CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ELEMENT

CITY OF GROVELAND

LAKE COUNTY, FLORIDA

ADOPTED ON OCTOBER 18, 2010

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ELEMENT
TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 8
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ELEMENT

ANNUAL UPDATE OF THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ELEMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

A. INTRODUCTION

1. BACKGROUND AND HISTORY

The preparation of the annual update to the *Capital Improvements Element (CIE)* was conducted consistent with and following the guidelines prepared by the Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) in A Guide to the Annual Update of the *Capital Improvements Element*. Staff followed the guide to ensure compliance and consistency with the requirements of the Florida Statutes and the Florida Administrative Code.

There is often confusion about the difference between the *CIE* and the *Capital Improvements Program (CIP)*. In brief, the *CIE* is a required element of the *Comprehensive Plan* and is concerned with the capital improvement projects necessary to meet or maintain the adopted Level of Service (LOS) standards established in the *Comprehensive Plan* or to implement the Goals, Objectives, and Policies of the *Comprehensive Plan*. The *CIP* provides a schedule of all capital projects to be undertaken by the City, including the purchase of equipment and the construction of new governmental facilities and buildings.

The update of the *CIE* includes two parts: the Data and Analysis section and the *Schedule of Capital Improvements*. The Data and Analysis section includes an explanation of Level of Service (LOS) standards, the public facilities to be included in the report, an analysis of the existing and projected LOS for the planning period covered by the Schedule, a projection of future revenues and expenditures, and most importantly an analysis of the Schedule's financial feasibility.

The second section of the update is the *Capital Improvements Project Schedule (the Schedule)*. This is a table with information on every capital project necessary to meet or maintain the adopted LOS standards. Information such as a brief project description, the funding source, and the fiscal year for funding different phases of the project are also included in the Schedule. The Schedule establishes a link between the proposed improvements and the LOS standards established for the public infrastructure.

Chapter 163.3180, F.S., requires that all local governments shall maintain concurrency and establish LOS standards for the following public facilities:

1. Potable Water,
2. Wastewater,
3. Public Recreation and Open Space,
4. Transportation,
5. Drainage or stormwater,
6. Solid Waste, and
7. Public Schools (beginning in Dec. 1, 2008).

In 2005, the Florida Legislature enacted Senate Bill 360 (SB360). The legislation amended Chapter 163, F.S. to strengthen the relationship between the *CIE* and the statutory requirements to maintain LOS standards for public infrastructure. SB 360 requires the annual adoption of a financially feasible *CIE* schedule beginning on December 1, 2007. House Bill 7203, which was passed in May of 2007, delayed the submittal deadline for a financially feasible *CIE* to December 1, 2008. SB 360 also provided penalties for the failure to adopt an annual update to the *CIE*. These penalties are discussed in more detail in the next section.

The other requirements of Senate Bill 360 are as follows:

As of July 1, 2005,

- The annual *CIE* update requires only a single public adoption hearing and compliance review by the Department of Community Affairs (DCA). [Chapter 163.3177(3)(b)2., F.S.]

- The definition of financial feasibility was amended to mean that sufficient revenues are currently available or will be available from committed funding sources for the first 3 years or will be available from committed or planned funding sources for years 4 and 5, of a *5-year Capital Improvement Schedule* for financing capital improvements. These funding sources include, but are not limited to, ad valorem taxes, bonds, state and federal funds, tax revenues, impact fees, and developer contributions, which are adequate to fund the projected costs of the capital improvements identified in the comprehensive plan necessary to ensure that adopted level-of-service standards are achieved and maintained within the period covered by the *5-year Schedule of Capital Improvements*.

  Subsequent legislation amended the Chapter to state that for the purposes of transportation and school facilities, a *Comprehensive Plan* is deemed to be financially feasible if it can be demonstrated that the LOS standards will be achieved and maintained by the end of the planning period even if in a particular year such

improvements are not concurrent as required by Chapter 163.3180, F.S. [Chapter 163.3164(32), F.S.]

The schedule must include the Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) Transportation Improvements Program (TIP) to the extent that such improvements are relied upon to ensure concurrency and financial feasibility. [Chapter 163.3177(3)(a)6., F.S.]

A summary of de minimis records must be submitted with the annual CIE update. [Chapter 163.3180(6), F.S.]

A plan amendment is required to change the scheduled date of construction of a project. [Chapter 163.3177(3)(b)1., F.S.]

If a planned revenue source is used, the plan must include existing revenue sources that will be used if the referendum or other action does not secure the planned source. [Chapter 163.317793)(a)5., F.S.]

As of December 1, 2006,

The schedule must reflect proportionate fair-share projects for transportation. [Chapter 163.3180(16)(b)1., F.S.]

As of December 1, 2007,

The *CIP Schedule* must incorporate water supply projects 18 months after the Water Management District (WMD) updates the *Regional Water Service Plan (RWSP)*. [Chapter 163.3177(6)(c), F.S.]

As of December 1, 2008,

The *CIE* must include school projects consistent with the school district's work plan, a public school facilities LOS Standard, identify the concurrency service areas, and must identify the proportionate fair-share projects for schools. [Chapter 163.3180(13)(d)1., F.S.]

As of December 1, 2009

The annual update to the *CIE* need not comply with the financial feasibility requirement until December 1, 2011. Thereafter, a local government may not amend its future land use map, except for plan amendments to meet new requirements under this part and emergency amendments pursuant to s. 163.3187(1)(a), after December 1, 2011, and every year thereafter, unless and

until the local government has adopted the annual update and it has been transmitted to the state land planning agency. [Chapter 163.3177(3)(b)1., F.S.]

2. PROCESS FOR ANNUAL ADOPTION AND REVIEW

The purpose of the annual update is to maintain a financially feasible *5-year Schedule of Capital Improvements*. The *CIE* is a statement of budgetary policy and a planning document for capital expenditures and improvements for public use.

Section 163.3177 (3)(b), F.S. mandates that the *CIE* must be updated "on an annual basis". The adopted updated amendment must be received by the DCA by December 1 of each year. Chapter 163.3187(1)(f), F.S. exempts the annual update amendment from the twice-per year limitation on *Comprehensive Plan* amendments.

The statute allows a local government to amend the *CIE* up to three times per year: one as the annual update; and two times as part of the regular twice-per-year large scale amendment package. In addition, the *Schedule* and *CIE* may also be amended as part of an amendment that is adopted as an exception to the two times per year limitation; such as a DRI –related amendment.

Unlike other large-scale amendments, the *CIE* annual update may be adopted with only one public hearing. The local government sends the adopted *CIE* to DCA and DCA then publishes a Notice of Intent after conducting a compliance review. A local government has the option of submitting the *CIE* update as a proposed amendment (following the process for a large-scale amendment); however, the deadline for submitting an adopted *CIE* is still December 1.

Effective December 1, 2011, the failure to adopt an updated *CIE* will result in possible sanctions. One penalty is the prohibition on the local government from adopting *Future Land Use Map* amendments, except for amendments to meet new statutory requirements or emergency amendments. The second penalty is, the DCA's obligation to notify the Administration Commission (the Governor's Cabinet) of a local government's noncompliance which could result in the imposition of sanctions on the local government.

The Administration Commission is authorized to impose sanctions which may include:

- withholding infrastructure funds,
- ineligibility for revenue-sharing funds such as gas tax, cigarette tax, or half cent sales tax, and/or
- ineligibility for grant programs such as the Florida Small Cities Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) and the Florida Recreation Development Assistance Program (FRDAP). [Chapter 163.3184(11), and 163.3177(3)(c), F.S]

3. GENERAL COMPONENTS OF THE SCHEDULE

Rule 9J-5.016(4)(a), F.A.C., specifies the general components of the *Schedule*. In general, the Schedule must include those capital improvement projects for which the local government has fiscal responsibility. The *Schedule* must also include projects such as school facilities, certain transportation facilities funded by other agencies (FDOT, or County), and privately funded projects necessary to ensure that adopted LOS standards are achieved or maintained.

a. Time Period

The *Schedule* must be sub-divided into five one-year (fiscal year) periods. If the government has adopted a long-term (10 or 15-year period) *Transportation Concurrency Management System*, then the *Schedule* must address transportation facilities within the long-term concurrency management area for either a 10 or 15-year period. Local governments that have adopted an urban service boundary, must adopt a *10-year Facilities Plan* for the area within the *CIE*.

b. Project Description and General Location

The *Schedule* should include a brief general description of each project. The description must contain enough detail to demonstrate that the project is consistent with the facility needs identified in the other elements of the plan or in the data and analysis section of the *CIE*.

The *Schedule* should indicate the location of the project. Identifying the location of the project informs the community and landowners where infrastructure improvements are scheduled. If necessary, a map indicating the location of the capital improvements may be included as part of the update.

c. Consistency with Other Elements

The *Schedule* must include a demonstration of consistency with the individual elements of the *Comprehensive Plan*. One way to demonstrate such consistency is by citing the page number, table or policy in which the project is identified in another element of the plan as a deficiency, replacement project, or designed to meet a future need. [Rule 9J-5.016(4)(a)1b, F.A.C.]

When necessary to maintain consistency between plan elements and the *CIE*, an amendment may be made once in a calendar year outside of the twice per year limitations on *Comprehensive Plan* amendments when it is necessary to coincide with the adoption of the local government's budget and capital improvements program. [Chapter 163.3187(1)(f), F.S.]

d. Projects and Costs

A local government has discretion in establishing the types of projects that will be included in the *Schedule*. Rule 9J-5.003(12) defines "capital improvement" as physical assets "which are large scale and high in cost … generally nonrecurring and may require multiyear financing". The State has suggested that the definition of capital improvements for the purposes of the *Schedule* might be relative to the size of the total community budget. For example in a large community with hundreds of improvements, the minimum may be $100,000, while for a smaller community with few improvements, the minimum may be $10,000.

The *Schedule* must identify the cost for each project. For roadway facilities, FDOT is preparing guidelines for local governments to use in estimating costs. Local governments may develop and use their own cost estimates, but they must be justified. It is important to note that funding for right-of-way acquisition or Project Development and Environmental (PD&E) studies is not acceptable to meet concurrency because neither acquisition nor studies provide actual capacities. Only programmed construction phases will satisfy concurrency.

Under the recently adopted HB 7203, a *Comprehensive Plan* shall be deemed financially feasible for transportation and school facilities throughout the planning period addressed by the *Schedule* if it can be demonstrated that the level-of-service standards will be achieved and maintained by the end of the planning period even if in a particular year such improvements are not concurrent as required by Chapter 163.3180, F.S.

e. Revenue Sources

The revenue sources that will be used to fund each project must be identified in the *Schedule*. The supporting data and analysis needs to identify "existing funding sources" and include a projection of the amount of revenue expected to be collected from existing sources and other revenue sources.

Revenue sources could include any source that can be used to fund capital projects, including ad valorem taxes, bonds, state and federal funds or grants including FDOT funding, tax revenues, impact fees, and developer contributions.

In order for the *Schedule* to be financially feasible, the supporting data and analysis must demonstrate that sufficient revenues are available or will be available from "committed funding sources" to fund the projects included in the first three (3) years of the *Schedule*. Projects in year 4 and 5 may be funded from sources that are either "committed" or "planned".

f. "Committed" versus "Planned" Funding Sources

A "committed funding" source is one which is available for and dedicated to financing capital improvements included in the *Schedule* and is based on expected revenues from an existing source. Rule 9J-5.003(29), F.A.C. notes that a currently available revenue source is "…an existing source and amount of revenue presently available to the local government. It does not include a local government's present intent to increase the future level or amount of a revenue source which is contingent on ratification by public referendum." Thus, "committed funding source" means that expected revenues from an existing revenue source have been dedicated to funding the capital improvements included in the *Schedule*. A developer's contribution becomes a committed funding source when it is included in a legally binding agreement.

A "planned funding" source is one that is not currently available to the local government to use to fund capital projects. Chapter 163.3177(3)(a)5, F.S. states that a planned revenue source is one which requires "… referenda or other actions to secure the revenue source." Examples of these include grants or the issuing of bonds based on referenda. A local government must demonstrate that a source is planned by adopting in the *CIE* a reasonable strategy that will be pursued to secure the revenue source. For example, the strategy could commit the local government by a certain date to initiate the referendum process or submit a grant application.

Chapter 163.3177(3)(a)5, F.S. requires that the plan must identify other existing revenue sources that will be used to fund the capital projects or otherwise amend the plan in the event a "planned" funding source does not secure the planned revenue.

g. Grants as a Funding Source

Grants may be used to fund *CIE* projects. When reporting grants as a funding source it is necessary to identify the specific grant program to be used, the amount of the grant, and the funding source of any required local match. Depending on the status of a grant application, grants may be a "committed" or "planned" funding source. Grants which have been approved may be used as "committed funding" source for any of the five years of the *CIE Schedule*. However, grants which have not been approved may not be used to fund projects in years 1, 2, or 3 of the *Schedule*, the grant may only be considered as a "planned funding" source for years 4 and 5 of the *Schedule*.

4. PROJECTS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE SCHEDULE

The projects to be included in the *Schedule* must include all the capital projects necessary to achieve and maintain the LOS standards, reduce existing deficiencies, provide for necessary replacements, and meet future demands during the time period covered by the *Schedule*. [Rule 9J-5.016(1)(a), F.A.C.].

The *Schedule* may include other facilities related to locally approved concurrency, or facilities not required to address either state-required or locally approved concurrency. In general, the *Schedule* need only include projects for which the local government has fiscal responsibility. However, the *Schedule* must include certain public and privately funded projects for which the government does not have fiscal responsibility. These could include: (1) Water supply projects, (2) public schools, (3) MPO's TIP, and (4) developer funded projects necessary to maintain LOS standards.

The annual update of the *CIE* must demonstrate that the *Comprehensive Plan* contains adequate strategies for achieving and maintaining adopted LOS standards. The annual update should include an assessment of the current operating conditions of the seven (7) concurrency-related facilities to identify current deficiencies and a projection of future operating conditions to identify needed capital improvements.

a. Projects to Achieve and Maintain LOS standards

As previously stated, the *Schedule* must address the facility needs identified in the other elements of the plan for which LOS Standards must be adopted; these are the facilities for which concurrency is required. The concurrency facilities are: (1) Sanitary sewer, (2) Potable Water, (3) Drainage or stormwater, (4) Solid waste, (5) Parks and recreation, (6) Transportation facilities, including mass transit, and (7) Public Schools (beginning in Dec. 1, 2008). [Chapter 163.3180(1)(a), F.S.].

b. Projects to Reduce Existing Deficiencies

In addition to projects to achieve and maintain LOS standards, the *Schedule* must also include projects to reduce existing deficiencies. A deficiency is a facility or service that is operating below the adopted LOS standard. The update should include supporting data and analysis to identify the facilities operating below the adopted LOS standard. If the annual update demonstrates that LOS standard will not be met during the five year planning period, then the local government must adopt either a long-term concurrency management system or planning strategies to address these deficiencies.

c. Replacement Projects

The *Schedule* must include projects that are needed as "replacement" for facilities that wear out or are obsolete. Such projects may include facilities that have are malfunctioning or are constantly out of service such that the facility is unable to meet the demand for services.

d. Projects to Meet Future Demand

The updated *Schedule* must include projects to meet future demand. Such projects should be identified in the data and analysis section of each element. The basic concurrency requirement included in the statute [Chapter 163.3202(2)(g), F.S.] states that facilities must be "available when needed". The exact definition varies from facility to facility. The function of the *Schedule* is to time the construction of capital projects so that they are available when needed.

The following discussion defines "available when needed" for each type of concurrency:

Sanitary sewer, solid waste and drainage [Rule 9J-5.0055(3)(a), F.A.C.]

- At the time of issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy (CO), the necessary facilities are in place, or
- At the time of issuance of Development Order (DO), the necessary facilities are guaranteed in an enforceable development agreement to be in place at the time of issuance of CO.

Potable Water [Rule 9J-5.0055(3)(a), F.A.C.)]

- Potable water facilities must be available as described in Section A. 1, above and prior to approving a building permit the local government must check with its water supplier to verify that adequate water supplies will be available no later than the anticipated date of issuance of a CO. [Chapter 163.3180(s)(a), F.S.]
- If the local government is located in an area for which the water management district (WMD) has prepared a *Regional Water Supply Plan (RWSP)*, the *Potable Water sub-element* must incorporate the water supply projects chosen by the local government from those identified in the *RWSP* or proposed by the local government to meet projected demand within the area served by the local government.

In addition the *Potable Water sub-element* must include a 10-year water supply facilities work plan for building needed facilities. The first five years of the

adopted work plan must be included in the *Schedule*. [Chapter 163.3177(6)(c), F.S.]

Recreation and Open Space: The statute distinguishes between open space and outdoor recreation acreage and the actual facilities constructed on such land. [Chapter 163.3180(2)(b), F.S.]

- Before a local government can issue a CO, the acreage for needed park and recreation facilities must be dedicated or acquired by the local government. If developer fair share funds are to be used to acquire the acreage, then these funds must be committed before the local government can grant approval to begin construction.
- The actual facilities needed to serve new development must be in place or under actual construction no later than one (1) year after the local government issues a CO. The *Schedule* should be constructed so that the local government is able to meet both these tests and avoid denying COs. The list of park and recreation facilities in the Schedule must be consistent with the supporting data and analysis in the *Recreation and Open Space Element.*

Public Schools: Beginning December 1, 2008, the *CIE* must address public school facilities needed to ensure concurrency. Under House Bill 7203, passed in May 2007, a *Comprehensive Plan* shall be deemed financially feasible for school facilities throughout the planning period addressed by the capital improvements schedule if it can be demonstrated that the LOS standards will be achieved and maintained by the end of the planning period even if in a particular year such improvements are not concurrent by Chapter 163.3180, F.S.

- General: Unless exempt, local governments must adopt public school facilities elements on a phased schedule, but no later than December 1, 2008. The following items must be submitted as an amendment to the *CIE* at the same time as the submittal of the school element: public school LOS standards per Chapter 163.3180(13)(b)2, F.S.; and a financially feasible public school capital facilities program per Chapter 163.3180(13)(d)1., F.S.
- Concurrency Test: Adequate school facilities must be in place or under actual construction within three (3) years after issuance of final subdivision approval or site plan approval. [Chapter 163.3180(13)(e), F.S.].
- Supporting Data and Analysis and Goals, Objectives and Policies: the supporting data and analysis and the goals, objectives and policies in the *Pubic School Facilities Element* (Chapters 163.3177(12)(c) and (i), F.S. and Rule 9J-5.025, F.A.C.) must address correction of existing deficiencies and ensure adequate school capacity for the five year and long

range planning time frames and include options for proportionate share mitigation of impacts on public school facilities.

- Funding: In addition to the traditional state and local sources of funding, school facilities can be funded using developer contributions through a proportionate share mitigation program, if the developer executes a legally binding commitment to provide such proportionate share mitigation.
- List of School Projects: Since the *Schedule* must address facilities for which concurrency standards have been adopted, the Schedule must include the projects in the School District's *5-year Work Plan*. This can be done through incorporation by reference. When incorporated by reference, the local government must supply a copy of the *Work Plan* to the Department consistent with Rule 9J-5.005(2)(g), F.A.C. Funds collected under the proportionate share program must be directed to school facilities included in the School District's *5-year District Work Plan*. Chapter 163.3180(13)(e)3., F.S.
- Long-Range School Planning: A local government may adopt a long range (up to 10 years) *School Concurrency Management System* within a specifically designated area or areas where significant backlogs exist. The 10-year *Schedule* must be adopted and include projects to correct existing deficiencies and address backlogged schools. Chapter 163.3180(9)(a), F.S. A local government may adopt a 15 year *School Concurrency Management System* with the concurrence of the Department as provided for in Chapter 163.3180(9)(b), F.S. In this case, the schedule would be for 15 years.
- Proportionate Share: Chapter 163.3180(13)(e), F.S., contains proportionate share provision that applies to public school facilities: "Any proportionate-share mitigation must be directed by the school board toward a school capacity improvement identified in a financially feasible *5-year District Work Plan* and which satisfies the demands created by that development in accordance with a binding developer's agreement." Since the proportionate-share mitigation must be in a financially feasible *5-year District Work Plan*, it must also be in the *Capital Improvements Element*. [Chapter 163.3180(13)(d)1., F.S.].

Transportation Facilities (Including mass transit): A *Comprehensive Plan* is financially feasible for transportation facilities if it can be demonstrated that LOS standards will be achieved and maintained by the end of the planning period even if in a particular year such improvements are not concurrent as required by Chapter 163.3180, F.S.

- Concurrency Test: Transportation facilities needed to serve new development must be in place or under actual construction within three (3) years after the local government issues a building permit. [Chapter 163.3180(2)(c), F.S.].

- List of projects: The *Schedule* must include projects on which the local government has relied or intends to rely for concurrency purposes. The *Schedule* need not include costs related to project planning and design since this phase of a project does not add roadway capacity and cannot be used to satisfy concurrency.
- Right-of-way acquisition projects can be included in the *Schedule* as one component of the total cost of a project. If a right-of-way acquisition project is included in the *Schedule*, the *Schedule* must also include the construction phases of the project.

Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Projects: The *Schedule* must include transportation improvements included in the first five years of the applicable MPO's *Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)* adopted pursuant to Chapter 339.175(7), F.S., to the extent that such improvements are relied upon to ensure concurrency and financial feasibility. See Chapters 163.3177(3)(a)6, F.S. and 339.155, F.S. The *Schedule* must also be coordinated with the applicable MPO's long range transportation plan adopted pursuant to Chapters 339.175(6), F.S., and 163.3177(3)(a)6., F.S.

Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Projects: The local government must adopt LOS Standards for SIS facilities that are consistent with FDOT standards [Chapter 163.3180(10), F.S.]. Projects needed to maintain the Standards must be included in the Schedule. MPO's are required to update their *TIP* every summer (July 1) and to include all regional/county projects in the new five-year work plan.

- Proportionate-share: As referenced in Chapter 163.3180(16)(b)1., F.S., a developer may choose to satisfy all transportation concurrency requirements by contributing or paying proportionate fair-share mitigation if transportation facilities or facility segments identified as mitigation for traffic impacts are specifically identified for funding in the *5-year Schedule of Capital Improvements* or if contributions for such facilities or segments are incorporated in the next update of the *5-year Schedule of Capital Improvements Element*.

- De Minimis Report Requirement: A de minimis impact is an impact that affects no more than 1% of the maximum service volume at the adopted LOS standard. Development which causes only a de minimis impact is not subject to traffic concurrency. However, total traffic volume should not exceed 110% of the maximum service volume at the adopted LOS standard. Local governments must maintain records to ensure that the 110% criterion is not exceeded.

The annual update of the *CIE* must demonstrate that the 110% criterion has not been exceeded or, if it has been exceeded, that the impacted roadway is scheduled

for improvement in the *Schedule*. No de minimis exceptions may be granted on roadways where the 110% criterion is exceeded until such time as the volume of the roadway is reduced below 110%. A single family home on an existing lot of record will always constitute a de minimis impact regardless of the level of deficiency.

5. FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY

The *Schedule* must be demonstrated to be financially feasible. The statute allows the local government to use any professionally acceptable method to demonstrate that its *Schedule* is financially feasible. [Chapter 163.3177(2), F.S.].

In general terms, a plan is financially feasible if committed revenues are projected to be sufficient to pay for the projects included in the first three years of the *Schedule* and planned revenues are sufficient to pay for projects in years 4 and 5.

a. Supporting Data and Analysis

The update of the *CIE* must include Data and Analysis to demonstrate that the *Schedule* is financially feasible. If necessary other elements of the *Comprehensive Plan* must be updated to maintain internal consistency between plan elements.

The forecast of expenditures should include an analysis of the costs and an explanation of the basis of the cost estimates. Data and analysis should include an inventory of existing revenue sources and a forecast of revenues for the next five years. For roadway and schools, the analysis must include a forecast of revenues from proportionate share contributions from developers.

Projections of revenues should include consideration of:

a) past trends in impact fee revenues;
b) reasonable estimates of future building permit activities;
c) estimates of entitlements that have been approved, but not yet permitted; and
d) new revenue sources.

b. Demonstration of Financial Feasibility

As required by Rule 9J-5.016(2)(f), F.A.C., it must be demonstrated that sufficient funds are available or will be available from committed funding sources to fund all identified capital improvements during the first three years of the Schedule. If after subtraction of all other expenses of the local government, projected revenues exceed projected expenditures, then sufficient funds are available.

Sufficient funds must also be available to fund the projects scheduled for construction in years 4 and 5 of the *Schedule*. However, such funds may include planned (reasonably estimated to be available from an anticipated revenue source) as well as committed sources of funds.

If the schedule includes planned revenue sources that require referenda or other action to secure revenue source, the plan must identify alternative revenue sources that will be used to fund the project in the event the referenda are not passed or other actions to secure the planned revenue source do not succeed.

If capital improvements are to be funded by a developer, financial feasibility shall be demonstrated by being guaranteed in an enforceable development agreement or interlocal agreement.

B. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS INVENTORY

1. Need Derived from Other Elements

The analysis documented in the preceding comprehensive plan elements have identified facility improvements needed to meet the existing service deficiencies and those needed to meet the demands of future growth.

The City does not provide public education services. Public education in Lake County is a function of the elected Lake County School Board. Groveland Elementary and Cecil E. Gray Middle School are the only public schools located in the City. The South Lake High School is adjacent to the City limits on Silver Eagle Road. There are 12 Lake County public schools within 5 miles of Groveland. The Cecil E. Gray Middle School recently underwent a $38 million complete renovation. There are no new public school facilities planned in the City during the short-range (2011-2015) and long-range (2025) planning period. Appendix B of the *Public School Facilities Element* features the concurrency service areas for the public schools in Lake County. [9J-5.016 (1)(b), F.A.C.]

The State Department of Children and Families (DCF) determines the need for new health care facilities with a formula based on occupancy rates, historic use by age group, and population projections by age group. Although the City currently has no full-service hospitals, there is the South Lake Hospital located about 4 ½ miles east in the City of Clermont that serves the Groveland area. The nearest Emergency Medical Service stations are located about 1.3 miles east of the City in the City of Clermont on Chestnut Street and about 2 miles west of City in the City of Mascotte on South Carol Avenue (see the City's *Public Health Care Facilities and EMS Map*). [9J-5.016 (1)(b), F.A.C.]

Individual capital improvement needs identified in this *Element* are, for the most part, those improvements, which cost $1,500 or more and are generally non-recurring purchase items. The capital improvements identified in the other elements of this *Comprehensive Plan* are listed with a brief description in the City's *5-year Schedule of Improvements* along with their estimated costs and projected year of expenditure. As required by Section 9J-5.016, F.A.C., the *Capital Improvements Element* addresses existing and future capital improvements needed for at least the first five fiscal years after the adoption of the *Comprehensive Plan*. Therefore, the City's *5-year Schedule* lists improvements identified for the years 2010 - 2014. [9J-5.016 (2)(c), F.A.C.]

It should be noted that the capital improvement projects contained in the City's *5-year Schedule* of Improvements are not inclusive of all the anticipated capital expenditures by the City during the planning period. The City's *5-year Schedule* is limited only to those major components identified by the preceding elements of the City's *Comprehensive Plan* in order to analyze development impacts and trends at a level of detail which is both manageable and fairly accurate. [9J-5.016 (2)(c), F.A.C.]

The cost estimates for the capital improvements indicated in this *Element* were developed using standard engineering practice regarding construction costs, in conjunction with information derived from actual construction costs of similar projects, certified bid documents on similar projects, and engineering cost estimates conducted on similar projects.

2. Existing Financial Resources

The first step in planning capital improvements, as well as arranging the necessary financing through the budgeting process, is to inventory the major sources of funding available to the City. These major sources of funding are expected to contribute a total revenue sum of $2,334,786 in fiscal year 2010. The revenue sources listed below comprises a working inventory for which the City's ability to fund the needed capital improvements will be assessed. In addition, the current status of each revenue source currently used by the City is indicated. It is important to note that the list below includes all of the major financial resources available to the City and is not limited to the funds which will be used for the capital improvement projects identified in the *5-year Schedule of Improvements* included in this *Element*. These currently utilized financial resources comprise, in part, the revenue sources which will be used to fund the identified capital improvements projects.

3. Local Revenue Sources

a. Property Taxes (Ad Valorem)

Property taxes are normally based on a millage rate (i.e. one mill equates to $1 per $1,000 of assessed value, or .1%), which is then applied to the taxable value of all

real property, as well as all other tangible personal property. The revenue from ad valorem taxes may be used to fund both operating costs and capital projects, unless prohibited by local policies. Provisions at the State level exist for raising the millage rate above the 10-mill cap set by local referendum for debt service or provision of municipal-type services within the City.

CURRENT STATUS: The City's current millage rate for the General Revenue Fund is set at approximately 5.1800 mills. The expected tax yield for fiscal year 2010 is $2,334,786.

b. Public Utility or User Charges

The revenue from these charges is generated primarily as a result of the rates charged to Town residents of utilization of City-owned utilities such as water, drainage, and solid waste removal/disposal. Revenue from these operations include user fees, miscellaneous customer service charges, and interest income.

CURRENT STATUS: The expected public utility revenue for fiscal year 2010 is estimated to be approximately $5,822,100.

c. Public Service or Utility Tax

A municipality may levy a tax on the purchase of electricity, metered or bottled gas, water, cable television, and telecommunication services. The tax may be levied upon only the purchases within the municipality and may not exceed ten (10) percent of the applicable payments received by the seller of the taxable item from the purchaser of the purchase of such service.

CURRENT STATUS: The City currently charges a public service or utility tax on the previously mentioned applicable and available utility services, with the exception of cable television services. The City presently charges 68 percent of revenues for electricity, gas and water, and none of the revenues for telecommunications.

d. Special Source of Revenue

Additional funding mechanisms are sometimes required due to the availability of existing revenue sources and/or the project priorities assigned by the City Council. The options available to the City regarding alternate sources of revenue for funding capital improvement projects are listed below.

1) **System Development of Impact fees.** Fees which are charged in advance of new development to pay for infrastructure needs, but not operating costs, resulting directly from the new development. The fees

must be equitably allocated to the specific group(s) which directly benefit from the capital improvements. In addition, the assessment levied must fairly reflect the true cost of the capital improvements.

CURRENT STATUS: The City currently charges impact fees for water, wastewater, police, fire, recreation, and administration. Approximately $294,000 in impact fee revenues (including interest income on fund balances) are expected to be generated during fiscal year 2010.

e. Special Assessment

Similar to impact fees, special assessments are charged to residents, agencies or areas who directly benefit from the provision of a new service or facility by the City. For example, the construction of a gravity sewer system for an existing neighborhood may be financed through a special assessment to the neighborhood's individual homeowners rather than through a revenue fund of the City. The requirement that all of the City's residents fund the new sewer system through a City revenue source is not considered equitable.

CURRENT STATUS: The City currently does not have any special assessments.

f. Borrowing

Occasionally, many local governments are required to resort to borrowing funds to pay for capital improvements due to their extremely high cost. Usually, either long-term or short-term financing is used to provide these funds. The short-term financing option is normally handled by local banks and is used to raise the required revenue for periods of one to five years. The more customary method is to authorize long-term bond issues, which range in length from five to thirty years.

Listed below are several types of bond issues available to the City.

1) **General Obligation Bonds.** These are bonds which are backed by the full faith and credit of the local government, and are required to be approved by a voter referendum. Since these bonds are secured by the taxing power of government, they generally offer lower interest rates than other bonds. The revenues collected from ad valorem taxes on real estate, as well as other sources of revenue are used to service the government's debt. General obligation bonds should be used to fund capital improvements which benefit the whole City rather than specific areas or groups of citizens.

CURRENT STATUS: The City currently has two outstanding general obligation bonds: Public Safety Land and Administration Facility Land. The City only has principal and interest payments on both obligation bonds.

2) **Revenue Bonds.** The revenue obtained from the issuance of these bonds is normally used to finance publicly owned facilities such as water treatment and wastewater treatment facilities. The charges collected from the users of the facilities are used directly to retire the bond obligations. This basically allows the capital project to be self-supporting. It should be noted that the interest rates generally tend to be higher than those of general obligation bonds. Also, the issuance of the bonds may be approved by the City Council without a voter referendum.

CURRENT STATUS: The City has issued several revenue bonds to fund the improvements to its water and wastewater facilities. The bond revenues are deposited into Enterprise Trust Fund accounts for each of the utilities, from which funds are specifically earmarked for a particular project. User charges are then used to service the debt. The total annual debt service on these bonds is as follows:

Debt Services	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
USDA Sewer	$225,878	$225,878	$225,878	$225,878	$225,878
USDA Sewer	$ 99,800	$ 99,800	$ 99,800	$ 99,800	$ 99,800
USDA Sewer	$ 85,600	$ 85,600	$ 85,150	$ 85,600	$ 85,600
USDA Sewer	$ 29,950	$ 29,450	$ 29,950	$ 29,400	$ 29,850
USDA Water	$ 59,600	$ 59,350	$ 59,050	$ 58,700	$ 59,300
USDA Water	$ 9,900	$ 9,700	$ 10,500	$ 10,250	$ 10,000
SRF Sewer	$ 89,211	$ 89,211	$ 89,211	$ 89,211	$ 89,211

3) **Industrial Revenue Bonds.** This type of bond, though issued by a local government, is actually assumed by companies or industries that use these funds to construct facilities. The low interest rates associated with this type of bond (due to their tax exempt status) makes it particularly attractive to industry. The advantages to the local government is that the private sector is responsible for the retirement of the debt and that the new employment opportunities are created in the community.

CURRENT STATUS: The City has not issued any Industrial Revenue Bonds.

4. State Sources

The City also depends on annual disbursements from State government to supplement its revenue sources. The revenue sources discussed above represent those funds generated by Town levies which may be collected and disbursed at the local level. The revenue sources discussed in this section represent those funds which are:

(1) generated locally, but collected and later reimbursed to the City by the State;
(2) adopted as a local option tax or license fee, collected and reimbursed by the State; or
(3) shared by the State in the form of grants to the local government, but originate from State general revenues. The amounts available from these sources may vary widely from year to year depending on legislative actions.

a. Revenue Sharing Trust Fund

This component of revenue consists of 71.02 percent of sales and use tax collections and 28.98 percent of the State alternative fuel use decal fee collections. The sales and use tax collections were substituted for the cigarette tax revenues that previously were used for this fund by the Florida Legislature. The municipal fuel tax funds are restricted for transportation related expenditures.

CURRENT STATUS: The City anticipates receiving $107,000 from this revenue source in the fiscal year 2010. Of this revenue, 71.02% comes from the sales and use tax collections and 28.98 percent comes from the user decal fee collections.

b. Other Shared Revenue

This category of revenue sources includes several major financial resources which, like the Revenue Sharing Trust Fund, are shared between local and State government agencies.

The following taxes and licensing fees generate a large portion of the total annual revenue for the City's General Fund.

1) **Sales Tax** – The current sales tax in the State is 6%, and is levied on retail sales, and such things as commercial rentals, admission fees to entertainment facilities, and motor vehicle sales. The collection is returned to the counties and municipalities in accordance with specific formulae. The variables of the formulae, in the case of towns, include the population of the municipality, as well as the total and unincorporated population of the County.

CURRENT STATUS: The City's portion of the State sales tax is expected to amount to approximately $70,000 in fiscal year 2010, which represents 1% of the City's General Fund revenue budget for that year.

c. Mobile Home Licenses

Mobile Home licenses currently range from $31.60 to $86.60, depending on what time length is established in the rate structure. Each city or town in the State shares in the allocation of the revenues from this source based on the number of units located in the city or town. The city or town in turn shares a portion of the revenue with the local school board. This has proven to be a relatively stable revenue source over time.

CURRENT STATUS: The City's share of this revenue source estimated for fiscal year 2010 amounts to approximately $5,000 which represents less than 1% of the General Fund revenue budget.

d. Local Option Taxes

Currently, there are four (4) possible sources of revenue available to the City within this category. All of the funds are generated locally, but the funds are collected and disbursed by the Florida Department of Revenue. The City currently shares in only two (2) of these revenue sources.

CURRENT STATUS: The City's share of this revenue source estimated for fiscal year 2010 is approximately $25,000 (County Recycling $2,000 and County One-cent Gas Tax $23,000), which amounts to less than 1% of the City's 2010 General Fund revenues.

e. Alcoholic Beverage License

The Division of Alcoholic Beverages and Tobacco for the State of Florida administers the issuance of licenses associated with the sale and/or consumption of alcoholic beverages. The State collects in excess of $37 million annually from this fee. Of this amount, a portion is returned to counties and municipalities as a State shared revenue.

CURRENT STATUS: The City's share of this revenue source is anticipated to amount to approximately $2,000 in fiscal year 2010 which is less than 1% of the City's General Fund revenues.

f. Other Sources of Shared Revenues

The City also receives other shared revenues from both the County and other government agencies. These revenues include the County Business Tax Receipt fees, the County half-cent sales tax, and the Agency Sharing – ALS.

CURRENT STATUS: The City's share of these revenues for the fiscal year 2010 is anticipated to amount to:

a.	County Business Tax Receipt Fees:	$ 6,000
b.	Half-cent Sales Tax	$ 300,000
c.	Agency Sharing - ALS	$ 47,000
	Total	$ 353,000

The sum of these revenue sources amounts to less than 5% of the City's fiscal year 2010 General Fund revenues.

5. Federal and State Grants and Loans

The system by which Federal general revenue sharing was formerly provided (U.S. State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972) has been substantially modified. The Federal funds are now available through allocations to the state agencies which administer and monitor block grants or disbursed by federal agencies as block grants directly to state and local agencies, as well as other eligible organizations and individuals. The purpose of the block grants program is to allow recipients greater freedom in the actual funds, though the funds must still be used for projects in specific categories. Since these funds require the competitive applications be submitted in order to receive an allocation, the grant monies are usually non-recurring and cannot accurately be projected for annual budgeting purposes.

A partial list of available Federal grant sources is shown in Figure 1. Other grants and loans are administered at the state level, with state executive departments acting as "pass-through agencies" for federally funded projects. The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) is an example of a federally funded grant project. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development administers this program and allocates 70% of its CDBG funds to "entitlement communities", or the larger urban areas. These communities must apply for grants for financing specific projects from a list of eligible activities outlined in Title I statutes. These projects include infrastructure improvements, housing projects, and commercial revitalization. The remaining 30% of the grant funds are allocated to state pass-through agencies such as the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) in the State of Florida. DCA administers these grants for the same types of projects mentioned previously, but restricts their availability to small cities and counties.

In addition to block grants, there are several direct loan programs available at the Federal level, but their applicability to capital projects is extremely limited. State loans however, are usually available to finance capital projects such as land acquisition for low-income housing. DCA administers loans and grants for these projects to eligible governments through its Bureau of Housing.

CURRENT STATUS:

The City has received a Safer Grant for 6 firefighters as well as a Community Development Block Grant for 2.Neighborhood Revitalization from DCA.

FIGURE 1: FEDERAL GRANT AGENCIES AND PROGRAM TITLES

AGENCY	TITLE
Department of Commerce	Public Works and Development Facilities Support for Planning Organizations Public Works Impact Projects Public Telecommunications Facilities Construction and Planning
Department of Children & Families	Community Health Concerns
Department of Housing and Urban Development	Housing Development Grants Community Development Block Grant/Entitlement Community Development Block Grant/Small Cities Program
Department of Interior	Outdoor Recreation: Acquisition, Development and Planning Urban Park and Recreation and Recovery Program
Department of Transportation	Urban Mass Transportation Capital Improvement Grants Urban Mass Transportation Technical Studies Grant
Environmental Protection Agency	State Revolving Loan Fund (DFR) Program Comprehensive Estuarine Management

Source: "Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance", Government Printing office, Washington, D.C.

C. LOCAL POLICIES AND PRACTICES

To guide the location and timing of land development, local policies and practices are used, particularly in support of the goals, objectives, and policies of the *Future Land Use Element*. State agencies and water management districts which provide public facilities within the City's jurisdiction will directly influence these policies and practices. One such influence was found to be generated by the Florida Department of Transportation's (FDOT) 5-year Transportation Plan. This influence stemmed from the fact that State Road 19, State Road 33, and State Road 50 are within the City's jurisdiction, and therefore largely the financial responsibility of the FDOT. Plans for the improvement of State Road 19, State Road 33, or State Road 50 may be included in the before mentioned 5-year Transportation Plan. However, there are other such roadways not included in the Plan. Either scenario affects the capacity of the roadways, which in turn affects the level and intensity of development, as well as the degree of financial commitment for which the City must plan.

In the absence of improvement plans by FDOT, special provisions may be made when the City desires improvement of a State road to maintain local levels of service standards. These provisions may include the City expending funds for roadway improvements or providing FDOT with the funds, either of which may be collected through an impact fee.

In this section, many of the local practices and policies used by the City are described in terms of their general concept and the circumstances surrounding their use. The policies and practices both used in the past and currently in use are identified. Policies and practices not in use which have the potential for being used by the City are discussed in a later section of the *CIE*.

1. Level of Service Standards

Level of Service (LOS) standards indicate the degree of service provided, or proposed to be provided by public facilities based on their operational characteristics. Basically, the LOS indicates the capacity per unit of demand for each public facility. Therefore, the LOS is a summary of the existing or desired public facility conditions. Chapter 163, F.S., and Chapter 9J-5, F.A.C., both require LOS standards to be included for all public facilities addressed by local governments in their comprehensive plan. These LOS standards are to be established for the specific purpose of issuing permits or development orders to ensure that adequate capacity is available and will be maintained in public facilities for future development.

LOS standards can effect both the timing and location of development by encouraging development of those areas which have public facilities with excess capacity. In addition, development is not allowed unless the needed facilities and services are available. This development and provision of services usually occur in a phased sequence over a period of time.

CURRENT STATUS: The City has adopted formal LOS standards with the completion of their *CIP*. The LOS standards as outlined in the various elements of the *CIP* are featured in the Data and Analysis Section of this *Element.*

2. Capital Improvements Program (CIP)

A *Capital Improvements Program* is a plan for capital expenditures to be incurred each year over a fixed period of years to meet anticipated facility improvements and needs. The *CIP* identifies each capital project or other capital expenditures anticipated by the Town, as well as presenting estimates of the resources needed to finance the project.

The *CIP* is designed to be consistent with the *CIE* of the local comprehensive plan because it reflects the goals, objectives, and policies of the *Element* and its implementation strategy, including the *5-year Schedule of Improvements*. In addition, the *CIP* is not restricted to only those public facilities addressed in the comprehensive plan, as is the *CIE*.

The first year of a *CIP* becomes the annual capital budget with longer range capital expenditures identified for the 5-year program. The capital budget encompasses enacting appropriations for those capital projects delineated for the first year of the *CIP*. The *CIP*, similar to *CIE*, is reviewed on an annual basis.

CURRENT STATUS: The Town is currently preparing a *CIP* with 5-year increments, within which are contained annual capital budgets.

3. Impact Fees

Impact fees are imposed by many local governments on new developments to offset the costs of new public facilities necessitated by the development. Local government may use this strategy as one method of implementing the *CIE*. Chapter 163, F.S. includes impact fees as an innovative technique that may be integrated into the land development regulations.

Impact fee development is a logical outgrowth of the *CIE* preparation. A rational basis for developing an impact fee ordinance comes from the assessment of the local government's capital improvement needs and its capability to provide for those needs which is required by Chapter 9J-5, F.A.C.

Infill development location and timing may be affected and controlled through the use of impact fees. This is because infill development usually occurs in those areas having

capital facilities with excess capacity. If the local government chooses not to recover the costs of capital facilities in underutilized service areas, infill development may be encouraged by the absence of impact fees on developments proposed within those areas.

CURRENT STATUS: The City currently has impact fee resolutions or ordinances for providing potable water, wastewater, recreation, administration, and fire and police services.

4. Utility Service Areas

The delineation of utility service areas within a comprehensive plan or *CIP* may be used to describe areas where local governments intend to provide public facilities and services. When used in conjunction with a *CIE* and *CIP*, utility service areas can be used as a tool to coordinate the timing of public facilities and service provision within areas planned for development.

Additionally, the following benefits may be the result of using utility service areas:

a) Encourage efficient and orderly growth patterns;
b) Preserve agricultural and environmentally sensitive areas; and
c) Support control on facility extensions

CURRENT STATUS: Utility service areas have been included in the *Public Facilities Element* of this *Comprehensive Plan*, but only for water and wastewater facilities and services.

5. User Charges and Connection Fees

User charges are designed to recover the costs of public facilities or services from those who benefit from them. Many areas of local government employ the use of user charges. Monthly sewer charges paying for the operation and maintenance of wastewater facilities as well as retiring debt service on revenue bonds is a good example of user charge usage. This technique may also be applied to transportation, potable water, solid waste, recreation, and parking facilities and services.

These charges may be designed to vary, depending on the quantity and location of the services rendered, in order to affect the pace and pattern of development. In other words, the greater the distance from the service area, the higher the user charge.

CURRENT STATUS: User charges and connection fees are currently used for potable water, wastewater, reclaim water, and solid waste.

6. Concurrency Management System

This controls the timing and location of development by conditioning new development approvals on evidence that sufficient facilities and services are present or will be provided in order to maintain adopted LOS standards. In effect, this implements the 1985 Legislative mandate (Chapter 163, F.S.) that requires public facilities to be available to support the impacts of new development. Therefore, development approval becomes contingent on the ability of local governments to provide facilities and services, and furthermore, may require the development itself to furnish the facilities and services in order to maintain the adopted LOS standards. Additional benefits associated with a Concurrency Management System are as follows:

a) Supports the consistency of the *CIE* with the *Future Land Use Element*;
b) Provides for the orderly expansion of public facilities;
c) Stabilizes capital improvement expenditures and taxing structures for capital improvements; and
d) Reduces the possibility of damage to the environment from the use of overburdened facilities.

Typically, the Concurrency Management System interacts with the development approval process by requiring that all zoning, subdivision, or planned unit development (PUD) approval be granted only upon demonstrated compliance with the system. The building permit stage is another level at which a Concurrency Management System may function. In this context, the Concurrency Management System may control development in areas that are already approved, but not as yet built on, such as pre-platted lands.

CURRENT STATUS: The City has developed a Concurrency Management System as part of this *Element*.

7. Mandatory Dedication or Fees in Lieu Of

The City may require, as a condition to plat approval, that subdivision developers dedicate a portion of the land within the development to be used for public purposes such as roads, parks, and schools. Dedication may be made to the governing body or to a private group such as a homeowners association.

When a subdivision is of such small scale or topographic conditions that a land dedication cannot reasonably be required, the City may require that the subdivider pay a fee in lieu of dedication which is equivalent to the amount of land that otherwise would have been dedicated by the developer. The fee may be deposited into a separate account for use in the future towards the provision of such facilities.

As a result of the public facility provision, the adjacent area benefiting from the initiative would likely become more attractive to development. Therefore, the acquired service potential may be used to encourage growth in desired areas.

CURRENT STATUS: The City currently requires mandatory dedications of land or fees in lieu of.

8. Moratoria

A moratorium, or stop-gap ordinance, is used to temporarily halt or freeze development in an area for a specified period of time on an emergency basis. The ordinance may be imposed on building permits, development approvals, or governmental services such as potable water connections or wastewater system extensions and/or connections. The moratorium normally is imposed for a "reasonable time" to allow the necessary planning activities to take place pending comprehensive plan preparation, adoption, or amendment. The State of Florida's legal system has found development moratoria to be a valid measure of last resort in the protection of local public health, safety, and welfare when adopted in accordance with applicable procedures. Some other considerations in adopting a moratorium include:

a) Determining legal status of existing permit applications and approvals to determine the extent of "vested rights" for those developments approved prior to ordinance adoption;
b) Specifying the geographic extent of the moratorium (whether it will include the entire City limits, or limited to specific hazard areas with existing service insufficiencies); and
c) Specifying the time frame and conditions under which the moratorium will be imposed.

CURRENT STATUS: The City is not currently imposing any moratoria.

D. FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

1. Fiscal Assessment

In this section, an examination is made of the City's ability to fund the capital improvements listed in the *5-year Schedule of Improvements*. The purpose of the examination is to determine whether sufficient revenue will be available using the existing budgeting framework utilized by the City to fund the required improvements at the time when they are needed.

The assessment process estimates future revenue receipts which the City will use to fund capital improvements, then balances these revenues against the anticipated capital improvement expenditures. Using this process, it becomes possible to quantify annual

revenue surpluses and shortfalls, thereby providing a basis for examining opportunities for financing the required capital improvements. The examination of these opportunities is included in the next portion of this section, entitled "Summary and Recommendations".

In addition to the direct cost for capital improvements, this section will review the fiscal impacts of the capital improvements identified in the other *Comprehensive Plan Elements* upon the actual operation of the City departments responsible for facility management. This will include costs for additional personnel and routing operation/maintenance activities. It should be noted that this assessment includes only those items planned for in other *Comprehensive Plan Elements*.

a. Accounting System

The accounting system employed by the City records financial transactions in individual accounts called "funds". Records for each fund provide a complete accounting of fund assets, liabilities, reserves, equities, revenues, and expenditures. The following is a brief description of the funds which the City has established for capital improvement financing.

GENERAL FUND: The General Fund is the basic operating fund of the City. It accounts for all revenues and expenditures used to finance the traditional services associated with a municipal government which are not accounted for in other funds. These services include police and fire protection, civil defense, emergency rescue services, street services, parks and recreation, building safety, general administration and any other activity for which a specific special fund has not been created.

ENTERPRISE FUND: Enterprise Funds are established to account for the financing of self-supporting municipal activities which render services on a user charge basis to the general public. In the City, the water, wastewater, and sanitation are operated as enterprise activities.

The significant characteristic of an Enterprise Fund is that the accounting system makes it possible to determine whether the activity is operated at a profit or loss. All reports of Enterprise Funds are self-contained. In this way, creditors, legislators, and the general public can evaluate the performance of the municipal enterprise on the same basis as investor-owned enterprise in the same industry.

b. Projected Revenues

Ad valorem tax yields were projected assuming the fiscal year 2010 rate of millage and the average annual increase (3%) in adjusted taxable value over the next five years. It should be noted that the five-year average rate for millage amounts to a rate of 5.1800 per $1,000 of taxable property value.

TABLE 1: AD VALOREM TAX YIELD PROJECTIONS

Tax Base	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Ad Valorem Tax Yield	$2,334,786	$2,404,830	$2,476,975	$2,551,285	$2,627,823

SOURCE: City of Groveland Finance Dept. Assume a collection of 95% of the total ad valorem tax billings.

Table 2 indicates the revenues expected to be available to the City to finance the expenditures and capital improvements for the years 2010-2014. Revenue projections are based on past trends and anticipated changes in funding sources. These amounts are represented in 2010 dollars.

TABLE 2: REVENUE PROJECTIONS AFFECTING CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
FUND					
General Fund:					
Ad Valorem	$ 58,300	$ 76,800	$ 117,500	$ 56,000	
Park Impact Fees	$ 500,000	-	-	-	-
Discretionary Funds	$ 694,000	$ 521,700	-	-	-
Subtotal:	**$ 1,252,300**	**$ 598,500**	**$ 117,500**	**$ 56,000**	**-**
Enterprise Funds:					
Charges for Services	$ 97,900	$ 33,300	$ 100,000	$ 56,300	$ 52,100
Water Impact Fees	$ 168,000	$ 83,000	$ 1, 658,000	$ 2,083,000	$ 583,000
Loans	-	-	-	-	$3,000,000
Discretionary Funds	$ 875,200	$ 4,750	$ 307,250	$ 326,700	$ 860,000
Grants	-	$ 2,100,000	-	$ 450,000	$ 1,500,000
Subtotal	**$ 1,141,100**	**$ 2,221,050**	**$ 2,065,250**	**$ 2,916,000**	**$ 1,500,000**
Total Revenues	**$ 2,393,400**	**$ 2,819,550**	**$ 2,182,750**	**$ 2,972,000**	**$ 5,995,100**

The Enterprise Fund projected revenues for each account include anticipated income from user charges, connection fees, impact fees, assessment receipts, and customer service charges. The revenue projections for water user charges and

connection fees are based on current individual fee amounts (average monthly charge and connection fees) and projected total service connections.

The amount shown for net bond proceeds represents the use of bond proceeds which are anticipated to be issued for major capital projects. The amounts shown reflect the year when the proceeds are estimated to be encumbered for the project and not the use of the proceeds deposited in the construction fund for financing the project.

c. Projected Expenditures

Table 3 lists these projected expenditures by Fund for 2010-2014.

TABLE 3: EXPENDITURE PROJECTIONS FOR SCHEDULED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
FUND					
General Fund					
Annual Capital Expenditures	$ 1,252,300	$ 598,500	$ 117,500	$ 56,000	$ 108,200
Enterprise Funds					
Water	$ 362,400	$ 2,219,050	$ 1,696,150	$ 2,566,300	$ 5,112,100
Wastewater	$ 778,700	$ 2,000	$ 369,100	$ 349,700	$ 883,000
Total Expenses	**$ 2,393,400**	**$ 2,819,550**	**$ 2,182,750**	**$ 2,972,000**	**$ 6,103,300**

The 5-year CIP does not anticipate acquiring any additional debt until the year 2014-2015; therefore, no debt service expenditures are projected.

The final category of expenditures contains the annual operating costs for providing the necessary facility improvements and services to the City's customers. These operating costs consist of the recurring expenses associated with the normal operation of capital facilities such as supplies, maintenance, personnel, and utility costs associated with the assessed capital improvement needs. The operating costs have been assigned to the first year in which they are expected to be incurred based on the schedule of improvement contained in Table 4. Table 4 presents the annual operating expenditure of the City for years 2010-2014.

TABLE 4: ANNUAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
FUND					
General Fund	$ 6,620,300	$ 6,785,808	$ 6,955,453	$ 7,129,339	$ 7,307,572
Enterprise Fund					
Water	$ 1,469,500	$ 1,506,237	$ 1,543,893	$ 1,582,491	$ 1,622,053
Wastewater	$ 1,265,300	$ 1,296,933	$ 1,329,356	$ 1,362,590	$ 1,396,654
Refuse	$ 576,000	$ 590,400	$ 605,160	$ 620,289	$ 635,796

In order to assess the City's capability to fund the necessary capital improvement expenditures, a determination of revenue sufficiency must be made. This capability is shown by finding the difference between the projected annual revenues and expenditures for each fund the City uses to finance the capital improvements. The assessment results are shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5: FISCAL ASSESSMENT NO. 1

FUND	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
GENERAL FUND					
REVENUES	$ 6,620,300	$ 6,785,808	$ 6,955,453	$ 7,129,339	$ 7,307,572
EXPENDITURES	$ 6,620,300	$ 6,785,808	$ 6,955,453	$ 7,129,339	$ 7,307,572
BALANCE	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0
ENTERPRISE FUND					
WATER					
REVENUES	$ 1,469,500	$ 1,506,237	$ 1,543,893	$ 1,582,491	$ 1,622,053
EXPENSES	$ 1,469,500	$ 1,506,237	$ 1,543,893	$ 1,582,491	$ 1,622,053
BALANCE	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0
WASTEWATER					
REVENUES	$ 1,265,300	$ 1,296,933	$ 1,329,356	$ 1,362,590	$ 1,396,654
EXPENSES	$ 1,265,300	$ 1,296,933	$ 1,329,356	$ 1,362,590	$ 1,396,654
BALANCE	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0
REFUSE					
REVENUES	$ 576,000	$ 590,400	$ 605,160	$ 620,289	$ 635,796
EXPENSES	$ 576,000	$ 590,400	$ 605,160	$ 620,289	$ 635,796
BALANCE	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0

Included in Table 5 are the projected revenues (as previously listed in Table 1) and expenditures (consisting of the sum of the cost and expenditures shown in

Tables 3 and 4). The balance of each fund indicates the difference between the projected revenues and expenditures. Revenue shortfalls for a given year are indicated by a negative balance.

The City uses revenues from both the General and Enterprise Funds to meet annual operating expenses. The General Fund is primarily used for transportation and recreation/park operating services, while the Enterprise Fund is used for the operating costs associated with the Public Works and Utilities Departments. Also included in the General Fund are *CIP* projects associated with paving and drainage activities, and expenditure of the Public Works Department.

Supplemental funding is provided by the fees collected by the various departments from the persons directly receiving the service.

The City-wide millage rate and the Enterprise Fund user charges are reviewed periodically by the City as part of its budgeting process. Adjustments are made in order to ensure that sufficient funds are available to meet expected expenses, including a reserve for contingency funds. In anticipation of future increases in operating costs, the City may desire to adjust the millage rate and/or user charges upward by small increments over a period of several years. This will initially provide additional operating reserves, which can later be used to offset operating expense increases as they occur and allow the City to moderate annual charges in the millage rates and user charges. For example, a one-half mill ($0.0005) increase in the ad valorem tax millage rate will generate approximately $237,227 for the anticipated 2010 adjusted taxable value of $474,453,487. In addition, the anticipated increases in ad valorem tax revenues for 2010-2014 are featured below in Table 6.

TABLE 6: ANTICIPATED INCREASE IN AD VALOREM TAX REVENUE PROJECTIONS

Tax Base	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Result of one-half mill increase	$237,227	$243,157	$249,235	$255,313	$261,391

d. Summary and Recommendations

General Fund: As shown in Table 5, the General Fund is projected to have a balanced budget during 2010-2014.

Enterprise Fund: The Enterprise Fund is projected to have a balanced budget during 2010-2014.

In the event that some of the proposed sources are not attained, the following alternative strategies will be pursued;

1. Additional deferral of projects to later years;
2. Procurement of additional revenue bonds instead of funding projects on a "pay-as-you-go" basis;
3. Procurement of additional grant funding;
4. Procurement of a state revolving fund loan; and
5. Increase user fees for municipal services.

Additionally, improved planning and coordination will be initiated among the City's utility departments in order to ensure that public facility and service provision is optimal for cost effectiveness. For example, department representatives will work together to encourage the provision of public facilities and services concurrently (where feasible), in order to limit the negative impacts of separate installation (i.e. construct water/sewer services prior to paving/drainage improvements).

E. DATA AND ANALYSIS

The Data and Analysis Section provides an inventory of the existing public facilities, an update of on-going and proposed improvements to the public facilities, and an analysis of the existing and projected Level of Service (LOS) standard for the public facilities that are required to be included in the *5-year CIE Schedule* per s. 163.3180, F.S. The data and analysis for this report is for the 5-year planning period from fiscal years 2009-2014. When data is available for an extended period, the report provides an extended analysis period. However, consistent with the requirements of State Statutes, the *Schedule of Capital Improvements* (the *Schedule*) only covers the 5-year planning period.

The data used to analyze the public facilities are from the most recent and best available data sources. Due to the available data sources having different planning periods, when data and analysis is provided beyond the 5-year planning period, the last year included in the analysis may differ.

1. POTABLE WATER

Groveland maintains and operates the potable water system that provides potable water service to the City. In addition, the City's potable water system provides service to the unincorporated areas of the County within the City's Utility Service Area.

a. Existing Facility Capacity

The City currently owns, operates, and maintains a central potable water treatment and distribution system. The City's potable water system provides water for both residential and non-residential purposes, including fire-fighting demands. The system meets demands not only within the City's boundaries, but

also the demand from surrounding unincorporated areas of Lake County including the Christopher C. Ford Commerce Park, commercial development on US Highway 27, and residential developments close to the City boundary.

The City owns and operates a public water system comprised of five water treatment plants and associated water transmission and distribution pipes. The City's five water plants are grouped into two separate systems. The south system is comprised of water treatment plant (WTP) 1 and WTP 2 and the recently completed WTP 5. The north system is comprised of WTP 3 and WTP 4. These five water treatment facilities are capable of producing a permitted capacity of 6.3 million gallons per day (see Table 7).

TABLE 7: CAPACITY OF WATER TREATMENT PLANTS

Water Treatment Plant	Design Capacity	Storage Capacity
Pomelo WTP #1	617,000 gallons per day	50,000 gallon elevated storage tank
Sampey WTP #2	1,440,000 gallons per day	250,000 gallon ground storage tank and 100,000 gallon elevated tank
Sunshine WTP #3	1,084,000 gallons per day (2.7 million gallons per day of additional capacity planned within 2010-2012)	108,182 gallon ground storage tank and 10,000 gallon pressure tank
Palisades WTP #4	1,152,000 gallons per day	15,000 gallon pressure tank
WTP #5	1,944,000 gallons per day	750,000 gallon ground storage tank

Source: City of Groveland Utilities Department

b. Consumptive Use Permit (CUP)

The City currently has two consumptive use permits (2796 and 2913). The WTP 1 (Pomelo), WTP 2 (Sampey), and WTP 5 fall under CUP 2796. The WTP 3 (Sunshine) and WTP 4 (Palisades) are covered under CUP 2913. The 2010 average daily and maximum annual withdrawals permitted under each CUP are below in Table 8.

TABLE 8: SJRWMD CONSUMPTIVE USE PERMIT MAXIMUM ANNUAL AND DAILY WITHDRAWALS, 2010

Consumptive Use Permit (CUP)	Maximum Annual Withdrawal for 2010	Average Daily Withdrawal
CUP 2796	558.26 million gallons	1.5 million gallons per day
CUP 2913	91.98 million gallons	.192 million gallons per day

Source: City of Groveland Utilities Department

c. Level of Service Analysis

Policy 1.2.3 of the *Public Facilities Element* establishes the following LOS standard for potable water as the basis for determining the availability of facility capacity and planning for demand to be generated by development:

250 gallons per day per Equivalent Residential Unit

This LOS shall be based on the average daily demand.

In 2008, the Pomelo Plant (WTP # 1) had an average daily flow of 343,792 million gallons per day (mgd). The Sampey Plant (WTP #2) had an average daily flow of 814,062. The total 1,157,854 was below the 1.5 mgd allowed under the 2008 allotment for CUP #2796.

The Pomelo Plant had an annual flow of 80,559,439 and the Sampey Plant had an annual flow of 297,949,692. The total was below the 558.26 allowed under the CUP.

Also in 2008, the Sunshine Plant had an average daily flow of 130,450 mgd and the Palisades Plant had an average daily flow 288,005 mgd for a total 418,455 mgd. This was over the 252,000 mgd allocated under the CUP # 2913.

To address this issue the City is working with the St. Johns River Water Management District to revise the CUP. The City has also funded a reclaimed water master plan in the CIP. Currently, all reclaimed water is going to the Green Valley golf course. The City is planning to build the necessary infrastructure to begin using reclaimed water in neighborhoods to reduce the demand on the potable water system. The City is also planning to fund the necessary infrastructure to withdraw from Cherry Lake to supplement the water needed for irrigation. These projects will help bring the City into compliance with its consumptive use permit.

The City is also in the process of adopting new landscape requirements to reduce the need for irrigation.

2. WASTEWATER

The wastewater treatment system for the City is operated and maintained by the City's Utility Department. The service area of the system encompasses all areas within the municipal boundary as well as areas of potential new development within the City's Chapter 180 Utility Service Area.

a. Existing Facility Capacity

The City's Utility Department operates and maintains three Wastewater Treatment Facilities (WWTF) capable of treating a combined capacity of 2.055 million gallons per day. The Sampey WWTF #1 has a capacity of 1 million gallons per day. This facility was updated on April 25, 2007. The Green Valley WWTF #2has the smallest capacity at .055 million gallons per day. The Sunshine Park WWTF #3 has a capacity of 1 millions gallons per day.

b. Level of Service Analysis

Policy 1.12.2 of the *Public Facilities Element* establishes the following LOS standard as the basis for determining the availability of facility capacity and planning for demand to be generated by development:

250 gallons per day per Equivalent Residential Unit

Currently, the City is only utilizing XX percent of the available capacity in the wastewater treatment system. There is sufficient capacity to handle growth for the foreseeable future.

3. PUBLIC RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE

The City has adopted LOS standards for parks and recreation facilities. LOS standards for parks are based on availability of recreational resources divided by the total number of users. This is the basic system for calculation of recreational LOS as established by the National Park and Recreation Association (NPRA). Utilization of such standards by the City provides for adequate public access to recreational facilities and parkland. Employing these same standards into the future should likewise continue to satisfy LOS requirements.

The inventory of parks and recreational facilities provided in Table 9 below has been updated recently by the Public Works Department, as well as information from approved Development Orders provided by the Building Department. In the City's *Comprehensive Plan*, the hierarchy of park facilities based on size and intended service area range from:

- community parks (greater than 5 acres, 3 mile service area),
- neighborhood parks (greater than 2 acres, ¾ mile service area),
- local parks (greater than ½ acre, up to ¼ mile service area) and
- parks are further classified as passive public open space or active recreation facilities.

a. Existing Parks and Recreational Facilities

The inventory of existing parks and recreational facilities only includes those facilities which are owned or will be dedicated to the City as part of an approved Development Order. Other recreational facilities which may serve the citizens of Groveland but are located outside of the City limits or are not owned by the City have been excluded from the CIE/CIP analysis.

TABLE 9: PARK LAND

Site Name	Facilities	Size (acres)
Lake David Park	Skateboard court; basketball court; grills; playground; covered and open picnic tables; volleyball court; fishing dock; boat ramp; community building; restrooms	3.79
Jimmy Thomas Memorial Park	T-ball field; 2 baseball diamonds; playground; concession stand	2.5
Beverly Park	pavilion; walking trail; playground; grills; volleyball; basketball	1.4
South Street Park	playground and basketball court	0.4
Puryear Community Building and Veteran's Park	community center; courtyard with fountain, benches and landscaping	0.8
Senior Center	Senior center	0.44
Un-named Parkland at the Estates at Cherry Lake	Not yet developed	20
Eagle Point	Not yet developed	5
Preserve at Lake Lucy	Not yet developed	3
Cypress Oaks	Not yet developed	3.5
TOTAL		**40.83**

b. Level of Service Analysis

Policy 1.1.1 of the *Recreation and Open Space Element* establishes the park land and park facilities LOS standards as follow:

The City hereby adopts the following minimum level of service for the provision of park land, through the year 2025.

Total Park Land: 6.0 acres per 1,000 residents. Park Facilities: 3.0 Acres Per 1,000 residents.

The City also uses the following size and population guidelines to help in determining the provision of recreational facilities and user oriented parks:

Population Guidelines for User-Oriented Outdoor Recreation Activities

Activity	Resource Facility	Population Served
Tennis	Tennis court	2,000
Baseball/softball	Baseball/softball field	3,000
Football/soccer	Football/soccer field	4,000
Basketball	Basketball court	5,000
Shuffleboard	Shuffleboard court**	1,000
Freshwater fishing non-boat	800 feet of Fishing pier	5,000
Freshwater fishing power boating, water skiing, and sailing	Boat ramp lane	1,500

* May be substituted for horseshoe pits, bocci court, or other lawn game.

Size and Population Guidelines for User Oriented Park Sites:

Vest Pocket /Tot Lot Park	0.5 acres per 1,000 population and a minimum park size of 0.25 acres
Community Park	2 acres per 1,000 population and a minimum park size of 20 acres or 5 acres for parks adjoining schools
Neighborhood Park	2 acres per 1,000 population and a minimum park size of 2 acres

An analysis of the existing and projected population increase and the available acreage for parks and recreational facilities indicate that the City currently has a deficiency in parks and recreation acreage to meet the demand for public park land/open space. They also have a deficiency for recreation facilities for active parks due to the four undeveloped parks that total 31.5 acres. These parks have been delayed due to slowing of the current economy but have already been dedicated to the City so once those parks are developed with facilities the City will have a surplus of active park land. The City also have park impact fees set aside to address this deficiency and is in the process of searching for appropriate land to purchase. The City will soon begin the design of a multi-field baseball park on a 20-acre site that Groveland already owns. As developments are

considered, the City will continue to ensure that park land and park facilities will be required as part of those residential developments and that adopted level of service standards are met.

TABLE 10: LEVEL OF SERVICE ANALYSIS FOR PARK FACILITIES

Year	Population	Total Acreage Available	Acreage Required to Meet LOS Standard (3 acres/ 1,000 people)	Reserve Capacity (in acres)
2009	7,366	9.33	22.10	-12.77
2010	7,478	9.33	22.43	-13.10
2011	7,617	9.33	22.85	-13.52
2012	7,826	9.33	23.48	-14.15
2013	8,105	9.33	24.32	-14.99
2014	8,454	9.33	25.36	-16.03
* Using the City's *Capital Improvement Plan Fiscal Year 2009-2014.*				

TABLE 11: LEVEL OF SERVICE ANALYSIS FOR PARK LAND

Year	Population	Total Acreage Available	Acreage Required to Meet LOS Standard (6 acres/ 1,000 people)	Reserve Capacity (in acres)
2009	7,366	40.83	44.20	-3.37
2010	7,478	40.83	44.87	-4.04
2011	7,617	40.83	45.70	-4.87
2012	7,826	40.83	46.96	-6.13
2013	8,105	40.83	48.63	-7.80
2014	8,454	40.83	50.72	-9.89
* Using the City's *Capital Improvement Plan Fiscal Year 2009-2014.*				

4. TRANSPORTATION

Under Policy 1.1.1 of the *Transportation Element*, the City has adopted the following peak hour LOS standard:

Classification	**Peak Hour Minimum***
FIHS: SR 25/US 27	C
Principal Arterials: SR 50	E
Minor Arterials:	D

SR 33, SR 19

Collectors: D
CR 565, CR 565A, CR. 478, Crittenden Street, Sampey Road, Bible Camp Road, Wilson Lake Parkway

Local Roads: D
All roadways not classified as collectors or arterials.

(*) Level of service shall be predicated on the lowest quality design hour, which shall represent the thirtieth highest hour of traffic, as determined by FDOT.

A LOS C represents stable traffic flow operations. However, ability to maneuver and change lanes may be more restricted than LOS B, and longer queues and/or adverse signal coordination may contribute to lower average travel speeds. A LOS D borders on a range in which small increases in traffic flow may cause substantial increase in approach delay and, hence, decrease in speed. This may be due to adverse signal progression, inappropriate signal timing, high volumes, or some combination of these. LOS E represents traffic flow characterized by significant delays and lower operating speeds. Such operation may be due to some combination of adverse progression, high signal density, extensive queuing at critical intersections, and inappropriate signal timing. For planning purposes, this LOS equals lane capacity.

In 2007, the City entered into an Interlocal Agreement with the Lake-Sumter MPO, along with Lake County and all the other local governments in Lake County, to create and fund a Master Transportation Concurrency Management System Program. This unique approach was seen as the best way to ensure that levels of service are monitored and that necessary improvements are approached on a County-wide basis to make the best use of available funds.

Table 12 below represents the Lake County Transportation Concurrency Management System traffic counts for the roads monitored in and around Groveland. These counts were performed in 2009.

As part of the interlocal agreement with the MPO, as new development is proposed in Groveland (either land use amendments or subdivision or site plan submittals), the land owner is required to perform a Traffic Impact Study (TIS). All jurisdictions have agreed to use the same TIS methodology in order to assist the MPO staff with making it as easy as possible to administer the concurrency management system.

Any proposed development that will impact a road segment beyond the adopted level of service standards will need to follow the City's *Transportation Proportionate Fair Share Program*. As development is proposed, it will need to provide adequate analysis of its

impact on the road segments in Groveland to determine if the adopted LOS will be maintained.

a. Level of Service Analysis

As seen in Table 7 below, all of the roads in the City have additional capacity to support growth.

The City currently does not collect road impact fees. These fees are collected by the Lake County and dispersed to appropriate districts for improvements to roadways. Currently there are two approved roadways within Groveland that will be improved through the County's road impact fee program. Information on these roadways can be found in Appendix A: Lake County 2009-2013 Transportation Construction Program.

TABLE 12: LAKE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION CONCURRENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM TRAFFIC COUNTY, 2009 - 2025

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	# of Lanes	FDOT LOS Standard	LOS CAPACITY	2009			GROWTH RATE	2015		
						AADT	V/C RATIO	LOS		AADT	V/C RATIO	LOS
C.R. 478	SR 19	JAMARLY RD	2	D	13,680	712	0.05	B	4.03%	884	0.06	B
C.R. 565	US 27	KJELLSTROM LANE	2	D	9,880	788	0.08	B	4.03%	978	0.10	B
C.R. 565 (VILLA CITY RD)	KJELLSTROM LANE	SR 50	2	D	10,725	1,868	0.17	B	4.03%	2,319	0.22	B
C.R. 565A	SR 50	CR 561A	2	D	10,725	4,810	0.45	B	4.03%	5,972	0.56	B
C.R. 565A	SR 50	CR 565B	2	D	10,725	1,721	0.16	B	4.03%	2,137	0.20	B
EMPIRE CHURCH RD	CR 565	ANDERSON RD	2	C	8,820	1,200	0.14	C	4.03%	1,490	0.17	C
WILSON LAKE PKWY	US 27	LIBBY RD	2	D	9,880	481	0.05	B	4.03%	597	0.06	B
SR 19	CR 455	US 27 / SR 25	2	C	15,100	6,901	0.46	B	2.07%	7,756	0.51	B
SR 19	US 27 / SR 25	CR 478	2	C	15,100	7,336	0.49	B	2.07%	8,245	0.55	C
SR 19	CR 478	LAKE CATHERINE RD	2	C	15,100	7,336	0.49	B	2.07%	8,245	0.55	C
SR 19	LAKE CATHERINE RD	SR 50/ SR 33	2	C	15,100	9,426	0.62	C	2.07%	10,594	0.70	C
SR 33	SR 50/ SR 33	ANDERSON RD	2	D	16,500	6,420	0.39	B	2.70%	7,461	0.45	B
SR 33	ANDERSON RD	CR 565B	2	C	14,200	6,494	0.46	B	2.70%	7,547	0.53	B
SR 50	GROVELAND FARMS RD	SR 50 ONE WAY PAIRS	4	D	36,700	21,946	0.60	B	2.70%	25,505	0.69	B
SR 50 (E)	SR 50 ONE WAY PAIRS	SR 19	4	D	22,020	12,240	0.56	B	2.10%	13,781	0.63	B
SR 50 (W)	SR 19	SR 50 ONE WAY PAIRS	4	D	22,020	11,088	0.50	B	2.10%	12,484	0.57	B
SR 50 (W)	SR 33 SOUTH	SR 19	4	D	22,020	13,770	0.63	B	2.10%	15,504	0.70	B
SR 50 (E)	SR 19	SR 33 SOUTH	4	D	22,020	11,132	0.51	B	2.10%	12,534	0.57	B
SR 50	SR 33 SOUTH	CR 565A NORTH	4	D	36,700	22,201	0.60	B	2.07%	24,953	0.68	B

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	# of Lanes	FDOT LOS Standard	LOS CAPACITY	2009			GROWTH RATE	2015		
						AADT	V/C RATIO	LOS		AADT	V/C RATIO	LOS
SR 50	CR 565A NORTH	CR 561	4	D	36,700	22,898	0.62	B	2.07%	25,737	0.70	B
US 27/SR 25	FLORIDA TURNPIKE	SR 19	4	C	32,100	19,596	0.61	B	2.07%	22,025	0.69	B
US 27/SR 25	SR 19	CR 561	4	C	32,100	15,633	0.49	B	2.07%	17,571	0.55	B

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	# of Lanes	FDOT LOS Standard	LOS CAPACITY	GROWTH RATE	2020			2025		
							AADT	V/C RATIO	LOS	AADT	V/C RATIO	LOS
C.R. 478	SR 19	JAMARLY RD	2	D	13,680	4.03%	1,027	0.08	B	1,171	0.09	B
C.R. 565	US 27	KJELLSTROM LANE	2	D	9,880	4.03%	1,137	0.12	B	1,296	0.13	B
C.R. 565 (VILLA CITY RD)	KJELLSTROM LANE	SR 50	2	D	10,725	4.03%	2,695	0.25	B	3,071	0.29	B
C.R. 565A	SR 50	CR 561A	2	D	10,725	4.03%	6,940	0.65	C	7,909	0.74	C
C.R. 565A	SR 50	CR 565B	2	D	10,725	4.03%	2,483	0.23	B	2,830	0.26	B
EMPIRE CHURCH RD	CR 565	ANDERSON RD	2	C	8,820	4.03%	1,731	0.20	C	1,973	0.22	C
WILSON LAKE PKWY	US 27	LIBBY RD	2	D	9,880	4.03%	694	0.07	B	791	0.08	B
SR 19	CR 455	US 27 / SR 25	2	C	15,100	2.07%	8,469	0.56	C	9,182	0.61	C
SR 19	US 27 / SR 25	CR 478	2	C	15,100	2.07%	9,003	0.60	C	9,761	0.65	C
SR 19	CR 478	LAKE CATHERINE RD	2	C	15,100	2.07%	9,003	0.60	C	9,761	0.65	C
SR 19	LAKE CATHERINE RD	SR 50/ SR 33	2	C	15,100	2.07%	11,568	0.77	C	12,542	0.83	C
SR 33	SR 50/ SR 33	ANDERSON RD	2	D	16,500	2.70%	8,329	0.50	B	9,197	0.56	B
SR 33	ANDERSON RD	CR 565B	2	C	14,200	2.70%	8,425	0.59	C	9,303	0.66	C
SR 50	GROVELAND FARMS RD	SR 50 ONE WAY PAIRS	4	D	36,700	2.70%	28,472	0.78	B	31,438	0.86	C

ROAD NAME	FROM	TO	# of Lanes	FDOT LOS Standard	LOS CAPACITY	GROWTH RATE	2020			2025		
							AADT	V/C RATIO	LOS	AADT	V/C RATIO	LOS
SR 50 (E)	SR 50 ONE WAY PAIRS	SR 19	4	D	22,020	2.10%	15,066	0.68	B	16,350	0.74	B
SR 50 (W)	SR 19	SR 50 ONE WAY PAIRS	4	D	22,020	2.10%	13,648	0.62	B	14,812	0.67	B
SR 50 (W)	SR 33 SOUTH	SR 19	4	D	22,020	2.10%	16,949	0.77	B	18,394	0.84	C
SR 50 (E)	SR 19	SR 33 SOUTH	4	D	22,020	2.10%	13,702	0.62	B	14,870	0.68	B
SR 50	SR 33 SOUTH	CR 565A NORTH	4	D	36,700	2.07%	27,247	0.74	B	29,540	0.80	C
SR 50	CR 565A NORTH	CR 561	4	D	36,700	2.07%	28,102	0.77	B	30,467	0.83	C
US 27/SR 25	FLORIDA TURNPIKE	SR 19	4	C	32,100	2.07%	24,050	0.75	B	26,074	0.81	B
US 27/SR 25	SR 19	CR 561	4	C	32,100	2.07%	19,186	0.60	B	20,801	0.65	B

5. STORMWATER

The City's stormwater management system relies upon the natural drainage patterns to convey, reduce, and control the stormwater run-off. When necessary to provide adequate flood protection, the natural drainage pattern was altered. Also, the drainage basins were interconnected to provide adequate relief during major storm events. The system was originally designed to handle a 100-year/24-hour storm event without flooding adjacent lands.

a. Level of Service Analysis

In the City, all proposed development projects are reviewed for compliance with the rules and regulations established in the Land Development Code. In addition to approval by the City, new development exceeding thresholds established in Chapter 40C-42, F.A.C are required to apply for a SJRWMD Environmental Resource Stormwater Permit (ERSP). Existing stormwater management systems that increase pollutant loadings, peak discharge rate, decrease on-site detention storage, or meet the thresholds established under new stormwater management systems are also required to apply for a new ERSP or a modification to their existing permit.

The *Comprehensive Plan* sets various LOS standards for drainage. The first set of standards is for Retention Volume and Design Storm. (Policy 1.17.4 of the *Public Facilities Element*)

Retention Volume: Complete retention of the post-development minus the predevelopment run off occurring at the established design storm.

Design Storm: The following interim LOS standards will be used until the *Comprehensive Plan* is amended to incorporate findings and recommendations of the programmed *Stormwater Master Plan*:

Facility Type	Design Storm
Canals, ditches, roadside swales, or culverts for stormwater external to the development	25 Year
Canals, ditches, roadside swales, or culverts for stormwater internal to the development	10 Year
Crossdrains	25 Year
Storm Sewers	10 Year
Major Detention/Retention Structures	For the probable maximum precipitation as required by SJRWMD
Minor Detention/Retention Structures	25 Year

Note: Major/Minor Detention/Retention Structures are based on Hazard Classification for Dams and Impoundments as defined by the SJRWMD.

The second set of LOS standards for drainage outlined in the *Comprehensive Plan* is for pollution abatement treatment. (Policy 1.17.5 of the *Public Facilities Element*)

The following minimum stormwater drainage LOS standards are required for pollution abatement treatment:

Facility Type	Pollution Abatement Treatment
Retention with percolation or detention with filtration	Runoff from first inch of rainfall or one-half inch of runoff if it has less than 50% impervious surface and less than 100 acres, whichever is greater.
Detention without filtration or wet detention	The first inch of runoff from the site or 2.5 inches times the site's impervious surface, whichever is greater.

Note: If the site's runoff directly discharges to Class I, Class II, or Outstanding Florida Waters (OFW), then the Pollution Abatement Treatment requirements shall be increased an additional fifty percent (50%) more than described, an off-line retention or off-line detention with filtration of the first inch of runoff shall be required. The City shall discourage the use of detention with filtration pollution abatement systems due to their high failure rate and costly maintenance; thus, the City shall allow detention with filtration only if detention without filtration cannot be used.

Projects located within the Green Swamp Area of Critical State Concern and within the Most Effective Recharge Areas must retain three inches of runoff from directly connected impervious areas within the project. Applicants may instead demonstrate that the post-development recharge will be equal to or greater than the pre-development recharge. Most Effective Recharge Areas are those areas with soils classified by the Soil Conservation Service as Type "A" Hydrologic Soil Group. Directly connected impervious areas are those impervious areas which are connected to the surface water management system by a drainage improvement such as a ditch, storm sewer, paved channel, or other man-made conveyance. Stormwater that is retained must be infiltrated into the soil or evaporated such that the storage volume is recovered within 14 days following a storm event.

The City ensures the provision of adequate stormwater drainage systems through the development review process. The above standards are used in reviewing all new development. Permits are also required from all applicable State, Federal, and local agencies with regard to stormwater. No development is approved or is allowed to begin construction until all such permits are received by the City.

6. SOLID WASTE

The City does not provide exclusive solid waste collection service to every residential, commercial, and industrial establishment but has a franchise agreement with Veolia Environmental Services. This contract includes the collection of all residential trash (once a week), recyclables, yard waste, and residential bulk waste. After collection the solid waste is transported and disposed in the Lake County Landfill.

a. Level of Service Analysis

The LOS standard for solid waste in the City's *Comprehensive Plan* is 6.0 pounds per person per day (Policy 1.8.1 of the *Public Facilities Element*). This LOS was derived taking into consideration the capacity of the landfill.

TABLE 13: SOLID WASTE COLLECTION DATA

Month	Tons Collected	Number of Customers	Monthly Average/Customer (pounds)
August 2007	374.52 (749,040 lbs.)	2744	272.97
September 2007	295.63 (591,260 lbs.)	2758	214.37
October 2007	350.95 (701,900 lbs.)	2767	253.66
November 2007	279.06 (558,120 lbs.)	2782	200.61
December 2007	278.30 (556,600 lbs.)	2780	200.21
January 2008	350.77 (701,540 lbs.)	2775	252.80
February 2008	296.07 (592,140 lbs.)	2768	213.92
March 2008	320.23 (640,460 lbs.)	2788	229.72
April 2008	389.88 (779,760 lbs.)	2788	279.68
May 2008	279.17 (558,340 lbs.)	2786	200.40
June 2008	297.69 (595,380 lbs.)	2776	214.47
July 2008	384.06 (768,120 lbs.)	2768	277.50
Total Average			**234.19 pounds**

Based on the City's *2008 – 2009 Annual Concurrency Report*, there are 2,773 solid waste customers in Groveland. With 12 months of data, the average amount of garbage generated each month was 234.19 pounds per month or 7.8 pounds per household per day. The City's population in 2009 was 7,366. With 2,773 solid waste customers, that would equate to 2.66 persons per household. The 2000 Census estimated the number of persons per household in Groveland was 2.79. Using the 2.66 persons per household, and the average of 7.8 pounds of solid waste per customer per day, each person in the City generated an average of 2.93 pounds per day. The City's adopted level of service for solid waste is a maximum of 6 pounds per person per day. So the current LOS of 2.93 pounds per day meets the City's adopted concurrency standard.

7. PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES

One of the requirements of Senate Bill 360 (SB 360) passed in 2005 is the requirement for Comprehensive Plans to include a public school facilities element. SB 360 also mandates that beginning in December 1, 2008, the *CIE* must include the public school facilities needed to maintain concurrency. As part of the submittal of the required public school element, an amendment to the *CIE* creating a LOS standard must also be submitted.

For now the Data and Analysis includes a list of capital improvement projects as presented by the Lake County School District (See Appendix B- *Lake County School District 5-Year District Facilities Work Program*).

a. Enrollment Projections and Projected New Student Capacity

The Lake County School Board uses the Florida Inventory of School Houses (FISH) capacity information for each school based on Florida Department of Education (FDOE) formulas. FISH Capacity is the number of students that may be housed in a facility 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 the student stations assigned to each room type. The capacity of some spaces is modified for actual square footage of the teaching space.

The School Enrollment to Capacity Comparison is used to determine the percent utilization of a school facilities capacity and includes the number of portables on campus and portable capacity, the total capacity that includes portables and the permanent facility, dining capacity, and media capacity.

The school enrollment to capacity comparison is a major indicator of school overcrowding. Using the ratio of enrollment to permanent FISH capacity, an analysis can be conducted to determine which schools in Lake County are over capacity. An analysis can also be done to determine capacity utilization using portable capacity and/or dining and media capacity. An enrollment to Capacity Comparison for schools located in the City of Groveland and surrounding jurisdictions required under interlocal agreements to share capacity is provided by the Lake County School Board in its adopted *Five Year Facilities Master Plan / Capital Improvement Program.*

b. Ten Year Planned Facilities

In anticipation of the projected increase in student population for Lake County, the School District has prepared a list of planned facilities for the ten-year

planning period (See Tables 14 and 15 below). This list is prepared to address anticipated student growth beyond the period covered by the *5-year Work Program*. Additional analysis is necessary to determine the exact location and capacity of the proposed facilities.

TABLE 14: TEN YEAR FACILITIES PLAN: ENROLLMENT FORECAST THRU 2017

District Totals	FY 2017 Projected Enrollment	2007 Capacity	Add'l Planned Capacity thru 2012	Total Existing and Planned Capacity thru 2012	Add'l Projected Capacity thru 2017	# Schools FY 2012 - 2017
Elementary	27,663	17,437	4,000	21,445	6,218	6
Middle	14,203	8,042	2,627	10,669	3,534	3
High	15,837	11,211	3,268	14,476	1,358	.5
Total	57,703	36,609	9,895	46,590	11,110	

Source: Lake County Planning Department, Lake County Public Schools

TABLE 15: RECOMMENDED ADDITIONAL CAPACITY THROUGH 2017

School Type	Location	Planned Capacity[1]	Cost Per Stu. Sta.[2]	Projected Cost	Approximate Year
Elementary "M"	Mascotte Area	940	$34,853	$32,761,857	2013
Elementary "N"	Leesburg Area	940	$34,853	$32,761,857	2014
Elementary "P"	Tavares	600	$43,864	$26,318,498	2014
Elementary "R"	Central County	940	$38,971	$36,633,167	2015
Elementary "S"	South County	940	$40,352	$37,931,198	2016
Additions	Various Elementary Schools	940	$21,772	$20,465,680	2012-17
Middle School "EE"	South Lake County	1,274	$22,714	$32,141,436	2014
Middle School "FF"	North Lake County	1,274	$41,21	$58,299,293	2016
Middle School "GG"	Central Lake County	1,274	$42,691	$60,407,697	2016
Additions	Various High Schools	1,358	$49,811	$71,179,336	2012-17

School Type	Location	Planned Capacity[1]	Cost Per Stu. Sta.[2]	Projected Cost	Approximate Year
Total		10,480		$408,900,019	

(1) Please note this is planned FISH capacity and **not** student stations.
(2) Projected cost if facility divided by the number of student stations.

c. Level of Service

Policy 1.1.1 of the *Public Schools Facilities Element* of the *Comprehensive Plan* states that "LOS is defined as school enrollment as a percentage of school student capacity based upon the Florida Inventory of School Houses (FISH). The LOS standard is the maximum level of school utilization that will be permitted in the Lake County School District. The LOS for all schools shall be set at 100% of FISH permanent capacity. In instances where the CORE (dining) capacity is greater than the FISH permanent capacity, the school capacity shall then be increased to that of the CORE (dining) capacity and the level of service maintained at 100% of the school capacity. In no instance shall the school capacity increase more than 125% due to additional CORE (dining) capacity." Appendix B: *Lake County School Districts 5-Year District Facilities Work Program* is attached.

F. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS SCHEDULE

Appendix C provides a series of spreadsheets from the adopted City's *Capital Improvements Plan* for FY 2009-2014. These spreadsheets include all capital projects, including those not subject to concurrency requirements under Chapter 163.3180, F.S. The series of spreadsheets and charts in Appendix C provide a summary of the Capital *Improvement Plan*.

G. GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND IMPLEMENTING POLICIES

GOAL 1: To provide for a timely, efficient, and fiscally prudent capital improvements program that upholds quality of life through the use of sound growth management and fiscal policies..

OBJECTIVE .1: ***Adoption of Capital Improvement Program***. To adopt each year, as part of the budget process, a *Capital Improvements Program (CIP)* that implements this *Plan*, ensures the availability of services at adopted levels, and carry out the fiscal policies in this *Element*.

Policy 1.1.1: ***Establishing 5-year Schedule.*** The *CIP* shall establish the *5-year Schedule of Capital Improvements* (see Table 16) and process for regular, periodic evaluation, and updating of multi-year financial projections and of fiscal policies, practices and strategies for all City programs, services, and facilities.

Policy 1.1.2: ***Evaluating and Ranking Capital Improvements.*** Proposed capital improvement projects shall be evaluated and ranked in order of priority according to the following guidelines:

A) To remove a direct and immediate threat to the public health or safety;
B) Are necessary to meet established levels of service;
C) Are essential for the maintenance of existing facilities or infrastructure;
D) Increase the efficiency of existing facilities or infrastructure;
E) Will accommodate new development or redevelopment anticipated in this *Plan*;
F) Whether the project competes with other facilities that have been or could reasonably be provided by other government entities or the private sector;
G) The revenue-generating potential of the project; and
H) Whether the project leverages additional benefits to the City, such as offers to donate land or services by the private sector and/or other governmental entities.

OBJECTIVE 1.2: ***Maintaining Level of Service (LOS) Standards***. Maintain and adopt LOS standards, as defined in the various *Elements* of this *Comprehensive Plan,* and meet existing and future needs by coordinating land use decisions with the *5-year Schedule of Capital Improvements* provided by this *Element* [9J-5.016 (3)(b) and 9J-5.016 (4)(4)(b), F.A.C.].

Policy 1.2.1: ***Adequate Facility Ordinance.*** The City Council shall adopt an adequate facilities ordinance to ensure that at the time the

development order is issued adequate facility capacity is available or will be available when needed to serve the development or as otherwise provided for in Rule 9J-5.0055, F.A.C.

Policy 1.2.2: ***Financially Feasible CIP.*** The City shall construct a financially feasible *Capital Improvements Plan* [9J-5.016 (3)(a) and 9J-5.016 (35)(c)(1)(f)d, F.A.C.].

Policy 1.2.3: ***Adopted Level of Service Standards.*** The following level of service standards are herby adopted and shall be maintained for existing or previously permitted development and for new development or redevelopment in the City or in the City's Utility Service Area [9J-5.016(3)(c)(4), F.A.C.].

Potable Water:

250 gallons per day per Equivalent Residential Unit. ERU totals are calculated by dividing the estimated population by 2.79 persons (2.79 persons per household was reported by the 2000 Census). Upon the completion of the 2010 Census data, the 2010 Census estimate for persons per household shall trump the 2000 Census estimate for persons per household.

Minimum storage capacity of the City water system shall be at least 25% of the maximum daily demand plus fire flow of 1,000 gpm for 2 hours

The potable water distribution system shall provide a minimum pressure of 50 pounds per square inch of average daily flow.

Sanitary Sewer:

250 gallons per day per Equivalent Residential Unit. ERU totals are calculated by dividing the estimated population by 2.79 persons (2.79 persons per household was reported by the 2000 Census). Upon the completion of the 2010 Census data, the 2010 Census estimate for persons per household shall trump the 2000 Census estimate for persons per household.

The capacity of the collection force mains and lift stations shall be based on the following peaking factors based upon the average design flow (ADF): flows to 0.050 MGD ADF use a 3.5 factor, flows 0.050 to 0.250 MDG ADF use a 3.0 factor, and flows above 0.250 MGD ADF use a factor of 2.5.

Solid Waste:

6 pounds per person per day

Stormwater Drainage:

Water Quantity	
Facility Type	**Design Storm**
Canals, ditches, roadside swales, or culverts for stormwater external to the development	25 Year
Canals, ditches, roadside swales, or culverts for stormwater internal to the development	10 Year
Crossdrains	25 Year
Storm sewers	10 Year
Major Detention/Retention Structures	For the Probable Maximum Precipitation as required by SJRWMD(1)
Minor Detention/Retention Structures	25 Years(1)
Development occurring in the 100 Year Flood Zone must elevate the first floor 18 inches above the 100 Year Flood Elevation	
Water Quality	
Facility Type	**Pollution Abatement Treatment (2)**
Retention with percolation or detention with filtration	Runoff from first inch of rainfall or one-half inch of runoff if it has less than 50% impervious surface and less than 100 acres, whichever is greater.
Detention without filtration or wet detention	The first inch of runoff from the site or 2.5 inches times the site's impervious surface, whichever is greater.

Notes: (1) Major/Minor Detention/Retention structures are based on Hazard Classification for dams and impoundments as defined by SJRWMD.

(2) If the site's runoff directly discharges to Class I, Class II or Outstanding Florida Waters (OFW), then the Pollution Abatement Treatment Requirements shall be increased an additional fifty percent (50%) more than described, an off-line retention or off-one detention with filtration of the first inch of runoff shall be required. The City shall discourage the use of detention with filtration pollution abatement systems due to their high failure rate and costly maintenance; thus, the City shall allow detention with filtration only if detention without filtration cannot be used.

Projects located within the Green Swamp Area of Critical State Concern and within the Most Effective Recharge Areas must retain three inches of runoff from directly connected impervious areas within the project. Applicants may instead demonstrate that the

post-development recharge will be equal to or greater than the pre-development recharge. Most Effective Recharge Areas are those areas with soils classified by the Soil Conservation Service as Type "A" Hydrologic Soil Group. Directly connected impervious areas are those impervious areas which are connected to the surface water management system by a drainage improvement such as a ditch, storm sewer, paved channel, or other man-made conveyance. Stormwater that is retained must be infiltrated into the soil or evaporated such that the storage volume is recovered within 14 days following a storm event.

Transportation:

Classification	Peak Hour Minimum*
FIHS: SR 25/US 27	C
Principal Arterials: SR 50	E
Minor Arterials: SR 33, SR 19	D
Collectors: CR 565, CR 565A, CR. 478, Crittenden Street, Sampey Road, Bible Camp Road, Wilson Lake Parkway	D
Local Roads: All roadways not classified as collectors or arterials.	D

(*) Level of service shall be predicated on the lowest quality design hour, which shall represent the thirtieth highest hour of traffic, as determined by FDOT.

Recreation and Open Space:

Total Park Land: 6.0 acres per 1,000 residents.
Park Facilities: 3.0 Acres Per 1,000 residents.

Population Guidelines for User-Oriented Outdoor Recreation Activities

Activity	Resource* Facility	Population Served
Tennis	Tennis court	2,000
Baseball/softball	Baseball/softball field	3,000
Football/soccer	Football/soccer field	4,000
Basketball	Basketball court	5,000
Shuffleboard	Shuffleboard court	1,000
Freshwater fishing non-boat	800 feet of Fishing pier	5,000
Freshwater fishing power boating, water skiing, and sailing	Boat ramp lane	1,500

* Based on a standard community swimming pool measuring 81 ft x 60 ft (4,860 ft).

Size and Population Guidelines for User Oriented Park Sites:

Vest Pocket /Tot Lot Park	0.5 acres per 1,000 population and a minimum park size of 1 acre or 0.25 acres for parks adjoining schools
Community Park	2 acres per 1,000 population and a minimum park size of 20 acres or 5 acres for parks adjoining schools
Neighborhood Park	2 acres per 1,000 population and a minimum park size of 5 acres or 2 acres for parks adjoining schools

Source: Florida Department of Environmental Protection – Division of Parks and Recreation, Outdoor Recreation in Florida – 2000: Florida's Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan, Tables 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5.

Public Schools Facilities:

The level of service for all schools shall be set at 100% of FISH permanent capacity. In instances where the CORE (dining) capacity is greater than the FISH permanent capacity, the school capacity shall then be increased to that of the CORE (dining) capacity and the level of service maintained at 100% of the school capacity. In no instance shall the school capacity increase more than 125% due to additional CORE (dining) capacity. Coordination with the Lake County School Board's *Five Year District Facilities Work Plan*, the plans of other local governments,

and as necessary, updates to the Concurrency Service Area Map is required to ensure that the adopted LOS standards for concurrency service areas will be achieved and maintained.

On or before September 15th of each year and after consideration of the written comments of the County and the Cities, the Lake County School Board shall adopt a financially-feasible Work Program that includes school capacity sufficient to meet anticipated student demand within the County, based on the LOS standards set forth in the Interlocal Agreement. The School Board shall construct and/or renovate school facilities sufficient to maintain LOS standards set forth in the Interlocal Agreement, consistent with the adopted Five Year Facilities Work Program. Nothing in this agreement shall be construed to abrogate the School Boards constitutional authority in determining delivery of student services, including but not limited to school scheduling or to require the School Board to redistrict any school more than once in any three consecutive year period. The City of Groveland shall adopt the School Board's adopted work program into their CIE updates each December.

Policy 1.2.4: ***Public School Deficiencies and Future Needs.*** The City shall ensure existing deficiencies and future needs are addressed consistent with the adopted level of service standards for public schools.

Policy 1.2.5 ***Monitoring and Tracking De Minimis Impacts.*** The City shall implement a methodology to monitor and track approved de minimis impacts on the roadway network within its jurisdiction. All de minimis impacts (an impact that would not affect more than one percent of the maximum volume at the adopted Level of Service of the affected transportation facility) shall be compiled into an annual report and submitted to the state land planning agency with the annual *Capital Improvements Element* update.

Policy 1.2.6: ***Issuance of Development Order.*** The City shall issue no development order for new development which results in an increase in demand on deficient facilities prior to the completion of improvements required to upgrade the respective facility to adopted standards.

Policy 1.2.7: ***Deficiency in Park Land and Park Facilities.*** To address the deficiency in park land and park facilities needed to support the population demand during the short-range (2010-2015) and long-

range (2025) planning periods of this *Comprehensive Plan*, the City shall incorporate park land and park facilities as needed in the *5-year Schedule of Capital Improvements*, as funding become available. Additionally, the City shall pursue alternative funding methods, such as grants, private-public partnerships, and collocation of facilities, to alleviate the deficiency of park land and park facilities in the City.

OBJECTIVE 1.3: ***Concurrency Management System.*** Issuance of development orders and permits by the City shall be controlled by the City's Concurrency Management System, which requires that facilities and services which do not reduce the adopted level of service standards are in place, shall be in place, or are guaranteed by a binding contract or agreement to be provided prior to the impact of the development [9J-5.016(3)(b), F.A.C. and 9J-5.0055, F.A.C.]

Policy 1.3.1: ***Concurrency Provisions.*** The City's Concurrency Management System shall provide the following [9J-5.055(2), F.A.C.]:

a. the capital improvements budget and a five year schedule of capital improvements which, in addition to meeting all of the other statutory and rule requirements, must be financially feasible and are adopted annually in the budget process [9J-5.016(3)(c)(7), F.A.C.];

b. the *Five-year Schedule of Improvements* which includes both necessary facilities to maintain the established level of service standards to serve the new development proposed to be permitted and the necessary facilities required to eliminate that portion of existing deficiencies which are a priority to be eliminated during the five-year period under the City's *Schedule of Capital Improvements* pursuant to Rule 9J-5.016(4)(a)1., F.A.C.;

c. a realistic, financially feasible funding system based on currently available revenue sources which is adequate to fund the public facilities required to serve the development authorized by the development order and development permit and which public facilities are included in the *Five-year Schedule of Capital Improvements*;

d. the *Five-year Schedule of Capital Improvements* must include the estimated date of commencement of actual construction and the estimated project completion date and which areas will be provided with public funds in accordance with the *5-year Capital Improvement Schedule*;

e. a provision that a plan amendment shall be required to eliminate, defer, or delay construction of any facility or service which is needed to maintain the adopted level of service standard and which is listed in the *5-year Schedule of Improvements*;

f. a requirement that development orders and permits are issued in a manner that will guarantee that the necessary public facilities and services will be available to accommodate the impact of that development;

g. a provision that the City, on an annual basis, shall determine whether it is adhering to the adopted level of service standards and its *5-year Schedule of Capital Improvements* and that the City has a demonstrated capability of monitoring the availability of public facilities and services; and

h. development guidelines for interpreting and applying level of service standards to applications for development orders and permits and determining when the test for concurrency must be met. At a minimum, the latest point in the application process for the determination of concurrency is prior to the approval of a development order or permits which contains a specific plan for development and which would authorize the commencement of construction of physical activity on the land. Development orders and permits approved prior to the actual authorization for the commencement of construction or physical activity will be contingent upon the availability of public facilities and services necessary to serve the proposed development.

Policy 1.3.2: ***Requirement for Public Facilities and Services.*** The City's *Concurrency Management System* shall provide that public facilities and services needed to support development are available concurrent with the impacts of such development by meeting the following standards prior to issuance to permit. [9J-5.055, F.A.C.]

a. For potable water, sewer, solid waste, and drainage, at a minimum, the following standards will satisfy the concurrency requirement:

(1) the necessary facilities and services are in place at the time a development permit is issued; or

(2) a development permit is issued subject to the condition that the necessary facilities and services will be in the place when the impacts of the development occur; or

(3) the necessary facilities are under construction at the time a development permit is issued; or

(4) the necessary facilities and services are guaranteed in an enforceable development agreement that includes the provisions of Rule 9J-5.0055(2)(a)1.-3, F.A.C. An enforceable development agreement may include, but is not limited to, development agreements pursuant to Section 163.3220, Florida Statutes or an agreement or development order issued pursuant to Chapter 380, Florida Statutes. The agreement must guarantee that the necessary facilities and services will be in place when the impact of development occur; or

(5) the necessary facilities and services are in place no later than the issuance of a certificate of occupancy as required by Chapter 163.3180 F.S.

The City shall issue no development orders or development permits without first consulting its utility department to determine whether adequate water supplies to serve a new development will be available no later than the anticipated date of issuance of a certificate of occupancy or its functional equivalent.

b. For parks and recreation, at a minimum, the following standards will satisfy the concurrency requirement:

(1) at the time the development permit is issued, the necessary facilities and services are the subject of a binding executed contract which provides for the commencement of the actual construction of the required facilities or the provision of services within one year of the issuance of the development permit; or

(2) the necessary facilities and services are guaranteed in an enforceable development agreement which requires the

commencement of the actual construction of the facilities or the provision of services within one year of the issuance of the applicable development permit. An enforceable development agreement may include, but is not limited to, development agreements pursuant to Section 163.3220, Florida Statutes or an agreement or development order issued pursuant to Chapter 380, Florida Statutes; or

(3) the necessary facilities and services are in place no later than 1 year after issuance of a certificate of occupancy as required by Chapter 163.3180 F.S.

c. For roads, at a minimum, the following standards will satisfy the concurrency requirement:

(1) the necessary facilities and services are in place at the time a development permit is issued; or

(2) a development permit is issued subject to the condition that the necessary facilities and services will be in place when the impacts of the development occur; or

(3) the necessary facilities are under construction at the time a permit is issued; or

(4) at the time the development permit issued, the necessary facilities and services are the subject of a binding executed contract which provides for the commencement of the actual construction of the required facilities or the provision of services within three years of the approval of the development permit as required by Chapter 163.3180, F.S.; or

(5) The necessary facilities and services are guaranteed in an enforceable development agreement which requires the commencement of the actual construction of the facilities or the provision of services within three years of the approval of the applicable development permit as required in Chapter 163.3180, F.S. An enforceable development agreement may include , but is not limited to, development agreements pursuant to section 163.3220, Florida Statutes or an agreement or

development order issued pursuant to Chapter 380, Florida Statutes; or

(6) the necessary facilities and services are guaranteed in an enforceable development agreement that includes the provisions of paragraphs 1-3 above. An enforceable development agreement may include, but is not limited to, development order issued pursuant to Chapter 380, Florida Statutes. The agreement must guarantee that the necessary facilities and services will be in place when the impacts of the development occur; or

(7) the necessary facilities and services are in place or under actual construction no later than 3 years after issuance of a certificate of occupancy as required by Chapter 163.3180 F.S.

d. In determining the availability of services or facilities, a developer may propose and the City Council by a majority of the votes of its total membership may approve developments in stages or phases so that facilities and services needed for each phase shall be available in accordance with the standards required by Rule 9J-5.0055(2)(a),(2)(b) and (2)(c), F.A.C.

e. The latest point in the application process for the determination of concurrency is prior to the approval of an application for a development order or permit which contains a specific plan for development, including the densities and intensities of development.

Policy 1.3.3: ***Exemptions from Transportation Concurrency.*** The City shall allow exemptions from transportation concurrency for infill development, redevelopment projects, and downtown revitalization as long as such exemption is consistent with the guidelines established in subsection 5 of Chapter 163.3180 F.S.

Policy 1.3.4: ***De Minimis Transportation Impact.*** The City shall allow a de minimis transportation impact of not more than 0.1% of the maximum volume of the adopted level of service as an exemption from concurrency as required by Chapter 163.3180 F.S.

Policy 1.3.5: ***Transportation Impact of Redevelopment Projects.*** In the event of redevelopment projects, the City shall allow the redevelopment project to create 110% of the actual transportation impact caused

by existing development before complying with concurrency as required by Chapter 163.3180 F.S.

Policy 1.3.6: ***Approved Development and Proportionate Fair Share.*** The City shall allow approved development that does not meet concurrency to occur if the City has failed to implement the requirements of this *CIE* and the developer makes a binding commitment to pay the proportionate fair share of the cost for facilities and services associated with the development.

Policy 1.3.7: ***Adoption of a Monitoring System.*** The City shall adopt a monitoring system that enables the City to determine whether it is adhering to the adopted LOS standards and the *5-year Schedule of Capital Improvements*. Findings and determinations from the monitoring system shall be used in each review and annual update of the *Capital Improvements Element*.

OBJECTIVE 1.4: ***Proportionate Cost of Future Development***. Ensure that future development bears a proportionate cost of facility improvements necessitated by the development in order to adequately maintain the adopted level of service standards [9J-5.016 (3)(b)(4), F.A.C.].

Policy 1.4.1: ***Future Development and Proportionate Share of Cost.*** All future development will bear an equitable and proportionate share of the cost of providing new or expanded public facilities required to maintain adopted levels of service through mechanisms such as impact fees, capacity fees, developer dedications, developer contributions pursuant to land development regulations, and special benefit assessment/taxing districts.

Policy 1.4.2: ***Evaluation of Fees.*** The City shall regularly evaluate the following:

A) Whether the present fee levies are adequate to address impacts of inflations;
B) Whether the City needs to appropriate new impact fees; and
C) Whether capacity fees, user charges, special benefit assessment/taxing district and other mechanisms are adequately and fully meeting the fiscal demands placed on the City by new development.

OBJECTIVE 1.5: ***Update and Refinement of Fiscal Resources.*** Ensure that the City's *Capital Improvements Program* process for the update and refinement of multi-year projections of fiscal resources is responsible and financially feasible 9J-5.016(4)(5), F.A.C].

Policy 1.5.1: ***Adoption of Annual Budget.*** Adoption of annual budgets shall include a specific capital budget, which shall implement adequate funding sources and be consistent with the *Capital Improvements Element*.

Policy 1.5.2: ***Grants for Capital Facility Construction.*** The City will actively seek grants from federal, state, and other sources where available and when appropriate for capital facility construction.

Policy 1.5.3: ***Reviewing and Evaluating Funding Sources.*** To ensure optimum strategies for financial feasibility, the City shall review and evaluate available and potential funding sources to ensure that a financially feasible strategy exists to adequately fund the *5-year Capital Improvements Plan*. If alternative funding sources are not successfully adopted on the *Schedule* identified, the City shall either:

A) Increase the rates of current revenue sources or implement other available sources such that the City's *Schedule of Capital Improvements* is adequately funded in each budget year; or
B) Amend the *Plan Elements* included level of service standards and the *Schedule of Capital Improvements*, as appropriate and necessary, such that internal consistency of the *Plan* and financial feasibility are maintained.

Policy 1.5.4: ***Consistency of CIP.*** The *Capital Improvements Program* shall embody and be consistent with the following:

A) Maintenance of existing infrastructure, including renewal/replacement of worn-out facilities and rehabilitation/reuse of existing facilities, shall be specifically projected and the funding identified;
B) Debt obligations shall be specifically identified and projected to ensure compliance with debt covenants, including coverage requirements;
C) A debt management strategy and set of criteria, which shall be based upon the debt management principles set out in Policy 12.5.5;

D) Maintenance of levels of undesignated reserves adequate to serve sound public fiscal management purposes; and
E) Equity of the uses of a revenue source relative to the populace generating the revenue.

Policy 1.5.5: ***Managing Dept Issuance and Obligations.*** The City shall manage debt issuance and obligations according to sound public fiscal management principles, including the following [9J-5.016 (3)(c)(2) c., F.A.C.]:

A) Debt issuance will be included in the City's long-term capital plan;
B) The City will only issue debt to fund capital expenditures that have an expected life greater than five (5) years;
C) Debt may not be issued for a period of more than forty (40) years or the expected useful life of the asset being funded, whichever is less;
D) Total City debt will not exceed fifteen percent (15%) of the taxable value of property located within the City; and
E) Credit enhancement will be utilized when necessary to lower total borrowing costs.

Policy 1.5.6: ***Use of Revenue Bonds.*** The limitation on the use of revenue bonds as a percent of total debt shall follow applicable Florida statutes and acceptable financial practices [9J-5.016 (3)(c)(2) a., F.A.C.].

Policy 1.5.7: ***Total Dept Service.*** The maximum ratio of total debt service to total revenue shall follow applicable Florida statutes and acceptable financial practices [9J-5.016 (3)(c)(2) b., F.A.C.].

Policy 1.5.8: ***Collection of Impact Fees.*** All new development, which has a direct or indirect impact on roads, schools, parks, potable water, or sewer, shall continue to be subject to impact fees collected and/or administered by the City. Monies collected as impact fees shall be spent to benefit the City's infrastructure [9J-5.016(3)(b)(4), F.A.C.].

Policy 1.5.9: ***Impact Fee Ordinance.*** The City shall assess its impact fee ordinances to assure that new development pays its pro rata share of the costs required to finance capital improvements necessitated by such development [9J-5.016 (3)(c)(8), F.A.C.].

Policy 1.5.10: ***Reviewing all Sources of Revenue.*** Before the annual budget process is initiated, the City shall review all sources of revenue not previously utilized as revenue and shall act to obtain and receive revenue from these potential sources where a benefit to the City can be predicted.

Policy 1.5.11: ***Private Contributions.*** The City shall rely upon private contributions as a funding source within the *Five-year Schedule of Capital Improvements* only when the obligation to fund a specific capital improvement is addressed in an enforceable development agreement or development order. The City shall not be responsible for funding capital improvements that are the obligation of the developer. If the developer fails to meet any capital improvement commitment that is programmed in the *Five-year Schedule of Capital Improvements*, a plan amendment to delete the capital improvement from the *Schedule* shall be required.

OBJECTIVE 1.6: ***Water Supply Facilities Work Plan***. Continue to use available funds for the expansion and enhancement of water supply facilities in accordance with the City's *Water Supply Facilities Work Plan* and to establish new lines of funding for such and for the establishment of programs and incentives that are in accordance with said *Plan*.

Policy 1.6.1: ***Enhancing, Upgrading, and Expanding Water Supply Facilities.*** The City shall continue to use the current line of funding (Impact and Water Fees) to enhance, upgrade, and expand the water supply facilities, which shall be in accordance with the approved *Water Supply Facilities Work Plan*.

Policy 1.6.2: ***Establishing New Lines of Funding.*** The City shall investigate and establish new lines of funding for the enhancement, upgrading, and expansion of water supply facilities when applicable. The City shall prioritize investigating funding through Federal and State agencies.

Policy 1.6.3: ***Water Conservation.*** In accordance with the City's *Water Supply Facilities Work Plan* and the policies established in the *Intergovernmental Coordination Element*, *Public Facilities Element*, and *Conservation Element*, the City shall dedicate funds, when and where practicable, to establish City-based programs that promote water conservation to current and future consumers. The City shall investigate the establishment of incentives or grants for consumers who desire to conserve water that currently have not water conservation measures in place.

Policy 1.6.4: ***Incentives or Grants to Conserve Water.*** By December 2012, the City shall investigate the establishment of procedures to demonstrate how consumers can apply for the incentives or grants established in Policy 1.6.3 to conserve water. These procedures shall be included with the mailing of utility bills as well as on the City's website.

Policy 1.6.5: ***Assessing SJRWMD's Water Supply Facilities Work Plan***. The City' *WSFWP (Work Plan)*, shall assess existing and projected water sources and needs for at least a 10-year planning period and consider the *Regional Water Supply Plan* of the St. Johns River Water Management District. The *Work Plan* shall identify traditional and alternative water supply sources that the City may use to meet existing and projected water demands. The alternative water supply projects in the *Work Plan* will be selected from the applicable District's Regional Water Supply Plans or otherwise proposed by the City.

Policy 1.6.6: ***Update of the City's Water Supply Facilities Work Plan.*** The City shall coordinate with the St. Johns River Water Management District during updates to their *Regional Water Supply Plan*, to identify potentially feasible alternative water supply projects in the City. Within 18 months of the adoption of St. Johns River Water Management District's *Water Supply Plan*, the City shall complete updates of the appropriate elements and adopt related plan amendments to address all of the 10-year water facilities supply work plan components of Chapter 163, F.S.

OBJECTIVE 1.7: ***Local Government and External Agency Plans.*** To adopt all applicable outside local government and external agency plans necessary in order to maintain and provide for level of service.

Policy 1.7.1: ***Adoption of School District's Work Plan.*** The City hereby adopts by reference the Lake County School District's *Facilities 5-Year Work Program (2010-2014)*, as adopted on September 14, 2009, to meet anticipated school capacity and student demands projected by the County and municipalities based on the adopted Level of Service standards for public schools.

Policy 1.7.2: ***Adoption of FDOT's Work Plan.*** The City hereby adopts by reference the Florida Department of Transportation's *5- Year Work Program (2010-2014)*, as adopted and amended on April 8, 2010, to meet anticipated demand through improvement of state transportation facilities within the jurisdiction.

Policy 1.7.3: ***Adoption of SJRWMD's Work Plan.*** The City hereby adopts by reference the St. Johns River Water Management District's (SJRWMD) *Water Supply Plan 2005*, as adopted on February 7, 2006, to meet anticipated water supply and demand needs within the jurisdiction.

Policy 1.7.4: ***Adoption of Lake-Sumter MPO's Plans.*** The City hereby adopts by reference the following Lake-Sumter MPO's transportation plans to meet the regional transportation needs, including road improvements funded with the MPO, of the City:

- 2025 Long Range Transportation Plan as amended and adopted on May 23, 2007;
- Unified Planning Work Program (FY 2010/11-2011/12); and
- Transportation Improvement Plan (FY 2009/10 – 2013/14).

Policy 1.7.5: ***Road Improvements and the 5-year CIP.*** The City shall reference all road improvements that are located in the City or within the City's Utility Service Area and are funded by the Lake-Sumter MPO or Lake County as part of its *5-year Capital Improvements Program*.

OBJECTIVE 1.8: ***Public Facility Needs.*** Demonstrate the City's ability to require provisions for needed improvements identified in the *Comprehensive Plan's Elements* in order to manage the land development process so that public facility needs created by previously issued development orders or future development do not exceed the ability of local government to fund and provide provisions of future needed capital improvements [9J-5.016 (3)(b)(5), F.A.C.].

Policy 1.8.1: ***Construction and Replacement Schedule.*** The City shall identify needs and establish construction and replacement schedules within the *Capital Facilities Element* [9J-5.016 (3)(c)(3), F.A.C.].

Policy 1.8.2: ***Establishing LOS Standards.*** The City shall establish level of service standards for public facilities [9J-5.016 (3)(c)(4), F.A.C.].

Policy 1.8.3: ***Prior Issued Development Orders.*** The City shall account for needed facilities of prior issued development orders in the assessment of public facility needs for those development orders issued prior to the adoption of this *Comprehensive Plan* [9J-5.016 (3)(c)(5), F.A.C.].

Policy 1.8.4: ***Support of Comprehensive Plan.*** Proposed capital improvement projects shall support the Goals, Objectives and Policies of this *Comprehensive Plan* [9J-5.016 (3)(c)(9), F.A.C.].

OBJECTIVE 1.9: ***Coordination of Land Uses and Fiscal Resources.*** Ensure the coordination of the City's land use decisions and available or projected fiscal resources with a schedule of capital improvements in order to maintain adopted levels of service which meet the existing and future facility standards [9J-5.016 (3)(b)(3), F.A.C.].

Policy 1.9.1: ***Elimination of Public Hazards.*** The Town shall eliminate public hazards in its implementation of capital improvements [9J-5.016 (3)(c)(1) a., F.A.C].

Policy 1.9.2: ***Capacity Deficits and Local Budget Impact.*** The City shall work to avoid and eliminate capacity deficits and minimize local budget impact when implementing capital improvements [9J-5.016 (3)(c)(1) b and 9J-5.016 (3)(c)(1)(c), F.A.C.].

Policy 1.9.3: ***Anticipating and Projecting Growth Patterns.*** The City shall anticipate and project growth patterns in its implementation and accommodation of new development and the redevelopment of facility and capital improvements [9J-5.016 (3)(c)(1)(d)] and [9J-5.016 (3)(c)(1)(e), F.A.C.]

Policy 1.9.4: ***Capital Improvements Financial Feasibility.*** All capital improvements shall be made in a financially feasible manner and take into account the plans of State agencies, local governments, and water management districts that provide facilities within the City of Groveland [9J-5.016 (3)(c)(1)(f) and 9J-5.016 (3)(c)(1)(g), F.A.C.].

Policy 1.9.5: ***Concurrency of Public Facilities and Services.*** The City shall make public facilities and services available concurrent with the impacts of development subsequent to the writing of this *Comprehensive Plan*. The City shall deem which public facilities and services are necessary in cases of phased development but shall require that this provision is made available concurrent to the impact of development [9J-5.016 (3)(c)(6), F.A.C.].

Policy 1.9.6: ***Public Facilities and Environmentally Sensitive Lands.*** The City shall not invest public funds in public facilities located on designated environmentally sensitive lands, as defined in the *Conservation Element,* within its jurisdiction unless the facility is necessary to:

a. Preserve an environmentally sensitive land;
b. Provide access to designated passive recreation sites or to connect developable areas; and
c. Promote the health and safety of citizens.

Capital Improvements Implementation

The City Manager shall have the responsibility for implementing the *Goals, Objectives and Policies* within this *Element*. Specific responsibilities include:

1. Request capital budget and public improvements updates from each municipal department head.

2. Request recommendations from each elected official.

3. Present an updated *5-year Schedule of Capital Improvements* (Table 11) to the City Council, with explanations for each addition, deletion or revision.

4. Develop administrative procedures to implement the capital improvement policies. The City's Planner or designated representative shall provide checklists, directions, time frames and such other review criteria as shall be necessary to assure that facilities and services meet the standards adopted as a part of this *Comprehensive Plan* and are available concurrent with the impacts of development.

Table 16 *Five-year Schedule of Capital Improvements* (see next page).

TABLE 16: CITY OF GROVELAND'S 5-YEAR SCHEDULE OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS SCHEDULE

Fiscal Years 2009-2014
By Fund/Department/Source (Amounts in Dollars)

	Funding Source	Total	Fiscal Year 2009-2010	Fiscal Year 2010-2011	Fiscal Year 2011-2012	Fiscal Year 2012-2013	Fiscal Year 2013-2014
Fund							
General Fund		$4,681,000	$387,800	$364,500	$306,500	$308,000	$3,314,200
Enterprise Fund		15,570,600	2,094,600	495,000	3,595,000	2,940,000	6,446,000
Total		**$20,251,600**	**$2,482,400**	**$859,500**	**$3,901,500**	**$3,248,000**	**$9,760,200**
Department Funds and Project Overview							
City Administration	**Current Revenues**	**7,300**	**7,300**				
Finance	**Current Revenues**	**15,300**	**15,300**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Generator	Current Revenues	5,000	5,000	-	-	-	-
Capital – Rental/Lease	Current Revenues	10,300	10,300	-	-	-	-
Community Development	**Current Revenues**	**5,300**	**5,300**				
Building Department	**Current Revenues**	**5,300**	**5,300**				
Police	**Current Revenues $1, 180, 400, Grant $58,000 and Loan $1,500,000**	**2,738,400**	**175,700**	**220,000**	**285,500**	**243,000**	**1,814,200**
Capital – Rental/Lease	Current Revenues	20,300	20,300	-	-	-	-

	Funding Source	Total	Fiscal Year 2009-2010	Fiscal Year 2010-2011	Fiscal Year 2011-2012	Fiscal Year 2012-2013	Fiscal Year 2013-2014
(5) Patrol Cars (Replacement)	Grant $58,000 FY 2009-10; Current Revenues	1,090,000	140,000	220,000	232,000	243,000	255,000
(1) Equipment needed to outfit officer	Current Revenues	15,700	-	-	7,500	-	8,200
(1) Patrol Car (New)	Current Revenues	97,000	-	-	46,000	-	51,000
Construction-Public Safety Complex (Relocation Station)	Loan	1,500,000	-	-	-	-	1,500,000
Code Enforcement	**Current Revenues**	**26,800**	**2,300**	**24,500**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Capital – Rental/Lease	Current Revenues	2,300	2,300	-	-	-	-
(1) Replacement Vehicle	Current Revenues	24,500	-	24,500	-	-	-
Dispatching	**Current Revenues**	**26,300**	**5,300**	**-**	**21,000**	**-**	**-**
Capital – Rental/Lease	Current Revenues	5,300	5,300	-	-	-	-
Photo Copier	Current Revenues	21,000	-	-	21,000	-	-
Fire	**Current Revenues $57,000 and Loan $1,500,000**	**1,557,000**	**7,000**	**50,000**	**-**	**-**	**1,500,000**
Capital – Rental/Lease	Current Revenues	2,300	2,300	-	-	-	-
Brush Truck – 1 Ton Super Duty Pick-up	Current Revenues	50,000	-	50,000	-	-	-
Construction-Public Safety Complex (Relocation Main Station)	Loan	1,500,000	-	-	-	-	1,500,000

	Funding Source	Total	Fiscal Year 2009-2010	Fiscal Year 2010-2011	Fiscal Year 2011-2012	Fiscal Year 2012-2013	Fiscal Year 2013-2014
Animal Control	**Current Revenue**	**30,000**	**-**	**30,000**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Temperatured Control Truck	Current Revenue	30,000	-	30,000	-	-	-
Streets	**Discretionary Funds**	**125,000**	**60,000**	**-**	**-**	**65,000**	**-**
Sweeper	Discretionary Funds	60,000	60,000	-	-	-	-
Backhoe Loader	Discretionary Funds	65,000	-	-	-	65,000	-
Parks & Recreation	**Current Revenues $2,300, Economic Pick-Up Current Revenues $12,000, and Recreation Impact Fees $130,000**	**144,300**	**104,300**	**40,000**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Capital – Rental/Lease	Current Revenues	2,300	2,300	-	-	-	-
½ Ton Pickup (New)	Economic Pick-up Truck Current Revenues	12,000	12,000	-	-	-	-
South Street Park Parking	Recreation Impact Fees	25,000	25,000	-	-	-	-
South Street Park Lighting	Recreation Impact Fees	25,000	25,000	-	-	-	-
Beverly Park Restrooms	Recreation Impact Fees	40,000	40,000	-	-	-	-
South Street Park Restrooms	Recreation Impact Fees	40,000	-	40,000	-	-	-

	Funding Source	Total	Fiscal Year 2009-2010	Fiscal Year 2010-2011	Fiscal Year 2011-2012	Fiscal Year 2012-2013	Fiscal Year 2013-2014
Water	**Current Revenues $394,400; Water Impact Fees $4,688,100; Discretionary Funds 1,229,600; and Loans $6,342,800**	**12,654,900**	**344,900**	**25,000**	**3,595,000**	**2,640,000**	**6,050,000**
Capital – Rental/Lease	Current Revenues	11,900	11,900	-	-	-	-
Reclaim Water Master Plan	Water Impact Fees	50,000	50,000	-	-	-	-
Sunshine WTP#3 design	Water Impact Fees	50,000	50,000	-	-	-	-
SCADA Upgrade	Water Impact Fees	75,000	75,000	-	-	-	-
CUP Renewal	Water Impact Fees	75,000	75,000	-	-	-	-
Lower Ocklawaha River Alternative Water Supply	Current Revenues	83,000	83,000	-	-	-	-
½ Ton 4x4 (Replacement 201)	Current Revenues	25,000	-	25,000	-	-	-
½ Ton 4x4 (Replacement 301)	Current Revenues	20,000	-	-	20,000	-	-
Sampey Water Plant Upgrades (WTP#2)	Current Revenue $49,900; Discretionary Funds $227,000; Water Impact Fees $1,298,100	1,575,000	-	-	1,575,000	-	-
Sunshine Water Plant Pressure Upgrades (WTP#3)	Water Impact Fees	2,000,000	-	-	2,000,000	-	-
Sampey water plant control panel replacement	Current Revenues	40,000	-	-	-	40,000	-
Catherine Lane-Water Main Replacement	Loan	150,000	-	-	-	150,000	-

	Funding Source	Total	Fiscal Year 2009-2010	Fiscal Year 2010-2011	Fiscal Year 2011-2012	Fiscal Year 2012-2013	Fiscal Year 2013-2014
A/C Water Main Replacement	Loan	450,000	-	-	-	450,000	-
Palisades WTP Control and Chlorination Upgrade	Water Impact Fees	500,000	-	-	-	500,000	-
Phase 1 Reclaim Water distribution System	Loan	1,500,000	-	-	-	1,500,000	-
Palisades Water system Interconnect	Loan	750,000	-	-	-	-	750,000
Water System Looping for Pressure	Loan	800,000	-	-	-	-	800,000
Phase 2 Reclaim Water Distribution System	Water Impact Fees $640,000 and Loan $860,000	1,500,000	-	-	-	-	1,500,000
Cherry Lake Water Plant #6	Current Revenues $164,600; Discretionary Funds $1,002,600; and Loan $1,832,800	3,000,000	-	-	-	-	3,000,000
Wastewater	**Current Revenues $412,400; Discretionary Funds $1,553,300; Grant $650,000; and Loan $300,000**	**2,915,700**	**1,749,700**	**470,000**	**-**	**300,000**	**396,000**
Turbidity Meter	Current Revenues	3,000	3,000	-	-	-	-
Analyzer	Current Revenues	3,000	3,000	-	-	-	-
Capital – Rental/Lease	Current Revenues	8,400	8,400	-	-	-	-
1/2 Ton Truck (Replacement 401)	Current Revenues	20,000	20,000	-	-	-	-

	Funding Source	Total	Fiscal Year 2009-2010	Fiscal Year 2010-2011	Fiscal Year 2011-2012	Fiscal Year 2012-2013	Fiscal Year 2013-2014
Effluent Filters	Current Revenues	36,500	36,500	-	-	-	-
Max Hooks Lift Station and Force Main	Discretionary Funds	395,000	395,000	-	-	-	-
Wendell Ave, Catherine Lane	Discretionary Funds $388,300 and Grant $650,000	1,038,300	1,038,300	-	-	-	-
10 inch Lined Vitrified Clay Pipe 4500' Sunshine Plant	Discretionary Funds	170,000	-	170,000	-	-	-
Lift Station #18 Rehabilitation and Relocate	Discretionary Funds	300,000	-	300,000	-	-	-
Silver Eagle Master Pump Station	Loan	300,000	-	-	-	300,000	-
Sunshine Parkway WWTP#3 aerator motor	Current Revenues	20,000	-	-	-	-	20,000
Sampey WWTP#1 aerator motor	Current Revenues	20,000	-	-	-	-	20,000
Sunshine Parkway WWTP#3 aerator gearbox	Current Revenues	28,000	-	-	-	-	28,000
Sampey WWTP#1 aerator gearbox	Current Revenues	28,000	-	-	-	-	28,000
Sampey WWTP Expansion (Phase 2) Engineering	Discretionary Funds	300,000	-	-	-	-	300,000
Total		**$20,251,600**	**$2,482,400**	**$859,500**	**$3,901,500**	**$3,248,000**	**$9,760,200**
Funding Sources Overview							
Current Revenue		$2,271,900	$405,200	$349,500	$659,400	$283,000	$574,800
Park Impact Fees		130,000	90,000	40,000	-	-	-
Admin. Impact Fees		-	-	-	-	-	-
Water Impact Fees		4,330,100	175,000	-	3,015,100	500,000	640,000

	Funding Source	Total	Fiscal Year 2009-2010	Fiscal Year 2010-2011	Fiscal Year 2011-2012	Fiscal Year 2012-2013	Fiscal Year 2013-2014
Sewer Impact Fees		-	-	-	-	-	-
Loans		9,642,800	-	-	-	2,400,000	7,242,800
Discretionary Funds		3,153,400	1,088,800	470,000	227,000	65,000	1,302,600
Grants		723,400	723,400	-	-	-	-
Other		-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		**$20,251,600**	**$2,482,400**	**$859,500**	**$3,901,500**	**$3,248,000**	**$9,760,200**

Source: City of Groveland, 2010 [9J-5.016(4)(a)(1), F.A.C.]