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Presentation Overview

- Setting the Stage for Current Funding Problems
- Reason for Change and Potential Strategies
- Mobility Plans / Multimodal Fees
- Final Remarks
History of Transportation Funding

• 1985: Transportation Concurrency is Born

• Implementation led to:
  – Developer Contributions
  – Last-one-in-the-door Problems
  – Gov’t and Developer “work-arounds”

• Series of Responsive Amendments, *incl.*:
  – Exception Areas
  – Prop-Share
  – Mobility
Historical Funding Sources in FL

• Gas Tax
• Impact Fees
• Ad Valorem Based
• Local Option Sales Tax
Why We Have Funding Issues

The graph shows the trend of Average Saturation Level and Average Travel Time from 1990 to 2035 for Typical Urban Community. The saturation level has been increasing steadily over the years, indicating potential funding issues due to rising travel times and congestion.
Why We Have Funding Issues

- Consuming Road Capacity Faster than Building
- Too Dependent on Roads for Mobility
- No Dedicated Funding Source(s)
- Florida’s 20-year Statewide Transportation Funding Shortfall = $62.5B*
- Reducing Demand

*Source: Estimating a Statewide Funding Shortfall Using MPO Long Range Plans, CUTR (March 2010)
Legislation (2009 to 2013)

- Statewide Mobility Study
- Legislation struck down as an unfunded mandate at the circuit court level in August 2010
- Eliminated transportation concurrency requirements
- Require dollar for dollar credit
- Encourage the use of mobility systems
- Use of pay and go mobility fees
- Developer friendly proportionate fair share
Florida Fuel Tax Revenues
Decrease in Value of 1¢ of Fuel Tax

- Decrease in value of 1¢ of fuel tax
- Decrease due to fuel efficiency and inflation
  - ≈ -30%
  - ≈ -90%
Florida: Higher-than-Average Fuel Tax

[Map showing gasoline taxes across the United States, with Florida highlighted in red indicating a higher-than-average fuel tax.]
Fuel Tax per Gallon (Europe vs. U.S.)

Gas Tax per Gallon (1996-2010)

- **Europe**
  - 2010 Avg. = $4.33
  - Gap = $3.86

- **U.S.**
  - 2010 = $0.47
How Has Europe Avoided Our Issues?

• Higher Fuel Taxes
• Emphasis on Transit/Dedicated Lanes
• User-Fees
  – Congestion pricing, managed lanes, and tolls
No Easy Funding Solution

• No single funding solution
• Need a balanced revenue plan
• Funding burden shifted to local governments

Must balance “who pays” in a fair and equitable manner
Presentation Overview
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Reason for Change?

• Is there a reason?
• Political desire for change?
• Public consensus for change?
Reason for Change?

What is Your Reason?

• New Jobs?
• Higher wages?
• Economy?
• Funding?
• Tax Base?
• Others
Potential Strategies

- Spending flexibility on alternative modes
- Creating development incentive tools
- Creating new jobs with higher wages
- Getting the right development mix/form/location
Potential Strategies

• Need more than one revenue source
• Optimizing revenues through density and mix of use
• Reducing costs through development mix of uses
• Others?
Presentation Overview

• Setting the Stage for Current Funding Problems
• Reason for Change and Potential Strategies
• Mobility Plans / Multimodal Fees
• Final Remarks
Mobility Plans / Multimodal Fees

- Mobility Plans
- Strategic Vision
- Changing mix of assets
- Transportation Impact Fees vs Mobility Fees
- Economic Growth Strategy
- Examples
Ingredients for a Successful Mobility Plan

- Community Buy-In
- Infrastructure Needs
- Funding Sources
- Strategies/Policies
- Consider Land Use and Transportation
Mobility Plan: Guide to Strategic Vision

Mobility Plan

The Strategic Vision

Land Use Strategies

Funding the Mobility Plan

Implementation Plan
Transitioning from Road to Mobility/Multimodal Fee

Flexibility

- Combine each mode
  - Roads
  - Bicycle & Pedestrian
  - Transit

Mix of Capital Assets (roadways, bicycle, pedestrian, and transit) and Differential Fees and Benefit Districts

Transportation Assets Today
**Mobility/Multimodal Fee Approach**

**Flexibility**

- Combine modes
- Blend assets
- Person miles of travel
- Allocate revenues based on “Strategic Vision”

**Future Transportation Investment**

**Mix of Capital Assets (roadways, bicycle, pedestrian, and transit) and Differential Fees and Benefit Districts**
Transportation Impact Fees: Status

*Information was unavailable (2)

Avg. Annual Population Growth
1980-2007: ≈ 2.4% ≈ 2.7% ≈ 1.9%
2007-2013: ≈ 0.8% ≈ 0.6% ≈ 0.7%

- Fee in Place (28)
- Suspended/Moratorium (14)
- No Transp. Impact Fee (23)

*Information was unavailable (2)
Multi-Modal Transportation Impact Fees

- City of Oviedo
- City of Tampa
- Pasco
- Plant City
- City of Aventura
- City of Sarasota
- City of Destin
- Panama City
- Alachua
- City of Casselberry
- City of Oviedo
- Orange
- City of Orlando
- City of Kissimmee
- City of Tampa
- Plant City
- City of Sarasota
- City of Jacksonville

= Mobility/Multi-Modal Fee
Multi-Modal Transportation Impact Fees

Urban Cities:

• City of Sarasota
• City of Orlando
• City of Tampa
• City of Oviedo
• City of Casselberry

Cities build few roadways; need flexibility for multi-modal capacity expansion.
Economic Growth Strategy

- City of Sarasota Mobility Plan / Multimodal Fee
- City of Orlando Multimodal Transportation Impact Fee
- Pasco Mobility Fee
Economic Growth Strategy

Economic Growth:

• Based on future growth rate & available funding
• Options for buy-down by land use or area
• Tool to assist with policy decisions
  ✓ Economic development
  ✓ Growth management
• Not legally required
Economic Growth Strategy
Marion County Property Tax Base Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Agricultural</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Vacant Non-Residential</th>
<th>Vacant Residential</th>
<th>Multi Family</th>
<th>Single Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970's</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980's</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990's</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000's</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010's</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LAND USE DIVERSITY?
Economic Growth Strategy
Marion County Property Tax Base Distribution

Uninc. Marion County - Res vs. Non-Res

City of Ocala - Res vs. Non-Res

Residential | Non-Residential
---|---
2008/09: 71% 29% | 2008/09: 58% 42%
2009/10: 68% 32% | 2009/10: 60% 40%
2010/11: 70% 30% | 2010/11: 60% 40%
2011/12: 67% 33% | 2011/12: 61% 39%
2012/13: 65% 35% | 2012/13: 62% 38%
2013/14: 65% 35% | 2013/14: 62% 38%
Economic Growth Strategy

Impact Fee Rate / Percentage

0% 1% 2% 3% 4% 5% 6% 7% 8% 9% 10% 125%

Roadway Capacity Level-of-Service
- Facility Needs
- Economic Needs
- Land Use Needs

Marion County Projected Annual Growth Rate (1.4%)

Revenues from Existing Residents (for transportation capacity)

New Growth Credit/Future Tax Revenues

Total Cost
Maximum Impact Fee
Roadway Capacity LOS

Revenues from Existing Residents
(for transportation capacity)
Economic Growth Strategy

New Growth Credit/Future Tax Revenues

- Revenues from Existing Residents (for transportation capacity)
- Marion County Projected Annual Growth Rate (1.4%)

Roadway Capacity Level-of-Service
- Facility Needs
- Economic Needs
- Land Use Needs

Impact Fee Rate / Percentage

Avg. Annual Growth Rate

Total Cost
Maximum Impact Fee
Roadway Capacity LOS

0% 1% 2% 3% 4% 5% 6% 7% 8% 9% 10%
Economic Growth Strategy

Adopted Discounts Using Economic Growth Method:

• Pasco County: By land use and area
• Indian River County: Countywide discount for non-residential land uses & lower discount for residential land uses
• Hernando County: Countywide all land uses
• City of Orlando: TODs in downtown core
Examples

- City of Sarasota Mobility Plan / Multimodal Fee
- City of Orlando Multimodal Transportation Impact Fee
- City of Tampa
- Pasco Mobility Fee
City of Sarasota Citywide Mobility Plan and Multimodal Fee Overview

Alex DavisShaw, P.E., PTOE,
City Engineer, City of Sarasota
City of Orlando Multi-Modal Transportation Impact Fee

Key Concepts:

• Flexibility to spend fees across modes
• Improve equitability in fees charged between land uses
• Create incentives for transit oriented / mixed-use land uses
City of Orlando Multi-Modal Transportation Impact Fee
City of Orlando Multi-Modal Transportation Impact Fee

Connecting Activity Centers and Corridors

Activity Centers & Corridors

3% of land
48% of tax rev
City of Orlando Multi-Modal Transportation Impact Fee

- Mix of Assets
- Benefit Districts
- Expanded Downtown Mobility District
- Differential Fees
City of Orlando Multi-Modal Transportation Impact Fee

- Transit-Oriented Development Policy
  - ¼ mile of premium transit
  - Up to 100% fee reduction based on meeting City criteria
City of Orlando/Orange County

Multi-Modal Transportation Impact Fees

Orange County:
- Transportation Impact Fee updated in 2012
- Created Alternative Mobility Area (AMA)
- Within AMA, multi-modal impact fee implemented
City of Tampa
Varying Development Review Process

Targeted Growth Districts
- Pay-and-Go
- Expedited Review Requirements

Strategic Vision

- TCEA Redevelopment Districts
- Westshore DRIs
- Downtown CRAs
City of Tampa
Varying Development Review Process

Targeted Corridors
- Pay-and-Go
- Expedited Review Requirements

Protected Neighborhoods
- Bus Rapid Transit
- Corridors
- Streetcar Service Area
- Transit Centers
- Bus Transfer Centers
City of Tampa
Varying Development Review Process

Protected Areas
- Stringent Review Requirements
- Must Meet Concurrency

Protected Neighborhoods
- Bus Rapid Transit
- Corridors
- Streetcar Service Area
- Transit Centers
- Bus Transfer Centers

Strategic Vision
Pasco County Mobility Fee

Pasco County:

- Mobility Fee adopted in 2011 (2014 update)
  - Fee incentives by area & land use

  **Rural**
  Office (50k sf) = $2,347

  **Suburban**
  Office (50k sf) = $1,174

  **Urban**
  Office (50k sf) = $0
Pasco County Mobility Fee

Summary:

• Implement comprehensive plan
• Economic development incentive tool
• New jobs in Pasco County
• Right development form, right place, right time
• Spent funds on state highway projects
Presentation Overview

- Setting the Stage for Current Funding Problems
- Mobility/Multimodal Fees
- **Concluding Remarks**
Multimodal/Mobility Fees

- Creates flexibility
- More needed in urbanized areas
- Not sufficient to fund needs
Transportation Funding Summary

- No single funding solution
- Need a balanced revenue plan
- Funding burden shifted to local governments

Must balance “who pays” in a fair and equitable manner
**Mechanisms for Funding in FL**

- Must develop a balanced program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Operating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact Fees/Mobility Fees</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Tax</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Valorem/General Fund</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Services Taxing Unit (MSTU)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Services Benefit Unit (MSBU)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fees</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop-Share/Mitigation Assessment Fees</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Fees</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Assessments</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Private Partnerships</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions or Comments?
Recent Legislation Changing the Legal Framework on Transportation Funding

- HB 1205 (2009) and HB 1271 (2010) Extending Eligibility of the Charter County Transportation System Surtax
- H1-B (2009) - High Speed and Commuter Rail
- SB 360 (2009) - Directive for Statewide Mobility Fee Study
HB 1205 (2009)

• HB 1205 expanded the scope and availability of the Charter County Transit System Surtax in Fl. Stat. 212.055
• Sales tax of up to 1%
• Must be placed on the ballot by Board of County Commissioners
• And then approved by the voters
The bill makes 13 additional charter counties eligible to approve this tax by removing an existing provision requiring charter adoption prior to January 1, 1984. The prior law authorized this tax in only Broward, Duval, Hillsborough, Miami-Dade, Pinellas, Sarasota, and Volusia Counties. The revised law now authorizes this tax in Alachua, Brevard, Charlotte, Clay, Columbia, Lee, Leon, Orange, Osceola, Palm Beach, Polk, Seminole, and Wakulla Counties.
HB 1205 (2009)

• The bill also allows proceeds of the surtax to be remitted to transit authorities.

• If new cities are created, then interlocal agreements implementing the tax must be revised (every 5 years).
HB 1271 (2010)

- Further expanded the authority in Fl. Stat. 212.055 to include Regional Transportation or Transit Authorities.
- Also authorized use of the surtax for "on-demand transportation services."
- Defined as “transportation provided between flexible points of origin and destination selected by individual users with such service being provided at a time that is agreed upon by the user and the provider of the service and that is not fixed-schedule or fixed-route in nature.”
HB 1B (2009)

- Special session to deal with High Speed Rail and related issues.
- Created the Florida Rail Enterprise, modeled after the Florida Turnpike program, to coordinate the development and operation of passenger rail services statewide, including high-speed rail.
- Establishes a Statewide Passenger Rail Commission.
- Creates dedicated funding sources for the rail programs by revising effective 2014, the documentary stamp tax revenues that are allocated among transportation programs.
HB 1B (2009)

- Allows FDOT to provide more funding for rail systems than previously authorized.
- Grants FDOT the authority to contractually indemnify freight rail operators when FDOT buys the ability to use their rail lines.
- FDOT authorized to purchase insurance and establish a self-insurance retention fund.
- Allowed for an escrowed closing for the Central Florida Rail Corridor program.
- Updated and revised obsolete provisions relating to FDOT’s prior rail plans.
HB 7207 (2011)

- Dollar-for-dollar credit for concurrency purposes
- The payment must be reduced by % share of project’s traffic
- No ruling on whether local governments may still charge an impact/mobility fee instead of proportionate share if the fee is higher than proportionate share
HB 319 (2013)

• Encouraged local governments to adopt alternative mobility systems through:
  – Long-terms strategies that support multimodal solutions
  – Adoption of area wide LOS, not depending on single segment
  – Assigning primary priority to pedestrian environment, with transit access
  – Establishing multimodal LOS standards
  – Reducing impact fees or local access fees to promote development within urban areas, multimodal transportation districts, and a balance of mixed-use development
Total Cost per Gallon of Gas (Europe vs. U.S.)

2010 Avg. = $7.84
Gap= $5.07
2010 = $2.77

Total Cost per Gallon of Gas (1996-2009)
Digging Out of a Hole

- Needs vs. Investment Gap Widening
- Federal Fuel Tax Not Enough
  - No adjustment for inflation
  - Cumulative loss of 33% since last increase (1993)

Status of Highway Trust Fund

Funds in Billions of Dollars

Total Income
Expenditure
Closing Balance

Source: Government Accountability Office (GAO), FHWA Highway Statistics Series

$8B rescue from Federal Government to Fund Shortfall

Fund Balance
Issues to Overcome in Florida

- Inadequate Dedicated Funding
- Funding for Transit Operations
- Techniques to Incentivize Transit
- Congestion Pricing/Managed Lanes
- Disincentives for SOV-use
Mobility Fee vs. Multimodal Fee

- **Mobility Fee**: Relates to Concurrency
  - Ex: Pasco County

- **Multimodal Fee**: Emphasizes Flexibility
  - Ex: Orange County, Cities of Orlando, Oviedo, Casselberry, Tampa, Sarasota
Phase II Analysis

Potential Overlay Zones (1a to 4a)
Pasco County Mobility Fees

- Market Areas
- Issues To Be Addressed
- Development Growth Rates
- Credit/Buy-Down of Fees
Proposed Market Areas/Mobility Fee Zones

- West
- North
- Central
- South
- East
Adopted Countywide Transportation Impact Fees

Single Family (2ksf) = $10,302 (per du)
Office (50ksf) = $4,778 (per ksf)
Commercial (100ksf) = $8,877 (per ksf)

Source: FY 2010 impact fees adopted April 2007
Market Area Characteristics/Objectives:

1. West Area:
   a. Existing Urbanized Area
   b. Promote Redevelopment & Infill Development
   c. Higher Density

2. North Area:
   a. Rural Area
   b. Preserve Rural Character
   c. Discourage Development

3. East Area:
   a. Rural Area
   b. Preserve Rural Character
   c. Discourage Development
Market Area Characteristics/Objectives:

4. Central Area:
   a. Existing Rural Area
   b. Development is Desired but at a Later Point in Time

5. South Area:
   a. Suburban Area/Adjacent to Hillsborough County
   b. Where Most of the Recent Development has Happened
   c. Development is Encouraged
Multi-Modal 2035 LRTP
Issues To Be Addressed

• Growth Assumptions
• Construction/Right of Way Costs
• Modes
  – Roads/Transit/Bicycle & Pedestrian
• System Applicability
  – i.e. Interstate/Expressway Travel
• Quality of Service/System Performance
  – LOS by Market Area
Development Growth Rates

- Growth Rates Driving Factor
- Affect Mobility Fee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Buying-Down Mobility Fees

Buy-down Incentives:

• Helps Direct Development
• “Right Place Right Time” Concept
• Buy-down Must be Affordable
• Buy-down Subsidized by Other Revenue Sources
Buying-Down Mobility Fees

- Existing Creditable Revenue Sources
- Represents ~ 20% Growth Credit
Buying-Down Mobility Fees

- DRAFT
Buy-down Concepts by Market Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Area</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Total Fee</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90% 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50% 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90% 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50% 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90% 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90% 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>40% 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75% 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>70% 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed-Use/TOD</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10% 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>30% 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75% 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60% 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed-Use/TOD</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10% 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>30% 70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Buy-Down Concept

Total Fee = $10,000

Total Fee, $8,000

South Market Area – Mixed-Use/TOD Land Use
Buy-Down Concept

Total Fee = $10,000

Total Credit = $2,000

Net Fee = $8,000

Grow Credit, $2,000

Net Fee, $8,000

South Market Area – Mixed-Use/TOD land Use
Buy-Down Concept

Total Fee = $10,000
Total Credit = $2,000
Buy Down (90%) = $7,200
Net Fee = $800

South Market Area – Mixed-Use/TOD Land Use
# 2035 LRTP Financing of Multi-Modal Transportation System

## Existing 2035 LRTP Financing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Operating</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State, Federal, SIS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Impact Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Option Sales Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Surtax</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportionate Share</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Local Revenues)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Local, State, Federal, SIS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2035 LRTP Financing of Multi-Modal Transportation System

• Distribution of Funding Sources Will Change
• Facilitates Buy-Down Concept

• Replacement Revenue Source:
  – Mobility Fee

• Potential New Revenue Sources:
  – MSTU
  – Tax Increment Financing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State, Federal, SIS</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Fee</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Tax</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Option Sales Tax</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Surtax</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportionate Share</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contributions</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Local Revenues)</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Local, State, Federal, SIS)</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Orlando Multi-Modal Impact Fee
Local Funding Sources Summary

**Tier 1 Revenue Sources**
- Used in Past
  - Impact Fees
  - 1st Local Option Gas Tax
  - Diesel Ninth Cent Gas Tax
  - Constitutional Gas Tax
  - County Gas Tax

**Tier 2 Revenue Sources**
- Requires BOCC Vote
  - 2nd Local Option Gas Tax
  - Motor Fuel Ninth Cent Gas Tax

**Tier 3 Revenue Sources**
- Requires Voter Referendum
  - Charter County Transportation System Surtax
  - Rental Car Surcharge
Orlando Multi-Modal Impact Fee
Local Funding Sources Summary

Tier 1, $554.6, 22%

Tier 2, $81.0, 3%

Tier 3, $1,933.8, 75%
Orange County:
- Transportation Impact Fee updated in 2012
- Created Alternative Mobility Area (AMA)
- Within AMA, multi-modal impact fee implemented
Transportation Impact vs Mobility Fees

- Transportation Impact Fees
- Multimodal Transportation Impact Fees
- Development Growth Rates
- Credit/Buy-Down of Fees