

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS**

**BILL #:** CS/CS/HB 235 Alternative Mobility Funding Systems  
**SPONSOR(S):** Ways & Means Committee, Local Administration, Federal Affairs & Special Districts Subcommittee, Robinson, W.  
**TIED BILLS:** **IDEN./SIM. BILLS:** SB 350

REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR or BUDGET/POLICY CHIEF
1) Local Administration, Federal Affairs & Special Districts Subcommittee	16 Y, 0 N, As CS	Mwakyanjala	Darden
2) Ways & Means Committee	23 Y, 0 N, As CS	LaTorre	Aldridge
3) Commerce Committee			

**SUMMARY ANALYSIS**

Each county and municipality is required to plan for future development and growth by adopting, implementing, and amending as necessary a comprehensive plan. All elements of a plan or plan amendment must be based on relevant, appropriate data and an analysis by the local government. Each comprehensive plan must include a transportation element addressing traffic circulation, including the types, locations, and extent of existing and proposed major thoroughfares and transportation routes, including bicycle and pedestrian ways.

Certain public facilities and services must be in place and available to serve new development no later than the issuance of a certificate of occupancy or its functional equivalent by a local government. Local governments may extend this concurrency requirement to additional public facilities such as transportation. Local governments electing to repeal transportation concurrency are encouraged to adopt an alternative mobility funding system. One method of funding local government transportation concurrency requirements is through the adoption and imposition of impact fees to fund the infrastructure needed to expand local services to meet the demands of population growth caused by new growth. Local governments may increase impact fees only under limited circumstances, including upon a showing of extraordinary circumstances.

In 2013, the concept of a mobility fee-based funding system was added to the comprehensive planning statutes as an encouraged alternative to transportation concurrency.

The bill revises provisions concerning impact fees and concurrency and provides additional guidance concerning mobility fees. The bill provides definitions for “mobility fee” and “mobility plan” to be used within the Community Planning Act. The bill provides that local governments adopting and collecting impact fees by ordinance or resolution must use localized data available within the previous 12 months of adoption for the local government’s calculation of impact fees.

The bill does not have a fiscal impact on state or local government.

The bill takes effect on July 1, 2023.

# FULL ANALYSIS

## I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

### A. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

#### Present Situation

Every local government, defined as any county and municipality,<sup>1</sup> is required to plan for future development and growth by adopting, implementing, and amending as necessary a comprehensive plan.<sup>2</sup> All elements of a plan or plan amendment must be based on relevant, appropriate data<sup>3</sup> and an analysis by the local government that may include surveys, studies, aspirational goals, and other data available at the time of adopting the plan or amendment.<sup>4</sup> The data supporting a plan or amendment must be taken from professionally accepted sources<sup>5</sup> and must be based on permanent and seasonal population estimates and projections.<sup>6</sup>

Each comprehensive plan must include a transportation element, the purpose of which is to plan for a multimodal transportation system emphasizing feasible public transportation, addressing mobility issues pertinent to the size and character of the local government, and designed to support all other elements of the comprehensive plan.<sup>7</sup> The transportation element must address traffic circulation, including the types, locations, and extent of existing and proposed major thoroughfares and transportation routes, including bicycle and pedestrian ways.<sup>8</sup> The plan of a local government with a population exceeding 50,000 that is not within the planning area of a metropolitan planning organization (MPO)<sup>9</sup> also must address mass transit, ports, and aviation<sup>10</sup> and related facilities.<sup>11</sup> The transportation planning element for a local government with a population exceeding 50,000 located within the area of a MPO specifically must address the following:

- All alternative modes of travel, including public transportation, pedestrian, and bicycle;
- Aviation, rail, and seaport facilities, access to those facilities, and intermodal transportation;
- Capability to evacuate coastal population prior to a natural disaster; and
- Identification of land use densities, building intensities, and transportation management programs to promote public transportation.<sup>12</sup>

The transportation planning element for a municipality with a population exceeding 50,000, or a county with a population exceeding 75,000, must provide for moving people by mass transit, including:

- Providing efficient, safe, and convenient public transit, including accommodation for the transportation disadvantaged;
- Plans for port, aviation, and related facilities; and
- Plans for circulation of recreational traffic, including bicycle and riding facilities and exercise trails.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> S. 163.3164(29), F.S. For the purpose of the act, the Central Florida Tourism Oversight District may exercise the powers of a municipality for the area under its jurisdiction. S. 163.3167(6), F.S. See also ch. 2023-5, Laws of Fla. (renaming the Reedy Creek Improvement District to the Central Florida Tourism Oversight District).

<sup>2</sup> Ss. 163.3167(2), 163.3177(2), F.S.

<sup>3</sup> "To be based on data means to react to it in an appropriate way and to the extent necessary indicated by the data available on that particular subject at the time of adoption of the plan or plan amendment at issue." S. 163.3177(1)(f), F.S.

<sup>4</sup> S. 163.3177(1)(f), F.S.

<sup>5</sup> S. 163.3177(1)(f)2., F.S. The statute does not further define "professionally accepted sources."

<sup>6</sup> S. 163.3177(1)(f)3., F.S. Population estimates may be those published by the Office of Economic and Demographic Research or may be generated by the local government based upon a professionally acceptable methodology. *Id.*

<sup>7</sup> S. 163.3177(6)(b), F.S.

<sup>8</sup> S. 163.3177(6)(b)1., F.S.

<sup>9</sup> S. An MPO must be designated as provided in 23 U.S.C. s. 450.310(a) for each urbanized area with a population of more than 50,000. S. 339.175(2), F.S. Florida MPOs are intended specifically to develop plans and programs in metropolitan areas for the development and management of transportation systems and facilities, including pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities to function as an intermodal transportation system. S. 339.175(1), F.S.

<sup>10</sup> All local governments have the option to include within the transportation element an airport master plan, incorporated into the plan through the comprehensive plan amendment process. S. 163.3177(6)(b)4., F.S.

<sup>11</sup> S. 163.3177(6)(b), F.S.

<sup>12</sup> S. 163.3177(6)(b)2., F.S.

<sup>13</sup> S. 163.3177(6)(b)3., F.S.

In addition to the general requirements for data supporting a comprehensive plan or amendment, the transportation planning element must include one or more maps showing the general location of existing and proposed transportation system features and data, analyses, and associated principles pertaining to:

- Existing transportation system levels of service and system needs and availability of transportation facilities and services;
- Growth trends and travel patterns, as well as interactions between land use and transportation;
- Current and projected intermodal<sup>14</sup> deficiencies and needs;
- Projected transportation system levels of service and system needs; and
- How the local government will correct existing facility deficiencies, meet the needs of the projected transportation system, and advance the transportation purposes of the plan.<sup>15</sup>

Generally, local government transportation and mobility planning should address providing mobility options, such as automobile, bicycle, pedestrian, or mass transit, that minimize environmental impacts, expand transportation options, and increase connectivity between destinations.<sup>16</sup>

### Transportation Concurrency

Certain public facilities and services must be in place and available to serve new development no later than the issuance of a certificate of occupancy or its functional equivalent by a local government.<sup>17</sup> Local governments may extend this concurrency requirement to additional public facilities such as transportation.<sup>18</sup> Where concurrency is applied to transportation, the local government comprehensive plan must provide the principles, guidelines, standards, and strategies, including adopted levels of service, to guide its application.<sup>19</sup> The plan must show that the included levels of service may reasonably be met.<sup>20</sup> Local governments utilizing transportation concurrency must use professionally accepted studies to evaluate levels of service and techniques to measure such levels of service when evaluating potential impacts of proposed developments.<sup>21</sup> While local governments implementing a transportation concurrency system are encouraged to develop and use certain tools and guidelines, such as addressing potential negative impacts on urban infill and redevelopment<sup>22</sup> and adopting long-term multimodal strategies,<sup>23</sup> such local governments must follow specific concurrency requirements including consulting with the Florida Department of Transportation if proposed amendments to the plan affect the Strategic Intermodal System, exempting public transit facilities from concurrency requirements, and allowing a developer to contribute a proportionate share to mitigate transportation impacts for a specific development.<sup>24</sup>

An applicant for a development-of-regional-impact development order, development agreement, rezoning, or other land use development permit satisfies the requirements for transportation concurrency if the applicant in good faith offers to enter into a binding agreement to pay for or construct its proportionate share of transportation improvements required to mitigate the impact of the proposed

---

<sup>14</sup> “Intermodal transportation” is not defined in the statute but generally means the transportation by or involving more than one form of carrier in a single journey, particularly for moving cargo. See “intermodal,” available at <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/intermodal> (last visited April 11, 2023); “intermodal transport,” available at <https://www.ups.com/us/en/supplychain/insights/knowledge/glossary-term/intermodal-transport.page> (last visited April 11, 2023). Part of the intent in creating the Florida Strategic Intermodal System is to address the increased demands placed on the entire statewide transportation system by economic and population growth and projected increases in freight movement, international trade, and tourism designing and operating a strategic intermodal system to meet the mobility needs of the state. See s. 339.61(2), F.S.

<sup>15</sup> S. 163.3177(6)(b)1., F.S.

<sup>16</sup> Dept. of Economic Opportunity, “Transportation Planning,” available at <https://www.floridajobs.org/community-planning-and-development/programs/community-planning-table-of-contents/transportation-planning> (last visited April 11, 2023), herein DEO Transportation Planning.

<sup>17</sup> S. 163.1380(2), F.S. The only such services for which concurrency is mandatory are sanitary sewer, solid waste, drainage, and potable water supplies.

<sup>18</sup> S. 163.3180(1), F.S.

<sup>19</sup> Ss. 163.3180(1)(a), 163.3180(5)(a), F.S. See DEO Transportation Planning, *supra* n. 16.

<sup>20</sup> S. 163.3180(1)(b), F.S.

<sup>21</sup> S. 163.3180(5)(b)-(c), F.S.

<sup>22</sup> S. 163.3180(5)(e), F.S.

<sup>23</sup> S. 163.3180(f), F.S.

<sup>24</sup> S. 163.3180(5)(h), F.S. See DEO Transportation Planning, *supra* n. 16.

development and the proffered proportionate share contribution or construction is sufficient to accomplish one or more mobility improvements benefitting a regionally significant transportation facility.<sup>25</sup> The plan for transportation concurrency must provide the basis on which landowners will be assessed a proportionate share,<sup>26</sup> which must include a compliant formula for calculating the proportionate share.<sup>27</sup> The proportionate share may not include additional costs to reduce or eliminate existing transportation deficiencies.<sup>28</sup>

Local governments electing to repeal transportation concurrency are encouraged to adopt an alternative mobility funding system. Such an alternative system may not be used to restrict or deny certain development approval applications provided the developer agrees to pay for the development's transportation impacts using the funding mechanism implemented by the local government. Local government mobility fee systems must comply with all requirements for adopting and implementing impact fees. An alternative funding system that is not mobility fee based may not impose on new development any responsibility for funding existing transportation deficiencies.<sup>29</sup>

### Impact Fees

One method of funding local government transportation concurrency requirements is through the adoption and imposition of impact fees on new development. Local governments impose impact fees to fund infrastructure<sup>30</sup> needed to expand local services to meet the demands of population growth caused by new growth.<sup>31</sup> Impact fees must meet the following minimum criteria when adopted:

- The fee must be calculated using the most recent and localized data.<sup>32</sup>
- The local government adopting the impact fee must account for and report impact fee collections and expenditures. If the fee is imposed for a specific infrastructure need, the local government must account for those revenues and expenditures in a separate accounting fund.<sup>33</sup>
- Charges imposed for the collection of impact fees must be limited to the actual costs.<sup>34</sup>
- All local governments must give notice of a new or increased impact fee at least 90 days before the new or increased fee takes effect, but need not wait 90 days before decreasing, suspending, or eliminating an impact fee. Unless the result reduces total mitigation costs or impact fees on an applicant, new or increased impact fees may not apply to current or pending applications submitted before the effective date of an ordinance or resolution imposing a new or increased impact fee.<sup>35</sup>
- A local government may not require payment of the impact fee before the date of issuing a building permit for the property that is subject to the fee.<sup>36</sup>
- The impact fee must be reasonably connected to, or have a rational nexus with, the need for additional capital facilities and the increased impact generated by the new residential or commercial construction.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> S. 163.3180(5)(h)1.c., F.S.

<sup>26</sup> S. 163.3180(5)(h)1.d., F.S.

<sup>27</sup> S. 163.3180(5)(h)2.a.-d., F.S.

<sup>28</sup> S. 163.3180(5)(h)2., F.S. For purposes of s. 163.3180(5), F.S., "transportation deficiency" means a facility or facilities on which the level of service standard adopted in the comprehensive plan is exceeded by the number of existing, projected, or vested trips together with additional trips originating from any source other than the development project under review, and trips forecast by established traffic standards. S. 163.3180(5)(h)4., F.S. Local governments may resolve existing transportation deficiencies within an identified transportation deficiency area by creating a transportation development authority with specific powers to implement a transportation sufficiency plan funded through a formula of tax increment funding. Adopting a transportation sufficiency plan is deemed as meeting transportation level of service standards, and proportionate fair-share mitigation is limited to ensure developments within the transportation deficiency area are not responsible for additional costs to eliminate deficiencies. S. 163.3182, F.S.

<sup>29</sup> S. 163.3180(5)(i), F.S.

<sup>30</sup> "Infrastructure" means the fixed capital expenditure or outlay for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of public facilities with a life expectancy of five or more years, together with specific other costs required to bring the public facility into service but excluding the costs of repairs or maintenance. The term also includes specific equipment. S. 163.31801(3), F.S.

<sup>31</sup> S. 163.31801(2), F.S. Water and sewer connection fees are not impact fees. S. 163.31801(12), F.S.

<sup>32</sup> S. 163.31801(4)(a), F.S.

<sup>33</sup> S. 163.31801(4)(b), F.S.

<sup>34</sup> S. 163.31801(4)(c), F.S.

<sup>35</sup> S. 163.31801(4)(d), F.S.

<sup>36</sup> S. 163.31801(4)(e), F.S.

<sup>37</sup> S. 163.31801(4)(f), F.S.

- The impact fee must be reasonably connected to, or have a rational nexus with, the expenditures of the revenues generated and the benefits accruing to the new residential or commercial construction.<sup>38</sup>
- The local government must specifically earmark revenues generated by the impact fee to acquire, construct, or improve capital facilities to benefit new users.<sup>39</sup>
- The local government may not use revenues generated by the impact fee 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 commercial construction.<sup>40</sup>

The types of impact fees charged and the timing of their collection after issuing a building permit are within the discretion of the local government or special district authorities choosing to impose the fees.<sup>41</sup> In general, a building permit must be obtained before the construction, erection, modification, repair, or demolition of any building.<sup>42</sup> A development permit pertains to any building permit, zoning permit, subdivision approval, rezoning, certification, special exception, variance, or any other official action of local government having the effect of permitting the development of land.<sup>43</sup> Local governments providing an exception or waiver of impact fees for the development or construction of affordable housing are not required to use any revenues to offset the impact of such development.<sup>44</sup>

Local governments must credit against impact fee collections any contribution related to public facilities or infrastructure on a dollar-for-dollar basis at fair market value for the general category or class of public facilities or infrastructure for which the contribution was made. If no impact fee is collected for that category of public facility or infrastructure for which the contribution is made, no credit may be applied.<sup>45</sup> Credits for impact fees may be assigned or transferred at any time once established, from one development or parcel to another within the same impact fee zone or district or within an adjoining impact fee zone or district within the same local government jurisdiction.<sup>46</sup>

Local governments may increase impact fees only under limited circumstances. A fee may be increased no more than once every four years, may not be increased retroactively, the increase may not exceed 50 percent of the current impact fee amount, and any increase must be consistent with a statutorily-compliant plan for the imposition, collection, and use of the fees. An increase not exceeding 25 percent of the current fee amount must be implemented in two equal annual increments, while an increase greater than 25 percent but not exceeding 50 percent of the current amount must be implemented in four equal annual installments. However, a local government may increase a fee more than once in four years or for more than 50 percent of a current impact fee amount if it has:

- Prepared a demonstrated-need study within 12 months before adopting the increase showing extraordinary circumstances necessitating the need for the increase;
- Conducted at least two publicly noticed workshops on the extraordinary circumstances justifying the increase; and
- Approved the increase by at least a two-thirds vote of the governing body.<sup>47</sup>

A local government that increases an impact fee must still provide the holder of any impact fee credit the full benefit of the density and intensity prepaid by the credit balance.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> S. 163.31801(4)(g), F.S.

<sup>39</sup> S. 163.31801(4)(h), F.S.

<sup>40</sup> S. 163.31801(4)(i), F.S.

<sup>41</sup> See s. 163.31801(2), F.S.

<sup>42</sup> S. 553.79, F.S.

<sup>43</sup> S. 163.3164(16), F.S.

<sup>44</sup> S. 163.31801(11), F.S.

<sup>45</sup> S. 163.31801(5), F.S.

<sup>46</sup> S. 163.31801(10), F.S. In an action challenging an impact fee or a failure to provide proper credits, the local government has the burden of proof to establish the imposition of the fee or the credit complies with the statute, and the court may not defer to the decision or expertise of the government. S. 163.31801(9), F.S.

<sup>47</sup> S. 163.31801(6), F.S.

<sup>48</sup> S. 163.31801(7), F.S.

With each annual financial report or audit filed<sup>49</sup> a local government must report specific information on impact fees imposed, including the specific purpose of the fee, the impact fee schedule describing the method of calculating the fee, the amount assessed for each purpose and for each type of dwelling, the total amount of fees charged by type of dwelling, and each exception or waiver to the imposition of impact fees provided for construction of affordable housing.<sup>50</sup> Additionally, the chief financial officer or executive officer (if there is no chief financial officer) must submit with the annual financial report an affidavit attesting that all impact fees were collected and expended by the local government, or on its behalf, in full compliance with the spending period provisions in the local ordinance and that funds expended from each impact fee account were used to acquire, construct, or improve those specific infrastructure needs.<sup>51</sup>

### Mobility Plans and Fees

In the Community Renewal Act<sup>52</sup> of 2009 (Act), the Legislature found that the concept and application of transportation concurrency was “complex, inequitable, lack(ed) uniformity among jurisdictions, (was) too focused on roadways to the detriment of desired land use patterns and transportation alternatives, and frequently prevent(ed) the attainment of important growth management goals.”<sup>53</sup> The Act required completion and submission of a mobility fee methodology study<sup>54</sup> and stated the Legislature’s intent that a mobility fee “should be designed to provide for mobility needs, ensure that development provides mitigation for its impacts on the transportation system in approximate proportionality to those impacts, fairly distribute the fee among the governmental entities responsible for maintaining the impacted roadways, and promote compact, mixed-use, and energy-efficient development.”<sup>55</sup> In 2013, the concept of a mobility fee-based funding system was added to the comprehensive planning statutes as an encouraged alternative to transportation concurrency.<sup>56</sup>

Alternative mobility funding systems using a mobility fee are encouraged to incorporate one or more of the statutory tools and techniques, including:

- Adoption of long-term strategies to 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; and
- 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.<sup>57</sup>

Some local governments have adopted mobility plans and mobility fees.<sup>58</sup>

### **Effect of Proposed Changes**

---

<sup>49</sup> See ss. 218.32, 218.39, F.S.

<sup>50</sup> S. 163.31801(13), F.S.

<sup>51</sup> S. 163.31801(8), F.S.

<sup>52</sup> Ch. 2009-96, s. 1, Laws of Fla.

<sup>53</sup> Ch. 2009-96, s. 13(1)(a), Laws of Fla.

<sup>54</sup> Center for Urban Transportation Research, *Evaluation of the Mobility Fee Concept Final Report*, University of South Florida (Nov. 2009), available at <https://cutr.usf.edu/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/Evaluation-of-the-Mobility-Fee-Concept-CUTR-Webcast-04.21.11.pdf> last visited April 11, 2023).

<sup>55</sup> Ch. 2009-96, s. 13(1)(b), Laws of Fla.

<sup>56</sup> Ch. 2013-78, s. 1, Laws of Fla.

<sup>57</sup> S. 163.3180(5)(f), F.S.

<sup>58</sup> See Hillsborough County Code of County Ordinances, ch. 40, art. III, div. 2, *Mobility Fees*; Pasco County Code of Ordinances, Land Development Code, ch. 1300, s. 1302.2; City of Port St. Lucie Code of Ordinances, Title XV, ch. 159, s. 159.101, *Port St. Lucie Mobility Fee Ordinance*.

The bill revises provisions concerning impact fees and concurrency while providing additional guidance concerning mobility fees. The bill provides definitions for “mobility fee” and “mobility plan” to be used within the Community Planning Act.<sup>59</sup>

The bill requires agreements between local governments that implement a transportation concurrency system and applicants for a development-of-regional-impact development order, development agreement, rezoning, or other land use permit concerning the applicants offer to pay for or construct its proportionate share of required improvements to that after an applicant makes its contribution or constructs its proportionate share, the project shall be considered to have mitigated its transportation impacts and must be allowed to proceed. The bill provides that local governments may not prevent a single applicant from proceeding after the applicant has satisfied its proportionate-share contribution.

The bill prohibits local governments from charging for transportation impacts if they are not the local government that is issuing a building permit, requires that local governments collect for extra-jurisdictional impacts if they are issuing building permits, and prohibits local governments from assessing multiple charges for the same transportation impact.

Impact Fees

The bill provides that local governments adopting and collecting impact fees must use localized data available within the previous 12 months of adoption for the local government’s calculation of impact fees. The bill provides that a local government must credit against the collection of the impact any contribution identified in the development order or any form of exaction, including monetary contributions.

The bill provides that holders of transportation or road impact fee credits granted under s. 163.3180 or s. 380.06, F.S., along with other provisions, which existed before the adoption of the mobility fee-based funding system, is entitled to the full benefit of the intensity and density prepaid by the credit balance as of the date it was first establish.

**B. SECTION DIRECTORY:**

- Section 1: Amends s. 163.3164, F.S., relating to Community Planning Act definitions.
- Section 2: Amends s. 163.3180, F.S., relating to concurrency.
- Section 3: Amends s. 163.31801. F.S., relating to impact fees.
- Section 4: Amends s. 212.055, F.S., relating to discretionary sales surtaxes.
- Section 5: Provides an effective date of July 1, 2023.

**II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT**

**A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:**

- 1. Revenues:  
None.
- 2. Expenditures:  
None.

**B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:**

- 1. Revenues:

<sup>59</sup> The Community Planning Act is part II of ch. 163, F.S.  
**STORAGE NAME:** h0235c.WMC  
**DATE:** 4/12/2023

None.

2. Expenditures:

None.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

None.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

None.

### III. COMMENTS

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

1. Applicability of Municipality/County Mandates Provision:

Not applicable. This bill does not appear to require counties or municipalities to spend funds or take action requiring the expenditures of funds; reduce the authority that counties or municipalities have to raise revenues in the aggregate; or reduce the percentage of state tax shared with counties or municipalities.

2. Other:

None.

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

The bill neither authorizes nor requires administrative rulemaking by executive branch agencies.

C. DRAFTING ISSUES OR OTHER COMMENTS:

None.

### IV. AMENDMENTS/COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES

On March 20, 2023, the Local Administration, Federal Affairs, & Special Districts Subcommittee adopted one amendment and reported the bill favorably as a committee substitute. The amendment revises the ability of local governments to increase impact fees based upon a showing of extraordinary circumstances by:

- Replacing the term with “extraordinary impacts,” defined as effects of development that will require mitigation by the affected local government, school district, or special district in the next four year that will exceed the total of the current impact fee amount, together with any increase that is permissible under the four-year phase-in provisions.
- Requires the demonstrated needs study to show that the projected population growth and in demand for the specific services funded by the impact fee will exceed the projected rates of population growth and demand for those specific services statewide.
- Revises the publicly noticed workshops requirement, necessitating the workshops must be solely dedicated to the extraordinary impacts, and requires two properly noticed public meetings also solely dedicated to the extraordinary impacts as a requirement.
- Provides that in any administrative or judicial proceeding challenging an impact fee increase by a local government due to extraordinary impacts, the local government shall have the burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that the local government justifiably relied upon the demonstrated-need study in the process of increasing impact fees.

On April 12, 2023, the Ways & Means Committee adopted a strike-all amendment and reported the bill favorably as a committee substitute. The committee substitute differs from CS/HB 235 by:

- Creating s. 163.3180(5)(j), F.S., which prohibits local governments from charging for transportation impacts if they are not the local government that is issuing a building permit, requires that local governments collect for extra-jurisdictional impacts if they are issuing building permits, and prohibits local governments from assessing multiple charges for the same transportation impact.
- Removing changes made by the bill to s. 163.31801(6)(g), F.S., which revised the ability of local governments to increase impact fees based upon a showing of extraordinary circumstances.
- Amending s. 163.3180(7), F.S., requiring local governments transitioning to alternative funding system to provide holders of impact fee credits with full benefit of intensity and density of prepaid credit balances.
- Removing s. 163.31803, F.S., which was created by CS/HB 235 to establish a method for the adoption and implementation of mobility plans as an alternative to transportation concurrency.

The analysis is drafted to the committee substitute as passed by the Ways & Means Committee.