

**MOBILITY FEE UPDATE STUDY 2017-2018
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #4**

ANNOTATED MINUTES

JUNE 20, 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**

12:00 P.M.

**PASCO COUNTY INTERNAL SERVICES BLDG - MULTIPURPOSE ROOMS 129-130,
7536 STATE STREET, NEW PORT RICHEY, FL 34654**

MEMBERS:

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

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

STAFF:

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

William “Bill” Oliver – Consultant

1. Call to Order

Chairman Gassaway called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Each of the Committee Members and Staff introduced themselves for the record. Mr. Mark Spada arrived to the meeting at 12:29 p.m. Mr. Robert Griffiths arrived to the meeting at 12:32 p.m. Mr. Fred Krauer and Mr. Michael Ryan were absent.

3. Property Valuation Discussion

Mr. Spada explained he and Mr. Oliver exchanged a number of messages reviewing the valuation that was discussed at the last meeting. He provided data from a third party market resource firm to Mr. Oliver. He felt in the prior discussion they missed that it was an increment. The increment was the difference between what Mr. Oliver saw as the prior valuation. It was not the gross value of a residential home, but rather the incremental value. They also had to apply the exemptions that most people received.

Mr. Oliver referred to a slide shown at the last meeting and the County's taxable value which came out of the Property Appraiser's database. He displayed a slide showing information from Landmark which showed the average closing costs for homes and the the calculations. He spoke regarding the original database used and that he expanded the size range to include all homes, not just properties constructed in 2017 or before. He noted that townhomes were included as single-family homes in the Property Appraiser's database and spoke further regarding the taxable values.

Mr. Spada said the increment part started from a small number. His point was that the supermajority of development land was formerly in agriculture before it was developed.

Mr. Sheridan asked Mr. Oliver if he was changing his numbers in the study or leaving them.

Mr. Oliver said he was going back and re-checking the values for all of the uses in the schedule. A lot of the taxable values had increased. He explained property tax was just a tax. The Board of County Commissioners were under no obligation to continue to spend property taxes on transportation.

Mr. Sheridan asked if part of the process was to identify the change from Ag use to new development.

Mr. Spada felt they had assumed the Ag portion was zero.

The item was for information only. No action was taken.

4. Infill Lot Incentive for West Market Area Discussion

Mr. Pittos distributed information to the Committee Members regarding the scenarios for the infill lot incentive. He explained there were three scenarios where infill lots may be considered and noted the infill lot incentive was specific to the West Market Area/the Harbors. In the first scenario nodes were identified within the West Market Area and they determined what type of incentive might come out of a node. The second scenario was to look at all of the vacant parcels throughout the West Market Area and The Harbors. He referred to two maps that were distributed. The first map displayed the first scenario and the second map considered all of the vacant parcels within the Harbors. The third scenario was based on an infill definition that was discussed at a previous meeting.

Ms. Smita Ambadi provided an extensive review of each scenario, and spoke regarding the calculations and criteria used. She responded to questions asked by the Committee Members.

Discussion followed that the infill lot incentive was only for the West Market Area; the node displayed was from Camry Drive to Shamrock Drive along U.S. 19; that the Harbors equaled West Market Area; commercial areas which had high potential for re-development; incentives already in place for re-development; the second scenario just looked at vacant lots within the boundary; the Universal Plaza area; the examples used; the permitting data for the Harbors; that the total number of parcels was different in each scenario; and the subsidy calculations.

MR. MARK SPADA ARRIVED TO THE MEETING AT 12:29 P.M. AND MR. ROBERT GRIFFITHS ARRIVED TO THE MEETING AT 12:32 P.M.

Discussion continued regarding assumptions made in the calculations; that land use had not been considered as criteria in any of the scenarios; a suggestion to look at all ten nodes for the scenario, not just an example of one node; the mobility fee rates, the processes followed; absorption rates; confusion with the table used; growth rates and reasonable land uses; the number of permits per year; development constraints; incenting the core re-development areas; the application of mobility fee incentives; that using pre-defined nodes was a viable alternative; the incentive amounts; available funding; the criteria developed and the models used; aggregated parcels of the same ownership; that it was always more difficult and expensive to re-develop; Greenfield development; and what levels of incentives could they afford.

Mr. Goldstein said that based on the current budget they could afford to subsidize everything in Scenario 2. If they chose to subsidize something less than that, they could obviously afford the subsidy. He noted the re-development incentive had been in place since 2014. They had not seen a huge spike in permitting numbers. He spoke regarding consistency with the Comp Plan. The issue was how much they wanted to incentivize Greenfield development versus re-development. He spoke regarding re-development costs.

Discussion continued among the Committee Members and Staff that they needed to be careful in incentivizing Greenfields due to growth rates; a feeling they should use the existing nodes for the Harbors Plan; support for subsidizing residential within the Harbors nodes along U.S. 19; support for Scenario 1; the numbers assumed they subsidized 9,500 dwelling units to the full fee rate over 25 years in the West Market Area; what should be incentivized in the West Market Area; and the location of the nodes.

Mr. Goldstein clarified the consensus was to apply the vacant lot incentive to all of the nodes along U.S. 19, excluding the two located on Little Road and to apply 50 percent incentive of the full fee. He suggested the Committee pick TND or MUTRUM and incentivize that rate.

The Committee agreed to incentivize at the MUTRUM rate.

Mr. Goldstein stated he would draft language for the Committee's review at the next meeting.

The item was for information only. No action was taken.

5. Questions Regarding Capital Improvements Plan (if necessary)

Mr. Pittos said at the last meeting the Committee Members had requested a map be provided for all of the listed capital improvements. The map was provided to the Committee Members and Staff was available to address any questions.

6. Next Meeting: June 27, 2018

Chairman Gassaway reminded the Committee Members the next meeting would be held in the same location as today's meeting.

7. Questions

There were no questions.

8. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

9. Adjourn

The Committee adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

MOBILITY FEE UPDATE STUDY 2017-2018
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #4
JUNE 20, 2018



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

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