

ALACHUA COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF GROWTH MANAGEMENT OFFICE OF CODES ENFORCEMENT

120 South Main Street • First Floor • Gainesville, Florida 32601-6294 Zoning (352) 374-5244 • Building (352) 374-5243 Fax (352) 491-4510 • Suncom 651-5244 Home Page: www.co.alachua.fl.us

Rick Drummond, AICP Director Growth Management

Richard Wolf Assistant Director Growth Management

> Carol Hurst Building Official

Benny Beckham Zoning Administrator

Steven Lachnicht, AICP Principal Planner Development Services

Ken Zeichner, AICP Principal Planner Comprehensive Planning

> Tom Webster Housing Programs Manager

Juna Papajorgji GIS Manager May 1st, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Randall H. Reid

County Manager

THRU: Rick Drummond, AICP

Growth Management Director

THRU: Richard Wolf

Growth Management Assistant Director

FROM: Jonathan B. Paul, AICP, MA²

Impact Fee Administrator

CC: Dave Wagner, County Attorney

SUBJECT: 2007 Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance Update

The Alachua County Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance requires that the transportation impact fees be re-evaluated every two years. Since the adoption of the current transportation impact fees in September 2004 and subsequent enactment in March 2005, the cost of constructing additional roadway capacity has increased over 100%. Consequently, the most significant proposed revisions to the Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance have been made to reflect the significant increase in construction cost. In addition, a number of new land use categories have been proposed to better reflect the variation in traffic generation for each land use. The proposed revisions also include a recommendation to increase the transportation impact fee at the beginning of each calendar year to reflect inflation of roadway construction cost.

Date: May 1st, 2007

"A Report Presenting Development Impact Fees" written by James C. Nicholas, PhD, provided a detailed description of the process utilized to develop the current impact fee ordinances. The technical analysis conducted to calculate the Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance utilizes the same methodology and process as provided for in the Dr. Nicholas Report.

The following is a summary of the proposed changes to the Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance:

- 1. Update cost for construction, right-of-way, and engineering
- 2. Update the impact fee rates for each land use to reflect updated cost
- 3. Add land use categories to better reflect the traffic impact of each land use
- 4. Add definitions for mixed- retail centers and large scale retail developments
- 5. Add definition of Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND)
- 6. Add separate rate for rural residential and residential additions
- 7. Add separate rate for residential expansion
- 8. Require that the owners of Shell Building provide tenants with a disclosure affidavit regarding the assessment of impact fees for shell buildings
- 9. Recommend that Transportation Impact Fees automatically be adjusted by the average of the FDOT Inflation Factor and the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Producer Price Index for highway and street construction each calendar year.
- 10. Increase the Area Median Income threshold from 80% to 100% to be eligible for the Affordable Housing Impact Fee Program.

On January 31st, 2007, a memo summarizing the initial proposed revisions to the Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance was provided to the County Manager. Shortly after, the summary memo was provided to the Board of County Commissioners and various stakeholder organizations. The County Manager and the Board of County Commissioners directed staff to discuss the proposed revisions with various stakeholder groups and obtain feedback regarding the proposed revisions. Throughout February and March, meetings were held with the following stakeholder organizations: Gainesville Chamber of Commerce, the Sierra Club, the North Florida Builders Association, Women for Wise Growth, the Gainesville Realtors Association, the Southwest Alliance for Planning and the Coalition for Responsible Growth. In addition, County Staff contracted with James Nicholas, PhD to provide a review of the proposed ordinance revisions and provide recommendations, as deemed necessary.

The initial transportation impact fee revisions distributed for comments and review of January 31st, 2007 were based on the projected 2007 cost to construct a new two (2) lane divided roadway. The projected costs were based on data provided by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and the Alachua County Public Works Department. The FDOT costs were based on a statewide average construction cost. The Alachua County costs were based on the projected cost to construct SW 24th Avenue from SW 34th Street to SW 43rd Street. The cost from both entities was adjusted to 2007 dollars utilizing inflation factors provided by the Florida Department of Transportation. The resulting impact fees utilizing the updated transportation data resulted in a significant increase in the transportation impact fee rate for all land uses.

The meetings with the various stakeholder groups resulted in some very useful feedback. The primary topic of conversation was the calculated significant increase in the impact fee rates, with some of the stakeholder groups supporting the higher fees, while others were opposed to the higher fees. Not all of the stakeholders groups supported raising the transportation impact fees; however, there was an overall acknowledgment amongst the stakeholder groups that there was likely to be some increase in the transportation impact fees. The various stakeholder groups were informed that if the impact fee rates stayed as calculated that there would likely be a reduction in the range of 50% across all the impact fee categories, with a gradual yearly increase thereafter. There was general acceptance of the idea amongst several stakeholder groups that the transportation rates would likely be reduced by some percentage, given the significant increase in the calculated impact fees. Discussions also included comments about multi-modal facilities, integrated mixed-retail centers and Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND).

The input provided by the various stakeholder groups as well as the recommendations provided by James Nicholas, PhD (hereon referred to as the "consultant"), have resulted in Staff reevaluating the initially calculated transportation impact fees provided on January 31st, 2007. One of the primary recommendations from the consultant was to expand the number of roadway cross-sections utilized to determine the base construction cost. Since the County's transportation impact fee is not based on specific roadways such as SW 24th, it is appropriate to expand the number of cross-sections utilized in the analysis. The roadway cross-sections chosen for the reevaluation are consistent with the County's draft plans for addressing transportation concurrency. The following are the six (6) cross-sections used in the re-evaluation, along with the 2006 per mile and per lane mile construction cost from FDOT:

Roadway Cross-section	Per Mile Cost	Per Lane Mile Cost				
Rural Cross-Section (No curb & gutter, open swale used for drainage)						
Two (2) lane undivided	\$3,242,206	\$1,621,103				
Two (2) lane divided	\$3,845,907	\$1,922,954				
Expand Two (2) lane to Four (4) lane divided	\$3,984,587	\$1,992,294				

Date: May 1st, 2007

Roadway Cross-section	Per Mile Cost	Per Lane Mile Cost			
Urban Cross-Section (Curb & gutter used for	drainage)				
Two (2) lane undivided	\$6,323,546	\$3,161,773			
Two (2) lane divided	\$6,879,750	\$3,439,875			
Expand Two (2) lane to Four (4) lane divided	\$6,277,691	\$3,138,846			
Average	\$5,092,281	\$2,546,141			

In addition, since some roadways will have high right-of-way (ROW) acquisition cost, whereas others will not require any additional right-of-way; it is appropriate to utilize a more conservative ROW cost estimate. Likewise, due to specific Federal and State requirements, the FDOT cost for the Design & Engineering (PE) studies for State maintained roadways is higher than what the County would pay for the design and engineering of County maintained roadways; therefore, it appropriate to utilize a more conservative Design & Engineering (PE) cost estimate. The ROW and PE cost are determined based upon a percentage of the total roadway construction cost. Based on experience in developing impact fee ordinances through-out Florida, the consultant recommends utilizing the following factors to determine ROW and PE cost:

ROW & PE Cost	% of Construction Cost	Per Lane Mile Cost
Right-of-way (ROW)	27%	\$687,458
Design & Engineering (PE)	20%	\$509,228
Total		\$1,196,686
Total Cost (Construction, ROW, & Pl	\$3,742,817	

The expansion of the roadway cross-sections utilized, in conjunction with the estimates for ROW and PE, results in a conservative base per lane mile roadway cost. The total base per lane mile cost used in the current adopted impact fee and the proposed impact fee are as follows:

Roadway Cost Components	2004 Impact	2006 Proposed	% Increase
	Fee Cost	Cost Per Lane Mile	
Construction Cost	\$1,250,000	\$2,546,141	104%
Right-of-way (ROW)	\$250,000	\$687,458	175%
Design & Engineering (PE)	\$250,000	\$509,228	104%
Total	\$1,750,000	\$3,742,827	114%

The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics data for highway and street construction cost, series ID PCUBHWY, would suggest an expected increase of 80% in construction cost for the two (2) year period. Moreover, the historic FDOT costs show an increase in construction cost of 82.25%. Why then would the relevant construction cost for Alachua County increase by 104% when both general indices and FDOT data suggest an 80-82% increase? The answer is that the 2004 construction cost per lane-mile datum used for Alachua County was understated. The construction cost used was \$1,250,000 per lane-mile. The cost that should have been used was \$1,459,052. In an abundance of caution, the 2004 road impact fee calculations were understated. Had the full cost been accounted for, the percentage change for construction cost would be 75% and the overall increase would be 83%, inline with the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Florida Department of Transportation increase in inflation. The fact that rights of way experienced the highest increase should be expected, since the cost of land has increased significantly over the past few years. The following illustrates the difference in overall cost had the true roadway cost been utilized for the initial 2004 impact fee calculation:

Roadway Cost Components	2004 Impact	2006 Proposed	% Increase
	Fee Cost	Cost Per Lane Mile	
Construction Cost	\$1,459,052	\$2,546,141	75%
Right-of-way (ROW)	\$291,180	\$687,458	136%
Design & Engineering (PE)	\$291,180	\$509,228	75%
Total	\$2,041,042	\$3,742,827	83%

The cost calculations above do not address an important and relevant point. The Florida Department of Transportation construction cost data are for 2006; it is already 2007. The inflation adjustments have not been made to the 2006 data to bring them to 2007 cost. FDOT projects the inflation rate for 2007 as somewhere between 10% and 15%. The rational behind not adjusting the data to 2007 is that the 2007 rate is based on prior year increases; it is not the actual rate of inflation that occurred in 2007. Furthermore, the projected 2007 inflation rate may come down, as the overall demand for roadway materials and labor decreases. In addition, the rate for 2007 proposed revisions to the Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance would annually adjust the impact fees to account for inflation, thus as of April 1st, 2008, the transportation impact fee would be adjusted by the average of the inflation rates from the 2007 FDOT and U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Produce Price Index series ID PCUBHWY.

There are four (4) significant factors that go into determining the transportation impact fee for individual land uses. The first (1st) factor is base *per lane mile cost*. The cost utilized in the Staff proposed transportation impact fee rates is as described above. The base per lane mile cost is the only one of the four (4) factors that is the same for all individual land uses, except for rural residential (see page 7).

The second (2nd) factor is the *trip generation rate*, per the latest edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, for each individual use. The current Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance combines all commercial uses into one (1) commercial category, all office uses into one (1) office land uses category and all industrial uses into one (1) industrial land use category. Thus, under the current transportation impact fee: a bank, doctors office, government facility, private school, office park and realtors office all pay the same office impact fee rate. In addition, commercial land uses such as gas stations, fast food restaurants, home improvement centers, discount superstores, and a small mom and pop boutique shop are all combined into one broad commercial land use category and are assessed the same impact fee rate regardless of the type of commercial land use. According to the ITE manual, uses such as a doctors office or a bank generate more traffic than a real estate office. In addition, a gas station, home improvement center, or discount superstore has a significantly higher trip generation rate than a small boutique shop. The proposed Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance increases the number of land use categories to better reflect the trip generation characteristics of each individual use.

The third (3rd) factor is the *average trip length to the land use*. The average trip lengths for each land use are based upon the U.S. Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, "Summary of Travel Trends: 2001 National Household Transportation Study". The longer the overall average travel length for a land use, the higher the impact fee rate will be. The consultant also provided information on factors from the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, "National Personal Transportation Survey" that were utilized to reduce the length of overall trips for uses classified as convenience, neighborhood, local, and community. Convenience uses such as banks, fast-food and gas stations generate a significant amount of traffic, however, the trip length to and from these types of convenience uses in reality is quite short. The vast majority of trips come from adjacent land uses. For example, an individual driving from their place of work to their house may first stop at a grocery store, then drive a mile or less to a gas station or bank and then head home. The average trip length to the gas station or bank is not the trip from home or work to the use, but is likely part of a trip on the way to some other destination. Regional retail uses such as a home improvement center or a discount superstore are uses that are typically destinations, are limited in total number of stores and have a longer average trip length.

The **fourth** (4th) factor is the *average pass-by rate*. The average pass-by rates are based upon the (ITE) Trip Generation Handbook and data provided by the consultant from various studies conducted through-out the State of Florida. A pass-by trip is a trip that is already on the roadway and stops at a land uses between an origin point (typically a dwelling) and a destination (place of employment, park). For example, a person drives from home to work in the morning and stops for a quick breakfast at a fast-food restaurant along the way. If the fast-food restaurant is accessed from the same roadway that the person is going to work on, then this trip would be treated as a *pass-by trip*. A pass-by trip is different than the convenience trip length reduction factor, in that a pass-by trip only counts as a pass-by trip if an individual travels one the same roadway; whereas the convenience trip length reduction in travel applies to the trip length between uses and the need to access another roadway. For example, if an individual traveling from Gainesville to Newberry on Newberry Road stops at the grocery store in Jonesville, then exists onto CR 241 and

stops for gas, then gets back on Newberry Road to head towards Newberry, then the trip to the grocery store is a pass-by trip, but the trip to the gas station via CR 241 is not a pass-by trip. However, the trip length to the gas station is shorter because it is based on the trip length from the grocery store to the gas station, not from Gainesville to the gas station. The impact fee calculation does not get into the level of travel described above. The average pass-by rates, along with the other factors, are based on averages from larger survey samples and are applied to various land uses.

The development of the proposed revisions to the adopted transportation impact fees is largely based on the significant increase in the cost to construct additional roadway capacity. In addition, the other significant change is the proposed expansion of land use categories to more accurately reflect that actual trip impact from individuals land uses. Land uses that generate more traffic and have longer average trip lengths subsequently have a greater impact on the overall transportation network. Thus, the proposed transportation impact fee revisions result in land uses that have high *trip generation rates* and *longer average travel lengths* will be assessed higher transportation impact fees.

The proposed revisions to the transportation impact fee include several provisions that support elements of the Alachua County Comprehensive Plan. The 1st provision is the recognition that residential development within the Urban Service / Cluster area has less of an impact on the overall transportation system and supporting infrastructure. The calculated transportation impact fee is 23% less for residential development within the urban area. The average travel length of residential development within the urban area is shorter than residential development in the rural portions of the County. While the total number of trips for rural residential is less (30% less) than for urban residential, the total distance traveled is greater. The difference in average trip length between rural residential and urban residential largely impacts rural roadway sections. To account for the difference in impact on roadway sections, the per lane mile cost have been adjusted downward by \$288,404. This adjustment reflects the fact that the increase in average travel length primarily impacts rural section roadways. Thus, the weighting of cost factors has been increased by 28% for rural roadway sections and lowered by 28% for urban roadway sections. The 28% factor is the difference in Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) between rural and urban residential development.

CONSTRUCTION, ROW & PE Cost		Per Lane Mile Cost
Construction		\$2,349,947
Right-of-way (ROW)	27% of construction cost	\$634,486
Design & Engineering (PE)	20% of construction cost	\$469,989
Total		\$3,454,422

The 2nd **provision** is the recognition that mixed-use Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) has less of an impact on the overall transportation system by reducing the numbers of trips on external roadways and encouraging pedestrian and bicycle mobility. The transportation impact fees for developments that are constructed in accordance with TND guidelines and provided a mixture of residential, retail and offices uses within a single master development plan are proposed to be reduced by 25% to account for the internal capture of vehicular trips and for the increase in pedestrian and bicycle trips that occur when there is a mixture of uses within an interconnected development.

The 3rd provision is the recognition that mixed-retail centers that include a mixture of retail, office, financial, and restaurant uses, provide for vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle interconnectivity and control access to external roadway have less of an overall impact to the transportation system. Providing for a mixture of interconnected uses allows for the combining of vehicular trips without having to impact external roadways to access the various land uses. Smaller neighborhood and community scale retail centers that provide pedestrian and bicycle facilities also provides the opportunity for individuals to walk or bike between uses. Mixed-retail centers that provide interconnectivity for all modes of travel and limit the number of access to external roadways will pay a lower transportation impact fee than the impact fee that would be assessed if all uses were free-standing isolated uses that lack interconnectivity and have a greater impact on the overall transportation system.

The proposed transportation impact fee more accurately reflects the overall impact to the transportation system for each land use. The current transportation impact fee rates charges flat rates for office, industrial and commercial land uses, regardless of the overall traffic impact for each use. The office and industrial land uses categories are proposed for expansion to include separate rates for professional offices less than 50,000 square feet, medical/dental offices, miniwarehouses, and private schools. The commercial land use categories are proposed for expansion to include separate rates for uses such as gas stations, banks, restaurants, large scale discount retail and superstores, and various size mixed-use retail developments. The proposed transportation impact fee recognizes that neighborhood scale retail, restaurant and office uses have less of an impact to the transportation system due to shorter trip lengths and trip generation. In addition, neighborhood scale uses are frequently owned and occupied by local owners. Large retail discount stores, large scale superstores, and wholesale clubs are typically national chains that draw trips from a broader area, resulting in longer trip lengths and a greater number of vehicular trips. The proposed transportation impact fee rates for urban residential, Traditional Neighborhood Developments (TND), neighborhood scale retail and office uses reflect that these uses have less of an impact to the overall transportation network. Large scale regional retail, freestanding retail uses and rural residential uses will be required to pay a higher transportation impact fee due to there greater impact on the overall transportation network.

The Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance contains provisions that the owner of any land use has the right to conduct an alternative traffic study to show that their proposed project has less of an impact to the overall transportation system; subsequently, they would pay a lower impact fee if the study showed that the land use had less of an impact the calculated.

A comparative analysis has been conducted to illustrate the existing transportation impact fee rates compared with the Staff recommend transportation impact fees rates. The following is a summary of each column in the **comparative analysis (table 1)**:

- 1. Current Impact Fee (Reduced 35% for residential and 55% for non-residential): This column displays the current adopted transportation impact fee rates and the rates for land uses not specifically included in the impact fee ordinance, based on the adopted impact fee formula.
- 2. Current Impact Fee No Reduction: This column displays what the transportation impact fee rates would be if the current rates *were not* reduced by 35% for residential and 55% for non-residential.
- 3. 2007 Staff Proposed Impact Fee: This column displays what the Staff proposed transportation impact fee rates would be based upon the *updated* roadway construction, ROW, design and engineering cost. In addition, the number of office, industrial and commercial land use categories have been expanded to better reflect the different trip generation rates for each land use. The same impact fee methodology and formula that was utilized to develop the current impact fee rates was utilized for the Staff proposed transportation impact fee rates.

Table 2 illustrates the **Comparative County Analysis** between the proposed 2007 transportation impact fee and the current transportation impact fees for the following similar size (population) counties: (1) Marion, (2) Citrus, (3) Indian River, (4) St Johns, (5) Osceola, and (6) Charlotte.

Table 3 contains the background traffic data used to calculate the impact fee rate for each land use. This data is an update of the data utilized to develop the current impact fee. A description of each item is provided in "A Report Presenting Development Impact Fees" written by James C. Nicholas, PhD.

Table 4 contains the background cost data used to calculate the impact fee rate for each land use. This data is an update of the data utilized to develop the current impact fee. A description of each item is provided in "A Report Presenting Development Impact Fees" written by James C. Nicholas, PhD.

TABLE 1 TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEES	CURRENT IMPACT FEE REDUCED 35% RES / 55% NON-RES	CURRENT IMPACT FEE NO REDUCTION	2007 PROPOSED IMPACT FEE EXPANDED LAND USES
RESIDENTIAL:			
RESIDENTIAL URBAN SERVICE / CLUSTER AREA:			
All Residential per 1,000 FT ²	\$1,052	\$1,618	\$2,439
All Traditional Neighborhood Development Residential per 1,000 FT ²	\$1,052	\$1,618	\$1,819
Residential Expansion per 1,000 FT ²	\$1,052	\$1,618	\$1,264
RESIDENTIAL RURAL - AGRICULTURAL AREA:			
All Residential per 1,000 FT ^a	\$1,052	\$1,618	\$3,160
Residential Expansion per 1,000 FT ²	\$1,052	\$1,618	\$1,597
RECREATION:			
County Park Per Acre	\$219	\$487	\$1,329
Golf Course Per Hole	\$484	\$1,076	\$16,543
Racquet/Tennis Club Per Court	\$3,713	\$8,251	\$8,949
Health/Fitness Club Per 1,000 FT ²	\$3,159	\$7,020	\$7,624
Recreation/Community Center Per 1,000 FT ²	\$2,195	\$4,878	\$5,312
INSTITUTIONAL:			
Private School (K-12) Per 1,000 FT ²	\$1,821	\$4,047	\$2,720
Place of Worship Per 1,000 FT ²	\$918	\$2,040	\$2,499
Day Care Center Per 1,000 FT²	\$2,785	\$6,189	\$3,644
Library Per 1,000 FT ²	\$1,821	\$4,047	\$4,692
OFFICE PER 1,000 FT ² :			
Businesses & Professional Services Under 50,000 FT ²	\$1,821	\$4,047	\$3,763
Businesses & Professional Services 50,000 FT ² & Over	\$1,821	\$4,047	\$5,030
MEDICAL BUILDINGS PER 1,000 FT2:			
Medical Offices Per 1,000 FT²	\$1,821	\$4,047	\$5,529
Hospitals Per 1,000 FT ²	\$1,681	\$3,736	\$5,155
Nursing Home Per 1,000 FT ²	\$882	\$1,960	\$1,480

TABLE 1 TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEES	CURRENT IMPACT FEE REDUCED 35% RES / 55% NON-RES	CURRENT IMPACT FEE NO REDUCTION	2007 PROPOSED IMPACT FEE EXPANDED LAND USES
INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS:			
Industrial, Manufacturing, Warehousing Per 1,000 FT ²	\$1,072	\$2,382	\$3,362
Mini-Warehousing Per 1,000 FT ²	\$1,072	\$2,382	\$1,082
GENERAL COMMERCIAL RETAIL PER 1,000 FT ² :			
Traditional Neighborhood (TND) Retail Center - Less than 100,000 FT²	\$3,814	\$8,476	\$4,754
Traditional Neighborhood (TND) Retail Center - Greater than 100,000 FT ²	\$3,814	\$8,476	\$7,132
Neighborhood Mixed-Retail Center- Less Than 100,000 FT ²	\$3,814	\$8,476	\$6,327
Community Mixed-Retail Center - 100,000 - 200,000 FT ²	\$3,814	\$8,476	\$10,557
Regional Mixed-Retail Center - Greater Than 200,000 FT ²	\$3,814	\$8,476	\$17,224
Large Scale Discount Retail Store Per 1,000 FT²	\$3,814	\$8,476	\$25,715
Large Scale Retail Superstore Per 1,000 FT ²	\$3,814	\$8,476	\$29,785
Large Scale Wholesale Club - Membership Per 1,000 FT ²	\$3,814	\$8,476	\$19,166
Drive in Bank Per 1,000 FT ²	\$1,821	\$4,047	\$15,776
Restaurant with Drive-Thru Per 1,000 FT ²	\$3,814	\$8,476	\$20,345
Pharmacy / Drugstore Per 1,000 FT ²	\$3,814	\$8,476	\$11,483
Car Sales Per 1,000 FT ²	\$3,814	\$8,476	\$12,161
Auto Parts Stores Per 1,000 FT ²	\$3,814	\$8,476	\$11,513
Tire & Auto Repair Per 1,000 FT ²	\$3,814	\$8,476	\$4,262
NON-RESIDENTIAL:			
Hotel Per Room	\$1,292	\$2,871	\$3,645
Movie Theater Per Screen	\$335	\$744	\$17,285
Convenience Market & Gas Per Pump	\$3,814	\$8,476	\$25,618
Gas Station Per Pump	\$3,814	\$8,476	\$7,964
Quick Lube Vehicle Service Per Bay	\$3,814	\$8,476	\$4,782
Self-Service Car Wash Per Stall	\$3,814	\$8,476	\$5,092

TABLE 2 COMPARATIVE COUNTY ANALYSIS TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEES	2007 PROPOSED ALACHUA COUNTY IMPACT FEE	MARION COUNTY	CITRUS COUNTY	INDIAN RIVER COUNTY	OSCEOLA COUNTY	ST JOHNS COUNTY	CHARLOTTE COUNTY
RESIDENTIAL:							
RESIDENTIAL URBAN SERVICE / CLUSTER AREA:							
All Residential (Based on 2,000 FT ² Dwelling)	\$4,878	\$5,462 ⁽¹⁾	\$4,852	\$5,202	\$7,388 ⁽¹⁾	\$3,830	\$5,080
All Traditional Neighborhood Development Residential (2,000 FT²)	\$3,639				- 1		822
Residential Expansion per 1,000 FT ²	\$1,264		\$3,425	\$3,542	1 111	-	\$2,540
RESIDENTIAL RURAL - AGRICULTURAL AREA:							
All Residential (Based on 2,000 FT ² Dwelling)	\$6,321				1.77		
Residential Expansion per 1,000 FT ²	\$1,597				144		8 44]
RECREATION:							
County Park Per Acre	\$1,329	\$1,329	\$975	\$769	855	\$1,515	10 11
Golf Course Per Hole	\$16,543	\$22,488	\$15,894	\$13,090	122		
Racquet/Tennis Club Per Court	\$8,949	\$21,646	\$13,379	\$11,368			
Health/Fitness Club Per 1,000 FT²	\$7,624	\$21,646	\$13,379	\$6,556	\$27,850	\$3,972	
Recreation/Community Center Per 1,000 FT ²	\$5,312		\$9,785		122		922
INSTITUTIONAL:				2 550		25	
Private School (K-12) Per 1,000 FT ²	\$2,720	\$629 ⁽²⁾	1	513 ⁽²⁾	\$6,300	\$4,011	644
Place of Worship Per 1,000 FT ²	\$2,499	\$3,205		\$3,016	\$4,210	-	\$2,373
Day Care Center Per 1,000 FT ²	\$3,644	\$11,322	\$11,432	\$10,555	\$66,690		\$6,071
Library Per 1,000 FT ²	\$4,692	\$14,896	\$9,983	\$20,023	\$38,820		
OFFICE PER 1,000 FT ² :		12-20					
Businesses & Professional Services Under 50,000 FT ²	\$3,763	\$8,883	\$6,322	\$7,348	\$9,690	\$6,274	\$6,198
Businesses & Professional Services 50,000 FT ² & Over	\$5,030	\$6,893	\$5,756	\$5,326	\$8,850	\$4,798	\$4,417
MEDICAL BUILDINGS PER 1,000 FT2:							
Medical Offices Per 1,000 FT ²	\$5,529	\$17,847	\$13,865	\$15,553	\$23,000	\$6,105	\$13,212
Hospitals Per 1,000 FT ²	\$5,155	\$8,758	\$3,914 ⁽³⁾	\$6,267	\$6,530	\$6,785	\$4,037
Nursing Home Per 1,000 FT ²	\$1,480	\$545 ⁽³⁾	\$475 ⁽³⁾	\$560 ⁽³⁾	\$1,055 ⁽³⁾	\$1,030	\$2,373

Date: May 1st, 2007

TABLE 2 COMPARATIVE COUNTY ANALYSIS TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEES	2007 PROPOSED ALACHUA COUNTY IMPACT FEE	MARION COUNTY	CITRUS COUNTY	INDIAN RIVER COUNTY	OSCEOLA COUNTY	ST JOHNS COUNTY	CHARLOTTE COUNTY
INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS:							
Industrial, Manufacturing, Warehousing Per 1,000 FT ²	\$3,362	\$3,294	\$2,909	\$2,797	\$6,320	\$2,632	\$3,911
Mini-Warehousing Per 1,000 FT ²	\$1,082	\$706	\$727	\$1,003	\$1,670	\$944	\$2,783
GENERAL COMMERCIAL RETAIL PER 1,000 FT ² :							S .
Traditional Neighborhood (TND) Retail Center - Less than 100,000 FT ²	\$4,754						(
Traditional Neighborhood (TND) Retail Center - Greater than 100,000 FT ²	\$7,132						
Neighborhood Mixed-Retail Center- Less Than 100,000 FT ²	\$6,327	\$8,569	\$5,671	\$9,837	\$15,810	\$5,420	\$8,304
Community Mixed-Retail Center - 100,000 - 200,000 FT ²	\$10,557	\$6,651	\$5,846	\$6,860	\$17,930	\$5,539	\$10,585
Regional Mixed-Retail Center - Greater Than 200,000 FT ²	\$17,224	\$6,352	\$5,778	\$6,977	\$17,930	\$6,049	\$11,435
Large Scale Discount Retail Store Per 1,000 FT ²	\$25,715		\$10,572				644
Large Scale Retail Superstore Per 1,000 FT ²	\$29,785		\$25,313		277		2
Large Scale Wholesale Club - Membership Per 1,000 FT ²	\$19,166				122		- 22
Drive in Bank Per 1,000 FT²	\$15,776	\$31,371	\$26,779	\$27,607	\$46,850	\$14,577	\$20,576
Restaurant with Drive-Thru Per 1,000 FT ²	\$20,345	\$67,920	\$60,116	\$41,971	\$126,850	\$19,875	\$12,727
Pharmacy / Drugstore Per 1,000 FT²	\$11,483	\$5,904	\$5,420		144	\$6,257	\$4,532
Car Sales Per 1,000 FT ²	\$12,161	\$12,458	\$10,304	\$13,212	\$15,180		\$12,829
Auto Parts Stores Per 1,000 FT²	\$11,513	12/	\$13,102		\$18,570	7.2	7 <u>22</u>
Tire & Auto Repair Per 1,000 FT²	\$4,262	\$9,778	\$6,532		\$21,090	-	
NON-RESIDENTIAL:							
Hotel Per Room	\$3,645	\$3,784	\$2,923	\$3,271	\$2,744	\$3,344	\$4,003
Movie Theater Per Screen	\$17,285	\$15,780	\$16,996	\$26,940	\$33,540		\$13,585
Convenience Market & Gas Per Pump	\$25,618	\$33,476 ⁽⁴⁾	\$30,172	\$26,459 ⁽⁴⁾	\$31,368	(3 <u>-1-</u>)	\$11,359
Gas Station Per Pump	\$7,964	\$7,990	\$6,114	\$6,694	\$23,219	-	\$2,595
Quick Lube Vehicle Service Per Bay	\$4,782	\$10,220	\$7,830			722	- 2
Self-Service Car Wash Per Stall	\$5,092	\$14,985 ⁽⁴⁾	\$14,063	\$17,232	\$27,018	722	122
Notes: (1) Per Unit; (2) Per Student; (3) Per Bed; (4) Per Square Foot; rows		cate that the u				fee schedule	

Table 3 TRAFFIC IMPACT DATA	ITE No.	No. of Trips	Avg. Length (Miles)		New Roads (Lane Feet)	Proposed 2007 Impact Fee
RESIDENTIAL URBAN SERVICE / CLUSTER AREA:						
Single Family Detached Unit	210	9.57	3.41	1.00	8.40	\$4,911.09
Attached Housing Unit	230	5.86	3.41	1.00	5.12	\$2,993.54
Multi-Family Unit	220	6.72	3.41	1.00	5.86	\$3,424.54
Mobile Home	240	4.99	3.41	1.00	4.38	\$2,564.55
All Residential per 1,000 FT ²		4.77	3.41	1.00	4.17	\$2,438.83
All Traditional Neighborhood Development Residential per 1,000 FT ²		3.58	3.41	1.00	3.12	\$1,819.27
Residential Expansion per 1,000 FT ²		2.50	3.41	1.00	2.16	\$1,263.56
RESIDENTIAL RURAL - AGRICULTURAL AREA:						
Single Family Detached Unit	210	6.70	6.82	1.00	11.72	\$6,212.82
Mobile Home	240	3.49	6.82	1.00	6.12	\$3,248.13
All Residential per 1,000 FT ²		3.42	6.82	1.00	5.97	\$3,160.50
Residential Expansion per 1,000 FT ²		1.71	6.82	1.00	3.01	\$1,597.02
RECREATION:						
County Park Per Acre (ITE #: 411, 412, 413, 417)		2.27	3.86	1.00	2.27	\$1,329.42
Golf Course Per Hole	430	35.74	3.09	1.00	28.30	\$16,542.55
Racquet/Tennis Club Per Court	491	38.70	1.54	1.00	15.31	\$8,949.20
Health/Fitness Club Per 1,000 FT ²	492	32.93	1.54	1.00	13.04	\$7,623.78
Recreation/Community Center Per 1,000 FT ²	495	22.88	1.54	1.00	9.08	\$5,311.66
INSTITUTIONAL:						
Private School (K-12) Per 1,000 FT ²	536	22.09	1.63	0.50	4.65	\$2,719.69
Place of Worship Per 1,000 FT ²	560	9.11	2.45	0.75	4.28	\$2,498.69
Day Care Center Per 1,000 FT ²	565	79.26	0.61	0.50	6.23	\$3,643.54
Library Per 1,000 FT ²	590	54.00	1.16	0.50	8.03	\$4,692.10
OFFICE PER 1,000 FT ² :						
Businesses & Professional Services Under 50,000 FT ²	710		3.05	0.75	6.44	\$3,763.25
Businesses & Professional Services 50,000 FT ² & Over	710	11.01	4.07	0.75	8.61	\$5,029.81
MEDICAL BUILDINGS PER 1,000 FT ² :						
Medical Offices Per 1,000 FT ²	720			0.50	9.45	\$5,528.66
Hospitals Per 1,000 FT ²	610		3.26	0.60	8.82	\$5,154.52
Nursing Home Per 1,000 FT ²	620	6.10	3.26	0.50	2.53	\$1,479.56

Table 3 TRAFFIC IMPACT DATA	ITE No.	No. of Trips	Avg. Length (Miles)		New Roads (Lane Feet)	Proposed 2007 Impact Fee
INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS:						
Industrial, Manufacturing, Warehousing Per 1,000 FT ² (ITE #: 110, 140, 150)		5.25		0.90	5.76	\$3,361.68
Mini-Warehousing Per 1,000 FT ²	151	2.50	3.82	0.75	1.85	\$1,081.99
GENERAL COMMERCIAL RETAIL PER 1,000 FT ² :						
Hotel Per Room (ITE #: 310, 311, 320)		6.23		0.95	6.23	\$3,644.54
Movie Theater Per Screen	445	49.77	4.63	0.50	29.57	\$17,284.83
Large Scale Discount Retail Store Per 1,000 FT ²	815	56.02	4.37	0.70	43.98	\$25,714.75
Traditional Neighborhood (TND) Retail Center - Less than 100,000 FT ²	820	32.21	2.19	0.45	8.13	\$4,753.95
Traditional Neighborhood (TND) Retail Center - Greater than 100,000 FT ²	820	32.21	3.28	0.45	12.20	\$7,131.93
Neighborhood Mixed-Retail Center- Less Than 100,000 FT ²	820	42.94	2.19	0.45	10.82	\$6,326.79
Community Mixed-Retail Center - 100,000 - 200,000 FT ²	820	42.94	3.28	0.50	18.06	\$10,557.47
Regional Mixed-Retail Center - Greater Than 200,000 FT ²	820	43.80	4.37	0.60	29.46	\$17,223.97
Car Sales Per 1,000 FT ²	841	33.34	2.86	0.85	20.80	\$12,160.74
Auto Parts Stores Per 1,000 FT ²	843	61.91	1.91	0.65	19.69	\$11,512.74
Tire & Auto Repair Per 1,000 FT2 (ITE #: 848, 849, 942)		15.83	2.39	0.75	7.29	\$4,262.10
Large Scale Retail Superstore Per 1,000 FT2 (ITE Special Study)		69.94	4.37	0.65	50.95	\$29,785.28
Convenience Market & Gas Per Pump	853	542.60	0.95	0.33	43.82	\$25,618.46
Large Scale Wholesale Club - Membership Per 1,000 FT ²	861	41.80	4.37	0.70	32.79	\$19,165.95
Pharmacy / Drugstore Per 1,000 FT ² (ITE #: 880, 881)		89.11	1.91	0.45	19.64	\$11,483.32
Furniture Store Per 1,000 FT ²	890	5.06	4.37	0.95	5.39	\$3,147.68
Drive in Bank Per 1,000 FT ²	912	246.49	1.07	0.40	26.98	\$15,775.84
Restaurant with Drive-Thru Per 1,000 FT ²	934	496.12	1.09	0.25	34.80	\$20,345.23
Quick Lube Vehicle Service Per Bay	941	40.00	1.07	0.75	8.18	\$4,782.38
Gas Station Per Pump	944	168.56	0.95	0.33	13.62	\$7,964.49
Self-Service Car Wash Per Stall	947	108.00	0.95	0.33	8.71	\$5,091.66

Table 4 ROADWAY COST FACTORS DATA	ITE No.	Annual Gas	Credit	Road Cost	Net Cost
RESIDENTIAL URBAN SERVICE / CLUSTER AREA:	112110:	Taxes			
Single Family Detached Unit	210	\$64.82	\$1,040	\$5,951	\$4,911
Attached Housing Unit	230	\$39.69	\$637	\$3,631	\$2,994
Multi-Family Unit	220	\$45.51	\$730	\$4,155	\$3,425
Mobile Home	240	\$33.80	\$542	\$3,107	\$2,565
All Residential per 1,000 FT ²		\$32.31	\$518	\$2,957	\$2,439
All Traditional Neighborhood Development Residential per 1,000 FT ²		\$24.23	\$389	\$2,208	\$1,819
Residential Expansion per 1,000 FT ²		\$16.90	\$271	\$1,535	\$1,264
RESIDENTIAL RURAL - AGRICULTURAL AREA:		•			
Single Family Detached Unit	210	\$90.74	\$1,456	\$7,669	\$6,213
Mobile Home	240	\$47.31	\$759	\$4,007	\$3,248
All Residential per 1,000 FT ²		\$46.34	\$743	\$3,903	\$3,160
Residential Expansion per 1,000 FT ²		\$23.17	\$372	\$1,969	\$1,597
RECREATION:					
County Park Per Acre (ITE #: 411, 412, 413, 417)		\$17.43	\$280	\$1,609	\$1,329
Golf Course Per Hole	430	\$219.32	\$3,519	\$20,062	\$16,543
Racquet/Tennis Club Per Court	491	\$118.74	\$1,905	\$10,854	\$8,949
Health/Fitness Club Per 1,000 FT ²	492	\$101.04	\$1,621	\$9,245	\$7,624
Recreation/Community Center Per 1,000 FT ²	495	\$70.20	\$1,126	\$6,438	\$5,312
INSTITUTIONAL:					
Private School (K-12) Per 1,000 FT ²	536	\$35.81	\$574	\$3,294	\$2,720
Place of Worship Per 1,000 FT ²	560	\$33.22	\$533	\$3,032	\$2,499
Day Care Center Per 1,000 FT ²	565	\$48.17	\$773	\$4,417	\$3,644
Library Per 1,000 FT ²	590	\$62.13	\$997	\$5,689	\$4,692
OFFICE PER 1,000 FT ² :					
Businesses & Professional Services Under 50,000 FT ²	710	\$50.06	\$803	\$4,566	\$3,763
Businesses & Professional Services 50,000 FT ² & Over	710	\$66.74	\$1,071	\$6,101	\$5,030
MEDICAL BUILDINGS PER 1,000 FT ² :					
Medical Offices Per 1,000 FT ²	720	\$73.01	\$1,171	\$6,700	\$5,529
Hospitals Per 1,000 FT ²	610	\$68.34	\$1,096	\$6,251	\$5,155
Nursing Home Per 1,000 FT ²	620	\$19.77	\$317	\$1,797	\$1,480

Table 4 ROADWAY COST FACTORS DATA	ITE No.	Annual Gas Taxes	Credit	Road Cost	Net Cost				
INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS:									
Industrial, Manufacturing, Warehousing Per 1,000 FT2 (ITE #: 110, 140, 150)		\$44.74	\$718	\$4,080	\$3,362				
Mini-Warehousing Per 1,000 FT ²	151	\$14.21	\$228	\$1,310	\$1,082				
GENERAL COMMERCIAL RETAIL PER 1,000 FT2:									
Hotel Per Room (ITE #: 310, 311, 320)		\$48.13	\$772	\$4,417	\$3,645				
Movie Theater Per Screen	445	\$229.07	\$3,675	\$20,960	\$17,285				
Large Scale Discount Retail Store Per 1,000 FT ²	815	\$340.54	\$5,463	\$31,178	\$25,715				
Traditional Neighborhood (TND) Retail Center - Less than 100,000 FT ²	820	\$62.93	\$1,010	\$5,764	\$4,754				
Traditional Neighborhood (TND) Retail Center - Greater than 100,000 FT ²	820	\$94.39	\$1,514	\$8,646	\$7,132				
Neighborhood Mixed-Retail Center- Less Than 100,000 FT ²	820	\$83.90	\$1,346	\$7,673	\$6,327				
Community Mixed-Retail Center - 100,000 - 200,000 FT ²	820	\$139.84	\$2,243	\$12,800	\$10,557				
Regional Mixed-Retail Center - Greater Than 200,000 FT ²	820	\$228.22	\$3,661	\$20,885	\$17,224				
Car Sales Per 1,000 FT ²	841	\$161.20	\$2,586	\$14,747	\$12,161				
Auto Parts Stores Per 1,000 FT ²	843	\$152.60	\$2,448	\$13,961	\$11,513				
Tire & Auto Repair Per 1,000 FT2 (ITE #: 848, 849, 942)		\$56.27	\$903	\$5,165	\$4,262				
Large Scale Retail Superstore Per 1,000 FT ² (ITE Special Study)		\$394.78	\$6,333	\$36,118	\$29,785				
Convenience Market & Gas Per Pump	853	\$339.51	\$5,447	\$31,065	\$25,618				
Large Scale Wholesale Club - Membership Per 1,000 FT ²	861	\$254.10	\$4,077	\$23,243	\$19,166				
Pharmacy / Drugstore Per 1,000 FT ² (ITE #: 880, 881)		\$152.07	\$2,440	\$13,923	\$11,483				
Furniture Store Per 1,000 FT ²	890	\$41.75	\$670	\$3,818	\$3,148				
Drive in Bank Per 1,000 FT ²	912	\$208.79	\$3,350	\$19,126	\$15,776				
Restaurant with Drive-Thru Per 1,000 FT ²	934	\$269.28	\$4,320	\$24,665	\$20,345				
Quick Lube Vehicle Service Per Bay	941	\$63.53	\$1,019	\$5,801	\$4,782				
Gas Station Per Pump	944	\$105.47	\$1,692	\$9,656					
Self-Service Car Wash Per Stall	947	\$67.58	\$1,084	\$6,176	\$5,092				