



September 6, 2011

# Appendix D - Transportation Impact Fee Analysis



# TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE ANALYSIS

PROVO CITY, UTAH

**FEBRUARY 2011**

**PREPARED BY:  
LEWIS YOUNG ROBERTSON &  
BURNINGHAM, INC.**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	2
GENERAL IMPACT FEE REQUIREMENTS.....	2
IMPACT FEE SERVICE AREAS AND DEMAND ANALYSIS .....	2
PROJECT COSTS AND FINANCING.....	4
CALCULATION OF TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEES.....	6
FORMULA FOR THE CALCULATION OF NON-STANDARD IMPACT FEES.....	6
EXPENDITURE OF IMPACT FEES .....	7
IMPACT FEE CERTIFICATION .....	7
SECTION II: OVERVIEW OF IMPACT FEES .....	8
REQUIRED ELEMENTS FOR THE ADOPTION OF IMPACT FEES .....	8
IMPACT FEE ENACTMENT NOTICING AND ADOPTION REQUIREMENTS.....	10
ACCOUNTING FOR, EXPENDITURE OF, AND REFUND OF IMPACT FEES .....	10
SECTION III: FUTURE IMPACTS FROM GROWTH .....	12
GROWTH IN AVERAGE DAILY TRIPS .....	12
SECTION IV: TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES.....	14
LEVEL OF SERVICE .....	14
GROWTH IN AVERAGE DAILY TRIPS .....	15
FUTURE CAPITAL PROJECT COSTS.....	15
FUTURE CAPITAL FINANCING COSTS.....	16
SECTION V: PROPORTIONATE SHARE ANALYSIS .....	17
CONSUMPTION OF ANY EXISTING CAPACITY .....	17
MANNER OF FINANCING PUBLIC FACILITIES .....	18
PROPOSED CREDITS OWED TO DEVELOPMENT.....	19
GROWTH-DRIVEN EXTRAORDINARY COSTS.....	19
PROPOSED TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE.....	19
APPENDIX A: DETAIL OF PROPOSED CAPITAL FACILITY NEEDS.....	21
APPENDIX A: DETAIL OF PROPOSED CAPITAL FACILITY NEEDS.....	21

## SECTION 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

Provo City (the City) has retained Lewis Young Robertson & Burningham, Inc. (LYRB) to evaluate the City's transportation impact fee to reflect changes to the *Provo City Master Transportation Plan (MTP)* and the *Provo City Transportation Capital Facilities Plan (CFP)*. LYRB has relied on the Master Plan prepared by Hales Engineering and the Capital Facilities Plan prepared by Civil Science in order to complete the updated impact fees. The recommended impact fee structure presented in this analysis has been prepared to satisfy Utah State Code Title 11, Chapter 36, Sections 1-5 and represents the maximum impact fee that the City may impose on new development activity as a condition of development approval. LYRB has strictly applied the requirements of the Utah Impact Fees Act in calculating the maximum equitable impact fees related to roadway facilities. The City will be required to use other revenue sources to fund projects identified in the CFP that constitute repair and replacement, cure any existing deficiencies, or maintain the existing level of service for current users.

This Executive Summary outlines the contents of the Impact Fee Analysis, meeting the requirements of Utah Code 11-36-201(5)(c). The contents of this summary will be further explained in the following chapters of this Analysis.

### GENERAL IMPACT FEE REQUIREMENTS

- ☐ Before imposing impact fees, each local political subdivision and private entity shall prepare an impact fee analysis.
- ☐ All entities shall provide written notice of intent to prepare (or their intent to contract for such services) an impact fee analysis.
- ☐ The analysis must include aspects outlined in UCA 11-36-201 and may include other considerations (found in UCA 11-36-202).
- ☐ The primary focus of this written analysis is conducting a proportionate share analysis which establishes a reasonable relationship between cost of facilities and new development.
- ☐ Impact fees should consider the unique requirements found in UC 11-36-202(7-9) relating to fire suppression vehicles, school districts or charter schools, road facilities, and law enforcement facilities.
- ☐ Upon completion of the impact fee analysis, the entity must comply with the noticing requirements found in the Utah Code and hold a public hearing.
- ☐ The analysis must be accompanied by an impact fee certification.
- ☐ The impact fees are adopted by enactment. In the case of the City this is accomplished by ordinance.
- ☐ Each municipality must comply with additional noticing requirements found in UCA 11-36-201 with regard to the impact fee enactment (ordinance).
- ☐ Impact fees do not take effect until 90 days after enactment of the ordinance.

This list is not inclusive of all legislative requirements. For complete requirements related to capital facility planning and impact fee legislation, please see Utah Code Title 11 Chapter 36.

LYRB has performed this analysis using capital project and engineering data, planning analysis and other information provided by Hales Engineering, Metroanalytics and Civil Science. The accuracy and correctness of this report is contingent upon the accuracy of the data provided to LYRB. This Impact Fee Analysis accurately evaluates the City's capital project needs by calculating the appropriate impact fees required to adequately fund growth-related capital needs. Any material deviations or changes in the capital projects or other relevant information provided by the City may be cause for this analysis to be modified.

### IMPACT FEE SERVICE AREAS AND DEMAND ANALYSIS

The proposed roadway impact fees will be assessed in one City-wide service area, which includes all areas included in the Provo City municipal boundaries. Should the City annex additional land into the City in the future, the impact fees will be assessed in said areas, and the fee calculations will be reviewed to ensure accurate sharing of costs throughout the service area. The impact fee analysis is based on future growth related to residential and commercial development as outlined in the *Provo City Master Transportation Plan (MTP)* and the *Provo City Transportation Capital Facilities Plan (CFP)*. The anticipated growth in population, households and

employment is shown in Table 1.1. As stated in the MTP, demographic projections are based on the Wasatch Front Regional Council's (WFRC) small area socioeconomic projections. It is recommended that the impact fees be updated at least every three to five years, as changes are made to the City's Land Use Plan, as growth rates change, or as capital facility plans change.

The City's population as of the last US Census (2000) was 105,200. The CFP estimates that the population will reach 133,600 in 2025 and 154,300 in 2040. Employment is projected to increase by nearly 19 percent from 2010 to 2025, reaching 75,600 by 2025 and 87,800 by 2040. Provo is a first-class city and a major economic hub for Utah County. Therefore, Provo accommodates a large amount of pass-through traffic that does not originate from within its municipal boundaries. The costs associated with the pass-through traffic must be borne by the community as a whole, and not by new development.

TABLE 1.1: PROJECTED POPULATION GROWTH

YEAR	POPULATION	HOUSEHOLDS	EMPLOYEES
2009	111,200	36,500	62,900
2010	112,600	36,900	63,700
2015	119,600	39,200	67,700
2025	133,600	43,700	75,600
2040	154,300	50,300	87,800

Source: Provo City Master Transportation Plan, p. 21

The proposed impact fees are based upon the projected growth in demand units (a combination of households and employees that drive the increased demand in ADTs) which are used as a means to quantify the impact that future users will have upon the City's system. The demand unit used in the calculation of the transportation impact fee is based upon each land use category's impact and road usage characteristics expressed in the number of average daily trips generated. Table 1.2 summarizes the projected annual increase in average daily trips.

TABLE 1.2: PROJECTED GROWTH IN AVERAGE DAILY TRIPS, 2010 - 2040

DEVELOPMENT TYPE	EMPLOYEE/HH GROWTH	BASIS	ITE LAND USE CODE	TRIPS GENERATED PER UNIT	INCREASED TRIPS GENERATED 2010-2040	BLDG SF GROWTH
Residential	13,400	per HH	210	17.67	236,778	
<b>Commercial</b>						
Office	19,762	per Employee	710	3.32	65,610	2,198,625
Retail	3,374	per 1,000 SF	820	42.92	22,233	518,017
Industrial	964	per Employee	130	3.34	3,220	297,082
<b>TOTAL</b>					<b>327,841</b>	<b>3,013,725</b>

Source: Hales Engineering; Institute of Traffic Engineers Trip Generation Manuals, 8th Edition; LYRB; HH = Household

The average daily trips per employee or household were then analyzed based on commercial building square feet to determine the average trips per 1,000 sq ft for each commercial land use type.

TABLE 1.3: CONVERSION OF AVERAGE DAILY TRIPS BY LAND USE TYPE

DEVELOPMENT TYPE	INCREASED TRIPS GENERATED 2010-2040	BLDG SF GROWTH	CONVERSION	TRIPS PER HH OR PER 1,000 SF
Residential	236,778		per HH	17.67
<b>Commercial</b>				
Office B	65,610	2,198,625	per 1,000 SF	29.84
Retail	22,233	518,017	per 1,000 SF	42.92
Industrial	3,220	297,082	per 1,000 SF	10.84
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>327,841</b>	<b>3,013,725</b>		

Source: Hales Engineering; Institute of Traffic Engineers Trip Generation Manuals, 8th Edition; LYRB; HH = Household

## PROJECT COSTS AND FINANCING

The proposed impact fees are comprised of the costs of future transportation capital projects as outlined in the *Provo City Master Transportation Plan* and the *Provo City Transportation Capital Facilities Plan*.

At the direction of the City, no principal and interest payments relating to future bond issuance are included in this analysis. Over the next six years, the City is planning to fund future projects on a pay-as-you-go basis using either impact fee revenues or general fund revenues. Future impact fee cash flows are projected based upon the annual schedule of capital on the measurable growth of future development.

Transportation impact fees are justified when trips are added to system-wide roadways that are at or nearing capacity or when new system-wide roads are needed to help meet the demands of new development. A buy-in component is contemplated for the roadways that have sufficient capacity to handle new growth while maintaining safe and acceptable levels of service. Capital projects required to maintain existing service levels, as a result of new growth, are considered impact fee eligible projects. According to City records, the existing transportation system is valued at \$84,194,637 based on original construction year costs.<sup>1</sup> The “net” book value of these assets as of 2010 is \$29,240,643. *The net book value is provided for informational purposes only and is not included in any calculations in this impact fees analysis.*

TABLE 1.4: VALUE OF EXISTING FACILITIES

ASSET TYPE	HISTORIC COST	NET BOOK VALUE
Addition	\$16,922,037	\$14,742,634
Improvement	\$18,086,064	\$3,582,898
Street	\$34,051,966	\$5,177,824
Other	\$15,134,571	\$5,737,297
Grand Total	\$84,194,637	\$29,240,653

Source: Provo City

The level of service maintained by the CFP is based on comparing existing traffic volumes against Livable Street Standards. Where the ratio of existing traffic volume versus existing Livable Street Standards exceeds 1.0, the traffic volume is determined to have exceeded its capacity. The CFP states that the Livable Street capacities were created based on the physical capacities of the roads, adjusted based on input from Provo City staff and a Citizen Advisory Committee (by approximately ten percent of the physical capacity of the streets - CFP p. 77) to more accurately reflect a reasonable level of service for Provo regarding the livability of a street.

TABLE 1.5: LEVEL OF SERVICE OBJECTIVES

DESCRIPTION OF TRAFFIC CONDITIONS	(VOLUME / LIVABLE STREET CAPACITY)
Traffic volumes are below livable street capacity	. 0.9
Traffic volumes are approaching livable street capacity	> 0.9 and 1.0
Traffic volumes exceed livable street capacity	> 1.0

Source: Hales Engineering Descriptions, based on Provo Transportation Master Plan (2000).

In order to determine the impact fee eligible costs, the CFP identified system improvements as well as projects related to curing existing deficiencies. To do this, the CFP compares existing traffic volumes against Livable Street Standards and identifies areas where street capacity surpasses these standards. Existing deficiencies were identified as shortfalls in the current system based on these standards and as roadways requiring improvement for the system to function properly to support the existing demand (CFP p. 16). Impact fee eligible costs were calculated based on the percent attributed to new growth. The CFP allocated these costs using four categories:

1. New Roadway – Developer Portion
2. New Roadway – Impact Fee Eligible
3. Roadway Widening – Impact Fee Eligible
4. Roadway Reconstruction – Impact Fee Eligible

<sup>1</sup> Total cost does not include rehab costs.

Developers will pay a portion of the costs associated with new roadway construction based on a base exaction equivalent to a 50-foot local road, as access to this level would be required for any development for emergency response. This equates to a 32' pavement width as shown in the Provo local road cross section standards. A portion of new roadway construction is considered impact fee eligible based on a 32' pavement width.

The CFP also states that roadway widening costs in Provo City will be paid by impact fees based on the determination that Provo is generally a developed city and future roadway widening will occur in areas which have little or no need for immediate adjacent development. Thus, new transportation users will be creating the need for roadway widening and therefore impact fees are justified to cover the cost of roadway widening. Roadway reconstruction costs in Provo City will be paid by impact fees under the following conditions: if the roadway widening is less than five feet in width then reconstruction of existing roadway surface will not be necessary; if roadway widening is greater than five feet then reconstruction of the existing asphalt is necessary. Future transportation capital facility projects are only applied to impact fees for those projects that are designed to maintain the existing level of service.

The list of the future, growth-related projects needed to accommodate the City through build-out is summarized in Tables 1.5 and 1.6 as provided by the Engineer. It should be noted that only system improvements (serving the City as a whole) have been included in the CFP and will be factored into the impact fee, and project improvements (serving only a specific area) will be funded by the developer or other means.

TABLE 1.6: TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL PROJECTS

YEAR	SYSTEM STREET IMPROVEMENT	FUNDING	% CUT-THROUGH	% NEW GROWTH	TOTAL COST
<b>Roadway Improvements</b>					
2015	Independence Ave	Impact Fee	5%	100%	\$486,472
2015	200 North	Impact Fee	0%	100%	\$312,605
2015	Seven Peaks Blvd Extension	Impact Fee	0%	100%	\$1,636,549
2015	Provo West Side Connector	Impact Fee	0%	100%	\$19,046,144
2015	Provo Northwest Connector	Impact Fee	0%	100%	\$17,738,133
2015	820 North	Impact Fee	1%	27%	\$1,219,090
2015	Independence Ave	Impact Fee	5%	100%	\$1,785,452
2015	500 North	Impact Fee	0%	100%	\$6,086,095
2015	Seven Peaks / 1450 East	Impact Fee	0%	100%	\$1,090,495
2015	1600 West	Impact Fee	1%	13%	\$3,513,013
2015	500 West	Impact Fee	2%	33%	\$8,579,847
2015	Freedom Blvd	Partial Funded	1%	20%	\$10,021,783
<b>Intersection Improvements</b>					
2015	Center Street: Traffic Signal	Impact Fee	0%	100%	\$185,000
2015	500 West: Traffic Signal	Impact Fee	1%	100%	\$185,000
2015	1860 South: Traffic Signal	Impact Fee	9%	21%	\$140,000

TABLE 1.7: TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL PROJECTS ALLOCATED TO NEW DEVELOPMENT

YEAR	SYSTEM STREET IMPROVEMENT	IMPACT FEE ELIGIBLE	CUT-THROUGH AND NEW DEV %	AMT ALLOCATED TO NEW DEVELOPMENT
<b>Roadway Improvements</b>				
2015	Independence Ave	\$486,472	95%	\$462,148
2015	200 North	\$312,605	100%	\$312,605
2015	Seven Peaks Blvd Extension	\$660,846	100%	\$660,846
2015	Provo West Side Connector	\$5,482,462	100%	\$5,482,462
2015	Provo Northwest Connector	\$5,122,512	100%	\$5,122,512
2015	820 North	\$1,219,090	26%	\$321,840
2015	Independence Ave	\$236,356	95%	\$224,538
2015	500 North	\$6,086,095	100%	\$6,086,095
2015	Seven Peaks / 1450 East	\$50,360	100%	\$50,360

YEAR	SYSTEM STREET IMPROVEMENT	IMPACT FEE ELIGIBLE	CUT-THROUGH AND NEW DEV %	AMT ALLOCATED TO NEW DEVELOPMENT
2015	1600 West	\$3,513,013	12%	\$434,735
2015	500 West	\$7,119,408	33%	\$2,325,673
2015	Freedom Blvd	\$10,021,783	20%	\$1,984,313
<b>Subtotal Roadway Improvements</b>		<b>\$40,311,002</b>		<b>\$23,468,128</b>
<b>Intersection Improvements</b>				
2015	Center Street: Traffic Signal	\$185,000	100%	\$185,000
2015	500 West: Traffic Signal	\$185,000	99%	\$183,150
2015	1860 South: Traffic Signal	\$140,000	19%	\$26,821
<b>Subtotal Intersection Improvements</b>		<b>\$510,000</b>		<b>\$394,971</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$40,821,002</b>		<b>\$23,863,099</b>

### CALCULATION OF TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEES

The Impact Fees Act allows a City to include in the impact fee calculations: “(i) the construction contract price; (ii) the cost of acquiring land, improvements, materials, and fixtures; (iii) the cost for planning, surveying, and engineering fees for services provided for and directly related to the construction of the system improvements; and (iv) debt service charges, if the (City) might use impact fees as a revenue stream...to finance the costs of the system improvements.”<sup>2</sup>

The estimated construction year cost of growth-related improvements to be funded by the City is approximately \$23,863,099, which will serve an additional 327,841 average daily trips, based on the projected growth estimated in the CFP (using ITE Trip Generation figures for number of trips generated by the various land use types). The total amount allocated to new development is offset by the existing impact fee fund balance of \$12,064, for a total of \$23,851,035 in capital costs related to new growth and included in the impact fee analysis. This results in a cost-per-trip of \$72.75, which is then applied to commercial development types within Provo to determine the impact fee per 1,000 sf. The detailed analysis of the calculation of the transportation impact fee is presented in Section V, and the resulting transportation impact fee schedule is shown below in Tables 1.8 and 1.9.

TABLE 1.8: CALCULATION OF THE FEE PER TRIP

DEVELOPMENT TYPE	INCREASED TRIPS GENERATED 2010-2040	AMT ALLOCATED TO NEW DEVELOPMENT	EXISTING IMPACT FEE FUND BALANCE	TOTAL IMPACT FEE ELIGIBLE COSTS	COST PER TRIP
TOTAL	327,841	\$23,863,099	\$12,064	\$23,851,035	\$72.75

Source: Hales Engineering; Institute of Traffic Engineers Trip Generation Manuals, 8th Edition HH = Household

TABLE 1.9: RECOMMENDED IMPACT FEE PER LAND USE CATEGORY

DEVELOPMENT TYPE	COST PER CRITICAL TRIP	BASIS	TRIPS PER UNIT	COST PER UNIT	PROJECTED REVENUES
Residential	\$72.75	per HH	17.67	\$1,285.53	\$17,226,039
<b>Commercial</b>					
Office/Other	\$72.75	per 1,000 SF	29.84	\$2,171.01	\$4,773,238
Retail	\$72.75	per 1,000 SF	42.92	\$3,122.51	\$1,617,514
Industrial	\$72.75	per 1,000 SF	10.84	\$788.48	\$234,244
<b>TOTAL</b>					<b>\$23,851,035</b>

### FORMULA FOR THE CALCULATION OF NON-STANDARD IMPACT FEES

Non-residential impact fees can be calculated by determining the development type square footage divided by 1,000 and then multiplied by the cost per unit based on the development classification as shown below.

$$(\text{DEVELOPMENT TYPE SQUARE FOOTAGE} / 1,000) \times \text{COST PER UNIT}$$

<sup>2</sup> 11-36-202(1)(c)



### **EXPENDITURE OF IMPACT FEES**

Legislation requires that impact fees should be spent or encumbered within six years after each impact fee is paid. The City's CFP has identified \$23,863,099 in capital costs necessary within the 2015 planning horizon. Impact fees collected in the next five to six years should be spent only on those projects outlined in the CFP as growth related costs.

### **IMPACT FEE CERTIFICATION**

LYRB certifies that the attached impact fee analysis includes only the costs for qualifying public facilities that are allowed under the Impact Fees Act that are projected to be incurred or encumbered within six years after each impact fee is paid; contains no cost for operation and maintenance of public facilities; offsets costs with grants or other alternate sources of payment; does not include costs for qualifying public facilities that will raise the level of service for the facilities, through impact fees, above the level of service that is supported by existing residents; and complies in each and every relevant respect with the Impact Fees Act.

DRAFT

## SECTION II: OVERVIEW OF IMPACT FEES

---

Impact fees are one-time fees charged to new development that serve to: (1) proportionally allocate the cost of future projects to the new development that they will be constructed to serve; and (2) allow new customers to buy in to excess capacity in the existing system. Therefore, the basic impact fee methodology is essentially a blending of future project costs and the unused value of the existing system. An impact fee is distinctly different from a tax, special assessment, building permit fee, hook-up fee, or other reasonable permit or application fee such as a conditional use or subdivision application fee.

Current legislation regarding the implementation of impact fees is set forth in the Impact Fees Act Utah Code Annotated §11-36-101 et seq. This legislation gives certainty to the ability of this City and other local governments to impose equitable impact fees on new development.

### REQUIRED ELEMENTS FOR THE ADOPTION OF IMPACT FEES

Local governments must follow the requirements established in the Impact Fees Act regarding the assessment of impact fees. The following documents must be prepared and completed before the City can legally commence public notice and adopt the proposed impact fees.

#### (1) NOTICING REQUIREMENTS

Before preparing the impact fee analysis, the local political subdivision or private entity must provide public notice by posting a public notice on the Utah Public Notice website (11-36-201(5)(b)(i)).

#### (2) CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN

The Impact Fees Act requires that a city, county or district serving a population of 5,000 or greater have a Capital Facilities Plan prepared in coordination and compliance with its General Plan that identifies:

- ☐ the demands that will be placed upon the existing and future facilities by new development; and,
- ☐ the proposed means that the City will use to accommodate the additional demand.<sup>3</sup>

The City meets this requirement with the Provo City Transportation Capital Facilities Plan adopted in 2011.

#### (3) WRITTEN IMPACT FEE AND PROPORTIONATE SHARE ANALYSIS

The written impact fee analysis is required under the Impact Fees Act and must identify the impacts placed on the facilities by development activity and how these impacts are reasonably related to the new development. The written impact fee analysis must include a proportionate share analysis, as described below, and clearly detail all cost components and the methodology used to calculate each impact fee. Specifically, an impact fee must:<sup>4</sup>

- ☐ identify the anticipated impact on or consumption of any existing capacity of a public facility by the anticipated development activity;
- ☐ identify the anticipated impact on system improvements required by the anticipated development activity to maintain the established level of service for each public facility;
- ☐ demonstrate how those anticipated impacts are reasonably related to the anticipated development activity;
- ☐ estimate the proportionate share of:
  - the costs for existing capacity that will be recouped; and
  - the costs of impacts on system improvements that are reasonably related to the new development activity (further discussed in UCA 11-36-201(5)(c)); and
- ☐ identify how the impact fee was calculated.

---

<sup>3</sup> 11-36-201(2)(c)

<sup>4</sup> 11-36-201(5)(a)

The Impact Fees Act requires that the written analysis include a proportionate share analysis which is intended to equitably divide the cost of proposed capital facilities between future and existing users relative to the benefit each group will receive from the improvement.

In analyzing whether or not the proportionate share of the costs of public facilities are reasonably related to the new development activity, the impact fee analysis should identify **if applicable**:

- ☐ the cost of each existing public facility that has excess capacity to serve the anticipated development resulting from the new development activity;
- ☐ the cost of system improvements for each public facility;
- ☐ other than impact fees, the manner of financing each public facility, such as user charges, special assessments, bonded indebtedness, general taxes, or federal grants;
- ☐ the relative extent to which development activity will contribute to financing the excess capacity of and system improvements for each existing public facility, by such means as user charges, special assessments, or payment from the proceeds of general taxes;
- ☐ the relative extent to which development activity will contribute to the cost of existing public facilities and system improvements in the future;
- ☐ the extent to which the development activity is entitled to a credit against impact fees because the development activity will dedicate system improvements or public facilities that will offset the demand for system improvements, inside or outside the proposed development;
- ☐ extraordinary costs, if any, in servicing the newly developed properties; and
- ☐ the time-price differential inherent in fair comparisons of amounts paid at different times.

**(4) EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Impact Fees Act requires that an Executive Summary of the impact fee analysis be prepared that provides a clear and concise overview of the proposed impact fee structure and assumptions used to calculate the maximum allowable impact fees.<sup>5</sup>

**(5) IMPACT FEE ENACTMENT**

The Impact Fee Enactment, referred to in this analysis as the Ordinance, must be adopted by the City Council to enact the proposed fees. The Ordinance may not impose a fee higher than the maximum legal fee defined in this written analysis, but the Ordinance may adopt a fee that is lower than the maximum fee defined in this analysis.<sup>6</sup> An impact fee enactment may not take effect until 90 days after it is enacted.

According to the Impact Fees Act, the enactment must contain:

- ☐ a provision establishing one or more service areas within which the local political subdivision or private entity calculates and imposes impact fees for various land use categories;
- ☐ a schedule of impact fees for each type of development activity that specifies the amount of the impact fee to be imposed for each type of system improvement; or
  - the formula that the local political subdivision or private entity, as the case may be, will use to calculate each impact fee;
- ☐ a provision authorizing the local political subdivision or private entity, as the case may be, to adjust the standard impact fee at the time the fee is charged to respond to:
  - unusual circumstances in specific cases; or
  - a request for a prompt and individualized impact fee review for:
    - the development activity of the state or a school district or charter school; and
    - an offset or credit for a public facility for which an impact fee has been or will be collected;
- ☐ a determination that that the impact fees are imposed fairly; and
- ☐ a provision governing calculation of the amount of the impact fee to be imposed on a particular development that permits adjustment of the amount of the fee based upon studies and data submitted by the developer; and

<sup>5</sup> 11-36-201(5)(d)

<sup>6</sup> 11-36-202(1)(a-b)

- allows a developer, including a school district or charter school, to receive a credit against or proportionate reimbursement of an impact fee if the developer:
  - dedicates land for a system improvement;
  - builds and dedicates some or all of a system improvement; or
  - dedicates a public facility that the local political subdivision or private entity and the developer agree will reduce the need for a system improvement.
- a provision in an impact fee enactment that provides for fee exemption based on related development activity.

**IMPACT FEE ENACTMENT NOTICING AND ADOPTION REQUIREMENTS**

As stipulated in UCA 11-36-202, the actual adoption of an impact fee must be done by Ordinance. This Ordinance must include the provisions described above and must be reviewed during a public hearing. A reasonable notice of the public hearing must be posted in three public places or on the entity’s website *and* published in a local newspaper at least ten (10) days before the actual hearing. A copy of the proposed Impact Fee Ordinance, the Written Impact Fee Analysis, Executive Summary, and Capital Facilities Plan must be made available to the public during the 10-day noticing period for public review and inspection. Copies of these four items must also be submitted to the registered agent of the Utah Home Builders Association, the registered agent of the Utah Association of Realtors and the registered agent of the Utah Chapter of the Associated General Contractors of America. In addition, a written certification must accompany the impact fee analysis.

At the end of the 10-day noticing period, a public hearing shall be held at which point the City Council may adopt, amend and adopt, or reject the Impact Fee Ordinance and proposed fee schedule. Following the adoption, Utah Code Sections 10-3-711 and 712 require that a summary of the Ordinance be published in order for it to become effective.

**ACCOUNTING FOR, EXPENDITURE OF, AND REFUND OF IMPACT FEES**

**ACCOUNTING FOR IMPACT FEES**

The Impact Fees Act requires that any entity that imposes impact fees establish an interest bearing ledger account for each type of public facility for which an impact fee is collected. All impact fee receipts must be deposited into the appropriate account. Any interest earned in each account must remain in the corresponding account. At the end of each fiscal year, the City must prepare a report in a format developed by the state auditor on each fund or account showing the source and amount of all monies collected, earned, expended or received by each account. Once the City has received payment, the impact fees will be deposited into each specific Impact Fee Fund and used to defray capital costs as identified herein and in the CFP.

The current balance in Provo City’s Transportation Impact Fees Account is: \$12,064.<sup>7</sup>

**EXPENDITURE OF IMPACT FEES**

The City may only expend impact fees for system improvements identified in the Capital Facilities Plan.<sup>8</sup> All funds collected must be spent or encumbered within six years of collection or the City must provide an extraordinary or compelling reason why the fees must be held longer and provide an ultimate date by which the impact fees collected will be expended.<sup>9</sup> The improvements that are financed through impact fees must be owned and operated by the City or another local public entity with which the City has contracted or will contract for services and improvements that will be operated on the City’s behalf.

**REFUNDING OF IMPACT FEES**

The City is required to refund any impact fees collected, plus interest earned since their collection, if: 1) a developer who has paid impact fees does not proceed with the development activity and has filed a written

<sup>7</sup> Based on information provided by Provo City, January 2011.

<sup>8</sup> 11-36-302(1(a))

<sup>9</sup> 11-36-302(2(b))



request for a refund; 2) the fees have not been spent or encumbered within the six-year period; or 3) no impact has resulted.<sup>10</sup>

Impact fees serve three main purposes: (1) proportionally allocate the costs of future projects to the new development that they will be constructed to serve; (2) allow new customers to purchase equity in the existing system capacity; and (3) perpetuate the historic level of service paid for growth-related facilities.

DRAFT

---

<sup>10</sup> 11-36-303(1-3)

## SECTION III: FUTURE IMPACTS FROM GROWTH

The proposed impact fees will be assessed in one City-wide service area, which includes all areas included in the Provo City boundaries. Should the City annex additional land into the City in the future, the impact fees will be assessed in said areas, and the fee calculations will be reviewed to ensure accurate sharing of costs throughout the service area. The impact fee analysis is based on future growth related to residential and commercial development as outlined in the *Provo City Master Transportation Plan (MTP)* and the *Provo City Transportation Capital Facilities Plan (CFP)*. The anticipated growth in population, households and employment is shown in Table 3.1. As stated in the MTP, demographic projections are based on Wasatch Front Regional Council's (WFRC) small area socioeconomic projections. It is recommended that the impact fees be updated at least every three to five years, as changes are made to the City's Land Use Plan, or as growth rates change.

The City's population as of the last US Census (2000) was 105,200. The CFP estimates the population needed to reach 133,600 in 2025 and 154,300 in 2040. Employment is projected to increase by nearly 19 percent from 2010 to 2025, reaching 75,600 by 2025. The demographic data summarized below serve as inputs to determine the additional average daily trips (ADTs) related to each land use category.

TABLE 3.1: PROJECTED POPULATION GROWTH

YEAR	POPULATION	HOUSEHOLDS	EMPLOYEES
2009	111,200	36,500	62,900
2010	112,600	36,900	63,700
2015	119,600	39,200	67,700
2025	133,600	43,700	75,600
2040	154,300	50,300	87,800

Source: Provo City Transportation Master Plan, p. 21

### GROWTH IN AVERAGE DAILY TRIPS

The proposed impact fees are based upon the projected growth in demand units which are used as a means to quantify the impact that future users will have upon the City's system. The demand unit used in the calculation of the transportation impact fee is based upon each land use category's impact and road usage characteristics expressed in the number of average daily trips generated. The existing and future average daily trips used in this analysis are based upon information gathered from the Institute of Traffic Engineers *Trip Generation Manuals, 8<sup>th</sup> Edition*. Table 3.2 summarizes the projected annual increase in average daily trips.

TABLE 3.2: PROJECTED GROWTH IN AVERAGE DAILY TRIPS

DEVELOPMENT TYPE	EMPLOYEE/ HH GROWTH	BLDG SF GROWTH	BASIS	ITE LAND USE CODE	TRIPS GENERATED PER UNIT	INCREASED TRIPS GENERATED 2010-2040
Residential	13,400		per HH	210	17.67	236,778
<b>Commercial</b>						
Office Building	19,762	2,198,625	per Employee	710	3.32	65,610
Retail	3,374	518,017	per 1,000 SF	820	42.92	22,233
Industrial	964	297,082	per Employee	130	3.34	3,220
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>3,013,725</b>				<b>327,841</b>

Source: Hales Engineering; Institute of Traffic Engineers Trip Generation Manuals, 8th Edition; LYRB; HH = Household

The average daily trips per employee or household were analyzed based on commercial building square feet to determine the average trips per 1,000 sq ft for each commercial land use type, as shown in Table 3.3.



TABLE 3.3: CONVERSION OF AVERAGE DAILY TRIPS BY LAND USE TYPE

DEVELOPMENT TYPE	INCREASED TRIPS GENERATED 2010-2040	BLDG SF GROWTH	CONVERSION	TRIPS PER HH OR PER 1,000 SF
Residential	236,778		per HH	17.67
<b>Commercial</b>				
Office Building	65,610	2,198,625	per 1,000 SF	29.84
Retail	22,233	518,017	per 1,000 SF	42.92
Industrial	3,220	297,082	per 1,000 SF	10.84
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>327,841</b>	<b>3,013,725</b>		

*Source: Hales Engineering; Institute of Traffic Engineers Trip Generation Manuals, 8th Edition; LYRB; HH = Household*

DRAFT

## SECTION IV: TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

### LEVEL OF SERVICE

Impact fees cannot be used to finance an increase in the level of service to current or future users of capital improvements. Therefore, it is important to maintain the levels of service within the City that have historically been maintained for the existing development in the City. The future capital projects have been designed to maintain a reasonable level of service for future development, and repair and replacement projects have been excluded from the Capital Facilities Plan and impact fees.

The level of service maintained by the CFP is based on comparing existing traffic volumes against Livable Street Standards. Where the ratio of existing traffic volume versus existing Livable Street Standards exceeds 1.0, the traffic volume is determined to have exceeded its capacity. The CFP states that the Livable Street capacities were created based on the physical capacities of the roads, adjusted based on input from Provo City staff and a Citizen Advisory Committee (by approximately ten percent of the physical capacity of the streets, CFP p. 77) to more accurately reflect a reasonable level of service for Provo regarding the livability of a street.

TABLE 4.1: LEVEL OF SERVICE OBJECTIVES

DESCRIPTION OF TRAFFIC CONDITIONS	(VOLUME / LIVABLE STREET CAPACITY)
Traffic volumes are below livable street capacity	. 0.9
Traffic volumes are approaching livable street capacity	> 0.9 and 1.0
Traffic volumes exceed livable street capacity	> 1.0

Source: Hales Engineering Descriptions, based on Provo Transportation Master Plan (2000).

In order to determine the impact fee eligible costs, the CFP identified system improvements as well as projects related to curing existing deficiencies. To do this, the CFP compares existing traffic volumes against Livable Street Standards and identifies areas where street capacity surpasses these standards. Existing deficiencies were identified as shortfalls in the current system based on these standards and as roadways requiring improvement for the system to function properly to support the existing demand (CFP p. 16). Impact fee eligible costs were calculated based on the percent attributed to new growth. The CFP allocated these costs using four categories:

1. New Roadway – Developer Portion
2. New Roadway – Impact Fee Eligible
3. Roadway Widening – Impact Fee Eligible
4. Roadway Reconstruction – Impact Fee Eligible

Developers will pay a portion of the costs associated with new roadway construction based on a base exaction equivalent to a 50-foot local road, as access to this level would be required for any development for emergency response. This equates to a 32' pavement width as shown in the Provo local road cross section standards. A portion of new roadway construction is considered impact fee eligible based on a 32' pavement width.

The CFP also states that roadway widening costs in Provo City will be paid by impact fees based on the determination that Provo is generally a developed city and future roadway widening will occur in areas which have little or no need for immediate adjacent development. Thus, new transportation users will be creating the need for roadway widening and therefore impact fees are justified to cover the cost of roadway widening. Roadway reconstruction costs in Provo City will be paid by impact fees under the following conditions: if the roadway widening is less than five feet in width then reconstruction of existing roadway surface will not be necessary; if more the roadway widening is greater than five feet then reconstruction of the existing asphalt is necessary. Future transportation capital facility projects are only applied to impact fees for those projects that are designed to maintain the existing level of service. .

## GROWTH IN AVERAGE DAILY TRIPS

The proposed impact fees are based upon the projected growth in demand units which are used as a means to quantify the impact that future users will have upon the City's system. Table 4.2 summarizes the projected annual increase in average daily trips.

TABLE 4.2: PROJECTED GROWTH IN AVERAGE DAILY TRIPS

DEVELOPMENT TYPE	BASIS	ITE LAND USE CODE	TRIPS GENERATED PER UNIT	INCREASED TRIPS GENERATED 2010-2040
Residential	per HH	210	17.67	236,778
<b>Commercial</b>				
Office Building	per Employee	710	3.32	65,610
Retail	per 1000 sf	820	42.92	22,233
Industrial	per Employee	130	3.34	3,220
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>327,841</b>

Source: Hales Engineering; Institute of Traffic Engineers Trip Generation Manuals, 8th Edition; LYRB; HH = Household

## FUTURE CAPITAL PROJECT COSTS

The CFP estimates that \$71.82 million dollars (2010 dollars) of transportation improvements are needed to meet Provo City Livable Street Standard requirements in 2040. A total of approximately \$40.8 million of growth-related capital project has been identified within the next five-year period. \$23.8 million of these facilities are directly related to new development activity. The Impact Fees Act allows a City to include the costs of transportation facilities, defined as "streets or roads that have been designated on an officially adopted subdivision plat, transportation plan, or general plan of a political subdivision, together with all necessary appurtenances"<sup>11</sup> in the calculation of the impact fee. The list of the future projects needed to accommodate the City through build-out is summarized in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 as provided by the Engineer. It should be noted that only system improvements (serving the City as a whole) have been included in the CFP and will be factored into the impact fee, and project improvements (serving only a specific area) will be funded by the developer or other means. For a detailed list of the proposed capital improvements related to new growth, see Appendix A.

TABLE 4.3: TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL PROJECTS

YEAR	STREET IMPROVEMENT	FUNDING	% CUT-THROUGH	% NEW GROWTH	TOTAL COST
<b>Roadway Improvements</b>					
2015	Independence Ave	Impact Fee	5%	100%	\$486,472
2015	200 North	Impact Fee	0%	100%	\$312,605
2015	Seven Peaks Blvd Extension	Impact Fee	0%	100%	\$1,636,549
2015	Provo West Side Connector	Impact Fee	0%	100%	\$19,046,144
2015	Provo Northwest Connector	Impact Fee	0%	100%	\$17,738,133
2015	820 North	Impact Fee	1%	27%	\$1,219,090
2015	Independence Ave	Impact Fee	5%	100%	\$1,785,452
2015	500 North	Impact Fee	0%	100%	\$6,086,095
2015	Seven Peaks / 1450 East	Impact Fee	0%	100%	\$1,090,495
2015	1600 West	Impact Fee	1%	13%	\$3,513,013
2015	500 West	Impact Fee	2%	33%	\$8,579,847
2015	Freedom Blvd	Partial Funded	1%	20%	\$10,021,783
<b>Intersection Improvements</b>					
2015	Center Street: Traffic Signal	Impact Fee	0%	100%	\$185,000
2015	500 West: Traffic Signal	Impact Fee	1%	100%	\$185,000
2015	1860 South: Traffic Signal	Impact Fee	9%	21%	\$140,000

<sup>11</sup> 11-36-102 (14)(a)

TABLE 4.4: TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL PROJECTS ALLOCATED TO NEW DEVELOPMENT

YEAR	STREET IMPROVEMENT	IMPACT FEE ELIGIBLE	CUT-THROUGH AND NEW DEV %	AMT ALLOCATED TO NEW DEVELOPMENT
<b>Roadway Improvements</b>				
2015	Independence Ave	\$486,472	95%	\$462,148
2015	200 North	\$312,605	100%	\$312,605
2015	Seven Peaks Blvd Extension	\$660,846	100%	\$660,846
2015	Provo West Side Connector	\$5,482,462	100%	\$5,482,462
2015	Provo Northwest Connector	\$5,122,512	100%	\$5,122,512
2015	820 North	\$1,219,090	26%	\$321,840
2015	Independence Ave	\$236,356	95%	\$224,538
2015	500 North	\$6,086,095	100%	\$6,086,095
2015	Seven Peaks / 1450 East	\$50,360	100%	\$50,360
2015	1600 West	\$3,513,013	12%	\$434,735
2015	500 West	\$7,119,408	33%	\$2,325,673
2015	Freedom Blvd	\$10,021,783	20%	\$1,984,313
<b>Subtotal Roadway Improvements</b>		<b>\$40,311,002</b>		<b>\$23,468,128</b>
<b>Intersection Improvements</b>				
2015	Center Street: Traffic Signal	\$185,000	100%	\$185,000
2015	500 West: Traffic Signal	\$185,000	99%	\$183,150
2015	1860 South: Traffic Signal	\$140,000	19%	\$26,821
<b>Subtotal Intersection Improvements</b>		<b>\$510,000</b>		<b>\$394,971</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$40,821,002</b>		<b>\$23,863,099</b>

**FUTURE CAPITAL FINANCING COSTS**

The Impact Fees Act allows for the costs related to the financing of future capital projects, including costs of issuance and interest costs, to be legally included in the impact fee. This allows the City to finance and construct infrastructure as it is needed for new development and later repay the debt from impact fee revenues for the costs of principal and interest.

At the direction of the City, no principal and interest payments relating to future bond issuance are included in this analysis as the City prefers a pay-as-you-go approach, and has not yet determined the extent of debt financing or how it will be employed.

## SECTION V: PROPORTIONATE SHARE ANALYSIS

The written impact fee analysis is required under the Impact Fees Act and must identify the impacts placed on the facilities by development activity and how these impacts are reasonably related to the new development. The written impact fee analysis must include a proportionate share analysis, as described below, and clearly detail all cost components and the methodology used to calculate each impact fee. Specifically, an impact fee must:<sup>12</sup>

1. identify the anticipated impact on or consumption of any existing capacity of a public facility by the anticipated development activity;
2. identify the anticipated impact on system improvements required by the anticipated development activity to maintain the established level of service for each public facility;
3. demonstrate how those anticipated impacts are reasonably related to the anticipated development activity;
4. estimate the proportionate share of:
  - a. the costs for existing capacity that will be recouped; and
  - b. the costs of impacts on system improvements that are reasonably related to the new development activity; and
5. identify how the impact fee was calculated.

Items 1-3 are identified in the previous sections. This section addresses items 4-5, or the Proportionate Share Analysis. The Impact Fees Act requires that the written analysis include a proportionate share analysis which is intended to equitably divide the cost of proposed capital facilities between future and existing users relative to the benefit each group will receive from the improvement.

In analyzing whether or not the proportionate share of the costs of public facilities are reasonably related to the new development activity, the impact fee analysis should identify **if applicable**:

- ☐ the cost of each existing public facility that has excess capacity to serve the anticipated development resulting from the new development activity;
- ☐ the cost of system improvements for each public facility;
- ☐ other than impact fees, the manner of financing each public facility, such as user charges, special assessments, bonded indebtedness, general taxes, or federal grants;
- ☐ the relative extent to which development activity will contribute to financing the excess capacity of and system improvements for each existing public facility by such means as user charges, special assessments, or payment from the proceeds of general taxes;
- ☐ the relative extent to which development activity will contribute to the cost of existing public facilities and system improvements in the future;
- ☐ the extent to which the development activity is entitled to a credit against impact fees because the development activity will dedicate system improvements or public facilities that will offset the demand for system improvements, inside or outside the proposed development;
- ☐ extraordinary costs, if any, in servicing the newly developed properties; and
- ☐ the time-price differential inherent in fair comparisons of amounts paid at different times.

### CONSUMPTION OF ANY EXISTING CAPACITY

Transportation impact fees are justified when trips are added to system-wide roadways that are at or nearing capacity or when new system-wide roadways are needed to meet the demands of growth. A buy-in component is contemplated for the roadways that have sufficient capacity to handle new growth while maintaining safe and acceptable levels of service. According to City records, the existing transportation system is valued at \$84,194,637 based on original construction year costs.<sup>13</sup> The net book value of these assets as of 2010 is \$29,240,643. Although not included in the calculation of impact fees, the historic cost and net book values have been included herein for informational purposes only.

<sup>12</sup> 11-36-201(5)(a)

<sup>13</sup> Total does not include rehab improvement costs.

TABLE 5.1: EXISTING TRANSPORTATION ASSETS

ASSET TYPE	HISTORIC COST	NET BOOK VALUE
Addition	\$16,922,037	\$14,742,634
Improvement	\$18,086,064	\$3,582,898
Street	\$34,051,966	\$5,177,824
Other	\$15,134,571	\$5,737,297
Grand Total	\$84,194,637	\$29,240,653

**MANNER OF FINANCING PUBLIC FACILITIES**

The City has funded its existing capital infrastructure through a combination of different revenue sources, including general fund revenues, bond proceeds, developer exactions, impact fees, and grants. This analysis has removed any projects funded from federal grants and donations from non-resident citizens to ensure that none of those infrastructure items are included in the level of service. Removing projects funded with federal grant monies shows that the City’s existing infrastructure has been funded by the City’s existing residents through general fund revenues, user fees, and other means. Funding the future improvements through impact fees places a similar burden upon future users as that which has been placed upon existing users and assures that existing users do not subsidize growth related improvements.

The City’s objective is to fairly and equitably recover the costs of new growth-related infrastructure from new development. This implies that new growth will be expected to pay its fair share of the costs that will be incurred for improvements that serve new growth. In accordance with this philosophy, the following explains the pros and cons of the funding mechanisms that are available to the City to pay for new infrastructure.

**PROPERTY TAX REVENUES OR GENERAL FUND REVENUES**

Ad valorem taxes such as property taxes are a stable source of revenue. However, ad valorem taxes allocate new system costs to new development based upon property valuation rather than true impact. In addition, the costs of new infrastructure would be borne by existing users who have already contributed to the existing infrastructure through their property taxes and other fees. This would place an unfair burden upon existing users who have already paid for existing infrastructure and will continue to subsidize growth.

Other general fund revenue sources include Class “C” road funds which are distributed based on both population and road miles. These funds, however, are generally used for operations and maintenance, rather than for capital construction costs.

Sales tax revenues can be used for road costs and are distributed to cities based on both population and point of sale. They are often used to backstop a variety of bonds, and cities need to carefully evaluate how they commit these funds.

**USER FEES**

Like property tax and General Fund revenues, user fees require existing users to subsidize new growth since existing users have already contributed to infrastructure.

**SPECIAL ASSESSMENT AREA BONDS**

Special Assessment Area (SAA) bonds are an acceptable mechanism to recover the costs of growth-related infrastructure from new users by means of placing an assessment upon a property user’s land. SAA bonds are a stable funding mechanism but have some limitations. One limitation is that assessments are typically based upon lot size rather than by a measure of the true impact that a user will have. Special Assessment Areas generally work best in specific geographic areas, and would be difficult to establish and administer when parcels are spread throughout a City.

**IMPACT FEES**

Impact fees have become an ideal mechanism for funding growth-related infrastructure. Analysis is required to accurately assess the true impact of a particular user upon the City infrastructure and to prevent existing users from subsidizing new growth.

It is the opinion of this analysis that given the historic methods of funding existing infrastructure and the intent of the City to equitably allocate the costs of growth-related infrastructure in accordance with the true impact that a user will place upon the transportation system, impact fees can be used to fund applicable growth-related infrastructure planned by the City.

**PROPOSED CREDITS OWED TO DEVELOPMENT**

Provo City has \$5,510,000 of outstanding debt on its 2006 Road Bonds, as well as \$29,984 of unamortized debt for road bonds – both of which are general obligation bonds. None of the road bond funds were spent for capital projects included in the calculation of impact fees. There are no credits due for the general obligation bonds.

To the extent that a developer constructs improvement(s) included in the CFP, the developer will be eligible for an impact fee credit or reimbursement. This situation does not apply to developer exactions, minimum standards required by the developer or project improvements.

**GROWTH-DRIVEN EXTRAORDINARY COSTS**

The City does not anticipate any extraordinary costs necessary to provide services to future development.

**PROPOSED TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE**

The transportation impact fees proposed in this chapter will be assessed to all areas within the City’s service area. The impact fee is based upon the portion of costs associated with future infrastructure necessary to serve new growth. The methodology used to calculate the transportation fee considers the total average daily trips that will be generated within the City by the development that will take place on the remaining undeveloped land within the City. The total growth related construction expenses are then spread equally across the total future trips (327,841) and a cost per trip is determined (see Table 5.2). Each land use category is then charged the impact fee based on the trips generated per dwelling unit (for residential land) and per 1,000 square feet (for non-residential land). The trips generation statistics were based on the Capital Facilities Plan and the *ITE Trip Generation Manuals, 8<sup>th</sup> Edition*, and are widely used among engineers for similar purposes. The total cost per trip is shown in Table 5.2 and is the basis for the maximum impact fees per land-use category shown in Table 5.3.

The estimated construction year cost of growth-related improvements to be funded by the City is approximately \$23,863,099, which will serve an additional 327,841 average daily trips, based on the projected growth estimated in the CFP (using ITE Trip Generation figures for number of trips generated by the various land use types). The total amount allocated to new development is offset by the existing impact fee fund balance of \$12,064, for a total of \$23,851,035 in capital costs related to new growth and included in the impact fee analysis. This results in a cost per trip of \$72.75, which is then applied to commercial development types within Provo to determine the impact fee per 1,000 square feet.

TABLE 5.2: CALCULATION OF THE FEE PER TRIP

DEVELOPMENT TYPE	INCREASED TRIPS GENERATED 2010-2040	AMT ALLOCATED TO NEW DEVELOPMENT	EXISTING IMPACT FEE FUND BALANCE	TOTAL IMPACT FEE ELIGIBLE COSTS	COST PER TRIP
TOTAL	327,841	\$23,863,099	\$12,064	\$23,851,035	\$72.75

Source: Hales Engineering; Institute of Traffic Engineers Trip Generation Manuals, 8th Edition HH = Household

TABLE 5.3: RECOMMENDED IMPACT FEE PER LAND USE CATEGORY



DEVELOPMENT TYPE	COST PER CRITICAL TRIP	BASIS	TRIPS PER UNIT	COST PER UNIT	PROJECTED REVENUES
Residential	\$72.75	per HH	17.67	\$1,285.53	\$17,226,039
<b>Commercial</b>					
Office/Other	\$72.75	per 1,000 SF	29.84	\$2,171.01	\$4,773,238
Retail	\$72.75	per 1,000 SF	42.92	\$3,122.51	\$1,617,514
Industrial	\$72.75	per 1,000 SF	10.84	\$788.48	\$234,244
<b>TOTAL</b>					<b>\$23,851,035</b>

DRAFT

## APPENDIX A: DETAIL OF PROPOSED CAPITAL FACILITY NEEDS

TABLE A.1: TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL PROJECTS

YEAR	STREET IMPROVEMENT	FUNDING	% CUT-THROUGH	% NEW GROWTH	TOTAL COST
<b>Roadway Improvements</b>					
2015	Independence Ave: Construct a 3 lane collector	Impact Fee	5%	100%	\$486,472
2015	200 North: Construct a 2 lane collector	Impact Fee	0%	100%	\$312,605
2015	Seven Peaks Blvd Ext: Construct a 3 lane collector	Impact Fee	0%	100%	\$1,636,549
2015	Provo West Side Connector: Construct a 5 lane arterial	Impact Fee	0%	100%	\$19,046,144
2015	Provo Northwest Connector: Construct a 5 lane arterial	Impact Fee	0%	100%	\$17,738,133
2015	820 North: Widen from 2 to 3 lane collector, widen bridge	Impact Fee	1%	27%	\$1,219,090
2015	Independence Ave: Construct 3-lane collector	Impact Fee	5%	100%	\$1,785,452
2015	Independence Ave: Re-stripe from 2 to 3 lane collector	Impact Fee	5%	87%	\$3,278
2015	500 North: Construct new 3-lane collector	Impact Fee	0%	100%	\$6,086,095
2015	Seven Peaks / 1450 East: Construct new 2 lane collector	Impact Fee	0%	100%	\$1,090,495
2015	1600 West: Widen/re-stripe from 2 to 3 lane collector	Impact Fee	1%	13%	\$3,513,013
2015	500 West: Widen/re-stripe from 2 to 3 lane collector	Impact Fee	2%	33%	\$8,579,847
2015	Freedom Blvd: Grade Separate Freedom over Commuter Rail	Partial Funded	1%	20%	\$10,021,783
<b>Intersection Improvements</b>					
2015	Center Street: Traffic Signal	Impact Fee	0%	100%	\$185,000
2015	500 West: Traffic Signal	Impact Fee	1%	100%	\$185,000
2015	1860 South: Traffic Signal	Impact Fee	9%	21%	\$140,000

TABLE A.2: TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL PROJECTS ALLOCATED TO NEW DEVELOPMENT

YEAR	STREET IMPROVEMENT	IMPACT FEE ELIGIBLE	CUT-THROUGH AND NEW DEV %	AMT ALLOCATED TO NEW DEVELOPMENT
<b>Roadway Improvements</b>				
2015	Independence Ave: Construct a 3 lane collector	\$486,472	95%	\$462,148
2015	200 North: Construct a 2 lane collector	\$312,605	100%	\$312,605
2015	Seven Peaks Blvd Ext: Construct a 3 lane collector	\$660,846	100%	\$660,846
2015	Provo West Side Connector: Construct a 5 lane arterial	\$5,482,462	100%	\$5,482,462
2015	Provo Northwest Connector: Construct a 5 lane arterial	\$5,122,512	100%	\$5,122,512
2015	820 North: Widen from 2 to 3 lane collector, widen bridge	\$1,219,090	26%	\$321,840
2015	Independence Ave: Construct 3-lane collector	\$236,356	95%	\$224,538
2015	500 North: Construct new 3-lane collector	\$6,086,095	100%	\$6,086,095
2015	Seven Peaks / 1450 East: Construct new 2 lane collector	\$50,360	100%	\$50,360
2015	1600 West: Widen/re-stripe from 2 to 3 lane collector	\$3,513,013	12%	\$434,735
2015	500 West: Widen/re-stripe from 2 to 3 lane collector	\$7,119,408	33%	\$2,325,673
2015	Freedom Blvd: Grade Separate Freedom over Commuter Rail	\$10,021,783	20%	\$1,984,313



YEAR	STREET IMPROVEMENT	IMPACT FEE ELIGIBLE	CUT-THROUGH AND NEW DEV %	AMT ALLOCATED TO NEW DEVELOPMENT
<b>Subtotal Roadway Improvements</b>		<b>\$40,311,002</b>		<b>\$23,468,128</b>
<b>Intersection Improvements</b>				
2015	Center Street: Traffic Signal	\$185,000	100%	\$185,000
2015	500 West: Traffic Signal	\$185,000	99%	\$183,150
2015	1860 South: Traffic Signal	\$140,000	19%	\$26,821
<b>Subtotal Intersection Improvements</b>		<b>\$510,000</b>		<b>\$394,971</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$40,821,002</b>		<b>\$23,863,099</b>

DRAFT