

Town of Mead, Colorado

Non-Utility Impact Fee Study



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Section 1 - Introduction and Assumptions	5
1.1. Introduction.....	5
1.2. Overview of the Study	5
1.3. Overview of the Impact Fee Calculation Process	5
1.4. Development Impact Fee Authority	5
1.5. Calculation Methodologies	6
1.6. Reliance on Data	7
Section 2 - Land Use Assumptions	8
2.1. Impact Fee Authority	8
2.2. Land Use Assumption Requirements	8
2.3. Service Areas	8
2.4. Key Requirements for Future Growth and Development.....	8
2.5. Occupancy Density Assumptions.....	9
Section 3 - Police Vehicles and Equipment Fee Calculation.....	10
3.1. Introduction.....	10
3.2. Existing Level of Service	10
3.3. Planned Capital Needs	10
3.4. Police Vehicles and Equipment Impact Fee Calculation	10
3.4.1 Existing Facilities and Planned Improvements.....	10
3.4.2 Service Units.....	10
3.4.3 Proposed Police Vehicles and Equipment Impact Fee	12
Section 4 - Municipal Facilities Fee Calculation	13
4.1. Introduction.....	13
4.2. Existing Level of Service	13
4.3. Planned Improvements.....	13
4.4. Proposed Town Facility Impact Fee Calculation.....	13
4.4.1 Service Population	13
4.4.2 Proposed Municipal Facilities Impact Fee	14



Section 5 - Storm Drainage and Streets Fee Calculation 15

5.1. Storm Drainage Introduction 15

5.2. Storm Drainage Planned Improvements 15

5.3. Storm Drainage Component Fee Calculation 15

5.3.1 Service Units 15

5.3.2 Proposed Storm Drainage Fee Component 16

5.4. Streets Introduction 17

5.5. Trip Generation Rates 17

5.5.1 Average Weekday Vehicle Trip Ends (VTE) 18

5.5.2 Trip Adjustment Factors 18

5.5.3 Average Trip Length 18

5.5.4 Trip Length Weight Factor 19

5.5.5 Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) 19

5.6. Total VMT 19

5.7. Planned Street Improvements 19

5.8. System Value 20

5.9. Proposed Streets Fee Component Calculation 20

5.9.1 Cost per VMT and Proposed Fee 20

5.9.2 Proposed Storm Drainage and Streets Fee 22

Section 6 - Parks Fee Calculation 23

6.1. Introduction 23

6.2. Existing Level of Service 23

6.3. Planned Improvements 23

6.4. Proposed Parks Impact Fee 23

6.4.1 Service Units 23

6.4.2 Planned Improvements 24

6.4.3 Proposed Parks Impact Fee 24

Executive Summary

Willdan Financial Services “Willdan” was retained by the Town of Mead, Colorado (“Town”) to conduct a Non-Utility Development Impact Fee Study (“Study”). This report details the results of the Study analysis for the forecast fiscal period, 2020-2038.

The Town of Mead currently assesses impact fees for Municipal facilities, storm drainage, streets and parks to new development to help offset the cost new development places on the respective systems as they develop within the Town limits. The current fees vary by development type (single family, multifamily, commercial/retail, office & institutional and industrial). As part of this study a new fee category was established for police vehicles and equipment.

Willdan conducted an analysis of the costs to provide capacity to new development by examining existing assets as well as planned capital facilities that are required to serve new development. The approach used to calculate the fees for each area varied upon the circumstances of each fee, but all adhere to Colorado State law.

Tables ES-1 through ES-5, illustrates the fees comparisons by development type. Residential fees are displayed on a per dwelling unit basis and non-residential fees on a per 1,000 square foot basis.

The Engineering News Record (ENR) 20-Cities Construction Cost Index (CCI) estimates the increase in construction costs over time. The current 5-year cost increase is 2.13% in construction costs. We recommend that the fees be increased in future years by the 5-year construction cost increase.

Table ES-1
Single Family Residential Impact Fee Comparison

Fee	Current	2021	Difference \$	Difference %
Police	\$0	\$508	\$508	n/a
Municipal Facilities	1,772	4,457	2,685	152%
Storm Drainage & Streets	3,257	6,167	2,910	89%
Parks	<u>2,776</u>	<u>2,750</u>	<u>(26)</u>	<u>(1%)</u>
Total	\$7,805	\$13,882	\$6,077	78%

Table ES-2
Multifamily Residential Impact Fee Comparison

Fee	Current	2021	Difference \$	Difference %
Police	\$0	\$258	\$258	n/a
Municipal Facilities	1,252	2,267	1,015	81%
Storm Drainage & Streets	2,334	4,237	1,903	82%
Parks	<u>1,961</u>	<u>1,399</u>	<u>(562)</u>	<u>(29%)</u>
Total	\$5,547	\$8,161	\$2,614	47%



**Table ES-3
Commercial Impact Fee Comparison**

Fee	Current	2021	Difference \$	Difference %
Police	\$0	\$200	\$200	n/a
Municipal Facilities	1,040	1,095	55	5%
Storm Drainage & Streets ⁽¹⁾	<u>3,010</u>	<u>3,881</u>	<u>871</u>	<u>29%</u>
Total	\$4,050	\$5,176	\$1,126	28%

**Table ES-4
Office and Institutional Impact Fee Comparison**

Fee	Current	2021	Difference \$	Difference %
Police	\$0	\$254	\$254	n/a
Municipal Facilities	1,730	1,390	(340)	(20%)
Storm Drainage & Streets ⁽¹⁾	<u>1,390</u>	<u>2,913</u>	<u>1,523</u>	<u>110%</u>
Total	\$3,120	\$4,557	\$1,464	46%

**Table ES-5
Industrial Impact Fee Comparison**

Fee	Current	2021	Difference \$	Difference %
Police	\$0	\$99	\$99	n/a
Municipal Facilities	940	543	(397)	(42%)
Storm Drainage & Streets ⁽¹⁾	<u>760</u>	<u>1,622</u>	<u>862</u>	<u>113%</u>
Total	\$1,700	\$2,264	\$564	33%



Section 1 - Introduction and Assumptions

1.1. Introduction

Willdan Financial Services “Willdan” was retained by the Town of Mead, Colorado (“Town”) to conduct a Non-Utility Development Impact Fee Study (“Study”). This report details the results of the Study analysis for the forecast fiscal period, 2020 through 2038.

1.2. Overview of the Study

The impact fee study was a collaboration between Willdan and the Town. Willdan reviewed data and assumptions with Town staff, specifically existing development units, growth projections used in developing the land use assumptions (demographic data), and the existing and future capital needs to develop impact fees. Growth projections generally conform to the Town’s 2018 Comprehensive Plan.

1.3. Overview of the Impact Fee Calculation Process

This Study presents an overview of the concepts employed in the development of the analysis contained herein. The analysis is followed by a discussion of the data, assumptions and results associated with each component of the study. Finally, appendices with detailed schedules are presented for further review of the data, assumptions and calculations which drive the results presented in this Study. The report is organized as follows:

- Executive Summary
- Section 1 - Introduction
- Section 2 – Land Use Assumptions
- Section 3 – Police Fee Calculation
- Section 4 – Municipal Facilities Fee Calculation
- Section 5 – Storm Drainage Fee Calculation
- Section 6 – Streets Fee Calculation
- Section 7 – Parks Fee Calculation
- Appendix A – Land Use Assumptions
- Appendix B – Police Fee
- Appendix C – Municipal Facilities Fee
- Appendix D – Storm Drainage Fee
- Appendix E – Streets Fee
- Appendix F – Parks Fee

1.4. Development Impact Fee Authority



The portion of the state statute that pertains to municipalities is Colorado Revised Statute (CRS) §29-20.-104.5. The impact fee study prepared for the Town has been conducted in accordance with the State Statute.

1.5. Calculation Methodologies

Three basic methodologies were examined to calculate the Town’s impact fees. The methodologies are used to determine the best measure of demand created by new development for each impact fee area (parks, Municipal Facilities etc.). The methodologies can be classified as looking at the past, present and future capacities of infrastructure. The three basic methodologies are described below:

Under the **existing standard** method new development will fund the expansion of facilities at the same standard currently serving existing development. The existing standard method results in no facility deficiencies attributable to existing development. This method is often used when a long-range plan for new facilities is not available. Future facilities to serve growth are identified through an annual capital improvement plan and budget process, possibly after completion of a new facility master plan.

The **incremental** (plan based) methodology uses the Town’s capital improvement plan (CIP) and related master plans to determine new developments share of planned projects. Projects that do not add capacity, such as routine maintenance or replacement of existing facilities, are excluded from the fee calculation. Projects that add capacity are further evaluated as to the percentage of the project attributable to existing development versus new development. Only the incremental projects attributable to new development are included in the impact fees.

The third approach is **the system standard average cost** methodology and is a hybrid variation of the existing standard and incremental cost methodologies. Whereas the incremental cost methodology only looks at the projected growth-related capital that is required to serve new development, the system standard average cost methodology looked at all existing investments as well as all capital (growth and non-growth) for the study period. The total costs were then divided by the total development at the end of the study period. Under this method all development (existing and new) contribute capital investments based on their proportionate share of total development.

Table 1-1 summarizes the methodology used to calculate the impact fees for each fee area.



**Table 1-1
Summary of Impact Fee Methodologies**

Fee Area	Methodology
Police	System Standard Average Cost
Municipal Facilities	System Standard Average Cost
Storm Drainage	Incremental
Streets	System Standard Average Cost
Parks	Incremental

1.6. Reliance on Data

During this project, the Town provided Willdan with a variety of technical information, including demographic data. This data was used by Willdan in the process of developing the impact fees. Willdan did not independently assess or test for the accuracy of such data historic or projected but worked with Town staff to better understand the data and believe it to be the best available information at the time of the study.



Section 2 - Land Use Assumptions

2.1. Impact Fee Authority

Impact fees are one-time fees assessed to new development which helps pay for the proportionate share of infrastructure costs new development imposes on a community. Impact fees are charges that are assessed on new development using a standard formula based on specific characteristics such as the type of housing unit or the square footage of the development.

2.2. Land Use Assumption Requirements

The growth projections included in this report generally conform to the Town’s 2018 Comprehensive Plan growth assumptions.

2.3. Service Areas

A key requirement of an impact fee study is the identification of the service area for which the fee will be applied. Accordingly, the Town intends to assess all impact fees using one Town-wide system that serves the entire Town, rather than multiple individual service areas.

2.4. Key Requirements for Future Growth and Development

Existing residential development and population in the Town was identified in data from the US Census’ American Community Survey, 2018 5-Year Estimates. Growth to 2038 was identified in the Town’s Comprehensive Plan, under the “medium” growth scenario.

Existing nonresidential square footage was identified by Town staff. Existing nonresidential employment was identified in data from the US Census Bureau’s OnTheMap application. Growth in employees and corresponding nonresidential building square footage to 2038 was estimated by increasing jobs-housing balance by 10%, per Town staff guidance.

This section of the report identifies the population of the Town as of 2020, number of dwelling units and existing non-residential development and the projection of new development in 2038 for the same metrics. In 2020, the population was 4,523 residents, with 1,516 single family households and 32 multifamily households. Tables 2-1 and 2-2 summarize the incremental development unit projections through 2038.

**Table 2-1
Incremental Development Projections**

Development	2020	2038
Single Family Units	1,516	4,897
Multifamily Units	32	103
Commercial (1,000 sq ft)	400	2,789
Office & Institutional (1,000 sq ft)	206	1,557
Industrial (1,000 sq ft)	295	4,645



**Table 2-2
Incremental Development Summary**

Development	Study Total
Single Family Units	3,381
Multifamily Units	71
Commercial (1,000 sq. ft.)	2,389
Office & Institutional (1,000 sq. ft.)	1,351
Industrial (1,000 sq. ft.)	4,350

The population is anticipated to grow to 14,602 residents an additional 10,079 persons. In total it is projected that an additional 8,090,000 square feet of non-residential development will be added through 2038.

2.5. Occupancy Density Assumptions

Occupant densities ensure a reasonable relationship between the increase in service population and the amount of the fee. Developers pay the fee based on the number of additional housing units or building square feet of non-residential development, so the fee schedule must convert service population estimates to these measures of project size. This conversion is done with average occupant density factors by land use type, shown in Table 2-3.

The residential occupant density factors are derived from the U.S Census Bureau, 2014-2018 American Community Survey (ACS) Tables B25024 and B25033). Table B25024 provides total housing units by land use designation. Table B25033 documents the total population residing in occupied housing. Residents, by land use, are divided by units, by land use, to estimate factors for citywide persons per type of dwelling unit. The non-residential density factors are derived from data from the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition.

**Table 2-3
Occupancy Density Assumptions**

Single Family Units	2.95
Multifamily Units	1.50
Commercial (1,000 sq ft)	2.34
Office & Institutional (1,000 sq ft)	2.97
Industrial (1,000 sq ft)	1.16



Section 3 - Police Vehicles and Equipment Fee Calculation

3.1. Introduction

The police fee has been developed on the value per equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) of incremental capital costs, with the fees generated being expended on vehicles and equipment needs. The calculation of EDUs is described in Section 3.4.2.

3.2. Existing Level of Service

The existing police level of service was determined by the current number of officers serving the Town and the number of vehicles and equipment that currently equips the police department. The value of the Town’s existing police related vehicles and equipment assets are valued at \$836,676.

3.3. Planned Capital Needs

The Town has projected capital needs (vehicles and equipment) of \$3,094,126. The capital needs through 2038 are summarized in Table 3-1 below.

**Table 3-1
Projected CIP through 2038**

Project	Cost
Police Vehicles	\$2,037,746
Police Equipment	1,056,380
Total	\$3,094,126

3.4. Police Vehicles and Equipment Impact Fee Calculation

This section of the report including all subsections will discuss the approach and calculations that were undertaken to identify the police impact fee for each development category. The police vehicles and equipment fee was calculated using the system standard average cost method.

3.4.1 Existing Facilities and Planned Improvements

As discussed in sections 3.3 and 3.4, the Town has existing police vehicles and equipment valued at \$836,676. The total value of planned improvements is \$3,094,126, for a total system value in 2038 of \$3,930,802.

3.4.2 Service Units

The total increase in service units during the study period was calculated using a functional population approach to determine equivalent dwelling units (EDUs). Under the functional population approach, the anticipated functional residential population was based on 2.95 persons per single family development and 1.50 multifamily persons per unit with a demand factor for both development types of 0.67 (based on industry accepted standards). The demand factor assumes that 8 hours of the day are spent at work (nonresidential classification) and the balance of the 24 hour day 16 hours (or 67%) is allocated to the residential development classification. The functional population for non-residential development, uses an assumed number of employees per 1,000 square feet working 8 hours per day.



A single-family residential dwelling unit is assumed to represent one EDU. EDUs for all other development types were derived based on the ratio of functional population for each development type as compared to the functional population for a single-family development. For example, the functional population for single family developments is 1.98 persons per unit and the functional population for multifamily is 1.01 persons per unit, therefore a multifamily unit represents 0.51 EDUs (1.01/1.98). The functional population calculation is shown in Table 3-2. A summary of existing EDUs by development type is presented in table 3-3 and incremental EDUs are presented in table 3-4.

**Table 3-2
Functional Population**

Development Type	(a)	(b)	Functional Population per Unit ⁽¹⁾
	Persons per Household/Employees per 1,000 Square Feet	Residential Demand Factor	
Single Family	2.95	0.67	1.98
Multifamily	1.50	0.67	1.01
Commercial	2.34	n/a	0.7800
Office & Institutional	2.97	n/a	0.9900
Industrial	1.16	n/a	0.3867

(1) Residential functional population is calculated by (a) X (b) and is per dwelling unit. Non-residential functional population is calculated by (a) x 8 hours per day /24 hours in a day and is per 1,000 square feet.
Note: Variances are due to rounding.

**Table 3-3
Current Equivalent Dwelling Units**

Development Type	(a)	(b)	(c)	Current EDUs ⁽¹⁾
	Functional Population per Unit	EDUs per Unit	Current Development Units	
Single Family	1.98	1.000	1,516	1,516
Multifamily	1.01	0.51	32	16
Commercial	0.7800	0.39	400	158
Office & Institutional	0.9900	0.50	206	103
Industrial	0.3867	0.20	295	58
Total				1,851

(1) EDUs are calculated by (b) x (c).
Note: Variances are due to rounding.



**Table 3-4
Incremental Equivalent Dwelling Units**

Development Type	(a)	(b)	(c)	
	Functional Population per Unit	EDUs per Unit	Incremental Development Units	Incremental EDUs ⁽¹⁾
Single Family	1.98	1.000	3,381	3,381
Multifamily	1.01	0.51	71	36
Commercial	0.7800	0.39	2,389	943
Office & Institutional	0.9900	0.50	1,351	677
Industrial	0.3867	0.20	4,350	<u>851</u>
Total				5,888

(1) EDUs are calculated by (b) x (c).
Note: Variances are due to rounding.

3.4.3 Proposed Police Vehicles and Equipment Impact Fee

The maximum supportable proposed police vehicles and equipment impact fee that can be assessed to new development is based on each development type’s proportionate impact placed on the Town’s system. The police fees were calculated using the system standard average cost methodology as all development will benefit from existing and new police vehicles and equipment through 2038. The proposed fees reflect the value per EDU of the police vehicles and equipment as determined by dividing the total value of the existing and new assets by the projected number of EDUs ($\$3,930,802 / 7,739 = \508). The proposed police vehicles and equipment impact fees and a comparison to the Town’s current fees (the Town does not currently have a police vehicles and equipment impact fee) are summarized in Table 3-5.

**Table 3-5
Proposed Police Vehicles and Equipment Impact Fees**

Development Type	Current	2021	Difference \$	Difference %
Per Dwelling Unit				
Single Family	\$0	\$508	\$508	n/a
Multifamily	0	258	258	n/a
Per 1,000 Square Feet				
Commercial	0	200	200	n/a
Office & Institutional	0	254	254	n/a
Industrial	0	99	99	n/a

Note: Variances are due to rounding.

The proposed fees identified in Table 3-5 represent the fees necessary to fund new development, or “growth’s” proportionate share of police vehicles and equipment through 2038.

The full proposed impact fee calculation can be found in Appendix B.



Section 4 - Municipal Facilities Fee Calculation

4.1. Introduction

The municipal facilities fee is based on both existing assets as well as the construction of new Town facilities, with the fees to be expended upon new municipal facilities. This fee includes buildings of Town-wide significance, including City Hall, Public Works and Police buildings.

4.2. Existing Level of Service

The Town has identified existing facilities of 0.43 acres of land and 12,465 square feet of buildings including Town Hall and public works and police facilities. The existing level of service also includes equipment related to the day to day functioning of the Town. In total the value of existing Municipal Facilities assets is \$2,159,862.

4.3. Planned Improvements

During the study period the Town is proposing to add a new public works facility of 12,442 square feet and a new police station of 20,000 square feet. The estimated value of the new facilities is \$23,380,220.

4.4. Proposed Town Facility Impact Fee Calculation

This section of the report including all subsections will discuss the approach and calculations that were undertaken to identify the Town facility impact fee for each development category. The system standard average cost method was used to calculate the municipal facilities impact fee.

4.4.1 Service Population

Municipal facilities serve both residents and businesses. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities is based on the Town's service population including residents and workers.

Table 4-1 shows the current estimated service population and the service population in 2038. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for these facilities, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these facilities is less for one employee compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development yields a lesser demand for municipal facilities.



**Table 4-1
Existing and Projected Service Population**

Development Type	(a) Residents	(b) Workers	C = (a) + ((b) x 0.31) Service Population ⁽¹⁾
Existing	4,523	2,047	5,200
Future Development	10,079	5,226	<u>11,700</u>
Total			16,900

(1) Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40-hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week (40 / 128 =0.31)
Note: Variances are due to rounding.

4.4.2 Proposed Municipal Facilities Impact Fee

The maximum supportable proposed municipal facilities impact fee that can be assessed to new development is based on each development type’s proportionate impact placed on the Town’s system. The proposed fees reflect the growth-related portion of total system value. The proposed municipal facilities impact fees and a comparison to the Town’s current fees are summarized in Table 4-2.

**Table 4-2
Proposed Municipal Facilities Impact Fees**

Development Type	Current	2021	Difference \$	Difference %
Per Dwelling Unit				
Single Family	\$1,772	\$4,457	\$2,685	152%
Multifamily	1,252	2,267	1,015	81%
Per 1,000 Square Feet				
Commercial	1,040	1,095	55	5%
Office & Institutional	1,730	1,390	(340)	(20%)
Industrial	940	543	(397)	(42%)

Note: Variances are due to rounding.

The proposed fees identified in Table 4-2 represent the fees necessary to fund new development or “growth’s” proportionate share of the municipal facilities through 2038.

The full proposed impact fee calculation can be found in Appendix C.



Section 5 - Storm Drainage and Streets Fee Calculation

The Town typically conducts storm drainage and street related projects in conjuncture with each other. As such, a combined storm drainage and streets fee is being proposed. The balance of this section of the report discusses the storm drainage and streets components of the combined fee as well as illustrating the combined fee by development type.

5.1. Storm Drainage Introduction

The storm drainage fee has been developed on the value per EDU of incremental assets, with the fees generated to be expended on additional infrastructure needs.

5.2. Storm Drainage Planned Improvements

The Town has projected growth-related improvements of \$2,525,000, which includes culvert upsizing and drainage construction among other projects. The CIP is summarized in Table 5-1 below.

**Table 5-1
 Projected CIP through 2038**

Project	Cost
East I-25 Business Park and CR9 1/2 Drainage	\$441,000
North Creek Ditch Flood Analysis	326,000
Culvert Upsizing (Contribution to Development/Drainage Analysis)	120,000
Ditch Lateral #3 Improvements (CR 9½ crossing)	529,000
WCR 38 and WCR 7 Intersection Drainage Improvements	100,800
North Creek Drainage Construction	<u>1,008,000</u>
Total	\$2,525,000

5.3. Storm Drainage Component Fee Calculation

This section of the report including all subsections will discuss the approach and calculations that were undertaken to identify the storm drainage impact fee for each development category. The storm drainage fee was calculated using the incremental method.

5.3.1 Service Units

The total increase in service units during the study period was calculated on an EDU basis based on the anticipated square footage of impervious area by development type.

A single-family residential dwelling unit is assumed to represent one EDU. EDUs for all other development types were derived based on the ratio of functional population for each development type as compared to the impervious square feet for a single-family development. For example, the impervious area for a single-family development is 4,901 square feet per unit and the impervious area per multifamily unit is 2,334 square feet, therefore a multifamily unit represents 0.48 EDUs (2,334 sq. ft./4,901 sq. ft.). Table 5-2 summarizes the EDU calculation. The Town is anticipated to add 7,863 EDUs during the study period as noted in Table 5-3.



**Table 5-2
EDU Calculation**

Development Type	(a) Dwelling Units (DU) or 1,000 Square Feet/ Acre	(b) Average Percent Impervious Area per Acre	(c) Impervious Square Feet per DU or 1,000 square feet ⁽¹⁾	Equivalent Dwelling Unit ⁽²⁾
Single Family	4.00	45%	4,901	1.00
Multifamily	14.00	75%	2,334	0.48
Commercial/Retail	21.78	95%	1,900	0.39
Office & Institutional	13.07	75%	2,500	0.51
Industrial	10.89	80%	3,200	0.65
(1) $C = (43,560 / (a)) \times (b)$				
Note: variances are due to rounding.				

**Table 5-3
Incremental EDU Projection**

Development Type	(a) Dwelling Units (DU) or 1,000 Square Feet	(b) EDU Factor	Equivalent Dwelling Units ⁽¹⁾
Single Family	3,381	1.00	3,381
Multifamily	71	0.48	34
Commercial/Retail	2,389	0.39	932
Office & Institutional	1,351	0.51	689
Industrial	4,350	0.65	<u>2,827</u>
Total			<u>7,863</u>
(1) Equivalent dwelling units is calculated by (a) x (b)			
Note: Variances are due to rounding.			

5.3.2 Proposed Storm Drainage Fee Component

The maximum supportable proposed storm drainage impact fee that can be assessed to new development is based on each development type's proportionate impact placed on the Town's system. The storm drainage fees were calculated using the incremental methodology based on the additional system capacity needed to serve new development through 2038. The proposed fees reflect the value per EDU of storm drainage capital costs per as determined by dividing the total value of the new capital by the projected number of incremental EDUs ($\$2,525,000 / 7,863 = \321). The proposed storm drainage impact fee component and a comparison to the Town's current fees are summarized in Table 5-4.



**Table 5-4
Proposed Storm Drainage Impact Fee Component**

Development Type	Current	2021	Difference \$	Difference %
Per Dwelling Unit				
Single Family	\$648	\$321	(\$327)	(50%)
Multifamily	229	154	(75)	(33%)
Per 1,000 Square Feet				
Commercial	150	125	(25)	(17%)
Office & Institutional	150	164	14	9%
Industrial	330	209	(121)	(37%)
Note: Variances are due to rounding.				

The proposed fees identified in Table 5-4 represent the fees necessary to fund new development, or “growth’s” proportionate share of the storm drainage capital needs through 2038.

The proposed storm drainage component of the storm drainage and streets fee calculation can be found in Appendix D.

5.4. Streets Introduction

The full streets system value through 2038 is projected to be \$59.0 million. The Town intends to use streets impact fees to fund the construction of new roads benefiting all development through 2038.

5.5. Trip Generation Rates

Streets impact fees are developed based on the impact or burden each classification of new development places on the system. The industry standard metric used to identify the impact new development places on the streets system is vehicle miles traveled (VMT). VMT represents the number of trips as well as the typical trip length generated by development. This is a formula using Vehicle Trip Ends (VTE) to represent the number of trip ends generated by each development type as identified in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation manuals. The Trip Adjustment Factor from the National Household Travel Survey (NHTS) is an adjustment accounting for the fact that not all trip ends represent the primary destination of the trip. The average trip length reflects the average length of trip specific to Mead. It is determined by comparing the VMT in Mead from existing development and comparing it to the national average VMT using NHTS average trip length data. The trip length weight factor represents the average trip length by development type as reported by the NHTS. The product of each of these individual components is the VMT for Mead by development type. Each of these components is detailed in Sections 5.5.1 through 5.5.5. Table 5-5 provides a summary of the inputs used to identify the VMT by development type for Mead. Each component of the preliminary fee will be discussed individually.



**Table 5-5
Development of Vehicle Miles Traveled**

Development Type	Weekday VTE ⁽¹⁾	Trip Adjustment Factor	Average Trip Length	Trip Length Weight Factor	Average VMT ⁽²⁾
Single Family Residential	9.52	65%	9.02	1.21	67.50
Multifamily Residential	6.65	65%	9.02	1.21	47.15
Commercial	40.36	33%	9.02	0.66	79.25
Office & Institutional	16.89	50%	9.02	0.73	55.89
Industrial	2.48	50%	9.02	0.73	8.17

(1) VTE per dwelling unit for residential and per 1,000 square feet for non-residential
 (2) VMT per dwelling unit for residential and per 1,000 square feet for non-residential
 Note: Variances are due to rounding.

5.5.1 Average Weekday Vehicle Trip Ends (VTE)

Average weekday VTE were taken from the ITE Trip Generation Manuals and represent the number of trip ends generated by each development type. For example, a trip from home to the grocery store and returning home represents four trip ends. The home represents two trip ends, one leaving the home and one returning to the home. The grocery store also represents two trip ends, one arriving at the grocery store and one leaving the grocery store. The second column of Table 5-5 illustrates that a single-family development generates 9.52 trip ends per housing unit, while an office & institutional development generates 16.89 trips ends per 1,000 square feet of developed space.

5.5.2 Trip Adjustment Factors

The trip adjustment factor (column 3 of Table 5-5) reflects the fact that trips can have multiple purposes and not all trip ends represent the primary destination. In the Section 5.5.1 example, if the stop at the grocery store was on the way home from work at the end of the day, the grocery store would not be the primary trip destination, it would be a pass by stop on the way home. As such, adjustments are made to reflect that not all trip ends are primary purposes of the trip. The trip adjustment factor also accounts for commuters (residential developments) leaving the Town for work that is outside the Town’s boundaries.

The residential trip adjustment factor is larger than the adjustment factor for the other development types to account for the fact that some commuters leave the Town for work. Residential development is assigned all inbound trips (50% representing one half of the trip) plus an additional 15% trip factor to account for jobs that are located outside the Town’s boundaries. Per the NHTS approximately 31% of weekday work trips are out-bound trips. The additional 15% trip adjustment allocation to residential developments reflects 31% of work-related trips are outside the Town’s boundaries adjusted by 50% to reflect half of the trip.

Commercial/retail developments have a trip adjustment factor of less than 50% because these developments attract vehicles as they pass by on arterial roads (the grocery store example from Section 5.5.1). In this case the grocery store is not the primary destination.

5.5.3 Average Trip Length



The starting point used to identify the local trip length for Mead is national data, specifically data published by the 2009 NHTS. National trip length data will not necessarily correspond with trip lengths for individual municipalities, therefore an adjustment must be made by comparing the VMT based on national trip length data (from the NHTS) to the current VMT experienced by the Town based on the current number of lane miles and the existing capacity per lane mile. For Mead, the existing VMT is 95.2% of the national average VMT. As such the average national trip length of 9.47 miles was decreased to 9.02 miles (Table 5-5, column 4) to be Mead specific.

5.5.4 Trip Length Weight Factor

Trip length weight factor reflects the fact that not all trips are of the same length and therefore place less demand on the Town’s system. The 2009 NHTS reports that trips from residential developments tend to be 121% of the overall average trip length. By contrast commercial trips lengths represent 66% of the overall average trip lengths and all other non-residential trips are approximately 73% of average overall trip lengths. The trip length weight factor is listed in column 5 of Table 5-5.

5.5.5 Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)

By multiplying the previously identified components together, the VMT per development type can be identified. The VMT by development type is summarized in the final column of Table 5-5.

5.6. Total VMT

Once the VMT per development type has been determined, it is possible to identify the total VMT that is projected at the end of the study period. Table 5-6 summarizes the calculation of total VMT through 2038.

**Table 5-6
Total Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)**

Development Type	2038 Total		
	Development ⁽¹⁾	Unit VMT ⁽²⁾	Total VMT ⁽²⁾
Single Family Residential	4,897	67.50	303,550
Multifamily Residential	103	47.15	4,857
Commercial/Retail	2,790	79.25	221,099
Office & Institutional	1,557	55.89	88,556
Industrial	4,645	8.17	37,944
Total			681,005
(1) Residential development per dwelling unit, non-residential per 1,000 square feet			
(2) VMT per dwelling unit for residential and per 1,000 square feet for non-residential.			
Note: Variances are due to rounding.			

5.7. Planned Street Improvements

The Town developed a streets capital program based on the Town’s 2018 Transportation Master Plan. The projects through 2038 totaled \$22,433,534. The master plan identifies all of the projects that the Town should complete, which must be balanced with the Town’s ability to undertake projects (the expense in a given year as well as managing the disruption that would be placed on residents and businesses). In managing the ability to execute projects and not base an impact fee on projects that will not be completed in a reasonable timeframe, not all of the total identified capital projects costs were included in the study. Of the projected total, 35% of the capital projects



(a total of \$7,851,737) was included in the current calculation. The cost of these projects was divided by the total anticipated VMT at 2038 ensuring that existing and new development shares the total cost of the capital with each group paying their proportionate share without increasing the existing level of service through new development.

5.8. System Value

The value of the street system that forms the basis of the streets impact fee is based on both the existing streets system as well as new capital needs. The existing system is valued at \$51,126,325 and future capital of \$7,851,737 for a total system value of \$58,978,062.

5.9. Proposed Streets Fee Component Calculation

This section of the report including all subsections will discuss the approach and calculations that were undertaken to identify the Streets impact fee for each development category. The streets impact fee was calculated using the system demand average cost method. The methodology looked at all capital (growth and non-growth) for the study period. The total capital costs were then divided by total VMT at the end of the study period. Under this method all development (existing and new) share in the capital costs based on their proportionate share of total development.

5.9.1 Cost per VMT and Proposed Fee

In order to calculate the proportionate share of costs to be allocated to each development type and in turn calculate equitable impact fees matching the burden or capacity used up by each development type, it was necessary to identify the unit cost per VMT. The unit cost per VMT has been calculated at \$86.60 per VMT (system value of \$58,978,062 from Section 5.8 divided by total VMT of 681,005 from Table 5-6). While the capital cost per VMT is the same regardless of the type of development (\$86.60 per VMT), different development types place a different demand on the Town's streets system. The calculation of the proposed streets impact fee component by development type based on their proportionate demand placed on the system is shown in Table 5-7 below. A comparison of current and proposed fees is shown in Table 5-8.



**Table 5-7
Cost per VMT and Associated Impact Fees**

Development Type	Cost Per VMT	Average VMT	Maximum Fee
Residential Per Dwelling Unit Basis			
Single Family	\$86.60	67.50	\$5,846
Single Family - Attached	86.60	52.33	4,532
Multifamily	86.60	47.15	4,083
Commercial Per 1,000 Square Foot Basis			
General Retail/Commercial	86.60	44.92	3,891
RV Park (per stall/site/pad)	86.60	35.45	3,070
Lodging Per Room			
Hotel/Motel	86.60	11.50	996
Office & Institutional Per 1,000 Square Foot Basis			
General Office	86.60	31.71	2,749
Industrial Per 1,000 Square Foot Basis			
General Light Industrial	86.60	16.32	1,413
Note: Variances are due to rounding.			

**Table 5-8
Proposed Street Impact Fees Component**

Development Type	Current	2021	Difference \$	Difference %
Residential Per Dwelling Unit Basis				
Single Family	\$2,609	\$5,846	\$3,237	124%
Single Family - Attached	n/a	4,532	4,532	n/a
Multifamily	2,180	4,083	1,903	87%
Commercial Per 1,000 Square Foot Basis				
General Retail/Commercial	2,860	3,891	1,031	36%
RV Park (per stall/site/pad)	n/a	3,070	3,070	n/a
Lodging Per Room				
Hotel/Motel	n/a	996	996	n/a
Office & Institutional Per 1,000 Square Foot Basis				
General Office	1,240	2,749	1,509	122%
Industrial Per 1,000 Square Foot Basis				
General Light Industrial	430	1,413	983	229%
Note: Variances are due to rounding.				

The proposed fees identified in Table 5-8 represent the fees necessary to fund new development or “growth’s” proportionate share of the Town’s street system.

The proposed streets fee component calculation of the storm drainage and streets fee can be found in Appendix E.



5.9.2 Proposed Storm Drainage and Streets Fee

The maximum supportable proposed storm drainage and streets impact fee that can be assessed to new development is identified in Table 5-9.

**Table 5-9
Proposed Storm Drainage and Streets Impact Fee**

Development Type	Current	2021	Difference \$	Difference %
Residential Per Dwelling Unit Basis				
Single Family	\$3,257	\$6,167	\$2,910	89%
Single Family - Attached	3,257	4,853	1,596	49%
Multifamily	2,409	4,237	1,828	76%
Commercial Per 1,000 Square Foot Basis				
General Commercial	3,010	4,016	1,006	33%
RV Park (per stall/site/pad) ⁽¹⁾	n/a	3,195	3,299	n/a
Lodging Per Room				
Hotel/Motel ⁽²⁾	n/a	1,121	1,160	n/a
Office & Institutional Per 1,000 Square Foot Basis				
General Office	1,390	2,913	1,523	110%
Industrial Per 1,000 Square Foot Basis				
General Light Industrial	760	1,622	862	113%
(1) RV Parks are assessed the streets fee per stall/site/pad plus the storm drainage fee per 1,000 square feet				
(2) Hotel/motels are assessed the streets fee per room plus the storm drainage fee per 1,000 square feet.				
Note: Variances are due to rounding.				



Section 6 - Parks Fee Calculation

6.1. Introduction

The parks fee has been developed on an EDU basis reflecting the existing value of parks per acre and trails per linear feet as currently experienced by existing Town residents. The fees generated will be expended on additional infrastructure needs.

6.2. Existing Level of Service

To calculate the value of parks per acre and the value of trails per linear foot, an examination of the existing assets was undertaken. The Town currently has an inventory of 123.40 Town owned parks at a value of \$18,535,494 for a cost per acre of \$150,207. The Town currently serves 1,532 EDUs for a Town owned park acreage per EDU value of 0.08. The Town currently has 31,574.40 linear feet of trails at a value of \$4,622,984 for a cost per linear foot of \$146.42. Using the Town's existing EDUs of 1,532 results in 20.61 linear feet of trails per existing EDU.

The calculated cost per acre and per linear foot was used as the cost basis for future parks and trails.

6.3. Planned Improvements

Through discussions with the Town it was identified that there will be additional parks and trails provided from sources other than the Town itself that will benefit existing and future residents. Based on the addition of other parks and trails, the proposed fee is based on a lower level of service of Town owned parks and trails. The parks impact fee anticipates 0.01 acres of parks per EDU and 7.50 linear feet of trails per EDU.

6.4. Proposed Parks Impact Fee

This section of the report including all subsections will discuss the approach and calculations that were undertaken to identify the Parks impact fee for each development category. The Parks impact fee was calculated using the incremental expansion method.

6.4.1 Service Units

The total increase in service units during the study period was calculated using a functional population approach to determine EDUs. Under the functional population approach, the anticipated functional residential population was based on 2.95 persons per single family development and 1.50 multifamily persons per unit. Nonresidential development was not considered in the parks impact fee as parks are generally built to provide benefit to residential development not nonresidential development.

A single-family residential dwelling unit is assumed to represent one EDU. EDUs for multifamily was derived based on the ratio of functional population as compared to the functional population for a single-family development. For example, the functional population for single family developments is 2.95 persons per unit and the functional population for multifamily is 1.50 persons



per unit, therefore a multifamily unit represents 0.51 EDUs (1.50/2.95). Table 6-1 provides a summary of the projected EDUs

**Table 6-1
Incremental Equivalent Dwelling Units**

Development Type	(a)	(b)	(c)	
	Functional Population per Unit	EDUs per Unit	Incremental Development Units	Incremental EDUs ⁽¹⁾
Single Family	2.95	1.00	3,381	3,381
Multifamily	1.50	0.51	71	<u>36</u>
Total				3,417
(1) EDUs are calculated by (b) x (c).				
Note: Variances are due to rounding.				

6.4.2 Planned Improvements

As discussed in sections 6.2 and 6.3, the value per acre of parks is \$150,207 and an additional 0.01 acres per EDU is anticipated. The cost per linear foot of trails is \$146.42 and an additional 7.50 linear feet per EDU is anticipated. Thus, the planned improvement costs forming the basis of the parks impact fee is \$9,398,360 (the calculation is shown in Table 6-2).

**Table 6-2
Planned Improvements**

Fee Area	Incremental EDUs	Incremental Park Acreage/Trails Linear Feet	Cost per Acre/Linear Foot	Incremental Cost
Parks	3,381	0.01	\$150,207	\$5,645,983
Trails	36	7.50	146.42	<u>3,752,377</u>
Total				\$9,398,360
Note: Variances are due to rounding.				

6.4.3 Proposed Parks Impact Fee

The maximum supportable proposed Parks impact fee that can be assessed to new development is based on each development type's proportionate impact. As discussed in Section 6.2 the anticipated level of service per EDUs is calculated at 0.01 of park acres per EDU and 7.50 linear feet of trails. At an estimated cost of \$150,207 per acre of developed parks, \$146.42 per linear foot of trails and 3,417 new EDUs during the study period, the total cost of developed parks and trails to be funded via impact fees is \$9,398,360. The impact fee is calculated at \$2,750 per EDU (\$9,398,360/3,417).

A comparison of the current and proposed parks impact fees are summarized in Table 6-3.



**Table 6-3
Proposed Parks Impact Fees**

Development Type	Current	2021	Difference \$	Difference %
Single Family	\$2,776	\$2,750	(\$26)	(1%)
Multifamily	1,961	1,399	(562)	(29%)
Note: Variances are due to rounding.				

The proposed fees identified in Table 6-3 represent the proposed fees necessary to fund new development or “growth’s” proportionate share of the parks system through 2038.

The full proposed impact fee calculation can be found in Appendix F.



Appendix A – Land Use Assumptions

Table A.1: Demographic Assumptions

	2020	2038	Increase
<i>Residents¹</i>	4,523	14,602	10,079
<i>Dwelling Units²</i>			
Single Family	1,516	4,897	3,381
Multifamily	32	103	71
Total - Dwelling Units	1,548	5,000	3,452
<i>Building Square Feet (000s)³</i>			
Commercial	400	2,789	2,389
Office & Institutional	206	1,557	1,351
Industrial	295	4,645	4,350
Total - Building Square Feet	901	8,991	8,090
<i>Employment⁴</i>			
Commercial	400	1,421	1,021
Office & Institutional	162	617	455
Industrial	1,485	5,235	3,750
Total - Employment	2,047	7,273	5,226

¹ Current population from American Community Survey, 2018 5-Year Estimates. Projection for 2038 from the medium growth scenario from Table 1 in the Town's Comprehensive Plan.

² Current values from American Community Survey. Projection for 2038 calculated based number of dwelling units needed to achieve 14,602 residents in medium growth scenario from the Comprehensive Plan, Table 1 at the current occupancy density, and single to multifamily dwelling unit ratio.

³ Current values provided by the Town of Mead. Increase in building square feet calculated based on increase of employees and employment density factors in Table A.2.

⁴ Current estimates of primary jobs from the US Census' OnTheMap. Increase in employment based on increasing current jobs-housing ratio by 10%. The share of office employees has also been increased by 10%, and industrial employment has been adjusted downward to compensate.

Sources: Town of Mead Comprehensive Plan Adoption Draft, March 2018, Table 1; American Community Survey Tables B25024 and B25033, 2018 Five-year Estimates; OnTheMap Application, <http://onthemap.ces.census.gov>; Willdan Financial Services.



Table A.2: Occupant Density Assumptions

Residential

Single Family	2.95	Residents per dwelling unit
Multifamily	1.50	Residents per dwelling unit

Nonresidential

Commercial	2.34	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Office & Institutional	2.97	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Industrial	1.16	Employees per 1,000 square feet

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2014-2018 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Tables B25024 and B25033; ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition; Willdan Financial Services.



Appendix B – Police Vehicles and Equipment Impact Fee Analysis Detailed Tables

Table B.1: Police Vehicles and Equipment Functional Population Calculation

	Housing Units/ KSF	Occupant Demand Density ¹	Functional Pop./ Factor	Functional Unit or KSF	Population	EDU Factor	EDUs
Existing - 2020							
<i>Residential</i>							
Single Family	1,516	2.95	0.67	1.98	2,996	1.00	1,516
Multifamily	32	1.50	0.67	1.01	32	0.51	16
Subtotal					3,029		1,532
<i>Nonresidential Square Feet (1,000's)</i>							
Retail	400	2.34		0.78	312	0.39	158
Office & Institutional	206	2.97		0.99	204	0.50	103
Industrial	295	1.16		0.39	114	0.20	58
Subtotal					630		319
Total					3,659		1,851
Incremental (2020 to 2038)							
<i>Residential</i>							
Single Family	3,381	2.95	0.67	1.98	6,683	1.00	3,381
Multifamily	71	1.50	0.67	1.01	71	0.51	36
Subtotal					6,754		3,417
<i>Nonresidential Square Feet (1,000's)</i>							
Retail	2,389	2.34		0.78	1,863	0.39	943
Office & Institutional	1,351	2.97		0.99	1,337	0.50	677
Industrial	4,350	1.16		0.39	1,682	0.20	851
Subtotal					4,883		2,470
Total					11,637		5,888

¹ Persons per household for residential, employees per 1,000 square feet for nonresidential.



Table B.2: Police Vehicles and Equipment Current Level of Service Calculations

Description	
Current Number of Police Vehicles	8
Current EDUs	1,851
Current Police Vehicles Per EDU	0.004
Current Number of Officers	15
Current EDUs	1,851
Current Number of Officers Per EDU	0.008
Total Equipment Cost (Current Standard)	\$ 16,589
Equipment Cost per EDU (officers per EDU x Equipment Cost per Officer)	134

Table B.3: Police Vehicles and Equipment Capital Improvement Program

Description	Total
Police Vehicles (\$60,000 per Vehicle x Incremental EDUs)	\$1,526,748
Equipment (Uniforms, Vest, Rifles, Body Camera, Taser, etc. x Incremental EDUs)	791,476
Subtotal Police	2,318,224
Total CIP	\$2,318,224
Total with Inflation Allowance of 3.10%	\$3,094,126
Total Growth-Related	\$2,318,224
Total Growth-Related with Inflation	\$3,094,126



Table B.4: Police Vehicles and Equipment Fee Analysis - Plan Based

Description	
Value of Existing Assets	
Total Police	Total Value \$ 836,676
Add: Interest on Outstanding Debt	-
Total Value of Police	\$ 836,676
Existing and Incremental EDUs	7,739
Cost Per EDU	\$ 108
Capital Improvement Plan	
Total Police	Total CIP \$ 3,094,126
Add: Interest on Outstanding Debt	-
Total Capital Improvement Plan	\$ 3,094,126
Existing and Incremental EDUs	7,739
Cost Per EDU	\$ 400
Total Cost to be Recovered	
Total Costs of Assets to be Recovered	\$ 836,676
Capital Improvement Plan Costs to be Recovered	3,094,126
Total Costs to be Recovered	\$ 3,930,802



Table B.5: Police Vehicles and Equipment Cost Allocation - Plan Based

Description	
Total System Value Through FY 2038	\$ 3,930,802
Residential EDUs	
Single Family	4,897
Multi-Family	52
Total	<u>4,949</u>
Non-Residential EDUs	
Commercial	1,101
Office & Institutional	780
Industrial	909
Total	<u>2,789</u>
Total EDUs	7,739
Residential Allocation	\$ 2,514,020
Non-Residential Allocation	1,416,782

Table B.6: Police Vehicles and Equipment Fee Schedule - Plan Based

Description	
Total Cost	\$ 3,930,802
EDUs	<u>7,739</u>
Cost per EDU	\$ 508
Single Family Fee (1.00 EDU)	\$ 508
Multi-Family Fee (0.51 EDU)	258
Commercial Fee per 1,000 Square Feet (0.39 EDU)	\$ 200
Office & Institutional Fee per 1,000 Square Feet (0.50 EDU)	254
Industrial Fee per 1,000 Square Feet (0.20 EDU)	99



Table B.7: Police Vehicles and Equipment Fee Comparison - Plan Based

	Calculated Fee	Current Fees	Change in Dollars	Percent Change
Residential				
Single Family	\$ 508	\$ -	\$ 508	N/A
Multi-Family	258	-	258	N/A
Non-residential				
Commercial	\$ 200	\$ -	\$ 200	N/A
Office & Institutional	254	-	254	N/A
Industrial	99	-	99	N/A



Appendix C: Municipal Facilities Impact Fee Analysis Detailed Tables

Table C.1: Municipal Facilities Service Population

	A	B	$C = A + (B \times 0.31)$
	Residents	Workers	Service Population
Existing (2020)	4,523	2,047	5,200
New Development (2020-2038)	10,079	5,226	11,700
Total (2038)	14,602	7,273	16,900
Weighting factor ¹	1.00	0.31	

¹ Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40 hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week ($40/128 = 0.31$)



Table C.2: Existing Municipal Facilities Inventory

	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Replacement Cost
<u>Land (acres)¹</u>				
Government Community Service Building - 441 Third Street ²	0.16	acres	\$ 19,000	\$ 3,040
Shop Building - 537 Main Street	0.18	acres	19,000	3,420
Police and Public Works Modular Building - 537 Main Street	0.09	acres	19,000	1,710
Subtotal	0.43			\$ 8,170
<u>Buildings (square feet)³</u>				
Government Community Service Building, Fire Station - 441 Third Street ⁴	8,249	Sq. Ft.	\$ 208	\$ 1,715,792
Shop Building - 537 Main Street	2,116	Sq. Ft.	69	146,000
Police and Public Works Modular Building - 537 Main Street	2,100	Sq. Ft.	119	250,000
Subtotal	12,465	Sq. Ft.		\$ 2,111,792
<u>Vehicles and Equipment</u>				
PC	17	PCs	\$ 1,200	\$ 20,400
Laptop	5	Laptops	1,200	6,000
Tablet	18	Tablets	750	13,500
Subtotal				\$ 39,900
Total Value of Existing Facilities				\$ 2,159,862

¹ Unit cost of \$19,000 per acre based on weighted average of land sales in Mead in the past two years, as

² Excludes approximately 40% of land associated with building leased to Fire Department.

³ Building size and replacement cost as reported in Town of Mead 2018 CIRSA Building Appraisal.

⁴ Square footage excludes 5,411 square feet that are leased to the Fire Department. Total building size is 13,660 square feet.



Table C.3: Planned Municipal Facilities

Project Name	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Total Project Cost
<i>Mead Public Works Facility</i>				
Wash Bay	1,356	Sq. Ft.		
Service Bays 1 thru 3	4,021	Sq. Ft.		
Training / Shops / Lube	2,635	Sq. Ft.		
Offices / Restrooms / Locker Rooms	3,650	Sq. Ft.		
Mech Mezzanine above Restrooms	780	Sq. Ft.		
Total	12,442		\$ 272	\$ 3,380,220
<i>Police Station</i>				
New Building	20,000	Sq. Ft.	\$ 1,000	\$ 20,000,000
Total				\$ 23,380,220

Table C.4: Municipal Facilities System Standard

Value of Existing Facilities	\$	2,159,862
Net Value of Planned Facilities		23,380,220
Total System Value (2038)	\$	25,540,082
Future Service Population (2038)		16,900
Cost per Capita	\$	1,511
Facility Standard per Resident	\$	1,511
Facility Standard per Worker ¹		468

¹ Based on a weighing factor of 0.31.



Table C.5: Municipal Facilities Impact Fee Revenue Projection - System Standard

Cost per Capita	\$ 1,511
Growth in Service Population (2020- 2038)	11,700
Fee Revenue	\$ 17,679,000
Cost of Planned Facilities	\$ 23,380,220
Less: Fee Revenue	17,679,000
Non-Fee Revenue to Be Identified	\$ 5,701,220

Table C.6: Municipal Facilities Fee Schedule

Land Use	Cost Per Occupant Capita	Density	Impact Fee
<i>Residential - per Dwelling Unit</i>			
Single Family	\$ 1,511	2.95	\$ 4,457
Multifamily	1,511	1.50	2,267
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.</i>			
Commercial	\$ 468	2.34	\$ 1,095
Office & Institutional	468	2.97	1,390
Industrial	468	1.16	543

Table C.7: Municipal Facilities Impact Fee Comparison

	Calculated Fee	Current Fees	Change in Dollars	Percent Change
Residential - per Dwelling Unit				
Single Family	\$ 4,457	\$ 1,772	\$ 2,685	152%
Multifamily	2,267	1,252	1,015	81%
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.				
Commercial	\$ 1,095	\$ 1,040	\$ 55	5%
Office & Institutional	1,390	1,730	(340)	-20%
Industrial	543	940	(397)	-42%



Appendix D: Storm Drain Impact Fee Analysis Detailed Tables

Table D.1: Storm Drain Equivalent Dwelling Units

	A	B	$C = (43,560 / A) \times B$	$D = C /$ <small>Single Family</small>
	DU or 1,000 Sq. Ft. per acre ¹	Average Percent Impervious per Acre	Impervious Square feet per DU or 1,000 Sq. Ft.	Equivalent Dwelling Unit (EDU) ²
<i><u>Residential - per Dwelling Unit</u></i>				
Single Family	4.00	45%	4,901	1.00
Multifamily	14.00	75%	2,334	0.48
<i><u>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Square Feet</u></i>				
Commercial	21.78	95%	1,900	0.39
Office & Institutional	13.07	75%	2,500	0.51
Industrial	10.89	80%	3,200	0.65

Note: Figures have been rounded.

¹ Dwelling units for residential and thousand building square feet for non-residential. Based on floor area ratio (FAR) assumptions of 0.5 for commercial, 0.3 for office and 0.25 for industrial.

² EDUs per dwelling unit for residential development and per thousand square feet for nonresidential development.



Table D.2: Land Use Scenario and EDU Generation

	EDU Factor	2020		Growth 2020 to 2038		Total - 2038	
		Units/ 1,000 Sq. Ft.	EDUs	Units/ 1,000 Sq. Ft.	EDUs	Units/ 1,000 Sq. Ft.	EDUs
<i>Residential - Dwelling Units</i>							
Single Family	1.00	1,516	1,516	3,381	3,381	4,897	4,897
Multifamily	0.48	32	15	71	34	103	49
Subtotal		1,548	1,531	3,452	3,415	5,000	4,946
<i>Nonesidential - 1,000 Square Feet</i>							
Commercial	0.39	400	156	2,389	932	2,789	1,088
Office & Institutional	0.51	206	105	1,351	689	1,557	794
Industrial	0.65	295	192	4,350	2,827	4,645	3,019
Subtotal		901	453	8,090	4,448	8,991	4,901
Total			1,984 20.1%		7,863 79.9%		9,847 100%

Table D.3: Storm Drain Project List and Allocation to New Development

Project	Total Project Cost	Allocation to New Development	Cost
			Allocated to New Development
<i>From Town of Mead Storm Water Master Plan, 2019</i>			
East I-25 Business Park and CR9 1/2			
Drainage	\$ 441,000	100%	\$ 441,000
North Creek Ditch Flood Analysis	326,000	100%	326,000
Culvert Upsizing (Contribution to Development/Drainage Analysis)	120,000	100%	120,000
Subtotal	\$ 887,000		\$ 887,000
<i>From Capital Improvement Plan</i>			
Ditch Lateral #3 Improvements (CR 9½ crossing)			
	\$ 529,200	100%	\$ 529,200
WCR 38 and WCR 7 Intersection Drainage Improvements			
	100,800	100%	100,800
North Creek Drainage Construction	1,008,000	100%	1,008,000
Subtotal	\$1,638,000		\$ 1,638,000
Total	\$2,525,000		\$ 2,525,000



Table D.4: Storm Drain Facilities Cost Per EDU

Cost Allocation To New Development	\$ 2,525,000
Growth in EDUs	7,863
Cost per EDU	\$ 321

Table D.5: Storm Drain Facilities Fee Schedule

	Cost Per EDU	EDU Factor	Impact Fee
<i>Residential - per Dwelling Unit</i>			
Single Family	\$ 321	1.00	\$ 321
Multifamily	321	0.48	154
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Square Feet.</i>			
Commercial	\$ 321	0.39	\$ 125
Office & Institutional	321	0.51	164
Industrial	321	0.65	209

Table D.6: Storm Drain Facilities Impact Fee Comparison

	Calculated Fee	Current Fees	Change in Dollars	Percent Change
Residential - per Dwelling Unit				
Single Family	\$ 321	\$ 648	\$ (327)	-50%
Multifamily	154	229	(75)	-33%
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Square Feet.				
Commercial	\$ 125	\$ 150	\$ (25)	-17%
Office & Institutional	164	150	14	9%
Industrial	209	330	(121)	-37%



Appendix E: Transportation Impact Fee Analysis Detailed Tables

Table E.1: System Valuation - Existing Assets

Description	Acquisition Date	Original Cost	Accumulated Depreciation	2020 CCI Replacement Cost	Replacement New Less (RCNLD)
Streets					
Existing Streets (valued at \$3,928,000 per mile for minor arterials)	1/1/2020	\$ 48,118,000	\$ -	\$ 48,118,000	\$ 48,118,000
5th Street Paving, Curb & Gutter Infrastructure Around FNB Mead	11/1/2004	225,153	118,580	225,153	106,572
Weld County Road 28 Drainage	12/31/2005	53,877	21,551	53,877	32,326
Downtown Street, Curb & Gutter Improvements	7/1/2010	46,578	8,733	46,578	37,845
Downtown Street Tree Guards	7/1/2012	671,742	147,738	671,742	524,004
	7/1/2015	32,084	2,674	32,084	29,410
Vehicles					
Kubota 60" Sweeper	12/8/2006	\$ 4,800	\$ 4,800	\$ 4,800	\$ -
Snow Plow	3/1/2010	6,610	6,610	6,610	-
Tractor	3/31/1996	16,674	16,674	16,674	-
98 IH Dump truck	12/28/1998	61,580	61,580	61,580	-
Dodge PU	10/25/1999	16,941	16,941	16,941	-
1989 Single Axel Int'l Truck	9/6/2000	3,000	3,000	3,000	-
1435 Front Mower	3/22/2001	13,089	13,089	13,089	-
JD Backhoe	7/25/2001	53,854	53,854	53,854	-
Ford F-350	5/1/2002	35,505	35,505	35,505	-
Kabota 8200 Tractor	3/10/2003	25,719	25,719	25,719	-
Chevy 4x4	12/31/1997	7,662	7,662	7,662	-
06 Ford Ranger	5/31/2006	18,300	18,300	18,300	-
Kubota 60" Sweeper	12/8/2006	4,800	4,800	4,800	-
200 Gal Skid Sprayer	7/1/2008	4,490	4,490	4,490	-
Snow Plow	3/1/2010	6,610	6,610	6,610	-
JD 4520 Tractor	2/10/2012	39,260	33,184	39,260	6,076
Gooseneck Trailer	11/9/2012	7,010	5,174	7,010	1,836
Volvo Motor Grater	3/12/2012	207,600	173,000	207,600	34,600
2015 Dodge Ram S/N 3C7WRTCL3FG681480	1/1/2016	68,180	19,480	68,180	48,700
H630 Hi-Way Model TGC 18 Spreader	10/12/2016	12,990	2,320	12,990	10,670
GMC K2500 4 WD PU	4/26/2016	2,500	833	2,500	1,667
Chev C3500 2 WD Dump Tk	4/26/2016	5,630	1,877	5,630	3,754
2017 Ford F350 VIN 45336	9/29/2017	75,105	10,729	75,105	64,376
2017 Ford F350 VIN 53451	9/26/2017	51,223	7,318	51,223	43,905
2018 International 7600 Cab and Chassis Depo:	8/20/2018	138,356	19,765	138,356	118,591
2018 International 7600 Cab and Chassis					
Deposit - Dump Truck	8/20/2018	110,834	15,833	110,834	95,001
Chevy Flatbed	1/1/1994	80,000	80,000	80,000	-
GMC 3/4 Ton	1/1/1998	56,000	56,000	56,000	-
Dodge 3/4 Ton	1/1/1999	80,000	80,000	80,000	-
Dodge Ram 1 Ton	1/1/2015	80,000	33,320	80,000	46,680
Ford F250 Crew Cab	1/1/2020	33,642	-	33,642	33,642
Tandem International Dump Truck	1/1/1999	235,000	235,000	235,000	-
Tandem International Dump Truck	1/1/2018	248,356	41,376	248,356	206,980
Kubota M5-11 Tractor	1/1/2012	58,558	39,023	58,558	19,535
Offset Mower	7/17/2018	15,500	2,214	15,500	13,286



Table E.1: System Valuation - Existing Assets - Continued

Description	Acquisition Date	Original Cost	Accumulated Depreciation	2020 CCI	Replacement
				Replacement Cost	New Less Depreciation (RCNLD)
Building/Equipment/Land/Structures					
Compressor	11/23/1999	\$ 6,419	\$ 6,419	\$ 6,419	\$ -
Shop Heating	4/19/2000	3,984	3,984	3,984	-
Storage Shed	1/1/2002	3,500	3,500	5,588	2,088
Shop	1/1/1960	40,000	40,000	367,922	327,922
Public Works Maint Facility Land	5/2/2011	154,000	-	154,000	154,000
Air Conditioner for JD Backhoe purch in 2001	10/11/2012	5,804	5,804	5,804	-
Hilltop Road & Sekich Bus Park Storm Drainag	7/1/2016	783,307	46,998	783,307	736,309
Walker Roller	3/21/2016	6,091	1,523	6,091	4,568
Variable Message Board	1/1/2019	16,000	960	16,000	15,040
Variable Message Board	1/1/2019	16,000	960	16,000	15,040
Sander Box/Spreader	1/1/2018	28,815	1,729	28,815	27,086
Traffic Lights					
Downtown Street Lights	7/1/2010	\$ 30,525	\$ 6,487	\$ 36,146	\$ 29,659
Bridges					
Mead WCR 28 - E I25	1/1/2015	\$ 9,194	\$ -	\$ 9,846	\$ 9,846
Mead WCR 9.5 - N .28	1/1/2015	16,319	-	17,475	17,475
Mead Ct N Mulligan	1/1/2015	7,450	-	7,978	7,978
Mead WCR 7 - N.66	1/1/2015	15,475	-	16,572	16,572
Mead WCR 32 - W.07	1/1/2015	13,597	-	14,561	14,561
Mead WCR 34 - E.03	1/1/2015	13,362	-	14,309	14,309
Mead WCR 34 - 003.0B	1/1/2015	15,460	-	16,555	16,555
Mead WCR 34 - EI25	1/1/2015	49,208	-	52,696	52,696
Mead 38.0 - 009-0A	1/1/2015	17,857	-	19,123	19,123
Mead N Crk Wy - N N Crk Circ	1/1/2015	10,668	-	11,424	11,424
Mead W CR 5 - S.38	1/1/2015	21,956	-	23,512	23,512
Mead W CR 5 - S.34	1/1/2015	12,237	-	13,105	13,105
Total		\$ 52,330,040		\$ 52,680,044	\$ 51,126,325



Table E.2: Capital Improvement Program

Description	Total Cost
3rd Street and Welker Intersection	\$1,134,000
3rd Street and SH 66 Intersection	453,600
WCR 5 and SH 66 Intersection	907,200
WCR 28 - I25 to WCR 9 1/2	365,400
3rd Street - Welker to RR Tracks	604,800
3rd Street and WCR 34 1/2 Intersection	907,200
WCR 34 1/2 Intersection	756,000
3rd Street and WCR 38 Intersection	756,000
WCR 5 and Welker Intersection	756,000
3rd Street - Highway 66 to Welker	1,512,000
3rd Street - WCR 34 1/2 to North Town Limits (Lake Hollow)	1,838,992
CR 9.5 - Highway 66 to WCR28	2,625,000
Welker - East of I-25	554,400
Welker - 3rd Street to I-25	1,549,586
Mulligan St - WCR 9 1/2 to Frontage Road and Mead Street	1,096,200
3rd Street - Highway 66 to WCR 28	1,946,556
WCR 38 - 3rd Street to I-25	1,965,600
Welker Avenue - 3rd Street to WCR 5	945,000
Dump Trucks (4 @ \$250,000)	1,000,000
Sanders (12 @ \$30,000)	360,000
Road Grader (1 @ \$250,000)	250,000
ROW Mowing Equipment (6 @ \$25,000)	150,000
Total CIP	\$22,433,534

Table E.3: VMT Generation by Land Use

Land Use Pattern	(a) Ave Day VTE	(b) Trip Adjustment Factor	(c) Mead Average Trip Length	(d) Trip Length Wt Factor	(e) Average VMT
					(a) * (b) * (c) * (d)
Weekday Average VTE (per Dwelling Unit)					
Single Family	9.52	65%	9.02	1.21	67.50
Multi-Family	6.65	65%	9.02	1.21	47.15
Weekday Average VTE (per Ksq ft)					
Commercial	40.36	33%	9.02	0.66	79.25
Office & Institutional	16.89	50%	9.02	0.73	55.59
Industrial	2.48	50%	9.02	0.73	8.17



Table E.4: VMT Generation in 2038

Land Use	2038 Development	Unit VMT	Total VMT	Percent Distribution
Weekday Average VTE (per Dwelling Unit)				
Single Family	4,897	67.50	330,550	48.54%
Multi-Family	103	47.15	4,857	0.71%
Weekday Average VTE (per Ksq ft)				
Commercial	2,790	79.25	221,099	32.47%
Office & Institutional	1,557	55.59	86,556	12.71%
Industrial	4,645	8.17	37,944	5.57%
Total			681,005	100%

Table E.5: 2038 System Value

All Development	
Existing - Transportation System Value	\$ 51,126,325
Total CIP Cost - Transportation (2020 - 2038)	22,433,534
Total System Value	\$ 73,559,859
Current LOS (VMT)	681,005
Cost per VMT	\$ 108
Recommended LOS (VMT)	
Existing - Transportation System Value	\$ 51,126,325
Projected CIP Funding Level	35%
Proposed CIP Funding Cost -Transportation (2020 - 2038)	\$ 7,851,737
2038 System Value	\$ 58,978,062



Table E.6: Transportation Facilities Impact Fee Schedule and Comparison to Current Fees

Line No.	Land Use Pattern	(a) System Value	(b) Total Capacity VMT	(c) Cost per VMT	(d) Average VMT	(e) Proposed Impact Fee	(f) Current Impact Fee	(g) % Change
Residential Weekday Average VTE (per Dwelling Unit)								
1	Single Family	\$58,978,062	681,005	\$86.60	67.50	\$5,846	\$2,609	124%
2	Single Family - Attached	58,978,062	681,005	86.60	52.33	4,532	n/a	n/a
3	Multifamily	58,978,062	681,005	86.60	47.15	4,083	2,180	87%
Commercial Weekday Average VTE (per Ksq ft)								
4	General Retail/Commercial	\$58,978,062	681,005	\$86.60	44.92	\$3,891	\$2,860	36%
5	RV Park (per stall/site/pad)	58,978,062	681,005	86.60	35.45	3,070	n/a	n/a
Lodging Weekday Average VTE (per room)								
6	Hotel/Motel	\$58,978,062	681,005	\$86.60	11.50	\$996	n/a	n/a
Office Weekday Average VTE (per Ksq ft)								
7	General Office	58,978,062	681,005	86.60	31.74	2,749	1,240	122%
Industrial Weekday Average VTE (per room)								
10	General Light Industrial	\$58,978,062	681,005	\$86.60	16.32	\$1,413	\$430	229%



Appendix F – Park Impact Fee Analysis Detailed Tables

Table F.1: Parks - System Valuation - Existing Assets

Description	Acq Date	Original Cost	Accumulated Depreciation	2020 CCI Replacement Cost	Replacement Cost New Less Depreciation (RCNLD)
Building and Improvements					
Tuff Shed	5/31/2018	\$ 3,542	\$ 354	\$ 3,571	\$ 3,216
Storage Shed	1/1/2016	63,036	12,607	64,824	52,217
Field Prep Shed	1/1/2018	6,630	663	6,684	6,021
Parks Stage	1/1/2020	15,221	-	15,221	15,221
Dome Stage Building	1/1/2016	36,771	7,354	37,814	30,460
Concession Stand	1/1/2018	18,600	1,860	18,752	16,892
Park irrigation system	7/1/1997	18,335	18,335	32,081	13,746
North Creek Park Sprinkler System	9/6/2000	17,282	17,282	27,464	10,182
North Creek Picnic Shelter	1/1/1997	42,024	42,024	73,531	31,507
Highland Lake Park Pavillion	1/1/2018	9,500	950	9,578	8,628
Highland Lake Park Shack	1/1/2018	22,400	2,240	22,583	20,343
Gazebo (From Asset Listing)	7/1/2002	19,000	19,000	30,337	11,337
Gazebo (From Property Inventory PDF)	1/1/2008	30,467	18,280	38,881	20,601
Margil Farms Gazebo	1/1/2007	22,945	14,914	30,244	15,329
3 Park shelters - Ames Park	12/31/2007	31,872	17,529	42,010	24,481
Liberty Ranch Landscaping	12/31/2017	47,716	3,817	48,764	44,946
Liberty Ranch Picnic Shelter	1/1/2015	36,771	9,193	39,377	30,185
Ames Park Irrigation	7/1/2008	58,926	41,248	75,200	33,952
Ames Skateboard Park	7/1/2002	36,000	36,000	57,480	21,480
Total - Buildings and Improvements		\$ 537,037	\$ 263,652	\$ 674,395	\$ 410,744
Infrastructure					
Fishing Pond	7/1/2006	\$ 70,255	\$ 17,564	\$ 93,251	\$ 75,687
Mead Pedestrian Bridge	7/1/2006	13,439	8,399	17,838	9,438
Ames Park Sidewalk	7/1/2006	19,892	9,946	26,403	16,457
Ames Park Driplines	7/1/2006	12,500	12,500	16,591	4,091
Fishing Pier	7/1/2008	41,519	17,438	52,986	35,548
Walking Path from N Creek	7/1/2009	44,197	20,994	52,780	31,787
Mead Ponds Improvements	7/1/2011	102,980	30,894	113,276	82,382
Sidewalk Trail behind Featheridge (TEP grant)	12/31/2011	344,660	96,505	379,119	282,615
Founders Park Restroom	11/5/2012	36,760	11,334	39,898	28,564
Mead Pond Restrooms	1/1/2006	40,154	28,108	53,297	25,189
Ames Park Restroom Building	1/1/2004	27,443	21,954	38,141	16,187
Founders Park Irrigation System	12/31/2011	79,737	27,908	87,709	59,801
Founders Park Playground & Sprots Eq	12/31/2011	150,000	42,000	164,997	122,997
Liberty Ranch Park Basketball/Tennis Court	6/1/2020	119,000	-	119,000	119,000
Founder Park Tennis/Basketball Court	6/1/2020	50,000	-	50,000	50,000
Mead Ponds Pier	6/1/2020	20,000	-	20,000	20,000
North Creek Playground	6/1/2020	10,000	-	10,000	10,000
North Creek Basketball Court	6/1/2020	10,000	-	10,000	10,000
Town Hall Gazebo	6/1/2020	31,325	-	31,325	31,325
Founders Park Sidwalks	12/31/2011	143,785	40,260	158,161	117,901
Liberty Ranch Park Improvements	12/31/2015	352,607	42,313	377,600	335,287
Total - Infrastructure		\$ 1,720,253	\$ 428,117	\$ 1,912,373	\$ 1,484,256



Table F.1: Parks - System Valuation - Existing Assets Continued

Description	Acq Date	Original Cost	Accumulated Depreciation	1944 CCI Replacement Cost	Replacement Cost New Less Depreciation (RCNLD)
Land					
Ames Park	1/1/2016	\$ 2,844,000	\$ -	\$ 2,844,000	\$ 2,844,000
Founders Park	1/1/2016	1,620,000	-	1,620,000	1,620,000
Town Hall Park	1/1/2016	228,000	-	228,000	228,000
Feather Ridge 1		428,983	-	428,983	428,983
Feather Ridge 2		53,623	-	53,623	53,623
Founders Park 2		549,634	-	549,634	549,634
Industrial Park		160,869	-	160,869	160,869
Margil 1		134,057	-	134,057	134,057
Margil 2		134,057	-	134,057	134,057
Margil 3		536,229	-	536,229	536,229
Mead Ponds		4,799,246	-	4,799,246	4,799,246
North Creek		670,286	-	670,286	670,286
Liberty Ranch 2		4,383,669	-	4,383,669	4,383,669
Total - Land		\$ 16,542,651	\$ -	\$ 16,542,651	\$ 16,542,651
Vehicles, Furniture & Equipment					
Playground Equipment & bedding therefore	12/1/1999	\$ 20,141	\$ 20,141	\$ 20,141	\$ -
Ames Park Disc Golf	6/1/2020	4,000	-	4,000	4,000
Feather Ridge Playground	6/1/2020	15,000	-	15,000	15,000
Founders Park Playground Equipment and Benches	6/1/2020	16,800	-	16,800	16,800
Highland Lake Picnic Tables	6/1/2020	5,000	-	5,000	5,000
Liberty Ranch Park Picnic/Trash/Benches/BBQ	6/1/2020	13,100	-	13,100	13,100
Margil Park Playground, Etc	6/1/2020	15,000	-	15,000	15,000
Mead Ponds Picnic Tables	6/1/2020	2,400	-	2,400	2,400
Ames Park Picnic Shelters/Tables	1/1/2007	37,442	24,337	37,442	13,105
North Creek Benches	6/1/2020	2,000	-	2,000	2,000
Portable Summer Stage for Park	6/1/2016	5,000	1,292	5,000	3,708
Kawasaki 72" Lawn Mower	7/1/2009	9,562	9,562	9,562	-
Kawaski lawn mower	6/15/2010	9,922	9,922	9,922	-
Gator Utility Vehicle	2/1/2013	18,644	18,644	18,644	-
Mower	10/22/2018	9,662	1,932	9,662	7,730
Total - Vehicles, Furniture & Equipment		\$ 183,673	\$ 85,831	\$ 183,673	\$ 97,843
Grand Total Parks		\$18,983,615	\$777,599	\$19,313,093	\$18,535,494
Trails Assets					
Infrastructure					
Area Trails 2	7/1/2016	\$ 656,741	\$ 54,728	\$ 675,373	\$ 620,645
Area Trails Project - 3	11/19/2018	425,036	14,168	428,507	414,339
Total - Trails Infrastructure		\$ 1,081,777	\$ 68,896	\$ 1,103,880	\$ 1,034,984
Land					
All Trails	1/1/2016	\$ 3,588,000	\$ -	\$ 3,588,000	\$ 3,588,000
Total - Trails Land		\$ 3,588,000	\$ -	\$ 3,588,000	\$ 3,588,000
Grand Total - Trails		\$ 4,669,777	\$ 68,896	\$ 4,691,880	\$ 4,622,984
Total Parks and Trails		\$ 23,653,392	\$ 846,495	\$ 24,004,973	\$ 23,158,477



Table F.2: Parks - Capital Improvement Program

Description	Total Cost	%	Growth-Related	
			Allocated Cost	Acres/ Linear Feet
Parks - Amenities				
Highland Lake Phase 1	\$ 393,264	69%	\$ 271,514	-
Highland Lake Phase 2	375,840	69%	259,484	-
Highland Lake Phase 3	148,176	69%	102,302	-
Highland Lake Phase 4	-	69%	-	-
Ames Park Option 1	8,067,502	69%	5,569,892	-
Subtotal Parks - Amenities	\$ 8,984,782		\$ 6,203,193	-
Trails				
Area Trails Extension to Mead High School - underpass (1.25 Miles)	\$ 1,010,625	69%	\$ 697,747	4,557
Hwy 66/WCR 7 Underpass	3,000,000	69%	2,071,233	-
Welker - 3rd Street to Mead Ponds (1.50 Miles)	1,212,750	69%	837,296	5,468
Highland Lake Loop (2.50 Miles)	2,021,250	69%	1,395,493	9,113
Mead Ponds Loop (1.25 Miles)	1,010,625	69%	697,747	4,557
Subtotal Trails	\$ 8,255,250		\$ 5,699,516	23,695
Total CIP	\$17,240,032		\$ 11,902,708	
Total Growth-Related			\$ 11,902,708	



Table F.3: Park Fee Analysis - Plan Based

Planned Based Parks Level of Service	
Value of Existing Parks System	\$ 18,535,494
Existing Park Acres	123.40
Value Per Acre	<u>\$ 150,207</u>
Existing EDUs	1,532
Park Acres per EDU	<u>0.08</u>
Incremental EDUs	3,417
Recommended LOS (Acres per EDU)	0.01
Acres Attributed to Incremental EDUs	<u>38</u>
Park Value Attributable to Incremental EDUs	\$ 5,645,983
Planned Based LOS (Cost/EDU)	\$ 1,652
Planned Based Trails Level of Service	
Value of Existing Trails System	\$ 4,622,984
Existing Trails Linear Feet	31,574.40
Value Per Linear Foot	<u>\$146.42</u>
Existing EDU's	1,532
Linear Feet per EDU	<u>20.61</u>
Incremental EDUs	3,417
Recommended LOS (Linear Feet per EDU)	7.50
Linear Feet Attributed to Incremental EDUs	<u>25,628.26</u>
Trails Value Attributable to Incremental EDUs	\$ 3,752,377
Planned Based LOS (Cost/EDU)	1,098
Combined Parks and Trails System Value	\$ 9,398,360
Incremental EDUs	3,417
Value per EDU	<u>\$ 2,750</u>



Table F.4: Park Fee Schedule - Plan Based

Description	Fee per Dwelling Unit
Single Family Fee (1.00 EDU)	\$ 2,750
Multi-Family Fee (0.51 EDU)	1,399

Table F.5: Park Impact Fee Comparison - Plan Based

	Calculated Fee	Current Fees	Change in Dollars	Percent Change
Residential				
Single Family	\$ 2,750	\$ 2,776	\$ (26)	-1%
Multi-Family	1,399	1,961	(562)	-29%
Non-residential				
Retail	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	N/A
Office & Institutional	-	-	-	N/A
Industrial	-	-	-	N/A



1555 South Havana Street, Suite F305
Aurora, CO 80012
800.755-6864 | Fax: 888.326.6864

www.willdan.com