



Intergovernmental Coordination Element Evaluation and Appraisal

Major Issues Assessment

Issue 3: Encourage Livable Neighborhoods for People of All Ages. (N/A)

Multi-generational neighborhoods. As a large percentage of the population ages and moves toward retirement, Gainesville finds itself in the position of needing to provide affordable housing that provides convenient access to the needs of everyday life.

Gainesville's current comprehensive plan does not provide the tools to create neighborhoods that allow a multi-generational spectrum of residents to 'age in place'. Access to everyday needs such as shopping, services, and medical facilities as well as libraries, schools, community colleges, churches, museums, civic, social and cultural associations, parks, and the arts attracts young families to needed resources, encourages people to stay in their homes as they age, and helps develop intergenerational neighborhoods.

Affordable Housing. The availability of affordable housing is an ongoing issue for this community. This is not simply about housing for the poor but also about reasonable housing for all income levels in all parts of the community. During the rise in housing prices a few years ago, moderate income households had more difficulty finding the housing that they wanted. The University of Florida has concerns about affordable housing, especially near campus and in particular for UF employees. Higher density areas near campus are attracting more students.

Housing the homeless is an ongoing issue related to affordable housing. At this point in time, a location with housing, camping, and/or a tent area with facilities such as showers and lockers is needed for our homeless population.

Analysis of Existing Objectives and Policies

The Intergovernmental Coordination Element (ICE) policies that pertain to Major Issue 3 are Policies 1.14, 1.1.15, 1.1.16, and 1.4.1, as shown in the Major Issues Evaluation Matrix for the ICE.

Policy 1.1.14 and all but one of the sub-policies of 1.4.1 have been achieved and are ongoing; the recommendation is that they remain in place. Sub-policy 1.4.1 e. required coordination efforts with Alachua County re: "development of a countywide "fair share" housing ordinance for dispersal of affordable housing units" occurred (there were several

workshops). However, the County elected not to develop such an ordinance. This sub-policy needs to be better defined, and it should be reviewed after EAR assessment of the Housing Element.

There has been limited coordination with Santa Fe College (SFC) with respect to the master plan for expansion of its downtown campus. Policy 1.1.15 needs to be revised to reflect the fact that the Santa Fe College master plan for its downtown campus exists, and that its continuing implementation needs to be coordinated with the City.

There is no interlocal agreement with Santa Fe College regarding the type of development proposals of SFC that would be subject to review by the City. Planning staff has concluded that SFC is not interested in developing such an agreement at this time, and recommends deletion of the sentence in Policy 1.1.16 that calls for an interlocal agreement.

See Table 1, Issue 3.

Issue 4: Fund Transportation Choice.

The current Comprehensive Plan does not contain adopted level of service (LOS) standards for transit, pedestrians, and bicyclists. As a result, it is difficult to determine at what level the City should be providing those services and whether the City is adequately funding the transportation modifications and operations needed to provide multi-modal transportation choice. According to the Regional Transit System, transit service cannot be expanded in terms of additions of standard buses or articulated buses for bus rapid transit (BRT) without a new bus maintenance facility, which is currently not a fully funded project. At the same time, revenue collections from property taxes, gas taxes and TCEA Agreements are lower than in previous years, which creates challenges to funding transportation choice even at existing levels.

Analysis of Existing Objectives and Policies

There are no policies in the ICE of the 2000-2020 Comprehensive Plan that address the major issue of funding transportation choice (e.g., transit). Should the City wish to obtain additional transportation funds (from increased sales taxes) that can be made available following voter approval, then a new policy and possibly a new objective for the ICE should be developed. The new policy should address coordinating with Alachua County because the additional funding sources require the approval and participation of the County. See Table 1, Issue 4.

Issue 7: Navigate the New Economy.

The recent financial crisis in the US points to a new economy for the future. Growth in Florida's population and development has diminished, which has led to unemployment, foreclosures, vacant buildings, and a reduction in property and sales tax revenues. The upheaval in the financial markets has limited financing for projects. While Gainesville has not suffered from the extreme economic downturn that most other Florida cities have experienced, there are pockets of overbuilding (the multi-family market), vacant

buildings, and closed businesses in the city. One example is along North Main Street where several automobile dealerships have gone out of business or consolidated with other dealerships, leaving behind large buildings and vacant parking lots where cars used to be. These buildings and sites have limited utility for other uses (related to the infill/redevelopment major issue).

At the same time, the new economy offers opportunities for green developments, green technologies, and green employment that will make the community more sustainable and aid the local economy. It is unclear whether the current Comprehensive Plan has broad enough categories and designated areas on the Future Land Use Map to allow for these new industries or technologies such as solar generation stations.

In 2007 the City adopted a new objective and policies (Objective 1.7) in the Intergovernmental Coordination Element that included a map of the Innovation Zone. With amendments processed for a new business/industrial park near the airport and also in the Southwest area (west of SW 34th Street), the map may not adequately depict all of the areas targeted for innovation and new economy-type businesses. An inventory of infrastructure in the Innovation Zone has not been completed (Policy 1.7.3), which means there is incomplete information to provide economic development assistance. There are questions about whether there are compromises the City should make to compete for innovative “new economy” development and redevelopment projects while maintaining our vision for the future.

Analysis of Existing Objectives and Policies

The ICE objective and policies that pertain to Major Issue 7 are Objective 1.7 and Policies 1.7.1, 1.7.2, 1.7.3, 1.7.4, 1.7.5 and 1.7.6, , as shown in the Major Issues Evaluation Matrix for the ICE. See Table 1, Issue7.

Objective 1.7 and Policies 1.7.1 and 1.7.3 – 1.7.5 have been and continue to be met, and should be retained. Policy 1.7.2 has been partially met. Although formal review of the comprehensive plan and the land development code has not occurred as required by this policy, the need to amend either document with respect to the Innovation Zone has not been identified by either the public or private sectors.

The Innovation Zone has been strengthened by adoption of both the Business Industrial and the Urban Mixed Use land use and zoning categories, and their application to areas both within the Innovation Zone and elsewhere. Both the Urban Mixed Use 2 and the Innovation Zone are supportive of the pending redevelopment of part of the Alachua General Hospital site as the Innovation Hub.

Policy 1.7.2 should be revised to delete the formal review requirement, and to reflect the fact that amendments to the comprehensive plan and/or land development code will be made when the need becomes evident during the long-term process of developing the Innovation Zone.

Issue 8: Strengthen Natural Resource Protection.

The Comprehensive Plan includes numerous policies with respect to the protection of natural resources, but the Uplands map in the Environmentally Significant Land & Resources map series merits review for inclusion of additional significant uplands. Assessment should be made in the EAR regarding the need for comprehensive plan amendments pertaining to the protection of other natural resources, particularly considering that additional environmental protections have been proposed for the City's land development regulations. Similarly, determination should be made in the EAR as to the need to amend the comprehensive plan to provide protection for annexed land with Alachua County Strategic Ecosystem designation.

There is considerable concern about the long-term water supply for our region. The St. Johns River Water Management District conducts water supply assessments to identify areas where projected future uses cannot be sustained by proposed water resources without unacceptable impacts to water resources and related natural systems of the region. Such areas are designated as Priority Water Resource Caution Areas (PWRCA). Prior to the Water Management District's draft 2008 Water Supply Assessment (WSA), the City and Alachua County were not identified as a Priority Water Resource Caution Areas. However, the draft WSA identifies most of the District, including the Gainesville area, as a *Potential* PWRCA. As of September 2009 the District was continuing to refine the groundwater flow simulation models used in the WSA. Once model review/refinement model is complete, the District will publish the final 2008 WSA, which will include PWRCA designations. It is not certain at this time whether or not the Gainesville area will be in a PWRCA, but the determination is expected to be made. The PWRCA designation would require amendments to Gainesville's comprehensive plan within 18 months after the District approves (expected in December 2010) the 2010 Water Supply Plan. Such amendments could include increased water conservation measures, greater expansion of reclaimed water service, and possibly development of alternative water supplies.

Whether or not the City is designated as a Priority Water Resource Caution Area, assessment should be made in the EAR as to whether current policies in the Comprehensive Plan need to be amended to meet updated statutory requirements pertaining to water supply. In addition, assessment should be made in the EAR as to whether current comprehensive plan policies need to be updated regarding water conservation, including the use of reclaimed water. Assessment should also be made in the EAR as to whether the comprehensive plan should address Low-impact development (LID), which is a set of stormwater management features and practices that mimic natural hydrologic functions on developed land and that are intended to conserve natural systems. LID addresses both water quantity and water quality.

Analysis of Existing Objectives and Policies

The ICE policies that pertain to Major Issue 8 are Policies 1.5.1 and 1.6.2, as shown in the Major Issues Evaluation Matrix for the ICE. See Table 1, Issue7.

Policy 1.5.1 addresses coordination with the County on wetlands and significant inventories, conservation and acquisition of significant habitat, wetlands mitigation, and wetlands protection. This policy has been partially if not substantially met, and should be reviewed further following EAR assessment of the Conservation, Open Space and Groundwater Recharge Element.

Policy 1.6.2 requires the City to maintain a water conservation plan consistent with the Water Management Districts' plans. This policy needs to be revised to reflect the fact that the City (GRU) has conservation policies and programs rather than a designated water conservation plan. Additional changes may be recommended after EAR assessment of the Conservation, Open Space and Groundwater Recharge Element.

The other Major Issues, which follow, are not applicable to the EAR assessment of the ICE:

- Issue 1: Clarify Activity Center, Mixed-use, and Urban Design Requirements;
- Issue 2: Establish Policies for the Reduction of Greenhouse Gases within the City;
- Issue 5: Amend Future Land Use Map as Justified by Data and Analysis; and
- Issue 6: Encourage Infill and Redevelopment in Central and East Gainesville.

Unforeseen or Unanticipated Changes

Staff anticipated better coordination with Santa Fe College regarding the College's expansion of its downtown campus in the Pleasant Street Historic District. Poor coordination resulted in two historic district houses owned by the college falling into total disrepair (demolition by neglect), despite requests by City staff for the college to take measures to prevent it. See Table 1, Issue 3, Policy 1.1.15.

An unanticipated change was the closure of the Shands at AGH (formerly Alachua General) hospital in 2009. A community icon has been lost, but a large opportunity has been created. Part of this strategically located site (within walking distance of the University of Florida) is undergoing redevelopment with plans that are going forward for a 45,000 square-foot Innovation Hub building that will facilitate biomedical research and development and related enterprises.

Recommended Changes

The recommended changes that are needed to address Issue 3, Encourage Livable Neighborhoods for People of All Ages, are as follows:

- Policy 1.1.15 (re: coordination of Santa Fe's master plan for its downtown campus) needs minor revisions.
- Policy 1.1.16 (re: review of Santa Fe College development proposals by the City): delete first sentence that requires an interlocal agreement.
- Policy 1.4.1 e. (re: dispersal of affordable housing) needs either to be implemented or deleted.

The recommended changes that are needed to address Issue 4, Fund Transportation Choice are:

- New Policy (re: coordination with Alachua County on additional funding sources).

The recommended changes that are needed to address Issue 7, Navigate the New Economy are:

- Policy 1.7.2 (re: review comprehensive plan and land development code for needed amendments pertaining to the Innovation Zone) needs to be revised to delete the formal review requirement.

The recommended changes that are needed to address Issue 8, Strengthen Natural Resource Protection are:

- Policy 1.5.1 (re: working with County on: wetlands inventory, mitigation and protection; significant habitat inventory; and conserving & acquiring significant habitat in the Urban Reserve Area) will have any needed changes identified subsequent to EAR assessment of the Conservation, Open Space and Groundwater Recharge Element.
- Policy 1.6.2 (re: water conservation) needs revision to reflect the fact that the City has water conservation policies and programs rather than a water conservation plan.
- A new policy is needed to address coordination of the comprehensive plan with regional water supply plans, as required by FS 163.3177(6) (h).

Table 1

**Major Issues Evaluation Matrix –Intergovernmental Coordination Element
Issue 3: Encourage Livable Neighborhoods for People of All Ages.**

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
<p>1.1.14 The City shall coordinate with the University of Florida in efforts to stabilize and strengthen neighborhoods in the university context area.</p>	<p>Coordination as specified</p>	<p>Yes, through various efforts. These include but are not limited to: expansion of the context area; the College Park/U. Heights Advisory Board to the CRA and the many infrastructure and redevelopment projects it has supported, UF student membership on MTPO and its advisory boards, student transit fees that help support RTS services and have led to dramatically increased student bus ridership, identifying and limiting the no. of UF Special Event Parking Days, UF Office of Off-campus Living (one function of which is to educate students about the rights and responsibilities of renting houses in single-family neighborhoods), and initiation of a Joint Neighborhood Outreach Program in August and October of 2009 in the UPNA in which City Codes Enforcement partnered with the Office of Off-campus Living, GPD and Solid Waste to contact student tenants residing in the UPNA to welcome them and provide information re: codes, waste disposal, safety, and crime prevention. The neighborhood outreach program is intended to be repeated in 2010. The City's Neighborhood Planning Program has funded several neighborhood enhancement projects in the context area. To address concerns about disorderly parking, the City created the Residential Overlay Parking District. To conserve the character and aesthetics of neighborhoods, the City created the Heritage Overlay District. Both of these overlay districts are available for any neighborhood after public hearing by the City Plan Board and approval by the City Commission.</p>	<p>None</p>

Table 1

Major Issues Evaluation Matrix – Intergovernmental Coordination Element
 Issue 3: *Encourage Livable Neighborhoods for People of All Ages*

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
<p>1.1.15 The City shall coordinate with Santa Fe Community College to develop a master plan for the expansion of its downtown campus that is sensitive to impacts on the Pleasant Street Historic District, the NW Fifth Avenue neighborhood, and on the West University Avenue corridor.</p>	<p>Coordination as specified</p>	<p>Partially. City staff met several times with Santa Fe College representatives in an attempt to coordinate the City's plan for the historic neighborhood and the College's Master Plan for the Downtown Campus. The College to date has not provided the City with a copy of the Master Plan for the Downtown Campus, which is located in the Pleasant Street Historic District. The poor coordination resulted in two historic district houses owned by the College falling into total disrepair (demolition by neglect).</p>	<p>Revise to reflect the fact that the SF College master plan for its downtown campus exists, and that its continuing implementation needs to be coordinated with the City.</p>
<p>1.1.16 The City shall enter into an interlocal agreement with Santa Fe Community College that describes the types of development proposals of SFCC subject to review by the City. Review of SFCC development proposals will be according to applicable provisions of the City of Gainesville Code of Ordinances and Comprehensive Plan, subject to applicable provisions of the Florida Statutes.</p>	<p>Development and adoption of an interlocal agreement as described</p>	<p>No. City staff has approached Santa Fe about this since adoption of the 2000-2010 Comprehensive Plan, and has concluded that Santa Fe is not interested in such an agreement. Furthermore, unlike the University of Florida, Santa Fe has no statutory requirements for such an agreement. Planning staff recommends that the interlocal agreement requirement be dropped.</p>	<p>Delete the first sentence of this policy.</p>
<p>1.4.1 The City shall continue to work with the County in developing Land Development Regulations that promote the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the City's Comprehensive Plan. Coordination efforts shall include: a. The regulation of land uses and site and</p>	<p>As described</p>	<p>a. Yes, on-going coordination b. Yes c. Yes, on-going through MTPO committees d. Yes e. Partially. Coordination efforts with Alachua County occurred (there were several workshops), but the County elected not to</p>	<p>None to sub-policies a., b., c., d., and f. Sub-policy e. needs to be better defined, and it should be reviewed after EAR assessment of the Housing Element.</p>

Table 1
 Major Issues Evaluation Matrix – Intergovernmental Coordination Element
 Issue 3: *Encourage Livable Neighborhoods for People of All Ages*

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
<p>facility design in compliance with the Murphree Wellfield Management Code;</p> <p>b. The development of guidelines for the design of stormwater detention and retention facilities that allow increased use of native vegetation suitable for stormwater treatment and that encourage greater diversity of plant and animal habitat, particularly within stream-to-sink basins;</p> <p>c. The adoption of regulations and design criteria to encourage mass transit, bicycle and pedestrian travel;</p> <p>d. The development of a plan, regulations and design criteria for the establishment and preservation of tree-lined streets and giving priority to highly visible streets such as gateways to the City and important activity centers.</p> <p>e. The development of a countywide “fair share” housing ordinance for dispersal of affordable housing units.</p> <p>f. The development of regulations that restrict urban sprawl.</p>		<p>develop such an ordinance.</p> <p>f. Yes</p>	

Table 1
Major Issues Evaluation Matrix – Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Issue 4: Fund Transportation Choice			
Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
New Policy		N/A	<p>If supported by the City Commission, a new policy (and possibly a new objective) could be developed with respect to coordinating with Alachua County on additional funding sources for transportation. As a charter county, Alachua County is eligible to take advantage of applicable provisions of Sec. 212.055 (Discretionary sales surtaxes), Florida Statutes. Sub-section 212.055(1) (Charter County Transportation Surtax) allows a levy of up to 1 percent (1 cent) for fixed guideway rapid transit systems, bus systems, roads or bridges, up to 2.5 percent of which can be used for non-transit purposes (road, bicycle, pedestrian). The entire 1 cent levy can be used for transit operations. Voter approval of the additional sales tax is required. The City may obtain proceeds from the tax through an interlocal agreement.</p> <p>Sub-section 212.055(2) (Local Government Infrastructure Surtax) allows charter counties to levy a discretionary sales tax of 0.5 percent or 1 percent, which can only be used for capital costs. Voter approval is required. The City would obtain its share of the tax proceeds either through an interlocal agreement or by statutory formula (Sec. 218.62, F.S.).</p>

Table 1

Major Issues Evaluation Matrix –Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Issue 7: Navigate the New Economy

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
<p>Objective 1.7 - The City shall work with community partners such as the University of Florida, Santa Fe Community College, the Gainesville Area Chamber of Commerce, Alachua County, and the Alachua County School Board to help develop the Innovative Economy within the non-residential areas of the Gainesville Innovation Zone. For purposes of this objective, Innovative Economy means those technology firms and/or entities that bring a new process or technique to the production process and that are often, but not exclusively, related in some manner to University driven research, and are generally represented by sectors such as Agritechnology, Aviation and Aerospace, Information Technology, Life Sciences and Medical Technology.</p>	<p>Implementation of Policies 1.7.1 – 1.7.5</p>	<p>Yes, on-going</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>1.7.1 The City shall work with its community partners on the Economic Development University Community Committee (EDUCC) to encourage development of the Gainesville Innovation Zone.</p>	<p>Working with community partners on the EDUCC re: development of the Innovation Zone</p>	<p>Yes, on-going</p>	<p>None</p>

Table I
Major Issues Evaluation Matrix –Intergovernmental Coordination Element
Issue 7: Navigate the New Economy

<p>1.7.2 The City shall review the comprehensive plan and the land development code within 18 months of the effective date of Policy 1.7.2. Should the review conclude that any amendments to the comprehensive plan or land development code are needed for the appropriate development of the Gainesville Innovation Zone, the City shall draft such amendments and present them to the City Plan Board within 24 months of the effective date of Policy 1.7.2.</p>	<p>Review comprehensive plan and land development code and prepare amendments within the specified time periods.</p>	<p>Partially. Formal review has not occurred, but the need to amend either the comprehensive plan or the land development code with respect to development of the Innovation Zone has not been identified either by the public or private sectors. Note: The City has adopted the Business Industrial land use and zoning categories, which furthers the prospects for the initially defined Innovation Zone and for other areas in the City (e.g., west of the Post Office located on SW 34th ST, and the site of the County Fairgrounds and the Cooperative Extension Service offices on NE 39th Avenue, east of Waldo Road and south of Gainesville Regional Airport) where BI land use and/or zoning have been approved or are pending final approval. The City has also adopted the Urban Mixed Use land use and zoning categories, and has applied them in several areas, one of which is the Alachua General Hospital (AGH) site nearby and to the east of the University of Florida, and located within the Innovation Zone. Both the UMU-2 land use and zoning and the Innovation Zone are bearing fruit for the AGH site as staff is presently reviewing the proposed Innovation Hub.</p>	<p>Revise policy to delete the formal review requirement, and to reflect the fact that any such amendments will be made when the need to do so arises in the long-term process of developing the Innovation Zone.</p>
<p>1.7.3 The City shall work to ensure that adequate public infrastructure is in place for development of the Gainesville Innovation Zone.</p>	<p>Provision of public infrastructure</p>	<p>Yes, on-going.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>1.7.4 The City shall work to ensure that pertinent local,</p>	<p>Ensure that pertinent incentive programs are</p>	<p>Yes, on-going.</p>	<p>None</p>

Table 1

Major Issues Evaluation Matrix – Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Issue 7: Navigate the New Economy

<p>state and federal incentive programs are made available to those seeking Innovative Economy development opportunities.</p>	<p>available.</p>		
<p>1.7.5 The City shall work to ensure that negative impacts resulting from Innovative Economy development within the Gainesville Innovation Zone are minimized, particularly with respect to adjacent residential areas.</p>	<p>Minimization of negative developmental impacts</p>	<p>Yes, on-going.</p>	<p>None</p>

Table 1
Major Issues Evaluation Matrix –Intergovernmental Coordination Element
Issue 8: Strengthen Natural Resource Protection

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
<p>1.5.1 The City shall work with the County to develop and maintain an inventory of wetlands and significant habitat, develop a joint planning effort to conserve and acquire significant habitat in the Urban Reserve Area, develop provisions for offsite mitigation of development impacts upon wetlands, and work towards a county-wide wetlands protection ordinance.</p>	<p>As described in 1.5.1</p>	<p>Partially. Environmental staffs from the City and County have worked closely on pending, comprehensive revisions to the City's environmental protection regulations. Similar City/County staff coordination occurred in assessing lands for the 2001 Environmental Resources Report that was used as a basis for the significant ecological communities overlay district. City/County staff coordination also occurred with revision of the City's wetlands requirements in the comprehensive plan and the land development code. The County's subsequent wetlands ordinance was in large part based on the City's. City and County staffs more recently worked together to rank lands for acquisition through the Wild Spaces, Public Places program.</p>	<p>Identify changes after EAR assessment of the Conservation, Open Space and Groundwater Recharge Element.</p>
<p>1.6.2 The City shall maintain a water conservation plan consistent with the Water Management Districts' plans.</p>	<p>Water conservation plan.</p>	<p>Yes. Although there is not a specific water conservation plan, GRU, the city's utility, has various pertinent policies and programs. GRU's primary water conservation programs are: tiered water conservation rate; irrigation system audit rebate; irrigation system rain sensor rebate; residential & commercial water audits; customer education;</p>	<p>Revise to reflect the fact GRU has conservation policies and programs rather than a water conservation plan. Additional changes may be recommended after EAR assessment of the Conservation, Open Space and Groundwater Recharge Element.</p>

Table 1

Major Issues Evaluation Matrix –Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Issue 8: Strengthen Natural Resource Protection

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
		anticipated adoption & enforcement (by Alachua County Environmental Protection Department) of the Saint Johns River Water Management District's watering restrictions; leak detection (GRU distribution system); Soil Moisture Sensor Pilot Study – research study in cooperation with UF & SJRWMD; and targeted toilet retrofit.	
New Policy		N/A	Add a policy regarding coordination (by the City, through GRU) of the comprehensive plan with regional water supply plans, as required by FS 163.3177(6) (h).

Intergovernmental Coordination Element Evaluation and Appraisal

Element Assessment

Key Findings for the ICE

1. The City of Gainesville has substantially met the majority of the objectives, and policies of the Intergovernmental Coordination Element.
2. There are no policies in the ICE of the 2000-2020 Comprehensive Plan that address the major issue of funding transportation choice (e.g., transit). Should the City wish to obtain additional transportation funds (from increased sales taxes) then a new policy for the ICE should be developed. The new policy should address coordinating with Alachua County because the additional funding sources require the approval and participation of the County.
3. There has been limited coordination with Santa Fe College (SFC) with respect to the master plan for expansion of its downtown campus. Policy 1.1.15 needs to be revised to reflect the fact that the Santa Fe College master plan for its downtown campus exists, and that its continuing implementation needs to be coordinated with the City.
4. Planning staff has concluded that Santa Fe College is not interested at this time in developing an interlocal agreement regarding SFC development proposals would be subject to review by the City. Staff recommends deletion of the sentence in Policy 1.1.16 that calls for an interlocal agreement.
5. Coordination efforts with the County regarding development of a countywide “fair share” housing ordinance for dispersal of affordable housing units (Sub-policy e., of Policy 1.4.1) have occurred, but the County elected not to proceed with such an ordinance. This sub-policy should be reviewed after EAR assessment of the Housing Element.
6. The ICE Objective (1.7) and its related policies have been successful with respect to the long-term development of the Innovation Zone.

Successes

The City of Gainesville has substantially met the majority of the objectives, and policies of the Intergovernmental Coordination Element. A few highlights are as follows:

1. The City has successfully coordinated with the University of Florida in various efforts to stabilize and strengthen neighborhoods in the university context area. See Table 1, Issue, Policy 1.1.14. In addition, the City, in its implementation of Policy 1.1.13, has signed the Agreement pertaining to the Campus Master Plan that was prepared pursuant to Florida Statutes.
2. The City has entered into, updated twice, and has implemented the required Interlocal Agreement for Public School Facility Planning. This agreement is

between the School Board and various cities and towns within our county, and is required by Objective 1.1 and Policy 1.1.1.

3. The City has been successful in coordinating with the Gainesville/Alachua County Regional Airport Authority to ensure that incompatible land uses are kept out of the airport noise zone, as required by Policy 1.1.10. The most recent example of this is the 498-acre Hatchet Creek PUD that was adopted in December of 2010, and which permits no residential development within the 60-75 dB LDN noise contour.
4. The City has been successful with many of the annexations it has initiated within the Urban Reserve Area. The goal of annexing half of the 124-square mile utility service area by 2010 has been met, for the area of the City is currently 62.6 square miles. See Objective 1.2 and its related policies.
5. The City has successfully worked with various community partners to encourage development of the Gainesville Innovation Zone. See Table 1, Issue 7, Objective 1.7 and Policies 1.7.1 – 1.7.5.

Shortcomings

The City of Gainesville has substantially met the majority of the objectives, and policies of the Intergovernmental Coordination Element, but there have been the following shortcomings:

1. There has been limited coordination with Santa Fe College (SFC) with respect to the master plan for expansion of its downtown campus. Policy 1.1.15 needs to be revised to reflect the fact that the Santa Fe College master plan for its downtown campus exists, and that its continuing implementation needs to be coordinated with the City. See Table 1, Issue 3, Policy 1.1.15.
2. Policy 1.1.6 has not been met with respect to entering into an interlocal agreement with Santa Fe College that describes the types of development proposals by Santa Fe that would be subject to review by the City. City staff has approached the college about this issue, and has concluded that Santa Fe is not interested in entering into such an agreement. See Table 1, Issue 3, Policy 1.1.16.

Impact of Rule Changes on the ICE Element

1. A new policy is needed to address coordination of the comprehensive plan with regional water supply plans, as required by F.S. 163.3177(6) (h).
2. Policy 1.1.12 needs to be revised to reference the intergovernmental dispute resolution process prescribed in Section 186.509, F.S. This is required by F.S. 163.3177(6) (h)1.c.
3. A new policy is needed regarding an interlocal agreement pursuant to s.333.03 (1) (b), F.S., between adjacent local governments, regarding airport zoning regulations.

Recommended Changes

The recommended changes that are needed to update the ICE (see Table 2, Evaluation Matrix – Intergovernmental Coordination Element) and that are unrelated to Major Issues are:

- Objective 1.1 needs to be revised to indicate that an interlocal agreement between the School Board and various local governments is in effect.
- Policy 1.1.8 needs to be deleted because Santa Fe College has designated a representative to the MTPD Technical Advisory Committee.
- Policy 1.1.10 needs to be revised to reflect the new airport noise contours.
- Policy 1.1.12 needs to be revised to reference the intergovernmental dispute resolution process prescribed in Section 186.509, F.S., and to delete the phrase re: dues-paying member of the regional planning council.
- Policy 1.2.3 is no longer needed and should be deleted because the City has met this annexation goal.
- Policy 1.3.4 will have changes recommended after EAR assessment of the Transportation Mobility Element. LOS standards need to be added for transit, bicycles and pedestrians.
- Policy 1.3.6 needs to be revised regarding comprehensive plan and plan amendments within transportation concurrency exception areas. This policy also needs to be expanded - to include City of Alachua plan amendments that may have transportation LOS impacts in Gainesville, and City of Gainesville amendments that may impact LOS standards in the City of Alachua.
- Policy 1.3.7 needs to be revised to reference the FEMA FIRM maps.
- Policy 1.3.8 needs to be revised for consistency with FL DEP requirements that take effect in July 2010.
- Policy 1.4.3 needs revision to make it clear that the County's tourism plan is prepared by the County. The requirement of City sponsorship of an economic study should be replaced text indicating that the City is supportive of the County's efforts on such a study.
- Policy 1.4.4 needs to delete reference to a proposed joint planning agreement.
- Policy 1.5.4 needs revision to sub-policy b. to limit it to support of existing monitoring programs, and expansion of sub-policies d. and e. to include contamination sites in general rather than brownfield sites only.
- Delete Policy 1.5.5. This policy requires the City to work with FDEP and Alachua County to develop a plan regarding water discharge by Sweetwater Branch into Paynes Prairie. A Basin Management Action Plan was developed by City, County and State staffs and adopted by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection. A major component of the Plan is the Sweetwater Branch/Paynes Prairie Sheet Flow Restoration Project, which is being implemented.
- A new policy is needed regarding an interlocal agreement pursuant to s.333.03 (1) (b), F.S., between adjacent local governments, regarding airport zoning regulations.

Table 2

Evaluation Matrix - Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
<p>Objective 1.1 - Within one year of adoption of the Intergovernmental Coordination Element, the City of Gainesville shall enter into interlocal or other formal agreements that describe joint processes for collaborative planning and decision-making with the School Board of Alachua County (SBAC), Santa Fe Community College (SFCC), and other units of local government that provide services but do not have regulatory authority over the use of land, and with Alachua County and the City of Alachua. The joint processes shall include coordination on siting of facilities with countywide significance, including locally unwanted land uses.</p>	<p>Implementation of Policies 1.1.1.1 – 1.1.1.16</p>	<p>Yes, other than the adoption date. There is an interlocal agreement with the School Board in which The City of Gainesville, School Board, Alachua County, and other cities and towns entered into an Interlocal Agreement for Public School Facility Planning in November 2003. The Agreement was updated in August 2006 and December 2008.</p>	<p>Revise to reflect the fact that the interlocal agreement has been adopted.</p>
<p>1.1.1 The City shall enter into an interlocal agreement with SBAC which shall describe joint processes for collaborative planning and decisionmaking on population projections and criteria for the selection of school sites in accordance with the goals, objectives and policies of this plan. Per Sub-Sec. 1013.33(1), F.S., the planning effort must also consider the feasibility of keeping central facilities viable, in order to encourage central city redevelopment and efficient use of infrastructure and to discourage urban sprawl.</p>	<p>Adoption of interlocal agreement with the School Board</p>	<p>Yes. See above re: Objective 1.1</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>1.1.2 All development proposals by the SBAC shall be reviewed according to the provisions of the City of</p>	<p>Review of SBAC development proposals as specified.</p>	<p>Yes, for any SBAC development proposals within City limits.</p>	<p>None</p>

Table 2

Evaluation Matrix - Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
<p>Gainesville Code of Ordinances and Comprehensive Plan, subject to the provisions and exclusions of Chapter 1013, F.S.</p>			
<p>1.1.3 The City shall collect sufficient data from the SBAC, SFCC, UF, Florida Department of Management Services, Alachua County and U.S. Government to document the expected impacts of school site improvements and other government installations for concurrency management purposes regardless of whether fees are assessed or building permits are issued by the City.</p>	<p>Collection of date and documentation of impacts as specified.</p>	<p>Yes, on-going</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>1.1.4 In accordance with the provisions of Sections 163.3177(12) and 163.3180, F.S., the City shall coordinate with the SBAC to implement the interlocal agreement described in Policy 1.1.1 and to implement the Public School Facilities Element of the comprehensive plan to extend concurrency requirements to public schools.</p>	<p>Coordination and implementation as specified.</p>	<p>Yes, on-going and in accordance with the updated Interlocal Agreement and the new Public Schools Facilities Element that were adopted on December 18, 2008.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>1.1.5 The City shall provide notice of proposed land use amendments and development proposals to governmental agencies providing services that may be affected, including the SBAC, the University of Florida, Santa Fe Community College, applicable Water Management District (WMDs), the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP),</p>	<p>Provision of notices and of opportunity to address concerns.</p>	<p>Yes, on-going</p>	<p>None</p>

Table 2

Evaluation Matrix - Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
<p>and Florida Department of Children and Families, and provide an opportunity for the concerns of these agencies to be addressed in the review process.</p>			
<p>1.1.6 The City shall provide notice of proposed land use amendments and development proposals to Alachua County and the several municipalities within the County and provide an opportunity for the concerns of these local governments to be addressed in the review process.</p>	<p>Provision of notices and of opportunity to address concerns.</p>	<p>Yes, on-going</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>1.1.7 The City shall continue to participate in the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization (MTPO) to provide coordinated transportation planning for the Urbanized Area in conjunction with the FDOT, Alachua County, Gainesville/Alachua County Regional Airport Authority, SBAC, UF, FDEP, and North Central Florida Regional Planning Council (NCFRPC).</p>	<p>Continued participation.</p>	<p>Yes, on-going</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>1.1.8 The City shall recommend both to SFCC and the MTPO that SFCC become a member of the MTPO Technical Advisory Committee.</p>	<p>SFCC representation on the TAC.</p>	<p>Yes. Santa Fe College designated Mr. Bill Reese, Associate Vice President for Facilities, as its TAC representative on May 28, 2009.</p>	<p>Delete. Policy is no longer needed.</p>
<p>1.1.9 The City shall coordinate with MTPO and FDOT in planning services for the transportation disadvantaged within the Regional Transit System service area. Coordination with the MTPO and</p>	<p>Participation in the MTPO's TAC.</p>	<p>Yes, on-going</p>	<p>None</p>

Table 2

Evaluation Matrix - Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
<p>FDOT shall be achieved through the City's participation in the Technical Advisory Committee of the MTPO.</p>			
<p>1.1.10 The City shall continue to coordinate with the Gainesville/Alachua County Regional Airport Authority to ensure that non-compatible land uses within the 65, 70 and 75 Ldn airport noise contours are eliminated by requesting the Authority's review of proposed Land Use Plan Amendments and Development Plans within the noise contour areas.</p>	<p>Continued coordination as described</p>	<p>Yes, on-going. The most recent example is the 498-acre Hatchet Creek PUD, adopted on December 17, 2010, which permitted no residential development within the 60-75 dB DNL noise contour.</p>	<p>Revise to reflect the new noise contours in the Revised Airport Hazard Zoning Regulations that were approved on December 3, 2009.</p>
<p>1.1.11 The City shall continue to provide information and assistance to the Gainesville Housing Authority, the Alachua County Housing Authority and other agencies providing housing assistance for low-income persons.</p>	<p>Provision of information and assistance</p>	<p>Yes, on-going</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>1.1.12 The City of Gainesville shall use the NCFRPC to mediate those issues that cannot be resolved through established coordinating mechanisms, as part of the services provided to the city as a dues-paying member of the NCFRPC.</p>	<p>Use of NCFRPC for mediation</p>	<p>No. The City has not requested mediation by the NCFRPC during the planning period. No such mediation has been requested or needed.</p>	<p>Revise to reference dispute resolution process prescribed in Section 186.509, F.S., and to delete phrase re: dues-paying member of the NCFRPC.</p>
<p>1.1.13 The City of Gainesville recognizes the adopted University of Florida Campus Master Plan as the campus master plan prepared pursuant to Florida</p>	<p>Recognition by the City, which has signed the Agreement pertaining to the Campus Master Plan</p>	<p>Yes, on-going</p>	<p>None</p>

Table 2

Evaluation Matrix - Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
<p>statutory requirements.</p> <p>I.1.14 The City shall coordinate with the University of Florida in efforts to stabilize and strengthen neighborhoods in the university context area.</p>		<p>See Table 1, Major Issue 3</p>	
<p>I.1.15 The City shall coordinate with Santa Fe Community College to develop a master plan for the expansion of its downtown campus that is sensitive to impacts on the Pleasant Street Historic District, the NW Fifth Avenue neighborhood, and on the West University Avenue corridor.</p>		<p>See Table 1, Major Issue 3</p>	
<p>I.1.16 The City shall enter into an interlocal agreement with Santa Fe Community College that describes the types of development proposals of SFCC subject to review by the City. Review of SFCC development proposals will be according to applicable provisions of the City of Gainesville Code of Ordinances and Comprehensive Plan, subject to applicable provisions of the Florida Statutes.</p>		<p>See Table 1, Major Issue 3</p>	
<p>Objective 1.2 - The City of Gainesville shall continue to initiate annexation(s) of areas within its designated Urban Reserve Area which meet the criteria of "urban in character" outlined in Section 9 of the Alachua County Boundary Adjustment Act, and are projected to be urban in character within the</p>	<p>Implementation of Policies 1.2.1-1.2.3</p>	<p>Yes, on-going</p>	<p>None</p>

Table 2

Evaluation Matrix - Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
horizon of the Comprehensive Plan.			
<p>1.2.1 The City shall proceed with annexation according to the criteria of the Alachua County Boundary Adjustment Act. Urban areas within its Urban Reserve Area that meet the criteria of "urban in character" outlined in Section 9 of the Boundary Adjustment Act are subject to annexation by the City.</p>	Annexation as described	Yes, on-going	None
<p>1.2.2 The City shall work with the County to develop the required urban services report that will address the fiscal issues related to urban services for residents in the Urban Reserve Area that are not yet annexed by the City, and minimize the time that one jurisdiction is providing services to an area for which it is not receiving revenue.</p>	Development of urban services reports as described	Yes, on-going. Achieved through the Annexation Transition Agreement.	None
<p>1.2.3 It is the intent of the city to: annex areas within the adopted Urban Reserve Area that are urban in character and pursue City-sponsored annexations at a minimum of once every two years; and, by 2010, annex half of the urban reserve area or the extent of the utility service area, whichever is greater.</p>	Annexation as described	Yes. A City-sponsored annexation referendum has been held at least once every two years, and the goal of annexing half of the utility service area by 2010 has been met. The 124 square mile electric service area has not changed since the 2002 adoption of the Future Land Use Element and the Generalized Future Land Use Map. The area of the City is currently 62.6 sq. mi., which is 50.5 percent of the electric service area. This policy is not needed and should be deleted.	Delete
Objective 1.3 - Upon adoption of this plan, the City	Implementation of		

Table 2

Evaluation Matrix - Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
<p>of Gainesville shall coordinate Level of Service (LOS) standards with Alachua County for those services requiring LOS standards that are provided by the City within unincorporated Alachua County and for those services provided by Alachua County within the City and shall share information with other agencies and individual as needed to promote the goals, objectives and policies of the City, County and Regional comprehensive plans.</p>	<p>Policies 1.3.1 – 1.3.9</p>		
<p>1.3.1 The City shall adopt the LOS standards for potable water, which are established in the Potable Water and Wastewater Element and in the Concurrency Management Element.</p>	<p>Adoption of these LOS standards in the Comprehensive Plan</p>	<p>Yes. The LOS standards are being reviewed for the EAR assessment of the Potable Water and Wastewater Element, particularly in consideration of water supply concurrency requirements.</p>	<p>Changes may be recommended after EAR assessment of the Potable Water and Wastewater Element</p>
<p>1.3.2 The City shall adopt the LOS standards for wastewater, which are established in the Potable Water and Wastewater Element and in the Concurrency Management Element.</p>	<p>Adoption of these LOS standards in the Comprehensive Plan</p>	<p>Yes. The LOS standards are being reviewed for the EAR assessment of the Potable Water and Wastewater Element</p>	<p>Changes may be recommended after EAR assessment of the Potable Water and Wastewater Element</p>
<p>1.3.3 The City shall set a LOS standard for solid waste per capita as established in the Solid Waste Element and in the Concurrency Management Element.</p>	<p>Adoption of these LOS standards in the Comprehensive Plan</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Changes may be recommended after EAR assessment of the Solid Waste Element</p>
<p>1.3.4</p>	<p>As specified in 1.3.4</p>	<p>Yes, through adoption of the Citywide TCEA</p>	<p>Changes will be</p>

Table 2

Evaluation Matrix - Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved? in 2009	Recommended Changes recommended after EAR assessment of the Transportation Mobility Element. State law requires LOS standards for transit, bicycles and pedestrians.
<p>The City shall adopt LOS standards for roads and public transit facilities. For facilities on the Florida Intrastate Highway system as defined in Section 338.001, Florida Statutes, the level of service standards shall be as established by the Florida Department of Transportation. For all other road facilities, the City shall adopt adequate level of service standards. Within the Transportation Concurrency Exception Area, development shall be regulated for roadway level of service standards as shown in the Concurrency Management Element.</p>			
<p>1.3.5 The City shall continue to coordinate with Alachua County through the Technical Advisory Committee to the MTPO in implementing the City's Transportation Concurrency Exception Area.</p>	Continued coordination	Yes, on-going. The TCEA is citywide, based on SB 360 of 2009.	None
<p>1.3.6 The City shall coordinate with Alachua County, FDOT, and other municipalities to adopt concurrency management mechanisms to maintain adopted LOS standards by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Reviewing all County Land Use Plan Amendments that may impact adopted LOS standards within the City; and b. Requesting the County to review and comment on Land Use Amendments that may impact adopted LOS standards within the County. 	Coordination as specified	Yes, on-going. The Policy should be revised to specifically include the City of Alachua, which as a result of annexations abuts the City of Gainesville.	The Policy should be amended to reflect the fact that a local government's comprehensive plan and plan amendments for land uses within all transportation concurrency exception areas that are designated and maintained in accordance with s. 163.3180(5), F.S. shall be deemed to meet the requirement to achieve and maintain LOS standards for transportation. The Policy

Table 2

Evaluation Matrix - Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
<p>1.3.7 The City shall continue to coordinate with Alachua County and other governmental entities to ensure that the capacity and function of shared watersheds are maintained and that stormwater quantity LOS standards are designed to maintain floodplain elevations at or below the 10-year flood channel and 100-year floodplain as established in the Master Flood Control Planning Maps (1990) on file in the Public Works Departments of the City of Gainesville and Alachua County, and the North Central Florida Regional Planning Council.</p>	<p>Coordination as described</p>	<p>Yes. The Master Flood Control Planning Maps were used in developing the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM). The approved maps have been implemented by ordinances of the City and the County.</p>	<p>should be expanded to include City of Alachua plan amendments that may impact transportation mobility standards within the City, and to request that the City of Alachua review and comment on Gainesville plan amendments that may impact adopted LOS standards within the City of Alachua.</p>
<p>1.3.8 The City shall set LOS standards for stormwater quality that meet or exceed the requirements of the applicable Water Management District for stream-to-sink basins.</p>	<p>LOS standards as specified</p>	<p>Yes, the LOS standards are in the Stormwater Management Element.</p>	<p>Revise for consistency with FL Department of Environmental Protection requirements that take effect in July 2010.</p>

Table 2

Evaluation Matrix - Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
<p>1.3.9 Upon adoption of this plan, the City shall make concurrency management information, inventories and other data as are collected and maintained by the City available to other units of government and the public.</p>	<p>Avail information as described</p>	<p>Yes, on-going</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Objective 1.4 - The City shall coordinate with Alachua County to resolve planning issues in the urban area.</p>	<p>Implementation of Policies 1.4.1. - 1.4.7</p>	<p>Yes, on-going</p>	
<p>1.4.1 The City shall continue to work with the County in developing Land Development Regulations that promote the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the City's Comprehensive Plan. Coordination efforts shall include:</p> <p>a. The regulation of land uses and site and facility design in compliance with the Murphree Wellfield Management Code;</p> <p>b. The development of guidelines for the design of stormwater detention and retention facilities that allow increased use of native vegetation suitable for stormwater treatment and that encourage greater diversity of plant and animal habitat, particularly within stream-to-sink basins;</p> <p>c. The adoption of regulations and design criteria to encourage mass transit, bicycle</p>	<p>As described</p>	<p>a. Yes, on-going coordination b. Yes c. Yes, on-going through MTPO committees d. Yes e. Partially. Coordination efforts with Alachua County occurred (there were several workshops), but the County elected not to develop such an ordinance. f. Yes</p>	<p>None to sub-policies a., b., c., d., and f. Sub-policy e. needs to be better defined, and it should be reviewed after EAR assessment of the Housing Element. See Table 1, Major Issue 3</p>

Table 2

Evaluation Matrix - Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
<p>d. and pedestrian travel;</p> <p>The development of a plan, regulations and design criteria for the establishment and preservation of tree-lined streets and giving priority to highly visible streets such as gateways to the City and important activity centers.</p> <p>e. The development of a countywide "fair share" housing ordinance for dispersal of affordable housing units.</p> <p>f. The development of regulations that restrict urban sprawl.</p>			
<p>1.4.2</p> <p>The City shall seek an interlocal agreement with Alachua County to coordinate the planning, acquisition and management of recreation and open space lands and facilities within the Urban Reserve Area (URA).</p>	<p>Interlocal agreement</p>	<p>Yes and on-going. Each instance (acquisition, service agreement, etc.) has its own particular interlocal agreement.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>1.4.3</p> <p>As part of a tourism development program, the City shall cooperate with the County to prepare a tourism plan and sponsor an economic study of the impacts of cultural, heritage, and eco-tourism on Gainesville and Alachua County.</p>	<p>Preparation of tourism plan and sponsorship of described economic study</p>	<p>Partially. The tourism plan is a 5-year plan that is prepared in-house by the Alachua County Visitors & Convention Bureau and not by the City. The positive working relationship between the Bureau and the City's Department of Parks, Recreation and Cultural Affairs is very supportive of tourism development in our community. Under an interlocal agreement with the County, the Cultural Affairs Division administers the tourism tax grants (Tourism Product</p>	<p>Revise policy to make it clear that it is the County's tourism plan that is prepared by the County. Due to fiscal and staffing constraints, the requirement of sponsoring an economic study should be deleted and replaced with text indicating that the City is supportive of County</p>

Table 2

Evaluation Matrix - Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
		<p>Development (TPD) Grants) for the County. There are two part time employees at Cultural Affairs whose salaries are funded by the tourism tax and who work with the TPD grants. The TPD grant is an advertising/operational grant for festivals and events that have as a main purpose the attraction of tourists as evidenced by the promotion to tourists as required by state statute 125.0104.</p> <p>The TPD grant program was developed by the Alachua County Convention & Visitors Bureau and the City's Cultural Affairs Division and is annually reviewed by the Tourist Development Council (TDC). The TDC also scores the grants and determines which grants are to be awarded. Cultural Affairs manages the grants for compliance and invoices the Bureau. Cultural Affairs also holds workshops to assist festivals and events in attracting tourists, creates new programs and products, such as, cell phone tours.</p> <p>Cultural Affairs staff with financial support from the City (not counting staff time), the Bureau, and the State of Florida, and with the help of citizen volunteers, also participated in the Americans for the Arts' national study entitled Arts and Economic Prosperity III. Staff and volunteers surveyed approximately 750 attendees at various art/cultural events three years ago, and the report was completed</p>	<p>efforts on such studies.</p>

Table 2

Evaluation Matrix - Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
<p>1.4.4 The City shall continue to work with Alachua County to promote cooperative planning within the Urban Reserve Area through the Boundary Adjustment Act and the proposed Joint Planning Agreement.</p>	<p>Promotion of cooperative planning</p>	<p>two years ago. Also, 35 financial surveys were completed by local arts organizations (including UF and Cultural Affairs) as part of the information collected by Americans for the Arts. This information was compared to other communities our size throughout the nation. The economic effects of eco-tourism were not part of the study. Yes, in large part. The City and County work closely on annexation through implementation of the Boundary Adjustment. Representatives of the City, County, Micanopy, Hawthorne and Waldo have served on the Countywide Visioning and Planning Committee (CVPC) that has met intermittently since 2005, but it has been concluded that the municipalities were not interested in developing joint plans for the unincorporated area.</p>	<p>Delete reference to the proposed Joint Planning Agreement</p>
<p>1.4.5 Through joint planning processes, the City and County shall evaluate the impacts of their respective comprehensive plans on "areas of concern" identified in the North Central Florida Regional Policy Plan.</p>		<p>Yes, on-going through review of the impacts of proposed land use changes, re-zonings, and development plans on State roadways.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>1.4.6 Upon the annexation of any land, the City shall begin the process of amending the Comprehensive Plan to reflect data and analysis changes, establish land use on newly annexed areas, and provide</p>		<p>Yes, on-going</p>	<p>None</p>

Table 2

Evaluation Matrix - Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
<p>services to meet adopted LOS standards.</p> <p>1.4.7</p> <p>In the interim period between annexation and the amendment of this Comprehensive Plan to include the newly annexed areas, the City shall implement the County's adopted Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Regulations.</p>		Yes, on-going	None
<p>Objective 1.5 - The City shall continue to work with Alachua County, the several municipalities, SFCC and UF to protect groundwater and other environmental resources throughout Alachua County.</p>	Implementation of Policies 1.5.1 – 1.5.5	Yes, on-going	None
<p>1.5.1</p> <p>The City shall work with the County to develop and maintain an inventory of wetlands and significant habitat, develop a joint planning effort to conserve and acquire significant habitat in the Urban Reserve Area, develop provisions for offsite mitigation of development impacts upon wetlands, and work towards a county-wide wetlands protection ordinance.</p>		See Table 1, Major Issue 8	
<p>1.5.2</p> <p>The City shall work with the County regarding criteria for the location of hazardous materials collection/transfer treatment facilities. One criterion shall be consideration of potential groundwater contamination.</p>	As described in 1.5.2	Yes	None

Table 2

Evaluation Matrix - Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
<p>1.5.3</p> <p>The City shall continue to cooperate with the County and other waste material handlers in the establishment of periodic special waste collection programs for difficult to dispose of waste such as tires, used oil, batteries, and asbestos.</p>		<p>Yes</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>1.5.4</p> <p>The City shall continue to cooperate with the County to identify areas of pollution to surface water and groundwater and to establish a monitoring program that provides an annual report describing present conditions and cleanup status. The City shall assist in identifying the parties responsible for the polluted areas and require such parties to mitigate pollution problems. The City shall continue to cooperate with the Alachua County Environmental Protection Department, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP), the Water Management Districts, and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and shall support the appropriate agencies with efforts to accomplish the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identify areas of pollution to surface waters and groundwater. b. Establish a monitoring program that provides an annual report describing present environmental conditions and clean-up status. 	<p>Monitoring Program Annual Report Pollution Detection and Elimination</p>	<p>a. & b. The City works cooperatively with Alachua County through the Gainesville Clean Water Partnership to identify areas of pollution to surface water and groundwater. The Alachua County Environmental Protection Department (ACEPD) maintains an active monitoring program to identify pollutants in local waterways. ACEPD works with the City to maintain an active Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination System Program that includes quarterly reports.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Yes, on-going d. Yes, on-going e. Yes, on-going 	<p>None to a. and c. Revise sub-policy b. so that it is limited to support of existing monitoring programs.</p> <p>d. & e. Expand to include contamination sites in general.</p>

Table 2

Evaluation Matrix - Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
<p>c. Identify parties responsible for polluted areas, and require such parties to mitigate pollution problems.</p> <p>d. Discourage the creation of new brownfield sites by implementing existing regulations and improving them as needed; and</p> <p>e. Encourage environmentally sound development and redevelopment of existing brownfield sites.</p>			
<p>1.5.5 The City shall continue to work with FDEP and Alachua County to prepare a plan which at a minimum will be consistent with National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting to ensure that water discharged by Sweetwater Branch into Paynes Prairie will be discharged in a manner that will support the reasonable management objectives of FDEP, and City objectives regarding protection of the Floridan Aquifer, wastewater treatment and stormwater management.</p>		<p>Yes. Staff from the City (general government & GRU), Alachua County and the FL Dept. of Environmental Protection (FDEP) working together developed a Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP) that has been adopted by the FDEP Secretary. A major component of the adopted BMAP is the Sweetwater Branch/Paynes Prairie Sheet Flow Restoration Project. Due to adoption of the BMAP, this policy is no longer needed and can be deleted.</p>	Delete
<p>Objective 1.6 - The City shall continue to work with state agencies to assure compliance with the State Comprehensive Plan, the North Central Florida Strategic Regional Policy Plan, and agency</p>	<p>Implementation of Policies 1.6.1 - 1.6.6</p>	<p>Yes, on-going</p>	None

Table 2

Evaluation Matrix - Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
functional plans.			
<p>1.6.1 The City shall comply with State pollution control requirements at the former Gainesville Airport Landfill and Burn Site described in the Solid Waste Element.</p>	Compliance with State pollution control requirements	Yes, on-going	None
<p>1.6.2 The City shall maintain a water conservation plan consistent with the Water Management Districts' plans.</p>		See Table 1, Major Issue 8	
<p>1.6.3 The City shall pursue agreements with the SBAC for joint use and maintenance of SBAC recreation facilities at schools and develop policies for handling liability for public use of all school recreational facilities.</p>	Agreements and policies as described.	Yes, on-going	None
<p>1.6.4 The City shall improve the development process of group homes and foster care facilities by improving coordination with the Department of Children and Families and by disseminating information on requirements and procedures for siting them.</p>		Yes. The Planning Department maintains records to insure that minimum distance and all other applicable requirements for these State-regulated facilities are met. The Department's good working relationship with the FL Department of Children and Families is an asset in the regulation of these facilities.	None
<p>1.6.5</p>		Yes, on-going	None

Table 2

Evaluation Matrix - Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
<p>The City shall promote compact urban development by increasing densities, concentrating commercial and office activities in activity centers and improving access to non-auto transportation in the Transportation Concurrence Exception Area.</p>			
<p>1.6.6 The City shall evaluate Development of Regional Impact (DRI) proposals that impact the City to ensure appropriate phasing so that the demands of such DRIs are integrated with the expected availability of facilities and services.</p>		<p>Yes, on-going</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Objective 1.7 - The City shall work with community partners such as the University of Florida, Santa Fe Community College, the Gainesville Area Chamber of Commerce, Alachua County, and the Alachua County School Board to help develop the Innovative Economy within the non-residential areas of the Gainesville Innovation Zone. For purposes of this objective, Innovative Economy means those technology firms and/or entities that bring a new process or technique to the production process and that are often, but not exclusively, related in some manner to University driven research, and are generally represented by sectors such as Agritechnology, Aviation and Aerospace, Information Technology, Life Sciences and Medical Technology.</p>	<p>Implementation of Policies 1.7.1 – 1.7.5</p>	<p>See Table 1, Major Issue 7</p>	

Table 2

Evaluation Matrix - Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
<p>1.7.1 The City shall work with its community partners on the Economic Development University Community Committee (EDUCC) to encourage development of the Gainesville Innovation Zone.</p>		<p>See Table 1, Major Issue 7</p>	
<p>1.7.2 The City shall review the comprehensive plan and the land development code within 18 months of the effective date of Policy 1.7.2. Should the review conclude that any amendments to the comprehensive plan or land development code are needed for the appropriate development of the Gainesville Innovation Zone, the City shall draft such amendments and present them to the City Plan Board within 24 months of the effective date of Policy 1.7.2.</p>		<p>See Table 1, Major Issue 7</p>	
<p>1.7.3 The City shall work to ensure that adequate public infrastructure is in place for development of the Gainesville Innovation Zone.</p>		<p>See Table 1, Major Issue 7</p>	
<p>1.7.4 The City shall work to ensure that pertinent local, state and federal incentive programs are made available to those seeking Innovative Economy development opportunities.</p>		<p>See Table 1, Major Issue 7</p>	

Table 2

Evaluation Matrix - Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Objective or Policy	Measurable Target	Objective or Policy Achieved?	Recommended Changes
<p>1.7.5 The City shall work to ensure that negative impacts resulting from Innovative Economy development within the Gainesville Innovation Zone are minimized, particularly with respect to adjacent residential areas.</p>		<p>See Table 1, Major Issue 7</p>	