

CITY OF NORTH PORT

DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE UPDATE STUDY

FINAL

FEBRUARY 25, 2022



Oakland Office

66 Franklin Street
Suite 300
Oakland, CA 94607
Tel: (510) 832-0899

Corporate Office

27368 Via Industria
Suite 200
Temecula, CA 92590
Tel: (800) 755-6864
Fax: (888) 326-6864

www.willdan.com

Other Regional Offices

Aurora, CO
Orlando, FL
Phoenix, AZ
Plano, TX
Seattle, WA
Washington, DC

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	11
Land Value	12
3. GENERAL GOVERNMENT FACILITIES.....	14
Service Population	14
Facility Inventories and Standards	15
Existing Inventory	15
Existing Facility Standards	16
Planned Facilities	16
Credit Component	17
Cost Allocation	18
Projected Fee Revenue	19
Fee Schedule	19
4. FIRE AND RESCUE FACILITIES	21
Service Population	21
Facility Inventories and Standards	22
Existing Inventory	22
Existing Facility Standards	23
Planned Facilities	24
Credit Component	24
Cost Allocation	25
Projected Fee Revenue	26
Fee Schedule	26
5. LAW ENFORCEMENT FACILITIES	28
Service Population	28
Facility Inventories and Standards	29

Existing Inventory	29
Existing Facility Standards	30
Planned Facilities	30
Credit Component	31
Cost Allocation	32
Projected Fee Revenue	33
Fee Schedule	33
6. PARKS FACILITIES.....	35
Service Population	35
Facility Inventories	35
Existing Parkland Inventory	35
Special Use Facilities Inventory	37
Parkland Unit Costs	37
Existing Park Facility Standards	38
Facilities Needed to Accommodate New Development	39
Credit Component	39
Parks Cost per Capita	40
Fee Schedule	41
7. SOLID WASTE FACILITIES	43
Solid Waste Facilities Demand	43
EDU Generation by New Development	44
Existing Inventory	45
Existing Facility Standards	46
Planned Facilities	46
Credit Component	47
Cost per Equivalent Dwelling Unit	48
Projected Fee Revenue	48
Fee Schedule	49
8. IMPLEMENTATION.....	50
Impact Fee Adoption Process	50
Demonstrated Need Study	51
Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP	52
9. APPENDIX	53

Executive Summary

This report summarizes an analysis of public facilities fees needed to support future development in the City of North Port through 2045. 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 Program (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. The City can adopt fees up to, but not exceeding these amounts.

E.1: Maximum Justified Development Impact Fees

Land Use	Demand Unit	General Government Facilities	Fire and Rescue Facilities	Law Enforcement Facilities	Parks	Solid Waste Facilities	Total
<i>Residential (per Dwelling Unit)</i>							
Single Family	Dwelling Unit	\$ 377	\$ 785	\$ 503	\$ 2,284	\$ 399	\$4,348
Multifamily	Dwelling Unit	273	568	364	1,654	237	3,096
Senior Unit	Dwelling Unit	174	362	232	1,053	151	1,972
<i>Nonresidential (per 1,000 Sq. Ft. or per Hotel Room)</i>							
Commercial: Retail and Services	1,000 Sq. Ft.	\$ 102	\$ 1,492	\$ 1,624	\$ -	\$ 984	\$4,202
Commercial: Restaurant	1,000 Sq. Ft.	242	3,548	3,861	-	4,724	12,375
Commercial: Gas Station (Building Area)	1,000 Sq. Ft.	102	1,492	1,624	-	3,943	7,161
Commercial: Car Wash	Tunnel	84	1,232	1,341	-	659	3,316
Commercial: Hotel/Lodging	Room	27	394	429	879	277	2,006
Office	1,000 Sq. Ft.	156	2,295	2,497	-	463	5,411
Medical Office	1,000 Sq. Ft.	198	2,908	3,164	-	551	6,821
Industrial: Manufacturing/Warehouse	1,000 Sq. Ft.	56	817	889	-	845	2,607
Institutional (schools, churches, daycare)	1,000 Sq. Ft.	102	1,490	1,622	-	1,417	4,631
Nursing Home/ Congregate Care Facility	1,000 Sq. Ft.	98	1,436	1,563	-	399	3,496
Recreational: Golf Course ¹	Acre	24	345	375	-	-	744
Recreational: Golf Course ¹	1,000 Sq. Ft.	-	-	-	-	1,018	1,018
Recreational: Community Center	1,000 Sq. Ft.	51	746	812	-	899	2,508

¹ Fee for golf courses charged per acre for general government, fire and rescue, and law enforcement facilities. Charged per square foot for golf course buildings for solid waste facilities.

Sources: Tables 3.7, 4.7, 5.7, 6.10 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	\$ 10,965,888	\$ 10,965,888	\$ -
Fire and Rescue Facilities	33,831,234	33,831,234	-
Law Enforcement Facilities	33,000,000	27,401,000	5,599,000
Parks	61,307,740	61,307,740	-
Solid Waste Facilities	20,056,932	20,056,932	-
Total	\$ 159,161,794	\$153,562,794	\$ 5,599,000

Sources: Tables 3.7, 4.7, 5.7, 6.8 and 7.8.

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 2045. 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 (1) the revenue collected adequately funds the facilities needed by new development, and (2) the impact fees do not exceed the reasonably anticipated costs associated with the improvements and additions necessary to offset the demand generated by the new development on City facilities. 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.

It is recommended to conduct periodic updates of the fee documentation and calculation (such as this study) including 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 program and budget process, possibly after completion of a new facility master plan. This approach is used to calculate the general government, fire and rescue, parks facilities and solid waste 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 law enforcement 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
- Fire and Rescue Facilities
- Solid Waste Facilities
- ♦ Law Enforcement 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 2021 base year and a planning horizon of 2045.

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 2021 is used as an indicator of existing facility demand and to determine existing facility standards.
- The estimate of total development in 2045 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 2021 through 2045 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- Retail and Services:** Uses for which the floor area is primarily devoted to retail sale of goods or services (or the adjacent storage of goods for retail sale) to the general public or to small businesses, and which generates regular traffic during weekday p.m. peak hours. Examples of retail uses include, but are not limited to: automobile dealerships, automobile care and body repair centers, movie theaters, specialty retail centers containing a variety of retail shops specializing in quality apparel, hard goods, and services such as travel agencies, dance studios, tutoring services and florists.
- **Commercial- Restaurant:** Retail spaces that serve food, including sit down and fast food restaurants, cafeterias and dining halls.

- **Commercial- Gas Station (Building Area):** The retail space associated with gas stations. Includes convenience markets.
- **Commercial- Car Wash:** Uses that allow for the manual or automatic cleaning of automobiles.
- **Commercial- Hotel/Lodging -** Lodging including hotel, motel and resort development.
- **Office:** Uses for which the floor area is primarily devoted to office and meeting spaces. Examples of office uses are: Professional services (legal, engineering, accounting), investment broker, real estate office, advertising agency, social services, insurance, bank, or savings and loan institutions.
- **Medical Office:** Medical clinics, and dental care offices.
- **Industrial:** All manufacturing and warehouse development.
- **Institutional:** The institutional use category includes non-commercial uses such as hospitals, schools, social or religious institutions, and public institutions.
- **Nursing Home/ Congregate Care Facility:** Nursing homes and similar facilities that provide a combination of residential care with nursing and/or personal care as required by the residents are included in this category. Medical clinics (facilities that provide diagnoses and outpatient care only) are included in the "medical office" category.
- **Recreational- Golf Course:** Golf courses
- **Recreational- Community Center:** Gymnasiums, fitness and recreation centers.

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 permanent residents, seasonal residents, employment (jobs within the City boundaries), in North Port, both in 2021 and in 2045. These estimates factor into the calculation of the fees for all fee categories.

The estimate of existing permanent residents comes from University of Florida Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) data. The projection of permanent and seasonal residents in 2045 was estimated by BEBR for the City in February, 2021. The estimate of seasonal residents in 2021 based on an estimate BEBR for 2020, adjusted to 2021 using compound annual growth rate from the 2045 projection.

The estimate of 8,438 employees in 2021 is based on an estimate of 7,200 workers (7,960 total workers less 760 local government workers) in 2019 from OnTheMap.ces.census.gov, which was adjusted to 2021 using the historical compound annual growth rate from 2009 to 2019 from OnTheMap data. The projection of additional job creation within the City (18,178 new jobs) was estimated by Camoin Associates.

Table 2.1: Existing and New Development

	2021	2045	Increase
Permanent Residents ¹	78,129	140,943	62,814
Seasonal Residents ¹	6,920	12,393	5,473
Employment ²	8,438	26,616	18,178

¹ Existing permanent residents from University of Florida Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) data. Projection of permanent and seasonal residents in 2045 estimated by BEBR for the City in February, 2021. Seasonal residents in 2021 based on 2020 BEBR estimate adjusted to 2021 using compound annual growth rate from 2045

² Estimate of 7,200 workers (7,960 total workers less 760 local government workers) in 2019 based on data from OnTheMap.ces.census.gov. This figure was adjusted to 2021 (8,438) using the historical compound annual growth rate from 2009 to 2019 from OnTheMap data, 8.256%. Projection of additional job creation within the City (18,178 new jobs) estimated by Camoin Associates.

Sources: University of Florida, Bureau of Economic and Business Research, 2021; U.S. Census Bureau LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (2009-2019) accessed at <https://onthemap.ces.census.gov>; Camoin Associates; 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, 11th 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

<u><i>Residential</i></u>		
Single Family	2.43	Residents per dwelling unit
Multifamily	1.76	Residents per dwelling unit
Senior Unit	1.12	Residents per dwelling unit
<u><i>Nonresidential</i></u>		
Commercial: Retail	2.12	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Commercial: Restaurant	5.04	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Commercial: Gas Station (Building Area)	2.12	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Commercial: Car Wash ¹	1.75	Employees per Tunnel
Commercial: Hotel/Lodging	0.56	Employees per Hotel Room
Office	3.26	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Medical Office	4.13	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Industrial: Manufacturing/Warehouse	1.16	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Institutional (schools, churches, daycare) ²	2.12	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Nursing Home/ Congregate Care Facility	2.04	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Recreational: Golf Course	0.49	Employees per Acre
Recreational: Community Center	1.06	Employees per 1,000 square feet

¹ Data unavailable by employee in ITE trip generation manual. Assumption consistent with other recent Florida impact fee studies.

² Average employees per 1,000 square feet across institutional uses.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2019 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates Table B25033 and 1-Year Estimates Table B25024; Commission on affordable housing and health facility needs for seniors in the 21st century, 2002; Energy Star Benchmarking For Senior Care Facility, 2010; Economic Dimensions of the Florida Golf Course Industry, Department of Food and Resource Economics, Florida Cooperative Extension Service, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, University of Florida; ITE Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition, 2021; 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 five residential appraisals within the City in 2021. Commercial properties in the City are worth considerably more than the assumed \$116,700 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	\$	116,700

Sources: Appraisals of residential property in North Port, 8-12-21, 10-12-2021, 10-13-2021 and 10-14-2021 and 10-25-21.

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. Seasonal residents are assumed to create the same amount of demand for facilities as permanent residents. However, seasonal residents only inhabit the City for a limited amount of time each year. This analysis weights seasonal residents based on the assumption of them inhabiting the City for five months out of the year.

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
<u><i>Permanent Residents</i></u>			
Existing (2021)	78,129	1.00	78,129
New Development	62,814	1.00	62,814
Total (2045)	140,943		140,943
<u><i>Seasonal Residents</i>¹</u>			
Existing (2021)	6,920	0.42	2,906
New Development	5,473	0.42	2,299
Total (2045)	12,393		5,205
<u><i>Workers</i>²</u>			
Existing (2021)	8,438	0.31	2,616
New Development	18,178	0.31	5,635
Total (2045)	26,616		8,251
<u><i>Combined Weighted Service Population</i></u>			
Existing (2021)			83,651
New Development			70,748
Total (2045)			149,194

¹ Seasonal residents are weighted at 0.42 of a permanent resident based on the assumption of residence in North Port for five months out of a year.

² 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 \$29.8 million worth of general government facilities.

Table 3.2: Existing General Government Facilities Inventory

	Inventory	Units	Unit Cost	Replacement Cost
<u>Land (acres)</u>				
City Hall ¹	17.82	acres	\$ 116,700	\$ 2,080,000
Family Service Center/CEC	5.10	acres	116,700	595,000
Public Works/Fleet Facility ²	6.50	acres	116,700	759,000
Subtotal - Land	29.42	acres		\$ 3,434,000
<u>Buildings (square feet)</u>				
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 ²	19,333	sq. ft.	251	4,847,253
Subtotal - Buildings	128,074			\$ 24,459,097
<u>Vehicles (See Appendix Table A.1)</u>				\$ 1,933,060
Total Value - Existing Facilities				\$ 29,826,157

¹ 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.

² 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.

Existing Facility Standards

Table 3.3 displays the City's current general government facility infrastructure standards expressed in terms of units per 1,000 capita. Impact fees calculated using the existing standard methodology can provide a funding source from new development to ensure that these standards are maintained as new development creates additional demand for facilities.

Table 3.3: Existing Facility Standards

Component	Quantity	Units	Existing Service Population	Facility Standard per 1,000 Capita
Land	29.42	Acres	83,651	0.35
Buildings	128,074	Sq. Ft.	83,651	1,531.05
Vehicles	52	Vehicles	83,651	0.62

Sources: Tables 3.1 and 3.2.

Planned Facilities

The City of North Port's capital improvement program identifies Phase 2 of the Public Works Facility for the general government facility fee category. Much 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 3.4: Planned Facilities

	Value
Public Works Facility - Phase 2 - Total Cost	\$ 8,556,871
Less: Appropriated to Date	<u>496,871</u>
Remaining Cost	\$ 8,060,000
Less Road and Drainage District Funding	\$ 5,284,970
Less Fleet Management Funding	50,000
Less Solid Waste District Funding	<u>2,309,440</u>
Net Cost of Planned Facility	\$ 415,590

Source: City of North Port Fiscal Year 2022 - 2026 Capital Improvement Program.

Credit Component

To avoid overcharging new development for the capital cost of facilities and infrastructure, a review of the capital financing program for general government facilities was completed. The purpose of this review was to identify any potential revenues generated by new development, other than impact fees, that are programmed to fund expansion of capital facilities, land, and equipment over the next five years.

Capital expenditure credits per capita were calculated based on the non-impact fee revenue expenditures planned for capital expansion projects from FY2022 to FY2026 identified in the City's FY2022 Capital Improvement Program. The average annual capital expansion expenditures are divided by the average service population over the next five years to determine the capital expenditure per capita, for the five-year period.

The present value of the resulting average annual capacity expansion expenditures per capita is then calculated using a capitalization period of 20 years, and a 1.75% capitalization rate.¹ The result is the revenue credit per capita which represents new development's contribution to capital facilities from sources other than impact fees. **Table 3.5** details these calculations.

¹ Average 20-year interest rate as of February 10, 2022 for AAA municipal bonds at www.fmsbonds.com/market-yields/

Table 3.5: General Government Facilities Capital Expansion Expenditures Credit

Funding Source	FY 2022 Adopted	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025	FY 2026	Five Year Total
Capital Funds ¹	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Road and Drainage District Funding	95,000	5,189,970	-	-	-	5,284,970
Solid Waste District Funding ²	95,000	-	-	-	-	95,000
Other Special Revenue	25,000	25,000	-	-	-	50,000
Total	\$215,000	\$5,214,970	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$5,429,970
Service Population ³	85,693	87,784	89,926	92,120	94,368	
Average Annual Capacity Expansion Expenditures						\$1,085,994
Average Service Population (2022 to 2026)						89,978
Average Annual Capacity Expansion Expenditures per Capita						\$ 12.07
Capitalization Period (in years)						20
Capitalization Rate ⁴						1.75%
Total Revenue Credit per Capita						\$ (202)

¹ City of North Port, Resolution No. 2021-R-38, Exhibit B, Page 7.

² The Solid Waste District has programmed \$2,214,440 towards this project in FY2023. However, that funding is anticipated to come from solid waste impact fees, so it is not included here.

³ Based on 2.44% compound annual growth rate from 2021 to 2045 calculated from service population projections.

⁴ Average 20-year interest rate as of February 10, 2022 for AAA municipal bonds at www.fmsbonds.com/market-yields/

Sources: City of North Port Fiscal Year 2022 - 2026 Capital Improvement Program; www.fmsbonds.com/market-yields/; Willdan Financial Services.

Cost Allocation

Table 3.6 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 revenue credit per capita is subtracted from the existing cost per capita. The resulting net value per capita is multiplied by the worker weighting factor of 0.31 to determine the net value per worker. Note that the value of the existing inventory of general government facilities drives this facility standard and subsequent fee calculation, not the cost of the planned facilities.

**Table 3.6: General Government Facilities
Existing Cost Standard**

Value of Existing Facilities	\$ 29,826,157
Existing Service Population	<u>83,651</u>
Cost per Capita	\$ 357
Less Revenue Credit	<u>(202)</u>
Net Cost per Capita	\$ 155
Facility Standard per Resident	\$ 155
Facility Standard per Worker ²	48

¹ Based on a weighing factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 3.1, 3.2 and 3.5.

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 3.7** details a projection of fee revenue based on the service population growth increment identified in Table 3.1. The City will need to identify \$10.6 million in additional general government facilities to serve new development through 2045 in order to maintain its existing standard of general government facilities.

Table 3.7: Revenue Projection - Existing Standard

Cost per Capita	\$ 155
Growth in Service Population (2020- 2045)	<u>70,748</u>
Fee Revenue	\$ 10,965,888
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	<u>415,590</u>
Additional Facilities to Be Identified	\$ 10,550,298

Sources: Tables 3.1, 3.4 and 3.6.

Fee Schedule

Table 3.8 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 per demand unit identified in Table 2.2.

Table 3.8: Maximum Justified General Government Facilities Fee Schedule

Land Use	Demand Unit	A		B		C = A x B		D = C / 1,000	
		Cost Per		Density		Fee ¹		Fee per	
		Capita						Sq. Ft.	
<u>Residential</u>									
Single Family	Dwelling Unit	\$ 155		2.43		\$ 377			
Multifamily	Dwelling Unit	155		1.76		273			
Senior Unit	Dwelling Unit	155		1.12		174			
<u>Nonresidential</u>									
Commercial: Retail and Services	1,000 Sq. Ft.	\$ 48		2.12		\$ 102	\$	0.10	
Commercial: Restaurant	1,000 Sq. Ft.	48		5.04		242		0.24	
Commercial: Gas Station (Building Area)	1,000 Sq. Ft.	48		2.12		102		0.10	
Commercial: Car Wash	Tunnel	48		1.75		84		n/a	
Commercial: Hotel/Lodging	Room	48		0.56		27		n/a	
Office	1,000 Sq. Ft.	48		3.26		156		0.16	
Medical Office	1,000 Sq. Ft.	48		4.13		198		0.20	
Industrial: Manufacturing/Warehouse	1,000 Sq. Ft.	48		1.16		56		0.06	
Institutional (schools, churches, daycare)	1,000 Sq. Ft.	48		2.12		102		0.10	
Nursing Home/ Congregate Care Facility	1,000 Sq. Ft.	48		2.04		98		0.10	
Recreational: Golf Course	Acre	48		0.49		24		n/a	
Recreational: Community Center	1,000 Sq. Ft.	48		1.06		51		0.05	

¹ Fee per demand unit.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 3.6.

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. Seasonal residents are assumed to create the same amount of demand for facilities as permanent residents. However, seasonal residents only inhabit the City for a limited amount of time each year. This analysis weights seasonal residents based on the assumption of them inhabiting the City for five months out of the year.

The use of a worker demand factor of 2.18 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 October 2021. 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. See **Appendix Tables A.2 and A.3** for a detailed worker weighting analysis.

Table 4.1: Fire and Rescue Facilities Service Population

	A Persons	B Weighting Factor	A x B = C Service Population
<u><i>Permanent Residents</i></u>			
Existing (2021)	78,129	1.00	78,129
New Development	62,814	1.00	62,814
Total (2045)	140,943		140,943
<u><i>Seasonal Residents</i>¹</u>			
Existing (2021)	6,920	0.42	2,906
New Development	5,473	0.42	2,299
Total (2045)	12,393		5,205
<u><i>Workers</i>²</u>			
Existing (2021)	8,438	2.18	18,395
New Development	18,178	2.18	39,628
Total (2045)	26,616		58,023
<u><i>Combined Weighted Service Population</i></u>			
Existing (2021)			99,430
New Development			104,741
Total (2045)			198,966

¹ Seasonal residents are weighted at 0.42 of a permanent resident based on the assumption of residence in North Port for five months out of a year.

² Workers are weighted at 2.18 of residents based on an analysis of City of North Port calls for service from January 2018 through October 2021.

Sources: Table 2.1, Appendix Table A.3, 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.4**. In total, the City owns approximately \$42.7 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
<u>Land (acres)</u>				
Station 81/Headquarters ¹	3.65	acres	\$ 116,700	\$ 425,955
Station 82 ²	3.00	acres	116,700	350,100
Station 83	1.78	acres	116,700	207,726
Station 84	3.00	acres	116,700	350,100
Station 85	4.83	acres	116,700	563,661
Subtotal	16.26			\$ 1,897,542
<u>Buildings (square feet)</u>				
Fire Station 81	14,602	sq. ft.	\$ 397	\$ 5,796,994
Fire Station 82	12,743	sq. ft.	397	5,058,971
Fire Station 83	9,538	sq. ft.	397	3,786,586
Fire Station 84	11,408	sq. ft.	397	4,528,976
Fire Station 85	8,800	sq. ft.	397	3,493,600
Subtotal	57,091			\$ 22,665,127
<u>Vehicles and Apparatus (See Appendix Table A.4)</u>				<u>\$ 18,177,662</u>
Total Value - Existing Facilities				\$ 42,740,331

¹ 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.

² 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.

Existing Facility Standards

Table 4.3 displays the City's current fire and EMS facility infrastructure standards expressed in terms of units per 1,000 capita. Impact fees calculated using the existing standard methodology can provide a funding source from new development to ensure that these standards are maintained as new development creates additional demand for facilities.

Table 4.3: Existing Facility Standards

Component	Quantity	Units	Existing Service Population	Facility Standard per 1,000 Capita
Land	16.26	Acres	99,430	0.16
Buildings	57,091	Sq. Ft.	99,430	574.18
Vehicles	54	Vehicles	99,430	0.54

Sources: Tables 4.1 and 4.2.

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 4.4**.

Table 4.4: Planned Fire and Rescue Facilities

	Cost
Fire Station 87	\$ 6,636,000
Fire Station 86 ¹	8,921,000
Total Cost of Planned Facilities	\$15,557,000
Less Tax Funded	\$ 3,364,000
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	\$12,193,000

¹ Project cost net of \$475,000 funded in prior years by impact fees. This is currently under construction reimburse the developer with impact fees for associated costs.

Source: City of North Port Fiscal Year 2022 - 2026 Capital Improvement Program; City of North Port Fire Department.

Credit Component

To avoid overcharging new development for the capital cost of facilities and infrastructure, a review of the capital financing program for fire protection and rescue facilities was completed. The purpose of this review was to identify any potential revenues generated by new development, other than impact fees, that are programmed to fund expansion of capital facilities, land, and equipment over the next five years.

Capital expenditure credits per capita were calculated based on the non-impact fee revenue expenditures planned for capital expansion projects from FY2022 to FY2026 identified in the City's FY2022 Capital Improvement Program. The average annual capital expansion expenditures are divided by the average service population over the next five years to determine the capital expenditure per capita, for the five-year period.

The present value of the resulting average annual capacity expansion expenditures per capita is then calculated using a capitalization period of 20 years, and a 1.75% capitalization rate.² The result is the revenue credit per capita which represents new development's contribution to capital facilities from sources other than impact fees. **Table 4.5** details these calculations.

Table 4.5: Fire and Rescue Capital Expansion Expenditures Credit

Funding Source	FY 2022 Adopted	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025	FY 2026	Five Year Total
Capital Funds ¹	\$ 926,740	\$ 105,000	\$ 5,164,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,195,740
<i>Less Rehabilitation Projects</i>						
Fire Station 81 Renovation ²	\$ 838,540	\$ 105,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 943,540
F24PSC Public Safety						
Communication Replacement	-	-	1,800,000	-	-	1,800,000
Subtotal	\$ 838,540	\$ 105,000	\$ 1,800,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,743,540
Net Capital Expansion Funding	\$ 88,200	\$ -	\$ 3,364,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,452,200
Service Population ³	102,346	105,347	108,436	111,616	114,889	
Average Annual Capacity Expansion Expenditures						\$ 690,440
Average Service Population (2022 to 2026)						108,527
Average Annual Capacity Expansion Expenditures per Capita						\$ 6.36
Capitalization Period (in years)						20
Capitalization Rate ⁴						1.75%
Total Revenue Credit per Capita						\$ (107)

¹ City of North Port, Resolution No. 2021-R-38, Exhibit B, Page 6.

² Total capital expenditures in 2022 are \$210,000. Only half is funded through capital funds.

³ Based on 2.93% compound annual growth rate from 2021 to 2045 calculated from service population projections.

⁴ Average 20-year interest rate as of February 10, 2022 for AAA municipal bonds at www.fmsbonds.com/market-yields/

Sources: City of North Port Fiscal Year 2022 - 2026 Capital Improvement Program; www.fmsbonds.com/market-yields/; Willdan Financial Services.

Cost Allocation

Table 4.6 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 revenue credit per capita is subtracted from the existing cost per capita. The resulting net value per capita is multiplied by the worker weighting factor of 2.18 to determine the net facility standard per worker. Note that the value of the existing inventory of fire and rescue facilities drives this facility standard and subsequent fee calculation, not the cost of the planned facilities.

² Average 20-year interest rate as of February 10, 2022 for AAA municipal bonds at www.fmsbonds.com/market-yields/

Table 4.6: Fire and Rescue Facilities Existing Cost Standard

Value of Existing Facilities	\$ 42,740,331
Existing Service Population	<u>99,430</u>
Cost per Capita	\$ 430
Less Revenue Credit	<u>(107)</u>
Net Cost per Capita	\$ 323
Facility Standard per Resident	\$ 323
Facility Standard per Worker ¹	704

¹ Based on a weighing factor of 2.18.

Sources: Tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.5.

Projected Fee Revenue

Table 4.7 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 4.7: Revenue Projection - Existing Standard

Cost per Capita	\$ 323
Growth in Service Population (2020- 2045)	<u>104,741</u>
Fee Revenue	\$ 33,831,234
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	\$ 12,193,000
Additional Facilities to be Identified	\$ 21,638,234

Sources: Tables 4.1, 4.4 and 4.6.

Fee Schedule

Table 4.8 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 per demand unit identified in Table 2.2.

Table 4.8: Maximum Justified Fire and Rescue Facilities Impact Fee

		A	B	C = A x B	D = C / 1,000
Land Use	Demand Unit	Cost Per Capita	Density	Fee	Fee per Sq. Ft.
<i>Residential - per Dwelling Unit</i>					
Single Family	Dwelling Unit	\$ 323	2.43	\$ 785	
Multifamily	Dwelling Unit	323	1.76	568	
Senior Unit	Dwelling Unit	323	1.12	362	
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft. or Hotel Room</i>					
Commercial: Retail and Services	1,000 Sq. Ft.	\$ 704	2.12	\$ 1,492	\$ 1.49
Commercial: Restaurant	1,000 Sq. Ft.	704	5.04	3,548	3.55
Commercial: Gas Station (Building Area)	1,000 Sq. Ft.	704	2.12	1,492	1.49
Commercial: Car Wash	Tunnel	704	1.75	1,232	n/a
Commercial: Hotel/Lodging	Room	704	0.56	394	n/a
Office	1,000 Sq. Ft.	704	3.26	2,295	2.30
Medical Office	1,000 Sq. Ft.	704	4.13	2,908	2.91
Industrial: Manufacturing/Warehouse	1,000 Sq. Ft.	704	1.16	817	0.82
Institutional (schools, churches, daycare)	1,000 Sq. Ft.	704	2.12	1,490	1.49
Nursing Home/ Congregate Care Facility	1,000 Sq. Ft.	704	2.04	1,436	1.44
Recreational: Golf Course	Acre	704	0.49	345	n/a
Recreational: Community Center	1,000 Sq. Ft.	704	1.06	746	0.75

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 4.6.

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. Seasonal residents are assumed to create the same amount of demand for facilities as permanent residents. However, seasonal residents only inhabit the City for a limited amount of time each year. This analysis weights seasonal residents based on the assumption of them inhabiting the City for five months out of the year.

The use of a worker demand factor of 3.70 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 October 2021. 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. See **Appendix Table A.5** for a detailed worker weighting analysis.

Table 5.1: Law Enforcement Facilities Service Population

	A Persons	B Weighting Factor	A x B = C Service Population
<u><i>Permanent Residents</i></u>			
Existing (2021)	78,129	1.00	78,129
New Development	<u>62,814</u>	1.00	<u>62,814</u>
Total (2045)	140,943		140,943
<u><i>Seasonal Residents</i>¹</u>			
Existing (2021)	6,920	0.42	2,906
New Development	<u>5,473</u>	0.42	<u>2,299</u>
Total (2045)	12,393		5,205
<u><i>Workers</i>²</u>			
Existing (2021)	8,438	3.70	31,221
New Development	<u>18,178</u>	3.70	<u>67,259</u>
Total (2045)	26,616		98,480
<u><i>Combined Weighted Service Population</i></u>			
Existing (2021)			112,256
New Development			<u>132,372</u>
Total (2045)			239,423

¹ Seasonal residents are weighted at 0.42 of a permanent resident based on the assumption of residence in North Port for five months out of a year.

² Workers are weighted at 3.70 of residents based on an analysis of City of North Port calls for service from January 2018 through October 2021. See Appendix Table A.5.

Sources: Table 2.1, Appendix Table A.5, 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.6**. In total, the City owns approximately \$23.6 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
<u><i>Police Headquarters</i></u>				
Land	8.12	acres	\$ 116,700	\$ 947,604
Building	39,370	sq. ft.	340	13,385,800
Subtotal				\$ 14,333,404
<u><i>Vehicles and Equipment (Appendix Table A.6)</i></u>				\$ 9,306,350
Total Value - Existing Facilities				\$ 23,639,754

Sources: City of North Port; Tables 2.3 and A.6, Willdan Financial Services.

Existing Facility Standards

Table 5.3 displays the City's current law enforcement facility infrastructure standards expressed in terms of units per 1,000 capita. In this case the City's existing facility standards are not sufficient. The future planned facility will increase the City's facility standards. New development can fund a higher standard than current exists, but existing development must fund its share of the higher standard through funding sources other than impact fees.

Table 5.3: Existing Facility Standards

Component	Quantity	Units	Existing Service Population	Facility Standard per 1,000 Capita
Land	8.12	Acres	112,256	0.07
Buildings	39,370	Sq. Ft.	112,256	350.71
Vehicles	184	Vehicles	112,256	1.64

Sources: Tables 5.1 and 5.2.

Planned Facilities

The City plans to construct an additional station to serve both existing and new development within City limits, as identified by the City. The cost of this facility is shown in **Table 5.4**. Note that no alternative funding has yet been identified to fund the facility.

Table 5.4: Planned Law Enforcement Facilities

	Value
Police Station Construction	\$33,000,000

Source: City of North Port Fiscal Year 2022 thru 2026 Capital Improvement Program, page 80.

Credit Component

To avoid overcharging new development for the capital cost of facilities and infrastructure, a review of the capital financing program for law enforcement facilities was completed. The purpose of this review was to identify any potential revenues generated by new development, other than impact fees, that are programmed to fund expansion of capital facilities, land, and equipment over the next five years.

Capital expenditure credits per capita were calculated based on the non-impact fee revenue expenditures planned for capital expansion projects from FY2022 to FY2026 identified in the City's FY2022 Capital Improvement Program. The average annual capital expansion expenditures are divided by the average service population over the next five years to determine the capital expenditure per capita, for the five-year period.

The present value of the resulting average annual capacity expansion expenditures per capita is then calculated using a capitalization period of 20 years, and a 1.75% capitalization rate.³ The result is the revenue credit per capita which represents new development's contribution to capital facilities from sources other than impact fees. **Table 5.5** details these calculations.

³ Average 20-year interest rate as of February 10, 2022 for AAA municipal bonds at www.fmsbonds.com/market-yields/

Table 5.5: Law Enforcement Facilities Capital Expansion Expenditures Credit

Funding Source	FY 2022 Adopted	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025	FY 2026	Five Year Total
Capital Funds ¹	\$ 1,116,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,116,000
Service Population ²	115,856	119,571	123,405	127,362	131,446	
Average Annual Capacity Expansion Expenditures						\$ 223,200
Average Service Population (2022 to 2026)						123,528
Average Annual Capacity Expansion Expenditures per Capita						\$ 1.81
Capitalization Period (in years)						20
Capitalization Rate ³						1.75%
Total Revenue Credit per Capita						\$ (30)

¹ City of North Port, Resolution No. 2021-R-38, Exhibit B, Page 5.

² Based on 3.21% compound annual growth rate from 2021 to 2045 calculated from service population projections.

³ Average 20-year interest rate as of February 10, 2022 for AAA municipal bonds at www.fmsbonds.com/market-yields/

Sources: City of North Port Fiscal Year 2022 thru 2026 Capital Improvement Program; www.fmsbonds.com/market-yields/; Willdan Financial Services.

Cost Allocation

Table 5.6 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 2045. The revenue credit per capita from Table 5.5 is then subtracted from the cost per capita, to determine the net cost per capita, which drives the fee calculation.

Table 5.6: Law Enforcement Facilities System Standard

Value of Existing Facilities	\$ 23,639,754
Value of Planned Facilities	<u>33,000,000</u>
Total System Value (2045)	\$ 56,639,754
Future Service Population (2045)	<u>239,423</u>
Cost per Capita	\$ 237
Less Revenue Credit	\$ (30)
Cost Allocation per Resident	\$ 207
Cost Allocation per Worker ¹	766

¹ Based on a weighing factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3.

Projected Fee Revenue

Table 5.7 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 5.4.

Table 5.7: Revenue Projection - System Standard

Cost per Capita	\$ 207
Growth in Service Population (2020- 2045)	<u>132,372</u>
Fee Revenue	\$ 27,401,000
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	<u>33,000,000</u>
Non-Fee Revenue to Be Identified	\$ (5,599,000)

Sources: Tables 5.1, 5.4 and 5.6.

Fee Schedule

Table 5.8 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 per demand unit identified in Table 2.2.

Table 5.8: Maximum Justified Law Enforcement Facilities Fee

Land Use	Demand Unit	A		B	C = A x B		D = C / 1,000	
		Cost Per	Capita		Density	Base Fee	Fee per	Sq. Ft.
<u>Residential - per Dwelling Unit</u>								
Single Family	Dwelling Unit	\$	207	2.43	\$	503		
Multifamily	Dwelling Unit		207	1.76		364		
Senior Unit	Dwelling Unit		207	1.12		232		
<u>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft. or Hotel Room</u>								
Commercial: Retail and Services	1,000 Sq. Ft.	\$	766	2.12	\$	1,624	\$	1.62
Commercial: Restaurant	1,000 Sq. Ft.		766	5.04		3,861		3.86
Commercial: Gas Station (Building Area)	1,000 Sq. Ft.		766	2.12		1,624		1.62
Commercial: Car Wash	Tunnel		766	1.75		1,341		n/a
Commercial: Hotel/Lodging	Room		766	0.56		429		n/a
Office	1,000 Sq. Ft.		766	3.26		2,497		2.50
Medical Office	1,000 Sq. Ft.		766	4.13		3,164		3.16
Industrial: Manufacturing/Warehouse	1,000 Sq. Ft.		766	1.16		889		0.89
Institutional (schools, churches, daycare)	1,000 Sq. Ft.		766	2.12		1,622		1.62
Nursing Home/ Congregate Care Facility	1,000 Sq. Ft.		766	2.04		1,563		1.56
Recreational: Golf Course	Acre		766	0.49		375		n/a
Recreational: Community Center	1,000 Sq. Ft.		766	1.06		812		0.81

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 5.6.

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.

Seasonal residents are assumed to create the same amount of demand for facilities as permanent residents. However, seasonal residents only inhabit the City for a limited amount of time each year. This analysis weights seasonal residents based on the assumption of them inhabiting the City for five months out of the year.

This analysis also considers the demand from visitors on the City's parks. An estimate of existing daily hotel visitors assumes 143 existing rooms in North Port, 55% annual occupancy and 1.7 visitors per room per night. The projection of future hotel visitors is estimated to remain constant to the increase in permanent residents.

Table 6.1: Park Facilities Service Population

	Permanent Residents	Seasonal Residents	Hotel Visitors ¹	Weighted Service Population ²
Existing (2021)	78,129	6,920	134	81,169
New Development	62,814	5,473	108	65,221
Total (2045)	140,943	12,393	242	146,390

¹ Existing daily hotel visitors assumes 143 existing rooms in North Port, 55% annual occupancy and 1.7 visitors per room per night. Projection estimated constant to increase in permanent residents.

² Seasonal residents are weighted at 0.42 of a permanent resident based on the assumption of residence in North Port for five months out of a year. Average hotel visitors per day are weighted the same as permanent residents.

Source: Table 2.1, Willdan Financial Services.

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/open space land. 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 ¹	14.10	-	14.10
Garden of Five Senses ²	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 ³	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 ⁴	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	20.00	61.28	81.28
Future Park - 123 Acre Park	-	123.00	123.00
Future Park - Boca Chica	-	4.19	4.19
Future Park - Italy Ave	-	47.24	47.24
Future Park - Langlais	-	53.50	53.50
Total	264.94	598.73	863.67

¹ Total parcel size is 17.10 acres. Fire station 82 occupies 3 acres of this site. Park use allocation shown.

² Includes Boundless Adventures Playground.

³ Excludes 0.30 acres leased to Coast Guard

⁴ 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

	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					12,079,204
Subtotal					\$ 19,017,991
Total Value - Existing Facilities					\$ 19,017,991
Developed Park Acres					264.94
Investment per Developed Park Acre					\$ 71,782

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.7** for more detail regarding vehicles and equipment.

Table 6.4: Parkland Unit Costs

	Cost per Acre	Share of Parkland Costs
Standard Park Improvements ¹	\$ 75,000	
Special Use Facilities (See Table 6.3)	71,782	
Vehicles and Equipment (See Appendix Table A.7)	7,505	
Subtotal	\$ 154,287	57%
Land Acquisition	\$ 116,700	43%
Total Cost per Acre	\$ 270,987	100%

Note: Figures have been rounded.

¹ 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.

Existing Park Facility Standards

Table 6.5 shows the existing parkland standard based on the parkland acreage shown in Table 6.2, and the existing service population shown in Table 6.1. The City has an existing land standard of 10.64 acres per 1,000 capita, and an existing improved park standard of 3.26 acres of improved parkland per 1,000 capita.

Based on direction from the City Commission the following impact fee analysis is based on requiring new development to maintain the existing improved parkland standard, and to acquire land at a 5.0-acre per 1,000 capita standard.

Note that, the City's Comprehensive Plan Policy 1.5 states, "The City adopts a level of service of ten (10) acres of recreation and open space area per one-thousand (1,000) residents, to be allocated, among three (3) park classifications, with the following minimum acreage classifications: 1.5 acres of Community park; 1.5 acres of Open Space; 7.0 acres of Conservation lands." The current standards of 3.26 acres of improved parkland and 10.64 acres across all types of land exceed the Comprehensive Plan policy standards.

Table 6.5: Existing Parkland Standards

	Improved Park Acres	Unimproved Park/Open Space Acres	Total Existing Land Standard
Park Acreage	264.94	598.73	
Service Population	81,169	81,169	
Existing Standard (Acres per 1,000 Capita)	3.26	7.38	10.64
Policy Standard (Acres per 1,000 Capita)			5.00

Sources: Tables 6.1 and 6.2.

Facilities Needed to Accommodate New Development

Table 6.6 calculates the park facilities needed to accommodate new development at the existing standard. To contribute to new facilities at the existing improved parkland standard and the 5.0-acre land acquisition standard, new development must fund the acquisition of 326.11 and improvement of 212.62 acres of parkland.

Table 6.6: Park Facilities to Accommodate New Development

		Land	Improvements	Total
<u>Facility Needs</u>				
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 service population)	A	5.00	3.26	
Growth in Service Population	B	65,221	65,221	
Facility Needs (acres)	$C = (B/1,000) \times A$	326.11	212.62	
<u>Parkland Acquisition and Improvement</u>				
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	D	\$ 116,700	\$ 154,287	
Total Cost of Facilities	$E = C \times D$	\$38,057,037	\$ 32,804,502	\$70,861,539

Sources: Tables 6.1, 6.4, and 6.5.

Credit Component

To avoid overcharging new development for the capital cost of facilities and infrastructure, a review of the capital financing program for parks and recreations facilities was completed. The purpose of this review was to identify any potential revenues generated by new development, other than impact fees, that are programmed to fund expansion of capital facilities, land, and equipment over the next five years.

Capital expenditure credits per capita were calculated based on the non-impact fee revenue expenditures planned for capital expansion projects from FY2022 to FY2026 identified in the City's FY2022 Capital Improvement Program. The average annual capital expansion expenditures are divided by the average service population over the next five years to determine the capital expenditure per capita, for the five-year period.

The present value of the resulting average annual capacity expansion expenditures per capita is then calculated using a capitalization period of 20 years, and a 1.75% capitalization rate.⁴ The result is the revenue credit per capita which represents new development's contribution to capital facilities from sources other than impact fees. **Table 6.7** details these calculations.

⁴ Average 20-year interest rate as of February 10, 2022 for AAA municipal bonds at www.fmsbonds.com/market-yields/

Table 6.7: Park Facilities Capital Expansion Expenditures Credit

Funding Source	FY 2022 Adopted	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025	FY 2026	Five Year Total
Capital Funds ¹	\$3,633,430	\$ 630,000	\$ 425,000	\$1,355,000	\$800,000	\$ 6,843,430
<i>Less - Rehabilitation Projects¹</i>						
Dallas White Park - Conceptual Master Plan Design & Site Renovations	\$1,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,000,000
Narramore Soccer Field Rehabilitation and Replacement	-	-	100,000	100,000	100,000	300,000
Replacement Playground Equipment - Atwater Park	-	-	-	-	250,000	250,000
Replacement Playground Equipment - Dallas White Park	250,000	-	-	-	-	250,000
Replacement Playground Equipment - George Mullen Activity Center	-	-	250,000	-	-	250,000
Replacement Playground Equipment - McKibben Park	-	250,000	-	-	-	250,000
Replacement Playground Equipment - Pine Park	-	-	-	225,000	-	225,000
Warm Mineral Springs Building Rehabilitation	475,080	-	-	-	-	475,080
Total - Rehabilitation and Renovation	\$1,725,080	\$ 250,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 325,000	\$350,000	\$ 3,000,080
Net Capital Expansion Funding	\$1,908,350	\$ 380,000	\$ 75,000	\$1,030,000	\$450,000	\$ 3,843,350
Service Population ²	83,188	85,257	87,378	89,552	91,780	
Average Annual Capacity Expansion Expenditures						\$ 768,670
Average Service Population (2022 to 2026)						87,431
Average Annual Capacity Expansion Expenditures per Capita						\$ 8.79
Capitalization Period (in years)						20
Capitalization Rate ³						1.75%
Total Revenue Credit per Capita						\$ (147)

¹ City of North Port, Resolution No. 2021-R-38, Exhibit B, Page 5.² Based on 2.49% compound annual growth rate from 2021 to 2045 calculated from service population projections.³ Average 20-year interest rate as of February 10, 2022 for AAA municipal bonds at www.fmsbonds.com/market-yields/Sources: City of North Port Fiscal Year 2022 thru 2026 Capital Improvement Program; www.fmsbonds.com/market-yields/; 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, and the 5.0-acre land acquisition 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 capita. Then, those costs are divided by 1,000 to determine the cost needed to serve one person. Finally, the revenue credit calculated in Table 6.7 is subtracted from the investment per capita to determine the net investment per capita.

Table 6.8: Park Facilities Investment per Capita

	Total
<u>Land</u>	
Parkland Investment (per acre)	\$ 116,700
Facility Standard (acres per 1,000 service pop.)	5.00
Total Investment Per 1,000 capita	\$ 583,500
	1,000
Investment Per Capita	\$ 584
<u>Improvements</u>	
Parkland Investment (per acre)	\$ 154,287
Facility Standard (acres per 1,000 service pop.)	3.26
Total Investment Per 1,000 capita	\$ 502,976
	1,000
Investment Per Capita	\$ 503
<u>Total</u>	
Investment per Capita (Land + Improvements)	\$ 1,087
Revenue Credit per Resident	(147)
Net Investment per Capita	\$ 940
Service Population Growth (2021 to 2045)	\$ 65,221
Net Impact Fee Revenue	\$ 61,307,740

Sources: Tables 6.1, 6.4, 6.5 and 6.7.

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: Maximum Justified Park and Recreation Facilities Fee

	<i>A</i>		<i>B</i>	<i>C = A x B</i>	
	Cost Per				
Land Use	Capita		Density¹	Fee²	
<i>Residential - per Dwelling Unit</i>					
Single Family	\$	940	2.43	\$	2,284
Multifamily		940	1.76		1,654
Senior Unit		940	1.12		1,053
<i>Nonresidential</i>					
Hotel/Lodging	\$	940	0.94	\$	879

¹ Residential occupancy density assumptions from Table 2.2. Hotel visitor density assumes 55% annual occupancy and 1.7 visitors per room per night.

² Fee per dwelling unit or hotel room.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 6.8.

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 the most recent 5-year average, FY2017-FY2021. Other residential WGUs and all nonresidential factors based on data from the City's 2011 Impact Fee Update Study, adjusted to 2021 based on the percentage change in single family waste generation, as the City does not track this data. Note that waste generation for senior units was adjusted based on occupant density relative to multifamily unit to reflect lower amounts of waste generation. Also note that the demand unit for golf courses for this fee category is on building square footage, as opposed to acres for the other impact fee categories.

Table 7.1: Solid Waste - Equivalent Dwelling Units

Land Use	Demand Unit	Waste Generation Units (WGU) ¹	Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDU) ²
<i><u>Residential - per Dwelling Unit</u></i>			
Single Family	Dwelling Unit	1.18	1.00
Multifamily	Dwelling Unit	0.70	0.59
Senior Unit ³	Dwelling Unit	0.45	0.38
<i><u>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft. or Hotel Room</u></i>			
Commercial: Retail	1,000 Sq. Ft.	2.91	2.47
Commercial: Restaurant	1,000 Sq. Ft.	13.97	11.84
Commercial: Gas Station (Building Area)	1,000 Sq. Ft.	11.66	9.88
Commercial: Car Wash	Tunnel	1.95	1.65
Commercial: Hotel/Lodging	Room	0.82	0.69
Office	1,000 Sq. Ft.	1.37	1.16
Medical Office	1,000 Sq. Ft.	1.63	1.38
Industrial: Manufacturing/Warehouse	1,000 Sq. Ft.	2.50	2.12
Institutional (schools, churches, daycare)	1,000 Sq. Ft.	4.19	3.55
Nursing Home/ Congregate Care Facility	1,000 Sq. Ft.	1.18	1.00
Recreational: Golf Course ⁴	1,000 Sq. Ft.	3.01	2.55
Recreational: Community Center	1,000 Sq. Ft.	2.66	2.25

¹ 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, FY2017-FY2021. Other residential WGUs and all nonresidential factors based on data from the City's 2011 Impact Fee Update Study, adjusted to 2021 based on the percentage change in single family waste generation, as the City does not track this data.

² 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.

³ Waste generation for senior units adjusted based on occupant density relative to multifamily unit.

⁴ Charged based on building square footage for this fee category, as opposed to per acre for other categories.

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 2045. 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.

Residential EDUs are assumed to increase proportionally to the projected increase in permanent and weighted seasonal residential population growth from Table 2.1. Nonresidential EDUs are assumed to increase proportionally to employment growth from Table 2.1. The analysis assumes that the ratio of garbage to recycling to yard waste proportions will remain constant over time.

Table 7.2: Current and Projected Solid Waste Generation

	2021	2045	Increase ¹
<i><u>Residential</u></i>			
Garbage	30,569	55,131	24,562
Recycling	7,271	13,113	5,842
Yard Waste	<u>3,680</u>	<u>6,637</u>	<u>2,957</u>
Subtotal	41,520	74,881	33,362
<i><u>Commercial</u></i>			
Garbage	11,721	36,972	25,251
Recycling	<u>327</u>	<u>1,031</u>	<u>704</u>
Subtotal	12,048	38,003	25,955
Total Tonnage	53,568	112,884	59,316
Annual Waste Generation per EDU	1.18	1.18	1.18
Estimated EDUs	45,397	95,664	50,268

¹ Residential EDUs are assumed to increase proportionally to the projected increase in permanent and weighted seasonal residential population growth from Table 2.1. Nonresidential EDUs are assumed to increase proportionally to employment growth from Table 2.1. The analysis assumes that the ratio of garbage to recycling to yard waste proportions will remain constant over time.

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.8**. In total, the City owns approximately \$19.6 million worth of solid waste facilities.

Table 7.3: Existing Solid Waste Facilities Inventory

	Inventory	Unit	Unit Cost	Replacement Cost
<u><i>Solid Waste Facility</i></u>				
Land	0.44	acres	\$ 116,700	\$ 51,422
Public Works/Fleet Facility ¹	3.25	acres	116,700	379,275
Subtotal	3.69			\$ 430,697
<u><i>Buildings</i></u>				
Solid Waste Crew Building	1,776	sq. ft.	\$ 72	\$ 127,192
Public Works/Fleet Facility ¹	9,667	sq. ft.	251	2,423,627
Subtotal	11,443			\$ 2,550,819
<u><i>Vehicles and Equipment (See Appendix Table A.8)</i></u>				<u>\$ 16,664,801</u>
Total Value - Existing Facilities				\$ 19,646,317

¹ 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.

Existing Facility Standards

Table 7.4 displays the City's current solid waste facility infrastructure standards expressed in terms of units per 1,000 capita. Impact fees calculated using the existing standard methodology can provide a funding source from new development to ensure that these standards are maintained as new development creates additional demand for facilities.

Table 7.4: Existing Facility Standards

Component	Quantity	Units	Existing EDUs	Facility Standard per 1,000 EDU
Land	3.69	Acres	45,397	0.08
Buildings	11,443	Sq. Ft.	45,397	252.06
Vehicles	79	Vehicles	45,397	1.74

Sources: Tables 7.2 and 7.3.

Planned Facilities

Table 7.5 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. Budgeted surtax and 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 7.5: Planned Solid Waste Facilities

Solid Waste Transfer Station	\$ 4,819,700
Less Surtax Funding	<u>500,000</u>
Net Cost	\$ 4,319,700
Public Works Facility - Phase 2 - Solid Waste Share	\$ 2,309,440
Less Solid Waste District Funding ¹	<u>95,000</u>
Net Cost	\$ 2,214,440
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	\$ 6,534,140

¹ Identified for FY 2022.

Source: City of North Port Capital Improvement Program pages 94 and 119; North Port Solid Waste District.

Credit Component

To avoid overcharging new development for the capital cost of facilities and infrastructure, a review of the capital financing program for solid waste facilities was completed. The purpose of this review was to identify any potential revenues generated by new development, other than impact fees, that are programmed to fund expansion of capital facilities, land, and equipment over the next five years.

Capital expenditure credits per capita were calculated based on the non-impact fee revenue expenditures planned for capital expansion projects from FY2022 to FY2026 identified in the City's FY2022 Capital Improvement Program. The average annual capital expansion expenditures are divided by the average solid waste EDUs over the next five years to determine the capital expenditure per EDU, for the five-year period.

The present value of the resulting average annual capacity expansion expenditures per EDU is then calculated using a capitalization period of 20 years, and a 1.75% capitalization rate.⁵ The result is the revenue credit per capita which represents new development's contribution to capital facilities from sources other than impact fees. **Table 7.6** details these calculations.

⁵ Average 20-year interest rate as of February 10, 2022 for AAA municipal bonds at www.fmsbonds.com/market-yields/

Table 7.6: Solid Waste Facilities Capital Expansion Expenditures Credit

Funding Source	FY 2022 Adopted	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025	FY 2026	Five Year Total
Capital Funds ¹	\$ 500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500,000
EDUs ²	46,829	48,306	49,830	51,402	53,024	
Average Annual Capacity Expansion Expenditures						\$ 100,000
Average Service Population (2022 to 2026)						49,878
Average Annual Capacity Expansion Expenditures per Capita						\$ 2.00
Capitalization Period (in years)						20
Capitalization Rate ³						1.75%
Total Revenue Credit per Capita						\$ (34)

¹ City of North Port, Resolution No. 2021-R-38, Exhibit B, Page 10.

² Based on 3.15% compound annual growth rate from 2021 to 2045 calculated from EDU projections.

³ Average 20-year interest rate as of February 10, 2022 for AAA municipal bonds at www.fmsbonds.com/market-yields/

Sources: City of North Port Fiscal Year 2022 thru 2026 Capital Improvement Program; www.fmsbonds.com/market-yields/; Willdan Financial Services.

Cost per Equivalent Dwelling Unit

This chapter uses the existing facilities standard approach to calculate the solid waste facilities cost standard. The replacement cost of the entire system of current solid waste facilities is divided by the total amount of existing EDUs to determine a cost standard per EDU that will be the basis of the fee. The revenue credits are subtracted from the cost per EDU to determine the net cost per EDU which drives the fee calculation. **Table 7.7** shows the facility cost standard for solid waste facilities.

Table 7.7: Solid Waste Facilities Existing Cost Standard

Value of Existing Facilities	\$ 19,646,317
Existing EDUs	45,397
Cost per EDU	\$ 433
Less Revenue Credit	\$ (34)
Net Cost per EDU	\$ 399

Sources: Tables 7.2, 7.3 and 7.6.

Projected Fee Revenue

Table 7.8 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 maintain the existing facility standard through the

planning horizon. The City plans to construct the facilities listed in Table 7.5, but will also need to identify other capacity expanding improvements to serve new development.

Table 7.8: Projected Revenue

Cost per EDU	\$	399
Growth in EDUs (2020- 2045)		50,268
Fee Revenue	\$	20,056,932
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	\$	6,534,140
Additional Facilities to be Identified	\$	13,522,792

Sources: Tables 7.2, 7.5 and 7.7.

Fee Schedule

The maximum justified fee for solid waste facilities is shown in **Table 7.9**. The cost per EDU from Table 7.7 is multiplied by the EDU factors from Table 7.1 to determine the solid waste facilities fee per land use demand unit. The City can adopt any fee up to this amount.

Table 7.9: Maximum Justified Solid Waste Facilities Impact Fee Schedule

Land Use	Demand Unit	A	B	C = A x B	F =1,000
		Cost Per EDU	EDU Factor	Base Fee	Fee per Sq. Ft.
<u>Residential - per Dwelling Unit</u>					
Single Family	Dwelling Unit	\$ 399	1.00	\$ 399	
Multifamily	Dwelling Unit	399	0.59	237	
Senior Unit	Dwelling Unit	399	0.38	151	
<u>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft. or Hotel Room</u>					
Commercial: Retail and Services	1,000 Sq. Ft.	\$ 399	2.47	\$ 984	\$ 0.98
Commercial: Restaurant	1,000 Sq. Ft.	399	11.84	4,724	4.72
Commercial: Gas Station (Building Area)	1,000 Sq. Ft.	399	9.88	3,943	3.94
Commercial: Car Wash	Tunnel	399	1.65	659	0.66
Commercial: Hotel/Lodging	Room	399	0.69	277	0.28
Office	1,000 Sq. Ft.	399	1.16	463	0.46
Medical Office	1,000 Sq. Ft.	399	1.38	551	0.55
Industrial: Manufacturing/Warehouse	1,000 Sq. Ft.	399	2.12	845	0.85
Institutional (schools, churches, daycare)	1,000 Sq. Ft.	399	3.55	1,417	1.42
Nursing Home/ Congregate Care Facility	1,000 Sq. Ft.	399	1.00	399	0.40
Recreational: Golf Course ¹	1,000 Sq. Ft.	399	2.55	1,018	1.02
Recreational: Community Center	1,000 Sq. Ft.	399	2.25	899	0.90

¹ Charged based on building square footage for this fee category, as opposed to per acre for other categories.

Sources: Tables 7.1 and 7.7.

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:

(4) At a minimum, each local government that adopts and collects an impact fee by ordinance and each special district that adopts, collects, and administers an impact fee by resolution must:

(a) Ensure that the calculation of the impact fee is based on the most recent and localized data.

(b) Provide for accounting and reporting of impact fee collections and expenditures and account for the revenues and expenditures of such impact fee in a separate accounting fund.

(c) Limit administrative charges for the collection of impact fees to actual costs.

(d) Provide notice at least 90 days before the effective date of an ordinance or resolution imposing a new or increased impact fee. A local government is not required to wait 90 days to decrease, suspend, or eliminate an impact fee. Unless the result is to reduce the total mitigation costs or impact fees imposed on an applicant, new or increased impact fees may not apply to current or pending permit applications submitted before the effective date of a new or increased impact fee.

(e) Ensure that 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) Ensure that the impact fee is proportional and reasonably connected to, or has a rational nexus with, the need for additional capital facilities and the increased impact generated by the new residential or commercial construction.

(g) Ensure that the impact fee is proportional and reasonably connected to, or has a rational nexus with, the expenditures of the funds collected and the benefits accruing to the new residential or nonresidential construction.

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

(i) Ensure that revenues generated by the impact fee are not 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.

(6) A local government, school district, or special district may increase an impact fee only as provided in this subsection.

(a) An impact fee may be increased only pursuant to a plan for the imposition, collection, and use of the increased impact fees which complies with this section.

(b) An increase to a current impact fee rate of not more than 25 percent of the current rate must be implemented in two equal annual increments beginning with the date on which the increased fee is adopted.

(c) An increase to a current impact fee rate which exceeds 25 percent but is not more than 50 percent of the current rate must be implemented in four equal installments beginning with the date the increased fee is adopted.

(d) An impact fee increase may not exceed 50 percent of the current impact fee rate.

(e) An impact fee may not be increased more than once every 4 years.

(f) An impact fee may not be increased retroactively for a previous or current fiscal or calendar year.

(g) A local government, school district, or special district may increase an impact fee rate beyond the phase-in limitations established under paragraph (b), paragraph (c), paragraph (d), or paragraph (e) by establishing the need for such increase in full compliance with the requirements of subsection (4), provided the following criteria are met:

1. A demonstrated-need study justifying any increase in excess of those authorized in paragraph (b), paragraph (c), paragraph (d), or paragraph (e) has been completed within the 12 months before the adoption of the impact fee increase and expressly demonstrates the extraordinary circumstances necessitating the need to exceed the phase-in limitations.

2. The local government jurisdiction has held not less than two publicly noticed workshops dedicated to the extraordinary circumstances necessitating the need to exceed the phase-in limitations set forth in paragraph (b), paragraph (c), paragraph (d), or paragraph (e).

3. The impact fee increase ordinance is approved by at least a two-thirds vote of the governing body.

163.31801(8) also states:

A local government, school district, or special district must submit with its annual financial report required under s. 218.32 or its financial audit report required under s. 218.39 a separate affidavit signed by its chief financial officer or, if there is no chief financial officer, its executive officer attesting, to the best of his or her knowledge, that all impact fees were collected and expended by the local government, school district, or special district, or were collected and expended on its behalf, in full compliance with the spending period provision in the local ordinance or resolution, and that funds expended from each impact fee account were used only to acquire, construct, or improve specific infrastructure needs.

Demonstrated Need Study

The City has completed a Demonstrated Need Study dated February 25, 2022, consistent with the requirements listed above in s. 163.31801 (6) g to allow the City Commission the option to increase fees at a level greater than the established phase-in limitations. The study establishes the extraordinary circumstances in North Port necessitating the need to exceed the phase-in limitations for the general government, law enforcement, fire and EMS, parks and recreation and solid waste facilities fees. The following summarizes the extraordinary circumstances that are discussed in greater detail in the Demonstrated Need Study:

- North Port has grown at a rate that exceeds twice the rate of growth for Sarasota County and the State of Florida as a whole. The high rate of growth will continue to place significant demands for the City's infrastructure.
- Since the previous Impact Fee Study update in 2011, construction costs for capital facilities have increased significantly. The fees calculated in 2011 can no longer fund the intended facilities level of service.
- The City Commission never implemented the maximum justified fee levels from the 2011 study. The fees were initially implemented at 50% of the maximum justified fee levels. In

2019, the fee schedule was increased to 75% of the maximum justified fee levels from the 2011 study. In February 2021 the City adopted the maximum justified fee schedule from the 2011 study, but the fee increases were invalidated by HR 337.

- During the recession, the City placed a moratorium on transportation and solid waste Impact Fees.
- Implementing increased impact fees in the manner provided for under the phase-in limitations in s. 163.31801 (6) g would result in a significant revenue loss to North Port, especially in the City's case where the maximum fees had not been originally adopted and the City had relied upon the ability to phase them in. The current requirements are an additional restriction and delay on this phase in. Facilities needed to serve new development would have to be funded by existing taxpayers, or else the City's facility standards would decrease.

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.

9. Appendix

Appendix Table A.1: General Government Vehicle Inventory

Vehicle	Department	Year	Make	Model	Class	Estimated Replacement Cost
73074	ARBORIST	2017	FORD	F-150 4X4	LIGHT PU/VAN	\$ 37,000
73182	ARBORIST	2018	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
70582	BUILDING	2005	FORD	EXPLOR-4X	SUV	31,500
72896	BUILDING	2015	FORD	F150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
72897	BUILDING	2015	FORD	F150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
72900	BUILDING	2015	FORD	F150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
72901	BUILDING	2015	FORD	F150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
72902	BUILDING	2015	FORD	F150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
72940	BUILDING	2016	FORD	F150 4X4	LIGHT PU/VAN	37,000
72941	BUILDING	2016	FORD	F150 4X4	LIGHT PU/VAN	37,000
72945	BUILDING	2016	FORD	F150 4X4	LIGHT PU/VAN	37,000
73071	BUILDING	2017	FORD	F-150 4X4	LIGHT PU/VAN	37,000
73080	BUILDING	2017	FORD	EXPLORER 4WD	SUV	31,500
73184	BUILDING	2018	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
73245	BUILDING	2018	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
73246	BUILDING	2018	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
73302	BUILDING	2019	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
73334	BUILDING	2019	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
73087	CITY MNGR	2018	FORD	TRANSIT CONNECT	PASSCAR	26,500
71295	CODE ENFOR	2007	CHRYSLER	SEBRING	PASSCAR	24,000
72895	CODE ENFOR	2015	FORD	F150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
72898	CODE ENFOR	2015	FORD	F150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
72899	CODE ENFOR	2015	FORD	F150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
73324	CODE ENFOR	2019	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
73326	CODE ENFOR	2019	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
72847	COMMUNICAT	2016	FORD	FUSION	PASSCAR	24,000
10006	FACILITIES	2018	EXPRESS	TRAILER 14K	TRAILER	5,000
70050	FACILITIES	2002	WELLS CARGO	TRAILER	TRAILER	11,000
70391	FACILITIES	2004	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
70398	FACILITIES	2004	FORD	F-250-4X	DIESEL PICK UP	36,500
70616	FACILITIES	2006	FORD	F-150-4XLT	LIGHT PU/VAN	37,000
70854	FACILITIES	2006	FORD	F-150-4X	LIGHT PU/VAN	37,000
71003	FACILITIES	2007	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
71009	FACILITIES	2007	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
71606	FACILITIES	2011	FORD	VAN-E250	LIGHT PU/VAN	40,520
71848	FACILITIES	2013	TORO	Z T MOWER	MOWER	15,000
72851	FACILITIES	2015	FORD	F-550 BUCKET	BUCKET	148,500
73088	FACILITIES	2018	FORD	TRANSIT CONNECT	PASSCAR	26,000
73185	FACILITIES	2018	FORD	TRANSIT VAN	LIGHT PU/VAN	40,520
73214	FACILITIES	2018	FORD	TRANSIT VAN	LIGHT PU/VAN	40,520
73072	HR	2017	FORD	FUSION	PASSCAR	24,000
73407	I&T	2020	CHEVROLET	EQUINOX	SUV	24,500
72939	PLANNING	2016	FORD	F150 4X4	LIGHT PU/VAN	37,000
73183	PLANNING	2018	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
70495	PW-FLEET	2005	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
70915	PW-FLEET	2006	FORD	F-550-SERV	DIESEL PICK UP	115,000
71912	PW-FLEET	2005	MITSUBISHI	FG25N FORK LIFT	FORKLIFT	77,000
73346	PW-FLEET	2019	FORD	F-350 SERVICE	LIGHT PU/VAN	47,000
73363	PW-FLEET	2019	DODGE	GRAND CARAVAN	LIGHT PU/VAN	27,000
73415	PW-FLEET	2019	JOHN DEERE	HPX615E GATOR	UTILITY VEHICLE	18,000
73597	PW-FLEET	2020	FORD	F-350 WELDER	LIGHT PU/VAN	80,500
70696	SOCIAL SER	2006	JEEP	LIBERTY	SUV	30,000
Total Replacement Cost						\$ 1,933,060

Source: City of North Port.

Appendix Table A.2: Fire Protection Worker Weighting Factor - Calls for Service

	2018 Calls	2019 Calls	2020 Calls	2021 Calls
Residential				
400 - Residential, other	241	106	76	75
419 - 1 or 2 family dwelling	4,445	5,349	6,525	5,193
429 - Multifamily dwelling	338	264	264	176
439 - Boarding/rooming house, residential hotels	1	2	2	-
459 - Residential board and care	3	4	-	1
460 - Dormitory-type residence, other	7	2	2	1
881 - Parking garage, (detached residential garage)	-	-	-	1
899 - Residential or self-storage units	11	3	2	-
962 - Residential street, road or residential driveway	266	299	313	264
Total - Residential	5,312	6,028	7,184	5,711
Nonresidential Calls				
100 - Assembly, other	9	11	3	4
112 - Billiard center, pool hall	1	-	-	-
115 - Roller rink: indoor or outdoor	2	-	1	-
129 - Amusement center: indoor/outdoor	3	1	-	1
130 - Places of worship, funeral parlors, other	-	8	-	1
131 - Church, mosque, synagogue, temple, chapel	45	36	27	12
140 - Clubs, other	6	-	-	-
141 - Athletic/health club	2	6	3	4
142 - Clubhouse	12	18	24	18
160 - Eating, drinking places, other	1	9	3	4
161 - Restaurant or cafeteria	48	56	59	50
162 - Bar or nightclub	8	3	4	4
180 - Studio/theater, other	-	-	1	-
200 - Educational, other	2	1	-	1
210 - Schools, non-adult, other	3	3	1	2
211 - Preschool	3	5	4	5
213 - Elementary school, including kindergarten	24	16	10	9
215 - High school/junior high school/middle school	60	49	28	19
241 - Adult education center, college classroom	1	8	7	9
254 - Day care, in commercial property	4	6	1	9
255 - Day care, in residence, licensed	-	1	-	-
256 - Day care in residence, unlicensed	-	1	-	-
300 - Health care, detention, & correction, other	6	19	4	6
311 - 24-hour care nursing homes, 4 or more persons	436	601	473	436
321 - Mental retardation/development disability facility	1	1	1	1
323 - Asylum, mental institution	-	-	1	-
331 - Hospital - medical or psychiatric	10	11	5	6
340 - Clinics, doctors offices, hemodialysis cntr, other	84	138	122	104
341 - Clinic, clinic-type infirmary	3	24	20	14
342 - Doctor, dentist or oral surgeon office	19	20	28	31
343 - Hemodialysis unit	5	5	4	2
449 - Hotel/motel, commercial	7	17	39	27
500 - Mercantile, business, other	174	68	46	33
511 - Convenience store	15	32	22	14
519 - Food and beverage sales, grocery store	82	86	68	66
529 - Textile, wearing apparel sales	5	7	4	2
539 - Household goods, sales, repairs	15	7	7	4
549 - Specialty shop	8	3	6	11
557 - Personal service, including barber & beauty shops	2	8	5	1
559 - Recreational, hobby, home repair sales, pet store	14	6	2	5
564 - Laundry, dry cleaning	4	4	1	2
569 - Professional supplies, services	2	3	5	-
571 - Service station, gas station	47	41	35	28
579 - Motor vehicle or boat sales, services, repair	6	4	1	1
580 - General retail, other	9	14	14	16
581 - Department or discount store	10	16	7	7
592 - Bank	12	11	4	6
593 - Office: veterinary or research	2	-	2	-
599 - Business office	45	7	6	2
639 - Communications center	-	2	-	1
700 - Manufacturing, Processing	2	7	5	3
800 - Storage, other	3	5	-	-
807 - Outside material storage area	1	-	2	1
808 - Outbuilding or shed	-	2	1	2
890 - Vehicle storage, other	-	-	1	1
882 - Parking garage, general vehicle	-	-	1	1
891 - Warehouse	1	1	4	1
898 - Dock, marina, pier, wharf	-	-	2	-
935 - Campsite with utilities	-	1	1	1
963 - Street or road in commercial area	66	70	113	122
981 - Construction site	1	6	7	7
984 - Industrial plant yard - area	-	2	-	1
Total - Nonresidential	1,331	1,487	1,245	1,118
Other				
(None)	473	634	452	718
000 - Property Use, other	2	26	6	3
110 - Fixed-use recreation places, other	18	18	14	9
116 - Swimming facility: indoor or outdoor	-	5	7	6
120 - Variable-use amusement, recreation places, other	-	5	3	8
121 - Ballroom, gymnasium	-	4	1	1
123 - Stadium, arena	-	11	7	8
124 - Playground	3	12	6	7
150 - Public or government, other	10	25	22	7
151 - Library	8	6	1	9
152 - Museum	-	-	-	1
173 - Bus station	-	2	3	1
365 - Police station	20	10	7	22
596 - Post office or mailing firms	5	1	2	2
640 - Utility or Distribution system, other	-	-	-	1
642 - Electrical distribution	1	-	1	-
647 - Water utility	2	1	1	1
669 - Forest, timberland, woodland	-	5	6	4
888 - Fire station	59	43	52	56
900 - Outside or special property, other	34	28	30	15
926 - Outbuilding, protective shelter	2	2	1	1
931 - Open land or field	51	32	38	37
936 - Vacant lot	107	110	155	112
939 - Graded and cared-for plots of land	4	14	4	4
940 - Water area, other	1	4	6	2
946 - Lake, river, stream	1	1	-	2
960 - Street, other	115	132	124	94
961 - Highway or divided highway	306	409	420	294
965 - Vehicle parking area	37	82	130	141
983 - Pipeline, power line or other utility right-of-way	3	2	5	2
NNN - None	21	33	81	31
UUU - Undetermined	10	73	13	-
Total - Other	1,293	1,730	1,598	1,599
Total	7,936	9,245	10,027	8,428

Source: City of North Port Fire Department.

Appendix Table A.3: Fire Protection Worker Weighting Factor - Calls for Service

	2018	2019	2020	2021	Average Weighting Factor
<i>Summary</i>					
Residential	5,312	6,028	7,184	5,711	
Nonresidential	1,331	1,487	1,245	1,118	
Other	1,293	1,730	1,598	1,599	
Total	7,936	9,245	10,027	8,428	
Residents ¹	70,631	73,652	77,561	78,129	
Calls per 1,000 Residents	75.21	81.84	92.62	73.10	
Employees ²	6,657	7,200	7,794	8,438	
Calls per 1,000 Employees	199.94	206.53	159.73	132.50	
Employment Weighting Factor ³	2.66	2.52	1.72	1.81	2.18

¹ Based on BEBR data.

² 2018 and 2019 based on OnTheMap data. 2020 and 2021 estimated based on historical compound annual growth rate from 2009 to 2019.

³ Calls per 1,000 Employees / Calls per 1,000 Residents

Sources: City of North Port; University of Florida, Bureau of Economic and Business Research, 2020 and 2021; U.S. Census Bureau LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (2009-2019) accessed at <https://onthemap.ces.census.gov>; Willdan Financial Services.

Appendix Table A.4: Fire and Rescue Vehicle and Apparatus Inventory

Vehicle	Department	Year	Make	Model	Class	Estimated
						Replacement Cost
71478	EMS	2009	CHEVROLET	AMBULANCE	AMB	\$ 448,528
73066	EMS	2017	FREIGHTLINER	M2 AMBULANCE	AMB	448,528
73067	EMS	2017	FREIGHTLINER	M2 AMBULANCE	AMB	448,528
73217	EMS	2019	INTERNATIONAL	AMBULANCE	AMB	448,528
73218	EMS	2019	INTERNATIONAL	AMBULANCE	AMB	448,528
73268	EMS	2019	INTERNATIONAL	AMBULANCE	AMB	448,528
73269	EMS	2019	INTERNATIONAL	AMBULANCE	AMB	448,528
73270	EMS	2019	INTERNATIONAL	AMBULANCE	AMB	448,528
73333	EMS	2018	INTERNATIONAL	AMBULANCE	AMB	448,528
70133	F/R ADMIN	2003	FORD	F-550	DIESEL PICK UP	94,500
71687	F/R ADMIN	2012	FORD	EXPEDIT	SUV	58,830
72494	F/R ADMIN	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUV	58,830
72496	F/R ADMIN	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUV	58,830
72936	F/R ADMIN	2016	FORD	TRANSIT VAN	LIGHT PU/VAN	32,356
72946	F/R ADMIN	2016	FORD	EXPLORER	SUV	41,303
72947	F/R ADMIN	2016	FORD	EXPLORER	SUV	41,303
72963	F/R ADMIN	2016	FORD	F250 4X4 UTIL	LIGHT PU/VAN	52,475
73064	F/R ADMIN	2017	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	39,515
73165	F/R ADMIN	2018	FORD	EXPLORER	SUV	41,303
73230	F/R ADMIN	2018	FORD	EXPEDITION SSV	SUV	58,830
73292	F/R ADMIN	2019	FORD	EXPEDITION	SUV	58,830
73323	F/R ADMIN	2019	WELLS CARGO	GOOSE TRAILER	TRAILER	35,071
73336	F/R ADMIN	2019	FORD	EXPEDITION	SUV	58,830
73337	F/R ADMIN	2019	FORD	EXPEDITION	SUV	58,830
73361	F/R ADMIN	2019	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	39,515
73433	F/R ADMIN	2020	FORD	F-550 TRT	DIESEL PICK UP	54,017
73439	F/R ADMIN	2019	FORD	EXPEDITION	SUV	58,830
232	FIRERESCUE	1978	AMERGEN	BRUSHTRUCK	BRUSHTRUCK	40,659
233	FIRERESCUE	1978	AMERGEN	BRUSHTRUCK	BRUSHTRUCK	40,659
234	FIRERESCUE	1978		BRUSHTRUCK	BRUSHTRUCK	40,659
236	FIRERESCUE	2000	UNKNOWN	BRUSH TRUCK	BRUSHTRUCK	40,659
70016	FIRERESCUE	2002	PIERCE	FIRETRUCK	FIRETRUCK	983,345
70427	FIRERESCUE	2004	EMERGENCY1	FIRETRUCK	FIRETRUCK	983,345
70586	FIRERESCUE	2005	Kenworth/ Fouts	T300TANKER	FIRETRUCK	297,451
70611	FIRERESCUE	2005	FORD	F-150-4X	LIGHT PU/VAN	39,515
71148	FIRERESCUE	2006	EMERGENCY1	FIREAERIAL	FIRETRUCK	1,255,418
71149	FIRERESCUE	2006	EMERGENCY1	FIREAERIAL	FIRETRUCK	1,255,418
71266	FIRERESCUE	2008	FORD	F-350-4X	DIESEL PICK UP	94,500
71277	FIRERESCUE	2008	MISC	TRAILER	TRAILER	5,290
71290	FIRERESCUE	2005	POLARIS	ATV-4X	UTILITY VEHICLE	17,517
71480	FIRERESCUE	2009	PIERCE	FIRETRUCK	FIRETRUCK	983,345
71545	FIRERESCUE	2007	ANDERSON	TRAILER	TRAILER	2,496
71876	FIRERESCUE	1946	SEAGRAVE	FIRE TRUCK	FIRETRUCK	-
72314	FIRERESCUE	2015	PIERCE	PUMPER	FIRETRUCK	983,345
72378	FIRERESCUE	2014	EXPRESS	TRAILER	TRAILER	6,560
73005	FIRERESCUE	2017	PIERCE	IMPEL PUMPER	FIRETRUCK	983,345
73006	FIRERESCUE	2017	PIERCE	VELOCITY AERIAL	FIRETRUCK	1,255,418
73164	FIRERESCUE	2018	FORD	EXPLORER	SUV	41,303
73212	FIRERESCUE	2018	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	39,515
73229	FIRERESCUE	2019	PIERCE	LADDER TRUCK	FIRETRUCK	1,255,418
73389	FIRERESCUE	2020	KENWORTH/ FOUTS	T300TANKER	FIRETRUCK	297,451
73408	FIRERESCUE	2020	PIERCE	FIRETRUCK	FIRETRUCK	983,345
73497	FIRERESCUE	2020	INTIMIDATOR	INTIMIDATOR	UTILITY VEHICLE	17,517
73601	FIRERESCUE	2021	PIERCE	AERIAL LADDER	FIRETRUCK	1,255,418
Total Replacement Cost						\$ 18,177,662

Source: City of North Port.

Appendix Table A.5: Law Enforcement Worker Weighting Factor - Calls for Service

Zoning	Classification	2018	2019	2020	2021	Average Weighting Factor
<Null>	Other	6,146	6,755	5,914	8,153	
Agriculture	Residential	388	316	381	269	
Commercial General	Nonresidential	1,289	1,179	1,194	888	
Commercial Recreation	Nonresidential	12	6	6	10	
Commercial Redevelopment Low impact	Residential	143	41	27	6	
Conservation District	Other	2	3	-	-	
Government Use	Other	2,310	2,187	2,061	1,803	
Industrial/Light Warehouse	Nonresidential	104	146	144	94	
Neighborhood Commercial-High Intensity	Nonresidential	36	52	36	36	
Neighborhood Commercial-Low Intensity	Nonresidential	1	1	1	1	
No Zoning Designation	Other	2	4	9	5	
Office/Professional/Institutional	Nonresidential	48	58	24	26	
Planned Community Development	Nonresidential	3,973	3,559	3,104	2,369	
Recreation/Open Space	Other	60	39	38	51	
Residential Manufactured Housing	Residential	174	97	138	86	
Residential Multi-Family	Residential	358	288	170	71	
Residential Single Family 2	Residential	14,146	13,469	12,774	8,015	
Residential Single Family 3	Residential	1,466	1,120	1,202	914	
Residential Two Family	Residential	192	139	156	124	
Village	Nonresidential	611	463	722	464	
Total		31,461	29,922	28,101	23,385	
Summary						
Residential		16,867	15,470	14,848	9,485	
Nonresidential		6,074	5,464	5,231	3,888	
Other		8,520	8,988	8,022	10,012	
Total		31,461	29,922	28,101	23,385	
Residents ¹		70,631	73,652	77,561	79,436	
Calls per 1,000 Residents		239	210	191	119	
Employees ²		6,657	7,200	7,794	8,438	
Calls per 1,000 Employees		912	759	671	461	
Employment Weighting Factor ³		3.82	3.61	3.51	3.86	3.70

¹ Based on BEBR data.² 2018 and 2019 based on OnTheMap data. 2020 and 2021 estimated based on historical compound annual growth rate from 2009 to 2019.³ Calls per 1,000 Employees / Calls per 1,000 ResidentsSources: City of North Port; University of Florida, Bureau of Economic and Business Research, 2020 and 2021; U.S. Census Bureau LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (2009-2019) accessed at <https://onthemap.ces.census.gov>; Willdan Financial Services.

Appendix Table A.6: Law Enforcement Vehicle Inventory

Vehicle	Year	Make	Model	Class	Estimated Replacement Cost
10016	2020	STRYKER	TRAILER-10K	TRAILER	\$ 4,000
10018	2021	TEXAS TRAILER	TRAILER-7K	TRAILER	7,500
10019	2021	CONTINENTAL	TRAILER	TRAILER	7,000
70494	2005	FORD	F-150-4X	LIGHT PU/VAN	57,200
70560	2005	FORD	F-450	DIESEL PICK UP	97,000
70630	2006	FORD	FREESTAR	LIGHT PU/VAN	28,000
70659	2006	FORD	F-150-4X	LIGHT PU/VAN	57,200
70707	2006	FORD	ESCAPE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
70708	2006	FORD	ESCAPE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
70779	2006	FORD	EXPEDIT-4X	SUVPOLICE	57,000
70780	2006	FORD	EXPEDIT-4X	SUVPOLICE	57,000
71015	2007	SUZUKI	ATV	UTILITY VEHICLE	10,000
71146	2005	TRU TOW	TRAILER	TRAILER	4,000
71162	2007	FORD	F-150-4X	LIGHT PU/VAN	57,200
71309	2007	FORD	F-150-CREW	LIGHT PU/VAN	57,200
71323	2007	CHEVROLET	COMBUS	BUS	250,000
71575	2010	TRIPLE CROWN	TRAILER	TRAILER	3,000
71609	2011	FORD	TAURUS	POLICECAR	35,000
71937	2014	FORD	INTERCEPTOR	POLICECAR	50,000
71940	2014	FORD	INTERCEPTOR	POLICECAR	50,000
71949	2014	FORD	INTERCEPTOR	POLICECAR	50,000
72373	1999	CHEVROLET	ASTRO	LIGHT PU/VAN	28,000
72466	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72467	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72468	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72469	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72470	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72471	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72472	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72473	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72474	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72475	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72477	2014	CHEVROLET	IMPALA	POLICECAR	35,000
72479	2015	CHEVROLET	IMPALA	POLICECAR	35,000
72480	2015	CHEVROLET	IMPALA	POLICECAR	35,000
72486	2015	FORD	FUSION	POLICECAR	35,000
72491	2000	ROAD MASTER	ENCLOSED TRAILER	TRAILER	5,000
72492	2005	EXPRESS	ENCLOSED TRAILER	TRAILER	7,000
72493	2005	FOREST RIVER	ENCLOSED TRAILER	TRAILER	7,500
72527	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72528	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72529	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72530	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72531	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72532	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72533	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72534	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72535	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72536	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72537	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72539	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000

Source: City of North Port.

Appendix Table A.6: Law Enforcement Vehicle Inventory Continued

Vehicle	Year	Make	Model	Class	Estimated Replacement Cost
72540	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	\$ 57,000
72541	2015	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72542	2015	CHEVROLET	IMPALA	POLICECAR	35,000
72543	2015	CHEVROLET	IMPALA	POLICECAR	35,000
72905	2004	NISSAN	TITAN	LIGHT PU/VAN	57,200
72913	2016	FORD	EXPLORER AWD	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72914	2016	FORD	EXPLORER AWD	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72915	2016	FORD	EXPLORER AWD	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72916	2016	FORD	EXPLORER AWD	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72917	2016	FORD	EXPLORER AWD	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72918	2016	FORD	EXPLORER AWD	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72919	2016	FORD	EXPLORER AWD	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72920	2016	FORD	EXPLORER AWD	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72921	2016	FORD	EXPLORER AWD	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72922	2016	FORD	EXPLORER AWD	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72924	2016	FORD	EXPLORER AWD	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72925	2016	FORD	EXPLORER AWD	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72926	2016	FORD	EXPLORER AWD	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72927	2016	FORD	EXPLORER AWD	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72928	2016	FORD	EXPLORER AWD	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72929	2016	FORD	EXPLORER AWD	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72931	2016	FORD	EXPLORER AWD	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72932	2016	FORD	EXPLORER AWD	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72933	2016	FORD	EXPLORER AWD	SUVPOLICE	57,000
72934	2016	CHEVROLET	EQUINOX	SUVPOLICE	31,000
72942	2016	CHEVROLET	IMPALA	POLICECAR	35,000
72943	2016	CHEVROLET	IMPALA	POLICECAR	35,000
73001	2016	POLARIS	ATV	UTILITY VEHICLE	10,000
73002	2016	POLARIS	ATV	UTILITY VEHICLE	10,000
73010	2017	CHEVROLET	TRAVERSE	SUVPOLICE	31,000
73011	2017	CHEVROLET	TRAVERSE	SUVPOLICE	31,000
73013	2017	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	57,200
73014	2017	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	57,200
73015	2017	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	57,200
73017	2017	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73026	2017	CHEVROLET	SILVERADO	SUVPOLICE	38,000
73034	2017	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73035	2017	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73036	2017	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73037	2017	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73038	2017	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73044	2017	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73045	2017	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73046	2017	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73047	2017	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73048	2017	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73049	2017	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73050	2017	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73051	2017	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000

Source: City of North Port.

Appendix Table A.6: Law Enforcement Vehicle Inventory Continued

Vehicle	Year	Make	Model	Class	Estimated Replacement Cost
73052	2017	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	\$ 57,000
73053	2017	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73054	2017	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73055	2017	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73056	2017	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73057	2017	POLARIS	ATV	UTILITY VEHICLE	10,000
73159	2018	CHEVROLET	TRAVERSE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73160	2018	CHEVROLET	TRAVERSE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73161	2018	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73162	2018	KUSTOM SIGNALS	VMS ROAD SIGN	TRAILER	20,500
73163	2018	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73166	2018	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	57,200
73168	2018	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73169	2018	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73170	2018	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73171	2018	WANCO	PD LPR TRAILER	TRAILER	50,000
73179	2018	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73180	2018	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73181	2018	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73186	2018	FORD	TRANSIT VAN	LIGHT PU/VAN	59,000
73187	2018	FORD	TRANSIT VAN	LIGHT PU/VAN	59,000
73188	2018	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73193	2018	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73195	2018	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73196	2018	FORD	TAURUS	POLICECAR	35,000
73254	2018	LENCO	BEARCAT	DIESEL PICK UP	356,000
73262	2019	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73264	2019	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73274	2019	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73276	2019	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73278	2019	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73279	2019	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73280	2019	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73281	2019	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73282	2019	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73283	2019	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73284	2019	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73285	2019	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73286	2019	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73287	2019	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73288	2019	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73289	2019	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73290	2019	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73291	2019	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73297	2013	CLUBCAR	GOLF CART	UTILITY VEHICLE	14,000
73303	2019	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73304	2019	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73332	2019	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000

Source: City of North Port.

Appendix Table A.6: Law Enforcement Vehicle Inventory Continued

Vehicle	Year	Make	Model	Class	Estimated Replacement Cost
73344	2010	SKY WATCH	TRAILER	TRAILER	\$ 15,000
73373	2019	FORD	TRANSIT VAN	LIGHT PU/VAN	59,000
73402	2017	TOYOTA	RAV4	POLICECAR	35,000
73403	2008	SUZUKI	FORENZA	POLICECAR	25,000
73434	2020	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73435	2020	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73436	2020	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73450	2020	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	57,200
73451	2020	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	57,200
73453	2020	CHEVROLET	TAHOE	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73455	2020	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	57,200
73465	2020	WANCO	LIGHTTOWER	TRAILER	11,000
73466	2020	WANCO	LIGHTTOWER	TRAILER	11,000
73467	2020	WANCO	MESSAGE BOARD	TRAILER	16,750
73468	2020	WANCO	ARROW BOARD	TRAILER	12,500
73469	2020	WANCO	ARROW BOARD	TRAILER	12,500
73471	2020	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73474	2020	INTIMIDATOR	INTIMIDATOR	UTILITY VEHICLE	25,000
73475	2020	INTIMIDATOR	INTIMIDATOR	UTILITY VEHICLE	25,000
73500	2020	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	57,200
73506	2020	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73507	2020	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73508	2020	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73509	2020	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73510	2020	FORD	EXPLORER	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73514	2020	WANCO	PD LPR TRAILER	TRAILER	52,000
73515	2020	WANCO	PD LPR TRAILER	TRAILER	52,000
73516	2020	WANCO	PD LPR TRAILER	TRAILER	52,000
73543	2020	WANCO	MESSAGE BOARD	TRAILER	16,750
73544	2020	WANCO	MESSAGE BOARD	TRAILER	16,750
73554	2021	WANCO	LIGHTTOWER	TRAILER	11,000
73555	2021	WANCO	LIGHTTOWER	TRAILER	11,000
73556	2021	WANCO	LIGHTTOWER	TRAILER	11,000
73567	2021	CHEVROLET	TRAVERSE	SUVPOLICE	31,000
73568	2021	DODGE	DURANGO	SUVPOLICE	57,000
73569	2021	DODGE	DURANGO	SUVPOLICE	57,000
Total					\$ 9,306,350

Source: City of North Port.

Appendix Table A.7: Park Vehicle Inventory

Vehicle	Year	Make	Model	Class	Estimated Replacement Cost
70390	2004	FORD	EXPLOR	SUV	\$ 29,500
71008	2007	FORD	F-150-4X	LIGHT PU/VAN	37,000
5722	1997	FORD	F-350-UTL	DIESEL PICK UP	75,000
10002	2017	BIG TEX	TILT TRAILER	TRAILER	10,000
10003	2018	EXPRESS	TRAILER 14K	TRAILER	10,000
10009	2018	EXPRESS	TRAILER - 14K	TRAILER	10,000
10010	2018	EXPRESS	TRAILER - 14K	TRAILER	10,000
10011	2018	EXPRESS	TRAILER - 14K	TRAILER	10,000
10012	2018	EXPRESS	TRAILER - 14K	TRAILER	10,000
10017	2020	SIMPSON	TRAILER - WASHR	TRAILER	10,000
10020	2015	BAD BOY	ZTM DIESEL 1500	MOWER	12,000
10021	2018	TORO	ZTM DIESEL 7210	MOWER	15,000
10022	2017	TORO	WORKMAN 4X2	UTILITY VEHICLE	14,500
70080	2002	FORD	F-600-TANK	WATER TANKER	100,000
70500	2005	STEINER	MOW-ZTM	MOWER	18,000
70621	2006	FORD	F-150-4X	LIGHT PU/VAN	37,000
70869	2006	FORD	F-350-4X4	DIESEL PICK UP	50,540
70981	2007	FORD	F-250-4X	DIESEL PICK UP	36,500
70982	2007	FORD	F-250-4X	DIESEL PICK UP	36,500
70987	2006	TORO	WORKMAN	UTILITY VEHICLE	14,500
70988	2007	TORO	WORKMAN	UTILITY VEHICLE	14,500
71004	2007	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
71007	2007	FORD	F-150-4X	LIGHT PU/VAN	37,000
71172	2008	FORD	ESCAPE-HY	SUVHY	27,000
71222	2008	FORD	F-250	DIESEL PICK UP	34,500
71239	2007	HUSQVARNA	UTILITYCAR	UTILITY VEHICLE	14,500
71292	2008	FORD	F-550-DUMP	DIESEL PICK UP	61,700
71293	2008	FORD	F-550-DUMP	DIESEL PICK UP	61,700
71310	2008	WELLS CARGO	TRAILER	TRAILER	35,100
71716	2012	TORO	MOW-ZTM63	MOWER	15,000
71847	2013	TORO	ZTMOWER	MOWER	15,000
71849	2013	TORO	Z T MOWER	MOWER	15,000
71856	2013	BOBCAT	UTILITY VEHICLE	UTILITY VEHICLE	12,000
71925	2013	TRIPLE CROWN	TRAILER	TRAILER	5,000
71928	2014	LARK UNITED	TRAILER	TRAILER	5,000
72320	2014	TORO	ZERO TURN	MOWER	15,000
73069	2017	BOBCAT	T590 T4 SKDSTR	LOADER	128,000
73073	2017	TORO	ZTM	MOWER	15,000
73075	2017	TORO	74906 ZT25HP	MOWER	15,000
73096	2018	TORO	ZERO TURN MOWER	MOWER	15,000
73097	2018	TORO	ZERO TURN MOWER	MOWER	15,000
73138	2017	FORD	F - 250	LIGHT PU/VAN	34,500
73144	2018	TORO	ZERO TURN	MOWER	15,000
73325	2019	FORD	F-250	LIGHT PU/VAN	34,500
73428	2019	EXPRESS	TRAILER - 14K	TRAILER	10,000
73438	2020	FORD	F-250	LIGHT PU/VAN	34,500

Sources: City of North Port; Table 6.2, Willdan Financial Services.

Appendix Table A.7: Park Vehicle Inventory

Vehicle	Year	Make	Model	Class	Estimated Replacement Cost
73521	2021	TEXAS TRAILERS	TRAILER - 20FT	TRAILER	\$ 7,537
73540	2021	TEXAS TRAILERS	TRAILER - 20FT	TRAILER	7,672
73541	2021	TEXAS TRAILERS	TRAILER - 20FT	TRAILER	7,571
73573	2021	TORO	MULTIPRO 1750	SPECIALTY EQUIP	40,470
73574	2021	TORO	4300-D	MOWER	57,606
73575	2021	TORO	SAND PRO	SPECIALTY EQUIP	32,997
73576	2021	TORO	PROCORE 1298	SPECIALTY EQUIP	35,363
73577	2021	TORO	BLOWER	SPECIALTY EQUIP	8,124
73578	2021	TORO	WORKMAN HD	UTILITY VEHICLE	22,538
73579	2021	TORO	WORKMAN MDX	UTILITY VEHICLE	11,862
73580	2021	TORO	TRACTOR 9060	TRACTOR	72,685
73581	2021	TORO	WORKMAN MDX	UTILITY VEHICLE	11,863
73582	2021	TORO	WORKMAN HD	UTILITY VEHICLE	22,538
73583	2021	TORO	MH-400	SPECIALTY EQUIP	27,213
73584	2021	TORO	VERSA VAC	SPECIALTY EQUIP	28,463
73585	2021	TORO	TOPDRESSER	SPECIALTY EQUIP	13,275
73586	2021	TORO	SANDPRO 5040	SPECIALTY EQUIP	32,977
73587	2021	TORO	4500-D	MOWER	70,535
73590	2021	TORO	ZTM 7200	MOWER	21,494
73591	2021	TORO	ZTM 7200	MOWER	21,494
73605	2022	FORD	F-250	LIGHT PU/VAN	27,939
73606	2022	FORD	F-250	LIGHT PU/VAN	27,899
73607	2022	FORD	F-250	LIGHT PU/VAN	27,944
73608	2022	FORD	F-250 4X4	LIGHT PU/VAN	37,828
73609	2021	TORO	REELMASTER 3100	MOWER	39,217
73626	2019	TEXAS TRAILER	GOOSE NECK	TRAILER	9,795
Total					\$ 1,988,438
Improved Parkland Acreage					264.94
Cost per Acre					\$ 7,505

Sources: City of North Port; Table 6.2, Willdan Financial Services.

Appendix Table A.8: Solid Waste Vehicle Inventory

					Estimated Replacement Cost
Vehicle	Year	Make	Model	Class	
71476	2010	PETERBILT	ROLL-OFF	SW COLLECTION	\$ 225,000
71477	2010	PETERBILT	ROLL-OFF	SW COLLECTION	225,000
71617	2011	CRANECARR	REARLOAD	SW COLLECTION	305,000
71618	2011	CRANECARR	REARLOAD	SW COLLECTION	305,000
71727	2013	PETERBILT 365	GRAPPLE	GRAPPLE	260,000
71857	2013	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
71942	2014	PETERBILT	GRAPPLE/ROLLOF	GRAPPLE	260,000
71943	2014	PETERBILT	GRAPPLE/ROLLOF	GRAPPLE	260,000
72323	2014	FORD	F-550	LIGHT PU/VAN	65,000
72324	2014	FORD	F-550 BOX BODY	LIGHT PU/VAN	78,000
72410	2014	AUTOCAR	ACX-R	SW COLLECTION	368,000
72445	2014	AUTOCAR	FRONT LOADER	SW COLLECTION	368,000
72449	2014	AUTOCAR	FRONT LOADER	SW COLLECTION	368,000
72450	2014	AUTOCAR	FRONT LOADER	SW COLLECTION	368,000
72451	2014	AUTOCAR	FRONT LOADER	SW COLLECTION	350,500
72452	2014	AUTOCAR	FRONT LOADER	SW COLLECTION	350,500
72454	2014	CRANECARR	SPLIT BODY	SW COLLECTION	361,000
72577	2015	FORD	F-550	DIESEL PICK UP	106,000
72578	2015	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
72824	2015	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
72857	2016	PETERBILT	SPECIALTY	GRAPPLE	175,000
72912	2016	FORD	CMAX HYBRID SE	PASSCAR	27,000
72965	2016	CRANECARR	REARLOAD	SW COLLECTION	305,000
72968	2016	AUTOCAR	FRONT LOADER	SW COLLECTION	350,500
72969	2016	AUTOCAR	FRONT LOADER	SW COLLECTION	350,500
72970	2016	AUTOCAR	FRONT LOADER	SW COLLECTION	350,500
72979	2016	AUTOCAR	FRONT LOADER	SW COLLECTION	350,500
73012	2017	PETERBILT	GRAPPLE/ROLLOFF	GRAPPLE	275,000
73020	2017	AUTOCAR	FRONTLOAD	SW COLLECTION	350,500
73021	2017	AUTOCAR	FRONTLOAD	SW COLLECTION	350,500
73022	2017	AUTOCAR	FRONTLOAD	SW COLLECTION	350,500
73023	2017	AUTOCAR	FRONTLOAD	SW COLLECTION	350,500
73024	2017	AUTOCAR	FRONTLOAD	SW COLLECTION	350,500
73025	2017	AUTOCAR	FRONTLOAD	SW COLLECTION	350,500
73028	2017	CUROTTO	SLAMMIN EAGLE	CAN	40,000
73029	2017	CUROTTO	SLAMMIN EAGLE	CAN	40,000
73030	2017	CUROTTO	SLAMMIN EAGLE	CAN	40,000
73031	2017	CUROTTO	SLAMMIN EAGLE	CAN	40,000
73032	2017	CUROTTO	SLAMMIN EAGLE	CAN	40,000
73033	2017	CUROTTO	SLAMMIN EAGLE	CAN	40,000
73039	2017	CUROTTO	SLAMMIN EAGLE	CAN	40,000
73040	2017	CUROTTO	SLAMMIN EAGLE	CAN	40,000
73140	2017	CUROTTO	SLAMMIN EAGLE	CAN	40,000
73141	2017	CUROTTO	SLAMMIN EAGLE	CAN	40,000

Source: City of North Port.

Appendix Table A.8: Solid Waste Vehicle Inventory Continued

					Estimated Replacement Cost
Vehicle	Year	Make	Model	Class	
73142	2017	CUROTTO	SLAMMIN EAGLE	CAN	\$ 40,000
73224	2018	AUTOCAR	ACX FRONT LDR	SW COLLECTION	368,000
73225	2018	AUTOCAR	ACX FRONT LDR	SW COLLECTION	368,000
73226	2018	AUTOCAR	ACX FRONT LDR	SW COLLECTION	368,000
73227	2018	AUTOCAR	ACX FRONT LDR	SW COLLECTION	368,000
73247	2018	CUROTTO	SLAMMIN EAGLE	CAN	40,000
73248	2018	CUROTTO	SLAMMIN EAGLE	CAN	40,000
73249	2018	CUROTTO	SLAMMIN EAGLE	CAN	40,000
73250	2018	CUROTTO	SLAMMIN EAGLE	CAN	40,000
73251	2018	CUROTTO	SLAMMIN EAGLE	CAN	40,000
73252	2018	CUROTTO	SLAMMIN EAGLE	CAN	40,000
73253	2018	CUROTTO	SLAMMIN EAGLE	CAN	40,000
73260	2018	PETERBILT	GRPPL PAC MAC	GRAPPLE	260,000
73362	2019	AUTOCAR	FRONTLOAD	SW COLLECTION	350,500
73367	2019	FORD	F-550 BOX BODY	LIGHT PU/VAN	78,000
73369	2019	FORD	F-150	LIGHT PU/VAN	33,000
73372	2019	JCB	LOADER TM320	LOADER	210,000
73404	2019	AUTOCAR	SIDELOAD	SW COLLECTION	346,543
73405	2019	AUTOCAR	SIDELOAD	SW COLLECTION	346,543
73406	2019	AUTOCAR	SIDELOAD	SW COLLECTION	346,543
73413	2020	CUROTTO	SLAMMIN EAGLE	CAN	40,000
73414	2020	CUROTTO	SLAMMIN EAGLE	CAN	40,000
73473	2020	CRANECARR	REARLOAD	SW COLLECTION	305,000
73480	2020	KENWORTH	GRAPPLE/ROLLOFF	GRAPPLE	210,000
73481	2020	KENWORTH	GRAPPLE/ROLLOFF	GRAPPLE	210,000
73483	2020	AUTOCAR	FRONT LOADER	SW COLLECTION	350,500
73534	2020	KENWORTH	GRAPPLE	GRAPPLE	260,000
73545	2021	AUTOCAR	SIDELOAD	SW COLLECTION	346,543
73546	2021	AUTOCAR	SIDELOAD	SW COLLECTION	346,543
73547	2021	AUTOCAR	SIDELOAD	SW COLLECTION	346,543
73548	2021	AUTOCAR	SIDELOAD	SW COLLECTION	346,543
73571	2021	MAC	Trailer - Walk	SPECIALTY EQUIP	110,000
73572	2021	MAC	Trailer - Walk	SPECIALTY EQUIP	110,000
73589	2021	MAC	Trailer - Walk	SPECIALTY EQUIP	110,000
73610	2021	CRANECARR	SPLIT BODY	SW COLLECTION	361,000
Total					\$ 16,664,801

Source: City of North Port.