2010 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ELEMENT

March 2007

The Honorable John Peyton
Mayor

Brad Thoburn
Director of Planning & Development

JACKSONVILLE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
128 E. Forsyth Street, Suite 700, Jacksonville, Florida 32202

CITY OF JACKSONVILLE
The Honorable John Peyton, Mayor

CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS 2007-2011

The Honorable Ronnie Fussell	*At-Large, Group 1*
The Honorable Jay Jabour	*At-Large, Group 2*
The Honorable Stephen Joost	*At-Large, Group 3*
The Honorable Kevin Hyde	*At-Large, Group 4*
The Honorable Glorious Johnson	*At-Large, Group 5*
The Honorable Clay Yarborough	*District 1*
The Honorable William Bishop	*District 2*
The Honorable Richard Clark	*District 3*
The Honorable Don Redman	*District 4*
The Honorable Art Shad	*District 5*
The Honorable Jack Webb	*District 6*
The Honorable Johnny Gaffney	*District 7*
The Honorable Denise Lee	*District 8*
The Honorable Warren Jones	*District 9*
The Honorable Mia Jones	*District 10*
The Honorable Ray Holt	*District 11*
The Honorable Daniel Davis	*District 12*
The Honorable Arthur Graham	*District 13*
The Honorable Michael Corrigan	*District 14*

INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to the requirements of Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes (F.S.) and Chapter 9J-5, Florida Administrative Code (FAC), the City of Jacksonville adopted the 2010 Comprehensive Plan, which includes the Capital Improvements Element, on September 1990. Section 163.3191, F.S. requires that the plan be updated periodically. Prior to the update of the plan, the local governments are required to prepare an Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) on the adopted plan. The City of Jacksonville's EAR was submitted to the Florida Department of Community Affairs for review on September 1, 1997 and determined to be sufficient on October 31, 1997.

The EAR for the 2010 Comprehensive Plan comprises the 1990-1995 period. The EAR summarizes the condition of the element at the time of adoption of the 2010 Comprehensive Plan (1990) and the conditions at the time of preparation of the EAR (1995), analyzes the changes since adoption, identifies the success or failure in implementing the policies and recommendations in the plan and the reasons thereof, analyzes the impact of any unforeseen problems or opportunities presented, and identifies the mandatory statutory and rule changes since the adoption of the Plan. Based on this analysis, the report makes recommendations for revisions to update the Plan.

The update of the Capital Improvement Element, presented in the following pages, reflects all the changes recommended in the EAR. Objectives and policies requiring only one time action by the City, which have already been implemented and require no further action, have been deleted. Other more ongoing policies in which action recommended in the adopted plan has been completed but should continue, and policies which have been partially implemented, have been modified appropriately. Finally, some new policies have been added as recommended in the EAR and mandated by updates to the Florida Statutes and Florida Administrative Code. Various editorial and other appropriate organizational name changes have been made as well.

In addition to the aforementioned revisions, the Background Report of this document has also been updated to support the amended Goals, Objectives and Policies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION

A. GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES..... 6

Issue : Existing Deficiencies for Infrastructure Provision..... 6
Issue : Capital Funding..... 19
Issue : Concurrency Management System 20

ATTACHMENT A: 2006-2011 CIE Schedule..... 28

B. DEFINITIONS 43

2010 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ELEMENT

A

GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

JACKSONVILLE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES

GOAL 1

The City shall undertake actions to provide and maintain, in a timely and efficient manner, necessary and adequate public facilities to all residents within its jurisdiction and to promote compact urban growth in areas identified through the 2010 Comprehensive Plan as having existing capacity.

Issue: Existing Deficiencies for Infrastructure Provision Have Been Identified by the City's Departments

The City either has adopted a program to correct those deficiencies or is in the process of identification through studies for needs assessments. The City has established a priority system for ranking projects as follows: 1) correct public health hazards; 2) correct deficiencies; 3) replace obsolete facilities; and 4) support new growth.

Objective 1.1 The City shall provide capital improvements to correct existing public facilities determined to be deficient, to accommodate desired future growth, and replace those facilities determined to be irreparable in a capital improvements schedule within the element.

Policies

1.1.1 The City shall maintain and annually inventory those public facilities required by Chapter 9J-5, F.A.C., within its jurisdiction and identify those facilities that are operating deficiently or have become obsolete. This inventory includes facilities related to roads, sanitary sewer, solid waste, drainage, potable water, parks and recreation, and mass transit.

1.1.2 The City shall review and evaluate its Capital Improvement Program ordinance periodically to ensure close coordination between the Capital Improvement Program process and the City's Annual Budgeting process. This coordination will include such things as timing, budget estimates, and defining a capital improvement project.

1.1.3 The City shall maintain and annually update a listing of necessary capital improvements ranked in order of priority. This capital facilities list will be based on evaluative criteria and will be adopted as a component of the City's Five-Year Capital Improvements Schedule. The following criteria will be utilized to prioritize the City's

schedule of capital improvements:

a. Enhancement, expansion, or new construction which eliminates existing public health hazards or existing capacity deficits and does not exacerbate existing nor create new deficiencies;

b. Repair, enhancement, or replacement of deficient or irreparable public facilities to achieve compliance with adopted Level of Service standards;

c. Financial feasibility, including impact on the City's capital and operating budgets;

d. New construction or redevelopment consistent with the City's Future Land Use Element and projected growth patterns, provided that the facilities meet adopted Level of Service standards for all other required elements and do not conflict with plans of State agencies and the St. Johns River Water Management District or their regional agency functional plans;

e. New construction or redevelopment consistent with the City's Future Land Use Element and projected growth patterns which may initially exceed current Level of Service standards, but are phased concurrent with the created impacts of construction;

f. Once established, Level of Service standards for any area will not be diminished due to the loss of population in that area.

1.1.4 The City shall use the following LOS standards in reviewing the impacts of new developments upon the enactment of its Concurrency Management System in accordance with Chapter 163 (Part II), F.S.

PUBLIC FACILITY

LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS

MASS TRANSIT

The level of service for passenger comfort shall be "D" as defined in the Highway Capacity Manual: Special Report 209 (Transportation

Research Board, 1985). This stipulates that the occupancy shall not exceed 1.25 persons/seat, except for the Automated Skyway Express (ASE) which provides seating only for the elderly and the handicapped.

Persons who, for reasons of physical or mental handicap, cannot use the standard mass transit services shall be provided with demand responsive service (e.g. DART). The level of service standard to be used in establishing such service shall be an average of one round trip per handicapped person per day.

The frequency of service of JTA bus routes shall be thirty (30) minutes in the peak period.

TRAFFIC CIRCULATION:

The minimum levels of service acceptable on all roads shall be as stated below and applicable to the peak hour and 24 hour periods. These minimum levels of service standards shall be applicable to both local roadways and state highway system facilities. The Jacksonville Urbanized Area designation includes the urban boundaries established for Duval County by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) for its planning and funding purposes, as well as the Urban and Suburban Areas established in the Capital Improvements Element. The Jacksonville Transition Area designation includes the rural boundaries established for Duval County in the Capital Improvements Element.

Jacksonville Urbanized Area

A.	Florida Intrastate Highway System	
	Limited Access Highways (Freeways) and Controlled Access Highways including the Wonderwood Connector Expressway	Level of Service D (E)*
B.	Principal Arterials, Minor Arterials, Collectors and Local Streets	Level of Service E

Jacksonville Transition Area

A. Florida Intrastate Highway System

Limited Access Highway (Freeways) and Controlled Access Highways	Level of Service C

B.

Principal Arterials, Minor Arterials Collectors, Local Streets	Level of Service D

The Florida Intrastate Highway System (FIHS) comprises a statewide network of limited and controlled access highways. The primary function of the system is for high speed and high volume traffic movement within the state. Access to abutting land is subordinate to this function and such access must be prohibited or highly regulated. Highways in the City of Jacksonville currently designated in the Florida Transportation Plan as part of the Florida Intrastate Highway System are I-95, I-10, I-295, S.R. 9A, U. S. 301 and the proposed Branan Field/Chaffee Road.

*The level of service designation shown in parentheses apply only when exclusive through lanes are physically separated from general use lanes along limited and controlled access facilities. Access to the exclusive use lanes is highly regulated and may be used for high occupancy vehicles, express buses, passenger rail service, etc.

The level of service (LOS) definitions which follow are to be the primary point of reference in consideration of level of service issues:

Level of Service A describes primarily free flow operations at average travel speeds, usually about 90 percent of the free flow speed for the arterial class. Vehicles are completely unimpeded in their ability to maneuver within the traffic stream. Stopped delay at signalized intersections is minimal.

Level of Service B represents reasonably unimpeded operations at average travel speeds, usually about 70 percent of the free flow speed for the arterial class. The ability to maneuver within the traffic stream is only slightly restricted and stopped delays are not bothersome. Drivers are not generally subjected to appreciable

tension.

Level of Service C represents stable operations. However, ability to maneuver and change lanes in mid-block locations may be more restricted than in LOS B, and longer queues and/or adverse signal coordination may contribute to lower average travel speeds of about 50 percent of the average free flow speed for the arterial class. Motorists will experience an appreciable tension while driving.

Level of Service D borders on a range on which small increases in flow may cause substantial increases in approach delay and, hence, decreases in arterial speed. This may be due to adverse signal progression, inappropriate signal timing, high volumes, or some combination of these. Average travel speeds are about 50 percent of free flow speed.

Level of Service E is characterized by significant approach delays and average travel speeds of one-third of the free flow speed or lower. Such operations are caused by some combination of adverse progression, high signal density, extensive queuing at critical intersections, and inappropriate signal timing.

Level of Service F characterizes arterial flow at extremely low speeds below one-third to one-quarter of the free flow speed. Intersection congestion is likely at critical signalized locations, with high approach delays resulting. Adverse progression is frequently a contributor to this condition.

The City shall make a determination as to a link's ability to meet these standards by comparing City of Jacksonville and FDOT annual average daily traffic (ADT) data with the threshold values contained in the FDOT Florida's Level of Service Standards and Guidelines Manual for Planning as amended, for the corresponding facility type, average signalization-per-mile rate, and minimum acceptable level of service. Each roadway segment failing to meet these criteria shall be reviewed and a determination will be made as to whether the segment is either constrained, backlogged or located in a Transportation Concurrency Management Area.

The City's level of service standards for constrained and backlogged segments shall be as shown below:

Constrained Facilities

A. Florida Intrastate Highway System

Limited Access Highways (Freeways) and Controlled Access Highways	Maintain

B. Principal Arterials, Minor Arterials Collectors, Local Streets — Maintain

Backlogged Facilities

A. Florida Intrastate Highway System

Limited Access Highways (Freeways) and Controlled Access Highways	Maintain

B. Principal Arterials Minor Arterials Collectors, Local Streets — Maintain

The City will utilize the following measures to ensure operating conditions are being maintained on State and City roads classified as constrained or backlogged.

Constrained Facilities - A roadway facility is classified as a constrained facility when, for physical, environmental or political reasons the facility cannot be expanded by at least two through-lanes. A constrained facility in the Jacksonville Urbanized Area will be allowed to operate at levels that do not exceed a ten percent (10%) increase in the facility's peak hour or average daily two-way traffic volumes, or a ten percent (10%) reduction in the facility's peak hour or daily operating speed. A constrained facility in the Jacksonville Transition Area will be allowed to operate at levels that do not exceed a five percent (5%) increase in the facility's peak hour or average annual daily two-way traffic volumes or a five percent (5%) reduction in the facility's operating speed. The initial classification of facilities as constrained shall be based on same-year field counts and shall be concurrent with adoption of the 2010 Comprehensive Plan. Traffic count data shall be reviewed and the identification of constrained facilities shall occur at minimum at the start of each Jacksonville Urban Area Transportation Study (JUATS) Update.

Backlogged Facilities - A roadway facility shall be classified as backlogged when it has begun to operate at less than the minimum

acceptable level of service, as defined in Policy 1.1.4 and when no constraints exist which would prohibit installation of capacity improvements and such improvements are not programmed for construction in the first three years of FDOT's adopted work program or the five year schedule of improvements in the Capital Improvements Element. A backlogged facility in the Jacksonville Urbanized Area will be allowed to operate at levels that do not exceed a ten percent (10%) increase in the facility's peak hour or average annual daily two-way traffic volumes, or a ten percent (10%) reduction in the facility's peak hour or daily operating speed. A backlogged facility in the Jacksonville Transition Area will be allowed to operate at levels that do not exceed a five percent (5%) increase in the facility's peak hour or average annual daily two-way traffic volumes, or a five percent (5%) reduction in the facility's peak hour or daily operating speed. The initial classification of facilities as backlogged shall be based on same-year field counts and shall be concurrent with adoption of the 2010 Comprehensive Plan. Traffic count data and the Transportation Improvement Program shall be reviewed at a minimum of every two years.

Development orders will not be issued for projects which will significantly degrade the operating conditions of either a constrained or backlogged facility. The City of Jacksonville considers the operating condition of a constrained or backlogged facility to be significantly deteriorated if the standards stated above are exceeded. Development proposed along constrained or backlogged facilities must provide mitigation to accommodate the increased traffic volumes that will be generated.

Development orders for projects served by constrained or backlogged facilities will be issued only if the applicable standards for the Jacksonville Urbanized Area and/or Transition Area discussed above are not exceeded and if the operating condition on the constrained or backlogged facility can be maintained through the implementation of one or more of the following:

1. Mitigation of impacts during the peak hour of roadway traffic through implementation of flexible work shifts, off-peak work shifts or other measures to reduce peak-hour impacts.

2. Provision of extraordinary mass transit support such as reducing the number of available employee parking spaces and subsidizing employee transit fares.

3. Make road improvements or contribute a sufficient amount of

money to the mass transit system's operating or capital costs program, which will cause operating conditions on the constrained facilities to be maintained or maintain and improve operating conditions on backlogged facilities.

4. Provision of data collected in the field using Florida Department of Transportation guidelines to demonstrate that the facility in question is actually operating at a better level than would be assumed using a computer analysis procedure.

Prior to implementing any of the above mitigation measures, the developer must provide documentation which shows how the proposed measure will mitigate for the increase in traffic volumes that will be generated.

For the purpose of issuing a development order or permit, a proposed development which is deemed to have a de minimis impact, meeting the requirements of Rule 9J-5.0055(3)(C)6a-c. F.A.C., shall not be subject to the concurrency requirements of Rule 9J-5.0055(3)(C)1-4, F.A.C. In this regard, the City shall implement a de minimis exemption provision as a component of its Concurrency Management System.

1.1.5 The City shall identify and designate Transportation Concurrency Management Areas (TCMA) as the need arises. If a portion of the State Highway System is located within the TCMA, the City shall negotiate with the FDOT the appropriate levels of service for the state roadways located therein.

DRAINAGE

These Levels of Service shall define the depth of flooding allowed within and adjacent to the street rights-of-way as stated below and shall based on a 5-year design storm.

LOS A - For new systems: Hydraulic gradeline at or below inlet grate: lowest roadway grade elevation at or above the 25-year design high-water elevation for the stormwater management facility.

LOS B - For retrofitting an existing system: Flooding of streets and some yard area.

LOS C - For existing system: Flooding up to the finished floor elevation of structures.

SANITARY SEWER

1. Effluent discharged from wastewater treatment plants shall meet all federal, state, and local standards.

2. Proposed wastewater collection, transmission, treatment and disposal facilities shall be designed and constructed to maintain the capacity associated with the following wastewater generation rates:

   Residential : 100 gallons per capita per day (gpcd) [includes an infiltration/inflow factor of 25 gpcd]

   Non-Residential: flows to be evaluated on a site specific basis using Section 10D-6, 48(1) F.A.C.

   Peak Flows will be determined in accordance with Recommended Standards for Sewage Works, latest edition (Ten State Standards) and the Water Pollution Control Federation Manual of Practice #9.

SOLID WASTE

The Level of Service for solid waste disposal facilities shall accommodate a solid waste generation rate of 6.7 lbs. per capita per day.

POTABLE WATER

The Levels of Service for potable water facilities within the City shall be as follows:

1. Existing and proposed water facilities shall be designed and constructed in such a manner as to maintain the capacity associated with the following water consumption rates:

   Residential: 100 gallons per capita per day (gpcd)

   Non-Residential: As it applies to non-residential land uses, demand for potable water will be evaluated on a site specific basis, in accordance with Table PW-1

TABLE PW-1: COMMERCIAL WATER DEMAND IN THE UNITED STATES

TYPES OF ESTABLISHMENTS	GPD
Airports (per passenger)	3-5
Apartments, multiple family (per resident)	60
Bath house (per bather)	10
Camps:	
Construction, semipermanent (per worker)	50
Day with no meals served (per camper)	15
Luxury (per camper)	100-150
Resorts, day and night, with limited plumbing (per camper)	50
Tourist with central bath and toilet facilities (per person)	35
Cottages with seasonal occupancy (per resident)	50
Courts, tourist with individual bath units (per person)	50
Clubs:	
Country (per resident member)	100
Country (per non-resident member present)	25
Dwellings:	
Boarding houses (per boarder)	50
Additional kitchen requirements for non-resident boarders	10

TYPES OF ESTABLISHMENTS	GPD
Luxury (per person)	100-150
Multiple family apartments (per resident)	40
Rooming houses (per resident)	60
Single family (per resident)	50-75
Estates (per resident)	100-150
Factories (gal. per person per shift)	15-35
Hotels with private baths (two persons per room)	60
Hotels without private baths (per person)	50
Institutions other than hospitals (per person)	75-125
Hospitals (per bed)	250-400
Laundries, self-service (gal. per washing, per customer)	50
Motels with bath, toilet and kitchen facilities (per bed space)	50
Motels with bed and toilet (per bed space)	40
Parks:	
Overnight with flush toilets (per camper)	25
Trailers with individual bath units (per camper)	50
Picnic Areas:	
With bath houses, showers, and flush toilets (per picnicker)	20

TYPES OF ESTABLISHMENTS	GPD
With toilet facilities only (gal. per picnicker)	10
Restaurants with toilet facilities (per patron)	7-10
Without toilet facilities (per patron)	21-23
With bar and cocktail lounge (additional quantity (per patron)	2
Schools:	
Boarding (per pupil)	75-100
Day with cafeteria, gymnasium and showers (per pupil)	25
Day with cafeteria, but no gymnasiums or showers (per pupil)	20
Day without cafeteria, gymnasiums or showers (per pupil)	15
Service stations (per vehicle)	10
Stores (per toilet room)	400
Swimming pools (per swimmer)	10
Theatres:	
Drive-in (per car space)	5
Movie (per auditorium seat)	5
Workers:	
Construction (per person per shift)	50
	15

TYPES OF ESTABLISHMENTS	GPD
Day (school or offices per person per shift)	

In cases where ranges are shown, the lower number shall be used for testing purposes.

2. The water supply system within the City shall operate with a rated capacity, which is no less than 5 percent above the historical maximum daily flow.

3. Minimum Pressure--All systems and grids:

CONDITION	PRESSURE
Minimum	20 psi
Normal Operations	40 to 80 psi

4. Storage Volume

   a. System-wide storage capacity for the regional system for finished water shall equal no less than 17 percent of system-wide average daily demand.

   b. Nongrid systems without ground or elevated storage reservoirs shall provide for ten (10) minute retention time within the hydropneumatic tank along with adequate and redundant well capacity to meet the fire peak demand condition of the system.

5. Fire Flow

Unless otherwise stipulated by the City Public Safety Department, minimum fire flows based on land use shall be maintained as follows:

LAND USE	GALLONS PER MINUTE (GPM)
Single Family	500
2-family homes and Mobile Homes	750
Multi-family Residential, and Commercial	1,500
Institutional and Industrial	2,000

RECREATION

The City shall provide 1.87 acres per one thousand population of “Active” parks in the Urban area.

The City shall provide 0.50 acres per one thousand population of “Active/Passive” parks in the suburban and rural areas.

By 2010, the City shall provide one week of open public swimming at all public aquatic facilities per each 70,000 population.

By 2000, the City shall provide one athletic field per 2,400 population.

By 2005, the City shall provide one athletic field per 2,000 population.

By 2010, the City shall provide one court (basketball/tennis) per each 2,400 population.

By 2010, the City shall provide one mile of trail per each 50,000 population.

The City shall provide 1.51 acres per thousand population of "Active/Passive" parks by Planning District.

By 2000, the City shall provide 1.60 acres per thousand population of "Active/Passive" parks by Planning District.

By 2005, the City shall provide 1.73 acres per thousand population of "Active/Passive" parks by Planning District.

By 2010, the City shall provide 1.93 acres per thousand population of "Active/Passive" parks by Planning District.

By 2010, the City shall provide 2.50 acres per thousand population of “Regional” parks citywide.

However, in no event shall the existing park and open space acreage be reduced in accordance with Section 122.48, Ordinance Code.

Issue: Capital Funding

The expenditures required to fulfill the requirements of capital improvements are substantial. The funding sources necessary to meet these costs are derived from a variety of areas, with revenue bonds being the primary source.

Objective 1.2 Future development will be required to bear its proportionate share

of the cost of the improvements necessitated by the development in order to adequately maintain adopted Level of Service standards unless the required improvements are identified in the Capital Improvements Element, an approved development agreement, or the first three years of the Florida Department of Transportation's Five Year Work Program.

Policies

1.2.1 The City shall include in the annual capital appropriations of its budget a list of anticipated capital improvements and expenditures for the appropriate fiscal year.

1.2.2 The City shall continue to explore the feasibility of alternative financing mechanisms to facilitate the availability of public facilities. This shall include a feasibility review of dedicating a portion of the ad valorem taxes specifically for capital improvements.

1.2.3 The Jacksonville Transportation Authority and the City shall ensure that the Automated Skyway Express (ASE) or an alternative non-polluting transit system will be extended to residential portions of the City as federal funds matched with State, local and private monies become available.

1.2.4 The JTA and the City shall provide for an efficient, non-polluting light rail system as an integrated transit mode outside of the CBD. Construction of this efficient, non-polluting transit system and park-and-ride facilities along the right of way shall be, contingent upon receipt of federal, State and local funds.

1.2.5 The City shall utilize the requirements of Chapter 9J-5.0055(2), F.A.C., Minimum Requirements for Concurrency F.A.C. to be adopted as a part of and consistent with the Land Development Regulations.

Issue: Concurrency Management System

The City has adopted a concurrency management system and Land Development Regulations and has integrated that system into its planning and decision making process. The intent is to ensure consistency with the goals, objectives and policies of this comprehensive plan, and with those of adjacent local governments, State and regional plans. The evaluation and maintenance of the City's levels of services will also be included.

Objective 1.3 The City shall coordinate its land use decisions and manage its

fiscal resources in a manner that maintains adopted Level of Service standards, ensures that existing and future facility needs will be met, and does not conflict with adjacent local governments' comprehensive plans or with State or regional agency functional plans.

Policies

1.3.1 The City shall integrate its land use planning and decision making process with its five year Schedule of Capital Improvements as adopted within this Capital Improvements Element. The City's annual five year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) shall be prepared in conjunction with the annual review and update of the Capital Improvements Element. The CIP shall contain all of the projects listed in the Schedule of Capital Improvements of the updated version of the Capital Improvements Element. The Planning and Development Department shall closely monitor capital project construction startup and progress to eliminate the lag between infrastructure, land use changes and new development.

1.3.2 Public facilities needed to support development shall be required to be provided concurrent with the impacts of such development. The City will continue to allow the use of development agreements between the City and developers.

1.3.3 Decisions regarding the issuance of development orders and permits shall be based upon coordination of the development requirements set forth in the 2010 Comprehensive Plan, including, but not limited to, the Land Development Regulations and the availability of public facilities needed to support development concurrent with the impact of that development in a manner consistent with Chapter 9J-5.0055(2), F.A.C.

<u>Objective 1.4</u> The City shall limit public expenditures in Coastal High Hazard Areas, as defined in the Conservation/Coastal Management Element, to those improvements which restore or enhance natural resources or which maintain existing public facilities and services at their existing levels, except for public recreational facilities, which may be expanded and improved.

Policies

1.4.1 The City shall include in its review process for infrastructure planning an assessment of appropriateness based upon the identified Coastal High Hazard Areas (CHHA).

1.4.2 The City shall limit the expenditure of public funds in Coastal High

Hazard Areas to the restoration or enhancement of natural resources and to the replacement and renewal of existing public facilities, except for public recreational facilities, which may be expanded and improved.

1.4.3 The City shall limit the expenditure of public funds to maintain existing public facilities and services at their existing levels in the CHHA, except for public recreational facilities, which may be expanded and improved.

Objective 1.5 The City shall manage its fiscal resources and its development review process to ensure the provision of needed capital improvements identified in the other plan elements, for previously issued development orders, and future development and redevelopment.

Policies

1.5.1 Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the City through the implementation and enforcement of its Concurrency Management System, shall ensure that all public facilities needed to serve development for which development orders were previously issued are provided concurrent with the impacts of said development.

1.5.2 Direct Net Debt shall not exceed 5% of assessed valuation.

1.5.3 Annual General Fund debt service requirements of tax supported debt shall not exceed 20% of General Fund operating revenues.

1.5.4 Fiscal policies to direct expenditures for capital improvements shall recognize the policies of the other elements of the 2010 Comprehensive Plan.

1.5.5 The City shall continue to adopt a five year capital improvement program and annual capital budget as a part of its budgeting process.

IMPLEMENTATION

Five Year Capital Improvements Schedule

Attachment A is the Capital Improvement Element Schedule of projects which the City has identified throughout the various elements as needed to support its adopted Levels of Service for the next five years. The Capital Improvements Schedule is the implementation mechanism for the Capital Improvements Element. This schedule stages the timing, location, projected costs, and revenue sources for funding the

projects in the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) which will be adopted by ordinance. As the CIE is updated each year, the additional projects will also be included in the CIP. The data for this schedule are based upon the inventory and assessments of facilities forms which comprise Attachment A of the support documents. These forms indicate the priority establishment for each project based upon (1) the correction of a health hazard, (2) the correction of a deficiency, (3) the replacement of an existing facility, (4) and/or projected need to accommodate growth.

The expenditures and funding sources from FY 2006/07 through FY 2011/12 are shown by year. For the planning period beyond to 2012, only lump sum expenditures are identified. The projects were taken from their respective elements of the 2010 Comprehensive Plan, which ensures consistency among the elements.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation of this element are necessary to ensure effectiveness. Chapter 163 (Part II), F.S., requires that this element be reviewed annually to ensure that facilities are available concurrent with the impacts of development and that the levels of service are maintained.

The annual review will be the responsibility of the Planning and Development Department. The review and subsequent analysis will culminate in recommendation to be presented to the City Council for action. Applicable planning staff should provide input to the Finance Department during the budget formulation process. The annual review process will include:

a) an evaluation of costs, revenues, and scheduling;

b) an evaluation of the continued consistency with the infrastructure sub-elements and in particular, support of the Future Land Use Element;

c) the establishment of priorities and ranking of projects;

d) the correction of deficiencies;

e) a determination as to whether the Levels of Service are measurable and the effectiveness in maintaining them;

f) the inclusion of the next years' capital facilities needs into the five-year schedule; and

g) concurrency status.

Concurrency Management System

The City has adopted a Concurrency Management System as part of its Land Development Regulations. The Concurrency Management System ensures, prior to the issuance of a development order and development permit, that the adopted Level of Service standards for roads, potable water, sanitary sewer, solid waste, drainage, mass transit and parks and recreation will be maintained and that public facilities and services needed to support development are available concurrent with the impacts of development.

The City shall require concurrency tests for local development orders and local development permits to be conducted by each agency or department having responsibility for the impacted facility(s) prior to the consideration of such local development orders or local development permits, which shall include data concerning proposed densities and intensities, according to the following guidelines:

1. Each affected agency or department shall develop customized concurrency testing procedures and mechanisms that assess the capacity demands of a proposed development upon its particular facility(s);

2. Each affected agency or department shall communicate the results of its customized concurrency test via the computer software program developed by the City's Central Services Computer Systems Division.

The computer software program developed by the City's Central Service Computer Systems Division shall be called the Automated Concurrency Management System Data Base. The Automated Concurrency Management System Data Base and each affected agency or department shall monitor changes in the capacities of affected public facilities over time and changes in the Levels of Service provided for affected public facilities over time.

All local development orders and local development permits approved by the City shall be accompanied by an approved Concurrency Management Reservation Certificate (CRC) for that specific project, certifying that it has passed mandated concurrency tests.

Capacity for all local development orders and local development permits holding approved Concurrency Reservation Certificates shall be reserved in the affected public facilities for the life of its associated and approved local development order or local development permit.

Objective 1.6 The City may allow a landowner to proceed with development of a specific parcel of land notwithstanding a failure of the proposed development to satisfy transportation concurrency, when all of the following policies are shown to exist:

Policies

1.6.1 The City has adopted a local comprehensive plan that is in compliance.

1.6.2 The proposed development would be consistent with the future land use designation for the specific property and with pertinent portions of the adopted City comprehensive plan, and determined by the City.

1.6.3 The City's comprehensive plan includes a financially feasible Capital Improvements Element that provides for transportation facilities adequate to serve the proposed development and the City has not implemented that element.

1.6.4 The City has provided a means by which the landowner will be assessed a fair share of the cost of providing the transportation facilities necessary to serve the proposed development.

1.6.5 The landowner has made a binding commitment to the City to pay the fair share of the cost of providing the transportation facilities to serve the proposed development.

1.6.6 The City shall identify in the comprehensive plan a process for assessing, receiving and applying a fair share of the cost of providing the transportation facilities necessary to serve the proposed development.

1.6.7 The transportation facilities necessary to serve the proposed development shall be included by the City in a financially feasible Five-Year Capital Improvement Schedule adopted pursuant to Rule 9J-5.016 of the Florida Administrative Code.

1.6.8 The fair share assessment shall have a reasonable relationship to the transportation impact that is generated by the proposed development.

<u>Objective 1.7</u> The City's process for assessing, receiving and applying a landowner's fair share of the cost of providing the transportation facilities necessary to serve a proposed development fitting the requirements of Objective 1.6, shall be governed by the following:

Policies

1.7.1 For purposes of assessing a landowner's fair share of the cost of

providing transportation facilities necessary to serve a proposed development, the City shall use a quantitative formula where the landowner's fair share contribution (A), shall equal the development's total peak hour trips generated (B), divided by the increase in peak hour capacity created by the proposed improvement to be constructed on the impacted road link (C), multiplied by the total cost of the proposed road improvement, including any drainage or utility costs (D).

$$\text{Landowner's Fair Share } A = \frac{B}{C} \times D$$

1.7.2 The City shall use the most recent issue of the Florida Department of Transportation Office of Policy Planning, Policy Analysis and Program Evaluation publication entitled Transportation Costs to calculate the value of (D) in the formula found in Policy 1.7.1 The Jacksonville Public Works Department will be consulted to assist with calculation of the drainage and utility costs associated with the value of (D).

1.7.3 The City shall use the most recent edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineer's publication entitled Trip Generation to calculate the value of (B) in the formula found in Policy 1.7.1.

1.7.4 The City shall receive any fair share dollars having a reasonable relationship to the transportation impacts generated by a landowner's proposed development notwithstanding a failure of the proposed development to satisfy transportation concurrency when all of the policies under Objective 1.6 are shown to exist, into Transportation Roadway Link Analysis Trust Funds, said trust funds to be dedicated to the transportation roadway improvements determined to be necessary by the City's Department of Planning and Development Director.

1.7.5 The City shall apply Transportation Roadway Link Analysis Trust Fund monies when such funds equal the investment necessary to commence engineering and construction development of the roadway link that is its subject in view of the requirements under Part 6, Chapter 122, City of Jacksonville Ordinance Code.

Attachment A: 2006-2011 Capital Improvement Element (CIE) Schedule

Traffic Circulation - Roads

	Agency	Project Name	Funding Source	Cost (X 1,000)	Financially Feasible FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	Programmed FY 09-10	FY 10-11	Beyond 5th Year	Element, Goal, Objective Showing Comp Plan Consistency
1	COJ	Kernan Boulevard Widening McCormick Rd to J. Turner Butler Blvd	BJP	57,830	57,830						Transportation 2.1
2	COJ	Alta Drive Widening - Design Faye Rd to SR9A	BJP	3,000	3,000						Transportation 2.1
3	COJ	Old Middleburg Rd Widening Clay County Line to 103rd St	BJP	28,726	28,726						Transportation 2.1
4	COJ	Hodges Blvd Widening Altantic Blvd to Beach Blvd	BJP	18,894	18,894						Transportation 2.1
5	COJ	San Pablo Rd Widening Atlantic Blvd to Beach Blvd	BJP	17,100	17,100						Transportation 2.1
6	COJ	Greenland Rd Widening Coastal Lane to Philips Hwy	BJP	15,643	15,643						Transportation 2.1
7	COJ	Collins Rd Widening Rampart Rd to Blanding Blvd	BJP	22,730	22,730						Transportation 2.1
8	COJ	Old St. Augustine Rd Widening I-295 to Hood Landing Rd	BJP	26,436	26,436						Transportation 2.1
9	COJ	Starratt Rd Widening Duval Station Rd to New Berlin	BJP	8,124	8,124						Transportation 2.1
10	COJ	Shindler Dr Widening 103rd St to Argyle Forest Blvd	BJP	22,156	22,156						Transportation 2.1
11	COJ	Old Middleburg Rd Widening Herlong Rd to Wilson Blvd	BJP	4,855	4,855						Transportation 2.1
12	COJ	Collins Rd Widening Blanding Blvd to Roosevelt Blvd	BJP	13,819	13,819						Transportation 2.1
13	COJ	Fort Caroline Rd Widening	BJP	15,359	15,359						Transportation 2.1

		Townsend Blvd to McCormick Rd					
14	COJ	Girvin Rd Widening Mt. Pleasant Rd to Atlantic Blvd	BJP	16,305	16,305		Transportation 2.1
15	COJ	St. Johns Bluff Rd Widening Fort Caroline Rd to Atlantic Blvd (row & const)	BJP	5,490	5,490		Transportation 2.1
6	COJ	Harts Rd Widening Dunn Ave to Dead End	BJP	4,943	4,943		Transportation 2.1
17	COJ	Broward Rd Widening Lem Turner Rd to I-95	BJP	19,913	19,913		Transportation 2.1
18	COJ	Hood Rd Widening Sunbeam Rd to St. Augustine Rd	BJP	13,091	13,091		Transportation 2.1
19	COJ	8th Street Widening Boulevard to Liberty	BJP	7,124	7,124		Transportation 2.1.4
20	COJ	Spring Park Rd Widening Bowden Rd to University Blvd	BJP	3,642	3,642		Transportation 2.1
21	COJ	McDuff Ave Widening 5th St to Edgewood	BJP	9,083	9,083		Transportation 2.1
22	COJ	Touchton Rd Widening Belfort Rd to Southside Blvd	BJP	6,366	6,366		Transportation 2.1
23	COJ	Lenox Ave Widening Lane Ave to Normandy Blvd	BJP	7,598	7,598		Transportation 2.1
24	COJ	Hartley Rd Widening St. Augustine Rd to SR 13	BJP	12,274	12,274		Transportation 2.1
25	COJ	Rampart Rd Widening Argyle Forest Blvd to Park City Dr	BJP	6,263	6,263		Transportation 2.1
26	COJ	Cahoon Rd Widening Normandy Blvd to Beaver St	BJP	16,723	16,723		Transportation 2.1
27	COJ	Collins Rd Widening Shindler Dr to Old Middleburg Rd	BJP	8,993	8,993		Transportation 2.1
28	COJ	Ricker Rd Widening Morse Ave to Park City Dr	BJP	12,836	12,836		Transportation 2.1
29	COJ	Collins Rd Widening	BJP	9,979	9,979		Transportation 2.1

		Shindler Dr to Westport								
30	COJ	Collins Rd Widening Westport to Rampart	BJP	10,159	10,159					Transportation 2.1
31	COJ	Crystal Springs Widening Chaffee Rd to Cahoon	BJP	24,268	24,268					Transportation 2.1
32	COJ	Caron Dr Extension St. Augustine Rd to Greenland Rd	BJP	3,000	3,000					Transportation 2.1
33	COJ	Dean Rd Widening Beach Blvd to Parental Home Rd	BJP	8,059	8,059					Transportation 2.1
34	COJ	Moncrief Rd Widening Soutel Dr to US 1	BJP	4,668	4,668					Transportation 2.1
35	COJ	Parramore Rd Extension *Pending*	BJP	3,000	3,000					Transportation 2.1
36	COJ	Morse Ave Improvements Shindler Dr to Ricker Rd	BJP	750	750					Transportation 2.1
37	COJ	Morse Ave Improvements Ricker Rd to Blanding Blvd	BJP	750	750					Transportation 2.1
38	COJ	Myrtle Ave Widening 15th to Moncrief	BJP	2,000	2,000					Transportation 2.1
39	COJ	Yellow Bluff Rd Widening New Berlin Rd to Rushing Branch	F.S.	15,000		15,000				Transportation 2.1
40	COJ	Plummer Rd Widening Nassau County Line to Old Kings Rd	F.S.	10,000		10,000				Transportation 2.1
41	COJ	Old St. Augustine Rd Widening Hood Landing Rd to Bartram Park Blvd	F.S.	15,000			15,000			Transportation 2.1
42	COJ	Garden St Widening Shane Rd to Imeson Rd	F.S.	10,000			10,000			Transportation 2.1
43	COJ	Belfort Rd Widening Southpoint Parkway to Touchton Rd	F.S.	10,000				10,000		Transportation 2.1
44	COJ	Pritchard Rd Widening I-295 to Old Kings Rd	F.S.	12,000				12,000		Transportation 2.1
45	COJ	Pecan Park Rd Widening	F.S.	8,000				8,000		Transportation 2.1

		I-95 to Main St						
46	COJ	Braddock Rd Widening Dunn Ave to Lem Turner Rd	F.S.	5,000		5,000		Transportation 2.1
47	COJ	New Berlin Rd Widening Yellow Bluff Rd to Cedar Point Rd	F.S.	10,000			10,000	Transportation 2.1
48	COJ	Parental Home Rd Widening Beach Blvd to Bowden Rd	F.S.	5,000			5,000	Transportation 2.1
49	COJ	Yellow Bluff Rd Widening Starratt Rd to New Berlin Rd	F.S.	10,000			10,000	Transportation 2.1
50	COJ	Bowden Rd Widening Southpoint Pkwy to Parental Home Rd	F.S./BJP	8,000			8,000	Transportation 2.1
51	COJ	New Berlin Rd Widening Pulaski Rd to Yellow Bluff Rd	F.S./BJP	12,000			12,000	Transportation 2.1
52	COJ	Hodges Blvd Widening Beach Blvd to J. Turner Butler Blvd	F.S./BJP	20,000			20,000	Transportation 2.1
53	COJ	Pulaski Rd Widening Eastport Rd to New Berlin Rd	F.S./BJP	1,200			1,200	Transportation 2.1
54	COJ	Old St. Augustine Rd Widening Bartram Park Blvd to I-95	F.S./BJP	18,000			18,000	Transportation 2.1
55	COJ	New Berlin Rd Widening Cedar Point Rd to Heckscher Dr	F.S./BJP	35,000			35,000	Transportation 2.1
56	COJ	Trout River Blvd Widening Old Kings Rd to New Kings Rd	F.S./BJP	12,000			12,000	Transportation 2.1
57	COJ	Old Kings Rd Widening Edgewood Ave to Plummer Rd	F.S./BJP	12,000			12,000	Transportation 2.1
58	COJ	Park St Improvements Margaret St to I-95	F.S./BJP	6,000			6,000	Transportation 2.1
59	COJ	Deerwood Park Blvd Widening Southside Blvd to Gate Pkwy	F.S./BJP	15,000			15,000	Transportation 2.1
60	COJ	Pecan Park Rd Widening Dixie Clipper Drive to I-95	F.S./BJP	8,000			8,000	Transportation 2.1
61	COJ	Monument Rd Widening	F.S./BJP	15,000			15,000	Transportation 2.1

		SR 9A to Regency Square Blvd North				
62	COJ	St. Johns Bluff Rd Widening Beach Blvd to J. Turner Butler Blvd	F.S./BJP	18,000	18,000	Transportation 2.1
63	COJ	Loretto Rd Widening San Jose Blvd to Old St. Augustine Rd	F.S./BJP	12,000	12,000	Transportation 2.1
64	COJ	Losco Rd Widening Old St. Augustine Rd to Hood Rd South	F.S./BJP	12,000	12,000	Transportation 2.1
65	COJ	Cedar Point Rd Widening New Berlin Rd to Horseshoe Creek	F.S./BJP	28,000	28,000	Transportation 2.1
66	COJ	Imeson Rd Widening Pritchard Rd to Garden St	F.S./BJP	12,000	12,000	Transportation 2.1
67	COJ	Sunbeam Rd Widening San Jose Blvd to Philips Hwy	F.S./BJP	30,000	30,000	Transportation 2.1
68	COJ	Fouraker Rd/Cahoon Rd Widening Normandy Blvd to I-10	F.S./BJP	10,000	10,000	Transportation 2.1
69	COJ	Monument Rd Widening McCormick Rd to St. Johns Bluff Rd	F.S./BJP	18,000	18,000	Transportation 2.1
70	COJ	San Pablo Rd Widening Beach Blvd to Wm Davis Pkwy/Port Arthur	F.S./BJP	10,000	10,000	Transportation 2.1
71	COJ	Emerson St Widening Philips Hwy to Emerson St Expy	F.S./BJP	6,000	6,000	Transportation 2.1
72	COJ	Jones Rd Widening Cisco Dr to Pritchard Rd	F.S./BJP	5,000	5,000	Transportation 2.1
73	COJ	Bowden Rd Widening Parental Home Rd to Belfort Rd	F.S./BJP	10,000	10,000	Transportation 2.1
74	COJ	New Kings Rd Widening Old Kings Rd to Dunn Ave	F.S./BJP	9,000	9,000	Transportation 2.1
75	COJ	New Berlin Rd Widening Main St to Pulaski Rd	F.S./BJP	20,000	20,000	Transportation 2.1
76	COJ	Ramona Blvd Widening Hammond Blvd to Memorial Park Rd	F.S./BJP	8,000	8,000	Transportation 2.1
77	COJ	Gate Pkwy Improvements	F.S./BJP	4,000	4,000	Transportation 2.1

		J. Turner Butler Blvd to Southside Blvd									
78	COJ	Hood Rd Widening South Losco Rd to Hood Rd/Shad Rd	F.S./BJP	8,000						8,000	Transportation 2.1
79	COJ	Monument Rd Widening St. Johns Bluff Rd to SR 9A	F.S./BJP	8,000						8,000	Transportation 2.1
80	COJ	Old St. Augustine Rd Widening Losco Rd to I-295	F.S./BJP	8,000						8,000	Transportation 2.1
81	COJ	Duval Station Rd Widening Main St to Starratt Rd	F.S./BJP	10,000						10,000	Transportation 2.1
82	COJ	Duval Rd Widening First Coast Center to Main St	F.S./BJP	6,000						6,000	Transportation 2.1
	Totals			**996,149**	**471,949**	**25,000**	**25,000**	**35,000**	**25,000**	**414,200**	

Mass Transit - Jacksonville Transportation Authority (JTA)

	Agency/Authority	*Project Name*	*Cost*	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 09-10	FY 10-11	Element, Goal, Objective Showing Comp Plan Consistency
1	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	Argyle Forest Boulevard, Segment 2 (Westport Rd. to Bridgecreek Rd.)	13,200,000	6,640,000	3,020,000				Transportation 2.1
2	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	Beach Boulevard Intracoastal Waterway Bridge (San Pablo to Penman)	80,000,000	24,059,000	24,059,000	17,649,000			Transportation 2.1
3	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	Beaver Street Widening (Cahoon Rd. to Edgewood Ave.) - PD&E	1,078,200	785,222					Transportation 2.1
4	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	Blanding Boulevard Widening (I-295 to Wilson Blvd.) - PD&E	2,190,000						Transportation 2.1
5	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	Branan Field Chaffee Road, Phase 2 (Argyle Forest Blvd. to 103rd St.)	17,000,000						Transportation 2.1
6	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	Cecil Field Connector (Branan Field Rd. to Commerce Center)	8,513,700	1,000,000	2,500,000	5,013,700			Transportation 2.1
7	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	East-West Connector (US-17 to New Berlin Rd.)	26,110,000	7,400,000	7,800,000				Transportation 2.1
8	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	Heckscher Drive Widening, Phase 1 (August Dr. to 9A)	4,721,338						Transportation 2.1
9	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	Heckscher Drive Widening, Phase 2 (Drummond Pt. to August Dr.)	61,707,000	11,068,500	25,550,000	20,944,000			Transportation 2.1
10	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	I-95 / J.T. Butler Interchange (Phase 1A - Ramps)	14,000,000	1,400,000	11,400,000	900,000			Transportation 2.1
11	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	I-95 / J.T. Butler Interchange, Phase 1	21,250,000	2,419,000	2,150,000	1,650,000	6,000,000	8,500,000	Transportation 2.1
12	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	ITS Improvements	5,000,000			500,000	2,500,000	2,000,000	Transportation 2.1
13	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	J.T. Butler Boulevard Widening (Belfort Rd. to Gate Pkwy.)	20,495,000						Transportation 2.1

Mass Transit - Jacksonville Transportation Authority (JTA)

	Agency/Authority	*Project Name*	*Cost*	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 09-10	FY 10-11	Element, Goal, Objective Showing Comp Plan Consistency
14	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	Mathews Bridge Replacement - PD&E	3,300,000						Transportation 2.1
15	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	McDuff Avenue Improvements (Roosevelt Blvd. to Beaver St.)	11,923,000	4,600,000	4,041,000				Transportation 2.1
16	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	Merrill Road at Southside Connector	17,870,000						Transportation 2.1
17	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	Rapid Transit Corridor Right-of-Way	100,000,000	24,050,000	24,050,000	24,050,000	24,050,000		Transportation 6.3
18	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	Regency Area Intersection Improvement (Arlington/Atlantic/Monument)	4,340,000	1,340,000	3,000,000				Transportation 2.1, 5.2
19	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	Regency Bypass, Phase 2	21,570,000						Transportation 2.1
#	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	Soutel Drive, Phase 1 (JTA Bond Project)	5,000,000						Transportation 2.1
21	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	Southeast Access Road (A.C. Skinner Parkway) (JTA Bond Project)	16,300,000						Transportation 2.1
#	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	SR-9A (I-295 to US-1) -- FDOT	4,200,000						Transportation 2.1
#	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	US-17/Collins Road Interchange (Design & R/W)	4,000,000	1,050,000	2,600,000	350,000			Transportation 2.1
#	Jacksonville Transportation Authority	Wonderwood, Segment 3 & JTA Bond Projects (A.C. Skinner Pkwy. & Soutel Dr., Phase 1)	62,150,000	20,900,000	15,300,000	3,685,000			Transportation 2.1
		TOTAL	**$525,918,238**	**$106,711,722**	**$125,470,000**	**$74,741,700**	**$32,550,000**	**$10,500,000**	

Duval County Public Schools

2006-2007
PROPOSED LONG RANGE FACILITIES PROJECTS PLAN
SCHOOL BOARD

5/23/2006

	2006-2007-Year 1		2007-2008-Year 2		2008-2009-Year 3		2009-2010-Year 4		2010-2011-Year 5		Totals
	OTHER FUNDING	COPs	OTHER FUNDING	COPs	OTHER FUNDING	COPs	OTHER FUNDING	COPs	OTHER FUNDING(1)	COPs(1)	
Balance Forward	**$0**	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	
Revenue	**$ 48,218,527**	$ -	**$ 40,186,571**	**$ 15,000,000**	**$ 41,653,291**	$ -	**$ 41,111,744**	**$ 15,000,000**	**$ 43,276,124**	$ -	
Subtotal	**$48,218,527**	$0	**$40,186,571**	**$15,000,000**	**$41,653,291**	**$0**	**$41,111,744**	**$15,000,000**	**$43,276,124**	**$0**	$ 244,446,257
North Shore K-8	3,397,868										$ 3,397,868
North Shore K-8	**800,000**										$ 800,000
New Elementary Chaffee Rd	**4,500,000**										$ 4,500,000
HS AAA	13,152,273										$ 13,152,273
HS AAA	**4,650,000**										$ 4,650,000
Fire Safety Projects	**2,000,000**		**2,395,254**		**1,000,000**		**1,000,000**		**1,000,000**		$ 7,395,254
ESE Improvements	**500,000**		**500,000**		**500,000**		**500,000**		**500,000**		$ 2,500,000
Minor Capital Improvements	**1,500,000**		**1,500,000**		**1,500,000**		**1,500,000**		**1,500,000**		$ 7,500,000
Security Equipment	**1,146,126**		**1,500,000**								$ 2,646,126
New K-8 School (103rd/Westside)			~~17,415,982~~		~~13,584,018~~						$ -
New K-8 School (103rd/Westside)	**2,000,000**		**20,000,000**		**20,000,000**						$ 42,000,000
New K-8 School (JTB/Southside)				~~15,000,000~~	~~7,915,982~~		~~8,084,018~~		**18,139,744**		$ 18,139,744
New Elementary Bartram Springs				**2,000,000**	**7,752,000**		**15,248,000**	**3,000,000**			$ 28,000,000
Nathan B. Forrest High							~~2,500,000~~				$ -
Ed White High							~~2,415,982~~				$ -
New K-8 School (Waterleaf/E. Arlington)							~~5,000,000~~	~~15,000,000~~	~~14,000,000~~		$ -
New K-5 School (Waterleaf/E. Arlington) & convert Sabal Palm ES to a K-8				**13,000,000**			**6,863,744**	**12,000,000**	**6,136,256**		$ 38,000,000
Technology	10,000,000		**10,000,000**		7,329,620		10,000,000		10,000,000		$ 47,329,620
Gender Equity/Athletics/PE	500,000		**500,000**		500,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		$ 3,500,000
ADA Requirements	500,000		**500,000**		500,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		$ 3,500,000
Portables	**1,500,000**		**500,000**		500,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		$ 4,500,000
Land Acquisition	**2,072,260**		2,791,317		2,071,671		**3,000,000**	**0**	**3,000,124**		$ 12,935,372
Total Project Costs	**$48,218,527**	**$0**	**$40,186,571**	**$15,000,000**	**$41,653,291**	**$0**	**$41,111,744**	**$15,000,000**	**$43,276,124**	**$0**	**$ 244,446,257**
Balance Forward	**0**	0	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	

Potable Water-Sanitary Sewer - Jacksonville Electric Authority (JEA)

CIP Description	*Improvement Type*	*Project Description*	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	Element, Goal, Objective Showing Comp Plan Consistency
Reclaim Water Distribution	Growth	Grid Capacity Developer Cost Participation - Reclaimed	$500,000	$300,000	$300,000	$300,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Reclaim Water Distribution	Growth	Arlington East Reuse HSP Upgrade	$200,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Reclaim Water Distribution	Growth	Craig Field-Kernan Blvd. to Monument Rd. Reclaimed Transmission	$100,000	$2,100,000	$1,400,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Reclaim Water Distribution	Growth	COM - Developer Driven Projects - Reclaim	$0	$1,900,000	$1,500,000	$1,500,000	$1,500,000	$1,500,000	$1,500,000	$1,500,000	$1,500,000	$1,500,000	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Reclaim Water Distribution	Growth	Hidden Hills Reclaimed Transmission	$0	$0	$500,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Reclaim Water Distribution Total			**$800,000**	**$4,300,000**	**$3,700,000**	**$1,800,000**	**$1,500,000**	**$1,500,000**	**$1,500,000**	**$1,500,000**	**$1,500,000**	**$1,500,000**	
Sewage Pump Stations	Growth	Bradley Master Pump Station Improvements	$1,500,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Sanitary Sewer 1.4
Sewage Pump Stations	Growth	Huffman Master Pump Station Improvements	$0	$2,250,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Sanitary Sewer 1.4
Sewage Pump Stations Total			**$1,500,000**	**$2,250,000**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	
Sewer Collection	Growth	North Jacksonville FM - S	$3,724,000	$3,734,000	$305,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Sanitary Sewer 1.6
Sewer Collection	Growth	COM - Thomas Creek Offsite - Sewer	$1,875,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Sanitary Sewer 1.6

Potable Water-Sanitary Sewer - Jacksonville Electric Authority (JEA)

CIP Description	*Improvement Type*	*Project Description*	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	Element, Goal, Objective Showing Comp Plan Consistency
Sewer Collection	Growth	Fury Dr PS Upgrade & Force Main	$1,500,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Sanitary Sewer 1.6
Sewer Collection	Growth	Grid Capacity Developer Cost Participation - Sewer	$1,000,000	$900,000	$900,000	$900,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Sanitary Sewer 1.4
Sewer Collection	Growth	COM - New Sewer Service Additions	$800,000	$800,000	$800,000	$800,000	$800,000	$800,000	$800,000	$800,000	$800,000	$800,000	Sanitary Sewer 1.4
Sewer Collection	Growth	COM - The Trails - Sewer	$800,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Sanitary Sewer 1.6
Sewer Collection	Growth	Ortega Hills Sewer Force Main	$500,000	$500,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Sanitary Sewer 1.6
Sewer Collection	Growth	South Shores Second Sub-Aqueous FM Crossing	$350,000	$0	$350,000	$3,500,000	$4,500,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Sanitary Sewer 1.6
Sewer Collection	Growth	COM - Ranch Village/ AFI Developments - Sewer	$125,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Sanitary Sewer 1.4
Sewer Collection	Growth	Northwest Jacksonville Force Main Improvements	$100,000	$1,250,000	$650,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Sanitary Sewer 1.6
Sewer Collection	Growth	Linwood Loop Low Pressure Sewer System - Phase-Out	$50,000	$853,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Sanitary Sewer 1.6
Sewer Collection	Growth	COM - Developer Driven Projects - Sewer	$0	$11,400,000	$8,400,000	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	Sanitary Sewer 1.4
Sewer Collection Total			**$10,824,000**	**$19,437,000**	**$11,405,000**	**$8,200,000**	**$8,300,000**	**$3,800,000**	**$3,800,000**	**$3,800,000**	**$3,800,000**	**$3,800,000**	

Potable Water-Sanitary Sewer - Jacksonville Electric Authority (JEA)

CIP Description	*Improvement Type*	*Project Description*	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	Element, Goal, Objective Showing Comp Plan Consistency
Wastewater Treatment	Growth	Southwest Biosolids Pumping System Upgrade	$750,000	$3,250,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Sanitary Sewer 1.3
Wastewater Treatment	Growth	Dinsmore Regional WWTF	$0	$3,000,000	$5,000,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Sanitary Sewer 1.5
Wastewater Treatment Total			**$750,000**	**$6,250,000**	**$5,000,000**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	
Water Distribution	Growth	Main Extensions & Taps	$2,769,000	$2,000,000	$2,000,000	$2,000,000	$2,000,000	$2,000,000	$2,000,000	$2,000,000	$2,000,000	$2,000,000	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Distribution	Growth	Water Meter Installations for Growth & Emergency Replacement	$2,600,000	$2,600,000	$2,600,000	$2,600,000	$2,600,000	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Distribution	Growth	Grid Capacity Developer Cost Participation - Water	$2,000,000	$1,200,000	$1,200,000	$1,200,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Distribution	Growth	COM - Thomas Creek Offsite - Water	$1,875,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Distribution	Growth	COM - The Trails - Water	$1,200,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Distribution	Growth	New World Av - Brannon Field - Chaffee to Chaffe Rd.	$900,000	$1,200,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Distribution	Growth	Deeder Ln - Julington Creek Rd - St. Augustine Rd to Aladdin Rd	$800,000	$1,485,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Distribution	Growth	COM - New Water Service Additions	$600,000	$600,000	$600,000	$600,000	$600,000	$600,000	$600,000	$600,000	$600,000	$600,000	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4

Potable Water-Sanitary Sewer - Jacksonville Electric Authority (JEA)

CIP Description	*Improvement Type*	*Project Description*	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	Element, Goal, Objective Showing Comp Plan Consistency
Water Distribution	Growth	Highlands Water Transmission Improvements Phase I	$600,000	$2,500,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Distribution	Growth	COM - Westport Development - Water	$350,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Distribution	Growth	Relocate In-Line Booster From St. County to Northside	$300,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Distribution	Growth	Jones Rd - Teague Rd to Prichard Rd	$250,000	$2,850,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Distribution	Growth	Braddock Rd - Westport RAC to Thomas Creek PUD	$250,000	$2,108,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Distribution	Growth	South Grid Backbone Transmission	$200,000	$4,150,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Distribution	Growth	Cisco Dr - Jones Rd - Westlake WTP to Garden St	$200,000	$2,290,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Distribution	Growth	Chaffee Rd - Old Plank Rd. to Prichard Rd.	$200,000	$2,050,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Distribution	Growth	Abess Rd - Girvin Rd. to Deadend	$133,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Distribution	Growth	COM - Ranch Village/ AFI Developments - Water	$125,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Distribution	Growth	Trout River Bv - Finch Ave to US 1	$100,000	$1,746,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4

Potable Water-Sanitary Sewer - Jacksonville Electric Authority (JEA)

CIP Description	*Improvement Type*	*Project Description*	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	Element, Goal, Objective Showing Comp Plan Consistency
Water Distribution	Growth	Pecan Park Rd - Pecan Park Rd. to US Post Office	$100,000	$850,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Distribution	Growth	Cecil Commerce - Oakleaf Intertie	$100,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Distribution	Growth	Rivercrossing II	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,000,000	$3,000,000	$15,000,000	$19,000,000	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Distribution	Growth	COM - Developer Driven Projects - W	$0	$5,700,000	$4,200,000	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Distribution	Growth	Yellow Bluff Rd - Starrat Rd to Pecan Park Hideaway	$0	$0	$200,000	$2,176,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Distribution	Growth	Roosevelt Bv - Birmingham Gate to Collins Rd	$0	$115,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Distribution Total			**$15,652,000**	**$33,444,000**	**$10,800,000**	**$11,576,000**	**$9,200,000**	**$11,600,000**	**$23,600,000**	**$27,600,000**	**$8,600,000**	**$8,600,000**	
Water Treatment	Growth	Ridenour Well No 7	$800,000	$300,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Treatment	Growth	Monitoring Wells Northwest Duval County	$800,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Treatment	Growth	Oakridge Well No 7	$466,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Treatment	Growth	Southeast Well No 3	$245,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Treatment	Growth	Westlake WTP Expansion	$0	$0	$600,000	$3,500,000	$2,000,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Treatment	Growth	Oakridge Well No 8	$0	$150,000	$300,000	$1,000,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4

Potable Water-Sanitary Sewer - Jacksonville Electric Authority (JEA)

CIP Description	*Improvement Type*	*Project Description*	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	Element, Goal, Objective Showing Comp Plan Consistency
Water Treatment	Growth	Ridenour Well 8	$0	$0	$0	$300,000	$1,100,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Treatment	Growth	Highlands WTP - Well No 7	$0	$0	$300,000	$1,000,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Treatment	Growth	Highlands WTP - Well No 6	$0	$1,000,000	$300,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Treatment	Growth	Cecil Commerce Well No 4	$0	$1,000,000	$250,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Treatment	Growth	Cecil Commerce Well No 5	$0	$0	$0	$300,000	$950,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Treatment	Growth	Southwest WTP Well No 5	$0	$300,000	$800,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Treatment	Growth	Dinsmore Joint Site WTP	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$800,000	Potable Water 1.3 & 1.4
Water Treatment Total			**$2,311,000**	**$2,750,000**	**$2,550,000**	**$6,100,000**	**$4,050,000**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$800,000**	
Fiscal Year Expenditure Totals			**$31,837,000**	**$68,431,000**	**$33,455,000**	**$27,676,000**	**$23,050,000**	**$16,900,000**	**$28,900,000**	**$32,900,000**	########	**$14,700,000**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ELEMENT

B

DEFINITIONS

JACKSONVILLE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

DEFINITIONS

Capital Budget - The portion of each local government's budget which reflects capital improvements scheduled for a fiscal year.

Concurrency - With regard to the provision of facilities and services, the assurance that the necessary public facilities and services to maintain the City's adopted level of service standards are available when the impacts of development occur.

Concurrency Management System - The procedures and/or process the City will use to assure that development orders and permits when issued will not result in a reduction of the adopted level of service standards at the time the impact of the development occurs.

Infrastructure - Those man-made structures which serve the common needs of the population, such as: sewage disposal systems; potable water systems; potable water wells serving a system; solid waste disposal sites or retention areas; stormwater systems; utilities; piers; docks; wharves; breakwaters; bulkheads; seawalls; bulwarks; revetments; causeways; marinas; navigation channels; bridges and roadways.

Public Facilities – Major capital improvements, including, but not limited to, transportation, sanitary sewer, solid waste, drainage, potable water, educational, parks and recreational, and health systems and facilities, and spoil disposal sites for maintenance dredging located in the intracoastal waterways, except for spoil disposal sites owned or used by ports listed in s.403.021(9)(b).

Rural Area - The predominantly undeveloped portions of the City in the areas that generally remain unplatted. Development in these areas tends to be at very low densities and intensities, thus creating little demand for community-serving supporting uses. Widely spaced roads typify the area, and result in a small number of intersections per square mile. The area of the City not intended to be developed with urban services or at urban densities and intensities during the long-range timeframe of the 2010 Comprehensive Plan.

Services - The programs and staff determined necessary by the City to provide adequate operation and maintenance of public facilities and infrastructure, as well as those educational, health care, social and other programs necessary to support the programs, public facilities and infrastructure set out in the 2010 Comprehensive Plan, or required by local, State or federal law.

Shall - The term used to indicate mandatory action.

Should - The term used to indicate an action that is strongly advised.

Suburban Area - The urbanizing portions of the City in areas that have usually been

developed since 1960. Development tends to be at single family residential densities, although multi-family developments may occur near major intersections or on the peripheries of neighborhoods near transit corridors. Curvilinear street patterns typify these areas, and result in a moderate number of at-grade intersections per square mile. Suburban areas generally constitute the less densely developed portions of the City that have developed or are developing beyond the urban area in the low density and intensity exclusive-use patterns characteristic of post WWII communities. Suburban areas do not include lands designated for use under the Agriculture (A) land use plan category.