

**MOBILITY FEE UPDATE STUDY 2017-2018
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #2**

ANNOTATED MINUTES

APRIL 30, 2018

**PREPARED IN THE OFFICE OF
PAULA S. O'NEIL, CLERK & COMPTROLLER**

**THE MINUTES WERE PREPARED IN AGENDA ORDER
AS PUBLISHED AND NOT IN THE ORDER
THE ITEMS WERE HEARD**

10:00 A.M.

**RASMUSSEN COLLEGE – LAND O'LAKES CAMPUS
18600 FERNVIEW ST., ROOMS 102-103, LAND O'LAKES, FL 34638**

MEMBERS:

Pat Gassaway, Chairman
Jamie Soderland Ballard, Vice-Chairman
Stewart Gibbons
Robert Griffiths
Steve Henry
Clarke Hobby
David Key

Fred Krauer
Kelly Miller
Jennifer Motsinger
Michael Ryan
Scott Sheridan
Mark Spada

STAFF:

David Goldstein, Chief Assistant County Attorney
Nectarios Pittos, Long Range Planning Manager
Ernie Monaco, Acting Planning & Development Director
Aurybel Rivero, Sr. Planner – Transportation
Ali Atefi, Planning & Development, Engineer III
Smita Ambadi, Planning & Development, Principal Planner

William "Bill" Oliver - Consultant

1. Call to Order

Chairman Gassaway called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

2. Roll Call

Each Member introduced themselves for the record. All Members were present.

3. Infill Lot Discussion

Mr. Monaco led discussion regarding infill and provided various scenarios. Key items included:

- Malls with high vacancies.
- Discounts offered to motivate developers to come into the Harbors area.
- The County did not want to continue to be a bedroom community.
- The need for households with large disposable incomes.
- Three options to consider – Definition of Infill and Implications, All Vacant Parcels in Harbors, and Catalyst Nodes Along US 19.

Discussion followed regarding mapping the areas; the different approaches to infill; that redevelopment already existed in the Code; if there was development on a parcel it was already exempt and paid zero; fundamental disagreements about what was infill; the location of the Harbors West Market Area; the incentive was not limited to residential; that Staff would provide information to the Committee Members for input at the next meeting; the difference between infill and vacant; and catalyst sites.

The item was for information only; no action was taken.

4. Rural Lot Discussion

Mr. Monaco reviewed Staff's direction from the Board of County Commissioners to not increase mobility fees. Key items included:

- The use of mobility fees.
- That the BCC wanted to place a bigger discount on rural lots.
- A rural lot was defined as 10 acres or greater.
- The Northeast Rural Protection Area.
- A desire to offer a variety of housing types.
- Zoning designation.
- Rural area building permits.
- The character of the rural area.
- The intention of mobility fees.

Discussion followed regarding the number of permits for single-family detached units in the entire rural area; an estimate of 3 to 5 ten acre lots per year were sold; they could afford to subsidize 10 acre lots; the question was how much the 10 acre lots should be subsidized; and agreement to match the suburban rate for single-family detached in rural areas for 10 acres or more.

The item was for information only; no action was taken.

5. How Mobility Fees are Calculated

Mr. Oliver reviewed the item using a PowerPoint presentation. Key topics included:

- Cost Indicators.
- Costs per lane mile.
- Cost comparisons with the 2014 Study.
- $\text{Fee} = \text{Travel Generated} \times \text{Cost of Capacity} - \text{Credits} - \text{Incentives}$.
- Use of toll roads.
- Rate of growth versus rate of system expansion.
- Funding capacity.
- Tax increment revenues.

Mr. Ernie Monaco and Mr. Terry Pittos arrived to the meeting at 10:08 a.m.

Discussion followed regarding whether the construction costs included right-of-way acquisition; the Pasco County and FDOT numbers provided included everything, while the Federal number just included construction costs; low cost examples given in the table provided; urban and suburban trip lengths; that the County had not yet used TIP revenue for roads; the Penny for Pasco; funding sources; policy discounts; actions by the Board of County Commissioners that were applicable to mobility fees; the BCC did not want to see a net increase in any residential categories; the only new direction from the BCC since 2014 was that they did not want any fee increases, they wanted them to look at potentially subsidizing large lots in the rural area, and to look at subsidizing infill lots in the Harbors Market area; policies on subsidizing different land uses at different rates; level of service expectations; congestion since the last update; funding for regional transit plans; TIF calculations; and home costs.

The item was for information only; no action was taken.

6. Update on the Growth Rate

7. Review Cost Indicators

Mr. Oliver reviewed the items using a PowerPoint presentation. Key topics included:

- Rate of growth vs. rate of system expansion.
- The quantity of travel had increased.
- The BEBR forecast.
- The MPO proposed a 1.99 percent growth rate.
- The employment growth rate was 2.17 percent per year.
- The cities did not participate in the mobility fees.
- Growth allocation to incentive categories.
- Transportation needs.

Discussion followed regarding the information displayed; the growth rate of 2 percent was an important factor; LTRP projections; the method followed for developing the projections; the employment to population ratio; the percentage of Mettler-Toledo employees who came from Hillsborough County into Pasco; the models and surveys used; reductions in retail; building permits issued to the incentivized categories; Capacity Addition Ratio (CAR); federal funding assumptions; congestion levels; concerns with the quality of life and attractiveness to Pasco as a place to live; that improvements at I-75 and SR 56 were funded; and that many of the future improvements included a transit component.

The item was for information only; no action was taken.

8. Questions

Ms. Soderland asked whether formal motions were required for the items discussed at the meeting today.

Mr. Goldstein explained the Committee was not asked to take any actions today. The Committee would not be expected to vote on anything until the last meeting.

Mr. Ryan stated he was confused by the infill discussions.

Mr. Monaco responded and spoke regarding vacant undeveloped land. At the next meeting they would review infill site criteria.

Mr. Goldstein spoke regarding Staff's definition of infill and that at least one Commissioner felt the definition was too restrictive and that it should be all vacant land in the entire West Market Area.

Mr. Griffith asked when would they receive the information.

Mr. Monaco said the information would be sent to the Committee Members by tomorrow.

Chairman Gassaway reviewed the items discussed during the meeting. He requested the Committee Members think about the infill issue, whether they liked the catalyst sites, whether there were specific criteria in order to map the area, and the percentages of development within the urban, rural and suburban areas.

Mr. Gibbons requested the Committee Members receive the charts and information in advance of the meeting.

9. Public Comment

Mr. Richard Riley spoke regarding the meeting being interesting and that he wanted the record show that people did attend the meeting. He thanked them for the information.

10. Adjourn

The Committee adjourned at 11:57 a.m.

MOBILITY FEE UPDATE STUDY 2017-2018
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #2
APRIL 30, 2018



Office of Paula S. O'Neil, Clerk & Comptroller

Prepared by: Donalee Schmidt
Donalee Schmidt, Operations Lead
Board Records Division