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## Impact Fee Study Results

2017 to 2022 Completed TIP Construction

| Service Area | LaneMiles | Developer Cost | Developer \% | City Funds (Bond or Pay/GO) | City Fund \% | Transportation Impact Fee Use | Transportation Impact Fee \% | Total Cost | 2017 TIP <br> Cost <br> Estimate | $\begin{gathered} \text { Completion } \\ \text { \% of } 2017 \text { TIP } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | 13.4 | \$2,695,587.25 | 12\% | \$19,354,258.73 | 85\% | \$600,000.00 | 3\% | \$22,649,845.98 | \$82,948,456.00 | 27\% |
| B | 13.4 | \$4,999,075.80 | 12\% | \$29,408,892.47 | 73\% | \$5,888,000.00 | 15\% | \$40,295,968.27 | \$134,917,734.00 | 30\% |
| C | 2.1 | \$0 | 0\% | \$11,264,302.08 | 80\% | \$2,881,678.76 | 20\% | \$14,145,980.84 | \$115,228,275.00 | 12\% |
| D | 10.1 | \$11,375,006.85 | 33\% | \$17,408,856.29 | 50\% | \$6,008,939.00 | 17\% | \$34,792,802.14 | \$114,822,986.00 | 30\% |
| E | 2.2 | \$2,787,593.16 | 100\% | \$0 | 0\% | \$0 | 0\% | \$2,787,593,16 | \$107,246,643.00 | 3\% |
| F | 0.4 | \$0 | 0\% | \$3,386, 173.23 | 49\% | \$3,455,900.33 | 51\% | \$6,842,073.56 | \$53,570,581.00 | 13\% |
| G | 9.3 | \$853,092.80 | 3\% | \$20,738,523.46 | 78\% | \$5,020,500.00 | 19\% | \$26,612,116.26 | \$74,352,719.00 | 36\% |
| L | 6.8 | \$0 | 0\% | \$556,185.02 | 100\% | \$0 | 0\% | \$556,182.02 | \$6,796,373.00 | 8\% |
| M | 0.7 | \$2,372,054.30 | 100\% | \$0 | 0\% | \$0 | 0\% | \$2,372,054.30 | \$109,985,466.00 | 2\% |
| S | 15.2 | \$8,012,766.26 | 61\% | \$0 | 0\% | \$2,510,247.12 | 19\% | \$13,033,260.50 | \$94,860,483.00 | 14\% |
| U | 4.2 | \$1,400,161.61 | 77\% | \$418,164.12 | 23\% | \$0 | 0\% | \$1,818,325.73 | \$186,748,775.00 | 1\% |
| V | 0.9 | \$1,286,210.93 | 100\% | \$0 | 0\% | \$0 | 0\% | \$1,286,210.93 | \$25,376,275.00 | 5\% |
| W | 1.7 | \$2,142,422.16 | 100\% | \$0 | 0\% | \$0 | 0\% | \$2,142,422.16 | \$28,989,177.00 | 7\% |
| X | 3.6 | \$3,037,598.27 | 100\% | \$0 | 0\% | \$0 | 0\% | \$3,037,598.27 | \$77,041,525.00 | 4\% |
| Y | 17.2 | \$4,600,207.95 | 17\% | \$22,331,928.34 | 83\% | \$500,000.00 | 2\% | \$26,932,190.29 | \$156,702,662.00 | 17\% |
| Z | 3.3 | \$1,397,817.78 | 34\% | \$2,664,029.15 | 66\% | \$1,301,493.84 | 32\% | \$4,061,846.93 | \$12,648,818.00 | 32\% |
| TOTAL | 109.2 | \$49,049,118.91 | 24\% | \$129,623,449.89 | 63\% | \$28,166,759.05 | 13\% | \$206,839,327.85 | \$1,382,236,948.00 | 15\% |

## FORT Worth

## 2017 to 2022 Completed TIP Construction

Transportation Improvement Funding Source


- Developer Construction
- City Funds
- Impact Fees


## Transportation Improvement Funding



## Service Areas:

- Boundaries adjusted for annexations
- No Fee Service Areas to increasing:
- L (East Fort Worth)
- W (Hulen/Stonegate)


Kimley»Horn

## Fort Worth.

## New No-Fee Service Areas

- Roadway projects are complete
- Majority of service area served by adequate facilities
- Growth in service area is low



## Fort Worth.

## Future Growth:

- Planned Service Area Map
- Annexations added as they occur


Kimley»)Horn

## Land Use Assumptions

- Goal: Identify 10-Year Growth
- Establishes Infrastructure Demands and Master Plans
- Population and Employment Projections
- Build upon 2017 assumptions.
- 2022 - Updated based on permit data
- 2032 - Based on Future Land Use Plan and known developments


## 10- Year Growth

- Based on Recent Plats and PDCs
- Reasonable Density Estimates based on Future Land Use Plan
- Compared to Historic Growth



## Transportation Improvements Plan

- Design, Construction, Legal, Fiscal, ROW, etc.
- 5-yr CIP vs. 10-yr Impact Fee CIP (TIP)
- Completed, Underway, and Future Projects
- Development Ordinances
- Zoning
- Development Rules and Regulations
- Construction Standards and Details


## FORt WORTH <br> Transportation Improvements Plan: Service Area B

\$238.6 M Recoverable cost

| Legend |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| = Impact Fee Eligible - Median | - Local Roads |
| -meImpact Fee Eligible - New | O Roundabout-Recent |
| -Impact Fee Eligible - Previously Completed | $\square$ Intersection Improvements |
| $\checkmark$ Impact Fee Eligible - Widening | - Project Limits |
| - Non-Impact Fee Eligible | - Railroad |
|  | Floodplain |



## FORT WORTH <br> Transportation Improvements Plan: Service Area E

\$319.8 M Recoverable cost

| Legend |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $=$ Impact Fee Eligible - Median | -Local Roads |
| -meImpact Fee Eligible - New | O Roundabout-Recent |
| -Impact Fee Eligible - Previously Completed | $\square$ Intersection Improvements |
| $\checkmark$ Impact Fee Eligible - Widening | - Project Limits |
| - Non-Impact Fee Eligible | + Railroad |
|  | Floodplain |



## Impact Fee Methodology

- How are Impact Fees Calculated?
- Land Use and Population Projections
- Master Plan Infrastructure Requirements
- Develop 10-Year Impact Fee CIP
- Remove costs associated with existing development and growth at 10+ years
- Calculate Pre-Credit Max Assessable Impact Fee Impact Fee Per Service Unit $=\frac{\text { Recoverable Cost of the CIP (\$) }}{\text { New Service Units }}$
- Credit Calculation


## FORt WORTH.

## Maximum Assessable Rate (Schedule 1)

What is it:

- Requirement of Chapter 395
- The development's share of the TIP
- The most the city can collect in impact fees

How Established:

- Determined by Impact Fee Study
- Amended only by Study Update


Where Located:

- Table 8 of the 2022 Transportation Impact Fee Study


## Maximum Assessable Rate Per Service Unit

| Service Area | Recoverable Cost | Growth Units | Schedule 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | $\$ 96,825,195$ | 58,954 | $\$ 1,642$ |
| AA | $\$ 33,775,487$ | 95,255 | $\$ 355$ |
| B | $\$ 238,641,700$ | 72,138 | $\$ 3,308$ |
| C | $\$ 165,568,047$ | 92,943 | $\$ 1,781$ |
| D | $\$ 68,010,556$ | 81,573 | $\$ 834$ |
| F | $\$ 319,815,796$ | 109,252 | $\$ 2,927$ |
| F | $\$ 29,503,752$ | 39,699 | $\$ 743$ |
| G | $\$ 87,235,684$ | 42,443 | $\$ 2,055$ |
| M | $\$ 119,682,189$ | 18,797 | $\$ 6,367$ |
| N | $\$ 26,361,960$ | 9,614 | $\$ 2,742$ |
| O | $\$ 20,961,433$ | 5,895 | $\$ 3,556$ |
| PI | $\$ 23,538,252$ | 8,540 | $\$ 2,756$ |
| S | $\$ 184,849,115$ | 40,144 | $\$ 4,605$ |
| T | $\$ 43,694,064$ | 11,724 | $\$ 3,727$ |
| U | $\$ 489,766,375$ | 192,653 | $\$ 2,542$ |
| V | $\$ 42,415,804$ | 9,605 | $\$ 4,416$ |
| X | $\$ 119,883,973$ | 36,391 | $\$ 3,294$ |
| Y | $\$ 290,318,088$ | 112,163 | $\$ 2,588$ |
| Z | $\$ 409,143,899$ | 67,057 | $\$ 6,101$ |
| TOTAL | $\$ 2,809,961,369$ | 58,149 | $\$ 2,543$ |

## Fort Worth

## Schedule 1 Rate Comparison

| SA | 2017 <br> Schedule 1 | 2022 <br> Schedule 1 | Difference |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | $\$ 2,025$ | $\$ 1,642$ | $-\$ 383$ | $-19 \%$ |
| AA | $\$ 205$ | $\$ 355$ | $\$ 150$ | $73 \%$ |
| B | $\$ 3,316$ | $\$ 3,308$ | $-\$ 8$ | $0 \%$ |
| C | $\$ 1,144$ | $\$ 1,781$ | $\$ 637$ | $56 \%$ |
| D | $\$ 463$ | $\$ 834$ | $\$ 371$ | $80 \%$ |
| E | $\$ 3,449$ | $\$ 2,927$ | $-\$ 522$ | $-15 \%$ |
| G | $\$ 675$ | $\$ 743$ | $\$ 68$ | $10 \%$ |
| M | $\$ 1,799$ | $\$ 2,055$ | $\$ 256$ | $14 \%$ |
| N | $\$ 3,164$ | $\$ 6,367$ | $\$ 3,203$ | $101 \%$ |
| O | $\$ 845$ | $\$ 2,742$ | $\$ 1,897$ | $224 \%$ |
| Pl | $\$ 2,492$ | $\$ 3,556$ | $\$ 2,064$ | $138 \%$ |
| S | $\$ 1,894$ | $\$ 2,756$ | $-\$ 138$ | $-5 \%$ |
| U | $\$ 3,457$ | $\$ 4,605$ | $\$ 2,779$ | $152 \%$ |
| V | $\$ 3,269$ | $\$ 3,727$ | $\$ 270$ | $8 \%$ |
| X | $\$ 1,356$ | $\$ 2,542$ | $-\$ 727$ | $-22 \%$ |
| Y | $\$ 3,806$ | $\$ 4,416$ | $\$ 3,060$ | $226 \%$ |
| Z | $\$ 2,348$ | $\$ 2,294$ | $-\$ 512$ | $-13 \%$ |

## Maximum Rate Calculations

## Single Family (\$ per home)

| Impact Fee Components | City-Wide Average | SA B | SA E | SA S | SA Z |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Eligible Capital Improvement Costs | \$2,809,961,369 | \$238,641,700 | \$319,815,796 | \$184,849,115 | \$409,143,899 |
| Growth in Service Units ${ }^{(1)}$ | 1,104,842 | 72,138 | 109,252 | 40,144 | 67,057 |
| Maximum Impact Fee per Service Unit ${ }^{(2)}$ | \$2,543 | \$3,308 | \$2,927 | \$4,605 | \$6,101 |
| 2022 Vehicle-Miles per Single Family Home ${ }^{(3)(4)}$ | 4.61 | 4.61 | 4.61 | 4.61 | 4.61 |
| Maximum Allowable Roadway Impact Fee | \$11,725 | \$15,251 | \$13,493 | \$21,227 | \$28,127 |
| 2017 Maximum Allowable Roadway Impact Fee | \$8,722 | \$16,082 | \$16,730 | \$14,471 | \$17,975 |

(1) Roadway Service Units are Vehicle Miles (the capacity consumed by one vehicle making a peak hour trip of one mile in length)
(2) Total Eligible Costs After Impact Fee Credit divided by the Growth in Service Units.
(3) Service Unit for General Light Industrial and Shopping Center is 1,000 Sq. Ft. GLA
(4) 2022 Update Incorporates trip rates from the 11th Edition of the ITE Trip Generation Manual

Maximum Rate Calculations

| Multi-Family (\$per unit) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Impact Fee Components | City-Wide Average | SA B | SA E | SA S | SA Z |
| Total Eligible Capital Improvement Costs | \$2,809,961,369 | \$238,641,700 | \$319,815,796 | \$184,849,115 | \$409,143,899 |
| Growth in Service Units ${ }^{(1)}$ | 1,104,842 | 72,138 | 109,252 | 40,144 | 67,057 |
| Maximum Impact Fee per Service Unit ${ }^{(2)}$ | \$2,518 | \$3,308 | \$2,927 | \$4,605 | \$6,101 |
| 2022 Vehicle-Miles per Multi-Family Unit ${ }^{(3)(4)}$ | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 |
| Maximum Allowable Roadway Impact Fee | \$6,296 | \$8,270 | \$6,708 | \$11,457 | \$15,254 |
| 2017 Maximum Allowable Roadway Impact Fee | \$4,927 | \$9,086 | \$9,451 | \$8,175 | \$10,155 |

(1) Roadway Service Units are Vehicle Miles (the capacity consumed by one vehicle making a peak hour trip of one mile in length)
(2) Total Eligible Costs After Impact Fee Credit divided by the Growth in Service Units.
(3) Service Unit for Warehouse and Shopping Center is 1,000 Sq. Ft. GLA
(4) 2022 Update Incorporates trip rates from the 11th Edition of the ITE Trip Generation Manual

## Maximum Rate Calculations

## 50,000 Sq. Ft. Shopping Center

| Impact Fee Components | City-Wide Average | SA B | SA E | SA S | SA Z |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Eligible Capital Improvement Costs | \$2,809,961,369 | \$238,641,700 | \$319,815,796 | \$184,849,115 | \$409,143,899 |
| Growth in Service Units ${ }^{(1)}$ | 1,104,842 | 72,138 | 109,252 | 40,144 | 67,057 |
| Maximum Impact Fee per Service Unit ${ }^{(2)}$ | \$2,518 | \$3,308 | \$2,683 | \$4,583 | \$6,101 |
| 2022 Vehicle-Miles per Development Unit ${ }^{(3)(4)}$ | 9.60 | 9.60 | 9.60 | 9.60 | 9.60 |
| Maximum Allowable Roadway Impact Fee/KSF ${ }^{(5)}$ | \$24,173 | \$31,757 | \$25,757 | \$43,997 | 58,570 |
| Maximum Allowable Roadway Impact Fee ${ }^{(5)}$ | \$1,208,828 | \$1,587,911 | \$1,287,882 | \$2,199,668 | \$2,928,675 |
| 2017 Maximum Allowable Roadway Impact Fee | \$632,089 | \$1,165,559 | \$1,212,472 | \$1,048,776 | \$1,302,730 |

(1) Roadway Service Units are Vehicle Miles (the capacity consumed by one vehicle making a peak hour trip of one mile in length)
(2) Total Eligible Costs After Impact Fee Credit divided by the Growth in Service Units.
(3) Service Unit for Warehouse and Shopping Center is 1,000 Sq. Ft. GLA
(4) 2022 Update Incorporates trip rates from the 11th Edition of the ITE Trip Generation Manual
(5) Maximum Allowable Impact Fee shown is the total for a 50ksf shopping center

## Maximum Rate Calculations

## 300k Sq. Ft. General Light Industrial

| Impact Fee Components | City-Wide Average | SA B | SA E | SA S | SA Z |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Eligible Capital Improvement Costs | \$2,809,961,369 | \$238,641,700 | \$319,815,796 | \$184,849,115 | \$409,143,899 |
| Growth in Service Units ${ }^{(1)}$ | 1,104,842 | 72,138 | 109,252 | 40,144 | 67,057 |
| Maximum Impact Fee per Service Unit ${ }^{(2)}$ | \$2,518 | \$3,308 | \$2,683 | \$4,583 | \$6,101 |
| 2022 Vehicle-Miles per Development Unit ${ }^{(4)}$ | 3.71 | 3.71 | 3.71 | 3.71 | 3.71 |
| Maximum Allowable Roadway Impact Fee/KSF ${ }^{(3)}$ | \$9,342 | \$12,273 | \$9,954 | \$17,003 | \$22,634 |
| Maximum Allowable Roadway Impact Fee ${ }^{(5)}$ | \$2,802,534 | \$3,681,804 | \$2,986,179 | \$5,100,879 | \$6,790,413 |
| 2017 Maximum Allowable Roadway Impact Fee | \$2,057,609 | \$3,143,568 | \$3,269,652 | \$3,369,831 | \$3,277,125 |

(1) Roadway Service Units are Vehicle Miles (the capacity consumed by one vehicle making a peak hour trip of one mile in length)
(2) Total Eligible Costs After Impact Fee Credit divided by the Growth in Service Units.
(3) Service Unit for Warehouse and Shopping Center is 1,000 Sq. Ft. GLA
(4) 2022 Update Incorporates trip rates from the 11th Edition of the ITE Trip Generation Manual
(5) Maximum Allowable Fee is for a 300KSF General Light Industrial building

## FORT WORTH

## Collection Rate (Schedule 2)

What is it:

- The dollar amount collected during building permitting
- Created in 2008 to ease transition to the program
- May not exceed Schedule 1

How Established:

- Can be amended without updating the Study

Current Policy:


- Council adopted a smoothed rate across Service Areas in 2018

FORT WORTH,

## Collection Rate Considerations

## Collection Rate Considerations

- Remove Smoothing Across Service Areas
- Collection Rate as a percentage of Maximum Assessable Rate
- Service Areas with Maximum Assessable Rates at or lower than current Schedule 2 will be set at Maximum Assessable Rate (Schedule 1)
- Use two categories:
- Residential (single-family and multi-family)
- Non-Residential (commercial and industrial)
- Reduced Collection Rate for Non-Residential maintaining current policy
- Consistent with the City's Economic Development Plan

Median House Price vs Impact Fee Collection \$400,000


## Fort Worth

## Residential Collection Rate Options

| Option | $\%$ of <br> Sch. 1 | SF <br> City-wide <br> Average | SF <br> Uncaptured <br> Demand | MF <br> City-wide <br> Average | MF <br> Uncaptured <br> Demand |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $50 \%$ | $\$ 7,069$ | $\$ 6,601$ | $\$ 3,834$ | $\$ 3,579$ |
| 2 | $65 \%$ | $\$ 8,885$ | $\$ 4,785$ | $\$ 4,907$ | $\$ 2,506$ |
| 3 | $80 \%$ | $\$ 10,936$ | $\$ 2,734$ | $\$ 5,981$ | $\$ 1,432$ |
| 4 | $100 \%$ | $\$ 13,670$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 7,413$ | $\$ 0$ |

* Service Areas AA, D and F will be set at Schedule 1

|  | $\%$ of <br> Sch. 1 | SF <br> City-wide <br> Average | SF <br> Uncaptured <br> Demand | $\%$ <br> Sch. 1 | MF <br> City-wide <br> Average | MF <br> Uncaptured <br> Demand | $\%$ <br> Sch. 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current | $30 \%$ | $\$ 3,429$ | $\$ 7,098$ | $33 \%$ | $\$ 1,937$ | $\$ 5,476$ | $26 \%$ |

## Kimley»Horn

## FORT WORTH

## Residential Option 1: 50\% by Council District

| Council <br> District | Service <br> Area | 2017 | 2022 |  | Uncollected <br> Demand |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City-Wide Average | $\$ 3,228$ | $\$ 7,069$ | $\$ 6,601$ | $\$ 1,868$ | $\$ 3,834$ | $\$ 3,579$ |  |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{G}$ | $\$ 3,750$ | $\$ 4,737$ | $\$ 4,737$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 2,569$ | $\$ 2,569$ |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{S}$ | $\$ 3,750$ | $\$ 10,615$ | $\$ 10,615$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 5,757$ | $\$ 5,757$ |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{D *}$ | $\$ 2,245$ | $\$ 3,845$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 2,085$ | $\$ 0$ |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\$ 2,475$ | $\$ 6,321$ | $\$ 6,321$ | $\$ 1,398$ | $\$ 3,428$ | $\$ 3,428$ |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{Y}$ | $\$ 3,750$ | $\$ 5,966$ | $\$ 5,966$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 3,235$ | $\$ 3,235$ |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{B}$ | $\$ 3,750$ | $\$ 7,625$ | $\$ 7,625$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 4,135$ | $\$ 4,135$ |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{Z}$ | $\$ 3,750$ | $\$ 14,063$ | $\$ 14,063$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 7,627$ | $\$ 7,627$ |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{X}$ | $\$ 3,750$ | $\$ 7,593$ | $\$ 7,593$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 4,118$ | $\$ 4,118$ |

## FORT WORTH

## Residential Option 2: 65\% by Council District

| Council <br> District | Service <br> Area | 2017 | 2022 | Uncollected <br> Demand | 2017 | 2022 | Uncollected <br> Demand |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City-Wide Average | $\$ 3,228$ | $\$ 8,885$ | $\$ 4,785$ | $\$ 1,868$ | $\$ 4,907$ | $\$ 2,506$ |  |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{G}$ | $\$ 3,750$ | $\$ 6,158$ | $\$ 3,316$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 3,340$ | $\$ 1,798$ |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{S}$ | $\$ 3,750$ | $\$ 13,799$ | $\$ 7,430$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 7,483$ | $\$ 4,030$ |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | D* | $\$ 2,245$ | $\$ 3,845$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 2,085$ | $\$ 0$ |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\$ 2,475$ | $\$ 8,217$ | $\$ 4,424$ | $\$ 1,398$ | $\$ 4,456$ | $\$ 2,399$ |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{Y}$ | $\$ 3,750$ | $\$ 7,755$ | $\$ 4,176$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 4,206$ | $\$ 2,265$ |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{B}$ | $\$ 3,750$ | $\$ 9,913$ | $\$ 5,338$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 5,376$ | $\$ 2,895$ |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{Z}$ | $\$ 3,750$ | $\$ 18,282$ | $\$ 9,844$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 9,914$ | $\$ 5,339$ |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{X}$ | $\$ 3,750$ | $\$ 9,870$ | $\$ 5,315$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 5,353$ | $\$ 2,882$ |

## FORT WORTH

Residential Option $380 \%$ by Council District

| Council <br> District | Service <br> Area | 2017 | 2022 | Uncollected <br> Demand | 2017 | 2022 | Uncollected <br> Demand |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City-Wide Average | $\$ 3,228$ | $\$ 10,936$ | $\$ 2,734$ | $\$ 1,868$ | $\$ 5,981$ | $\$ 1,432$ |  |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{G}$ | $\$ 3,750$ | $\$ 7,579$ | $\$ 1,895$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 4,110$ | $\$ 1,028$ |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{S}$ | $\$ 3,750$ | $\$ 16,983$ | $\$ 4,246$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 9,210$ | $\$ 2,303$ |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{D *}$ | $\$ 2,245$ | $\$ 3,845$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 2,085$ | $\$ 0$ |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\$ 2,475$ | $\$ 10,113$ | $\$ 2,528$ | $\$ 1,398$ | $\$ 5,484$ | $\$ 1,371$ |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{Y}$ | $\$ 3,750$ | $\$ 9,545$ | $\$ 2,386$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 5,176$ | $\$ 1,294$ |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{B}$ | $\$ 3,750$ | $\$ 12,200$ | $\$ 3,050$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 6,616$ | $\$ 1,654$ |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{Z}$ | $\$ 3,750$ | $\$ 22,501$ | $\$ 5,625$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 12,202$ | $\$ 3,051$ |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{X}$ | $\$ 3,750$ | $\$ 12,148$ | $\$ 3,037$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 6,588$ | $\$ 1,647$ |

## FORT WORTH

## Residential Option 4 100\% by Council District

| Council <br> District | Service <br> Area | 2017 | 2022 | Uncollected <br> Demand | 2017 | 2022 | Uncollected <br> Demand |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City-Wide Average | $\$ 3,228$ | $\$ 13,670$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 1,868$ | $\$ 7,413$ | $\$ 0$ |  |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{G}$ | $\$ 3,750$ | $\$ 5,724$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 5,138$ | $\$ 0$ |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{S}$ | $\$ 3,750$ | $\$ 21,229$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 11,513$ | $\$ 0$ |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{D *}$ | $\$ 2,245$ | $\$ 3,845$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 2,085$ | $\$ 0$ |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\$ 2,475$ | $\$ 12,641$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 1,398$ | $\$ 6,855$ | $\$ 0$ |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{Y}$ | $\$ 3,750$ | $\$ 11,931$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 6,470$ | $\$ 0$ |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{B}$ | $\$ 3,750$ | $\$ 15,250$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 8,270$ | $\$ 0$ |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{Z}$ | $\$ 3,750$ | $\$ 28,126$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 15,253$ | $\$ 0$ |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{X}$ | $\$ 3,750$ | $\$ 15,185$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 2,118$ | $\$ 8,235$ | $\$ 0$ |

## Fort Worth

## Non-Residential Collection Rate Options

| Option | $\%$ of <br> Schedule 1 | SC <br> City-wide <br> Average | Sncaptured <br> Demand | GLI <br> City-wide <br> Average | GLI <br> Uncaptured <br> Demand |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $25 \%$ | $\$ 355,825$ | $\$ 1,067,476$ | $\$ 825,070$ | $\$ 2,475,209$ |
| 2 | $40 \%$ | $\$ 569,320$ | $\$ 853,981$ | $\$ 1,320,112$ | $\$ 1,980,168$ |
| 3 | $55 \%$ | $\$ 782,816$ | $\$ 640,485$ | $\$ 1,815,153$ | $\$ 1,485,126$ |
| 4 | $75 \%$ | $\$ 1,067,476$ | $\$ 355,825$ | $\$ 2,475,209$ | $\$ 825,070$ |

* Service Areas AA, D and F will be set at Schedule 1

|  | $\%$ of <br> Schedule <br> 1 | SC <br> City-wide <br> Average | Uncaptured <br> Demand | $\%$ <br> Sch. 1 | GLI <br> City-wide <br> Average | GLI <br> Uncaptured <br> Demand | $\%$ <br> Sch. 1 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current | $12 \%$ | $\$ 159,780$ | $\$ 1,263,521$ | $11 \%$ | $\$ 430,928$ | $\$ 2,869,351$ | $12 \%$ |

## Fort Worth

Non-Residential Option 1: 25\% by Council District

|  |  | 50,000 SF Shopping Center |  |  | 300,000 General Light Industrial Bldg. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Council District | Service <br> Area | 2017 | 2022 | Uncollected Demand | 2017 | 2022 | Uncollected Demand |
| City-Wide | verage | \$159,780 | \$355,825 | \$1,067,476 | \$430,928 | \$825,070 | \$2,472,209 |
| 2 | G | \$164,766 | \$246,600 | \$739,800 | \$444,375 | \$571,804 | \$1,715,411 |
| 3 | S | \$164,766 | \$552,600 | \$1,657,800 | \$444,375 | \$1,281,341 | \$3,844,024 |
| 4 | D | \$162,745 | \$400,320 | \$0 | \$348,091 | \$928,242 | \$0 |
| 5 | N | \$164,766 | \$329,033 | \$987,098 | \$444,375 | \$762,962 | \$2,288,885 |
| 6 | Y | \$164,766 | \$310,560 | \$931,680 | \$444,375 | \$720,111 | \$2,160,333 |
| 7 | B | \$164,766 | \$396,960 | \$1,190,880 | \$444,375 | \$920,450 | \$2,761,351 |
| 8 | Z | \$164,766 | \$732,120 | \$2,196,360 | \$444,375 | \$1,697,603 | \$5,092,810 |
| 9 | X | \$164,766 | \$395,280 | \$1,185,840 | \$444,375 | \$916,556 | \$2,749,667 |

## Non-Residential Option 2: 40\% by Council District

|  |  | 50,000 SF Shopping Center |  |  | 300,000 General Light Industrial Bldg. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Council District | Service <br> Area | 2017 | 2022 | Uncollected Demand | 2017 | 2022 | Uncollected Demand |
| City-Wid | verage | \$159,780 | \$355,825 | \$1,067,476 | \$430,928 | \$825,070 | \$2,472,209 |
| 2 | G | \$164,766 | \$246,600 | \$739,800 | \$444,375 | \$571,804 | \$1,715,411 |
| 3 | S | \$164,766 | \$552,600 | \$1,657,800 | \$444,375 | \$1,281,341 | \$3,844,024 |
| 4 | D | \$162,745 | \$400,320 | \$0 | \$348,091 | \$928,242 | \$0 |
| 5 | N | \$164,766 | \$329,033 | \$987,098 | \$444,375 | \$762,962 | \$2,288,885 |
| 6 | Y | \$164,766 | \$310,560 | \$931,680 | \$444,375 | \$720,111 | \$2,160,333 |
| 7 | B | \$164,766 | \$396,960 | \$1,190,880 | \$444,375 | \$920,450 | \$2,761,351 |
| 8 | Z | \$164,766 | \$732,120 | \$2,196,360 | \$444,375 | \$1,697,603 | \$5,092,810 |
| 9 | X | \$164,766 | \$395,280 | \$1,185,840 | \$444,375 | \$916,556 | \$2,749,667 |

## Fort WOrth

Non-Residential Option 3: 55\% by Council District

|  |  | 50,000 SF Shopping Center |  |  | 300,000 General Light Industrial Bldg. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Council District | Service <br> Area | 2017 | 2022 | Uncollected Demand | 2017 | 2022 | Uncollected Demand |
| City-Wide Average |  | \$159,780 | \$355,825 | \$1,067,476 | \$430,928 | \$825,070 | \$2,472,209 |
| 2 | G | \$164,766 | \$246,600 | \$739,800 | \$444,375 | \$571,804 | \$1,715,411 |
| 3 | S | \$164,766 | \$552,600 | \$1,657,800 | \$444,375 | \$1,281,341 | \$3,844,024 |
| 4 | D | \$162,745 | \$400,320 | \$0 | \$348,091 | \$928,242 | \$0 |
| 5 | N | \$164,766 | \$329,033 | \$987,098 | \$444,375 | \$762,962 | \$2,288,885 |
| 6 | Y | \$164,766 | \$310,560 | \$931,680 | \$444,375 | \$720,111 | \$2,160,333 |
| 7 | B | \$164,766 | \$396,960 | \$1,190,880 | \$444,375 | \$920,450 | \$2,761,351 |
| 8 | Z | \$164,766 | \$732,120 | \$2,196,360 | \$444,375 | \$1,697,603 | \$5,092,810 |
| 9 | X | \$164,766 | \$395,280 | \$1,185,840 | \$444,375 | \$916,556 | \$2,749,667 |

## Fort Worth

Non-Residential Option 4: 75\% by Council District

|  |  | 50,000 SF Shopping Center |  |  | 300,000 General Light Industrial Bldg. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Council District | Service Area | 2017 | 2022 | Uncollected Demand | 2017 | 2022 | Uncollected Demand |
| City-Wide | verage | \$159,780 | \$355,825 | \$1,067,476 | \$430,928 | \$825,070 | \$2,472,209 |
| 2 | G | \$164,766 | \$246,600 | \$739,800 | \$444,375 | \$571,804 | \$1,715,411 |
| 3 | S | \$164,766 | \$552,600 | \$1,657,800 | \$444,375 | \$1,281,341 | \$3,844,024 |
| 4 | D | \$162,745 | \$400,320 | \$0 | \$348,091 | \$928,242 | \$0 |
| 5 | N | \$164,766 | \$329,033 | \$987,098 | \$444,375 | \$762,962 | \$2,288,885 |
| 6 | Y | \$164,766 | \$310,560 | \$931,680 | \$444,375 | \$720,111 | \$2,160,333 |
| 7 | B | \$164,766 | \$396,960 | \$1,190,880 | \$444,375 | \$920,450 | \$2,761,351 |
| 8 | Z | \$164,766 | \$732,120 | \$2,196,360 | \$444,375 | \$1,697,603 | \$5,092,810 |
| 9 | X | \$164,766 | \$395,280 | \$1,185,840 | \$444,375 | \$916,556 | \$2,749,667 |

## Staff Recommendation

## Residential Collection Rate

| Option | Percentage of <br> Schedule 1 | Single-Family <br> Average | Single-family <br> Uncollected | Multi-family <br> Average | Multi-family <br> Uncollected |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | $80 \%$ | $\$ 10,936$ | $\$ 2,734$ | $\$ 5,981$ | $\$ 1,432$ |

## Non-Residential Collection Rate

| Option | Percentage of <br> Schedule 1 | Shopping Center <br> Average | Shopping <br> Center <br> Uncollected | Gen. Light <br> Industrial <br> Average | Gen. Light <br> Industrial <br> Uncollected |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | $55 \%$ | $\$ 782,816$ | $\$ 640,485$ | $\$ 1,815,153$ | $\$ 1,485,126$ |

Kimley»Horn

## Staff Recommendation

- Removes Smoothing Across Service Areas
- Consistent with current thoroughfare construction cost
- Allows for growth within the existing service areas
- Balances economic development goals and thoroughfare construction needs


## Fort Worth

## Sample Development Project with Option 3

| Service Area | Land Use | Units | 2017 Sch. 2 | 2022 Rate | Total Fees |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | Single-family | 330 | \$1,237,500 | \$12,200 | \$4,026,000 |
|  | Multi-family | 334 | \$557,780 | \$6,616 | \$2,209,744 |
|  | Shopping Center | 1 | \$164,750 | \$873,312 | \$873,312 |
|  | Distribution Ctr. | 1 | \$444,300 | \$2,024,991 | \$2,024,991 |
| B | TOTAL |  | \$2,404,330 | \$2,917,119 | \$9,134,047 |
| D* | Single-family | 330 | \$740,850 | \$3,845 | \$1,268,850 |
|  | Multi-family | 334 | \$334,000 | \$2,085 | \$696,390 |
|  | Shopping Center | 1 | \$162,700 | \$400,320 | \$400,320 |
|  | Distribution Ctr. | 1 | \$438,900 | \$928,242 | \$928,242 |
| D* | TOTAL |  | \$1,676,450 | \$1,334,492 | \$3,293,802 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Kimley»>Hor |

## FORT WORTH

## Sample Development Project

| Service Area | Land Use | Units | 2017 Sch. 2 | 2022 Rate | Total Fees |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| S | Single-family | 330 | $\$ 1,237,500$ | $\$ 10,164$ | $\$ 3,354,120$ |
|  | Multi-family | 334 | $\$ 557,780$ | $\$ 7,283$ | $\$ 2,432,522$ |
|  | Shopping Center | 1 | $\$ 164,750$ | $\$ 1,310,940$ | $\$ 1,310,940$ |
|  | Distribution Center | 1 | $\$ 444,300$ | $\$ 4,052,990$ | $\$ 4,052,990$ |
| S | TOTAL |  | $\$ 2,404,330$ | $\$ 5,381,377$ | $\$ 11,150,572$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Y | Single-family | 330 | $\$ 1,237,500$ | $\$ 9,545$ | $\$ 3,149,784$ |
|  | Multi-family | 334 | $\$ 557,780$ | $\$ 5,176$ | $\$ 1,728,784$ |
|  | Shopping Center | 1 | $\$ 164,750$ | $\$ 683,232$ | $\$ 683,232$ |
|  | Distribution Center | 1 | $\$ 444,300$ | $\$ 1,584,244$ | $\$ 1,584,244$ |
| Y | TOTAL |  | $\$ 2,404,330$ | $\$ 2,282,197$ | $\$ 7,146,044$ |

FORT WORTH,

## Policy Changes

## Amendments to the Adequate Facilities Discount

- Improve Definition of Adequate Facilities
- At least three (3) thoroughfares within 1 mile radius are designated as (E) Established conditions
- Utilization of a TxDOT on-system facility to count as one of the three thoroughfares for consideration
- Revise Roadway Eligibility
- Roadways listed on most recent TIP would not be eligible as adequate facilities
- Revise Project Eligibility
- Projects with transportation impact fee credits would be ineligible until credits are exhausted


Kimley»Horn

## FORT WORTH

Amendments to the Adequate Facilities Discount


## Amendments to the Land Use/Transportation Discount

- Renaming the discount to Mixed-Use/Multi-modal Development Discount
- Increasing Discount from 15\% to 25\%
- Amending the Trip Capture impact fee reduction amounts:
- 5 to $9 \%=10 \%$ Impact Fee Reduction
- 10 to 14\% = 15\% Impact Fee Reduction
- $15 \%+=25 \%$ Impact Fee Reduction


## Amendments to the Extraordinary Investment Discount

- Increasing Discount to 25\% from 15\%
- Revising capital investment, salary and number of jobs to closely match the City's current Economic Development Policy


## Shell Building Considerations

- Add a definition for Shell buildings
- A new, non-residential building that is built without a final use determined.
- Clarify how shell buildings will be reviewed and calculated
- Non-residential shell buildings will be assessed transportation impact fees based on the general land use definition from the ITE Trip Generation Manual for the building type proposed set as a value for the shell.


## 2022 Impact Fee Study Calendar

| Study Item | Date |
| :--- | :---: |
| Community meetings with various stakeholders (July - September) | Ongoing |
| CIAC Review of Ordinance Text Revisions | $9 / 14$ |
| Council IR on Ordinance Text Revisions | $9 / 20$ |
| Council Public Hearing | $9 / 27$ |
| Council Briefing | $10 / 4$ |
| Council Adoption of Study, Max Fee (Sch. 1), Collection Rate (Sch. 2) and <br> Ordinance | $10 / 25$ |
| Council Adoption of Collection Rate (Sch.2) (if not done on 10/25) | $11 / 8$ |

## QUESTIONS



## Contact Information

Mirian Spencer - Transportation Impact Fee Coordinator (817) 392-2677

Mirian.Spencer@FortWorthTexas.gov
Website:
https://www.fortworthtexas.gov/impactfees/transportationrthtexas.gov

## Fort Worth

