

1. Tree Planting Program

- DESCRIBE UPDATES TO TREE CANOPY GIS
-

2. Tree Trust Fund

- Additional avenues for funding the program are being investigated.
 - Boca Raton funds the program directly from the city budget.
 - Boynton Beach funds their program and many other sustainability and resilience initiatives through a development fee (0.05%) based on the total cost of development
-

3. Sustainability and Resilience Master Plan

- Resulting from a meeting with Public Works and the City Manager we are exploring the use of a consultant to help facilitate the creation and integration of the CAP with our existing city master plans. Comprehensive Plan, Stormwater Management Plan, Bike and Pedestrian Master Plan, Dune Management Plan, Adaptation Plan to name a few.
 - RFP drafted, awaiting Director input to finalize
 - Consultant review has loosely begun and will be finalized upon RFP finalization.
-

4. LEED for Cities

- Haven't picked up any additional points in MR section yet. Still 3 maybes out there.
 - QL section deep dive is half way completed. Picked up 6 points so far with 10 maybes still to be reviewed.
 - Currently sitting at 42 points overall. 40 to certify. 50 for Silver.
 - There are at least 30 points of maybes still left.
-

5. Facility Energy Benchmarking

- Benchmarking efforts remain limited by the utility's current data sharing structure.
 - Hoping to work with Public Works to get this data from FPL consistently and in the format needed.
-

6. Public Outreach

- No new public outreach
-

7. State Legislation Monitoring

Housing supply, infill, and land-use process

Florida Starter Homes Act

SB 948 / HB 1143 – Local Government Land Development Regulations & Orders

Intent

Create the "Florida Starter Homes Act" and **reduce regulatory barriers** to certain residential development by limiting when local governments may impose land development regulations on residential lots (including additional restrictions when lots are connected to public water and sewer).

The bill also standardizes certain application/permit procedures and includes provisions that require “as-of-right” permitting for certain housing types in specified zoning contexts.

Potential positive effects if it performs as intended

- **More entry-level unit production** via easier lot utilization, standardized approvals, and reduced discretionary delays.
- **Lower per-unit cost drivers** (time, uncertainty, entitlement risk) for small-scale housing that can be sensitive to local procedural friction.
- **More predictable rules statewide**, which can increase participation by smaller builders who otherwise avoid jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction variability.

Potential unintended negative effects / risks

- **Infrastructure mismatch risk:** incremental density increases can occur **faster than capital planning cycles** for water/sewer/stormwater/transportation, shifting costs to the public (ratepayers/taxpayers) or degrading service levels.
- **Reduced ability to apply updated resilience standards over time:** if local governments are constrained from applying new/stronger standards to qualifying lots, adapting to new flood data, rainfall intensities, heat mitigation, or evacuation/egress constraints may become more difficult.
- **Cumulative site impacts from “small” approvals:** multiple lot splits / redevelopments can collectively increase impervious area and runoff impacts even when each individual project appears minor.
- **Administrative strain:** standardized timelines and “as-of-right” pathways can improve predictability but may also pressure staff capacity and reduce the practical opportunity for robust technical review in smaller jurisdictions.

Infill Redevelopment Act (Affordable Housing on Brownfields / impacted parcels)

SB 1434 – Infill Redevelopment

Intent

Create the “Infill Redevelopment Act” and require administrative approval for development on certain **qualifying parcels** (including environmentally impacted parcels such as brownfields / cleanup program sites), while **preempting certain local land development regulations and oversight** for those parcels.

Potential positive effects if it performs as intended

- **Accelerates reuse of disturbed land** and can reduce pressure to expand into greenfield areas by making infill more feasible.
- **Pairs housing supply with site cleanup** when redevelopment unlocks remediation financing and productive reuse.
- **Could improve jobs/services proximity** if qualifying sites are located within developed areas near employment and amenities.

Potential unintended negative effects / risks

- **Cleanup/financing timing gap:** eligibility to redevelop does not guarantee deliverability— projects can stall if remediation costs, insurance, or liability protections don’t pencil out.
- **Risk communication and trust:** even compliant remediation can face community opposition if health-risk communication is weak or the history of the site is contentious.

- **Local coordination constraints:** if local governments are preempted from applying certain standards, it can be harder to ensure alignment with stormwater master planning, mobility plans, or neighborhood context—creating downstream operational/fiscal impacts.
- **“One-size” buffers/standards** may not fit edge cases (adjacent stable neighborhoods, constrained drainage basins, sensitive receiving waters).

Live Local Expansion

SB 1548 – Affordable Housing

Intent

Expand the Live Local framework by requiring counties/municipalities to authorize certain residential uses on **publicly owned property** (including school district property under defined circumstances), expand anti-discrimination provisions related to affordable housing, and provide a **waiver of sovereign immunity** for certain housing discrimination causes of action.

Potential positive effects if it performs as intended

- **Unlocks public land as a supply lever**, which can reduce land acquisition cost and accelerate project feasibility.
- **Greater uniformity in treatment of affordable housing proposals**, potentially reducing inconsistent outcomes.
- **Stronger guardrails against discriminatory outcomes** in housing-related land use and permitting decisions.

Potential unintended negative effects / risks

- **Public-land tradeoffs not fully priced in:** public parcels often serve multi-purpose functions (utilities, drainage, emergency staging, parks, civic facilities). A mandate can reduce flexibility for resilience or long-range capital needs if siting criteria are not careful.
- **Operational complexity on school lands:** constraints around safety, circulation, facility planning, and long-term educational needs can introduce friction or delay.
- **Higher legal exposure and risk management costs** due to the waiver of sovereign immunity in specified discrimination contexts, increasing the stakes of process and documentation even for well-intended decisions.
- **“Compliance siting” risk:** jurisdictions may feel pressure to place housing where land is easiest rather than where outcomes are strongest (jobs access, transit access, lower hazard exposure).

Transit-Oriented Development Act / Transportation Infrastructure LDRs

SB 1342 / HB 1183 – Transportation Infrastructure Land Development Regulations

Intent

Require local governments (and some special districts) to establish **Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) zones** and rural “livable urban village” areas by a deadline, set parameters for mixed use and commercial uses in those areas, limit certain local building regulations, restrict reduction/elimination of TOD zones once established, and create a **private cause of action** with remedies and attorney fees/costs provisions (and sovereign immunity waiver language in the House summary).

Potential positive effects if it performs as intended

- **More housing near transit infrastructure**, which can improve accessibility and reduce car dependence in places with real transit service and walkability improvements.

- **Greater feasibility for mixed-use infill**, potentially supporting economic activity around corridors and stations.
- **Standardized expectations** that can attract investment near transportation infrastructure.

Potential unintended negative effects / risks

- **“TOD without the T”**: if transit frequency/reliability and first/last-mile infrastructure lag, increased density may show up as congestion and parking spillover instead of mode shift.
- **Heat and safety exposure**: without concurrent sidewalks, shade, crossings, and bike networks, added residents can face higher heat and traffic risk even if the land use pattern is “transit-oriented” on paper.
- **Local calibration limits**: state-set minimums can reduce local ability to tailor building form/height/parking to historic districts, evacuation routes, or stormwater constraints.
- **Displacement dynamics**: TOD can raise land values; if affordability/anti-displacement mechanisms are insufficient, transit-adjacent areas can become less accessible to lower-income households.
- **Increased litigation leverage** via private cause of action + attorney fees can shift dispute resolution toward courts rather than planning processes.

Disaster-related land use constraints

Post-disaster land use restrictions (prior year)

SB 180 (2025) – Emergency preparedness/response changes with land-use impacts (as implemented in statute)

Intent

SB 180 (2025) made broad changes related to emergency preparedness/response and—most relevant to local planning—created temporary constraints for certain “impacted” local governments after hurricanes regarding moratoria and adoption/enforcement of more restrictive development standards/procedures.

(Local note for the report: Delray Beach has joined multi-municipality litigation challenging SB 180 — included here as status context per OSAR.)

Potential positive effects if it performs as intended

- **Faster recovery and rebuilding** by limiting delays or changing rules mid-recovery.
- **Increased predictability for property owners** seeking repairs/reconstruction post-storm.

Potential unintended negative effects / risks

- **Reduced flexibility to respond to newly revealed hazards** (flood pathways, drainage failures, repetitive loss conditions) if local governments are constrained from strengthening standards quickly after a storm.
- **Potential cost shifting**: if local governments cannot adapt standards but must still manage infrastructure and public safety outcomes, more of the long-term cost burden can migrate to public budgets.
- **Retroactivity/conflict with voter-adopted planning** (where applicable) can create governance tension and implementation uncertainty.

SB 840 – Disaster-Related Land Use Regulations (2026)

SB 840 – Land Use Regulations for Local Governments Affected by Natural Disasters

Intent

SB 840 narrows and clarifies parts of the SB 180 framework by **tightening the geographic scope** and

clarifying when certain moratoria and procedural changes may be enforced by impacted local governments, while also adding/clarifying exceptions (e.g., for stormwater/floodwater management, potable water supply, sanitary sewer). The bill analysis also notes a sunset structure for certain temporary restrictions.

Potential positive effects if it performs as intended

- **Restores limited local operational flexibility** for critical infrastructure protection (stormwater, potable water, sanitary sewer) while keeping a predictable post-disaster recovery framework.
- **Reduces ambiguity** about when moratoria and procedural requirements can be used, potentially lowering disputes and uncertainty.

Potential unintended negative effects / risks

- **Edge-case ambiguity remains:** even with clarified exceptions, disputes can still arise over what qualifies as infrastructure-protection vs. “more restrictive” regulation.
- **Planning whiplash:** frequent statutory adjustments across sessions can complicate long-range comprehensive planning and capital scheduling.
- **Uneven outcomes:** jurisdictions with greater staffing/legal capacity may navigate the framework more effectively than smaller cities, creating practical inequities in implementation.

Local land-use review / compatibility / fee setting

SB 208 – Land Use and Development Regulations

SB 208 / HB 399 (companion) – Land Use and Development Regulations

Intent

Make local review/approval for certain residential development and redevelopment projects **more efficient and less costly**, including:

- constraints that application fees must reasonably relate to costs,
- changes to how “compatibility” is defined/used in decisions, and
- requirements for denials to specify certain information (and limits on denying if certain measures are proposed), plus limits on certain building design element regulations.

Potential positive effects if it performs as intended

- **More predictable approvals** by narrowing subjective compatibility disputes and requiring clearer denial findings.
- **Lower transaction costs** by requiring fee rationality and reducing some discretionary design constraints.
- **Potential increase in infill feasibility**, especially for small and mid-scale redevelopment where process risk is a major cost driver.

Potential unintended negative effects / risks

- **Reduced neighborhood-context calibration:** compatibility standards can be used (well or poorly) to manage transitions; narrowing them may increase conflict where redevelopment is sensitive.
- **Fee limitations can constrain service delivery:** if fees are capped below real staff/consultant costs, the public may subsidize review, or review quality/timelines could degrade.
- **Design quality externalities:** restricting local design controls can yield lower-performing outcomes (shade, heat mitigation, stormwater, tree canopy preservation) unless standards are preserved through other lawful pathways.

Conservation lands transparency

SB 546 – Conservation Lands

CS/SB 546 (and identical CS/HB 441)

Intent

Increase transparency and public notice when the state Division of State Lands or water management districts consider the **sale or exchange** of conservation lands, including required notice content and minimum notice timelines prior to formal consideration.

Potential positive effects if it performs as intended

- **Stronger public process integrity** for conservation land decisions.
- **Reduced perception of opaque land swaps**, which can improve trust and reduce controversy risk.

Potential unintended negative effects / risks

- **Longer transaction timelines** for routine or low-risk swaps could increase administrative burden.
- **Negotiation impacts**: more advance disclosure could affect bargaining dynamics (not necessarily negative, but can complicate some transactions).
- **Process vs. outcome**: increased notice improves transparency but does not itself guarantee conservation outcomes—implementation details still matter.

Large-scale development framework

SB 354 – “Blue Ribbon Projects”

SB 354 – framework for large-scale projects with reserve-area tradeoffs

Intent

Create a framework for “Blue Ribbon Projects” (very large-scale development proposals) that **trade state preemption over local comprehensive planning/land use regulations** in exchange for large “reserve area” set-asides (e.g., environmental protection, agriculture, recreation, utilities sites). The bill analysis describes threshold acreage and long-term buildout horizons.

Potential positive effects if it performs as intended

- **Potentially large, contiguous conservation/reserve set-asides** if the reserve components are high-quality, enforceable, and permanent.
- **More master-planned infrastructure coordination** at a regional scale if projects truly internalize infrastructure costs and delivery sequencing.

Potential unintended negative effects / risks

- **Governance and accountability risk**: preemption can reduce local ability to adapt standards over time, including resilience-driven updates.
- **Reserve quality risk**: “reserve area” quantity does not automatically equal ecological function (connectivity, hydrology, management funding).
- **50-year buildout uncertainty**: climate risk, insurance markets, and infrastructure realities may change significantly, and long-horizon entitlements can become misaligned with future hazard conditions.
- **Infrastructure externalities**: even with large set-asides, developed portions can still drive regional traffic, water demand, and stormwater impacts beyond project boundaries.

Environmental product regulation / local preemption

SB 958 – Drinking Straws and Stirrers

SB 958 (and companion HB referenced in coverage) – statewide standards for straw/stirrer regulations

Intent

Establish statewide uniformity for local regulation of drinking straws and stirrers, with legislative findings referencing paper straw performance, disability accessibility concerns, and health-risk concerns (including PFAS), and requiring that any local regulation align with specified environmental criteria/certifications (e.g., compostable/biodegradable standards) if a local government chooses to regulate.

Potential positive effects if it performs as intended

- **Avoids “regrettable substitutions”** by discouraging low-performing alternatives that look greener but are not (or may have unintended chemical concerns).
- **Improves accessibility outcomes** if regulations account for residents who cannot use certain straw types.
- **Reduces compliance complexity** for multi-location businesses by creating uniform rules.

Potential unintended negative effects / risks

- **Local innovation constraint:** uniform standards can reduce local pilot programs and rapid iteration (e.g., targeting litter hotspots or coastal areas).
- **Certification/market readiness risk:** if required certifications are hard to source at scale or cost-competitive, implementation may become a de facto limitation on local action.
- **Narrow scope:** focusing on straws/stirrers can shift attention away from higher-impact waste streams unless paired with broader source reduction measures.

Wetlands / buffers / local water protections

HB 479 – Wetland Buffers / Land and Water Management

CS/HB 479 – Land and Water Management

Intent

Prohibit counties and municipalities from adopting rules/policies that prohibit certain adjacent upland activities **outside wetland buffers** that meet specified requirements, and repeal water management district land management review teams. (Effective date in the House bill summary is July 1, 2026.)

Potential positive effects if it performs as intended

- **Statewide consistency** for buffer-related land regulation, potentially reducing uncertainty for applicants working across jurisdictions.
- **Streamlined permitting** if overlapping local restrictions are reduced and review structures are simplified.

Potential unintended negative effects / risks

- **Reduced local ability to reflect site-specific hydrology:** wetland function varies; uniform minimums may not match local waterbody sensitivity, seasonal high groundwater, or flood storage needs.
- **Cumulative water quality impacts** if buffers are narrower than what local conditions require for filtration and habitat connectivity.
- **Resilience implications:** wetlands and adjacent buffers can serve as flood attenuation and surge/rainfall storage; limiting local standards may increase downstream flooding costs.
- **Governance gap:** removing or reducing certain review teams/structures may reduce technical coordination across agencies if not replaced with equivalent capacity.

8. EV Charger monetization

- Met with Parking Manager and a third party to discuss the possibility of linking our EV chargers to a third party system in order to monetize and centralize data for our EV charging network.
- No new progress

9. Green Building Ordinance

- At the end of November, the GBO will be up for review.
- In 3 years, there is not a building under construction that has triggered the GBO requirements (as of 2024/09/12).
 - 13 in development, but not yet permitted for construction
 - 11 additional in development if SF threshold was reduced to 5,000 SF

10. Civic Owls Sustainability Internship

Began a project unofficially known as “Digitize Delray” which so far has included:

- The Sustainability & Resilience Data Improvement Project
 - Re-symbolizing and updating GIS layers for tree-plotter data.
 - Building a template for the “Sustainability and Resilience Data Viewer”, which will allow for dynamic user-driven interaction with the most up-to-date data.
 - The ArcGIS Experience will allow for the filtering of different characteristics, including but not limited to: tree condition and health, species of tree, biodiversity enhancement zones (BEZ), plant/animal species collection/spotting data, transit stops/routes, bike-ped infrastructure.
 - Developed Biodiversity Enhancement Zones (BEZ) mapping project and prepared web layer, with plans to collaborate with Parks Dept and deliver data-collection improvements
- The Transit & Mobility Data Improvement Project
 - Integrated and symbolized PalmTran spatial data; digitized bus stops and mapped routes within Delray Beach
 - Advanced auto-alternative modal mapping project and bus stop redesign concept
 - Attaining bike-ped data from previous contractor
 - End goal of creating a “master transit layer” which is currently WIP
 - Meeting with relevant city personnel about real-time parking data collection and use, EV charger utilization plans for the future
- Attended sustainability meetings/events and updated Spring 2026 GIS Deliverables Document for accountability.

End goals are to: complete Transit & Mobility Improvement Project