

Memorandum



Date: November 9, 2016
To: Honorable Chairman Jean Monestime
and Members, Board of County Commissioners
From: Carlos A. Gimenez
Mayor
Subject: Fiscal Impact Statement for Ordinance Relating to Road Impact Fees

UMSA
Supplement No. 2 to
Agenda Item No. 1G1

The proposed ordinance relating to Road Impact Fees implements a recommendation, made in the study conducted in response to Resolution No. R-772-14, to amend Chapter 33E of the Miami-Dade County Code to define a pedestrian oriented development based on specific criteria, which would qualify such developments to receive a 14.1 percent reduction in road impact fees. It also allows all areas within 1,500 feet of the core of the County's existing urban centers and urban area districts to be deemed as pedestrian oriented developments.

The administrative site plan review for an initial determination of a site's qualification as a pedestrian oriented development, along with any subsequent verification, will be performed through existing staff in the Department of Regulatory and Economic Resources. Administrative costs associated with these determinations could be covered through a proposed administrative site plan review processing fee of \$1,500.00 for an initial determination and the existing \$220.16 fee applied to zoning verifications. An amendment to Implementing Order No. 4-111 to cover these fee adjustments will be required if this ordinance is implemented.

With respect to the fiscal impact on future road impact fee collections, this reduction credits pedestrian oriented developments with a daily internalization rate and, therefore, allows the road impact fee assessed to more accurately account for a development's particular vehicular impacts. In Fiscal Year 2015-16, for development activities within 1,500 feet of the core of all urban centers and urban area districts, had the proposed discount been in place during this time period, the amount payable to the County would have been reduced by approximately \$2 million. The implementation of this ordinance may require adjusting the timeline on capital projects currently funded by road impact fee revenues to accommodate the impact of the reduction. The five year impact includes an average Present Day Cost growth of 3.3 percent.

Outside of the urban districts, it is difficult to determine how many large scale developments countywide might have qualified under these criteria, but such projects have had the ability to commission their own traffic studies, as provided for in Section 33E-9 of the Code, Fee Computation by Independent Study, to similarly account for the proposed daily internalization discount rate. Such a study would have been subject to review and approval by the Department of Transportation and Public Works. Assuming the study would have been approved, a similar discount would likely have been provided, resulting in no new fiscal impact on impact fee collections in these cases.

Attachment

Jack Osterholt
Deputy Mayor

Fis00517 162296

POD Road Impact Fee Fiscal Impact - 162296

Fiscal Impact Table

Use Existing Resources

Revenue Category	Value	Year 1	Future Yr 1	Future Yr 2	Future Yr 3	Future Yr 4	Future Yr 5	Yes	No
General Fund									
Proprietary	-\$2,072,378	-\$2,072,378	\$ (2,142,632)	\$ (2,212,696)	\$ (2,284,166)	\$ (2,360,000)	\$ (2,437,880)		X
Federal Funds									
State Funds									
Interagency Transfers									
Subtotal	\$ (2,072,378)	\$ (2,072,378)	\$ (2,142,632)	\$ (2,212,696)	\$ (2,284,166)	\$ (2,360,000)	\$ (2,437,880)		
Expenditure Category									
<i>Operating</i>									
Salary	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
Fringes	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
Court Costs									
Contractual Services									
Charges for County Services									
Other Operating	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
Grants to Outside Organizations									
Capital									
Subtotal	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
<i>Non-Operating</i>									
Debt Services									
Distribution of Funds In Trust									
Transfers									
Depreciation, Amortization, and Deletions									
Subtotal	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
Grand Total	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	

Note: Fiscal impact narrative (paragraph above the table) should contain the following, if applicable:

1. Description of the anticipated increase or decrease of expenditures listed above and current and subsequent fiscal years, if any,
2. Description of projected dollar value of anticipated expenditures that will be absorbed within existing resources within the current fiscal year,
3. Description of subsequent governmental action that will be required in order to determine anticipated revenues and expenditures, including new revenues (federal, state, or the need to increase existing fees)
4. Any long-term fiscal implications as a result of the implementation of the proposed legislation, if any, in cases where risk factors or other variables that may impact future revenues or expenditures are uncertain, volatile, or difficult to project, a description of risk factors or variables and estimate or projection of anticipated or projected impacts to revenues and expenditures
5. Description of all assumptions used to project the fiscal impact of the proposed legislation and include estimate anticipated revenues and expenditures
6. In the cases where the Mayor has determined a "no fiscal impact", a description of the assumptions and analysis used to reach that conclusion