

City of Santa Fe, New Mexico

LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY

BILL NO. 2013-44 Impact Fees (Substitute)

SPONSOR(S): Wurzburger

SUMMARY: This proposed substitute bill would

- Set residential impact fees to 50% of their full rate for 24 months (beginning February 27, 2014 and ending February 26, 2016).
- Return residential impact fees to 100% of their full rate on February 27, 2016.

The proposed substitute bill is an extension of Ordinance No. 2012-2 which reduced residential impact fees by 100% for a period of 24 months. Ordinance No. 2012-02 expired on January 23, 2014 and was one of several measures that were approved by the Governing Body to eliminate barriers to residential construction projects. Other measures approved by the Governing Body were Ordinance No 2010-10 and Resolution Nos. 2010-43 and 2011-26, the so-called "Sunset" resolution that extended the expirations of approved building permits and development approvals; and Ordinance No. 2011-17 that reduced the Santa Fe Homes Program fees and affordable percentage requirements.

PREPARED BY: Rebecca Seligman, Legislative Liaison Assistant

FISCAL IMPACT: Yes

DATE: February 19, 2014

ATTACHMENTS: Amendment Sheet
Substitute Bill
FIR
Original Memo, Bill and FIR
Action Sheets & Committee Minutes

CITY OF SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO
PROPOSED AMENDMENT(S) TO BILL NO. 2013-44
(Impact Fees)

Mayor and Members of the City Council:

I propose the following amendment(s) to Bill No. 2013-44:

1. On page 2, line 8, delete "January 23, 2016" and insert, in lieu thereof "February 27, 2016"

Respectfully submitted,

Staff

ADOPTED: _____
NOT ADOPTED: _____
DATE: _____

Yolanda Y. Vigil, City Clerk

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. 2013-44

INTRODUCED BY:

Councilor Rebecca Wurzbarger

AN ORDINANCE

RELATING TO IMPACT FEES, SECTION 14-8.14 SFCC 1987; AMENDING SECTION 14-8.14(E) TO MODIFY THE AMOUNT OF IMPACT FEES ASSESSED FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS; AND MAKING SUCH OTHER STYLISTIC OR GRAMMATICAL CHANGES THAT ARE NECESSARY.

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

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

(E) Fee Determination

(1) A person who applies for a construction *permit*, except those exempted or preparing an independent fee calculation study, shall pay impact fees in accordance with one of the following fee schedules. If a credit is due pursuant to Section 14-8.14(I), the amount of the credit shall be deducted from the amount of the fee to be paid.

(2) [~~The fee schedule in this Subsection 14-8.14(E)(2), also referred to as the~~

1 “temporary” fee schedule, shall be used and its fees assessed on *residential*
 2 *plats and development plans* for a period of two years beginning on January
 3 *23, 2012 and ending on January 22, 2014*. Beginning February 27, 2014 and
 4 ending February 26, 2016, residential plats, development plans and
 5 construction permits for residential developments shall be assessed impact
 6 fees. At the time of assessment, fifty percent (50%) of the scheduled values
 7 in the Fee Schedule in Subsection 14-8.14(E)(3) shall be assessed.
 8 ~~[Thereafter,]~~ Beginning January 23, 2016, such residential developments
 9 shall be assessed impact fees in accordance with [the “new” and “old” fee
 10 schedules in] Subsection[s] 14-8.14(E)(3). [and 14-8.14(E)(4) below] At the
 11 time of assessment, one hundred percent (100%) of the scheduled values in
 12 the Fee Schedule shall be assessed.

13 ~~[TEMPORARY FEE SCHEDULE FOR RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS]~~

<u>Land Use Type</u>	<u>Unit</u>	<u>Roads</u>	<u>Parks</u>	<u>Fire</u>	<u>Police</u>	<u>Total</u>
Single Family Detached Dwelling or Manufactured Home						
Heated Living Area:						
(0 to 1,500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(1,501 to 2,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(2,001 to 2,500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(2,501 to 3,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(3,001 to 3,500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(3,501 to 4,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(more than 4,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Accessory dwelling unit (attached or detached)						
Heated Living Area:						
(0 to 500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(501 to 1,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(1,001 to 1,500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other (Apts., Condos, Attached	Dwelling	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Land Use Type	Unit	Roads	Parks	Fire	Police	Total
Dwellings [S.F. Attached Guest House]]						

1 (3) The fee schedule in this Subsection 14-8.14(E)(3)[, also referred to as the
 2 "new" fee schedule,] shall be used and its fees assessed on *plats* and
 3 *development* plans that receive final approval from the *city* or the *state*
 4 construction industries division after June 30, 2008. The ["new"] fee
 5 schedule shall also be applied to construction *permits* issued after June 30,
 6 2008, [~~except where the permit is issued for a subdivision or for a~~
 7 ~~*development plan that is still subject to the "old" fee schedule.*~~]

8 **[NEW] 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)						
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

Land Use Type	Unit	Roads	Parks	Fire	Police	Total
Other (Apts., Condos, Attached Dwellings, [S.F. Attached Guest House])	Dwelling	\$1,554	\$971	\$110	\$39	\$2,674
Hotel/Motel	Room	\$1,203	\$0	\$82	\$29	\$1,314
Retail/Commercial	G.F.A.					
Shopping Center/General Retail	1000 sq.	\$4,597	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$4,896
Auto Sales/Service	1000 sq.	\$2,180	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$2,479
Bank	1000 sq.	\$4,948	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$5,247
Convenience Store w/Gas Sales	1000 sq.	\$8,778	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$9,077
Health Club, Recreational	1000 sq.	\$4,394	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$4,693
Movie Theater	1000 sq.	\$10,412	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$10,711
Restaurant, Sit-Down	1000 sq.	\$5,083	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$5,382
Restaurant, Fast Food	1000 sq.	\$11,064	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$11,363
Restaurant, Pkgd Food	1000 sq.	\$4,597	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$4,896
Office/Institutional	G.F.A.					
Office, General	1000 sq.	\$2,429	\$0	\$124	\$44	\$2,597
Medical Building	1000 sq.	\$3,903	\$0	\$124	\$44	\$4,071
Nursing Home	1000 sq.	\$1,354	\$0	\$124	\$44	\$1,522
Church	1000 sq.	\$1,521	\$0	\$124	\$44	\$1,689
Day Care Center	1000 sq.	\$3,202	\$0	\$124	\$44	\$3,370
Educational Facility	1000 sq.	\$586	\$0	\$124	\$44	\$754
Educational Facility Dorm Room	1000 sq.	\$1,203	\$0	\$82	\$29	\$1,314
Industrial	G.F.A.					
Industrial, Manufacturing	1000 sq.	\$1,610	\$0	\$74	\$26	\$1,710
Warehouse	1000 sq.	\$1,147	\$0	\$47	\$16	\$1,210
Mini-Warehouse	1000 sq.	\$417	\$0	\$47	\$16	\$480

1
2
3
4
5

~~[(4) The fee schedule in this Subsection 14-8.14(E)(4), also referred to as the "old" fee schedule, shall be used and its fees assessed on plats and development plans that received final approval from the city or the state construction industries division on or before June 30, 2008, which assessment is valid for a period not to exceed four years from the date of the~~

subdivision or development plan approval. The "old" fee schedule shall also be applied to construction permits issued on or before June 30, 2008.

OLD FEE SCHEDULE

Land Use Type	Unit	Roads	Parks	Fire	Police	Total
S-F Detached Dwelling or Guesthouse						
Heated Living Area						
— (0 to 1,500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$1,135	\$767	\$118	\$29	\$2,049
— (1,501 to 2,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$1,527	\$1,128	\$165	\$40	\$2,860
— (2,001 to 2,500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$1,820	\$1,397	\$212	\$52	\$3,481
— (2,501 to 3,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$2,053	\$1,614	\$259	\$63	\$3,989
— (3,001 to 3,500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$2,247	\$1,793	\$306	\$75	\$4,421
— (3,501 to 4,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$2,414	\$1,946	\$353	\$86	\$4,799
— (more than 4,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$2,560	\$2,080	\$400	\$98	\$5,138
Other (Apts., Condos, S.F. Attached)	Dwelling	\$1,485	\$863	\$94	\$61	\$2,503
Hotel/Motel	Room	\$2,017	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$2,260
Retail/Commercial	G.F.A.	-	-	-	-	-
Shopping Center/General Retail	1000 sq. ft.	\$3,893	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$4,136
Auto Sales/Service	1000 sq. ft.	\$3,123	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$3,366
Bank	1000 sq. ft.	\$5,249	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$5,492
Convenience Store w/Gas Sales	1000 sq. ft.	\$7,336	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$7,579
Health Club, Recreational	1000 sq. ft.	\$2,814	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$3,057
Movie Theater	1000 sq. ft.	\$8,730	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$8,973
Restaurant, Sit Down	1000 sq. ft.	\$4,248	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$4,491
Restaurant, Fast Food	1000 sq. ft.	\$9,247	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$9,490
Office/Institutional	G.F.A.	-	-	-	-	-
Office, General	1000 sq. ft.	\$2,191	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$2,434
Medical Building	1000 sq. ft.	\$3,503	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$3,746
Nursing Home	1000 sq. ft.	\$981	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$1,224
Church	1000 sq. ft.	\$1,632	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$1,875
Day Care Center	1000 sq. ft.	\$3,404	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$3,647
Elementary/Sec. School	1000 sq. ft.	\$534	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$777
Industrial	G.F.A.	-	-	-	-	-
Industrial, Manufacturing	1000 sq. ft.	\$1,557	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$1,800
Warehouse	1000 sq. ft.	\$1,109	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$1,352
Mini Warehouse	1000 sq. ft.	\$386	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$629
G.F.A. Gross Floor Area; fees shown for nonresidential uses are per one thousand square feet of gross floor area]						

1 ([5]4) If the type of new *development* for which a construction *permit* is requested
2 is not specified on the fee schedule, the *impact fee administrator* shall
3 determine the fee on the basis of the fee applicable to the most nearly
4 comparable type of land use on the fee schedule. The following shall be used
5 as a guideline for impact fee determination when the specific use is not
6 identified in the fee chart. (Ord. No. 2013-16 § 55)

7 (a) Residential

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

14 (b) Retail/Commercial

- 15 (i) the general retail fee shall be used for a hair salon,
16 *laundromat*, dry cleaner, garden center/nursery retail display
17 area, gas station without a convenience store and inventory
18 storage for a retail *business*, including growing area for a
19 garden center/nursery;
20 (ii) the bank fee assessment shall include the square footage of
21 any drive-through kiosk and parking area with or without a
22 roof;
23 (iii) the restaurant fast food fee shall include square footage for
24 the drive-through kiosk and parking area with or without a
25 roof; and

1 (iv) the packaged food restaurant fee shall be used for a
2 restaurant or bar that does not have any food preparation
3 facilities.

4 (c) Office/Institutional

5 (i) the *office* general fee shall be used for a studio that is not
6 *residential* and not retail;

7 (ii) the *office* general fee shall be used for a medical office that
8 does not have any medical equipment, such as an *office* for
9 psychiatry;

10 (iii) the medical *office* fee shall be used for an animal hospital;
11 and

12 (iv) the nursing home fee shall be used for an assisted living
13 facility.

14 (d) Industrial

15 (i) the warehouse fee shall be used for an animal shelter, storage
16 that is not inventory storage or maintenance equipment; and

17 (ii) the mini-warehouse fee shall be used for a single storage unit
18 or for multiple storage units.

19 (e) Development Outside of Buildings

20 The impact fees for *development* of land outside of *buildings* that
21 increases the demand for capital facilities is determined by
22 application of the fee for the corresponding type of *building* or by
23 preparation of an independent fee calculation study.

24 ([6]5) Impact fees shall be assessed and collected based on the primary use of the
25 *building* as determined by the *impact fee administrator*. Uses that are

1 distinct and separate from the primary use, which are not merely ancillary to
2 the primary use and are one thousand square feet or greater, will be charged
3 the impact fee category based on the distinct and separate use.

4 ([7]6) Where a *permit* is to be issued for a *building* "shell" and the *impact fee*
5 *administrator* is unable to determine the intended use of the *building*, the
6 *impact fee administrator* shall assess and collect impact fees according to the
7 zoning district in which the *building* is to be located as follows:

- 8 (a) C-2 and all SC zones - "Shopping Center/General Retail" fee rate;
- 9 (b) HZ zone - "Medical *Building*" fee rate; and
- 10 (c) C-1, C-4 and all other *nonresidential* zones - "Office, General" fee
11 rate.

12 ([8]7) If there is an increase in the amount of the impact fee calculation once a
13 tenant improvement *permit* is submitted, the difference from what was paid
14 at the time of the shell *permit* and the tenant improvement fee calculation
15 shall be paid prior to issuance of the construction *permit*. If the fee schedule
16 determination for the square footage of the use identified in the tenant
17 improvement construction *permit* results in a net decrease from what was
18 paid at the time of the shell *permit*, there shall be no refund of impact fees
19 previously paid.

20 ([9]8) Live/work *developments* containing *dwelling units* in combination with
21 *nonresidential* floor area in a common *building* shall pay impact fees for
22 each *dwelling unit* according to the *residential* fee rate for "Other" and for
23 the *gross floor area* intended for *nonresidential* use according to the "Office,
24 General" fee rate. If the initial Live/Work construction *permit application* is
25 for a shell construction *permit*, the *impact fee administrator* shall collect

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

7 ([10]9) If a construction *permit application* changes or intensifies the use of an
8 existing *building*, increases the *gross floor area* of an existing *building*, or
9 replaces an existing *building* with a new *building* and new use, the fee shall
10 be based on the net increase in the fee for the new use or increase as
11 compared to what the current fee would be for the previous use or floor area.
12 If the proposed change results in a net decrease in the fee there shall be no
13 refund of impact fees previously paid.

14 **Section 2. Effective Date.** This Ordinance shall become effective immediately upon
15 adoption.

16 **Section 3. Review.** This Ordinance shall be reviewed one year from the date of
17 adoption.

18 APPROVED AS TO FORM:

19 

20 KELLEY A. BRENNAN, INTERIM CITY ATTORNEY
21
22
23
24

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

Short Title(s): An Ordinance Relating To Impact Fees, Section 14-8.14 Sfcc 1987; Amending Section 14-8.14(E) To Modify The Amount Of Impact Fees Assessed For Residential Developments; And Making Such Other Stylistic Or Grammatical Changes That Are Necessary.

Sponsor(s): Councilors Wurzburger

Reviewing Department(s): Land Use

Person Completing FIR: Matthew O'Reilly Date: 1-28-14 Phone: x 6617

Reviewed by City Attorney: [Signature] Date: 1/28/14
(Signature)

Reviewed by Finance Director: [Signature] Date: 1/30/14
(Signature)

Section B. Summary

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

The proposed substitute Bill is an extension of Ordinance No. 2012-2 which reduced residential impact fees by 100% for a period of 24 months. Ordinance No. 2012-2 expired on January 23, 2014 and was one of several measures that were approved by the governing body to eliminate barriers to residential construction projects. Other measures approved by the governing body were Ordinance No. 2010-10 and Resolution Nos. 2010-43 & 2011-26, the so-called "Sunset" resolutions that extended the expirations of approved building permits and development approvals; and Ordinance No. 2011-17 that reduced the Santa Fe Homes Program fees and affordable percentage requirements.

The proposed substitute Bill would: 1) set residential impact fees to 50% of their full rate for 24 months (beginning February 27, 2014 and ending February 26, 2016); and 2) return residential impact fees to 100% of their full rate on February 27, 2016.

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 11/12	"A" Costs Absorbed or "N" New Budget Required	"R" Costs Recurring or "NR" Non-recurring	FY 12/13	"A" Costs Absorbed or "N" New Budget Required	"R" Costs – Recurring or "NR" Non-recurring	Fund Affected
	Personnel*	\$ _____	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____
	Fringe**	\$ _____	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____
	Capital Outlay	\$ _____	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____
	Land/ Building	\$ _____	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____
	Professional Services	\$ _____	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____
	All Other Operating Costs	\$ _____	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____
	Total:	\$ _____	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____

* 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 (Reduction)	FY 13/14	"R" Costs Recurring or "NR" Non-recurring	FY 14/15	"R" Costs – Recurring or "NR" Non-recurring	Fund Affected

<u>Reduction of Residential Impact Fees</u>	<u>\$(129,046)</u>	<u>NR</u>	<u>\$(516,184)</u>	<u>NR</u>	<u>Residential Impact Fee Funds</u>
_____	\$ _____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____
_____	\$ _____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____
Total:	<u>\$(129,046)</u>		<u>\$(516,184)</u>		

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.)

Adoption of the Bill will result in an estimated decrease in collected residential impact fees of \$129,046 in FY 2013/14 and an estimated decrease in collected residential impact fees of \$387,138 in FY 2014/15, for a total estimated decrease in collected residential impact fees during FY 2013/14 and FY 2014/15 combined of \$516,184. The provisions of the ordinance extend into FY 2015/16 resulting in an estimated decrease in collected residential impact fees of \$774,276 over the 24-month term.

The estimates above are calculated as follows and assume that residential construction continues at the same pace as it did for the first 22 months of the previous ordinance (Ord. #2012-2):

Fiscal Year Calculation

(Impact Fees (Not-Collected) (1/23/12 through 11/23/13) = \$1,419,514 = \$64,523/Month)

<u>FY 2013/14: 4 Months X 50% Reduction X \$64,523/Mo. =</u>	<u>\$ 129,046</u>
<u>FY 2014/15: 12 Months X 50% Reduction X \$64,523/Mo. =</u>	<u>\$ 387,138</u>
	<u>\$ 516,184</u>

Full 24-Month Term of Proposed Ordinance

(Impact Fees (Not-Collected) (1/23/12 through 11/23/13) = \$1,419,514 = \$64,523/Month)

<u>Year 1 (2/27/14 – 2/26/15): 12 Months X 50% Reduction X \$64,523 =</u>	<u>\$ 387,138</u>
<u>Year 2 (2/27/15 – 2/26/16): 12 Months X 50% Reduction X \$64,523 =</u>	<u>\$ 387,138</u>
	<u>\$ 774,276</u>

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 Bill revises Section 14-8.14(E) SFCC 1987.

2. Consequences of Not Enacting This Bill/Resolution:

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

Any incentive effects of the Bill would not be available for residential construction if the Bill is not enacted.

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.

None.

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.

Adoption of the Bill will continue to make residential construction less expensive and will ease the transition to 100% impact fees over a 24-month period. This may be particularly important at a time of continued uncertainty regarding residential construction. Residential construction projects create construction jobs and construction material purchases and generate gross receipts tax revenue for the city. Net new gross receipts tax (GRT) revenue that accrues to the city through the direct and secondary economic effects of residential construction has been shown to exceed the amount of uncollected impact fees.

Adoption of the Bill will reduce the amount of impact fees available for use by the city.

City of Santa Fe, New Mexico

memo

DATE: November 27, 2013

TO: Planning Commission
Capital Improvements Advisory Committee
Public Works, CIP & Land Use Committee
Finance Committee
City Council

FROM: Matthew O'Reilly, Land Use Department Director *MO*

RE: Extension of Temporary Reduction in Residential Impact Fees

BACKGROUND

On January 11, 2012 the Governing Body adopted Ordinance No. 2012-2 which reduced residential impact fees by 100% for a period of 24 months beginning on January 23, 2012 and ending on January 22, 2014. The ordinance was part of a series of measures approved by the Governing Body to facilitate economic development and to create construction jobs in response to the economic downturn. These measures included the passage of Ordinance No. 2010-10 and Resolution Nos. 2010-43 & 2011-26, the so-called "sunset" resolutions that extended the expirations of approved building permits and development approvals; and Ordinance No. 2011-17 that reduced the Santa Fe Homes Program fees and affordable percentage requirements. Only residential impact fees (collected for roads, parks, police and fire) were affected by the ordinance.

The intent of the existing ordinance was to stimulate previously-planned residential projects that may have been stalled due to difficulty in obtaining construction financing by making those projects less expensive to build and therefore easier to finance or otherwise afford by prospective homebuilders thereby creating construction jobs and construction material purchases and generating gross receipts tax revenue for the city.

INCREASES IN NEW RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION

The Land Use Department has tracked residential permits since January 23, 2012 (the effective date of the existing ordinance). Exhibit A contains data on all new single-family and multi-family residential development permitted from January 23, 2012 through November 23, 2013 (the first 22 full months that the ordinance has been in effect). The Exhibit compares those numbers with the same permit types from March 23, 2010 through January 22, 2012 (the 22 months preceding the ordinance). The data contains only new residential construction and does not include residential remodels or additions. Pages 7 and 8 of Exhibit A contain summaries of the permit

data and the total impact fees that would have been collected had the ordinance not been in effect and compares the uncollected impact fee totals with the gross receipts taxes (GRT) and building permit fees based on the construction valuation.

The data in Exhibit A reveals that single-family residential construction has increased 32% and that multi-family residential construction has increased from zero to 176 units through November 23, 2013 while the ordinance has been in effect compared to the 22 months preceding the ordinance. In total, 284 new residential permits were issued compared to 211 in the preceding 22 months – a 35% increase.

Exhibits A also reveals that, through November 23, 2013, a total of \$1,419,514 in residential impact fees have been “not-collected” during the ordinance period. This breaks down to \$948,890 not-collected for single-family and \$470,624 not-collected for multi-family construction.

Exhibit A compares the not-collected impact fees with the net new gross receipts tax (GRT) and net new building permit fees generated based on construction valuation. The total net new gross receipts tax and building permit fees generated to date during the ordinance period amount to \$1,155,217 (\$892,329 GRT and \$262,978 Building Permit Fees). Based solely on direct construction valuation, the net new revenue generated is therefore \$264,208 less (\$1,419,514 - \$1,155,217) than the amount of impact fees not-collected. However, when the net new revenue is adjusted for the secondary effects of economic output through indirect and induced activities related to construction, the net new GRT revenue rises from \$892,239 to \$1,551,313. If these secondary economic effects are included, the result is net revenue that exceeds the amount of impact fees not-collected by \$394,777.

PROPOSED BILL

Section 1

Section 1 of the proposed Bill would extend the current temporary reduction in residential impact fees for a period of 12 months beginning on January 23, 2014. On January 23, 2015, residential impact fees would increase to 50% of their full amounts for a period of 12 months. On January 23, 2016, residential impact fees would return to 100% of their full amounts.

The Bill also eliminates the so-called “Old Fee Schedule” to reflect the fact that the four-period during which developments would have been assessed pre-2008 impact fees has since expired. Section 1 also makes a minor clarification to the Fee Schedule regarding attached dwelling units.

Section 2

Section 2 of the Bill makes the ordinance effective immediately upon adoption so that there is no gap between its effect and the expiration of the existing ordinance.



EXHIBIT A - LAND USE DEPARTMENT
IMPACT FEE TRACKING: 1/23/12 - 1/23/13 (FIRST 22 FULL MONTHS)

SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION

SINGLE-FAMILY CONSTRUCTION CODE	PERMIT#	UNITS	VALUATION	PERMIT FEE	HEATED SF	\$/SF	IMPACT FEES (If Collected)				TOTAL
							ROADS	PARKS	FIRE	POLICE	
1 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	11-2347	1	284,710	2,905	2,307	123.41	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
2 New Residence >3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFCI	11-2491	1	875,000	8,478	3,980	219.85	2,359	1,444	163	58	4,024
3 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-62	1	254,942	2,919	2,182	116.84	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
4 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-68	1	264,000	2,999	2,061	128.09	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
5 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-69	1	750,000	7,457	2,830	265.02	2,248	1,379	155	55	3,837
6 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-70	1	209,000	2,510	1,655	126.28	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
7 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-121	1	202,843	2,457	1,763	115.06	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
8 New Guest House	12-129	1	60,000	1,121	680	88.24	1,554	971	110	39	2,674
9 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-146	1	200,000	2,430	1,251	159.87	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
10 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-150	1	199,000	2,421	1,828	108.86	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
11 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-162	1	260,000	2,964	2,911	89.32	2,248	1,379	155	55	3,837
12 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-179	1	163,389	2,110	1,451	112.60	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
13 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-180	1	202,272	2,457	1,781	113.57	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
14 New Guest House	12-197	1	25,000	637	500	50.00	1,554	971	110	39	2,674
15 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-213	1	202,272	2,457	1,781	113.57	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
16 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-214	1	216,594	2,581	1,883	115.03	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
17 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-215	1	216,594	2,581	1,883	115.03	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
18 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-238	1	120,000	1,719	1,286	93.31	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
19 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-283	1	350,000	3,616	2,348	149.06	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
20 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-297	1	225,714	2,661	1,991	113.37	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
21 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-343	1	199,000	2,421	1,827	108.92	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
22 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-344	1	189,000	2,332	1,748	108.12	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
23 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-371	1	160,000	2,074	1,662	96.27	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
24 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-417	1	179,000	2,243	1,748	102.40	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
25 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-418	1	199,000	2,421	1,827	108.92	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
26 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-439	1	179,000	2,243	1,748	102.40	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
27 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-456	1	229,000	2,688	1,671	137.04	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
28 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-457	1	228,000	2,679	1,671	136.45	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
29 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-458	1	965,000	2,226	1,356	711.65	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
30 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-462	1	141,409	1,914	1,210	116.87	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
31 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-463	1	141,409	1,914	1,210	116.87	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
32 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-464	1	625,000	7,220	2,981	209.66	2,248	1,379	155	55	3,837
33 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-466	1	173,315	2,199	1,700	101.95	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
34 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-467	1	163,389	2,110	1,451	112.60	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
35 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-468	1	216,591	2,581	1,883	115.02	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
36 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-483	1	219,000	2,599	1,943	112.71	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
37 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-489	1	271,322	3,071	1,877	144.55	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
38 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-514	1	280,000	2,850	2,449	114.33	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
39 New Guest House	12-568	1	75,000	1,278	889	84.36	1,036	647	73	26	1,782
40 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-577	1	350,000	3,616	2,366	147.93	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
41 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-693	1	199,000	2,421	1,827	108.92	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
42 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-694	1	179,000	2,243	1,748	102.40	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
43 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-706	1	274,412	3,097	2,484	110.47	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
44 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-735	1	138,000	1,879	1,167	118.25	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130



EXHIBIT A - LAND USE DEPARTMENT
IMPACT FEE TRACKING: 1/23/12 - 1/23/13 (FIRST 22 FULL MONTHS)

SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION

SINGLE-FAMILY CONSTRUCTION CODE	PERMIT#	UNITS	VALUATION	PERMIT FEE	HEATED SF	\$/SF	IMPACT FEES (If Collected)				TOTAL
							ROADS	PARKS	FIRE	POLICE	
45 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-749	1	141,408	1,914	1,210	116.87	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
46 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-766	1	189,000	2,332	1,748	108.12	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
47 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-786	1	392,000	4,076	1,743	224.90	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
48 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-795	1	125,000	1,879	1,167	107.11	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
49 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-803	1	254,942	2,919	2,188	116.52	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
50 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-838	1	216,500	2,581	1,934	111.94	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
51 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-845	1	124,000	1,754	1,049	118.21	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
52 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-862	1	171,240	2,181	1,526	112.21	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
53 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-877	1	190,000	2,341	1,924	98.75	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
54 New Guest House GHDI	12-887	1	65,000	1,173	574	113.24	1,036	647	73	26	1,782
55 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-903	1	550,000	5,748	1,933	284.53	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
56 New Guest House GHAI	12-932	1	10,000	322	298	33.56	518	324	37	13	892
57 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-999	1	160,000	2,074	1,027	155.79	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
58 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1030	1	254,942	2,919	2,188	116.52	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
59 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1031	1	219,158	2,608	1,930	113.55	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
60 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1039	1	124,000	1,754	1,049	118.21	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
61 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1086	1	237,000	2,759	1,849	128.18	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
62 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1087	1	237,000	2,759	1,849	128.18	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
63 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1089	1	213,457	2,555	2,297	92.93	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
64 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1152	1	185,000	2,297	1,356	136.43	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
65 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1155	1	195,000	2,386	1,748	111.56	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
66 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1156	1	195,000	2,386	1,748	111.56	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
67 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1157	1	185,000	2,297	1,356	136.43	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
68 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1163	1	200,000	2,430	500	400.00	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
69 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1164	1	600,000	6,168	2,939	204.15	2,248	1,379	155	55	3,837
70 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1166	1	176,000	2,217	1,356	129.79	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
71 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1181	1	219,158	2,608	1,356	161.62	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
72 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-692	1	189,000	2,332	1,748	108.12	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
73 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1165	1	238,000	2,768	1,849	128.72	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
74 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1167	1	204,000	2,466	1,849	110.33	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
75 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1232	1	347,000	3,583	2,587	134.13	2,248	1,379	155	55	3,837
76 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1269	1	180,000	2,252	1,743	103.27	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
77 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1270	1	180,000	2,252	1,743	103.27	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
78 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1323	1	140,000	1,896	1,376	101.74	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
79 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1332	1	320,997	3,299	2,096	153.15	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
80 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1358	1	254,942	2,919	2,188	116.52	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
81 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1362	1	202,594	2,457	1,781	113.75	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
82 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1400	1	216,594	2,581	1,883	115.03	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
83 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1421	1	300,000	3,069	2,739	109.53	2,248	1,379	155	55	3,837
84 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1440	1	238,000	2,768	1,849	128.72	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
85 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1376	1	725,000	7,218	3,156	229.72	2,309	1,418	159	56	3,942
86 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFCI	12-1457	1	1,000,000	9,528	5,857	170.74	2,424	1,495	169	59	4,147
87 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1498	1	625,000	6,378	2,753	227.03	2,248	1,379	155	55	3,837
88 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1564	1	141,408	1,914	1,210	116.87	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130



EXHIBIT A - LAND USE DEPARTMENT

IMPACT FEE TRACKING: 1/23/12 - 1/23/13 (FIRST 22 FULL MONTHS)

SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION

SINGLE-FAMILY CONSTRUCTION CODE	PERMIT#	UNITS	VALUATION	PERMIT FEE	HEATED SF	\$/SF	IMPACT FEES (If Collected)				
							ROADS	PARKS	FIRE	POLICE	TOTAL
89 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1565	1	279,165	2,850	2,484	112.39	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
90 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1625	1	209,085	2,519	1,781	117.40	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
91 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1626	1	141,884	1,914	1,210	117.26	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
92 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1629	1	160,000	2,074	1,638	97.68	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
93 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1660	1	216,594	2,581	1,545	140.19	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
94 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1733	1	144,000	1,932	1,241	116.04	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
95 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1734	1	266,000	3,017	2,061	129.06	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
96 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1735	1	209,000	2,510	1,655	126.28	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
97 New Guest House	12-1754	1	250,000	2,875	810	308.64	1,036	647	73	26	1,782
98 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1793	1	274,412	3,097	2,484	110.47	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
99 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1587	1	22,000	574	1,792	12.28	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
100 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1690	1	121,920	1,736	1,016	120.00	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
101 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1691	1	121,920	1,736	1,016	120.00	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
102 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1845	1	205,000	2,475	1,828	112.14	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
103 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1849	1	215,000	2,564	1,828	117.61	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
104 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1852	1	195,000	2,386	1,748	111.56	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
105 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1857	1	195,000	2,386	1,748	111.56	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
106 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1874	1	200,000	2,430	1,748	111.56	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
107 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1913	1	177,000	2,226	1,985	89.17	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
108 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1914	1	167,000	3,026	1,985	84.13	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
109 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1915	1	140,000	1,896	1,985	70.53	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
110 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1959	1	274,412	3,097	2,484	110.47	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
111 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1989	1	180,000	2,252	1,748	102.97	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
112 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1993	1	180,000	2,252	1,748	102.97	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
113 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-2164	1	274,416	3,097	2,484	110.47	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
114 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-2215	1	274,412	3,097	2,484	110.47	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
115 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-1912	1	180,000	2,252	1,590	113.21	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
116 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-2011	1	246,413	2,848	2,417	101.95	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
117 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-2033	1	185,000	2,297	1,494	123.83	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
118 New Residence >3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFCI	12-2066	1	465,000	4,876	3,151	147.57	2,309	1,418	159	56	3,942
119 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-2143	1	289,000	2,978	1,975	146.33	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
120 New Guest House	12-2144	1	168,000	2,145	1,080	155.56	1,036	647	73	26	1,782
121 New Guest House	12-2200	1	180,000	490	576	312.50	518	324	37	13	892
122 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-2235	1	700,000	7,008	3,411	205.22	2,309	1,418	159	56	3,942
123 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-2258	1	195,106	2,395	1,700	114.77	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
124 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-2281	1	228,000	2,673	2,061	110.63	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
125 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-2282	1	209,000	2,510	1,671	125.07	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
126 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-2329	1	171,240	2,181	1,526	112.21	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
127 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-2330	1	254,557	2,919	2,188	116.34	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
128 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-2341	1	209,000	2,510	1,671	125.07	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
129 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-2342	1	223,000	2,635	1,849	120.61	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
130 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-2343	1	135,000	1,852	1,241	108.78	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
131 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-2344	1	217,000	2,581	1,731	125.36	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
132 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	12-2345	1	209,000	2,510	1,671	125.07	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498



EXHIBIT A - LAND USE DEPARTMENT
IMPACT FEE TRACKING: 1/23/12 - 11/23/13 (FIRST 22 FULL MONTHS)

SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION

SINGLE-FAMILY CONSTRUCTION CODE	PERMIT#	UNITS	VALUATION	PERMIT FEE	HEATED SF	\$/SF	IMPACT FEES (If Collected)				TOTAL
							ROADS	PARKS	FIRE	POLICE	
133 New Guest House	12-945	1	157,000	2,048	742	211.59	1,036	647	73	26	1,782
134 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 12-1955	1	308,000	3,156	2,625	117.33	2,248	1,379	155	55	3,837
135 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 12-2377	1	215,000	2,564	2,132	100.84	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
136 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 12-2378	1	215,000	2,564	2,132	100.84	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
137 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 12-2418	1	316,589	3,225	2,803	112.95	2,248	1,379	155	55	3,837
138 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 12-2499	1	205,000	2,475	1,655	123.87	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
139 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 12-2500	1	237,000	2,759	1,849	128.18	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
140 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 12-2503	1	277,900	2,828	1,985	140.00	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
141 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 12-2538	1	216,594	2,581	1,883	115.03	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
142 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 12-2539	1	225,714	2,661	1,991	113.37	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
143 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 12-2540	1	225,714	2,661	1,991	113.37	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
144 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 12-2578	1	170,599	2,172	1,526	111.79	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
145 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 12-2376	1	195,000	2,386	1,748	111.56	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
146 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 12-2530	1	206,000	2,484	1,655	124.47	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
147 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 12-2614	1	225,714	2,661	1,991	113.37	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
148 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 13-02	1	195,000	2,386	1,703	114.50	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
149 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 13-03	1	208,000	2,501	1,671	124.48	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
150 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 13-30	1	598,516	6,159	3,552	168.50	2,359	1,444	163	58	4,024
151 New Guest House	GHD1 13-114	1	55,000	1,173	462	140.69	518	324	37	13	892
152 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 13-197	1	216,594	2,581	1,883	115.03	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
153 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 13-231	1	195,000	2,386	1,494	130.52	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
154 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 13-232	1	180,000	2,252	1,748	102.97	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
155 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 13-234	1	210,000	2,519	2,132	98.50	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
156 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 13-235	1	210,000	2,519	2,132	98.50	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
157 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 13-283	1	500,000	5,259	2,840	176.06	2,248	1,379	155	55	3,837
158 Manufactured Home Placement	MBHI 12-651	1	50,000	121	840	59.52	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
159 Manufactured Home Placement	MBHI 12-825	1	50,000	121	1,260	39.68	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
160 Manufactured Home Placement	MBHI 12-888	1	50,000	121	1,344	37.20	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
161 Manufactured Home Placement	MBHI 12-1075	1	50,000	121	1,216	41.12	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
162 Manufactured Home Placement	MBHI 12-1138	1	50,000	121	2,128	23.50	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
163 Manufactured Home Placement	MBHI 12-1151	1	50,000	121	1,152	43.40	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
164 Manufactured Home Placement	MBHI 12-1678	1	50,000	121	1,716	29.14	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
165 Manufactured Home Placement	MBHI 12-1743	1	50,000	121	4,800	10.42	2,424	1,495	169	59	4,147
166 Manufactured Home Placement	MBHI 12-1744	1	50,000	121	1,280	39.06	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
167 Manufactured Home Placement	MBHI 12-2225	1	50,000	121	1,568	31.89	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
168 Manufactured Home Placement	MBHI 12-2255	1	50,000	121	2,280	21.93	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
169 Manufactured Home Placement	MBHI 12-252	1	50,000	121	1,680	29.76	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
170 Manufactured Home Placement	MBHI 12-1736	1	50,000	121	1,280	39.06	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
171 Manufactured Home Placement	MBHI 12-2478	1	50,000	121	1,280	39.06	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
172 Manufactured Home Placement	MBHI 13-173	1	50,000	121	1,344	37.20	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
173 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 12-1797	1	660,000	6,672	2,907	227.04	2,248	1,379	155	55	3,837
174 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 12-2022	1	185,000	2,297	1,651	69.78	2,248	1,379	155	55	3,837
175 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 12-2645	1	284,250	2,905	1,680	169.20	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
176 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft.	SFDI 12-2646	1	297,750	3,047	1,680	177.23	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498



EXHIBIT A - LAND USE DEPARTMENT
IMPACT FEE TRACKING: 1/23/12 - 11/23/13 (FIRST 22 FULL MONTHS)

SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION

SINGLE-FAMILY CONSTRUCTION CODE	PERMIT#	UNITS	VALUATION	PERMIT FEE	HEATED SF	\$/SF	IMPACT FEES (If Collected)				
							ROADS	PARKS	FIRE	POLICE	TOTAL
177 New Residence >3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFCI	13-92	1	900,000	8,688	4,800	107.50	2,424	1,495	169	59	4,147
178 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-168	1	228,000	2,679	2,128	107.14	1,850	1,328	150	53	3,381
179 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-233	1	210,000	2,519	2,128	98.68	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
180 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-265	1	131,000	1,816	1,680	77.98	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
181 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-285	1	160,000	2,074	1,680	95.24	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
182 New Guest House	13-313	1	70,000	953	1,470	47.62	1,554	971	110	39	2,674
183 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-338	1	239,000	2,777	2,061	115.96	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
184 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-340	1	138,000	1,879	1,241	111.20	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
185 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-341	1	152,000	2,003	1,241	122.48	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
186 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-342	1	208,000	2,501	1,671	124.48	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
187 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-343	1	179,000	2,243	1,671	107.12	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
188 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-363	1	316,589	3,255	2,803	112.95	2,248	1,379	155	55	3,837
189 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-393	1	400,000	4,164	2,208	181.16	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
190 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-424	1	159,000	2,065	1,457	109.13	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
191 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-425	1	126,000	1,772	1,393	90.45	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
192 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-426	1	169,000	2,154	1,481	114.11	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
193 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-589	1	266,000	3,017	2,061	129.06	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
194 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-609	1	274,412	3,097	2,484	110.47	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
195 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-664	1	290,000	2,959	1,731	167.53	2,248	1,379	155	55	3,837
196 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-665	1	170,000	2,163	1,356	125.37	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
197 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-666	1	170,000	2,163	1,356	125.37	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
198 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-669	1	205,000	2,475	1,356	151.18	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
199 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-670	1	200,000	2,430	2,132	93.81	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
200 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-682	1	222,931	2,635	1,883	118.39	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
201 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-684	1	141,408	1,914	1,210	116.87	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
202 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-752	1	260,736	2,973	2,188	119.17	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
203 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-753	1	254,557	2,919	2,188	116.34	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
204 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-764	1	210,000	2,519	1,731	121.32	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
205 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-804	1	254,557	2,919	2,188	116.34	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
206 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-850	1	725,000	7,218	2,995	242.07	2,248	1,379	155	55	3,837
207 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-867	1	195,000	2,386	1,494	130.52	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
208 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-883	1	141,408	1,914	1,210	116.87	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
209 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-884	1	141,408	1,914	1,210	116.87	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
210 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-913	1	225,714	2,661	1,991	113.37	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
211 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-922	1	200,000	2,430	920	217.39	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
212 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-933	1	250,000	2,875	2,879	86.84	2,248	1,379	155	55	3,837
213 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-964	1	195,106	2,395	1,700	114.77	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
214 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-975	1	635,000	6,462	2,870	221.25	2,248	1,379	155	55	3,837
215 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1041	1	216,594	2,581	1,883	115.03	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
216 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1084	1	515,000	5,454	2,295	224.40	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
217 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1135	1	225,714	2,661	1,991	113.37	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
218 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1136	1	163,389	2,110	1,451	112.60	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
219 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1138	1	216,594	2,581	1,883	115.03	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
220 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1148	1	209,914	2,519	2,060	101.90	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714



EXHIBIT A - LAND USE DEPARTMENT
IMPACT FEE TRACKING: 1/23/12 - 11/23/13 (FIRST 22 FULL MONTHS)

SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION

SINGLE-FAMILY CONSTRUCTION CODE	PERMIT#	UNITS	VALUATION	PERMIT FEE	HEATED SF	\$/SF	IMPACT FEES (If Collected)				TOTAL
							ROADS	PARKS	FIRE	POLICE	
221 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1222	1	215,000	2,564	1,828	117.61	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
222 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1226	1	160,000	2,074	1,638	97.68	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
223 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1237	1	141,408	1,914	1,210	116.87	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
224 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1245	1	200,000	2,430	1,655	120.85	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
225 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1246	1	200,000	2,430	1,655	120.85	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
226 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1269	1	900,000	8,688	3,491	257.81	2,309	1,418	159	56	3,942
227 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1277	1	555,000	5,790	2,290	242.36	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
228 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1278	1	171,240	2,181	1,526	112.21	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
229 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1279	1	261,121	2,982	1,526	171.11	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
230 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1287	1	180,000	2,252	1,715	104.96	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
231 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1288	1	180,000	2,252	1,715	104.96	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
232 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1300	1	300,000	3,059	1,732	173.21	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
233 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1320	1	163,389	2,110	1,451	112.60	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
234 New Guest House GHDI	13-1331	1	55,000	900	1,500	36.67	1,554	971	110	39	2,674
235 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1342	1	163,389	2,110	1,451	112.60	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
236 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1351	1	55,000	1,068	1,200	45.83	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
237 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1352	1	55,000	1,068	1,200	45.83	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
238 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1372	1	163,000	2,101	1,805	90.30	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
239 New Single Family Attached <3 SFAI	13-1446	1	200,000	2,430	1,342	149.03	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
240 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1469	1	163,389	2,110	1,342	121.75	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
241 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1518	1	216,594	2,581	1,863	115.03	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
242 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1519	1	141,408	1,914	1,210	116.87	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
243 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1554	1	163,389	2,110	1,451	112.60	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
244 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1605	1	163,389	2,110	1,451	112.60	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
245 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1643	1	251,226	2,893	2,342	107.27	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
246 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. FB51	13-839	1	150,000	2,308	1,579	95.00	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
247 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. FB51	13-840	1	166,000	2,495	1,680	100.00	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
248 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. FB51	13-841	1	162,300	2,443	1,680	96.61	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
249 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. FB51	13-842	1	170,000	2,515	1,791	94.92	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
250 Manufactured Home Placement MBHI	12-2255	1	50,000	121	2,280	21.93	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
251 Manufactured Home Placement MBHI	12-2598	1	50,000	121	1,232	40.58	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
252 Manufactured Home Placement MBHI	13-173	1	50,000	121	1,344	37.20	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
253 Manufactured Home Placement MBHI	13-1247	1	50,000	121	1,024	48.83	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
254 Manufactured Home Placement MBHI	13-1419	1	50,000	121	2,128	23.50	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
255 Manufactured Home Placement MBHI	12-2478	1	50,000	121	2,280	21.93	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
261 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1570	1	195,000	2,386	1,494	130.52	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
262 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1593	1	465,000	4,866	2,325	200.00	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
263 New Guest House GHAI	13-1594	1	193,000	2,358	967	199.59	1,036	647	73	26	1,782
264 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1603	1	214,900	2,564	1,600	134.31	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
265 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1634	1	440,000	4,602	2,214	198.74	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
266 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1643	1	251,226	2,893	2,342	107.27	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
267 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1653	1	640,000	6,404	1,852	345.57	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
268 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1712	1	265,000	3,008	2,688	98.59	2,248	1,379	155	55	3,837
269 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1763	1	195,106	2,395	1,700	114.77	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498



EXHIBIT A - LAND USE DEPARTMENT
IMPACT FEE TRACKING: 1/23/12 - 11/23/13 (FIRST 22 FULL MONTHS)

SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION

SINGLE-FAMILY CONSTRUCTION CODE	PERMIT#	UNITS	VALUATION	PERMIT FEE	HEATED SF	\$/SF	IMPACT FEES (If Collected)			TOTAL	
							ROADS	PARKS	FIRE POLICE		
270 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1768	1	550,000	5,748	2,528	217.56	2,248	1,379	155	55	3,837
271 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1817	1	489,279	5,149	2,205	221.90	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
272 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1820	1	195,106	2,395	1,700	114.77	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
273 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1821	1	202,843	2,457	1,763	115.06	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
274 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1829	1	228,460	2,688	1,972	115.85	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
275 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1950	1	241,000	2,795	1,393	173.01	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
276 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1951	1	190,000	2,331	1,481	128.29	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
277 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-1954	1	195,106	2,385	1,700	114.77	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
278 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-2010	1	520,000	5,486	2,254	230.70	2,183	1,328	150	53	3,714
279 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-2165	1	163,117	2,082	1,561	104.50	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
280 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-2166	1	134,225	1,842	1,162	115.51	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
281 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-2230	1	201,000	2,428	1,655	121.45	2,100	1,214	136	48	3,498
282 New Residence <3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFDI	13-2261	1	141,408	1,904	1,210	116.87	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
283 New Residence >3, 500 Sq. Ft. SFCI	13-2285	1	410,000	4,363	2,609	157.15	2,248	1,379	155	55	3,837
284 Manufactured Home Placement MBHI	13-1611	1	50,000	121	1,344	37.20	1,850	1,111	125	44	3,130
TOTAL Single-Family (This Period)	279	279	64,397,036	725,016	509,533	\$ 131.30	563,023	334,931	37,648	13,288	948,890
TOTAL Single-Family (Prev. Period)	211	211	(Prev. 22 Months: 3/22/10 to 1/22/12)	(AVG.\$/SF)							
Change	68	32%	INCREASE								
City Share GRT	3.5375%										
ESTIMATED New Net GRT	\$ 555,222	SEE NOTE 1									
BLDG. PERMIT FEES (Net New)	\$ 176,707	ADJUSTED FOR NET INCREASE									
IMPACT FEES (Not Collected)	\$ (948,890)										
NET TO CITY (+/-)	\$ (216,961)										

MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION

MULTI-FAMILY CONSTRUCTION CODE	PERMIT#	UNITS	VALUATION	PERMIT FEE	HEATED SF	\$/SF	IMPACT FEES (If Collected)			TOTAL	
							ROADS	PARKS	FIRE POLICE		
1 New 5 or more Family Building FAMS	11-2582	54	2,907,656	25,055	58,878	49.38	83,916	52,434	5,940	2,106	144,396
2 New 5 or more Family Building FAMS	11-2583	42	2,327,539	20,589	42,840	54.33	65,268	40,782	4,620	1,638	112,308
3 New 5 or more Family Building FAMS	11-2584	7	488,110	5,986	11,792	41.39	10,878	6,797	770	273	18,718
4 New 5 or more Family Building FAMS	11-2585	20	1,092,615	11,080	20,038	54.53	31,080	19,420	2,200	780	53,480
5 New 5 or more Family Building FAMS	11-2586	53	2,713,583	23,561	50,082	54.18	82,362	51,463	5,830	2,067	141,722
TOTAL Multi-Family (This Period)	5	176	9,529,503	86,271	183,630	\$ 50.76	273,504	170,896	19,360	6,864	470,624
TOTAL Multi-Family (Prev. Period)	5	176	(Prev. 22 Mo.: 3/22/10 to 1/22/12)								
Change			UNIT INCREASE								
City Share GRT	3.5375%										
ESTIMATED New Net GRT	\$ 337,106	SEE NOTE 1									
BLDG. PERMIT FEES (Net New)	\$ 86,271	ADJUSTED FOR NET INCREASE									
IMPACT FEES (Not Collected)	\$ (470,624)										
NET TO CITY (+/-)	\$ (47,247)										



EXHIBIT A - LAND USE DEPARTMENT
IMPACT FEE TRACKING: 1/23/12 - 11/23/13 (FIRST 22 FULL MONTHS)

SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION

SINGLE-FAMILY CONSTRUCTION CODE	PERMIT#	UNITS	VALUATION	PERMIT FEE	HEATED SF	\$/SF	ROADS	PARKS	FIRE	POLICE	TOTAL
---------------------------------	---------	-------	-----------	------------	-----------	-------	-------	-------	------	--------	-------

SUMMARY - ALL RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION

ALL CONSTRUCTION	PERMITS	UNITS	VALUATION	PERMIT FEE	HEATED SF	\$/SF	ROADS	PARKS	FIRE	POLICE	TOTAL
TOTAL All Construction (This Period)	284	455	73,926,539	811,287	693,163	N/A	836,527	505,827	57,008	20,152	1,419,514
TOTAL All Construction (Prev. Period)	211										
Change	73										
City Share GRT	3.5375%										
ESTIMATED New Net GRT	\$ 892,329										
BLDG. PERMIT FEES (Net New)	\$ 262,978										
IMPACT FEES (Not Collected)	\$ (1,419,514)										
NET TO CITY (+/-)	\$ (264,208)										

EST. New Net GRT (Adjusted)
 NET TO CITY (+/-) (Adjusted)

\$ 1,551,313
 \$ 394,777

NOTE 1: Estimates of new GRT are based on construction valuation only and do not include secondary effects of economic output through indirect and induced activities related to the construction. For example, the Sacramento Regional Research Institute (SRRI), utilizing the IMPLAN input-output model, calculates an additional \$781,054 of economic output per \$1.0 million (78.1%) of construction valuation from new single-family & multi-family construction. Adjusting this figure for CPI-U (New Mexico) versus CPI-U (California) [(226/239) x 78.1%] yields an estimate of secondary economic effects of 73.85%.

**CITY OF SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO
PROPOSED AMENDMENT(S) TO BILL NO. 2013-44
Impact Fees**

Mayor and Members of the City Council:

I propose the following amendment(s) to Bill No. 2013-44:

1. On page 5, line 16 *insert* the following section.

Section 3. Review. This Ordinance shall be reviewed one year from the date of adoption.

Respectfully submitted,

Councilor Peter Ives

ADOPTED: _____

NOT ADOPTED: _____

DATE: _____

Yolanda Y. Vigil, City Clerk

1 CITY OF SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

2 BILL NO. 2013-44

3 INTRODUCED BY:

4
5
6
7
8
9
10 AN ORDINANCE

11 AMENDING SECTION 14-8.14(E) SFCC 1987 TO EXTEND FOR ONE YEAR THE PERIOD
12 DURING WHICH IMPACT FEES FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS SHALL BE
13 REDUCED BY 100% AND TO REDUCE IMPACT FEES FOR RESIDENTIAL
14 DEVELOPMENTS BY 50% FOR A PERIOD OF ONE YEAR THEREAFTER; AND
15 MAKING SUCH OTHER STYLISTIC OR GRAMMATICAL CHANGES THAT ARE
16 NECESSARY.

17
18 BE IT ORDAINED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE CITY OF SANTA FE:

19 Section 1. Section 14-8.14(E) SFCC 1987 (being Ord. No. 2011-37, §11, as
20 amended) is amended to read:

21 (E) Fee Determination

22 (1) A person who applies for a construction *permit*, except those exempted or
23 preparing an independent fee calculation study, shall pay impact fees in
24 accordance with one of the following fee schedules. If a credit is due

pursuant to Section 14-8.14(I), the amount of the credit shall be deducted from the amount of the fee to be paid.

(2) The fee schedule in this Subsection 14-8.14(E)(2), also referred to as the "temporary" fee schedule, shall be used and its fees assessed on *residential plats*, ~~[and] development plans and construction permits~~ for a period of ~~[two]~~ three years beginning on January 23, 2012 and ending on January 22, ~~[2014]~~ 2015. Beginning January 23, 2015 and ending January 22, 2016, such residential developments shall be assessed impact fees in accordance with Subsection 14-8.14(E)(3) at fifty percent (50%) of the scheduled values of that Subsection at the time of assessment. Beginning January 23, 2016, [Thereafter,] such residential developments shall be assessed impact fees in accordance with [the "new" and "old" fee schedules in] Subsection[s] 14-8.14(E)(3) [and 14-8.14(E)(4) below] at one hundred percent (100%) of the scheduled values of that Subsection at the time of assessment.

TEMPORARY FEE SCHEDULE FOR RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS

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	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(1,501 to 2,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(2,001 to 2,500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(2,501 to 3,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(3,001 to 3,500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(3,501 to 4,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(more than 4,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Accessory dwelling unit (attached or detached)						
Heated Living Area:						
(0 to 500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Land Use Type	Unit	Roads	Parks	Fire	Police	Total
(501 to 1,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(1,001 to 1,500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other (Apts., Condos, Attached Dwellings [S.F. Attached Guest House])	Dwelling	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

(3) The fee schedule in this Subsection 14-8.14(E)(3) [~~also referred to as the "new" fee schedule,~~] 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 ["new"] 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 the "old" fee schedule.~~]

[NEW] 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)						
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

Land Use Type	Unit	Roads	Parks	Fire	Police	Total
Other (Apts., Condos, Attached Dwellings, [S.F. Attached Guest House])	Dwelling	\$1,554	\$971	\$110	\$39	\$2,674
Hotel/Motel	Room	\$1,203	\$0	\$82	\$29	\$1,314
Retail/Commercial	G.F.A.					
Shopping Center/General Retail	1000 sq.	\$4,597	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$4,896
Auto Sales/Service	1000 sq.	\$2,180	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$2,479
Bank	1000 sq.	\$4,948	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$5,247
Convenience Store w/Gas Sales	1000 sq.	\$8,778	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$9,077
Health Club, Recreational	1000 sq.	\$4,394	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$4,693
Movie Theater	1000 sq.	\$10,412	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$10,711
Restaurant, Sit-Down	1000 sq.	\$5,083	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$5,382
Restaurant, Fast Food	1000 sq.	\$11,064	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$11,363
Restaurant, Pkgd Food	1000 sq.	\$4,597	\$0	\$221	\$78	\$4,896
Office/Institutional	G.F.A.					
Office, General	1000 sq.	\$2,429	\$0	\$124	\$44	\$2,597
Medical Building	1000 sq.	\$3,903	\$0	\$124	\$44	\$4,071
Nursing Home	1000 sq.	\$1,354	\$0	\$124	\$44	\$1,522
Church	1000 sq.	\$1,521	\$0	\$124	\$44	\$1,689
Day Care Center	1000 sq.	\$3,202	\$0	\$124	\$44	\$3,370
Educational Facility	1000 sq.	\$586	\$0	\$124	\$44	\$754
Educational Facility Dorm Room	1000 sq.	\$1,203	\$0	\$82	\$29	\$1,314
Industrial	G.F.A.					
Industrial, Manufacturing	1000 sq.	\$1,610	\$0	\$74	\$26	\$1,710
Warehouse	1000 sq.	\$1,147	\$0	\$47	\$16	\$1,210
Mini-Warehouse	1000 sq.	\$417	\$0	\$47	\$16	\$480

1 ~~[(4) The fee schedule in this Subsection 14-8.14(E)(4), also referred to as the~~
2 ~~"old" fee schedule, shall be used and its fees assessed on plats and~~
3 ~~development plans that received final approval from the city or the state~~
4 ~~construction industries division on or before June 30, 2008, which~~
5 ~~assessment is valid for a period not to exceed four years from the date of the~~

subdivision or *development* plan approval. The "old" fee schedule shall also be applied to construction *permits* issued on or before June 30, 2008.

OLD FEE SCHEDULE

Land-Use Type	Unit	Roads	Parks	Fire	Police	Total
S-F Detached Dwelling or Guesthouse						
Heated Living Area	-	-	-	-	-	-
— (0 to 1,500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$1,135	\$767	\$118	\$29	\$2,049
— (1,501 to 2,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$1,527	\$1,128	\$165	\$40	\$2,860
— (2,001 to 2,500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$1,820	\$1,397	\$212	\$52	\$3,481
— (2,501 to 3,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$2,053	\$1,614	\$259	\$63	\$3,989
— (3,001 to 3,500 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$2,247	\$1,793	\$306	\$75	\$4,421
— (3,501 to 4,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$2,414	\$1,946	\$353	\$86	\$4,799
— (more than 4,000 sq. ft.)	Dwelling	\$2,560	\$2,080	\$400	\$98	\$5,138
Other (Apts., Condos, S.F. Attached)	Dwelling	\$1,485	\$863	\$94	\$61	\$2,503
Hotel/Motel	Room	\$2,017	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$2,260
Retail/Commercial	G.F.A.	-	-	-	-	-
Shopping Center/General Retail	1000 sq. ft.	\$3,893	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$4,136
Auto Sales/Service	1000 sq. ft.	\$3,123	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$3,366
Bank	1000 sq. ft.	\$5,249	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$5,492
Convenience Store w/Gas Sales	1000 sq. ft.	\$7,336	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$7,579
Health Club, Recreational	1000 sq. ft.	\$2,814	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$3,057
Movie Theater	1000 sq. ft.	\$8,730	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$8,973
Restaurant, Sit Down	1000 sq. ft.	\$4,248	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$4,491
Restaurant, Fast Food	1000 sq. ft.	\$9,247	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$9,490
Office/Institutional	G.F.A.	-	-	-	-	-
Office, General	1000 sq. ft.	\$2,191	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$2,434
Medical Building	1000 sq. ft.	\$3,503	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$3,746
Nursing Home	1000 sq. ft.	\$981	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$1,224
Church	1000 sq. ft.	\$1,632	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$1,875
Day Care Center	1000 sq. ft.	\$3,404	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$3,647
Elementary/Sec. School	1000 sq. ft.	\$534	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$777
Industrial	G.F.A.	-	-	-	-	-
Industrial, Manufacturing	1000 sq. ft.	\$1,557	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$1,800
Warehouse	1000 sq. ft.	\$1,109	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$1,352
Mini Warehouse	1000 sq. ft.	\$386	\$0	\$182	\$61	\$629
G.F.A. <i>Gross Floor Area</i> ; fees shown for nonresidential uses are per one thousand square feet of gross floor area]						

1
2
3
4

1 ([5]4) If the type of new *development* for which a construction *permit* is requested
2 is not specified on the fee schedule, the *impact fee administrator* shall
3 determine the fee on the basis of the fee applicable to the most nearly
4 comparable type of land use on the fee schedule. The following shall be used
5 as a guideline for impact fee determination when the specific use is not
6 identified in the fee chart. (Ord. No. 2013-16 § 55)

7 (a) Residential

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

14 (b) Retail/Commercial

- 15 (i) the general retail fee shall be used for a hair salon,
16 *laundromat*, dry cleaner, garden center/nursery retail display
17 area, gas station without a convenience store and inventory
18 storage for a retail *business*, including growing area for a
19 garden center/nursery;
20 (ii) the bank fee assessment shall include the square footage of
21 any drive-through kiosk and parking area with or without a
22 roof;
23 (iii) the restaurant fast food fee shall include square footage for
24 the drive-through kiosk and parking area with or without a
25 roof; and

1 (iv) the packaged food restaurant fee shall be used for a
2 restaurant or bar that does not have any food preparation
3 facilities.

4 (c) Office/Institutional

5 (i) the *office* general fee shall be used for a studio that is not
6 *residential* and not retail;

7 (ii) the *office* general fee shall be used for a medical office that
8 does not have any medical equipment, such as an *office* for
9 psychiatry;

10 (iii) the medical *office* fee shall be used for an animal hospital;
11 and

12 (iv) the nursing home fee shall be used for an assisted living
13 facility.

14 (d) Industrial

15 (i) the warehouse fee shall be used for an animal shelter, storage
16 that is not inventory storage or maintenance equipment; and

17 (ii) the mini-warehouse fee shall be used for a single storage unit
18 or for multiple storage units.

19 (e) Development Outside of Buildings

20 The impact fees for *development* of land outside of *buildings* that
21 increases the demand for capital facilities is determined by
22 application of the fee for the corresponding type of *building* or by
23 preparation of an independent fee calculation study.

24 ([6]5) Impact fees shall be assessed and collected based on the primary use of the
25 *building* as determined by the *impact fee administrator*. Uses that are

1 distinct and separate from the primary use, which are not merely ancillary to
2 the primary use and are one thousand square feet or greater, will be charged
3 the impact fee category based on the distinct and separate use.

4 ([7]6) Where a *permit* is to be issued for a *building* "shell" and the *impact fee*
5 *administrator* is unable to determine the intended use of the *building*, the
6 *impact fee administrator* shall assess and collect impact fees according to the
7 zoning district in which the *building* is to be located as follows:

- 8 (a) C-2 and all SC zones - "Shopping Center/General Retail" fee rate;
- 9 (b) HZ zone - "Medical *Building*" fee rate; and
- 10 (c) C-1, C-4 and all other *nonresidential* zones - "Office, General" fee
11 rate.

12 ([8]7) If there is an increase in the amount of the impact fee calculation once a
13 tenant improvement *permit* is submitted, the difference from what was paid
14 at the time of the shell *permit* and the tenant improvement fee calculation
15 shall be paid prior to issuance of the construction *permit*. If the fee schedule
16 determination for the square footage of the use identified in the tenant
17 improvement construction *permit* results in a net decrease from what was
18 paid at the time of the shell *permit*, there shall be no refund of impact fees
19 previously paid.

20 ([9]8) Live/work *developments* containing *dwelling units* in combination with
21 *nonresidential* floor area in a common *building* shall pay impact fees for
22 each *dwelling unit* according to the *residential* fee rate for "Other" and for
23 the *gross floor area* intended for *nonresidential* use according to the "Office,
24 General" fee rate. If the initial Live/Work construction *permit application* is
25 for a shell construction *permit*, the *impact fee administrator* shall collect

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

7 ([10]9) If a construction *permit application* changes or intensifies the use of an
8 existing *building*, increases the *gross floor area* of an existing *building*, or
9 replaces an existing *building* with a new *building* and new use, the fee shall
10 be based on the net increase in the fee for the new use or increase as
11 compared to what the current fee would be for the previous use or floor area.
12 If the proposed change results in a net decrease in the fee there shall be no
13 refund of impact fees previously paid.

14 **Section 2. Effective Date.** This Ordinance shall become effective immediately upon
15 adoption.

16 APPROVED AS TO FORM:

17 

18
19 KELLEY A. BRENNAN, INTERIM CITY ATTORNEY

**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: X Resolution: _____
(A single FIR may be used for related bills and/or resolutions)

Short Title(s): An Ordinance amending Section 14-8.14(E) SFCC 1987 to extend for one year the period during which impact fees for residential developments shall be reduced by 100%, and to reduce impact fees for residential developments by 50% for a period of one year thereafter; and making such other stylistic or grammatical changes that are necessary.

Sponsor(s): Councilors Wurzbarger

Reviewing Department(s): Land Use

Person Completing FIR: Matthew O'Reilly ^{MGO} Date: 12-2-13 Phone: x 6617

Reviewed by City Attorney: Kelly A. Brunner Date: 12/2/13
(Signature)

Reviewed by Finance Director: [Signature] Date: 12/2/13
(Signature)

Section B. Summary

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

The proposed Bill is an extension of Ordinance No. 2012-2 which reduced residential impact fees by 100% for a period of 24 months. Ordinance No. 2012-2 expires on January 23, 2014 and was one of several measures approved by the governing body to eliminate barriers to residential construction projects. Other measures approved by the governing body were Ordinance No. 2010-10 and Resolution Nos. 2010-43 & 2011-26, the so-called "Sunset" resolutions that extended the expirations of approved building permits and development approvals; and Ordinance No. 2011-17 that reduced the Santa Fe Homes Program fees and affordable percentage requirements.

The proposed Bill would: 1) extend the current 100% reduction in residential impact fees (roads, parks, police and fire) for an additional 12 months (January 23, 2014 through January 22, 2015); 2) reduce residential impact fees to 50% for 12 months thereafter (January 23, 2015 through January 22, 2016); and 3) return residential impact fees to their full rate beginning January 23, 2016).

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)*

I. 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 11/12	"A" Costs Absorbed or "N" New Budget Required	"R" Costs Recurring or "NR" Non-recurring		FY 12/13	"A" Costs Absorbed or "N" New Budget Required	"R" Costs – Recurring or "NR" Non-recurring	Fund Affected

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

* 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 (Reduction)	FY <u>13/14</u>	"R" Costs Recurring or "NR" Non-recurring	FY <u>14/15</u>	"R" Costs – Recurring or "NR" Non-recurring	Fund Affected	
<u>Reduction of Residential Impact Fees</u>	<u>\$(338,746)</u>	<u>NR</u>	<u>\$(604,903)</u>	<u>NR</u>	<u>Residential Impact Fee Funds</u>	
_____	\$ _____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	
_____	\$ _____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	
Total:	<u>\$(338,746)</u>		<u>\$(604,903)</u>			

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.)

Adoption of the Bill will result in an estimated decrease in collected residential impact fees of \$338,746 through the end of FY 2013/14, an estimated decrease in collected residential impact fees of \$604,903 through the end of FY 2014/15, and an estimated decrease in collected residential impact fees of \$1,161,414 over the 24-month term of the ordinance.

The estimates above are calculated as follows and assume that residential construction continues at the same pace as it has for the first 22 months of the existing ordinance:

Fiscal Year Calculation

(Impact Fees (Not-Collected) (1/23/12 through 11/23/13) = \$1,419,514 = \$64,523/Month)

FY 2013/14: 5.25 Months X 100% Reduction X \$64,523/Mo. = \$ 338,746

FY 2014/15: 6.75 Months X 100% Reduction X \$64,523/Mo. = \$ 435,530

+ 5.25 Months X 50% Reduction X \$64,523/Mo. = \$ 169,373

\$ 604,903

Full 24-Month Term of Proposed Ordinance

(Impact Fees (Not-Collected) (1/23/12 through 11/23/13) = \$1,419,514 = \$64,523/Month)

Year 1 (1/23/14 – 1/22/15): 12 Months X 100% Reduction X \$64,523 = \$ 774,276

Year 2 (1/23/15 – 1/22/16): 12 Months X 50% Reduction X \$64,523 = \$ 338,138

\$1,161,414

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 Bill revises Section 14-8.14(E) SFCC 1987.

2. Consequences of Not Enacting This Bill/Resolution:

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

Any incentive effects of the Bill would not be available for residential construction if the Bill is not enacted.

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.

None.

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.

Adoption of the Bill will continue to make residential construction less expensive and will maintain consistency with the way that residential impact fees have been assessed during the term of the existing ordinance. This may be particularly important at a time of continued uncertainty regarding residential construction. Residential construction projects create construction jobs and construction material purchases and generate gross receipts tax revenue for the city. Net new gross receipts tax (GRT) revenue that accrues to the city through the direct and secondary economic effects of residential construction has been shown to exceed the amount of uncollected impact fees.

Adoption of the Bill will reduce the amount of impact fees available for use by the city.

ACTION SHEET
CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE MEETING OF 02/12/14
ITEM FROM FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING OF 02/03/14

ISSUE:

24. Request for Approval of an Ordinance Relating to Impact Fees, Section 14-8.14 SFCC 1987; Amending Section 14-8.14(E) to Modify the Amount of Impact Fees Assessed for Residential Developments; and Making Such Other Stylistic or Grammatical Changes that are Necessary. (Councilor Wurzburger) (Matthew O'Reilly)

Committee Review:

Public Works Committee (approved)	12/09/13
City Council (request to publish) (approved)	12/11/13
Capital Improvements Advisory Committee (approved)	12/12/13
Planning Commission (denied)	12/19/13
Finance Committee (postponed)	01/07/14
City Council (public hearing) (postponed)	01/08/14
City Council (public hearing)	02/12/14

Fiscal Impact – Yes

FINANCE COMMITTEE ACTION: APPROVED AS DISCUSSION ITEM

SPECIAL CONDITIONS OR AMENDMENTS

Approved with amendment to Bill and amendment to FIR.

STAFF FOLLOW-UP:

VOTE	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
COUNCILOR BUSHEE		X	
COUNCILOR CALVERT	Excused		
COUNCILOR DIMAS	X		
COUNCILOR IVES	X		
CHAIRPERSON DOMINGUEZ			

END OF CONSENT CALENDAR DISCUSSION

DISCUSSION

24. **REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO IMPACT FEES, SECTION 14-8.14 SFCC 1987; AMENDING SECTION 14-8.14(E) TO MODIFY THE AMOUNT OF IMPACT FEES ASSESSED FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS; AND MAKING SUCH OTHER STYLISTIC OR GRAMMATICAL CHANGES THAT ARE NECESSARY (COUNCILOR WURZBURGER. (MATTHEW O'REILLY) Committee Review: Public Works Committee (approved) 12/09/13; City Council (request to publish) (approved) 12/11/13; Capital Improvements Advisory Committee (approved) 12/12/13; Planning Commission (denied) 12/19/13; Finance Committee (postponed) 01/07/14; City Council (public hearing) (postponed) 01/08/14; and City Council (public hearing) 02/12/14. Financial Impact – Yes.**

An amendment sheet with proposed amendments to Bill No. 2013-44 on this bill, is incorporated herewith to these minutes as Exhibit "2."

Mr. O'Reilly said there is an amendment sheet on the Committee members desk to correct a typographical error on page 2 of the Ordinance [Exhibit "2"]. Mr. O'Reilly said there is a numerical error on packet page 13, under FY 14/15. The number shown of \$516,184 is the cumulative total for 13/14, 14/15 fiscal years. The correct number in column 4 should be \$387,138.

Matthew O'Reilly noted the sponsor has introduced a Substitute Bill which is in the Committee packet. Mr. O'Reilly reviewed the proposed bill. Please see the Substitute Bill for specifics of this presentation.

Responding to Councilor Bushee, Mr. O'Reilly said the Planning Commission recommended denial, and the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee recommended approval of the first bill. The Planning Commission and the CIAC haven't seen the substitute bill, but that will be done if that is what the Sponsor would like. He said, "We have received all of the relevant input that is necessary from these committees and to be quite frank, I think this is something for the Governing Body to hash out."

Councilor Bushee said she personally would like their review, noting this is changed completely from what they sought.

Councilor Ives said this is an attempt to stimulate the residential construction by not reimposing impact fees back to the 100% levels, and if we don't take action, those fees will go back up to 100%.

Mr. O'Reilly said, "Unfortunately, the fees have already gone up to 100% because the Ordinance couldn't be adopted before the end of the old Ordinance. He said the intent of the original bill two years ago was partly to try to stimulate residential construction, which is a large part of the construction industry. He said what is important is that we allow continued recovery.

Councilor Ives said it makes sense to send this onto the Council at this time because of timing issues, and he believes it is appropriate at this point.

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

VOTE: The motion was approved on a voice vote, with Councilor Ives, Councilor Dimas and Chair Dominguez voting in favor of the motion and Councilor Bushee voting against the motion.

25. STAFF SUMMARY ON PARKS BOND AUDIT. (ISAAC PINO)

This item is postponed to the next meeting of the Finance Committee on February 17, 2014.

26. REQUEST FOR ACCEPTANCE AND PRESENTATION OF THE CITY OF SANTA FE COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUN 30, 2013. (TERESITA GARCIA AND MARTY MATHISEN)

This item is postponed to the next meeting of the Finance Committee on February 17, 2014.

27. OTHER FINANCIAL INFORMATION:

There was no other financial information.

28. MATTERS FROM THE COMMITTEE

A copy of Bills and Resolutions Scheduled for introduction by members of the Governing Body, for the Finance Committee meeting of February 3, 2014, is incorporated herewith to these minutes as Exhibit "3."

Chair Dominguez introduced the following Resolution on behalf of Councilor Calvert:

A Resolution authorizing and approving submission of a completed application for final assistance and project approval to the New Mexico Finance Authority for the procurement of seven heavy duty transit buses. A copy of the Resolution is incorporated herewith to these minutes as Exhibit "4."

Mr. Tapia said he will answer any questions about this Resolution.

Councilor Ives asked if we always bring these kinds of items to Finance and/or Council for action.

Mr. Tapia said he doesn't know, but he thinks it's appropriate to come to this Committee.

ACTION SHEET
ITEM FROM THE
PUBLIC WORKS/CIP AND LAND USE COMMITTEE MEETING
OF
MONDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2013

ITEM 10

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 14-8.14(E) SFCC 1987 TO EXTEND FOR ONE YEAR THE PERIOD DURING WHICH IMPACT FEES FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS SHALL BE REDUCED BY 100% AND TO REDUCE IMPACT FEES FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS BY 50% FOR A PERIOD OF ONE YEAR THEREAFTER; AND MAKING SUCH OTHER STYLISTIC OR GRAMMATICAL CHANGES THAT ARE NECESSARY (COUNCILOR WURZBURGER) (MATTHEW O'REILLY)

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE ACTION: Approved on Consent

SPECIAL CONDITIONS OR AMENDMENTS:

STAFF FOLLOW UP:

VOTE	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
CHAIRPERSON WURZBURGER			
COUNCILOR CALVERT	X		
COUNCILOR IVES	X		
COUNCILOR RIVERA	X		
COUNCILOR TRUJILLO	X		

e. **CASE #2013-72. KAVANAUGH FAMILY TRANSFER SUBDIVISION.**

MOTION: Commissioner Padilla moved, seconded by Commissioner Harris, to approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, in Case #2013-72, Kavanaugh Family Transfer Subdivision, as presented.

VOTE: The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote, with Commissioners Bemis, Harris, Lindell, Padilla, Pava, Schackel-Bordegary and Villarreal voting in favor of the motion and no one voting against [7-0].

f. **CASE #2013-103. LOT 6A, PLAZA LA PRENSA, SOUTHWEST BUSINESS PARK PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAT.**

MOTION: Commissioner Villarreal moved, seconded by Commissioner Bemis, to approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, in Case #2013-69, Saiz Family Transfer Subdivision, as presented.

VOTE: The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote, with Commissioners Bemis, Harris, Lindell, Padilla, Pava, Schackel-Bordegary and Villarreal voting in favor of the motion and no one voting against [7-0].

E. **OLD BUSINESS**

There was no old business

F. **NEW BUSINESS**

1. **AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 14-8.14(E) SFCC 1987, TO EXTEND FOR ONE YEAR THE PERIOD DURING WHICH IMPACT FEES FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS SHALL BE REDUCED BY 100% AND TO REDUCE IMPACT FEES FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS BY 50% FOR A PERIOD OF ONE YEAR THEREAFTER; AND MAKING SUCH OTHER STYLISTIC OR GRAMMATICAL CHANGES THAT ARE NECESSARY (COUNCILOR REBECCA WURZBURGER). (MATTHEW O'REILLY)**

A Memorandum dated November 27, 2012, with attachments, to the Planning Commission, Capital Improvements Advisory Committee, Public Works, CIP & Land Use Committee, Finance Committee and City Council, in this matter, is incorporated herewith to these minutes as Exhibit "7."

The staff report was presented by Matthew O'Reilly from his Memorandum, with Attachments, dated November 27, 2013, which is in the Commission packet. Please see Exhibit "6" for specifics of this presentation. Mr. O'Reilly reviewed the spreadsheets attached to Exhibit "6," noting that the spreadsheets only cover the first 22 months, and the City did not collect approximately \$1.4 million in impact fees during

the term when impact fees were not being collected. He said staff estimates when the term of the Ordinance expires, that figure will be approximately \$1.5 million in impact fees. During this time residential construction increased by 35%, and the net revenue exceeds the amount of impact fees not collected by \$394,777.

Mr. O'Reilly commented that this is not to say that the increase in GRTs is tied to the fact that there were no impact fees during this time, noting studies done in this regard around the country have been inconclusive as to whether the reduction in impact fees actually spurs residential construction.

Mr. O'Reilly noted this Ordinance was unanimously approved by the City's Public Works Committee. It was also approved by the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee. He said Councilor Ives has proposed an amendment that the Ordinance be reviewed after the first 12 months, before the City proceeds to the 50% level of the Ordinance.

Public Hearing

Speaking to the Request

There was no one speaking for or against the request.

The Public Testimony Portion of the Public Hearing Was Closed

The Commissioners commented and asked questions as follows:

- Commissioner Lindell said the intent of the Ordinance was to stimulate previously planned, residential projects which were stalled due to difficulty in obtaining construction financing. She asked if the backlog of previously planned construction, about which Mr. O'Reilly spoke, has been cleared.

Mr. O'Reilly said there is a sizable backlog, and we continue to have a sizeable backlog, noting, "There are many many residential projects that have been approved previously, where the actual housing has not commenced yet."

- Commissioner Lindell said in going through the very long list of single family homes, she is troubled that on a \$1 million home, we leave \$4,000 in uncollected fees, which is less than ½ % on a home like that. She said, "I don't feel that is something that stops the homeowner from building that home." She said there is some development, some builders that build numerous single family homes. She said, "I don't think that affected their plans to build at all, and the monies saved weren't passed on to the purchasers and it was kind of windfall money for them [builders]. Some of the larger builders that do subdivisions, I don't think they lowered their prices to reflect this."

Commissioner Lindell continued, "So, I think where I'm going with this is I would like to see us do a little bit more analyzing this and I guess I would like to see us go ahead and reduce this to 50%

sooner rather than later. And also to take a look at it, in terms of probably the commercial construction, so we analyze this a little bit more than just a broad, across the board reduction of fees. Because as Director O'Reilly pointed out, this type that I can barely read, just number upon number here, there's a lot of homes in there that I think would be built without this. I don't really think these fees impact people getting financing at this point in time. And even though we've seen an increase of 35%, the other side of that is that people are hurrying to get things done, and once this is taken away completely, then we have a lull in new permits. No one knows the answer to that. The real number is \$1.4 million that we didn't collect. You can minus the GRTs, and the Building Permit Fees, you can slice and dice those numbers however you want to, but the actual number is \$1.4 million that we didn't collect."

Commissioner Lindell continued, "I don't know if extending this at 100% for another year is necessary. We are in some tough financial times with the City with some things that are going on, and I don't know at this point if this is really stopping people from getting financing and accomplishing what the intent of the Ordinance was."

- Commissioner Harris thanked staff for the spreadsheet which makes it easier to quantify the effect of the Ordinance. He said he, unlike Commissioner Lindell, doesn't feel the need to discriminate, in terms of construction evaluation. He said the important numbers, to him, have to do with the averages. He said 279 permits were issued for a construction valuation of \$64,397,036, which averages to \$230,813 per home. On a square footage basis, the same number of permits, divided into the heated square footage of 509,533, is 1,826 square feet. He said that number times the average square footage cost of \$131.30 there is an average of \$239,790. He thinks the greater good is served. He is interested in the aggregate and those numbers are encouraging. He said even some young families can afford that cost. He said, "I think it's been effective and I would support its continuation."
- Commissioner Schackel-Bordegary said she appreciates the commentary by Commissioners Lindell and Harris. She said she is unsure if we can attribute the increase of 35% in residential building permits to the reduction in impact fees as has been stated, especially over this time period because it has been since 2008 which was the beginning of the recession and it has improved gradually over time. She said, "That said, the homebuilding industry is very important to Santa Fe's economy, and we have to consider that."

Commissioner Schackel-Bordegary said she appreciates the second point about valuation of homes. She said, "I just did a quick tally of the 279 units, and I appreciate the spreadsheet analysis as well. About 16 of them are just over \$500,000, and is a threshold for me that does hold some meaning. I'm living in a home that is nowhere near valued at that. I question, from a public infrastructure funding perspective, how responsible it is for our City to forego impact fees on homes of that valuation, particularly when we just annexed as we have. That's what I wanted to say. I think it is always difficult to quantify policies. This is one effort at that, but I do echo... or share the opinion of Commissioner Lindell that homes valued over \$500,000 should not have any impact fees waived. That's just what I believe."

- Commissioner Padilla spoke in favor of the Resolution before the Commission this evening. He said, "Being in the business myself, and having done many single-family homes, and also now working on projects that are impacted by the reduction that has been experienced over the last two years, I think it really has motivated some developers to really move projects forward. I think, as they look at the forecast, or in the future here, the year of impact fees that will remain at zero will really motivate developers to put more inventory into the market. I feel it's not only the \$500,000 plus, but those more affordable housing that's being done by our Housing Trust, Homewise and so forth. That's where the real impact is felt – on the affordable housing.... \$1,000 is significant in being able to add to the value of that house in quality of materials or additional materials in construction. So the difference, over the last two years, of 73 additional houses isn't a big number, but I would venture to say in the next 12 month period, because of the extension of this, if it does go through and continues in the route it's going now to City Council, I think it will motivate a number of developers to move forward. It does spur construction. It does speak positively to the City's concern to contractors and developers that we feel what you're going through. We understand what it takes to develop a project. So I definitely will be voting In favor of this Ordinance.

 - Commissioner Pava said he is generally in favor of extending the period of impact fee reduction. He thanked his fellow Commissioners for pointing out nuances and detail he didn't pay attention to, particularly Commissioner Lindell and Commissioner Schackel-Bordegary. He said, "What I see here is generally a good idea, to continue to stimulate the construction industry and whatnot and provide housing. But I do see, I can't ignore the large gap, if I understand this correctly, that a million dollar house would collect \$4,147 in impact fees, and a mobile home placement \$3,180. And what I would go on record as saying.... and there are a lot more mobile home placements than million dollar homes and rightly so, because Santa Fe is more skewed toward that way with the income gap as this recession continues."

 - Commissioner Pava continued, "I would encourage, in fact admonish our City decision-makers to consider revising this, because this is a recessive tax, frankly. And although I can support, for good reason, the extension of this, I think this needs to be tweaked. I don't know what the threshold should be, \$500,000, \$750,000, \$1 million. I don't think it's fair to have such a small difference in impact fees for such a great difference in the value of these kinds of homes. This I think could be studied more. I would be more than willing to help out with that, or.... That's all I have to say."

 - Commissioner Villarreal said Commissioner Pava's comments brought to her attention the inequities of how the impact fees are collected or based on the valuation of a home. She asked Director O'Reilly to talk about how impact fees are used in the City.
-]
- Mr. O'Reilly said, "The City applies its impact fees through the enabling state legislation, the Development Fees Act. Currently, the City collects impact fees for roads, parks, police and fire. The difference between impact fees that we collect and other revenues the City takes in, such as building permit fees, or GRTs or other kinds of development applications, is that they go into the General Fund and can be used in any way by the City. Impact fees, development fees, defined by

State statutes can only be used for specific things. Roadway impact fees can only be used for roadways, to construct roadways, and more specifically, only those roadways that are part of the City's impact fee capital improvements plan and the same for parks, police and fire. A small portion of impact fees, up to 3%, can be used for administration of the fees, but other than that, they have to be applied in only those areas. So these aren't revenues that can be moved into the General Fund and used to operate the City."

Mr. O'Reilly noted the Long Range Planning Division has contracted with a consultant to redo the City's Impact Fee/Capital Improvements Plan/Land Use Assumptions, which is required to be done every 5 years. He said the bottom line is that impact fees have to be calculated on the impacts the homes will have on the City's infrastructure and described that process.

Mr. O'Reilly said although it may seem inequitable, a \$1 million home does not create 3 times the impacts of a \$333,000 home, for example. He said the Study is on-going and a new set of impact fees will be brought to this Commission and the City Council. He said The Development Fees Act requires a municipality adopting the impact fees to revise its fees and assumptions every 5 years.

Mr. O'Reilly said if the Ordinance is adopted and residential fees stay at zero, it won't matter the first year, but when it ramps back up and we apply the full value, what they are will make a difference. It may be that there is something in recent research that shows that larger buildings do or do not create more impacts. He said he understands the research is the opposite, and the larger buildings generate less VMTs than a lot of the smaller residences do.

Mr. O'Reilly said staff has been advised it is not possible for the City to charge impact fees on larger buildings and homes, and not charge on smaller homes. He said in 2008 when the consultant prepared the current fee schedule, the fees weren't those adopted by the Governing Body. The fees adopted are only 60% of what the consultant recommended, noting that is fairly common around the nation.

- Commissioner Villarreal thanked Mr. O'Reilly for the information. She said she didn't vote for this the last time.
- Commissioner Schackel-Bordegary said, in response to Commissioner Padilla's comment about homebuilders being able to add more value to homes in the lower threshold range. She asked, in the analysis of how this Ordinance is working, if someone tried to quantify whether that was true – or did all of the funds go into the hands of out-of-state developers who built much needed affordable homes. She said this is a local economy issue as well.

Mr. O'Reilly said it is hard to get into the pro formas of the different developers, and find out where things are going. However, there have been reports in the news media, and statements made by large builders like Cen-Tex. He said they have made statements to the effect that lowering the fees doesn't do much to their pro forma, and they will move forward based on market conditions. He said many of the permits were not pulled by Cen-Tex, but by individual people building houses. He said what he has seen for the past 22 months is, when you tell them they don't have to pay

\$3,500 in impact fees they are relieved, and many times they haven't known it was coming. He said it makes an immediate difference in the person's finances – whether they put it into the house or save the money for something else. He said this is a good thing and this is money that can be spent in the community. He said, however, no one can say whether they make the decision to build the house just because of that, and he won't say that. However, he does know it helps.

- Commissioner Pava said he appreciates Mr. O'Reilly's explanation and it is complicated. He said, "To paraphrase the words of somebody who just recently passed away, 'It just isn't right.' He said when he sees a \$50,000 mobile home placement at 5% and a million dollar house paying .5%, it just isn't right.
- Chair Spray said he opposed this bill when it came to the Commission the last time. He said his assumption is that the impact fees are created because there is a need to provide money for roads, parks, police and fire. He said if houses and structures are being built, there is an impact. He asked if the both the GRTs and impact fees go into the General Fund.

Mr. O'Reilly said no, the GRTs do go to the General Fund, but impact fees go into segregated funds only for those specific uses.

- Chair Spray said he was speaking of the building permits.

Mr. O'Reilly said those go into the General Fund.

- Chair Spray said, from a political standpoint, you might be able to trade off having to spend citizen funds on roads, parks, police and fire, which everybody would be in favor of, versus taking GRTs which goes into a general pot which can go to whomever we want, and there are no restrictions on those funds. He said, "The way this is structured is, I would say we're either in or out. If we have impact for a reason, and I assume we do, then we should make the money available for something which presumably is needed. Because when we lay it out and those buildings come on line, they have an impact. That's why it was there in the first place. If they don't have an impact, let's stimulate the industry forever and eliminate the entire tax, and then you can keep right on going. What you're saying when you waive it off, you don't need to spend it, and I don't know what the.... you mentioned the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee. Is that a part of the allocation of these funds."

Mr. O'Reilly said the City Capital Improvements Advisory Committee, is an advisory committee that makes recommendations to the Governing Body, and reviews proposal for the expenditure of impact fees and related things. It only deals with capital impacts, and not all the other things you do as Planning Commissioners.

- Chair Spray said in terms of fairness, then we should waive the whole thing, because if it is reduced to zero, what we are saying that there is no impact, so why should people pay at all. If there is an impact, then we should put that impact fee in place.

- Commissioner Harris said in terms of impact to our roads, parks, police and fire, the far greater impact in cost to the City and the citizens of Santa Fe has been undertaken by the annexation that we all deal with. He said, "To me, 279 homes, during this two-year period is incremental, given the scale of what the City has undertaken. I think it had an effect on industry, one of the few industries in this town. When you say many industries, what are they. We have government, we have tourism and we have construction, and that's about it."
- Chair Spray said, "Many industries would be suffering in that sense, but I would be glad to talk about what the issue is with the annexation, and I had issues with that, if you recall, at the last meeting because there was no provision built into the impact statement that we had for where that revenue was going to come, as well. So we can debate that. But I just think in this particular case, it's not a question of giving a break to someone. The idea was to be able to stimulate this and bring in higher gross receipts taxes that go to one particular fund. But if we have an impact fee in the first place, why did we, the citizens, create an impact fee -- because there is an impact. And if we allow things to be built and then do not provide the roads, the parks, the police and the fire to do that, what are we doing. We can only have it one of two ways. We say we need that, or we don't need that. And if we don't need that, then we should waive it and put it to zero in my judgment."
- Commissioner Bemis asked about schools -- if we are building a lot of homes in an area, are the schools included.

Mr. O'Reilly said School Boards are a separate governmental subdivision of the State, with its own funding mechanisms. However, we do charge impact fees for school construction, and sometimes they pay them.

Mr. O'Reilly said, "Impact fees are a funding source for all different kinds of capital improvements. Other funding sources are bonds and others. The amount the City receives from impact fees cannot pay for the large construction projects that the City undertakes, because we don't collect enough in impact fees. He said our impact fees and building permit fees are close to the highest in the State of New Mexico, but they can't, alone, pay for some of these things. He said it's not that if the impact fees are set to zero we're saying there is no impact. I believe what you can say is that we believe that we can mitigate the impacts through other methods for the short term that these impact fees are set to zero, again through bonds and other things. We just recently issued a \$30 million Parks Bonds. We don't collect anywhere near that in Parks impact fees. It's just another funding source the City can use for some of these things, but by no means does it mean that there aren't any impacts, or that those improvements might not take place."

- Commissioner Padilla said he has one final comment. He said it is 279 single-family residences, the majority \$250,000 to \$300,000. 279 new homeowners. He said if you look at projects identified for 5 or more family buildings, 54 units, 42 units, 7 units, 20 units and 53 units, those are new, residential apartment units that have come on the market. He said we need more quality housing. He said, "Over the past two years, 279 new homes have been constructed. They've benefitted from the impact fees not collected, and as Mr. O'Reilly has said, they stepped up and

paid all the other fees they've been assessed. The impact fee is a minor item to it, but a major item to a homeowner or a developer of 54 or more units in their final pro forma. I just wanted to make that statement."

- Commissioner Schackel-Bordegary said it was an excellent debate, and impact fees are "an animal all of their own" having to do with our State legislation. However, from what she has heard here this evening, and based on her personal experience in the design and building industry, it has made a difference. It may be more symbolic than anything else, but it's made a difference.

MOTION: Commissioner Schackel-Bordegary moved, seconded by Commissioner Padilla, to recommend approval of the extension of the temporary reduction in residential impact fees, as outlined in the Staff Memorandum to the Commission.

DISCUSSION: Commissioner Lindell said she won't support this, because she believes we can come up with something else. She said just extending it seems like the easy way to deal with it. She said, "Given some more thought and analysis, we can do better than just extending this. I'm for finding a way to stimulate this industry, and jobs, but I just think we're grabbing onto the easy way out of this and there is something that is more effective than this. We just haven't put the work into deciding what that might be. That's my reason for not supporting this."

VOTE: The motion failed to pass on a roll call vote as follows:

For: Commissioner Harris, Commissioner Padilla and Commissioner Schackel-Bordegary.

Against: Commissioner Lindell, Commissioner Pava, Commissioner Villarreal and Commissioner Bemis.

[3-4]

MOTION: Commissioner Villarreal moved, seconded by Commissioner Pava, to recommend denial of the proposed Ordinance to the Governing Body.

VOTE: The motion was approved on a roll call vote as follows:

For: Commissioner Bemis, Commissioner Lindell, Commissioner Pava, Commissioner Schackel-Bordegary and Commissioner Villarreal.

Against: Commissioner Harris and Commissioner Padilla.

[5-2]

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Veneklasen moved to approve the Agenda as published. Mr. Hiatt seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

• Meeting of October 10, 2013

The following changes were made to the Minutes of the October 10, 2013 meeting:

Page 2, 7th paragraph, 1st sentence was changed to read: *“This report provides land use assumptions (growth projections) for the Santa Fe Urban Area, a unified service area, within which the city may annex land...”*

Page 3, 3rd paragraph was changed to read: *“Mr. Liming said yes, they kept it in the service area...”*

Page 3, 4th paragraph from the bottom was changed to read: *“Mr. Martinez asked if Monte Sereno is annexed.”*

Page 4, 5th paragraph, last sentence was changed to read: *“The City would have brought in \$148,144.00 in impact fees in this quarter (July-September 2013) if waived impact fees had been paid.”*

Ms. Van Peski moved to approve the Minutes of the October 10, 2013 meeting as amended. Mr. Hiatt seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

5. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

A. Proposed Bill Extending the Residential Impact Fee Waiver as follows:

- **Waiver of all impact fees through January 22, 2015;**
- **Waiver of 50% of full impact fee amounts from January 23, 2015 through January 22, 2016**

Copies of the Memo (*Exhibit 5a*) from Matthew O'Reilly, Land Use Department Director dated November 27, 2013 regarding the Extension of Temporary Reduction in Residential Impact Fees were distributed in the Commissioners' packets.

Mr. O'Reilly said before the Committee is a proposed bill that is being sponsored by Councilor Wurzburger.

Mr. O'Reilly reported as follows:

- In January 11, 2012, the Governing Body adopted Ordinance No. 2012-2 which reduced residential impact fees by 100% for a period of 24 months beginning on January 23, 2012 and ending on January 22, 2014. The ordinance was part of a series of measures approved by the Governing Body to facilitate economic development and to create construction jobs in response to the economic downturn. These measures included the passage of Ordinance No. 2010-10 and Resolution Nos. 2010-43 and 2011-26, the so-called "sunset" resolutions that extended the expirations of approved building permits and development approvals; and Ordinance No. 2011-17 that reduced the Santa Fe Homes Program fees and affordable percentage requirements. Only residential impact fees (collected for roads, parks, police and fire) were affected by the ordinance.
- The intent of the existing ordinance was to stimulate previously-planned residential projects that may have been stalled due to difficulty in obtaining construction financing by making those projects less expensive to build and therefore easier to finance or otherwise afford by prospective homebuilders thereby creating construction jobs and construction material purchases and generating gross receipts tax revenue for the city.
- The Land Use Department has tracked residential permits since January 23, 2012 (the effective date of the existing ordinance).
- Handouts that were included in the packet contain data on all new single-family and multi-family residential development permitted from January 23, 2012 through November 23, 2013 (the first 22 months that the ordinance has been in effect). The data contains only new residential construction and does not include residential remodels or additions.
- The data reveals that single-family residential construction has increased 32% and that multi-family residential construction has increased from zero to 176 units through November 23, 2013, while the ordinance has been in effect and compared to the 22 months preceding the ordinance. In total, 284 new residential permits were issued compared to 211 in the preceding 22 months – a 35% increase.

- Exhibit "A" contains summaries of the permit data and the total impact fees that would have been collected had the ordinance not been in effect, and compares the uncollected impact fee totals with the gross receipt taxes and building permit fees based on the construction valuation.
- Exhibit "A" also reveals that through November 23, 2013, a total of \$1,419,514 in residential impact fees have been "not collected" during the ordinance period. This breaks down to \$948,890 not-collected for single-family and \$470,624 not-collected for multi-family construction.
- The total net new gross receipts tax and building permit fees generated to date during the ordinance period amount to \$1,155,217 (\$892,329 GRT and \$262,978 Building Permit Fees). Based solely on direct construction valuation, the net new revenue generated is therefore \$264,208 less (\$1,419,514-\$1,155,217) than the amount of impact fees not-collected.
- However, when the net new revenue is adjusted for the secondary effects of economic output through indirect and induced activities related to construction, the new net GRT revenue rises from \$892,239 to \$1,551,313. If these secondary economic effects are included, the result is net revenue that exceeds the amount of impact fees not-collected by \$394,777.

Proposed Bill:

Section 1

Section 1 of the proposed Bill would extend the current temporary reduction in residential impact fees for a period of 12 months beginning on January 23, 2014. On January 23, 2015, residential impact fees would increase to 50% of their full amounts for a period of 12 months. On January 23, 2016, residential impact fees would return to 100% of their full amounts.

The Bill also eliminates the so-called "Old Fee Schedule" to reflect the fact that the four-period during which developments would have been assessed pre-2008, impact fees has since expired. Section 1 also makes a minor clarification to the Fee Schedule regarding attached dwelling units.

Section 2

Section 2 of the Bill makes the ordinance effective immediately upon adoption so that there is no gap between its effect and the expiration of the existing ordinance.

Copies of the Ordinance were distributed in the Commissioners' packets. The Ordinance amends *Section 14-8.14(E) SFCC 1987 to extend for one year the period during which impact fees for residential developments shall be reduced by 100% and to reduce impact fees for residential developments by 50% for a period of one year thereafter; and making such other stylistic or grammatical changes that are necessary.*

DISCUSSION

Chair Walker asked what percentage of the 35% increase was market rate versus affordable.

Mr. O'Reilly said he was not sure, but the affordable units are a very small percentage.

Chair Walker said she was curious as to whether or not the 35% increase (in residential construction) was a rebound from the market- because the stock market has gone up on an upward trend in the last two years. She said this leads to the question as to whether or not the waiving of impact fees had anything to do with the increase; or was this due to other factors.

Ms. Pope asked if they know - in the 22 months when the residential permits went up 35% - what did the construction permits do because they were not subject to the waiver.

Mr. O'Reilly said yes, but first of all a couple of things: the year the City issued the most building permits in the last 10 years was in FY 2005-2006 (July 2005 through June 2006). In the last two fiscal years, the City has issued permits at a level of 84% of that maximum year (in terms of volume of permits issued, not valuations). In valuations, the City is harboring at 67% of the maximum year of 2005-2006. However, construction permits have increased since the waiver. In the last 12 months, there were two months that the City issued more construction permits than the City has in the history of record keeping.

Ms. Van Peski said this is affected by different factors and therefore it is not a potential comparison. She referred to the letter from Clancy Mullen of Duncan Associates where he states that “the *Development Fees Act*” appears to prohibit selective waivers or fee reductions (i.e., those that apply to certain developments or land uses, as opposed to all classes of development), except for affordable housing, unless the city uses other funds to make up for the lost impact fee revenue. She asked Mr. O’Reilly if this is his interpretation as well.

Mr. O’Reilly said absolutely not, that is an error. He said the Cities of Albuquerque, Rio Rancho and Santa Fe have all selectively reduced, not waived, in accordance with the Act, their development fees or impact fees in different ways. In 2009, the City of Albuquerque reduced all impact fees and took them down to zero for people who followed their “green track” program. They renewed this ordinance once it was set to expire. In 2012, the city of Rio Rancho reduced impact fees by 50% for residential and 100% for commercial.

Mr. O’Reilly mentioned that the Act sets limits on the maximum amount of impact fees you can charge, but it does not prohibit you from reducing them and there is no limit on how low the city reduces the fees. He said the Act allows for a waiver for affordable housing.

There was discussion as to whether or not any projects suffered because of the \$1.4 million in impact fees that were not collected in the last 22 months. Mr. O’Reilly explained that there are other funding sources for these projects.

Mr. Hiatt asked if the waiver of impact fees stimulated residential construction and accomplished the goal or intent of the waiver.

Chair Walker said residential construction could have increased for a number of other reasons.

Mr. O’Reilly said during the term of the ordinance, residential construction has increased 35%. He said anecdotally, the City had people coming in asking when this would take effect so that they could build. He noted that the building permit fees and impact fees in Santa Fe are some of the highest fees in the state, and in most categories Santa Fe is higher than other cities.

Mr. Chapman said there are two other problems to keep in mind: 1) appraisals are becoming more and more of a problem because appraisals are coming in low for Santa Fe. 2) There will be a new set of rules for documenting residential financing, which will impact first-time homebuyers, individuals who are self-employed and people who have their own money. It is harder to document exactly what their earnings are. Therefore, the amount of documentation that is going to be required (starting in January 2014), is going to increase dramatically and the fines to the lenders will also be dramatic, should they fail to comply. This could greatly impact the ability to provide housing for people and to meet the demand.

Mr. Chapman mentioned that rental units are becoming more popular.

Ms. Veneklasen said the rental market is higher than it has been and the American dream of owning a house is not the American dream anymore. There are a lot of people who are going to rent for the rest of their lives because they can't qualify to buy a house.

Mr. O'Reilly noted that the proposed Ordinance has been approved by the Public Works Committee, as written, including the one-year extension and then the second year at 50%. At last night's City Council meeting, Councilor Ives proposed an amendment to the Ordinance to do a review at the end of the first year to see where the City is at that point in time. The Ordinance will go before the Finance Committee at the beginning of January 2014 and will go before the Planning Commission next week.

Ms. Van Peski moved to accept the proposed Ordinance as amended at the City Council December 11, 2013 meeting to provide that the Governing Body will review it at the end of 2014. Ms. Veneklasen seconded the motion. The motion passed with 1 in opposition.

~~6. **INFORMATION ITEMS**~~

~~There were no informational items.~~

~~7. **MATTERS FROM THE CHAIR / COMMITTEE / STAFF**~~

~~Mr. Liming noted that Clancy Mullen of Duncan Associates will be at the next Committee meeting in January.~~