

## CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ELEMENT



CITY OF GROVELAND

LAKE COUNTY, FLORIDA

ADOPTED ON \_\_\_\_\_, 2019  
ORDINANCE 2018-10-34

DRAFT EVALUATION AND APPRAISAL REPORT  
OCTOBER 1, 2018

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ELEMENT  
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

A. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

1. BACKGROUND AND HISTORY .....1

2. PROCESS FOR ANNUAL ADOPTION AND REVIEW .....3

3. GENERAL COMPONENTS OF THE SCHEDULE .....3

    a. Time Period.....3

    b. Project Description and General Location .....3

    c. Consistency with Other Elements .....3

    d. Projects and Costs .....4

    e. Revenue Sources .....4

    f. Grants as a Funding Source .....4

4. PROJECTS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE SCHEDULE.....5

    a. Projects to Achieve and Maintain LOS standards .....5

    b. Projects to Reduce Existing Deficiencies .....5

    c. Replacement Projects .....6

    d. Projects to Meet Future Demand .....6

    e. Supporting Data and Analysis .....8

B. Capital Improvements Inventory ..... 8

1. Need Derived from Other Elements .....8

2. Existing Financial Resources .....9

3. Local Revenue Sources.....9

    a. Property Taxes (Ad Valorem).....9

    b. Public Utility or User Charges.....10

    c. Public Service or Utility Tax .....10

    d. Special Source of Revenue .....10

    e. Special Assessment.....11

    f. Borrowing .....11

4. State Sources .....12

    a. Revenue Sharing Trust Fund .....13

    b. Other Shared Revenue .....13

    c. Mobile Home Licenses .....14

    d. Local Option Taxes.....14

e.	Alcoholic Beverage License .....	14
f.	Other Sources of Shared Revenues .....	14
5.	Federal and State Grants and Loans.....	15
C.	LOCAL POLICIES AND PRACTICES .....	18
1.	Level of Service Standards .....	18
2.	Capital Improvements Program (CIP).....	19
3.	Impact Fees .....	19
4.	Utility Service Areas.....	20
5.	User Charges and Connection Fees .....	20
6.	Concurrency Management System .....	20
7.	Mandatory Dedication or Fees in Lieu Of .....	21
8.	Moratoria.....	22
D.	FINANCIAL ANALYSIS .....	22
1.	Fiscal Assessment .....	22
a.	Accounting System .....	23
b.	Projected Revenues .....	23
c.	Projected Expenditures .....	25
d.	Summary and Recommendations .....	27
E.	DATA AND ANALYSIS .....	28
1.	POTABLE WATER .....	28
a.	Existing Facility Capacity.....	28
b.	Consumptive Use Permit (CUP).....	29
c.	Level of Service Analysis .....	29
2.	WASTEWATER.....	30
a.	Existing Facility Capacity.....	30
b.	Level of Service Analysis .....	30
3.	PUBLIC RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE .....	31
a.	Existing Parks and Recreational Facilities.....	31
b.	Level of Service Analysis .....	31
4.	TRANSPORTATION.....	33
a.	Level of Service Analysis .....	34
5.	STORMWATER.....	37
a.	Level of Service Analysis .....	37
6.	SOLID WASTE .....	38
a.	Level of Service Analysis .....	38
7.	PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES .....	39
a.	Enrollment Projections and Projected New Student Capacity.....	39

b. Level of Service .....40

F. Goals, Objectives and Implementing Policies ..... 41

b. For parks and recreation, at a minimum, the following standards will satisfy the concurrency requirement: .....47

**APPENDICES**

APPENDIX A: LAKE COUNTY 2009-2013 TRANSPORTATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM.

APPENDIX B: LAKE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS 5-YEAR CAPITAL PLAN

APPENDIX C: CITY OF GROVELAND 5-YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN SUMMARY

**LIST OF TABLES**

TABLE 1: AD VALOREM TAX YIELD PROJECTIONS..... 23

TABLE 2: REVENUE PROJECTIONS AFFECTING CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ..... 24

TABLE 3: EXPENDITURE PROJECTIONS FOR SCHEDULED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ..... 25

TABLE 4: ANNUAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES .....26

TABLE 5: FISCAL ASSESSMENT NO. 1 ..... 26

TABLE 6: ANTICIPATED INCREASE IN AD VALOREM TAX REVENUE PROJECTIONS ..... 27

TABLE 7: CAPACITY OF WATER TREATMENT PLANTS**ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED**

TABLE 8: SJRWMD CONSUMPTIVE USE PERMIT MAXIMUM ANNUAL AND DAILY WITHDRAWALS, 2010 .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

TABLE 9: PARK LAND.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

TABLE 10: LEVEL OF SERVICE ANALYSIS FOR PARK FACILITIES..... 32

TABLE 11: LEVEL OF SERVICE ANALYSIS FOR PARK LAND..... 33

TABLE 12: LAKE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION CONCURRENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM TRAFFIC COUNTY, 2009..... 36

TABLE 13: SOLID WASTE COLLECTION DATA..... 38

TABLE 14: TEN YEAR FACILITIES PLAN: ENROLLMENT FORECAST THRU 2017..... 40

TABLE 15: RECOMMENDED ADDITIONAL CAPACITY THROUGH 2017 **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

TABLE 16: CITY OF GROVELAND’S 5-YEAR SCHEDULE OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS SCHEDULE ..... 58

**LIST OF FIGURES**

FIGURE 1: FEDERAL GRANT AGENCIES AND PROGRAM TITLES ..... 17

## 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 update to the *Capital Improvements Element (CIE)* was conducted consistent with and following the guidelines required by the Department of Economic Opportunity in *Florida Statutes (F.S.) § 163.3177(3)(a)-(b)*.

There is often confusion about the difference between the *CIE* and the *Capital Improvements Plan (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 three (3) parts: the Data and Analysis section; the Goals, Objectives, and Policies section, and the *CIP*. 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 *CIP*; and a projection of future revenues and expenditures.

The second section of the update is the Goals, Objectives, and Policies sections. Per the definitions contained in F.S. § 163.3164, a goal is “the long-term end toward which programs or activities are ultimately directed.” An Objective is “a specific, measurable, intermediate end that is achievable and marks progress towards a goal.” A policy is “the way in which programs and activities are conducted to achieve an identified goal”.

The third section of the update is the *Capital Improvements Plan*. 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 *CIP*. This plan 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. Drainage or stormwater, and
4. Solid Waste.

Under the Community Planning Act of 2011 (HB 7207), Chapter 163.1380 F.S. was amended to make the following public facilities voluntary regarding maintaining concurrency and LOS standards:

1. Public Recreation and Open Space;
2. Transportation; and
3. Public Schools.

The decision to include or exclude these public facilities was left up to the individual local government.

The City of Groveland has chosen to voluntarily include concurrency and LOS standards for these facilities within this Element.

The Community Planning Act of 2011 eliminated the former requirement of the 2005 Senate Bill 360 (SB 360) that the Capital Improvement Element be financially feasible. Additionally, the requirement of SB 360 that the annual update to a City's *CIP* be transmitted to the former Department of Community Affairs (DCA) has also been removed by this. The *CIP* now must only be adopted by a local government ordinance.

The *CIP* must include the Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) Transportation Improvements Program (TIP) to the extent that such improvements are relied upon to ensure concurrency [ § 163.3177(3)(a) 5., F.S.].

As of December 1, 2007,

The *CIP* 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)(3), F.S.].

For governments opting to include the voluntary School Concurrency Element, 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].

## 2. PROCESS FOR ANNUAL ADOPTION AND REVIEW

The purpose of the annual update is to maintain a feasible *CIP*. 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 Community Planning Act of 2011 removed State review of the *CIE*. Rather, the *CIE* and guiding *CIP* are to be reviewed annually by the respective local government, with amendments to the documents being adopted by ordinance.

## 3. GENERAL COMPONENTS OF THE SCHEDULE

F.S. § 163.3177 (3)(a)1-5 specifies the general components of the *CIP*. In general, the *CIP* must include those capital improvement projects for which the local government has fiscal responsibility. The *CIP* 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 *CIP* must be sub-divided into five one-year (fiscal year) periods *CIP*

### b. Project Description and General Location

The *CIP* 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 *CIP* 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 *CIP* 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 (F.S. § 163.3177(2)).



When necessary to maintain consistency between plan elements and the *CIE*, an amendment may be made annually when it is necessary to coincide with the adoption of the local government’s budget and capital improvements program. [ § 163.3177(3)(b))

**d. Projects and Costs**

A local government has discretion in establishing the types of projects that will be included in the *CIP*. F.S. §163.3164(7) 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 *CIP* 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 *CIP* must identify the cost for each project. For roadway facilities, FDOT has prepared 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 are not acceptable to meet concurrency because neither acquisition nor studies provide actual capacities. Only programmed construction phases will satisfy concurrency.

**e. Revenue Sources**

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

**f. 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 *CIP*, the grant may only be considered as a “planned funding” source for years 4 and 5 of the *CIP*.

#### **4. PROJECTS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE SCHEDULE**

The projects to be included in the *CIP* 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 *CIP* (F.S. § 163(3)(a).4).

The *CIP* 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 *CIP* need only include projects for which the local government has fiscal responsibility. However, the *CIP* 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 four (4) mandatory and three (3) optional 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 *CIP* 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, and (4) Solid waste. [Chapter 163.3180(1)(a), F.S.].

##### **b. Projects to Reduce Existing Deficiencies**

In addition to projects to achieve and maintain LOS standards, the *CIP* 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 *CIP* must include projects that are needed as “replacement” for facilities that wear out or are obsolete. Such projects may include facilities that 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 *CIP* must include projects to meet future demand. Such projects should be identified in the data and analysis section of each element. The function of the *CIP* 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 (F.S. § 163.3180(2))

- 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 (F.S. § 163.3180(2))

- 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(2), 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 *CIP*. [ §163.3177(6)(c).3, F.S.]

Recreation and Open Space: The statute distinguishes between open space and outdoor recreation acreage and the actual facilities constructed on such land.

- 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: Under the Community Planning Act of 2011, school concurrency became an optional element of comprehensive plans.

- General: As a municipality utilizing the voluntary School Concurrency Element, the Amendment to the *CIE* must ensure that public school LOS standards can be met per Chapter 163.3180(6)(c), 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(h).2, F.S.].
- Supporting Data and Analysis and Goals, Objectives and Policies: the supporting data and analysis and the goals, objectives and policies in the optional *Pubic School Facilities Element* must include options for proportionate share mitigation of impacts on public school facilities (F.S. § 163.3180(6)(g).c).
- 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 *CIE* must address facilities for which concurrency standards have been adopted, the *CIE* must include the projects in the School District's *5-year Work Plan* (Chapter 163.3180(6)(g)., F.S.).

Proportionate Share: Subsection 163.3180((6)(h)1.c, F.S., contains proportionate share provision that applies to public school facilities.

- Concurrency Test: Transportation facilities needed to serve new development must be in place at the time of the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. List of projects: The *CIP* must include projects on which the local government has relied or intends to rely for concurrency purposes. The *CIP* 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 *CIP* as one component of the total cost of a project. If a right-of-way acquisition project is included in the *CIP*, it must also include the construction phases of the project.

Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Projects: The *CIP* 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(8), F.S., to the extent that such improvements are relied upon to ensure concurrency. The *CIP* must also be coordinated with the applicable MPO's long range transportation plan adopted pursuant to §339.175(7), F.S.

Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Projects: The local government must consult with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) when plan amendments affect facilities on the SIS [Chapter 163.3180(5)(h).a, F.S.]. Projects needed to maintain the Standards must be included in the *CIP*. MPO's are required to update their *TIP* annually (October 1) and to include all regional/county projects in the new five-year work plan.

Proportionate-share: As referenced in Chapter 163.3180 (5)(h).2. a-e., 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.

**e. Supporting Data and Analysis**

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 (5) years. For roadway and schools, the analysis must include a forecast of revenues from proportionate share contributions from developers.

**B. CIP 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 (2020-2025) and long-range (2026-2040) planning period. Appendix B of the *Public School Facilities Element* features the concurrency service areas for the public schools in Lake County.

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 CIP along with their estimated costs and projected year of expenditure. As required by § 163.3177(3)(a).1 F.S., the *Capital Improvements Element* addresses existing and future capital improvements needed for at least a five-year fiscal period. The City's CIP lists improvements identified for the years 2010 - 2014.

It should be noted that the capital improvement projects contained in the City's CIP are not inclusive of all the anticipated capital expenditures by the City during the planning period. The City's CIP 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.

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 comprise 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 CIP 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 for utilization of City-owned utilities such as water and, drainage. 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 2019.

**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. 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 (1) to five (5) years. The more customary method is to authorize long-term bond issues, which range in length from five (5) to thirty (30) 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 are 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 2019. Of this revenue, 71.02 percent 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 2019 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 2019 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 2019 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 2019 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 Economic Opportunity (DEO) in the State of Florida. The DEO 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. The DEO administers loans and grants for these projects to eligible governments.

**CURRENT STATUS:**

The City has received a Safer Grant for six (6) firefighters as well as Community Development Block Grants for two (2) neighborhood revitalization projects from DEO.

**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 Work 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 Work 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. 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. requires LOS standards to be included for all public facilities addressed by local governments in both required and optional elements of 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 affect 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 concurrent with the impacts of development. 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 Plan* documents 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. 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. *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. .

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, are good examples 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. The Community Planning Act of 2011 makes concurrency for potable water, drainage, solid waste, and sanitary sewer mandatory. This act changed transportation, schools, and parks/recreation to optional elements (local government choice) for concurrency. 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, site plans, planned unit development (PUD) or Building Permit approvals be granted only upon demonstrated compliance with the system. 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 applicant for subdivision 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 utilizes 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 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 *CIP*. 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
<b>FUND</b>					
<b>General Fund:</b>					
Ad Valorem	\$ 58,300	\$ 76,800	\$ 117,500	\$ 56,000	
Park Impact Fees	\$ 500,000	-	-	-	-
Discretionary Funds	\$ 694,000	\$ 521,700	-	-	-
<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$ 1,252,300</b>	<b>\$ 598,500</b>	<b>\$ 117,500</b>	<b>\$ 56,000</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Enterprise Funds:</b>					
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
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 1,141,100</b>	<b>\$ 2,221,050</b>	<b>\$ 2,065,250</b>	<b>\$ 2,916,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,500,000</b>
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>\$ 2,393,400</b>	<b>\$ 2,819,550</b>	<b>\$ 2,182,750</b>	<b>\$ 2,972,000</b>	<b>\$ 5,995,100</b>

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
<b>FUND</b>					
<b>General Fund</b>					
Annual Capital Expenditures	\$ 1,252,300	\$ 598,500	\$ 117,500	\$ 56,000	\$ 108,200
<b>Enterprise Funds</b>					
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
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>\$ 2,393,400</b>	<b>\$ 2,819,550</b>	<b>\$ 2,182,750</b>	<b>\$ 2,972,000</b>	<b>\$ 6,103,300</b>

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
<b>FUND</b>					
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
<b>GENERAL FUND</b>					
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
<b>ENTERPRISE FUND</b>					
<b>WATER</b>					
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
<b>WASTEWATER</b>					
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
<b>REFUSE</b>					
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 infrastructure-creating 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 concurrent and included in the *5-year CIE Schedule* per §163.3180(1), 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 *CIP* 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 (5) 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 6, Public Facilities Element).

**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 in Table 7, Public Facilities Element.

**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 has worked 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 Utility Service Area established per the requirements of Chapter 180 F.S.

### **a. Existing Facility Capacity**

The City's Utility Department operates and maintains three (3) 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 #2 has the smallest capacity at .055 million gallons per day. The Sunshine Park WWTF #3 has a capacity of 1 million 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 wastewater 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 1 of the Recreation and Open Space Element 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. See Table 1, Recreation and Open Space Element for a listing of parks.

#### 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 2040.

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:**

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

An analysis of the existing and projected population increases 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 has 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 the City 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 7: LEVEL OF SERVICE ANALYSIS FOR PARK FACILITIES**

Year	Population	Total Acreage Available	Acreage Required to Meet LOS Standard	Reserve Capacity (in acres)
------	------------	-------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------

			(3 acres/ 1,000 people)	
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 8: 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:

<u>Classification</u>	<u>Peak Hour Minimum*</u>
FIHS: SR 25/US 27	C
Principal Arterials: SR 50	D
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:	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 #, Transportation Element 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 #, Transportation Element, 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/Table #, Transportation Element, titled Lake County 2009-2013 Transportation Construction Program.



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

## 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 62-330.20, F.A.C are required to apply for a St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD) Environmental Resource Permit (ERP). 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 ERP 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.

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*)


Note

Projects located within the Green Swamp Area of Critical State Concern and within the Most Effective Recharge Areas must retain three (3) 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 evaporate 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 authorizing approval 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 Heart of Florida Landfill in Sumter County. The Lake County Landfill was recently closed. The contract with Heart of Florida Landfill will continue until a replacement landfill can be opened in Lake County.

**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 8: 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
<b>Total Average</b>			<b>234.19 pounds</b>

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. The current LOS of 2.93 pounds per day meets the City’s adopted concurrency standard.

**7. PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES**

One of the changes of the Community Planning Act of 2011, was that it became voluntary that a Comprehensive Plans include a public school facilities element. The City of Groveland has voluntarily decided to retain the School Concurrency Element.

For now the Data and Analysis includes Appendix B of the Public School Facilities Element, which provides a list of capital improvement projects as presented by the Lake County School District.

**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 Table 2 (Groveland Schools) and Appendix A (All County Schools) in the *Public School Facilities Element*.

*CIPICIP*

(1) Please note this is planned FISH capacity and **not** student stations.

(2) Projected cost if facility divided by the number of student stations.

**b. 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.”

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN**

Appendix # C and D of the Public School Facilities Element provides a series of spreadsheets from the adopted City’s *Capital Improvements Plan* for FY 2017-2022. These spreadsheets include the Schools Boards revenues and expenditures, r

## F. 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 9 ) 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 *Comprehensive 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 *CIP* provided by this *Element* (F.S. §163.3177(3)(a)).

**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 F.S. § 163-3180(b)..

***CIP***

**Policy 1.2.2:**

***Adopted Level of Service Standards.*** The following level of service standards are hereby 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..

**Potable Water:**

250 gallons per day per equivalent residential unit (ERU). 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 gallons per minute (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). 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 million gallons day (MGD) ADF use a 3.5 factor, flows 0.050 to 0.250 MGD 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:**

The LOS for stormwater drainage shall be as stated in Policy 1.17.4 of the Public Facilities Element.

Projects located within the Green Swamp Area of Critical State Concern and within the Most Effective Recharge Areas must retain three (3) 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:**

<b><u>Classification</u></b>	<b><u>Peak Hour Minimum*</u></b>
FIHS: SR 25/US 27	C
Principal Arterials: SR 50	D
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:**

// The LOS for recreation and open space shall be as set forward in the Recreation and Open Space Element.

**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 Capital Plan*, the plans of other local governments, and as necessary, updates to the Concurrency Service Area Map are required to ensure that the adopted LOS standards for concurrency service areas will be achieved and maintained.

On or before September 15<sup>th</sup> of each year and after consideration of the written comments of the County and the Cities, the Lake County School Board shall adopt a Capital Plan 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

Capital Plan. 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 (3) 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.

***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 1.2.5:** *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 1.2.6:** *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 ( 2020-2025) and long-range ( 2026-2040) planning periods of this *Comprehensive Plan*, the City shall incorporate park land and park facilities as needed in the *CIP*, 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 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 F.S. §163.3180(1)(b).

**Policy 1.3.1:** *Concurrency Provisions.* The City's Concurrency Management System shall provide the following (F.S. §163.):

- a. the capital improvements budget and a *CIP* which, in addition to meeting all of the other statutory and rule requirements, must be adopted annually in the budget process ;
- b. the *CIP* 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 *CIP* pursuant to F.S. §163.3180(1)(b).;

- c. a realistic 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 *CIP*;
- d. the *CIP* 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 *CIP*;
- e. 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 at the time they occur;
- f. a provision that the City, on an annual basis, shall determine whether it is adhering to the adopted level of service standards and its *CIP* and that the City has a demonstrated capability of monitoring the availability of public facilities and services; and
- g. 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. F.S. §163.3180(1)(b))

- 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 and services are guaranteed in an enforceable development agreement that includes the provisions of §163.3227 F.S.. The agreement must guarantee that the necessary facilities and services will be in place when the impact of development occur; or
  - (4) 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.

a. 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
- (3) the necessary facilities and services are in place no later than 1 year after issuance of a certificate of occupancy.
- 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.; or
  - (5)
  - (5) the necessary facilities and services are guaranteed in an enforceable development agreement that includes the provisions of paragraphs 1-3 above. The agreement must guarantee that the necessary facilities and services will be in place when the impacts of the development occur; or
  - (7)
- 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 concurrent with the impact of the phase.

- 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(5)(e).1-4 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 allowed by Chapter 163.3180(5)(e).1-4 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(5)(e).1-4 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 *CIP*. 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.

**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 (163.3177(3)(b)).

**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 strategy exists to adequately fund the *CIP*. If alternative funding sources are not successfully adopted on the identified, the City shall either:

- A) Increase the rates of current revenue sources or implement other available sources such that the City's *CIP* is adequately funded in each budget year; or
- B) Amend the *Plan Elements* included level of service standards and the *CIP*, as appropriate and necessary, such that the *Plan* is 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 shall be in place;
- 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 Debt Issuance and Obligations.* The City shall manage debt issuance and obligations according to sound public fiscal management principles, including the following]:
- 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.
- Policy 1.5.7:** *Total Debt Service.* The maximum ratio of total debt service to total revenue shall follow applicable Florida statutes and acceptable financial practices.
- Policy 1.5.8:** *Collection of Impact Fees.* All new development, which has a direct or indirect impact on 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.
- 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
- 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 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 *CIP* 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 *CIP*, a plan amendment to delete the capital improvement from the *CIP* 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 2025, 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's *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 *5-Year Capital Plan*, as adopted July 24, 2017, 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 (2019-2023)*, as adopted and amended on September 20, 2018, 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, Fifth Amendment*, as adopted on April 11, 2017, 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 *Traffic Improvement 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

**Policy 1.8.1:** *Construction and Replacement Schedule.* The City shall identify needs and establish construction and replacement schedules within the *Capital Facilities Element* [ F.S. §163.3180(1)(b).

**Policy 1.8.2:** *Establishing LOS Standards.* The City shall establish level of service standards for public facilities (F.S. §163.3180(1)(a)(b).

**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*

**Policy 1.8.4:** *Support of Comprehensive Plan.* Proposed capital improvement projects shall support the Goals, Objectives and Policies of this *Comprehensive Plan* (F.S. §163.3180(1).

**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 .

**Policy 1.9.1:** *Elimination of Public Hazards.* The City shall eliminate public hazards in its implementation of capital improvements

**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.

- Policy 1.9.3:** *Anticipating and Projecting Growth Patterns.* The City shall cipntiate and project growth patterns in its implementation and accommodation of new development and the redevelopment of facility and capital improvements
- Policy 1.9.4:** *Capital Improvements Financial Feasibility.* All capital improvements shall be made in a financially sound manner and take into account the plans of State agencies, local governments, and water management districts that provide facilities within the City of Groveland
- 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 F.S. §163.3180(2).
- 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 *CIP 9* 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 9: CITY OF GROVELAND'S 5-YEAR SCHEDULE OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS SCHEDULE**

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

	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2009-2010</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2010-2011</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2011-2012</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2012-2013</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2013-2014</b>
<b>Fund</b>							
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
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$20,251,600</b>	<b>\$2,482,400</b>	<b>\$859,500</b>	<b>\$3,901,500</b>	<b>\$3,248,000</b>	<b>\$9,760,200</b>
<b>Department Funds and Project Overview</b>							
<b>City Administration</b>	<b>Current Revenues</b>	<b>7,300</b>	<b>7,300</b>				
<b>Finance</b>	<b>Current Revenues</b>	<b>15,300</b>	<b>15,300</b>	-	-	-	-
Generator	Current Revenues	5,000	5,000	-	-	-	-
Capital – Rental/Lease	Current Revenues	10,300	10,300	-	-	-	-
<b>Community Development</b>	<b>Current Revenues</b>	<b>5,300</b>	<b>5,300</b>				
<b>Building Department</b>	<b>Current Revenues</b>	<b>5,300</b>	<b>5,300</b>				
<b>Police</b>	<b>Current Revenues \$1, 180, 400, Grant \$58,000 and Loan \$1,500,000</b>	<b>2,738,400</b>	<b>175,700</b>	<b>220,000</b>	<b>285,500</b>	<b>243,000</b>	<b>1,814,200</b>
Capital – Rental/Lease	Current Revenues	20,300	20,300	-	-	-	-

	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2009-2010</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2010-2011</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2011-2012</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2012-2013</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2013-2014</b>
(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
<b>Code Enforcement</b>	<b>Current Revenues</b>	<b>26,800</b>	<b>2,300</b>	<b>24,500</b>	-	-	-
Capital – Rental/Lease	Current Revenues	2,300	2,300	-	-	-	-
(1) Replacement Vehicle	Current Revenues	24,500	-	24,500	-	-	-
<b>Dispatching</b>	<b>Current Revenues</b>	<b>26,300</b>	<b>5,300</b>	-	<b>21,000</b>	-	-
Capital – Rental/Lease	Current Revenues	5,300	5,300	-	-	-	-
Photo Copier	Current Revenues	21,000	-	-	21,000	-	-
<b>Fire</b>	<b>Current Revenues \$57,000 and Loan \$1,500,000</b>	<b>1,557,000</b>	<b>7,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>	-	-	<b>1,500,000</b>
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



	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2009-2010</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2010-2011</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2011-2012</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2012-2013</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2013-2014</b>
<b>Animal Control</b>	<b>Current Revenue</b>	<b>30,000</b>	-	<b>30,000</b>	-	-	-
Temperated Control Truck	Current Revenue	30,000	-	30,000	-	-	-
<b>Streets</b>	<b>Discretionary Funds</b>	<b>125,000</b>	<b>60,000</b>	-	-	<b>65,000</b>	-
Sweeper	Discretionary Funds	60,000	60,000	-	-	-	-
Backhoe Loader	Discretionary Funds	65,000	-	-	-	65,000	-
<b>Parks &amp; Recreation</b>	<b>Current Revenues \$2,300, Economic Pick-Up Current Revenues \$12,000, and Recreation Impact Fees \$130,000</b>	<b>144,300</b>	<b>104,300</b>	<b>40,000</b>	-	-	-
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
<b>Water</b>	<b>Current Revenues \$394,400; Water Impact Fees \$4,688,100; Discretionary Funds 1,229,600; and Loans \$6,342,800</b>	<b>12,654,900</b>	<b>344,900</b>	<b>25,000</b>	<b>3,595,000</b>	<b>2,640,000</b>	<b>6,050,000</b>
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
<b>Wastewater</b>	<b>Current Revenues \$412,400; Discretionary Funds \$1,553,300; Grant \$650,000; and Loan \$300,000</b>	<b>2,915,700</b>	<b>1,749,700</b>	<b>470,000</b>	-	<b>300,000</b>	<b>396,000</b>
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	-	-	-	-

	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2009-2010</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2010-2011</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2011-2012</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2012-2013</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2013-2014</b>
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
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$20,251,600</b>	<b>\$2,482,400</b>	<b>\$859,500</b>	<b>\$3,901,500</b>	<b>\$3,248,000</b>	<b>\$9,760,200</b>
<b>Funding Sources Overview</b>							
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

	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2009-2010</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2010-2011</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2011-2012</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2012-2013</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2013-2014</b>
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		-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$20,251,600</b>	<b>\$2,482,400</b>	<b>\$859,500</b>	<b>\$3,901,500</b>	<b>\$3,248,000</b>	<b>\$9,760,200</b>

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