

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ELEMENT
DATA AND ANALYSIS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Maps	ii
List of Tables	ii
 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	
1	
 INTRODUCTION	
Purpose and Overview	2.
Evaluation and Appraisal Report	4.
 DATA AND ANALYSIS REQUIREMENTS	
1. Local Practices Guiding Timing and Development of Public Facilities (9J-5.016(2)(a).	5.
(Public Facility Needs Supporting Future Land Use, Transportation, Solid Waste, Recreation, and Conservation and Open Space Elements)	
2. Major System Components Service Areas and Locations	10.
A. Public Education	
B. Public Health	
3. Intergovernmental Coordination Issues.	12.
4. Existing Revenue Sources and Funding Mechanisms	12.
5. Analysis of Existing Deficiencies	12.
6. Estimated Cost of Correcting Existing Deficiencies	12.
7. Fiscal Impact Analysis	13.
A. 5 year CIP	
 REFERENCES	14
 APPENDICES	

LIST OF MAPS

- # MAP
1. Alachua County Fire and EMS Stations
 2. Alachua County Public Hospitals
 3. Alachua County Educational Facilities
 4. Alachua County (Unincorporated) Public Schools
 5. Alachua County Elementary School Districts
 6. Alachua County Middle School Districts
 7. Alachua County High School Districts

LIST OF TABLES

- # TABLE
1. Concurrency Related Road Improvements FY 2001/2002-2005/2006 **(Adopted)**
 2. System Management Modifications and Safety Improvements: FY 2001/2002-2005/2006 **(Adopted)**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Capital improvements are physical assets constructed or purchased to provide, improve or replace a public facility and which are large scale and high in cost. The cost of a capital improvement is generally nonrecurring and may require multi-year financing. For the purpose of this element, physical assets which have been identified as existing or projected needs in the individual comprehensive plan elements shall be considered capital improvements.

The purpose of the Capital Improvements Element (CIE) is : (1) to evaluate the need for public facilities as identified in the other Comprehensive Plan Elements; (2) to estimate the cost of the improvements for which Alachua County has some or all of the fiscal responsibility; (3) to analyze the fiscal capability of the County to finance and construct improvements; (4) to adopt financial policies to guide the funding of improvements; and (5) to schedule the funding and construction of improvements in a manner necessary to ensure that capital improvements are provided when required based on needs identified in the other Comprehensive Plan Elements.

The overall goal of Alachua County Capital Improvement Element is:

Provide and maintain in a timely and efficient manner, adequate public facilities for both existing and future populations consistent with available financial resources.

A CIE objective supporting the conservation policies of the plan requires, “Limit capital improvements where such improvements may directly or indirectly, through accompanying development, degrade environmentally sensitive areas or other natural resources important to health, safety and welfare of the citizens and environment of Alachua County. These resource include but are not limited to: aquifer recharge areas, potable water wellfields, wetlands, significant uplands, and habitat for threatened or endangered species.”

The key policies in the Element to implement this and other objectives include: a statement of level of service; priority rating criteria for evaluating capital projects; and the components of the County's concurrency management system (development monitoring and financial feasibility).

I. INTRODUCTION

Purpose and Overview

Chapter 163 Florida Statutes (FS) and Rule 9J-5, Florida Administrative Code (FAC) provide the statutory and administrative rule requirements for local governments to adopt a Capital Improvements Element (CIE) as an Element of their Comprehensive Plans. The purpose of the Capital Improvements Element is: (1) to evaluate the need for public facilities as identified in the other Comprehensive Plan Elements; (2) to estimate the cost of the improvements for which Alachua County has some or all of the fiscal responsibility; (3) to analyze the fiscal capability of the County to finance and construct improvements; (4) to adopt financial policies to guide the funding of improvements; and (5), to schedule the funding and construction of improvements in a manner necessary to ensure that capital improvements are provided when required based on needs identified in the other Comprehensive Plan Elements.

The inventory and analysis section addresses the requirements of 9J-5.016(1)&(2) F.A.C. Areas discussed include existing revenue sources and funding mechanisms, local practices guiding the timing and location of capital improvements, projected capital improvement costs based on other elements of the Comprehensive Plan, fiscal implications of public facility needs, alternative funding sources and recommendations based on the inventory and analysis.

Over and above the purposes set out in Rule 9J-5.016, the Capital Improvements Element can provide the County with additional opportunities to: increase coordination of existing County capital improvement programs for transportation, solid waste, parks, public buildings, and other facilities with land use plans; increase coordination of capital improvements planning with other agencies such as Gainesville Regional Utilities, Florida Department of Natural Resources, School Board of Alachua County, and Florida Department of Transportation with County improvements and land use plans; and, investigate and implement innovative methods to maximize use of limited revenue sources to provide facilities and services to serve both existing and future citizens of Alachua County.

There is an inverse relationship between percent of property on tax rolls and levied millage rates. The average peer county has 26% more property on the tax rolls and 26% less average and countywide millage levy than Alachua County (Source: Budget Workshop). Alachua County taxes are distributed among five government institutions: county (33%), libraries (7%), water management districts (2%), school board (40%), and MSTU (18%).

(http://www.acpafl.org/annual_reports/2001_reports/2001_report/yourdollar_2001.htm)

Relationship of the CIE to the Capital Improvements Program

The Capital Improvements Element includes the data and analysis, goals, objectives, and policies, and the Capital Improvement Program, indicating the five year schedule of projects to implement the element. The goals, objectives, and policies and Capital Improvement Program are the sections which must be adopted by the Board of County Commissioners. The Capital Improvement Element contains facility types as required by Rule 9J-5 with adopted level of service standards to be used for evaluating development orders to meet the requirement that adequate facilities be available concurrent with the

impact of that new development. These facility types are: 1) transportation mobility; 2) sanitary sewer; 3) potable water; 4) solid waste; and 5) stormwater management. In addition, the element addresses other facility types and capital needs, and sets level of service guidelines to be used for purposes of planning the full range of capital improvement needs. These additional facility types include fire and rescue services, administrative buildings, sheriff, correctional facilities, preservation lands, and other capital improvements needed by both constitutional officers and general government. The Alachua County Capital Improvements Program (CIP) allowed as part of the Concurrency Management Plan addresses those projects for which the County has fiscal responsibility needed in the next 5 years to address LOS/Concurrency needs.

Relationship of the CIE to Elements of the Comprehensive Plan

The intent of the CIE is to ensure the public sector's implementation of the public infrastructure needs and standards identified in the comprehensive plan, just as the future land use element and land development regulations are intended to guide private sector development in a manner consistent with the comprehensive plan. This section will summarize the key areas of the CIE addressing the general comprehensive plan goals:

Future Land Use. Integration of the Future Land Use and CIE is vital to the success of the Comprehensive Plan. Directing new development to areas where infrastructure capacity exists or is programmed for the future can maximize the benefit of public infrastructure investment.

Transportation Mobility. Maintaining adopted levels of service for roads is a primary function of the CIE. New quality of service standards for bicycles are provided for a transportation alternative.

Sanitary Sewer, Solid Waste, Stormwater Management, and Potable Water. Maintaining adopted levels of service for infrastructure and County services is a primary function of the CIE.

Conservation. The Conservation and Open Space Element addresses protection, conservation, and appropriate use of the natural resources of the county. Implicit in the requirements for the objectives and policies for this element is the understanding that natural resources perform functions beneficial to the health, safety, and welfare of society, and perform those functions without cost to the citizenry. Protection of resources such as groundwater, floodplains, wetlands and surface waters today minimizes expenditures in the future. Preservation of sensitive lands through direct purchase or other methods is considered as a capital expenditure but not needed for Concurrency Management.

Recreation. The recreation objectives and policies must ensure that parks and recreation facilities are adequately and efficiently provided; and establish level of service standards for recreation and correct or improve deficiencies in existing parks.

Intergovernmental Coordination. The intergovernmental coordination element requires Alachua County to coordinate the comprehensive plan with the plans of the School Board of Alachua County, other units of local government providing services but not having regulatory authority over the use of land, and with the comprehensive plans of adjacent municipalities and adjacent counties; and ensure coordination in establishing level of service standards for public facilities with other entities having operational and maintenance responsibilities. Numerous opportunities exist for orchestration of capital improvements between different agencies. Examples include: coordination of school, library, and neighborhood park planning; and, combining Conservation and Recreation Lands (CARL) and Water Management District

land purchases with local trail, park, and open space programs.

The University of Florida, with extensive facilities throughout the county, has a major impact on development, and Alachua County participates in the Campus Master Plan process. The University facilities are tax exempt.

EVALUATION AND APPRAISAL REPORT

On September 14, 1998, the Board held a preliminary public hearing on the Capital Improvements Element. The Board provided direction on the recommendations forwarded by the LPA for the final public hearing on September 28, 1998. The recommendations adopted by the Board of County Commissioners are included in the CIE policies and Capital Improvements Program.

II. DATA AND ANALYSIS

1. Local Practices Guiding Timing and Development of Public Facilities (9J-5.016(2)(a))

This section reviews, by facility type, current local practices guiding the timing and development of public facilities. Three different capital improvement programs are in operation in the county. There are separate programs for transportation facilities and solid waste facilities and a general capital improvement program for all other improvement categories. The Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Regulations, Subdivision Regulations, and budget policies also influence the capital improvement program process.

Management of public facilities is guided through three distinct processes. The Concurrency Management System (CMS) monitors development activity of available capacity of supporting facilities or service through the monthly monitoring report. Programming of funding for identified needs is in accordance with the annual Public Meeting Process, which culminates in the annual adopted County Budget. These two processes cover management of facility increases. Decreases in public facilities, (such as road jurisdiction transfers) occur because of municipal annexations. The management of this process is presented in the Intergovernmental Coordination Element in the policies which address the Alachua County Boundary Adjustment Act.

Transportation Facilities

The Alachua County Transportation Needs Plan is a planning document that identifies transportation system needs and funding requirements to assist the public works staff in recommending the most cost-effective expenditure of available transportation funding resources to meet the goals of the County Commission. The needs list is organized within the categorical areas of Multi-Modal, Efficiency, Maintenance and Capacity.

This plan is an important element in the development and updating of the Five-Year Transportation Modification Program, which is transmitted to the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) annually. Planned transportation projects are shown in Table 1: Concurrency Related Road Improvements and Table 2: System Management Modifications and Safety Improvements, FY 2001/2002 to 2005-2006.

An analysis of the Concurrency-related road improvements within the next five-year period has been completed. The total cost to implement this plan is slightly more than 20.8 million dollars with an estimated cost to the County being slightly more than 11.9 million dollars. Additional funding comes from the Campus Development Agreement and a grant from the Florida Department of Transportation.

The CIE includes new Quality of Service standards for bicycles, not a Concurrency requirement. The Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan, June 2001 evaluated bicycling conditions using the Bicycle Level of Service Model. This plan also includes a section on possible revenue sources for implementing the Bicycle Quality of Service standards.

Recreation Facilities

The Recreation Element of the Comprehensive Plan requires the completion of a Recreation Master Plan,

which is underway in early 2002. During the planning process, the Parks Coordinator at the Department of Public Works develops park plans and cost estimates. The Recreation and Open Space Advisory Committee (ROSCO) prioritizes park projects. In presenting capital improvement recommendations to the BoCC based on all facility needs, staff evaluates and makes recommendations on the list of park projects in conjunction with all other projects. Several park projects are unfunded, and recently three park playgrounds were closed due to CCA contamination of the equipment. The Comprehensive Plan proposes changing the LOS for recreation to 0.5 improved acres per 1000 population for activity-based recreation and 5.0 improved acres per 1000 population for resource-based recreation. No acreage is needed to meet the proposed activity-based recreation level of service standard thru 2020. As for resource-based recreation, 22 acres will be needed in 2005, 62.5 needed by 2010, 96 needed by 2015 and 128.5 needed by 2020. Acquisitions through the Alachua County Forever Land Conservation Program, funded through a 1 mil ad valorem property tax assessment, are expected to meet those needs.

Conservation and Open Space

As noted above, the Alachua County Forever Land Conservation Program, approved by voter referendum, began in 2001. The first acquisitions were approved by the BoCC on February 26, 2002. The prioritization process is detailed in the COSE.

Solid Waste

Solid Waste disposal is performed through the County's Public Works Department, Office of Waste Management, and the plan establishes the LOS as 0.73 tons per capita. As discussed in the Solid Waste Element, the Leveda Brown Environmental Park and transfer station should have adequate capacity to serve both Alachua and Gilchrist Counties well beyond 2020. The transfer station and other structures within the park are of high quality and are expected to last a minimum of thirty years. The capital cost of the buildings at the facility are amortized over thirty years.

Stormwater Management

There are no publicly funded stormwater projects which are required to maintain the proposed level of service standards included in the Capital Improvement Program. Required LOS Standards for stormwater facilities must be met by new developments as they receive development approval. Stormwater management is provided through the Concurrency process since post-development runoff cannot exceed pre-development runoff. A list of capital improvements needs to address localized existing deficiencies associated with existing development has been developed as detailed in the Stormwater Management Element.

Potable Water and Sewer

Potable water and sanitary sewer projects have historically not been included in the County's Capital Improvements Program since the County does not currently operate any central systems. Extensions of municipal central water and sewer systems into the unincorporated County must be approved by the Board of County Commissioners.

Other Facilities

Other capital improvements for the departments and constitutional officers are programmed through the

Capital Improvement Program. This program is updated annually and contains a first year Capital Budget and a five year schedule of capital improvements. This is not related to Concurrency Management. Map 1 shows the location of Fire and EMS Stations.

The cost of the funded FY 2002-2006 CIP totals \$2,575,964. Funded improvement categories areas are represented as follows: Transportation Improvement Program projects (\$394,750); Solid Waste (\$261,720), Administrative Services(\$1,919,494).

An infrastructure sales surtax was approved by voter referendum in November 2000 to fund a new \$26 million criminal courthouse. The 1 cent for 1 year sales tax will pay for the new judicial complex/parking facility. The 2002 budget workshop reported Traffic Court Service Fees are \$400 thousand less than anticipated.

2. Use of Timing and Location of Capital Improvements to Support Efficient Land Development (9J-5.016(2)(e))

Efficient land development is that which avoids extensions of infrastructure to serve "leapfrog" development or isolated new development which requires major investments in new infrastructure in order to allow that isolated development to tie in economically or socially with an existing developed area. The Future Land Use Element delineates the urban service line so as to provide for the efficient development of land through the extension of infrastructure within designated areas. The timing and location of infrastructure is incorporated into the capital improvement program by examination of the Future Land Use Map.

The County budget process is the mechanism to implement the capital improvements program. Alachua County Comprehensive Plan policies establish the priorities for facility improvements. Alachua County shall set the relative priorities for improvement projects within types of public facilities as:

- A. Capital improvements to be funded with a funding source other than impact fees shall be evaluated in accordance with the criteria listed below. Projects eligible for the use of impact fees shall be evaluated consistent with Policy 1.8.2.

Priority 1 - The repair, remodeling, renovation, or replacement of obsolete or worn out facilities that contribute to achieving or maintaining adopted LOS standards.

Priority 2 - New public facilities and improvements or modifications to existing public facilities that eliminate public hazards:

Priority 3 - New public facilities and improvements or modifications to existing public facilities that are needed to maintain health, safety, and welfare.

Priority 4 - New public facilities or improvements to existing public facilities that are required by contractual obligation or legal mandates.

Priority 5 - New and expanded facilities that reduce or eliminate deficiencies relative to LOS

standards for existing demands. Projects to address deficiencies to serve existing development or approved vested development in urban service areas designated in the Future Land Use Element shall have priority within this category.

Priority 6 - New or expanded facilities, including land acquisition, that are needed to maintain adopted LOS for new development and redevelopment during the next five years. Projects to serve new development within urban service areas designated in the Future Land Use Element shall have priority within this category.

In the event that capacity of public facilities is insufficient to serve all applicants for development orders, the priorities shall be as follows:

1. Capital Improvements to serve DRIs and vested (i.e., where development has commenced and is continuing in good faith) final development orders issued prior to plan adoption. Criteria to rank the following shall be established in the Concurrency Ordinance: Projects subject to development agreements. Final development orders not vested. Non-final development orders. Other categories of development based on the Comprehensive Plan policies.

Analysis of Priorities for Facility Improvements

First priority for Capital Facility Improvements is now related to LOS standards, which strengthens the link between the CIE and land use. Impact fees as allowed by Policy 1.8.2. can address priorities 1 and 6.

Policies for Urban Development- Current and Proposed Practices to Assist Efficient Land Development

The Comprehensive Plan designates the Urban Cluster as an area for urban development, which includes residential densities ranging from one unit per acre to 24 units per acre or greater, non-residential development, and is generally served by urban services. In order to phase development for the Urban Cluster and promote efficient use of land and infrastructure and minimize sprawl, an urban services line is designated in the Future Land Use Map series. This line identifies the limits of the area within the Urban Cluster within which phased development shall be promoted through the year 2010. Beyond this line, using a variety of growth management tools such as limitations on the density or intensity of development through zoning and limits on capital improvements, urban type development is prohibited or strongly discouraged.

Analysis of Policies for Urban Development

Dr. James Nicholas of the University of Florida completed a review of a report submitted to the County by the Gainesville Builder's Association. The GBA report was entitled "Growth and Infrastructure in Alachua County: Does Conventional Development pay it Share of Public Costs?" While the Homebuilders Association economic analysis might be used to indicate their industry's contribution to the state and local economy, it is inappropriate for the Association to further claim that development pays for the cost associated with local government expenditures related to infrastructure. Dr. Nicholas points out that revenues from local development, which the report implies is available to offset costs of local infrastructure in reality is collected by the state and generally not redistributed to local governments.

Major commercial development is directed to activity centers. An innovation in the new plan is the concept of Village Centers, allowing small scale mixed use areas in residential neighborhoods to promote pedestrian life. The Comprehensive Plan supports the MTPO Livable Cities Reinvestment Plan in the policy framework.

The tax impacts of land use policies has a direct impact on the provision of capital improvements. In 1989, a Urban Land Institute report estimated a \$48,000 per house sprawl “premium” for providing services to a three unit per acre development located ten miles from central facilities and employment centers. By contrast, the same costs for a home in a 12-unit per acre development, located closer in, with an equal mix of residential uses (townhouses, garden apartments and single family) would be 50 percent lower (CNU).

Policies for Rural Development-Current and Proposed Practices to Assist Efficient Land Development

The updated plan requires clustering of all rural residential subdivision development and maintains the Rural Clusters for limited commercial development.

Analysis of Policies for Rural Development

In general, rural development policies have been successful in restricting commercial uses in rural areas. The allowance of one dwelling unit per five acres in rural residential areas is not conducive to maintenance of rural and agricultural land uses and may, in the future, create competition between rural and urban areas for limited capital improvement funding for roads and other facilities. The plan requires clustered subdivisions in the rural area to minimize this and ensure maximum utilization of infrastructure. In *Growing Greener* (November 1997), Randall Arendt states that “property assessments on (rural cluster) conservation subdivisions should not differ, in total, from those on conventional developments. This is because the same number of houses and acres of land are involved in both cases (except when part of the open space is owned by a public entity, which is uncommon). Although the open space in conservation subdivisions is taxed low because easements prevent it from being developed, the rate is similar to that applied to land in conventional subdivisions where the larger houselots are not big enough to be further subdivided.”

Cluster Development is a pattern in which uses are grouped or clustered through density transfer within a parcel, rather than spread evenly throughout a parcel as in conventional lot-by-lot development. Cluster zoning is favored by many communities and developers since it allows protection of open space lands, creates less monotonous designs, and saves money by requiring fewer streets and shorter utility lines.

Currently the zoning regulations provide for clustering through PUDs. A major change in the proposed plan is a requirement for clustered subdivisions for the rural/agricultural land use. The County will update the existing cluster ordinance.

Protecting agricultural land in Alachua County is important, in addition to the quality of life and economic diversity concerns, because of the tax base benefits. Although not widely known, farmland, not residential and commercial development, contributes the most to a local government's tax base and save communities money. Numerous studies from around the nation have found that such lands contribute more in tax dollars than they demand in tax-supported services. Several of many examples include (Source: 1000 Friends of Florida):

- Hebron, CT: Farms required \$0.43 in services for every dollar they generated in taxes. In contrast, residential properties required \$1.06 in services for every dollar contributed in taxes.
- Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN: In three nearby rural communities, farms drew an average of \$0.50 in services for every tax dollar paid. Residential properties required an average of \$1.04 in services for every tax dollar.
- Dunn, WI: Farms required \$0.18 in services for every tax dollar; residential development cost taxpayers \$1.06 for every tax dollar collected.¹²
- Frederick County, MD: Residential property cost local government \$1.14 in services for every tax dollar collected, resulting in a net deficit. Farmland and open space required only \$0.53 in services for every tax dollar paid, thereby subsidizing residential land.

One (Virginia) study showed that for every dollar of tax revenue collected from residential land, \$1.25 is spent on public services. For each dollar generated from an open space tax, 19 cents is spent on services. (EPA, 1997, Community Based Environmental Protection, p. 3-26)

State and federal finance and tax incentives are provided to assist agricultural operations. But current policies are not proving adequate to deter the widespread conversion of farmland, ranges, forests and other rural properties to development. As rural areas are transformed to urban and suburban, the taxes on area residents also rise to support new infrastructure and public services.

2. **Public Health and Educational Facilities (9J-5.016(1)(b) & 9J-5.016(2)(d))**

Geographic service areas and location of Public Education and Public Health Systems

- a. **Public Health Facilities:** There are three major acute care facilities in the County, a veteran's administration hospital and numerous smaller specialty hospitals serving specific groups. The three acute care facilities in Alachua County are Shands at U.F., Shands at Alachua General Hospital (A.G.H.), and North Florida Regional Medical Center. Shands at U.F. and Shands at A.G.H. are private non-profit facilities, while North Florida Regional Medical Center is owned by Hospital Corporation of America. See Map 2 for the location of the public hospitals. The data on number of beds is located in Table A.

Table A. Existing and Planned Hospital Beds in Major Hospitals in Alachua County (excluding the Veteran's Administration Hospital)

Hospital	Ownership	Beds	Planned Beds	Total
Shands/Alachua Gen.	Non-profit	367		
North Fla. Regional	Proprietary	254		
Shands/UF	Non-profit	570	48	618
Shands Rehab	Non-profit	40		
Shands/Vista	Non-profit	81		
Total		1,312	48	1,360

Source: North Central Florida Health Planning Council, Inc. Hospital Data Report 2000.

Special population government hospitals in Alachua County are the 17-bed Tacachale-Dahlia Hospital on Waldo Road and the 255 bed Malcolm Randall VA Medical Center on Archer Road. These facilities are not required to receive Certificates of Need prior to expansion.

Alachua County is home to a world-class medical community. The area supports six hospitals with more than 1,800 beds, including the Gainesville Veterans Affairs Medical Center, North Florida Regional Medical Center, and SHANDS Healthcare System. An estimated 2,000 doctors and 135 dentists work in

patient care, research, service and education positions at area health-care facilities.

Gainesville Veterans Affairs Medical Center is a five-story, 480-bed hospital on Archer Road dedicated to the treatment of veteran patients. Affiliated with the University of Florida's J. Hillis Miller Health Science Center, the hospital is a general medical, surgical and psychiatric facility that provides primary, secondary and tertiary care for veterans in North Florida and South Georgia. Twenty-five different medical specialties are represented on the staff and extensive research is carried out in cancer, cardiology, alcoholism, psycho-physiology, nuclear medicine and ophthalmology.

The Gainesville VA Medical Center is one of the most active hospitals in the Department of Veterans Affairs, caring for more than 10,000 veterans each year. The hospital totals more than 130,000 out-patient visits each year.

The Santa Fe Health Care System Satellite Campus Hospital is a private health care facility in Alachua County. The Campus Hospital will at the completion of its 30 year plan, provide a total of 1,360,000 square feet of building area, of which there will be an 83 bed Psychiatric Hospital (52,295 square feet) and a 40 bed Rehabilitation Hospital (33,363 square feet). Ten percent of the Campus Hospital external trips are estimated to either originate or end outside of Alachua County, with the remainder distributed within the County. Analysis results have shown that the Campus will have little impact on adjacent roadway systems.

These facilities are expanded from time to time and the urban locations take advantage of existing infrastructure. HRS recently opened a Children's Medical Center next to the VA Hospital in Gainesville which is projected to treat 30 to 40 patients daily. This location also took advantage of existing infrastructure.

Central water and sewer systems, solid waste facilities, mass transit and transportation facilities are the public facilities most likely to be impacted by hospital expansions. A general hospital generates approximately 15 trips per bed while a University hospital generates roughly 37 trips per bed.

b. Public Education Facilities

Maps 3 and 4 and show the location of public school facilities. The Enrollment Projection and Capacity Analysis proposed for the June 26, 2001 Capital Outlay Workshop of the School Board of Alachua County reported the district enrollment for February 2001 full-time equivalents to be 27,727 students, with a projected enrollment of 27,140 students for 2003/04. This enrollment capacity information for public education facilities is detailed in the report.

The Comprehensive Plan requires the County shall collocate public facilities such as parks, recreational areas, libraries, and community centers with schools to the extent possible. School districts are shown on Maps 5-7. Joint planning between the School Board, Alachua County and the municipalities can help facilitate programming of adequate road facilities to serve existing and planned schools, linkage of all schools to surrounding residential areas via a safe system of sidewalks and bikeways, development of neighborhood park sites in conjunction with school sites, and provision of other infrastructure such as central water and sewer, if available, and fire and emergency medical facilities. The mechanisms to provide for coordination of School Board and County planning are detailed in the Intergovernmental Coordination Element.

Alachua County also contains private educational facilities, however, the impact on infrastructure associated with the facilities has not been assessed.

3. Intergovernmental Coordination Issues

The two Water Management Districts with jurisdiction in Alachua County plan to update the mapping of prime aquifer recharge areas. The NCFRPC SRPP Evaluation and Appraisal Report (December 2000) notes that Regional Policy 4.3.1. calls for coordination between water management districts in the mapping of high aquifer recharge areas to prevent map inconsistencies near District boundaries, but this has not been implemented to date. Alachua County is bisected by the St. John's River and the Suwannee River Water Management Districts. Each district has used different methodologies and assumptions in preparing the maps of high aquifer recharge areas. The regional planning council report states that a threat of a lawsuit could result if a map beyond the jurisdictional limits of the St. Johns River Water Management District is applied county-wide. Alachua County staff have some technical concerns with the SRWMD mapping model as well. As noted by Sloan and Chandwani (ASCE, 1997, p. 12) some of the dangers in ground-water modeling include misconceptualization of the physical system, over-simplification, over-calibration, misapplication of the code, and unrealistic expectations.

4. Existing Revenue Sources and Funding Mechanisms Available for Capital Improvement Financing [9J-5.016(1)(c)]

The County's 5 year Capital Improvement Program is updated each year in conjunction with development of the budget and preparation and review of the Annual Concurrence Status Report. Priority projects are classified according to categories and process identified in the Capital Improvements Element. Revenue sources and funding information is updated annually as part of the budget process. Information is available from the :Alachua County Office of Management and Budget, 2002. *Annual Budget for FY02 and FY03 and Capital Improvements Program for FY02 through FY06.*

5. Analysis of Existing Deficiencies

Unfunded projects in the Capital Improvement Program FY02-FY06 are not required for concurrency management.

6. Estimated Cost of Correcting Existing Deficiencies

Estimates for unfunded projects in the Capital Improvement Program FY02 are included in the adopted County budget. An impact fee ordinance and other strategies are under consideration.

7. FISCAL ANALYSIS (9J-5.016(2)(f))

This section provides a preliminary assessment of the County's ability to finance capital improvements based on anticipated revenues and expenditures for FY 2002 through FY 2006. The fiscal analysis requirements of Rule 9J-5.016(2)(f) are detailed in Alachua County Office of Management and Budget, 2002. *Annual Budget for FY02 and FY03 and Capital Improvements Program for FY02 through FY06.*

Cost estimates for those capital improvements identified in individual Elements as needed to support the Future Land Use Element come from a variety of sources. All concurrency related areas for which the County has capital responsibility are under the administration of the Department of Public Works. Public Works has the in-house ability to generally estimate project costs for roadways, parks and stormwater management improvements. Estimates are reviewed by OMB during the budget process and then a project budget is set with the County Commission. These budget estimates guide the County in determining whether sufficient funds are available to call for bids and implement the project.

A report to Alachua County on Tax Increment Financing for Rural Heritage Districts was prepared by the UF Conservation Clinic. In addition a case study of Cross Creek was performed to assess the value of using tax increment financing in rural areas. This case study of tax increment financing in Cross Creek is based on the computed tax increment revenues over the next thirty years. The total increment revenue in the study is \$4, 525, 243.93.

The capital improvements element shall be reviewed on an annual basis and modified as necessary in accordance with s. [163.3187](#) or s. [163.3189](#), except that corrections, updates, and modifications concerning costs; revenue sources; acceptance of facilities pursuant to dedications which are consistent with the plan; or the date of construction of any facility enumerated in the capital improvements element may be accomplished by ordinance and shall not be deemed to be amendments to the local comprehensive plan. All public facilities shall be consistent with the capital improvements element.

REFERENCES:

Alachua County Board of County Commissioners, 1998. *Evaluation and Appraisal Report on Alachua County Comprehensive Plan: 1991-2011*.

Alachua County Office of Management and Budget, 2002. *Annual Budget for FY02 and FY03 and Capital Improvements Program for FY02 through FY06*.

American Society of Civil Engineers, 1997. *Groundwater, Protection Alternatives and Strategies in the U.S.A.* New York: ASCE.

Ankersen, Thomas T., et.al., 2002. "Case Study of Cross Creek." Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Conservation Clinic.

Ankersen, Thomas T., et.al., 2002. "Tax Increment Financing for Rural Heritage Districts, A Report to Alachua County." Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Conservation Clinic.

Congress for the New Urbanism. *Correcting the Record, Comparing development policy in Portland, Oregon and Atlanta, Georgia*.

http://www.acpaf1.org/annual_reports/2001_reports/2001_report/yourdollar_2001.htm

<http://www/ntdprogram.com/NTD/NTDData.nsf>

North Central Florida Regional Planning Council Strategic Regional Policy Plan Evaluation and Appraisal Report (December 2000)

Nicholas, Dr. James, 2001. "Growth and Infrastructure in Alachua County: Does Conventional Development pay its Share of Public Costs?"

North Central Florida Regional Planning Council, June 2001. Alachua Countywide Bicycle Master Plan.

School Board of Alachua County, Florida, June 26, 2001. Capital Outlay Program, 1999/00 through 2003/04.

United States Environmental Protection Agency, 1997. *Community-Based Environmental Protection: A Resource Book for Protecting Ecosystems and Communities*. Washington, DC: U.S. EPA (EPA 230-B-96-003).

