



CITY OF TWIN FALLS
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Thursday, January 23, 2014 – 11:30p.m.
City Council Chambers
305 3rd Avenue East – Twin Falls, Idaho

DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

John Bonnett Chairman	Kent Collins	Jeff Gooding	Tony Hughes	Brent Jussel Vice-Chairman	Dusty Tenney	Doug Vollmer	Brad Wills
-----------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	----------------	----------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	---------------

CITY STAFF: Humble, Rice, Spendlove, Strickland

MEMBER ATTENDANCE: Bonnett, Collins, Gooding, Hughes, Jussel, Tenney, Vollmer, Wills

STAFF ATTENDANCE: Bowyer, Humble, Rice, Spendlove, Strickland

I. Call Meeting to Order

Chairman Bonnett called the meeting to order at 11:38 a.m. and confirmed a quorum.

II. Consideration of Minutes: [November 14, 2013 Meeting](#)

Motion:

Commissioner Gooding made a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner Hughes seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of the motion.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

III. Discuss updates/changes to CIP program

- Community Development Director Humble explained that today is a continuation of the discussion from the previous meeting. At the last meeting the proposed updates to the Capital Improvement Projects for Fire, Police, Streets and Parks & Recreation were presented for the Committee to review the list of projects. The Committee was then asked to think about the projects. At the last meeting was more informational and staff did not show the committee how the proposed changes would alter the impact fees if approved, as presented. Since the last meeting, requests were made to have information about what other Cities/Districts are doing with impact fees. Staff has provided this information in the agenda packet for this meeting. Staff would like to review the impact the changes will have on the fee.
- Member Gooding asked for a brief recap of the CIP proposals for each area.
- Member Hughes asked if the what if scenarios allow for an adjustment to the permit base numbers.
- Community Development Director Humble explained that staff went back through all of the population growth data to how all of the numbers calculate into things, and all of it is driven by the population. When staff looked at the population projections staff is comfortable with those numbers. The number of permits issued for single family weren't exactly in line with the population projections and staff could provide some education regarding this topic at the next meeting. Today staff has prepared a spreadsheet so that adjustments can be made in order to show how different projects if added or subtracted from the list would impact the fee.

Police CIP Recap:

- Community Development Director Humble reviewed the changes made to the Police Department Capital Improvement Plan. The reason why the cost is higher for the police station is because it accommodates for an increase over the additional five years. The additional five years of growth related needs increased the square footage paid for by growth from 3150 sq. ft. to 5220 sq. ft. Another change that was made is a growth related SWAT vehicle, now they are not going to grow the team so there is only one SWAT vehicle on the list to replace the existing SWAT vehicle. The next change was the vehicle and handheld radio

needs. The new plan has been adjusted for 20 new officers to be equipped with items that typically last 10 years (handgun, radio and rifle) and 10 new vehicles radios.

Fire CIP Recap:

- Community Development Director Humble explained that most of the changes on the Fire Department Capital Improvement Plan are just cost adjustments. The fire stations are still in the plan. It has been determined that a ladder truck is still needed and that both new stations need to accommodate the ladder truck so they will be built the same increasing the cost.
- Member Gooding asked what other sources of funding are available to assist in paying for the changes.
- Finance Officer Rice stated that the Fire District pays for the service the City provides, but she is not clear on what the exact agreement includes, she will get that information and bring it back to the Committee.
- Community Development Director Humble stated he thinks the district would have a difficult time paying for additional cost related to ladder trucks, because there is not much demand for a ladder truck throughout the rest of the district.
- Member Gooding stated that if station #2 is being relocated to the northwest it will help the outlying areas.
- Community Development Director Humble stated the other change is the increase in cost for the communication center the same change seen in the Police Department CIP because the growth related portion has increased. The size of the communication center is not growing but the cost related to additional growth has changed. The price of the trucks increased.
- Member Wills stated that he was reading an article on ways for a City to save money and the article implied that when you combine fire and police stations into the same location it saves money because the land and the facilities share the cost.
- Community Development Director Humble stated that there are different views on satellite facilities. From an operational standpoint we only have one police station and it is on the same land as the fire department station #1. Staff has discussed satellite stations with the police and fire department. The former and current police chief want a centralized police station with no satellite police stations. The fire department does need satellite locations due to response time related issues. The police patrol the City all the time where the fire department is responding from a fixed location. The ISO rating only has to do with Fire Department response time, and not Police Department response time.

Parks & Recreation CIP Recap:

- Community Development Director Humble reviewed the changes and stated the sub-category for trails was added because the City Council requested that staff look at how impact fees could support additional trails. There are limits for using impact fees, a level of service has to be maintained the funds can't be used to improve a level of service; the funds can't be spent more than 10 years out and other things that way into the use of the funds.
- In order to define a level of service calculations had to be made to determine a baseline for the current level of service for the trails and by adding trails will that maintain that level of service. This number was calculated by length of a trail per capita. When staff looked at what is built today, what is yet to build and is in the future trail master plan, with Canyon Trails being the only thing that was looked at and to maintain the same ratio in the future the City can only gather 10.4% from growth. The concern is if \$4.2 million dollars are put in the impact fee program for trails \$440,000.00 would be collected from impact fees leaving the other \$3.8 million has to be funded by the City and it has to be done. Currently the City doesn't have to spend \$3.8 million on trails. If we start collecting impact fees with trails on the list it will have to be used for that project.
- Community Development Director Humble explained that does not mean that the citizen is paying \$3.8 million of the fund in taxes. However if the trails are listed as a project the city has to come up with \$3.8 million dollars, this does not have to be paid with taxes, it can be supplemented by other means such as

grants. A grant request for \$44,000.00 was made for trails with the City's match equaling \$20,000.00 so the total project equals \$64,000.00. That \$40,000.00 could be used to put towards the \$3.8 million or not put the trails on the list and use it without being forced to use it because of the CIP requirement. If the trails are put on the list it will require the City to come up with \$3.8 million. There are other sources of funding, there are places where development will occur and trails will be completed by the developer it just may not happen as quickly. A level of service was defined for Snake River Canyon, Rock Creek Canyon and Auger Falls. The level of service for Auger Falls is zero so none of the impact fees can be used for trails in this area and the other two are at the 10.4%. Maybe there is a different way to calculate the level of service that would reduce the cost but in the end the cost would be \$4.2 million for Rock Creek Canyon Trails, \$1.8 million for Snake River Canyon Trails, and then the cost for Auger Falls.

- Member Wills asked how the Rock Creek Canyon Trails project was calculated to equal \$4.2 million.
- Parks & Recreation Director Bowyer explained where the trail would be located and the path he used to calculate the cost and the total linear foot amounted to approximately 10 miles.
- Member Gooding asked if the Parks & Recreation Commission has discussed the shifting of funds moving from the development of a new community park to developing of trails.
- Parks & Recreation Director Bowyer explained the original calculations for the New Community Park were incorrect.
- Member Hughes asked how the trail location was decided.
- Parks & Recreation Director Bowyer explained the ultimate goal is to have the Snake River Canyon Trail and the Rock Creek Canyon Trail connect. The long term goal is to continue further south from where the two trails connect to the Blue Lakes crossing so he just followed along the Area of Impact. The community would like to see a trails system go as far as possible.
- Member Hughes stated impact fees can only be collected for the defined service area which is the City Limits and some of the property is in the Area of Impact where impact fees are not collected until the land is annexed and becomes part of the City Limits. The number is incorporating land in the Area of Impact so the number is falsely inflated because we can't collect for these areas. The numbers should only include area within the City Limits for which impact fees can be collected.
- Community Development Director Humble explained the numbers were calculating what was shown on the master development plan for trails but that is correct portions of the trails are in the Area of Impact.
- Member Bonnett stated if the Council wants to include the trails on the list and accept the unintended consequences of that it might make good since to go back to the calculations and limit them to the City Limits area and the cost may not be as large.
- Community Development Director Humble stated including the trails in the impact fee was not the directive staff was just asked to see what the impacts would be if they were added. For the City Council they would like this Committee to make a recommendation.
- Member Wills stated the same argument would apply to the New Community Park.
- Community Development Director Humble stated the other parks on the list don't make it into the impact fee plan it's just a way for the department to keep track of their list of projects.
- Member Bonnett stated he noticed the large Urban Parks list changed.
- Community Development Director Humble stated a few were removed from the list because the projects were completed. In summary that was a decrease in cost of the New Community Park and the potential increase if trails are added.

Streets CIP Recap:

- Community Development Director Humble reviewed the changes to the Street Department Capital Improvement Plan. Staff reviewed the big list of traffic signals took a few off added a few more to make sure the list was accurate. The price is not impacted the fees are still going to fund 5 traffic signals over the next 10 years and the cost difference is due to the increase that is built into the program. The big issue is the street project list and City Engineer Fields reviewed and update cost estimates and broke the projects down into a manageable list and added the growth rates. The question is does this Committee

want to recommend streets be included or not in the CIP. When this process was adopted the street projects were not included, a couple of years ago this Committee made a recommendation to include a couple small street projects and City Council chose not to add them. This is an opportunity for the projects to be reviewed again and make recommendations to the City Council.

- Member Hughes asked if the project listed as Falls Avenue from Washington to Grandview has been completed and be removed from the list.
- City Engineer Fields explained that a portion of this street has been rebuilt but that would be 5 lane arterial and the center turn bay has not been built. The road has been reconstructed within the existing curb lines. The same situation has occurred on Eastland from Candleridge to Kimberly Road reconstruction occur along with some major expansion but it was not all rebuilt but there are still some capacity issues; it is very piece milled construction.
- Member Wills asked for more clarification on the Falls Avenue from Washington to Grandview project and if the cost listed is what it would cost to make it a 5 lane road.
- City Engineer Fields explained that would be the cost because in order to make it a 5 lane road it will require the purchasing of right-of-way. This doesn't suggest this is a next year job but it is still part of the long range need.
- Community Development Director Humble stated long range still means the projects have to be completed within the bounds of the impact fee program if they are on the list. These are projects that staff sees as happening within the next 8-10 years.
- Member Gooding stated having lived in this community forever he has seen projects like this take up to 20 year to get done. Is it possible to add a fifth lane in 10 years his gut instinct is it won't happen.
- Member Bonnett explained that if the funds are collected through impact fees it has to happen within a 10 year period.
- City Engineer Fields stated intuitively the funds would be used for Pole Line Road between Bridgeview and Mountain View Drive because that section is dilapidated that could really use some help. Staff has been chipping away at other places like Falls Avenue between Blue Lakes Blvd N and Locust Street. It would be nice to do a little more in other places too.
- Member Wills asked if Hankins Road will take some of Eastland Drives traffic moving more of the heavier traffic off of Eastland Drive.
- City Engineer Fields stated that it depends on the section of Hankins that is being referred to; the section of Hankins south of Kimberly Road will see and is seeing heavier traffic, there was a study done to try and move the heavy traffic onto Hankins Road however that was not an adopted philosophy.

Summary:

- Community Development Director Humble stated that staff has created a spreadsheet that can be adjusted to show changes in the fee to the customer if certain projects are included or excluded from the proposed CIP. If all of the proposed changes are made the following is an example of how things change.

	Current	Proposed
• Single Family Dwelling	\$1656	\$3473
• Multi-Family Dwelling(per unit)	\$2935	\$1560
• Retail (per sq. ft.)	\$1.10	\$1.73
• Office (per sq. ft.)	\$0.80	\$2.91
• Indus (per sq. ft.)	\$0.68	\$2.26
• Institution (per sq. ft.)	\$0.47	\$1.06

- Member Bonnett stated the \$3400 is not too different from the fee other places charge.

- Member Will explained that he did a review of City's with a population over 5,000 and the average Impact Fee for a single family dwelling was approximately \$2000. Government does have to be funded, if it is not done through impact fees and connection fees it has to be done through taxes.
- Member Gooding stated that taxes are limited to 3% taxes and that would not pay for government.
- Member Hughes asked if this is still based on the average of 500 residential permits per year.
- Community Development Director Humble explained that the numbers are based on the growth projections.
- Member Hughes explained that the reason he keeps bringing this up is because he would like to know how things would end up if the numbers were scaled back.
- Community Development Director Humble explained that based on the population figures that are projected and the number of people living in a home and the number of homes that will be needed to house the predicted population. The population estimates are in line, the permit numbers don't appear to be in line with the projections. There have been multiple population growth studies and they all seem to be fairly accurate. The average of 500 homes per year was not an anticipated permit count it was a backward calculation from this growth and how many homes are going to be needed to house that many people.
- Member Hughes asked if the numbers for 2013 were based on the projected growth or based on what would happen that year.
- Community Development Director Humble explained that number would be a projection from 2009.
- Member Hughes stated that the number says the City should be at 17,150 housing units by 2013.
- Community Development Director Humble explained that the City is probably closer to 15,000 housing units, but the population is still very close to 45,000.
- Member Gooding explained what the number says is that the 2.2 persons per household, is probably higher than estimated.
- Member Bonnett explained he is not sure that the system could be approximated any better now than when the system was created, especially when the population predictions seem to be on track. Maybe the rest of it is just delayed, but who really knows.
- Community Development Director Humble explained the numbers are looking in to the future for the next five years. He understands the point but is not sure what could be done differently.
- Member Bonnett asked if there is data that divides the numbers into single family vs multi-family.
- Community Development Director Humble stated there are water account numbers that can be used but they don't account for all of the homes.
- Member Hughes summarized that the population is on track and based on these projections these numbers these projects will be needed due to growth. We are not collecting enough to pay for the capital projects with the way it is tracking. If the growth is there but the impact fees have not collected enough money what happens then.
- Community Development Director Humble explained that is correct from a residential standpoint. If there are not enough impact fees collected the City will supplement the project.
- Member Wills stated that according to the census in 2010 there were 18,300 households calculated. The number included everything.
- Community Development Director Humble explained the number would also include homes that don't connect to the water system.
- Member Hughes is the commercial growth following the track it should be following based on the population with the anomalies aside.
- Community Development Director Humble explained that the industrial sq. ft. growth projection and the institutional growth projection have been exceeded. The office projection has probably not been exceeded and retail is fairly close. Square footage of the other categories can be calculated which may help. The role of the Committee is to look at what is acceptable to the community and what isn't and make a recommendation.

- Member Bonnett explained that if things are not acceptable the Committee has to make a recommendation for making it acceptable, or eliminate projects like streets.
- Member Tenney explained parks projects could be removed also, even though the net change was zero trails sections could be removed. You don't have to take out all the streets projects some of the community would rather take the streets than the trails. If we know we are not going to do things don't include them, lowering some of the fees.
- Member Bonnett asked if there was an estimate for how much the cost would change if the trails were just limited to property within the city limits.
- Parks & Recreations Director Bowyer explained he could estimate for a portion of the numbers but would have to verify which property is within the city limits. For example the Rock Creek Canyon Trails if everything north of the counties Rock Creek were reduce the amount by approximately half. He would have to do more calculations to provide accurate numbers.
- Community Development Director Humble explained that if you removed the trails that fall in the Area of Impact they also have to be removed from the level of service calculations which would increase the level of service for the remaining area.
- Member Bonnett asked City Engineer Fields if she could prioritize the streets projects how would the list be organized.
- City Engineer Fields prioritized the list as follows: 1) Pole Line: Bridgeview to Mt. View 2) Falls: Blue Lakes to Locust 3) Eastland: Kimberly to Orchard 4) Eastland: Candleridge to Kimberly 5) Falls: Washington to Grandview. She stated her goal would be to complete the Eastland project between Kimberly to Orchard prior to the time impact fees will be available for use, but things don't always work out as planned.
- Member Hughes asked if the 1.5 million per lane mile is accurate for calculations.
- City Engineer Fields stated yes that is accurate and land purchase ends up being measurable for several of these projects.
- Community Development Director Humble explained the standard that each project is calculated according to what needs to be done not all of them are calculated at 1.5 million per lane mile. He would suggest that the Committee at this point review all the information that was discussed today and plan to have another meeting to follow-up with making a recommendation to the City Council regarding the proposed list of Capital Improvement Projects.

IV. Next Committee meeting: [February 20, 2014 12:30 p.m.-1:00 p.m.](#)

V. Adjourn:

Chairman Bonnett adjourned the meeting at 1:00 p.m.