

CCNA Multimodal Transportation Ad Hoc Committee Follow-Up Questions

1) TRANSPORTATION STUDIES: One reason given by the City for eliminating many transportation concurrency studies was because many are not useful and only suggest more roads, which people do not want. Can these studies be modified and customized to include multi-modal forms of transportation?

Below are some of the reasons not to eliminate, but to have thresholds for traffic studies:

For small businesses, a traffic study can be daunting. The cost of the study can be challenging for a small business and the six weeks (average time of a traffic study) of the unknown impacts can deter many of these businesses from considering the City of Sarasota. While a small business use will almost certainly not impact a road operating appropriately, it is hard for them to consider this implication when their financial viability hinges on the outcome. The larger developments typically have the ability to work through this effort and many have experience with traffic studies from previous ventures.

For smaller developments, the cost of the multimodal transportation impact fee is more than the proportionate fair share and most will not have a proportionate fair share requirement. If a proportionate fair share payment is required, then it is credited against the multimodal transportation impact fee and used for projects as noted below. If a multimodal transportation impact fee is paid without the traffic study, the fee would go toward the multimodal projects already approved by the Commission and listed in the CIP.

For the other modes of travel, currently the LOS is often based on existing facilities. A map is being developed to reflect existing and proposed facilities, which will eliminate the need to fund yet another study to depict, for example, a missing bike route segment. The City will be looking at revisions to traffic study requirements and an enhanced site plan review in order to address multimodal needs at both the site access and the regional mobility review levels.

2) ABILITY TO SAY NO: If the City believes a project is simply too large/intense for a particular location (but zoning would permit it), can the city say no:

- 1) under the current concurrency system?
- 2) under the proposed multi modal system?
- 3) under a multi modal system which retains some type of concurrency?

The City cannot say 'no' under any of the three scenarios referenced above. State law requires that the City allow the development to pay their proportionate fair share of costs related to specific project impacts, consistent with the above scenarios. If the proportionate fair share is cost prohibitive for the development, then that would effectively stop the development. The current law states that this is only for roads operating at the adopted LOS. As it stands now, the City has to "assume" the road operates at the LOS adopted in the Comprehensive Plan when evaluating traffic impacts from a proposed development, and the developer pays their proportionate fair share only if the development causes the road to then fall below that adopted level of service. What is being proposed is to adopt the existing operation (level of service) of the road so that future development can no longer further degrade the road and the City will no longer have to "assume" the road operates better than it does.

3) MULTI-MODAL CONCURRENCY: If we developed a multi-modal concurrency model, can road impact fees be used for multi-modal projects, or only for road projects?

Today, the City collects the multimodal transportation impact fees and if a proportionate fair share payment is not needed, the money will fund a multimodal project on the CIP list. If a traffic study is performed for a development project and it identifies specific transportation improvements for mitigation, and the cost of those improvements is more than the calculated multimodal transportation impact fee, then the development does pay their proportionate fair share to construct an improvement that will benefit a regionally significant transportation facility as identified in the study. If their share is less, the City would credit their proportionate fair share payment against their calculated multimodal transportation impact fee.

4) CIP LIST: Will there be a project list developed other than the CIP that will prioritize projects in line for multi-modal funding? Is this the list you are presently working on for the April public discussion?

The draft CIP list that will be available for the April discussion will include those projects where multimodal transportation impact fees have been identified as a funding source. Another list is expected to be available reflecting unfunded multimodal projects and seeking input on prioritizing such projects, as well as any new projects which may be generated by the public.

5) Will the Local Option Fuel Tax Fund be available for multi-modal projects, as well as the Multi Modal Transportation Impact Fees?

Local Option Fuel Tax (LOFT) dollars are able to fund multimodal projects, however, much of the LOFT funding has already been programmed for other transportation projects such as bridge refurbishment/replacement and road resurfacing.