By Senator Bennett

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1617

1819

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

21-00621B-09 20091306

A bill to be entitled

An act relating to growth management; amending s. 163.3164, F.S.; redefining the term "financial feasibility" to provide for school facilities that do not meet concurrency requirements in a particular year; amending s. 163.3177, F.S.; conforming a crossreference; amending s. 163.3180, F.S.; revising provisions relating to the concurrency requirements for public facilities and transportation facilities; providing for the designation of certain geographic areas as transportation concurrency exception areas; revising provisions relating to the level-of-service standards for transportation; authorizing a local government to adopt a lower level-of-service standard under certain circumstances; revising provisions relating to the calculation of the proportionate-share contribution; providing definitions; providing for the applicability and calculation of proportionate fairshare mitigation; providing incentives for landowners or developers who contribute or pay proportionate fair-share mitigation; amending s. 163.3182, F.S.; revising provisions relating to the creation of transportation concurrency backlog authorities; requiring that each local government adopt transportation concurrency backlog areas as part of the capital improvements element of the local comprehensive plan; amending s. 380.06, F.S.; revising provisions relating to the preapplication procedures for developments of regional impact; requiring that

21-00621B-09 20091306

the levels of service in the transportation methodology be the same standards used to evaluate concurrency and proportionate-share contributions; providing for a transportation mobility fee; providing legislative findings and intent; requiring that the Department of Community Affairs and the Department of Transportation coordinate their independent mobility fees studies to develop a methodology for a mobility fee system; providing guidelines for developing the methodology; requiring that the Secretary of Community Affairs and the Secretary of Transportation submit joint interim reports to the Legislature by specified dates; requiring that the Department of Community Affairs develop proposed amendments to chapter 9J-5, F.A.C., for incorporating the mobility fee methodology; requiring that the department submit the proposed amendments to the Legislature for review by a specified date; providing for future repeal of s. 163.3180, F.S., relating to transportation concurrency requirements; requiring that the Department of Transportation establish a transportation methodology; requiring that such methodology be completed and in use by a specified date; providing an effective date.

5354

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

4.3

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

5556

57

58

Section 1. Subsection (32) of section 163.3164, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

163.3164 Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68 69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

21-00621B-09 20091306

Development Regulation Act; definitions.—As used in this act: (32) "Financial feasibility" means that sufficient revenues are currently available or will be available from committed funding sources for the first 3 years, or will be available from committed or planned funding sources for years 4 and 5, of a 5year capital improvement schedule for financing capital improvements, including such as ad valorem taxes, bonds, state and federal funds, tax revenues, impact fees, and developer contributions, which are adequate to fund the projected costs of the capital improvements identified in the comprehensive plan and necessary to ensure that adopted level-of-service standards are achieved and maintained within the period covered by the 5year schedule of capital improvements. A comprehensive plan or comprehensive plan amendment shall be deemed financially feasible for transportation and school facilities throughout the planning period addressed by the capital improvements schedule if it can be demonstrated that the existing or adopted level-ofservice, whichever has the greater maximum service volume, standards will be achieved and maintained by the end of the planning period even if in a particular year such improvements are not concurrent as required by s. 163.3180. A comprehensive plan shall be deemed financially feasible for school facilities throughout the planning period addressed by the capital improvements schedule if it can be demonstrated that the levelof-service standards will be achieved and maintained by the end of the planning period even if in a particular year such improvements are not concurrent as required in s. 163.3180.

Section 2. Paragraph (e) of subsection (3) of section 163.3177, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

21-00621B-09 20091306

163.3177 Required and optional elements of comprehensive plan; studies and surveys.—

(3)

- (e) At the discretion of the local government and notwithstanding the requirements  $\underline{in}$  of this subsection, a comprehensive plan, as revised by an amendment to the plan's future land use map, shall be deemed to be financially feasible and to have achieved and maintained level-of-service standards as required  $\underline{in}$  by this section with respect to transportation facilities if the amendment to the future land use map is supported by a:
- 1. Condition in a development order for a development of regional impact or binding agreement that addresses proportionate-share mitigation consistent with s. 163.3180(12); or
- 2. Binding agreement addressing proportionate fair-share mitigation consistent with <u>s. 163.3180(16)(h)</u> <u>s. 163.3180(16)(f)</u> and the property subject to the amendment to the future land use map is located within an area designated in a comprehensive plan for urban infill, urban redevelopment, downtown revitalization, urban infill and redevelopment, or an urban service area. The binding agreement must be based on the maximum amount of development identified by the future land use map amendment or as may be otherwise restricted through a special area plan policy or map notation in the comprehensive plan.

Section 3. Subsections (1) through (12) and (14) through (16) of section 163.3180, Florida Statutes, are amended, and subsection (18) is added to that section, to read:

163.3180 Concurrency.

21-00621B-09 20091306\_\_\_

- (1) APPLICABILITY OF CONCURRENCY REQUIREMENT.-
- (a) <u>Public facility types.</u>—Sanitary sewer, solid waste, drainage, potable water, parks and recreation, schools, and transportation facilities, including mass transit, where applicable, are the only public facilities and services subject to the concurrency requirement on a statewide basis. Additional public facilities and services <u>are may</u> not <u>be made</u> subject to concurrency on a statewide basis without appropriate study and approval by the Legislature; however, any local government may extend the concurrency requirement <u>so that it applies</u> to <u>apply</u> to additional public facilities within its jurisdiction.
- (b) <u>Transportation methodologies.</u>—Local governments shall use professionally accepted techniques for measuring level of service for automobiles, bicycles, pedestrians, transit, and trucks. These techniques may be used to evaluate increased accessibility by multiple modes and reductions in vehicle miles of travel in an area or zone. The <u>state land planning agency and the</u> Department of Transportation shall develop methodologies to assist local governments in implementing this multimodal levelof-service analysis <u>and</u>. The Department of Community Affairs and the Department of Transportation shall provide technical assistance to local governments in applying <u>the</u> these methodologies.
  - (2) PUBLIC FACILITY AVAILABILITY STANDARDS.-
- (a) <u>Sanitary sewer</u>, <u>solid waste</u>, <u>drainage</u>, <u>adequate water</u> <u>supply</u>, <u>and potable water facilities</u>.—Consistent with public health and safety, sanitary sewer, solid waste, drainage, adequate water supplies, and potable water facilities shall be in place and available to serve new development no later than

21-00621B-09 20091306

the <u>date on which</u> <u>issuance by</u> the local government <u>issues</u> of a certificate of occupancy or its functional equivalent. <u>Before approving Prior to approval of</u> a building permit or its functional equivalent, the local government shall consult with the applicable water supplier to determine whether adequate water supplies to serve the new development will be available <u>by no later than</u> the anticipated date of issuance <u>by the local government</u> of <u>the a certificate of occupancy or its functional equivalent. A local government may meet the concurrency requirement for sanitary sewer through the use of onsite sewage treatment and disposal systems approved by the Department of Health to serve new development.</u>

- (b) Parks and recreation facilities.—Consistent with the public welfare, and except as otherwise provided in this section, parks and recreation facilities to serve new development shall be in place or under actual construction within no later than 1 year after issuance by the local government issues of a certificate of occupancy or its functional equivalent. However, the acreage for such facilities must shall be dedicated or be acquired by the local government before it issues prior to issuance by the local government of the a certificate of occupancy or its functional equivalent, or funds in the amount of the developer's fair share shall be committed no later than the date on which the local government approves commencement of government's approval to commence construction.
- (c) <u>Transportation facilities.—</u>Consistent with the public welfare, and except as otherwise provided in this section, transportation facilities needed to serve new development <u>must</u>

21-00621B-09 20091306

shall be in place or under actual construction within 3 years after the local government approves a building permit or its functional equivalent that results in traffic generation.

- entities that are not responsible for providing, financing, operating, or regulating public facilities needed to serve development may not establish binding level-of-service standards to apply to on governmental entities that do bear those responsibilities. This subsection does not limit the authority of any agency to recommend or make objections, recommendations, comments, or determinations during reviews conducted under s. 163.3184.
  - (4) APPLICATION OF CONCURRENCY TO PUBLIC FACILITIES.-
- (a) <u>State and other public facilities.—</u>The concurrency requirement as implemented in local comprehensive plans applies to state and other public facilities and development to the same extent that it applies to all other facilities and development, as provided by law.
- (b) <u>Public transit facilities.</u>—The concurrency requirement as implemented in local comprehensive plans does not apply to public transit facilities. For the purposes of this paragraph, public transit facilities include transit stations and terminals; transit station parking; park-and-ride lots; intermodal public transit connection or transfer facilities; fixed bus, guideway, and rail stations; and airport passenger terminals and concourses, air cargo facilities, and hangars for the maintenance or storage of aircraft. As used in this paragraph, the terms "terminals" and "transit facilities" do not include seaports or commercial or residential development

21-00621B-09 20091306

constructed in conjunction with a public transit facility.

- (c) <u>Infill and redevelopment areas.</u>—The concurrency requirement, except as it relates to transportation facilities and public schools, as implemented in local government comprehensive plans, may be waived by a local government for urban infill and redevelopment areas designated pursuant to s. 163.2517 if such a waiver does not endanger public health or safety as defined by the local government in the its local government's government comprehensive plan. The waiver must shall be adopted as a plan amendment using pursuant to the process set forth in s. 163.3187(3)(a). A local government may grant a concurrency exception pursuant to subsection (5) for transportation facilities located within these urban infill and redevelopment areas.
  - (5) COUNTERVAILING PLANNING AND PUBLIC POLICY GOALS.-
- (a) <u>Legislative findings</u>.—The Legislature finds that under limited circumstances <u>dealing</u> with transportation facilities, countervailing planning and public policy goals may come into conflict with the requirement that adequate public <u>transportation</u> facilities and services be available concurrent with the impacts of such development. The Legislature further finds that often the unintended result of the concurrency requirement for transportation facilities is often the discouragement of urban infill development, infill, and redevelopment. Such unintended results directly conflict with the goals and policies of the state comprehensive plan and the intent of this part. The Legislature finds that in urban areas transportation cannot be effectively managed and mobility cannot be improved solely through the expansion of roadway capacity,

21-00621B-09 20091306

that in many urban areas the expansion of roadway capacity is not always physically or financially possible, and that a range of transportation alternatives are essential to satisfy mobility needs, reduce congestion, and achieve healthy, vibrant areas.

Therefore, exceptions from the concurrency requirement for transportation facilities may be granted as provided <u>in</u> by this subsection.

- (b) <u>Geographic applicability of transportation concurrency</u> exception areas.—
- 1. Transportation concurrency exception areas are established within geographic areas that are designated in a local comprehensive plan for urban infill development, urban redevelopment, downtown revitalization, or urban infill and redevelopment under s. 163.2517. Areas that are designated as such in a future local comprehensive plan shall be transportation concurrency exception areas; however, the local government shall implement long-term strategies to support and fund mobility within the designated exception area, including alternative modes of transportation.
- $\underline{2.}$  A local government may grant an exception from the concurrency requirement for transportation facilities if the proposed development is otherwise consistent with the adopted local government comprehensive plan and:
  - $\underline{\text{a.}}$  Is a project that promotes public transportation;  $\underline{\text{or}}$
- $\underline{\text{b.}}$  Is located within an area designated in the comprehensive plan  $\underline{\text{as}}$   $\underline{\text{for:}}$ 
  - 1. Urban infill development;
    - 2. Urban redevelopment;
    - 3. Downtown revitalization;

2.75

21-00621B-09 20091306

4. Urban infill and redevelopment under s. 163.2517; or

5. an urban service area specifically designated as a transportation concurrency exception area, which includes lands appropriate for compact, contiguous urban development, which does not exceed the amount of land needed to accommodate the projected population growth at densities consistent with the adopted comprehensive plan within the 10-year planning period, and which is served or is planned to be served with public facilities and services as provided by the capital improvements element or;.

- c. Is an agricultural enclave, as defined in s. 163.3164(33), which is located within a transportation concurrency backlog area.
- (c) <u>Projects that have special part-time demands.—</u>The Legislature also finds that developments located within urban infill, urban redevelopment, <u>existing</u> urban service <u>areas</u>, or downtown revitalization areas or areas designated as urban infill and redevelopment areas under s. 163.2517, which pose only special part-time demands on the transportation system, are <u>exempt should be excepted</u> from the concurrency requirement for transportation facilities. A special part-time demand is one that does not have more than 200 scheduled events during any calendar year and does not affect the 100 highest traffic volume hours.
- (d) <u>Establishment of transportation concurrency exception</u>

  <u>areas.-A</u> local government that adopts transportation concurrency exception areas under subparagraph (b) 2. shall:
- $\underline{\text{1.}}$  A local government shall Establish guidelines in the comprehensive plan for granting transportation concurrency

21-00621B-09 20091306

exceptions, the exceptions authorized in paragraphs (b) and (c) and subsections (7) and (15) which must be consistent with and support a comprehensive strategy adopted in the plan to promote and facilitate development consistent with the planning and public policy goals upon which the establishment of the concurrency exception areas was predicated the purpose of the exceptions.

2. (e) The local government shall Adopt into the plan and Implement long-term strategies to support and fund mobility within the designated exception area, including alternative modes of transportation. The plan amendment must also demonstrate how strategies will support the purpose of the exception and how mobility within the designated exception area will be provided. In addition, the strategies must address urban design; appropriate land use mixes, including intensity and density; and network connectivity plans needed to promote urban infill, redevelopment, or downtown revitalization. The comprehensive plan amendment designating the concurrency exception area must be accompanied by data and analysis justifying the size of the area.

3.(f) Before designating Prior to the designation of a transportation concurrency exception area pursuant to subparagraph (b)2., consult with the state land planning agency and the Department of Transportation shall be consulted by the local government to assess the impact that the proposed exception area is expected to have on the adopted level-of-service standards established for Strategic Intermodal System facilities, as defined in s. 339.64, and roadway facilities funded in accordance with s. 339.2819 and Further, the local

21-00621B-09 20091306

government shall, in consultation with the state land planning agency and the Department of Transportation, develop a plan to mitigate any impacts to the Strategic Intermodal System.

- 4. Meet with adjacent jurisdictions that may be impacted by the designation and discuss strategies for minimizing the impacts., including, if appropriate, the development of a long-term concurrency management system pursuant to subsection (9) and s. 163.3177(3)(d). The exceptions may be available only within the specific geographic area of the jurisdiction designated in the plan. Pursuant to s. 163.3184, any affected person may challenge a plan amendment establishing these guidelines and the areas within which an exception could be granted.
- (g) Transportation concurrency exception areas existing prior to July 1, 2005, must, at a minimum, meet the provisions of this section by July 1, 2006, or at the time of the comprehensive plan update pursuant to the evaluation and appraisal report, whichever occurs last.
- (6) <u>DE MINIMIS IMPACT.</u>—The Legislature finds that a de minimis impact is consistent with this part. A de minimis impact is an impact that <u>does would</u> not affect more than 1 percent of the maximum volume at the adopted level of service of the affected transportation facility as determined by the local government. <u>An No impact is not will be</u> de minimis if the sum of existing roadway volumes and the projected volumes from approved projects on a transportation facility <u>exceeds would exceed</u> 110 percent of the maximum volume at the adopted level of service of the affected transportation facility; <u>provided</u> however, <u>the that an</u> impact of a single family home on an existing lot is <u>will</u>

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371372

373

374

375

376

377

21-00621B-09 20091306

constitute a de minimis impact on all roadways regardless of the level of the deficiency of the roadway. Further, an <del>no</del> impact is not will be de minimis if it exceeds would exceed the adopted level-of-service standard of any affected designated hurricane evacuation routes. Each local government shall maintain sufficient records to ensure that the 110-percent criterion is not exceeded. Each local government shall submit annually, with its updated capital improvements element, a summary of the de minimis records. If the state land planning agency determines that the 110-percent criterion has been exceeded, the state land planning agency shall notify the local government of the exceedance and that no further de minimis exceptions for the applicable roadway may be granted until such time as the volume is reduced below the 110 percent. The local government shall provide proof of this reduction to the state land planning agency before issuing further de minimis exceptions.

(7) CONCURRENCY MANAGEMENT AREAS.—In order to promote <u>urban</u> development and infill development and redevelopment, one or more transportation concurrency management areas may be designated in a local government comprehensive plan. A transportation concurrency management area must be a compact geographic area <u>that has with</u> an existing network of roads where multiple, viable alternative travel paths or modes are available for common trips. A local government may establish an areawide level-of-service standard for such a transportation concurrency management area based upon an analysis that provides for a justification for the areawide level of service, how urban <u>infill</u> development, <u>infill</u>, and <u>or</u> redevelopment will be promoted, and how mobility will be accomplished within the

379

380 381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396397

398399

400

401 402

403

404

405

406

21-00621B-09 20091306

transportation concurrency management area. Before Prior to the designation of a concurrency management area is designated, the local government shall consult with the state land planning agency and the Department of Transportation shall be consulted by the local government to assess the impact that the proposed concurrency management area is expected to have on the adopted level-of-service standards established for Strategic Intermodal System facilities, as defined in s. 339.64, and roadway facilities funded in accordance with s. 339.2819. Further, the local government shall, in cooperation with the state land planning agency and the Department of Transportation, develop a plan to mitigate any impacts to the Strategic Intermodal System, including, if appropriate, the development of a long-term concurrency management system pursuant to subsection (9) and s. 163.3177(3)(d). Transportation concurrency management areas existing prior to July 1, 2005, shall meet, at a minimum, the provisions of this section by July 1, 2006, or at the time of the comprehensive plan update pursuant to the evaluation and appraisal report, whichever occurs last. The state land planning agency shall amend chapter 9J-5, Florida Administrative Code, to be consistent with this subsection.

(8) <u>URBAN REDEVELOPMENT.</u>—When assessing the transportation impacts of proposed urban redevelopment within an established existing urban service area,  $\underline{150}$   $\underline{110}$  percent of the actual transportation impact caused by the previously existing development must be reserved for the redevelopment, even if the previously existing development  $\underline{had}$   $\underline{has}$  a lesser or nonexisting impact pursuant to the calculations of the local government. Redevelopment requiring less than 150  $\underline{110}$  percent of the

21-00621B-09 20091306

previously existing capacity shall not be prohibited due to the reduction of transportation levels of service below the adopted standards. This does not preclude the appropriate assessment of fees or accounting for the impacts within the concurrency management system and capital improvements program of the affected local government. This subsection paragraph does not affect local government requirements for appropriate development permits.

- (9) (a) LONG-TERM CONCURRENCY MANAGEMENT.—Each local government may adopt, as a part of its plan, long-term transportation and school concurrency management systems that have with a planning period of up to 10 years for specially designated districts or areas where significant backlogs exist. The plan may include interim level-of-service standards on certain facilities and must shall rely on the local government's schedule of capital improvements for up to 10 years as a basis for issuing development orders authorizing the that authorize commencement of construction in the these designated districts or areas. The concurrency management system must be designed to correct existing deficiencies and set priorities for addressing backlogged facilities. The concurrency management system must be financially feasible and consistent with other portions of the adopted local plan, including the future land use map.
- (b) If a local government has a transportation or school facility backlog for existing development which cannot be adequately addressed in a 10-year plan, the state land planning agency may allow the local government it to develop a plan and long-term schedule of capital improvements covering up to 15 years for good and sufficient cause. The state land planning

21-00621B-09 20091306

agency's determination must be, based on a general comparison between the that local government and all other similarly situated local jurisdictions, using the following factors:

- 1. The extent of the backlog.
- 2. For roads, whether the backlog is on local or state roads.
  - 3. The cost of eliminating the backlog.
- 4. The local government's tax and other revenue-raising efforts.
- (c) The local government may issue approvals to commence construction notwithstanding this section, consistent with and in areas that are subject to a long-term concurrency management system.
- (d) If the local government adopts a long-term concurrency management system, it must evaluate the system periodically. At a minimum, the local government must assess its progress toward improving levels of service within the long-term concurrency management district or area in the evaluation and appraisal report and determine any changes that are necessary to accelerate progress in meeting acceptable levels of service.
- (10) TRANSPORTATION LEVEL-OF-SERVICE STANDARDS.—With regard to roadway facilities on the Strategic Intermodal System which are designated in accordance with s. 339.63 ss. 339.61, 339.62, 339.63, and 339.64, the Florida Intrastate Highway System as defined in s. 338.001, and roadway facilities funded in accordance with s. 339.2819, local governments shall adopt the level-of-service standard established by the Department of Transportation by rule; however, if a project involves qualified jobs created and certified by the Office of Tourism, Trade, and

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

21-00621B-09 20091306

Economic Development or if the project is a nonresidential project located within an area designated by the Governor as a rural area of critical economic concern under s. 288.0656(7), the affected local government, after consulting with the Department of Transportation, may adopt into its comprehensive plan a lower level-of-service standard than the standard adopted by the Department of Transportation. The lower level-of-service standard shall apply only to a project conducted under the Office of Tourism, Trade, and Economic Development. For all other roads on the State Highway System, local governments shall establish an adequate level-of-service standard that need not be consistent with any level-of-service standard established by the Department of Transportation. In establishing adequate level-ofservice standards for any arterial roads, or collector roads as appropriate, which traverse multiple jurisdictions, local governments shall consider compatibility with the roadway facility's adopted level-of-service standards in adjacent jurisdictions. Each local government within a county shall use a professionally accepted methodology for measuring impacts on transportation facilities for the purposes of implementing its concurrency management system. Counties are encouraged to coordinate with adjacent counties, and local governments within a county are encouraged to coordinate, for the purpose of using common methodologies for measuring impacts on transportation facilities and for the purpose of implementing their concurrency management systems.

(11) <u>LIMITATION OF LIABILITY.</u>—In order to limit <u>a local</u> government's the liability of local governments, the a local government shall may allow a landowner to proceed with the

21-00621B-09 20091306

development of a specific parcel of land notwithstanding a failure of the development to satisfy transportation concurrency,  $\underline{\text{if}}$  when all the following factors are shown to exist:

- (a) The local government  $\underline{\text{having}}$  with jurisdiction over the property has adopted a local comprehensive plan that is in compliance.
- (b) The proposed development <u>is</u> would be consistent with the future land use designation for the specific property and with pertinent portions of the adopted local plan, as determined by the local government.
- (c) The local plan includes a financially feasible capital improvements element that provides for transportation facilities adequate to serve the proposed development, and the local government has not implemented that element.
- (d) The local government has provided a means <u>for assessing</u> by which the landowner <u>for will be assessed</u> a fair share of the cost of providing the transportation facilities necessary to serve the proposed development.
- (e) The landowner has made a binding commitment to the local government to pay the fair share of the cost of providing the transportation facilities to serve the proposed development.
  - (12) REGIONAL IMPACT PROPORTIONATE-SHARE CONTRIBUTION.-
- (a) A development of regional impact <u>satisfies</u> may satisfy the transportation concurrency requirements of the local comprehensive plan, the local government's concurrency management system, and s. 380.06 by <u>paying payment of</u> a proportionate-share contribution for local and regionally significant traffic impacts, if:

21-00621B-09 20091306

 $\underline{1.}$  (a) The development of regional impact which, based on its location or mix of land uses, is designed to encourage pedestrian or other nonautomotive modes of transportation;

- 2.(b) The proportionate-share contribution for local and regionally significant traffic impacts is sufficient to pay for one or more required mobility improvements that will benefit the network of a regionally significant transportation facilities facility;
- 3.(c) The owner and developer of the development of regional impact pays or assures payment of the proportionateshare contribution; and
- 4.(d) If The regionally significant transportation facility to be constructed or improved is under the maintenance authority of a governmental entity, as defined by s. 334.03(12), other than the local government <u>having with</u> jurisdiction over the development of regional impact, the developer <u>must is required</u> to enter into a binding and legally enforceable commitment to transfer funds to the governmental entity having maintenance authority or to otherwise assure construction or improvement of the facility.
- (b) The proportionate-share contribution may be applied to any transportation facility to satisfy the provisions of this subsection and the local comprehensive plan., but, for the purposes of this subsection,
- $\underline{\text{1.}}$  The amount of the proportionate-share contribution shall be calculated as follows:
- a. The determination of significantly affected roadways shall be based upon the cumulative number of trips from the previously approved stage or phase of development and the

21-00621B-09 20091306

proposed <u>new stage or phase of</u> development expected to reach roadways during the peak hour <u>at</u> <del>from</del> the complete buildout of a stage or phase being approved.

- b. For significantly affected roadways, the developer's proportionate share shall be based solely upon the number of trips from the proposed new stage or phase being approved which would exceed the peak hour maximum service volume of the roadway at the adopted or existing level of service, whichever has the greater maximum service volume, divided by the change in the peak hour maximum service volume of the roadways resulting from the construction of an improvement necessary to maintain the adopted or existing level of service, whichever has the greater maximum service volume.
- 2. The calculated proportionate-share contribution shall be multiplied by the construction cost, at the time of developer payment, of the improvement necessary to maintain the adopted or existing level of service, whichever has the greater maximum service volume, in order to determine the proportionate-share contribution. For purposes of this subparagraph subsection, the term "construction cost" includes all associated costs of the improvement.
- 3. Proportionate-share mitigation shall be limited to ensure that a development of regional impact meeting the requirements of this subsection mitigates its impact on the transportation system but is not responsible for the additional cost of reducing or eliminating backlogs.
- 4. A developer shall not be required to fund or construct proportionate-share mitigation that is more extensive than mitigation necessary to offset the impact of the development

21-00621B-09 20091306

581 project under review.

- 5. Proportionate-share mitigation shall be applied as a credit against any transportation impact fees or exactions assessed for the traffic impacts of a development.
- 6. Proportionate-share mitigation may be directed toward one or more specific transportation improvements reasonably related to the mobility demands created by the development and such improvements may address one or more modes of transportation.
- 7. The payment for such improvements that significantly benefit the impacted transportation system satisfies concurrency requirements as a mitigation of the development's stage or phase impacts upon the overall transportation system even if there remains a failure of concurrency on other impacted facilities.
  - (c) As used in this subsection, the term:
- 1. "Backlogged" or "backlogged transportation facility" means a facility on which the adopted level-of-service standard is exceeded by the existing trips plus background trips, including transportation facilities that have exceeded their useful life.
- 2. "Background trips" means forecasted trips from sources other than the development project under review. The forecasted trips shall be based on established traffic modeling standards.

This subsection also applies to Florida Quality Developments pursuant to s. 380.061 and to detailed specific area plans implementing optional sector plans pursuant to s. 163.3245.

(14) <u>RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.—</u>The state land planning agency shall, by October 1, 1998, adopt by rule minimum criteria for

611612

613

614

615

616

617

618619

620

621

622

62.3

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638

21-00621B-09 20091306

the review and determination of compliance of a public school facilities element adopted by a local government for purposes of the imposition of school concurrency.

(15) (a) MULTIMODAL DISTRICTS.—Multimodal transportation districts may be established under a local government comprehensive plan in areas delineated on the future land use map for which the local comprehensive plan assigns secondary priority to vehicle mobility and primary priority to assuring a safe, comfortable, and attractive pedestrian environment, with convenient interconnection to transit. Such districts must incorporate community design features that will reduce the number of automobile trips or vehicle miles of travel and will support an integrated, multimodal transportation system. Before Prior to the designation of multimodal transportation districts, the Department of Transportation shall, in consultation with <del>be</del> consulted by the local government, to assess the impact that the proposed multimodal district area is expected to have on the adopted level-of-service standards established for Strategic Intermodal System facilities, as provided in s. 339.63 defined in s. 339.64, and roadway facilities funded in accordance with s. 339.2819. Further, the local government shall, in cooperation with the Department of Transportation, develop a plan to mitigate any impacts to the Strategic Intermodal System, including the development of a long-term concurrency management system pursuant to subsection (9) and s. 163.3177(3)(d). Multimodal transportation districts existing prior to July 1, 2005, shall meet, at a minimum, the provisions of this section by July 1, 2006, or at the time of the comprehensive plan update pursuant to the evaluation and appraisal report, whichever

21-00621B-09 20091306

639 <del>occurs last.</del>

(b) Community design elements of such a <u>multimodal</u> transportation district include:

- 1. A complementary mix and range of land uses, including educational, recreational, and cultural uses;
- 2. Interconnected networks of streets designed to encourage walking and bicycling, with traffic-calming where desirable;
- 3. Appropriate densities and intensities of use within walking distance of transit stops;
- $\underline{4.}$  Daily activities within walking distance of residences, allowing independence to persons who do not drive; and
- <u>5.</u> Public uses, streets, and squares that are safe, comfortable, and attractive for the pedestrian, with adjoining buildings open to the street and with parking not interfering with pedestrian, transit, automobile, and truck travel modes.
- (c) Local governments may establish multimodal level-of-service standards that rely primarily on nonvehicular modes of transportation within the district, if when justified by an analysis demonstrating that the existing and planned community design will provide an adequate level of mobility within the district based upon professionally accepted multimodal level-of-service methodologies. The analysis must also demonstrate that the capital improvements required to promote community design are financially feasible over the development or redevelopment timeframe for the district and that community design features within the district provide convenient interconnection for a multimodal transportation system. Local governments may issue development permits in reliance upon all planned community design capital improvements that are financially feasible over

21-00621B-09 20091306

the development or redevelopment timeframe for the district, regardless of without regard to the period of time between development or redevelopment and the scheduled construction of the capital improvements. A determination of financial feasibility shall be based upon currently available funding or funding sources that could reasonably be expected to become available over the planning period.

- (d) Local governments may reduce impact fees or local access fees for development within multimodal transportation districts based on the reduction of vehicle trips per household or vehicle miles of travel expected from the development pattern planned for the district.
- (e) By December 1, 2007, The Department of Transportation, in consultation with the state land planning agency and interested local governments, may designate a study area for conducting a pilot project to determine the benefits of and barriers to establishing a regional multimodal transportation concurrency district that extends over more than one local government jurisdiction. If designated:
- 1. The study area must be in a county that has a population of at least 1,000 persons per square mile, be within an urban service area, and have the consent of the local governments within the study area. The Department of Transportation and the state land planning agency shall provide technical assistance.
- 2. The local governments within the study area and the Department of Transportation, in consultation with the state land planning agency, shall cooperatively create a multimodal transportation plan that meets the requirements  $\underline{in}$  of this section. The multimodal transportation plan must include viable

21-00621B-09 20091306

local funding options and incorporate community design features, including a range of mixed land uses and densities and intensities, which will reduce the number of automobile trips or vehicle miles of travel while supporting an integrated, multimodal transportation system.

- 3. <u>In order</u> to effectuate the multimodal transportation concurrency district, participating local governments may adopt appropriate comprehensive plan amendments.
- 4. The Department of Transportation, in consultation with the state land planning agency, shall submit a report by March 1, 2009, to the Governor, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives on the status of the pilot project. The report must identify any factors that support or limit the creation and success of a regional multimodal transportation district including intergovernmental coordination.
- (16) PROPORTIONATE FAIR-SHARE MITIGATION.—It is the intent of the Legislature to provide a method by which the impacts of development on transportation facilities can be mitigated by the cooperative efforts of the public and private sectors. The methodology used to calculate proportionate fair-share mitigation shall be calculated as follows: mitigation under this section shall be as provided for in subsection (12).
- (a) The determination of significantly affected roadways shall be based upon the cumulative number of trips from the previously approved stage or phase of development and the proposed new stage or phase of development expected to reach roadways during the peak hour at the complete buildout of a stage or phase being approved.

21-00621B-09 20091306

(b) For significantly affected roadways, the developer's proportionate fair-share mitigation shall be based solely upon the number of trips from the proposed new stage or phase being approved which would exceed the peak hour maximum service volume of the roadway at the adopted or existing level of service, whichever has the greater maximum service volume, divided by the change in the peak hour maximum service volume of the roadways resulting from the construction of an improvement necessary to maintain the adopted or existing level of service, whichever has the greater maximum service volume.

(c) (a) By December 1, 2006, Each local government shall adopt by ordinance a methodology for assessing proportionate fair-share mitigation options consistent with this section. By December 1, 2005, the Department of Transportation shall develop a model transportation concurrency management ordinance with methodologies for assessing proportionate fair-share mitigation options.

(d) (b)1. In its transportation concurrency management system, a local government shall, by December 1, 2006, include methodologies that will be applied to calculate proportionate fair-share mitigation. A developer may choose to satisfy all transportation concurrency requirements by contributing or paying proportionate fair-share mitigation if transportation facilities or facility segments identified as mitigation for traffic impacts are specifically identified for funding in the 5-year schedule of capital improvements in the capital improvements element of the local plan or the long-term concurrency management system or if such contributions or payments to such facilities or segments are reflected in the 5-

21-00621B-09 20091306

year schedule of capital improvements in the next regularly scheduled update of the capital improvements element. Updates to the 5-year capital improvements element which reflect proportionate fair-share contributions may not be found not in compliance based on ss. 163.3164(32) and 163.3177(3) if additional contributions, payments or funding sources are reasonably anticipated during a period not to exceed 10 years to fully mitigate impacts on the transportation facilities.

- 2. Proportionate fair-share mitigation shall be applied as a credit against <u>all transportation</u> impact fees <u>or any exactions</u> assessed for the traffic impacts of a development to the extent that all or a portion of the proportionate fair-share mitigation is used to address the same capital infrastructure improvements contemplated by the local government's impact fee ordinance.
- (e) (e) Proportionate fair-share mitigation includes, without limitation, separately or collectively, private funds, contributions of land, or and construction and contribution of facilities and may include public funds as determined by the local government. Proportionate fair-share mitigation may be directed toward one or more specific transportation improvements reasonably related to the mobility demands created by the development and such improvements may address one or more modes of travel. The fair market value of the proportionate fair-share mitigation may shall not differ based on the form of mitigation. A local government may not require a development to pay more than its proportionate fair-share contribution regardless of the method of mitigation. Proportionate fair-share mitigation shall be limited to ensure that a development meeting the requirements of this section mitigates its impact on the transportation

21-00621B-09 20091306

system but is not responsible for the additional cost of reducing or eliminating backlogs.

(f) (d) This subsection does not require a local government to approve a development that is not otherwise qualified for approval pursuant to the applicable local comprehensive plan and land development regulations; however, a development that satisfies the requirements of s. 163.3180 shall not be denied on the basis of a failure to mitigate its transportation impacts under the local comprehensive plan or land development regulations. This paragraph does not limit a local government from imposing lawfully adopted transportation impact fees.

 $\underline{(g)}$  (e) Mitigation for development impacts to facilities on the Strategic Intermodal System made pursuant to this subsection requires the concurrence of the Department of Transportation.

(h)(f) If the funds in an adopted 5-year capital improvements element are insufficient to fully fund construction of a transportation improvement required by the local government's concurrency management system, a local government and a developer may still enter into a binding proportionate-share agreement authorizing the developer to construct that amount of development on which the proportionate share is calculated if the proportionate-share amount in such agreement is sufficient to pay for one or more improvements which will, in the opinion of the governmental entity or entities maintaining the transportation facilities, significantly benefit the impacted transportation system. The improvements funded by the proportionate-share component must be adopted into the 5-year capital improvements schedule of the comprehensive plan at the next annual capital improvements element update. The funding of

21-00621B-09 20091306

any improvements that significantly benefit the impacted transportation system satisfies concurrency requirements as a mitigation of the development's impact upon the overall transportation system even if there remains a failure of concurrency on other impacted facilities.

- <u>(i) (g)</u> Except as provided in subparagraph <u>(d)1.</u> (b)1., this section <u>does may</u> not prohibit the <u>state land planning agency</u>

  Department of Community Affairs from finding other portions of the capital improvements element amendments not in compliance as provided in this chapter.
- $\underline{\text{(j)}}$  (h) The provisions of This subsection  $\underline{\text{does}}$  do not apply to a development of regional impact satisfying the requirements in  $\underline{\text{of}}$  subsection (12).
- (k) A developer shall not be required to fund or construct proportionate share mitigation that is more extensive than mitigation necessary to offset the impact of the development project under review.
- (1) The payment for such improvements that significantly benefit the impacted transportation system satisfies concurrency requirements as a mitigation of the development's stage or phase impacts upon the overall transportation system even if there remains a failure of concurrency on other impacted facilities.
  - (m) As used in this subsection, the term:
- 1. "Backlogged" or "backlogged transportation facility"
  means a facility on which the adopted level-of-service standard
  is exceeded by the existing trips, plus background trips,
  including transportation facilities that have exceeded their
  useful life.
  - 2. "Background trips" means forecasted trips from sources

21-00621B-09 20091306

other than the development project under review. Forecasted trips shall be based on established traffic modeling standards.

- developers, including landowners or developers of developments of regional impact, who propose a large-scale development of 500 cumulative acres or more may satisfy all of the transportation concurrency requirements by contributing or paying proportionate share or proportionate fair-share mitigation. If such contribution is made, a local government shall:
- (a) Designate the traffic impacts for transportation facilities or facility segments as mitigated for funding in the 5-year schedule of capital improvements in the capital improvements element of the local comprehensive plan or the long-term concurrency management system; or
- (b) Reflect that the traffic impacts for transportation facilities or facility segments are mitigated in the 5-year schedule of capital improvements in the next regularly scheduled update of the capital improvements element.

Updates to the 5-year capital improvements element which reflect proportionate share or proportionate fair-share contributions are deemed compliant with s. 163.3164(32) or s. 163.3177(3) if additional contributions, payments, or funding sources are reasonably anticipated during a period not to exceed 10 years and would fully mitigate impacts on the transportation facilities and facility segments.

Section 4. Subsection (2) of section 163.3182, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

163.3182 Transportation concurrency backlogs.-

872

873

874

875

876

877

878

879

880

881

882

883

884

885

886

887

888

889

890

891

892

893

894

895896

897

898

899

21-00621B-09 20091306

(2) CREATION OF TRANSPORTATION CONCURRENCY BACKLOG AUTHORITIES.—

- (a) A county or municipality may create a transportation concurrency backlog authority if it has an identified transportation concurrency backlog.
- (b) No later than 2012, each local government that has an identified transportation concurrency backlog shall adopt one or more transportation concurrency backlog areas as part of its capital improvements element update to its financially feasible submission to the state land planning agency. On a biannual basis, the creation of additional areas shall be submitted to the state land planning agency until the local government has demonstrated by no later than 2027 that the backlog existing in 2012 has been mitigated through construction or planned construction of the necessary transportation mobility improvements. If, because of economic conditions, the local government cannot meet the biannual requirements of the capital improvements update for new areas, it may request from the state land planning agency a one-time waiver of the requirement to file the biannual creation of new transportation concurrency backlog authority areas.
- (c) Landowners or developers within a large-scale development area of 500 cumulative acres or more may request the local government to create a transportation concurrency backlog area coterminous with the boundaries of the development area. If a development permit is issued or a comprehensive plan amendment is approved within the development area, the local government shall designate the transportation concurrency backlog area if the funding is sufficient to address one or more transportation

21-00621B-09 20091306

capacity improvements necessary to satisfy the additional deficiencies coexisting or anticipated with the new development. The transportation concurrency backlog area shall be created by ordinance and shall be used to satisfy all fair share or proportionate fair-share transportation concurrency contributions of the development which are not otherwise satisfied by impact fees. The local government shall manage the area acting as a transportation concurrency backlog authority and all applicable provisions of this section apply, except that the tax increment shall be used to satisfy transportation concurrency requirements not otherwise satisfied by impact fees.

- (d) (b) Acting as the transportation concurrency backlog authority within the authority's jurisdictional boundary, the governing body of a county or municipality shall adopt and implement a plan to eliminate all identified transportation concurrency backlogs within the authority's jurisdiction using funds provided pursuant to subsection (5) and as otherwise provided pursuant to this section.
- (e) Notwithstanding any general law, special act, or ordinance to the contrary, a local government shall not require any payments for transportation concurrency beyond a subject development's traffic impacts as identified pursuant to impact fees or s. 163.3180(12) or (16) nor shall a condition of a development order or permit require such payments. If payments required to satisfy a development's share of transportation concurrency costs do not mitigate all traffic impacts of the planned development area because of existing or future backlog conditions, the landowner or developer shall be entitled to petition the local government for designation of a

930

931

932

933

934

935

936

937

938

939

940

941

942

943

944

945

946

947948

949

950

951

952

953

954

955

956

957

21-00621B-09 20091306

transportation concurrency backlog area pursuant to this section, which shall satisfy any remaining concurrency backlog requirements in the impacted area.

Section 5. Paragraph (a) of subsection (7) of section 380.06, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

380.06 Developments of regional impact.

- (7) PREAPPLICATION PROCEDURES.-
- (a) Before filing an application for development approval, the developer shall contact the regional planning agency having with jurisdiction over the proposed development to arrange a preapplication conference. Upon the request of the developer or the regional planning agency, other affected state and regional agencies shall participate in the this conference and shall identify the types of permits issued by the agencies, the level of information required, and the permit issuance procedures as applied to the proposed development. The levels of service required in the transportation methodology must be the same levels of service used to evaluate concurrency and proportionate share pursuant to s. 163.3180. The regional planning agency shall provide the developer information to the developer regarding about the development-of-regional-impact process and the use of preapplication conferences to identify issues, coordinate appropriate state and local agency requirements, and otherwise promote a proper and efficient review of the proposed development. If an agreement is reached regarding assumptions and methodology to be used in the application for development approval, the reviewing agencies may not subsequently object to those assumptions and methodologies, unless subsequent changes to the project or information obtained during the review make

959

960

961

962

963

964

965

966

967

968

969

970

971

972

973

974

975

976

977

978

979

980

981

982

983

984

985

986

21-00621B-09 20091306

those assumptions and methodologies inappropriate.

Section 6. Transportation mobility fee.-

(1) The Legislature finds that the existing transportation concurrency system has not adequately addressed Florida's transportation needs in an effective, predictable, and equitable manner and is not producing a sustainable transportation system for the state. The current system is complex, lacks uniformity among jurisdictions, is too focused on roadways to the detriment of desired land use patterns and transportation alternatives, results in unjustified financial inequities between comparable applicants, and frequently prevents the attainment of important growth management goals. Therefore, the Legislature has determined that the state shall evaluate and, as deemed feasible, implement a different adequate public facility requirement for transportation which would utilize a mobility fee based either on net external trip volume generated or vehicle and people miles traveled. The mobility fee shall be designed to provide for mobility needs, ensure that development provides mitigation for its impacts on the transportation system in approximate proportionality to those impacts, fairly distribute financial burdens among all applicants for development permits, and promote compact, mixed-use, and energy efficient development. Therefore, the Legislature directs the Department of Community Affairs and the Department of Transportation, both of whom are currently performing independent mobility fee studies, to coordinate and use those studies in developing a methodology for a mobility fee system as follows:

(a) The uniform mobility fee methodology for statewide

21-00621B-09 20091306

application shall replace the existing transportation concurrency management systems adopted and implemented by local governments. The independent, yet coordinated, studies shall focus upon developing a methodology as follows:

- 1. The amount, distribution, and timing of vehicular and people miles traveled shall be determined by applying professionally accepted standards and practices in the disciplines of land use and transportation planning, including requirements of constitutional and statutory law;
- 2. The development of an equitable mobility fee which provides funding for future mobility needs whereby new development mitigates in approximate proportionality for its impacts on the transportation system, yet is not delayed or held accountable for system backlogs or failures that are not directly attributable to the proposed development;
- 3. The replacement of transportation financial feasibility obligations, proportionate share contributions for developments of regional impacts, proportionate fair-share contributions, and locally adopted transportation impact fees, with the mobility fee such that a single transportation fee, whether based on number of trips or vehicle miles traveled, may be applied uniformly on a statewide basis by application of the mobility fee formula developed by these studies;
- 4. Applicability of the mobility fee on a statewide or more limited geographic basis and, if the latter, the preferred methodology in lieu of the existing concurrency or impact fee system for equitably mitigating transportation impacts from new development in those geographic areas where the mobility fee is not recommended;

1017

1018

1019

1020

1021

1022

1023

1024

1025

1026

1027

1028

1029

1030

1031

1032

10331034

1035

1036

1037

1038

1039

1040

1041

1042

1043

1044

21-00621B-09 20091306

5. The ability for developer contributions of land for right-of-way or developer-funded improvements to the transportation network, to be recognized as credits against the mobility fee via mutually acceptable agreements reached with the impacted jurisdiction; and

- 6. An equitable methodology for distribution of the mobility fee proceeds among those jurisdictions responsible for construction and maintenance of the impacted roadways, such that 100 percent of the collected mobility fees are utilized for improvements to the overall transportation network of the impacted jurisdiction.
- (b) No later than February 15, 2010, the Secretary of Community Affairs and the Secretary of Transportation shall provide an interim joint report to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives which contains the status of the mobility fee methodology study. A second interim joint report shall be provided on or before February 15, 2011. On or before December 1, 2010, the Department of Community Affairs, with input from the Department of Transportation, shall develop and submit to the Legislature proposed amendments to chapter 9J-5, Florida Administrative Code, incorporating the mobility fee methodology developed from the studies. The 2011 Legislature shall consider the amendments and approve as submitted, approve with revisions, or reject. If approved as submitted, the amendments shall go into effect on July 1, 2011. If approved with revisions, the Department of Community Affairs shall adopt the amendments as revised such that they will become effective not later than July 1, 2011. The Legislature declares that changes made to chapter 9J-5, Florida Administrative Code,

1046

1047

1048

1049

1050

1051

1052

10531054

1055

1056

1057

1058

1059

1060

1061

1062

1063

1064

1065

1066

1067

1068

1069

1070

1071

1072

1073

21-00621B-09 20091306

pursuant to this paragraph shall not be subject to rule challenges under s. 120.56(2), Florida Statutes, or to drawout proceedings under s. 120.54(3)(c)2., Florida Statutes.

(2) In order to facilitate the replacement of the current dysfunctional transportation concurrency system, the Legislature directs that s. 163.3180, Florida Statutes, relating to transportation, be repealed effective October 1, 2012, unless the amendments to chapter 9J-5, Florida Administrative Code, are rejected and s. 163.3180, Florida Statutes, is reenacted by the Legislature.

Section 7. The Legislature directs the Department of Transportation to establish an approved transportation methodology which recognizes that a planned, sustainable, or self-sufficient development area will likely achieve a community internal capture rate in excess of 30 percent when fully developed. A sustainable or self-sufficient development area consists of 500 acres or more of large-scale developments individually or collectively designed to achieve self containment by providing a balance of land uses to fulfill a majority of the community's needs. The adopted transportation methodology shall use a regional transportation model that incorporates professionally accepted modeling techniques applicable to well-planned, sustainable communities of the size, location, mix of uses, and design features consistent with such communities. The adopted transportation methodology shall serve as the basis for sustainable or self-sufficient development's traffic impact assessments by the department. The methodology review must be completed and in use no later than July 1, 2009.

Section 8. This act shall take effect July 1, 2009.