

City of Orlando
Response to Agency Review of
Proposed Evaluation and Appraisal Report
August 29, 2007

Department of Community Affairs Comments

1. *Population growth and changes in land area [Section 163.3191(2)(a), F.S.]*

Comment: The proposed EAR does address changes in population growth as required by this provision. However, the proposed EAR does not clearly address the changes in land area since the adoption of the most recent update amendments also required by this provision. The proposed EAR includes Exhibit 2-3, which is a map showing areas where annexation activity has taken place in the City from 1980 through 2006. As such, the City's land area has increased by 42,904 acres, of which, much of this acreage includes the Orlando International Airport property, the Southeast Orlando Sector Plan and Vista East annexations as depicted on Exhibit 2-3. However, the proposed EAR does not identify how much land area has been annexed into the City's limit since the time of the last EAR update, and how much development potential the annexations have added.

Recommendation: Indicate, using tabular and graphic formats, the City's boundaries at the time of the previous EAR, and how those boundaries have changed during the evaluation period. The map should show where the annexations occurred and the table should indicate the land area, the type of land use assigned, and the development potential added to the City.

City of Orlando Response: The City has revised Exhibit 2-3 to clearly show the City limits in 1998 and 2006. In addition, Exhibit 2-2B has been added to provide the maximum development potential allowed by the future land use designations of the annexed properties.

2. *The financial feasibility of providing needed infrastructure to achieve and maintain adopted levels of service standards and sustain concurrency through capital improvements as well as the ability to address infrastructure backlogs and meet the demands of growth and public facilities [Section 163.3191(2)(c)]*

Comment: The proposed EAR does not satisfy this requirement. The EAR indicates that the City has successfully implemented a concurrency management system that is integrated into the permitting system and corresponds to the facility needs identified in the Capital Improvements Element. The City has not identified any infrastructure backlogs caused by existing development. The EAR includes a discussion of the current condition of all public facilities in terms of capacity, including roadway level of service of all major roadways. The level of service analysis shows deficiencies but the proposed EAR also indicates that there are no existing backlogs caused by existing development. Furthermore, the EAR includes the City's current 2006-2011 Fire-year Schedule of Capital Improvements which includes the capital improvements needs and cost to address the deficiencies through the five-year planning time frame. However, the EAR does not analyze whether the comprehensive plan was financially feasible over the past evaluation period. The EAR is unclear as to how the City arrived at the needed facilities improvements and a five-year schedule to address identified deficiencies if the EAR did not identify any backlog.

Recommendation: This critical portion of the EAR Report allows the local government to assess past financial management and capital budgeting practices that enabled or prevented the community from meeting its public facility needs. It provides an opportunity to assess and amend the policies and future infrastructure needs at the adopted level of service. To this end, the report should be retrospective and should include the following data and analysis:

- A. The public facility needs that were projected for the past planning period (for roads, potable water, sewer, drainage, solid waste, recreation and open space) and included in the plan.

For roads, the EAR should list all deficient roadways since the beginning of the evaluation period;

- B. A discussion of the extent to which the identified needs of the community were met in terms of attaining and maintaining the adopted level of service standard and whether the deficiencies were corrected or not corrected. If deficiencies occurred, and especially if they were prolonged, that would provide a good indication why adequate funding was not provided to implement the comprehensive plan. The EAR should analyze and discuss why the deficiencies occurred (e.g. insufficient funding, inefficient growth pattern that fails to deliver resources efficiently, unexpected growth, or a catastrophic event that caused local government to divert funds to other needs), then make recommendations to help ensure that level of service standards are achieved and maintained to the maximum extent feasible during the next five and ten year planning horizon.

The EAR should incorporate a discussion of the strategies, priorities, the financial planning, and budgeting mechanisms that will enable the City to meet its projected level of service capital facility needs for the upcoming short and long range planning periods. The discussion should include the identification of the sources of funding.

- C. A discussion of the current condition of all public facilities in terms of capacity (including roadway level of service of roadways included on the Future Transportation Map.

City of Orlando Response: For Part A, the City has revised section 2.2 to include the 1998-2003 5-year capital improvements schedule that was adopted in 1998. Current status of those projects (most of which have been completed) demonstrates that the GMP was financially feasible over the planning period. Exhibit 2-35 provides a list of roadway segments that have been found deficient between 1998-2006. As shown in the EAR, the City has either already addressed each deficiency, or has a financially feasible plan in place to provide improvements.

For Part B, the City has revised section 2.2 to include level of service deficiencies for each type of public facility from 1998-2006, as reported in each annual Capacity Availability Report. Wastewater, potable water, and stormwater had no deficiencies over the previous planning period. Road and park facilities have had small deficiencies from time to time, and the EAR describes how those deficiencies were addressed, and how the City uses growth projections and transportation modeling to identify potential future deficiencies. In addition, the City has added section 2.2.10 to include more detail about funding sources for capital improvements projects. As shown in the EAR, the City's existing funding sources are sufficient to meet the funding needs of the 5-year Capital Improvements Schedule.

For Part C, section 2.2 includes current level of service for all public facilities. Level of service for roadways is provided in Exhibit 2-38.

3. Location of existing development in relation to the location of development as anticipated in the Plan [Section 163.3191(2)(d), F.S.]

Comment: The proposed EAR has not clearly addressed this requirement. The proposed EAR analyzed the City's 1991 Growth Management Plan projections compared to actual development growth by land use type. The proposed EAR also indicates that the Future Land Use Map describes the proposed location and distribution of uses in the City and adjacent areas through the year 2030. However, the proposed EAR does not discuss the existing land use patterns of today in relation to the pattern that was anticipated to occur at the time of the previous EAR to show the extent to which the pattern of development today mirrors or is different from the pattern that was anticipated.

Recommendation: The EAR should discuss the existing land use patterns of today in relation to the pattern that was anticipated to occur at the time of the previous EAR to show the extent to which the pattern of development today mirrors the pattern that was anticipated. If there are marked differences between the uses that were planned and the uses that are actually occurring, the EAR should analyze

and discuss why, and anticipate whether any changes in policies are warranted to better direct growth to suit the community's desires.

City of Orlando Response: The City amended section 2.1.3 to provide additional detail about growth that was projected in 1998, and growth that actually occurred. Both the amount and location of growth is similar to what was projected in 1998. No policy changes are necessary or proposed.

East Central Florida Regional Planning Council Comments

1. We support the City's multifaceted approach to provide attainable housing in the region. While LEED certification is the recognized standard for measuring building sustainability, the City should also examine the criteria established by the Florida Green Building Coalition.

City of Orlando Response: The City has amended Urban Design Policies 6.10.3 and 6.10.4, and Conservation Policy 1.8.1 to add the FGBC standards to the list of options that the City is exploring to implement its green building policies.

2. On page 3-80 add the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council to the list of agencies that the City will coordinate with the effectively plan for meaningful connections to the state greenway system.

City of Orlando Response: The City has added the ECFRPC as requested.

Department of Transportation Comments

Review Comments

1. Exhibit 2-32 (Figure TE-1 in the Transportation Element) shows SIS facilities with LOS E standards. This is not consistent with FDOT's adopted LOS standards as found in Rule 14-94, F.A.C.

City of Orlando Response: The City cannot update adopted figures as part of the EAR. The City plans to coordinate with FDOT to amend Figure TE-1 as part of the EAR-based amendments.

2. Regarding Major Issue 3, Please provide more detail about how the weighted average transit corridor headway is calculated.

City of Orlando Response: See Section 2.2.3 for additional information about headway calculations.

3. Regarding the TCEA discussion (Special Topic 3):
 - Please state the year of the data in Exhibit 4-2.
 - The discussion of the TCEA does not quantify the impacts of the TCEA on alternative transportation modes or quantify use of alternative transportation modes in the TCEA.
 - Please clarify how the trip allocation program addresses the long-term impacts of comprehensive plan amendments and impacts to specific State roadways.

City of Orlando response: The City has made a number of changes to Section 4.3 to address these comments. In particular, the City addresses SIS facilities inside the TCEA and provides data related to use of alternative modes inside the TCEA.

Recommendations

1. Please update Exhibit 2-32 (Figure TE-1 in the Transportation Element) to reflect FDOT's adopted LOS standards for SIS roadways.

City of Orlando Response: The City cannot update adopted figures as part of the EAR. The City plans to coordinate with FDOT to amend Figure TE-1 as part of the EAR-based amendments.

2. The City should provide data quantifying alternative mode use in the TCEA and showing how it has changed since the last EAR. AT a minimum, please provide before-and-after weighted average headway data (consistent with Transportation Policy 1.13.1).

City of Orlando Response: As stated in Section 2.2.3, the LOS standard of 59% of designated transit corridors within the TCEA operating at 30-minute weighted average headways has been met since 1998. No changes are proposed. Regarding quantifying alternative mode use, limited data is available. As stated in Section 4.3.2, the City has provided results from travel to work data provided by the US Census. The City is not aware of any other data sources that provide trip modeling or surveys by mode split. Therefore, if FDOT is looking for more specific information, the City recommends that FDOT develop guidelines for local jurisdictions. Lack of data related to the number of people walking, cycling, and carpooling is a common problem nation-wide. Although LYNX collects ridership information system-wide, there is no way to determine ridership inside the TCEA.

4. Regarding Major Issue 5, if the land use mix percentages in Future Land Use Policy 2.2.6 are amended such that net allowed intensities increase, please provide data and analysis demonstrating that planned and programmed infrastructure will adequately support the increase in intensity.

City of Orlando Response: The land use mixes provided in Policy 2.2.6 are City-wide goals, and do not limit development on specific parcels. Maximum allowable densities and intensities are established by future land use designations, and may be limited through subarea policies. Therefore, infrastructure needs are analyzed whenever a future land use map amendment is proposed. Additional infrastructure needs are also addressed through projections based on transportation modeling and growth projections.