

## **Key Largo Wastewater Treatment District**



**FUNDING ANALYSIS** 

**OF** 

UNINCORPORATED MONROE COUNTY

**WASTEWATER PROJECTS** 



#### KEY LARGO WASTEWATER TREATMENT DISTRICT FUNDING ANALYSIS OF UNINCORPORATED MONROE COUNTY WASTEWATER PROJECTS

#### **Table of Contents**

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL
FUNDING ANALYSIS SUMMARY
UNINCORPORATED WASTEWATER PROJECT FUNDING
KEY LARGO PROJECT
CUDJOE REGIONAL PROJECT 6
BIG COPPITT PROJECT 8
CONCH KEY & DUCK KEY PROJECTS9
BAY POINT PROJECT
STOCK ISLAND PROJECT
LONG KEY PROJECT
APPENDIX
TABLE 2 – MONROE COUNTY PROVIDED INFORMATION ON COUNTY WIDE UNINCORPORATED AREAS - WASTEWATER FUNDING STATUS AS OF JULY 2014
TABLE 3 – KEY LARGO WASTEWATER TREATMENT DISTRICT PROVIDED INFORMATION ON COUNTY WIDE UNINCORPORATED AREAS WASTEWATER FUNDING STATUS AS OF SEPTMBER 23, 2014
APPENDIX 1 – KLWTD CAPITAL PROJECTS
APPENDIX 2 – KLWTD STATE & FEDERAL FUNDING BY YEAR 16
APPENDIX 3 – MONROE COUNTY ACCOUNTING OF KLWTD OUTSIDE FUNDING . 17
APPENDIX 4 – BOCC EXCERPT OF MEETING MINUTES FROM 11/20/13 18



Dennis M. Bishop, CPA (Ret.) Peter L. Rosasco, CPA Donna M. Hoffman, CPA



Rita A. Couch, CPA Daniel E. Deighton, CPA Linda K. Johnson, CPA

November 20, 2014

To the Honorable Chairman, Members of the Governing Board, and Citizens of Key Largo

It is our pleasure to submit to you the results of the funding analysis of the unincorporated Monroe County wastewater projects. This analysis is based on information that was released by Monroe County and the Key Largo Wastewater Treatment District (KLWTD).

The results of the funding analysis indicates that currently the tax & rate payers in the Key Largo Wastewater Treatment District area will pay \$22,489,276 more for their wastewater project than taxpayers & rate payers in other unincorporated Monroe County. A KLWTD District taxpayer will pay \$12,029,276 more in assessments, and rate payers will contribute an additional \$10,460,000 in wastewater service rate revenue that will be used to fund the difference between outside funding sources and assessment and MSTU local funding sources.

Wastewater projects in the other unincorporated areas have direct access to discretionary sales surtax revenues as a local funding source for their projects, and this funding source can be utilized to cover and gaps between outside funding and local taxpayer funding. Wastewater service rates are not used to cover project funding gaps in other unincorporated areas.

While the results of the analysis will fluctuate as projects progress and outside funding sources are realized, the results of this analysis clearly indicate that there is a significant difference in local funding sources between the KLWTD wastewater project and wastewater projects in other unincorporated areas.

A summary of the funding analysis is on the page following this letter. Details about each project and sources of funding follow that summary.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Rosasco, CPA

# DRAFT

# KLWTD FUNDING ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION/OVERALL FINDINGS:
Results of the wastewater funding analysis are presented in TABLE 1; and they confirm that Monroe County taxpayers in the Key Largo area pay substantially more for their wastewater funding analysis are presented in TABLE 1; and they confirm that Monroe County taxpayers in the Key Largo area pay substantially more for their wastewater project than do taxpayers in the other unincorporated areas. The figures in Table 1 indicate that this difference is somewhat larger than was calculated by earlier estimates. The principal amount of that difference is \$26,251,041.

This analysis was performed using the most recent reports from Monroe County and the Key Largo Wastewater Treatment District (KLWTD). These reports are attached as TABLE 2 and TABLE 3. The projects were analyzed on an individual basis to locate and explain any discrepancies between the two reports. Corroborating documents have also been provided where available. The idea was to provide numbers that were verifiable using some other source besides the reports provided by each entity.

TABLE 1: WASTEWATER PROJECT FUNDING SUMMARY - UNINCORPORATED AREA

		Number of			Outside Funding	nding				77	Local Funding			Local Contribution
Project Name	Project Cost	Project Cost Developed EDUs	Federal	State	County	Other	Subtotal	%	MSTU	SDF/Assmts	Rates	Subtotal	%	per EDU
Key Largo (KLWTD)	169.85	14,054	21.25	28.00	23.11	10.18	82.54	49%	3.76	73.08	10.46	87.30	21%	6,212
Cudjoe Regional	170.00	8,859	3.80	30.00	96.03	00.00	129.83	%9/	0:30	39.87	0.00	40.17	24%	4,534
Big Coppitt	36.50	1,726	0.00	11.10	17.30	00.00	28.40	78%	0.40	7.70	0.00	8.10	22%	4,693
Conch Key/Duck Key	19.50	1,454	1.40	0.30	8.60	3.00	13.30	%89	0.33	5.87	0.00	6.20	32%	4,264
Bay Point	6.40	357	3.00	0.50	1.90	00.00	5.40	84%	0.20	0.80	0.00	1.00	16%	2,801
Stock Island	4.50	1,500	0.00	0.00	0.30	0.00	0.30	7%	0.10	4.10	0.00	4.20	93%	2,800
Unincorporated Long Key	0.70	•	0.00	0.00	0.00	00.00	0.00	%0	0.05	0.65	0.00	0.70	100%	
<b>Subtotal Excluding KLWTD</b>	237.60	13,896	8.20	41.90	124.13	3.00	177.23	75%	1.38	58.99	0.00	60.37	72%	4,344
GRAND TOTAL	407.45	27,950	29.45	06'69	147.24	13.18	259.77	1.23	5.14	132.07	10.46	147.67	0.77	5,283

			Patenguer contribution - Key large:	6 212
Total Assessment Per EDU			Ratepayer contribution - other unincorporated areas:	4,344
KLWTD	❖	5,200	Difference in ratepayer contribution per EDU:	1,868
Average for Unincorporated				
Monroe County	ş	4,344	Number of EDU's:	14,054
Difference in Assessment	\$	929	Total difference in ratepayer contribution:	26,251,041
Developed EDUs		14,054		
Assessment Revenue				
Difference	\$	\$ 12,029,276		
Local Project Funding				
covered by Rates	\$	\$ 10,460,000		
Total Local Funding				
Difference	÷	\$ 22,489,276		
Total Difference from				
calculation to the right	\$	\$ 26,251,041		
Difference				
= MSTU contribution	\$ (3,	\$ (3,761,765.00)		



## RECONCILIATION OF WASTEWATER PROJECT FUNDING NUMBERS FOR PROJECTS WITHIN THE UNINCORPORATED AREA

Below is a table showing the reconciled numbers for the Key Largo Project. The numbers in red have been revised pursuant to the discussion below.

Ta	Table 1b: Key Largo Project - Reconciled			
	Monroe County	KLWTD	Difference	
Project Cost	169.85	169.85	0.00	
Number of Developed EDUs	14,054	14,054		
Federal Funding	21.25	21.25	0.00	
State Funding	28.00	28.00	0.00	
County Funding	23.11	23.11	0.00	
Other Outside Funding	10.18	10.18	0.00	
Subtotal Outside Sources	82.54	82.54	0.00	
MSTU	3.76	3.76	0.00	
SDF/Assessments	73.08	73.08	0.00	
Rates	10.46	10.46	0.00	
Subtotal Local Sources	87.30	87.30	0.00	
Difference	0.00	0.00	0.00	

Tab	le 1a: Key Largo Project - Pre	-reconciled	
	Monroe County	KLWTD	Difference
Project Cost	154.50	163.00	-8.50
Number of Developed EDUs	14,052	14,052	-
Federal Funding	21.40	50.00	-0.50
State Funding	28.10	30.00	-0.50
County Funding	28.20	23.10	5.10
Other Outside Funding	10.20	10.60	-0.40
Subtotal Outside Sources	87.90	83.70	4.20
MSTU	3.90	3.90	0.00
SDF/Assessments	72.00	72.00	0.00
Rates	0.00	3.40	-3.40
Subtotal Local Sources	75.90	79.30	-3.40
Difference	-9.30	0.00	-9.30

#### Project Cost:

The largest discrepancy between the county's report and KLWTD's report is the difference in the cost of the project. The \$154.5 million came from a projected cost estimate completed in August 2013. It included approximately \$8.5 million in budgeted, but not completed projects. When KLWTD was awarded \$17 million in state money in May of 2014, that money came with the requirement that it must be spent on new projects. Since KLWTD already had \$8.5 million in new projects budgeted, the remaining \$8.5 million will be applied to necessary projects that were in the planning stages and not yet budgeted at the time. This increased the overall project cost by \$8.5 million from \$154.5 million to \$163 million. The County's estimate includes the full \$17 million received from the state but does not include the additional \$8.5 million in project costs, thus understating the contribution from local ratepayers by \$8.5 million.



According to KLWTD's most recent CAFR available (FY 2013), capital spending on the sewer project totaled \$145,219,990 through September 30, 2013. An estimated \$1,624,322 was spent on projects through September 30, 2014. An additional \$23,002,294 is budgeted from October 1, 2014 through September 30, 2017. That brings the total project cost to \$169,846,606. The calculation of the updated project cost is included as Appendix 1.

#### Number of Developed EDU's

Out of financial necessity, KLWTD assessed undeveloped properties as well as developed ones. This was not the case in the other unincorporated areas, which were heavily subsidized by the infrastructure sales tax. For the purposes of this analysis, only developed EDUs that have been assessed or are located in areas which KLWTD plans to assess will be considered. This will ensure an apples-to-apples comparison. According to the latest KLWTD records, 16,640.3 EDUs have been

assessed to date or will be assessed assuming budgeted projects go forward. Of those, 2,585.9 EDU's are undeveloped according to either their PC code or their description in the Property Appraisers database. That means there are 14,054.4 developed EDUs in the Key Largo area at present. Assessment revenues has been updated accordingly using the number of developed EDUs.

#### State and Federal Funding:

According to financial records, KLWTD received \$21,249,026 from the federal government and \$28,004,135 from the state government for a total of \$49,253,161. See Appendix 2 for details.

#### **County Funding:**

The County has provided a detailed spreadsheet to support the \$28.2 million included in its report. However, there are several items included that, according to County officials, have not been included in the amounts received by the projects in the other unincorporated areas. This results in an inaccurate comparison that understates the local contribution by \$5.1 million. The County was unable to provide a similarly detailed report for the other projects at the time the request was made. For an accurate comparison, these items should be deducted from the amount received by KLWTD from the County. The actual amount to be used for an accurate comparison is \$23,113,955, see Appendix 3.

#### Other Outside Funding:

This is the capital contribution charge from the Village of Islamorada. The county's number, \$10.2 million excludes interest. KLWTD's number, \$10.6 million, includes interest. Since interest has been excluded for all other items in this analysis, it should be excluded from this number as well. The principal amount of this payment is \$10,176,000.

#### **Local Contribution:**

For the projects in the unincorporated area outside of Key Largo, the local contribution is static. Those customers will pay an assessment. They will pay nothing for the project out of rates. Any shortfall is made up using the infrastructure sales tax, which is collected county-wide. In other words, the burden of any funding shortfall does not fall on the local customers, but on all Monroe County taxpayers. The KLWTD does not have direct access to the infrastructure sales tax. So the sales tax cannot be used to correct any funding shortfalls. Those shortfalls must come from the local customers out of rates.



For this reason, it makes sense for KLWTD to compute the local contribution simply by deducting state, federal, county, and other outside funding from the project cost. Any change in assessment revenue affects what is needed out of rates. Simply put, a decrease in assessment revenue necessitates an increase in rates. For instance, if assessment revenue drops from \$73 million to \$63 million, then the contribution from rates increases from \$10 million to \$20 million. In the end, it all comes from the local customer.

<u>MSTU:</u> The County shows \$3.9 million collected from the Key Largo area. KLWTD' records show \$3,764,645. In the past, KLWTD has simply used the county's number as the difference is negligible. However, in the interest of accuracy KLWTD's number will be used in the reconciled table.

<u>Rates:</u> As stated above, any shortfall for the Key Largo project is made up out of rates. This is not so for the projects in the other unincorporated areas. The contribution from those customers is limited to assessments only. Any shortfall for those projects is made up out of the sales tax which is collected county-wide, including Key Largo. In other words, the Key Largo project is fully funded. However, a very large proportion of that funding comes from the local ratepayers. Whereas the projects in the other unincorporated areas are largely funded by the county-wide sales tax.



## RECONCILIATION OF WASTEWATER PROJECT FUNDING NUMBERS FOR PROJECTS WITHIN THE UNINCORPORATED AREA

Please see below for a reconciled table for the Cudjoe Regional Project.

Tal	ble 4b: Cudjoe Regional	- Reconciled	
	Monroe County	KLWTD	Difference
Project Cost	170.00	170.00	0.00
Number of Developed EDUs	8,859	8,859	-
Federal Funding	3.80	3.80	-
State Funding	30.00	30.00	-
County Funding	96.03	96.03	-
Other Outside Funding	0.00	0.00	-
Subtotal Outside Sources	129.83	129.83	0.00
MSTU	0.30	0.30	0.00
SDF/Assessments	39.87	39.87	0.00
Subtotal Local Sources	40.17	40.17	0.00
Difference	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table	e 4a: Cudjoe Regional - I	Pre-reconciled	
	Monroe County	KLWTD	Difference
Project Cost	161.00	170.00	-9.00
Number of Developed EDUs	9,000	8,696	304
Federal Funding	0.00	32.60	-2.60
State Funding	30.00	52.00	-2.00
County Funding	90.20	97.50	-7.30
Other Outside Funding	0.00	0.00	0.00
Subtotal Outside Sources	120.20	130.10	-9.90
MSTU	0.30	39.90	0.90
SDF/Assessments	40.50	59.90	0.90
Subtotal Local Sources	40.80	39.90	0.90
Difference	0.00	0.00	0.00

#### Project Cost:

The largest discrepancy, as was the case with the Key Largo project, is the difference in the cost of the project. The \$170 million came from Amendment 7 of the County's contract with FKAA that was approved by the BOCC at the meeting on November 20, 2013, Appendix 4. No official documents were found to support a project cost of \$161 million as reported by the County. Unless the \$161 million can be supported by a more recent document, \$170 million should be used. It should also be noted that an additional change order for a deep well is under discussion. According to FKAA estimates, influent flows are expected to top one million gallons per day. A deep well for effluent disposal will become necessary at that point pursuant to FDEP regulations. The deep well would increase the overall cost of the project to \$176-\$178 million.

Approximately 160 properties will be provided with onsite systems at an estimated cost of \$25,000 each. This will be paid for by assessments and an EPA grant of \$3.8 million. It is unclear whether the additional cost of these systems has been included in the overall project cost. If not, another \$4,000,000 should be added to the cost of the Cudjoe Regional project, bringing the overall total to \$180-\$184 million.



Information on the Cudjoe Regional onsite project was obtained from the FKAA's website.

#### Number of Developed EDU's:

According to initial assessment resolutions available on the Monroe County Clerk's website, 8,696 EDUs will be assessed in the Cudjoe Regional area. An additional 163 were added later for a total of 8,859 EDUs. The county is using 9,000 EDUs. KLWTD is using the original 8,696. For the purposes of the analysis, 8,859 EDUs will be used. That number is supported by official documentation.

#### MSTU and SDF/Assessments:

The county reports MSTU collected of \$0.3 million. For the purposes of this analysis, that is the number that will be used.

The assessment on Cudjoe Regional is \$4,500 per EDU. Therefore, the calculation of this number is very straightforward, the number of EDUs multiplied by \$4,500. That means the total amount to be collected from the local service area in assessments is \$39,865,500.

#### State and Federal Funding:

The county and KLWTD agree on the amount of state funding, \$30 million. However, the EPA funding for the onsite systems was not included in the county's analysis. KLWTD's analysis understated the amount of this funding source. As mentioned above, the estimated amount of the EPA grant for onsite systems is \$3.8 million.

#### **County Funding:**

Since the infrastructure sales tax is used to make up for any shortfall in funding for wastewater projects in the unincorporated area, excluding Key Largo, this number is essentially a plug. The county reported county funding of \$90.2 million. However, this does not tie to the reported contribution of \$101,920,051 shown in their Project History. The \$102 million includes funding from other sources and it also includes bond costs, which are not included in the project cost. When the project cost and federal funding are reconciled to reflect amounts supported by official documentation, the amount of county-wide funding is estimated to be approximately \$96 million.



# RECONCILIATION OF WASTEWATER PROJECT FUNDING NUMBERS FOR PROJECTS WITHIN THE UNINCORPORATED AREA

Again the only difference is in the number of EDUs. The amount collected from assessments is reported to be \$7.7 million; and according to Monroe County resolution 264-2007, the per EDU assessment is \$4,500. That would put the number of EDUs at around 1,700. Therefore, the county's number will be used for the purposes of this analysis.

#### See below for a reconciled table.

	Table 6b: Big Coppitt - Re	conciled	
	Monroe County	KLWTD	Difference
Project Cost	36.50	36.50	0.00
Number of Developed EDUs	1,726	1,726	0.00
Federal Funding	0.00	0.00	0.00
State Funding	11.10	11.10	0.00
County Funding	17.30	17.30	0.00
Other Outside Funding	0.00	0.00	0.00
Subtotal Outside Sources	28.40	28.40	0.00
MSTU	0.40	0.40	0.00
SDF/Assessments	7.70	7.70	0.00
Subtotal Local Sources	8.10	8.10	0.00
Difference	0.00	0.00	0.00

	Table 6a: Big Coppitt - Pro	e-reconciled	
	<b>Monroe County</b>	KLWTD	Difference
Project Cost	36.50	36.50	0.00
Number of Developed EDUs	1,726	2,023	(297)
Federal Funding	0.00	11.10	-11.10
State Funding	11.10	11.10	11.10
County Funding	17.30	17.30	0.00
Other Outside Funding	0.00	0.00	0.00
Subtotal Outside Sources	28.40	28.40	0.00
MSTU	0.40	8.10	-7.70
SDF/Assessments	7.70	6.10	7.70
Subtotal Local Sources	8.10	8.10	0.00
Difference	0.00	0.00	0.00



# RECONCILIATION OF WASTEWATER PROJECT FUNDING NUMBERS FOR PROJECTS WITHIN THE UNINCORPORATED AREA

Please see below for the revconciled table for the Conch Key and Duck Key project.

Table	3b: Conch Key and Duck Key	/ - Reconciled	
	Monroe County	KLWTD	Difference
Project Cost	19.50	19.50	0.00
Number of Developed EDUs	1,454	1,454	-
Federal Funding	1.40	1.40	0.00
State Funding	0.30	0.30	0.00
County Funding	8.60	8.60	0.00
Other Outside Funding	3.00	3.00	0.00
Subtotal Outside Sources	13.30	13.30	0.00
MSTU	0.33	0.33	0.00
SDF/Assessments	5.87	5.87	0.00
Subtotal Local Sources	6.20	6.20	0.00
Difference	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table 3a	a: Conch Key and Duck Key -	Pre-reconciled	
	Monroe County	KLWTD	Difference
Project Cost	19.50	19.20	0.30
Number of Developed EDUs	1,454	1,454	-
Federal Funding	1.40	1.70	0.00
State Funding	0.30	1.70	0.00
County Funding	8.60	11.30	-2.70
Other Outside Funding	3.00	0.00	3.00
<b>Subtotal Outside Sources</b>	13.30	13.00	0.30
MSTU	0.33	6.20	0.00
SDF/Assessments	5.87	0.20	0.00
Subtotal Local Sources	6.20	6.20	0.00
Difference	0.00	0.00	0.00



# RECONCILIATION OF WASTEWATER PROJECT FUNDING NUMBERS FOR PROJECTS WITHIN THE UNINCORPORATED AREA

The only difference is in the number of developed EDUs. It seems that the Bay Point project was assessed by FKAA at \$2,700 per EDU. See the excerpt from FKAA rules provided in ATTACHMENT D. If that is the case, then the number of EDUs is probably 357. This is the number that will be used for the purposes of this analysis.

#### Please see below for the revconciled table for the Bay Point project.

Table 5b: Bay Point - Reconciled			
	<b>Monroe County</b>	KLWTD	Difference
Project Cost	6.40	6.40	0.00
Number of Developed EDUs	357	357	-
Federal Funding	3.00	3.00	0.00
State Funding	0.50	0.50	0.00
County Funding	1.90	1.90	0.00
Other Outside Funding	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Subtotal Outside Sources</b>	5.40	5.40	0.00
MSTU	0.20	0.20	0.00
SDF/Assessments	0.80	0.80	0.00
Subtotal Local Sources	1.00	1.00	0.00
Difference	0.00	0.00	0.00

	Table 5a: Bay Point - Pre-re	econciled	
	<b>Monroe County</b>	KLWTD	Difference
Project Cost	6.40	6.40	0.00
Number of Developed EDUs	437	357	80
Federal Funding	3.00	3.50	0.00
State Funding	0.50	5.50	0.00
County Funding	1.90	1.90	0.00
Other Outside Funding	0.00	0.00	0.00
Subtotal Outside Sources	5.40	5.40	0.00
MSTU	0.20	1.00	0.00
SDF/Assessments	0.80	1.00	0.00
Subtotal Local Sources	1.00	1.00	0.00
Difference	0.00	0.00	0.00





Again the only difference is in the number of EDUs. The amount collected from assessments is reported to be \$4.1 million; and according to Monroe County resolution 261-2004, the per EDU assessment is \$2,700. That would put the number of EDUs at a little over 1,500. Therefore, the county's number will be used for the purposes of this analysis.

See below for a reconciled table.

	Table 7b: Stock Island - Red	conciled	
	<b>Monroe County</b>	KLWTD	Difference
Project Cost	4.50	4.50	0.00
Number of Developed EDUs	1,500	1,500	-
Federal Funding	0.00	0.00	0.00
State Funding	0.00	0.00	0.00
County Funding	0.30	0.30	0.00
Other Outside Funding	0.00	0.00	0.00
Subtotal Outside Sources	0.30	0.30	0.00
MSTU	0.10	0.10	0.00
SDF/Assessments	4.10	4.10	0.00
Subtotal Local Sources	4.20	4.20	0.00
Difference	0.00	0.00	0.00

	able 7a: Stock Island - Pre-	reconciled	
	<b>Monroe County</b>	KLWTD	Difference
Project Cost	4.50	4.50	0.00
Number of Developed EDUs	1,500	1,479	21
Federal Funding	0.00	0.00	0.00
State Funding	0.00	0.00	0.00
County Funding	0.30	0.30	0.00
Other Outside Funding	0.00	0.00	0.00
Subtotal Outside Sources	0.30	0.30	0.00
MSTU	0.10	4.20	0.00
SDF/Assessments	4.10	4.20	0.00
Subtotal Local Sources	4.20	4.20	0.00
Difference	0.00	0.00	0.00



# RECONCILIATION OF WASTEWATER PROJECT FUNDING NUMBERS FOR PROJECTS WITHIN THE UNINCORPORATED AREA

KLWTD did not include unincorporated Long Key in the analysis. However, for the purposes of this discussion, it should be included. *See reconciled table below.* 

	Unincorporated Long Key - F	Reconciled	
	Monroe County	KLWTD	Difference
Project Cost	0.70	0.70	0.00
Number of Developed EDUs	-	-	-
Federal Funding	0.00	0.00	0.00
State Funding	0.00	0.00	0.00
County Funding	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Outside Funding	0.00	0.00	0.00
Subtotal Outside Sources	0.00	0.00	0.00
MSTU	0.05	0.05	0.00
SDF/Assessments	0.65	0.65	0.00
Subtotal Local Sources	0.70	0.70	0.00
Difference	0.00	0.00	0.00

Ur	nincorporated Long Key -	Pre-reconciled	
	<b>Monroe County</b>	KLWTD	Difference
Project Cost	0.70	0.00	0.70
Number of Developed EDUs	-	-	-
Federal Funding	0.00	0.00	0.00
State Funding	0.00	0.00	0.00
County Funding	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Outside Funding	0.00	0.00	0.00
Subtotal Outside Sources	0.00	0.00	0.00
MSTU	0.05	0.00	0.05
SDF/Assessments	0.65	0.00	0.65
Subtotal Local Sources	0.70	0.00	0.70
Difference	0.00	0.00	0.00



TABLE 2

# INFORMATION PROVIDED BY MONROE COUNTY County-Wide Wastewater Funding Status - Jul 2014

							FEDERAL	FEDERAL / STATE / OTHER	TO /	IER						LOCAL	1					
Service Area			Cost	Number of	Fed	Federal	State	Other	F	Total	%	2	MSTU	SDF	Sust	Sustotal- C	Countywide Total Local	e Tota		% Local	Remaining to	ng to
				EDUs					Fed/	ed/State/ F Other	Fed/State/ Fed/State/ Other Other				Local	Local Users	Funds	Sot		Sources	be Funded	ded
Cities / Districts																						
Ocean Reef	(note 1)	\$	32.5	1,884	\$	\$ -	1.0		÷	1.0	3.1%	Ş	1	\$ 31.5	\$	31.5		\$	31.5	%6.96	\$	
KLWTD		❖	154.5	14,052	\$	21.4 \$	28.1	\$ 10.2	<b>\$</b>	59.7	38.6%	\$	3.9	\$ 72.0	ψ.	\$ 6.57	28.2	2	104.1	67.4%	\$	(6.3)
Islamorada	(note 7)	❖	139.4	7,556	↔	4.0 \$	37.6		⊹	41.6	29.8%	Ş	1	\$ 47.0	ψ.	47.0		⋄	47.0	33.7%	❖	50.8
Layton		\$	5.2	351	↔	0.8 \$	3.3		↔	4.1	78.8%	Ş	1	5 1.1	\$	1.1	•	\$	1.1	21.2%	❖	,
Key Colony Beach	(note 2)	\$	1.7	1,502	↔	0.2 \$	1.0		↔	1.2	<b>%9</b> .0 <b>Z</b>	Ş	1	\$ 0.5	\$	0.5	•	\$	0.5	29.4%	❖	,
City of Marathon	(note 3)	❖	120.0	8,665	↔	20.3 \$	30.1		⋄	50.4	42.0%	\$	3.3	\$ 40.0	ψ,	43.3	•	-γ-	43.3	36.1%	\$	26.3
Key West	(note 4)	\$	78.9	24,075	\$	9.9 \$	5.0		\$	14.9	18.9%	\$	,	\$ 64.0	\$	64.0 \$		\$	64.0	81.1%	\$	
Unincorporated County																						,
Unincorp Long Key		\$	0.7		\$-	\$ -	1		\$			\$	0.05	\$ 0.65	\$	0.70	ľ	\$	0.70	100.0%	\$	1
Conch Key	(note 5)	❖	2.3	281	↔	1.4 \$	0.3		⊹	1.7	73.9%	Ş	0.03	\$ 0.57	\$	09.0		-γ-	09.0	26.1%	❖	•
Duck Key	(note 8)	ş	17.2	1,173	↔	\$ -	•	\$ 3.0	<b>\$</b> 0	3.0	%0.0	❖	0.3	5 5.3	\$.	5.6	8.6	ş	14.20	82.6%	❖	,
Cudjoe Regional		ş	161.0	000′6	↔	\$ -	30.0		٠	30.0	18.6%	❖	0.3	\$ 40.5	\$	40.8 ♦	90.	ş	131.00	81.4%	❖	,
Bay Point		ş	6.4	437	↔	3.0 \$	0.5		٠	3.5	54.7%	❖	0.2	\$ 0.8	₩.	1.0 \$	1.9	ş	2.90	45.3%	❖	,
Big Coppitt		ş	36.5	1,726	ψ.	\$ -	11.1		÷	11.1	30.4%	❖	0.4	5 7.7	₩.	8.1	17.	ş	25.40	%9.69	❖	,
Stock Island	(note 6)	\$	4.5	1,500	\$	÷ -	-		\$	-	0.0%	\$	0.1	\$ 4.1	\$	4.2 \$	0.3	3 \$	4.50	100.0%	\$	-
Unincorporated County Total	v Total	\$	228.6		\$	4.4 \$	41.9	\$ 3.0	\$ 0	49.3	20.3%	\$	1.38	\$ 59.62	\$	\$ 00.19	118.30	\$	179.30			
																						Ī

Note 1 - Ocean Reef cost includes an estimate for the original collection system. Number EDUs does not include commercial accounts. Actual EDU count is significantly higher. \$1 million state grant was for inflow and infiltration work.

Note 2 - System completed in 1978. Cost is estimate of original construction. Does not include significant investments in maintenance and upgrades over the years.

Note 3 - City of Marathon figures for cost, EDUs and SDFs are very rough estimates.

Note 4 - City of Key West original cost is about \$66 million. They have approximately \$23 million in planned upgrades. Only completed upgrades are included.

Note 5 - Conch Key project was a collection system which in now connected to the Duck Key project.

Note 6 - Stock Island project was a collection system and payment to Key West Resort Utilities for capacity rights for 1500 EDUs and aid in upgrading their plant to AWT standards.

Note 7 - Village-wide initial EDU count of 9,564 reduced to 7,556 due to analysis of properties not likely to be developed. Assessment phase 1 & 2 of \$20 million each, approx \$3.5 million prepay. NPKL assessment of \$7 million, \$2 million prepay. Note 8 - FKAA capitalized \$3.0 million

# TABLE 3



COMPUTATION OF FUNDING ANALYSIS - EXCLUDE UNDEVELOPED PARCELS

KEY LARGO WASTEWATER TREATMENT DISTRICT

DATE: SEPTEMBER 23, 2014

Service Area	Stock Island (1)	Big Coppitt (2)	Bay Point	Cudjoe Regional	Conch Key/Duck Key	Conch Key/Duck Key Subtotal County/FKAA	KLWTD	GRAND TOTAL
BOCC District	1	2	2	2	4		5	
Project Cost \$	4.5 \$	36.5 \$	6.4 \$	170.0	\$ 19.2	\$ 236.6	\$ 163.0 \$	399.6
State and Federal Funding \$	5	11.1	\$	32.6	\$ 1.7	\$ 45.4	\$ 20.05	95.4
Countywide Funds \$	0.3 \$	17.3 \$	1.9 \$	97.5	\$ 11.3	\$ 128.3	\$ 23.1 \$	151.4
Islamorada Capital Contribution \$	'	· ·	\$			· ·	\$ 10.6 \$	10.6
Subtotal Outside Sources \$	\$ 6.0	28.4 \$	\$ 1.9	130.1	\$ 13.0	\$ 173.7	\$ 83.7 \$	257.4
Contribution from Local Ratepayers \$	4.2 \$	8.1 \$	4.5 \$	\$ 6.68	\$ 6.2	\$ 62.9	\$ 2.62	142.2
Number of EDUs (3)	1,479	2,023	357	969'8	1,454	14,009	14,052	28,061
Contribution per EDU \$	\$ 2,840 \$	4,004 \$	12,605 \$	4,588	\$ 4,264	\$ 4,490	\$ 2,643	2,068
Cost per EDU \$	3,043 \$	18,043 \$	\$ 17,927 \$	19,549	\$ 13,205	\$ 16,889	\$ 11,600 \$	14,240
-							<u>.</u>	
Amount of Disnasity nor EDII.	1 153 35							

(1) Note that the facts surrounding the Stock Island project are murky, contradictory and difficult to verify. The sales tax numbers used in this spreadsheet were provided by County's own Infrastructure Sales Tax spreadsheet. In an effort to be conservative, the lower sales tax numbers provided by County staff were used. The discrepancy could actually be somewhat worse than presented depending on which figures are correct.

See Note 4.

16,206,931.26 6,318,515.00 22,525,446.26

Borrowing Costs: \$

Total Amount of Disparity: \$

Estimated Excess Borrowing Costs: \$ Amount of Disparity Excluding Excess

(2) The sales tax discrepancy also exists for the Big Coppitt project. The lower numbers have been used in an effort to be conservative.

(3) Due to the funding disparity, the District was obligated to assess undeveloped lots. In the other unincorporated areas, undeveloped lots are not assessed. Therefore, in order to accurately compute the disparity, undeveloped lots were excluded from the number of EDUs. (4) Due to the funding disparity, the District was obligated to take out bridge loans to complete its project, including a \$1.2 million line of credit, a \$10 million FRWA loan which has since been refinanced through SRF, and a \$30 million commerical loan from BB&T. Interest paid on those three loans as of 9/30/2013 is \$6,318,515. The county has promised to provide data on borrowing costs so an apples-to-apples comparison can be performed, but they have not yet provided the needed information. At this time, excess borrowing costs are expected add approximately \$450 per EDU to the disparity. That brings the total to \$1,852 per EDU.



**APPENDIX 1** 

# DRAFT

	KL	KLWTD CAPITAL PROJECTS	ECTS		
	2013-14 Unaudited (1)	2014-15 Adopted Budget (2)	2015-16 Requested <sup>(2)</sup>	2016-17 Requested <sup>(2)</sup>	Total
Capital Outlay: Infrastructure					
Vacuum Station E Pump Room Ventilation		- 35,000	ı	ı	35,000
Vacuum Station E Hurricane Doors		- 25,300	ı	1	25,300
Upgrade Odor Control		- 150,000	ı	1	150,000
Chemical Feed Systems Upgrade		- 1,000,000	1,100,000	1	2,100,000
Fully Enclosed Headworks		1	100,000	200,000	300,000
Shallow W ells	110,701	1	ı	1	110,701
Sludge Handling System	351,105	5 3,293,305	474,056	ı	4,118,466
Low Pressure Collection/Transmission System	828,664	1,749,633	ı		2,578,297
Onsite systems for outlying properties		300,000	700,000		1,000,000
Vacuum Pit Monitoring System		- 2,000,000	3,075,000	425,000	5,500,000
Upgrade Blowers		- 400,000	000,009		1,000,000
Onsite Chemical Generation		- 700,000	1,100,000		1,800,000
Plant Intellipro II SCADA Upgrade	309,102	2 68,000	432,000	ı	809,102
Manatee Bay Sewer Improvements		1	2,000,000	3,000,000	5,000,000
Service Connection Additions	24,750	30,000	25,000	20,000	99,750
GRAND TOTAL	1,624,322	9,751,238	9,606,056	3,645,000	24,626,616
					145,219,990

<sup>(1) =</sup> From KLWTD unaudited October 1, 2013-September 30, 2014 BS&A Revenue & Expenditure Report (2) = From FY14-15 Adopted Budget. (3) = From FY 2013 CAFR, p. 16.

169,846,606

Total KLWTD project costs \$

**APPENDIX 2** 

		2004 Funding	2005 Funding	2004 Funding 2005 Funding 2006 Funding	2007 Funding	2008 Funding	2009 Funding	2010 Funding	2011 Funding	2012 Funding	2007 Funding 2008 Funding 2009 Funding 2010 Funding 2011 Funding 2012 Funding 2013 Funding 2014 Funding	2014 Funding	TOTAL
FEMA Phase I (Fed, St, Local)	Federal	482,108	100,870										582,978
FEMA Phase II Construction	Federal	1,426,314	2,524,450	808,813									4,759,577
ACOE Grants	Federal						1,453,543	13,251,024	1,200,338				15,904,906
ACOE Interest	Federal						174	1,391					1,565
FDEP Grant - Key Largo Park	State	101,466	223,696	1,522,150									1,847,312
DCA Unmet Needs (FEMA II Match)	State	237,719	420,743	134,800									793,262
FDEP Grant - North Components	State				550,727	2,154,996	3,332,277						6,038,000
SFWMD Grant	State	100,000											100,000
DCA Cesspit Replacement	State			1,216,403	9,159								1,225,561
FDEP Grant	State										1,000,000		1,000,000
FDEP Mayfield Grant	State											17,000,000	17,000,000
Total Income	ne	2,347,607	3,269,759	3,682,166	559,886	2,154,996	4,785,994	13,252,415	1,200,338				49.253.161

KEY LARGO WASTEWATER TREATMENT DISTRICT - OUTSIDE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Funding Identification	Source	Amount	Notes
THE CONTRACTOR OF THE PERSON O		Halitailata	
MONTOE COUNTY EAFENDITURES - ONE CENTINFRAS INDICIONE	CENT INFRA		
Ogden Project	304	372	FRAA Reso 093-2000, 232-2000
Cess Pit Grant Match	304	\$ 792	.049   County contributed match for grant to KLWTD
CDBG Sewer Hook up Grant Match	304	\$ 200	.000 County contributed match for KLWTD portion of Sewer Hook Up Grant
Homeowners WW Assistance Grant	304	\$ 509	County portion paid directly to DOH
Dec 2002 ILA	304	69	County provided no-Interest loan to assist with start-up costs for KLWTD: Ioan was formiven on 2/06 BOCC flem .14
February 2003 ILA	304	69	356.000   County provided funding for project engineering design planning costs for Key Laron Park (2003 II A Res 349-2002)
February 2003 ILA	304	<del>()</del>	250.425 County provided funding for design, engineerian, legal and admin costs for Rey Largo Trailey Village (2003 II A Att F)
Land Purchase	304	69	.234 [County burchased 21 acre parcel at MM 101.5 and transferred title to KLWTD
FEMA Phase 1 and 2 Grant Match	304	\$ 914	285 [County contributed match to FEMA grant was originally an interest free loan (2003 II A) that was formiven on 10/06 ROCC tem 1-4
Environmental Mitigation	304	\$ 294	County paid portion of Mitigation for cleaning of plant site. KLWTD naid \$423,796.56.
June 2005 ILA	304	\$ 20	County contributed 20 million to KLWTD (14 M via bond issue)
June 2005 ILA-Interest on share of bond issu	304	↔	County is paying the interest on KLWTD's 14M portion of \$30M bond issue.
Monroe County Total One Cent Infrastructure	ucture	\$ 26,215,979	
MONROE COUNTY EXPENDITURES - OTHER	ter.		
Ogden Settlement	148	85,728	County paid from Planning Building, Zoning
FKAA Prior to District formation		697,485	Per KLWTD CAFR
MSTU (03-07)	170	\$ 3,931	County established, adminstered, collected and distributed KLWTD MSTU -Paid by the residents and businesses of Key Largo
Monroe County Total Other Expenditures	sa.	\$ 4,714,286	
	0.0000		
TOTAL - MONROE COUNTY		\$ 32,930,265	
STATE & FEDERAL GRANTS			
&DBG Sewer Hookup Grant (FY 03)	HUD	\$ 232,200	County directed state funding toward KLWTD
Homeowners WW Assistance Grant	DCA	\$ 100	County directed state funding toward KLWTD - Paid directly to DOH
Homeowners WW Assistance Grant	DEP	\$ 150,000	Paid directly to FKAA
DEP Grant/State Appropriation 2002	DEP	\$ 1,66(	0,000 County directed state funding toward construction of Key Largo Park ww project
Amendment to 2002 Appropriation	DEP	\$ 187	County directed additional appropriated funds to this project
Capital Grant for KLTV	SFWMD	\$ 100,000	County directed state funding toward KLWTD
FEMA Phase 1 and 2 Grant Match	DCA	\$ 914	State Share as described is the Disaster Relief Funding Agreement dated August 30, 2002
FEMA Phase 1 and 2 Grant	FEMA	\$ 5,485,714	County directed federal wastewater grant to KLWTD
DCA Cess Pit Grant (FY 03)	DCA	\$ 1,225	County directed state funding toward KLWTD
DEP Grant/State Appropriation 2006	DEP	\$	County contributed 6 million to KLWTD of 18 million appropriation to County
Monroe County's FKWQIP Allocation (2009)	ACE	\$ 2,465	100% of Monroe County's FKWQIP allocation goes to KLWTD
ARRA Funding	ACE	\$ 13,440,870	Stimulus administered by ACOE per FKWQIP formula (100% of Monroe County's FKWQIP allocation goes to KLWTD)
2013 Legislative	DEP	\$ 1,000,000	
2014 Mayfield	DEP	\$	
Total State & Federal Grants		\$ 49,999,271	
		2000	
TOTAL		909 000 60	
		878.378	

(\$3,698,728.33)

MINUTES
OF THE MONROE COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS



Regular Meeting Board of County Commissioners Wednesday, November 20, 2013 Key Largo, Florida

A Regular Meeting of the Monroe County Board of County Commissioners convened at 9:00 A.M., at the Murry E. Nelson Government Center. Present and answering to roll call were Commissioner Heather Carruthers, Commissioner Danny Kolhage, Commissioner Sylvia Murphy, Commissioner David P. Rice and Mayor George Neugent. Also present at the meeting were Roman Gastesi, County Administrator; Bob Shillinger, County Attorney; Vitia Fernandez, Deputy Clerk; County Staff, members of the press and radio; and the general public.

Item A Presentation by Ananth Prasad, Secretary Department of Transportation and Gus Pego, District Six Secretary of FDOT regarding the Old 7-Mile Bridge.

State Representative Holly Raschein and Christine Hurley, Growth Management Director updated the Board regarding the Senate Bill 1770.

Item B/C A presentation along with comments from fellow Commissioners was made to Mayor George Neugent.

# CALL TO ORDER OF 2014 BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS COMMISSION ORGANIZATION

Item D1 The Board held the selection of the Mayor and Mayor Pro Tem for the Board of County Commissioners. Mayor George Neugent nominated Commissioner Sylvia Murphy to serve as Mayor/Chairman for the Board. Commissioner Heather Carruthers nominated Commissioner Danny Kolhage to serve as Mayor Pro Tem for the Board. There being no other nominations, said nominations were closed.

Item D2 Approval of a Resolution electing the Mayor and Mayor Pro Tem for the Board of County Commissioners. Motion was made by Commissioner Rice and seconded by Commissioner Kolhage to adopt the following Resolution. Motion carried unanimously.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 341-2013**

Said Resolution is incorporated herein by reference

[Type text] Page 1



Item G42 Board granted approval to reject Bid in the amount of \$1,742,100 for construction of Wayfinding Sign Program and to re-advertise for construction bids. This project is funded through a Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and Local Agency Program (LAP) Agreement

Item G44 Board granted approval to waive Purchasing Policies and Procedures for engineering design and construction of emergency repairs to No Name Key Bridge. Approval to amend a contract with Kisinger Campo & Associates Corp. (KCA) to include engineering design services for emergency repairs. Approval to authorize County Administrator to execute construction contract for emergency repairs to No Name Key Bridge on behalf of the Board of County Commissioners.

Item G45 Board adopted a Resolution of the Monroe County Board of County Commissioners requesting the Florida Legislature issue bonds in the amount of an additional fifty million dollars (\$50,000,000.00) from Save Our Everglades Trust Fund monies to be appropriated this fiscal year toward the Florida Keys Area of Critical State Concern protection program to restore and conserve natural systems through the implementation of wastewater management projects.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 378-2013**

Said Resolution is incorporated herein by reference

Item G46 Board granted approval of a 7th Amendment to the Cudjoe Regional Interlocal Agreement to increase funds by a total of \$20 million to \$170 million, to address two Change Orders approved in October 2013 and also as a result of the change from grinder to gravity technology approved at the October BOCC meeting.

Item G47 Board granted approval of Receipt of monthly report on Change Orders reviewed by the County Administrator's Office.

Item G50 Board granted approval of a Contract with Currie Sowards Aguila Architects for the final Design through Construction Administration services for the conversion of the recycling center on Magnolia Street in Key Largo to Public Works offices. This project is funded by Ad Valorem.

Item G51 Board granted approval of a Third Amendment to Contract with MBI/K2M Architecture, Inc. for the Marathon Customs & Border Terminal project to include project design modifications in regards to the relocation of the existing Guardian Ad Litem Offices within the Airport Terminal Facility.

#### TOURIST DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

Item H2 Board granted approval of an Agreement with New Orleans House of Key West, Inc. covering New Year's Eve Shoe Drop in December 2014 in an amount not to exceed \$10,000, DAC I, FY 2014 Event Resources.

[Type text] Page 8