RESOLUTION NO.	
----------------	--

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF GAINESVILLE SUPPORTING THE PROPOSED COUNTY-WIDE VISIONING AND PLANNING OPPORTUNITY; AND PROVIDING AN IMMEDIATE EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, in January 2001, elected and appointed officials from all of the County's municipalities, the School Board, regional agencies and citizens convened to discuss issues of mutual concern including the Boundary Adjustment Act (BAA), annexation and joint planning; and

WHEREAS, a Steering Committee of volunteers was created to meet monthly to continue the discussion of the current issues with the BAA, including any changes that should be made to the BAA so as to reduce and/or eliminate conflicts related to annexations while furthering joint planning; and

WHEREAS, after much deliberation and discussion, the Alachua County/Municipal Leaders Steering Committee recommended pursuing a County-wide Visioning and Planning Opportunity that would emphasize each community's vision statement and area plans, which would be consistent and compatible with the plans of other communities and the County, thereby fostering a greater understanding of each community's values and characteristics as they relate to future growth; and

WHEREAS, the City Commission believes it is in the best interest of the City of Gainesville to support the County-wide Visioning and Planning Opportunity.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA:

Section 1. The City Commission of the City of Gainesville endorses a County-wide Visioning and Planning Opportunity that will protect unique local characteristics and home rule authority; provide for coordinated service transitions between governments; allow for joint planning agreements that insure compatible and desirable land uses; and create a streamlined and predictable comprehensive planning amendment and implementation process.

Section 2.	The City Commission	on of the City of Gainesville will provide financial
and/or in kind services	to support the County	v-wide Visioning and Planning Opportunity subject to
the annual appropriation	on of funds.	
Section 3.	This resolution shal	I be effective immediately upon adoption.
PASSED AND	ADOPTED this	day of, 2002
		By: Thomas D. Bussing, Mayor
ATTEST:		
Kurt Lannon, Clerk of t	the Commission	APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY
(SEAL)		
		Marion Radson, City Attorney

Proposed Funding Commitments for the Countywide Visioning and Planning Opportunity

Governmental Entity	Population	Proposed Funding
Alachua	6,268	\$ 6,268
Archer	1,273	1,273
Gainesville	96,446	96,446
Hawthorne	1,373	1,373
High Springs	3,967	3,967
LaCrosse	151	151
Micanopy	644	644
Newberry	3,450	3,450
Waldo	831	831
Alachua County Board of County Commissioners	108,532	108,532
Totals	222,935	\$222,935

Alternative Funding Commitments Based on Land Area

Governmental Entity	Square Miles 3	% of Total	Funding
Alachua	33. 2 9	3.4	\$ 7,580
Archer	2.37	.2	446
Gainesville	51.35	5.3	11,816
Hawthorne	2.67	.3	669
High Springs	17.58	1.8	4,013
LaCrosse	2.78	.3	669
Micanopy	1.05	,1	223
Newberry	45.14	4.7	10,478
Waldo	1.60	.2	446
Alachua County Unincorporated	811.56	83.7	186,595
Total	969.49	100	\$222,935

Second Alternative Funding Commitment Based Equally on Population and Land Area

Governmental Entity	Population Amount	Land Area Amount	Funding
Alachua	\$ 6,268	\$ 7,580	\$ 6,924
Archer	1,273	446	860
Gainesville	96,446	11,816	54,131
Hawthorne	1,373	669	1,021
High Springs	3,967	4,013	3,990
LaCrosse	151	669	410
Micanopy	644	223	434
Newberry	3,450	10,478	6,964
Waldo	831	446	638
Alachua County Unincorporated	108,532	186,595	147,563
Totals	\$222,935	\$222,935	\$222,935

ALACHUA COUNTY VISION PLAN WITH POSSIBLE AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY

Part I. County-wide Tasks

	Tasks/Process	Consultant Takes Lead Fees (Approx.)	Non-Consultant Agencies Lead
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6.	Project Kick-off Meeting Data Collection/Analysis Mapping/Graphics/GIS Market/Economic Analysis Stakeholder Interviews Congress I - Guiding Principles	\$3,000* \$5,000* \$10,000* TBD \$6,000 \$25,000	County/Cities County/Cities County/Cities County/Cities
SUB	TOTAL - Consultant Leads	\$49,000 + Market An	alysis

Part II. Municipal Vision Plans

Tasks/Process	Consultant Takes Lead Fees (Approx.)	Non-Consultant Agencies Lead County/Cities
 Project Kick-off Meeting Data Collection/Analysis Mapping/Graphics/GIS Council/Stakeholder Interviews Visioning Workshop Conceptual Land Use & Design Pland Implementation Strategy Presentations, Review Meetings Draft Plan Document Revisions and/or Refinement Final Presentation(s) 	\$1,500* \$2,500* \$2,500* \$3,000 \$10,000* n \$15,000 \$4,000 \$5,000 \$10,000 \$5,000 \$5,000	County/Cities County/Cities County/Cities
SUBTOTAL - Consultant Leads	\$112,500** (For one co	ommunity as a Pilot)

Part III. Municipal Design Guidelines

	Tasks/Process	Consultant Takes Lead Fees (Approx.)	Non-Consultant Agencies Lead
1.	Municipal Design Guidelines	\$15,000 - \$25,000 (For one con \$135,000 - \$225,000 (For all nine	nmunity) communities)
	AL - Consultant Leads AL - Consultant Leads	\$127,500 - \$137,500 (For one cor \$247,500 - \$337,500 (For all nine	nmunity) communities)

*Note: The total estimated consultant fee for the items shown in **bold** is \$34,500. It may be possible to significantly reduce this total fee amount by providing staff assistance from the County, the municipalities and/or other outside agencies.

^{**}Note: Individual Municipal Vision Plans may range from \$40,000 - \$125,000.

Post-it® Fax Note

Co/Dept.

Phone #

TO Commissioner

10:099M SEP.27.2001 JACKSON

GLATTING MERCHER ANGLIN TOPEZ

RINEHART

and the second of the second o	NO 694 P. 1/4
SLATTING, JACKSON TO: MALE H	FROM: TENGA DATE: 727018
	THIS PAGE: LC
FAX #:	FAX #: PHONE #:

-7.03

7671

From

Phone # Fax #

Co.



September 27, 2001

Mr. Mark Hill Assistant County Manager Alachua County 12 SE 1st Street PO Box 2877

Gainesville, FL 32602-2877

Community-wide Planning Process Re:

Dear Mark,

You asked that we prepare a "menu of estimated costs" for the various tasks involved in conducting the Community-wide Planning Process that we presented at the Municipal Leaders Summit. Attached is a Preliminary Schedule of Fees for you to review and discuss with the Steering Committee.

Obviously a major challenge is to figure out how to move forward with the process within the constraints of your existing budget. The County and the municipalities have several options to reduce costs, including:

- 1. reduce the level of detail
- 2. utilize County/municipal staff and/or volunteers to accomplish some of the tasks
- 3. complete the work in phases

In our experience, reducing the level of detail (Option 1) only leads to eventual dissatisfaction; the plans need to be as detailed as possible in order for you to identify specific capital improvement projects, prepare new design guidelines and land development regulations, and develop realistic implementation strategies. I recommend that you focus on the other two options instead.

You can cut costs significantly by utilizing County/municipal staff or residents to accomplish such tasks as data collection, mapping, meeting coordination and facilitation (Option 2). Municipalities can also save money by working together to develop common design guidelines.

Phasing the project (Option 3) would allow you to develop a comprehensive, detailed plan over a 2 -3 year period. I recommend that you complete Part I - County-wide Tasks to establish the broad principles for the region, and to possibly develop a conceptual, Countywide Vision. Then you may want to select one community to be the

William J. Anglia, Jr. David L Barth Jay H. Exact Jack F. Glaming Carry S. Hayo by P. Hood Timothy L. Jackson William C. Kniebor, Je Walter M. Kulash Sharon K. Lamantia 5, Paymond Lapes John H. Perry John F. Rinchart

Gregory A. Bryh David R. Class ⊜ച്ച് a P. Cobbla Michael R. Cochesa Troy S. Collins ka P Durg. Jr. Bruce C. Hall David Ivi. Kumar Frank A. Justiewick Gail D. Lacty William D. Liter Edward J. McKinney boman J. McMackon, Jr. Doughs A. Monget John J. Moore III Theothy R. Palerno Troy P. Russ York L. Raumana Kelley J. Samuela Percy C. Sechler Mathan P. Silva Laura K. Turoct Report L Urbanish G. TOLES Williams

Community Planning

Gary E. Warner

222 Clematis Street Spice 200 West Palm Beach Plantida, 33401 161 659 6552 n; 561 935 1790 www.elotting.com ācesse # EB 000581Z IC 0000049



pilot project for Part II - Municipal Vision Plans. This will allow you to test the feasibility of using staff and/or volunteers for the project; create a model template for other communities to follow; and help you to identify potential costs savings for subsequent plans.

If there are still funds available beyond Parts I and II, you may want to focus on Part III—Municipal Design Guidelines for typical areas such as Town Centers and Rural Areas. These could be developed in conjunction with a Steering Committee of representatives from across the County, and utilized by all of the municipalities when completed.

In summary, a meaningful first phase of the project might include:

- Part I: County-wide Tasks;
- Part II Model Municipal Vision Plan; and
- · Part III Typical Town Center, Rural Design Guidelines

I estimate the fees for this work to be in the range of approximately \$150,000 - \$200,000, not including the market/economic analysis. As we discussed previously, however, you may already have adequate marketing data from other sources.

Please let us know if we can help you to define the project further, or if you would like for us to develop a specific proposal based on your available budget. We are excited about what the County and the municipalities are trying to accomplish together, and look forward to the opportunity to discuss our ideas with you in more detail.

Sincerely,

David L. Barth, ASLA, AICP

Cc:

Randall Reid David Kumer

P. 3/4 NO.504



ALACHUA COUNTY VISION PLAN

Preliminary Schedule of Fees (Not a Proposal - For Discussion Only) September 25, 2001

L	County-wide Tasks	
1.	Project Kick-off Meeting	\$3,000
2.	Data Collection/ Analysis	\$5,000
3.	Mapping	\$10,000
4.	Market/Economic Analysis: Regional, Local	TBD
5.	Stakeholder Interviews - Countywide	\$6,000
6	Congress I - Guiding Principles	\$25,000

SUBTOTAL

\$49,000 + Market Analysis

Possible areas to reduce costs include mapping, facilitation

II.	Municipal Vision Plans (Typical)*	
1.	Project Kick-off Meeting	\$1,500
2.	Data Collection/ Analysis	\$2,500
3.	Mapping	\$2,500
4.	Council/ Stakeholder Interviews	\$3,000
s.	Visioning Workshop	\$10,000
6.	Conceptual Land Use and Design Plan	\$15,000
7.	Implementation Strategy	\$4,000
8.	Presentations, Review Meetings	\$5,000
9.	Draft Plan Document	\$10,000
10-	Revisions, Refinement	\$5,000
11.	Final Presentation(s)	\$ <i>5</i> ,000

SUBTOTAL

\$63,500

Small Area Plans typically range from \$40,000 (Rio) to \$125,000 (Jupiter Inlet Village). Possible areas to reduce costs include data collection/ mapping, presentations, review meetings, revisions and the final document

Municipal Design Guidelines III.

\$15,000

\$25,000 per

community

\$135 - 225,000

Costs can be reduced if common guidelines developed for multiple communities, i.e. town center, rural guidelines.





IV.	Countywide Vision	
1.	Land Use and Design Plan (Draft)	\$150,000
2.	Congress II - Countywide Land Use/ Design Plan	\$25,000
3.	Congress III - Character, Implementation	\$25,000
4.	Final Countywide Vision Plan	\$50,000
5,	Presentations, Review Meetings	\$25,000

SUBTOTAL

\$275,000

Possible areas to reduce costs include data collection/ mapping, presentations, review meetings, revisions and the final document