TOWN OF LAKE PARK

MOBILITY PLAN & MOBILITY FEE TECHNICAL REPORT



OCTOBER 2022















NUE URBAN CONCEPTS, LLC 200 PGA Blvd, Suite 4440 Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33408 833-NUC-8484 nueurbanconcepts@gmail.com

October 28th, 2022

Mr. John O. D'Agostino Town Manager Town of Lake Park 535 Park Avenue Lake Park, FL 33403

Re: Town of Lake Park Mobility Plan & Mobility Fee

Dear Mr. D'Agostino:

Enclosed is the draft Town of Lake Park Mobility Plan and Mobility Fee Technical Report. This is a first draft prepared for consideration by the Town Commission based on the most recent and localized data consistent with Florida Statute. The Mobility Fee is based upon the projects included in the Mobility Plan. The adoption of the Mobility Plan and Mobility Fee Technical Report through an implementing ordinance will require two hearings before the Town Commission. The implementing ordinance can be formally adopted at the second hearing. The Mobility Fee would become effective 90 calendar days after adoption.

The Mobility Plan includes projects addressing future mobility needs for the residents, businesses, and visitors to Lake Park. The Mobility Plan emphasizes continuing the Olmstead Brothers legacy by expanding the Town's existing Streetscaped and Landscaped corridors along Park Avenue, Flagler Blvd, Date Palm, and other key corridors within the Town. The Mobility Plan also emphasizes reimagining the function of streets within the Town from moving cars to moving people by repurposing existing right-of-way to add bicycle and multimodal lanes, on-street parking, and shared-use paths. The Plan also focuses on implementing Vision Zero initiatives by increasing safety along major County and State Roads and calming cut-through and community traffic on Town Streets.

The Mobility Fee is based on the Mobility Plan projects and will provide Lake Park with a funding source paid by development activity to construct the Mobility Plan projects. The Mobility Fee as presently calculated is intended to be assessed in addition to Palm Beach County's current Road Impact Fee on development activity within the Town. The Technical Report provides support documentation for the Town to discuss with Palm Beach County possible reduction or prioritization of County Road Impact Fees within the Town. The calculated Mobility Fee is consistent with all legal and statutory requirements and meets the dual rational nexus test and the rough proportionality test. The NUE Urban Concepts team looks forward to continuing working closely with Town staff on outreach efforts and finalizing the Mobility Plan and Mobility Fee for adoption.

Sincerely,

onathan B. Paul

Jonathan B. Paul, AICP Principal

www.nueurbanconcepts.com

TOWN OF LAKE PARK MOBILITY PLAN & MOBILITY FEE UPDATE

TECHNICAL REPORT OCTOBER 2022

Prepared for: Town of Lake Park



Prepared by: Jonathan B. Paul, AICP Principal, NUE Urban Concepts, LLC 2000 PGA Blvd, Suite 4440 Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33408 833-NUC-8484 nueurbanconcepts@gmail.com www.nueurbanconcepts.com



© 2022 NUE Urban Concepts, LLC. All rights reserved. This material may not be reproduced, displayed, modified or distributed without the express prior written permission of the copyright holder. For permission, send written request to NUE Urban Concepts, LLC 2000 PGA Blvd, Suite 4440 Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33408, or email nueurbanconcepts@gmail.com. This work may be reproduced, in whole or in part, without prior written permission, solely by the Town of Lake Park; provided all copies contain the following statement: "© 2022 NUE Urban Concepts, LLC. This work is reproduced with the permission of NUE Urban Concepts. No other use is permitted without the express prior written permission of NUE Urban Concepts, LLC. For permission, send written request to NUE Urban Concepts, LLC 2000 PGA Blvd, Suite 4440 Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33408 or email nueurbanconcepts@gmail.com."



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview	4
Legislative Background	5
Impact Fee & Mobility Fee Comparison	10
The Impact Fee Act & Case Law Overview	11
Developing the Mobility Plan & Fee	22
Comprehensive Plan	23
Growth	25
Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT)	26
Person Miles of Travel (PMT)	27
Level & Quality of Service	29
Town of Lake Park Mobility Plan	30
Town of Lake Park Mobility Fee	32
Existing Conditions Evaluation (ECE)	33
Multimodal Capacity	36
Mobility Plan Project Summary	37
Funding	40
New Growth Evaluation (NGE)	42
Mobility Fee Assessment Area	43
Person Miles of Capacity Rate (PMCr)	44
Person Travel Demand per Use (PTDu)	45
Mobility Fee Schedule	50
Mobility Fee Comparison	56
Mobility Fee Benefit District	59
Definitions	60
Conclusion	69

NUE URBAN CONCEPTS

Mobility Plan & Mobility Fee Technical Report: October

LAND USE • MOBILITY • PARKING • FEES

Figures

Figure 1.	Concurrency Cycle	9
Figure 2.	Developing a Mobility Plan & Mobility Fee	22
Figure 3.	Integrating Land Use, Transportation, Parking & Funding	23
Figure 4.	Person Miles of Travel (PMT) Increase	27
Figure 5.	Moving People Providing Choices	30
Figure 6.	Speed of Travel	31
Figure 7.	Mobility Plan and Mobility Fee	32
Figure 8.	New Growth Evaluation (NGE)	42
Figure 9.	Person Miles of Capacity Rate (PMCr)	44
Figure 10.	Person Travel Demand Per Use (PTDu)	45
Figure 11.	Mobility Fee Calculation	50
Figure 12.	Mobility Fee Schedule Components	51

Tables

Table 1.	Projected Growth	25
Table 2.	Growth in Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT)	26
Table 3.	Increase in Person Miles of Travel (PMT)	28
Table 4.	2022 Existing Conditions Evaluation (ECE)	33
Table 5.	2045 Future Conditions Evaluation (FCE)	34
Table 6.	2022 Areawide VMT & VMC Analysis by Ownership	35
Table 7.	Mobility Plan Project Summary	37
Table 8.	Mobility Plan Project Summary: Streets	38
Table 9.	Mobility Plan Project Summary: Intersections	39
Table 10.	Anticipated Available Funding	41
Table 11.	New Growth Evaluation (NGE)	42
Table 12.	Person Miles of Capacity Rate (PMCr)	44
Table 13.	Limited Access Evaluation (LAEf)	46
Table 14.	Trip Characteristics by Trip Purpose	48
Table 15.	Average Household Travel in Palm Beach County by Area	58
Table 16.	Vehicles Available per Household Travel in Palm Beach County by Area	58

NUE URBAN CONCEPTS LAND USE • MOBILITY • PARKING • FEES

Maps

- Map A. Mobility Study Network
- Map B. 2045 Town of Lake Park Mobility Plan
- Map C. 2045 Town of Lake Park Streetscape, Street Trees, & Landscape Enhancement Plan
- Map D. Mobility Fee Assessment Area
- Map E. Mobility Fee Benefit District

Appendices

- Appendix A. Florida Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) Transportation Guidance
- Appendix B. Traffic Analysis Zones
- Appendix C. Regional Travel Demand Network
- Appendix D. 2017 National Household Travel Survey Data: Southeast Florida
- Appendix E. Mobility Plan: Streets
- Appendix F. Mobility Plan: Intersections
- Appendix G. Traffic Characteristics Data: Core Mobility Area
- Appendix H. FDOT Generalized Daily Service Volumes
- Appendix I. Person Miles of Capacity (PMC): Streets
- Appendix J. Person Miles of Capacity (PMC): Intersections
- Appendix K. Planning Level Cost (PLC): Streets
- Appendix L. Planning Level Cost (PLC): Intersections
- Appendix M. Trip Generation
- Appendix N. Person Travel Demand per Use (PTDu)
- Appendix O. 2017 National Household Travel Survey Data: Mobility Fee Trip Purpose
- Appendix P. Mobility Fee Schedule
- Appendix Q. Scenario A: Town Mobility Fee vs Palm Beach County Road Impact Fee Comparison
- Appendix R. Scenario B: Town Mobility Fee vs Palm Beach County Road Impact Fee Comparison
- Appendix S. Scenario A & Scenario B Comparison

The Remainder of This Page Intentionally Left Blank

NUE URBAN CONCEPTS LAND USE • MOBILITY • PARKING • FEES

OVERVIEW

The Town of Lake Park, once known as the "Gateway to the World's Winter Playground," was founded in 1923 by Harry Seymore Kelsey. Originally named Kelsey City, Lake Park was the first zoned municipality in the State of Florida. During its time as a nationally recognized, groundbreaking town, the Town's founder commissioned the Olmsted Brothers company, owned, and operated by the famous landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted's sons, to design and landscape the community. Today, the Town boasts a historic downtown main street, beautiful landscaping and parks, a marina and waterfront promenade, the Kelsey Theater, and the historic Town Hall building listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

The Town of Lake Park amended its Comprehensive Plan in 2022 to establish the legislative intent to develop a mobility plan and a mobility fee. The Town of Lake Park 2045 Mobility Plan brings together various Town initiatives to enhance Lake Park's history and character as an Olmsted legacy by creating a vibrant, lush oasis. The Plan is a vision, over the next 22 years, to emphasize the movement of people, versus moving cars. This is done by planning for multimodal transportation projects that provide people choices: whether they want to walk, bicycle, ride transit, use new mobility technology, or continue to drive their cars. The Mobility Plan also proposes innovative programs that enhance access to businesses and future rail transit service within Lake Park and reduce the impact of traffic on neighborhood streets.

The Mobility Plan serves as the basis for the establishment of a Mobility Fee system as enacted by the Florida Legislature. The Mobility Fee allows new development and redevelopment to equitably mitigate its transportation impact to Lake Park's multimodal transportation system. The methodology used to develop the Town's Mobility Fee reflects that the Mobility Fee will be assessed in addition to the current Palm Beach County Road Impact Fee; in recognition of the need for new road capacity on County Roads, such as Park Avenue and Silver Beach Road, within and the Town of Lake Park needed to accommodate existing and future travel demand.

The Mobility Plan and Mobility Fee includes multimodal projects on Town Streets, County Roads and State Roads to allow the Town to pursue federal and state funding through the Palm Beach County Transportation Planning Agency (TPA) and provide funds to serve as a local contribution to advance multimodal projects on County and State Roads within and adjacent to the Town. The Town of Lake Park Mobility Plan and Mobility Fee Technical Report, dated October 2022, documents the data and methodology used to develop a mobility fee that meets legally established dual rational nexus and rough proportionality tests, along with the requirements of Florida Statute Sections 163.3180 and 163.31801 and Florida Statute Chapter 380.

Mobility Plan & Mobility Fee Technical Report: October



LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

The State of Florida passed the Growth Management Act of 1985 that required all local governments in Florida to adopt Comprehensive Plans to guide future development. The Act mandated that adequate public facilities must be provided "concurrent" with the impacts of new development. State mandated "concurrency" was adopted to ensure the health, safety, and general welfare of the public by ensuring that adequate public facilities would be in place to accommodate the demand for public facilities created by new development.

Transportation concurrency became the measure used by the Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA), Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), Regional Planning Councils (RPCs), and local governments to ensure that adequate public facilities, in the form of road capacity, was available to meet the transportation demands from new development. To meet the travel demand impacts of new development and be deemed "concurrent", transportation concurrency was primarily addressed by constructing new roads and widening existing roads.

Traditional transportation concurrency allowed governmental entities to deny development where road capacity was not available to meet the travel demands from new development. Transportation concurrency also allowed governmental entities to require that developments be timed or phased concurrent with the addition of new road capacity. In addition, transportation concurrency also allowed governmental entities to require new development to improve (widen) roads that were already overcapacity (aka "deficient" or "backlogged").

In urban areas throughout Florida, traditional transportation concurrency had the unintended consequence of limiting and often stopping growth in urban areas (aka cities). This occurred because roads were often over capacity based on traffic already on the roads or the combination of that traffic and trips from approved developments. Further, the ability to add road capacity in urban areas was more limited as right-of-way was often constrained by existing development and utilities, physical barriers, environmental protections, and community opposition from homeowners worried about increases in traffic and the impact adding road capacity would have on their homes. Stopping development in urban areas encouraged suburban sprawl by forcing new development to suburban and rural areas where road capacity was either readily available or cheaper to construct. In the late 90's, as the unintended impact of transportation concurrency became more apparent, the Legislature adopted Statutes to provide urban areas with alternatives to address the impact of new development through Transportation Concurrency Exception Areas (TCEA) and Transportation Concurrency Management Areas (TCMA).



The intent of TCEAs and TCMAs was to allow local governments alternative solutions to provide mobility within urban areas by means other than providing road capacity and to allow infill and redevelopment in those areas. In the mid 2000's, Florida experienced phenomenal growth that strained the ability of local governments to provide the necessary infrastructure to accommodate that growth. Many communities across the State started to deny new developments, substantially raise impact fees and require significant transportation capacity improvements. In 2005, the Legislature enacted several laws that weakened the ability of local governments to implement transportation concurrency by allowing new development, that was not a development of regional impact (DRI), to make proportionate share payments to mitigate its travel demand. Prior to 2005, only DRIs were permitted to mitigate their impact through proportionate share payments. The Legislature also introduced Multi-Modal Transportation Districts (MMTD) for areas that did not meet requirements to qualify for TCEAs or TCMAs.

In 2007, the Florida Legislature introduced the concept of mobility plans and mobility fees to allow development to equitably mitigate its impact and placed additional restrictions on the ability of local governments to charge new development for over capacity roadways. The Legislature directed the Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) and the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to evaluate mobility plans and mobility fees and report the finding to the Legislature in 2009.

In 2009, the Legislature designated Dense Urban Land Areas (DULA), which are communities with a population greater than 1,000 persons per square mile, as TCEA's. The Legislature accepted the findings of the DCA and FDOT analysis for mobility plans and mobility fees but did not take any formal action as the State was in the midst of the great recession. The Legislature also placed further restrictions on local government's ability to implement transportation concurrency, by adding direction on how to calculate proportionate share and how overcapacity road are addressed.

In 2011, the Florida Legislature through House Bill (HB) 7207 adopted the "Community Planning Act" which implemented the most substantial changes to Florida's growth management laws since the 1985 "Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act," which had guided comprehensive planning in Florida for decades. The 2011 legislative session eliminated State mandated concurrency, made concurrency optional for local governments, and eliminated the Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) and replaced it with the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO). The Act essentially removed the DEO, Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), and Regional Planning Councils (RPC) from the transportation concurrency review process.



Although local governments are still required to adopt and implement a comprehensive plan, the requirements changed significantly and shifted more discretion to local governments to plan for mobility within their community and enacted further restrictions on the implementation of transportation concurrency, proportionate share and backlogged roads. The Florida Legislature did not include any provisions in House Bill 7207 exempting local governments existing transportation concurrency system, when it elected to abolish statewide transportation concurrency, made transportation concurrency optional for local governments, and enacted further restrictions on the implementation of transportation concurrency. Florida Statute Section 163.3180(1) provides local governments with flexibility to establish concurrency requirements:

"Sanitary sewer, solid waste, drainage, and potable water are the only public facilities and services subject to the concurrency requirement on a statewide basis. Additional public facilities and services may not be made subject to concurrency on a statewide basis without approval by the Legislature; however, any local government may extend the concurrency requirement so that it applies to additional public facilities within its jurisdiction".

House Bill 319, passed by the Florida Legislature in 2013, amended the Community Planning Act and brought about more changes in how local governments could implement transportation concurrency and further recognized the ability of local governments to adopt alternative mobility funding system, such as mobility fees based on a plan of improvements, to allow development, consistent with an adopted Comprehensive Plan, to equitably mitigate its travel demand impact. Florida Statute Section 163.3180(5)(i) states:

"If a local government elects to repeal transportation concurrency, it is encouraged to adopt an alternative mobility funding system that uses one or more of the tools and techniques identified in paragraph (f). Any alternative mobility funding system adopted may not be used to deny, time, or phase an application for site plan approval, plat approval, final subdivision approval, building permits, or the functional equivalent of such approvals provided that the developer agrees to pay for the development's identified transportation impacts via the funding mechanism implemented by the local government. The revenue from the funding mechanism used in the alternative system must be used to implement the needs of the local government's plan which serves as the basis for the fee imposed. A mobility fee-based funding system must comply with the dual rational nexus test applicable to impact fees. An alternative system that is not mobility fee-based shall not be applied in a manner that imposes upon new development any responsibility for funding an existing transportation deficiency as defined in paragraph (h)."



Florida Statute Section 163.3164(29) very clearly defines a local government as: *"any county or municipality"*. If the Legislature had intended for a County or Charter County to be exempt from provisions of the Community Planning Act or to have authority over a municipality as it relates to transportation concurrency, impact fees, or mobility fees, it would have either included specific references or defined city and county separately, not cohesively as a *"local government."*

The Community Planning Act did not elect to **"grandfather"** any local governments existing transportation concurrency system and did not place restrictions on any local government from repealing transportation concurrency or adopting an alternative mobility funding system in either House Bill 7207 adopted in 2011 or House Bill 319 adopted in 2013. After 20 years of amending Florida Statute Section 163.3180 (roughly every two (2) years over a 20-year period between 1993 and 2013) the Legislature was fully aware that local governments through-out Florida implemented alternatives to transportation concurrency and elected not to provide any exemptions in 2013 to preempt Florida Statute Section 163.3180, like it did in 2009.

In 2009, the Legislature enacted statutory provisions in Florida Statute Section 163.3180 (5)(b)5. that exempted Broward County and Florida Statute Section 163.3180 (5)(b)6. that exempted Miami Dade County from specific statutory requirements related to transportation concurrency exception area requirements. Those exemptions were repealed as part of the 2011 Community Planning Act that made concurrency optional and eliminated statutory provisions related to dense urban land areas (DULAs), long term transportation concurrency management areas (TCMAs), multimodal transportation districts (MMTDs), and transportation concurrency exception areas (TCEAs). The Legislature clearly had established prior precedent in exempting certain local governments from requirements under Florida Statute Section 163.3180 and elected not to do so in 2011 and 2013.

Prior to the passage of the Florida Community Planning Act by the Legislature on June 2, 2011, transportation concurrency was mandatory for local governments statewide, except those with approved TCEAs or MMTDs. After adoption of the Community Planning Act, transportation concurrency became optional for any local government and the Legislature encouraged local governments to adopt alternative mobility funding systems and specifically references mobility fees, based on a plan for mobility improvements. Accordingly, the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO), which replaced the Department of Community Affairs, provided direction related to elimination of transportation concurrency and adoption of a mobility fee-based plan, in accordance with Florida Statute 163.3180 (Appendix A):



In 2019, the Florida Legislature, through House Bill 7103, amended the Community Planning Act and required mobility fees to be governed by the same procedures as impact fees. This amendment further confirmed that mobility fees are an equivalent form of mitigation to impact fees that allow development to mitigate its impact to the transportation system consistent with the needs identified in the local governments adopted mobility plan per Florida Statute Section 163.3180(5)(i):

"If a local government elects to repeal transportation concurrency, it is encouraged to adopt an alternative mobility funding system that uses one or more of the tools and techniques identified in paragraph (f). Any alternative mobility funding system adopted may not be used to deny, time, or phase an application for site plan approval, plat approval, final subdivision approval, building permits, or the functional equivalent of such approvals provided that the developer agrees to pay for the development's identified transportation impacts via the funding mechanism implemented by the local government. The revenue from the funding mechanism used in the alternative system must be used to implement the needs of the local government's plan which serves as the basis for the fee imposed. <u>A mobility fee-based funding system must comply with s. 163.31801 governing impact fees.</u> An alternative system that is not mobility fee-based shall not be applied in a manner that imposes upon new development any responsibility for funding an existing transportation deficiency as defined in paragraph (h)." (emphasis added)

The elimination of state mandated transportation concurrency was the culmination of 20 years of amendments to Florida Statute Section 163.3180 and a recognition that governments cannot build their way out of congestion. The allowance to adopt alternative mobility funding systems was a recognition of the need for government to proactively plan for mobility, instead of reactively regulate road capacity (Figure 1).

Further, Florida Statute defines **"local** governments" as both **"counties and** municipalities" and did not provide counties any preemptions over cities or



grandfather in any county transportation concurrency, proportionate share, or impact fee system. The Legislature recognized impact fees, mobility fees, and other mitigation as equal options in both the requirement to provide credits for proportionate share payments and improvements, and as alternatives mobility funding systems to replace transportation concurrency and proportionate share systems under Florida Statute Section 163.3180.

Figure 1. Concurrency Cycle

NUE URBAN CONCEPTS LAND USE • MOBILITY • PARKING • FEES

IMPACT FEE & MOBILITY FEE COMPARISON

The Florida Constitution grants local governments broad home rule authority to establish special assessments, impact fees, mobility fees, franchise fees, user fees, and service charges as revenue sources to fund specific governmental functions and capital infrastructure. Payment of impact fees or mobility fees are one of the primary ways local governments can require new development, along with redevelopment or expansion of existing land uses which generates additional transportation demand, to mitigate its impact to a local governments transportation system. While road impact fees and mobility fees are both intended to be means in which a development can mitigate its transportation impact, the following are the major differences between the two fees:

Road Impact Fees

- Partially or fully fund road capacity improvements, including new roads, the widening of existing roads, and the addition or extension of turn lanes at intersections to move people driving vehicles (i.e., cars, trucks, SUVs, motorcycles).
- Are based on increases in trip generation, vehicle trip length, and road capacity, along with the cost of road capacity improvements and the projected vehicle miles of travel from development.
- May be based on either an adopted LOS standard (aka standards or consumption-based fee) or on future road improvements (aka plan or improvements-based fee).

Mobility Fees

- Pay for the cost associated with adding new multimodal capacity to move people walking, bicycling, scooting, riding transit, driving vehicles, or using shared mobility technology.
- Partially or fully fund multimodal projects, including sidewalks, multi-use paths, greenways, bike lanes, multimodal lanes and ways, streetscape, landscape, micromobility (i.e., electric bikes, electric scooters) devices, programs, and services, microtransit (i.e., golf carts, neighborhood electric vehicles, autonomous transit shuttles) circulators, services and vehicles, new roads, the widening of existing roads, traffic control devices, intersection improvements, and roundabouts.
- Are based on increases in person trips, person trip lengths, and person miles of capacity from multimodal projects, along with projected person miles of travel from development.
- Assessment areas may vary based on geographic location (e.g., either side of an Interstate), type of development (e.g., mixed-use), or differences in person travel characteristics.
- Must be based on future multimodal projects adopted as part of a mobility plan and incorporated or referenced in the local governments Comprehensive Plan.

NUE URBAN CONCEPTS LAND USE • MOBILITY • PARKING • FEES

THE IMPACT FEE ACT & CASE LAW OVERVIEW

Local governments through-out Florida began adopting road impact fees in the late 70's and early 80's as a means for new development to pay for its traffic impact and provide local governments with revenues to fund transportation infrastructure improvements. Counties, especially Charter Counties, began to require that cities collect road impact fees on their behalf to fund improvements to the county road system. Throughout the 1980's, 1990's, and 2000's, municipalities through-out Florida challenged the ability of counties to compel cities to collect road impact fees for new development. The opposition stemmed in part from an unintended consequence of transportation concurrency which was that it essentially stopped development in urban areas (aka "cities"). Both municipalities and new development were constrained in their ability to add road capacity due to cost of acquiring developed land and fierce opposition from existing residents concerned about increased traffic and the impact new road capacity would have on their homes.

The inability of development in urban areas to meet transportation concurrency resulted in development moving to suburban and rural areas (aka "urban sprawl") where fewer residents would come out in opposition to new road capacity improvements and road capacity was either available or was cheaper to construct. Municipalities found themselves in the unenviable position of sending road impact fees to counties, when development did meet concurrency, only to see those road impact fees being spent on new road capacity projects outside of urban areas that made it even easier for development to continue to sprawl outside municipal limits.

Further, the courts frequently sided with counties, as municipalities that did challenge the legality of counties compelling them to collect impact fees did not offer alternatives to show how they would address the traffic impacts from new development. These challenges all occurred prior to the Florida Legislature adopting the "Impact Fee Act" through Florida Statute 163.31801. Further, these challenges also existed prior to the introduction of mobility plans and mobility fees and the adoption of the "Community Planning Act" through Florida Statute 163.3180.

Before the Florida "Impact Fee Act" was adopted, many local governments had already developed impact fees through their home rule powers. In 2006, the Legislature adopted the "Impact Fee Act" to provide process requirements for the adoption of impact fees and formally recognized the authority of local governments to adopt impact fees. Prior to 2006, the Florida Legislature, unlike many States throughout the U.S. that had adopted enabling legislation, elected to defer to the significant case law that had been developed in both Florida and throughout the U.S. to provide guidance to local governments to adopt impact fees.



In 2009, the Legislature made several changes to the "Impact Fee Act", the most significant of which was placing the burden of proof on local governments, through a preponderance of the evidence, that the imposition of the fee meets legal precedent and the requirements of Florida Statute Section 163.31801. Prior to the 2009 amendment, Courts generally deferred to local governments as to the validity of an imposed impact fee and placed the burden of proof, that an imposed impact fee was invalid or unconstitutional on the plaintiff.

In 2019, the Legislature, through HB 207 and HB 7103, made several changes to the "Impact Fee Act", the most significant of which was the requirement that fees not be collected before building permit. The changes also expanded on the requirements of the dual rational nexus test, the collection and expenditure of fees, credits for improvements and administrative cost.

In 2020, the Legislature, through SB 1066, made several additional changes to the Impact Fee Act to clarify that new or updated impact fees cannot be assessed on a permit if the permit application was pending prior to the new or updated fee. The bill also made credits assignable and transferable to third parties.

In 2021, the Legislature, through HB 337 made significant amendments to the "Impact Fee Act", which the Governor subsequently approved. The amendments require that impact fees be based on planned improvements and that there is a clear nexus between the need for improvements and the impact from new development. The amendments have a greater impact on increases to existing impact fees and have phasing requirements for increases to existing fees.

There are provisions that allow a local government to fully implement updated fees based on a finding of extraordinary circumstances, holding public hearings, and requiring a super majority approval by elected officials. Florida Statute Section 163.31801 now reads as follows:

- "(1) This section may be cited as the "Florida Impact Fee Act."
- (2) The Legislature finds that impact fees are an important source of revenue for a local government to use in funding the infrastructure necessitated by new growth. The Legislature further finds that impact fees are an outgrowth of the home rule power of a local government to provide certain services within its jurisdiction. Due to the growth of impact fee collections and local governments' reliance on impact fees, it is the intent of the Legislature to ensure that, when a county or municipality adopts an impact fee by ordinance or a special district adopts an impact fee by resolution, the governing authority complies with this section.
- (3) For purposes of this section, the term:



- (a) "Infrastructure" means a fixed capital expenditure or fixed capital outlay, excluding the cost of repairs or maintenance, associated with the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of public facilities that have a life expectancy of at least 5 years; related land acquisition, land improvement, design, engineering, and permitting costs; and other related construction costs required to bring the public facility into service. The term also includes a fire department vehicle, an emergency medical service vehicle, a sheriff's office vehicle, a police department vehicle, a school bus as defined in s. 1006.25, and the equipment necessary to outfit the vehicle or bus for its official use. For independent special fire control districts, the term includes new facilities as defined in s. 191.009(4).
- (b) "Public facilities" has the same meaning as in s. 163.3164 and includes emergency medical, fire, and law enforcement facilities.
- (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 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.
- (5)(a) Notwithstanding any charter provision, comprehensive plan policy, ordinance, development order, development permit, or resolution, the local government or special district must credit against the collection of the impact fee any contribution, whether identified in a proportionate share agreement or other form of exaction, related to public facilities or infrastructure, including land dedication, site planning and design, or construction. Any contribution must be applied on a dollar-for-dollar basis at fair market value to reduce any impact fee collected for the general category or class of public facilities or infrastructure for which the contribution was made.
 - (b) If a local government or special district does not charge and collect an impact fee for the general category or class of public facilities or infrastructure contributed, a credit may not be applied under paragraph (a).
- (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.
- (h) This subsection operates retroactively to January 1, 2021.
- (7) If an impact fee is increased, the holder of any impact fee credits, whether such credits are granted under s. 163.3180, s. 380.06, or otherwise, which were in existence before the increase, is entitled to the full benefit of the intensity or density prepaid by the credit balance as of the date it was first established.
- (8) 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.
- (9) In any action challenging an impact fee or the government's failure to provide required dollarfor-dollar credits for the payment of impact fees as provided in s. 163.3180(6)(h)2.b., the government has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the imposition or amount of the fee or credit meets the requirements of state legal precedent and this section. The court may not use a deferential standard for the benefit of the government.
- (10) Impact fee credits are assignable and transferable at any time after establishment from one development or parcel to any other that is within the same impact fee zone or impact fee district or that is within an adjoining impact fee zone or impact fee district within the same local government jurisdiction and which receives benefits from the improvement or contribution that generated the credits. This subsection applies to all impact fee credits regardless of whether the credits were established before or after the date the act become law.
- (11) A county, municipality, or special district may provide an exception or waiver for an impact fee for the development or construction of housing that is affordable, as defined in s. 420.9071. If a county, municipality, or special district provides such an exception or waiver, it is not required to use any revenues to offset the impact.
- (12) This section does not apply to water and sewer connection fees.

- (13) In addition to the items that must be reported in the annual financial reports under s. 218.32, a local government, school district county, municipality, or special district must report all of the following information data on all impact fees charged:
 - (a) The specific purpose of the impact fee, including the specific infrastructure needs to be met, including, but not limited to, transportation, parks, water, sewer, and schools.
 - (b) The impact fee schedule policy describing the method of calculating impact fees, such as flat fees, tiered scales based on number of bedrooms, or tiered scales based on square footage.
 - (c) The amount assessed for each purpose and for each type of dwelling.
 - (d) The total amount of impact fees charged by type of dwelling.
 - (e) Each exception and waiver provided for construction or development of housing that is affordable."

One of the purposes of this Technical Report, consistent with Florida Statute Sections 163.31801(4)(f) and (g), is to demonstrate that the Town of Lake Park Mobility Fees are proportional and reasonably connected to, or has a rational nexus with, both the **"need"** for new multimodal improvements and the mobility **"benefit"** provided to those who pay the fee, otherwise known as the "dual rational nexus test", herein further described as:

The "Need" for additional (new) capital facilities (improvements and projects) to accommodate the increase in demand from new development (growth), and

The "Benefit" that the new development (growth) receives from the payment and expenditure of fees to construct the new capital facilities (improvements).

In addition to the "dual rational nexus test", the U.S. Supreme Court in *Dolan v. Tigard* also established a "rough proportionality test" to address the relationship between the amount of a fee imposed on a new development and the impact of the new development. The "rough proportionality test" requires that there be a reasonable relationship between the impact fee and the impact of new development based upon the applicable unit of measure for residential and non-residential uses and that the variables used to calculate a fee are reasonably assignable and attributable to the impact of each new development.



The Courts recognized the authority of a municipality to impose "impact fees" in Florida in 1975 in the case of City of Dunedin v. Contractors and Builders Association of Pinellas County, 312 So.2d 763 (2d DCA. Fla., 1975), where the court held: "that the so-called impact fee did not constitute taxes but was a charge using the utility services under Ch. 180, F. S."

The Court set forth the following criteria to validate the establishment of an impact fee:

"...where the growth patterns are such that an existing water or sewer system will have to be expanded in the near future, a municipality may properly charge for the privilege of connecting to the system a fee which is in excess of the physical cost of connection, if this fee does not exceed a proportionate part of the amount reasonably necessary to finance the expansion and is earmarked for that purpose." 312 So.2d 763, 766, (1975).

The case was appealed to the Florida Supreme Court and a decision rendered in the case of Contractors and Builders Association of Pinellas County v. City of Dunedin 329 So.2d 314 (Fla. 1976), in which the Second District Court's decision was reversed. The Court held that "impact fees" did not constitute a tax; that they were user charges analogous to fees collected by privately owned utilities for services rendered.

However, the Court reversed the decision, based on the finding that the City did not create a separate fund where impact fees collected would be deposited and earmarked for the specific purpose for which they were collected, finding:

"The failure to include necessary restrictions on the use of the fund is bound to result in confusion, at best. City personnel may come and go before the fund is exhausted, yet there is nothing in writing to guide their use of these moneys, although certain uses, even within the water and sewer systems, would undercut the legal basis for the fund's existence. There is no justification for such casual handling of public moneys, and we therefore hold that the ordinance is defective for failure to spell out necessary restrictions on the use of fees it authorizes to be collected. Nothing we decide, however prevents Dunedin from adopting another sewer connection charge ordinance, incorporating appropriate restrictions on use of the revenues it produces. Dunedin is at liberty, moreover, to adopt an ordinance restricting the use of moneys already collected. We pretermit any discussion of refunds for that reason." 329 So.2d 314 321, 322 (Fla. 1976)

The case tied impact fees directly to growth and recognized the authority of a local government to impose fees to provide capacity to accommodate new growth and basing the fee on a proportionate share of the cost of the needed capacity. The ruling also established the need for local government to create a separate account to deposit impact fee collections to help ensure those funds are expended on infrastructure capacity.



The Utah Supreme Court had ruled on several cases related to the imposition of impact fees by local governments before hearing Banberry v. South Jordan. In the case, the Court held that: "the fair contribution of the fee-paying party should not exceed the expense thereof met by others. To comply with this standard a municipal fee related to service like water and sewer must not require newly developed properties to bear more than their equitable share of the capital costs in relation to the benefits conferred" (Banberry Development Corporation v. South Jordan City, 631 P. 2d 899 (Utah 1981). To provide further guidance for the imposition of impact fees, the court articulated seven factors which must be considered (Banberry Development Corporation v. South Jordan City, 631 P. 2d 904 (Utah 1981):

- "(1) the cost of existing capital facilities;
- (2) the manner of financing existing capital facilities (such as user charges, special assessments, bonded indebtedness, general taxes or federal grants);
- (3) the relative extent to which the newly developed properties and the other properties in the municipality have already contributed to the cost of existing capital facilities (by such means as user charges, special assessments, or payment from the proceeds of general taxes);
- (4) the relative extent to which the newly developed properties in the municipality will contribute to the cost of existing capital facilities in the future;
- (5) the extent to which the newly developed properties are entitled to a credit because the municipality is requiring their developers or owners (by contractual arrangement or otherwise) to provide common facilities (inside or outside the proposed development) that have been provided by the municipality and financed through general taxation or other means (apart from user fees) in other parts of the municipality;
- (6) extraordinary costs, if any, in servicing the newly developed properties; and
- (7) the time-price differential inherent in fair comparisons of amounts paid at different times."

The Court rulings in Florida, Utah and elsewhere in the U.S. during the 1970's and early 1980's led to the first use of what ultimately became known as the "dual rational nexus test" in Hollywood, Inc. v. Broward County, which involved a Broward County ordinance that required a developer to dedicated land or pay a fee for the County park system. The Florida Fourth District Court of Appeal found to establish a reasonable requirement for dedication of land or payment of an impact fee that:



"... the local government must demonstrate a reasonable connection, or rational nexus between the need for additional capital facilities and the growth of the population generated by the subdivision. In addition, the government must show a reasonable connection, or rational nexus, between the expenditures of the funds collected and the benefits accruing to the subdivision. In order to satisfy this latter requirement, the ordinance must specifically earmark the funds collected for the use in acquiring capital facilities to benefit new residents." (Hollywood, Inc. v. Broward County, 431 So. 2d 606 (Fla. 4th DCA), rev. denied, 440 So. 2d 352 (Fla. 1983).

In 1987, the first of two major cases were heard before the U.S. Supreme Court that have come to define what is now commonly referred to as the "dual rational nexus test". The first case was Nollan v. California Coastal Commission which involved the Commission requiring the Nollan family to dedicate a public access easement to the beach in exchange for permitting the replacement of a bungalow with a larger home which the Commission held would block the public's view of the beach. Justice Scalia delivered the decision of the Court: "The lack of nexus between the condition and the original purpose of the building restriction converts that purpose to something other than what it was...Unless the permit condition serves the same governmental purpose as the development ban, the building restriction is not a valid regulation of land use but an out-and-out plan of extortion (Nollan v. California Coastal Commission, 483 U. S. 825 (1987)". The Court found that there must be an essential nexus between an exaction and the government's legitimate interest being advanced by that exaction (Nollan v. California Coastal Commission, 483 U. S. 836, 837 (1987).

The second case, Dolan v. Tigard, heard by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1994 solidified the elements of the "dual rational nexus test". The Petitioner Dolan, owner and operator of a Plumbing & Electrical Supply store in the City of Tigard, Oregon, applied for a permit to expand the store and pave the parking lot of her store. The City Planning Commission granted conditional approval, dependent on the property owner dedicating land to a public greenway along an adjacent creek and developing a pedestrian and bicycle pathway to relieve traffic congestion. The decision was affirmed by the Oregon State Land Use Board of Appeal and the Oregon Supreme Court. The U.S. Supreme Court overturned the ruling of the Oregon Supreme Court and held:

"Under the well-settled doctrine of "unconstitutional conditions," the government may not require a person to give up a constitutional right in exchange for a discretionary benefit conferred by the government where the property sought has little or no relationship to the benefit. In evaluating Dolan's claim, it must be determined whether an "essential nexus" exists between a legitimate state interest and the permit condition. Nollan v. California Coastal Commission, 483 U. S. 825, 837. If one does, then it must be decided whether the degree of the exactions demanded by the permit conditions bears the required relationship to the projected impact of the proposed development." Dolan v. City of Tigard, 512 U.S. 383, 386 (1994)



The U.S. Supreme Court in addition to upholding the "essential nexus" requirement from Nollan also introduced the "rough proportionality" test and held that:

"In deciding the second question-whether the city's findings are constitutionally sufficient to justify the conditions imposed on Dolan's permit-the necessary connection required by the Fifth Amendment is "rough proportionality." No precise mathematical calculation is required, but the city must make some sort of individualized determination that the required dedication is related both in nature and extent to the proposed development's impact. This is essentially the "reasonable relationship" test adopted by the majority of the state courts. Dolan v. City of Tigard, 512 U.S. 388, 391 (1994)"

An often-overlooked component of Dolan v. City of Tigard is the recognition that while multimodal facilities may off-set traffic congestion there is a need to demonstrate or quantify how the dedication of a pedestrian / bicycle pathway would offset the traffic demand generated. per the following excerpt from the opinion of the Court delivered by Chief Justice Rehnquist:

"The city made the following specific findings relevant to the pedestrian/bicycle pathway: "In addition, the proposed expanded use of this site is anticipated to generate additional vehicular traffic thereby increasing congestion on nearby collector and arterial streets. Creation of a convenient, safe pedestrian/bicycle pathway system as an alternative means of transportation could offset some of the traffic demand on these nearby streets and lessen the increase in traffic congestion." We think a term such as "rough proportionality" best encapsulates what we hold to be the requirement of the Fifth Amendment. No precise mathematical calculation is required, but the city must make some sort of individualized determination that the required dedication is related both in nature and extent to the impact of the proposed development.

With respect to the pedestrian/bicycle pathway, we have no doubt that the city was correct in finding that the larger retail sales facility proposed by petitioner will increase traffic on the streets of the Central Business District. The city estimates that the proposed development would generate roughly 435 additional trips per day. Dedications for streets, sidewalks, and other public ways are generally reasonable exactions to avoid excessive congestion from a proposed property use. But on the record before us, the city has not met its burden of demonstrating that the additional number of vehicle and bicycle trips generated by the petitioner's development reasonably relate to the city's requirement for a dedication of the pedestrian/bicycle pathway easement. The city simply found that the creation of the pathway "could offset some of the traffic demand . . . and lessen the increase in traffic congestion."

"As Justice Peterson of the Supreme Court of Oregon explained in his dissenting opinion, however, "[t]he findings of fact that the bicycle pathway system could offset some of the traffic demand' is a far cry from a finding that the bicycle pathway system will, or is likely to, offset some of the traffic demand." 317 Ore., at 127, 854 P. 2d, at 447 (emphasis in original). No precise mathematical calculation is required, but the city must make some effort to quantify its findings in support of the dedication for the pedestrian/bicycle pathway beyond the conclusory statement that it could offset some of the traffic demand generated." Dolan v. City of Tigard, 512 U.S. 687 (1994).



The U.S. Supreme Court recently affirmed, through Koontz vs. St. Johns River Water Management District, that the "dual rational nexus" test equally applies to monetary exactions in the same manner as a governmental regulation requiring the dedication of land. Justice Alito described:

"Our decisions in Nollan v. California Coastal Commission, 483 U. S. 825 (1987), and Dolan v. City of Tigard, 512 U. S. 374 (1994), provide important protection against the misuse of the power of land-use regulation. In those cases, we held that a unit of government may not condition the approval of a landuse permit on the owner's relinquishment of a portion of his property unless there is a "nexus" and "rough proportionality" between the government's demand and the effects of the proposed land use. In this case, the St. Johns River Water Management District (District) believes that it circumvented Nollan and Dolan because of the way in which it structured its handling of a permit application submitted by Coy Koontz, Sr., whose estate is represented in this Court by Coy Koontz, Jr. The District did not approve his application on the condition that he surrender an interest in his land. Instead, the District, after suggesting that he could obtain approval by signing over such an interest, denied his application because he refused to yield." Koontz v. St. Johns River Water Management District 1333 S. Ct. 2586 (2013).

"That carving out a different rule for monetary exactions would make no sense. Monetary exactions particularly, fees imposed "in lieu" of real property dedications—are "commonplace" and are "functionally equivalent to other types of land use exactions." To subject monetary exactions to lesser, or no, protection would make it "very easy for land-use permitting officials to evade the limitations of Nollan and Dolan." Furthermore, such a rule would effectively render Nollan and Dolan dead letters "because the government need only provide a permit applicant with one alternative that satisfies the nexus and rough proportionality standard, a permitting authority wishing to exact an easement could simply give the owner a choice of either surrendering an easement or making a payment equal to the easement's value." Koontz v. St. Johns River Water Management District 1333 S. Ct. 2599 (2013).

The Florida First District Court of Appeals recently reaffirmed, through The BoCC of Santa Rosa County vs. the Builders Association of West Florida, that impact fees are required to meet the "dual rational nexus" test to avoid being found to be an unconstitutional tax and cited the Florida Impact Fee Act that requires impact fees to be based on the most recent and localized data.

The Court cited expert testimony that the County's school impact fee "failed the dual rational nexus test because they did not account for the differences between the northern and southern parts of the county. This resulted in impact fees that were disproportionate to the growth in these geographical regions."



DEVELOPING THE MOBILITY PLAN & FEE

There were multiple steps that went into development of the Town of Lake Park 2045 Mobility Plan and the Mobility Fee. The Town established legislative intent to consider development of a mobility plan and mobility fee through the 2022 amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. The following is a step-by-step overview of the process used to develop the Mobility Plan and Mobility Fee consistent with legal and statutory requirements (Figure 2).

Figure 2. Developing a Mobility Plan & Mobility Fee





COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

In 2022, the Town amended the Capital Improvements Element and the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan to consider the adoption of a mobility fee to fund multimodal projects to encourage walking, bicycling, transit ridership, and the efficient use of the transportation system. The following are pertinent goals, objectives, and policies in the Capital Improvements Element and the Transportation Element (Figure 3):

Figure 3. Integrating Land Use, Transportation, Parking & Funding



CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ELEMENT

Policy 1.10: "The Town shall adopt a mobility plan that identifies multimodal capital improvements over the next 10 to 25 years. These improvements will be prioritized by the Town Commission for funding as part of the annual Capital Improvements Program. The Town shall periodically evaluate the mobility plan and update the plan at least once every five years."

Objective 3: "At such time that a mobility plan becomes effective, future development or redevelopment will be required to mitigate its impacts to local roads and areawide roads serving the town and other local governments. Where appropriate, the Town may enter into interlocal

agreements to address mobility planning for roads serving the town and other local governments. Future development may also be required to make site related access and multimodal improvements through requirements and standards adopted through a multimodal site access assessment, or its functional equivalent."

Policy 3.1: "If a Mobility Plan establishes the basis for a mobility fee, and one is adopted, the Town may require developers to pay the fee to fund multimodal improvements identified in the Mobility Plan."

Policy 4.4: "Efforts shall be made to secure grants, private funds, and federal and state funds through the TPA and leverage mobility fees, if adopted, whenever possible to finance the provision of capital improvements. In accordance with Policy 1.6 of this element, a review of grants or private funds shall be conducted to identify funding sources."

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

TOWN GOAL STATEMENT 4.6.1: "A safe, connected, convenient, and efficient multimodal transportation that emphasizes the movement of people and goods in a sustainable manner and minimizes environmental and neighborhood impact to benefit all residents, businesses, and visitors to the Town."



Objective 1: "The Town shall coordinate as appropriate with adjacent municipalities, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), Palm Beach County, the Palm Beach County Transportation Planning Agency (TPA), Palm Tran, the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC), Tri-Rail, and private transportation mobility entities, such as Brightline, to implement projects to address roadway deficiencies and address current and projected multimodal transportation needs through whatever modes of transportation the Town deems appropriate."

Policy 1.6: "The Town shall establish multimodal quality of service standards for people walking, bicycling, and riding transit."

Policy 1.7: "The Town shall establish multimodal quality of service standards for its streets, based on posted speed, to replace segment-based road level of service standards."

Objective 2: "The Town shall develop a Mobility Plan which emphasizes the movement of people via a multimodal transportation system that provides safe and convenient improvements, services, and programs for people walking, bicycling, riding, or using micro mobility devices and micro transit vehicles, using shared mobility services and programs, and driving motor vehicles."

Policy 2.1: "The Town shall adopt a Mobility Plan that addresses impact to Town, County, and State of Florida transportation facilities within and adjacent to the Town. The multimodal improvements identified in the Mobility Plan shall be based on future person travel demand and multimodal projects necessary to meet that demand as required by the needs requirement of the dual rational nexus test. The horizon year for the Mobility Plan shall be either consistent with the Town's Comprehensive Plan or the most recently adopted Palm Beach County TPA Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The Mobility Plan may identify improvements that may be used in the calculation of a Mobility Fee, which may be wholly or partially attributable to new development, or redevelopment."

Objective 3: "The Mobility Plan may evaluate the adoption of a Mobility Fee to mitigate the travel demand of persons in and through the Town attributable to future development and redevelopment on the Town, County, and state of Florida roads identified in this Element."

Policy 3.1: "If adopted, a Mobility Fee shall be used to implement the travel demand within and through the Town as set forth in a Mobility Plan."

Policy 3.3: "The Town shall encourage adjacent local governments including the County to enter into interlocal Agreements related to mobility, whereby these local governments agree to expend revenues they collect on multi-modal improvements to shared roadways, and in particular those County owned or maintained road segments as identified in this Element. If a Mobility Fee is implemented, the Town shall set aside a pro-rata share of Mobility Fees collected to mitigate transportation impacts to County owned or maintained road segments, for those improvements identified in the Mobility Plan. The Town shall seek to coordinate improvements to County owned or maintained road segments to County owned or maintained road segments with the County's expenditure of any impact fees collected from new development or redevelopment in the Town to ensure that there is a rational nexus maintained between the fees collected and the improvements made."

Objective 4: "The Town multimodal transportation system shall emphasize and prioritize making streets safer and aesthetically pleasing for all users of the transportation system."

NUE URBAN CONCEPTS LAND USE • MOBILITY • PARKING • FEES

GROWTH

The first requirement of the dual rational nexus for a mobility fee is to demonstrate that there is a need for multimodal projects to accommodate projected growth in person travel demand. An evaluation of the existing and projected population and employment was conducted for the Town of Lake Park and the Mobility Study Area (Map A). The data was obtained from the Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs) used in Southeast Florida Regional Planning Model (SEFRPM).

The SEFRPM was developed by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) District Four (Southeast District) and used by the Palm Beach County Transportation Planning Agency (TPA) in development of the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The SEFRPM demonstrates that there is projected to be an increase in both population and employment for both the Town and Mobility Study Area (Table 1). The projected increase in both population and employment will generate additional person travel demand and will create a need for new multimodal projects to meet that demand.

	Town of Lake Park		Mobility S	tudy Area
Year	Population	Employees	Population	Employees
2015	8,244	7,547	48,165	39,512
2045	9,722	9,367	56,277	46,744
Increase	1,478	1,820	8,112	7,232

TABLE 1. PROJECTED GROWTH

Source: The 2015 and 2045 Population and Employment data based on the Southeast Florida Regional Planning Model (SEFRPM) Version 8.511 developed by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) District 4 (Southeast District). The Mobility Study Area includes areas outside Town limits as multimodal travel extends beyond Town Limits (Map A). Population and employment data were obtained from the SEFRPM Traffic Analysis Zones (Appendix B). The projected increase was obtained based on the difference between 2015 and 2045. Population growth in the Town is projected to increase by almost 18% (1,478 / 8,244 = 17.9%).

The Remainder of This Page Intentionally Left Blank



VEHICLE MILES OF TRAVEL (VMT)

The growth in vehicle miles of travel (VMT) is one of the factors evaluated to determine the need for future multimodal projects within the Town. Future traffic does not terminate at Town limits, thus the evaluation of VMT data includes the road network within the Mobility Study Area (Map A). The model analyses evaluated projected growth in vehicle miles of travel (VMT) for Town, County, and State roads within the model study network (Appendix C).

To ensure the future model volumes evaluated terminate at logical endpoints such as intersecting roads, the areas the model network extends outside Town limits **(Appendix C)**. The latest version of the Southeast Florida Regional Planning Model (SEFRPM) was used to determine the VMT growth in and around the Town of Lake Park between 2015 and 2045 **(Table 2)**.

Year	Arterial & Collector Roads	Interstate 95	Total
2015 (Model base year)	728,056	897,538	1,625,594
2022 (Mobility Plan base year)	775,247	923,173	1,698,420
2045 (Model & Plan future year)	952,923	1,012,671	1,965,594
VMT increase (2022 to 2045)	177,676	89,498	267,174
Source: Projected growth in VMT prepared by NUE Urban Concepts, LLC. The 2015 base year and 2045 future year VMT were extracted using the Southeast Florida Regional Planning Model Version 8.511. The model files were obtained from the Palm Beach County Transportation			

TABLE 2. GROWTH IN VEHICLE MILES OF TRAVEL (VMT)

Source: Projected growth in VMT prepared by NUE Urban Concepts, LLC. The 2015 base year and 2045 future year VMT were extracted using the Southeast Florida Regional Planning Model Version 8.511. The model files were obtained from the Palm Beach County Transportation Planning Agency (TPA). The annual growth rate of travel on arterial and collector roads is .901% and .40% for Interstate 95. The model growth rates were used to calculate the 2022 Mobility Plan base year VMT. The VMT increase is based on the difference between 2022 and 2045. The model network includes portions of the regional road network that extend outside of the incorporated Town limits (Appendix C). VMT in the Mobility Study Area is projected to increase by almost 23% (177,676 / 775,247 = 22.9%).

The Mobility Fee methodology will use the projected VMT on Interstate 95 (aka Limited Access Facilities) to adjust person travel demand for uses in the Mobility Fee schedule. Travel on limited access facilities is excluded from both road impact fee and mobility fee studies as improvements are funded by federal and state gas tax revenues and the facilities serve intercity and regional travel.

The Remainder of This Page Intentionally Left Blank



PERSON MILES OF TRAVEL (PMT)

The growth in vehicle miles of travel (VMT) is often used in road impact fees to evaluate the need for road capacity improvements to move vehicles. Mobility Fees utilize person miles of travel (PMT) to evaluate the need for multimodal projects to move people. To account for multimodal trips made by people walking, biking, riding transit, and the number of people per vehicle (aka vehicle occupancy), the projected increase in vehicle miles of travel (VMT) is converted into person miles of travel (PMT). The calculation for the increase in person miles of travel (PMT) is based on the projected increase in vehicle miles of travel (VMT) multiplied by the applicable person miles of travel factor (PMTf) illustrated in further detail on **Figure 4**.

Figure 4: Person Miles of Travel Increase (PMTi)

Person Miles of	Trav	vel increase (PMTi)		
Σ VMT = (Σ Ve	∑ VMT = (∑ Vehicle per Trip x ∑ Average Vehicle Trip Length)			
Σ PMT = (Σ Pe	rso	ns per Trip x∑Average Person Trip Length)		
PMTf=(∑ of l	PMT	⁻ / Σ of VMT)		
VMTi = (2045	VM	T - 2022 VMT)		
PMTi = (VMTi	x P	MTf)		
WHERE:				
VMT	=	Vehicle Miles of Travel		
PMT	=	Person Miles of Travel		
Σ ΜΜΤ	=	Sum of Vehicle Miles of Travel by trip purpose (Appendix D)		
Σ ΡΜΤ	=	Sum of Person Miles of Travel by trip purpose (Appendix D)		
PMTf	=	Person Miles of Travel factor		
VMTi	=	Vehicle Miles of Travel Increase (Table 2)		
PMTi	=	Person Miles of Travel increase (Table 3)		
Prepared by NUE Urban Concep	ots, LLC			

Person and vehicle trips and trip lengths are summarized by trip purpose to develop the person miles of travel factor (PMTf) based on data from Southeast Florida obtained from the 2017 National Household Travel Survey (NHTS). The 2017 NHTS data reflects the most recent and localized data for trip lengths and trip purpose for the municipalities and counties within the Core Based Statistical Area (CBSA) #33100 for Miami, Ft. Lauderdale, & West Palm Beach.

The evaluation of the vehicle and person data from the 2017 NTHS resulted in a person miles of travel factor (PMTf) based 1.81 (Appendix D). The data was obtained from 1,367 unique surveys collected within Southeast Florida. The following is the calculation for the increase in PMT for the Mobility Study Area:

VMT increase x PMTf = PMTi (177,676 x 1.81 = 321,594)

The projected increase of 321,594 person miles of travel (PMT) demonstrates that there is future person miles or travel demand projected by 2045 that will result in the "**need**" for multimodal projects to accommodate the increase in person travel demand **(Table 3)**. The documented increase in PMT and the identification of needed multimodal projects via the Mobility Plan demonstrates compliance with the "**needs**" test of the dual rational nexus test.

2045 Vehicle Miles of Travel increase (VMTi)	177,676		
Person Miles of Travel factor (PMTf)	1.81		
Total Increase in Person Miles of Travel (PMTi)	321,594		
Source: The 2045 VMT increase was obtained from Table 2. PMTi obtained by multiplying VMTi by 1.81 in Figure 4 and is representative of the most recent methodology.			

TABLE 3. INCREASE IN PERSON MILES OF TRAVEL (PMT)

The Remainder of This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Mobility Plan & Mobility Fee Technical Report: October



LEVEL & QUALITY OF SERVICE

The 2045 Town of Lake Park provides recommendations for the establishment of multimodal quality of service (QOS) standards for people bicycling, walking, accessing transit, and making roads safer for all users. The Mobility Fee Technical Report provides areawide roadway level of (LOS) analysis to evaluate the current transportation system within Lake Park. The areawide roadway LOS analysis and multimodal QOS standards are intended to be used for the following planning and design activities:

- (1) Identification of multimodal projects to develop and update the Mobility Plan,
- (2) Performance measures to evaluate, over time, changes in service and mobility provided,
- (3) Determine multimodal capacities for the Mobility Plan and Mobility Fee,
- (4) Prioritize multimodal projects for annual capital improvement programming,
- (5) Establish complete street designs and implementing land development regulations,
- (6) Develop mobility strategies in the LDRs for new development activity, and
- (7) Evaluate site access studies and amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.

Florida Statute 163.3180 (5)(f)(2) identifies the establishment of areawide roadway level of service (LOS) as an alternative to traditional segment-based LOS. The standard approach is to evaluating LOS on an individual segment basis using a metric known as a volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio, with the capacity based on an adopted LOS standard for the road. The intent of an areawide LOS analysis is to evaluate the traffic and capacity of multiple roads across a transportation system versus an individual segment-by-segment analysis.

Florida Statute 163.3180 (5)(f)(5) identifies the establishment of multimodal level of service (LOS) standards as part of a mobility plan and fee as one of several alternatives to provide for a transition away from transportation concurrency. The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) recognizes the use of the more common descriptor Quality of Service (QOS) Street for multimodal facilities (FDOT 2020 Quality/Level of Service Handbook). Street quality of service (QOS) standards, based on posted speed limits, are intended to be used in conjunction with areawide roadway LOS standards as a planning tool used for innovative street design. Multimodal QOS standards are based on the types of facilities for people walking and bicycling included in the Mobility Plan. Transit QOS standards are based on the type, frequency, and span of future transit service.

The Remainder of This Page Intentionally Left Blank



TOWN OF LAKE PARK MOBILITY PLAN

The Mobility Plan served as the basis to develop the Town's Mobility Fee. The Mobility Plan will provide a foundation for Lake Park to proactively prioritize multimodal projects to meet the growth, travel, and mobility needs of the community in a manner that is coordinated with the Future Land Use Element in the Town's Comprehensive Plan. The Mobility Plan is a vision, over the next 22 years, for how the Town's transportation system will transition from primarily moving vehicles, towards a multimodal system focused on safely moving people, whether they choose to continue driving their cars, or decide to walk, bicycle, ride transit, or use a new mobility technology (Figure 5).

Figure 5. Moving People, Providing Choices



The Mobility Plan features multimodal projects for sidewalks, shared-use paths, trails, bike lanes, mid-block crossings, multimodal lanes, low speed streets, landscape, streetscape, traffic calming, and transit stops (Appendix E). The Mobility Plan also features new road capacity through developer funded roads, new streets, the upgrade of existing roads to two lane divided complete streets, and the extension of Park Avenue from its current terminus east of Congress Avenue to Old Dixie Highway (Appendix E). The Mobility Plan also includes capacity and safety improvements at intersections and the addition of roundabouts (Appendix F). The Mobility Plan further defines multimodal projects, intersection and road capacity and safety improvements, along with projected time frames and potential funding (Appendix E & F).

To facilitate the transition from a transportation system focused on moving cars towards a multimodal system focused on the movement of people, it's important to understand that the speed of travel varies greatly whether a person is walking, bicycling, scooting, riding transit or driving a car. The speed of multimodal travel generally falls within five tiers, each of which requires appropriate multimodal improvements, to accommodate the desired speed of travel (Figure 6).

Figure 6. Speed of Travel



The 2045 Lake Park Mobility Plan provides further detail for multimodal improvements based on speed of travel including sidewalks, shared-use paths, greenways, bike lanes, and multimodal lanes **(Map B)**. The Plan also establishes two overlay areas: (1) Residential Traffic Calming Program; and (2) Federal Highway Mixed-Use Overlay District. These two areas feature various elements as part of the Mobility Plan to enhance multimodal mobility. Enhanced safety along US Hwy 1, Northlake Blvd, Congress Ave, and Silver Beach Road are significant components of the Mobility plan that will require coordination with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and the County.

To further the Olmstead Brothers vision, a Streetscape, Street Trees, and Landscape Enhancement Plan has also been developed for Town Streets (Map C). The Streetscape Plan identifies streets where canopy and understory trees should be added, along with infilling trees and landscape on streets which currently feature street trees and landscape. Mobility Plan Implementation projects have also been added for micromobility devices, microtransit vehicles, and shared mobility services. The Plan also recognizes that additional design, ordinances, plans, and studies will be required to implement multimodal projects and pursue federal, local, and state funding opportunities.



TOWN OF LAKE PARK MOBILITY FEE

The basis for the Town of Lake Park's Mobility Fee are the multimodal projects identified in the 2045 Lake Park Mobility Plan consistent with Florida Statute 163.3180(5)(i). The Mobility Fees collected from development activity are to be used to fund the multimodal projects identified in the Mobility Plan (Figure 7). The multimodal projects in the 2045 Mobility Plan are intended to provide the person miles of capacity needed to meet increases in person miles of travel demand, consistent with the "needs" requirement of the dual rational nexus test. The Mobility Fees collected from development activity are to be used to fund the needed multimodal projects to provide a mobility benefit to development activity and serve the increase in person travel demand from that development activity, consistent with the "benefits" requirement of the dual rational nexus test.

Figure 7. Mobility Plan and Mobility Fee





EXISTING CONDITIONS EVALUATION (ECE)

Florida Statute prohibits local governments from charging development activity for an existing transportation deficiency (aka over capacity or backlogged roads), except for Mobility Fees. Per Florida Statute Section 163.3180(i), Mobility Fees can be assessed to cure an existing transportation deficiency, other alternative mobility funding systems may not. While not required, is an abundance of caution, the capacity of the major road system has been evaluated on a system-wide basis to ensure that development activity is not being charged for existing transportation deficiencies.

The existing conditions evaluation (ECE) is achieved by dividing vehicle miles of travel (VMT) by vehicle miles of capacity (VMC). A VMT/VMC ratio greater than 1.00 indicates that there are system deficiencies. The Mobility Study Road Network evaluated includes major roads within the Town of Lake Park Core Mobility Area including Town, County, and State facilities (Appendix G). Based on the evaluation of existing conditions, the VMT/VMC ratio for 2022 is 0.51 (Table 4). Thus, there are no backlogged facilities for which development activity is being assessed and the major roads evaluated provide adequate capacity to meet existing travel demand. For purposes of the Mobility Fee calculation, the existing conditions evaluation factor (ECEf) is set to 1.00.

Functional Classification	Length (miles)	2022 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT)	2022 Vehicle Miles of Capacity (VMC)	VMT to VMC (VMT/VMC)
Minor Collector	4.84	39,870	79,224	.50
Major Collector	0.42	1,680	4,351	.39
Minor Arterial	3.09	57,357	102,834	.56
Principal Arterial	1.71	56,649	102,429	.55
Major Local	3.1	6,003	30,562	.20
Total	13.16	161,559	319,400	.51

TABLE 4. 2022 EXISTING CONDITIONS EVALUATION (ECE)

Source: Existing conditions evaluation is based on Traffic Characteristics Data for the Core Mobility Area (**Appendix G**). The Traffic Characteristics Data was obtained from the Town, County, FDOT, and TPO. VMT is based on AADT x length of a road segment. VMC is based on the daily capacity x length of a road segment. Capacities for roads are based on the FDOT Generalized Tables (**Appendix H**). Level of Service Standards are based on a LOS standard of "D". The Core Mobility Area is a subset of the Mobility Study Road Network (**Map A**).
In addition to the existing conditions analysis, a future conditions analysis was also performed for the Core Mobility Area in 2045. The projected VMT/VMC ratio for 2045 is 0.62 **(Table 5)**. This analysis does not include the additional capacity provided by proposed multimodal projects. Given the VMT/VMC ratio for 2045 is 0.62 without proposed multimodal projects, the projected VMT/VMC in 2045 with multimodal projects would add capacity and result in a lower VMT/VMC ratio. Thus, development activity is not being assessed to cure projected deficiencies.

Functional Classification	Length (miles)	2045 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT)	2045 Vehicle Miles of Capacity (VMC)	VMT to VMC (VMT/VMC)
Minor Collector	4.84	48,972	79,224	.62
Major Collector	0.42	2,058	4,351	.47
Minor Arterial	3.09	70,479	102,834	.69
Principal Arterial	1.71	69,575	102,429	.68
Major Local	3.1	7,467	30,562	.24
Total	13.16	198,551	319,400	.62
Source: Existing conditions evaluation is based on Traffic Characteristics Data for the Core Mobility Area (Appendix G). The Traffic Characteristics Data was obtained from the Town, County, FDOT, and TPO. VMT is based on AADT x length of a road segment. VMC is based on the daily capacity x length of a road segment. Capacities for roads are based on the FDOT Generalized Tables (Appendix H). Level of Service Standards are based				

TABLE 5. 2045 FUTURE CONDITIONS EVALUATION (FCE)

To evaluate potential impact to County and State Roads from new development, a further analysis of existing (2022) conditions was developed. The analysis includes total length of facilities, total lane miles, vehicle miles of travel (VMT), vehicle miles of capacity (VMC), and a breakdown of percentages by road ownership **(Table 6)**. The analysis illustrates that the VMT on Town Streets is estimated to be just under 15% in 2022, with just over 48% occurring on County Roads and 37% on State Roads. In terms of the total length of roads, just under 45% are owned and maintained by the Town, with County Roads accounting for just over 38% and State Roads just over 17%, respectively. Based on the metrics evaluated below, the County Road system represents just over 38% of the transportation network in the Town and accommodates just over 48% of the travel. Town and State Roads represent 62% of the transportation network in the Town and carry just over 52% of the current vehicle miles of travel. This is only travel on major roads and does not included travel on all the local streets maintained by the Town.

on a LOS standard of "D". The Core Mobility Area is a subset of the Mobility Study Road Network (Map A).



Government Entity	Length (miles)	Lane Miles	2022 VMT	2022 VMC
Town	5.89	14.68	23,981	85,750
County	5.02	14.76	77,950	126,651
State	2.25	11.48	59,628	107,000
Total	13.16	40.92	161,559	319,400
Town	44.8%	35.9%	14.8%	26.8%
County	38.1%	36.0%	48.2%	39.7%
State	17.1%	28.1%	37.0%	33.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Source: Traffic Characteristics Data for the Core Mobility Area (Appendix G). The Core Mobility Area is a subset of the Mobility Study Road				

TABLE 6. 2022 AREAWIDE VMT & VMC ANALYSIS BY OWNERSHIP

Source: Traffic Characteristics Data for the Core Mobility Area (Appendix G). The Core Mobility Area is a subset of the Mobility Study Road Network (Map A).

The 2022 analysis in **Table 6** excludes travel on Interstate 95. The funding for travel on Interstate 95 comes from federal and state gas taxes. The calculations for Person Travel Demand for land uses included on the Mobility Fee schedule provides additional analysis related to travel on Town, County, State, and limited access roads. The current Palm Beach County Road Impact Fee only provides a 0.50-mile reduction for travel on local and municipal owned roads. The analysis above, which excludes travel on non-major local Town maintained Streets, indicates that the current County Road Impact Fee may not reduce travel enough within the Town of Lake Park to account for the travel on all streets maintained by the Town and the State.

The County Road Impact Fee is currently charging for 100% of the travel that occurs on State Roads. The County Charter addresses transportation concurrency on County Roads and the enactment of a Road Impact Fee for travel on County Roads. The County does not generally maintain or make improvements on State or Town Roads. Within Lake Park, the impact to County Roads is roughly 48% of daily travel. The County, depending on the type of land use, collects Road Impact Fees for anywhere between 85% to 95% of the travel from new development. The existing conditions analysis indicates that number should be closer to 48%, not 85% to 95%.

MULTIMODAL CAPACITY

The multimodal projects identified in the Mobility Plan form the basis of the Mobility Fee. These multimodal projects are necessary to meet future person miles of travel demand and lay the foundation for use of new micromobility devices such as electric pedal assist bicycles (e-bike) and electric scooters (e-scooter) and microtransit vehicles such as autonomous transit shuttles, golf carts, and neighborhood electric vehicles. To account for the capacity benefit of multimodal projects, it requires the establishment of base person capacity rates for the multimodal projects included in the Mobility Plan.

The FDOT Generalized Service Volume Tables were used to establish daily capacities for roadways and intersections **(Appendix H)**. A difference between a road impact fee based on vehicle miles of travel (VMT) and a mobility fee based on person miles of travel (PMT) is accounting for vehicle occupancy. To account for vehicle occupancy, road capacities are multiplied by a Vehicle Occupancy factor of 1.84 based on data from the 2017 National Household Travel Survey **(Appendix D)**. The vehicle occupancy factor is used in the multimodal capacity analysis for road and intersection projects identified in the Mobility Plan.

The capacities for people walking and bicycling are based on both a level of service (LOS) and a quality of service (QOS). There is an inverse relationship between the LOS and QOS for people walking, bicycling, and scooting. The higher the LOS of a multimodal facility, the lower the QOS. Conversely, the higher the QOS of a multimodal facility, the lower the LOS. This is due to LOS being a measure of capacity where few users result in unimpeded flow and a higher LOS, whereas as congestion increases, whether in the form of bikes, cars, or people, the LOS decreases as more users equals impeded flow.

Multimodal capacities for bicycling, walking, transit, and driving, using bike lanes, multimodal lanes, roads, shared-use paths, sidewalks, streets, and trails are illustrated in **Appendix I**. Multimodal capacities for crosswalks, intersections, and roundabouts are illustrated in **Appendix J**. These multimodal capacities have been used to calculate person miles of capacity (PMC) for the Mobility Plan. These multimodal capacities are also utilized to evaluate the share of Planning Level Cost (PLC) that is attributable to new development. The multimodal capacities will also be utilized by the Town, in conjunction with multimodal quality of service standards, to evaluate projects as part of the annual update of the Capital Improvements Program and in future Mobility Plan updates.

The Remainder of This Page Intentionally Left Blank

MOBILITY PLAN PROJECT SUMMARY

The Mobility Plan includes detailed description for each multimodal project that serve as the basis for development of the Mobility Fee (Appendix E & F). Planning level cost estimates have been developed for the multimodal projects based on cost from the Town, County, FDOT, and Southeast Florida communities (Appendix K & L). The person miles of capacity (PMC) have been calculated for Mobility Plan streets and intersections (Appendix I & J). The timing for streets and intersections has been defined as either: (1) 2022 to 2025; (2) 2026 to 2030; (3) 2031 to 2035; (4) 2036 to 2040; (5) 2041 to 2045; (6) developer driven; or (7) connected to a defined project. The following is a summary of the total number, length, planning level cost, and person miles of capacity for the Mobility Plan projects (Table 7).

Improvements	Length (Miles) or Number of Intersections	Planning Level Cost Estimates	Person Miles of Capacity
Multimodal Projects: Streets	49.45 miles	\$105,592,020	284,808
Multimodal Projects: Intersections	36 Intersections	\$23,352,315	103,100
Total	49.45 miles & 36 Intersections	\$128,944,335	387,908
Source: Multimodal Projects: Streets (Appendix E). Multimodal Projects: Intersections (Appendix F).			

TABLE 7. MOBILITY PLAN PROJECT SUMMARY

Further detail related to multimodal projects is summarized in **Table 8 and Table 9**. The multimodal projects for streets and intersections includes several unique projects that are location specific, such as the proposed Tri-Rail Station, the Waterfront Promenade, the Lake Park (C-17 Canal) Greenway, the Park Avenue Curbless Main Street, and the Northlake Bridge improvement to increase access from South Lake to North Lake and the C-17 Canal (Map B).

The multimodal projects include 49.45 miles of street improvements, at a cost of just under \$106 million, which will increase person miles of capacity (PMC) by 284,808 **(Table 8)**. The multimodal projects include 36 intersection improvements, at a cost of just over \$23 million, that will increase person miles of capacity (PMC) by 103,100 **(Table 9)**. The total planning level cost estimates for the Mobility Plan is \$128,944,335 and the projected increase in person miles of capacity (PMC) is 387,908 **(Table 7)**.



Multimodal Project	Length (Miles) or Number	Planning Level Cost	Person Miles of Capacity	
Complete Street	4.22 miles	\$8,079,134	24,818	
Low Speed Street	6.98 miles	\$5,382,278	16,752	
Two (2) Lane Divided Complete Street	3.93 miles	\$24,326,865	122,291	
Park Ave Curbless Main Street	0.38 miles	\$7,600,000	15,200	
Greenway	1.27 miles	\$1,441,425	4,572	
Waterfront Promenade	0.93 miles	\$4,590,899	8,928	
New Two (2) Lane Road	0.69 miles	\$6,744,669	12,571	
New Two (2) Lane Road (Developer)	1.29 miles	\$4,540,549	14,456	
Tri-Rail Station	1 station	\$15,000,000	1,600	
Multimodal Improvements	6.22 miles	\$7,114,329	26,416	
Multimodal Programs	23.54 miles	\$20,771,873	37,204	
Total	49.45 miles	\$105,592,020	284,808	
Source: Multimodal Projects: Streets (Appendix E).				

TABLE 8. MOBILITY PLAN PROJECTS: STREETS

The multimodal projects for intersections emphasize multimodal safety to achieve the person miles of capacity established for multimodal improvements. The majority of the multimodal projects for intersections on County and State Roads seek to address frequent crash locations involving vehicles and people walking and bicycling. Roundabouts, both signalized and unsignalized, are proposed along Park Avenue to distribute traffic across the transportation system to minimize impact on Old Dixie Highway and 10th Street (Map B). Intersection improvements include capacity and safety enhancements at locations through-out Lake Park on Town Streets, County and State Roads.



Multimodal Project	Number of Intersections	Planning Level Cost Estimates	Person Miles of Capacity
High Visibility Crosswalk	6 intersections	\$937 , 320	4,800
Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB)	9 intersections	\$1,405,980	7,200
Roundabout	7 intersections	\$8,510,125	62,500
High-Intensity Activated CrossWalK (HAWK)	2 intersections	\$3,025,160	2,400
Intersection Improvements	11 intersections	\$6,473,730	25,200
Bridge Improvement	1 intersection	\$3,000,000	1,000
Total	36 intersections	\$23,352,315	103,100
Source: Multimodal Projects: Intersections (Appendix F).			

TABLE 9. MOBILITY PLAN PROJECTS: INTERSECTIONS

The Remainder of This Page Intentionally Left Blank

FUNDING

The availability of funding for Mobility Plan projects over the next 22 years is projected to come from a variety of funding sources. Palm Beach County and the Town can allocate a portion of gas taxes and infrastructure sales tax towards Mobility Plan projects. Gas taxes have been declining locally, statewide, and nationally as vehicles have become more fuel efficient and the percentage of electric vehicles and hybrid vehicles increase. Neither the Federal Government nor the State of Florida have raised gas taxes in a number of years. The gas taxes that are available are largely earmarked for maintenance and operations of the existing transportation network.

There has been some discussion of a VMT tax to replace the gas tax at the federal and state level. There are several states that are testing pilot programs for a VMT tax. Given the current political climate, a VMT tax is unlikely to pass anytime soon. However, as a greater number of electric vehicles and autonomous vehicles come online, there may be renewed interest in replacing the gas tax with a VMT fee in the future. The County's existing infrastructure sales tax provides a broader opportunity to have available funds to contribute towards Mobility Plan projects. However, the sales tax is set to expire in 2024. If the County intends to place an infrastructure sales tax on the 2024 ballot, it requires voter approval.

The Palm Beach County Transportation Planning Agency (TPA) has available funding identified through the 2045 Cost Feasible Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). A large portion of projected funding is allocated towards improvements on the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS), with a significant amount of the funds allocated toward the Florida Turnpike and Interstate 95. However, Historically, the TPA still has a number of funding opportunities through grants and various pool of funds identified in the LRTP to allocate towards multimodal projects in Lake Park. Palm Beach County has also received or will receive large Road Impact Fee payments from ongoing and future developments in Lake Park that can fund projects such as the Park Avenue extension and improvements to Silver Beach Blvd.

While the infrastructure sales tax will expire in 2024, for purposes of forecasting future fund availability, it is assumed that some form of sales tax revenues will be available annually over the time frame of the Mobility Plan. In addition, many of the new roads included in the Mobility Plan would be funded as new development is constructed with Lake Park. Further, FDOT and the County have various capacity funding sources available for multimodal projects on State and County Roads such as US Hwy 1, Northlake Blvd, Old Dixie Hwy, and Silver Beach Road. The County, FDOT, and the TPA also have revenues available for funding safety enhancements such as crosswalks and pedestrian activated signals, and multimodal projects such as sidewalks and shared-use paths.

The Mobility Plan identifies the percentage of funding projected to be available for multimodal projects on Town, County, and State Roads. The Mobility Plan identifies local matches ranging between 10% and 20% for certain multimodal projects. The Plan also identifies projected funding contributions from County, Federal, and State funds (programmed through the TPA) that range from 10% to 90% for select multimodal projects.

The Mobility Plan identifies new roads that are projected to be 100% funded by new development and redevelopment. The Mobility Fee does include 10% of the cost of the developer funded projects to ensure other developments that may benefit provide a share of the funding and that the development activity that constructs the improvements would be eligible for mobility fee credits based on 10% of the cost of the multimodal projects.

The total funding anticipated to be available over the next 22 years is \$61,696,444 **(Table 10)**. This level of funding equates to roughly \$2,804,384 per year over the next 22 years. The Town has been very successful in securing County, Federal, and State funds. With the recently adopted Federal Stimulus package, the potential for an infrastructure sales tax extension, various grant funding opportunities, and the County Road Impact Fee levied in the Town are all significant funding sources that would provide varying levels of revenue to fund multimodal projects by 2045. In addition, the cost of several new roads identified in the Mobility plan would be covered by development activity constructing the roads as part of their development activity.

\$128,944,335	Mobility Plan Cost	
\$45,113,219	Anticipated Available Funding: Streets (2022 to 2045)	
\$16,583,225	Anticipated Available Funding: Intersections (2022 to 2045)	
\$61,696,444	Total Anticipated Funding	
\$67,247,892	Unfunded Mobility Plan Cost	
Source: Mobility Plan Cost Table 7 . Anticipated funding for multimodal street projects (Appendix E). Projected funding for intersection improvements (Appendix E). Anticipated available funding of \$2,817,847 per year from infrastructure sales tax, construction of new		

TABLE 10. ANTICIPATED AVAILABLE FUNDING

Source: Mobility Plan Cost **Table 7**. Anticipated funding for multimodal street projects **(Appendix E)**. Projected funding for intersection improvements **(Appendix F)**. Anticipated available funding of \$2,817,847 per year from infrastructure sales tax, construction of new roads by development and redevelopment, and other revenue sources between 2022 and 2045. The unfunded Mobility Plan cost obtained by subtracting the total anticipated funding sources from the total Mobility Plan cost. Available funding will be re-evaluated as part of future updates of the Mobility Plan, developments, and annual Capital Improvement Program (CIP) updates.



New GROWTH EVALUATION (NGE)

A new growth evaluation has been conducted to ensure that development activity is not paying for more than its fair share of the cost of the multimodal projects identified in the Mobility Plan, as required by case law and Florida Statute. The new growth evaluation is based on the projected increase in person miles of travel (PMT) and the projected increase in person miles of capacity (PMC) from the Mobility Plan projects. A PMT / PMC ratio less than 1.00 means that more multimodal capacity is being provided than is needed to accommodate future travel demand; greater than 1.00 means that development activity is not being charged more than its fair share of the cost of Mobility Plan projects. The new growth evaluation factor (NGEf) calculation is illustrated on Figure 8.

FIGURE 8. NEW GROWTH EVALUATION FACTOR (NGEf)

New Growth Evaluation factor (NGEf) $PMGi = \sum (I = Nacity PMGct) + \sum (PMGit)$
$P(N C = \sum (LENST \land P(N C C) + \sum (P(N C C))$
NGET = (PMTT/ PMCI)
If NGEf > 1.00, then the NGEf is set at 1.00
Where:
NGEf = New Growth Evaluation factor (Table 11)
LENst = Length of Mobility Plan: Streets (Appendix E)
PMC = Person Miles of Capacity
PMCst = PMC of Mobility Plan: Streets (Appendix E)
PMCit = PMC of Mobility Plan: Intersections (Appendix F)
PMTi = Person Miles of Travel increase (Table 3)
PMCi = Person Miles of Capacity increase (Table 7)
Prepared by NUE Urban Concepts, LLC

The projected PMTi / PMCi ratio is 0.829, which is less than 1.00 **(Table 11)**. Thus, development activity is being charged more than its attributable share of the cost of Mobility Plan projects. For purposes of the calculation of the Mobility Fee rate, the NGEf is set to 0.829 to ensure that development activity is not paying more than its fair share of the cost.

TABLE 11. NEW GROWTH EVALUATION (NGE)

Increase in Person Miles of Travel (PMTi)	321,594	
Increase in Person Miles of Capacity (PMCi)	387,908	
New Growth Evaluation factor (NGEf)	0.829	
Source: The increase in person miles of travel is based on Table 3. The increase in person miles of capacity is based on Table 7. The new growth evaluation calculation is based on the formula in Figure 8.		

MOBILITY FEE ASSESSMENT AREA

There are two kinds of geographic areas in mobility fee systems: assessment areas and benefit districts. Assessment areas are based on either a physical location, such as a downtown, or a type of development pattern, such as a traditional neighborhood development (TND). Development activity within the Town only pays the mobility fee rate applicable to the assessment area in which the new development is located. A benefit district is an area within which mobility fees collected and are earmarked for expenditure as required by the **"benefits"** test of the dual rational nexus test.

The establishment of different assessment areas is done in recognition that certain geographic locations or types of developments will result in shorter trips, more people walking and bicycling, and higher levels of internal capture; thus, minimizing impact to the external roadway network. Multiple assessment areas are established if there is a desire to see a mobility fee that reflects differences dues to internal capture or external distribution of trips.

Due to the compact nature of the Town of Lake Park, the Mobility Fee Assessment Area is the existing municipal limits of the Town (Map D). In the future, when a Tri Rail Train Station is constructed, the Town may elect to establish a Transit Oriented Development of Downtown Assessment Area to reflect internal capture and transit mode share. The Town could also consider establishing an assessment area west of the railroad tracks. This assessment area would incorporate new roads to be built by development activity and assigned a higher mobility fee so that all development activity in the area would contribute towards the funding of the new roads or upgraded infrastructure.

PERSON MILES OF CAPACITY RATE (PMCR)

The unfunded cost of the Mobility Plan in **Table 10**, the existing conditions evaluation factor (ECEf) in **Table 4**, the new growth evaluation factor (NGEf) in **Table 11**, and the increase in person miles of capacity in **Table 7** are used in the formula to calculate the PMCr. The methodology for calculating the person miles of capacity rate is provided in **Figure 9**. With a Mobility Plan attributable cost of **\$55,748,502** and a PMC increase of **387,908** the calculated PMC rate is **\$143.72 (Table 12)**.

FIGURE 9. PERSON MILES OF CAPACITY RATE (PMCr)



Unfunded Mobility Plan Cost	\$67,247,892	
Existing Conditions Evaluation Factor (ECEf)	1.00	
New Growth Evaluation Factor (NGEf)	0.829	
Attributable Mobility Plan (MP) Cost	\$55,748,502	
Person Miles of Capacity Increase (PMCi)	387,908	
Person Miles of Capacity Rate (PMCr)	\$143.72	
Source: The unfunded cost of multimodal projects is obtained from Table 10 . The existing conditions evaluation factor is obtained from Table 4 . The new growth evaluation factor is obtained from Table 11 . The person miles of capacity rate (PMCr) are determined per the calculation in Figure 9 .		

TABLE 12. PERSON MILES OF CAPACITY RATE (PMCr)

PERSON TRAVEL DEMAND PER USE (PTDU)

The second component in the calculation of a mobility fee is the calculation of person travel demand (PTD) for each use included on the Mobility Fee schedule. The factors utilized in the calculation of person travel demand (PTD) for each use are the principal means to achieve the "rough proportionality" test established by the courts and Florida Statute 163.31801. Figure 10 illustrates the formula used to calculate the person travel demand per use (PTDu) in the mobility fee schedule.

FIGURE 10. PERSON TRAVEL DEMAND PER USE (PTDu)





Limited Access Evaluation Factor (LAEf)

Travel on Interstate 95, which is a limited access facility, is excluded from Mobility Fee calculations as the Interstate System is principally funded and maintained by the Federal Government in coordination with FDOT. To ensure development that generates new person travel demand is not charged for travel on Interstate 95, a limited access factor has been developed. The factor is developed based on 2022 volumes from the SEFRPM (Table 2). The limited access evaluation factor (LAEf) of 0.46 is applied to person trip lengths to account for the 54.0% of travel occurring on Interstate 95 in 2022 (Table 13).

Facility	2022 VMT	
Collector & Arterial Roads VMT	775,247	
Florida Turnpike & Interstate 95 VMT	923,173	
Total VMT	1,684,420	
Limited Access Evaluation Factor (LAEf)	0.46	
Source: The 2022 VMT data was obtained using the SEFRPM Version 8.511 and obtained from Table 2.		

TABLE 13. LIMITED ACCESS EVALUATION FACTOR (LAEf)

Trip Generation

Trip generation rates are based on daily trip information published in the *Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 11th edition.* The detail for the daily trip generation rates for each land use is included in **Appendix M**. For uses where daily trips are not provided or there are only a few samples, the AM and PM Peak hours of adjacent street traffic were averaged and divided by a peak-to-daily ratio of 0.1 (on average 10% of daily traffic occurs during peak periods).

The streamlined schedule requires that some trip generation rates be based on trip rates from multiple uses. For Overnight Lodging, Mobile Residence, Community Serving, Private Education, Indoor and Outdoor recreation used weighted AM and PM trip generation data to develop the trip generation rates. For uses with more than one ITE land use code, the trip generation was calculated by weighting trips based on the number of studies completed as indicated in the ITE Trip Generation Manual. The simplest way to calculate the daily trip generation rate for a use, where trip generation is based on multiple trip generation rates, would be to simply average the trip rates.

The issue with a simple average is that the ITE Manual may only have one or two studies for a given land use and 50 studies for another use. Generally, the greater the number of studies, the more accurate the trip generation rate is for a given use. To ensure that a trip generation rate based on one (1) study does not have the same weight as a trip generation rate based on thirty (30) studies, a weighted trip generation rate is calculated for each ITE Land Use associated with a use included on the mobility fee schedule.

% New Trips

The percentage of new trips is based on a combination of the various pass-by analyses provided in ITE's Trip Generation Handbook, 3rd edition and various traffic studies conducted throughout Florida. The percentage of new trips differs slightly from the commonly used pass-by trip term as it is the percentage difference in trips after pass-by trips are deducted. The concept is better understood based on the following example:

(10 trips x (100% - 30% pass-by rate)) = 7 trips or 70% new trips).

While the ITE's Trip Generation does not recognize pass-by rates for uses other than retail, passby rates are utilized for uses such as offices, day care, entertainment and recreation use to reflect how people move about the community. A pass-by trip is a trip that is traveling and stops at another land use between an origin point (commonly a dwelling) and a destination (place of employment). The detail for the % new trips is included in **Appendix M**.

Person Trip Factor (PTf) & Person Trip Length (PTl)

The person trip factor (PTf) is used to convert vehicle trips to person trips based on the recently released 2017 National Household Travel Survey (NHTS). The person trip length (PTI) is used to convert person trips to person travel demand. The person trip factors, and person trip lengths vary by trip purpose. Several trip purposes have been combined to reflect trip characteristics more accurately for the uses established in the mobility fee schedule (Appendix N).

To obtain the most recent and localized data, the travel survey was evaluated specifically for the Core Based Statistical Area (CBSA) consisting of Miami, Ft. Lauderdale, and West Palm Beach. The person trip factors vary by trip purpose. Several trip purposes have been combined to reflect trip characteristics more accurately for the uses established in the mobility fee schedule. The data for the CBSA is based on 1,367 unique survey data points for trips that average 30 miles or less in length **(Appendix N)**.



The home to work trip has been the most studied of trip purposes as the trip has generally occurred during the AM and PM peak hours. However, the work trip has been decreasing its share of overall trips for the last five (5) National Household Travel Surveys (NHTS). Non-work-based trip purposes now account for 82% to 89% of overall person miles of travel (PMT) and 75% to 83% of overall vehicle miles of travel (VMT) nationwide. **Table 14** provides a summary of the trip characteristics by trip purpose for the NHTS data used in the Mobility Fee calculations *with 82% of the PMT and 75% of the VMT representing non-work-based trips (emphasis added).*

Trip Purpose	Number of Trips	Person Trips	Person Miles of Travel	Vehicle Trips	Vehicle Miles of Travel
Buy Goods, Meals, Services (Retail)	399	783	3,397	365	1,700
Percent Share of Travel	29.21%	31.93%	27.63%	31.14%	25.04%
Errands / Medical	59	87	367	49	249
Percent Share of Travel	4.32%	3.55%	2.99%	4.18%	3.66%
Exercise / Entertainment / Social	125	234	1,264	93	611
Percent Share of Travel	9.15%	9.54%	10.28%	7.94%	9.00%
Family Care / Religious / School	54	106	497	42	238
Percent Share of Travel	3.95%	4.32%	4.04%	3.58%	3.51%
Home Based	504	961	4,564	418	2,298
Percent Share of Travel	36.90%	39.19%	37.12%	35.67%	33.85%
Work Based	225	281	2,206	205	1,693
Percent Share of Travel	16.47%	11.46%	17.94%	17.49%	24.95%
Non-Work Based	1,141	2,171	10,090	967	5,095
Percent Share of Travel	83.53%	88.54%	82.06%	82.51%	75.05%
Total	1,366	2,452	12,296	1,172	6,788
Percent Share of Travel	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 14. TRIP CHARACTERISTICS BY TRIP PURPOSE

Source: 2017 National Household Travel Survey Date (Appendix D). Note: Non-Work trips based on the sum of all non-work-based trip purposes (emphasis added). The percent share of travel is the trip characteristic by trip purpose divided by the total of all trip characteristics.



Urban Area Factor (URBf)

Palm Beach County charges a Road Impact Fee within the Town of Lake Park. The County's fee does not vary by urban area or location, it is a uniform fee assessed within the urbanized area of the County. The only reduction that the County makes is 0.50 miles for travel on local roads. As was illustrated in the Existing Conditions Evaluation, just over 48% of the travel within Lake Park occurs on County Roads. The other 52% occurs on major Town Streets and State Roads. If travel on local roads was also accounted for within Lake Park, the percentage of travel would be even less on County Roads. Outside of Lake Park, travel is roughly split between County and State Roads.

At this time, the Town of Lake Park intends to assess its Mobility Fee in addition to the County Road Impact Fee. An Urban Area Factor (URBf) has been developed for each use in the Mobility Fee schedule to ensure new development is not being charged for travel outside of the Town. This factor is based on 2.5 miles of travel within the Town of Lake Park. The Urban Area Factor (URBf) is calculated based on dividing 2.5 miles by the overall Person Trip Length (in miles) per use in the Mobility Fee Schedule **(Appendix N)**. The Town may wish to negotiate with the County reducing the travel length it charges new development in Lake Park. A percentage reduction or reduction of up to 2.5 miles would lower the County's Road Impact Fee within the Town, thus reducing the mitigation impact required by new development, while still collecting a portion of the County's Road Impact Fee within the Town. Under this scenario, the Town's Mobility Fee would not increase.

Origin and Destination Factor (ODf)

Trip generation rates represent trip-ends at the site of a land use. Thus, a single origin trip from home to work counts as one trip-end for the residence and from work to the residence as one trip-end, for a total of two trip ends. To avoid double counting of trips, the net person travel demand is multiplied by the origin and destination adjustment factor of 0.50. This distributes the impact of travel equally between the origin and destination of the trip and eliminates double charging.

Person Travel Demand per Use (PTDu)

The result of multiplying trip generation rates, percentage of new trips, urban area factor, the person trip factor, the person trip length, the limited access evaluation factor, and the origin and destination factor are the establishment of a per unit Person Travel Demand per use **(Appendix N)**. The PTD per use by assessment area reflects the projected travel during an average weekday by the various uses in the Mobility Fee schedule. The following is an example of the calculation for PTDu for a residential dwelling unit:

(((TG x % NEW) x PTf) x PTI) = PTDg; (((PTDg x LAEf) x URBf) x ODf) = PTDu (((5.42 x 1.00) x 0.734) x 1.91) x 4.75) = 49.17; (((49.17 x 0.46) x 0.53) x 0.50) = 5.99



MOBILITY FEE SCHEDULE

To ensure the rough proportionality test is addressed, the person travel demand of individual uses is evaluated through the development of a mobility fee schedule. The Mobility Fee is based on the person travel demand for each use (PTDu) listed on the Mobility Fee schedule multiplied by the person miles of capacity rate (PMCr) established in **Table 12**. The calculated person travel demand for each use (PTDu) represents the person travel demand impact of that use within the Town **(Appendix N)**. The Mobility Plan and Mobility Fee has been developed to provide the needed multimodal projects on Town roads and a share of the cost of County and State Roads to address future person travel demand from development activity within the Town and allow that development activity to mitigate its impact by payment of a Mobility Fee to the Town. The calculations for determining the Mobility Fee per Use are illustrated in **Figure 11**.

FIGURE 11. MOBILITY FEE CALCULATION

Mobility	Mobility Fee per Use (MFu)			
MFu	=	(PTDu x PMCr)		
MFau	=	(MFu x UMu)		
Where:				
PTDu	=	Person Travel Demand per use (Appendix N)		
PMCr	=	Person Miles of Capacity Rate (Table 12)		
MFu	=	Mobility Fee per use (Appendix P)		
UM	=	Unit of Measure per Use (Appendix P)		
MFau	=	Mobility Fee assessed per Use		
Prepared by NUE Urb	an Con	icepts, LLC		

The calculated Mobility Fee per Use is provided in **Appendix P.** The following are examples of the calculation for a Mobility Fee for a 1,500 square foot residential dwelling unit, followed by a calculated Mobility Fee 100 room hotel (note PMC rates are rounded):

(PTDu x PMCr) = MFu; (MFu / 1,000) = MFsf; (MFu x UMu) = MFau

(5.99 x 143.72) = \$861 per 1,000 sq. ft.; (861 / 1,000) = 0.86 per sq. ft.; (0.86 x 1,500) = \$1,290

(PTDu x PMCr) = MFu; (MFu x UM) = MFau

(6.76 x 143.72) = \$972 per room; (972 x 100) = \$97,200



The Mobility Fee schedule provides fees on both a square foot or applicable unit of measure basis and per 1,000 square foot basis, or applicable unit of measure **(Appendix P).** The recommendation is to provide rates on a per square foot basis or applicable unit of measure. For the majority of non-residential uses, this is how impact fees and mobility fees are actually calculated and is how the construction industry prices buildings. Converting residential to a per sq. ft. rate is one way to address affordability and is in line with how the building industry prices construction of residential buildings. The Mobility Fee rates are also provided per 1,000 square feet or applicable unit of measure to allow for comparison with applicable Palm Beach County Road Impact Fees.

The Mobility Fee schedule seeks to strike a balance between the Town's Comprehensive Plan and current market trends. The uses included on the Mobility Fee schedule enable the Town to use the Mobility Fee as an additional tool to further integrate land use and transportation planning consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

The Mobility Fee schedule of uses are broken down into five (5) components further described below: (1) category of uses; (2) individual use classifications; (3) representative uses; (4) unit of measure; and (5) the mobility fee per use. The following is an example the five (5) components of the mobility fee schedule (Figure 12):

Five (5) Components of a Mobility Fee Schedule					
Use Categories, Land Uses Classifications, and Representative Land Uses	(4 th - Unit of Measurement)	(5 th - Mobility Fee)			
(1 st - Use Category) = Institutional Uses					
(2 nd - Use Classification) = Community Serving (3 rd - Representative Use = (Civic, Place of Assembly, Museum, Gallery)	per sq. ft.	TBD			

FIGURE 12. MOBILITY FEE SCHEDULE COMPONENTS

The first (1st) component are overall categories of uses, such as residential or office. Under each overall category there are multiple uses for which a mobility fee is calculated. The overall category is generally consistent with the overall function of a use of land for the individual land use classification. These overall categories are generally consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the ITE Trip Generation Manual.



The second (2nd) component are individual use classifications, such as community serving or commercial storage. These individual use classifications have similar person travel demand characteristics and / or similar functions to the overall use category. These individual use classifications are generally consistent with the ITE Trip Generation Manual classification under a give category of uses.

The third (3rd) component are representative uses under the individual use classifications. These representative uses are shown in brackets such as (Child Care, Day Care, Private Primary School, Pre-K) after the individual use classification of Private Education. These representative uses have similar person travel demand characteristics and functions to the individual use classification. Theses uses are not exhaustive and are intended to serve as a guide to describe the types of use that would be assessed a mobility fee based on the rate for the individual use classification. The definition of each individual use classification provides further detail on the types of representative uses would fall under an individual use classification. These representative uses are generally consistent with the ITE Trip Generation Manual classification under a give category of uses and individual use classifications.

The fourth (4th) component are the unit of measure used to calculate the Mobility Fee per use. Each use has a specific unit of measure provided to determine the mobility fee, such as per square foot (sq. ft.), per room for overnight lodging, or per acre for outdoor commercial. The mobility fee for most uses is based on square footage. Each of the additive fees is based on a use classification.

The fifth (5th) component are the mobility fee rates per individual use classification. The mobility fees are illustrated for each use on the schedule. The mobility fee for an individual uses is determined by multiplying the mobility fee rate by the applicable unit of measure.

Residential Land Uses

The Mobility Fee schedule proposes a streamlined approach to residential mobility fees that is easy to administer and addresses affordability. The schedule proposes a flat residential Mobility Fee rate per square foot for residential uses, regardless of the type of residential use. The Mobility Fee is set up so that a 600 sq. ft. studio pays for 600 sq. ft., a 1,200 sq. ft. two-bedroom apartment pays for 1,200 sq. ft., and a 2,000 sq. ft. single-family detached dwelling pays for 2,000 sq. ft. There is a direct correlation between the size of a unit and the Mobility Fee to be paid. The calculation of Mobility Fees per sq. ft. fee is consistent with how the building industry prices permits and is a tool available to the Town to address affordability.



Affordable, Attainable, or Workforce Housing

The Mobility Fee schedule includes a lower rate for affordable, attainable, or workforce housing to encourage this type of development and in recognition that trip generation data for affordable housing, coupled with the number of households without access to a vehicle available, provides a defensible technical basis for having a lower mobility fee rate. The calculated mobility fee rate is roughly 50% of the mobility fee rate for market rate residential uses. Due to the various factors involved with determining what housing would qualify for the affordable, attainable, or workforce housing designation, it is recommended that Lake Park develop criteria for new development activity to qualify as providing affordable, attainable, or workforce housing and being eligible for a lower Mobility Fee. Florida Statute would also allow the Town to waive the Mobility Fee for uses approved as affordable, attainable, or workforce housing.

Institutional Uses

The Mobility Fee schedule features three (3) institutional use classifications: (1) community serving; (2) long term care; and (3) private education. Community serving uses include civic uses, museums, performing arts venues, and places of assembly, such as clubs, lodges, and places of worship. Long term care uses include assisted living facilities, congregate care facilities, and nursing homes. Private education uses include day cares, private schools, and Pre-K. Public and charter schools are exempt from mobility fees and impact fees per Florida Statue.

Recreational Uses

The Mobility Fee schedule includes three (3) recreational use classifications: (1) marina; (2) outdoor commercial recreation; and (3) indoor commercial recreation. Marina use is straight forward. Outdoor recreation uses consist of uses such as golf courses, tennis courts, and multipurpose recreation facilities, and the mobility fee is based on the number of acres. A separate indoor commercial recreation category is included and is based on a rate per sq. ft. for indoor uses such as gyms, health clubs, yoga, and dance studios. The use classifications have similar trip and trip length characteristics and reflect current real estate market trends.

Industrial and Office Uses

The Mobility Fee schedule features two industrial use categories. The first use is for general industrial uses such as assembly, manufacturing, and trades. The second use is for commercial storage, such as mini-warehouses, outdoor storage, and warehouses. The Mobility Fee schedule features two office use categories. The first use is for general office uses such as accounting or real estate. The general office use also includes banking, hospitals, financial services, and higher education. The second use is medical, such as clinics, dentist, medical doctors, and veterinary. Medical uses generate two to three times the number of trips as a non-medical office use.



Commercial and Retail Land Uses

The Mobility Fee schedule proposes four (4) commercial and retail use classifications: (1) small retail business; (2) retail; (3) beverage and restaurants; and (4) convenience retail uses. To support smaller and more often local retail uses and in recognition that national chain retail uses have greater transportation impacts, a small retail business category has been established with a mobility fee that is 50% less than the retail land use. It is recommended that the Town work with Palm Beach County, local Chambers of Commerce, and small businesses within the community to develop criteria to qualify as a small business.

This ensures that a broader representation is part of the effort and utilizes their local knowledge to develop criteria that reflects the needs of the community. The Town could then designate uses that meet the established criteria as small retail business and allow them to pay the lower Mobility Fee rate. Until criteria is developed and a use is designated or approved the small retail business Mobility Fee would not go into effect.

A significant update in the 11th edition of the ITE Trip Generation Manual is the addition of several multi-tenant retail center use classifications. This change prompted the development of a general retail use classification that includes multi-tenant retail buildings and master planned retail developments that feature shared access, parking, circulation, utilities, stormwater, and signage. These uses tend to have similar trip generation characteristics that are generally less than 100 trips per 1,000 square feet.

The third category is beverage and restaurant. These uses tend to have similar trip generation characteristics of roughly 100 trips per 1,000 square feet. The fourth category is convenience uses such as gas stations and fast-food restaurants. These uses tend to have trip generation rates in excess of 250 trips per 1,000 square feet.

To reflect higher travel demand, there are also five (5) individual uses that will be assessed additive mobility fees. As more land uses downsize, a Mobility Fee based solely on building size does not fully capture the travel demand impact of certain high travel demand uses. A Mobility Fee for any retail building would be assessed at the appropriate mobility fee rate. In addition, uses with a bank, quick service restaurant, or pharmacy drive-thru, a car wash, or a commercial motor vehicle charging or fueling position would pay additive fees based on the number of features proposed for the new development activity or existing development retrofit.



Quick service restaurant (aka fast food) uses have the highest impact of any retail land use and are experiencing a transformation where buildings are getting smaller, while the number of drivethru lanes and delivery services are increasing. Due to their high travel demand impact, an additive fee has been calculated per quick service restaurant (QSR) drive-thru lane to capture the impact of QSR uses that offer one or more drive-thru lanes. Some QSR uses are migrating to walkup ordering, outdoor seating only, with two drive-thru lanes and one delivery pick-up lane, further increasing travel demand. This impact is not captured by simply evaluating the building.

Convenience uses have primarily been uses with motor vehicle fueling. Increasingly superstores, supermarkets, variety stores, and wholesale clubs have started to add vehicle fueling. The additive mobility fees will be assessed to any use that offers commercial vehicle charging and fueling and is accessible to the public or through a membership club. The mobility fee is assessed per commercial charging station or fueling position. Any motor vehicle charging station that does not charge for service will not be assessed a mobility fee, such as charging stations provided in a public or private garage that do not charge for use.

Uses with a car wash shall be required to pay a mobility fee per lane, stall, or bay for the use, plus any mobility fee associated with any building space that are not captured as part of a lane, stall, or bay. Any building solely for maintenance or supply purposes that does not include any accessible spaces for personnel would not be required to pay a mobility fee beyond that associated with the additive fee for the car wash.

Some financial institutions, especially Credit Unions, are increasing their brick-and-mortar presence to attract additional customers. Other banks are eliminating branches entirely and just offering drive-thru or walk-up free-standing ATMs. For banks with drive-thru lanes, an additional Mobility Fee is assessed per drive-thru lane. A Mobility Fee is also assessed for any free-standing walk-up ATMs or ATMs accessed via drive-thru lanes.

The Remainder of This Page Intentionally Left Blank



MOBILITY FEE COMPARISON

A comparison between the Town of Lake Park Mobility Fee and the Palm Beach County Road Impact Fee has been prepared (Appendix Q). As currently calculated, the Town of Lake Park Mobility Fee will be assessed in addition to the Palm Beach County Road Impact Fee. An additional Town Mobility Fee comparison has been developed where the Town Mobility Fee would be the only Fee assessed in the Town and the Town would no longer collect the Palm Beach County Road Impact Fee (Appendix R). If the Town Mobility Fee was the only fee assessed within Lake Park, then the attributable share of cost for County Roads and Intersections would be increased. The Mobility Plans for Streets and Intersections indicate two scenarios (A & B) where projected funding for County Roads differs (Appendix E & F).

Under the proposed Mobility Fee (aka Scenario A), the calculations include a local contribution between 10% and 20% for road capacity projects and 10% to 50% for multimodal projects such as shared-use paths for County Roads, with the majority of funding coming from Palm Beach County through Road Impact Fees it has already collected and will collect in the future from development in Lake Park and surrounding Lake Park. If the Mobility Fee was the only Fee collected within Lake Park (aka Scenario B), the Mobility Fee calculation includes 100% of the cost of improvements on County Roads. Under Scenario B, Lake Park would contribute a share of Mobility Fees it collects to Palm Beach County when the County moved forward with an improvement to a County Road included in the Mobility Plan. The share to be contributed would be established in an interlocal agreement. If the Town moved forward with Scenario B, Palm Beach County has indicated that it would likely file a legal challenge against the Town's Mobility Fee.

A comparison of the total Fees assessed on new development, based on Scenario A and B, within the Town has also been prepared (Appendix S). Scenario A illustrates the total amount of Fees to be assessed within Lake Park based on the proposed Town Mobility Fee and the County Road Impact Fee. Scenario B illustrates the total amount of Fees to be assessed within Lake Park if only a Mobility Fee was assessed within Lake Park (Town Mobility Fee would be the only Fee collected by the Town). Scenario A results in new development being assessed an additional fee within Lake Park that is higher than what is currently collected in the Town and unincorporated Palm Beach County. Scenario B results in a lower fee within Lake Park than what is currently collected in the Town and unincorporated Palm Beach County for the majority of uses in the Mobility Fee will result in a higher total fee being collected within the Town of Lake Park than unincorporated County, Rivera Beach, and the Town of North Palm Beach. The total fee would be lower than what is currently collected in Palm Beach Gardens.



The other option available to the Town of Lake Park is to move forward with adoption of a Mobility Fee and approach the County about possibly lowering its Road Impact Fee within the Town to reflect both local travel and shorter travel lengths in urbanized areas of Palm Beach County east of Interstate 95. The County currently charges a uniform Road Impact Fee within its Urban Area boundary that only provides a 0.50-mile reduction for travel on local roads. The Town could request that this reduction be increased from 0.50 miles up to 2.5 miles.

The Town could also request that the County lower its Road Impact Fee by a certain percentage, such as 50% for up to 2.5 miles to account for travel on Town Streets and State Roads within and adjacent to Lake Park. The Town could also request the County lower its Road Impact Fee by the amount of the calculated Mobility Fee so that new development in Lake Park would not pay more than the current County Road Impact Fee. There is data collected within Palm Beach County that does support differences in travel based on urban, suburban, and rural areas.

The Bureau of Transportation Statistics (BTS) developed a model that allows for Census tract estimation using the National Household Travel Survey (NHTS) data along with American Community Survey (ACS) data from the Census Bureau. This model, known as the Local Area Transportation Characteristics for Households (LATCH) Survey, was developed to estimates average weekday household person trips, vehicle trips, person miles traveled, and vehicle miles traveled (per day), for all Census tracts in the United States. The model divides the NHTS data into six geographic areas and classifies these areas as either: (1) urban; (2) suburban; or (3) rural. The model then estimates average weekday household for each geographic area for the following: (1) person miles traveled; (2) person trips; (3) vehicle miles traveled; and (4) vehicle trips. The LATCH model then transfers the estimates to individual Census tracts using the household and demographic data from the American Community Survey (ACS) for each Census tract.

The resulting Census tract estimates provide beneficial indicators to local governments and other customers who may not have the budget and/or time for conducting their own local survey. Additionally, the use of a standard set of questions across all geographies in the NHTS enables comparison across geographies that otherwise would be captured in separate local surveys with potentially different methodologies.

The average household travel in Palm Beach County was calculated by area type **(Table 15).** This data illustrates that average vehicle miles of travel is just over 24% less in urban areas of the County versus suburban and almost 82% less than rural areas. This data also illustrates that average person miles of travel is just under 21% less in urban areas of the County versus suburban and almost 72% less than rural areas. Average person and vehicle trips were also lower in urban areas.

Road	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Average Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT)	30.79	38.29 (+24.4%)	56.00 (+81.9%)	
Average Person Miles of Travel (PMT)	44.51	53.79 (+20.8%)	76.45 (+71.8%)	
Average Vehicle Trips (VT)	4.47	5.10 (+14.1%)	5.36 (+19.9%)	
Average Person Trips (VT)	7.35	7.59 (+3.3%)	8.21 (+11.7%)	
Source: The percentages illustrate the percent increase in average household travel above average household travel in urban areas of Palm Beach County. The data was obtained from the U.S. Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, Local Area Transportation				

TABLE 15. AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD TRAVEL IN PALM BEACH COUNTY BY AREA

Source: The percentages illustrate the percent increase in average household travel above average household travel in urban areas of Palm Beach County. The data was obtained from the U.S. Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, Local Area Transportation Characteristics for Households (LATCH Survey). The LATCH survey combines National Household Travel Survey Data (NHTS) and American Community Survey (ACS) Data to develop estimates of average weekday household person trips and vehicle trips, and daily person miles of travel and vehicle miles of travel by census tract. There are 334 census tracts for which data is provided. Of those, 313 census tracts contained complete data for vehicle and person travel and were used in the analysis. The LATCH Survey summary details where data may be incomplete for certain census tracts.

The number of vehicles available per household in Palm Beach County was calculated by area type **(Table 16).** The availability of household vehicles is one factor that indicates where other modes of travel maybe utilized by households or if there would be differences in travel based on area type. The data illustrates that the number and percentage of households within urban areas without a vehicle available is the highest of the three area types.

Road	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
No Vehicle Available	24,489	6,828	1,331	32,648
	(7.8%)	(4.1%)	(4.1%)	(6.3%)
One Vehicle Available	140,606	65,747	10,179	216,532
	(44.6%)	(39.2%)	(30.0%)	(42.0%)
Two (2) or More Vehicles Available	150,195	95,270	21,279	266,744
	(47.6%)	(56.8%)	(64.9%)	(51.7%)
Total (Percentage Basis)	315,290	167,845	32,789	515,924
	(100%)	(100%)	(100%)	(100%)

TABLE 16. VEHICLES AVAILABLE PER HOUSEHOLD IN PALM BEACH COUNTY BY AREA

Source: The percentages illustrate the share of vehicles available per household by area type in Palm Beach County. The data was obtained from the U.S. Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, Local Area Transportation Characteristics for Households (LATCH Survey). The LATCH survey combines National Household Travel Survey Data (NHTS) and American Community Survey (ACS) Data to develop estimates of average weekday household person trips and vehicle trips, and daily person miles of travel and vehicle miles of travel by census tract. There are 334 census tracts for which data is provided. Of those, 313 census tracts contained complete data for vehicle and person travel and were used in the analysis. The LATCH Survey summary details where data may be incomplete for certain census tracts.



MOBILITY FEE BENEFIT DISTRICT

The benefit test of the dual rational nexus test requires that local governments establish defined areas or districts within which mobility fees collected are earmarked for expenditure. The geographic limits of the proposed Mobility Fee Benefit District extend beyond Town limits to include areas of adjacent to the Town where Mobility Plan improvements make logical terminus points. The extension of a Mobility Fee Benefit District beyond current Town limits was done in recognition that travel demand does not start or stop at the limits of Lake Park (Map E).

Having a Mobility Fee Benefit District that extends beyond current Town limits ensures that the Town can expend mobility fees on multimodal projects identified in the Mobility Plan outside Town limits that cross enclaves or terminate at logical endpoints. If the limits of the Mobility Fee Benefit Districts mirrored existing Town limits, then mobility fees could not be expended outside of the Town. There may be instances that a local contribution for multimodal projects at Congress Avenue and Northlake Blvd or US Hwy 1 and Northlake Blvd by the County or FDOT would provide a benefit to development within Lake Park that paid a Mobility Fee. The Benefit District provides the Town with flexibility to work in partnership with other governmental entities to improve mobility within Lake Park and advance multimodal projects identified in the Mobility Plan.

The Remainder of This Page Intentionally Left Blank

DEFINITIONS

Additive Fee means a mobility fee rate based on a unit of measure that generates high levels of person travel demand per unit such as service bays, car wash stalls, or fueling for motor vehicles or drive-thru lanes for banks, quick service restaurants, and pharmacies. Additive mobility fees per unit of measure are assessed in addition to mobility fees assessed per use based on square footage or the applicable unit of measure for the use.

Affordable, Attainable, or Workforce Residential means a dwelling unit and shall include those uses specified in the ITE Trip Generation Manual under the Land Use Code Series 200, except for Land Use Codes 240, 253, 254, and 255. Residential includes accessory dwelling units, dormitories, and tiny homes. The Town may elect to establish a program that establishes criteria to qualify as affordable, attainable or workforce housing. Until the Town establishes a program, and an applicant receives formal approval, the affordable, attainable or workforce housing mobility fee rate would not be applicable.

Assessment Area means a geographic area of the Town where mobility fees are assessed on development activity.

Bank Drive-Thru or Free-Standing ATM means any bank or financial institution with a drive-thru lane used for banking purposes such as deposits, withdrawals, balance inquires, or bill pay. The drivethru may include either a teller window, pneumatic device for transferring banking information or funds, or an Automated Teller Machine (ATM). An ATM inside or attached to a building that has a use open to the public or end user is not assessed a separate fee as a stand-alone ATM. Credit Unions and Savings and Loans are also considered to be banks for purposes of this definition and the applicable mobility fees. This use also includes free standing bank drive-thru lanes and freestanding walk-up or drive-thru ATM machines. The fee shall be based upon the total number of drive-thru lanes with a banking window, pneumatic device, or ATM and/or the total number of free-standing ATM's. Free-standing ATM's may be either walk-up or feature drive-thru lanes.

Benefit District means areas designated in the applicable mobility fee ordinance where fees paid by development activity are expended.

Beverage and Restaurant means a drinking establishment or restaurant including chain and national high turn-over and side down restaurants (non-fast food), bars, nightclubs, or lounges.

Capacity means the maximum sustainable flow rate, at a service standard, at which persons or vehicles reasonably can be expected to traverse a point or a uniform section of a bicycle facility, pedestrian facility, roadway, or shared-use multimodal facility during a given time-period under prevailing conditions. For transit, the capacity is the maximum number of persons reasonably accommodated riding a transit vehicle, along with the frequency and duration of transit service.



Commercial and Retail Uses mean those commercial activities which provide for sale, lease, or rent of goods, products, services, vehicles, or accommodations for use by individuals, businesses, or groups and which include those uses specified in the ITE Trip Generation Manual under Land Use Code Series 800 and 900.

Community Serving means those uses that are operated by non-profit civic organizations, governmental entities, foundations, or fraternal organizations, including places of assembly. Community serving also includes uses such as YMCA, museum, art studio, gallery, cultural center, community meeting spaces, community theater, library, or a fraternal or masonic lodge or club, or any community and civic based uses that do not sell retail goods or services for profit and that participates in community and public activities. Food, beverages, goods, and services may be offered for ancillary fundraising and sales to support the community serving use.

Complete Streets means a transportation policy and design approach that requires multimodal transportation improvements to be planned, designed, operated, and maintained to enable safe, convenient and comfortable travel and access for users of all ages and abilities regardless of their mode of transportation and to allow for safe travel by those walking, bicycling or using other forms of non-motorized travel, riding public transportation or driving motor vehicles or low speed electric vehicles. Separate and defined spaces are provided for the various modes of travel planned within the street cross-section.

Convenience Retail means convenience stores, gas stations, service stations, coffee, donut, sandwich, food, and beverage that would be considered fast food or quick service restaurants.

Development Activity means new residential and non-residential construction, any new land development or site preparation activity, any new construction of buildings or structures, any modification, reconstruction, redevelopment, or upgrade of buildings or structures, any change of use of a building, land, or structure, and any special exception approval, variance, or special use permit that results in an increase in person travel demand above the existing use of property.

Indoor Commercial Recreation means facilities that primarily focus on individual or group fitness, exercise, training or provide recreational activities. The uses typically provide exercise, dance or cheerleading classes, weightlifting, yoga, Pilates, cross-fit training, fitness, and gymnastics equipment. Indoor commercial recreation also includes uses such as bowling, pool, darts, arcades, video games, batting cages, trampolines, laser tag, bounce houses, skating, climbing walls, and performance centers. Food, beverages, equipment, and services may be offered for ancillary sales. Industrial means those activities which are predominantly engaged in building and construction trades, the assembly, finishing, processing, packaging, or distribution of goods or products, utilities, recycling, waste management and uses that include brewing and distilling that may have taps, sampling or tasting rooms, and include those uses specified in the ITE Trip Generation Manual under Land Use Code Series 000 and 100 but excluding governmental uses.



Industrial means uses that typically have ancillary office space and may have display or merchandise display areas for various trades and industries that are not open to the general public. Industrial uses are also located in land uses and zoning districts intended for industrial uses. Commercial storage means facilities or acreage in which one or more warehouses, storage units or vaults are rented for the storage of goods and/or acreage or is providing for the storage of boats, RVs, vehicle trailers and other physical items that are larger than what is typically stored within an enclosed structure. The acreage for outdoor storage, excluding drive aisles, buffers, and stormwater management areas, shall be converted to square footage for purposes of calculating the fee. This shall not include an individual's personal property where such items are stored by the owner of the land and not for commercial purposes, subject to allowance by land development and zoning regulations.

Institutional Uses means those public or quasi-public uses that serve one or more community's social, educational, health, cultural, and religious needs and which include those uses specified in the ITE Trip Generation Manual under the Land Use Code Series 500, and includes Land Use Codes 253, 254, 255, and 620. Land Use Codes 540 and 550 are included in office uses and 580 and 590 falls under community serving. Federal, state, and local government institutional uses, except for community development districts, are exempt from payment of mobility fees.

ITE Trip Generation Manual means and refers to the latest edition of the report entitled "Trip Generation" produced by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), and any official updates hereto.

Level of Service (LOS) means a quantitative stratification of the level of service provided to a facility, roadway, or service stratified into six letter grade levels, with "A" describing the highest level and "F" describing the lowest level; a discrete stratification of a level of service continuum.

Long Term Care means communities designed for long term care of on-site residents, such as assisted living facilities, congregate care facilities and nursing homes, with common dining and on-site health facilities for residents that is not a general retail or commercial use open to the public. This use includes ITE Trip Generation Manual Land Use Codes 253, 254, 255, and 620.

Low Speed Streets mean a multimodal transportation facility based on either the Dutch Woonerf concept that treats all modes equally with no defined spaces for any mode or bicycle boulevards which feature pavement markings, signage and posted speed limits. Low speed streets also include shared streets which typically do not have raised curbs, distinct pavement markings, traffic control devices, defined parking spaces, or vehicular speed limit signs or have posted speed limits fifteen (15) miles per hour or less. A low-speed street often features signage and sometimes a speed limit that indicates there are multiple users of the shared street.

Marina means facilities that provide docks and berths for boats. Any buildings for shops, retail, or restaurants would fall under the retail land use and pay the mobility fee rate for retail uses.



Medical Office means a building or buildings that provide medical, dental, or veterinary services and care. Medical office shall also include any clinics, emergency care uses, hospitals and any uses specified in the ITE Trip Generation Manual under Land Use Code Series 600, including Land Use Code 720. The Land Use Code 620 for Nursing Homes is excluded from medical offices and included under the definition of Long Term Care.

Micromobility means electric powered personal mobility devices such as electric bicycles, electric scooters, hoverboards, One-Wheel, Unicycle, electric skateboards, and other electric assisted personal mobility devices. Low speed vehicles such as golf carts or mopeds are not considered personal micromobility devices.

Microtransit Vehicle means low speed vehicles such as autonomous transit shuttles, golf carts neighborhood electric vehicles, or trolleys subject to requirements established by a governmental entity responsible for approval, permitting or regulating said vehicles.

Mobility means the ability to move people and goods from an origin to a destination by multiple modes of travel in a timely (speed) manner.

Mobility Fee means a monetary exaction imposed on development activity to fund multimodal projects identified in a mobility plan.

Mobility Fee Off-Set means the equivalent amount of a mobility fee associated with an existing use of a building that is being redeveloped or where a change of occupancy or use is requested. The equivalent mobility fee shall be based on the current use of the building, or the most recent use of the building for a vacant building. Upon demolition of a building, offsets shall be available for up to five years from the date of demolition, unless otherwise provided for in a written agreement with the Town or specified in an implementing ordinance.

Mobility Plan means the plan adopted by the Town of Lake Park that identifies multimodal projects to meet the person miles of travel demands of development activity.

Mobile Residence means land uses for the temporary or permanent placement of mobile homes, RVs, tiny homes on wheels, or travel trailers within predefined lots or spaces that have connections for communications, electric, water and wastewater. Mobile residential parks may have common amenities and building with recreation uses, laundry and park office.

Mode means the choice of travel that a person undertakes and can include walking, jogging, running, bicycling, paddling, scooting, flying, driving a vehicle, riding a boat, transit, taxi or using a new mobility technology.

Motor Vehicle means a car, SUV, truck, van, or motorcycle that is either electric powered, gasoline powered, a hybrid, or some other fuel source that propels the motor vehicle.



Motor Vehicle and Boat Cleaning means a building, stalls, stations, or tunnels for the cleaning, detailing, polishing, washing, or waxing of motor vehicles or boats which fall under the description of ITE Trip Generation Manual Land Use Code Series 800 and 900. The fee is based on both the number of lanes and stalls.

Motor Vehicle Charging or Fueling means the total number of vehicles that can be charged or fueled at one time (fueling positions). Increasingly, land uses such as superstores, (i.e., super Wal-Mart), variety stores, (i.e., Dollar General), and wholesale clubs (i.e., Costco) are also offering vehicle fueling with or with/out small convenience stores. Outside of Florida, several grocery store chains are also starting to sell fuel. The mobility fee rate per fueling position would be in addition to any mobility fee per square foot under the applicable retail land use with vehicle fueling. Motor vehicle charging stations that do not require a customer to pay for charging are exempt from payment of the mobility fee.

Multimodal means multiple modes of travel including, but not limited to walking, bicycling, jogging, rollerblading, skating, scootering, riding transit, driving a golf cart, low speed electric vehicle or motor vehicle.

Multimodal Projects mean improvements such as sidewalks, bike lanes, trails, paths, protected bike lanes, transit facilities, streetscape, landscape, roundabouts, raised medians, crosswalks, and high visibility crosswalks. Multimodal projects also include shared mobility programs and services, wayfinding, micromobility devices, programs, and services, and microtransit vehicles and lanes. Improvements can include new or additional road travel lanes and turn lanes, complete and low speed streets, new or upgraded traffic signals, traffic synchronization, mobilization, maintenance of traffic, survey, geotechnical and engineering, utilities, construction, engineering and inspection, utility relocation, right-of-way, easements, stormwater facilities.

Multimodal Project Expenses means expenditures for: (a) the repayment of principal and interest or any redemption premium for loans, advances, bonds, bond anticipation notes, and any other form of indebtedness then outstanding consistent with statutory allowances; (b) reasonable administrative and overhead expenses necessary or incidental to expanding and improving multimodal projects; (c) crosswalks, traffic control and crossing warning devices, landscape, trees, multimodal way finding, irrigation, hardscape, and lighting related to projects; (d) micromobility devices, programs and services, (e) transit circulators, facilities, programs, shuttles, services and vehicles; (f) reasonable expenses for engineering studies, stormwater reports, soil borings, tests, surveys, construction plans, and legal and other professional advice or financial analysis relating to projects; (g) the acquisition of right-of-way and easements for the improvements, including the costs incurred in connection with the exercise of eminent domain; (h) the clearance and preparation of any site, including the demolition of structures on the site and relocation of utilities; (i) floodplain compensation, wetland mitigation and stormwater management facilities; (j) all expenses incidental to or connected with the issuance, sale, redemption, retirement, or purchase of bonds, bond anticipation notes, or other forms of indebtedness, including funding of any reserve, redemption, or other fund or account provided for in the ordinance or resolution authorizing such bonds, notes, Prepared for the Town of Lake Park Page 64 Prepared by NUE Urban Concepts, LLC



or other form of indebtedness; (k) reasonable costs of design, engineering and construction, including mobilization, maintenance of traffic during construction and CEI (construction engineering and inspection) services of related projects, (I) Town administration, implementation updates to the Mobility Plan and Mobility Fee, including any assessments, counts or studies needed for projects; and (m) local contribution to advance federal, state and county funded projects, repayment of loans from the State of Florida Infrastructure Bank used to front-end the design and/or construction of multimodal projects.

Non-Residential Square Feet means the sum of the gross floor area (in square feet) of the area of each floor level under cover, including cellars, basements, mezzanines, penthouses, corridors, lobbies, stores, and offices, that are within the principal outside faces of exterior walls, not including architectural setbacks or projections. Included are all areas that have floor surfaces with clear standing head room (six feet six inches, minimum) and are used as part of primary use of the property of their use. If an area within or adjacent to the principal outside faces of goods and materials, or merchandise display, and is determined to be a part of the primary use of property, this gross floor area is considered part of the overall square footage of the building. Areas for parking, circulation, ingress, egress, buffers, conservation, walkways, landscape, stormwater management, and easements or areas granted for transit stops or multimodal parking are not included in the calculation of square feet.

Office means banks without drive-thru, financial services without drive-thru, general office, and professional activities primarily involving the provision of professional or skilled services, including but not limited to accounting, legal, real estate, insurance, financial, engineering, architecture, accounting, and technology.

Office Uses means those businesses which provide professional services to individuals, businesses, or groups and which include those uses in the ITE Trip Generation Manual under Land Use Code Series 600 and 700 and includes Land Use Codes 540, 550, 911 and 912. Land Use Code 620 for Nursing Homes in not considered an office use and included under institutional uses.

Off-site Improvement means improvements located outside of the boundaries of the parcel proposed for development. Access improvements required to provide ingress and egress to the development parcel, which may include rights-of-way, easements, paving of adjacent or connecting roadways, turn lanes and deceleration/acceleration lanes, sidewalks, bike lanes, trails, paths, transit stops along with required traffic control devices, signage, and markings, and drainage and utilities, shall be considered on-site improvements.

Outdoor Commercial Recreation means outdoor recreational activity including land uses with miniature golf, batting cages, video arcade, bumper boats, go-carts, golf driving ranges, tennis, racquet or basketball courts, soccer, baseball and softball fields, paintball, skating, cycling or biking that require paid admittance, membership or some other type of fee for use. Buildings for refreshments, bathrooms, changing and retail may be included. The fee shall be based upon the Prepared for the Town of Lake Park Page 65 Prepared by NUE Urban Concepts, LLC

total acreage of the facility for active uses outside of buildings and all buildings used to carry out a primary function of the land use activity. Areas for parking, buffers and stormwater that are not active features of the land use are excluded from the fee acreage. The use would generally fall under the ITE Land Use Code Series 400.

Overnight Lodging means places of accommodations, such as bed and breakfast, inns, motels, hotels and resorts that provide places for sleeping and bathing and may include supporting facilities such as restaurants, cocktail lounges, meeting and banquet rooms or convention facilities, and limited recreational facilities (pool, fitness room) intended for primary use by guest(s) and which include those uses specified in the ITE Trip Generation Manual under the Land Use Code Series 300.

Person Miles of Capacity (PMC) means the number of persons "capacity" that can be accommodated, at a determined standard, on a facility while walking, bicycling, riding transit, driving or using a mobility assisted device over a defined distance.

Person Miles of Travel (PMT) means a unit used to measure person travel made by one person where each mile traveled is counted as one person mile. PMT is calculated by multiplying person trip length by the number of person trips. The increase in future person miles of travel is used to plan multimodal project needs that form the basis for a mobility fee.

Person Travel Demand (PTD) means travel demand from development activity based on trip generation, pass-by trips, person trips, person trip lengths, limited access travel, urban area travel, and both the origin and destination of trips. The resulting mobility fees are roughly proportional to the person travel demand per use and assessment area provided on the mobility fee schedule.

Person Trip means a trip by one person by one or more modes of travel including, but not limited to, driving a motor vehicle or low speed electric vehicle, riding transit, walking, bicycling or form of person powered, electric powered or gasoline powered device.

Person Trip Length means the length, in miles, of a person trip per trip purpose.

Pharmacy Drive-Thru means the drive-thru lanes associated with a pharmacy. The number of drivethru lanes will be based on the number of lanes present when an individual places or pick-up a prescription or item. The fee per drive-thru is in addition to the retail fee per square foot for the pharmacy building.

Private Education means a building used for pre-school, private school, or day care. Private school (Pre-K to 12) shall mean a building or buildings in which students are educated by a non-governmental entity with grades ranging from pre-kindergarten to 12th grade. Private schools do not include charter schools, which are exempt from local government fees per Florida Statute. Day care shall mean a facility where care for young children or for older adults is provided, normally during the daytime hours. Day care facilities generally include classrooms, offices, eating areas and playgrounds.



Quick Service Restaurant Drive-Thru means a quick service restaurant where an order for food is placed or a pick-up/delivery lane where an order is picked-up by either a customer that placed an online order or a delivery service. Quick service restaurants are establishments serving beverages, food, or both with higher turnover, quick service, and may feature either counter service or selection of items from a counter and would fall under the descriptions of ITE Trip Generation Manual Land Use Codes 930, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, and 938. The vehicle will proceed to one or more common pick-up windows, lockers, stations, or functional equivalent after the order has been placed. Quick service restaurant with drive-thru may be located in multi-tenant retail or free-standing retail buildings. This use also includes any quick service restaurants that do not offer indoor seating and are intended to primarily be served by vehicle delivery services or pick-up or drive-thru only orders placed online. These uses may provide a walk-up order window.

Quality of Service (QOS) means a quantitative stratification of the quality of service of personal mobility stratified into six letter grade levels, with "A" describing the highest quality and "F" describing the lowest quality; a discrete stratification of a quality-of-service continuum.

Recreation Uses mean those public or quasi-public uses that serve a community's social, cultural, fitness, entertainment, and recreational needs, which include applicable land uses specified in the ITE Trip Generation Manual under Land Use Code Series 400 and 500.

Residential Uses mean a dwelling unit and shall include those uses specified in the ITE Trip Generation Manual under the Land Use Code Series 200.

Residential means a dwelling unit and shall include those uses specified in the ITE Trip Generation Manual under the Land Use Code Series 200, except for Land Use Codes 253, 254, and 255. Residential includes tiny homes, accessory dwelling units, and dormitories.

Residential Square Feet means the sum of the area (in square feet) of each dwelling unit measured from the exterior surface of the exterior walls or walls adjoining public spaces such as multifamily or dormitory hallways, or the centerline of common walls shared with other dwelling units. Square feet include all livable, habitable, and temperature controlled enclosed spaces (enclosed by doors, windows, or walls). This square footage does not include unconditioned garages or unenclosed areas under roof. For multifamily and dormitory uses, common hallways, lobbies, leasing offices, and residential amenities are not included in the square feet calculation, unless that space is leased to a third-party use and provides drinks, food, goods, or services to the public or paid memberships available to individuals that do not reside in a dwelling unit.

Residential and Lodging Uses means a dwelling unit or room in overnight accommodations or mobile home or RV park and shall include those uses specified in the ITE Trip Generation Manual under the Land Use Code Series 200 and 300 and Land Use Code 416. Land Use Codes 253, 254, and 255 are considered institutional uses.



Retail means entertainment, personal service, restaurant, and retail uses. This includes land uses under ITE Land Use Codes Series 400, 800, and 900. Retail includes all uses that do not fall under Beverage & Restaurant or Convenience Retail.

Service Standard means the adopted or desired quality or level of service for a bicycle facility, pedestrian facility, roadway, shared-use multimodal facility, or transit.

Shell Building means the foundational and structural elements that separate interior and exterior space and includes the roof, walls, windows, doors, mechanical systems, and rough plumbing and electric. Common areas are typically finished. Interior spaces are designed to be finished by the tenant with wall coverings, ceiling, flooring, lighting, electrical and plumbing finishes, and furnishings. The floor may or may not be finished with concrete to allow for flexibility in the location of plumbing service lines.

Small Retail Business means entertainment, personal service, restaurant, and retail uses. Buildings maybe either free-standing or multi-tenant. The Town of Lake Park may elect to establish a program that establishes criteria to qualify as a small retail business. Until the Town establishes a program, and an applicant receives formal approval, the small retail business mobility fee rate would not be applicable. This includes land uses under ITE Land Use Codes Series 400, 800, and 900.

Streetscape means hardscape elements such as pavers, benches, lighting, trash and recycling receptacles, fountains, seating, shade structure, crosswalks, landscape elements such as canopy and understory trees, shrubs, bushes, grasses and flowers, green infrastructure and architectural structures and projections that provide shade and protection from various weather conditions.

Trip means travel between locations, often times between an origin, such as a home, to a destination, such as a business, but the trip can end and begin at the same location, such as walking a dog in the neighborhood where the home is both the origin and destination.

Trip Purpose means the primary purpose at the destination of a trip such as travel to buy goods, services, or meals, entertainment, recreation, school, work, places of assembly, errands, medical, day care, or work related. Trip purpose may be either home based, meaning the trip originates at a residence, or non-home based, meaning the trip originates at a destination other than a residence.

Vehicle miles of travel (VMT) means a unit to measure vehicle travel made by a motor vehicle where each mile traveled is counted as one vehicle mile regardless of the number of persons in the vehicle. VMT is calculated by multiplying the length of a road segment by the total number of vehicles on that road segment.

Vehicle Trip means a single motor vehicle, regardless of the number of persons in the motor vehicle.

CONCLUSION

The Town of Lake Park's Mobility Fee is based on the multimodal projects identified in the Mobility Plan. The increase in person miles of travel provided in this Technical Report demonstrates there is growth in travel demand projected within the Town. The Mobility Plan establishes the framework over the next 22-years to move people, provide choices, and meet increases in person travel demand from development activity through expansion of the Town's multimodal transportation system by adding greenways, sidewalks, shared-use paths, and additional road capacity.

The Town's Mobility Fee is a streamlined, equitable way for development activity to mitigate its impact to the multimodal transportation system. Mobility Plan projects and the Mobility Fee are based on the projected increase in person miles of travel and person miles of capacity between 2022 and 2045: consistent with the **"needs"** requirement of the dual rational nexus test. The Mobility Fee is also based on the person travel demands attributable to development activity and is roughly proportional to the impact the new development has on the Town's multimodal transportation system, consistent with Florida Statute Sections 163.3180 and 163.31801.

The implementation of a Mobility Fee Benefit District, where a Mobility Fee paid by development activity is to be expended to fund multimodal projects within a Mobility Fee Benefit District, ensuring that the Mobility Fee will meet the **"benefits"** requirement of the dual rational nexus test. The Town's Mobility Fee will be assessed and collected by the Town on development activity that results in an increase in person travel demand within the Town. The Mobility Fee has been developed to offset the impact of development activity on Town streets and County and State roads within and adjacent to the Town.

The Town should consider meeting with the County to discuss the possibility of a lower County Road Impact Fee within the Town. There are several options that could be considered to minimize the impact to new development. The County could consider increasing the trip length reduction in its calculations from 0.50 miles up to 2.50 miles to account for travel in the Town of Lake Park. This reduction could be adjusted to account for travel in the Town on County Roads, which is roughly 48%. The miles reduction could also vary by use since the County does not assess nonresidential uses at the same trip length as residential uses. The County could also consider reducing its fee by the amount of the Mobility Fee so that new development would pay a combined Town Mobility Fee and County Road Impact Fee that is roughly the same as the County's Road Impact Fee. The Town could also discuss that the Park Avenue Extension, the Silver Beach upgrade and extension over the C-17 canal, and multimodal improvements on Congress and Northlake be emphasized and prioritized for Road Impact Fee expenditure.


The Town will determine how Mobility Fee revenues are allocated and expended through its annual Capital Improvements Program. Mobility Fee revenues may be expended on projects identified in the Mobility Plan and within the Mobility Fee Benefit District. The Town's Mobility Plan can be amended to add, remove, or update projects. The effect on the Mobility Fee should be evaluated if amendments exceed \$13,000,000. While \$13,000,000 is a large number in isolation, it represents roughly 10% of the \$130,000,000 Mobility Plan cost.

Due to the number of calculations involved in Mobility Fees, a 10% change in cost does not result in a 10% change in Mobility Fees. There are a multitude of factors that go into calculating the Mobility Fee. In addition, unless there are extraordinary circumstances that can be documented by the Town, or all Mobility Fees rates on the Mobility Fee schedule are reduced, or if there are changes in Statute related to County Fees in municipalities, Florida Statute Section 163.31801 limits updates of the Mobility Fee to once every four (4) years.

The person travel demand for each use included in the Mobility Fee schedule meets the "rough proportionality test" established through case law and Florida Statute 163.31801. The new growth evaluation demonstrates that development activity is not being assessed more than its fair share of the cost of the Mobility Plan. Payment of the Mobility Fee addresses mitigation of the person travel demand generated by development activity within the Town. The Mobility Plan and the Mobility Fee meet all legal requirements and are consistent with the requirements of Florida Statute Sections 163.3180 and 163.31801 and Florida Statute Chapter 380.

The Remainder of This Page Intentionally Left Blank

MAP A

Mobility Study Network



MAP B

2045 Town of Lake Park Mobility Plan



П

OCTOBER 2022 MODIFIED: 26OCT2022

2045 LAKE PARK MOBILITY PLAN

AT APPARA RBAN CONCEPTS LAND USE • MOBILITY • PARKING • FEES © 2022 NUE Urban Concepts, LLC. All Rights Reserved www.nueurbanconcepts.com ©©®®







RESIDENTIAL TRAFFIC CALMING PROGRAM

FEDERAL HIGHWAY MIXED-USE OVERLAY DISTRICT (FHMUDO)

CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS

+ INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT MULTIMODAL IMPROVEMENT ROUNDABOUT PRIORITY RESIDENTIAL TRAFFIC CALMING STREET (DESIGN TBD BASED ON FURTHER EVALUATION) **6**3 SIGNALIZED ROUNDABOUT -

- HIGH-INTENSITY ACTIVATED CROSSWALK (HAWK)
- HIGH VISIBILITY CROSSWALK ////
- **RECTANGULAR RAPID** ÷ FLASHING BEACON (RRFB)

TRAIN STATION

- **BOAT UNDERPASS**
- #15, 17, 24, 26, 55A, 62 PROJECT REQUIRES RIGHT-OF WAY FROM PRIVATELY-OWNED PROPERTY 1 *
- 2 🌟 #13, 27 - PROJECT REQUIRES UTILITY EASEMENT
- 3 🌟 #64 - PROJECT REQUIRES RIGHT-OF-WAY OWNED BY PALM BEACH COUNTY
- 4 🜟 #1, 2, 3, 7, 13, 27, 73, 76, 106 - ENTIRELY OR PARTIALLY LOCATED OUTSIDE LAKE PARK TOWN LIMITS



MAP C

2045 Town of Lake Park Streetscape, Street Trees, & Landscape Enhancement Plan



MAP D

Mobility Fee Assessment Area



AUGUST 2022 MODIFIED: 11 AUG2022

2045 LAKE PARK MOBILITY PLAN MOBILITY FEE ASSESSMENT AREA

NORTHLAKE BLVD

ISHIO

TSHIO

PARK AVE

SILVER BEACH RD

OLD DIXIE HWY

MOBILITY FEE ASSESSMENT AREA

CONGRESS AVE

NUE URBAN CONCEPTS LAND USE - MOBILITY - PARKING - FEES B 2022 NUE Urban Concepts, LLC. All Rights Reserved. www.nueurbanconcepts.com @@@@

1

1



MAP E

Mobility Fee Benefit District



BENEFIT DISTRICT

AUGUST 2022 MODIFIED: 11 AUG2022

CONGRESS AVE

2045 LAKE PARK MOBILITY PLAN MOBILITY FEE BENEFIT DISTRICT

NORTHLAKE BLVD

10TH ST

PARK AVE

SILVER BEACH RD

ISHIOI

OLD DIXIE HWY

NUE URBAN CONCEPTS LAND USE - MOBILITY - PARKING - FEES B 2022 NUE Urban Concepts, LLC. All Rights Reserved. www.nueurbanconcepts.com @@@@

1



APPENDIX A

Florida Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) Transportation Guidance



Reemployment Assistance Service Center

Workforce Statistics



Community Planning, Development & Services

Workforce Development Board Resources

Transportation Planning

Home > Community Planning, Development and Services > Community Planning > Community Planning Table of Contents > Transportation Planning

Business Growth & Partnerships

Community Planning

Community Planning Table of Contents Areas of Critical State

Concern Program Accessing Comprehensive Plans

and Plan Amendments (Florida Papers)

ORC Reports and Notices of Intent

Evaluation and Appraisal Review of the **Comprehensive Plan**

General Information About Developments of Regional Impact and Florida Quality Developments

Developments of Regional Impact Repository

List of Local Governments Qualifying as Dense Urban Land Areas

Revitalization of Expired Homeowners Association Declarations and Covenants

Community Planning Staff Directory (Alphabetical)

Community Planning Review Team Assignments

Community Services

Community Development Block Grants

- Community Partnerships
- Broadband
- Small and Minority ⊳ Business Resources
- **Rural Community** Programs
- Special Districts
- Homeowner Assistance

Transportation Element

Section 163.3177(6)(b), Florida Statutes, establishes the requirements for transportation and mobility planning in local government comprehensive plans. Comprehensive plans must focus on providing a multimodal transportation system that emphasizes public transportation systems, where feasible, and encourages economic development through flexible transportation and mobility options for Florida communities. Links to transportation planning related issues and organizations are included below to help provide additional information on transportation mobility planning in Florida.

Multimodal Transportation

A multimodal transportation system recognizes the importance of providing mobility options through a variety of integrated travel modes, such as by bus or rail transit, bicycle, automobile, or foot. A well-designed multimodal transportation network minimizes impacts to the environment and enhances the livability of neighborhoods by increasing transportation options, expanding access, and increasing connectivity between destinations.

A well-designed and efficient transportation network can help create a sustainable development pattern that contributes to the community's prosperity, enhances transportation efficiency by minimizing vehicle trips and contributes to a healthier environment by reducing air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.

The Transportation Element of a local government's comprehensive plan should contain policies that will create a well-connected multi-modal transportation network; support increased residential densities and commercial intensity; help walking become more practical for short trips; support bicycling for both short- and long-distance trips; improve transit to serve frequented destinations; conserve energy resources; reduce greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution; while maintaining vehicular access and circulation. Key multimodal transportation strategies can include the following:

- Create an interconnecting grid network of streets, connectors, arterials and sidewalks that provide a complete and accessible transportation network;
- Establish land use patterns that support a mixture of residential, commercial and retail uses, and dense populations and urban intensities, so that transit service may be provided more efficiently and economically;
- Increase the viability of pedestrian and bicycle travel:
- Integrate land use and transportation planning to create communities that provide transportation choice; and,
- Accommodate the flow of freight throughout the state so that the economy can continue to grow.

Other multimodal transportation planning efforts, such as transit-oriented developments, defined in section 163.3164(46). Florida Statutes. are being developed and planned by the Cities of Boca Raton, Clearwater, Gainesville, Jacksonville, Miami, Tampa and West Palm Beach, and in Broward, Miami-Dade, Palm Beach and Pinellas Counties and other locations. Below are a several examples of successful multimodal transportation planning efforts in Florida:

- Alachua County, Department of Growth Management, Transportation Planning 🗗 Alachua County's Mobility Plan includes transit-oriented development and multimodal transportation planning as one of several methods being implemented to provide mobility options.
- 🕨 City of Gainesville, Planning Department, Comprehensive Planning 🔄 The City of Gainesville comprehensive plan includes six mixed-use categories and eight Special Area Plans based on Traditional Neighborhood Development standards and an established Urban Infill and Redevelopment Area.

Complete Streets

Complete Streets is a transportation strategy to develop an integrated, connected networks of streets that are safe and accessible for all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and transit riders of all ages and abilities. According to Smart Growth America and the National Complete Streets Coalition, Complete Streets make active transportation such as walking and bicycling convenient, provide increased access to employment centers, commerce, and educational institutions, and allow greater choice in travel.

In Florida, complete streets are context-sensitive. For example, a street considered complete for use within a dense urban area would look and function very differently from one located in a rural area, and a complete suburban street would look and function differently from both the urban and rural complete streets. One way to think about what elements are necessary to create a complete street is to determine its context within the community and based upon that context, match the design and operation of that street with the direction and guidance provided in the local government's comprehensive plan.

As an example, some communities use an Urban-Rural Transect (or simply Transect) to assign portions of their community into approximately five or six "context zones" based on the degree of development intensity desired and geographic location, ranging from very low intensity rural context zones to more intense urban context zones. For each context zone, the community establishes a context in terms of appropriate public facility design, urban design, general spatial form, and appropriate street types

This approach allows the local government to determine, in its comprehensive plan or other public planning document, which portions of the community fit within which context zone, and to provide guidance within the comprehensive plan as to what mobility functions (such as walking, biking, transit use) are most important in that context zone, and what design features and operational characteristics are appropriate for streets in that location.

Several examples of communities have initiated complete streets planning in Florida. Here are a few excellent examples:

- Model Design Manual for Living Streets Los Angeles County, 2011 T
- 🕨 Deerfield Beach Complete Street Guidelines 🔮
- Ft. Lauderdale Complete Streets Id

Transportation Concurrency

In accordance with the Community Planning Act, local governments may establish a system that assesses landowners the costs of maintaining specified levels of service for components of the local government's transportation system when the projected impacts of their development would adversely impact the system. This system, known as a concurrency management system, must be based on the local government's comprehensive plan. Specifically, the local government comprehensive plan must provide the principles, guidelines, standards, and strategies, including adopted levels of service, to guide the application of its transportation concurrency management system.

Prior to June 2, 2011, transportation concurrency was mandatory for local governments. Now that transportation concurrency is optional, if a local government chooses, it may eliminate the transportation concurrency provisions from its comprehensive plan and is encouraged to adopt a mobility fee based plan in its place (see below). Adoption of a mobility fee based plan must be accomplished by a plan amendment that follows the Expedited State Review Process. A plan amendment to eliminate transportation concurrency is not subject to state review.

It is important to point out that whether or not a local government chooses to use a transportation concurrency system, it is required to retain level of service standards for its roadways for purposes of capital improvement planning. The standards must be appropriate and based on professionally accepted studies, and the capital improvements that are necessary to meet the adopted levels of service standards must be included in the five-year schedule of capital improvements. Additionally, all local governments, whether implementing transportation concurrency or not, must adhere to the transportation planning requirements of section 163.3177(6)(b), Florida Statutes.

Mobility Fee Based Plans

If a local government elects to repeal transportation concurrency, it is encouraged to adopt an alternative mobility funding system that uses one or more of the tools and techniques identified in section 163.3180(5)(f), Florida Statutes:

- Adoption of long-term strategies⁴ o facilitate development patterns that support multimodal solutions, including urban design, appropriate land use mixes, intensity and density.
- Adoption of an area wide level of service not dependent on any single road segment function.
- Exempting or discounting impacts of locally desired development.
- Assigning secondary priority to vehicle mobility and primary priority to ensuring a safe, comfortable, and attractive pedestrian environment with convenient interconnection to transit.
- Establishing multimodal level of service standards that rely primarily on non-vehicular modes of transportation where existing or planned community design will provide adequate a level of mobility.
- Reducing impact fees or local access fees to promote development within urban areas, multimodal transportation districts, and a balance of mixed-use development in certain areas or districts, or for affordable or workforce housing.

Requirements for Transportation Concurrency

If a local government elects to use transportation concurrency, it must adhere to the following concurrency requirements in section 163.3180(5), Florida Statutes:

- Include principles, guidelines, standards, and strategies, including adopted levels of service, to guide the application of concurrency to transportation.
- Use professionally accepted studies to evaluate the appropriate levels of service.
- Adopt appropriate amendments to the capital improvements element of the comprehensive plan consistent with the requirements of section 163.3177(3), Florida Statutes.
- Allow for proportionate share contributions to mitigate transportation impacts for all developments, including developments of regional impact (DRIs), consistent with section 163.3180(5)(h), Florida Statutes.
- Consult with the Florida Department of Transportation when proposed amendments affect the Strategic Intermodal System.

ß

R

ß

Exempt public transit facilities from concurrency.

In addition, local governments are encouraged to develop tools and techniques to complement the application of transportation concurrency consistent with section 163.3180(5)(f), Florida Statutes, and to coordinate with adjacent local governments for the purpose of using common methodologies for measuring impacts to transportation facilities.

Links

- 🕨 Florida Department of Transportation Florida Transportation Plan 🖪
- 🕨 Model Regulations and Plan Amendments for Multimodal Transportation Districts 📆
- 🕨 Florida Metropolitan Planning Organizations 🖪
- Florida Department of Transportation Forecasting and Trends Office I
- 🕨 East Central Florida Corridor Task Force 🖪
- Florida Scenic Highways II
- Transportation Site Impact Handbook I 3
- 🕨 Florida Transit-Oriented Development 🥈
- A / Framework for Transit Oriented Development in Florida, published March 2011 T
- Florida Department of Transportation Pedestrian and Bicycle Design C
- 🕨 Florida Department of Transportation, Public Transit Office 🖪

ß

- 🕨 Florida Safe Mobility for Life Coalition 🖪
- Florida Safe Mobility for Life Coalition's Aging in Place Checklist 1/2
- 🕨 The Florida Greenbook 🗹 🛛 🖻
- Pasco County Mobility Fees II



APPENDIX B

Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs)

Town of Lake Park & Mobility Study Area Traffic Analysis Zones



APPENDIX C

Regional Travel Demand Network

Mobility Study Area 2015 Model Network



Mobility Study Area 2045 Model Network



APPENDIX D

2017 National Household Travel Survey Data: Southeast Florida

	Appendix D: 2017 National Household Travel Survey Data: Southeast Florida														
Trip Purpose	Trip Length	Number of Trips	Average Trip Length	Persons per Trip	Person Trip factor (PTf)	Person Miles of Travel (PMT)	Average Person Trip Length (PTI)	Person Miles of Travel factor (PMTf)	Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT)	Average Vehicle Trip Length	Vehicles per Trip	# of Persons per Vehicle	Vehicle Occupancy factor (VOf)		
Buy Goods	1,018.44	221	4.61	375	1.70	1,728.12	4.61	1.75	986.36	4.79	206	360	1.75		
Buy Meals	554.54	131	4.23	318	2.43	1,346.13	4.23	2.46	548.18	4.73	116	281	2.42		
Buy Services	168.57	47	3.59	90	1.91	322.79	3.59	1.96	164.99	3.84	43	86	2.00		
Child Care	3.82	2	1.91	6	3.00	11.45	1.91	3.00	3.82	1.91	2	6	3.00		
Entertainment	419.76	62	6.77	140	2.26	947.85	6.77	2.27	417.09	7.72	54	114	2.11		
Errand / Library / PO	73.90	34	2.17	50	1.47	108.68	2.17	1.47	73.91	3.08	24	38	1.58		
Exercise	211.78	63	3.36	94	1.49	315.99	3.36	1.63	193.85	4.97	39	63	1.62		
Home	2,393.84	504	4.75	961	1.91	4,564.44	4.75	1.99	2,297.74	5.50	418	830	1.99		
Medical	174.68	25	6.99	37	1.48	258.52	6.99	1.48	174.68	6.99	25	37	1.48		
Religious	107.32	23	4.67	53	2.30	247.30	4.67	2.33	105.97	5.89	18	45	2.50		
School	147.05	29	5.07	47	1.62	238.31	5.07	1.86	128.42	5.84	22	39	1.77		
Work	1,766.66	225	7.85	281	1.25	2,206.37	7.85	1.30	1,693.45	8.26	205	254	1.24		
Total	7,040.35	1,366	5.15	2,452	1.80	12,295.95	5.01	1.81	6,788.45	5.79	1,172	2,153	1.84		
Source: 2017 National Household Travel	Survey Data	for the Cor	e Based Sta	atistical Area	a (CBSA) #3	3100 Miami, F	ort Lauderda	ale & West Pa	alm Beach. A	total of 1,367	unique trip	surveys where	evaluated		

based on trips of 30 miles or less in length. Trip purpose data aggregated by listed trip purpose. The total data is based on unaggreagated data from the 2017 NHTS for CBSA # 33100.

APPENDIX E

Mobility Plan: Streets

			E: TOWN OF LAKE PARK MOBILITY PLAN: S	TREETS	1	1		1	-	1				
ID	Facility Name	From	То	Length (Miles)	Project Type	Construction Entity	Project Description	Time Frame	Planning Level Cost (PLC)	Person Miles of Capacity (PMC)	Projected Funding	Notes	Funding Sources	Mobility Fee Scenario
1	US Hwy 1	Northlake Bivd (SR 850)	Silver Beach Road	1.03	Complete Street	FDOT	Designated Primary Street and Greenway by the Town of Lake Park in Federal Highway Mixed Use Overlay District Ordinance (FMMUDD). The Ordinance states US Hwy 1 must be designed in accordance with design guidelines in the FMMUDD including a minimum 10 wide landscaged minimum 57 bite later on 10 wide travel and on the inner laters and 11 wide on outer laters, and a minimum 57 bite later on 10 wide travel and on this project words be led by FODT and coordinated deveals. S for street tests. The design of this project words be led by FODT and coordinated deveals. The test tests. The design of this project words be led by FODT and coordinated (FPA), and the Town of North Palm Beach consistent with the enhanced traval and associated minimumoli improvements planned in the Palm Beach Courg/2005 FPA IRT (Coord Frashile TPAQ1). The Town will work with community partners in pursuit of funding opportunities that implement the FHMUDD.	2026-2030	\$ 4,022,820	11,742	\$ 3,620,538	3, 6, 11 (1)	Projected 30% Federal & State Funding: Mubility Fee includes a 10% local match Pursue other sources, as appropriate and necessary.	Scenario A & B
2	Northlake Blvd	Lake Park Greenway	10th Street	0.58	Complete Street	County / FDOT	Coordinate with Palm Beach County and Palm Beach Gardens and support County efforts to pursue funding from the TPA to widen the existing S wide sidewarks to S shared-use paths where ROV is available. In addition, pursue TPA funding and coordinate with the County to evaluate the addition of maltimodal side relative prathements stars and side coordinate, high withBHy intersection crossings, demand actuated crossing signals (HWKG), curb extensions, etc.	2036-2040	\$ 438,860	1,392	\$ 394,974	2 (1)	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match. Pursue other sources, as appropriate and necessary.	Scenario A
3	Northlake Blvd (SR 850)	10th Street	US Hwy 1	1.25	Complete Street	FDOT	Coordinate with FDOT and Town of North Palm Beach and pursue funding with the Town of North Palm Beach from the TAN to widen the existing 5° wide sidewalks to 8° shared-use paths where ROW is available: In addition, porcure TAN funding and coordinate with the Coordinate evaluate the addition of malimodal safety enhancements such as meb block crossings, high validably intersection coording, demand actuated crossing signals (INWMO), cure developes, etc. cutes and South Lake.	2036-2040	\$ 945,819	3,000	\$ 851,237	2 (1)	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match. Pursue other sources, as appropriate and necessary.	Scenario A & B
4	10th Street	Northlake Blvd (SR 850)	Park Ave	0.67	Complete Street	Town	Complete Street design in accordance with the 10th Street & Park Avenue Landscape and Streetscape Filse, Landscape, increatizape and hardscape including shade trees, raised planets, bench seating, perposition for shade, water foruntains, train receptorises and decorative street pole lighting. Toulaise reducing lane widths to 10' to provide a 4' wide bia' multimodal (e.g., Buyckies, Eviles, escoter, micromobility) lane of 2' curbisid ant median side shoulders (10' wide lanes visuality, 12' wide lanes physically) to slow down traffic approaching Park Ave.	2026-2030	\$ 1,349,393	4,020		6, 11	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
5	10th Street	Park Ave	Silver Beach Road	0.42	Two (2) Lane Divided Complete Street	Town	wide lanes visually, 12 wide lanes physically) to slow down traffic approaching Park Ave. Convert to 2-lane divided Complete Street with green infrastructure and complete street elements such as landscaping and street trees. Option 1: Reconstruct with 5' wide siderwalls, 5' wide grass buffers, and 5' wide bike / multimodal lanes on both sides of the ROW. Reduce travel lane width to 10' wide travel lane, dai 41 Ju' dive center trun lane. Option 2: Reconstruct with 5' wide siders with and 5' wide grass buffers on both sides of the travel. Reconstruct with 5' wide physically and a 10' wide center trun lane. Option 3: Reconstruct with 5' to 8' wide shades no both sides of the travel lane widths 10' wide visually and 3' 10' wide enter trun lane. Option 3: Reconstruct with 5' to 8' wide shades no bit wide shades are buffer on both sides of the travel lane widths' of the travel lane. Option 3: to 6' wide lands' of the travel lane. Option 5: Option 4: Complete Street Control Design Study. 2031-2035 5' 2,655 6' the ROW. Construct 3: To 10' wide raised and landscaped median, provide 10' to 12' wide travel lanes. Option 4: Complete Street Control Design Study. 2031-2035 6' the ROW. Construct 3: To 10' wide raised and landscaped median, provide 10' to 12' wide travel lanes. Option 4: Complete Street Control Design Study. 2031-2035 2031-2035 2031-2035 2031-2035 2031-2035 2031-2035 2031-2035 2031-2035 2031-2035 2031-2035		\$ 2,655,551	12,932		1, 6, 11, 18	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
6	Park Ave West	Lake Park Greenway	Congress Ave	0.28	Complete Street	Town	Reconstruct sidewalk on the northside of the ROW from a 5' sidewalk to an 6' shared-use path or add a 5' wide shared-use path with a 1' to 2' wide paved separator adjacent to the existing sidewalk. Add landscaping, shade trees and streetscape along the pathway.	2031-2035	\$ 544,069	1,428		1, 11	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
7	Congress Ave	Silver Beach Road	Northlake Blvd	1.01	Multimodal Improvement	County / Town	Widen existing 8' wide shared-use paths to 12' wide shared-use paths where ROW is available. Coordinate with Palm Beach County to allow the use of micromobility and low speed electric vehicles on the multi-use trails.	2031-2035	\$ 955,278	3,030	\$ 477,639	1 (1)	50% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes 50% local match. Pursue other sources, as appropriate and necessary.	Scenario A
8	Park Ave Extension	Terminus of Park Ave West	Old Dixie Hwy	0.67	Two (2) Lane Divided Complete Street	County / Developer	vehicles on the multi-use trails. Construct a new two (2) lane divided road with Complete Street elements such as landscaping and shade trees, with 8' wide shared-use paths and 5' wide bile lanes along both sides of the ROW. 2022-2025 \$ 6,007,354 22,157 \$ 5,406,619					2, 6, 16	90% Funding by Palm Beach County and Palm Beach County Road Impact Fees paid by new development in Lake Park between 2018 and 2022.	Scenario A
9	Old Dixie Hwy	Park Ave Extension	Park Ave	0.04	Complete Street	County / Town	Add Complete Street design elements consistent with the 10th Street & Park Avenue Landrcape and Streetscape Plan to the maximum eatern (easilie) as part of the extension of Park Avenue. Elements include landscape, streetscape and hardscape including shade trees, raised galarett, bench senting. Bengolas for shade, water fountains, trash receptacies and decorative street pole lighting. Provide inter-size spatial comuli-use trail on both sides of the ROW based on the final intersection design or noundabouts.	2022-2025	\$ 107,990	336	\$ 97,191	2, 11	90% Funding by Palm Beach County and Palm Beach County Road Impact Fees paid by new development in Lake Park between 2018 and 2022.	/ Scenario A
10	Park Ave	Old Dixie Hwy	10th Street	0.07	Complete Street	Town	Add Complete Street design elements consistent with the 10th Street & Park Avenue Landicage and Streetcape Plan to the maximum eatern (easible as part of the extension of Park Avenue. Elements include landscape, streetcapes and hardscape including shade trees, raised galarett, bench senting, bengolas for shade, water fountains, trash receptaces and decorative street pole lighting. Prode share-size spatio comuli-use trail on both sides of the ROW based on the final intersection design or noundabouts.	2022-2025	\$ 188,983	588		2, 11	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
11	Park Ave	10th Street	7th Street	0.38	Park Ave Curbless Main Street	Town	Consider conversion to a low speed carbiess shared street with on-street parting or flexible carbide loading zones. Incorporate Comjete Street design elements in accordance with the 20th Street & Park Avenue Landcape and Streetscape Planc Landcape, Itreetscape and hirdscape including: Junde trees, Isodo Junters, benchmilding, prepairs for shade, where fountains, trash receptance and econative street pole lighting.	2031-2035	\$ 7,600,000	15,200	\$ 760,000	27	10% Federal and State Funding through the TPA. Mobility Fees and other sources, as appropriate and necessary.	Scenario A & B
12	Park Ave	7th Street	US Hwy 1	0.73	Two (2) Lane Divided Complete Street	Town	Reimagine Park Ave as a two (2) lane divided road by repurposing existing travel lanes to provide a raised 20 fo 16 Viet a landscape median, two (2) 10 fo 12 Viete travel lanes, and on-street straining on one-side Reconstruct estima isolwalls to provide 10 vide lander due paths where ROW allows. Add Complete Street elements such as landscaping, shade trees, streetscape, cub- eleminions at inferenciona, and rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs). Cools section is subject to change per final design.	2036-2040	\$ 4,701,915	22,477	\$ 470,192	3, 11, 18	10% Federal and State Funding through the TPA. Mobility Fees and other sources, as appropriate and necessary.	Scenario A & B
13	Lake Park Greenway	Northlake Blvd (SR 850)	Silver Beach Rd	1.06	Greenway	Town	Construct a 12' to 14' wide multi-use trail on top of an elevated berm to enhance flood protection along the C-17 Canal.	2036-2040	\$ 1,203,079	3,816	\$ 601,539	4 (1 & 2)	50% Federal and State Funding through the South Florida Water Management District and TPA. Mobility fee includes 50% of the cost as a local match. Pursue other sources, as appropriate and necessary.	Scenario A & B
14	Watertower Road	Congress Ave	Old Dixie Hwy	0.5	Multimodal Improvement	Town	Reconstruct existing 5' sidewalk on the north side of the ROW to an 8' wide shared use path.	2031-2035	\$ 378,328	1,200		2	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
15	Watertower Road Extension	Old Dixie Hwy	Park Ave	0.25	New Two (2) Lane Road (Developer)	Developer / Town	Construct new two (2) lane road. Provide a 5' to 6' wide sidewalk on one side of the ROW and an if wide shared-use path on the other. Construction would occur in conjunction with future development as part of the redevelopment of property along and within the proposed alignment.	Developer Driven	\$ 886,550	2,823	\$ 797,895	1, 2, 14 (3)	100% development funded. The mobility fee will include 10% of the cost. Developer will be eligible for a 10% mobility fee credit for construction of road.	Scenario A & B
16	Congress to Lake Park Greenway	Congress Ave	Lake Park Greenway	0.21	Greenway	Town	RESERVED Construct a 12' to 14' wide multi-use trail on top of an elevated berm to enhance flood protection approaching the C-17 Canal. RESERVED		\$ 238,346	756		4 (3)	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
19	12th Street Connector	Watertower Road	Park Ave Extension	0.16	New Two (2) Lane Road	Construct new two (2) lane road and reconstruct existing portions of 12th Street. Provide a 5' to S vide sidewalk on one side of the ROW and in 8' wide shared-use path on the other. To be constructed as part of the Park Ave extension. This connection is proposed to disperse traffic from the Park Ave and Old Diale Hwy intersection.		2022-2025	\$ 1,125,216	3,021	\$ 562,608	1, 2, 15	50% funded by Federal & State Funding, Palm Beach County and Palm Beach County Road Impact Fees paid by new development in Lake Park between 2018 and 2022.	Scenario A & B
20	Park Ave to Silver Beach Connector	Industrial Ave Connector	Silver Beach Road	0.26	New Two (2) Lane Road (Developer)	RESErved Reserved Developer / Town Construct-new two (2) Jave road. Provide a 5' to 6' wold: Identification would accur in conjunction with during development as part of the redevelopment of property along and within the proposed alignment. Developer during development as part of the redevelopment of property along and within the proposed alignment. Developer during development as part of the redevelopment of property along and within the proposed alignment. Developer during development as part of the redevelopment of property along and within the proposed alignment. Developer during development as part of the redevelopment of property along and within the proposed alignment. Developer during development as part of the redevelopment of property along and within the proposed alignment. Developer during development as part of the redevelopment of property along and within the proposed alignment. Developer during development as part of the redevelopment of property along and within the proposed alignment. Developer during development as part of the redevelopment of property along and within the proposed alignment. Developer during development as part of the redevelopment of property along and within the proposed alignment.			\$ 922,012	2,935	\$ 829,811	1, 2, 14	100% development funded. The mobility fee will include 10% of the cost. Developer will be eligible for a 10% mobility fee credit for construction of road.	Scenario A & B
22							RESERVED							

APPENDIX E: TOWN OF LAKE PARK MOBILITY PLAN: STREETS														
ID	Facility Name	From	То	Length (Miles)	Project Type	Construction Entity	Project Description	Time Frame	Planning Level Cost (PLC)	Person Miles of Capacity (PMC)	Projected Funding	Notes	Funding Sources	Mobility Fee Scenario
23	Industrial Ave Connector	Park Ave to Silver Beach Connector	Old Dixie Hwy	0.15	New Two (2) Lane Road	County / Town	Construct new two [2] lane road to connect the future Park Are Extension to Old Disle Highway. Provide 5' to 5' wide sidewalia on both sides of the ROW. This connection is proposed to provide relief to the Park Are and Old Disk Hwy intersection. Roadway to be constructed by new development / redevelopment.	2022-2025	\$ 1,054,890	2,832	\$ 527,445	1, 2, 15	50% funded by Federal & State Funding, Palm Beach County and Palm Beach County Road Impact Fees paid by new development in Lake Park between 2018 and 2022.	Scenario A
24	S. Killian Drive Extension	Watertower Road Extension	Killian Drive	0.36	New Two (2) Lane Road (Developer)	Developer / Town	Construct new two [2] lane road. Provide 5' to 6' wide sidewalls on both sides of the ROW. Construction would occur in conjunction with future development as part of the redevelopment of property along and within the proposed alignment.	Developer Driven	\$ 1,276,632	4,064	\$ 1,148,959	1, 2, 14 (3)	100% development funded. The mobility fee will include 10% of the cost. Developer will be eligible for a 10% mobility fee credit for construction of road.	Scenario A & B
25	S. Killian Drive	S. Killian Drive Extension (24)	S. Killian Drive Extension (26)	0.29	Two (2) Lane Divided Complete Street	Town	Ad a center turn lane in conjunction with an extension of 5. Killian Dr to Congress Ave. Add multimodal crossings or raised median islands with landscape or street trees where appropriate as part of the center turn lane.	Concurrent with ext. to Congress Ave	\$ 1,175,631	7,850		9, 17	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
26	S. Killian Dr Extension	S. Killian Drive	Congress Ave	0.12	New Two (2) Lane Road (Developer)	Developer / Town	Construct new two [2] lane road and reconstruct existing service drive on the south side of Target to a two [2] lane road. Provide 5' to 6' wide sidewalks on both sides of the ROW. Construction would occur in conjunction with future development as part of the redevelopment of property along and within the proposed alignment. Town could elect to make this connection in the future to facilitate future connectivity.	Developer Driven	\$ 391,495	1,247	\$ 352,345	1, 14 (3)	100% development funded. The mobility fee will include 10% of the cost. Developer will be eligible for a 10% mobility fee credit for construction of road.	e Scenario A & B
27	Silver Beach Road Extension	Garden Drive	West of Congress Ave	0.38	New Two (2) Lane Road	County / Town	Construct a new two [2] Jane road and reconstruct the existing two [2] Jane portions of Silver Beach Rd. Construct an S [*] to 10 [°] wide shared-use path of the northiside of the ROW. Widen existing idewalk to 3 [°] to 10 [°] shared-use path to the extent ROW is a wailable. Construct a new bridge over the -10 [°] canal. Construct needed intersection in provements at Garden Drive. Pursue TPA funding in conjunction with the County and Rivera Beach.	2036-2040	\$ 4,564,563	6,718	\$ 4,108,107	3, 15, plus bridge (1 & 2)	90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes between 10% local match. Planning Level estimate of \$2,000,000 for bridge. Pursue other sources, as appropriate and necessary.	3 Scenario A
28	Silver Beach Road	Old Dixie Hwy	US Hwy 1	1.06	Two (2) Lane Divided Complete Street	County / Town	Coordinate with Palm Beach County and Riviers Beach and support County efforts to pursue finding from the TPA to reconstruct as a 2-lane divided Complete Street with design elements such as landcarging, street trees, streetage, and tigh visibuity conswalls. Evaluate replacement of existing 5' weids idewalls with 8' wide shared-use path to both sides of the street or add 5' wide blier, Multimodal mines on both side of the ROW. The segment of Silver Beach Ridewise Justice US Hwy 1 is a designated Secondary Street and Greenway in the Federal Rightwy Med Use District Overlay (FIMUDO) and must be designed in accordance with design guidelines therein.	2031-2035	\$ 5,474,487	32,510	\$ 4,927,038	2, 17	90% County, Federal & State Funding, Mobility Fee includes between 10% local match. Planning Level estimate of \$2,000,000 for bridge. Pursue other sources, as appropriate and necessary.	g Scenario A
29	Silver Beach Road	US Hwy 1	Lake Shore Drive	0.07	Complete Street	County / Developer	Reconstruct as a Complete Street with design elements such as landscaping, street trees, streetscape, and widen existing sidewalks to 8" wide shared-use paths where ROW exist.	Developer Driven	\$ 168,760	712	\$ 151,884	2, 20	100% development funded. The mobility fee will include 10% of the cost. Developer will be eligible for a 10% mobility fee credit for construction of road.	e Scenario A
30	Flagler Blvd	Northlake Blvd (SR 850)	W. Jasmine Drive	0.32	Two (2) Lane Divided Complete Street	Town	Reconstruct as a two (2) lane divided roadway with a 12 to 15 wide landscape median. Option 1. Widen existing sidewails to 8' wide shared-use path and ad5 ' wide landscape median. Option to both sides of the ROW adjacent to the median. Option 2' Widen existing sidewails to 10' wide shared-size paths on both sides of the ROW. Travel lane widths shauld be reduced to 10' wide widen size of the ROW. The ROW the ROW. To be added to a state of the ROW to be added to be the two of the ROW. The ROW the size of the ROW to be added to be adde	2026-2030	\$ 1,917,498	10,582		2, 6, 17	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
31	Flagler Blvd	W. Jasmine Dr	Palmetto Dr	0.69	Multimodal Improvement	Town	Option 1: Restripe existing 15° to 15° wide taxed lanes to 10° wide travel lanes and 5° to 5° buffered bile / multimodal lanes adjacent to the median. Option 2: Widen existing 5° wide idewalks to 10° wide shard-code paths and reckim 5° to 5° of buffer by reducing travel lanes to 10° wide with 2 pade shardlers on other sides of the travel lane is obio down whichce 110° widbe width, 12° wide physical width). Option 3: Complete Street Condor Design Study	2026-2030	\$ 470,366	1,656		7	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
32	W. Jasmine Drive	Northlake Blvd (SR 850)	10th Street	0.74	Multimodal Improvement	Town	Option 1: Restripe existing 15' to 15' wide travel lanes to 10' wide travel lanes and 5' to 5' baffered bite / multimodal lanes. Option 2: Widen existing 5' wide sidewills to 10 wide hared are paths and reclams 5' to 6' of buffer by reducing travel lanes to 10' wide with 2' panel thouders on both sides of the travel lane to slow down vehicles (10' visible width, 12' wide physical width). Option 3: Complete Street Conford Design Study	2026-2030	\$ 504,451	1,776		7	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
33	Palmetto Drive	US Hwy 1	Flagler Blvd	0.21	Multimodal Improvement	Town	Option 1: Widen existing roadway to provide two (2) 10' wide travel lanes and two (2) 5' to 6' wide bite / multimodal lanes on both sides of the RDW. Option 2: Widen existing 5' wide sidewails to 8' to 2' wide shared-use path on both sides of the RDW. Option 3: Complete Street Corridor Design Study	2031-2035	\$ 324,512	1,350		6, 19	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
34	Palmetto Drive	Flagier Blvd	W. Jasmine Drive	0.47	Low Speed Street	Town	Add appropriate treatments per the Residential Traffic Calming Program Criteria. Add appropriate street trees and landscape per the Street Tree and Landscape Enhancement Program criteria. This street has been specialized identified as a low Special Street because it provides continuity between proposed multimodal improvements on Palmetto Drive and W. Lamine Orive and has a direct connection to US Hwy 1 and to Northlake Bird via Crestent Drive and is prone to cut-through traffic.	2031-2035	\$ 362,417	1,128		5, 9	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
35	Crescent Drive	Northlake Blvd (SR 850)	Palmetto Drive	0.51	Low Speed Street	Town	Add appropriate treatments per the Residential Traffic Calming Program Criteria. Add appropriate street trees and landscape per the Street Tree and Landscape Enhancement Program Criteria. This street has been specifically identified as a Juow Speed Street because it has a direct connection to Northlake Bivd and is prone to cut-through traffic.	2026-2030	\$ 393,261	1,224		5, 9	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
36	Seminole Blvd	Crescent Drive	Greenbriar Drive	0.23	Multimodal Improvement	Town	Option 1: Restripe existing 16' to 18' wide travel lanes to 10' wide travel lanes and 6' to 8' buffered bile / multimodal lanes adjucent to the median. Option 2: Widen existing 5' wide sidewaiks to 10' wide shared-use paths and rectain 5' to 6' of buffer by reducing travel lanes to 10' wide with ?pad shadles on obtains dises of the travel lane to four down threads. If U' widble width, 12' wide physical width). Option 3: Complete Street Contdor Design Study	2026-2030	\$ 156,789	552		7	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
37	6th Street	Flagier Blvd	Park Ave	0.16	Two (2) Lane Divided Complete Street	Town	Reconstruct as a two [2] lane divided road with a 12 ² to 15 ⁶ wide landscape median and two [2] 10 ⁶ wide travel lanes. Option 1: Construct two [2] 5 ¹ to 6 ⁷ wide bile / multimodal lanes and expand existing buffer. Option 2: Construct S to 10 ⁷ wide on-street parking spaces and widen existing 5 ¹ wide shows its to 8 ¹ to 10 ⁷ wide shared-use paths. Option 3: Conduct a Complete Street Corridor Design Study.	2031-2035	\$ 716,619	4,523		6, 17	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
38	6th Street	Park Ave	Evergreen Drive	0.13	Two (2) Lane Divided Complete Street	Town	Reconstruct as a two (2) lane divided roadway with a 12' to 15' wide landscape median. Option 2: Widen existing sidewalls to 8' wide shared-use path and add 5' wide bike / multimodal lanes on both sides of the ROW. Option 2: Widen existing sidewalks to 10' wide with the option of providing 1' wide paved shoulders on both sides of the travel lane to slow down vehicles (10' visible width, 12' wide physical width). Option 3 : Complete Street Corridor Design Study	2031-2035	\$ 778,983	4,299		2, 6, 17	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
39	6th Street	Evergreen Drive	Bayberry Drive	0.2	Multimodal Improvement	Town	Option 1: Restripe existing 18' to 20' wide travel lanes to 10' wide travel lanes and 8' to 10' Differed bile / multimodal lanes. Option 2: Widen existing 5' wide sidewalls to 10' wide shared- are path and restains 10' to 12' of baffer by restaining travel lanes to 10' wide with 1' paved baged and the state of the displant wide. Option 4: Restances in the state of the state of the state of the state of the wide travel lanes, how (2) 8' wide on-street parking spaces with a 2' wide baffer adjacent to wide travel lanes, how (2) 8' wide on-street parking spaces with a 2' wide baffer adjacent of multimodal lanes. Option 4: Complete Street Corridor Design Study	2026-2030	\$ 572,338	1,440		8	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
40	6th Street	Bayberry Drive	Silver Beach Road	0.06	Multimodal Improvement	Town	Option 1: Widen existing mathemy to provide two [2] 10 ⁻ wide travel laters and two [2] 5 ⁻ to 6 ⁻ wide bibly / multimodia laters on both sides of the DOW. Option 2: Widen existing 5 ⁻ wide selevalite to 5 ⁻ or Wider barred-use path on both sides of the ROW. Option 3: Complete Street Corridor Design Study	2026-2030	\$ 92,718	386		6, 19	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
41	7th Street	Crescent Drive	Silver Beach Road	0.77	Low Speed Street	Town	Add appropriate treatments per the Residential Traffic Calming Program Criteria. Add appropriate street trees and landscape per the Street Tree and Landscape Phanecement Program criteria: his street has been specialically identified as 1 uox Special Street because it provides continuity between proposed multimodal improvements on Fagler Biod and Date Palm Drive, it provides an additional, safe north-south route for multimodal travel, and has direct access to Silver Beach Rd.	2022-2025	\$ 593,747	1,848		5, 9	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	

					4	APPENDIX	E: TOWN OF LAKE PARK MOBILITY PLAN: ST	TREETS						
ID	Facility Name	From	То	Length (Miles)	Project Type	Construction Entity	Project Description	Time Frame	Planning Level Cost (PLC)	Person Miles of Capacity (PMC)	Projected Funding	Notes	Funding Sources	Mobility Fee Scenario
42	Sth Street	Flagier Blvd	Park Ave	0.15	Two (2) Lane Divided Complete Street	Town	Reconstruct as a two (2) lane divided nadway with a 12 'to 16' wide landscape median. Option 1: Widen existing sidewails to 6' wide shares-use path and add 5' wide like / multimodal lanes to both sides of the RNO. Option 2: Widen existing sidewails to 30' wide shared-use paths on both sides of the ROW. Tavel alnew widths should be reduced to 10' wide shared-wides (10' providing 1' wide path should be reduced to 10' wide shared-wides (10' shible width, 12' wide physical width). Option 3: Complete Street Contidor Design Study	2026-2030	\$ 898,827	4,961		2, 6, 17	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
43	Sth Street	Park Ave	Silver Beach Road	0.4	Low Speed Street	Town	Add appropriate treatments per the Residential Traffic Galming Program Oriteria. This street has been specifically identified as a Low Speed Street because it provides continuity between proposed multimotial improvements on Traffer tible and Date Panin Drive, it provides an additional, side north-rough node for multimodal travel, and has direct access to Shref Beach R.E.	2022-2025	\$ 308,440	960		5, 9	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
44	3rd Street	Palmetto Drive	Park Ave	0.38	Multimodal Improvement	Town	Option 1: Widen existing roadway to provide two (2) 10' wide travel lanes and two (2) 5' to 6' wide bite / multimodal lanes on both sides of the ROW. Option 2: Widen existing 5' wide sidewails to 8' to 0' wide shared-use path on both sides of the ROW. Option 3: Complete Street Corridor Design Study	2031-2035	\$ 587,212	2,443		6, 19	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
45	3rd Street	Park Ave	Silver Beach Road	0.39	Multimodal Improvement	Town	Option 1: Widen existing roadway to provide two [2] 10' wide travel lanes and two [2] 5' to 6' wide bike / multimodal lanes on both sides of the ROW. Option 2: Widen existing 5' wide sidewalks to 8' to 10' wide shared-use path on both sides of the ROW. Option 3: Complete Street Corridor Design Study	2026-2030	\$ 602,665	2,508		6, 19	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
46	2nd Street	Evergreen Drive	Silver Beach Road	0.39	Low Speed Street	Town	Conduct a Low Speed Street Study that evaluates the appropriate treatments and conducts community outreach per the Residential Traffic Calming Program Citteria and evaluates the impact of modifying, opening, and leaving Closed the 2nd Street and Silver Beach Road intersection. As part of the Low Speed Street Study, also evaluate the appropriate street trees and landscape per bits Street Tree and Landscape Erhancement Program criteria. Construct appropriate treatments identified in the Study.	2026-2030	\$ 300,729	936		5, 9	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
47	4th Street	Date Palm Drive	Silver Beach Road	0.2	Low Speed Street	Town	Conduct a Low Speed Street Study that evaluates the appropriate treatments and conducts community outreach per the Residential Traffic Calming Program Citteria and evaluates the impact of cut-throught Infile avoiding the intersection of Silvenbeach RA GL Street JA. La part of the Low Speed Street Study, also evaluate the appropriate street trees and Lindicage per the Street Tree and Landscape Enhancement Program criteria. Construct appropriate treatments identified in the Study.	2026-2030	\$ 154,220	480		Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Pr 5, 9 Private Partnerships, Sponsors State, User Charges, and Othe Available Sources.		
48	9th Street	Northern Drive	Cypress Drive	0.77	Multimodal Improvement	Town	This corridor provides a multimodal alternative to 10th Street. Option 1: Widen existing roadway to provide two (2) 10' wide travel lanes and two (2) 2' to 6' wide bits / multimodal lanes on both sides of the ROW. Option 2: Widen existing 5' wide existenals' to 12' wide shared-use path on both sides of the ROW. Option 3: Complete Street Corridor Design Study		Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.					
49	Northern Drive	Flagler Blvd	10th Street	0.38	Low Speed Street	Town	path on both sides of the ROW. Option 3: Complete Street Corridor Design Study			5, 9	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.			
50	West Road	Poplar Drive	Northern Drive	0.14	Low Speed Street	Town	Town Landscape Enhancement Program criteria. Construct appropriate treatments and conducts Study.		Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.					
51	Prosperity Farms Road	Northlake Blvd (SR 850)	10th Street	0.23	Complete Street	County / Town	Add multimodal saflety enhancements such as protected mid-block crossings, Ngh visibility intersection crossings, demand actuated crossing signals, curb extensions, etc.	2031-2035	\$ 312,440	1,600	\$ 156,220	12	50% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes 50% local match. Pursue other sources, as appropriate and necessary.	Scenario A
52	Poplar Drive	Prosperity Farms Road	Northern Drive	0.29	Low Speed Street	Town	Conduct a Low Speed Street Study that evaluates the appropriate treatments and conducts community outnexch per the Residential Traffic Calming Program Citeria. The Study is proposed a Poplar Drive evants the 90 Street multimodal improvement and it provides an alternative roate to Northäke for multimodal travel, and the street is prove to cut-through traffic. This Study would be conducted in conjunction with the Poplar Court Low Speed Street Study As part of the Low Speed Street Study, also evaluate the appropriate street trees and landscape per the Street Tree and landscape Enhancement Program criteria. Construct appropriate treatments identified in the Study.	2022-2025	\$ 223,619	696		5, 9	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
53	Poplar Ct	Poplar Drive	Northlake Blvd (SR 850)	0.05	Low Speed Street	Town	Conduct a Low Speed Street Study that evaluates the appropriate treatments and conducts community outreach per the Residential Traffic Calming Program Otheria and evaluates the impact of modifying, opening, and leaving Closed Popul. Court, just south of Northäle Bivd. This Study would be conducted in conjunction with the Popul Provide Uoo Speed Steet Study. As part of the Low Speed Street Study, also evaluate the appropriate street trees and landscape per the Street Tree and Landscape Enhancement Program Otheria. Construct appropriate treatments dentified in the Study.	2022-2025	\$ 38,555	120		5, 9	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
54	Teak Drive	W. Jasmine Drive	Crescent Drive	0.21	Low Speed Street	Town	Conduct a Low Speed Street Study that evaluates the appropriate treatments and conducts community outerack-per the Residential Traffic Calming Program Criteria. The Study is proposed Tack hore periodes an alternative context to Northakie for multimodal travel and will address issues with cal-through traffic on both Teak Drive and Sabal Palm Drive. As part of the Low Travel and Landscape Enhancement Program criteria. Construct appropriate treatments identified in the Study.	2022-2025	\$ 161,931	504		5, 9	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
55	Alley North of Teak Dr	W. Jasmine Drive	Existing Terminus of the Alley	0.27	Low Speed Street	Town	Conduct a Low Speed Street Study that evaluates the appropriate treatments and conducts community outstack pare the Residential Traffic Clening Program Circleria. The Study is progood at ivall loop on up to correctly closed connection between the existing termina or the alignway and the future Northake Promenade Apartments. The connection should be considered for mobility improvements to provide further connectivity between the C-3 area and the residential districts of the Town. As part of the Low Speed Street Study, also evaluate the appropriate street trees and landscape the Storet Tree and Landscape Enhancement Program criteria. Construct appropriate treatments identified in the Study.	2031-2035	\$ 208,197	648		5, 9	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnershipa, Sporsorshipa, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	
55A	Alley North of Teak Dr	Existing Terminus of the Alley	Twin Gities Mixed Use District	0.04	Multimodal Improvement	Town	The Low Speed Street Study on the Alley North of Teak Dr (#55), should consider opening up the currently closed connection between the existing terminus of the alleyway and the future Twin CHE Miked Use Datist. The connection should be considered for mobility furgements to provide further connectivity between the C-3 area and the residential districts of the Town. As periode further connectivity between the C-3 area and the residential districts of the Town. As the Street Tree and Landcage Enhancement Program criteria. Construct appropriate treatments identified in the Study.		100% development funded. The mobility fee will include 10% of the cost. Developer will be eligible for a 10% mobility fee credit for construction of road.	e Scenario A & B				
56	Greenbriar Drive	6th Street	5th Street	0.14	Low Speed Street	Town	Conduct a low Speed Street Study that evaluates the appropriate treatments and conducts to a address out through traffic Calming Program. Citeria: The Study is proposed to address out through traffic Calming Program. Citeria: The Study is proposed the appropriate street trees and landscape per the Street Street Study, also evaluate the appropriate street trees and landscape per the Street Street Study.		Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.					
57	Date Palm Drive	US Hwy 1	6th Street	0.64	Multimodal Improvement	Town	Option 1: Widen existing roadway to provide two (2) 10' wide travel lanes and two (2) 5' to 6' wide bite / multimodal lanes on both sides of the ROW. Option 2: Widen existing 5' wide sidewalls to 5' to 10' widen bitmed-use path on both sides of the ROW. Option 3: Complete Strett Control Designs thatmed-use path on both sides of the ROW. Option 3: Complete is a designated by the Town of Lake Park as a Secondary Street and Greenway in the Federal Righway Mixed Useritic Overlay (FHMUDD) and must be designed in accordance with design guidelines therein.	roadway to provide two (2) 10' wide travel lanes and two (2) 5' to 5' new on both vides of the ROW. Option 2: wide (esting 5' wide) e shard-use path out bids of the Row Option 3: complete upt, The segment of Date Patim Deteneor 2nd 5t and Lakeshore Blind upt (Law Charge) wide Path (Path Path) (c) Detendance (c) Complete (c) Detendance (c) Deten		Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.				
58	Date Palm Drive	6th Street	9th Street	0.36	Multimodal Improvement	Town	patient: subscriters untertent. ption 1: Restripe existing 10" to 15" wide travel lanes to 10" wide travel lanes and 6" to 5" subscriters wide travel lanes to 10" wide travel lanes to 10" wide travel lanes and 6" to 5" affered bite / multimodal lanes. Option 2: Widen existing 5" wide sidewalls to 10" wide with 1" puwed to 200° wide to 10" wide with 1" puwed to 200° wide with 1" puwed to 200° wide with 1.2" wide width. 200° 200 psical width). Option 3: Complete Street Confider Design Study Study 200° 200		\$ 245,408	864		7	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.	

	ID Facility Name From To Length Project Type Construction Project Description Time Frame Planning Level Of Capacity Projected Notes Funding Sources Mobility Fee														
ID	Facility Name	From	То	Length (Miles)	Project Type	Construction Entity	Project Description	Time Frame	Planning Level Cost (PLC)	Person Miles of Capacity (PMC)	Projected Funding	Notes	Funding Sources	Mobility Fee Scenario	
59	Evergreen Drive	9th Street	US Hwy 1	1.1	Low Speed Street	Town	Canduct a Low Speed Street Study that evaluates the appropriate treatments and conducts community outreach per the Residential Traffic Calming Program Criteria. The Study is proposed to address cut-through traffic on tvergreen as an alternative to Silver Beach Road and Park Aue exonstruction as a two (2) lane divided retes. As part of the Low Speed Street Study, also evaluate the appropriate street trees and landscape per the Street Tree and Landscape Enhancement Program criteria. Construct appropriate treatments identified in the Study.	2026-2030	\$ 848,210	2,640		5, 9	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.		
60	Cypress Drive	6th Street	US Hwy 1	0.64	Low Speed Street	Town	Conduct a Low Speed Street Study that evaluates the appropriate treatments and conducts community outreach per the Residential Tarlfic Calming Program Criteria. The Study is proposed to address cut-through traffic on Cypress Drive as an alternative to Silver Beach Road and Park are econstruction as two (21) are divided streets. As part of the Low Speed Street Study, also evaluate the appropriate street trees and landscape per the Street Tree and Landscape Enhancement Program criteria. Construct appropriate treatments identified in the Study.	2026-2030	\$ 493,504	1,536		5, 9	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.		
61	Bayberry Drive	10th Street	US Hwy 1	1.02	Low Speed Street	Town	Conduct a Low Speed Street Study that evaluates the appropriate treatments and conducts community outreach per the Residential Traffic Calming Program Criteria. The Study is proposed to address cit-through Traffic on Appropriate san attentive route during Prafix Are reconstruction as a two (2) lane boulevard and daily traffic on Northkale Bird. As part of the Low Speed Street Study, also evaluate the appropriate street trees and landscape per the Street Tree and Landscape Enhancement Program criteria. Construct appropriate treatments identified in the Study.	2026-2030	\$ 786,522	2,448		5, 9	Mobility Fees, County, Development, Federal, Non-Profit, Private Partnerships, Sponsorships, State, User Charges, and Other Available Sources.		
62	Waterfront Promenade	Lakeshore Drive	Silver Beach Road	0.93	Waterfront Promenade	Town	Conduct an Engineering Study to evaluate the existing seawall for structural integrity. Conduct a Promenade Design Study to identify streetscape and placemaking elements such as pedestrian intriture, pedestrian lighting, signage, public art, special parkies, istreet wendors, a separate area for runners and walkers, a dog park, etc. Construct needed improvements.	2026-2030	\$ 4,590,899	8,928	\$ 2,295,449	11, 28 (3)	50% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes 50% local match. Pursue other sources, as appropriate and necessary.	Scenario A & B	
63	Tri-Rail Coastal Station	Park Ave	10th Street	-	Tri-Rail Coastal Station	FDOT / Town	Costal Link/Trai-rail/Palm Tran Extension improvements for parking and feeder system improvements on the Town-rowned property behind fire Station 68 - including green infrastructure; Design hold include millimodal access and parking, streetscape and landscaping, and placemaking elements	2031-2035	\$ 15,000,000	1,600	\$ 13,500,000		90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes 10% local match. Pursue other sources, as appropriate and necessary.	Scenario A & B	
64	64 Brank Ave Extension Rev Two (2) Lane Brank Red New Two (2) Lane Brank Red Developer / Town Construction work (2) to provide sidewalks on both side sidewalks on both side of the ROW. Construction work (2) Lane read. Provide 5' to 6' wide sidewalks on both side of the ROW. Second Fragment Fragm														
65 Newman Road Connector Newman Road Park Are to Silver Beach Connector New Two (2) Lane Road (Developer / Town Construction or tow dispersion with future development as part of the redevelopment as part of the redevelopment as part of the redevelopment. Developer Driven S 283,065 903 S 255,255 1, 1, 1 Construction or road. Park Are to Silver Beach a 10% mobility fee will indue 10% of a 10% mobility fee will indue 10% of a 10% mobility fee will indue 10% of a 10% mobility fee will except or road. 66 ESERVED															
66						1	RESERVED		1			1		1	
67	Residential Traffic Calming Program	Town of Lake Park	Palm Beach County	2.0	Residential Traffic Calming Program	Town	The Town shall develop a Residential Traffic Calming Program and Ordinance as a follow-on effort to the Mobility Plan. The limits of the Residential Traffic Calming program and Ordinance allow for the Mobility Plan. The limits of the Residential Traffic Calming program will be to south, and the Fiorial East Coast (FEC) Railcoad to the west. The purpose of the Residential Traffic Calming Program will be to dow dow velce titrific and profitze the self and efficient movement of people bicycling, walking, and accessing transit. The Residential Traffic Calming Program markings to designate on-street parking or on-street bie / multimodal lames to narrow effective tabilish winnows there calming bortomatic alternets to be implemented such as using pavement markings to designate on-street parking or on-street bie / multimodal lames to narrow effective establish of the vertical elements to be used tables, chokers, or orth estension. In addition, the Residential Traffic Calming Program shall also establish corteria for traffic control devices a tirterescitors, such as top gisers, multific circles and mundabouts The Residential Traffic Calming Program shall also establish prioritization criteria, study parameters, and resident Residential Traffic Calming improvements as warranted.	2022-2045	\$ 1,542,200	4,800	\$ 154,220	5, 9	10% Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes 90% of cost. Pursue other sources, as appropriate and necessary.	Scenario A & B	
68	Streetscape, Street Trees & Landscape Enhancement Program	Town of Lake Park	Palm Beach County	17.37	Streetscape, Street Trees & Landscape Enhancement Program	Town	The Town shall develop a Streetscape. Street Trees & Landscape Enhancement Program to establish ordering for adding landscape, understory and canopy trees to existing street ROW. The trown shall determine the appropriate trees and landscape (were ROW withs), irrigation availability, and stormwater management. The Streetscape. Street Trees & Landscape Enhancement Program shall also establish forintization criteria, study parameters, and resident request for street tree and landscape enhancement.	2022-2045	\$ 13,059,673	28,404	\$ 1,305,967	9 (5.03 mi), 10 (9.49), 11 (2.86)	10% Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes 90% of cost. Pursue other sources, as appropriate and necessary.	Scenario A & B	
69	Green Alleys Program	Town of Lake Park	Palm Beach County	1.5	Green Alley Program	Town	The Town shall conduct a study to explore development of a Green Alleys Program to repurpose and publicly utilize Town owned open space property located in utility examems in residential englobariosa. The alleys' should be exponent bicycle and peterstima flows only quiet modes) and could include landscaping, uturns gardens, open space areas, benches, picnic tables and solution of the developing a volument circum alleys of the space areas, benches, picnic tables and could reduce and the space of the space areas, benches, picnic tables and solution of the developing a volument circum alleys community boards to extrem entimeratore, manage funding, determine what the space can be used for and potentially develop programming for the space (e.g. pop-up markets, block parties, yoga classes, urban gardens, etc.)	2022-2045	\$ 1,000,000		\$ 100,000		10% Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes 90% of cost. Pursue other sources, as appropriate and necessary.	Scenario A & B	
70	Federal Highway Mixed Use District Overlay (FHMUDO)	Town of Lake Park	Palm Beach County	2.67	Federal Highway Mixed Use District Overlay (FHMUDO)	Town	Implement the Federal Highway Mixed Use District Overlay (FIMUDO). The limits of the FMMUDO are Palmetto Drive to the north. Silver Beach Road to the south, 2nd Street to the west and the waterfront to the sast. The FMMUDO was stabilished by the Town of Lake Park to encourage an urban form that promotes transit usage and pedestrian oriented development along the Federal Highway control which is connected to the Park Are Downtoon District. District street design standards are established within the ordnance for US Hwy 1, Park Are, 2nd Street, Lake Shore Diver as well as for identified Greenways, Primary Streets, Secondary Streets, and Tertiany Streets.	2022-2045	\$ 2,000,000		\$ 200,000		10% Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes 90% of cost. Pursue other sources, as appropriate and necessary.	Scenario A & B	
71	Micromobility & Low Speed Electric Vehicle Program	Town of Lake Park	Palm Beach County	-	Micromobility & Low Speed Electric Vehicle Program	Town	The Town will develop a Micromobility & Low Speed Electric Vehicle Program and Ordinasce regulating the use of micromobility devices (e.g., e.bik, e-scooters) and low speed electric whiches within the town. The Town will coordinate with FOOT (regarding use of micromobility devices and low speed electric vehicles on and consing US they 1 and Northiale Bid. The Town will coordinate with FOD Pamil Beach Country, Rives Beach, and North Palm Beach regarding use of micromobility devices and low speed electric vehicles on and crossing country Roads and within adjuect municipatilite. The Program and Ordinance will address hours of operation, safety, shared mobility providers, rentals, and equipment.	2022-2045	\$ 500,000		\$ 50,000		10% Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes 90% of cost. Pursue other sources, as appropriate and necessary.	Scenario A & B	
72	Transit Stops Program	Town of Lake Park	Palm Beach County	-	Transit Stops	Town	Evaluate existing transit stops and, where feasible and appropriate, add transit shelters and amerities such as benches, Wi-Fi hotspots, bike racks, plantings & landscaping. Provide up to 20 stops.	2022-2045	\$ 670,000	4,000	\$ 67,000	13	10% Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes 90% of cost. Pursue other sources, as appropriate and necessary.	Scenario A & B	
114	Multimodal Plans, Programs, Services & Studies	Town of Lake Park	Palm Beach County	-	Mobility Program, Service, or Study	Town	umobai vrojects 73 thru 113 are included under the Intersection Plan (Appendix F) Conduct and / or develop corridor and multimodal plans and studies, develop traffic count program, develop a multimodal way finding program, pursue matching grant fund opportunities through Courts, POT, Fedral, Stats, and TPA Funding Programs, develop mobility equity programs, develop omplete strete policies, design standards, and programs, develop mobility equity services and joint shared mobility, microtransit and transit services with adjacent north Palm Beach municipalities, FDOT, Palm Beach Courty, Palm Tran, Tri-Rail and private entities.	2022-2045	\$ 2,000,000		\$ 200,000		10% Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes 90% of cost. Pursue other sources, as appropriate and necessary.	Scenario A & B	
Source to the estima proper A & B i 284,80	: Mobility Plan prepared by N corresponding Planning Level tes. The numbers provided in ty; (3) Multimodal project wo lustrate projects that are inc 3.	UE Urban Concepts Tear Cost and Person Miles of (brackets) under the not ruld require the dedicatio luded as funding available	n. Time frames are initia Capacity multimodal fac es column reference to n of right-of-way by the e for both Mobility Fee c	I projecti ilities. Pli the follow property alculation	ions. Each year the To anning Level Cost (PLC ving: (1) Multimodal p owner or the grantin ns. Mobility Fee Scena	wn of Lake Park Co C) and Person Miles project is partially o g of access, public u urio A illustrate proj	mmission will prioritize projects through the annual Capital Improvements Program. P of Capacity (PMC) utilize the length of the project in the calculations. Where there are entriely located outside the municipal limits of the Toron of Lake Park (2) Multimodal se, utility, and other required eastments; and (4) Multimodal project requires right-of- ects that are only funded under Scenario A, under Scenario B, not funding is assumed t	anning Level Co multiple numbe project will requ way on land curr o be available fo	et (PLC) are provie rs under notes, it uire granting of a ently owned by P r these projects.	ded in Appendix denotes more th ccess, public use, 'alm Beach Count The total Mobilit	K. Person Miles o an one type of n and utility easen y. Funding sourd y Plan PLC for str	of Capacity (PMC) nultimodal facilit nents by the enti ces are projection eets is \$105,592,) are provided in Appendix I . The y was used as the basis for the PI ty with ownership or granted rig s of available funding. Mobility 020. The total Mobility Plan PM	e notes refer LC and PMC Ints to the Fee Scenarios C for streets is	

APPENDIX F

Mobility Plan: Intersections

		АР	PENDIX	F: TOWN OF LAKE PARK MOBIL	ITY PL	AN:	INTERSEC	TIONS				
ID	Location	Project Type	Construction Entity	Project Description	Planning Cost (l	g Level PLC)	Person Miles of Capacity (PMC)	Note	Projected Funding	Funded	Mobility Fee Scenario	Time Frame
73	Northlake Blvd @ Congress Ave	High Visibility Crosswalk	Town	Add High Visibility Crosswalk	s	156,220	800	12 (1)	\$ 140,598	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A	2036-2040
74	Northlake Blvd @ Old Dixie Hwy	High Visibility Crosswalk	Town	Add High Visibility Crosswalk	\$	156,220	800	12	\$ 140,598	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A	2036-2040
75	Northlake Blvd @ 10th Street	High Visibility Crosswalk	Town	Add High Visibility Crosswalk	\$	156,220	800	12	\$ 140,598	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A & B	2036-2040
76	Northlake Blvd @ US Hwy 1	High Visibility Crosswalk	FDOT	Add High Visibility Crosswalk	s	156,220	800	12 (1)	\$ 140,598	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A & B	2036-2040
77	US Hwy 1 @ Date Palm	RRFB	FDOT	Add Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon	s	156,220	800	12	\$ 140,598	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A & B	2026-2030
78	US Hwy 1 @ at llex	RRFB	FDOT	dd Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon \$		156,220	800	12	\$ 140,598	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A & B	2026-2030
79	10th Street @ Prosperity Farms Road	Roundabout	FDOT	onstruct one (1) lane ovalabout \$,008,315	12,500	26	\$ 1,807,484	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A & B	2026-2030
80	Northlake Blvd @ Prosperity Farms Road	High Visibility Crosswalk	FDOT	dd High Visibility Crosswalk \$		156,220	800	12	\$ 140,598	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A & B	2026-2030
81	Northlake Blvd @ Jasmine Dr	High Visibility Crosswalk	FDOT	dd High Visibility Crosswalk \$		156,220	800	12	\$ 140,598	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A & B	2026-2030
82	Park Ave @ 5th Street	RRFB	Town	dd Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon \$		156,220	800	12		Mobility Fees and Other Sources		2026-2030
83	Silver Beach Road @ 7th Street	RRFB	Town	Add Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon	s	156,220	800	12	\$ 140,598	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A	2031-2035
84	Silver Beach Road @ 5th Street	RRFB	Town	Add Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon	ş	156,220	800	12	\$ 140,598	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A	2031-2035
86	Silver Beach Road @ Avenue S	Intersection Improvements	Town	Add traffic signal	\$ 1	,512,580	1,200	22	\$ 1,361,322	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A	2022-2025
87	Northlake Blvd @ Flagler Blvd	HAWK	Town	Add High-Intensity Activated CrossWalK (HAWK)	\$ 1	,512,580	1,200	22	\$ 1,361,322	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A & B	2026-2030
88	Northlake Blvd @ Crescent Drive	HAWK	Town	Add High-Intensity Activated CrossWalK (HAWK)	\$ 1	,512,580	1,200	22	\$ 1,361,322	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A & B	2026-2030
89	Park Ave @ 10th Street	Roundabout	Town	Add Signalized Roundabout	\$ 2,	,008,315	12,500	26	\$ 1,807,484	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A	2022-2025
90	Park Ave @ Old Dixie Hwy	Intersection Improvements	Town	Add Intersection Improvements	\$	496,115	2,400	23	\$ 446,504	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A	2022-2025
91	Park Ave @ 7th Street	Roundabout	Town	Add Roundabout	\$2,	,008,315	12,500	26		Mobility Fees and Other Sources		2026-2030
92	Park Ave @ 3rd Street	RRFB	Town	Add Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon	\$	156,220	800	12		Mobility Fees and Other Sources		2026-2030
93	Old Dixie Hwy @ Watertower Road	Roundabout	Town	Add Roundabout	\$	621,295	6,250	25	\$ 559,166	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A	2031-2035
94	Park Ave West Extension @ Industrial Ave Connector	Roundabout	Town	Add Roundabout	\$	621,295	6,250	25 (4)	\$ 559,166	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A	Developer Driven
95	Old Dixie Hwy @ Park Ave West Extension	Roundabout	Town	Add Signalized Roundabout	\$	621,295	6,250	25	\$ 559,166	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A	2022-2025
96	Watertower Rd @ 12th Street	Intersection Improvements	Town	Add Intersection Improvements	s	496,115	2,400	23		Mobility Fees and Other Sources		Developer Driven
98	Old Dixie Hwy @ S. Killian Street	Intersection Improvements	Town	Add Intersection Improvements	s	496,115	2,400	23	\$ 446,504	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A	Developer Driven
99 100	Watertower Road @ 13th Street	Intersection Improvements	Town	RESERVED Add Intersection Improvements \$		496,115	2,400	23		Mobility Fees and Other Sources		Developer Driven
101	Park Ave Extension @ Watertower to Park Ave Connector	Roundabout	Town	Add Roundabout	s	621,295	6,250	25	1	Mobility Fees and Other Sources		2022-2025
102	Old Dixie Hwy @ Independence Drive	Intersection Improvements	Town	wn Add Intersection Improvements \$		496,115	2,400	23	\$ 446,504	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A	2022-2025
104	2nd Street @Evergreen Dr	Intersection Improvements	Town	Add intersection improvements and consider a traffic circle	s	496,115	2,400	23		Mobility Fees and Other Sources		2022-2025
105	Park Ave @ San Marco Circle	RRFB	Town	Add Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon	s	156,220	800	12	\$ 140,598	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A	2031-2035
106	Silver Beach Road @ Garden Road	Intersection Improvements	Town	Add Intersection Improvements		496,115	2,400	23 (1)	\$ 446,504	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A	2031-2035

		AP	PENDIX	F: TOWN OF LAKE PARK MOBIL	ITY PLAN:	INTERSEC [®]	TIONS								
ID	Location	Project Type	Construction Entity	Project Description	Planning Level Cost (PLC)	Person Miles of Capacity (PMC)	Note	Projected Funding	Funded	Mobility Fee Scenario	Time Frame				
107	Park Ave @ Lake Park Greenway	RRFB	Town	Add Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon	\$ 156,220	800	12	\$ 140,598	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A	2031-2035				
108	D8 Congress Ave @ Congress to Lake Park Greenway RRFB Town Add Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon \$ 156,220 800 12 \$ 140,581 State Funding: Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match. Scenario A Developer Driven Image: Image														
110	10 Date Palm Drive approximately 325' east of 3rd Street Intersection Improvements Town Add intersection improvements and consider a traffic circle \$ 496,115 2,400 23 Mobility Fees and Other Sources 2022-2025														
111	Image: North Lake Bridge Improvement State Elevate the bridge over the canal to increase boat access between South Lake, North Lake, and the C-17 canal. State Elevate the bridge over the canal to increase boat access between South Lake, North Lake, and the C-17 canal. State Elevate the bridge over the canal to increase boat access between South Lake, North Lake, and the C-17 canal. State Elevate the bridge over the canal to increase boat access between includes a 10% local match. Scenario A Scenario A 2031-2035														
112	Congress Ave @ Park Ave West	Intersection Improvements	County	Add intersection improvements to address high crash location	\$ 496,115	2,400	23	\$ 446,504	Projected 90% County, Federal & State Funding. Mobility Fee includes a 10% local match.	Scenario A	2022-2025				
113	113 Congress Ave @ 5. Killian Dr Extension Intersection Improvements County Add intersection improvements to address high crass location \$ 496,115 2,400 23 \$ 446,500 State Funding, Mobility Fee indices a 10% location A \$ 2022-2025														
114				RESERVED											
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Mahility Blas assessed by NUE Lisban Conserva Taxan 3	·····		Town of Lolis Dody Commission will existing an instable		Linear and a Dec	Dia ania	a Laural Cart (Dennes Miller of Co.					

Source: Mobility Plan prepared by NUE Urban Concepts Team. Time frames are initial projections. Each year the Town of Lake Park Commission will prioritize projects through the annual Capital Improvements Program. Planning Level Cost (PLC) are provided in **Appendix L**. Person Miles of Capacity (PMC) are provided in **Appendix J**. The notes refer to the corresponding Planning Level Cost and Person Miles of Capacity (PMC) are than one type of multimodal facility was used as the basis for the PLC and PMC estimates. The numbers provided in **(**brackets) under the notes column refere to the following: (1) Multimodal project is partially or entirely located outside the municipal limits of the Town of Lake Park; (2) Multimodal project will require granting of access, public use, and utility easements by the entity with ownership or granted rights to the property; (3) Multimodal project would require the dedication of right-of-way on land currently owned on Pam Beach County. Funding sources are projections of available for intersections & 8 B illustrate projects that are included as funding available for both Mobility Fee Calculations. Mobility Fee Scenario A, under Scenario B, not funding is assumed to be available for these projects. The total Mobility Plan PLC for intersections is \$23,352,315. The total Mobility Plan PMC for streets is 103,100.

APPENDIX G

Traffic Characteristics Data: Core Mobility Area

				APPENDIX	G: TRAFFI	C CHARACT	ERISTICS D	ATA: CORI		AREA									
Name	From Street	To Street	Functional Classification	Maintaining Entity	Travel Lanes	Lane Miles	Speed Limit	Length (mi)	LOS Standard	Daily Capacity	Year Count	2022 AADT	2022 VMT	2022 VMC	VMT/ VMC	2045 AADT	2045 VMT	2045 VMC	VMT/ VMC
10th Street	Northlake Blvd	Park Ave	Minor Arterial	Town	4LD	2.64	35	0.66	D	29,160	2022	12,470	8,230	19,246	0.43	15,300	10,098	19,246	0.52
10th Street	Park Ave	Silverbeach Rd	Major Collector	Town	2LU	0.84	30	0.42	D	10,360	2022	4,000	1,680	4,351	0.39	4,900	2,058	4,351	0.47
Congress Ave	Northlake Blvd	Silverbeach Rd	Minor Arterial	County	4LD	4	45	1.00	D	35,820	2021	22,200	22,200	35,820	0.62	27,300	27,300	35,820	0.76
Flagler Blvd	Northlake Blvd	Palmetto Dr	Major Local	Town	2LU	2.02	30	1.01	D	10,360	2022	2,490	2,515	10,464	0.24	3,100	3,131	10,464	0.30
Jasmine Drive	Northlake Blvd	Flagler Blvd	Major Local	Town	2LU	0.66	30	0.33	D	10,360	2022	1,750	578	3,419	0.17	2,200	726	3,419	0.21
Jasmine Drive	Flagler Blvd	10th Street	Major Local	Town	2LU	0.78	30	0.39	D	10,360	2022	1,500	585	4,040	0.14	1,800	702	4,040	0.17
Lakeshore Drive	US Hwy 1	Cypress Dr	Major Local	Town	2LU	1.4	25	0.70	D	8,140	2022	700	490	5,698	0.09	900	630	5,698	0.11
Northlake Blvd	Congress Ave	SR 811	Principal Arterial	County	6LD	2.82	45	0.47	D	59,900	2021	41,900	19,693	28,153	0.70	51,500	24,205	28,153	0.86
Northlake Blvd	SR 811	Posperity Farms Rd	Principal Arterial	FDOT	6LD	0.84	40	0.14	D	59,900	2021	36,800	5,152	8,386	0.61	45,200	6,328	8,386	0.75
Northlake Blvd	Posperity Farms Rd	Southwind Dr	Principal Arterial	FDOT	6LD	3.24	40	0.54	D	59,900	2021	33,800	18,252	32,346	0.56	41,500	22,410	32,346	0.69
Northlake Blvd	Southwind Dr	US Hwy 1	Principal Arterial	FDOT	6LD	3.36	40	0.56	D	59,900	2021	24,200	13,552	33,544	0.40	29,700	16,632	33,544	0.50
Old Dixie Hwy	Northlake Blvd	Park Ave	Minor Collector	County	2LD	1.5	30	0.75	D	16,280	2022	9,650	7,238	12,210	0.59	11,900	8,925	12,210	0.73
Old Dixie Hwy	Park Ave	Silverbeach Rd	Minor Arterial	County	4LD	1.68	40	0.42	D	35,820	2022	10,130	4,255	15,044	0.28	12,400	5,208	15,044	0.35
Park Ave	Gardens Rd	Congress Ave	Minor Collector	County	2LD	0.5	35	0.25	D	16,280	2022	13,830	3,458	4,070	0.85	17,000	4,250	4,070	1.04
Park Ave	Old Dixie Hwy	10th St	Minor Collector	Town	4LD	0.28	30	0.07	D	29,160	2022	4,700	329	2,041	0.16	5,800	406	2,041	0.20
Park Ave	10th St	7th St	Minor Collector	Town	2LU	0.88	20	0.44	D	8,140	2022	3,700	1,628	3,582	0.45	4,500	1,980	3,582	0.55
Park Ave	7th St	Federal Hwy US 1	Minor Collector	Town	4LD	2.88	30	0.72	D	29,160	2022	3,100	2,232	20,995	0.11	3,800	2,736	20,995	0.13
Palmetto Drive	US Hwy 1	Jasmine Drive	Major Local	Town	2LU	1.34	30	0.67	D	10,360	2022	2,740	1,836	6,941	0.26	3,400	2,278	6,941	0.33
Prosperity Farms Rd	10th Street	Northlake Blvd	Minor Collector	County	4LD	0.44	35	0.22	D	29,160	2022	4,340	955	6,415	0.15	5,300	1,166	6,415	0.18
Silverbeach Rd	Congress Ave	Old Dixie Hwy	Minor Collector	County	2LD	1.74	35	0.87	D	16,280	2021	13,900	12,093	14,164	0.85	17,100	14,877	14,164	1.05
Silverbeach Rd	Old Dixie Hwy	US Hwy 1	Minor Collector	County	2LU	2.08	30	1.04	D	10,360	2022	7,750	8,060	10,774	0.75	9,500	9,880	10,774	0.92
US Hwy 1	Northlake Blvd	Park Ave	Minor Arterial	FDOT	4LD	2.52	35	0.63	D	32,400	2021	23,200	14,616	20,412	0.72	28,500	17,955	20,412	0.88
US Hwy 1	Park Ave	Silverbeach Rd	Minor Arterial	FDOT	4LD	1.52	35	0.38	D	32,400	2021	21,200	8,056	12,312	0.65	26,100	9,918	12,312	0.81
Watertower Rd	Congress Ave	Old Dixie Hwy	Minor Collector	Town	2LU	0.96	35	0.48	D	10,360	2022	8,080	3,878	4,973	0.78	9,900	4,752	4,973	0.96

Source: Traffic data provided by Florida Department of Transportation & NUE Urban Concepts, LLC. LOS Standards based on adopted Comprehensive Plan. Daily Capacity based on FDOT Generalized Tables (Appendix H). Growth Factor of 0.9% based on FDOT District 4 (Southeast) 2045 Southeast Regional Planning Model. 2021 AADT projected from base year of traffic count multiplied by the annual application of the model growth factor of 0.9%. 2022 AADT based on field collected data by NUE Urban Concepts, LLC and multiplied by the latest FDOT Peak Season Converions Factor of 1.03. 2022 and 2045 AADT rounded to the nearest 10th. VMT is length x AADT. VMC is length x Daily Capacity. 2045 AADT and VMT derived by applying growth rates.

APPENDIX H

Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Generalized Service Volumes

Generalized Annual Average Daily Volumes for Florida's

Urbanized Areas

UNINTERUPTED FLOW FACILITIESUNINTERUPTED FLOW FACSTATE SIGNALIZED ARTERIALSClass I (40 mph or higher posted speed limit)Lanes MedianBCD2Undivided* 37,90039,800**4Divided* 37,90039,800**559200125,200125,900Class II (35 mph or slower posted speed limit)EELanes MedianBCD4Divided* 14,50032,4004Divided* 14,50032,00066,81004Divided* 32,00067,30068,1006Divided* 32,00067,30068,1007Mon-State Signalized Roadway Adjustments (Alter corresponding state volumes by he indicated percent.) Non-State Signalized Roadway Adjustments (Alter corresponding state volumes by he indicated percent.) Non-State Signalized Roadway Adjustments (Alter dorresponding two-directonal volumes.)Tereway Adjustments $+ 20,000$ Multi UndividedNo -25% Multi UndividedMolBCDC-LE MODE ² (Multity vehicle volumes, shown helow ty number of directional roadway lanes to deermine two-way maximum service vulumes.)Winterrupted Flow Highway Ad LanesPavedShoulder Bicycle Lane CoverageBCD10EDESTRIAN MODE ² (Multity vehicle volumes, shown helow ty number of directional roadway lanes to deermine two-way maximum service vulumes.)* 2,000Paved <th></th>											
STATE SIGNALIZED ARTERIALSClass I (40 mph or higher posted speed limit)LancesMedianBCDE2Undivided* 16,80017,700***44454Divided* 37,90039,800***67,10066,4008.3,5Divided* 78,80080,100***670,10097,800123,900124,9001LancesMedianBCDE12136,500124,400246,1LancesMedianBCDE12136,500192,400246,2Undivided* 7,30014,80015,600445,90060,27,0075,6Divided* 23,20067,30068,100891,900125,200151,10115,000156,800189,90125,200151,10115,000156,800189,9022,000133,8008DividedYesNon-State Signalized Roadway AdjustmentsNon-State Signalized Roadways - 10%Non-State Signalized Roadways - 10%MultiUndividedNoNo-25%DCD2DividedYesNo-20%MultiUndividedNoMedian & Exclusive left LancesKeith LancesKeith LancesKeith LancesKeith Lances2DividedYesNo-25%MultiUndividedNo2 <td< th=""><th></th><th>INTERR</th><th>RUPTED F</th><th>LOW FAC</th><th>ILITIES</th><th></th><th></th><th>UNINTE</th><th>RRUPTED F</th><th>LOW FA</th><th>CILITIES</th></td<>		INTERR	RUPTED F	LOW FAC	ILITIES			UNINTE	RRUPTED F	LOW FA	CILITIES
Class I (40 mph or higher posted speed limit) Lanes Median B C D E 2 Undivided * 37,900 39,800 *** 4 Divided * 58,400 59,900 *** 6 Divided * 58,400 59,900 *** 8 92,200 128,900 123, 6 Divided * 78,800 80,100 *** Class II (35 mph or slower posted speed limit) Lancs Median B C D E 2 Undivided * 7,300 14,800 15,600 4 Divided * 7,300 14,800 15,600 4 Divided * 7,300 50,000 50,900 8 Divided * 23,300 50,000 68,100 8 Divided * 32,000 67,300 68,100 8 Divided * 32,000 67,300 68,100 10 115,000 125,200 125,200 151, 10 115,000 125,200 151, 10 115,000 125,200 151, 10 115,000 125,200 151, 10 115,000 156,800 189, Vertause Signalized Roadway Adjustments Auxiliary Lanes Median B C C 2 Undivided No No -25% Multi Undivided No No -25% FBEDESTENIAN MODE ² Multigby vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional readway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0.49% * 2,000 7,600 19,700 ** Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0.49% * * 2,000 F,000 9,500		STATE SI	IGNALIZ	ZED AR	FERIALS	5			FREEW	AYS	
Lanes Median I B C T D E Lanes B C L Lanes B C Lanes B C L Lanes B C L Undivided N N N - 20% A Lanes Median B C L Undivided N N N - 20% A Lanes Median C Lanes Median B C L Undivided N N N - 20% A Lanes Median C Lanes Median C Lanes Median C Lanes Median C Lanes Median B C L Undivided N N N - 25% A Lanes M C Lanes Median C L		Class I (40 n	nph or hig	her posted	speed limi	it)			Core Urb	anized	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Lanes	Median	В	C	D	E	Lanes	В	C		D
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	2	Undivided	*	16.800	17.700	**	4	47.600	66.400) 8	3.200
6Divided $*$ $58,400$ $59,900$ $**$ 8Divided $*$ $78,800$ $80,100$ $**$ 1LanesH (35 mph or slower posted speed limit)10 $115,300$ $158,900$ $223,100$ 1LanesBCDE2Undivided $*$ $7,300$ $14,800$ $15,600$ 4Divided $*$ $23,300$ $50,000$ $50,900$ 6Divided $*$ $23,300$ $50,000$ 7Divided $*$ $32,000$ $50,900$ 8Divided $*$ $32,000$ $50,900$ 8Divided $*$ $32,000$ $50,900$ 8Divided $*$ $32,000$ $50,900$ 8Divided $*$ $20,000$ Ketsive Exclusive Exclusive Exclusive Exclusive AdjustmentsLanesMedianLeft LanesFactoris2DividedNo -5% 2DividedNo -5% 4DividedNo -25% 4Divided $78,800$ MultiUndividedNo0MultiUndividedYesMultiUndividedNo1Divided $45,600$ 7DividedYesMultiUndividedNo2DividedYesMultiUndivided1Intercetional2DividedYesMultiUndivided1LaneeD	4	Divided	*	37,900	39,800	**	6	70,100	97 800) 12	3 600
8 Divided * 78,800 80,100 ** Class II (35 mph or slower posted speed limit) Lanes Median B C D E 2 Undivided * 7,300 14,800 15,600 4 Divided * 14,500 32,400 33,800 6 Divided * 23,300 50,000 50,900 8 Divided * 32,000 67,300 68,100 10 115,300 158,900 203, 12 136,500 192,400 246, Lanes B C 4 45,900 62,700 75, 6 6 8,900 93,900 125,200 151, 10 115,000 156,800 189, 10 115,000 156,800 1	6	Divided	*	58 400	59,000	**	8	92,200	128 900) 16	4 200
Class II (35 mph or slower posted speed limit) Lanes Median B C D E 2 Undivided * 14,500 32,400 33,800 6 Divided * 23,300 50,000 50,900 8 Divided * 32,000 67,300 68,1001212136,500 192,400 246, 1212136,500 192,400 246, 12Lanes B C 4 45,900 62,700 75, 6 6 Bivided * 32,000 67,300 68,10013Non-State Signalized Roadway Adjustments (Alter corresponding state volumes by the indicated percent.) Non-State Signalized Roadways - 10%10115,000 156,800 189, 10Median & Turn Lane Adjustments Exclusive Exclusive Adjustments Exclusive Exclusive Adjustments Exclusive Adjustments Multi Undivided Yes No -5%, 010115,000 156,800 189, 10Median & Strum Lane Adjustments Exclusive Adjustment Multi Undivided Yes No -25%, Yes +5%No No -25%, 4 Divided 36,300 78,800Multi Undivided No No -25%, Yes +5%Divided Yes No -3%, Multi Undivided No No -25%, 10Divided Yes No -45%, 4 Divided Yes No -45%, 10Multi Undivided Yes Noures in this table by 0.6Unitic Undivided Yes Noulter/Bicycle Lanee Coverage B C D E 0.44%, * 2,900 7,600 19,700 >19,700 19,700 19,700 19,700 \$25.100%, 9,300 19,700 >19,700 >19,700 \$25.100%, 9,300 19,700 >19,700 \$25.100%, 9,300 19,700 >19,700 \$25.100%, 9,300 19,700 >19,700 \$25.100%, 9,300 19,700 >19,700 \$25.	8	Divided	*	78 800	80,100	**	10	115 300	158 900	20^{-10}	3 600
Class II (35 mph or slower posted speed limit)It we hold the lease to the limit limit of the lease below in the limit		Divided		70,000	00,100		10	136,500	192,400	20 24	6.200
Lanes A DividedMedian $*$ 1,500 2,30014,800 3,80015,600 414,500 3,80014,500 3,80014,500 3,80014,500 414,500 414,500 3,80015,600 615,700 7,5015,700 7,5015,700 7,5015,700 7,5015,700 7,5015,700 7,5015,700 7,5015,700 7,5015,700 7,50015,700 815,700 9,70015,700 15,80018,700 12,5,20015,700 15,80018,700 12,5,20015,700 15,80018,700 12,5,20015,700 15,80018,700 12,5,20015,700 15,70015,700 16,70018,700 12,70017,700 15,80018,700 12,5,20015,700 13,70018,700 12,70018,700 12,70018,700 12,70011,700 12,70018,700 1	((Class II (35 r	nph or slo	wer posted	l speed lim	it)			TT1		- ,
12Unitided*1,30013,8004Divided*14,50032,40033,8006Divided*23,30050,00050,9008Divided*32,00067,30068,1008Divided*32,00067,30068,1008Divided*32,00067,30066,890093,900113,9Non-State Signalized Roadway Adjustments (Alter corresponding state volumes by the indicated percent.) Non-State Signalized Roadways - 10%Freeway Adjustments Auxiliary Lanes Present in Both Directions + 20,0001LanesMedianLeft LanesFreeway Adjustment Auxiliary Lanes Present in Both Directions + 20,0001UndividedNo-2Unitrerupted FLOW HI Lanes Auxiliary Lanes1LanesMedianBC202DividedYesNo21UndividedNo204DividedYes01UndividedYesYes1Multiply the corresponding two-directional volumes.)No1BICYCLE MODE ² (Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway alaes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.)2PavedSiboulder/Bicycle2Lane CoverageBCD- </td <td>Lanes</td> <td>Median</td> <td>В *</td> <td>7 200</td> <td>D</td> <td>E 15 (00</td> <td>Tamaa</td> <td>П</td> <td>Urban</td> <td>zea</td> <td>D</td>	Lanes	Median	В *	7 200	D	E 15 (00	Tamaa	П	Urban	zea	D
4Divided $*$ 14,30052,40053,8006Divided*23,30050,00050,900668,90093,90013,8Divided*32,00067,30068,100891,900125,200151,10115,000156,800189,10115,000156,800189, Non-State Signalized Roadways -10% Median & Turn Lane Adjustments LanesKedian & Turn Lane AdjustmentsLanesKedian & State ValueseAdjustmentLanesMedian & YesNo+ 25%,2UndividedYesNo+ 5%,2UndividedYesNo- 25%,Yes+ 25%,Multi UndividedNoNo- 25%,Yes+ 25%,Multi ply the corresponding two-directional volumes in this table by 0.610 BICYCLE MODE2 (Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.)PavedShouldler/BicycleLane CoverageBCD0.49% 2 ,9007,60019,70050-84%2,1006,70019,70055-84%2,1006,70019,70055-84%2,1006,70019,70055-84%2,1006,70019,70055-100%9,30019,700>19,70056-84%2,1006,70019,700<		Divided	*	14,500	14,800	13,000	Lanes	D 45 000	$c_{2,200}$. 7	D 5 (00
6Divided*23,300 $50,000$ $50,900$ $52,900$ $115, 8$ 8Divided* $32,000$ $67,300$ $68,900$ $93,900$ $125,200$ $151, 10$ Non-State Signalized Roadway Adjustments (Alter corresponding state volumes by the indicated percent.) Non-State Signalized Roadways -10% 8 $91,900$ $125,200$ $151, 10$ Non-State Signalized Roadways -10% Median & Turn Lane Adjustments ExclusiveExclusive Adjustments Exclusive Exclusive Adjustment 2Divided Yes $N0$ -5% 2UndividedNo -20% 2 Undivided 11,700 $18,000$ 4DividedNo -25% 2 Undivided 36,300 $52,600$ MultiUndividedYes $N0$ 2 Divided $78,800$ Median B C 2 2 Undivided Yes $8,91,900$ $125,200$ MultiUndividedNo -25% 6 Divided 4 $78,800$ Median Exclusive left lanes 2 Divided NoNo -25% Median Exclusive left lanes 2 Divided Y	4	Divided	*	14,500	32,400	33,800	4	45,900	62,700) /	5,600
8Divided* $32,000$ $67,300$ $68,100$ 8 $91,900$ $122,200$ $151,10$ Non-State Signalized Roadway Adjustments (Alter corresponding state volumes by the indicated percent.)Image: Signalized Roadway acceleration of the signalized Roadway acceleration accelerati	6	Divided	*	23,300	50,000	50,900	6	68,900	93,900) 11	3,600
Non-State Signalized Roadway Adjustments (Alter corresponding state volumes by the indicated percent.) Non-State Signalized Roadways - 10% Freeway Adjustments (Alter corresponding state volumes by the indicated percent.) Non-State Signalized Roadways - 10% Median & Turn Lane Adjustments Exclusive Exclusive Adjustments (Alter corresponding two-directional volumes in this table by 0.6 Multi Undivided Yes Non - 52% (Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) Paved Shoulder/Bicycle Lane Coverage B C D E O 49% s 2,000 7,000 19,700 >19,700 s 5-100% 9,3300 19,700 >19,700 >19,700 s 5-100% 9,3300 19,700 >19,700 *18,700 ¹Dust shown acondiferrack nomobile track nomable track	8	Divided	*	32,000	67,300	68,100	8	91,900	125,200) 15	1,300
Non-State Signalized Roadways Adjustments							10	115,000	156,800) 18	9,300
Four-struct organization of the structure in the stable of the structure in the structure in the stable of the structure in the s	,	Non-State Si	analized	Roadway	Adjustma	nte		Г	moowow Ad	instmont	-
Image: State Signalized Roadways - 10% Median & Turn Lane Adjustments Exclusive Exclusive Exclusive Adjustments Lanes Median Left Lanes Right Lanes Present in Both Directions 2 Divided 2 Undivided Nulti Undivided Non-State Signalized Roadways - 10% 2 Undivided 2 Undivided 2 Undivided Nulti Undivided Multi Undivided Multi Undivided Multipy the corresponding two-directional volumes.) Yes BICYCLE MODE ² Wulti (Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) - Values shown are presented as two-way annual average daily service and are for the automobile track modes unless specific or the bicycle and pedestrian modes in this table is do to corridor or intersection segne, which this table is do the HCM i and Quality of Service Manual. ¹ Values shown are only for the peak hour in the single of the corridor or intersection deriving corridor or intersection deriving corridor or intersection segne, which this table is do into single pholescience. The computer models from which this table is do service Delater ande of the HCM i and Quality of Service Manual.<		(Alter	r correspond	ing state volu	Aujustinei mes	lits		F Auviliary Lan	reeway Au	Justmen	S Ramn
Non-State Šignalized Roadways - 10% Non-State Šignalized Roadways - 10% Median & Turn Lane Adjustments Exclusive Exclusive Adjustment Lanes Median Left Lanes Right Lanes Factors 2 Divided Yes No +20,000 2 Undivided No +20,000 4 Divided Yes No 4 Divided Yes No 4 Divided Yes Yes Multi Undivided Yes No Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) Yalues shown are only for the peak hour in the single class. Shoulder/Bicycle Lane Coverage B C D Lane Coverage B C D E 0-49% 2,900 7,600 </td <td></td> <td>(7 110)</td> <td>by the indica</td> <td>ted percent.)</td> <td>lines</td> <td></td> <td>Pres</td> <td>ent in Both Dir</td> <td>rections</td> <td></td> <td>Metering</td>		(7 110)	by the indica	ted percent.)	lines		Pres	ent in Both Dir	rections		Metering
Median & Turn Lane Adjustments Lanes Median Left Lanes Right Lanes Factors 2 Divided Yes No +5% 2 Undivided No No -20% Multi Undivided Yes No -5% Multi Undivided Yes No -20% Multi Undivided Yes +5% Multi Undivided Yes +5% Multipy the corresponding two-directional volumes in this table by 0.6 One-Way Facility Adjustment Nultiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) Values shown are presented as two-way annual average dails service and are for the automobil-fruck models from which his table is down or specific planning applications. The table and deriving conton to used for which his table is down or specific planning applications. The table and deriving conton to used on planning applications of the HCM and this table is down or specific planning applications of the HCM and this table is down or specific planning applications of the HCM and this table is down or specific planning applications of the HCM and this table is down or specific planning applications of the HCM and the specified or values of bookers planning applications of the HCM and the specified or values of the specified or the beach determine two-way maximum service volumes.) Paved Sh		Non-State	Śignalized	Roadways	- 10%		1103	+20,000	cettons		+5%
Exclusive Exclusive Adjustment Lanes Median Left Lanes Right Lanes Factors 2 Divided Yes No +5% 2 Undivided Yes No -20% Multi Undivided Yes No -20% Multi Undivided Yes No -20% Multi Undivided No No -22% - - Yes +5% One-Way Facility Adjustment Multiply the corresponding two-directional volumes in this table by 0.6 Uninterrupted Flow Highway Ad Multiply vehicle volumes is this table by 0.6 Uninterrupted Flow Highway Ad Multiply vehicle volumes is down below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) 'Values shown are presented as two-way annual average dails excication design, where more recalculations are based on planning applications. The computer models from which this table is defining applications. The table and deriving control the standard and should be used only for gen applications. The table and deriving control the standard and should be used only for yet and plantion or intersection design, where more recalculations are based on planning applications of the HCM is and Quality of Service Manaul. ¹ Lane Coverage B C D <td< th=""><th></th><th>Median</th><th>& Turn I</th><th>ane Adiu</th><th>stments</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></td<>		Median	& Turn I	ane Adiu	stments						
Lanes Median Left Lanes Right Lanes Factors 2 Divided Yes No +5% 2 Undivided Yes No +5% 2 Undivided No No -20% Multi Undivided Yes No -5% Multi Undivided No No -25% - - Yes +5% - - Yes +5% One-Way Facility Adjustment Multiply the corresponding two-directional volumes in this table by 0.6 Undivided Yes Median Exclusive left lanes 2 Divided Yes Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) 'Values shown are presented as two-way annual average daily service and are for the automobile/ruke modes unless specific planning applications. The table and deriving contact the service or intersection design. where more recalculations are based on planning applications of the HCM and Quality of Service Manual. 'Lanee Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) 'Level of service or the bicycle and pedestrian modes in this of vehicles, not number of bicyclis		1. Iculum	Exclusive	e Exclu	isive A	djustment	τ	J NINTERR	UPTED F	LOW H	HGHW
2 Divided Yes No +5% 2 Undivided No No -20% Multi Undivided Yes No -20% - - - -5% 6 Divided 54,600 78,800 One-Way Facility Adjustment Multiply the corresponding two-directional volumes in this table by 0.6 Undivided Yes BICYCLE MODE ² (Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) Yalues shown are presented as two-way annual average daily core and ref or the automobileturck modes unleadering of constored or paintersection design, where more recalculations are based and particulations are based on planning applications of the HCM and Quality of Service Manual. Paved Shoulder/Bicycle E Lane Coverage B C D E 0-49% * 2,900 7,600 19,700 ** *	Lanes	Median	Left Lane	s Right	Lanes	Factors	Lanes	Median	В	С	D
2 Undivided No -20% Multi Undivided Yes No -5% Multi Undivided No No -25% - - Yes +5% One-Way Facility Adjustment Multiply the corresponding two-directional volumes in this table by 0.6 Uninterrupted Flow Highway Ad BICYCLE MODE ² Multi Undivided Yes (Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) Values shown are presented as two-way annual average daily service and are for the automobile/truck modes unless specific planning applications. The computer models from which this table is do more specific planning applications of the HCM at and Quilty of Service Manual. Paved Shoulder/Bicycle Lane Coverage B C D Lane Coverage B C D E -3 Buses per hour shown are only for the peak hour in the single of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) -3 Buses per hour shown are only for the peak hour in the single of directional roadway mases to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) Sidewalk Coverage B C D E Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0-49% <td>2</td> <td>Divided</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>N</td> <td>0</td> <td>+5%</td> <td>2</td> <td>Undivided</td> <td>11,700</td> <td>18,000</td> <td>24,200</td>	2	Divided	Yes	N	0	+5%	2	Undivided	11,700	18,000	24,200
Multi Undivided Yes No -5% Multi Undivided No No -25% - - Yes + 5% One-Way Facility Adjustment Multiply the corresponding two-directional volumes in this table by 0.6 Uninterrupted Flow Highway Ad Divided Yes Multi Undivided Yes Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) 1 Values shown are presented as two-way annual average daily service and are for the automobile/truck modes unless specifit does not constitute a standard and should be used only for get applications. The table and deriving circulations are based on planning applications. The table and deriving circulations are based on planning applications of the HCM and Quality of Service Manual. *2 Paved Shoulder/Bicycle Lane Coverage Lane Coverage B C D 0-49% * 2,900 7,600 19,700 50-84% 2,100 6,700 19,700 8 PEDESTRIAN MODE ² * * (Multiply vehicle volumes, bown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) * *	2	Undivided	No	Ν	0	-20%	4	Divided	36,300	52,600	66,200
Multi Undivided No -25% - - Yes +5% One-Way Facility Adjustment Uninterrupted Flow Highway Ad Multi Unlivided Yes Multi Undivided No Yalues shown are presented as two-way annual average daily service and are for the automobile/track modes unless queting to the set of the set of service from which this table is de triving or on the set of the HCM is and Quality of Service Manal. Shoulder/Bicycle A A Lane Coverage B	Multi	Undivided	Yes	N	0	-5%	6	Divided	54,600	78,800	99,400
 Yes + 5% One-Way Facility Adjustment Multiply the corresponding two-directional volumes in this table by 0.6 BICYCLE MODE² (Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) Paved Shoulder/Bicycle Lane Coverage B C D E 0-49% * 2,900 7,600 19,700 85-100% 9,300 19,700 >19,700 >19,700 85-100% 9,300 19,700 >19,700 *** PEDESTRIAN MODE² (Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0-49% * 2,900 7,600 19,700 >19,700 85-100% 9,300 19,700 >19,700 *** Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0-49% * 2,000 7,600 19,700 *** Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0-49% * 2,900 7,600 19,700 *** Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0-49% * 2,000 7,600 19,700 *** Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0-49% * 2,000 7,600 19,700 *** 	Multi	Undivided	No	N	0	-25%					
One-Way Facility Adjustment Multiply the corresponding two-directional Wultiply the corresponding two-directional volumes in this table by 0.6 BICYCLE MODE ² (Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) Paved Shoulder/Bicycle Lane Coverage B 0-49% * 2,900 50-84% 2,100 6,700 19,700 85-100% 9,300 9,300 19,700 85-100% 9,300 19,700 >19,700 ** Not applicable for that level of service letter grade. For the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade. For the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade. For the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade. For the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade. For the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade. For the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade. For the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade. For the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade. For the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade. For the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade. For the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade. For the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade. For the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade. For the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade. For the b	-	—	-	Ye	es	+ 5%		Uninterrup	ted Flow Hi	ghway A	djustme
2 Divided Yes Multiply the corresponding two-directional volumes in this table by 0.6 Yes BICYCLE MODE ² Multi Undivided Yes (Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) Values shown are presented as two-way annual average daily service and are for the automobile/truck modes unless specific design. Where more recalculations. The computer models from which this table is de more specific planning applications. The table and deriving control to be used for corridor or intersection design, where more recalculations are based on planning applications of the HCM and Quality of Service for the bicycle and pedestrian modes in this of vehicles, not number of bicyclists or pedestrians using the software shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) ² Level of service for the bicycle and pedestrian modes in this of vehicles, not number of bicyclists or pedestrians using the software than level of service better grade. For the sorteware than level of service better grade. For the force the bicycle mode, the level of service better grade. For the fore the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade. For the fore the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade. For the fore the bicycle mode, the level of service better grade. For the fore the bicycle mode, the level of service better grade. For the fore the bicycle mode, the level of service better grade. For the fore the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade. For the fore the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade. For the fore the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade. For the fore the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade (finctube) because there		Ore V	Vor Fosil	:4 A J:4			Lanes	Median	Exclusive l	eft lanes	Adjustn
Multiply the corresponding two-unectional volumes in this table by 0.6 BICYCLE MODE ² (Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) Paved Shoulder/Bicycle Lane Coverage B C D E 0-49% * 2,900 7,600 19,700 50-84% 2,100 6,700 19,700 >19,700 85-100% 9,300 19,700 >19,700 ** CMultiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) ** Cannot be achieved using table input value defaults. ** Not applicable for that level of service D become F because intersection For the bicycle nod, the level of service tetter grade. (includ because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using 50,000 \$** Not applicable for that level of service tetter grade. (includ because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using 50,000		Une-V Multiply f	way racii	ity Adjust	ment		2	Divided	Yes	3	-
Multi Undivided No Multi Undivided No Multi Undivided No BICYCLE MODE ² (Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) Paved Shoulder/Bicycle Lane Coverage B C D E onto be used for corridor or intersection design, where more recalculations are based on planning applications of the HCM and Quality of Service Manual. ² Level of service for the bicycle and pedestrian modes in this of vehicles, not number of bicyclists or pedestrians using the to service leter grade. For the single of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) ³ Buses per hour shown are only for the peak hour in the single of flow. Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0-49% * 2,800 9,500 \$ No Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0-49% * * 2,800 9,500 \$ S Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0-49% * * 2,800 9,500 \$ S		winnpiy t	lumes in thi	is table by 0	6		Multi	Undivided	Yes	3	
BICYCLE MODE ² (Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) Paved Shoulder/Bicycle Lane Coverage B C D E 0-49% 2,100 6,700 19,700 >19,700 50-84% 2,100 6,700 19,700 >19,700 85-100% 9,300 19,700 >19,700 ** PEDESTRIAN MODE ² (Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0-49% * 2,800 9,500 * Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0-49% * 2,800 9,500 \$ Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0-49% * 2,800 9,500 \$ \$ Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0-49% * * 2,800 9,500 Source *		•0	funcs in un	is table by 0.	0		Multi	Undivided	No		-
(Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) service and are for the automobile/truck modes unless specific does not constitute a standard and should be used only for get applications. The table and derving or not be used for corridor or intersection design, where more re Calculations are based on planning applications of the HCM at and Quality of Service Manual. Paved Shoulder/Bicycle Lane Coverage B C D 0-49% * 2,900 7,600 19,700 50-84% 2,100 6,700 19,700 55-100% 9,300 19,700 >19,700 85-100% 9,300 19,700 >19,700 Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) * Cannot be achieved using table input value defaults. ** Not applicable for that level of service letter grade. For the greater than level of service letter grade (includ) because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using Fource'.]	BICYCLI	E MODE ²			¹ Values s	hown are presented	l as two-way annu	al average da	aily volumes fo
directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) does not constitute a standard and should be used only for get applications. The computer models from which this table is do more specific planning applications. The table is do more specific planning applications of the HCM and Quality of Service Manual. Paved Lane Coverage B C D E 0-49% * 2,900 7,600 19,700 and Quality of Service Manual. * Level of service for the bicycle and pedestrian modes in this of vehicles, not number of bicyclists or pedestrians using the standard and should be used only for the peak hour in the single of the vehicles, not number of bicyclists or pedestrians using the standard and should be used only for get applications. The computer models from which this table is do more specific planning applications of the HCM and Quality of Service for the bicycle and pedestrian modes in this of vehicles, not number of bicyclists or pedestrians using the standard and should be used only for the peak hour in the single of thow. PEDESTRIAN MODE ² * Cannot be achieved using table input value defaults. ** Not applicable for that level of service because intersection For the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade (includit because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using the cause there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using the cause there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using the standard and should be used only the peak hour in the single of the bicycle mode, the level of service D become F because intersection For the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade (includit because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using t		(Multiply v	vehicle volur	nes shown be	low by numb	er of	service a	nd are for the auton	nobile/truck mode	s unless spec	ifically stated.
Volumes.) Paved Paved Shoulder/Bicycle Lane Coverage B C D E 0-49% * 2,900 7,600 19,700 50-84% 2,100 6,700 19,700 >19,700 50-84% 2,100 6,700 19,700 >19,700 85-100% 9,300 19,700 >19,700 ** PEDESTRIAN MODE ² (Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) * Cannot be achieved using table input value defaults. Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0-49% * 2,800 9,500 Source:	d	irectional roadw	ay lanes to d	letermine two	o-way maxim	um service	does not	constitute a standar	d and should be us	sed only for g	general plannii derived shoul
Paved Shoulder/Bicycle Lane Coverage B C D E 0-49% * 2,900 7,600 19,700 50-84% 2,100 6,700 19,700 >19,700 50-84% 2,100 6,700 19,700 >19,700 85-100% 9,300 19,700 >19,700 ** PEDESTRIAN MODE ² (Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) * Cannot be achieved using table input value defaults. Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0-49% * 2,800 9,500 Source:			volu	mes.)			more spe	cific planning appli	cations. The table	and deriving	computer mo
Shoulder/Bicycle Lane Coverage B C D E 0-49% * 2,900 7,600 19,700 50-84% 2,100 6,700 19,700 >19,700 85-100% 9,300 19,700 >19,700 ** PEDESTRIAN MODE ² (Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) * Cannot be achieved using table input value defaults. Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0-49% * 2,800 9,500 Source:	F P	Paved					not be us	ed for corridor or in	itersection design,	where more	refined techni
Lane Coverage B C D E 0-49% * 2,900 7,600 19,700 50-84% 2,100 6,700 19,700 >19,700 85-100% 9,300 19,700 >19,700 ** PEDESTRIAN MODE ² (Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) * Not applicable for that level of service D become F because intersection For the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade (includit because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using Source:	Should	der/Bicycle					and Qual	ity of Service Manu	ial.	is of the HCI	
0-49% * 2,900 7,600 19,700 50-84% 2,100 6,700 19,700 >19,700 85-100% 9,300 19,700 >19,700 ** PEDESTRIAN MODE ² (Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) * Cannot be achieved using table input value defaults. Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0-49% * * 2,800 9,500	Lane	Coverage	В	С	D	E	2				
50-84% 2,100 6,700 19,700 >19,700 85-100% 9,300 19,700 >19,700 ** PEDESTRIAN MODE ² (Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) * Cannot be achieved using table input value defaults. Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0-49% * * 2.800 9.500	0)-49%	*	2,900	7,600	19,700	of vehicle	es, not number of bi	ycle and pedestria icyclists or pedest	n modes in t rians using th	his table is bas ne facility.
85-100% 9,300 19,700 >19,700 ** PEDESTRIAN MODE ² (Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) * Cannot be achieved using table input value defaults. Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0-49% * * 2,800 9,500 Source:	50	0-84%	2,100	6,700	19,700	>19,700	or venier	int number of b	legensis or pedest	interior disting di	ie idenity.
PEDESTRIAN MODE ² (Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0-49% * 2.800 9.500 Source:	85	5-100%	9,300	19,700	>19,700	**	³ Buses pe flow.	er hour shown are o	nly for the peak ho	ur in the sing	le direction of t
(Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) ** Not applicable for that level of service letter grade. For the greater than level of service D become F because intersection For the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade (includi because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using the service letter grade (includi because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using the service letter grade (includi because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using the service letter grade (includi because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using the service letter grade (includi because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using the service letter grade (includi because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using the service letter grade (includi because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using the service letter grade (includi because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using the service letter grade (includi because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using the service letter grade (includi because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using the service letter grade (includi because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using the service letter grade (includi because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using the service letter grade (includi because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using the service letter grade (includi because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using the service letter grade (includi because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using the service letter grade (includi because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using the service letter grade (includi because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using the service letter grade (includi because there is no maximum vehicle volume the service letter grade (includi because there is no maxim		PE	DESTRL	AN MOD	E^2		* Cannot	be achieved using	table input value o	lefaults	
directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.) Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0-49% * * 2.800 9.500	(Mu	ltiply vehicle vo	olumes show	n below by m	umber of		Cannot	be achieved using	table input value c	ierauns.	
Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0-49% * * 2.800 9.500 Source:	direc	ctional roadway l	lanes to deter	rmine two-wa	ay maximum	service	** Not ap	plicable for that level of service	vel of service lette	r grade. For	the automobile
Sidewalk Coverage B C D E 0-49% * 2.800 9.500 Source			volui	mes.)			For the b	icycle mode, the lev	vel of service lette	er grade (incl	uding F) is not
0-49% * * 2.800 9.500 Source	Sidewal	lk Coverage	В	С	D	E	because t	here is no maximun	n vehicle volume	threshold usi	ng table input
2,000 2,000 00000	0)-49%	*	*	2,800	9,500	Source:				
50-84% * 1,600 8,700 15,800 Florida Department of Transportation	50	0-84%	*	1,600	8,700	15,800	Florida D	epartment of Trans	portation fice		
85-100% 3,800 10,700 17,400 >19,700 https://www.fdot.gov/planning/systems/	85	5-100%	3,800	10,700	17,400	>19,700	https://wv	ww.fdot.gov/planning	g/systems/		
BUS MODE (Scheduled Fixed Route) ³		BUS MOI	DE (Sched	luled Fixe	d Route) ³						
(Buses in peak hour in peak direction)		(Buses	in peak hou	r in peak dire	ction)						
Sidewalk Coverage B C D E	Sidewa	lk Coverage	В	С	D	Е					
$0-84\%$ >5 ≥ 4 ≥ 3 ≥ 2	0)-84%	> 5	≥ 4	\geq 3	≥ 2					
$85-100\% > 4 \geq 3 \geq 2 \geq 1$	85	5-100%	>4	\geq 3	≥ 2	≥ 1					

January 2020

			FREE	WAYS		
			Core Ur	hanized		
	Lanes	В	C		D	Е
	4	47.600	66.4	00 83	3.200	87.300
	6	70,100	97.80	12^{-3}	3.600	131.200
	8	92,200	128.90	164	4.200	174.700
	10	115.300	158.90	20°	3.600	218.600
	12	136 500	192.4	200 246	5 200	272,900
	12	120,200	172,1	210	,200	272,200
		_	Urba	nized	_	_
	Lanes	В	C		D	E
	4	45,900	62,70	00 75	5,600	85,400
	6	68,900	93,90	0 113	3,600	128,100
0	8	91,900	125,20	0 151	,300	170,900
	10	115,000	156,80	00 189	9,300	213,600
		F	reeway A	djustment	5	
	D	Auxiliary Lan	es		Ramp	
	Prese	± 20.000	ections		⊥ 5%	
		+ 20,000			+ 570	
	τ	ININTERR	UPTED	FLOW H	IGHWA	YS
	Lanes	Median	B	С	D	E
	2	Undivided	11.700	18.000	24.200	32.600
	4	Divided	36.300	52.600	66.200	75.300
	6	Divided	54.600	78.800	99.400	113.100
	-		- ,		,	-)
		Uninterrupt	ed Flow H	Iighwav A	diustmen	its
	Lanes	Uninterrupt Median	ed Flow H Exclusive	lighway A e left lanes	djustmen Adjustm	ts ent factors
	Lanes 2	Uninterrupt Median Divided	ed Flow H Exclusive Y	lighway A e left lanes es	djustmen Adjustm +	ts ent factors 5%
	Lanes 2 Multi	Uninterrupt Median Divided Undivided	ed Flow H Exclusive Y Y	lighway A e left lanes es es	djustmen Adjustm +	ts ent factors 5% 5%
	Lanes 2 Multi Multi	Uninterrupt Median Divided Undivided Undivided	ed Flow H Exclusive Y Y N	lighway A e left lanes es es Io	djustmen Adjustm + -: -2	ts ent factors 5% 5% 25%
	Lanes 2 Multi ¹ Values s	Uninterrupt Median Divided Undivided Undivided	ed Flow H Exclusive Y Y N	lighway A e left lanes es es lo	djustmen Adjustm + -2	ts ent factors 5% 5%
	Lanes 2 Multi ¹ Values s service ar	Uninterrupt Median Divided Undivided Undivided hown are presented a are for the autom	ed Flow F Exclusive Y Y N as two-way an obile/truck mod	Highway A e left lanes es es lo nual average dai des unless speci	djustmen Adjustm + -2 ily volumes for fically stated.	ts ent factors 5% 5% 25% r levels of Fhis table
	Lanes 2 Multi ¹ Values s service ar does not a application	Uninterrupt Median Divided Undivided Undivided hown are presented and are for the autom constitute a standard	ed Flow F Exclusive Y Y N as two-way an obile/truck mod l and should be	Highway A e left lanes es es to nual average dai des unless specit used only for g ich this table is.	djustmen Adjustm + -2 ily volumes for fically stated, ' eneral planning derived should	ts ent factors 5% 5% 25% r levels of This table
	Lanes 2 Multi Multi ¹ Values s service ar does not a applicatio more spec	Uninterrupt Median Divided Undivided Undivided Undivided hown are presented at are for the autom constitute a standard ons. The computer n cific planning applied	ed Flow F Exclusive Y Y N as two-way an obile/truck moe a and should be nodels from wh cations. The tab	Highway A e left lanes es es lo nual average dai des unless specii used only for gr ich this table is le and deriving	djustmen Adjustm + -: -2 ily volumes for fically stated. eneral planning derived should computer mod	ts ent factors 5% 5% 5% 5% r levels of this table g be used for els should
	Lanes 2 Multi Multi ¹ Values s service ar does not applicatio more spec- not be use	Uninterrupt Median Divided Undivided Undivided divided hown are presented ad are for the autom constitute a standard ons. The computer n cific planning applied for corridor or in see are based on pla	ed Flow F Exclusive Y Y N as two-way an obile/truck moo obile/truck moo obile/truck moo obile/truck moo hard for the tab	Highway A e left lanes es es lo nual average dai des unless specir used only for g ich this table is ble and deriving n, where more 1	djustmen Adjustm + -: -2 ily volumes for fically stated. 7 eneral planning derived should computer mod refined technig (and the Trans	ts ent factors 5% 5% 25% elevels of this table g be used for els should ues exist.
	Lanes 2 Multi Multi ¹ Values s service ar does not applicatio more spee not be uss Calculati and Quali	Uninterrupt Median Divided Undivided Undivided undivided hown are presented ad are for the autom constitute a standarc ons. The computer n cific planning applie ed for corridor or in ons are based on pla ity of Service Manu	ed Flow H Exclusive Y Y N as two-way am obile/truck mod l and should be nodels from wh cations. The tab tersection desig mnning applicati al.	Highway A e left lanes es es lo nual average dai des unless speci- used only for g ich this table is le and deriving m, where more r ons of the HCM	djustmen Adjustm + -2 ily volumes for fically stated. 7 eneral planning derived should computer mod refined techniq i and the Trans	ts ent factors 5% 5% 25% r levels of This table g be used for els should ues exist. it Capacity
	Lanes 2 Multi ¹ Values s service ar does not o applicatio more spec calculatic and Quali	Uninterrupt Median Divided Undivided Undivided dundivided hown are presented dare for the autom constitute a standard ons. The computer n cific planning applie do for corridor or in nons are based on pla ity of Service Manu	ed Flow H Exclusive Y Y N as two-way an obile/truck moo l and should be nodels from wh cations. The tab tersection desig nning applicati al.	Highway A e left lanes es es lo nual average dai des unless speci used only for g ich this table is le and deriving n, where more to ons of the HCM	djustmen Adjustm + -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2	ts ent factors 5% 5% 25% r levels of This table g be used for els should ues exist. it Capacity
0	Lanes 2 Multi ¹ Values s service ar does not of application more speat not be use Calculation and Qualit ² Level of of vehicle	Uninterrupt Median Divided Undivided Undivided dundivided hown are presented dare for the autom constitute a standard ons. The computer n cific planning applie d for corridor or in ons are based on pla ity of Service Manu	ed Flow H Exclusive Y Y N as two-way an obile/truck moo l and should be nodels from wh cations. The tab ming applicati al.	Highway A e left lanes es es to nual average dai des unless specir used only for g ich this table is- ole and deriving n, where more r ons of the HCM ian modes in th	djustmen Adjustm + -2 dy volumes for fically stated. 7 eneral planning derived should computer mod refined techniq t and the Trans is table is based e facility.	ts ent factors 5% 5% 25% r levels of This table g be used for els should ues exist. it Capacity d on number
000	Lanes 2 Multi Multi ¹ Values s service ar does not (applicatio more spect not be use Calculatic and Quali ² Level of of vehicle	Uninterrupt Median Divided Undivided Undivided Undivided dare for the autom constitute a standard ons. The computer n cific planning applie ed for corridor or in pass are based on pla ity of Service Manu service for the bicy es, not number of bi-	ed Flow F Exclusive Y Y N as two-way an obile/truck mov a ad should be nodels from wh cations. The tab tersection desig nnning applicati al. vcle and pedestri cyclists or pede	Highway A e left lanes es es lo nual average dai des unless specii used only for gr ich this table is- le and deriving m, where more r ons of the HCM rian modes in the strians using the	djustmen Adjustm + -: -2 ily volumes for fically stated. 7 eneral planning derived should computer mod refined techniq i and the Trans is table is base e facility.	ts ent factors 5% 5% 5% 5% clevels of this table g be used for els should ues exist. it Capacity d on number
000	Lanes 2 Multi Multi ¹ Values s service ar does not a applicatio more spec not be uss Calculatio and Quali ² Level of of vehicle ³ Buses pe flow.	Uninterrupt Median Divided Undivided Undivided undivided date for the autom constitute a standar ons. The computer m cific planning applie def for corridor or in ons are based on pla ity of Service Manu service for the bicy se, not number of bic	ed Flow F Exclusive Y Y N as two-way an obile/truck mod bole/truck mod obile/truck mod obile/truck mod obile/truck mod as two-way an obile/truck mod bole/truck mod as two-way an obile/truck mod obile/truck mod as two-way an obile/truck mod as two-way as two-way as two- struck mod as two-way as two- two- struck mod as two- struck mod as two- two- struck mod as two- struck mod as two- two- struck mod as two- struck mod a	Highway A e left lanes es es lo nual average dai des unless specif used only for g ich this table is de and deriving m, where more r ons of the HCM rian modes in th strians using the	djustmen Adjustm + -: -2 ily volumes for fically stated. 7 eneral planning derived should computer mod refined techniq f and the Trans is table is based e facility.	ts ent factors 5% 5% 5% 5% cf levels of fhis table g be used for els should ues exist. it Capacity d on number e higher traffic
000	Lanes 2 Multi Multi ¹ Values s service ar does not applicatio more spee not be use Calculatii and Quali ² Level of of vehicle ³ Buses pe flow.	Uninterrupt Median Divided Undivided Undivided Undivided hown are presented ad are for the autom constitute a standarc ons. The computer m cific planning applie ed for corridor or in ons are based on pla ity of Service Manu constance of the bicy es, not number of bic er hour shown are on	ed Flow H Exclusive Y Y N as two-way an obile/truck mod l and should be nodels from wh rations. The tab tersection desig mnning applicati al. vcle and pedestr cyclists or pede	Highway A e left lanes es es lo nual average dai des unless specif used only for g ich this table is le and deriving m, where more r ons of the HCM tian modes in th strians using the	djustmen Adjustm + -2 ily volumes for fically stated. 7 eneral planning derived should computer mod refined techniq i and the Trans is table is base e facility. e direction of th	ts ent factors 5% 5% 25% r levels of Chis table g be used for els should ues exist. it Capacity d on number e higher traffic
000	Lanes 2 Multi Multi ¹ Values s service ar does not o applicatio more spec not be uso Calculati and Quali ² Level of of vehicle ³ Buses pe flow. * Cannot	Uninterrupt Median Divided Undivided Undivided Undivided hown are presented ad are for the autom constitute a standard ons. The computer n cific planning applie ed for corridor or in ons are based on pla ity of Service Manu cost are based on pla ity of Service for the bicy es, not number of bi er hour shown are or be achieved using t	ed Flow H Exclusive Y Y N as two-way am obile/truck mod l and should be nodels from wh aations. The tab tersection desig mining applicati al. vcle and pedestr cyclists or pede ally for the peak	Highway A e left lanes es es lo nual average dai des unless specif used only for g ich this table is le and deriving (n, where more r ons of the HCM rian modes in th strians using the hour in the single e defaults.	djustmen Adjustm + -2 ily volumes for fically stated. 7 eneral planning derived should computer mod refined techniq I and the Trans is table is base e facility. e direction of th	ts ent factors 5% 5% 25% r levels of This table be used for els should ues exist. it Capacity d on number e higher traffic
000	Lanes 2 Multi ¹ Values s service ar does not o applicatio more spee not be uso Calculati and Quali ² Level of of vehicle ³ Buses pe flow. * Cannot ** Not ap	Uninterrupt Median Divided Undivided Undivided Undivided hown are presented da are for the autom constitute a standard ons. The computer n cific planning applie d for corridor or in ons are based on pla effor corridor or in ons are based on pla effort and the based of correct of the bicy of correct or the bicy of correct of the bicy of the bicy of correct of the bicy of the bicy of th	ed Flow H Exclusive Y Y N as two-way am obile/truck moo l and should be nodels from wh rations. The tab tersection desig anning applicati al. vcle and pedesti cyclists or pede aly for the peak able input value tel of service le be	Highway A e left lanes es es lo nual average dai des unless speci used only for g ich this table is de and deriving m, where more r ons of the HCM rian modes in th istrians using the hour in the single e defaults.	djustmen Adjustm + -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2	ts ent factors 5% 5% 25% r levels of This table g be used for els should ues exist. it Capacity d on number e higher traffic mode, volumes
000	Lanes 2 Multi ¹ Values s service ar does not of application more speed not be use Calculation and Qualit ² Level of of vehicle ³ Buses per flow. * Cannot ** Not ar greater th For the bi	Uninterrupt Median Divided Undivided Undivided Undivided dare for the autom constitute a standard ons. The computer n cific planning applie def for corridor or in ons are based on pla effor corridor or in ons are based on pla ity of Service Manu service for the bicy es, not number of bi or hour shown are or be achieved using t	ed Flow H Exclusive Y Y N as two-way an obile/truck moo l and should be nodels from wh cations. The tab etersection desig nning applicati al. vcle and pedestu cyclists or pede able input value el of service le D become F bec rel of service le	Highway A e left lanes es es lo nual average dai des unless speci- used only for g ich this table is- ole and deriving n, where more r ons of the HCM ian modes in th istrians using the hour in the single e defaults. tter grade. For th cause intersection tter grade (inclu	djustmen Adjustm + -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2	ts ent factors 5% 5% 25% r levels of This table g be used for els should ues exist. it Capacity d on number e higher traffic mode, volumes twe been reached achievable
000	Lanes 2 Multi Multi ¹ Values s service ar does not of application more speed not be use Calculation and Qualit ² Level of of vehicle ³ Buses pe flow. * Cannot ** Not appreate th For the bi because th	Uninterrupt Median Divided Undivided Undivided Undivided dare for the autom constitute a standard ons. The computer n cific planning applie d for corridor or in ons are based on pla ity of Service Manu service for the bicy ser, not number of bi er hour shown are or be achieved using t oplicable for that leve an level of service l icycle mode, the leve here is no maximum	ed Flow H Exclusive Y Y N as two-way an obile/truck moo l and should be nodels from wh cations. The tab cations. The tab ming applicati al. cle and pedestric cyclists or pede able input value el of service le D become F bec el of service le vehicle volum	Highway A e left lanes es es Io nual average dai des unless specir used only for g ich this table is- ole and deriving n, where more r ons of the HCM ian modes in th strians using the hour in the single e defaults. tter grade. For the cause intersection tter grade (inclu- e threshold usin	djustmen Adjustm + -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2	ts ent factors 5% 5% 5% r levels of This table g be used for els should ues exist. it Capacity d on number e higher traffic mode, volumes twe been reached achievable alue defaults.
0000	Lanes 2 Multi Multi ¹ Values s service ar does not a applicatio more spect not be uss Calculatio and Qualit ² Level of of vehicle ³ Buses pe flow. * Cannot ** Not ap greater th For the bi because th <i>Source</i> :	Uninterrupt Median Divided Undivided Undivided Undivided whown are presented ad are for the autom constitute a standar ons. The computer m cific planning applie ed for corridor or in ons are based on pla ity of Service Manu service for the bicy es, not number of bi- er hour shown are or be achieved using the plicable for that leve an level of service 1 icycle mode, the leve here is no maximum	ed Flow F Exclusive Y Y N as two-way an obile/truck mou land should be nodels from wh cations. The tab tersection desig mning applicati al. cle and pedestr cyclists or pede ally for the peak able input value el of service le D become F bec el of service le vehicle volum	Highway A e left lanes es es lo nual average dai des unless specie used only for g ich this table is de and deriving m, where more r ons of the HCM ian modes in th strians using the hour in the single e defaults. tter grade. For the cause intersection tter grade (inclu- e threshold using	djustmen Adjustm + -2 ily volumes for fically stated. 7 eneral planning derived should computer mod refined techniqi (and the Trans is table is based e facility. e direction of th he automobile n capacities ha ding F) is not a g table input v	ts ent factors 5% 5% 5% r levels of fhis table g be used for els should ues exist. it Capacity d on number e higher traffic mode, volumes we been reached alue defaults.
0000	Lanes 2 Multi Multi ¹ Values s service ar does not a applicatio more spee not be use Calculatii and Quali ² Level of of vehicle ³ Buses pe flow. * Cannot ** Not ar greater th For the bi because ti	Uninterrupt Median Divided Undivided Undivided Undivided dare for the autom constitute a standarc ons. The computer m cific planning applie ed for corridor or in ons are based on pla ity of Service Manu 's service for the bicy es, not number of bi er hour shown are or be achieved using the oplicable for that leve an level of service licy cycle mode, the leve here is no maximum	ed Flow H Exclusive Y Y N as two-way an as two-way an as two-way an an an an an an an an an as two-way as two-way as two-way as two-	Highway A e left lanes es es lo nual average dai des unless specie used only for g ich this table is le and deriving m, where more r ons of the HCM tian modes in th estrians using the hour in the single e defaults. tter grade. For the cause intersection tter grade (inclu- e threshold using	djustmen Adjustm + -2 ily volumes for fically stated. 7 eneral planning derived should computer mod refined techniq i and the Trans is table is based e facility. e direction of the he automobile n capacities he ding F) is not a g table input v	ts ent factors 5% 5% 25% r levels of Chis table g be used for els should ues exist. it Capacity d on number e higher traffic mode, volumes twe been reached achievable alue defaults.
	Lanes 2 Multi Multi ¹ Values s service ar does not a applicatio more spee not be uss Calculati and Quali ² Level of of vehicle ³ Buses pe flow. * Cannot ** Not ap greater th For the bi because th Source: Florida D Systems I	Uninterrupt Median Divided Undivided Undivided Undivided dare for the autom constitute a standarc ms. The computer n cific planning applie ed for corridor or in ons are based on pla ity of Service Manu ser, not number of bi- er hour shown are on be achieved using t oplicable for that leve an level of service l there is no maximum	ed Flow H Exclusive Y Y N as two-way am obile/truck mod l and should be nodels from wh ations. The tab tersection desig mining applicati al. vcle and pedestr cyclists or pede able input value el of service le D become F bec el of service le D become F bec el of service le D become F bec vehicle volum portation ice //systems/	Highway A e left lanes es es lo nual average dai des unless specif used only for g ich this table is le and deriving m, where more r ons of the HCM rian modes in th strians using the hour in the single e defaults. Iter grade. For th ause intersectio tter grade (inclu	djustmen Adjustm + -2 -2 -2 	ts ent factors 5% 5% 25% r levels of This table be used for els should ues exist. it Capacity d on number e higher traffic mode, volumes twe been reached alue defaults.
0 0 0 0 0	Lanes 2 Multi Multi ¹ Values s service ar does not o applicatio more spee not be use Calculati and Quali ² Level of of vehicle ³ Buses pe flow. * Cannot ** Not ap greater th For the bi because th Source: Florida D Systems I https://www	Uninterrupt Median Divided Undivided Undivided Undivided dare for the autom constitute a standard ons. The computer n cific planning applie d for corridor or in ons are based on pla ity of Service Manu service for the bicy es, not number of bi r hour shown are or be achieved using t oplicable for that lev an level of service l cycle mode, the lev here is no maximum epartment of Trans implementation Off	ed Flow H Exclusive Y Y N as two-way am obile/truck mov l and should be nodels from wh rations. The tab tersection desig and should be nodels from wh rations. The tab tersection desig application al. vcle and pedestic cyclists or pede ally for the peak. able input value to become F bec el of service le vehicle volum portation ice /systems/	Highway A e left lanes es es lo nual average dai des unless speci used only for g ich this table is de and deriving m, where more r ons of the HCM rian modes in th istrians using the hour in the single e defaults. Itter grade. For th cause intersection there shold usin	djustmen Adjustm + -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2	ts ent factors 5% 5% 25% r levels of This table g be used for els should ues exist. it Capacity d on number e higher traffic mode, volumes we been reached alue defaults.

(continued)

Generalized Annual Average Daily Volumes for Florida's

Urbanized Areas

lanuary	2020
January	2020

	Unin	tommented	Flow Fooi	lition		Int	errupted l	Flow Facil	ities	
INPUT VALUE		lierrupied	Flow Faci	nues		State A	Arterials		Cla	ass I
ASSUMPTIONS	Freeways	Core Freeways	High	ways	Cla	iss I	Cla	ss II	Bicycle	Pedestrian
ROADWAY CHARACTERISTICS										
Area type (urban, rural)	urban	urban								
Number of through lanes (both dir.)	4-10	4-12	2	4-6	2	4-8	2	4-8	4	4
Posted speed (mph)	70	65	50	50	45	50	30	30	45	45
Free flow speed (mph)	75	70	55	55	50	55	35	35	50	50
Auxiliary Lanes (n,y)	n	n								
Median (d, twlt, n, nr, r)				d	n	r	n	r	r	r
Terrain (l,r)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
% no passing zone			80							
Exclusive left turn lane impact (n, y)			[n]	у	у	у	у	у	у	у
Exclusive right turn lanes (n, y)					n	n	n	n	n	n
Facility length (mi)	3	3	5	5	2	2	1.9	1.8	2	2
TRAFFIC CHARACTERISTICS										
Planning analysis hour factor (K)	0.090	0.085	0.090	0.090	0.090	0.090	0.090	0.090	0.090	0.090
Directional distribution factor (D)	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.550	0.560	0.565	0.560	0.565	0.565
Peak hour factor (PHF)	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Base saturation flow rate (pcphpl)	2,400	2,400	1,700	2,200	1,950	1,950	1,950	1,950	1,950	1,950
Heavy vehicle percent	4.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.5	2.0
Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF)	0.975	0.975		0.975						
Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF)	0.968	0.968		0.968						
% left turns					12	12	12	12	12	12
% right turns					12	12	12	12	12	12
CONTROL CHARACTERISTICS										
Number of signals					4	4	10	10	4	6
Arrival type (1-6)					3	3	4	4	4	4
Signal type (a, c, p)					с	с	с	с	с	с
Cycle length (C)					120	150	120	120	120	120
Effective green ratio (g/C)					0.44	0.45	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.44
MULTIMODAL CHARACTERIST	ICS	•			•		•	•	•	•
Paved shoulder/bicycle lane (n, y)									n, 50%, y	n
Outside lane width (n, t, w)									t	t
Pavement condition (d, t, u)									t	
On-street parking (n, y)										
Sidewalk (n, y)										n, 50%, y
Sidewalk/roadway separation(a, t, w)										t
Sidewalk protective barrier (n, y)										n
		LEVEL	OF SERV	ICE THR	ESHOLD	S	•			•
	Freeways	High	ways		Arte	rials		Bicycle	Ped	Bus
Level of		Two-Lane	Multilane	e Class I		Cla	ss II			
Service	Density	%ffs	Density	a	ts	a	ts	Score	Score	Buses/hr.
В	≤17	> 83.3	≤ 17 [°]	> 31	mph	> 22	mph	≤ 2.75	≤ 2.75	≤6
С	≤24	> 75.0	≤ 24	> 23	mph	> 17	mph	≤ 3.50	≤ 3.50	≤ 4
D	≤31	> 66.7	≤31	> 18	mph	>13	mph	<u>≤</u> 4.25	 ≤4.25	< 3
Е	 ≤ 39	> 58.3	 ≤ 35	> 18 mph > 15 mph		> 10	mph	<i>≤</i> 5.00	≤ 5.00	< 2

% ffs = Percent free flow speed ats = Average travel speed

APPENDIX I

Person Miles of Capacity (PMC): Streets

ID	Improvement	РМС
(1)	New Construction 5' Sidewalk	1,500
(2)	New Construction 8' Shared-Use Path	2,400
(3)	New Construction 10' Shared-Use Path	2,700
(4)	New Construction 12' Multi-Use Trail / Greenway	3,600
(5)	Low Speed Street / Traffic Calming	1,200
(6)	New Construction 5' Bike / Multimodal Lane	1,200
(7)	New Construction 7' Buffered Bike / Multimodal Lane	2,400
(8)	New Construction 8' Protected Bike / Multimodal Lane	3,600
(9)	Understory Landscape	1,200
(10)	Canopy Landscape	2,400
(11)	Landscape & Streetscape Enhancements	3,600
(13)	Bus / Transit Stop	200
(14)	New Two (2) Lane Road (Developer)	7,390
(15)	New Two (2) Lane Road (Urban)	14,980

(16) New Two (2) Lane Divided Road 25,870 (17) Widen to Two (2) Lane Rd to Three (3) Lane Divided Rd 25,870 (18)Upgrade Four (4) Lane Undivided to Two (2) Lane Divided 21,790 Upgrade Existing Two (2) Lane Road, Widen Total Lane (19) 4,030 Width (2' to 6' Wide), Increase Functional Classification (20)Upgrade Existing Two (2) Lane Road (20' to 26' Wide) 5,370 Upgrade & Repurpose Existing Two (2) Lane Road to Add (21) 7,390 Multimodal Facilities (28' to 32' Wide), Increase FC (27) **Curbless Shared Street** 40,000 (28) 6,000 Promenade Source: Florida Department of Transportation, Quality/Level of Service (LOS) Handbook, Generalized Annual Average Daily Volumes for Florida's Urbanized Areas (Appendix H). Capacities are based on a LOS D standard. The daily person capacity is based on a vehicle occupancy factor of 1.84 per the 2017 NHTS Data sets for Florida (Appendix D). Turn lane person capacity is derived by multiplying the daily person capacity by .5% per the FDOT Generalized Service Volume Tables. The person miles are rounded to the nearest 10th.

Capacity methodologies for multimodal facilities are based on methodologies established in Transportation Research Record 1636 Paper No. 98-0066, the 2006 Shared-Use Path Level of Service Calculator-A User's Guide developed for the Federal Highway Administration, and the Highway Capacity Manual.
APPENDIX J

Person Miles of Capacity (PMC): Intersections

APPENDIX J	I: PERSON MIL	LES OF CAPA	CITY (PMC)	INTERSECTIONS

ID	Improvement	Person Miles of Capacity (PMC)
(12)	High Visibility Mid-Block Crossing (per unit)	800
(22)	Hawk Pedestrian Signal	1,200
(23)	Intersection Improvement (Minor)	2,400
(24)	Intersection Improvement (Major)	7,600
(25)	Roundabout (Single-Lane)	6,250
(26)	Roundabout (Multi-Lane, Signalized)	12,500
(29)	Bridge Upgrade	1,000

Source: Florida Department of Transportation, Quality/Level of Service (LOS) Handbook, Generalized Annual Average Daily Volumes for Florida's Urbanized Areas (**Appendix H**). Capacities are based on a LOS D standard. The daily person capacity is based on a vehicle occupancy factor of 1.84 per the 2017 NHTS Data sets for Florida (**Appendix D**). Turn lane person capacity is derived by multiplying the daily person capacity by .5% per the FDOT Generalized Service Volume Tables. The person miles are rounded to the nearest 10th. Capacity methodologies for multimodal facilities are based on methodologies established in Transportation Research Record 1636 Paper No. 98-0066, the 2006 Shared-Use Path Level of Service Calculator-A User's Guide developed for the Federal Highway Administration, and the Highway Capacity Manual.

APPENDIX K

Planning Level Cost (PLC): Streets

ID	Improvement	Cost per Mile
(1)	New Construction 5' Sidewalk	\$472,910
(2)	New Construction 8' Shared-Use Path	\$756,555
(3)	New Construction 10' Shared-Use Path	\$945,815
(4)	New Construction 12' Multi-Use Trail / Greenway	\$1,134,980
(5)	Low Speed Street / Traffic Calming	\$368,500
(6)	New Construction 5' Bike / Multimodal Lane	\$413,785
(7)	New Construction 7' Buffered Bike / Multimodal Lane	\$681,690
(8)	New Construction 8' Protected Bike / Multimodal Lane	\$1,430,845
(9)	Understory Landscape	\$402,600
(10)	Canopy Landscape	\$805,200
(11)	Landscape & Streetscape Enhancements	\$1,186,450
(13)	Bus / Transit Stop	\$33,500
(14)	New Two (2) Lane Road (Developer)	\$2,316,635
(15)	New Two (2) Lane Road (Urban)	\$5,803,035
(16)	New Two (2) Lane Divided Road	\$6,625,320
(17)	Widen to Two (2) Lane Rd to Three (3) Lane Divided Rd	\$3,651,300
(18)	Upgrade Four (4) Lane Undivided to Two (2) Lane Divided	\$3,362,900
(19)	Upgrade Existing Two (2) Lane Road, Widen Total Lane Width (2' to 6' Wide), Increase Functional Classification	\$717,725
(20)	Upgrade Existing Two (2) Lane Road (20' to 26' Wide)	\$897,540
(21)	Upgrade & Repurpose Existing Two (2) Lane Road to Add Multimodal Facilities (28' to 32' Wide), Increase FC	\$2,692,615
(27)	Curbless Shared Street	\$20,000,000
(28)	Promenade	\$3,750,000
Source: municipa Relocatio Inspectio	Cost based on the most recent and localized data from the Town, County, FDOT District lities. Costs include Planning (P), Design (PE), Right-of-Way (ROW), Maintenance of Traffic (MOT n (UR), Stormwater Management (SWM), Landscape (LS), Hardscape (HS), Constriction (C) and G n (CEI) cost.	Four, and Southeast Florida (), Mobilization (MOB), Utility Construction Engineering and

APPENDIX K: PLANNING LEVEL COST (PLC) STREETS

APPENDIX L

Planning Level Cost (PLC): Intersections

APPENDIX L: PLANNING LEVEL COST (PLC) INTERSECTIONS

ID	Improvement	Cost
(12)	High Visibility Mid-Block Crossing (per unit)	\$156,220
(22)	Hawk Pedestrian Signal	\$1,512,580
(23)	Intersection Improvement (Minor)	\$496,115
(24)	Intersection Improvement (Major)	\$2,213,690
(25)	Roundabout (Single-Lane)	\$621,295
(26)	Roundabout (Multi-Lane, Signalized)	\$2,008,315
(29)	Bridge Upgrade	\$3,000,000
Source:	Cost based on the most recent and localized data from the Town, County, FDOT District	Four, and Southeast Florida

municipalities. Costs include Planning (P), Design (PE), Right-of-Way (ROW), Maintenance of Traffic (MOT), Mobilization (MOB), Utility Relocation (UR), Stormwater Management (SWM), Landscape (LS), Hardscape (HS), Constriction (C) and Construction Engineering and Inspection (CEI) cost.

APPENDIX M

Trip Generation

APPENDIX M: TRIP GENERATIO	N			
Use Categories, Use Classifications, and Representative Uses	Unit of Measure	Trip Generation ¹	% New Trips	ITE Land Use Codes
Residential / Lodging Uses				
Affordable, Attainable or Workforce Residential	per 1,000 sq. ft.	2.71	1.00	210, 215, 220, 221, 222, 251, 252 ²
Residential	per 1,000 sq. ft.	5.42	1.00	210, 215, 220, 221, 222, 251, 252 ²
Overnight Lodging (Hotel, Inn, Motel, Resort)	per room	6.79	0.90	265, 310, 311, 312, 320, 330 ³
Mobile Residence (Mobile Home, Recreational Vehicle, Travel Trailer)	per space or lot	3.98	1.00	240, 416 ⁴
Institutional Uses				
Community Serving (Civic, Museum, Performing Arts, Place of Assembly or Worship)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	5.52	1.00	560, 580 ⁵
Long Term Care (Assisted Living, Congregate Care Facility, Nursing Facility)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	5.96	0.50	254, 620
Private Education (Day Care, Private Primary School, Pre-K)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	9.82	0.50	530, 532, 534 ⁶
Industrial Uses				
Industrial (Assembly, Brewing, Distilling, Fabrication, Flex Space, Manufacturing, Trades, Utilities)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	5.80	1.00	110, 130, 140, 160, 170, 180
Industrial (Distribution, Fulfillment, Nursery, Outdoor Storage, Storage, Warehouse)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	2.15	1.00	150, 151, 155, 155, 156, 157 ⁷
Recreational Uses		• 		
Marina (Including dry storage)	per berth	2.41	1.00	420
Outdoor Commercial Recreation (Amusement, Golf, Multi-Purpose, Parks, Sports, Tennis)	per acre	12.19	1.00	411, 430, 432, 480, 488, 490, 491 ⁶
Indoor Commercial Recreation (Dance, Gym, Fitness, Indoor Sports, Kids Activities, Yoga)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	23.07	1.00	434, 435, 436, 437, 492, 493, 495 ⁸

APPENDIX M: TRIP GENERATIO	N			
Use Categories, Use Classifications, and Representative Uses	Unit of Measure	Trip Generation ¹	% New Trips	ITE Land Use Codes
Office Uses				
Office (Finanical, General, Higher Education, Hospital, Professional)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	11.58	1.00	610, 710, 712, 714, 715, 750, 760, 770
Medical Office (Clinic, Dental, Emergency Care, Medical, Veterinary)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	29.33	1.00	610, 630, 640, 650, 720
Commercial & Retail Uses				
Small Retail Business (Entertainment, Restaurant, Retail, Services)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	23.14	0.30	820, 821, 821, 822 ⁹
Retail (Discount, Entertainment, Financial, Retail, Services, Superstore)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	46.28	0.30	820, 821, 821, 822 ⁹
Beverage & Restaurant (Chain and National High Turn-Over & Sit-Down Bar and / or Restaurant)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	103.21	0.30	930, 931, 932
Convenience Retail (Convenience, Motor Vehicle Charging & Fueling, Quick Service Restaurant)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	293.02	0.30	851, 933, 934, 937, 945 ¹⁰
Additive Fees for Commercial Services & Re	etail Uses			
Bank Drive-Thru Lane or Free-Standing ATM	per lane or ATM	113.45	0.50	912 ¹¹
Motor Vehicle & Boat Cleaning (Detailing, Wash, Wax)	per lane or stall	145.84	0.15	947, 948, 949 ¹²
Motor Vehicle Charging or Fueling	per charging or fueling position	150.53	0.15	944, 945 ¹³
Pharmacy Drive-Thru	per lane	123.66	0.15	880, 881 ¹⁴
Quick Service Restaurant Drive-Thru	per lane	204.15	0.15	934, 935, 937, 938 ¹⁵

APPENDIX M: TRIP GENERATION Trip % New Use Categories, Use Classifications, and Representative Uses Unit of Measure **ITE Land Use Codes** Generation¹ Trips Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) 11th Edition Trip Generation Manual. The trip generation rates are based on the weekday trip generation rate per the indicated land use code. For uses where daily trips are not provided, the AM and PM Peak hours of adjacent street traffic where averaged and divided by a peak-to-daily ratio of 0.1 (on average 10% of daily traffic occurs during peak periods). For land uses with more than one ITE code, the trip generation was calculated by weighting trips based on the number of studies completed as indicated in the ITE Trip Generation Manual to ensure that a trip generation rate based on one (1) study does not have the same weight as a trip generation rate based on thirty (30) studies. Weighting is based on the total number of studies for each ITE Code listed under a use classification. The total studies per use were divided by the sum of studies completed for all ITE codes listed under a use classification. The final trip generation is equal to the sum of the weight per ITE code times the trip generation rate per ITE Code. See footnotes Residential and Private Education Trip Generation for examples. See Residential Trip Generation. See Overnight Lodging Trip Generation. The rate for Mobile Homes (ITE Code 240) and RV Parks (ITE Code 416) is based on conversion of AM and PM Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic to Daily trips based on a peak-to-daily ratio of 0.1 (10% of daily traffic occurs during peak hours). The final trip generation is weighted based on total studies per footnote 1. Based on AM and PM Peak of Adjacent Street Traffic. Weighted based on total number of studies. Utilized a Peak to Daily ratio of 0.70. See Private Education Trip Generation.

The ITE Code for use 155 is provided twice as there are two (2) separate trip generation rates for fulfillment centers based on the type of sorting of packages occurs.

⁸ Golf driving range converted to acreage at two tee positions per one acre, Soccer Complex fields converted to acres at ratio of 2 acres per 1 field, Racquet / Tennis Club assume 2 courts plus accessory buildings per acre, Utilized vehicle occupancy of 2 persons per vehicle.

⁸ Converted AM and PM Peak Hour Periods and applied a Peak to Daily Conversion of .1 (10% of daily traffic occurs during peak hours).

⁹ The ITE Code for use 821 is provided twice as there are two (2) separate trip generation rates for multi-tenant centers with and with-out grocery stores. Small Retail Business is 50% of the retail rate. Lake Park may elect to establish programs that establish criteria to qualify for a small retail business designation.

¹⁰ The trip generation is based on the study weighted daily trip generation per each use. The total trips producded are 586 per 1,000 sq. ft. The Trip Generation is reducded by 50% to account for addittive mobility fees.

¹¹ The trip generation is based on the trip rate per drive-thru lane (125.03) minus the trips associated with office uses (11.58), since the bank square footage, falls under the office land use category.

¹² The weighted trip generation (729.20) is divided by an average of five (5) stall per use. The trip rate for ITE Code 948 only provided a PM Peak.

¹³ The trip generation associated with vehicle fueling positions is based on the sum of trip generation per fueling positions (per identified ITE Land Use Codes). The following are the number of fuel positions and square footage for each ITE Land Use Code: (944) 8 positions and 1,500 sq. ft; (945: 2K to 4K) 8 positions and 3,000 sq. ft.; (945: 4K to 5.5K) 14 positions and 4,750 sq. ft.; (945: 5.5K to 10K) 12 positions and 7,750 sq. ft.; The trip generation was reduced by multiplying the trip generation for convenience retail (293.02) by the average square footage for each use evaluated. The net trip generation is then divided by the total number of fueling positions for each of the ITE Land Use Codes. The trip generation is the weighted net average rate per fuel position for the four ITE land use codes used in the analysis.

¹⁴ The trip generation is based on the difference in trip generation for pharmacies with drive-thru's (108.40) minus the trips for retail uses (46.28) and pharmacies with-out drive-thru's (90.08) minus the trips for retail uses (46.26). The calcualtion is as follows: (108.40 - 46.28 = 62.21; 90.08 - 46.26 = 43.80). The net difference (62.12 - 43.80 = 18.32) is then multiplied by the standard size of a pharmacy (13,500 sq. ft. / 1,000 = 13.5). The gross trip generation (18.32 x 13.5 = 247.32) associated with drive-thru's is then divided by two (2) to account for the average number of drive-thru lanes associated with a pharmacy, for a net trip generation of 123.66 per drive-thru-lane.

¹⁵ The trip generation rate for quick service drive thru lanes is determined by calculating the weighted trip generation rate (497.92) per 1,000 sq. ft. for the four (4) land uses minus the trips associated with convenience retail use (293.02).

	RESIDENTIAL TRIP GENERATION												
Residential Use	ITE Land Use Code	Trip Generation	Total Number of Studies	Occupancy	Lake Park Occupancy	Occupancy Adjustment	Occupancy Adjusted Trip Generation	Square Footage	Square Footage Adjusted	Trip Generation per 1,000 sq. ft.	Trip Study (Weighted)	Trip Generation (Weighted)	
Single Family Detached	210	9.43	174	3.6	3.17	0.881	8.304	1,600	1.6	5.19	0.674	3.50	
Single Family Attached	215	7.2	22	3.16	3.17	1.003	7.223	1,200	1.2	6.02	0.085	0.51	
Multi-Family (Low-Rise)	220	6.74	22	2.72	3.05	1.121	7.558	1,000	1.0	7.56	0.085	0.64	
Multi-Family (Mid-Rise)	221	4.54	11	2.5				900	0.9	5.04	0.043	0.22	
Multi-Family (High Rise)	222	4.54	8	1.6				800	0.8	5.68	0.031	0.18	
Senior Adult Housing (Single-Family)	251	4.31	15	1.5				900	0.9	4.79	0.058	0.28	
Senior Housing Attached (Multi-Family)	252	3.24	6	1.25				800	0.8	4.05	0.023	0.09	
Total			258									5.42	

Notes: Residential trip generation rates were converted into trip rates per 1,000 square feet. The first step in the conversion was assigning typical square footage for Lake Park by type of unit per the 11th Edition of the ITE Trip Generation Manual. The assigned square footage of each unit type is then divided by 1,000 (square footage adjusted). Trip Generation is then adjusted for localized occupancy where ITE provides occupancy characteristics. A Trip Study weighting is then calculated based on the number of studies per use. A Trip Generation weight is then calculated based on the weighted trip studies. Affordable, Attainable and Workforce Housing is 50% of the residential rate. Lake Park may elect to establish programs that establish criteria to qualify for affordable, attainable, and workforce residential designations.

				OVERNIGHT LO	DDGING TRIP GEN	IERATION				
ITE LAND USE	ITE LAND USE CODE	VARIABLE	AM PEAK OF GENERATOR	AM NUMBER OF STUDIES	PM PEAK OF GENERATOR	PM NUMBER OF STUDIES	NUMBER STUDIES TUDIES TUDIES TRIPS TRIPS (WEIGHT		TRIP STUDIED (WEIGHTED)	TRIP GENERATION (WEIGHTED)
HOTEL	310	ROOM	0.53	32	0.6	33	65	8.07	0.37	3.02
ALL SUITES HOTEL	311	ROOM	0.37	9	0.38	9	18	5.36	0.10	0.55
BUSINESS HOTEL	312	ROOM	0.34	10	0.35	10	20	4.93	0.11	0.57
MOTEL	320	ROOM	0.4	16	0.41	16	32	5.79	0.18	1.06
RESORT HOTEL	330	ROOM	0.41	6	0.5	6	12	6.50	0.07	0.45
TIMESHARE	265	ROOM	0.4	14	0.63	13	27	7.36	0.16	1.14
TOTAL						87	174		1.00	6.79
Notes: Overnight Lodg	ging Trip Gene	eration based	on the AM and I	PM Peak of the Q	Generator per room	m based on the	11th Edition of t	he ITE Trip	Generation Man	ual due to the

limited number of daily studies. The total number of studies conducted for the AM and PM Peaks are used to calculate a Trip Study weight. The daily trip generation is based on the average of the AM and PM peaks divided by a peak to daily ratio of 0.70. The Trip Generation weight is calculated based on daily trips multiplied by Trip Study weighting. The total trips per room is the sum of the weighted Trip Generation.

PRIVATE EDUCATION TRIP GENERATION												
ITE LAND USE	ITE LAND USE CODE		AM PEAK OF GENERATOR	NUMBER OF STUDIES	PM PEAK OF GENERATOR	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDIES	DAILY TRIPS	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDIES	TRIP STUDIED (WEIGHTED)	TRIP GENERATION (WEIGHTED)		
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	520	STUDENTS	0.75	46	0.45	54	1.80	100	0.19	0.34		
MIDDLE SCHOOL / JR HIGH SCHOOL	522	STUDENTS	0.74	25	0.36	29	1.65	54	0.10	0.17		
HIGH SCHOOL	525	STUDENTS	0.51	51	0.32	65	1.25	116	0.22	0.28		
PRIVATE K-8	530	STUDENTS	1.01	14	0.6	12	2.42	26	0.05	0.12		
PRIVATE K-12	532	STUDENTS	0.8	5	0.53	3	2.00	8	0.02	0.03		
PRIVATE HIGH SCHOOL	534	STUDENTS	0.66	4	0.40	4	1.59	8	0.02	0.02		
CHARTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	536	STUDENTS	1.07	26	0.72	27	2.69	53	0.10	0.27		
CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL	538	STUDENTS	0.94	4	0.73	4	2.51	8	0.02	0.04		
DAY CARE	565	STUDENTS	0.79	75	0.81	75	2.40	150	0.29	0.69		
TOTAL								523	1.00	1.96		

DAILY TRIP GENERATION RATE PER 1,000 SQ. FT. IS 9.82 PER 1,000 SQ. FT.

DAILY TRIP GENERATION RATE OF 9.82 PER 1,000 SQ. FT. BASED ON 1,000 SQ. FT. DIVIDED BY THE AVERAGE SQUARE FEET PER STUDENT OF 200 SQ. FT. MULTIPLIED BY WEIGHTED TRIP GENERATION PER STUDENT: (1,000 / 200 = 5.00); (1.96 X 5.00 = 13.76). TRIP GENERATION ROUNDED TO NEAREST 100TH PLACE. DAILY TRIPS BASED ON THE SUM OF THE AM AND PM PEAK HOUR OF GENERATOR TIMES A PEAK-TO-DAILY FACTOR OF 1.5: (E.G., CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL 0.94 + 0.73 = 1.67; 1.67 X 1.5 = 2.51). PEAK HOUR DATA HAD SIGNIFICANTLY MORE STUDIES THAN DAILY DATA. TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDIES BASED ON THE SUM OF THE NUMBER OF STUDIES FOR THE AM AND PM PEAK HOUR OF GENERATOR PER SCHOOL TYPE. ALL TRIP GENERATION DATA BASED ON THE ITE TRIP GENERATION MANUAL, 11TH EDITION.

AVERAGE SQUARE FEET PER STUDENT = 142.5 SQ. FT. BASED ON A WEIGHTED AVERAGE OF STUDENTS PER SCHOOL TYPE BASED ON TABLE 10 FROM THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REVIEW & ADJUSTMENT FOR FLORIDA'S COST PER STUDENT STATION (JANUARY 2020).

APPENDIX N

Person Travel Demand per Use (PTDu)

APPENDIX N: PERSON TRAVEL DEMAND PER USE (PTDu)													
Use Categories, Use Classifications, and Representative Uses	Unit of Measure	Person Trip Factor (PTf)	Person Trip Length (PTI)	Person Travel Demand Gross (PTDg)	Limited Access Adjustment (LAE)	Urban Area Factor (URBf)	Person Travel Demand per Use (PTDu)						
Residential & Lodging Uses													
Affordable, Attainable or Workforce Residential	per 1,000 sq. ft.	1.91	4.75	24.59	11.31	0.53	3.00						
Residential	per 1,000 sq. ft.	1.91	4.75	49.17	22.62	0.53	5.99						
Overnight Lodging (Hotel, Inn, Motel, Resort)	per room	1.91	4.75	55.44	25.50	0.53	6.76						
Mobile Residence (Mobile Home, Recreational Vehicle, Travel Trailer)	per space or lot	1.91	4.75	36.11	16.61	0.53	4.40						
Institution	al Uses												
Community Serving (Civic, Museum, Performing Arts, Place of Assembly or Worship)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	1.81	3.46	34.57	15.90	0.72	5.72						
Long Term Care (Assisted Living, Congregate Care Facility, Nursing Facility)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	1.91	4.75	27.04	12.44	0.53	3.30						
Private Education (Day Care, Private Primary School, Pre-K)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	1.58	3.48	27.00	12.42	0.72	4.47						
Industria	Uses												
Industrial (Assembly, Brewing, Distilling, Fabrication, Flex Space, Manufacturing, Trades, Utilities)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	1.30	6.99	52.70	24.24	0.36	4.36						
Industrial (Distribution, Fulfillment, Nursery, Outdoor Storage, Storage, Warehouse)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	1.30	6.99	19.54	8.99	0.36	1.62						
Recreation	al Uses												
Marina (Including dry storage)	per berth	1.79	4.83	20.84	9.58	0.52	2.49						
Outdoor Commercial Recreation (Amusement, Golf, Multi-Purpose, Parks, Sports, Tennis)	per acre	1.79	4.83	105.39	48.48	0.52	12.60						
Indoor Commercial Recreation (Dance, Gym, Fitness, Indoor Sports, Kids Activities, Yoga)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	1.79	4.83	199.46	91.75	0.52	23.85						

APPENDIX N: PERSON TRAVEL	DEMAND PER USI	E (PTDu)					
Use Categories, Use Classifications, and Representative Uses	Unit of Measure	Person Trip Factor (PTf)	Person Trip Length (PTI)	Person Travel Demand Gross (PTDg)	Limited Access Adjustment (LAE)	Urban Area Factor (URBf)	Person Travel Demand per Use (PTDu)
Office U	Jses						
Office (Finanical, General, Higher Education, Hospital, Professional)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	1.30	6.99	105.23	48.40	0.36	8.71
Medical Office (Clinic, Dental, Emergency Care, Medical, Veterinary)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	1.30	6.99	266.52	122.60	0.36	22.07
Commercial &	Retail Uses						
Small Retail Business (Entertainment, Restaurant, Retail, Services)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	1.97	4.58	62.63	28.81	0.55	7.92
Retail (Discount, Entertainment, Financial, Retail, Services, Superstore)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	1.97	4.58	125.27	57.62	0.55	15.85
Beverage & Restaurant (Chain and National High Turn-Over & Sit-Down Bar and / or Restaurant)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	1.97	4.58	279.37	128.51	0.55	35.34
Convenience Retail (Convenience, Motor Vehicle Charging & Fueling, Quick Service Restaurant)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	1.73	3.08	468.40	215.46	0.81	87.26
Additive Fees for Commercial	Services & Retail	Uses					
Bank Drive-Thru Lane or Free-Standing ATM	per lane or ATM	1.73	3.08	302.25	139.04	0.81	56.31
Motor Vehicle & Boat Cleaning (Detailing, Wash, Wax)	per lane or stall	1.73	3.08	116.56	53.62	0.81	21.72
Motor Vehicle Charging or Fueling	per charging or fueling position	1.73	3.08	120.31	55.34	0.81	22.41
Pharmacy Drive-Thru	per lane	1.73	3.08	98.84	45.46	0.81	18.41
Quick Service Restaurant Drive-Thru	per lane	2.43	4.23	314.77	144.79	0.59	42.71

APPENDIX O

2017 National Household Travel Survey Data: Mobility Fee Trip Purpose

APPENDIX O: 2017 NATIONAL HOUSEHOLD TRAVEL SURVEY DATA: MOBILITY FEE TRIP PURPOSE													
Trip Purpose	Trip Length	Number of Trips	Average Trip Length	Persons per Trip	Person Trip factor (PTf)	Person Miles of Travel (PMT)	Average Person Trip Length (PTI)	Person Miles of Travel factor (PMTf)	Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT)	Average Vehicle Trip Length	Vehicles per Trip	# of Persons per Vehicle	Vehicle Occupancy factor (VOf)
Buy Goods, Meals, Services / Entertainment / Errands	2,235	495	4.52	973	1.97	4,454	4.58	2.03	2,191	4.94	443	879	1.98
Buy Meals	555	131	4.23	318	2.43	1,346	4.23	2.46	548	4.73	116	281	2.42
Child Care / School / Errand	225	65	3.46	103	1.58	358	3.48	1.74	. 206	4.29	48	83	1.73
Exercise / Errand	286	97	2.95	144	1.48	425	2.95	1.59	268	4.25	63	101	1.60
Religion / Errand	181	57	3.18	103	1.81	356	3.46	1.98	180	4.28	42	83	1.98
Entertianment / Exercise / Errand	705	159	4.44	284	1.79	1,373	4.83	2.00	685	5.85	117	215	1.84
Work / Medical / Errand	2,015	284	7.10	368	1.30	2,574	6.99	1.33	1,942	7.65	254	329	1.30
Home Based	2,394	504	4.75	961	1.91	4,564	4.75	1.99	2,298	5.50	418	830	1.99
Errand / Services	242	81	2.99	140	1.73	431	3.08	1.81	239	3.57	67	124	1.85
<i>Source:</i> 2017 National Household Travel 30 miles or less in length. Trip purpose d	Survey Data lata aggregat	for the Core ted by listec	Based Statis	stical Area ((The total d	CBSA) #331(lata is based	00 Miami, Fort I 1 on unaggreag a	Lauderdale & W	/est Palm Beac the 2017 NHT!	ch. A total of 1,3 5 for CBSA # 331	67 unique trip	surveys where	evaluated base	ed on trips of

APPENDIX P

Mobility Fee Schedule

APPENDIX P: TOWN OF LAKE PARK MOBILITY FEE							
	Recom	mended	For Compari	son Purposes			
Use Categories, Use Classifications, and Representative Uses	Unit of Measure	Mobility Fee	Unit of Measure	Mobility Fee			
Residential & Lodging Uses							
Affordable, Attainable or Workforce Residential ^{1, 2}	per sq. ft.	\$ 0.43	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 431			
Residential ²	per sq. ft.	\$ 0.86	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 861			
Overnight Lodging (Hotel, Inn, Motel, Resort) ³	per room	\$ 971	per room	\$ 971			
Mobile Residence (Mobile Home, Recreational Vehicle, Travel Trailer) ³	per space or lot	\$ 633	per space or lot	\$ 633			
Institutional Uses							
Community Serving (Civic, Museum, Performing Arts, Place of Assembly or Worship)	per sq. ft.	\$ 0.82	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 823			
Long Term Care (Assisted Living, Congregate Care Facility, Nursing Facility)	per sq. ft.	\$ 0.47	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 474			
Private Education (Day Care, Private Primary School, Pre-K)	per sq. ft.	\$ 0.64	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 643			
Industrial Uses							
Industrial (Assembly, Brewing, Distilling, Fabrication, Flex Space, Manufacturing, Trades, Utilities)	per sq. ft.	\$ 0.63	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 627			
Industrial (Distribution, Fulfillment, Nursery, Outdoor Storage, Storage, Warehouse) 4	per sq. ft.	\$ 0.23	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 232			
Recreational Uses							
Marina (Including dry storage) ³	per berth	\$ 358	per berth	\$ 358			
Outdoor Commercial Recreation (Amusement, Golf, Multi-Purpose, Parks, Sports, Tennis) ³	per acre	\$ 1,812	per acre	\$ 1,812			
Indoor Commercial Recreation (Dance, Gym, Fitness, Indoor Sports, Kids Activities, Yoga)	per sq. ft.	\$ 3.43	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 3,428			
Office Uses							
Office (Financial, General, Higher Education, Hospital, Professional)	per sq. ft.	\$ 1.25	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 1,252			
Medical Office (Clinic, Dental, Emergency Care, Medical, Veterinary)	per sq. ft.	\$ 3.17	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 3,172			
Commercial & Retail Us	25						
Small Retail Business (Entertainment, Restaurant, Retail, Services) ⁵	per sq. ft.	\$ 1.14	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 1,139			
Retail (Discount, Entertainment, Financial, Retail, Services, Superstore) ⁶	per sq. ft.	\$ 2.28	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 2,277			
Beverage & Restaurant (Chain and National High Turn-Over & Sit-Down Bar and / or Restaurant) 7	per sq. ft.	\$ 5.08	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 5,079			
Convenience Retail (Convenience, Motor Vehicle Charging & Fueling, Quick Service Restaurant) ⁸	per sq. ft.	\$ 12.54	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 12,541			
Additive Fees for Commercial Services & Retail Uses ⁹							
Bank Drive-Thru Lane or Free-Standing ATM ¹⁰	per lane or ATM	\$ 8,093	per lane or ATM	\$ 8,093			
Motor Vehicle & Boat Cleaning (Detailing, Wash, Wax) ¹¹	per lane or stall	\$ 3,121	per lane or stall	\$ 3,121			
Motor Vehicle Charging or Fueling ¹²	per charging or fueling position	\$ 3,221	per charging or fueling position	\$ 3,221			
Pharmacy Drive-Thru 13	per lane	\$ 2,646	per lane	\$ 2,646			
Quick Service Restaurant Drive-Thru ¹⁴	per lane	\$ 6,139	per lane	\$ 6,139			

APPENDIX P: TOWN OF LAKE PARK MOBILITY FEE

¹ The Town of Lake Park may elect to establish a program that establishes criteria to qualify as affordable, attainable or workforce housing. Until the County or City establishes a program, and an applicant receives formal approval, the affordable, attainable or workforce housing mobility fee rate would not be applicable.

² Residential square feet is the sum of the area (in square feet) of each dwelling unit measured from the exterior surface of the exterior walls or walls adjoining public spaces such as multifamily or dormitory hallways, or the centerline of common walls shared with other dwelling units. Square feet include all livable, habitable, and temperature controlled enclosed spaces (enclosed by doors, windows, or walls). This square footage does not include unconditioned garages or unenclosed areas under roof. For multifamily and dormitory uses, common hallways, lobbies, leasing offices, and residential amenities not accessible to the public are not included in the square feet calculation, unless that space is leased to a third-party use and provides drinks, food, goods, or services to the public or paid memberships available to individuals that do not reside in a dwelling unit.

³ Any space that is leased to a third-party use or provides drinks, food, goods, or services to the public shall be required to pay the applicable mobility fee per the individual uses identified in the mobility fee schedule.

⁴ Acreage for any unenclosed material and vehicle storage, including but not limited to boats, commercial vehicles, recreational vehicles (RV), and trailers, sales and display shall be converted to square footage.

⁵ The Town of Lake Park may elect to establish a program that establishes criteria to qualify as a small retail business. Until the County or City establishes a program and an applicant receives formal approval, the small retail business mobility fee rate would not be applicable.

⁶ Retail includes all uses that do not fall under Drinking Establishment & Restaurant or Convenience Retail.

⁷ Drinking Establishment & Restaurant includes chain and national high turn-over and sit down restaurants (non fast food), bars, nightclubs, lounges. test ITE Generation Manual. These uses generate less than 150 daily trips per 1,000 sq. ft. per the latest ITE Generation Manual.

⁸ Convenience Retail includes convenience stores, gas stations, service stations, coffee, donut, sandwich, food and beverage that would be considered fast food or quick service restaurants. These uses generate more than 150 daily trips per 1,000 sq. ft. per the latest ITE Generation Manual.

⁹ Additive multimodal transportation impact fees are assessed in addition to the multimodal transportation impact fees assessed with the square footage of the building.

¹⁰ Bank shall pay the retail rate for the square footage of the building under the retail use category. Drive-thru lanes, Free Standing ATM's and Drive-thru lanes with ATM's are assessed a separate fee per lane or per ATM and are added to any mobility fee associated with a bank building. The free-standing ATM is for an ATM only and not an ATM within or part of another non-financial building, such as an ATM within a grocery store.

¹¹ Motor Vehicle or Boat cleaning shall mean any car wash, wax, or detail where a third party or automatic system performs the cleaning service. Mobility Fee are assessed per lane, stall, or cleaning and wash station, plus a retail rate associated with any additional building square footage under retail uses.

¹² Rates per vehicle charging or fueling position apply to a convenience store, gas station, general store, grocery store, supermarket, superstore, variety store, wholesale club or service stations with fuel pumps. In addition, there shall be a separate mobility fee for the square footage of any retail building per the applicable mobility fee rate under commercial and retail uses. The number of charging or fueling positions is based on the maximum number of vehicles that could be charged or fueled at one time. Non-commercial vehicle charging stations associated with residential or non-residential uses shall not be assessed a mobility fee, unless there is cost or payment required to charge an electric vehicle.

¹³ Any drive-thru associated with a pharmacy will be an additive fee in addition to the applicable retail mobility fee per square foot of the building under retail uses. The number of drive-thru lanes will be based on the number of lanes present when an individual places or pick-up a prescription or item. This includes any pharmacies located within a dispensary, grocery store, super market, variety store, or wholesale club.

¹⁴ Any drive-thru associated with a quick service restaurant (aka fast food) will be an additive fee in addition to the applicable retail mobility fee per square foot of the building. The number of drive-thru lanes will be based on the number of lanes present when an individual places an order or picks up an order, whichever is greater. Quick service restaurants include those in convenience stores or multi-tenant buildings.

APPENDIX Q

Scenario A: Town Mobility Fee vs Palm Beach County Road Impact Fee Comparison

APPENDIX Q: SCENARIO A (TOWN MOBILITY FEE VS PALM BEACH COUNTY ROAD IMPACT FEE COMPARISON)									
Use Categories, Use Classifications, and Representative Uses	Unit of Measure	Mobility (Scenari	Fee o A)	Palm Beach County Road Impact Fee Unit of Measure	Pal Cou Im	lm Beach unty Road pact Fee (2022)	Unit of Measure	Mo (Sci	bility Fee enario A)
Residential	& Lodging Uses								
Affordable, Attainable or Workforce Residential	per sq. ft.	\$	0.43	per dwelling	\$	3,987	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	431
Residential	per sq. ft.	\$	0.86	per dwelling	\$	5,892	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	861
Overnight Lodging (Hotel, Inn, Motel, Resort)	per room	\$	971	per room	\$	2,620	per room	\$	971
Mobile Residence (Mobile Home, Recreational Vehicle, Travel Trailer)	per space or lot	\$	633	per dwelling	\$	2,185	per space or lot	\$	633
Institu	tional Uses								
Community Serving (Civic, Museum, Performing Arts, Place of Assembly or Worship)	per sq. ft.	\$	0.82	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	3,051	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	823
Long Term Care (Assisted Living, Congregate Care Facility, Nursing Facility)	per sq. ft.	\$	0.47	per bed	\$	776	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	474
Private Education (Day Care, Private Primary School, Pre-K)	per sq. ft.	\$	0.64	per student	\$	655	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	643
Indus	trial Uses								
Industrial (Assembly, Brewing, Distilling, Fabrication, Flex Space, Manufacturing, Trades, Utilities)	per sq. ft.	\$	0.63	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	2,284	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	627
Industrial (Distribution, Fulfillment, Nursery, Outdoor Storage, Storage, Warehouse)	per sq. ft.	\$	0.23	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	919	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	232
Recrea	tional Uses								
Marina (Including dry storage)	per berth	\$	358				per berth	\$	358
Outdoor Commercial Recreation (Amusement, Golf, Multi-Purpose, Parks, Sports, Tennis)	per acre	\$ 1	,812				per acre	\$	1,812
Indoor Commercial Recreation (Dance, Gym, Fitness, Indoor Sports, Kids Activities, Yoga)	per sq. ft.	\$	3.43	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	8,323	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	3,428
Offi	ce Uses								
Office (Finanical, General, Higher Education, Hospital, Professional)	per sq. ft.	\$	1.25	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	5,127	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	1,252
Medical Office (Clinic, Dental, Emergency Care, Medical, Veterinary)	per sq. ft.	\$	3.17	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	11,837	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	3,172
Commercia	l & Retail Uses								
Small Retail Business (Entertainment, Restaurant, Retail, Services)	per sq. ft.	\$	1.14	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	4,262	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	1,139
Retail (Discount, Entertainment, Financial, Retail, Services, Superstore)	per sq. ft.	\$	2.28	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	8,756	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	2,277
Beverage & Restaurant (Chain and National High Turn-Over & Sit-Down Bar and / or Restaurant)	per sq. ft.	\$	5.08	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	18,337	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	5,079
Convenience Retail (Convenience, Motor Vehicle Charging & Fueling, Quick Service Restaurant)	per sq. ft.	\$ 1	2.54	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	50,878	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	12,541
Additive Fees for Commercial Services & Retail Uses									
Bank Drive-Thru Lane or Free-Standing ATM	per lane or ATM	\$ 8	,093	-		-	per lane or ATM	\$	8,093
Motor Vehicle & Boat Cleaning (Detailing, Wash, Wax)	per lane or stall	\$ 3	,121	per bay	\$	7,277	per lane or stall	\$	3,121
Motor Vehicle Charging or Fueling	per charging or fueling position	\$ 3	,221	per fueling position	\$	9,135	per charging or fueling position	\$	3,221
Pharmacy Drive-Thru	per lane	\$ 2	,646	-		-	per lane	\$	2,646
Quick Service Restaurant Drive-Thru	per lane	\$ 6	,139	-		-	per lane	\$	6,139

APPENDIX R

Scenario B: Town Mobility Fee vs Palm Beach County Road Impact Fee Comparison

APPENDIX R: SCENARIO B (TOWN MOBILITY FEE VS PALM BEACH COUNTY ROAD IMPACT FEE COMPARISON)						
Use Categories, Use Classifications, and Representative Uses	Unit of Measure	Mobility Fee (SCENARIO B)	Palm Beach County Road Impact Fee Unit of Measure	Palm Beach County Road Impact Fee (2022)	Unit of Measure	Mobility Fee (SCENARIO B)
Residential	& Lodging Uses					
Affordable, Attainable or Workforce Residential	per sq. ft.	\$ 1.15	per dwelling	\$ 3,987	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 1,151
Residential	per sq. ft.	\$ 2.30	per dwelling	\$ 5,892	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 2,303
Overnight Lodging (Hotel, Inn, Motel, Resort)	per room	\$ 2,596	per room	\$ 2,620	per room	\$ 2,596
Mobile Residence (Mobile Home, Recreational Vehicle, Travel Trailer)	per space or lot	\$ 1,691	per dwelling	\$ 2,185	per space or lot	\$ 1,691
Institut	ional Uses					
Community Serving (Civic, Museum, Performing Arts, Place of Assembly or Worship)	per sq. ft.	\$ 1.62	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 3,051	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 1,619
Long Term Care (Assisted Living, Congregate Care Facility, Nursing Facility)	per sq. ft.	\$ 1.27	per bed	\$ 776	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 1,266
Private Education (Day Care, Private Primary School, Pre-K)	per sq. ft.	\$ 1.26	per student	\$ 655	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 1,264
Indust	rial Uses					
Industrial (Assembly, Brewing, Distilling, Fabrication, Flex Space, Manufacturing, Trades, Utilities)	per sq. ft.	\$ 2.47	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 2,284	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 2,468
Industrial (Distribution, Fulfillment, Nursery, Outdoor Storage, Storage, Warehouse)	per sq. ft.	\$ 0.91	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 919	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 915
Recreat	ional Uses					
Marina (Including dry storage)	per berth	\$ 976			per berth	\$ 976
Outdoor Commercial Recreation (Amusement, Golf, Multi-Purpose, Parks, Sports, Tennis)	per acre	\$ 4,935			per acre	\$ 4,935
Indoor Commercial Recreation (Dance, Gym, Fitness, Indoor Sports, Kids Activities, Yoga)	per sq. ft.	\$ 9.34	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 8,323	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 9,341
Offic	ce Uses					
Office (Financial, General, Higher Education, Hospital, Professional)	per sq. ft.	\$ 4.93	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 5,127	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 4,928
Medical Office (Clinic, Dental, Emergency Care, Medical, Veterinary)	per sq. ft.	\$ 12.48	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 11,837	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 12,481
Commercial & Retail Uses						
Small Retail Business (Entertainment, Restaurant, Retail, Services)	per sq. ft.	\$ 2.93	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 4,262	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 2,933
Retail (Discount, Entertainment, Financial, Retail, Services, Superstore)	per sq. ft.	\$ 5.87	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 8,756	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 5,866
Beverage & Restaurant (Chain and National High Turn-Over & Sit-Down Bar and / or Restaurant)	per sq. ft.	\$ 13.08	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 18,337	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 13,083
Convenience Retail (Convenience, Motor Vehicle Charging & Fueling, Quick Service Restaurant)	per sq. ft.	\$ 21.94	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 50,878	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 21,935
Additive Fees for Commercial Services & Retail Uses						
Bank Drive-Thru Lane or Free-Standing ATM	per lane or ATM	\$ 14,155	-	-	per lane or ATM	\$ 14,155
Motor Vehicle & Boat Cleaning (Detailing, Wash, Wax)	per lane or stall	\$ 5,459	per bay	\$ 7,277	per lane or stall	\$ 5,459
Motor Vehicle Charging or Fueling	per charging or fueling position	\$ 5,634	per fueling position	\$ 9,135	per charging or fueling position	\$ 5,634
Pharmacy Drive-Thru	per lane	\$ 4,629	-	-	per lane	\$ 4,629
Quick Service Restaurant Drive-Thru	per lane	\$ 14,741	-	-	per lane	\$ 14,741

APPENDIX S

Scenario A & Scenario B Comparison

APPENDIX S: SCENARIO A & SCENARIO B COMPARISON							
Use Categories, Use Classifications, and Representative Uses	Palm Beach County Road Impact Fee Unit of Measure	Palm Beach County Road Impact Fee (2022)	Palm Beach County Road Impact Fee (2022) Town of Lake Park Unit of Measure		Town Mobility Fee Only (Scenario B)		
Residential & Lodging Uses							
Affordable, Attainable or Workforce Residential	per dwelling	\$ 3,987	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 4,418	\$ 1,151		
Residential ² {Assume 1,500 sq. ft. dwelling unit}	per dwelling	\$ 5,892	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 7,184	\$ 3,454		
Overnight Lodging (Hotel, Inn, Motel, Resort)	per room	\$ 2,620	per room	\$ 3,591	\$ 2,596		
Mobile Residence (Mobile Home, Recreational Vehicle, Travel Trailer)	per dwelling	\$ 2,185	per space or lot	\$ 2,818	\$ 1,691		
Institutional Uses							
Community Serving (Civic, Museum, Performing Arts, Place of Assembly or Worship)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 3,051	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 3,874	\$ 1,619		
Long Term Care (Assisted Living, Congregate Care Facility, Nursing Facility) {Assume 2 bed per 1,000 sq. ft.	per bed	\$ 776	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 2,026	\$ 1,266		
Private Education (Day Care, Private Primary School, Pre-K) {Assume 4 students per 1,000 sq. ft.}	per student	\$ 655	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 3,263	\$ 1,264		
Industrial Uses							
Industrial (Assembly, Brewing, Distilling, Fabrication, Flex Space, Manufacturing, Trades, Utilities)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 2,284	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 2,911	\$ 2,468		
Industrial (Distribution, Fulfillment, Nursery, Outdoor Storage, Storage, Warehouse)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 919	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 1,151	\$ 915		
Recreational Uses							
Marina (Including dry storage)			per berth	\$ 358	\$ 976		
Outdoor Commercial Recreation (Amusement, Golf, Multi-Purpose, Parks, Sports, Tennis)			per acre	\$ 1,812	\$ 4,935		
Indoor Commercial Recreation (Dance, Gym, Fitness, Indoor Sports, Kids Activities, Yoga)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 8,323	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 11,751	\$ 9,341		
Office Uses							
Office (Financial, General, Higher Education, Hospital, Professional)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 5,127	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 6,379	\$ 4,928		
Medical Office (Clinic, Dental, Emergency Care, Medical, Veterinary)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 11,837	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 15,009	\$ 12,481		
Commercial & Retail U	ses						
Small Retail Business (Entertainment, Restaurant, Retail, Services)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 4,262	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 5,401	\$ 2,933		
Retail (Discount, Entertainment, Financial, Retail, Services, Superstore)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 8,756	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 11,033	\$ 5,866		
Beverage & Restaurant (Chain and National High Turn-Over & Sit-Down Bar and / or Restaurant)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 18,337	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 23,416	\$ 13,083		
Convenience Retail (Convenience, Motor Vehicle Charging & Fueling, Quick Service Restaurant)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 50,878	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$ 63,419	\$ 21,935		
Additive Fees for Commercial Services & Retail Uses							
Bank Drive-Thru Lane or Free-Standing ATM	-	-	per lane or ATM	\$ 8,093	\$ 14,155		
Motor Vehicle & Boat Cleaning (Detailing, Wash, Wax)	per bay	\$ 7,277	per lane or stall	\$ 10,398	\$ 5,459		
Motor Vehicle Charging or Fueling	per fueling position	\$ 9,135	per charging or fueling position	\$ 12,356	\$ 5,634		
Pharmacy Drive-Thru	-	-	per lane	\$ 2,646	\$ 4,629		
Quick Service Restaurant Drive-Thru	-	-	per lane	\$ 6,139	\$ 14,741		

This is the Last Page in the

Town of Lake Park Mobility Plan & Mobility Fee Technical Report

October 2022



Contact:	Jonathan B. Paul, AICP Principal 2000 PGA Blvd, Suite 4440	Uyen Dang Principal 250 Royal Ct
	Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33408	Delray Beach, FL 33444
	P 833-NUC-8484E nueurbanconcepts@gmail.com	P 813-380-6574E uyen@ddec.com
	www.nueurbanconcepts.com	
	www.ddec.com	
	www.mobilitycohort.com	









