORD. ENTITY	LAND USE	TRANSPOR-TATION	HOUSING	INFRASTR	CONSERV DEV.	COASTAL	REC	ECON	CIE
DNP	X				X	X		X	
DC&F	X		X	X	X				
Game & Freshwater Fish Commission					X	X			
BEBR	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
FEDERAL									
EPA	X				X	X			
SCS				X	X	X			
USACOE				X	X	X			
HUD			X						
USGS	X	X		X	X	X			
USFWS	X				X	X			

Source: Indian River County Planning Division

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Attachment 4
MATRIX C
 EXISTING INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION
 INDIAN RIVER COUNTY

ENTITY	SUBJECT/ACTIVITY	EXISTING MECHANISM	NATURE OF RELATIONSHIP	OFFICE WITH PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY	EFFECTIVENESS/ CHANGES
STATE AGENCIES:					
Fla. Dept. of Environmental Protection (DEP)	Manatee plan	Formal Agreement	-Financial -Administrative -Technical	BCC	Mutually beneficial
DEP	Sebastian Inlet Recreation District; beach erosion	Formal	Review, Comment, Coordinate	BCC/Sebastian inlet district	Adequate
DEP	Stormwater	Formal Procedure	-Administrative	DEP	Good, coordination between county, DEP & SJRWMD
Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA)	Emergency Management Assistance	Formal Agreement	-Financial -Administrative	BCC	Beneficial
DCA/Florida Communities Trust (FCT)	Environmental lands acquisition cost-share	Formal Agreement	-Financial	BCC	Good
DCA	Comp plan and Comp plan amendments	Required per Florida Statutes	-Administrative	Both	Beneficial
DCA	Small Cities CDBG	Formal Application	-Financial -Administrative	DCA	Beneficial
DCA/Florida Housing Finance Agency (FHFA)	State Housing Initiatives Partnership Program (SHIP)	Formal Approval	-Financial	Both	Beneficial
Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)	Financial assistance for community service	Formal Agreement	-Financial	BCC	Adequate
Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)	Joint participation funds for development of MPO's long-range transportation plan	Formal Agreement	-Financial -Technical Support	DOT and IRC MPO	Very Helpful
FDOT	Right-of-way permit	Formal Agreement	-Administrative	DOT	Beneficial
FDOT	Stormwater	Review DOT plans	County must obtain permit	DOT	Extensive permit application
Fla. Dept of HRS	Annual funding contract for I.R.C. Health Dept.	Formal Agreement	-Financial	HRS	Beneficial
Fla. Dept. of Agriculture & Consumer Service	Wildfire Protection/ ecological burn assistance	Annual Contract (wildfire) Informal (ecological burns)	Professional Assistance	Joint	Beneficial
ADJACENT COUNTIES:					
Brevard & Orange Counties	Mutual Aid Pact	Formal Agreement	-Technical and emergency support	Joint	Adequate
Osceola County	Maintenance of Fellsmere	Formal Agreement	- Maintenance	Joint	Beneficial

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

ENTITY	SUBJECT/ACTIVITY	EXISTING MECHANISM	NATURE OF RELATIONSHIP	OFFICE WITH PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY	EFFECTIVENESS/ CHANGES
Okeechobee County	Transfer of Prisoners	Formal Agreement	- Cooperation	Joint	Beneficial
St. Lucie County	Quad-County Council of Governments	Formal Agreement	-Coordination, conflict resolution	Joint	Beneficial
MUNICIPALITIES:					
All Municipalities	Comprehensive Plan Technical Advisory Committee	Informal	-Advisory -Comp plan related issues	IRC Planning Division	Effective Needs to be formalized
City of Vero Beach	Parks and Recreation Programs	Informal Agreement	-Financial -Administrative	IRC Public Works	Beneficial, productive Need to be more formalized
City of Vero Beach	Utility Provision	Formal Agreement	-Administrative	Joint	Beneficial
City of Vero Beach	Traffic (traffic light, impact fee)	Formal Agreement	-Administrative	Joint	Beneficial
City of Vero Beach	Annexation	Formal Agreement	-Administrative	Joint	Beneficial
City of Vero Beach	Jail Site	Formal Agreement	-Administrative	Joint	Effective
City of Sebastian	Utility Provision	Formal Agreement	-Administrative	IRC Utilities Dept.	Beneficial
City of Sebastian	Collection of Impact Fees	Formal Agreement	-Administrative	Sebastian	Beneficial
Town of Indian River Shores	Collection of Impact Fees	Formal Agreement	-Administrative	Town of IR Shores	Beneficial
City of Fellsmere	Collection of Impact Fees	Informal	-Financial -Administrative	Planning IRC Utilities	Adequate
	Utility provision	Formal Agreement	-Administrative	City of Fellsmere	City of Fellsmere stopped collecting. Great need or coordination
Town of Orchid	Utility provision Collection of impact fees	Formal Agreement	-Administrative	Town of Orchid	Beneficial
All Municipalities	Stormwater - Delineation of watersheds inventory	Informal, meeting with City Engineering Dept.	-Review, Comment, Coordinate	Joint	Need more formal coordination
OTHER ENTITIES:					
SJRWMD	St. Johns Marsh Upper River Basin	County Advises Formal Agreement	-Review, Comment -Financial	Planning/Public Works Joint	Good Beneficial
	Grant fund, for investigation of pollution sources and enforcement of pollution laws affecting IR Lagoon				
	Swim Plan	Formal	-Regular report -Financial	SJRWMD	Beneficial
	Stormwater	Committee meeting	-Administrative (permitting)	SJRWMD	Good
	Environmental lands acquisition/management partnership	Multi-party agreement	-Financial -Administrative -Coordination	Both	Mutually beneficial

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

ENTITY	SUBJECT/ACTIVITY	EXISTING MECHANISM	NATURE OF RELATIONSHIP	OFFICE WITH PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY	EFFECTIVENESS/ CHANGES
U.S. Dept. of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service	Soil Survey Digitizing Map	Formal Agreement	-Financial -Technical	Soil Conservation Service	Beneficial
Marine Resource Council	Stormwater, IRL watershed protection/ enhancement	Workshops/Committee meeting	-Advisory -Coordination	MRC	Good
Drainage Districts	Stormwater	Informal meetings Districts are responsible for the primary system. County is responsible for the secondary system	-Development Review	Drainage District	Good

Attachment 5

GOAL, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

GOAL

It is the goal of Indian River County to have an effective intergovernmental coordination system to ensure consistency among local, regional, state, and federal plans and policies, to identify and resolve conflicts, and to promote cooperation regarding implementation of growth management plans within Indian River County.

OBJECTIVE 1 Coordination Among All Local Plans

By 2005, there will be no inconsistencies or conflicts between the county's comprehensive plan, the plans of municipalities within the county, the plans of adjacent counties, the plans of the school board, and the plans of other units of local government providing services but not having regulatory authority over the use of land.

POLICY 1.1: The county shall utilize the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council's and the Department of Community Affairs' review and comment process for comprehensive plan and plan amendment proposals of other local governments in order to ensure consistency between the County Comprehensive Plan and the local comprehensive plans of municipalities within the county, and the comprehensive plans of Brevard, St. Lucie, Okeechobee, and Osceola counties.

POLICY 1.2: The county shall continue to utilize the Comprehensive Plan Technical Advisory Committee and the Quad-County Council of Governments to provide coordination between Indian River County planning activities and the planning activities of the municipalities within the county, St. Lucie County, and Okeechobee County.

POLICY 1.3: By 1998, the county shall maintain and expand its computer access with the municipalities within the county in order to ensure a quick and efficient response to any land use ordinance changes, concurrency related reviews, and other intergovernmental coordination efforts.

POLICY 1.4: By 1999, the county shall establish interlocal agreements with all municipalities, requiring that applications for changes in land use or zoning for areas located within 500 feet of corporate boundaries be referred to the affected agency (city or county) for staff review and comment before any action is taken.

POLICY 1.5: The county shall use the mediation procedures of the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council and the appropriate regional agencies when interjurisdictional incompatibilities are identified.

POLICY 1.6: The county shall coordinate planning activities mandated by the various elements of its comprehensive plan with plans and activities of other governmental entities.

POLICY 1.7: The county shall review proposed comprehensive plan amendments and evaluation and appraisal reports submitted by adjacent counties and municipalities within Indian River County.

POLICY 1.8: By 2000, the county shall clearly define its intergovernmental responsibilities as they relate to municipalities and adjacent counties by jointly developing procedures and signing interlocal agreements.

POLICY 1.9: To ensure coordinated management of the Indian River Lagoon, the county shall continue active participation with the Indian River Lagoon National Estuary Program (IRLNEP) by:

- Providing information to the IRLNEP on environmental issues related to land development;
- Participating in meetings of the IRLNEP.

The county will continue coordination with the SJRWMD on the SWIM plan and with other agencies that regulate the Indian River Lagoon. The county will continue to coordinate with the SJRWMD on the SWIM plan by:

- Applying for SWIM funds for implementation of programs designed to improve surface water quality;
- Submitting regular reports to the SJRWMD on progress of the programs.

The county will continue to coordinate drainage related issues with the municipalities in the county and the 298 drainage districts by implementing policies of the drainage sub-element.

POLICY 1.10: By 1998, the county shall pass a resolution asking the state to eliminate the regional planning councils.

POLICY 1.11: By 1999, the county shall coordinate with the Fellsmere Farms Water Control District to ensure access to and use of the water control district's canal/road right-of-ways by adjacent property owners and to establish maintenance responsibilities for the access roads.

POLICY 1.12: The county shall promote joint meetings between the Board of County Commissioners and elected officials of other jurisdictions, as needed.

POLICY 1.13: By 1999, the county staff shall coordinate with the staffs of municipalities and adjacent counties and prepare a report identifying inconsistencies and conflicts between the county plan and each local plan.

OBJECTIVE 2 Coordination of Level of Service Standards

By 2005, the county will have an adopted formal mechanism for coordination of adopted

comprehensive plan level-of-service standards with municipalities, adjacent counties, the region, and the state.

POLICY 2.1: The county shall ensure that the Indian River County Comprehensive Plan remains consistent with the State Comprehensive Plan and the Strategic Regional Policy Plan by reviewing revisions to the state and regional plans and subsequently amending the county's plan, as needed.

POLICY 2.2: By 2000, the county shall work with the municipalities in the county to establish county-wide level-of-service standards for services that are not affected by local variations.

POLICY 2.3: By 1999, the county shall coordinate its comprehensive plan level-of-service standards with the level of service standards adopted by the municipalities within county to ensure overall consistency.

POLICY 2.4: The county shall utilize its existing review and permitting process to coordinate level-of-service standards for public facilities and services with any state, regional and local entity having operational and maintenance responsibilities for such facilities and services within the county.

OBJECTIVE 3 Impact of Development in Other Jurisdictions

By 2005, the county will have an established formal coordination mechanism with municipalities and adjacent counties to ensure that development in one jurisdiction does not adversely affect the adequacy of public facilities and services in other jurisdictions.

POLICY 3.1: The county shall maintain its concurrency management system to ensure the availability of public facilities and services needed to support development concurrent with the impact of such development in the unincorporated areas.

POLICY 3.2: By 1999, the county shall identify all facilities and services which can be affected by the plans and developments in other jurisdictions and monitor facility and service capacity through multi-jurisdictional coordination.

POLICY 3.3: By 2005, the county shall coordinate with municipalities to establish a countywide concurrency management system which ensures the availability of necessary facilities and services concurrent with the impact of development on a countywide basis.

POLICY 3.4: The county shall maintain its Engineering Utility Coordination Committee to ensure that the municipalities' land use intensities are not increased beyond the capacity of the county's public facilities.

POLICY 3.5: By 2000, the county, through interlocal agreements with the municipalities, shall coordinate the timing, location, and capacity of public facility improvements to ensure that required services will be available when needed and are economically feasible.

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

POLICY 3.6: The county shall notify the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council of development proposals likely to affect other local governments in the region.

POLICY 3.7: The county shall maintain the level of service set in various elements of the comprehensive plan and notify other local governments of the level-of-service standards.

POLICY 3.8: By 1998, the county shall request in writing that the state enact legislation requiring state agencies to comply with local plans, adhere to local land development regulations, and pay local impact fees.

POLICY 3.9: By 2000, the county shall establish a formal coordination mechanism with adjacent counties and the municipalities in Indian River County to identify joint planning areas (JPA) and to address the following areas:

- Improvement in communication between the county and various local, regional, and state agencies
- Identification of local and regional resources
- Identification of activities having extra-jurisdictional impact
- Identification of locally unwanted land uses
- Identification of expected impacts
- Notification of affected jurisdictions
- Development of measures to mitigate impacts
- Development of a process to resolve disputes

OBJECTIVE 4 **Coordination of Annexation Areas**

By 2010, the amount of enclave properties in the county will be reduced by fifty percent (50%) compared to the 1997 amount.

POLICY 4.1: By 2000, the county shall coordinate with the municipalities within the county to eliminate existing enclave areas and resolve annexation issues.

POLICY 4.2: By 1999, the county shall encourage municipalities to identify potential areas for annexation, set up criteria for annexation decisions, and execute interlocal agreements with the county to formalize these criteria.

POLICY 4.3: The county, through coordination with municipalities within the county, shall ensure that future annexation will not create enclave areas.

POLICY 4.4: By 2000, the county shall identify and inventory parcels, owners, and existing uses of enclaves.

POLICY 4.5: By 2002, the county shall notify enclave landowners of annexation procedures and assist them in requesting annexation in appropriate municipalities.

POLICY 4.6: The county shall prepare an annual report on enclave annexation results.

OBJECTIVE 5 Coordination with School Board

By 2000, the county and the school board will have a formal process for sharing information, for coordinating plans and projects, for planning and providing infrastructure improvements, and for siting school facilities.

POLICY 5.1: The county's Land Development Regulations shall allow schools within all residential, commercial (excluding the heavy commercial district), planned development, and agricultural zoning districts. School sites within the agricultural zoning districts will be limited to mixed use projects and traditional neighborhood design projects or to school sites outside but contiguous to the Urban Service Area boundary.

POLICY 5.2: Within its residential districts, the county shall designate sufficient lands to accommodate the projected needs for schools.

POLICY 5.3: By 1999, the county and school board shall jointly assess their school siting criteria and ensure that these criteria adequately address schools of different types and sizes.

POLICY 5.4: The county shall notify the school board of all proposed development projects.

POLICY 5.5: The county and school board shall share data on a regular basis.

POLICY 5.6: The county shall obtain school board input on proposed sidewalk and road construction projects.

POLICY 5.7: By 1999, the county and school board shall jointly establish a process for preliminary review of school sites before the school board acquires or leases property for a new school.

POLICY 5.8: The county and school board jointly will determine the consistency of proposed school sites and proposed school development projects with the comprehensive plan, as early in the design phase as possible.

POLICY 5.9: The county and school board will hold joint meetings as needed.

POLICY 5.10: The county and school board shall maintain their memorandum of understanding regarding site selection and site plan reviews for school facilities.

POLICY 5.11: The county shall review site plans for school development projects consistent with the development standards identified in Ch. 163, F.S. and Ch. 235 F.S. Site plan review for school projects shall be limited to:

- compatibility with the surrounding properties
- environmental concerns
- health, safety and welfare concerns

OBJECTIVE 6 Coordination of New Dredge Spoil Disposal Sites

By 2000, the county will have a coordination mechanism with appropriate agencies for designation of new dredge spoil disposal sites within the county.

POLICY 6.1: The county shall coordinate with the navigation and inlet districts and other appropriate state and federal agencies and the public in identifying dredge spoil disposal sites.

POLICY 6.2: The county shall utilize the dispute resolution process of the coastal resource interagency management committee to resolve conflicts between the county and public agencies seeking a dredge spoil disposal site.

Appendix A
 Comprehensive Plan Evaluation and Appraisal Report
 Conditions at the Time of Last Major Plan Update (1998) and Existing Conditions (2006)
 Element: Intergovernmental Coordination (**Data**)

DATA ELEMENT	CONDITIONS IN 1998 EAR			EXISTING CONDITION (2006)		TABLE #
1.Inventory of entities For intergovernmental Coordination	Attachment #1 and #2		Table 11.1 and Table 11.2 of ICE	Same as 1998 with minor changes		Table 11.1 and Table 11.2 of ICE
2.Description of existing coordination mechanism:	Yes					
•The county coordinates with all jurisdictions identified in Table 11.1 and 11.2	Yes	1998	Pages 2-8	Yes	2006	
•The county coordinates with adjacent jurisdictions for all projects which will impact other jurisdictions	Yes	1998		Yes	2006	
•Rezoning requests are coordinated with adjacent jurisdictions	Yes	1998		Yes	2006	
•Comprehensive plan amendments are coordinated with RPC, DCA, other state agencies, and adjacent jurisdictions	Yes	1998		Yes	2006	
•The county coordinates with other jurisdictions and agencies for protection of state, regional, and local resources	Yes	1998		Yes	2006	
•The county coordinates all transportation related issues with other jurisdictions through the IRC MPO	Yes	1998		Yes	2006	IRC MPO was officially approved by the Governor in April 1993
•Number of enclave properties	7	1995		4	2006	
•Acreage of enclave properties	208.39	1995		43.78	2006	

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

<p>•Coordination based on various elements of the comprehensive plan</p>	<p>the comp plan</p> <p>The county coordinates with other jurisdictions, regional and state agencies as needed per requirements of each comprehensive plan element.</p>	<p>Same as 1990</p> <p>Same as 1990</p>	<p>page 27-41 of ICE</p>
<p>2.Problems identified in the plan which would benefit from improved coordination</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Number of agencies with which the county must coordinate •Lack of communication between various offices of state agencies •Duplication of efforts •In some cases lack of clear written guidelines •In some cases, lack of formal procedures or agreements and lack of a clear understanding of all responsibilities •In some cases, a delay in informing local government of recent changes in regulations and criteria 	<p>Same as 1998</p>	<p>pages 42-46 of ICE</p>
<p>3.Need for additional coordination on planning related issues based on the comparison of growth proposed in the plan with the regional policy plan</p>	<p>- the county comprehensive plan and all plan amendments are reviewed by the TCRPC for consistency with the regional plan</p>	<p>Same as 1998</p>	
<p>4.Coordination with any designated area of critical state concern</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No area of critical state concern - Barrier island is included in the Hutchinson Island Resource Management area 	<p>Same as 1998</p>	

**APPENDIX C
EAR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN EVALUATION MATRIX
EVALUATING THE ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES OF
INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION ELEMENT**

ELEMENT	OBJECTIVE	MEASURABLE TARGET	BASELINE CONDITIONS AT DATE OF PLAN ADOPTION (1998)	CURRENT CONDITION (2006)	OBJECTIVE ACHIEVED?			COMMENTS/RECOMMENDED ACTION
					YES	NO	OTHER(S) (SPECIFY)	
Intergovernmental Coordination	1) By 2005, there will be no inconsistencies or conflicts between the county's comprehensive plan, the plans of municipalities within the county, the plans of adjacent counties, the plans of the school board, and the plans of other units of local government providing services but not having regulatory authority over the use of land.	Coordination with other local governments to ensure compatibility of plans	1998 existing coordination mechanism	- There is no know inconsistency between the county plan and other jurisdiction's plan - Try to coordinate with other jurisdictions and agencies	X			Sent copy of IRC plan to other jurisdictions and requested a copy of their plan which was never received. Change the objectives target date
	2) By 2005, the county will have an adopted formal mechanism for coordination of adopted comprehensive plan level-of-service standards with municipalities, adjacent counties, the region, and the state.	Adopted some formal coordination mechanism with other jurisdictions and planning agencies	-Agreement with Vero Beach for issuing building permits -Countywide impact fee ordinance and agreement -Countywide public school planning (not including IRS and Orchid)	- Formal agreement with the City of Vero Beach for issuing building permits and concurrency management certificates - countywide impact fee -Countywide school planning agreement -No agreement on: o LOS Standards o Concurrency			Partially Achieved	Change the objective's target date.
	3) By 2005, the county will have an established format coordination mechanism with municipalities, and	Tried to establish coordination mechanisms with the municipalities and adjacent counties regarding impact of development	No adopted formal coordination mechanism	No adopted formal coordination mechanism			Partially Achieved	Revise objective's target date

EAR Intergovernmental Coordination Element

	adjacent counties to ensure that development in one jurisdiction does not adversely affect the adequacy of public facilities and services in other jurisdictions.	in one jurisdiction on public facilities and services of other jurisdictions						
	4) By 2010, the amount of enclave properties in the county will be reduced by fifty percent (50%) compared to the 1997 amount.	Decreased in enclave area	An enclaved area annexed to City of Sebastian; another to Town of IRS	There is still some enclaved area			Partially Achieved	Revise objective's target date
	5) By 2000, the county and the school board will have a formal process for sharing information, for coordinating plans and projects, for planning and providing infrastructure improvements, and for siting school facilities.	Formal Coordination Agreement	Formal Coordination agreement signed in 2003	Formal agreement enclosed	X			Revise to indicate the adopted agreement
	6) By 2000, the county will have a coordination mechanism with appropriate agencies for designation of new dredge spoil disposal sites within the county.	Coordination mechanism RE: New dredge spoil sites	Coordination	Coordination will continue			Partially achieved	Revised the objectives target date

F:\Community Development\Users\LONG RANGE\EAR\EAR 2006\Intergovernmental Coordination Element\EARintgov2006.doc

