MOBILITY FEES
IN PASCO COUNTY
Objectives Today

- History
- Overview of Pasco County Mobility Fees
- Overcoming Objections to Mobility Fees
Motivating Factors

- \( \approx 48\% \) of Pasco County workers employed outside of Pasco County boundaries – Highest % in Region
- \( \approx 12\% \) Unemployment – Highest % in Region
- Highest impact fees in Region
- Unsustainable Growth Patterns and Tax Base
History-2006

- 2006 Comprehensive Plan
- Creation of Town Centers and Employment Centers
- Adoption of Town Center/Traditional Neighborhood Development Ordinance
History-2007/2008

- Creation of TBARTA
- Urban Land Institute Report
  - Market Areas
  - More Predictable/Less Time Consuming Transportation Mitigation System
  - Focus on Transit Oriented Development and Traditional Neighborhood Development
History-2009

- SB 360
  - Dense Urban Land Area/Urban Service Area Exemptions
  - Mobility Fees
  - DCA/FDOT Joint Report
- TBARTA Adopts Master Plan
- Pasco MPO Adopts 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan
History-2009

- Board Adopts Strategic Plan
  - Concentrate Future Growth in Urban Service Area
  - Mobility Fees in Place by 2012
  - New Transportation Funding Sources—Tax Increment
  - Focus on Job Creation
  - Innovation Encouraged
Building on Progress

- ULI
- Strategic Plan
- Business Plan
Market Area Planning
ULI Market Area Analysis
ULI Market Areas on Base Map
Water and Sewer Service Areas and Lines
Public Lands/Conservation
Rural Areas and VOPH
EC, TC, IL and CPEV
Current MPUD’s & DRI’s
Market Areas
History-2010

- Market Areas and Market Area Strategies Adopted into Comprehensive Plan
- Urban Service Area/Transportation Concurrency Exception Area Adopted
- Transit Oriented Development Conceptual Locations and Standards Adopted into Comprehensive Plan
Transit Oriented Development

MAP 2-24 TRANSIT EMPHASIS CORRIDOR WITH TRANSIT CENTER OVERLAY

Legend
- Transit Emphasis Corridor Boundary
- Transit Center Overlay

Legend:
- Roads
  - Collector
  - Interstate
  - Intrastate
  - Rail
- CSX Railroad

Scale: 0 1 2 3 4 Miles
History-2011

- March--Board Chose Prototype Mobility Fee
  - Relies in part on Tax Increment Financing
  - Ordinances and Full Fee Schedules within 90 days
- Urban Service Area Approved by DCA
History-June 2011

HB 7207 (Community Planning Act)
  • Transportation Concurrency Optional
  • Less State Oversight
  • Favorable Language for Mobility Fees
July 12, 2011

- Adopted a Multi-Modal Mobility Fee that Helps Implement 5 Years of Planning Concepts
July 12, 2011

- One of the First Counties in Florida/United States to Adopt a Mobility Fee
- Innovative
- Promotes Smart Growth
- Promotes Economic Development
- Could be Model for other Communities
Ordinance - Overview

- Replaces transportation impact fee with a mobility fee
- Assesses Capital Costs for
  - Roads
  - Transit
  - Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities
- Operation and Maintenance Costs Excluded
Overview - TCEA

- Creates and implements Transportation Concurrency Exception Area for Urban Service Area Based on Mobility Fee
- Subsequent Comp Plan and Code Amendments Will Replace Transportation Concurrency with Mobility Fee County-wide
Overview - LRTP

- Adopts MPO 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan as Mobility Plan
Map 7-36 Pasco County 2005 LAFTP - 2035 Cost Affordabile 2020-2035 Roadway Improvements

This map includes the improvements that are cost affordable during 2025 to 2035 and the number of lanes by 2035. The blue highlights indicate roadways that will be improved by 2035.

Map 7-36: Pasco County 2005 LAFTP - 2035 Cost Affordabile 2020-2035 Roadway Improvements

Chapter 7: Cost Affordabile Plan

Pasco County MPO 1955 Long Range Transportation Plan
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Map 7-3: Pasco County 2035 RTP - 2015 - 2035 Cost Affordability Roadway Improvements Only

The map combines Map 7-2a and Map 7-2b and displays improvements from 2015 to 2035.
2016 to 2025 Bonded Funds are to include $0.5 million per year from county revenue sources and $0.5 million per year from Federal Enhancement project funds for bicycle, pedestrian, and trail projects.

2026 to 2035 Bonded Funds are to include $0.75 million per year from county revenue sources and $0.5 million per year from Federal Enhancement project funds for bicycle, pedestrian, and trail projects.

The Bonded Funds can be used to fund Conceptual Trails.

Map 7-7: Pasco County 2035 LRTP - 2035 Cost Affordable Multi-Use Trail Facilities

The map displays existing multi-use trails as well as trails to be built by 2014. The reserves in Table 7-5 can be used to build desired trails from the conceptual trails identified in grey.
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2016 to 2025 Bond Funds are to include $0.5 million per year from county revenue sources and $0.5 million per year from Federal Enhancement project funds for bicycle, pedestrian, and trail projects.

2025 to 2035 Bond Funds are to include $0.75 million per year from county revenue sources and $0.5 million per year from Federal Enhancement project funds for bicycle, pedestrian, and trail projects.
2016 to 2025: Bexar Funds are to include $0.5 million per year from county revenue sources and $2.5 million per year from Federal Enhancement project funds for bicycle, pedestrian, and trail projects.

2026 to 2035: Bexar Funds are to include $0.75 million per year from county revenue sources and $3.5 million per year from Federal Enhancement project funds for bicycle, pedestrian, and trail projects.
Ordinance - Tiered Fees

- Tiered Mobility Fee Rates
- Lower Fees in Urban Market Areas
- Higher in Suburban & Rural Market Areas
Ordinance - Preferred Rates

- Office
- Industrial
- Lodging (Hotel)
- Traditional Neighborhood Development/Town Centers (TND)
- Transit Oriented Development (TOD)
Ordinance - Rate Buy-Down

- Other revenues will subsidize/buy-down mobility fee for preferred uses and areas
  - Gas Tax
  - Penny for Pasco (Sales Tax)
  - 33.33% Tax Increment
- Required buy-down calculated yearly based on actual permits and revenues
# Tax Increment Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base Year</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/01/11</td>
<td>01/01/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tax Roll Date</strong></td>
<td>FY 2012</td>
<td>FY 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiscal Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Countywide Taxable Valuation</strong></td>
<td>$20,200,000,000</td>
<td>$21,695,405,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deduct Community Redevelopment Areas</strong></td>
<td>($828,200,000)</td>
<td>($889,511,605)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Countywide Taxable Valuation</strong></td>
<td>$19,371,800,000</td>
<td>$20,805,893,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Year minus FY 2012 (Base Year)</strong></td>
<td>$1,434,093,395</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiply by millage rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Divide by $1,000 (taxable value)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiply by percentage available for transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiply by percentage collected (3% discount for paying early)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>97.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tax Increment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,951,928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mobility Fee Subsidy Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobility Fee Collection/Benefit District 1 - West (MFCBD1)</th>
<th>Number Resid Permits</th>
<th>SF Non-Res Permits</th>
<th>Revenues with buy-down</th>
<th>Revenues without buy-down</th>
<th>Difference (Mobility Fee Subsidy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment District A</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>171,847</td>
<td>$ 690,194</td>
<td>$ 1,886,163</td>
<td>$(1,195,969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment District B</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$ 730,848</td>
<td>$ 809,343</td>
<td>$(78,495)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment District C</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2,884</td>
<td>$ 1,218,007</td>
<td>$ 1,406,064</td>
<td>$(188,057)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>309</td>
<td>174,731</td>
<td>$ 2,639,049</td>
<td>$ 4,101,570</td>
<td>$(1,462,521)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gas Tax Revenues spent in Collection/Benefit District 1 - West**

| Sales Tax Revenues spent in Collection/Benefit District 1 - West | $  | 

**Total Tax Revenues spent in Collection/Benefit District 1 - West**

| Total Tax Revenues spent in Collection/Benefit District 1 - West | $  | 

Deduct Mobility Fee Subsidy Needed

| Deduct Mobility Fee Subsidy Needed | $(1,462,521) |

**Required Transfer Needed from the Multi-Modal Fund to the MFCBD1 Fund**

| Required Transfer Needed from the Multi-Modal Fund to the MFCBD1 Fund | $(1,462,521) |
Overview -
Retains Expenditure Zones

- Retains and uses existing road impact fee zones for expenditures
- Renamed collection/benefit districts
- Travel characteristics predominantly north-south; easier to satisfy “benefit” prong of dual rational nexus test
Overview - Municipalities

- Municipalities can participate; not required to participate.
- If participate, mobility fees and tax increment revenues collected in cities will be earmarked for improvements benefiting cities; CRA’s excluded.
- Will benefit from TND/Town Center rates in fee schedule.
Overview - SIS Facilities

- Portion of fee earmarked for improvements that benefit Strategic Intermodal System in Pasco County
  - US 19
  - I-75
  - Suncoast Parkway
  - portions of US 41 and SR 54
- Requires consultation with FDOT prior to budgeting SIS portion
- Can eventually be spent on regional (TBARTA) transit facilities
Overview - Reductions and Increases

- Reductions retroactive to building permits applied for or issued on or after March 1, 2011
- If fees increasing, or otherwise adversely affected by mobility fees, have 3-year period to opt-out and remain subject to transportation impact fees
Key Assumptions - Growth Rate

- ≈ 1.5% growth rate in person-miles of travel
- Consistent with most recent BEBR population projections
Key Assumptions - Level of Service

- More tolerance for congestion in South and West Market Areas; increased reliance on transit
- Commitment to expand transit operations with tax increment revenue
- Less tolerance for congestion in Central, East and North Market Areas
- Measure level of service area-wide instead of road by road
Key Assumptions - Funding

- Penny for Pasco will be reauthorized in 2014; same percentage allocated for transportation ($\approx 22\%$)
- 2.5 cents of existing gas tax used for capital; other 7.5 cents used for operation and maintenance
- 3% average annual growth rate in property values for tax increment (1.2 percent in first year); no decrease in millage rate
Key Assumptions - Costs

- Includes interstate travel costs
- Excludes costs of regional (TBARTA) transit facilities
- Mobility fee for transit capital (park and rides, buses and shelters) is less than .25% of the fee
- Transit share likely to increase in future as regional transit plans are finalized and O&M sources identified
- Mobility fee for bicycle/pedestrian facilities (sidewalks, trails, multi-use paths) is less than 4% of the fee
Overview - Updates

- Every 3 years at a minimum; can occur sooner
- Will re-examine all assumptions
  - Growth Rates
  - Construction Costs
  - Availability of Buy-down Revenue Sources
  - LRTP Changes
  - Include Regional Transit?
## FEE COMPARISON TABLE
(Non-residential fees are per 1,000 sf)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing TIF</th>
<th>Mobility Fee Urban (West/South)</th>
<th>Mobility Fee Suburban (Central/East)</th>
<th>Mobility Fee Rural (North)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>$10,302</td>
<td>$5,835</td>
<td>$8,570</td>
<td>$9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1501-2499 s.f.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>$7,564</td>
<td>$3,971</td>
<td>$5,845</td>
<td>$6,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>$3,151</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$3,703</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50,000-100,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>$8,877</td>
<td>$5,641</td>
<td>$7,051</td>
<td>$8,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50,000-200,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>$3,147</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$597</td>
<td>$1,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing TIF</td>
<td>Mobility Fee Urban (West/South)</td>
<td>Mobility Fee Suburban (Central/East)</td>
<td>Mobility Fee Rural (North)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Center/ TND Single-Family (1501-2499 s.f.)</td>
<td>$10,302</td>
<td>$1,459</td>
<td>$2,143</td>
<td>$2,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Center/ TND Apartments</td>
<td>$7,564</td>
<td>$993</td>
<td>$1,463</td>
<td>$1,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Center/ TND Light Industrial</td>
<td>$3,151</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Center/ TND Office (50,000-100,000)</td>
<td>$3,703</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Center/ TND Retail (50,000-200,000)</td>
<td>$8,877</td>
<td>$1,410</td>
<td>$1,763</td>
<td>$2,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Center/ TND Hotel</td>
<td>$3,147</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$149</td>
<td>$298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD – All Uses</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overcoming Objections

- Tea Party – Agenda 21?
  - Tax Increase Concerns
  - Light Rail Concerns
  - “Human Habitation Zones”

- Rural Landowners
Overcoming Objections

- Only charged to **new** development; not a fee paid by existing residents
- **Does not** require any tax increase
- Fee buy-down is from earmarked **existing** revenue sources (gas tax, Penny for Pasco, and 33.33% ad valorem tax increment)
- **No new taxes or assessments** are being adopted
Local governments are encouraged to develop tools and techniques to complement the application of transportation concurrency such as:

1. Adoption of long-term strategies to facilitate development patterns that support multi-modal solutions, including urban design, and appropriate land use mixes, including intensity and density.
3. **Exempting** or **discounting** impacts of locally desired development, such as development in **urban areas**, **redevelopment**, **job creation**, and **mixed use** on the transportation system.

4. Assigning **secondary priority** to **vehicle mobility** and **primary priority** to ensuring a safe, comfortable, and attractive **pedestrian environment**, with convenient interconnection to **transit**.
Overcoming Objections
HB 7207 (2011)

Senate and House Vote for HB 7207 (2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Republicans</th>
<th>Democrats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Entire Pasco County Legislative Delegation Voted Yes
- Governor Scott signed into law on June 2, 2011
Overcoming Objections
Choices

Where do you want to live?
Overcoming Objections
Rural Area Fees

Generally higher than Urban and Suburban because:

• Longer trip lengths
• Paying for higher level of service-less congestion
Overcoming Objections
Rural Area Fees
Future Land Use Breakdown

≈ 98%
Residential/Conservation/Public

≈ 1% Office/Industrial

≈ 1% Retail

- **Fees being reduced for 99% of the Rural Area**
Overcoming Objections
Rural Area Fees-Retail

- For 1% Retail, ≈ 50% of fees are being reduced
- If any Retail increases, can opt-out for next three years, or develop in a Town Center
Overcoming Objections

Rural Area Fees

Town Center Comparison

Rural Movie Theater

- $21,454 per screen – 168% of existing transportation impact fee

Movie Theater in Town Center (Dade City, Pasadena Hills)

- $4,318 per screen – 34% of existing transportation impact fee
Overcoming Objections
Rural Area Fees
Town Center Comparison

**Rural Supermarket**
- $13,082 per 1,000 s.f. – 160% of existing transportation impact fee

**Supermarket in Town Center (Dade City, Pasadena Hills)**
- $2,611 per 1,000 s.f. – 32% of existing transportation impact fee
### Overcoming Objections
#### Rural Area Fees
#### Amount Spent on Buy-Down
#### Movie Theater (per screen)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$11,140</td>
<td>$15,759</td>
<td>$19,984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overcoming Objections
Rural Area Fees
Amount Spent on Buy-Down Supermarket (per 1,000 s.f.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>$4,010</td>
<td>$9,529</td>
<td>$12,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
www.pascocountyfl.net
County Attorney - Proposed
Ordinances and Adopted Resolutions

- Ordinances
- Fee Schedules
- Tindale, Oliver Technical Report
QUESTIONS?