

**AGENDA
TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND
TOWN COMMISSION MEETING
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 2026, 9:00 AM
ISLAND ROOM – TOWN HALL – 2 BRIDGE ROAD**

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

AGENDA APPROVAL AND COMMENTS*

A. Mayor/Commissioner Comments*

- a. Commissioner/Town Manager/Town Attorney Comments
- b. Town Coffee Update
- c. Agenda Approval

B. Public Comment*

Public Comment is an opportunity for the Mayor and Town Commissioners to listen to any issue(s) of importance to you. Public Comment is offered at the beginning of our meetings, in the event attendees cannot stay in chamber for the agenda item or meeting duration. If you elect to address an item on today's agenda during opening Public Comment, we ask that you please refrain from re-addressing the item during Public Comment at the agenda item. Residents also may submit comments, at any time, to the Mayor and Commissioners into the public record: THMail@tji.martin.fl.us. (Please email Public Comment at least one business day prior to the meeting to ensure timely distribution to the Mayor and Commissioners.)

NOTE: The Town Commission meeting will NOT recess at approximately 12:00pm to conduct a closed-door Attorney Client Session . The Session is not required and has been cancelled.

CONSENT ITEMS

1. Consent Agenda

Category A- To be reviewed and approved (as is or as edited) by the Town Commission

- a. Minutes of February 25, 2026 - Town Commission Meeting

Category B- Other Informational Materials (No Action Required)

- a. Minutes of March 24, 2025, Scholarship Committee Meeting - approved on March 2, 2026
- b. Minutes of February 9, 2026 Beautification Committee Meeting - approved on March 16, 2026
- c. Monthly Finance Report

PRIORITY MATTERS AND PRESENTATIONS

2. Legislative Session Recap - Ken Pruitt, the P5 Group

COMMISSION ACTION ITEMS

3. Ordinance No. 418 - Amending Land Development Regulations re. Variances - 2nd Reading
4. Ordinance No. 419 - Off-site Contractor Parking - 1st Reading
5. Appointment and Reappointment of Board/Committee Members
6. Beautification Fund Spending Authorization
7. Public Safety Marine Unit Spending Authorization

ADDITIONAL COMMISSION MATTERS

8. Comprehensive Plan Update
9. Board and Administrative Approval Discussion
10. Basement Discussion
11. Winter Construction Discussion Update

STANDING REPORTS

12. Town Manager's Report
 - a. Traffic Study
13. Town Attorney Report*
 - a. Litigation Update
14. Building Department Report
15. Public Works Department Report
 - a. Beautification Committee Update
 - b. Lethal Yellowing Update
16. Public Safety Department Report
 - a. Reaccreditation Award Recognition*
 - b. Activity Report

OTHER ITEMS

17. Meeting Dates
 - **March 24, 2026 – Town Coffee with Mayor Townsend – 9am**
 - **March 24, 2026 – SMRU Board Meeting – 10am**
 - **March 25, 2026 – Town Commission Meeting – 9am**
 - **March 25, 2026 – Beach Protection District Meeting – 1pm or Directly Following Town**

Commission

- **April 22, 2026 – Town Commission Meeting – 9am**
- **April 22, 2026 – Beach Protection District Meeting – 1pm or Directly Following Town Commission**
- **May 18, 2026 - SMRU Board Meeting – 9am**
- **May 19, 2026 – Town Commission Meeting – 9am**
- **May 19, 2026 – Beach Protection District Meeting – 11:30am or Directly Following Town Commission**
- **June 23, 2026 – Town Commission Meeting – 9am**
- **June 23, 2026 – Beach Protection District Meeting – 1pm or Directly Following Town Commission**

18. Other Items*

** No advanced materials provided*

TOWN COMMISSION

Penny Townsend, Mayor
Anne Scott, Vice Mayor
Marshall Field VI, Commissioner
Patricia Warner, Commissioner
Joseph Taddeo, Commissioner

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Town Manager, Robert Garlo
Town Attorney, Kyle B. Teal
Town Clerk, Kimberly Kogos

TOWN VISION

The Town of Jupiter Island is a barrier island community, between the Indian River Lagoon and the Atlantic Ocean, where the beauty of nature will always dominate the presence of man. Our vision for the future is illustrated by the traditions of the past, formed by a community of caring individuals who, with imagination and heart, have combined the island's beautiful gifts of nature with those of tradition and family. Inherent in the character of the Town are tranquility, seclusion and safety. The residents of Jupiter Island will faithfully endeavor to preserve and nurture their unique community for all future generations

STATE MANDATED STATEMENT

If a person decides to appeal any decision made by the board, agency, or commission with respect to any matter considered at such meeting or hearing, he will need a record of the proceedings, and that, for such purpose, he may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. Any person requiring a special accommodation at this meeting because of a disability or physical impairment should contact the Town prior to the meeting. Please contact the Town Hall, 2 Bridge Road, Hobe Sound, FL 33455, telephone (772) 545-0103.

PUBLIC NOTICE OF PRIVATE ATTORNEY-CLIENT MEETING

TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND, FLORIDA

TO THE CITIZENS OF THE TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND, FLORIDA

Please be advised that the members of the Town of Jupiter Island Town Commission will hold a **private Attorney-Client session on WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 2026 beginning at 12:00 P.M.** in the Town Manager's Conference Room, located in Town Hall, 2 Bridge Road, Hobe Sound, FL 33455. During the regularly scheduled Town Commission Meeting on this same day, the Commission will recess to a private Attorney-Client session at approximately **12:00 pm** in the Town Manager's Conference Room as authorized by §286.011(8), *Florida Statutes* to discuss pending litigation and the appeal in the case styled:

(1) *DAVID S. SLAN, JOANNA C SLAN, ARTHUR HANSEN AND ANTHONY HANSEN V. TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND, 19th Circuit Court Case No.: 23-00-1607-CAAA.*

The members of the Town Commission expected to attend the private Attorney-Client session include: Mayor Penelope "Penny" Townsend, Vice-Mayor Anne Scott, Commissioners Marshall Field VI, Patricia "Patsy" Warner and Joseph "Joe" Taddeo, Town Attorney Kyle B. Teal, Special Counsel, Raquel "Rocky" Rodriguez, and Town Manager Robert Garlo and/or Assistant Town Manager John Duchock.

The Attorney-Client session is expected to begin at approximately 12:00 P.M., and is anticipated to last for approximately 1 hour, however, it may continue so long as the members of the Town Commission determine necessary. At the conclusion of the private Attorney-Client Session, the members of the Town Commission will re-convene their regular meeting in the Town Commission Chambers and take up any other items on the agenda.

For information, please contact Kimberly Kogos, Town Clerk at 772-545-0100.

Posted: 03/17/2026

**MINUTES
TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND
TOWN COMMISSION MEETING
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2026**

TIME: Wednesday, February 25, 2026 – 9:00 AM
PLACE: Town Hall Island Room – 2 Bridge Rd., Hobe Sound, FL
PRESENT: Present were Mayor Penny Townsend, Vice Mayor Anne Scott, and Commissioners Marshall Field VI, Patricia Warner and Joseph Taddeo. Also present were Town Manager Robert Garlo, Town Clerk Kimberly Kogos, Town Attorney Kyle B. Teal and IT Director Bill Sutton.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Mayor Townsend called the meeting to order at 9:03am. She read the Town Vision Statement.

AGENDA APPROVAL AND COMMENTS*

A. Mayor/Commissioner Comments*

a. Commissioner/Town Manager/Town Attorney Comments

Mayor Townsend reported on the Treasure Coast Regional League of Cities (TCRLC) meeting she recently attended and noted a few of their benefits including ethics training and assistance with grant writing.

Commissioner Field welcomed back Town Manager Garlo. All Commissioners cheerfully agreed. Town Manager Garlo explained he had experienced health issues and has recovered. He noted that he has suspended the executive search for a Town Manager.

Vice Mayor Scott stated that participation in regional organizations such as the Council of Local Governments and the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council, while time-consuming, remained valuable in understanding regional priorities and evaluating the positions of other participants.

Mayor Townsend announced the Town Commission meeting would recess at 12:00 PM to conduct a closed-door Attorney-Client Session. Additionally, Agenda Item #4, Appeal of 7 South Beach Road Development Review Board Decision, would be heard at approximately 1:30 PM.

b. Agenda Approval

MOTION: *Commissioner Field/Commissioner Taddeo moved to Approve the agenda as presented.*
ACTION: *Motion Passed 5-0.*

NOTE:
The Town Commission meeting will **recess at 12:00pm to conduct a closed-door Attorney-Client Session** in the Town Manager's Conference Room to discuss pending litigation. The session is expected to last for approximately 1 hour. However, it may continue so long as the members of the Town Commission determine necessary. The Town Commission meeting

will reconvene at the conclusion of the private Attorney-Client session.

Additionally, **Agenda Item #4, Appeal of 7 South Beach** Road Development Review Board Decision, will be heard at approximately **1:30pm**.

B. Public Comment (Non-Agenda Related)

There was no public comment at this time.

Public Comment is an opportunity for the Mayor and Town Commissioners to listen to any issue(s) of importance to you. Public Comment is offered at the beginning of our meetings, in the event attendees cannot stay in chamber for the agenda item or meeting duration. If you elect to address an item on today's agenda during opening Public Comment, we ask that you please refrain from re-addressing the item during Public Comment at the agenda item.

PRIORITY MATTERS AND PRESENTATIONS

1. Legislative Update - Ken Pruitt, The P5 Group

Ken Pruitt of The P5 Group, attending remotely, greeted the Town Commission and provided an update on the current Florida Legislative Session. He noted the House and Senate have approved their respective budgets and the Legislature is now entering week eight of the session.

Mr. Pruitt reviewed several bills and their potential impacts on the Town. He discussed HB 691/SB 686, titled *Agricultural Enclaves*, which passed with an amendment by Senator Harrell creating an exception for parcels exceeding 1,280 acres within counties covered by the water protection plan. He stated this amendment was favorable to Jupiter Island.

He then reviewed HB 203 regarding the elimination of property taxes, noting the bill had passed the House and had been referred to committee in the Senate.

Mr. Pruitt discussed SB 636/HB 1297 relating to Beach Management, explaining the bill had passed all committees except one and could still be used as an amendment to another bill.

He referenced SB 48/HB 313 and noted the measure was gaining significant movement as an amendment to an affordable housing bill.

Mr. Pruitt reviewed HB 399/SB 208 pertaining to Land Use and Development Regulations, stating the bill was heard in the Senate the previous day. He explained it addresses urban service boundaries and was likely to pass.

He then discussed SB 840/HB 1465, commonly referred to as the "fix-it bill" to SB 180, noting SB 840 continues to receive positive interest from both chambers and may still advance.

Finally, he addressed SB 1366/HB 0145 regarding Sovereign Immunity, stating the House bill had passed in the House but is not currently gaining traction in the Senate.

Mr. Pruitt summarized that the next two weeks of session were expected to involve significant amendment activity, with amendments often requiring only one hour's notice.

Mayor Townsend asked whether there was anything the Town Commission could do to assist. Mr. Pruitt explained that the Florida League of Cities, The P5 Group, and the Association of Counties are actively engaged, and emphasized that the League's support was particularly important. He stated he would notify the Town immediately if any issue rises to a level requiring Town Commission input.

Town Manager Garlo added that the Agricultural Enclave bill, with Senator Harrell's amendment, would prohibit large-scale western development, which was of significant importance to the Town.

There were no further questions.

2. Fiscal Year 2025 Financial Audit Review - Daniel Anderson, CPA, Mauldin & Jenkins

Town Manager Garlo introduced Mr. Daniel Anderson of Mauldin & Jenkins.

Mr. Anderson greeted the Town Commission, commended the Town's Finance Department staff, and presented a summary of the audit review for fiscal year 2025.

Commissioner Taddeo asked a question regarding property tax reform. Mr. Anderson stated that property tax reform could represent a potential constraint requiring disclosure in the financial statements; however, as of the issuance date of the financial statements, the legislation had not advanced far enough to meet the "more likely than not" threshold for disclosure. He noted it remained a potential risk to monitor.

Town Manager Garlo asked about the state and federal dollars that the Town was awarded. Mr. Anderson noted Page 78 of the audit provided details. Town Manager Garlo and Vice Mayor Scott applauded Director John Duchock for obtaining the state and federal dollars.

No additional questions were posed.

3. Comprehensive Plan, LPA Workshop and Resident Survey Update - Ali Palmer, Kimley Horn

Director Duchock greeted the Town Commission and noted that Consultant Ali Palmer of Kimley-Horn would participate remotely.

Mayor Townsend referred to the Kimley-Horn memo of the January 7, 2026, Local Planning Agency meeting and reviewed specific policy recommendations. Regarding Policy 1.1.4.3, there was consensus to retain the Rights-of-Way language. Concerning Policy 6.1.6.6, Commissioner Field stated the provision was excessive; Mayor Townsend agreed, and Commissioner Taddeo stated it was unnecessary.

Vice Mayor Scott recommended requesting an extension due to pending legislation in Tallahassee. Town Attorney Teal advised that requesting an extension would be appropriate given the outstanding state legislation.

Ms. Palmer explained that many municipalities were currently seeking extensions and indicated the State had been supportive of such requests. She further advised that Kimley-Horn would submit the extension request to the State on behalf of the Town.

MOTION: *Commissioner Taddeo/Commissioner Field moved to request the state to grant an extension of time until the end of the year to complete the Comprehensive Plan Review.*

ACTION: *Motion Passed 5-0*

Mayor Townsend transitioned to discussion of the survey results and asked whether any policy changes were suggested. It was reported that 199 responses were received, of which 194 were from residents. The majority of responses were favorable to each of the questions presented.

It was noted that most written comments related to traffic concerns. Town Manager Garlo stated there were limited options available to restrict traffic volume, gate South Beach Road, or prohibit bicycles. Town Attorney Teal explained that even if the Town owned South Beach Road, regulatory authority over the roadway would remain limited. A suggestion was made to conduct a more detailed traffic engineering study of South Beach Road.

Discussion clarified that two separate analyses would be required. The first would involve legal analysis regarding ownership and regulatory authority over South Beach Road. The second would involve a traffic engineering evaluation regarding congestion mitigation measures. Town Attorney Teal explained that a traffic engineering study differed from concurrency review and that the immediate question involved understanding the legal distinctions between Town ownership and County ownership of South Beach Road.

Mayor Townsend continued reviewing the survey questions and comments. Additional survey related topics were discussed, including enforcement of traffic ordinances, roadway safety for vehicles, bicycles, golf carts, and pedestrians, building massing and scale, buffering and setbacks to preserve privacy and tranquility, and beach parking and hours of operation. It was noted that federal refuge and Nature Conservancy access points were closed at sunset, while County beach access hours differed.

Mayor Townsend read into the record a survey comment stating that “progress is not always defined by having more and progress can also be ‘making great things last’”, noting alignment with the Town’s Vision Statement.

Vice Mayor Scott summarized key themes emerging from responses, including septic to sewer evaluation, ownership and control of South Beach Road, density stabilization, prioritizing stability overgrowth accommodation, traffic management, beach access concerns, and financial considerations.

Commissioners agreed that further study was required before adopting specific policy changes, particularly regarding density, which may be affected by pending state legislation.

Discussion occurred regarding preparation of draft language by Kimley-Horn reflecting survey feedback and Town Commission comments. Commissioner Field requested that the Mayor’s written notes and ideas be shared with the Town Manager for distribution to Commissioners in advance of future meetings to allow thoughtful review. Mayor Townsend agreed to share her materials.

Discussion transitioned to the timeline for Comprehensive Plan amendments. Ms. Palmer clarified that after the Local Planning Agency issues its recommendation, the Town Commission would hold a first public hearing and transmit the amendment to the State within ten days of that hearing. It was further clarified that there could be time between the Local Planning Agency recommendation and the Town Commission’s first hearing.

Town Manager Garlo confirmed that a letter requesting an extension would be prepared for the Mayor's signature seeking additional time through the end of the year. The purpose of the extension was to allow evaluation of pending legislation.

Mayor Townsend noted that legislative uncertainty primarily affected density considerations and that other topics such as septic to sewer, traffic, massing and scale, and beach management could proceed independently.

COMMISSION ACTION ITEMS

4. Appeal of 7 South Beach Road Development Review Board Decision - Will be heard at approximately 1:30pm

Item 4 was heard at 1:30 PM.

As the Appellant in this matter, Vice Mayor Scott recused herself and left the dais.

Town Attorney Teal stated that both sides submitted witness list of two witnesses each. Mayor Townsend suggested 30 minutes for presentation and 10 minutes rebuttal for each, and confirmed with each attorney.

Town Clerk Kogos swore in anyone intending to present and/or testify including Attorney Collette Meyer of Meyer Law Firm, appellant Anne Scott, Building Department Director Catherine Harding, Attorney Jeremy Bowerman and Attorney Dave Markarian of Jeck Harris, Erin Bolin of Cotleur & Hearing, and Andrew Russo representing 7 South Beach LLC and property owners John and Joan Ngo.

Ex-Parte Communication:

Commissioner Warner stated that she had a conversation with Maria Bayazid after receiving correspondence and was initially unaware of the matter beyond prior comments made. She confirmed that she had since read all submitted materials and noted that she had also spoken briefly with Town Manager Garlo.

Commissioner Taddeo stated that he had not had conversations with anyone regarding the matter and had read all submitted materials. He also noted that he had participated in a conference call with Town Manager Garlo regarding unrelated matters during which Town Attorney Teal joined briefly, but the details of this case were not discussed.

Commissioner Field stated that he had spoken with Town Manager Garlo and reviewed the format of the proceeding.

Mayor Townsend stated that she had read all submitted materials, was familiar property, and had spoken only with staff in order to ensure the proceeding was properly organized.

Appeal Presentations and Discussion:

Attorney Collette Meyer, representing immediate neighbor Anne Scott, appealing the Development Review Board (DRB) decision introduced herself to the Commission. She provided photographs of the project from Beach Road and from the south neighboring property that has insufficient buffering. She explained the definition of de novo, permitting this application to be heard as it is being heard for the first time. She noted the photographs were taken one week ago, thus still providing insufficient buffering to date. She explained that the landscaping and driveway were not completed as approved, and no new plans

were submitted to the building department. She explained that a private inspector was used to conduct inspections. When the developer requested a Certificate of Occupancy (CO), the Building Director personally inspected the project and noticed the project was not completed per approved plans. The driveway violations included that the driveway was constructed rectangular rather than round as approved, the driveway was expanded beyond the approved plan, the interior island was reduced in size, and stone was installed instead of the approved paved surface. The matter was forwarded to the Development Review Board rather than Code Compliance. Attorney Meyer asserted that the Development Review Board had disregarded prior Impact Review Committee (IRC) and Development Review Board landscape buffer requirements, resulting in what she characterized as a “domino of errors.”

Resident Anne Scott provided comment, noting 62 years of residency. She remarked that she has been stripped of her privacy.

Attorney Dave Markarian representing the property owners and developer Mr. Russo greeted the Town Commission. He provided defending argument including lack of sunshine, drought conditions and unusual cold temperatures.

Andrew Russo stated that they are happy to comply with the plans as approved. Commissioner Field asked if the property owners were aware of the inconsistencies and stated that the development is obviously noncompliant. A question-and-answer session ensued between Commissioner Field and Mr. Russo.

Ms. Bolan provided comment regarding the landscape plan noting a species change from bamboo to clusia, but not a size/density change in the front and on the south buffer.

Commissioner Taddeo noted that there was a 2022 IRC approval and a separate, more recent Development Review Board approval associated with the property.

Commissioner Field suggested that the applicant withdraw the Development Review Board application and attempt to reach an agreement with Ms. Scott.

Mayor Townsend stated that conditions were imposed requiring the project to match the approved street and southern buffer plans, which showed that the house and neighboring property would not be visible. She noted those requirements were already included in the Development Review Board approval.

The Town Commission recessed for parties to discuss at 2:36 PM.

The Town Commission reconvened at 3:21 PM.

Town Attorney Teal outlined that an agreement had been reached containing high level terms. The agreement required reinstallation of landscape buffers using ten six-foot Clusia trees, trenched and planted five feet on center to create an opaque buffer. A rendering would be prepared by the appellees, reviewed by the appellant, and approved within thirty days, followed by an additional thirty-day period and a thirty-day installation period, for a total of ninety days. The island would be restored to its original 2022 size and rectangular shape. The driveway would otherwise remain as constructed, except for the modifications to the island as discussed.

It was stated that the Building Department would inspect compliance. The rendering would be reviewed and approved within thirty days by Anne Scott’s landscape architect.

Attorney Bowerman stated that an additional appeal had been filed the previous day and that there had not yet been an opportunity to fully review it. He noted that, pending satisfaction of all agreed upon plans by both parties, the proposed agreement was intended to serve as a global resolution.

MOTION: *Commissioner Field/Commissioner Warner moved to hold proceeding in abeyance pending completion of agreement as discussed, with the understanding that an extension could be granted, if necessary.*

ACTION: *Motion Passed 4-0*

The 2nd appeal would also be held in abeyance.

Vice Mayor Scott returned to the dais at this time, following the appeal hearing.

5. Ordinance No. 415 - Authority of Town Commission re. Development Review Board - 2nd Reading

Town Manager Garlo provided background information regarding Ordinance No 415. Town Attorney Teal read Ordinance No. 415 by title only.

MOTION: *Commissioner Taddeo/Commissioner Field moved to Approve and adopt Ordinance No 415 on second reading as presented.*

ACTION: *Motion Passed 5-0*

6. Ordinance No. 416 - Amending Town Code regarding Criteria for Variances - Fill - 2nd Reading

Town Attorney Teal read Ordinance No. 416 by title only.

MOTION: *Commissioner Field/Commissioner Taddeo moved to Approve and adopt on second reading as presented.*

ACTION: *Motion Passed 3-2, with Vice Mayor Scott and Commissioner Warner dissenting.*

7. Ordinance No. 417 - Amending Town Code regarding Criteria for Variances - IMP - 2nd Reading

Town Attorney Teal read Ordinance No. 417 by title only.

Discussion ensued regarding clarification of any impacts of the ordinance.

MOTION: *Commissioner Field/Vice Mayor Scott moved to approve and adopt Ordinance No. 417 on second reading as presented.*

ACTION: *Motion Passed 5-0*

Commissioner Field suggested further discussion regarding IMP and basements in relation to sea level rise. He recommended reviewing what other municipalities were doing and identifying consultants who could assist with evaluating potential impacts and best practices.

8. Ordinance No. 418 - Amending Land Development Regulations re. Variances - 1st Reading

Town Attorney Teal read the Ordinance by title only.

At the previous Town Commission meeting, the Commission directed Town Attorney Teal to prepare a draft ordinance regarding development variances.

Town Attorney Teal presented the draft and explained several revisions made based on suggestions from the Development Review Board. Discussion included the definition of “non-use,” which had been requested by Vice Mayor Scott. Vice Mayor Scott asked whether there had ever been a request involving a non-use variance. It was clarified that an example such as a pickleball court would not constitute a non-use, but rather an accessory use matter. Concern was expressed regarding potential limitations on property rights.

Vice Mayor Scott inquired whether the ordinance could be approved through Section 5.01 while excluding the “non-use” section. Town Attorney Teal confirmed the ordinance could be amended accordingly. Discussion ensued, and it was summarized that a variance cannot be granted for a non-use.

Discussion also occurred regarding reverting the ordinance title to “Standards for Approval of Variance.” Town Attorney Teal clarified that the title would remain consistent with the original language.

MOTION: *Commissioner Field/Vice Mayor Scott moved to amend and approve ordinance No 418 as discussed on first reading.*

ACTION: *Motion Passed 5-0*

9. Resolution No. 951 - Adopting Local Mitigation Strategy Plan

Mayor Townsend questioned the Local Mitigation Strategy Plan (LMS) and noted that she had read the 200 plus page document.

Director Duchock explained the strategy plan and the need for Resolution No. 951 by providing background information. He stated that the Martin County Local Mitigation Strategy was created to develop a unified approach and mitigation strategy plan among County and municipal governments for addressing identified hazards within Martin County. He noted that the LMS established funding priorities for proposed mitigation projects and eligibility for disaster assistance funds that may become available through disaster recovery legislation. He further stated that the Town had been engaged as a member of the LMS task force and had assisted Martin County in the preparation and adoption of the updated 2025 LMS plan as required by FEMA and FDEM.

MOTION: *Commissioner Taddeo/Commissioner Field moved to approve Resolution No. 951 as presented.*

ACTION: *Motion Passed 5-0*

10. Public Works Vehicle Spending Authorization

Director Duchock explained that the Public Works Department lost a sanitation truck through a no-fault, no-injury accident while in service, resulting in an insurance claim and reimbursement of \$12,127. He explained that staff had obtained quotes for a replacement truck and was now requesting a spending

authorization for up to \$38,527.

MOTION: *Vice Mayor Scott/Commissioner Taddeo moved to approve spending authorization not to exceed \$38,527.*

ACTION: *Motion Passed 5-0.*

The Town Commission recessed at 11:27 AM.

The Town Commission reconvened at 11:36 AM.

ADDITIONAL COMMISSION MATTERS

11. Winter Construction Discussion

Town Attorney Teal provided background information regarding the agenda item and explained that the issue of machinery and noise was more appropriately addressed as a compliance matter rather than through adoption of a moratorium. He noted that other municipalities had adopted regulations with various exceptions that allowed flexibility on a case-by-case basis and cautioned that a moratorium could be deemed overly restrictive. He stated it would be beneficial to meet with staff to identify whether additional machinery should be added to the restricted equipment list.

Discussion ensued regarding decibel levels and construction activity during periods when residents believed construction was not permitted. Construction related traffic was also discussed.

Suggestions included requiring a noise monitoring device on site that enforcement officers could review at any time, with the cost borne by the contractor.

Commissioners discussed whether longstanding cultural norms regarding construction practices should be codified. Vice Mayor Scott expressed support for codifying reasonable standards.

The Town Commission discussed the goal of ensuring construction projects were completed efficiently and quietly, with minimal impact to the community and neighboring properties, including consideration of parking and transportation plans.

The Town Commission recessed for the Attorney-Client Session at 12:02 PM.

The Town Commission reconvened from the Attorney-Client Session at 1:00 PM.

Town Attorney Teal requested a closed-door Attorney-Client Session in March.

12. Contractor Parking Discussion

Town Attorney Teal introduced the agenda item and provided background information. He stated that the purpose of the discussion was to address the practice of tradespeople and laborers using residential lots for parking during active construction projects when the lots were not associated with the construction site. He explained that he had been asked to provide viable options that would not create a nuisance related to noise, traffic, safety, or aesthetics.

Mayor Townsend stated that if construction activity could not be seen or heard, it would not present a concern.

MOTION: *Vice Mayor Scott/Commissioner Field moved to approve proposed language and bring back as an ordinance.*

ACTION: *Motion Passed 5-0*

STANDING REPORTS

13. Town Manager's Report*

Town Manager Garlo explained that a second appeal was received the previous day regarding 7 South Beach Road.

14. Town Attorney Report

Town Attorney Teal explained that he had prepared two memoranda in response to prior Commission requests, one addressing the Comprehensive Plan timeline and the other providing guidance regarding educational outreach to residents on state legislation. He summarized that if a Commissioner was asked by a resident about pending state legislation and its potential impact on the Town, the Commissioner was permitted to provide factual, informational responses.

15. Financial Report

Town Manager Garlo noted that the monthly financial report was enclosed for review. There were no questions regarding the report.

16. Building Department Report

Director Harding provided the monthly Building Department report noting 13 building permits and 90 inspections with 2 Certificates of Occupancy issued. She stated that Code Compliance responded to 20 formal complaints.

Vice Mayor Scott asked about the reports and suggested a different format.

17. Public Works Department Report

Director Duchock provided a summary report of the Blue Bag Recycling Pilot Program initiated on December 17, 2025, and limited to the north sanitation route for this initial trial period. He reported average usage of four bags per week per household and roughly 25% participation. Staff continued to monitor usage and analyze cost benefits.

Director Duchock reported that the Beautification Committee met on February 9th, welcoming Mrs. Jody Bush and Mr. Hugh O'Kane to the Committee. The Committee held discussions regarding the ficus allée trimming and removal of one large ficus tree on the north side of Bridge Road. The Committee reviewed

a draft management plan for the allée, following recommendations of the Town's arborist, King Tree Service. The recommended approach is to replace dead/dying trees through natural attrition, rather than interplanting or replacement of all trees at once. He reported that the Committee also discussed forming a not-for-profit, 501(c)(3), organization for the purpose of raising funds to support tree replacement along Bridge Road.

Commissioner Taddeo suggested the Beautification Committee consider a project south of the "S curve." Vice Mayor Scott suggested maintenance and improvement of the ramble where the county does not maintain.

18. Public Safety Department Report

a. Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan*

Chief Ewing provided an overview and background information pertaining to the Public Safety Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan.

He explained that more information is forthcoming in the next month or two.

b. Activity Report

Chief Ewing provided an overview of the January activity report and noted an incident that occurred at the Jupiter Island Yacht Club as well as a golf cart incident involving a minor. He added that the minor was transported but has recovered with no major injuries. He provided an explanation of the delay in ambulance response to the Yacht Club incident, although there was no delay in first responder life safety response time.

Vice Mayor Scott mentioned requests for a full-time ambulance on the island. Chief Ewing outlined several options and associated costs, stating that adding an ambulance and staffing would require eight additional personnel, equipment, and contracts, with an estimated first year cost of approximately \$2.8 million. He also described an option that included purchase of an ambulance.

Chief Ewing stated that maintaining the current contract was the most practical option and more than adequate, particularly given budget concerns in Tallahassee. He noted that the other options would require capital improvements to the Public Safety building.

Discussion ensued regarding golf cart safety. The Commission requested staff to come back with additional suggestions for improved safety. Chief Ewing suggested a letter to residents and an educational tutorial during spring break.

CONSENT ITEMS

19. Consent Agenda

MOTION: *Vice Mayor Scott/Commissioner Field moved to approve the Consent Agenda.*

ACTION: *Motion Passed 5-0*

Category A- To be reviewed and approved (as is or as edited) by the Town Commission

a. Minutes of January 6, 2026, Special Town Commission Meeting

- b. Minutes of January 16, 2026 - Town Commission Meeting

Category B- Other Informational Materials (No Action Required)

NOTE: Minutes are reviewed/approved by their respective Board/Committee/Agency at the next scheduled meeting. The Minutes in this section have been reviewed/approved on the date indicated.

- a. Minutes of February 27, 2025, Finance Advisory Committee Meeting - Feb. 6, 2026
- b. Minutes of November 10, 2025, Beautification Committee Meeting - Feb. 9, 2026
- c. Minutes of November 25, 2024, Local Planning Agency Meeting - January 7, 2026
- d. Minutes of December 4, 2025, Pension Plan Committee - February 19, 2026
- e. Minutes of December 4, 2025, Defined Contribution Plan Committee - February 19, 2026
- f. Minutes of January 8, 2026, Development Review Board Meeting - February 5, 2026
- g. Fixed Asset Disposals

OTHER ITEMS

20. Meeting Dates

- February 25, 2026 – Town Commission Meeting – 9am
- February 25, 2026 – Beach Protection – 3pm or Directly Following Town Commission
- March 24, 2026 – Town Coffee with Mayor Townsend – 9am
- March 24, 2026 – SMRU Board Meeting – 10am
- March 25, 2026 – Town Commission Meeting – 9am
- March 25, 2026 – Beach Protection District Meeting – 1pm or Directly Following Town Commission
- April 22, 2026 – Town Commission Meeting – 9am
- April 22, 2026 – Beach Protection District Meeting – 1pm or Directly Following Town Commission
- May 18, 2026 - SMRU Board Meeting – 9am
- May 19, 2026 – Town Commission Meeting – 9am
- May 19, 2026 – Beach Protection District Meeting – 11:30am or Directly Following Town Commission

Commissioner Warner stated that she would not be able to attend the March meeting.

It was agreed to hold the Town Commission and Beach Protection District meetings on June 23.

21. Other Items*

Future agenda items identified included discussion of DRB and basements, consideration of administrative approval for items that do not meet the site plan, review of the Town’s appeal process, and continued Comprehensive Plan discussion.

No additional matters were discussed.

Mayor Townsend adjourned the meeting at 4:17 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Kimberly Kogos, Town Clerk

**MINUTES
TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND
SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE MEETING
MARCH 24, 2025 – 1:30 P.M.
TOWN HALL CONFERENCE ROOM**

PRESENT: Barbara Carr, Chair
Missy Crisp
Laurie Gaylord
Ann Jackson
Sally Zunino

STAFF: Carol Hazel, Recording Secretary

1. WELCOME

Chair Carr called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. and welcomed the members present. Member Kirstin Devlin was out of town and traveling and unable to attend the meeting. However, she did provide commentary on each applicant, which the Committee members reviewed during the discussion on each candidate.

Chair Carr briefly reviewed a listing of scholarship awardees from the past ten years with their names and scholarship amounts.

2. REVIEW OF TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM AND PROGRAM FINANCES

Chair Carr provided a brief Scholarship Fund financial review and noted the current fundraising effort to fund future scholarships. In consideration of the increased costs of college attendance, the Scholarship Committee members voted unanimously to increase the 2025 scholarship awards to a maximum of \$3,000.

In general discussions relating to the Town’s Scholarship Program and rapidly increasing costs and expenses related to a college education, the members recommended further review of financial considerations in the coming years. Recommendations were made to also consider whether a Town Scholarship could be granted to students who receive full tuition benefits from another source, as well as to consider whether Scholarship funds could be used toward the cost of off-campus housing, if on-campus housing is not provided.

3. REVIEW OF SCHOLARSHIP APPLICATIONS FOR 2025

Chair Carr briefly reviewed how the vetting process would proceed in reviewing each applicant. The applicants were reviewed one by one. Mrs. Devlin’s written comments were considered for each applicant as they came up for review.

Thomas Duchock

Thomas is the son of John Duchock, Assistant Town Manager and Director of the Town’s Beach Protection District. He plans to attend the University of South Florida and major in Environmental Engineering with a minor in Business. After discussion and consideration of Thomas’ application, the Committee agreed to award him a \$3,000 scholarship.

Avery Potsko

Avery is the daughter of Corporal Matt Potsko of the Town’s Public Safety Department. She plans to major as a Veterinarian Technician. She will initially attend Indian River State College and hopes to transfer to a Florida University to pursue further studies in the field of veterinary science. The Committee members were very impressed with Avery’s application, her current interactions with animals, and her desire to pursue her career goals to become a veterinarian. They agreed to award her a \$3,000 scholarship.

Jack Ungerland

Jack is the son of Bonnie Ungerland, a member of the Town’s Finance Department. He is a returning applicant and scholarship awardee, currently attending graduate school at the University of North Florida, majoring in Physical Therapy. After discussion and consideration of Jack’s application, the Committee members agreed to award him a \$3,000 scholarship.

Holon Trent

Holon is the daughter of Stuart Trent, the Town’s Director of Engineering and Utilities. She plans to attend Florida State University, major in Speech Pathology and Child Psychiatry, and hopes to have a career focusing on children with autism. The Committee members were very impressed with Holon’s application, her current activities related to those impacted by autism, and her strong desires and future goals in that field. Following review and discussion of Holon’s application, the Committee members agreed to award her a \$3,000 scholarship.

**4. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM APRIL 24, 2024
SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE MEETING**

The minutes of the April 24, 2024 Scholarship Committee meeting were approved by affirmation by the Committee members in attendance.

5. OTHER BUSINESS – CONSIDERATION OF INFORMAL MEET AND GREET

The Scholarship Committee’s past practice has been to invite each individual scholarship awardee to come to Town Hall to meet informally with members of the Committee. However, for this year, following discussion among the Committee, the members agreed to invite all the scholarship awardees to an informal, late-afternoon get-together with the Committee members at the Town Hall. This event will be scheduled in the near future.

6. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Hazel, Recording Secretary

**MINUTES
TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND
BEAUTIFICATION COMMITTEE MEETING
February 9, 2026**

TIME: Monday, February 9, 2026 – 11:00 a.m.
PLACE: Town Hall Conference Room
PRESENT: Chair Ken McBrayer, Committee Members Joyce Vicenzi, Debbie Textor, Jody Bush, and Hugh O’Kane. Also present were Assistant Town Manager John Duchock, Assistant Director Public Works Jason Coppock, and Assistant Town Clerk Trenton Warren.

1. Welcome (New Committee Members)*

Chair Ken McBrayer called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m. and established a quorum. He welcomed new members Jody Bush and Hugh O’Kane. Director John Duchock introduced himself and Consultant Brian Fischer from King Tree Services. He gave a brief introduction of the Beautification Committee to the new members and discussed the current events concerning the Committee.

2. Approval of Minutes of Meeting Held November 10, 2025

MOTION: Member Textor/Member Vicenzi motioned to approve the minutes of November 10, 2025.

ACTION: Motion Passed 5-0.

3. Bridge Road Ficus Tree Removal and Replacement*

Director Duchock stated the last tree health assessment and analysis was completed in August 2025. He noted several trees were identified with an infection known as hypoxylon canker. Several trees were trimmed and pruned to remove the infection, with one tree being removed outright due to the severity of the infection.

He reviewed the previous species discussed in replacing the current Ficus Allée trees on Bridge Road, and the decision that was made to replace them with Strangler Figs. He stated he received one quote for a full-sized Strangler Fig replacement as of today that is on Island. He noted he has not confirmed a price for the purchase but did have an early price quote of \$20,000 to move the tree to its new location.

Chair McBrayer gave a review of the timeline of events that led to the replacement of the Ficus Allée trees near the Town Hall.

Resident Patsy Warner suggested starting a 501(c)(3) Ficus Allée Charity Foundation for donation purposes. This charity would allow residents to donate money or trees to the foundation. The Committee strongly agreed with the suggestion.

4. Bridge Road Ficus Allée Management Plan Discussion

Director Duchock gave a thorough review of the draft Allée Management Plan presented before the Committee. He presented a new strategy leaning towards attrition replacement rather than interplanting as previously discussed in past meetings. He noted that under this plan, the current Ficus Allée trees will be replaced slowly as they die or become feeble with the new Strangler Figs. He stated this will be a slower progression plan. Consultant Brian Fischer of King Tree Services stated last year's health analysis revealed the current Ficus Allée trees are in a much better state than previously believed. Discussion ensued over the plan and whether to approve the draft to be presented to the Town Commission.

Member Textor asked for clarification of the Tree Location Map in the draft plan. Director Duchock identified the locations of trees that have been removed and the remaining trees that have some health concerns. Member Textor supported the idea of acquiring Strangler Figs that are already planted on Island for replacement purposes as much as possible. She asked if the current spacing is sufficient for new Strangler Figs to survive. Mr. Fischer stated he was very confident the current space can support new trees.

Member Bush inquired about the optimal conditions for the new Strangler Figs. Mr. Fischer gave an explanation to the tree relocation process and the post care treatment after the relocation. He stated using trees on the Island is preferred as they are already adjusted to the conditions present on the island.

Member O'Kane inquired about the current maintenance costs for the care of the Ficus Allées along Bridge Road. Assistant Director Jason Coppock estimated it was roughly \$75-100,000 each year.

Chair McBrayer expressed approval of purchasing newer Strangler Figs and managing them over the years in a nursery on Island that can be used for replacement purposes at a later date.

MOTION: Member O'Kane /Member Textor motioned to adopt the Draft Bridge Road Ficus Allée Management Plan with a focus of attrition planting over direct interplanting; and to present it to the Town Commission for approval.

ACTION: Motion Passed 3-0, with Member Bush and Member Vicenzi abstaining.

5. Other Matters*

Member Vicenzi suggested reaching out to Resident Jay Wilson and having the Jupiter Island Resident's Association do an article in the Town News regarding the new plan for the Ficus Allée replacement.

Chair McBrayer announced that the Beautification Committee is looking for smaller projects to benefit the Town. He encouraged the Committee members to go out and find new possible projects to improve the island aesthetic. The Committee briefly discussed an Australian Pine removal project, with no consensus being reached.

6. Adjournment*

Chair McBrayer adjourned the meeting at 12:06 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Trenton Warren
Assistant Town Clerk



February 2026 General Fund FY 2025-2026 Interim Financial Report

**Town Commission Meeting
March 25, 2026**

**Town of Jupiter Island
FY 2025/2026 Budget Summary**

Account Description	Adopted Budget 2025-2026	YTD Actual 2/28/2026	Target 41%
Total General Fund Revenues	\$13,487,227	\$10,795,495	80%
Transfers from Reserves	\$100,000	\$0	0%
Total Revenues	\$13,587,227	\$10,795,495	79%
Total Administration	\$3,827,878	\$1,353,436	35%
Total Public Safety	\$6,319,911	\$2,429,761	38%
Total Building Department	\$950,057	\$283,975	30%
Total Public Works	\$2,489,381	\$771,109	31%
Total General Fund Expenditures	\$13,587,227	\$4,838,281	36%
Year to Date Net Income		\$5,957,214	

FY 2025-2026 Revenues

Account Description	Adopted Budget 2025-2026	PYTD Actual 2/28/2025	YTD Actual 2/28/2026	Actual % of Budget (Target 41%) 2025-2026
Ad Valorem	\$10,800,744	\$9,221,060	\$9,901,600	92%
Total Other Taxes and Fees	\$333,000	\$114,768	\$87,103	26%
Total Licenses and Permits	\$850,500	\$291,477	\$164,579	19%
Total Intergovernmental Revenue	\$330,700	\$43,640	\$75,924	23%
Total Charges for Services	\$131,000	\$48,144	\$31,425	24%
Total Fines and Forfeits	\$2,500	\$1,305	\$575	23%
Total Miscellaneous Revenues	\$289,500	\$278,262	\$232,503	80%
Transfers from Interfunds	\$749,283	\$285,550	\$301,785	40%
Subtotal Revenues	\$13,487,227	\$10,284,205	\$10,795,495	80%
Transfer from Reserves	\$100,000	\$0	\$0	
Total General Fund Revenues	\$13,587,227	\$10,284,205	\$10,795,495	79%

FY 2025-2026 Expenses by Department

Account Description	Adopted Budget 2025-2026	PYTD Actual 2/28/2025	YTD Actual 2/28/2026	Actual % of Budget (Target 41%)
Total Administration - Payroll	\$1,468,382	\$525,727	\$534,912	36%
Total Administration - Benefits	\$937,556	\$246,961	\$317,623	34%
Total Administration - Operating	\$1,411,940	\$545,756	\$496,633	35%
Subtotal	\$3,817,878	\$1,318,444	\$1,349,168	35%
Total Administration - Capital	\$10,000	\$0	\$4,268	43%
Total Administration	\$3,827,878	\$1,318,444	\$1,353,436	35%
Total Public Safety - Payroll	\$3,234,696	\$1,209,211	\$1,234,282	38%
Total Public Safety - Benefits	\$1,109,035	\$335,784	\$481,001	43%
Total Public Safety - Operating	\$1,511,380	\$477,538	\$439,640	29%
Subtotal	\$5,855,111	\$2,022,533	\$2,154,924	37%
Total Public Safety - Capital	\$464,800	\$413,701	\$274,837	59%
Total Public Safety	\$6,319,911	\$2,436,234	\$2,429,761	38%
Total Building - Payroll	\$408,640	\$228,823	\$149,872	37%
Total Building - Benefits	\$150,540	\$64,024	\$37,300	25%
Total Building - Operating	\$380,877	\$592,978	\$96,803	25%
Subtotal	\$940,057	\$885,825	\$283,975	30%
Total Building - Capital	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	0%
Total Building Department	\$950,057	\$885,825	\$283,975	30%
Total Public Works - Payroll	\$771,251	\$248,746	\$275,286	36%
Total Public Works-Benefits	\$427,080	\$140,572	\$130,001	30%
Total Public Works - Operating	\$770,050	\$271,989	\$184,919	24%
Subtotal	\$1,968,381	\$661,307	\$590,207	30%
Total Public Works - Capital	\$521,000	\$28,142	\$180,902	35%
Total Public Works	\$2,489,381	\$689,449	\$771,109	31%
Total General Fund Expenditures	\$13,587,227	\$5,329,952	\$4,838,281	36%

Balance Sheet as of 2/28/2026

Assets

CASH GENERAL ACCOUNT - SEACOAST	\$ 740,857
MONEY MARKET-SEACOAST	\$ 2,402,001
CASH PAYROLL - SEACOAST	\$ 50,000
CASH FLEX SPENDING - SEACOAST	\$ 50,212
INVESTMENT POOL	\$ 2,375,352
INVESTMENT- FL PALM	\$ 11,162,440
INVESTMENT - SBA	\$ 3,691,850
PETTY CASH	\$ 550
ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE	\$ 13,345
ACCOUNTS REC. - RETIREE BENEFITS	\$ 1,199
DUE FROM BEACH PROTECTION	\$ 16,917
DUE FROM CONSERVATION FUND	\$ 3,450
DUE FROM UTILITIES	\$ 101,706
<u>PREPAID ITEMS</u>	<u>\$ 3,219</u>
Total Assets	\$ 20,613,098

Liabilities

ACCOUNTS PAYABLE	\$ (144)
DUE TO BEACH PROTECTION	\$ 26,200
DUE TO O&M	\$ (499)
DUE TO SCHOLARSHIP FUND	\$ 100
DUE TO OTHER GOV. UNITS	\$ 1,111
UNEARNED REVENUE	\$ 2,323,000
ACCRUED PAYROLL/BENEFITS	\$ (17,829)
OVERPAYMENTS-RETIREES	\$ 891
DONATIONS	\$ 5,024
Total Liabilities	\$ 2,337,854

Reserves/Fund Balances

NONSPENDABLE PREPAID	\$ 107,213
RESTRICT- ENFORCE FL BLDG CODE	\$ 3,732,426
RESTRICTED- LGIS CONSERVATION SURTAX	\$ 78,137
ASSIGNED FOR EMERGENCIES	\$ 1,000,000
ASSIGNED FOR COMPENSATED AB	\$ 115,000
ASSIGNED FOR UNINSURED LOSS	\$ 80,000
FUND BALANCE	\$ 7,478,146
CHANGE IN FUND BALANCE - Current	\$ 5,957,214
CHANGE IN FUND BALANCE - PY	\$ (272,892)
<u>Total Reserves/Fund Balances</u>	<u>\$ 18,275,244</u>

Total Liabilities and Fund Balance

\$ 20,613,098

General Fund Reserves

Account Description	Audited YE 2022	Audited YE 2023	Audited YE 2024	Adopted Budget FY 2025*	Adopted Budget FY 2026*
Beginning Fund Balance (Reserves)	9,033,098	6,237,564	9,585,872	9,432,523	9,168,418
Transfer from / to General Fund Reserves	2,247,916	3,060,930	-	-	-
Amount Budgeted/From Reserves GF, ConF, Beaf	(793,404)	-	(126,424)	(371,318)	(250,000)
Budget Amendment From Reserves	(385,000)	-	-	-	-
Total Available Fund Balance	10,102,610	9,298,494	9,459,448	9,061,205	8,918,418
Non Spendable-Pre Paid Expenses	71,269	127,833	32,933	107,213	107,213
Assigned to Uninsured Losses	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000
Assigned to Compensated Absences	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000
Assigned to Beautification, Scholarship, Public Safety	163,791	176,170	171,145	235,413	235,413
Assigned to Conservation Projects	431,990	431,989	431,981	364,587	364,587
Assigned to Emergencies	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Assigned to ARPA-2022, Restr. LGIS Surtax-2025	312,393			78,137	78,137
Restricted-Enforcement of FL Building Code		3,865,046	3,672,568	3,732,426	3,732,426
Unassigned Fund Balance (Reserves)	8,836,382	7,495,335	7,661,322	7,188,068	7,045,281
Total Fund Balance (Reserves)	\$ 11,010,825	\$ 13,291,373	\$ 13,164,949	\$ 12,900,844	\$ 12,758,057

*Estimated/Unaudited at time of this Report



2026 Legislative Session Update

Table of Contents

<i>HB 399 Land Use and Development Regulations PASSED</i>	2
<i>HB 145 Claims Against the Government PASSED</i>	4
<i>HB 1451 Utility Services PASSED</i>	5
<i>SB 1434 Infill Redevelopment PASSED</i>	6
<i>SB 484 Data Centers PASSED</i>	7
<i>SB 0686 Agricultural Enclaves PASSED</i>	9
<i>HB 803 - Building Permits and Inspections PASSED</i>	11
<i>HB 1019 Perfluoroalkyl and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances PASSED</i>	13
<i>HB 927 - Local Land Planning and Development PASSED</i>	14
<i>HB 1329 - Local Government Finances PASSED</i>	16
<i>SB 290 - Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services PASSED</i>	20
<i>HB 437/ SB 770 - Public Records FAILED</i>	21
<i>SB 48/HB 313 – Housing (Accessory Dwelling Units) FAILED</i>	22
<i>HB 1297/SB 636 - Beach Management FAILED</i>	23
<i>SB 1014/HB 1075 - Provision of Municipal Utility Service to Owners Outside the Municipal Limits FAILED</i> ...	24
<i>SB 354/HB 299 - Blue Ribbon Projects FAILED</i>	25
<i>SB 840/ HB 1465 - Land Use Regulations for Local Governments Affected by Natural Disasters FAILED</i>	26
<i>HB 203 - Elimination of Non-school Property for Homesteads FAILED</i>	27
<i>HB 1167/ SB 1468 - Advanced Wastewater Treatment FAILED</i>	28

HB 399 Land Use and Development Regulations **PASSED**

HB 399 amends Florida Statutes to establish statewide standards and limitations on certain local government authorities related to development permitting, fees, housing options, and specific land use processes. The bill promotes greater predictability, cost-based fees, and equal treatment of certain housing types while preempting select local regulations in targeted areas. Most provisions become effective January 1, 2027, with the act taking effect upon becoming law unless otherwise specified. The expedited process for large destination resorts sunsets on July 1, 2031.

- **Development Permit and Order Application Fees** Counties and municipalities must establish fees that reasonably correspond to the direct and indirect costs of reviewing, processing, and disposing of applications. Fees must be publicly listed in the local government's fee schedule and may not be calculated as a percentage of construction costs, site costs, or overall project valuation. This provision takes effect January 1, 2027.
- **Interlocal Agreements for Public Schools** Agreements between local governments and school districts must include provisions ensuring reasonable access to available public easements and rights-of-way for the siting, construction, expansion, or improvement of public-school facilities (including charter schools). Such provisions must align with adopted level-of-service standards, school concurrency requirements, and public facilities elements of the comprehensive plan. This takes effect January 1, 2027.
- **Expedited Administrative Approvals for Large Destination Resorts** The bill establishes a temporary process (effective until July 1, 2031) requiring local governments to grant administrative approval—without quasi-judicial review—for minor special exceptions or variances requested by qualifying large destination resorts. Qualifying properties must meet defined thresholds (e.g., at least 5 contiguous acres, 500 guest rooms, and 70% average occupancy over the prior three years). Approvals apply only to maintenance, modification, or refurbishment of existing structures or sites, limited to no more than 20% of the parcel area, and must be consistent with previously permitted uses.
- **Composting Facilities** Local governments may not condition approvals for compost processing facilities on the purchase of additional land (e.g., for road expansion), though they may require emergency vehicle turnouts on the applicant's property where feasible. Existing permits may not be revoked if the facility complies with applicable statewide or regional best management practices or regulations administered by the Department of Environmental Protection, Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, or water management districts.
- **Residential Compatibility Assessments** Comprehensive plans and land development regulations must incorporate specific factors and mitigation measures for evaluating the compatibility of residential uses within residential zoning districts and future land use categories. Prior to recommending denial on compatibility grounds, staff must identify specific areas of concern and propose mitigation options. Denials require detailed written findings explaining why proposed mitigation is inadequate and no feasible alternatives exist; vague justifications (e.g., "community character") are insufficient. Approvals may include conditions. Exceptions apply to cross-category compatibility, planned unit developments, master planned communities, and certain pre-2026 historic districts. This takes effect January 1, 2027.
- **Certified Residential Manufactured Buildings** Local governments may not deny building permits for certified residential manufactured buildings placed on designated lots within mobile home parks, subdivisions, recreational vehicle parks, or similar developments. Such units remain subject to existing requirements (e.g., park owner approval, taxation under chapter 320, F.S., and contributions to the Florida Mobile Home Relocation Fund), with specific provisions for the Florida Keys. This takes effect January 1, 2027.

- **Off-Site Constructed Residential Dwellings** Off-site constructed (modular or manufactured) single-family dwellings must be permitted as-of-right in any zoning district that allows single-family detached homes. Local regulations may not impose more restrictive standards on these dwellings than on site-built homes, though uniform requirements (e.g., for setbacks, height, roof pitch, exterior materials, foundation, and orientation) may apply if enforced consistently. Restrictions based solely on construction method or off-site origin are prohibited, and any conflicting local ordinances are voided. Local governments must ensure reasonable and uniform enforcement. This takes effect January 1, 2027.

HB 145 Claims Against the Government **PASSED**

This bill amends Florida Statutes § 768.28 (waiver of sovereign immunity for tort claims) and related provisions. It applies to causes of action accruing on or after the effective date. The changes primarily affect the liability exposure of the state, its agencies, and political subdivisions (including local governments such as municipalities and counties).

- **Increases Statutory Liability Limits** Raises the maximum amount that can be paid or collected without additional legislative action (via a claims bill) from \$200,000 to \$350,000 per person and from \$300,000 to \$500,000 per incident (per occurrence). This applies to tort claims against government entities. Any judgment exceeding these caps would still require separate legislative approval for payment of the excess.
- **Shortens Time Limit for Presenting Claims** Reduces the general period for presenting a written tort claim to the appropriate government entity (and, in most cases, to the Department of Financial Services) from 3 years to 18 months after the claim accrues. Certain exceptions apply, including longer periods for specific claim types.
- **Revises Statute of Limitations for Tort Actions** Updates the limitations period for filing lawsuits on tort claims against government entities. It establishes a 2-year limit for general negligence actions, with tailored provisions for other types (e.g., contribution claims, medical malpractice, wrongful death). Notably, claims arising from sexual battery violations (under s. 794.011) involving victims under 16 years of age may be presented at any time, with wrongful death claims under this provision required within 2 years after accrual.
- **Adjusts Claim Denial and Notice Procedures** Extends the period after which a government entity's failure to resolve a claim is deemed a denial (from 4 months to 6 months in certain cases, while retaining 90 days for some medical/wrongful death matters). Clarifies and strengthens notice requirements, including mandatory inclusion of specific claimant information (e.g., date/place of birth, SSN, prior adjudicated claims over \$200 owed to the state) to facilitate settlement or litigation.

Effective Date: October 1, 2026.

HB 1451 Utility Services **PASSED**

HB 1451 require municipalities providing utility services outside their boundaries to execute written agreements, hold public meetings, disclose rate differentials, and meet new annual reporting requirements while modifying certain surcharges.

Requires written agreements for utility service extensions: Any new agreement—or extension, renewal, or material amendment—to provide retail electric, natural gas, water, or sewer services outside the municipality's boundaries (to another municipality, unincorporated areas, or customers there) must be in writing.

- **Mandates public meetings before agreements take effect:** Before such an agreement becomes effective, the providing municipality must hold public meetings (in coordination with the governing bodies of the affected areas) in each served municipality and unincorporated area. These meetings must disclose details about the services, proposed rates (including any differentials compared to inside-boundary customers), how revenues will be used (including for non-utility purposes), and other key terms, while allowing public input.
- **Requires annual public customer meetings for ongoing service:** Municipalities providing these utilities outside their boundaries must hold annual public meetings in each served area to gather customer feedback on rates, fees, charges, and service quality.
- **Tightens limits on water and sewer rate differentials:** For water and sewer services, the maximum allowable differential (surcharge) for customers outside the boundaries is reduced to 25% above inside-boundary rates (previously allowing up to 50% in some cases, with justification). Rates must comply with existing statutes (s. 180.191, F.S.), and any differentials require public hearings using the same methods as for inside customers. Existing surcharges in place before March 1, 2026, may continue only to meet bond covenants (as of July 1, 2024) but must be fully phased out by July 1, 2029, or earlier if the related debt is retired, expires, or refinanced.
- **Imposes new annual reporting requirements:** Starting January 1, 2027 (with initial reporting possibly tied to 2026 effective date for this section), municipalities must submit annual reports to the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC) detailing: the number and percentage of out-of-boundary customers, sales volume and revenues from those customers, any rate differentials, and use of revenues for non-utility purposes.
- **Grants limited PSC enforcement authority:** The PSC gains limited jurisdiction over these municipal utilities solely to enforce the reporting requirements. Noncompliance can result in penalties (under existing statutes ss. 366.095 and 367.161, F.S.). The PSC must compile the data and submit an annual report to the Governor, Senate President, and House Speaker by March 31 starting in 2027.
- **Preempts certain regional utilities authorities to the state:** The subject matter of any regional utilities authority created by the Legislature via charter amendment after January 1, 2023, is expressly preempted to the state (preventing local changes without state action).

Effective Date: July 1, 2027 (with the preemption provision effective upon becoming law, and reporting requirements effective July 1, 2026).

SB 1434 Infill Redevelopment **PASSED**

(ONLY APPLIES to Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach, based on population and number of municipalities criteria)

- **Establishes the Infill Redevelopment Act with legislative intent:** The Act addresses housing shortages in urban areas by promoting redevelopment of environmentally impacted parcels. It finds that such parcels are underutilized due to contamination or prior uses, and expedited residential development on them supports remediation, increases housing supply, and serves the public interest in infill (rather than greenfield) growth.
- **Defines key terms for applicability:**
 - "Environmentally impacted land": Parcels with detected contaminants/pollutants above residential cleanup levels (per Phase II assessments) or designated brownfield areas under s. 376.80, F.S.
 - "Qualifying parcel": At least 5 acres of environmentally impacted land, adjacent to parcels zoned for residential uses as of right, located in a county with >1.475 million population (per most recent census) and at least 15 municipalities (currently Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach Counties). Excludes designated agricultural land, public parks, land outside urban growth boundaries, land near certain military installations, and recent public utility-owned land.
 - "Recreational facilities": Former golf courses, tennis courts, pools, clubhouses, or similar uses.
- **Mandates permission for residential development on qualifying parcels:** Local governments must allow residential uses on qualifying parcels, overriding conflicting local laws/ordinances. Density is capped at the lower of: (1) the average density of adjacent zoning districts allowing residential uses as of right, or (2) 25 dwelling units per acre. Development intensity must match standards for adjacent parcels.
- **Requires administrative (non-discretionary) approvals:** Compliant subdivision applications must be approved administratively (no governing body vote needed). Local governments cannot use subdivision processes to reduce authorized density/intensity. Developments meeting Act criteria receive administrative approval overall, though local governments may require compliance with generally applicable architectural design standards (if no board review is involved and they do not reduce density/intensity).
- **Imposes compatibility buffers:** If the qualifying parcel is surrounded on all sides by single-family homes or townhouses, developers must provide a 20-foot buffer (lot line to lot line) around the new development. This buffer must remain open space or be improved for passive recreation accessible to the community (swales/retention areas qualify as open space).
- **Adds requirements for parcels with former recreational facilities:** For qualifying parcels (or portions) previously used as recreational facilities adjacent to single-family homes on all sides, developers must: (1) prove the facilities have not operated for at least 12 consecutive months; (2) pay double the applicable parks/recreation impact fees to offset lost open space; and (3) notify adjacent owners by certified mail, offering them the option to purchase the parcel/portion for recreational/open space use within 90 days (at a price not exceeding the seller's listed price +10% or recent bona fide offers). Buyers must close and record a 30-year deed restriction for recreational use or forfeit the option.
- **Preempts restrictive local actions:** Local governments are prohibited from adopting or enforcing any new laws, ordinances, or regulations that restrict, prohibit, or limit development of qualifying parcels under the Act. The Act must be liberally construed to achieve its goals of facilitating infill redevelopment.

SB 484 Data Centers **PASSED**

SB 484 sets up new rules for **large-scale data centers** (facilities using 50 megawatts or more of peak power at one site, mainly for processing and storing massive amounts of data, often linked to AI and cloud computing). The goal is to make sure these big operations pay their own way for electricity, water, and other infrastructure without raising costs for everyday customers or ignoring local rules.

- **Retains and clarifies local government authority over land use:** Local governments maintain full authority to exercise their powers for comprehensive planning and land development regulations with respect to large load customers (including data centers). A large load customer cannot be treated as an electric substation for zoning or planning purposes (under s. 163.3208, F.S.). This affirms local discretion over siting, compatibility, infrastructure capacity, environmental impacts, and efficient provision of public services—no preemption of local zoning or comprehensive plans occurs.
- **Defines key terms for applicability:**
 - "Data center": A facility (standalone or within a larger structure) primarily used to process, store, and transmit digital information with environmental controls for equipment.
 - "Large-scale data center": A single-location facility (including colocated entities) with an anticipated monthly peak electric load of 50 megawatts or more (highest average over a 15-minute interval).
 - "Large load customer": A customer at a single location with the same 50 MW+ peak load threshold (includes colocation agreements but not aggregated loads across multiple sites).
 - "Foreign entity": Entities owned/controlled by or principally based in a "foreign country of concern" (cross-referencing s. 692.201, F.S.).
- **Requires utilities to ensure large load customers bear their own costs:** Public utilities must file tariffs (by October 1, 2026) with the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC) that reasonably ensure large load customers pay their full cost of service—including connection, incremental transmission/generation, infrastructure, operations/maintenance, and other costs—without shifting burdens or nonpayment risks to general ratepayers. Tariffs may include tools like contributions in aid of construction, demand charges, financial guarantees, minimum load factors, take-or-pay provisions, and service term requirements.
- **Imposes prohibitions on service:** Utilities may not knowingly provide electric service to a large load customer that is a foreign entity. Customers cannot split a single-location load into multiple smaller connections to evade large load classification.
- **Establishes stricter water permitting for large-scale data centers:** Water management districts or the Department of Environmental Protection cannot issue consumptive use permits if the water use would harm area resources, violate local zoning/comprehensive plans, or fail standard tests (reasonable-beneficial, no interference with existing uses, consistent with public interest). Permits must require use of reclaimed water when feasible (available, accessible, environmentally/economically/technically viable, and not conflicting with discharge permits). Applications for 100,000+ gallons per day must detail all water sources/uses/losses and include a conservation plan (recycling cooling water, leak detection, efficient fixtures, employee education). High-volume applications or modifications require a public hearing.

- **Creates an independent study requirement:** The Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability (OPPAGA) must contract for an interdisciplinary study on large-scale data centers' construction and operation, covering economic/tax impacts, land/water/energy resource use, rate/cost effects, public health/safety, and unique Florida issues. Recommendations must address siting and mitigation. Report due to the Governor, Senate President, and House Speaker by July 1, 2027.
- **Addresses confidentiality:** Creates an exception to existing confidentiality extensions for economic development information related to data centers (altering prior one-year public records exemptions in some cases to allow disclosure of potential locations/expansions).

Effective Date: July 1, 2026 (except as otherwise provided; certain sections, like the act itself, take effect upon becoming law).

SB 0686 Agricultural Enclaves **PASSED**

- **Creates a new certification process for agricultural enclaves:** Property owners (or authorized agents) may apply to the local government's governing body to certify one or more parcels as an "agricultural enclave" if adjacent parcels or developments allow the same or higher residential density as proposed. Certification confirms eligibility under the revised definition (see below). Applicants cannot use the perimeter of another certified enclave to qualify.
- **Establishes strict timelines and automatic certification:** Local governments must issue a written report within 30 days of application receipt on whether the parcel meets criteria. A public hearing to approve or deny must occur within 30 days after the report. If no decision (approval or denial) is made within 90 days of application receipt, the parcel(s) are **automatically certified** as an agricultural enclave.
- **Provides judicial review for denials:** Denials require a written decision with detailed findings of fact and conclusions of law. Applicants may petition for writ of certiorari in circuit court within 30 days.
- **Allows streamlined development after certification:** Certified enclaves may submit single-family residential development plans consistent with adjacent land uses/densities/intensities. These are treated as **conforming uses** notwithstanding the local comprehensive plan, future land use designation, or zoning. Local governments and owners must agree in writing (within 30 business days of submission) to a review process/schedule not exceeding 180 days total, which may be administrative (no additional quasi-judicial hearings or public hearings required). Encourages (but does not mandate) site design measures like clustering, open space, or wildlife crossings to maintain habitat permeability where feasible.
- **Prohibits more burdensome local regulations:** Local governments cannot enact or enforce laws, ordinances, or regulations for certified agricultural enclaves that are more burdensome than those applied to comparable uses or densities elsewhere.
- **Treats qualifying enclaves as within urban service areas:** Agricultural enclaves adjacent to urban service districts, areas, or lines must be treated as if located **within** the urban service boundary for purposes of service provision and concurrency.
- **Authorizes certain commercial/industrial development:** Parcels certified as enclaves and adjacent to interstate highways may be developed for commercial, industrial, or single-family residential uses matching adjacent densities/intensities.
- **Revises and expands the definition of "agricultural enclave":** An enclave is an unincorporated, undeveloped parcel(s) owned/controlled by one entity; in continuous bona fide agricultural use (per s. 193.461, F.S.) for 5 years before application; surrounded on at least 75% of perimeter by existing or designated industrial/commercial/residential development (or combinations including interstates and urban service areas); with public services available, scheduled, or ensured via binding agreements for concurrency (s. 163.3180, F.S.); not exceeding 700 acres generally (up to 1,280 acres, or 4,480 acres in high-density residential adjacency cases where buildout reaches at least 1,000 residents per square mile); and located in counties with population of 1.75 million or less (per most recent census).
- **Preserves key environmental and other protections:** The bill does not preempt or replace protections for areas like the Wekiva Study Area, Everglades Protection Area, areas of critical state concern, recorded conservation easements, or military installations/compatibilities.

- **Replaces prior comprehensive plan amendment process:** Deletes existing provisions allowing comprehensive plan amendments specifically for agricultural enclaves; certification and negotiated development plans serve as the new pathway.
- **Includes a sunset/reversion clause:** Amendments to ss. 163.3162(4) and 163.3164(4), F.S., expire January 1, 2028, reverting to the text in effect on June 30, 2026 (except for unrelated amendments enacted separately).

Effective Date: July 1, 2026.

HB 803 - Building Permits and Inspections **PASSED**

- **Extends single-family dwelling permit expiration periods:** Building permits for single-family dwellings issued by counties or local governments expire 1 year after issuance or upon the effective date of the next Florida Building Code edition, whichever is later. Local governments retain authority to grant further extensions.
- **Mandates uniform statewide permit applications:** The Florida Building Commission must adopt uniform commercial and residential building permit applications by July 1, 2027. These must integrate with local software systems and accommodate local code amendments.
- **Prohibits discriminatory treatment of offsite-constructed residential dwellings:** Defines "offsite-constructed residential dwelling" to include certain manufactured buildings for single-family use or manufactured homes treated as real property. These must be permitted "as of right" in any zoning district allowing single-family detached dwellings. Local governments are prohibited from adopting or enforcing zoning, land use, or development regulations that treat them more restrictively than site-built homes (preempting differential treatment). Allows uniform application of general architectural, aesthetic, design, setback, height, bulk, or compatibility standards (limited to roof pitch, square footage, exterior materials, foundation enclosure, attached structures, setbacks/lot dimensions/orientation). Voids conflicting local ordinances as applied to these dwellings; prohibits exclusionary effects.
- **Strengthens and streamlines private provider options for plans review and inspections:** Fee owners or authorized contractors may opt to use private providers (licensed engineers, architects, or building code administrators) for plans review and/or inspections at any time. Local governments must reduce permit fees by at least 25% (for plans review or inspections) or 50% (if both) to reflect cost savings; prohibits punitive administrative fees, extra plans review charges, or fees exceeding actual costs. Limits local oversight to completeness checks; deems applications approved if not acted on timely; allows electronic submissions/affidavits; restricts audits (max 4/year, with notice); provides immunity for locals/private providers; prohibits discouraging private provider use. Requires the Department of Management Services to maintain state term contracts for inspection services.
- **Adds exemptions from building permits:** Exempts work valued under \$7,500 on single-family dwellings (except electrical, plumbing, structural, mechanical, gas, or flood-hazard-area work); prohibits splitting projects to evade thresholds; requires written exemption requests with documentation. Exempts installation of temporary hurricane/flood protection walls/barriers (nonhabitable, non-load-bearing, installed by licensed contractors, complying with zoning/drainage/easements/setbacks; excludes flood-hazard areas). Local governments have no duty/liability for exempted work. Requires permits for multi-lot retaining walls as a whole (not per-lot).
- **Addresses manufactured residential buildings:** Prohibits the Department of Business and Professional Regulation from denying permits for certified residential manufactured buildings on mobile home lots/parks/condos/cooperatives/subdivisions; requires taxation as mobile homes under ch. 723, F.S., if placed there.
- **Imposes permit issuance timelines and fee restrictions:** Requires local governments to approve/deny/comply with conditions on permit applications within set timeframes (e.g., 5–60 business days depending on project type/size). Prohibits inspection fees exceeding actual costs or based on project value.

- **Allows out-of-state inspectors in emergencies:** Authorizes individuals with valid out-of-state licenses (or similar qualifications) to serve in certain inspecting/plans review roles for up to 1 year after a declared emergency, under specified conditions.
- **Protects contractors from discipline in certain cases:** Exempts contractors from disciplinary action for performing work without required permits/inspections if otherwise authorized by law.
- **Prohibits HOAs from requiring government permits as prerequisite:** Homeowners' associations (or their committees) cannot require proof of a governmental building permit before conducting their own review/approval of proposed residential improvements.

HB 1019 Perfluoroalkyl and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances **PASSED**

- **Creates the "Joe Casello Act" and new statutory section:** Establishes s. 376.911, F.S., to regulate perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) in aqueous film-forming foam (AFFF), defined as any firefighting foam containing intentionally added PFAS (including perfluorooctanoic acid [PFOA] and perfluorooctane sulfonate [PFOS] as defined by the U.S. EPA).
- **Phased prohibitions on PFAS-containing AFFF:**
 - Effective July 1, 2026: Prohibits use for nonemergency instruction, training, or testing; requires all entities in possession to report AFFF inventories to the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP).
 - Effective July 1, 2027: Prohibits sale, purchase, or distribution statewide; requires entities with remaining inventories to submit disposal plans to DEP.
 - Effective July 1, 2029: Prohibits possession and use statewide (full phase-out).
- **Provides targeted exemptions:** The 2029 possession/use ban does not apply to:
 - Airports (as defined in s. 330.27, F.S., including certain federal aviation facilities serving scheduled passenger operations).
 - Military applications where no PFAS-free alternatives exist.
 - Emergency firefighting situations (including mutual aid responses) where alternative foam is unavailable.
 - Certain AFFF retrofit projects **submitted to state or local firefighting authorities.**
- **Grants DEP authority and support tools:**
 - Adopt rules for containment, collection, and disposal of AFFF.
 - Maintain a registry of PFAS-free firefighting foam alternatives.
 - Provide technical assistance and administer grants or cost-share programs to help local fire departments, airports, and other entities transition to PFAS-free products.
- **Imposes civil penalties and enforcement:**
 - Violations (including failure to report inventories or submit disposal plans) subject to civil penalties up to \$10,000 per violation per day.
 - DEP may seek injunctive relief to enforce compliance.
- **Requires quarterly PFAS sampling for wastewater facilities (amends s. 403.086, F.S.):**
 - Public entities disposing of domestic wastewater biosolids and/or treated effluent with a designed average daily flow of 25,000 gallons or more must conduct at least one quarterly sampling event for PFAS (including PFOA and PFOS, as applicable) in biosolids and treated effluent.
 - Results must be submitted to DEP in accordance with department rules.
 - Sampling and reporting are for informational purposes only until the U.S. EPA establishes water quality standards for PFAS and DEP adopts them—no basis for DEP enforcement actions or other causes of action in the interim.
- **Effective Date:** July 1, 2026.

HB 927 - Local Land Planning and Development **PASSED**

- **Mandates preapplication consultation programs** — Counties (population $\geq 75,000$) and municipalities (population $\geq 10,000$) must create and implement a program by January 1, 2027, offering development preapplication consultation services at an applicant's request for certain development permits/orders (site plans, plats, development approvals under ch. 163). Does not require modifying existing similar programs in place by July 1, 2026. Programs must specify minimum submission requirements, precertify application completeness (including site plans/plats), and confirm compliance with land development regulations/comprehensive plans. If applicant opts in: local government confirms receipt/completeness within 5 business days (deems complete if no notice); applicant cures deficiencies within 30 days; final action (approve, approve with conditions, or deny) within 45 days of completeness (deemed approved without conditions if no action after 45 days + 10-day notice response period). If applicant opts out or ineligible: completeness review within 30 days; approval within 120 days (no hearing) or 180 days (with hearing). Timeframes restart on substantive changes ($\geq 15\%$ density/intensity/square footage shift). Excludes areas of critical state concern.
- **Authorizes and regulates qualified contractors/firms** — Creates s. 163.3169, F.S., defining "qualified contractor" (e.g., licensed engineers, surveyors, architects, landscape architects, or certified planners with experience thresholds) and "qualified contractor firm." By January 1, 2027, covered local governments must establish a registry of at least 4 qualified contractors or 2 firms (cannot include own employees; may contract with other governments' staff). Registry supplements staff for preapplication services, plat/replat reviews, and expedited building permit reviews. Applicants may use registry contractors or their own (if no conflict of interest per s. 112.312, F.S.). Local governments prohibited from conditioning, delaying, denying, or adding burdens to applicant's choice; applicant pays fees/costs. Local governments must provide necessary public records access (excluding confidential info). Exception for historic properties (National Register/local landmarks). Prohibits conflicts of interest.
- **Establishes standardized refund schedules for delays** — Tiered refunds of application fees if timelines missed: 10% for no completeness notice within 30 days (or after first additional info request); 10% for no notice within 30 days (first additional request); 20% for no notice within 10 days (second request); 50% if no final action within 30 days after 120/180-day period; 100% if inaction 31+ days beyond. No refunds for agreed extensions, applicant delays, or force majeure.
- **Clarifies financial assurances and infrastructure requirements** — Local governments must accept/verify common forms (bonds, letters of credit, escrows) for infrastructure improvements per uniform standards (limited review to amount/form/issuer); act within 10 business days on deficiencies; no unreasonable delays. Prohibits conditioning building permits on full infrastructure completion/certification except minimum fire/emergency access (stabilized roads); allows performance bonds up to 130% of uncompleted work (waivable in some cases).
- **Expands expedited building permit reviews for subdivisions/phased communities** — Applies to counties ($\geq 75,000$ pop.) and municipalities ($\geq 10,000$ pop. with ≥ 25 acres designated residential/agricultural). Requires program for expedited issuance of building permits (up to 50% of units/phases, or more in some cases) before final plat recording, via two-step process (preliminary plat + stabilized access roads for emergency vehicles). If no program adopted/updated timely, applicants gain unconditional right to use qualified contractor for up to 75% of permits pre-plat; preempts conflicting local requirements. Requires utility notices; no full infrastructure completion needed beyond fire access minima.

- **Provides vested rights protections** — Applicants gain vested rights in approved preliminary plats for at least 5 years if relying in good faith (incurring substantial obligations/expenses, commencing construction), protecting against later changes.
- **Limits additional local procedures** — Prohibits inconsistent local procedures/conditions for administrative plat/replat approvals (ch. 177 compliance). Denials must cite specific authority; cannot require unrelated state/federal permits unless denied.

Effective Date: July 1, 2026 (with registry/program deadlines January 1, 2027).

HB 1329 - Local Government Finances **PASSED**

Enhances transparency and accountability in local government finances through expanded budget posting requirements, mandatory reduction exercises, and stricter impact fee regulations.

- **Enhances budget posting and transparency requirements** (applies to counties and municipalities):
 - Tentative budgets must be posted on the official website (or county website if no municipal site) at least 52 days before the public hearing (increased from shorter prior periods) and remain posted for at least 45 days.
 - Final adopted budgets must be posted within 30 days of adoption and remain available online for at least 52 years (increased from 2 years).
 - Posted budgets (tentative, adopted tentative, final) must include detailed elements: narrative overview/summary with graphical illustrations; overall revenue/expenditures summary; breakdowns by fund, department/division, program/function; debt obligations; capital projects; organizational chart/staffing summary; and analysis of reserves/fund balances for the proposed year, current year, and prior 4 fiscal years.

- **Mandates budget reduction exercises and workshops:**
 - Counties and municipalities must hold a public budget workshop at least 14 days before final budget adoption to perform a "budget reduction exercise" identifying strategies to reduce the ensuing fiscal year's budget by 10% compared to the current year—without compromising essential services (e.g., law enforcement, fire) or legal obligations.
 - The exercise/results (or workshop recording link) must be posted online in downloadable format.

- **Requires quarterly compensation disclosures and budget calendars:**
 - Quarterly summaries of compensation (job titles, names, salaries) for all funded employees must be posted online.
 - Annual budget development calendars must be published by January 30, detailing key deadlines (e.g., agency requests, valuations, workshops, hearings, reduction exercise); posting does not create basis for legal challenges to budget adoption.

- **Revises county budget amendment procedures:**
 - Proposed amendments (not otherwise authorized) require public hearing notice (2–5 days in newspaper) and posting on website at least 5 days before adoption.
 - Adopted amendments posted within 5 days and retained for 52 years.

- **Updates definitions and concurrency/impact fee frameworks:**
 - Defines "impact fee" as a one-time charge on new development to fund capital costs of infrastructure serving that development.
 - Defines "plan-based methodology" as a study using recent/localized data to project 10-year growth, anticipate capacity impacts, and list mitigation projects (must align with comprehensive plan requirements under s. 163.3177(6)(h)).
 - Authorizes local governments repealing transportation concurrency to adopt alternative systems (mobility-plan/fee-based or not, including impact fees); prohibits denying/time-phasing approvals if

developers pay identified impacts; revenues must implement plan needs; no double-charging for existing deficiencies.

- **Imposes stricter rules on impact fees (effective for adoptions/increases after July 1, 2026):**
 - Must use demonstrated-need study based on plan-based methodology with data no older than 4 years; study adopted within 12 months if increasing fees.
 - Requires separate accounting fund; limits administrative charges to actual costs; 90-day notice for new/increased fees (not for decreases); non-retroactive to pending applications unless reducing costs; collection at building permit issuance.
 - Proportionality/rational nexus requirements strengthened (to need, impacts, benefits); funds earmarked for new-user capital facilities; no use for existing debt/prior projects without nexus to new impacts.
 - Increases limited: phase-in rules apply; beyond limits only for "extraordinary circumstances" (measurable effects exceeding current fee + allowable increases in <4 years) via new plan-based study with specified capacity standards, localized data, declaration of use/timeframe, two public workshops, unanimous governing body vote; implemented in 2–4 equal annual increments; no increase if no prior increase in 5 years (excluding hurricane disaster areas); max 100% over 4 years; no deductions from prior fees; no use of data >4 years old.

- **Establishes impact fee refund/credit procedures:**
 - Payors may request refund/credit for overpayments in writing; local government/school district/special district must respond (approve/deny) within 30 days.
 - If approved, payor elects refund or credit within 30 days; full processing within 30 days (preference for credit if usable).
 - Requests/responses not admissible as admissions against interest in challenges.

- **Requires interlocal agreements for multi-jurisdictional transportation impacts:**
 - Counties/municipalities charging transportation fees must coordinate via interlocal agreement (no double-charging, plan-based methodology, collection/distribution rules); absent agreement by October 1, 2025, defaults apply (e.g., 10% developer fee reduction, 60-day distribution).

Effective Date: January 1, 2027 (with some impact fee/concurrency provisions tied to July 1, 2026, or October 1, 2025, deadlines).

HB 1389 - Affordable Housing **PASSED** *** (ADU Language NOT included in final bill)*

HB 1389 commonly referred to as an update to the **Live Local Act** (sometimes called "Live Local 4.0"), refines and expands state-level requirements to promote affordable and workforce housing development.

- **Mandates authorization of multifamily and mixed-use residential in commercial, industrial, and certain other zones/properties** (amends ss. 125.01055 and 166.04151, F.S.):
 - Counties and municipalities must allow multifamily residential and mixed-use developments (with at least 65% residential square footage) as allowable uses in areas zoned for commercial, industrial, or mixed use; flexibly zoned areas (e.g., planned unit developments) permitting those uses; property owned by the county, municipality, or school district (within its boundaries); and parcels over 3 acres owned by a religious institution with a house of public worship operating for at least 10 years (regardless of underlying zoning).
 - At least 40% of residential units must be affordable rental units (per s. 420.0004, F.S., income/rent limits) for a minimum of 30 years.
 - Local governments cannot require rezoning, special exceptions, variances, density transfers, or comprehensive plan amendments for these developments.

- **Prohibits certain local restrictions on qualifying developments:**
 - Cannot restrict building height below the higher of: three stories, or the tallest height currently allowed (or allowed as of July 1, 2023) for commercial/residential buildings within 1 mile.
 - Cannot impose more restrictive setbacks/stepbacks or use dimensional rules to indirectly limit height.
 - Limited exceptions apply near single-family zones (height capped at 150% of adjacent tallest or 10 stories max), historic districts/contributing structures, or airport-impacted areas (requires airport governing body approval; amends s. 333.03).

- **Exempts specific areas from applicability:**
 - Airport zoning/noise zones/runway protections (unless approved).
 - Working waterfronts zoned industrial.
 - Wekiva Study Area, Everglades Protection Area, areas of critical state concern.
 - Properties with recorded conservation easements.
 - Pre-July 1, 2026 regulations preserving open character (e.g., open-space districts).

- **Revises affordable housing ad valorem tax exemption (s. 196.1978, F.S.):**
 - Refines "multifamily project" definition (common ownership/control, same site plan; excludes separated single-family parcels).
 - Limits local taxing authorities' ability to opt out of exemptions (starting 2025 tax roll): requires 3 consecutive years of surplus affordable/available units (0–120% AMI per Shimberg Center data in MSA/region); 2/3 vote ordinance/resolution; 2-year term (renewable); existing exemptions continue; applies only to that authority's levies.
 - Amendments apply to 2027 tax roll.

- **Expands housing antidiscrimination protections (ch. 760, F.S.):**
 - Defines "person" to include governmental entities.

- Prohibits discrimination in land use decisions, development permitting, or zoning based on race, color, national origin, sex, disability, familial status, religion, or source of financing (including affordable housing status).
- Waives state sovereign immunity for causes of action under these provisions; allows injunctive/equitable relief, damages, attorney fees/costs.
- **Authorizes density bonuses for military family housing (s. 420.615, F.S.):**
 - Local governments may grant density bonuses to landowners donating fee-simple property suitable for affordable housing, including for military families (using basic allowance for housing), with deed restrictions ensuring affordability.
- **Directs OPPAGA study:**
 - Evaluate efficacy of mezzanine financing (second-position short-term debt) for owner-occupied affordable housing and potential of tiny homes to expand affordable supply.
 - Consult Florida Housing Finance Corporation and Shimberg Center; report findings/recommendations (e.g., model programs) to Legislature by December 31, 2027.

The bill takes effect **July 1, 2026**

SB 290 - Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services **PASSED**

**Signed by Governor DeSantis on March 23, 2026.*

- **Gasoline-Powered Farm & Landscape Equipment**

Prohibits counties and municipalities from enacting or enforcing any ordinance, rule, or policy that restricts or prohibits the use of gasoline-powered (including diesel) farm equipment or landscape equipment. Also bars treating gasoline-powered equipment differently from electric alternatives in retail, manufacturing, or distribution. *Impact:* Broad state preemption limiting local authority over noise, emissions, or sustainability rules for tractors, mowers, blowers, etc.

- **Growth Management – Ecologically Significant Parcels in Low-Density Municipalities**

In a **low-density municipality** (existing before Jan. 1, 2025; <2,500 acres and ≤5,000 residents), development applications on undeveloped land designated rural, conservation, agricultural, or greenspace (“ecologically significant parcel”) may **not** receive administrative (staff) approval unless the developer provides a sworn attestation that the project will not exceed **1 residential unit per 20 acres** (limited family exceptions allowed). Waiver requires **unanimous vote** of the municipal governing body. *Impact:* Adds density protection and procedural safeguard in qualifying small towns.

- **Agricultural Land Protections**

- For local government lands surplus on or after Jan. 1, 2024: Future development rights may **not** be transferred on parcels determined suitable for bona fide agricultural use.
- For certain state-owned conservation lands acquired on or after Jan. 1, 2024: May be surplus with a retained **rural-lands-protection easement** if suitable for agriculture; proceeds support additional agricultural land protection. Designated state forests, parks, wildlife areas, and Everglades lands remain protected. *Impact:* Strengthens preservation of agricultural and rural lands.

- **Other Notable Provisions**

Biosolids: New or renewed land-application permits (after July 1, 2020) limited to **Class AA biosolids**. Full compliance required by July 1, 2028 (July 1, 2031 for counties not exporting biosolids).

Pest Control: Fumigation businesses must carry higher insurance (\$1M/\$2M bodily injury; \$1M/\$2M property damage or \$2M combined single limit). Penalties for violations increased.

Contractors: Licensed contractors must pay subcontractors/suppliers within 45 days of receiving payment (or per contract, if sooner), absent a bona fide dispute.

Consumer Protection:

- Bans commercial solicitation at private homes displaying a clearly visible “No Solicitation” sign (min. 8.5 × 11 inches).
- Prohibits possession/use of signal jamming devices (with limited exceptions).
-

New Agricultural Programs:

- Florida Native Seed Research and Marketing Program
- Florida Food Animal & Equine Veterinary Medicine Loan Repayment Program (up to \$25,000/year for 5 years)
- Farmers Feeding Florida Program

HB 437/ SB 770 - Public Records **FAILED**

Strengthens public records access and enforcement by redefining duplication costs, imposing timely response requirements, eliminating certain fees, and increasing penalties for noncompliance.

- Redefines “actual cost of duplication” to include specified resources but exclude overhead.
- Requires prompt acknowledgment of public records requests within 3 business days and bars agencies from charging fees if they fail to do so.
- Mandates that record custodians provide detailed written reasons, statutory exemptions, and justifications for delays or denials.
- Removes fees for certain electronic access, prohibits charges for requests taking under 30 minutes, and forbids charging for redaction of exempt information.
- Allows fee reductions or waivers for public purposes and requires a written cost estimate upon request.
- Broadens liability and penalties for violations, including daily fines, attorney fees, and potential criminal penalties.
- Repeals s. 282.711, F.S., to conform to the above changes.

SB 48/HB 313 – Housing (Accessory Dwelling Units) **FAILED**

Require local governments to adopt, by December 1, 2026, an ordinance allowing accessory dwelling units in single-family residential zones with minimal restrictions and provide new affordable housing measures.

- Defines 'primary dwelling unit' and eliminates the former affidavit requirement for affordable ADUs.
- Mandates local governments to allow ADUs without public hearings or discretionary approvals, with exceptions for certain municipalities limited by state-law dwelling caps.
- Prohibits restrictive regulations on renting ADUs, requiring property owner residency, or imposing extra parking and conditional use approvals.
- Ensures ADUs providing affordable rental housing count toward comprehensive plan housing targets.
- Prevents loss of homestead exemption for property owners with ADUs and requires separate assessment for rented ADUs.
- Authorizes density bonus incentives for land donations supporting affordable housing options, including for military families.
- Directs OPPAGA to study mezzanine financing and tiny homes for affordable housing, consulting with state housing entities and reporting recommendations.

HB 1297/SB 636 - Beach Management **FAILED**

Strengthen beach management by requiring the Department of Environmental Protection to consider beaches repeatedly repaired and under local easements as critically eroded, authorizing local strategic beach management plans, and revising criteria for areas of critical state concern.

- Requires the department to review data on beaches that have been repeatedly repaired with private, local, and federal funds prior to designating them as critically eroded.
- Mandates that beaches with a perpetual easement, managed shoreline retreat, and repeated inland flooding or structural damage be designated as critically eroded when local governments preserve dedicated funding.
- Authorizes the secretary of the department to require coastal local governments to develop local strategic beach management plans, including analyses of compound flooding, property values, sensitive lands, and coastal engineering recommendations.
- Conforms existing law to incorporate local strategic beach management plans into the state's broader beach management planning process and updates criteria for designating areas of critical state concern.

SB 1014/HB 1075 - Provision of Municipal Utility Service to Owners Outside the Municipal Limits **FAILED**

Requires municipal utilities to extend water and sewer service to property owners outside municipal limits under certain conditions.

- Defines key terms such as municipal utility, main line, and sufficient capacity to clarify eligibility and service requirements.
- Prohibits municipal utilities from refusing service solely due to an owner's refusal to consent to annexation, unless covered by an existing agreement.
- Requires municipal utilities to determine sufficient capacity and outline connection costs within 90 days of an owner's application.
- Authorizes owners to enforce these requirements through civil action and recover attorney fees and court costs if successful.
- Clarifies that municipal utilities can collect all relevant rates, fees, charges, or contributions as permitted by law.

SB 354/HB 299 - Blue Ribbon Projects **FAILED**

Create a new framework for large-scale projects that preserve significant land for conservation and encourage diverse, mixed-use development opportunities.

- Defines the concept of blue ribbon projects for contiguous properties of 15,000 acres or more, requiring at least 60% of the land to be reserved for conservation, agriculture, and public benefit uses.
- Permits up to 40% of the property for development, allowing compact, mixed-use, walkable communities with a maximum of 12 residential units per gross acre and an 85% impervious surface ratio for nonresidential uses.
- Requires at least 20% of residential units to be affordable housing, “missing middle” housing, or housing for Florida’s Hometown Hero Program beneficiaries.
- Establishes long-term vested development rights of 50 years, extendable by 25 years if half of the development area is built within the initial time period.
- Mandates a “blue ribbon plan” detailing land use allocation, phasing, and environmental conservation, which once approved by a local government, presumes consistency with comprehensive plans.
- Allows recorded plans to operate in lieu of existing plan and zoning requirements, with limited review for any amendments, and offers an appeals process for both denial and approval decisions.
- Preserves compliance with applicable environmental regulations in chapters 373 and 403 of the Florida Statutes.

SB 840/ HB 1465 - Land Use Regulations for Local Governments Affected by Natural Disasters **FAILED**

Restrict impacted local governments from enforcing or enacting certain post-hurricane land use regulations that impede storm-damaged property repairs.

- Narrows the definition of “impacted local government” from those within 100 miles of a hurricane’s track to those within 50 miles and requires inclusion in a federal major disaster declaration.
- Prohibits enforcing moratoriums that delay hurricane-related repairs or reconstruction, requiring those repairs to comply with new regulations adopted after the hurricane, or imposing new procedures that extend approval timelines.
- Allows enforcement of certain amendments or development approvals sought by private property owners, required by law, or implementing floodplain management standards.
- Permits local governments to request proof of hurricane damage but removes prior provisions for injunctive relief against them.
- Clarifies that changes to the Florida Building Code or local technical amendments remain allowable.
- Shortens the timeline during which specified counties may not enact new moratoriums or land use restrictions and moves the expiration date for these provisions from 2028 to 2026.

HB 203 - Elimination of Non-school Property for Homesteads **FAILED**

Exempts homestead property from non-school property taxes and prohibits local governments from reducing funding for first responders below specified prior-year levels.

- Eliminates most of the current partial non-school ad valorem exemptions and provides a full exemption for homestead property from non-school property taxes. Removes provisions for annual inflation adjustments and optional local exemptions for certain senior homeowners previously allowed under existing law.
- Prohibits counties and municipalities from lowering total funding for law enforcement, firefighters, and other first responders below the highest amount budgeted in either the 2025-2026 or 2026-2027 fiscal year.

HB 1167/ SB 1468 - Advanced Wastewater Treatment **FAILED**

Require sewage disposal facilities with a capacity over 1 million gallons per day to submit annual infrastructure and treatment reports and direct the Department of Environmental Protection to compile and publicize these data for improved oversight.

- Declares legislative findings that inadequately treated wastewater from aging facilities harms environmental and economic resources.
- Mandates annual reporting by large-capacity sewage disposal facilities on infrastructure age, maintenance, spill history, treatment performance, and pollutant concentrations.
- Directs the Department of Environmental Protection to consult with water management districts and compile an annual report for state leaders and the public to prioritize upgrades and investments.

MEMORANDUM

To: Robert Garlo, Town Manager & Town Commission

From: Kyle B. Teal, Esq.

Re: Ordinance 418 - Second Reading

Date: March 13, 2026

During its regularly scheduled meeting on January 16, 2026, the Town Commission directed staff to bring forward a proposed ordinance, Ordinance No. 418, clarifying the intent of the Town's Land Development Regulations governing the review of applications for variances. On February 25, 2025, the Town Commission requested a minor revision to the proposed heading of the Article X, Division 5, Section 5 of the Town's LDRs, changing it from "Standards for Non-Use Variances," back to its original title, "Standards for Approval for Variances." The revision has been made in the proposed Ordinance for second reading. This revision to the title of Section 5 is the sole modification.¹

Full details of the changes to the variance standards and the rationale for those proposed changes can be found in my original memorandum to the Town Commission, dated February 16, 2026. Ordinance No. 418 clarifies the Town's LDRs to ensure compliance with Florida law and offers a clearer standard for the Town to apply when reviewing variance applications.

¹ Under Florida law, municipal commissions must re-notice ordinances when they make "substantial or material changes." The definitive test states that "the changes to an ordinance during the enactment process are only 'substantial or material' if they change the ordinance's general purpose." In the landmark case, *Neumont v. State*, 967 So. 2d 822, 831 (Fla. 2007), the first title of the ordinance at issue notified the public that the County was considering a change in the permissibility of vacation rentals in all land use districts. The second advertised title provided notice to all residential property owners that vacation rentals in those districts might be restricted. The Florida Supreme Court found that this was not a substantial or material change that necessitated publication of a new notice.

Buchanan

To: Robert Garlo, Town Manager & Town Commission

From: Kyle B. Teal, Esq.

Re: Ordinance 418

Date: February 16, 2026

The memorandum is a follow up to the “Variance Standards” memorandum dated January 6, 2026, which is hereby incorporated by reference. During its regularly scheduled meeting on January 16, 2026, the Town Commission directed staff to bring forward a proposed ordinance clarifying the intent of the Town’s Land Development Regulations governing the review of applications for variances. Please see my brief analysis below, including the current and proposed LDRs.

Proposed Clarifications

For ease of reference, Article X, Division 5 of the Town’s LDRs currently provides the following criteria for the approval of a variance:

Sec. 5.00 Standards for approval of variance.

Except as provided in article V, section 5.09 (variances related to subdivision standards), the board may grant a variance from the terms of these land development regulations if the development review board finds that the applicant has demonstrated that:

- A. Special conditions and circumstances exist which are peculiar to the land, structure or building involved and which are not applicable to other lands, structures or buildings in the same zoning district; and
- B. The special conditions and circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant; and
- C. The variance requested will not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied by these land development regulations to other lands, buildings or structures in the same zoning district; and
- D. Literal interpretation of the provisions of these land development regulations would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed

by other properties in the same zoning district under the terms of these land development regulations and would work unnecessary and undue hardship on the applicant; and

- E. The variance is the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building or structure; and
- F. The variance will be in harmony with the general intent and purpose of these land development regulations, and that such variance will not be injurious to the area involved or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare; and
- G. The variance does not authorize the use of land that is prohibited in the underlying zoning district

Article X, Division 5 of the Town's Land Development Regulations also provides factors *to be excluded* from consideration when reviewing an application for a variance:

Sec. 5.01. - Factors to be excluded from consideration.

The following shall not be considered by the development review board in its evaluation of an application for a variance:

- A. Any nonconforming use or structures in any zoning district; and
- B. Any permitted use of lands, structures or buildings in other zoning districts.

The following proposed edits would serve to clarify the Town's standards and procedures for the review of variance applications (see **red text** for changes since the draft provided on January 6th):

Sec. 5.00. Standards for Non-Use Variances.

Except as provided in article V, section 5.09 (variances related to subdivision standards), the **development review** board may grant a structural or lot (non-use) variance from the terms of these land development regulations if the applicant has demonstrated by competent, substantial evidence the following:

- A. The variance will be in harmony with the general intent and purpose of all applicable Town Code of Ordinances, Land Development Regulations and the Comprehensive Plan; **and**
- B. The variance is the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building or structure and/or preserve an applicant's vested right; **and**

- C. The applicant will suffer an exceptional and unique hardship if the variance is not granted, **and**
 - 1. the hardship does not result from the actions of the applicant; and
 - 2. **the applicant, despite reasonable diligence, was unaware of the hardship before taking title to the property; and**
 - 3. economic hardship is not the sole basis of the hardship; and
 - 4. **the** hardship is exceptional and unique with respect to the property, structure or building and not shared with other properties, structures or buildings similarly situated and in the same zoning district; **and**

- D. The variance will not substantially interfere with, or be injurious to, the health, safety or welfare of others whose property would be affected by allowance of the variance.

- E. Alternatively, an applicant may seek exemption from certain requirements of the Town's rules and regulations if they **establish through competent substantial evidence that they are entitled to a reasonable accommodation** as provided in article 4, division 4, section 4 of the Town's Land Development Regulations.

Sec. 5.01. Factors to be excluded from consideration

The following shall not be considered by the development review board in its evaluation of an application for a variance:

- A. Previously issued variances, and

- B. Any proposed **land** use of property **that is** inconsistent with the Town's Code of Ordinances, Land Development Regulations and the Comprehensive Plan. **If such a use is presented as part of an application, the application shall be summarily and administratively denied.**

Recommendation

Ordinance No. 418 clarifies the Town Code to demonstrate its compliance with Florida law and offers a clearer standard for the Town to apply when reviewing variance applications.

ORDINANCE NO. 418

AN ORDINANCE OF THE TOWN COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND, MARTIN COUNTY, FLORIDA, CLARIFYING APPENDIX A OF THE TOWN'S CODE OF ORDINANCES WHICH CONTAINS THE TOWN'S LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS; PROVIDING FOR THE TEXT AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE X, DIVISION 5, SECTION 5.00 REGARDING THE STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL OF VARIANCES; PROVIDING FOR THE TEXT AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE X, DIVISION 5, SECTION 5.02 REGARDING FACTORS TO BE EXCLUDED FROM CONSIDERATION; PROVIDING FOR THE REPEAL OF ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the Town Commission of the Town of Jupiter Island, Martin County, Florida ("Town") has such powers and authority as conferred upon it by the Florida Constitution and Chapter 166, Florida Statutes; and

WHEREAS, this Ordinance is necessary and appropriate to clarify the Land Development Regulations ("LDR") codified in Appendix A of the Code of Ordinances of Jupiter Island, Florida ("Code") to address all requisite factors identified by Florida Law; and

WHEREAS, the Town Commission has concluded that it is necessary and appropriate to clarify certain Articles of the LDRs previously adopted to ensure conformity with Florida law on the requisite showing applicants must demonstrate to receive a variance from the Town; and

WHEREAS, the Town Commission has concluded that it is also necessary and appropriate to clarify certain Articles of the LDR previously adopted to ensure conformity with Florida law on the factors to be excluded from consideration in review of a variance application from the Town.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE TOWN COMMISSION OF THE
TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND, MARTIN COUNTY, FLORIDA, AS FOLLOWS:**

Section 1: The “WHEREAS” clauses are incorporated herein as the legislative findings of the Town Commission.

Section 2. Article X, Division 5, Section 5.0 Standards for Approval for Variances is hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 5.00. Standards for Approval for Variances.

Except as provided in article V, section 5.09 (variances related to subdivision standards), the development review board may grant a structural or lot (non-use) variance from the terms of these land development regulations if ~~the development review board finds that~~ the applicant has demonstrated by competent, substantial evidence the following that:

- ~~A. Special conditions and circumstances exist which are peculiar to the land, structure or building involved and which are not applicable to other lands, structures or buildings in the same zoning district; and The variance will be in harmony with the general intent and purpose of all applicable Town Code of Ordinances, Land Development Regulations and the Comprehensive Plan; and~~
- ~~B. The special conditions and circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant; and~~
- ~~C. The variance requested will not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied by these land development regulations to other lands, buildings or structures in the same zoning district; and~~
- ~~D. Literal interpretation of the provisions of these land development regulations would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning district under the terms of these land development regulations and would work unnecessary and undue hardship on the applicant; and~~
- B. The variance is the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building or structure and/or preserve an applicant’s vested right; and;
and
- C. ~~The variance will be in harmony with the general intent and purpose of these land development regulations, and that such variance will not be injurious to the area involved or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare; and~~

~~D. The variance does not authorize the use of land that is prohibited in the underlying zoning district~~

C. The applicant will suffer an exceptional and unique hardship if the variance is not granted, and

1. the hardship does not result from the actions of the applicant; and
2. the applicant, despite reasonable diligence, was unaware of the hardship before taking title to the property; and
3. economic hardship is not the sole basis of the hardship; and
4. the hardship is exceptional and unique with respect to the property, structure or building and not shared with other properties, structures or buildings similarly situated and in the same zoning district; and

E. The variance will not substantially interfere with, or be injurious to, the health, safety or welfare of others whose property would be affected by allowance of the variance.

F. Alternatively, an applicant may seek exemption from certain requirements of the Town's rules and regulations if they establish through competent substantial evidence that they are entitled to a reasonable accommodation as provided in article 4, division 4, section 4 of the Town's Land Development Regulations.

Section 3. Article X, Division 5, Section 5.01 Factors to be excluded from consideration, is hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 5.01. Factors to be excluded from consideration

The following shall not be considered by the development review board in its evaluation of an application for a variance:

- A. ~~Any nonconforming use or structures in any zoning district;~~ Previously issued variances, and
- B. ~~Any permitted use of lands, structures or buildings in other zoning districts.~~ Any proposed land use of property that is inconsistent with the Town's Code of Ordinances, Land Development Regulations and the Comprehensive Plan. If such a use is presented as part of an application, the application shall be summarily and administratively denied.

Section 4. Repeal of ordinances in conflict.

All other ordinances of the Town of Jupiter Island, Florida, or parts thereof which conflict with this or any part of this ordinance are hereby repealed.

Section 5. Severability. If any court of competent jurisdiction holds any word, part, section, paragraph or provision hereof to be unlawful or unconstitutional, such ruling or finding shall not affect the remaining portions of this ordinance, which shall remain in full force and effect.

Section 6. Codification. This ordinance shall be codified and made a part of the official Code of Ordinances of the Town of Jupiter Island.

Section 7. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective immediately upon execution.

ORDINANCE NO. 418 PASSED UPON FIRST READING THE 25th DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026.

PASSED AND ADOPTED UPON THE SECOND READING FOLLOWING PUBLIC HEARING THE ____ DAY OF _____, 2026.

(SEAL)

TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND, FLORIDA

Mayor

Vice Mayor

Commissioner

Commissioner

Commissioner

ATTEST:

TOWN CLERK

#7515337 v1 18270-00002

Business Impact Estimate

Proposed ordinance's title/reference:

**Ordinance No. 419
Amending Town Code regarding Off-site Contractor Parking**

AN ORDINANCE OF THE TOWN COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND, MARTIN COUNTY, FLORIDA, CLARIFYING THE TOWN'S CODE OF ORDINANCES AND APPENDIX A OF THE TOWN'S CODE OF ORDINANCES WHICH CONTAINS THE TOWN'S LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS; RPOVINDING FOR THE TEXT AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE II, DIVISION I, SECTION 14-35 OF THE TOWN CODE OF ORDINANCES REGARDING THE PARKING OF COMMERCIAL VEHICLES; PROVIDING FOR THE TEXT AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE X, SECTION 10.02 OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS REGARDING STAGING PLAN REQUIREMENTS AND STANDARDS; PROVIDING FOR THE REPEAL OF ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Business Impact Estimate is provided in accordance with section 166.041(4), Florida Statutes. If one or more boxes are checked below, this means the Town of Jupiter Island is of the view that a business impact estimate is not required by state law¹ for the proposed ordinance, but the Town of Jupiter Island is, nevertheless, providing this Business Impact Estimate as a courtesy and to avoid any procedural issues that could impact the enactment of the proposed ordinance. This Business Impact Estimate may be revised following its initial posting.

- The proposed ordinance is required for compliance with Federal or State law or regulation;
- The proposed ordinance relates to the issuance or refinancing of debt;
- The proposed ordinance relates to the adoption of budgets or budget amendments, including revenue sources necessary to fund the budget;
- The proposed ordinance is required to implement a contract or an agreement, including, but not limited to, any Federal, State, local, or private grant or other financial assistance accepted by the municipal government;
- The proposed ordinance is an emergency ordinance;
- The ordinance relates to procurement; or
- The proposed ordinance is enacted to implement the following:
 - a. Part II of Chapter 163, Florida Statutes, relating to growth policy, county and municipal planning, and land development regulation, including zoning, development orders, development agreements and development permits;

¹ See Section 166.041(4)(c), Florida Statutes.

- b. Sections 190.005 and 190.046, Florida Statutes, regarding community development districts;
- c. Section 553.73, Florida Statutes, relating to the Florida Building Code; or
- d. Section 633.202, Florida Statutes, relating to the Florida Fire Prevention Code.

In accordance with the provisions of controlling law, even notwithstanding the fact that an exemption noted above may apply, the Town of Jupiter Island hereby publishes the following information:

1. Summary of the proposed ordinance (*must include a statement of the public purpose, such as serving the public health, safety, morals and welfare*):

This ordinance amends the LDR to provide for off-site contractor and construction parking during development activities.

The ordinance promotes the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare by helping to reduce contractor and construction vehicle traffic on narrow roads that are also used by bicyclists and pedestrians. This reduction in congestion enhances safety and improves overall mobility within the community.

2. An estimate of the direct economic impact of the proposed ordinance on private, for-profit businesses in the Town of Jupiter Island, if any: **None**

- (a) An estimate of direct compliance costs that businesses may reasonably incur;
- (b) Any new charge or fee imposed by the proposed ordinance or for which businesses will be financially responsible; and
- (c) An estimate of the Town of Jupiter Island regulatory costs, including estimated revenues from any new charges or fees to cover such costs.

3. Good faith estimate of the number of businesses likely to be impacted by the proposed ordinance: **N/A**

4. Additional information the governing body deems useful (if any): **None**

Buchanan

MEMORANDUM

To: Robert Garlo, Town Manager & Town Commission

From: Kyle B. Teal, Esq.

Re: Proposed Ordinance 419-Off-Site Parking for Construction Projects

Date: March 13, 2026

The Town Commission seeks to address the unauthorized use of off-site residential lots for parking during active construction projects. At the Commission meeting held on January 16, 2026, the Commission requested legal analysis on the issue. That analysis revealed that relatively minor clarifications to the Town's code and LDRs should allow the Town to prevent the use of vacant, residential lots in the Town as off-site parking lots for construction projects. Therefore, through a memorandum to the Commission dated February 16, 2026, I presented an assessment of the Town's current relevant regulations and present proposed revisions to the Town's Code to resolve the confusion over where commercial vehicles may be parked within the Town's limits during construction activity – namely, to prevent the use of *other* privately-owned, residential properties in the Town as parking and staging lots. On February 25, 2026, the Town discussed these recommendations and made no revisions to the language proposed. A final draft of Ordinance 419 was requested for consideration.

The revisions proposed to the Town's Code and its LDRs intend to clarify the currently existing regulations and resolve the ambiguity over whether other parcels besides those undergoing work can accommodate construction parking.

I. Proposed Clarifications

The following proposed revisions¹ to **Chapter 14, Article II, Division I, Section 14-35** and **Appendix A, Article X, Section 10.02,** are intended to ensure a clearer and more easily

¹ Since the memo regarding this issue dated February 16, 2025, and the Commission's discussion on February 25, 2026, additional revisions have been made to the proposed code amendments. Those new revisions are indicated with green text. The previously proposed revisions appear in red.

enforced process for commercial/construction parking on permitted properties in the Town’s limit to construction and/or outside of the Town’s municipal boundary:

Sec. 14-35. - Parking of commercial vehicles and trucks.

No commercial vehicle or truck may be parked or stored on any property within a residential district unless said vehicle or truck is parked or stored in a wholly enclosed garage. This restriction does not apply to the temporary parking of commercial vehicles while in actual use for ~~construction purposes~~ routine deliveries or service calls within the town. **Temporary parking of vehicles while in use for construction purposes may be permitted pursuant to article X, division 10, section 10.02.**

It shall be unlawful for any person, ~~firm or corporation or entity~~ to operate, park, stand or use any commercial vehicle upon a public street or road in the town, unless such vehicle contains the name of the company permanently affixed on both sides of the vehicle in lettering at least three inches high indicating the name of the person, firm, or corporation owning the vehicle and any company insignia or logo. The lettering and logo, if any, shall be in a color which contrasts with the color of the vehicle.

For the purposes of this section, a “commercial vehicle” is defined as any vehicle designed, used, or maintained primarily for the transportation of goods, supplies, or other property for purposes of business, trade or commerce, or for the purpose of providing services.

Sec. 10.02. – Staging and parking plan required; standards.

All applications for a development permit must include a staging **and parking** plan that demonstrates compliance with the following standards:

- A. Trailers, for purposes of storage or office during development:
 - 1. Are screened from view from contiguous lots and public rights-of-way, and
 - 2. Do not exceed 200 square feet; and
 - 3. Will be removed immediately upon completion of the project or any storm watch condition as issued by the National Weather Service (NWS)
- B. Off-street parking is provided for all vehicles used by any person, ~~firm or corporation or entity~~ involved or engaged

~~in-work construction on the parcel proposed for development at any given time~~ subject to the Town's approved permit (the "Permitted Parcel") ~~for development at any given time, and said off-street parking and staging are limited to the use of the parcel subject to demolition and/or construction~~ Permitted Parcel and is reasonably screened from view from contiguous lots and public rights-of-way. Applicants shall submit, as part of their staging and parking plan, a site plan delineating where the parking will be located on the ~~subject parcel~~. Permitted Parcel.

- C. Materials that are stored on-site are screened from view from contiguous lots and public rights-of-way, and are safely stored and reasonably secured.
- D. Dumpsters and trash receptacles are adequate to prevent trash piles or debris from gathering during the course of construction, and are screened from view from contiguous lots and public rights-of-way, are located so as to minimize the impact of their associated noise, dust, and odors on contiguous lots.
- E. Fencing. On all construction sites where work is being performed, the owner shall be responsible for installing a minimum six-foot high chain link fence with an eight-foot gate and screening along the frontage at the road and along neighboring property lines as needed, to shield the work from public view. The fence and screen shall be maintained throughout construction. Signage on the fence is prohibited.
- F. Vehicle wheel cleaning blanket. The owner shall be responsible for installing a vehicle wheel cleaning blanket on all unpaved driveways where construction vehicles enter the road. The blanket shall be maintained in good condition throughout construction.
- G. Construction gate keeper. Where deemed necessary by the building official to control access to a site, the owner of a property shall be responsible for retaining a gatekeeper to direct construction traffic on and off the public roads.
- H. Pest control. Commencing with the clearing of a property, the owner shall be responsible for retaining and maintaining monthly pest control service to prevent disturbance to adjacent properties throughout construction.
- I. Port-a-let placement. The owner shall be responsible for placing a port-a-let on the ~~property~~ Permitted Parcel during construction,

in a location approved by the building official. The port-a-let shall be screened to prevent public view.

- J. ~~Off-Site-Island~~ Parking. If off-street parking cannot be fully accommodated on the ~~parcel subject to the demolition and/or construction~~ Permitted Parcel, a staging and parking plan must also include:
1. The location (address and/or folio) of the property located outside of the Town that will host the off-site parking necessary for the ~~development~~ construction, and
 2. A transportation plan with an estimate as to the number of employees who will need transportation to and from the off-site parking location and ~~indicating~~ details regarding how they will travel to and from the Permitted Parcel. ~~the site~~
- K. Revocation of Permit. Applicants shall sign an acknowledgment of the Town's revocation authority in the event ~~of~~ the Town's Building Director and/or Special Magistrate determines they are ~~noncompliance~~ noncompliant with the approved staging and parking plan.

ORDINANCE NO. 419

AN ORDINANCE OF THE TOWN COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND, MARTIN COUNTY, FLORIDA, CLARIFYING THE TOWN'S CODE OF ORDINANCES AND APPENDIX A OF THE TOWN'S CODE OF ORDINANCES WHICH CONTAINS THE TOWN'S LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS; PROVIDING FOR THE TEXT AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE II, DIVISION I, SECTION 14-35 OF THE TOWN CODE OF ORDINANCES REGARDING THE PARKING OF COMMERCIAL VEHICLES; PROVIDING FOR THE TEXT AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE X, SECTION 10.02 OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS REGARDING STAGING PLAN REQUIREMENTS AND STANDARDS; PROVIDING FOR THE REPEAL OF ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the Town Commission of the Town of Jupiter Island, Martin County, Florida (“Town”) has such powers and authority as conferred upon it by the Florida Constitution and Chapter 166, Florida Statutes; and

WHEREAS, this Ordinance is necessary and appropriate to clarify the Code of Ordinances of Jupiter Island, Florida (“Code”) regarding whether parcels other than those being developed can accommodate construction parking; and

WHEREAS, this Ordinance is necessary and appropriate to clarify the Land Development Regulations (“LDR”) codified in Appendix A of the Code of Ordinances of Jupiter Island, Florida (“Code”) regarding the requirement to address parking in staging plans; and

WHEREAS, the Town Commission has concluded that it is necessary and appropriate to clarify certain Articles of the Town Code and LDRs previously adopted to eliminate confusion regarding permissible construction parking within the boundaries of the Town; and

Ordinance No. 419

Page 1 of 5

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE TOWN COMMISSION OF THE
TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND, MARTIN COUNTY, FLORIDA, AS FOLLOWS:**

Section 1: The “WHEREAS” clauses are incorporated herein as the legislative findings of the Town Commission.

Section 2. Chapter 14, Article II, Division I, Section I, Sec. 14-35 of the Town Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 14-35. - Parking of commercial vehicles and trucks.

No commercial vehicle or truck may be parked or stored on any property within a residential district unless said vehicle or truck is parked or stored in a wholly enclosed garage. This restriction does not apply to the temporary parking of commercial vehicles while in actual use for ~~construction purposes~~ routine deliveries or service calls within the town. Temporary parking of vehicles while in use for construction purposes may be permitted pursuant to article X, division 10, section 10.02.

It shall be unlawful for any person, ~~firm or corporation~~ or entity to operate, park, stand or use any commercial vehicle upon a public street or road in the town, unless such vehicle contains the name of the company permanently affixed on both sides of the vehicle in lettering at least three inches high indicating the name of the person, firm, or corporation owning the vehicle and any company insignia or logo. The lettering and logo, if any, shall be in a color which contrasts with the color of the vehicle.

For the purposes of this section, a “commercial vehicle” is defined as any vehicle designed, used, or maintained primarily for the transportation of goods, supplies, or other property for purposes of business, trade or commerce, or for the purpose of providing services.

Section 3. Appendix A, Article X, Section 10.02 of the Town Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 10.02. - Staging and parking plan required; standards.

All applications for a development permit must include a staging and parking plan that demonstrates compliance with the following standards:

- A. Trailers, for purposes of storage or office during development:
 - 1. Are screened from view from contiguous lots and public rights-of-way, and
 - 2. Do not exceed 200 square feet; and
 - 3. Will be removed immediately upon completion of the project or any storm watch condition as issued by the National Weather Service (NWS)

- B. Off-street parking is provided for all vehicles used by any person, ~~firm or corporation~~ or entity involved or engaged in ~~development~~ construction on the parcel ~~proposed for development at any given time~~ subject to the Town's approved permit (the "Permitted Parcel") and said off-street parking and staging is limited to the use of the Permitted Parcel and is reasonably screened from view from contiguous lots and public rights-of-way. Applicants shall submit, as part of their staging and parking plan, a site plan delineating where the parking will be located on the Permitted Parcel.

- C. Materials that are stored on-site are screened from view from contiguous lots and public rights-of-way, and are safely stored and reasonably secured.

- D. Dumpsters and trash receptacles are adequate to prevent trash piles or debris from gathering during the course of construction, and are screened from view from contiguous lots and public rights-of-way, are located so as to minimize the impact of their associated noise, dust, and odors on contiguous lots.

- E. Fencing. On all construction sites where work is being performed, the owner shall be responsible for installing a minimum six-foot high chain link fence with an eight-foot gate and screening along the frontage at the road and along neighboring property lines as needed, to shield the work from public view. The fence and screen shall be maintained throughout construction. Signage on the fence is prohibited.

- F. Vehicle wheel cleaning blanket. The owner shall be responsible for installing a vehicle wheel cleaning blanket on all unpaved driveways where construction vehicles enter the road. The blanket shall be maintained in good condition throughout construction.
- G. Construction gate keeper. Where deemed necessary by the building official to control access to a site, the owner of a property shall be responsible for retaining a gatekeeper to direct construction traffic on and off the public roads.
- H. Pest control. Commencing with the clearing of a property, the owner shall be responsible for retaining and maintaining monthly pest control service to prevent disturbance to adjacent properties throughout construction.
- I. Port-a-let placement. The owner shall be responsible for placing a port-a-let on the ~~property~~ Permitted Parcel during construction, in a location approved by the building director ~~official~~. The port-a-let shall be screened to prevent public view.
- J. Off-Site Island Parking. If off-street parking cannot be fully accommodated on the Permitted Parcel, a staging and parking plan must also include:
 - 1. The location (address and/or folio) of the property located outside of the Town that will host the off-site parking necessary for the construction, and
 - 2. A transportation plan with an estimate as to the number of employees who will need transportation to and from the off-site parking location and details regarding how they will travel to and from the Permitted Parcel.
- K. Revocation of Permit. Applicants shall sign an acknowledgment of the Town's revocation authority in the event the Town's building director and/or special magistrate determines they are noncompliant with the approved staging and parking plan.

Section 4. Repeal of ordinances in conflict.

All other ordinances of the Town of Jupiter Island, Florida, or parts thereof which conflict with this or any part of this ordinance are hereby repealed.

Section 5. Severability. If any court of competent jurisdiction holds any word, part, section, paragraph or provision hereof to be unlawful or unconstitutional, such ruling or finding shall not affect the remaining portions of this ordinance, which shall remain in full force and effect.

Section 6. Codification. This ordinance shall be codified and made a part of the official Code of Ordinances of the Town of Jupiter Island.

Section 7. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective immediately upon execution.

ORDINANCE NO. 419 PASSED UPON FIRST READING THE ____ DAY OF _____, 2026.

PASSED AND ADOPTED UPON THE SECOND READING FOLLOWING PUBLIC HEARING THE ____ DAY OF _____, 2026.

(SEAL)

TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND, FLORIDA

Mayor

Vice Mayor

Commissioner

Commissioner

Commissioner

ATTEST:

TOWN CLERK

Ordinance No. 419

Page 5 of 5

Business Impact Estimate

Proposed ordinance's title/reference:

Ordinance No. 419

Amending Town Code regarding Off-site Contractor Parking

AN ORDINANCE OF THE TOWN COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND, MARTIN COUNTY, FLORIDA, CLARIFYING THE TOWN'S CODE OF ORDINANCES AND APPENDIX A OF THE TOWN'S CODE OF ORDINANCES WHICH CONTAINS THE TOWN'S LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS; RPOVINDING FOR THE TEXT AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE II, DIVISION I, SECTION 14-35 OF THE TOWN CODE OF ORDINANCES REGARDING THE PARKING OF COMMERCIAL VEHICLES; PROVIDING FOR THE TEXT AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE X, SECTION 10.02 OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS REGARDING STAGING PLAN REQUIREMENTS AND STANDARDS; PROVIDING FOR THE REPEAL OF ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Business Impact Estimate is provided in accordance with section 166.041(4), Florida Statutes. If one or more boxes are checked below, this means the Town of Jupiter Island is of the view that a business impact estimate is not required by state law¹ for the proposed ordinance, but the Town of Jupiter Island is, nevertheless, providing this Business Impact Estimate as a courtesy and to avoid any procedural issues that could impact the enactment of the proposed ordinance. This Business Impact Estimate may be revised following its initial posting.

- The proposed ordinance is required for compliance with Federal or State law or regulation;
- The proposed ordinance relates to the issuance or refinancing of debt;
- The proposed ordinance relates to the adoption of budgets or budget amendments, including revenue sources necessary to fund the budget;
- The proposed ordinance is required to implement a contract or an agreement, including, but not limited to, any Federal, State, local, or private grant or other financial assistance accepted by the municipal government;
- The proposed ordinance is an emergency ordinance;
- The ordinance relates to procurement; or
- The proposed ordinance is enacted to implement the following:
 - a. Part II of Chapter 163, Florida Statutes, relating to growth policy, county and municipal planning, and land development regulation, including zoning, development orders, development agreements and development permits;

¹ See Section 166.041(4)(c), Florida Statutes.

- b. Sections 190.005 and 190.046, Florida Statutes, regarding community development districts;
- c. Section 553.73, Florida Statutes, relating to the Florida Building Code; or
- d. Section 633.202, Florida Statutes, relating to the Florida Fire Prevention Code.

In accordance with the provisions of controlling law, even notwithstanding the fact that an exemption noted above may apply, the Town of Jupiter Island hereby publishes the following information:

1. Summary of the proposed ordinance (*must include a statement of the public purpose, such as serving the public health, safety, morals and welfare*):

This ordinance amends the LDR to provide for off-site contractor and construction parking during development activities.

The ordinance promotes the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare by helping to reduce contractor and construction vehicle traffic on narrow roads that are also used by bicyclists and pedestrians. This reduction in congestion enhances safety and improves overall mobility within the community.

2. An estimate of the direct economic impact of the proposed ordinance on private, for-profit businesses in the Town of Jupiter Island, if any: **None**

- (a) An estimate of direct compliance costs that businesses may reasonably incur;
- (b) Any new charge or fee imposed by the proposed ordinance or for which businesses will be financially responsible; and
- (c) An estimate of the Town of Jupiter Island regulatory costs, including estimated revenues from any new charges or fees to cover such costs.

3. Good faith estimate of the number of businesses likely to be impacted by the proposed ordinance: **N/A**

4. Additional information the governing body deems useful (if any): **None**



TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND

MEMORANDUM

To: Mayor & Town Commission

Through: Robert Garlo, Town Manager

From: Kimberly Kogos, Town Clerk

RE: Board and Committee Appointments and Reappointments

Date: 3/25/2026

Background:

Each year at this time, Board and Committee members whose terms are expiring are asked whether they wish to continue serving for another term. The residents of Jupiter Island are well known for their dedicated service to the community, and most members choose to remain on their respective boards. However, as responsibilities and personal circumstances change, some volunteers occasionally decide to step away from their current roles.

This year, Public Safety special risk employees have a new Defined Contribution Plan, creating the need for a representative from that group to serve on the Defined Contribution Plan Committee. A recommendation has been submitted to fill that position.

Recommendation

Based on the feedback received, staff recommends moving forward with the attached appointments and reappointments. A motion will be required to affirm the reappointments for terms expiring in March 2026, as well as the new appointments filling vacant positions.

Please note that Beautification Committee members are affirmed at the April Town Commission meeting, following confirmation of each representative by their respective organizations.

Board/Committee Reappointments and Appointments March 25, 2026

Local Planning Agency (Three-year Term)

Reappointments – Term ending March 2029

- Kate Nelson, Vice Chair
- Scott Hughes

Finance Advisory Committee (Three-year Term)

Reappointments – Term ending March 2029

- Stephen Timbers, Chair
- Chip Brennan
- Candice Bagby

Grievance Resolution Board (Two-year Term)

Reappoint – Term ending March 2028

- Marc Gaylord, Alternate
- Angelo Schiralli, Alternate

Vacancy

- Alternate TBD (Harry Rhoads)

Joint Town/SMRU/Public Safety Defined Contribution Plan Committee

Reappoint – Term ending March 2028

- Robert Garlo
- John Duchock
- Matthew Pazanski
- Bill Sutton
- Dustin Lindholm

New Appointments – Term ending March 2028

- Matthew Hammond (filling SMRU position)
- Joseph Scolly (filling Public Safety position)



TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND

MEMORANDUM

To: Mayor & Town Commission

Through: Robert Garlo, Town Manager *RUG*

CC: Kimberly Kogos, Town Clerk

From: John Duchock, Public Works Dir./Asst. Town Manager

RE: Agenda Item No. 6 – Beautification Fund Authorization

Date: 3/11/2026

Background:

During the May 2025 meeting, the Town Commission authorized expenditure of up to \$100,000 from the Beautification Fund for the following:

1. Locate, acquire, and plant ten (10), 200-gallon size strangler fig trees (est. \$80,000)
2. Engage with a nursery to initiate a contract to grow 140 strangler fig trees (est. \$5,000)
3. Retain King Tree Service for consulting services (est. \$15,000)

Subsequently, during the July 2025 meeting, the Town Commission adjusted the spending authorization to allow for the use of the Town's General Funds (Public Works Grounds Projects budget) to complete the acquisition and planting of the ten (10) strangler fig trees described above. Currently, there is \$85,000 remaining in the original spending authorization.

The Beautification Committee has since approved moving forward with ficus tree replacement along Bridge Road following the plan-recommended approach of replacement of dead/dying trees through attrition. The Town recently removed a dying tree on the north side of Bridge Road and staff solicited and received quotes to transplant two large/mature trees within existing gaps. Three quotes were received, with the lowest qualified bid being offered by South Coast Grower at a price of \$47,875. Attached to this memo are copies of the bids.

Request:

Town staff is seeking Commission approval to utilize the previously authorized Beautification Fund spending authorization to transplant two new mature strangler figs, and to authorize the Town Manager to execute a contract with South Coast Grower in an amount not to exceed \$47,875.



6190 Western Way
Lake Worth, FL 33463

Phone 561-649-8835
Jonny@southcoastgrower.com

Estimate

Date	Estimate #
1/31/2026	10786

Name / Address
Town of Jupiter Island John Duchock 2 SE Bridge Road Hope Sound, FL 33455

Ship To

P.O. No.	Terms	Ship Date	Rep	Project
		1/31/2026		

Item	Description	Qty	Unit Price	Total
Relocate	<p>Bridge Tree on 138th Street Relocate Ficus aurea "Strangler Fig" from where it is on 138th Street to the new site on SE Bridge Road between the existing trees. This price is all inclusive.</p> <p>This includes the following: Building a temporary ditch crossing. We will place (2) 15" diameter culverts in the ditch and back fill around it using soil from the surrounding site. When we are done, we will repair the ground we dig up. Root Pruning the tree. Harvesting, loading and trimming the tree for transport. Transporting the tree to the install site with our lowboy trailer to allow for added height of the tree. This is priced at 12ft wide, 14.5ft off the road and NO escorts. If you would like us to go 15-16ft wide with escorts, it will raise the price by approximately \$1,500. MOT at the install site. We will have signs and flagmen. Irrigation work. This is to attach to an existing zone within 25 feet of the tree. We will trap into the existing zone with a T and run funny pipe to the tree and 4 bubblers.</p> <p>Items needed by town. A water source within 200ft of the trees being installed. We can fill our tank up to water in the tree but need water fairly close. Any permits.</p>		20,350.00	20,350.00
I have read, understand and agree to all the terms and conditions of sale set forth on the front and the back of this Estimate and Agreement. Once signed this Estimate becomes a binding contract.		Subtotal		\$20,350.00
Estimate Void after 30 days from date if not signed.		Sales Tax (7.0%)		\$0.00
Sign here _____	Total		\$20,350.00	
Date _____				



6190 Western Way
Lake Worth, FL 33463

Phone 561-649-8835
Jonny@southcoastgrower.com

Estimate

Date	Estimate #
1/31/2026	10787

Name / Address
Town of Jupiter Island John Duchock 2 SE Bridge Road Hope Sound, FL 33455

Ship To

P.O. No.	Terms	Ship Date	Rep	Project
		1/31/2026		

Item	Description	Qty	Unit Price	Total
Relocate	<p>Jupiter Island Tree Relocate Ficus aurea "Strangler Fig" from where it is on 138th Street to the new site on SE Bridge Road between the existing trees. This price is all inclusive.</p> <p>This includes the following:</p> <p>Root Pruning the tree. Harvesting, loading and trimming the tree for transport. Transporting the tree to the install site with our lowboy trailer to allow for added height of the tree. This is priced at 12ft wide, 14.5ft off the road and NO escorts. If you would like us to go 15-16ft wide with escorts, it will raise the price by approximately \$1,500. MOT at the install site. We will have signs and flagmen. Irrigation work. This is to attach to an existing zone within 25 feet of the tree. We will trap into the existing zone with a T and run funny pipe to the tree and 4 bubblers.</p> <p>Items needed by town. A water source within 200ft of the trees being installed. We can fill our tank up to water in the tree but need water fairly close. Any permits.</p>		18,350.00	18,350.00
Rem	<p>Remove dead stump. This includes digging around it and removing all of the stump and roots larger then 1" in diameter. Also includes clean backfill.</p>	1	2,500.00	2,500.00T

I have read, understand and agree to all the terms and conditions of sale set forth on the front and the back of this Estimate and Agreement. Once signed this Estimate becomes a binding contract.		Subtotal	\$20,850.00
Estimate Void after 30 days from date if not signed.		Sales Tax (7.0%)	\$175.00
Sign here _____		Total	\$21,025.00
Date _____			



6190 Western Way
 Lake Worth, FL 33463
 Phone 561-649-8835
 Jonny@southcoastgrower.com

Estimate

Date	Estimate #
1/31/2026	10788

Name / Address
Town of Jupiter Island John Duchock 2 SE Bridge Road Hope Sound, FL 33455

Ship To

P.O. No.	Terms	Ship Date	Rep	Project
		1/31/2026		

Item	Description	Qty	Unit Price	Total
Boxed	Ficus aurea "Strangler Fig" 35-40ft OA		20,000.00	20,000.00T
Del Out	Delivered by outside vender. Semi Truck 15ft Wide load	1	3,000.00	3,000.00
Escort	Escort Services for Wide Load Transport 1 Front and rear	2	550.00	1,100.00T
Install	Installation of above material. This includes all labor, equipment (unless additional equipment is listed below) and materials to professionally install the material per FNGLA specifications. All installations come with a 1 year guarantee on material larger then 15 gallon. Material under 15 gallon is a 90 day guarantee. This price is for open access to the planting area and no obstacles such as roots over 1 inch diameter, stumps or solid rock. If we encounter any obstacles it can raise the cost of install. Any changes will be approved by the client first.	1	5,500.00	5,500.00T
Telehandler Mob	Mobilization, Delivery and Pick Up of Telehandler	2	650.00	1,300.00T

I have read, understand and agree to all the terms and conditions of sale set forth on the front and the back of this Estimate and Agreement. Once signed this Estimate becomes a binding contract.	Subtotal	\$30,900.00
	Sales Tax (6.5%)	\$1,813.50
Estimate Void after 30 days from date if not signed.	Total	\$32,713.50
Sign here _____		
Date _____		

ESTIMATE

#EST00017

2/10/2026



Bill To
 John Duchok
 Attn: Jason Coppock
 2 Bridge Road
 Hobe Sound FL 33455

Ship To
 John Duchok
 Attn: Jason Coppock
 2 Bridge Road
 Hobe Sound FL 33455

Expires
 3/11/2026

Sales Rep
 Anthony B. Burr

Quantity	Item	Rate	Amount
	Acquire, prepare, transport, and plant up to two (2) large (20'-30' tall), mature Strangler Fig trees. Attn: Jason Coppock - jcoppock@tji.martin.fl.us Bridge Road Tree (located off of 138th Street):		
1	1.Tree Purchase Price (Leave Blank: Town to request price from Owner directly).	\$0.00	\$0.00
1	2.Temporary Ditch Crossing (inc. culvert):	\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00
1	3.Root prune/trim for transport	\$5,500.00	\$5,500.00
1	4.Transport and plant (5 miles)	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00
1	5.Maintenance of Traffic	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00
30	6.Irrigation Work (estimate) - Water tank, per day, estimated for 6 weeks/5 days a week	\$200.00	\$6,000.00
	Jupiter Island Tree:		
1	1.Stump Removal	\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00
1	2.Root prune/trim for transport	\$5,500.00	\$5,500.00
1	3.Transport and plant (1/4 mile)	\$15,500.00	\$15,500.00
1	4.Maintenance of Traffic	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00
1	5.Irrigation Work (estimate)	\$500.00	\$500.00

Estimate Notes

- 1) All precautions will be taken not to damage water line or fiber.
- 2) 25% Deposit required upon signing.
- 3) No warranty on transplanted material.

Subtotal \$54,000.00

Tax Total (%) \$0.00

Total \$54,000.00

Terms & Conditions Link

<https://jenkinslandscape.com/tc/>

By signing below, I approve the estimate and agree to pay the amount stated. I further acknowledge and agree to the Terms and Conditions, including all applicable disclaimers, available at <https://jenkinslandscape.com/tc/>, which are incorporated into this agreement.



TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND.
2 BRIDGE ROAD
HOBE SOUND FL. 33455, FL

Sales: JOSEPH PEGLER
BRIDGE ROAD | EST5950487 | FICUS (2) EAST OF
DRAWBRIDGE
BRIDGE ROAD HOBE SOUND FL. 33455, FL 33455

Est ID: EST5950487
Date: Jan-26-2026

ROOT PRUNNING 2 FICUS \$8,100.00

TOWN OF JUPITERS ISLAND MAY REALIZE A SAVINGS , SHOULD THEY HAVE AN IN HOUSE METHOD OF WATERING THE 138 STREET TREE.

1 DAY	LANDSCAPE CREW PER DAY +/- TO BE BILLED AT ACTUAL UPON COMPLETION (138th. Street Tree)	\$1,800.00	\$1800.00
1 DAY	LANDSCAPE CREW PER DAY +/- TO BE BILLED AT ACTUAL UPON COMPLETION (Corner of Pitou Trl. and Gomez)	\$1,800.00	\$1800.00
30 DAYS	IRRIGATION--WATER BUFFALO AT 138 STREET - 60 GALLONS PER TREE DAILY - 30 DAYS	\$150.00	\$4500.00

IPM- AFTER ROOT PRUNNING \$778.24

LIQUID FERTILIZER, PEST PREVENTATIVE AND FUNGUS PREVENATIVE APPLY 100 GALLONS EACH TREE.

2 Hours	IPM LAWN & ORNAMENTALS TECH	\$90.00	\$180.00
2 EA	IPM CHEMICALS FOR NEW TREES	\$299.12	\$598.24

REMOVAL & DISPOSAL OF CURRENT STUMP \$2,300.00

1 DAY	LANDSCAPE CREW PER DAY +/- TO BE BILLED AT ACTUAL UPON COMPLETION	\$1,800.00	\$1800.00
-------	---	------------	-----------

Blue Water Landscape
11110 SE Federal Hwy
Hobe Sound, Florida
33455

P.772-546-7773


bluewaterlandscape.net
eric@bwfl.com

1 LOAD	HAUL: STUMP +/- TO BE BILLED AT ACTUAL	\$500.00	\$500.00
CRANE- LOAD AND SET TWO FIGUS		\$67,968.00	
4 DAYS	CRANE RENTAL- 250 TON - 1 @ 30K @ 90'RADIUS 1 @ 50K @ 50' RADIUS +/- TO BE BILLED UPON COMPLETION	\$16,117.00	\$64468.00
2 L/S	DELIVERY OF TWO OVERSIZED FIGUS TO BRIDGE ROAD LOCATIONS	\$1,750.00	\$3500.00
MOT-PER TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND SPECIFICATIONS		\$855.00	
1 LS	MOT SUPPLIED: SET UP AND BREAK DOWN	\$855.00	\$855.00
INSTALLATION OF 2 FIGUS		\$13,428.00	
4 DAYS	LANDSCAPE CREW W/ EQUIPMENT +/- TO BE BILLED AT ACTUAL UPON COMPLETION (INSTALLERS)	\$2,000.00	\$8000.00
4 DAYS	LANDSCAPE : FLAGGERS	\$1,000.00	\$4000.00
6 EACH	HARDSCAPE MATERIAL: 8" X 16' DOCK PILLINGS - INSTALLED	\$238.00	\$1428.00
IRRIGATION- BRIDGE ROAD		\$220.00	
8 EACH	IRRIGATION SUPPLIES - ADJUSTABLE FLOOD BUBBLERS- INSTALLED	\$15.00	\$120.00
50 LF	IRRIGATION SUPPLIES - 50' FUNNY PIPE - INSTALLED	\$1.00	\$50.00
10 EACH	IRRIGATION SUPPLIES - 10 +/- FUNNY PIPE FITTINGS- INSTALLED	\$5.00	\$50.00
		Subtotal	\$93,649.24
		Taxes	\$0.00
		Estimate Total	\$93,649.24

Blue Water Landscape
 11110 SE Federal Hwy
 Hobe Sound, Florida
 33455

P.772-546-7773

bluewaterlandscape.net
 eric@bwfl.com

Contractor: 

JOSEPH PEGLER

Client: _____

Signature Date: 02/25/2026


Signature Date: _____

Email: joe@bwfl.com



MEMORANDUM



TO: TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND, COMMISSION
THRU: ROBERT GARLO, TOWN MANAGER
FROM: MICHAEL EWING, DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC SAFETY 
DATE: MARCH 13, 2026
SUBJECT: CAPITAL PURCHASE AUTHORIZATION; TWO REPLACEMENT MARINE OUTBOARD ENGINES

I am requesting spending authorization for the purchase of two (2) replacement Mercury outboard engines for the Public Safety Department’s marine unit vessel at a total cost of **\$40,292.66**. The purchase price is based on informal request for quotes that were obtained from three local Mercury-authorized service centers, with the selected quote representing the best value for the Town while meeting the required specifications for our vessel.

Funding for the replacement of the engines was approved and allocated in the current fiscal year Public Safety Department budget, specifically designated for marine unit equipment replacement.

The current engines have exceeded their serviceable life span and have begun to show signs of mechanical wear consistent with extended operational use in the marine environment. Continued operation of the existing engines increases the likelihood of mechanical failure and could impact the reliability and safety of marine patrol operations. Replacing the engines will ensure the vessel remains fully operational and capable of supporting our ongoing maritime patrol, emergency response, and public safety missions.

Given the operational importance of the marine unit and the age and condition of the current engines, replacement at this time is both necessary and fiscally prudent to ensure continued reliability and safety of the vessel. The existing engines will be sold at public auction as allowed by Florida State Statute 274.05/274.06, to offset a portion of the replacement costs.

Staff is requesting the Town Commission approve the purchase and installation of two (2) Mercury Outboard Engines in the specified amount of \$40,292.66 and the disposal of the existing Yamaha outboard engines listed below:

2018 Yamaha F150XCA	Serial # 6HPX-1001087	Eng. Hours 2483.2
2018 Yamaha LF150XCA	Serial #6HRX-1000765	Eng. Hours 2488.2



4550 Anglers Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33312

T: 954-894-9895 | F: 954-894-9970

www.InterMarineBoats.com

Intermarine...big enough to perform, small enough to care.

Customer Name: _____ Date: _____

Address: _____

Home Ph: _____ Work Ph: _____ Fax: _____

Cell Ph: _____ Email: _____

Boat Make: _____ Model: _____ HIN: _____

Engine Make: _____ Model: _____

Engine Serial #: _____ Engine Hours: _____

Parts:

Problem:

"AS IS"THE ONLY WARRANTIES APPLYING TO THIS PART(S) ARE THOSE WHICH MAY BE OFFERED BY THE MANUFACTURER. THE SELLING DEALER HEREBY EXPRESSLY DIS-CLAIMS ALL WARRANTIES. EITHER EXPRESS OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE, AND NEITHER ASSUMES NOR AUTHORIZES ANY OTHER PERSON TO ASSUME FOR IT ANY LIABILITY IN CONNECTION WITH THE SALE OF THIS PART(S) AND/OR CUSTOMER CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES, DAMAGES TO PROPERTY, DAMAGES FOR LOSS OF USE, LOSS OF TIME, LOSS OF PROFITS OR INCOME OR ANY OTHER INCIDENTAL DAMAGES. HOWEVER, THE DEALER DOES GUARANTEE THAT THE PARTS AND LABOR SERVICE PERFORMED BY THIS REPAIR FACILITY WILL BE WARRANTED FOR DEFECTS IN MATERIAL OR WORKMANSHIP FOR A PERIOD OF 30 DAYS FROM THE DATE OF COMPLETED REPAIRS. THIS WARRANTY REMAINS IN EFFECT UNLESS OTHERWISE STIPULATED IN WRITING ON THE FACE OF THIS DOCUMENT. NO WARRANTIES ON RUST OR CORROSION.

I hereby authorize the above repair work to be done along with the necessary materials. It is distinctly understood that all labor and materials so used shall be charged to this job at current bill- ing rates. It is further understood that any denied warranty claims are my responsibility. You and your employees may operate the above boat for the purpose of testing, inspections, or deliver- ing at my risk. An express mechanic's lien is acknowledged on the above boat to secure the amount of repairs thereto. It is understood that Intermarine, Inc assumes no responsibility and that cus- tomer expressly absolves Intermarine, Inc from responsibility for damage to customer's boat and any materials or items appurtenant thereto resulting or arising out of fire, theft, acts of nature or any other cause when such items are placed in the custody of Intermarine, Inc for sale, service, repair, testing, storage, pickup or delivery. In the event that legal action is necessary to enforce this contract, i will pay all reason-able attorney's fees and other costs incurred. All payments are C.O.D. I agree to pay storage fees at the rate of \$3.50 per foot/per day if boat is not removed from facility within 48 hours of notice of completion.

IN THE EVENT A HURRICANE WATCH IS ISSUED FOR BROWARD, MARTIN, OR PALM BEACH COUNTIES, ALL SERVICE CUSTOMERS ARE REQUIRED TO RE-MOVE THEIR BOAT(S) FROM THE HARBOR AND PREMISES. IN THE EVENT THE BOAT(S) IS NOT REMOVED FROM THE FACILITY AT SUCH TIME A HURRI-CANE WARNING IS PLACED INTO EFFECT, YOU WILL BE CHARGED AND AGREE TO PAY A FEE BASED ON CURRENT HURRICANE RATES, PER OCCURRENCE.

Authorized by: _____

Coastal Marine

CELEBRATING OVER 45 YEARS OF EXCELLENCE!!

3191 SE Waaler St.
 Stuart, FL 34997
 TEL: 772-283-7733
 FAX: 772-283-7762

Date	Estimate #
2/23/2026	4825

Estimate for:

Customer Name
TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND 103 BUNKER HILL RD. HOBE SOUND FL, 33455

BOAT		MOTOR		
RIB		300 ETEC 5400674		
Qty	Item	Description	Cost	Total
1	MERCURY ENGINE	SEAPRO 150XL BLACK 25" ENGINE	14,930.00	14,930.00
1	MERCURY PART	150CXL BLACK 25" ENGINE	15,375.00	15,375.00
1	SHIPPING & HA	SHIPPING	500.00	500.00
1	MERCURY PART	ENGINE RIGGING COMPONENTS: BINNACLE, HARNESS', KEY SWITCH, SS PROPS, 2) SC1000 GAUGE, AGM BATTERIES.	5,000.00	5,000.00
1	TECH. SERVICE	REPLACE ENGINES AND RIGGING. SET UP, WATER TEST AND SELECT CORRECT PROPS. ***NEED TO INSPECT STEERING SYSTEM, FUEL SYSTEM AND ELECTRICAL SYSTEM	4,500.00	4,500.00

DUE TO CURRENT MARKET CONDITIONS, IMMEDIATE PAYMENT IS REQUIRED FOR PARTS LISTED TO SECURE ABOVE PRICING.

Subtotal	\$40,305.00
Sales Tax (0.0%)	\$0.00
Total	\$40,305.00

CENTRAL MARINE - STUART

200 NW ALICE AVE

STUART FL 34994

(772) 692-2000

Buyer's Order

JUPITER ISLAND POLICE DEPT

Date 02/27/2026

Deal No.

Salesperson RICK BEACH

Lienholder NONE

H W C 772-708-4184 Email PETERSON@TJI.MARTIN.FL.US

I hereby agree to purchase the following unit(s) from you under the terms and conditions specified. Delivery is to be made as soon as possible. It is agreed, however, that neither you nor the manufacturer will be liable for failure to make delivery.

Unit Information

New/U	Year	Make	Model	Serial No.	Stock No.	Price (Incl factory options)
New	2025	MERCURY	150XL 4S	3B658686	M45328	\$15,920.00
New	2022	MERCURY	150CXL 4S	3B152363	M43204	\$14,320.00

Options:

Dealer Unit Price	\$30,240.00
Factory Options	\$0.00
Added Accessories	\$11,082.00
Freight	\$0.00
Dealer Prep	\$0.00

LABOR	\$4,100.00	D
PROPS	\$1,250.00	D
TWIN RIGGING KIT	\$2,412.00	D
SEA STAR TWIN KIT	\$3,320.00	D

Cash Price	\$41,322.00
Trade Allowance	\$0.00
Payoff	\$0.00

Notes:

Net Trade	\$0.00
Net Sale (Cash Price - Net Trade)	\$41,322.00
Sales Tax	\$2,529.32
Title/License/Registration Fees	\$0.00
Document or Administration Fees	\$0.00
Credit Life Insurance	\$0.00
Accident & Disability	\$0.00

Trade Information

Total Other Charges	\$2,529.32
Sub Total (Net Sale + Other Charges)	\$43,851.32
Cash Down Payment	\$0.00

Amount to Pay/Finance **\$43,851.32**

Monthly Payment of \$0.00 For 0 Months at 0.00% Interest

NOTICE TO BUYER: (1) Do not sign this agreement before you read it or if it contains any blank spaces to be filled in. (2) You are entitled to a completely filled in copy of this agreement. (3) If you default in the performance of your obligations under this agreement, the vehicle may be repossessed and you may be subject to suit and liability for the unpaid indebtedness evidenced by this agreement.

TRADE-IN NOTICE: Customer represents that all trade in units described above are free of all liens and encumbrances except as noted.

*With Approved Credit. Interest rates and monthly payment are approximate and may vary from those determined by the lender.

Customer(s) Signature _____ Dealer Signature _____

Thank You for Your Business!



Date: March 12, 2026
 To: John Duchock, Town of Jupiter Island
 From: Ali Palmer, Kimley-Horn
 Subject: Comprehensive Plan Amendments
 Recommendation to Defer Transmittal

Purpose

This memorandum provides the best practice planning consideration for deferring the transmittal of any proposed comprehensive plan amendments to the Florida Department of Commerce (State Land Planning Agency) until there is clearer direction on the post-disaster land use restrictions enacted in SB 180 (2025).

State Review and Procedural Timelines

Once the governing body (the Town) holds the initial (transmittal) public hearing, state law requires that proposed amendments be transmitted to the State Land Planning Agency within a short statutory timeframe (generally within 10 working days after the first hearing for expedited review amendments). Practically, this means that scheduling a transmittal hearing effectively commits the jurisdiction to transmit.

Current Law (2025): SB 180

SB 180 (2025) was enacted as Chapter 2025-190, Laws of Florida, with an effective date in late June 2025. SB 180 has been interpreted to prohibit certain local governments in federally-declared disaster areas (and certain nearby jurisdictions) from proposing or adopting “more restrictive or burdensome” comprehensive plan amendments or land development regulation changes through October 1, 2027, with the law applying retroactively to August 1, 2024, and with actions potentially deemed “null and void ab initio.” The Town of Jupiter Island is included in geographic areas identified by SB 180.

Importantly for planning practice, municipal experience has included correspondence from the State indicating conflicts with Chapter 2025-190 restrictions and treating certain transmitted amendments as null and void—a risk that creates substantial uncertainty for jurisdictions considering transmittal while SB 180 remains in place as enacted.

In addition, a documented example of a “notice letter” expressly invokes SB 180’s “null and void ab initio” language, provides a 14-day withdrawal demand, and threatens attorney’s fees and costs if

the local government does not withdraw the challenged action—illustrating the litigation posture that can arise around SB 180 compliance questions.

Based on these actions by the Florida Department of Commerce, transmitting amendments now—particularly those that could be characterized as adding new standards, tightening development parameters, or lengthening approval processes—may elevate the risk of (a) a state “null and void” determination, and/or (b) private enforcement actions and fee exposure.

2026 Legislative Session: SB 840

SB 840 was introduced by Sen. Nick DiCeglie during the 2026 session to clarify and modify the land use restrictions established by SB 180 (2025) after hurricanes. SB 840 (“Land Use Regulations for Local Governments Affected by Natural Disasters”) specifically amends the restrictions from SB 180, including provisions related to Section 18 (s. 252.422, F.S.) and session-law restrictions connected to the 2024 hurricane disaster declarations. According to Senate committee analysis and the bill text, SB 840 would, among other changes:

- A. Changes “impacted local government” from within 100 miles to 50 miles of a hurricane’s path.
- B. Updated restrictions address moratoria enforcement delaying repairs, require compliance with new plan/LDR amendments after landfall, and modify procedural timelines.
- C. Moves the expiration for local governments under recent federal disaster declarations from October 1, 2027 to June 30, 2026, updating the relevant clause.
- D. Takes effect July 1, 2026 and has passed the Senate with further House actions pending.

During the 2026 Legislative Session, SB 840 passed all Senate committees, passed the Florida Senate unanimously, was sent to the House, where it received its first reading and was referred to committee, but did not complete the House process before the 2026 session ended. Because it did not pass both chambers in the same session, **SB 840 died at the close of the 2026 session** and did not carry over. SB 180 remains in effect as adopted, without the refinements SB 840 would have been provided. The planning and comp plan amendment limitations tied to post-disaster periods remain unchanged unless a new corrective bill is filed and passed in a future session, or Courts invalidate or narrow SB 180 through ongoing litigation (separate from the legislative process).

Survey Results

The Commission reviewed the Comprehensive Plan survey results during the February 25, 2026 Town Commission meeting. The Commissioners requested additional information regarding the ownership and traffic control of South Beach Road based on the survey results, including several written comments from residents.

Recommendation

In light of the 2026 legislative outcome—specifically, SB 840 not passing and therefore not modifying SB 180—the recommended approach is to defer transmittal of the EAR-based amendments. The Town may submit an extension notification letter to the Florida Department of Commerce confirming that the EAR-based amendments to the Town’s Comprehensive Plan will be transmitted before March 2027.

This reduces the risk of rework and adverse state action under the current, unsettled framework, and allows time to reassess the amendment package for compliance with SB 180 as it remains in full effect. In the short term, deferral helps avoid a potential “null and void” determination by the State and the need for amendment re-adoption if a conflict with SB 180 is identified.

While the transmittal hearing is deferred, the jurisdiction should focus on the following actions to ensure readiness and legal soundness:

- Complete technical drafts and conduct a thorough internal consistency review, with an explicit focus on reviewing the current draft of the plan for full compliance with the operative provisions of SB 180.
- Work closely with the local attorney to identify any provisions that could be seen as “more restrictive or burdensome” under SB 180 and consider risk-limiting edits where policy intent allows, given the unchanged status of the law.
- Authorize studies regarding the legal ownership and traffic control of South Beach Road to address resident comments and survey results.

Schedule

Following this recommendation, the next section outlines the key dates and tasks to guide the Town’s comp plan amendment and adoption process moving forward. In general, the adjusted timeline is intended to: 1) allow for adequate time to respond to legislative changes; 2) allow for additional time to review the current comp plan draft in sections and consider potential amendments; and, 3) to complete the final steps leading to transmittal and adoption during the winter season when more constituents are in residence. The amended schedule below provides a clear framework for upcoming actions and ensures all necessary steps are completed within the extended timeline period, including initial transmittal to the state and a 30-day state comment period prior to final adoption by the Town. It should be noted that only the initial transmittal to the state is required to be completed before the February 15, 2027 extended deadline and that the additional time has been provided as a buffer for future discussions and scheduling unknowns. The Commission may consider further adjustments to the timeline and extension deadline as it sees fit.

DATE	TASK	NOTES
25-Mar	Town Commission presentation including the extension memo, revised schedule and additional task	
31-Mar	Town to file extension letter with State Department of Commerce	Extension letter will allow plan to be transmitted up until Feb 15, 2027.
13-Apr	Draft #3 to be delivered	Address LPA, Town Commission and Town Counsel comments received to date. This draft will not address SB 180 items.
22-Apr	Town Commission - Present Draft #3	Present Town Vision, Purpose, and Profile plus first 3 elements (Future Land Use, Transportation, Housing)
19-May	Town Commission update - Present Draft #3	Present next 3 elements (Infrastructure, Coastal Management, Conservation)
23-Jun	Town Commission update - Present Draft #3	Present last 4 elements (Recreation and Open Space, Intergovernmental Coordination, Capital Improvements, Property Rights)
30-June	Completion of 2026 Legislative Session	
July	Town Commission – Legislative and Legal Update	Counsel to present update on all 2026 bills that may impact the current comprehensive plan update and on South Beach Road Ownership & Traffic Control.
September	Draft #4 to be delivered for Town staff review	Address comments from April, May and June Town Commission meetings as well as changes required by legislative updates, including conflicts with SB 180 from 2025 session. This draft is not currently included in the comprehensive plan update contract or amendment.
September	Town Commission - Present Draft #4	This draft will be utilized for the transmittal hearing unless there are changes requested during this meeting.
October	LPA - Transmittal Hearing	

November	Town Commission - Transmittal Hearing	
December	30-day state review	
January	Draft #5 (final draft) to be delivered	Draft #5 will address LPA and Town Commission comments as well as any comments from the state review process.
February	Town Commission – Adoption Hearing	Presentation and adoption of Draft #5

Sample Letter to the Florida Department of Commerce Deferment Notification

[On Jurisdiction Letterhead]

[Date]

James Stansbury, Chief
Florida Department of Commerce
Bureau of Community Planning and Growth
107 East Madison Street MSC 160
Tallahassee, FL 32399-4120

Subject: Transmittal Deferment of EAR-Based Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Dear Mr. Stansbury:

We are writing to notify the Department of the Town’s decision to defer the transmittal of our Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR)-based Comprehensive Plan Amendments from July 15, 2026, to March 1, 2027.

This deferment is due to ongoing uncertainty surrounding the implementation of Senate Bill 180. Additional time is necessary to ensure that our amendments fully align with the new state standards and minimize the risk of procedural or substantive conflicts.

The deferment will also allow the Town to complete several critical studies and obtain necessary legal opinions, which are essential for the successful and compliant adoption of our plan amendments. By deferring transmittal until March 1, 2027, we aim to reduce the risk of avoidable rework, ensure consistency with evolving state law, and protect the Town’s investment in its comprehensive planning process.

Please let us know if you require any additional information or documentation to support this deferment.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Penelope D. Townsend

Mayor

Town of Jupiter Island

[Contact Information]

MEMORANDUM

To: Robert Garlo, Town Manager & Town Commission

From: Kyle B. Teal, Esq.

Re: Referrals and Development Approval Modifications

Date: March 16, 2026

I was asked to evaluate potentially amending the Town's Land Development Regulations (LDRs) to clarify and refine the Town's processes for addressing deviations from site plans that may require quasi-judicial hearings before the Development Review Board ("DRB") or the Town Commission. A review of the Town's code enforcement procedures in this context was also requested.

I. Current Provisions

Under the current LDRs, administrative officials may refer approval to the DRB for a quasi-judicial hearing if "the administrative official determines that there is any reasonable likelihood that a particular proposal that is otherwise within the administrative official's jurisdiction will have any adverse impact on adjacent properties, the surrounding area or the town as a whole." TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND, Appendix A §1.02. Additionally, the official may also refer similar applications involving or regulating development to the Town Commission for similar quasi-judicial hearings. *See, e.g.*, TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND, Appendix A, Art. 1, Div. 3, Sec. 3.03 and Art. VII, Div. 1, Sec. 102.

II. Procedural Clarifications

To clarify the LDRs and ensure that the intent of the original development approval is maintained in the final development, the Commission may consider adding language to address modifications that substantially deviate from prior approvals. Such amendments would not include minor adjustments that are in "substantial compliance" with the original site plan approval. Such minor changes could be approved administratively, rather than requiring an additional quasi-judicial hearing before the same board that originally approved the site plan.

Many municipalities permit administrative officials to approve modifications that are in "substantial compliance" with the original approval and address major deviations separately. Though not defined by statute or case law, "substantial compliance" is a common phrase used in Florida municipal codes. For example, several municipalities define substantial compliance as "having no or only minor deviations," and permit material/major deviations to be rectified when brought into substantial compliance within a reasonable period of time. *See, e.g.*, CITY OF NEPTUNE BEACH, §27-124. 2025; THE CITY OF WALDO §11.09.02.D; CITY OF WALACHUA, § 8.02.04.

Codes in other cities, such as the Town of Fort Myers Beach, require a certificate of substantial compliance as part of the final inspection process. That zoning code states:

Substantial compliance means that the development, as determined by an on-site inspection by a professional engineer or his designated representative, is completed to all the specifications of the approved development order plans and that any deviation between the approved development order plans and actual as-built construction is so inconsequential that, on the basis of accepted engineering practices, it is not significant enough to be shown on the development site plan.

TOWN OF FORT MYERS BEACH, §10-183 (2025). Other cities do not define substantial compliance but nonetheless require an applicant to demonstrate that the development is in “substantial compliance” with the prior approval by as demonstrated through several enumerated factors. *See, e.g., CITY OF DORAL, § 53-556 (2026).*

III. Proposed Changes

It logically follows that the administrative official conducting the initial application review have the discretion to make substantial compliance determinations. We propose the Town incorporate the principle of “substantial compliance” in Article X, Division 2, Section 1.02 of its LDRs:

Sec. 1.02. – Referral to Quasi-Judicial Hearing to development review board.

- A. If the administrative official determines that there is any reasonable likelihood that a particular proposal that is otherwise within the administrative official’s jurisdiction will have an ~~any~~ adverse impact on adjacent properties, the surrounding area or the town as a whole, the administrative official may require that the application be heard by the Development Review Board and/or the Town Commission, in accordance with these LDRs.

- B. If the administrative official determines that any modifications to previously approved development applications are not in substantial compliance with the Town’s original approval, the administrative official must require the application to amend the site plan be heard by the same governing body that issued the original approval. If the approval was administrative, the administrative official may require that the development review board hear the application seeking to amend the site plan regardless of whether the application is brought before or after the work is completed, in accordance with Section 2.06 herein.

- C. For purposes of these LDRs, “substantial compliance” means that any deviation between the approved plans and actual as-built construction is so inconsequential that it is not significant enough to be shown on the development site plan.
- D. If a written request for a hearing is received from any owner of property within 1,320 feet of the parcel proposed for development within 21 days of the date that notice of the application is mailed, the administrative officials shall refer the application to the development review board.

Currently, the LDRs do not specifically detail the Town’s authority to approve development that significantly deviates from the original approval, whether approval was administrative, with the DRB or with the Town Commission. Therefore, we propose the following additional provision to clarify the LDRs and account for this process:

Sec. 2.06 – Modifications of Development Approval

- A. Applicants seeking to amend previously approved site plans shall first seek authorization of the modifications with the same administrative official and/or governing body in advance of the applicant commencing the work. Any modifications to a development approval may be approved if consistent with the Town’s Land Development Regulations.
- B. Upon finding that an applicant has undergone and/or completed unauthorized modifications to its plans that resulted in substantial deviations from the original approved development (“Unpermitted Work”), the administrative official may refer the applicant to code enforcement and/or the special magistrate to determine whether the applicant has violated the provisions of the Town’s Land Development Regulations. The applicant shall be subject to code enforcement measures pursuant to Chapter 2, Article VI, Division I, Section 2-133 of the Town’s Code.
- C. Applicants who have done Unpermitted Work may submit an application for an after-the-fact permit which will require the Town to assess whether the Unpermitted Work is otherwise consistent with the Town’s Land Development Regulations. The application must be made with the same governing body that issued the original development approval. A showing that Unpermitted Work is nevertheless

consistent with Town regulations may not serve as a defense during code enforcement proceedings but such evidence may be presented as a mitigating factor that the special magistrate may consider when assessing code enforcement fines. The submittal of an application for an after-the-fact permit may function to stay the code enforcement proceedings if requested in writing by the applicant.

- D. In the event the Town body hearing an after-the-fact permit finds that the Unpermitted Work did not comply with Town regulations, it may as a consequence, order compliance with the originally approved application by a date certain, order the building official to refrain from issuing a certificate of occupancy, revoke an issued certificate of occupancy and/or refer the matter to code enforcement or lift a stay of code enforcement proceedings.

MEMORANDUM

To: Robert Garlo, Town Manager & Town Commission

From: Kyle B. Teal, Esq.

Re: Basement/ “living space” issue

Date: March 16, 2026

Due to recent applications considered by the Development Review Board, staff have requested circulation of the notes below for discussion at the upcoming March 25th Commission meeting. In sum, this issue is being raised so that the Commission may consider clarifying or amending the LDRs to eliminate a purported “exception” to the allowable Floor Area limitations through the use of basements as “non-living space.” Ideally, the proposed amendment would not include underground garages, which would remain non-living space within the meaning of the LDRs and would not count towards allowable floor area. If the Commission is inclined to allow utility rooms and storage areas as exceptions, it could also include an allowance not to exceed 10 percent of the permitted floor area.

I. Basement Regulations & Maximum Floor Area

It is within the Town’s police powers to regulate the allowable floor area of homes constructed on the island. A revision to the Town’s LDRs that would clarify the lack of permissible exceptions to such a cap may be permissible if it is will of the Commission.

Currently, the relevant LDR definitions read as follows:

Basement: A part of a building which:

1. Has a ceiling which is no higher than three feet above the adjacent ground level if located within the footprint of the first floor, or
2. Has a ceiling which is completely below ground level if located outside the footprint of the first floor. (See Illustration 1: Basement, Exhibit A)

App. A, Art. II, Sec. 1.

Floor area: The sum of all of the areas of building floors and areas under certain other structures, measured as provided in article IV, section 2.01.

Living space: A space within a dwelling unit utilized for living, sleeping, eating, cooking bathing, washing and sanitation purposes.

Living space within a basement that was developed prior to the adoption of this ordinance, shall not be included in non-conforming uses providing the property is not redeveloped over 50 percent.

Id.

Article IV, Section 2.01 reads as follows:

Sec. 2.01. - Floor area.

Floor area is measured as follows:

- A. All areas on all floors of all buildings which are included within the outside faces of their exterior walls, including floor penetration areas for circulation and shaft areas that connect one floor to another, except basements and other floors below the first floor, which are counted as provided in paragraphs D and E of this section (See Illustration 14: Floor Area Measurement, Buildings, Exhibit A), plus

.....

- D. Basement areas designated as living space are included in floor area calculations. Basement areas not designated as living space do not count as floor area, and no floor or part of a floor which would otherwise qualify as a basement shall be disqualified as a basement due to access to ground level which is provided by light wells that:

1. Extend no more than four feet from the outside wall of the building and cumulatively occupy no more than 25 percent of the length of the first floor wall to which they are adjacent; and
2. Are configured such that they are not visible from:
 - a. The building envelopes of neighboring properties; and
 - b. Public rights-of-way.

- E. Floors or parts of floors which are below the first floor, but do not qualify as basements, are counted as follows:

1. If the entire floor does not qualify as a basement, then the entire floor is counted as floor area.
2. If part of the floor does not qualify as a basement, then only that area which does not qualify as a basement is counted as floor area. (See Illustration 19: Floor Area Measurement, Basements, Exhibit A)

3. If a single wall of a floor which is below the first floor is exposed such that it no longer qualifies as a basement wall, but no floor area can be calculated due to the absence of a depth measurement, then the width of the exposed wall shall be multiplied by five feet to calculate the floor area of the exposed portion of the floor.

For the Commission's consideration: a proposed text amendment to Section 2.01(D) that would eliminate the 'basement exception' to the LDRs:

Sec. 2.01. - Floor area.

Floor area is measured as follows:

- D. Basement areas **not designated as garages** ~~designated as living space~~ shall be included in floor area calculations. Basement areas **exempt from floor area calculations must be designated as utility rooms and storage areas and may not exceed 10 percent of the total permitted floor area.** ~~not designated as living space do not count as floor area, and no floor or part of a floor which would otherwise qualify as a basement shall be disqualified as a basement due to access to ground level which is provided by light wells that:~~
1. ~~Extend no more than four feet from the outside wall of the building and cumulatively occupy no more than 25 percent of the length of the first floor wall to which they are adjacent; and~~
 2. ~~Are configured such that they are not visible from:~~
 - a. ~~The building envelopes of neighboring properties; and~~
 - b. ~~Public rights of way.~~
- E. ~~Floors or parts of floors which are below the first floor, but do not qualify as basements, are counted as follows:~~
1. ~~If the entire floor does not qualify as a basement, then the entire floor is counted as floor area.~~
 2. ~~If part of the floor does not qualify as a basement, then only that area which does not qualify as a basement is counted as floor area. (See Illustration 19: Floor Area Measurement, Basements, Exhibit A)~~
 3. ~~If a single wall of a floor which is below the first floor is exposed such that it no longer qualifies as a basement wall, but no floor area can be calculated due to the absence of a depth measurement, then~~

~~the width of the exposed wall shall be multiplied by five feet to calculate the floor area of the exposed portion of the floor.~~

II. Zoning in Progress

If the Commission opts to undergo any such legislation described above, it is advised to consider issuing a zoning in progress notice. The Town's LDR governing zoning in progress reads as follows:

Sec. 10.01. - Effect of zoning in progress.

When the town commission declares zoning in progress, no development permits shall be issued by the administrative official which are in contravention of proposed amendments to provisions of the town zoning code.

App. A, Art. 10, §10.01.

The zoning in progress notice would alert potential applicants of the forthcoming change to and/or clarification of the code and may subject those owners who have yet to submit applications to the new regulations that are pending the Commission's vote. However, the amendment to the LDRs could likely not be applied retroactively to applications already submitted for consideration before the ordinance modifying the LDRs is deemed "pending" under Florida law.

For a zoning change to be considered "pending" under Florida law, there "must be active and documented efforts on the part of those authorized to do the work which, in the normal course of municipal action, culminate in the requisite zoning change. The city council or the applicable city planning board must at least be aware that these efforts are going forward." *Smith v. City of Clearwater*, 383 So. 2d 681 (1980). The change does not need to be formally before the city council if the appropriate administrative department is actively pursuing it.

The temporal application of zoning amendments to pending matters follows established principles from *City of Coral Gables v. Sakolsky*, 215 So. 2d 329 (1968). In that case, the Florida Third District Court of Appeal held that a zoning application "was governed, not by zoning ordinance which existed at time application had been filed, but by amended ordinance, compelling denial of the application, that was enacted after the application was filed but six months before suit was brought." The court explained that "the right of a plaintiff to recover must be measured by the facts as they exist when the suit was instituted." *Id.* See also *City of Gainesville v. Cone*, 365 So. 2d 737 (Fla. 1st DCA 1978) (holding that property owners acquire no vested rights in existing zoning categories unless equitable estoppel applies, requiring expenditure of money in compliance with existing zoning).

MEMORANDUM

To: Robert Garlo, Town Manager & Town Commission

From: Kyle B. Teal, Esq.

Re: Seasonal Construction Regulations

Date: March 16, 2026

As you are aware, this office presented a Memorandum, dated February 17, 2026, to the Town Commission regarding Seasonal Construction Moratorium and/or Regulations. At the Town Commission meeting dated February 25, 2026, the Town Commission inquired about additional regulations, including, for example, decibel measurements and gross weight vehicle (GWV) restrictions. The purpose of this memorandum is to evaluate those ideas and offer the Town regulatory proposals for discussion.

I. Enjoyment of Property in the Town

To recap, while a complete ban on construction during winter months may raise complications, the Town should consider clarifying the seasonal regulations of construction related activity to preserve the health, safety and welfare of the community. Currently, the Town regulates seasonal construction by prohibiting the use of certain equipment enumerated in Section 9-62(b) of the Town's Municipal Code. The Town of Palm Beach has a similar ordinance:

(a) *Prohibited.* During the period of the year commencing on November 1 and ending April 30, no person shall operate or cause to be operated the following machinery or equipment within the town:

(1) Dredges, whether used in making hydraulic fills, dry fills, piledriving or any other purpose.

(2) Hammer-driven piledrivers, whether operated from water or land, or from motor truck or tractor, and whether stationary or moveable.

(3) Gasoline, diesel and/or steam engines, operated in such a manner as to emit odors or noises offensive or disagreeable to the inhabitants of the town.

(4) Dry sandblasting machines and jackhammers.

(5) Any other class of machinery or appliance that in its operation would render the enjoyment of property within the town less agreeable than if such appliances or machinery were not operated.

(emphasis added)

Adopting similar provisions to subsections (a)(3)(5) would provide the Town with discretion in its code enforcement measures and preclude an individual in the Town from using newly developed machinery or equipment not contemplated by, expressly listed in, section 9-62 of the Town's LDRs.

Subsection "(b) *Exceptions.*" reads as follows

(1) It shall be within the discretion of the town council when, in its opinion, the operation of any of the prohibited machinery or appliances mentioned in subsection (a) of this section shall not be overly offensive to the residents or inhabitants of the town, in the vicinity of the equipment's operation, to grant an exception to this section.

(2) The operation of equipment relating to essential services of the town and equipment operation during emergency conditions shall be exempt from subsection (a) of this section.

Town of Palm Beach, Code § 42-198 (2026) (emphasis added). Similarly, exceptions similar to those provided in subsections b (1) and (2) would offer the Town flexibility and the opportunity to assess certain construction activities on a case-by-case basis.

II. Decibel Measuring

One idea presented by the Town was to install a decibel reader on sites under construction. Under Sec. 9-62 of the Town Code, there are several regulations on construction equipment during the winter season including use of:

- 1) gasoline, diesel and/or steam engines that produce noise in excess of 60 decibels (dbs), measured at any property line
- 2) Any construction equipment, device or activity, which though otherwise permitted, produces noise in excess of 72 decibels (dbs), measured
 - i. Fifty feet from the construction activity, or
 - ii. From the property line nearest to where the construction activity is taking place, whichever is greater.
- 3) Lawn maintenance equipment that exceeds 69 decibels, measured:

- i. Fifty feet from the point of operation of the equipment, or
- ii. From the nearest property line to where the equipment is operated, whichever is greater.
- iii. Leaf blowers, backpack sprayers and hand-held blowers shall be limited to a maximum decibel level that shall not exceed 65 (dbs) at a distance of 30 feet from the point of operation of the equipment or from the nearest property line to where the equipment is operated, whichever is greater.

As worded now, the current Town Code does not specify how these decibel limits are enforced.

Municipalities are not required to use decibel readers to enforce noise ordinances. *City of Miami Beach v. Kwartin*, 399 So. 3d 1151 (Fla. 3d DCA 2024) (holding that noise ordinances "do not require mathematical precision, nor do they require a decibel reader."). However, decibel readers are a permissible method of enforcing noise ordinances. *Park Crossing Homeowners Assoc., Inc. v. Suarez*, 415 So. 3d 676 (Fla. 4th DCA 2025) (holding that decibel-based standards give violators "fair notice of what violates" the ordinance because they "can monitor the noise with a decibel meter and know exactly when the noise exceeds the limits.").

However, a decibel reader installed on the property undergoing construction presumably will be unable to decipher between construction noise and other sounds that would not violate Sec. 9-62, such as a neighbor's deafening music or a loud passing vehicle. Under Florida law, a "code enforcement officer is authorized to issue a citation to a person when, based upon personal investigation, the officer has reasonable cause to believe that the person has committed a civil infraction in violation of a duly enacted code or ordinance and that the county court will hear the charge." Fla. Stat. §162.21(3)(a). Further, when challenged to a circuit court, code violations are reviewed by the competent, substantial evidence standard and property owners are entitled to due process. *See e.g., Town of Mangonia Park v. Palm Beach Oil, Inc.*, 436 So. 2d 1138, 1139 (Fla. 4th DCA 1983). From a practical standpoint, the fact that a decibel reader exceeds a certain level on a construction site does not mean that the construction itself caused such a reading. Without a code enforcement officer present to verify the source of the sound, the installation of the decibel reader on a construction site may present evidentiary challenges.

Many Florida municipalities enforce noise ordinances through use of readers or meters, though none indicate the installation of such devices on the property site. The City of Orlando enforces their decibel limits as follows:

measurements shall be made with a sound level meter. The sound level meter shall be calibrated in accordance with the meter manufacturer's recommendations. As necessary, a windscreen shall be utilized with the sound level meter. The measurements shall in general be made in accordance with the standards as promulgated by the American Society for Testing and Materials guidance.

CITY OF ORLANDO, §42.08.

The City of Fort Lauderdale’s municipal code provides:

Sound level measurement shall be made with a sound level meter using the “A” weighting scale or “C” weighting scale, as specified in this chapter for the specific sound source being investigated.

CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, §17-4.

The City of Tampa defines “sound levels” by explicitly incorporating their means of measurement:

Sound level means in decibels, a weighted sound pressure level, determined by the use of metering characteristics and frequency weightings specified in ANSI S1.4-1983, or subsequent revisions...

CITY OF TAMPA, §368.104.

In terms of specific measuring devices, municipalities do not always specify the exact device used to measure decibel levels. For example, the City of Bradenton defines sound level as

the weighted sound pressure level obtained by the use of a sound level meter and frequency weighting network, such as A, B, or C as specified in American National Standards Institute specifications for sound level meters (ANSI). If the frequency weighting employed is not indicated, the A -weighting shall apply.

Further, the City of Bradenton defines “sound level meters” as

any instrument including a microphone, amplifier, an output meter, and frequency weighting networks for the measurement of noise and sound levels in a specific manner and which complies with standards established by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) specifications for sound level meters.

a. Proposed Decibel Language

Should the Town wish to clarify the means by which the existing decibel limits in Section 9-62 of the Town Code are enforced, the Town may do so through use of readers being operated by a code enforcement officer. The Town must enforce the noise restrictions of 9-62 based on competent substantial evidence that the sound violating the ordinance is in fact being produced by the construction devices regulated by the LDRs.

It would be prudent to start by clarifying this language by defining decibel levels. For example, the Town may add the following definition to Section 9-62(a):

(a) *Definitions.*

(1) "*Winter season*" means the period between November 1 and April 30.

(2) "*Summer season*" means the period between May 1 and October 31.

....

(6) "*Decibel levels*" means the unit of sound measurement as measured by methods accepted by and in accordance with standards established by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) specifications for sound level meters.

Accordingly, we will work with Town staff to evaluate an alternative method of accurately measuring construction sound without the installation of a device on or near the permitted property.

III. GVW Restrictions

Chapter 316, Florida Statutes governs the ability of municipalities to regulate traffic within its jurisdiction.¹ Such authority includes the rights

to place and maintain such traffic control devices which conform to the manual and specifications of the Department of Transportation upon all streets and highways under their original jurisdiction as they shall deem necessary to indicate and to carry out the provisions of this chapter or to regulate, warn, or guide traffic.

§316.006(2)(a), Fla. Stat. Section 316.008, Florida Statutes enumerates a number of powers of municipalities to "regulate streets and highways under their jurisdiction."

However, it is unlawful for any local authority to pass or to attempt to enforce any ordinance in conflict with the provisions of Chapter 316 which contain numerous state restrictions on traffic. Fla. Stat. § 316.002. Thus "no local authority shall enact or enforce any ordinance on a matter covered by this chapter unless expressly authority." § 316.007, Fla. Stat. While Chapter 316 contains various provisions limiting the loads, weights and speeds of motor vehicles, municipalities

¹ Chapter 316 also permits municipalities to regulate traffic of county roads pursuant to an interlocal agreement. §316.006(2)(c).

may prescribe, by notice hereinafter provided for, loads and weights and speed limits lower than [those] limits... whenever in its or their judgment any road or part thereof or any bridge or culvert shall, by reason of its design, deterioration, rain, or other climatic or natural causes be liable to be damaged or destroyed by motor vehicles, trailers, or semitrailers, if the gross weight or speed limit thereof shall exceed the limits prescribed in said notice.

§316.555, Fla. Stat.

Municipalities may also

by like notice, regulate or prohibit, in whole or in part, the operation of any specified class or size of motor vehicles, trailers, or semitrailers on any highways or specified parts thereof under its or their jurisdiction, whenever in its or their judgment, such regulation or prohibition is necessary to provide for the public safety and convenience on the highways, or parts thereof, by reason of traffic density, intensive use thereof by the traveling public, or other reasons of public safety and convenience.

Id. Thus, municipalities may pass ordinances regulating vehicle weight on municipal roads.

The Town's goal of regulating such GVW, in the context of the winter construction provisions provided by Section 9-62, is not common. Most municipal codes regulate GVW throughout the municipal jurisdiction and without seasonal application. For example, the City of Orlando restricts vehicles with a GVW exceeding **8,000 pounds** from certain streets. City of Orlando, §39.04-1. The City of Fort Lauderdale requires permits for the movement of heavy machinery or other heavy objects. City of Fort Lauderdale, §25-11. The Town of Palm Beach prohibits vehicles over 5,051 pounds, from using any Town street that are not state-designated highways without a permit. Town of Palm Beach, §118-13.

Should the Town wish to revise its Code to address GVW, it would need to do so in a way that would clarify the Town's existing regulations so as not to run afoul of state law. For example, Section 9-62 currently states:

- (c) During the winter season, construction work is restricted to the following hours:
 - a. 8:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday; and
 - b. 8:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. on Saturday.

The Town may seek to clarify this language by defining “construction work” to include the use of trucks over a certain GVW (e.g., 8,000 pounds). Such language would require that any construction truck operating during the winter season could only commute to and from the construction site between the permitted hours.

Should the Town wish to prohibit construction trucks altogether, it may consider installing “No Truck” signs on all local roads in the Town.



Memorandum

To: Mayor & Town Commission
From: R. Garlo, Town Manager
Date: March 16, 2026
Re: Potential Acquisition of South Beach Road

At the February 2026 Commission meeting, the Commission discussed the possible acquisition of South Beach Road. This discussion was prompted by the results of a recent Town wide survey in which a large portion of respondents pointed to traffic as one of their main concerns.

The Commission went on to suggest that staff identify a qualified consultant to provide a cost/benefit analysis. Assuming the Town was to take ownership of South Beach Road, staff understood the focus of the analysis was to be a determination of what measures the Town could take to alleviate traffic congestion on the Island.

Town Attorney Kyle Teal and I interviewed Thomas A. Hall, of Thomas A. Hall, Inc., and found him to be extremely qualified to perform this analysis. Mr. Hall has forty years of experience on this subject, having done similar studies in several barrier islands.

I was extremely impressed with his three-step approach focusing on communication with stakeholders.

I've attached the appropriate engagement letter for your consideration. While the not-to-exceed amount is within the Town Manager's purview, I am seeking Commission approval to execute the engagement.

Thomas A. Hall, Inc.
1355 Adams Street
Hollywood, FL 33019
954-288-4447
tomhall1234@gmail.com

March 12, 2026

Robert Garlo
Town Manager
Town of Jupiter Island
2 Bridge Road
Hobe Sound, FL 33455

RE: Jupiter Island Traffic Representation (Revised)
Project No. 202607.0P

Dear Mr. Garlo:

It is with great pleasure that Thomas A. Hall, Inc. (TAH) provides this proposal for the provision of transportation planning services to the Town of Jupiter Island, Florida. It is our understanding that the Town wishes to have our firm meet with Town staff, conduct interviews with stakeholders in the Town, conduct field reviews of South Beach Road, and prepare a report centering on a cost/benefit analysis for the proposed transfer of South Beach Road from County to Town ownership. Using the information gathered from these sources, as well as County records on road rights of way and maintenance costs, we will seek to determine the best method(s) for reducing access along the roadway to local traffic only.

We have prepared a work program for this effort based on our discussion with you, the Town Clerk, Ms. Kimberly Kogos, and Kyle Teal, Esq., Town Attorney. The specific work program to be completed, in conjunction with this effort, includes the following:

SCOPE OF WORK

Task 1 – Public Involvement

Thomas A. Hall will meet with Town staff to understand the local issues from their viewpoint and, with the aid of Town staff, will contact stakeholders in the community. Depending on those individuals' preferences, we will either meet with them individually or in public meetings that include all interested members of the Town. Notes on residents' concerns will be collected and some sense of the overall community's resident majority opinion will be sought.

A summary letter report will be provided to the Town of Jupiter Island administration that documents the resident meeting dates, those in attendance, and the information discussed at those meetings.

Task 2 – Field Observations and Recommendations

Using the road right of way and annual maintenance cost information provided by County staff, field reviews of the studied roadway, and those issues noted by residents, an analysis of the proposed transfer from County ownership to Town ownership will be conducted. The emphasis will be on providing a fact-based analysis of the pros and cons of Town ownership of South Beach Road while also looking for opportunities to limit “outside” traffic.

The services to be performed pursuant to this agreement are strictly limited to those expressly set forth herein.

FEE

All work will be completed on an hourly basis at an hourly rate of \$300.00. It is expected that the fee for Tasks 1 and 2 above will not exceed \$15,000.00. Additional project time or meeting attendance required for other requested services beyond the scope of services outlined above will be provided on a time and materials basis, and also will be charged at a standard hourly rate of \$300.00 per hour. Invoices will be prepared and submitted monthly, and will reflect all expenses including reproduction, postage, graphics, reimbursement of personal automobile use (at \$0.56 per mile), parking, tolls and other incidental expenses.

SCHEDULE

We are prepared to initiate work on the project upon receipt of written authorization to proceed. We will work with the Town of Jupiter Island to meet your schedule.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Technical and pricing information in this proposal is the confidential and proprietary property of Thomas A. Hall, Inc. and is not to be disclosed or made available to third parties without our written consent.

COMMITMENTS

Fee and schedule commitments will be subject to renegotiation for delays caused by the client's failure to provide specified facilities or information, or any other unpredictable occurrences.

TERMINATION

This agreement may be terminated by the authorized representative effective immediately upon receipt of written notice. Payment will be due for services rendered through the date written notice is received.

BINDING STATUS

The client and Thomas A. Hall, Inc. bind themselves, their partners, successors, assigns, heirs, and/or legal representatives to the other party to the Agreement, and to the partners, successors, assigns and legal representatives of such other party with respect to all covenants of the proposal.

AGREEMENT TERMS

The terms of this agreement call for the execution of this contract. Invoices will be submitted monthly and are payable upon receipt. All invoices not paid within 30 days are subject to a 1.5% monthly interest charge, and all projects with overdue balances exceeding 90 days will be subject to a stoppage of all work. Any changes in the specific work program described above will result in an adjustment of the conditions and fees.

This agreement (and Exhibits, if any,) hereto sets forth the entire understanding between the parties with respect to the subject matter hereof, supersedes any and all prior understandings whether written or oral with respect to the subject matter hereof and may not be altered, modified, changed, amended or waived in any manner, except in a writing signed by all of the parties hereto.

The fee quoted above is valid for a period of 90 days from the date of this proposal. If the terms of this contract, as contained herein, are agreeable to you, please execute and return one original to me. If you have any questions or require further information, please feel free to contact me.

I greatly appreciate the opportunity to present a proposal on this project and look forward to working with you.

Very truly yours,



Thomas A. Hall
President

TAH/kh

Robert Garlo
March 12, 2026
Page 4 of 4

RE: Jupiter Island Traffic Representation (Revised)
Project No. 202607.0P

Accepted for Town of Jupiter Island:

By: _____
(Signature of Authorized Representative)

(Printed Name of Authorized Representative)

Title: _____

Date: _____

Please provide your Accounts Payable contact information:

Name: _____

Phone Number: _____

E-mail Address: _____

In the space below, please provide any details, including the date invoices are due each month for prompt payment:



TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND BUILDING DEPARTMENT REPORT February 2026

To: Mayor & Town Commission
Through: Robert Garlo, Town Manager
CC: Kimberly Kogos, Town Clerk
From: Catherine Harding, Building, Planning and Zoning Director
RE: February 1, 2026-February 28, 2026
Date: March 4, 2026

Construction Revenue			
	<i>Permits issued</i>	<i>Construction Value</i>	<i>Fees</i>
<i>January</i>	13	\$304,011.00	\$4,693.00
<i>February</i>	10	\$2,206,184.00	\$33,511.55
<i>March</i>			
<i>April</i>			
<i>May</i>			
<i>June</i>			
<i>July</i>			
<i>August</i>			
<i>September</i>			
<i>October</i>			
<i>November</i>			
<i>December</i>			
YTD	23	\$2,510,195.00	\$38,204.55

Construction Revenue and Permitting: Permits issued and revenue collected are consistent with previous years. The Development Review Board is anticipating several applications to be ready for review in March, which historically produces a large building permit influx for April and May.

Building Activity													
	<i>Jan</i>	<i>Feb</i>	<i>March</i>	<i>April</i>	<i>May</i>	<i>June</i>	<i>July</i>	<i>Aug</i>	<i>Sept</i>	<i>Oct</i>	<i>Nov</i>	<i>Dec</i>	<i>YTD</i>
<i>Complete DRB Applications</i>	2	0											2
<i>DRB Approvals</i>	2												2
<i>Permits Issued</i>	13	10											23
<i>Permits Finaled</i>	11	10											21
<i>Building Inspections</i>		132											132

The Development Review Board (DRB) heard the application for 114 Gomez Road, requesting DRB approval to demolish a 1-story residence, garage, and guest house to be replaced by a new 2-story residence and garage. The application was approved. Owners have a year to submit for the building permit.

The DRB's January 8th decision to allow 7 South Beach Road to amend its previously approved driveway was appealed on February 9th. The Commission heard the appeal on February 25th, and a settlement between the parties was achieved, agreeing to the new landscape and driveway stipulations, which more closely follow the original March 2022 approval.

DRB was cancelled for March due to the lack of completed applications. Several applications are in process; however, the agents are not returning the requested information in time for adequate review by engineering, landscape, zoning, and building staff, nor allowing adequate time for legal notices to be mailed. The Building Department is anticipating a very busy April DRB agenda.

Code Compliance													
	Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD
Site Maintenance		1	6										7
Illegal Equipment		1	6										7
Illegal Sign		2	2										4
Landscape Lighting			1										1
Landscape Maintenance		4	3										7
Noise Complaints		3	3										6
ROW		3	4										7
Violation of LDR's		5											5
Work W/O Permit		1	1										2
Monthly Total		20	26										

Code Enforcement Overview: In accordance with Sec. 2-132, FS 162.06, and FS 162.21, anonymous reports are not permitted. The Building Department provides a standardized form to collect required information via email, phone, or in person. Once a report is received, it is entered into our database with a unique case number and assigned to the Code Officer. The Code Officer typically conducts a site visit promptly—often within 10 minutes of the complaint—to investigate.

The following are the most common reports and responses:

Noise: Measured via decibel reader against the standards set in the Land Development Regulations (LDRs).

Maintenance: Photos are taken and reviewed by the Building Official and/or Landscape Consultant to determine if LDR standards are being met.

Right-of-Way: Addressed immediately upon arrival; the ordinance is explained to the driver, and the vehicle is relocated.

Escalation and Compliance: If a violation is confirmed, the department follows a progressive enforcement path:

Initial Notification: An email is sent to the owner (and contractor, if applicable) outlining the specific ordinance, providing photo evidence, and establishing a deadline for correction.

Certified Letter: If the issue remains unresolved after the initial deadline, a formal certified letter is issued.

Public Hearing: If compliance is still not achieved, a formal hearing is scheduled.

Cases are closed immediately upon a successful follow-up inspection.

Current Community Focus Areas:

Landscape Buffers: We have seen an increase in inquiries regarding residential landscape buffers due to the age of original plantings and recent freeze damage. Our Code Officer and Landscape Consultant are evaluating these on a case-by-case basis. Please remember that residents are responsible for maintaining their side of the buffer; we anticipate a high volume of permit applications for replanting this spring.

Dock Lighting: To maintain community standards, please note that dock lights must be white and limited to one per pile. Underwater lights are permitted in colors but are restricted to two per structure. We evaluate color, placement, count, and lumens during all inspections.

Monthly Activity Report

This month, the department processed 26 reports, resulting in 7 confirmed code enforcement cases (including infractions for LDR

violations and right-of-way parking). We are pleased to report that all 7 cases have already been brought into full compliance.



**TOWN OF JUPITER ISLAND
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
REPORT**

To: Mayor & Town Commission
Through: Robert Garlo, Town Manager *RG*
CC: Kimberly Kogos, Town Clerk
From: John Duchock, Public Works Director
Date: 3/16/2026

The following report is a brief summary of ongoing Public Works projects, as well as expected upcoming actions to be undertaken by the Department. Where appropriate, supporting budget and decision-making information is included for Commission consideration.

Beautification Committee Report

The Beautification Committee met on March 16th to review and discuss ficus tree replacement and the status of the ficus allée management plan. Town staff presented three quotes to acquire, relocate, and plant two large strangler figs within the existing gaps along the Bridge Road corridor. The committee approved selection of the low bid contractor, South Coast Grower, pending confirmation of two positive references from similar projects/clients.

Additionally, the Beautification Committee discussed the potential to form a not for profit, 501(c)(3), organization for the purpose of raising funds to support tree replacement along Bridge Road ficus allée.

Lethal Yellowing Disease Sampling

As directed by the Town Commission, Town staff has continued to coordinate with Dr. Brian Bahder with the University of Florida’s Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (IFAS) and arborist consultant, King Tree Service, to establish a sampling program focused on determining the presence of insect vectors that may carry and transmit lethal yellowing and/or lethal bronzing disease on Jupiter Island. Staff met with Dr. Bahder and Brian Fisher on March 3rd to complete the sampling protocol and conduct an island-wide site inspection to finalize the preferred locations for deployment of sticky traps. A total of 18 locations have been identified as shown in the attached figure. Traps will be set beginning in April and will be monitored on a biweekly basis initially to monitor for presence of the vector insect. Sampling will continue through the summer to cover the peak season for the vector, with testing of select samples for the disease. Results will be reported back to the Commission during future meetings.



“Sticky Trap” Sampling Locations



Jupiter Island Public Safety Department February 2026 Activity Report



Monthly Activity By Month

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD 2026
<i>Calls for Service</i>	187	156											343
<i>Arrests</i>	1	0											1

Traffic & Marine Activity By Month

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD 2026
<i>Traffic Stops</i>	121	70											191
<i>Vehicle Citations</i>	6	4											10
<i>Parking Citations</i>	3	3											6
<i>Vehicle Crashes</i>	3	1											4
<i>Marine Unit Activity</i>	21	21											42

Major Crimes By Month

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD 2026
<i>Robbery</i>	0	0											0
<i>Burglary</i>	0	0											0
<i>Theft</i>	1	0											1
<i>Auto Theft</i>	0	0											0
<i>Assault</i>	0	0											0
<i>Total</i>	1	0											1



Jupiter Island Public Safety Department

February 2026 Activity Report



Other Crimes By Month

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD 2026
<i>Fraud</i>	1	0											1
<i>Drug Violations</i>	0	0											0
<i>Trespassing</i>	0	0											0
<i>Vandalism</i>	0	0											0
<i>Disorderly Conduct</i>	0	0											0
<i>Lewd & Lascivious</i>	0	0											0
Total	1	0											1

ALS Fire Rescue Responses By Month

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD 2026
<i>Medical Calls</i>	15	13											28
<i>Medical Average Response Time</i>	5.5 Mins	3.6 Mins											4.5 Mins
<i>Fire Calls</i>	15	11											26
<i>Fire Average Response Time</i>	4.8 Mins	3.2 Mins											4.0 Mins



Jupiter Island Public Safety Department February 2026 Activity Report



Criminal Activity

Hit and Run w/ Property Damage / February 10, 2026; Officers responded to the area of the 100 block of S. Beach Rd in reference to a report of property damage to a mailbox. The mailbox was struck by an unknown vehicle that did not remain in the area. No vehicle description or information at this time.

Hobe Sound Beach Statistics

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	YTD 2026
<i>Calls for Service-Day</i>	4	6											10
<i>Calls for Service-Night</i>	2	2											4
<i>Patrols</i>	81	77											158
<i>Traffic Stops</i>	6	9											15
<i>Medical Calls</i>	1	1											2

Hobe Sound Beach Activity

DAYTIME 7am-7pm

Found Property / February 4, 2026, 8:58 am; Officers responded to a report of a found wallet in the area of the pavilion. The wallet was recovered and stored until owner can be located.

Animal Control Call- Loose Dog / February 6, 2026, 5:45 pm; Officers responded to a report of a loose dog at the public beach. The owner of the dog was contacted and responded to recover his dog.

Animal Control Call- Loose Dog / February 7, 2026, 8:19 am; Public Safety received a report of the same dog from 2/6, running loose on the beach. The owner was present and attempting to locate the dog.

Police Service Call/ Vehicle Lock-out / February 8, 2026, 12:58 pm; Officers responded to the public beach in reference to keys locked in a vehicle. Officers were successful in unlocking the door

Drowning / February 19, 2026, 3:46 pm; Officers responded to the public beach in reference to a report



Jupiter Island Public Safety Department February 2026 Activity Report



of a possible drowning. Upon arrival all subjects were accounted for and evaluated by MC Fire Rescue. They refused medical attention.

Parking Problem / February 28, 2026, 1:04 pm; Officers responded to the parking lot for a vehicle blocking a driving lane. The vehicle was moved and legally parked

NIGHTTIME 7pm-7am

Animal Control Call- Loose Dog / February 11, 2026, 7:17 pm; Officers responded to the area in reference to a loose dog last observed running to the public beach. The dog was later located and returned to the owners on North Beach Rd. Ongoing problem.

Animal Control Call- Loose Dog / February 24, 2026, 7:17 pm; Officers responded to the area in reference to a loose dog in the parking lot of the public beach. The dog was later located and returned to the owners on North Beach Rd. Ongoing problem.

Code Compliance- TOV Activity By Month

<i>Violation Type</i>	Jan 2026	Feb 2026	Mar 2026	Apr 2026	May 2026	Jun 2026	Jul 2026	Aug 2026	Sep 2026	Oct 2026	Nov 2026	Dec 2026	YTD 2026
<i>Parking in Right of Way</i>	20	10											30
<i>No Flag Persons Present</i>	4	4											8
<i>Working Outside Hours</i>	0	1											1
<i>Work with No Permit</i>	0	0											0
<i>All Other Violations</i>	1	7											8
Total Violations	25	22											47
<i>Officer patrols</i>	1,000	901											1,901

Upcoming Town Meetings and Events
2026

Date	Day	Time	Event/Meeting	Location
March 5	Thursday	9am	Development Review Board - Not Required	Island Room
March 24	Tuesday	9am	Town Coffee with Mayor Townsend	Conference Room
March 24	Tuesday	10am	SMRU Board Meeting	Island Room
March 25	Wednesday	9am	Town Commission and Beach Protection Meeting	Island Room
April 2	Thursday	9am	Development Review Board	Island Room
April 3	Friday	All Day	Good Friday - Holiday - Town Offices Closed	
April 22	Wednesday	9am	Town Commission and Beach Protection Meeting	Island Room
April 30	Thursday	9am	Pension Board Meeting	Conference Room
April 30	Thursday	10:15am	Joint Town/SMRU Defined Contribution Plan Mtg	Conference Room
May 7	Thursday	9am	Development Review Board	Island Room
May 18	Monday	9am	SMRU Board Meeting	Island Room
May 19	Tuesday	9am	Town Commission and Beach Protection Meeting	Island Room
May 25	Monday	All Day	Memorial Day Holiday - Town Offices Closed	
June 4	Thursday	9am	Development Review Board	Island Room
June 23	Tuesday	9am	Town Commission and Beach Protection Meeting	Island Room

4-Mar-26

Key	
Changes from Previous Schedule	
Development Review Board	
Town Hall Closed	
Municipal Election	

Agendas posted on Town Website: www.townofjupiterisland.com prior to the meeting