

Capital Improvements Element

Revised October 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Purpose and Format	1
Inventory	4
Analysis	12
*Goals, Objectives and Policies	
*Implementation	

*Indicate Portions to be adopted.

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Apalachicola Capital Improvements, 1990-1995	2
II	Revenue Projections Affecting Capital Improvements	14
III	Debt Service Expenditures Projections	15
IV	Debt Service Expenditure projections	15
V	Summary of Needs Derived from other Elements	16
VI	Fiscal Assessment	17
VII	Annual Operating Cost Increase	18
VIII	Cumulative Operating Cost	19

Purpose and Format

In 1985, the Florida Legislature mandated that local governments plan for the availability of public facilities and services to support development concurrent with this- impacts of such development. The purpose of the Capital Improvements Element is to: (1) evaluate the need for public facilities in support of the Future Land Use Element ; (2) estimate the costs of improvements for which local government has fiscal responsibility; (3) analyze the fiscal capability of the local government to finance and construct improvements; and (4) adopt financial policies to guide the funding and construction of improvements.

The Capital Improvements Element (CIE) differs from the City's capital improvements program as its scope is limited to only those capital improvements derived from the other elements of the comprehensive plan. The CIA may be used to demonstrate the economic feasibility of the comprehensive plan. It focuses on the capital outlay required to meet existing deficiencies and to maintain adopted level of service standards planned for public facilities in the plan.

The content of this element includes: (1) an inventory of capital improvements needs, financial resources, and local policies and practices; (2) a fiscal assessment of revenues and expenditures; (3) a discussion of issues and recommendations; (4) a listing of goals, objectives, and policies; (5) a section detailing implementation, including a 5-year schedule of capital improvements, and a section describing monitoring and evaluation strategies.

2. INVENTORY

A. NEEDS Derived FROM OTHER ELEMENTS

The analysis performed in the preceding City of Apalachicola Comprehensive Plan Elements have identified facility improvements needed to meet the demands; of existing and future development. Public education is administered by the Franklin County School Board. Public health facilities are provided by the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, and the private sector. The County public education and public health facilities are located within the City. It was determined that these systems and facilities (no new schools or public health facilities are projected during this planning period), were adequately served by roadways, sanitary sewer, solid waste, drainage, potable water, and recreation facilities. No additional public facilities of this nature will be needed beyond those already planned in order to adequately satisfy the projected demand and maintain adopted level of service standards, as proposed in the other elements of its comprehensive plan. The area of service is the City of Apalachicola.

Therefore this inventory is concerned with those needed improvements which are of relatively large scale, are of generally non-recurring high cost, and which -may require multi-year financing. A financial criterion used by the City classifies , non-recurring improvements as \$25,000 or more for the construction, acquisition or installation of facilities. The needed improvements derived from the preceding elements of this plan which qualify as capital improvements are listed in Table I, below. These improvements were ranked in order of priority by the Chairman of the Planning and Zoning Commission, the Commissioner appointed to the Water and Sewer Departments, and the Director of the Community Development Block Grant.

Table I lists capital improvements identified for the years 1990-1995, since the plan is scheduled for adoption in 1990. This is consistent with the provision of Section 9J-5.016, F.A.C., which requires this element to address existing and future capital improvements needed for at least the first five fiscal years after the adoption of the comprehensive plan. Capital improvements needed for the latter part of the planning period will be evaluated during the required annual review of this element.

Table I provides a brief description of each of the capital improvement projects, indicates whether the project is needed to correct existing deficiencies or address projected needs, and provides an estimate of the total project cost. Projects are grouped by facility type. Capital improvement projects have been identified for sanitary sewer, drainage, recreation, and potable water.

TABLE I: APALACHICOLA CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS, 1990 -2010
PROJECT DESCRIPTION
TARGET YEAR
ESTIMATED COST

Project Description	Target Year	Estimated Cost
Sanitary Sewer Facility		
Phase IV - Two-Mile, Brownsville Road and airport	2006-2010	Est. \$2.4 million
Phase V - Bluff Road	2006-2010	Est. \$2 million
Phase VI - Bluff Roa North	2006-2010	Est. \$2 million
Rehabilitation of existing sewer lines	Completed 2002	\$8 million
Portable Water Facilities		
New water plant, wells, elevated and ground storage Rehabilitation of existing water system and replace under-size lines, loading removal tubariation from mains	2002 -2004	\$4 million
Drainage Facilities		
Stormwater management study to be completed 12/89: a multi-phased plan will be developed based on study recommendations	2002 -2004	Multi-million
Recreation and Tourist Facilities		
Construct Civic Center – Battery Park	Complete 1995	\$200,000
Sylvester Williams park	2003 - 2004	\$125,000
Parking Area with sidewalks from Downtown to Scipio Creek	2004 - 2005	\$250,000
Batter Park Complex – Rehabilitate and improve city boat basin	Complete 2003	\$140,000
Waterfront – Ave. D. and E, work dock and river walk	2002 - 2005	(partial complete in '02 \$250,000) Total project \$450,000

Lafayette Park – Rehabilitate and landscaping, etc.	Complete in 1992	\$150,000
Rehabilitate and improve City Squares (Franklin, City, Madison, Gorrie and Chapman)	2005 - 2007	\$375,000
Renovate Old Dixie Theater	Sold in 1993	(Renovated with private funds)
Rehabilitate and improve Magnolia Street Cemetery	2006 - 2007	\$600,000
Renovation of Chapman School Auditorium	1992-95	Administered by FCSB - current
Renovate City Hall	2002 - 2005	\$700,000
Traffic Facilities		
Paving of platted unpaved streets; repaving existing roads on an annual basis of approximately 1 mile per year.	2004 - 2009	Market Price
Housing Facilities		
Construct additional public housing (approximately 50 units)	2006 - 2010	Est. \$4 million

The column in Table I labeled "Target Year" indicates the year by which the projects must be completed in order to maintain the adopted level of service standards for the respective facilities. The notation "ED" has been used to indicate that the project is required to correct an existing deficiency, a situation where existing conditions are currently below adopted service level standards.

The capital improvement projects lifted in fable 1 are not inclusive 01 all anticipated capital expenditures during this period. The list of improvements has been limited to the major components of each facility. Smaller scale improvements of less than \$25,000 in cost will be addressed in the City's annual budget.

The bases for all cost estimates in this element were as follows:

Sewerage system construction coats were based upon: Master Plan Report, Water and Wastewater Systems Improvements for City of Apalachicola, Florida by Hubbard, Bates & Associates, Inc. Potable water rehabilitation costs were derived from; Master Plan Report, Water and Wastewater Systems Improvements for the City of Apalachicola, Florida by Hubbard, Bates & Associates, Inc. Construction costs for parks were estimated using data developed by the Apalachicola Community Development Block Grant Office engineering estimates were derived from Master Plan Report. Water and Wastewater Systems Improvements for City of Apalachicola. Florida by Hubbard, Bates & Associates,

B. FINANCIAL RESOURCES

In order to plan for capital improvements, the following is an inventory of major funding sources available to the City of Apalachicola. In 1990, these sources will contribute to a total revenue sum of \$1.3 million.

The following list of revenue sources comprises a working Inventory from which the City's capability to appropriate the needed revenue for capital improvement is assessed. The financial status of each revenue is addressed below. The list includes all major resources available to the

City and is not limited to those sources which will be used for capital improvement projects included in this element's five-year Schedule of Improvements.

LOCAL SOURCES

a. **Property Taxes (Ad Valorem)**: Property taxes are based on a millage rate (one mill is the equivalent of \$1 per \$1000 of assessed value or .1%) which is applied to the total taxable value of all real property. Depending upon local policy established by the City Commission, revenue from ad valorem taxes may be used to fund both operating costs and capita: projects. State constitutional provisions exist for raising the millage rate above the 10-mill cap by local referendum. CURRENT STATUS: The ad valorem tax accounts for approximately 11% of the city's annual budget. The current millage rate is set at approximately 6.2914 mills. The tax yield for 1990 is expected to be \$160,000 from a tax base (adjusted taxable value) of \$ 2.5 million.

b. Public Utility or User Charges . These charges are derived from the operation of publicly owned and operated utilities, such as water sewer, and the provision & maintenance of docks. Current Status: This source of revenue currently make up about 26.5% of all City revenues. The public utility revenue yield for 1990 will be 623 thousand.

c. Other Taxes, Fees and Charge. This category includes special assessments, various administrative fees, and other user charges for services and facilities operated by Apalachicola. Examples are sales of public documents, sale by the City of public property, and all private contributions (real estate, gifts, donations, etc.) to the City.

CURRENT STATUS: Approximately 15.4% of the City's revenues are generated from these sources. The sum of 200 thousand dollars in other taxes, fees and charges is anticipated in 1990.

d. Special Sources of Revenue. Depending upon priorities assigned by the City Commission and the availability of other revenue sources, it may be necessary to seek additional funding mechanisms. The following sources of revenue represent options available to the City to finance required capital improvements.

CURRENT STATUS:

2. Borrowing.

a) General Obligation Bonds. These bonds are backed by the full faith and credit of the local government, and are required to be approved by voter referendum. General Obligation Bonds offer lower interest rates than other bonds because they are secured by the taxing power of the local government. Revenues collected from the ad valorem taxes on real estate and other sources of general revenue are used to service the government's debt. Capital Improvements financed through General Obligation Bonds should benefit the City as a whole rather than particular areas or groups.

CURRENT STATUS: General Obligation Bonds have not been utilized to date.

b) Revenue Bonds. Unlike general obligations bonds, revenue bonds are financed by those directly benefiting from the capital improvement. Revenue obtained from the issuance of these bonds is used to finance publicly-owned facilities such as the Water and Sewage Plant. Charges collected for the users of these facilities are used, in turn, to retire the bond obligations. In this respect, the capital project is self-supporting. Issuance of these bonds may be approved by the City commission.

Bond revenues are deposited in the respective Enterprise Trust Fund Account for these projects. Funds are specifically earmarked for particular projects, and user charges are used to service the debt. In 1990, the ratio of revenue bonds to total debt service on these bonds (in thousands) for 1990 - 1995 is as follows:

1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
54.9	54.5	54.1	53.7	54.3	54.9

c) Industrial Revenue Bonds.

The City has not issued Industrial Revenue Bonds in the past.

STATE SOURCES

Apalachicola depends on annual disbursements from the state to supplement its operating and capital budget revenues. This section addresses those funds which are: a) generated locally, but collected and later returned by state agencies to the county; b) adopted as a local option tax or license fee, collected and returned by the state; or c) shared by the state in the form of grants to the local government, but originated from state general revenues. Amounts available from these sources may vary widely from year to year, depending upon legislative actions.

a. Revenue Sharing (eleven-cent cigarette tax and motor fuel tax) is given to the city each year. The motor fuel tax portion is for local use.

CURRENT STATUS: Approximately \$101,605.00 is received from this source .

b. Revenue Sharing Trust Fund. This fund receives Cigarette taxes. Cigarettes are currently taxed at 24 cents per pack. Two-cents is returned to the City.

CURRENT STATUS: The City receives approximately 19 thousand dollars per year from this source.

b. Other Shared Revenue.

1. Sales Tax. The current sales tax rate in Florida is 6%, and is levied upon retail sales, and such things as commercial rentals, admission fees to entertainment facilities, and motor vehicle sales. The formulae for allocation is based upon City population.

CURRENT STATUS: Approximately 51.4 thousand is received per year from this source.

2 .Mobile Home Licenses. Rates for mobile home licenses range from \$20 to \$80, depending upon the structure's length. Each City receives a share of these revenues based on the number of units located in the City.

CURRENT STATUS: Apalachicola's share comes to approximately 2 thousand per year.

3 .Motor Fuel Tax. Of the eight cents per gallon collected by the state for gas taxes, the county receives three cents as shared revenue.

CURRENT STATUS: The City has an informal agreement with the County for road improvements. No direct funds are received from this source.

MISCELLANEOUS:

This category includes the Beverage License Tax.

CURRENT STATUS: This source produces approximately \$1,000 annually. There is no Tourist Development Tax, County Voted Gas Tax nor a County Local Option Gas Tax within Franklin County.

BORROWED FUNDS

The City receives no funding from the following sources:

Motor Vehicles licenses;
motorboat licenses;
Oil and Gas Production Tax;
Pari mutuel Tax;
Solid Mineral Tax

FEDERAL AND STATE GRANTS AND LOANS

Federal and State funding may be secured through competitive grants. The City makes full use of the "Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance", 1986, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

CURRENT STATUS: The City has received Community Development Block Grants for economic development: three grants totaling approximately \$1,000,000 over the last three years. Three Neighborhood Revitalization, Housing, and Sewer Rehabilitation totaling \$2,000,000 over the last four years; two legislative allocations for sewerage (\$3,758,000 in 1985-1987); a federal Economic Development Administration Grant for \$851,000 in 1986; and a Department of Transportation Highway Beautification Grant \$85,000 in 1989.

Inventory

C. Local Policies and Practices

Local policies and practices will be used to guide the location and timing of land development, in support of the goals, objectives, and policies of the Future Land Use Element. Most elements, such as Future Land Use, Recreational, Housing, and Public Facilities, in particular, are dependent and/or influenced by capital improvements. This makes the Capital Improvement Element pivotal to many actions required or proposed in other elements of this plan. Many of these policies and practices may be influenced by state agencies and the county and other outside agencies that provide public facilities within the City jurisdiction. For example, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Year Transportation Plan may have an impact.

Several arterial roadways within the City's jurisdiction are on the state highway system and are therefore, largely the financial responsibility of FDOT. Likewise there is the County road system and other countywide responsibilities of Franklin County. Plans for improvement of some of these roadways are included within the 3-Year Transportation Plan and Franklin County's Plan. However, there are other such roadways that are not planned for improvements by either the County or FDOT. Either scenario will affect the intensity of development or degree of financial commitment for which the City must plan.

Special provisions may be made in those instances when the City desires improvement of a State or County road in order to maintain the City's adopted level of service- standard, in the absence of expending funds for improving the roadways or providing the County with funds to do so, either of which may be collected through a transportation fee. This management practice is discussed in greater detail in the Intergovernmental Coordination Element of this plan.

1. Level of Service Standards. Level of service (LOS) standards are an indicator of the extent or degree of service provided by, or proposed to be provided by a facility based on and related to the operational characteristics of the facility. LOS indicates the capacity per unit of demand of each public facility. They are, in short, a summary of existing or desired public facility conditions.

Chapter 163, F.S., and Chapter 9J-5, F.A.C., now require LOS standards to be included for public facilities addressed by local governments in their comprehensive plans.

LOS standards can effect the timing and location of development by encouraging development in areas where facilities may have excess capacity. On the other hand, development will not be permitted unless needed facilities and services are provided. Such provision and development may occur in a phase sequence over time.

CURRENT STATUS: The City had not formally adopted LOS standards for public facilities prior to the completion of this comprehensive plan. However, within the other elements of this comprehensive plan, the following LOS standards have been proposed :

Sanitary Sewer

Citywide Service area - 116 gallons per capita per day (gpcd)

1,450 gallons per day commercial/light industrial

Solid Waste 7.1 pound per capita per day

Drainage -25-year, 24-hour design storm, per FDOT Drainage Manual
 Potable Water - Citywide Service Area 135 gpcd;
 Collector Roadways - LOS C at peak hour
 Arterial Roadways - LOS C at peak hour
 Recreation Standards for Facilities –

Facility		Unit of Measure
Boat Ramps	1 boat ramp	Per 2,700 persons
Ball Diamonds	1 diamond	Per 2,400 persons
Basketball Courts	1 4-goal court	Per 2,400 persons
Multi-purpose Fields	1 field	Per 10,000
Tennis Courts	1 court	Per 7,000 persons
Nature and Study Community	1 site	Per 7,000 persons
Activity Centers	1 Facility	Per 7,000 persons
Hiking Trail	1 mile trail	Per 3,400 persons
Interpretive Trails	1 mile of trail	Per 10,000 persons
Nature and Study	1 site	Per 7,000 persons
Swimming	1 public pool	Per 8,000 persons
Skateboard Facility	1 site	Per 5,000 persons
Football Fields*	1 field	Per 20,000 persons

*The football field and other recreational facilities are available from time to time and by special arrangement between the County Schoolboard and the City. They have not been included on this list

The Capital Improvements Program will be consistent with the Capital Improvements Element of the local comprehensive plan, as it will reflect the goals, objectives, and policies of the element and its implementation strategies, including the 5-Year Schedule of Improvements. It is, however, more inclusive, as it contains those projects of relatively small scale and low cost (less than \$25,000) which are generally recurring and do not require multi-year financing. Also the CIP is not limited to those public facilities addressed in comprehensive plan, as the CIE is constrained.

Time periods covered by a CIP may range from short term to long term (5 years). The first year of the CIP is converted into the annual budget. The capital budget encompasses enacting appropriations for projects each budget year and is reviewed on an annual basis.

CURRENT STATUS: The City currently prepares a CIP as a part of the annual capital budget.

IMPACT FEES. Impact fees are imposed by many local governments on new development to offset the cost of new facilities necessitated by that development. These fees are a natural outgrowth of the CIE and is a rational basis for developing an impact fee ordinance. Impact fees be used to effect the timing of infill development. Infill development usually occurs in facilities. If the municipality areas with excess capacity of capital chooses not to recoup the costs of capital facilities in underutilized areas, infill development may be encouraged by the absence of impact fees on development in other service areas.

CURRENT STATUS: At present time the City has no adopted Impact fee ordinances.

5. User Charges and Connection Fees. User charges recoup the costs of public facilities by charging those who benefit from them.

CURRENT STATUS; User charges and connection fees are utilized for sanitary sewer, solid waste, potable water, and the provision and maintenance of docks.

Adequate Facilities Ordinance. Adequate ordinances control the timing and location of development by conditioning development approval upon a showing that sufficient facilities and services are present or will be provided to maintain LOS standards. It may in fact implement the 1985 Legislative mandate which requires that public facilities be available to support development. The ordinance may make development approval contingent upon the local government's ability to provide facilities and services. These ordinances:

- 1) Support consistency of the Capital Improvements Element with the Future Land Use Element;
- 2) Provide for the orderly expansion of public facilities;
- 3) Stabilize capital improvements expenditures and taxing structure for capital improvements; and
- 4) Reduce the possibility of damage to the environment from the use of overburdened facilities. Typically these ordinance interact with the development approval process by conditioning zoning, subdivision, or planned unit development approval on demonstrated compliance with the ordinance. Adequate Ordinances may also function at the building permit stage. The ordinances may control development in areas that are already approved but not as yet built out, such as pre-platted lands.

CURRENT STATUS: The Land Development Regulation and the Subdivision Ordinance which is a part of the Code provide for these controls.

Mandatory Dedications or Fees In Lieu Of:

The City may require, as a condition of plat approval, that subdividers dedicate a portion of land in the development to be used for public purposes such as roads, and parks.

CURRENT STATUS: Mandatory dedications or fees in lieu of are required by the City.

9. Moratoria: A moratorium, or stop-gap ordinance, may temporarily halt or freeze development for a specified period of time on an emergency basis. It may be imposed on building permits, development approvals, or governmental services such as potable water connection, sanitary sewer extensions or hook-ups. Moratoria may generally be imposed for a "reasonable time" to allow for necessary planning activities pending comprehensive plan preparation, adoption, or amendment.

CURRENT STATUS: The City is not imposing any moratoria

3. ANALYSIS

A. FISCAL ASSESSMENT

The purpose of this section is to determine whether sufficient revenue will be available within the existing budgeting framework utilized by the City to fund the needed improvements at the time they will be required.

The assessment process consists of estimating future receipts of revenues which the City uses for capital Improvement financing and then, balancing these receipts against anticipated expenditures for capital improvements.

In addition to direct costs for capital improvements, this section will review the fiscal impacts of the capital improvement derived from other elements upon the operation of the City departments responsible for facility management. This assessment includes only those items planned for in the other comprehensive plan elements.

Accounting System

The accounting system employed by the City records financial transactions in individual accounts which are called "funds." 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. All ad valorem tax revenues not required to be account for in other funds are accounted for in the General Fund. These funds generally provide for City Departments operation and the CIP.

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT FUND: This fund is used to account for roadway system capital Improvements and maintenance. State Gas Tax receipts are the revenue source for this fund. Expenditures for this fund included direct annual outlays for small capital improvements and normal maintenance.

ENTERPRISE FUMDS: Enterprise funds are used to account for City services that are operated and financed in a manner similar to private business enterprises. Presently the city maintains enterprise funds for sanitary sewer and potable water services. Revenues for these 'funds are generated from user charges and connection fees. Revenue bonds may be issued using a portion of City-wide receipts for debt service needs for large-scale capital improvement projects.

Projected Revenues

The City's tax base is projected to increase assuming a 5 percent rate of growth for the adjusted taxable value of property (including new construction), as indicated below. The City's assessment ratio is projected to remain stable at 100 percent.

Projected City Tax Base Increase						
Tax Base	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Adjusted Taxable value (including new	24.36	25.58	26.86	28.20	29.60	31.09

construction) 5% increase						
Source: Apalachicola Planning Department						

Table II Indicates the expected revenues available to the city to finance capital improvements for the years 1990 - 1995. Revenue amounts projected are based on past trends. These amounts represent 1987 dollars.

Ad valorem tax yields listed below were projected assuming a millage increase of .10 each year and annual increase in adjusted taxable value for five years.

Projected Ad Valorem Tax Yields						
	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Ad Valorem Tax Yields	153.5	163.7	174.6	186.1	198.4	211.4
Source: Apalachicola Planning Department, Note all figures in thousands						

Table II: Revenue Projections Affecting Capital Improvements						
Fund	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Transportation Improvement Fund (in thousands)	30	32	33	35	36	38
Enterprise Fund and grants (in millions)						
Sanitary Sewer	.810	1,060	1188	1,600	1,100	1,049
Potable Water	.704	.5	1.5	.560	.560	.060
Dock Facilities	0	.250	.750	.100	.100	0
Other Funds						
Drainage	.100	.250	.500	.500	.500	.500
Recreation	.100	.325	1.000	1.000	.500	.500
Source: Apalachicola Planning Department						

The Transportation Improvement Fund revenue amounts represent total receipts from state gas taxes. The projection estimates are based on state projections of gasoline consumption and state revenue sharing methodologies and a possible local option gas tax.

Enterprise Fund projected revenues for each account Include income from user charges, connection fees, bond issues and carryover reserves. Also included are anticipated grants and loans based on past experiences. User charge and connection fee revenue projections for sanitary sewer and potable water are based on current individual fee amounts (average monthly charge and connection fees) and projected total service connections. Revenues from revenue bond issues for sanitary sewer and potable water are also included in these figures. Docking facilities projected revenue estimates are based on a grant and user charges for the facilities and projected annual operations.

Projected Expenditures

For this assessment, expenditures have been aggregated into three categories: scheduled capital improvements project expenditures, capital improvement debt service expenditures; and expenditures for improvements derived from the other elements. The Department service

expenditures as projected are considered v/ the maximum debt capacity the City can handle under anticipated growth and other requirements.

Fund	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Transportation Improvement Fund (in thousands)	30	32	33	35	36	38
Enterprise Fund and grants (in millions)						
Sanitary Sewer	.810	1,060	1188	1,600	1,100	1,049
Potable Water	.704	.5	1.5	.560	.560	.060
Dock Facilities	0	.250	.750	.100	.100	0
Other Funds						
Drainage	.100	.250	.500	.500	.500	.500
Recreation	.100	.325	1.000	1.000	.500	.500

Source: Apalachicola Planning Department

Fund	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Enterprise Fund (in Thousands)						
Sanitary Sewer	30	30	30	+70	+70	+70
Potable Water	.810	1,060	1188	1,600	1,100	1,049

Source: Apalachicola Planning Department

The third category includes the direct costs of capital improvements listed in Table I. The projected cost of these improvements are summarized by facility type for 1990 - 1995 in Table V. These represent additional costs the City must incur in order to maintain adopted level of service standards under projected growth conditions.

Fund	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Traffic Facilities	0	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050
Sanitary Sewer	1.0	1.0	.5	1.5	1.5	.841
Drainage	.1	.25	.5	.5	.5	.5
Potable Water	.704	.5	1.5	.500	.500	.0
Recreation	.1	.325	1.0	1.0	.5	.5
Housing	0	.1	.5	1.0	.400	0
Dock Facilities	.0	.1	.5	.5	.1	0

Source: Apalachicola Planning Department (1989), Note: All figures in millions

In order to assess the ability of the City to meet anticipated capital improvements expenditures, it is necessary to determine whether sufficient revenues will be available. This has been done by finding the difference between the projected annual revenues and expenditures for each fund used by the City to finance capital improvements. The results of these assessments are shown in Table VI.

Table VI indicates the projected revenues for each of the funds, as previously listed in Table II, for the years 1990 -1995. Listed beneath the revenues are the projected expenditures for the year. The expenditures are the sum of the scheduled capital improvement costs (from Table III), the debt service expenditures (from Table IV), and applicable costs of capital improvements derived from the other elements (from Table V). Improvement costs from the other elements for sanitary sewer, potable water, transportation, and dock facilities have been assigned to the Enterprise Fund. Improvement costs and grants from the other elements for drainage, recreation, and housing have been assigned to the Grant Fund which has been the funding source used by the City in the past to pay for improvements. The balance for each fund indicates the difference between the projected revenues and expenditures. A negative balance indicates a revenue shortfall for that year.

Table VI: Fiscal Assessment 1						
Fund	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Transportation Improvement Funds						
Revenues	.030	.032	.033	.035	.036	.038
Expenditures	.030	.032	.045	.034	.050	.050
Balance	0	.002	-.002	-.010	-.014	-.012
Enterprise Funds and Grants						
Sanitary Sewer						
Revenues	.810	1.080	1.188	1.610	1.100	1.043
Expenditures	1.060	1.060	1.060	1.060	1.600	.941
Balance	-.250	.020	.128	.128	1.500	.102
Potable Water						
Revenues	.704	.500	1.500	.560	.560	.060
Expenditures	.704	.500	1.500	.560	.560	.060
Balance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dock Facilities						
Revenues	0	.250	.750	.100	.100	0
Expenditures	0	.100	.500	.500	.100	0
Balance	0	.150	.250	-.400	0	0
Drainage						
Revenues	.160	.250	.500	.500	.100	.500
Expenditures	.1	.250	.500	.500	.100	.500
Balance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recreation						
Revenues	.1	.325	1.00	1.0	.5	.500
Expenditures	.1	.325	1.00	1.0	.5	.500
Balance	0	0	0	0	0	0

Source: Apalachicola Planning Department

(Note: Funds scheduled for dock facilities, drainage and recreation are to be obtained from grants. No alternative funding will be available for these purposes. Sanitary sewer and potable water facilities funding is primarily from grants with provisions for some city funding by enterprise funds in 1993-95.)

Operating Costs

In addition to the capital costs of providing the needed facility improvements, the City will also incur increases in annual operating costs. These are the recurring expenses associated with routine operation of the capital facilities, such as supplies, utilities, maintenance and personnel costs. The anticipated increase in annual operating cost associated with the assessed capital improvement needs are shown in Table VII for each of the capital improvement categories. The operating costs have been assigned to the year they will first be incurred based on the improvement schedule shown in Table V.

Operation	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Traffic Facilities	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sanitary Sewer	0	0	.020	0	0	0
Drainage	0	0	0	0	.025	0
Potable Water	0	.025	0	0	0	0
Recreation	0	0	.015	.010	0	0
Dock Facilities	0	0	0	.020	0	0
Housing	0	0	0	0	.025	0

Source: Apalachicola Planning Department (1987), Note: all figures are in millions

As indicated in Table VII, not all of the needed capital improvements will result in increased operational costs. The traffic facilities for example, involve improvements to existing facilities which are already included in the City's maintenance program. The most significant increases are associated with expansion of facilities which require maintenance of mechanical components and operator staffing, and other costs such as the sewer, potable water and dock facilities.

TABLE VIII: CUMULATIVE OPERATING COST INCREASE

OPERATION		1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Sanitary Sewer	0	0	.020	.020	.020	.0	
Drainage		0	0	0	0	.025	.0
Potable Water		0	.025	.025	.025	.025	.0
Recreation		0	0	.015	.025	.025	.0
Housing		0	0	0	0	.025	.0
Dock Facilities	0	0	0	.020	.020	.0	
TOTAL		0	.025	.060	.090	.140	.1

Source: Apalachicola Planning Department Note: all figures are in millions

In order to assess the impact of the increase in operation costs, the cumulative operating costs were compared to the total projected City operating costs. The result of this comparison, shown in Table IX, indicates the extent of increase required in the total City operating budget to absorb these additional operating costs. As shown in Table IX, the maximum impact of these additional costs will occur in 1993, 94 and 95, when a 8% increase in operating cost would be incurred.

TABLE IX: IMPACT OF CUMULATIVE OPERATING COST INCREASE ON TOTAL PROJECTED CITY OPERATING COST

COST	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Projected Operating cost	1,284	1,346	1,413	1,484	1,558	1,636
Cumulative Operating Cost Increase	0.00	.025	.060	.090	.140	.140
Percent of Projected Operating Cost	0%	1.9%	4.3%	6.1%	9.0%	8.6%

Source: City Planning Department (1987). Note: All figures are in millions.

The City uses revenues from the General Fund and the various Enterprise Fund accounts to meet annual operating expenses. General Fund revenues are used primarily for meeting expenses associated with providing general government services. This include the offices of the elected officials, the City Attorney and City Clerk and Office, the Police Department, Community Services, and Recreation. Supplemental funding is provided by fees collected by these offices, Water and Sewer Department and the Dock Facilities meet operational expenses through the collection of user charges. These are charges for direct receipt of service which are paid by persons using the service.

The City's millage rate and the Enterprise Fund user charges are reviewed on an annual basis by the City as part of its budgeting process. Adjustments are made in order to ensure that sufficient funds are generated to meet anticipated expenses, usually including a reserve for contingency funds. In anticipation of future increases in operating costs, the City may adjust the millage and/or user charges upward by small increments for several years. This provides additional operating reserve initially, which can be used to offset later operating expense increases For example: a one-tenth mill (.001) increase in ad valorem tax millage rate could generate the following increases for 1991-1995.

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
One tenth mill increase	.010	.011	.012	.012	.012	.013

Source: Apalachicola Planning Department (1989), Note: all figures are in millions

3. ANALYSIS

B. ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Within this section, projected revenue shortfalls are examined and recommendations made to minimize impact; and at the same time, meet urgent needs in an effective manner.

Issue 1 ;

The expectation and dependences on grant and other funding without repayment obligations, which are major projected sums of incoming revenue, can be uncertain and erratic. While the past five years have the City has received grants of various types (both Federal and State) in excess of \$7,720 million, continuation at this level could be questionable.

Recommendations:

11) That the first year (1990) operation under the Capital Improvement Element be monitored closely with in depth review of the five year projection to reconducted jointly by the City Commission and the Planning and Zoning Commission.

(2) The above review to be made in special workshop meeting to be scheduled in October and November, 1990.

(3) Based on this review indicated changes will be considered and made as necessary.

Issue 2:

Funds projected for Transportation Facilities may be uncertain because of other general funds needs and the uncertainty of road building support from the County.

Recommendations:

(1) That the City Commission reconsider the use made of C Tax provided for this purpose as a part of the State Revenue Sharing Fund.

(2) That an interlocal agreement be reached between the City and The County as to the County's responsibilities and the County's road building capabilities and contracting be utilized.

(3) That the County be encouraged to enact a local option gas tax to provide additional funds for road paving.

Additionally, the following strategies are recommended:

(1) Improved planning and coordination should ensure that public facility and service provision is optimally timed for cost effectiveness. For example, department representative should work together to encourage the provision of public facilities and services where only one of several types of facilities may be located, in order to limit the negative impact of timing delay.

(2) That capital improvement needs be placed in priority order to require proper emphasis on obtaining funds and accomplishing improvements.

(3) That the land Development Code be used to interact with the development approval process by conditioning zoning, subdivision, or planned unit development (PUD) approval upon public facility provision. This would ensure the provision of public facilities necessary to support land development; and

(4) Enterprise Fund surpluses, unless indicated otherwise within this element, should be held in reserve for major capital expenditures and/or grant matching fund when needed.

4. GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES

GOAL: THE CITY SHALL UNDERTAKE ACTIONS NECESSARY TO ADEQUATELY PROVIDE NEEDED PUBLIC FACILITIES TO ALL RESIDENTS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION IN A MANNER WHICH PROTECTS INVESTMENTS IN EXISTING FACILITIES, MAXIMIZES THE USE OF EXISTING FACILITIES, AND PROMOTES

ORDERLY COMPACT URBAN GROWTH. THESE ACTIONS SHOULD ALSO PROVIDE FOR A HEALTH ENVIRONMENT WITH FACILITIES FOR RECREATION AND PLAY AS WELL AS AN ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT FOR FINANCIAL WELLBEING AND GROWTH.

OBJECTIVE 1

Capital improvements will be provided to correct existing deficiencies, to accommodate desired future growth, and to replace worn out or obsolete facilities, as indicated in the 5-Year Schedule of Improvements of this element.

Policy 1.1 The City shall include all projects identified in the other elements of this plan and determined to be (\$25,000 or greater), as capital improvements projects for inclusion within the 5-year Schedule of Improvements of this element. Capital improvements with costs of less than \$25,000 shall be addressed in the City's annual budget.

Policy 1.2 The City shall endeavor as a matter of priority, to schedule and fund all capital improvement projects in the 5-Year Schedule of Improvements which are designed to correct existing deficiencies listed in the Capital Improvements Element.

Policy 1.3 Proposed capital improvement projects shall be evaluated and ranked in order of priority according to the following guidelines;

- (a) Whether the project is needed to protect public health and safety, to fulfill the City's legal commitment to provide facilities and services, or to preserve or achieve full use of existing facilities;
- (b) Whether the project increases efficiency of use of existing facilities, prevents or reduces future improvement cost, provides services to developed areas lacking full service, or promotes in-fill development; and
- (c) Whether the project represents a logical extension of facilities and services within a designated urban service area.

OBJECTIVE 2 Public expenditures that subsidize development in high hazard coastal areas will be limited to those improvements included in the Coastal Management Element. (See Objective 8 and policies)

Policy 2.1 The City shall expend funds in high hazard coastal areas for the replacement and renewal of existing public facilities.

Policy 2.2 The City shall continue to provide or require provision of recreational facilities within high hazard coastal areas.

Policy 2.3 The City shall continue to expend funds to maintain existing facilities and services at their existing capacity.

OBJECTIVE 3 Future developments will bear their full proportionate cost of facility improvements necessitated by the development in order to maintain adopted LOS standards. Proportion of cost will be determined by the city's facilities staff and made a part of the permitting records.

	400 gallons per customer per day
Solid Waste	5 pounds per capita per day
Drainage Facilities	Design Storm Retains first 1.5 inch of run off - 25 - year frequency, 24-hour duration; Rainfall Intensity curve-zone 1, DOT Drainage Manual, 1979
Potable Water Facilities	Average Water Consumption Rate 300 gallons per customer per day
Traffic Facilities	Collector Roadway - LOS C at peak hour; Arterial Roadway - LOS C at peak hour; Limited Access Facilities - LOS C at peak hour; and

Recreation Standards for Facilities

Facility	Unit of Measure	Standard
Basketball Courts	1 court	Per 5,000 persons
Baseball/Softball Fields	1 field	Per 4,700 persons
Boat Ramps	1 lane	Per 4,700 persons
Camping	1 acre	Per 5,600 persons
Community Buildings	1 facility	Per 7,000 persons
Fishing Piers	800 linear feet	Per 5,000 persons
Football/Soccer Fields	1 field	Per 4,000 persons
Picnic Areas	1 acre	Per 3,000 persons
Playgrounds	1 acre	Per 3,000 persons
Swimming Pools	4860 sq. feet	Per 8,700 persons
Swimming (shoreline/beach)	1/4 mile	Per 25,000 persons
Tennis Courts	1 court	Per 2,000 persons
Hiking Trails	1 mile	Per 6,750 persons

(note - County and a school recreation (facilities for many of the recreation areas not include above as well as facilities in addition to those listed).

Policy 5.2 The City's shall utilize the Land Development Code through the required site development to ensure that, at the time a development permit is issued, adequate facility capacity is available or will be available concurrently as the facility needs are impacted by the development.

Policy 5.3 Proposed plan amendments and requests for new development or redevelopment shall be evaluated according to the following guidelines as to whether the proposed action would:

- a) contribute to a condition of public hazard as described in the Sanitary Sew, Solid Waste. Drainage. Potable Water, and Natural Groundwater Recharge Element, and Coastal Management Element;
- b) Exacerbate any existing condition of public facility capacity deficits, as described in the Traffic Circulation Element; Sanitary Sewer, Solid Waste. Drainage. Potable Water, and Natural Groundwater Recharge Element; and Recreation and Open Space Element;
- c) generate public facility demands that may be accommodated by capacity increases planned in the five-year schedule of improvements;
- d) conform with future land uses as shown on the future land use map of the Future Land use element, and service areas as described in the Sanitary Sewer, Solid Waste, Drainage, and Natural Groundwater Recharge Element;
- e) if public facilities are developer provided, accommodate public facility demands based upon adopted LOS standards;
- f) if public facilities are provided, in part or whole, by the City demonstrate financial feasibility, subject to this element; and
- g) affect state agencies and water management district facilities plans. Coordination with affect agencies will be made in all such situations with input made a part of the evaluation.

Policy 5.4 The City shall limit debt (bonds, loans, etc.) as a means of financing new, additions to, rehabilitation of public facilities to a minimum that can be supported by assured income, such as Ad Valorem taxes and Enterprise funds.

Policy 5.5 The City shall require cost sharing by new developments for required system facilities (utilities, roads, drainage facilities, parks and open spaces) as provided in the City’s land development code. This will be determined by engineering estimates and evaluations.

5. Implementation

A. 5-Year Schedule of Improvements:

The 5-year schedule of improvements (See Table XI) is the mechanism by which the City can effectively stage the timing , location, projected cost, and revenue sources for the Capital Improvements derived from the other comprehensive plan elements, in support of the Future Land Use Element. The 5-Year schedule of improvements has been used to document the “economic feasibility” of the City, comprehensive plan based upon the preceding section of this element entitled “inventory”, “analysis”, and “goals, objectives and policies.”

Table XI: 5-Year Schedule of Improvements 1990-1995

Project Description	Schedule	Projected Cost	General Location	Revenue Source	Consistency with Other elements
Traffic Circulation					
1. Prepare and Pave One Mile of Road	1990-1995	.250	To be determined each year	Transportation Improvement fund	Yes
Sanitary					

Sewer					
2. Phase IV Brownsville Road	1990-1991	1,273		Grant	Yes
3. Phase V – Bluff Road	1991-1992	1,956		Grant	
4. Phase VI – Bluff Road, N.	1992-1993	1,072		Grant	
5. Rehab existing sewer lines	1993-1995	2,940	Citywide	Enterprise Fund and/or grant	
Potable Water facilities					
6. Water Plan – wells and storage 1990	1990	.704		Enterprise Fund and/or grant	
7. Rehab old water system		3,000		Enterprise Fund and/or grant	
Drainage facilities					
8. Multi- phased plan to be developed	1990-1995	2,350	Citywide	Grant	
Recreation Facilities (Tourist Enhancement)					
9. Civic Center Battery Park	1990	.200	See Map – battery park	General fund	
10. Batter Park: rehab, landscape, etc. 1991	1991	.700	See Map	Grant	
11. Waterfront Ave. D&E	1991	.400	See Map as stated	Grant	
12. Lafayette Park; Rehab & Landscape	1992	.150	See Map	General Fund and grant	
13. City Square Open Space (5	1992-1995	.375	See Map	Grant	

14 . Rehab. Old Dixie Theater as Center for Performing Arts 1993	1993	.450		Grant	
15. Rehab and Improve Magnolia Street Cemetery	1993-1994	.600	See Map	Grant	
16. Complete Renovation Chapman School Auditorium	1992-1994	.500	See Map	Grant	
Docking Facilities					
17. Riverfront Dock: Ave D& E Rehab and Enhance	1991	.200	See Map	Grant	
18. City Boat Basin: Battery Park - Rehab and Enhance	1991	1.000	See Map	Grant	
19. Construct Public Housing (50 units)	1992-1993	2.000		Grant	

Source: Apalachicola Planning Department

5. IMPLEMENTATION

B. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The role of monitoring and evaluation is vital to the effectiveness of any planning program and particularly for the Capital Improvements Element. This is largely because the City's revenue and expenditure streams are subject to fluctuations in the market and economy. It is the behavior of these streams which will be used to predict fiscal trends in order to maintain the City's adopted level of service standards for public facilities. Therefore, the Capital Improvements Element requires a continuous program for monitoring and evaluation, and pursuant to Chapter 163, F.S., this element will be reviewed on an annual basis to ensure that required fiscal resources are available to provide public facilities needed to support adopted LOS standards.

The annual review will be the responsibility of the local planning agency, will serve as advisory members at all formal deliberations related to capital improvement monitoring and evaluation. The local planning agency's findings and recommendations will be presented to the Board of

City Commissioners at a public meeting. The Commissioners will direct staff to take action deemed appropriate based upon the local planning agency's findings and recommendations.

The review will include the following considerations, and will include an examination of these considerations in order to determine their continued appropriateness:

- 1) any corrections, updates, and modifications concerning costs; revenue sources; or the date of construction of any facility enumerated in the element;
- 2) the Capital Improvement Element's consistency with the other elements and its support of the Future Land Use Element;
- 3) the City's ability to provide public facilities and services within the service area in order to determine any need for boundary modification or adjustment;
- 4) the priority assignment of existing public facility deficiencies,
- 5) the City's progress in meeting those needs determined to be existing deficiencies;
- 6) the criteria used to evaluate capital improvement projects In order to ensure that projects are being ranked in their appropriate order of priority;
- 7) the City's effectiveness in maintaining the adopted LOS standards;
- 8) the City's effectiveness in reviewing the impacts of plans and programs of state agencies and the County that provide public facilities within the jurisdiction;
- 9) the City's effectiveness of impact fees, and mandatory dedications for assessing new development a pro rata share of the improvement costs which they generate;
- 10) the Impacts of special districts and any regional facility and service provision upon the City's ability to maintain its adopted LOS standards;
- 11) the ratio of outstanding indebtedness to the property tax base;
- 12) efforts made to secure grants or private funds, whenever available, to finance the provision of capital improvements;
- 13) the transfer of any unexpended account balances;
- 14) the criteria used to evaluate proposed plan amendments and requests for new development or redevelopment; and
- 15) capital improvements needed for the latter part of the planning period, for inclusion in the 5-Year Schedule of Improvements.