

**Hillsborough County  
Mobility Fee Technical Committee**

**Meeting Minutes**

January 19, 2009 at 9:30 a.m.  
20<sup>th</sup> Floor County Center

The following committee members were present:

**Members**

Robert Campbell  
Charles White  
John Patrick  
Michael Williams  
Adam Gormly  
Domingo Noriega  
Joe Zambito  
Danny Lamb  
Calvin Thornton  
Steve Henry

Randy Coen  
Brad Parrish  
Brett Gocka  
James Fogarty for Steve  
Feigenbaum  
Randy Goers <sup>(1)</sup>  
Ronnie Blackshear <sup>(1)</sup>  
Dan Santos <sup>(1)</sup>  
Scott Jones <sup>(1)</sup>  
Thomas Stinson <sup>(1)</sup>

Marlo Chavama <sup>(1)</sup>  
Christopher Hatton <sup>(1)</sup>  
Elizabeth Lyon-Hall <sup>(1)</sup>  
Kamala Corbett <sup>(1)</sup>  
Allison Yeh <sup>(1)</sup>  
Bill McTeer <sup>(1)</sup>

<sup>(1)</sup> Non-Member

**Proceedings:**

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 am by Bob Campbell.

*Public Policy Forum – Questions and Concerns*

- Staff presented potential answers to the “fee collection” comments from the Public Policy Forum on December 15, 2009 for the discussion of the committee.
- The Committee came up with the answers to be presented at the January 29, 2010 Public Policy Forum.

*Next Meeting:*

- February 26, 2010 at 9:30am.

Note: For more details on this meetings please contact Hillsborough County Transportation and Land Development Review Staff at 813-276-8428

**Response Worksheet  
Mobility Fee Technical Committee  
January 19, 2009**

**Fee Collection Comments (Green) from December 15, 2009  
Policy Meeting**

**1.0 How Fee Will Be Calculated**

| Comment   | Response   |                            |                        |  |                           |                            |                                  |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |        |                          |        |        |
|---|--|----------------------------|------------------------|--|---------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|--------|--------------------------|--------|--------|
| 1.1 Cost in formula should clearly include multimodal improvements.   | The cost formula does include the cost of multimodal improvements, if by multi-modal we mean bike lanes, sidewalks, and bus bays. The cost of fixed guide-way systems are not included because: (a.) these systems are not yet available; and (b.) these improvements have their own exclusive funding source.   |                            |                        |  |                           |                            |                                  |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |        |                          |        |        |
| 1.2 Fee is calculated based on providing road capacity for all trips. Actually providing that capacity is not realistic in much of the urbanized area, due to impact on adjacent neighborhoods and businesses. The mobility fee should be calculated based on the multi-modal plan for accommodating future transportation needs. | The fee is calculated on the percentage of the transportation system consumed by the project and not according to any specific plan. One advantage of this system is that there is no need to change the formula every time the plan changes, and plans do change often. The more frequently a formula changes, the less fair it becomes. Another advantage is that it separates the issues of collection versus expenditure. Expenditures will be determined by the locally responsible jurisdiction and other transportation agencies (FDOT, HART), and are independent of the fee calculation.  |                            |                        |  |                           |                            |                                  |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |        |                          |        |        |
| 1.3 Will there be reduction or credit of fee for uses to reduce VMT? (Retail in Wimauma for example)  | <p>Trip lengths have been adjusted based on the size of retail business as given below.</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Retail Land Use</th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Trip Length (in miles)</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Inside Urban Service Area</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Outside Urban Service Area</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Convenience store (&lt;20,000sq.ft)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neighborhood Retail (≥20,000sq.ft and ≤150,000sq.ft)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Community retail (&gt;150,000sq.ft and ≤350,000sq.ft)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Model*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Regional (&gt;350,000sq.ft)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Model*</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Model*</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Retail Land Use            | Trip Length (in miles) |  | Inside Urban Service Area | Outside Urban Service Area | Convenience store (<20,000sq.ft) | 1 | 2 | Neighborhood Retail (≥20,000sq.ft and ≤150,000sq.ft) | 2 | 4 | Community retail (>150,000sq.ft and ≤350,000sq.ft) | 3 | Model* | Regional (>350,000sq.ft) | Model* | Model* |
| Retail Land Use   | Trip Length (in miles)   |                            |                        |  |                           |                            |                                  |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |        |                          |        |        |
|   | Inside Urban Service Area  | Outside Urban Service Area |                        |  |                           |                            |                                  |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |        |                          |        |        |
| Convenience store (<20,000sq.ft)  | 1  | 2                          |                        |  |                           |                            |                                  |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |        |                          |        |        |
| Neighborhood Retail (≥20,000sq.ft and ≤150,000sq.ft)  | 2  | 4                          |                        |  |                           |                            |                                  |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |        |                          |        |        |
| Community retail (>150,000sq.ft and ≤350,000sq.ft)  | 3  | Model*                     |                        |  |                           |                            |                                  |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |        |                          |        |        |
| Regional (>350,000sq.ft)  | Model*   | Model*                     |                        |  |                           |                            |                                  |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |        |                          |        |        |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>* Model refers to the average trip length generated by the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Model</p> <p>The transportation model from which the trip lengths come is based on land use data by traffic analysis zones (number of dwelling units, jobs, household income, etc.), as such, the first opportunity to satisfy a trip will satisfy trip lengths.</p>  |
| 1.4 Will trip lengths be adjusted as patterns change? How often?  | Yes. Trip lengths will be adjusted every four years to coincide with the MPO's long-range transportation planning updates.  |
| 1.5 "Operational" & "safety" impacts should be limited to access (as roads approach capacity, operational & safety increase – should not be held against development) | <p>Traffic operations at site access and adjacent intersections are directly related to the impact of the development and are not system mobility issues. The land development code specifies thresholds for improvements at site access.</p> <p>Site Access: A way or means of vehicular or pedestrian approach to provide physical entrance to a property.</p> <p>Adjacent Intersection: The nearest intersection to a development which would, during the buildout period of the development, result in net trips equal to or more than ten percent of the total traffic on the approach lane group on a AADT basis.</p> |
| 1.6 Fee should be cheaper for areas where we want development- USA, TOD, redevelopment areas  | <p>The formula accounts for this by virtue of the trip lengths being shorter inside the Urban Service Area (USA). The land development code Sec.5.08.06(C) and Sec 5.08.06(D) provides for trip reduction for TOD and POD developments and consequently reduction in mobility fee. In cases of redevelopment, the projects can receive credit for trips generated by existing development on the site.</p> <p>These trip reductions also serve as incentives for developers to build within USA.</p>  |
| 1.7 Mode split – was additional capacity created by alternate modes included in fee calculation or only road capacity?  | The modeling accounted for both highway and transit trips. Therefore the trip length does consider those trips utilizing alternative modes of transportation.   |
| 1.8 No calculation for internal capture/pass-by in ITE for daily trips. Need to apply for retail/mixed use.   | Technical Committee to work on an acceptable internal capture and pass-by capture rates. A recommendation to will be presented in the subsequent meetings.  |
| 1.9 Is fee same for all use types?  | There are two unit costs per trip; one within the Urban Service Area and one outside the Urban Service Area. The variables that determine the difference in the fee are the number of trips generated by the land use and location of the project.  |
| 1.10 Validity of inclusion of 1) reconstruction costs; 2) Pre-2008 ROW cost data; 3) operating costs  | <p>1. Reconstruction due to lane expansion not only addresses the reconstruction but also addresses the requirements of FDOT and Hillsborough County standards. 2. The ROW cost is calculated as a percentage of total construction cost similar to the methodology used in the MPO Long Range Transportation planning process. The ROW cost is assumed to be 50% of the total construction cost in the USA, and 100% of the total construction outside the USA 3.</p>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | Operating cost is not included in the formula.  |
| 1.11 Need to re-evaluate trip length in rural areas  | Given the lack of land uses in the rural area rural trips will be longer. Agricultural land uses and housing associated with agricultural uses could be exempt from the mobility fee.<br><br>The model trip lengths properly reflect travel behavior based on the projected land uses in the long range transportation plan.  |
| 1.12 Development serving community – rural areas – fee concessions??                           | All public schools and government agencies will be exempt from mobility fee.  |
| 1.13 Will external adjacent site improvements be excluded from credits; will there be credits? | Site access improvements will remain the financial responsibility of the developer and are separate from mobility fees. As distinguished from impact fees, under the mobility fee there will be no credit as developments will not be creating additional capacity. Refer to 1.5 for Site access definition.  |
| 1.14 Ability to take developer improvements as alternative to payment?                         | We do not believe this a good idea. To do so, we would have to switch from a “consumption-based” system to a “planned improvement” system. This would bring us back to negotiating on a project by project basis which, by design, is unfair. One of the tenets of our mobility fee effort is fairness. That is, everyone should pay only for the capacity that they consume. |
| 1.15 How often will the amount of the mobility fee be re-evaluated?                            | Every four years. As the MPO updates the Long Range Transportation plan and the ZDATA, the mobility fee will be updated.  |

## 2.0 Who Collects Fee

| Comment   | Response  |
|---|---|
| 2.1 Collect by umbrella agency – County Clerk                 | This issue has not yet been decided. However, we know of at least two possible alternatives. 1. Since this is proposed to be a county-wide fee, the County could collect the fee, record the zone from which it is collected, and issue a receipt to the builder to take back to his jurisdiction at the time the certificate of occupancy. Then, on a quarterly basis, the County would remit by wire; the funds collected back to the appropriate jurisdiction which budgets the funds. 2. Alternatively, it could be modeled after the way we collect impact fees today. That is, each jurisdiction would collect its own fees. In either case, the budgeting decisions would be left to the elected officials of each jurisdiction. |
| 2.2 Regional issue – independent agency collects/distributes? | Hillsborough County is where fee is applied and calculated. Local governments already have accounting systems for collecting and distributing of funds. Funds are distributed to a variety of agencies and organization continuously by local governments. The fee is not calculated on a regional basis!   |

|  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| 2.3 Who collects the fee when multiple jurisdictions are involved? | See comment 2.1 |
| 2.4 County should collect fee                                      | See Comment 2.1 |

### 3.0 When will the fee be collected?

| Comment  | Response   |
|--|--|
| 3.1 When collected?                                  | <p>There are three options to consider:<br/> 1. At the time of Certificate of Occupancy, which is what we do now with impact fees; 2. Up front at site plan approval; or, 3. Developer's choice.</p> <p>In favor of the first option is its simplicity. We do it now and no change would be necessary. Opposed to this option is the fact that projects which take longer than four years to complete may have their fees recomputed to account for increased costs. In favor of the second option is a guarantee that the fees for these longer term projects would not rise (or fall) in four years or more. The third option leaves it up to the developer.</p> |
| 3.2 Fee should be collected at home closing          | NO   |
| 3.3 When is fee paid in the process?                 | See comment 3.1  |
| 3.4 Are fees paid at time of permitting or platting? | See comment 3.1  |
| 3.5 Fee collection at time of impact (i.e. @ C.O.)   | See comment 3.1  |
| 3.6 Collection @ C.O.? Pay at time of impact.        | See comment 3.1  |
| 3.7 Will there be a deposit due, and if so, when?    | No deposits are contemplated at this time. See comment 3.1   |
| 3.8 When/how are you vested?                         | At time of payment of mobility fee the project is vested for the entitlements paid.  |

#### 4.0 Relationship of Mobility Fee and Impact Fees

| Comment  | Response   |
|--|--|
| 4.1 Relationship to impact fees? Phase out IF; timing?   | The law prohibits charging for the same thing twice. The prevailing opinion is that if mobility fees are adopted, impact fees for transportation would be repealed. Note: By law all other non-transportation impact fees would remain unaffected.   |
| 4.2 How impact fee and mobility fee not charging for same improvement  | See comment 4.1  |
| 4.3 Mobility fee = impact fee? Similar terms: trip length, # of trips, CCM, etc  | <p>The Transportation Impact Fee and the Mobility Fee are both fees that are calculated and assessed by the County to address a project's transportation impacts.</p> <p>The Transportation Impact assessment is for the additional cost associated with a land development activity that attracts or generates additional vehicular traffic in excess of the traffic generation or attraction associated with the existing land use.</p> <p>The amount of impact fees charged bears a reasonable relationship to the cost of providing public facilities necessitated by new development, and the impact fees collected are earmarked and spent in the zones where they are collected. The majority of the transportation impact assessment collected is used to make improvements to the road network.</p> <p>The Mobility Fee is calculated based on a project's vehicle miles of travel consumed on the transportation system. The Mobility Fee would have the flexibility to be spent outside of the zone where it is collected as the majority of trips extend beyond the zone from which it originates. Mobility fee could be spent on a variety of mobility improvements other than just roadways identified on the long range transportation plan. Mobility improvements would be "mode neutral".</p> |
| 4.4 Combine or eliminate impact fees to create one payment   | See comment 4.1  |
| 4.5 Impact fee credits – against mobility fee?   | Yes, we will recommend applying the existing impact fee credits against the mobility fee.  |
| 4.6 Simplify pay and go fee phased in to replace transportation impact fees  | See comment 4.1  |
| 4.7 Does it replace impact fee?  | Yes. See comment 4.1   |
| 4.8 Will the existing transportation impact fees still be collected? If so, will they be a "credit" against the mobility fees? | See comments 4.1 and 4.5   |

## 5.0 Miscellaneous

| Comment  | Response   |
|--|--|
| 5.1 Remember the legislative purpose of 360!<br>– Compact efficient growth | By virtue of the trip-length factor, that's what this fee does.  |
| 5.2 Relationship to existing development agreements and development orders | By statute, the prevailing thought is that all development agreements and development orders remain in effect unless and until the developer chooses to amend either of these two legal documents. These documents will be amended in the usual fashion, but doing so may subject the project to evaluation for mobility fees. Hence it is a business decision. If the project comes out ahead with mobility fees, the developer may elect to go that route. |
| 5.3 ROW sensitive to fee district  | The ROW cost does not vary from one mobility fee zone to another. The ROW cost is calculated as a percentage of total construction cost similar to the methodology used in the MPO Long Range Transportation planning process. The ROW cost is assumed to be 50% of the total construction cost in the USA, and 100% of the total construction outside the USA   |
| 5.4 How and when are 'operational' traffic issues identified and addressed | Site access and operation improvements will be addressed at rezoning or site plan review which ever comes first. The review will be limited to access points and adjacent intersections. For site access and adjacent intersection definitions please refer to 1.5.  |