

**MOBILITY FEE UPDATE STUDY 2017-2018  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #5**

**ANNOTATED MINUTES**

**AUGUST 2, 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**

**2:00 P.M.**

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

---

**MEMBERS:**

Pat Gassaway, Chairman	Fred Krauer - <b>ABSENT</b>
Jamie Soderland Ballard, Vice-Chairman - <b>ABSENT</b>	Kelly Miller
Stewart Gibbons - <b>ABSENT</b>	Jennifer Motsinger
Robert Griffiths - <b>ABSENT</b>	Michael Ryan
Steve Henry	Scott Sheridan
Clarke Hobby	Mark Spada
David Key	

**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  
Dan Risola, Assistant Budget Director  
Dan Biles, County Administrator

William “Bill” Oliver – Consultant

---

## **1. Call to Order**

Mr. Pittos called the meeting to order at 2:12 p.m.

## **2. Roll Call**

Each of the Committee Members and Staff introduced themselves for the record. Mr. Gibbons, Ms. Ballard, Mr. Griffiths and Mr. Krauer were absent. Mr. Gassaway arrived to the meeting at 2:22 p.m.

## **Minutes – June 20, 2018**

**The Committee approved** the June 20, 2018 meeting minutes.

## **3. Administration Fee Discussion**

Mr. Risola reviewed the item and noted the administration fee had decreased. He compared the amounts from 2014 and 2018 and spoke regarding the estimated number of permits.

There was no public comment.

**The Committee approved** to adopt the new Administration Fee of \$136.00.

## **4. Tax Increment Self-Credit Discussion**

## **5. Fee Schedules Discussion**

Mr. Oliver spoke regarding the updated proposed fee schedules and the numbers included on the fee schedules. He spoke regarding the basic fee schedules and the development of additional fee schedules. There were no changes in methodology proposed. He reviewed the new land uses and explained that most fees had remained the same, with some fee reductions.

Mr. Oliver spoke regarding the Tax Increment Self-Credit. The County established a policy which was adopted by Ordinance to create a Tax Increment District. They committed to take one-third of the revenue from the proceeds of the Tax Increment and earmark those funds for transportation. He continued with his presentation and spoke regarding the expansion of transit operations, operation and maintenance of the road system, that it appeared they were taking more of the tax increment revenue and shifting it into funding capacity increases, and to credit land uses that were actually generating the tax increment revenue. The last analysis was done based upon the

2010 tax roll and was updated to reflect the current 2017 tax roll. He noted valuations had increased significantly and spoke regarding a policy decision to increase the share of the revenue going to transportation capital.

#### **CHAIRMAN GASSAWAY ARRIVED TO THE MEETING AT 2:22 P.M.**

Mr. Oliver continued with his presentation and explained there was more restructure on the low income dwelling units in using the Property Appraiser's data base, that the schedules may be adjusted slightly, and there would not be much of an impact on the computed fee schedule. He spoke regarding the costs of providing road facilities and transportation facilities, that the costs had increased approximately 6.7 percent, a proposal to expand the incentives program in the West Market Area, that they had targeted improving the level of service in the urban district, the forecast for a slower growth rate than when the 2014 study was done, that they were seeing a stronger forecast of tax increment revenues, and the general philosophy of the incentive program. He reviewed the specific fees for the land uses. Office, industrial or lodging had a zero fee. He reviewed the five new land uses which included non-veterinary kennel, restaurants that served only breakfast and lunch, fast casual, ice skating arena, and warehousing operations. He reviewed the land uses in which the fees had declined and spoke regarding the reasons for the decrease. He reviewed the fee schedules that were distributed and noted a portion of the fee was earmarked for the FDOT.

Discussion followed regarding the effects to the fees; reducing the need for subsidy; exceptions where the self-credit would cause the fee to be reduced; it was assumed the County would spend more money on improvements within the urban area; incentivized fees were the same in suburban and urban; complaints received from MUTRM developers in the suburban area; CDAs; traffic generation rates; the SIS system; and fee credits for creditable work.

Mr. Goldstein requested motions be made after the discussion regarding the West Market Area.

#### **6. West Market Area Incentive Maps**

Mr. Goldstein explained at the last meeting there was discussion that for infill they would pay the same rate as MUTRM which was basically a 25 percent reduction.

Mr. Pittos reviewed the discussions from the previous meeting concerning The Harbors nodes regarding how they incentivized the vacant lots and redevelopment. The nodes were identified as lengths along the U.S. 19 corridor. He reviewed a map showing the nodes and explained they had also identified the individual corridor nodes.

Mr. Goldstein spoke regarding information that was e-mailed to the Committee Members regarding the number of residential permits issued in the West Market Area. He explained this was information for the entire West Market Area and was only for new

construction, not redevelopment. For all of Fiscal Year 2017 and half of 2016 a total of 200 residential permits were issued in the West Market Area, 45 of which were single family residential. The West Market Area was approximately one-fifth of the growth in west side of the County.

Discussion followed regarding the nodes; the urban area; and that everything in the West Market Area was in the urban service area.

Mr. Goldstein stated the resources were available if the Committee wanted to subsidize a larger area or subsidize it to a greater extent than just the 25 percent reduction. He noted very little of the County's growth was occurring in the West Market Area. He reviewed the targeted redevelopment area and he explained they could afford to expand the incentive for the West Market Area to include a larger area.

Discussion continued regarding upcoming projects and the possible development of large tracts; the possible expansion of the target nodes to cover everything to the west; the possibility of expanding to the east; commercial lots located within the nodes; that whatever incentive was given would also be applied to commercial; possible boundaries; and the amount to be incentivized.

Mr. Hobby disclosed he had the Harvey-Madison project that could benefit by an incentive.

Chairman Gassaway said they were discussing creating an incentive in an area where for years they recognized they should be providing an incentive. The effect of the incentive was nothing because there was no activity. He felt they may need to raise the incentive. He was receptive to a motion that would recognize a broader boundary starting further to the east in combination with a deeper discount.

Mr. Hobby asked if they would use the TOD amount.

Mr. Goldstein explained TOD would be a 75 percent reduction. He felt that would be a fair amount because it was not the same as redevelopment. There would still be an incentive to choose the redevelopment parcel versus the vacant parcel.

Mr. Hobby felt there was a stopping point at Rowan and the area from Veterans Village to the west. He felt anyone who would invest infill in the area would help the West Market Area.

Ms. Miller noted the Walmart property located on the corner of Grand and 54 that could be developed.

Mr. Goldstein requested motions be made regarding the boundaries and the level of incentive. He preferred for the Committee to assign a MUTRM, TND or TOD incentive amount.

Chairman Gassaway called for public comment. No one spoke.

Mr. Sheridan asked if these numbers were exclusive of redevelopment. He felt an incentive was appropriate.

Mr. Goldstein said redevelopment already paid zero. He suggested that an incentive to raw development may spur the redevelopment.

Discussion followed regarding support for a 50 percent incentive or the same rate as TND; that redevelopment received 100 percent; infill development; additional costs associated with redevelopment sites; agreement that a subsidy was appropriate; considerations that drove projects; the fear of not having a substantive difference between development and redevelopment incentives; and the limited amount of activity in the West Market Area.

**A motion was made** to move the line from Seven Springs Road into Rowan Road into Regency as it intersected with U.S. 19 west of the roadways and west of U.S. 19 to the gulf, and including all of the nodes west of the intersection of Little Road and U.S. 19.

Discussion followed regarding the motion and the area to be included.

**The motion was amended** to include all of the nodes and everything west of U.S. 19.

Mr. Goldstein clarified that going south, it would include everything west of Rowan, Seven Springs, and Regency.

Ms. Ambadi clarified the area would also include the Harbors all the way to the coast.

The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Goldstein requested a motion for the amount of the reduction. He noted commercial would receive a little more of a benefit because residential paid other fees.

**The Committee approved** the rate of a 75 percent reduction or the TOD rate with Mr. Sheridan voting nay.

## **7. Mobility Fee Text Changes**

Mr. Goldstein referred to information included in the packet and reviewed the proposed text changes. Throughout the code references to Opt-Out Developments or Opt-Out Procedures were removed because the time period to Opt-Out of mobility fees expired in 2016. He noted that some fees had decreased. Staff proposed the changes be applied to permits after December 31, 2018. He noted that was also when the school

impact fee increased. Staff preferred to apply fee changes at the same time. He continued to review the proposed text changes.

Discussion followed regarding the 80 percent rule; fee credits; and a feeling that the build out condition relative to selling mobility fee credits should be revisited.

Mr. Goldstein stated he would add a clause to state “unless otherwise approved through an alternative standard”.

Mr. Goldstein reviewed the revised definitions. After discussion, he reviewed the three additional revisions that would be made which included the removal of the term “higher quality food” from the fast casual restaurants, the addition of the alternative standard language for the sale of credits, and the rate for the West Market Area incentive would be changed from MUTRM to TOD.

Chairman Gassaway called for public comment. No one spoke.

**The Committee approved** the proposed text changes.

## **8. Questions**

Mr. Oliver explained he did not bring the information regarding the 4<sup>th</sup> generation fee schedule to the meeting.

Mr. Goldstein stated the information would be mailed to the Committee Members.

## **9. Public Comment**

There was none.

## **10. Vote on Recommendations**

Motions and votes were taken on each item as they were discussed.

## **11. Tentative BCC Workshop Date: September 25, 2018**

Mr. Goldstein explained a Workshop was scheduled in order to present the Committee’s recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners on September 25, 2018. He requested that Chairman Gassaway attend the meeting to respond to questions from the Board and encouraged the other Committee Members to also attend the meeting.

He thanked the Committee Members for their attendance and recommended when the Committee adjourned the meeting they also move to disband the Committee.

Chairman asked whether action needed to be taken on the tables.

Mr. Goldstein stated a motion would be needed for the tables.

**The Committee approved** the fee schedules subject to the three changes discussed during the meeting.

## 12. Adjourn

**The Committee approved** to adjourn and to disband the meeting at 3:47 p.m.

MOBILITY FEE UPDATE STUDY 2017-2018  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #5  
AUGUST 2, 2018



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

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