

EVALUATION OF MAJOR ISSUES

2.4A LAND USE, LOS AND INFRASTRUCTURE LINKAGE

Land Use and Transportation linkage: The County will evaluate the coordination and implementation of the Thoroughfare Roads System with respect to Future Land Use.

INTRODUCTION

The Future Land Use Map (FLUM) is intended to be the official guide as to what areas of the County will be devoted to urban use and what areas will remain for rural, agricultural and natural resource use. Since urban areas represent population and economic centers, urban areas need more infrastructure than rural areas. The basic philosophy behind the allocation of land uses on the County's FLUM is to foster a compact urban growth pattern in a manner that represents a logical expansion of urban growth from existing urban centers. Compact urban growth patterns represent an efficient and economical use of existing infrastructure and serves as a base for new growth. Therefore, land use allocation on the FLUM also is intended to serve as a guide for the provision of services including roads.

The movement of people, goods and services is important to the economic and social well being of a community and region. Historically, transportation needs within Volusia County have been facilitated by rivers, railroads and roads. Currently roads serve most of the transportation needs of the County, and roads link homes and businesses with other areas of the County and the region. Within Volusia County (and much of the state and nation) contemporary development patterns have been designed for the automobile. Rapid expansion of the County's roadway network over the past two decades, combined with sprawling patterns of development, have created serious concerns about the relationship between future land use and transportation policies. Current conditions and circumstances suggest that new policies and strategies are needed and that reconsideration of past practices must be made. The dynamic relationship between roads and modern development patterns creates a significant planning challenge with regard to the appropriate management of growth and development within a community, and the need to facilitate the safe and efficient mobility. The subject planning challenge is exemplified by a simple question: Should roads drive the location of land uses, or should planned land uses drive the location of roads?

LAND USE INTENSIFICATION

The creation of a new road, or even the expansion of an existing road, can create an expectation that land near or fronting the road will be used for more intense land uses. For example, constructing new roads through rural or agricultural areas can lead to pressure to convert land near the road to land uses that allow urban densities and intensities. In some cases there is an expectation that property fronting the road would be appropriate for commercial uses. However, the proliferation of highway "strip" commercial development on thoroughfares typically creates traffic flow and safety problems in part because of numerous driveway cuts. The result is a need for another "by-pass" route to relieve traffic on thoroughfares that have become congested because of highway commercial development and a lack of access management. In addition, the creation of new roads or the expansion of existing roads in rural areas can lead to urban

sprawl as residential development radiates along such thoroughfares from traditional developed areas that contain employment, social and commercial opportunities. The situation of urban sprawl following new or expanded roads is a result of opening up raw land for development by facilitating access.

LAND USE LOCATION AND DESIGN - CURRENT CONDITIONS

Strip commercial and urban sprawl can be a result of roadway improvements that drive a local government land use decision process. Older development patterns that featured housing in close proximity to goods and services aligned along a grid-style street layout represented a development pattern that was not designed solely to accommodate automobiles. These development patterns occurred in the first part of the 20th century. In the second half of the 20th century development design and practice evolved to include single use residential areas with limited street connectivity, and shopping centers with large parking areas situated along major roads. The separation of land uses into single uses, including the introduction of a “big box” commercial format, has further increased reliance on the automobile. Many of these development patterns have followed roadway improvements occurring on the periphery of traditional urban areas where more traffic capacity was available and/or have been located near interstate interchanges.

While the shopping center concept is still a viable development type there has been a change in the commercial market. New retail commercial development in the recent years is evolving from a shopping center format to “big box” retail stores that have abundant product types under one roof, and to stand alone stores that are situated on an individual parcel. In addition, “big box” developments may feature out-parcel uses that do not directly compete with the major anchor. The theme of the new commercial development trends is convenience. The “big box” features a wide variety of goods and services under one roof, and the stand-alone model offers drive through service. This shift in commercial development types has not come without some impacts on the community. Market radius dynamics that are needed to support a “big box” are large and require access. Therefore, interstate interchange areas and other high visibility sites along major roads have become coveted locations for “big box” developments. The stand-alone commercial developments need enough land to allow easy access to keep the drive-through service functioning. The result of these trends is creation of new commercial areas along new or improved roads. Vacant and under-utilized shopping centers and other commercial developments have been left in the wake of the “big box”/stand-alone commercial evolution. There are many examples within the County where roads have created an impetus for new commercial development. The I-95/SR-40 interchange is the location of significant commercial development that occurred not only because of the interchange location, but because the County constructed interstate parallel transportation facilities such as Williamson and Clyde Morris Blvds. Another commercial center grew at the I-4/Saxon/Veterans Memorial area. This commercial area has various “big box” uses and commercial uses that serve the traveling public as well as small office buildings that are associated with the nearby hospital.

The two examples resulted from County and State highway improvements. In addition, the two development examples are more than just nodes of commercial development, but represent commercial development that has resulted in a proliferation of commercial uses occurring along major roads. In addition, the new commercial development has rendered some existing shopping centers in existing urban areas obsolete. The fact that

there are vacant and under-utilized commercial developments cast doubt on the argument that new commercial development is solely being built to serve an expanded population. The nexus between new road construction and new commercial development cannot be ignored. The advent of new commercial development and related trips generated occurring on new roads the County built to relieve traffic on old thoroughfares will ultimately create congestion on the new road. The result is a loss of investment in traffic infrastructure.

CURRENT ACTIONS AND POLICIES

The County is the major provider of arterial roads within the County, especially now that the FDOT is applying 75% of its funding towards the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) mainly consisting of the interstate highway system. The existing network of roadways and other transportation facilities across the County represent an investment that can be valued in the billions. As greater volumes of traffic attempt to use the network, efforts must be made to maintain existing capacity before new investments are considered. However, in many cases the County does not have land use jurisdiction over the land on which the County road traverses. The County currently reviews municipal Comprehensive Plan amendments with regard to impacts to County roads. The process has begun to open a dialogue between the municipalities, the County, and sometimes developers, to discuss matters of proportionate (fair) share costs, and the appropriateness of land use intensification along roads. The County has also denied land use changes and developments that generate traffic on area roads above an acceptable level of service. With the passage and implementation of SB 360 further discussion about roads and land use intensification will occur.

Maintaining an acceptable level of service on County roads has been a long time goal. Furthering that goal, the County needs to continue to review land uses that impact roadway level of service and limit direct access on County roads as much as possible. The County's planning program recognizes the land use/transportation linkage by discouraging strip, highway commercial, allocating urban land uses in a compact manner and articulating policies that are intended to coordinate transportation improvements with the County land use plan. The discouragement of strip commercial and new retail uses has been a challenge. The County's pre-Comprehensive Plan Zoning Map series had a significant amount of highway commercial zoning along major roads. In many cases long reaches of major roadways were flanked on each side by commercial zoning regardless of the existing development pattern. A significant amount of the strip commercial zoning was eliminated during the County rezoning effort during the early to mid 1990's. The intent of the rezoning was to make the zoning and land use map consistent. While strip commercial opportunities were curtailed, discouraging new highway and other retail commercial remains an issue.

The County in the last three years has taken a different approach to road building/improvements. In the past, roads were sometimes improved or built based on assumptions and intuition. However, the County has started to look at new roads and road improvements more critically with regard to environmental, social and land use impacts.

The first experience in which the County reviewed land use impacts with regard to a proposed road improvement was with the SR 415 improvement land use study. FDOT

was in the process of analyzing the feasibility for a 4-lane improvement of the SR 415 corridor through both Volusia and Seminole Counties. At the County's request FDOT contracted a planning study to review the impacts a 4-lane highway would have on the land use in the vicinity of the SR 415 corridor. After several months of study a land use analysis was generated for the SR 415 corridor. Known as the Gladding-Jackson Study (named for the planning consulting firm) the results of the study were that SR 415 should not be widened to 4 lanes north of the Deltona area. The intent of maintaining SR 415 as a two lane rural road north of Deltona was to protect the agricultural and rural character of central Volusia County.

In 2004 the County contracted a planning firm to study the land use associated with the CR 415 corridor (SR 44 north to US 92). There was consideration of changing the number of lanes status for CR 415 from two to four-lanes. After public scoping meetings and various meetings with municipalities the County accepted the report. The report recommended that in the future CR 415 may need to be widened, but widening was not needed in the near term.

Another example of the County altering its road program to protect rural and environmental areas was the removal of a segment of a proposed thoroughfare from the County Thoroughfare Map. The road was known as the Elkcam extension and was placed on the Thoroughfare Map in 1998. The Elkcam extension was proposed to extend all the way from the City of Deltona in southwest Volusia to SR 442 in the City of Edgewater in east Volusia. The road would have been another east/west thoroughfare through the County, and as planned, extended through some of the most environmentally sensitive areas of the County. The County in 2003 realized that the Elkcam extension would have major impacts on the land use and environmental resources and as part of the 03-1 Amendment Cycle a segment of Elkcam was removed from the T-fare map. Not all of the proposed road was removed from the T-fare map. Only the segment approximately from the City limits of Deltona to SR 415 was removed. A remaining segment of Elkcam from SR 415 to I-95 in the Edgewater area remains. Since the portions of the Elkcam T-fare from Edgewater to SR 415 extend through rural and environmentally sensitive areas such as Spruce Creek Swamp, the County should continue the theme of protecting the rural and environmental character of the central Volusia area by conducting a study to determine the appropriateness of the portion of the Elkcam extension from SR 415 east to the western extent of the City of Edgewater.

As part of the 03-1 Amendment Cycle, the County also realigned a T-fare known as the Williamson Blvd. Extension to direct the proposed road away from land that was included within the Spruce Creek Preserve. Instead of over-passing the interstate to the east in the vicinity of the Preserve, the road will now run along the western side of the interstate and serve planned development that will occur within the Cities of New Smyrna Beach and Edgewater.

Finally, as part of the 03-1 Amendment Cycle the County adopted the T-fare map addition of the Tomoka Farms Road (TFR) extension from LPGA Blvd. to SR 40. The intent of the T-fare addition is, in part, to provide a parallel facility to I-95. The TFR extension was not found in compliance by FDCA and the County, FDCA, and intervening parties, are in the process of a non-compliance process.

SMART GROWTH

As part of the smart growth initiative there were several recommendations made to the County that deal with the transportation/land use linkage. The information of this section of the EAR does address those “smart growth” recommendations. However, the committee did recommend that safe wildlife movement across/under roadways should be a priority with regard to roadway improvement. The idea of providing wildlife access across roads is not new, but the County, in the course of road building projects, has not typically considered building wildlife under or overpasses. Based on the “smart growth” recommendations the County should look at the provision of wildlife ingress and egress with regard to road construction.

OBJECTIVE ANALYSIS

The Objective analysis is provided in Table 2.4A using the recommended matrix format.

Table 2.4A: Objective Analysis Regarding Land Use and Transportation Linkage

OBJECTIVE	TARGET	CONDITIONS AT THE 1998 EAR	CURRENT CONDITIONS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS
1.1.1 Growth management criteria will be established to ensure that future land use patterns will maintain vital natural functions and in conjunction with the availability of public facilities and services to support that development at the appropriate level of service.	To encourage compact urban growth and to ensure that new growth is adequately served by public facilities. Maintain Objective.	The County had established levels of service, and in some cases roads were planned with very little coordination with the County Future Land Use Map or compatibility with the land use characteristics of the area.	The County, in the last planning cycle, has started to study the effects of roads on existing and future land use. Planning reports were generated to review land use impacts with regard to proposed road improvements. The County also removed a T-fare segment off of the T-fare Map because the road extended through an area the County did not plan for urban development.	There are several Policies that implement the subject Objective that address the land use/transportation linkage. These Policies may need to be updated to reinforce the need for land use/traffic coordination. In addition, a policy statement requiring a land use study for certain T-fare map designations or road improvements would be appropriate. Finally, this section, concerning policy modifications and/or additions to encourage access control would be appropriate.
1.1.3 Volusia County shall limit urban sprawl by directing urban growth to those areas where public facilities and services are available inside designated service areas.	This Objective illustrates a basic growth management tenet. Maintain Objective.	The County had established level of service for infrastructure including the road network. Land use proposals were reviewed to ascertain the impacts a new land use would have on the road system.	The County has realized that roads, even conceptual roads on the T-fare map can lead to expectations of land use intensification. The County did remove a segment of a proposed road from the T-fare map.	Policies that address highway commercial uses under this Objective are sound, but the language of these Policies may need to be updated to further discourage highway commercial and require access management. Revising LOS standards may also need to be addressed.

OBJECTIVE	TARGET	CONDITIONS AT THE 1998 EAR	CURRENT CONDITIONS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS
<p>1.1.4 Volusia County shall provide approximately 270 acres for the existing and future needs for water and wastewater facilities and other public facilities and services, by locating needed facilities in areas suitable for such use.</p>	<p>As has been identified in other sections of this EAR report, the 270-acre figure is vague and needs to be clarified. However the basic intent of this Objective is sound.</p>	<p>The County provided the requisite infrastructure for existing and new development.</p>	<p>The County is currently running out of year 2020 capacity on certain road segments. The result will be a curtailment of land use intensification along certain road segments. The result could be the encouragement of outward development as growth is shifted to areas where more road capacity exists.</p>	<p>Policy language may need to be revised to further the protection of the level of service on County roads. A policy addition may be needed to allow for LOS revision based on certain situations with regard to roadway capacity in existing urban areas.</p>
<p>1.2.2 Volusia County shall protect natural, and historic resources from the adverse impact of development as outlined in the Conservation and Historic Preservation elements.</p>	<p>The intent of this Objective is to protect natural and historic resources. Maintain Objective.</p>	<p>The County has always been concerned about resource protection and established a scenic road designation to protect the visual qualities of certain roads. However, new road construction and improvement was not well coordinated with Plan provisions.</p>	<p>With regard to road improvements, environmental awareness has advanced beyond just rote permitting matters. With some of the more recent major road projects there is more planning work performed in the early stages to address environmental impacts. In addition, the County has formulated scenic road plans for several roads that are associated with historic and environmental resources.</p>	<p>The provisions of this Objective are sound and do not need to be modified.</p>

OBJECTIVE	TARGET	CONDITIONS AT THE 1998 EAR	CURRENT CONDITIONS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS
<p>1.2.3 Consistent with section 163.3202(1) F.S. Volusia County shall continue to review its Land Development Regulations to ensure innovative design and the conservation of open space and natural resources.</p>	<p>This Objective establishes guidelines for the implementation of the Zoning Ordinance and Land Development Code.</p>	<p>The County has been implementing programs such as the Wetlands Ordinance and Zoning that were consistent with the FLUM since the early to mid 1990's.</p>	<p>The County continues to implement this Objective through the requirements of the Land Development Code and Zoning Ordinance.</p>	<p>With regard to transportation planning changes to existing Policy(ies) may be appropriate to reinforce the concept of directing traffic improvements away from environmentally sensitive areas and also to encourage access control along major thoroughfares. In addition, a policy could be added that addresses wildlife movement regarding roadway improvement.</p>

OBJECTIVE	TARGET	CONDITIONS AT THE 1998 EAR	CURRENT CONDITIONS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS
<p>1.3.1 Volusia County shall provide for adequate and appropriate lands for the location of all land use types (residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural, recreational, conservation and public facility) to support the anticipated population and maximize compatibility with existing uses.</p>	<p>The intent of this Objective is to appropriately allocate a mixture of land uses in light of community needs predicated on appropriate population projections.</p>	<p>The County, during the first planning cycle, implemented the FLUM by rezoning the County to be consistent with the Plan. However, the County road program was not entirely in step with the planning program.</p>	<p>The County made strides in fostering more coordination with regard to transportation and land use planning (SR 415 and CR 415 planning studies are examples). The County also has been very supportive of multimodal transportation alternatives by funding the VOTRAN bus service and pledging money for the commuter rail program. With regard to the assignment of land uses, the County has been reviewing municipal annexations and subsequent FLUM amendments to determine impacts to County roads and seeking appropriate mitigation.</p>	<p>The Comp Plan already discourages the proliferation of commercial uses and seeks to concentrate such uses to nodes around major intersections. However, not all intersections and major road frontage areas should be used for commercial development. The need for new commercial development proposals should be demonstrated to support the population. Also, the County needs to review policies to foster more multi and mixed-use development to encourage more internal trip capture.</p>

OBJECTIVE	TARGET	CONDITIONS AT THE 1998 EAR	CURRENT CONDITIONS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS
<p>2.1.1 Volusia County shall implement programs to provide a safe, convenient, and energy efficient multimodal transportation system.</p>	<p>This Objective helps establish guidelines for the establishment of the T-fare Map and contains Policies that are intended to protect County transportation resources.</p>	<p>This Objective contains sound planning Policies that speak to the linkage between land use and the transportation program. However, in some cases road program was in a reactive mode with regard to the location of roads and development.</p>	<p>The County has made progress with regard to the land use/transportation linkage. Examples are the SR 415 and CR 415 land use studies that were prepared in response to the proposed expansion of these roads. In addition, the County removed a segment of the proposed Elkcam extension from the T-fare map because the area that the segment was to traverse is earmarked for low intensity land uses and is environmentally sensitive.</p>	<p>The further prioritization of the road program needs to occur. Policies need to be modified or generated to incorporate a prioritization program into the Comp Plan. In addition, there needs to be further language that encourages the County to look at other alternatives (LOS changes, intersection modifications, mass transit, etc.) before travel lanes are added or new roads are built.</p>
<p>2.1.2 Volusia County shall coordinate the transportation system with the Future Land Use Element to ensure compatibility between land use and the thoroughfare system necessary to support it.</p>	<p>Subject Objective captures the essence of the EAR land use/transportation issue. The Objective is sound and should be maintained.</p>	<p>Much of the County road program was in a reactive mode responding to development activities occurring both in the County and the municipalities.</p>	<p>As has been illustrated elsewhere in this analysis, the County has made improvements with regard to the land use/transportation linkage.</p>	<p>This Objective has numerous Policies that are sound. However, the land use/transportation linkage theme could be further reinforced by language changes to individual Policies. In addition, Policy revision to include the concept of fair share, and the SIS funding issue need to be addressed.</p>

OBJECTIVE	TARGET	CONDITIONS AT THE 1998 EAR	CURRENT CONDITIONS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS
<p>2.1.7 Volusia County shall ensure that current and future transportation system needs are financed in an effective, efficient, and equitable manner.</p>	<p>The Objective articulates a position that the transportation program will be funded in an appropriate manner. Maintain Objective.</p>	<p>The County pays for the transportation program by collecting an optional gas tax and impact fees. Additional funds from the State and Federal Government are also used for improvements, etc.</p>	<p>The County local funding sources have not changed. The impact fee has been increased and the County still collects a gas tax. However, road costs have far outpaced funding sources and the demand for road improvements has increased. In addition, the State SIS program has further resulted in a reduction of funds for road improvement.</p>	<p>A priority system needs to be established to ensure that limited transportation funds are disturbed in a manner that, in part, facilitates compact urban growth patterns, and is not used to encourage sprawl development patterns. In addition Policy changes need to further illustrate the importance of appropriate land use management to maximize County investment in transportation infrastructure. In addition, studying the impact of LOS requirements relating to traffic management and roadway construction would be appropriate.</p>

OBJECTIVE	TARGET	CONDITIONS AT THE 1998 EAR	CURRENT CONDITIONS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS
<p>2.2.1 Where possible, development of the Volusia County transportation system shall be directed away from areas which are naturally incapable of the service capacity to accommodate growth in an environmentally acceptable manner.</p>	<p>This Objective is applicable to the land use/ transportation issue and should be maintained or maybe combined with Objective 2.1.2.</p>	<p>During the first planning cycle, the County implemented various programs and Policies that were meant to afford protection to the environment.</p>	<p>The County continued to implement those programs and Policies and also realized that roads, especially secondary impacts, could have environmental impacts that are contrary to established environmental goals.</p>	<p>There is only one Policy that implements this Objective. The Objective could be combined with Objective 2.1.2. However, there needs to be more definitive policy language that clearly directs road development away from natural resource areas and also addresses the secondary impacts to road development.</p>

RECOMMENDATIONS

The County is in an introspective mode with regard to its transportation plans. The removal of roads and the modification of existing roads on the T-fare map illustrate that the County is interested in prioritizing transportation efforts in light of budget constraints, environmental and land use goals and community/social concerns. Providing parallel, reliever routes, to major traffic infrastructure such as the interstates, remains a major goal. In addition, there is an understanding of how transportation planning can drive land use, and to fully assess this dynamic the County has initiated planning studies to ascertain land use impacts associated with proposed traffic improvements.

The foundation has been laid for the further integration of the land use and transportation programs. However, there needs to be more analysis with regard to the cost/benefit associated with roads and related traffic improvements. The County realizes that transportation funds for road improvements are limited. Therefore, the construction of new roads and adding lanes of travel are not always going to be possible with regard to dealing with traffic problems. Cheaper and more cost effective methods of dealing with transportation deficiencies need to be explored before adding travel lanes. In addition, the County needs to review its Thoroughfare Road Map to ensure that existing planned roads are needed and will not create urban sprawl. Suggested actions include the following:

- 1) Determine if there is a demonstrated need for a new road or the addition of travel lanes: Any new road or lane additions need to be supported by actual traffic demand that cannot be managed in other ways. Extemporaneous reasons to improve roads such as for hurricane evacuation should not be the sole reason to justify road improvements.
- 2) Fully analyze the impacts of new or improved roads on environmental resources, communities and neighborhoods, the County Land Use Plan. New or improved roads should complement, and be consistent with, the Future Land Use Map.
- 3) Analyze conceptual roads on the Thoroughfare Map for possible removal: Proposed roads that open up rural areas for development, and roads that are not needed to support the County traffic needs, should be removed from the T-fare Map. An example of a conceptual road that should be considered for removal from the T-fare map is the road known as the Elkcam extension from SR 415 to SR 442. The conceptual location of Elkcam extends through environmentally sensitive areas and rural land.
- 4) Intersection improvements need to be reviewed to improve level of service: Adding turn lanes and more vehicle storage within existing turn lanes can result in better mobility. In addition, stoplight timing can help smooth traffic flow. Smart traffic monitoring systems that influence traffic lights and traffic patterns can help address peak hour traffic situations.
- 5) Multimodal transportation alternatives investments: The County has been very receptive to multimodal transportation. County support of the commuter rail system to link west Volusia to the greater Orlando area is evidence of County support for multimodal transportation. The County has also consistently funded VOTRAN, the County bus system. Notwithstanding the County commitment to multimodal transportation, techniques such as enhanced bus service could be used to further relieve

traffic congestion. The promotion of transit-oriented development, including mixed-use development types, would help encourage multimodal transportation alternatives.

6) Land use and access control: Problematic traffic conditions are often the result of cumulative land use decisions. The full impact of incremental land use decisions is not often understood or apparent until traffic becomes a problem. The County should continue to review projects for impacts to the County road network, and if appropriate, deny projects that adversely impact the County transportation system. The County should also continue to review the actions of other local governments with regard to the County road network. Finally, the County should strive to implement a fair share program that will seek funds or other mitigation from developers and municipalities to offset impacts to County road facilities.

7) Education programs: Strive to educate the community about transportation alternatives. Transportation in Volusia County and much of Florida is focused on the use of personal automobiles. However, traveling at non-peak times for those that have schedule flexibility can help reduce traffic. The County could also work with local businesses to incorporate flexible work hours for employees. Flexible work hours will help reduce peak hour traffic. Providing convenient and safe public transit will help make mass transit a more attractive alternative to driving.

8) Level of service (LOS) standard revision: The County has LOS standards for County roads. The intent is to provide a level of service that allows a certain level of mobility on County roads. The LOS concept is sound but the implementation of high LOS standards can create a need for more road improvements, including adding travel lanes. High LOS standards can also promote urban sprawl development patterns as development is forced to the urban edge/rural areas where more capacity tends to be available. In addition, high LOS standards may not be sustainable with regard to the costs of providing roadway infrastructure. Therefore, the County could investigate revising the LOS standards on roads that are located within urban areas and/or areas the County planned for urban uses. The trade-off is that the amount of traffic will be higher in urban areas, but the County will have to rely less on the construction of new roads that can open up rural land for development and impact existing residents.

9) Wildlife passage: The County should begin to review new and improved road projects for the possible installation of under or over passes. Other techniques could be used to help minimize wildlife mortality on roads, such as lowering speed limits and designing roads with ample fields of vision to allow for safe wildlife passage.

EVALUATION OF MAJOR ISSUES

2.4B LAND USE, LOS AND INFRASTRUCTURE LINKAGE

Land Use and Schools Linkage: The County will evaluate whether school capacity is effectively linked to development decisions and explore school concurrency options.

INTRODUCTION

Volusia County has been successful in coordinating future land uses and residential development with the capacity of existing and planned schools. Senate Bill 1906 passed by the legislature in 2002 created an interlocal agreement requirement, and in February 2003 the County and the School Board established appropriate population via an interlocal agreement. In addition, planning, coordination and siting of new schools is required in Policy 1.1.4.5 of the Future Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan as adopted and certified by DCA and the Volusia County Growth Management Commission in May, 1990.

Sites for New School Facilities

Volusia County's Future Land Use Element allows schools in all land uses except Conservation and Environmental System Corridor (Policy 1.3.1.6). The County, at the request of the School Board, does site suitability analysis when it comes to prospective school sites. The County evaluates proposed school sites for infrastructure availability and capacity, road access, environmental limitations, zoning, and neighborhood compatibility analysis. The County has included the School Board on its Technical Review Section since 1988, which gives the School District input on all residential site plans even when there is not an increase in density.

The School Board, despite limitations in their budget, does an excellent job of meeting County and City concerns when it comes to development of school sites. While not required by state law, the School Board makes every effort to be compatible within the County and land use regulations when economically feasible. The School Board's sensitivity toward local jurisdictions creates a good working relationship with the County and most of its jurisdictions. The School Board's planners meet with County and City planning officials to find suitable sites among vacant land in each jurisdiction.

BACKGROUND

How Public School Facilities and Land Use are Linked Since the First EAR

After the first Evaluation and Appraisal Report, the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) was required by law to show local government comprehensive plans future land use categories were not restrictive on schools. Comprehensive plans had to show schools were allowed to co-locate with libraries and parks. Counties without these plan policies were required to amend their Comprehensive Plans. Volusia County did not need to amend its Comprehensive Plan. Volusia County Policies 1.1.4.7, 13.1.4.3, 13.1.4.4 and 15.4.5.9 met DCA's co-location requirements.

Volusia County uses School Board land and recreational facilities as part of its inventory of local parks. In return, County Leisure Services provides maintenance of these lands and facilities per the interlocal agreement with the Volusia County Schools (see Objective 13.1.4 and its related Policies). Policy 1.1.3.6 allows schools as an allowable use in all land use categories except Environment System Corridor and Conservation. In non-urban areas schools are evaluated against the urban sprawl criteria. The few Volusia County Schools located in rural areas predate the Comprehensive Plan, and serve existing rural communities.

Senate Bill 1906 - Interlocal Agreement and School Coordination

Land use and schools are linked through legislation, and an interlocal agreement required by Senate Bill 1906 passed in 2002. Pursuant to SB 1906, an interlocal agreement was signed by Volusia County and 14 municipalities by the 2003 deadline. The County and its 14 Cities approved the interlocal agreement drafted by a committee of city, county and school board planners. This agreement made the Volusia County School Board an ex officio member on all local planning agency boards. Volusia County approved the interlocal agreement on February 20, 2003.

Senate Bill 1906 did not mandate a concurrency requirement. Instead the school legislation required coordination and planning between local governments and schools. The County, its municipalities, and the School Board coordinate population projections, school enrollment, capacity demands and development trends in its meetings twice a year in October and May. In addition the school facilities planner meets with the various municipal planning departments and Volusia County to look for prospective school sites among vacant land sites in the municipalities and unincorporated County.

Daytona Beach Shores and Ponce Inlet were exempt municipalities under state legislation. Neither city is an appropriate location for a school because of its location in the Coastal High Hazard Area.

One of the early successes of this new legislation occurred with High School DDD. Volusia County amended its 5-year Road Program to add the western extension of Rhode Island to service the new high school planned in Orange City. This road connection to the high school site was not on the County's 5-year road program as initially proposed. The coordination meeting, which notified Volusia County that the School Board might pick the Orange City site, allowed the Public Works Department extra time to add the thoroughfare to the County Capital Improvements Plan.

School Board Policy 613 and Increases in Residential Density

The School Board is a member of the County Technical Review Section. As a result they see all site and development plans when new subdivisions are built even if there is not an increase in density. As a result of Volusia County School Board Policy 613 passed in May 2005, Volusia County will now send any increases in density for Future Land Use Map (FLUM) amendments and rezonings to the Volusia County School Board for review and comment. Recently the School Board attended the Volusia County Planning and Land Development Regulation Commission (PLDRC) and the Volusia County Council to voice its opposition to an increase in density for the Hontoon Island development. Although the School Board later reached a proportionate share mitigation agreement

with the developers to handle the additional students generated, the PLDRC and County Council did not approve the Hontoon Island development based on other considerations.

School Policy 613 does not force local governments to mitigate for the impact that increased residential development has on the school system. Yet School Board Policy 613 offers the Volusia County School Board an opportunity to raise this issue of student overcrowding and mitigation as part of the land use decision-making process. The overcrowded situation of public schools has been an issue raised repeatedly by citizens in hearings on rezonings and future land use amendments. School Board Policy 613 ensures the School Board, and its representatives, are heard in public hearings on all land use decisions that impact schools.

Senate Bill 360 which passed this legislative session now requires all local governments (except Palm Beach County, which has concurrency) to adopt a school concurrency facility element to their Comprehensive Plan by December 1, 2008. Volusia County's school concurrency deadline will be February 1, 2008 under a schedule prepared by the Department of Community Affairs. The new law requires that adequate facilities must be in place, or under actual construction, within 3 years after the issuance of final subdivision or site plan approval. In many ways the requirements of Senate Bill 360 resemble what Palm Beach County did in adopting its optional school concurrency element.

Volusia County Schools Overcrowded

Overcrowded schools are shown on Table 2.4B as published by the Volusia County School Board. Table 2.4B is from September 22, 2005. The data shows a substantial number of overcrowded schools from the Elementary, Middle and High School levels. The County has approved a ½ cent optional sales tax to finance the replacement of existing schools and construction of new schools with the capacity numbers substantially changing for the better by 2010-2011. Yet with the new schools being built, and some existing schools expanded through renovations, Elementary and Middle schools are still shown to be over capacity in the year 2010-11. Only High schools at 97 percent in 2010-2011 are below the district wide level for school capacity.

It should be noted that most of these Volusia County school capacity deficits are a result of the class size amendment, which is now Article IX of the Florida State Constitution. The class size reduction amendment, which passed in 2002, re-calculated a school's FISH capacity (Florida Inventory of School Housing) that created an 8,000 student station loss, which represents most of the deficit in the present Volusia County school system. Under the voluntary concurrency system and FISH capacity formulas that was in place under Senate Bill 1906, Volusia County would have zero deficits in the Volusia County school system.

School concurrency was allowed to be computed on a district-wide basis, which allowed under-enrolled areas to neutralize schools that were above capacity. The chart shows most of the overcrowding in the school system is in West Volusia. Deltona has the highest number of overcrowded schools with DeLand a close second. When the County did its Comprehensive Plan back in 1990, 7 of the 8 new schools being built were in the Deltona area. On the east side, overcrowded schools are located primarily in Ormond Beach, New Smyrna Beach and Port Orange areas.

Table 2.4B: Volusia County School Capacity Report follows:

SCHOOL RECAP REPORT 2005-06

FACILITY	Sept. 22, 2005	ENROLL. 20 DAY	2010-11 COFTE ENROLL. PROJECT	PERM. STUDENT STATIONS	PORT. STUDENT STATIONS	PERM. STUDENT CAPACITY	TOTAL STUDENT CAPACITY	PERCENT OF PERM. CAPACITY	2010-11 PERM. STUDENT CAPACITY	PERCENT OF PERM. CAPACITY	# OF PERM. CLRMS	# OF PORT. CLRMS	SQ. FT. PERM. BLDGS	SQ. FT. PORT. BLDGS	TOTAL SQ. FT.	SQ. FT. PER STUDENT	
																	2010-11 PERM. STUDENT CAPACITY
ELEMENTARY																	
Blue Lake	644	712	703	-	703	703	703	92%	703	101%	37	-	89,170	720	89,890	128	26
Bonner	425	425	551	99	551	650	77%	551	77%	29	7	55,839	5,526	61,365	94	11	
Burns-Oak Hill	212	234	250	66	250	316	85%	250	94%	13	3	32,477	2,972	35,449	112	15	
Chisholm	406	449	297	156	297	453	137%	479	94%	16	8	52,604	5,968	58,572	129	21	
Coronado	319	353	264	110	264	374	121%	264	134%	14	5	37,568	3,888	41,456	111	11	
DeBary	1,154	876	561	230	561	791	206%	743	118%	29	11	94,760	9,120	103,880	131	18	
Deltona Lakes	1,011	1,118	744	260	744	1,004	136%	926	121%	41	12	105,322	9,976	115,298	115	40	
Discovery	866	727	543	186	543	729	159%	725	100%	29	13	101,926	10,162	112,088	154	19	
Edgewater	638	638	729	66	729	795	88%	729	88%	38	3	76,398	3,485	79,883	100	24	
Enterprise	676	757	489	150	489	639	138%	489	155%	26	8	66,093	6,180	72,273	113	8	
Forest Lake	726	723	551	126	551	677	132%	733	99%	29	7	92,758	5,600	98,358	145	20	
Freedom	739	827	600	-	600	600	123%	782	106%	32	-	92,457	-	92,457	154	30	
Friendship	768	694	528	348	528	876	145%	710	98%	29	17	88,502	12,672	101,174	115	14	
Holly Hill	648	648	569	106	569	675	114%	569	114%	30	8	84,331	7,321	91,652	136	19	
Horizon	918	565	543	274	543	817	169%	543	104%	29	15	87,024	11,880	98,904	121	10	
Hurst	433	479	655	76	655	691	66%	691	69%	35	6	70,085	4,823	74,908	102	15	
Indian River	722	722	546	88	546	634	132%	546	132%	29	4	88,757	3,456	92,213	145	24	
Longstreet	419	419	456	120	456	576	92%	456	92%	24	6	53,973	4,326	58,299	101	10	
Marks	914	735	621	318	621	939	147%	717	103%	34	15	66,676	11,882	78,558	84	28	
McInnis	469	518	420	117	420	537	112%	420	123%	22	8	49,288	7,746	57,034	106	15	
New Elementary "X", Or. City	-	720	-	-	-	-	0%	717	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	20
New Elementary "V", Port Or.	-	615	-	-	-	-	0%	717	86%	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	24
New Elementary "Y", Delt.	-	745	-	-	-	-	0%	717	104%	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-
New Elementary "Z", DeLand	-	690	-	-	-	-	0%	717	96%	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-
New Elementary "A", Port Or.	-	675	-	-	-	-	0%	717	94%	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-
New Elementary "D", Delt.	-	720	-	-	-	-	0%	717	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-
Orange City	865	656	517	258	517	775	167%	517	127%	28	15	63,870	12,330	76,200	98	8	
Ormond Beach	337	366	294	76	294	370	115%	294	124%	15	5	36,795	3,790	40,585	110	4	
Ortona	261	261	254	76	254	330	103%	254	103%	13	4	37,862	4,250	42,112	128	11	
Osceola	433	433	449	58	449	507	96%	449	96%	24	3	60,884	2,592	63,476	125	13	
Osteen	809	704	525	106	525	631	154%	717	98%	27	5	77,247	3,750	80,997	128	32	
Palm Terrace	702	776	810	44	810	854	87%	810	96%	44	2	106,829	3,384	110,213	129	20	
Pathways	626	732	553	22	553	575	113%	735	100%	29	1	94,133	864	94,997	165	20	
Pierson	449	570	376	182	376	558	119%	691	82%	20	13	59,624	11,864	71,488	128	11	
Pine Trail	813	899	604	157	604	761	135%	747	120%	32	8	99,175	6,636	105,811	139	19	
Port Orange	470	520	344	112	344	456	137%	344	151%	18	6	39,628	6,532	46,160	101	5	
Read-Partillo	476	476	493	36	493	529	97%	493	97%	26	4	60,098	2,966	63,064	119	11	
Samsula	280	280	156	98	156	254	179%	156	179%	8	6	24,862	5,278	30,140	119	8	
Seville	121	-	-	144	-	144	0%	-	0%	-	8	18,587	6,164	24,751	172	3	
Small	408	408	452	212	452	664	90%	452	90%	24	14	57,855	10,674	68,529	103	11	
South Daytona	864	864	562	303	562	865	154%	900	96%	31	17	73,936	15,730	89,666	104	13	
Spirit	750	849	600	0	600	600	125%	782	109%	32	-	92,457	-	92,457	154	20	
Spruce Creek	793	727	641	154	641	795	124%	823	88%	34	7	94,615	6,703	101,318	127	20	
Starke	392	453	457	116	457	573	86%	457	99%	24	6	61,261	4,320	65,581	114	15	

SCHOOL RECAP REPORT 2005-06

Sept. 22, 2005	Sept. 2, 05		2010-11		PERM.		PORT.		TOTAL		PERCENT OF		2010-11		2010-11		SQ. FT.		SQ. FT.		# OF		
	ENROLL.	20 DAY	ENROLL.	ENROLL.	STUDENT	STATIONS	STUDENT	STATIONS	STUDENT	STATIONS	STUDENT	STATIONS	PERM.	PORT.	STUDENT	STATIONS	PERM.	PORT.	STUDENT	STATIONS	PERM.	PORT.	STUDENT
		800	709	623	623	124	623	623	747	128%	623	114%	33	6	102,074	4,320	106,394	142	20				
Sunrise	978	626	553	553	553	340	553	893	177%	553	113%	30	17	94,862	12,712	107,574	120	13					
Sweetwater	968	690	543	543	825	282	543	825	178%	825	95%	29	13	82,016	10,512	92,528	112	17					
Timbercrest	854	804	540	540	876	336	540	876	158%	876	111%	29	16	92,067	14,259	106,326	121	20					
Tomoka	892	986	690	690	990	300	690	990	129%	990	143%	36	16	77,675	12,400	90,075	91	15					
Volusia Pines	712	807	563	563	651	88	563	651	126%	651	143%	29	4	93,966	3,312	97,278	149	20					
Westside	487	487	513	513	579	66	513	579	95%	579	88%	28	6	70,663	4,576	75,239	130	15					
Woodward	817	653	652	652	862	210	652	862	125%	862	100%	35	12	77,384	9,106	86,490	100	13					
SUBTOTAL	29,464	32,520	23,384	23,384	30,180	6,796	23,384	30,180	126%	31,032	105%	1,243	370	3,336,433	306,727	3,643,160	121	799					
MIDDLE SCHOOL																							
			2010-11																				
			ENROLL.	COFTE	PERM.	PORT.	PERM.	PORT.	TOTAL	PERCENT OF	PERM.	PERCENT OF	# OF	# OF	SQ. FT.	SQ. FT.	TOTAL	SQ. FT.	PER	# OF			
			20 DAY	ENROLL.	STUDENT	STATIONS	STUDENT	STATIONS	STUDENT	PERM.	STUDENT	PERM.	CLRMS	PORT.	PERM.	PORT.	SQ. FT.	PORT.	PER	PER	# OF		
			PROJECT.	PROJECT.	CAPACITY	CAPACITY	CAPACITY	CAPACITY	CAPACITY	CAPACITY	CAPACITY	CAPACITY	CLRMS	CLRMS	BLDGS	BLDGS	SQ. FT.	BLDGS	STUDENT	STUDENT	ACRES		
Campbell	823	939	1,309	1,178	1,178	-	1,178	1,178	70%	1,178	80%	57	-	163,379	-	163,379	-	139	39				
Creekside	1,279	1,459	1,190	1,071	1,071	-	1,071	1,071	119%	1,071	136%	51	-	159,243	-	159,243	-	149	41				
DeLand	1,667	1,463	1,290	1,161	1,599	487	1,161	1,599	144%	1,161	126%	50	31	199,883	22,728	222,611	139	44					
Deltona	1,473	1,380	1,322	1,190	1,575	428	1,190	1,575	124%	1,190	116%	51	27	131,082	21,126	152,208	97	36					
Galaxy	1,848	1,208	1,296	1,166	1,741	638	1,166	1,741	158%	1,166	104%	53	30	157,043	23,362	180,405	104	30					
Heritage	1,424	1,225	1,278	1,150	1,447	330	1,150	1,447	124%	1,150	107%	52	16	163,011	12,096	175,107	121	40					
Hinson	925	1,055	1,143	1,029	1,029	-	1,029	1,029	90%	1,029	103%	53	-	162,930	-	162,930	-	158	53				
Holly Hill	686	686	970	873	992	132	873	992	79%	873	79%	42	12	105,637	9,914	115,551	117	25					
New Middle "DD", Orange City	-	1,167	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	-	98%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	40			
New Middle "HH", Deltona	-	1,185	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	-	99%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0			
New Smyrna	1,538	1,538	1,242	1,118	1,472	394	1,118	1,472	138%	1,118	138%	50	30	173,664	23,354	197,018	134	35					
Ormond Beach	1,039	1,185	1,434	1,291	1,429	154	1,291	1,429	81%	1,291	92%	57	11	167,771	8,144	175,915	123	29					
Silver Sands	1,278	1,458	1,231	1,108	1,306	220	1,108	1,306	115%	1,108	115%	51	10	163,741	7,332	171,073	131	49					
Southwestern	673	768	720	648	1,038	433	648	1,038	104%	648	118%	30	22	90,002	18,052	108,054	104	20					
SUBTOTAL	14,653	16,717	14,425	12,983	15,877	3,216	12,983	15,877	113%	15,369	109%	597	189	1,837,386	146,108	1,983,494	125	481					
HIGH SCHOOL																							
			2010-11																				
			ENROLL.	COFTE	PERM.	PORT.	PERM.	PORT.	TOTAL	PERCENT OF	PERM.	PERCENT OF	# OF	# OF	SQ. FT.	SQ. FT.	TOTAL	SQ. FT.	PER	# OF			
			20 DAY	ENROLL.	STUDENT	STATIONS	STUDENT	STATIONS	STUDENT	PERM.	STUDENT	PERM.	CLRMS	PORT.	PERM.	PORT.	SQ. FT.	PORT.	PER	PER	# OF		
			PROJECT.	PROJECT.	CAPACITY	CAPACITY	CAPACITY	CAPACITY	CAPACITY	CAPACITY	CAPACITY	CAPACITY	CLRMS	CLRMS	BLDGS	BLDGS	SQ. FT.	BLDGS	STUDENT	STUDENT	ACRES		
Atlantic	1,548	1,548	1,612	1,531	1,747	227	1,531	1,747	101%	1,531	84%	63	17	194,589	14,496	209,085	120	70					
DeLand	3,282	2,710	3,054	2,901	3,407	532	2,901	3,407	113%	2,901	93%	125	23	335,802	21,736	357,538	105	65					
Deltona	2,898	2,103	2,021	1,920	3,378	1,535	1,920	3,378	151%	1,920	110%	82	60	291,452	51,460	342,912	102	80					
Mainland	1,906	1,929	1,330	1,264	2,214	1,000	1,264	2,214	151%	1,264	84%	59	53	185,639	44,480	230,119	104	52					
New High "DDD", Or. City	-	1,860	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	-	74%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	105			
New Smyrna	2,060	2,085	1,678	1,594	2,055	485	1,594	2,055	129%	1,594	97%	65	21	203,128	16,110	219,238	107	70					
Pine Ridge	2,621	2,126	1,987	1,888	2,453	595	1,888	2,453	139%	1,888	113%	81	27	235,904	21,897	257,801	105	83					
Seabreeze	2,009	2,034	1,923	1,827	1,827	-	1,827	1,827	110%	1,827	111%	74	-	245,641	-	245,641	-	134	23				
Spruce Creek	2,797	2,797	2,175	2,066	3,069	1,055	2,066	3,069	135%	2,066	135%	85	45	233,390	34,673	268,063	87	67					
Taylor	919	919	908	863	1,073	221	863	1,073	107%	863	71%	35	24	109,003	20,818	129,821	121	68					
SUBTOTAL	20,040	20,112	16,688	15,854	21,221	5,650	15,854	21,221	126%	20,686	97%	669	270	2,034,548	225,670	2,260,218	107	683					

There are 32 Elementary, 9 Middle Schools and 9 High Schools that are listed in the chart as overcrowded. Deltona and its feeder area (Orange City, DeBary Enterprise and Osteen) account for 10 Elementary, 3 Middle Schools and 2 High Schools that are overcrowded.

POTENTIAL SOCIAL IMPACTS

The location of public schools is a major factor in where people choose to live, and schools are a community focal point. Public schools are used as shelters during hurricanes and other natural disasters such as the wildfires. Many public schools do not shut down at the end of a school day but are open at night to provide adult education for residents in the community. This is another reason why the County and the School Board work together in selecting appropriate school sites.

POTENTIAL ECONOMIC IMPACTS

Good public schools have an important economic development impact on a community. Conversely poor public schools are seen as an impediment to economic development and growth. Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) make corporate relocation decisions based on the quality of the local school system. Realtors market housing developments based on the quality or availability of local schools in the area. Anything that Volusia County can do to assist the School Board on the issue of public school over-crowding and school siting will aid the County as far as economic development.

POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Policy 1.3.1.6 of the Volusia County Comprehensive Plan in the Future Land Use Element limits public schools from developing in environmentally sensitive and conservation areas. In rural areas, the School Board and Volusia County applies FDCA's criteria on urban sprawl in siting public schools. The County does site suitability analysis when it comes to prospective school sites,

OBJECTIVE ANALYSIS

The objective analysis is provided in Table 2.4C using the recommended matrix format.

Table 2.4C: Objective Analysis Regarding Land Use and Schools Linkage

OBJECTIVE	TARGET	CONDITIONS AT THE 1998 EAR	CURRENT CONDITIONS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS
Objective 1.1.1 Growth management criteria will be established to ensure that future land use patterns will maintain vital natural functions and in conjunction with the availability of public facilities and services to support that development at the appropriate level of service.	Schools and Public Services.	This Objective defining what public services should be available in the urban areas was in the 1990 Comprehensive Plan and remains unchanged.	Same as first EAR and Comprehensive Plan.	Maintain Objective and Policies.
Objective 1.1.4 Volusia County shall provide approximately 270 acres for the existing and future needs for water and wastewater facilities and other public facilities and services, by locating needed facilities in areas suitable for such use.	School Facilities and Park Services.	This Objective contains 3 Policies that coordinate school siting with adequate public service. Co-location of schools and parks with city and county government facilities are under this Objective.	Same as first EAR and Comprehensive Plan.	Maintain Objective and Policies.
Objective 1.3.1 Volusia County shall provide for adequate and appropriate lands for the location of all land use types (residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural, recreational, conservation and public facility) to support the anticipated population and maximize compatibility with existing uses.	Appropriate zoned sites for public schools.	This Objective contains 2 Policies that delineate school location and site criteria. Policy 1.3.1.6 that allows public schools in all categories except environmental and conservation areas. Section D in Chapter 1 under Public Facilities and Utilities list the location criteria for public schools.	Same as first EAR and Comprehensive Plan.	Maintain Objective and Policies.

OBJECTIVE	TARGET	CONDITIONS AT THE 1998 EAR	CURRENT CONDITIONS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS
<p>Objective 13.1.4 Volusia County shall maintain current cooperative agreements for public recreation opportunities and shall coordinate and develop a monitoring system and new inter-local agreements with the local public suppliers to ensure park and recreation facilities meet local recreation demands. Coordination with private suppliers of recreational opportunities shall be accomplished through residential land development review process, analysis of impact on level of services and amendment to the Land Development Code to include District and Local Parks impact fees in the unincorporated area for the purpose of providing new parks necessitated by such development.</p>	<p>Agreement with School Board and County on local parks.</p>	<p>This Objective and its related Policies defines the Interlocal Agreement that allows Volusia County to count School Board property in its inventory of local park and recreational facilities.</p>	<p>Same as first EAR and Comprehensive Plan.</p>	<p>Maintain Objective and Policies. If Leisure Services changes its impact fee structure, school lands and parks will be part of the overall inventory of County Parks under the new single Level of Service standard. Presently there is a two-tier Level of Service standard for Parks based on local and district parks. Schools are counted toward the local park service standard.</p>
<p>Objective 13.1.7 County staff shall periodically review park property for safety and security deficiencies and shall incorporate, where practical, those improvements in the design and operation of the County's park system.</p>	<p>Public schools and Park safety.</p>	<p>This Objective relates to public safety and security at parks, which includes school property.</p>	<p>Same as first EAR and Comprehensive Plan.</p>	<p>Maintain Objective and Policies.</p>

OBJECTIVE	TARGET	CONDITIONS AT THE 1998 EAR	CURRENT CONDITIONS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS
Objective 15.2.4 The County shall help to support these long term cultural facility needs through revenue sources as deemed appropriate, dependent upon availability of revenue and the general condition of Volusia County's finances.	School Facilities and Park LOS.	This Objective and its related Policies defines the Interlocal Agreement that allows Volusia County to count School Board property in its inventory of local park and recreational facilities.	Same as first EAR and Comprehensive Plan.	Maintain Objective and Policies.
15.3.4 The County shall modify revise or add service level standards based on changing circumstances and needs.	Schools and LOS standards.	This Objective and Policy 15.3.4.4 may have to be modified to adopt the LOS service standards for concurrency.	Same as first EAR and Comprehensive Plan.	This LOS policy needs to be adjusted as part of Senate Bill 360.

RECOMMENDATION

The Volusia County School Board will be the lead agency in forging the interlocal agreement and writing the new school concurrency element. The County is ready to assist with the school concurrency element. The goal is to have the proportionate fair share mitigation plan help assist with the construction of new schools and related infrastructure. Capacity reservation fees might be encouraged. Whatever system is chosen, it has to be a system that the county, School Board and municipalities can agree upon.

There will be a discussion whether there should be exemptions or discounts for downtown redevelopment or urban infill. The unintended consequence of Senate Bill 360 may be urban sprawl. However, in the long run, it would be in the best interest of the School Board, Volusia County and its municipalities to maintain its road network and school facilities within the urban core area. Proportionate fair share mitigation should not be utilized as an incentive to expand into rural areas.

EVALUATION OF MAJOR ISSUES

2.4C LAND USE, LOS AND INFRASTRUCTURE LINKAGE

Land Use and Water Supply Link: The County will evaluate the Future Land Use Element with respect to the St. Johns River Water Management District's Regional Water Supply Plan.

INTRODUCTION

This sub-issue of the Land Use, LOS and Infrastructure Linkage issue is in response to recent legislative changes to strengthen the relationship between regional water supply planning and local comprehensive planning. Further, regional water supply planning efforts indicate that there is a limit to the continued reliance on groundwater to meet the projected potable water supply need resulting from anticipated population growth. Changes to Chapter 163, F.S. now require that the EAR include a special topic to evaluate the Comprehensive Plan with respect to the water management districts regional water supply plan (See Section 3.2, Special Topic – Water Supply). The Water Supply Special Topic section addresses the linkage requirement and current status of County efforts to coordinate with the ongoing regional water supply planning. The special topic section also outlines the County's interim water supply strategy recognizing that the regional water supply planning is still underway at this time. Legislation passed in 2005 (SB 444) requires a multi-step process that will lead to the preparation of a Water Supply Facilities Work Plan (Work Plan). The Work Plan must identify and implement traditional and alternative water supply sources, including conservation and reuse, necessary to meet the projected need. The Work Plan and water supply sources identified in the Work Plan are required to be incorporated into the County's Comprehensive Plan. This section will focus on the relationship of the Future Land Use Element with the regional water supply planning process to avoid any redundancy with the Water Supply Special Topic section.

BACKGROUND

Local governments have the authority to regulate land use, and the water management districts have the sole authority to regulate water use. Local governments regulate land use through the comprehensive planning authority (Chapter 163, F.S.) and the Water Management Districts have historically regulated water use through the Consumptive Use Permitting (CUP) authority (Chapter 373, F.S.). From the comprehensive planning perspective, water supply availability has historically been assessed as a function of a water supplier's capacity to meet the projected potable water need for anticipated urban growth. The allocation of Future Land Uses by the local government, particularly for urban uses, is based on meeting the population growth projected for the planning period of the comprehensive plan. Public services needed to meet the demand attributed to the projected urban population growth are based on Level of Service (LOS) standards to ensure that facilities are planned and provided concurrent with the anticipated growth.

The County's adoption in 1990 of its Comprehensive Plan pre-dated the advent of regional water supply planning that was commenced by the Water Management Districts beginning in mid-1990. For the County's Comprehensive Plan, the focus on water supply availability was on the supplier's capacity to treat and distribute potable water to

meet the needs of urban growth within the unincorporated area. The cities did likewise for their respective incorporated areas. The assumption was that the suppliers would obtain the necessary CUP's and that groundwater would continue to be relied on as the source of potable water. Policies were incorporated into the plan to protect the viability of that source recognizing the County's designation as a sole source aquifer. This involved incorporating policies in the Comprehensive Plan to protect groundwater quantity and quality (See Section 1.5 – Brief Assessment Of Successes & Shortcomings: Natural Groundwater And Aquifer Recharge Element). Additional policies were added to the Comprehensive Plan with the EAR-based amendments in 1998 recognizing the need to coordinate with the regional water supply planning process. This included water supply planning efforts both at the County level through the Volusian Water Alliance, and regionally with the SJRWMD.

Regional Water Supply Assessments prepared by the SJRWMD (1998/2003 SJRWMD Water Supply Assessments) have indicated the potential for adverse impacts to water resources (i.e., spring flow, lake levels, and wetlands) due to projected groundwater withdrawals within the County. The increase in projected groundwater withdrawals is primarily a result of anticipated population growth within the urban areas served by public supply utilities. The projected water use for Volusia County in the 2003 SJRWMD Water Supply Assessment is provided in Table 2.4D. According to the assessment, public supply water use accounts for 91% of the increase in projected water use from 1995 to 2025 for all categories of water use in the County. The public supply use category share of total water use for all categories is projected to increase from 49% in 1995 to 62% in 2025. This trend in water use is similar to trends in other urbanizing areas of the state with agricultural water use remaining static or decreasing.

Initial regional water supply planning efforts conducted by the SJRWMD (2000/2001) in conjunction with County water supply planning entities (most recently the Volusian Water Alliance, 2002) have indicated a need to consider the development of alternative water supply sources (e.g., fresh surface water, saltwater, and several regional aquifer management projects, along with increased reuse and conservation). These plans have also indicated that the development of these alternative sources will require a regional effort involving many, if not all, the utilities within the County. This will present a challenge to many local governments depending on the particular relationships that exist with how water is supplied. As an example, the County is not a major water supplier and relies on several city utilities to serve urban unincorporated areas whether through formal or informal agreements. As illustrated in Table 2.4D, the County's utility system produced 2.15 MGD of water that amounted to 5% of the total public supply production of 47.73 MGD for all suppliers. The need for a regional approach to develop new supplies led to the formation of the Water Authority of Volusia (WAV) as the replacement entity for the Volusian Water Authority which was limited as a planning entity.

POTENTIAL SOCIAL IMPACTS

Efforts have been underway to change behaviors concerning the use of water. A key water supply strategy has been to increase conservation efforts in order to reduce demand. Reducing demand leads to a reduction in per capita usage and thus can reduce the projected need for the same projected population growth. Conservation efforts serve as an optimization tool to reduce the need to develop new sources of water whether traditional (i.e., groundwater) or alternative (e.g., fresh surface or saltwater).

This effort to change behavior will require the continuation of local (local governments/WAV) and regional (SJRWMD) partnerships to implement educational programs that encourage conservation measures such as the drought tolerant landscape design, water conserving irrigation methods, acceptance of reuse, and so on. The County recently enacted a County-wide Water Wise Ordinance to implement water conserving landscape and irrigation design with new development. As noted in the Water Supply Topic Section, these conservation efforts, along with increased reuse, has led to a recent reduction in per capita usage.

Table 2.4D: Projected Water Use and Production Volusia County

Category	1995 Actual Water Use (MGD)			2025 Demand Projections (MGD)			Change (MGD)	% Change
	Ground	Surface	Total	Ground	Surface	Total		
Public Supply	47.73	0.00	47.73	87.93	0.00	87.93	40.20	84%
Domestic/Small Public Supply	9.95	0.00	9.95	5.38	0.00	5.38	-4.57	-46%
Agricultural Irrigation	24.45	3.42	27.87	21.64	3.51	25.15	-2.72	-10%
Recreational Irrigation (Golf Course)	7.63	2.41	10.04	10.91	3.45	14.36	4.32	43%
Commercial, Industrial, & Institutional	0.69	0.00	0.69	0.66	0.00	0.66	-0.03	-4%
Thermoelectric Power Generation	0.37	0.00	0.37	0.69	6.54	7.23	6.86	1854%
Total	90.82	5.83	96.65	127.21	13.50	140.71	44.06	46%
Water Production - Utilities								
Volusia County	2.15	0	2.15	11.63	0	11.63	9.48	441%
All Other	45.58	0	45.58	76.3	0	76.3	30.72	67%
Total	47.73	0	47.73	87.93	0	87.93	40.20	84%

Source: 2003 Water Supply Assessment, SJRWMD

POTENTIAL ECONOMIC IMPACTS

Implementation of the Regional Water Supply Plans is anticipated to increase the cost of producing new water supplies especially for potential development of alternative sources such as surface or salt water. Implementation of water conserving rate structures will mean that water rates will increase incrementally as the usage increases. The increase in rate structures by the public suppliers will ultimately affect the water bills of the customers.

POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The implementation of the regional water supply plans is intended to reduce the potential for adverse impacts to natural resources based on projected groundwater withdrawals.

OBJECTIVE ANALYSIS

The Objective analysis is provided in Table 2.4E using the recommended matrix format.

Table 2.4E: Objective Analysis Regarding the Relationship of the Future Land Use Element and Regional Water Supply Plan

OBJECTIVE	TARGET	CONDITIONS AT THE 1998 EAR	CURRENT CONDITIONS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS
<p>1.1.1 Growth management criteria will be established to ensure that future land use patterns will maintain vital natural functions and in conjunction with the availability of public facilities and services to support that development at the appropriate level of service.</p>	<p>Availability of water for projected growth.</p>	<p>Potable water from public systems (public supply) whether city or County systems limited to urban areas.</p> <p>LOS maintained for unincorporated population growth.</p> <p>Continued reliance on groundwater to meet public supply needs.</p> <p>Coordination with the ongoing regional water supply planning process (SJRWMD/Volusian Water Alliance).</p>	<p>County is operating under interim water supply strategy until ongoing regional water supply planning process is complete pursuant to SB 444 and regional supply solutions determined.</p>	<p>Update of population projections to be coordinated with projected need/population projections of the local water suppliers (County/city utilities) and regional entities (WAV/SJRWMD).</p> <p>Potential for development of alternative water supply sources to meet projected need – will require regional solution whether through WAV or other entity.</p>
<p>1.2.2 Volusia County shall protect natural, and historic resources from the adverse impact of development as outlined in the Conservation and Historic Preservation elements.</p>	<p>Protection of natural resources from the potential for adverse impacts from increased groundwater withdrawals.</p>	<p>Policies reference reliance on protection criteria in Natural Groundwater and Aquifer Recharge and Conservation Elements – focus on impact of development such as recharge criteria, wellfield protection, etc.</p>	<p>Increased focus on conservation measures such as passage of the Water Wise Ordinance and increased reuse led to decrease in usage.</p> <p>Continued participation in WAV, and coordination with the regional water supply planning process.</p>	<p>Potential for limit on continued reliance on groundwater to meet projected need.</p> <p>Will require a regional effort to implement the ongoing regional water supply planning.</p>

RECOMMENDATION

The issues related to implementation of the recent legislation strengthening the linkage for water supply and comprehensive planning are detailed in the Water Supply Special Topic Section. The special topic section also addresses the County's interim water supply strategies that will be pursued until the issues related to implementation of these new requirements and the ongoing regional water supply planning process are resolved. The focus for development of new supplies (alternative or traditional) currently resides with the WAV, which completed a water supply facility master plan in February 2006 for its member local governments. WAV membership consists of local governments and their respective utilities within Volusia County including the County government and all but two of the cities. This effort will also need to be coordinated with SJRWMD's District Water Supply Plan and take into account the recent changes to the water supply provisions of Chapter 373, F.S. (primarily SB 444). Once this planning effort has been completed and traditional and any alternative sources identified, the County will prepare its Water Supply Facilities Work Plan. This will be followed with the required amendments to the County's Comprehensive Plan to adopt the Work Plan and identification of sources as required by the statutory changes.

EVALUATION OF MAJOR ISSUES

2.4D LAND USE, LOS AND INFRASTRUCTURE LINKAGE

LOS Standards for Parks: The County will evaluate whether the adopted LOS standards for Local and District Parks is currently appropriate.

INTRODUCTION

The existing County parks and recreation system is based on local and district park classifications and corresponding minimal facilities and Level of Service (LOS) standards: Local Parks – 2.0 acres per 1000 population; District Parks – 5.0 acres per 1000 population. Analysis of local and district park classifications found that some local parks actually function as district parks and some district parks function as local parks. Also, the list of minimal facilities, as provided in the Comprehensive Plan, is too constraining and does not leave room for building parks based on the desires of the public.

BACKGROUND

At the time of the first EAR, there was a surplus of park acreage for local and district parks above the established LOS, except in the Central Planning Region (an area rural in nature; however, park planning region boundaries have been altered since the first EAR to coincide with park impact fee zones). The 2004 Local Park Analysis shows no deficiencies in park acreage. The 2004 analysis shows 455 total acres of local parks. At 2 acres per 1000 persons, there is an overall surplus of around 227 acres. Currently, there are 2,847 total acres for district parks. At 5 acres per 1000 persons, there is no deficiency in district park acreage.

Local parks were intended to be situated and developed within the urbanizing areas to encourage pedestrian access and to minimize the length of vehicular trips. District parks were intended to provide activities and opportunities that rely on the abundant natural resources associated with coastal beaches, inland rivers and lakes, or land-based outdoor areas that provide user-oriented or resource-based activities. However, it has been found that some local parks actually function as district parks and some district parks function as local parks. For example, a beachfront park is usually pretty small, but it attracts people from all over the Volusia County and surrounding counties. On the other hand, some County district parks include playgrounds and trails that function as local parks for the adjacent neighborhoods. Based on the aforementioned situation pertaining to the existing park classifications, the Volusia County Leisure Services Division is interested in amending the existing local and district park classifications to one standard “County Park” Classification with a LOS standard of 3.5 acres per 1,000 persons (unincorporated population). This proposed change does not create any deficiencies. Establishing one park classification has been a recommended change to the County park and recreation system since the first EAR, but has not been implemented due to issues associated with the implementation of park impact fees.

POTENTIAL SOCIAL IMPACTS

There are no anticipated negative social impacts. The proposed change to the park standard and corresponding LOS would not create any deficiencies. The proposed change may produce more customized park venues based on actual public desire and need (e.g., dog parks and skateboard parks). However, there will be a substantial discussion and debate over park impact fees. For instance, County park impact fees are tied to planning quadrants and are not collected within municipalities. Municipalities typically collect their own park impact fees. The expenditures of these fees within various impact fee zones must be reviewed carefully to ensure a fair and equitable distribution of park resources. The proposed change to the park LOS standards represents the first step in a lengthy public debate regarding park impact fees and how these funds are distributed.

POTENTIAL ECONOMIC IMPACTS

Currently impact fees for local and district parks are collected by quadrant only in the unincorporated area. The proposed change to the park standard and corresponding LOS would necessitate a change in the existing impact fee formula. One suggested change is to collect impact fees for the unincorporated area as a whole, rather than by quadrant, so that there is increased flexibility in addressing recreational needs and demand County-wide. Since impact fees are only collected in the unincorporated area, there is a concern that as annexation activities increase, and unincorporated land area decreases, funding for parks will ultimately decrease. However, any needed changes to the parks impact fee formula will be determined during the impact fee study being conducted in 2007 by the Building and Zoning Permit Activity.

POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

There are no anticipated negative environmental impacts. There are no negative affects relating to land acquisition for parks anticipated by this proposed change; however, since land has become so expensive it will become more difficult to acquire land compared to previous years.

OBJECTIVE ANALYSIS

The existing County parks and recreation system, as per Objective 13.1.5, is based on local and district park classifications and corresponding minimal facilities and Level of Service (LOS) standards: Local Parks – 2.0 acres per 1000 population; District Parks – 5.0 acres per 1000 population. Objectives 13.1.4 and 13.1.6 also address the County-wide park system with regard to local recreational demand, park impact fees, impact to LOS and financial feasibility. Please refer to Table 2.4F for the analysis of these Objectives.

Table 2.4F: Objective Analysis Regarding LOS Standards for Parks

OBJECTIVE	TARGET	CONDITIONS AT THE 1998 EAR	CURRENT CONDITIONS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS
<p>13.1.4 Volusia County shall maintain current cooperative agreements for public recreation opportunities and shall coordinate and develop a monitoring system and new inter-local agreements with the local public suppliers to ensure park and recreation facilities meet local recreation demands. Coordination with private suppliers of recreational opportunities shall be accomplished through residential land development review process, analysis of impact on level of services and amendment to the Land Development Code to include District and Local Parks impact fees in the unincorporated area for the purpose of providing new parks necessitated by such development.</p>	<p>Increasing recreational opportunities through joint agreements with public/private sector.</p>	<p>The County has entered into interlocal agreements with the Cities and the Volusia County School Board that provide for joint use of recreational facilities.</p> <p>The County maintains lease agreements with federal, state and regional agencies to use facilities owned by these agencies for parks and recreational purposes.</p>	<p>The County continues to maintain interlocal agreements with the cities and the Volusia County School Board that provide for joint use of recreational facilities. The County also has interlocal agreements with 11 municipalities for various cooperative recreational programs.</p> <p>The County continues to maintain lease agreements with federal, state and regional agencies to use facilities owned by these agencies for parks and recreational purposes.</p>	<p>This Objective should be revised to reflect proposed change to one standard County park classification, LOS standard, minimal facilities and subsequent impact fee in conjunction with the proposed impact fee study being conducted in 2007 by the Building and Zoning Permit Activity. This proposed change will likely occur after the EAR-based amendments.</p> <p>Proposed change may produce more parks based on actual public desire and need.</p>
<p>13.1.5 Volusia County shall develop and maintain a system of recreation sites and facilities to meet the level of service standards of the County.</p>	<p>LOS for recreation sites and facilities.</p>	<p>Sufficient park acreage to meet the established LOS (there were surpluses in most planning regions) except in the Central Planning Region.</p>	<p>No deficiency in LOS.</p> <p>Planning regions were redefined based on impact fee zone quadrants.</p>	<p>There are proposed changes to the LOS standard for parks as stated in the corresponding Policies of the subject Objective.</p>

OBJECTIVE	TARGET	CONDITIONS AT THE 1998 EAR	CURRENT CONDITIONS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS
<p>13.1.6 Volusia County shall ensure that parks, recreation facilities and open space areas are economically feasible to acquire, develop, operate and maintain through the year 2010 by coordinating and implementing a County-wide park system between the public and private sectors.</p>	<p>Economic feasibility.</p>	<p>Funding sources include grants from local, state and federal agencies. Interlocal agreements were established with local governments to assist in joint funding of operations and maintenance. Maintenance of the parks system is primarily funded through the general fund.</p>	<p>This Objective continues to be successfully implemented as the County annually applies for, and receives, grants from local, state and federal agencies. Maintenance of the County parks system continues to be funded through the general fund. The County continues to work with private developers to provide recreation facilities and trails.</p>	<p>The Local and District Parks Impact Fee Ordinance will be reviewed in 2007.</p>

RECOMMENDATION

It has been found that some local parks actually function as district parks and some district parks function as local parks. Volusia County Leisure Services recommends amending the existing local and district park classifications to one standard "County Park" Classification with a LOS standard of 3.5 acres per 1,000 persons (This is a projection of the current standard and does not create any deficiencies.) The proposed County Park classification would have the following corresponding proposed minimal facilities requirement:

Proposed County Park – Minimal Facilities

A County Park must contain a parking area and at least three of the following facilities:

1. Restroom/Bathhouse
2. Playground
3. Picnic Area/Pavilions
4. Sports field (Lighted and Unlighted)
5. Basketball Court
6. Multi-Purpose Hard-court
7. Tennis Court
8. Racquetball Court
9. Volleyball Court
10. Shuffleboard Court
11. Jogging/Fitness Trail
12. Nature Trail
13. Multi-use Trail
14. Equestrian Trail
15. Boardwalk
16. Educational/Historical Feature
17. Multipurpose Clubhouse/Community Meeting Facility
18. Boat Ramp/Canoe Launch
19. Fishing Pier
20. Camping
21. Wildlife Observation Area
22. Gun Range/Skeet Range
23. BMX Track
24. Skateboard Park
25. Dog Park
26. Open or free play area
27. Other Recreational Facilities according to Public Need

The impact fee formula for parks would also need to be changed to correspond with the proposed change in park classification and LOS standard, and so that the County can maintain an acceptable level of service with a true growth related formula. These changes should be made in conjunction with the proposed impact fee study being conducted in 2007 by the Building and Zoning Permit Activity.

EVALUATION OF MAJOR ISSUES

2.4E LAND USE, LOS AND INFRASTRUCTURE LINKAGE

Intergovernmental coordination: The County will assess current partnerships with the state, municipalities and the Volusia County School Board with respect to coordinating the provision of urban services.

INTRODUCTION

Intergovernmental coordination is a process where two or more jurisdictions enter into an agreement to accomplish a common objective. In this analysis the objective is the provision of urban services that support, maintain, protect and enhance existing and future populations. The placement, availability and quality of those services can and do influence the geographic distribution of urban populations and the issue is “do the current partnerships (agreements) encourage the use of services to effect a desirable geographic population distribution”? For the purposes of this analysis a desirable distribution of population would be one that: encourages compact growth in relation to planned or established urban centers; concentrates population to maximize efficient transportation and utility systems; and is situated to protect natural resources.

BACKGROUND

In the past the distribution of population has been a function of land availability and economics. Until recently there has been a sufficient quantity of relatively inexpensive land adjacent to existing urban concentrations to fuel the development industry. The current Florida land boom has caught up with Volusia County and seemingly overnight the supply of large, well-suited development parcels has greatly diminished. Symptomatic of this land crunch is the difficulty the County School Board is having in locating land of a suitable size and quality to build new schools to serve urban school-age populations. The reduction of well-suited lands close to the urban centers has placed pressure on the conversion of agricultural, forestry and natural resource lands for urban use. Many of these areas are not adjacent to existing urban services, resulting in a land use pattern that makes service delivery inefficient and costly. The other result is a reduction in resource lands.

One method to address service delivery issues is through interlocal agreements between local governments that identify which areas are to be annexed, and how urban services will be provided in a rational and cost-effective manner. Through interlocal agreements consensus can be achieved relating to the linkage between land use, supporting infrastructure, ability to meet adopted level of service standards, and conformance with the tenets of smart growth concepts such as compact development and resource protection.

OBJECTIVE ANALYSIS

The Objective analysis is provided in Table 2.4G using the recommended matrix format.

Table 2.4G: Objective Analysis Regarding Intergovernmental Coordination

OBJECTIVE	TARGET	CONDITIONS AT THE 1998 EAR	CURRENT CONDITIONS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS
<p>14.1.1 Volusia County shall continue communication with adjacent cities and counties and federal, state, and regional agencies, among others, via effective formal and informal coordination mechanisms to ensure consistency in planning related matters and to coordinate the impacts of development. The formal and informal mechanisms shall include membership in area wide organizations and multi-level staff communication.</p>	<p>Coordination of plan consistency and impacts between local jurisdictions.</p>	<p>The County had the following mechanisms for the coordination of land use planning and related infrastructure and facility LOS.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) – a County-wide organization that coordinates capital expenditures regarding the planning of major road projects. 2. Volusia Council of Governments (VCOG) – an advisory organization that was conceived as an area-wide planning organization. VCOG offers planning assistance to local governments and serves as a resource for intergovernmental coordination. 3. Volusia Growth Management Commission (VGMC) – was created under the County Charter and is charged with the responsibility to determine if a local government’s plan and plan amendments are consistent with the plans and programs of adjacent or affected local governments. All local governments have membership on the Commission. 4. The Joint City-County Coordinating Committee (JCCC)- created by the state legislature for coordinating potable water and sewer services in an area outside of the City of DeLand in unincorporated Volusia County. Also reviews matters related to planning, zoning, and development. 	<p>With the following exceptions the same mechanisms exist in their previous form.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Volusia County Land Acquisition Committee – this activity was discontinued and its function was taken up by the “Volusia 2000” initiative in which the voters approved, by referendum, to establish a property tax expected to generate over 80 million dollars. The funds are to be used to purchase <u>E</u>cological, <u>C</u>ultural <u>H</u>istoric, & <u>O</u>utdoor (ECHO) lands. The ECHO program is overseen by a committee appointed by the County Council. The Committee makes recommendations to the Council on funding priorities. 	<p>Maintain Objective 14.1.1 as is.</p>

OBJECTIVE	TARGET	CONDITIONS AT THE 1998 EAR	CURRENT CONDITIONS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS
14.1.1 Cont...	Coordination of plan consistency and impacts between local jurisdictions.	<p>5. The Volusia County Land Acquisition Committee – charged with the responsibility of identifying and recommending areas for public purchase as part of the Land Acquisition Program. The committee has representation from the County and from each local government.</p> <p>6. Volusia County Recreation Directors Association – informal group of local government recreation staff that serves as a forum for the exchange of ideas and information.</p> <p>7. The Mosquito Lagoon Watershed Action Committee – formed in 1987 for the purpose of involving local agencies in Volusia County in water quality issues associated with the Lagoon. The committee was an outgrowth of the Surface Water Improvement and Management Plan (SWIM) Program.</p> <p>8. Water Alliance of Volusia (WAV) – primary goal is the development of a County-wide potable water supply plan. Mission is to ensure a sustainable water supply while maintaining stability of the aquifer.</p>	<p>2. The responsibility of the Mosquito Lagoon Watershed Action Committee was folded into the Halifax River/ Indian River Task Force. The Task Force was sunset on October 1, and the Ponce deLeon Inlet and Port Advisory Board absorbed their responsibilities.</p>	Maintain Objective 14.1.1 as is.

OBJECTIVE	TARGET	CONDITIONS AT THE 1998 EAR	CURRENT CONDITIONS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS
14.1.1 Cont...	Coordination of plan consistency and impacts between local jurisdictions.	<p>9. Volusia County School Board – School Board has interlocal agreements with all local governments in the County to share and review capital improvement plans and population data between School Board staff and local governments.</p> <p>10. Volusia County School Board – Informal process to perform staff-to-staff review of alternative school sites for site selection process.</p> <p>11. “Planners’ Lunch” – informal forum to discuss planning related issues on an ad hoc basis. Participants include school board and local government planners.</p> <p>12. St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD)</p>	<p>3. The Volusia Water Alliance (VWA) no longer exists and has been replaced by the Water Authority of Volusia (WAV). Its mission is very similar to the former VWA and is stated as: “to plan, provide, and preserve a high quality water supply in a sustainable manner through innovative, cost-effective, and environmentally sensitive management practices, through the unified voice of its members.” Membership in the WAV consists of one elected official from each of its 14 members governing bodies.</p> <p>4. The Agreement with the Volusia County School Board is unchanged, however, it will need to be updated to reflect new public school facility requirements of Senate Bill 360.</p>	Maintain Objective 14.1.1 as is.

OBJECTIVE	TARGET	CONDITIONS AT THE 1998 EAR	CURRENT CONDITIONS	COMMENTS / ACTIONS
<p>14.1.2 Volusia County shall negotiate interlocal agreements coordinating land and planning development activities to allow for orderly growth and facilitate the efficient provision of government services and facilities. The County shall coordinate with that State, regional or local entities having operation and maintenance responsibility for public facilities when establishing level of service standards. The interlocal agreements may include, but not be limited to, the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Land Use * Transportation * Recreation * Utility Services * Conservation * Housing * Libraries * Schools 	<p>Use interlocal agreements as a tool to guide orderly growth, promote the efficient delivery of services, and protect resources.</p>	<p>13. East Central Florida Planning Council (ECFRPC) – Volusia County had at the time of the 1998 EAR a number of interlocal agreements with municipalities. Most of these agreements dealt with a single subject or a defined and limited geographical sub-area. The County has formal and informal agreements on police, fire, medical and emergency medical services. There are a number of agreements in place covering land use, utility service areas, annexation, and urban transition areas. Taken together, these help meet the intent of Objective 14.1.2.</p>	<p>The County is seeking to move in the direction of establishing the “next generation” of Interlocal agreement. To more fully implement Objective 14.1.2 the County is seeking to establish comprehensive interlocal agreements that cover a number of planning related subjects with each local government. A prototype agreement has been drafted and negotiations have begun with at least one municipality.</p>	<p>Objective 14.1.2 will remain as worded with the exception of adding the topics of “Development Activity” and “Annexation” to the items listed under the Objective. The addition of the “Annexation” topic is that annexation is a topic relevant to the subject of service delivery. The addition of the topic “Development Activity” resulted from the proposed deletion of Objective 14.1.1.3 (dealing with the establishment of a County-wide permit system) for reasons described in the section entitled Assessment Of Successes & Shortcomings – Chapter 14.</p>

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend that the stated Objectives remain in current form (with minor addition of the two topics to 14.1.2). Further recommend that County continue with its program to establish comprehensive interlocal agreements with units of state, regional and local governments.