

CHAPTER 8: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ELEMENT

GOAL 8-1: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT MANAGEMENT. THE CITY SHALL UNDERTAKE ACTIONS NECESSARY TO ADEQUATELY PROVIDE NEEDED PUBLIC FACILITIES WITHIN THE CITY'S JURISDICTION IN A MANNER WHICH PROTECTS INVESTMENTS AND EXISTING FACILITIES, MAXIMIZES THE USE OF EXISTING FACILITIES, AND PROMOTES ORDERLY COMPACT GROWTH.

Objective 8-1.1: Capital Improvements Rationale. Capital improvements will be provided for purposes of correcting existing deficiencies, accommodating future growth, and replacing worn-out or obsolete facilities, as programmed in the Five-Year Capital Improvement Program.

Policy 8-1.1.1: Capital Improvement Element Intent. The City is committed to growth management which incorporates appropriate fiscal management practices and procedures. The City shall consider the use of all legal and equitable fiscal management techniques to achieve delivery of public services and facilities needed by existing and anticipated future populations. The capital improvement program presented herein identifies capital improvements needed by the existing and projected future population to maintain adopted level of service (LOS) standards. The City shall consider performance standards as well as legal and equitable impact fees, where appropriate, to ensure that new developments cover the costs of needed to maintain the adopted LOS for facilities and services based upon the impacts of the development.

The capital improvement program and budgeting process provides an on-going process for planning and review of the City's capital outlays, including their location, timing, estimated cost, relative priority, and potential funding sources. Capital outlays are approved only by the City Commission.

Policy 8-1.1.2: Capital Improvement Program Criteria. The term "capital improvement", as used in the Comprehensive plan, is defined as a project that is self-contained and that will usually be constructed or purchased as a unit. Capital improvements generally include only those items constructed or purchased that have a useful life extending beyond a 10-year period following their acquisition, and usually involve a cost in excess of \$25,000 or involve the acquisition or disposal of land regardless of cost. Minor recurring annual expense items including routine maintenance and repairs are excluded. All projects that are to be financed from bond funds are included. Similarly, preliminary engineering studies for public facilities such as the design improvements to the transportation, water, wastewater, public school facilities and drainage systems are generally itemized as capital expenditure items due to their significant cost and their impact on the capital improvement program. The capital improvement program and budget is concerned with the assessment of need, assignment of priorities, and efficient allocation of the City's existing and potential fiscal resources for major community improvements or acquisitions over a five to 10-year period. The fundamental purposes of the capital improvement programming are as follows:

- a. To consolidate and coordinate all the various departmental requests by taxing district with the hope of reducing delays and coordinating individual improvement programs.
- b. To establish a system of procedures and priorities by which each proposal can be evaluated in terms of public needs, long range development plans, and short and long-term fiscal management impacts.
- c. To schedule future capital outlay projects pursuant to identified needs and priorities.

- d. To set forth a financing program that identifies potential funding sources, including but not limited to ad valorem taxes/general obligation bonds; user fees/revenue of excise tax bonds; grant programs; equitable contributions (exactions, such as impact fees) as well as performance standards and other components of a growth management program which may be used as fiscal strategies for obtaining needed capital improvements in developing areas.
- e. To coordinate joint projects involving participation by one or more local governments, as well as regional, state, or federal agencies.

Policy 8-1.1.3: Utilize Capital Improvement Program and Budget as a Plan Implementation Device. The capital improvement program shall be used for achieving orderly urban growth and development. By providing a planned and reasonably reliable schedule of public projects, the capital improvement program and budget shall provide a guide for both public and private capital investment decisions influencing community development patterns. The capital improvement programming and budgeting process is the primary tool for closely coordinating land use planning and fiscal management required to successfully carry out the Comprehensive Plan.

Policy 8-1.1.4: Program Availability and Scheduling of Capital Improvements. The City shall include within the Five-Year Capital Improvement Program all capital improvements which are identified in any of the respective elements of the City's Comprehensive Plan. The Five-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and annual capital budget shall be prepared by the City and the CIP and budget shall be adopted by the City Commission.

In the case of the capital improvement program for public school facilities, the City relies on the School Board's obligation to prepare, adopt and implement a financially feasible capital facilities program to achieve public schools operating at the adopted LOS consistent with the timing specified in the Board's Capital Facilities Plan.

Policy 8-1.1.5: Prioritize Capital Improvements. In allocating priorities for scheduling and funding capital improvement needs, the City shall assign highest priority to capital improvement projects in the Five-Year Capital Improvement which are designed to correct existing deficiencies and maintain the adopted LOS standards for public facilities.

Policy 8-1.1.6: Draft and Rank Capital Improvement Priorities. The City Manager shall have the authority and responsibility to evaluate and recommend a rank order of priority for each capital improvement is proposed for inclusion in the Five-Year Capital Improvement Program. The City Commission shall retain its authority to adopt the recommendations of the Planning and Zoning Commission, with or without modifications to the proposed Five-Year Capital Improvement Program.

Policy 8-1.1.7: Evaluate and Rank Capital Improvement Projects. Proposed capital improvement projects shall be evaluated and ranked according to the following priority level guidelines:

- a. "Level 1": Whether the project is needed to:
 - Protect public health and safety.
 - Fulfill the City's legal commitment to provide facilities and services.
 - Preserve or achieve full use of existing facilities.

- b. "Level 2": Whether the project accomplishes the following:
- Increases efficiency of existing facilities.
 - Prevents or reduces future improvement costs.
 - Provides service to developed areas lacking full service or promotes in-fill development.
- c. "Level 3": Whether the project:
- Represents a logical extension of facilities and services in a manner consistent with future Land Use Element goals, objectives and policies, including the Future Land Use Map.

The applicable plans of state agencies and the St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD) shall be part of the evaluation criteria for capital improvement projects.

Policy 8-1.1.8: Coordinate Capital Improvements with School District. The City shall adopt the capacity portions of the annual School Board's Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan into the Capital Improvement Element of the Comprehensive Plan each year. By adopting the capacity portions of the Seminole County Public School's Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan in the Capital Improvement Element of the City's Comprehensive Plan, Sanford shall have neither the obligation nor the responsibility for funding or implementing the School Board Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan.

Objective 8-1.2: Require Future Developments to Bear Proportionate Costs Infrastructure Impacts. Future development shall bear a proportionate cost for facility improvements necessitated by the development in order to maintain adopted LOS standards. This objective shall be measured through the implementation of the following policies.

Policy 8-1.2.1: Require Funding Transportation Fees for New Development. The City shall participate in the Seminole County traffic impact fee program for purposes of assisting the funding of new or improved roadways and intersection improvements required to accommodate traffic impacts of new development. The traffic impact fee program assesses new development a pro-rata share of costs required to fund transportation improvement needs generated by such development.

Policy 8-1.2.2: Supplement Transportation Funding. The local option gas tax and other funding measures that may be made available to the City shall be used to supplement impact fees and fund non-County-maintained transportation improvements.

Policy 8-1.2.3: Require Recreation Impact Fees for New Development. The City shall continue to enforce the City's recreation impact fee which shall require that new development pay a pro-rata for recreational land and facility needs generated by the respective developments.

Policy 8-1.2.4: Require Water and Wastewater Impacts Fees for New Development. The City shall continue assessing impact fees from new development for water and wastewater facility improvements necessitated by the respective development. The land development regulations shall continue to incorporate performance criteria assuring that all new development provide water and wastewater improvements to meet the adopted LOS standards.

Policy 8-1.2.5: Fund Drainage Improvements. The City shall continue to correct deficiencies in the drainage system through the implementation of identified capital improvements projects, and by maintaining the stormwater utility district as a dedicated funding source for drainage improvements. The City shall continue to comply with the standards for discharge authorized by EPA permit No. FLS 000038, or its successor under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System. The City will continue to include projects in the Five-Year Capital Improvement Program when needed to maintain adopted LOS standards for drainage.

Policy 8-1.2.6: Collect School Impact Fees. The City shall continue to collect impact fees imposed by the School Board to fund public school facility needs generated by new development.

Objective 8-1.3: Manage Fiscal Resource. The City shall manage fiscal resources to ensure provision of needed capital improvements for approved development orders and for future development and redevelopment.

Policy 8-1.3.1: Ensure Availability of Adequate Public Facilities. The City shall issue no development order for new development which would result in an increase in demand on deficient facilities prior to completion of improvements needed to achieve the adopted LOS standard. The City shall include an adequate facilities requirement as part of the concurrency management regulations within the land development regulations.

The provisions governing adequate facilities shall mandate that future applications for development shall include a written evaluation of the impact of the anticipated development on the LOS for the water and wastewater systems, solid waste system, drainage, recreation, public school facilities, and the traffic circulation system. Prior to issuing a building permit, the City shall render a finding that the applicant has provided written assurance that the proposed development shall be served with each of the above cited facilities. The written statement shall ensure compliance with the City's adopted LOS standards. The application for development shall include written assurances that any required improvements shall be in place concurrent with the impacts of the development (i.e., by the time a building permit is granted by the City).

Policy 8-1.3.2: Indebtedness. For capital improvements, the City shall limit its maximum ratio of outstanding general obligation indebtedness to no greater than 1.5 percent of the property tax base. The City shall restrict maximum ratio of total debt service to total revenue to a ratio of 50 percent. In funding capital improvements, the City shall use revenue bonds as opposed to general obligation bonds when possible. The City does not limit the use of revenue bonds as compared to total debt.

Policy 8-1.3.3: Adopt Capital Improvements Program. The City shall prepare and adopt a Five-Year Capital Improvement Program and annual capital budget as part of its budgeting process. The Five-Year Capital Improvement Program shall be annually updated and those projects required to maintain LOS standards shall be adopted as part of this Element.

Policy 8-1.3.4: Correct Transportation Deficiencies. Road improvements required to correct existing deficiencies in adopted LOS standards shall be included in the Five-Year Capital Improvement Program. Improvements funded by FDOT, Metroplan, Seminole County, or other governmental entity, and which occur on roadways within the City shall also be included.

Policy 8-1.3.5: Correct Drainage System Deficiencies. Stormwater drainage system LOS deficiencies shall be included in the City's Five-Year Capital Improvement Program in order to meet the adopted LOS standard.

Policy 8-1.3.6: Plan New Public Schools. New public schools within the City shall be planned for through cooperation and in conjunction with the parties to the *2007 Interlocal Agreement for Public School Facility Planning and School Concurrency, as amended in January 2008*.

Policy 8-1.3.7: Pursue Available Grants. The City shall continue to pursue available grants such as the Community Development Block Grant Fund in coordination with Seminole County public facility revolving loan programs administered through the Department of Environmental Regulation; the Land and Water Conservation Fund; and other public or private grants programs in order to finance the provision of needed capital improvements.

Objective 8-1.4: Manage Concurrency. The City's concurrency management system shall ensure that facilities and services needed to support development are available concurrent with the impacts of such development and maintain LOS at or above the adopted standards. Prior to the approval of a building permit or its functional equivalent, the City shall determine whether adequate water supplies to serve the new development will be available no later than the anticipated date of issuance of the City of a certificate of occupancy or its functional equivalent. Acreage for parks and recreation shall be dedicated by the development or acquired by the City or necessary funds provided as part of a developer's proportionate fair share, before the City may issue a certificate of occupancy or its equivalent. Facilities for parks and recreation shall be in place or under construction within one year of the City issuing a certificate of occupancy or its equivalent. Within three years of the City approving a building permit or its equivalent, necessary transportation facilities needed to serve new development shall be in place.

Policy 8-1.4.1 Maintain LOS Standards. In order to ensure that future development maintains the adopted LOS standards, the City shall issue no development order or permit for development unless the applicant provides narrative and graphic information demonstrating to the satisfaction of the City that the adopted LOS standards for public facilities, including roads, water and wastewater services, drainage, solid waste, public schools and recreation will be maintained and that improvement needs shall be planned.

Policy 8-1.4.2: Implement Concurrency Management. The Land Development Code shall further implement the concurrency management. Development review procedures shall contain evaluation criteria to determine whether public facility capacity is or will be available according to the adopted LOS standards.

Policy 8-1.4.3: Resolve Concurrency Issues. In order to implement the above measures, the City shall require that all developments requiring a development permit (as defined in Section 163.3164, F.S.) shall at the time the subject permit application is filed submit information which demonstrates that all urban services needed by the proposed development can and will be provided concurrent with the new development. In addition, all determine whether there will be adequate water supplies to serve the new development no later than the anticipated date of development order issuance or its functional equivalent, prior to approval of a building permit. All the developments are subject to the City's Concurrency Management system. The City will keep track of the total of current demands and outstanding commitments, and determine the availability of adequate water supply prior to the approval of the proposed development.

In order to establish an orderly review process, the City shall refine the land development regulations by stipulating specific narrative and/or graphic data and information required at the time a development plan application is filed with the City. At a minimum, the information shall include the following:

- The specific land use(s) and the proposed density and/or intensity of the land use;
- Estimated trips per day and per peak hour, peak direction generated by the proposed land use(s) together with anticipated on and off-site improvements needed to accommodate the traffic impacts generated by the development including, additional R/W, roadway improvements, additional paved lanes, traffic signalization, proposed methods for controlling access and egress, and other similar improvements;
- Planned improvements in potable water and/or wastewater systems required to establish and/or maintain adopted water and wastewater LOS. System improvements and proposed funding resources required for implementing any improvements required to establish and/or maintain adopted potable water and wastewater system LOS standards;
- Conceptual plan for accommodating stormwater run-off and demonstrated evidence that the proposed drainage improvements shall accommodate stormwater run-off without adversely impacting natural systems or the City's adopted LOS for storm drainage;
- In cases where residential development is proposed, information shall be submitted describing plans for accommodating recreational demands generated by the development, including demonstrated evidence that the City's adopted LOS for recreation shall not be adversely impacted;
- Projected demand generated by the development on the solid waste disposal system and assurances that the City's adopted LOS for solid waste disposal shall not be adversely impacted;
- A School Impact Analysis projecting the demand generated by the development for permanent student stations within the public school facilities system based on student generation rates provided by the school administration and a School Capacity Availability Letter Determination issued by the School Board;
- Other information which the City determines is necessary to assure that the concurrency requirement shall be satisfied without adversely impacting LOS or the City's ability to adequately service anticipated developments which are consistent with adopted plans and policies of the City.

All such information submitted pursuant to this subsection shall incorporate proposed funding sources, including any identification of improvements which the applicant anticipates shall be funded by the City or other public or private entity other than the applicant.

Policy 8-1.4.4: Stipulate De Minimis Impacts for Roadways. A proposed development may be deemed to have a de minimis impact on roadways and may not be subject to concurrency requirements if the de minimis impacts are defined within the Land Development Code. For a development to qualify as a de minimis impact, the Land Development Code must stipulate conditions compatible with Section 163.3180(6), F.S.

Policy 8-1.4.5: Consider Transportation Concurrency Exception(s). All new development and redevelopment occurring within the Downtown/Waterfront and US 17-92 Corridor Transportation Concurrency Exception Areas may be authorized for exceptions to transportation concurrency requirements.

Policy 8-1.4.6: Assess Transportation Concurrency. The Concurrency Management System shall assess transportation impacts for new development or redevelopment according to the minimum standards listed below. These minimum standards shall be incorporated into the Land Development Code.

- a. LOS standard shall be based upon peak hour, peak direction trips.
- b. Roads analyzed shall include roads located within one mile of the project site.
- c. Uniform methodology for analyzing transportation concurrency shall be provided within the Land Development Code and shall be consistent with methodologies established within the FDOT LOS Guidelines Manual, Highway Capacity Manual, or other methodology consistent with transportation professional standards.
- d. Traffic generation rates used for concurrency analysis shall be based upon the most recent published edition of the Trip Generation manual prepared by the Institute of Transportation Engineers or by an independent study accepted by the City.

Policy 8-1.4.7: Maintain Consistency with Other Transportation Plans. Update of the Five-Year Capital Improvement Program shall identify multi-modal transportation system projects, including those completed by FDOT, Metroplan, Seminole County, and other agency transportation plans, as appropriate.

Policy 8-1.4.8: Coordinate US 17-92 Corridor Redevelopment Plan. All planned capital improvement projects along or adjacent to the US 17-92 Corridor shall be coordinated with the US 17-92 (CRA) Corridor Redevelopment Plan to ensure consistency between this Comprehensive Plan and the CRA. The US 17-92 CRA Plan is located within five jurisdictions and unincorporated Seminole County. In order for the US 17-92 CRA Plan to be successful, each jurisdiction shall comply with the plan's overall vision to ensure the success of the redevelopment plan.

Policy 8-1.4.9: Implement Public School Facility Concurrency. The City shall school concurrency using concurrency service area (CSA) boundaries adopted by the School Board. The CSA boundaries established by the School Board will be based on clustered attendance zones for each school type (elementary, middle and high school) based on adjacency and will be re-evaluated by the School Board, as needed. At the determination of the School Board, CSA maps may be modified from time to time, to maximize utilization of school capacity. The School Board shall transmit the proposed change request with supporting data and analysis to the City and the other local jurisdictions. The City, upon receipt of supporting data and analysis for the proposed modification shall review and submit comments to the School Board within 45 days.

General Provisions. The County, the Cities and the School Board shall ensure that the LOS Standard established for each school type is maintained.

- A. No site plan, final subdivision, or functional equivalent for new residential development may be approved by the County or Cities, unless the residential development is exempt from these requirements as provided in section 12.1(C) of the of the 2007 Interlocal Agreement for Public

School Facility Planning and School Concurrency (ILA) or until a School Capacity Availability Letter Determination (SCALD) has been issued by the School Board to the local government indicating that adequate school facilities exist.

- B. The City may condition the approval of the residential development to ensure that necessary school facilities are in place. This shall not limit the authority of a local government to deny a site plan, final subdivision or its functional equivalent, pursuant to its home rule regulatory powers.
- C. The following residential uses shall be considered exempt from the requirements of school concurrency:
 - 1. All residential lots of record at the time the School Concurrency implementing ordinance becomes effective.
 - 2. Any new residential development that has a site plan approval, final subdivision or the functional equivalent for a site specific development approval prior to the commencement date of the School Concurrency Program.
 - 3. Any amendment to any previously approved residential development, which does not increase the number of dwelling units or change the type of dwelling units (single-family, multi-family, etc.).
 - 4. Any age restricted community with no permanent residents under the age of 18. An age restricted community shall be subject to a restrictive covenant on all residential units limiting the age of permanent residents to 18 years and older.
- D. Upon request by a developer submitting a land development application with a residential component, the School Board shall issue a determination as to whether or not a development, lot or unit is exempt from the requirements of school concurrency and submit a copy of the determination to the local government within 10 days.

School Concurrency Application Review. The county, cities and the School Board shall administer the following application review process.

- A. Any developer submitting a development permit application (such as site plan or final subdivision) with a residential component that is not exempt under Section 12.1(C) of the ILA is subject to school concurrency and shall prepare and submit a School Impact Analysis (SIA) to the School Board for review.
- B. The SIA shall indicate the location of the development, the number of dwelling units by unit type (single-family detached, single family attached, multi-family, apartments), a phasing schedule (if applicable), and age restrictions for occupancy (if any). The School Board concurrency test shall follow the following steps:
 - 1. The developer shall submit a SIA to the School Board with a copy to the local government with jurisdiction over the proposed development. The completed SIA must be submitted a minimum of five working days but not more than 30 days prior to Development Application submittal to the local government. The School Board shall perform a sufficiency review on the SIA application. An incomplete SIA application will be returned to the Owner/Developer without processing. The School Board will have 20 working days to determine sufficiency

and complete the Test Review. The School Board may charge the applicant a non-refundable application fee payable to the School Board to meet the cost of review in accordance with Florida Statutes.

2. Each SIA application will be reviewed in the order in which it is received by the School Board.
3. If the available capacity of public schools for each type within the CSA [or contiguous CSAs as provided for in 12.3(C) of the ILA] containing the proposed project is equal to or greater than the proposed project's needed capacity, the concurrency test is passed. The School Board will issue a SCALD identifying the school capacity available to serve the proposed project and that said capacity has been encumbered for the proposed project for a period of one year. A capacity encumbrance fee will be established during the regulatory phase of this process.
4. If the available capacity of public schools for any type within the CSA (or contiguous CSAs as provided for in 12.3(C) of the ILA) containing the proposed project is less than the proposed project's needed capacity, the concurrency test is failed. The School Board will issue a SCALD and inform the developer. If capacity is not available the School Board will advise the developer of the following options:
 - a. Accept a 30-day encumbrance of available school capacity, and within the same 30 day period, amend the Development Application to balance it with the available capacity; or
 - b. Accept a 60-day encumbrance of available school capacity, and within the same 60 day period, negotiate with the School Board and the local government on a Proportionate Share Mitigation plan as outlined in Section 12.7 of the ILA; or
 - c. Appeal the results of the failed test pursuant to the provisions in Section 12.8 below; or
 - d. Withdraw the SIA application.
5. If no option under Section 12.2(B)(4) of the ILA is exercised by the developer within 45 days, then the application shall be deemed abandoned.

Methodology. The methodology for performing the concurrency test shall follow the steps outlined below:

- A. To determine a proposed development's projected students, the proposed development's projected number and type of residential units shall be converted into projected students for all schools of each type within the specific CSA using the adopted Student Generation Multiplier, as established in the most current adopted Seminole County BCC Public School Impact Fee Ordinance.
- B. New school capacity within a CSA which is in place or under actual construction in the first three years of the School Board's Capital Improvement Plan will be added to the capacity shown in the CSA, and is counted as available capacity for the residential development under review.
- C. If the projected student growth from a residential development causes the adopted LOS to be exceeded in the CSA, an adjacent CSA which is contiguous with and touches the boundary of,

the concurrency service area within which the proposed development is located shall be evaluated for available capacity. An adjacency evaluation review shall be conducted as follows:

1. In conducting the adjacency review, the School Board shall first use the adjacent CSA with the most available capacity to evaluate projected enrollment impact and, if necessary, shall continue to the next adjacent CSA with the next most available capacity.
2. Consistent with Rule 6A-3.0171, F.A.C., at no time shall the shift of impact to an adjacent CSA result in a total morning or afternoon transportation time of either elementary or secondary students to exceed 50 minutes or one hour, respectively. The transportation time shall be determined by the School Board transportation routing system and measured from the school the impact is to be assigned, to the center of the subject parcel/plat in the amendment application, along the most direct improved public roadway free from major hazards.

Reserved Capacity. School capacity will be reserved when there is a final disposition of the Development Application by the local government. If the local government approves the Development Application by means of a Development approval, or its equivalent, the School Board shall move the school capacity from encumbered status to reserved status for the proposed project. This reserved capacity is held for a period of one year from the date of the Development approval, or the issuance of a building permit, whichever occurs first. If the building permit once issued expires under the development regulations of the local government, the project will lose its reserved capacity. When the local government issues a Development approval for a residential project it shall notify the School Board within 10 working days.

School Concurrency Approval. Issuance of a SCALD by the School Board identifying that adequate capacity exists indicates only that school facilities are currently available, and capacity will not be reserved until the local government issues development approval.

- A. A local government shall not issue a development approval for a residential development until receiving confirmation of available school capacity in the form of a SCALD from the School Board. The Development approval shall include a reference to the findings of the SCALD indicating that the project meets school concurrency. Once the local government has issued a Development approval, school concurrency for the residential development shall be valid for one year from the date of issuance of the Development approval. Expiration, extension or modification of a Development approval for a residential development shall require a new review for adequate school capacity to be performed by the School Board.
- B. Local governments shall notify the School Board within 10 working days of any official change in the validity (status) of a Development approval for a residential development.
- C. The Local Government shall not issue a building permit or its functional equivalent for a non-exempt residential development until receiving confirmation of available school capacity from the School Board in the form of a SCALD. Once the local government has issued a final development approval, school concurrency for the residential development shall be valid for the life of the final development approval.

Development Review Table. The School Board shall create and maintain a Development Review Table (DRT) for each CSA, and will use the DRT to compare the projected students from proposed residential developments to the CSAs available capacity programmed within the first three years of

the current five-year capital planning period.

- A. Student enrollment projections shall be based on the most recently adopted School Board Capital Facilities Work Program, and the DRT shall be updated to reflect these projections. Available capacity shall be derived using the following formula:

$$\text{Available Capacity} = \text{School Capacity}^1 - (\text{Enrollment}^2 + \text{Approved}^3)$$

Where:

¹School Capacity = Permanent School Capacity as programmed in the first three years of the School Board's Five-Year CIP.

²Enrollment = Student enrollment as counted at the Fall FTE.

³Approved = Students generated from approved residential developments after the implementation of school concurrency.

- B. Using the Fall FTE, the vested number of students on the DRT will be reduced by the number of students represented by the residential units that received certificates of occupancy within the previous 12 month period.

Policy 8-1.4.10: Proportionate Share Mitigation Options for Public School Concurrency. In the event there is no available school capacity to support a development, the School Board shall entertain proportionate share mitigation options and, if accepted, shall enter into an enforceable and binding agreement with the developer to mitigate the impact from the development through the creation of additional school capacity.

- A. When the anticipated student impacts from a proposed development cause the adopted LOS to be exceeded, the developer's proportionate share will be based on the number of additional student stations necessary to achieve the established LOS. The amount to be paid will be calculated by the cost per student station for elementary, middle and high school as determined and published by the State of Florida.
- B. The methodology used to calculate a developer's proportionate share mitigation shall be as follows:

$$\text{Proportionate Share} = \frac{(\text{Development students} - \text{Available Capacity}) \times 2}{\text{Total Cost per student station}}$$

Where:

¹Development students = those students from the development that are assigned to a CSA and have triggered a deficiency of the available capacity.

²Total Cost = the cost per student station as determined and published by the State of Florida.

- C. The applicant shall be allowed to enter a 90 day negotiation period with the School Board in an effort to mitigate the impact from the development through the creation of additional capacity. Upon identification and acceptance of a mitigation option deemed financially feasible by the School Board, the developer shall enter into a binding and enforceable development agreement with the School Board.
 - 1. A mitigation contribution provided by a developer to offset the impact of a residential development must be directed by the School Board toward a school capacity project identified in the School Board's Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan. Capacity enhancing projects identified within the first three years of the Five-Year Capital

Improvement Plan shall be considered as committed in accordance with Section 9.5 of the 2007 Interlocal Agreement for Public School Facility Planning and School Concurrency.

2. If capacity projects are planned in years four or five of the School Board's Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan within the same CSA as the proposed residential development, the developer may pay his proportionate share to mitigate the proposed development in accordance with the formula provided in Section 12.7(B) of the 2007 Interlocal Agreement for Public School Facility Planning and School Concurrency.
3. If a capacity project does not exist in the Capital Improvement Plan, the School Board will add a capacity project to satisfy the impacts from a proposed residential development, if it is funded through the developer's proportionate share mitigation contributions. Mitigation options may include, but are not limited to:
 - a. Contribution of land or payment for land acquisition suitable for and in conjunction with, the provision of additional school capacity; or
 - b. Mitigation banking based on the construction of a educational facility in exchange for the right to sell capacity credits; or
 - c. Provide modular or permanent student stations acceptable for use as an educational facilities; or
 - d. Provide additional student stations through the remodeling of existing buildings acceptable for use as an educational facility; or
 - e. Construction or expansion of permanent student stations at the impacted school within the CSA; or
 - f. Construction of an educational facility in advance of the time set forth in the School Board's Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan.
- D. For mitigation measures (a) thru (f) above, the estimated cost to construct the mitigating capacity will reflect the estimated future construction costs at the time of the anticipated construction. Improvements contributed by the developer shall receive school impact fee credit.
- E. Developer shall receive an impact fee credit for the proportionate share mitigation. Credits will be given for that portion of the impact fees that would have been used to fund the improvements on which the proportionate fair share contribution was calculated. The portion of impact fees available for the credit will be based on the historic distribution of impact fee funds to the school type (elementary, middle, high) in the appropriate CSA. Impact fee credits shall be calculated at the same time as the applicant's proportionate share obligation is calculated. Any school impact fee credit based on proportionate fair share contributions for a proposed development cannot be transferred to any other parcel or parcels of real property within the CSA.
- F. A proportionate share mitigation contribution shall not be subsequently amended or refunded after final site plan or plat approval to reflect a reduction in planned or constructed residential density.

- G. Impact fees shall be credited against the proportionate share mitigation total.
- H. Any proportionate share mitigation must be directed by the School Board toward a school capacity improvement identified in the School Board’s Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan.
- I. Upon conclusion of the negotiation period, a second Determination Letter shall be issued. If mitigation is agreed to, the School Board shall issue a new Determination Letter approving the development subject to those mitigation measures agreed to by the local government, developer and the School Board. Prior to, site plan approval, final subdivision approval or the functional equivalent, the mitigation measures shall be memorialized in an enforceable and binding agreement with the local government, the School Board and the Developer that specifically details mitigation provisions to be paid for by the developer and the relevant terms and conditions. If mitigation is not agreed to, the Determination Letter shall detail why any mitigation proposals were rejected and why the development is not in compliance with school concurrency requirements. A SCALD indicating either that adequate capacity is available, or that there is not a negotiated proportionate share mitigation settlement following the 90 day negotiation period as described in Section 12.7(C) of the 2007 Interlocal Agreement for Public School Facility Planning and School Concurrency, constitutes final agency action by the School Board for purposes of Chapter 120, F.S.

Appeal Process. A person substantially affected by a School Board’s adequate capacity determination made as a part of the School Concurrency Process may appeal such determination through the process provided in Chapter 120, F.S.

Objective 8-1.5: Require Development Orders and Permits Comply with Concurrency Management, LOS Standards, and Capital Improvement Schedule. Decisions regarding the issuance of development orders, building permits, certificates of occupancy, and other applicable permits shall be consistent with goals, objectives, and policies of the respective Comprehensive Plan elements, the City’s adopted land development regulations, and requirements for adequate public facilities meeting stated levels of service criteria.

The City shall ensure that land use decisions and fiscal decisions are coordinated with the adopted schedule of capital improvements to maintain adopted LOS standards and meet existing and future needs. An applicant for development shall be required to ensure that public facilities shall be available concurrent with the impacts of development. An applicant/developer shall be issued a development order only if the following policies are met, as determined by the City:

Policy 8-1.5.1: Enforce LOS Standards. All facilities shall be assigned the appropriate adopted LOS standards for each public facility. New development orders and permits shall be issued only if they maintain the adopted LOS standards. The City shall use the following LOS standards in reviewing the impacts of new development and redevelopment upon public facilities:

Facility/Service		LOS Standard
Solid Waste	Osceola Landfill	4.2 lbs/capita/day
	Central Transfer Station	4.3 lbs/capita/day

Facility/Service		LOS Standard
Wastewater System		132 gal/capita/day
Potable Water System		144 gal/capita/day
Fire flow	Residential	600 gpm/20 psi
	Non-residential	1200 gpm/20 psi
Drainage System By Facility Type	Retention/Detention for parcels with positive outfall ⁽²⁾	25-Year, 24-Hour
	Retention for parcels without positive outfall	25-Year, 96-Hour
	Closed drainage for urban streets with piped drainage	10-Year, 24-Hour
	Open drainage for rural streets with swales	10-Year, 24-Hour
	Canals, ditches, culverts, and other off-the-premise facilities	25-Year, 24-Hour
	Bridges and major highway crossings	100-Year, 24-Hour
Pollution Abatement		Schedule O, Land Development Regulations
Water Quality		Provide on-site retention or detention with filtration for the first one-half inch of runoff or the runoff from the first one inch of rainfall, whichever is greater. Parcels greater than 100 acres shall retain runoff from the first one inch of rainfall.
		All storm water treatment and disposal facilities shall be required to meet the design and performance standards established in Chapter 62, F.A.C.

Facility/Service		LOS Standard
		Treatment of the first inch of run-off on-site to meet water quality standards required by Chapter 62, F.A.C.
		Designed so as not to degrade the receiving water body below the minimum conditions necessary to assure the suitability of water for the designated use of its classification as established in Chapter 62, F.A.C. Where a conflict exists between two or more LOS standards, the more restrictive shall be enforced.
Roadways		
All City Collectors		LOS D
All County collectors and minor arterials that are not within a County designated urban center		LOS D
All County collectors and minor arterials that are within an area designated as I-4 High intensity, Westside Industry and Commerce, and Airport Industry and Commerce		LOS E
All state principal arterials other than freeways that are not classified as backlogged or constrained		LOS D
Exceptions	US 17-92 ⁽³⁾	LOS E
	US 17-92 ⁽³⁾ from Lake Mary Boulevard to Airport Boulevard	LOS F with acceptable traffic volumes consistent with LOS E for a 6-lane roadway (i.e., 51,800 daily; 4,920 peak hour two-way; and 2,710 peak hour peak direction)
Limited Access Roadways	I-4	LOS D
	SR 417	LOS D
State minor arterials within the urbanized area		LOS E
State minor arterials outside the urbanized area		LOS D

Facility/Service		LOS Standard
Recreation Areas		4 acres per 1,000 population
Public School Facilities		
School Type	2008 - 2012	Beginning 2013
Elementary & Middle CSA	100% of Permanent FISH Capacity	100% of Permanent FISH Capacity
High School CSA	110% of Permanent FISH Capacity	100% of Permanent FISH Capacity

- (1) The design frequency may be increased if deemed necessary by the Public Works Department.
- (2) Mill Creek/Cloud Branch basins shall have a 25-year, 6-hour retention/detention for parcels with positive outfall since these basins are currently incorporate significantly older drainage systems. For purposes of designing practical improvements to such older systems, the City shall adopt a 25-year, 6-hour storm event for the period 1991-1995. The City's long term objective for redesigning these older drainage systems shall be the 25-year, 24-hour storm event for the period 1996-2005.
- (3) The City may grant exceptions to the transportation concurrency requirements for future development projects within the City's two TCEAs, US 17-92 and Downtown Sanford. The section of US 17-92 from Lake Mary Boulevard to Airport Boulevard has a defined capacity as provided in the table above.

Policy 8-1.5.2: Enforce Potable Water, Sewer, Solid Waste, Drainage Concurrency Requirements. For potable water, sanitary sewer, solid waste, drainage, the City shall ensure the following criteria have been met in order for a proposed development to be found in compliance with concurrency management requirements:

- a. Facilities and services must be in place or under construction at the time a development order or permit is issued. If the facilities will be under construction at the time a development order or permit is issued, the final development order is issued subject to the condition that such facilities must be in place and operational before or at the time of the issuance of a certificate of occupancy or its functional equivalent. No certificate of occupancy will be issued unless the necessary potable water, sewer, solid waste and drainage facilities and services are in place and available to serve the new development and its occupants.
- b. At the time the final development order is issued, the necessary facilities and services are guaranteed in a binding executed development agreement, pursuant to Section 163.3220, F.S. or an agreement or development order issued pursuant to Chapter 380, F.S., to be in place and available to serve new development at the time of the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

Policy 8-1.5.3: Regulate Parks and Recreation Facilities Criteria. For parks and recreation facilities, at a minimum, the City shall find ensure following criteria have been met in order for a proposed development to be found in compliance with concurrency management requirements:

- a. At the time the final development order is issued, the necessary facilities and services are in place; or

- b. At the time the development permit is issued, the necessary facilities and services are the subject of a binding executed contract which provides for the commencement of the actual construction of the required facilities or the provision of services within one year of the issuance of the development permit; or
- c. The necessary facilities and services are guaranteed in an enforceable development agreement which requires the commencement of the actual construction of the facilities or the provision of services within one of the issuance of the applicable development permit. An enforceable development agreement may include, but is not limited to, development agreements pursuant to Section 163.3220, F.S., or an agreement or development order issued pursuant to Chapter 380, F.S.

Policy 8-1.5.4: Regulate Transportation Criteria. For roadways, the City shall ensure the following criteria have been met in order for a proposed development to be found in compliance with concurrency management requirements:

- a. At the time the final development order is issued, the necessary facilities and services are in place or under actual construction; or
- b. A final development order is issued subject to the conditions that the necessary facilities and services needed to serve the new development are scheduled to be in place or under actual construction not more than three years after issuance of a certificate of occupancy as provided in the City's adopted Five-Year Capital Improvement Program. The CIP may recognize and include transportation projects included in the first three years of the adopted Florida Department of Transportation Five-Year work program. The Capital Improvement Program must include the estimated fiscal year of commencement of actual construction and the estimated fiscal year the project will be completed. A plan amendment is required to eliminate, defer, or delay construction of any road or mass transit facility or service which is needed to maintain the adopted LOS standard and which is listed in the Five-Year Capital Improvement Program; or
- c. At the time the final development order is issued, the necessary facilities and services are the subject of a binding executed agreement which requires the necessary facilities and services to serve the new development to be in place or under actual construction not more than three years after issuance of a certificate of occupancy; or
- d. At the time the final development order is issued, the necessary facilities and services are guaranteed in an enforceable development agreement, pursuant to section 163.3220, F.S., or an agreement or development order issued pursuant to Chapter 380, F.S., to be in place or under actual construction not more than three years after issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

Policy 8-1.5.5: Provide Adequate Public School Facilities. For public school facilities, in compliance with the availability standards of Section 163.3180(13)(e), F.S., at a minimum, the City shall find that the following criteria have been met in order for a proposed development to be found in compliance with concurrency management requirements:

- Adequate school facilities are planned and will be in place or under construction within three years of the development approval.

- The developer executes a legally binding commitment to provide mitigation proportionate to the demand for public school facilities consistent with the methodology in the *2007 Interlocal Agreement for Public School Facility Planning and School Concurrency for Coordinated Planning and School Concurrency*.

Policy 8-1.5.6: Coordinate Concurrency with the Capital Improvements Program. In areas in which the City of Sanford commits to provide the necessary public facilities and services in accordance with its Five-Year Capital Improvement Program the concurrency requirement for roads may be met by the adoption and implementation of a concurrency management system based upon an adequate capital improvements program and schedule and adequate implementing regulations which, at a minimum, include the following provisions:

- a. A Capital Improvement Element and a Five-Year Capital Improvement Program which, in addition to meeting all of the other statutory and rule requirements, must be financially feasible. The Capital Improvement Element and schedule of capital improvements may recognize and include transportation projects included in the first three years of the applicable adopted Florida Department of Transportation Five Year Work Program.
- b. Committed improvements which are relied upon to meet concurrency and which are funded by the City, Seminole County, or the Florida Department of Transportation must be scheduled within the first three years of the capital improvements program for the respective government agency. A committed improvement scheduled in the first three years of the City's capital improvements program shall not be delayed, eliminated or removed from said program except through the act of a comprehensive plan amendment.
- c. A Five-Year Capital Improvement Program which must include both necessary facilities to maintain the adopted level of service standards to serve the new development proposed to be permitted and the necessary facilities required to eliminate those portions of existing deficiencies which are a priority to be eliminated during the five-year period under the local government plan's schedule of capital improvements pursuant to Rule 9J-5.016(4)(a)1, F.A.C.
- d. A realistic, financially feasible funding system based on currently available revenue sources which must be adequate to fund the public facilities required to serve the development authorized by the development order and development permit and which public facilities are included in the Five-Year Capital Improvement Program.
- e. A Five-Year Capital Improvement Program which must include the estimated date of commencement of actual construction and the estimated date of project completion.
- f. A Five-Year Capital Improvement Program which must demonstrate that the actual construction of the road and the provision of services are scheduled to commence within the third year of the five-year timeframe.
- g. A provision that a plan amendment would be required to eliminate, defer or delay construction of any road which is needed to maintain the adopted level of service standard and which is listed in the Five-Year Capital Improvement Program.
- h. A requirement that the local government must adopt local development regulations which, in conjunction with the capital improvements element, ensure that development orders and permits are issued in a manner that will assure that the necessary public facilities and services will be available to accommodate the impact of that development.

- i. A provision that a monitoring system shall be adopted which enables the local government to determine whether it is adhering to the adopted level of service standards and its schedule of capital improvements and that the local government has a demonstrated capability of monitoring the availability of public facilities and services.
- j. A clear designation within the adopted comprehensive plan of those areas within which facilities and services will be provided by the local government with public funds in accordance with the Five-Year Capital Improvement Program.

In determining the availability of services or facilities, a developer may propose and the City of Sanford may approve developments in stages or phases so that facilities and services needed for each phase will be available in accordance with the standards required by Rules 9J-5.0055(2)(a), (2)(b) and (2)(c), F.A.C.

If any change in the Comprehensive Plan future land use map is proposed, no such amendment shall be approved until the impacts of proposed new land use activities on existing infrastructure as well as infrastructure included in the City's adopted capital improvement program have been identified and evaluated. The plan amendment shall be approved only if the projected impacts have been resolved through amendments to the capital improvements program or through an enforceable development agreement which ensures that any public facility needs generated by the proposed change in land use shall be met concurrent with the impacts of development and that adopted LOS standards shall be met.

Policy 8-1.5.7: Ensure Availability of Adequate Facilities. The City shall issue no development order for new development which would result in a facility deficiency prior to completion of improvements needed to address the deficiency and maintain the adopted LOS standard. The City shall include an adequate facilities requirement as part of the updated land development regulations.

The provisions governing adequate facilities shall mandate that future applications for development shall include a written evaluation of the impact of the anticipated development on the LOS for the water and wastewater systems, solid waste system, drainage, recreation, public school facilities and the traffic circulation system. Prior to issuing a building permit the City shall render a finding that the applicant has provided written assurance that the proposed development shall be served with each of the above cited facilities with a LOS at least equal to the City's adopted LOS standards. The application for development shall include written assurances that any required improvements shall be in place concurrent with the impacts of the development.

Policy 8-1.5.8: Evaluate Criteria for Plan Amendments. Proposed Plan amendments and requests for new development or redevelopment shall be evaluated according to the following guidelines:

- a. Does the proposed action contribute to any condition of public hazard;
- b. Does the proposed action increase any existing condition of public facility capacity deficits, as described in the Traffic Circulation, Public Facilities, and/or Recreation and Open Space Elements;
- c. Does the proposed action generate public facility demands that may be accommodated by capacity increases planned in the Five-Year Capital Improvement Program;

- d. Does the proposed action conform with the future land uses designated on the Future Land Use Map within the Future Land Use Element;
- e. Does the proposed action comply with and accommodate public facility demands based on the adopted LOS standards contained herein;
- f. If the proposed action requires that any public facilities be provided by the City, the applicant shall demonstrate that funds shall be available; acceptable to the City; and no project requiring a City expenditure for a capital improvement shall be approved by the City unless the City Commission approves the funding for the subject property prior to the project approval;
- g. Does the proposed action impact facility plans of any State agencies or facility plans of the SJRWMD.

Objective 8-1.6: Implement Capital Improvements. This section stipulates a Five-Year Capital Improvement Program together with criteria for monitoring and evaluating the capital improvements element.

Policy 8-1.6.1: Establish Short Range Schedule of Improvements. The Five-Year Capital Improvement Program, contained herein, establishes the estimated projected cost, and potential revenue sources for each of the capital improvement needs identified within the respective comprehensive plan elements. These programs are scheduled in order to ensure that the goals, objectives, and policies established in the capital improvements element shall be met.

Policy 8-1.6.2: Adopt Local School District Capital Improvements. The City hereby adopts the 2009/2010 Five-year Capital Improvement Plan of the Seminole County Public Schools Annual School Budget prepared by John G. Pavelchak, Executive Director of Finance and Budgeting as formally adopted by the Seminole County School Board on September 8, 2009.

[This space intentionally left blank]

Five-Year Capital Improvement Program

<u>Department/Project</u>	<u>Revenue Source</u>	<u>FY 08/09</u>	<u>FY 09/10</u>	<u>FY 10/11</u>	<u>FY 11/12</u>	<u>FY 12/13</u>	<u>Total (FY 08/09 - FY 12/13)</u>
Capital Projects Fund- Revenues							
Communication Services Tax		\$750,000	-	-	-	-	\$750,000
Debt Proceeds		\$23,400,000	\$9,817,519	-	\$2,350,043	-	\$35,567,562
Contributions and Donations- Whippoorwill Court		\$50,000	-	-	-	-	\$50,000
Contributions and Donations- TFA Inc.- Northshore		\$177,000	-	-	-	-	\$177,000
Contributions and Donations- CRA- Northshore		\$177,000	-	-	-	-	\$177,000
Transfers from Impacts Fees- Recreation		\$301,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$1,501,000
Transfers from General Fund		\$3,523,670	\$3,000,000	\$3,089,420	\$5,000,000	\$1,385,897	\$15,998,987
Cash Carryforward- Ft. Mellon Park		\$600,000	-				\$600,000
Total Capital Funding		\$28,978,670	\$13,117,519	\$3,389,420	\$7,650,043	\$1,685,897	\$54,821,549
Capital Projects Fund- Expenditures							
Public Works							
Country Club Addition Street Sand Drainage	CPF	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$130,000	-	-	\$390,000
Marina Northshore Project	CPF	\$531,000	-	-	-	-	\$531,000
Whippoorwill Court	CPF	\$100,000	-	-	-	-	\$100,000
Total Public Works	CPF	\$761,000	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,021,000
Public Works- Parks and Grounds							
Westside Community Center	CPF	-	\$1,500,000	-	-	-	\$1,500,000
Eastside Community Center	CPF	-	\$660,000	-	\$4,000,000	-	\$4,660,000
Fort Mellon Park- Phase One	CPF	\$3,800,000	\$1,100,000	-	-	-	\$4,900,000
Chase Park	CPF	-	\$14,000	\$6,500	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$30,500
Grove View Park Fitness Trail	CPF	-	\$25,000	-	-	-	\$25,000
Riverwalk Phase II	CPF	-	\$5,500,000	-	-	-	\$5,500,000
Goldsboro Trail	CPF	\$395,000	-	-	-	-	\$395,000
Total Public Works- Parks and Grounds	CPF	\$4,195,000	\$8,799,000	\$6,500	\$4,005,000	\$5,000	\$17,010,500
Total Capital Projects Expenditures		\$4,956,000	\$8,929,000	\$136,500	\$4,005,000	\$5,000	\$18,031,500

<u>Department/Project</u>	<u>Revenue Source</u>	<u>FY 08/09</u>	<u>FY 09/10</u>	<u>FY 10/11</u>	<u>FY 11/12</u>	<u>FY 12/13</u>	<u>Total (FY 08/09 - FY 12/13)</u>
Special Revenue Funds							
Roads and Streets- Revenues							
Local Option Gas Tax (LOGT)		\$946,294	\$1,230,182	\$1,599,236	\$2,079,000	\$2,702,709	\$8,557,421
Sales Tax- Second Generation (STSG)							
Sales, Use and Fuel Tax		\$7,919,598	\$1,700,151	\$1,698,034	\$1,695,811	\$2,161,897	\$15,175,491
Interest		\$40,332	\$42,349	\$44,466	\$46,689	\$49,023	\$222,859
Revenue Total		\$8,906,224	\$2,972,682	\$3,341,736	\$3,821,500	\$4,913,629	\$23,955,771
Roads and Streets- Expenditures							
Street Rehabilitation Program	LOGT	\$946,294	\$1,230,182	\$1,599,236	\$2,079,000	\$2,702,709	\$8,557,421
Oleander Avenue (14th-18th)	STSG	\$566,470	-	-			\$566,470
North White Cedar/Church Street Improvements	STSG	\$2,123,530	-	-			\$2,123,530
Railroad Crossing Safety Improvements	STSG	\$264,500	\$264,500	\$264,500	\$264,500	\$264,500	\$1,322,500
St. Johns Parkway Phase II	STSG	\$3,527,430	-	-	-	-	\$3,527,430
New Sidewalk Program	STSG	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$500,000
Traffic Circulation Improvements	STSG	\$367,600	\$367,600	\$367,600	\$367,600	\$364,000	\$1,834,400
Roads and Streets- Total Expenditures		\$7,895,824	\$1,962,282	\$2,331,336	\$2,811,100	\$3,431,209	\$18,431,751
Community Redevelopment- Revenues							
Property Tax Increment- City		\$832,817	\$916,099	\$1,007,709	\$847,800	-	\$3,604,425
Property Tax Increment- County		\$678,349	\$746,184	\$336,891	-	-	\$1,761,424
Carryforward		\$372,834	\$334,517	-	-	-	\$707,351
Revenue Total		\$1,884,000	\$1,996,800	\$1,344,600	\$847,800	\$0	\$6,073,200
Community Redevelopment- Expenditures							
Intersection Improvements	Tax Increment	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	-	-	-	\$3,000,000
Community Redevelopment- Total Expenditures		\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	-	-	-	\$3,000,000
Storm Water							
Cloud Branch 13th St. Outfall Project	Stormwater Fees, Debt		\$4,272,594				\$4,272,594

<u>Department/Project</u>	<u>Revenue Source</u>	<u>FY 08/09</u>	<u>FY 09/10</u>	<u>FY 10/11</u>	<u>FY 11/12</u>	<u>FY 12/13</u>	<u>Total (FY 08/09 - FY 12/13)</u>
Cloud Branch Railroad Corridor Stormwater Improvements	Stormwater Fees, Debt	\$4,327,304					\$4,327,304
Southeast Outfall- final phase of stormwater master plan	Stormwater Fees, Debt		\$3,200,000				\$3,200,000
Holly, Cedar, Lake & Chase Av Drainage Project/Phase II	Stormwater Fees, Debt		\$20,000				\$20,000
Southwest Rd Drainage Improvements	Stormwater Fees, Debt			\$10,000			\$10,000
Driftwood Ln Drainage Project	Stormwater Fees, Debt	\$29,700					\$29,700
Holly, Cedar, Lake & Chase Av Drainage Project/Phase I	Stormwater Fees, Debt	\$20,000					\$20,000
Storm Water- Total Expenditures		\$4,377,004	\$7,492,594	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$11,879,598
Water/Wastewater Capital Improvement Plan							
Twin Lakes Water Well	Utility Fund	-	\$250,000	-	-	-	\$250,000
New Water Treatment Facility	Utility Fund	-	-	\$3,750,000	\$3,750,000	-	\$7,500,000
St. Johns Parkway WM (Meisch Rd to Airport Blvd)	Utility Fund	\$220,000	-	-	-	-	\$220,000
New Force Main Celery Ave	Utility Fund	-	-	\$2,280,000	-	-	\$2,280,000
Augmentation System- Mill Creek Pond and Pumping	Utility Fund	\$2,500,000	-	-	-	-	\$2,500,000
Augmentation System Improvements (City Share)	Utility Fund	\$210,000	-	-	-	-	\$210,000
New Reclaimed Water Main- SSWRC to Victoria St	Utility Fund	-	-	-	-	\$750,000	\$750,000
New Reclaimed Water Main- US 17-92 to SR 46	Utility Fund	-	-	-	-	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
St Johns Parkway RWM (Meisch Rd to Airport Rd)	Utility Fund	\$150,000	-	-	-	-	\$150,000
Altamonte Springs Interconnect	Utility Fund	-	\$500,000	-	-	-	\$500,000
Winter Springs Interconnect	Utility Fund	-	\$500,000	-	-	-	\$500,000
SCC Reclaimed Line Extension	Utility Fund	\$175,000	-	-	-	-	\$175,000
Wastewater Sludge Treatment Upgrade	Utility Fund	\$200,000	-	-	-	-	\$200,000
Actiflow- North Water Reclamation Facility	Utility Fund	\$500,000	-	-	-	-	\$500,000
Reclaimed Water Project	Utility Fund	-	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	-	\$150,000

<u>Department/Project</u>	<u>Revenue Source</u>	<u>FY 08/09</u>	<u>FY 09/10</u>	<u>FY 10/11</u>	<u>FY 11/12</u>	<u>FY 12/13</u>	<u>Total (FY 08/09 - FY 12/13)</u>
Denitrification Upgrade- North Water Resource	Utility Fund	\$800,000	\$100,000	-	-	-	\$900,000
Reclaimed Water Augmentation System	Utility Fund	-	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	-	\$1,500,000
Master Lift Station Pump Improvement	Utility Fund	\$500,000	-	-	-	-	\$500,000
Distribution Pump	Utility Fund	\$250,000	-	-	-	-	\$250,000
SCADA	Utility Fund	\$100,000	-	-	-	-	\$100,000
South Sewer Plan Improvements	Utility Fund	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$250,000
Lift Station Improvements	Utility Fund	-	\$50,000	\$100,000	\$150,000	-	\$300,000
Water/Wastewater- Total Expenditures		\$5,655,000	\$2,000,000	\$6,730,000	\$4,500,000	\$2,800,000	\$21,685,000
Metroplan Orlando Transportation Improvement Program 2007/08-2011/12							
<i>Highway Projects</i>							
US 17/92 from Shepard Rd. to Lake Mary Blvd, widen to 6 lanes (Preliminary Engineering) ¹	Federal transportation funds			\$200,000			\$200,000
US 17/92 from Shepard Rd. to Lake Mary Blvd, widen to 6 lanes (Right-of-way acquisition) ¹	State designated in-house funds				\$89,000		\$89,000
US 17/92 from Shepard Rd. to Lake Mary Blvd, widen to 6 lanes (Right-of-way acquisition) ¹	Federal transportation funds				\$1,789,000		\$1,789,000

1- Capital Project addressing existing deficiency

**2009-2010 FIVE (5) YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
SEMNOLE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

Tentative 5 Year Plan (August; Revised Sales Tax Revenue Forecast 8/5/09)

REVENUE	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	%
STATE						7.1%
CLASSROOMS FOR KIDS						0.0%
PBCO NEW CONSTRUCTION	\$0	\$323,138	\$1,016,488	\$408,884	\$1,308,979	1.1%
PBCO MAINTENANCE	\$826,004	\$3,833,837	\$3,437,174	\$3,436,177	\$3,889,139	5.9%
COLDS	\$288,380	\$288,380	\$288,380	\$288,380	\$288,380	0.8%
LOCAL						82.9%
1.88 MILL	\$42,380,068	\$48,888,983	\$47,882,878	\$48,888,188	\$52,738,778	86.9%
COPE						0.0%
SALES TAX	\$1,708,887	\$1,888,887	\$887,888			1.8%
IMPACT FEES	\$1,888,888	\$2,888,888	\$3,888,888	\$1,388,888	\$3,388,888	2.0%
GASOLINE TAX REFUND	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	0.2%
INTEREST	\$888,888	\$888,888	\$888,888	\$888,888	\$888,888	0.8%
SUB-TOTAL	\$47,887,736	\$53,448,888	\$56,352,888	\$54,888,888	\$58,788,888	
PRIOR YEAR CARRYOVER	\$4,888,818	\$4,888,818	\$3,388,888	\$2,448,884	\$881,888	
	\$52,776,554	\$58,337,706	\$59,741,776	\$57,337,772	\$59,670,776	

EXPENDITURES	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	%
SUPPORT GENERAL FUND						88.9%
CATASTROPHIC LOSS/MAINT RESERVE						0.0%
PROPERTY & CASUALTY PREMIUM		\$3,888,888	\$3,778,878	\$3,778,878	\$3,778,878	0.3%
MAINTENANCE	\$3,841,888	\$3,841,888	\$3,841,888	\$3,841,888	\$3,841,888	7.1%
SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL EQUIPT PURCH	\$888,888	\$888,888	\$888,888	\$888,888	\$888,888	1.2%
BUS REPLACEMENT	\$0	\$1,888,888	\$1,888,888	\$1,888,888	\$1,888,888	1.8%
VEHICLES	\$0	\$288,888	\$288,888	\$288,888	\$288,888	0.4%
FLOOR COVERING	\$288,888	\$288,888	\$288,888	\$288,888	\$288,888	0.4%
HVAC	\$2,888,888	\$1,888,888	\$1,888,888	\$1,888,888	\$1,888,888	2.3%
RENOV	\$0	\$1,888,888	\$1,888,888	\$1,888,888	\$1,888,888	1.8%
PAVEMENT	\$188,888	\$188,888	\$188,888	\$188,888	\$288,888	0.3%
PAINTING	\$188,888	\$288,888	\$288,888	\$288,888	\$288,888	0.4%
LEASED PORTABLES	\$388,888	\$388,888	\$388,888	\$388,888	\$388,888	0.6%
SCHOOL CAP OUTLAY	\$0	\$888,888	\$1,888,888	\$1,888,888	\$1,888,888	1.3%
MAGNET SCHOOL EQUIPT	\$188,888	\$188,888	\$188,888	\$188,888	\$188,888	0.2%
EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT	\$0	\$0	\$788,888	\$0	\$788,888	0.6%
GROOMS TECH REPLACEMENT	\$288,888	\$288,888	\$288,888	\$288,888	\$288,888	0.6%
COMMUNICATIONS	\$188,888	\$188,888	\$188,888	\$188,888	\$188,888	0.2%
TECHNOLOGY UPGRADES	\$888,888	\$888,888	\$888,888	\$1,188,888	\$1,188,888	1.8%
DISTRICT LEVEL SUPPORT EQUIPT	\$0	\$88,888	\$88,888	\$88,888	\$88,888	0.1%
MISC.	\$288,888	\$288,888	\$288,888	\$288,888	\$288,888	0.4%
INSTRUCTIONAL TECH EQUIPT	\$347,888	\$347,888	\$347,888	\$347,888	\$347,888	1.3%
DATA & VOICE NETWORK	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,888,888	\$1,888,888	1.1%
DEBT SERVICE						41.8%
COPE PAYMENT	\$22,388,888	\$22,788,188	\$22,888,188	\$22,788,718	\$22,788,888	
NEW CONSTRUCTION						0.2%
LAND						
NEW MIDWAY (OFFSITE)	\$888,888					
REMODELING & ADDITIONS						28.9%
GREENWOOD LAKE MIDDLE					\$1,888,888	
GENOVA					\$1,888,888	
HAMILTON	\$788,888	\$8,888,888				
JACKSON HEIGHTS	\$1,888,888	\$8,888,888	\$8,888,888			
LAWTON				\$788,888	\$7,888,888	
MILWAU REMODELING			\$1,888,888	\$18,888,888		
SPRING LAKE	\$8,888,888					
VERONA		\$888,888	\$4,888,888			
VERONA/VERONA POSE & RENOVATIONS			\$888,888	\$8,888,888		
SMALL PROJECTS	\$888,888	\$888,888	\$888,888	\$788,888	\$788,888	
2001 SALES TAX PROJECTS						
RED BUG	\$8,888,888					
MISC.						
CONTINGENCY & FUND BALANCE	\$3,888,888	\$3,888,888	\$3,888,888	\$3,888,888	\$3,888,888	0.5%
TOTAL	\$47,887,736	\$53,448,888	\$56,352,888	\$54,888,888	\$58,788,888	