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• In 2000, a lawsuit was filed alleging the Comprehensive Plan lacked sufficient environmental protections.
• Settlement resulted in comprehensive plan policies requiring implementation of wildlife corridor plan.
• In 2002, Pasco County initiated a study to evaluate wildlife habitat protections.
• The study supported a regional conservation strategy for habitat and natural resource protection.
In 2003 the Environmental Lands Task Force recommended protection of corridors through acquisition, regulation, and partnerships.
RECAP

• Recommendations resulted in County amendment to Conservation Element of the Comprehensive Plan in 2005.

• Comprehensive Plan Policy CON 1.2.2 outlines development standards and currently requires that the LDC be amended by 2010 to adopt implementation measures for corridors.

• Staff has reinitiated the LDC implementation process.
RECAP

• Staff conducted 4\textsuperscript{th} public workshop at the request of the LPA.
• Public notice on workshop initiated via mailing (235), email (100+) and website.
• Meeting was well attended (55+).
• Staff collected additional public comments and met with various property owners.
• Completed responses to all public comments and revised draft ordinance.
• Responses and revised ordinance distributed to the public and made available on County website.
RECAP

• Board of County Commissioners (BCC) Workshop was held on September 15, 2015.

• The BCC has directed staff to prepare several cost analyses for further review by the BCC.

• Next BCC Workshop was set for today February 16, 2016.
• Only when an applicant wants to rezone to greater density or intensity.
• **What is “density?”** The number of allowable dwelling units authorized per acre.
• **What is “intensity?”** How much office, industrial or commercial activity there is per parcel - measured by use, size, traffic generated, or floor-to-area ratio.
DRAFT ORDINANCE KEY POINTS

• Assists in achieving County’s conservation strategy and compliance with the 2000 settlement agreement
• Applicability is **only** triggered by increase in density or intensity
• Contains certain exemptions
• Incentives incorporated into ordinance:
  - Density Transfer
  - Compensation in lieu of Density Transfer; or
  - Combination of transfer and compensation
  - Boundary Modifications and Reduction incorporated
  - Other Incentives: reduced setbacks, park requirements, landscaping and tree requirements, increased lot coverage and building heights
Exemptions – these types of development activities do not trigger the implementation of LDC Section 804

• Prior Development Approvals in accordance with Existing Zoning
• All Development Applications not Increasing Density or Intensity
• Prior Development Approvals prior to effective date of ordinance adoption (i.e. MPUD, site plan)
• All lawfully permitted uses and structures within an Ecological Corridor existing prior to the effective date of ordinance adoption
• Existing residential units constructed at a density greater than one (1) dwelling unit per acre
• Pools, fences, walls, not considering intensity/density increases
Density Transfer

Allows density transfer from land inside the Ecological Corridor [**sending area**] to land onsite or offsite outside of the Ecological Corridor [**receiving area**].
Compensation in Lieu of Density Transfer

• Unutilized transferable density within an Ecological Corridor may be eligible for compensation by the County.
• Compensation will be based on the average of (2) appraisals; one by County and one by property owner.
• Appeal process available for either party if not satisfied with valuation.
Corridor Boundary Modifications

Movement must maintain **width**, ecological **function** and **connectivity** to publicly-owned parcels; no negative impact to adjacent owners.
Corridor Boundary Modifications

- May be reduced because some areas are highly disturbed along edge of the corridor.
- May be reduced because land within the corridor receives score below 25 using site selection scoring in Guidelines.
## Cost Analysis Revenue

### Penny for Pasco 2005-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collected Revenues</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 36,647,333.00</td>
<td>Total Collected From FY 2005-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,753,789.73</td>
<td>Total Collected in FY 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,063,662.00</td>
<td>Total Collected in FY 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 42,464,784</td>
<td>Total Revenues Collected Through 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$17,830,635</td>
<td>Current ELAMP Balance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projected Penny for Pasco 2016-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Revenues</th>
<th>PROP 2016</th>
<th>PROP 2017</th>
<th>PROP 2018</th>
<th>PROP 2019</th>
<th>PROP 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$51,449,720.00*</td>
<td>'16</td>
<td>'17</td>
<td>'18</td>
<td>'19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,604,563.00</td>
<td>$4,811,768.00</td>
<td>$5,028,298.00</td>
<td>$5,254,571.00</td>
<td>$5,491,027.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TOTAL ESTIMATED FUNDS AVAILABLE = $69.2M
Cost Analysis

- Fee Simple
- Less Than Fee
- Proactive Acquisition with Selective Use of Eminent Domain
- Land Management Costs
Total Acreage in Analysis

• Approximately 7,000 Total Acres in Corridors.
• Staff performed an analysis of the total acreage which excluded various categories.
• This resulted in a total of **2,500** Upland Acres in the Corridor to be regulated.
Cost Analysis

1. **Fee Simple**

- Acquisition Costs range $6,000 - $15,000 per acre
- Average cost $10,500 per acre

Projected Fee Acquisition Costs

$10,500 per acre X 2,500 acres = $26,250,000
Cost Analysis

2. Less Than Fee

- Acquisition Costs range $4,500 - $11,250 per acre.
- Less Than Fee can be approximately 75% cost of fee, for unentitled land but subject to fluctuation.
- Average cost $7,875 per acre.

Projected Less Than Fee Acquisition Costs
$7,875 per acre X 2,500 acres = $19,687,500
Cost Analysis

3. Proactive Acquisition with Selective Use of Eminent Domain

1. Corridors would be prioritized.
2. All selected projects would be appraised. May be fee simple or conservation easements.
3. Offers would be based on fair market value.
4. Not all parcels in corridors would be condemned.
5. Acquisition under threat of eminent domain can be 300% of the cost of the willing seller program.
   - Average cost of Fee $10,500 per acre
   - $10,500 X 3 = $31,500 per acre

Possible Projected Eminent Domain Acquisition Costs

$31,500 per acre X 2500 acres = $78,750,000
## ELAMP Purchases to Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>AC/EC*</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>ELAMP Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Cotee</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>1,642,725.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress Creek</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Less Fee</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aripeka Heights</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>4,367,004.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco Palms</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>725,472.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey Star</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Less Fee</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tierra del Sol</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>613,419.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress Creek</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>36,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy Scout</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>31,575.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morsani/Jumping Gully</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>3,376,210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baillies Bluff</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>2,434,066.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crockett Lake</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden River South</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimison</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>1,692,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawk Ranch</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Less Fee</td>
<td>2,275,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gills</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>2,737,380.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Creek</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>3,100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAMP</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,030,851.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Managed Land</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent in Corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,354,500 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent out Corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,678,500 (64%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*AC/EC is all acreage in corridors
Management Cost Analysis

• The State of Florida management cost
  – $46.00 acre / year (includes salaries)
  – Land Management Uniform Accounting Counsel

• Pasco County average yearly management cost (includes salaries)
  – $52.00 acre / year

• Average of Cost = $49.00 acre / year

Projected Land Management Annual Cost
= $49.00 X 2,500 acres = $122,500*
(*represents total if all land is regulated)
Integral Parts of Conservation Strategy

1. ELAMP - buy environmentally sensitive lands from willing sellers.
2. Form partnerships to fund conservation land purchases.
3. Implementation of Corridor Ordinance.
Cost Analysis Summary and Alternatives

1. **Ordinance Adoption** –

1. Allows negotiation with land owner, when willing;
2. More affordable to county taxpayers;
3. May be fee-simple and less-than-fee conservation easements;
4. Creates incentives and clear guidelines for implementation;
5. Allows existing willing seller program (ELAMP) to continue to operate unrestricted.
Cost Analysis Summary and Alternatives

• **Proactive acquisition via willing sellers and selective use of eminent domain** –

1. Initiate acquisition from all owners regardless of willingness or interest;
2. More expensive to county taxpayers (3 x appraised value);
3. May be fee simple or conservation easements;
4. Land management concerns may increase conservation easement acquisitions;
5. May be insufficient funds;
6. Would require additional staff to run program;
7. Reduce potential to acquire other environmental sensitive lands outside the corridors.
Summary of Analysis

• Adoption of the ordinance is best, most practical alternative.
• Ordinance is in compliance with Settle Agreement.
• Ordinance is consistent with Comprehensive Plan.
• Ordinance includes streamlined implementation and incentives.
• Ordinance protects floodplains and natural resources.
• Ordinance secures the County’s Conservation Objectives.
• No action is not an alternative due to settlement agreement.
Staff Recommendation

• Direct staff to schedule the implementation of the Ecological Corridor Ordinance by setting the necessary public hearing dates.
• Staff will continue to meet with any property owners or agents to resolve any outstanding concerns prior to scheduling public hearings.

QUESTIONS?