Element X - PUBLIC SCHOOLS FACILITIES ELEMENT Goals, Objectives and Policies City of Stuart, Florida Effective August 25, 2008

Sec. 10.1. - Background and definitions.

Education is fundamental to achieving a better life. No organization has as much basic impact on the future of the nation as the public school system. The City of Stuart recognizes that such impact starts at the local level. The City's future citizens will be faced with many challenges. Coordination between the City, Martin County and the School District is paramount in ensuring that our future citizens have the educational background necessary to make the difficult choices that lie ahead.

Public School physical facilities capacity is directly affected by residential development. The Public School Facilities Element (PSFE) focuses on coordinated planning among the School District, Martin County and the City to accommodate future student growth needs in the public school system. This element establishes public school system concurrency requirements, including a level of service standard for public schools and procedures for establishing a concurrency management system.

The aim of school concurrency is to ensure that the public school facilities necessary to maintain the adopted level of service for schools are in place before or concurrent with the school impacts of new residential development.

10.1. A. *Definitions.*

1. *Interlocal Agreement for School Facilities Planning and Siting.* The interlocal agreement between Martin County, the City of Stuart, and the School Board of Martin County, signed by the School Board on February 19, 2008, and made effective by Martin County on March 11, 2008, which details the responsibilities and coordination processes necessary to implement joint planning, school siting procedures, and school concurrency.
2. *School Concurrency Review Report.* This report provides the City with the schools' determination on whether there is enough school capacity to accommodate a new development. It is produced by the School District Staff and submitted to the City.
3. *Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).* The TAC is a five-member committee appointed by the City, Martin County and the School Board whose main purpose is to evaluate school siting needs. The Interlocal Agreement for School Facilities Planning and Siting provides details on the TAC.

(Ord. No. 2158-08, § 1, 5-12-2008)

Sec. 10.2. - The planning environment.

10.2. A. *Population.* According to the U.S. Census, between 1990 and 2000 Martin County grew by over 25 percent from 100,900 to 126,731, including residents within the City of Stuart. BEBR estimates an average of 2,896 new residents annually have been moving into Martin County in recent years. Population estimates for 2007 place the county's population at 143,737.

The Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) estimates the population will grow to 154,050 residents by 2010 and 178,974 residents by 2020. By 2030 Martin County's population is projected to be 199,714.

Approximately 87% of the estimated population resides east of the Florida Turnpike. For the years 2004 to 2006 more than 84% of the county's Certificates of Occupancy went to residential units east of the Turnpike. This indicates that the area east of the Turnpike continues to attract the majority of the population. However, with vacant residential land available and its relatively lower land costs, Indiantown is becoming attractive to residential developers. Based on approved and planned projects, it is estimated that the Indiantown/West County area could experience a 96% increase in population going from 9,270 residents in 2005 to 18,210 in 2025. Table 10-1 shows permanent population by the county's Comprehensive Plan planning areas for 2005 and 2006, and projected permanent population through 2025.

Table 10-1 POPULATION FORECAST BY PLANNING AREA

Planning Areas	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2015	2020	2025	% Increase 2005-2025
N. River Shores	4,237	4,245	4,260	4,273	4,285	4,295	4,342	4,390	4,432	4.6%
North County	16,703	16,788	16,833	16,884	16,932	16,970	17,153	17,338	17,500	4.8%
Hutchinson Island	2,643	2,649	2,658	2,665	2,672	2,678	2,705	2,732	2,756	4.3%
Stuart Urban	18,661	18,875	19,189	19,692	20,334	21,104	23,218	24,332	25,495	36.6%
Palm City	23,093	23,293	23,532	23,753	23,959	24,125	24,918	25,720	26,423	14.4%
Pt. Salerno/76	29,641	30,155	31,187	32,138	33,030	33,746	37,167	40,631	43,663	47.3%
Mid County	8,440	8,637	8,999	9,333	9,645	9,896	11,095	12,309	13,372	58.4%
South County	28,371	28,701	29,400	30,044	30,647	31,133	33,450	35,795	37,849	33.4%
Indiantown/West County	9,270	9,312	9,452	9,592	9,732	10,152	12,952	15,752	18,210	96.4%
Total County	141,059	142,645	145,509	148,373	151,236	154,100	167,000	179,000	189,700	34.5%
Source: Population Technical Bulletin, May 2007 Growth Management Department, Martin County Board of County Commissioners										

On average, Martin County (incorporated and unincorporated areas) approves between 1,100 to 1,700 certificates of occupancy a year.

Table 10-2 CERTIFICATES
OF OCCUPANCY

Type	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Single-Family	753	1165	1000	956	914	880
Duplex	18	162	128	198	106	8
Multifamily	298	384	36	256	131	339
Mobile Home	34	15	17	23	29	6

Totals	1103	1726	1181	1433	1180	1233

Source: 2006 Growth Development Trends Report

Martin County Schools planning staff are tracking more than 60 active housing developments that contain more than 7,700 unbuilt housing units. Although many of these units will be marketed to retirees and seasonal residents, single family homes in Martin County are still expected to generate 2.5 school-age children for every ten homes based on the most recent Impact Fee Study. The outstanding units represent nearly 2,000 new students for the schools.

Like most of South Florida, Martin's population growth has been a mainstay of the economy for decades. However, in 2007 many counties began seeing a slowing in the housing industry that will impact enrollment growth. The district will need to monitor permit activity through the year and reassess long term needs.

10.2. B. *School Enrollment.* Between 1997 and 2007, the Martin County enrollment grew from 14,626 to 17,804 students or 22 percent. Table 10-3 shows the trends in the last five years by school type. Note that in 2004, two hurricanes hit the county and caused a displacement of some of the county's residents and a decrease in in-migration that impacted two years of growth.

Table 10-3 School Enrollment History

Year	Elementary	Middle	High	Total *	Annual Growth
2002	7,859	4,158	5,060	17,077	
2003	8,041	4,295	5,261	17,597	520
2004	7,956	4,250	5,326	17,532	-65
2005	8,113	4,115	5,435	17,663	131
2006	8,234	4,092	5,633	17,959	296
2007	8,176	4,052	5,576	17,804	-155

* Enrollment numbers represent only PK—12 students housed in District-owned facilities. Enrollment does not include adult-education students, homebound students, home-schooled students, and students in other special or alternative programs.

10.2. C. *Demographic Trends.* Martin County, including the City of Stuart, is demographically older (median age of the population is older than the State's population as a whole) and less diverse than the State as a whole. The moderate year-round climate, casual lifestyle, and affordability compared to neighboring counties make Stuart and Martin County desired locations for retirees.

Racially, Martin County's demographic composition shows small increases in the Hispanic population and other minority groups since 2000. Although the public-school population tends to follow similar patterns, it is more diverse than the County as a whole. Following a trend throughout Florida and the nation, Martin County's Hispanic population has been the fastest growing of all racial groups. Table 10-4 shows a comparison of the County and School District changes starting in 2000.

Table 10-4
Population
by Race
and Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	General Population		Student Population	
	2000	2006	2000	2006
White	89.9%	83.9%	74.1%	68.3%
African-American	5.3%	5.5%	10.9%	8.5%
Hispanic	7.5%	9.1%	12.6%	18.3%
Asian	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	1.2%
Other	1.4%	1.4%	1.5%	3.7%

10.2. D. *Legislative Changes.* In November 2002, Florida voters passed Constitutional Amendment 9 requiring the State legislature to provide funding to reduce the maximum class size in Florida's public schools. The goals set by the amendment to be reached by 2010 are 18 students per Prekindergarten through Grade 3, 22 students per class in Grades 4 through 8, and 25 students per class in Grades 9 through 12. The amendment specified a two-student-per-year reduction from district averages to school averages, and finally to individual classes. Implementation began with the 2003-2004 school year and continues until class size goals are reached.

Class size reduction has impacted a school's capacity calculation in that class size factors and utilization levels are lower. See Table 10-5 for current guidelines.

Table 10-5
Classroom Size

Program	Class Size Amendment	Utilization %
Pre-Kindergarten	18	100%
Kindergarten	18	100%
Primary Grades (1st—3rd)	18	100%

Intermediate Grades (4th, 5th)	22	100%
6th—8th Grades	22	90%
9th—12th Grades	25	85 - 95%

In 2005 the State Legislature passed Senate Bill 360, a Growth Management Reform Act, which mandated a comprehensive focus on school planning by requiring the school district, county, and municipalities to adopt a school concurrency system. Key features included in this Act are:

· School concurrency is now mandatory Statewide.

· School boards and local governments within each county must create school concurrency management systems by December 1, 2008 or else face substantial penalties.

· Developers must be given the option to pay for school improvements in order to avoid a school concurrency requirement. The amount of payment must be proportional to the number of students who will come from the new development. This option is called proportionate share mitigation.

The objective of school concurrency is to provide sufficient capacity in the public-school system timed to keep pace with student growth from new residential development and to balance enrollment.

10.2. E. *Fiscal Considerations.* The key component to a successful Concurrency Program is the ability of the School District to implement a financially feasible plan to provide sufficient capacity at the Level of Service adopted in the Interlocal Agreement.

Martin County School District's Five-Year Work Plan for FY 2010/11—2014/15, approved by the School Board on September 21, 2010, describes the plans to expand existing facilities and construct new facilities to meet enrollment demand. Capital improvements are considered after evaluating student enrollment to school capacity and population growth trends. This evaluation of school facility needs allows the School District to be proactive in addressing changes in enrollment and the other factors that drive capital improvements.

The Revenue Summary for FY 2010/11—2014/15 describes the incoming revenue used to finance the corresponding Capital Improvement Program. The two primary revenue streams for the Martin County School District are from the property tax levy and school impact fees.

Current local sources of capital revenue for the Martin County School District are the 2 Mill Ad Valorem Property Tax collected from residential and nonresidential development, and impact fees that are collected from new non-age-restricted residential development. The School District is currently levying two mills. In addition, school districts may sell Certificates of Participation (COP) or bonds based on lease payments for new construction up to $600,000,000.00.

Primary State funds include Public Education Capital Outlay (PECO) funds from the State's gross receipt tax on utilities, and Capital Outlay and Debt Service (CO&DS) from motor vehicle license fees.

Although funding available through local and State sources may need to be increased in the future, the current sources for funding are adequate to address the needs.

Table 10-6 compares the balanced projected five-year revenue to proposed expenditures by year. Known capital revenue from State and local sources is expected to total over $300,000,000.00 over this period.

Table 10-6 Comparison of Five-Year Projected Revenue and Expenditures

Category	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	Total
Projected State and Local Revenue	$60,255,243	$58,366,208	$61,264,199	$64,294,772	$67,518,469	$311,698,891
Proposed Yearly Expenditures	$60,255,243	$58,366,208	$61,264,199	$64,294,772	$67,518,469	$311,698,891

The FY 2010/11—2014/15 Capital Improvement Program for the Martin County School District includes funds for two new elementary schools and classroom additions at two existing elementary schools. Table 10-7 summarizes these projects.

Table 10-7 Capital Improvement Program: New Schools and Classroom Additions

Addition of Capacity	Approx. Opening	Additional/ New Capacity	Enrollment Relief To
New Elementary "A" (Tuscawilla)	2008	750	Bessey Creek ES Crystal Lake ES Palm City ES
Pinewood ES Classroom Addition	2008	128	Pinewood ES
Seawind ES lassroom Addition	2008	161	Seawind ES
New Elementary "B" (Indiantown)	2012	750	Warfield ES Indiantown MS

In addition to capacity-adding projects, the School District also budgets for the comprehensive needs of existing schools to ensure the facilities are safe and up to date to meet diverse educational program needs. These major repair and renovation projects include additions of noninstructional support spaces, ADA compliance and modernization of all or portions of a facility. To ensure that facility needs are addressed in an equitable manner, staff of the school district prioritizes comprehensive needs projects based on the District's approved facilities list for elementary, middle and high schools, age of the facility, and capacity needs.

In 2004 the School Board developed master plans for each school in the district. These master plans provide a basis for project prioritization and a foundation for a project scope. Martin County School District has budgeted over $16 million to address comprehensive needs projects in FY 2007/08.

In 2007 the estimated value of all school facilities was $922,000,000.00. There is existing outstanding debt of $21,000,000.00 and a

new Certificates of Participation (COPs) issue of $40,000,000.00.

The local educational facility costs will be paid by a combination of appropriations from the State of Florida, the annual CIT, and impact fees. State funding reflects the anticipation of State funds for Classroom Size reduction. Classroom size allocations are not a recurring revenue.

(Ord. No. 2158-08, § 1, 5-12-2008; Ord. No. 2218-2011, § 1, 1-10-2011)

Sec. 10.3. - Enrollment forecast.

Enrollment forecasting requires analysis of multiple data sources including, but not limited to, birth rates, historical enrollment trends, makeup of neighborhoods, local and regional economic and housing trends, program and boundary changes, and an empirical understanding of individual communities.

School population projections are most reliable when enrollment is projected for large geographic areas for one or two years in the future. For example, the district-wide projections for next year are expected to have a higher degree of certainty than the fifth-year estimates. Conversely, accuracy diminishes as the geographic area becomes smaller and the forecast is for more distant points in the future.

In accordance with Florida Department of Education guidelines, the Martin County School District annually prepares or updates enrollment forecasts following a study of local government area and school level trends. A history of each school's grade-by-grade enrollment is compiled and analyzed. This history reveals patterns in the "aging" or progression (less out-migration factors) of students from one grade to the next. These patterns are extrapolated to develop a school's basic forecast. This approach, termed the Cohort-Survivorship Model, is the most widely applied forecasting method for schools.

10.3. A. *Department of Education forecast.* Around June of each year, the Florida DOE publishes grade-by-grade COFTE enrollment projections for every school district for the next ten years. The State uses a standard "cohort survival" method using five-year enrollment trends. The State's projections are an average of two "head counts" - one in October and one in February. This poses three issues for facilities planning:

The first is timing. The school district does not know the actual COFTE enrollment until after the end of the school year and therefore does not know whether there will be changes to the forecast until two months before starting the new school year. The school district is then required to develop school by school projections that are consistent with the State's forecast.

The second concern is the implication for the high school forecast. By using the average of two counts, the COFTE tends to under-project the number of high school students that show up in the fall by including winter dropouts from the spring count.

Finally, the State forecast is based on historic trends and not on local knowledge. If there is a change in the trend (Indiantown for example), the State forecast will lag behind.

10.3. B. *Local forecast.* This year, the enrollment projections were prepared in the fall using the actual first-quarter information. The same Cohort-Survivorship method "ages" students ahead through the grade levels and calculates a ratio based on a five-year history. This ratio is then applied to future years.

However, the data yielded by the basic survivorship model was only the foundation for the enrollment projections. The model data was compared to projected county population growth associated with new housing starts and County in-migration rates. Population projection data is proportionately matched to school attendance zone data to provide an indication of future growth patterns.

The most difficult segment of the K-12 population to predict is each year's kindergarten class. In order to project the kindergarten population for each year, statistical profiles of residential birth data was matched to growth patterns and applied to individual schools.

Finally, the District-wide forecast was compared to the Department of Education (DOE) forecast for the Martin County School District. Differences may be explainable in light of specific Martin County data on new housing.

Survivorship trends. Because of the "aging" pattern in population forecasting, schools may have changes from both in-migration (new housing) and from aging out. Table 10-9 shows the history of elementary growth and the impact of both patterns.

Growth between grades typically is the result of in-migration from new housing or housing turnover. This is shown in columns identified with Δ. However, enrollment increases can also occur as a smaller fifth grade is replaced by a larger kindergarten class as was the case in 2006 for the elementary schools. Table 10-9 History of Elementary School Enrollment by Grade

Year	Total	Gth	PK	K	Δ	1	Δ	2	Δ	3	Δ	4	Δ	5
2002	7684	-91	229	1158	71	1210	45	1208	31	1275	10	1282	47	1322
2003	8032	348	415	1292	71	1229	10	1220	81	1289	12	1287	18	1300
2004	7995	-37	431	1245	-18	1274	-5	1224	35	1255	-22	1267	12	1299
2005	8080	85	386	1278	55	1300	-11	1263	83	1307	-7	1248	31	1298
2006	8234	154	436	1325	22	1300	2	1302	38	1301	2	1309	13	1261
2007	8186	-145	437	1273	-53	1272	-11	1289	6	1308	-33	1268	30	1339

Source: Public Pathways, Inc., Presentation to Long-Range Planning Committee, November 27, 2007.

A couple of small grades are moving through the system causing a slight decline in the middle schools in 2005 and 2006. As these grades age through the system, middle school enrollment will increase and high school enrollment will moderate and may decrease. It is important not to base long term planning on temporary fluctuations in the enrollment. After 2011, high school enrollments will once again begin the increase as heralded by the elementary forecast.

Births. Table 10-9 shows the history of annual births in Martin County and the kindergarten class six years later. For the past several years the number of births has steadily increased. The growth, combined with in-migration has created a positive survivorship trend.

The local forecast assumes that the growth trends for the preschool years will continue at the current rate.

Table 10-9 Births

Birth Year	Number Births	Kindergarten (+6 Years)	Survivorship %
2003	1,127	1,292 *	1.15
2004	1,110	1,245 *	1.13

2005	1,255	1,278 *	1.02
2006	1,241	1,325 *	1.07
2007	1,205	1,273	1.06
2008	1,172	1,274	1.09
2009	1,256	1,288	1.03
2010	1,307	1,327	1.02
2011	1,316	1,343	1.02
2012	1,345	1,363	1.01
* Years used to project kindergarten enrollment for school years 2008—2012			
Sources for birth data: Florida DOE FTE Forecast; Source: Public Pathways, Inc., Presentation to Long-Range Planning Committee, November 27, 2007.			

In-migration. The impact of several years of bad weather and the recent uncertainty in the housing market suggest that the District may see fewer students from new housing—at least in the urban cores—for the next several years. The local forecast assumes a conservative 1,000 new units a year.

Local enrollment projections. Based on the above analysis, enrollment in Martin County schools is projected to grow from approximately 17,804 students in 2007 to 18,155 students in 2012—an increase of approximately 350 students.

Tables 10-10 through 10-14 show actual enrollment from 2002 through 2007, and projected enrollment from 2008 through 2017 for elementary, middle and high schools.

Table 10-10 Elementary School Enrollment by Grade

Year	Total	Growth	PK	K		1		2		3		4		5
2002	7684	-91	229	1,158	71	1,210	45	1,208	31	1,275	10	1,282	47	1,322
2003	8,032	348	415	1,292	71	1,229	10	1,220	81	1,289	12	1,287	18	1,300
2004	7,995	-37	431	1,245	-18	1,274	-5	1,224	35	1,255	-22	1,267	12	1,299
2005	8,080	85	386	1,278	55	1,300	-11	1,263	83	1,307	-7	1,248	31	1,298
2006	8,234	154	436	1,325	22	1,300	2	1,302	38	1,301	2	1,309	13	1,261
2007	8,186	-145	437	1,273	-53	1,272	-11	1,289	6	1,308	-33	1,268	30	1,339

Source: Public Pathways, Inc., Presentation to Long-Range Planning Committee, November 27, 2007.

Table 10-11 Middle School Enrollment by Grade

Year	Total	Growth	5th to 6th	6		7		8
2002	4,158	130	37	1,376	23	1,385	22	1,397
2003	4,295	137	65	1,387	67	1,443	80	1,465
2004	4,250	-45	45	1,345	48	1,435	27	1,470
2005	4,115	-135	50	1,349	-11	1,334	-3	1,432
2006	4,092	-23	20	1,318	27	1,376	43	1,398
2007	4,052	-40	48	1,309	6	1,324	38	1,419

Source: Public Pathways, Inc., Presentation to Long-Range Planning Committee, November 27, 2007.

Table 10-12 High School Enrollment by Grade

	Total	Growth	8th to 9th	9		10		11		12
2002	5,060	228	263	1,554	-166	1,324	-158	1,185	-90	997
2003	5,261	201	239	1,636	-207	1,347	-121	1,203	-110	1,075
2004	5,326	65	290	1755	-271	1,365	-206	1,141	-138	1,065
2005	5,435	109	262	1,732	-279	1,476	-172	1,193	-107	1,034
2006	5,633	198	269	1,701	-214	1,518	-199	1,277	-56	1,137
2007	5,576	-57	171	1,569	-225	1,476	-218	1300	-46	1,231

* 9th Grade stabilizes at around 1,560 for the next three to four years and will cause some decline as the larger grades graduate.

Source: Public Pathways, Inc., Presentation to Long-Range Planning Committee, November 27, 2007.

Table 10-13 2008-2012 Forecast

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Elementary	8,163	8,183	8,246	8,338	8,483
Middle	4,037	4,069	4,103	4,121	4,161
High	5,562	5,501	5,425	5,498	5,511
Total	17,224	17,219	17,240	17,428	17,634

Source: Public Pathways, Inc., Presentation to Long-Range Planning Committee, November 27, 2007.


Table 10-14 Forecast 2013-2017

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Elementary	8,658	8,796	8,935	9,073	9,211
Middle	4,208	4,275	4,342	4,409	4,476
High	5,583	5,672	5,762	5,851	5,940
Total	18,450	18,744	19,038	19,332	19,626


Ten-year forecast is based on County population projections and assumes approximately 0.114 percent of the population in public schools.

Source: Public Pathways, Inc., Presentation to Long-Range Planning Committee, November 27, 2007.

Comparison to the State DOE COFTE forecast. In 2006, the State forecast little or no enrollment increases for Martin County based on trends established in 2004-2005. Graph 10-1and Graph 10-2 shows a comparison of COFTE to the Local Forecast.



Graph 10-2 2004-2017 Forecast



Source: Public Pathways, Inc., *Presentation to Long-Range Planning Committee,* November 27, 2007.

Conclusion. The local forecast indicates little or no growth in enrollment for the next five years and slow to moderate growth over the ten-year period from in-migration and increasing births. Small grades moving through the system will slow enrollment increases in the high schools for a couple of years but [will] pick up again beyond 2011.

Every year the forecasts are updated to reflect the most recent information—on births, housing, and grade level changes. The determination of patterns and trends, such as this year's enrollment decline are incorporated into this process.

(Ord. No. 2158-08, § 1, 5-12-2008)

Sec. 10.4. - Capacity and level of service.

An essential component of a school concurrency system is the level of service (LOS) standard or utilization at which a school is expected to operate. The LOS standard for public schools is based upon the capacity of the facility divided by enrollment. Levels of service standards for public school facilities serve several purposes:

- To guide long range projections of school facility needs.
- To assist with the determination of school facility needs over the five-year capital improvement time frame.
- To provide a basis for the review of petitions for final subdivisions and site plans for residential development.

Florida Inventory of School Houses (FISH) Capacity

"The number of students that may be housed in a facility (school) at any given time based on a utilization percentage of the number of existing satisfactory student stations", based on FDOE formulas.

It is a product of the number of classrooms at a school and gthe student stations assigned to each room type.

The capacity of some spaces is modified for actual square footage of the teaching space.

Teaching stations are defined as being 600 square feet or more with a teacher and students regularly assigned to the space.

No capacity is assigned to small instructional spaces and specialized labs including art, music, resource, etc.

10.4. A. *Capacity and campus master plans.* One of the most effective ways to improve student achievement and curb school violence is to reduce the size of the nation's schools. Hundreds of studies have found that students who attend small schools outperform those in large schools on every academic measure from grades to test scores. They are less likely to dropout and more likely to attend college.

Small schools also build strong communities. Parents and neighbors are more likely to be actively involved in the school. The students benefit from community support and the school in turn fosters connections among neighbors and encourages civic participation.

Often State and local policy makers prefer large schools because they are less expensive to operate on an annual per-pupil basis. In many States, such as Florida, education funding formulas provide a flat rate per pupil and make no adjustment for the higher costs of running a small school. This favors larger schools and pressures smaller ones to close. Such policies are short-sighted. Small schools may require higher levels of annual per-pupil funding, but they are far more cost effective. Small schools have higher graduation rates and, on a per graduate basis, they cost about the same or less than large schools.

The Martin County School District is evidence of the wisdom of smaller, more parent/community based schools in that the District is only one of two Florida school districts with all "A" performing schools and the lowest dropout rate and highest graduation rate of any Florida school district.

Recognizing the benefits of smaller schools, the School Board of Martin County adopted a maximum school size of 750 for elementary schools, 1,200 for middle schools and 1,800 for high schools. Master plans have been developed for each school campus for phased renovation and reconstruction that will comply with the caps where feasible.

Following this direction of the School Board and Superintendent, Martin County school capacities are based on the following:

1) Permanent FISH capacity (without portables);
2) Permanent FISH capacity adjusted for Title I schools' special programmatic needs;
3) Permanent FISH capacity adjusted to reflect the Board's long-term plans to cap school size, permanent capacity, at 750 for elementary schools, 1,200 for middle schools and 1,800 for high schools

To be efficiently run, a school's core capacity should match the number of students that is expected to be served. As a result of the Class Size Reduction (CSR) legislation, many of the District's schools appear to have available core capacity (defined as media centers, dining areas, administration and support spaces, and assembly spaces) that would support a classroom addition project. However, due to various constraints on-site expansions are not always feasible.

Level of Service Standard. The LOS standard for the Martin County School District is as follows:

(1) *Reserved.*

(2) *Elementary.*

Step 1. Aggregating the permanent capacity of all elementary schools within the CSA. For purposes of this analysis, "permanent capacity" for each elementary school (except for schools designated for receiving Title I assistance) shall mean 100 percent of the permanent existing satisfactory student stations planned to house students by the end of the third year of the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan (after applying the DOE utilization rate), capped at a total capacity of 750 student stations per school. For purposes of this analysis, "permanent capacity" for receiving Title I assistance shall mean 85 percent of the permanent existing satisfactory student stations planned to house students by the end of the third year of the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan (after applying the DOE utilization rate), capped at a total capacity of 750 student stations per school.

Step 2. Adding to the aggregate number of student stations determined above, the CSA's aggregate temporary capacity for elementary schools within the CSA. For purposes of this analysis, each CSA's elementary school "temporary capacity" shall mean the CSA's proportionate share of the number of student stations required on a district-wide basis to accommodate elementary school student enrollment which is 450

students more than the School Board's district-wide elementary school permanent capacity. Each CSA's proportionate share of such temporary capacity shall be determined by dividing 450 by the total number of elementary schools operating in the district, and then multiplying by the number of elementary schools operating in the CSA.

(3) *Middle.*

Step 1. Aggregating the permanent capacity of all middle schools within the CSA. For purposes of this analysis, "permanent capacity" for each elementary school (except for schools designated for receiving Title I assistance) shall mean 100 percent of the permanent existing satisfactory student stations planned to house students by the end of the third year of the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan (after applying the DOE utilization rate), capped at a total capacity of 1,200 student stations per school. For purposes of this analysis, "permanent capacity" for receiving Title I assistance shall mean 85 percent of the permanent existing satisfactory student stations planned to house students by the end of the third year of the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan (after applying the DOE utilization rate), capped at a total capacity of 1,200 student stations per school.

Step 2. Adding to the aggregate number of student stations determined above, the CSA's aggregate temporary capacity for middle schools within the CSA. For purposes of this analysis, each CSA's middle school "temporary capacity" shall mean the CSA's proportionate share of the number of student stations required on a district-wide basis to accommodate middle school student enrollment which is 720 students more than the School Board's district-wide middle school permanent capacity. Each CSA's proportionate share of such temporary capacity shall be determined by dividing 720 by the total number of middle schools operating in the district, and then multiplying by the number of middle schools operating in the CSA

(4) *High.*

Step 1. Aggregating the permanent capacity of all high schools within the CSA. For purposes of this analysis, "permanent capacity" for each high school shall mean 100 percent of the permanent existing satisfactory student stations planned to house students by the end of the third year of the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan (after applying the DOE utilization rate), capped at a total capacity of 1,800 student stations per school.

Step 2. Adding to the aggregate number of student stations determined above, the CSA's aggregate temporary capacity for high schools within the CSA. For purposes of this analysis, each CSA's high school "temporary capacity" shall mean the CSA's proportionate share of the number of student stations required on a district-wide basis to accommodate high school students until the School Board experiences district-wide high school student enrollment, which is 1,080 students more than the School Board's district-wide high school permanent capacity. Each CSA's proportionate share of such temporary capacity shall be determined by dividing 1080 by the total number of high schools operating in the district, and then multiplying by the number of high schools operating in the CSA.

(Ord. No. 2158-08, § 1, 5-12-2008)

Sec. 10.5. - Co-location and infrastructure needs.

Co-location and shared use of facilities are important to both the School District and the Local Governments. The School District will look for opportunities to co-locate and share use of school facilities and civic facilities when preparing the Educational Plant Survey. Likewise, co-location and shared use opportunities will be considered by the local governments when preparing the updates to their Comprehensive Plan, Schedule of Capital Improvements, and when planning and designing new or renovating existing, community facilities which may be compatible with schools. For example, opportunities for co-location and shared use may be considered for libraries, parks, recreation facilities, community centers, auditoriums, learning centers, museums, performing arts centers, and

stadiums. Coordinated planning for co-location and joint use will result in capital savings for the School District and Local Governments and create community focal points. Co-location and shared use of facilities are important tools in budgeting and community building for the School District and Local Governments.

Through the State's coordinated planning requirements for school concurrency, Local Governments and the School District are directed to recognize the benefits and opportunities realized through the sharing of facilities and costs to the greatest extent possible. The School District would benefit from joint use of parks in the vicinity of public schools, due largely to the Local Governments' parks and recreation departments dedication to promoting health and wellness, alternative leisure activities, community involvement through sports and special events for County residents.

Co-location is intended to provide efficient use of existing infrastructure and discourage sprawl. Identification early in a budget cycle and coordination among agencies will promote successful and effectively utilized public facilities. Cost effective co-location or joint use of School District or Local Government-owned property could provide substantial savings for existing and future public facilities.

Opportunities for co-location and joint use should be explored with the Local Governments' parks and recreation departments and the School District. As residential development proceeds in different areas of the County, opportunities for co-location and joint use should be incorporated into the planning of public facilities to serve the local communities.

10.5. A. Co-location. In the School District's adopted Five-Year Work Program for the 2007-08 school year four new schools were identified to maintain the District's level of service. These are shown in Table 10-15 below:

Table 10-15
Planned Schools

School	Approx. Opening	Capacity	Planned Location
Elementary "A"	2008	750	Palm City
Elementary "B"	2009	750	Indiantown
Elementary "C" [1]	2011	750	East Coast
High School "BBB" [1]	2013	1,800	West County
[1] The 2007-08 Five-Year school CIP was prepared and adopted before the 2007 October count. The October count showed an unexpected enrollment drop. These projects are expected to be delayed due to drop in enrollment.			

Only the location of Elementary A is known. The current matrices for co-location opportunities are listed in Table 10-16.

Table 10-16 Co-location Consideration Matrix

Geographic-Complementary Uses
Raw Score (1-5) Weight Factor (2)

Matrix 6	Proximity of existing/planned public park/rec. uses/sites (w/in 2-3 miles; after-school activities)	0 = Distant 5 = Close (existing + within first 5 years of adopted CIP)
Matrix 7	Proximity of existing/planned complementary public uses (library, community center, etc.) (within 2 miles)	0 = Distant 5 = Close (existing + within first 5 years of adopted CIP)
Matrix 8	Potential to co-locate with proposed school facility, public partnership/recreation use, or complementary public use.	0 = Not Able 5 = Able
	Max Points for this category = 40	

The matrix criteria 10-16 highlights sustainable community design. Sustainable community design promotes the location of schools that will enhance their role as community focus points. Table 10-17 lists the matrices for this category.

Table 10-17 Sustainability Considerations Matrix

Sustainable Community Design		
Raw Score (1-5)		
Matrix 10	Inclusion of site within adopted public sector plan (e.g., CRA or neighborhood plan)	0 = No Plan 5 = Within Plan Weight Factor = 4
Matrix 11	Inclusion of site within adopted private master plan	0 = No Plan 5 = Within Plan Weight Factor = 2
Matrix 12	Proximity to population centers	0 = Close 5 = Distant (MC TAZ) Weight Factor = 5
Matrix 13	Degree of triangulation	0 = Poor Triangulation 5 = Ideal Triangulation (Use SB Standard) Weight Factor = 4

Matrix 14	Opportunity to redevelop existing underutilized site/adaptive reuse	0 = No Redevelopment 5 = Full Redevelopment Weight Factor = 4
Matrix 15	Ability to maintain diversity of student population (reflect MC student demographics)	0 = Less Diverse; As Diverse (Existing condition - SB FL Schools Indicator Report) Weight Factor = 5
Matrix 16	Size of site as compared to technical standard	0 = Too Big or Small 5 = Optimal (NOTE: Technical standards; Elementary = 20; Middle = 40; High = 60) (Prerequisite minimums: Elementary = 10; Middle = 20; High = 35; SB to scale optimization)
	Max Points for this category = 140	

10.5. B. *Infrastructure needs.* The School Siting Matrix criteria also include evaluation of infrastructure needs. Table 10-18 lists the criteria and scoring factors.

Table 10-18 Infrastructure Considerations Matrix

Raw Score (1-5)		
Matrix 3	Existing/proposed condition of sidewalk network	0 = Need to build whole network 5 = Network ready (Existing within first 5 years of adopted CIP + within adopted private master plan) Weight Factor = 1
Matrix 20	Availability of water-line proximity	0 = Lines beyond 10 years in CIP 3 = Lines within 5 years in CIP 5 = Lines close/abutting property Weight Factor = 1

Matrix 21	Water plant capacity	0 = No plant capacity available 3 = Minimal capacity improvement needed 5 = Surplus capacity available Weight Factor = 2
Matrix 23	Sewer plant capacity	0 = No plant capacity available 3 = Minimal capacity improvements needed 5 = Surplus capacity available Weight Factor = 1
Matrix 24	Availability of storm water	0 = Lines beyond 10 years in CIP; no plant capacity available 3 = Lines within 5 years in CIP; minimal capacity improvements needed 5 = Lines close/abutting property; surplus capacity available Weight Factor = 2
Matrix 25	Transportation costs for School Board (amount of busing required)	0 = All busing 5 = Minimal busing Weight Factor = 5
Matrix 26	Acquisition complications (need for eminient domain, multiple ownership)	0 = Many 5 = Single-owner and no problems Weight Factor = 5
Matrix 27	Inclusion of site within Urban Service Boundary	0 = Outside 3 = Within secondary 5 = Within Urban Service Boundary Weight Factor = 5
	Max points for this category = 405	

Infrastructure needs are planned and coordinated as identified in the Interlocal Agreement for School Facilities Planning and Siting. Further discussion of infrastructure needs associated with proposed educational facilities are set out under Section 3.2.2. "Review of Work Program"

(Ord. No. 2158-08, § 1, 5-12-2008)

Sec. 10.6. - Concurrency service areas.


The Martin County School District has defined six geographic zones as Concurrency Service Areas (CSAs) for elementary and middle schools, and five for high schools. These service areas are established for the purpose of managing level of service standards for the county's public schools. Table 10-19 lists the CSAs and existing elementary and middle schools. Table 10-20 lists the CSAs and existing high schools.

The CSAs have been established to maximize available school capacity, taking into account transportation costs and district policies affecting student assignment.

Schools that do not have a specific geographic boundary have not been included in the Concurrency Analysis.

Table 10-19 Concurrency Service Areas Elementary and Middle School Membership

CSA # and Name	Elementary and Middle Schools
1: West County Zone	Warfield Elementary Indiantown Middle
2: Mid-County Zone	No schools at this time
3: North Zone	Felix A. Williams Elementary Jensen Beach Elementary
4: Palm City Zone	Bessey Creek Elementary Palm City Elementary Elementary "A" Hidden Oaks Middle
5: Stuart Zone	J.D. Parker Elementary Pinewood Elementary Port Salerno Elementary Stuart Middle
6: South Zone	Crystal Lake Elementary Hobe Sound Elementary Seawind Elementary Dr. David L. Anderson Middle Murray Middle



*Shows Charter Schools





Table 10-20 Concurrency Service Areas and High Schools

CSA # and Name	High Schools
1: West County Zone	No school at this time
2: North County Zone	Jensen Beach High

3: Palm City Zone	No school at this time
4: Stuart Zone	Martin County High
5: South Zone	South Fork High



Concurrency Service Area tables. These tables present current and projected enrollment through 2012/13. The District's elementary and middle schools have been organized into six geographic planning zones, and the high schools into five geographic planning zones based on their location in the District's Concurrency Service Areas (CSA).

The tables in the CSA zones show the 2007-08 level of service capacity, current enrollment for the 2007/08 school year, and the projected enrollment for school years 2008/09 through 2012/13 along with the projected utilization level. Schools that do not have a geographic boundary (Spectrum, Challenger) are not included in this analysis.

The information contained in this section is a tool used by the District to effectively manage enrollment and capacity, and to plan for future facilities to match the projected need.

Concurrency Analysis — ***West County Zone***

School	Concurrency Capacity	Actual 2007 / 2008 Enroll	Cap	LOS	2008 / 2009 Enroll	Cap	LOS	Projected 2009 / 2010 Enroll	Cap	LOS	2010 / 2011 Enroll	Cap	LOS	2011 / 2012 Enroll	Cap	LOS	2012 / 2013 Enroll	Cap	LOS
MS Reserve Capacity Indiantown		0			0	144		0	144		0	144		0	144		0	144	
Indiantown MS*	589	408	589	69%	411	589	70%	403	589	68%	404	589	69%	403	589	68%	417	589	71%
Middle Total	589	408	589	69%	411	733	56%	403	733	55%	404	733	55%	403	733	55%	417	733	57%
ES Reserve Capacity Indiantown		0			0	38		0	38		0	38		0	38		0	38	
Elementary B (Indiantown)																	0	750	
Warfield Elem.*	638	618	638	97%	629	638	99%	643	638	101%	680	638	107%	693	638	109%	762	638	119%
Elementary Total	638	618	638	97%	629	676	93%	643	676	95%	680	676	101%	693	676	103%	762	1426	53%

* Title One School Capacity at 85% **Concurrency Capacity is FISH Permanent Capacity capped by School Board policy LOS=Level of Service

Concurrency Analysis — *Palm City Zone*

School	Concurrency Capacity	Actual 2007 / 2008 Enroll	Cap	LOS	2008 / 2009 Enroll	Cap	LOS	Projected 2009 / 2010 Enroll	Cap	LOS	2010 / 2011 Enroll	Cap	LOS	2011 / 2012 Enroll	Cap	LOS	2012 / 2013 Enroll	Cap	LOS
HS Reserve Capacity Palm City		0			0	360		0	360		0	360		0	360		0	360	
South Fork High	1800	1964	1800	109%	1973	1800	110%	1943	1800	108%	1886	1800	105%	1915	1800	106%	1898	1800	105%
High Total	1800	1964	1800	109%	1973	2160	91%	1943	2160	90%	1886	2160	87%	1915	2160	89%	1898	2160	88%
MS Reserve Capacity Palm City		0			0	144		0	144		0	144		0	144		0	144	
Hidden Oaks Middle	1200	1119	1200	93%	1106	1200	92%	1179	1200	98%	1185	1200	99%	1205	1200	100%	1199	1200	100%
Middle Total	1200	1119	1200	93%	1106	1344	82%	1179	1344	88%	1185	1344	88%	1205	1344	90%	1199	1344	89%
ES Reserve Capacity Palm City		0			0	150		0	150		0	150		0	150		0	150	
Bessey Creek Elem.	589	752	589	128%	514	589	87%	507	589	86%	458	589	85%	492	589	84%	501	589	85%
Crystal Lake Elem.	620	733	620	118%	504	620	81%	503	620	81%	510	620	82%	526	620	85%	534	620	86%
Elementary A (Tuscawilla)					437	750	58%	437	750	58%	441	750	59%	441	750	59%	419	750	56%
Palm City Elem.	713	881	713	124%	856	713	120%	829	713	116%	809	713	113%	801	713	112%	814	713	114%
Elementary Total	1922	2366	1922	123%	2311	2822	82%	2276	2822	81%	2258	2822	80%	2260	2822	80%	2268	2822	80%

* Title One School Capacity at 85% **Concurrency Capacity is FISH Permanent Capacity capped by School Board policy LOS=Level of Service

Concurrency Analysis — *Hobe Sound Zone*

School	Concurrency Capacity	Actual 2007 / 2008 Enroll	Cap	LOS	2008 / 2009 Enroll	Cap	LOS	Projected 2009 / 2010 Enroll	Cap	LOS	2010 / 2011 Enroll	Cap	LOS	2011 / 2012 Enroll	Cap	LOS	2012 / 2013 Enroll	Cap	LOS
MS Reserve Capacity Hobe Sound		0			0	288		0	288		0	288		0	288		0	288	
Dr. David L. Anderson Middle	1200	901	1200	75%	931	1200	78%	946	1200	79%	961	1200	80%	979	1200	82%	994	1200	83%
Murray Middle	1033	750	1033	73%	776	1033	75%	761	1033	74%	761	1033	74%	750	1033	73%	750	1033	73%
Middle Total	2233	1651	2233	74%	1707	2521	68%	1707	2521	68%	1722	2521	68%	1729	2521	69%	1744	2521	69%
ES Reserve Capacity Hobe Sound		0			0	114		0	114		0	114		0	114		0	114	
Hobe Sound Elem.	750	711	750	95%	729	750	97%	745	750	99%	761	750	101%	760	750	101%	779	750	104%
Port Salerno Elem.*	638	660	638	103%	676	638	106%	685	638	107%	688	638	108%	687	638	108%	681	638	107%
Seawind Elem.	589	673	589	114%	690	750	92%	689	750	92%	698	750	93%	731	750	97%	741	750	99%
Elementary Total	1977	2044	1977	103%	2095	2252	93%	2119	2252	94%	2147	2252	95%	2178	2252	97%	2201	2252	98%

* Title One School Capacity at 85% **Concurrency Capacity is FISH Permanent Capacity capped by School Board policy LOS=Level of Service

Concurrency Analysis — *Stuart Zone*

School	Concurrency Capacity	Actual 2007 / 2008 Enroll	Cap	LOS	2008 / 2009 Enroll	Cap	LOS	Projected 2009 / 2010 Enroll	Cap	LOS	2010 / 2011 Enroll	Cap	LOS	2011 / 2012 Enroll	Cap	LOS	2012 / 2013 Enroll	Cap	LOS
HS Reserve Capacity Stuart		0			0	360		0	360		0	360		0	360		0	360	
Martin County High	1800	1951	1800	108%	1946	1800	108%	1953	1800	108%	1945	1800	108%	1985	1800	110%	1999	1800	111%
High Total	1800	1951	1800	108%	1946	2160	90%	1953	2160	90%	1945	2160	90%	1985	2160	92%	1999	2160	93%
MS Reserve Capacity Stuart		0			0	144		0	144		0	144		0	144		0	144	
Stuart Middle	1200	919	1200	77%	874	1200	73%	852	1200	71%	865	1200	72%	864	1200	72%	879	1200	73%
Middle Total	1200	919	1200	77%	874	1344	65%	852	1344	63%	865	1344	64%	864	1344	64%	879	1344	65%
ES Reserve Capacity Stuart		0			0	75		0	75		0	75		0	75		0	75	
Parker School of Science*	638	607	638	95%	621	638	97%	628	638	98%	634	638	99%	639	638	100%	643	638	101%
Pinewood Elem.	622	761	622	122%	747	750	100%	753	750	100%	747	750	100%	763	750	102%	772	750	103%
Elementary Total	1260	1368	1260	109%	1368	1463	94%	1381	1463	94%	1381	1463	94%	1402	1463	96%	1415	1463	97%

* Title One School Capacity at 85% **Concurrency Capacity is FISH Permanent Capacity capped by School Board policy LOS=Level of Service

(Ord. No. 2158-08, § 1, 5-12-2008)

Sec. 10.7. - Goals, objectives, and policies.

10.7. A. *Goal.* The City of Stuart shall coordinate with the School Board of Martin County to ensure public school facilities are of the highest quality and meet the needs of the County's existing and future population.

1. *Objective. To ensure public school facilities are maintained at the highest quality.*

   a. Policy: The City hereby adopts the LOS standards for public schools established in the Interlocal Agreement for School Facilities Planning and Siting and reflected in policy A.3.1 of the Capital Improvements Element.

   b. *Policy:* The City hereby adopts by reference the School Board's Concurrency Service Areas as established in the Interlocal Agreement for School Facilities Planning and Siting. Concurrency Service Areas may be altered from time to time via amendment of the Interlocal Agreement, but shall not necessitate an amendment to this plan.

   c. *Policy:* The School Board staff shall monitor each of the applicable levels of service within each concurrency service area to determine whether any deficiencies exist. In the event that one or more deficiencies are identified, the School Board shall initiate action to cure the deficiency by no later than the time of the next annual update of the Public School Facilities Element.

      (1) In the event that a Concurrency Service Area lacks a school, (Elementary, Middle School, High School) students residing within that CSA shall attend a school in an adjacent CSA.

   d. *Policy:* Level of service standards will be applied by Concurrency Service Area. Concurrency Service Areas shall be documented in the data and analysis documentation. The boundaries of the Concurrency Service Areas and any modifications shall be based on the consideration of the following criteria:

(1) Maximum utilization of school facilities;

(2) Future growth and demographic changes;

(3) Demographic/socioeconomic balance;

(4) Transportation costs;

(5) Minimizing the disruption to students and families related to attendance zone changes;

(6) Capacity commitments;

(7) The County's Urban Service Districts.

Modifications to the Concurrency Service Area boundaries may be made by the School Board, only after review and a reasonable opportunity for comment by the City and County.

2. *Objective. To ensure adequate capacity is available to accommodate projected development at the adopted level of service.*

   a. *Policy:* The City shall not approve any final site plans which include residential units until the receipt of a School Concurrency Review Report from the School District determining that adequate school capacity exists for the proposed development pursuant to the requirements of the Comprehensive plan and the Land Development Regulations.

   b. *Policy:* The City shall consider the following residential uses exempt from the requirements of school concurrency:

      (1) Single-family lots of record existing at the time the school concurrency ordinance becomes effective.

      (2) Any new residential development that has final site plan approval or the functional equivalent for a site specific development order prior to the commencement date of the School Concurrency Program.

      (3) Any amendment to any previously approved residential development that does not increase the number of dwelling units or changes the type of dwelling units (single-family to multifamily, etc.).

      (4) Age-restricted communities with no permanent residents under the age of 18. Exemption of an age-restricted community will be subject to a restrictive covenant limiting the age of permanent residents to 55 years and older.

   c. *Policy:* The City, through its Land Development Code, shall establish a school concurrency review process for all residential projects that are not exempt under Policy 10.4.A.2. The school concurrency review process shall conform to the process established in the Interlocal Agreement for School Facilities Planning and Siting.

   d. *Policy:* In the event that development would cause the applicable levels of service to be exceeded, then the City and the School Board shall review mitigation options in order to offset the impacts of a proposed development. Acceptable forms of mitigation may include:

      (1) The donation of funding for the construction and/or acquisition of school facilities sufficient to offset the demand for public school facilities to be created by the proposed development.

      (2) The creation of mitigation banking based on the funding of the construction of a public school facility in exchange for the right to sell excess capacity credits.

      (3) Charter schools may also be accepted by the School Board as mitigation under the provisions of this Agreement provided they meet the following operational and design standards:

         (a) The school has a charter approved by the School Board.

         (b) The charter school's facilities to be accepted as mitigation shall be built according to the SREF standards set forth in Florida Administrative Code.

         (c) The charter school's facilities to be accepted as mitigation adhere to the building policies and practices of the School Board, including but not limited to architecture, building materials, and structural hardening.

         (d)

The core facilities for all charter schools, including, but not limited to, cafeteria, media center, administrative offices, and land area available for recreational uses, parking areas, and storm water retention, shall be sized to accommodate the standard educational facility sizes established by policy of the School Board as follows:

Elementary school: 750 student stations;

Middle school: 1,200 student stations;

High school: 1,800 student stations.

(e) All charter schools shall be located along publicly-owned roadways and accessible to any member of the general public.

(f) Other mitigation as permitted by State law, including the donation of land and payment for land acquisition.

e. *Policy:* Within 30 days after the School District Staff receives a completed public school impact form for amendments to the Comprehensive Plan future land use map, rezonings, developments of regional impact, and master site plans which include residential units, the School District Staff shall provide the local government with a general capacity analysis which indicates the generalized capacity for all applicable school facilities. This analysis shall be used in the evaluation of the development proposals but shall not provide a guarantee of availability of services or facilities.

f. *Policy:* Upon receipt of a completed public school impact form for final site plans which include residential units, the School District Staff shall provide the local governments with a School Concurrency Review Report that States whether adequate school capacity exists for a proposed development, based on the LOS standards, CSAs, and other standards set forth in this Agreement, as follows:

(1) Calculate the aggregate Permanent Capacity and Temporary Capacity for each type of school facility within the CSA within which the project is proposed to be located, and the CSAs which are adjacent thereto. For purposes of this calculation, permanent and temporary capacities shall include the capacities of both existing school facilities, as well as those which are planned to be operational by no later than the conclusion of the third year of the School Board's Five Year Capital Improvement Plan. For purposes of this calculation, CSA's which are separated by rivers or other bodies of water shall only be deemed "adjacent" if connected by a publicly owned bridge accommodating vehicular traffic.

(2) Calculate available school capacity, by type of school and relevant CSA, by subtracting from the sums determined above:

(a) Current student enrollment (determined by the District's October count) for each type of school facility within the CSA within which the project is proposed to be located, and the CSAs which are adjacent thereto;

(b) Reserved capacity for student enrollment projected to be developed within three years from projects previously determined to have met school concurrency, and having met the requirements for a reservation of capacity for each type of school facility within the CSA within which the project is proposed to be located, and the CSAs which are adjacent thereto;

(c) The demand on school facilities created by the proposed development shall be projected at the county-wide student generation rates specified in the School District's latest Educational Impact Fee report, as the same may be amended from time to time upon request of the School Board; provided that projects granted educational impact fee waivers pursuant to County ordinance shall be deemed to generate no students.

The City shall approve final site plans, which include residential units, only after the receipt of a School Concurrency Review Report from the School District Staff determining that adequate school capacity exists for the proposed development pursuant to the requirements of the Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Regulations.

In the event that development would cause the applicable levels of service to be exceeded in the concurrency service area where the development is located, a positive concurrency evaluation may be granted if capacity exists in one or more contiguous school concurrency service areas.

g. *Policy:* In the event that a Concurrency Service Area lacks a school, (Elementary, Middle School, High School) students residing within that CSA shall attend a school in an adjacent CSA.

h. *Policy:* Any mitigation funds provided as a result of the school concurrency system shall be directed by the School Board toward a school capacity improvement identified in a financially feasible five-year district work plan and which satisfies the demands created by that development in accordance with a binding developer's agreement.

i. *Policy:* The City, in conjunction with the School District and the municipalities within the County, shall identify issues relating to public school emergency preparedness, such as:

(1) The determination of evacuation zones, evacuation routes, and shelter locations.

(2) The coordination of efforts to design and use schools as emergency shelters.

(3) The consideration of all facilities owned by a local governmental body and all charter schools for enhancement as public shelters.

(4) The designation of sites other than public schools as long-term shelters, to allow schools to resume normal operations following emergency events.

3. *Objective. To ensure all new public schools will be consistent with the FLU map designation, will have needed supporting infrastructure; and to encourage that new public schools will be co-located with other appropriate service facilities where possible.*

a. *Policy:* The City, in conjunction with the School District, shall jointly determine the need for and timing of on-site and off-site improvements necessary to support a new school.

b. *Policy:* No imposition of design standards, site plan standards or other development conditions that exceed or are inconsistent with [F.S.] ch. 1013 and State Requirements for Educational Facilities or that are inconsistent with maintaining a balanced, financially feasible district facilities work plan will be established unless mutually agreed.

c. *Policy:* The City, in conjunction with the School District and the County, shall identify issues relating to public school emergency preparedness, and target all facilities owned by a local governmental body and all charter schools for enhancement as public shelters.

d. *Policy:* The City and the School District will coordinate review of the School District's Long Range Public School Facilities Map to ensure it is consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map. The City and School Board will consider any necessary changes during its annual review specified in Policy 10.7A.5. Any changes to the School District's Long Range Public School Facilities Map that are required to ensure consistency with the Comprehensive Plan will be processed as a Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

4. *Objective. To ensure the Five-Year Capital Improvements Plan will include all necessary projects to address current and future needs.*

a. *Policy:* The City shall, no later than December 1 of each year, update the Public Schools Facilities Element to include an update to the financially feasible public schools capital facilities program and to coordinate the capital improvements program with the fiver district facilities work plan, the plans for other local

governments, and, as necessary, to update the concurrency service area map. The annual plan amendments shall ensure that the capital improvements program continues to be financially feasible and that the level of service standards will continue to be achieved and maintained.

b. *Policy:* The City, in conjunction with the School District, shall annually review the Public School Facilities Element and maintain a long-range public school facilities map series, including the planned general location of schools and ancillary facilities for the five-year planning period and the long-range planning period.

5. *Objective. The City in cooperation with the School Board shall annually review the Public Schools Facilities Element to ensure that it remains financially feasible.*

   a. *Policy:* Staff of the City, County and the School Board shall meet at least quarterly to discuss issues regarding coordination of land use and school facilities planning, including such issues as population and student projections, development trends, school needs, co-location and joint use opportunities, and ancillary infrastructure improvements needed to support schools and ensure safe student access.

   b. *Policy:* The elected boards of the City, County and the School District will hold semiannual joint meetings in the first and third quarters of each calendar year or as otherwise mutually agreed. A representative of the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council will also be invited to attend. The joint meetings will provide an opportunity for the representatives to hear reports, discuss policy, set direction, and reach understandings concerning issues of mutual concern regarding school budgets, coordination of land use and school facilities planning, including population and student growth, development trends, school needs, off-site improvements, joint use opportunities, school concurrency, and other school planning issues. The Superintendent, County Administrator and City Manager or their designees shall be responsible, on a rotating basis amongst the three entities, for making meeting arrangements and providing notification, including notice to the general public.

      (1) The first semiannual meeting shall occur after January 1 but within the first quarter of each year and generally include presentations as follows: (1) the City and County staff shall address population projections, summary of development activity, and large-scale development projects currently under review, and (2) the School District Staff shall address the most current Florida Department of Education ("DOE") Capital Outlay Full Time Equivalent ("CO-FTE") counts for each school grade, the fall student enrollment count by grade, any updates to the Five-Year Educational Plant Survey; Five-Year Work Program; and the School Board's Five Year Capital Improvement Plan.

      (2) The second semiannual meeting shall occur prior to September 1 but within the third quarter of each year and generally include presentations as follows: (1) the City and County staff shall address the draft capital improvements programs of each local government and large-scale development projects currently under review, and (2) the School District Staff shall address the Five Year Capital Improvement Plan for the pending year and the spring enrollment count by grade. Additionally, all staffs shall work collaboratively to present legislative updates as they relate to the topics addressed in this Agreement.

6. *Objective. The City and School Board will explore opportunities to co-locate and share use of school facilities and civic facilities, such as libraries, parks, recreation facilities, community centers.*

   a. *Policy:* Co-location and shared use opportunities will be considered by the City and School Board when preparing annual updates to their schedules of capital improvements and when planning and designing new, or renovating existing, community facilities.

   b. *Policy:* Where possible, commensurate with the School Board's acquisition of property for a school site, the City will be given an opportunity to consider simultaneously acquiring property for an adjoining park, library, recreation facility, or community center.

   c. *Policy:* Where possible, commensurate with the City's acquisition of property for a park, library, recreation facility, community center, auditorium, learning center, museum, performing arts center or stadium, the School Board will be given an opportunity to consider simultaneously acquiring property for an adjoining school site.

(Ord. No. 2158-08, § 1, 5-12-2008)