

**CITY OF TEMPLE TERRACE, FLORIDA
MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL
REPORT OF WORK SESSION**

**Tuesday, March 3, 2009
Council Chambers - City Hall
5:00 p.m.**

Having been duly advertised as required by law, the Mayor and City Council of the City of Temple Terrace, Florida, met in a work session, beginning at approximately 5:00 p.m., for a status of the Multi-Modal Transportation District and related provisions to amend the Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Code.

PRESENT WERE: Mayor Joe Affronti, Council Members Alison M. Fernandez, Ron A. Govin, Ken Halloway, Mark A. Knapp, and Mary Jane Neale, City Manager Kim Leinbach, City Attorney Mark Connolly, and City Clerk Lisa Burns.

ALSO PRESENT WERE: Public Information Officer Michael Dunn, Community Development Director Charles Stephenson, Leisure Services Director James Chambers, Public Works Director Joe Motta, Code Enforcement Director Joe Gross, Finance Director Diane Reichard, Police Chief Ken Albano, Fire Chief Keith Chapman, Planner Bradley Parrish, Senior Planner Susanne Hicks, Assistant City Engineer Michael Hall, Deputy City Clerk Judith Read, Joe Bell, Terry Cullen, Beth Alden, Wiatt Bowers, and several other persons.

Mayor Affronti called on Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission Staff Member Joe Bell for the presentation.

Mr. Bell introduced the other persons who will join him in the presentation: Beth Alden, Staff Member of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), and Wiatt Bowers of PBS & J (Post, Buckley, Schuh, & Jernigan). Mr. Bell reviewed that multimodal transportation has been discussed for some time, and tonight the City will be considering the multimodal transportation district (MTD) concurrency management ordinance; after adoption of the ordinance, the Policy and Procedures Manual, which is an extension of the ordinance, will be presented for adoption, and subsequent to that, the City will be adopting its updated Comprehensive Plan, which will include the MTD.

Utilizing a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Bell explained the City needs the multimodal transportation district as an alternative to road concurrency, in order to allow the City to grow, because the City is unable to meet traditional road concurrency because of cost and jurisdictional issues. He commented that the State created an "out" in the form of Transportation Concurrency Exception Areas, such as the one the City adopted for the downtown area, and the Multimodal Transportation District, which is proposed to be applied City-wide. He reviewed the basic process the City and Planning Commission has been going through to implement the district, which started about 20 months ago when the MTD was first proposed, through the resolution of one final issue with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), which was finally accomplished yesterday. He reiterated that in May or June this year the updated Comprehensive Plan will be presented for adoption, which includes the MTD. [A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is part of the record.]

Mayor Affronti commented that he doesn't believe everyone appreciates what a "big deal" this is, to which Mr. Bell responded that this will be the first City-wide MTD, which is one of the reasons it has taken so long; it is breaking new ground and will serve as a model to the rest of the State. He added that the feedback from the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) is that they want it to succeed and are impressed with how it has developed so far.

Mr. Bell turned the presentation over to Beth Alden. Ms. Alden presented background information, which is the basis for the ordinance under consideration, including a brief roadway status, where she identified several State- and County-maintained failing roads in the City, and noted there are no plans to add capacity. She explained the lack of capacity creates obstacles to infill & redevelopment and commented the Capital Improvement Element will not be financially feasible to meet current Level of Service (LOS) Standards. She briefly commented on areas of flexibility in the State law, which include the ability to take a longer time period to meet the Level of Service Standards, assume reasonably-available revenues for later years of that time period, and a provision that a “significant benefit” to the transportation system can satisfy concurrency. She continued that the approach used in creating the MTD was to expand the options by shifting transportation system emphasis so that other less costly modes are viable, desirable choices; the options they looked at included:

- Support mixed use & higher densities in key nodes or corridors
- Connect the nodes with transit
- Improve walking conditions throughout the City
- Create a network of cycling routes
- Expand local street connections as redevelopment occurs

For the purposes of DCA, Ms. Alden said they were required to go through the options mode by mode, and show exactly what they meant by “significant benefit” to the transportation system. Referring to pedestrian connections, Ms. Alden explained they looked at the existing pedestrian network and filling in gaps, with sidewalks on 56th Street and Fletcher Avenue, enhancements downtown, arterial road crossings, and local street sidewalks to destinations.

Relative to meeting the standards with bicycle connections, Ms. Alden explained they looked at on-road facilities and off-road trails; on-road facilities include Whiteway Drive, Ridgedale Road/Sunnyside Road, 127th Avenue and 131st Avenue. She continued that opportunities for bicycle trails include a bridge over the Hillsborough River (there is an MPO Grant for the bridge), the Temple Terrace Trail, Fletcher, Gillette Extension, and the TECO corridor.

Regarding transit connections, Ms. Alden pointed out that the one location, where an expansion of bus service would have the most benefit, would include extending the Fletcher Avenue Route further east. She remarked Fletcher Avenue is slated for bus enhancements as a Transit Emphasis Corridor through Hillsborough County’s capital improvements tax bonding. In the rest of the City, she said they looked at a flex-route circulator service. Opportunities for filling gaps in street connectivity would include the downtown redevelopment area, as development occurs, and the Telecom Park area, she said.

Ms. Alden then reviewed the variety of funding sources for the improvements. She commented they used the assumption that HART would continue to operate its existing bus routes; the ad valorem that is noted as HART’s in the program represents the existing property taxes that HART collects in the City of Temple Terrace, which are identified as supporting the transit service that is on the ground today. Relative to the gas tax amount that is shown for the capital improvements, she explained that does not represent the total amount of gas tax revenues for Temple Terrace; some of the City’s gas tax revenues will be needed for operations and maintenance. She continued that the Community Investment Tax is from the County’s allocation for the Fletcher Avenue Transit Emphasis Corridor.

Ms. Alden explained that the Proportionate Fair Share fills in the other “piece of the puzzle”, which Mr. Bowers will discuss later in the presentation. She noted that Grants & Other Revenues complete the funding sources for the improvements, and includes such things as developer contributions and some of the grants the City has already applied for and is receiving for transportation improvements.

Ms. Alden reviewed that they have been working with the DCA and FDOT to gain approval for moving forward with this proposal. She reviewed various State agency concerns and how the Planning Commission addressed each of them:

1. Show how multimodal needs will be addressed and funded.
Developed program of improvements described above.
2. Adopt proportionate fair share ordinance.
Drafted for City Council consideration.
3. Develop urban design guidelines district-wide.
Comprehensive Plan Amendment Policy: Develop within 3 years.
4. Define who is exempt from concurrency.
Add policy language regarding insignificant impacts.
5. Adopt a measurable LOS standard for roadways.
Level of Service “E” is suggested but not expected to be achieved.
Other modes significantly benefit the transportation system.

Ms. Alden reviewed the suggested next steps, which would be to consider the adoption of the multimodal transportation district as a part of the Comprehensive Plan, draft locally-appropriate design guidelines for adoption by 2011, and consider adoption of the proportionate fair share ordinance.

Wiatt Bowers, of PBS&J, briefly explained proportionate fair share, which was part of the 2005 Growth Management Legislation, and required local governments to enact fair share provisions in their concurrency management ordinances. He offered an example to show the comparisons for roadway capacity, with traditional concurrency and with proportionate fair share, which demonstrated a per trip cost of \$173 with proportionate fair share, as opposed to \$975 per trip with traditional concurrency.

While there are numerous advantages to the MTD trip fee, Mr. Bowers suggested the biggest advantage is that it is very easy to calculate; the cost will be known up front to the developer. He reviewed the other benefits, which included: implements a “pay and go” concept; true “fair share” – based on number of trips, regardless of deficiency; a sort of combination of concurrency and impact fees in that it deals with existing problems as well as future projects; and funds are spent on a variety of projects, not just roads. Mr. Bowers also briefly expounded on the pitfalls of traditional concurrency and the documents created for the multimodal transportation concurrency system, which include the management ordinance, the Policy & Procedures Manual, the Concurrency Worksheet used to determine if the concurrency review process is needed, and the Concurrency System Tracking Database. He explained the Ordinance is very streamlined, with most of the detail being in the Policy and Procedures Manual, allowing for minor changes to be made without having to amend the Ordinance. He briefly reviewed the contents of the Policy & Procedures Manual, which will be introduced for approval in April.

Mr. Bell summarized this is a very simple system. He commented that the money available to pay for improvements will not go towards roadway improvements, which are very expensive and are not under the City's jurisdiction; the money the developers or taxpayers pay will "stay" in Temple Terrace for improvements within the City, according to the Schedule of Projects that has been developed. He interjected the Schedule was developed with City staff, relative to already proposed or anticipated projects over the next 15 to 20 years, to provide the level of detail required by DCA. He continued that they were able to identify the funding sources based on funds the City is already collecting.

Mr. Bell explained that the example cited earlier was based on the multi-million dollar project that was proposed on Fletcher Avenue and did not materialize. He noted the average project in Temple Terrace is substantially smaller; the trip cost would be much more reasonable, and a lot of the projects would not have significant impact. He explained that for what little impact they do have, staff is able to look at the site plan for items which may result in credits to offset the fee, such as bus shelters, improved access points, pedestrian friendliness, and other similar items. He concluded that it is the large developer that will create the large impact, remarking that they tried to make it as easy as possible, while protecting the City's ability to continue to approve projects so the City can grow.

Council Member Fernandez asked for confirmation that when the proportionate fair share fee would be applied, it would stay within the City's boundary and the City would decide what projects that fee would fund.

Mr. Bell responded that was correct, stating that in September of this fiscal year, when the City adopted its Annual Budget and the five-year Capital Improvements Budget, part of that was a five-year Capital Improvement Plan that dealt with pedestrian improvements, etc. He explained that the City will look at the list of projects and needs and adjust them each year to the City's revenue sources; each year after that is done, an Amendment to the Capital Improvements Element in the Comprehensive Plan is done and sent to the Department of Community Affairs. He noted it is possible the per trip cost may vary according to the cost of projects and the schedule the City has adopted; however, the City has the authority, under this program, to apply the fee that was collected to any project within the City that the City has identified as a high priority, to make things work. While money contributed on proportionate fair share may not benefit that particular developer, he said it benefits the community at-large, which is the beauty of having a City-wide multimodal transportation district. He explained the only dilemma is the law requires the boundaries be fixed to those of the City right now; as annexation takes place, those annexed areas are not automatically in the multimodal transportation district, but can be brought in by amending the plan.

Council Member Fernandez questioned if a development comes in and needs a roadway improvement, whether they pay a FDOT concurrency fee in addition to the City's fee.

Mr. Bell responded that under this law and under this program implementing the law, the developer and the City are exempt from having to meet concurrency for the roadways. He explained the City has no way to order those improvements because the City does not have jurisdiction over the roadway. Council Member Fernandez clarified she was not talking about the City ordering the improvements; she was referring to Fletcher Avenue needing to be six lanes instead of four, and whether FDOT would require a developer to pay what FDOT would consider the cost of a turn lane into the property, in addition to the fees per trip.

Mr. Bowers responded that part of the reason for their extensive discussions with FDOT is because this is “their” time – FDOT does not get to come back and ask for something as part of traffic concurrency later. Relative to turn lanes, he said that is a little different, because in addition to transportation concurrency, there is something called, “Traffic Operations.” He explained that if a developer is coming in and wants a driveway permit on a State road, they have to apply to FDOT, and FDOT may require them to pay for a turn lane or other improvements as part of Traffic Operations; that would be separate from the City’s fee.

Council Member Fernandez asked whether having the designation makes it easier for the City to obtain grants or matching funds for bike trails or tunnels or other improvements that the City might not be able to afford.

Ms. Alden said there are some programs that look for a local match; there is one at the State level for trails that looks for a local match. She noted the one they used to fund the Temple Terrace Trail does not require a local match. She added they may be able to leverage contributions from the private sector with some of these other funds.

Mr. Bell added that whether they are looking for a grant or other funds, almost all programs will look for most well-thought out plan when deciding to whom they will award their grant funds. He commented that he believes the fact that the City has adopted into the City’s long-range plan a multimodal transportation district that has identified funding sources and shows the improvements the City is trying to make on a certain schedule, will be an advantage for the City when applying for additional funding. He noted the MTD will be presented in a Public Hearing tonight with a very brief introduction by City staff. He concluded that he believes this program is to the City’s advantage in the long-run and will protect its ability to grow.

The work session ended at 5:40 p.m.

Submitted by,

Melissa E. Burns, MMC
City Clerk