

SECTION 1: FIRE/EMS

- 1.1 Background
- 1.2 Existing Fire/EMS Service Provision
- 1.3 Development Program
- 1.4 EMS/Fire Level of Service Evaluation – Identification of Fire/EMS Needs
- 1.5 Capital Improvement Needs

SECTION 2: RECREATION

- 2.1 Background
- 2.2 Existing Recreation Service Provision
- 2.3 Development Program
- 2.4 Recreation Level of Service Evaluation – Identification of Recreation Needs
- 2.5 Capital Improvement Needs

SECTION 3: SOLID WASTE

- 3.1 Background
- 3.2 Existing Solid Waste Service Provision
- 3.3 Development Program
- 3.4 Solid Waste Level of Service Evaluation – Identification of Solid Waste Needs
- 3.5 Capital Improvement Needs

SECTION 4: PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES

- 4.1 Background
- 4.2 Existing Public School Facilities Service Provision
- 4.3 Development Program
- 4.4 Public School Facilities Level of Service Evaluation – Identification of Public School Facilities Needs
- 4.5 Capital Improvement Needs

SECTION 1: FIRE/EMS FACILITY ANALYSIS

1.1 Background

Alachua County Comprehensive Plan (ACCP) Requirements

The Capital Improvements Element Policy 1.2.1 identifies three basic ‘categories’ of public facilities for the purposes of establishing levels of service standards in Alachua County: Category A, Category B or Category C public facilities. Fire/EMS is determined to be a Category C public facility. The proposed plan amendment for the EASP proposes a future land use map amendment that increases the density and intensity of land only within the EA-EOMU future land use category, which has been proposed to function as an urban cluster under the ACCP. The adopted level of service for Fire/EMS within an urban cluster is established as follows:

***Policy 1.2.5** Alachua County shall adopt LOS guidelines for Category "C" public facilities, and include those facilities in the CIP. These LOS guidelines are to be used for analysis and identification of Capital Improvement Project needs for these facilities to be included in the Capital Improvement Program. These level of service guidelines shall be for advisory purposes only. The LOS guidelines for Category "C" public facilities are the following:*

(a) Fire LOS guidelines are as follows:

(2) In the Urban Cluster, initial unit response LOS guideline is within 6 minutes for 80% of all emergency responses within a 12 month period. Fire suppression /protection service levels for all properties in the Urban Cluster shall be at the ISO (Insurance Service Office) Class Protection 6 or better. Land development regulations shall require that 100% of development shall provide water supply served by hydrants.

Alachua County Fire/Emergency Medical Services Performance Update (F&EMS PU)

The F&EMS PU is a formal report of the County’s master plan update. Emergency Services Consulting International (ESCI) was engaged by Alachua County to complete an update to the Fire and EMS Master Plan originally performed by ESCI in 2004. The original document, along with subsequent revisions and updated data and information, was used to evaluate the current deployment of Alachua County Fire and Rescue (ACFR).

Urban Cluster Performance Level of Service (LOS) Standards: The most recent F&EMS PU recognizes that the County has adopted a tiered response performance objective based on population density, each measured at the 80th percentile. Within the urban cluster this has been established as 6 minutes at least 80% of the time. These standards are based on a ‘driving-mile’ approach, from station to incident. Currently, standards are met by the established ‘closest responder’ policy and joint-communications dispatch. These two (2) protocols assist in the proximate and timely provision of F&EMS, to the best extent practicable within Alachua County.

Based on Alachua County's size and the number of small municipalities within the County, basic Fire/EMS standards and requirements are graded on service provision within timeframes set by International Organization for Standardization (ISO). Timeframes are based from station to incident, which is a factor of road miles and travel times related to speed limits, traffic signals, etc.

Plum Creek Sector Plan/Comprehensive Plan Amendment Application CPA-01-14 Workshop Staff Report

The Workshop Staff Report identified issues associated with the required Data & Analysis for Fire/EMS as follows:

- The estimated public facility costs, including a delineation of when facilities will be needed, the general location of the facilities, and projected revenue sources to fund the facilities are required by State Statute (Section 163.3177(3)(a), F.S.) at the Comprehensive Plan Amendment stage.
- Emergency services including fire rescue needs are not included as a part of this analysis, thus there is no data to determine the effect this amendment would have on emergency services provision.
- The capital costs of a single fire station are likely to exceed the projected revenues generated through fire impact fees.

Supplemental Analysis Information

Based upon a series of meetings held in spring 2015 with the ACFR Chief, staff, and administrators, three key elements in fire protection and protecting residents were identified:

1. Early detection,
2. Prompt response, and
3. Fire prevention.

1.2 Existing Fire/EMS Service Provision

Eastern Alachua County is currently served by F&EMS stations located in Hawthorne, Orange Heights, and a volunteer station in Windsor. In March 2015, Alachua County officially moved the non-permanent Grove Park Station from its aluminum awning truck bay and manufactured housing building to the City of Hawthorne in a permanent fire station. This move involved the renovation of an existing building for approximately \$800,000. In addition, ACFR maintains ownership of the Grove Park lands. The new Hawthorne station has full-time staff with a full complement of fire and EMS vehicles.

The Orange Heights station, which the ACFR would like to upgrade to a full station, currently houses only an EMS vehicle. The Windsor volunteer station consists of only a vehicle, with no building or other permanent structures. Both the Orange Heights and Windsor locations have adequate land, at over two (2) acres each, which could house a typical station, vehicles, and fire/emergency medical services personnel.

1.3 Development Program

The EASP application proposes urban levels of development within a new future land use classification EA-EOMU which is concentrated in two (2) areas: the SR 20 Jobs Center and the US 301 Jobs Center. The EASP is projected to reach build-out in 2070 and allows for a total of 11.2M sq. ft. of non-residential development and 8,700 residential units. No development is projected to occur within the EASP until 2021.

Table 1A: 2020 Development Program (Five-Year Program)

	SR 20 Jobs Center		US 301 Jobs Center		Total EA-EOMU	
Non-Residential	Sq. Ft.	Jobs	Sq. Ft.	Jobs	Sq. Ft. / Jobs	
R&D/Office	0	0	0	0	0	0
Advanced Manufacturing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Retail	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Total Non-Residential</i>	0	0	0	0	0	
Residential	Dwellings	Population	Dwellings	Population	Dwellings/Pop	
Single-Family	0	0	0	0	0	0
Multi-Family/Attached	0		0		0	
<i>Total Residential</i>	0	0	0	0	0	

Source: EA Development Programs, May 21, 2015.

Table 1B: 2030 Development Program (ACCP Planning Horizon)

	SR 20 Jobs Center		US 301 Jobs Center		Total EA-EOMU	
Non-Residential	Sq. Ft.	Jobs	Sq. Ft.	Jobs	Sq. Ft. / Jobs	
R&D/Office	1.3M	4,727	0	0	1.3M	4,727
Advanced Manufacturing	0	-	0	0	0	-
Retail	0.3M	667	0	0	0.3M	667
<i>Total Non-Residential</i>	1.6M	5,394	0	0	1.6M / 5,394	
Residential	Dwellings	Population	Dwellings	Population	Dwellings/Pop	
Single-Family	1,500	4,840	0	0	1,500	4,840
Multi-Family/Attached	700		0		700	
<i>Total Residential</i>	2,200	4,840	0	0	2,200 / 4,840	

Source: EA Development Programs, May 21, 2015.

Table 1C: 2070 Development Program (Build-out)

	SR 20 Jobs Center		US 301 Jobs Center		Total EA-EOMU	
Non-Residential	Sq. Ft.	Jobs	Sq. Ft.	Jobs	Sq. Ft. / Jobs	
R&D/Office	5.0M	18,182	0	-	5.0M	18,182
Advanced Manufacturing	0	-	5.0M	5,000	5.0M	5,000
Retail	0.9M	2,000	0.3M	667	1.2M	2,667
<i>Total Non-Residential</i>	5.9M	20,182	5.3M	5,667	11.2M / 25,848	
Residential	Dwellings	Population	Dwellings	Population	Dwellings/Pop	
Single-Family	3,000	12,980	2,240	6,160	5,240	19,140
Multi-Family/Attached	2,900		560		3,460	
<i>Total Residential</i>	5,900	12,980	2,800	6,160	8,700 / 19,140	

Source: EA Development Programs, May 21, 2015.

1.4 EMS/Fire Level of Service Evaluation – Identification of Fire/EMS Needs

Consistent with Plum Creek’s conversations and ongoing coordination with ACFR staff, a planned and coordinated approach is essential to provide reliable Fire/EMS service. The planned and coordinated approach considers the proposed building programs, building uses, and site locations. This ensures site safety, and can be achieved during the development plan approval process.

This analysis assumes that both the non-residential and residential EA-EOMU development components will be constructed with the most advanced building materials and techniques, containing fully integrated security and fire alarm/suppression systems. Currently, there is an ongoing community discussion on residential fire sprinklers. However, to date no regulations have been adopted mandating such systems.

The Alachua County F&EMS PU Report shows no current deficiencies in Eastern Alachua County, as shown in Figures 1 and 2. However, the Report does not account for the development proposed within the EASP application. Based on a series of meetings in spring 2015 with ACFR Administration and staff regarding the proposed development program for the EASP amendment, the following anticipated needs were identified:

- The F&EMS PU contemplates a new station at SR 20 and CR 234 intersection to provide Fire/EMS coverage to southeast Alachua County. The deployment of this new station is based upon the assumption that Station 25 is located in Hawthorne, and that Volunteer Station 30 (Windsor) and Station 31 (Cross Creek) are unavailable. The level of development in the EASP could at a minimum require the relocation of the proposed station if there is no need for another additional station.
- The F&EMS PU identifies that Alachua County currently provides 0.76 firefighters per 1,000 persons population served. Using the ratio of 0.76 firefighters per 1,000 population, and an expected population of the Sector Plan Area of 19,140 people results in an additional demand of 14 full-time firefighters to serve this area. This general analysis does not take into account any specialized equipment that may be needed to specifically

address the type of non-residential development that may occur in the Sector Plan area (i.e. industrial, advanced manufacturing, hazardous materials, etc.).

In summary, the meetings with ACFR staff identified that Fire/EMS services coordinated with the EASP development program would require the conversion of the Windsor Station from volunteer to full time, re-establishment of the Grove Park Station or a station at County Road 234, and expansion of the Orange Heights station. Figures 1.1 and 1.2 identify current F&EMS response time capabilities.

Additional Special Considerations

To assist in the preparation of this analysis, the consultant team conducted a series of meetings with ACFR department staff to assess the facility and service needs associated with the proposed amendment for Fire/Rescue. Based upon these meetings it was determined that the traditional development program envisioned for the SR 20 Job Center will not require specialized F&EMS equipment nor enhanced staffing while the US 301 Job Center with Advanced Manufacturing and typically larger buildings, is likely to require an aerial truck to provide overhead coverage for larger buildings. This vehicle will ideally be situated in the existing Orange Creek station to serve the EA-EOMU Areas, as well as Hawthorne, Waldo, and Melrose, if needed.

Similar Alachua County Examples: The County contain a variety of similar specialized facilities with corresponding particular needs for Fire & Emergency Medical Services. Both Alachua County and the municipalities have engaged in Hazardous Materials (HazMat) training programs to address specialty needs created by laboratories, light and heavy manufacturing, and specialty processing facilities. Alachua County contains numerous regional hospitals with advanced life support and trauma care, capable of serving any program elements that may occur.

Justification and Response on Similar Case Studies: In the City of Alachua, the introduction of both Research & Development (R&D) at Progress Park and Light Industrial uses along the CR 235A corridor, fire prevention standards were established as unique needs were developed. For example, the Progress Park R&D areas, with their concentration on life sciences, often include interior fire suppression in concert with advance detection and notification systems.

In the Light Industrial areas, with large-scale warehouse distribution and food processing, an elevated storage tank was integral to providing both the necessary volume and water pressure for fire suppression. This potable water infrastructure element was timed with development through a public/private partnership.

Table 2: Alachua County Examples

LOCATION	PROJECT SPECIFICS			
	Acreage	Development Type	Entitlements	Specific needs
Gainesville Technology Exchange Center (GTEC)	±10	Technology startup with small-scale labs	Mixed-Use Low	None
City of Alachua (<i>two examples</i>)	±400 Progress Park ±2,700 CR 235A	Life Sciences and Distribution / Logistics	Planned Development and Industrial	Elevated Water Storage
City of Newberry	±800 North & South	Light Manufacturing and Cement Plant	Planned Development and Industrial	Elevated Water Storage

1.5 Capital Improvement Needs

Based on the information provided by ACFR staff, reinstating the Grove Park Station, or opening a new station at CR 234, would provide proximate coverage to the SR 20 Job Center and the US 301 Job Center. In addition, with new transportation facilities constructed within the EA-EOMU area, the Grove Park or CR 234 location is well situated to serve these areas with coverage meeting or exceeding the Level of Service Standard.

Expansion of the Orange Heights location, which currently only has an EMS vehicle, to include a vehicle and potentially an aerial ladder truck would provide excellent near immediate coverage to the US 301 Job Center. This location also serves the adjacent City of Waldo and could serve the Melrose area within acceptable timeframes and established LOS. The additional vehicles will also boost ISO ratings for existing residents & businesses. Overall, the additions will address potential EA-EOMU development needs.

Lastly, ACFR staff stated that the Hawthorne Station may need re-evaluation as Hawthorne's population grows. This is solely due to physical location, with railroad tracks immediately adjacent to the west and north station property boundaries. When a train is on the tracks, service vehicles are blocked from western Hawthorne and potentially northern Hawthorne. Long-term thought is that coverage west of downtown may be warranted as the community grows.

These proposed improvements will provide sufficient coverage to meet EASP projected demands. Specific needed improvements are outlined in Tables 3A-C. Improvements will be timed with development to ensure that F&EMS facilities are available concurrent with need.

Table 3A: 2020 Improvement Needs

LOCATION	PROJECT SPECIFICS			
	Existing Facility	Site Facility Area	Existing Equipment	NEED
SR 20 Job Center	Windsor Volunteer Fire Department, St. #30	Three (± 3) acres held	Fire truck and brush truck only	<i>None w/in 5 yr.</i>
US 301 Job Center	Orange Heights Station #8	Four (4) acre rural facility	EMS only in 2015	<i>None w/in 5 yr.</i>

Table 3B: Additional Capacity/Equipment to Meet 2030 Demand, at Existing Stations

LOCATION	PROJECT SPECIFICS DEVELOPMENT IN AREA A ONLY			
	Existing Facility	Specific Need	Need / Timing	Costs
SR 20 Job Center	Windsor Volunteer Fire Department, St. #30	Transform to full station location with EMS	Prior to 2030	$\pm \$2M$ building $\pm \$0.35M$ vehicle $\pm \$1.5M$ staffing

Table 3C: Additional Capacity/Equipment to Meet 2070 Demand, at Existing Stations

LOCATION	PROJECT SPECIFICS			
	Existing Facility	Specific Need	Need / Timing	Costs
SR 20 Job Center	Reopen Grove Park or establish CR 234 Station	Three (± 3) acres	Replace truck (12yr) and add EMS (6yr) prior to 2030	$\pm \$2M$ building $\pm \$0.35M$ vehicle $\pm \$1.5M$ staffing
US 301 Job Center	Orange Heights Station #8	Add equipment expand existing station, new truck/potential aerial rig	Building expansion and add truck	$\pm \$1M$ building $\pm \$1.4M$ vehicle $\pm \$1.2M$ staffing

According to Alachua County Fire Rescue administrative staff and leadership, no additional physical land areas are needed, unless the CR 234 location is preferred over the existing lands owned in Grove Park. ACFR has indicated that adequate land exists at each of the other existing location, and only building facilities upgrades and additional vehicles, equipment, and staffing, will be needed, as shown in Tables 3A-C. With the expansion of facilities, or potential restoration of the Grove Park site, personnel will be needed to staff the stations, as shown in Table 3B.

Standards that ensure adequate facilities, in the form of buildings, vehicles, and personnel are established to facilitate coordinated and safe development within Alachua County, and similarly within the EASP Areas. Aligned with County-wide standards for both urban and rural facilities, the EASP Areas would be required to have adequate life safety policies and protection in the form of F&EMS in place at the time of Certificates of Occupancy.




Figure 1.1: Fire Response Time Capability – Current Fire Deployment




Figure 1.2: EMS Response Time Capability – Current Fire Deployment

SECTION 2: RECREATION FACILITY ANALYSIS

2.1 Background

Alachua County Comprehensive Plan (ACCP) requirements.

The Capital Improvements Element (Policy 1.2.1) identifies three basic ‘categories’ of public facilities for the purposes of establishing levels of service standards in Alachua County: Category A, Category B or Category C public facilities. Recreation contains only two (2) categories. Category "A" public facilities include recreation facilities owned and operated by the County, and Category "B" public facilities include recreation facilities located in the unincorporated area of the County that are owned and operated by other entities. The adopted level of service for Recreation is established as follows:

Policy 1.2.4 LOS standards for Category "A" and "B" public facilities shall be as follows:

(b) Recreation LOS Standards: The County shall adopt and maintain, at a minimum, the following level of service standards for recreation of: (1) 0.5 acres of improved activity-based recreation sites per 1000 persons in the unincorporated area of Alachua County; (2) 5.0 acres of improved resource-based recreation sites per 1000 persons in the unincorporated area of Alachua County

The Recreation Element of the ACCP further provides the following:

Policy 1.1.1 The County shall use the Park Planning Districts identified in the Alachua County Recreation Master Plan as service areas to analyze the recreational needs of different geographic areas throughout the County.

Policy 1.1.2 The County shall adopt and maintain, at a minimum, the following level of service standards for recreation: (1) 0.5 acres of improved activity-based recreation sites per 1,000 persons in the unincorporated area of Alachua County; (2) 5.0 acres of improved resource-based recreation sites per 1,000 persons in the unincorporated area of Alachua County. The level of service standards shall consider the location of the site and the population within the service areas for the park types, as set forth in Table 1 of this Element. The level of service standards shall account for changes in population due to annexation. The level of service standards shall include County funded or County developed facilities that are operated by other jurisdictions and shall include facilities provided by other entities for which Alachua County has cooperative use agreements.

Recreation Element Definitions

Activity-Based: sites that provide recreation which is user-oriented independent of

location or the natural environment.

Resource-Based: recreational activities that are essentially dependent upon the natural, scenic, or historic resources of the area provided the associated activities do not have significant adverse impacts on the ecological integrity or ecological or historical values of the resources in these areas.

Envision Alachua Sector Plan (EASP)/Comprehensive Plan Amendment Application CPA-01-14 Workshop Staff Report

The Workshop Staff Report identified issues associated with the required Data & Analysis for Recreation as follows:

- The estimated public facility costs, including a delineation of when facilities will be needed, the general location of the facilities, and projected revenue sources to fund the facilities are required by State Statute (Section 163.3177(3)(a), F.S.) at the Comprehensive Plan Amendment stage;
- The County currently does not have planned public recreation within this area of the County; and
- The County's recreation master plan did not consider a potential population proposed in the Amendment within this rural area of the County.

2.2 Existing Recreation Service Provision

The current Alachua County Parks Master Plan was completed in 2002 and was prepared by HHI. The Master Plan provided for 8 parks planning sectors for which specific measures were created. The 'sector' that includes the lands owned by Plum Creek was programmed as a rural area under the Parks Master Plan. Given that the County has been slow to implement the recommendations identified in this Master Plan, it has been determined that the 2002 Plan provides a sufficient framework to guide the County for the foreseeable future in the urban areas.

Table 4: Existing Alachua County Park Facilities

Activity-Based Parks	Acres	Resource-based Parks	Acres
Copeland	5	Earl P. Powers	12.47
Grove Park	4.32	Lake Alto	22.33
Gainesville/Hawthorne Rail Trail	195.6	Lochloosa Park	1.1
Total Activity-based Parks	204.92	Melrose Boat Ramp	0.25
		M.K. Rawlings	12
		Owens-Illinois Park	21.57
		Santa Fe Lake Park	24.98
		Waldo Canal	10.15
		Gainesville/Hawthorne Rail Trail	± 20
		Total Resource-based Parks	124.85

The Gainesville/Hawthorne Rail Trail is listed as a facility in both categories due to its unique characterizes. While the vast majority of land is primarily for bicycling, running, jogging, skating, skateboarding, and walking, numerous Recourse-based facilities exist along the trail that allow access to Paynes Prairie and other Alachua County and State recreation opportunities and facilities. Therefore, adjacent to the EASP Areas, it offers a tremendous opportunity for both Activity- and Resource-based recreation.

To assist in the preparation of this analysis, the consultant team conducted a series of meetings with Alachua County Public Works (ACPW) Parks and Recreation Department staff to assess the facility and service needs associated with the proposed amendment for Recreation. Based upon these meetings it was identified that the County currently has a very limited operation and management budget for the parks department. All recreational programs in unincorporated Alachua County are provided by private entities. The County ‘leverages’ its relationships with various private groups to program county facilities by committing public resources to ongoing general maintenance of the facilities which typically amounts to mowing, garbage collection and, where available, restroom maintenance. Most recreation facilities lack restrooms or structures to escape the elements or hold organized functions.

Since the Master Plan does not provide an urban parks framework for the area affected by the EASP, staff provided the following guidance for programming parks and recreation services for the residential areas within the EASP:

1. The appropriate time to develop a new parks master plan for this area is the same time that the residential development plan for the area is being developed. The plan amendment should specify that the process for creating the ‘EASP Parks Master Plan’ be tied to the development area plan (DSAP). A Parks Master Plan ‘update’ could be prepared for each Area and submitted as a part of the DSAP application for the Area.
2. The Parks Master Plan Update for the EASP should address the following:
 - Parks program overall at build-out.
 - Timing and phasing of the construction of the parks program.
 - Standards for determining the location of the parks within the development which address parking, utilities, how the park will interact with any environmental constraints of the location, etc.
 - General planning principles that should be followed in the development of the parks plan for each area should include: facility efficiency of location (accessibility to the majority of residences, adjacencies to schools, with an eye toward long-term maintenance of the facility, ability of the location to be flexible over time with regard to programming). The parks department was particularly sensitive to parks that were located near or adjacent to protected environmental areas or had these areas included within the park boundaries. They found the development constraints associated with these areas had limited the ability of those parks to best serve their intended purpose of serving the citizen’s various recreational needs.
 - The programming of specific uses should be built around a community-based approach that is user-driven and specialized to truly serve the population. It was suggested that perhaps the master plan would denote the provision of parks in two

tiers or phases. The first being a BASIC or foundational system of parks facilities that provide general amenities on the front end of development and the provision of the system for a second tier of SPECIALIZED facilities to be brought on-line after there was a sufficient population base to articulate their preference for the types of facilities that would best serve them.

2.3 Development Program

The EASP application proposes urban levels of development within a new future land use classification EA-EOMU which is concentrated in two (2) areas: the SR 20 Jobs Center and the US 301 Jobs Center. The EASP is projected to reach build-out in 2070 and allows for a total of 11.2M sq. ft. of non-residential development and 8,700 residential units. No development is projected to occur within the EASP until 2021.

The development program tables are repeated here for ease of review.

Table 1A: 2020 Development Program (Five-Year Program)

	SR 20 Jobs Center		US 301 Jobs Center		Total EA-EOMU	
Non-Residential	Sq. Ft.	Jobs	Sq. Ft.	Jobs	Sq. Ft. / Jobs	
R&D/Office	0	0	0	0	0	0
Advanced Manufacturing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Retail	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Non-Residential	0	0	0	0	0	
Residential	Dwellings	Population	Dwellings	Population	Dwellings/Pop	
Single-Family	0	0	0	0	0	0
Multi-Family/Attached	0		0		0	
Total Residential	0	0	0	0	0	

Source: EA Development Programs, May 21, 2015.

Table 1B: 2030 Development Program (ACCP Planning Horizon)

	SR 20 Jobs Center		US 301 Jobs Center		Total EA-EOMU	
Non-Residential	Sq. Ft.	Jobs	Sq. Ft.	Jobs	Sq. Ft. / Jobs	
R&D/Office	1.3M	4,727	0	0	1.3M	4,727
Advanced Manufacturing	0	-	0	0	0	-
Retail	0.3M	667	0	0	0.3M	667
Total Non-Residential	1.6M	5,394	0	0	1.6M / 5,394	
Residential	Dwellings	Population	Dwellings	Population	Dwellings/Pop	
Single-Family	1,500	4,840	0	0	1,500	4,840
Multi-Family/Attached	700		0		700	
Total Residential	2,200	4,840	0	0	2,200 / 4,840	

Source: EA Development Programs, May 21, 2015.

Table 1C: 2070 Development Program (Build-out)

	SR 20 Jobs Center		US 301 Jobs Center		Total EA-EOMU	
Non-Residential	Sq. Ft.	Jobs	Sq. Ft.	Jobs	Sq. Ft. / Jobs	
R&D/Office	5.0M	18,182	0	-	5.0M	18,182
Advanced Manufacturing	0	-	5.0M	5,000	5.0M	5,000
Retail	0.9M	2,000	0.3M	667	1.2M	2,667
<i>Total Non-Residential</i>	5.9M	20,182	5.3M	5,667	11.2M / 25,848	
Residential	Dwellings	Population	Dwellings	Population	Dwellings/Pop	
Single-Family	3,000	12,980	2,240	6,160	5,240	19,140
Multi-Family/Attached	2,900		560		3,460	
<i>Total Residential</i>	5,900	12,980	2,800	6,160	8,700 / 19,140	

Source: EA Development Programs, May 21, 2015.

2.4 Recreation Level of Service Evaluation – Identification of Recreation Needs

Consistent with Plum Creek’s conversations and ongoing efforts with ACPW Parks and Recreation Department staff, a coordinated approach, which considers proposed facilities, operation & maintenance assistance, and site locations, will ensure Alachua County residents’ recreation needs are met.

Table 5A: 2016–2020 Projected Recreation Needs

	SR 20 Jobs Center		US 301 Jobs Center		Total EA-EOMU	
Residential	Population	Rec. Need	Population	Rec. Need	Pop. / Rec. Need	
Single Family	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Multi-Family/Attached						

Table 5B.1: 2030 Projected Recreation Needs

	SR 20 Jobs Center		US 301 Jobs Center		Total EA-EOMU	
Residential	Population	Rec. Need	Population	Rec. Need	Pop. / Rec. Need	
Single Family	4,840	26.62 ac.	0	N/A	4,840	26.62 ac.
Multi-Family/Attached						

Table 5B.2: 2030 Projected Recreation Needs By Park Type

Park Type	Supply in Study Area (Acres)	Estimated Population in Study Area ¹	Existing Demand (Acres)	Available capacity (Acres)	EA-EOMU Population (2030)	EA-EOMU Demand (Acres)	Residual Capacity (Acres)
Activity	204.92	8,067	4	200.88	4,840	2.24	198.64
Resource	124.85		40	84.52		22.4	62.12

¹ Population is based on Alachua County Parks and Recreation data for the Study Area, which includes the Eastern Alachua County and Hawthorne Park Planning Districts, Areas 10 and 11, respectively.

Table 5C.1: 2070 Projected Recreation Needs

	SR 20 Jobs Center		US 301 Jobs Center		Total EA-EOMU	
Residential	Population	Rec. Need	Population	Rec. Need	Pop. / Rec. Need	
Single Family	12,980	71.39 ac.	6,160	33.88 ac.	19,140	105.27 ac. ¹
Multi-Family/Attached						

¹ Includes one Trail (minimum 20 acres) and one Regional Park (minimum 180 acres).

Table 5C.2: 2070 Projected Recreation Needs By Part Type

Park Type	Supply in Study Area (Acres)	Estimated Population in Study Area ¹	Existing Demand (Acres)	Available capacity (Acres)	EA-EOMU Population (2030)	EAS-EOMU Demand (Acres)	Residual Capacity (Acres)
Activity	204.92	8,067 ²	4	200.88	19,140	9.57	191.31
Resource	124.85		40	84.52		95.7	-11.18

¹ Population is based on Alachua County Parks and Recreation data for the Study Area, which includes the Eastern Alachua County and Hawthorne Park Planning Districts, Areas 10 and 11, respectively.

² Population project held constant with the EA EOMU Population being projected to be the increase between 2030 and 2070 within Eastern Alachua County and Hawthorne Park Planning Districts, Areas 10 and 11, respectively.

2.5 Capital Improvement Needs

The EASP project site falls within two (2) Alachua County Park Planning Areas, Eastern Alachua County (Area 10) and Hawthorne (Area 11). These planning boundaries currently have a surplus of activity- and resource-based parks. As seen in Table 4A, by 2030, the EASP development will require 2.24 and 22.4 acres of activity- and resource-based facilities, respectively. This additional demand is well within the area's available facility capacity.

At buildout, the EASP demand for activity-based parks will not exceed the County's LOS for parks within the study area, as seen in Table 4B. However, the EASP will require Plum Creek to contribute activity-based parks as a part of each DSAP through the development of a EA Parks Master Plan.

a. BASIC parks facilities.

East Alachua County's existing resources are numerous, and there is no anticipated need for additional facilities to meet the EASP 2030 demand. Therefore, it is anticipated that the EASP

area's BASIC park facility needs have been met. There is still a need for playgrounds. At buildout, the EASP will create a demand for additional playgrounds, as well as neighborhood parks. These facilities can be considered appropriate for basic park facilities, since they consist of typical amenities and do not cater to specific resident preferences.

b. SPECIALIZED parks facilities.

All other parks facilities will be planned and programmed as a part of each DSAP. The 'Land Use Data & Analysis: Addendum' prepared June 2015 by Sasaki Associates, Inc included a preliminary estimate of future parks facilities as follows:

The recreational needs within the EA-EOMU lands at build-out are estimated to include parks/open space as well as specific recreational facilities. The analysis is based upon standards established by the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA). The standards for parks and open space are expressed in acres per 1,000 residents. Based on the NRPA standards, which exceed Alachua County standards, the EA-EOMU lands will need approximately 150 acres of parks and open space including playgrounds, neighborhood parks, and community parks. EA-EOMU will also need to accommodate a portion of the additional 100 acres needed for regional parks and trails that will largely be accommodated within EA-CON. This acreage for active recreation is embedded within the acreage allocations for residential and non-residential uses noted in the scenarios; some active recreation uses may be accommodated within the floodplain or the EA-CON land use. The EASP anticipates development of a regional trail connecting the existing Hawthorne Trail to Windsor/Newnans Lake and potentially to Waldo. Table 9 below describes the projected community recreation needs in greater detail.

Table 9: Projected Community Recreation Needs

<i>NRPA Standards</i>	<i>Acres per 1,000 Population</i>	<i>Minimum Size</i>	<i>Total Acres</i>	<i># of Parks</i>
<i>Playgrounds</i>	<i>0.5</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Neighborhood Parks</i>	<i>3.5</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Community Parks</i>	<i>''</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>77</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Regional Park</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>180</i>	<i>77</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>Trails</i>	<i>---</i>	<i>---</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>---</i>
<i>Total</i>	<i>---</i>	<i>---</i>	<i>252</i>	<i>21</i>

Source: National Recreation and Parks Association

This analysis indicates that approximately 21 new park facilities totaling 252 acres will be required within the EA-EOMU by 2070. Per direction from County staff, specific specialized facilities would be identified during the Parks Master Planning Process associated with each DSAP that includes residential uses.

SECTION 3: SOLID WASTE FACILITY ANALYSIS

3.1 Background

Alachua County Comprehensive Plan (ACCP) Level of Service (LOS) Requirements

The Capital Improvements Element (Policy 1.2.1) identifies three basic ‘categories’ of public facilities for the purposes of establishing levels of service standards in Alachua County: Category A, Category B or Category C public facilities. Solid Waste is classified as a Category “A” facility:

- (a) *Category "A" public facilities are arterial and collector roads, bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, transit facilities, storm water management systems, **solid waste**, and recreation facilities owned and operated by the County, and are addressed in other elements of this Comprehensive Plan;*

And, Policy 1.2.4 (c) states:

“The level of service (LOS) standard for solid waste disposal, used as the basis for determining availability of disposal capacity to accommodate the demand generated by existing and new development in Alachua County, is at a minimum, at 0.73 tons per person per year.”

The ACCP has no separate LOS standards for non-residential uses, that is, all solid waste demand is projected using a population -based standard.

Alachua County’s most recent Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) Based Amendments, EAR RECOMMENDATION #4.4.1

Promote industrial Recycling Market Development Zone (RMDZ)/Resource Recovery Park and economic development business recruitment, and include a program for mandatory Curbside Recycling and composting (anaerobic or aerobic) of organic waste.

3.2 Existing Solid Waste Service Provision

Landfill

Alachua County currently contract with New River Landfill for the disposal of solid waste. This contract expires in 2018 and is currently being negotiated. The New River Landfill is owned by a combination of three counties (Union, Baker, and Bradford). New River landfill has capacity and wants to continue to serve Alachua County, however, the County does have other options that it is exploring including a very large private facility in Sumter County.

Within Alachua County, all waste goes to the New River Landfill, with the exception of construction and demolition waste, that is trucked by licensed haulers to Construction & Demolition (C&D) landfills, which exist in SW, SE, and NE Alachua County.

Collection

Current collection/transport services in Alachua County are categorized as either Commercial or Residential.

Commercial Franchise Haulers. Alachua County current has a non-exclusive franchise process for the collection of commercial waste in unincorporated Alachua County – that is, there are no zones for restricting commercial franchise haulers. Haulers are charged 1-% of receipts for the franchise. There has been no interest or discussion of the County Commission in changing this current policy for service provision.

Residential Franchise Haulers. Alachua County provides residential waste collection services in two tiers to unincorporated residents.

Urban collection is provided weekly curbside within an area established through an MSBU. The urban collection area is delineated by section in a map attached to the MSBU resolution that is supplemented by additional areas as identified by subdivision name in an attachment to the map. The associated fee is updated annually at which time new subdivisions that are to be included for urban service are included in the resolution. The relevant resolutions for 2014 are (14-54 and 14-86).

Within the rural area, the county provides a drop-off center and the ability for individual homeowners to subscribe with the designated franchise hauler for limited collection services. Currently only 28% of the residences within the rural service area subscribe to this service.

3.3 Development Program

The EASP application proposes urban levels of development within a new future land use classification EA-EOMU which is concentrated in two (2) areas: the SR 20 Jobs Center and the US 301 Jobs Center. The EASP is projected to reach build-out in 2070 and allows for a total of 11.2M sq. ft. of non-residential development and 8,700 residential units. No development is projected to occur within the EASP until 2021.

The development program tables are repeated here for ease of review.

Table 1A: 2020 Development Program (Five-Year Program)

	SR 20 Jobs Center		US 301 Jobs Center		Total EA-EOMU	
Non-Residential	Sq. Ft.	Jobs	Sq. Ft.	Jobs	Sq. Ft. / Jobs	
R&D/Office	0	0	0	0	0	0
Advanced Manufacturing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Retail	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Total Non-Residential</i>	0	0	0	0	0	
Residential	Dwellings	Population	Dwellings	Population	Dwellings/Pop	
Single-Family	0	0	0	0	0	0
Multi-Family/Attached	0		0		0	
<i>Total Residential</i>	0	0	0	0	0	

Source: EA Development Programs, May 21, 2015.

Table 1B: 2030 Development Program (ACCP Planning Horizon)

	SR 20 Jobs Center		US 301 Jobs Center		Total EA-EOMU	
Non-Residential	Sq. Ft.	Jobs	Sq. Ft.	Jobs	Sq. Ft. / Jobs	
R&D/Office	1.3M	4,727	0	0	1.3M	4,727
Advanced Manufacturing	0	-	0	0	0	-
Retail	0.3M	667	0	0	0.3M	667
<i>Total Non-Residential</i>	1.6M	5,394	0	0	1.6M / 5,394	
Residential	Dwellings	Population	Dwellings	Population	Dwellings/Pop	
Single-Family	1,500	4,840	0	0	1,500	4,840
Multi-Family/Attached	700		0		700	
<i>Total Residential</i>	2,200	4,840	0	0	2,200 / 4,840	

Source: EA Development Programs, May 21, 2015.

Table 1C: 2070 Development Program (Build-out)

	SR 20 Jobs Center		US 301 Jobs Center		Total EA-EOMU	
Non-Residential	Sq. Ft.	Jobs	Sq. Ft.	Jobs	Sq. Ft. / Jobs	
R&D/Office	5.0M	18,182	0	-	5.0M	18,182
Advanced Manufacturing	0	-	5.0M	5,000	5.0M	5,000
Retail	0.9M	2,000	0.3M	667	1.2M	2,667
<i>Total Non-Residential</i>	5.9M	20,182	5.3M	5,667	11.2M / 25,848	
Residential	Dwellings	Population	Dwellings	Population	Dwellings/Pop	
Single-Family	3,000	12,980	2,240	6,160	5,240	19,140
Multi-Family/Attached	2,900		560		3,460	
<i>Total Residential</i>	5,900	12,980	2,800	6,160	8,700 / 19,140	

Source: EA Development Programs, May 21, 2015.

3.4 Solid Waste Level of Service Evaluation – Identification of Solid Waste Needs

The EASP contemplates a variety of uses, ranging from traditional residential and commercial buildings to Research & Development (R&D)/Office, and Advanced Manufacturing. Alachua County Public Works staff stated that the traditional development program envisioned for the Areas will be subject to typical waste collection and pickup as throughout the County.

Estimated Demand – 2030

As shown in Tables 1B, by 2030, the SR 20 Job Center will consists of 1.3M sq. ft. of Research & Development (R&D) and Office and 300K sq. ft. of Retail uses, with 1,500 Single-Family (SF) and 700 Multi-Family/Attached (MF) residential units by 2030. Based on this population projection of 2,200 dwelling units and Alachua County's 0.73 tons per person per year numbers, at 2.2 persons household, **3,533.2 tons of waste will be generated.** The US 301 Job Center will not have any development by 2030.

Estimated Demand – 2070 Buildout

The SR 20 Job Center consists of 5M sq. ft. of R&D and Office, 900K sq. ft. Retail uses, with 3,000 SF and 2,900 MF residential units. Based on this population projection of 5,900 dwelling units and Alachua County's 0.73 tons per person per year numbers, at 2.2 persons per household, **9,475.4 tons of waste will be generated.**

The US 301 Job Center consists of 5M sq. ft. Advanced Manufacturing, 300K sq. ft. Retail uses, with 2,240 SF and 560 MF residential units. Based on this population projection of 2,800 dwelling units and Alachua County's 0.73 tons per person per year numbers, at 2.2 persons per household, **4,496.8 tons of waste will be generated.**

3.5 Capital Improvement Needs

The EA-EOMU lands are projected to conduct Solid Waste disposal in a similar manner as other similar uses within Alachua County. With the New River Landfill projected to have capacity for at least fifty (50) years, either through participation in accordance with existing practices will be the mechanism or direct contracting with an authorized Alachua County carrier will be an acceptable practice.

As stated in the most recent EAR Based Amendments

"The permitted capacity of the Alachua County Transfer Station is 1,200 tons per day. From FY 03 through FY 08, 643 tons per day (annualized) has been the highest tonnage. Historically, annual growth in waste generation has been approximately 2% to 3%. Alachua County's agreement with the New River Solid Waste Association, to take all of our waste for disposal at the New River Landfill, will be in effect through December 31, 2018. Therefore, at least until December 31, 2018, Alachua County has adequate solid waste disposal capacity using the existing facilities."

SECTION 4: PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITY ANALYSIS

4.1 Background

Alachua County Comprehensive Plan (ACCP) Basic Level of Service (LOS) Requirements

The Capital Improvements Element Policy 1.2.1 identifies three (3) basic ‘categories’ of public facilities for the purposes of establishing levels of service standards in Alachua County: Category A, Category B, or Category C public facilities. Public Schools are determined to be a Category B public facility. The EASP plan amendment proposes a Future Land Use Map (FLUM) amendment that increases density and intensity of land only within the EA-EOMU Future Land Use (FLU) category, which has been proposed to function as an Urban Cluster under the ACCP. The Level of Service (LOS) standard, Capital Improvement Element Policy 1.2.4 states:

- (f) *Public Schools LOS Standard (based on Public School Facilities Element)*
The uniform, district-wide LOS standards shall be 100% of Program Capacity [see definition] for elementary, middle and high schools. This LOS standard shall apply to all concurrency service areas (CSA) as adopted in the Interlocal Agreement. These LOS standards shall be applied to School Concurrency Service Areas (SCSAs) as specified in the Public School Facilities Element.

Alachua County’s School Concurrency Program is both a planning tool and regulation that fundamentally relates school capacity to the housing inventory that it serves. The CSAs are organized around elementary (K-5), middle (6-8), and high schools (9-12), as shown in Figures 4.1, 4.2, & 4.3, below.

The adopted Level of Service (LOS) is 100% of “Program Capacity”. ACPS uses the following definition for Program Capacity:

“Program Capacity - capacity that is provided by “buildings and facilities” as defined in the Florida Inventory of School Houses (FISH) Manual and modified by the SBAC [School Board of Alachua County] to reflect measurable programmatic changes. (ILA Section 8.1(11))”.

Alachua County Public Schools (ACPS) Concurrency Standards

Within Alachua County, school concurrency is based on an overall system-wide basis. Therefore, if there is capacity individual schools or CSAs they are not deemed to lack capacity in the CSA. Furthermore, the ACCP’s Policy 1.3.2 states:

- (d) *For public schools, the concurrency requirement may be satisfied by:*
 - (1) *Adequate school facilities will be in place or under construction within three years, as provided in the School Board 5-Year District Facilities Work Plan for School Concurrency adopted as part of this element, after the issuance of the final development order; or,*

- (2) Adequate school facilities are available in an adjacent SCSA, and when adequate capacity at adopted LOS Standards will be in place or under construction in the adjacent SCSA within three years, as provided in the School Board 5-Year District Facilities Work Plan for School Concurrency, after the issuance of the final development order; or,
- (3) The developer executes a legally binding commitment to provide mitigation proportionate to the demand for public school facilities to be created by development of the property subject to the final development order as provided in the Public School Facilities Element.




Figure 1: Elementary School CSAs in Alachua County




Figure 4.2: Middle School CSAs in Alachua County




Figure 3: High School CSAs in Alachua County

4.2 Existing Public School Facilities Service Provision

Table 6: 2014-2015 Program Capacity

School	CSA	2014-2015 School Capacity	Student Enrollment	Available Capacity
Elementary School				
<i>Duval¹</i>	<i>East Gainesville</i>	<i>467</i>	<i>225</i>	<i>242</i>
Lake Forest	East Gainesville	600	275	325
Metcalfe	East Gainesville	428	493	-65
Rawlings	East Gainesville	427	226	201
Shell	Hawthorne	380	176	204
<i>Waldo²</i>	<i>Waldo</i>	<i>244</i>	<i>191</i>	<i>53</i>
<i>From our interviews and coordination with ACPS staff, they've stated "For purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the Waldo Community School capacity will remain in the inventory although the facility is being converted for other uses. Data developed in May, 2015 shows that 4,067 single family dwellings and 328 multifamily dwellings currently exist within the Waldo CSA and Hawthorne CSA combined. Currently 494 elementary students reside within these CSA boundaries"</i>				
Williams	East Gainesville	490	555	-65
Total		3,036	2,141	895
Middle School				
Bishop	Bishop	1,068	750	318
Hawthorne	Hawthorne	178	209	-31
Lincoln	Lincoln	1,053	739	314
Total		2,299	1,601	698
High School				
Eastside	Eastside	2,001	1,359	642
Hawthorne	Hawthorne	486	223	263
Total		2,487	1,505	982

¹ ACPS restructuring of Duval Elementary school will disperse students to other schools within the East Gainesville CSA, primarily Metcalfe.

² ACPS closure of the Waldo Community school and respective CSA will disperse students to other schools within adjacent CSAs, primarily Shell and Lake Forest.

As noted above, In May 2015 the School Board closed the Waldo Community School, combining its enrollment with Shell Elementary in Hawthorne and Lake Forest Elementary in East Gainesville. However, the Waldo CSA remains in place. In addition, schools in the East Gainesville CSAs will be recipients of students from adjacent CSAs.

Previous program capacity changes, which were completed in January 2015, are now outdated due to the ACPS decision to close Waldo Community School, its' respective CSA, and modify Duval Elementary within the East Gainesville CSA to pre-K. ACPS does not have capacity numbers at this time. Capacity numbers may be available later in the year, prior to the fall 2015/16 school year.

The Plum Creek EASP team will continue to monitor ACPS progress reallocating students in the East County CSAs. And, ACPS staff will provide confirmation, similar to their previous review comments, supporting the EASP project. ACPS staff has reviewed the Development Program and retain the same confidence on coordination and long-term collaboration with Plum Creek.

4.3 Development Program

The EASP application proposes urban levels of development within a new future land use classification EA-EOMU which is concentrated in two (2) areas: the SR 20 Jobs Center and the US 301 Jobs Center. The EASP is projected to reach build-out in 2070 and allows for a total of 11.2M sq. ft. of non-residential development and 8,700 residential units. No development is projected to occur within the EASP until 2021.

The development program tables are repeated here for ease of review.

Table 1A: 2020 Development Program (Five-Year Program)

	SR 20 Jobs Center		US 301 Jobs Center		Total EA-EOMU	
Non-Residential	Sq. Ft.	Jobs	Sq. Ft.	Jobs	Sq. Ft. / Jobs	
R&D/Office	0	0	0	0	0	0
Advanced Manufacturing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Retail	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Total Non-Residential</i>	0	0	0	0	0	
Residential	Dwellings	Population	Dwellings	Population	Dwellings/Pop	
Single-Family	0	0	0	0	0	0
Multi-Family/Attached	0		0		0	
<i>Total Residential</i>	0	0	0	0	0	

Source: EA Development Programs, May 21, 2015.

Table 1B: 2030 Development Program (ACCP Planning Horizon)

	SR 20 Jobs Center		US 301 Jobs Center		Total EA-EOMU	
Non-Residential	Sq. Ft.	Jobs	Sq. Ft.	Jobs	Sq. Ft. / Jobs	
R&D/Office	1.3M	4,727	0	0	1.3M	4,727
Advanced Manufacturing	0	-	0	0	0	-
Retail	0.3M	667	0	0	0.3M	667
<i>Total Non-Residential</i>	1.6M	5,394	0	0	1.6M / 5,394	
Residential	Dwellings	Population	Dwellings	Population	Dwellings/Pop	
Single-Family	1,500	4,840	0	0	1,500	4,840
Multi-Family/Attached	700		0		700	
<i>Total Residential</i>	2,200	4,840	0	0	2,200 / 4,840	

Source: EA Development Programs, May 21, 2015.

Table 1C: 2070 Development Program (Build-out)

	SR 20 Jobs Center		US 301 Jobs Center		Total EA-EOMU	
Non-Residential	Sq. Ft.	Jobs	Sq. Ft.	Jobs	Sq. Ft. / Jobs	
R&D/Office	5.0M	18,182	0	-	5.0M	18,182
Advanced Manufacturing	0	-	5.0M	5,000	5.0M	5,000
Retail	0.9M	2,000	0.3M	667	1.2M	2,667
<i>Total Non-Residential</i>	5.9M	20,182	5.3M	5,667	11.2M / 25,848	
Residential	Dwellings	Population	Dwellings	Population	Dwellings/Pop	
Single-Family	3,000	12,980	2,240	6,160	5,240	19,140
Multi-Family/Attached	2,900		560		3,460	
<i>Total Residential</i>	5,900	12,980	2,800	6,160	8,700 / 19,140	

Source: EA Development Programs, May 21, 2015.

4.4 Public School Facilities Level of Service Evaluation – Identification of Public School Facilities Needs

The development program contains 5,240 single-family and 3,460 multi-family/attached dwellings, for 8,700 total dwellings. Table 7B indicates that the SR 20 Job Center will generate approximately 579 students by 2030, and Table 7C indicates that the entire EA-EOMU will collectively generate 2,102 students at build-out in year 2070.

Table 7A: 2016-2020 Projected Public School Facility Needs

School Type	Available Capacity	Student Generation ¹	Student Demand	Required # of Schools	Required # of Acres
Elementary School	995	0	0	0	0
Middle School	698	0	0	0	0
High School	982	0	0	0	0
Total	2,675	0	0	0	0

¹ Source: Alachua County Public Schools, May 2015.

Table 7B: 2030 Projected Public School Facility Needs

School Type	Available Capacity	Student Generation ¹	Student Demand	Required # of Schools	Required # of Acres
Elementary School	995	267	728	0	0
Middle School	698	131	567	0	0
High School	982	181	801	0	0
Total	2,675	579	2,096	0	0

¹ Source: Alachua County Public Schools, May 2015.

Table 7C: 2070 Projected Public School Facility Needs

School Type	Available Capacity	Student Generation ¹	Student Demand	Required # of Schools	Required # of Acres
Elementary School	995	1,083	-88	2	40
Middle School	698	527	170	1	35
High School	982	727	255	1	65
Total	2,675	2,336	338.1	4	150

¹ Source: Alachua County Public Schools, May 2015.

The Eastern County CSAs surrounding Plum Creek properties are the subject of consolidation. The plan to close the Waldo Community School has an effect on the data. ACPS plans to changes Duval Elementary enrollment, within the East Gainesville CSA, also affects other system capacity numbers. Duval is currently slated to become Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten.

Although ACPS has not published revised student capacity data that reflects ACPS closure of the Waldo Community School and modified enrollment in Duval Elementary School, ACPS staff still project that the EA-EOMU development program will require two additional (2) elementary schools, one (1) additional middle school, and one (1) additional high school to support the proposed 8,700 dwelling units, as noted in their review of the 2015 EASP development program.

4.5 Capital Improvement Needs

Consistent with Plum Creek’s conversations and ongoing efforts with ACPS, a coordinated approach, which considers Superintendent Robert’s plan, proposed student generation, facilities, and site locations, will ensure Alachua County residents’ student needs are met.

From the School Boards Report, “Plum Creek is seeking approval as a “Sector Plan” and “Development of Regional Impact” (DRI) to be developed over a 50 year plus time frame. The project proposes 10,500 single-family entitlements. ACPS staff has reviewed the proposal and has advised Plum Creek representatives to include two elementary school sites, one middle school site, and one high school site in the development plans.” This projection remains accurate and was confirmed in late May 2015

Table 8 summarizes Florida Department of Education data for new facility construction within calendar year 2013 and Operation and Maintenance (O&M) costs for Alachua County public schools from 2013-2014. Florida’s 2013 average school facilities are larger than what is required to meet student demand resulting from the EASP. Therefore, combining a middle school and high school, such as Hawthorne’s middle/high school facility, may reduce acreage and costs estimated in Tables 3B and 4.

Table 8: Projected Public School Facility Costs

School Type	Average # of Student Stations ¹	Average Gross Square Foot (GSF) ¹	Facility Costs per GSF ¹	O&M Costs per GSF ²
Elementary School	850	110,000	\$188	\$4.87
Middle School	1,200	240,000	\$159	\$4.87
High School	1,200	195,000	\$181	\$4.87

¹ Source: Florida Department of Education, New Construction Report, Calendar Year 2013.

² Source: Florida Department of Education, Annual Plant Maintenance and Operations Cost Information, Alachua County, 2013-2014.

The ACPS CIP will not likely be available until fall, but the presented need will likely match previous ACPS projections and planning figures. Based on existing student capacity and enrollment data, Tables 3A through C indicate that three (3) elementary schools, one (1) middle school, and one (1) high school will be required to support the proposed 8,700 dwelling units. More specific projections will be possible once ACPS publishes revised student capacity data that reflects Superintendent Roberts' plans to close Waldo Community School and Duval Elementary School.