

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS

BILL #: HB 905 CS Transportation Concurrency Management
SPONSOR(S): Goodlette and others
TIED BILLS: **IDEN./SIM. BILLS:** SB 1862

REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR
1) <u>Local Government Council</u>	<u>8 Y, 0 N</u>	<u>Grayson</u>	<u>Hamby</u>
2) <u>Transportation & Economic Development Appropriations Committee</u>	<u>19 Y, 1 N, w/CS</u>	<u>McAuliffe</u>	<u>Gordon</u>
3) <u>State Infrastructure Council</u>	<u></u>	<u>Grayson</u>	<u>Havlicak</u>
4) <u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
5) <u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>

SUMMARY ANALYSIS

HB 905 w/CS provides local governments that have adopted concurrency management systems prior to July 1, 2005, which are stricter than those provided in law are not required to issue a building permit, or its functional equivalent, when that permit would result in traffic generation until adequate transportation facilities are in place as required by that local government's adopted concurrency management system.

The bill has an effective date of July 1, 2006.

FULL ANALYSIS

I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

A. HOUSE PRINCIPLES ANALYSIS:

Provide limited government – The bill allows local government to be more restrictive in implementing transportation facilities concurrency. If local government chooses to be more restrictive than the state standard, then such action could be considered to either limit government by decentralizing the implementation standard or increase government by further restricting when development may occur.

Safeguard individual liberty – The bill allows local government to be more restrictive in implementing transportation facilities concurrency. Thus, if local government chooses a more restrictive implementation, then such action could be considered to decrease or prohibit a private organization (developer) in the conduct of its affairs.

B. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

Background

Transportation Concurrency - CS/CS/CS SB 360 (2005)

The 2005 Legislature enacted CS/CS/CS SB 360 relating to infrastructure funding and planning (ch. 2005-290, L.O.F., the “2005 Act”). Among other revisions to existing law, the 2005 Act provides for stricter facilities concurrency than existed in prior law. Concurrency is a growth management concept intended to ensure that the necessary public facilities and services are available concurrent with the impacts of development. One of the types of facilities to which concurrency applies under the 2005 Act is transportation facilities. Specifically, the 2005 Act provided that *transportation facilities must be in place or under actual construction within 3 years from the local government’s approval of a building permit or its functional equivalent that results in traffic generation*. To carry out transportation concurrency, local governments must define what constitutes an adequate level of service and measure whether the service needs of a new development exceed existing capacity and any scheduled improvements in the capital improvements element of the local government’s comprehensive plan.

Transportation Concurrency Exception Areas

The law provides that under limited circumstances, the requirement for transportation facilities concurrency conflicts with other public policy goals and leads to the discouragement of urban infill development and redevelopment. In such instances, existing law allows a local government to designate a transportation concurrency exception area (TCEA) to provide for an exception to the concurrency requirements. This results in an increase in the number of people and goods that need to move around within the TCEA and means that their mobility must be addressed in ways other than the traditional provision of roads. When a local government chooses to designate a TCEA, they must follow certain requirements in the law. Among those requirements is the adoption of a comprehensive plan amendment that supports the designated area in the ways outlined below.

- Implements strategies to support and fund mobility within the TCEA, including alternative modes of transportation.
- Demonstrates how strategies will support the purpose of the exception area and how mobility within the exception area will be provided.
- Addresses urban design; appropriate land use mixes, including intensity and density; and network connectivity plans needed to promote urban infill, redevelopment, or downtown revitalization.
- Be accompanied by data and analysis justifying the size of the area.

Effect of Proposed Changes

HB 905 w/CS provides local government's that have adopted concurrency management systems prior to July 1, 2005, which are stricter than those provided in law are not required to issue a building permit, or its functional equivalent, when that permit would result in traffic generation until adequate transportation facilities are in place as required by that local governments adopted concurrency management system.

C. SECTION DIRECTORY:

Section 1 – Amends s. 163.3180(2)(c), F.S., relating to transportation concurrency.

Section 2 – Provides an effective date of July 1, 2006.

II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues:

The bill does not appear to have an impact on state revenues.

2. Expenditures:

The bill does not appear to have an impact on state expenditures.

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues:

The bill does not appear to have an impact on local revenues.

2. Expenditures:

The bill may increase the demand for local expenditures to ensure that transportation facilities are funded and in place in tandem with development demand.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

The bill may have an impact on the private sector by limiting when development may proceed in relation to the availability of adequate transportation facilities.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

Not applicable.

III. COMMENTS

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

1. Applicability of Municipality/County Mandates Provision:

The bill does not require counties or municipalities to spend funds or to take an action requiring the expenditure of funds. The bill does not reduce the percentage of a state tax shared with counties or municipalities. The bill does not reduce the authority that municipalities have to raise revenue.

2. Other:

None.

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

N/A.

C. DRAFTING ISSUES OR OTHER COMMENTS:

None.

IV. AMENDMENTS/COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE & COMBINED BILL CHANGES

At the April 4, 2006 meeting, the Transportation & Economic Development Appropriations Committee approved HB 905 with one strike-all amendment. The amendment provides local governments that have adopted concurrency management systems prior to July 1, 2005, which are stricter than those provided in law are not required to issue a building permit, or its functional equivalent, when that permit would result in traffic generation until adequate transportation facilities are in place as required by that local government's adopted concurrency management system.