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Transportation Impact Fees

- Est. 1986 (last updated 1989)
- Six Districts:
  - Downtown
  - Interbay
  - Westshore
  - Central East
  - North Central
  - University North
Transportation Impact Fee Revenue

- Provide $ for roadway “capacity” improvements
Transition from a Roadway-based Fee to a Multi-Modal Fee

- Flexibility
A Multi-Modal Fee provides flexibility to expand capital facilities for bicycle, pedestrian, and transit modes in addition to funding automobile capacity along the classified roadway network.
Purpose

Impact Fee

Multi-Modal Fee

Roadway
Transit
Pedestrian
Bicycle

Roadways
Development Example

Transportation Modal Fee

Vintage Lofts at West End (Cypress St)
Approx. $165,000

New 4 Lane Divided Road
150 ft

Sidewalk
1.5 miles

Bike Facilities
0.75 miles

Transit Capital
6 Shelters

TIF District: Interbay
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Impact Fee Equation:

\[\text{Demand} \times \text{Cost} - \text{Credit} = \text{Impact Fee}\]
Components of Impact Fee Study:

- **Demand** – Trip characteristics for each land use
- Conversion to PMT using an occupancy factor or 1.3
- **Cost** – Unit cost to construct a roadway (w/bike-ped and transit)
- **Credit** – Recognizes non-impact fee expenditures on transportation capacity
Conversion to Multi-Modal Fee

Limited Update Study:

• **Demand** – Update trip generation rate
• Ensure that the current fee is conservative
• Partial update of benefit district boundaries
Demand Component:

• **Trip generation rates** updated based on ITE 9th Edition and recent trip characteristics studies throughout Florida

• 18 Land Uses (avg TGR increase = 126%)
  • 13 land uses increased less than 30%
  • 2 land uses increased between 30% and 100%
  • 5 land uses increased more than 100%

• 26 Land Uses (avg TGR decrease = -18%)

• 9 Land Uses did not change
Cost Component:

- Cost component was reviewed, but not updated
- Confirmed that current cost is not over-charging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>1989 Study</th>
<th>2014 Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Business</td>
<td>$1.9 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central/East</td>
<td>$1.1 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interbay</td>
<td>$1.2 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>$0.8 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University North</td>
<td>$1.3 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westshore</td>
<td>$2.3 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.4 M</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3.6 M</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cost Component:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/County</th>
<th>Unit CpLM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tampa (1989 avg.)</strong></td>
<td>$1.4 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River County</td>
<td>$2.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casselberry</td>
<td>$2.9 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oviedo</td>
<td>$2.9 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernando County</td>
<td>$3.2 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk County</td>
<td>$3.2 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tampa (2014 review)</strong></td>
<td>$3.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>$3.7 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte County</td>
<td>$3.8 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier County</td>
<td>$3.9 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>$4.0 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cost Component:

- The added cost for constructing/expanding a roadway that includes transit facilities is less than 5% more than constructing a roadway without transit.

- The current unit construction cost is representative of the cost to provide transportation capacity for all modes of travel.
Credit Component:

- Credit was reviewed, but not updated
- Inclusion of multi-modal projects resulted in an increase in the revenue credits
- However, increased credit does not offset the fee increase due to higher costs
Fee Changes (CBD District):

- **Due to trip generation update**
- 18 Land Uses  (avg fee increase = 134%)
  - 13 land uses increased less than 30%
  - 2 land uses increased between 30% and 100%
  - 5 land uses increased more than 100%
- 25 Land Uses  (avg fee decrease = -20%)
- 10 Land Uses did not change

- **Policy Option:** Freeze fees and adopt only the decreases
Benefit Districts:

- Regulate where IF revenues can be spent
- Currently have same boundaries as impact fee districts, but function separately
- Potential adjustment to benefit districts ONLY, fee districts to remain unchanged
Benefit District Adjustments

Benefit Districts:

- **Existing**
- **Alternative #1**
  - No NCT
  - Expand West
- **Alternative #2**
  - No NCT
  - Expand West & North
Policy Decision:

• Adopt alternative benefit districts
  ✓ Alternative #1
  ✓ Alternative #2

• Change only benefit district boundaries vs. benefit and fee district boundaries
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Next Steps:

• Staff input to finalize the report

• Presentation to Stakeholders – June 30th

• City Council Workshop/Hearing
THANK YOU

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS?