

Palm Beach County Agricultural Reserve Roundtables

John Streitmatter, LRI, Inc.

This document contains the principal outputs of the Agricultural Reserve Roundtable process conducted in conjunction with the Palm Beach County Planning Division in the fall of 2014 and spring of 2015.

PALM BEACH COUNTY AGRICULTURAL RESERVE ROUNDTABLES

Roundtable Overview

The Board of County Commissioners chartered the Roundtable process as a result of a March 25, 2014 session to consider a number of proposals to the policies concerning the Agricultural Reserve. The objective of the Roundtable process was to gather input from a number of interest groups to enable the Board to better understand the issues and perspectives on the proposed changes.

Roundtable Process Summary

County staff determined 9 distinct interest groups as follows:

- Agents and Developers
- Agricultural Reserve Residents
- Community Organizations and Groups
- Environmental Organizations and Groups
- Equestrian
- Farmers and Food Brokers
- Interested Citizens
- Non-Residential Uses
- Nursery Operators

The interest groups each met independently to:

- Provide input on the long term vision and objective of the Agricultural Reserve.
- Consider the various components of the proposal and provide input on those components.
- Provide input on any other ideas or aspects of the Agricultural Reserve that they wished to provide.
- Select three people to serve as the group's representative at the Roundtable.

All the input from each of the interest group sessions was captured and shared with the Roundtable representatives and is also available on the County website.

Roundtable Session 1

The focus of the first Roundtable session was to surface common ground across the interest groups on the various components of the proposal.

Roundtable 1 Process Flow:

- 3 groups, each with one representative from the 9 interest groups

- Discussed each component of the proposal
 - Individual thoughts
 - Then group discussion
 - Then thoughts of the table
 - Then synthesis of the three tables
- Review and discussion of input
- Public Comment

The components of the proposal to be considered were:

- Objective of the Agricultural Reserve
- Commercial Land Uses
- 60/40 PUD Development Area Size and Location
- Preserve Area Size/Location Criteria
- Preserve Area Uses
- Single Farm Residence / Caretaker's Quarters
- TDR Residential Overlay

Output from Roundtable 1

Finding common ground across the interest groups proved to be very elusive. A few overall themes emerged from the session and are outlined in the following section.

Overall Themes:

- Overall desire to support agriculture in the reserve.
- It is important to understand the overall implications to the reserve of any specific change.
- Even more important is the need to understand the overall implications of the entire set of any changes – taken as a whole.
- Overall desire to see a number of options for the various topics, not just one proposal.

The following section synthesizes the output from the entire Roundtable on each of the components of the proposal.

Output by Component:

- Objective of the Agricultural Reserve
 - Consensus to keep public owned lands in agricultural uses
- Commercial Land Uses
 - Supportive of some additional commercial to support agricultural purposes

PALM BEACH COUNTY AGRICULTURAL RESERVE ROUNDTABLES

- Need based
- Some support for some additional commercial to support other uses (e.g. residents)
- Need based
- 60/40 PUD Development Area Size and Location
 - No clear consensus on this topic
- Preserve Area Size/Location Criteria
 - Agreement in concept to this idea
 - Some concerns about the specifics about how it would be put in place
- Preserve Area Uses
 - Supportive of allowing increased size of packing houses
 - Open to additional uses but that support greatly depends on:
 - The specific use being proposed, and
 - The linkage of that use to agriculture
- Single Farm Residence / Caretaker’s Quarters
 - Support concept of on property residence
 - Many questions about implementing it in practice
 - Additional option for single farm residence tied to bona fide agricultural uses without size restriction
 - Clarify that the option is a Residence OR Caretaker’s Quarters, not AND
- TDR Residential Overlay
 - No clear consensus on this topic
 - Generally believe that the Agricultural Reserve should not be a receiver of additional TDR’s.

Public Comment Themes:

- Why are we contemplating changes to the Reserve?
 - Unclear that there is a problem currently
 - What are we trying to solve?
- Importance of Reserve for water and wildlife
- Importance of individual’s property rights
 - County restriction on property uses
- The public spoke about the desire to preserve agricultural lands with the bond issue. To

further develop the Reserve would represent a violation of public trust.

Technical Sessions

As a result of the input from the Roundtable regarding a desire to more fully understand the impacts of a number of the components of the proposal, County Staff performed additional analyses and then conducted in depth technical sessions to share the analyses with the interest groups.

At the conclusion of the technical sessions attendees were asked to submit their input in advance of the second Roundtable session.

Complete information regarding the technical sessions can be found on the County website.

Roundtable Session 2

The focus of the second Roundtable session was to gain input regarding the components of the proposal in light of the additional analyses and information shared at the Technical Sessions. The input from the Roundtable was consolidated into a Red, Yellow, Green Report Card to reflect each group’s position on a component by component basis.

One additional component was considered as a result of input from Roundtable 1 – Agricultural Enhancement Measures.

Roundtable 2 Process Flow:

- Technical Sessions and Comment Period review
- Interest Group discussions, including members of the public.
- Input from all attendees for consideration by the Roundtable representatives through a structured exercise.
 - In this exercise, all attendees were given three “dots”, one green, one red, and one yellow.
 - The “dots” were to be used as follows – green to reflect general agreement with the elements of the component, red to reflect general disagreement with the elements, and yellow to reflect mixed reaction to the

PALM BEACH COUNTY AGRICULTURAL RESERVE ROUNDTABLES

element, or support with some specific concerns.

- Public Comment period
- Roundtable representative discussion by interest group (9 discussions of the 3 reps).
 - During this discussion the representatives considered the results of the structured exercise and the comments that were received during the technical sessions to determine their overall positions.
- Debriefs from each interest group on a component by component basis to fill out the Red, Yellow, Green Report Card

Output from Roundtable 2

Finding common ground across the interest groups again proved to be very elusive. However, two distinct groupings of interest groups emerged when the groups were asked to categorize their input for the Report Card. In general, the input of the Agent/Developer, Farmer/Food Broker, Nursery Operator, Agricultural Reserve Resident, and Non Residential Uses groups aligned. The Community Organizations, Environmental, Equestrian, and Interested Citizens groups also aligned. In general the two “groups of groups” saw the components from different perspectives. The only exception to that difference was regarding the Agricultural Enhancement Measures component, where most of the 9 groups supported the component, though with a number of reservations.

Overall Themes:

At the conclusion of the session, two overall themes emerged.

- Sensitivity and openness to addressing the concerns of the small landowners and agricultural operators who may have been inadvertently restricted in their ability to either continue farming or selling their land for other purposes by the existing policy and regulatory environment.
- Any change to the existing policy and regulatory environment must be considered in light of the totality of any other changes being considered in order to minimize the likelihood of creating unintended consequences for the future – a more integrated approach. Ideally, alternative

proposals would be considered in addition to the proposal currently being considered.

Output by Component:

The one page Red, Yellow, Green Report Card best summarizes the input of the Roundtable and the Interest Groups within it. A thumbnail is included below. The full size Report Card is included in the appendices to this report. In addition, a table including the specific thoughts of each of the groups is included immediately after the Report Card in the appendices.

Topic:	Commercial	60/40 PUD Dev Area	60/40 PUD Preserve Area	Preserve Area Uses	Farm Res/ Caretaker Quarters	TDR Overlay Option	Ag Enhancement Measures
Interest Group:							
Community Groups	Red	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Red	Green
Environmental	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Green
Equestrian	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Green
Developer/Agent	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Yellow
Farmer/Food Broker	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Yellow
Nursery Operator	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
Ag Reserve Resident	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
Non-residential Uses	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red
Interested Citizen	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Green

Legend:

- Green – Generally agree with the elements of the component
- Red – Generally disagree with the elements
- Yellow – Mixed reaction to the elements, or support with some specific concerns.

Appendix

The following pages contain a number of slides and documents which summarize the Roundtable sessions in a more complete fashion.

PALM BEACH COUNTY AGRICULTURAL RESERVE ROUNDTABLES

Red, Yellow, Green Report Card

The following pages contain the Report Card, and a synthesized summary of the comments of the Interest Groups.

Red, Yellow, Green Report Card – Facilitator Notes

Topic	Commercial Land Uses	60/40 PUD: Development Area Size/Location	60/40 PUD: Preserve Area Size / Location	Preserve Area Uses	Farm Residence / Caretaker's Quarters	TDR Overlay Option	Ag Enhancement Measures
Interest Group							
Community Groups	No devp. West of 441	West of 441	Sensitive to smaller owners, but by and large OK with current	Open to larger packing houses. Mulching and chipping aren't environmentally friendly.	Depends on the specifics Enforcement is very difficult	No need. Plenty of existing opportunities for Agriculture.	
Environmental Groups	Negatively impact agriculture	Development options already exist for smaller owners Need to preserve west of 7 buffer Exacerbate adjacency issues	Purpose was to enable large scale farming areas No legal right to a density increase or upzoning	Landscape and mulching aren't really agricultural uses. Additional uses are not environmentally friendly. Open to larger packing houses	Difficult to tease out the actual implications are	Strongly opposed – fundamentally opposite to the purpose of the Ag Reserve	This is where we should be focused
Equestrian	Not needed	No need	No need to change	Horses and cattle need open space	Need more clear guidelines – difficult to enforce	No new development.	
Devp. + Agents	200 acres too much	Allow smaller owners to participate	Master plan is the inequity	Yes to ancillary uses that support Ag	Replace caretaker with Farm resident		There are more important issues than this one
Farmers/Food Brokers	200 acres is too much	Promote property rights	Property rights – 5 and 10 acre owners were left out	Enhanced some uses, related ag uses, packing house size	Supports family farms. Already OK for Nursery.	Realistic solution to the end of the ag reserve	There are more important issues than this one

Red, Yellow, Green Report Card – Facilitator Notes

Topic	Commercial Land Uses	60/40 PUD: Development Area Size/Location	60/40 PUD: Preserve Area Size / Location	Preserve Area Uses	Farm Residence / Caretaker's Quarters	TDR Overlay Option	Ag Enhancement Measures
Nursery Operator	Doesn't need to be 200	OK in smaller properties	Small owners left out	Non ag uses already – make it fair for everyone		Time to do something different	
AGR Residents	Don't need 200 acres Targeted to need	OK in smaller properties	Small owners left out	Non ag uses already			Not an important issue.
Non-Residential Uses	Should be located where there is already commercial instead of new locations	OK in smaller properties	Best way to preserve agriculture in the reserve	Non ag uses already exist – need to make it official		New approach needed	The ship has sailed – too late.
Interested Citizens	No need	No demand	Want to consider other proposals	Want to consider other proposals		Not needed	Needs to be more than just signs. Would like to see this be expanded to be a true set of enhancements
Summary of Component	Two different groups of input	Two different groups of input	Two different groups of input	Two different groups of input	Open to a solution – it's all about the details.	Two different groups of input	General support, but not an important issue

PALM BEACH COUNTY AGRICULTURAL RESERVE ROUNDTABLES

Red, Yellow, Green Report Card - Detail

The following pages contain the actual Report Cards from each of the Interest Groups.



Red, Yellow, Green exercise

- On each of the seven charts around the room
- Place one sticker (R,Y,or G) that reflects your point of view.
- Place the sticker in the box that reflects your interest group.
- Color code
 - **Green** – generally agree with the elements
 - **Red** – Disagree with the elements
 - **Yellow** – Mixed reaction to the element, or support with some specific concerns



Red, Yellow, Green Report Card – Agents and Developers

Interest Group: Agents and Developers		
TOPIC:	POSITION (red, yellow, or green)	COMMENT/RATIONALE, especially if yellow
Commercial Land Use	D	Commercial is needed, but 200 acres is too much. In addition, it should be non-residential uses, not just shopping centers.
Development Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	D	Lowering development sites to 35 acres would allow more properties to be in play and still require the necessary preservation. It shouldn't matter what the size of a development is.
Preserve Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	D	By eliminating the 150 acre rule, it would enable almost all property owners to be included. There is no magic in a nursery site being adjacent to a 150 acre row crop farm. P&C should want as much preservation as possible.
Uses allowable in 60/40 PD Preserve Area	D	Expanding uses for such things as mulching, soil production and maintenance are all ancillary uses for nurseries, whether trees or plants. It's like a parking house for a local crop farmer.
Single-Family/Caretaker's Quarters	D	A caretaker quarters of 1000 sq ft doesn't require any development rights. If a property is in bonafide agriculture, then leave one unit behind for an operator and his family to live on their land. Cap size at 4000 sq ft.
TDR Residential Overlay	D	The County TDR bank has density that is expected to be used within the County, but it rarely gets used. The County could make it attractive and buy environmentally sensitive land or more farms in the ag reserve.
Agricultural Enhancement Programs	D	These are worthless changes that won't help agriculture, but they don't harm anything.



Red, Yellow, Green Report Card – Agricultural Reserve Residents

Interest Group: AGR Residents		
TOPIC:	POSITION (red, yellow, or green)	Comment/Rationale, especially if yellow
Commercial Land Use <i>Township CELEBRATES + CONGRATS PROPOSERS BORN + AGRICULTURE ALREADY MOSTLY COMM.</i>	GREEN - # AGRS	Del Rio Market + Downtown + byons are so busy that hard to get parking. Need business that support Ag, chemical, tractor, hardware, no hotel in area.
Development Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	GREEN	Small Average is Bored in with NO WAY OUT BUT to Stay Farming. HOUSING SURROUNDS SOME of these already.
Preserve Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	GREEN	Smaller Properties were eliminated from participating in PARTICIPATING.
Uses allowable in 60/40 PD Preserve Area	GREEN	Smaller LANDSCAPE COMPANIES ALREADY OUT THERE. MOWING OR IF AWAY FROM HOUSES, INCREASE SIZE OF MOWING IF WANT FARMERS to STAY.
Single-Family/Caretaker's Quarters	GREEN	THE 5 Acre parcels with homes that are NURSERIES ARE ELIMINATED FROM PROGRAMS BECAUSE THE HOUSES SHOULD BE 1 ACRE + OTHER 4 ACRES SHOULD GET THE RIGHT.
TDR Residential Overlay	GREEN	For the MINIMAL overlap, lets we are discussing - it would be advantageous to have the Ag as a Reserving area.
Agricultural Enhancement Programs	GREEN	Change Retail OPERATIONS so we can do them on Side Streets, otherwise a commercial nursery acceptable would NOT do.

© 2015 Leadership Research Institute, Confidential & Proprietary



Red, Yellow, Green Report Card – Community Organizations

Interest Group: Community Organizations		
TOPIC:	POSITION (red, yellow, or green)	Comment/Rationale, especially if yellow
Commercial Land Use	C	No development west of 441, in particular.
Development Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	C	No development west of 441, in particular.
Preserve Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	C	The larger the preserve parcels, the better.
Uses allowable in 60/40 PD Preserve Area	C	Packing + Storage (passive uses) on a site Specific basis. No mulch, chipping or environmentally deleterious effects from use.
Single-Family/Caretaker's Quarters	C	This item needs work to be acceptable to the groups. Would permit some possible change.
TDR Residential Overlay	C	No!
Agricultural Enhancement Programs	C	Great suggestions, thank you.

© 2015 Leadership Research Institute, Confidential & Proprietary



Red, Yellow, Green Report Card – Environmental Groups

Interest Group: Environmental Groups		
TOPIC:	POSITION (red, yellow, or green)	Comment/Rationale, especially if yellow
Commercial Land Use	Red	
Development Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	Red	
Preserve Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	Red	
Uses allowable in 60/40 PD Preserve Area	Red	
Single-Family/Caretaker's Quarters	Red	
TDR Residential Overlay	Red	
Agricultural Enhancement Programs	Green	

© 2015 Leadership Research Institute, Confidential & Proprietary



Red, Yellow, Green Report Card – Equestrians

Interest Group: Equestrians		
TOPIC:	POSITION (red, yellow, or green)	Comment/Rationale, especially if yellow
Commercial Land Use	RED	plunders the land
Development Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	^{smaller} Red ^{proposed}	plunders the land
Preserve Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	Red	plunders the land The best reason is compelling reason to deviate from the Master Plan created in 1999
Uses allowable in 60/40 PD Preserve Area	Red ✓	plunders the land Reserve the land for agriculture and keep the development out side the Reserve
Single-Family/Caretaker's Quarters	Red	plunders the land Necessity has will it? W/ open N/A/Preserve + Basis of N/A/Preserve + Basis of N/A/Preserve + Basis of
TDR Residential Overlay	Red	plunders the land
Agricultural Enhancement Programs	Green	Always green preserves the land

E 10/14 (L10117) (R & 10/17)

© 2015 Leadership Research Institute, Confidential & Proprietary



Red, Yellow, Green Report Card – Non Residential Uses

Interest Group: Reps of Non-Residential Uses		
TOPIC:	POSITION (red, yellow, or green)	Comment/Rationale, especially if yellow
Commercial Land Use		
Development Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs		
Preserve Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs		
Uses allowable in 60/40 PD Preserve Area		
Single- Family/Caretaker's Quarters		
TDR Residential Overlay		
Agricultural Enhancement Programs		<i>Much to late for this. Signs saying "buyer beware" should have been put up 30 years ago.</i>

© 2015 Leadership Research Institute, Confidential & Proprietary



Red, Yellow, Green Report Card – Nursery Operators

Interest Group: Nursery Operators		
TOPIC:	POSITION (red, yellow, or green)	Comment/Rationale, especially if yellow
Commercial Land Use	<i>a) Green</i> ✓	
Development Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	<i>Green</i> ✓	
Preserve Area Requirements for 60/40 PDs	<i>Green</i> ✓	
Uses allowable in 60/40 PD Preserve Area	<i>Green</i> ✓	
Single- Family/Caretaker's Quarters	<i>Green</i> ✓	
TDR Residential Overlay	<i>Green</i> ✓	
Agricultural Enhancement Programs	<i>Mixed Sign</i>	

© 2015 Leadership Research Institute, Confidential & Proprietary