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Background & Objectives

- Concurrency
- Concurrency Exception Areas
  - Rationale
  - Risks/Issues
- Tampa’s TCEA (1998 – 2008)
- TCEA Update Objectives
Concurrency - Definition

- Adequate public facilities must be in place at the time development impacts occur.
  - LOS Standards Adopted by local government (except SIS/TRIP)
Concurrency - Definition

- Adequate public facilities must be in place at the time development impacts occur.

  - Oh Brother!
    - 3 years – old school concurrency
    - 5 years – proportionate fair share
    - 10 or even 15 years – long term CMS
    - Never – improvements which “significantly benefit the impacted transportation system”
Seems Reasonable... Except:
– Roads aren’t sewers

Quality of Life

Health, Safety, & Welfare
Another way to say it:

- 
  **Countervailing** planning and public policy goals may come into conflict with the requirement that adequate public [transportation] facilities and services be available concurrent with the impacts of development.
What’s a Countervailing Goal?

New Development

Revenue

Capital and Operating
Countervailing Goals...

- Constrained Roads
  - Cost
  - Livability
- Create Multimodal “Habitat”
- Apply Latent Infrastructure
  - Utilities
  - Schools
  - Parks
- Preserve Greenspace/Sustainability
Concerns/Risks

- Impact to SIS/Regional Transportation System and Economy
  - Dynamic equilibrium or Malthusian dilemma?
  - In the valley...

![Graph showing density, time, transit/multimodal supportive density, and roadway network carrying capacity](image)
Concerns/Risks

- Development not paying fair share
- Development getting out of hand
Evolution of Areawide DRIs & 1985 Comprehensive Plan (Tiered LOS)

Concern over FIHS Facilities

Pay (Impact Fee) and Go!

Endeavor to Persevere!
  - Encourage, promote, etc...
Criticisms
- Impact to low density neighborhoods
- Does not do enough to focus growth
- Lack or clear mass transit plan
- Gandy Boulevard...
- Provide Mechanisms to Focus Growth

- Statutory Requirements
  - Justify size and area
  - Document multimodal mobility options
  - Document SIS impacts/mitigation strategies
  - Develop policy linkage between urban form, mobility plan, and concurrency exemptions
Data and Analysis

- Justify size and area
- Document multimodal mobility options
- Document SIS impacts/mitigation strategies
Size and Area

- Florida Administrative Code 9J-5.0055
  - Less Than 10% Vacant Land
  - At Least 5 Dwelling Units / Gross Residentially Developed Acre

- Compared to Hillsborough Urban Services Boundary (2000 TBRPM Z Data)
  - 15% of Acreage
  - 33% of Dwelling Units
  - 50% of Employment
SIS Impacts

- **SIS Demand Select Zone Assignment**
  - 40% E : E (Trips Pass Through TCEA)
  - 49% E : I (One Trip-End in TCEA)
  - 11% I : I (Both Trip-Ends in TCEA)

- **Plan to Mitigate**
  - Make Surface Street Traffic Ops and Capacity Improvements (where cost feasible)
  - Concentrate new development within existing business centers or along “Primary” transit corridors
  - Encourage Development Within Urban Services Boundary
Overall Roadway Conditions

2005

Percent of Travel by Saturation Level

Near Congestion (21%)

2015

Percent of Travel by Saturation Level

Near Congestion (14%)

2025

Percent of Travel by Saturation Level

Near Congestion (12%)

Idea Travel (13%)

Congested (75%)
Mobility Options/Needs

- No Specific Guidance for TCEAs
- Used Multimodal Transportation District (MMTD) Measures
  - Appropriate Scale of Development
  - Complementary Mix of Uses
  - Land Uses Promoting Multimodal Usage
  - Acceptable Separation of Land Uses
  - Appropriate Density and Intensity of Use
  - **Appropriate Organization of Land Uses**
  - Regional Intermodal Connectivity
  - **Interconnected Multimodal Network**
  - Acceptable Level of Service for Each Mode
  - **Acceptable Areawide Quality of Service for Each Mode**
## Organization of Land Uses (With Respect to Transit)

- 85% of Dwelling Units & 91% of Employees Served by Transit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Total Employees</th>
<th>Dwelling Units Served by a Transit Route</th>
<th>% of Dwelling Units Served by a Transit Route</th>
<th>Employees Served by a Transit Route</th>
<th>% of Employees Served by a Transit Route</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCEA</td>
<td>125,900</td>
<td>316,300</td>
<td>106,900</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>287,800</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interconnected Network

- Average of 100 Blocks/Square Mile
- 50 Blocks/Mile is Adequate
- River & Interstates Are Main Connectivity Breaks
Areawide Q/LOS

- Level of Service x Population Served
- For Transit Acceptable Q/LOS is:
  - LOS “C” for 70% of Jobs and Population

- For Current Transit Service & Year 2000 Z-Data LOS “C” Service Applies to:
  - 37% of Employees
  - 17% of Dwelling Units
Needs:

- HART Transit Emphasis Corridor Plan (or Similar Investment)
- $125 - $200m over 20 years
- $1500 - $4000 per new Unit of Development
Policy Approach

- Comprehensive Plan Policies **Enable** Variation in Sub-Area Review and Mitigation Procedures

- Sub-Area Policies Consider:
  - Magnitude of Project Impacts
  - Planned Mass Transit System
  - Urban Form Standards

- Procedural Details to be Established in Land Development Code
Downtown Revitalization
  – Downtown & Channel District CRAs
  – Downtown Areawide DRI
- Downtown Revitalization
- Urban Redevelopment
  - Westshore DRI
  - TIA
  - Drew Park CRA
  - USF
  - Heights, Central Park, Ybor CRAs
  - Port Authority
- Downtown Revitalization
- Urban Redevelopment
- Mixed-Use Corridor Villages
  - Major Commercial Corridors
  - Concurrency Exemption Dependent on Cost Affordable Transit Plan
- Downtown Revitalization
- Urban Redevelopment
- Urban Infill
  - Remainder South of Fletcher
All Development Required to:
- Be Consistent with Comprehensive Plan
- Mitigate Site Traffic Impacts
- Pay Standard Assessment (i.e. Impact Fee)
Exempt from Roadway Mitigation if:
- Consistent with Urban Form/Code
Exempt from Roadway Mitigation if:
- Consistent with Urban Form/Code
- Served by Planned Mass Transit Infrastructure
- Large Project Site Impacts (Potentially Extending to Adjacent Signals) are Addressed
Exempt from Roadway Mitigation if:
- Consistent with Urban Form/Code
- Served by Planned Mass Transit Infrastructure
- Large Project Site Impacts (Potentially Extending to Adjacent Signals) are Addressed
- Neighborhood Traffic Impacts Mitigated
Exempt from Roadway Mitigation if

- Roadway System Impacts are De Minimus
- Moderate and Large Projects Must Offset Impacts:
  - Construct Improvements
  - Proportionate Fair Share and/or
  - Neighborhood Traffic Management
Not Exempt from Concurrency;
- However, Most Development Vested by Prior Dev Orders
- Any New Development Agreements Should
  - Restore Cost Affordable LOS Standard
  - Prop Share at City’s Discretion
Land Development Code Concepts:

- Mass Transit Service Area
- Alternative LOS Measures
  - Cut-line or sub-area system performance
  - Duration of Congestion
- Neighborhood Mitigation
  - Traffic Calming
  - Bike & Pedestrian Facilities
- Implement TOD/TND Form-Based Code
Infrastructure Planning:

- Update Transportation Impact Fee
- Identify Roadway/Intersection Improvements
  - Impact Fee Project List
  - Remaining Projects Eligible for PFS
- Coordinate w/ HART for “Primary” Transit Corridor network
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