
LAND USE IMPACTS
AND
SOLUTIONS TO SEA LEVEL RISE
IN
EAST CENTRAL FLORIDA

East Central Florida Regional Planning Council
November 2004



LAND USE IMPACTS AND SOLUTIONS TO SEA LEVEL RISE IN EAST CENTRAL FLORIDA

CONTENTS

List of Figures	iii
List of Tables	iv
Executive Summary	1
Introduction	4
The Changes and Causes of Sea Level Rise	8
Global Contributors	8
Sea Level Rise in East Central Florida	11
Global vs. Relative Sea Level Rise.....	13
Effects Related to Sea Level Rise	15
General.....	15
Local Issues.....	16
Sea Level Rise Policies	19
Federal.....	19
State.....	21
Local	24
Private	26
Sea Level Rise Protection Scenario Maps Methods	29
Study Area	29
Data Collection and Compilation.....	31
<u>Topographic</u>	31
<u>Existing Land Use</u>	31
<u>Future Land Use</u>	31
<u>Critical Facilities</u>	33
Protection Scenario Classifications.....	34
<u>General Classifications</u>	34
<u>Site Specific Classifications</u>	37
<u>Local Stakeholder Review</u>	41
Recommended Scale.....	45
Analysis	46
Sea Level Rise Planning Solutions	48
Regulating Land Use.....	49
<u>Comprehensive Planning</u>	49
<u>Zoning Regulations</u>	50
<u>Planned Unit Development</u>	51
<u>Development of Regional Impact</u>	51
<u>Public and Critical Facilities Location</u>	51
Public Acquisition and Preservation.....	52
<u>Open Space Controls</u>	52
<u>Rolling Easements</u>	53
<u>Public Acquisition and Preservation Programs</u>	53
<u>Areas of Critical State Concern</u>	54
<u>Transfer of Development Rights</u>	54

Engineered Solutions	55
<u>Beach Renourishment</u>	55
<u>Seawalls</u>	55
Public Awareness.....	56
Conclusion	57
References	59
Appendix	62

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Florida shoreline 1.8 million to 10,000 years ago8
Figure 2: Global mean temperature change9
Figure 3: Global mean sea level variations10
Figure 4: Greenhouse Contribution to Sea Level 1990-210011
Figure 5: Monthly sea level variations at Miami Beach13
Figure 6: Monthly sea level variations at Mayport13
Figure 7: Seawalls along the Volusia County coastline.....17
Figure 8: Areas of Brevard County with beach renourishment18

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Estimated sea level rise for East Central Florida.....12

Table 2: Sea level rise scenarios for Daytona Beach, Florida14

Table 3: Relative sea level rise for Daytona Beach, Florida.....14

Table 4: Categories of future land use used in project.....32

Table 5: Statewide sea level rise classifications36

Table 6: Categories on final map and corresponding colors.....45

Table 7: Breakdown of acreage in region subject to sea level rise46

Table 8: Acres of assigned sea level rise protection scenarios in region.....47

Table 9: Percentage of dry land by likelihood of shore protection.....47

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The large number of hurricanes during 2004 reminded us that the coast of Florida is very vulnerable to changes in climate and sea level. During a period of relative calm, development has concentrated along our coasts with many residents not always aware of the possibility that the climate might return to a period of frequent and intense hurricanes.

It is important to understand our shorelines constantly change due to erosion, sedimentation, and sea level rise. During the last century, sea level has risen approximately 6-9 inches worldwide and 9 inches along the coast of East Central Florida. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has been analyzing the causes, effects, and possible responses to sea level rise. EPA's 1995 report, *The Probability of Sea Level Rise* estimates that if humanity continues to emit greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, mean sea level could rise 1-2 feet in the next century and 5 feet over the next 150-300 years.

Rising sea level has the potential to substantially change the U.S. coastal zone. Studies by EPA and others have concluded that such a rise will force coastal communities to make a fundamental decision: preserve the coastal environment by fostering a gradual evacuation along some parts of the nation's coastal zone, preserve coastal development by implementing shore protection measures that eliminate wetlands and shallow water ecosystems, or preserve both coastal development and coastal ecosystems through innovative but expensive land-use planning and new technologies.

The EPA is conducting a nationwide study to provide local governments with a better understanding of the effects of sea level rise on their community and strategies they can use to respond to the anticipated changes along their coastline. The East Central Florida Regional Planning Council (ECFRPC) was contracted by the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council (SWFRPC) through a grant from the USEPA to participate in this study, which includes all coastal states along the eastern seaboard. ECFRPC hopes to increase the level of awareness about sea level rise and implications for Brevard and Volusia counties. Long term planning strategies are offered as a means of preparing for the predicted sea level rise.

This report includes maps created for the coastal zones of Brevard and Volusia counties that distinguish the shores that are likely to be protected from erosion, inundation, and flooding, from those shores where natural shoreline retreat likely will

take place. The maps divide coastal lowlands into four categories: areas where shore protection is almost certain (brown), likely (red), or unlikely (blue), and areas where current environmental policies would preclude shore protection and enable wetlands to migrate inland (light green). The maps also show wetlands (dark green). The study focused on the lowest 240 square miles, using a common mapping benchmark for defining low coastal land: the 10-foot contour. More than 141,000 acres of uplands and almost 96,000 acres of wetlands, almost 15% of the Brevard and Volusia combined area, are in this area and hence would be directly affected by a continued rise in sea level.

The maps show that for all practical purposes, past and planned development have already made it inevitable that property will be protected and the inland migration of wetlands will be blocked and eventually eliminated along 30% of Brevard and 60% of Volusia County shores. Existing conservation lands, however, ensure that wetlands will be able to adjust to rising sea level along the shores of about 45% and 15% of the two counties, respectively. Perhaps most importantly, we still have a realistic opportunity to choose between wetland migration and the type of coastal development that causes a gradual loss of wetlands, for approximately 25% of the land in each county.

The Brevard and Volusia coastline is an important ecological and economical resource for the region and state. Land use is a state and local responsibility and decisions should be made concerning the protection of developed and undeveloped land before it becomes too expensive or impossible to protect the shoreline and property. The counties and cities are presented, through this study, with options for decision making on land use and the protection of common infrastructure, property, resources, and the economic base of the community from sea level rise.

The decision whether to preserve wetlands or armor the coast in the face of rising sea level must be made within the context of the comprehensive plans of Brevard and Volusia counties, both of which recognize the potential adverse impacts of sea level rise on their communities. The Brevard County comprehensive plan addresses sea level rise in Policy 4.9 stating, “Brevard County shall continue to collect and make available to the public information related to sea level changes.” The Volusia County comprehensive plan states in section 11.4.1.21, “Volusia County should continue to monitor sea level rise science to determine when and if a sea level rise event will affect the County. Based on pertinent data, the county will act accordingly.”

This report leaves little doubt that a continuation of rising sea level will affect Brevard and Volusia counties. The key question is: When? The answer depends on our priorities as well as on scientific uncertainties regarding how much the sea level will rise in the next century and beyond. In some cases, it is reasonable to wait and respond as the sea rises. However, infrastructure changes may require a lead time of a few decades, and land use decisions last centuries. If we want to preserve more than half of our coastal environment as sea level rises, we must develop policies to ensure such a preservation before the rest of our coastal zone is developed. Doing so need not impair property values; but a failure to act soon would preclude opportunities to preserve the coastal environment in a cost-effective manner.

Even if we are satisfied with preserving approximately one-third of our coastal wetland ecosystems, we are most likely to protect property values, and the commercial, industrial, tourism and residential economies if we start factoring the implications of rising sea level into the planning process now, rather than later. Low-lying developed areas will either have to be elevated or protected by dikes. By deciding now which form of protection is most appropriate, we can ensure that development and re-development are consistent with the long-term evolution of our communities, and thereby minimize the cost and community disruptions that might otherwise result from a rising sea.

INTRODUCTION

From the beginning of time through today, the Earth has constantly changed through both slow and abrupt changes in atmosphere, geosphere, temperature, and biota. Shorelines are some of the most unique places on Earth due to being the only place on Earth where the geosphere, atmosphere, and hydrosphere meet¹. Shorelines constantly change dependent upon sediment deposition and erosion over time from fluctuations sea level.

Early changes in sea level are believed to be a result of changes in ocean volume and the “glacio-hydro-isostatic effect,” or changes in ice and water loads². The mean surface temperature of the Earth has increased since the Industrial Revolution coinciding with an increase in the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. Whether these recent changes are due to anthropogenic factors to the natural cycle of the Earth has been discussed and debated for years³. One of the debated impacts of this increase in greenhouse gases is the acceleration of sea level rise¹. If greenhouse gases continue to be released into the atmosphere at the current rate, the EPA estimates that the mean sea level rise in the next 200 years will reach approximately five feet³.

The East Central Florida Regional Planning (ECFRPC) has been contracted by the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council (SWFRPC) through a grant from the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) to participate in a nationwide project promoting planning for and awareness of sea level rise. The other Regional Planning Council’s along the Atlantic Coast (Northeast Florida, Treasure Coast, and South Florida) are also participating in this study; and the cooperative agreement between EPA and SWFRPC contemplates extending the study to include the entire coast of Florida. The Florida studies are part of a national effort by the US Environmental Protection Agency to encourage the long-term thinking required to deal with the impacts of sea level rise issues.

Each of the Regional Planning Council studies are developing maps that distinguish the areas likely to be protected¹ as the sea rises, from the areas where shores will probably retreat naturally, either because the cost of holding back the sea is greater

¹ For purposes of this study “protect” generally means some form of human intervention that prevents dry land from being inundated or eroded. The most common measures include rock revetments, bulkheads, dikes, beach nourishment and elevating land with fill.

than the value of the land, or because there is a current policy of allowing the shore to retreat. These maps are intended for two very different audiences:

- *State and local planners and others concerned about long-term consequences.*
Whether one is trying to ensure that a small town survives, that coastal wetlands are able to migrate inland, or some mix of both, the most cost-effective means of preparing for sea level rise often requires implementation several decades before developed areas are threatened.² EPA seeks to accelerate the process by which coastal governments and private organizations plan for sea level rise. The first step in preparing for sea level rise is to decide which areas will be elevated or protected with dikes or seawalls, and which areas will be abandoned to the sea.
- *Policy makers and citizens concerned about long-term climate change.*
Governments at all levels and many citizens are considering measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The urgency of doing so depends in part on the consequences of climate change and sea level rise. Those consequences in turn depend to a large degree on the extent to which local coastal area governments will permit or undertake sea level rise protection efforts.³ In addition, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, signed by President Bush in 1992, commits the United States to taking appropriate measures to adapt to the consequences of global warming.

This study analyzes present and future land use and various coastal policies. The maps that accompany this study illustrate the areas that planners within this region expect will be protected from erosion and inundation in the coming decades. Those expectations incorporate state policies and regulations, local concerns, land-use data, and general planning judgment. Within the study area, our maps use the following colors:

- Brown—areas that almost certainly will be protected if and when the sea rises enough to threaten them.

² Titus, J.G., "Rising Seas, Coastal Erosion and the Takings Clause: How to Save Wetlands and Beaches Without Hurting Property Owners," *Maryland Law Review*, 57:1279-1399, 1998.

³ Titus, J.G., et al., "Greenhouse Effect and Sea level rise: The Cost of Holding Back the Sea," *Coastal Management*, 19:171-204, 1991. and Yohe, G., "The Cost of Not Holding Back the Sea. Toward a National Sample of Economic Vulnerability," *Coastal Management* 18:403-431. 1990.

- Red—areas that probably will be protected, but where it is still reasonably possible that shores might retreat naturally if development patterns change or scientists were to demonstrate an ecological imperative to allow wetlands and beaches to migrate inland.
- Blue—areas that probably will not be protected, generally because property values are unlikely to justify protection of private lands or the land is not planned for development and is situated to allow for wetland migration or a buffer, but in some cases because managers of publicly owned lands are likely to choose not to hold back the sea.
- Light Green—areas where existing policies would preclude holding back the sea. These areas include both publicly and privately owned lands held for conservation purposes.

We generally show wetlands as dark green.

The East Central Florida Regional Planning Council's study area included Brevard and Volusia County coastal areas. Maps have been developed to illustrate critical areas in the counties that may be affected by a five foot rise in sea level rise as well as where the ocean would be held back or where development may retreat. Geographic Information Systems (GIS) was used to develop the maps and land use impact analysis of the coastal areas below the ten foot NGVD contour. The ten-foot contour was estimated as the maximum elevation that may periodically be flooded by a five foot rise in sea level⁴.

The study area, the coastal areas of Brevard and Volusia counties, is divided into uplands (141410 acres/221 square miles) and wetlands (95812 acres/150 square miles) below ten feet in elevation. The study area is approximately 237, 222 total acres which comprise 14.5 percent of the combined area of both counties. According to the 2000 census, the current population in the coastal census tracts within the study area is approximately 503, 000 in 260,000 dwelling units. Certain census tracts are completely within the study area while others are partial. Therefore, these estimates are high end approximations based on the census tract information. Volusia is expected to have a population of 350,000 in 183,000 dwelling units by 2020 while Brevard's 2020 population is expected to be 199, 000 in 104,000 dwelling units^{5,6}. Therefore, the study

area is expected to have a population of roughly 550, 000 residents in 287,000 dwelling units by 2020.

Tourism is Florida's number one industry, bringing in approximately \$46.7 billion in 1999⁷. Major tourist destinations such as Daytona Beach, Cocoa Beach, and Melbourne Beach are included in the study area. Therefore, the effects of sea level rise will affect not only the residents, but may have a major effect on tourist destinations as well, which may result in dramatic effects on the economic well being of the counties⁸.

Sea level rise can have various effects on the coastline. Inundation and higher flood elevations can occur. Shoreline erosion is another effect related to sea level rise. Also, due to higher water tables caused by sea level rise, salt water intrusion and contamination of the aquifer may occur resulting in the contamination of wells; thus impacting the local economy^{8,9}.

This project is the first detailed study to examine the potential effects of sea level rise on East Central Florida. Currently, land use regulations address flood mitigation and not sea level rise. The comprehensive plans in Brevard and Volusia counties minimally address the issue of sea level rise. Section 11.4.1.21 of the Volusia County comprehensive plan states, "Volusia County should continue to monitor sea level rise science to determine when and if a sea level rise event will affect the County. Based on pertinent data, the county will act accordingly." The Brevard County comprehensive plan addresses sea level rise in Policy 4.9 stating, "Brevard County shall continue to collect and make available to the public information related to sea level changes."

As will be discussed in further detail in this report, many regulations designed for flood mitigation also may be used as sea level rise planning. However, development continues and more infrastructure is incorporated into coastal areas without adequate planning for the effects or costs of sea level rise caused flooding, erosion, and storm damage¹⁰. According to the USGS, the study area is considered a high vulnerability area since it is comprised of Barrier Island with a low coastal slope. Therefore, this lack of planning for future sea level rise can be costly to the community. The East Central Florida Regional Planning Council hopes that this report will bring more local awareness to the issue of sea level rise and aid local governments of Brevard and Volusia counties in long-term planning for sea level rise so that both property and the environment can be preserved.

THE CHANGES AND CAUSES OF SEA LEVEL RISE

Evidence from the past 10,000 to 20,000 years indicates sea level variations occurred on the order of every few thousand years. Figure 1 shows the historical Florida shoreline between 1.8 million and 10,000 years ago. Data also indicate that for the past 6,000 years, sea volume increased causing a sea level rise of 2.5-3.5 meters. The early changes in sea level rise are believed to be a result of changes in the ocean volume and the “glacio-hydro-isostatic effect” or changes in ice and water loads².




Figure 1: Florida Shoreline 1.8 million to 10,000 years ago ¹¹.

Global Contributors

When comparing data over the past 100 years to that of the past two millennia, the rate of sea level rise has increased as a result of glacial mass changes and thermo-

expansion². In addition, tectonic movements and neotectonics (postglacial rebounds) are also possible contributors to changes in the global ocean volume⁸. These causes of sea level rise may be a result of or accentuated by the debated global climatic change possibly accelerated by human impacts.

Data have shown the mean surface air temperature of the Earth has increased by 0.5° C over the past 100 years, coinciding with the increase in concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere³. Although the climate of the Earth has always fluctuated, the increased concentration of certain gases in the atmosphere may be accelerating the warming processes¹². Figure 2 illustrates the atmospheric temperature increase from 1861 to 1988, relative to 1950 - 1979. The boxes in the graph represent temperature anomalies in the 5 year period while the line represents the 5 year mean.




Figure 2: Global Mean Temperature Change: Combined land, air, and sea surface temperatures, from 1861-1981, relative to 1950-1979 (Daniels, 1992).

If conditions continue as the current trend indicates, air temperature may increase by 1.5 – 4.5° C over the next 100 years¹³. The EPA estimates that by 2050, air temperature will rise 1°C and 2°C by 2100. There is only a 10 percent chance that the temperature will increase higher than 4°C over the next 100 years. However, there is a 90 percent probability that temperature will rise 0.6°C over the temperature rise of the previous century³. Also, according to Peter Clark (2003) of Oregon State University,

global warming may also cause the disruption of North Atlantic currents, resulting in the cooling of Europe. The atmospheric warming, in turn, would then eventually melt the Antarctic ice sheet and cause the currents to move again, resulting in sea level rise, inundating coastal regions.

Another contributor to sea level rise could be in the form of thermal expansion and glacial changes². Thermal expansion, the expansion of water due to heating, depends upon the amount of heat penetrating into the deeper and intermediate waters. As Figure 3 depicts, mean sea level fluctuates closely with the sea surface temperature as thermal expansion would indicate. However, there is a delay in thermal expansion when compared to the increase in air temperature. This results in a larger thermal expansion than increase in air temperature at a certain time. The Environmental Protection Agency estimates that by 2100, thermal expansion of the ocean will reach approximately 20 cm.

(3)




Figure 3: Global mean sea level variations (light line) computed from the TOPEX/POSEIDON satellite altimeter data compared with the global averaged sea surface temperature variations (dark line) for 1993 to 1998 (Cazenave et al., 1998, updated). The seasonal components have been removed from both time-series².

Figure 4 illustrates the probability distributions of the melting of various glaciers from greenhouse effects on sea level rise. The Daniels et al., graph shows that when comparing the above, Greenland may have the greatest probability of contributing to sea level rise while Antarctica has the least. Changing of glacial volume can affect sea level in two ways. Some water from the glaciers enters the sea thus increasing the volume of the ocean. Also, by changing the volume of the glaciers, there is less displacement of the water, thus sea level rises although the ocean volume may not¹⁴.




Figure 4: Cumulative probability distributions showing the contribution of thermal expansion, small glaciers, Greenland, and Antarctica to sea level from 1900 – 2100¹³.

Sea Level Rise in East Central Florida


Table 1, provided by the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council, is the probability of sea level rise in east central Florida based on Tables 9-1 and 9-2 from the EPA publication “The Probability of Sea Level Rise.” Table 1 predicts the probability of various sea level rise scenarios over the next 200 years along the coastline of east central Florida. For example, there is a 90 percent probability there will be over a 1 foot rise in sea level by 2150 along the Florida coast. However, there is a 50 percent probability that this rise could be seen by the year 2075. The table also suggests a 30 percent chance that sea level will rise two feet in the next century and five feet in the next 200 years.

Table 1: Estimated sea level rise for East Central Florida derived from the EPA Report, “The Probability of Sea Level Rise.”¹⁵

ESTIMATED SEA LEVEL RISE FOR EAST CENTRAL FLORIDA*												
Sea Level Projection by Year												
Probability (%)	2025		2050		2075		2100		2150		2200	
	cm	inches	cm	inches	cm	inches	cm	inches	cm	inches	cm	inches
90	6.7	2.6	12.2	4.8	18.7	7.4	25.2	9.9	38.2	15.0	51.2	20.2
80	8.7	3.4	16.2	6.4	24.7	9.7	34.2	13.5	51.2	20.2	69.2	27.2
70	10.7	4.2	19.2	7.6	28.7	11.3	40.2	15.8	61.2	24.1	83.2	32.8
60	11.7	4.6	21.2	8.3	32.7	12.9	44.2	17.4	70.2	27.6	97.2	38.3
50	12.7	5.0	23.2	9.1	35.7	14.1	49.2	19.4	78.2	30.8	110.2	43.4
40	13.7	5.4	26.2	10.3	39.7	15.6	54.2	21.3	88.2	34.7	124.2	48.9
30	15.7	6.2	28.2	11.1	42.7	16.8	60.2	23.7	100.2	39.4	144.2	56.8
20	16.7	6.6	31.2	12.3	47.7	18.8	68.2	26.9	115.2	45.4	171.2	67.4
10	19.7	7.8	36.2	14.3	55.7	21.9	79.2	31.2	141.2	55.6	220.2	86.7
5	21.7	8.5	40.2	15.8	61.7	24.3	90.2	35.5	169.2	66.6	277.2	109.1
2.5	24.7	9.7	44.2	17.4	68.7	27.0	102.2	40.2	202.2	79.6	342.2	134.7
1	26.7	10.5	48.2	19.0	75.7	29.8	116.2	45.7	245.2	96.5	448.2	176.5
Mean	12.7	5.0	24.2	9.5	36.7	14.4	51.2	20.2	86.2	33.9	127.2	50.1

*The results of this table are based on using Tables 9-1 and 9-2 of the EPA Report "The Probability of Sea Level Rise". Basically, the formula is multiplying the historic sea level rise (2.2 mm/yr) in East Central Florida (closest point used is Mayport, FL, Table 9-2) by the future number of years from 1990 plus the Normalized Sea Level Projections in Table 9-1. In summary, the EPA Report has relied on various scientific opinions regarding sea level changes affected by factors such as radiative forcing caused by both greenhouse gases and sulfate aerosols, global warming and thermal expansion, polar temperatures and precipitation, and the contributions to sea level from Greenland, Antarctica, and small glaciers.

Ocean levels have been monitored by stations around the world. According to most of these monitoring stations, mean sea level has increased steadily over the past century¹⁶. The two graphs below illustrate data from the two closest NOAA sea level monitoring stations to the study area, Mayport to the north and Miami Beach to the south. As both graphs illustrate, sea level along the east coast of Florida has been increasing for at least the past 70 years.



Figures 5 and 6: Monthly sea level variations at the Miami Beach and Mayport monitoring stations over the past 70 years. Miami Beach monitoring station shows a mean sea level trend of 2.39 mm/year based on data from 1931 to 1981. Mayport exhibits a mean sea level trend of 2.43 mm/year (0.80 feet/century) based on data from 1928 to 1999¹⁷.

Global vs. Relative Sea Level Rise

Global sea level rise is a result of increasing global ocean volume. The measurements of global sea level rise are the same regardless of the location on Earth. Relative sea level rise is the measure of the increase or decrease of sea level relative to land in specific locations. Relative sea level measurements will vary from location to location, as a result of the primary contributors to the rise⁸. Local trends in subsidence or emergence may cause local variances in ocean levels⁹. For example, subsidence of the coastal region can be caused by extensive development. Land, under the weight of development, sinks below its original elevation. Increased development also means increased use of resources. The over pumping of wells, both oil and water, also lead to

land subsidence. Since the magnitude of possible causes of sea level rise vary from site to site, relative sea level rise is important as it measures the cumulative effects of all the causes of sea level on a local basis ¹⁴. Therefore, focusing on relative sea level rise, rather than global sea level rise, is important in local planning in order to protect shorelines.

In a study by the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, three sea level rise scenarios were calculated for Daytona Beach with its current local subsidence rate of 0.513 mm/year using a sea level rise trend for Daytona Beach of 2.013 mm/yr ¹³. Table 2 illustrates the sea level rise scenarios, without including land subsidence, of the Daniel’s study based on the International Panel of Climate Controls Business as Usual for 2100.

Table 2: Sea Level Rise Scenarios for Daytona Beach, Florida used in Daniels, et al. Study.

Scenario	Year				
	2000	2025	2050	2075	2100
A. Low Scenario	2 cm	6.5 cm	14cm	22 cm	31 cm
B. Moderate Scenario	5 cm	7 cm	32 cm	48 cm	66 cm
C. High Scenario	8 cm	27 cm	50 cm	78 cm	110 cm

The sea level rise scenarios in the Daniels et al. study were then calculated using the subsidence rate of Daytona Beach, resulting in Table 3. Local subsidence, as evident from the data, creates relative sea level rise of 5.6 cm by 2100 along the Volusia coastline, in addition to global sea level rise. When increased ocean volume is combined with local subsidence, relative sea level may be even higher along the coastline, as evident from the data in Table 3. Depending upon the scenario, subsidence can account for 5 percent – 18 percent of the rise in sea level 2100.

Table 3. Relative sea level rise for Daytona Beach, Florida. Present subsidence rate for Daytona Beach is 0.513 mm/year. The current sea level rise scenario represents local subsidence only ¹³.

	Year		
	1988	2050	2100
Current (as of 1988)*	0	3.1 cm	5.6 cm
A. Low		17.1 cm	36.6 cm
B. Moderate		35.1 cm	71.6 cm
C. High		53.1 cm	115.6 cm

EFFECTS RELATED TO SEA LEVEL RISE

General

Coastlines could be affected by simple sea level rise with the “retreat” of the shoreline. Natural occurrences such as storm surges and waves may reach beyond current levels, while floodplains may be subjected to more effects as well. As a result, the total area affected by sea level rise and storm events could be larger than the land area projected to be covered with water². Issues of sea level rise reach far beyond inundation and flooding. As sea level rises, salt water intrusion which can contaminate private and public wells, increased erosion, a loss of infrastructure and wetlands, and effects on the National Flood Insurance Program may occur⁸. Sea level rise would force wetland migration that, with continued development, may be impeded if no open land exists to where the wetland may migrate⁹. With wetland, beach, and spoil island loss from no protection against sea level rise, the coastline can expect to have a decline in critical habitats and productivity¹. Also, the larger, more powerful waves resulting from increasing sea level accelerate beach erosion¹⁶.

Although sea level rise contributes to or exacerbates these effects, it is not the lone culprit. Increasing development along the coast creates a greater withdrawal from the aquifer. This, in turn, enables the salt water wedge to move further inland, contaminating the groundwater. Surface waters and wetlands may also be affected from saltwater intrusion. Shoreline erosion can be caused by both boat traffic and inlet stabilization¹. Major hurricanes and Nor’easters are culprits of massive beach erosion and destruction, such as the 1984 Thanksgiving Day Nor’easter. A storm of this magnitude has a return period of 10-20 years. Currents, such as the powerful Florida Gulf Stream, are active transporters of beach sediment¹⁶. However, all aspects of shore erosion must be considered in our study since shoreline protection or natural wetland migration is not dependent on the cause of erosion. Also, areas already experience erosion may indicate how similar areas may respond to sea level rise¹.

Local Issues

The Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Beaches and Coastal Systems updated the “Critical Erosion” List in 2003. Erosion is considered critical when there is a threat of loss of one of the following four interests: recreation, wildlife habitat, upland development, or important cultural resources. If a certain area has substantial erosion, but no public or private interests are threatened, the area is considered a “non critical erosion area” and close monitoring is required. Approximately 41.7 miles of coastline in the study area are listed as “critical erosion” while 13.4 miles are “noncritical,” making up almost half of the beaches/coastline in the study area ¹⁸.

According to the Volusia County comprehensive plan, most of the county coastline has accreted over that past 115 years, while erosion was experienced in the 1970s. This erosion then slowed in the 1980s ¹⁹. However, over sixteen miles of beach in Volusia County are classified as critical. The erosion threatens the area’s tourism, development, and recreational interests. Although the entire county is not experiencing major erosion issues, over an eight mile stretch of beach between Ormond Beach, Daytona Beach, and Daytona Beach Shores is critically eroded. Although Bethune Beach is armored by a rock revetment and New Smyrna Beach is to receive sand from Ponce Inlet, just less than 8.5 miles of the beaches are critically eroding in these areas. North of Ponce de Leon Inlet is a small stretch of beach, less than one mile, critically eroding and threatening the State Park’s recreational wellbeing. Finally, a one mile stretch of the Canaveral National Seashore is listed as non-critical erosion ¹⁸.

Brevard County has twenty five miles of critically eroding beaches, including a 24.6 mile stretch of beach southward from Canaveral Inlet. Due to Brevard County’s beach restoration program, beaches in Canaveral, Indialantic, and Melbourne beach have been renourished, along with proposals for Melbourne Beach, Indialantic, and Cocoa Beach. These areas consist of high density development with major tourist recreation interests. In south Brevard, a 0.4 mile stretch of beach is critically eroding. Although two areas north of Cape Canaveral are considered non-critical, no monitoring is taking place ¹⁸.

With almost half of the beaches in the study area considered critically eroding or eroding substantially, it is apparent that some action has taken place in order to protect the area from the destruction associated with erosion. It is extremely important to protect

the beaches in these counties due to the dependence of the local economy on the beach tourist industry. Although the steps taken by the jurisdictions to protect the beaches, development, and infrastructure are for erosion purposes, these actions can be used to prepare and protect the coast from expected sea level rise as well.

Using data from a NOAA study in 1980 and 2004 Volusia County data and analyzing it in ArcView, over 5,000 parcels in the study area are protected through armoring. By 2003, Volusia County increased their armoring from under 1,800 parcels to almost 2,500 parcels. (Current data for Brevard County is unavailable.) As seen in Figure 7, beach armoring through seawalls is common in northern Volusia County.



Figure 7: Seawalls along the Volusia County Coastline, represented in red.

Volusia County does not have an active beach nourishment program. However, a beach erosion feasibility study completed in December 2003 addresses the need for renourishment of the southern beaches. The report addresses the main causes of erosion

in the area, including storms, currents, and sea level rise. Brevard County has been actively renourishing the coastline for years. Over 500 parcels in Brevard County front renourished beach, comprising almost 12 miles of renourished beach, and a half-mile of natural accretion due to Cape Canaveral. Figure 8 illustrates the areas of Brevard County with beach renourishment.




Figure 8: Areas of Brevard County with Beach Renourishment

SEA LEVEL RISE POLICIES

Although policies for sea level rise are not explicit on the local level or even the state level, current policies for coastal management can be used for protection against sea level rise. Land use, development, and economic growth may also influence how the certain areas would respond to sea level rise.

Federal

Policies in the Federal government concerning the protection of the shore from erosion, inundation, and sea level rise, whether directly or indirectly stated, influence the protection scenario of the coastline from sea level rise. Federally owned undeveloped coastal land most likely would not be protected from sea level rise, even without a direct policy. Conservation agencies generally follow the National Park Service policy of allowing nature to take its course, thus allowing the shoreline to naturally erode, wetlands migrate, or land become inundated. National Wildlife Refuges generally allow wetland migration³⁶. Since the northern barrier island of Brevard County, the Cape, is Federally owned, shore protection is unlikely for much of this barrier. However, with the Kennedy Space Center in the area, the protection of areas in the Cape is more likely.

Although the federal government does not directly regulate privately owned dry lands, it does require landowners to obtain permits to fill wetlands under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act. Although bulkheads and stone revetments are allowed, they are considered fill when constructed in areas flooded by the tides and hence require a permit.⁴ As sea level rises and the shore erodes, even if the armoring is built inland of mean high water, eventually they will sit within the tides and a permit will be required for repair or replacement³⁶.

The Clean Water Act and federal estuary programs are motivators for local governments to create setbacks for septic tanks and runoff. These setbacks will allow for retreat of a period of time while sea level rises. However, with continued erosion and sea level rise, the setback buffer eventually will be eliminated³⁶.

⁴ Although state ownership of tidelands extends up to the mean high water mark, federal jurisdiction includes all “waters of the United States.” While the precise meaning of US waters must occasionally be litigated in the courts (especially with respect to inland wetlands that are

The Coastal Barrier Resources Act (CoBRA), administered through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, was enacted during the Reagan Administration by a coalition of environmental organizations and fiscal conservatives. The environmental objectives were to protect ecologically sensitive land, geologically vulnerable land, and the aesthetic and recreational values of barrier islands. The fiscal objective was to stop federal subsidies of coastal development. The law prohibits the expenditure of Federal money on new structures in these CoBRA areas. (Federal funding may be used for repair of bridges, utilities, or structures built prior to October of 1983 and removal of debris after a disaster²⁰.) The statute also precludes federal flood insurance, beach nourishment, and federally-backed mortgages. Although CoBRA does not prohibit development, the law tends to discourage development in these areas³⁶.

East Central Florida includes nine CoBRA areas: five in Canaveral, and one each in Ponce Inlet, Ormond by the Sea, Spessard Holland Park, and Coconut Point. In this region, the CoBRA areas generally are undeveloped, except for the southern CoBRA areas of Brevard County. The majority of the CoBRA areas are in the Cape Canaveral National Seashore, which is primarily wetlands. As a result, the area likely will be left to allow wetland migration. In the northern area of the region, the CoBRA areas are mostly wetlands or sparsely developed dry land. Some areas have no bridge access or are undeveloped islands in the middle of wetlands. Beach nourishment and other forms of shore protection may not be cost-effective in these areas.

In the southern portion of the region, however, the CoBRA areas are more developed, due to island access and lack of wetlands in the immediate area. Although Federal funding for beach nourishment, flood insurance, and other programs is unavailable in this area, the level of development in the area appears to be great enough for property owners to protect their land through other funds. For example, property owners might vote to create a special-taxing district to fund beach nourishment. Another possibility would be to petition for the reversal of the CoBRA designation. In short, in the region of Volusia and Brevard counties, land with CoBRA designations mostly likely would be left to retreat naturally as sea level rise, with the possible exception of southern Brevard County.

only connected to navigable waters), there is no doubt that it includes all tidal wetlands, as well as nontidal wetlands immediately adjacent to tidal wetlands.

Subsidies for stabilizing harbor entrances through jetties and beach nourishment for highly developed shores have been provided by the Federal government. While many areas of the shoreline are armored with seawalls, a major storm may destroy the wall and result in beach erosion of 50-100 feet³⁶. The Federal subsidy for beach nourishment enables the shore to be protected, which in this beach tourist region is critical. Brevard County, the southern portion of the region, has continued beach renourishment for many years. Some federal policies, such as the Federal flood insurance, indirectly encourage and allow dense development in the coastal area due to the lower risk of coastal construction. As a result of flood regulations, improvements have been made that allow homes to withstand greater damage and remain standing although the beach has eroded. The federal government wetland program allows for wetland armoring, which is addressed in the section below on state policies³⁶.

The Coastal Zone Management Act specifically addresses sea level rise and the need for the study and development of plans for addressing land subsidence and sea level rise. The Act states that coastal states must anticipate and plan for sea level rise in order to prevent or reduce the threats to property and life along the coast (and other hazard areas). Although specific policies and procedures are not discussed, the CZMA declares that coastal development must be managed to minimize the loss of property and life due to sea level rise, salt water intrusion, and the destruction of natural protective features²¹.

State

The state of Florida has no specific policy on sea level rise. However, as on the Federal level, coastal management policies address consequences of sea level rise (e.g. coastal erosion, flooding, and wetland loss) as well as factors that will tend to help determine how the state ultimately responds to sea level rises (e.g. beach nourishment, seawall construction, conservation lands, coastal development).

In 1965, the Department of Environmental Protection began the coastal construction regulatory program. In 1970, a setback from the mean high water line was established at 50 feet. However, in 1978 when the setback line was renamed “coastal construction control lines,” it was stated that the CCCL lines should be representative of the 100 year storm surge. Any structure seaward of the CCCL should be able to withstand the wind and waves of the 100 year storm, and 110 mph winds²².

The purpose of the CCCL is to protect the beach and dune system and therefore allow for public access to the beaches, decrease erosion attributed to development, and protect upland structures. Within the CCCL zone, a 30 year erosion setback exists, which is determined on a site by site basis by evaluating historical measurements by Department of Environmental Protection. However, this erosion setback does not factor in sea level rise. Permits for major structures seaward of the erosion setback are prohibited except for piers, coastal or shore protection structures, and single family dwellings meeting specific requirements ²².

The National Flood Insurance Program, established in 1968, encouraged local governments to adopt regulations to decrease the costs associated flooding. If the local government adopted such regulations, homeowners in the jurisdiction would be able to collect money from the program. However, if the city did not adopt such regulations, homeowners would be ineligible for the funding. This would include federally insured lenders ²².

The Coastal Protection Act, which encompasses land from the seasonal high water line to 1500 feet landward of the CCCL, was enacted in 1985 by the Florida State Legislature. However, for barrier islands, the coastal building zone is the land from the seasonal high water line to 5000 feet landward of the established CCCL or the entire island, whichever is less. Its aim is through construction standards, private property and the natural environment would be protected from damage. The elevation and foundation requirements are based on NFIP regulations, while the standard wind code applies. CCCL construction standards are stricter than those regulated by the local governments in the Coastal Building Zone ²².

Seeing the need to protect and restore the beaches throughout Florida, the Florida Legislature adopted a comprehensive beach management program. Implementing beach management planning is essentially performed through the Beach Erosion Control Program. The program works with local, state, and federal entities to preserve and restore beaches. To receive funding, the activities slated for the beach must include restoration and nourishment activities, environmental studies and monitoring, dune restoration and protection activities, inlet sand transfer, inlet management planning, project design and engineering studies, and other activities designed to protect the beach from erosion ²². Although this program is associated with erosion, the activities funded

through the program are important planning and solutions to sea level rise and its associated erosion.

A Strategic Beach Management Plan has been developed for the Cape Canaveral and Indian River Coast areas, as well as the coast of Volusia County. The Brevard County Shore Protection Project, a federal project authorized in 1968, restored the shoreline south from Port Canaveral Inlet to Indialantic-Melbourne beach. In 1996, the project was reauthorized with nourishment of the beach from South Jetty to Patrick Air Force Base, and north of Indialantic to Spessard Holland Park. The Indian River County Shore Protection Project was authorized in 1986 for Sebastian Inlet Park and the city of Vero Beach. In Volusia County, the dredging of Ponce de Leon Inlet takes place every three years, with the shoreline north of the inlet receiving the dredged sand. However, there are no beach nourishment programs in place at the current time in Volusia County, although feasibility studies are being conducted²³.

The state of Florida is aware of the importance of Florida beaches and the protection of private structures and infrastructure, as well as the extensive beach erosion problem along the beaches. Therefore, no one can install rigid shoreline armoring without first obtaining a permit from the Department of Environmental Protection. If DEP determines that these structures are unnecessary or will impede beach restoration projects, DEP may require removal even of structures that had been previously permitted.

Along estuarine shores, Florida statutes discourage the construction of vertical sea walls, which may threaten wetlands. The State prefers that property owners and local governments employ riprap or other and gently sloping artificial shorelines, with wetland vegetation. In order to obtain a permit for a new vertical wall in wetlands, one of the following conditions must be present: the construction would be located in a port, the construction is necessary to build a marina or public facilities, the construction is in a canal which is currently occupied by vertical seawalls, or the construction is by a public utility serving the public²⁴

The State of Florida has programs to help acquire land for conservation purposes. Coastal land may be acquired if it is necessary to protect, manage, conserve, or restore important ecosystems to enhance or protect coastal, recreational, fish, or wildlife resources. Florida has enacted the Florida Preservation Act 2000, Florida Forever Act, Florida Forever Act Trust Fund, Conservation and Recreation Lands Trust Fund, and the

Florida Communities Trust program in order to promote and enable acquisition of public land. Through the Department of Environmental Protection, a certain amount of funds is used expressly for the acquisition of coastal lands²². Acquiring public land now along the coast will help to create a setback or a buffer for the developed areas as sea level rises. This will allow the shoreline to naturally erode without endangering development.

Local

Currently, no specific sea level rise policies exist on the local level. The Volusia County Comprehensive Plan in section 11.4.1.21 states, “Volusia County should continue to monitor sea level rise science to determine when and if a sea level rise event will affect the County. Based on pertinent data, the county will act accordingly”¹⁹. The Brevard County Comprehensive Plan Policy 4.9 states, “Brevard County shall continue to collect and make available to the public, information related to sea level rise changes”²⁵. However, current policies dealing with erosion, development, shore protection, and flood hazard mitigation together form an implicit response to sea level rise.

As evident from county and city comprehensive plans, local entities have the common goal to reduce the impact of damage from a storm on property, life, public facilities, and natural resources. This goal is achieved by discouraging new development in coastal high hazard areas through limiting new public expenditures in those areas, limiting housing densities, and not financing new local transportation corridors unless there is no other cost feasible alternative⁵. Also, as the coastline changes, Brevard County will reevaluate the Brevard Coastal Setback Line and the Brevard Coastal Construction Line^{19,25}. In unprotected areas, adjusting the setback will aid in the reduction of property and infrastructure loss as sea level rises.

According to local comprehensive plans, seawall construction on the local level must be consistent with the standards set for by the state. In Volusia County, new vertical seawalls may be built only where there is serious threat to health, safety, principal buildings, or public infrastructure. A dune system with vegetation must be established over the sea wall in order to prevent the wall from being exposed. However,

⁵ Coastal High Hazard Areas include all areas that would be inundated with storm surge from a Category 1 Hurricane. It is part of Hurricane Vulnerability Zone which is the portion of the

Volusia County prefers to use sloping stabilization with vegetation in lieu of vertical seawalls. Development adjacent to estuarine and riverine shorelines are to maintain a buffer zone to conserve the vegetation and wetlands. Volusia County takes priority in preserving coastal and riverine wetlands. Therefore, activities around wetlands should enhance them and natural buffer zones or setbacks should be incorporated landward of all protected wetlands ¹⁹.

In Volusia County, the CCCL line varies dependent upon protection already in place. For non-seawalled open ocean coasts, the CCCL is located behind the landward base of the foredune ridge. The ridge should be allowed to expand landward by having a buffer between the ridge and building construction ¹⁹.

Brevard County prohibits new shoreline hardening structures along the Atlantic Ocean north of Patrick Air Force Base. South of the base, no new hardening structures are allowed along the Atlantic Ocean unless they are of emergency provisions as noted in Florida Statutes Chapter 163.3187 (1) (a). If no other alternative is feasible, the county will allow vertical wood, rock, or concrete walls which may also require dune restoration or revegetation. If more than 50 percent of a seawall is in need of repair, it is considered new construction. Therefore, a permit is needed. In areas of wetlands, Natural Buffer Zones or setbacks are required landward of all protected wetlands. Hardening estuarine shoreline in Brevard County is only allowed when a serious threat is posed to life and property. Like Volusia County, vegetation and other stabilization methods are encouraged. To help ensure no net loss of wetlands, Brevard County requires a 15 foot natural buffer around isolated wetlands and a 50 foot natural buffer around all others ²⁵.

Oceanfront development in Brevard County must maintain 50 percent of its native dune vegetation while no vegetation is allowed to be removed seaward of the CCCL. The county also requires a 200 foot shoreline protection buffer from the ordinary or mean high waterline. Only passive uses may be used seaward of the buffer ²⁵.

In Volusia County, the Environmental Management Services Group supports and sponsors shoreline habitat reclamation. Activities include dune restoration, stabilizing shorelines, and regulation of urban shoreline redevelopment ¹⁹. Also, beach nourishment efforts in the southern region of the study area (Brevard County) are extensive.

unincorporated county that is evacuated during a Category 3 Hurricane (111-130 mph wind and storm surge of 9-12 feet).

Both Volusia and Brevard encourage the acquisition of public land for conservation and enhancement of coastal resources. Efforts such as these may be used to protect the shoreline from sea level rise. Each county has programs to help conserve important land in the county. The Friends of the Scrub is an organization found in Brevard County aimed at protecting the scrub jay habitat²⁷. Brevard County's Environmentally Endangered Lands Program (EEL) has acquired 18,000 acres of endangered land mostly through assistance from the state and the Saint Johns River Water Management District²⁸. Both Volusia County and Brevard County share the Regional Land Trust for the Indian River Lagoon to create conservation easements.

In 1987, the Volusia County Land Acquisition Program came into effect to acquire land that meets resource conservation goals and objectives. Approximately 2,320 acres of recreation and environmentally endangered lands have been purchased in the coastal area through the program. An additional 47,000 acres of coastal zone land is federally, state, and county owned resource and park lands. These lands are undevelopable¹⁹. Volusia County property owners may also donate or sell land to the Volusia County Land Trust and the Volusia County Greenways and Parks Program/Land Acquisition and Management. The Greenways and Parks Program works to protect open space that are managed for conservation and/or recreation purposes by creating corridors to link major parks and communities. In 2000, Volusia Forever was created. It is anticipated that over the life to the program, \$100 million will be raised to finance the acquisition, improvement, and management of environmentally sensitive lands, water resource protection, and recreational lands²⁷.

By continuing land acquisition on the local, county, state, and federal level, a buffer may be created along areas of the coast as well as allowing land for wetland migration or development movement.

Private

Development in the study area includes single family, multi family which includes apartments, town homes, and condos, and a number of resorts, hotels, and motels. Some cities such as Indian Harbour Beach have a high concentration of luxury homes, while other cities are geared towards the tourism industry, such as Daytona Beach. Daytona Beach Shores is the fastest growing city in Volusia County and consists

of a 5.5 mile stretch of high rise condominiums, hotels, motels, townhouses, and single family dwelling^{26,35}. In the study area, various types of housing are protected by seawalls and beach renourishment; single family and multi family housing, as well as commercial due to the resorts and dependence of the study area on its beaches and tourists.

The development trend in the study area is that of build out in all upland areas, except that which is owned by the federal government. This is evident in that the study area consists of over 31,000 acres of undeveloped uplands. The majority of this undeveloped upland is situated in wetland areas, between wetlands and development, or splattered in other developed areas. There currently exist little or no large tracts to use for retreat purposes in the study areas, especially on the barrier island. In the southern portion of the study area, where development is less intense, there exists more undeveloped land. However, this part of the barrier island is very narrow and has wetlands bordering areas. Therefore, due to lack of open space for development, the continued use of beach restoration and seawalls will be of great importance in protecting this study area from sea level rise.

Private land owners have a number of options for conserving their land. Programs on the federal, state, and local levels, as well as private organizations allow private land owners to donate, sell, or create conservation easements with some financial and tax benefits associated with it. Private land owners may opt to create a conservation easement on their property. This easement is a legal agreement that limits the amount of development on the property. The agreement between the government, land trust, or other agency and the property owner protects the conservation or agricultural interests. Benefits to the private land owner include not only assuring that the land is managed to their intent, but they may receive income tax savings through a charitable tax deduction, decrease in real property taxes due to the reduced market value of the land by creating the conservation easement, no federal gift and estate taxes, and the exclusion of the easement property from the federal estate tax²⁷.

Property owners also have the option to donate land or a portion of their land to a land trust, public agency, or nonprofit organization. As with creating an easement, the ecological or agricultural values of the land will be maintained. Also, the owner may experience a decrease in income tax and federal estate taxes. A third option is for a

Bargain Sale or Charitable Sale of the land. In this option, a portion of the value of the land is sold while a portion is donated. This will result in charitable income tax deductions as well as savings on capital gains taxes²⁷.

There are a number of public and private organizations to which land donations, easements, and sales can be made. On the National level, the Natural Resources Conservation Service administers the Farmland Protection Program and the Wetlands, Reserve Program. The USFWS's Partners for Fish and Wildlife program works to restore wildlife habitat on private land. The Nature Conservancy has a number of programs for the public land owner such as the Immediate Land Donation Program and the Charitable Remainder Unitrust Program. Other national organizations include the Sustainable Forests Alliance, The Conservation Fund, the Land Trust Alliance, The Trust for Public Land, the Wildlife Land Trust, The Farmland Stewardship Program, and the Stewardship America²⁷.

On the state level, Florida offers the Florida Forever Program, which replaced the Preservation 2000 Program. This program works toward the restoration of damaged environmental systems, increase public access, increase protection through conservation easements, and public lands management. The Florida Division of Forestry oversees the Rural and Family Lands Act, conserving agricultural land. Finally, the Conservation Trust for Florida helps to protect vital rural land²⁷.

By acquiring easements or land along the coast, a natural buffer can be created to protect development from the effects of sea level rise as well as avoid development in critical hazard areas.

SEA LEVEL RISE PROTECTION SCENARIO MAPS METHODS

The current trends and policies provide a basis for developing maps depicting the region's likely responses to sea level rise. Those responses will depend upon the development in the area, current and future policies, and the state of shore protection along the coastline. Land uses may change; therefore, we must analyze the future land use as well as the current densities in the study area. The majority of dry land within the study area has been developed and portions of the barrier island have high density. In East Central Florida, as with other coastal areas in this state, planners are unable to foresee circumstances that would lead residential areas near the coast to revert to agriculture or forest. Therefore, this area may not see dramatic changes in densities or development of areas of currently open space. Nevertheless, the likelihood of future shore protection depends on the status of the land when it becomes threatened by erosion or inundation, so preparing maps that depict future shore protection must consider both future land use plans and existing land use.

Study Area

As with all the sea level rise planning studies in Florida, this study considers all land below the 10-foot (NGVD) contour. *The selection of this study area does not imply that we are predicting—or even analyzing the consequences of—a 10-foot rise in sea level.* Because tidal influence can extend almost to the 5-ft contour, the 10-foot contour is approximately the highest elevation that might be inundated by tides were sea level to rise five feet over the next few hundred years—but that is not the primary reason we used the 10-foot contour to delineate the study area. In addition, current Category 3 Hurricane storm surge reaches at least 9 feet. Even with a five foot rise in sea level, a storm surge will reach beyond the current ten foot contour to the 15 foot contour. Therefore, the 10 foot contour study area does not include all areas that would be effected by major hurricane as seen in 2004.

During the original design of this study, EPA and SWFRPC sought to identify a study area that could be implemented throughout Florida and that would include all land that might be significantly affected by sea level rise during the next century. If possible, they also sought to include land that might be affected over a longer period of time, but

that goal had to be balanced against the extra cost of studying a larger study area. All things being equal, it is better to make the study area over-inclusive rather than under-inclusive: If someone later needs a map only depicting land below the 8-foot contour, then it would be very easy to subdivide our data and only show shore protection for land below the 8-foot contour. By contrast, if someone needs a map that includes some areas inland of our original study area, they will have to repeat our study for these higher areas.

The quality of topographic information varies throughout Florida. Some counties have LIDAR, and some water management districts have two-foot contours. Nevertheless, the best topographic maps for some portions of Florida have 5-foot contour intervals. Therefore, the only realistic choices for a statewide study area were the 5-, 10-, 15- and 20-foot contours.

Considering the criteria, EPA and SWFRPC decided that a 10-foot contour would probably be the most appropriate study area for Florida. Although the land below 5 feet is the most vulnerable, limiting the study area to such low land would exclude many areas that are potentially vulnerable to sea level rise during the next century. Statewide, most of the land between 5 and 10 feet is already below the base flood elevation for a 100-year storm, and hence will experience greater flooding as sea level rises. In East Central Florida, land with a five foot elevation is generally within the coastal high hazard zone; thus a 5 foot rise in sea level would bring all land below the 10-ft contour within the coastal high hazard zone. Finally, topographic contours are only estimates. Under the National Mapping Standards, up to 10 percent of the land can be higher or lower than the map indicates, by more than one-quarter of the contour interval. Thus a substantial amount of land depicted as between 5 and 10 feet may in reality be between 3 and 4 ft; using the 10-ft contour to delineate the study area helps to ensure that this very low land is considered.

The study area also includes all land within 1000 feet of the shore, even if it is above the 10-ft contour. Rising sea level and other coastal processes can cause beaches, dunes, bluffs, and other land to erode even though it may have sufficient elevation to avoid direct inundation by rising water levels. The 1000-foot extension is somewhat arbitrary; we chose that distance primarily to be consistent with similar studies in other

states.⁶ Extending the study area 1000 feet inland also ensures that the study area is large enough to be seen along the entire shore on the county-scale maps produced by this study.

Data Collection and Compilation

Future Land Use shape files or hard copy maps were obtained by contacting each jurisdiction and county in the study area⁷. The Existing Land Use and Five Foot Topography Polygon shape-files were downloaded from the St. John’s River Water Management District Website.

Topographic

Five foot interval topographic polygons were downloaded from the St. Johns River Water Management District website. The file was digitized from USGS 24k scale maps. Each quadrant of Volusia and Brevard County was downloaded and then merged into one shape file for each county. A field named “Elevation” was added to the attribute table and elevations were categorized as “0 – 5 ft,” “5 – 10 ft,” and “Above 10 Ft.”

Existing Land Use

Using the Florida Land Use Cover Classification Code System (FLUCCS), all land uses were classified as water, wetlands, and uplands. Changes applied to the shape file were as follows: “canals and locks,” “slough waters,” and “embayments not opening” were classified as water; “beaches other than swimming beaches” were classified as uplands. The Existing Land Use Map was unioned with the topographic data to determine the study area of the ten foot elevation and below.⁸

Future Land Use

Shape file maps sent from the jurisdictions were reviewed for inconsistencies, corrections, and missing areas. Areas marked as “Unknown” on city FLU shape files

⁶ Maryland’s land-use rules to protect Chesapeake and other coastal bays apply to land within 1000 feet of the shore.

⁷ The jurisdictions in the study area include Brevard County, Cape Canaveral, Cocoa, Cocoa Beach, Indian River, Indian Harbour Beach, Malabar, Melbourne, Melbourne Beach, Palm Bay, Palm Shores, Rockledge, Satellite Beach, and Titusville. Also, Volusia County, Daytona Beach, Daytona Beach Shores, Edgewater, Holly Hill, New Smyrna Beach, Oak Hill, Ormond Beach, Ponce Inlet, Port Orange, and South Daytona.

⁸ As discussed later in the text, our final maps also include all land within 1000 feet of the shore, to account for possible shore erosion and to ensure that in areas where the ground near the water is relatively high, the study area is still large enough to show up on county-scale maps.

were compared to the county FLU files and were categorized accordingly. If no FLU category existed, if possible, the unknown areas were classified as the surrounding land uses indicated or as noted by the city planner. Maps of cities currently not using GIS were digitized using Arc View GIS. By incorporating aerial photographs from Florida Geographic Data Library, street shape files, and city municipality files, city FLU maps were digitized and compared for accuracy. Areas within the cities maintaining the county FLU classifications were checked against County FLU map and the correct classifications were recorded. Future land use categories were also reclassified into the categories in Table 4. The original and reclassified maps were sent to each city for review and to ensure the maps and reclassifications were consistent with the cities' Future Land Use Categories. After collaborating with individual cities, the maps were revised if necessary. All changes suggested by the jurisdictions were made to the shape file.

Table 4: Categories of Future Land Use used in project.

Estate (1 un/4.9 ac – 1 un/ 0.9ac) ⁹	Industrial
Single Family Residential (1 un/ 1 ac – 5.9 un/ac)	Mining
Multi Family Residential (>= 6 un/ac)	Military
Agriculture	Wetlands
Preserve	Water
Commercial	

When the shape files were merged using ArcView 3.2, many of the boundaries were inconsistent and overlapping. This was possibly due to the various original projections used by the different cities, as well as the base maps used to create the files. Therefore, a new Future Land use file was created for the study area using the existing land use file and city boundaries. A new field called “Future Land Use” was added to the Existing Land Use shape file and the “uplands” were populated according to the data received from each jurisdiction. Wetlands were classified according to the existing land use codes assuming current wetlands will remain intact. However, due to using the SJRWMD Existing Land Use as the base map, some issues were encountered when classifying beaches, as most jurisdictions do not classify beaches on their Future Land Use. Therefore, any known beach or undeveloped upland without a future land use classification from the previous maps were given the classification “Preserve.” By doing

⁹ The residential land use criteria were taken from the South West Florida Regional Planning Council Sea Level Rise Project in order to maintain consistency.

this, we can easily recognize and change any areas that are in fact beaches or undeveloped land but not conservation. Changes to these areas were made during the Protection Classification step. Therefore, in the shape file itself, some coastal areas with the attribute “Preserve” may not actually be conservation areas.

Critical Facilities

Critical Facility lists, which include municipal, county, federal, and private facilities, were obtained from Volusia and Brevard County. Volusia County critical facilities were determined using the county guidelines that any facility labeled with a 2 or 3 on the facility assessment list is considered critical facilities. Facilities without a number but within the surge zone were added to the critical facility list. According to Volusia County, a critical facility is “any facility that can not go more than 24 hours without operational capability.”²⁹ Addresses for each critical facility in Volusia County were researched through the reports provided by Volusia County, internet resources, and by contacting individual cities or departments. A shape-file was created and addresses were geocoded using ArcView 3.2. Facilities with no street address were mapped by the closest cross streets or were given middle address numbers for the appropriate street. The Brevard County Critical Facility list was provided by the Emergency Management Division in an Access Database. Therefore, the data base was brought into ArcView 3.2 and the points were mapped according to the GPS coordinates provided in the data base.

Critical facilities outside the study area were deleted from the file. Other facilities not included due to type included any facility deemed not necessary such as (non governmental facilities, churches, businesses, nursing homes, etc.)¹⁰ The remaining critical facilities were included on the map as a point of interest for the jurisdictions, to indicate the number and types of critical facilities that would be affected by sea level rise. Critical facilities were represented by black points. Critical facilities included in this study are as follows:

- | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| NASA | |
| Water Treatment Plant | Emergency Operations Centers |
| Police Department | Wastewater Treatment Plant |
| Fire Department | Utility Plant |
| School | Hospital |

¹⁰ Performed per methods sent by SWFRPC. A list of other critical facilities in the study area not included on the map is found in the Appendix.

Air Force Base	Lift Stations
Water towers	Central Services
Sewer Pump Stations	Wells
Stormwater Pumping Station	Armory
Evac	Industrial Park

Protection Scenario Classifications

General Classifications

Our primary objective is to divide land within the study area into one of four categories: shore protection almost certain (brown), shore protection likely (red), shore protection legal but unlikely (blue), and no shore protection (light green). Current trends, policies, and development are the most important factors used to determine protection scenario classifications. Table 5 illustrates the initial general scenarios classifications for the various land uses that all of the Florida studies are following. By using Future and Existing Landuse densities and categories, the majority of the study area was initially classified as directed in the state-wide classification Table 5. All polygons labeled “water” and “wetlands” based on the existing land-use field were selected and copied to the new “Scenario” field. All “Uplands” polygons were then classified initially according to the table below. To aid in initial classification, various shape files were used. A CoBRA shape file was downloaded from the Florida Geographic Data Library and a shape file available on the ECFRPC’s network was used for District Owned Land, land currently or potentially public owned. Volusia County GIS department provided the planning council with a sea wall shape file while Brevard County was the source for a beach renourishment shape file. However, as the study progressed on site by site basis, some areas were changed due to surrounding areas or other considerations.

Our maps generally followed those categories because they are appropriate for East Central Florida³¹. There is relatively little doubt that developed areas will be protected, with the possible exception of low-density areas without water and sewer, and CoBRA areas along the Atlantic Ocean, where the absence of federal subsidies might conceivably make sure protection unlikely if beach nourishment costs escalate in the future. Aside from those exceptions, the demand for a home near the coast is so great that property values can easily justify shore protection costs. Even though we recognize

that tastes can change, we have been unable to identify any plausible reason to expect an inland migration of coastal residents comparable to the coastal migration that took place during the last fifty years. At the other extreme, there is relatively little doubt that within conservation areas, dry lands will gradually be flooded by as sea level rises, with the possible exception of those adjacent to key federal installations such as the Kennedy Space Center.

Undeveloped areas where growth is expected will almost certainly be protected if they are developed, but until they become development, it is still possible for conservation organizations to make arrangements that would allow wetlands to migrate inland in some of these areas. Therefore, most undeveloped lands where development is expected will likely be protected. In some areas, even undeveloped areas are almost certain to be protected, because the development is imminent, or the land is already surrounded by developed areas that are certain to be protected.

Outside of the public lands, only about 2 percent of the coastal lowlands in our area are unlikely to become developed. Those lands include remote areas where development is impractical, and some privately owned agricultural and forest preservation areas. Shore protection is unlikely in these areas, either because shore protection costs are likely to be greater than the value of the land lost from allowing the shore to retreat, or—in the case of lands with conservation easements--because allowing natural processes to proceed is more consistent with the conservation ethic. Nevertheless, no policies would prevent owners from protecting their lands, so “protection unlikely” is a reasonable designation.

The approach does not always have a perfect one-to-one correspondence with the available data. For example, some land use categories (e.g. parks) could be certain, likely, or unlikely to be protected, depending on the fates of surrounding lands, and specific purposes to which property is put. Moreover, although the Florida land use categories are all mutually exclusive, we also considered other data. Since some areas did not fall into one category, other determining factors may have been used to classify the area, including site specific review.

Table 5.

STATEWIDE APPROACH FOR IDENTIFYING LIKELIHOOD OF LAND USE PROTECTION¹

Likelihood of Protection ²	Land-Use Category	Source Used to Identify Land Area
Protection Almost Certain (brown)	Existing developed land (FLUCCS Level 1-100 Urban and Built-up) within extensively developed areas and/or designated growth areas.	Developed Lands identified from Water Management Districts (WMD) existing Florida Land Use, Cover and Forms Classification System (FLUCCS) as defined by Florida Department of Transportation Handbook (January 1999); Growth areas identified from planner input and local comprehensive plans.
	Future development within extensively developed areas and/or designated growth areas (residential/office/commercial/industrial).	Generalized Future Land Use Maps from local comprehensive plans, local planner input and Water Management Districts.
	Extensively-used parks operated for purposes other than conservation and have current protection ³ or are surrounded by brown colored land uses.	County-Owned, State-Owned, and Federally-Owned Lands (based on local knowledge) or lands defined as 180 Recreational on the Level 1 FLUCCS, local planner input and Florida Marine Research Info System (FMRIS) for current protection measures.
Protection Reasonably Likely (red)	Existing development within less densely developed areas, outside of growth areas, mobile home development not anticipated to gentrify, not on central water and sewer, and within a coastal high hazard area ⁴ .	Developed Lands identified from WMD existing FLUCCS; Growth areas identified from local planner input, local comprehensive plans and current regional hurricane evacuation studies.
	Projected future development outside of growth areas could be estate land use on Future Land Use Map.	Local planner input
	Moderately-used parks operated for purposes other than conservation and have no current protection or are surrounded by red colored land uses.	County-Owned, State-Owned, and Federally-Owned Lands (based on local knowledge) or lands defined as 180 Recreational on the Level 1 FLUCCS, local planner input and FMRIS.
	Coastal areas that are extensively developed but are ineligible for beach nourishment funding due to COBRA (or possibly private beaches unless case can be made that they will convert to public)	Flood Insurance Rate Maps for COBRA, local knowledge for beach nourishment.
	Undeveloped areas where most of the land will be developed, but a park or refuge is also planned, and the boundaries have not yet been defined so we are unable to designate which areas are brown and which are green; so red is a compromise between	Local planner input
	Agricultural areas where development is not expected, but where there is a history of erecting shore protection structures to protect farmland.	Local planner input
	Military Lands in areas where protection is not certain.	FLUCCS Level 173
Protection Unlikely (blue)	Undeveloped privately-owned that are in areas expected to remain sparsely developed (i.e., not in a designated growth area and not expected to be developed) and there is no history of erecting shore protection structures to protect farms and forests.	Undeveloped Lands identified from WMD existing FLUCCS Level 1-160 mining, 200 Agriculture, 300 Rangeland, 400 Upland Forest, 700 barren land ; Non-growth areas identified from planner input, local comprehensive plans, Flood Insurance Rate Maps for COBRA and current regional hurricane evacuation studies.
	Unbridged barrier island and COBRA areas or within a coastal high hazard area that are not likely to become developed enough to justify private beach nourishment.	Flood Insurance Rate Maps for COBRA, local knowledge for beach nourishment and local planner input.
	Minimally-used parks operated partly for conservation, have no current protection or are surrounded by blue colored land uses, but for which we can articulate a reason for expecting that the shore might be protected.	County-Owned, State-Owned, and Federally-Owned Lands (based on local knowledge) or lands defined as preserve on Future Land Use Map, local planner input and FMRIS.

Table 5.		
STATEWIDE APPROACH FOR IDENTIFYING LIKELIHOOD OF LAND USE PROTECTION¹		
Likelihood of Protection²	Land-Use Category	Source Used to Identify Land Area
	Undeveloped areas where most of the land will be part of a wildlife reserve, but where some of it will probably be developed; and the boundaries have not yet been defined so we are unable to designate which areas are brown and which are green; so blue is a compromise between red and green.	Local planner input
	Conservation Easements (unless they preclude shore protection)	Local planner input
No Protection (light green)	Private lands owned by conservation groups (when data available)	Private Conservation Lands
	Conservation Easements that preclude shore protection	Local planner input
	Wildlife Refuges, Portions of Parks operated for conservation by agencies with a policy preference for allowing natural processes (e.g. National Park Service)	Local planner input
	Publicly-owned natural lands or parks with little or no prospect for access for public use.	County-Owned, State-Owned, and Federally-Owned Lands (based on local knowledge) defined as preserve on the Future Land Use Map and local planner input.
Notes:		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. These generalized land use categories describe typical decisions applied in the county studies. County-specific differences in these decisions and site-specific departures from this approach are discussed in the county-specific sections of this report. 2. Colored line file should be used in areas where less than 10 ft. elevations exist within 1,000 feet of the rising sea or color can't be seen on ledger paper map. 3. Current protection may include sea walls, rock revetments, beach renourishment, levees, spreader swales or dikes. 4. Coastal High Hazard Area defined in Rule 9J-5 FAC as the Category 1 hurricane evacuation zone and/or storm surge zone. 		

Site Specific Classifications

After classifying land areas according to the table above, changes were performed based on site by site analysis. Ariel photographs were used to observe current density, and/or surrounding density if the land was currently undeveloped, and types of development (i.e., expensive housing, apartments, hotels, resorts, open space, recreation area with development, etc). Also taken into account was the future land use and location of property relative to wetlands. Let us examine these exceptions from the initial classifications in detail.

Environmental aspects as well as social and economic aspects must be considered when classifying sea level rise protection scenarios. Undeveloped land around wetlands could be used to allow wetland migration and preserve habitat and functions. Therefore, large areas of currently open/undeveloped land behind wetlands or between wetlands were classified as “Protection Reasonably Likely” based on the statewide approach,

although the future land use category is developed. Current low density development areas near wetlands or water bodies planning for greater development were also classified as “Protection Reasonably Likely.” By limiting the development in these areas to its current density, less money would need to be expended to protect the property and infrastructure, and the property owners may be able to relocate their homes. If development were to build out in these areas, the cost to the public and/or jurisdiction may be greater and there would be no room for wetland migration.

An example of such a situation is located on the middle barrier island in Brevard County, just past the military/governmental land and north of SR A1A. This section of upland includes sporadic high and low density development occurring between large areas of undeveloped land. The uplands are located within and surrounded by wetlands with a preserve located to the east. Due to the current low development in the area as well as the surrounding wetlands and preserve, our maps classify most of this area as “Protection Reasonably Likely.” Four areas have high-density development, and hence we have classified them as “Protection Almost Certain.” Therefore, our maps recognize that the undeveloped areas probably will be developed and protected, but that they might remain undeveloped to allow for a buffer to protect the developed portions of the island and to allow for wetland migration. The maps also recognize that areas with light development could relocate to the existing highly developed areas. This could reduce the cost of protecting infrastructure such as roads and wells as well as create open space to act as a buffer for the more developed areas.

Our maps show the area just north of the NASA Causeway on the mainland in Brevard County as “protection almost certain” (brown) because the area is currently developed. The area south of the NASA Causeway is also developed and certain to be protected. In between these two areas, is a large area of undeveloped property that is bordered by a large wetland and the causeway. If the future land use map and Table 5 together were used to classify this area, the area would be classified as “Protection Almost Certain” due to the anticipated development. It is realistic to assume that this area is also certain to be protected, because an inlet between the developed communities would not be desirable. Because a road already exists in this corridor, it would provide the best area for development. The entire area would be protected by raising the infrastructure or building seawalls. However, from an environmental perspective, it may

be preferable if property owners in this undeveloped area traded rights of development for rights to develop within other undeveloped areas surrounded by development. This would allow the area to be used for wetland migration and environmental buffers. Regardless of whether the area is “Protection Almost Certain” or “Protection Reasonably Likely” (RED), US 1 would need to be raised to either kept the connectivity of the two developed areas or the entire area would be raised due to development (more would need to be done to protect the entire area than only raising US 1). Therefore, due to the current lack of development, it is currently classified as “Protection Reasonably Likely” in order to provide the opportunity for either development or wetland migration. If the area was classified as “Protection Almost Certain,” it would be insinuated from the methods of this report, there would be no opportunity for the land to be used for wetland or habitat migration; the land would be protected as the surrounding developed land. By classifying this area as is, the option is left open to use the land in an environmental capacity or to develop the land and protect it. The blue areas within this section are agricultural lands classified according to Table 5. They have not been changed due to surrounding classification for the fact they border wetlands and would be expected to allow wetland and habitat migration or serve as a buffer if the surrounded area is indeed protected.

Other small undeveloped lands surrounded by areas with a certain classifications were classified according to the surrounding scenarios. If protection is almost certain, it is not foreseeable that the open land would be left to give way to the ocean if the surrounding areas are to be protected. The land may also be protected to allow for future development for areas that may need to retreat.

Following EPA’s national approach as well as the statewide approach, all military and NASA property in undeveloped areas were colored red. This designation is meant to convey our uncertainty, rather than a specific expectation that shore protection is likely.¹¹ According to the EPA, federal governmental land is exempt from local and state

¹¹ EPA’s project manager Jim Titus has advised all contractors and grantees on this project that in his personal opinion, it is not appropriate for EPA to speculate on what the Department of Defense will choose to do with it’s coastal lands. He also points out that the Department of Defense is exempt from state and local regulations. EPA studies represent military bases as red to highlight the uncertainty, not to indicate that shore protection is likely. EPA hopes to eventually obtain an opinion from the Department of Defense regarding the most reasonable assumption for sea level rise studies, once all of the state-specific studies are complete. Nevertheless, the EPA studies classify military bases in urban areas as shore protection almost certain, because doing so does not

regulations. Also, since the area is in an undeveloped area, one can not be certain as to how the government will address this issue and future land uses³⁰. Most of this area is located on the Cape and situated in wetlands and preserve areas. However, in northern Brevard, a few sporadic military uplands were located within a COBRA area. We decided not to follow the national and statewide approaches in these areas because they are small isolated areas outside the major military installations. These “developments” areas would most likely be moved to other more densely developed areas. Therefore, we classified these areas as “Protection Unlikely” and colored them blue.¹²

As mentioned previously, some issues were encountered when classifying beach areas and undeveloped land along the beach in which jurisdictions did not include in future land use maps. Therefore, the eastern most sections (beaches and adjacent undeveloped land) of the barrier islands of both Brevard and Volusia County were classified on a site by site basis.

Some beaches were classified as “Preserve” upon the recommendation of jurisdictions during the course of the study. For example, in Brevard County, New Smyrna Beach identified a beach area classified as conservation, thus classified as “No Protection” while the beach on the north side of this area is a recreational beach. Beaches experiencing beach renourishment, as based on the shape file from Brevard County, were classified as “Protection Almost Certain.” All land areas in Brevard County that are behind renourished beaches were classified as “Protection Almost Certain” due to current protection already in place. Otherwise, beaches were given the same classification as the surrounding area, unless otherwise suggested by the local governments or are located in a CoBRA area, in which they were classified as “No Protection.” For example, in Brevard County, a CoBRA area exists along the southern end of the barrier island. The beach in this area has been classified as “No Protection” while the undeveloped uplands have been classified as blue, “Protection Unlikely” and the small areas of developed uplands are classified as red “Protection Reasonably Likely.”

Seawalls are an important form of protection for sea level rise whether they are built to protect property from erosion or flooding. A shape-file of all current seawall

require speculation regarding military intention—in such areas, even if the base were to close, it would require shore protection given it’s location in an area being protected in its entirety.

armoring was obtained from Volusia County GIS Department. All property behind a seawall, including the adjacent beach, was classified as “Protection Almost Certain” due to the existing protection. Current data for seawalls were unavailable for Brevard County. A shape-file downloaded from the NOAA website provided seawall data up to 1980. This data was used in the same capacity as the Volusia County file. However, much of the property in the region was already classified as “Protection Almost Certain” due to beach renourishment or existing development.

Agricultural areas were classified according to Table 5. However, upon review of the map, small agricultural areas exist in Brevard County which are surrounded by areas of reasonable or almost certain protection. In these cases, the farms will probably be rezoned for residential as development occurs around them. Therefore, these small plots, surrounded by current development or planned development, where the plan still contemplates agriculture, were classified according to the surrounding protection scenario. Areas such as these are found along the mainland of Brevard County and north of A1A in the middle barrier island.

Only Brevard County has a future land use of mining and the area is inland and surrounded by undeveloped land, wetlands, and single family (low density) development. Therefore, the mining future land use was classified as “Protection Reasonably Likely” as is the surrounding area.

Local Stakeholder Review

Finally, local review of the maps was important in classifying land areas. Initially, during the first few months of 2004, we provided draft maps that focused exclusively on the role of elevation in the classification process. Volusia County and cities were sent draft maps to review in which areas between 0 and five feet were classified as “Protection Unlikely” and areas between five and ten feet were classified as “Protection Reasonably Likely.” Each jurisdiction was asked to review and change the protection scenarios based on the protection scenario guidelines initially suggested by the USEPA¹³. Responses from Volusia County and the cities did not result in significant

¹² The shapefiles we make available to SWFRPC and EPA designate military lands, so our departure from the general approach will not prevent others from modifying the maps if better information regarding DOD or NASA intentions becomes available.

¹³ These initial draft maps and guidelines were sent to Volusia County before more in-depth classification guidelines and Table 5 were given to the ECFRPC by SWFRPC and the EPA.

changes. Volusia County stated the 200 year time frame exceeded their 20 year planning policy and therefore they had no suggested changes to the initial maps.¹⁴ Daytona Beach Shores emailed a response of “no suggested changes” to the map. However, as the study progressed, the city was classified almost entirely as “Protection Almost Certain” due to density and sea walls around the city. The City of New Smyrna Beach recommended the entire city to be classified as “Protection Almost Certain.” Some discussion took place with Ormond Beach concerning the purpose and process of the study and the process of local review. However, no changes were suggested by city staff. Finally, the City of Daytona Beach questioned the underlying assumptions of the study and had no comments to make about the map. Following completion of the local reviews, and with further discussion with the USEPA and SWFRPC, and follow-up analysis of the coastal areas using aerials, and both the existing and future land use maps, the Volusia County map was modified based on the methodology previously described.

After the issues and lack of responses from Volusia County, we took a different approach with Brevard County. Rather than providing a map that only considered elevations and ask for comments and changes based on the more specific guidelines now suggested by SWFRPC and the EPA, we prepared a map based on our general approach.¹⁵ The maps were then sent to the appropriate jurisdictions. In Brevard County, the cities of Cocoa, Cocoa Beach, Palm Bay, Indian Harbour Beach, Cape Canaveral, Satellite Beach, Malabar, and Palm Shores responded with suggestions to the maps.

- The City of Cocoa suggested the marina be classified as “Protection Almost Certain” due to residences and offices in the marina. Also, it was suggested that Lee Wenner and MacFarland parks be classified as “Protection Almost Certain” due to the location, use of, and walls at the parks.

Therefore, the initial steps taken in the project did not include the specifics included in the final classification guidelines and site specific reasonings.

¹⁴ The original draft report left many readers with the impression that the study is primarily focused on events 200 years hence, because of our explanation for the study area selection. We have tried to revise the report so that it is more clear that shore protection may be required in the next few decades along most shores, and that the study is meant to inform planners about the long-term consequences of the decisions they make during the next comprehensive plan revision.

¹⁵ We prepared the initial map based on the more specific guidelines set forth by the SWFRPC and the EPA. Instead of relying on the jurisdictions to make the classifications as with Volusia County, the ECFRPC classified the study area initially based on the above guidelines. These initial maps were then sent to the jurisdictions for more site by site review.

- The City of Cocoa Beach informed the ECFRPC that the parks are protected by beach renourishment and should be classified as “Protection Almost Certain.”
- Palm Bay reviewed the maps and stated they had no additional comments or suggestions for the study area.
- The City of Indian Harbour Beach stated the entire city should be classified as “Protection Almost Certain.” The north east island of the city was originally classified as “Protection Reasonably Likely” due to density, however, the city stated the area is newly developed and the most expensive housing in the city. The parks along the coast are hardened as well.
- The City of Cape Canaveral’s planner suggested the entire city be classified as “Protection Almost Certain” due to development patterns.
- The City of Satellite Beach pointed out a park that is used for conservation purposes as well as another park used as recreation. These areas are represented on the map as “Protection Unlikely” and “Protection Reasonably Likely,” respectively. Otherwise, the city’s protection scenario appeared accurate.
- The City of Malabar had no additional comments for the map.
- The Town of Palm Shores, informed the ECFRPC that Palm Shores is built on a twenty foot bluff and is not in a flood zone. The Future Land Use category of “low density” has recently been changed to “Medium Density” and since roads have been widened, lands once inaccessible are now accessible. Therefore, the entire town should be classified as “Protection Almost Certain.”

All suggestions offered by jurisdictions were documented and changed on the maps. Given the experience from jurisdictions within Brevard County, we concluded that providing localities with a first-cut sea level rise planning map based on familiar land use classifications and established policies is a more effective way to engage local government, than simply providing a map with elevations and asking the localities to develop the classifications from scratch. Although it was not practical to engage in a second round of interactions with each of the localities in Volusia County, we provided the County Emergency Management Department with the revised map and explained the

revisions and logic over the phone. Since the first submittal, East Central Florida experienced three hurricanes in rapid succession. Of the three, Hurricanes Charley and Frances inflicted the most damage, which included severe erosion along the barrier islands. In Volusia County most beaches lost their primary dunes and the buildings behind them suffered varying levels of damage. Volusia County Emergency Management expressed interest in the study, recognizing the additional damage that could be caused by a five foot increase in water levels. They requested the RPC explore the possibility of updating the Regional Hurricane Evacuation Study and the potential for incorporating the results of the study into the storm surge models.

Further analysis and changes of the maps continued during the project as new information, directions, and comments were made available. Additionally, during the late stages of the project, SWFRPC informed us that the study area should include all land within 1000 feet of the shore, to account for possible erosion and ensure that the protection classification is visible in county-scale maps.¹⁶ As a result, we added the 1000-foot buffer to the mainland of Brevard County and assigned protection classifications. SWRPC further suggested that the areas over ten feet on the barrier islands of Brevard and Volusia Counties be assigned a protection classification. This was also completed. However, the above changes were not reviewed by the appropriate jurisdictions due to time constraints.¹⁷

Finally, the protection scenarios were colored according to the project guidelines. Table 6 describes each protection scenario and the corresponding color.

¹⁶ This issue had not come up in the original study done by SWFRPC, because all land in that region within 1000 feet of the shore is below the 10-foot contour anyway. Although EPA had provided drafts of reports from other states at the outset of this project, EPA, SWFRPC, and the other RPC's did not discuss the need for this buffer until SWFRPC has a conference call with the various RPC's during a visit by the EPA's project manager during November 2003.

¹⁷ The lack of review is probably not problematic. Including entire barrier islands within the study area makes the maps less confusing, but we know of no reason why the portion of a barrier island above 10 feet in elevation would have any different fate than surrounding portions, given that erosion—not—inundation is the primary impact on both the beach and the high ground immediately inland of the beach. Similarly, inclusion of land within 1000 feet of the shore simply makes the maps easier to read, but we know of no areas where the land between 500-1000 feet from the shore would have a different classification than land 0-500 feet from the shore. The only exception would be some CoBRA areas where we had already dealt with that issue.

Table 6: Categories on final map and corresponding colors.

Conservation	No Protection	Tzavorite Green
Wetlands	Wetlands	Dark Green
Water	Water	Sodalite Blue
Uplands	Protection Unlikely	Cretean Blue
Uplands	Protection Reasonably Likely	Mars Red
Uplands	Protection Almost Certain	Raw Umber
Critical Facilities	Reference	Black Points

Adobe Files of each map were created. See Appendix K and L for final maps. This allows for easy distribution via the Internet and display on the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council website.

Recommended Scale

The scale for the maps of Volusia County and Brevard County were 1:100,000 and 1:150000, respectively. This scale was used in order to provide the maps at the largest scale possible with the counties cut into two 11 x 17 maps each. The Adobe files were then created to allow users to zoom in to specific areas.

ANALYSIS

The study area of Volusia and Brevard counties consists of 153,464 acres (240 square miles) of uplands and 95,950 acres (150 square miles) of wetlands. Therefore, a five foot rise in sea level would affect over 250,000 acres/390 square miles of the coastline, excluding water bodies. This accounts for approximately 18% of the land within Brevard and Volusia Counties. According to the 2000 census, the current population in the coastal census tracts found completely and partially within the study area is approximately 503, 000 in 260,000 dwelling units¹⁸. Coastal Volusia is expected to have a population of 350,000 in 183,000 dwelling units by 2020 while Brevard’s 2020 coastal population is expected to be 199, 000 in 104,000 dwelling units. Therefore, the entire study area is expected to have a high end estimate population of 550, 000 residents in 287,000 dwelling units by 2020.

Table 7 illustrates the breakdown of the various land uses in the study area that are subject to sea level rise. Wetlands and preserves make up the largest percentage of the study area while the most developed/able land use subject to sea level rise is single family residential at 46,000 acres.

Table 7: Breakdown of acreage in region subject to sea level rise.

East Central Florida Land Use Acreage Subject to Sea Level Rise					
Future Land Use	Brevard	Volusia	Total	Square Miles	% of Study Area
Agriculture	246	2674	2920	5	0.653%
Commercial	16002	9211	25213	39	5.637%
Industrial	1616	2690	4306	7	0.963%
Estate	2029	3773	5802	9	1.297%
Multi Family	8035	6423	14458	23	3.233%
Single Family	23471	22815	46286	72	10.349%
Preserve	41194	10809	52003	81	11.627%
Military	1908	0	1908	3	0.427%
Mining	12	0	12	0	0.003%
Wetlands	53613	42395	96008	150	21.466%
Unknown	447	51	498	1	0.111%
Water	165933	31903	197836	309	44.234%
Total Acreage	314506	132744	447250	699	100.000%

¹⁸ Census tracts were used as the analysis was preformed through GIS and the available data was census tacts. The analysis consists of all of the tracts that are entirely or partly in the study area. Therefore, the population analysis includes a population projection for the entire study area and immediate surrounding areas. As a result, the projection numbers are a high end estimate.

The protection scenarios assigned in the region break down as shown in Table 8. For example, the land where shore protection is almost certain accounts for 65,000 acres/102 square miles, which is 15% of the study area. Wetlands and water comprise 65% of the study area.

Table 8: Acreage by Likelihood of Shore Protection – East Central Florida Region

East Central Florida Acreage Per Protection Scenario					
Protection Scenarios	Brevard	Volusia	Total	Square Miles	% of Study Area
No Protection	40976	10287	51263	80	11.46%
Protection Unlikely	618	2990	3608	6	0.81%
Protection Reasonably Likely	21620	11358	32978	52	7.37%
Protection Almost Certain	31740	33812	65552	102	14.66%
Wetlands	53613	42395	96008	150	21.47%
Submerged/Open Water	165933	31902	197835	309	44.23%
Total Acreage	314500	132744	447244	699	100.00%

Table 9 presents the same results, expressed as a percentage of the dry land within the study area. For all practical purposes, past and planned development have already made it inevitable that property will be protected and the inland migration of wetlands will be blocked along 30% of Brevard and 60% of Volusia County shores. Existing conservation lands, however, ensure that wetlands will be able to adjust to rising sea level along the shores of about 45% and 15% of the two counties coastal areas, respectively. Perhaps most importantly, we still have a realistic opportunity to choose between wetland migration or the type of coastal development that causes a gradual loss of wetlands, for approximately 25% of the land in each county. Given current trends, a substantial portion of that land (5%) in Volusia County probably will not be protected, enabling wetlands to migrate.

Table 9: Percentage of Dry Land by Likelihood of Shore Protection

East Central Florida: Percentage of Dry Land by Likelihood of Shore Protection			
Protection Likelihood	Brevard	Volusia	Region
No Protection	43.2%	17.6%	33.4%
Protection Unlikely	0.7%	5.1%	2.4%
Protection Reasonably Likely	22.8%	19.4%	21.5%
Protection Almost Certain	33.4%	57.9%	42.7%

SEA LEVEL RISE PLANNING SOLUTIONS

Beaches erode 100 – 200 feet with every one foot rise in sea level. With a 50 percent chance of the sea level rising 4 feet by 2200, the beaches could erode 200 to 800 feet. Therefore, since most of the waterfront homes are located within 100 to 200 feet of the high water mark, these homes may be largely affected by sea level rise³². This can be very costly when protecting high density areas. “Land use is a state and local responsibility.”³² Therefore, it is important for decisions be made concerning the protection of developed and undeveloped land before it becomes too expensive or impossible to protect the shoreline and property. To determine the areas needing protection, coastal managers should look for relative sea level rise in specific areas. Each regional area has specific forces determining the extent of sea level rise, sea level decline, and inundation. These forces include vertical land movement, coastal erosion, saltwater intrusion, and high water tables⁸.

In the United States, a 1 meter rise in sea level may result in the loss of 50 to 82 percent of coastal wetlands provided all shores are protected. A 2 meter rise could result in a loss of 60 to 90 percent of the wetlands³³. However, it is estimated by protecting only developed areas, less wetlands would be lost because they would have the ability to migrate with the rising sea. Through protecting only developed areas, a 1 meter rise may only inundate 29 to 69 percent of wetlands; 20 percent less than by protecting the entire coastline. A 2 meter rise could result in a 61 to 80 percent loss, not a significant difference from protecting the entire coastline. Since the southeast U.S. contains 85 percent of the coastal wetlands, 90 to 95 percent of the wetland loss would take place in this region³³. This may become a large area of concern for Florida when the time comes to decide how to protect property owners, the natural shoreline, and natural resources.

In order to prevent or prepare for the negative impacts associated with sea level rise, it is important to begin planning for the short term and the long term. There are a number of solutions to every problem and the best solution may vary from site to site. The study area of the Brevard and Volusia coastline is an important ecological and economical resource for the region and the state. Therefore, the best solutions should be planned well enough in advance to protect the resources and property of the region. Some solutions may require immediate action while others may take place over the

course of 200 years; yet the best solutions may be a mix of techniques, structures, and planning.

Regulating Land Use

Comprehensive Planning

The Florida State Legislature enacted the Comprehensive Planning program to address development activity in Florida. The comprehensive plan process addresses the future in a realistic effort by implementing various environmental, social, and economic policies. Comprehensive plans address issues such as location and type of land development, allowable infrastructure in various areas, and coastal and environmental management.

Local comprehensive plans and zoning could be used to limit building in critical areas and provide policies to regulate the type of building and communities desired. These plans are currently not only used to regulate building but also to protect natural areas to ensure the natural migration and change of natural habitats along the coast ¹.

Future land use plans, found in the comprehensive plan, may be an important regulatory tool to protect infrastructure and property from the effects of sea level rise. It can provide specific goals and objectives concerning development, especially in critical areas. Future land use plans also address areas needed for conservation. Analysis of areas along the coast that should be preserved to aid in protection of the coastline should be performed and identified in the land use plans ¹. The plans and regulations can be adjusted to regulate critical areas, thus minimizing the negative effects of sea level rise, economically, physically, and socially.

Future land use plans can be utilized to limit the density and type of development allowed in critical areas. However, this would only be most effective in undeveloped areas or locations which have not been “built out” yet. While most of the developable land in the study area has already been developed, there are still areas currently undeveloped or with low density development. By limiting or discouraging development in these areas, sea level rise may have less impact on infrastructure, the economy, and private property. Future building in critical areas could also be aimed towards activities

related to the ocean and therefore continue to be utilized as sea level rises¹. This would keep the property value and allow the local government to use the areas to create local revenue. While amending the future land use section of the comprehensive plan may be a short term task and the development that may occur may also be short to long term, the effects of these changes will provide long term planning for protection from sea level rise. Without proper planning for the future and poor land use goals and objectives, the effects of sea level rise can be more costly over time¹.

Other changes to comprehensive plans concerning future development in areas in danger of sea level rise can include making new structures in critical areas be temporary and portable. For example, the State of Maine developed the Coastal Sand Dune Rules requires structures interfering with the landward migration of the natural dune system or migration of a sea level rise of up to 3 feet to be mobile and move with the migrating dunes³. Placing regulations on new infrastructure (or rebuilding after destruction), such as being limited to areas outside the critical zones, would be an important change to comprehensive plans. This would encourage development in these areas and limit development in areas likely to be affected by sea level rise. The Volusia and Brevard County Comprehensive plans to discuss the above. Therefore, this is a step in protection against sea level rise. It is important to make certain the suggestions in the comprehensive plan are stringent and followed.

Zoning Regulations

Zoning is the legal aspect of development which regulates a variety of parameters that must be followed by the developer in order to ensure the safety and welfare of the jurisdiction's citizens. Zoning regulations include where a structure is to be placed on the property, maximum allowable structure height, amount of site coverage, and allowable densities¹. As with the comprehensive plan, regulating zoning regulations in critical areas can be an important tool in protecting property, resources, infrastructure, and the economy from sea level rise.

For site specific development, zoning regulations can be amended to regulate where a structure may be placed on a lot, the size or height of the structure, and the densities of a development¹. The placement of a structure on a lot may be of critical importance on

beach front property. The placement can allow for the beach to naturally migrate. Setbacks can be issued and purchased by the government to ensure public beach access³.

Planned Unit Development

Planned Unit Development regulations take zoning to another level. The plans address issues that are unique to a specific parcel of land and the zoning regulations on a PUD may be changed to best fit the land to be developed. Just as changing zoning regulations in critical areas, changing regulations in PUDs can help to limit development, create natural buffers to allow for environmental processes to continue naturally, and allow for more open space to ensure areas for mitigation. Also placing restrictions on development such as building regulations to withstand sea level rise or requiring structures to be mobile so that they may be relocated as sea level rises are important to protect private property and investments. Mitigation for off site areas can be increased so that it may be used if the land's future land use must be eliminated¹.

Developments of Regional Impact

The State of Florida enacted the Development of Regional Impact in order to assess development proposals that may have multi jurisdictional impact. This process is important if one jurisdiction's DRI will effect the sea level rise regulations, mitigations, or policies of another jurisdiction. However, since DRI requires jurisdictions to work together, and then have the approval of the State and Planning Council, many recommendations can be made to ensure the DRI considers local comprehensive plans in regard to sea level rise¹. It may also allow for more cooperation and awareness throughout the region to ensure the best policies and regulations are in effect to protect investments and resources in the coastal communities.

Public and Critical Facilities Location

The development of a region is based generally on the location of certain public facilities and infrastructure. Development of schools, hospitals, and major roadways encourages development and growth in the surrounding areas. In order to limit development in critical areas, a public policy change to place future public facilities and infrastructure outside these critical areas could reduce the impacts of sea level rise on property and resource loss and the cost of protection¹.

Regulations can also be placed on the locations of critical facilities. Structures on the coast may need to be rebuilt or modified to deal with sea level rise and/or the policies the communities may create for beach structures. Any future critical facility construction or reconstruction could be recommended to be placed away from any area vulnerable to sea level rise. More coastal communities may implement such policies for future land use and modeling simulations could be performed. Modifications of structure design, especially emergency buildings, will prepare for the future estimated rise in sea level and associated storm surge.

Critical facilities in vulnerable areas may be relocated by moving the entire structure with its contents or moving the contents only to a new location. The decision would be made dependent upon the type of facility, availability of developable property, and the cost analysis of relocation. If only the contents of the facility are relocated, the vulnerable building could be either demolished or used in a capacity coinciding with sea level rise ¹.

Public Acquisition and Preservation

Open Space Controls

Open space can be classified as public or private. Private lands are owned by a private land owner and may include yards, commercial buffer areas, golf course, agricultural fields, forests, or even private conservation areas. Public lands include right of ways, parks, and conservation/preservation areas. As sea level rises, open space acting as shoreline buffers or outside wetlands will help allow the shore to naturally retreat and wetlands to migrate, as well as shore habitats. Having an appropriate amount of open space could limit the amount of development in critical areas and therefore decrease the loss of expenditure to protect the area and decrease the loss of property ¹. Open space may also be mitigated in order to provide areas for structures to move if necessary when sea level rises. These areas of open space could be used in a method that is compatible with sea level rise while providing an income to the region.

In order to protect natural habitat, such as wetlands or estuaries, public land acquisition may be a feasible solution. This land acquisition may occur through

donations, purchase, or expropriation. Leasebacks, the acquisition of land by a public agency which then sells the land to third parties with the stipulation of open space requirements, and sale backs, similar to the above but the land is acquired by the government and sold to private developers with open space regulations, may also be used to ensure open space in critical areas ¹.

Rolling Easements

The best scenario for low density mainland areas may be a rolling easement as the sea rises. Rolling easements are an option because if the sea level does not rise to expected levels, money would not be spent. If the sea level does rise, the provisions will have been well planned and established before the easements would be in effect. Protecting low value property below the expected rise in sea level would not be realistic as the land would have to be raised at least 5 feet to keep it from becoming inundated. In this scenario, the property will continue to be used beneficially until it must give way to the ocean. Primarily, rolling easements are a warning for the property owner that, eventually, the property may be useless ³².

Public Acquisition and Preservation Programs

Besides obtaining land to limit development to decrease funds spent on protection, acquiring critical areas for habitat migration and reestablishment ensures natural shorelines and resources for the future. However, finding funding to acquire such land may not be feasible at one time. Spanning land acquisitions over time, acquiring the most important areas first, could be more economical. Placing tax exemptions on undeveloped land may encourage private owners to keep the land open ¹.

Public land may be acquired through full fee title or through the acquisition of land use easements. The transfer of private land to public is full fee title acquisition and the use can be compatible with changes in sea level. For example, using land acquired by this method as a public park would decrease the cost of damage if there are few or no buildings. The use of a park may be able to change as sea level rises, especially if land is acquired with buildings on it. As needed the buildings could be moved or demolished and land's use may change as needed. Private ownership still remains when land easements are acquired. However, restrictions on the easement can limit the possible damage of sea level rise to structures ¹. These easements may provide enough buffer on

the property to provide protection to the structures. This may reduce the protection cost encountered by the property owner since the building of a seawall, renourishment, or relocating may not be necessary.

Areas of Critical State Concern

Areas of Critical State Concern is a state program that designates critical areas based on the qualities of the land. A Critical Area must be of environmental, historical, natural, or archaeological importance to the region or state, have major public investment, or present major development potential. This program can be used to control development in areas subjected to sea level rise. The regulations set forth in a critical area are the responsibility of the local government. The state is empowered to regulate land development in a critical area if the local government fails to properly regulate the development and administer its responsibilities¹. Designating areas subjected to sea level rise as critical may be an important step in controlling development and reducing the economic impact of protecting or moving a number of structures.

Transfer of Development Rights

When one area is considered less desirable for development, a transfer of rights may occur between property owners. The development rights that were on the parcel of land are moved to a parcel where development is more desirable. The property may then be used in a less intensive manner or one compatible with sea level rise¹.

Density development rights can be used to keep development in areas subjected to sea level rise to a minimum and transfer the density rights outside the critical areas. Owners outside the area could develop at higher densities than originally allowed if they purchase density development rights from land owners in areas to be affected by sea level rise. If the property owner then chooses to develop the land, it may be used in a less intense capacity¹.

In order for the transfer of development/density rights to work, the property owner outside the critical area must be zoned for densities lower than that which is desirable by the developer. If the densities are already acceptable, the developer may not purchase the development rights. Other restrictions on the land which may limit the densities may include environmental and political. It is also important to determine if the growth that would then occur in the area would be acceptable and committed in terms of infrastructure and public facilities¹.

Engineered Solutions

Beach Renourishment

An effective possibility for resort communities would be to raise the island, or even mainland area, in place by pumping in sand from offshore. To raise the island in place, sand is used to raise lots, roads, and houses. Sand would also be added underwater to maintain the beach slope. Sand would not be needed to raise the entire area. Lots containing buildings could potentially be raised with cheaper materials than sand¹. To deal with small levels of sea level rise, sand would only need to be added to the beach profile. As sea level rises, more sand may be needed to be added further in land to compensate for the continued beach nourishment. Consequently, pumping sand onto the island may result in bays becoming deeper and wider from the sand extraction, thus resulting in increased wetland erosion⁹.

Beach renourishment projects are generally expensive, time consuming, and large scale. However, the study area is dependent upon the beach for tourism and the economy. Therefore, protecting the beaches in Brevard and Volusia Counties is of great importance now and in the future. Brevard County does have an active beach renourishment program; however, Volusia County does not.

Seawalls

Seawalls are found in the study area and may continue to be an important protection option for property owners along the coastline. To keep the wall from cutting under due to increased erosion associated with sea level rise and greater wave energy, beach renourishment, especially in front of sea walls, may be a critical element. This would decrease the chances of the wall crumbling. Engineering a seawall is an option that may be made now depending on the view of the property owner, the erosion experienced on the property, and whether a form of beach renourishment is active in the area. However, a seawall may be built further in the future as sea level rises.

The Army Corps of Engineers has the authority to issue permits to build erosion control features such as bulkheads as long as no vegetated wetlands are filled³². If the property owner is able to fill wetlands to protect their property or compensate for the beachfront loss, they must obtain a permit issued by the Army Corps of Engineers. By

receiving this permit, the property owner must create new wetlands or enhance degraded wetlands³². However, building hard structures to protect property does not allow for the migration of wetlands. It is recommended that wetlands migrate in response to rise in sea level in order to continue to serve as habitat, water filtration system, and mainland protection. If wetland loss of an armored shoreline is compared to wetland loss of unarmored shoreline, 38 percent – 61 percent of wetlands will be lost if the shore is protected, while only 17 percent to 43 percent will be lost if the shore is unprotected³².

Public Awareness

Public awareness and response plays a critical role in preparing for sea level rise. Through hearings, seminars, and workshops, the public can be informed of where sea level rise is expected to impact property and the choices they have as property owners if their property is located in such an area. It is important to make the public aware of the short term and long term responses, policies, and actions available to deal with sea level rise. Specialized media and journals oriented toward various workforce communities are valuable mediums to reach audiences such as engineers, planners, architects, and the like. Public involvement in creating policies and regulations to deal with sea level rise can influence the passage of legislation. Legislation passed may affect the way a community responds to sea level rise.

CONCLUSION

Rule 9J-5 of the Florida Administrative Code does not indicate that local governments are required to address planning for future sea level rise³⁴. Currently, there are no known regulations in effect in Brevard or Volusia County to deal with sea level rise. In the Volusia County comprehensive plan, Policy 11.4.1.21 states that the county will monitor sea level rise to determine when the rise will affect the county and will then act accordingly. Brevard County Policy 4.9 states, “Brevard County shall continue to collect and make available to the public, information related to sea level rise changes.” If statewide and local decisions and efforts are not made to implement ways to protect the shorelines from sea level rise, property owners may take a step in the wrong direction, both economically and environmentally, to protect their property. Issuing statewide regulations may ensure the most economically and environmentally sound efforts are made to ensure the future of the region’s coastline.

As evident from this study, a considerable number of acres of the Brevard and Volusia county coast may be affected from a potential five foot rise in sea level. The areas affected include barrier islands as well as the mainland. Due to the importance of the beach community to the economic well being of the region, important decisions to protect the natural and developed coastline of the counties may eventually be inevitable. Depending upon the area affected, the solution to sea level rise and the implementation costs may vary. Also, the timing to implement the solution may be a critical factor. Should local governments decide through this study and other studies performed in the county that sea level rise evidence does exist and could potentially affect the county, the local government and property owners may begin the initial steps to decide the constraints, areas, solutions, policies, and costs of protecting the region. By beginning initial steps to plan for future sea level rise, the financial and environmental burdens may be eased on the future citizens of the county.

Policies such as redefining zoning, land-use, and density regulations could take effect in the near future and prevent more development in critical areas. Other solutions such as retreating or seawalls may not be necessary until protection is absolutely crucial. However, it may be beneficial for the decision and planning for such a project to be made

in advance to ensure the best research, engineering, costs, and funding. Solutions phased over time, (i.e. beach renourishment and land acquisition) researched and analyzed now, could maximize benefits and cut costs associated with damage and inundation.

This study documents the possible impacts of sea level rise on the coast Brevard and Volusia County. Therefore, in keeping with county policy, if the county and local governments determine this study, combined with other sea level rise studies, to provide enough evidence to begin discussion and more studies on how to protect the coastline from the projected sea level rise, the solutions presented in this study may be a stepping stone. The county and cities are presented, through this study, with options for decision making on land use and protection of common infrastructure and the economic base of the community. Many changes in policies and probable solutions to sea level rise will need to be researched more for specific local costs and effects. Each area needing protection may benefit differently from various solutions. In developing areas, the EPA recommends impact assessments of sea level rise on manmade and natural coastal features. Land use planning processes are recommended to coincide with the impact assessment³. By performing research now and making proactive changes to the infrastructure and management of the coastlines, the problems associated with future sea level rise may be limited and less costly⁸.

The future is always hard to predict with precision. Changes made in the present may influence the predictions made for the future. However, regardless of the predictions for the future, local governments, county government, and property owners are presented with possible solutions for protecting the valuable coastline of the region as well as the impacts a possible five foot rise of sea level may cause. If the sea level does not rise to the predicted levels, at least society was prepared and perhaps changes were made to lower losses in floods and reduce beach erosion. If sea level rises to the predicted levels and preparations have been implemented, there may be less loss of natural habitat, property, infrastructure, and money.

REFERENCES

1. Southwest Regional Planning Council. *Land Use Impacts and Solutions to Sea Level Rise in Southwest Florida*. N.p., n.d.
2. IPCC, 2001: *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis, and Impacts, Adaption, and Vulnerability Reports. A Contribution of Working Groups I, II, and III to the Third Assessment Report of the Integovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Watson, R.T. and the Core Writing Team (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom, and New York, NY, USA.
3. Titus, James, and Narayanan, Vijay. *The Probability of Sea Level Rise*. The United States Environmental Protection Agency: 230-R-95-008, 1995.
4. East Central Florida Regional Planning Council Scope of Work and Methodology, 2004.
5. *Volusia County MPO 2020 Long Range Transportation Plan-Refinement*. Volusia County Metropolitan Planning Organization: November 2000. 4 June 2004. <www.volusiacountympo.com/documents/documents_lrtp.html>
6. Riger, J. "RE: Long Range Plan 2020" jriger@ciesthatwork.com (09 April 2004)
7. Twilley et al. "Confronting Climate Change in the Gulf Coast Region: (Florida)." Union of Concerned Scientists. The Ecological Society of America. (October 2001).
8. Nicholls, Robert and Letherman, Stephen. "Adapting to Sea Level Rise: Relative Sea Level Rise Trends to 2100 for the United States." *Coastal Management*. 24 (1996) 301 -324.
9. Titus, James. "Greenhouse Effect, Sea Level Rise, and Barrier Islands: Case Study of Long Beach Island, New Jersey." *Coastal Management* 18 (1990) 65-90.
<[http://yosemite.epa.gov/oar/globalwarming.nsf/UniqueKeyLookup/SHS_U5BNJTL/\\$File/barrier_islands.pdf](http://yosemite.epa.gov/oar/globalwarming.nsf/UniqueKeyLookup/SHS_U5BNJTL/$File/barrier_islands.pdf)>
10. Thieler, Robert E. *National Assessment of Coastal Vulnerability to Future Sea Level Rise*. United States Geological Society. USGS Fact Sheet FS-076-00. June 2000. 4 June 2004
<<http://pubs.usgs.gov/factsheet/fs76-00/>>
11. Lane, Ed. *Florida's Geological History and Geological Resources*. Tallahassee, Florida: Florida Geological Survey, 1994. 4 June 2004
<<http://webluis.fcla.edu/cgi-bin/cgiwrap/fclwlv3/wlv3/DBCO/DI579156565/DGdlib/SGfeol/FGfeol/SFIP0000130000010044D3C1D5C540E2C3D6E3E34040E2E8D4D6D5E240D1D6C8D540C34040E500004040a%3dLane%2c+Ed/RO1/RP33/CM34/P17>>
12. Lane, Ed., ed. *Global Warming and Sea Level Rise*. Florida Geological Society, 4 June 2004.
<<http://www.clas.ufl.edu/users/guerry/GLY4155/sp35/Fgs35.HTM>>

13. Daniels, R.C., Gornitz, V.M., Mehta, A.J., Lee, S.C., and Cushman, R. M. *Adapting to Sea-Level Rise in the U.S. Southeast: The Influence of Built Infrastructure and Biophysical Factors on the Inundation of Coastal Areas*. Oak Ridge National Laboratory: Environmental Science Division, Publication NO. 3915. November 1992.
14. Ross, David. Introduction to Oceanography. New York: Harper Collins College Publishers, 1995.
15. Trescott, D. "Re: EPA Sea Level Rise Table" dtrescott@swfrpc.org (12 Nov 2003)
16. *Volusia County Erosion Assessment Study for Shorelines South of Ponce DeLeon Inlet to Canaveral National Seashore*. Jacksonville, FL: Taylor Engineering, Inc., December 2003.
17. "Mean Sea Level Trends." Tides and Currents. NOAA. 2 May 2004.
<http://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/sltrends_states.shtml?region=fl>
18. *Critical Beach Erosion Areas in Florida*. Department of Environmental Protection. Division of Water Resources Management. Bureau of Beaches and Wetland Resources. Report # BCS-99-02. Updated August 2003. 7 June 2004.
<<http://www.dep.state.fl.us/beaches/publications/pdf/errptall.pdf>>
19. *Volusia County Comprehensive Plan*. Volusia County Government: Ordinance #2002-14. 2002. 7 June 2004.
<<http://www.volusia.org/growth/planinfo.htm>>
20. "Coastal Barriers Resource Act (CBRA), 1990 as Amended." FEMA: Environment and Historic. Federal Emergency Management Agency. Last Updated 24 May 2004. 7 June 2004. <<http://www.fema.gov/ehp/cbra.shtm>>
21. "Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972: Sections 1451, 1452, 1456." Coastal Zone Management. Revised March 30, 2004. 7 June 2004.
<http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/czm/czm_act.html>
22. "Building Regulations on the Coast." Florida Department of Environmental Protection. 31 March 2004. 7 June 2004.
<<http://www.dep.state.fl.us/cmp/issues/build.htm>>
23. *Strategic Beach Management Plan: Central Atlantic Coast Region*. Florida Department of Environmental Protection Office of Beaches and Coastal Systems. 10-2-2000. 7 June 2004.
<<http://www.dep.state.fl.us/beaches/publications/pdf/cen-atl.pdf>>
24. "Florida State Statutes: Chapters 161 and 373." The 2003 Florida State Statutes. The Florida Senate. 7 June 2004.
<http://www.flsenate.gov/Statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Index&Title_Request=XL#TitleXL>
25. *1988 Brevard County Comprehensive Plan*. Brevard County Government: 1988. 16 September 2003. 7 June 2004.
<<http://countygovt.brevard.fl.us/zoning/p-compplan6.cfm#preface>>

26. “Long Range Transportation Plan Update: Populations and Trends.” Volusia County MPO 2025. Volusia County Metropolitan Planning Organization. 7 June 2004. <http://www.vcmpo2025.com/volusia_cities.html>
27. Main, M. Karim, A., and Hostetler, M. *Conservation Options for Private Landowners In Florida*. Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation, Florida Cooperative Extension Service, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, University of Florida Series: Circular 144. April 2003. EDIS. University of Florida, Institute of Food and Agricultural Services. 7 June 2004. <<http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu/UW194>>
28. Environmentally Endangered Lands Program. Brevard County Parks 4 June 2004. <<http://www.brevardparks.com/eel/>>
29. *Facility Vulnerability Assessment*. Volusia County Emergency Management Division. 2003.
30. Titus, J. “Completion of Last Email Sent by Mistake” jtitus@epamail.epa.gov 3 Dec. 2003.
31. Trescott, D. “Statewide Approach for Identifying Likelihood of Land Use Protection.” dtrescott@swfrpc.org 26 May 2004.
32. Titus, J. “Rising Seas, Coastal Erosion, and the Takings Clause: How to Save Wetlands and Beaches without Hurting Property Owners.” *Maryland Law Review* no. 57 (1998) 4:1280-1399.
33. Titus, J. et al. “Greenhouse Effect and Sea Level Rise: The Cost of Holding Back the Sea.” *Coastal Management* 19 (1991) 171-210.
34. Florida Administrative Code Chapter 9J-5. 7 June 2004. <<http://fac.dos.state.fl.us/faconline/chapter09.pdf>>
35. Brevard County Florida Real Estate Magazine. 2004. 7 June 2004. <<http://www.4brevard.com/brevard-real-estate.shtml>>
36. Trescott, D. “Fw: Sea Level Rise Report” dtrescott@swfrpc.org 7 April 2004.

APPENDIX

Appendix A

EAST CENTRAL FLORIDA REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

SCOPE OF WORK AND METHODOLOGY

SEA LEVEL RISE MAPPING AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT REVIEW AND APPROVAL

A. Mapping Requirements (Completion Date 12/31/03 or sooner)

1. A five-foot rise in sea level within 200 years will be analyzed by the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council (ECFRPC) for the counties of Brevard and Volusia Counties. The estimated rate of sea level rise over the next 200 years and the probability of that rise for the Southeast Florida region will be provided in a table by the Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council (SWFRPC) based on an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) report Title "The Probability of Sea Level Rise".
2. Based on the five-foot rise in 200 years, the new mean sea level shoreline will be at the current five-foot contour line. Furthermore, when adding a few feet for an astronomical high tide the sea level will be at the seven or eight-foot contour line. However, because seven or eight-foot contour lines are not readily available the ten foot contour line must be used. Therefore, the ECFRPC study area for a five-foot rise will be everything below the ten-foot contour line.
3. The maps for each county will include the following:
 - A. Water features shown light cyan
 - B. Wetlands shown as dark green
 - C. 0' to 10' Uplands, not protected from sea level rise shown as light green
 - D. 0' to 10' Uplands, protection likely but wetland migration possible shown as dark red
 - E. 0' to 5, 0' to 10' or 5' to 10' Uplands, protection not likely shown as blue
 - F. 0' to 5, 0' to 10' or 5' to 10' Uplands, protection definite shown as brown
 - G. Above 10' shown as white
 - H. Critical Facilities 0' to 5' Protection not recommended shown as dark blue
 - I. Critical Facilities 5' to 10' Protection definite shown as brown
 - J. Roads shown as thin black lines
 - K. Above 10' shown as white
 - L. North arrow symbol and scale.
4. To complete the maps features discussed above the ECFRPC will use the best

available data as follows:

- A. 5 and 10-foot contour lines are usually available from the Saint Johns Water Management Districts, the U. S. Geological Survey Quadrangles and/or local governments. All land areas above 10' in elevation are to be shown as white.
 - B. Water, wetlands and uplands will be determined using the Florida Land Use Cover Classification Code System (FLUCCS) Level 1. A few exceptions to be applied as water and uplands in the Level 1 non wetland areas, are "canals and locks", "slough waters" and "embayments not opening" to be shown as water and "beaches other than swimming beaches" to be shown as uplands.
 - C. Using the FLUCCS a determination can be made as to what is water to be colored light cyan and what are wetlands to be colored dark green.
 - D. To determine the protection scenarios colors on the upland areas, knowledge of the generalized land uses must be defined based on the future land use map of the region, which is based on the local government future land use map in their Local Government Comprehensive Plan. The generalized land uses shall be defined as follows: agriculture, commercial, estate, industrial, mining, multi-family, preserve, single family and water.
 - E. The ECFRPCs must make assumptions regarding the protection scenarios by land use. For example, in the Southwest Florida Region it was assumed that agriculture, mining and upland preserves between 0 to 10' in elevation would not protect their property from sea level rise and therefore would be colored light green. While most commercial, estate, industrial, multi-family and single family between 0 to 10' in elevation would "likely protect" their property from sea level rise and therefore would be colored red. Dark blue areas would be land uses between 0 to 5' in elevation that are not likely to be protected from sea level rise and might be areas such as unbridged barrier island, low income housing, low value property not on central water and sewer or repetitive flood loss properties.
 - F. The final color to be assigned to the map is brown and it is assumed that protection of these areas would be definite. In the Southwest Florida Region only critical facilities as defined within the Local Mitigation Strategy Reports between the elevation of 5' and 10' are colored brown. Critical facilities below 5' in elevation are shown as blue where protection is not recommended. It is assumed that government owned critical facilities in this area should relocate these facilities to higher ground.
5. The final maps must be completed in Graphic Information System shape files or coverage. Acreages must be provided for areas colored on the maps except for water areas. JPGs for each map must also be created for easy distribution through the

Internet and for display on the ECFRPC website and Environmental Protection Agency website. The SWFRPC will provide a readme file on further explanation on the GIS development of these maps to assist the ECFRPC in this GIS mapping effort.

6. The ECFRPC shall provide paper maps in E-size to local governments for their review and approval. A compatible printable electronic version of the maps shall also be produced so maps can be printed within the region by local governments.

B. Local Government Review within the ECFRPC Planning Area (Completion Date 4/1/04)

1. A draft map of each county will be reviewed by local government staff. The Local Mitigation Strategy group organized in each county could be the best forum for presenting this map. However, other meetings with local government staff to seek input on the maps will be up to the discretion of the ECFRPC staff.
2. Final approval of the maps must be from the ECFRPC at one of their regular Council meetings or by other local elected officials at a public hearing held within a local government.

C. Final Report (Completion Date 6/1/04)

The final report shall include a summary of the mapping results including regional acreage subject to sea level rise, regional wetland acreage subject to sea level rise, regional land use acreage subject to sea level rise, local government and ECFRPC meeting summaries of map reviews, current planning if any for sea level rise at the local level. The final report shall also include a table provided by the SWFRPC staff predicting the rate of sea level rise over the next 200 years and a summary of solutions to sea level rise impacts on land uses to be provided by the SWFRPC and supplemented by other solutions the ECFRPC may develop during the course of the project from input within the region.

D. Coordination between the ECFRPC and SWFRPC (On going)

The SWFRPC staff will be available to coordinate with the ECFRPC staff in the completion of any portion of A and B above. The ECFRPC staff will provide draft maps to the SWFRPC and USEPA staff for review and approval before review by local government staff. The review is necessary to ensure nationwide consistency of this mapping effort.

Appendix B

Volusia County Comprehensive Plan (Sea Level Rise Section)

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES

GOAL:

11.4 Protect, enhance and restore the functioning of the beach and dune systems and prohibit development activities that would damage or destroy such systems.

OBJECTIVE:

11.4.1 Maintain standards to minimize the impacts of structures and development on beach and dune systems and where necessary initiate dune restoration programs.

POLICIES:

11.4.1.21 Volusia County should continue to monitor sea level rise science to determine when and if a sea level rise event will affect the County. Based on pertinent data, the County will act accordingly.

Appendix C

Brevard County Comprehensive Plan (Sea Level Rise Section)

Objective 4

Brevard County shall implement and improve as necessary a comprehensive beach and dune management program which protects, enhances and restores a naturally functioning beach system as funding is available.

Policy 4.9

Brevard County shall continue to collect and make available to the public information related to sea level changes.

Appendix D

Email with Estimated Sea Level Rise for East Central Florida Table

From: Dan Trescott [dtrescott@swfrpc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2003 8:34 AM
To: tara@ecfrpc.org
Subject: RE: EPA sea level rise table

I believe I sent this table earlier to Jeff Jones, but here it is again. Any questions, please let me know.

Dan

-----Original Message-----

From: Tim Walker [mailto:twalker@swfrpc.org]
Sent: Monday, November 10, 2003 1:57 PM
To: tara
Cc: Dan Trescott
Subject: RE: EPA sea level rise table

Tara,
Dan Trescott should have that or at least know more. I'm copying him this email so you'll have his email or that he can respond to you. Dan is out of the office till Wed.

Tim Walker
GIS Coordinator
Southwest Florida Regional
Planning Council
(239) 656-7720
<http://www.swfrpc.org/>

-----Original Message-----

From: tara [mailto:tara@ecfrpc.org]
Sent: Monday, November 10, 2003 1:31 PM
To: 'Tim Walker'
Subject: EPA sea level rise table

Tim,

According to our scope, we should receive from SWFRPC a table to put in our report that is from the EPA predicting the sea level rise over the next 200 years.

Do you have this table or know who to contact to get it?

Thanks

Tara McCue

East Central Florida Regional Planning Council

tara@ecfrpc.org

407-623-1075

Appendix E

Email with Federal Policies Attachment from Jim Titus

From: Dan Trescott [dtrescott@swfrpc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, April 07, 2004 11:45 AM
To: 'tara'
Subject: FW: Sea Level Rise Report

-----Original Message-----

From: Titus.Jim@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Titus.Jim@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, April 06, 2004 4:55 PM
To: Dan Trescott
Subject: Re: Sea Level Rise Report

(See attached file: Federal Policies Insert.doc)

As discussed--I may have missed a few important ones but this gives a flavor. There are other policies that mention sea level rise, but it's a bit hard to tell what the actual impact is.

Dan Trescott

<dtrescott@swfrpc To: Jim
Titus/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
.org> cc:
Subject: Sea Level Rise
Report
03/26/2004 03:47
PM

Jim:

As part of your comments on the report, you indicated that you would send the Federal Policies regarding sea level rise. We are ready to add that section to the report. The other RPCs need it too for their report.

Thanks
Dan

Appendix F

Coastal Zone Management Act

(Sea Level Rise Sections)

§ 1451. Congressional findings (Section 302)

(I) Because global warming may result in a substantial sea level rise with serious adverse effects in the coastal zone, coastal states must anticipate and plan for such an occurrence.

§ 1452. Congressional declaration of policy (Section 303)

The Congress finds and declares that it is the national policy—

2) to encourage and assist the states to exercise effectively their responsibilities in the coastal zone through the development and implementation of management programs to achieve wise use of the land and water resources of the coastal zone, giving full consideration to ecological, cultural, historic, and esthetic values as well as the needs for compatible economic development, which programs should at least provide for—

B) the management of coastal development to minimize the loss of life and property caused by improper development in flood-prone, storm surge, geological hazard, and erosion-prone areas and in areas likely to be affected by or vulnerable to sea level rise, land subsidence, and saltwater intrusion, and by the destruction of natural protective features such as beaches, dunes, wetlands, and barrier islands,

(K) the study and development, in any case in which the Secretary considers it to be appropriate, of plans for addressing the adverse effects upon the coastal zone of land subsidence and of sea level rise; and

(3) to encourage the preparation of special area management plans which provide for increased specificity in protecting significant natural resources, reasonable coastal-dependent economic growth, improved protection of life and property in hazardous areas, including those areas likely to be affected by land subsidence, sea level rise, or fluctuating water levels of the Great Lakes, and improved predictability in governmental decision making;

§ 1453. Definitions (Section 304)

For the purposes of this title--

(1) The term "coastal zone" means the coastal waters (including the lands therein and thereunder) and the adjacent shorelands (including the waters therein and thereunder), strongly influenced by each other and in proximity to the shorelines of the several coastal states, and includes islands, transitional and intertidal areas, salt marshes, wetlands, and beaches. The zone extends, in Great Lakes waters, to the international boundary between the United States and Canada and, in other areas, seaward to the outer limit of State title and ownership under the Submerged Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.), the Act of March 2, 1917 (48 U.S.C. 749), the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America, as approved by the Act of March 24, 1976 (48 U.S.C. 1681 note), or section 1 of the Act of November 20, 1963 (48 U.S.C. 1705), as applicable. The zone extends inland from the shorelines only to the extent necessary to control shorelands, the uses of which have a direct and significant impact on the coastal waters, and to control those geographical areas which are likely to be affected by or vulnerable to sea level rise. Excluded from the coastal zone are lands the use of which is by law subject solely to the discretion of or which is held in trust by the Federal Government, its officers or agents.

1456b. Coastal Zone Enhancement Grants (Section 309)

(a) For purposes of this section, the term "coastal zone enhancement objective" means any of the following objectives:

- (1) Protection, restoration, or enhancement of the existing coastal wetlands base, or creation of new coastal wetlands.
- (2) Preventing or significantly reducing threats to life and destruction of property by eliminating development and redevelopment in high-hazard areas, managing development in other hazard areas, and anticipating and managing the effects of potential sea level rise and Great Lakes level rise.

Appendix G

Email from Dan Trescott with State-wide Approach for Identifying Likelihood of Land Use Protection

From: Dan Trescott [dtrescott@swfrpc.org]
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2004 12:04 PM
To: tara; 'Jeff Alexander'; 'Jjones'; 'John Hulsey'; 'Manny Cela'; 'Peter G. Merritt'; 'Postal, Maurice'; 'Keith Joiner'
Subject: SLR Land Use Decision Table

Good Morning All:

Attached is the Land Use Decision table for SLR project. The Titus changes are accepted in the SWFRPC changes table. So we are going with the changes Titus made. So the SWFRPC changes will be the most up to date table we will use. I only added (based on local knowledge next to the government owned sources used column relative to parks and local planner input). Please review these changes one final time and let me know if you have any concerns implementing this on the maps. Regarding the Line File issue we are going with the land use defined under the line and if the line is over a beach or below mean high water such as is the case apparently in portions of ECFRPC the adjacent land use based on the Decision Table will define the color. Any questions please let me know.

Thanks

Dan

Appendix H

Brevard County Critical Facilities							
FACILITY NAME	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP	FACILITY NUMBER	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE
MELBOURNE BEACH FIRE STATION	505 OCEAN AVE	MELBOURNE BEACH	FL	32951000	12009440000002	28.067780	-80.564440
MELBOURNE BEACH PUBLIC WORKS DEPT	507 OCEAN AVE	MELBOURNE BEACH	FL	32951000	12009440000003	28.067780	-80.564440
MELBOURNE BEACH TOWN HALL	507 OCEAN AVE	MELBOURNE BEACH	FL	32951000	12009440000004	28.067780	-80.564440
MELBOURNE FIRE STATION #1	865 EAU GALLIE BLVD.	MELBOURNE	FL	32935000	12009439750010	28.128330	-80.635560
MELBOURNE WWTP-GRANT ST	2300 GRANT STREET	MELBOURNE	FL	32901000	12009439750021	28.073610	-80.609720
SATELLITE BEACH FIRE DEPARTMENT	1390 S. PATRICK DRIVE	SATELLITE BEACH	FL	32937000	12009644000001	28.188330	-80.606940
SATELLITE BEACH POLICE DEPARTMENT	510 CINNAMON DRIVE	SATELLITE BEACH	FL	32937000	12009644000002	28.109170	-80.580280
SATELLITE BEACH PUBLIC WORKS	530 CINNAMON DRIVE	SATELLITE BEACH	FL	32937000	12009644000003	28.172220	-80.610280
SCHOOL BOARD, AUDUBON ELEMENTARY	1201 N. BANANA RIVER DRIVE	MERRITT ISLAND	FL	32927800	12009442750004	28.376940	-80.668610
SCHOOL BOARD, CAPE VIEW ELEMENTARY	8440 NORTH ROSALIND	CAPE CANAVERAL	FL	32920219	12009102500004	28.391670	-80.599440
SCHOOL BOARD, EDGEWOOD JUNIOR HIGH	180 E. MERRITT AVENUE	MERRITT ISLAND	FL	32953349	12009442750006	28.361670	-80.696940
SCHOOL BOARD, FAIRGLEN ELEMENTARY	201 INDIAN TRAIL	COCOA	FL	32927590	12009131500025	28.438060	-80.760280
SCHOOL BOARD, GARDENDALE ELEMENTARY	301 GROVE BLVD.	MERRITT ISLAND	FL	32953449	12009442750007	28.378890	-80.707780
SCHOOL BOARD, GEMINI ELEMENTARY	2100 OAK STREET	MELBOURNE BEACH	FL	32951279	12009440000005	28.054440	-80.554440
SCHOOL BOARD, HOOVER JUNIOR HIGH SCHO	1 HAWK HAVEN DRIVE	INDIALANTIC	FL	32903299	12009333750003	28.100280	-80.575560
SCHOOL BOARD, INDIALANTIC ELEMENTARY	1050 NORTH PALM AVE	INDIALANTIC	FL	32903309	12009333750004	28.099720	-80.573330
SCHOOL BOARD, JEFFERSON JUNIOR HIGH	1275 S. COURTENAY PARKWAY	MERRITT ISLAND	FL	32952389	12009442750008	28.334720	-80.686940
SCHOOL BOARD, MERRITT ISLAND HIGH SCH	100 EAST MUSTANG WAY	MERRITT ISLAND	FL	32953319	12009442750009	28.376390	-80.700280
SCHOOL BOARD, MILA ELEMENTARY	288 W. MERRITT AVE	MERRITT ISLAND	FL	32953472	12009442750010	28.361670	-80.702220
SCHOOL BOARD, OCEAN BREEZE ELEMENTARY	1101 CHEYENNE DRIVE	INDIAN HARBOUR BEAC	FL	32937369	12009334500002	28.149440	-80.591940
SCHOOL BOARD, ROOSEVELT K-8 SCHOOL	1400 MINUTEMEN CAUSEWAY	COCOA	FL	32931209	12009131500027	28.316670	-80.631390
SCHOOL BOARD, SEA PARK ELEMENTARY	300 SEA PARK BOULEVARD	SATELLITE BEACH	FL	32937219	12009644000004	28.202500	-80.605560
SCHOOL BOARD, TITUSVILLE HIGH SCHOOL	150 TERRIER TRAIL	TITUSVILLE	FL	32780473	12009719000018	28.594720	-80.806110

Brevard County Critical Facilities

FACILITY NAME	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP	FACILITY NUMBER	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE
SCHOOL BOARD, TROPICAL ELEMENTARY	885 S. COURTENAY PARKWAY	MERRITT ISLAND	FL	32952499	12009442750011	28.341110	-80.694720
TITUSVILLE POLICE DEPT. SUB-STATION	1026 PALMETTO	TITUSVILLE	FL	32796000	12009719000020	28.609440	-80.808610
TITUSVILLE, CITY HALL ANNEX	445 S. WASHINGTON AVE.	TITUSVILLE	FL	32796000	12009719000023	28.609440	-80.807220
TITUSVILLE, MUNICIPAL MARINA	451 MARINA ROAD	TITUSVILLE	FL	32796000	12009719000024	28.621390	-80.811390
SATELLITE BEACH POLICE DEPT	565 CASSIA BLVD	SATELLITE BEACH	FL	0	12009644000005	28.170870	-80.604810
INDIAN HARBOUR BCH	40 CHEYENNE CT	INDIAN HARBOUR BEAC	FL	0	12009334500003	28.146110	-80.598060
COCOA BCH POLICE DEPT	20 S ORLANDO AVE	COCOA	FL	32932	12009131500030	28.309200	-80.610850
INDIALANTIC POLICE DEPT	220 FIFTH AVE	INDIALANTIC	FL	32903	12009333750005	28.090890	-80.570130
MELBOURNE BEACH POLICE DEPT	505 CINNAMON DR	MELBOURNE BEACH	FL	32951	12009440000006	28.067430	-80.564700
LEWIS CARROLL ELEMENTARY	1 SKYLINE BLVD	MERRITT ISLAND	FL	32953		28.393850	-80.699900
CAPE VIEW ELEMENTARY	8440 N ROSALIND AV	CAPE CANAVERAL	FL	0	12009102500005	28.392800	-80.599380
DEVINE MERCY CATHOLIC SCHOOL	1940 N COURTENAY PKWY	MERRITT ISLAND	FL	32953		28.390830	-80.702980
PALM CHAPEL CHRISTIAN SCHOOL	1890 N COURTENAY PKWY	MERRITT ISLAND	FL	32953		28.389260	-80.702750
GARDENDALE ELEMENTARY	GROVE BLVD	MERRITT ISLAND	FL	32953		28.378720	-80.706800
AUDUBON ELEMENTARY	1201 N BANANA RIVER DR	MERRITT ISLAND	FL	32953		28.377040	-80.669280
MERRITT ISLAND HIGH	100 E MUSTAND WAY	MERRITT ISLAND	FL	32953		28.376250	-80.701400
CHURCH OF OUR SAVIOUR	5301 N ATLANTIC AV	COCOA	FL	0	12009131500037	28.366240	-80.607230
EDGEWOOD JUNIOR HIGH	180 E MERRITT AV	MERRITT ISLAND	FL	32953		28.361750	-80.695550
MILA ELEMENTARY	288 W MERRITT AV	MERRITT ISLAND	FL	32953		28.361650	-80.703280
BARRY UNIVERSITY	41 E MERRITT AV	MERRITT ISLAND	FL	32953		28.360630	-80.699360
MERRITT ISLAND CHRISTIAN SCHOO	140 MAGNOLIA AV		FL	0		28.356050	-80.701700
ST MARKS ACADEMY	4 CHURCH ST	COCOA	FL	0	12009131500039	28.353650	-80.724900
TROPICAL ELEMENTARY	885 S COURTENAY PKY	MERRITT ISLAND	FL	32953		28.341340	-80.695080
THOMAS JEFFERSON JR HIGH	1275 S COURTENAY PKWY	MERRITT ISLAND	FL	32953		28.334560	-80.686970
MICHAEL BIEBINK SCHOOL	1900 S TROPICAL TR	MERRITT ISLAND	FL	32953		28.323070	-80.689350
COCOA BEACH HIGH	1500 MINUTEMEN CSWY	COCOA	FL	0	12009131500041	28.317550	-80.626830
THEODORE ROOSEVELT K-8	1400 MINUTEMEN CSWY	COCOA	FL	0	12009131500042	28.317540	-80.626300
COCOA BEACH CHRISTIAN SCHOOL	830 S ATLANTIC AV	COCOA	FL	0	12009131500044	28.303290	-80.609400
EMBRY RIDDLE AERONAUTICAL UNIV	1140 SCHOOL AV		FL	0		28.228120	-80.602380
SEA PARK ELEMENTARY	300 SEA PARK BLVD	SATELLITE BEACH	FL	0	12009644000006	28.202500	-80.604360
SATELLITE HIGH	300 SCORPION CT	SATELLITE BEACH	FL	0	12009644000007	28.186360	-80.597400
SPESSARD L HOLLAND ELEMENTARY	50 HOLLAND CT	SATELLITE BEACH	FL	0	12009644000008	28.185400	-80.604000
DELAURA JUNIOR HIGH	300 JACKSON AV	SATELLITE BEACH	FL	0	12009644000009	28.183450	-80.597000

Brevard County Critical Facilities

FACILITY NAME	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP	FACILITY NUMBER	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE
SURFSIDE ELEMENTARY	401 CASSIA BLVD	SATELLITE BEACH	FL	0	12009644000010	28.171450	-80.598800
ESPECIALLY FOR CHILDREN	1230 BANANA RIVER DR	INDIAN HARBOUR BEAC	FL	0	12009334500004	28.152100	-80.597990
OCEAN BREEZE ELEMENTARY	1101 CHEYENNE DR	INDIAN HARBOUR BEAC	FL	0	12009334500005	28.149570	-80.591760
BREVARD CO PUBLIC SAFETY - STA #83	5455 OLD DIXIE HIGHWAY	GRANT	FL	32949000		27.928330	-80.528060
BREVARD CO ROAD & BRIDGE-CENTRAL AREA	555 CONE ROAD	MERRITT ISLAND	FL	32952000	12009442750002	28.345830	-80.689440
BREVARD CO ROAD AND BRIDGE-TRAFFIC OP	580 MANOR DRIVE	MERRITT ISLAND	FL	32952000	12009442750003	28.345000	-80.688890
BREVARD CO WWTP-SO BEACHES REGIONAL	2800-S. HIGHWAY A1A	MELBOURNE BEACH	FL	32951000	12009440000001	28.041670	-80.547220
CAPE CANAVERAL WWTP	600 TOWER BOULEVARD	CAPE CANAVERAL	FL	32920000	12009102500003	28.393060	-80.619440
COCOA BEACH POLICE DEPT	2 SOUTH ORLANDO AVENUE	COCOA	FL	32931000	12009131500008	28.325000	-80.645830
COCOA BEACH WATER RECLAMATION	1600 WESTEND MINUTEMEN CAUSEWAY	COCOA	FL	32931000	12009131500011	28.325000	-80.645830
COCOA BEACH, FIRE STATION #1	25 SOUTH ORLANDO AVENUE	COCOA	FL	32931000	12009131500013	28.325000	-80.645830
COCOA BEACH, FIRE STATION #2	151 WEST VOLUSIA LANE	COCOA	FL	32931000	12009131500014	28.325000	-80.645830
HOSPITAL, CAPE CANAVERAL	P.O. BOX 320069 (STATE ROAD #520)	COCOA	FL	32932006	12009131500016	28.361110	-80.622220
INDIALANTIC FIRE STATION	216 FOURTH AVE	INDIALANTIC	FL	32903000	12009333750001	28.090830	-80.570280
INDIAN HARBOUR BEACH POLICE DEPT	2055 S. PATRICK DRIVE 40 CHEYENNE COUR	INDIAN HARBOUR BEAC	FL	32937000	12009334500001	28.146110	-80.598000
SCHOOL BOARD, CARROLL ELEMENTARY	1 SKYLINE BLVD.	MERRITT ISLAND	FL	32953309	12009442750005	28.394440	-80.699720
SCHOOL BOARD, COCOA BEACH HIGH SCHOOL	1500 MINUTEMAN CAUSEWAY	COCOA	FL	32931209	12009131500021	28.316670	-80.631390
RIVERSIDE CHRISTIAN ACADEMY	3333 N RIVERSIDE DR	INDIALANTIC	FL	0	12009333750006	28.130720	-80.591230
EAU GALLIE HIGH	1400 COMMODORE BLVD	MELBOURNE	FL	0	12009439750046	28.128360	-80.647680
HERBERT C HOOVER JUNIOR HIGH	1 HAWK HAVEN DR	INDIALANTIC	FL	0	12009333750007	28.101550	-80.575040
INDIALANTIC ELEMENTARY	1050 N PALM AV	INDIALANTIC	FL	0	12009333750008	28.096430	-80.573360
GEMINI ELEMENTARY	2100 OAK ST	MELBOURNE BEACH	FL	0	12009440000007	28.054730	-80.556130
TITUSVILLE HIGH	150 TERRIER TRAIL	TITUSVILLE	FL	0	12009719000036	28.592330	-80.804240
ST TERESA CATHOLIC SCHOOL	207 OJIBWAY AV	TITUSVILLE	FL	0	12009719000041	28.580950	-80.803880
FAIRGLEN ELEMENTARY	201 INDIAN TRAIL	COCOA	FL	0	12009131500047	28.438050	-80.760470

Brevard County Critical Facilities

FACILITY NAME	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP	FACILITY NUMBER	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE
CAPE CANAVERAL HOSPITAL	701 W COCOA BEACH CAUSEWAY	COCOA	FL	0	12009131500051	28.358820	-80.623370
FIRE STATION	113 HOPKINS AV S	TITUSVILLE	FL	32796	12009719000048	28.613630	-80.808070
FIRE STATION	6400 TROPICAL TRL N	MERRITT ISLAND N	FL	0		28.471710	-80.710810
FIRE STATION	300 ALMA BLVD	MERRITT ISLAND	FL	32953	12009442750012	28.384130	-80.707780
FIRE STATION	840 BANANA RIVER DR N	MERRITT ISLAND NE	FL	0		28.371070	-80.668090
FIRE STATION	151 VOLUSIA LA W	COCOA	FL	32931	12009131500053	28.359170	-80.610440
FIRE STATION	902 AIRPORT RD	MERRITT ISLAND	FL	32952	12009442750013	28.341560	-80.690660
FIRE STATION	25 ORLANDO AV S	COCOA	FL	32931	12009131500056	28.317340	-80.609920
FIRE STATION	299 SEA PARK BLVD	SATELLITE BEACH	FL	0	12009644000012	28.204050	-80.603700
FIRE STATION	216 FOURTH AV	INDIALANTIC	FL	32903	12009333750010	28.090890	-80.570260
FIRE STATION	2550 A1A HWY S	MELBOURNE BEACH	FL	31951	12009440000008	28.047800	-80.551680
FIRE STATION	5455 OLD DIXIE HWY	GRANT	FL	32949		27.928230	-80.527540
FIRE STATION	7400 A1A HWY	SUNNYLAND BEACH	FL	32951		27.927300	-80.486910
FIRE STATION	190 JACKSON AV	CAPE CANAVERAL	FL	32920	12009102500007	28.386930	-80.604730
FIRE STATION	1390 PATRICK DR S	SATELLITE BEACH	FL	0	12009644000013	28.172390	-80.606750
FIRE STATION	505 OCEAN AV.	MELBOURNE BEACH	FL	32951	12009440000009	28.067460	-80.564230
FIRE STATION	600 WALLACE AV	INDIAN HARBOUR BEAC	FL	0	12009334500012	28.139750	-80.583490
FIRE STATION	505 1/2 OCEAN AV.	MELBOURNE BEACH	FL	0	12009440000010	28.067290	-80.564230
FIRE STATION	418 PINE ST	TITUSVILLE	FL	0	12009719000053	28.610060	-80.810910
FIRE STATION		INDIAN HARBOUR BEAC	FL	0	12009334500013	28.150510	-80.599370
FIRE STATION		PAFB	FL	0		28.271290	-80.606580
BCU - SYKES CREEK REGIONAL WWTP			FL	0		28.423890	-80.705670
SOUTH BREVARD WATER CO-OP			FL	0		27.927320	-80.488580
SOUTH BREVARD WATER CO-OP			FL	0		27.927320	-80.488580
CITY OF COCOA - BANANA RIVER PUMP STA			FL	0		28.359490	-80.654480
CITY OF MELBOURNE - GRANT STREET WRF		MELBOURNE	FL	0	12009439750090	28.073070	-80.609480
CITY OF MELBOURNE - GRANT STREET WRF		MELBOURNE	FL	0	12009439750091	28.073070	-80.609480
CITY OF TITUSVILLE - SAND POINT WRF		TITUSVILLE	FL	0	12009719000065	28.623660	-80.816940
CITY OF TITUSVILLE - SAND POINT WRF		TITUSVILLE	FL	0	12009719000066	28.623660	-80.816940
CITY OF TITUSVILLE - SAND POINT WRF		TITUSVILLE	FL	0	12009719000067	28.623660	-80.816940
BCU - SOUTH BEACHES REGIONAL WWTP			FL	0		28.040750	-80.548760

Brevard County Critical Facilities

FACILITY NAME	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP	FACILITY NUMBER	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE
BCU - SOUTH BEACHES REGIONAL WWTP			FL	0		28.040750	-80.548760
CITY OF COCOA BEACH - WATER RECLAM. F		COCOA	FL	0	12009131500068	28.317120	-80.632630
COLONY PARK UTILITIES - WWTP			FL	0		28.478030	-80.712420
NASA - JOHN F. KENNEDY SPACE CENTER (FL	0		28.586670	-80.650360
NASA - JOHN F. KENNEDY SPACE CENTER (FL	0		28.586670	-80.650360
NASA - JOHN F. KENNEDY SPACE CENTER (FL	0		28.586670	-80.650360
NASA - JOHN F. KENNEDY SPACE CENTER (FL	0		28.586670	-80.650360
NASA - JOHN F. KENNEDY SPACE CENTER (FL	0		28.586670	-80.650360
NASA - JOHN F. KENNEDY SPACE CENTER (FL	0		28.586670	-80.650360
NASA - JOHN F. KENNEDY SPACE CENTER (FL	0		28.586670	-80.650360
NASA - JOHN F. KENNEDY SPACE CENTER (FL	0		28.586670	-80.650360
NASA - JOHN F. KENNEDY SPACE CENTER (FL	0		28.586670	-80.650360
PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE			FL	0		28.253240	-80.607630
CAPE CANAVERAL 36 A&B			FL	0		28.472710	-80.540790
CAPE CANAVERAL #40			FL	0		28.561680	-80.577350
CAPE CANAVERAL #40			FL	0		28.561680	-80.577350
CAPE CANAVERAL #40			FL	0		28.561680	-80.577350
CAPE CANAVERAL #41			FL	0		28.583180	-80.583090
CAPE CANAVERAL #41			FL	0		28.583180	-80.583090
CAPE CANAVERAL #41			FL	0		28.583180	-80.583090
CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION			FL	0		28.490980	-80.577390
CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION			FL	0		28.490980	-80.577390
CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION			FL	0		28.490980	-80.577390
SEWER LIFT STATION # 45	DIXON/INDIAN RIVER DR.	COCOA	FL	0	12009131500089	28.391360	-80.738890
SEWER LIFT STATION # 1	100 RIVERSIDE DR.	COCOA	FL	0	12009131500132	28.360470	-80.727030
BCU - SYKES CREEK REGIONAL WWTP			FL	0		28.423890	-80.705670
SOUTH BREVARD WATER CO-OP			FL	0		27.927320	-80.488580
SOUTH BREVARD WATER CO-OP			FL	0		27.927320	-80.488580
CITY OF COCOA - BANANA RIVER PUMP STA			FL	0		28.359490	-80.654480
CITY OF MELBOURNE - GRANT STREET WRF			FL	0		28.073070	-80.609480

Brevard County Critical Facilities

FACILITY NAME	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP	FACILITY NUMBER	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE
CITY OF MELBOURNE - GRANT STREET WRF			FL	0		28.073070	-80.609480
CITY OF TITUSVILLE - SAND POINT WRF			FL	0		28.623660	-80.816940
CITY OF TITUSVILLE - SAND POINT WRF			FL	0		28.623660	-80.816940
CITY OF TITUSVILLE - SAND POINT WRF			FL	0		28.623660	-80.816940
BCU - SOUTH BEACHES REGIONAL WWTP			FL	0		28.040750	-80.548760
BCU - SOUTH BEACHES REGIONAL WWTP			FL	0		28.040750	-80.548760
CITY OF COCOA BEACH - WATER RECLAM. F			FL	0		28.317120	-80.632630
AT&T - CELLULAR ONE MERRITT ISLAND			FL	0		28.449850	-80.700180
COLONY PARK UTILITIES - WWTP			FL	0		28.478030	-80.712420
NASA - JOHN F. KENNEDY SPACE CENTER (FL	0		28.586670	-80.650360
NASA - JOHN F. KENNEDY SPACE CENTER (FL	0		28.586670	-80.650360
NASA - JOHN F. KENNEDY SPACE CENTER (FL	0		28.586670	-80.650360
NASA - JOHN F. KENNEDY SPACE CENTER (FL	0		28.586670	-80.650360
NASA - JOHN F. KENNEDY SPACE CENTER (FL	0		28.586670	-80.650360
NASA - JOHN F. KENNEDY SPACE CENTER (FL	0		28.586670	-80.650360
NASA - JOHN F. KENNEDY SPACE CENTER (FL	0		28.586670	-80.650360
NASA - JOHN F. KENNEDY SPACE CENTER (FL	0		28.586670	-80.650360
NASA - JOHN F. KENNEDY SPACE CENTER (FL	0		28.586670	-80.650360
NASA - JOHN F. KENNEDY SPACE CENTER (FL	0		28.586670	-80.650360
PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE			FL	0		28.253240	-80.607630
CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION			FL	0		28.490980	-80.577390
CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION			FL	0		28.490980	-80.577390
CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION			FL	0		28.490980	-80.577390
CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION			FL	0		28.490980	-80.577390
BCU - SYKES CREEK REGIONAL WWTP			FL	0		28.423890	-80.705670
SOUTH BREVARD WATER CO-OP			FL	0		27.927320	-80.488580
SOUTH BREVARD WATER CO-OP			FL	0		27.927320	-80.488580
CITY OF COCOA - BANANA RIVER PUMP STA			FL	0		28.359490	-80.654480
CITY OF MELBOURNE - GRANT STREET WRF			FL	0		28.073070	-80.609480
CITY OF MELBOURNE - GRANT STREET WRF			FL	0		28.073070	-80.609480

Brevard County Critical Facilities

FACILITY NAME	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP	FACILITY NUMBER	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE
CITY OF MELBOURNE - FRONT ST. BOOSTER			FL	0		28.080040	-80.599780
PRAXAIR - LINDE DIV. AIR SEPERATION P			FL	0		28.674300	-80.827990
CITY OF TITUSVILLE - SAND POINT WRF			FL	0		28.623660	-80.816940
CITY OF TITUSVILLE - SAND POINT WRF			FL	0		28.623660	-80.816940
CITY OF TITUSVILLE - SAND POINT WRF			FL	0		28.623660	-80.816940
BCU - SOUTH BEACHES REGIONAL WWTP			FL	0		28.040750	-80.548760
BCU - SOUTH BEACHES REGIONAL WWTP			FL	0		28.040750	-80.548760
CITY OF COCOA BEACH - WATER RECLAM. F			FL	0		28.317120	-80.632630
COLONY PARK UTILITIES - WWTP			FL	0		28.478030	-80.712420
PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE			FL	0		28.253240	-80.607630
NORTHGATE PROPERTIES - WTP & WWTP			FL	0		28.586670	-80.650360
FIRE STATION	1116 PINETREE DR	INDIAN HARBOUR BEAC	FL	32937000	12009334500008	0.000000	0.000000

APPENDIX I

VOLUSIA COUNTY CRITICAL FACILITIES			
FACILITY	ADDRESS	CITY	ADDRESS
South Beach Fire Station	4840 S. Atlantic Ave	County	4840 S. ATLANTIC AVE
Police Department	170 West Granada Blvd	Ormond Beach	170 WEST GRANADA BLVD
Fire Station	160 E. Granada Blvd	Ormond Beach	160 E. GRANADA BLVD
Fire Station	170 W. Granada Blvd	Ormond Beach	170 W. GRANADA BLVD
BT Utility Plant	35 Breakaway Trail	Ormond Beach	35 BREAKAWAY TRAIL
Halifax Onc. L/S	W. Granada Blvd	Ormond Beach	0 W. GRANADA BLVD
Lift Station 11 M	Timberline Tr & Main Tr	Ormond Beach	TIMBERLINE TR. & MAIN TR.
Lift Station 5 M	Misner's Branch & SR 40	Ormond Beach	MISNERS TR & GRANADA BLVD
Lift Station 8 M	N. Nova Rd & Florida East Coast Railroad	Ormond Beach	N. NOVA RD & FLORIDA EAST COAST RAI
Lift Station 8 M 3	River Bluff Dr & La Costa CT	Ormond Beach	RIVER BLUFF DR & LA COSTA CT
Lift Station 6 P	Neptune & John Anderson	Ormond Beach	NEPTUNE & JOHN ANDERSON
Lift Station 9 M	Main Tr & Shady Branch Tr	Ormond Beach	MAIN TR & SHADY BRANCH TR
Standish Ground Tank	Standish Dr. & John Anderson Dr.	Ormond Beach	STANDISH DR. & JOHN ANDERSON DR.
Water Plant	301 Jefferson St	Ormond Beach	301 JEFFERSON St
Water Tower	Airport Rd. & Leeway Tr.	Ormond Beach	AIRPORT RD. & LEEWAY TR.
WWTP	N. Orchard & Wilmette Ave	Ormond Beach	N. ORCHARD & WILMETTE AVE
Civil - Daytona	250 N. Beach Street	Daytona Beach	250 N. BEACH STREET
Fire Station #1	301 S. Beach St.	Daytona Beach	301 S. BEACH ST.
Fire Station #5	627 Nova Rd.	Daytona Beach	627 NOVA RD.
Central Services	950 Bellevue	Daytona Beach	948 BELLEVUE
Lift Station 97	2500 LPGA Blvd	Daytona Beach	2500 LPGA BLVD
Lift Station 100	100 Tournament Dr.	Daytona Beach	100 TOURNAMENT DR
Criminal Justice Center	251 North Ridgewood Ave	Daytona Beach	251 NORTH RIDGEWOOD AVE
Daytona Beach Police Dept.	990 Orange Ave	Daytona Beach	990 ORANGE AVE
Daytona Beach Police Dept.	510 Harvey Ave	Daytona Beach	510 HARVEY Ave
Master Pump Station	117 Seaway Ave	Daytona Beach Shores	117 SEAWAY AVE
River Point Sewer Station	3400 S. Peninsula	Daytona Beach Shores	3500 S. PENINSULA
Sewer Pump Station #1	3751 Cardinal Blvd	Daytona Beach Shores	3751 CARDINAL BLVD
Sewer Pump Station #2	113 Dunlawton Blvd	Daytona Beach Shores	113 DUNLAWTON BLVD
Sewer Pump Station #3	133 Atares Ave	Daytona Beach Shores	133 ATARES AVE
Sewer Pump Station #4	2800 S. Atlantic Ave	Daytona Beach Shores	2800 S. ATLANTIC AVE
Sewer Pump Station #5	2422 S. Atlantic Ave	Daytona Beach Shores	2422 S. ATLANTIC AVE

VOLUSIA COUNTY CRITICAL FACILITIES

FACILITY	ADDRESS	CITY	ADDRESS
Sewer Pump Station #7	Florida Shores Blvd & S. Peninsula	Daytona Beach Shores	FLORIDA SHORES BLVD & S. PENINSULA
Sewer Pump Station #9	2900 S. Atlantic Ave	Daytona Beach Shores	2900 S. ATLANTIC AVE
Fire Station	2628 Hibiscus Dr.	Edgewater	2628 HIBISUCS DR
Fire Station	1651 S. Ridgewood	Edgewater	1651 S. RIDGEWOOD
Police Department	135 E. Park Ave	Edgewater	135 E. PARK AVE
Elevated water tank	Jarecki Ave.	Holly Hill	JARECKI AVE & LPGA BLVD
Lift Station #1	475 Carswell Ave	Holly Hill	475 CARSWELL AVE
Lift Station #10	410 Dorothy Ave	Holly Hill	410 DOROTHY AVE
Lift Station #2	231 Riverside Dr.	Holly Hill	231 RIVERSIDE DR.
Lift Station #3	504 Riverside Dr.	Holly Hill	504 RIVERSIDE DR.
Lift Station #4	345 10th St.	Holly Hill	345 10TH ST.
Lift Station #5	946 Riverside Dr.	Holly Hill	946 RIVERSIDE DR.
Lift Station #6	1136 State Ave	Holly Hill	1136 STATE AVE
Lift Station #7	1300 Riverside Dr.	Holly Hill	1300 RIVERSIDE DR.
Lift Station #9	1601 Riverside Dr	Holly Hill	1601 RIVERSIDE DR
Lift Station #10-A	429 3rd St	Holly Hill	429 3RD ST
Lift Station #11	440 Magnolia Ave	Holly Hill	440 MAGNOLIA AVE
Lift Station #11-A	702 Commercial Ave	Holly Hill	702 COMMERCIAL AVE
Lift Station #12	620 Center Ln.	Holly Hill	620 CENTER LN
Lift Station #13	397 Dubs Dr.	Holly Hill	397 DUBS DR.
Lift Station #14	660 6th St.	Holly Hill	660 6TH ST.
Lift Station #16	834 8th St.	Holly Hill	834 8TH ST.
Lift Station #17	566 10th St.	Holly Hill	566 10TH ST.
Lift Station #17-A	1017 Chippewa Tr.	Holly Hill	1017 CHIPPEWA TR.
Lift Station 17-B	Great Oaks Circle	Holly Hill	GREAT OAKS & CHEROKEE
Lift Station 18	460 Walker St.	Holly Hill	460 WALKER ST.
Lift Station 18-A	1000 15th St.	Holly Hill	1000 15TH ST.
Lift Station 19	407 Flomich St.	Holly Hill	407 FLOMICH ST.
Lift Station 20	926 Flomich St.	Holly Hill	926 FLOMICH ST.
Lift Station 21	1000 Walker St.	Holly Hill	1000 WALKER ST.
Lift Station 24	944 Alabama Ave	Holly Hill	944 ALABAMA AVE
Lift Station 25	500 Calle Grande St	Ormond Beach	500 CALLE GRANDE
Well #6	455 LPGa Blvd	Holly Hill	455 LPGA BLVD
Well #11	Jarecki St. & LPGa BLVD	Holly Hill	JARECKI ST. & LPGA BLVD.
Well #12	1200 Center Ave	Holly Hill	1200 CENTER Ave

VOLUSIA COUNTY CRITICAL FACILITIES

FACILITY	ADDRESS	CITY	ADDRESS
Well #12 C	15th St. & Center Ave	Holly Hill	15TH ST. & CENTER AVE
District 5/ Law Enforcement Services	101 E. Canal St.	New Smyrna Beach	101 E. CANAL ST.
Fire Station 51	103 Faulkner St.	New Smyrna Beach	103 FAULKNER ST.
Fire Station 52	309 Columbus Ave.	New Smyrna Beach	309 COLUMBUS AVE.
Fire Station 53	1400 N. Dixie Freeway	New Smyrna Beach	1400 N. DIXIE FREEWAY
Fire Station 54	813 Mary Ave	New Smyrna Beach	813 MARY AVE
Lift Station 08 - Submersible	Gorman Ct. & 10th St.	New Smyrna Beach	GORMAN CT. & 10TH ST.
Lift Station 14 - Can	Wayne Av & Lynn St	New Smyrna Beach	WAYNE AVE & LYNN ST.
Lift Station 58 - Submersible	Saxon Dr.	New Smyrna Beach	SAXON DR & CEDAR DUNES
Lift Station 59 - ABG	2051 Pioneer Rd	New Smyrna Beach	2051 PIONEER RD
Lift Station 63	2600 Turnbull Estates	New Smyrna Beach	2600 TURNBULL ESTATES
Lift Station 68 - Submersible	Engram Rd. & Ladyfish Rd.	New Smyrna Beach	ENGRAM RD. & LADYFISH RD.
Lift Station 69 - Submersible	Engram Rd. & Redfish Rd.	New Smyrna Beach	ENGRAM RD. & REDFISH RD.
Lift Station 70 - Submersible	Turtlemound Rd. and Starfish Rd.	New Smyrna Beach	TURTLEMOUND RD. & STARFISH RD.
Police Department	4680 S. Peninsula Dr.	Ponce Inlet	4680 S. PENINSULA DR.
Fire Station	46800 S. Peninsula Dr.	Ponce Inlet	4680 S. PENINSULA DR.
Fire Station #2	5839 Trailwood Dr.	Port Orange	5839 TRAILWOOD DR.
Lift Station - Emerald Isle PI #1	4332 S. Peninsula Dr.	Port Orange	4332 S. PENINSULA DR.
Police Station	1672 S. Ridgewood Ave	South Daytona	1672 S. RIDGEWOOD AVE
Fire Station	1672 S. Ridgewood Ave	South Daytona	1672 S. RIDGEWOOD AVE
Fire Station	2107 Brian Ave	South Daytona	2107 BRIAN AVE
Aspen Lake Stormwater Pumping Station	922 Aspen Dr.	South Daytona	922 ASPEN DR.
Lift Station #01	1690 S. Palmetto Ave	South Daytona	1690 S. PALMETTO AVE
Lift Station #02	501 Big Tree Rd.	South Daytona	503 BIG TREE RD.
Lift Station #04	2323 Anastasia Dr.	South Daytona	2323 ANASTASIA DR.
Lift Station #05	635 Violet St.	South Daytona	635 VIOLET ST.
Lift Station #06	808 Valencia Rd,	South Daytona	808 VALENCIA RD,
Lift Station #08	2451 S. Ridgewood Ave	South Daytona	2451 S. RIDGEWOOD AVE
Lift Station #09	29 Sandusky Circle	South Daytona	29 SANDUSKY CIRCLE
Lift Station #10	918 Reed Canal Rd.	South Daytona	918 REED CANAL RD.
Lift Station #11	8 1/2 Spinnaker	South Daytona	8 1/2 SPINNAKER
Lift Station #12	2025 Hickorywood Dr.	South Daytona	2025 HICKORYWOOD DR.
Lift Station #13	2938 Lantern Dr.	South Daytona	2938 LANTERN DR.
Lift Station #14	794 Aspen Dr.	South Daytona	794 ASPEN DR.

VOLUSIA COUNTY CRITICAL FACILITIES

FACILITY	ADDRESS	CITY	ADDRESS
Lift Station #17	1610 Magnolia Ave	South Daytona	1610 MAGNOLIA AVE
Lift Station #18	115 Bryan Cave Rd.	South Daytona	115 BRYAN CAVE RD.
Reed Canal Stormwater Control	740 Reed Canal Rd.	South Daytona	740 REED CANAL RD.
Sherwood Dr. Stormwater Pumping St.	2165 Sherwood Dr.	South Daytona	2165 SHERWOOD DR.
Law Enforcement Services	101 E. Canal St.	New Smyrna Beach	101 E. CANAL ST.
VOTRAN	950 Big Tree Rd.	New Smyrna Beach	950 BIG TREE RD.
EVAC	112 Carswell Ave	Daytona Beach	112 CARSWELL AVE
Armory	725 Ballough Rd	Daytona Beach	725 BALLOUGH RD
Chisolm Head Start Center	531 Mary Ave	New Smyrna Beach	531 MARY AVE
Ormond Beach Middle School	151 Domicilio Ave	Ormond Beach	151 DOMICILIO AVE
Ormond Beach Element. School	100 Corbin Ave	Ormond Beach	100 CORBIN AVE
Osceola Elementary School	100 Osceola Ave	Ormond Beach	100 OSCEOLA AVE
Holly Hill Middle School	1200 Center Ave	Holly Hill	1200 CENTER AVE.
Holly Hill Elementary School	1500 Center Ave.	Holly Hill	1500 CENTER AVE
Seabreeze High School	2700 N. Oleander Ave	Daytona Beach	2700 N. OLEANDER AVE
Bethune Cookman College	640 Dr Mary McLeod Bethune Blvd	Daytona Beach	640 DR MARY MCLEOD BETHUNE BLVD
Turie T Small Elem. School	800 South St.	Daytona Beach	800 SOUTH ST
Campbell Middle School	601 S. Keech St.	Daytona Beach	601 S. KEECH ST.
South Daytona Elem. School	600 Elizabeth Pl	South Daytona	600 ELIZABETH PL
Sugar Mill Elementary School	1101 Charles St.	Port Orange	1101 CHARLES ST.
Port Orange Elementary School	402 Dunlawton Ave	Port Orange	402 DUNLAWTON AVE
Longstreet Elementary School	2724 S. Peninsula Dr.	Daytona Beach	2724 S. PENINSULA DR.
New Smyrna Beach High School	100 Barracuda Blvd	New Smyrna Beach	100 BARRACUDA BLVD
Chisholm Elementary School	557 Ronnoc Ln.	New Smyrna Beach	557 RONNOC LN
Read-Pattillo Elementary School	400 Sixth St.	New Smyrna Beach	400 SIXTH ST.
New Smyrna Beach Middle School	1200 S. Myrtle Ave	New Smyrna Beach	1200 S. MYRTLE AVE
Edgewater Elementary School	500 S. Old County Rd.	Edgewater	500 S. OLD COUNTY RD.
Halifax County Fire Station	1580 Derbyshire Rd.	County	1580 DERBYSHIRE RD.
Port Orange County Fire Station	4200 S. Ridgewood Ave	County	4200 RIDGEWOOD AVE
Turnbull County Fire Station	1850 Pioneer Tr.	County	1850 PIONEER TR.
Massey Industrial Park	635 Airpark Rd.	County	635 AIRPARK RD.
New Smyrna Beach Brannon Memorial	105 S. Riverside Dr.	New Smyrna Beach	105 S. RIVERSIDE DR.
South Waterfront Park WTP	4632 Nellie St.	Edgewater	4632 NELLIE ST.
Holly Hill Industrial Area	Flomich St. and Railroad	Holly Hill	FLOMICH ST & RAILROAD
City of Holly Hill/07164 - WTPA	453 11 St.	Holly Hill	453 LPGA BLVD

VOLUSIA COUNTY CRITICAL FACILITIES

FACILITY	ADDRESS	CITY	ADDRESS
Golden Bay WWTP	200 Golden Bay Blvd	Oak Hill	GOLDEN BAY BLVD & CHEROKEE DR
New Smyrna Beach Airport Ind. Park	1504 Industrial Drive	New Smyrna Beach	1499 INDUSTRIAL DRIVE
Bert Fish Medical Center	401 Palmetto St.	New Smyrna Beach	401 PALMETTO ST.
Memorial Hospital-Ormond Beach	246 S. Atlantic Ave	Ormond Beach	246 S. ATLANTIC AVE
New Smyrna Airport Ind. Park	1500 Airway Circle	New Smyrna Beach	1500 AIRWAY CIRCLE
New Smyrna Airport Ind. Park	404 United Dr.	New Smyrna Beach	404 UNITED DR.
New Smyrna Airport Industrial Park	1486 Turnbull Bay Rd	New Smyrna Beach	1486 TURNBULL BAY RD
Holly Hill Industrial Area	LPGA Blvd & Enterprise Ct.	Holly Hill	LPGA BLVD & ENTERPRISE CT.
A T & T /21146	400 Carswell Ave	Daytona Beach	400 CARSWELL AVE

Appendix J

Responses from Jurisdictions Concerning Draft Protection Scenario Map

CORRESPONDANCE

MessageFrom: Danielle McCain [dmccain@malabartown.org]
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2004 12:28 PM
To: 'tara'
Subject: RE: Sea Level Rise Map Comments

Hi Tara, My name is Debby Franklin and I am filling in for Danielle in the Building Department. She is on leave. I have asked our Building Official and also our Town Administrator about these sea level maps you referred to in your email. Neither knows anything about them. Could you please send more information on who you sent them to or resend them so that we may comment upon them. Mr. Ed Booth is our Town Administrator and also sits on the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council.

Message From: Danielle McCain [dmccain@malabartown.org]
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2004 9:06 AM
To: 'tara'
Subject: Malabar

Tara, I received the color map and decriptive text. Mr. Booth said what he could see looked fine but the area picture doesn't show all of Malabar. It only shows the very southern part of Malabar. I didn't know if you knew that. Thanks for allowing us this input.

From: Planning4u2@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 02, 2004 2:08 PM
To: tara@ecfrpc.org
Subject: Re: Sea Level Rise Map Comments
Tara,

All the area in Red should be the Brown color. There probably shouldn't be any red on the map based on the development patterns. Also the area in green that runs along the northern portion of the City should be brown east of A1A.

That large red area shown is almost entirely under construction most of which are 45 foot condos.

If you have any questions, please call me 407-249-1503.

Sincerely,

Todd Peetz, AICP
City Planner
Cape Canaveral

From: Planning4u2@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 02, 2004 3:58 PM
To: tara@ecfrpc.org
Subject: Re: Sea Level Rise Map Comments
Tara,

The beaches have under gone multiple renourishment efforts and my understanding is they will in the future as well. As the Port channel fills with sand they pump it out to get to the Cape Canaveral side.

My understanding is they brought in sand from some other part of the County and it was not consistent with what is on the beach and that is why the beach surf isn't all that clear. Anyway, as sea levels rise, life will get interesting for those living in Cape Canaveral.

If you have any other questions, let me know.

From: tara [tara@ecfrpc.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 19, 2004 10:35 AM
To: 'Nelson T. Lau'
Subject: responses to sea level rise

Mr. Lau,

Thank you for your response and I will make the changes you suggest.

As for your comments:

1. Since this park is a recreational park and surrounded by almost certain protection, I can change the park to "Reasonably Likely" or "Almost Certain". If the park is capacity constrained by the amount of land (i.e. Ballfield, intensely used park, or boatyard – examples given by EPA) then it may be best to assign it "Almost Certain protection". (It appears to me that it would be considered the above). However, if the natural shore is a key feature and there is plenty of land

- to allow for erosion, then the "Reasonably Likely" classification may be more appropriate. I will await your response on what classification to assign this park.
2. I will classify Whitley Marina as "Protection Almost Certain"
 3. I will classify the area as "Protection Almost Certain"
 4. See number 1. I will await your response on what classification to assign this park.

Responses to other comments:

1. Since the areas with the drainage ditches and canals are well behind areas that are greater than 10 feet in elevation and are not directly feeding/connected to the Indian River, we are going to take them off the map. Also, these areas would almost certainly not be reached or affected by the estimated 5 foot rise of sea level. Therefore, the areas focused on in Cocoa will be east of US 1.
2. I only focused on the area of the city which had land elevations 10 feet and under so that the necessary areas were more visible. This is why the western areas are not included on the map I emailed you.

-----Original Message-----

From: Nelson T. Lau [mailto:nlau@cocoaf1.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 18, 2004 8:23 AM
To: tara
Subject: RE: Cocoa Scenario Review

Hi Tara,

I reviewed the map, which contains the protection scenarios. I drew black arrows on the image where I think that the classification should be changed from "Protection Reasonably Likely" to "Protection Almost Certain". The map is attached in the original format you submitted to me. Here are my comments by arrow number:

1. McFarland Park: This park is a personal watercraft launching facility, which is a City of Cocoa park. To the north and south are single-family homes. Are parks not considered for protection?
2. The Whitley marina area contains a residential and professional office condominium. It should warrant as much protection as similar structures to the south, which are classified as "Protection Almost Certain".
3. This narrow strip is the edge of the westbound lanes of State Road 520 and the bridge which leads to and from Merritt Island (to the east). The absence of protection here would undermine road infrastructure.
4. Lee Wenner Park: This is another personal watercraft launching facility, and is a joint Brevard County/City of Cocoa Park. It is improved with parking facilities, playground equipment, boardwalks, docks, etc. Are parks not considered for protection?

Here are my other comments, which are separate from the four (4) arrows...

- On the left part of the map, there are many narrow strips of red. These are drainage ditches and canals. What is the policy regarding these?
- The City of Cocoa limits extends westward to Adamson Road. I have included the current city limits maps, which is in PDF format.

Thanks!
Nelson.

Hi Tara,

I concur with the information you sent to me.

I reviewed the map again and I noticed that by numbers 2, 3, and 4, there are still two small doughnut hole areas that are classified as "Protection Unlikely". They should be reclassified because everything around them is "Protection Almost Certain".

With all these changes, it appears that the entire shoreline along Cocoa will now be classified as "Protection Almost Certain".

Thank you,
Nelson Lau.

-----Original Message-----

From: tara [mailto:tara@ecfrpc.org]
Sent: Monday, March 01, 2004 4:31 PM
To: Nelson T. Lau
Subject: Cocoa Parks

Mr. Lau,

In response to the picture you sent concerning Lee Wenner and MacFarland Parks

- 1) Lee Wenner : I would suggest classifying as "Protection Almost Certain" as it is in close proximity to a major bridge, there appears to be "sea walls" already in place which would indicate protection practices already in effect. Also, it appears as though it is an intensely used park.
- 2) MacFarland park: I would suggest to classify as "Protection almost certain" as well just for the fact that it is surrounded by single family homes that would most likely be protected and this land would also be protected as to 1) aid in the protection of the surrounding houses. Or 2) this land could be protected to allow for natural erosion of the shore of the park. (I personally would assume scenario #1).

Therefore, I would suggest the parks be classified as "Protection Almost Certain". If you agree with this or would rather change either park to "Protection Reasonably Likely", let me know so that I may make the changes to the map.

Thank you.


Tara M. McCue
East Central Florida Regional Planning Council
407.623.1075

From: Tony Caravella [tcaravella@cityofcocoa.com]
Sent: Friday, February 13, 2004 11:52 AM
To: tara
Subject: RE:

Tara – I've reviewed the map and have some questions: Some areas identified as white has finished floor elevations lower than 10 feet, but most probably protected by a seawall (from canal). It appears light green are parks regardless of their location relative to the ocean, which these land areas would be protected by beach renourishment. I'm confused with the different shades of green identified on the island areas. Although these lands are identified as conservation on the City's future land use map I do not have knowledge that they may be classified as wetlands.

As to protection from flooding and hurricanes, the City implements the Florida Building Code and does have flood protection regulations for construction.

Anthony Caravella, AICP
Development Services Director
City of Cocoa Beach
321-868-3297 - Phone
321-868-3378 – Fax



RECEIVED MAR 05 2004

CITY OF
PALM BAY
FLORIDA

120 MALABAR ROAD, S.E. • PALM BAY, FLORIDA 32907-3009 • (321) 952-3400
Visit our website at: <http://www.palmbayflorida.org>

March 2, 2004

Ms. Tera McCue
East Central Fla. Reg. Planning Council
631 N. Wymore Road
Suite 100
Maitland, FL 32751

Re: Sea Rise Study

Dear Ms. McCue:

The purpose of this letter is to provide you with our comments concerning the map depicting impacts from the 5' Sea Level Rise Scenarios for Palm Bay. Attached to this letter is the original map you provided our office with annotations of areas of concern.

We have included copies of three aerial photos to depict the areas marked on the map as aerial "A", aerial "B" and aerial "C". These aerials are provided to support our view that many of the "submerged/open water" areas on the map are not actually present.

There are also two wetlands that we have circled that do not show up in the National Wetlands Inventory and do not appear to be wetlands (based on our general field review). They also do not show up in SJRWMD wetland maps we have available.

Please feel free to contact this office if additional information is needed.

Sincerely,

David Watkins, AICP
Planning Manager

cc: Christopher Norton, Director
Tim Ford, Principal Planner

"PROGRESS THROUGH PARTNERSHIP"

Jim Ford, CFA
Brevard County Property Appraiser - Map Search



Aerial "A"

Jim Ford, CFA
Brevard County Property Appraiser - Map Search



Aerial "B"

Jim Ford, CFA
Brevard County Property Appraiser - Map Search



Aerial "C"

From: Dave Watkins [watkid@palmbayflorida.org]
Sent: Tuesday, March 09, 2004 4:31 PM
To: tara
Subject: RE: Palm Bay sea level rise map
Ms. McCue:

Thanks for looking at our comments. I don't believe the City desires to change any of the proposed classifications at this time.

David Watkins
Planning Manager
-----Original Message-----

From: tara [mailto:tara@ecfrpc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, March 09, 2004 2:44 PM
To: Dave Watkins
Subject: Palm Bay sea level rise map

Mr. Watkins,

Good afternoon. I received your responses to the sea level rise map. I agree with your concerns for the water layer. I found the Tiger data is more accurate. However, since those areas were outside the area project to be effected (0 – 10' in elevation), I will be omitting those water and wetland areas.

Also, you did not provide any comments on assigned protection scenarios. I just want to verify that you want to keep all areas classified as "Protection Reasonably Likely" as such and did not suggest changing the entire city to "Protection Almost Certain". To remind you, the only areas classified as "Protection Reasonably Certain" are along the wetland associated with Turkey Creek and the south eastern most areas. I will make any adjustments Palm Bay suggests.

Thank you again for your time.

Tara M. McCue
East Central Florida Regional Planning Council
407.623.1075

From: Bruce Cooper [bcooper@satellitebeach.org]

Sent: Thursday, March 04, 2004 10:31 AM
To: 'tara'
Subject: RE: Sea Level Rise Map Comments

Dear Tara,

Appreciate your time today going over the map. Attached is a couple of notes that I have discussed with you. Let me know if you need anything else.

Based on your comments and the intent of the map, I believe that the map represents the City as intended.

Have a great day.
Bruce Cooper
Planning Director

1 Rise
of
each


Scenarios

- 1.0 feet - Almost Certain
- 1.5 feet - Reasonably Likely
- 2.0 feet - Unlikely
- 3.0 feet - Unlikely
- 4.0 feet - Unlikely
- 5.0 feet - Unlikely
- 6.0 feet - Unlikely
- 7.0 feet - Unlikely
- 8.0 feet - Unlikely
- 9.0 feet - Unlikely
- 10.0 feet - Unlikely
- 11.0 feet - Unlikely
- 12.0 feet - Unlikely
- 13.0 feet - Unlikely
- 14.0 feet - Unlikely
- 15.0 feet - Unlikely
- 16.0 feet - Unlikely
- 17.0 feet - Unlikely
- 18.0 feet - Unlikely
- 19.0 feet - Unlikely
- 20.0 feet - Unlikely
- 21.0 feet - Unlikely
- 22.0 feet - Unlikely
- 23.0 feet - Unlikely
- 24.0 feet - Unlikely
- 25.0 feet - Unlikely
- 26.0 feet - Unlikely
- 27.0 feet - Unlikely
- 28.0 feet - Unlikely
- 29.0 feet - Unlikely
- 30.0 feet - Unlikely
- 31.0 feet - Unlikely
- 32.0 feet - Unlikely
- 33.0 feet - Unlikely
- 34.0 feet - Unlikely
- 35.0 feet - Unlikely
- 36.0 feet - Unlikely
- 37.0 feet - Unlikely
- 38.0 feet - Unlikely
- 39.0 feet - Unlikely
- 40.0 feet - Unlikely
- 41.0 feet - Unlikely
- 42.0 feet - Unlikely
- 43.0 feet - Unlikely
- 44.0 feet - Unlikely
- 45.0 feet - Unlikely
- 46.0 feet - Unlikely
- 47.0 feet - Unlikely
- 48.0 feet - Unlikely
- 49.0 feet - Unlikely
- 50.0 feet - Unlikely
- 51.0 feet - Unlikely
- 52.0 feet - Unlikely
- 53.0 feet - Unlikely
- 54.0 feet - Unlikely
- 55.0 feet - Unlikely
- 56.0 feet - Unlikely
- 57.0 feet - Unlikely
- 58.0 feet - Unlikely
- 59.0 feet - Unlikely
- 60.0 feet - Unlikely
- 61.0 feet - Unlikely
- 62.0 feet - Unlikely
- 63.0 feet - Unlikely
- 64.0 feet - Unlikely
- 65.0 feet - Unlikely
- 66.0 feet - Unlikely
- 67.0 feet - Unlikely
- 68.0 feet - Unlikely
- 69.0 feet - Unlikely
- 70.0 feet - Unlikely
- 71.0 feet - Unlikely
- 72.0 feet - Unlikely
- 73.0 feet - Unlikely
- 74.0 feet - Unlikely
- 75.0 feet - Unlikely
- 76.0 feet - Unlikely
- 77.0 feet - Unlikely
- 78.0 feet - Unlikely
- 79.0 feet - Unlikely
- 80.0 feet - Unlikely
- 81.0 feet - Unlikely
- 82.0 feet - Unlikely
- 83.0 feet - Unlikely
- 84.0 feet - Unlikely
- 85.0 feet - Unlikely
- 86.0 feet - Unlikely
- 87.0 feet - Unlikely
- 88.0 feet - Unlikely
- 89.0 feet - Unlikely
- 90.0 feet - Unlikely
- 91.0 feet - Unlikely
- 92.0 feet - Unlikely
- 93.0 feet - Unlikely
- 94.0 feet - Unlikely
- 95.0 feet - Unlikely
- 96.0 feet - Unlikely
- 97.0 feet - Unlikely
- 98.0 feet - Unlikely
- 99.0 feet - Unlikely
- 100.0 feet - Unlikely



1 Miles

East Central Florida
REGIONAL
PLANNING
COUNCIL



From: Collins, Belinda [CollinsB@CODB.US]

Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2004 5:03 PM
To: tara
Subject: RE: Review of Daytona Beach

I would first like to verify with our Engineering Department before anything is done on behalf of the City of Daytona Beach.

Thank you.

-----Original Message-----

From: tara [mailto:tara@ecfrpc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2004 4:26 PM
To: Collins, Belinda
Subject: RE: Review of Daytona Beach

Ms. Collins,

Thank you for taking the time to respond. Unless we hear otherwise, we will proceed under the notion that Daytona Beach is not requesting any specific changes to the information displayed on the map.

Thank you for your help.

Tara M. McCue

-----Original Message-----

From: Collins, Belinda [mailto:CollinsB@CODB.US]
Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2004 3:46 PM
To: tara
Subject: Review of Daytona Beach

Tara,

I forwarded your request to our Engineering Department and the following concerns were raised:

1. What is the purpose of the map ? If it is to establish another set of limits on land use the department is opposed to the effort does not endorse it nor does it wish to be subject to any restrictions that the development of such a map might be used to "legitimize" such restrictions.

2. When is the five-foot sea level rise projected to occur ? The department feels that there are many more issues of immediate and vital concern to which both the EPA and the Regional Planning Council could more beneficially direct their resources.

3. It was also suggested that this effort may need to be reconsidered before it goes any further.

I would appreciate a response to these concerns so that they may be properly addressed. Thank you for your help.

Belinda Collins, AICP

Principal Planner

City of Daytona Beach

From: Michelle Gallagher [mgallagher@dbshores.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2004 11:11 AM
To: tara
Subject: Re: Review of Sea Level Rise Scenarios

Tara,
I don't have any comments on the map.

Michelle Gallagher, AICP
City Planner
Daytona Beach Shores



City of New Smyrna Beach

*Responded
1/26/03*

January 22, 2004

Ms. Tara M. McCue
East Central Florida Regional Planning Council
631 N. Wymore Road, Suite 100
Maitland, FL 32751

Dear Ms. McCue;

This letter is in response to your request for comments on the 5 Foot Rise in Sea Level Map. Please be aware City staff is not certain of the intent of the map so it is difficult to review. If you have any literature on the purpose of the map it would be very helpful.

Below are some questions/concerns the City staff has on the map.

1. The red areas classification does not appear to accurately describe the City, particularly on the beachside (barrier island). The description reads indicates the red areas might have low-density zoning, not have high property values be on septic tanks and individual wells and be older developed areas. The description also reads that the red areas might be where you would encourage wetland migration (perhaps what was meant was mitigation) and that the area should be preserved if not developed. Although we are uncertain what you mean by low-density some of these areas have relatively high density, have the highest property values of the City, have few wetlands and has little vacant land that could be preserved. Most of the area is served by central water and sewerage systems.
2. The concern is the same for the dark blue areas, particularly on the beachside.
3. The brown areas are not shown on the map but there are many places that appear to qualify for the description. It appears that many of the areas that should be brown on the map are shown as light green on the map.
4. The dark green, light blue and white areas seem correct.


January 22, 2004
Ms. McCue
Page 2

Please provide an explanation on what the intended use of the map is to be so we can provide a better review.

Should you have any questions pertaining to this letter please call me at (386) 424-2265 or email me at Mrakowski@cityofnsb.com.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,



Mark H. Rakowski, AICP
Chief Planner

From: Charles Herbold [cherbold@cityofnsb.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 14, 2004 11:13 AM
To: 'tara'
Subject: Question

I just have a quick question
What is the Time Frame for the rise in sea level to occur ?
Thanks

-----Original Message-----

From: tara [<mailto:tara@ecfrpc.org>]
Sent: Monday, January 12, 2004 1:41 PM
To: cherbold@cityofnsb.com
Cc: Rakowski, Mark
Subject: RE: Review of Sea Level Rise Scenarios

Good Afternoon,

We are asking you to review the classifications of the areas. For instance, if you feel there is an area that is classified as "Right to Protect..." But you feel that it falls under the guidelines I sent as "Protection Reasonably Likely", then make that change. (Please note that all existing wetlands were kept intact.)

Of course if you find an area that is wrong in elevation, please indicate that as well. (The elevation file was downloaded from SJRWMD).

If you have any more questions please feel free to email or call me at 407.623.1075

Thanks!

Tara McCue

-----Original Message-----

From: Charles Herbold [mailto:cherbold@cityofnsb.com]

Sent: Monday, January 12, 2004 12:58 PM

To: 'tara'

Cc: Rakowski, Mark

Subject: RE: Review of Sea Level Rise Scenarios

Hi Tara

We are unclear on what our input on this map should be.

Do we need to return comments on the Size, Boundary & Classification of these Areas that will be affected by a rise in Sea Level ?

Are we to indicate areas that we feel are not Accurate in the Elevation / Effect of the Rise of Sea Level

(i.e. A location know to be at Elevation 35' , but shown in the Red Zone)

Please Send us any Material that might make this more clear to us.

Thank You

From: Mark Rakowski [mrakowski@cityofnsb.com]

Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2004 9:08 AM

To: 'tara'

Subject: RE: sea level rise map

Tara,

I must say I am having a very difficult time understanding what you are driving at with this map and so is everyone else in my office. I will try to explain my confusion below after each one of your sentences. I suspect if we are having difficulty with this other jurisdictions are or may not be responding to your request.

I wish I could help more. Sorry

Mark

-----Original Message-----

From: tara [mailto:tara@ecfrpc.org]

Sent: Monday, January 26, 2004 10:43 AM

To: mrakowski@cityofnsb.com

Subject: sea level rise map

Mr. Rakowski.

I received your letter today concerning the sea level rise map. The purpose of the map is to provide the EPA (and cities) with a tool that can be used to depict the areas of the coastline that may be affected by a potential five foot rise in sea level and the areas property owners would most likely protect and those areas which would not. [Rakowski, Mark] I don't understand why anybody would not try to protect every property within the City. The data from the map will also be analyzed. [Rakowski, Mark] Analyzed for what? What we present to you is a map created using the future land use maps sent by each jurisdiction. [Rakowski, Mark] How are the future land use designations represented at all with this map? We have classified the map into general categories and elevations of 0'-5'; and 5'-10'. [Rakowski, Mark] The map reads 0' - 5' and 0' - 10' and not as you described. The red and blue currently represent developed/planned developed areas (red 5-10' and blue 0-5'). [Rakowski, Mark] I think I understand this. We understand that according the category definitions I had sent you, the color classifications of many areas would change. [Rakowski, Mark] How can you change the elevation on the ground? Do you mean change the description of the colors? We do not know your jurisdiction's property value and development as well as you and that is why we are asking you to change classifications as you see fit. [Rakowski, Mark] The entire beachside (barrier island) is high property value as well as the North Causeway and lands along the river. In fact much of the mainland is fairly high property value compared to neighboring communities. However, the definition of high property value is fairly subjective. Also, are we going to protect land only based on its value? The City often has high value land very close to not as high value land. If one parcel were to be protected then the other would be. We are asking you to review any blue areas. Any areas currently colored blue that fall under the red or brown definitions, indicate on the map and we will change them as you recommend. [Rakowski, Mark] The red definition does not apply to our City. It seems as that definition is the opposite of the definition of our City. The Brown definition more closely fits the City except the part about the protection. If sea level rises 5-feet the area will be flooded unless some large levee system is built. (We provided the definitions so that you may be able to review and reclassify the areas. We thought by originally classifying the developed areas into elevations, it may be easier for your review of the property.) [Rakowski, Mark] This doesn't make sense to me. You do not need to change any red to blue because the blue color is only for property below five feet in elevation. [Rakowski, Mark] According to your map most of the City is 0' -5' and I don't think that is correct if you are referring to elevation above sea level.

Light green includes agriculture and preserve areas. [Rakowski, Mark] On the map you provided the light green areas are golf courses, schools, spoil islands and parks, essentially. If there is a mistake and you feel some of these areas should be classified differently, please indicate as such and if possible include the future land use classification so we may change that as well.[Rakowski, Mark] I don't think I can begin to change the map since it does not seem appropriate at all for our City.

For the wetland migration/mitigation, it would constitute as both. Yes, it would include areas that could be acquired for future wetlands, but may also be areas left open for wetlands to migrate to as sea level rises.[Rakowski, Mark] This is about the only section that makes any sense for our City.

I hope this helps. [Rakowski, Mark] Sorry to say that it doesn't really. Perhaps this map is appropriate for a rural area but I don't think it makes any sense for an urban community.

If you have any further questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at 407.623.1075[Rakowski, Mark] I don't mean to appear to be uncooperative but the map doesn't fit in with our community to the point that I don't think we can comment on it.

Thank you.
Tara M. McCue
East Central Florida Regional Planning Council
407.623.1075

From: Mark Rakowski [mrakowski@cityofnsb.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2004 9:15 AM
To: 'tara'
Subject: RE: sea level rise color classifications

The entire City needs to be brown except that there is no protection. Would you be available for a conference call some time so you can try to explain this to our City Engineer and perhaps we can together figure out what you are trying to get with this map?

Mark



County of Volusia

GROWTH AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

123 West Indiana Avenue · Room 202 · DeLand, FL 32720-4604
(386) 736-5959 · (386) 239-7776 · (386) 423-3367
www.volusia.org

January 13, 2004

Ms. Tara McCue
East Central Florida Regional Planning Council
631 N. Wymore Road, Suite 100
Maitland, FL 32751

RECEIVED JAN 14 2004

Re: Sea Level Rise

Dear Ms. McCue:

This office is in receipt of the map depicting a 5-foot increase of sea level over a 200-year period sent by the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council.

The map depicts some extensive inundation as a result of a 5-foot increase of sea level. However, the increase is expected to occur over a 200-year period and 200 years is well beyond what the County would consider to be a reasonable planning horizon. (For example the County's Comprehensive Plan extends only to the year 2020.)

While the map does represent a forecast of events projected to occur far into the future, the County does appreciate the Planning Council keeping up to date on these issues and disseminating the information to the County. Furthermore, consistent with Comprehensive Plan policy 11.4.1.21 the County will continue to monitor sea level rise science. Policy 11.4.1.21 is as follows:

11.4.1.21 *Volusia County should continue to monitor sea level rise science to determine when and if a sea level rise event will affect the County. Based on pertinent data, the County will act accordingly.*

Volusia County should continue to monitor sea level rise science to determine when and if a sea level rise event will affect the County. Based on pertinent data, the County will act accordingly.

Thank you very much for keeping the County informed on this and other issues.

Sincerely,

Ben L. Dyer, Manager
Comprehensive Planning

BD:RP:ps



\\COVF01SRV\GMP\PLAN\04\Paradise\McCue.doc

*Responded in email
1/26/04
for clarification.*

From: Ben Dyer [BDyer@co.volusia.fl.us]
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2004 8:39 AM

To: tara@ecfrpc.org
Cc: John Thomson; Montye Beamer; Ron Paradise
Subject: Re: Sea level rise map


Tara

The County has no adopted policy or plan to address the issues contained in the "Sea Level Rise Map". Therefore we have not developed categories or classifications as mentioned in your transmission below. As such the categories "Right to protection, but protection unlikely" or "Protection reasonably likely" or "Protection Almost certain" have no relevance at this time for local planning initiatives in unincorporated Volusia County. The "Sea Level Rise Map" is a theoretical document covering a geologic span of time and we do not feel it should serve as a present basis to make local land use recommendations.


As most of the area shown in the "Sea Level Rise Map" affects incorporated areas of the County you would need to contact individual Coastal Cities to find out how they view the proposed Map and its categories and classifications.

I hope this clarifies the County staff position, please call me if you have any questions.


Brevard County Protection Scenarios for a 5' Rise in Sea Level



Brevard County Protection Scenarios for a 5' Rise in Sea Level




Volusia County Protection Scenarios for a 5' Rise in Sea Level



East Central Florida
**REGIONAL
PLANNING
COUNCIL**

Volusia County Protection Scenarios for a 5' Rise in Sea Level



East Central Florida
**REGIONAL
PLANNING
COUNCIL**