

City of Santa Fe, New Mexico

memo

DATE: Public Hearing of Wednesday, August 27, 2014
TO: Mayor & City Council
VIA: Brian Snyder, City Manager *BS*
Kate Noble, Acting Director, Housing & Community Development Department *KN*
FROM: Reed Liming, Long Range Planning Division Director *RL*
SUBJECT: Impact Fees Bill – Amendments to 14-8.14 and 14-8.15

Summary

The Impact Fees Bill, sponsored by Councilor Bushee, includes the following provisions:

- 1. 50% Reduction of Impact Fees for All Residential Permits** – The bill keeps the 50% reduction for all residential permits previously approved by city council in effect through February 26, 2016.
- 2. Review of 50% Reduction for Residential Permits** - Requires a review of the above provision in one year.
- 3. Land Use Category Consolidation** – The new fee schedule consolidates more detailed categories into more generalized categories, from 20 to six non-residential and from six to five single-family residential categories. This approach recognizes that commercial land uses (tenants) often change, avoids extremely high fees for a small number of land uses, eliminates most impact fee charges for change of use, thereby encouraging reuse of existing buildings, and simplifies impact fee administration.
- 4. Fee Schedule Set at 70% of Maximum** – the new fee schedule would have fees set at 70% of the maximum the CIP states the city could justify, in order to have most of the categories pay slightly lower fees than the current fee schedule. By setting fees somewhat lower in the new fee schedule, subdivisions and development plans that would normally still pay according to the previous more detailed fee schedule, would choose to be charged according to the new, lower fee schedule. This allows those developments that have been approved within the last four years to use the newer more simplified fee schedule. This also would virtually eliminate the need for the current fee schedule to be used, thereby having the vast majority of building permits all using the same consolidated new fee schedule. This would make impact fee administration much easier for both the applicant to understand and for Land Use Department staff to administer.
- 5. Adding Definitions to 14-8.14** – Because the new fee schedule consolidates and simplifies land use categories, more detailed definitions of the various general land use categories are included within 14-8.14 to provide guidance to staff and applicants in determining which category is to be used and fees paid, upon permit application.
- 6. Amends the Park Dedication section (14-8.15)** – The proposed bill also clarifies the definition of “parks” by eliminating the distinction between regional and neighborhood parks for the purposes of assessing impact fees.
- 7. Effective Date** – The bill sets an effective date of Monday, September 15, 2014 for the new ordinance and fee schedule.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CITY OF SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

BILL NO. 2014-23

INTRODUCED BY:

AN ORDINANCE

RELATING TO IMPACT FEES – AMENDING SECTION 14-8.14 (C), (E) AND (F) TO ADOPT A NEW IMPACT FEE SCHEDULE AND INCORPORATE DEFINITIONS RELATED TO LAND USE TYPES; AND RELATING TO PARK DEDICATIONS – AMENDING SECTION 14-8.15 (C)(2) SFCC 1987, THE PARK DEDICATION SECTION; AND MAKING SUCH OTHER CHANGES AS ARE NECESSARY.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE CITY OF SANTA FE:

Section 1. Subsection 14-8.14(C) SFCC 1987 (being Ord. No. 2011-37, §11) is amended to read:

(C) Fee Assessment and Collection

(1) The assessment for impact fees occurs on the date a *plat* or *development* plan receives final approval, from the *city* or the *state* construction industries division or, in the absence of a *plat* or plan, the date of the *development permit application*. Impact fees collected within four years of the date of assessment shall be based on the impact fee schedule in effect at the time of

1 assessment. After the expiration of the four-year period, the new
2 *development* shall be subject to the fee schedule in effect at the time of
3 *application* for a construction *permit*. No action on the part of the city
4 is required for assessment to occur. It shall be the responsibility of the
5 applicant for a construction *permit* to present evidence of the date of *plat* or
6 *development plan* approval in order for the fees to be based on the previous
7 impact fee schedule. After the impact fee has been paid, no refunds will be
8 provided based on the differences in the fee schedules. An applicant must
9 pay all fees according to one fee schedule only and may not mix the various
10 fees from the schedules.

- 11 (2) The collection of impact fees shall occur at the time of issuance of a
12 construction *permit* according to the fee schedule in effect for the
13 *development*.

14 **Section 2. Subsection 14-8.14(E) SFCC 1987 (being Ord. No. 2011-37, §11, as**
15 **amended) is amended to read:**

16 **(E) Fee Determination**

- 17 (1) A person who applies for a construction *permit*, except those exempted or
18 preparing an independent fee calculation study, shall pay impact fees in
19 accordance with ~~[one of]~~ the following fee schedule[s]. If a credit is due
20 pursuant to Section 14-8.14(I), the amount of the credit shall be deducted
21 from the amount of the fee to be paid.
- 22 (2) Beginning February 27, 2014 and ending February 26, 2016, ~~[residential~~
23 ~~*plats, development plans and*~~ construction *permits* for *residential*
24 *developments* shall be ~~[assessed impact fees. At the time of assessment,]~~
25 charged fifty percent (50%) of the scheduled values in the Fee Schedule in

Subsection 14-8.14(E)(3) [~~shall be assessed~~]. Beginning February 27, 2016, such residential developments shall be [~~assessed impact fees in accordance with Subsection 14-8.14(E)(3)~~]. ~~At the time of assessment,~~ charged one hundred percent (100%) of the scheduled values in the Fee Schedule [~~shall be assessed~~].

(3) The fee schedule in this Subsection 14-8.14(E)(~~3~~2) shall be used and its fees assessed on *plats* and *development* plans that receive final approval from the *city* or the *state* construction industries division, [~~after June 30, 2008~~]. ~~The fee schedule shall also be applied to construction permits issued after June 30, 2008~~ except where the permit is issued for a subdivision or for a development plan that is still subject to a prior fee schedule available and on file in the Land Use Department.

FEE SCHEDULE

[Land Use Type]	Unit	Roads	Parks	Fire	Police	Total
Single Family Detached Dwelling or Manufactured Home						
Heated Living Area:						
(0 to 1,500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$1,850	\$1,111	\$125	\$44	\$3,130
(1,501 to 2,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$2,100	\$1,214	\$136	\$48	\$3,498
(2,001 to 2,500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$2,183	\$1,328	\$150	\$53	\$3,714
(2,501 to 3,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$2,248	\$1,379	\$155	\$55	\$3,837
(3,001 to 3,500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$2,309	\$1,418	\$159	\$56	\$3,942
(3,501 to 4,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$2,359	\$1,444	\$163	\$58	\$4,024
(more than 4,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$2,424	\$1,495	\$169	\$59	\$4,147
Accessory dwelling unit (attached or detached)						

Substitute Bill With Amendments Incorporated

[Land-Use Type	Unit	Roads	Parks	Fire	Police	Total
Heated Living Area:						
(0 to 500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$518	\$324	\$37	\$13	\$892
(501 to 1,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$1,036	\$647	\$73	\$26	\$1,782
(1,001 to 1,500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$1,554	\$971	\$110	\$39	\$2,674
Other (Apts., Condos, Townhomes)	Dwelling	\$1,554	\$971	\$110	\$39	\$2,674
Land-Use Type	Unit	Roads	Parks	Fire	Police	Total
Hotel/Motel	Room	\$1,203	\$0	\$82	\$29	\$1,314
Retail/Commercial	G.F.A.					
Shopping Center/General Retail	1000 sq. ft.	\$4,597	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$4,896
Auto Sales/Service	1000 sq. ft.	\$2,180	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$2,479
Bank	1000 sq. ft.	\$4,948	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$5,247
Convenience Store w/Gas Sales	1000 sq. ft.	\$8,778	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$9,077
Health Club, Recreational	1000 sq. ft.	\$4,394	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$4,693
Movie Theater	1000 sq. ft.	\$10,412	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$10,711
Restaurant, Sit-Down	1000 sq. ft.	\$5,083	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$5,382
Restaurant, Fast Food	1000 sq. ft.	\$11,064	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$11,363
Restaurant, Packaged Food	1000 sq. ft.	\$4,597	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$4,896
Office/Institutional	G.F.A.					
Office, General	1000 sq. ft.	\$2,429	\$0	\$124	\$44	\$2,597
Medical Building	1000 sq. ft.	\$3,903	\$0	\$124	\$44	\$4,071
Nursing Home	1000 sq. ft.	\$1,354	\$0	\$124	\$44	\$1,522
Church	1000 sq. ft.	\$1,521	\$0	\$124	\$44	\$1,689
Day-Care Center	1000 sq. ft.	\$3,202	\$0	\$124	\$44	\$3,370

[Land Use Type	Unit	Roads	Parks	Fire	Police	Total
Educational Facility	1000 sq. ft.	\$586	\$0	\$124	\$44	\$754
Educational Facility Dorm Room	1000 sq. ft.	\$1,203	\$0	\$82	\$29	\$1,314
Industrial	G.F.A.					
Industrial, Manufacturing	1000 sq. ft.	\$1,610	\$0	\$74	\$26	\$1,710
Warehouse	1000 sq. ft.	\$1,147	\$0	\$47	\$16	\$1,210
Mini Warehouse	1000 sq. ft.	\$417	\$0	\$47	\$16	\$480]

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

~~[(4) If the type of new development for which a construction permit is requested is not specified on the fee schedule, the impact fee administrator shall determine the fee on the basis of the fee applicable to the most nearly comparable type of land use on the fee schedule. The following shall be used as a guideline for impact fee determination when the specific use is not identified in the fee chart. (Ord. No. 2013-16 § 55)~~

~~(a) Residential~~

- ~~(i) a home occupation business shall be charged according to the fee schedule for the appropriate residential category; and~~
- ~~(ii) the hotel/motel ancillary use fee shall apply to meeting rooms, lobby area and general use areas of the facility. Retail and restaurant square footage shall be charged under the commercial use category.~~

~~(b) Retail/Commercial~~

- ~~(i) the general retail fee shall be used for a hair salon, laundromat, dry cleaner, garden center/nursery retail display area, gas station without~~

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

- ~~a convenience store and inventory storage for a retail business, including growing area for a garden center/nursery;~~
- ~~(ii) the bank fee assessment shall include the square footage of any drive through kiosk and parking area with or without a roof;~~
- ~~(iii) the restaurant fast food fee shall include square footage for the drive-through kiosk and parking area with or without a roof; and~~
- ~~(iv) the packaged food restaurant fee shall be used for a restaurant or bar that does not have any food preparation facilities.~~
- ~~(e) Office/Institutional~~
 - ~~(i) the office general fee shall be used for a studio that is not residential and not retail;~~
 - ~~(ii) the office general fee shall be used for a medical office that does not have any medical equipment, such as an office for psychiatry;~~
 - ~~(iii) the medical office fee shall be used for an animal hospital; and~~
 - ~~(iv) the nursing home fee shall be used for an assisted living facility.~~
- ~~(d) Industrial~~
 - ~~(i) the warehouse fee shall be used for an animal shelter, storage that is not inventory storage or maintenance equipment; and~~
 - ~~(ii) the mini warehouse fee shall be used for a single storage unit or for multiple storage units.~~
- ~~(e) Development Outside of Buildings~~

~~The impact fees for development of land outside of buildings that~~

Substitute Bill With Amendments Incorporated

increases the demand for capital facilities is determined by application of the fee for the corresponding type of building or by preparation of an independent fee calculation study.]

<u>Land Use Type</u>	<u>Unit</u>	<u>Roads</u>	<u>Parks</u>	<u>Fire</u>	<u>Police</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Single-Family Detached / Heated Living Area</u>						
1,500 sq. ft. or less	Dwelling	\$1,894	\$967	\$154	\$64	\$3,079
1,501-2,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$2,064	\$1,010	\$161	\$68	\$3,303
2,001-2,500 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$2,141	\$1,108	\$176	\$74	\$3,499
2,501-3,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$2,245	\$1,163	\$186	\$78	\$3,672
3,001 sq. ft. or more	Dwelling	\$2,377	\$1,238	\$197	\$83	\$3,895
Accessory Dwelling	Dwelling	\$947	\$483	\$77	\$32	\$1,539
Multi-Family	Dwelling	\$1,299	\$945	\$150	\$63	\$2,457
<u>Nonresidential</u>	<u>G.F.A.</u>					
Retail/Commercial	1,000 sq. ft.	\$4,006	\$0	\$269	\$113	\$4,388
Office	1,000 sq. ft.	\$2,402	\$0	\$126	\$53	\$2,581
Industrial	1,000 sq. ft.	\$1,856	\$0	\$55	\$23	\$1,934
Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft.	\$968	\$0	\$24	\$10	\$1,002
Mini-Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft.	\$375	\$0	\$22	\$9	\$406
Public/Institutional	1,000 sq. ft.	\$1,460	\$0	\$113	\$48	\$1,621

(3) The land use director shall determine the fee to be collected as a condition of

1 construction permit approval based on the applicable fee schedule in
2 Subsection 14-8.14(E)(2) above and the provisions of this Subsection 14-
3 8.14(E)(3), or on the basis of an independent fee calculation study pursuant
4 to Subsection 14-8.14(F).

5 (a) The determination of the appropriate land use category shall be
6 based on the following.

7 (i) Single-Family Detached means a *single-family dwelling,*
8 which may consist of a *manufactured home or mobile home.*

9 (ii) Multi-Family means a *multiple-family dwelling.*

10 (iii) Retail/Commercial means an establishment engaged in the
11 selling or rental of goods, services, lodging or entertainment
12 to the general public. Such uses include, but are not limited
13 to, shopping center or mall, alcoholic beverage sales
14 activities, antique shop, bed and breakfast inn, boarding
15 house, commercial recreational use or structure, drive-in,
16 equipment rental or leasing, filling station, flea market,
17 florist, garden center, gift shop, grocery store, hotel,
18 laundromat, motel, nightclub, personal service
19 establishment, pet service establishment pharmacy, repair
20 garage, residential suite hotel or motel, or retail
21 establishment.

22 (iv) Office means a building not located in a shopping center and
23 exclusively containing establishments providing executive,
24 management, administrative or professional services, and
25 which may include ancillary services for office workers.

1 such as a restaurant, coffee shop, newspaper or candy stand,
2 or child care facilities. Such uses include, but are not limited
3 to, real estate, insurance, property management, investment,
4 employment, travel, advertising, secretarial, data processing,
5 telephone answering, telephone marketing, music, radio and
6 television recording and broadcasting studios; professional
7 or consulting services in the fields of law, architecture,
8 design, engineering, accounting and similar professions;
9 interior decorating consulting services; medical and dental
10 offices and clinics, including veterinarian clinics; and
11 business offices of private companies, utility companies,
12 trade associations, unions and nonprofit organizations.
13 Specific examples include *business services* (excluding
14 equipment rental and leasing), *arts and crafts studio, clinic,*
15 *funeral home, veterinary establishment and vocational*
16 *school.*

17 (v) Industrial/Manufacturing means an establishment primarily
18 engaged in the fabrication, assembly or processing of goods.
19 Typical uses include manufacturing plants, welding shops,
20 wholesale bakeries, commercial laundries, commercial
21 greenhouses, food and drug manufacturing, dry cleaning
22 plants, and bottling works. Specific uses include *light*
23 *assembly and manufacturing* and *manufacturing.*

24 (vi) Warehouse means an establishment primarily engaged in the
25 display, storage and sale of goods to other firms for resale, as

1 well as activities involving significant movement and storage
2 of products or equipment. Such uses include, but are not
3 limited to, wholesale distributors, storage warehouses,
4 moving and storage firms, trucking and shipping operations,
5 and major mail processing centers. Specific uses include
6 commercial stable, junkyard, outdoor storage, salvage yard,
7 warehouse and wholesale operations.

8 (vii) Mini-Warehouse means mini-storage units.

9 (viii) Public/Institutional means a governmental, quasi-public or
10 institutional use, or a non-profit recreational use, not located
11 in a shopping center. Such uses include, but are not limited
12 to, elementary, secondary or higher educational
13 establishments, day care centers, hospitals, mental
14 institutions, nursing homes, assisted living facilities, fire
15 stations, city halls, courthouses, post offices, jails, libraries,
16 museums, places of religious worship, military bases,
17 airports, bus stations, fraternal lodges, and parks and
18 recreational buildings. Specific examples include child day-
19 care facility, club, college or university, community
20 residential corrections program, continuing care community,
21 electric facilities, extended care facility, group residential
22 care facility, hospital, human services establishment,
23 institutional building, museum, personal care facility for the
24 elderly, private club or lodge, public utility, recreational
25 facility, religious assembly, sheltered care facility and

transportation terminal.

1
2 (b) If the type of new development for which a construction permit is
3 requested is not specified on the fee schedule, the land use director
4 shall determine the fee on the basis of the fee applicable to the
5 most nearly comparable type of land use on the fee schedule.

6 (c) The impact fees for development of land outside of buildings that
7 increases the demand for capital facilities is determined by
8 application of the fee for the corresponding type of building. In
9 particular, the building square footage for a retail/commercial use
10 shall include indoor or outdoor sales areas or inventory storage areas,
11 growing area for a garden center/nursery, and any drive-through
12 kiosk and associated queuing lane with or without a roof. If the land
13 use director determines that development of land outside of buildings
14 is intended for seasonal usage that reduces the increased demand for
15 capital facilities, the land use director may reduce impact fees
16 charged for the development of land outside of buildings by up to
17 75% of the original assessment.

18 (~~5~~d) Impact fees shall be assessed and collected based on the primary use
19 of the building as determined by the [~~impact fee administrator~~] land
20 use director. Uses that are distinct and separate from the primary
21 use, which are not merely ancillary to the primary use and are one
22 thousand (1,000) square feet or greater, will be charged the impact
23 fee category based on the distinct and separate use.

24 (~~6~~e) Where a permit is to be issued for a building "shell" and the [~~impact~~
25 ~~fee administrator~~] land use director is unable to determine the

1 intended use of the *building*, the [~~impact fee administrator~~] land use
2 director shall assess and collect impact fees according to the zoning
3 district in which the *building* is to be located as follows:

4 ((a)i) C-2 and all SC zones – [~~Shopping Center/General Retail~~
5 ~~fee rate~~] “Retail/Commercial”;

6 ((b)ii) HZ zone – [~~Medical Building~~ fee rate] “Office”; [and]

7 ((e)iii) C-1 [5] and C-4 [~~and all other nonresidential zones~~ “Office,
8 General” fee rate.] – “Office”; and

9 (iv) I-1 and I-2 – “Industrial/Manufacturing”.

10 ((7)f) If there is an increase in the amount of the impact fee calculation
11 once a tenant improvement *permit* is submitted, the difference from
12 what was paid at the time of the shell *permit* and the tenant
13 improvement fee calculation shall be paid prior to issuance of the
14 construction *permit*. If the fee schedule determination for the square
15 footage of the use identified in the tenant improvement construction
16 *permit* results in a net decrease from what was paid at the time of
17 the shell *permit*, there shall be no refund of impact fees previously
18 paid.

19 ((8)g) Live/work *developments* containing *dwelling units* in combination
20 with *nonresidential* floor area in a common *building* shall pay impact
21 fees for each *dwelling unit* according to the *residential* fee rate for
22 [~~Other~~] “Multi-Family” and for the *gross floor area* intended for
23 *nonresidential* use according to the “Office” [5; ~~General~~] fee rate.
24 If the initial Live/Work construction *permit* application is for a shell
25 construction *permit*, the [~~impact fee administrator~~] land use director

1 shall collect impact fees at the "Office" [~~"Office, General"~~] fee
2 rate. If *dwelling units* are added as a use within the *building* after the
3 *building* has been charged impact fees at a *nonresidential* fee rate,
4 and there is no increase in *gross floor area*, the [~~impact-fee~~
5 ~~administrator~~] *land use director* shall collect only the required park
6 impact fees for the *dwelling units* at the [~~residential~~]
7 [~~"Other"~~] "Multi-Family" at the time of the *dwelling unit permit*
8 *application*.

9 (h) If a construction *permit application* changes or intensifies the use of
10 an existing *building*, increases the *gross floor area* of an existing
11 *building*, or replaces an existing *building* with a new *building*
12 and new use, the fee shall be based on the net increase in the fee for
13 the new use or increase as compared to what the current fee would
14 be for the previous use or floor area. If the proposed change
15 results in a net decrease in the fee there shall be no refund of impact
16 fees previously paid.

17 (i) "G.F.A." in the fee schedule refers to gross floor area.

18 **Section 3. Subsection 14-8.14(F) SFCC 1987 (being Ord. No. 2011-37, §11) is**

19 **amended to read:**

20 **(F) Independent Fee Calculation**

21 (1) The [~~impact-fee administrator~~] *land use director* may require an independent
22 fee calculation for any proposed *development* interpreted by the [~~impact-fee~~
23 ~~administrator~~] *land use director* as not one of those types listed on the fee
24 schedule or as one that is not comparable to any land use on the fee schedule.

25 (2) The preparation and cost of the independent fee calculation study is the sole

1 responsibility of the *applicant*.

2 (3) The independent fee calculation study shall be based on the same service
3 standards and facility costs used in the impact fee *capital improvements plan*
4 and shall document the methodologies and assumptions used. The
5 independent fee calculation shall be based on the expected long-term
6 occupancy of the *building or development*, based on physical characteristics,
7 and not on the characteristics of the proposed initial owner or occupant of the
8 *building or development*.

9 (4) An independent fee calculation study submitted by an *applicant* to calculate a
10 road impact fee shall address all three factors relevant to the generation of
11 service units, namely, trip generation rates, primary trip factors and average
12 trip lengths.

13 (5) After review, the [~~impact fee administrator~~] land use director shall approve
14 or reject the conclusions of the independent fee calculation study.

15 **Section 4. Subsection 14-8.14(J)(5) (being Ord. No. 2011-37, §11) is amended to**

16 **read:**

17 (5) Furnishing false information on any matter relating to the administration of
18 this Section 14-8.14, including the furnishing of false information regarding
19 the expected size, use or impacts from a proposed *new development*, is a
20 violation of this Section 14-8.14. The *city* may issue a stop work order or
21 rescind any *permits* [~~issues~~] issued in reliance on the previous payment of
22 such impact fee.

23 **Section 5. Subsection 14-8.15(C)(2) (being Ord. No. 2011-37, §11) is amended to**

24 **read:**

25 (2) For any other *development* proposing *dwelling units*, the *city* shall require

1 land to be dedicated for either neighborhood parks or regional parks or both,
2 unless the amount of land or type of land is not suitable for public parks,
3 *open space or recreation facilities*. Where the *city* determines that no land is
4 to be dedicated for [~~neighborhood~~] parks, then [~~neighborhood~~] park impact
5 fees shall be collected according to Section 14-8.14. [~~Where the city~~
6 ~~determines that no land is to be dedicated for regional parks, then regional~~
7 ~~park impact fees shall be collected according to Section 14-8.14.~~]

8 **Section 6. Article 14-12 SFCC 1987 (being Ord. #2011-37, §15, as amended) is**
9 **amended to repeal the following definition:**

10 [~~IMPACT FEE ADMINISTRATOR~~

11 ~~The city employee primarily responsible for administering the provisions of Section 14-8.14~~

12 ~~(Impact Fees).]~~

13 **Section 7. Editor's Note: Chapter 14 SFCC 1987 (being Ord. #2011-37, as**
14 **amended) is amended to delete all references to "impact fee administrator" and substitute in lieu**
15 **thereof "land use director".**

16 **Section 8. Effective Date.** This ordinance shall become effective on September 15,
17 2014.

18 **Section 9. Review.** This ordinance shall be reviewed one year from the effective date.

19 APPROVED AS TO FORM:

20 

21
22 KELLEY A. BRENNAN, CITY ATTORNEY

23
24
25 M/Melissa/Bills 2014/2014-23 Impact Fee - one fee schedule

City of Santa Fe, New Mexico

memo

DATE: For Public Hearing of Wednesday, August 27, 2014

TO: Mayor & City Council

VIA: Brain Snyder, City Manager *BKS*
Kate Noble, Acting Director, Housing & Community Development Department *KN*

FROM: Reed Liming, Long Range Planning Division Director *RL*

SUBJECT: Impact Fee Capital Improvements Plan 2020

Summary

The *Impact Fee Capital Improvements Plan 2020 for Roads, Parks, Fire/EMS and Police* provides the basis for determining new impact fees and includes "land use assumptions" (i.e. growth projections) as required by the New Mexico Development Fees Act (§§ 5-8-1 to 5-8-43, NMSA 1978) and provides the basis for new impact fees. The Act requires that a local government's impact fees must be updated every five years (unless the governing body determines that no update is needed). The draft Impact Fee CIP 2020 update recommends changes in the following major areas of the CIP and for the Impact Fees ordinance. These changes include:

1. Land Use Categories – The city has been using a detailed list of land uses in the previous fee schedules.

Changes recommended include:

- Non-Residential Land Use Categories – reduce from 20 to six categories,
- Residential Categories – set the upper limit at "3,001 square feet or more"
- Residential Categories – add a single "Accessory Dwelling Unit" category (i.e. for Guest Houses, etc.),

The study shows that moving from more specific, detailed non-residential uses to fewer, more general uses would result in a 6% loss of impact fee revenues from commercial uses. However, a benefit of moving to fewer, more general uses includes ease of assessing and collecting fees and greatly reducing the number of cases where new commercial tenants are charged impact fees due to their business falling into a detailed commercial land use category that owes more in impact fees than the previous tenant's business.

2. Level of Impact Fees to be Adopted – In 2008, the City Council adopted an impact fee schedule with fees set at 60% of the maximum the consultant stated the city could justify charging. The draft Impact Fee CIP 2020 shows the maximum amount the city could charge (Table 2, p.3) and what the fees would be if adopted at 70% of maximum as recommended by the CIAC (Table 3, p. 4). Currently, all residential permits pay only 50% of the amounts shown in the fee schedule through February 26, 2016. (The draft Impact Fees Bill proposes to remove the 50% reduction; the CIAC recommended that the 50% reduction remain in the ordinance.)

3. Capital Facility Plans – The final two pages of the document (pp. 77-78) contain Tables 80-83 which list the planned projects eligible for impact fees through 2020, as recommended by city staff in the key departments that manage the projects.

- Table 80 – Planned Major Roadway Improvements, 2014-2020
- Table 81 – Planned Park/Trail Improvements, 2014-2020
- Table 82 – Planned Fire/EMS Improvements, 2014-2020
- Table 83 – Planned Police Improvements, 2014-2020

DATE: For Public Hearing of Wednesday, August 27, 2014
TO: Mayor & City Council
VIA: Brian Snyder, City Manager
Kate Noble, Acting Director, Housing & Community Development Director
FROM: Reed Liming, Long Range Planning Division Director
SUBJECT: Impact Fee Capital Improvements Plan 2020
Page 2 of 2

4. Service Areas / Benefit Districts – Multiple service areas or benefit districts were discussed by the CIAC, but were not recommended by the consultant or the CIAC. Separate benefit districts would charge the same impact fees but would limit the fees collected in a district to being spent only in that district. Growth and annexation in the southwest area of the city has provided a basis for ensuring that impact fees collected in that area be spent only in that area. U.S. Census data shows that the Southwest Area (bounded by Cerrillos Road, I-25, NM 599, Agua Fria THC and Richards Avenue) absorbed 45.3% of all new housing units in the urban area from 2000-2010. Separate analysis of the city’s monthly permit reports indicates that the Southwest Area absorbed 44.4% of all new housing from 2004-2013. During that time approximately 48% of all impact fee funds expended have been for projects generally serving that area.

The following questions arise when considering possible multiple benefit districts:

- A. Which fees would have multiple benefit districts? (Study suggests “Roads” and “Parks” would be appropriate)
- B. What would be the specific boundaries for the districts?
- C. How would existing account balances be divided among the new districts? (50/50, if just two districts?)
- D. Would funds from one benefit district be able to be used for a project in another district? If yes, under what circumstances?
- E. Could reduced impact fee revenue (due to continued lower growth in the city combined with a 50% waiver of residential fees for two years), when split among separate accounts in multiple benefit districts, leave all accounts with too little revenue for useful project funding?

1 CITY OF SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

2 RESOLUTION NO. 2014 - _____

3 INTRODUCED BY:

4
5 Councilor Patti Bushee

6
7
8
9
10 A RESOLUTION

11 ADOPTING THE *“IMPACT FEE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN 2020 FOR ROADS,*
12 *PARKS, FIRE/EMS AND POLICE”* TO MEET THE STATE REQUIRED IMPACT FEE
13 PROGRAM 5-YEAR UPDATE AS CALLED FOR IN THE STATE DEVELOPMENT FEES
14 ACT (5-8-30 NMSA 1978).

15
16 WHEREAS, the State of New Mexico established the “Development Fees Act” (§§ 5-8-1 to
17 5-8-43, NMSA 1978) (the “Act”) to enable local governments to adopt local development impact
18 fees; and

19 WHEREAS, the Act requires periodic updates of the impact fee land use assumptions and
20 capital improvement plan at least every five years (§ 5-8-30); and

21 WHEREAS, the *“Impact Fee Capital Improvements Plan, 2020”* provides the background
22 and basis for approving new projects and adopting a new fee schedule; and

23 WHEREAS, the City previously adopted the *“Impact Fee Capital Improvements Plan and*
24 *Land Use Assumptions, 2007-2012”* (Resolution 2008-7) and amended the *“Impact Fee Ordinance”*
25 (Ordinance 2008-2; SFCC 14-8.14) on January 9, 2008, all in accordance with the

1 Act.

2 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE
3 CITY OF SANTA FE that the Governing Body hereby adopts the "Impact Fee Capital
4 Improvements Plan and Land Use Assumptions 2020 for Roads, Parks, Fire/EMS and Police,"
5 attached hereto as Exhibit "A."

6 PASSED, APPROVED and ADOPTED this ____ day of _____, 2014.

7 CITY OF SANTA FE:

8
9 _____

10 JAVIER M. GONZALES, MAYOR

11 ATTEST:

12
13 _____

14 YOLANDA Y. VIGIL, CITY CLERK

15 APPROVED AS TO FORM:


16 
17 _____

18 KELLEY A. BRENNAN, CITY ATTORNEY

19
20
21
22
23
24

25 M/Melissa/Resolutions 2014/Impact Fee CIP 2020

EXHIBIT "A"



**Impact Fee
Capital Improvements Plan 2020
for Roads, Parks, Fire/EMS and Police**

City of Santa Fe, New Mexico

June 2014

CIAC APPROVED DRAFT

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
LEGAL FRAMEWORK	6
SERVICE AREAS.....	8
LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS	11
METHODOLOGIES	12
LAND USE CATEGORIES.....	14
ROADS	18
PARKS/TRAILS	31
FIRE/EMS	39
POLICE	47
APPENDIX A: ROAD INVENTORY	53
APPENDIX B: AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE	58
APPENDIX C: FUNCTIONAL POPULATION.....	61
APPENDIX D: PARK/TRAIL INVENTORY.....	64
APPENDIX E: OUTSTANDING DEBT.....	67
APPENDIX F: LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS.....	74
APPENDIX G: CAPITAL FACILITY PLANS.....	77

List of Tables

Table 1. Adopted Impact Fee Schedule.....	2
Table 2. Updated Fees Compared to 2008 Calculated/Adopted Fees	3
Table 3. Updated Fees at 70% Compared to Adopted Fees	4
Table 4. Potential Impact Fee Revenue, 2014-2020	4
Table 5. Land Use Assumptions Summary, 2014-2020	11
Table 6. Impact Fee Revenue, Detailed vs. General Nonresidential Categories	16
Table 7. Impact Fee Revenue, Detailed vs. General Residential Categories	17
Table 8. System-Wide Ratio of Road Capacity to Demand.....	20
Table 9. Traffic Signal Level Of Service.....	21
Table 10. Single-Family Trip Generation Rates	22
Table 11. Expected Vehicle-Miles of Travel.....	23
Table 12. Local Trip Length Adjustment Factor	23
Table 13. Average Trip Length by Trip Purpose	24
Table 14. Travel Demand Schedule	24
Table 15. Road Segment Cost per Service Unit	25
Table 16. Traffic Signal Cost per Service Unit	25
Table 17. Total Road Cost per Service Unit	26
Table 18. Total Daily Travel Demand, 2014-2020.....	26
Table 19. Major Road Capital Needs, 2014-2020.....	26
Table 20. Federal and State Transportation Funding, FY 2011-2014.....	27
Table 21. Federal/State Funding Credit per Service Unit	27
Table 22. Road Debt Credit	28
Table 23. Road Net Cost per Service Unit.....	28
Table 24. Road Net Cost Schedule.....	28
Table 25. Road Impact Fee Comparisons	29
Table 26. Potential Road Impact Fee Revenue, 2014-2020.....	30
Table 27. Park/Trail Equivalent Dwelling Unit Multipliers	32
Table 28. Park/Trail Service Units, 2014-2020	33
Table 29. Park/Trail Replacement Cost.....	33
Table 30. Park/Trail Cost Per Service Unit	34
Table 31. Park/Trail Capital Needs, 2014-2020	34
Table 32. Park/Trail Debt Credit	35
Table 33. Park/Trail Grant Funding Credit.....	35
Table 34. Park/Trail Net Cost Per Service Unit	35
Table 35. Park/Trail Grant Funding, FY 2008-2013	36
Table 36. Park/Trail Net Cost Schedule	37
Table 37. Park/Trail Impact Fee Comparisons.....	37
Table 38. Potential Park/Trail Impact Fee Revenue, 2014-2020	38
Table 39. Fire/EMS Facility Replacement Cost.....	41
Table 40. Fire/EMS Equipment Replacement Cost	41
Table 41. Fire/EMS Cost Per Service Unit	42
Table 42. Fire/EMS Capital Needs, 2014-2020	42
Table 43. Fire/EMS Debt Credit	43
Table 44. Fire/EMS Grant Funding, FY 2008-2013.....	43
Table 45. Fire/EMS Grant Funding Credit Per Service Unit	44
Table 46. Fire/EMS Net Cost Per Service Unit.....	44
Table 47. Fire/EMS Net Cost Schedule.....	44
Table 48. Fire/EMS Impact Fee Comparisons	45
Table 49. Potential Fire/EMS Impact Fee Revenue, 2014-2020.....	46

Table 50. Police Facility Replacement Cost	48
Table 51. Police Equipment Replacement Cost.....	48
Table 52. Police Cost Per Service Unit.....	48
Table 53. Police Capital Needs, 2014-2020.....	49
Table 54. Police Debt Credit.....	49
Table 55. Police Grant Funding, FY 2008-2013	50
Table 56. Police Grant Funding Credit Per Service Unit.....	50
Table 57. Police Net Cost Per Service Unit	50
Table 58. Police Net Cost Schedule	51
Table 59. Police Impact Fee Comparisons	51
Table 60. Potential Police Impact Fee Revenue, 2014-2020	52
Table 61. Major Roadway Inventory.....	53
Table 62. Average Household Size by Housing Type, 2000	58
Table 63. Average Household Size by Housing Type, 2008-2012	58
Table 64. Equivalent Dwelling Unit Multipliers.....	59
Table 65. Single-Family Average Household Size by Unit Size.....	60
Table 66. Residential Functional Population per Unit	61
Table 67. Nonresidential Functional Population per Unit	62
Table 68. Functional Population Multipliers.....	63
Table 69. Total Functional Population, 2014-2020	63
Table 70. Inventory of Existing Parks and Open Space	64
Table 71. Existing Trail Inventory.....	66
Table 72. Outstanding Non-Utility Debt Summary	67
Table 73. Distribution of Debt by Facility Type.....	68
Table 74. Outstanding Debt by Facility Type.....	68
Table 75. 2002 Gross Receipts Tax Bond Projects.....	69
Table 76. 2004A Gross Receipts Tax Bond Projects	70
Table 77. 2006A Gross Receipts Tax Bond Projects	71
Table 78. 2008 Gross Receipts Tax Bond Projects.....	72
Table 79. 2012A Gross Receipts Tax Bond Projects	73
Table 80. Planned Major Road Improvements, 2014-2020.....	77
Table 81. Planned Park/Trail Improvements, 2014-2020	78
Table 82. Planned Fire/EMS Improvements, 2014-2020	78
Table 83. Planned Police Improvements, 2014-2020	78

List of Figures

Figure 1. Santa Fe Urban Area.....	9
Figure 2. Current and Proposed Land Use Categories.....	15
Figure 3. Major Roadway System	19
Figure 4. Road Impact Fee Formula	21
Figure 5. Existing Parks, Open Space and Trails	31
Figure 6. Existing Fire Stations.....	39
Figure 7. Nonresidential Functional Population Formula	62

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Duncan Associates has been retained by the City of Santa Fe to update the City's capital improvements plans, land use assumptions and impact fees for roads, parks/trails, fire/EMS and police facilities. This study calculates maximum impact fees that Santa Fe can charge based on the existing levels of service.

Report Layout

The report begins with five chapters that have general applicability to all four fee types: legal framework, service areas, land use assumptions, methodologies and land use categories. The last four chapters address the four facility types: roads, parks/trails, fire/EMS and police. Appendices provide more detailed data and analysis to support the individual fee calculations. The final appendix contains the list of planned improvements, which may be amended prior to the next comprehensive impact fee update.

Background

The last comprehensive update of the City's impact fees was based on a 2008 study that was adopted by the City Council on January 9, 2008.¹ **The fees were adopted at 60% of the calculated amounts.**

Impact fees for residential uses were suspended for two years, effective January 22, 2012. Beginning February 27, 2014, residential impact fees are being collected at 50% of adopted amounts for the next two years.

The current adopted fees are summarized in Table 1 on the following page. The temporary 50% residential fee reduction is not reflected in the table.

In addition to impact fees, the City assesses Utility Expansion Charges (UECs) for water and wastewater. UECs are similar to impact fees, but are adopted under authority provided in state law to assess charges for water and wastewater facilities, rather than under the authority of the *Development Fees Act* that regulates impact fees. The City's UECs are addressed in a separate analysis.

Land Use Categories

It is recommended that the current 20 nonresidential land use categories in the impact fee schedules be reduced to six: retail/commercial, office, industrial, warehouse, mini-warehouse and public/institutional. This approach recognizes that commercial land uses often change, avoids extremely high fees for a small number of land uses (e.g., restaurants, convenience stores, medical offices), eliminates most impact fee charges for change of use, thereby encouraging reuse of existing buildings, and simplifies impact fee administration. This change, however, would result in impact fee revenues about 6% lower than under the more detailed land use categories (see page 16).

¹ Duncan Associates, *Impact Fee Capital Improvements Plan and Land Use Assumptions for Roads, Parks, Fire and Police*, approved by the Santa Fe City Council on January 9, 2008.

Table 1. Adopted Impact Fee Schedule

Land Use Type	Unit	Roads	Parks	Fire	Police	Total
Single Family Detached Units (heated living area):						
(0 to 1,500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$1,850	\$1,111	\$125	\$44	\$3,130
(1,501 to 2,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$2,100	\$1,214	\$136	\$48	\$3,498
(2,001 to 2,500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$2,183	\$1,328	\$150	\$53	\$3,714
(2,501 to 3,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$2,248	\$1,379	\$155	\$55	\$3,837
(3,001 to 3,500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$2,309	\$1,418	\$159	\$56	\$3,942
(3,501 to 4,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$2,359	\$1,444	\$163	\$58	\$4,024
(more than 4,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$2,424	\$1,495	\$169	\$59	\$4,147
Accessory Units (attached or detached)						
(0 to 500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$518	\$324	\$37	\$13	\$892
(501 to 1,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$1,036	\$647	\$73	\$26	\$1,782
(1,000 to 1,500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$1,554	\$971	\$110	\$39	\$2,674
Other (Apts., Condos, S.F. Attached)	Dwelling	\$1,554	\$971	\$110	\$39	\$2,674
Hotel/Motel	Room	\$1,203	\$0	\$82	\$29	\$1,314
Retail/Commercial (gross floor area)						
Shopping Center/General Retail	1000 sq. ft.	\$4,597	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$4,896
Auto Sales/Service	1000 sq. ft.	\$2,180	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$2,479
Bank	1000 sq. ft.	\$4,948	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$5,247
Convenience Store w/Gas Sales	1000 sq. ft.	\$8,778	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$9,077
Health Club, Recreational	1000 sq. ft.	\$4,394	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$4,693
Movie Theater	1000 sq. ft.	\$10,412	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$10,711
Restaurant, Packaged Food	1000 sq. ft.	\$4,597	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$4,896
Restaurant, Sit-Down	1000 sq. ft.	\$5,083	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$5,382
Restaurant, Fast Food	1000 sq. ft.	\$11,064	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$11,363
Office/Institutional (gross floor area)						
Office, General	1000 sq. ft.	\$2,429	\$0	\$124	\$44	\$2,597
Medical Building	1000 sq. ft.	\$3,903	\$0	\$124	\$44	\$4,071
Nursing Home	1000 sq. ft.	\$1,354	\$0	\$124	\$44	\$1,522
Church	1000 sq. ft.	\$1,521	\$0	\$124	\$44	\$1,689
Day Care Center	1000 sq. ft.	\$3,202	\$0	\$124	\$44	\$3,370
Educational Facility	1000 sq. ft.	\$586	\$0	\$124	\$44	\$754
Educational Facility Dorm Room	1000 sq. ft.	\$1,203	\$0	\$82	\$29	\$1,314
Industrial/Warehousing (gross floor area)						
Industrial, Manufacturing	1000 sq. ft.	\$1,610	\$0	\$74	\$26	\$1,710
Warehouse	1000 sq. ft.	\$1,147	\$0	\$47	\$16	\$1,210
Mini-Warehouse	1000 sq. ft.	\$417	\$0	\$47	\$16	\$480

Source: Santa Fe City Code, Sec. 14-8.14/E(a), as amended by Ordinance 2013-44 adopted February 27, 2014.

Updated Fees

While the updated fees are generally lower than those calculated in the 2008 study, the 2008 fees were adopted at only 60% of the full proportionate-share amounts. Consequently, the updated fees are higher than the current adopted fees for most land uses, as shown in Table 2. Note that a 67% increase from current levels would be necessary to bring the fees up to the levels calculated in 2008 (while it may not be intuitive, if fees are adopted with a 40% reduction, it takes a 67% increase to get back to 100%). Because the updated fees are generally lower than those calculated in 2008, the maximum percentage increases from current adopted fees are generally significantly below 67%.

Table 2. Updated Fees Compared to 2008 Calculated/Adopted Fees

Land Use Type	Unit	Roads	Parks	Fire	Police	Total
Single-Family Detached (avg.)	Dwelling	\$3,009	\$1,552	\$247	\$104	\$4,912
1,500 sq. ft. or less	Dwelling	\$2,706	\$1,381	\$220	\$92	\$4,399
1,501-2,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$2,949	\$1,443	\$230	\$97	\$4,719
2,001-2,500 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$3,059	\$1,583	\$252	\$106	\$5,000
2,501-3,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$3,207	\$1,661	\$265	\$111	\$5,244
3,001 sq. ft. or more	Dwelling	\$3,395	\$1,769	\$282	\$119	\$5,565
Multi-Family	Dwelling	\$1,855	\$1,350	\$214	\$90	\$3,509
Retail/Commercial	1,000 sq. ft	\$5,723	\$0	\$384	\$161	\$6,268
Office	1,000 sq. ft	\$3,431	\$0	\$180	\$76	\$3,687
Industrial	1,000 sq. ft	\$2,651	\$0	\$78	\$33	\$2,762
Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft	\$1,383	\$0	\$34	\$14	\$1,431
Mini-Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft	\$535	\$0	\$31	\$13	\$579
Public/Institutional	1,000 sq. ft	\$2,086	\$0	\$162	\$68	\$2,316

Percent Change from 2008 Calculated Fees

Single-Family Detached						
1,500 sq. ft. or less	Dwelling	-12%	-25%	5%	24%	-16%
1,501-2,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	-16%	-29%	1%	21%	-19%
2,001-2,500 sq. ft.	Dwelling	-16%	-29%	1%	19%	-19%
2,501-3,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	-14%	-28%	3%	22%	-18%
3,001 sq. ft. or more	Dwelling	-12%	-25%	6%	27%	-15%
Multi-Family	Dwelling	-28%	-17%	17%	38%	-21%
Retail/Commercial	1,000 sq. ft	-25%	n/a	4%	24%	-23%
Office	1,000 sq. ft	-15%	n/a	-13%	4%	-15%
Industrial	1,000 sq. ft	-1%	n/a	-37%	-25%	-3%
Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft	-28%	n/a	-56%	-48%	-29%
Mini-Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft	-23%	n/a	-60%	-52%	-28%
Public/Institutional	1,000 sq. ft	-8%	n/a	-22%	-7%	-9%

Percent Change from Adopted Fees

Single-Family Detached						
1,500 sq. ft. or less	Dwelling	46%	24%	76%	109%	41%
1,501-2,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	40%	19%	69%	102%	35%
2,001-2,500 sq. ft.	Dwelling	40%	19%	68%	100%	35%
2,501-3,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	43%	20%	71%	102%	37%
3,001 sq. ft. or more	Dwelling	47%	25%	77%	113%	41%
Multi-Family	Dwelling	19%	39%	95%	131%	31%
Retail/Commercial	1,000 sq. ft	24%	n/a	74%	106%	28%
Office	1,000 sq. ft	41%	n/a	45%	73%	42%
Industrial	1,000 sq. ft	65%	n/a	5%	27%	62%
Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft	21%	n/a	-28%	-13%	18%
Mini-Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft	28%	n/a	-34%	-19%	21%
Public/Institutional	1,000 sq. ft	54%	n/a	31%	55%	52%

Source: Updated fees from Table 24 (roads), Table 36 (parks), Table 47 (fire/EMS) and Table 58 (police); percentage comparison to 2008 fees based on fees calculated in Duncan Associates, *Impact Fee Capital Improvements Plan and Land Use Assumptions for Roads, Parks, Fire and Police*, approved by the Santa Fe City Council on January 9, 2008 and adopted fees from Table 1 (comparison uses shopping center for retail/commercial, general office for office and nursing home for public/institutional).

Adoption of the updated fees at a 70% implementation rate would essentially be revenue-neutral (see Table 4). The updated total impact fees are very similar to current adopted fees for most land uses, as illustrated in Table 3. The Impact Fee Capital Improvements Advisory Committee (CIAC) recommends adoption of the updated fees at this percentage.

Table 3. Updated Fees at 70% Compared to Adopted Fees

Land Use Type	Unit	Roads	Parks	Fire	Police	Total
Single-Family Detached (avg.)	Dwelling	\$2,106	\$1,086	\$173	\$73	\$3,438
1,500 sq. ft. or less	Dwelling	\$1,894	\$967	\$154	\$64	\$3,079
1,501-2,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$2,064	\$1,010	\$161	\$68	\$3,303
2,001-2,500 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$2,141	\$1,108	\$176	\$74	\$3,499
2,501-3,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$2,245	\$1,163	\$186	\$78	\$3,672
3,001 sq. ft. or more	Dwelling	\$2,377	\$1,238	\$197	\$83	\$3,895
Multi-Family	Dwelling	\$1,299	\$945	\$150	\$63	\$2,457
Retail/Commercial	1,000 sq. ft	\$4,006	\$0	\$269	\$113	\$4,388
Office	1,000 sq. ft	\$2,402	\$0	\$126	\$53	\$2,581
Industrial	1,000 sq. ft	\$1,856	\$0	\$55	\$23	\$1,934
Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft	\$968	\$0	\$24	\$10	\$1,002
Mini-Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft	\$375	\$0	\$22	\$9	\$406
Public/Institutional	1,000 sq. ft	\$1,460	\$0	\$113	\$48	\$1,621

Percent Change from Adopted Fees

Single-Family Detached						
1,500 sq. ft. or less	Dwelling	2%	-13%	23%	45%	-2%
1,501-2,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	-2%	-17%	18%	42%	-6%
2,001-2,500 sq. ft.	Dwelling	-2%	-17%	17%	40%	-6%
2,501-3,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	0%	-16%	20%	42%	-4%
3,001 sq. ft. or more	Dwelling	3%	-13%	24%	48%	-1%
Multi-Family	Dwelling	-16%	-3%	36%	62%	-8%
Retail/Commercial	1,000 sq. ft	-13%	n/a	22%	45%	-10%
Office	1,000 sq. ft	-1%	n/a	2%	20%	-1%
Industrial	1,000 sq. ft	15%	n/a	-26%	-12%	13%
Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft	-16%	n/a	-49%	-38%	-17%
Mini-Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft	-10%	n/a	-53%	-44%	-15%
Public/Institutional	1,000 sq. ft	8%	n/a	-9%	9%	7%

Source: 75% of updated fees from Table 2; percentage comparison to adopted fees from Table 1 (comparison uses shopping center for retail/commercial, general office for office and nursing home for public/institutional).

Potential Revenue

If the updated fees are adopted at 100% of the proportionate fair-share costs identified in this study, total impact fee revenues over the next seven years would be about \$14 million, assuming no residential fee waivers or reductions, other than for affordable housing. The revenue effects of 100%, 70% and 60% adoption rates are summarized in Table 4, based on the growth projections contained in the updated Land Use Assumptions, and compared to revenue from current fees.

Table 4. Potential Impact Fee Revenue, 2014-2020

Fee Type	Adoption Rates (No Waivers)			Current Fees
	100%	70%	60%	
Roads	\$10,352,347	\$7,246,643	\$6,211,408	\$8,140,027
Parks/Trails	\$2,674,647	\$1,872,253	\$1,604,788	\$2,192,480
Fire/EMS	\$774,244	\$541,971	\$464,546	\$455,399
Police	\$325,566	\$227,896	\$195,340	\$162,915
Total	\$14,126,804	\$9,888,763	\$8,476,082	\$10,950,821

Source: Revenue for updated fees at 100% from Table 26 (roads), Table 38 (parks), Table 49 (fire/EMS) and Table 60 (police); revenue from current fees assumes single-family fee for 2,001-2,500 sq. ft. unit; 95% shopping center rate plus 5% fast-food restaurant rate (fast-food restaurant was actually 9% of retail square footage over the last two years) for retail, general office for office, average of industrial/warehouse for industrial/warehouse and nursing home for institutional.

Recommendations

The consultant offers the following recommendations relating to the impact fee update:

1. **Consolidate/Reduce Number of Nonresidential Land Use Categories.** The City should consolidate the nonresidential land use categories as reflected in the updated fee schedules. Even though this is likely to result in slightly less revenue than would be received if the current detailed categories were retained, such consolidation will recognize that commercial land uses often change, avoid extremely high fees for a small number of land uses, eliminate most impact fee charges for change of use, thereby encouraging reuse of existing buildings, and simplify impact fee administration.
2. **Consider Single-Family Flat Rate.** The City could also consider adopting flat rate for single-family detached units in place of the current differentiated fees by dwelling unit size. Both options have been calculated in this study, and both options would generate about the same amount of revenue. This would result in somewhat higher fees for smaller units and lower fees for larger units. However, the difference between fees for the smallest and largest single-family size categories has gone down from a theoretical maximum of \$3,089 when the differential fees were first calculated in 2003 to only \$1,166 in this update,² due to switch to more reliable regional data. The City may well decide that this relatively small differential is no longer worth the additional complexity.
3. **Adopt Fees at the Same Percentage for All Land Uses.** The updated fees may be adopted at a percentage less than the proportionate fair-share amounts documented in this study. Different adoption percentages could be applied to the different types of fees (e.g., roads or parks), but the percentage for each fee type should be applied uniformly to all land use types in order to retain the proportionality of the fees to the impact of various types of development. Adoption of all fees at 70% would produce about the same revenue as current fees.

² Sum of road, park, fire and police fees, if adopted at 100% with no residential fee waivers.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

Impact fees are a way for local governments to require new developments to pay a proportionate share of the infrastructure costs they impose on the community. In contrast to traditional “negotiated” developer exactions, impact fees are charges that are assessed on new development using a standard formula based on objective characteristics, such as the number and type of dwelling units constructed. The fees are one-time, up-front charges, with the payment usually made at the time of building permit issuance. Impact fees require each new development project to pay its pro-rata share of the cost of new capital facilities required to serve that development.

Impact fees were pioneered by local governments in the absence of explicit state enabling legislation. Consequently, such fees were originally defended as an exercise of local government's broad “police power” to protect the health, safety and welfare of the community. The courts gradually developed guidelines for constitutionally-valid impact fees, based on a “rational nexus” that must exist between the regulatory fee or exaction and the activity that is being regulated. To date, 28 states have adopted impact fee enabling legislation. These acts have tended to embody the constitutional standards that have been developed by the courts. Impact fees in New Mexico are governed by the New Mexico *Development Fees Act* (Sec. 5-8-1, et. seq., New Mexico Revised Statutes).

Service Area

The New Mexico *Development Fees Act* requires that Land Use Assumptions and Capital Improvements Plans must be prepared for each “service area.” A service area is a geographic area within which a set of capital facilities provides roughly equivalent benefit to all development located within the area. In general, impact fees collected within a service area will be spent within the same service area, although there may be instances where the facility that serves development in the service area is actually physically located outside the service area.

Land Use Assumptions

An impact fee update must include land use assumptions (growth projections) for each service area. The *Development Fees Act* defines land use assumptions as “projections of changes in land uses, densities, intensities and population in the service area over at least a five-year period.” Because the Capital Improvements Plan that must be prepared for each service area must identify improvement needs for a period not to exceed ten years, a 5-to-10-year time-frame is appropriate for an impact fee study. A seven-year time frame is used for the land use assumptions and capital improvements plans in this study. The land use assumptions are provided in Appendix F.

Capital Improvements Plan

According to the *Development Fees Act*, impact fees can only be spent on improvements identified in the Capital Improvements Plan. The Capital Improvements Plan required by the *Development Fees Act* is somewhat different from the traditional capital improvements program. Like a traditional capital improvements program, the Capital Improvements Plan required by the *Development Fees Act* must include a list of capital projects, their costs and anticipated sources of funding. However, the similarity stops there. Elements required in the Capital Improvements Plan but not found in a typical capital improvements program include an inventory of existing facilities, including an analysis of current usage and capacity of such facilities; a determination of the portion of the cost of planned improvements, as well as existing improvements with remaining excess capacity, that is attributable to growth; an equivalency table that estimates the service demand generated by different

land use types; and the projected growth in service demand based on the recommended Land Use Assumptions over a period not to exceed ten years. In essence, the impact fee Capital Improvements Plan is the impact fee study.

Capital Facilities Plans

While the Capital Improvements Plan includes much more than a list of planned projects, the project list has special relevance. Impact fees can only be spent on projects that are listed in the adopted Capital Improvements Plan. In addition, credits against the impact fees in return for dedications of land or improvements made by developers are only allowed if the dedication or improvement is listed in the Capital Improvements Plan. In order to distinguish between the full Capital Improvements Plan and the list of projects, the list of projects will be referred to as the Capital Facilities Plan. The Capital Facility Plans for each of the four fee types are provided in Appendix G.

Level of Service

The Act requires “an analysis of the total capacity [and] the level of current usage” of existing facilities, a relationship that is often referred to as “level of service” (although this term does not appear in the Act). The impact fee principle that is being referred to here is that new development should not be charged for a higher level of service than is being provided to existing development. If facilities are currently deficient with respect to the capacity standard that is being used to calculate the impact fees, a credit should be provided to new development to acknowledge tax or rate payments that will be made by new development and used to remedy the deficiency. In general, the necessity of providing a deficiency credit is avoided by basing the impact fees on the current level of service.

Service Unit

Both demand and capacity need to be expressed in terms of the same “service units” – defined by the Act as “a standardized measure of consumption, use, generation or discharge.” The service unit for parks, for example, might be acres of park land. In order to translate land use projections into additional demands for service, the Capital Improvements Plan must include “an equivalency or conversion table establishing the ratio of a service unit to various types of land uses, including residential, commercial, and industrial.” Such a table, which relates various land use categories and the service demands associated with them, is the basis for the fee schedule. The equivalency table for road impact fees, for example, would specify the typical travel demand generated by a single-family unit, 1,000 square feet of office space, etc.

Fee Schedule

The fee schedule brings together all of the fee calculation components. These include the land use categories, service demands associated with a unit of development, cost per service unit and revenue credits. Although the Act does not specifically mention credits for other revenue contributions (e.g., gross receipts taxes used to pay debt service on the same facility), established case law clearly indicates that double-charging must be avoided and that such contributions must be credited in the impact fee formulation.

Updates

The *Development Fees Act* requires that the land use assumptions and capital improvements plan be updated within five years from the date that the last capital improvements plan was adopted.

SERVICE AREAS

The New Mexico *Development Fees Act* defines “service area” as

the area within the corporate boundaries or extraterritorial jurisdiction of a municipality or the boundaries of a county to be served by the capital improvements or facility expansions specified in the capital improvements plan designated on the basis of sound planning and engineering standards.

The service area for the City’s current impact fees is the Santa Fe Urban Area (see Figure 1). The Urban Area is the geographic area that includes the City’s incorporated area as well as some additional unincorporated area that is likely to be annexed into the city at some time in the future. In the future, comparisons between the “city” and “urban area” may be unnecessary as the city annexes most of the urban area. However, the Agua Fria Traditional Historic Community, containing 2,800 residents and 1,134 housing units according to the 2010 Census, is located within the urban area and is expected to remain unincorporated. City impact fees are charged only within the corporate limits and unincorporated areas within the Urban Area where the City has building permit authority.

The City currently has a single service area for all of the fees. In general, multiple service areas should be avoided where possible. Each service area requires the preparation of separate land use assumptions, facility inventories, impact fee calculations and capital improvements plans. In addition, multiple service areas limit the City’s ability to accumulate sufficient funds to make improvements.


Multiple service areas are sometimes used to create fee differentials as an incentive to steer development to desired locations. Impact fee differentials by area, however, are unlikely to be large enough to have any significant effect on the location of development.

Benefit District Option. While multiple service areas are to be avoided, the City could consider the division of the service area (for one or more impact fee types) into two or more “benefit districts.” Benefit districts are not described in the State’s impact fee enabling act, but they are used in many impact fee systems around the country. A benefit district is simply a requirement that impact fees collected in a defined area be spent in the same area. Benefit districts use a requirement of geographic proximity to help ensure that the fees are spent on improvements that benefit the developments generating the fees.

Multiple benefit districts put the same restrictions on the expenditure of funds as multiple service areas would, but the preparation of separate land use assumptions, capital improvements plans and impact fee calculations for each benefit district is not required. Multiple benefit districts generally make the most sense for road and park impact fees. Fire and police facilities tend to be either more centralized (police) or more integrated (fire), and are generally not appropriate for multiple benefit districts.

The City has been experiencing significant growth in its recently-annexed southwest portion of the Urban Area, and some interest has been expressed in implementing two benefit districts (southwest/non-southwest) for road and park/trail impact fees.

Figure 1. Santa Fe Urban Area



Roads

The City's road impact fees fund improvements to the major roadway system, defined as arterial and collector roadways, excluding I-25 and NM 599. Because the major roadway system facilitates travel throughout the community, a single service area continues to be appropriate for road impact fees.

Parks/Trails

The City's park/trail impact fees fund improvements to the system of recreational facilities, including regional parks, neighborhood parks and trails. Regional parks and trails tend to serve relatively large areas, while neighborhood parks have more localized benefit. As long as the City makes a good faith effort to use park/trail impact fees to fund neighborhood park improvements in areas that are experiencing residential development, a single service area will continue to be appropriate for park/trail impact fees.

Fire and Police

A single service area continues to be appropriate for fire and police facilities. Police facilities tend to be centralized, and police protection is provided throughout the city from roving patrol cars. While fire facilities are by necessity more decentralized, responding units are not always located at the nearest station, and units respond to major incidents from all over the city. The City's fire and police facilities and equipment thus form integrated systems, and single service areas are appropriate.

LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS

Land Use Assumptions for the impact fees are provided in Appendix F. The land use assumption report provides growth projections for the Santa Fe Urban Area, a unified service area within which the city may expend impact fee monies for eligible capital improvement projects. The New Mexico Development Fees Act (§§ 5-8-1 through 5-8-43, NMSA 1978), specifies that land use assumptions must be adopted for a period of at least five years. The land use assumptions cover a period of seven calendar years from the beginning of 2014 through the end of 2020. Over this period, the land use assumptions anticipate that the service area will gain 2,100 new dwelling units with approximately 3,500 new residents and approximately 1.23 million square feet of new nonresidential development. The growth projections for housing, population and nonresidential floor area from 2014 through 2020 are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5. Land Use Assumptions Summary, 2014-2020

	2014	2020	Increase
Population	86,500	90,000	3,500
Single-Family Detached*	25,075	26,563	1,488
Multi-Family**	14,125	14,737	612
Mobile Home	5,200	5,200	0
Total Housing Units	44,400	46,500	2,100
Retail (1,000 sf)	10,198	10,898	700
Office (1,000 sf)	8,972	9,322	350
Industrial (1,000 sf)	4,360	4,465	105
Institutional (1,000 sf)	2,960	3,030	70
Total Nonresidential (1,000 sf)	26,490	27,715	1,225

* 85% of combined single-family detached and attached provided in the *Land Use Assumptions* (percentage from U.S. Census, American Community Survey, 2008-2012 for City of Santa Fe)

** adjusted from *Land Use Assumptions* to include single-family attached, per note above

Source: City of Santa Fe Long Range Planning Division, *Santa Fe Urban Area, Impact Fee Land Use Assumptions 2014-2020*, August 2013 (see Appendix F).

vehicle-miles of travel (VMT) generated by a unit of development of a particular land use type to determine the gross impact fee (i.e., before credits). A variant is the modified consumption-based approach, which uses a system-wide VMC/VMT ratio higher than the 1:1 ratio implicit in the standard approach.

The City's current road impact fees are based on the standard consumption-based methodology. This is a relatively conservative approach, because most roadway systems require a VMC/VMT ratio greater than one to operate effectively, due to the fact that vehicular travel does not always go where excess road capacity is located. Nevertheless, it is a widely-used, reliable approach to the calculation of road impact fees.

Parks

The standards-based methodology is sometimes referred to as "incremental expansion," because it uses the existing level of service to determine the cost required to serve future development. It is based on the reasonable assumption that facilities will need to be expanded proportional to the amount of growth that occurs. This approach is appropriate for facilities that do not have a significant amount of excess capacity to serve future development.

Park impact fees are typically only assessed on residential development, because the need for parks is related to the number of people residing in the community. Some park impact fees use the ratio of park acres to population as the level-of-service measure. However, rather than using population as the service unit for parks, the current fees use Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDUs). A typical single-family home is 1.00 EDU, while the EDUs for other housing types are based on the average household size relative to a typical single-family unit. Using EDUs rather than population has the advantage of taking volatile occupancy rates out of the equation.

While a ratio of acres to population may be a useful level-of-service measure for park planning purposes, it is less appropriate as the basis for impact fee calculation. An acre developed with ball fields represents a much lower capital investment than an acre developed with a community center or a swimming pool. The current park methodology uses the inventory of actual improvements and current replacement costs to quantify the capital investment in existing facilities. The existing LOS is defined in terms of capital investment per EDU.

Fire and Police

The current fire and police impact fees are also based on the incremental expansion approach, based on the existing city-wide level of service. The level of service is quantified in terms of the capital investment per service unit. The service unit for fire and police fees is "functional population." A functional person is similar to the concept of a full-time equivalent worker, and represents the equivalent of a person being present at the land use for 24 hours a day. The functional population approach is appropriate for fire and police services, since the demand for such services is strongly related to the number of people present at a land use.

LAND USE CATEGORIES

This section contains the consultant's recommendations relating to the land use categories to be included in the updated impact fee schedule.

Single-Family Fees by Unit Size

The analysis provided in Appendix B indicates that average household size does not increase for single-family detached units over about 3,000 square feet. Consequently, this update recommends collapsing the 3,001-3,500 square feet, 3,501-4,000 square feet, and over 4,000 square foot categories. Alternatively, the City Council could choose to charge single-family fees based on the average fee per dwelling unit.

Nonresidential Land Use Categories

The consultant recommends reducing the number of nonresidential land use categories in the impact fee schedule. In hindsight, the categories we initially prepared for the City in 2003, and updated in 2008, are probably too detailed. In recent years, we have been encouraging clients to simplify their impact fee systems, including reducing the land uses in their fee schedules to fewer, more general, categories. Fewer, broader land use categories are just as defensible from a legal standpoint and offer several advantages, including avoiding extremely high fees for a small number of land uses (e.g., restaurants, convenience stores, medical offices), eliminating most impact fee charges for change of use, thereby encouraging reuse of existing buildings, and simplifying impact fee administration. We most recently applied this approach in our 2012 update of Albuquerque's impact fees.³

The major suggested change is to simplify and reduce the number of nonresidential land use categories included in the impact fee schedule. Including many land use categories seems on the face of it to be more accurate and to make it easier to classify proposed uses. After all, if a use is specifically listed, that should make it easier to assess fees when that particular use is proposed. The problem is that it is impossible to list all potential uses, and including many land use categories does not necessarily improve accuracy. For example, while the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation* manual provides trip rates for many categories, the land uses are often not well defined, many of the rates are based on very small samples, and data on pass-by rates and average trip lengths for most of those uses are not readily available. In addition, short-term accuracy can end up overcharging for long-term impacts, because commercial uses change frequently and impact fees are not refunded when a use is changed to one that generates less impact.

The alternative approach of listing fewer, broader categories in the fee schedule is becoming increasingly popular as a way to encourage the reuse of existing buildings and simplify impact fee administration. Such fee schedules list a few very general nonresidential categories, such as retail/commercial, office, public/institutional, industrial, warehouse and mini-warehouse. This approach may not generate as much revenue as the more detailed approach, but it is legally

³ Duncan Associates, *Impact Fee Land Use Assumptions and Capital Improvements Plan, 2012-2022, prepared for the City of Albuquerque, New Mexico*, September 2012 (<https://www.cabq.gov/council/documents/OC127.pdf>).

defensible, reasonable and simpler to administer. It recognizes that the use of buildings often changes over time, and it focuses on average long-term impacts. Short-term impacts in the immediate vicinity of a use are a legitimate focus for traffic impact analyses designed to determine impacts on nearby intersections, but are not necessarily the most appropriate for road impact fees. Most commercial uses tend to be located in shopping centers, and the ITE trip generation rates for shopping centers are based on a broad mix of land uses. Shopping centers often include high-traffic uses such as movie theaters, banks, medical offices and restaurants, and the ITE manual notes that some of the studies of shopping centers include trips generated from outparcels, which tend to be occupied by the highest-traffic uses, such as convenience stores, gas stations and fast food restaurants. This approach recognizes that commercial land uses often change, avoids extremely high fees for a small number of land uses (e.g., restaurants, convenience stores), eliminates most impact fee charges for change of use, thereby encouraging reuse of existing buildings, and simplifies impact fee administration.

The proposed land use categories are compared to the current categories in Figure 2. In addition, this update calculates an average impact fee for single-family detached units, which would allow the City to update the current single-family fees by size category or use a single, average fee.

Figure 2. Current and Proposed Land Use Categories

Proposed Land Use Categories	Current Land Use Categories	
Single Family Detached	Single Family Detached	
Up to 1,500 sq. ft.	Up to 1,500 sq. ft.	
1,501 - 2,000 sq. ft.	1,501 - 2,000 sq. ft.	
2,001 - 2,500 sq. ft.	2,001 - 2,500 sq. ft.	
2,501 - 3,000 sq. ft.	2,501 - 3,000 sq. ft.	
More than 3,000 sq. ft.	3,001 - 3,500 sq. ft.	3,501 - 4,000 sq. ft.
Guest Unit, 750 sf or less	Guest Unit, 500 sf or less	Guest Unit, 501-750 sf
Multi-Family/Guest Unit >750 sf	Multi-Family/Other	Guest Unit, > 750 sf
Retail/Commercial	Shopping Center/Gen. Retail Auto Sales/Service Bank Conv. Store w/Gas Sales Health Club	Hotel/Motel Movie Theater Restaurant, Packaged Food Restaurant, Sit-Down Restaurant, Fast Food
Office	Office, General	Medical Building
Public/Institutional	Nursing Home Church	Day Care Center Educational Facility/Dorm
Industrial	Industrial	
Warehouse	Warehouse	
Mini-Warehouse	Mini-Warehouse	

To estimate the potential revenue loss from moving to the more generalized nonresidential categories, permit data were reviewed for the last two years. Table 6 below shows the difference between the impact fees that would have been collected under the current adopted fee schedule (with no reduction or waiver of residential fees) versus under the proposed more general land use categories. Industrial and warehouse categories are not shown, because the City did not permit any developments of these types over the last two years. This comparison suggests that the more general land use categories would result in total impact fee revenue about 6% lower than under the more detailed categories.

Table 6. Impact Fee Revenue, Detailed vs. General Nonresidential Categories

Land Use Categories	Unit	No. of Units Permitted	Impact Fee Revenue				
			Roads	Parks	Fire	Police	Total
Residential (all)	Dwelling	455	\$563,023	\$604,240	\$68,250	\$24,115	\$1,259,628
Shopping Center/Gen. Retail	1,000 sq. ft.	89.319	\$410,599	\$0	\$19,739	\$6,967	\$437,305
Auto Sales	1,000 sq. ft.	8.852	\$19,297	\$0	\$1,956	\$690	\$21,943
Bank	1,000 sq. ft.	6.267	\$31,009	\$0	\$1,385	\$489	\$32,883
Restaurant, Sit-Down	1,000 sq. ft.	22.321	\$113,458	\$0	\$4,933	\$1,741	\$120,132
Restaurant, Fast Food	1,000 sq. ft.	13.096	\$144,894	\$0	\$2,894	\$1,021	\$148,809
Health Club	1,000 sq. ft.	2.740	\$12,040	\$0	\$606	\$214	\$12,860
Office, General	1,000 sq. ft.	31.501	\$76,516	\$0	\$3,906	\$1,386	\$81,808
Office, Medical	1,000 sq. ft.	3.328	\$12,989	\$0	\$413	\$146	\$13,548
Nursing Home	1,000 sq. ft.	17.068	\$23,110	\$0	\$2,116	\$751	\$25,977
Church	1,000 sq. ft.	32.897	\$50,036	\$0	\$4,079	\$1,447	\$55,562
Mini-Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft.	3.106	\$1,295	\$0	\$146	\$50	\$1,491
Total, Detailed Categories			\$1,458,266	\$604,240	\$110,423	\$39,017	\$2,211,946
Residential (all)	Dwelling	455	\$563,023	\$604,240	\$68,250	\$24,115	\$1,259,628
Retail/Commercial	1,000 sq. ft.	142.595	\$655,509	\$0	\$31,513	\$11,122	\$698,144
Office	1,000 sq. ft.	34.829	\$84,600	\$0	\$4,319	\$1,532	\$90,451
Public/Institutional	1,000 sq. ft.	49.965	\$29,279	\$0	\$6,196	\$2,198	\$37,673
Mini-Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft.	3.106	\$1,295	\$0	\$146	\$50	\$1,491
Total, General Categories			\$1,333,706	\$604,240	\$110,424	\$39,017	\$2,087,387
Percentage Revenue Change			-8.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-5.6%

Note: Approximate two-year revenue, based on 22 months of residential permits (1/23/12-11/23/13) and nonresidential permits for 2012-2013 calendar years

Source: Residential permits and revenue from Table 7; nonresidential permits for calendar years 2012 and 2013 from City of Santa Fe Long Range Planning Division, February 21, 2014; impact fee revenue based on current fees for detailed land use categories from Table 1 and general categories based on shopping center for retail, general office for office, and education for public/institutional.

Most of the reduced revenue is attributable to fast food restaurants, which would pay significantly less under the more generalized retail/commercial category. However, this may be a function of the fact that the City experienced a lot of fast food restaurant development over the last two years, but not any development in some other high-fee categories, such as convenience store/gas sales and movie theaters. While the distribution of land use types developed may change, the percentage shown in the above table is a reasonable estimate of the relative amounts of revenue likely to be received under the detailed versus general nonresidential land use categories.

While only modest changes are proposed to the residential categories, the City also has the option of charging a flat rate for single-family detached, rather than the tiered rates by dwelling size. The 2008 study did not calculate an average single-family fee, but the current fee for the 1,501-2,000 square feet category is a reasonable approximation (the City has been issuing an equal number of permits for smaller and larger units). Accessory units are treated as multi-family in the general categories, because fees for accessory units were not calculated in the 2008 study and are not calculated in this update, due to the lack of data on impacts of accessory units. The analysis suggests that collapsing the residential categories would have very little revenue impact, as shown in Table 7 below.

ROADS

The New Mexico Development Fees Act authorizes local governments to impose impact fees for “roadway facilities,” including traffic signals. In the 2008 update, the arterial impact fee was expanded to include collector roads and was combined with the traffic signal impact fee into comprehensive road impact fee.

Service Area

Road impact fees will be calculated in this section for the City’s Urban Area, which includes the incorporated area of the City of Santa Fe and unincorporated areas around the city that will likely be provided with City service and may ultimately be annexed by the City. The road impact fees will be collected by the City only within the city limits and unincorporated areas within the Urban Area where the City has building permit authority, and will be limited to being spent within the Urban Area.

Service Unit

In impact fee analysis, capital costs, revenue credits and net costs are calculated on the basis of a “service unit,” which is a common unit of measurement of facility demand and capacity. An appropriate service unit for roadway capital cost analysis is vehicle-miles of travel (VMT). Vehicle-miles is a combination of the number of vehicles traveling during a given time period and the distance (in miles) that these vehicles travel. The two time periods most often used in traffic analysis are the 24-hour day (average daily trips or ADT) and the single hour of the day with the highest traffic volume (peak hour trips or PHIT). Since available traffic counts are in the form of daily volumes, the impact fees will continue to be based on ADT.


Major Road System

The New Mexico Development Fees Act limits the use of transportation impact fees to “roadway facilities,” which are defined as:

...arterial or collector streets or roads that have been designated on an officially adopted roadway plan of the municipality or county, including bridges, bike and pedestrian trails, bus bays, rights of way, traffic signals, landscaping and any local components of state or federal highways.

The City’s road impact fee ordinance defines the major road system as all collector and arterial roads. The major road system excludes I-25, because this facility serves long-distance travel and it is unlikely that the City will make any contributions toward expanding its capacity. In this update, NM 599 is also excluded, because it is a State-maintained expressway that is on the border of its incorporated boundary. The City’s major roadway system is illustrated in Figure 3. Traffic signals and intersection improvements that are associated with the major road system can be funded with the road impact fee.

Figure 3. Major Roadway System



An inventory of the major roadway system was prepared as part of this update and presented in Table 61 in Appendix A. The major purpose of the inventory is to determine the total amount of travel on the major road system, expressed in vehicle-miles of travel (VMT), and system-wide capacity, expressed as vehicle-miles of capacity (VMC). The system-wide VMT is used to calibrate national travel demand factors to local conditions.

Road impact fees will only be allowed to be spent to make improvements to the major road system. By the same token, no credit should be given unless the developer is required to improve the major road system being funded by the fee.

Methodology

As with the previous road impact fee calculation, the methodology for determining the road segment component of the road impact fee is based on a “consumption-based” model, which basically charges a new development the cost of replacing the capacity that it consumes on the major road system. That is, for every vehicle-mile of travel (VMT) generated by the development, the road impact fee charges the net cost to construct an additional vehicle-mile of capacity (VMC).

Since travel is never evenly distributed throughout a road system, actual road systems require more than one unit of capacity for every unit of demand in order for the system to function at an acceptable level of service. Suppose, for example, that the City completes a major arterial widening project. The completed arterial is likely to have a significant amount of excess capacity for some period of time. If the entire system has just enough capacity to accommodate all of the vehicle-miles of travel, then the excess capacity on this segment must be balanced by another segment being over-capacity. Clearly, road systems in the real world need more total aggregate capacity than the total aggregate demand, because the traffic does not always precisely match the available capacity. Consequently, the standard consumption-based model generally underestimates the full cost of accommodating new development at the existing level of service.

In most rapidly growing communities, some roads will be experiencing an unacceptable level of congestion at any given point in time. One of the principles of impact fees is that new development should not be charged for a higher level of service than is provided to existing development. In the context of road impact fees, this has sometimes been interpreted to mean that impact fees should not be spent on roads that are already over-capacity. However, it is not necessary to address existing deficiencies in a consumption-based system, which, unlike an improvements-driven system, is not designed to recover the full costs to maintain the desired LOS on all road segments. Instead, it is only designed to maintain a minimum one-to-one overall ratio between system demand and system capacity. Virtually all major road systems have more capacity (VMC) than demand (VMT) on a system-wide basis. Consequently, under a consumption-based system, the level of service standard is really a system-wide VMC/VMT ratio of one.

The existing system-wide VMC/VMT ratio is considerably higher than one, as shown in Table 8. Because the City’s major road system currently operates at better than a one-to-one ratio, there are no existing deficiencies on a system-wide basis.

Table 8. System-Wide Ratio of Road Capacity to Demand

Daily Vehicle-Miles of Capacity (VMC)	2,813,450
÷ Daily Vehicle-Miles of Travel (VMT)	1,324,631
System-Wide Capacity/Demand Ratio	2.12

Source: Table 61 in Appendix A.

The road impact fee formula is presented in Figure 4.

Figure 4. Road Impact Fee Formula

FEE	=	VMT X NET COST/VMT
Where:		
VMT	=	TRIPS x % NEW x LENGTH x ADJUST
TRIPS	=	1/2 average daily trip ends during weekday
% NEW	=	Percent of trips that are primary trips
LENGTH	=	Average length of a trip
ADJUST	=	Local travel demand adjustment factor
NET COST/VMT	=	COST/VMT - CREDIT/VMT
COST/VMT	=	COST/VMC X VMC/VMT
COST/VMC	=	Average cost per new VMC
VMC/VMT	=	Ratio of vehicle-miles of capacity to vehicle-miles of travel
CREDIT/VMT	=	Credit per VMT based on revenues generated

The traffic signal portion of the road impact fee is based on the ratio of existing traffic demand to existing signals. The current traffic signal level of service is shown in Table 9.

Table 9. Traffic Signal Level Of Service

Existing Vehicle-Miles of Travel (VMT)	1,324,631
÷ Existing Traffic Signals	119
Existing VMT per Signal	11,131

Source: Existing Urban Area VMT from Table 8; existing signals from City of Santa Fe Long Range Planning Division, October 25, 2013.

Travel Demand

The travel demand generated by specific land use types is a product of three factors: 1) trip generation, 2) percent new trips and 3) trip length. The first two factors are well documented in the professional literature, and the average trip generation characteristics identified in studies of communities around the nation should be reasonably representative of trip generation characteristics in Santa Fe. In contrast, trip lengths are much more likely to vary between communities, depending on the geographic size and shape of the community and its major street system.

Trip Generation

Trip generation rates are based on information published in the most recent edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ (ITE) Trip Generation manual. Trip generation rates represent trip ends, or driveway crossings at the site of a land use. Thus, a single one-way trip from home to work counts as one trip end for the residence and one trip end for the work place, for a total of two trip ends. To avoid over-counting, all trip rates have been divided by two. This places the burden of travel equally between the origin and destination of the trip and eliminates double-charging for any particular trip.

As with the current impact fee schedule, the road impact fees calculated in this report will vary by the size of the dwelling unit for single-family detached units. The average household size of single-family detached units by unit size is available from the 2008-2012 American Community Survey

conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau for Santa Fe. This information is combined with the trip rate data by household size provided by the National Cooperative Highway Research Program to derive daily trip generation rates, as shown in Table 10.

Table 10. Single-Family Trip Generation Rates

Single-Family Unit Size (Heated Living Area)	Average HH Size	Daily Trips
1,500 sq. ft. or less	1.95	8.56
1,501-2,000 sq. ft.	2.04	9.33
2,001-2,500 sq. ft.	2.23	9.68
2,501-3,000 sq. ft.	2.35	10.15
3,001 sq. ft. or more	2.50	10.74
All Single-Family Detached Units	2.19	9.52
Guest Unit, 750 sq. ft. or less	1.66	5.80

Source: Average household sizes from Table 65; daily trips derived from Transportation Research Board, NCHRP Report 365, "Travel Estimation Techniques for Urban Planning," Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, Table 9 (for urban areas with populations of 50,000 to 199,999), 1998.

New Trip Factor

Trip rates also need to be adjusted by a "new trip factor" to exclude pass-by and diverted-link trips. This adjustment avoids over-counting by only including primary trips generated by the development. Pass-by trips are those trips that are already on a particular route for a different purpose and simply stop at a particular development on that route. For example, a stop at a convenience store on the way home from the office is a pass-by trip for the convenience store. A pass-by trip does not create an additional burden on the street system and therefore should not be counted in the assessment of impact fees. A diverted-link trip is similar to a pass-by trip, but a diversion is made from the regular route to make an interim stop. The reduction for pass-by and diverted-link trips was drawn from ITE and other published information.

Average Trip Length

In the context of a road impact fee based on a consumption-based methodology, it is important to determine the average length of a trip on the local major road system. The point of departure in developing local trip lengths is to utilize national data. The U.S Department of Transportation's 2009 National Household Travel Survey identifies average trip lengths for specific land uses and trip purposes. However, these trip lengths are unlikely to be representative of travel on the major road system utilized in this study for Santa Fe, since the major road system does not include local roads or the interstate highway system. An adjustment factor for local trip lengths can be derived by dividing the VMT that is actually observed on the major road system by the VMT that would be expected using national average trip lengths and trip generation rates.

The first step in developing the adjustment factor for local travel demand is to estimate the total daily vehicle-miles of travel (VMT) that would be expected on Santa Fe's major road system based on national travel demand characteristics. Existing land use data from the Land Use Assumptions are multiplied by average daily trip generation rates, percent of primary trips and national average trip lengths and summed to estimate total city-wide VMT. As shown in Table 11, existing service area land uses, using national trip generation and trip length data, would be expected to generate approximately 2.9 million VMT every day.

Table 11. Expected Vehicle-Miles of Travel

Land Use Type	Unit	Existing Units	Trip Rate	New Trips	Trip Length	Expected VMT
Single-Family Detached	Dwelling	25,075	9.52	100%	9.75	1,163,731
Multi-Family	Dwelling	14,125	6.65	100%	8.62	404,844
Mobile Home/RV Park	Space	5,200	4.99	100%	6.03	78,233
Retail/Commercial	1,000 sf	10,198	42.70	42%	6.27	573,363
Office	1,000 sf	8,972	11.03	100%	9.61	475,508
Industrial/Warehouse*	1,000 sf	4,360	5.20	100%	11.98	135,805
Public/Institutional	1,000 sf	2,960	7.60	100%	8.47	95,271
Total Expected VMT						2,926,755

* Trip rate is average of industrial and warehouse from Table 14

Source: Existing units from Table 5; trip rates and percent new trips from Table 14; national average trip lengths from Table 13.

The next step in developing the local trip length adjustment factor is to determine actual service area VMT on the City of Santa Fe’s major road system. Road segment lengths and recent traffic counts from Table 61 in Appendix A are used to determine actual daily VMT.

Annualized average daily traffic (AADT) volumes were obtained from the Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Organization. Traffic volumes from 2008 and 2011 were available, with the most recent segment volume utilized in the analysis of system-wide volume. Lack of traffic counts for some road segments required use of estimated volumes; arterial road volume estimates were based on 75 percent of the volume for roads with counts, while collector road volume estimates were based on 50 percent of the volume for roads with counts. Where this occurred, it has been noted in the road inventory in Table 61 in Appendix A.

An adjustment of total VMT is sometimes necessary to take into account trips that travel on the major road system without an origin or destination in the urban area. However, since this study excludes I-25 and NM 599, which carry the vast majority of through trips, an adjustment is not deemed necessary.

The expected system-wide VMT based on existing land use data and national travel demand characteristics over-estimates VMT actually observed on the major road system. This is not surprising, given that the major road system excludes all local roads, I-25 and NM 599. Consequently, it is necessary to develop an adjustment factor to account for this variation. The local trip length adjustment factor is the ratio of actual to projected VMT on the major road system. As shown in Table 12, the average trip length for each land use should be multiplied by a local adjustment factor of 0.453.

Table 12. Local Trip Length Adjustment Factor

Actual Daily VMT on Major Road System	1,324,631
÷ Expected Daily VMT on Major Road System	2,926,755
Ratio of Expected to Actual VMT	0.453

Source: Actual daily VMT from Table 8; expected VMT from Table 11.

The U.S. Department of Transportation’s 2009 National Household Travel Survey identifies average trips lengths for residential housing types and for specific trip purposes, including home-to-work trips, doctor/dentist, school/church and shopping trips. The national average trip lengths by trip

purpose have been adjusted by the local adjustment factor calculated in the preceding table to derive local trip lengths, as shown in Table 13.

Table 13. Average Trip Length by Trip Purpose

Land Use Type	Trip Type	National (miles)	Ratio of Local/National	Local (miles)
Single-Family Detached	Single-Family Detached	9.75	0.453	4.42
Multi-Family	Multi-Family	8.62	0.453	3.90
Mobile Home	Mobile Home	6.03	0.453	2.73
Retail/Commercial	Shopping	6.27	0.453	2.84
Office	Medical/Dental	9.61	0.453	4.35
Industrial	To or From Work	11.98	0.453	5.43
Warehouse	To or From Work	11.98	0.453	5.43
Mini-Warehouse	Family/Personal	6.61	0.453	2.99
Public/Institutional	School/Church	8.47	0.453	3.84

Source: National average trip lengths from US. Department of Transportation, National Household Travel Survey, 2009; local adjustment factor from Table 12.

Travel Demand Schedule

The result of combining trip generation rates, primary trip factors and average trip lengths is a travel demand schedule that establishes the VMT during the average weekday generated by various land use types per unit of development for Santa Fe. The recommended travel demand schedule is presented in Table 14.

Table 14. Travel Demand Schedule

Land Use Type	Unit	ITE Code	Trip Rate	New Trips	Trip Length	VMT/ Unit
Single-Family Detached (avg.)	Dwelling	210	9.52	100%	4.42	21.04
1,500 sq. ft. or less	Dwelling	210	8.56	100%	4.42	18.92
1,501-2,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	210	9.33	100%	4.42	20.62
2,001-2,500 sq. ft.	Dwelling	210	9.68	100%	4.42	21.39
2,501-3,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	210	10.15	100%	4.42	22.43
3,001 sq. ft. or more	Dwelling	210	10.74	100%	4.42	23.74
Guest Unit, 750 sf or less	Dwelling	n/a	5.80	100%	3.90	11.31
Multi-Family	Dwelling	220	6.65	100%	3.90	12.97
Mobile Home/RV Park	Space	240	4.99	100%	2.73	6.81
Retail/Commercial	1,000 sq. ft.	820	42.70	66%	2.84	40.02
Office	1,000 sq. ft.	710	11.03	100%	4.35	23.99
Industrial	1,000 sq. ft.	130	6.83	100%	5.43	18.54
Warehousing	1,000 sq. ft.	150	3.56	100%	5.43	9.67
Mini-Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft.	151	2.50	100%	2.99	3.74
Public/Institutional	1,000 sq. ft.	620	7.60	100%	3.84	14.59

Source: Trip rate is average daily trip ends during a weekday from Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), *Trip Generation*, 9th ed., 2012; trip rates for single-family by unit size from Table 10; new trip factor for shopping center from ITE, *Trip Generation Handbook*, 2004; average trip lengths from Table 13 (small guest unit uses multi-family trip length).

Cost per Service Unit

The road impact fee is designed to cover the cost of adding capacity to the road system and major intersections. All of the normal components of a road expansion or intersection improvement project are eligible for impact fee funding, including construction of new lanes, reconstruction of

existing lanes and relocation of utilities where necessary as part of a widening project, traffic signals and installation of sidewalks, street lighting, and landscaping along new roads and at intersections. However, transportation impact fees should not be used for ancillary components of an expansion project when not part of a capacity-expanding improvement. For example, installing sidewalks along an existing road, landscaping an existing median or reconstructing an existing road would not be eligible improvements.

The road segment component of the impact fee calculation is based on the cost of new capacity added by recent and planned road widening and extension projects. The road improvement costs exclude the cost of traffic signals, which are addressed in the calculation of the traffic signal component of the transportation impact fee calculation. Recent and planned road improvements are summarized in Table 15. The average cost of the capacity added by these projects, without the two Cerrillos Road projects, is \$345 per vehicle-mile of capacity (VMC). This is double the cost per VMC identified in the 2008 study. The increase may be due in part to the fact that the projects are relatively short (all under one mile), and consequently lack economies of scale. In consideration of this, a more conservative estimate of \$200 per VMC will be used in the impact fee calculations. Under the standard consumption-based methodology, the cost per VMC does not need to be adjusted by the actual VMC/VMT ratio to determine the cost per VMT, because a ratio of one-to-one is assumed.

Table 15. Road Segment Cost per Service Unit

Road Improvement	Miles	Lanes	Capacity		New VMC	Cost	Cost/ VMC
			Before	After			
Siler Rd, Agua Fria-W Alameda St (2010)	0.68	0-2	0	14,800	10,064	\$4,000,000	\$397
S Meadows, Agua Fria-NM 599 (2012)	0.91	0-2	0	14,800	13,468	\$3,925,000	\$291
Cerrillos, Cielo Ct-Camino Carlos Rey (2012)	0.57	6-8	50,000	67,300	9,861	\$6,906,677	\$700
Cerrillos, Camino Carlos Rey-St. Michaels	0.57	6-8	50,000	67,300	9,861	\$10,300,000	\$1,045
Calle P'o Ae Pi, Airport Rd-Rufina St	0.09	0-2	0	14,800	1,332	\$500,000	\$375
Rufina St, Harrison-Camino Carlos Rey	0.07	0-2	0	14,800	1,036	\$500,000	\$483
Total	2.89				45,622	\$26,131,677	\$573
Total without Cerrillos	1.75				25,900	\$8,925,000	\$345
Assumed in Fee Calculations							\$200

Source: City of Santa Fe Long Range Planning Division, February 13, 2014; generalized daily capacity estimates from Florida Department of Transportation, 2011 Quality/Level of Service Handbook, Table 1.

The traffic signal improvement component of the road impact fee calculation is based on the average cost of traffic signals, which is estimated to be \$350,000. The cost per service unit is calculated by dividing the average cost of a traffic signal by the existing level of service, which is expressed as the ratio of existing traffic to existing traffic signals. As shown in Table 16, the traffic signal cost per service unit is \$31 per VMT.

Table 16. Traffic Signal Cost per Service Unit

Average Cost per Traffic Signal	\$350,000
÷ Existing Vehicle-Miles of Travel per Signal	11,131
Traffic Signal Cost per VMT	\$31

Source: Cost per signal from City of Santa Fe Public Works Department, October 25, 2013; VMT per signal from Table 9.

The combined cost for the road segment and traffic signal components of the impact fee is \$231 per VMT, as shown in Table 17.

Table 17. Total Road Cost per Service Unit

Road Segment Cost per Vehicle-Mile of Travel (VMT)	\$200
Traffic Signal Cost per VMT	\$31
Total Road Cost per VMT	\$231

Source: Road segment cost per VMT from Table 15; traffic signal cost per VMT from Table 16.

Capital Facilities Plan

Projected growth from the Land Use Assumptions can be translated into projected impact on the major road system by multiplying existing and projected development in each major land use category by daily vehicle-miles of travel (VMT) associated with each land use. In Table 18, existing and future land uses within Santa Fe’s Urban Area have been multiplied by VMT rates and summed to determine reasonable estimates of new daily travel demand that will be generated by anticipated new development within the Urban Area. As can be seen, new development is expected to increase travel demand by 78,160 daily VMT in the service area over the next seven years.

Table 18. Total Daily Travel Demand, 2014-2020

Land Use Type	Unit	Projected Units		VMT/ Unit	Projected VMT		
		2014	2020		2014	2020	New
Single-Family Detached	Dwelling	25,075	26,563	21.04	527,578	558,886	31,308
Multi-Family	Dwelling	14,125	14,737	12.97	183,201	191,139	7,938
Mobile Home	Dwelling	5,200	5,200	6.81	35,412	35,412	0
Retail/Commercial	1,000 sq. ft.	10,198	10,898	40.02	408,124	436,138	28,014
Office	1,000 sq. ft.	8,972	9,322	23.99	215,238	223,635	8,397
Industrial/Warehouse*	1,000 sq. ft.	4,360	4,465	14.11	61,520	63,001	1,481
Public/Institutional	1,000 sq. ft.	2,960	3,030	14.59	43,186	44,208	1,022
Total					1,474,259	1,552,419	78,160

Source: Projected development units from Table 5; VMT per unit from Table 14 (industrial/warehouse is average).

A conservative method of estimating growth-related capital needs uses an approach that is consistent with the consumption-based methodology used to calculate road impact fees in this study. This approach is to multiply new VMT by the capital cost per VMT to get an estimate of the cost of expanding the capacity of the major road system to accommodate projected growth. This technique is applied in Table 19, and it results in estimated capital road needs in the Urban Area of \$18.1 million over the next seven years.

Table 19. Major Road Capital Needs, 2014-2020

New Vehicle-Miles of Travel, 2014-2020	78,160
x Capital Cost per VMT	\$231
Road Capital Needs, 2014-2020	\$18,054,960

Source: New VMT from Table 18; road and signal cost per VMT from Table 17.

The planned road, intersection and traffic signal improvements over the next seven years are summarized in Table 80 in Appendix G. The cost of the planned improvements (\$24.8\$24.8

million) exceeds the anticipated capital cost attributed to growth. The actual pace of development may be faster or slower than anticipated by the Land Use Assumptions, resulting in greater or lesser growth-related capital needs. In addition, the planned capital projects and estimated costs may change over time, and some of the costs may be funded from other sources.

Net Cost per Service Unit

In the calculation of the impact of new development on infrastructure costs, credit should be given for non-local funding that will be generated by new development and used to pay for capacity-related capital improvements. Credit should also be provided for taxes that will be paid by new development and used to retire outstanding debt for past major road improvements.

Over the 2011-2014 fiscal year period, approximately \$30.2 million in State and Federal highway funding was available to help pay for capacity-expanding improvements to the major road system in the urban area, as summarized in Table 20.

Table 20. Federal and State Transportation Funding, FY 2011-2014

Project Name	Fed/State
Design and Construction of the NM599/County Road 62 Interchange 1	\$7,304,000
NM475/Washington Ave Intersection Reconstruction 1	\$2,731,456
Cerrillos Road Reconstruction Phase IIC - Camino Carlos Rey to St Michaels Dr	\$11,000,000
Design and Construction of improvements to the I-25/Cerrillos Rd Interchange 2	\$9,060,683
Design of Guadalupe St & Defouri St Bridge Improvements	\$150,000
Total, Road Funding	\$30,246,139

Source: City of Santa Fe Public Works Department, October 22, 2013.

Based on recent trends, the projected annual State and Federal funding for capacity-expanding road projects is approximately \$7.6 million. Dividing the anticipated annual State and Federal funding by existing travel on the major road system yields the annual State and Federal capital funding per VMT. Multiplying annual capacity funding per service unit by the appropriate present value factor provides the equivalent current value of the future stream of funding over the next 25 years, a period that generally corresponds to the period used for long-term debt repayment. The result is a Federal/State funding credit of \$84 per VMT, as shown in Table 21.

Table 21. Federal/State Funding Credit per Service Unit

Federal and State Funding for Capacity, FY 2011-2014	\$30,246,139
÷ Years in Funding Period	4
Annual Federal/State Capacity Funding	\$7,561,535
÷ Existing VMT	1,324,631
Annual Federal/State Capacity Funding per VMT	\$5.71
x Net Present Value Factor (25 years)	14.68
Federal/State Funding Credit per VMT	\$84

Source: Federal/State capacity funding from Table 20; existing road VMT from Table 8; discount rate for present value factor is the average interest rate on state and local bonds for November 2013 from the Federal Reserve at <http://www.federalreserve.gov/releases/h15/data/Monthly>.

The City of Santa Fe has some outstanding debt for past street improvements. The principal and interest payments on the outstanding debt are funded with revenues from the City's one-half cent gross receipts tax dedicated for capital improvements. Dividing the City's outstanding debt by existing travel demand on the major road system results in a debt credit of \$4 per service unit, as

shown in Table 22. This puts existing and new development on the same footing with respect to the portion of their attributable costs that will be paid through future debt service payments made by both existing and new development.

Table 22. Road Debt Credit

Total Outstanding Eligible Debt	\$5,100,580
÷ Existing Major Road System Vehicle-Miles of Travel (VMT)	1,324,631
Road Debt Credit per VMT	\$4

Source: Outstanding debt principal from Table 74; total VMT from Table 8.

Deducting the Federal/State funding credit per VMT and the debt credit per VMT from the capital cost per VMT yields the net cost per service unit, as summarized in Table 23.

Table 23. Road Net Cost per Service Unit

Road Cost per Vehicle-Mile of Travel (VMT)	\$231
– Federal/State Funding Credit per VMT	-\$84
– Debt Credit per VMT	-\$4
Road Net Cost per VMT	\$143

Source: Road cost per VMT from Table 17; federal/state funding credit per VMT from Table 21; debt credit per VMT from Table 22.

Potential Fee Schedule

The maximum road impact fees that could be charged by the City, based on the data, methodology and assumptions utilized in this report, are presented in Table 24. The updated fees are calculated by multiplying the daily vehicle-miles of travel (VMT) generated by the development by the net cost per VMT calculated above.

Table 24. Road Net Cost Schedule

Land Use Type	Unit	VMT/ Unit	Net Cost/ VMT	Net Cost/ Unit
Single-Family Detached (avg.)	Dwelling	21.04	\$143	\$3,009
1,500 sq. ft. or less	Dwelling	18.92	\$143	\$2,706
1,501-2,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	20.62	\$143	\$2,949
2,001-2,500 sq. ft.	Dwelling	21.39	\$143	\$3,059
2,501-3,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	22.43	\$143	\$3,207
3,001 sq. ft. or more	Dwelling	23.74	\$143	\$3,395
Guest Unit, 750 sf or less	Dwelling	11.31	\$143	\$1,617
Multi-Family	Dwelling	12.97	\$143	\$1,855
Mobile Home/RV Park	Space	6.81	\$143	\$974
Retail/Commercial	1,000 sq. ft.	40.02	\$143	\$5,723
Office	1,000 sq. ft.	23.99	\$143	\$3,431
Industrial	1,000 sq. ft.	18.54	\$143	\$2,651
Warehousing	1,000 sq. ft.	9.67	\$143	\$1,383
Mini-Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft.	3.74	\$143	\$535
Public/Institutional	1,000 sq. ft.	14.59	\$143	\$2,086

Source: Daily VMT per unit from Table 14; net cost per VMT from Table 23.

Comparative Road Fees

The updated road impact fees calculated in this report are compared with the City's current fees in Table 25. In general, the updated fees are lower than the fees calculated in the 2008 study. However, because the current fees were adopted at only 60% of the proportionate fair-share costs identified in the 2008 study, the updated fees are higher than the current adopted fees for most land uses. The comparison to adopted fees does not include the temporary 50% fee reduction for residential uses.

Table 25. Road Impact Fee Comparisons

Land Use Type	Unit	2008 Net Cost/Unit	Adopted Fee (60%)	Updated Fee/Unit	% Change From	
					2008 Net Cost/Unit	Adopted Fee (60%)
Single Family Detached						
Up to 1,500 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$3,084	\$1,850	\$2,706	-12%	46%
1,501 - 2,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$3,500	\$2,100	\$2,949	-16%	40%
2,001 - 2,500 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$3,639	\$2,183	\$3,059	-16%	40%
2,501 - 3,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$3,746	\$2,248	\$3,207	-14%	43%
3,001 - 3,500 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$3,848	\$2,309	\$3,395	-12%	47%
3,501 - 4,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$3,932	\$2,359	\$3,395	-14%	44%
More than 4,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$4,040	\$2,424	\$3,395	-16%	40%
Multi-Family	Dwelling	\$2,590	\$1,554	\$1,855	-28%	19%
Retail/Commercial						
Shopping Center/General Retail	1,000 sq. ft.	\$7,661	\$4,597	\$5,723	-25%	24%
Auto Sales/Service	1,000 sq. ft.	\$3,634	\$2,180	\$5,723	57%	163%
Bank	1,000 sq. ft.	\$8,246	\$4,948	\$5,723	-31%	16%
Convenience Store w/Gas Sales	1,000 sq. ft.	\$14,630	\$8,778	\$5,723	-61%	-35%
Health Club	1,000 sq. ft.	\$7,324	\$4,394	\$5,723	-22%	30%
Movie Theater	1,000 sq. ft.	\$17,354	\$10,412	\$5,723	-67%	-45%
Restaurant, Sit-Down	1,000 sq. ft.	\$8,471	\$5,083	\$5,723	-32%	13%
Restaurant, Fast Food	1,000 sq. ft.	\$18,440	\$11,064	\$5,723	-69%	-48%
Office						
Office, General	1,000 sq. ft.	\$4,049	\$2,429	\$3,431	-15%	41%
Medical Office	1,000 sq. ft.	\$6,505	\$3,903	\$3,431	-47%	-12%
Industrial/Warehouse						
Industrial	1,000 sq. ft.	\$2,683	\$1,610	\$2,651	-1%	65%
Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft.	\$1,912	\$1,147	\$1,383	-28%	21%
Mini-Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft.	\$695	\$417	\$535	-23%	28%
Public/Institutional						
Nursing Home	1,000 sq. ft.	\$2,256	\$1,354	\$2,086	-8%	54%
Church	1,000 sq. ft.	\$2,535	\$1,521	\$2,086	-18%	37%
Day Care Center	1,000 sq. ft.	\$5,336	\$3,202	\$2,086	-61%	-35%
Elementary/Sec. School	1,000 sq. ft.	\$976	\$586	\$2,086	114%	256%

Source: 2008 net cost per unit is 1.67 times adopted fees from Table 1; updated fees from Table 24.

Potential Revenue

Based on forecast residential and nonresidential construction, the City might expect the road impact fee revenue adopted at the full rate calculated in this report to generate \$10.4 million over the next seven years, as shown in Table 26. These revenue projections assume that the fees are adopted at 100% and that there are no residential waivers or fee reductions, other than for affordable housing.

Table 26. Potential Road Impact Fee Revenue, 2014-2020


Land Use Type	Unit	New Units	Fee/Unit	Potential Revenue
Single-Family Detached	Dwelling	1,488	\$3,009	\$3,819,215
Multi-Family	Dwelling	612	\$1,855	\$968,377
Subtotal, Residential				\$4,787,592
Retail/Commercial	1,000 sq. ft.	700	\$5,723	\$4,006,100
Office	1,000 sq. ft.	350	\$3,431	\$1,200,850
Industrial/Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft.	105	\$2,017	\$211,785
Public/Institutional	1,000 sq. ft.	70	\$2,086	\$146,020
Subtotal, Nonresidential				\$5,564,755
Total				\$10,352,347

Source: New units from Table 5; fee per unit from Table 24 (industrial/warehouse is average of the two); potential revenue is units times fee per unit, except that residential revenue is reduced by 14.7%, which is the percentage of residential units from 2008-2013 that were exempted as affordable housing from City of Santa Fe Long Range Planning Division, March 11, 2014.

PARKS/TRAILS

This section of the study updates the City's park/trail impact fee. The primary purpose of this study is to update the fees to reflect the current level of service and current costs to provide park facilities. As is currently the practice, this study recommends that the entire Urban Area be included in the service area. The locations of the City's existing parks, open space and trails are illustrated in Figure 5.

Figure 5. Existing Parks, Open Space and Trails



Service Unit

Disparate types of development must be translated into a common unit of measurement that reflects the impact of new development on the demand for park facilities. This unit of measurement is called a “service unit.” The most common service unit used in park impact fee analysis is population. Population estimates are based on three factors: the number of dwelling units, average household sizes for various types of units and occupancy rates. The number of dwelling units can be estimated with some degree of precision, and average household size has been declining somewhat predictably but has been stabilizing in recent years. Occupancy rates, on the other hand, tend to vary significantly over time, and not in predictable directions. Consequently, this report recommends the use of a service unit that avoids the need to make assumptions about occupancy rates. This service unit is the “equivalent dwelling unit” or EDU, which represents the impact of a typical single-family dwelling. By definition, a typical single-family unit represents, on average, one EDU. Other types of units each represent a fraction of an EDU, based on their relative average household sizes.

Because the level of service for park facilities is measured in terms of population, demand for park facilities is proportional to the number of people in a dwelling unit. Consequently, data on average household size for various types of units is a critical component of a park impact fee. These data are presented and analyzed in Appendix B.

As described earlier, the service unit for Santa Fe’s park/trail impact fees is defined as an equivalent dwelling unit, or EDU. An EDU is a unit that has an average household size equivalent to a typical single-family unit in Santa Fe. The EDUs associated with each housing type and unit size category are shown in Table 27.

Table 27. Park/Trail Equivalent Dwelling Unit Multipliers

Housing Type	Avg. HH Size	EDUs/ Unit
Single-Family Detached (avg.)	2.19	1.00
1,500 sq. ft. or less	1.95	0.89
1,501-2,000 sq. ft.	2.04	0.93
2,001-2,500 sq. ft.	2.23	1.02
2,501-3,000 sq. ft.	2.35	1.07
3,001 sq. ft. or more	2.50	1.14
Guest Unit, 750 sq. ft. or less	1.66	0.76
Multi-Family	1.90	0.87
Mobile Home	3.04	1.39

Source: Average household size for single-family detached (average), multi-family and mobile home from Table 63; average household sizes by square feet for single-family units from Table 65.

The number of existing and future park/trail service units, as well as the growth in service units, based on the Land Use Assumptions can be determined by multiplying the number of dwelling units by housing type by the park/trail service units per dwelling unit for each housing type. As shown in Table 28, a total of 2,020 new park/trail service units is projected to be added in the Santa Fe Urban Area between 2014 and 2020.

Table 28. Park/Trail Service Units, 2014-2020

Housing Type	Dwelling Units		EDUs/ Unit	Park Service Units (EDUs)		
	2014	2020		2014	2020	New
Single-Family Detached	25,075	26,563	1.00	25,075	26,563	1,488
Multi-Family	14,125	14,737	0.87	12,289	12,821	532
Mobile Home	5,200	5,200	1.39	7,228	7,228	0
Total	44,400	46,500		44,592	46,612	2,020

Source: Dwelling units from Table 5; EDUs/unit from Table 27.

Cost per Service Unit

This study bases the park/trail impact fees on the existing level of service for parks, open space and trails. The level of service is measured in terms of the ratio of the replacement value of existing facilities to the number of existing service units, or park EDUs. The level of service used in calculating the park/trail impact fee relies on the replacement value of existing park land and improvements, rather than on acres, since, for example, an acre of intensively-developed park land is not equivalent to an acre of open space or passive recreation land.

An initial step in determining the current level of service is to identify the current inventory of parks, open space and trails currently provided by the City. A detailed inventory of existing City parks, trails and open space is presented in Appendix D. Based on current unit costs provided by the City, the total replacement cost of existing park land and facilities is about \$128 million, as summarized in Table 29.

Table 29. Park/Trail Replacement Cost

Type of Park Capital Facility	Units	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Park Land and Open Space (acres)	3,073.26	\$16,260	\$49,971,208
Playground	32	\$60,300	\$1,929,600
Picnic Area	41	\$54,300	\$2,226,300
Activity Area	12	\$24,100	\$289,200
Tennis Court	25	\$72,400	\$1,810,000
Soccer Field	9	\$241,200	\$2,170,800
Basketball Court	22	\$48,200	\$1,060,400
Baseball Field	15	\$253,300	\$3,799,500
Softball Field	8	\$253,300	\$2,026,400
Trails - Paved (per mile)	26.09	\$800,000	\$20,872,000
Trails - Soft Surface (per mile)	69.36	\$10,000	\$693,600
Handball Court	1	\$36,200	\$36,200
Volleyball Court	5	\$42,200	\$211,000
Skateboard Park	2	\$313,600	\$627,200
Bicentennial Pool	1	\$1,929,600	\$1,929,600
Salvador Perez Pool and Fitness Center	1	\$3,376,800	\$3,376,800
Genoveva Chavez Community Center	1	\$30,150,000	\$30,150,000
Fort Marcy Recreation Center	1	\$5,065,200	\$5,065,200
Total Replacement Cost			\$128,245,008

Source: Acres and number of facilities from Appendix D, Table 70; miles of trail from Table 71; unit costs from City of Santa Fe Parks Department, January 7, 2014 (pools and community/recreation center costs are estimated replacement costs).

The cost to maintain the existing park level of service is the ratio of the total replacement cost of existing park land and improvements divided by the existing service units. The park cost per service unit is summarized in Table 30.

Table 30. Park/Trail Cost Per Service Unit

Total Replacement Cost	\$128,245,008
÷ Existing Park Service Units (EDUs)	44,592
Park Cost per EDU	\$2,876

Source: Cost from Table 29; existing EDUs from Table 28.

Capital Facilities Plan

A reasonable method of estimating growth-related capital needs is one that is consistent with the methodology used to calculate park/trail impact fees in this study. This approach is to multiply the projected new park EDUs by the capital cost per EDU to get an estimate of the cost of expanding the capacity of the park system to accommodate projected growth. As shown in Table 31, this results in estimated growth-related park capital improvement need over the next seven years of \$5.8 million.

Table 31. Park/Trail Capital Needs, 2014-2020

New Park Service Units (EDUs), 2014-2020	2,020
x Park Cost per EDU	\$2,876
Park Capital Needs, 2014-2020	\$5,809,520

Source: New park EDUs from Table 28; cost per EDU from Table 30.

Park improvements currently planned over the next seven years are summarized in Table 81 in Appendix G. The cost of the planned improvements (\$37.1 million) far exceeds the projected capital cost attributable to growth over the next seven years. The actual pace of development may be faster or slower than anticipated by the Land Use Assumptions, resulting in greater or lesser growth-related capital needs. In addition, the planned capital projects and estimated costs may change over time, and some of the costs may be funded from other sources.

Net Cost per Service Unit

As noted earlier, to avoid double-charging, credit against impact fees should be provided to account for debt service payments by new development that will be used to retire outstanding debt on existing facilities and for outside funding sources available to pay a portion of the capital costs of growth.

The City’s primary funding source for park-related capital improvements is revenue bonds repaid primarily with revenues from the City’s half-cent capital improvement gross receipts tax (GRT). An analysis of the City’s outstanding debt indicates that the debt attributable to past park-related improvements equals 32% of the total estimated replacement cost of all of the City’s parks, open space and recreational facilities. In order to account for the outstanding debt, the impact fees must be reduced to ensure that new development is placed on the same footing as existing development in terms of the portion of park costs funded through debt. As shown in Table 32, the debt credit is \$917 per service unit.

Table 32. Park/Trail Debt Credit

Total Outstanding Debt Principal	\$40,885,335
÷ Existing Park Service Units (EDUs)	44,592
Park Debt Credit per EDU	\$917

Source: Outstanding debt from Table 73; EDUs from Table 28.

Although future grant funding is difficult to predict, it is reasonable to assume that the level of funding received over the next seven years will continue to the extent that growth rates are constant. Actual funding received over the last six fiscal years is shown in Table 35 on the following page.

As noted above, it is reasonable to assume that the grant funding received per park/trail service unit in the recent past will continue in the future. Based on this assumption, the City should receive the current present value equivalent of \$407 in grant funding for parks, open space and trails for each new single-family home or park/trail service unit equivalent over the next 25 years, as shown in Table 33.

Table 33. Park/Trail Grant Funding Credit

State/County Funding for Capacity, FY 2008-2013	\$7,411,295
÷ Years in Funding Period	6
Annual State/County Capacity Funding	\$1,235,216
÷ Existing Park Service Units (EDUs)	44,592
Annual State/County Capacity Funding per EDU	\$27.70
x Net Present Value Factor (25 years)	14.68
State/County Funding Credit per EDU	\$407

Source: Capacity funding from Table 35; existing park EDUs from Table 28; discount rate for present value factor is the average interest rate on state and local bonds for November 2013 from the Federal Reserve at <http://www.federalreserve.gov/releases/h15/data/Monthly>.

The City does not have any additional dedicated funding for park capital improvements. As shown in Table 34, deducting the credits for outstanding debt and park grants results in a net park cost of \$1,552 per service unit.

Table 34. Park/Trail Net Cost Per Service Unit

Park Cost per Service Unit (EDU)	\$2,876
– Debt Credit per EDU	-\$917
– Grant Funding Credit per EDU	-\$407
Park Net Cost per EDU	\$1,552

Source: Park cost per EDU from Table 30; debt credit from Table 32; grant credit from Table 33.

Table 35. Park/Trail Grant Funding, FY 2008-2013

Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Project Description	Amount
2011	County	Acequia Trails	\$94,322
2008	State	Alto Park	\$50,000
2010	State	Arroyo Chamiso Trail	\$80,000
2011	County	Arroyo Chamiso Trail	\$75,868
2012	State	Arroyo Chamiso Trail	\$122,811
2013	State	Arroyo Chamiso Trail	\$6,321
2008	State	Bikeways/Horse Trails, Grant	\$489,640
2009	State	Bikeways/Horse Trails, Grant	\$1,570,592
2010	State	Bikeways/Horse Trails, Grant	\$1,119,244
2011	State	Bikeways/Horse Trails, Grant	\$310,164
2008	State	Cathedral Park	\$40,013
2008	State	Fort Marcy	\$150,000
2008	State	Franklin Miles Park Improvements	\$40,000
2009	State	Franklin Miles Park Improvements	\$25,000
2008	State	Genoveva Chavez Center	\$144,606
2009	State	Genoveva Chavez Center	\$286,548
2010	State	Genoveva Chavez Center	\$17,029
2013	State	Gonzales Road Pedestrian Trail	\$258,330
2008	State	La Tierra Trails	\$20,468
2008	State	Larragoite Park	\$105,000
2010	State	Old Pecos Trail Design	\$160,000
2011	State	Old Pecos Trail Design	\$150,000
2009	State	Ortiz Park	\$15,493
2009	State	Ragle Park Expansion	\$67,714
2008	State	Santa Fe River and Rail Trails	\$36,594
2008	County	Santa Fe River and Rail Trails	\$226,066
2009	County	Santa Fe River and Rail Trails	\$54,035
2010	State	Santa Fe River and Rail Trails	\$610,840
2011	State	Santa Fe River and Rail Trails	\$89,160
2012	State	Santa Fe River and Rail Trails	\$4,899
2009	State	Santa Fe River Trail	\$224,070
2010	State	Santa Fe River Trail	\$192,757
2011	State	Santa Fe River Trail	\$331,928
2008	State	Tierra Contenta Spine Trail	\$94,130
2008	County	Trails and Bike Paths	\$1,975
2010	State	Trails	\$30,000
2011	County	Trails and Bike Paths	\$102,282
2013	State	Trails and Bike Paths	\$11,634
2013	State	Trails and Bike Paths	\$1,762
Total Funding, FY 2008-2013			\$7,411,295

Source: City of Santa Fe Finance Department, February 20, 2014.

Potential Fee Schedule

The maximum park fees that can be adopted by the City based on this study are derived by multiplying the number of equivalent dwelling units (EDUs) represented by each dwelling unit by the net cost per EDU, as shown in Table 36.

Table 36. Park/Trail Net Cost Schedule

Land Use Type	Unit	EDU/ Unit	Net Cost/ EDU	Net Cost/ Unit
Single-Family Detached (avg.)	Dwelling	1.00	\$1,552	\$1,552
1,500 sq. ft. or less	Dwelling	0.89	\$1,552	\$1,381
1,501-2,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	0.93	\$1,552	\$1,443
2,001-2,500 sq. ft.	Dwelling	1.02	\$1,552	\$1,583
2,501-3,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	1.07	\$1,552	\$1,661
3,001 sq. ft. or more	Dwelling	1.14	\$1,552	\$1,769
Guest Unit, 750 sf or less	Dwelling	0.76	\$1,552	\$1,180
Multi-Family	Dwelling	0.87	\$1,552	\$1,350

Source: EDUs per unit from Table 27; net cost per EDU from Table 34.

Comparative Fees

The updated park/trail impact fees calculated in this report are compared with the City’s current fees in Table 37. In general, the updated fees are significantly lower than the fees calculated in the 2008 study, due to higher credits for outstanding debt and grant funding. Because the 2008 fees were adopted at only 60% of the proportionate fair-share costs identified in the 2008 study, the updated fees are higher than the current adopted fees. The comparison to adopted fees does not include the temporary 50% fee reduction for residential uses.

Table 37. Park/Trail Impact Fee Comparisons

Land Use Type	Unit	2008 Net Cost/Unit	Adopted Fee (60%)	Updated Fee/Unit	% Change From	
					2008 Net Cost/Unit	Adopted Fee (60%)
Single Family Detached						
Up to 1,500 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$1,852	\$1,111	\$1,381	-25%	24%
1,501 - 2,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$2,023	\$1,214	\$1,443	-29%	19%
2,001 - 2,500 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$2,214	\$1,328	\$1,583	-29%	19%
2,501 - 3,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$2,299	\$1,379	\$1,661	-28%	20%
3,001 - 3,500 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$2,363	\$1,418	\$1,769	-25%	25%
3,501 - 4,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$2,406	\$1,444	\$1,769	-26%	23%
More than 4,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$2,491	\$1,495	\$1,769	-29%	18%
Multi-Family	Dwelling	\$1,618	\$971	\$1,350	-17%	39%

Source: 2008 net cost per unit is 1.67 times adopted fees from Table 1; updated fees from Table 36.

Potential Revenue

Under the updated fee structure, the City would expect to receive about \$2.7 million in park/trail impact fees over the next seven years. This estimate assumes that the updated fees are adopted at the full net cost, that development occurs as anticipated in the Land Use Assumptions, that all new residential development in the Urban Area falls under the City’s building permit authority, and that there are no residential fee waivers or reductions, other than for affordable housing.

Table 38. Potential Park/Trail Impact Fee Revenue, 2014-2020

Housing Type	Unit	New Units	Fee/Unit	Potential Revenue
Single-Family Detached	Dwelling	1,488	\$1,552	\$1,969,898
Multi-Family	Dwelling	612	\$1,350	\$704,749
Total				\$2,674,647


Source: New units from Table 28; fee per unit from Table 34; potential revenue is units times fee per unit, except that residential revenue is reduced by 14.7%, which is the percentage of residential units from 2008-2013 that were exempted as affordable housing from City of Santa Fe Long Range Planning Division, March 11, 2014.

FIRE/EMS

This section updates the City of Santa Fe fire/EMS impact fee. The scope of this update incorporates all eligible firefighting equipment as defined in the New Mexico Development Fees Act, which authorizes cities to establish impact fees for “buildings for fire, police and rescue, and essential equipment costing \$10,000 or more and having a ten-year life expectancy.”

The City of Santa Fe Fire Department operates five primary fire stations, one airport station that houses the aircraft rescue and firefighting apparatus, two supplemental facilities and a repair service center/ training facility. The existing fire/EMS facilities are shown in Figure 6.

Figure 6. Existing Fire Stations



Supplemental facilities provide back-up for the primary facilities. One of the supplemental facilities, located on West Alameda Street, is primarily a Police Department substation; the Fire Department uses it for the staging of an additional fire truck that can be used in the event of a major fire. The

other supplemental facility, located on Camino Entrada, was originally a primary fire station, but became a supplemental facility upon completion of the new Station #8 on Jaguar Drive. Fire Station #10 is located at the airport, and consists of one fire truck located in aircraft hangar space that is provided to the Fire Department.

In addition to fire suppression, the Fire Department provides emergency medical services (EMS), enforces City fire codes, reviews building plans, investigates fires and provides fire safety and injury prevention education. The Department is also responsible for response to and initial mitigation of reported hazardous materials incidents, technical rescues that include high angle rescue, trench rescue, swift-water rescue and building collapse and Wildland Urban Interface Fires to initiate incident command and initial fire attack.

Service Area

While fire and rescue units and ambulances may be dispatched from a station primarily to calls within that station's fire district, which is the station's primary response area, these units also respond to calls in neighboring districts when needed. In addition, the headquarters and training facilities are centralized. Consequently, fire/EMS facilities constitute an interrelated system that provides service throughout the City's jurisdiction, which is appropriately defined as a single service area.

Service Unit

Disparate types of development must be translated into a common unit of measurement that reflects the impact of new development on the demand for fire/EMS service. This common unit of measurement is referred to as a "service unit." Service units create the link between the supply of fire capital facilities and the demand for such facilities generated by new development.

The two most common methodologies used in calculating fire/EMS impact fees are the "calls-for-service" approach and the "functional population" approach. While annual call data are available for fire/EMS calls, this study continues to use functional population. Typically, the majority of fire calls are responses to emergencies, which are associated with the presence of people, rather than structural fires. In addition, almost 40 percent of calls in Santa Fe's Fire Department are not directly attributed to a land use; such calls are likely responses to motor-vehicle accidents, which are related to movement between land uses.

The functional population approach is a more generalized approach than calls-for-service, and it presumes that the demand for fire services is strongly related to the presence of people at the site of a land use. Functional population is analogous to the concept of "full-time equivalent" employees. It represents the number of "full-time equivalent" people present at the site of a land use, and it is used for the purpose of determining the impact of a particular development on the need for fire facilities. For residential development, functional population is simply average household size times the percent of time people are assumed to spend at home. For nonresidential development, functional population is based on a formula that factors trip generation rates, average vehicle occupancy and average number of hours spent by visitors at a land use. Functional population multipliers by land use type and total existing and projected functional population for the Urban Area are presented in Appendix C.

Cost per Service Unit

Fire/EMS impact fees are designed to charge new development the cost of providing the same level of service that is provided to existing development. The existing level of service for fire/EMS facilities is based on the replacement cost of existing facilities. The replacement cost of the existing Fire Department facilities can be determined based on the most recent construction costs related to the construction of Station No. 3. Based on the actual construction cost, this station cost \$294 per square foot. However, because this station required a significant amount of site work, the Department estimates that the two new stations will cost somewhat less, about \$238 per square foot. The total building and land replacement cost for the Fire Department's existing City-owned facilities is \$19.4 million, as shown in Table 39.

Table 39. Fire/EMS Facility Replacement Cost

Station No.	Address	Building Sq. Feet	Land Acres	Building Value	Land Value	Total Value
1	200 Murales Road	11,440	1.20	\$2,718,373	\$204,000	\$2,922,373
3A	1751 Cerrillos Road	3,124	1.00	\$742,325	n/a	\$742,325
3	1751 Cerrillos Road	10,605	1.00	\$2,519,960	\$189,600	\$2,709,560
4	1130 Arroyo Chamiso	8,242	1.00	\$1,958,464	\$169,600	\$2,128,064
5	1130 Siler Road	10,156	5.00	\$2,413,269	\$749,000	\$3,162,269
6	1030 W. Alameda	470	0.20	\$111,681	\$34,000	\$145,681
7	2391 Richards Ave	14,440	2.25	\$3,431,233	\$382,500	\$3,813,733
8	6796 Jaguar Drive	10,241	2.52	\$2,433,466	\$342,000	\$2,775,466
9	2501 Camino Entrada	2,100	3.00	\$499,002	\$540,000	\$1,039,002
10	121 Aviation Drive (leased)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total		70,818	17.17	\$16,827,773	\$2,610,700	\$19,438,473

Source: Building square feet from City of Santa Fe Fire Department, November 4, 2013; land and land value from City of Santa Fe Fire Department, March 13, 2014; building value based on \$237.62 per square foot from City of Santa Fe Fire Department, November 4, 2013.

The New Mexico Development Fees Act authorizes the use of impact fees for all essential fire-fighting and EMS equipment costing \$10,000 or more and having a life expectancy of at least ten years. Table 40 lists the current capital equipment that is eligible for impact fee funding under the New Mexico Development Fees Act. The total replacement cost for eligible equipment is \$8.3 million.

Table 40. Fire/EMS Equipment Replacement Cost

Apparatus/Equipment	Units	Cost per Unit	Total Cost
Pumper	8	\$450,000	\$1,500,000
Quint	3	\$750,000	\$1,400,000
Ambulance	10	\$175,000	\$175,000
Rescue Vehicle	1	\$750,000	\$175,000
Brush Truck	3	\$160,000	\$2,800,000
Haz. Mat. Truck & Trailer	1	\$550,000	\$1,100,000
Pump Simulator	1	\$90,000	\$750,000
Tire Machine	1	\$10,000	\$280,000
Posi-Check	1	\$15,000	\$90,000
Service Truck	1	\$65,000	\$10,000
Total Replacement Cost			\$8,280,000

Source: Fire/EMS equipment, number of units and cost per unit from City of Santa Fe Fire Department, November 4, 2013.

The fire/EMS impact fee is based on the replacement value of existing capital facilities divided by the total number of service units associated with the City’s functional population. As shown in Table 41, the replacement cost for fire and EMS facilities and equipment is \$299 per service unit.

Table 41. Fire/EMS Cost Per Service Unit

Fire/EMS Facility Replacement Cost	\$19,438,473
Fire/EMS Equipment Replacement Cost	\$8,280,000
Total Fire/EMS Replacement Cost	\$27,718,473
÷ Existing Functional Population	92,577
Fire/EMS Cost per Functional Population	\$299

Source: Fire/EMS facility replacement cost from Table 39; fire/EMS equipment replacement cost from Table 40; existing functional population from Table 69.

Capital Facilities Plan

The magnitude of growth-related fire/EMS capital needs can be estimated by multiplying the anticipated growth in service units associated by the existing level of service cost per unit. As shown in Table 42, this results in estimated fire/EMS capital improvement needs over the next seven years of about \$1.4 million.

Table 42. Fire/EMS Capital Needs, 2014-2020

New Functional Population, 2014-2020	4,557
x Fire/EMS Cost per Functional Population	\$299
Fire/EMS Capital Needs, 2014-2020	\$1,362,543

Source: New functional population Table 69, Appendix C; cost per functional population from Table 41.

According to the Fire Department, existing fire/EMS facilities and equipment are only marginally adequate based on the population served, travel distance, and call volume. Current plans call for the construction of one or two additional fire stations over the next seven years to better serve the expanding southern and southwestern areas, and to remodel and expand Station No. 5. New fire-fighting apparatus will be needed to equip the proposed stations.

As summarized in Table 82 in Appendix G, planned fire/EMS improvements identified and eligible to receive impact fee funding over the next seven years total about \$7.4 million. All of the identified improvements would be eligible for funding with fire/EMS impact fees. However, only about 18% of the planned project costs can be attributed to projected growth over the next seven years, based on the Land Use Assumptions and the existing level of service.

Net Cost per Service Unit

In the calculation of the impact of new development on infrastructure costs, credit should be given for non-local funding that will be generated by new development and used to pay for capacity-related capital improvements. Credit should also be provided for taxes that will be paid by new development and used to retire outstanding debt for past fire/EMS facility improvements.

The City of Santa Fe has some outstanding debt for past fire/EMS capital improvements, including construction of a fire station and purchase of fire apparatus. As shown in Table 43, dividing the outstanding debt by existing service units results in the debt credit per service unit. This puts existing and new development on the same footing with respect to the portion of their attributable costs that will be paid through future debt service payments made by both existing and new development.

Table 43. Fire/EMS Debt Credit

Total Outstanding Eligible Debt	\$3,895,495
÷ Existing Functional Population	92,577
Fire/EMS Debt Credit per Functional Population	\$42

Source: Outstanding fire-related debt from Table 74 in Appendix E; existing functional population from Table 69, Appendix C.

The City has received some grants for fire protection, EMS and related services in recent years. However, some of these grants were for operating costs, or for equipment that is not eligible for impact fee funding under the Development Fees Act. Deducting the amounts for operational costs or minor equipment, the eligible grant amounts received over last six years for impact fee-eligible capital totaled \$2.6 million, as shown in Table 44.

Table 44. Fire/EMS Grant Funding, FY 2008-2013

Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Project Description	Amount
2008	Federal	Assistance to Firefighters Grant	\$137,167
2008	State	Fire Protection	\$471,847
2009	State	Fire Protection	\$461,076
2010	State	Fire Protection	\$398,504
2011	State	Fire Protection	\$616,322
2009	State	Fire Station #3	\$138,600
2009	State	Fire Station #3	\$346,500
2009	State	Emergency Medical Service	\$20,000
2010	State	Emergency Medical Service	\$29,000
Total Funding, FY 2008-2013			\$2,619,016

Source: City of Santa Fe Finance Department, February 20, 2014.

Assuming that the grant funding received over the last six years for impact fee-eligible fire/EMS capital improvements will continue to increase proportional to the amount of development in Santa Fe, the City will receive the present value equivalent of \$69 per service unit over the next 25 years, as shown in Table 45.

Table 45. Fire/EMS Grant Funding Credit Per Service Unit

Federal and State Funding for Capacity, FY 2008-2013	\$2,619,016
÷ Years in Funding Period	6
Annual Federal/State Capacity Funding	\$436,503
÷ Existing Functional Population	92,577
Annual Federal/State Funding per Functional Population	\$4.72
x Net Present Value Factor (25 years)	14.68
Federal/State Funding Credit per Functional Population	\$69

Source: Grant funding from Table 44; existing functional population from Table 69 in Appendix C; discount rate for present value factor is the average interest rate on state and local bonds for November 2013 from the Federal Reserve at <http://www.federalreserve.gov/releases/h15/data/Monthly>.

Deducting the credits for outstanding debt and grants from the capital cost yields the net fire/EMS cost per service unit, as summarized in Table 46.

Table 46. Fire/EMS Net Cost Per Service Unit

Fire/EMS Cost per Functional Population	\$299
- Debt Credit per Functional Population	-\$42
- Grant Funding Credit per Functional Population	-\$69
Fire/EMS Net Cost per Functional Population	\$188

Source: Cost from Table 41; debt credit from Table 43; grant credit from Table 44.

Potential Fee Schedule

The maximum fire/EMS impact fees that may be charged by the City of Santa Fe based on the data, assumptions and methodology used in this report are shown in Table 47.

Table 47. Fire/EMS Net Cost Schedule

Land Use Type	Unit	Func. Pop/ Unit	Net Cost/ Func. Pop.	Net Cost/ Unit
Single-Family Detached (avg.)	Dwelling	1.314	\$188	\$247
1,500 sq. ft. or less	Dwelling	1.170	\$188	\$220
1,501-2,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	1.224	\$188	\$230
2,001-2,500 sq. ft.	Dwelling	1.338	\$188	\$252
2,501-3,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	1.410	\$188	\$265
3,001 sq. ft. or more	Dwelling	1.500	\$188	\$282
Guest Unit, 750 sf or less	Dwelling	0.996	\$188	\$187
Multi-Family	Dwelling	1.140	\$188	\$214
Mobile Home/RV Park	Space	1.824	\$188	\$343
Retail/Commercial	1,000 sq. ft.	2.041	\$188	\$384
Office	1,000 sq. ft.	0.959	\$188	\$180
Industrial	1,000 sq. ft.	0.416	\$188	\$78
Warehousing	1,000 sq. ft.	0.180	\$188	\$34
Mini-Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft.	0.167	\$188	\$31
Public/Institutional	1,000 sq. ft.	0.863	\$188	\$162

Source: Functional population per unit from Table 68 in Appendix C; net cost per functional population from Table 46.

Comparative Fees

The updated fire/EMS impact fees calculated in this report are compared with the City’s current fees in in Table 48. In general, the updated fees are slightly higher than the fees calculated in the 2008 study for residential and retail uses and lower for other nonresidential uses. Because the 2008 fees were adopted at only 60% of the proportionate fair-share costs identified in the 2008 study, the updated fees are significantly higher than the current adopted fees most land uses other than warehouse and mini-warehouse. The comparison to adopted fees does not include the temporary 50% fee reduction for residential uses.

Table 48. Fire/EMS Impact Fee Comparisons

Land Use Type	Unit	2008 Net Cost/Unit	Adopted Fee (60%)	Updated Fee/Unit	% Change From	
					2008 Net Cost/Unit	Adopted Fee (60%)
Single Family Detached						
Up to 1,500 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$209	\$125	\$220	5%	76%
1,501 - 2,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$227	\$136	\$230	1%	69%
2,001 - 2,500 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$250	\$150	\$252	1%	68%
2,501 - 3,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$258	\$155	\$265	3%	71%
3,001 - 3,500 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$265	\$159	\$282	6%	77%
3,501 - 4,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$271	\$163	\$282	4%	73%
More than 4,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$281	\$169	\$282	0%	67%
Multi-Family	Dwelling	\$183	\$110	\$214	17%	95%
Retail/Commercial	1,000 sq. ft.	\$368	\$221	\$384	4%	74%
Office	1,000 sq. ft.	\$207	\$124	\$180	-13%	45%
Industrial	1,000 sq. ft.	\$124	\$74	\$78	-37%	5%
Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft.	\$78	\$47	\$34	-56%	-28%
Mini-Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft.	\$78	\$47	\$31	-60%	-34%
Public/Institutional	1,000 sq. ft.	\$207	\$124	\$162	-22%	31%

Source: 2008 net cost per unit is 1.67 times adopted fees from Table 1; updated fees from Table 47.

Potential Revenue

If adopted at the full updated amounts, the fire/EMS impact fees could generate \$0.77 million over the next seven years, based on the development projected in the Land Use Assumptions, as shown in Table 49. These revenue projections assume no residential waivers or fee reductions, other than for affordable housing.

Table 49. Potential Fire/EMS Impact Fee Revenue, 2014-2020

Land Use Type	Unit	New Units	Fee/Unit	Potential Revenue
Single-Family Detached	Dwelling	1,488	\$247	\$313,508
Multi-Family	Dwelling	612	\$214	\$111,716
Subtotal, Residential				\$425,224
Retail/Commercial	1,000 sq. ft.	700	\$384	\$268,800
Office	1,000 sq. ft.	350	\$180	\$63,000
Industrial/Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft.	105	\$56	\$5,880
Public/Institutional	1,000 sq. ft.	70	\$162	\$11,340
Subtotal, Nonresidential				\$349,020
Total				\$774,244

Source: New units from Table 5; fee/unit from Table 47; potential revenue is units times fee per unit, except that residential revenue is reduced by 14.7%, which is the percentage of residential units from 2008-2013 that were exempted as affordable housing from City of Santa Fe Long Range Planning Division, March 11, 2014..

POLICE

This section updates the City of Santa Fe police impact fee. The Santa Fe Police Department was originally founded in 1851, and is responsible for upholding the law within the jurisdictional boundaries of the City of Santa Fe. The Police Department utilizes the “community policing” concept by operating two neighborhood community substations. Current substations include the Administrative Complex at Siringo Road and the West Alameda station. The West Alameda substation is a shared facility; the Fire Department stages a fire truck at this facility for use in cases of emergencies. In addition to utilizing community substations, the Police Department maintains two other facilities, the main headquarters and the professional standards/internal affairs building.

Service Area

While police substations do have a primary response area, officers respond to calls on a community-wide basis. In addition, the headquarters and training facilities are centralized. Consequently, police facilities constitute an interrelated system that provides service throughout the City’s jurisdiction, which, combined with the City’s Urban Area, is appropriately defined as a single service area.

Service Unit

Disparate types of development must be translated into a common unit of measurement that reflects the impact of new development on the demand for police protection. This common unit of measurement is referred to as a “service unit.” Service units create the link between the supply of capital facilities and the demand for such facilities generated by new development.

The two most common methodologies used in calculating police impact fees are the “calls-for-service” approach and the “functional population” approach. While annual call data are available for police calls, this study uses functional population in order to allocate police capital costs among more specific land-use categories. The functional population approach is a more generalized approach than calls-for-service, and it presumes that the demand for police services is strongly related to the presence of people at the site of a land use. Functional population is analogous to the concept of “full-time equivalent” employees. It represents the number of “full-time equivalent” people present at the site of a land use, and it is used for the purpose of determining the impact of a particular development on the need for police facilities. For residential development, functional population is simply average household size times the percent of time people are assumed to spend at home. For nonresidential development, functional population is based on a formula that factors trip generation rates, average vehicle occupancy and average number of hours spent by visitors at a land use. Functional population multipliers by land use type and total existing and projected functional population for the Urban Area are presented in Appendix C.

Cost per Service Unit

Police impact fees are designed to charge new development the cost of providing the same level of service that is provided to existing development. The existing level of service for police facilities is based on the replacement cost of existing facilities. The total building and land replacement cost for the Police Department’s existing facilities is \$10.45 million, as shown in Table 50.

Table 50. Police Facility Replacement Cost

Station	Location	Building (sq. ft.)	Land (acres)	Building Value	Land Value	Total Value
Police Records	2651 Siringo Rd.	2,610	1.00	\$430,650	\$212,500	\$643,150
Alameda Substation	1030 West Alameda St	760	0.90	\$125,400	\$191,250	\$316,650
Frenchy's Park Substation	2011 Agua Fria St.	558	0.20	\$78,120	\$40,000	\$118,120
Internal Affairs	2509 Camino Entrada	1680	0.60	\$277,200	\$112,500	\$389,700
Police Headquarters	2515 Camino Entrada	25,560	2.30	\$4,734,900	\$2,761,875	\$7,496,775
Police Evidence Impound Lot	4201 Huey Road	3,684	1.18	\$1,300,000	\$184,994	\$1,484,994
Total		34,852	6.18	\$6,946,270	\$3,503,119	\$10,449,389

Source: City of Santa Fe Facility Division, November 4, 2013.

The New Mexico Development Fees Act authorizes the use of impact fees for all essential police equipment costing \$10,000 or more and having a life expectancy of at least ten years. The table below lists the current capital equipment that is eligible for impact fee funding under the New Mexico Development Fees Act. As shown in Table 51, the total replacement cost for eligible equipment is \$2.02 million.

Table 51. Police Equipment Replacement Cost

Major Equipment	Total Cost
Firearms Training System	\$91,000
Firearms Moving Target System	\$14,000
SWAT Rescue Truck	\$55,000
SWAT Equipment	\$390,000
EOD Equipment	\$663,000
FARBER Mobile Command Post	\$600,000
Mobile Crime Scene Truck	\$202,674
Total	\$2,015,674

Source: City of Santa Fe Police Department, November 4, 2013.

The police protection impact fee is based on the replacement value of existing capital facilities divided by the total number of service units associated with the City's functional population. As shown in Table 52, the replacement cost for police facilities and equipment is \$135 per service unit.

Table 52. Police Cost Per Service Unit

Police Facility Replacement Cost	\$10,449,389
Police Equipment Replacement Cost	\$2,015,674
Total Police Replacement Cost	\$12,465,063
÷ Existing Functional Population	92,577
Police Cost per Functional Population	\$135

Source: Police facility replacement cost from Table 50; police equipment replacement cost from Table 51; existing functional population from Table 69 in Appendix C.

Capital Facilities Plan

The magnitude of growth-related police protection capital needs can be estimated by multiplying the anticipated growth in service units by the existing level of service cost per unit. As shown in Table 53, this results in estimated police protection capital improvement needs over the next seven years of about \$0.6 million.

Table 53. Police Capital Needs, 2014-2020

New Functional Population, 2014-2020	4,557
x Police Cost per Functional Population	\$135
Police Capital Needs, 2014-2020	\$615,195

Source: New functional population Table 69, Appendix C; cost per functional population from Table 52.

According to the Police Department, existing police facilities and equipment are only marginally adequate based on the population served and call volume. Current plans call for the construction of a new substation, expansion of professional standards and records facilities, and Phase III of the addition to the main police facility over the next seven years.

As summarized in Table 83 in Appendix G, planned police improvements identified and eligible to receive impact fee funding over the next seven years total about \$0.65 million. All of the identified improvements would be eligible for funding with police impact fees. However, only about 95% of the planned project costs can be attributed to projected growth over the next seven years, based on the Land Use Assumptions and the existing level of service.

Net Cost per Service Unit

In the calculation of the impact of new development on infrastructure costs, credit should be given for non-local funding that will be generated by new development and used to pay for capacity-related capital improvements. Credit should also be provided for taxes that will be paid by new development and used to retire outstanding debt for past police facility improvements.

The City of Santa Fe has some outstanding debt for past police protection capital improvements. As shown in Table 54, dividing the outstanding debt by existing service units results in the debt credit per service unit. This puts existing and new development on the same footing with respect to the portion of their attributable costs that will be paid through future debt service payments made by both existing and new development.

Table 54. Police Debt Credit

Total Outstanding Eligible Debt	\$2,465,460
÷ Existing Functional Population	92,577
Police Debt Credit per Functional Population	\$27

Source: Outstanding police-related debt from Table 74 in Appendix E; existing functional population from Table 69, Appendix C.

The City has received some grants for police protection in recent years. However, some of these grants were for operating costs, or for equipment that is not eligible for impact fee funding under the Development Fees Act. Deducting the amounts for operational costs or minor equipment, the eligible grant amounts received over last six years for impact fee-eligible capital totaled \$1.1 million, as shown in Table 55.

Table 55. Police Grant Funding, FY 2008-2013

Fiscal Year	Funding Source	Project Description	Amount
2008	State	Public Safety Building (Police Main Facility)	\$691,502
2009	State	Public Safety Building (Police Main Facility)	\$298,498
2013	State	Santa Fe Police Station	\$107,766
Total Funding, FY 2008-2013			\$1,097,766

Source: City of Santa Fe Finance Department, February 20, 2014.

Assuming that the grant funding received over the last six years for impact fee-eligible police protection capital improvements will continue to increase proportional to the amount of development in Santa Fe, the City will receive the present value equivalent of \$29 per service unit over the next 25 years, as shown in Table 56.

Table 56. Police Grant Funding Credit Per Service Unit

Federal and State Funding for Capacity, FY 2008-2013	\$1,097,766
÷ Years in Funding Period	6
Annual Federal/State Capacity Funding	\$182,961
÷ Existing Functional Population	92,577
Annual Federal/State Funding per Functional Population	\$1.98
x Net Present Value Factor (25 years)	14.68
Federal/State Funding Credit per Functional Population	\$29

Source: Grant funding from Table 55; existing functional population from Table 69 in Appendix C; discount rate for present value factor is the average interest rate on state and local bonds for November 2013 from the Federal Reserve at <http://www.federalreserve.gov/releases/h15/data/Monthly>.

Deducting the credits for outstanding debt and grants from the capital cost yields the net police cost per service unit, as summarized in Table 57.

Table 57. Police Net Cost Per Service Unit

Police Cost per Functional Population	\$135
- Debt Credit per Functional Population	-\$27
- Grant Funding Credit per Functional Population	-\$29
Police Net Cost per Functional Population	\$79

Source: Cost from Table 52; debt credit from Table 54; grant credit from Table 55.

Potential Fee Schedule

The maximum police impact fees that may be charged by the City of Santa Fe based on the data, assumptions and methodology used in this report are shown in Table 58.

Table 58. Police Net Cost Schedule

Land Use Type	Unit	Func. Pop/ Unit	Net Cost/ Func. Pop.	Net Cost/ Unit
Single-Family Detached (avg.)	Dwelling	1.314	\$79	\$104
1,500 sq. ft. or less	Dwelling	1.170	\$79	\$92
1,501-2,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	1.224	\$79	\$97
2,001-2,500 sq. ft.	Dwelling	1.338	\$79	\$106
2,501-3,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	1.410	\$79	\$111
3,001 sq. ft. or more	Dwelling	1.500	\$79	\$119
Guest Unit, 750 sf or less	Dwelling	0.996	\$79	\$79
Multi-Family	Dwelling	1.140	\$79	\$90
Mobile Home/RV Park	Space	1.824	\$79	\$144
Retail/Commercial	1,000 sq. ft.	2.041	\$79	\$161
Office	1,000 sq. ft.	0.959	\$79	\$76
Industrial	1,000 sq. ft.	0.416	\$79	\$33
Warehousing	1,000 sq. ft.	0.180	\$79	\$14
Mini-Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft.	0.167	\$79	\$13
Public/Institutional	1,000 sq. ft.	0.863	\$79	\$68

Source: Functional population per unit from Table 68 in Appendix C; net cost per functional population from Table 57.

Comparative Fees

The updated police impact fees calculated in this report are compared with the City's current fees in in Table 59. In general, the updated fees are higher than the fees calculated in the 2008 study for residential and retail uses and the same or lower for other nonresidential uses. Because the 2008 fees were adopted at only 60% of the proportionate fair-share costs identified in the 2008 study, the updated fees are significantly higher than the current adopted fees for all land uses other than warehouse and mini-warehouse.

Table 59. Police Impact Fee Comparisons

Land Use Type	Unit	2008 Net Cost/Unit	Adopted Fee (60%)	Updated Fee/Unit	% Change From	
					2008 Net Cost/Unit	Adopted Fee (60%)
Single Family Detached						
Up to 1,500 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$74	\$44	\$92	24%	109%
1,501 - 2,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$80	\$48	\$97	21%	102%
2,001 - 2,500 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$89	\$53	\$106	19%	100%
2,501 - 3,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$91	\$55	\$111	22%	102%
3,001 - 3,500 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$94	\$56	\$119	27%	113%
3,501 - 4,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$96	\$58	\$119	24%	105%
More than 4,000 sq. ft.	Dwelling	\$99	\$59	\$119	20%	102%
Multi-Family	Dwelling	\$65	\$39	\$90	38%	131%
Retail/Commercial	1,000 sq. ft.	\$130	\$78	\$161	24%	106%
Office	1,000 sq. ft.	\$73	\$44	\$76	4%	73%
Industrial	1,000 sq. ft.	\$44	\$26	\$33	-25%	27%
Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft.	\$27	\$16	\$14	-48%	-13%
Mini-Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft.	\$27	\$16	\$13	-52%	-19%
Public/Institutional	1,000 sq. ft.	\$73	\$44	\$68	-7%	55%

Source: 2008 net cost per unit is 1.67 times adopted fees from Table 1; updated fees from Table 58.

Potential Revenue

If adopted at the full updated amounts, police impact fees could generate \$0.33 million over the next seven years, based on the development projected in the Land Use Assumptions, as shown in Table 60. These revenue projections assume no residential waivers or fee reductions, other than for affordable housing.

Table 60. Potential Police Impact Fee Revenue, 2014-2020

Land Use Type	Unit	New Units	Fee/Unit	Potential Revenue
Single-Family Detached	Dwelling	1,488	\$104	\$132,003
Multi-Family	Dwelling	612	\$90	\$46,983
Subtotal, Residential				\$178,986
Retail/Commercial	1,000 sq. ft.	700	\$161	\$112,700
Office	1,000 sq. ft.	350	\$76	\$26,600
Industrial/Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft.	105	\$24	\$2,520
Public/Institutional	1,000 sq. ft.	70	\$68	\$4,760
Subtotal, Nonresidential				\$146,580
Total				\$325,566

Source: New units from Table 5; fee/unit from Table 58; potential revenue is units times fee per unit, except that residential revenue is reduced by 14.7%, which is the percentage of residential units from 2008-2013 that were exempted as affordable housing from City of Santa Fe Long Range Planning Division, March 11, 2014..

APPENDIX A: ROAD INVENTORY

Table 61. Major Roadway Inventory

Street Name	Street Segment	Lns	Mi.	Cap.	AADT	VMC	VMT
Agua Fria	Airport-Jemez	2	1.61	14,800	6,125	23,828	9,861
Agua Fria	Jemez-Lopez	2	0.98	14,800	3,257	14,504	3,192
Agua Fria	Lopez-Henry Lynch	2	1.23	14,800	11,900	18,204	14,637
Agua Fria	Henry Lynch-Siler	2	0.38	14,800	11,900	5,624	4,522
Agua Fria	Siler-Osage	2	1.08	14,800	13,033	15,984	14,076
Agua Fria	Osage-Cam. Alire	2	1.17	14,800	12,003	17,316	14,044
Agua Fria	Cam. Alire-St Francis	2	0.57	14,800	10,225	8,436	5,828
Agua Fria	St Francis-Guadalupe	2	0.57	14,800	6,100	8,436	3,477
Airport Rd	NM 599-Agua Fria Rd	4	0.52	32,400	10,800	16,848	5,616
Airport Rd	Agua Fria Rd-Country Club	4	0.50	32,400	17,200	16,200	8,600
Airport Rd	Country Club-S Meadows Rd	4	1.00	32,400	17,200	32,400	17,200
Airport Rd	S Meadows-Jemez Rd	4	0.12	32,400	28,012	3,888	3,361
Airport Rd	Jemez Rd-Cerrillos	4	0.91	32,400	28,012	29,484	25,491
Alameda	NM 599-Chicoma Vista	2	0.95	14,800	1,050	14,060	998
Alameda	Chicoma Vista-Calle Nopal	2	1.42	14,800	5,300	21,016	7,526
Alameda	Calle Nopal-Cam. Alire	2	0.95	14,800	6,400	14,060	6,080
Alameda	Cam. Alire-St Francis	2	0.85	14,800	11,404	12,580	9,693
Alameda	St Francis-Guadalupe	2	0.57	14,800	8,050	8,436	4,589
Alameda	Guadalupe-Paseo de Peralta	2	0.66	14,800	3,800	9,768	2,508
Alameda	Paseo de Peralta-Canyon Rd	2	0.95	14,800	3,800	14,060	3,610
Alta Vista	Cerrillos-St Francis	2	0.38	14,800	3,056	5,624	1,161
Alta Vista	St Francis-Galisteo	2	0.51	14,800	3,056	7,548	1,559
Armenta	Old Pecos Trail-Cam. Corrales	2	0.25	14,800	2,592	3,700	648
Baca Street	Hickox-Cerrillos	2	0.57	14,800	6,865	8,436	3,913
Bishop's Lodge Rd	Paseo Peralta-Cam. Encantado	2	1.70	14,800	2,169	25,160	3,687
Bishop's Lodge Rd	Cam. Encantado-City Limits	2	1.04	14,800	2,430	15,392	2,527
Botulph Rd	Siringo Rd-Zia St	2	0.40	14,800	4,200	5,920	1,680
Botulph Rd	Zia-St Michael's	2	0.85	14,800	4,200	12,580	3,570
Camino Carlos Rey	Gov. Miles-Rodeo	2	0.76	14,800	3,900	11,248	2,964
Camino Carlos Rey	Rodeo-Zia	4	0.09	32,400	4,200	2,916	378
Camino Carlos Rey	Zia-Siringo	2	0.85	14,800	5,600	12,580	4,760
Camino Carlos Rey	Siringo-Cerrillos	2	0.47	14,800	11,300	6,956	5,311
Camino Alire	Alameda-Agua Fria	2	0.38	14,800	7,137	5,624	2,712
Camino Cabra	Cam. Cruz Blanca-Canyon	2	0.66	14,800	3,000	9,768	1,980
Camino Cruz Blanca	Cam. Monte Sol-Cam. Cabra	2	0.38	14,800	3,000	5,624	1,140
Camino del Monte Sol	Cam. Cruz Blanca-Old Santa Fe	2	0.15	14,800	4,337	2,220	651
Cerrillos Rd	Beckner-Jaguar	6	1.14	50,000	25,650	57,000	29,241
Cerrillos Rd	Jaguar-Airport	6	0.85	50,000	26,458	42,500	22,489
Cerrillos Rd	Airport-Richards	6	1.17	50,000	45,991	58,500	53,809
Cerrillos Rd	Richards-St Michael's	6	1.65	50,000	46,375	82,500	76,519
Cerrillos Rd	St Michael's-2nd St	4	0.50	32,400	35,100	16,200	17,550
Cerrillos Rd	2nd St-Alta Vista	4	0.60	32,400	33,700	19,440	20,220
Cerrillos Rd	Alta Vista-St Francis	4	0.54	32,400	28,903	17,496	15,608
Cerrillos Rd	St Francis-Galisteo	4	0.76	32,400	9,250	24,624	7,030

Appendix A: Road Inventory

Table 61. Continued

Street Name	Street Segment	Lns	Mi.	Cap.	AADT	VMC	VMT
Cordova	Cerrillos-St Francis	4	0.27	32,400	19,356	8,748	5,226
Cordova	St Francis-Don Diego	4	0.28	32,400	9,017	9,072	2,525
Cordova	Don Diego-Old Pecos Trail	4	0.80	32,400	9,017	25,920	7,214
Country Club	Airport-Jaguar	2	0.76	14,800	5,400	11,248	4,104
Galisteo	St Michael's-Cordova	2	0.95	14,800	9,350	14,060	8,883
Galisteo	Cordova-Alameda	2	0.95	14,800	3,216	14,060	3,055
Galisteo	Zia-Rodeo	2	0.73	14,800	3,306	10,804	2,413
Governor Miles	Cerrillos-Walking Sky	2	1.00	14,800	2,829	14,800	2,829
Governor Miles	Walking Sky-Richards	2	0.74	14,800	1,900	10,952	1,406
Governor Miles	Richards-Cliff Palace	2	0.57	14,800	11,250	8,436	6,413
Governor Miles	Cliff Palace-Cam. Carlos Rey	2	0.38	14,800	11,250	5,624	4,275
Guadalupe	Cerrillos-Alameda	2	0.57	14,800	10,661	8,436	6,077
Guadalupe	Alameda-Paseo de Peralta	4	0.38	32,400	14,709	12,312	5,589
Guadalupe	Paseo de Peralta-84/285	4	0.38	32,400	14,709	12,312	5,589
Henry Lynch Rd	Rufina-Agua Fria	2	0.47	14,800	3,700	6,956	1,739
Hickox St	Agua Fria-St Francis	2	0.57	14,800	8,800	8,436	5,016
Hyde Park Rd	Bishop's Lodge-Gonzales	2	1.38	14,800	4,050	20,424	5,589
Hyde Park Rd	Gonzales-City Limits	2	1.70	14,800	3,150	25,160	5,355
Jaguar Dr	NM599-Country Club	2	1.33	14,800	3,000	19,684	3,990
Jaguar Dr	Country Club-S Meadows	2	1.14	14,800	5,942	16,872	6,774
Jaguar Dr	S Meadows-Cerrillos	2	0.38	14,800	3,000	5,624	1,140
Jemez Rd	Agua Fria-Airport	2	0.80	14,800	3,477	11,840	2,782
Llano	Siringo-St Michaels	2	0.53	14,800	4,876	7,844	2,584
Lopez Ln.	Agua Fria-Airport	2	1.10	14,800	5,300	16,280	5,830
Old Pecos Trail	Rodeo Rd-Arroyo Chamiso	4	1.52	32,400	11,040	49,248	16,781
Old Pecos Trail	Arroyo Chamiso-Cordova	2	0.95	14,800	14,125	14,060	13,419
Old Pecos Trail	Cordova-Old Santa Fe Trail	2	0.42	14,800	7,382	6,216	3,100
Old Santa Fe Trail	City Limits-Zia Rd	2	1.14	14,800	2,746	16,872	3,130
Old Santa Fe Trail	Zia-Cam. del Monte Sol	2	1.08	14,800	2,550	15,984	2,754
Old Santa Fe Trail	Cam. del Monte Sol-Paseo Peralta	2	1.42	14,800	12,939	21,016	18,373
Osage	Agua Fria-Cerrillos	2	0.66	14,800	5,373	9,768	3,546
Pacheco St	Siringo-St Michael's	2	0.51	14,800	9,318	7,548	4,752
Pacheco St	St Michael's-Cam. Monte Rey	2	0.47	14,800	4,705	6,956	2,211
Pacheco St	Cam. de Monte Rey-Alta Vista	2	0.41	14,800	4,705	6,068	1,929
Paseo de Peralta	St Francis-Cerrillos	4	0.47	32,400	8,825	15,228	4,148
Paseo de Peralta	Cerrillos-Acequia Madre	4	0.63	32,400	16,350	20,412	10,301
Paseo de Peralta	Acequia Madre-Alameda	4	0.25	32,400	8,667	8,100	2,167
Paseo de Peralta	Alameda-Palace	2	0.15	14,800	9,200	2,220	1,380
Paseo de Peralta	Palace-Washington	2	0.32	14,800	8,050	4,736	2,576
Paseo de Peralta	Washington-St Francis	4	1.04	32,400	13,350	33,696	13,884
Paseo del Sol	Airport-Jaguar	2	0.75	14,800	11,200	11,100	8,400
Paseo del Sol	Jaguar-Herrera	2	0.25	14,800	3,000	3,700	750
Richards Ave	Rodeo-I-25	2	1.14	14,800	8,834	16,872	10,071
Richards Ave	Cerrillos-Rufina	4	0.32	32,400	8,090	10,368	2,589
Rodeo Rd	Cerrillos-Richards	4	0.95	32,400	29,004	30,780	27,554
Rodeo Rd	Richards-Camino Carlos Rey	4	1.00	32,400	29,004	32,400	29,004
Rodeo Rd	Camino Carlos Rey-Galisteo	2	1.04	14,800	12,650	15,392	13,156
Rodeo Rd	Galisteo-Sawmill	4	0.28	32,400	8,025	9,072	2,247
Rodeo Rd	Sawmill-Old Pecos Trail	2	1.70	14,800	4,323	25,160	7,349

Appendix A: Road Inventory

Table 61. Continued

Street Name	Street Segment	Lns	Mi.	Cap.	AADT	VMC	VMT
Rufina St	S Meadows Rd-Jemez	2	0.20	14,800	9,800	2,960	1,960
Rufina St	Jemez-Lopez	2	0.91	14,800	11,482	13,468	10,449
Rufina St	Lopez-Richards	2	1.40	14,800	5,850	20,720	8,190
Rufina St	Richards-Siler	2	0.55	14,800	5,016	8,140	2,759
Rufina St	Siler-Jorgensen Rd	2	0.25	14,800	9,800	3,700	2,450
San Mateo Rd	Calle Lorca-St Francis	2	0.42	14,800	3,200	6,216	1,344
San Mateo Rd	St Francis-Galisteo	2	0.47	14,800	4,450	6,956	2,092
San Mateo Rd	Galisteo-Old Pecos Trail	2	0.66	14,800	9,900	9,768	6,534
Second Street	Cerrillos-Calle Lorca	2	0.57	14,800	3,200	8,436	1,824
Siler Rd	Agua Fria-Cerrillos	4	0.64	32,400	15,250	20,736	9,760
Siler Rd	Agua Fria-West Alameda	2	0.40	14,800	3,000	5,920	1,200
Siringo Rd	Richards-Camino Carlos	2	0.91	14,800	7,700	13,468	7,007
Siringo Rd	Cam. Carlos Rey-Llano	2	0.63	14,800	12,504	9,324	7,878
Siringo Rd	Llano-St Francis	2	0.98	14,800	13,700	14,504	13,426
Siringo Rd	St Francis-Botulph	2	0.47	14,800	3,500	6,956	1,645
South Meadows	Jaguar-Airport	2	0.66	14,800	3,925	9,768	2,591
South Meadows	Airport-Agua Fria	2	0.80	14,800	3,800	11,840	3,040
South Meadows	Agua Fria-NM 599	2	1.00	14,800	3,000	14,800	3,000
St Francis	Rodeo-Siringo	4	0.95	32,400	45,212	30,780	42,951
St Francis	Siringo-San Mateo	4	0.70	32,400	43,687	22,680	30,581
St Francis	San Mateo-Cerrillos	6	0.98	50,000	42,162	49,000	41,319
St Francis	Cerrillos-Paseo de Peralta	6	0.28	50,000	44,850	14,000	12,558
St Francis	Paseo de Peralta-Agua Fria	6	0.20	50,000	37,300	10,000	7,460
St Francis	Agua Fria-Alameda	6	0.31	50,000	36,500	15,500	11,315
St Francis	Alameda-Alamo	6	0.57	50,000	20,450	28,500	11,657
St Francis	Alamo-NM599	6	1.33	50,000	33,450	66,500	44,489
St Francis	NM599-Tano Rd	4	0.76	32,400	37,800	24,624	28,728
St Francis	Tano Rd-1st Tesuque Exit	4	1.33	32,400	36,400	43,092	48,412
St Michael's Dr	Cerrillos-St Francis	6	1.29	50,000	25,472	64,500	32,859
St Michael's Dr	St Francis-Old Pecos Trail	4	1.04	32,400	23,150	33,696	24,076
Yucca	Rodeo-Zia	2	0.40	14,800	5,000	5,920	2,000
Yucca	Zia-Siringo	2	0.63	14,800	5,322	9,324	3,353
Zafrano	Cerrillos-Rodeo	4	0.27	32,400	11,250	8,748	3,038
Zia Rd	Rodeo- St Francis	4	1.70	32,400	14,635	55,080	24,880
Zia Rd	St Francis-Botulph	2	0.51	14,800	3,674	7,548	1,874
Subtotal, Arterial Roads			95.84			2,140,736	1,216,683
2nd St	Cerrillos Rd-W San Mateo Rd	2	0.43	13,300	1,700	5,719	731
5th St	Cerrillos Rd-Saint Michaels Dr	2	0.43	13,300	3,711	5,719	1,596
5th St	Saint Michaels Dr-Siringo Rd	2	0.52	13,300	1,700	6,916	884
Acequia Madre	Paseo de Peralta-Garcia St	2	0.14	13,300	1,700	1,862	238
Acequia Madre	Garcia St-Camino del Monte Sol	2	0.48	13,300	1,700	6,384	816
Acequia Madre	Camino del Monte Sol-Canyon Rd	2	0.25	13,300	1,700	3,325	425
Alamo Dr	Camino de las Crucitas-Rio Vista St	2	0.47	13,300	1,700	6,251	799
Alamo Dr	Camino de las Crucitas-Rio Vista St	2	0.23	13,300	1,700	3,059	391
Alamo Dr	Rio Vista St-N St Francis Dr	2	0.07	13,300	1,700	931	119
Alamo Dr	N Saint Francis Dr-N Guadalupe St	2	0.13	13,300	1,700	1,729	221
Alto St	Camino Alire-N Saint Francis	2	0.72	13,300	1,700	9,576	1,224
Arroyo Chamiso Rd	Botulph Rd-Old Arroyo Chamiso Rd	2	0.28	13,300	1,700	3,724	476
Arroyo Chamiso Rd	Old Arroyo Chamiso Rd-St Michaels	2	0.30	13,300	1,700	3,990	510

Appendix A: Road Inventory

Table 61. Continued

Street Name	Street Segment	Lns	Mi.	Cap.	AADT	VMC	VMT
Arroyo Chamiso Rd	Saint Michaels Dr-Old Pecos Trail	2	0.15	13,300	1,700	1,995	255
Ave de las Campanas	Siringo Rd-Rodeo Rd	2	0.84	13,300	1,700	11,172	1,428
Avenida Rincon	N Ridgetop Rd-NM 599	2	0.41	13,300	1,700	5,453	697
Avenida Rincon	NM 599-Calle David	2	0.63	13,300	1,700	8,379	1,071
Buckman Rd	Paseo Nopal-Camino de los Montoyas	2	1.60	13,300	1,700	21,280	2,720
Buckman Rd	Cam Los Montoyas-Cam Las Crucitas	2	0.12	13,300	1,700	1,596	204
Caja del Oro Grant Rd	Agua Fria St-Alameda Frontage Rd	2	0.81	13,300	4,550	10,773	3,686
Calle de Leon	Calle de Sebastian-Conejo Dr	2	0.20	13,300	1,700	2,660	340
Calle de Sebastian	Old Pecos Trail-Calle de Leon	2	0.40	13,300	1,700	5,320	680
Calle de Sebastian	Calle de Leon-E Zia Rd	2	0.37	13,300	1,700	4,921	629
Calle del Cielo	Siringo Rd-Cerrillos	2	0.26	13,300	2,499	3,458	650
Calle Estado	Bishops Lodge Rd-Old Taos Hwy	2	0.68	13,300	1,700	9,044	1,156
Calle Nopal	W Alameda St-Paseo de Vistas	2	0.34	13,300	1,700	4,522	578
Camino Carlos Real	Agua Fria St-W Alameda St	2	0.42	13,300	1,700	5,586	714
Camino Corrales	Fort Union Dr-Armenta St	2	0.57	13,300	1,700	7,581	969
Camino Corrales	Armenta St-Old Santa Fe Trail	2	0.15	13,300	1,700	1,995	255
Camino Corrales	Old Santa Fe Trail-Garcia St	2	0.18	13,300	1,700	2,394	306
Cam de las Crucitas	Buckman-Alamo Dr	2	2.03	13,300	1,700	26,999	3,451
Cam de las Crucitas	Alamo Dr-Rio Vista St	2	2.00	13,300	1,700	26,600	3,400
Cam de las Crucitas	Vista St-N Saint Francis Dr	2	0.13	13,300	1,700	1,729	221
Cam de los Arroyos	Zafarano Dr-Vegas Verde Dr	2	0.22	13,300	1,700	2,926	374
Cam de los Montoyas	Buckman-NM 599	2	0.53	13,300	1,700	7,049	901
Cam de los Montoyas	NM 599-Avenida de Sevilla	2	1.70	13,300	1,700	22,610	2,890
Camino Encantado	Circle Dr-Bishops Lodge Rd	2	0.97	13,300	1,781	12,901	1,728
Camino La Canada	Paseo de La Conquist.-Ave Chris. Colon	2	0.54	13,300	1,700	7,182	918
Canyon Rd	Garcia St-Camino del Monte Sol	2	0.48	13,300	2,106	6,384	1,011
Canyon Rd	Camino del Monte Sol-E Palace Ave	2	0.09	13,300	1,700	1,197	153
Canyon Rd	E Palace Ave-Acequia Madre	2	0.14	13,300	1,700	1,862	238
Canyon Rd	Acequia Madre-E Palace Ave	2	0.24	13,300	1,700	3,192	408
Canyon Rd	E Alameda St-Camino Cabra	2	0.10	13,300	1,700	1,330	170
Canyon Rd	Camino Cabra-Cerro Gordo Rd	2	1.30	13,300	3,800	17,290	4,940
Cerro Gordo Rd	Canyon Rd-Gonzales Rd	2	1.73	13,300	1,723	23,009	2,981
Cerro Gordo Rd	Gonzales Rd- E Palace Ave	2	0.11	13,300	1,700	1,463	187
Conejo Dr	E Zia Rd-Calle de Leon	2	0.33	13,300	1,700	4,389	561
Conejo Dr	Calle de Leon-Fort Union Dr	2	0.39	13,300	1,700	5,187	663
Don Diego Ave	Cordova Rd-Cam. de los Marquez	2	0.08	13,300	7,793	1,064	623
Don Diego Ave	Camino de los Marquez-Cerrillos	2	0.50	13,300	7,793	6,650	3,897
Don Gaspar Ave	E San Mateo Rd-Cordova Rd	2	0.50	13,300	1,700	6,650	850
Don Gaspar Ave	Cordova Rd-Paseo de Peralta	2	0.80	13,300	1,801	10,640	1,441
Don Gaspar Ave	Paseo de Peralta-W Alameda St	2	0.23	13,300	3,425	3,059	788
Don Gaspar Ave	W Alameda St-E Water St	2	0.10	13,300	4,250	1,330	425
Don Gaspar Ave	E Water St-W San Francisco St	2	0.05	13,300	1,700	665	85
E de Vargas Rd	Paseo de Peralta-Garcia St	2	0.07	13,300	1,700	931	119
E Palace Ave	Washington Ave Cathedral Pl	2	0.06	13,300	1,700	798	102
E Palace Ave	Cathedral Pl-Paseo de Peralta	2	0.17	13,300	5,000	2,261	850
E Palace Ave	Paseo de Peralta-Cerro Gordo	2	0.71	13,300	3,026	9,443	2,148
E Palace Ave	Cerro Gordo Rd-E Alameda St	2	0.07	13,300	3,026	931	212
E Palace Ave	E Alameda St-Canyon Rd	2	0.04	13,300	3,026	532	121
E Zia Rd	Old Pecos Tr-Calle de Sebastian	2	0.09	13,300	1,700	1,197	153
E Zia Rd	Calle de Sebastian-Conejo Dr	2	0.28	13,300	1,700	3,724	476

Appendix A: Road Inventory

Table 61. Continued

Street Name	Street Segment	Lns	Mi.	Cap.	AADT	VMC	VMT
E Zia Rd	Conejo Dr-Old Santa Fe Trail	2	0.52	13,300	1,700	6,916	884
Fort Union Dr	Conejo Dr-Camino Corrales	2	0.18	13,300	1,700	2,394	306
Garcia St	Cam. del Monte Sol-Cam. Corrales	2	0.41	13,300	1,700	5,453	697
Garcia St	Camino Corrales-Acequia Madre	2	0.53	13,300	3,182	7,049	1,686
Garcia St	Acequia Madre-Canyon Rd	2	0.20	13,300	1,700	2,660	340
Gonzales Rd	Vallecita Dr-Hyde Park Rd	2	0.61	13,300	1,168	8,113	712
Gonzales Rd	Hyde Park Rd-Cerro Gordo Rd	2	1.26	13,300	1,700	16,758	2,142
Gonzales Rd	Cerro Gordo Rd-E Alameda St	2	0.07	13,300	1,700	931	119
Harrison Rd	Cerrillos Rd-Agua Fria Rd	2	0.65	13,300	2,650	8,645	1,723
Herrera Drive	Cerrillos Road-Paseo del Sol	2	0.50	13,300	1,700	6,650	850
Maez Rd	Cerrillos Rd-Agua Fria Rd	2	0.69	13,300	1,700	9,177	1,173
Murales Rd	Bishops Lodge Rd-Old Taos Hwy	2	0.29	13,300	1,700	3,857	493
Ocate Rd	Cerrillos Rd-Calle Caridad	2	0.43	13,300	1,700	5,719	731
Old Arroyo Chamiso	Arroyo Chamiso Rd-W Zia Rd	2	0.48	13,300	1,700	6,384	816
Old Taos Hwy	Paseo de Peralta-Murales Rd	2	0.39	13,300	1,684	5,187	657
Old Taos Hwy	Murales Rd-Calle Estado	2	0.55	13,300	1,684	7,315	926
Old Taos Hwy	Calle Estado-Calle Largo	2	0.47	13,300	1,684	6,251	791
Paseo Conquistadora	Camino Alire-Camino La Canada	2	0.63	13,300	1,700	8,379	1,071
Paseo Conquistadora	Camino La Canada-Alejandro St	2	0.20	13,300	1,700	2,660	340
Paseo de Vistas	Calle Nopal-Rincon de Torreon	2	1.02	13,300	4,700	13,566	4,794
Paseo de Vistas	Rincon de Torreon-Cam. de las Crucitas	2	0.74	13,300	4,700	9,842	3,478
Paseo Nopal	Paseo de Vistas-NM 599	2	1.40	13,300	3,084	18,620	4,318
Ridgetop Rd	NM 599-Avenida Rincon	2	0.45	13,300	1,700	5,985	765
Ridgetop Rd	Avenida Rincon-Tano Rd	2	0.49	13,300	1,700	6,517	833
Rincon de Torreon	W Alameda St-Paseo de Vistas	2	0.74	13,300	1,700	9,842	1,258
Rio Vista St	Solana Dr-Alamo Dr	2	0.05	13,300	1,700	665	85
Rio Vista St	Alamo Dr-Camino de las Crucitas	2	0.37	13,300	1,700	4,921	629
Rio Vista St	Camino de las Crucitas-Alamo	2	0.30	13,300	1,700	3,990	510
S Meadows Rd	Agua Fria St-Rufina St	2	2.27	13,300	1,700	30,191	3,859
S Ridgetop Rd	Camino Francisca-NM 599	2	0.38	13,300	1,700	5,054	646
Sawmill Rd	Rodeo Rd-S Saint Francis Dr	2	0.32	13,300	4,286	4,256	1,372
Sawmill Rd	S Saint Francis Dr-Rodeo Rd	2	0.68	13,300	1,700	9,044	1,156
Solana Dr	W Alameda St-Rio Vista St	2	0.08	13,300	1,700	1,064	136
Tano Rd	N Ridgetop Rd-Opera Dr	2	0.69	13,300	1,700	9,177	1,173
Vallecita Dr	Valley Dr-Gonzales Rd	2	0.76	13,300	1,700	10,108	1,292
Valley Dr	Bishops Lodge Rd-Vallecita Dr	2	0.38	13,300	1,700	5,054	646
Vegas Verde Dr	Camino de los Arroyos-Cerrillos	2	0.22	13,300	1,700	2,926	374
W Palace Ave	Grant Ave-Lincoln Ave	2	0.11	13,300	1,700	1,463	187
W Palace Ave	Lincoln Ave-Old Santa Fe Trail	2	0.05	13,300	1,700	665	85
W Palace Ave	Old Santa Fe Trail-Washington Ave	2	0.01	13,300	1,700	133	17
W Zia Rd	Old Arroyo Chamiso Rd-Old Pecos Tr	2	0.65	13,300	2,500	8,645	1,625
Subtotal, Collectors			50.58			672,714	107,948
Total			146.42			2,813,450	1,324,631

Source: City of Santa Fe Long Range Planning Division, November 25, 2013; generalized daily capacity estimates from Florida Department of Transportation, *2013 Quality/Level of Service Handbook*, Table 1: Generalized Annual Average Daily Volumes for Florida's Urbanized Areas; AADT is annualized averaged daily traffic from Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Organization, *Santa Fe Traffic Counts*, 2011 (2008 if 2011 count not available); volume in italics are estimated based on 75% of the average AADT for 2, 4 and 6-lane arterials with counts and 50% of the average AADT for 2-lane collector roads.

APPENDIX B: AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE

The 2000 U.S. Census provided data on average household sizes by housing types based on a robust sample consisting of one in six dwelling units. The 2000 household sizes for the City of Santa Fe are shown in Table 62.

Table 62. Average Household Size by Housing Type, 2000

Housing Type	Household Population	Occupied Units	Average HH Size
Single-Family Detached	38,868	16,410	2.37
Single-Family Attached	5,177	2,913	1.78
Multi-Family	13,047	7,131	1.83
Mobile Home	3,239	1,065	3.04
Total	60,331	27,519	2.19

Source: 2000 U.S. Census SF-3 data (1-in-6 sample) for the City of Santa Fe.

The Census Bureau has since replaced the sample data collected during the decennial census with the annual American Housing Survey, which conducts a sample of 1% of dwelling units each year. The most current data from the American Housing Survey are provided in a 5% sample dataset, consisting of 1% samples collected in 2008 through 2012. These data do not provide household population for single-family detached units separately from single-family attached units (i.e., townhouses). However, the 2000 Census data presented in the preceding table shows that single-family attached units in Santa Fe have an average household size that is very similar to other types of multi-family units, such as apartments and condominiums. Using this knowledge, updated average household sizes by housing type for Santa Fe can be derived from the American Community Survey data, as shown in Table 63.

Table 63. Average Household Size by Housing Type, 2008-2012

Housing Type	Household Population	Occupied Units	Average HH Size
Single-Family Detached	n/a	18,618	2.19
Single-Family Attached	n/a	2,980	1.90
Single-Family Detached/Attached	46,361	21,598	2.15
Other Multi-Family	15,417	8,102	1.90
Mobile Home	4,707	1,546	3.04
Total	66,485	31,246	2.13

Source: U.S. Census, American Community Survey, 2008-2012 for City of Santa Fe (single-family attached assigned same average household size as other multi-family).

In the 2008 study, average household sizes by square footage ranges for single-family units were estimated using (1) census micro data for Santa Fe County and Los Alamos County to determine average household size by bedrooms (normalized for the City of Santa Fe overall average household size), and (2) realtor listings of homes for sale to determine average dwelling unit size by bedrooms. The two data sets were combined by taking the realtor data set and assuming the average household size for the number of bedrooms in the unit (e.g., each 3-bedroom unit was assumed to have the average number of residents for all 3-bedroom units). Finally, linear regression analysis was performed to develop an equation relating average household size to unit square feet, and the midpoints of the size categories was used as the average household size for each size range.

While the approach used in the 2008 study was reasonable and had the advantage of relying solely on local data, its weakness is that neither data set contains both of the key variables – the census data lack information on the size of the unit, and the realtor data lack information on the number of persons in the unit. Consequently, the 2008 analysis had to utilize an intervening variable – the number of bedrooms in the unit.

A simpler and more direct approach is to utilize regional or national data from the American Housing Survey, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau. The most recent survey was done in 2011. This survey provides data on the number of residents and the square footage of a sample of individual housing units. Regional data for the Western Census Region, which includes New Mexico, can also be used and shows a very similar pattern. Average household sizes by dwelling unit size can be converted to Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDUs), with one EDU representing the average number of persons residing in an occupied single-family detached unit. These national and regional EDU multipliers are compared to those used in the 2008 study in Table 64.

Table 64. Equivalent Dwelling Unit Multipliers

Single-Family Unit Size (Heated Living Area)	2008 Study	Amer. Housing Survey	
		Western Region	Entire U.S.
1,500 sq. ft. or less	0.87	0.89	0.88
1,501-2,000 sq. ft.	0.95	0.93	0.94
2,001-2,500 sq. ft.	1.04	1.02	1.01
2,501-3,000 sq. ft.	1.08	1.07	1.07
3,001-3,500 sq. ft.	1.11	1.16	1.12
3,501-4,000 sq. ft.	1.13	1.13	1.11
4,001 sq. ft. or more	1.17	1.13	1.11
Average, All Units	1.00	1.00	1.00
3,001 sq. ft. or more	n/a	1.14	1.11

Note: EDU multipliers by unit size are ratios of average household size to overall average household size for all single-family detached units.

Source: 2008 study data from Duncan Associates, *Impact Fee Capital Improvements Plan and Land Use Assumptions for the City of Santa Fe, 2008*; American Housing Survey data for units built 1990 or later from the *2011 American Housing Survey*.

The national and regional data are consistent with the 2008 study results for units up to 3,500 square feet. However, the national and regional data clearly show that household size plateaus at about 3,000 square feet. It is recommended that updated average household sizes by unit size categories be based on American Housing Survey data and that the upper size category include all units larger than 3,000 square feet, as shown in Table 65.

A similar approach is used to determine average household sizes for accessory or guest units built as attached or detached additions to single-family units. The current ordinance provides for fees that vary by the size of the guest unit, but the basis for these fees is unclear. In general, the multi-family fee would be reasonable to use for guest units, but consideration could be made for smaller guest units. Analysis of American Housing Survey data indicates that guest units of 750 square feet or less would have somewhat fewer residents than the average of all multi-family units, as shown in Table 65.

Table 65. Single-Family Average Household Size by Unit Size

Single-Family Unit Size (Heated Living Area)	EDU Multiplier	Avg. HH Size
1,500 sq. ft. or less	0.89	1.95
1,501-2,000 sq. ft.	0.93	2.04
2,001-2,500 sq. ft.	1.02	2.23
2,501-3,000 sq. ft.	1.07	2.35
3,001 sq. ft. or more	1.14	2.50
All Single-Family Detached	1.00	2.19
Guest Unit, 750 sq. ft. or less	0.76	1.66

Source: EDU multipliers for western U.S. from Table 64 (EDU multiplier for guest house of 750 sq. ft. or less derived from American Housing Survey data for multi-family units built in the Western Region in 1990 or later from the 2011 American Housing Survey); average household size for all single-family detached units in Santa Fe from Table 63; household sizes by unit size for Santa Fe based on EDU multipliers.

APPENDIX C: FUNCTIONAL POPULATION

As previously mentioned, this study modifies the approach for determining service demand for fire/EMS and police impact fee calculations from a service call basis to a “functional population” approach. Under this approach, functional population is calculated for each major land use and then converted into “equivalent dwelling units.” The equivalent dwelling unit, or EDU, represents the impact of a typical single-family dwelling on the demand for police and fire/EMS services.

To a large extent, the demand for police and fire/EMS functions are proportional to the presence of people. The functional population concept is analogous to the concept of “full-time equivalent” employees. It represents the number of “full-time equivalent” people present at the site of a land use.

The residential functional population is considerably simpler than the nonresidential component. It is assumed that people spend 12 hours per day at home during week days and 20 hours per day during weekends. In total, people are assumed to spend 100 hours per week, or 60 percent of their time, at home. The other 40 percent of their time spent away from home accounts for working, shopping and other away-from-home activities. For residential uses, then, equivalent dwelling units are calculated by first multiplying average household size by 60 percent to determine functional population per unit. The functional population per unit multipliers for residential uses are shown in Table 66.

Table 66. Residential Functional Population per Unit

Housing Type	Unit	Average HH Size	Occupancy	Func. Pop./Unit
Single-Family, Detached (All)	Dwelling	2.19	0.60	1.314
Less than 1,500 sf	Dwelling	1.95	0.60	1.170
1,500 to 1,999 sf	Dwelling	2.04	0.60	1.224
2,000 to 2,499 sf	Dwelling	2.23	0.60	1.338
2,500 to 2,999 sf	Dwelling	2.35	0.60	1.410
3,000 sf or greater	Dwelling	2.50	0.60	1.500
Guest Unit, 750 sf or less	Dwelling	1.66	0.60	0.996
Multi-Family	Dwelling	1.90	0.60	1.140
Mobile Home/RV Park	Pad/Space	3.04	0.60	1.824

Source: Overall single-family, multi-family and mobile home average household size from Table 63; single-family average household size by housing size from Table 65; occupancy factor estimated (see text above).

Nonresidential Functional Population

The functional population methodology for nonresidential uses is based on trip generation data utilized in developing the transportation demand schedule prepared for the updated transportation impact fee update. Functional population per 1,000 square feet is derived by dividing the total number of hours spent by employees and visitors during a weekday by 24 hours. Employees are estimated to spend eight hours per day at their place of employment, and visitors are estimated to spend one-half to one hour per visit depending on land use. The formula used to derive the nonresidential functional population estimates is summarized in Figure 7.

Figure 7. Nonresidential Functional Population Formula

Functional population/1000 sf = (employee hours/1000 sf + visitor hours/1000 sf) ÷ 24 hours/day

Where:

Employee hours/1000 sf = employees/1000 sf x 8 hours/day

Visitor hours/1000 sf (retail/office/public) = visitors/1000 sf x 1 hour/visit

Visitors hours/1000 sf (industrial/warehouse) = visitors/1000 sf x 1/2 hour/visit

Visitors/1000 sf = ADT/1000 sf x avg. vehicle occupancy - employees/1000 sf

ADT/1000 sf = average daily trips (1/2 trip ends) on a weekday per 1000 sf

Using this formula and information on trip generation rates used in this study for the transportation impact fee update, vehicle occupancy rates from the *National Household Travel Survey* and other sources and assumptions, nonresidential functional population estimates per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area are calculated. Table 67 presents the results of these calculations for a number of nonresidential land use categories.

Table 67. Nonresidential Functional Population per Unit

Land Use	Unit	Trip Rate	Persons/ Trip	Employee/ Unit	Visitors/ Unit	Functional Pop./Unit
Retail/Commercial	1,000 sq. ft.	21.35	1.96	1.02	40.83	2.041
Office	1,000 sq. ft.	5.52	1.24	2.31	4.53	0.959
Industrial	1,000 sq. ft.	3.42	1.24	1.05	3.19	0.416
Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft.	1.78	1.24	0.43	1.78	0.180
Mini Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft.	1.25	1.24	0.43	1.12	0.167
Public/Institutional	1,000 sq. ft.	3.80	1.86	1.95	5.11	0.863

Source: Trip rates are one-half trip ends from Table 14; persons/trip is average vehicle occupancy from Federal Highway Administration, *Nationwide Household Travel Survey*, 2009; employees/unit from U.S. Department of Energy, *Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey*, 2003; visitors/unit is trips times persons/trip minus employees/unit; functional population/unit calculated based on formula from Figure 7.

Functional Population Summary

The functional population multipliers for the residential and nonresidential land use categories are summarized in Table 68.

Table 68. Functional Population Multipliers

Land Use	Unit	Functional Pop./Unit
Single-Family, Detached (All)	Dwelling	1.314
Less than 1,500 sf	Dwelling	1.170
1,500 to 1,999 sf	Dwelling	1.224
2,000 to 2,499 sf	Dwelling	1.338
2,500 to 2,999 sf	Dwelling	1.410
3,000 sf or greater	Dwelling	1.500
Guest Unit, 750 sf or less	Dwelling	0.996
Multi-Family	Dwelling	1.140
Mobile Home/RV Park	Pad/Space	1.824
Retail/Commercial	1,000 sq. ft.	2.041
Office	1,000 sq. ft.	0.959
Industrial	1,000 sq. ft.	0.416
Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft.	0.180
Mini Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft.	0.167
Public/Institutional	1,000 sq. ft.	0.863

Source: Residential dwelling unit functional population per unit from Table 66; nonresidential functional population per unit from Table 67.

Existing and projected total functional population for the Urban Area are derived based on existing and projected land uses from the Land Use Assumptions and functional population per unit multipliers summarized above. The results are displayed in Table 69.

Table 69. Total Functional Population, 2014-2020

Land Use	Unit	No. of Units	Functional Pop.	
			per Unit	Total
Existing (2014)				
Single-Family Detached	Dwelling	29,500	1.314	38,763
Multi-Family	Dwelling	9,700	1.140	11,058
Mobile Home	Dwelling	5,200	1.824	9,485
Retail/Commercial	1,000 sq. ft.	10,198	2.041	20,814
Office	1,000 sq. ft.	8,972	0.959	8,604
Industrial/Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft.	4,360	0.298	1,299
Public/Institutional	1,000 sq. ft.	2,960	0.863	2,554
Total Functional Population, 2014				92,577
Projected (2020)				
Single-Family Detached	Dwelling	31,250	1.314	41,063
Multi-Family	Dwelling	10,050	1.140	11,457
Mobile Home	Dwelling	5,200	1.824	9,485
Retail/Commercial	1,000 sq. ft.	10,898	2.041	22,243
Office	1,000 sq. ft.	9,322	0.959	8,940
Industrial/Warehouse	1,000 sq. ft.	4,465	0.298	1,331
Public/Institutional	1,000 sq. ft.	3,030	0.863	2,615
Total Functional Population, 2020				97,134

New Functional Population, 2014-2020 4,557
 Source: Existing and projected land uses from Table 5; functional population per unit from Table 68; total functional population is product of units and functional population per unit.

APPENDIX D: PARK/TRAIL INVENTORY

Table 70. Inventory of Existing Parks and Open Space

Park Facility	Acres	Play- grnd	Picnic Area	Activ. Area	Tennis Court	Hand- ball	Soccer Field	Bskt- ball	Base- ball	Soft- ball	Vball Ct	Skate- board	Swim Pool
Arroyo Sonrisa Park	0.26												
Cielo Vista	1.20												
Canada Gardens	0.89												
City Hall Park	0.68												
Don Diego Entrada Park	0.31												
Espinacitas Park	0.16												
Gregory Lopez Park	1.87	1	1										
Guadalupe Neighborhood Parcel	0.17												
John F. Griego Park (Vietnam Vets)	0.92	1	1					1					
Kiva Center	0.72												
La Farge Library	1.20												
La Villa Serena Park	1.28												
Los Milagros Park	1.16												
Maclovía Park	1.19												
Main Library	0.93												
Maloof Park	2.62												
Melendez Park	0.45												
Monica Roybal Center	0.81	2	1	1				2					
Dancing Ground Community Park	1.66	1	1	1									
Orlando Fernandez Park	0.46		1										
Peralta Park	0.78			1									
Plaza Entrada	0.22												
Rancho Del Sol Phase II Park	0.48												
Rancho Siringo Park	0.31	1	1					1					
Resolana Park	1.58	1	1										
Santa Fe Riverside Park	0.72		1	1									
South Meadows	1.64												
Sunnyslope Meadows	0.41												
Thomas Macaione Park	0.40		1										
Valentine Park	0.67	1	1										
Young Park	0.91	1	1					1					
Subtotal, Pocket Parks	27.06	9	9	3	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
Adam Gabriel Armijo Park	5.68	1	1										
Alvarado Park	4.85	1	1										
Amelia E White Park	2.97		1										
Calle Lorca Park	6.94	1	1					2					
Candeler Park	6.60	1	1		2			1					
Frank S. Ortiz Park Playground	6.19	1	1										
Herb Martinez Park	7.64		1		6				1				
Las Acequias Park	5.59	2	1	1				2					
Las Acequias Park - Phase 4	2.47												
Las Estancías #1	2.07												
Los Hermanos Rodriguez Park	3.76	1	1					1					
Martin Luther King Park	1.21	1	1	1									
Mark Brandt Park	5.27		1										
Monica Lucero Park	10.75	1	1						1				
Monsignor Patrick Smith Park	4.63	1	1				1	2					
Parque Del Rio	4.00												
Pueblos del Sol	5.30												
Santa Fe Estates	6.33												
Torreón Park	3.44	2	1					2					
Villa Caballero Park	4.83												
Subtotal, Neighborhood Parks	100.52	13	14	2	8	0	1	12	1	1	0	0	0
Ashbaugh Park	16.12		1				1				1		
Bicentennial Park	15.92	1	1		4			1	3				
Fort Marcy Complex	25.32	1	1	1	2		2		1				
General Franklin E. Miles Park	28.60	2	1					2	7			1	
Larragoite Park	11.52	1	1		2			1			1	1	
Ragle Park	38.41	1	1			1				4			
Salvador Perez Park / Patio Park	15.12	2	1	1	4		1		3	2	1		
Villa Linda Park	16.12	1	1				1						
Subtotal, Community Parks	167.13	9	8	2	12	1	4	4	14	7	5	1	0

Appendix D: Park/Trail Inventory

Table 70. Continued

Park Facility	Acres	Play- grnd	Picnic	Activ. Area	Tennis Court	Hand- ball	Soccer Field	Bskt- ball	Base- ball	Soft- ball	Vball Ct	Skate- board	Swim Pool
Municipal Recreation Complex	428.38						4						
Subtotal, Regional Parks	428.38	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Boys and Girls Club	1.59												
Cathedral Park	0.62		1	1									
Cornell Park (Rose Garden)	2.06		1										
Cross of the Martyrs	2.35		1										
De Vargas Park (East/West)	2.93		1	1							1		
Dr Richard Engle Tennis Courts	0.72				3								
Frank S. Ortiz Park	134.29												
Plaza Park	1.07			1									
Prince Park	10.13		1	1									
Power Plant Park	3.40	1											
Railyard Park	10.54												
Santa Fe River Park	6.91												
Santa Fe River Park Downtown East	2.29		1										
Santa Fe River Park Downtown West	1.06		1										
Santa Fe River Park East	9.98		1										
Santa Fe River Park West	11.21		1										
Subtotal, Special Use Parks	201.15	0	9	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Baca Street Cristobal Colon Parcels	1.27												
Bicentennial Pool	0.80												1
Boys and Girls Club	0.70												
Fort Marcy Rec. Center*	2.67												
Galisteo Tennis Courts	0.66				2								
Genoveva Chavez Community Center*	3.74												
Monica Roybal Center	0.40							1					
Salvador Perez Pool	1.33												1
Senior Citizens Center	1.15												
Subtotal, Recreation Facilities*	12.72	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Airport Rd Open Space (Lot 9 Sec 7)	1.69												
Cerro Gordo O.s.	2.41												
Frenchy's Field Park & Commons	16.53	1		1									
Genoveva Chavez Park Land	17.29												
La Paz Open Space	3.82												
Mountain View Apartments Dedication	0.03												
Mountain View Apartments Dedication	0.11												
Municipal Recreation Center	1,291.94												
N Tract W Portion of Ne Quad. Of Sf	141.58												
Nava Ade	8.46												
Parque Escudero	0.65												
Pueblos Del Sol	64.30												
Rio Vista	4.86												
Santa Fe Estates Open Space	25.63												
Sierra Del Norte	58.96												
Tierra Contenta	452.18												
Tierra Escondida Drainage Pond	0.47		1										
Tract A; E of Alameda Public Housing	0.12												
Vista De La Sierra Drainage and Rec	1.16												
Vista Del Prado Openspace	2.07												
Vista Del Sol	28.79												
Vistas De Santa Fe	0.90												
Wuest Parcel	0.83												
Yucca Park	2.07												
Zia Vista	9.45												
Subtotal, Open Space	2,136.30	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total, Neighborhood & Pocket Parks	127.58	22	23	5	8	0	1	17	1	1	0	0	0
Total, Community/Reg./Rec./Sp. Use	809.38	9	17	6	17	1	8	5	14	7	5	2	2
Total, Open Space	2,136.30	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total, All Parks	3,073.26	32	41	12	25	1	9	22	15	8	5	2	2

* recreational facilities subtotal includes land but excludes facilities for Fort Marcy and Genoveva Chavez Community Center

Source: City of Santa Fe Long Range Planning, December 17, 2013.

Table 71. Existing Trail Inventory

Trails	Miles
Acequia Trail	3.60
Arroyo Chamisos Trail	5.68
Botolph Rd. Trail	0.25
Gonzales Road Trail	1.00
Marc Brandt Park - Siringo Rd	0.50
Museum Hill Trail	0.50
Nava Ade Trails	2.25
Old Pecos Trail ROW Trail	1.00
Pueblos del Sol Trails	1.60
Rail Trail	4.00
Santa Fe River Trail	3.21
St. Francis Drive Trail	1.00
Tierra Contenta	1.50
Subtotal, Paved Trails	26.09
Arroyo Mascaras Trail	0.33
Arroyo Mora (Polai) Trail	1.63
Atalaya Wilderness Trail	5.16
Dale Ball Trails	22.22
De Vargas Heights Bridle Paths	n/a
Dorothy Stewart Trail	1.45
Fullerton Legacy	0.27
La Tierra Trail System	25.00
Las Estrellas Trails - Santa Fe Estates	3.00
MRC Trails	7.00
MRC to Agua Fria	2.00
Prince Park Trail	1.00
Visto Del Prado	n/a
Zocalo	0.30
Subtotal, Soft Surface Trails	69.36
Total All Trails	95.45

Source: City of Santa Fe Long Range Planning, December 17, 2013.

APPENDIX E: OUTSTANDING DEBT

The City of Santa Fe's outstanding gross receipts tax (GRT) and general obligation (GO) bonds are summarized in Table 72. The 2013 GO bonds and the portion of the 2012A GRT bonds not used for refunding are not included, because none of the projects funded by these bond issues have been included in the existing facility inventories for the road, park, fire and police impact fee analyses. The debt for land acquisition for general government purposes, convention center, solid waste, wastewater and the Railyard are unrelated to the impact fee facilities and are excluded from the remainder of this analysis.

Table 72. Outstanding Non-Utility Debt Summary

Bond Issue	Purpose	Original	Outstanding
GRT Rev. Bonds 2006A	CIP	\$17,710,000	\$3,045,000
GRT Rev. Bonds 2008	CIP	\$20,135,000	\$19,840,000
GRT Refunding Bonds 2010A	Refund 2002	\$15,005,000	\$9,415,000
GRT Refunding Bonds 2012A*	Refund 2004A	\$14,390,000	\$14,390,000
GRT Rev. Bonds 2012A*	CIP	\$18,335,000	\$18,335,000
GRT Refunding Bonds 2013A	Refund 2006A	\$10,880,000	\$10,880,000
MRC 2005 Refunding Bonds	Parks	\$15,315,000	\$9,165,000
NMFA - Land Acquisition	Land Purch.	\$3,610,000	\$2,965,784
Total from 1/2% GRT		\$115,380,000	\$88,035,784
General Obligation 2008	Parks	\$20,000,000	\$17,070,000
General Obligation 2010	Parks	\$10,300,000	\$9,440,000
Total from Property Tax		\$30,300,000	\$26,510,000
GRT Rev. Bonds 2008-Con. Ctr	Conv. Ctr.	\$8,570,000	\$7,725,000
NMFA - Conv. Center (+ fees)	Conv. Ctr.	\$42,220,000	\$37,625,000
Total from Lodger's Tax		\$50,790,000	\$45,350,000
GRT Refunding Bonds 2006B	Solid Waste	\$15,160,000	\$10,190,000
Total from MGRT Infrastructure		\$15,160,000	\$10,190,000
GRT Rev. Ref. Bonds 2012B	WW	\$14,280,000	\$12,540,000
GRT/WW Bonds 2006C	WW	\$9,780,000	\$6,070,000
Total from MGRT Env & WW Rev		\$24,060,000	\$18,610,000
GRT Refunding Bonds 2010B	Railyard	\$10,490,000	\$9,785,000
GRT Refunding Bonds 2013B	Parking Garage	\$13,780,000	\$13,780,000
GRT Rev Bonds 2012C	Market Station	\$4,685,000	\$4,685,000
Total from Railyard GRT		\$28,955,000	\$28,250,000

* \$32,725,000 bond split between refunding and new capital projects

Source: City of Santa Fe Finance Department, October 15, 2013.

Appendix E: Outstanding Debt

The outstanding debt amounts attributable to refunding issues, as well as to original issues that funded a variety of improvement types, are allocated among facility types based on the original planned project costs for each bond issue. Only debt that was incurred for capacity-expanding improvements is included. The analysis of the individual bond issues is provided at the end of this appendix. The resulting distributions by facility type are summarized in Table 73.

Table 73. Distribution of Debt by Facility Type

Bond Issue	Streets	Parks	Police	Fire	Other	Total
Planned Project Costs						
GRT Revenue Bonds 2002	\$250,000	\$0	\$0	\$150,000	\$17,595,000	\$17,995,000
GRT Revenue Bonds 2004 A	\$2,200,000	\$3,960,000	\$0	\$1,700,000	\$10,800,000	\$18,660,000
GRT Revenue Bonds 2006 A	\$1,740,000	\$3,900,000	\$670,000	\$460,000	\$11,730,000	\$18,500,000
MRC 2005 Refunding	\$0	\$6,126,000	\$0	\$0	\$9,189,000	\$15,315,000
GRT Rev. Bonds 2008	\$1,200,000	\$2,450,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,200,000	\$12,285,000	\$20,135,000
GRT Rev. Bonds 2012A	\$430,000	\$2,300,000	\$0	\$0	\$19,270,000	\$22,000,000
Percentage of Bond Project Cost						
GRT Revenue Bonds 2002	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	97.8%	100.0%
GRT Revenue Bonds 2004 A	11.8%	21.2%	0.0%	9.1%	57.9%	100.0%
GRT Revenue Bonds 2006 A	9.4%	21.1%	3.6%	2.5%	63.4%	100.0%
MRC 2005 Refunding	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%	60.0%	100.0%
GRT Rev. Bonds 2008 - CIP	6.0%	12.2%	9.9%	10.9%	61.0%	100.0%
GRT Rev. Bonds 2012A (CIP)	2.0%	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%	87.6%	100.0%

Source: Original planned project costs from the following tables: GRT 2002 (Table 75), GRT 2004A (Table 76), GRT 2006A (Table 77), GRT 2008 (Table 78) and GRT 2012A (CIP portion, Table 79); MRC 2005 refunding bond issued to refund the 1996C and 1998 MRC bonds that were used for parks (60% attributed to golf courses per City of Santa Fe Finance Department, August 15, 2002 – classified as “other”).

The distributions from the table above are multiplied by the total outstanding debt for those mixed-facility bond issues to determine outstanding debt for each impact fee facility type.

Table 74. Outstanding Debt by Facility Type

Bond Issue (Refunded Issue)	Streets	Parks	Police	Fire	Total
GRT Refunding 2010A (2002)	\$131,810	\$0	\$0	\$75,320	\$9,415,000
GRT Refunding 2012A (2004A)	\$1,698,020	\$3,050,680	\$0	\$1,309,490	\$14,390,000
GRT Refunding 2013A (2006A)	\$1,022,720	\$2,295,680	\$391,680	\$272,000	\$10,880,000
GRT 2006A	\$286,230	\$642,495	\$109,620	\$76,125	\$3,045,000
GRT 2008	\$1,190,400	\$2,420,480	\$1,964,160	\$2,162,560	\$19,840,000
GRT 2012A	\$430,000	\$2,300,000	\$0	\$0	\$18,335,000
MRC 2005 Refunding	\$0	\$3,666,000	\$0	\$0	\$9,165,000
General Obligation 2008	\$341,400	\$17,070,000	\$0	\$0	\$17,070,000
General Obligation 2010	\$0	\$9,440,000	\$0	\$0	\$9,440,000
Total	\$5,100,580	\$40,885,335	\$2,465,460	\$3,895,495	\$111,580,000

Source: Total outstanding principal from Table 72; outstanding amount by facility for mixed-facility issues based on percent of original debt from Table 73.

Table 75. 2002 Gross Receipts Tax Bond Projects

Project	Amount	Eligible
Traffic Calming	\$1,500,000	\$0
Intersection Safety	\$250,000	\$250,000
Repaving	\$1,000,000	\$0
Unpaved Streets Rehabilitation	\$150,000	\$0
Small Sidewalks	\$100,000	\$0
Bridge Rehabilitation	\$50,000	\$0
Recycled Asphalt	\$50,000	\$0
Preventative Asphalt	\$100,000	\$0
Subtotal, Streets	\$3,200,000	\$250,000
Fire Station #8 Design	\$150,000	\$150,000
Subtotal, Fire	\$150,000	\$150,000
Water Management/ Conservation	\$700,000	\$0
Turf Rehabilitation	\$870,000	\$0
Subtotal, Parks	\$1,570,000	\$0
Maez Road Drainage	\$500,000	n/a
Municipal Repairs	\$600,000	n/a
Building Infrastructure Technology	\$500,000	n/a
ITS Infrastructure	\$200,000	n/a
Small Drainage	\$100,000	n/a
Affordable Housing	\$500,000	n/a
Arts	\$180,000	n/a
Social Services Facility	\$500,000	n/a
Water System Improvements	\$10,500,000	n/a
Total	\$18,500,000	\$400,000

Source: City of Santa Fe Finance Department, June 15, 2002.

Table 76. 2004A Gross Receipts Tax Bond Projects

Project	Amount	Eligible
Parks and Median Maint.	\$400,000	\$0
Water Management	\$500,000	\$0
Artificial Turf	\$500,000	\$0
Tennis Court Rehab	\$200,000	\$0
Alto Park, Phase II	\$700,000	\$700,000
Trails	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000
Railyard Infrastructure	\$350,000	\$350,000
Tierra Contenta Park	\$200,000	\$200,000
La Cieneguita Park	\$200,000	\$200,000
Plaza Improvements	\$500,000	\$500,000
State Game and Fish Property	\$450,000	\$450,000
Amelia White Park	\$60,000	\$60,000
Subtotal, Parks	\$5,560,000	\$3,960,000
Traffic Safety Improvements	\$300,000	\$300,000
Re-paving	\$1,250,000	\$0
Unpaved Rehab.	\$150,000	\$0
Small Sidewalks	\$100,000	\$0
Bridge Rehab.	\$200,000	\$0
Recycled Asphalt Paving Program	\$250,000	\$0
Siler Road Extension Design	\$400,000	\$400,000
Alire Bridge Rehab.	\$400,000	\$0
Traffic Calming	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000
Subtotal, Streets	\$4,550,000	\$2,200,000
Fire Station #8	\$1,700,000	\$1,700,000
Subtotal, Fire	\$1,700,000	\$1,700,000
ADA Improvements	\$300,000	n/a
Municipal Facility Repair	\$600,000	n/a
Cerrillos Road IT Conduit	\$100,000	n/a
Airport Matching Funds	\$285,000	n/a
Small Drainage	\$100,000	n/a
Ortiz Landfill Re-mediation	\$200,000	n/a
South Side Library	\$4,800,000	n/a
Affordable Housing	\$500,000	n/a
Arts	\$180,000	n/a
Total	\$18,875,000	\$7,860,000

Source: City of Santa Fe Finance Department, March 8, 2007.

Table 77. 2006A Gross Receipts Tax Bond Projects

Project	Amount	Eligible
Parks and Median Maint.	\$400,000	\$0
Water Management	\$300,000	\$0
Turf Rehabilitation	\$300,000	\$0
Tennis Court Rehab	\$200,000	\$0
Alto Park	\$500,000	\$500,000
Sports Facilities Improvements	\$600,000	\$600,000
Railyard Park Offsite Improvements	\$800,000	\$800,000
Santa Fe River Trail	\$750,000	\$750,000
Santa Fe Railyard Park	\$250,000	\$250,000
Amelia White Park	\$100,000	\$100,000
Dog Parks	\$150,000	\$150,000
Trails (Citywide)	\$500,000	\$500,000
Franklin Miles Park Improvements	\$250,000	\$250,000
Subtotal, Parks	\$5,100,000	\$3,900,000
Intersection/Signal Improvements	\$350,000	\$350,000
Traffic Safety Improvements	\$300,000	\$300,000
Signal Maint.	\$200,000	\$0
Sign and Striping Maint.	\$200,000	\$0
Paved Street Rehab.	\$3,905,000	\$0
Unpaved Rehab.	\$150,000	\$0
Small Sidewalks	\$300,000	\$0
Bridge Rehab.	\$500,000	\$0
Recycled Asphalt Paving Program	\$100,000	\$0
Camino Alire Bridge	\$700,000	\$700,000
Carson St. Bridge	\$40,000	\$40,000
Area Traffic Plan on Galisteo St.	\$100,000	\$100,000
Traffic Calming	\$250,000	\$250,000
Subtotal, Streets	\$7,095,000	\$1,740,000
Main Station Improvements	\$600,000	\$600,000
Alameda Substation Parking	\$70,000	\$70,000
Subtotal, Police	\$670,000	\$670,000
Fire Vehicle Access, Station #8	\$300,000	\$300,000
Fire Station #3 Design	\$160,000	\$160,000
Fleet Mechanic	\$200,000	\$0
Subtotal, Fire	\$660,000	\$460,000
ADA Improvements	\$1,000,000	n/a
Municipal Facility Repair	\$600,000	n/a
Telecommunications Improvements	\$1,000,000	n/a
Airport Matching Funds	\$100,000	n/a
Small Drainage	\$300,000	n/a
Property Control–City Hall	\$250,000	n/a
Fleet Expansion	\$300,000	n/a
Night Sky Implementation	\$200,000	n/a
Solid Waste Landfill Closure	\$200,000	n/a
Community Services	\$400,000	n/a
Warehouse 21	\$200,000	n/a
La Familia	\$100,000	n/a
PLUD Software	\$25,000	n/a
Women’s Health Services	\$100,000	n/a
Arts	\$200,000	n/a
Total	\$18,500,000	\$7,900,000

Source: City of Santa Fe Finance Department, February 26, 2007.

Table 78. 2008 Gross Receipts Tax Bond Projects

Project	Amount	Eligible
Intersection Safety	\$350,000	\$0
Safety Misc. Projects	\$300,000	\$0
Signal Maintenance	\$200,000	\$0
Sight, Paint & Signal	\$200,000	\$0
Municipal Facilities Repair	\$600,000	\$0
Paved Street Rehab.	\$3,230,000	\$0
Unpaved Street Rehab.	\$150,000	\$0
Small Sidewalks	\$150,000	\$0
Small Drainage	\$300,000	\$0
Bridge Rehab.	\$500,000	\$0
Cerrillos Road	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
Airport Road Safety Project	\$100,000	\$0
Paseo de Vista Prelim Design	\$200,000	\$200,000
Subtotal, Streets	\$7,280,000	\$1,200,000
Park Maintenance	\$400,000	\$0
Parks/Water Mgt.	\$300,000	\$0
Turf Rehab.	\$300,000	\$0
Bicentennial Pool	\$300,000	\$300,000
Santa Fe Railyard Park & Plaza	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
Trails City Wide (incl. Santa Fe Trail)	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
Old Power Plant Building & Park	\$150,000	\$150,000
Subtotal, Parks	\$3,450,000	\$2,450,000
Fire Station #3	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
Fire Station #4 (#9 Design NWQ)	\$200,000	\$200,000
Subtotal, Fire	\$2,200,000	\$2,200,000
Police Facility Design (Main Station)	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
Subtotal, Police	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
Effluent Line for SW Sector	\$500,000	n/a
CIP for the Arts	\$370,000	n/a
ADA Improvements	\$300,000	n/a
Telecomm Imp City Wide	\$500,000	n/a
Airport Matching Funds	\$100,000	n/a
Court Rehab.	\$200,000	n/a
GCCC-CIP Bond	\$250,000	n/a
City Hall Renovations	\$600,000	n/a
Warehouse 21 (Youth Center)	\$1,000,000	n/a
Tino Griego Teen Ctr (La Farge Lib.)	\$500,000	n/a
Farmers Market	\$200,000	n/a
Affordable Housing	\$500,000	n/a
Zona del Sol (Youth Consortium)	\$750,000	n/a
ITT	\$300,000	n/a
Total	\$21,000,000	\$7,850,000

Source: City of Santa Fe Finance Department, February 7, 2014.


Table 79. 2012A Gross Receipts Tax Bond Projects

Project	Amount	Eligible
Intersection Safety	\$350,000	\$0
Traffic Miscellaneous Safety	\$300,000	\$0
Paved Street Rehabilitation	\$4,000,000	\$0
Unpaved Street Rehabilitation	\$2,000,000	\$0
Small Sidewalks	\$500,000	\$0
Small Drainage	\$300,000	\$0
Bridge Rehabilitation	\$500,000	\$0
Signal Replacement/Repair	\$340,000	\$0
Signing and Striping	\$260,000	\$0
Paseo de Peralta/Washington Intersection	\$230,000	\$230,000
Road Sharrows	\$250,000	\$0
Airport Road Landscaping	\$200,000	\$200,000
Butulph Rd Shoulders/Pedestrian Safety	\$250,000	\$0
LED Streetlights at Traffic Signals	\$120,000	\$0
Total, Streets	\$9,600,000	\$430,000
Parks and Medians	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
Poof Roof/HVAC Renovations	\$300,000	\$0
Gonzales Road Pedestrian Trail	\$300,000	\$300,000
Total, Parks	\$2,600,000	\$2,300,000
Municipal Facilities	\$600,000	n/a
City Roofs	\$200,000	n/a
GCCC	\$500,000	n/a
Airport Matching Funds	\$200,000	n/a
Transit Matching Funds	\$500,000	n/a
Rodeo de SF Arena & Ag Disaster Relief	\$100,000	n/a
Effluent Line SW Sector	\$1,000,000	n/a
ITT Citywide	\$1,000,000	n/a
Court ITT Improvements	\$300,000	n/a
Zona del Sol	\$100,000	n/a
ADA Improvements	\$300,000	n/a
Bus Replacement	\$2,000,000	n/a
Santa Fe Railyard	\$600,000	n/a
2% for Arts	\$400,000	n/a
Solar Loan Program	\$200,000	n/a
Affordable Housing	\$800,000	n/a
Broadband Infrastructure	\$1,000,000	n/a
Total	\$22,000,000	\$2,730,000

Source: City of Santa Fe Finance Department, February 10, 2014.

APPENDIX F: LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS

Santa Fe Urban Area
Impact Fee Land Use Assumptions
2014–2020



City of Santa Fe
Housing & Community Development Department
Long Range Planning Division
August, 2013

INTRODUCTION

This report provides land use assumptions (growth projections) for the Santa Fe Urban Area, a unified service area, within which the city is planning to annex land and therefore expend impact fee monies for eligible capital improvement projects (see map). The New Mexico *Development Fees Act* (§§ 5-8-1 through 5-8-43, *NMSA 1978*), specifies that land use assumptions must be adopted for a period of at least five years. These land use assumptions cover a period of seven years from the beginning of 2014 through the end of 2020.

The projections assume that urban area growth through 2020 will generally reflect slower growth than occurred during the last decade (2000-2010), due to the slow recovery from the depth of the Great Recession and slower population growth.

Residential and Non-Residential Development, 2014–2020

The following table summarizes anticipated growth from the beginning of 2014 through 2020.

Table 1. Residential & Non-Residential Development, 2014–2020

<i>Housing Units</i>				
	<u>2014</u>	<u>Added</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>(Annual Avg.)</u>
City/Urban Area Total	44,400	2,100	46,500	300
<i>Population</i>				
	<u>2014</u>	<u>Added</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>(Annual Avg.)</u>
City/Urban Area Total	86,500	3,500	90,000	500
<i>Housing Units, By Type</i>				
	<u>2014</u>	<u>Added</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>(Annual Avg.)</u>
Single-Family (Detached: Attached)	29,500	1,750	31,250	250
Multi-Family	9,700	350	10,050	50
Mobile Homes	5,200	0	5,200	0
City/Urban Area Total	44,400	2,100	46,500	300
<i>Commercial Development (square feet of gross floor area)</i>				
<u>Land Use Category</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Added</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>(Annual Avg.)</u>
Retail	10,198,000	700,000	10,898,000	100,000
Office	8,972,000	350,000	9,322,000	50,000
Industrial	4,360,000	105,000	4,465,000	15,000
Institutional	2,960,000	70,000	3,030,000	10,000
Commercial Total	26,490,000	1,225,000	27,715,000	175,000

Source: *Santa Fe Trends, 2013*; city and county building permit data through July, 2013.

Housing & Population Assumptions

Housing in the city/urban area will continue to grow slowly based on continued lower demand for new housing both from within the community and from those moving here from other places. Larger master-planned developments in the city will continue to account for much of the new housing. Projections of population growth are based on assumptions about the average number of new housing units built each year and the number of occupants in each new unit. The overall average number of occupants in each new housing unit is projected to be 1.67.

Commercial Assumptions

Commercial construction, which for these purposes includes all non-residential construction, is projected to continue at a modest, but healthy, annual average of 175,000 square feet. This represents the annual average of new commercial development from 2006-2012. Though much of this period includes the Great Recession, it is anticipated that an oversupply of commercial floor area leading up to the recession and the increase of computer-based retail sales will keep the annual levels of construction of commercial space moderate through the rest of the decade.

Historical Housing and Population Growth, 2000-2010

From 2000–2010, city population growth represented nearly all of the urban area growth, a dramatic change from the 1990s when the city accounted for less than half of the total urban area population growth. Meanwhile, city housing growth represented 97% of total urban area housing growth from 2000–2010 (compared to only 73% during the 1990s). When comparing the 2000 and 2010 Census, the city and urban area experienced the following population and housing growth:

Note: In the future, comparisons between the “city” and “urban area” may be unnecessary as the city annexes most of the urban area. The Agua Fria Traditional Historic Community (2,800 residents and 1,134 housing units; 2010 Census) located within the urban area is expected to remain part of county jurisdiction.

Table 2. Population & Housing Growth, 2000-2010

	Total Population		2000-2010 Growth	Annual Average	Urban Area Growth
	2000	2010			
City of Santa Fe	62,203	67,947	+5,744	574	99%
Outside the City	16,897	16,930	+ 33	3	1%
Urban Area Total	79,100	84,877	+5,777	577	100%

	Total Housing Units		2000-2010 Growth	Annual Average	Urban Area Growth
	2000	2010			
City of Santa Fe	30,533	37,200	+6,667	667	97%
Outside the City	6,046	6,205	+ 159	16	3%
Urban Area Total	36,579	43,405	+6,826	683	100%

	Persons per Housing Unit		
	2000	2010	
City of Santa Fe	2.04	1.82	<i>(not Persons-per-Household)</i>
Outside the City	2.79	2.73	
Urban Area Total	2.16	1.95	

Source: U.S. Census

APPENDIX G: CAPITAL FACILITY PLANS

Table 80. Planned Major Road Improvements, 2014-2020

Project Name	Location	Cost Estimate
Cerrillos Rd, Phase IIC	Camino Carlos Rey to St. Michaels Dr.	\$10,300,000
Calle P'o Ae Pi	Airport Road to Rufina St.	\$500,000
Bike Lanes/Sidewalks	Reconstruction / Expansion	\$4,000,000
Rufina St.	Harrison Rd. to Camino Carlos Rey	\$500,000
West Alameda St.	La Joya Road to Siler Road	\$3,000,000
Zia Station Infrastructure	Zia Road Rail Station	\$300,000
Total, Road Improvements		\$18,600,000
Agua Fria / South Meadows		\$1,000,000
Agua Fria / Cottonwood		\$1,000,000
Airport Road / Ca P'o Ae Pi		\$350,000
Airport Road / Jemez		\$100,000
Cerrillos / Sandoval / Manhattan		\$1,000,000
Galisteo / St. Michaels		\$350,000
Galisteo / Rodeo		\$350,000
Galisteo / San Mateo		\$350,000
Paseo de Peralta / Marcy		\$350,000
Rufina / Ca P'o Ae Pi		\$350,000
Rufina / Lopez		\$500,000
Sandoval / Montezuma		\$500,000
Total, Intersection/Signalization Improvements		\$6,200,000
Total, All Road Projects		\$24,800,000

Source: Planned improvements and costs from City of Santa Fe Long Range Planning Division, November 5, 2013 and April 1, 2014.

Table 81. Planned Park/Trail Improvements, 2014-2020

Project Name	Cost Estimate
Colonia Prisma Park	\$50,000
Las Acequias Park Phase 2	\$89,000
Los Soleras Park	\$7,250,000
Nava Ade Park Development (Phase 2- South Park)	\$2,115,000
San Isidro Park	\$20,000
Southwest Activity Node (SWAN - Tierra Contenta) Ph 2-4	\$18,670,000
Small Parks (new)	\$500,000
Play Equipment (new)	\$200,000
Neighborhood & Community Park, Subtotal	\$28,894,000
Acequia Trail - Underpass at St. Francis/Cerrillos	\$3,500,000
Acequia Trail - Otowi Rd. to Harrison Rd.	\$535,000
Arroyo Chamiso Trail - Villa Linda Park to Governor Miles Road	\$610,000
Cañada Rincon Trail - Calle Mejia to Cam. Francisca/Ave. Rincon	\$250,000
Dale Ball Trail Improvements and Extensions	\$50,000
La Tierra Trail - Connections to Camino de las Crucitas & Montoyas	\$800,000
MRC Trail Improvements and Extension	\$225,000
Rail Trail - Pen Road to Alta Vista	\$660,000
River Trail & Parkway - St. Francis Drive to Canyon Road	\$1,000,000
Tierra Contenta Trail - Buffalo Grass Road to Camino Entrada	\$600,000
Trails, Subtotal	\$8,230,000
Parks & Trails, Total	\$37,124,000

Source: City of Santa Fe Long Range Planning Division, November 15, 2013.

Table 82. Planned Fire/EMS Improvements, 2014-2020

Improvement	Building Sq. Feet		Building Cost	Equipment Cost	Total Eligible Cost
	Existing	Proposed			
New Southwest (Agua Fria) Station	0	10,605	\$2,520,000	\$673,000	\$3,193,000
Fire Station No. 5 Remodel*	10,156	15,000	\$1,151,050	\$0	\$1,151,050
New Las Soleras Station	0	10605	\$2,520,000	\$525,000	\$3,045,000
Total	10156	36,210	\$6,191,050	\$1,198,000	\$7,389,050

* Construction cost represents share of expansion only.

Source: City of Santa Fe Fire Department, November 4, 2013 and February 17, 2014.

Table 83. Planned Police Improvements, 2014-2020

Improvement	Cost
Professional Standards-Camino Entrada	\$125,000
Police Records	\$220,000
Police Main Facility/Evidence Room	\$300,000
Total	\$645,000

Source: City of Santa Fe Police Department, November 4, 2013 and April 10, 2014.

**City of Santa Fe
Fiscal Impact Report (FIR)**

This Fiscal Impact Report (FIR) shall be completed for each proposed bill or resolution as to its direct impact upon the City's operating budget and is intended for use by any of the standing committees of and the Governing Body of the City of Santa Fe. Bills or resolutions with no fiscal impact still require a completed FIR. Bills or resolutions with a fiscal impact must be reviewed by the Finance Committee. Bills or resolutions without a fiscal impact generally do not require review by the Finance Committee unless the subject of the bill or resolution is financial in nature.

Section A. General Information

(Check) Bill: Resolution: (A single FIR may be used for related bills and/or resolutions)

Short Title(s): Impact Fee CIP 2020 and Impact Fees Bill

Sponsor(s): Councilor Bushee

Reviewing Department(s): Housing and Community Development

Person Completing FIR: Reed Liming Date: August 5, 2014 Phone: 955-6610

Reviewed by City Attorney: Vicky A. Brennan Date: 8/21/14
(Signature)

Reviewed by Finance Director: Debra Garcia Date: 8/21/14
(Signature)

Section B. Summary

Briefly explain the purpose and major provisions of the bill/resolution.

"The Impact Fee Capital Improvements Plan 2020" sets out the methodology for determining the impact fees and also lists the eligible projects that may receive impact fee monies. The Impact Fees Bill amends the ordinance and adds a "new" fee schedule.

Section C. Fiscal Impact

Note: Financial information on this FIR does not directly translate into a City of Santa Fe budget increase. For a budget increase, the following are required:

- a. The item must be on the agenda at the Finance Committee and City Council as a "Request for Approval of a City of Santa Fe Budget Increase" with a definitive funding source (could be same item and same time as bill/resolution)
- b. Detailed budget information must be attached as to fund, business units, and line item, amounts, and explanations (similar to annual requests for budget)
- c. Detailed personnel forms must be attached as to range, salary, and benefit allocation and signed by Human Resource Department for each new position(s) requested (prorated for period to be employed by fiscal year)*

1. Projected Expenditures:

- a. Indicate Fiscal Year(s) affected – usually current fiscal year and following fiscal year (i.e., FY 03/04 and FY 04/05)
- b. Indicate: "A" if current budget and level of staffing will absorb the costs
"N" if new, additional, or increased budget or staffing will be required
- c. Indicate: "R" – if recurring annual costs
"NR" if one-time, non-recurring costs, such as start-up, contract or equipment costs
- d. Attach additional projection schedules if two years does not adequately project revenue and cost patterns
- e. Costs may be netted or shown as an offset if some cost savings are projected (explain in Section 3 Narrative)

_____ Check here if no fiscal impact

Column #:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Expenditure Classification	FY _____	"A" Costs Absorbed or "N" New Budget Required	"R" Costs Recurring or "NR" Non-recurring	FY _____	"A" Costs Absorbed or "N" New Budget Required	"R" Costs – Recurring or "NR" Non-recurring	Fund Affected

Personnel*	\$ N/A	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____
Fringe**	\$ N/A	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____
Capital Outlay	\$ N/A	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____
Land/ Building	\$ N/A	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____
Professional Services	\$ N/A	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____
All Other Operating Costs	\$ N/A	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____
Total:	\$ N/A	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____

* Any indication that additional staffing would be required must be reviewed and approved in advance by the City Manager by attached memo before release of FIR to committees. **For fringe benefits contact the Finance Dept.

2. Revenue Sources:

- a. To indicate new revenues and/or
- b. Required for costs for which new expenditure budget is proposed above in item 1.

Column #:	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Type of Revenue	FY 14/15	"R" Costs Recurring or "NR" Non-recurring	FY _____	"R" Costs – Recurring or "NR" Non-recurring	Fund Affected

_____	\$750,000	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____
_____	\$	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____
_____	\$	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____
Total:	\$750,000	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____

3. Expenditure/Revenue Narrative:

Explain revenue source(s). Include revenue calculations, grant(s) available, anticipated date of receipt of revenues/grants, etc. Explain expenditures, grant match(s), justify personnel increase(s), detail capital and operating uses, etc. (Attach supplemental page, if necessary.)

The Impact Fee CIP 2020 states that based on land use and growth assumptions, the city could collect up to \$9.8 million in impact fee revenue through 2020, but assumed no waivers. However, more modest growth coupled with a 50% reduction in impact fees charged for all residential permits through February 26, 2016 could reduce total impact fee revenues below \$9.8 million by 2020.

The projected revenue for FY 14/15 is \$750,000 based on growth during the past 6-12 months and continuation of the 50% fee reduction for all residential permits.

Section D. General Narrative

1. Conflicts: Does this proposed bill/resolution duplicate/conflict with/companion to/relate to any City code, approved ordinance or resolution, other adopted policies or proposed legislation? Include details of city adopted laws/ordinance/resolutions and dates. Summarize the relationships, conflicts or overlaps.

The proposed Bill retains the 50% impact fee reduction for all residential permits that was adopted by the governing body earlier this year (February). Due to this provision anticipated impact fee revenue for FY 14/15 is \$750,000.

2. Consequences of Not Enacting This Bill/Resolution:

Are there consequences of not enacting this bill/resolution? If so, describe.

According to the New Mexico Development Fees Act, if the Impact Fee CIP 2020 and the Impact Fee Bill are not adopted, the Governing Body would need to adopt a resolution stating that "no update of the impact fees are needed at this time."

3. Technical Issues:

Are there incorrect citations of law, drafting errors or other problems? Are there any amendments that should be considered? Are there any other alternatives which should be considered? If so, describe.

4. Community Impact:

Briefly describe the major positive or negative effects the Bill/Resolution might have on the community including, but not limited to, businesses, neighborhoods, families, children and youth, social service providers and other institutions such as schools, churches, etc.

While the impact fees collected on each new home raises the sale price for the typical new single family home about 1%, the city has collected \$14.2 million in total impact fee revenue over the ten years and spent \$12.8 million of that revenue on the construction of a number of road projects, intersections, parks, trails, Police and Fire/EMS improvements. Attached is a list of projects and impact fee funds appropriated by year, since 2004.

~~building or development, based on physical characteristics, and not on the characteristics of the proposed initial owner or occupant of the building or development.~~

~~She asked who creates this expectation of how long someone is going to occupy a building.~~

~~In response, Mr. Liming said in the 12 years of impact fees, he does not think that anyone has ever done an independent fee calculation. Therefore, this has not come into play but it is State law or State code.~~

~~Commissioner Van Peski said it will probably never happen because people would have to pay for this.~~

~~Chair Walker asked why this is in the Ordinance at all.~~

~~Commissioner Van Peski said she could see why this is in the Ordinance because there could be an instance where somebody comes in and does something that has never been done before, and this would give the City an option.~~

~~5. INFORMATION ITEMS~~

~~There were no information items.~~

6. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

[Copies of the Memo {*Exhibit 6A*} to the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee from Reed Liming, Long Range Planning Division Director, regarding the Recommended Amendment of Impact Fee CIP 2020, Impact Fee Bill (Draft) and Analysis of Utility Expansion Charges for Water and Wastewater were distributed in the Members' packets.]

A. Impact Fee Capital Improvements Plan 2020 (proposed amendments)

1. Reconsideration of New Fee Schedule set at 70% of Calculated Fees vs. 75% (page 4)

Staff requests that the Committee consider the following changes to its recommended CIP document:

New Fee Schedule at 70% - Staff recommends that the new fee schedule to be set at 70%, instead of 75% level that was approved by the CIAC at its April 2014

meeting. By lowering the new fee schedule to 70% of the calculated fees, all residential permits and most non-residential permits would pay lower impact fees. By setting fees somewhat lower in the new fee schedule, subdivisions and development plans that would normally still pay according to the previous more detailed fee schedule, would chose to be charged according to the new, lower fee schedule. This would have the effect of moving the vast majority of permits onto the new more simplified fee schedule, thereby making administration of impact fees simpler for city staff and for applicants.

Mr. Liming said the idea of doing this is to get everybody on one simple fee schedule.

2. Adding previously approved project, “Zia Station Infrastructure” (page 77, Table 80)

Zia Station Infrastructure - Staff recommends that this be added as an eligible project to “Table 80” Planned Major Road Improvements, 2014-2020”. This project was previously approved to be added as an eligible project for funding with impact fees by City Council Resolution 2011-2014. This project was overlooked when staff compiled the new eligible project list in “Appendix G: Capital Facility Plans” (all other projects approved by resolution and added to the eligible project list have been started and/or completed and accounted for in the new CIP.)

Commissioner Lucero asked for an update on the Zia Station project.

Mr. Liming said basically the State Department of Transportation has indicated that they would open the Zia Station but the City of Santa Fe and/or developer have to take care of some things first, like fencing off the St. Francis right-of-way and creating vehicular access off of Galisteo Road, to access this platform. The City would also have to connect electricity for this and come up with funds for the Zia station Infrastructure project.

The Committee discussed whether or not the Zia Station is necessary and if people would use it.

Mr. McPherson mentioned that many of the employees from CHRISTUS St. Vincent Regional Medical Center that travel from Albuquerque have indicated that they would use it. They would love to see a closer connection to the hospital.

Chair Walker noted that CHRISTUS St. Vincent Regional Medical Center is the second largest employer in Santa Fe.

Mr. Liming mentioned that there are also two State buildings at Rodeo Plaza and these employees may use the Zia Station.

Commissioner Shanahan moved to approve Items 6A -1 (*Reconsideration of New Fee Schedule set at 70% of Calculated Fees vs. 75% (page 4)*) and 6A-2 (*Adding previously approved project, "Zia Station Infrastructure" (page 77, Table 80)*). Ms. Veneklasen seconded the motion. The motion carried with 1 in opposition.

B. Proposed Impact Fee Bill (ordinance amendment)

Staff recommended that the attached bill (with the proposed amendments) that is included in the Members' packets go forward to the Planning Commission and City Council. The Bill removes old language and the old fee schedule via strikethrough and adds new language and new fee schedule via underline. The Bill would amend sections (C) and (E) in the Impact Fees Ordinance (14-8.14), as well as Section (C) (2) of 14-8.15 of the Park dedication standards.

Mr. Liming noted that Councilor Bushee has indicated that she will sponsor this bill and she will be asking that the 50% reduction in impact fees for all residential permits for two years, be eliminated.

Mr. Liming said he has not had a discussion with Councilor Bushee but he will keep the Committee informed as this moves forward. He noted that the Ordinance in the Members' packets does not include Councilor Bushees' proposed amendment.

Commissioner Shanahan said by eliminating the 50% for residential permits for two years, it will overturn the previous Ordinance that was approved.

Commissioner Shanahan requested a copy of the Minutes of the City Council meeting of February 26th where the City Council approved the 50% reduction impact fees for all residential permits for two years.

*Of note: On June 13th, Mr. Liming e-mailed Commissioner Shanahan the Minutes of the February 26th City Council Meeting.

Commissioner Shanahan moved to approve the Proposed Impact Fee Bill as presented in the packet. Mr. Lucero seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

C. Water and Wastewater Utility Expansion Charge (UEC) Report by Duncan Associates

The Water and Wastewater Utility Expansion Charge report/analysis was discussed. The major conclusions of the report are:

- **Water UEC Fees** – Could be nearly doubled (82% increase) for all meter sizes, which is the basis for the city's Utility Expansion Charges for water.
- **Wastewater UEC Fees** – Could be increased by 8% for most non-residential meters (wastewater UEC fees are also charged according to water meter size). However, for residential sizes, wastewater UEC increases vary by unit size.
- **Water and Wastewater UEC funds** – It is recommended that the water UEC and wastewater UEC revenue be segregated from the water and wastewater funds and spent only for capacity-expanding improvements, which could include payment of debt on existing water and wastewater facilities with excess capacity. In essence, while acknowledging that the City may want to keep the current system of charging utility expansion charges, rather than creating water and wastewater impact fees, the report states that UEC revenues should and could be administered by the Utilities Department in much the same way as impact fees.

No action was taken on the report, as a whole, but the following motion was made:

Commissioner Shanahan moved that the Capital Improvement Advisory Committee recommends that City Council establish a citizen oversight committee (similar to the CIAC) to track the collection and expenditures of utility expansion charges as suggested by the Consultant in the report. Ms. Van Peski seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

his wife agree with the conditions of approval. He thanked the Planning Commission for hearing their case.

Public Hearing

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case and the Public Hearing was closed.

Questions from the Planning Commission

There were no questions from the Planning Commission.

Action of the Planning Commission

Commissioner Villarreal moved to approve Case #2014-56 – 5364 Agua Fria Final Subdivision Plat with staff conditions of approval. Commissioner Pava seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

1. **A Resolution adopting the “Impact Fee Capital Improvements Plan 2020 for Roads, Parks, Fire/EMS and Police” to meet the State required Impact Fee Program 5-Year Update as called for in the State Development Fees action (5-8-30 NMSA 1978) (Councilor Bushee) (Reed Liming).**

A Memorandum regarding the Impact Fee Capital Improvements Plan 2020 for Roads, Parks, Fire/EMS and Police with attachments, undated, for the July 10, 2014 meeting from Mr. Reed Liming, Long range Planning Division Director to the Planning Commission is incorporated herewith to these minutes as Exhibit #5.

Mr. Liming presented the staff report for this resolution to the Commission. He explained that this was an 80-page study that updated the impact fees which, by state law, must be updated every 5 years and Duncan and Associates did the study. The resolution was sponsored by Councilor Bushee.

There were a number of changes suggested and he reviewed them briefly.

- 1). Land Use categories - The first recommendations for CIP 2020 were that categories be consolidated from 20 commercial categories to 6, primarily because of the advantage of administering fee schedules. When a tenant moved out and another moved into a commercial space, the City charged them impact fees by code so by consolidating the commercial categories, the City wouldn't have as much of that to do. So in retail establishments, a new tenant wouldn't be hit with an impact fee. The bill described what was included in those categories.
- 2). The level of impact fees to be adopted – The study showed the maximum fee. Last time (five years ago), the Council adopted 60% of maximum and now they recommended 70% of the maximum amount. Adopting a new fee schedule at 70% of maximum would set the new fee schedule very similar

to the current fees. Most of the fees would be slightly below current fees. The rationale was to get everyone on one fee schedule. The Development Fees Act stipulated that a finalized subdivision plat or commercial plan would provide four years to pull permits and pay the impact fees that were imposed at final approval. So inevitably it would make almost two fee schedules, making it more difficult for staff to administer and applicants to understand. But setting them slightly below, would bring the vast majority of permit applicants into the one new fee schedule, making it much simpler for staff and applicants. And the overall revenue picture would not change much for impact fees coming into the City.

- 3). The Capital Facilities Plan section of the study was presented in the last two pages of the report. Those fees were collected so that the City could make capital improvements but they had to be growth related. The funds couldn't be used for operations, for personnel or for maintenance but things like a new road, a traffic signal, or a new park. They couldn't be used for police cars because by state law, each purchase had to have a \$10,000 minimum value and last ten years. Ambulances and fire engines could use impact fees as well as a new or expanded fire station. That section sets out the capital improvement projects identified for roads, parks, fire and police through 2020. Those were identified and listed on pages 80-83.
- 4). Finally, a benefit district concept was brought up. At present, the City of Santa Fé was identified as one service area. There had been some question if southwest Santa Fé was getting their fair share of impact fees. Councilor Dominguez brought up having a separate benefit district where revenues and costs would be just for that district. The Capital Improvements Advisory Committee (CIAC) did not recommend having separate benefit districts.

Questions from the Commission

Commissioner Padilla asked if Mr. Liming could speak to the rationale behind not identifying separate benefit districts.

Mr. Liming said the problem was that if you have slower growth, you might create so many pots of money that one pot wouldn't have enough money to provide any help. The City now spends the money wherever needed. Some needs required considerable amounts of money. Staff studied where permits came from and found that 45% of all new residences were happening in southwestern Santa Fé and 48% of impact fees had been spent in that area so there was a good correlation.

Probably they would only need separate accounts for roads and parks but police and fire were city-wide. In addition, they would have to determine specific boundaries for such districts and figure out how to divide existing balances now in the impact fee fund. They would have to decide if funds from one benefit district could be used in another. Those were the issues raised.

The consultant had worked on the City's original impact fees in 2003 and updated them in 2008 and they said all along that the City was small enough to operate with one service area.

Commissioner Bemis asked if it would include schools.

Mr. Liming said new schools paid them but the City did not collect impact fees for schools. That question had come up before and in other states. But in New Mexico, there was no enabling legislation to collect the fees for schools.

Vice Chair Harris asked what the existing account balances were.

Mr. Liming said they were just over \$1 million for roads; \$240,000 for parks' \$70,000 for police; \$88,000 for fire. Impact fees obviously didn't pay for an entire project but were handy as a supplement to get a project done.

Vice Chair Harris clarified that the project had to be tied to the CIP. Mr. Liming agreed.

Vice Chair Harris asked if those balances were average balances from year to year.

Mr. Liming said they were higher just recently because they were collecting administrative fees that had not been used. But they had been drawn down in recent years and with residential projects paying none or only 50% there was less revenue coming in whereas it had been over a million before the recession, it was about \$400,000 annually.

Vice Chair Harris noticed that Councilor Bushee had a different opinion than the CIAC was recommending.

Mr. Liming clarified that was the next agenda item but the CIAC had an amendment with the 50% reduction for residential impact fees to remain in effect through February, 2016. Councilor Bushee's bill would remove the 50% fee reduction.

Vice Chair Harris was curious whether the account balance was being put into service. It appeared to be turning fairly quickly.

Mr. Liming agreed and the CIP list now could easily deplete the balances.

Vice Chair Harris said if it didn't turn, there would be no compelling reason to impose the fees.

Commissioner Schackel-Bordegary asked about the structure of the CIAC - who was on it and how often they met.

Mr. Liming said the CIAC was required by state law. It had 9 members, including the Mayor. Karen Walker was the Chair and he listed the other members. Forty percent of the membership had to be from construction or real estate sectors. They met just this afternoon. The CIAC meets monthly but they could meet quarterly. Most of the members have been on it for 7+ years so they were well versed in the tasks.

Commissioner Schackel-Bordegary asked Mr. Liming if he staffed the CIAC. Mr. Liming agreed.

Ms. Baer asked if the state enabling legislation allowed the City to use fees for other infrastructure - things like sewer or water extensions.

Mr. Liming explained that the City collected utility expansion charges for water and waste water so the impact fees cannot be used for those purposes. Water meters were \$2,000 for a home and wastewater expansion charges \$800 for a single family home. Water and wastewater were enterprise departments so they were treated differently.

Commissioner Pava said regarding what was pointed out on Land Use categories that he assumed accessory dwelling unit structures was a new category.

Mr. Liming said they had accessory dwellings with three different breakdowns by square footage and with this resolution, they would be combined.

Commissioner Pava recalled when the Planning Commission saw this a year ago, they discussed whether it these fees were potentially regressive in that there wasn't that much difference between something over 3,000 square feet with something that was 1,500 square feet or less. When Duncan and Associates did this, he asked if questions were raised about what was happening nationwide or at least statewide with trend and whether this was appropriate for dwellings.

Mr. Liming said other communities base them on the value or size of the home. But here it was based on the number of persons per home. As you get into a larger house, they generally have more people per household. The study found no reason to charge more for 4,000 square feet or larger as the City did currently. The bill set it at 3000+.

Vice Chair Harris asked what kind of action was required here.

Mr. Liming said this was a resolution brought to the Planning Commission because it would be a resolution at Council and was to help explain the ordinance with this background study. The Commission could take whatever action it wanted to take.

Ms. Baer said the Commission could make it part of the option for part B.

Commissioner Pava thought in light of the fact that the Commission discussed it last year and had disagreements that it would be good to endorse it in a motion.

Commissioner Pava moved that the Planning Commission recommends that the Governing Body approve the Impact Fee Capital Improvements Plan 2020 for Roads, Parks, Fire/EMS and Police. Commissioner Padilla seconded the motion.

Commissioner Villarreal was perplexed about the benefit districts and thought it should be worked out

some way. There was work to be done in that area but she didn't know how to make suggestions on it.

Vice Chair Harris agreed it would be a worthy discussion about fairness regarding attention in various parts of town.

Commissioner Padilla thanked Mr. Liming for a quality presentation that was enlightening and informative.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 2. An Ordinance relating to Impact Fees – amending Section 14-8.14 (C), (E) and (F) to remove the 50 percent reduction of Residential Impact Fees, adopt a New Impact Fee Schedule and incorporate definitions related to Land Use Types; and relating to Park Dedications – amending Section 14-9.15 (C)(2) SFCC 1987, the Park Dedication section; and making such other changes as were necessary. (Councilor Bushee) (Reed Liming)**

A Memorandum with attachments, undated, for the July 10, 2014 meeting, to the Planning Commission from Mr. Reed Liming, Long range Planning Division Director, is incorporated herewith to these minutes as Exhibit #6.

Mr. Liming said this ordinance was an amendment to Chapter 14 and the bill as introduced by Councilor Bushee would eliminate the 50% residential fee for building permits and what was in the bill right after the memo was the language from the CIAC recommendation as an amendment to the bill which would keep the 50% reduction through February, 2016. It includes the Land Use category consolidation to make it simpler and easier to understand. The new fee schedule would set it at 70% of maximum fees. It would add definitions for land uses - making them more general; and also amend the parks dedication which was just a minor change.

Vice Chair Harris was curious about the logic of CIAC's recommendation for the extension of the 50%.

Mr. Liming said there was some discussion but not a lot at the time the CIAC reviewed it. He thought their thinking was that it was just decided by Council at the end of February and if that was the way they wanted to do it, they would leave it as approved by Council last February.

Vice Chair Harris asked if there was any discussion on the amount of revenue that would be generated.

Mr. Liming said that would depend on the growth. So far through the first six months of this year the City had waived or reduced about \$94,000 for residential fee revenues. Before the 50% was approved, it was waived entirely.

Commissioner Schackel-Bordegary asked if he said that the bill clarified the difference between local and regional parks for the purposes of impact fees. She asked how that worked before and if the fee

structure was different for regional parks vs. neighborhood parks.

Mr. Liming said they had neighborhood parks and regional parks and it was not necessarily good to distinguish them from each other. The City would always have a need for more neighborhood parks. It was unnecessary to make that distinction. Simplifying it helped the situation.

Vice Chair Harris noted that the language as proposed from Councilor Bushee just strikes the 50% language and that was the ordinance as proposed. The CIAC amendment reinstates the 50% to 2016. He asked if that was correct understanding. Mr. Liming agreed.

Vice Chair Harris said the Planning Commission's role was to recommend to the Governing Body.

Commissioner Padilla moved to recommend approval of Ordinance relating to Impact Fees – amending Section 14-8.14 (C), (E) and (F) to remove the 50 percent reduction of Residential Impact Fees, adopt a New Impact Fee Schedule and incorporate definitions related to Land Use Types; and relating to Park Dedications – amending Section 14-9.15 (C)(2) SFCC 1987, the Park Dedication section; and making such other changes as were necessary to the Governing Body. Commissioner Schackel-Bordeguy seconded the motion.

Mr. Liming asked if that motion included the CIAC amendment or not.

Commissioner Padilla said his motion was to recommend approval as proposed.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

- ~~3. **Case #2014-50. 16 and 17 Dos Hermanos Lot Line Adjustment.** JenkinsGavin Design & Development, Inc., agent for Dos Hermanos Trust and Norma & Rey Garcia de Orozco, requests lot line adjustments to increase the area of 17 Dos Hermanos from 4.99 to 5.00 acres. The property was zoned R-1 (Residential-1 dwelling unit per acre). (William Lamboy)~~
- ~~4. **Case #2014-51. 17 Dos Hermanos Preliminary Subdivision Plat.** JenkinsGavin Design & Development, Inc., agent for Dos Hermanos Trust, requests Preliminary Subdivision Plat approval for a 5-lot single family residential subdivision on 5.00 acres. The property was zoned R-1 (Residential-1 dwelling unit per acre). (William Lamboy, Case Manager)~~

~~By consensus decision of the Planning Commission, these two cases were considered together.~~

~~A Memorandum with attachments, dated June 20, 2014 for the July 10, 2014 Meeting, to the Planning Commission from Mr. William Lamboy, AICP, Land Use Planner Senior, Current Planning Division, is incorporated herewith to these minutes as Exhibit #7.~~

~~An aerial photograph used by Mr. Lamboy in his staff report and entered for the record by Mr. Lamboy,~~

Mr. Gurule said there are citations that are warranted, and they do the best they can to be visible and pro-active. The number of citations issued have decreased.

Councilor Bushee said, "Okay, so you're in favor of this new system."

Mr. Gurule said, "Yes ma'am."

Councilor Dimas thanked Mr. Gurule, Ms. Byers and Ms. Amer for the time spent on this Ordinance, noting they have been working on the Ordinance for about a year. He said this is our way of changing the violations from criminal to civil, and he believes it will work a whole lot better since we are able to use a collections agency. He said it makes it much easier for the judges than issuing bench warrants for parking meter violations. He agrees that the tourists should be paying like everybody else in the City of Santa Fe. However, the advantage of this is we now have a mechanism to get registered owner information, even out-of-state, because there are reciprocal agreements with most other states to get that information, and those also can be sent to a collection agency. He is happy to be welcoming to all of our tourists, but they understand as well as our citizens that the parking meters are there to generate revenues for our economy. He thanked Mr. Gurule for all of the research he has done, and for providing requested information in this process. He thinks we are well on our way to increasing our revenues.

MOTION: Councilor Dimas moved, seconded by Councilor Rivera, to approve this request.

VOTE: The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

18. IMPACT FEES:

A. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE "IMPACT FEE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN 2020 FOR ROADS, PARKS, FIRE/EMS AND POLICE," TO MEET THE STATE REQUIRED IMPACT FEE PROGRAM 5-YEAR UPDATE, AS CALLED FOR IN THE STATE DEVELOPMENT FEES ACTION (5-8-30 NMSA 1988) (COUNCILOR BUSHEE). (REED LIMING) Committee Review: Capital Improvements Advisory Committee (CIAC) (Approved) 06/12/14; Finance Committee (Scheduled) 08/04/14 and Council (Scheduled) 08/13/14.

B. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO IMPACT FEES – AMENDING SECTION 14-8.14(C), (E) AND (F), TO REMOVE THE 50 PERCENT REDUCTION OF RESIDENTIAL IMPACT FEES, ADOPT A NEW IMPACT FEE SCHEDULE AND INCORPORATE DEFINITIONS RELATED TO LAND USE TYPES; AND RELATING TO PARK DEDICATIONS – AMENDING SECTION 14-8.15(C)(2) SFCC 1987, THE PARK DEDICATION SECTION; AND MAKING SUCH OTHER CHANGES AS ARE NECESSARY (COUNCILOR BUSHEE). (REED LIMING) Committee Review: CIAC (Approved with amendment) 06/12/14; Planning Commission (Approved) 07/10/14; Council (Request to publish) 07/30/14; Finance Committee (Scheduled) 08/04/14 and Council (Public hearing) 08/27/14.

Councilor Bushee said she is withdrawing 18(b) for the time being, and will take a look at it in a year to see if the economy has picked up for the residential homebuilders. She said there is no need to discuss that this evening.

Mr. Liming said this is part of the State's update to the Impact Fees Act, and there are two parts to it, and he appreciates her pulling this item for discussion. He said, "The first part is the CIP which is the study which provides the basis for the impact fees for a new fee schedule which is in the bill being sponsored and changes to the Impact Fees bill which we need to make. I appreciate your pulling the item. I don't think I've ever heard myself say that before, thanking someone for pulling my item, but we do need to discuss these items. First of all, Clancy Mullins is here, the City's Impact Fee consultant from Austin, Duncan Associates. This is the third round they've worked on the City's Impact Fee system. Also, we may have some members from the public that want to speak to it. I guess that's up to the Committee, but they are here tonight thinking they would be able to speak."

Mr. Liming continued, "The first item is the study itself, I think that is 8(a). Within the study there are some major aspects that move toward the Impact Fees bill. The first is, we're reducing the number of land use categories in the fee schedule. We think this will make it simpler to administer the Impact Fees going forward. We're going from 20 commercial categories to 6, also reducing the number of residential categories. Number 2, the level at which the new Impact Fee Schedule would be adopted is set at 70%. In the study, the consultant, basically as part of the study, says here's the maximum could set the Impact Fees at. The Capital Improvements Advisory Committee, with staff, recommended they be set at 70% of the maximum level. This would put the new fees just below the current Impact Fees, and that way, we would be able to get everyone on one fee schedule moving forward, so we feel that's an advantage, hopefully with this Committee recommending the approval of this study and the Council's adoption of it."

Mr. Liming continued, "The Capital Facilities Plan, it's the last two pages in this document. It's a 78 page document, but this lists the eligible projects moving forward through 2020 for Impact Fees. It's similar to the regular CIP, but it's a little different because Impact Fees have to be capacity expanding a project. So the last two pages, working with staff of the various departments, we came up with a list of projects for roads, parks, fire and police that Impact Fee money can be used for. So I would just call your attention to those four tables in the last two pages of the document."

Mr. Liming continued, "Finally, there has been some discussion. I know Councilor Dominguez brought forward the idea of service areas splitting-off, or creating a separate service area. We've been using a unified service area for about 10 years now, and there some questions that would need to be answered in order to amend our current process to create a separate benefit district, so that monies in one area would only be collected and spent in that area. So, this is a summary of the CIP document which is 18(a). The second document is the Impact Fees bill itself, and both items are sponsored by Councilor Bushee."

Councilor Bushee said, "But I've withdrawn the second document."

Mr. Liming said, "So it's moving forward to the Council. Okay, we need a bill moving forward. We have a number of changes in the bill being sponsored by Councilor Bushee, so we do have a new fee schedule ready to go forward."

Councilor Bushee said, "Then I guess I'm going to need to amend Item B and remove the language that says "to remove the 50% reduction of residential impact fees throughout the bill. So that may mean it's not ready for prime time just yet."

Ms. Byers said, "The CIAC Committee did make a recommendation to restore the 50%, so this Committee could recommend approval of CIAC's amendment to move on to Council."

Councilor Bushee said, "I would do that as the sponsor, and I would stay the sponsor, and add Councilor Lindell to both bills."

Mr. Liming said, "If I could also just request that the staff would request that we put an effective date on the bill of September 15, 2014. We're scheduled to have, at this point, Wednesday in front of Council. It will be a request to publish for a public hearing on August 27, 2014. We would respectfully request that in the Impact Fees bill going forward, it doesn't have an effective date now, but if we have that hearing August 27, 2014, we would request an effective date of September 15, 2014. We think that would allow us time to get the new Impact Fee schedule."

Councilor Bushee said, "And I would ask for additional language that says we will review this in a year. And then I had a comment about the service area."

Councilor Dominguez said, "So just in terms of the date that we start, Land Use has agreed to that, because that will have an impact on Land Use, and them being able to educate the public about that."

Mr. Liming said, "Yes. Matt and I talked about it just before this meeting, and effective date of September 14, 2014, I think would work."

Councilor Dominguez said he would like to have a discussion on the benefit district options. He said, "It is one service area with potentially two benefit districts, I think."

Councilor Bushee said that is the reason she put her hand up first, and Councilor Dominguez said he will defer to Councilor Bushee.

Councilor Bushee said, "I know we started that discussion somewhere around the budget cycle, and I know there is this need for infrastructure. But I want you to look back to the projects in here, starting in FY 2005, on that chart at the back that he was just reading from, page 109. Look at it. You will see even in 2005, Rodeo and Richards almost \$1 million. You will see Rodeo Arterial and Signals over a million in 2006/2007. Airport Signals \$350,000. Cerrillos Road and Rodeo Road over \$1.2 million. This chart on the back, the last page. You will see Rufina Street extension. You will see the Colonia Prisma Park. You will see Fire and Police stuff, you will see Southside Library, Southside Library Amphitheater, Colonia Prisma Park. Police, Fire, Southwest Activity Node, Cerrillos Phase whatever. And then you'll see

up until 2013, Herrera Drive, Paseo del Sol \$1 million. Airport Median landscaping \$80,000. So, other than the Railyard projects and a couple of older parks, almost everything has been directed... because that's where the need is. So I guess I'm going to say, for right now, I'm in favor of keeping single service districts. We'll continue to have an advisory committee and the Council pointing out where the needs are. And staff has been doing the same, so I'm pretty happy with the system at the moment."

Councilor Dominguez said, "I actually agree with you to some degree, Councilor Bushee. I think it would be beneficial just to have one service area. And I'm not sure we want to go down the road of having benefit districts, because that means if there is a significant project out the benefit district that may need the improvements or not, you don't have access to those funds. But I think I remember reading somewhere in here that only 46% of the impact fees were spent."

Mr. Liming said the staff did our own analysis of both the census from 2000 and 2010, said not quite 50% of all new housing went west of Cerrillos, generally between Cerrillos and 599, about not quite all at 50% of new housing, 45% of new residential went west of Cerrillos and about 48% of the money had been spent in that area. So we tried to show that there has been a rough proportionality between the growth and the Impact Fee dollars that have gone west of Cerrillos. He said, "The other thing I would call your attention to, again the last two pages in the CIP, the Capital Facility Plans, which are pages 77-78 of the document itself, those give you an idea of the projects moving forward through 2020 that would be eligible. And I think if you go through there, you will notice a lot of projects in the southwest area part of town. So that's another way to kind of judge, or projects for the future that could use impact fees, are they showing up in these capital facility plans in this document."

Councilor Dominguez said, "Let me turn you to the second page of your cover memo, Reed, and under number 4, it's the very last sentence that says, 'During that time, approximately 48% of all Impact Fee funds expended have been for projects generally serving that area.' That area is the area that is part of the U.S. Census data showing as the southwest area, correct."

Mr. Liming said, "Right."

Councilor Dominguez said, "Not quite 50% or not quite half of the money has been spent in the southwest area. So I guess that conflicts with a little bit with what is showing on the list that Councilor Bushee was just talking about. I don't want to necessarily go there. I guess the point I'm trying to make is that the Council, I don't want to say its been generous necessarily, although they have been understanding about recognizing where the need is. But, given that number, 48% of the fees that have only been expended in the southwest, I was looking for a way to kind of codify the fact that we do what the Council has been doing, and that is spending the money where it needs to be spent. And so benefit districts was a way to try to get there, but I think as long as the Governing Body continues down that path, we don't necessarily need those benefit districts. But I would like to have some language built in somewhere that makes it very clear an understanding to the Governing Body that is where the needs exist."

Councilor Bushee said, "You know where I think we're deficient, more than in actual capital infrastructure, is social infrastructure, operational dollars, and that's the hardest thing for us to grow and measure, and all of it. Even though we have a lot of infrastructure in my part of town, the older part of

town, I think we have been keeping up in the southwest area. But I think it's just a natural result, given that is where most of the growth happened. But the social infrastructure, it's hard as heck to get the money for operational dollars, and if the feds and the state and everybody else cuts it, we're left with only so much. I'm in favor of earmarking for social services. And I think even those programs are being directed to places like Zona and other places, but we could use much more."

Councilor Dominguez said, "Quite frankly, Councilor Bushee, it's a whole different demographic that has a whole different level of service that is require. I don't know it can be measured necessarily with dollars or what has been provided here. All I'm looking for is a way, outside of codifying benefit districts, to make it very clear, and I use the word codify loosely, to ensure that that continues to be the trend that the Governing Body has demonstrated so far. And I don't know if this is the place to do it. Reed."

[Mr. Liming's remarks here are totally inaudible]

Mr. Liming said, "It should be, if we've done this right, without making a formal statement, you should see in most of these tables, I think the projects will be in the southwest area. For Fire, we've listed a Fire Station in the southwest area. Again, that was prompted, some of that discussion, when we were talking about the Phase 2 Annexation. So that is one way that may be explicit, may be implicit, in terms of where the needs are."

Councilor Dominguez asked, "What is the stopgap measure, because lists can change, they can be amended, this document can be amended. What is the stopgap measure to make sure there is extra scrutiny, if you want to call it that, in getting some of these projects changed. Because, right now, all it would require is a piece of legislation from a member of the Governing Body that would go to the ICIP, it would go to that committee and then it would go through the major Council committees, correct."

Mr. Liming said, "Right, and again I would say the Impact Fees are sometimes a small portion, the CIP itself, the GRT generated CIP potentially has more money over two years. Right now, for instance, we have \$230,000 in our Impact Fees Parks account. We have about \$70,000 in Police, \$80,000 in Fire and just over \$1 million in roads. So, while Impact Fees can be important in finishing projects or getting them to 100%, they are oftentimes just that, kind of a supplement to get a project there."

Councilor Dominguez said there is \$29 million sitting in there to complete all the parks. He said, "Just so I can wrap my arms around this and move for approval, what is the that is taken in order to change this list."

Mr. Liming said, "A resolution, with a project. We're done probably 10, which you're probably familiar with. Since the last update of the Impact Fees in 2008, we've done 10 amendments that are resolutions that come through the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee reviews them, makes a recommendation and then they go on to the Council for approval, to amend these."

Councilor Dominguez asked if it is required to go before committees.

Mr. Liming said he believes they do. If they are parks or roads projects, they probably go to Public Works, but they certainly have to go through the Council, they're resolutions.

Councilor Dominguez said, "And I think that the Committee also has been very fair and very considerate, but if that Committee ever changes and nothing gets out of that Committee, is there recourse. Is it just advisory."

Mr. Liming said, "Yes. The Capital Improvements Advisory Committee is required by State law for any local government that has impact fees, but they're just an advisory body. They recommend. They recommended this document, they worked through it, and they recommended this. As they went through the bill, the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee recommended the bill with 50% as Melissa mentioned, with the 50% residential permit fee reduction left in it. That was the difference between the bill Councilor Bushee had sponsored and the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee's bill. That was the only difference in the two bills. But everything they look at, goes through them and then onward."

Councilor Dominguez said so even if they don't recommend, it still goes forward, and Mr. Liming said yes.

MOTION: Councilor Dominguez moved, seconded by Councilor Bushee, to approve this request.

DISCUSSION: Councilor Bushee asked if we are due for a General Plan update, long overdue.

[Mr. Liming's response was inaudible]

Councilor Bushee said, "I'm just asking if that is the place in some kind of nice language to build a correlation between growth needs and resources, rather than trying to upend the single service district."

Mr. Liming said, "In large part, this takes care of it. The only problem with the General Plan is when you go out... remember we do these. Is it time for a General Plan update. We're still talking about Siler Road. Our General Plan in 1999 that's still in effect talked about a redevelopment district. So, those issues, are still current. They're in our current General Plan. That's a different discussion I guess. You could get different answers. It's been 15 years, yes, it probably is time for an update. I would argue against a very comprehensive update."

Councilor Bushee said, "I know that. I'm just asking for a place. We've done the Southwest Area Sector Plan. I'm just looking for a way, and he used the word 'loosely codify,' that we can make the connection that resources get directed."

Mr. Liming said, "I think, in large part, this does it, because we have to update this every 5 years, and even with that, we've made 8 amendments in the last 5 years. Doing a large scoped plan can be even more unwieldy."

Councilor Bushee said, "So, he's speaking as a planner and telling you the plan is that the projects will be on that side of that town that will get funded, but you're not comfortable, you're missing some language."

Councilor Dominguez said, "No. I'm comfortable. I like the fact that this stuff is in the list. What I don't want is for that list, as Councils change, as Committees change, for that list to be greatly deviated from. And so I think that just the fact that the Committee is a recommending body, that ultimately the Governing Body has the final say, if you want to call it that, via a resolution that a member of the Governing Body would potentially put forward. I'm comfortable with that. Again, I think the Governing Body and the Committee have been understanding of the fact that there are needs out there. So I think the list we've been provided with captures that for the most part."

Councilor Bushee said we don't usually amend these a whole lot, is that right.

Mr. Liming said, "Actually we do. And this is the difficulty, getting back to the General Plan issue, even when you just go out 5 or 6 years. So when we did our last update in 2008, and we went out 5-6 years, we've amended that, added projects that were unforeseen 8-10 times in 5 years. We didn't drop anything off the list, but I think this gets to Councilor Dominguez's concern which is, do other projects come in, leap-frog something that's already been identified in the Facilities Plan in the back of the CIP's."

Councilor Bushee said her greater concern is that we weren't going to have any Impact Fees to disburse. She is taking a wait and see approach in a year's time to see if the economy has picked up.

Councilor Rivera said, "In my limited experience with the CIAC, I recall, and this is during the time of the EZA where if you were going to spend Impact Fee money, it had to be spent in the area in which it was collected, or at least a percentage. Does that work the same way now that it's strictly City Impact Fees and not necessarily Extraterritorial Zoning Impact Fees as well."

Mr. Liming said, "Even before our annexation, we identified the urban area, thinking we would annex into it, as an area that we could spend Impact Fee money, we didn't necessarily collect. Let's say a road project like Rufina, it went through the old EZ out of the City. Because that was our road, we wanted to be able to use monies for the entire length of that, even if it was outside the City. Now that we've annexed our service area and the City are much more one and the same. The Agua Fria traditional historic community is not part of our area, so we can't collect funds from that area, nor would we expend funds at this point for specific projects in that area. But everywhere else, where we've annexed and even the anticipated Phase 3 annexation between West Alameda and 599, there we will be collecting Impact Fees and we could expend them."

Councilor Bushee departed the meeting

Councilor Rivera asked if there is a law or something codified with the State that says Impact Fees should be spent within a certain area where they were collected.

Mr. Liming said, "Yes, generally, and we have one service area and they can be collected and spent within that one service area. Larger cities tend to have multiple service areas where you only collect and spend within a service area."

Councilor Rivera said then our service area is the entire City limits.

Mr. Liming said it is the entire City plus the Phase 3 proposed annexation areas.

Councilor Rivera said since we don't have an EZ, we are still providing services in Phase 3, and potentially in areas outside the City limits. He asked if impact fees are being collected on our behalf in those areas.

Mr. Liming said he is not familiar with the agreement. He said the County was collecting a Fire Impact Fee and the question was whether that would be shared with the City based on use. He said, "In our Fire Impact Fee account, only fees collected through Impact Fees and Building Permits through the City is going into that account. There is no outside money being shared that I'm aware of."

Councilor Rivera said with the changes the County has made with its fire services, the only area he is thinking about right now is the Hyde Park area where the City provides 100% of the services and he would imagine the County is collecting impact fees in that area that probably are significant. He asked if the City is entitled by law to a share of those.

Mr. Liming said he can't say we would be entitled to a share, because they are outside the City, technically. It would really need to be a mutual agreement between the City and County Fire Departments in terms of sharing the revenues.

VOTE: The motion was approved on a voice vote, with Councilor Dimas, Councilor Rivera and Councilor Dominguez voting in favor of the motion, no one voting against, and Councilor Bushee absent for the vote.

- ~~19. **REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF THE 2016-2020 INFRASTRUCTURE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN (ICIP)**
A. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE 2016-2020 INFRASTRUCTURE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN (ICIP) (COUNCILOR TRUJILLO). (ISAAC PINO)
Committee Review: Finance Committee (Scheduled) 08/04/14 and Council (Scheduled) 08/13/14.~~

~~Councilor Rivera said there were changes in the list, specifically the top 5, and asked who came up with the new list and how it was ranked.~~

~~Mr. Pino said, "Councilor Maestas, acting as Chair of the Finance Committee, made a lot of these recommendations at the Finance Committee."~~

~~Mr. Chavez said, "By the way, the cameras do work."~~

19. **IMPACT FEES (COUNCILOR BUSHEE). (REED LIMING)**

- (B) **REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO IMPACT FEES – AMENDING SECTION 14-8.14(C), (E) AND (F), TO REMOVE THE 50 PERCENT REDUCTION OF RESIDENTIAL IMPACT FEES, ADOPT A NEW IMPACT FEE SCHEDULE AND INCORPORATE DEFINITIONS RELATED TO LAND USE TYPES; AND RELATING TO PARK DEDICATIONS – AMENDING SECTION 14-8.15(C)(2) SFCC 1987, THE PARK DEDICATION SECTION; AND MAKING SUCH OTHER CHANGES AS ARE NECESSARY (COUNCILOR BUSHEE). (REED LIMING) NOTE: THIS CAPTION MAY BE AMENDED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE AMENDMENT SHEET IN THE PACKET. Committee Review: CIAC (Approved with amendment) 06/12/14; Planning Commission (Approved) 07/10/14; Public Works Committee (approved w/amendment) 07/28/14; Council (Request to publish) 07/30/14; and Council (Public hearing) 08/27/14. Fiscal Impact – Yes.**

Councilor Maestas asked if tonight's action is to approve this with the amendment to restore the 50% reduction.

Mr. Liming said, "The bill that is being put forward for Request to Publish, has the 50% reduction back in it."

Councilor Maestas asked the reason the caption wasn't changed, noting the caption still has the removal of the 50% reduction of Residential Impact Fees.

Chair Dominguez said he thinks it is because of the action taken at the Council Meeting and how it was noticed.

Councilor Maestas said, "I'm just worried about the notice for this meeting."

Melissa Byers said, "If you look at the caption of 19(B), it says, 'Note: This caption may be amended in accordance with the amendment sheet in the packet.' So it notifies the public that there is a possible amendment that could take place. So at Council, yes, there was the action to restore the 50%, so when the bill goes for Request to Publish for the public hearing, it will have the correct title on the Council agenda and in the newspaper when this is going. So it won't say to remove the 50%. Do you understand what I said."

Councilor Maestas said yes.

MOTION: Councilor Maestas moved, seconded by Councilor Rivera, to approve this request.

VOTE: The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.