



LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATION ADVISORY BOARD (LDRAB)
TRAFFIC PERFORMANCE STANDARDS SUB-COMMITTEE

MAY 9, 2018, 9:00 AM – 11:00 AM
2300 NORTH JOG ROAD, ROOM VC-1W-47

MEETING SUMMARY

A. Call to Order

Meeting commenced at 9:06 am.

1. Subcommittee Members, Interested Parties and Staff Introductions

LDRAB Subcommittee Members: Terrance Bailey, Jim Knight, Abraham Wien, Anna Yeskey;

County Staff: Quazi Bari, Leonard Berger, Monica Cantor, Jehan Wallace.

2. Select Chair and Vice Chair

Elections – Mr. Wein nominated Mr. Bailey as Chair and Mr. Bailey nominated Mr. Knight as Vice Chair, motion passed (4– 0).

3. Additions, Substitutions and Deletions

Mr. Bari presented a two-sheet document of an example of proportionate share calculation.

4. Motion to Adopt Agenda

Motion by Mr. Knight and seconded by Ms. Yeskey.

B. Review ULDC Art. 12, Traffic Performance Standards (Related to Proportionate Share Program)

Mr. Bary indicated that this amendment makes the regulations consistent with Florida Statutes for local governments to implement transportation concurrency systems to allow applicants to meet concurrency by entering into a Proportionate Share Agreement. He also added that the amendment codifies existing practices within the Engineering Department. Mr. Bary explained an example of the calculations that go into determining the proportionate share cost percentages for a new applicant. Proportionate Share Agreements require developers to pay a

percentage of the total cost of widening a roadway that exceeds level of service as result of the new project's traffic. The exact percentage is based on the amount of extra vehicles that use predicts it will generate over the capacity added from the required road improvement.

After this explanation, the subcommittee members had a number of questions in order to obtain further clarification.

Mr. Bailey asked for clarification on what type of criteria are considered when analyzing a traffic link. Mr. Bary explained that all background projects are considered in the analysis including existing approved projects, actual trips in the networks, and current projects.

Mr. Wien asked who supplements the extra costs of the roadway improvements. Mr. Berger noted that sometimes the County has the funds to complete it and sometimes it does not. In those cases when the County does not have the funds, the money is placed in a trust fund to be used in a manner that ultimately benefits the project. He noted that proper checks and balances are in place that accounted for the funds paid in the Proportionate Share Program.

Mr. Bailey wanted to ensure that if the County rescinded the transportation concurrency, it would inform the municipality or city involved to avoid approval of a development from going any further. Mr. Berger indicated that a concurrency letter is not given unless the County has a proportionate share agreement with the applicant. Mr. Bary provided a sample copy of a Proportionate Share Agreement for the subcommittee members to see.

Mr. Knight noted that on page 2, line 37 the language does not read correctly. Mr. Berger responded by saying that the text reading "improvement costs based upon the actual" needs to be shown as stricken text.

Motion by Mr. Knight to approve the exhibit as presented along with the change to line 37, page 2. Ms. Yeskey seconded it. Motion passed (4-0)

Meeting adjourned at 10:04 a.m.