

Walton County Board of County Commissioners AGENDA ITEM REPORT

21-0604

Meeting:Board of County Commissioners - Apr 27 2021Department:Planning DepartmentSubmitted by:Karen OwensStaff Contact:Kristen Shell, Asst. Director

□ Consent Agenda □ Regular Agenda

□ Public Hearing

TITLE/REQUESTED ACTION:

Mobility Plan and Fee – First Reading. Request to approve an ordinance of the Board of County Commissioners of Walton County, Florida, approving and adopting the county's mobility plan and mobility fee technical report, consistent with the provisions of section 163.3180 et seq., Florida Statutes, specifically subsection (5) (i) with regard to transportation concurrency; providing a conflicts clause, a severability clause, and authority to codify; providing an effective date; and for other purposes.

PURPOSE / SUMMARY EXPLANATION OR HISTORY:

The Planning Commission recommended approval with no changes on March 23, 2021.

ATTACHMENTS: WC_MICROMOBILITY_OVERVIEW_1.2 WC_MP_MF_TR_April_2021_OPT_1 Combined Public Comment Chapter 3 Concurrency Mobility_NUC

WHAT IS THE COMMON DEFINITION OF A MICROMOBILITY DEVICE?

Micromobility device is the common term used to describe personal electric mobility devices, the most common of which are electric bicycles (e-bike) and electric "motorized" scooters (e-scooter). When micromobility devices are provided by a private company, they often are designed with self-locking mechanisms that do not have to be attached to a bike or scooter rack and are known as "dockless" micromobility devices.

HOW ARE MICROMOBILITY DEVICES DEFINED BY FLORIDA STATUTE?

The Florida Legislature adopted House Bill 453 that established statutory requirements on micromobility device share programs. Section 316.003, Florida Statutes, defines a micromobility device as "[a]ny motorized transportation device made available for private use by reservation through an online application, website, or software for point-to-point trips and which is not capable of traveling at a speed greater than 20 miles per hour on level ground. This term includes motorized scooters and bicycles as defined in this chapter." The more commonly known definition is a private entity (micromobility operator) that rents e-bikes and e-scooters for use by the public, also known as bicycle share or scooter share programs.

WHERE CAN MICROMOBILITY DEVICES BE USED?

The Florida Legislature, through Florida Statutes 316.20655 and 316.2128, grants users (riders) of micromobility devices (e-bikes and e-scooters) the same rights as people riding bicycles. This means that anywhere a bicycle is allowed, micromobility devices are allowed. Per Statute, an individual can ride a micromobility device on any sidewalk, path, trail, street, or road where an individual is allowed to ride a bicycle. Thus, micromobility devices are allowed to be used on the multi-use paths along 30A and Scenic 98. The Mobility Plan proposes the construction of multimodal lanes and ways to provide a dedicated space, safely separated from people walking and bicycling on paths and driving on roads, for use of micromobility devices.

WHY DOES THE COUNTY NEED A MICROMOBILITY ORDINANCE?

The Florida Legislature allows private companies to provide micromobility share programs anywhere in Florida with no regulations; other than where devices have the same operation requirements and rights as bicycles and the removal of devices from public right-of-way during emergency events, such as a hurricane. The Legislature does provide local governments the ability to develop regulations for private companies that want to operate and rent shared micromobility devices.

Absent an adopted ordinance by Walton County, any micromobility operator could offer micromobility devices for rent and the only regulations in effect would be existing County regulations regarding riding and parking bicycles. The results of no regulations, which have been largely reported, are dockless micromobility devices left in the middle of sidewalks and paths or left on the ground blocking accessible curb ramps and access to businesses and residences.



WHAT CAN THE COUNTY REGULATE?

The County can regulate the following related to micromobility devices: (1) the number of micromobility operators permitted to rent devices; (2) the operation (riding) of devices; (3) where devices are allowed (deployment area); (4) the number of devices that may be rented; (5) the allowable speed of rental devices; (6) the hours of operation of rental devices; (7) the amount charged to rent devices; **(8) the parking of and location of parking for devices**; (9) insurance and indemnification requirements; (10) fees to hire Staff to monitor devices in deployed areas; (11) procedure for confiscating devices not in compliance with agreement, and (12) additional regulations related to data sharing, point of contact, public outreach, fees, resolution of complaints, confiscated vehicles, redistribution of devices, etc.

HOW CAN THE COUNTY REGULATE USE OF MICROMOBILITY DEVICES?

The County can update Chapter 16 (Roads and Bridges) and Chapter 20 (Traffic and Motor Vehicles) of the Code of Ordinances to establish regulations for the operation of micromobility devices in the County. The County currently has limited policies related to multi-use paths under Chapter 20 that includes definitions that need to be updated to reflect current Florida Statutes. If the County bans bicycles on certain sidewalks, paths and trails, it can ban micromobility devices. If it allows bicycles on sidewalks, paths and trails, then micromobility devices are allowed. An individual can purchase a micromobility device today for personal use and is allowed to operate it anywhere a bicycle is allowed. The County is currently lacking safe places to ride bicycles outside of sidewalks and paths and to prohibit bicycles along the paths on 30A and Scenic 98 would likely be met with opposition. The proposed Mobility Plan recommends multimodal lanes on 30A and Scenic 98 for use by micromobility devices and potentially golf carts. However, construction of those facilities, if approved, would be a few years away. In the interim, it is recommended the County consider adoption of the following micromobility speed limits:







© 2020 NUE Urban Concepts, LLC. All Rights Reserved. www.nueurbanconcepts.com ()(in)



HOW CAN THE COUNTY REGULATE MICROMOBILITY OPERATORS?

The County can adopt a micromobility ordinance that regulates the rental of micromobility devices. Through the ordinance, the County could establish the following:

- (1) Issue a Request for Proposal (RFP) to be a micromobility operator in Walton County. While the County could determine how many micromobility operators it selects, the RFP process only makes sense if the County wished to select one or two operators. The RFP would expand on requirements stipulated in the micromobility ordinance and establish a process to evaluate and rank firms that submitted a proposal to operate a micromobility system in the County; or
- (2) Establish a separate agreement, franchises, permit, or license process with ordinance requirements, qualification criteria, maximum number of devices, and compliance with ordinance regulations, fees, etc. Under this process, unlike the RFP process, there would be no limit on the number of private companies that could offer micromobility devices. The County could implement requirements that dockless devices that cannot be secured to designated racks (locked) would not be permitted to be parked within public rights-of-way and would need to be secured in corrals or stations on private property with the consent of property owners and the County. The County would determine, if and where any Dockless devices maybe located within a public right-of-way. The County or the Sheriff's Department could confiscate vehicles left in public right-of-way and charge a fee to release the device. The County could also charge a fee to cover the cost of Staff to monitor the deployment area to ensure devices are not parked in unapproved areas; or
- (3) A hybrid approach where the County issues an RFP for a single micromobility operator with the ability to offer dockless micromobility devices (most likely a national firm) and a separate permit or license process for local Walton County based companies to offer docked micromobility devices. <u>The County could implement requirements that dockless</u> <u>devices that cannot be secured to designated racks would not be permitted to be parked</u> within public rights-of-way and would need to be secured in corrals or stations on private property with the consent of property owners.

RECOMMENDED MICROMOBILITY OPTION

The second option accommodates both local and national micromobility operators and allows the County to establish an agreement, franchisee, license or permit process that does not require an RFP and allows the County to requirements for micromobility operators related to parking and use of devices. The third option allows the County to permit a single entity to provide a dockless system through the RFP process. It is most likely a dockless system can really only be provided by a national firm with geofencing technology to remotely control how a dockless system would operate. Geofencing technology allows a micromobility operator to regulate the speed of devices, restrict where devices are used, remotely disable devices where they are prohibited, restrict parking a micromobility device in prohibited areas, and require that the devices be parked



only in designated locations. The County can establish specific enforcement and compliance regulations for both options.



DRAFT 2040 WALTON COUNTY MOBILITY PLAN & MOBILITY FEE TECHNICAL REPORT APRIL 2021

Prepared for:



Prepared by:



Page 6 of 264



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview	4
Introduction	5
Legislative Background	10
Legal	13
Comprehensive Plan	21
Growth	22
Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT)	22
Person Miles of Travel (PMT)	25
Mobility Plan	27
Mobility Fee	49
Daily Road Capacity	50
Multimodal Capacity	51
Multimodal Projects	54
New Growth Evaluation	55
Funding	55
Person Miles of Travel (PMT) Rate	57
Mobility Fee Assessment Areas	60
Person Travel Demand (PMT) per Land Use	61
Mobility Fee Schedule	62
Mobility Fee Benefit District	62
Conclusion	62

Figures

Figure 1.	Increase in Vehicle Miles of Travel	23
Figure 2.	Percentage Increase in Vehicle & Person Miles of Travel	26
Figure 3.	Moving People Providing Choices	27
Figure 4.	Types of Projects in the Mobility Plan	28
Figure 5.	Multimodal Elements	29
Figure 6.	Speed of Travel	30
Figure 7.	Street Quality of Service (QOS) Standards	31
Figure 8.	Scenic 98 Multimodal Cross-Section	33
Figure 9.	30A Multimodal Cross-Section: Seaside	35
Figure 10.	30A Multimodal Cross-Section: Watercolor	36
Figure 11.	30A Multimodal Cross-Section: Western Lake	37
Figure 12.	30A Multimodal Cross-Section: Alys Beach	38
Figure 13.	30A Multimodal Cross-Section: Rosemary Beach	39
Figure 14.	Seagrove Connector Multimodal Cross-Section	44
Figure 15.	Mobility Plan and Mobility Fee	49





Tables

Table 1.	Projected Growth	22
Table 2.	Growth in Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT)	24
Table 3.	Increase in Person Miles of Travel (PMT)	25
Table 4.	Increase in Person Miles of Travel (PMT) by Planning Area	26
Table 5.	Projected 2040 Volumes on South Walton Roads	45
Table 6.	Daily Road Capacities	50
Table 7.	Bicycling and Walking Person Capacity	52
Table 8.	Multimodal Daily Person Capacities	53
Table 9.	Summary of Mobility Plan Multimodal Projects	54
Table 10.	New Growth Evaluation	55
Table 11.	Multimodal Project Cost Allocation	56
Table 12.	Multimodal Project Cost Allocation Central & North Walton	57
Table 13.	Multimodal Project Cost North Central & North Walton	57
Table 14.	Multimodal Project Cost Central Walton	58
Table 15.	Multimodal Project Cost South Walton	58
Table 16.	North Walton Person Miles of Travel Rate	59
Table 17.	Central Walton Person Miles of Travel Rate	59
Table 18.	South Walton Person Miles of Travel Rate	60

Appendices

Appendix A.	2017 National Household Travel Survey Data
Appendix B.	Miramar Beach Sandestin Walking & Bicycling Plan
Appendix C.	Miramar Beach Sandestin Transit Circulator Plan
Appendix D.	Miramar Beach Sandestin Multimodal Lanes Plan
Appendix E.	Miramar Beach Sandestin Roads Plan
Appendix F.	South Walton Walking & Bicycling Plan
Appendix G.	South Walton Transit Circulator Plan
Appendix H.	South Walton Micromobility & Microtransit Plan
Appendix I.	South Walton Roads Plan
Appendix J.	30A Cross-sections: 70' Wide ROW
Appendix K.	30A Cross-sections: Various ROW Widths
Appendix L.	US Hwy 98 Cross-sections
Appendix M.	Watercolor Multimodal Alternatives
Appendix N.	Central & North Walton Mobility Plan
Appendix O.	Four (4) Lane Road Cross-Sections
Appendix P.	FDOT Generalized Daily Service Volumes
Appendix Q.	Mobility Fee Schedule



Maps

Map A.	Miramar Beach Sandestin Walking & Bicycling Plan
Мар В.	Miramar Beach Sandestin Transit Circulator Plan
Мар С.	Miramar Beach Sandestin Multimodal Lanes Plan
Map D.	Miramar Beach Sandestin Roads Plan
Map E.	South Walton Walking & Bicycling Plan
Map F.	South Walton Transit Circulator Plan
Map G.	South Walton Micromobility & Microtransit Plan
Мар Н.	South Walton Roads Plan
Map I.	Central & North Walton Mobility Plan
Map J.	Central & North Walton Needs Plan
Мар К.	Mobility Fee Assessment Areas
Map L.	Mobility Fee Benefit Districts



OVERVIEW

In 1985, the Florida Legislature passed the Growth Management Act that required all local governments in Florida adopt Comprehensive Plans to guide future development and mandated that adequate public facilities be provided "concurrent" with the impacts of new development. Transportation concurrency became the measure used by local governments to ensure that adequate public facilities, in the form of road capacity, was available to meet the transportation demands from new development. By 1993, the Florida Legislature recognized an unintended consequence of transportation concurrency is that it essentially stopped development in urban areas where road capacity was constrained pushed development to suburban and rural areas where road capacity was either available or was cheaper to construct.

In 2007, the Legislature introduced the concept of mobility plans and mobility fees as a replacement of transportation concurrency, proportionate share and road impact fees. In 2009, the Legislature created Dense Urban Land Areas (DULAs) that allowed local governments to adopt Transportation Concurrency Exception Areas (TCEAs). In 2011, the Legislature eliminated state mandated transportation concurrency and made it optional for any local government. In 2013, the Legislature encouraged local governments to adopt alternative mobility funding systems, such as mobility plans and fees, as an alternative to transportation concurrency and proportionate share. In 2019, the Legislature required that mobility fees, based on a mobility plan, explicitly follow the requirements for impact fees per Florida Statute 163.31801.

The Walton County 2040 Mobility Plan is a vision, over the next 20 years, for how the County's transportation system will transition from one focused primarily on moving cars, towards a multimodal system focused on safely providing mobility and accessibility for people of all ages and abilities consistent with Florida Statute 163.3180 (5)(f). Achieving that vision will not happen overnight; it will be an iterative process that involves coordinating land use, transportation, parking, and funding. The Mobility Plan will serve as a guide to proactively plan for and prioritize multimodal projects to meet the growth, travel, and mobility needs of the community. The Mobility Plan also seeks to facilitate development of park-once environments along 30A and Scenic 98 to encourage visitors to the County's beach communities to park their car when they arrive and use other forms of transportation to explore their destinations. The Mobility Fee is a streamlined, one-time fee paid by new development and redevelopment to mitigate the impact to the County's transportation system and partially fund the multimodal projects adopted as part of the Mobility Plan. Mobility Fees were enacted to provide local governments alternative mobility funding systems to replace transportation concurrency and proportionate share.



INTRODUCTION

The Florida Constitution grants local governments broad home rule authority to establish assessments and fees. Special assessments, impact fees, mobility fees, franchise fees, and user fees or service charges are examples of these home rule revenue sources. Florida Statute grants local governments the authority to develop alternative mobility funding systems to replace transportation concurrency and proportionate share. Walton County is one of the fastest growing Counties in the U.S. That growth, combined with an ever-increasing number of visitors, has resulted in the current transportation system experiencing significant congestion during peak tourism season. At the same time, the current system is also starting to experience intermittent congestion during previously slower seasons, as both new residents and businesses move in and as an increasing number of visitors are opting to travel to the community during off-peak seasons.

The 2040 Regional Travel Demand Model reflects a projected increase of 3,417,648 vehicle miles of travel (VMT) in the County between 2020 and 2040. To put that into perspective, assuming an average daily capacity of 8,500 cars a day per mile of road, Walton County would need 402 miles of new travel lanes, or an equivalent of 201 miles of new two (2) lane roads to meet projected demand. Accounting for person travel demand, which includes people walking, bicycling, using other modes of transportation and vehicle occupancy (the number of persons per car), the projected increase in personal travel demand is 6,220,119. To account for person travel demand, the daily person capacity of a road would increase to 15,470, which would still result in a need of 402 miles of new travel lanes, or an equivalent of 201 miles of new two (2) lane roads to meet projected person travel demand. The resulting per lane mile demand does not change between VMT and PMT as the same conversion factor is utilized. The conversion of VMT to PMT is undertaken to incorporate person travel and allow the County to develop an alternative mobility funding system that can be used to fund multimodal projects identified in the 2040 Mobility Plan.

The 2040 Mobility Plan provides a balanced approach to meeting projected future travel demand through identification of multimodal projects for people walking, bicycling, accessing transit, and driving motor vehicles (e.g., cars, motorcycles, SUVs, trucks). The Mobility Plan also seeks to create a park-once environment along 30A and Scenic 98 to reduced vehicle travel on both roads. The park-once environment is designed around mobility hubs connected by sidewalks, paths, trails and dedicated multimodal lanes and ways for people walking, bicycling and using micromobility devices (e.g., e-bikes, e-scooters) and microtransit vehicles (e.g., autonomous transit shuttles, golf carts, neighborhood electric vehicles, trolleys). The mobility plan includes the upgrade or widening of existing Federal, State and County roads, along with primarily new County roads and a few State roads with an emphasis on expanding the overall transportation grid versus just widening roads.



The total projected cost of multimodal projects identified over the next 20 years in Walton County is \$1,825,492,993.97, of which \$1,312,651,053 would be attributable to Federal and State Roads (Interstate 10 and Interchanges are excluded in this cost). Walton County's share of the Mobility Plan would be \$512,841,940.81. For purposes of providing a local match, Walton County's share of Federal and State Roads would be \$131,265,105.32 (10% share) for a total projected cost of \$644,107,046.13. The equates to an annual need of roughly \$32,205,352.31 in funding for the County's share of the Mobility Plan. While the County is technically under no obligation to fund improvements to the Federal and State System, if the County desires multimodal projects other than FDOT standards and wants to be competitive with adjacent Counties in securing Federal and State funds and advancing multimodal projects, a local match is often required.

The projected need for multimodal projects is significant and will continue to increase as growth in both development and tourism continues. Walton County is not unique in having projected transportation demand that exceed current funding. Counties in Florida that have been able to keep property taxes at moderate levels have adopted infrastructure sales taxes, have utilized maximum gas tax revenues, have actively pursued state and federal funds, have used tourism taxes, parking and user fees, and have either mobility fees, proportionate share or road impact fees in place to ensure new development pays a share of the cost of the multimodal projects identified in the Mobility Plan. There have been voices from the development community that have spoken in opposition to the mobility fee. The reality is the County is going to need multiple revenue streams to address current infrastructure needs and the person travel demand from new development.

The County has several options to require new development to mitigate its transportation impact. One option not recommended is that the County keep its existing proportionate share system. The County has already been ordered to modify its existing system or consider an alternative. Further, the Legislature has greatly restricted how local governments implement proportionate share. The following are four options the County could consider as an alternative:

Eliminate Transportation Concurrency & Proportionate Share

- The State has eliminated State mandated transportation concurrency and made it optional for any local government to also eliminate transportation concurrency.
- New development would no longer be required to mitigate its transportation impact. The County may still require site related improvements identified in Traffic Impact Analysis.
- The County would need to fund mobility plan projects through other sources such as gas taxes, property taxes, sales taxes, tourist taxes, special assessments, Municipal Service Benefit Units and Municipal Service Taxing Units (MSBUs/MSTUs) and federal and state funds.



Develop Road Impact Fees

- Principally pay for the cost associated with adding new road capacity to move people driving vehicles (i.e., cars, trucks, SUVs, motorcycles). They cannot be used for bike lanes, sidewalks, paths, trails, mobility hubs or multimodal lanes.
- 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.
- Are based on increases in vehicle miles of capacity from road improvements and the projected vehicle miles of travel from development.
- Maybe based on either an adopted LOS standard (aka standards or consumption-based fee) or on future road improvements (aka plan or improvements-based fee). The roadway projects identified in the Mobility Plan could be used to develop a road impact fee.
- Could vary based on geographic area and the need for new road capacity.

Develop an Alternative Mobility Funding System through Mobility Studies

- The County could develop an alternative mobility funding system that is a hybrid between proportionate share and mobility fees. Like any exaction or fee, the system would be required to demonstrate it meets the dual rational nexus test and rough proportionality test.
- The alternative mobility funding system could be based on the developed mobility plan. Unlike proportionate share, where some developments pay and other developments do not pay based on whether there is or is not road capacity available, all new development would be required if the mobility plan included projects that are within their study area. In this instance, the multimodal projects currently identified on the Mobility Plan may need to be expanded.
- The new system would establish study area requirements for all new development that determined how far they would need to evaluate their impact to the transportation system. The limits of the study area would be determined based on the developments projected person trips.
- The developer would be required to either pay a fee to the County and have the County prepare a Mobility Impact Analysis of the developer could hire a traffic engineer or transportation planning consultant to conduct a Mobility Impact Analysis to hold a methodology meeting with the County and conduct the Mobility Impact Analysis.
- The Mobility Impact Analysis would focus on calculating the internal and external person trips, person trip length by mode of travel, and distribution of person trips.



- Unlike proportionate share where the development would evaluate the need for road capacity improvements, the mobility plan will have already identified needed multimodal projects. The mobility plan has also established a person capacity and cost for each multimodal project. The development would be required to divide the distributed person trips from the development over the study network by the person capacity of the multimodal project. The percentage of capacity consumed would be multiplied by the multimodal project cost to determine the developments mitigation per multimodal project.
- The current mobility plan is fairly extensive, especially in South Walton. The Mobility Plan does include a Needs Plan north of the Bay that identifies a number of smaller scale projects that would need to be incorporated into the system as they are geared more towards future development north of the Bay around DeFuniak Springs and Freeport.
- Like proportionate share, new development will not know what its transportation mitigation will be until a Mobility Impact Analysis is completed. Unlike proportionate share, almost all new development will likely be required to pay something as the Mobility Plan has identified multimodal projects countywide. Similar to proportionate share, some development will be required to pay higher mitigation depending on the size of the development and the identified multimodal projects. For example, any development along 30A and Scenic 98 have fairly extensive multimodal projects for walking, bicycling and accessing microtransit that would require mitigation. Along 98, there are extensive roadway and parallel roadway projects identified, as well as future mobility hubs, sidewalks, paths and trails.
- Like proportionate share, development would be required to pay the mitigation at the time of development order approval. The final mitigation due would be dependent on the County approving the Mobility Impact Analysis.
- For reasons that will be elaborated further, the County would need to develop internal travel demand modeling capabilities and have dedicated staff or have an on-call consultant available to assist with review the methodology, review the Mobility Impact Analysis, be able to run and update the model, and be available to complete the Mobility Impact Analysis for developments that elect to pay the County to complete the Study. An alternative mobility funding system is a fairly intensive undertaking to be administered in accordance with case law and to meet statutory requirements.
- Unlike a Mobility Fee, which is a more streamlined and uniform impact within a given assessment area, an alternative mobility funding system would more directly reflect the individual impact of proposed land uses as the analysis will be land use specific, whereas the Mobility Fee provides a more consolidated, more wholistic approach to land use classifications to facilitate and streamline the assessment process. There is no way to tell which approach would result in lower overall mitigation. Larger developments or non-residential land uses may pay higher mitigation, whereas small scale developments of single-family homes may pay less.



Develop Mobility Fees

- Mobility Fee are based on the multimodal projects identified in the 2040 Mobility Plan. Mobility
 Fees are calculated to ensure new developments pay their share of the cost associated with
 adding new multimodal person capacity to move people walking, bicycling, scooting, riding
 transit, driving vehicles or using shared mobility technology. This study presents a technical
 finding that the Mobility Fee meets case law and statutory requirements.
- Mobility Fees are to be used to partially or fully fund multimodal projects, including sidewalks, paths, trails, bike lanes, streetscape and landscape, complete and low speed streets, microtransit circulators, micromobility (i.e., electric bikes, electric scooters) devices, programs and services, microtransit (i.e., golf carts, neighborhood electric vehicles, autonomous transit shuttles, trolleys) services and vehicles, new roads, the widening of existing roads, and the addition or extension of turn lanes at intersections.
- The Mobility Fees are based on increases in person miles of capacity from multimodal projects, the cost of those projects, and the projected person travel demand from new development.
- Unlike proportionate share or an alternative mobility funding system, the Mobility Fees are predetermined and provided on the mobility fee schedule included in this Report.
- The Mobility Fee is tired where new development in South Walton pays a higher Mobility Fee rate based on the need for multimodal projects primarily on County Roads. The Mobility Fee is lower in the Central Planning Area around the City of Freeport which has a mixture of multimodal projects but includes a less extensive transportation network and a higher number of multimodal improvements on Federal and State Roads. The Mobility Fee is lowest in the North Central and North Planning Areas around the City of DeFuniak Springs and Town of Paxton due to most identified multimodal projects being located on State Roads.
- Unlike South Walton, Central and North Walton also has a needs plan that identifies multimodal projects that would be largely developer driven and require additional public input before they are added to the Mobility Plan. The vast majority of these multimodal improvements are on County Roads. As multimodal projects are added to the Mobility Plan, the Mobility Fee may increase as the future multimodal improvements will largely be on City and County roads, versus on State Roads.
- Unlike proportionate share or an alternative mobility mitigation system, mobility fees are
 assessed during planning review of building permits and paid prior to approval of the planning
 review of a building permit. Any request for Mobility Fee off-sets or credits would need to be
 requested prior to submittal of building permits for planning review. Most local governments
 are electing to adopt Mobility Fees as a streamlined, transparent alternative mobility funding
 system that is easier to implement and administer.



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 stopping growth in urban areas. 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, and environmental protections. 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 urban 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 to make proportionate share payments to mitigate its travel demand. 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 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 HB 7207 exempting any local governments existing transportation concurrency system from meeting these new requirements when it elected to abolish statewide transportation concurrency and make transportation concurrency optional for local governments. Florida Statute 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".

The 2013 Legislative Session 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. House Bill 319, passed by the Florida Legislature in 2013, amended the Community Planning Act and established mobility plans and associated mobility fees as an alternative to transportation concurrency by which local governments can allow development, consistent with an adopted Comprehensive Plan, to equitably mitigate its travel demand impact. The Legislature also clarified in the Community Planning Act that any backlogged facility is the responsibility of local governments; new development shall not be charged for backlog and that new developments can assume any backlogged facility will be addressed by local governments when calculating its proportionate share mitigation. The Community Planning Act did not elect to "grandfather" in any local governments existing transportation concurrency system and did not place restrictions of any local government from adopting an alternative.

In 2019, the Florida Legislature, through House Bill 7103, amended the following guidance for local governments, provided for in the Community Planning Act, to adopt an alternative to transportation concurrency through Florida Statute 163.3180(5)(i): *(strikethrough and underline show 2013 to 2019 change)*

"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 <u>s. 163.31801</u> governing 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)."



The Community Planning Act provides the following guidance for local governments that elect to repeal transportation concurrency and adopt an alternative mobility funding system using one or more of the tools and techniques identified in Florida Statutes 163.3180(5)(f) such as:

- "1. Adoption of long-term strategies to facilitate development patterns that support multimodal solutions, including urban design, appropriate land use mixes, intensity and density.
- 2. Adoption of an area wide level of service not dependent on any single road segment function.
- 3. Exempting or discounting impacts of locally desired development, such as development in urban areas, redevelopment, job creation, and mixed use on the transportation system.
- 4. Assigning secondary priority to vehicle mobility and primary priority to ensuring a safe, comfortable, and attractive pedestrian environment with convenient interconnection to transit.
- 5. 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.
- 6. Reducing impact fees or local access fees to promote development within urban areas, multimodal districts, and a balance of mixed-use development in certain areas or districts, or for affordable or workforce housing."

LEGAL

In 2006, the Legislature adopted the "Impact Fee Act" to provide general criteria that local governments who adopted an impact fee are required to meet. Unlike many States throughout the U.S. that have adopted enabling legislation, the Florida Legislature deferred largely to the significant case law that has been developed in both Florida and throughout the U.S. to provide guidance to local governments. By the time the "Impact Fee Act" was adopted, many local governments had already developed impact fees through their broad home rule powers.

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 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. There has yet to be a legal challenge to impact fees in Florida since the 2009 legislation, due in large part to the great recession and the fact that many local governments either reduced impact fees or placed a moratorium on impact fees between 2009 and 2015.



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 was approved prior to the new or updated fee. The bill also made credits assignable and transferable to third parties. The "Impact Fee Act" in Florida Statute 163.31801 reads: *(strikethrough and underline show 2018 to 2020 change)*

- "(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) At a minimum, an impact fee adopted by ordinance of a county or municipality or by resolution of a special district must satisfy all of the following conditions:
 - (a) The calculation of the impact fee must be based on the most recent and localized data.
 - (b) The local government must provide for accounting and reporting of impact fee collections and expenditures. If a local governmental entity imposes an impact fee to address its infrastructure needs, the entity must account for the revenues and expenditures of such impact fee in a separate accounting fund.
 - (c) Administrative charges for the collection of impact fees must be limited to actual costs.
 - (d) The local government must provide notice not less than 90 days before the effective date of an ordinance or resolution imposing a new or increased impact fee. A county or municipality 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 an ordinance or resolution imposing a new or increased impact fee.
 - (e) 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) The impact fee must be proportional and 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.
- (g) The impact fee must be proportional and reasonably connected to, or have a rational nexus with, the expenditures of the funds collected and the benefits accruing to the new residential or nonresidential construction.
- (h) The local government must specifically earmark funds collected under the impact fee for use in acquiring, constructing, or improving capital facilities to benefit new users.
- (i) Revenues generated by the impact fee may not be 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.
- (4) <u>Notwithstanding any charter provision, comprehensive plan policy, ordinance, or resolution,</u> the local government 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 education facilities, including land dedication, site planning and design, or construction. Any contribution must be applied to reduce any education-based impact fees on a dollar-for-dollar basis at fair market value.
- (5) If a local government increases its impact fee rates, 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. This subsection shall operate prospectively and not retrospectively.
- (6) Audits of financial statements of local governmental entities and district school boards which are performed by a certified public accountant pursuant to s. 218.39 and submitted to the Auditor General must include an affidavit signed by the chief financial officer of the local governmental entity or district school board stating that the local governmental entity or district school board has complied with this section.
- (7) In any action challenging an impact fee or the government's failure to provide required dollar-fordollar 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.
- (8) 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 receives benefits from the improvement or contribution that generated the credits.



(9)(8) 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.

(10)(9) This section does not apply to water and sewer connection fees.

The purpose of preparing a technical report is to demonstrate that the mobility fee is proportional and reasonably connected to, or has a rational nexus with, both the need for new facilities and the benefits provided to those who pay the fee, otherwise known as the "dual rational nexus test" and "rough proportionality test", as required by Florida Statute 163.31801(3)(f)(g). The "dual rational nexus test" requires a local government demonstrate that there is a reasonable connection, or rational nexus, between:

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

The "Benefit" that the new development receives from the payment and expenditure of fees to construct the new capital 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 first time the Courts recognized the authority of a municipality to impose "impact fees" in Florida occurred in 1975 in the case of City of Dunedin v. Contractors and Builders Association of Pinellas County, 312 So.2d 763 (2 D.C.A. 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 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 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. 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). Justice Scalia delivered the following 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 outand-out plan of extortion (Nollan v. California Coastal Commission, 483 U. S. 825 (1987)".

The second case, Dolan v. Tigard, heard by the 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)"

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 land-use 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 Remainder of This Page Intentionally Left Blank



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The following are goals, objectives, and policies in the Transportation Elements integrating land use, transportation, and implementation to the County's mobility plan and fee:

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

"GOAL T-1: PROVIDE A SAFE, COST EFFECTIVE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM WITH ADEQUATE TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES AND SERVICES IN PLACE TO MITIGATE IMPACTS FROM DEVELOPMENT."

Objective T-1.5: "The County shall develop a corridor specific transportation mitigation fee to promote multi-modal improvements on all local roadway/corridors identified within this element as being constrained."

Policy T-1.5.1: "The following roadways/segments shall be designated by Walton County as constrained facilities:

- CR 30A US 98 on the West End to US 98 on the East End
- CR 2378 Okaloosa County Line to US 98 on the East End"

Objective T-1.6: "Walton County shall develop transportation corridors on state and local roads in order that the public health, safety, and welfare may be protected, preserved, and improved by planning for future growth, coordinating land use and transportation planning, and complying with the concurrency requirements of Chapter 163.3180 F.S."

GOAL T-2: "PROVIDE A MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM THAT SERVES TO INCREASE MOBILITY, PROMOTE ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION, AND IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR THE CITIZENS OF WALTON COUNTY."

Policy T-2.1.4: "Walton County shall develop a priority list by December 2011 for the installation of bicycle lanes and multi-use paths on County roads. Based on the Master Plan recommendations Walton County shall implement sidewalk and multi-use path construction projects where necessary to close existing gaps along arterial, collector, and local roads."

Policy T-2.1.5: "Encourage non-motorized transportation facilities to link residential areas with recreational and commercial areas in a safe manner, in part by requiring the construction of sidewalks, bike lanes, multi-use paths, installation of signage, develop inter-connectivity, and/or striping of roadways to accommodate non-motorized transportation facilities."

Objective T-2.2: "Walton County shall promote a multi-modal transportation network within the County to better balance auto, truck, bicycle, pedestrian and basic transit systems to reduce total auto dependence, save energy, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and reduce excess travel."



GROWTH

The first requirement of the dual rational nexus for a mobility fee is to demonstrate that there is a need for future multimodal projects to accommodate the travel demand from future growth. An evaluation of the projected population, dwelling units, and employment was conducted for Walton County based on the 2040 Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) District Three (3) Regional Travel Demand Model used to develop the Okaloosa-Walton County Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The 2010 and 2040 population, dwelling units, and employment data was obtained from the Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs) used in the 2040 Model. The 2019 existing conditions is based on the 2019 American Community Survey for Walton County prepared by the U.S. Census Bureau. The socio-economic data used in the 2040 Model demonstrates that there is projected to be more than a doubling of the population and number of dwelling units over the next 20 years, along with significant increases in employment within Walton County by 2040 (Table 1).

Year	Population	Dwelling Units	Employment
2010	50,722	43,643	30,576
2019	68,262	51,966	32,394
2040	147,679	115,645	51,757
Increase	79,417	63,649	19,363
2019 2040 Increase	147,679 79,417	63,649	52,394 51,757 19,363

TABLE 1. PROJECTED GROWTH

Source: The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) District Three (3) Regional Travel Demand Model for the Okaloosa-Walton County TPO 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The data was extracted from the 2010 and 2040 Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZ). The base year for the model is 2010 and the future year of the model is 2040. The 2019 estimated data is based on the American Community Survey for Walton County prepared by the U.S. Census Bureau.

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. The FDOT District Three 2040 Regional Travel Demand Model was used to determine the VMT growth within Walton County between 2010 and 2040. The VMT data is used to project future person miles of travel (PMT) demand to evaluate the "need" for future multimodal projects necessary to meet that PMT demand and demonstrate compliance with the "needs" test under the dual rational nexus test. The VMT analysis was conducted for all of Walton County with and with-out Interstate 10 and the County's Four Planning Areas which are used for developing Mobility Fee Assessment Areas and Benefit Districts (Figure 1).



Figure 1. Increase in Vehicle Miles of Travel



Travel on Interstate 10 is illustrated for informational purposes. The growth in travel on Interstate 10 is excluded from the evaluation of future multimodal project needs and in the Mobility Fee calculations. Interstate 10 travel demand is excluded due to fact that the Interstate system is largely funded through federal fuel tax revenues and the potential to levy user fees (tolls) for managed travel lanes. The projected growth on Interstate 10 is relatively moderate given current conditions, even though FDOT District Three is looking to secure funds to widen Interstate 10 to six (6) lanes.

The projected increase in VMT by planning area is utilized in the development of Mobility Fee rates for the various Mobility Fee Assessment Areas **(Table 2)**. The largest increase in VMT is within the South Walton Planning Areas with a projected increase of 1,592,225 in VMT between 2020 and 2040. The smallest increase in VMT is within the North Walton Planning Areas with a projected increase of 237,331 in VMT between 2020 and 2040. The lowest overall increase in VMT is projected to occur on Interstate 10, with a projected increase in VMT of 121,022 by 2040.



Location	2010 Model Base Year	2020 Mobility Plan Base Year	2040 Model & Plan Future year	Increase 2020-2040
Walton County	3,184,558	4,272,447	7,690,095	3,417,648
Walton County (w/o I-10)	2,653,758	3,689,173	6,985,799	3,296,626
North Planning Area	312,083	394,883	632,214	237,331
North Central Planning Area	846,912	1,024,489	1,499,152	474,663
Central Planning Area	436,366	692,839	1,746,608	1,053,769
South Walton Planning Area	1,058,397	1,515,600	3,107,825	1,592,225
Interstate 10	530,800	583,274	704,296	121,022
Source: The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) District Three (3) Regional Travel Demand Model for the Okaloosa-Walton County TPO 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The 2010 base year data and 2040 projections are based of the FDOT District 3 Regional Planning Model. The 2020 mobility plan base year VMT was interpolated based on an annual growth rate of 2.98% based on the increase in VMT between the 2010 base year model data and the 2040 horizon year model data. The VMT increase is based on the difference between 2020 and 2040.				

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

An evaluation of future travel demand was undertaking using the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and Okaloosa-Walton County Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) 2040 Regional Travel Demand Model. The NUE Urban Concepts Team, with over 85 years of travel demand modeling, transportation engineering and planning experience, had to make use of that experience to address issues with the 2040 Model that significantly underpredicted demand in South Walton County. The 2040 Model has been updated to address household occupancy factors and the number of dwelling units, both of which were significantly underpredicted in South Walton County. In addition, traffic analysis zones were modified to accurately distribute traffic and include projected development to occur over the next twenty years as part of the St. Joes Sector Plan in both Bay and Walton County. Of significant note, the 2040 model year assumed household occupancy of between 0.3 and 0.5 persons per household, versus the 2010 model year which included just over 2.0 persons for both the 2010 and 2040 model years for both Bay and Okaloosa County and used similar persons per household in both model years for development in Walton County north of the Bay.



Another issue that was discovered was the number of dwelling units projected in 2040 in South Walton was less than what existed on the ground in 2020. So not only did the prior model underpredict development in South Walton, it also does not in any way address vacation rentals. So instead of the 12 to 20 persons per week that may occupy a vacation rental, the model predicted roughly 0.3 to 0.5 persons used that vacation rental. How these model issues have been missed by large developments or in evaluation of corridor needs in South Walton is unknown and occurred prior to the NUE Urban Concepts Team being selected by Walton County to develop a Mobility Plan and Mobility Fee. FDOT and the TPO are both developing a 2045 Regional Travel Demand Model. Whether the County continues to use the NUE Urban Concepts Team or another firm, the County needs to ensure that it has a Regional Travel Demand Model that accurately reflects existing conditions in Walton County, integrates the Mobility Plan, uses available Streetlight data to validate existing demand, and accurately reflects approved and pending developments within the County.

PERSON MILES OF TRAVEL (PMT)

The evaluation of future person miles of travel (PMT) is the initial component in the development of a mobility fee. To account for person trips made by walking, biking, riding transit, and vehicle occupancy in a multimodal travel environment, vehicle travel demand is converted into person travel demand based on data from the 2017 National Household Travel Survey (NHTS). Person travel demand, also referred to as person miles of travel, is calculated based on person trips and person trip length from the NHTS data. An evaluation of the personal travel data from the NHTS resulted in a PMT factor of 1.87 (**Appendix A**). The projected increase in PMT for Walton County between the Mobility Plan base year of 2020 and the Mobility Plan future year of 2040 is 6,391,002 (**Table 3**).

2020 Base Year Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT)	4,272,447	
2020 Base Year Person Miles of Travel (PMT)	7,989,476	
2040 Future Year Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT)	7,690,095	
2040 Future Year Person Miles of Travel (PMT)	14,380,478	
Increase in Person Miles of Travel (PMT)	6,391,002	
Source: Base and future year vehicle travel data from Table 2. PMT obtained by multiplying VMT by PMT conversion factor of		

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

Source: Base and future year vehicle travel data from Table 2. PMT obtained by multiplying VMT by PMT conversion factor of 1.87 based on 2017 NHTS (Appendix A).

The increase in PMT by Planning Area illustrated in **Table 4** will be utilized in the determination of the Mobility Fee rate per Mobility Fee Assessment Area. South Walton experienced the largest increase in projected, representing almost 50% of the total increase in PMT over the next 20 years.



Location	2040 VMT Increase	2040 PMT
Walton County	3,417,648	6,391,002
Walton County (w/o I-10)	3,296,626	6,164,690
North Planning Area	237,331	443,810
North Central Planning Area	474,663	887,619
Central Planning Area	1,053,769	1,970,548
South Walton Planning Area	1,592,225	2,977,461
Interstate 10	121,022	226,312
Source: PMT obtained by multiplying Increase in VMT by the PMT conversion factor 1.87 based on the 2017 NHTS (Appendix A).		

TABLE 4. INCREASE IN PERSON MILES OF TRAVEL (PMT) BY PLANNING AREA

The Central Planning Area experienced the largest percent increase in PMT at 152% over the next 20 years. The PMT within the South Walton Planning Area is projected to increase by 105%. The overall projected increase in Countywide PMT, excluding travel on I-10, is almost 90% (Figure 2).



Figure 2. Percentage Increase in Vehicle and Person Miles of Travel



MOBILITY PLAN

The Walton County 2040 Mobility Plan is a vision, over the next 20 years, for how the County's transportation system will transition from one focused primarily on moving cars, towards a multimodal system focused on safely providing mobility and accessibility for people of all ages and abilities consistent with Florida Statute 163.3180 (5)(f). Achieving that vision will not happen overnight; it will be an iterative process that involves coordinating land use, transportation, parking, and funding. The Mobility Plan will serve as a guide to proactively plan for and prioritize multimodal projects to meet the growth, travel, and mobility needs of the community. The Mobility Plan also seeks to facilitate development of park-once environments along 30A and Scenic 98 to encourage visitors to the County's to park-once use other forms of transportation to explore (**Figure 3**).

Figure 3. Moving People, Providing Choices



The types of multimodal projects included in the Mobility Plan are intended to implement the Vision of the Mobility Plan (Figure 4). The multimodal projects identified in the Mobility Plan were established based on the multimodal elements necessary to transition from a transportation system focused on moving cars, towards a safe, comfortable, and convenient multimodal system focused on moving people (Figure 5).



Figure 4. Types of Projects in the Mobility Plan





Figure 5. Multimodal Elements

AND USE • MOBILITY • PARKING • FEES NUE URBAN CONCEPT www.nueurbanconcepts.com 🏽 🕲 🕤 🔟 2021 NUE Urban Concepts, LLC. All Rights Reserved. 9

MOBILITY: The ability to move people from place (origin) to place (destination) by multiple modes (walk, bike, transit, vehicle) of travel in a timely (speed) and efficient manner. The lack of sidewalks, paths, trails, bike lanes, and curb access ramps are often impediments to people choosing to walk or bike from home to work and other daily activities.

EQUITY: The ability to access relevant activities such as employment, education, entertainment, health care, personal services, recreation, and retail opportunities by people of all ages, abilities, race, and socioeconomic strata without undue and unjust burden. Equitable mobility provides transportation justice for not only underserved and/or disadvantaged communities but also for vulnerable users. People have a fundamental right to move around easily, safely, and conveniently.

ACCESSIBILITY: The ease at which people reach, enter, and use modes of travel (walk / bike / transit / vehicle) at the origin and destination of their trip. Transit systems are frequently burdened with addressing the issue of first and last mile access. Providing Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant curb access ramps at origins, destinations, intersections, driveways, and mid-block crossings is imperative to removing impediments for vulnerable users such as the disabled, children, the elderly, and people riding bicycles and micromobility devices.

CONNECTIVITY: The number of route options people have available to them and their directness and/or distance. Gridded street networks provide a high level of connectivity, whereas dead-end cul-de-sacs do not. Innovative approaches to enhance connectivity, such as Low Speed and Shared Streets, along with using paths and trails for non-vehicular connections, improve mobility and accessibility for people walking, bicycling, riding micromobility devices, and accessing transit.

VISIBILITY: The frequency at which those driving a car see people walking, bicycling, riding various micromobility devices, and accessing transit. More people walking and biking = greater awareness and more people walking and biking = safer conditions (i.e. safety in numbers). Green bike lanes, pavers at crosswalks, and flashing signals are all design elements used to increase visibility of people walking and bicycling.

CONTINUITY: The uninterrupted consistency of sidewalks, paths, trails, and bike lanes in width and condition with logical beginning and endpoints that are without gaps and without sudden and abrupt termination. Roads do not suddenly terminate without warning, change number of lanes, or randomly change width without proper transitions – neither should sidewalks, paths, trails, or bike lanes.

SAFETY: The combination of behavioral and physical design elements of the built environment can make mobility comfortable and pleasant for all ages and abilities. The elements that provide safety include slower speeds, physical separation, enhanced visibility crossings, and designations for different mobility modes. Enhanced safety features encourage behavioral changes that make safety everyone's responsibility.

COMFORT: The sum of all the mobility elements plus the overall quality of the built environment provided for the various mobility modes that allow for comfortable travel, trip satisfaction, travel choice, and time-cost choice. The perception of comfort shows that the availability of a car doesn't automatically make it a first mode choice and the most obvious or direct route may also not be the most comfortable. Improving conditions can remove impediments, increase trip satisfaction and usefulness, and incline travellers to use non-vehicular modes.

SOCIAL VALUE: The people-to-people connections one experiences in a shared space environment, whether biking, walking, or riding transit. The social value of these interactions increases both individual happiness and societal happiness through active engagement with the community that overall increases the quality of life and fosters independence, especially for children and the elderly.



In order 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 projects to accommodate the desired speed of travel (**Figure 6**). Future updates of the Mobility Plan may involve additional multimodal projects to accommodate desired modes of travel other than single occupant cars. Specifically, as micromobility (e.g., electric bikes and electric scooters), microtransit (e.g., golf carts, neighborhood electric vehicles, and autonomous transit shuttles), and shared mobility (e.g., transit, ride-hail, and car-share) devices, services, and programs expand and new technology options become available, there will be a need to reimagine and repurpose road and street rights-of-way and travel lanes to accommodate the different speeds of travel for these multimodal modes of personal mobility.



Figure 6. Speed of Travel

The County seeks to enhance safety, convenience, and connectivity for all users of the transportation system and the multimodal projects lay the foundation for the County to consider development of a program to move towards implementing Vision Zero. There are two primary components in moving towards the ultimate goal of zero fatalities on the transportation system (Vision Zero): **multimodal projects and speed**. The first component is achieved through the Mobility Plan. The second component is lowering the speeds at which cars travel. Studies have shown there is a direct correlation between the speed of car travel and the severity of crashes. As speeds increase, so does the probability that a crash involving people walking, bicycling or driving will result in one or more fatalities. Lowering speed limits is a quick and inexpensive way towards Vision Zero.


Slower speed streets create an environment that is safer and more comfortable to walk, bicycle, scoot, or use a new form of mobility technology; while also making all users of the transportation system more visible to people driving cars: achieving three of the established multimodal elements (Figure 5). The intent of the Mobility Plan and Mobility Fee is to provide a distinct alternative to transportation concurrency. One way to make a clean break from transportation concurrency is to replace roadway LOS standards with street quality of service (QOS) standards based on the posted speed limit. Street QOS standards are intended to enhance mobility for all modes of travel and move towards Vision Zero, by prioritizing slower speeds for cars. Street QOS goes up. Whereas, as speed limits go down the LOS of roadways also goes down. The Mobility Plan recommends initially establishing street QOS standards along 30A and Scenic 98 (Figure 7). The County can consider utilization of street QOS standards elsewhere during future updates of the Mobility Plan.

Figure 7. Street Quality of Service (QOS) Standards

MOVING TOWA	rds	WALTON COUNTY STREET QUALITY OF SERVICE STANDARDS NUE URBAN CONCEPTS LAND USE - MOBILITY - PARKING - FEES		
STREET QUALITY OF SERVICE (QOS) STANDARDS	30A & SCENIC 98	APPLICABLE LOCATIONS 🛛 2021 NUE Urban Concepts, LLC. All Rights Reserved, www.nueurbanconcepts.com @@@@@		
Quality of Service (QOS) A	speed Limit 10	Central Plaza, Square or Shared Street on 30A in Alys Beach, Rosemary Beach, Seaside, Watercolor, and at Regional Beach Access on Scenic 98		
Quality of Service (QOS) B	SPEED LIMIT 15	Alys Beach, Rosemary Beach, Seaside, Watercolor, at Regional Beach Access on 30A and at the approaches to Regional Beach Access on Scenic 98		
Quality of Service (QOS) C	speed Limit 20	Blue Mountain, Grayton, Santa Rosa, Seacrest and Seagrove Beaches, Dune Allen, Gulf Place, Seacrest, Watersound, at approaches to Regional Beach Access on 30A, between Regional Beach Access on Scenic 98, and within a 1/2 mile of 30A on all collector and arterial streets connecting to 30A		
Quality of Service (QOS) D	SPEED LIMIT 25	Approaches to 30A Beach Communities listed above, between 1/2 and 1 mile of 30A on all collector and arterial streets connecting to 30A and on Scenic 98 at the approach to US HWY 98		
Quality of Service (QOS) E	SPEED LIMIT 30	30A between US Hwy 98 West and approach to Dune Allen, between approaches to Blue Mountain and Grayton Beaches, between approaches to Seagrove Beach and Watersound, between 1 mile north of 30A and US Hwy 98 on all collector and arterial streets connecting to 30A		

Street QOS standards that promote slower speeds provide planners and engineers with greater flexibility to implement innovative street designs, such as low speed and complete streets, narrower travel lanes, and locating buildings and trees closer to travel lanes. The street QOS standards are intended to be flexible with regards to generally applicable locations based on type of street. The street QOS table also includes speed limits for the use of micromobility devices. Slower speeds are proposed along 30A and Scenic 98 to accommodate the integration of multimodal lanes, multimodal ways, low speed streets, and shared streets.



The Mobility Plan is comprised of ten (10) separate plans covering all of Walton County, including the Cities of DeFuniak Springs and Freeport and the Town of Paxton. There are multiple plans for South Walton detailing multimodal projects along 30A, Scenic 98, US 98, US 331 and other major County roads in the area. The Mobility Plan for Central and North Walton consist of new roads, widening of existing roads, complete streets, upgrading and realigning roads, and new trails.

A Needs Plan has also been developed that details future multimodal projects for consideration by the County and its municipalities for possible inclusion in the Central and North Walton Mobility Plan. Each Plan, with the exception of the Needs Plan, has a corresponding table that further describes the multimodal projects included in each of the Plans, as well as the estimated cost and increase on person miles of capacity. It should be noted, there are multimodal projects that are included in the Plans for South Walton that have been opposed by some residents. A Needs Plan could also be developed for South Walton that reassigns controversial multimodal projects from the various Plans to a new South Walton Needs Plan for future consideration. The following are a brief summary of each Plan that make up the overall 2040 Walton County Mobility Plan:

Miramar Beach & Sandestin

- Walking & Bicycling Plan (Map A): Consisting of existing sidewalks, new shared-use sidewalks, paths, trails, multimodal sidewalks, and buffered bike lanes (Appendix B); and
- **Transit Circulator Plan (Map B)**: Consisting of phased microtransit circulator routes connecting mobility hubs and laying the foundation for future transit connecting Miramar Beach and Destin along US Hwy 98 (Appendix C); and
- Multimodal Lanes Plan (Map C): Consisting of phased multimodal lanes along Scenic 98 and US Hwy 98 to accommodate micromobility and microtransit vehicles connecting mobility hubs along both corridors (Appendix D); and
- Roads Plan (Map D): Consisting of new roads, upgraded and reconfigured roads, the conversion of travel lanes on Scenic 98 to low speed shared lanes, enhanced safety for people walking and bicycling along US 98 and the conversion of Poinciana Blvd to a multiway blvd (Appendix E).

Multimodal projects for the Scenic 98 corridor include widening the existing 8' path to a minimum of a 12' trail. In addition, to keep micromobility devices (e.g., electric bicycles and electric scooters) off travel lanes, multimodal lanes (6' in width) are proposed for both sides of Scenic 98. The addition of multimodal lanes will require both a reduction in travel lane width and a reduction in the current buffer between the existing travel lanes and the existing path (Figure 8). The speed limits are proposed to be reduced (Figure 5) to allow for the conversion of Scenic 98 to a low-speed street that is safer for people walking and bicycling to cross Scenic 98.



Figure 8. Scenic 98 Multimodal Cross-Section (Miramar Beach)





The low-speed street designation on Scenic 98 will also allow for microtransit vehicles (e.g., autonomous transit shuttles (ATS), golf carts, neighborhood electric vehicles (NEV), and trolleys) to utilize Scenic 98 and provide realistic expectations that people who wish to drive on Scenic 98 should be expected to drive slower and stop more frequently. Faster trips and trips that are more regional in nature would be encouraged to use US 98. The following is a summary of the South Walton Plans:

South Walton

- Walking & Bicycling Plan (Map E): Consisting of existing sidewalks and paths, new shareduse sidewalks, paths, trails, forest paths, and buffered bike lanes (Appendix F); and
- **Transit Circulator Plan (Map F):** Consisting of phased microtransit circulator routes and transit routes connecting mobility hubs and eventually laying the foundation for enhanced transit access to Freeport and DeFuniak Springs via US 331 and new transit service along US Hwy 98 connecting mobility hubs from Inlet Beach to Miramar Beach (Appendix G); and
- Micromobility & Microtransit Plan (Map G): Consisting of phased multimodal lanes, multimodal ways and shared streets to accommodate micromobility and microtransit vehicles connecting mobility hubs in South Walton (Appendix H); and
- Roads Plan (Map H): Consisting of new and upgraded two (2) lane roads, the four (4) lane West Bay Parkway and the widening of US 98 to six (6) lanes from Bay County to Mack Bayou Road. The SR 81 extension and West Bay Parkway could be funded by tolls or significant state and federal funds. The SR 81 extension is an alternative to widening US 331 to six (6) lanes from north of the Bay to US 98 (Appendix I).

The 30A Corridor - Seaside

The proposed cross-section for 30A through Seaside was the result of multiple days of meetings held with the Seaside Institute, the 30A Alliance, Walton County Staff, the NUE Urban Concepts Team and the Congress for New Urbanism. There have been more than 40 cross-sections developed for this 70' wide ROW section of 30A that traverses Seaside, several of which have been provided for reference purposes in this Report (**Appendix J**). The 30A Seaside section proposes to remove existing on-street parking, the 7' to 8' path on the northside (non-beach side) would be widened to 12' to 14' for people walking and bicycling, the bi-directional 16' wide multimodal ways for micromobility devices and microtransit vehicles would be provided on the southside of 30A (beach-side) and the existing travel lanes on 30A would remain in place (**Figure 9**). The multimodal ways, intended to provide space for e-bikes and golf carts to have them stop using travel lanes or paths, would run on the southside of 30A between Grayton Beach (CR 283) and Seagrove Beach (CR 395). The existing street trees on both the northside and southside of 30A through Watercolor will be relocated to accommodate the bi-directional multimodal ways on the south side of 30A and the replacement of on-street parking with a 12' to 14' wide trail on the north side of 30A (**Figure 10**).



Figure 9. 30A Multimodal Cross-Section (Seaside)



Figure 10. 30A Multimodal Cross-Section (Watercolor)





The addition of multimodal ways to this section of 30A will require the need for two new bridge structures across Western Lake on the southside of the ROW (Figure 11). FDOT is in the process of replacing both bridges. The replacement of the bridges is an opportunity for the County to work with FDOT to ensure the design and construction accommodates the proposed multimodal ways. FDOT will likely require a County contribution towards the increased cost to design and construct. However, coordinating now will save significant time and money in the future as the County would not have to design and construct the multimodal ways as a standalone project.







The 30A Corridor

The ROW for 30A varies from 50' wide within Seagrove Beach east of CR 395 to a width of +/- 120' through Alys Beach (Figure 12). In workshops held at the Seaside Institute with various representatives from neighborhoods and beach communities along 30A and at public workshops, there has been a strong desire to ensure the sections of 30A through iconic beach communities, such as Rosemary Beach (Figure 13) and Seaside, maintain their unique characteristics. There was also a strong desire to maintain or provide landscape buffers between travel lanes and existing and planned paths and trails along 30A similar to what currently exist in Alys Beach, Rosemary Beach, Seaside, Watercolor, along with other areas of the 30A corridor.



Figure 12. 30A Multimodal Cross-Section (Alys Beach)



In addition, where multimodal lanes or ways are proposed for autonomous transit shuttles and ebikes, there was an expressed desire that the multimodal lanes and ways be separated by landscaped buffers from travel lanes, paths, and trails. The proposed section for 30A through Rosemary Beach would replace existing 5' sidewalks with 8' wide multimodal ways and add 8' shared-use paths on the edge of the 30A ROW (Figure 13).







The existing cross-section for 30A does not currently have adequate dedicated areas for all modes of travel that want to utilize the ROW. There are frequent complaints about the speed of bicycles and golf carts using the travel lanes on 30A and causing traffic backups. There are also complaints about e-bikes and golf carts using existing paths, even though they are both prohibited on the paths. The multimodal lanes and ways are intended to accommodate micromobility devices and microtransit vehicles, so those devices and vehicles stop using the existing travel lanes and path. Community support was also strong to provide an 8' wide shared-use path on both sides of 30A to minimize the number of times that people bicycling and walking have to cross 30A to use the path. The only portion of 30A where a shared-use path is not provided along both sides is the section between Grayton Beach (CR 283) to Seagrove Beach (CR 395) which will feature a 12' to 14' shared-use trail on the northside of 30A.

The community also expressed support for enhanced landscape to be added within along the backside of the 30A ROW and within setbacks along 30A. There are requirements for landscape buffers within existing setbacks for a number of developments along the 30A corridor. Overtime, some of those requirements have not been enforced and new development and residential units have placed fences, structures, driveways and other ancillary items within both setbacks and County ROW. Ultimately, a more detailed design for 30A will be required given the significant variation in ROW and the need for further community input. In the interim, a variety of cross-sections, based on community input, have been developed for the various ROW widths along 30A that will allow for initial planning and phased construction of improvements on 30A **(Appendix K)**. The initial cross-sections for Aly Beach, Rosemary Beach, Seaside and Watercolor are illustrated in this Report.

The US Hwy 98 Corridor

FDOT has plans to widen US Hwy 98 between Mack Bayou Road and 30A West. County Staff and the NUE Urban Team approached FDOT District Three about adding 12' wide shared-use trails and 8' multimodal ways to the design. Because the Mobility Plan was not officially adopted, FDOT declined to add those features at this present time. Upon adoption of the Mobility Plan, there will be stronger backing to request that FDOT consider adding these elements. The 7' wide buffered bikes lanes along the outside curb and the 6' inside paved shoulders along the median of US 98 will allow for multimodal ways to be added in the future and FDOT did agree to add a 10' wide shared-use path on the southside of US 98. Longer term, FDOT has plans to widen US 98 to six (6) lanes from Bay County to 30A West. The Mobility Plan includes this widening, along with recommendations for the US 98 cross-section to add shared-use trails and multimodal ways (Appendix L). The US 98 cross-sections also request that FDOT consider ensuring the medians on US 98 could accommodate dedicated lanes for transit vehicles or new mobility technology.



Balancing the Environment and Mobility

The Mobility Plan includes multimodal projects within portions of existing State Forest and State Parks. These multimodal projects have received significant and vocal opposition at workshops and on social media, with active campaigns to remove all multimodal projects from the Mobility Plan that are within portions of existing State Forest and State Parks. There has also been positive support for all of the multimodal projects identified in the Mobility Plan within portions of existing State Forest and state Parks, however, those voices are not as persistent or as vocal to those opposed to these multimodal projects.

Multimodal projects are provided in State Forest and State Parks through-out Florida. The design of those multimodal projects is critical. Walton County is blessed to have preserved natural resources and it is understandable that residents which to maintain those preserved areas and minimize any impacts to those areas. Walton County also experiences existing congestion which will only increase as growth in development and tourism continue. Ideally that congestion would be addressed by providing an interconnected network of streets. However, given environmental and geographic constraints through preserved areas and water bodies, the ability to provide a gridded network is limited. Thus, most traffic is forced to use US 98, US 331 and 30A with few other options to move around South Walton. There are no easy solutions, if there were, they would have already been constructed. The Mobility Plan proposes several mobility solutions to try and seek a balance between enhances mobility and minimizing impact to environmentally sensitive areas.

The Mobility Plan includes multimodal projects known as forest paths that are intended to be compacted, unpaved pathways along the 30A corridor within the State Forest to serve as both a fire break from existing development and also to provide an American with Disability Act (ADA) compliant surface for mobility impaired individuals and an accessible surface for parents pushing strollers or children riding bicycles. The vast majority of unimproved pathways feature sugar sand or worn-out paths that only accommodate actively mobile adults and teenagers and exclude a number of people who would like to have access. These forest paths are opposed by residents who are also opposed to any projects in environmentally sensitive areas.

The Mobility Plan also includes several proposed shared-use trails through the Topsail State Park, along the powerline easement north of US Hwy 98, and one along the proposed Seagrove Connector. These shared-use trails are proposed to be 12' wide paved surfaces to provide access and connectivity for people bicycling and walking (non-motorized travel). These shared-use trails are opposed by residents who are opposed to any projects in environmentally sensitive areas.



The Mobility Plan proposes multimodal only improvements including multimodal ways, shared-use paths and trails through portions of Deer Lake State Park and the State Forest that would connect the St. Joes development on US 98 with the Hub at Watersound on 30A. These multimodal projects, referred to as Watersound Multimodal, would not allow motor vehicles and would be designed in a context sensitive manner respecting the location within the Forest and Park. Four (4) alternative sections have been designed with the express intent of being context sensitive and restricting motor vehicle use of the multimodal corridor (Appendix M). These shared-use trails are opposed by residents who are opposed to any projects in environmentally sensitive areas.

There has been some consideration for support of the multimodal corridor if it were to be located within St. Joes property on the westside of Watersound Parkway (Aka Camp Creek Road). One proposed route would be along the existing boundary of the St. Joes development and Deer Lake State Park. This route would require the acquisition of some unaffiliated parcels on the southern end of the St. Joes property to access 30A. The one drawback of this route is that it is only .6 miles west of the Watersound Parkway and 30A intersection, versus the proposed connection which is located 2 miles west of the Watersound Parkway and 30A. It is 8 miles on US 98 and 6 miles on 30A between CR 395 and Watersound Parkway 98 without any multimodal or vehicle connections between US 98 and 30A. The intent of the Watersound Multimodal project is to partially close that gap and provide for enhanced connectivity and limit impacts to 30A. The Watersound Multimodal project would also encourage people to use non-motor vehicle options to access 30A from St Joes and US 98, versus driving their motor vehicle to access the Hub, Watersound Beach and Deer Lake State Park.

The multimodal project that has received the most opposition is the proposed Seagrove Connector that would link the South Walton Sports Complex, Dune Lake Elementary and US 98 with 30A just east of Eastern Lake at the eastern end of Seagrove Beach. This multimodal project has been discussed for a number of years and has meet with opposition during that entire discussion time frame. Between 30A West and CR 395, there is an existing north-south roadway connecting US 98 and 30A every 1 to 1 ½ miles and include Thompson Road, CR 393, CR 83, CR 283 and CR 395. Between CR 395 and Watersound Parkway, the spacing of connections is 8 miles on US 98 and 6 miles on 30A. The proposed Seagrove Connector would be located roughly equal distance between CR 395 and Watersound Parkway to provide for enhanced connectivity and also improved access to 30A for fire rescue, law enforcement, and emergency medical vehicles, which currently have to navigate limited ROW and congestion on 30A and the beaches to respond to accidents, crashes, fires, incidents, inclement weather events, and medical emergencies.



The following are alternatives that have been recommended for the Seagrove Connector:

- The **first (1st)** alternative is to remove the Seagrove Connector from the Mobility Plan.
- The second (2nd) alternative would be to widen both CR 395 and Watersound Parkway from two
 (2) to four (4) lanes between US 98 and 30A. This alternative would address north-south travel
 demand but would still increase traffic volumes on 30A at both intersections and does not
 address the lack of connectivity between CR 395 and Watersound Parkway and does not address
 traffic on 30A.
- The third (3rd) alternative would be to locate the road on St. Joes property to the west of Watersound Parkway. Similar to the Watersound Multimodal corridor, this multimodal project would intersect 30A just .6 miles west of Watersound Parkway. The proposed Seagrove Connector is located 3.6 miles west of Watersound Parkway and 2.6 miles east of CR 395. connection to corridor way on the widen both CR 395 and Watersound Parkway from two (2) to four (4) lanes between US 98 and 30A. This alternative would address north-south travel demand but would still increase traffic volumes on 30A at both intersections and does not address the lack of connectivity between CR 395 and Watersound Parkway and does not address traffic on 30A. If there are no other alternatives, any additional connectivity between US 98 and 30A is better than what is provided today, but the benefit would be limited.
- The **fourth (4th)** alternative is to elevate the Seagrove Connector from US 98 to 30A. Essentially the Seagrove Connector would basically be a bridge, but instead of being over water, would be over the existing State Forest. A bridge 2.5 miles long would approach \$125 million, based upon the cost estimate provided for the proposed SR 81 extension. This would be an expensive endeavor but would minimize impact.
- The fifth (5th) alternative is to remove the travel lanes on the Seagrove Connector and provide a multimodal only corridor similar to what is proposed for the Watercolor Multimodal Connector. This would provide access for people bicycling, walking, riding micromobility devices and microtransit vehicles, but would prohibit motor vehicles. The Seagrove Connector could be designed in such a manner to also allow access for fire rescue, law enforcement, and emergency service vehicles with stabilized surfaces, shared use of multimodal ways, and removal bollards accessible only by first responders.



The sixth (6th) alternative has been developed by the NUE Urban Concepts Team and tries to strike a balance between mobility, environmental protection, improved distribution of traffic, and multimodal access. While the cost to elevate the Seagrove Connector may be cost prohibitive, an alternative would be to provide wildlife crossings through both overpasses and underpasses and to install wildlife fencing to limit access to the Forest and Direct wildlife to the crossings and underpasses. The wildlife crossings and underpasses would cost roughly \$500,000 each and could provide a balance between mobility and protecting the environment (Figure 14).

Figure 14. Seagrove Connector Cross-Section





The other multimodal project that has experienced both support and opposition is the extension of SR 81 from the future Westbay Parkway to SR 20 north of the Choctawhatchee River Basin. Besides the impact for the Choctawhatchee River, there is potential impact to a wetland mitigation bank being provided by St. Joes north of the intercoastal and additional traffic through the Nokuse Plantation. North of the Choctawhatchee River Basin, the proposal would be to use the existing 100' wide ROW for CR 3280 (Black Creek Road) and SR 81. There would need to be a realignment of the SR 20 and SR 81 intersection with a likely shift to the east to align with the CR 3280 intersection. The Mobility Plan maps note that additional environmental studies are needed. One impetus for including the SR 81 project on the Mobility Plan for the immediate future is to obtain Federal and State funds to further evaluate the impacts of the project.

The proposed Mobility Plan attempts to strike a balance between providing mobility while minimizing, to the maximum extent feasible, impact to environmentally sensitive areas. The projected increase in future VMT and PMT within South Walton is significant. While VMT and PMT, which are based on projected volumes times the length of a given road, were evaluated, the projected volumes for roads were also evaluated to determine the need for multimodal projects given potential environmental impact. The projected 2040 volumes for major roads east of US 331 and south of the Bay were evaluated with and with-out the Seagrove Connector **(Table 5)**:

Roadway and Location	Without Seagrove Connector	With Seagrove Connector
Seagrove Connector between US 98 and 30A	0	10,030
CR 395 between US 98 and 30A	18,300	16,030
Watersound Parkway between US 98 and 30A	16,600	14,700
CR 283 between US 98 and 30A	14,740	13,850
US 98 East of CR 395	67,600	65,790
30A East of CR 395	19,150	18,380
US 98 West of Watersound Parkway	50,500	47,700
30A West of Watersound Parkway	18,620	16,500
US Hwy 331 North of US 98	37,389	37,714
SR 81 Extension North of Westbay Parkway	18,880	18,875
Westbay Parkway North of US 98	62,430	62,039
Source: Updated 2040 Regional Travel Demand Model.		

TABLE 5. PROJECTED 2040 VOLUMES ON SOUTH WALTON ROADS

Source: Opdated 2040 Regional Travel Demand Mo



Central & North Walton:

Mobility Plan (Map I): Consisting of new roads, widening of existing roads to four (4) and six (6) lanes, complete streets, upgrading and realigning roads, and new trails (Appendix N). There are a number of Federal and State roads that are proposed to be widened from two (2) to four (4) lanes within Central and North Walton. The Mobility Plan proposes that the majority of the roads to be widen to four (4) lanes provide a 12' wide shared-use trail and within more developed areas, buffered bike lanes or multimodal ways (Appendix O).

The Mobility Plan also includes the extension of SR 81 south of SR 20 with a new 60' wide three (3) mile long bridge across the Choctawhatchee River. The bridge is the most expensive project identified in the Mobility Plan at a cost of almost \$180,000,000. It is assumed that the majority of the bridge would be funded by Federal and State Funds as well as a potential toll bridge. North of Choctawhatchee River, the SR 81 Extension would use the existing 100' right-of-way (ROW) on CR 3028 (Black Creek Road) and SR 81. There would be a need to realign the SR 20 and SR 81 intersection to remove the existing intersection off-set with CR 3028.

The Mobility Plan also includes a proposed extension of Marquis Way on the west side of US 331 just south of the Freeport Publix. The two (2) lane road would extend across Lafayette Creek where it would connect with Shipyard Road. Shipyard Road and Madison Street are proposed to be upgraded from the Creek bridge to SR 20, where the intersection aligns with Business 331. The northbound left on US 331 at SR 20 experiences significant back-up today, past the Marquis Way intersection for extended hours in the PM starting as early at 2:00 PM. This is a critical need as the back-up extends into the inside northbound lane on US 331. Besides congestion, the back-up is a critical safety situation. While FDOT is studying the widening of SR 20 to four (4) lanes and adding intersection improvements, there is a critical need to come up with an interim solution that can also be used while SR 20 is being widened. This improvement would also provide an opportunity for Freeport residents to access Publix and other retail uses, along with accessing US 331, without the need to use SR 20.

At the recommendation of the City of Freeport, the Mobility Plan includes a realignment of the CR 83A East intersection west to allow for a traffic signal with SR 20. The current 83A intersection is too close to the traffic signal at Business 331 to warrant a traffic signal. To minimize impact to existing homeowners to the greatest extent possible, roundabouts are proposed CR 83A and Business 331 as part of the 83A East intersection realignment.



The City of Freeport also requested the inclusion of a two (2) lane bypass on the north side of SR 20 that would extend from the SR 20 East and Black Creek Blvd intersection to the SR 20 West and CR 83A West intersection, with traffic signals at both intersections and the intersections with Business 331 and US 331. The shown alignment attempted to minimize impact to existing residential units as possible. The alignment is just conceptual and would need further design and study before an actual alignment is agreed upon.

• Needs Plan (Map J): Consisting of complete streets, new roads, upgraded roads, access management, activity center roads and future regional rail that could eventually be added to the Central and North Walton Mobility Plan.

The intent of the Needs Plan is to recognize that there are needed roadway improvements to roads other than Federal, State and major County Roads in Central and North Walton. The Needs Plan recognizes and identifies a number of multimodal projects that would be needed as new development continues to be approved in the area. For the most part, these multimodal projects have not been identified on the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan, have not been part of any corridor studies, and are not currently identified on any County or State approved Plans.

These multimodal projects are needed upgrades and new roads to provide some semblance of a grid network outside of the Cities of DeFuniak Springs and Freeport. The currently undeveloped areas feature a relatively limited and disconnected network of County roads and dirt roads. Since US 331 is currently the only north-south corridor that connects US 98 and Interstate 10, there is a need to provide a support network of secondary roads so that all future traffic from new development does not just access SR 20 or US 331 or result in a number of cul-de-sacs and dead-end roads which is fairly common in South Walton and are one of the factors that certain areas experience significant delay, as there is limited connectivity. The Needs Plan identifies upgrading a number of County Road and making logical extensions of those County Roads that require further analysis and public input.

The Needs Plan also identifies a network of new two (2) lane roads to serve Activity Center Development. The County should consider the development, in conjunction with the Cities of DeFuniak Springs and Freeport as either part of a Mobility Plan update, a Special Area Plan or standards in all three local governments Land Development Regulations and possible Comprehensive Plan to further establish an Activity Center road network along US 331 and require new development to help in construction of that network and limit cul-de-sacs and dead-end roads.



Depending on the outcome of the SR 81 extension, the County and State will likely face the need to six-lane US 331 from the Bay to Interstate 10. Without the SR 81 extension, its likely by 2040 the County and State would be looking at the need to eight (8) lane US 331 and add additional lanes across the Bay. It is strongly recommended that the County, in conjunction with FDOT, DeFuniak Springs, and Freeport, develop a frontage road or parallel road system to US 331 to limit the need to widen the road beyond six (6) lanes. A coordinated frontage road or parallel road system would preserve through travel movements on US 331 and make it safer to provide a multi-use trail along US 331 from US 98 to Interstate 10 by limiting the number of driveway connections.

The City of DeFuniak Springs expressed concern regarding a US 331 bypass between Interstate 10 and US 90 to align with US 331 north of US 90. The concern was due to impact to the airport runway and business on US 331. An alternative US 331 bypass alignment has been added for consideration. Further coordination with the City will be needed to garner City support for the project.

The Remainder of This Page Intentionally Left Blank



MOBILITY FEE

The basis for the Walton County Mobility Fees is the multimodal projects identified in the Mobility Plan consistent with Florida Statute 163.3180(5)(i). The Mobility Fees collected from new development and are to be used to fund the multimodal projects identified in the Mobility Plan (Figure 15). The multimodal projects identified in the Mobility Plan are intended to provide the person miles of capacity needed to meet the future person miles of travel demand from new development, consistent with the "needs" requirement of the dual rational nexus test. The mobility fees collected from new development are to be used to fund the needed multimodal projects to provide a mobility benefit to new development and serve the increase in person travel demand from that development, consistent with the "benefits" requirement of the dual rational nexus test.

Figure 15. Mobility Plan and Mobility Fee





DAILY ROAD CAPACITY

The 2013 Florida Department of Transportation's (FDOT) Generalized Service Volume Tables were used to establish daily capacities for roadways and intersections **(Appendix P)**. A principal 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, the road capacities in **Table 6** are multiplied by a Vehicle Occupancy factor of 1.82, based upon data from the 2017 NHTS **(Appendix A)**. The Vehicle Occupancy factor is used in the multimodal capacity analysis for road and intersection projects identified in the Mobility Plan.

Lane Type & Number	Vehicle Capacity	Person Capacity	Per Lane Person Capacity	Turn Lane Person Capacity
2-Lane Undivided (Class I – LOS D)	14,160	25,770	12,885	640
2-Lane Undivided (Class II – LOS D)	11,840	21,550	10,775	540
2-Lane Divided (Class I – LOS D)	18,585	33,820	16,910	850
2-Lane Divided (Class II – LOS D)	15,540	28,280	14,140	710
2-Lane Undivided (Class II - Local)	2,555	4,600	2,300	115
2-Lane Undivided (Class II – Minor)	5,110	9,200	4,600	230
2-Lane Undivided (Class II – LOS C)	5,840	10,630	5,315	270
2-Lane Divided (Class II – LOS C)	7,665	13,950	6,975	350
2-Lane Undivided (Rural - Local)	2,300	4,190	2,095	105
2-Lane Undivided (Rural – Minor)	4,600	8,370	4,185	210
2-Lane Undivided (Rural – Major)	6,880	12,520	6,260	310
2-Lane Undivided (Rural – Arterial)	8,600	15,650	7,825	390
2-Lane Divided (Rural-Arterial)	9,030	16,440	8,220	410
4-Lane Divided (Class I)	39,800	72,240	18,110	910
4-Lane Divided (Class II – LOS D)	32,400	58,970	14,740	740
4-Lane Divided (Class II - LOS C)	14,500	26,390	6,600	330
4-Lane Divided (Rural - LOS C)	29,300	53,330	13,330	670
6-Lane Divided (Class I)	59,900	109,018	18,170	910
6-Lane Divided (Class II)	50,900	92,640	15,440	770
Source: Florida Department of Transportation, 2013 Quality/Level of Service (LOS) Handbook, Generalized Annual Average Daily Volumes for Florida's Urbanized Areas, Appendix P . The daily person capacity is based on a vehicle occupancy factor of 1.82 per the 2017 National				

TABLE 6. DAILY ROAD CAPACITIES

Source: Florida Department of Transportation, 2013 Quality/Level of Service (LOS) Handbook, Generalized Annual Average Daily Volumes for Florida's Urbanized Areas, **Appendix P**. The daily person capacity is based on a vehicle occupancy factor of 1.82 per the 2017 National Household Travel Survey Data for Florida, **Appendix A**. Turn lane person capacity is derived by multiplying the daily person capacity by .5% per the FDOT Generalized Service Volume Tables. The person capacity, per lane person capacity, and turn lane person capacity are rounded to the nearest 10th.



MULTIMODAL CAPACITY

The multimodal projects identified in the Mobility Plan form the basis of the mobility fee. The multimodal projects necessary to serve person miles of travel demand include sidewalks, paths, trails, bike lanes, microtransit circulators, low speed and complete streets, streetscape, intersections, and roadways. 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 establishment of multimodal capacities for people walking and bicycling are based on methodologies from multiple technical reports and manuals. 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 LOS capacities for people walking, bicycling, and scooting are based upon the number of people that can be accommodated on a facility over a one-hour period.

A LOS of "A" typically denotes few people are using a sidewalk or bike lane and there is ample room for people to freely walk, bicycle, or scoot. A LOS "D" typically denotes more people are using a sidewalk or bike lane and movements are restricted. A QOS "D" typically denotes an environment where there is minimal separation between people walking and bicycling and vehicles and there is often a lack of landscape, shade, streetscape or protections from cars. In environments that feature a QOS "A", there are often wider sidewalks, paths or trails, with street trees and/or on-street parking and a landscape buffer that separate people walking, bicycling, and scooting from cars.

For people bicycling on-street, the presence of a protected barrier, a painted buffer or higher visibility green lane makes for a higher QOS. In Florida, most facilities for people walking, bicycling, and scooting feature a LOS "A" and a QOS "D" or "E": meaning few, if any, people use the facilities to walk, bicycle, or scoot. The multimodal capacity for the various types of multimodal projects in the Mobility Plan are based on varying LOS and QOS standards **(Table 7)**. The establishment of capacities for microtransit circulators is based on methodologies from the Transit Capacity and Quality of Service Manual. The establishment of capacities for microtransit circulators have also been established for multimodal lanes, multimodal ways, shared streets and microtransit circulators **(Table 8)**.



Multimodal Facility Type		Unit of Measure	Daily Person Capacity
Forest Path	D	6' to 12' wide	600
Forest Path	В	6' to 12' wide	1,200
Shared-Use Sidewalk	D	5' to 7' wide	1,200
Shared-Use / Multimodal Sidewalk	С	5' to 7' wide	1,800
Protected Shared-Use Sidewalk	В	5' to 7' wide	2,400
Protected Shared-Use Sidewalk	Α	5' to 7' wide	3,000
Shared-Use Path	E	8' wide	2,400
Shared-Use Path	D	8' wide	3,600
Shared-Use Path	С	8' wide	4,800
Protected Shared-Use Path	В	8' wide	6,000
Protected Shared-Use Path	Α	8' wide	7,200
Shared-Use Trail	E	10' or wider	3,600
Shared-Use Trail	D	10' or wider	4,800
Shared-Use Trail	С	10' or wider	6,000
Protected Shared-Use Trail	В	10' or wider	7,200
Protected Shared-Use Trail	Α	10' or wider	8,400
Bicycle Boulevard	В	16' to 24' wide	1,200
Paved Shoulder	E	4' to 6' wide	1,800
Bicycle Lane	D	4' to 6' wide	2,400
Bicycle Lane	С	5' to 6' wide	3,000
Green Bicycle Lane	В	4' to 6' wide	3,600
Buffered Bicycle Lane	D	6' to 8' wide	3,600
Buffered Bicycle Lane	С	6' to 8' wide	4,800
Buffered Bicycle Lane	В	6' to 8' wide	6,000
Protected Bicycle Lane	В	6' to 8' wide	7,200
Protected Bicycle Lane	Α	6' to 8' wide	8,400

TABLE 7. BICYCLING & WALKING DAILY PERSON CAPACITY

Source: The capacity for a forest path with a QOS of "B" or "D" is based on a LOS "A" capacity. The capacity for sidewalks with a QOS of "C" or "D" is based on a LOS "B" capacity. The capacity for sidewalks with a QOS of "B" is based on a LOS "C" capacity and a QOS of "A" is based on a LOS "D" capacity. The capacity for paths and trails with a QOS of "D" is based on a LOS "B" capacity and a QOS of "C" is based on a LOS "D" capacity for paths and trails with a QOS of "B" is based on a LOS "B" capacity and a QOS of "C" is based on a LOS "C" capacity. The capacity for paths and trails with a QOS of "B" is based on a LOS "D" capacity and a QOS of "A" is based on a LOS "C" capacity for a bike boulevard and paved shoulder is based on a LOS "A" capacity. The capacity for a bike lane with a QOS of "C" or "D" is based on a LOS "B" capacity. The capacity for green bike lanes with a QOS of "B" or "C" is based on a LOS "C" capacity. The capacity for buffered bike lanes with a QOS of "B" of "C" is based on a LOS "D" capacity. The capacity for protected bike lanes with a QOS of "A" or "B" is based on a LOS "E" capacity. Capacity. The capacity for green bike lanes with a QOS of "B" or "C" is based on a LOS "C" capacity. The capacity for "B" or "C" is based on a LOS "C" capacity. The capacity for buffered bike lanes with a QOS of "B" of "C" is based on a LOS "D" capacity. The capacity for protected bike lanes with a QOS of "A" or "B" is based on a LOS "E" capacity. Capacity methodologies for sidewalks, trails and bicycle facilities is 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 2010 Highway Capacity Manual.



Multimodal Facility Type		Unit of Measure	Daily Person Capacity
Multimodal Lane	D	5' to 7' wide	4,800
Multimodal Lane	С	5' to 7' wide	6,000
Multimodal Lane	В	5' to 7' wide	7,200
Protected Multimodal Lane	В	6' to 8' wide	8,400
Protected Multimodal Lane	А	6' to 8' wide	9,600
Multimodal Way	D	7' to 9' wide	6,000
Multimodal Way	С	7' to 9' wide	7,200
Multimodal Way	В	7' to 9' wide	8,400
Protected Multimodal Way	В	9' to 11' wide	9,600
Protected Multimodal Way	Α	9' to 11' wide	10,800
Dedicated Transit / High Occupancy Vehicle Lane	Α	10' to 12' wide	20,400
Shared / Low Speed Street	Α	20' wide	20,000
Shared / Low Speed Street	А	30' wide	27,200
Shared / Low Speed Street / Multiway Blvd	Α	40' wide	35,600
Microtransit Circulator	E	Per vehicle	1,800
Microtransit Circulator	D	Per vehicle	2,800
Microtransit Circulator	С	Per vehicle	3,800
Microtransit Circulator	В	Per vehicle	4,800
Microtransit Circulator	Α	Per vehicle	5,800

TABLE 8. MULTIMODAL DAILY PERSON CAPACITY

Source: The capacity for multimodal lanes and ways with a QOS of "D" is based on a LOS "A" capacity and a QOS of "C" is based on a LOS "B" capacity. The capacity for multimodal lanes and ways with a QOS of "B" is based on a LOS "C" capacity. The capacity for protected multimodal lanes and ways with a QOS of "B" is based on a LOS "D" capacity and a QOS of "A" is based on a LOS "E" capacity. Capacity methodologies for sidewalks, trails and bicycle facilities is 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 2010 Highway Capacity Manual. The capacity of dedicated transit lanes and high occupancy vehicle lanes is based on 4 trolleys and buses an hour, with capacities of 36 and 60 persons respectively, 10 microtransit vehicles an hour, with capacities of 12 persons and 600 car/ride share and taxis with an occupancy of 2.5 persons. The capacity for 20' wide shared streets is based on 14,200 vehicles and 5,800 microtransit riders. The capacity for 30' wide shared streets is based on 14,200 vehicles, 5,800 microtransit riders, and 7,200 scooters and bikes. The capacity for 40' wide shared streets is based on 14,200 vehicles, 5,800 microtransit riders, 7,200 scooters and bikes, and 8,400 people walking. The microtransit circulator capacity is based on an operating span of service of 12 hours. The capacity of an autonomous transit shuttle (ATS) is 12 passengers per vehicle, neighborhood electric vehicles (NEV) is 5 passengers per vehicle, golf carts (GC) is assumed to be 3 passenger per vehicle, and trolleys (T) are 22 passengers per vehicle. For a microtransit circulator with a QOS of "E", it was assumed the following hourly mix: 2 (ATS); 4 (NEV); 20 (GC); 2 (T). For a microtransit circulator with a QOS of "D", it was assumed the following hourly mix: 4 (ATS); 6 (NEV); 22 (GC); 4 (T). For a microtransit circulator with a QOS of "C", it was assumed the following hourly mix: 6 (ATS); 8 (NEV); 24 (GC); 6 (T). For a microtransit circulator with a QOS of "B", it was assumed the following hourly mix: 8 (ATS); 10 (NEV); 26 (GC); 8 (T). For a microtransit circulator with a QOS of "A", it was assumed the following hourly mix: 10 (ATS); 12 (NEV); 28 (GC); 10 (T).



MULTIMODAL PROJECTS

The Person Miles of Capacity (PMC) for the multimodal projects was calculated based on the established road and multimodal capacities **(Tables 6-8)**. The cost for the multimodal projects identified in the Mobility Plan are based on the latest cost from projects completed by Walton County and the FDOT. The cost of design, right-of-way (ROW), construction, engineering and inspection (CEI), utility relocation, and landscape vary by the type of multimodal project. The total projected cost for the Mobility Plan multimodal projects is \$48,062,028 **(Table 9)**.

Multimodal Project Plans	Person Miles of Capacity	Cost of Projects
Miramar Beach Sandestin Walking & Bicycling Plan	107,088	\$14,880,292
Miramar Beach Sandestin Transit Circulator Plan	Other Plans	\$16,225,000
Miramar Beach Sandestin Multimodal Lanes Plan	81,200	\$6,495,515
Miramar Beach Sandestin Roads Plan	99,345	\$20,740,937
South Walton Walking & Bicycling Plan	682,218	\$112,968,861
South Walton Transit Circulator Plan	2,750	\$46,637,500
South Walton Micromobility & Microtransit Plan	645,976	\$94,600,857
South Walton Roads Plan	1,509,237	\$457,584,438
Central & North Walton Mobility Plan	3,061,997	\$1,006,059,594
Total	6,189,811	\$1,825,492,994
Source: The person miles of capacity and cost per Plan obtained from detailed multimodal project list (Appendix B thru I and Appendix N).		

TABLE 9. SUMMARY OF MOBILITY PLAN MULTIMODAL PROJECTS

The Remainder of This Page Intentionally Left Blank



New Growth Evaluation

To ensure that new growth 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, it is necessary to evaluate the projected increase in person miles of travel (PMT) versus the projected increase in person miles of capacity (PMC). A ratio less than 1.0 means that more capacity is being provided than is needed to accommodate future travel demand and would require a reduction in the overall cost of capacity projects attributable to new growth. A ratio greater than 1.0 means that new development is not being charged more than its fair share of the cost of multimodal projects and that no adjustments are needed. The new growth evaluation is calculated by dividing the increase in PMT from **Table 3** by the increase in PMC from **Table 10**.

The projected Demand to Capacity Ratio is .996%, which is just less than 1.0 **(Table 10)**. Thus, based on the 2040 model, there is slightly more projected person miles of capacity than there is new growth. It should be noted that the 2045 model is being developed and the St. Joes project is ongoing. Thus, future updates may see an increase in PMT beyond the projected PMC. Further, there is the possibility that some projects get removed from the various Plans, thus reducing projected PMC. The new growth evaluation factor will be applied to the total mobility plan cost to ensure new growth does not pay more than its share of the overall cost of the multimodal projects.

6,164,690	Increase in Person Miles of Travel (PMT)	
6,189,811	Increase in Person Miles of Capacity (PMC)	
.996%	Demand-to-Capacity Ratio	
Source: The increase in person miles of travel is based on Table 3. The increase in person miles of capacity is based on Table 9.		

TABLE 10. NEW GROWTH EVALUATION

FUNDING

The availability of funding for multimodal projects over the next 20 years is projected to come from a variety of funding sources. Walton County has the ability to allocate a portion of gas taxes towards multimodal projects. Gas taxes have been declining 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.



The Okaloosa Walton Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) has available funding identified through the Cost Feasible Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The vast majority of projected funding is allocated towards improvements on the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS), with a significant amount of the funds allocated toward Interstate 10. There is a pool of funds available to fund improvements on the State Highway System (SHS). In addition, there are off SHS improvements, as well as several additional pools of funds identified in the LRTP, which could include some multimodal improvements that form the basis for the updated mobility fee.

Historically, there have been grants, earmarks and the use of the various pool of funds identified in the LRTP to allocate towards multimodal improvements in Walton County. While there are specific multimodal projects identified as funded in the LRTP, there are several that are eligible for funding and have been identified under various pools of available funding. These funds are typically part of a competitive process that identifies projects as part of the annual update of the TPO Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The County has discussed an infrastructure sales tax to provide a broader opportunity to have available funds to contribute towards the multimodal projects identified in the Mobility Plan. Infrastructure sales taxes are the most significant funding source available to local governments. However, an infrastructure sales tax requires approval by the voters.

There are a number of projects that are located on State Road and would likely be funded in large part by the State. This is especially true for Central and North Walton. In recognition that State Funds would likely address a significant portion of funding, adjustments will be made to the person miles of capacity for Central and North Walton to address the presence of State Roads. Of the \$1.8 billion in needed improvements, just over \$1.3 billion are located on Federal and State Roads **(Table 11)**.

Federal & State Multimodal Project Cost	\$1,312,651,053	
County Multimodal Project Cost	\$512,841,940	
Total Multimodal Project Cost	\$1,825,492,994	
County Share of Federal & State Cost (10%)	\$131,265,105	
Total County Share of Multimodal Project Cost	\$644,107,046	
Source: Appendix B thru I and Appendix N.		

TABLE 11. MULTIMODAL PROJECT COST ALLOCATION



PERSON MILES OF TRAVEL (PMT) RATE

The Central and North Walton Mobility Plan primarily consist of Federal and State multimodal projects. The number of County multimodal projects increased in Central Walton based on feedback from the City of Freeport. The number of County multimodal projects may increase in North Walton as the City of DeFuniak Springs, and the Town of Paxton consider adding multimodal projects in future Mobility Plan updates. The total multimodal project cost in Central and North Walton is just over \$1 billion, of which just under 90% is for Federal and State multimodal projects **(Table 12)**.

TABLE 12. MULTIMODAL PROJECT COST CENTRAL & NORTH WALTON

Federal & State Multimodal Project Cost	\$884,764,647
County Multimodal Project Cost	\$121,294,946
Total Multimodal Project Cost	\$1,006,059,594
Source: Appendix N.	

The vast majority of Mobility Plan multimodal projects in the North Central and North Walton Planning Areas are Federal and State roads. There are a limited numbers of County road projects on the Mobility Plan for North Walton. The Needs Plan includes a greater number of County road projects that could eventually be added to the Mobility Plan. The total attributable cost for development in the North Central and North Walton Planning Areas is \$69,301,555 (Table 13).

TABLE 13. MULTIMODAL PROJECT COST NORTH CENTRAL & NORTH WALTON

Federal & State Multimodal Project Cost (North Walton)	\$564,851,49
County Multimodal Project Cost (North Walton)	\$12,816,405
North Walton County Share of Federal & State Cost (10%)	\$56,485,149
North Walton Share of Multimodal Project Cost	\$69,301,555
<i>Source:</i> Appendix N.	

The Mobility Plan multimodal projects in the Central Walton Planning Area consist of a mixture of County, Federal and State projects. Based on input from the City of Freeport, the number of County multimodal projects increased. Further, the Needs Plan includes a greater number of County road projects that could eventually be added to the Mobility Plan.



The projected increase in VMT and PMT in the Central Walton Planning Area exceeds the PMC provided by multimodal projects in the Central Planning Area. Thus, additional travel demand will likely utilize a portion of the person capacity provided by multimodal projects in South Walton. To account for travel within South Walton from development in the Central Planning Area, 12.5% of the cost of South Walton multimodal projects will be attributable to the Central Planning Area. The total attributable cost for development in the Central Planning Areas is \$194,761,811 (Table 14).

TABLE 14. MOLTIMODAL PROJECT COST CENTRAL WALTON			
Federal & State Multimodal Project Cost (Central Walton)	\$319,913,153		
County Multimodal Project Cost (Central Walton)	\$108,478,541		
Central Walton County Share of Federal & State Cost (10%)	\$31,991,315		
Central Walton County Share of South Walton Cost (12.5%)	\$54,291,954		
Central Walton Share of Multimodal Project Cost	\$194,761,811		
<i>Source:</i> Appendix N.			

TABLE 14. MULTIMODAL PROJECT COST CENTRAL WALTON

The Mobility Plan multimodal projects in the South Walton Planning Area consist of a greater number of County multimodal projects than Central and North Walton. There is not currently a Needs Plan for South Walton as the need for multimodal projects is well known and the area is relatively built-out, thus limiting the potential for additional multimodal projects. To account for travel within South Walton from development in the Central Planning Area, 12.5% of the cost of South Walton multimodal projects will be attributable to the Central Planning Area. The total attributable cost for development in the South Walton Planning Areas is \$380,043,680 (Table 15).

TABLE 15. MULTIMODAL PROJECT COST SOUTH WALTON

Federal & State Multimodal Project Cost (South Walton)	\$427,886,406
County Multimodal Project Cost (South Walton)	\$391,546,994
South Walton County Share of Federal & State Cost (10%)	\$42,788,641
Central Walton County Share of South Walton Cost (12.5%)	-(\$54,291,954)
South Walton Share of Multimodal Project Cost	\$380,043,680
Source: Appendix B thru I.	



The person miles of travel (PMT) rate are based on the total cost per Planning Area **(Tables 13-15)** multiplied by the new growth evaluation factor **(Table 10)** divided by the increase in PMT by Planning Area **(Table 4)**. The PMT rate for the North Central and North Walton Planning Area is \$51.84 **(Table 16)**. The PMT rate for the Central Walton Planning Area is \$51.84 **(Table 17)**.

North Walton Share of Multimodal Project Cost	\$69,301,555
New Growth Evaluation Factor	.996%
Net Cost	\$69,024,348
Increase in Person Miles of Travel (PMT) North Walton	443,810
Increase in Person Miles of Travel (PMT) North Central Walton	887,619
North Walton Increase in PMT	1,331,429
North Walton PMT Rate	\$51.84
Source: The North Walton PMT rate was calculated based on Multimodal Project Cost times the New Growth Evaluation Factor divided by the sum of the Increase in PMT for the North Central and North Planning Areas.	

TABLE 16. NORTH WALTON PERSON MILES OF TRAVEL (PMT) RATE

The PMT rate for the Central Walton Planning Area is \$51.84 (Table 17).

TABLE 17. CENTRAL WALTON PERSON MILES OF TRAVEL (PMT) RATE

Central Walton Share of Multimodal Project Cost	\$194,761,811	
New Growth Evaluation Factor	.996%	
Net Cost	\$193,982,764	
Increase in Person Miles of Travel (PMT) Central Walton	1,970,548	
Central Walton PMT Rate	\$98.44	
Source: The Central Walton PMT rate was calculated based on Multimodal Project Cost times the New Growth Evaluation Factor divided by the sum of the Increase in PMT for the Central Florida Planning Areas.		



The PMT rate for the Central Walton Planning Area is \$127.12 (Table 18).

South Walton Share of Multimodal Project Cost	\$380,043,680	
New Growth Evaluation Factor	.996%	
Net Cost	\$378,501,277	
Increase in Person Miles of Travel (PMT) Central Walton	2,977,461	
Central Walton PMT Rate	\$127.12	
Source: The Central Walton PMT rate was calculated based on Multimodal Project Cost times the New Growth Evaluation Factor divided by the sum of the Increase in PMT for the Central Florida Planning Areas.		

TABLE 18. SOUTH WALTON PERSON MILES OF TRAVEL (PMT) RATE

MOBILITY FEE ASSESSMENT AREAS

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). New development within the City 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 are earmarked for expenditure as required by the second test of the dual rational nexus test.

There are three assessment areas proposed as part of the Mobility Fee (Map K). The assessment areas are based on the County's current Planning Areas established in the Comprehensive Plan. The North Central and North Planning Areas have been combined to form a single assessment area. The North Central and North Planning Area will feature the lowest mobility fee rate due to the number of Federal and State multimodal projects. The calculated PMT rate is rounded to \$50.00 until a final list of multimodal projects is finalized. The Central Planning Area will feature a higher mobility fee rate due to the greater number of County multimodal projects and projected increase in PMT. The calculated PMT rate is rounded to \$100.00 until a final list of multimodal projects. The South Planning Area will feature the highest mobility fee rate due to the number of County multimodal projects and projects and projects is finalized. The South Planning Area will feature the highest mobility fee rate due to the number of County multimodal projects and projects and projects is finalized. The South Planning Area will feature the highest mobility fee rate due to the number of County multimodal projects and the projected increase in PMT. The calculated PMT rate is rounded to \$125.00 until a final list of multimodal projects is finalized.



PERSON TRAVEL DEMAND (PTD) PER LAND USE

The second component in the calculation of a mobility fee is the calculation of person miles of travel for each land use included on the mobility fee schedule. The factors utilized in the calculation of person miles of travel for each land use are the principal means to achieve the "rough proportionately" test established by the courts and Florida State 163.31801. The following factors are used to determine the PMT per land use.

Trip Generation (Tg): Trip generation rates are based on daily trip information published in the *Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 10th edition.*

% New Trips (Nt): 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, pass-by rates were utilized for uses such as offices, day care, places of worship, entertainment and recreation uses 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).

Person Trip Factor (PTf): The person trip factor is used to convert vehicle trips to person trips based on the recently released 2017 National Household Travel Survey (NHTS).

Person Trip Length (PTI): The person trip length is based on the recently released 2017 NHTS.

Origin and Destination Adjustment 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 trips are multiplied by 50%. This distributed the impact of travel equally between the origin and destination of the trip and eliminates double charging for trips.

Person Travel Demand (PTD) per Land Use: The result of multiplying trip generation rates, percentage of new trips, person trip length, the person trip factor and the origin and destination factor are the establishment of a per unit person miles of travel per land use for each of the three assessment areas. PTDlu = ((((Tg x Nt) x (PTf)) x (PTI))*ODf)



MOBILITY FEE SCHEDULE

The mobility fee is based on the person miles of travel for each land use (PMTLU) within the three (3) assessment areas and the person miles of travel rate (PMTr) for each assessment area. The proposed mobility fee schedule is provided in **Appendix Q**.

MOBILITY FEE BENEFIT DISTRICT

The benefit test of the dual rational nexus test requires that local governments establish separate areas within which mobility fees collected are earmarked for expenditure. The mobility fee proposes a total of four Benefit Districts based on the four Planning Areas, plus any municipality that opts-in to the County System (Map L). Mobility Fee Benefit Districts ensure that mobility fees collected within the District are expended on multimodal projects within the District to the benefit of development which pays the fee. The implementation of the Mobility Fee Benefit Districts ensures the second requirement of the dual rational nexus test is met by clearly defining where funds are collected and where they are expended. The Districts also ensures that the land uses within the Districts that pay the fee are provided the benefit of mobility from the multimodal projects to be funded within the District.

CONCLUSION

Walton County's mobility fee is based upon the multimodal projects included in the 2040 Mobility Plan. The Mobility Plan is a 20-year vision for moving people and providing choices through expansion of the multimodal transportation network through construction of bike lanes, paths, sidewalks, and trails. The County will continue to work with its Cities, FDOT, adjacent Counties and Cities and the TPO in a cooperative manner to improve transportation mobility within and surrounding the County.

A mobility fee is a streamlined, equitable way for new development to continue to mitigate its impact to the multimodal transportation system. The Mobility Plan projects are based on the projected increase in person miles of travel from new development and redevelopment, between 2020 and 2040, within the County; consistent with the **"needs"** requirement of the dual rational nexus test. The mobility fee is based on the projected increase in person miles of capacity (PMC), provided by the multimodal projects identified in the Mobility Plan, to meet the demands for new person capacity attributable to new development as required by Florida Statute.



The implementation of Mobility Fee Benefit Districts, where a mobility fee paid by new development and redevelopment is to be expended to fund the multimodal projects identified in the Mobility Plan, thus ensuring that the mobility fee will meet the **"benefits"** requirement of the dual rational nexus test. The County's mobility fee will be the only "fee" assessed on new development and redevelopment within the County, in order to offset the impact of that new development and redevelopment on the County's multimodal transportation system.

The County will determine how mobility fee revenue is allocated through its annual Capital Improvements Program. Mobility fee revenues may be expended on multimodal projects identified in the Mobility Plan within the applicable Mobility Fee Benefit Districts, so long as the multimodal projects are included in the County's Capital Improvements Program. Within a year of adoption of the Mobility Plan and mobility fee, the County shall update its Comprehensive Plan to implement the Mobility Plan and reflect the adoption of a mobility fee. As new mobility technologies and shared mobility services evolve, the County will consider future updates to its mobility plan and Comprehensive Plan to promote the movement of people through multiple modes of travel.

It is recommended that the County move forward with adoption of the Mobility Plan and mobility fee. If the County desires to lower the fee, then it should consider including potential available funding sources to lower the fee, as opposed to an arbitrary reduction of the mobility fee or a phased-in mobility fee. It is also recommended that the County consider incorporating an annual inflation index in the mobility fee ordinance so future updates will feature smaller increases in the mobility fee rate. To ensure that the Mobility Plan and mobility fee is consistent with the Statutory requirement that fees be based on the most recent and localized date, the Mobility Plan and mobility fee should be updated every three (3) years.

The person miles of travel for each land use included in the updated mobility fee schedule meet the "rough proportionality test" established through case law and Florida Statute 163.31801. The new growth evaluation demonstrates that new development is not being assessed more than its fair share of the cost of the Mobility Plan projects. Payment of the mobility fee addresses full mitigation of the person travel demand generated by new development and redevelopment within the County. The Mobility Plan and the calculated mobility fee are consistent with the requirements of Florida Statutes 163.3180 and 163.319801 and meet all legal requirements.

MAPS

Map A.



Map B.


Map C.



Map D.



Map E.



Map F.



Map G.



Map H.











APPENDIX

Page 83 of 264

	Appendix A: 2017 National Household Travel Survey Data for Florida													
Trip Purpose	Trip Length	Number of Trips	Average Trip Length	Number of Persons	PT Rate	РМТ	PMT Rate	VMT	Average Trip Length	Number of Vehicles	# of Person per Vehicle	Vehicle Occupancy		
Buy Goods	2,873.55	957.00	3.00	1,649	1.72	4,951.40	1.74	2847.37	3.11	917	1603	1.75		
Buy Meals	uy Meals 1,639.97 508.00 3.23 1,132 2.23 3,751.52 2.32 1617.02 3.55 455 1000 2.20													
Buy Services	481.82	154.00	3.13	267	1.73	795.87	1.65	480.95	3.19	151	263	1.74		
Child Care	27.14	8.00	3.39	19	2.38	73.05	2.85	25.67	3.67	7	17	2.43		
Entertainment	574.78	175.00	3.28	405	2.31	1,331.73	2.42	549.44	3.90	141	321	2.28		
Errand / Library / PO	365.80	161.00	2.27	237	1.47	521.09	1.46	355.80	2.58	138	211	1.53		
Exercise	547.95	234.00	2.34	374	1.60	834.82	1.80	462.84	3.53	131	203	1.55		
Home	6,410.86	2,067.00	3.10	3,801	1.84	12,512.18	2.04	6135.43	3.53	1737	3334	1.92		
Medical	397.13	97.00	4.09	148	1.53	623.71	1.58	395.92	4.17	95	146	1.54		
Religious	501.36	127.00	3.95	279	2.20	1,143.73	2.30	497.76	4.18	119	268	2.25		
School	417.15	121.00	3.45	256	2.12	872.79	2.20	396.80	3.71	107	242	2.26		
Work	2,481.70	615.00	4.04	766	1.25	2,958.97	1.21	2450.82	4.24	578	710	1.23		
Total	16,719.21	5,224.00	3.20	9,333	1.79	30,370.87	1.87	16215.82	3.54	4576	8318	1.82		
Note: 2017 National Hous	ehold Travel Su	vey Data for the S	tate of Florida based	l on trips of 10 mil	es or less in	length								

	Appendix B: Miramar Beach Sandestin Walking & Bicycling Plan												
ID	Facility Name	From	То	Length (Miles)	Multimodal Projects	Description	Multimodal Person Capacity	Cost	Time Frame				
1	Scenic 98	US Hwy 98	Okaloosa County	2.9	Shared-Use Trail	Replace the existing 8' path with a 12' trail on the northside of Scenic 98	24,360	\$ 1,847,524	2020-2025				
2	US Hwy 98	Mack Bayou Road	Sandestin Blvd	1.5	Shared-Use Trail	Replace the existing 8' path with a 12' trail on the northside from Seagrove Beach (CR 395) to Grayton Beach (CR 283)	10,800	\$ 955,616	2020-2025				
3	US Hwy 98	Sandestin Blvd	Scenic 98	1.2	Multimodal Sidewalk	Convert existing sidewalks into multimodal sidewalks to allow use of micromobility devices. Provide treatments are driveway and intersection crosings.	4,320	\$ 799,742	2026-2030				
4	US Hwy 98	Scenic 98	Driftwood Drive	2.4	Shared-Use Path & Buffered Bike Lanes	Add an 8' shared-use path along both sides of US 98 where there is not a shared-use path. Replace existing sidewalks with a 8' shared-use path. Add landscape between travel lanes and shared-use path. Construct 7' to 9' buffered bike lanes on both sides of US 98.	43,776	\$ 4,603,056	2026-2030				
5	US Hwy 98	Driftwood Drive	Okaloosa County	0.7	Shared-Use Path & Buffered Bike Lanes	Add an 8' shared-use path along both sides of US 98 where there is not a shared-use path. Replace existing sidewalks with a 8' shared-use path. Add landscape between travel lanes and shared-use path. Contstruct 7' to 9' buffered bike lanes on both sides of US 98.	8,484	\$ 1,342,558	2026-2030				
6	Poinciana Blvd	US Hwy 98	Scenic 98	0.22	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path.	1,056	\$ 93,438	2020-2025				
7	Driftwood Drive	Forest Shore Drive	US Hwy 98	0.5	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path.	2,400	\$ 212,359	2026-2030				
8	Driftwood Drive	US Hwy 98	Scenic 98	0.5	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path.	2,400	\$ 212,359	2026-2030				
9	Ellis Road	US Hwy 98	Scenic 98	0.5	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path.	2,400	\$ 212,359	2026-2030				
10	Geronimo Street	Crest Drive	US Hwy 98	0.26	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path.	1,248	\$ 2,357,184	2026-2030				
11	Miramar Beach Drive	US Hwy 98	Scenic 98	0.46	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path.	2,208	\$ 1,234,422	2020-2025				
12	North Holiday Road	Shore Drive	US Hwy 98	0.46	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Contstruct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	552	\$ 153,284	2020-2025				
13	Forest Shore Drive	US Hwy 98	Driftwood Drive Extension	1.36	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Contstruct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	1,632	\$ 453,187	2026-2030				
14	Bayshore Drive	Crest Drive	Darrow Drive	0.54	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Contstruct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	648	\$ 179,942	2026-2030				
15	Crest Drive	Shore Drive	Bayshore Drive	0.38	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Contstruct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	456	\$ 126,626	2020-2025				
16	Shore Drive	Crest Drive	Bay Tree Drive	0.14	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Contstruct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	168	\$ 46,652	2020-2025				
17	Darrow Drive	Bayshore Drive	Forest Shore Drive	0.15	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Contstruct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	180	\$ 49,984	2020-2025				
Total					State Roads (\$5,945,614.0 100% of County Roads (\$8 of \$9,529,239.56.	0); State Share @ 90% (\$5,351,052.60); County Share @ ,934,678.16) & @ 10% of State Roads (\$594,561.40) for total	107,088	\$ 14,880,292.16	2020-2040				

Note: Buffered bike lanes, shared-use sidewalks, paths, and trails are further described in the Mobility Plan and Fee Technical Report. Cost are based on the latest FDOT and Walton County per mile construction cost. The following factors, based on percentage of construction cost, were added to the overall cost: design (PE) 12%; right-of-way (ROW) 30%; construction, engineering and inspection (CEI) 10%; utility relocations (UTL) 5%; stormwater (SW) 5%; landscape (LS). 8%; streetscape and hardscape (SH) 10%; and contingency 15%. The cost estimates are planning level numbers and will differ based on final design of each project. The prioritization is also subject to change annually during the County's budgeting process and Capital Improvements Programming.

				Appen	ıdix C: Miramar Be	ach Sandestin Transit Circulator Plan				
ID	Facility Name	From	То	Length (Miles)	Multimodal Project	Description	Multimodal Person Capacity		Cost	Time Frame
1	Scenic 98 Transit Circulator Phase 1 (Top Priority)	Miramar Beach Regional Mobility Hub	Driftwood Drive Communtiy Mobility Hub	3.3	Microtransit Circulator	This is the number one priority microtransit circulator for Miramar Beach and should feature the highest frequency and hours of operation of any route. Microtransit circulator service and cost will vary based on season, frequency of service (headways), hours of operation (span of service), and types of microtransit vehicles (autonomous transit shuttles, golf carts, neighborhood electric vehicles, and trolleys. The initial cost includes contribution towards microtransit vehicles. Addittional funding would be obtained from advertisments, tourist development taxes and user fees. To be an effective mode of transport, frequency needs to be between 5 and 10 minutes per hour and at least 18 hours of operation during peak season. During off- peaks, frequencies should be between 10 and 15 minutes per hour and at least 14 hours of operation during peak season.	Roads Plan, Micromobility & Microtransit Plan	\$	2,475,000	2020-2025
2	Sandestin Transit Circulator Phase 2	Grand Blvd Neighborhood Mobility Hub	Miramar Beach Regional Mobility Hub	3.9	Microtransit Circulator	Microtransit circulator service and cost will vary based on season, frequency of service (headways), hours of operation (span of service), and types of microtransit vehicles (autonomous transit shuttles, golf carts, neighborhood electric vehicles, and trolleys. The inital cost includes contribution towards microtransit vechicles. Addittional funding would be obtained from advertisments, tourist development taxes and user fees. To be an effective mode of transport, frequency needs to be between 7.5 and 10 minutes per hour and at least 16 hours of operation during peak season. During off-peaks, frequencies should be between 10 and 15 minutes per hour and at least 14 hours of operation during peak season.	Micromobility & Microtransit Plan	\$	1,950,000	2026-2030
3	US Hwy 98 Transit Service	Miramar Beach Regional Mobility Hub	Okaloosa County / Destin	2.2	Transit Route	Future transit route sering the US 98 corridor with stops at Mobility Hubs. Frequency and span of service to be determined at a future date based on demand.	TBD		TBD	2031-2035
Total	al l		9.4				\$ 4	1,425,000.00	2020-2040	

Note: The capacity for microtransit circulators is captured in the multimodal person capacity of multimodal lanes, ways, and shared streets as further defined in the Mobility Plan and Fee Technical Report. Cost are based on microtransit vechiles with additional funding to come from advertising, user fees and touirst development dollars. Cost estimates will vary with transit service frequenxcy and hours of operation. The prioritization is also subject to change annually during the County's budgeting process and Capital Improvements Programming.

	Appendix C: Miramar Beach Sandestin Mobility Hubs												
ID	Facility Name	Multimodal Project	Description	Cost	Time Frame								
1	Seascape Neighborhood Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Neighborhood Mobility Hub serving Seascape. Proposed phase 1 microtransit circulator connection and multimodal lanes on Scenic 98. Assumes public / private partnership on land availability.	\$ 250,000	2020-2025								
2	Sandestin Neighborhood Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Neighborhood Mobility Hub serving Sandestin. Proposed phase 2 microtransit circulator connection and multimodal lanes on US Hwy 98. Assumes public / private partnership on land availability.	\$ 250,000	2026-2030								
3	Grand Blvd Neighborhood Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Neighborhood Mobility Hub serving Sandestin. Proposed phase 2 microtransit circulator connection and multimodal lanes on US Hwy 98. Assumes public / private partnership on land availability.	\$ 250,000	2026-2030								
4	Driftwood Community Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Community Mobility Hub serving Miramar Beach. 300 spot parking area on existing County property, that may eventually become a parking structure based on demand.	\$ 1,500,000	2020-2025								
5	Miramar Beach Regional Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Regional Mobility Hub serving Scenic 98 with primary service to Miramar Beach. The Miramar Beach Regional Mobility Hub is the primary component in creating an overall Park-Once Environment for Scenic 98. The Regional Mobility Hub will feature multiple micromobility and microtransit services and offer shared mobility servies and programs as well as a 400 space parking structure. The County does not own land near the Scenic 98 and US Hwy 98 intersection. The County will likely need to purchase land or preferably enter into a public private partnership to secure the necessary land to construct a Regional Mobility Hub.	\$ 10,000,000	2026-2030								
Total				\$ 12,250,000	2020-2040								

Note: Mobility hubs are further described in the Mobility Plan and Fee Technical Report. The need for future parking spaces is based on a separate draft park-once environemnt report. The ultimate size of parcles and cost for mobility hubs is dependant on market conditions and market demand. The cost estimates for land are based on recent data for land in Walton County. Cost are increasingly rapidly and any final cost will be subject to County appraislas and negitations with land owners. The cost of surface parking spaces is estimated at \$5,000 per spot based on recent construction cost. The cost of structured parking spaces was estimated at \$25,000 per spot based on recent construction cost. The cost of structured parking spaces was estimated at \$25,000 per spot based on recent construction cost. The cost of structured parking spaces was estimated at \$25,000 per spot based on recent construction cost. The cost of structured parking spaces was estimated at \$25,000 per spot based on recent construction cost. The cost of structured parking spaces was estimated at \$25,000 per spot based on recent construction cost. The cost of structured parking spaces was estimated at \$25,000 per spot based on recent construction cost. The cost of structured parking spaces was estimated at \$25,000 per spot based on recent construction cost. The cost of structured parking spaces was estimated at \$25,000 per spot based on recent construction cost. The cost of structured parking spaces was estimated at \$25,000 per spot based on recent construction cost. The cost of structured parking spaces to the creation of park-once environements and the need to use modes of transportation other than motor vehicles. The County should seek to enter into public-private partnerships wherever possibel due to the hight cost of land in South Walton. The county should continue to look at parcels along US 98 for future needs and should create land development regulations to require new developments. The cost estimates are preliminary planning level number

				Apper	ndix D: Miramar B	each Sandestin Multmodal Lanes Plan			
ID	Facility Name	From	То	Length (Miles)	Multimodal Project	Description	Multimodal Person Capacity	Cost	Time Frame
1	Scenic 98 Phase 1	US Hwy 98	Okaloosa County	2.9	Multimodal Lanes	Add directional multimodal lanes on both sides of Scenic 98. Multimodal lanes are intended to be provided adjacent to existing travel lanes. To the extent right- of-way allows, buffers of varying width should be provided between travel lanes and the multimodal lanes and between the multimodal ways and adjacent shared use paths.	34,800	\$ 2,165,172	2020-2025
2	US Hwy 98 Phase 2	Mack Bayou Road	Sandestin Blvd	1.5	Multimodal Lanes	Add directional multimodal lanes on both sides of US Hwy 98. Multimodal lanes are intended to be provided adjacent to existing travel lanes. To the extent right- of-way allows, buffers of varying width should be provided between travel lanes and the multimodal lanes and between the multimodal ways and adjacent shared use paths.	12,000	\$ 1,119,916	2026-2030
3	US Hwy 98 Phase 2	Sandestin Blvd	Scenic 98	1.2	Multimodal Lanes	Add directional multimodal lanes on both sides of US Hwy 98. Multimodal lanes are intended to be provided adjacent to existing travel lanes. To the extent right- of-way allows, buffers of varying width should be provided between travel lanes and the multimodal lanes and between the multimodal ways and adjacent shared use paths.	9,600	\$ 895,933	2026-2030
4	US Hwy 98 Phase 3	Scenic 98	Driftwood Drive	2.4	Multimodal Lanes	Add directional multimodal lanes on both sides of US Hwy 98. Multimodal lanes are intended to be provided adjacent to existing travel lanes. To the extent right- of-way allows, buffers of varying width should be provided between travel lanes and the multimodal lanes and between the multimodal ways and adjacent shared use paths.	19,200	\$ 1,791,866	2031-2035
5	US Hwy 98 Phase 3	Driftwood Drive	Okaloosa County	0.7	Multimodal Lanes	Add directional multimodal lanes on both sides of US Hwy 98. Multimodal lanes are intended to be provided adjacent to existing travel lanes. To the extent right- of-way allows, buffers of varying width should be provided between travel lanes and the multimodal lanes and between the multimodal ways and adjacent shared use paths.	5,600	\$ 522,628	2031-2035
Total				8.7			81,200	\$ 6,495,515.48	2020-2040

Note: Multimodal lanes are further described in the Mobility Plan and Fee Technical Report. The capacity of multmodal lanes is further defined in the Mobility Plan and Fee Technical Report. Cost are based on the latest FDOT and Walton County per lane mile construction cost. The following factors, based on percentage of construction cost, were added to the overall cost: design (PE) 12%; right-of-way (ROW) 30%; construction, engineering and inspection (CEI) 10%; utility relocations (UTL) 5%; stormwater (SW) 5%; landscape (LS) .8%; streetscape and hardscape (SH) 10%; and contingency 15%. The cost for lake and water body crossings was estimated at \$1,000,000 a crossing assumming the majority of existing structures needed to be replaced. The cost estimates are planning level numbers and will differ based on final design of each project. The prioritization is also subject to change annually during the County's budgeting process and Capital Improvements Programming.

	Appendix E: Miramar Beach Sandestin Roads Plan													
ID	Facility Name	From	То	Length (Miles)	Multimodal Project	Construction Entity	Description	Mulimodal Person Capacity	Cost	Time Frame				
1	US Hwy 98	Mack Bayou Road	Baytown Avenue East	1.0	Safety Enhancements	State	Improve visability for people bicycling, walking, and accessing transit, narrow distance crossing intersections, add raised refugae islands, enhance visability at driveway crossings	Reflected in Multimodal Projects	\$ 1,000,000	2020-2025				
2	US Hwy 98	Baytown Avenue East	Tang O Mar Drive	1.3	Safety Enhancements	State	Install raised landscape median. Improve visability for people bicycling, walking, and accessing transit, narrow distance crossing intersections, add raised refugae islands, enhance visability at driveway crossings. Add two HAWKS to create gaps for people crossing on foot, bike and accessing transit.	Reflected in Multimodal Projects	\$ 3,250,000	2020-2025				
3	US Hwy 98	Tang O Mar Drive	Scenic 98	0.4	Safety Enhancements	State	Improve visability for people bicycling, walking, and accessing transit, narrow distance crossing intersections, add raised refugae islands, enhance visability at driveway crossings	Reflected in Multimodal Projects	\$ 400,000	2020-2025				
4	US Hwy 98	Scenic 98	Driftwood Drive	2.4	Safety Enhancements	State	Improve visability for people bicycling, walking, and accessing transit, narrow distance crossing intersections, add raised refugae islands, enhance visability at driveway crossings	Reflected in Multimodal Projects	\$ 2,400,000	2026-2030				
5	US Hwy 98	Driftwood Drive	Okaloosa County	0.7	Safety Enhancements	State	Improve visability for people bicycling, walking, and accessing transit, narrow distance crossing intersections, add raised refugae islands, enhance visability at driveway crossings	Reflected in Multimodal Projects	\$ 700,000	2026-2030				
6	Scenic 98	US Hwy 98	Okaloosa County	2.9	Low Speed Street	County	Convert Scenic 98 to a Low Speed Street to accommodate multimodal lanes, a wider trail, and microtransit service between the Miramar Beach Mobility Hub and the Driftwood Community Mobility Hub	58,000	\$ 3,625,000	2026-2030				
7	Poinciana Blvd	US Hwy 98	Scenic 98	0.22	Multiway Blvd	County	Upgrade to a landscaped multiway blvd that safely accomodates all modes of travel and encourages redevelopment of adjacent parcels.	7,832	\$ 2,776,864	2026-2030				
8	Driftwood Extension	Forest Shore Drive	US Hwy 98	0.5	New Road	County	New two (2) lane road	13,470	\$ 2,483,319	2020-2025				
9	Driftwood Upgrade	US Hwy 98	Scenic 98	0.5	Upgrade	County	Upgrade the existing road to facilitate access to the Driftwood Community Mobility Hub and enhance multimodal connectivity to Miramar Beach. Consider conversion to one-way pair with Ellis Road.	8,082	\$ 1,655,546	2020-2025				
10	Ellis Road Upgrade	US Hwy 98	Scenic 98	0.5	Upgrade	County	Upgrade the existing road to facilitate access to the Driftwood Community Mobility Hub and enhance multimodal connectivity to Miramar Beach. Consider conversion to one-way pair with Driftwood Drive.	8,082	\$ 1,655,546	2020-2025				
11	E. Bradley Street Upgrade	Ellis Road	Driftwood Drive	0.12	Upgrade	County	Upgrade the existing road to facilitate access to the Driftwood Community Mobility Hub and enhance multimodal connectivity to Miramar Beach. Consider conversion to one-way pair with Payne Street.	1,940	\$ 397,331	2020-2025				
12	Payne Street Upgrade	Ellis Road	Driftwood Drive	0.12	Upgrade	County	Upgrade the existing road to facilitate access to the Driftwood Community Mobility Hub and enhance multimodal connectivity to Miramar Beach. Consider conversion to one-way pair with Bradley Street.	1,940	\$ 397,331	2020-2025				
Total				10.66	State Roads (\$7,750,000) 10% of State Roads (\$77	; State Share @ 5,000) for total o	90% (\$6,975,000); County Share @ 100% of County Roads (\$12,990,936.77) & @ f \$13,765.936.77	99,345	\$ 20,740,936.77	2020-2040				
Note:	The capacity of roads is further defined in the Mobility Plan and Fee Technical Report. Cost are based on the latest FDOT and Walton Courty per lane mile construction cost. The following factors, based on percentage of construction cost, were added to the overall cost: design (P) 12%; right-													

scape (SH) 10 ngency re planning provery nover and construction, engineering and inspection (ctr) are; unity relocations (UTL) 5%; stormwater (SW) 5%; landscape (LS) project. The prioritization is also subject to change annually during the County's budgeting process and Capital Improvements Programming. cape

	Appendix F: South Walton 2040 Walking & Bicycling Plan												
ID	Facility Name	From	То	Length (Miles)	Multimodal Projects	Description	Capacity	Cost	Time Frame				
1	30A	US Hwy 98 East	CR 395 (Seagrove Beach)	7.98	Shared-Use Path	Add an 8' shared-use path along both sides of 30A where there is not a shared-use path. Replace existing sidewalks with a 8' shared-use path. Add landscape between travel lanes and shared-use path.	38,304	\$ 7,011,164	2020-2025				
2	30A	CR 395 (Seagrove Beach)	CR 283 (Grayton Beach)	2.99	Shared-Use Trail	Replace the existing 8' path with a 12' trail on the northside from Seagrove Beach (CR 395) to Grayton Beach (CR 283)	10,764	\$ 739,205	2020-2025				
3	30A	CR 283 (Grayton Beach)	CR 393 (Gulf Place)	4.31	Shared-Use Path	Add an 8' shared-use path along both sides of 30A where there is not a shared-use path. Replace existing sidewalks with a 8' shared-use path. Add landscape between travel lanes and shared-use path.	20,688	\$ 3,329,569	2020-2025				
4	30A	CR 393 (Gulf Place)	US Hwy 98 West	3.53	Shared-Use Path	Add an 8' shared-use path along both sides of 30A where there is not a shared-use path. Replace existing sidewalks with a 8' shared-use path. Add landscape between travel lanes and shared-use path.	16,944	\$ 2,727,002	2020-2025				
5	US 98	Bay County	Mack Bayou Rd	21.7	Shared-Use Trail	Contstruct a 12' shared-use trail on either side on US 98	104,160	\$ 13,824,564	2020-2025				
6	US 98	Bay County	Mack Bayou Rd	21.7	Buffered Bike Lanes	Contstruct 7' to 9' buffered bike lanes on both sides of US 98	104,160	\$ 48,776,913	2020-2025				
7	US Hwy 331	Chat Holley Rd	US Hwy 98	1.6	Shared-Use Trail	Contstruct a 12' shared-use trail	7,680	\$ 1,019,323	2026-2030				
8	US 331 Forest Path Connector	US Hwy 98	CR 283 to CR 83 Forest Path Connector	1.36	Forest Path	Contstruct compacted 6' to 12' forest path	1,632	\$ 238,000	2026-2030				
9	St Joes Powerline Trail	Medley Street East	Serenoa Road	6.08	Shared-Use Trail	Contstruct a 12' shared-use trail	51,072	\$ 3,873,426	2026-2030				
10	Gulf Powerline Trail East	Serenoa Road	CR 395	3.7	Shared-Use Trail	Contstruct a 12' shared-use trail	31,080	\$ 2,357,184	2026-2030				
11	Point Washignton Road	CR 395	Point Washignton Connector	2.81	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path.	13,488	\$ 1,234,422	2020-2025				
12	Point Washignton Connector	Pointe Washington Road	Gulf Powerline Trail East	1.11	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path.	5,328	\$ 487,619	2020-2025				
13	Gulf Powerline Trail East	Doodles Forest Road	US Hwy 331	0.59	Shared-Use Trail	Contstruct a 12' shared-use trail	4,956	\$ 375,875	2026-2030				
14	Gulf Powerline West Trail	US Hwy 331	Sandestin Lane (Grand Blvd)	7.85	Shared-Use Trail	Contstruct a 12' shared-use trail within powerline row / easment	65,940	\$ 5,001,052	2026-2030				
15	Thompson Road to Moll Drive Multimodal Connector	Thompson Road	Moll Drive	0.57	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path.	2,736	\$ 250,399	2020-2025				
16	Thompson Road Path Connector	Sugar Drive to Thompson Road Multimodal Connector	Thompson Road to Moll Drive Multimodal Connector	0.56	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path.	2,688	\$ 246,006	2020-2025				
17	Sugar Drive to Thompson Road Multimodal Connector	Sugar Drive	Thompson Road	0.53	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path.	2,544	\$ 232,827	2020-2025				
18	Sugar Drive Connector	Gulf Powerline West Trail	Sugar Drive to Thompson Road Multimodal Connector	1.23	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path.	5,904	\$ 540,334	2020-2025				
19	Donald Bishop Forest Path Connector	US Hwy 98	30A	0.93	Forest Path	Contstruct compacted 6' to 12' forest path	1,116	\$ 162,750	2031-2035				
20	Don Bishop to Sugar Dr Forest Path Connector	Donald Bishop Forest Path Connector	Sugar Drive	0.58	Forest Path	Construct compacted 6' to 12' forest path	696	\$ 101,500	2031-2035				
21	CR 393 to Thompson Road Forest Path Connector	CR 393 (Gulf Place)	Thompson Road	1.43	Forest Path	Construct compacted 6' to 12' forest path	1,716	\$ 250,250	2031-2035				
22	Sea Pond Road Forest Path Connector	US Hwy 98	30A	1.69	Forest Path	Construct compacted 6' to 12' forest path that connects 30A and the Santa Rosa Beach Publix.	2,028	\$ 295,750	2031-2035				
23	Sea Pond to CR 393 Forest Path Connector	CR 393 (Gulf Place)	Sea Pond Road	1.55	Forest Path	Construct compacted 6' to 12' forest path, with connection to Seacroft Drive	1,860	\$ 271,250	2031-2035				
24	TopSoil Trail	US Hwy 98	Beach	0.81	Shared-Use Trail	Contstruct a 12' shared-use trail	6,804	\$ 516,032	2031-2035				
25	Topsail Trail East	Gulf Powerline West Trail	Beach	1.8	Shared-Use Trail	Contstruct a 12' shared-use trail	15,120	\$ 1,146,738	2031-2035				
26	Topsoli to 30A Forest Path Connector	Topsail Trail East	30A	1.16	Forest Path	Construct compacted 6' to 12' forest path	1,392	\$ 203,000	2031-2035				
27	Old Blue Mountain Road Extension	Chat Holley Rd	US Hwy 98	1.28	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path.	6,144	\$ 562,299	2026-2030				
28	CR 83	US Hwy 98	83 Forest Access	1.54	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path.	7,392	\$ 676,516	2026-2030				
29	Old Blue Mountain (CR 83) to Sea Pond Forest Path Connector	CR 83 (Old Blue Mountain Road)	Sea Pond Road	1.18	Forest Path	Contstruct compacted 6' to 12' forest path	1,416	\$ 206,500	2031-2035				
30	Blue Mountain East Forest Path Connector	30A	CR 83 (Old Blue Mountain Road)	1.16	Forest Path	Construct compacted 6' to 12' forest path	1,392	\$ 203,000	2031-2035				
31	Mack Bayou Road	County Park	Terminus of existing Mack Bayou Path	1.93	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path.	9,264	\$ 847,841	2026-2030				
32	Lamb Drive and Aldberry Road Extension	Mack Bayou Road	Don Bishop Road	2.64	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Construct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	4,752	\$ 879,716	2026-2030				
33	East and West Hewitt Road	Gulf Powerline West Trail	US Hwy 98	3.1	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Construct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	5,580	\$ 1,033,000	2026-2030				
34	Church Street	Gulf Powerline West Trail	US Hwy 98	0.3	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path.	1,440	\$ 131,789	2026-2030				

	Appendix F: South Walton 2040 Walking & Bicycling Plan												
ID	Facility Name	From	То	Length (Miles)	Multimodal Projects	Description	Capacity	Cost	Time Frame				
35	Nellie Drive	Chat Holley Rd	US Hwy 98	1.03	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path.	4,944	\$ 452,475	2026-2030				
36	Bayou Drive	Enchanted Way	E. Lamb Drive	1.91	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Construct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	3,438	\$ 636,461	2026-2030				
37	Goldsby Road	Lamb Drive and Aldberry Road Extension	Gulf Powerline West Trail	0.95	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Construct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	1,710	\$ 316,564	2026-2030				
38	Goldsby Road	Gulf Powerline West Trail	US Hwy 98	0.27	Shared-Use Trail	Contstruct a 12' shared-use trail	1,620	\$ 172,011	2026-2030				
39	Hunter Road	Gulf Powerline West Trail	US Hwy 98	0.29	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Construct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	522	\$ 96,635	2026-2030				
40	Don Bishop Road	Lamb Drive and Aldberry Road Extension	US Hwy 98	1.01	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Construct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	1,818	\$ 336,558	2026-2030				
41	Veterans Road	Chat Holley Rd	US Hwy 98	1.01	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path.	4,848	\$ 443,689	2026-2030				
42	Bishop Tolbert Road	Gulf Powerline West Trail	US Hwy 98	0.29	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path.	1,392	\$ 127,396	2026-2030				
43	CR 393	Choctawhatchee Bay	Hogtown Bayou	1.38	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Contstruct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	2,484	\$ 459,852	2026-2030				
44	CR 393	Chat Holley Rd	Ridge Road	2.17	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path.	10,416	\$ 953,272	2026-2030				
45	CR 393	Penny Lane	30A	0.12	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path.	576	\$ 52,716	2026-2030				
46	CR 283 Bay Connector	Choctawhatchee Bay	South of US Hwy 98	1.69	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path on east side of CR 283 from US Hwy 98 to southern terminus. Construct 8' share-use path to Bay on either side of CR 283.	8,112	\$ 742,410	2026-2030				
47	CR 283 to CR 83 Forest Path Connector	CR 283 (Grayton Beach)	CR 83 (Old Blue Mountain Road)	2.19	Forest Path	Contstruct compacted 6' to 12' forest path	2,628	\$ 383,250	2031-2035				
48	CR 283 to 30A Forest Path Connector	CR 283	30A	0.99	Forest Path	Contstruct compacted 6' to 12' forest path	1,188	\$ 173,250	2031-2035				
49	Grayton Beach Forest Path Connector	CR 283 to CR 83 Forest Path Connector	Beach	0.74	Forest Path	Contstruct compacted 6' to 12' forest path	888	\$ 129,500	2031-2035				
50	Defuniak Street	South of 30A	Beach	0.4	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path.	1,920	\$ 175,718	2026-2030				
51	Watercolor Forest Path Connector	Seagrove Beach East Forest Path	CR 395	2.29	Forest Path	Contstruct compacted 6' to 12' forest path	2,748	\$ 400,750	2031-2035				
52	Watercolor Seaside Forest Path Connector	CR 395 (Seagrove Beach)	CR 283 to 30A Forest Path Connector	1.79	Forest Path	Contstruct compacted 6' to 12' forest path	2,148	\$ 313,250	2031-2035				
53	County Center Path	US Hwy 331	Boy and Girls Way	0.37	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path.	1,776	\$ 162,540	2031-2035				
54	Greenway Trail	US Hwy 331	Internal Paths	0.12	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path at southern US 331 access connection. Extend Path to Gulf Powerline West Trail.	576	\$ 52,716	2031-2035				
55	County Center Connector Sidewalk	W. of US Hwy 331	E. of Greenway Trail	0.04	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Contstruct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	72	\$ 13,329	2031-2035				
56	CR 395 Path	Point Washington	South of US Hwy 98	1.56	Shared-Use Path	Contstruct a 8' shared-use path on east side of road.	7,488	\$ 685,302	2026-2030				
57	North Wall Street	St Joes Powerline Trail	US Hwy 98	0.78	Shared-Use Trail	Contstruct a 12' shared-use trail	4,680	\$ 496,920	2031-2035				
58	South Wall Street	US Hwy 98	Beach	0.27	Shared-Use Trail	Contstruct a 12' shared-use trail on either side on S. Wall Street.	1,620	\$ 172,011	2026-2030				
59	Winston Lane	30A	Walton Rose Lane	0.13	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Contstruct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	234	\$ 43,319	2031-2035				
60	Walton Rose Lane	S. Wall Street	Existing Sidewalk	0.3	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Contstruct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	540	\$ 99,968	2031-2035				
61	South Orange Street	US Hwy 98	West Park Place Avenue	0.12	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Contstruct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	216	\$ 39,987	2031-2035				
62	South Walton Lakeshore Drive	US Hwy 98	Walton Magnolia Lane	0.18	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Contstruct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	324	\$ 59,981	2031-2035				
63	West Park Place Avenue	South Walton Lakeshore Drive	Emerald Cove Lane	0.12	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Contstruct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	216	\$ 39,987	2026-2030				
64	Emerald Cove Lane	South of West Park Place Avenue	Existing Sidewalk	0.03	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Contstruct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	54	\$ 9,997	2026-2030				
65	North Orange Street	Pinewood Lane	US Hwy 98	0.44	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Contstruct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	792	\$ 146,619	2026-2030				
66	Carson Lane	North Walton Lakeshore Drive	North Orange Street	0.25	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Contstruct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	450	\$ 83,306	2031-2035				
67	North Lakeshore Drive	Carson Lane	US Hwy 98	0.19	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Contstruct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	342	\$ 63,313	2026-2030				
68	Pinewood Lane Sidewalk	North Orange Street	30A	0.52	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Contstruct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	936	\$ 173,277	2031-2035				
69	Westbay Parkway	Bay County	US Hwy 98	2.7	Shared-Use Trail	Contstruct a 12' shared-use trail	Internal Connectivty	Developer / FDOT Funded	2026-2030				
70	Watersound Parkway Trail Gap	North of US Hwy 98	South of US Hwy 98	0.07	Shared-Use Trail	Contstruct a 12' shared-use trail on the east side of the road	420	\$ 44,595	2026-2030				
71	Watersound Multimodal	US Hwy 98	30A	2.27	Shared-Use Trail	Contstruct a 12' shared-use trail	19,068	\$ 1,446,164	2026-2030				

			Appendix	F: South	Walton 2040 Walking &	& Bicycling Plan			
ID	Facility Name	From	То	Length (Miles)	Multimodal Projects	Description	Capacity	Cost	Time Frame
72	Seagrove Connector	US Hwy 98	30A	2.53	Shared-Use Trail	Contstruct a 12' shared-use trail	21,252	\$ 1,611,804	2026-2030
73	Seagrove Beach East Forest Path Connector	30A	CR 395	2.29	Forest Path	Contstruct compacted 6' to 12' forest path	2,748	\$ 400,750	2031-2035
74	Greenway Station Forest Path Connector	30A	North Lake Drive	0.6	Forest Path	Contstruct compacted 6' to 12' forest path	720	\$ 105,000	2031-2035
75	North Lake Drive	Greenway Station Forest Path Connector	30A	0.11	Shared-Use Sidewalk	Contstruct a 5' to 6' shared-use sidewalk	198	\$ 36,655	2031-2035
76	Eastern Lake Forest Path Connector	Seagrove Forest Trail	Eastern Lake	0.23	Forest Path	Contstruct compacted 6' to 12' forest path	276	\$ 40,250	2031-2035
77	Alys Seacrest Rosemary Forest Path Connector	US Hwy 98	30A	1.54	Forest Path	Contstruct compacted 6' to 12' forest path	1,848	\$ 269,500	2031-2035
78	Watersound Forest Path Connector	Alys Seacrest Rosemary Forest Path Connector	Watersound Parkway	0.5	Forest Path	Contstruct compacted 6' to 12' forest path	600	\$ 87,500	2031-2035
79	St Joes Watersound Forest Path Connector	Watersound Parkway	Camp Creek Lake	1.51	Forest Path	Contstruct compacted 6' to 12' forest path	1,812	\$ 264,250	2031-2035
80	Watersound Beach East Forest Connector	Watersound Beach Trail Connector	St Joes Watersound Forest Path Connector	1.15	Forest Path	Contstruct compacted 6' to 12' forest path	1,380	\$ 201,250	2031-2035
Total					State Roads (62,601,477.1 100% of County Roads (\$5 total of \$56,627,531.47	9) State Share @ 90% (\$56,341,329.47); County Share @ 0,367,383.75) & @ 10% of State Roads (\$6,260,147.72) for	682,218	\$ 112,968,860.94	2020-2040

Note: Buffered bike lanes, shared-use sidewalks, paths, and trails, and forest paths are further described in the Mobility Plan and Fee Technical Report. The capacity of Buffered bike lanes, shared-use sidewalks, paths, and trails, and forest paths is further defined in the Mobility Plan and Fee Technical Report. Cost are based on the latest FDOT and Walton County per mile construction cost. The following factors, based on percentage of construction cost, were added to the overall cost: design (PE) 12%; right-of-way (ROW) 30%; construction, engineering and inspection (CEI) 10%; utility relocations (UTL) 5%; stormwater (SW) 5%; landscape (LS).8%; streetscape and hardscape (SH) 10%; and contingency 15%. The cost estimates are planning level numbers and will differ based on final design of each project. The prioritization is also subject to change annually during the County's budgeting process and Capital Improvements Programming.

	Appendix G: South Walton 2040 Transit Circulator Plan											
ID	Facility Name	From	То	Length (Miles)	Multimodal Project	Description	Capacity	Cost	Time Frame			
1	30A Transit Circulator Phase 1 (3rd Priority Route)	Inlet Beach	Hub at Watersound Beach Neighborhood Mobility Hub	3.93	Microtransit Circulator	Microtransit circulator service and cost will vary based on season, frequency of service (headways), hours of operation (span of service), and types of microtransit vehicles (autonomous transit shuttles, golf carts, neighborhood electric vehicles, and trolleys. The inital cost includes contribution towards microtransit vechiles. Additional funding would be obtained from advertisments, tourist development taxes and user fees. To be an effective mode of transport, frequency needs to be between 10 and 15 minutes per hour and at least 14 hours of operation.	Micromobility & Microtransit Plan	\$ 1,965,000	2020-2025			
2	30A Transit Circulator Phase 2	Hub at Watersound Beach Neighborhood Mobility Hub	Eastern Lake / Greenway Station Neighborhood Mobility Hub	2.1	Microtransit Circulator	Microtransit circulator service and cost will vary based on season, frequency of service (headways), hours of operation (span of service), and types of microtransit vehicles (golf carts or neighborhood electric vehicles). This would be a Phase 2 service to be further evaluated at a future date, based on demand for service.	Micromobility & Microtransit Plan	\$ 525,000	2026-2030			
3	30A Transit Circulator Phase 1	Eastern Lake / Greenway Station Neighborhood Mobility Hub	Watercolor / CR 395 Community Mobility Hub	2.77	Microtransit Circulator	Microtransit circulator service and cost will vary based on season, frequency of service (headways), hours of operation (span of service), and types of microtransit vehicles (autonomous transit shuttles, golf carts, neighborhood electric vehicles, and trolleys. The inital cost includes contribution towards microtransit vechiles. Addittional funding would be obtained from advertisments, tourist development taxes and user fees. To be an effective mode of transport, frequency needs to be 15 minutes per hour and at least 12 hours of operation.	Micromobility & Microtransit Plan	\$ 1,385,000	2020-2025			
4	30A Transit Circulator Phase 1 (Top Priority Route)	Seagrove Beach / CR 395 Neighborhood Mobility Hub	Grayton Beach Regional Mobility Hub / CR 283	2.98	Microtransit Circulator	This is the number one priority microtransit circulator and should feature the highest frequency and hours of operation of any route. Microtransit circulator service and cost will vary based on season, frequency of service (headways), hours of operation (span of service), and types of microtransit vehicles (autonomous transit shuttles, golf carts, neighborhood electric vehicles, and trolleys. The initial cost includes contribution towards microtransit vehicles. Addittional funding would be obtained from advertisments, tourist development taxes and user fees. To be an effective mode of transport, frequency needs to be between 5 and 10 minutes per hour and at least 18 hours of operation during peak season. During off-peaks, frequencies should be between 10 and 15 minutes per hour and at least 14 hours of operation during peak season.	Micromobility & Microtransit Plan	\$ 2,235,000	2020-2025			
5	30A Transit Circulator Phase 2	Grayton Beach Regional Mobility Hub / CR 283	Blue Mountain Community Mobility Hub / CR 83	2.06	Microtransit Circulator	Microtransit circulator service and cost will vary based on season, frequency of service (headways), hours of operation (span of service), and types of microtransit vehicles (golf carts on reighborhood electric vehicles). This would be a Phase 2 service to be further evaluated at a future date, based on demand for service.	Micromobility & Microtransit Plan	\$ 515,000	2031-2035			
6	30A Santa Rosa Beach Transit Circulator Loop Phase 2	Blue Mountain Community Mobility Hub / CR 83	Gulf Place Community Mobility Hub / CR 393	8.16	Microtransit Circulator	Proposed transit circulator loop running along 30A, US 98, CR 83 and CR 393 serving Blue Mountain Beach, Gulf Place, Santa Rosa Beach and US 98. Microtransit circulator service and cost will vary based on season, frequency of service (headways), hours of operation (span of service), and types of microtransit vehicles (golf carts or neighborhood electric vehicles). This would be a Phase 2 service to be further evaluated at a future date, based on demand for service.	Micromobility & Microtransit Plan	\$ 2,040,000	2026-2030			
7	30A Transit Circulator Phase 1 (2nd Priority Route)	Gulf Place Community Mobility Hub / CR 393	Dune Allen Beach Neighborhood Mobility Hub	1.67	Microtransit Circulator	This is the number two priority microtransit circulator and should feature the 2nd highest frequency and hours of operation of any route. Microtransit circulator service and cost will vary based on season, frequency of service (headways), hours of operation (span of service), and types of microtransit vehicles (autonomous transit shuttles, golf carts, neighborhood electric vehicles, and trolleys. The initial cost includes contribution towards microtransit vechiles. Addittional funding would be obtained from advertisments, tourist development taxes and user fees. To be an effective mode of transport, frequency needs to be between 7.5 and 10 minutes per hour and at least 16 hours of operation during peak season. During off-peaks, frequencies should be between 10 and 15 minutes per hour and at least 14 hours of operation during peak season.	Micromobility & Microtransit Plan	\$ 835,000	2020-2025			
8	30A to Grand Blvd Transit Circulator Phase 2	Dune Allen Beach Neighborhood Mobility Hub	Grand Boulevard Neighborhood Mobility Hub	4.28	Microtransit Circulator	Proposed transit circulator route connecting Dune Allen and Grand Blvd and stopping at Neighborhood Mobility Hubs along US 98. Microtransit circulator service and cost will vary based on season, frequency of service (headways), hours of operation (span of service), and types of microtransit vehicles (golf carts or neighborhood electric vehicles). This would be a Phase 2 service to be further evaluated at a future date, based on demand for service.	Micromobility & Microtransit Plan	\$ 1,070,000	2026-2030			
9	Grayton Beach Transit Circulator Phase 1	Grayton Beach Regional Mobility Hub / CR 283	Grayton Beach Neighborhood Mobility Hub	0.84	Microtransit Circulator	This route represented the County's first proof of concept transit circulator route and was extremely successful. Microtransit circulator service and cost will vary based on season, frequency of service (headways), hours of operation (span of service), and types of microtransit vehicles (autonomous transit shuttles, golf carts, neighborhood electric vehicles, and trolleys. The initial cost includes contribution towards microtransit vehicles and trolleys. The initial cost includes contribution towards tourist development taxes and user fees. To be an effective mode of transport, frequency needs to be between 7.5 and 10 minutes per hour and at least 16 hours of operation during peak season. During off-peaks, frequencies should be between 10 and 15 minutes per hour and at least 14 hours of operation during peak season.	1,650	\$ 420,000	2020-2025			
10	Blue Mountain Beach Transit Circulator Phase 1	Blue Mountain Community Mobility Hub / CR 83	Blue Mountain Beach Neighborhood Mobility Hubs	0.57	Microtransit Circulator	Microtransit circulator service and cost will vary based on season, frequency of service (headways), hours of operation (span of service), and types of microtransit vehicles (autonomous transit shuttles, golf carts, neighborhood electric vehicles, and trolleys. The initial cost includes contribution towards microtransit vechiles. Addittional funding would be obtained from advertisments, tourist development taxes and user fees. To be an effective mode of transport, frequency needs to be between 7.5 and 10 minutes per hour and at least 16 hours of operation during peak eason. During off-peaks, frequencies should be between 10 and 15 minutes per hour and at least 14 hours of operation during peak season.	1,100	\$ 285,000	2020-2025			
11	South County Center Transit Circulator Phase 2	South County Center Community Mobility Hub (US 331)	Grayton Beach Regional Mobility Hub / CR 283	4.04	Microtransit Circulator	Microtransit circulator service and cost will vary based on season, frequency of service (headways), hours of operation (span of service), and types of microtransit vehicles (golf carts or neighborhood electric vehicles). This would be a Phase 2 service to be further evaluated at a future date, based on demand for service.	Micromobility & Microtransit Plan	\$ 1,010,000	2026-2030			
12	County Sports Complex Transit Circulator Phase 2	Walton Sports Complex Community Mobility Hub	Watercolor / CR 395 Community Mobility Hub	5.93	Microtransit Circulator	Microtransit circulator service and cost will vary based on season, frequency of service (headways), hours of operation (span of service), and types of microtransit vehicles (golf carts or neighborhood electric vehicles). This would be a Phase 2 service to be further evaluated at a future date, based on demand for service.	TBD	TBD	2031-2035			

	Appendix G: South Walton 2040 Transit Circulator Plan													
ID	Facility Name	From	То	Length (Miles)	Multimodal Project	Description	Capacity	Cost	Time Frame					
13	Inlet Beach to Watersound Transit Circulator Phase 2	Inlet Beach Regional Beach Access	30A & Watersound Parkway	3.09	Microtransit Circulator	Microtransit circulator service connecting Inlet Beach and Watersound via US 98 and Watersound Parkway. Microtransit circulator service and cost will vary based on season, frequency of service (headways), hours of operation (span of service), and types of microtransit vehicles (golf carts or neighborhood electric vehicles). This would be a Phase 2 service to be further evaluated at a future date, based on demand for service.	TBD	TBD	2026-2030					
14	Watersound Transit Circulator Loop Phase 2	Watersound Parkway Regional Mobility Hub	Watersound Parkway Regional Mobility Hub	4.93	Microtransit Circulator	Microtransit circulator service servicing Watersound along US 98, Watersound Parkway and Internal Routes. Microtransit circulator service and cost will vary based on season, frequency of service (headways), hours of operation (span of service), and types of microtransit vehicles (golf carts or neighborhood electric vehicles). This route would be further evaluated as Watersound develops.	TBD	TBD	2031-2035					
15	US Hwy 98 Transit Service	30A East	Miramar Beach Regional Mobility Hub	23	Transit Route	Future transit route sering the US 98 corridor with stops at Mobility Hubs. Frequency and span of service to be determined at a future date based on demand.	TBD	TBD	2031-2035					
16	US 331 Enhanced Transit	DeFuniak Springs	South County Center Community Mobility Hub	26	Enhanced Transit Route	Enhanced transit route serving the US 331 corridor with stops at DeFuniak Springs, Freeport and the South County Center. Frequency and span of service to be determined at a future date based on demand.	TBD	TBD	2025-2030					
17														
Total				96.35			2,750	\$ 11,275,000.00	2020-2040					
Note: fundir Impro	lote: The capacity for microtransit circulators is captured in the multimodal person capacity of multimodal lanes, ways, and shared streets as further defined in the Mobility Plan and Fee Technical Report. Cost are based on microtransit vechiles with additional unding to come from advertising, user fees and touirst development dollars. Cost estimates will vary with transit service frequenxcy and hours of operation. The prioritization is also subject to change annually during the County's budgeting process and Capital mprovements Programming.													

	Appendix G: South Walton 2040 Mobility Hubs												
ID	Facility Name	Multimodal Project	Description	Cost	Time Frame								
1	Dune Allen Beach Neighborhood Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Neighborhood Mobility Hub serving Dune Allen Beach and Ft. Panic Regional Beach Access. Proposed microtransit circulator and multimodal way connection to Gulf Place Community Mobility Hub. Initial cost estimate for amenities, land and improvements assumming 1/4 of an acre.	\$ 700,000	2020-2025								
2	Santa Rosa Beach Neighborhood Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Neighborhood Mobility Hub serving Santa Rosa Beach Neighborhood Beach Access. Proposed phase 2 microtransit circulator and multimodal lane connection to Gulf Place Community Mobility Hub. Initial cost estimate for amenities, land and improvements assumming 1/8 of an acre.	\$ 325,000	2026-2030								
3	Grayton Beach Neighborhood Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Neighborhood Mobility Hub serving Grayton Beach Regional Beach Access. Proposed phase 1 microtransit circulator connection to Grayton Beach Regional Mobility Hub. Initial cost estimate for amenities, land and improvements assumming 1/8 of an acre, plus location.	\$ 750,000	2020-2025								
4	Watercolor / Seaside Neighborhood Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Neighborhood Mobility Hub serving Grayton Beach Regional Beach Access. Proposed phase 1 microtransit circulator connection to Grayton Beach Regional Mobility Hub. Assumes use of existing County Parking Area.	\$ 350,000	2020-2025								
5	Watercolor / 395 Neighborhood Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Neighborhood Mobility Hub serving Seagrove Neighborhood & Regional Beach Access. Proposed phase 1 microtransit circulator connection and shared street / multimodal lanes to Eastern Lake and Seagrove Beach. Initial cost estimate for amenities, land and improvements assumming 1/4 of an acre.	\$ 750,000	2020-2025								
6	Segrove Beach Neighborhood Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Neighborhood Mobility Hub serving Seagrove Neighborhood & Regional Beach Access. Proposed phase 1 microtransit circulator connection and shared street / multimodal lanes to Eastern Lake and Seagrove Beach. Initial cost estimate for amenities, land and improvements assumming 1/8 of an acre, plus location.	\$ 750,000	2020-2025								
7	Watersound Beach Neighborhood Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Neighborhood Mobility Hub serving the Hub. Proposed phase 1 microtransit circulator connection and multimodal lanes on 30A. Assumes public / private partnership on land availability.	\$ 350,000	2020-2025								
8	Seacrest Neighborhood Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Neighborhood Mobility Hub serving Neighborhood & Regional Beach Access. Proposed phase 1 microtransit circulator connection and multimodal lanes on 30A. Initial cost estimate for amenities, land and improvements assumming 1/4 of an acre.	\$ 750,000	2020-2025								
9	Alys Beach Neighborhood Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Neighborhood Mobility Hub serving Alys and Seacrest Beach. Proposed phase 1 microtransit circulator connection and multimodal ways on 30A. Assumes public / private partnership on land availability.	\$ 500,000	2020-2025								
10	Rosemary Beach Neighborhood Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Neighborhood Mobility Hub serving Rosemary and Seacrest Beach. Proposed phase 1 microtransit circulator connection and multimodal ways on 30A. Assumes public / private partnership on land availability.	\$ 350,000	2020-2025								
11	Gulf Place Community Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Community Mobility Hub serving Dune Allen, Gulf Place, and Santa Rosa Beach. 300 spot parking area on existing County property, that may eventually become a parking structure based on demand.	\$ 1,750,000	2020-2025								
12	Blue Mountain Beach Community Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Community Mobility Hub serving Blue Mountain Beach. 50 to 100 spot surface parking area with community amenities, plus 1/2 acre of land.	\$ 1,125,000	2020-2025								
13	395 & 30A Community Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Community Mobility Hub serving Seagrove Beach. 250 spot parking garage, plus the cost of land.	\$ 7,500,000	2020-2025								
14	Inlet Beach Community Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Community Mobility Hub serving Aly, Inlet, Rosemary & Seacrest Beaches. 250 spot surface parking area with community amenities, plus 2.5 acres of land.	\$ 2,500,000	2020-2025								

	Appendix G: South Walton 2040 Mobility Hubs										
ID	Facility Name	Multimodal Project	Description	Cost	Time Frame						
15	Grayton Beach Regional Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Regional Mobility Hub serving the 30A corrdior with primary service to Grayton. The Grayton Regional Mobility Hub is the primary component in creating an overall Park- Once Environment. The Regional Mobility Hub will feature multiple micromobility and microtransit services and offer shared mobility servies and programs as well as a 600 space parking structure on existing County owned property.	\$ 15,000,000	2020-2025						
16	Watersound Origins Regional Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Potential Regional Mobility Hub serving 30A East. There are limited opporotunities to aquire parcels greater than one acre in size outside of Inlet Beach north of US 98. There is a significnat existing need and there will be an even greater need as Watersound build-out to create a park once enviornment for 30A East. All existing neighborhood beach access connections in Seacrest are over capacity. Deer Lake State Park and Inlet Beach are really the only two opporotunities for public beach access, pending resolution of the customary use matter. 30A is largely at capapcity today and cannot accomodate additional traffic from Watersound. There needs to be a unified approach to mobility serving 30A East.	TBD	2026-2030						
17	Hospital / Mac Bayou Neighborhood Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Neighborhood Mobility Hub serving 30A west. Proposed phase 2 microtransit circulator connection and multimodal lanes north of US 98. Assumes public / private partnership on land availability.	\$ 250,000	2031-2035						
18	Super Wal-Mart Neighborhood Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Neighborhood Mobility Hub serving 30A west. Proposed phase 2 microtransit circulator connection and multimodal lanes north of US 98. Assumes public / private partnership on land availability.	\$ 250,000	2026-2030						
19	30A West Neighborhood Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Neighborhood Mobility Hub serving 30A west. Proposed phase 2 microtransit circulator connection and multimodal lanes north of US 98. Assumes public / private partnership on land availability.	\$ 250,000	2026-2030						
20	Santa Rosa Beach Publix Neighborhood Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Neighborhood Mobility Hub serving 30A west. Proposed phase 2 microtransit circulator connection and multimodal lanes north of US 98. Assumes public / private partnership on land availability.	\$ 250,000	2026-2030						
21	Greenway Station Neighborhood Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Neighborhood Mobility Hub serving Eastern Lake. Proposed phase 1 microtransit circulator connection and multimodal lanes on 30A. Privately provided mobility hub that will serve as possible basis for creating mobility hub requirements for new development.	Developer Funded	2020-2025						
22	South County Center Community Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Community Mobility Hub serving Central and North Walton. 250 spot parking lot. County owns land. Would serve as 2nd phase of South Walton Park-Once Environmnet, depending on demand for the Grayton Regional Mobility Hub.	\$ 1,300,000	2031-2035						
23	Walton County Sports Complex Community Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Community Mobility Hub serving Seagrove Beach, Seaside and Watersound. 250 spot parking lot. County owns land. Would serve as 2nd phase of South Walton Park-Once Environmnet, depending on demand for the 395 & 30A Community Mobility Hub and could serve as location of future parking garage if land is unavailable along 395.	\$ 1,300,000	2031-2035						
24	Westbay Parkway Regional Mobility Hub	Mobility Hub	Potential Regional Mobility Hub serving 30A East. There are limited opporotunities to aquire parcels greater than one acre in size outside of Inlet Beach north of US 98. The type and size of a mobility hub at this location is largely depenant on the type of regional mobility hub, if any, provided at Watersound Parkway and US 98 or at Inlet Beach. Future demand in 30A is drive by Watersound and St. Joes and it will take a coordinated PPP to provide adequate levels of mobility.	TBD	2031-2035						
Total				\$ 37,050,000	2020-2040						

Appendix G: South Walton 2040 Mobility Hubs										
ID Facility Name	Cost	Time Frame								
Note: Mobility hubs are further described in the Mobility Plan and Fee Technical Report. The need for future parking spaces is based on a separate draft park-once environemnt report. The ultimate size of parcles and cost for mobility hubs is dependant on market conditions and market demand. The cost estimates for land are based on recent data for land in Walton County. Cost are increasingly rapidly and any final cost will be subject to County appraislas and negitations with land owners. The cost of surface parking spaces is estimated at \$3,500 per spot based on recent construction cost. The cost of structured parking spaces was estimated at \$25,000 per spot based on recent construction cost. The cost of structured parking spaces was estimated at \$25,000 per spot based. The multimodal projects which assume high levels of utilization due to the creation of park-once environements and the need to use modes of transportation other than motor vehicles. The County should seek to enter into public-private partnerships wherever possibel due to the hight cost of land in South Walton. The County should continue to look at parcels along US 98 for future needs and should create land development regulations to require new developments of a certian scale or mixture of uses to provide mobility										

County's budgeting process and Capital Improvements Programming. As the County aquires, designs and constructs mobility hubs in the future, cost estimates shall be refined.

Page 97 of 264

	Appendix H: South Walton 2040 Micromobility & Microtransit Plan											
ID	Facility Name	From	То	Length (Miles)	Multimodal Project	Description	Capacity	Cost	Time Frame			
1	30A	US Hwy 98 East	Watersound Parkway	1.75	Multimodal Ways	Add directional multimodal ways on both sides of 30A. Buffers of varying width will be provided between travel lanes and the multimodal ways and between the multimodal ways and adjacent shared-use paths. Through Alys Beach, multimodal ways are intended to use the existing frontage lanes providing access to on-street parking. In Rosemary Beach, multimodal ways are intended to be located behind the existing Live Oaks. Multimodal ways are intended to be designed in a context sensitive manner.	37,800	\$ 3,484,185	2020-2025			
2	30A	Watersound Parkway	Deer Lake State Park	2.5	Multimodal Lanes	Add directional multimodal lanes on both sides of 30A. Multimodal lanes are intended to be provided adjacent to existing travel lanes. To the extent right-of- way allows, buffers of varying width should be provided between travel lanes and the multimodal lanes and between the multimodal ways and adjacent shared use paths.	30,000	\$ 6,733,055	2020-2025			
3	30A	Deer Lake State Park	Pelayo Avenue	2.96	Multimodal Lanes	Add directional multimodal lanes on both sides of 30A. Multimodal lanes are intended to be provided adjacent to existing travel lanes. To the extent right-of- way allows, buffers of varying width should be provided between travel lanes and the multimodal lanes and between the multimodal ways and adjacent shared use paths.	35,520	\$ 4,419,937	2026-2030			
4	30A	Pelayo Avenue	CR 395 (Seagrove Beach)	0.89	Shared Street	Convert 30A to a Shared Street that accomodated micromobility, microtransit, and motor vehicles. Shared-use paths are intended to serve non-motorized mobility. To the extent feasible, buffers should be provided between the shared street and shared-use paths. Right-of-way is constrained between 50' and 65'.	17,800	\$ 3,115,000	2026-2030			
5	30A	CR 395 (Seagrove Beach)	CR 283 (Grayton Beach)	2.99	Multimodal Ways	Add bi-directional multimodal ways on the southside of 30A. Buffers of varying width will be provided between travel lanes and the multimodal ways and between the multimodal ways and adjacent properties. Multimodal ways are intended to be designed in a context sensitive manner. Two bridges will be required across Western Lake. Right-of-way used for existing on-street parking will be used for multimodal ways.	64,584	\$ 10,458,041	2020-2025			
6	30A	CR 283 (Grayton Beach)	CR 393 (Gulf Place)	4.3	Multimodal Lanes	Add directional multimodal lanes on both sides of 30A. Multimodal lanes are intended to be provided adjacent to existing travel lanes. To the extent right-of- way allows, buffers of varying width should be provided between travel lanes and the multimodal lanes and between the multimodal ways and adjacent shared use paths.	51,600	\$ 10,420,854	2026-2030			
7	30A	CR 393 (Gulf Place)	Highland Ave (Dune Allen Beach)	1.67	Multimodal Ways	Add directional multimodal ways on both sides of 30A. Buffers of varying width will be provided between travel lanes and the multimodal ways and between the multimodal ways and adjacent shared-use paths to the maximum extent feasible. Multimodal ways are intended to be designed in a context sensitive manner. Right-of-way used for existing on-street parking will be used for multimodal ways.	28,056	\$ 7,111,668	2020-2025			
8	30A	Highland Ave (Dune Allen Beach)	US Hwy 98 West	1.83	Multimodal Lanes	Add directional multimodal lanes on both sides of 30A. Multimodal lanes are intended to be provided adjacent to existing travel lanes. To the extent right-of- way allows, buffers of varying width should be provided between travel lanes and the multimodal lanes and between the multimodal ways and adjacent shared use paths.	21,960	\$ 2,732,596	2026-2030			
9	CR 393 (Gulf Place)	Gulf Place Community Mobility Hub	30A	0.28	Multimodal Ways	Add directional multimodal ways on both sides of CR 393. Buffers of varying width will be provided between travel lanes and the multimodal ways and between the multimodal ways and adjacent shared-use paths to the maximum extent feasible. Multimodal ways are intended to be designed in a context sensitive manner. Right-of-way used for existing on-street parking may be used for multimodal ways.	4,704	\$ 1,192,375	2020-2025			
10	CR 395	Sandgrass Blvd	30A	1.02	Multimodal Lanes	Add bi-directional multimodal lanes on the east side of CR 395. To the extent right-of-way allows, buffers of varying width should be provided between travel lanes and the multimodal lanes and between the multimodal ways and adjacent property.	12,240	\$ 2,714,783	2020-2025			
11	Watersound Parkway	Westbay Parkway	Pathways Drive	1.2	Multimodal Lanes	Add directional multimodal lanes on both sides of internal St. Joes Roads. To be constructed concurrent with internal roads.	Internal Connectivty	Developer Funded	2031-2035			
12	Watersound Parkway	Pathways Drive	US Hwy 98	0.77	Multimodal Ways	Add directional multimodal ways on the eastside of Watersound Parkway. Buffers of varying width will be provided between travel lanes and the multimodal ways and between the multimodal ways and adjacent properties.	12,936	\$ 1,533,041	2026-2030			
13	Watersound Parkway	US Hwy 98	30A	1.12	Multimodal Ways	Add directional multimodal ways on the eastside of Watersound Parkway. Buffers of varying width will be provided between travel lanes and the multimodal ways and between the multimodal ways and adjacent properties.	18,816	\$ 2,229,878	2020-2025			
14	CR 283 (Grayton)	South County Center Community Mobility Hub (US 331)	30A (Grayton Beach Regional Mobility Hub)	4.21	Multimodal Ways	Add bi-directional multimodal ways on west side of US 331, within the Gulf Power Transmission Line, and the eastside of CR 283. Buffers of varying width will be provided between travel lanes and the multimodal ways and between the multimodal ways and adjacent shared-use paths to the maximum extent feasible.	50,520	\$ 8,381,953	2026-2030			
15	US Hwy 98	30A East	Westbay Parkway	2.22	Multimodal Ways	Add bi-directional multimodal ways on north side of US HWY 98. Buffers of varying width will be provided between travel lanes and the multimodal ways and between the multimodal ways and adjacent shared-use paths to the maximum extent feasible.	26,640	\$ 4,419,937	2026-2030			
16	St Joes Internal East	Watersound Parkway	US Hwy 98	2.54	Multimodal Ways	Add directional multimodal ways on both sides of internal St. Joes Roads. Buffers of varying width should be provided between travel lanes and the multimodal ways and between the multimodal ways and adjacent shared-use paths to the maximum extent feasible. To be constructed concurrent with internal roads.	Internal Connectivty	Developer Funded	2026-2030			

	Appendix H: South Walton 2040 Micromobility & Microtransit Plan									
ID	Facility Name	From	То	Length (Miles)	th s) Multimodal Project Description Capacity		Cost	Time Frame		
17	St Joes Internal West	US Hwy 98	South Walton Sports Complex	3.3	Multimodal Ways	Add directional multimodal ways on both sides of internal St. Joes Roads. Buffers of varying width should be provided between travel lanes and the multimodal ways and between the multimodal ways and adjacent shared-use paths to the maximum extent feasible. To be constructed concurrent with internal roads.	Internal Connectivty	Developer Funded	2026-2030	
18	Watersound Multimodal	US Hwy 98	30A (Neighborhood Mobility Hub at The Hub)	2	Multimodal Ways	Add directional multimodal ways connecting St. Joes properties. Facilitiy intended to be multimodal only, no motor vehicle travel lanes are proposed. To be designed in a context sensitive manner. Constructed in conjunction with a shared- use trail.	43,200	\$ 4,419,937	2026-2030	
19	US Hwy 98	South County Center Community Mobility Hub (US 331)	Santa Rosa Neighborhood Mobility Hub (Publix US 98)	2.26	Multimodal Lanes	Add bi-directional multimodal lanes within Gulf Power Trasmission lines.	27,120	\$ 3,374,682	2031-2035	
20	US Hwy 98	Santa Rosa Neighborhood Mobility Hub (Publix US 98)	30A West	3.79	Multimodal Lanes	Add directional multimodal lanes on both sides of US Hwy 98.	36,384	\$ 5,659,311	2031-2035	
21	US Hwy 98	30A West	Grand Boulevard / Mac Bayou	2.68	Multimodal Lanes	Add bi-directional multimodal lanes wiithin Gulf Power Trasmission lines.	32,160	\$ 4,001,835	2031-2035	
22	Seagrove Connector	South Walton Sports Complex	30A	2.53	Multimodal Lanes	Add bi-directional multimodal lanes connecting Walton Sports Complex with 30A. Facilitiy intended to be either standalone or constructed in conjunction with a two lane divided road. To be designed in a context sensitive manner. To be constructed in conjunction with a shared-use trail.	48,576	\$ 3,777,852	2026-2030	
23	Westbay Parkway	Bay County	US Hwy 98	2.7	Multimodal Ways	Add directional multimodal ways on both sides of Westbay Parkway. Buffers of varying width should be provided between travel lanes and the multimodal ways and between the multimodal ways and adjacent shared-use trails to the maximum extent feasible. To be constructed concurrent with Westbay Parkway.	45,360	\$ 4,419,937	2026-2030	
Total			51.51			645,976	\$ 94,600,856.69	2020-2040		

Note: Multimodal lanes, multimodal ways, and shared streets are further described in the Mobility Plan and Fee Technical Report. The capacity of multmodal lanes, multimodal ways, and shared streets is further defined in the Mobility Plan and Fee Technical Report. Cost are based on the latest FDOT and Walton County per lane mile construction cost. The following factors, based on percentage of construction cost, were added to the overall cost: design (PE) 12%; right-of-way (ROW) 30%; construction, engineering and inspection (CEI) 10%; utility relocations (UTL) 5%; stormwater (SW) 5%; landscape (LS) 8%; streetscape and hardscape (SH) 10%; and contingency 15%. The cost for lake and water body crossings was estimated at \$1,000,000 a crossing assumming the majority of existing structures needed to be replaced. The cost estimates are planning level numbers and will differ based on final design of each project. The prioritization is also subject to change annually during the County's budgeting process and Capital Improvements Programming.

Appendix I: South Walton 2040 Roads Plan										
ID	Facility Name	From	То	Length (Miles)	Multimodal Project	Construction Entity	Description	Multimodal Person Capacity	Cost	Time Frame
1	US Hwy 98	US 331	30A West	13.5	Widen Road	State	Widen from four (4) lane to six (6) lane	496,503	\$ 71,783,875	2020-2030
2	US Hwy 98	US 331	30A West	5.85	Widen Road	State	Widen from four (4) lane to six (6) lane	215,151	\$ 31,106,346	2020-2025
3	US Hwy 98	30A West	Mack Bayou Road	1.9	Widen Road	State	Widen from four (4) lane to six (6) lane	69,878	\$ 10,102,916	2020-2030
4	Alt Hwy 98	Veterans Road	Mack Bayou Road	5.0	New Road	County	New two (2) lane road	134,700	\$ 24,833,188	2020-2030
5	Mack Bayou Road	E. Harborview Road	US 98	2.2	Upgrade Road	County	Upgrade pavement width and add center turn lane	26,994	\$ 4,147,451	2020-2025
6	Westbay Parkway	Bay County	US 98	2.7	New Road	State	New four (4) lane divided road expandable to six (6) lanes	71,253	\$ 25,828,270	2020-2025
7	Pointe Washignton Connector	Pointe Washington Road	CR 395	0.94	New Road	County	New two (2) lane road	9,992	\$ 4,668,639	2020-2025
8	Alderberry Road Extension	Don Bishop Road	Eastern terminus	0.52	New Road	County	New two (2) lane road	5,528	\$ 2,582,652	2020-2025
9	Alderberry Road	Eastern terminus	E. Hewett Road	0.5	Upgrade Road	County	Upgrade pavement width and road functional classification	2,300	\$ 361,030	2020-2025
10	E. Lamb Drive Extension	E. Hewett Road	Goldsby Road	1.0	New Road	County	New two (2) lane road	10,630	\$ 4,966,638	2020-2025
11	E. Lamb Drive	Goldsby Road	Mack Bayou Road	0.65	Upgrade Road	County	Upgrade pavement width and road functional classification	2,990	\$ 469,339	2020-2025
12	Don Bishop Rd	Alderberry Rd Extension	US 98	1	Upgrade Road	County	Upgrade pavement width and road functional classification	4,600	\$ 722,061	2020-2025
13	Sugar Drive Extension	Thompson Road	Sugar Drive	0.53	New Road	County	New two (2) lane road	5,634	\$ 2,632,318	2020-2025
14	Walton Palm Road Extension	N. Orange Street	N. Wall Street	0.25	New Road	County	New two (2) lane road	2,658	\$ 1,241,659	2020-2025
15	Seagrove Connector	US Hwy 98	30A	2.53	New Road	County	New two (2) lane divided road, designed in a context sensitive manner, with four (4) wildlife crossing provisions, appropriately landscapped median, low design speeds, narrow travel lanes, and right-of-way connection restrictions on both sides of the road that would prohibit future access connections. Multimodal lanes to be located on one side with appropriate landscape seperation and a share-use trail on the other side with appropriate landscape seperation, further prohibiting any future vehicle connections.	35,294	\$ 19,818,895	2020-2025
16	JD Miller to Veterans Road Connector	JD Miller Road	Veterans Road	2	New Road	County	New two (2) lane road	21,260	\$ 9,933,275	2026-2030
17	Old Blue Mountain Road	Chat Holley Road	US Hwy 98	1.28	New Road	County	New two (2) lane road	27,584	\$ 6,357,296	2026-2030
18	Veterans Road	Chat Holley Road	US Hwy 98	1.02	New Road	County	New two (2) lane road	21,981	\$ 5,065,970	2026-2030
19	Watersound Parkway	Westbay Parkway	Pathways Drive	1.16	New Road	Developer	New two (2) lane road	Internal Connectivty	Developer Funded	2026-2030
20	St Joes Internal West	Westbay Parkway	Serenoa Road	4.1	New Road	Developer	New two (2) lane road	Internal Connectivty	Developer Funded	2020-2025
21	Sports Complex Connector	Serenoa Road	South Walton Sports Complex	0.35	New Road	County	New two (2) lane road	3,721	\$ 1,738,323	2026-2030
22	SR 81 Extension	Black Creek Road	South Side of Choctawhatchee River Basin	3	New Bridge over Choctawhatchee River Basin	State	New limited access 60' wide bridge over the entirety of the Choctawhatchee River Basin (3 miles). Project will be coordinated with FDOT and the TPO to secure funding as either a toll road or state funding as a hurricane evacuation route where the state pays 90% of the cost.	101,460	\$ 188,952,120	2026-2035
23	SR 81 Extension	South Side of Choctawhatchee River Basin	Westbay Parkway	4.25	New Road	State	New two (2) lane divided road. New road shall also feature a shared-use trail. Project will be coordinated with FDOT and the TPO to secure funding as part of toll road or hurricane evacuation route as part of SR 81 Bridge Extension.	143,735	\$ 23,815,789	2026-2035
24	Goldsby Road	E. Lamb Drive	US 98	1	Upgrade Road	County	Upgrade pavement width and road functional classification	4,600	\$ 1,040,085	2026-2030
25	W Hewett Rd	E. Lamb Drive Extension	US 98	1	Upgrade Road	County	Upgrade pavement width and road functional classification	4,600	\$ 1,040,085	2026-2030
26	E Hewett Rd	E. Lamb Drive Extension	US 98	1	Upgrade Road	County	Upgrade pavement width and road functional classification	4,600	\$ 1,040,085	2026-2030
27	JD Miller	Chat Holley Road	US 98	1.4	Upgrade Road	County	Upgrade pavement width and road functional classification	6,440	\$ 1,456,119	2026-2030
28	Chat Holley	US 331	Church Street	3.75	Upgrade Road	County	Upgrade pavement width and add center turn lane	46,013	\$ 7,069,519	2031-2035
29	CR 393	Nursery Road	US 98	2	Upgrade Road	County	Upgrade pavement width and add center turn lane	24,540	\$ 3,770,410	2031-2035
30	Church Street	Chat Holley Road	US 98	1	Upgrade Road	County	Upgrade pavement width and road functional classification	4,600	\$ 1,040,085	2031-2035
Total					State Roads (\$351,5 (\$105,995,123.42) 8	89,314.52); State Sh & @ 10% of State Ro	are @ 90% (\$316,430,383.07); County Share @ 100% of County Roads ads (\$35,158,931.45) for total of \$141,154,054.87	1,509,237	\$ 457,584,437.94	2020-2040

notes in the objective in the means in the means in the means of the mean of t





















* MICROTRANSIT LANE



* MICROTRANSIT LANE








Appendix K



Appendix K



Appendix K







© 2020 NUE Urban Concepts, LLC. All Rights Reserved. www.nueurbanconcepts.com @@@@





© 2020 NUE Urban Concepts, LLC. All Rights Reserved. www.nueurbanconcepts.com ©©@@





T xipuadd& 118 of 264







ransportation - Parking - Impact & Mobility Fees - Traffic - Funding

Land line



Appendix M







	Appendix N: Central & North Walton 2040 Mobility Plan										
ID	Facility Name	From	То	Length (Miles)	Multimodal Project	Construction Entity	Description	Multimodal Person Capacity	Cost	Time Frame	
1	US Hwy 331	Alabama State Line	US Hwy 90	21.26	Widen Road	State	Widen from two (2) lanes to four (4) lanes with a 12' wide shared-use trail	304,868	\$ 148,295,239	2026-2030	
2	SR 83	Alabama State Line	US Hwy 90	19.45	Widen Road	State	Widen from two (2) lanes to four (4) lanes with a 12' wide shared-use trail	278,913	\$ 135,669,916	2036-2040	
3	Clear Springs Road	US Hwy 331	SR 85	2.37	Upgrade Road	County	Upgrade and realign road	9,836	\$ 2,465,002	2026-2030	
4	Black Creek Road Extesnion	SR 20	Black Creek Blvd	2.41	New Road	County	New two (2) lane road with paved shoulders and shared-use path	37,837	\$ 12,993,168	2026-2030	
5	SR 2	SR 83	US Hwy 331	9.23	Upgrade Road	State	Upgrade and realign road	67,194	\$ 9,599,987	2036-2040	
6	US Hwy 90	CR 183 (Holmes County)	Dorsey Avenue	3.67	Widen Road	State	Widen from two (2) lanes to four (4) lanes with a 12' wide shared-use trail on northside of US Hwy 90	52,628	\$ 25,599,413	2031-2035	
7	US Hwy 90	Dorsey Avenue	US Hwy 331	2.96	Complete Street	State	Lower Speeds, enhance crossings, add demand actuated crossing signals, add median refuge islands, upgrade driveway and intersection crossings, widen existing sidewalks to shared-use paths or trails, add landscape and streetscape	14,208	\$ 5,920,000	2020-2025	
8	Madison Street	SR 20	Marquis Way / Shipyard Rd Extension	0.3	Upgrade Road	County	Upgrade and realign road with a 12' wide trail and buffered bike lanes	6,945	\$ 854,224	2020-2025	
9	Marquis Way / Shipyard Rd Extension	US 331	Madison Street	1.0	New Road	County	New two (2) lane road with buffered bike lanes and a 12' wide shared-use trail. The cost includes a 60' wide by 1,250' long bridge (\$14,910,000) across Lafayette Creek.	32,350	\$ 21,785,262	2020-2025	
10	Blue Ridge Parkway	SR 20	Lagrange Landing	0.15	Upgrade Road	County	Upgrade road with a 8' share-use trail	1,452	\$ 107,567	2020-2025	
11	Blue Ridge Parkway Extension	Lagrange Landing	Marquis Way	0.25	New Road	County	New two (2) lane road with 8' shared-use path	5,988	\$ 1,865,359	2020-2025	
12	83A East Extension	Business 331	83A East	0.5	New Road	County	New two lane divided road with buffered bike lanes, shared-use path, two roundabouts and traffic signal at SR 20	18,940	\$ 5,285,501	2020-2025	
13	US Hwy 90	US Hwy 331	SR 85	12.15	Widen Road	State	Widen from two (2) lanes to four (4) lanes with a 12' wide shared-use trail on northside of US Hwy 90 $$	174,231	\$ 84,750,102	2031-2035	
14	US Hwy 90	SR 85	Okaloosa County	2.68	Widen Road	State	Widen from two (2) lanes to four (4) lanes with a 12' wide shared-use trail on northside of US Hwy 90	38,431	\$ 18,693,850	2031-2035	
15	SR 85	US Hwy 90	Green Acres Drive	0.75	Widen Road	State	Widen from four (4) lanes to six (6) lanes with buffered bike lanes and 12' wide shared-use trail	35,684	\$ 5,854,215	2026-2030	
16	SR 85	Green Acres Drive	Okaloosa County	5.7	Widen Road	State	Widen from two (2) lanes to four (4) lanes with buffered bike lanes and a 12' wide shared-use trail	122,993	\$ 48,355,360	2031-2035	
17	US Hwy 331	US Hwy 90	Interstate 10	2.06	Enhanced Road	State	Enhance signal timings, reduce driveway conflicts, lenghten turn lanes, add turn lanes at Interstate 10, add traffic signal at Interstate 10 Ramps	12,148	\$ 5,150,000	2020-2025	
18	CR 280 Extension	CR 280A	US Hwy 331	1.92	New Road	County	New two (2) lane road with paved shoulders and shared-use path	30,144	\$ 10,351,403	2020-2025	
19	US Hwy 331	Interstate 10	Business 331	9.86	Widen Road	State	Widen from four (4) lanes to six (6) lanes with buffered bike lanes and 12' wide shared-use trail on west side of US 331	469,119	\$ 76,963,413	2031-2035	
20	US Hwy 331	Business 331	SR 20	4.33	New Road	State	Widen from four (4) lanes to six (6) lanes with buffered bike lanes and 12' wide shared-use trail on west side of US 331	206,013	\$ 33,798,335	2031-2035	
21	US Hwy 331	SR 20	Choctawhatchee Bay	4.75	New Road	State	Widen from four (4) lanes to six (6) lanes with buffered bike lanes and 12' wide shared-use trail on west side of US 331	225,996	\$ 37,076,695	2026-2030	
22	SR 20	Bay County	Burnham Road	6.67	Widen Road	State	Widen from two (2) lanes to four (4) lanes with a 12' wide shared-use trail on northside of SR 20 $$	95,648	\$ 46,525,364	2036-2040	
23	SR 20	Burnham Road	US Hwy 331	6.03	Widen Road	State	Widen from two (2) lanes to four (4) lanes with buffered bike lanes and a 12' wide shared-use trail	129,886	\$ 51,065,292	2031-2035	
24	SR 20	US Hwy 331	CR 83A West	3.11	Widen Road	State	Widen from two (2) lanes to four (4) lanes with buffered bike lanes and a 12' wide shared-use trail	66,989	\$ 26,337,157	2026-2030	
25	SR 20	CR 83A West	Okaloosa County	14.11	Widen Road	State	Widen from two (2) lanes to four (4) lanes with a 12' wide shared-use trail on northside of SR 20 $$	202,337	\$ 98,421,723	2031-2035	
26	Freeport Bypass North	Black Creek Blvd	83A West	7.0	New Road	County	New two (2) lane divded road with buffered bike lanes and 12' shared-use trail	273,560	\$ 52,594,292	2026-2035	
27	Black Creek Road Extesnion	SR 20	Black Creek Blvd	2.41	New Road	New Road County New two (2) lane road with paved shoulders and shared-use path		37,837	\$ 12,993,168	2026-2030	
28	SR 81	Interstate 10	SR 20	18.55	Upgrade Road	State	Upgrade and realign road	58,062	\$ 19,293,581	2031-2035	
29	SR 81 (Black Creek Road)	SR 20	Choctawhatchee Bay	7.11	Upgrade Road	Upgrade Road State Upgrade and realign road, transfer to State		51,761	\$ 7,395,006	2031-2035	
Total			172.75	State Roads (\$844,764,647.45); State Share @ 90% (\$796,288,182.71); County Share @ 100% of County Roads (\$121,224,946.47) & @ 10% of State Roads (\$88,476,464.75) for total of \$209,771,411.22 3,061,997 \$ 1,006,059,594 2/							
Note:	e. The capacity of roads is further defined in the Mobility Plan and Fee Technical Report. Cost are based on the latest FDOT and Walton County per lane mile construction cost. The following factors: based on percentage of construction cost were added to the overall cost: decien (DF) 19%-right-of-wav										

Note: The capacity of roads is further defined in the Mobility Plan and Fee Technical Report. Cost are based on the latest FDOT and Walton County per lane mile construction cost. The following factors, based on percentage of construction cost, were added to the overall cost: design (PE) 12%; right-of-way (ROW) 30%; construction, ensure in the latest FDOT and Walton County per lane mile construction cost. The following factors, based on percentage of construction cost, were added to the overall cost: design (PE) 12%; right-of-way (ROW) 30%; construction, engineering and inspaction (CEI) 10%; utility relocations (UTI) 5%; storestcope and hardscape (SH) 10%; and contingency 15%. The cost estimates are planning level numbers and will differ based on final design of each project. The prioritization is also subject to change annually during the County's budgeting process and Capital Improvements Programming.

Appendix O



Appendix O



Appendix O



Page 127 of 264

Lanes

2

4

6

8

Lanes

2

4

6

8

Median

Divided

Divided

Divided

Median

Divided

Divided

Divided

Undivided

Undivided

Urbanized Areas

UNINTERRUPTED FLOW FACILITIES											
	FDFF										
	FKEE	WAIS									
Core Urbanized											
В	Е										
47,600	66,40	00 83	3,200	87,300							
70,100	97,80	00 123	3,600	131,200							
92,200	128,90	00 164	4,200	174,700							
115,300	158,90	00 203	3,600	218,600							
136,500	192,40	00 246	5,200	272,900							
Urbanized											
В	C		D	Е							
45,900	62.70	00 75	5,600	85,400							
68,900	93.90	0 113	3.600	128,100							
91,900	125.20	0 151	1.300	170.900							
115.000	156.80	0 189	9.300	213.600							
F	reeway Ao	djustment	s								
Auxiliary Land	es	-	Ramp								
ent in Both Dire	ections		Metering								
+ 20,000			+ 5%								
ININTEDD		EI OW II		VC							
Median	B	гLUW П С	IGHWA D	13 F							
Undivided	11 700	18 000	24 200	32 600							
Divided	36 300	52 600	66 200	75 300							
Divided	54,500	78 800	00,200	113 100							
Divided	54,000	/0,000	77, 4 00	115,100							
Uninterrunt	ed Flow F	lighway A	diustmen	ts							
Median	Exclusive	left lanes	Adjustm	ent factors							
Divided	Y	+	5%								
Undivided	Y	es	_4	-5%							
Charriada	1										
	B 47,600 70,100 92,200 115,300 136,500 B 45,900 68,900 91,900 115,000 Fr Auxiliary Land ent in Both Dire + 20,000 JNINTERR Median Undivided Divided Divided Uninterrupt Median Divided Undivided	UNINTERRUPTED FREEV Core Ur B C 47,600 66,44 70,100 97,80 92,200 128,90 115,300 158,90 136,500 192,40 Urban B C 45,900 62,70 68,900 93,90 91,900 125,20 115,000 156,80 Freeway Ad Auxiliary Lanes ent in Both Directions + 20,000 UNINTERRUPTED I Median B Undivided 11,700 Divided 36,300 Divided 54,600 Uninterrupted Flow H Median Exclusive Divided Y	UNINTERRUPTED FLOW FA FREEWAYS Core Urbanized B C 47,600 66,400 83 70,100 97,800 123 92,200 128,900 164 115,300 158,900 203 136,500 192,400 240 Urbanized B C 45,900 62,700 73 68,900 93,900 113 91,900 125,200 153 115,000 156,800 189 Freeway Adjustment Auxiliary Lanes Ent in Both Directions + 20,000 UNINTERRUPTED FLOW H Median B C Undivided 11,700 18,000 Divided 36,300 52,600 Divided 54,600 78,800	FREEWA YS Core Urbanized B C D 47,600 66,400 83,200 70,100 97,800 123,600 92,200 128,900 164,200 115,300 158,900 203,600 136,500 192,400 246,200 Urbanized B C D 45,900 62,700 75,600 68,900 93,900 113,600 91,900 125,200 151,300 115,000 156,800 189,300 Kauxiliary Lanes Ramp Metering $+20,000$ $+5\%$ VINTERRUPTED FLOW HIGHWA Median B C D Undivided 11,700 18,000 24,200 Divided 36,300 52,600 66,200 Divided 54,600 78,800 99,400							

¹Values shown are presented as two-way annual average daily volumes for levels of service and are for the automobile/truck modes unless specifically stated. This table does not constitute a standard and should be used only for general planning applications. The computer models from which this table is derived should be used for more specific planning applications. The table and deriving computer models should not be used for corridor or intersection design, where more refined techniques exist. Calculations are based on planning applications of the HCM and the Transit Capacity and Quality of Service Manual.

² Level of service for the bicycle and pedestrian modes in this table is based on number of vehicles, not number of bicyclists or pedestrians using the facility.

³ Buses per hour shown are only for the peak hour in the single direction of the higher traffic flow

* Cannot be achieved using table input value defaults.

** Not applicable for that level of service letter grade. For the automobile mode, volumes greater than level of service D become F because intersection capacities have been reached For the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade (including F) is not achievable because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using table input value defaults.

Source: Florida Department of Transportation Systems Implementation Office https://www.fdot.gov/planning/systems/

Non-State Signalized Roadway Adjustments

INTERRUPTED FLOW FACILITIES

STATE SIGNALIZED ARTERIALS Class I (40 mph or higher posted speed limit)

Class II (35 mph or slower posted speed limit)

С

16.800

37,900

58,400

78,800

С

7,300

14,500

23,300

32,000

D

17,700

39,800

59,900

80,100

D

14,800

32,400

50.000

67,300

Ε

**

**

**

**

Е

15,600

33,800

50,900

68,100

В

*

*

*

*

В

*

*

*

*

(Alter corresponding state volumes by the indicated percent.) Non-State Signalized Roadways - 10%

Median & Turn Lane Adjustments

		Exclusive	Exclusive	Adjustment
Lanes	Median	Left Lanes	Right Lanes	Factors
2	Divided	Yes	No	+5%
2	Undivided	No	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

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	В	С	D	Е
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 MODE²

(Multiply vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.)

Sidewalk Coverage	В	С	D	Е
0-49%	*	*	2,800	9,500
50-84%	*	1,600	8,700	15,800
85-100%	3,800	10,700	17,400	>19,700
BUS MOD				
(Buses	in peak hou	ır in peak dire	ection)	
Sidewalk Coverage	В	С	D	E
0-84%	> 5	≥ 4	\geq 3	≥ 2

 ≥ 3

 ≥ 2

 ≥ 1

> 4

85-100%

WALTON	COUNTY DRAFT ONLY	Y MC	OBILITY FE	EE (01/06/202	1)							
Appendix Q	PER 1,000 SQ. FT. FC CONCURRENCY & A	RECOMMENDED PER SQ. FT. MOBILITY FEES										
••	MOBILITY FEE BY WALTON COUNTY PLANNING AREA				MOBILITY FEE BY WALTON COUNTY PLANNING AREA							
Land Use	UNIT OF MEASURE	:	SOUTH	CENTRAL NORTH CENTRAL		UNIT OF MEASURE SOUTH		CENTRAL		NORTH & NORTH CENTRAL		
PMC = Person Miles of Capacity. PMC based on the total cost, available funding, and person capacity provided by multimodal improvements identified in the mobility plan.	PMC Rate	\$	125.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 50.00	PMC Rate	\$	125.00	\$	100.00	\$	50.00
	RESIDENTIAL / LC	DGI	NG USES									
Residential	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	1,249	\$ 999	\$ 500	per sq. ft.	\$	1.25	\$	1.00	\$	0.50
Overnight Lodging (Bed and Breakfast / Inn / Motel / Hotel / Resort / Vacation Rentals) ¹	per room	\$	1,907	\$ 1,526	\$ 763	per room	\$	1,907	\$	1,526	\$	763
Boutique Overnight Lodging	per room	\$	1,127	\$ 901	\$ 451	per room	\$	1,907	\$	901	\$	451
Recreational Vehicle Park (RVs / Tiny Homes on Wheels / Travel Trailers)	per space / lot	\$	1,423	\$ 1,139	\$ 569	per space / lot	\$	1,423	\$	1,139	\$	569
INSTITUTIONAL USES												
Community (Civic / Day Care / Non-Profit / Place of Assembly or Worship / Private School)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	829	\$ 663	\$ 332	per sq. ft.	\$	0.83	\$	0.66	\$	0.33
Long Term Care (Assisted Living / Congregate Care / Nursing Facility)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	1,082	\$ 866	\$ 433	per sq. ft.	\$	1.08	\$	0.87	\$	0.43
INDUSTRIAL USES												
Industrial (Brewing / Distilling / Distribution / Manufacturing / Utility / Warehousing)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	700	\$ 560	\$ 280	per sq. ft.	\$	0.70	\$	0.56	\$	0.28
Mini Warehouse (plus Boat / Car / RV Storage & Other Outdoor Storage) ²	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	307	\$ 246	\$ 123	per sq. ft.	\$	0.31	\$	0.25	\$	0.12
RECREATION USES												
Marina	per berth	\$	216	\$ 173	\$ 86	per berth	\$	216	\$	173	\$	86
Outdoor Commercial Recreation (Golf / Multipurpose Recreation / Tennis)	per acre	\$	1,282	\$ 1,025	\$ 513	per acre	\$	1,282	\$	1,025	\$	513
Indoor Commercial Recreation (Fitness / Gym / Health / Play / Sports)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	1,839	\$ 1,472	\$ 736	per sq. ft.	\$	1.84	\$	1.47	\$	0.74
	OFFICE L	JSES	6									
Office (Bank / General / Higher Education / Medical / Professional / Veterinary)	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	1,284	\$ 1,027	\$ 513	per sq. ft.	\$	1.28	\$	1.03	\$	0.51
	COMMERCIAL & F	RETA	AIL USES									
Local (Non-Chain / Non-Franchise) Retail (Entertainment / Retail / Restaurant / Service) ³	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	1,356	\$ 1,085	\$ 542	per sq. ft.	\$	1.36	\$	1.08	\$	0.54
Retail (Entertainment / Retail / Restaurant / Personal Service) ³	per 1,000 sq. ft.	\$	2,711	\$ 2,169	\$ 1,084	per sq. ft.	\$	2.71	\$	2.17	\$	1.08
Motor Vehicle & Boat Cleaning (Detailing / Wash / Wax)	per stall	\$	4,408	\$ 3,526	\$ 1,763	per stall	\$	4,408	\$	3,526	\$	1,763
Bank Drive-Thru Lane or Free-Standing ATM ⁴	per lane / ATM	\$	7,253	\$ 5,802	\$ 2,901	per lane / ATM	\$	7,253	\$	5,802	\$	2,901
Quick Service Restaurant Drive Thru ⁵	per drive-thru lane	\$	18,210	\$ 14,568	\$ 7,284	per drive-thru lane	\$	18,210	\$	14,568	\$	7,284
Pharmacy Drive Thru ⁶	per drive-thru lane	\$	2,971	\$ 2,377	\$ 1,188	per drive-thru lane	\$	2,971	\$	2,377	\$	1,188
Vehicle Fueling Position ⁷	per fueling position	\$	7,391	\$ 5,913	\$ 2,956	per fueling position	\$	7,391	\$	5,913	\$	2,956
¹ The number of rooms excludes kitchens and bathrooms												
² Acreage for any unenclosed material and vehicle storage, sales and display shall be converted to square footage.												
³ Square footage shall be based on gross sq. ft. under roof or canopy and all areas used for outdoor display, sales, seating, and storage not under roof or canopy.												
⁴ Each bank building shall pay the office rate for the square footage of the building. 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 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.												
⁵ Any drive-thru associated with a quick service restaurant (aka fast food or fast casual) will be an additive fee in addition to the retail fee per square foot. The number of drive-thru lanes will be based on the number of lanes present when an individual places and / or picks-up an order. The restaurant drive-thru rate applies for any type of retail building, whether a multi-tenant or free-standing building.										e restaurant		
⁶ Any drive-thru associated with a pharmacy will be an additive fee in addition to the retail 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 or pick-up a prescription or item.												
⁷ Rates per vehicle fueling position apply to any retail uses with vehicle fueling, whether 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 retail fee per												

square foot for any building. The number of fueling positions is based on the maximum number of vehicles that could be fueled at one time.

From:Kristen ShellSent:Friday, February 5, 2021 2:59 PMTo:Karen OwensSubject:FW: Proposed Walton County Mobility Plan

Can you start a file for the march 11 PC meeting on the mobility plan and keep these emails.

Thanks

From: ts1987@windstream.net <ts1987@windstream.net>
Sent: Friday, February 5, 2021 2:50 PM
To: Kristen Shell <SheKristen@co.walton.fl.us>
Subject: Proposed Walton County Mobility Plan

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Thank you for sharing the Walton County Mobility Plan with the general public. It was very educational and we appreciate the hard work that went into putting this plan together.

We are in agreement that a mobility plan is becoming more and more important as time goes by and as the over development of 30A continues. My husband and I both agree with and like the proposed changes to 30A including 2 lanes for cars, separate lanes for bikes and walkers and another lane for electric vehicles (golf carts). We have no strong opposition to the proposed mobility hubs. It makes sense but I wonder if tourists will be receptive to loading up all their beach "stuff" into their cars and then hop on to another form of transportation to get them to the beach. It might be a hard sale.

The part of the Mobility Plan that address the creation of a new 2 lane road through the state forest is our greatest concern, and we are vehemently against it. The impact to the wild life, the forest itself, and to the natural benefits that the forests provide just isn't worth it. These are conservation lands and should be kept intact for future generations to enjoy. I don't believe that the addition of a forest road is going to alleviate the traffic congestion. Rather, it will create a new headache in Seagrove that is currently a fairly free flowing portion of 30A.

Thank you for your consideration, and we sincerely hope that your team eliminates the creation of a new forest road from the otherwise smart mobility plan proposal.

Shirley Laszcz Watersound West Beach Santa Rosa Beach

From:Kristen ShellSent:Monday, February 8, 2021 8:07 AMTo:Karen OwensSubject:FW: Proposed road through Pt Washington State Forest and Deer Lake SP

From: Valerie Lofton <crow2headstand@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2021 5:01 PM
To: Kristen Shell <SheKristen@co.walton.fl.us>
Subject: Proposed road through Pt Washington State Forest and Deer Lake SP

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

NO! Please don't cut more forest away! Pretty soon, we won't have anywhere for native species to live and thrive if we keep chopping things down and hauling away, poisionsing the ground with asphalt and giving motorists a new place to throw out trash. There has to be a stopping point to all the cutting and killing.

Thank you! Valerie Lofton 56 Seabreeze Forest Lane Inlet Beach

Every day at the beach is a good day!

Valerie

From:Kristen ShellSent:Monday, February 8, 2021 8:11 AMTo:Karen OwensSubject:FW: Proposed road through Point Washington State Forest and Deer Lake State Park

From: Joan Vienot <joanvienot@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2021 12:22 PM
To: Kristen Shell <SheKristen@co.walton.fl.us>
Subject: Proposed road through Point Washington State Forest and Deer Lake State Park

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Walton County Planning Commission Dear Ms. Shell,

The proposed road through Point Washington State Forest and Deer Lake State Park is unnecessary. We do not have heavy congestion on the north-south roads. If County Road 395 becomes congested, it would be far better to widen it than to put another road through our pristine State Forest.

Our real problem is the congestion on Highway 30A. We need to be looking at four-laning it or at least three-laning it with westbound traffic having the side with two lanes.

Five years ago I retired from owning a premier pool service business serving South Walton. The growing congestion on Hwy 30A was the chief inhibitor of my company's growth. Simply put, it began to take so long to travel from one job to the next that we had to completely change (dumb-down) our business model and create a new pricing structure for "No Frills" new business. When service businesses have to stop offering premium service, an area becomes less attractive -- it's just a matter of time.

Please focus on the congestion on Highway 30A, not building more spur roads. Sincerely, Joan Vienot

Santa Rosa Beach, FL 32459

From: Sent: To: Subject: Kristen Shell Monday, February 8, 2021 8:12 AM Karen Owens FW: Walton County 30A Mobility Strategy

-----Original Message-----From: Jim Hayden <jimhayden5555@gmail.com> Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2021 2:05 PM To: Kristen Shell <SheKristen@co.walton.fl.us> Cc: Sammy Sanchez <ssanchez@swfd.org>; Danny Glidewell <glidanny@co.walton.fl.us>; Boots McCormick <mccboots@co.walton.fl.us> Subject: Walton County 30A Mobility Strategy

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

>

> I appreciate the opportunity to briefly visit with you last week to discus your mobility study...This is a very comprehensive and critically important initiative, which most citizens would consider significantly overdue...At this late stage of the development cycle along 30A, no one should under estimates the challenges of implementing the solution, it will be like fixing a NASCAR while it continues to race around the track...

>

> The solutions are going to be costly but the rewards will exceed the price by ensuring a better environment for families to visit the area.. The revenue for these improvements should be linked to the source of the need for the improvements. Therefore, I would recommend that the vast amount of the revenues should be sourced from much high development fees along the 30A area and annual business licenses associated with short term rentals of Public Lodging Establishments (residences).

>

> Kristen, thank you again for taking on this important task...I really like how you are introducing trees into the solution... If I can be of any assistance please do not hesitate to call me.

From: Sent: To: Subject: Kristen Shell Monday, February 8, 2021 8:14 AM Karen Owens FW: road

From: nora@telenet.be <nora@telenet.be> Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2021 9:28 AM To: Kristen Shell <SheKristen@co.walton.fl.us> Subject: road

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please do not build a new road through Point Washington Forest en Deer Lake State Parkt. Everybody opposes to cutting trees in the Amazon but what I see in Walton county makes me weep. Every time I come to Santa Rosa Beach land has been clearcut. Please make room for other types of transport. It is time the US changes its habits. Give people at least a chance to leave their car at home!

Sincerely, Nora Venken 174 Via Largo Santa Rosa Beach

ps: I live in Belgium where my car has a very lazy life.

From: Sent: To: Subject: Kristen Shell Monday, February 8, 2021 8:15 AM Karen Owens FW: Seagrove beach road through the forest

From: linda@southernbeachgroup.com <linda@southernbeachgroup.com>

Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2021 8:42 AM

To: Breezy Adkinson <adkbreezy@co.walton.fl.us>; Boots McCormick <mccboots@co.walton.fl.us>; Teresa Lowery <lowteresa@co.walton.fl.us>; Danny Glidewell <glidanny@co.walton.fl.us>; Mike Barker <barmike@co.walton.fl.us>; Teresa Crawford <crateresa@co.walton.fl.us>; Trey Nick <nictrey@co.walton.fl.us>; Laura Ekstrom

<EksLaura@co.walton.fl.us>; Tony Anderson <AndTony@co.walton.fl.us>; Scott Brannon <brascott@co.walton.fl.us>; Kristen Shell <SheKristen@co.walton.fl.us>

Subject: Seagrove beach road through the forest

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I do agree we need that road to ease the traffic. I don't see how it will effect the trails or wildlife too much. Please consider it.

From: Sent: To: Subject: Kristen Shell Monday, February 8, 2021 8:15 AM Karen Owens FW: Road thru Park and Forrest

-----Original Message-----From: Edmond Alexander <edmondalexander@earthlink.net> Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2021 7:26 AM To: Kristen Shell <SheKristen@co.walton.fl.us> Subject: Road thru Park and Forrest

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

How rich does this County need to be? Do not approve development beyond the infrastructure needed to support it.

How many time have we told you to stay out of State Lands. The Forrest and the Parks is why we moved here!!!

Thank You,

Edmond Alexander

Page 136 of 264

From:Kristen ShellSent:Monday, February 8, 2021 8:18 AMTo:Karen OwensSubject:FW: Proposed road through Point Washington State Forest and Deer Lake State Park

From: Kimberly Maxwell <kimberly@netpr.net>
Sent: Saturday, February 6, 2021 8:28 PM
To: Kristen Shell <SheKristen@co.walton.fl.us>
Cc: maxwell Post <maxpost2001@gmail.com>
Subject: Fwd: Proposed road through Point Washington State Forest and Deer Lake State Park

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Kristen,

Why are we still looking at a two lane cut through, when we need traffic signals at every intersection along 30A to control traffic, wrecks and increase the flow? It's working in Seagrove, why not all other intersections along 30A.

Please help us understand. Kimberly Maxwell Walton County resident since 1986, four family generations lived in Walton County!

Begin forwarded message:

From: Max Post <<u>maxpost2001@gmail.com</u>> Subject: Fwd: Proposed road through Point Washington State Forest and Deer Lake State Park Date: February 6, 2021 at 6:29:33 PM CST To: Susan Maxwell <<u>kimberly@netpr.net</u>>

Please signal boost

Thank you, -Max

Begin forwarded message:

From: soappedaler <<u>soappedaler@gmail.com</u>> Date: February 6, 2021 at 18:51:59 EST To: <u>info@letitbeforest.com</u> Subject: Proposed road through Point Washington State Forest and Deer Lake State Park

Please forward to your contacts:

Walton County is currently reviewing a Mobility Study that includes a proposed road through Point Washington State Forest and Deer Lake State Park. The Mobility Study will go before the Walton County Planning Commission in March. Then two Board of County Commission meeting, likely April and May for approval. Email objections to Kristen Shell with Walton County Planning <u>shekristen@co.walton.fl.us</u>

Tell the County NO Road through Point Washington State Forest or Deer Lake State Park.

Link to County Commissioners Page: https://www.co.walton.fl.us/112/Commissioners



Celeste Cobena Let it be Forest Facebook 850-267-2227

Sent from my iPhone

From: Sent: To: Subject: Kristen Shell Monday, February 8, 2021 8:19 AM Karen Owens FW: Roads

-----Original Message-----From: Mary Marice <mwmarice@gmail.com> Sent: Saturday, February 6, 2021 7:13 PM To: Kristen Shell <SheKristen@co.walton.fl.us> Subject: Roads

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

It seems that county roads through beautiful state parks would not be in the best interest of anyone. Please vote NO for the proposed county roads through Point washing State Forest and Deer Lake State.

Thank you, Mary Marice

From: Sent: To: Subject: Kristen Shell Monday, February 8, 2021 8:19 AM Karen Owens FW: Remove the Seagrove Forest Rd. from the Mobility Plan

From: caroling@mchsi.com <caroling@mchsi.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 6, 2021 3:08 PM
To: Kristen Shell <SheKristen@co.walton.fl.us>
Subject: Remove the Seagrove Forest Rd. from the Mobility Plan

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I have attended the Mobility Plan presentation recently and found no justification for the road through Point Washington State Forest and Deer Lake State Park from Hwy 98 and 30A. It would benefit some drivers' driving time, but wreck the nature conservation public lands that drew us to the area and should be preserved forever onwards. Go ahead, improve mobility in south Walton but do not destroy the integrity of the forest, which must be saved.

Also, if there are more specific maps of the road in the plan, can you email them (or a link) to me, please?

Thank you, Carol Geary Resident, 32459

From: Sent: To: Subject: Kristen Shell Monday, February 8, 2021 8:20 AM Karen Owens FW: Road

-----Original Message-----From: Elizabeth Cork <efcork@mac.com> Sent: Saturday, February 6, 2021 11:25 AM To: Kristen Shell <SheKristen@co.walton.fl.us> Subject: Road

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please do not allow a road through PT Washington State Forest and Deer Lake State Park. It would not only hurt the environment but make traffic on 30a even worse. Thank you

Elizabeth Cork 22 S Founders Lane Inlet Beach 32461

Sent from my iPad

From: Sent: To: Subject: Kristen Shell Monday, February 8, 2021 8:20 AM Karen Owens FW: Highway through State Forest

From: twist249@aol.com <twist249@aol.com> Sent: Saturday, February 6, 2021 10:29 AM To: Kristen Shell <SheKristen@co.walton.fl.us> Subject: Highway through State Forest

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I am writing in opposition to the proposed road from US 98 through the state forest to the Watersound area. Any new road would negatively impact the area available for habitat for wild animal species, and would add stress to the native flora. We are so fortunate that twenty-five years ago Walton County residents had the foresight to preserve some of the natural beauty of the area for future generations. It would be a terrible injustice to their efforts to destroy this wonderful gift they left us. I support your assessment that we should be looking at moving people in South Walton, not moving cars. Thank you.

Crawford Sandefur Santa Rosa Beach, FL.

Sent from the all new Aol app for iOS

From:Kristen ShellSent:Monday, February 8, 2021 8:21 AMTo:Karen OwensSubject:FW: Proposed road through Point Washington State Forest and Deer Lake State Park

From: Bob <bobreidfl@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, February 5, 2021 11:28 PM
To: soappedaler@gmail.com; info@letitbeforest.com; Kristen Shell <SheKristen@co.walton.fl.us>
Subject: Re: Proposed road through Point Washington State Forest and Deer Lake State Park

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

thanks, Celeste. I do not believe this new road is needed nor justified. authorities have already allowed the entire South Walton coast to be developed well beyond reasonable limits. if approved, this roadway will only encourage more loss of the natural ecosystem and development of an area already subject to tropical storm devastation, as Hurricane Michael so effectively demonstrated. as a longtime Walton County taxpayer, I am opposed to this unneeded road thru Point Washington State Forest.

--b.

-----Original Message-----From: soappedaler <<u>soappedaler@gmail.com</u>> To: <u>info@letitbeforest.com</u> Sent: Fri, Feb 5, 2021 9:18 pm Subject: Proposed road through Point Washington State Forest and Deer Lake State Park

Please forward to your contacts:

Walton County is currently reviewing a Mobility Study that includes a proposed road through Point Washington State Forest and Deer Lake State Park. The Mobility Study will go before the Walton County Planning Commission in March. Then two Board of County Commission meeting, likely April and May for approval. Email objections to Kristen Shell with Walton County Planning <u>shekristen@co.walton.fl.us</u>

Tell the County NO Road through Point Washington State Forest or Deer Lake State Park. Link to County Commissioners Page: <u>https://www.co.walton.fl.us/112/Commissioners</u>



Celeste Cobena Let it be Forest Facebook 850-267-2227

Sent from my iPhone
From:Kristen ShellSent:Monday, February 8, 2021 10:27 AMTo:Karen OwensSubject:FW: NO ROAD through Point Washington State Forrest and Deer Lake State Park

From: Stacy Jacob <SLJacob@leyendeckergroup.com>
Sent: Monday, February 8, 2021 9:50 AM
To: Kristen Shell <SheKristen@co.walton.fl.us>
Subject: NO ROAD through Point Washington State Forrest and Deer Lake State Park

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. NO ROAD through Point Washington State Forrest and Deer Lake State Park. Thank you.

Stacy Leyendecker Jacob President, Leyendecker Management Services 713-975-6600

From: Sent: To: Subject: Kristen Shell Monday, February 8, 2021 2:16 PM Karen Owens FW: NO ROAD

From: Gabrielle Vetter <gvetter1@aol.com> Sent: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:57 AM To: Kristen Shell <SheKristen@co.walton.fl.us> Subject: NO ROAD

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

NO ROAD through Point Washington State Forrest and Deer Lake State Park. Gabrielle Vetter

From: Sent: To: Subject: Kristen Shell Tuesday, February 9, 2021 8:05 AM Karen Owens FW: Point Washington Road

From: Robert Vosbein <robert.vosbein@vosholdings.com>
Sent: Monday, February 8, 2021 6:00 PM
To: Kristen Shell <SheKristen@co.walton.fl.us>
Subject: Point Washington Road

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

This is to advise that the undersigned strenuously opposes a road through Point Washington State Forrest and Deer Lake State Park.

Robert Vosbein 61 Village Beach Road Santa Rosa Beach, Fl. 32459

From: Sent: To: Subject: Kristen Shell Tuesday, February 9, 2021 10:36 AM Karen Owens FW: NO ROAD THRU STATE LANDS

From: BRUCE PALADINI <redstripe6@cox.net> Sent: Tuesday, February 9, 2021 9:50 AM To: Kristen Shell <SheKristen@co.walton.fl.us> Subject: NO ROAD THRU STATE LANDS

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

PLEASE DO NOT PUSH TO GET A ROAD THRU OUR VERY PROTECTED STATE FOREST. THE DEVELOPERS JUST WON'T QUIT WILL THEY? THESE LANDS WERE PURCHASED SO THEY CAN BE PROTECTED FROM ANY DEVELOPMENT, THIS EVEN MEANS ROADWAYS.

DO NOT LET THIS HAPPEN. THERE WILL BE A FIGHT ON A STATE LEVEL TO CRUSH THIS IDEA. YA`LL CREATED THIS MESS SO DEAL WITH IT WITHOUT TAKING GREEN SPACE.

BRUCE PALADINI

COFFEEN NATURE PRESERVE

From: Sent: To: Subject: Kristen Shell Thursday, February 11, 2021 11:27 AM Karen Owens FW: PLEASE no road

-----Original Message-----

From: Vaughan <vaughan@vaughangreene.com> Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 10:02 AM To: Kristen Shell <SheKristen@co.walton.fl.us> Subject: PLEASE no road

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I live here, full time—in Inlet Beach—so I'm very familiar with traffic and seasonal problems. I don't believe that we need a new road, either through Point Washington State Forest or especially Deer Lake State Park.

The south part of Walton Co. that I have watched have explosive growth isn't doing so well. Part of the problem is rather willy-nilly planning and that include roads.

The widening of 98, I understand, and though I wasn't thrilled I saw that as needed.

But a road through yet more of our green belt and undeveloped land is not as necessary and is very damaging to wildlife and quality of life in general.

Sure there is traffic during the summer but it abates. Ruining a wilderness area for the ease of some congestion and maybe saving a few minutes in transit is just not worth it.

So often in the summer, when it took a bit longer for me to get somewhere, it ended up that a golf cart was the problem, having dozens of cars held up behind it. Tackle that issue for one thing.

When is it going to stop? The county is ruining what made it special to begin with and that was a good deal of undeveloped land, forests and unique wildlife. Perhaps you need to quit allowing so much development on and around 30a itself? Then so many folks wouldn't need to have to get off of it. I know that is not going to happen but that is the major cause of the problem.

South Walton Co, I hate to say, is turning into Destin. I and so many others never wanted that.

Thank you, Vaughan Greene 217 Walton rose lane Inlet Beach, 32461