

Transportation Impact Fee Advisory Committee

October 4, 2017

Meeting Minutes

Meeting called to order at 10:00 AM

Attendance

- Committee Members Present: Bill White, Craig Soehren, Arthur Whitten, John Dietzman, Jim Bakke, Amber Waldref, Sabrina Minshall, E.J. Iannelli, Joe Tortorelli,
- Committee Members Not Present: Kerry Brooks, John Fisher, Ben Stuckart, Alan Springer, Andrew Rolwes
- Staff Present: Inga Note, Eldon Brown, Patty Kells, Katherine Miller, James Richman

Discussion Items:

1. Code Incentives

Staff report: Inga Note

- There was general agreement on the latest version of section 17D.075.070 with a few edits to the first paragraph and the subsections references at the end of the document.

2. Land Use table adjustments

Staff report: Inga Note

- We discussed the addition of low-income housing to the trip table. There was general agreement on adding this with the restriction that it only be applied to units that qualify for certain types of programs (WA State's Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program, City of Spokane's HOME Program, HUD vouchers that are attached to the units, etc.) The intent is that these programs have already vetted the low-income housing which would save development staff from doing additional work to research the project.
- We also discussed a recent staff suggestion to change from the two different multi-family rates (based on building height) to separate rates for apartments vs. condo/townhouse units. Apartments typically have a higher trip generation rate than condos/townhouses. The current system of using two different multi-family rates appeared to be using too low of a trip generation rate for 3 level apartment units. There was general consensus to move forward with this concept.
- Staff presented the math behind the proposed college and K-12 school rates. The current method charges by student, which is difficult to administer as school enrollment fluctuates, and is not always influenced by school expansion. The proposed method would charge by the gross square footage for K-12 and assignable square feet for college/university.

3. Impact Fee Revenue, Project Lists & Future Rates

Staff report: Inga Note

- Staff provided an overview of the total impact fees collected between Jan 2011 and July 2017 broken down by each district.
- Items to address for the next meeting:
 - Update the cost % of projects such as Hamilton Corridor where we have a match obligation of less than 40%
 - Provide a few different scenarios for rates for the group to consider as options and send them ahead of the meeting to allow time for review. 1) Maintain the status quo on rates and developer share, then adjust the amount on "payback" projects to meet the desired impact fee rate. 2) What would the absolute minimum be in project costs?

Note: Minutes summarized by staff.

No payback projects, less money to bike-ped projects. 3) Maybe a scenario with higher developer share%?

- Find the section of code that discusses a fixed annual inflation adjustment and discuss implementation with the update.
- Add the dollar value of physical improvements made by developers to the spreadsheet to provide a better picture of revenue (or projects in lieu of) to the program.
- Break out the fees collected on an annual basis so we can see how the economy impacted the fee collection.

4. Next Meeting

Topics for the next meeting will include:

- More discussion on rates, developer share, etc.

Meeting Adjourned at 11:55 AM

Next Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting is scheduled for November 2017, date to be determined.