Florida’s Rising Seas: Mapping Our Future is a GIS-based analysis of the intersection between population growth, development patterns and sea level rise in Florida. A joint project of the University of Florida Center for Landscape Conservation Planning and 1000 Friends of Florida, it builds on the Florida 2070/Water 2070 reports released in 2016 but is distinguished from them by incorporating the impacts of sea level rise on lands available for development, conservation, agriculture and other purposes, and the associated need for population relocation.

Florida’s Rising Seas includes an introductory report and two separate studies, Sea Level 2040 and Sea Level 2070. This report focuses on Sea Level 2040, which reflects the impacts of sea level rise on Florida’s lands and land use over the next two decades. It includes two scenarios, which cover potential futures dominated by additional sprawl or efforts to contain growth and protect important conservation lands:

**Sprawl 2040** assumes 2019 densities and patterns of development will continue over the next two decades and also factors in the impacts of sea level rise on Florida’s lands and the resulting need for population relocation.

**Conservation 2040** accounts for the same population growth and sea level rise by 2040, but also emphasizes protection of much of the state’s highest priority lands for conservation, and assumes any new development will be 30% more compact.

Potential protection of the Florida Wildlife Corridor, which has been a state legislative focus in the last few years, is included in the Conservation Scenario. The overall goal of the Conservation scenario is to provide an alternative to the Sprawl scenario by showing what Florida might look in 2040 if we adopted more dense development patterns while committing to ambitious conservation land protection efforts. It is important to note that “protection” of additional priority conservation lands included in this scenario is intended to serve a potential future that shows how growth can be accommodated while still achieving very significant land conservation goals. Future conservation lands are much more likely to be protected by easements, which means that most land will stay privately owned, will be managed by the landowner, and will stay on the tax rolls.

The Scenarios are Based on Four Assumptions:

- **Florida’s population will grow to 26,406,000 residents in 2040**, based on 2021 Florida Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) medium projections.
- **Sea Level will rise by 0.25 meters**, based on the 2022 NOAA intermediate projection.
- **Residents on lands to be lost to sea level rise will relocate**, with half allocated within the same county, and with overflow to adjacent counties if there is insufficient capacity. The other half are assumed to move out of state. Population impacts are based on a NOAA Intermediate sea level rise scenario and a Florida State University (FSU) study on population relocation (Hauer 2016).
- **Likelihood of future development of land will vary depending on its location and characteristics.** For example, in this analysis proximity to cities, major roads and/or waterbodies or other features are deemed more likely to develop due to desirability, while wetlands are deemed less likely to develop due to higher development costs.

Gross Development Densities (GDD) is used to determine future densities and patterns of development. The GDD in this study was determined using the same approach as that of earlier models, dividing each county’s 2019 population by its 2019 developed acres. The lower the number of people per developed acre, the more sprawling the development patterns are in the region. GDD is calculated on a county-by-county basis to project density for the Sprawl 2040 Scenario, while the GDD was increased by 30% county-by-county for the Conservation Scenario to reflect higher density future development patterns.

For this project we describe “State priority natural lands” as including lands that are either currently protected or are high priorities for protection for Florida’s biodiversity, water, or other ecosystem services. Used throughout this report, this includes Florida Managed Lands (FLMA), Florida Forever conservation land protection projects, and Priorities 1, 2, and 3 in the Florida Ecological Greenways Network (FEGN), otherwise known as the Florida Wildlife Corridor.

More detailed information on the methodology is available in Appendix A on page 31.
Population Growth

- 4.9 million more residents, a 23% increase

Sea Level Rise

- 1 million acres of land lost, the majority of it protected land
- 205,000 residents relocated

Sprawl 2040 Scenario

- Nearly 1 million more acres of developed land
- 206,000 acres in the Florida Wildlife Corridor (FWC) lost
- 400,000 acres of agricultural lands lost
- 750,000 acres of “other” lands lost (timber, mining, etc.)

Conservation 2040 Scenario (compared with Sprawl Scenario):

- 270,000 fewer acres of developed lands
- 5 million more acres of proposed protected natural lands (including the FWC)
- 2.4 million more acres of proposed protected agricultural lands (including the FWC)
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Florida 2040 Statewide Results

Population Growth and Development Patterns

Using medium BEBR projections, by 2040 Florida is expected to have a population of 26,406,000 people, an increase of 23% in about two decades. With this growth in population comes even more development to accommodate new residents and visitors. This population is allocated using each county’s 2019 Gross Development Density, described earlier. The GDD remains the same as in 2019 for each county for the Sprawl Scenario and is increased by 30% for the Conservation Scenario. This is described in more detail in Appendix A.

Table 1: 2040 Statewide Population Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>2019 Census</th>
<th>2040 Projection</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
<th>Additional Population to be Allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019 - 2040</td>
<td>21,477,737</td>
<td>26,406,000</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4,928,263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lands Lost to Sea Level Rise

Compounding the impact of this population growth will be the loss of land and the displacement of existing residents due to sea level rise. Using the 0.25m projection, Florida stands to lose 1 million acres of land by 2040, which could result in the relocation of more than 205,000 residents. More information about how the population impacts from sea level rise were determined can be found on page 31 in Appendix A.

Certain inland counties show small numbers of population impacted by sea level rise. This is a result of increased water levels in inland water bodies that are hydrologically connected to the coast as a result of sea level rise. These effects are anticipated to increase with higher levels of sea level rise, and do not factor in other inland flooding (such as within inland floodplains) likely to occur as a result of broader climate change impacts.

As can be seen, over the next two decades Florida’s protected natural lands will experience the brunt of sea level rise. Most of these lands are in South Florida, known for its low elevations and preponderance of wetlands. The projected loss of 63,000 more acres in protected natural lands under the Conservation Scenario than the Sprawl Scenario is because these lands are on the future protection lists. However, it should not be assumed that these lands should not be protected, as they could provide important buffers or storm protection for already developed areas or other natural or agricultural areas.
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### Lands Lost to Sea Level Rise

#### Table 2: 2040 Statewide Lands Lost to Sea Level Rise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sprawl 2040 Acres Lost to SLR</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
<th>Conservation 2040 Acres Lost to SLR</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed Land</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Natural Lands</td>
<td>852,000</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
<td>915,000</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Agricultural Lands</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprotected Agriculture</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Land Uses</td>
<td>167,000</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
<td>103,000</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sea Level Inundation</td>
<td>1,055,000</td>
<td>2.97%</td>
<td>1,055,000</td>
<td>2.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3: Statewide Acreage Comparison of 2040 Development Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline % of Total Acreage</th>
<th>Sprawl 2040 % of Total Acreage</th>
<th>Conservation 2040 % of Total Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>5,428,000</td>
<td>14.94%</td>
<td>6,374,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Natural Land</td>
<td>9,850,000</td>
<td>27.11%</td>
<td>8,997,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Agriculture</td>
<td>856,000</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
<td>854,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>6,418,000</td>
<td>17.66%</td>
<td>6,022,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>11,778,000</td>
<td>32.41%</td>
<td>11,028,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 Open Water</td>
<td>2,006,000</td>
<td>5.52%</td>
<td>2,006,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Level Inundation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Lands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>854,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Level Inundation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Land Uses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>201,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Acreage</td>
<td>36,337,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>36,337,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Land Acreage</td>
<td>34,330,000</td>
<td>94.48%</td>
<td>33,275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sea Level Inundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1,055,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Open Water</td>
<td>2,006,000</td>
<td>5.52%</td>
<td>3,062,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Protected Natural Land is defined for the purposes of the report to include all protected natural communities, timberland, and other low intensity land uses not considered more intensive agriculture or developed.

**Other land includes timberlands, mining lands, and other miscellaneous land uses not classified as agriculture, developed, protected, protected agriculture, or open water based on the methods described in the technical report. **continued
In the Baseline, about 5.4 million acres – close to 15% of Florida’s lands – are developed. Under the Sprawl Scenario, almost 950,000 additional acres of lands would be developed by 2040, representing almost 18% of Florida’s lands. This is an almost 17% increase over 2019 and is further compounded by more than 1 million acres of land projected to be lost to sea level rise.

The Conservation Scenario reflects the protection of Florida’s priority natural lands, lands that have been identified as highest priorities for the long-term health of Florida’s environment. Under this scenario, developed lands would increase somewhat less than in the Sprawl Scenario, from under 18% to under 17%. But as shown in the next sections, based on our scenarios, Florida would see a significant increase in the amount of protected natural lands, from under 9 million acres to more than 14 million acres, and protected agricultural lands, from 854,000 acres to more than 3.2 million acres if the conservation land protection included in this scenario happens in the near future.

Redevelopment was not included in the Conservation 2040 Scenario. However, if the methodology from the 2070 Conservation Scenario is applied (see that report for more details) approximately 85,000 additional acres would not be developed by 2040 (assuming that redevelopment totals for each county are approximately 40% of those in 2070).

### Table 4: Statewide Developed Lands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
<th>Sprawl 2040</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
<th>Conservation 2040</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>5,428,000</td>
<td>14.94%</td>
<td>6,374,000</td>
<td>17.54%</td>
<td>6,102,000</td>
<td>16.79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Conservation Lands

Currently, close to 10 million acres — or 27% — of Florida’s priority natural lands (excluding protected agricultural lands) have been protected through federal, state, local and private programs. These include conservation easement agreements with private property owners who enter legally binding commitments to limit or eliminate development on their property in return for tax benefits, payment or some other consideration.

If no new protected conservation lands are added under the Sprawl Scenario, protected state priority natural lands will decrease to less than 25% as a share of Florida’s total acreage. This is due to the loss of more than 850,000 acres of existing protected natural conservation lands to sea level rise, or almost 9% of current protected natural lands.

If additional state priority natural lands are protected, the Conservation 2040 Scenario reflects a significant 12 percentage point increase in protected natural lands when compared with the Baseline, even when considering the 850,000 acres lost to sea level rise. Under this scenario, more than 14 million natural acres would be protected, or almost 39% of Florida’s overall area.
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It should be noted that the additional lands protected in the Conservation scenario do not represent all important natural landscapes. However, they do represent high priority natural lands as defined by the state’s existing Florida Forever land acquisition program, and the top three priorities in the Florida Ecological Greenways Network (the Florida Wildlife Corridor), which have been recognized as a high conservation priority by the

Table 5: Statewide Protected Natural Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Natural Land</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
<th>Sprawl 2040</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
<th>Conservation 2040</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1000fof.org/sealevel2040

Agricultural Lands

Close to 7.3 million acres in Florida are now in croplands, livestock, aquaculture and other agricultural uses, reflecting the major role agriculture plays in the state’s economy. The Florida Department of Agriculture’s Florida Statewide Agricultural Irrigation Demand (FSAID) study is used to determine agricultural lands for this report. It does not include silviculture, which is in the “other” category, or some lands identified as agricultural in local property appraiser data.

Agriculture includes a subcategory of “protected agricultural lands” in this study. Some of these lands are protected for their natural values, such as wetlands, habitat, and the like. More detailed analysis of the impacts of development on agricultural lands in the 2040 and 2070 scenarios is forthcoming.

Under the Sprawl Scenario, Florida would lose close to 400,000 acres of agricultural lands by 2040, 5% of the state’s total. This is due primarily to new development.

The Conservation Scenario, on the other hand, shows the effect of increased protection of priority natural lands on agricultural land uses. Protected agricultural lands would increase by 278% from 856,000 acres to 3.2 million acres by 2040.
Table 6: Statewide Agricultural Lands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
<th>Sprawl 2040</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
<th>Conservation 2040</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Agricultural Lands</td>
<td>856,000</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
<td>854,000</td>
<td>2.35%</td>
<td>3,236,000</td>
<td>8.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprotected Agriculture</td>
<td>6,418,000</td>
<td>17.66%</td>
<td>6,022,000</td>
<td>16.57%</td>
<td>3,751,000</td>
<td>10.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Agriculture</td>
<td>7,274,000</td>
<td>20.02%</td>
<td>6,876,000</td>
<td>18.92%</td>
<td>6,987,000</td>
<td>19.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Lands**

“Other” lands include all of the lands not included in the above categories of developed, protected natural, agriculture, or protected agriculture. “Other” lands include timberlands, mining lands, and other miscellaneous land uses.

This category is the most likely to be impacted by future development as some of the lands have fewer economic and environmental barriers to development. “Other” lands with significant resources may also become protected natural or protected agricultural lands in future scenarios.

The “other” category declines slightly, from more than 32% of Florida’s lands in the Baseline, to just over 30% in the Sprawl Scenario. The biggest change is in the Conservation Scenario when “other” drops to about 17% of Florida’s lands. While the Sprawl Scenario basically reflects the impact of new development, the Conservation Scenario also reflects significant conversion of “other” lands to protected status.

Table 7: Statewide Other Lands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
<th>Sprawl 2040</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
<th>Conservation 2040</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other**</td>
<td>11,778,000</td>
<td>32.41%</td>
<td>11,028,000</td>
<td>30.35%</td>
<td>6,110,000</td>
<td>16.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued
For more in-depth analysis, Florida has been divided into four roughly equal regions.

**Panhandle Florida** has by far the lowest current population. It is expected to experience a 17% increase in population by 2040. It is also projected to lose 109,000 acres of land to sea level rise, the majority protected natural land. This region has the lowest gross development density (GDD) at 1.79 people per developed acre. However, this represents a 21% increase over the GDD of 1.48 in 2010. According to FDOT, Walton and Santa Rosa counties are among the 10 counties where 60% of Florida’s population growth is currently concentrated and merit particular planning attention.

**Northeast Florida** has a somewhat higher population than the Panhandle, but its population is expected to increase more dramatically, by 28%, over the next two decades. This population increase, combined with a low GDD of 2.1 people per developed acre, puts this region in the crosshairs of sprawl. Additionally, Northeast Florida is projected to lose 211,000 acres of land to sea level rise, including 116,000 acres of protected natural land. Much of the current development is focused on St. Johns and Nassau counties which, according to FDOT, are among the top 10 counties where 60% of Florida’s population growth is concentrated.

**Central Florida**, with the largest amount of land and highest population of the four regions, is also expected to grow in population by 28% by 2040. But Central Florida has higher density than Northeast Florida, with a GDD of 4.14 people per developed acre. This region will lose fewer total acres of land to sea level rise than any other – 88,000 acres, including 58,000 acres of protected natural land. Central Florida is home to 5 of the 10 counties where 60% of Florida’s population growth is currently concentrated, including Osceola, Orange, Sumter, Lake, and Manatee counties.

**South Florida** is projected to lose 647,000 acres of land to sea level rise by 2040, including almost 600,000 acres of protected natural lands. This is more than half the lands lost to sea level rise in Florida. At the same time, South Florida’s population is expected to grow 16% by 2040. Unsurprisingly, this region is the most densely populated, with a GDD of 7.67 people per developed acre. Lee is one of the 10 counties where, according to FDOT, 60% of Florida’s population growth is concentrated.

---

**Regional Results**

For more in-depth analysis, Florida has been divided into four roughly equal regions.

- **Osceola**
- **St. Johns**
- **Sumter**
- **Walton**
- **Lake**
- **Orange**
- **Santa Rosa**
- **Manatee**
- **Nassau**
- **Lee**

**60% of Florida’s Current Population Growth is Concentrated in 10 Counties**

This is based on an analysis by the Florida Department of Transportation using Florida Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) county data for 2020.
### Table 8: 2040 Regional Population Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2019 Census</th>
<th>2040 Projection</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
<th>Population to be Allocated</th>
<th>2019 Gross Development Density (GDD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panhandle</td>
<td>1,529,159</td>
<td>1,790,000</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>260,841</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>2,643,040</td>
<td>3,386,500</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>743,460</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>9,503,600</td>
<td>12,154,700</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2,651,100</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>7,801,938</td>
<td>9,074,800</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1,272,862</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>21,477,737</td>
<td>26,406,000</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4,928,263</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Population by Region

![Bar Chart showing the comparison of 2019 Census and 2040 Projection for each region.](chart.png)
FLORIDA’S RISING SEAS
Panhandle Summary

Population Growth

- 261,000 more residents, a 17% increase

Sea Level Rise

- 109,000 acres of land lost, the majority of it protected land
- 12,000 residents relocated

Sprawl 2040 Scenario

- 103,000 more acres of developed land
- 10,000 acres of agricultural lands lost
- 119,000 acres of “other” lands lost (timber, mining, etc.)

Conservation 2040 Scenario (compared with Sprawl Scenario):

- 25,000 fewer acres of developed lands
- 2.2 million more acres of protected natural lands
- 109,000 more acres of protected agricultural lands

Panhandle Pie Charts
Panhandle Florida

Encompassing 8.3 million acres of land, the Panhandle includes 18 counties – Bay, Calhoun, Escambia, Franklin, Gadsden, Gulf, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Leon, Liberty, Madison, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa, Taylor, Wakulla, Walton, and Washington. As in the past, the Panhandle is projected to remain the least developed and one of the slowest growing regions in Florida, increasing from a little more than 1.5 million residents in 2019, to approximately 1.8 million in 2040, a 17% increase.

The Panhandle is projected to lose roughly 109,000 acres – about 1% of its land mass – to sea level rise by 2040. Of these lost lands, almost 83,000 acres were in conservation in the Baseline. Sea level rise will likely result in the relocation of 12,000 residents. By numbers, the most impacted counties are projected to be in Santa Rosa (2,436 residents), Bay (2,374), Escambia (1,961), Walton (1,483), and Okaloosa (1,295). By percent, Franklin County is the most impacted, with close to 5% of its population projected to face relocation.

The Panhandle also has the lowest gross development density (GDD) (meaning most sprawling patterns) at 1.79 people per developed acre, but still a 21% increase over the 1.48 GDD in 2010. However, this regional increase needs to be looked at critically, as changes range from a 52.72% increase in GDD in Jefferson County, to a 35.96 decrease in Liberty County.

Because of the Panhandle’s rich biodiversity, land conservation initiatives have been very robust here, with large tracts of land identified as priorities for future conservation.

### Table 9: 2040 Panhandle Population Projections and Gross Development Density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019 Census</th>
<th>2040 Projection</th>
<th>2019-2040 Increase</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>2019 Gross Development Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,529,159</td>
<td>1,790,000</td>
<td>260,841</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sprawl 2040**

Approximately half of the lands in the Panhandle were in the “other” category, in this case primarily timber lands, in both the Baseline and Sprawl 2040 Scenario. Comparing the Sprawl and Baseline land uses, developed lands increase slightly in the next two decades – from 10% in the Baseline to slightly more than 11%. The Panhandle is projected to lose 83,000 acres of natural protected lands due to sea level rise. Agricultural lands, both protected and unprotected, show only a slight decline.

**Conservation 2040**

The Conservation 2040 Scenario reflects the most dramatic change, with almost 52% of Panhandle lands under protection by 2040. Most of this is attributed to timber and rural lands in the “other” category shifting to “protected” status due to the region’s high conservation value. The acreage of agricultural lands – both protected and unprotected – remains virtually unchanged between the Sprawl and Conservation scenarios; however, within those categories protected agricultural lands increase significantly, from 15,000 acres in the Baseline and Sprawl Scenario, to 124,000 in the Conservation Scenario. Developed lands increase by about 9% over the Baseline, which is only slightly less than the Sprawl 2040 Scenario.
### Table 10: Panhandle Acreage Comparison of 2040 Development Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
<th>Sprawl 2040</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
<th>Conservation 2040</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>856,000</td>
<td>10.06%</td>
<td>959,000</td>
<td>11.26%</td>
<td>934,000</td>
<td>10.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Natural Land</td>
<td>2,374,000</td>
<td>27.87%</td>
<td>2,291,000</td>
<td>26.90%</td>
<td>4,494,000</td>
<td>52.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Agriculture</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>747,000</td>
<td>8.77%</td>
<td>737,000</td>
<td>8.65%</td>
<td>627,000</td>
<td>7.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>4,344,000</td>
<td>51.01%</td>
<td>4,225,000</td>
<td>49.62%</td>
<td>2,048,000</td>
<td>24.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 Open Water</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>2.12%</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>2.12%</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>2.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Level Inundation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Lands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>83,000</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
<td>101,000</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Level Inundation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Land Uses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acreage in Panhandle</strong></td>
<td>8,516,000</td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td>8,516,000</td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td>8,516,000</td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Land Acreage</td>
<td>8,336,000</td>
<td>97.88%</td>
<td>8,227,000</td>
<td>96.60%</td>
<td>8,227,000</td>
<td>96.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sea Level Inundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>109,000</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
<td>109,000</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Open Water</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>2.12%</td>
<td>289,000</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>289,000</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Protected Natural Land is defined for the purposes of the report to include all protected natural communities, timberland, and other low intensity land uses not considered more intensive agriculture or developed.

**Other land includes timberlands, mining lands, and other miscellaneous land uses not classified as agriculture, developed, protected, protected agriculture, or open water based on the methods described in the technical report.

### Table 11: 2040 Panhandle Sea Level Rise Projected Impact by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>% of population impacted by SLR</th>
<th>Population impacted by SLR</th>
<th>Displaced out of state (50% of those affected by SLR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAY</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
<td>2,374</td>
<td>1,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALHOUN</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCAMBIA</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td>1,961</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANKLIN</td>
<td>4.92%</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GADSDEN</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GULF</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLMES</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACKSON</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFFERSON</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEON</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERTY</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADISON</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKALOOSA</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA ROSA</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td>2,436</td>
<td>1,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAYLOR</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAKULLA</td>
<td>2.37%</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTON</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>1,483</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>11,749</td>
<td>5,875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*continued*
Panhandle Florida

NOTE: Table 11 shows small numbers of population impacted by sea level rise in certain inland counties, including Jefferson, Liberty, and Washington. This is a result of increased water levels in inland water bodies that are hydrologically connected to the coast because of sea level rise. These effects are anticipated to increase with higher levels of sea level rise, and do not factor in other inland flooding (such as within inland floodplains) likely to occur because of broader climate change impacts.

Table 12: Gross Development Density (GDD) Comparison for the Florida Panhandle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2010 GDD</th>
<th>2019 GDD</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAY</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>16.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALHOUN</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCAMBIA</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>8.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANKLIN</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-15.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GADSDEN</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-5.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GULF</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>26.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLMES</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACKSON</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFFERSON</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>52.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEON</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>38.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERTY</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-35.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADISON</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-7.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKALOOSA</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>22.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA ROSA</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>14.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAYLOR</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-6.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAKULLA</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>30.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTON</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>46.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>7.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION AVERAGE</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>20.95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Population Growth

- 743,000 more residents, a 28% increase

Sea Level Rise

- 211,000 acres of land lost, the majority of it protected land
- 6,000 residents relocated

Sprawl 2040 Scenario

- 227,000 more acres of developed land
- 61,000 acres of agricultural lands lost
- 261,000 acres of “other” lands lost (timber, mining, etc.)

Conservation 2040 Scenario (compared with Sprawl Scenario):

- 68,000 fewer acres of developed lands
- 1.6 million more acres of protected natural lands
- 154,000 more acres of protected agricultural lands

Northeast Pie Charts
Baseline

Sprawl 2040

Conservation 2040

- Developed
- Protected
- Sea Level Rise
- Other

continued

Northeast and Central Florida face the greatest development pressures, with the population in each projected to grow by 28%. Northeast Florida is expected to increase from 2.6 million residents in 2019 to 3.4 million in 2040.

Compounding this, Northeast Florida has more sprawling development patterns than Central Florida – with a GDD of 2.10 compared to 4.14 people per developed acre. This means that Northeast Florida will require almost twice the amount of land as Central Florida to accommodate each new resident if development continues at these very low densities. At the same time, it’s important to note that Northeast Florida’s GDD has increased by almost 23% since 2010 but, as with the Panhandle, there are dramatic differences from county to county. Hamilton County had a dramatic 180% increase, but it went from 0.26 GDD to 0.73 GDD. More urbanized St. Johns County had a 94% increase, from 1.73 to 3.35, while Nassau County experienced an 80% increase from 0.80 to 1.44. Some of the more rural counties, including Union, Bradford, and Lafayette, declined in GDD over that period.

Northeast Florida is projected to lose 211,000 acres to sea level rise by 2040, or approximately 2.6% of its land. About 26,000 residents in the Northeast would be forced to relocate due to the impacts of sea level rise, including 12,100 residents in Duval and almost 6,000 in St. Johns County. Clay (2,209 relocated) and Putnam (846 relocated) are projected to be the most impacted inland counties in Northeast Florida due to sea level rise associated with the St. Johns River.

### Table 13: 2040 Northeast Florida Population Projections and Gross Development Density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019 Census</th>
<th>2040 Projection</th>
<th>2019-2040 Increase</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>2019 Gross Development Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sprawl 2040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under the Sprawl Scenario, about 18% of lands in Northeast Florida are projected to be developed, up from about 15% in the Baseline. In addition, agricultural lands – including protected – will decrease slightly, from about 1.1 million acres in the Baseline to about 1 million acres in 2040. &quot;Other&quot; lands in this region, primarily timberlands, will decrease from about 46% in the Baseline to about 42% in 2040.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation 2040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even under the Conservation Scenario, about 17% of northeastern lands will be developed. But protected natural lands would close to double, increasing from about 1.6 million acres in the Sprawl Scenario to 3.1 million acres, or 39% of the region, in 2040. Many of the protected natural acres consist of lands shifted from the “other” category. “Other” includes almost 46% of the region’s lands in the Baseline but drops to about 23% under the Conservation Scenario. Compared with the Sprawl Scenario, total agricultural lands increase slightly, while protected agricultural lands increase from 35,000 to 189,000 acres.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued
## Table 14: Northeast Florida Acreage Comparison of 2040 Development Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
<th>Sprawl 2040</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
<th>Conservation 2040</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>1,258,000</td>
<td>15.48%</td>
<td>1,485,000</td>
<td>18.27%</td>
<td>1,417,000</td>
<td>17.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Natural Land</td>
<td>1,692,000</td>
<td>20.82%</td>
<td>1,576,000</td>
<td>19.39%</td>
<td>3,173,000</td>
<td>39.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Agriculture</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
<td>189,000</td>
<td>2.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1,083,000</td>
<td>13.32%</td>
<td>1,024,000</td>
<td>12.60%</td>
<td>883,000</td>
<td>10.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>3,708,000</td>
<td>45.64%</td>
<td>3,447,000</td>
<td>42.43%</td>
<td>1,905,000</td>
<td>23.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 Open Water</td>
<td>349,000</td>
<td>4.29%</td>
<td>349,000</td>
<td>4.29%</td>
<td>349,000</td>
<td>4.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Level Inundation:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Level Inundation:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>93,000</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Land Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Total Acreage in</td>
<td>8,127,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>8,127,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>8,127,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Land Acreage</td>
<td>7,778,000</td>
<td>95.71%</td>
<td>7,567,000</td>
<td>93.11%</td>
<td>7,567,000</td>
<td>93.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sea Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>211,000</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>211,000</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Open Water</td>
<td>349,000</td>
<td>4.29%</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>6.89%</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>6.89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Protected Natural Land is defined for the purposes of the report to include all protected natural communities, timberland, and other low intensity land uses not considered more intensive agriculture or developed.

**Other land includes timberlands, mining lands, and other miscellaneous land uses not classified as agriculture, developed, protected, protected agriculture, or open water based on the methods described in the technical report.

## Table 15: 2040 Northeast Florida Sea Level Rise Projected Impact by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>% of population impacted by SLR</th>
<th>Population impacted by SLR</th>
<th>Displaced out of state (50% of those affected by SLR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALACHUA</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAKER</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRADFORD</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAY</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
<td>2,209</td>
<td>1,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMBIA</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIXIE</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUVAL</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>12,148</td>
<td>6,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLAGLER</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td>1,818</td>
<td>909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILCHRIST</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMILTON</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAFAYETTE</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVY</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARION</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASSAU</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
<td>2,381</td>
<td>1,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUTNAM</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST JOHNS</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
<td>5,905</td>
<td>2,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUWANNEE</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
<td>25,767</td>
<td>12,884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NOTE: Table 15 shows some residents impacted by sea level rise in certain inland counties, including Clay and Putnam, which experience considerable impact due to potential sea level rise along the lower St. Johns River. This is a result of increased water levels in inland water bodies that are hydrologically connected to the coast because of sea level rise. These effects are anticipated to increase with higher levels of sea level rise, and do not factor in other inland flooding (such as within inland floodplains) likely to occur because of broader climate change impacts.

Table 16: Gross Development Density (GDD) Comparison for Northeast Florida

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2010 GDD</th>
<th>2019 GDD</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALACHUA</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>16.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAKER</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>3.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRADFORD</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>-6.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAY</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>23.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMBIA</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>6.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIXIE</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>10.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUVAL</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>19.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLAGLER</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>25.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILCHRST</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>7.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMILTON</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>179.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAFAYETTE</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-4.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVY</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>10.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARION</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>11.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASSAU</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>79.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUTNAM</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>3.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST JOHNS</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>93.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUWANNEE</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>8.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>-20.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>22.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Population Growth

- 2.7 million more residents, a 23% increase

Sea Level Rise

- 88,000 acres of land lost, the majority of it protected land
- 65,000 residents relocated

Sprawl 2040 Scenario

- 500,000 more acres of developed land
- 260,000 acres of agricultural lands lost
- 266,000 acres of “other” lands lost (timber, mining, etc.)

Conservation 2040 Scenario (compared with Sprawl Scenario):

- 135,000 fewer acres of developed lands
- 886,000 more acres of protected natural lands
- 1.5 million more acres of protected agricultural lands
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Central Florida

Brevard, Citrus, Desoto, Hardee, Hernando, Highlands, Hillsborough, Indian River, Lake, Manatee, Okeechobee, Orange, Osceola, Pasco, Pinellas, Polk, Sarasota, Seminole, St Lucie, Sumter, and Volusia are the 21 counties that make up Central Florida. This is the largest of the four regions, both in terms of land acreage – 10.4 million acres – and population – 9.5 million residents.

Central Florida is projected to lose about 88,000 acres — or about 1% — of its lands to sea level rise by 2040, which is projected to cause the relocation of 65,000 residents. The Gulf Coast will be hardest hit, with Pinellas (13,578 residents), Manatee (9,474), Hillsborough (6,650), Sarasota (6,193), and Pasco (5,973) counties having the highest relocations. On the East Coast, Volusia (8,325) and Brevard (7,085) counties will see the greatest impacts.

Central Florida’s population — significantly larger than any other region — is projected to increase by 28%, to 12,154,700 by 2040. Its gross development density of 4.14 persons per developed acre is higher than those of the Panhandle and Northeast Florida, but lower than South Florida. Central Florida’s GDD is 32% higher than in 2010, when it was 3.14. Individual counties seeing the greatest increase in GDD include St. Lucie (66.16%), Osceola (60.05%), and Orange (56.49%). The three counties experiencing declines in GDD include Seminole (-20.39%), Sarasota (-17.51%), and Hardee (-6.34%).

### Table 17: 2040 Central Florida Population Projections and Gross Development Density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019 Census</th>
<th>2040 Census</th>
<th>2019-2040 Increase</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>2019 Gross Development Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9,503,600</td>
<td>12,154,700</td>
<td>2,651,100</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sprawl 2040

Central Florida’s developed lands will increase fairly significantly — from 2.3 million acres (or 20%) in the Baseline to 2.8 million acres (or more than 24%) in 2040. Central Florida has by far the most agricultural lands of the four regions, with approximately 3.5 million acres — or about a third of its area — in the Baseline. Under the Sprawl Scenario, the region stands to lose 260,000 acres of these lands by 2040. About 22% of the region’s lands were in the “other” category, including timber in the Baseline. Other lands are projected to decrease to about 20% under the Sprawl Scenario in 2040.

### Conservation 2040

The Conservation Scenario results in approximately 23% of the region’s lands being developed, not significantly less than the 24% projected under the Sprawl Scenario. Protected natural lands are projected to increase from about 18% in the Baseline to 25% in 2040. Total agricultural lands (both protected and not) would increase slightly comparing the Sprawl and Conservation 2040 Scenarios, but protected agricultural lands would undergo a significant increase, from 528,000 acres in the Baseline to just over 2 million acres in 2040. “Other” lands decline from almost 2.6 million acres in the Baseline to 1.5 million by 2040.
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### Table 18: Central Florida Acreage Comparison of 2040 Development Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
<th>Sprawl 2040</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
<th>Conservation 2040</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>2,297,000</td>
<td>20.12%</td>
<td>2,793,000</td>
<td>24.47%</td>
<td>2,658,000</td>
<td>23.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Natural Land</td>
<td>2,058,000</td>
<td>18.03%</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>17.53%</td>
<td>2,886,000</td>
<td>25.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Agriculture</td>
<td>528,000</td>
<td>4.63%</td>
<td>528,000</td>
<td>4.62%</td>
<td>2,056,000</td>
<td>18.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3,004,000</td>
<td>26.32%</td>
<td>2,744,000</td>
<td>24.04%</td>
<td>1,286,000</td>
<td>11.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>2,556,000</td>
<td>22.40%</td>
<td>2,290,000</td>
<td>20.06%</td>
<td>1,469,000</td>
<td>12.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 Open Water</td>
<td>971,000</td>
<td>8.51%</td>
<td>971,000</td>
<td>8.51%</td>
<td>971,000</td>
<td>8.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Level Inundation: Protected Lands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Level Inundation: All Other Land Uses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acreage in Central</strong></td>
<td>11,414,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>11,414,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>11,414,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Land Acreage</strong></td>
<td>10,443,000</td>
<td>91.49%</td>
<td>10,355,000</td>
<td>90.72%</td>
<td>10,355,000</td>
<td>90.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sea Level Inundation</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>88,000</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
<td>88,000</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Open Water including SLR</strong></td>
<td>971,000</td>
<td>8.51%</td>
<td>1,059,000</td>
<td>9.28%</td>
<td>1,059,000</td>
<td>9.28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Protected Natural Land is defined for the purposes of the report to include all protected natural communities, timberland, and other low intensity land uses not considered more intensive agriculture or developed.

**Other land includes timberlands, mining lands, and other miscellaneous land uses not classified as agriculture, developed, protected, protected agriculture, or open water based on the methods described in the technical report.

### Table 19: 2040 Central Florida Sea Level Rise Projected Impact by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>% of Population impacted by SLR</th>
<th>Population impacted by SLR</th>
<th>Displaced out of state (50% of those affected by SLR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BREVARD</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td>7,085</td>
<td>3,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITRUS</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
<td>1,573</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESOTO</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARDEE</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERNANDO</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGHLANDS</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HILLSBOROUGH</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>6,650</td>
<td>3,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIAN RIVER</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
<td>2,614</td>
<td>1,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANATEE</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
<td>9,474</td>
<td>4,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKEECHOBEE</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSCEOLA</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASCO</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>5,973</td>
<td>2,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINELLAS</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
<td>13,578</td>
<td>6,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLK</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST LUCIE</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
<td>2,161</td>
<td>1,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARASOTA</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>6,193</td>
<td>3,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMINOLE</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMTER</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOLUSIA</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
<td>8,325</td>
<td>4,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>0.42%</td>
<td>65,040</td>
<td>32,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*continued*
NOTE: Table 19 shows small numbers of population impacted by sea level rise in certain inland counties, including DeSoto. This is a result of increased water levels in inland water bodies that are hydrologically connected to the coast as a result of sea level rise. These effects are anticipated to increase with higher levels of sea level rise, and do not factor in other inland flooding (such as within inland floodplains) likely to occur as a result of broader climate change impacts.

Table 20: Gross Development Density (GDD) Comparison for Central Florida

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2010 GDD</th>
<th>2019 GDD</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brevard</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>23.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>14.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desoto</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>22.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardee</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>-6.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernando</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>15.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>30.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>31.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>37.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>42.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manatee</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okeechobee</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>5.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>56.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osceola</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>60.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>24.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>26.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>37.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>-17.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>-20.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Lucie</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>66.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumter</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>19.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>36.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.14</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.14</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.85%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FLORIDA’S RISING SEAS
South Florida Summary

Population Growth

1.3 million more residents, a 16% increase

Sea Level Rise

647,000 acres of land lost, the majority of it protected lands; more than half of the lands lost to sea level rise in Florida
103,000 residents relocated

Sprawl 2040 Scenario

120,000 more acres of developed land
67,000 acres of agricultural lands lost
104,000 acres of “other” lands lost (timber, mining, etc.)

Conservation 2040 Scenario (compared with Sprawl Scenario):

44,000 fewer acres of developed lands
393,000 more acres of protected natural lands
591,000 more acres of protected agricultural lands

South Pie Charts

Baseline Sprawl 2040 Conservation 2040

- Developed
- Total Protected (Excluding Agriculture)
- Protected Agriculture
- Unprotected Agriculture
- Total Other
- Open Water
- Sea Level Rise
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South Florida

South Florida encompasses 7.8 million acres of land and 10 counties including Broward, Charlotte, Collier, Glades, Hendry, Lee, Martin, Miami-Dade, Monroe, and Palm Beach. Almost half of the lands in South Florida are already under protection, mostly for their natural value. This is due in large part to federal and state conservation lands protecting the Everglades and other large swaths of unique environmental resources in the region.

South Florida is expected to experience a 16% increase in population (actually the lowest percentage increase of the four regions), from 7.8 million residents in the Baseline to 9 million residents by 2040. With its major metropolitan areas, South Florida understandably has the highest gross development density of the four regions, with 7.67 people per developed acre. The region’s average GDD has increased by almost 27% since 2010 when it was 6.06. Lee County’s GDD has increased by 52%, Charlotte County by 37% and Monroe by 36%. There are no decreases in GDD in this region and all but one county, Hendry at 3%, show double-digit increases.

Because of its low elevation and vast expanses of wetlands, South Florida is expected to experience the greatest loss of land due to sea level rise, losing almost 650,000 acres, including 600,000 acres of currently protected land. This is projected to cause the potential relocation of 103,000 residents in the region, including 36,000 in Miami-Dade and 15,000 in Broward County on the east coast. On the west coast, 18,000 residents in Lee and 7,400 residents in Collier will likely need to relocate. Of course, Monroe County, which includes the island chain of the Florida Keys, will be the most impacted in terms of percent of residents, with more than 15% of its population potentially needing to move.

### Table 21: 2040 South Florida Population Projections and Gross Development Density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019 Census</th>
<th>2040 Projection</th>
<th>2019-2040 Increase</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>2019 Gross Development Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,801,938</td>
<td>9,074,800</td>
<td>1,272,862</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sprawl 2040

Even though South Florida is the most significantly impacted by sea level rise, the vast majority of those acres are protected – and thus undeveloped – reducing the number of residents and related infrastructure impacted by complete inundation. Also, to the region’s benefit is its GDD, by far the highest in Florida. Even with a 1.3 million increase in population, the Sprawl Scenario shows a relatively modest 120,000-acre increase in developed lands. The region also experiences relatively modest losses in agricultural and other lands.

### Conservation 2040

Under this scenario, 44,000 fewer acres are developed than under the Sprawl Scenario, reflecting the impact of the 30% increase in GDD. Protected natural lands in this region will increase by close to 400,000 acres – to a total of 3.5 million acres – when compared with the Sprawl Scenario. In addition, almost another 600,000 agricultural acres will be protected, resulting in a modest increase in all agricultural lands when compared with the Sprawl Scenario. The lands most impacted are projected to be in the “other” category, which will decline from 1 million to less than 700,000 acres.
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Table 22: South Florida Acreage Comparison of 2040 Development Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
<th>Sprawl 2040</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
<th>Conservation 2040</th>
<th>% of Total Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>1,017,000</td>
<td>12.28%</td>
<td>1,137,000</td>
<td>13.73%</td>
<td>1,093,000</td>
<td>13.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Natural Land</td>
<td>3,726,000</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
<td>3,130,000</td>
<td>37.81%</td>
<td>3,523,000</td>
<td>42.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Agriculture</td>
<td>276,000</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>276,000</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>867,000</td>
<td>10.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1,584,000</td>
<td>19.13%</td>
<td>1,517,000</td>
<td>18.32%</td>
<td>955,000</td>
<td>11.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>1,170,000</td>
<td>14.15%</td>
<td>1,066,000</td>
<td>12.88%</td>
<td>688,000</td>
<td>8.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 Open Water</td>
<td>506,000</td>
<td>6.12%</td>
<td>506,000</td>
<td>6.12%</td>
<td>506,000</td>
<td>6.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Level Inundation:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>595,000</td>
<td>7.19%</td>
<td>603,000</td>
<td>7.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Level Inundation:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Land Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Acreage in South</td>
<td>8,280,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>8,280,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>8,280,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Land Acreage</td>
<td>7,773,000</td>
<td>93.88%</td>
<td>7,126,000</td>
<td>86.07%</td>
<td>7,126,000</td>
<td>86.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sea Level Inundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>647,000</td>
<td>7.82%</td>
<td>647,000</td>
<td>7.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Open Water</td>
<td>506,000</td>
<td>6.12%</td>
<td>1,154,000</td>
<td>13.93%</td>
<td>1,154,000</td>
<td>13.93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Protected Natural Land is defined for the purposes of the report to include all protected natural communities, timberland, and other low intensity land uses not considered more intensive agriculture or developed.

**Other land includes timberlands, mining lands, and other miscellaneous land uses not classified as agriculture, developed, protected, protected agriculture, or open water based on the methods described in the technical report.

Table 23: 2040 South Florida Sea Level Rise Projected Impact by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>% of population impacted by SLR</th>
<th>Population impacted by SLR</th>
<th>Displaced out of state (50% of those affected by SLR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
<td>15,063</td>
<td>7,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td>5,839</td>
<td>2,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>7,352</td>
<td>3,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glades</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendry</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
<td>18,295</td>
<td>9,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>1.29%</td>
<td>2,298</td>
<td>1,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
<td>36,230</td>
<td>18,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>15.39%</td>
<td>13,263</td>
<td>6,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>4,236</td>
<td>2,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
<td>102,576</td>
<td>51,288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Table 24: Gross Development Density (GDD) Comparison for South Florida**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2016 Report GDD</th>
<th>2019 GDD</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BROWARD</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td>23.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLOTTE</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>37.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLIER</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>25.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLADES</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>23.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HENDRY</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>51.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>21.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIAMI-DADE</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>16.49</td>
<td>21.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONROE</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>35.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALM BEACH</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>19.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGION AVERAGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.06</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.67</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.57%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A

Sea Level 2040 Methodology

Sea Level 2040 includes a Baseline and two future scenarios, each reflecting the impacts of population growth and sea level inundation in Florida by the year 2040. The two future scenarios assume that by 2040, 50% of the population displaced by sea level rise in each county will relocate in the county or nearby counties, and 50% is projected to leave the state.

Sprawl 2040 reflects each county continuing similar patterns of development as in 2019 amid sea level rise and population growth, with development allowed to occur on state priority natural lands. Conservation 2040 accommodates the same population growth and sea level rise, does not allow development to occur on identified state priority natural lands, and reflects a 30% increase in gross development density in each county. Table 25 outlines major differences between the two future scenarios.

### Table 25: Comparison of Modeling Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sprawl 2040</th>
<th>Conservation 2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Densities</td>
<td>New population to be accommodated is allocated at each county’s 2019 gross density</td>
<td>New population is allocated at a development density 30% greater than that used for Sprawl 2040.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected lands</td>
<td>2021 Florida Managed Areas are included as protected</td>
<td>In addition to 2021 Florida Managed Areas, 2021 Florida Forever project lands, and the highest three priorities within the Florida Ecological Greenways are protected (the Florida Wildlife Corridor).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural lands</td>
<td>No agricultural lands are excluded from population allocation</td>
<td>All irrigated agricultural lands (2045) on good soils (USDA/NRCS Capability Rating Excellent – Marginal) from FSAID, 2020 are excluded from population allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Level Rise</td>
<td>50% of population impacted by sea level rise is reallocated within or near to the county affected. The other 50% are assumed to move out of the state.</td>
<td>50% of population impacted by sea level rise is reallocated within or near to the county affected. The other 50% are assumed to move out of the state.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology:

The University of Florida Center for Landscape Conservation Planning undertook these steps to develop the baseline and two future scenarios:

Steps:

1. Calculate the projected new population county by county — The Florida Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) medium projections for 2040 were used, based on 2020 U.S. census data. Regional projections are shown in Table 26.

Table 26: Population Projected Change by Region and State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019 Census</th>
<th>2040 Projection</th>
<th>2019-2040 Difference</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panhandle</td>
<td>1,529,159</td>
<td>1,790,000</td>
<td>260,841</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>2,643,040</td>
<td>3,386,500</td>
<td>743,460</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>9,503,600</td>
<td>12,154,700</td>
<td>2,651,100</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>7,801,938</td>
<td>9,074,800</td>
<td>1,272,862</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>21,477,737</td>
<td>26,406,000</td>
<td>4,928,263</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Map existing developed lands — County property appraiser data for the land use categories identified in Table 27 were used to identify developed lands for the Baseline. These were also shown as developed for both the Sprawl and Conservation 2040 Scenarios.

TABLE 27: Developed Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPED CATEGORIES</th>
<th>DEVELOPED CATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE FAMILY</td>
<td>BOWLING ALLEYS, SKATING RINGS, ENCLOSED ARENAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBILE HOMES</td>
<td>TOURIST ATTRACTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-FAMILY</td>
<td>RACE HORSE, AUTO, AND DOG TRACKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONDOMINIA</td>
<td>GOLF COURSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOPERATIVES</td>
<td>HOTELS, MOTELS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETIREMENT HOMES</td>
<td>LIGHT MANUFACTURING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOARDING HOMES (INSTITUTIONAL)</td>
<td>HEAVY MANUFACTURING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-FAMILY LESS THAN 10 UNITS</td>
<td>LUMBER YARDS, SAWMILLS, PLANNING MILLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORES ONE-STORE</td>
<td>FRUIT, VEGETABLES, AND MEAT PACKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIXED USE, I.E., STORE AND OFFICE</td>
<td>CANNERIES, DISTILLERIES, AND WINERIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT STORES</td>
<td>OTHER FOOD PROCESSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERMARKET</td>
<td>WAREHOUSES, AND DISTRIBUTION CENTERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIONAL SHOPPING MALLS</td>
<td>INDUSTRIAL STORAGE (FUEL, EQUIP, AND MATERIAL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY SHOPPING CENTERS</td>
<td>CHURCHES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONE-STORE NON-PROFESSIONAL OFFICES</td>
<td>PRIVATE SCHOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-STORE NON-PROFESSIONAL OFFICES</td>
<td>PRIVATE HOSPITALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SERVICE BUILDINGS</td>
<td>HOMES FOR AGED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIRPORTS, MARINAS, BUS TERMINALS, AND PIERS</td>
<td>MORTUARIES, CEMETERIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESTAURANTS, CAFETERIAS</td>
<td>CLUBS, LODGES, AND UNION HALLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRIVE-IN RESTAURANTS</td>
<td>SANITARIUMS, CONVALESCENT, AND BEST HOMES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS</td>
<td>CULTURAL ORGANIZATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE COMPANY OFFICES</td>
<td>PUBLIC SCHOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPAIR SERVICE SHOPS</td>
<td>COLLEGES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE STATIONS</td>
<td>PUBLIC HOSPITALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR, SERVICE, AND SALES</td>
<td>OTHER MUNICIPAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING LOTS, MOBILE HOME SALES</td>
<td>UTILITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHOLESALE, MANUFACTURING, AND PRODUCE OUTLETS</td>
<td>VACANT RESIDENTIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIST, GREENHOUSES</td>
<td>VACANT COMMERCIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRIVE-IN THEATERS, OPEN STADIUMS</td>
<td>VACANT INDUSTRIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCLOSED THEATERS, AUDITORIUMS</td>
<td>VACANT INSTITUTIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGHT CLUBS, BARS, AND COCKTAIL LOUNGES</td>
<td>continued</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Map existing protected lands and state priority natural lands — The Baseline included lands already protected in Florida based on May 21, 2021, Florida Managed Areas (FLMA) data from Florida Natural Areas Inventory. Additional state priority natural lands included projects identified as priorities in the Florida Forever land acquisition program and Florida Ecological Greenways Network (FEGN) highest priorities 1-3 (also known as the Florida Wildlife Corridor). The 2040 Sprawl Scenario assumed that priority natural lands could be developed over the coming decades, while the Conservation Scenario assumed they were not developed. Tables 28 and 29 include additional information on protected natural and protected agriculture lands in the Baseline and future scenarios.

### TABLE 28: Protected Natural Lands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Sprawl 2040</th>
<th>Conservation 2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Natural Lands</td>
<td>2021 Florida Managed Areas are included as protected</td>
<td>Lands in the 2021 Florida Managed Lands data layer (from Florida Natural Areas Inventory via FNAI)</td>
<td>Lands in the 2021 Florida Managed Lands data layer (from Florida Natural Areas Inventory via FNAI), or Florida Forever 2021 project lands, or Florida Ecological Greenways Network priorities 1, 2, and 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 29: Protected Agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Sprawl 2040</th>
<th>Conservation 2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Agriculture</td>
<td>Lands in the 2021 Florida Managed Lands data layer (from Florida Natural Areas Inventory via FGDL) and in the Crop, Livestock and Aquaculture Lands of 2018 (FSAID).</td>
<td>Lands in the 2021 Florida Managed Lands data layer (from Florida Natural Areas Inventory via FGDL) and in the Crop, Livestock and Aquaculture Lands of 2045 (FSAID).</td>
<td>Lands in the 2021 Florida Managed Lands data layer (from Florida Natural Areas Inventory via FGDL), and Florida Forever 2021 project lands, and Florida Ecological Greenways Network priorities 1,2, and 3 and in the Crop, Livestock and Aquaculture Lands of 2045 (FSAID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (crop, livestock, and aquaculture)</td>
<td>2018 lands so identified through FSAID not in the Florida Managed Lands data layer.</td>
<td>2045 lands so identified through FSAID not in the Florida Managed Lands data layer.</td>
<td>2045 lands so identified through FSAID not overtaken by development and not included in the protected category defined above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Identify lands and population projected to be impacted by sea level rise — The sea level rise scenario for Sea Level 2040 was based on the 2022 NOAA Intermediate sea level rise projection (0.25 meters). The number of people impacted in 2040 by a 0.25m sea level rise was identified using the ratio of a 0.9m sea level rise (the projection used for the Sea Level 2070 model) and a 0.25m sea level rise (the projection for 2040) to identify the percentage of population impacted in each county.

For this analysis, 50% of the population on inundated lands was assumed to relocate out of state as shown in Table 30, with the remaining 50% relocating within or near their existing county of residence, based on the premise that existing residents would want to move to locations close to their existing employment, social networks, and home. Counties with sufficient capacity accommodated the full 50% of the relocated population, but in counties with insufficient capacity, “overflow” population was assigned to an adjacent county or counties.

An additional 0.5m buffer (corresponding with a .75m sea level rise) was included where new population was allowed but given a low likelihood in the Sprawl Scenario and not allowed in the Conservation Scenario.
### TABLE 30: County Population Impacted by SLR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>% of population impacted by SLR</th>
<th>Population impacted by SLR</th>
<th>Displaced out of state (50% of those affected by SLR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALACHUA</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAKER</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
<td>2,374</td>
<td>1,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRADFORD</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREVARD</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>7,085</td>
<td>3,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWARD</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>15,063</td>
<td>7,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALHOUN</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLOTTE</td>
<td>8.90%</td>
<td>5,839</td>
<td>2,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITRUS</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>1,573</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAY</td>
<td>2.92%</td>
<td>2,209</td>
<td>1,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLIER</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>7,352</td>
<td>3,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMBIA</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESOTO</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIXIE</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUVAL</td>
<td>3.56%</td>
<td>12,148</td>
<td>6,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCAMBIA</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
<td>1,961</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLAGLER</td>
<td>3.93%</td>
<td>1,818</td>
<td>909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANKLIN</td>
<td>17.57%</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GADSDEN</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILCHRIST</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLADES</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GULF</td>
<td>5.37%</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMILTON</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARDEE</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HENDRY</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERNANDO</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGHLANDS</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HILLSBOROUGH</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
<td>6,650</td>
<td>3,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLMES</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIAN RIVER</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
<td>2,614</td>
<td>1,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACKSON</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFFERSON</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAFAYETTE</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE</td>
<td>6.32%</td>
<td>18,295</td>
<td>9,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEON</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVY</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*continued*
TABLE 30: County Population Impacted by SLR (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>% of population impacted by SLR</th>
<th>Population impacted by SLR</th>
<th>Displaced out of state (50% of those affected by SLR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIBERTY</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADISON</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANATEE</td>
<td>6.31%</td>
<td>9,474</td>
<td>4,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARION</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN</td>
<td>4.61%</td>
<td>2,298</td>
<td>1,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIAMI-DADE</td>
<td>4.22%</td>
<td>36,230</td>
<td>18,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONROE</td>
<td>54.95%</td>
<td>13,263</td>
<td>6,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASSAU</td>
<td>6.79%</td>
<td>2,381</td>
<td>1,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKALOOSA</td>
<td>1.86%</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKEECHOBEE</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSCEOLA</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALM BEACH</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>4,236</td>
<td>2,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASCO</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td>5,973</td>
<td>2,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINELLAS</td>
<td>4.77%</td>
<td>13,578</td>
<td>6,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLK</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUTNAM</td>
<td>4.03%</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST JOHNHS</td>
<td>4.91%</td>
<td>5,905</td>
<td>2,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST LUCIE</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
<td>2,161</td>
<td>1,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA ROSA</td>
<td>3.49%</td>
<td>2,436</td>
<td>1,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARASOTA</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>6,193</td>
<td>3,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMINOLE</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMTER</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUWANNEE</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAYLOR</td>
<td>3.24%</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOLUSIA</td>
<td>4.51%</td>
<td>8,325</td>
<td>4,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAKULLA</td>
<td>8.45%</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTON</td>
<td>4.64%</td>
<td>1,483</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>205,131</td>
<td>102,566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Determine the potential location of future development — Shown in Table 31, the likelihood of development criteria are used to determine where projected new development is to be allocated. These assume that available lands closer to cities, close to major roads, and in proximity to waterbodies would be more likely to develop. Due to higher development costs, wetlands were deemed less likely to develop. Likewise, lands with prime agricultural soils in the Florida Statewide Agricultural Irrigation Demand (FSAID) study for 2045 were determined less likely to develop in the Sprawl 2040 scenario because of the considerable investment in irrigation to make these lands more productive. These lands were excluded from development in the Conservation 2040 Scenario.
TABLE 31: Likelihood of Development (Development Suitability) Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Suitability Criterion</th>
<th>Rational for Use</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to Large Urban Areas (over 50,000 people)</td>
<td>Major urban areas tend to accommodate more additional population than smaller urban areas.</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to All Urban Areas (over 2,500 people)</td>
<td>New urban development tends to occur in close proximity to existing urban development.</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to coastline</td>
<td>The coast has historically been an attractor for urban development. However future sea level rise is expected to make these areas less attractive in 2040.</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Development Approvals</td>
<td>Areas within approved DRIs and DSAPs are highly likely to develop. The only DSAP that was used, however, was West Bay in Bay County, because the other existing DSAPs fell in the path and pattern of new urban development and their boundaries did not affect the pattern or timing of new urban development.</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road density</td>
<td>New urban development tends to occur in areas of relatively higher road density.</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence/absence of wetlands</td>
<td>Urban development on lands without wetlands is often less costly than on lands with wetlands.</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to open water</td>
<td>Physical or visual access to water has historically been an attractor for development.</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to major roads</td>
<td>Roads facilitate new urban development.</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of USDA/NRCS Soils within FSAID 2045 Projected Irrigated Agricultural Lands</td>
<td>There is an economic incentive to convert poorer agricultural soils to urban development before good agricultural soils.</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Determine the density of existing and future development — Gross Development Density (GDD) was used to determine the density of existing and projected development. GDD reflects the average number of people per every developed acre and is calculated on a county-by-county basis. For the future scenarios, the GDD was used to determine the acreage required to accommodate new development in each county.

For the Sprawl 2040 Scenario, the 2040 population projection for each county was divided by the 2019 GDD for that county to determine the amount of land needed to accommodate potential future development. This means that current patterns of development are presumed to persist. In order to show an alternative future scenario with less sprawling development patterns, for the Conservation 2040 Scenario the GDD was increased by 30%.
TABLE 32: Gross Development Density (GDD) by Urban and Rural County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2010 GDD</th>
<th>2019 GDD</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Counties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALACHUA</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>16.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>16.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREVARD</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>23.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWARD</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td>23.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLOTTE</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>37.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITRUS</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>14.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAY</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>23.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLIER</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>25.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMBIA</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>6.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUVAL</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>19.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCAMBIA</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>8.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLAGS</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>25.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERNANDO</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>15.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGHLANDS</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>30.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HILLSBOROUGH</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>31.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIAN RIVER</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>37.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>42.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>51.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEON</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>38.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANATEE</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARION</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>11.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>21.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIAMI-DADE</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>16.49</td>
<td>21.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONROE</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>35.98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2010 GDD</th>
<th>2019 GDD</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Counties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAKER</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>3.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRADFORD</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>-6.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALHOUN</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESOTO</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>22.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIXIE</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>10.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANKLIN</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-15.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GADSDEN</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-5.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILCHRIST</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>7.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLADES</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>23.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GULF</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>26.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMILTON</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>179.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARDEE</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>-6.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HENDRY</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLMES</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACKSON</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFFERSON</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>52.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAFAYETTE</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-4.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVY</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>10.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERTY</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-35.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADISON</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-7.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKEECHOBEE</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>5.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUWANEE</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>8.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAYLOR</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-6.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>-20.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAKULLA</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>30.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>7.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>11.43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Urban counties are those with a population of 50,000 or greater in the 2019 census, while rural counties have populations less than 50,000.

7. Identify lands within special planning areas that were available for new development — We assumed that certain lands that had already been approved for development were more likely to develop first. To address these lands, a special planning area mask was created for lands designated as Developments of Regional Impact (DRIs) and Detailed Specific Area Plans (DSAPs). Lands within those planning areas that could not be developed were excluded, including open water, major road rights of way, existing protected lands, mitigation banks, and Miccosukee Indian Reservation lands in western Broward County.

The lands with the highest Likelihood of Development scores derived from Table 31 were the first to have population allocated to them, using the 2019 GDD from the appropriate county, as shown in Table 32. This allocation process was repeated until all DRI/DSAP lands in each county were used or all new population accommodated. The population allocated to DRI/DSAP lands was then subtracted from remaining new population data to determine infill/greenfield population.

8. Identify lands outside of special planning areas that were available for new development — This involved creating an infill/greenfield mask for land use categories identified in the county property appraiser data from Table 33, and then excluding lands that could not be developed for other reasons (open water, major road rights of way, existing protected lands), mitigation banks, and Miccosukee Indian Reservation lands in western Broward County.

Population was allocated first to the areas identified as having the highest likelihood of development following the methodology in Table 31 and using the appropriate county GDD from Table 32. This allocation process was repeated until all the population was accommodated or all infill/greenfield lands in each county were used.

continued
9. **Allocate spillover population** — If there was insufficient land available to accommodate the projected population increase for a particular county, spillover population was allocated to adjacent counties. This was based upon the percentage of the sum of the total 2019 population of the adjacent counties, following the Likelihood of Development criteria in Table 31 and the GDD in Table 32 for the county accommodating the spillover. For example, if there was spillover population from Orange County, then Lake, Seminole, Brevard, Osceola and Polk counties received their proportionate share of the spillover. Population to be accommodated through redevelopment was calculated using the ratio of 2019 developed lands to available lands for development. Counties with less land available for future development were assumed to have higher levels of redevelopment than counties with abundant available land.

### TABLE 33: Infill-Greenfield Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMPS</th>
<th>GRAZING LAND SOIL CLASS 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVED AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>GRAZING LAND SOIL CLASS 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROPLAND SOIL CLASS 1</td>
<td>GRAZING LAND SOIL CLASS 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROPLAND SOIL CLASS 2</td>
<td>ORCHARD, GROVES, CITRUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROPLAND SOIL CLASS 3</td>
<td>POULTRY, BEES, TROPICAL FISH, RABBITS, ETC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMBERLAND</td>
<td>DAIRIES, FEED LOTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMBERLAND</td>
<td>ORNAMENTALS, MISC. AGRICULTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMBERLAND</td>
<td>MINING, PETROLEUM, AND GAS LANDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMBERLAND</td>
<td>ACREAGE NOT ZONED AGRICULTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMBERLAND</td>
<td>VACANT RESIDENTIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMBERLAND</td>
<td>VACANT COMMERCIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMBERLAND</td>
<td>VACANT INDUSTRIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMBERLAND</td>
<td>VACANT INSTITUTIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAZING LAND SOIL CLASS 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAZING LAND SOIL CLASS 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAZING LAND SOIL CLASS 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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