

# CITY OF NORTH PORT

## DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE UPDATE STUDY

*FINAL*

**AUGUST 31, 2020**



*Oakland Office*

1939 Harrison Street  
Suite 430  
Oakland, CA 94612  
Tel: (510) 832-0899  
Fax: (510) 832-0898

*Corporate Office*

27368 Via Industria  
Suite 110  
Temecula, CA 92590  
Tel: (800) 755-MUNI (6864)  
Fax: (909) 587-3510

*Other Regional Offices*

Lancaster, CA  
Memphis, TN  
Orlando, FL  
Phoenix, AZ  
Sacramento, CA  
Seattle, WA

[www.willdan.com](http://www.willdan.com)

This page intentionally left blank.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	3
Background and Study Objectives	3
Development Impact Fee Schedule Summary	3
Other Funding Needed	4
1. INTRODUCTION.....	5
Study Objectives	5
Fee Program Maintenance	5
Study Methodology	5
Types of Facility Standards	6
New Development Facility Needs and Costs	6
Organization of the Report	7
2. DEVELOPMENT FORECAST .....	9
Land Use Types	9
Existing and Future Development	10
Occupant Densities	10
Land Value	11
3. GENERAL GOVERNMENT FACILITIES.....	12
Service Population	12
Facility Inventories and Standards	13
Existing Inventory	13
Planned Facilities	13
Cost Allocation	14
Projected Fee Revenue	14
Fee Schedule	15
4. FIRE AND RESCUE FACILITIES.....	16
Service Population	16
Facility Inventories and Standards	17
Existing Inventory	17
Planned Facilities	17
Cost Allocation	18
Projected Fee Revenue	18
Fee Schedule	19
5. LAW ENFORCEMENT FACILITIES.....	20
Service Population	20
Facility Inventories and Standards	21
Existing Inventory	21
Planned Facilities	21
Cost Allocation	21
Projected Fee Revenue	22

Fee Schedule	23
<b>6. PARKS FACILITIES .....</b>	<b>24</b>
Service Population	24
Facility Inventories	24
Existing Parkland Inventory	24
Special Use Facilities Inventory	25
Parkland Unit Costs	26
Improved Parkland Equivalent	27
Existing Park Facility Standards	27
Facilities Needed to Accommodate New Development	28
Parks Cost per Capita	28
Fee Schedule	29
<b>7. SOLID WASTE FACILITIES .....</b>	<b>30</b>
Solid Waste Facilities Demand	30
EDU Generation by New Development	31
Existing Inventory	31
Planned Facilities	32
Cost per Equivalent Dwelling Unit	33
Projected Fee Revenue	33
Fee Schedule	34
<b>8. IMPLEMENTATION .....</b>	<b>35</b>
Impact Fee Adoption Process	35
Inflation Adjustment	35
Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP	36
<b>APPENDIX .....</b>	<b>37</b>

# Executive Summary

---

This report summarizes an analysis of public facilities fees needed to support future development in the City of North Port through 2030. It is the City's intent that the costs representing future development's share of public facilities and capital improvements be imposed on that development in the form of a development impact fee, also known as a public facilities fee. The public facilities and improvements included in this analysis are divided into the fee categories listed below:

- General Government Facilities
- Fire and Rescue Facilities
- Solid Waste Facilities
- Law Enforcement Facilities
- Park and Recreation Facilities

## Background and Study Objectives

The primary policy objective of a development impact fee program is to ensure that new development pays the capital costs associated with development. Although development also imposes operating costs, there is not a similar system to generate revenue from new development for services. The primary purpose of this report is to calculate and present fees that will enable the City to expand its inventory of public facilities, as new development creates increases in service demands.

All development impact fee-funded capital projects should be programmed through the City's five-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Using a CIP can help the City identify and direct its fee revenue to public facilities projects that will accommodate future development. By programming fee revenues to specific capital projects, the City can help ensure a reasonable relationship between new development and the use of fee revenues.

## Development Impact Fee Schedule Summary

**Table E.1** summarizes the maximum justified development impact fee schedule that would meet the City's identified needs and does not unfairly overburden new development.

**E.1: Maximum Justified Development Impact Fees**

Land Use	General Government Facilities	Fire and Rescue Facilities	Law Enforcement Facilities	Parks	Solid Waste Facilities	Total
<i>Residential (per Dwelling Unit)</i>						
Single Family	\$ 815	\$ 1,140	\$ 1,365	\$ 2,553	\$ 483	\$6,356
Multifamily	532	744	891	1,666	242	4,075
Senior Unit	382	534	640	1,196	242	2,994
<i>Nonresidential (per 1,000 Sq. Ft. or per Hotel Room)</i>						
Commercial	\$ 248	\$ 1,685	\$ 414	\$ -	\$ 2,128	\$4,475
Office	315	2,138	526	-	495	3,474
Industrial	123	835	205	-	670	1,833
Business Park	326	2,218	545	-	475	3,564
Institutional	67	454	112	-	1,449	2,082
Hotel Room	61	418	103	-	283	865

Sources: Tables 3.6, 4.6, 5.6, 6.8 and 7.7.

## Other Funding Needed

Impact fees can only fund the share of public facilities attributable to new development in North Port. They cannot be used to fund the share of facility needs generated by existing development. **Table E.2** summarizes the net project costs, impact fee revenue projections and non-fee funding required to fully fund the planned facilities identified in this report.

**Table E.2: Non-Impact Fee Funding Required**

Fee Category	Net Project Cost	Development Fee Revenue	Additional Funding Required
General Government Facilities	\$ 7,009,937	\$ 7,009,937	\$ -
Fire and Rescue Facilities	10,758,258	10,758,258	-
Law Enforcement Facilities	33,000,000	11,738,000	21,262,000
Parks	21,410,762	21,410,762	-
Solid Waste Facilities	7,712,250	5,318,000	2,394,250
Total	\$79,891,207	\$ 56,234,957	\$23,656,250

Sources: Tables 3.5, 4.5, 5.5, 6.6 and 7.6.

# 1. Introduction

---

This report presents an analysis of the need for public facilities to accommodate new development in the City of North Port. This chapter provides background for the study and explains the study approach under the following sections:

- Study Objectives;
- Fee Program Maintenance;
- Study Methodology; and
- Organization of the Report.

## Study Objectives

North Port is forecasted to experience continued development through 2030. This development will create an increase in demand for public services and the facilities required to deliver them. Given the revenue challenges described above, North Port has decided to use a development impact fee program to ensure that new development funds the share of facility costs associated with development. This report makes use of the most current available development forecasts and facility plans to update the City's existing fee program to ensure that the fee program accurately represents the facility needs resulting from new development.

## Fee Program Maintenance

Once a fee program has been adopted it must be properly maintained to ensure that the revenue collected adequately funds the facilities needed by new development. To avoid collecting inadequate revenue, the City must update inventories of existing facilities and the costs for planned facilities, and then recalculate the fees to reflect the revised costs. The use of established indices for each facility included in the inventories (land, buildings, and equipment), such as the *Engineering News-Record*, is necessary to accurately adjust the impact fees. For a list of recommended indices, see Chapter 8.

While fee updates using inflation indices are appropriate for annual or periodic updates to ensure that fee revenues keep up with increases in the costs of public facilities, it is recommended to conduct more extensive updates of the fee documentation and calculation (such as this study) when significant new data on development forecasts and/or facility plans become available. For further detail on fee program implementation, see Chapter 8.

## Study Methodology

Development impact fees are calculated to fund the cost of facilities required to accommodate development. The six steps followed in this development impact fee study include:

1. **Estimate existing development and future development:** Identify a base year for existing development and a development forecast that reflects increased demand for public facilities;
2. **Identify facility standards:** Determine the facility standards used to plan for new and expanded facilities;
3. **Determine facilities required to serve new development:** Estimate the total amount of planned facilities, and identify the share required to accommodate new development;

4. **Determine the cost of facilities required to serve new development:** Estimate the total amount and the share of the cost of planned facilities required to accommodate new development;
5. **Calculate fee schedule:** Allocate facilities costs per unit of new development to calculate the development impact fee schedule; and
6. **Identify alternative funding requirements:** Determine if any non-fee funding is required to complete projects.

The key public policy issue in development impact fee studies is the identification of facility standards (step #2, above). Facility standards document a reasonable relationship between new development and the need for new facilities. Standards ensure that new development does not fund deficiencies associated with existing development. An example of a facility standard is park acres per 1,000 residents. Using such a standard, the analysis can estimate the amount of parkland needed to serve the increase in population. Facility standards are identified for each facility category included in this analysis. An in-depth discussion of facility standards is included below.

## Types of Facility Standards

There are three separate components of facility standards:

- ◆ *Demand standards* determine the amount of facilities required to accommodate development, for example, park acres per thousand residents, square feet of library space per capita, or gallons of water per day. Demand standards may also reflect a level of service such as the vehicle volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio used in traffic planning.
- ◆ *Design standards* determine how a facility should be designed to meet expected demand, for example, park improvement requirements and technology infrastructure for City office space. Design standards are typically not explicitly evaluated as part of an impact fee analysis but can have a significant impact on the cost of facilities. Our approach incorporates the cost of planned facilities built to satisfy the City's facility design standards.
- ◆ *Cost standards* are an alternate method for determining the amount of facilities required to accommodate development based on facility costs per unit of demand. *Cost standards* are useful when demand standards were not explicitly developed for the facility planning process. *Cost standards* also enable different types of facilities to be analyzed based on a single measure (cost or value). Examples include facility costs per capita, cost per vehicle trip, or cost per gallon of water per day.

## New Development Facility Needs and Costs

A number of approaches are used to identify facility needs and costs to serve new development. This is often a two-step process: (1) identify total facility needs, and (2) allocate to new development its fair share of those needs.

There are three common methods for determining new development's fair share of planned facilities costs: the **existing inventory method**, the **system plan method** and the **planned facilities method**. Often the method selected depends on the degree to which the community has engaged in comprehensive facility master planning to identify facility needs.

The formula used by each approach and the advantages and disadvantages of each method are summarized below:

### *Existing Inventory Method*

The existing inventory method allocates costs based on the ratio of existing facilities to demand from existing development as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Current Value of Existing Facilities}}{\text{Existing Development Demand}} = \$/\text{unit of demand}$$

Under this method new development funds the expansion of facilities at the same standard currently serving existing development. By definition, the existing inventory method results in no facility deficiencies attributable to existing development. This method is often used when a long-range plan for new facilities is not available. Future facilities to serve development are identified through an annual capital improvement plan and budget process, possibly after completion of a new facility master plan. This approach is used to calculate the general government, fire and rescue and parks facilities fees in this report.

### ***System Plan Method***

This method calculates the fee based on the value of existing facilities plus the cost of planned facilities, divided by demand from existing plus new development:

$$\frac{\text{Value of Existing Facilities} + \text{Cost of Planned Facilities}}{\text{Existing} + \text{New Development Demand}} = \$/\text{unit of demand}$$

This method is useful when planned facilities need to be analyzed as part of a system that benefits both existing and new development. It is difficult, for example, to allocate a new fire station solely to new development when that station will operate as part of an integrated system of fire stations that together achieve the desired level of service.

The system plan method ensures that new development does not pay for existing deficiencies. Often facility standards based on policies such as those found in General Plans are higher than the existing facility standards. This method enables the calculation of the existing deficiency required to bring existing development up to the policy-based standard. The local agency must secure non-fee funding for that portion of planned facilities required to correct the deficiency to ensure that new development receives the level of service funded by the impact fee. This approach is used to calculate the police and solid waste facilities fees in this report.

### ***Planned Facilities Method***

The planned facilities method allocates costs based on the ratio of planned facility costs to demand from new development as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Cost of Planned Facilities}}{\text{New Development Demand}} = \$/\text{unit of demand}$$

This method is appropriate when planned facilities will entirely serve new development, or when a fair share allocation of the cost of planned facilities to new development can be estimated. An example of the former is a wastewater trunk line extension to a previously undeveloped area. An example of the latter is expansion of an existing library building and book collection, which will be needed only if new development occurs, but which, if built, will in part benefit existing development, as well. Under this method new development funds the expansion of facilities at the standards used in the applicable planning documents. This method is not used in this study.

## Organization of the Report

The determination of a public facilities fee begins with the selection of a planning horizon and identification of development projections for population and employment. These projections are used throughout the analysis of different facility categories and are summarized in Chapter 2.

Chapters 3 through 7 identify facility standards and planned facilities, allocate the cost of planned facilities between new development and other development, and identify the appropriate development impact fee for each of the following facility categories:

- General Government Facilities
- ♦ Law Enforcement Facilities

- Fire and Rescue Facilities
- Solid Waste Facilities
- ♦ Park and Recreation Facilities

Chapter 8 details the procedures that the City must follow when implementing a development impact fee program.

## 2. Development Forecast

---

Development projections are used as indicators of demand to determine facility needs and allocate those needs between existing and new development. This chapter explains the source for the development projections used in this study based on a 2019 base year and a planning horizon of 2030.

Estimates of existing development and projections of future development are critical assumptions used throughout this report. These estimates are used as follows:

- The estimate of existing development in 2019 is used as an indicator of existing facility demand and to determine existing facility standards.
- The estimate of total development in 2030 is used as an indicator of future demand to determine total facilities needed to accommodate development and remedy existing facility deficiencies, if any.
- Estimates of development from 2019 through 2030 are used to (1) allocate facility costs between new development and existing development, and (2) estimate total fee revenues.

The demand for public facilities is based on the service population, dwelling units or nonresidential development creating the need for the facilities. The service populations for all facilities included in this study include a varying weighted number of workers, to reflect varying levels of demand for facilities.

### Land Use Types

To ensure a reasonable relationship between each fee and the type of development paying the fee, development projections distinguish between different land use types. The land use types that impact fees have been calculated for are defined below.

- **Single Family:** Detached and attached single-family dwellings, including townhomes. Detached single family homes are one-unit structures detached from any other houses. Attached single family homes (also known as townhomes or row houses) are one-unit structures that have one or more walls extending from ground to roof separating them from adjoining structures.
- **Multifamily:** All attached multifamily dwellings such as duplexes, condominiums, plus mobile homes, apartments, and dormitories. These are units in structures containing two or more housing units. Second dwelling units on single family lots are also included in the other multifamily land use category.
- **Senior Unit:** All age restricted housing units.
- **Commercial:** All commercial and retail development.
- **Office:** All general, professional, and medical office development.
- **Industrial:** All manufacturing and warehouse development.
- **Business Park:** A business park consists of a group of flex-type or incubator one- or two-story buildings served by a common roadway system.
- **Institutional:** Education, worship and government land uses.
- **Hotel:** Lodging including hotel, motel and resort development.

Some developments may include more than one land use type, such as a mixed-use development with both multifamily and commercial uses. In those cases, the facilities fee would be calculated separately for each land use type.

The City has the discretion to determine which land use type best reflects a development project's characteristics for purposes of imposing an impact fee and may adjust fees for special or unique uses to reflect the impact characteristics of the use.

## Existing and Future Development

**Table 2.1** shows the estimated number of residents, dwelling units, workers, and building square feet in North Port, both in 2019 and in 2030. These estimates are used to calculate the fees for all fee categories.

The current population estimate for the North Port comes from University of Florida Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR). The projected increase in residents is based on data from the City's 2017 Comprehensive Plan.

The nonresidential estimate of 6,117 total workers less 664 local government workers is based on data from OnTheMap.ces.census.gov. The increase in employment in North Port to 2030 is estimated by maintaining the current jobs-housing balance.

**Table 2.1: Existing and New Development**

	2019	2030	Increase
Residents <sup>1</sup>	73,652	93,693	20,041
Employment <sup>2</sup>	6,117	7,781	1,664

<sup>1</sup> Existing residents from University of Florida Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) data. Residents in 2030 identified in the City of North Port Comprehensive Plan (2017) as a BEBR estimate.

<sup>3</sup> Estimate of 6,781 total workers less 664 local government workers based on data from OnTheMap.ces.census.gov. Increase in employment based on maintaining the current jobs-housing balance.

Sources: University of Florida, Bureau of Economic and Business Research, 2019.; U.S. Census Bureau LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (2002-2015) accessed at <https://onthemap.ces.census.gov>; Table 1-4, Table 2-6c, City of North Port Comprehensive Plan (2017); Willdan Financial Services.

## Occupant Densities

All fees in this report are calculated based on dwelling units or building square feet. Because service demand is based on population, it is necessary to use occupant density assumptions to calculate per-unit and per-square-foot fees. Occupant density assumptions ensure a reasonable relationship between the size of a development project, the increase in service population associated with the project, and the amount of the fee.

Occupant densities (residents per dwelling unit or workers per building square foot) are the most appropriate characteristics to use for most impact fees. The fee imposed should be based on the land use type that most closely represents the probable occupant of the development.

The average occupant density factors used in this report are shown in **Table 2.2**. The residential occupant density factors for both the various types of dwelling units were calculated using the most recently available data from US Census' American Community Survey specific to the City of North Port. Table B25033 identifies the estimated population, by type of dwelling unit. Table B25024 identifies the total amount of dwelling units, by type. The occupant densities resulting from dividing the population by the corresponding dwelling unit type is shown in Table 2.2.

The nonresidential occupancy factors are calculated based on data from the most recent Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 10<sup>th</sup> Edition. The transportation survey data reported in this resource per 1,000 building square foot or per employee can be cross referenced for each land use to calculate the number of employees per 1,000 square feet for building space for each land use included in the survey.

**Table 2.2: Occupant Density**

<i>Residential</i>		
Single Family	2.39	Residents per dwelling unit
Multifamily	1.56	Residents per dwelling unit
Senior Unit	1.12	Residents per dwelling unit
<i>Nonresidential</i>		
Commercial	2.34	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Office	2.97	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Industrial	1.16	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Business Park	3.08	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Institutional	0.63	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Hotel	0.58	Employees per Room

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Tables B25024 and B25033; Commission on affordable housing and health facility needs for seniors in the 21st century, 2002; Energy Star Benchmarking For Senior Care Facility, 2010; ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition; Willdan Financial Services.

## Land Value

The analysis in this report relies on valuing the City’s existing investment in public facilities. One component of this value is the value of land owned by the City. Table 2.3 displays the average assumed value per acre for land in North Port. This figure was calculated using data from three residential appraisals within the City in 2019. Commercial properties in the City are worth considerably more than the assumed \$43,000 per acre shown in Table 2.3, however, this analysis uses this lower residential land value per acre cost assumption to be conservative.

**Table 2.3: Land Values**

	Average Value Per Acre	
Residential	\$	43,000

Sources: Appraisals of residential property in North Port, 5-31-19, 8-7-19 and 11-6-19.

# 3. General Government Facilities

The purpose of the general government impact fee is to fund the general government facilities needed to serve new development.

## Service Population

General government facilities serve both residents and businesses. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities are based on the City's service population including residents and workers.

**Table 3.1** shows the existing and future projected service population for general government facilities. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one worker compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development yields a lesser demand for general government facilities.

**Table 3.1: General Government Facilities Service Population**

	A Persons	B Weighting Factor	A x B = C Service Population
<i>Residents</i>			
Existing (2019)	73,652	1.00	73,652
New Development	<u>20,041</u>	1.00	<u>20,041</u>
Total (2030)	93,693		93,693
<i>Workers</i>			
Existing (2019)	6,117	0.31	1,896
New Development	<u>1,664</u>	0.31	<u>516</u>
Total (2030)	7,781		2,412
<i>Combined Residents and Weighted Workers</i>			
Existing (2019)			75,548
New Development			<u>20,557</u>
Total (2030)			96,105

<sup>1</sup> Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40 hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week (40/128 = 0.31)

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

## Facility Inventories and Standards

This section describes the City's general government facility inventory and facility standards.

### Existing Inventory

**Table 3.2** shows the existing general government facility inventory. The replacement cost for the buildings is based on data provided by the City. The assumed per acre value of land is based on Willdan's review of three residential property appraisals provided by the North Port and is used consistently throughout this analysis. The table also includes the replacement value of the City's general government vehicle fleet. More detail regarding the vehicle fleet is contained in **Appendix Table A.1**. In total, the City owns approximately \$25.7 million worth of general government facilities.

**Table 3.2: Existing General Government Facilities Inventory**

	Inventory	Units	Unit Cost	Replacement Cost
<i>Land (acres)</i>				
City Hall <sup>1</sup>	17.82	acres	\$ 43,000	\$ 766,000
Family Service Center/CEC	5.10	acres	43,000	219,000
Public Works/Fleet Facility <sup>2</sup>	6.50	acres	43,000	280,000
Subtotal - Land	29.42	acres		\$ 1,265,000
<i>Buildings (square feet)</i>				
City Hall	71,747	sq. ft.	\$ 226	\$ 16,206,212
Community Education Center	8,455	sq. ft.	55	462,404
Social Services Building	28,539	sq. ft.	103	2,943,227
Public Works/Fleet Facility <sup>2</sup>	19,333	sq. ft.	251	4,847,253
Subtotal - Buildings	128,074			\$ 24,459,097
<i>Vehicles (See Appendix Table A.1)</i>				\$ 1,518,011
Total Value - Existing Facilities				\$ 25,724,097

<sup>1</sup> Total parcel size is 39.47 acres. Amount shown above excludes share allocated to Fire Station 81, City Hall Front Green, George Mullen Center grounds and Larry Thoennissen Athletic Fields.

<sup>2</sup> Public works share of 29,000 sf building and 9.75 acres, based on FTEs in public works relative to FTEs in solid waste. Two-thirds of the value of this facility is included in this general government fee, and one-third is included in the solid waste facilities fee.

Sources: City of North Port; Table 2.3, Willdan Financial Services.

### Planned Facilities

The City of North Port's unfunded capital improvement plan identifies Phase 2 of the Public Works Facility for the general government facility fee category. The majority of this facility will be funded by Road and Drainage District and Solid Waste District Funding. **Table 3.3** presents the planned cost estimates, net of identified funding. These facilities only represent the initial facilities to be funded through this impact fee. The City will have to identify additional general government

facilities in order to maintain its existing standard of general government facilities as new development occurs.

**Table 3.3: Planned General Government Facilities**

	Value
Public Works Facility - Phase 2	\$ 7,560,450
Less Road and Drainage District Funding	4,021,250
Less Solid Waste District Funding	<u>3,148,750</u>
Net Cost of Planned Facility	\$ 390,450

Source: City of North Port Capital Improvement Program.

## Cost Allocation

**Table 3.4** calculates the City's existing per capita investment in general government facilities. This facility standard is calculated by dividing value of the City's existing facility inventory by the existing service population. The value per capita is multiplied by the worker weighting factor of 0.31 to determine the value per worker. Note that the value of the existing inventory of general government facilities drives this facility standard, not the cost of the planned facility.

**Table 3.4: General Government Facilities Existing Standard**

Value of Existing Facilities	\$ 25,724,097
Existing Service Population	<u>75,548</u>
Cost per Capita	\$ 341
Facility Standard per Resident	\$ 341
Facility Standard per Worker <sup>2</sup>	106

<sup>1</sup> Based on a weighting factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 3.1 and 3.2.

## Projected Fee Revenue

The City plans to use general government facilities fee revenue to construct improvements to add to the system of general government facilities to serve new development. **Table 3.5** details a projection of fee revenue based on the service population growth increment identified in Table 3.1. The City will need to identify \$6.6 million in additional general government facilities to serve new development through 2030 in order to maintain its existing standard of general government facilities.

**Table 3.5: Revenue Projection - Existing Standard**

Cost per Capita	\$	341
Growth in Service Population (2019- 2030)		20,557
Fee Revenue	\$	7,009,937
Net Cost of Planned Facilities		390,450
Additional Facilities to Be Identified	\$	6,619,487

Sources: Tables 3.1, 3.3 and 3.4.

## Fee Schedule

**Table 3.6** shows the maximum justified general government facilities fee schedule. The facility standard cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or workers per 1,000 square feet nonresidential building space or per hotel room) identified in Table 2.2.

**Table 3.6: General Government Facilities Fee - Existing Standard**

Land Use	A	B	C = A x B	D = C / 1,000
	Cost Per Capita	Density	Fee <sup>1</sup>	Fee per Sq. Ft.
<i>Residential - per Dwelling Unit</i>				
Single Family	\$ 341	2.39	\$ 815	
Multifamily	341	1.56	532	
Senior Unit	341	1.12	382	
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft. or Hotel Room</i>				
Commercial	\$ 106	2.34	\$ 248	\$ 0.25
Office	106	2.97	315	0.32
Industrial	106	1.16	123	0.12
Business Park	106	3.08	326	0.33
Institutional	106	0.63	67	0.07
Hotel Room	106	0.58	61	n/a

<sup>1</sup> Fee per dwelling unit, per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential or per hotel room.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 3.4.

# 4. Fire and Rescue Facilities

The purpose of the fire and rescue facilities impact fee is to fund the fire and rescue facilities needed to serve new development.

## Service Population

Fire and rescue facilities serve both residents and businesses. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities are based on the City's service population including residents and workers.

**Table 4.1** shows the existing and future projected service population for fire and rescue facilities. To calculate service population for fire and rescue facilities, residents are weighted at 1.00. The use of a worker demand factor of 1.51 for workers in North Port is based on an analysis of calls for service, categorized by land use, in the City from January 2018 through February 2020. Total calls to residential land uses were divided by the residential population to yield an annual calls-per-capita factor. Dividing total calls to nonresidential areas by total employment in the City yielded a comparable per-capita factor. The ratio of the worker per capita factor to the resident per capita factor is the worker demand factor used in the analysis.

**Table 4.1: Fire and Rescue Facilities Service Population**

	A Persons	B Weighting Factor	A x B = C Service Population
<i>Residents</i>			
Existing (2019)	73,652	1.00	73,652
New Development	20,041	1.00	20,041
Total (2030)	93,693		93,693
<i>Workers</i>			
Existing (2019)	6,117	1.51	9,237
New Development	1,664	1.51	2,513
Total (2030)	7,781		11,750
<i>Combined Residents and Weighted Workers</i>			
Existing (2019)			82,889
New Development			22,554
Total (2030)			105,443

<sup>1</sup> Workers are weighted at 1.51 of residents based on an analysis of City of North Port calls for service from January 2018 through February 2020.

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

## Facility Inventories and Standards

This section describes the City's fire and rescue facility inventory and facility standards.

### Existing Inventory

**Table 4.2** shows the existing fire and rescue facility inventory. The replacement cost for the buildings is based on data provided by the City. The assumed per acre value of land is based on Willdan's review of three residential property appraisals provided by the North Port and is used consistently throughout this analysis. More detail regarding the fire and rescue vehicles and apparatus' is contained in **Appendix Table A.2**. In total, the City owns approximately \$39.5 million worth of fire and rescue facilities, including land, buildings, vehicles and apparatus

**Table 4.2: Existing Fire and Rescue Facilities Inventory**

	Inventory	Unit	Unit Cost	Replacement Cost
<i>Land (acres)</i>				
Station 81/Headquarters <sup>1</sup>	3.65	acres	\$ 43,000	\$ 156,950
Station 82 <sup>2</sup>	3.00	acres	43,000	129,000
Station 83	1.78	acres	43,000	76,540
Station 84	3.00	acres	43,000	129,000
Station 85	4.83	acres	43,000	207,690
Subtotal	16.26			\$ 699,180
<i>Buildings (square feet)</i>				
Fire Station 81	14,602	sq. ft.	\$ 400	\$ 5,840,800
Fire Station 82	12,743	sq. ft.	400	5,097,200
Fire Station 83	9,538	sq. ft.	400	3,815,200
Fire Station 84	11,408	sq. ft.	400	4,563,200
Fire Station 85	8,800	sq. ft.	400	3,520,000
Subtotal	57,091			\$ 22,836,400
<i>Vehicles and Apparatus (See Appendix Table A.2)</i>				\$ 15,961,030
Total Value - Existing Facilities				\$ 39,496,610

<sup>1</sup> Fire Station 81 shares a site with City Hall and the George Mullen Center. Total site acreage is 39.47 acres. Fire station allocation shown in this table.

<sup>2</sup> Fire Station 82 shares a site with Dallas White Park. Total site acreage is 17.10 acres. Fire station allocation shown in this table.

Sources: City of North Port; Table 2.3, Willdan Financial Services.

### Planned Facilities

The City plans to construct two new fire stations to serve both existing and new development within City limits, as shown in the City's CIP. The cost of these two facilities, net of tax funding is shown in **Table 4.3**.

**Table 4.3: Planned Fire and Rescue Facilities**

	Value
Fire Station 87	\$ 6,320,000
Fire Station 86 <sup>1</sup>	<u>8,921,000</u>
Total Cost of Planned Facilities	\$ 6,320,000
Less Tax Funded	\$ 3,364,000
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	\$ 2,956,000

<sup>1</sup> Project cost net of \$475,000 funded in prior years by impact fees.

Source: City of North Port Capital Improvement Program.

## Cost Allocation

**Table 4.4** calculates the City's existing per capita investment in fire and rescue facilities. This facility standard is calculated by dividing value of the City's existing facility inventory by the existing service population. The value per capita is multiplied by the worker weighting factor of 1.51 to determine the facility standard per worker. Note that the value of the existing inventory of fire and rescue facilities drives this facility standard, not the cost of the planned facilities.

**Table 4.4: Fire and Rescue Facilities Existing Standard**

Value of Existing Facilities	\$ 39,496,610
Existing Service Population	<u>82,889</u>
Cost per Capita	\$ 477
Facility Standard per Resident	\$ 477
Facility Standard per Worker <sup>2</sup>	720

<sup>1</sup> Based on a weighting factor of 1.51.

Sources: Tables 4.1 and 4.2.

## Projected Fee Revenue

**Table 4.5** details a projection of fee revenue based on the service population growth increment identified in Table 4.1. The City must spend the projected fee revenue on new or expanded fire and rescue facilities to serve new development in order to maintain its existing facility standard. Future uses of fire and rescue facilities fee revenue will be identified through the City's CIP.

**Table 4.5: Revenue Projection - Existing Standard**

Cost per Capita	\$	477
Growth in Service Population (2019- 2030)		22,554
Fee Revenue	\$	10,758,258
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	\$	2,956,000
Additional Facilities to be Identified	\$	7,802,258

Sources: Tables 4.1, 4.3 and 4.4

## Fee Schedule

**Table 4.6** shows the maximum justified fire and rescue facilities fee schedule. The City can adopt any fee up to these amounts. The facility standard cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or workers per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space or per hotel room) identified in Table 2.2.

**Table 4.6: Fire and Rescue Facilities Fee - Existing Standard**

Land Use	A		B		C = A x B		D = C / 1,000	
	Cost Per Capita		Density		Fee <sup>1</sup>		Fee per Sq. Ft.	
<i>Residential - per Dwelling Unit</i>								
Single Family	\$	477	2.39	\$	1,140			
Multifamily		477	1.56		744			
Senior Unit		477	1.12		534			
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft. or Hotel Room</i>								
Commercial	\$	720	2.34	\$	1,685	\$	1.69	
Office		720	2.97		2,138		2.14	
Industrial		720	1.16		835		0.84	
Business Park		720	3.08		2,218		2.22	
Institutional		720	0.63		454		0.45	
Hotel Room		720	0.58		418		n/a	

<sup>1</sup> Fee per dwelling unit, per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential or per hotel room.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 4.4.

# 5. Law Enforcement Facilities

The purpose of the law enforcement facilities impact fee is to fund the law enforcement facilities needed to serve new development.

## Service Population

Law enforcement facilities serve both residents and businesses. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities are based on the City's service population including residents and workers.

**Table 5.1** shows the existing and future projected service population for law enforcement facilities. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one worker compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development yields a lesser demand for law enforcement facilities.

**Table 5.1: Law Enforcement Facilities Service Population**

	A Persons	B Weighting Factor	A x B = C Service Population
<i>Residents</i>			
Existing (2019)	73,652	1.00	73,652
New Development	<u>20,041</u>	1.00	<u>20,041</u>
Total (2030)	93,693		93,693
<i>Workers</i>			
Existing (2019)	6,117	0.31	1,896
New Development	<u>1,664</u>	0.31	<u>516</u>
Total (2030)	7,781		2,412
<i>Combined Residents and Weighted Workers</i>			
Existing (2019)			75,548
New Development			<u>20,557</u>
Total (2030)			96,105

<sup>1</sup> Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40 hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week (40/128 = 0.31)

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

## Facility Inventories and Standards

This section describes the City’s law enforcement facility inventory and facility standards.

### Existing Inventory

**Table 5.2** shows the existing law enforcement facility inventory. The replacement cost for the buildings is based on data provided by the City. The assumed per acre value of land is based on Willdan’s review of three residential property appraisals provided by the North Port and is used consistently throughout this analysis. More detail regarding the law enforcement vehicle inventory is contained in **Appendix Table A.3**. In total, the City owns approximately \$21.9 million worth of law enforcement facilities, including land, buildings, vehicles and equipment.

**Table 5.2: Existing Law Enforcement Facilities Inventory**

	Inventory	Unit	Unit Cost	Replacement Cost
<i>Police Headquarters</i>				
Land	8.12	acres	\$ 43,000	\$ 349,160
Building	39,370	sq. ft.	340	13,385,800
Subtotal				\$ 13,734,960
<i>Vehicles and Equipment (Appendix Table A.3)</i>				\$ 8,184,925
Total Value - Existing Facilities				\$ 21,919,885

Sources: City of North Port; Table 2.3, Willdan Financial Services.

### Planned Facilities

The City plans to construct an additional station to serve both existing and new development within City limits, as shown in the City’s CIP. The cost of this facility is shown in **Table 5.3**. Note that no alternative funding has yet been identified to fund the facility.

**Table 5.3: Planned Police Facilities**

	Value
Police Station Construction	\$ 33,000,000

Source: City of North Port Capital Improvement Program.

## Cost Allocation

**Table 5.4** shows the calculation of the system standard of law enforcement facilities. The system standard represents new development’s projected per capita investment in law enforcement

facilities at the planning horizon. This value is calculated by dividing the total value of the system of law enforcement facilities by the projected service population in 2040.

**Table 5.4: Law Enforcement Facilities Existing Standard**

Value of Existing Facilities	\$	21,919,885
Value of Planned Facilities		<u>33,000,000</u>
Total System Value (2030)	\$	54,919,885
Future Service Population (2030)		<u>96,105</u>
Cost per Capita	\$	571
Cost Allocation per Resident	\$	571
Cost Allocation per Worker <sup>1</sup>		177

<sup>1</sup> Based on a weighing factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3.

## Projected Fee Revenue

**Table 5.5** details a projection of fee revenue based on the service population growth increment identified in Table 5.1. The City must spend the projected fee revenue on new or expanded law enforcement facilities to serve new development in order to achieve the system facility standard at the planning horizon. The City plans to construct the facilities listed in Table 5.3.

**Table 5.5: Revenue Projection - System Standard**

Cost per Capita	\$	571
Growth in Service Population (2019- 2030)		<u>20,557</u>
Fee Revenue	\$	11,738,000
Net Cost of Planned Facilities		<u>33,000,000</u>
Non-Fee Revenue to Be Identified	\$	(21,262,000)

Sources: Tables 5.1, 5.3 and 5.4.

## Fee Schedule

**Table 5.6** shows the maximum justified law enforcement facilities fee schedule. The City can adopt any fee up to these amounts. The facility standard cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or workers per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space or per hotel room) identified in Table 2.2.

**Table 5.6: Law Enforcement Facilities Fee - System Standard**

Land Use	A	B	C = A x B		D = C / 1,000
	Cost Per Capita	Density	Base Fee <sup>1</sup>		Fee per Sq. Ft.
<i>Residential - per Dwelling Unit</i>					
Single Family	\$ 571	2.39	\$ 1,365		
Multifamily	571	1.56	891		
Senior Unit	571	1.12	640		
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft. or Hotel Room</i>					
Commercial	\$ 177	2.34	\$ 414	\$	0.41
Office	177	2.97	526		0.53
Industrial	177	1.16	205		0.21
Business Park	177	3.08	545		0.55
Institutional	177	0.63	112		0.11
Hotel Room	177	0.58	103		n/a

<sup>1</sup> Fee per dwelling unit, per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential or per hotel room.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 5.5.

# 6. Parks Facilities

---

The purpose of this fee is to generate revenue to fund the park and recreation facilities needed to serve new development. The impact fee is based on maintaining the City’s existing parkland standard per 1,000 residents.

## Service Population

Facility standards for parks are typically expressed as a ratio of park acres per 1,000 residents. As residents are the primary users of parks in North Port, demand for parks and associated facilities is based on the City’s residential population, rather than a combined resident-worker service population. **Table 6.1** provides estimates of the City’s current and projected park service population.

**Table 6.1: Parks Service Population**

	<b>Residents</b>
Existing (2019)	73,652
New Development	<u>20,041</u>
Total (2030)	93,693

Source: Table 2.1.

---

## Facility Inventories

This section describes the City’s park facility inventory, facility standards, and park facility costs.

### Existing Parkland Inventory

The City of North Port maintains several park and recreation facilities throughout the city. **Table 6.2** summarizes the City’s existing parkland inventory. All facilities are located within the City limits. The inventory makes a distinction between fully improved parkland, and unimproved parkland. The City’s Park Master Plan served as the basis for this inventory. The data from the Master Plan was supplemented with data from the City’s geographic information systems (GIS) and parcel database.

**Table 6.2: Existing Parkland Inventory**

	Improved Park Acres	Unimproved Park/Open Space Acres	Total
Atwater Park	26.17	-	26.17
Blue Ridge Park	6.13	-	6.13
Butler Park	40.00	-	40.00
Canine Club	3.07	8.93	12.00
City Hall Campus - Front Green	6.00	-	6.00
City Hall Campus - George Mullen Center	7.00	-	7.00
City Hall Campus - Larry Thoennissen Athletic Fields	5.00	-	5.00
Dallas White Park <sup>1</sup>	14.10	-	14.10
Garden of Five Senses	16.43	18.84	35.27
Highland Ridge Park	7.99	-	7.99
Hope Park	1.89	-	1.89
Kirk Park	1.40	-	1.40
LaBrea Park	2.65	-	2.65
Marina Park <sup>2</sup>	0.72	-	0.72
Marius Park	-	0.51	0.51
McKibben Park	3.51	-	3.51
Myakkahatchee Creek Park	-	163.20	163.20
Narramore Park including Glenallen sports fields <sup>3</sup>	24.00	-	24.00
Oaks Park	16.60	-	16.60
Pine Park	2.56	-	2.56
Recreation / Open Space / Myakkahatchee Creek Corridor / Preserves	-	118.04	118.04
Skate Park	0.85	-	0.85
Sumter Linear Park	56.00	-	56.00
Veteran's Park	2.87	-	2.87
Warm Mineral Springs Park	81.28	-	81.28
Future Park - 63 Acre Park	-	63.00	63.00
Future Park - Boca Chica	-	4.19	4.19
Future Park - Italy Ave	-	47.24	47.24
Future Park - Langlais	-	53.50	53.50
<b>Total</b>	<b>326.22</b>	<b>477.45</b>	<b>803.67</b>

<sup>1</sup> Total parcel size is 17.10 acres. Fire station 82 occupies 3 acres of this site. Park use allocation show n.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes 0.30 acres leased to Coast Guard

<sup>3</sup> City has joint use agreement for public use of sports fields at Glenallen school. Fields are open for public use.

Sources: City of North Port Parks Master Plan; City of North Port GIS.

## Special Use Facilities Inventory

**Table 6.3** summarizes the City's inventory of special use facilities, including community centers and the City's recently completed Aquatic Center. The total value of these facilities is divided by the total developed park acres to determine the City's investment in special use facilities per developed park acre.

**Table 6.3: Special Use Facilities**

	Inventory Units	Unit Cost	Replacement Cost
George Mullen Activity Center	24,174 sq. ft.	\$ 121	\$ 2,933,820
Morgan Center	33,000 sq. ft.	121	4,004,967
North Port Aquatic Center			12,000,000
Subtotal			\$ 18,938,787
Total Value - Existing Facilities			\$ 18,938,787
Developed Park Acres			326.22
Investment per Developed Park Acre			\$ 58,055

Sources: City of North Port; Willdan Financial Services.

## Parkland Unit Costs

**Table 6.4** shows the estimated cost per acre for developing parkland, including land acquisition, standard park improvements. The assumed per acre value of land is based on Willdan's review of three residential property appraisals provided by the North Port and is used consistently throughout this analysis. The assumed standard park improvement cost per acre of \$75,000 is based on the cost of constructing a four-acre neighborhood park identified in the City's CIP. Also included in the inventory is average value per improved acre of special use facilities and vehicles and park maintenance equipment owned by the City. See **Appendix Table A.4** for more detail regarding vehicles and equipment.

**Table 6.4: Parkland Unit Costs**

	Cost per Acre	Share of Parkland Costs
Standard Park Improvements <sup>1</sup>	\$ 75,000	42%
Special Use Facilities (See Table 6.3)	58,055	
Vehicles and Equipment (See Appendix Table A.4)	2,300	
Subtotal	\$ 135,355	
Land Acquisition	\$ 43,000	24%
Total Cost per Acre	\$ 178,355	66%

Note: Figures have been rounded.

<sup>1</sup> Based on cost of constructing 4 acre neighborhood park identified in the City's Capital Improvement Plan.

Source: City of North Port Capital Improvement Program; Willdan Financial Services.

## Improved Parkland Equivalent

Prior to calculating the existing parkland standard, unimproved parkland owned by the City must be converted to an equivalent amount of improved parkland. This conversion is necessary so that the resulting parkland standards calculated later in this chapter accurately reflect the City's investment in parkland. Unimproved parkland costs less than improved parkland. If unimproved parkland was used to calculate the parkland standard, then the resulting standard would overstate the City's standards. Similarly, if unimproved parkland were completely excluded from the calculation of the City's parkland standard, then the resulting standard would be understated.

**Table 6.5** details this conversion. The conversion is based on the ratio of the cost of an improved acre of land (including land and improvements) relative to an acre of unimproved parkland (only land), by park type.

**Table 6.5: Improved Parkland Equivalent**

Type	
Improved Parkland	\$ 178,355
Land Acquisition	43,000
Land Acquisition Costs as Percentage of Improved Parkland costs	24%
Unimproved Acres	477.45
Equivalent Improved Acres	114.59

Sources: Tables 6.2 and 6.4.

## Existing Park Facility Standards

**Table 6.6** shows the existing parkland standard based on the parkland acreage shown in Table 6.2, the improved equivalent acres calculated in Table 6.5 and the existing residential population shown in Table 6.1. The City has an existing standard of 5.99 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents.

**Table 6.6: Existing Parkland Standard**

Improved Park Acreage	326.22
Improved Park Acreage Equivalent	114.59
Total - Park Acres	440.81
Service Population	73,652
Existing Standard (Acres per 1,000 Capita)	5.99

Sources: Tables 6.1, 6.2 and 6.5.

## Facilities Needed to Accommodate New Development

**Table 6.7** calculates the park facilities needed to accommodate new development at the existing standard. To contribute to new facilities at the existing standard new development must fund the acquisition and improvement of 120.05 acres of parkland.

**Table 6.7: Park Facilities to Accommodate New Development**

<b>Existing Standard</b>		
<i>Facility Needs</i>		
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 service population)	A	5.99
Growth in Service Population	B	<u>20,041</u>
Facility Needs (acres)	$C = (B/1,000) \times A$	120.05
<i>Parkland Acquisition and Improvement</i>		
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	D	<u>\$ 178,355</u>
<b>Total Cost of Facilities</b>	$E = C \times D$	<b>\$ 21,410,762</b>

Note: Totals have been rounded to the thousands.

Sources: Tables 6.1, 6.4, and 6.6; Willdan Financial Services.

## Parks Cost per Capita

**Table 6.8** calculates the cost per capita of providing new parks and recreation facilities at the existing facility standard. First, the per acre unit costs are multiplied by the acreage standards to determine the total amount of costs needed to serve 1,000 residents. Then, those costs are divided by 1,000 to determine the cost needed to serve one resident.

**Table 6.8: Park Facilities Investment Per Capita**

	<b>Total</b>
<b>Existing Standard</b>	
Parkland Investment (per acre)	\$ 178,355
Facility Standard (acres per 1,000 service pop.)	<u>5.99</u>
Total Investment Per 1,000 capita	\$ 1,068,348
	<u>1,000</u>
Investment Per Capita	\$ 1,068

Sources: Tables 6.4, and 6.6; Willdan Financial Services.

## Fee Schedule

**Table 6.9** shows the maximum justified park facilities fee schedule. The facility standard cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on the residential dwelling unit densities (persons per dwelling unit) identified in Table 2.2.

**Table 6.9: Park and Recreation Facilities Impact Fee**

Land Use	A		B		C = A x B	
	Cost Per		Density		Fee <sup>1</sup>	
	Capita					
<b>Existing Standard</b>						
<i>Residential - per Dwelling Unit</i>						
Single Family	\$	1,068	2.39	\$	2,553	
Multifamily		1,068	1.56		1,666	
Senior Unit		1,068	1.12		1,196	

<sup>1</sup> Fee per dwelling unit.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 6.8; Willdan Financial Services.

# 7. Solid Waste Facilities

The purpose of the solid waste impact fee is to fund the solid waste facilities needed to serve new development.

## Solid Waste Facilities Demand

Demand for solid waste facilities is expressed in terms of the tonnage of solid waste generated by a particular unit of development, commonly referred to as waste generation units (WGU). Waste generation units are the number of annual tons of waste produced by a dwelling unit, per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential space, or per hotel room. **Table 7.1** presents estimates of North Port's WGUs and then relates each WGU to the demand created by one single family dwelling unit. These equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) factors are then used to calculate the fee schedule by land use.

Single family WGUs were provided by the City of North Port, based on most recent 5-year average, FY2015-FY2019. Other residential WGUs and all nonresidential factors based on data from the City's 2011 Impact Fee Update Study.

**Table 7.1: Solid Waste - Equivalent Dwelling Units**

Land Use	Waste Generation Units (WGU) <sup>1</sup>	Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDU) <sup>2</sup>
<i>Residential - per Dwelling Unit</i>		
Single Family	1.16	1.00
Multifamily	0.58	0.50
Senior Unit	0.58	0.50
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft. or Hotel Room</i>		
Commercial	5.11	4.41
Office	1.19	1.03
Industrial	1.61	1.39
Business Park	1.14	0.98
Institutional	3.48	3.00
Hotel Room	0.68	0.59

<sup>1</sup> Waste generation units are the number of annual tons of waste produced by a dwelling unit, per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential space, or per hotel room. Single family waste generation provided by the City of North Port, based on most recent 5-year average, FY2015-FY2019. Other residential WGUs and all nonresidential factors based on data from the City's 2011 Impact Fee Update Study.

<sup>2</sup> EDU factors relate demand for solid waste facilities in terms of the demand created by a single family dwelling unit, in terms of tons of waste generated.

Sources: City of North Port; City of North Port Impact Fee Update, 2011; Willdan Financial Services.

## EDU Generation by New Development

**Table 7.2** shows the estimated EDU generation from new development through 2030. Residential and nonresidential populations are projected to increase by 27% by 2030. This analysis assumes that solid waste demand will increase proportionally to population and employment growth. Base year solid waste generation statistics were provided by the City of North Port. Total tonnage generated is divided by the WGU for a single family unit to determine the estimated number of EDUs creating demand for solid waste facilities in the base year and in 2030.

**Table 7.2: Total Residential Solid Waste Generation**

	2019	2030	Increase <sup>1</sup>
<i>Residential</i>			
Garbage	25,784	32,746	6,962
Recycling	6,866	8,720	1,854
Yard Waste	4,006	5,088	1,082
Subtotal	36,656	46,554	9,898
<i>Commercial</i>			
Garbage	10,024	12,730	2,706
Recycling	625	794	169
Subtotal	10,649	13,524	2,875
Total Tonnage	47,305	60,078	12,773
Annual Waste Generation per EDU	1.16	1.16	1.16
Estimated EDUs	40,780	51,791	11,011

<sup>1</sup> Increase based on projected 27% residential and nonresidential growth to 2030, consistent with Table 2.1.

Sources: City of North Port; Tables 2.1 and 7.1, Willdan Financial Services.

## Existing Inventory

**Table 7.3** shows the existing solid waste facility inventory. The assumed per acre value of land is based on Willdan's review of three residential property appraisals provided by the North Port and is used consistently throughout this analysis. More detail regarding the solid waste facilities vehicle inventory is contained in **Appendix Table A.5**. In total, the City owns approximately \$17.2 million worth of solid waste facilities.

**Table 7.3: Existing Solid Waste Facilities Inventory**

	Inventory	Unit	Unit Cost	Replacement Cost
<i>Solid Waste Facility</i>				
Land	0.44	acres	\$ 43,000	\$ 18,947
Public Works/Fleet Facility <sup>1</sup>	3.25	acres	43,000	<u>139,750</u>
Subtotal				\$ 158,697
<i>Buildings</i>				
Solid Waste Crew Building	1,776	sq. ft.	\$ 72	\$ 127,192
Public Works/Fleet Facility <sup>1</sup>	9,667	sq. ft.	251	<u>2,423,627</u>
Subtotal				\$ 2,550,819
<i>Vehicles and Equipment (See Appendix Table A.5)</i>				<u>\$ 14,488,191</u>
Total Value - Existing Facilities				\$ 17,197,707

<sup>1</sup> Solid waste share of 29,000 sf building and 9.75 acres, based on FTEs in solid waste relative to FTEs in public works. Two-thirds of the value of this facility is included in this general government fee, and one-third is included in the solid waste facilities fee.

Sources: City of North Port; Table 2.3, Willdan Financial Services.

## Planned Facilities

**Table 7.4** details the City's planned solid waste facilities. These include a new transfer station and a share of Phase 2 of the Public Works Facility. \$95,000 worth of dedicated solid waste district funding is subtracted from the total cost of future facilities to determine the new cost of capacity expanding solid waste facilities.

**Table 7.4: Planned Solid Waste Facilities**

	Value
Solid Waste Transfer Station	\$ 4,658,500
Public Works Facility - Phase 2 - Solid Waste Share	<u>3,148,750</u>
Cost of Planned Facilities	\$ 7,807,250
Less Solid Waste District Funding	<u>\$ 95,000</u>
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	\$ 7,712,250

Source: City of North Port Capital Improvement Program; North Port Solid Waste District.

## Cost per Equivalent Dwelling Unit

This chapter uses the system standard facilities approach to calculate the solid waste facilities cost standard. The replacement cost of the entire system of solid waste facilities at the planning horizon is divided by the total amount of EDUs at the planning horizon to determine a cost standard per EDU that will be achieved once development occurs and once the new facilities have been realized. **Table 7.4** shows the facility cost standard for solid waste facilities.

**Table 7.5: Solid Waste Facilities System Standard**

Value of Existing Facilities	\$	17,197,707
Value of Planned Facilities		<u>7,807,250</u>
Total System Value (2030)	\$	25,004,957
Future EDUs (2030)		<u>51,791</u>
Cost per EDU	\$	483

Sources: Tables 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4.

## Projected Fee Revenue

**Table 7.6** details a projection of fee revenue based on the EDU growth increment identified in Table 7.2. The City must spend the projected fee revenue on new or expanded solid waste facilities to serve new development in order to achieve the system facility standard at the planning horizon. The City plans to construct the facilities listed in Table 7.4.

**Table 7.6: Revenue Projection - System Standard**

Cost per EDU	\$	483
Growth in EDUs (2019- 2030)		<u>11,011</u>
Fee Revenue	\$	5,318,000
Net Cost of Planned Facilities		<u>7,712,250</u>
Non-Fee Revenue to Be Identified	\$	(2,394,250)

Sources: Tables 7.2, 7.4 and 7.5.

## Fee Schedule

The maximum justified fee for solid waste facilities is shown in **Table 7.6**. The cost per EDU from Table 7.5 is multiplied by the EDU factors from Table 7.1 to determine the solid waste facilities fee per land use. The City can adopt any fee up to this amount.

**Table 7.6: Solid Waste Facilities Fee - System Standard**

Land Use	A		B		C = A x B		F = 1,000	
	Cost Per	EDU	EDU	Factor	Base Fee <sup>1</sup>	Fee per	Sq. Ft.	
<i>Residential - per Dwelling Unit</i>								
Single Family	\$	483	1.00	\$	483			
Multifamily		483	0.50		242			
Senior Unit		483	0.50		242			
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft. or Hotel Room</i>								
Commercial	\$	483	4.41	\$	2,128	\$	2.13	
Office		483	1.03		495		0.50	
Industrial		483	1.39		670		0.67	
Business Park		483	0.98		475		0.48	
Institutional		483	3.00		1,449		1.45	
Hotel Room		483	0.59		283		n/a	

<sup>1</sup> Fee per dwelling unit, per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential or per hotel room.

Sources: Tables 7.1 and 7.5.

# 8. Implementation

---

## Impact Fee Adoption Process

The City imposes impact fees under authority granted by the Florida Impact Fee Act (the Act), contained in Section 163.31801 of the Florida Statutes. The analysis contained in the preceding chapters of this report meets the requirements of Act for imposition of impact fees.

Key portions of Section 163.31801 are reproduced below:

(3) At a minimum, an impact fee adopted by ordinance of a county or municipality or by resolution of a special district must satisfy all of the following conditions:

(a) The calculation of the impact fee must be based on the most recent and localized data.

(b) The local government must provide for accounting and reporting of impact fee collections and expenditures. If a local governmental entity imposes an impact fee to address its infrastructure needs, the entity shall account for the revenues and expenditures of such impact fee in a separate accounting fund.

(c) Administrative charges for the collection of impact fees must be limited to actual costs.

(d) The local government must provide notice not less than 90 days before the effective date of an ordinance or resolution imposing a new or increased impact fee. A county or municipality is not required to wait 90 days to decrease, suspend, or eliminate an impact fee.

(e) Collection of the impact fee may not be required to occur earlier than the date of issuance of the building permit for the property that is subject to the fee.

(f) The impact fee must be proportional and reasonably connected to, or have a rational nexus with, the need for additional capital facilities and the increased impact generated by the new residential or commercial construction.

(g) The impact fee must be proportional and reasonably connected to, or have a rational nexus with, the expenditures of the funds collected and the benefits accruing to the new residential or nonresidential construction.

(h) The local government must specifically earmark funds collected under the impact fee for use in acquiring, constructing, or improving capital facilities to benefit new users.

(i) Revenues generated by the impact fee may not be used, in whole or in part, to pay existing debt or for previously approved projects unless the expenditure is reasonably connected to, or has a rational nexus with, the increased impact generated by the new residential or nonresidential construction.

163.31801(6) also states:

(6) Audits of financial statements of local governmental entities and district school boards which are performed by a certified public accountant pursuant to s. 218.39 and submitted to the Auditor General must include an affidavit signed by the chief financial officer of the local governmental entity or district school board stating that the local governmental entity or district school board has complied with this section.

## Inflation Adjustment

The City can keep its impact fee program up to date by periodically adjusting the fees for inflation. Such adjustments should be completed regularly to ensure that new development will fully fund its share of needed facilities. We recommend that the following indices be used for adjusting fees for inflation:

- ◆ Buildings – Engineering News-Record’s Construction Cost Index (CCI)
- ◆ Equipment – Consumer Price Index, All Items, 1982-84=100 for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U)

The indices recommended can be found for local jurisdictions (state, region), and for the nation. With the exception of land, we recommend that the national indices be used to adjust for inflation, as the national indices are not subject to frequent dramatic fluctuations that the localized indices are subject to.

Due to the highly variable nature of land costs, there is no particular index that captures fluctuations in land values. We recommend that the City adjust land values based on recent land purchases, sales or appraisals at the time of the update.

While fee updates using inflation indices are appropriate for periodic updates to ensure that fee revenues keep up with increases in the costs of public facilities, the City will also need to conduct more extensive updates of the fee documentation and calculation (such as this study) when significant new data on development forecasts and/or facility plans become available.

## Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP

The City maintains a five-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to plan for future infrastructure needs. The CIP identifies costs and phasing for specific capital projects. The use of the CIP in this manner documents a reasonable relationship between new development and the use of those revenues.

The City may decide to alter the scope of the planned projects or to substitute new projects as long as those new projects continue to represent an expansion of the City’s facilities. If the total cost of facilities varies from the total cost used as a basis for the fees, the City should consider revising the fees accordingly.

# Appendix

**Appendix Table A.1: General Government Vehicle Inventory**

Vehicle	Department	Year	Make	Model	Projected Replacement Cost
73074	Arborist	2017	Ford	F-150 4X4	\$ 25,270
73182	Arborist	2018	Ford	F-150	24,444
70582	Building	2005	Ford	Explor-4X	34,035
70621	Building	2006	Ford	F-150-4X	24,972
70689	Building	2006	Ford	F-150-4X	22,536
72896	Building	2015	Ford	F150	24,442
72897	Building	2015	Ford	F150	24,442
72900	Building	2015	Ford	F150	24,442
72901	Building	2015	Ford	F150	24,442
72902	Building	2015	Ford	F150	24441.75
72940	Building	2016	Ford	F150 4X4	25,286
72941	Building	2016	Ford	F150 4X4	25,286
72945	Building	2016	Ford	F150 4X4	25,286
73071	Building	2017	Ford	F-150 4X4	25,270
73080	Building	2017	Ford	Explorer 4WD	28,648
73184	Building	2018	Ford	F-150	24,444
73245	Building	2018	Ford	F-150	27,411
73246	Building	2018	Ford	F-150	27,411
73302	Building	2019	Ford	F-150	24,021
73334	Building	2019	Ford	F-150	24,021
72847	City Manager	2016	Ford	Fusion	18,864
73087	City Manager	2018	Ford	Transit Connect	22,733
70693	Code Enforcement	2006	Ford	F-150-4X	21,057
70694	Code Enforcement	2006	Ford	F-150-4X	21,057
72895	Code Enforcement	2015	Ford	F150	24,442
72898	Code Enforcement	2015	Ford	F150	25,859
72899	Code Enforcement	2015	Ford	F150	25,859
73324	Code Enforcement	2019	Ford	F-150	26,412
73326	Code Enforcement	2019	Ford	F-150	26,412
70391	Facilities	2004	Ford	F-150	20,215
70398	Facilities	2004	Ford	F-250-4X	32,239
70616	Facilities	2006	Ford	F-150-4XLT	28,766
70854	Facilities	2006	Ford	F-150-4X	20,928
71003	Facilities	2007	Ford	F-150	21,301
71009	Facilities	2007	Ford	F-150	20,998
71606	Facilities	2011	Ford	Van-E250	27,460
71848	Facilities	2013	Toro	Z T Mower	8,362
72851	Facilities	2015	Ford	F-550 Bucket	141,702
73088	Facilities	2018	Ford	Transit Connect	22,733
73185	Facilities	2018	Ford	Transit Van	35,463
73214	Facilities	2018	Ford	Transit Van	35,463
T0006	Facilities	2018	Express	Trailer 14K	4,195
73072	HD	2017	Ford	Fusion	18,309
71117	I&T	2007	Ford	Explor-4X	30,389
71295	NDS	2007	Chrysler	Sebring	20,426
71202	Planning	2008	Ford	Escape-Hybrid	30,739
72939	Planning	2016	Ford	F150 4X4	25,286
73183	Planning	2018	Ford	F-150	24,444
70393	PW-Fleet	2004	Ford	Taurus-GI	16,856
70495	PW-Fleet	2005	Ford	F-150	23,299
70915	PW-Fleet	2006	Ford	F-550-Serv	67,561
70969	PW-Fleet	2006	John Deere	Gator	7,124
71912	PW-Fleet	2005	Mitsubishi	FG25N Fork Lift	24,613
73346	PW-Fleet	2019	Ford	F-350 Service	39,479
73363	PW-Fleet	2019	Dodge	Grand Caravan	23,579
70696	Social Services	2006	Jeep	Liberty	22,842
Total Replacement Cost					\$ 1,518,011

Source: City of North Port.

**Appendix Table A.2: Fire and Rescue Vehicle and Apparatus Inventory**

Vehicle	Department	Year	Make	Model	Projected
					Replacement Cost
71478	EMS R-87	2009	Chevrolet	Ambulance	\$ 388,572
73066	EMS R-83	2017	Freightliner	M2 Ambulance	388,572
73067	EMS R-88	2017	Freightliner	M2 Ambulance	388,572
73217	EMS R-81	2019	International	Ambulance	388,572
73218	EMS R-85	2019	International	Ambulance	388,572
73268	EMS R-84	2019	International	Ambulance	388,572
73269	EMS R-86	2019	International	Ambulance	388,572
73270	EMS R-82	2019	International	Ambulance	388,572
73333	EMS R-89	2018	International	Ambulance	388,572
71320	F/R Admin IT	2008	Ford	Escape	37,352
71687	F/R Admin Spare Batt	2012	Ford	Expedit	92,949
72494	F/R Admin NP-2	2015	Chevrolet	Tahoe	92,949
72496	F/R Admin Batt - 8	2015	Chevrolet	Tahoe	92,949
72946	F/R Admin Old NP-6	2016	Ford	Explorer	92,949
72947	F/R Admin NP-11	2016	Ford	Explorer	85,922
72963	F/R Admin NP-Maint	2016	Ford	F250 4X4 Util	44,567
73064	F/R Admin NP-41	2017	Ford	F-150	37,352
73165	F/R Admin NP-3	2018	Ford	Explorer	92,949
73230	F/R Admin NP-44	2018	Ford	Expedition Ssv	92,949
73292	F/R Admin NP-1	2019	Ford	Expedition	92,949
73323	F/R Admin New TRT	2019	Wells Cargo	Enclosed Tr	133,154
73336	F/R Admin NP-6	2019	Ford	Expedition	92,949
73337	F/R Admin NP-5	2019	Ford	Expedition	92,949
73361	F/R Admin NP-43	2019	Ford	F-150	55,789
00232	Fire Rescue BT-82	1978	Amergen	Brushtruck	38,723
00233	Fire Rescue BT-83	1978	Amergen	Brushtruck	38,723
00234	Fire Rescue BT-81	1978		Brushtruck	38,723
00235	Fire Rescue BT-84	2000	Unknown	Brush Truck	38,723
00236	Fire Rescue BT-85	2000	Unknown	Brush Truck	38,723
05722	Fire Rescue Utility	1997	Ford	F-350-Utl	92,949
70016	Fire Rescue P-81	2002	Pierce	Firetruck	832,031
70050	Fire Rescue Old TRT	2002	Wells Cargo	Trailer	33,154
70133	Fire Rescue Rav-84	2003	Ford	F-550	96,500
70427	Fire Rescue Training	2004	Emergency1	Firetruck	832,031
70586	Fire Rescue TN-83	2005	Kenworth/ Fouts	T300Tanker	315,000
71148	Fire Rescue TR-86	2006	Emergency1	Fireaerial	1,202,638
71149	Fire Rescue TR-87	2006	Emergency1	Fireaerial	1,202,638
71277	Fire Rescue MCI TR	2008	Misc	Trailer	33,154
71290	Fire Rescue	2005	Polaris	Atv-4X	17,050
71480	Fire Rescue P-85	2009	Pierce	Firetruck	832,031
71545	Fire Rescue Polaris Tr.	2007	Anderson	Trailer	8,768
	Fire Rescue	2020	Ford	F-550	83,500
72314	Fire Rescue E-83	2015	Pierce	Pumper	832,031
73005	Fire Rescue E-85	2017	Pierce	Impel Pumper	832,031
73006	Fire Rescue TR-84	2017	Pierce	Velocity Aerial	1,202,638
73164	Fire Rescue NP-4	2018	Ford	Explorer	92,949
73212	Fire Rescue NP-42	2018	Ford	F-150	55,879
73229	Fire Rescue TR-82	2019	Pierce	Ladder Truck	1,202,638
73389	Fire Rescue TN-81	2020	Kenworth/ Fouts	T300Tanker	315,000
73408	Fire Rescue E-81	2020	Pierce	Firetruck	832,031
	Fire Rescue	2020	Expdition	EM	92,949
Total Replacement Cost					\$ 15,961,030

Source: City of North Port.

**Appendix Table A.3: Law Enforcement Vehicle Inventory**

<b>Vehicle Type</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Average Cost per Unit</b>	<b>Total Replacement Cost</b>
Bus	1	\$ 245,049	\$ 245,049
Diesel Pick Up	2	217,095	434,190
Light PU/Van	17	39,999	679,978
Policecar	20	51,764	1,035,280
Suvpolice	111	49,839	5,532,117
Trailer	13	17,359	225,666
Utility Vehicle	5	6,529	32,646
<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>		<b>\$ 8,184,925</b>

Source: City of North Port.

**Appendix Table A.4: Park Vehicle Inventory**

<b>Vehicle Type</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Average Cost per Unit</b>	<b>Total Projected Replacement Cost</b>
Diesel Pick Up	4	34,314	\$ 137,256
Light Pickup/Van	6	27,258	163,546
Loader	1	60,645	60,645
Mower	10	10,243	102,428
Suv	1	32,911	32,911
Hybrid SUV	1	30,739	30,739
Trailer	10	8,679	86,790
Utility Vehicle	4	10,541	42,165
Water Tanker	1	79,750	79,750
<b>Total</b>	<b>38</b>		<b>\$ 736,230</b>
Improved Parkland Acreage			326.22
Cost per Acre			\$ 2,257

Source: City of North Port.

### **Appendix Table A.5: Solid Waste Vehicle Inventory**

<b>Vehicle Type</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Average Cost per Unit</b>	<b>Total Replacement Cost</b>
Can	28	\$ 27,184	\$ 761,145
Grapple	5	260,420	1,302,101
Light PU/Van	8	36,710	293,682
Loader	1	155,649	155,649
Passcar	1	24,233	24,233
Roll-off	3	131,658	394,975
Solid Waste Collection	34	339,894	11,556,407
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>		<b>\$ 14,488,191</b>

Source: City of North Port.