



NUE Urban Concepts would be providing a PowerPoint presentation via Zoom and that Louis Rotundo, also with NUE Urban Concepts, was in attendance.

Mr. Paul stated that NUE Urban Concepts was working on the mobility plan and mobility fee for the City of Port St. Lucie. He explained that a mobility fee is intended to replace transportation concurrency, proportionate share, and City & County road impact fees. He said the mobility fees are paid by new development to offset its impact to the transportation system.

Mr. Paul discussed how communities across Florida are chasing road capacity. He said the mobility plan will look at the City over the next twenty years and focus on moving people via walking, biking, transit, a new form of mobility, or even driving. He also discussed a multimodal transportation system.

Mr. Paul explained there are multiple steps to developing an overall mobility plan and mobility fee, and the team is focused on steps two to four: preparing a mobility plan and mobility fee, and putting the ordinance into effect. He stated the mobility plan will be done in a two-phase process. He said the first phase provides a big picture of the types of improvement needed and the next phase will provide more detail on a corridor-by-corridor basis. He spoke to how the City could repurpose or re-imagine its roadways for trails, golf carts, and autonomous transit shuttles.

Mr. Paul showed Council a map of a draft mobility plan, including multimodal and mobility corridors and intersections, of eastern Port St. Lucie along the US-1 corridor. He also presented a map depicting a draft mobility plan for all of Port. St. Lucie, which still needs fine-tuned. He explained that since the City is proposing to replace the County's roadway impact fee, the City has an obligation to look at corridors beyond City limits and roads. He stated this mobility plan is comprised of State, City, and County roads. He said the City is not 100% responsible for these projects, but the City's mobility fee will include a portion of it.

Mr. Paul indicated the team was looking for direction to make sure they were on the right path and asked if Council concurred with the corridor approach or recommended an alternative approach. Council consensus was to follow the corridor approach as recommended by the

team.

Mr. Paul presented two maps indicating the options for having an area wide level of service for the City or having segments. Council indicated they were in agreement with the area wide level of service approach as presented by Mr. Paul.

Mr. Paul reviewed the Quality of Service Standards for Streets, Bicycling & Walking, and Transit & Microtransit. He indicated that he did not need a decision on these factors, but stated that they would come into play in phase two and in the overall planning of the City.

Mr. Paul presented a map proposing two assessment areas, one west of the St. Lucie River and the other east of the river. He explained that the City currently has a single assessment area, which means the roadway impact fee assessed in Tradition is the same as in St. Lucie West and east of the St. Lucie River. He stated that most of the infrastructure west of I-95 will be provided by new development and the area between the river and I-95 will be mostly infield development and redevelopment. He said if they want improvements along the major roadways in the area, they will need to have a fee to represent impact. He stated the team proposes having a unified assessment area west of the St. Lucie River and an assessment area east of the river. He said the net result is that the fee west of the river will be the fully calculated rate and the fee east of the river will be lower. Most of Council was in favor of and concurred with the two assessment areas as presented by Mr. Paul. Councilwoman Morgan stated her preference was for one assessment area City wide, but that she would like some additional information.

Mr. Paul explained that a benefit district allows the City to expend mobility fees on roadways outside the City limits. He stated there is an important distinction between the assessment areas and the benefit districts. He said the assessment areas are where the fees are assessed and the benefit districts are where the fees are spent. He stated the benefit district will largely be what the mobility plan has for overall improvements. He said the City is currently a single city wide benefit district and it is recommended the City remain as such. Council agreed and concurred with the proposed benefit district as presented by Mr. Paul.

Mr. Paul reviewed the proposed Mobility Fee Schedule and its

components for Residential & Institutional, Industrial & Recreational, Office, Commercial & Retail, and Additive Fees.

Councilwoman Morgan questioned how drive-thru lanes and special exceptions work with the mobility fees. In response, Mr. Paul stated the mobility fee would be triggered at the building permit stage for the drive-thru lane. He said a construction permit can be tied to the construction permit itself. He explained if a developer comes in after the fact, the trigger would be set at the construction permit or building permit. Teresa Lamar-Sarno noted that the special exception use process is not contingent on this particular mobility fee. She said a drive-thru will still go through the same special use process, development review, oversight, and application process.

Mayor Oravec stated he was looking for anything that puts an additional fee on car washes, fast food, or gas stations. In response, Mr. Paul explained the Additive Fee. He stated these services would pay both the fee for the building and the fee for the different types of facilities. He said that mobility fees only reflect what is allowed per the City's comp plan, LDRs and special use process. He indicated it does not say the fee determines that this use is allowed within this area. He said it says that if a gas station is allowed here and it has fuel pumps, this is what the fee will be.

Mr. Paul reviewed the existing and proposed maximum County and City road impact fees. He indicated that the City mobility fees must be less than the combined County and City road impact fees if October 1, 2021, is going to be the effective date. He noted that some uses may be calculated higher, but they are will talk with the legal counsel on the best way to address this. He said some uses may be capped for the 90-day period after the fee is adopted and then it could theoretically go up. He stated in general terms for the residential, office, and retail uses that are not an auto-oriented use, the calculated fee will be either the same as the two fees or it will be lower, which is consistent with State Statute.

Mr. Paul stated that they will have the numbers for the mobility fee schedule and a draft implementing the Ordinance at their next presentation before Council. Mayor Oravec stated he was looking for at least a 5% decrease in the fee.

Councilwoman Caraballo commented on when it comes to allowing

businesses to do business, there is a difference between market driven and over saturation. She also commented on quality of service, elevating standards, and areas of speeding.

Mayor Oravec inquired if there was any additional feedback on the fee schedule, to which Vice Mayor Martin responded that she was in agreement with what has been stated.

Council consensus was to move forward with the proposed Mobility Fee Schedule and have Mr. Paul bring back the schedule with the details for a final determination.

Teresa Lamar-Sarno reviewed the mobility timeline and deliverables, including the meetings with their stakeholders and the community, for the mobility fee to be effective October 1, 2021. Councilwoman Morgan inquired about the stakeholder meetings and requested that a group stakeholder meeting of the developers be held in addition to the one-on-one meetings. In response, Ms. Lamar-Sarno stated that will happen with the developer agents meeting where they are all invited to attend. Mayor Oravec requested that the Council members personally invite any group or citizen they feel needs to be involved in the mobility fee process and follow up with staff to see that it happens.

Councilwoman Caraballo asked that examples of what the mobility fees could fund be provided for the public to see, to which Mr. Paul indicated that he would prepare a few ideas. Mayor Oravec requested that the team works with Communications and the City Manager to ensure that the big picture concepts or the two major phases are being explained to the public as the City transitions from the current impact fee structure to a mobility fee.

The City Manager advised that St. Lucie County reached out to the City and suggested that they may be open to negotiating the road impact fee. He said his response will be that his policy direction is to move toward a mobility plan and he will copy Council on his response.

Vice Mayor Martin questioned the status of the City's \$22 million that the County has and asked for an update. In response, the City Attorney indicated that he will meet with each Council member to discuss this privately and have his office schedule the appointments this week.

## **6. Adjourn**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:15 AM.

---

---

Sally Walsh, City Clerk

---

Traci Mehl, Deputy City Clerk