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# Inter Mountain West Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arizona</th>
<th>Colorado</th>
<th>Utah</th>
<th>Idaho</th>
<th>Montana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avondale</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>American Fork</td>
<td>Hailey</td>
<td>Billings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>Castle Rock</td>
<td>Brigham City</td>
<td>Kellogg</td>
<td>Bozeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carefree</td>
<td>Eaton</td>
<td>Clearfield</td>
<td>Nampa</td>
<td>Missoula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa Grande</td>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>Clinton City</td>
<td>Post Falls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eloy</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>Draper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Mirage</td>
<td>Greeley</td>
<td>Farmington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagstaff</td>
<td>Johnstown</td>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kaysville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodyear</td>
<td>Pitkin County</td>
<td>North Logan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoria</td>
<td>Pueblo</td>
<td>Pleasant Grove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Creek</td>
<td>Steamboat Springs</td>
<td>Salt Lake County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottsdale</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Valley Sewer District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish Fork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolleson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Springville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wellsville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Jordan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Woods Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact Fee Basics

- New development’s pro rata share of infrastructure costs
  - At last count 22 states have enabling legislation

- Not a revenue raising mechanism
  - A way to provide growth-related infrastructure

- Fee payers must receive a benefit
  - Timing of improvement
  - Geographic service areas
  - Accounting and expenditure controls
General Process

- Demographic analysis
  - Validate need for fees
- Determine capital costs
- Evaluate need for credits
- Public participation
  - Liaison committee
- Decisions by elected officials
  - Percentage of maximum supportable fee
  - Multi-year phase in
General Methods/Best Applications

- **Plan-Based**
  - Usually reflects an adopted CIP or master plan

- **Incremental Expansion**
  - Formula based approach using current levels of service

- **Cost Recovery**
  - Typically used for oversized facilities
Evaluate Need for Credits

- **Site specific**
  - Developer constructs a capital facility included in fee calculations

- **Debt service**
  - Avoid double payment due to existing or future bonds

- **Dedicated revenues**
  - Local option sales tax, gas tax
New and Innovative Approaches

- Progressive residential fee schedules
- Impact fees that increase with distance from urban areas
- Link fees to plans and a funding strategy for infrastructure
- City/County cooperation to implement fees
Innovative Examples

- Peoria, AZ
  - Tiered concept to encourage infill

- Scottsdale, AZ
  - Lower utility fees in the older part of the city and higher fees in new growth areas

- Suffolk, VA
  - Two-tiered approach for allocating capital costs
  - Environmental incentive that provided reimbursements for eliminating private well and septic systems
**Innovative Examples (continued)**

- **Missoula, MT**
  - Progressive housing multipliers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons Per Household - City of Missoula, 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Square Feet =&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Detached and Mobile Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Sizes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons Per Household - Unincorporated Missoula County, 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Square Feet =&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Detached and Mobile Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Sizes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Innovative Examples (continued)

- Manatee County, FL
  - Road fee calibrated by average travel time

![Map showing Minutes To Work by travel time ranges (20-23, 24-26, 27-38)]
Innovative Examples (continued)
Innovative Examples (continued)

Greeley, CO

- Tiered road fee based on VMT
  - As density and mix of development decreases VMT increases
  - Fees should vary by Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) based on Vehicle Miles of Travel
  - Geographic service areas determined by $/trip
Innovative Examples (continued)

- Average Vehicle Miles Traveled
Innovative Examples (continued)

- Collection and Expenditure Zones
Other Financing Mechanisms
Examples

- **Stormwater & Transportation Utilities**
  - Greeley, CO – stormwater fee of $45 per single family unit annually
  - Ashland, OR – transportation utility charges $39 per month on utility bill

- **Wheel Tax**
  - Lincoln, NE - $39 annual fee for transportation projects
Examples (continued)

- Special Taxing Districts/MSTUs
  - Over 1/3 of Florida counties use

- Excise/Development Taxes
  - Boulder, CO – transportation and housing excise taxes

- Jurisdictional Revenue Sharing
  - Westminster/Thornton, CO – sharing of sales tax
## Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Financing Funding Criteria</th>
<th>Revenue Potential</th>
<th>Technical Ease</th>
<th>Proportionate to Demand</th>
<th>Public Acceptance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonds</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Districts</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Exactions</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Fees</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excise Taxes</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Tax</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Charges</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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History

Location

Eastern Plaines – Douglas County on the West, Arapahoe on the North, Lincoln County on the East, and El Paso County in the south
State Highway 86, Us 24 and Interstate 70 pass through the County. The County covers 1,869 square miles.

Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>6,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>9,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>19,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>21,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>21,996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Development

Single-family residential developments
Subdivisions lot size 3 to 10 acres
Rezones 35 to 40 acre parcels A-1
Agricultural – 60+ acre parcels

Regulations

Zoning
Initial 1966

Subdivision
Initial 1975
1041 Regulations
1994 – Adopted only the Public Utilities and New Communities sections.

Master Plan / Growth Management Plan
1982 Growth Management Plan
1996 Current Master Plan

Impact Fees / Exactions

1980’s
Board of County Commissioners established a two tier road fee which could be levied against new subdivisions. $1,000 tier 1 and $500 tier two.

1990’s
Board of County Commissioners established a formula to calculate a Road impact fee taking into consideration the road classification and estimated traffic. The fee was restricted for improvements within 3 miles of the site.

2000’s

2003 the County initiates a new growth related Impact Fee Study, as a result of the passage of SB 15 in 2002.

2004 Implemented the Impact Fee Structure to provide for Capital improvements based on new development. The fees for Road and Bridge, Recreation Facilities, Sheriff and Public Facilities.

Results

Hopes and Desires