



Collier County Correctional Facilities Impact Fee Study

Final Report
October 8, 2025

Prepared for:

**Collier County Capital Projects Planning,
Impact Fees and Program Management Division**
2685 Horseshoe Drive South
Naples, Florida 34104
ph (239) 252-8192

Prepared by:

Benesch
1000 N. Ashley Dr., #400
Tampa, Florida 33602
ph (813) 224-8862
E-mail: nkamp@benesch.com

Collier County Correctional Facilities Impact Fee Study

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
INVENTORY.....	5
SERVICE AREA AND DEMAND COMPONENT.....	8
LEVEL OF SERVICE.....	9
COST COMPONENT.....	11
CREDIT COMPONENT.....	13
NET CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES IMPACT COST.....	15
CALCULATED CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES IMPACT FEE SCHEDULE.....	16
CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES IMPACT FEE SCHEDULE COMPARISON	20

Appendices:

Appendix A: Building and Land Value Analysis - Supplemental Information

Appendix B: Population Estimates – Supplemental Information

Introduction

With a population of over 400,000, Collier County ranks as the 19th most populous county in Florida. The county is continuing to grow and is estimated to add almost 100,000 new residents through 2050. In terms of residential permitting, Collier County ranks 19th out of Florida counties with an average of 4,200 new units per year over the past three years. To address additional infrastructure needs, Collier County implemented an impact fee program for correctional facilities, which was last updated in 2015. In compliance with impact fee ordinance requirements and to reflect current data, the County retained Benesch to prepare an update study.

This report serves as the technical study to support the calculation of the updated correctional facility impact fee. All data and support materials used in this analysis are incorporated by reference as set forth in this document.

The figures calculated in this study represent the technically defensible level of impact fee that the County could charge; however, the Board of County Commissioners may choose to discount the fee as a policy decision.

Methodology

In developing the County's correctional facilities impact fee, a consumption-based impact fee methodology is utilized, which is commonly used throughout Florida. A consumption-based impact fee charges new development based upon the burden placed on services from each land use (demand). The demand component is measured in terms of population per unit.

A consumption-based impact fee charges new growth the proportionate share of the cost of providing additional infrastructure for use by new growth. Unlike a "needs-based" approach, consumption-based approach ensures that the impact fee is set at a rate that generates revenues sufficient only for new capacity needs and does not generate revenues at a level to correct existing deficiencies. Given this, the County does not need to go through the process of estimating the portion of each capacity expansion project that may be related to existing deficiencies. In addition, per legal requirements, a credit is subtracted from the total cost to account for the value of future non-impact fee funding contributions of new development toward any capacity expansion projects. In other words, case law requires that the new development should not be charged twice for the same infrastructure.

Legal Overview

In Florida, legal requirements related to impact fees have primarily been established through case law since the 1980's. Impact fees must comply with the "dual rational nexus" test, which requires that they:

- Be supported by a study demonstrating that the fees are proportionate in amount to the need created by new development paying the fee; and
- Be spent in a manner that directs a proportionate benefit to new development, typically accomplished through establishment of benefit districts (if needed) and a list of capacity-adding projects included in the County's Capital Improvement Plan, Capital Improvement Element, or another planning document/Master Plan.

In 2006, the Florida legislature passed the "Florida Impact Fee Act," which recognized impact fees as "an outgrowth of home rule power of a local government to provide certain services within its jurisdiction." § 163.31801(2), Fla. Stat. The statute – concerned with mostly procedural and methodological limitations – did not expressly allow or disallow any particular public facility type from being funded with impact fees. In fact, which it was initially adopted, the Act largely codified requirements and standards common to the practice already.

However, the Legislature has amended the Impact Fee Act numerous times since 2006, significantly affecting the impact fee practice in Florida. For this reason, a summary of the key legislative changes since 2006 is provided:

- **HB 227 in 2009:** The Florida legislation statutorily clarified that in any action challenging an impact fee, the government has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the imposition or amount of the fee meets the requirements of state legal precedent or the Impact Fee Act and that the court may not use a deferential standard.
- **SB 360 in 2009:** Allowed fees to be decreased without the 90-day notice period required to increase the fees and purported to change the standard of legal review associated with impact fees. SB 360 also required the Florida Department of Community Affairs (now the Department of Commerce) and Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to conduct studies on "mobility fees," which were completed in 2010.
- **HB 7207 in 2011:** Required a dollar-for-dollar credit, for purposes of concurrency compliance, for impact fees paid and other concurrency mitigation required.
- **HB 319 in 2013:** Applied mostly to concurrency management authorities, but also encouraged local governments to adopt alternative mobility systems using a series of tools identified in section 163.3180(5)(f), Florida Statutes.
- **HB 207 in 2019:** Included the following changes to the Impact Fee Act along with additional clarifying language:

- Impact fees cannot be collected prior to building permit issuance; and
- Impact fee revenues cannot be used to pay debt service 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 and commercial construction.
- **HB 7103 in 2019:** Addressed multiple issues related to affordable housing/linkage fees, impact fees, and building services fees. In terms of impact fees, the bill required that when local governments increase their impact fees, the outstanding impact fee credits for developer contributions should also be increased. This requirement was to operate prospectively; however, HB 337 that was signed in 2021 deleted that clause and making all outstanding credits eligible for this adjustment. HB 7103 also allowed local governments to waive/reduce impact fees for affordable housing projects without having to offset the associated revenue loss.
- **SB 1066 in 2020:** Added language allowing impact fee credits to be assignable and transferable at any time after establishment from one development or parcel to another that is within the same impact fee zone or impact fee district or that is within an adjoining impact fee zone or district within the same local government jurisdiction, and which receives benefit from the improvement or contribution that generated the credits. Added language indicating any new/increased impact fee not being applicable to current or pending permit applications submitted prior to the effective date of an ordinance or resolution imposing new/increased fees.
- **HB 1339 in 2020:** Required reporting of various impact fee related data items within the annual financial audit report submitted to the Department of Financial Services.
- **HB 337 in 2021:** Placed limits on the amount and frequency of fee increases but also included a clause to exceed these restrictions if the local governments can demonstrate extraordinary circumstances, hold two public workshops discussing these circumstances and the increases are approved by two-thirds of the governing body.
- **HB 479 in 2024:** Required interlocal agreements between counties and municipalities when both entities collect a transportation impact fee. Placed limits on timing of impact fee study completion and adoption and data used in the studies.
- **SB 1080 in 2025:** Signed in 2025, this bill disallows the use of the extraordinary circumstances clause unless the local government has increased its fees within the past five years. It requires a unanimous vote of the governing body for fee increases above the 50-percent limit. Although the bill became effective on October 1, 2025, these two clauses will become effective on January 1, 2026.

The following paragraphs provide further detail on the generally applicable legal standards.

Impact Fee Definition

- An impact fee is a one-time capital charge levied against new development.
- An impact fee is designed to cover the portion of the capital costs of infrastructure capacity consumed by new development.
- The principal purpose of an impact fee is to assist in funding the implementation of projects identified in the Capital Improvements Element (CIE) and other capital improvement programs for the respective facility/service categories.

Impact Fee vs. Tax

- An impact fee is generally regarded as a regulatory function established based upon the specific benefit to the user related to a given infrastructure type and is not established for the primary purpose of generating revenue for the general benefit of the community, as are taxes.
- Impact fee expenditures must convey a proportional benefit to the fee payer. This is accomplished through the establishment of benefit districts as needed, where fees collected in a benefit district are spent in the same benefit district.
- An impact fee must be tied to a proportional need for new infrastructure capacity created by new development.

This technical report has been prepared to support legal compliance with existing case law and statutory requirements and documents the methodology used for the correctional facilities impact fee calculations, including an evaluation of the inventory, service area and demand component, level of service (LOS), cost, credit, and demand components. Information supporting this analysis was obtained from the County and other sources, as indicated.

Inventory

The correctional facilities inventory includes the County's jails and other related facilities that are primarily for the provision of correctional services and does not include any of the buildings or portions thereof included in the calculation of other impact fees.

According to information provided by the County, Collier County has a total of 417,200 square feet of correctional facility-related space. This includes the square footage of the Naples Jail (original and new), the square footage of the accompanying parking garage associated with the Naples Jail, and the Immokalee Jail. **Table 1** presents a summary of the correctional facilities building and land inventory, including a total building value of approximately \$140.3 million and a total land value of \$510,400. As mentioned previously, these values do not include building space or land associated with other County departments.

The building value is estimated based on cost increases observed since 2016, the insurance values of the existing correctional facilities, and estimates provided by Collier County, resulting in \$430 per square foot for correctional facilities and \$150 per square foot for the parking garage. Appendix A provides further detail on the building cost estimates.

Because the County is likely to purchase future jail sites in the Immokalee/Big Corkscrew area, the land value is based on an analysis of vacant land values and parcels sold in this area over the past five years, resulting in an estimate of \$40,000 per acre (see Appendix A).

In addition to building and land value, because correctional facilities typically require large scale investments, and therefore are funded with bond issues, an interest cost is added to the inventory value. Collier County funded both the Immokalee and Naples Jails with bond issues, which are being paid back with impact fee and General Fund revenues. To determine the appropriate cost factor, the interest cost for the expansion-portion of the Naples Jail debt schedule is brought back to present value and divided by the square footage of the jail expansion. This resulted in an interest cost of \$106 per square foot. As presented in Table 1, this value is applied to the square footage of existing jail facilities.

**Table 1
Building and Land Inventory Summary**

Facility Description	Location	Year Acquired/ Built	Number of Beds ⁽¹⁾	Square Feet ⁽²⁾	Total Square Feet on Site ⁽³⁾	Total Acres ⁽⁴⁾	Allocated Acres ⁽⁵⁾	Building Value ⁽⁶⁾	Land Value ⁽⁷⁾	Total Building and Land Value ⁽⁸⁾	Interest Cost ⁽⁹⁾
Naples Jail Parking Garage ⁽¹⁰⁾	3301 E. Tamiami Trail	2004	N/A	139,594	707,200	45.28	1.50	\$20,939,100	\$60,000	\$20,999,100	n/a
Naples Jail (2006 Expansion)		2006	1,112	132,412			2.50	\$56,937,160	\$100,000	\$57,037,160	\$14,035,672
Building "J" Sheriff 1st Floor (Original Naples Jail)		1986	101,962	2.84			\$43,843,660	\$113,600	\$43,957,260	\$10,807,972	
Immokalee Jail Center	302 Stockade Road	2003	<u>192</u>	<u>43,237</u>	60,941	41.81	<u>5.92</u>	<u>\$18,591,910</u>	<u>\$236,800</u>	<u>\$18,828,710</u>	<u>\$4,583,122</u>
Total			1,304	417,205			12.76	\$140,311,830	\$510,400	\$140,822,230	\$29,426,766
Building Value per Square Foot⁽¹¹⁾								\$336			
Land Value per Acre⁽¹²⁾									\$40,000		

- 1) Source: Collier County
- 2) Source: Collier County
- 3) Source: Collier County. Square feet of all buildings on a given parcel.
- 4) Source: Collier County
- 5) Source: Allocated acreage for the Naples Jail (2.50 acres) and Immokalee Jail (5.92 acres) were provided by Collier County. The acreage for the Naples Jail parking garage and Building J represent for the portion serving correctional facilities.
- 6) Jail square feet (Item 2) multiplied by the building value per square foot, which is estimated at \$430 per square foot for correctional facilities and \$150 per square foot for the parking garage. Appendix A provides further detail.
- 7) Source: Allocated acres (Item 5) multiplied by the land value per acre (Item 12)
- 8) Source: Sum of building value (Item 6) and land value (Item 7)
- 9) Interest cost associated with debt service on the bond issued to fund new jail facilities in Collier County. The interest cost is calculated by multiplying the square footage of each facility (Item 2) by \$106, estimated interest cost per square foot.
- 10) The total square footage of the parking garage (187,730 sf) is adjusted to account for the area used as evidence compound and the 46 out of 432 total parking spaces used by the Health Department, which are unrelated to the jail facilities.
- 11) Source: Total building value (Item 6) divided by jail square feet (Item 2)
- 12) Source: Appendix A

In addition to buildings, land, and interest costs, the correctional facility services also require the use of necessary vehicles and equipment. **Table 2** summarizes the vehicle and equipment inventory. Equipment included in this list follows the County’s definition of capital assets, which includes items that have a minimum value of \$5,000 and five years of useful life. As presented in Table 2, the total vehicle and equipment value is estimated at \$3.35 million.

Table 2
Correctional Facilities Vehicle and Equipment Inventory

Description	Total Cost ⁽¹⁾	Units ⁽²⁾	Cost per Unit ⁽³⁾
Detection Intox / Breathalyzer	\$55,080	9	\$6,120
Jail Equipment	\$56,271	6	\$9,379
Maintenance Equipment	\$17,119	2	\$8,560
Major Computer Equipment	\$206,815	3	\$68,938
Medical Equipment	\$46,835	6	\$7,806
Minor Comm Equip	\$26,021	2	\$13,011
Minor Recording Equipment	\$98,454	9	\$10,939
Minor Shop Equipment	\$22,847	1	\$22,847
Misc Security Equipment	\$108,828	11	\$9,893
Mobile Radio After FY 2010	\$10,365	2	\$5,183
Other Detection Devices	\$340,572	3	\$113,524
Servers	\$15,797	2	\$7,899
Specialty Vehicles	\$133,612	6	\$22,269
TV With Network	\$61,045	10	\$6,105
Vehicles	\$2,147,417	74	\$29,019
Total Value	\$3,347,078		

- 1) Source: Collier County Sheriff’s Office
- 2) Source: Collier County Sheriff’s Office
- 3) Total value (Item 1) divided by units (Item 2)

Service Area and Demand Component

Correctional facilities and related services are provided by Collier County Sheriff's Office in all areas of the county. Therefore, the proper benefit district for the correctional facilities impact fee is countywide.

The correctional facilities impact fee program requires the use of population data in calculating current levels of service and to be consistent with the population utilized in the County's comprehensive planning and Annual Update and Inventory Report (AUIR) process, this impact fee study considers not only the resident or permanent population of the County, but also the number of seasonal residents and visitors as well. Therefore, for purposes of this technical analysis, the peak season population is used in all population estimates and projections. Peak season population projections were provided by Collier County's Comprehensive Planning Division.

To measure effective population that benefits from correctional services, this study also developed functional population figures. Functional population, as used in the impact fee analysis, is a generally accepted methodology for several impact fee areas and is based on the assumption that demand for certain facilities is generally proportional to the presence of people at a land use, including residents, employees, and visitors. Appendix B provides additional details on population estimates.

Level of Service

Table 3 presents the calculation of the current LOS included in the inventory as well as Collier County’s adopted LOS standards according to the most recent AUJR. As presented, Collier County’s current level of service is 2.65 beds per 1,000 peak seasonal population.

While the current LOS for is 2.65 beds per 1,000 peak population, in order to calculate the correctional facilities impact fee, the LOS needs to be calculated in terms of beds per 1,000 functional residents. As shown in Table 3, the current achieved LOS is 2.76 beds per 1,000 functional residents.

Table 3 also presents the adopted LOS standard, which is 2.79 beds per 1,000 peak residents and 2.91 beds per 1,000 functional residents. While the achieved LOS indicates the investment made by the community, the adopted LOS standard provides the intended/goal LOS. For impact fee calculations, the lower of the two measures is used to ensure new development is not overcharged.

Table 3
Current Achieved & Adopted Level of Service Standard

Variable	Year 2024	
	Peak Seasonal Population	Functional Population
Population ⁽¹⁾	491,779	472,163
Number of Beds ⁽²⁾	1,304	1,304
Population per Bed ⁽³⁾	377	362
Achieved LOS (beds per 1,000 residents)⁽⁴⁾	2.65	2.76
Adopted LOS Standard (beds per 1,000 residents)⁽⁵⁾	2.79	2.91

1) Source: Appendix B, Table B-1 and Table B-7

2) Source: Collier County

3) Population (Item 1) divided by number of beds (Item 2)

4) Number of beds (Item 2) divided by the population (Item 1), multiplied by 1,000

5) Source: Collier County 2024 Annual Update and Inventory Report. LOS standard per peak population is converted to LOS standard per functional resident using the ratio of peak to functional population.

Table 4 provides a LOS comparison between Collier County and comparable counties throughout the State of Florida. The LOS is displayed in terms of permanent population for 2024 for all entities because functional population data analysis has not been completed for these jurisdictions. As presented, Collier County’s LOS is within the range of these counties.

**Table 4
Level of Service Comparison (2024)**

Jurisdiction	Total Available Beds⁽¹⁾	2024 Permanent Population⁽²⁾	LOS (Beds per 1,000 Residents)⁽³⁾
Palm Beach County	2,456	1,545,905	1.59
Osceola County	919	451,231	2.04
Lake County	893	433,331	2.06
Sarasota County	1,026	479,027	2.14
Lee County	2,009	827,016	2.43
Escambia County	840	336,358	2.50
Broward County	5,144	1,981,888	2.60
Brevard County	1,849	653,703	2.83
Collier County	1,304	408,381	3.19
St. Lucie County	1,370	385,746	3.55
Indian River County	668	171,029	3.91
Manatee County	1,780	455,356	3.91
Marion County	1,924	419,510	4.59
Highlands County	512	106,109	4.83
Charlotte County	1,074	210,645	5.10
Okeechobee County	232	40,230	5.77
Hendry County	266	45,413	5.86
Monroe County	704	84,147	8.37
Wakulla County	350	37,313	9.38

1) Source: Discussions with each county's Sheriff's/Corrections Office and/or county websites

2) Source: Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR), April 1, 2024

3) Permanent population (Item 2) divided by the total available beds (Item 1)

Cost Component

Table 5 provides a summary of correctional facility related capital assets owned by the County. As shown, total capital asset value associated with correctional facilities amounts to \$173.6 million. However, the County is still paying debt service on a portion of these assets. In addition, it is Collier County’s policy to use impact fee revenues to pay debt service associated with capacity expansion projects. To ensure that new development is not being overcharged for these future payments, the portion of the remaining principal for the Naples Jail addition that is to be repaid with impact fee revenues is subtracted from the total asset value in Table 5. The resulting owned capital asset value is approximately \$159.3 million or approximately \$122,100 per bed.

Table 5 also presents the cost per functional resident for the impact fee analysis. This cost is calculated by multiplying the owned capital asset value per bed by the current LOS of 2.76 beds per 1,000 functional residents and then dividing by 1,000. As shown, these calculations result in \$337 per functional resident for all correctional facilities assets considered in the impact fee calculations.

Table 5
Total Impact Cost per Functional Resident

Description	Figure	Percent of Total Cost ⁽¹²⁾
Building Value ⁽¹⁾	\$140,311,830	80.8%
Land Value ⁽²⁾	\$510,400	0.3%
Interest Cost ⁽³⁾	\$29,426,766	17.0%
Vehicle and Equipment Value ⁽⁴⁾	\$3,347,078	1.9%
Total Capital Asset Value⁽⁵⁾	\$173,596,074	100.0%
Less: Portion Not Owned ⁽⁶⁾	\$14,320,697	
Owned Capital Asset Value⁽⁷⁾	\$159,275,377	
Number of Beds ⁽⁸⁾	1,304	
Owned Capital Asset Value per Bed⁽⁹⁾	\$122,144	
LOS (beds per 1,000 residents) ⁽¹⁰⁾	2.76	
Total Impact Cost per Functional Resident⁽¹¹⁾	\$337.12	

1) Source: Table 1

2) Source: Table 1

3) Source: Table 1

4) Source: Table 2

5) Sum of building value, land value, interest cost, and vehicle and equipment value (Items 1, 2, 3, 4)

6) Source: Collier County Office of Management and Budget

7) Total capital asset value (Item 5) less the portion not owned (Item 6)

- 8) Source: Collier County
- 9) Owned capital asset value (Item 7) divided by the number of beds (Item 8)
- 10)Source: Table 3
- 11)Owned capital asset value per bed (Item 9) multiplied by the LOS (Item 10)
divided by 1,000
- 12)Distribution of total capital asset value

Credit Component

To avoid overcharging new development for the correctional facility impact fee, a review of the capital financing program for correctional services was completed. The purpose of this review was to determine any potential revenue credits generated by new development that are being used for expansion of capital facilities, land, and equipment included in the inventory.

Based on a review of the County's funding of capacity addition projects over the past five years, it has been determined that the County uses impact fees and the one-percent local government infrastructure surtax for expansion projects paid with cash. The local government infrastructure surtax was repealed on December 31, 2023, and the County does not intend to renew this funding mechanism. Given this, the surtax is excluded from credit calculations.

Capital Expansion "Debt Service" Credit

Any outstanding bond issues related to the correctional facilities also will result in a credit to the impact fee. As mentioned previously, Collier County funded the Naples Jail replacement and expansion expenditures with a bond issue. The capital expansion portion of the improvements to the Immokalee Jail was paid in cash using impact fee revenue, while the remaining payments of debt service on the bond issued for the capital expansion of the Naples Jail are to be repaid using impact fee revenues. As previously presented in Table 5, this study excluded the portion of the remaining principal for the Naples Jail expansion and parking garage from the capital asset value not to overcharge new development.

Although the expansion portion of the debt service is being paid with impact fee revenues, the remaining portion is being paid with the General Fund revenues. Because the non-expansion portion of the Naples Jail included replacing the old structures entirely, as opposed to renovating existing structures as in the case of Immokalee Jail, a credit is calculated for debt service payments related to the replacement portion of the Naples Jail. As presented in **Table 6**, the resulting credit for the correctional facility-related debt is approximately \$5 per functional resident.

Table 6
Capital Expansion "Debt Service" Credit

Description	Number of Remaining FY Payments ⁽¹⁾	Total Remaining Debt Service ⁽²⁾	Present Value of Payments Remaining ⁽³⁾	Average Annual Functional Population ⁽⁴⁾	Debt Service Credit per Functional Resident ⁽⁵⁾
<i>New Jail</i>					
2022A Special Obligation Refunding Revenue Bond	5	\$964,514	\$928,448	493,097	\$1.88
2022B Special Obligation Refunding Revenue Bond	9	\$1,928,903	\$1,692,657	505,444	<u>\$3.35</u>
Total Capital Expansion "Debt Service" Credit per Functional Resident					\$5.23

- 1) Source: Collier County Office of Management and Budget
- 2) Total remaining debt service for the replacement portion of the Naples Jail
- 3) Total value of remaining payments in 2024 dollars
- 4) Source: Appendix B, Table B-7. Represents the average annual functional population over the remaining issue period.
- 5) Present value of payment remaining (Item 3) divided by the average annual functional population over the remaining issue period (Item 4)

Net Correctional Facilities Impact Cost

Table 7 summarizes the net impact cost per functional resident, which is the difference between the cost component and the credit component. The resulting net impact cost is \$332 per functional resident.

Table 7
Net Impact Cost per Functional Resident

Variable	Per Functional Resident
Total Impact Cost	
Total Impact Cost ⁽¹⁾	\$337.12
Total Revenue Credit	
Capital Expansion "Debt Service" Credit ⁽²⁾	\$5.23
Net Impact Cost	
Net Impact Cost ⁽³⁾	\$331.89

- 1) Source: Table 5
- 2) Source: Table 6
- 3) Total impact cost per functional resident (Item 1) less capital expansion "debt service" credit per functional resident (Item 2)

Calculated Correctional Facilities Impact Fee Schedule

Table 8 presents the calculated correctional facilities impact fee schedule for residential and non-residential land uses, based on the net impact fee cost per functional resident figures presented in Table 7. Net impact cost per functional resident increased by approximately 25 percent since the 2015 study due to changes to cost and credit components. The remaining differences reflect the changes in the demand component since 2015 as well as new land use categories or units.

Table 8 also shows the maximum allowable impact fees consistent with F.S. 163.3180 and the corresponding percent change from the current adopted impact fee.

Table 8
Calculated Correctional Facilities Impact Fee Schedule

LUC	Land Use	Impact Unit	Functional Residents per Unit ⁽¹⁾	Calculated Impact Fee ⁽²⁾	Current Adopted Impact Fee ⁽³⁾	Percent Change ⁽⁴⁾	FS 163.31801 Maximum Impact Fee ⁽⁵⁾	Percent Change ⁽⁶⁾
RESIDENTIAL:								
210	Single Family Detached							
	- Less than 4,000 sf	du	1.74	\$577.49	\$499.19	16%	\$577.49	16%
	- 4,000 sf or greater	du	2.15	\$713.56	\$570.90	25%	\$713.56	25%
230/232	Multi-Family	du	0.90	\$298.70	\$228.91	30%	\$298.70	30%
240	Mobile Home	du	1.32	\$438.09	\$397.15	10%	\$438.09	10%
251	Retirement Community - Detached (Single Family)	du	1.07	\$355.12	\$215.12	65%	\$322.68	50%
252	Retirement Community - Attached (Multi-Family)	du	0.54	\$179.22	\$215.12	-17%	\$179.22	-17%
TRANSIENT, ASSISTED, GROUP:								
310/311	Hotel/All Suites Hotel	room	1.17	\$388.31	\$220.63	76%	\$330.94	50%
320	Motel	room	1.07	\$355.12	\$209.60	69%	\$314.40	50%
254	Assisted Living Facility	du	0.92	\$305.34	\$231.67	32%	\$305.34	32%
620	Nursing Home	1,000 sf	2.37	\$786.58	\$248.22/bed	N/A	N/A	N/A
RECREATION:								
416	Campground/RV Park	site	0.45	\$149.35	\$137.90	8%	\$149.35	8%
420	Marina	boat berth	0.12	\$39.83	\$52.41	-24%	\$39.83	-24%
430	Golf Course	hole	0.80	\$265.51	\$297.86	-11%	\$265.51	-11%
n/a	Bundled Golf Course	hole	0.24	\$79.65	\$89.33	-11%	\$79.65	-11%
445	Movie Theater	1,000 sf	3.33	\$1,105.19	\$1,649.27/screen	N/A	N/A	N/A
n/a	Dance Studio/Gymnastics	1,000 sf	1.72	\$570.85	\$612.28	-7%	\$570.85	-7%
INSTITUTIONS:								
520	Elementary School (Private)	student	0.10	\$33.19	\$16.55	101%	\$24.82	50%
522	Middle/Junior High School (Private)	student	0.09	\$29.87	\$19.31	55%	\$28.96	50%
525	High School (Private)	student	0.08	\$26.55	\$22.07	20%	\$26.55	20%
540/550	University/Junior College (7,500 or fewer students) (Private)	student	0.10	\$33.19	\$27.58	20%	\$33.19	20%
	University/Junior College (more than 7,500 students) (Private)	student	0.08	\$26.55	\$19.31	37%	\$26.55	37%
560	Church	1,000 sf	0.42	\$139.39	\$8.27/seat	N/A	N/A	N/A
565	Day Care Center	1,000 sf	0.69	\$229.00	\$13.79/student	N/A	N/A	N/A
MEDICAL:								
610	Hospital	1,000 sf	1.32	\$438.09	\$377.84	16%	\$438.09	16%

Table 8 (Continued)
Calculated Correctional Facilities Impact Fee Schedule

LUC	Land Use	Impact Unit	Functional Residents per Unit ⁽¹⁾	Calculated Impact Fee ⁽²⁾	Current Adopted Impact Fee ⁽³⁾	Percent Change ⁽⁴⁾	FS 163.31801 Maximum Impact Fee ⁽⁵⁾	Percent Change ⁽⁶⁾
OFFICE:								
710	General Office	1,000 sf	0.67	\$222.37	\$212.36	5%	\$222.37	5%
720	Medical Office/Clinic 10,000 sq ft or less	1,000 sf	0.99	\$328.57	\$314.41	5%	\$328.57	5%
	Medical Office/Clinic greater than 10,000 sq ft	1,000 sf	1.38	\$458.01	\$457.83	0%	\$458.01	0%
770	Business Park (Flex-Space)	1,000 sf	0.68	\$225.69	\$264.77	-15%	\$225.69	-15%
RETAIL:								
822	Retail 6,000 sfgla or less	1,000 sfgla	1.97	\$653.82	\$675.71	-3%	\$653.82	-3%
822	Retail 6,001 to 40,000 sfgla	1,000 sfgla	1.97	\$653.82	\$675.71	-3%	\$653.82	-3%
821	Retail 40,001 to 150,000 sfgla	1,000 sfgla	2.65	\$879.51	\$620.55	42%	\$879.51	42%
820	Retail greater than 150,000 sfgla	1,000 sfgla	1.85	\$614.00	\$576.42	7%	\$614.00	7%
840/841	New/Used Auto Sales	1,000 sf	1.47	\$487.88	\$405.42	20%	\$487.88	20%
849	Tire Superstore	1,000 sf	1.20	\$398.27	\$369.57/bay	N/A	N/A	N/A
850	Supermarket	1,000 sf	2.27	\$753.39	\$565.39	33%	\$753.39	33%
851	Convenience Market (24 hour)	1,000 sf	5.26	\$1,745.74	\$1,508.62	16%	\$1,745.74	16%
862	Home Improvement Superstore	1,000 sf	1.80	\$597.40	\$499.19	20%	\$597.40	20%
880/881	Pharmacy with & without Drive-Thru	1,000 sf	1.68	\$557.58	\$540.56	3%	\$557.58	3%
890	Furniture Store	1,000 sf	0.41	\$136.07	\$66.20	106%	\$99.30	50%
SERVICES:								
911	Bank/Savings w/out Drive-Thru	1,000 sf	1.08	\$358.44	\$615.04	-42%	\$358.44	-42%
912	Bank/Savings w/Drive-Thru	1,000 sf	1.40	\$464.65	\$628.82	-26%	\$464.65	-26%
930	Fast Casual Restaurant	1,000 sf	7.62	\$2,529.00	\$2,454.60	3%	\$2,529.00	3%
931	Low-Turnover Restaurant	1,000 sf	5.65	\$1,875.18	\$60.68/seat	N/A	N/A	N/A
932	High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurant	1,000 sf	5.29	\$1,755.70	\$74.46/seat	N/A	N/A	N/A
934	Fast Food Restaurant w/Drive-Thru	1,000 sf	9.36	\$3,106.49	\$2,454.60	27%	\$3,106.49	27%
934.1	Fast Food w/Drive-Thru with Two Meals	1,000 sf	8.25	\$2,738.09	\$2,454.60	12%	\$2,738.09	12%
941	Quick Lube	service bay	1.52	\$504.47	\$319.93	58%	\$479.89	50%
944	Gas Station w/Convenience Market <2,000 sq ft	fuel pos.	1.32	\$438.09	\$714.32	-39%	\$438.09	-39%
945	Gas Station w/Convenience Market 2,000 sq ft or more	fuel pos.	1.63	\$540.98	\$714.32	-24%	\$540.98	-24%
947	Self-Service Car Wash	service bay	0.79	\$262.19	\$239.94	9%	\$262.19	9%
948	Automated Car Wash	1,000 sf	2.65	\$879.51	\$485.40	81%	\$728.10	50%
n/a	Luxury Auto Sales	1,000 sf	1.21	\$401.59	\$284.07	41%	\$401.59	41%

Table 8 (Continued)
Calculated Correctional Facilities Impact Fee Schedule

LUC	Land Use	Impact Unit	Functional Residents per Unit ⁽¹⁾	Calculated Impact Fee ⁽²⁾	Current Adopted Impact Fee ⁽³⁾	Percent Change ⁽⁴⁾	FS 163.31801 Maximum Impact Fee ⁽⁵⁾	Percent Change ⁽⁶⁾
INDUSTRIAL:								
110	General Light Industrial	1,000 sf	0.27	\$89.61	\$190.30	-53%	\$89.61	-53%
140	Manufacturing	1,000 sf	0.45	\$149.35	\$137.90	8%	\$149.35	8%
150	Warehousing	1,000 sf	0.09	\$29.87	\$77.22	-61%	\$29.87	-61%
151	Mini-Warehouse	1,000 sf	0.03	\$9.96	\$16.55	-40%	\$9.96	-40%

- 1) Source: Table B-8 for residential land uses and Table B-9 for non-residential land uses
- 2) Source: Net impact cost per functional resident from Table 7 is multiplied by the functional residents per unit (Item 1) for each land use
- 3) Source: Collier County Capital Project Planning, Impact Fees, and Program Management Division.
- 4) Percent change from the calculated fee (Item 2) to the current adopted impact fee (Item 3)
- 5) Maximum allowable impact fees in compliance with 50 percent increase cap per F.S. 163.31801
- 6) Percent change from the current adopted impact fee (Item 3) to the F.S. 163.31801 maximum allowable impact fee (Item 5)

Impact Fee Schedule Comparison

As part of the work effort in updating Collier County’s correctional facilities impact fee program, a comparison of correctional facilities impact fee schedules was completed for several other Florida counties. **Table 9** presents this comparison.

Table 9
Correctional Facilities Impact Fee Schedule Comparison

Land Use	Unit ⁽²⁾	Collier County		Brevard County ⁽⁵⁾	Charlotte County ⁽⁶⁾	Polk County ⁽⁷⁾	Sarasota County ⁽⁸⁾
		Calculated ⁽³⁾	Current Adopted ⁽⁴⁾				
Date of Last Update		2025	2015	2000	2021	2024	2016
Adoption Percentage ⁽¹⁾		N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Residential:							
Single Family (2,000 sf)	du	\$577	\$499	\$72	\$284	\$662	\$1,009
Non-Residential:							
Light Industrial	1,000 sf	\$90	\$190	N/A	\$73	\$205	\$205
Office (50,000 sf)	1,000 sf	\$222	\$328	\$34	\$211	\$367	\$756
Retail (125,000 sf)	1,000 sf	\$880	\$621	\$100	\$442	\$727	\$1,319

- 1) Represents the portion of the maximum calculated fee for each respective county that is actually charged. Fees may have been lowered/raised through indexing or policy discounts. Does not account for moratoriums/suspensions
- 2) du = dwelling unit
- 3) Source: Table 8
- 4) Source: Collier County Capital Project Planning, Impact Fees, and Program Management Division
- 5) Source: Brevard County Planning & Development Department
- 6) Source: Charlotte County Community Development Department, Planning & Zoning Division
- 7) Source: Polk County Building Division
- 8) Source: Sarasota County Planning & Development Services. Fee shown reflects "Justice Facilities" impact fee.

Appendix A
Building and Land Value Analysis -
Supplemental Information

Appendix A - Building and Land Value Analysis

This appendix provides the additional data and information on building and land value estimates.

Building Values

In determining the appropriate unit value for buildings, the following analysis was conducted:

- Cost trends since the most recent technical study;
- Insurance value of the existing inventory; and
- Estimates provided by the County.

During the 2015 study, the value of jails was estimated at \$300 per square foot. Applying Engineering News Records Building Cost Index for the cost changes between 2015 and 2024 resulted in a unit cost of approximately \$450 per square foot.

The insured value of the Naples Jail is approximately \$202 per square foot and the Immokalee Jail is approximately \$264 per square foot. The insured value of the parking garage is approximately \$78 per square foot. It is important to note insurance values are considered to provide conservative estimates and do not take into consideration certain building components, such as foundation, architectural/design cost, furniture/fixture/equipment, security features, etc.

Given this data and based on estimates provided by the County, building cost for jails was estimated at \$430 per square foot. The value of support facilities was estimated at \$150 per square foot.

Land Values

To estimate the current land value the following analysis is conducted:

- Land value trends in Collier County;
- Current value of land where the jail buildings are located;
- Analysis of vacant land sales and values of similarly sized parcels; and
- Discussions with the County.

Value of vacant land increased by 146 percent since the last update study based on estimates published by the Florida Department of Revenue. Applying this increase to the average cost of \$25,000 per acre used in the previous study results in land value of approximately \$61,500 per acre.

According to the Collier County Property Appraiser, the value of the land where the Naples Jail is located is approximately \$871,000 per acre. The value of the land where the Immokalee Jail is located is much lower at \$20,000 per acre.

Based on discussions with the County, future land purchases for correctional facilities are likely to be in the Immokalee and Big Corkscrew areas. Therefore, the land value analysis considered sales over the past five years in these areas. Vacant land sales in this area over the last five years suggested a weighted average of \$57,600 per acre and a median value of \$31,900 per acre for parcels greater than 0.5 acres and less than 5 acres. Vacant land values within this area indicated an average value of \$35,700 per acre for parcels greater than 0.5 acres and less than 5 acres. Given these figures, an average land value of \$40,000 per acre is considered to be a reasonable estimate for the impact fee calculations.

Appendix B
Population Estimates - Supplemental Information

Appendix B - Population Estimates

The correctional facilities impact fee program requires the use of population data in calculating current levels of service. To be consistent with the population utilized in the County's comprehensive planning and Annual Update and Inventory Report (AUIR) process, this impact fee study considers not only the resident or permanent population, but also the number of seasonal residents and visitors as well. Therefore, for purposes of this technical analysis, the peak seasonal population estimates provided by Collier County's Comprehensive Planning Department are used for all population estimates and projections.

Table B-1 presents the peak seasonal population trends for Collier County. The projections indicate that the current peak seasonal population of the county is approximately 491,800 and is expected to increase to 582,700 (increase of 90,900) by 2040. The estimated average growth rate is approximately 1 percent per year.

**Table B-1
Collier County Population Estimates (Countywide)**

Year	Countywide	
	Peak Seasonal Population	Percent Change
2010	387,183	-
2011	392,180	1.3%
2012	398,107	1.5%
2013	402,268	1.0%
2014	408,351	1.5%
2015	416,402	2.0%
2016	424,603	2.0%
2017	433,359	2.1%
2018	442,240	2.0%
2019	451,303	2.0%
2020	455,059	0.8%
2021	464,155	2.0%
2022	474,235	2.2%
2023	483,487	2.0%
2024	491,779	1.7%
2025	499,426	1.6%
2026	506,406	1.4%
2027	513,483	1.4%
2028	520,660	1.4%
2029	527,936	1.4%
2030	534,305	1.2%
2031	539,741	1.0%
2032	545,233	1.0%
2033	550,781	1.0%
2034	556,384	1.0%
2035	561,339	0.9%
2036	565,633	0.8%
2037	569,960	0.8%
2038	574,320	0.8%
2039	578,714	0.8%
2040	582,721	0.7%

Source: Collier County Comprehensive Planning Department (population projections dated May, 2024)

Apportionment of Demand by Residential Unit Type and Size

The residential land uses to be used for the correctional facilities impact fee calculations include the following:

- Single Family (Detached)
- Multi-Family
- Mobile Home/ RV Park (tied down)
- Retirement Community (detached and attached)

Table B-2 presents the number of residents per housing unit for the residential categories identified above in Collier County. This analysis includes all housing units, both occupied and vacant.

To address fairness and equity issues between land uses, the single family land use is tiered based on two categories of square footage: less than 4,000 square feet and 4,000 square feet and greater. To accommodate the tiering of impact fee assessments for the single family residential land use category, an analysis was completed based on housing unit size and persons per housing unit, comparing nationwide averages to those of Collier County. This analysis utilized national data from the 2021 American Housing Survey (AHS) and data from the 2021 American Community Survey (ACS) to examine this relationship.

**Table B-2
Residents per Housing Unit**

Housing Type	Population ⁽¹⁾	Housing Units ⁽²⁾	Ratio ⁽³⁾	Residents / Housing Units ⁽⁴⁾
Single Family Detached	289,564	112,378		2.58
- Less than 4,000 sf			98%	2.53
- 4,000 sf or greater			121%	3.12
Multi Family	139,405	106,016		1.31
Mobile Home/RV Park (Tied Down)	21,446	11,189		1.92
Retirement Community - Detached (Single Family) ⁽⁵⁾	173,738	112,378		1.55
Retirement Community - Attached (Multi-Family) ⁽⁶⁾	83,643	106,016		0.79

- 1) Source: 2022 ACS 5-Yr Estimates, Table B25033 (owner occupied and renter occupied), adjusted for peak seasonal population.
- 2) Source: 2022 ACS 5-Yr Estimates, Table DP04
- 3) Ratios developed based on national PPH data derived from the 2021 American Housing Survey.
- 4) Population (Item 1) divided by housing units (Item 2). For single family detached tiers, the residents per housing unit is determined by multiplying the weighted average value (2.58) by the ratio developed from the AHS data (Item 3)

- 5) Estimate for retirement community (detached) is based on people per household figures for single family homes, adjusted for the residents over 55 years of age based on information obtained from the 2017 National Household Travel Survey, prepared by the US Department of Transportation.
- 6) Estimate for retirement community (attached) is based on people per household figures for multi-family homes, adjusted for the residents over 55 years of age based on information obtained from the 2017 National Household Travel Survey, prepared by the US Department of Transportation.

Functional Population

For correctional facilities, this study uses functional population as the demand component, which distributes the cost associated with the availability of correctional facilities among various land uses based on the density of people at each land use throughout the day.

Functional population, as used in the impact fee analysis, is a generally accepted methodology and is based on the assumption that demand for certain facilities is generally proportional to the presence of people at a land use, including residents, employees, and visitors. It is not enough to simply add resident population to the number of employees, since the service-demand characteristics can vary considerably by type of industry.

Functional population is the equivalent number of people occupying space within a community on a 24-hour-day, 7-days-a-week basis. A person living and working in the community will have the functional population coefficient of 1.0. A person living in the community but working elsewhere may spend only 16 hours per day in the community on weekdays and 24 hours per day on weekends for a functional population coefficient of 0.76 (128-hour presence divided by 168 hours in one week). A person commuting into the county to work five days per week would have a functional population coefficient of 0.30 (50-hour presence divided by 168 hours in one week). Similarly, a person traveling into the community to shop at stores, perhaps averaging 8 hours per week, would have a functional population coefficient of 0.05.

Functional population thus tries to capture the presence of all people within the community, whether residents, workers, or visitors, to arrive at an estimate of effective population that needs to be served.

This form of adjusting population to help measure real facility needs replaces the population approach of merely weighting residents two-thirds and workers one-third (Nelson and Nicholas 1992). By estimating the functional and weighted population per unit of land use across all major land uses in a community, an estimate of the demand for certain facilities and services in the present and future year can be calculated. The following paragraphs explain how functional population is calculated for residential and non-residential land uses.

Residential Functional Population

Developing the residential component of functional population is simpler than developing the non-residential component. It is generally estimated that people spend one-half to three-fourths of their time at home and the rest of each 24-hour day away from their place of residence. In developing the residential component of Collier County functional population, an analysis of the County's population and employment characteristics was conducted. Based on this analysis, it was estimated that people, on average, spend 16.5 hours, or approximately 69 percent, of each 24-hour day at their place of residence and the other 31 percent away from home. This analysis is presented in **Tables B-3** and **B-4**.

Table B-3
Population & Employment Characteristics

Item/Calculation Step	Year 2022
Total workers living in Collier County ⁽¹⁾	158,723
Collier County Population ⁽²⁾	380,221
Total workers as a percent of population ⁽³⁾	41.7%
School age population (5-17 years) ⁽⁴⁾	47,459
School age population as a percent of population ⁽⁵⁾	12.5%
Population net of workers and school age population ⁽⁶⁾	174,039
Other population as a percent of total population ⁽⁷⁾	45.8%

- 1) Source: Census OnTheMap 2022
- 2) Source: ACS 2022 5-Yr Estimates, Table S0101
- 3) Total workers (Item 1) divided by countywide population (Item 2)
- 4) Source: ACS 2022 5-Yr Estimates, Table S0101
- 5) Total school age population (Item 4) divided by total population (Item 2)
- 6) Total population (Item 2) less total workers (Item 1) and school age population (Item 4)
- 7) Population net of workers and school age population (Item 6) divided by total population (Item 2)

Table B-4
Residential Coefficient for Functional Population

Pop. Group	Hours at Residence ⁽¹⁾	Percent of Population ⁽²⁾	Effective Hours ⁽³⁾
Workers	13	41.7%	5.4
Students	15	12.5%	1.9
Other	20	45.8%	9.2
Total Hours at Residence ⁽⁴⁾			16.5
Residential Functional Population Coefficient⁽⁵⁾			68.8%

- 1) Estimated
- 2) Source: Table B-3
- 3) Hours at residence (Item 1) multiplied by percent of population (Item 2)
- 4) Sum of effective hours
- 5) Sum of effective hours (Item 4) divided by 24

The resulting percentage from Table B-4 is used in the calculation of the residential coefficient for the 24-hour functional population. These actual calculations are presented in **Table B-6**.

Non-Residential Functional Population

Given the varying characteristics of non-residential land uses, developing the estimates of functional residents for non-residential land uses is more complicated than developing estimated of functional residents for residential land uses. Nelson and Nicholas originally introduced a method for estimating functional resident population, now used widely¹. This method uses trip generation data from the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ (ITE) Trip Generation Manual and Benesch’s Trip Characteristics Database, information on passengers per vehicle, workers per vehicle, length of time spent at the land use, and other variables. Specific calculations include:

- Total one-way trips per employee (ITE trips multiplied by 50 percent to avoid double counting entering and exiting trips as two trips).
- Visitors per impact unit based on occupants per vehicle (trips multiplied by occupants per vehicle less employees).
- Worker hours per week per impact unit (such as nine worker-hours per day multiplied by five days in a work week).
- Visitor hours per week per impact unit (visitors multiplied by number of hours per day times relevant days in a week, such as five for offices and seven for retail shopping).

¹ Arthur C. Nelson and James C. Nicholas, “Estimating Functional Population for Facility Planning,” *Journal of Urban Planning and Development* 118(2): 45-58 (1992).

- Functional population coefficients per employee developed by estimating time spent by employees and visitors at each land use.

Table B-5 shows the functional population coefficients for residential and non-residential uses in Collier County. The functional population coefficients in Table B-5 were used to estimate the County's functional population in Table B-6.

**Table B-5
General Functional Population Coefficients**

Population/ Employment Category	ITE LUC	Employee Hours In-Place ⁽¹⁾	Trips per Employee ⁽²⁾	One-Way Trips per Employee ⁽³⁾	Journey-to-Work Occupants per Trip ⁽⁴⁾	Daily Occupants per Trip ⁽⁵⁾	Visitors per Employee ⁽⁶⁾	Visitor Hours per Trip ⁽¹⁾	Days per Week ⁽⁷⁾	Functional Population Coefficient ⁽⁸⁾
Population									7.00	0.688
Natural Resources	N/A	9.00	4.02	2.01	1.32	1.38	0.12	1.00	7.00	0.380
Construction	110	9.00	4.02	2.01	1.32	1.38	0.12	1.00	5.00	0.271
Manufacturing	140	9.00	2.67	1.34	1.32	1.38	0.08	1.00	5.00	0.270
Transportation, Communication, Utilities	110	9.00	4.02	2.01	1.32	1.38	0.12	1.00	5.00	0.271
Wholesale Trade	150	9.00	5.05	2.53	1.32	1.38	0.15	1.00	5.00	0.272
Retail Trade	820	9.00	56.10	28.05	1.24	1.73	13.74	1.50	7.00	1.234
Finance, Insurance, Real Estate	710	9.00	3.44	1.72	1.24	1.73	0.84	1.00	5.00	0.293
Services ⁽⁹⁾	N/A	9.00	20.34	10.17	1.24	1.73	4.98	1.00	6.00	0.499
Government ⁽¹⁰⁾	730	9.00	7.45	3.73	1.24	1.73	1.83	1.00	7.00	0.451

(1) Estimated

(2) Trips per employee represents all trips divided by the number of employees and is based on Trip Generation 12th Edition (Institute of Transportation Engineers 2025) as follows:

- ITE Code 110 at 4.02 weekday trips per employee, General Urban/Suburban and Rural (Land Uses 000-399), page 59
- ITE Code 140 at 2.67 weekday trips per employee, General Urban/Suburban and Rural (Land Uses 000-399), page 93
- ITE Code 150 at 5.05 weekday trips per employee, General Urban/Suburban and Rural (Land Uses 000-399), page 119
- ITE Code 710 at 3.44 weekday trips per employee, General Urban/Suburban and Rural (Land Uses 400-799), page 683
- ITE Code 730 at 7.45 weekday trips per employee, General Urban/Suburban and Rural (Land Uses 400-799), page 751
- ITE Code 820 (Volume 5, page 90) based on blended average of trips by retail center size calculated below.

Trips per retail employee from the following table:

<i>Retail Scale</i>	<i>Trip Rate</i>	<i>Sq Ft per Employee⁽¹¹⁾</i>	<i>Trips per Employee</i>	<i>Share</i>	<i>Weighted Trips</i>
Retail (Less than 40k sq. ft.)	54.45	890	48	50.0%	24.00
Retail (40k to 150k sq. ft.)	65.38	1,152	75	35.0%	26.25
Retail (greater than 150k sq. ft.)	36.39	1,070	39	15.0%	5.85
Sum of Weighted Trips/1k sq.ft.					56.10

(3) Trip per employee (Item 2) multiplied by 0.5.

(4) Journey-to-Work Occupants per Trip from 2001 National Household Travel Survey (FHWA 2001) as follows:

- 1.32 occupants per Construction, Manufacturing, TCU, and Wholesale trip
- 1.24 occupants per Retail Trade, FIRE, and Services trip

(5) Daily Occupants per Trip from 2001 National Household Travel Survey (FHWA 2001) as follows:

- 1.38 occupants per Construction, Manufacturing, TCU, and Wholesale trip
- 1.73 occupants per Retail Trade, FIRE, and Services trip

(6) [Daily occupants per trip (Item 5) multiplied by one-way trips per employee (Item 3)] - [(Journey-to-Work occupants per trip (Item 4) multiplied by one-way trips per employee (Item 3)]

(7) Typical number of days per week that indicated industries provide services and relevant government services are available.

(8) Table A-8 for residential and the equation below to determine the Functional Population Coefficient per Employee for all land-use categories except residential includes the following:

$$\frac{((\text{Days per Week} \times \text{Employee Hours in Place}) + (\text{Visitors per Employee} \times \text{Visitor Hours per Trip} \times \text{Days per Week}))}{(24 \text{ Hours per Day} \times 7 \text{ Days per Week})}$$

(24 Hours per Day x 7 Days per Week)

(9) Trips per employee for the services category is the average trips per employee for the following service related land use categories: quality restaurant, high-turnover restaurant, supermarket, hotel, motel, elementary school, middle school, high school, hospital, medical office, and church. Source for the trips per employee figure from ITE, 12th ed., when available, or else derived from the square feet per employee for the appropriate land use category from the Energy Information Administration from Table B-1 of the Commercial Energy Building Survey, 2003.

(10) Includes Federal Civilian Government, Federal Military Government, and State and Local Government categories.

(11) Square feet per retail employee from the Energy Information Administration from Table B-1 of the Commercial Energy Building Survey, 2018

Table B-6
Functional Population (Countywide)

Population Category	Collier County Baseline Data⁽¹⁾	Functional Resident Coefficient⁽²⁾	Functional Population⁽³⁾
2024 Peak Season Population	491,779	0.688	338,344
Employment Category			
Natural Resources	4,976	0.380	1,891
Construction	25,122	0.271	6,808
Manufacturing	6,231	0.270	1,682
Transportation, Communication, and Utilities	11,285	0.271	3,058
Wholesale Trade	6,543	0.272	1,780
Retail Trade	26,390	1.234	32,565
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	55,404	0.293	16,233
Services	126,779	0.499	63,263
Government Services	14,498	0.451	6,539
Total Employment by Category Population ⁽⁴⁾			133,819
2024 Total Functional Population⁽⁵⁾			472,163

- 1) Source: Table B-1 for population and 2025 Woods & Poole for employment data (2024 estimate)
- 2) Source: Tables B-4 and B-5
- 3) The functional population is Collier baseline data (Item 1) multiplied by the functional resident coefficient (Item 2)
- 4) The total employment population by category is the sum of the employment figures from the nine employment categories (e.g., natural resources, construction, etc.)
- 5) The total functional population is the sum of the residential functional population and the employment functional population

Table B-7 presents the County’s annual functional population figures from 2010 through 2040, based on the 2024 functional population figure from Table B-6 and the annual population growth rates from the population figures previously presented in Table B-1.

**Table B-7
Countywide Functional Population (2010-2040)**

Year	Functional Population
2010	371,738
2011	376,536
2012	382,227
2013	386,222
2014	392,062
2015	399,792
2016	407,666
2017	416,073
2018	424,600
2019	433,302
2020	436,908
2021	445,641
2022	455,319
2023	464,202
2024	472,163
2025	479,505
2026	486,207
2027	493,002
2028	499,893
2029	506,879
2030	512,994
2031	518,213
2032	523,486
2033	528,813
2034	534,193
2035	538,950
2036	543,073
2037	547,227
2038	551,413
2039	555,632
2040	559,479

Source: Table B-6 for the 2024 functional population figure and Table B-1 for annual growth rates

Functional Residents by Land Use Category

When a wide range of land uses impact services, an estimate of that impact is needed for each land use. This section presents functional population estimates by residential and non-residential land uses.

Residential and Transient Land Uses

For residential and transient land uses, the functional population coefficients are displayed in **Table B-8**. The transient land uses include hotel/all suites hotel, motel, assisted living facility and nursing home. Secondary sources, such as Smith Travel Research (STR), Collier County Convention and Visitors Bureau, and the Florida Department of Elderly Affairs, are used to determine the occupancy rate for these land uses.

Non-Residential Land Uses

A similar approach is used to estimate functional residents for non-residential land uses. **Table B-9** reports basic assumptions and calculations, such as trips per unit, trips per employee, employees per impact unit, one-way trips per impact unit, worker hours, occupants per vehicle trip, visitors (patrons, etc.) per impact unit, visitor hours per trip, and days per week for non-residential land uses. The final column in the tables shows the estimated functional resident per unit by land use. These figures represent the demand component for the correctional facility impact fee program and are used in the calculation of the correctional facilities impact fee schedule.

Table B-8
Functional Residents for Residential and Transient Land Uses

Residential Land Use	Impact Unit	ITE LUC ⁽¹⁾	Residents/ Visitors Per Unit ⁽²⁾	Occupancy Rate ⁽³⁾	Adjusted Residents Per Unit ⁽⁴⁾	Visitor Hours at Place ⁽⁵⁾	Workers Per Unit ⁽⁶⁾	Work Day Hours ⁽⁷⁾	Days Per Week ⁽⁸⁾	Functional Residents Per Unit ⁽⁹⁾
RESIDENTIAL										
Single Family Detached										
- Less than 4,000 sf	du	210	2.53	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.74
- 4,000 sf or greater	du	210	3.12	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.15
Multi-Family	du	220-232	1.31	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.90
Mobile Home	du	240	1.92	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.32
Retirement Community - Detached (Single Family)	du	251	1.55	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.07
Retirement Community - Attached (Multi-Family)	du	252	0.79	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.54
TRANSIENT/ASSISTED, GROUP										
Hotel/All Suites Hotel	room	310/311	2.80	73%	2.04	12	0.41	9	7	1.17
Motel	room	320	2.80	73%	2.04	12	0.13	9	7	1.07
Assisted Living Facility	du	254	1.18	70%	0.82	20	0.62	9	7	0.92
Nursing Home	1,000 sf	620	2.76	70%	1.93	20	2.04	9	7	2.37
<p>(1) Land use code from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Handbook, 12th Edition</p> <p>(2) Estimates for the residential land uses, retirement community (detached), retirement community (attached) from Table B-2; estimate for hotel/motel from Collier County Overnight Visitor Economic Impact Report 2021. Estimate for assisted living facility is based on people per household figures for single family and multi-family homes, adjusted for the residents over 55 years of age based on information obtained from the 2017 National Household Travel Survey, prepared by the US Department of Transportation. Estimate used for nursing home is based on 1 person per bed and an average square footage of 363 per bed in a nursing home, based on information provided in the ITE Trip Generation Handbook, 11th Edition.</p> <p>(3) Source for hotel/motel occupancy: Collier County Convention and Visitors Bureau Annual Reports and Smith Travel Research (STR). Average occupancy rate for 2016 through 2021, excluding 2020. Source for nursing home/ALF occupancy rate is the Florida Department of Elderly Affairs Collier County Profile and the Agency for Health Care Administration. Average occupancy rate for 2021 through 2022.</p> <p>(4) Residents/visitors per unit (Item 2) times occupancy rate (Item 3)</p> <p>(5), (7), (8) Estimated</p> <p>(6) Adapted from ITE Trip Generation Handbook, 12th Edition</p> <p>(9) For residential land uses, calculated as residents per unit times the functional population coefficient (0.688 from Table B-5). For transient, assisted, and group land uses, calculated as $[(\text{Adjusted Residents per Unit} \times \text{Hours at Place} \times \text{Days per Week}) + (\text{Workers Per Unit} \times \text{Work Hours Per Day} \times \text{Days per Week})]$ (24 Hours per Day X 7 Days per Week)</p>										

Table B-9
Functional Residents for Non-Residential Land Uses

ITE LUC ⁽¹⁾	Land Use	Impact Unit	Trips Per Unit ⁽²⁾	Trips Per Employee ⁽³⁾	Employees Per Unit ⁽⁴⁾	One-Way Factor @ 50% ⁽⁵⁾	Worker Hours ⁽⁶⁾	Occupants Per Trip ⁽⁷⁾	Visitors ⁽⁸⁾	Visitor Hours Per Trip ⁽⁹⁾	Days Per Week ⁽¹⁰⁾	Functional Residents per Unit ⁽¹¹⁾
RECREATION:												
416	Campground/RV Park	site	1.04	n/a	1.20	0.52	9	1.64	0.00	1.50	7	0.45
420	Marina	boat berth	2.41	20.52	0.12	1.21	9	1.64	1.86	1.00	7	0.12
430	Golf Course	hole	30.38	20.52	1.48	15.19	9	1.64	23.43	0.25	7	0.80
n/a	Bundled Golf Course ⁽¹²⁾	hole	9.11	20.52	0.44	4.56	9	1.64	7.04	0.25	7	0.24
445	Movie Theater	1,000 sf	82.30	53.12	1.55	41.15	9	1.64	65.94	1.00	7	3.33
n/a	Dance Studio/Gymnastics	1,000 sf	21.33	n/a	2.00	10.67	9	1.64	15.50	1.50	7	1.72
INSTITUTIONS:												
520	Elementary School (Private)	student	2.27	22.50	0.10	1.14	9	1.11	1.17	2.00	5	0.10
522	Middle/Junior High School (Private)	student	2.09	23.41	0.09	1.05	9	1.11	1.08	2.00	5	0.09
525	High School (Private)	student	1.94	21.95	0.09	0.97	9	1.11	0.99	2.00	5	0.08
540/550	University/Junior College (7,500 or fewer students) (Private)	student	2.00	11.75	0.17	1.00	9	1.11	0.94	2.00	5	0.10
	University/Junior College (more than 7,500 students) (Private)	student	1.50	11.75	0.13	0.75	9	1.11	0.70	2.00	5	0.08
560	Church	1,000 sf	6.78	20.64	0.33	3.39	9	2.16	6.99	1.00	7	0.42
565	Day Care Center	1,000 sf	42.89	19.30	2.22	21.45	9	1.11	21.59	0.15	5	0.69
MEDICAL:												
610	Hospital	1,000 sf	10.70	3.57	3.00	5.35	9	1.44	4.70	1.00	7	1.32
OFFICE:												
710	General Office	1,000 sf	7.83	3.44	2.28	3.92	9	1.09	1.99	1.00	5	0.67
720	Medical Office/Clinic 10,000 sq ft or less	1,000 sf	23.83	11.78	2.02	11.92	9	1.44	15.14	1.00	5	0.99
	Medical Office/Clinic greater than 10,000 sq ft	1,000 sf	33.13	11.78	2.81	16.57	9	1.44	21.05	1.00	5	1.38
770	Business Park (Flex-Space)	1,000 sf	11.75	5.42	2.17	5.88	9	1.09	4.24	0.75	5	0.68
RETAIL:												
822	Retail 6,000 sfgla or less	1,000 sfgla	54.45	17.42	3.13	27.23	9	1.52	38.26	0.50	7	1.97
822	Retail 6,001 to 40,000 sfgla	1,000 sfgla	54.45	17.42	3.13	27.23	9	1.52	38.26	0.50	7	1.97
821	Retail 40,001 to 150,000 sfgla	1,000 sfgla	65.38	17.42	3.75	32.69	9	1.52	45.94	0.65	7	2.65
820	Retail greater than 150,000 sfgla	1,000 sfgla	36.39	17.42	2.09	18.20	9	1.52	25.57	1.00	7	1.85
840/841	New/Used Auto Sales	1,000 sf	24.58	11.84	2.08	12.29	9	1.52	16.60	1.00	7	1.47
849	Tire Superstore	1,000 sf	20.37	n/a	1.65	10.19	9	1.52	13.84	1.00	7	1.20
850	Supermarket	1,000 sf	93.03	41.17	2.26	46.52	9	1.52	68.45	0.50	7	2.27
851	Convenience Market (24 hour)	1,000 sf	670.85	243.38	2.76	335.43	9	1.52	507.09	0.20	7	5.26
862	Home Improvement Superstore	1,000 sf	30.65	n/a	2.50	15.33	9	1.52	20.80	1.00	7	1.80
880/881	Pharmacy with & without Drive-Thru	1,000 sf	103.23	69.17	1.49	51.62	9	1.52	76.97	0.35	7	1.68
890	Furniture Store	1,000 sf	6.22	6.98	0.89	3.11	9	1.52	3.84	0.50	7	0.41
SERVICES:												
911	Bank/Savings w/out Drive-Thru	1,000 sf	57.02	32.73	1.74	28.51	9	1.52	41.60	0.35	6	1.08
912	Bank/Savings w/Drive-Thru	1,000 sf	102.09	32.73	3.12	51.05	9	1.52	74.48	0.15	6	1.40

Table B-9 (continued)
Functional Residents for Non-Residential Land Uses

ITE LUC ⁽¹⁾	Land Use	Impact Unit	Trips Per Unit ⁽²⁾	Trips Per Employee ⁽³⁾	Employees Per Unit ⁽⁴⁾	One-Way Factor @ 50% ⁽⁵⁾	Worker Hours ⁽⁶⁾	Occupants Per Trip ⁽⁷⁾	Visitors ⁽⁸⁾	Visitor Hours Per Trip ⁽⁹⁾	Days Per Week ⁽¹⁰⁾	Functional Residents per Unit ⁽¹¹⁾
SERVICES:												
930	Fast Casual Restaurant	1,000 sf	225.89	21.26	10.63	112.95	9	2.30	249.16	0.35	7	7.62
931	Low-Turnover Restaurant	1,000 sf	84.91	17.90	4.74	42.46	9	2.30	92.92	1.00	7	5.65
932	High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurant	1,000 sf	101.53	21.26	4.78	50.77	9	2.30	111.99	0.75	7	5.29
934	Fast Food Restaurant w/Drive-Thru	1,000 sf	463.96	44.52	10.42	231.98	9	2.30	523.13	0.25	7	9.36
934.1	Fast Food w/Drive-Thru with Two Meals	1,000 sf	409.25	44.52	9.19	204.63	9	2.30	461.46	0.25	7	8.25
941	Quick Lube	service bay	40.00	16.00	2.50	20.00	9	1.52	27.90	0.50	7	1.52
944	Gas Station w/Convenience Market <2,000 sq ft	fuel pos.	172.01	275.78	0.62	86.01	9	1.52	130.12	0.20	7	1.32
945	Gas Station w/Convenience Market 2,000 sq ft or more	fuel pos.	207.44	241.21	0.86	103.72	9	1.52	156.79	0.20	7	1.63
947	Self-Service Car Wash	service bay	38.89	n/a	0.50	19.45	9	1.52	29.06	0.50	7	0.79
948	Automated Car Wash	1,000 sf	253.51	n/a	1.75	126.76	9	1.52	190.93	0.25	7	2.65
n/a	Luxury Auto Sales	1,000 sf	16.30	n/a	2.08	8.15	9	1.52	10.31	1.00	7	1.21
INDUSTRIAL:												
110	General Light Industrial	1,000 sf	3.60	4.02	0.90	1.80	9	1.08	1.04	1.00	5	0.27
140	Manufacturing	1,000 sf	4.27	2.67	1.60	2.14	9	1.08	0.71	1.00	5	0.45
150	Warehousing	1,000 sf	1.48	5.05	0.29	0.74	9	1.08	0.51	0.75	5	0.09
151	Mini-Warehouse	1,000 sf	1.37	61.90	0.02	0.69	9	1.08	0.73	0.75	7	0.03

Sources:

- 1) Land use code found in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Handbook, 12th Edition
- 2) Land uses and trip generation rates consistent with those included in the 2025 Transportation Impact Fee Update Study
- 3) Trips per employee from ITE Trip Generation Handbook, 12th Edition, when available
- 4) Trips per unit (Item 2) divided by trips per person (usually employee). When trips per person are not available, the employees per unit is estimated
- 5) Trips per unit (Item 2) multiplied by 50 percent
- 6) Estimated
- 7) Source: 2022 National Household Travel Survey (FHWA 2022)
- 8) [(One-way Trips/Unit X Occupants/Trip) - Employees]
- 9) Estimated
- 10) Estimated
- 11) [(Workers X Hours/Day X Days/Week) + (Visitors X Hours/Visit X Days/Week)]/(24 Hours x 7 Days)
- 12) The trip generation rate for "bundled golf course" is assessed at 30 percent of the trip generation rate for the "golf course" land use (LUC 430)