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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In January 2019, the City of Waco, Texas, authorized Freese and Nichols, Inc. (FNI) to perform an impact fee analysis on the City's water, wastewater, and roadway systems. The purpose of this report is to summarize the methodology used in the development and calculation of impact fees for the City of Waco. The methodology used herein satisfies the requirements of the Texas Local Government Code Section 395 for the establishment of water, wastewater, and roadway impact fees.

## Land Use Assumptions

Population and land use assumptions are important elements in the analysis of water, wastewater, and roadway systems. To assist in the determination of need and timing of capital improvements to serve future development, a reasonable estimation of future growth is required. Growth and future development projections were formulated based on assumptions pertaining to the type, location, quantity, and timing of various future land uses within the community. These land use assumptions, which include population projections, are the basis for the preparation of impact fee capital improvements plans for water, wastewater, and roadway facilities.

## Capital Improvement Plan

Water, wastewater, and roadway impact fee capital improvements plans (CIP) were developed for the City of Waco based on the land use assumptions, input from City staff, and projects from previous studies. The recommended improvements will provide the required capacity to meet projected water demands, wastewater flows, and roadway demand through year 2030. The projects identified are consistent with the Chapter 395 definition of impact fee eligible projects. The water, wastewater, and roadway CIP projects are summarized in Tables ES-1, ES-2, and ES-3, respectively.

Table ES-1: Water Impact Fee CIP Projects

| Proj. No. | Description of Project |
| :---: | :---: |
| W-1 | Riverside to Gholson 30-inch Water Line |
| W-2 | Highway 84 Water Line Improvements |
| W-3 | Spring Valley Water Lines |
| W-4 | Owen Lane 2.0 MG Elevated Storage Tank |
| W-5 | Hillcrest Pump Station Expansion |
| W-6 | 16-inch Ritchie Road Water Line |
| W-7 | China Spring Water Line |
| W-8 | McGregor-Waco-Woodway Connection 16" Water Line |
| W-9 | Water Transmission Improvements |
| W-10 | Peach Street 16-inch Water Line |
| W-11 | Elm Street 12-inch Water Line |
| W-12 | Impact Fee Study |
| W-13 | Riverside Water Treatment Plant Expansion |
| W-14 | Riverside Pump Station Expansion |
| W-15 | Downtown Mary Avenue to 5th Street |
| W-16 | Pressure Plane 6 Water Storage |
| W-17 | Chapel Road 24-inch Water Line |
| W-18 | Old McGregor 3.0 MG Ground Storage Tank |
| W-19 | Airport 1.0 MG Ground Storage Tank |
| W-20 | 20/24-inch Water Line in Pressure Plane 1 |
| W-21 | 72-inch Parallel Raw Water Line |
| W-22 | 16/24-inch Water Line in Pressure Plane 3 |
| W-23 | Low Head Pump Station at Mt. Carmel WTP |

Table ES-2: Wastewater Impact Fee CIP Projects

| Proj. No. | Description of Project |
| :---: | :---: |
| WW-1 | FM 1637 12/15/21/24-inch Wastewater Line |
| WW-2 | China Spring 24-inch Wastewater Line |
| WW-3 | Transfer Lift Station, Force Main, and 66-inch Gravity Line |
| WW-4 | Impact Fee Study |
| WW-5 | Bull Hide Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion to 3.0 MGD |
| WW-6 | Brazos Basin: Gurley Ave |
| WW-7 | 54-inch Wastewater Line at Lake Brazos Park |
| WW-8 | TSTC Lift Station Expansion and Force Main |
| WW-9 | Highway 84 30-inch Wastewater Line |
| WW-10 | Cloice Creek and Church Road Lift Stations, Force Mains, and 21-inch Gravity Line |
| WW-11 | Highway 84 24-inch Wastewater Line |
| WW-12 | China Spring Wastewater Treatment Plant |
| WW-13 | Highway 84 Wastewater Treatment Plant |
| WW-14 | New Quest Wastewater Line |
| WW-15 | 24-inch Wastewater Line |
| WW-16 | Bridge 18-inch Wastewater Line |
| WW-17 |  |

Table ES-3: Roadway Impact Fee CIP Projects

| Project <br> Number | Roadway | From | To |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Service Area 1 |  |  |  |
| 1 | Gholson Rd | Herring Ave | 960' S of Herring Ave |
| 2 | Gholson Rd | 960' S of Herring Ave | Waco Dr |
| Service Area 2 |  |  |  |
| 3 | Lake Shore Dr | Mt Carmel Dr | Koehne Park Dr |
| 4 | Valley Mills Dr | Koehne Park Dr | Hillandale Rd |
| 5 | Valley Mills Dr | Hillandale Rd | Ridgewood Dr |
| 6 | Valley Mills Dr | Ridgewood Dr | Bishop Dr |
| Service Area 3 |  |  |  |
| 7 | Bagby Ave | New Rd | Monte Vista St |
| 8 | Bagby Ave | Monte Vista St | Richter Ave |
| 9 | Bagby Ave | Richter Ave | Valley Mills Dr |
| 10 | S New Rd | Bagby Ave | I-35 |
| 11 | Garden Dr | Robinson Rd | 16th St |
| 12 | 18th St | La Salle | Gurley Ln |
| 13 | $16^{\text {th }}$ | Gurley Ln | Garden Dr |
| 14 | $12^{\text {th }}$ | Garden Dr | TX-340 |
| 15 | University Parks Dr | La Salle Ave | Garden Dr |
| Service Area 4 |  |  |  |
| 16 | Martin Luther King Jr Blvd | BUS 77 | SH 484 |
| Service Area 6 |  |  |  |
| 1 | Gholson Rd | 960' S of Herring Ave | Herring Ave |
| 17 | Gholson Rd | Herring Ave | Lakeshore Dr |
| Service Area 7 |  |  |  |
| 18 | North River Crossing | End of bridge | 580' NE of Curry Ln |
| 19 | North River Crossing | 580' NE of Curry Ln | Yankie Rd |
| 20 | Flat Rock Rd | Yankie Rd | Tree Lake Rd |
| 21 | Flat Rock Rd | Tree Lake Rd | China Spring Rd |
| 22 | Yankie Rd | North River Crossing | Flat Rock Rd |
| 23 | Tree Lake Dr | China Spring Rd | Flat Rock Rd |
| 24 | Wortham Bend | North City Limit | China Spring Rd |
| Service Area 9 |  |  |  |
| 25 | Mars Dr | Hewitt Dr | Texas Central Pkwy |
| 26 | Beverly Dr | W Loop 340 | 4128' NE of Loop 340 |
| 27 | Beverly Dr | 4128' NE of Loop 340 | New Road |
| 28 | Hewitt Dr | Woodway Dr | Old McGregor Dr |
| 29 | Hewitt Dr | Old McGregor Dr | Imperial Dr |
| 30 | Hewitt Dr | Imperial Dr | Mars Dr |


| Project <br> Number | Roadway | From | To |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31 | Texas Central Pkwy | Railroad | Imperial Dr |  |
| 10 | S New Rd | Bagby Ave | I-35 |  |
| 32 | Bagby Ave. | New Road | TX 340 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 33 | Warren Rd | Service Area 10 | Ritchie Rd |  |
| 34 | Warren Rd | City Limit | Mitchie Rd |  |
| 35 | Farmiller Rd | 1300' south of Chapel Rd | 2100' north of Warren Rd |  |
| 29 | Hewitt Dr | Old McGregor Dr | Imperial Dr |  |
| 30 | Hewitt Dr | Imperial Dr | Mars Dr |  |
| 36 | Chapel Rd | Meadow Mountain Dr | Warren St |  |
| 37 | Ritchie Rd | Panther Way | US 84 |  |
| 38 | Val Verde Rd | Forvice Area 11 | Walking Horse Ln |  |
| 39 | Harris Creek Rd | Fossil Rim Rd | Oak Rd |  |
| 40 | Speegleville Rd | US 84 | US 84 |  |
| 41 | Speegleville Rd | Pecan Creek | Oak Rd |  |
| 42 | Old Lorena Rd | US 84 EBFR | South Bosque River |  |

## Impact Fee Analysis

Chapter 395 of the Texas Local Government Code states that the maximum impact fee may not exceed the amount determined by dividing the cost of capital improvements required by the total number of service units attributed to new development during the impact fee eligibility period, less the credit to account for revenues used to finance capital improvement plans. The total projected costs include the projected capital improvement costs to serve 10-year development, the projected finance cost for the capital improvements, and the consultant cost for preparing and updating the Capital Improvements Plan. Tables ES-4, ES-5, and ES-6 below display a summary of the maximum allowable impact fee calculations for water, wastewater, and roadway, respectively.

Table ES-4: Maximum Water Impact Fee Calculation

| Water Impact Fee |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Eligible Capital Improvement Costs | $\$ 34,046,711$ |
| Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee Planning Period | $\$ 17,023,355$ |
| Financing Costs | $\$ 6,531,589$ |
| Interest Earnings | $(\$ 541,910)$ |
| Total Eligible Impact Fee Costs | $\$ 23,013,034$ |
| Growth in Service Units | 12,753 |
| Maximum Impact Fee per Service Unit | $\$ 1,804$ |

Table ES-5: Maximum Wastewater Impact Fee Calculation

| Wastewater Impact Fee |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Eligible Capital Improvement Costs | $\$ 63,734,419$ |
| Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee Planning Period | $\$ 31,867,209$ |
| Financing Costs | $\$ 15,091,715$ |
| Interest Earnings | $(\$ 1,371,302)$ |
| Total Eligible Impact Fee Costs | $\$ 45,587,622$ |
| Growth in Service Units | 12,753 |
| Maximum Impact Fee per Service Unit | $\$ 3,574$ |

Table ES-6: Maximum Roadway Impact Fee Calculations

| Service Area: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Project Costs | \$204,914 | \$4,355,135 | \$16,064,507 | \$518,981 | \$ | \$615,707 | \$14,769,596 | \$ - | \$8,783,276 | \$7,002,158 | \$10,515,854 |
| Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee Planning Period | \$66,333 | \$2,102,651 | \$3,604,402 | \$109,788 | \$ - | \$306,773 | \$2,393,745 | \$ - | \$4,391,638 | \$2,263,085 | \$1,588,886 |
| Financing Costs | \$39,657 | \$1,265,970 | \$2,167,182 | \$65,135 | \$ - | \$183,836 | \$1,435,329 | \$ - | \$2,645,980 | \$1,362,050 | \$953,433 |
| Interest Earnings | \$(3,934) | \$(125,579) | \$(214,975) | \$(6,461) | \$ - | \$(18,236) | \$ $(142,378)$ | \$ - | \$(262,470) | \$(135,109) | \$ (94,576) |
| Total Eligible Impact Fee Costs | \$102,056 | \$3,243,042 | \$5,556,609 | \$168,462 | \$ - | \$472,373 | \$3,686,696 | \$ - | \$6,775,149 | \$3,490,026 | \$2,447,742 |
| Growth in Service Units | 15,947 | 4,650 | 4,293 | 650 | 1,650 | 2,002 | 3,879 | - | 10,967 | 2,636 | 2,094 |
| Maximum Assessable Fee | \$6 | \$697 | \$1,294 | \$259 | \$ | \$236 | \$950 | \$ | \$618 | \$1,324 | \$1,169 |

### 1.0 BACKGROUND

Chapter 395 of the Texas Local Government Code requires an impact fee analysis before impact fees can be created and assessed. Chapter 395 defines an impact fee as "a charge or assessment imposed by a political subdivision against new development in order to generate revenue for funding or recouping the costs of capital improvements or facility expansions necessitated by and attributable to the new development." In September 2001, Senate Bill 243 amended Chapter 395 thus creating the current procedure for implementing impact fees. Chapter 395 identifies the following items as impact fee eligible costs:

- Construction contract price
- Surveying and engineering fees
- Land acquisition costs
- Fees paid to the consultant preparing or updating the capital improvements plan (CIP)
- Projected interest charges and other finance costs for projects identified in the CIP

Chapter 395 also identifies items that impact fees cannot used to pay for, such as:

- Construction, acquisition, or expansion of public facilities or assets other than those identified on the capital improvements plan
- Repair, operation, or maintenance of existing or new capital improvements
- Upgrading, updating, expanding, or replacing existing capital improvements to serve existing development in order to meet stricter safety, efficiency, environmental, or regulatory standards
- Upgrading, updating, expanding, or replacing existing capital improvements to provide better service to existing development
- Administrative and operating costs of the political subdivision
- Principal payments and interest or other finance charges on bonds or other indebtedness, except as allowed above

In January 2019, the City of Waco authorized Freese and Nichols, Inc. (FNI) to perform an impact fee analysis on the City's water, wastewater, and roadway systems. The purpose of this report is to present the methodology used in the development and calculation of water, wastewater, and roadway impact fees for the City of Waco. The methodology used herein satisfies the requirements
of the Texas Local Government Code Chapter 395 for the establishment of water, wastewater, and roadway impact fees.

Table 1-1 provides a list of abbreviations used in this report.

Table 1-1: Abbreviations

| Abbreviation | Full Nomenclature |
| :---: | :---: |
| AWWA | American Water Works Association |
| CAGR | Capital Improvements Plan |
| CIP | Extra-territorial Jurisdiction |
| ETJ | Freese and Nichols, Inc. |
| FNI | gallons per minute |
| gpm | Impact Fee Capital Improvements Plan |
| IFCIP | Infiltration and Inflow |
| I/I | Level of Service |
| ITE | Land Use Assumptions |
| LOS | Million Gallons per Day |
| LUA | Metropolitan Planning Organization |
| MGD | Special Arterial |
| MPO | Special Collector |
| SA | square foot |
| SC | Traffic Analysis Zone |
| Sf | two-way left turn lane |
| TAZ | Vehicle-miles |
| TWLTL |  |
| veh-mi | VMT |

### 2.0 METHODOLOGY

Based upon the growth assumptions and the capital improvements needed to support growth, it is possible to develop an impact fee structure which fairly allocates improvement costs to growth areas in relationship to their impact upon the entire infrastructure system. The data in this report has been formulated using reasonable and generally accepted planning principles for the preparation of impact fee systems in Texas and meets the requirements of the Texas Local Government Code Section 395 for the establishment of impact fees.

For the formulation of the land use assumptions and the capital improvements plans, a series of work tasks were undertaken and are described below.

- A kick-off meeting was held to describe the general methodological approach in the study. Service areas were defined for roadway, water, and wastewater impact fee systems.
- Data from the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) was used as an initial database for this study. Population and employment data for 2010, 2015, and 2040 (MPO projections) by TAZ were collected.
- A compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of $1.2 \%$ was recommended for population and employment in the City Limits based on historical growth trends.
- The compound annual growth rates in the ETJ are higher than the City Limits due to the high amount of vacant land within the ETJ. This development potential in the ETJ area results in a $4.9 \%-5 \%$ CAGR for 2030 and 2040 population projection. In terms of employment, the CAGR for the 2030 projection is $4.06 \%$ and the CAGR for the 2040 projection is $5.74 \%$.
- Vehicle-miles of travel (VMT) in the PM peak hour was identified as the service unit of measure for analyses and impact fee calculations.
- A roadway inventory was conducted to document lane geometrics, roadway functional classification, and system capacity. Traffic volume count data were collected in May 2019 to determine roadway utilization and if any capacity deficiencies exist within each impact fee service area. Traffic volume counts were conducted at 30 locations throughout the city.
- Base and 10-year demographics were prepared for the respective service areas for water, wastewater, and roadway.
- Water demands and wastewater flow projections were developed based on the population projections.
- Projected 10-year growth was calculated for service areas based on land use assumptions (projections of population and employment growth) and translated into residential, office, commercial and industrial VMT using service unit equivalencies. Trip rate data was obtained from Trip Generation, Tenth Edition by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, and trip length statistics for Waco were obtained from the Waco MPO travel demand model and the National Household Workplace Survey.
- Water, wastewater, and roadway capital improvements plans were developed.
- The maximum allowable water, wastewater, and roadway impact fees were calculated.


### 3.0 LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS

### 3.1 Data Collection Zones and Service Area Maps

### 3.1.1 Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZ)

Data collection zones used for land use assumptions are based upon small geographic areas known as traffic analysis zones (TAZs). These zones, established by Waco Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), serve as the basis for socio-demographic data used in the regional travel forecast model. The TAZs were originally formulated on the basis of homogeneity and traffic generation potential using major arterials, creeks, railroad lines and other physical boundaries for delineation. A total of 322 TAZs have been analyzed for this process.

### 3.1.2 Service Areas

Chapter 395 requires that service areas be defined for impact fees to ensure that facility improvements are in close proximity to areas generating needs. The water and wastewater service areas were developed using the Extraterritorial Jurisdiction (ETJ). Figure 3-1 illustrates the water service area for the Waco Impact Fee study, and Figure 3-2 shows the wastewater service area.

Legislative requirements stipulate that roadway service areas be limited to a 6 -mile maximum and must be located within the current city limits. Transportation service areas are different from water and wastewater systems, which can include the city limits and its extra-territorial jurisdiction (ETJ) or other defined service area. This is primarily because roadway systems are "open" to both local and regional (non-city) use as opposed to a defined level of utilization from residents within a water and wastewater system. The result is that new development can only be assessed an impact fee based on the cost of necessary capital improvements within that service area. The service areas for roadways are illustrated on Figure 3-3.

Figure 3-1: Water Service Area


Figure 3-2: Wastewater Service Area


Figure 3-3: Roadway Service Area


### 3.1.3 Data Format

The existing database, as well as the future projections, were formulated according to the following format and categories:

| Service Area | Correlates to the City Limits and ETJ. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Traffic Analysis Zone | Geographic areas established by the MPO Traffic Model that are used for <br> data collection purposes and termed TAZs within this report. |
| Population (2020) | Existing population for the base year (2020). |
| Population (2030, 2040) | Projected population by service zone for the year 2030 and 2040 (10-year <br> and 20-year growth projections). |
| Employment (2020-2040) | Current employment population and future employment projections <br> based on historical employment to population ratio. |

### 3.1.4 Land Use Methodology

These land use assumptions and future growth projections take into consideration several factors influencing development patterns, including the following

- The character, type, density, and quantity of existing development,
- Anticipated future land use derived from the City's current land use trend, Waco 2040 (the City's Comprehensive Plan presented on Figure 3-4)
- Availability of land for future expansion,
- Current and historical growth trends of population and development within the City,
- Location and configuration of vacant land, and
- Known or anticipated development projects as defined by City Staff.

Figure 3-4: Future Land Use Map


A series of work tasks were undertaken in the development of this report and are described below:

## Step 1: Scope of the Study and Data Collection

A kick-off meeting was held to discuss the general methodological approach in the study. Data from MPO was used as an initial database for this study. Population and employment data for 2010, 2015, and 2040 (MPO projections) by TAZ were collected. The datasets were joined and examined thoroughly with spatial data using ArcGIS.

Step 2: Estimation of 2020 Population and Employment
Although TAZs were used as a basis for the data analysis purpose, it is important to note that TAZ boundaries do not follow the City Limits or ETJ in various locations. In order to calculate data for the study area, the base population and employment data for each TAZ were reviewed and adjustments were made where necessary. There were a few different scenarios to consider for the adjustments (also shown on Figure 3-5):
a) A TAZ is geographically located completely within the City Limits
b) A TAZ is geographically located completely within the ETJ
c) A TAZ is split between City Limits and ETJ
d) A TAZ is split between the City Limits and another city
e) A TAZ is split between the ETJ and another city

Figure 3-5: Land Use Assumption Scenarios


With scenario a) and b), the 2015 population and employment estimates were slightly adjusted to reflect 2020 base year estimates, as received from the MPO. However, with scenarios c), d), and e), detailed spatial and geographical analysis of that TAZ were conducted to adjust and estimate 2020 population and employment numbers proportionately. The 2020 total population and employment numbers were calculated by aggregating the numbers of all applicable TAZs.

## Step 3: Projection of 2030 and 2040 Population and Employment

Each TAZ was evaluated from the perspective of its current development condition and anticipated future development trends. In general, past growth rates and the anticipated development trends were analyzed. Aerial images were used extensively to gain proper understanding of the future development potential for each TAZ. For example, for a TAZ that is built-out and no redevelopment projects are anticipated for that TAZ, the 2020 numbers remained the same or similar for 2030 and 2040. On the other hand, for a TAZ that was only partially developed or completely vacant, the City's anticipated future land use pattern was analyzed for that area to determine what type of development that TAZ was likely to host by 2030 and 2040. Figure 3-6 illustrates these examples. Population and employment for 2030 and 2040 were also projected based on that analysis. Where it was anticipated that redevelopment would occur within portions of the study area, adjustments were also made. The 2030 and 2040 total population and employment numbers were calculated by aggregating the numbers for all applicable TAZs.

Figure 3-6: TAZ Developmental Potential


### 3.2 Base Year Data

This section documents the City's historical growth trends and data used to derive the 2020 base year population estimate for the City of Waco. This "benchmark" information provides a starting basis of data for the 10 -year and 20 -year growth assumptions that will be presented within the following section.

### 3.2.1 Historical Growth

In order to attain an appropriate understanding of the City's growth pattern, recent and historical population trends were analyzed. Waco has experienced significant population growth since 1970, there were years or decades with significant growth, whereas some years or decades grew in a more moderate manner. The Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR) between 1960 and 2010 was $0.49 \%$ and the CAGR between 2010 and 2020 was $1.11 \%$, indicating a trend that Waco's CAGR may increase in the approaching years.

Table 3-1: Population Trend by Decade (City Limits Only)

| Year | Population | Population Change | Percent <br> Change | CAGR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1960 | 97,808 | - | - |  |
| 1970 | 95,326 | $-2,482$ | $-2.54 \%$ | $0.49 \%$ |
| 1980 | 101,261 | 5,935 | $6.23 \%$ |  |
| 1990 | 103,590 | 2,329 | $2.30 \%$ |  |
| 2000 | 113,726 | 10,136 | $9.78 \%$ |  |
| 2010 | 124,805 | 11,079 | $9.74 \%$ |  |

Table 3-2: Population Trend in Recent Years (City Limits Only)

| Year | Population | Population Change | Percent <br> Change | CAGR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010 | 122,212 | - | - |  |
| 2011 | 123,584 | 1,372 | $1.12 \%$ |  |
| 2012 | 124,843 | 1,259 | $1.02 \%$ | $1.11 \%$ |
| 2013 | 126,406 | 1,563 | $1.25 \%$ |  |
| 2014 | 127,796 | 1,390 | $1.10 \%$ |  |
| 2015 | 129,193 | 1,397 | $1.09 \%$ |  |
| 2016 | 130,659 | 1,466 | $1.13 \%$ |  |
| 2020 | 131,996 | 1,337 | $1.02 \%$ |  |

### 3.2.2 Estimated City Limit Population Projections

Based on the historical growth trends of Waco, a series of projection alternatives using a 2020 base year population of $\mathbf{1 4 0 , 9 5 1}$ were developed. In order to develop an estimated population projection for 2030 and 2040, multiple compound annual growth rate (CAGR) scenarios in Table 3-3 were calculated. The recommended CAGR for population projection in this land use assumption process is $1.2 \%$.

Table 3-3: Population Projection Scenario (City Limits Only)

| CAGR (\%) | 1.00\% | 1.20\% | 1.25\% | 1.50\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Population | Population | Population | Population |
| 2020 | 140,951 | 140,951 | 140,951 | 140,951 |
| 2021 | 142,361 | 142,642 | 142,713 | 143,065 |
| 2022 | 143,784 | 144,354 | 144,497 | 145,211 |
| 2023 | 145,222 | 146,086 | 146,303 | 147,389 |
| 2024 | 146,674 | 147,839 | 148,132 | 149,600 |
| 2025 | 148,141 | 149,613 | 149,983 | 151,844 |
| 2026 | 149,622 | 151,409 | 151,858 | 154,122 |
| 2027 | 151,119 | 153,226 | 153,756 | 156,434 |
| 2028 | 152,630 | 155,064 | 155,678 | 158,780 |
| 2029 | 154,156 | 156,925 | 157,624 | 161,162 |
| 2030 | 155,698 | 158,808 | 159,595 | 163,579 |
| 2031 | 157,255 | 160,714 | 161,590 | 166,033 |
| 2032 | 158,827 | 162,643 | 163,610 | 168,524 |
| 2033 | 160,415 | 164,594 | 165,655 | 171,051 |
| 2034 | 162,020 | 166,569 | 167,725 | 173,617 |
| 2035 | 163,640 | 168,568 | 169,822 | 176,221 |
| 2036 | 165,276 | 170,591 | 171,945 | 178,865 |
| 2037 | 166,929 | 172,638 | 174,094 | 181,548 |
| 2038 | 168,598 | 174,710 | 176,270 | 184,271 |
| 2039 | 170,284 | 176,806 | 178,474 | 187,035 |
| 2040 | 171,987 | 178,928 | 180,704 | 189,841 |

### 3.2.3 Estimated City Limit Population Projections

In terms of employment, Waco's employment has historically been between $45 \%-48 \%$ of its total population. Applying that ratio and other demographic information available for the MPO, a 2020 base year employment of $\mathbf{6 7 , 2 9 7}$ was incorporated in order to serve as a basis for the land use assumption process. In order to develop an estimated employment projection for 2030 and 2040, multiple compound annual growth rate (CAGR) scenarios in Table 3-4 were calculated. The recommended CAGR for employment projection in this land use assumption process is approximately $1.2 \%$.

Table 3-4: Employment Projection Scenario (City Limits Only)

| CAGR (\%) | 1.00\% | 1.20\% | 1.25\% | 1.50\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Employment | Employment | Employment | Employment |
| 2020 | 67,297 | 67,297 | 67,297 | 67,297 |
| 2021 | 67,970 | 68,105 | 68,138 | 68,306 |
| 2022 | 68,650 | 68,922 | 68,990 | 69,331 |
| 2023 | 69,336 | 69,749 | 69,852 | 70,371 |
| 2024 | 70,030 | 70,586 | 70,725 | 71,427 |
| 2025 | 70,730 | 71,433 | 71,610 | 72,498 |
| 2026 | 71,437 | 72,290 | 72,505 | 73,585 |
| 2027 | 72,151 | 73,158 | 73,411 | 74,689 |
| 2028 | 72,873 | 74,035 | 74,329 | 75,810 |
| 2029 | 73,602 | 74,924 | 75,258 | 76,947 |
| 2030 | 74,338 | 75,823 | 76,198 | 78,101 |
| 2031 | 75,081 | 76,733 | 77,151 | 79,272 |
| 2032 | 75,832 | 77,654 | 78,115 | 80,462 |
| 2033 | 76,590 | 78,585 | 79,092 | 81,668 |
| 2034 | 77,356 | 79,529 | 80,080 | 82,893 |
| 2035 | 78,130 | 80,483 | 81,081 | 84,137 |
| 2036 | 78,911 | 81,449 | 82,095 | 85,399 |
| 2037 | 79,700 | 82,426 | 83,121 | 86,680 |
| 2038 | 80,497 | 83,415 | 84,160 | 87,980 |
| 2039 | 81,302 | 84,416 | 85,212 | 89,300 |
| 2040 | 82,115 | 85,429 | 86,277 | 90,639 |

### 3.2.4 Population and Employment Projections in the ETJ

In the ETJ, the 2020 base population is estimated to be 18,546 and the 2020 base employment is estimated to be 4,372, as indicated in the TAZ analysis. The CAGRs for the 2030 and 2040 projections for the ETJ area are higher than the CAGRs within the City Limits. The primary reason is the high amount of vacant land within the ETJ, as compared to the City Limits. Within the City Limits, many areas are already built-out with little development potential in the future, adding little significant new population and employment to those areas. On the other hand, the majority of the ETJ areas are either partially developed or completely vacant, making those areas ideal to add new population and employment. For example, it is anticipated that one development with 500 residential lots will be added in TAZ 239 alone in near future, which is in the ETJ area.

This development potential in the ETJ area results in a $4.9 \%-5 \%$ CAGR for 2030 and 2040 population projection. In terms of employment, the CAGR for the 2030 projection is $4.06 \%$ and the CAGR for the 2040 projection is $5.74 \%$.

### 3.2.5 Building Permit Analysis

Analyzing the building permits issued by the City in the recent years is helpful to obtain a perspective about future projection. For example, the City of Waco issued 536 residential building permits in 2018 and 514 residential building permits in 2017. However, the number of building permits issued were less than 400 in the year of 2015. The increase in building permits is also an indicator of upcoming growth and reflects emerging trends for projection purposes. In order to achieve a CAGR of $1.2 \%$, more than 600 dwelling units per year will need to be permitted.

### 3.2.6 2020 Population and Employment

For the land use assumptions process, 2020 base population and employment data was calculated using data from the Waco MPO. This information provided a breakout of population and employment by TAZ. For assumption purposes, and to be consistent with the population totals, an interpolation of the population and employment numbers was calculated to derive the 2020 population and employment estimates by TAZ. Adjustments were also made based on discussions with City staff. It is important to note that the TAZs do not follow City limits or water and wastewater service areas in some locations, so adjustments were made based on the locations of existing land uses and upon the percentage of each TAZ located within City limits. Figure 3-7 presents the TAZ boundaries. Since water, wastewater, and roadway have different service areas, three sets of assumptions were used, each tailored to its own service area.

Tables 3-5 and 3-6 summarize the population and employment for 2020.

Figure 3-7: Traffic Analysis Zone Boundaries


Table 3-5: Summary of Base Year (2020) Population

| Service <br> Area | Population |
| :---: | :---: |
| Water | 159,497 |
| Wastewater | 159,497 |
| Roadway | 140,951 |

Table 3-6: Summary of Base Year (2020) Roadway Population

|  | Employment | Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Service Area 1 | 23,939 | 76,420 |
| Service Area 2 | 17,162 | 19,903 |
| Service Area 3 | 3,003 | 14,789 |
| Service Area 4 | 290 | 1,224 |
| Service Area 5 | 1,315 | 1,304 |
| Service Area 6 | 1,307 | 2,911 |
| Service Area 7 | 956 | 3,886 |
| Service Area 9 | 17,862 | $\mathbf{1 , 2 6 1}$ |
| Service Area 10 | $\mathbf{1 4 0}$ |  |
| Service Area 11 | $\mathbf{6 7 , 2 9 7}$ | 5,365 |
| Total |  |  |

### 3.3 Ten-Year and Twenty-Year Growth Assumptions

Projected growth has been characterized in two forms: population and employment acreage. A series of assumptions were made to arrive at reasonable growth rates for population and employment. For description of the projection methodology, please see Section 3.1.4. Generally, the following assumptions were made as a basis from which ten-year and twenty-year projections could be initiated.

- Future land uses will occur based on similar trends of the past and will conform with the anticipated future development and redevelopment opportunities as forecasted in the Comprehensive Plan and other special area plan, and
- The City will be able to finance the necessary improvements to accommodate continued growth.

The roadway population and employment are presented in Table 3-7. Table 3-8 summarizes the population and employment projections for both roadway and water/wastewater from 2020-2040. Table 3-9 summarizes the change in population and employment by planning year for both roadway and water/wastewater. A full list of population and employment by TAZ is included in Appendix A.

Table 3-7: Population and Employment Projections for Roadway Service Area

|  | Population |  |  | Employment |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ |
| Service Area <br> $\mathbf{1}$ | 76,420 | 82,294 | 87,665 | 23,939 | 26,843 | 30,062 |
| Service Area <br> $\mathbf{2}$ | 19,903 | 21,043 | 22,373 | 17,162 | 18,280 | 19,277 |
| Service Area <br> $\mathbf{3}$ | 14,789 | 17,063 | 18,789 | 3,003 | 3,460 | 4,164 |
| Service Area <br> $\mathbf{4}$ | 1,224 | 1,649 | 2,212 | 290 | 330 | 524 |
| Service Area <br> $\mathbf{5}$ | 1,304 | 1,348 | 1,455 | 1,315 | 1,723 | 3,438 |
| Service Area <br> $\mathbf{6}$ | 2,911 | 3,905 | 8,495 | 1,307 | 1,561 | 1,956 |
| Service Area <br> $\mathbf{7}$ | 6,886 | 9,043 | 10,485 | 956 | 1,329 | 1,756 |
| Service Area <br> $\mathbf{9}$ | 3,439 | 4,982 | 5,648 | 17,862 | 20,345 | 21,881 |
| Service Area <br> $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 8,710 | 10,549 | 12,079 | 1,261 | 1,379 | 1,475 |
| Service Area <br> $\mathbf{1 1}$ | 5,365 | 6,589 | 8,157 | 202 | 370 | 456 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 4 0 , 9 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 8 , 4 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 7 , 3 5 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 7 , 2 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 , 6 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 4 , 9 8 9}$ |

Table 3-8: Roadway and Water/Wastewater Service Area Growth Projections

|  | Population |  |  | Employment |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 |
| (City Limits and ETJ) | 159,497 | 188,433 | 226,443 | 71,669 | 82,132 | 98,329 |
| Roadway Service Area (City Limits <br> minus TAZs 163, 166, 401) | 140,951 | 158,465 | 177,358 | 67,297 | 75,620 | 84,989 |

Table 3-9: Projected Change in Population and Employment

|  | Population |  | Employment |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2020-2030 <br> Change | 2020-2040 <br> Change | 2020-2030 <br> Change | 2020-2040 <br> Change |
| Water and Wastewater <br> Service Area (City Limits <br> and ETJ) | 28,936 | 66,946 | 10,463 | 26,660 |
| Roadway Service Area <br> (City Limits minus TAZs <br> $163,166,401$ ) | 17,514 | 36,407 | 8,323 | 17,692 |

It is important to visually depict the changes projected by the land use assumption process. Figure 3-8 presents the population change by each TAZ from 2020 to 2030, likewise Figure 3-9 presents changes in population from 2020-2040. These two maps show that all ETJ areas are likely to grow significantly more between 2030-2040, whereas only the southwest part of the ETJ will grow significantly the decade between 2020 to 2030. Figure 3-10 and 3-11, respectively show the employment change by each TAZ between 2020-2030 timeframe and 2020-2040 timeframe.

Figure 3-8: 2020-2030 Population Change


Figure 3-9: 2020-2040 Population Change


Figure 3-10: 2020-2040 Employment Change


Figure 3-11: 2020-2040 Employment Change


### 4.0 WATER AND WASTEWATER CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN

### 4.1 Existing Water and Wastewater Systems

The City of Waco's water distribution system includes six pressure planes, two water treatment plants with high service pump stations, six elevated storage tanks, the Airport ground storage tank and pump station, the Gholson ground storage tank and pump station, the Hillcrest ground storage tank and pump station, the Westview ground storage tank and pump station, and the Old McGregor ground storage tank and pump station. The existing water system is shown on Figure 4-1.

The City of Waco's wastewater collection system includes two wastewater treatment plants, approximately 4,682,000 linear feet of gravity and force main lines ranging in size from 2-inches to 72inches, and 73 lift stations. The existing collection system is shown on Figure 4-2.

Figure 4-1: Existing Water Distribution System


Figure 4-2: Existing Wastewater Collection System


### 4.2 Water Demand and Wastewater Load Projections

### 4.2.1 Water Demands

A water utility must be able to supply water at rates that fluctuate over time. Yearly, monthly, daily, and hourly variations in water use occur, with higher use during dry years and in hot months. Also, water use typically follows a diurnal pattern, being low at night and peaking in the early morning and late afternoon. Flow rates most important to the hydraulic design and operation of a water treatment plant and distribution system are average day and maximum day demands. Average day use is the total annual water use divided by the number of days in the year and is typically used in water supply planning. The average day demand is also typically used as a basis for estimating maximum day demands. Maximum day demand is the maximum quantity of water used on any one day of the year. Water supply facilities, such as treatment plants and pump stations, are typically designed based on the maximum day demand. Therefore, estimating future water demands directly impacts the projects needed to serve future growth.

Future water demands were developed by utilizing per-capita usage rates applied to the projected population and employment. A maximum day to average day peaking factor was then used to estimate future maximum day demands. Table 4-1 presents the population and employment by water pressure plane, and Table 4-2 presents the resulting projected water demands.

Table 4-1: Population and Employment by Water Pressure Plane

| Pressure <br> Plane | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ <br> Population | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ <br> Population | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ <br> Population | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ <br> Employment | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ <br> Employment | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ <br> Employment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 71,387 | 81,102 | 98,827 | 25,409 | 29,141 | 36,835 |
| 2 | 39,301 | 41,540 | 43,860 | 11,523 | 12,141 | 12,225 |
| 3 | 18,480 | 19,970 | 21,522 | 23,790 | 25,862 | 25,957 |
| 4 | 12,132 | 17,920 | 21,615 | 4,580 | 5,409 | 5,822 |
| 5 | 9,998 | 15,500 | 20,633 | 987 | 1,517 | 2,006 |
| 6 | 8,199 | 12,402 | 19,985 | 1,007 | 1,550 | 2,144 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5 9 , 4 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 8 , 4 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 6 , 4 4 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 7 , 2 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 , 6 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 4 , 9 8 9}$ |

Table 4-2: Projected Water Demands

| Planning Year | Pressure Plane | Average Day <br> Residential <br> Demand <br> (MGD) ${ }^{(1)}$ | Average Day Employment Demand (MGD) ${ }^{(2)}$ | Top Water Users Average Day Demand (MGD) ${ }^{(3)}$ | Total <br> Average <br> Day Water <br> Demand <br> (MGD) | Top Water <br> Users Maximum Day Demand (MGD) ${ }^{(3)}$ | Total <br> Maximum Day Water Demand (MGD) ${ }^{(4)}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2020 | PP1 | 9.64 | 2.92 | 0.18 | 12.74 | 0.29 | 21.77 |
|  | PP2 | 5.31 | 1.33 | - | 6.63 | - | 11.27 |
|  | PP3 | 2.49 | 2.74 | 1.10 | 6.33 | 1.39 | 11.05 |
|  | PP4 | 1.64 | 0.53 | 1.72 | 3.89 | 2.12 | 7.01 |
|  | PP5 | 1.35 | 0.11 | - | 1.46 | - | 2.49 |
|  | PP6 | 1.11 | 0.12 | - | 1.22 | - | 2.08 |
|  | Total | 21.53 | 7.74 | 3.00 | 32.27 | 3.81 | 55.67 |
| 2030 | PP1 | 10.95 | 3.35 | 0.18 | 14.48 | 0.29 | 24.73 |
|  | PP2 | 5.61 | 1.40 | - | 7.00 | - | 11.91 |
|  | PP3 | 2.70 | 2.97 | 1.10 | 6.77 | 1.39 | 11.80 |
|  | PP4 | 2.42 | 0.62 | 1.72 | 4.77 | 2.12 | 8.50 |
|  | PP5 | 2.09 | 0.17 | - | 2.27 | - | 3.85 |
|  | PP6 | 1.67 | 0.18 | - | 1.85 | - | 3.15 |
|  | Total | 25.44 | 8.70 | 3.00 | 37.14 | 3.81 | 63.94 |
| 2040 | PP1 | 13.34 | 4.24 | 0.18 | 17.76 | 0.29 | 30.30 |
|  | PP2 | 5.92 | 1.41 | - | 7.33 | - | 12.46 |
|  | PP3 | 2.91 | 2.99 | 1.10 | 6.99 | 1.39 | 12.18 |
|  | PP4 | 2.92 | 0.67 | 1.72 | 5.31 | 2.12 | 9.43 |
|  | PP5 | 2.79 | 0.23 | - | 3.02 | - | 5.13 |
|  | PP6 | 2.70 | 0.25 | - | 2.94 | - | 5.01 |
|  | Total | 30.57 | 9.77 | 3.00 | 43.34 | 3.81 | 74.49 |
| ${ }^{(1)} 135$ gallons per person per day a was assumed for Residential Demand <br> ${ }^{(2)} 115$ gallons per employee per day was assumed for Employment Demand <br> ${ }^{(3)}$ Demands assumed from 2015 Water Master Plan <br> ${ }^{(4)}$ A maximum day to average day peaking factor of 1.70 was used based the 2015 Water Master Plan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### 4.2.2 Wastewater Flows

Wastewater flows in a municipal collection system vary by time of day, wastewater discharge source and weather conditions. Average daily flow is defined as the total wastewater flow over a one-year period divided by the number of days in that year. Wastewater treatment plants are typically sized in terms of average daily flow. Peak wastewater flow consists of the peak dry weather flow plus infiltration and inflow (I/I). Infiltration is the seepage of groundwater into the sewer pipe and appurtenances. Inflow is the measurement of storm water runoff that enters the wastewater collection system during wet weather
rain events. I/I is typically expressed in terms of a wet weather peaking factor for the purposes of estimating future wastewater flows. The collection system is sized to convey peak wastewater flows. Therefore, developing future wastewater flows directly impacts the projects needed to serve future growth. Table 4-3 presents the population and employment by WWTP basin and Table 4-4 presents the projected wastewater flows for the City of Waco.

Table 4-3: Population and Employment by Wastewater Treatment Plant Basin

| Basin | Population |  |  | Employment |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ |
| WMARSS | 140,228 | 157,140 | 180,110 | 69,369 | 78,591 | 92,941 |
| Bull Hide Creek | 9,618 | 16,007 | 26,868 | 1,250 | 1,961 | 3,159 |
| China Spring | 9,650 | 15,282 | 19,471 | 1,064 | 1,580 | $\mathbf{2 , 2 4 0}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 5 9 , 4 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 8 , 4 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 6 , 4 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 , 6 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{8 2 , 1 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{9 8 , 3 4 0}$ |

Table 4-4: Projected Wastewater Flows

| Planning <br> Year | Major Basin | Residential <br> Average Annual <br> Daily Flow <br> (MGD) $^{(1)}$ | Employment <br> Average Annual <br> Daily Flow <br> (MGD) | Total <br> Average <br> Annual Daily <br> Flow <br> (MGD) | Peak Wet <br> Weather Flow <br> (MGD) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | WM) |  |  |  |  |

### 4.3 Water and Wastewater System Improvements

Proposed water and wastewater system improvement projects and costs were developed based on input from City staff and projects identified in recent studies conducted by the City, including:

- Highway 84 Corridor Wastewater Improvements Facility Plan, July 2019 prepared by CDM Smith
- Waco Metropolitan Area Regional Sewerage System Large Diameter Interceptor Improvements Report, February 2013 prepared by Burgess and Niple/Walker Partners
- Draft China Spring Wastewater Capacity Evaluation, September 2019 prepared by HDR Engineering, Inc.
- City of Waco Water Master Plan, October 2015 prepared by Wallace Group/Freese and Nichols, Inc.
- Wastewater Collection System Master Plan, July 2015 prepared by Walker Partners/HDR

The proposed 10-year impact fee eligible water system projects and costs are summarized in Table 4-5 and shown on Figure 4-3. Proposed impact fee eligible wastewater projects and costs are summarized in Table 4-6 and shown on Figure 4-4. Tables 4-5 and 4-6 show a 2020 percent utilization, which is the portion of a project's capacity that is required to serve existing development. This portion of the project cost is not impact-fee-eligible. The 2030 percent utilization is the portion of the project's capacity that will be required to serve projected growth in the City in 2030. The 2020-2030 percent utilization is the portion of the project's capacity required to serve development from 2020 to 2030. The impact fee eligible cost for each project is calculated as the total capital cost multiplied by the 2020-2030 percent utilization. Only this portion of the cost can be used to calculate maximum allowable impact fees. Full sized maps are provided in Appendix B.

Table 4-5: Water Impact Fee CIP Projects

| Proj. No. | Description of Project | Percent Utilization |  |  | Capital Cost | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10-Year } \\ & (2020-2030) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $2020{ }^{(1)}$ | 2030 | 2020-2030 |  |  |
| W-1 | Riverside to Gholson 30-inch Water Line | 50\% | 75\% | 25\% | \$12,242,880 | \$3,060,720 |
| W-2 | Highway 84 Water Line Improvements | 30\% | 60\% | 30\% | \$1,442,652 | \$432,796 |
| W-3 | Spring Valley Water Lines | 10\% | 80\% | 70\% | \$3,848,268 | \$2,693,787 |
| W-4 | Owen Lane 2.0 MG Elevated Storage Tank | 75\% | 95\% | 20\% | \$3,858,015 | \$771,603 |
| W-5 | Hillcrest Pump Station Expansion | 90\% | 95\% | 5\% | \$12,902,096 | \$645,105 |
| W-6 | 16-inch Ritchie Road Water Line | 30\% | 80\% | 50\% | \$787,155 | \$393,577 |
| W-7 | China Spring Water Line | 50\% | 75\% | 25\% | \$16,199,650 | \$4,049,913 |
| W-8 | McGregor-Waco-Woodway Connection 16" Water Line | 0\% | 30\% | 30\% | \$1,500,000 | \$450,000 |
| W-9 | Water Transmission Improvements | 5\% | 15\% | 10\% | \$8,000,000 | \$800,000 |
| W-10 | Peach Street 16-inch Water Line | 25\% | 60\% | 35\% | \$3,500,000 | \$1,225,000 |
| W-11 | Elm Street 12-inch Water Line | 15\% | 50\% | 35\% | \$1,800,000 | \$630,000 |
| W-12 | Impact Fee Study | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | \$124,073 | \$124,073 |
| W-13 | Riverside Water Treatment Plant Expansion | 40\% | 60\% | 20\% | \$10,363,510 | \$2,072,702 |
| W-14 | Riverside Pump Station Expansion | 40\% | 60\% | 20\% | \$11,000,000 | \$2,200,000 |
| W-15 | Downtown Mary Avenue to 5th Street | 30\% | 60\% | 30\% | \$3,000,000 | \$900,000 |
| W-16 | Pressure Plane 6 Water Storage | 40\% | 90\% | 50\% | \$5,000,000 | \$2,500,000 |
| W-17 | Chapel Road 24-inch Water Line | 5\% | 50\% | 45\% | \$5,000,000 | \$2,250,000 |
| W-18 | Old McGregor 3.0 MG Ground Storage Tank | 60\% | 80\% | 20\% | \$4,500,000 | \$900,000 |
| W-19 | Airport 1.0 MG Ground Storage Tank | 50\% | 75\% | 25\% | \$2,500,000 | \$625,000 |
| W-20 | 20/24-inch Water Line in Pressure Plane 1 | 30\% | 60\% | 30\% | \$14,000,000 | \$4,200,000 |
| W-21 | 72-inch Parallel Raw Water Line | 75\% | 85\% | 10\% | \$8,000,000 | \$800,000 |
| W-22 | 16/24-inch Water Line in Pressure Plane 3 | 50\% | 75\% | 25\% | \$7,289,740 | \$1,822,435 |
| W-23 | Low Head Pump Station at Mt. Carmel WTP | 80\% | 90\% | 10\% | \$5,000,000 | \$500,000 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  | \$141,858,038 | \$34,046,711 |

Table 4-6: Wastewater Impact Fee CIP Projects

| Proj. No. | Description of Project | Percent Utilization |  |  | Capital Cost | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10-Year } \\ \text { (2020-2030) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $2020{ }^{(1)}$ | 2030 | 2020-2030 |  |  |
| WW-1 | FM 1637 12/15/21/24-inch Wastewater Line | 50\% | 75\% | 25\% | \$5,773,963 | \$1,443,491 |
| WW-2 | China Spring 24-inch Wastewater Line | 50\% | 70\% | 20\% | \$14,000,000 | \$2,800,000 |
| WW-3 | Transfer Lift Station, Force Main, and 66 -inch Gravity Line | 70\% | 100\% | 30\% | \$45,500,000 | \$13,650,000 |
| WW-4 | Impact Fee Study | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | \$124,073 | \$124,073 |
| WW-5 | Bull Hide Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion to 3.0 MGD | 30\% | 50\% | 20\% | \$18,000,000 | \$3,600,000 |
| WW-6 | Brazos Basin: Gurley Ave | 40\% | 60\% | 20\% | \$7,000,000 | \$1,400,000 |
| WW-7 | 54-inch Wastewater Line at Lake Brazos Park | 85\% | 95\% | 10\% | \$1,000,000 | \$100,000 |
| WW-8 | Belmead Interceptor / Lacy Lakeview Interceptor | 50\% | 65\% | 15\% | \$16,000,000 | \$2,400,000 |
| WW-9 | TSTC Lift Station Expansion and Force Main | 35\% | 55\% | 20\% | \$8,000,000 | \$1,600,000 |
| WW-10 | Cloice Creek and Church Road Lift Stations, Force Mains, and 21inch Gravity Line | 45\% | 75\% | 30\% | \$10,000,000 | \$3,000,000 |
| WW-11 | Highway 84 30-inch Wastewater Line | 45\% | 75\% | 30\% | \$6,000,000 | \$1,800,000 |
| WW-12 | Highway 84 24-inch Wastewater Line | 10\% | 50\% | 40\% | \$4,000,000 | \$1,600,000 |
| WW-13 | China Spring Wastewater Treatment Plant | 50\% | 95\% | 45\% | \$35,000,000 | \$15,750,000 |
| WW-14 | Highway 84 Wastewater Treatment Plant | 40\% | 80\% | 40\% | \$35,000,000 | \$14,000,000 |
| WW-15 | New Quest Wastewater Line | 15\% | 40\% | 25\% | \$600,000 | \$150,000 |
| WW-16 | 24-inch Wastewater Line | 50\% | 70\% | 20\% | \$934,274 | \$186,855 |
| WW-17 | Bridge 18-inch Wastewater Line | 25\% | 45\% | 20\% | \$650,000 | \$130,000 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  | \$207,582,310 | \$63,734,419 |

Figure 4-3: Water Impact Fee Capital Improvements Plan


Figure 4-4: Wastewater Impact Fee Capital Improvements Plan
 City of Waco

### 5.0 ROADWAY IMPACT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN

### 5.1 Basis for Roadway Impact Fees

Legislative mandate (395.001.8) stipulates that roadway facilities, together with all necessary appurtenances, identified in the impact fee capital improvements plan (CIP) be designated as "arterial" or "collector" class streets or roads on an officially adopted roadway plan of the city. The Regional Thoroughfare Plan was obtained from The City Plan, Waco Comprehensive Plan 2040 adopted September 2016 and is illustrated in Figure 5-1. This plan identifies roadways by functional classification and context.

Figure 5-1: Roadway Impact Fee Capital Improvements Plan


With the Regional Thoroughfare Plan serving as the basis for capital improvements planning, the impact fee CIP focuses on capacity enhancing projects and its ability to address ten-year forecasted growth promulgated by the Land Use Assumptions identified in Chapter 3. Data driven analysis and input from the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee and City Staff was considered as part of roadway impact Fee CIP development.

### 5.2 Roadway Service Units

Service units establish a relationship between roadway projects and demand placed on the street system by development, as well as the ability to calculate and assess impact fees for specific development proposals. As defined in Chapter 395, "service unit means a standardized measure of consumption, use, generation, or discharge attributable to an individual unit of development in accordance with generally accepted engineering or planning standards for a particular category of capital improvements or facility expansions."

To determine the roadway impact fee for a new development, the service unit must accurately identify the impact that the development will have on the major roadway system (i.e., arterial and collector roads) serving the development. This impact is a combination of the number of new trips generated by the development, the peaking characteristics of the land-use(s) within the development, and the length of each new trip on the transportation system.

The service unit must also reflect the capacity, which is provided by the roadway system, and the demand placed on the system during the time in which peak, or design, conditions are present on the system. Transportation facilities are designed and constructed to accommodate volumes expected to occur during the peak hours (design hours). These volumes typically occur during the peak hours as motorists travel to and from work.

The vehicle-mile during the PM peak hour serves as the service unit for impact fees in Waco. This service unit establishes a more precise measure of capacity, utilization and intensity of land development through published trip generation data. It also recognizes legislative requirements with regards to trip length. This service unit has been tested and validated since the inception of impact fee legislation in 1989.

Service units create a link between supply (roadway projects) and demand (development). Both can be expressed as a combination of the number of vehicles traveling during the peak hour and the distance traveled by these vehicles in miles.

### 5.2.1 Service Unit Supply

For roadway capital project improvements, the number of service units provided during the peak hour is simply the product of the capacity of the roadway in one hour and the length of the product. For example:

Given a four-lane divided roadway project with a 600 vehicle per hour per lane capacity and a length of two miles, the number of service units provided is:

600 vehicles per hour per lane $\times 4$ lanes $\times 2$ miles $=4,800$ vehicles-miles

### 5.2.2 Service Unit Demand

The demand placed on the system can be expressed in a similar manner. For example, a development generating 100 vehicle trips in the PM peak hour with an average trip length of two miles would generate:

$$
100 \text { vehicle-trips } \times 2 \text { miles/trip }=200 \text { vehicle-miles }
$$

Similarly, demand placed on the existing roadway network is calculated in the same manner with a known traffic volume (peak hour roadway counts collected in 2019) on a street and a given segment length.

### 5.3 Existing Conditions Analysis

An inventory of major roadways that are designated as arterial and/or collector facilities on the Thoroughfare Plan was conducted to determine: 1) capacity provided by the existing roadway system, 2) the demand currently placed on the system, and 3 ) the potential existence of deficiencies on the system. Any deficiencies found to occur will be carried over in the impact fee calculations (netting out from capacity made available by the CIP). Data for the inventory was obtained from the Thoroughfare Plan, field reconnaissance, and peak hour traffic volume count data.

The roadways were divided into segments based on changes in lane configuration, major intersections, city limits or area development that may influence roadway characteristics. For the assessment of individual segments, lane capacities were assigned to each segment based on roadway functional class and type of cross-section, as listed in Table 5-1. Roadway hourly volume capacities are based on general carrying capacity values consistent with the MPO regional travel demand model and reflect level-ofservice (LOS) " D " operation, which has been identified as the minimum acceptable peak hour traffic operational condition by the city. City of Waco

Table 5-1: Roadway Facility Vehicle-Mile Lane Capacities

| Roadway Facility <br> Functional Classification | Designation | Hourly Vehicle-mile Capacity <br> per Lane Mile of Roadway <br> Facility |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Divided Arterial* | DA or SA | 665 |
| Divided Collector* | DC or SC | 565 |
| Undivided Arterial | UA | 590 |
| Undivided Collector | UC | 510 |
| *Facilities with a two-way left turn lane (TWLTL) are considered for this assessment as a divided <br> facility for capacity allocation and marked as Special Arterial (SA) or Special Collector (SC) designation. |  |  |

### 5.3.1 Existing Volumes

Existing directional PM peak hour volumes were obtained from automated traffic counts conducted in May 2019. Automated traffic counts at 30 separate locations were collected on major roadways throughout the city. To minimize the total number of counts, data was collected at locations where traffic volumes would typify link volumes on the major segments within the immediate area. For segments not counted, existing volume count data from the MPO and TxDOT were used or estimates were developed based on data from adjoining roadway counts.

This data was compiled for roadway segments throughout the city and input into the database for use in calculations. A summary of volumes by roadway segment is included in Appendix $\mathbf{D}$ as part of the existing capital improvements database.

### 5.3.2 Vehicle-Miles of Existing Excess Capacity and Deficiencies

For each roadway segment, the existing vehicle-miles of excess capacity and/or deficiencies were calculated and are listed in Table 5-2. Each direction was evaluated to determine if vehicle demands exceeded the available capacity. If demand exceeded capacity in one or both directions, the deficiency is deducted from the supply associated with the impact fee capital improvement plan. A summary of peak hour excess capacity and deficiencies is also shown in the table. Any deficiencies identified under current operations will be carried over to the impact fee calculation. A detailed listing of existing excess capacity and deficiencies by roadway segment is also located in Appendix D.

Table 5-2: Existing Roadway Analysis by Service Area

| Service Area | Capacity | Demand | Excess <br> Capacity | Existing <br> Deficiencies |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 127,576 | 55,849 | 71,905 | 178 |
| 2 | 45,655 | 20,952 | 24,811 | 107 |
| 3 | 22,504 | 8,286 | 14,307 | 89 |
| 4 | 4,960 | 1,666 | 3,295 | 0 |
| 5 | 2,664 | 999 | 1,664 | 0 |
| 6 | 25,374 | 13,407 | 11,973 | 6 |
| 7 | 10,438 | 7,597 | 3,593 | 752 |
| 8 | 5,281 | 946 | 4,335 | 0 |
| 9 | 34,723 | 17,441 | 17,281 | 0 |
| 10 | 9,245 | 4,725 | 4,733 | 213 |
| 11 | 2,897 | 771 | 2,126 | 0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 9 1 , 3 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 2 , 6 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 0 , 0 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 3 4 5}$ |

### 5.4 Growth Projections

The projected growth for the roadway service area is represented by the increase in the number of new vehicle-miles of demand generated over the 10-year planning period. The basis for the calculation of new demand is the population and employment projections that were prepared as part of the Waco Land Use Assumptions (LUA) Report for Impact Fees dated June 2019 by Freese and Nichols. Estimates of population and employment were prepared for the years 2020 and 2030.

Population data was provided in terms of the number of dwelling units and persons. Employment data was broken into three classes of employees that include basic, retail, and service, comprising a variety of employment groupings. Basic employment generally encompasses the industrial and manufacturing uses, retail employment includes commercial and retail uses, and service employment generally encompasses government and office uses. A summary of the projected growth is summarized in Table 5-3 and 5-4.

Table 5-3: Projected 10-Year Growth Summary Population

| Service Area | Population |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ | Net <br> Growth |
| 1 | 76,420 | 82,294 | 5,874 |
| 2 | 19,903 | 21,043 | 1,140 |
| 3 | 14,789 | 17,063 | 2,274 |
| 4 | 1,224 | 1,649 | 425 |
| 5 | 1,304 | 1,348 | 44 |
| 6 | 2,911 | 3,905 | 994 |
| 7 | 6,886 | 9,043 | 2,157 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 3,439 | 4,982 | 1,543 |
| 10 | 8,710 | 10,549 | 1,839 |
| 11 | 5,365 | 6,589 | 1,224 |
| Total <br> Population | $\mathbf{1 4 0 , 9 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 8 , 4 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 , 5 1 4}$ |

Table 5-4: Projected 10-Year Growth Summary Employment

| Service Area | Employment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2020 |  |  |  | 2030 |  |  |  | Net Growth |  |  |  |
|  | Basic | Retail | Service | Total | Basic | Retail | Service | Total | Basic | Retail | Service | Total |
| 1 | 2,277 | 7,882 | 13,780 | 23,940 | 2,592 | 8,690 | 15,563 | 26,845 | 315 | 808 | 1,783 | 2,905 |
| 2 | 1,588 | 5,430 | 10,143 | 17,162 | 1,649 | 5,735 | 10,896 | 18,280 | 61 | 305 | 753 | 1,118 |
| 3 | 668 | 1,159 | 1,176 | 3,003 | 764 | 1,320 | 1,375 | 3,460 | 96 | 162 | 199 | 457 |
| 4 | 154 | 5 | 131 | 290 | 162 | 17 | 150 | 330 | 8 | 12 | 19 | 40 |
| 5 | 410 | 174 | 731 | 1,315 | 774 | 180 | 769 | 1,723 | 364 | 6 | 38 | 408 |
| 6 | 910 | 40 | 357 | 1,307 | 983 | 64 | 514 | 1,561 | 73 | 24 | 157 | 253 |
| 7 | 458 | 187 | 312 | 956 | 545 | 310 | 473 | 1,329 | 87 | 124 | 161 | 373 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 8,299 | 5,137 | 4,425 | 17,862 | 9,772 | 5,601 | 4,972 | 20,345 | 1,472 | 464 | 547 | 2,483 |
| 10 | 277 | 430 | 553 | 1,261 | 307 | 452 | 620 | 1,379 | 30 | 21 | 67 | 117 |
| 11 | 54 | 57 | 91 | 202 | 141 | 76 | 153 | 370 | 88 | 20 | 61 | 168 |
| Total Employment | 15,095 | 20,501 | 31,701 | 67,297 | 17,688 | 22,446 | 35,486 | 75,620 | 2,593 | 1,945 | 3,785 | 8,323 | City of Waco

### 5.4.1 Projected Vehicle-Miles of New Demand

Projected vehicle-miles of demand were calculated based on the net growth expected to occur over the 10-year planning period, and on the associated service unit generation for each of the population and employment data components (basic, service and retail). Separate calculations were performed for each data component and were then aggregated for each service area. Vehicle-miles of demand for population growth were based on dwelling units (residential). Vehicle-miles of demand for employment were based on the number of employees and then converted to square footage of building space using estimates of square footage per employee for industrial, office, and retail uses. The 10-year projected vehicle-miles of demand by service area are summarized in Table 5-5. Appendix E contains the development of 10-year projected demand.

Table 5-5: 10-Year Projected Service Units of Demand

| Service Area | Projected 10-Year Growth <br> (Vehicle-Miles) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 15,947 |
| 2 | 4,650 |
| 3 | 4,293 |
| 4 | 650 |
| 5 | 1,650 |
| 6 | 2,002 |
| 7 | 3,879 |
| 8 | 0 |
| 9 | 10,967 |
| 10 | 2,636 |
| 11 | 2,094 |
| Total | 48,768 |

### 5.5 Roadway Capital Improvements Plan

The impact fee CIP is aimed at facilitating anticipated long-term growth in Waco. The CIP, which consists of strictly new capacity additions, were identified as needed to address the anticipated projected growth within the City.

### 5.5.1 Eligible Projects

Legislative mandate stipulates that the impact fee CIP contain only those roadways classified as arterial or collector status facilities that are included in the City's adopted Regional Thoroughfare Plan (see Figure

5-1). Impact fee legislation also allows for the recoupment of costs for previously constructed facilities and projects currently under construction, however none were identified as part of the initial impact fee program.

### 5.5.2 Eligible Costs

In general, those costs associated with the design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction and financing of all items necessary to implement the roadway projects identified in the capital improvement plan are eligible. These estimates are based on roadway sections identified in The City Plan, Waco Comprehensive Plan 2040. It is important to note that upon completion of the capital improvements identified in the CIP, the city must recalculate the impact fee using the actual costs. If service area costs are less than the impact fee paid by greater than 10 percent, a potential refund may be due. To prevent this situation, conservative (low) estimates of project costs were considered.

Chapter 395.012 identifies roadway costs eligible for impact fee recovery. The law states that:
"An impact fee may be imposed only to pay the cost of constructing capital improvements for facility expansions, including and limited to the construction contract price, surveying and engineering fees, land acquisition costs, including land purchases, court awards and costs, attorney fees, and expert witness fees; and fees actually paid or contracted to be paid to an independent qualified engineer or financial consultant preparing or updating the capital improvement plan who is not an employee of the political subdivision."
"Projected interest charges and other finance costs may be included in determining the amount of impact fees only if the impact fees are used for the payment of principal and interest on bonds, notes, or other obligations issued by or on behalf of the political subdivision to finance the capital improvements or facility expansions identified in the capital improvement plan and are not used to reimburse bond funds expended for facilities that are not identified in the capital improvement plan."

The following details the individual cost components of the impact fee CIP.
Construction: Construction costs include those costs which are normally associated with construction, including: paving, dirt work (including sub-grade preparation, embankment fill and excavation), clearing and grubbing, retaining walls or other slope protection measures, and
general drainage items which are necessary in order to build the roadway and allow the roadway to fulfill its vehicle carrying capability. Individual items may include bridges, culverts, inlets and storm sewers, junction boxes, manholes, curbs and/or gutters, and channel linings and other erosion protection appurtenances. Other items included in cost estimates may include sidewalks, traffic control devices at select locations (initial cost only), ancillary adjustments to existing utilities, and minimal sodding/landscaping.

Engineering: These are the costs associated with the design and surveying necessary to construct the roadway. Because the law specifically references fees, it has generally been understood that in-house City design and surveying cannot be included. Only those services that are contracted out can be included and it may be necessary to use outside design and surveying firms to perform the work. For planned projects, a percentage based on typical engineering contracts was used to estimate these fees.

Right-of-Way: Any land acquisition cost estimated to be necessary to construct a roadway can be included in the cost estimate. For planning purposes, only the additional amount of land needed to bring a roadway right-of-way to thoroughfare standard was considered. For example, if a $120^{\prime}$ right-of-way for an arterial road was needed and $80^{\prime}$ of right-of-way currently existed, only $40^{\prime}$ would be considered in the acquisition cost.

The cost for right-of-way may vary based on location of project and will be based on data from the most current County Appraisal District data.

Debt Service: Predicted interest charges and finance costs may be included in determining the amount of impact fees only if the impact fees are used for the payment of principle and interest on bonds, notes, or other obligations issued by the city to finance capital improvements identified in the impact fee CIP. They cannot be used to reimburse bond funds for other facilities.

Previous Assessments: The cost for any previous assessments collected by the City on projects identified on the impact fee CIP must be removed from program consideration. As this is a new impact fee program, there are no previous assessments to consider in the initial calculation.

Study Updates: The fees paid or contracted to be paid to an independent qualified engineer or financial consultant preparing or updating the capital improvement plan who is not an employee of the political subdivision can be included in the impact fees.

Only the cost necessitated by new development is considered for impact fee calculations. For example, if only $60 \%$ of the capacity provided by the impact fee CIP is needed over the ten-year window, then only $60 \%$ of the cost associated with those facilities will be considered.

### 5.5.3 Impact Fee CIP

The proposed CIP consists of 42 project segments over nine of the eleven service areas (no projects identified in service areas 5 and 8) and advance the implementation of the Thoroughfare Plan network, as seen on Figure 5-2. Table 5-6 list the roadway capital improvement projects as part of the impact fee program.

Figure 5-2: Roadway Impact Fee Capital Improvements Plan


Table 5-6: Roadway Impact Fee CIP Listing

| Proj <br> No. | Serv <br> Area | Shared Svc Area | Roadway | From | To | Length <br> (mi) | No. of Lanes | Thoroughfare Section | Type | Pct. in Serv. Area |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | 6 | Gholson Rd | Herring Ave | $960^{\prime}$ S of Herring Ave | 0.18 | 2 | Minor Art-4U Sec | UA | 50\% |
| 2 | 1 |  | Gholson Rd | $960^{\prime}$ S of Herring Ave | Waco Dr | 0.33 | 2 | Minor Art-4U Sec | UA | 100\% |
| Sub-Total Service Area 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.52 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 2 |  | Lake Shore Dr | Mt Carmel Dr | Koehne Park Dr | 0.62 | 4 | Major Art-60 Sec | DA | 100\% |
| 4 | 2 |  | Valley Mills Dr | Koehne Park Dr | Hillandale Rd | 0.15 | 4 | Major Art-6D Sec | DA | 100\% |
| 5 | 2 |  | Valley Mills Dr | Hillandale Rd | Ridgewood Dr | 0.26 | 4 | Major Art-6D Sec | DA | 100\% |
| 6 | 2 |  | Valley Mills Dr | Ridgewood Dr | Bishop Dr | 0.18 | 3 | Major Art-60 Sec | DA | 100\% |
| Sub-Total Service Area 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.21 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 3 |  | Bagby Ave | New Rd | Monte Vista St | 0.27 | 2 | Minor Art-4D Sec | DA | 100\% |
| 8 | 3 |  | Bagby Ave | Monte Vista St | Richter Ave | 0.68 | 2 | Minor Art-4D Sec | DA | 100\% |
| 9 | 3 |  | Bagby Ave | Richter Ave | Valley Mills Dr | 0.59 | 2 | Minor Art-4D Sec | DA | 100\% |
| 10 | 3 | 9 | SNew Rd | Bagby Ave | 1-35 | 0.80 | 1 | Minor Art-6D Sec | DA | 50\% |
| 11 | 3 |  | Garden Dr | Robinson Rd | 16th St | 1.34 | 2 | Minor Art-4U Sec | UA | 100\% |
| 12 | 3 |  | 18th St | La Salle | Gurley in | 0.45 | 2 | Major Art-6D Sec | DA | 100\% |
| 13 | 3 |  | 16th | Gurley Ln | Garden Dr | 0.42 | 4 | Major Art-60 Sec | DA | 100\% |
| 14 | 3 |  | 12th | Garden Dr | TX-340 | 1.08 | 4 | Major Art-6D Sec | DA | 100\% |
| 15 | 3 |  | University Parks Dr | La Salle Ave | Garden Dr | 0.84 | 2 | Minor Art-4D Sec | DA | 100\% |
| Sub-Total Service Area 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.46 |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | 4 |  | Martin Luther King Jr Blvd | Bus 77 | SH 484 | 0.39 | 6 | Major Art-60 Sec | DA | 100\% |
| Sub-Total Service Area 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.39 |  |  |  |  |
| No Projects in Service Area 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-Total Service Area 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 6 | 1 | Gholson Rd | 960' S of Herring Ave | Herring Ave | 0.18 | 2 | Minor Art-4U Sec | UA | 50\% |
| 17 | 6 |  | Gholson Rd | Herring Ave | Lakeshore Dr | 1.35 | 2 | Minor Art-4U Sec | UA | 100\% |
| Sub-Total Service Area 6 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.53 |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | 7 |  | North River Crossing | End of bridge | 580' NE of Curry Ln | 1.38 | 4 | Major Art-6D Sec | DA | 100\% |
| 19 | 7 |  | North River Crossing | $580^{\prime} \mathrm{NE}$ of Curry Ln | Yankie Rd | 0.47 | 4 | Major Art-6D Sec | DA | 100\% |
| 20 | 7 |  | Flat Rock Rd | Yankie Rd | Tree Lake Rd | 1.01 | 2 | Major Col-4U Sec | UC | 100\% |
| 21 | 7 |  | Flat Rock Rd | Tree Lake Rd | China Spring Rd | 1.66 | 2 | Major Col-4U Sec | uc | 100\% |
| 22 | 7 |  | Yankie Rd | North River Crossing | Flat Rock Rd | 1.89 | 2 | Major Col-4U Sec | uc | 100\% |
| 23 | 7 |  | Tree Lake Dr | China Spring Rd | Flat Rock Rd | 1.57 | 2 | Major Col-4U Sec | uc | 100\% |
| 24 | 7 |  | Wortham Bend | North City Lumit | China Spring Rd | 0.82 | 2 | Major Col-4U Sec | UC | 100\% |
| Sub-Total Service Area 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 8.80 |  |  |  |  |
| No Projects in Service Area 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-Total Service Area 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | 9 |  | Mars Dr | Hewitt Dr | Texas Central Pkwy | 0.94 | 2 | Minor Art-4U Sec | UA | 100\% |
| 26 | 9 |  | Beverly Dr | W Loop 340 | $4128^{\prime}$ NE of Loop 340 | 0.78 | 2 | Minor Art-4U Sec | UA | 100\% |
| 27 | 9 | $x$ | Beverly Dr | $4128^{\prime}$ NE of Loop 340 | New Road | 0.31 | 2 | Minor Art-4U Sec | UA | 50\% |
| 28 | 9 | $\times$ | Hewitt Dr | Woodway Dr | Old McGregor Dr | 0.19 | 1 | Major Art-60 Sec | DA | 50\% |
| 29 | 9 | 10 | Hewitt Dr | Old McGregor Dr | Imperial Dr | 0.45 | 1 | Major Art-6D Sec | DA | 50\% |
| 30 | 9 | 10 | Hewitt Dr | Imperial Dr | Mars Dr | 0.62 | 1 | Major Art-60 Sec | DA | 50\% |
| 31 | 9 |  | Texas Central Pkwy | Railroad | Imperial Dr | 0.34 | 2 | Minor Art-4U Sec | UA | 100\% |
| 10 | 9 | 3 | SNew Rd | Bagby Ave | $1-35$ | 0.80 | 1 | Major Art-6D Sec | UA | 50\% |
| 32 | 9 |  | Bagby Ave. | New Road | TX 340 | 0.83 | 1 | Minor Art-4D Sec* (4U to 4D) | DA | 100\% |
| Sub-Total Service Area 9 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.26 |  |  |  |  |
| 33 | 10 |  | Warren Rd | City Limit | Ritchie Rd | 0.38 | 3 | Minor Col-3s Sec | SC | 100\% |
| 34 | 10 | $x$ | Warren Rd | Ritchie Rd | 3700 ' east of Ritchie Rd | 0.70 | 2 | Minor $\mathrm{Col}-3 \mathrm{~S} \mathrm{Sec}$ | SC | 50\% |
| 35 | 10 | $\times$ | Farmiller Rd | 1300' south of Chapel Rd | 2100' north of Warren Rd | 1.13 | 2 | Minor Col-35 Sec | SA | 50\% |
| 29 | 10 | 9 | Hewitt Dr | Old McGregor Dr | Imperial Dr | 0.45 | 1 | Major Art-60 Sec | DA | 50\% |
| 30 | 10 | 9 | Hewitt Dr | Imperial Dr | Mars Dr | 0.62 | 1 | Major Art-6D Sec | DA | 50\% |
| 36 | 10 |  | Chapel Rd | Meadow Mountain Dr | Ritchie Rd | 1.15 | 3 | Minor Art-5s sec | SA | 100\% |
| 37 | 10 |  | Ritchie Rd | Panther Way | Warren st | 1.01 | 2 | Minor Art-4U Sec | UA | 100\% |
| Sub-Total Service Area 10 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.44 |  |  |  |  |
| 38 | 11 |  | Val Verde Rd | Fossil Rim Rd | US 84 | 0.89 | 2 | Minor Col-35 Sec | SC | 100\% |
| 39 | 11 |  | Harris Creek Rd | US 84 | Walking Horse Ln | 0.66 | 2 | Minor Col-35 Sec | SC | 100\% |
| 40 | 11 |  | Speegleville Rd | Pecan Creek | Oak Rd | 0.54 | 4 | Major Art-60 Sec | DA | 100\% |
| 41 | 11 |  | Speegleville Rd | Oak Rd | US 84 | 0.85 | 4 | Major Art-6D Sec | DA | 100\% |
| 42 | 11 |  | Old Lorena Rd | US 84 E8FR | South Bosque River | 0.90 | 4 | Major Art-6D Sec | DA | 100\% |
| Sub-Total Service Area 11 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.83 |  |  |  |  |

NOTE: DA = DIVIDED ARTERIAL, UA = UNDIVIDED ARTERIAL, SA = SPECIAL ARTERIAL (WITH CENTER DUAL LEFT TURN LANE), SC = SPECIAL COLLECTOR (WITH CENTER DUAL LEFT TURN LANE), RECOUP = RECOUPMENT PROJECT, NEW = NEW PROJECT

The added capacity and net capacity that would be provided by the impact fee CIP is summarized below in Table 5-7. Net capacity to be provided by the proposed CIP takes into consideration any deficiencies from the existing conditions analysis described in Section 5.3. A detailed listing by project of capacity supplied can be found in Appendix F.

Table 5-7: Capacity and Net Capacity to be Provided by the Proposed CIP

| Service Area | Capacity <br> Supplied by CIP <br> (veh-mi) | Existing <br> Utilization <br> (veh-mi) | Existing <br> Deficiencies <br> (veh-mi) | Net Capacity <br> Supplied by <br> CIP <br> (veh-mi) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 502 | 0 | 178 | 324 |
| 2 | 3,105 | 0 | 107 | 2,998 |
| 3 | 9,583 | 0 | 89 | 9,494 |
| 4 | 1,551 | 0 | 0 | 1,551 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 1,699 | 0 | 6 | 1,693 |
| 7 | 12,014 | 0 | 752 | 11,262 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 3,826 | 0 | 0 | 3,826 |
| 10 | 4,081 | 0 | 212 | 3,868 |
| 11 | 6,954 | 0 | 0 | 6,954 |
| Total | 43,315 | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 3 4 5}$ | 41,970 |

A comparison of net capacity to be provided by the proposed CIP compared to 10 -year needs (developed in Table 5-5) is listed below in Table 5-8. An analysis reveals an adequately matched overall impact fee CIP program to address growth attributable to new development.

The percent attributable to new growth is a direct result of the land use assumptions described earlier in the report. Based on the defined capital improvements plan, is some service areas project growth will exceed the projected capacity supplied. The ultimate net effect is that the cost per service unit will be lower as the cost of the specified CIP (by service area) is spread out over the 10-year growth. City of Waco

Table 5-8: Projected Demand and Net Capacity Provided by the Proposed CIP

| Service Area | Projected 10-Year <br> Growth <br> (Vehicle-Miles) | Net Capacity <br> Supplied by CIP <br> (veh-mi) | Pcnt. of CIP <br> Attributable to <br> New Dev. <br> $(10-$ Yr. $)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 15,947 | 324 | 100.0 |
| 2 | 4,650 | 2,998 | 100.0 |
| 3 | 4,293 | 9,494 | 45.2 |
| 4 | 650 | 1,551 | 41.9 |
| 5 | 1,650 | 0 | 100.0 |
| 6 | 2,002 | 1,693 | 100.0 |
| 7 | 3,879 | 11,262 | 34.4 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 100.0 |
| 10 | 10,967 | 3,826 | 100.0 |
| 11 | 2,636 | 3,868 | 68.1 |
| System Total | 48,768 | 6,954 | 30.1 |
|  | 41,970 | 100.0 |  |

### 5.5.4 Impact Fee CIP Cost

Project costs were developed based on unit cost estimates compiled by Freese and Nichols, Inc. and reviewed by Walker Partners. Individual project costs were developed for engineering, right-of-way, and construction. Project cost estimate worksheets for the roadway impact fee CIP is in Appendix G. Each roadway segment uses the Regional Thoroughfare Plan's defined functional classification to determine the ultimate roadway standard for each project segment. Construction estimates included all appurtenances called for in the City construction standards. Other costs developed for engineering and right-of-way were based on the following:

- Engineering/surveying - 9\% of construction costs
- Right-of-way acquisition - $\$ 1.00 /$ square foot

Only the cost for net right-of-way needed to achieve Thoroughfare Standard was included. For projects that are a part of the TxDOT system, city participation was assumed to be $20 \%$ of the total construction cost. TxDOT system roads in the impact fee program include:

- Service Area 1 and 6: Gholson Road
- Service Area 3: University Parks Drive
- Service Area 4: Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
- Service Area 7: North River Crossing and Wortham Bend Road
- Service Area 9: Hewitt Drive

Additionally, the cost of future impact fee study updates, as allowable by legislative mandate, were included into the overall system costing. The cost for projects identified in the roadway impact fee CIP program totals $\$ 62.9$ million. Table 5-9 lists the roadway impact fee CIP and individual total costs (construction, engineering, and right-of-way) and by service. Debt service, which is also allowable for inclusion for into the impact fee program is discussed in Chapter 6.

Table 5-9: Roadway Impact Fee Project Cost Summary

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Proj } \\ & \text { No, } \end{aligned}$ | Serv Area | SharedSvc Area Roadway |  | From | To | Length <br> (mi) | No. ofLanes | Type | Pct. in Serv. Area | Roadway Costs |  |  |  |  |  | Study Update Cost | Total Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Engineering |  | ROW |  | struction |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | 6 | Gholson Rd |  | Herring Ave | 960'S of Herring Ave | 0.18 | 2 | UA | 50\% | \$ | 3,250 | \$ | 1,920 | \$ | 36,065 | \$247 |  | \$41,482 |
| 2 | 1 |  | Gholson Rd | 960'S of Herring Ave | Waco Dr | 0.33 | 2 | UA | 100\% | \$ | 13,420 | \$ | - | \$ | 149,100 | \$912 |  | \$163,432 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.52 |  |  |  | \$ | 16,670 | \$ | 1,920 | \$ | 185,165 | \$1,159 |  | \$204,914 |
| 3 | 2 |  | Lake Shore Dr | Mt Carmel Dr | Koehne Park Dr | 0.62 | 4 | DA | 100\% | \$ | 198,700 | \$ | 49,400 | \$ | 2,208,267 | \$3,828 |  | \$2,460,194 |
| 4 | 2 |  | Valley Mills Dr | Koehne Park Dr | Hillandale Rd | 0.15 | 4 | DA | 100\% | \$ | 42,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 466,867 | \$905 |  | \$509,772 |
| 5 | 2 |  | Valley Mills Dr | Hillandale Rd | Ridgewood Dr | 0.26 | 4 | DA | 100\% | \$ | 74,400 | \$ | - | \$ | 826,133 | \$1,609 |  | \$902,142 |
| 6 | 2 |  | Valley Mills Dr | Ridgewood Dr | Bishop Dr | 0.18 | 3 | DA | 100\% | \$ | 38,300 | \$ | 18,900 | \$ | 425,000 | \$827 |  | \$483,027 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.21 |  |  |  | \$ | 353,400 | \$ | 68,300 | \$ | 3,926,267 | \$7,168 |  | \$4,355,135 |
| 7 | 3 |  | Bagby Ave | New Rd | Monte Vista St | 0.27 | 2 | DA | 100\% | \$ | 43,800 | \$ | - | \$ | 486,400 | \$831 |  | \$531,031 |
| 8 | 3 |  | Bagby Ave | Monte Vista St | Richter Ave | 0.68 | 2 | DA | 100\% | \$ | 121,900 | \$ | 71,500 | \$ | 1,354,500 | \$2,080 |  | \$1,549,980 |
| 9 | 3 |  | Bagby Ave | Richter Ave | Valley Mills Dr | 0.59 | 2 | DA | 100\% | \$ | 93,700 | \$ | 61,800 | \$ | 1,041,300 | \$1,796 |  | \$1,198,596 |
| 10 | 3 | 9 | SNew Rd | Bagby Ave | 1-35 | 0.80 | 1 | DA | 50\% | \$ | 56,850 | \$ | 42,450 | \$ | 631,433 | \$616 |  | \$731,350 |
| 11 | 3 |  | Garden Dr | Robinson Rd | 16th St | 1.34 | 2 | UA | 100\% | \$ | 369,500 | \$ | 566,100 | \$ | 4,105,600 | \$3,650 |  | \$5,044,850 |
| 12 | 3 |  | 18th St | La Salle | Gurley Ln | 0.45 | 2 | DA | 100\% | \$ | 63,200 | \$ | 23,600 | \$ | 702,633 | \$1,369 |  | \$790,802 |
| 13 | 3 |  | 16th | Gurley Ln | Garden Dr | 0.42 | 4 | DA | 100\% | \$ | 119,200 | \$ | 132,900 | \$ | 1,323,933 | \$2,576 |  | \$1,578,610 |
| 14 | 3 |  | 12th | Garden Dr | TX-340 | 1.08 | 4 | DA | 100\% | \$ | 323,400 | \$ | 342,100 | \$ | 3,593,333 | \$6,633 |  | \$4,265,466 |
| 15 | 3 |  | University Parks Dr | La Salle Ave | Garden Dr | 0.84 | 2 | DA | 100\% | \$ | 30,660 | \$ | - | \$ | 340,590 | \$2,572 |  | \$373,822 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.46 |  |  |  | \$ | 1,222,210 | \$ | 1,240,450 | \$ | 13,579,723 | \$22,124 |  | \$16,064,507 |
| 16 | 4 |  | Martin Luther King Jr Blvd | BUS 77 | SH 484 | 0.39 | 6 | DA | 100\% | \$ | 38,480 | \$ | 49,280 | \$ | 427,640 | \$3,581 |  | \$518,981 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.39 |  |  |  | \$ | 38,480 | \$ | 49,280 | \$ | 427,640 | \$3,581 |  | \$518,981 |
| No Projects in Service Area 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-Total Service Area 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$0 |  | \$0 |
| 1 | 6 | 1 | Gholson Rd | 960 'S of Herring Ave | Herring Ave | 0.18 | 2 | UA | 50\% | \$ | 3,250 | \$ | 1,920 | \$ | 36,065 | \$247 |  | \$41,482 |
| 17 | 6 |  | Gholson Rd | Herring Ave | Lakeshore Dr | 1.35 | 2 | UA | 100\% | \$ | 47,100 | \$ | - | \$ | 523,450 | \$3,675 |  | \$574,225 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 6 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.53 |  |  |  | \$ | 50,350 | \$ | 1,920 | \$ | 559,515 | \$3,922 |  | \$615,707 |
| 18 | 7 |  | North River Crossing | End of bridge | 580' NE of Curry Ln | 1.38 | 4 | DA | 100\% | \$ | 77,900 | \$ | - | \$ | 865,800 | \$8,475 |  | \$952,175 |
| 19 | 7 |  | North River Crossing | 580' NE of Curry Ln | Yankie Rd | 0.47 | 4 | DA | 100\% | \$ | 30,300 | \$ | - | \$ | 336,600 | \$2,902 |  | \$369,802 |
| 20 | 7 |  | Flat Rock Rd | Yankie Rd | Tree Lake Rd | 1.01 | 2 | uc | 100\% | \$ | 174,600 | \$ | 186,700 | \$ | 1,940,250 | \$2,378 |  | \$2,303,928 |
| 21 | 7 |  | Flat Rock Rd | Tree Lake Rd | China Spring Rd | 1.66 | 2 | uc | 100\% | \$ | 277,900 | \$ | - | \$ | 3,087,900 | \$3,909 |  | \$3,369,709 |
| 22 | 7 |  | Yankie Rd | North River Crossing | Flat Rock Rd | 1.89 | 2 | uc | 100\% | \$ | 317,200 | \$ | 199,600 | \$ | 3,524,300 | \$4,451 |  | \$4,045,551 |
| 23 | 7 |  | Tree Lake Dr | China Spring Rd | Flat Rock Rd | 1.57 | 2 | uc | 100\% | \$ | 263,500 | \$ | 165,800 | \$ | 2,927,500 | \$3,696 |  | \$3,360,496 |
| 24 | 7 |  | Wortham Bend | North City Limit | China Spring Rd | 0.82 | 2 | uc | 100\% | \$ | 30,200 | \$ | - | \$ | 335,810 | \$1,925 |  | \$367,935 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 8.80 |  |  |  | \$ | 1,171,600 | \$ | 552,100 | \$ | 13,018,160 | \$27,736 |  | \$14,769,596 |
| No Projects in Service Area 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-Total Service Area 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$0 |  | \$0 |
| 25 | 9 |  | Mars Dr | Hewitt Dr | Texas Central Pkwy | 0.94 | 2 | UA | 100\% | \$ | 210,200 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,335,450 | \$2,572 |  | \$2,548,222 |
| 26 | 9 |  | Beverly Dr | W Loop 340 | 4128' NE of Loop 340 | 0.78 | 2 | UA | 100\% | \$ | 121,200 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,346,300 | \$2,131 |  | \$1,469,631 |
| 27 | 9 | $x$ | Beverly Dr | $4128^{\prime}$ NE of Loop 340 | New Road | 0.31 | 2 | UA | 50\% | \$ | 22,550 | \$ | - | \$ | 250,500 | \$420 |  | \$273,470 |
| 28 | 9 | x | Hewitt Dr | Woodway Dr | Old McGregor Dr | 0.19 | 1 | DA | 50\% | \$ | 2,650 | \$ | - | \$ | 29,700 | \$145 |  | \$32,495 |
| 29 | 9 | 10 | Hewitt Dr | Old McGregor Dr | Imperial Dr | 0.45 | 1 | DA | 50\% | \$ | 6,850 | \$ | - | \$ | 76,250 | \$342 |  | \$83,442 |
| 30 | 9 | 10 | Hewitt Dr | Imperial Dr | Mars Dr | 0.62 | 1 | DA | 50\% | \$ | 8,800 | \$ | - | \$ | 97,700 | \$478 |  | \$106,978 |
| 31 | 9 |  | Texas Central Pkwy | Railroad | Imperial Dr | 0.34 | 2 | UA | 100\% | \$ | 59,500 | \$ | - | \$ | 661,100 | \$928 |  | \$721,528 |
| 10 | 9 | 3 | S New Rd | Bagby Ave | 1-35 | 0.80 | 1 | UA | 50\% | \$ | 56,850 | \$ | 42,450 | \$ | 631,433 | \$547 |  | \$731,280 |
| 32 | 9 |  | Bagby Ave. | New Road | TX 340 | 0.83 | 1 | DA | 100\% | \$ | 232,400 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,582,560 | \$1,270 |  | \$2,816,230 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 9 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.26 |  |  |  | \$ | 721,000 | \$ | 42,450 | \$ | 8,010,993 | 8,833 | \$ | 8,783,276 |
| 33 | 10 |  | Warren Rd | City Limit | Ritchie Rd | 0.38 | 3 | SC | 100\% | \$ | 92,300 | \$ | 100,500 | \$ | 1,025,400 | \$993 |  | \$1,219,193 |
| 34 | 10 | $x$ | Warren Rd | Ritchie Rd | 3700' east of Ritchie Rd | 0.70 | 2 | Sc | 50\% | \$ | 29,400 | \$ | - | \$ | 326,550 | \$457 |  | \$356,407 |
| 35 | 10 | x | Farmiller Rd | 1300' south of Chapel Rd | 2100 ' north of Warren Rd | 1.13 | 2 | SA | 50\% | \$ | 96,300 | \$ | 89,500 | \$ | 1,069,767 | \$868 |  | \$1,256,435 |
| 29 | 10 | 9 | Hewitt Dr | Old McGregor Dr | Imperial Dr | 0.45 | 1 | DA | 50\% | \$ | 6,850 | \$ | - | \$ | 76,250 | \$342 |  | \$83,442 |
| 30 | 10 | 9 | Hewitt Dr | Imperial Dr | Mars Dr | 0.62 | 1 | DA | 50\% | \$ | 8,800 | \$ | - | \$ | 97,700 | \$478 |  | \$106,978 |
| 36 | 10 |  | Chapel Rd | Meadow Mountain Dr | Ritchie Rd | 1.15 | 3 | SA | 100\% | \$ | 151,600 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,684,020 | \$3,532 |  | \$1,839,152 |
| 37 | 10 |  | Ritchie Rd | Panther Way | Warren St | 1.01 | 2 | UA | 100\% | \$ | 176,500 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,961,300 | \$2,752 |  | \$2,140,552 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 10 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.44 |  |  |  | \$ | 561,750 | \$ | 190,000 | \$ | 6,240,987 | \$9,422 |  | \$7,002,158 |
| 38 | 11 |  | Val Verde Rd | Fossil Rim Rd | US 84 | 0.89 | 2 | SC | 100\% | \$ | 78,900 | \$ | - | \$ | 877,133 | \$1,157 |  | \$957,190 |
| 39 | 11 |  | Harris Creek Rd | US 84 | Walking Horse Ln | 0.66 | 2 | SC | 100\% | \$ | 58,700 | \$ | - | \$ | 652,400 | \$859 |  | \$711,959 |
| 40 | 11 |  | Speegleville Rd | Pecan Creek | Oak Rd | 0.54 | 4 | DA | 100\% | \$ | 267,500 | \$ | 57,500 | \$ | 2,972,667 | \$3,345 |  | \$3,301,012 |
| 41 | 11 |  | Speegleville Rd | Oak Rd | US 84 | 0.85 | 4 | DA | 100\% | \$ | 221,800 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,464,467 | \$5,190 |  | \$2,691,457 |
| 42 | 11 |  | Old Lorena Rd | US 84 EBFR | South Bosque River | 0.90 | 4 | DA | 100\% | \$ | 235,200 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,613,533 | \$5,504 |  | \$2,854,237 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 11 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.83 |  |  |  | \$ | 862,100 | \$ | 57,500 | \$ | 9,580,200 | \$ 16,054 | \$ | 10,515,854 |
|  | Totals: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4,997,560 |  | ,203,920 |  | 5,528,650 | \$100,000 | \$ | 62,830,130 |

NOTE: DA = DIVIDED ARTERIAL, UA = UNDIVIDED ARTERIAL, SA = SPECIAL ARTERIAL (WITH CENTER DUAL LEFT TURN LANE), SC = SPECIAL COLLECTOR (WITH CENTER DUAL LEFT TURN LANE), RECOUP = RECOUPMENT PROJECT, NEW = NEW PROJECT

### 6.0 IMPACT FEE ANALYSIS

### 6.1 Water and Wastewater Impact Fee Analysis

The impact fee analysis involves determining the utilization of existing and proposed projects required as defined by the capital improvement plan to serve new development over the next 10-year time period. For existing or proposed projects, the impact fee is calculated as a percentage of the project cost, based upon the percentage of the project's capacity required to serve development projected to occur between 2020 and 2030. Capacity serving existing development and development projected for more than 10 years in the future cannot be charged to impact fees.

### 6.1.1 Service Units

According to Chapter 395 of the Texas Local Government Code, the maximum impact fee may not exceed the amount determined by dividing the cost of capital improvements required by the total number of service units attributed to new development during the impact fee eligibility period. A water service unit is defined as the service equivalent to a water only connection or a water/wastewater connection for a single-family residence. A wastewater service unit is defined as the service unit equivalent to a water/wastewater connection for a single-family residence.

The service associated with public, commercial, and industrial connections is converted into service units based upon the capacity of the meter used to provide service. The number of service units required to represent each meter size is based on the safe maximum operating capacity of the appropriate meter type. American Water Works Association (AWWA) standards C700 and C710 (Displacement Meters) and C701 (Class II Turbine meters), were used to determine the maximum operating capacity, as these meter types represent those in place and stocked by the City. The service unit equivalent for each meter size used by the City is listed in Table 6-1.

Typically, in Waco, single-family residences are served with $5 / 8 \times 3 / 4$-inch displacement water meters. Larger meters represent multi-family, public, commercial, and industrial water use. The City provided data that included the meter size of each active water meter. Table 6-2 shows the actual number water meters for 2020 and the projected number of water meters for 2030.

Table 6-1: Service Unit Equivalents

| Meter Size | Meter Type | Maximum Flow <br> Rate <br> $(\mathrm{gpm})^{(1)}$ | Service Unit <br> Equivalent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $5 / 8 \times 3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ | Displacement | 15 | 1.00 |
| 1 " | Displacement | 40 | 2.67 |
| $1.5^{\prime \prime}$ | Class II Turbine | 100 | 6.67 |
| $2^{\prime \prime}$ | Class II Turbine | 160 | 10.67 |
| $3 "$ | Class II Turbine | 350 | 23.33 |
| $4 "$ | Class II Turbine | 630 | 42.00 |
| $6 "$ | Class II Turbine | 1,400 | 93.33 |
| $8 "$ | Class II Turbine | 2,400 | 160.00 |
| $10 "$ | Class II Turbine | 3,800 | 253.33 |

(1) Maximum flow rate is based on Table 5-3 in AWWA Manual M6.

Table 6-2: Growth in Service Units

| Meter Size | 2020 |  | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ |  | Growth in <br> Service Units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Meters | Service Units | Meters | Service Units | 7,746 |
| $1 "$ | 42,697 | 42,697 | 50,443 | 50,443 | 8,840 |
| $1,5^{\prime \prime}$ | 1,393 | 7,715 | 3,315 | 125 |  |
| $2 "$ | 521 | 9,033 | 1,553 | 10,353 | 1,320 |
| $3 "$ | 188 | 4,557 | 597 | 6,368 | 811 |
| $4 "$ | 97 | 4,074 | 215 | 5,017 | 630 |
| $6^{\prime \prime}$ | 31 | 2,893 | 311 | 4,662 | 588 |
| $8 "$ | 10 | 1,600 | 11 | 3,267 | 373 |
| $10 "$ | 3 | 760 | 3 | $\mathbf{1 , 7 6 0}$ | 160 |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 7 , 7 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 8 , 7 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 6 , 2 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{9 1 , 4 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 , 7 5 3}$ |

### 6.1.2 Maximum Impact Fee Calculations

The impact fee determination method employed by NewGen Strategies and Solutions, LLC is developed through a financial based model, which fully recognizes the requirements of Chapter 395, including the recognition of cash and/or debt financing, interest earnings, fund balances, and applicable credits. In developing the components of the financial model, several assumptions must be made, including the following:

- Financing
- Method of financing (i.e. cash or debt financing)
- The level of financing (e.g. 100\% debt funding)
- Cost of financing
- Debt repayment structure
- Timing and Level of Expenditures and Revenues
- Interest Earnings
- Annual Service Unit Growth

The assumptions employed in the maximum assessable impact fee determination provide a reasonable basis for forecasting; however, it must be emphasized that these assumptions may not necessarily reflect actual future conditions. To address this, Chapter 395 requires the monitoring of impact fees through the Impact Fee Advisory Committee and allows for the option to update or revise impact fees to reflect the actual implementation of the impact fee program.

Once the cost of capacity added that is attributable to growth is determined, it must then be decided how the cost will be financed: cash and/or debt. For any previously funded projects, whether partially funded or in full, actual costs of capital have been included. Based on discussions with City staff, unless specific funding has already been determined, it is assumed that the City will debt finance $100 \%$ of the future impact fee eligible project costs. For debt financing, the cost of financing is based on the City's Financial Advisor's estimates of future debt costs for bonds issued with 20-year terms. Debt service payments for each future debt issue are assumed to remain constant over the issue's term.

Currently, the exact timing and annual level of cash capital expenditures over the forecast period is indeterminate; therefore, it is assumed that capital expenditures will occur in equal amounts over the 10 year program period. It is also assumed that for debt-financed capital projects, the City will expend debt proceeds over a 3 -year timeframe. For the calculation of the maximum assessable impact fee, debt is assumed to be issued in equal amounts for each year. In order to recognize the full amount of debt to be issued for the cost of capacity added that is attributable to growth during the 10-year period, a portion of years 8,9 , and 10 are assumed to be spent in the final 3 years.

Because debt is issued over 20-year terms and impact fees developed herein are to be charged over a 10year period, sufficient fund balance must be generated to meet the future debt service obligations. There is no existing fund balance at the time because this is a new impact fee. Once collection begins, the generation of fund balances will be available for interest earnings.

## Water, Wastewater, and Roadway Impact Fee Report

 City of WacoChapter 395 states that interest earnings are funds of the impact fee account and are to be held to the same restrictions as impact fee revenues. Therefore, in order to recognize that interest earnings are used to fund only these specific Water or Wastewater Impact Fee CIP projects, interest earnings are credited against the costs recoverable through impact fees. It should be noted that Chapter 395 does not require the upfront recognition of interest earnings in the impact fee determination; however, in an effort to acknowledge the time value of the impact fee payers' monies, interest earnings have been credited. Interest is assumed to be earned at an annual rate of $0.35 \%$ per City staff.

As with the timing and level of the capital expenditures over the 10-year forecast, the timing and annual level of service unit growth over the 10-year program period is indeterminate at the present time. As such, it is assumed that service unit growth will be consistent over the 10-year forecast.

Chapter 395 requires a plan for awarding either a credit for the portion of ad valorem tax and/or utility service revenues generated by new service units during the program period that are used for payment of improvements that are included in the Water Impact Fee CIP. As an alternative, a credit equal to 50\% of the total cost of implementing the Water and Wastewater Impact Fee CIP may be used. The City has elected to calculate a credit that is equal to $50 \%$ of the total cost of implementing the Water and Wastewater Impact Fee CIP. Tables 6-3 and 6-4 display a summary of the maximum allowable impact fee calculations for water and wastewater, respectively. The detailed financial calculations are provided in Appendix $I$.

Table 6-3: Maximum Water Impact Fee Calculation

| Water Impact Fee |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Eligible Capital Improvement Costs | $\$ 34,046,711$ |
| Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee Planning Period | $\$ 17,023,355$ |
| Financing Costs | $\$ 6,531,589$ |
| Interest Earnings | $(\$ 541,910)$ |
| Total Eligible Impact Fee Costs | $\$ 23,013,034$ |
| Growth in Service Units | 12,753 |
| Maximum Impact Fee per Service Unit | $\$ 1,804$ |

Table 6-4: Maximum Wastewater Impact Fee Calculation

| Wastewater Impact Fee |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Eligible Capital Improvement Costs | $\$ 63,734,419$ |
| Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee Planning Period | $\$ 31,867,209$ |
| Financing Costs | $\$ 15,091,715$ |
| Interest Earnings | $(\$ 1,371,302)$ |
| Total Eligible Impact Fee Costs | $\$ 45,587,622$ |
| Growth in Service Units | 12,753 |
| Maximum Impact Fee per Service Unit | $\$ 3,574$ |

### 6.2 Roadway Impact Fee Analysis

The roadway impact fee analysis involves the determination of capacity and the associated cost attributable to 10 -year growth from the defined capital improvement plan for each service area. The cost per service unit is calculated by dividing the cost of the CIP necessitated and attributable to new demand (net cost) by the projected service units of growth over the 10-year planning period.

### 6.2.1 Service Units for New Development

An important objective in the development of the impact fee system is the development of a specific service unit equivalency for individual developments. The vehicle-miles generated by a new development are a function of the trip generation and average trip length characteristics of that development. The following describes the process used to develop the vehicle-equivalency table, which relates land use types and sizes to the resulting vehicle-miles of demand created by that development.

### 6.2.2 Trip Generation

Trip generation information for the PM peak hour was based on data published in the Tenth Edition of Trip Generation by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). Trip Generation is a reference publication that contains travel characteristics of over 100 land uses across the nation and is based on empirical data gathered from over 3,200 studies that were reported to the Institute by public agencies, developers and consulting firms.

## Pass-by and Diverted Trips Adjustments

The actual "traffic impact" of a specific site for impact fee purposes is based on the amount of traffic added to the street system. To accurately estimate new trips generated by a new development, adjustments must be made to trip generation rates and equations to account for pass-by and diverted
trips. The added traffic is adjusted so that each development is assigned only for a portion of trips associated with that specific development, reducing the possibility of over-counting by counting only primary trips generated.

Pass-by trips are those trips that are already on a route for a different purpose and simply stop at a development on that route. For example, a stop at a convenience store on the way home from the office is a pass-by trip for the convenience store. A pass-by trip does not create an additional burden on the street system and therefore should not be counted in the assessment of impact fees of a convenience store.

A diverted trip is a similar situation, except that a diversion is made from the regular route to make an interim stop. On a system-wide basis, this trip places a slightly additional burden on the street system but in many cases, this burden is minimal.

Trip generation rates were reduced by the percentages presented in Table 6-5 to isolate the primary trip purpose. Adjustments were based on studies conducted by ITE and other published studies.

The resulting recommended trip rates are illustrated as part of the Land Use/Vehicle-Mile Equivalency Table illustrated later in this chapter. Rates were developed in lieu of equations to simplify the assessment of impact fees by the City and likewise, the estimation of impact fees by persons who may be required to pay an impact fee in conjunction with a development project.

A local study may also be conducted to confirm rates in Trip Generation or to change rates reflecting local conditions. In such cases, a minimum of three similar sites should be counted. Selected sites should be isolated in nature with driveways that specifically serve the development and no other land uses. The results should be plotted on the scatter diagram of the selected land use contained in Trip Generation for comparison purposes. It is recommended that no change be approved unless the results show a variation of at least fifteen percent across the range of the sample size surveyed.

Table 6-5: Trip Reduction Estimates (PM Peak Hour)

| Land Use Category RESIDENTIAL | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ITE } \\ & \text { Code } \end{aligned}$ | Development Unit | Trip Gen Rate (PM Peak) | Pass-by Rate (\%) | Diverted Rate (\%) | Trip Rate w/ Reductions (PM Peak) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Single-Family Detached Housing | 210 | Dwelling Units | 0.99 | 0\% | 0\% | 0.99 |
| Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) | 220 | Dwelling Units | 0.56 | 0\% | 0\% | 0.56 |
| Mid-Rise Residential with 1st-Floor Commercial | 231 | Dwelling Units | 0.36 | 0\% | 0\% | 0.36 |
| Senior Adult Housing - Detached | 251 | Dwelling Units | 0.3 | 0\% | 0\% | 0.30 |
| Assisted Living | 254 | Beds | 0.26 | 0\% | 0\% | 0.26 |
| Continuing Care Retirement Community | 255 | Dwelling Units | 0.16 | 0\% | 0\% | 0.16 |
| OFFICE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Office Building | 710 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 1.15 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.15 |
| Medical-Dental Office Building | 720 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 3.46 | 0\% | 0\% | 3.46 |
| United States Post Office | 732 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 11.21 | 70\% | 0\% | 3.36 |
| COMMERCIAL/RETAIL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hotel | 310 | Rooms | 0.6 | 0\% | 0\% | 0.60 |
| All Suites Hotel | 311 | Rooms | 0.36 | 0\% | 0\% | 0.36 |
| Miniature Golf Course | 431 | Holes | 0.33 | 0\% | 0\% | 0.33 |
| Golf Driving Range | 432 | Driving Positions | 1.25 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.25 |
| Movie Theater | 444 | Screens | 14.6 | 0\% | 0\% | 14.60 |
| Health/Fitness Club | 492 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 3.45 | 0\% | 0\% | 3.45 |
| Hospital | 610 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 0.97 | 0\% | 0\% | 0.97 |
| Nursing Home | 620 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 0.59 | 0\% | 0\% | 0.59 |
| Free-Standing Emergency Room | 650 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 1.52 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.52 |
| Shopping Center | 820 | 1,000 Sq Ft GLA | 3.81 | 34\% | 26\% | 1.52 |
| Building Materials and Lumber Store | 812 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 2.06 | 25\% | 0\% | 1.55 |
| Free-Standing Discount Store | 815 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 4.83 | 17\% | 35\% | 2.32 |
| Hardware/Paint Store | 816 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 2.68 | 26\% | 28\% | 1.23 |
| Nursery (Garden Center) | 817 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 6.94 | 25\% | 0\% | 5.21 |
| Supermarket | 850 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 9.24 | 36\% | 38\% | 2.40 |
| Discount Club | 857 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 4.18 | 30\% | 0\% | 2.93 |
| Sporting Goods Superstore | 861 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 2.02 | 40\% | 0\% | 1.21 |
| Home Improvement Superstore | 862 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 2.33 | 48\% | 24\% | 0.65 |
| Electronic Superstore | 863 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 4.26 | 40\% | 33\% | 1.15 |
| Baby Superstore | 865 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 1.82 | 30\% | 0\% | 1.27 |
| Department Store | 875 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 1.95 | 30\% | 0\% | 1.37 |
| Arts and Crafts Store | 879 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 6.21 | 30\% | 0\% | 4.35 |
| Pharmacy/Drugstore w/o Drive-Through Window | 880 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 8.51 | 49\% | 13\% | 3.23 |
| Pharmacy/Drugstore w/ Drive-Through Window | 881 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 10.29 | 49\% | 13\% | 3.91 |
| Furniture Store | 890 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 0.52 | 53\% | 31\% | 0.08 |
| Walk-in Bank | 911 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 12.13 | 47\% | 26\% | 3.28 |
| Drive-in Bank | 912 | Drive-in Lanes | 27.15 | 47\% | 26\% | 7.33 |
| Quality Restaurant | 931 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 7.8 | 44\% | 27\% | 2.26 |
| High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurant | 932 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 9.77 | 43\% | 26\% | 3.03 |
| Fast-Food Restaurant w/ Drive-Through Window | 934 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 32.67 | 50\% | 23\% | 8.82 |
| Quick Lubrication Vehicle Shop | 941 | Service Positions | 2.43 | 0\% | 0\% | 2.43 |
| Automobile Parts Service Center | 943 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 0.77 | 0\% | 0\% | 0.77 |
| Gasoline/Service Station w/ Convenience Market | 945 | Fueling Positions | 9.24 | 36\% | 38\% | 2.40 |
| Car Wash and Detail Center | 949 | Wash Stalls | 23.04 | 63\% | 26\% | 2.53 |
| INDUSTRIAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Light Industrial | 110 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 0.63 | 0\% | 0\% | 0.63 |
| Manufacturing | 140 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 0.67 | 0\% | 0\% | 0.67 |
| Warehousing | 150 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 0.19 | 0\% | 0\% | 0.19 |
| Mini-Warehouse | 151 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 0.17 | 0\% | 0\% | 0.17 |
| INSTITUTIONAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Private School (K-8) | 534 | Students | 0.26 | 0\% | 0\% | 0.26 |
| Private School (K-12) | 536 | Students | 0.17 | 0\% | 0\% | 0.17 |
| Charter Elementary School | 537 | Students | 0.14 | 0\% | 0\% | 0.14 |
| Church | 560 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 0.49 | 0\% | 0\% | 0.49 |
| Day Care Center | 565 | Students | 0.79 | 75\% | 0\% | 0.20 |

## Trip Length

Trip lengths (in miles) are used in conjunction with site trip generation to estimate vehicle-miles of travel. Trip length data was based on information generated for the Waco MPO travel demand modeling by TxDOT, the National Household Travel Survey, the North Central Texas Council of Governments Workplace Survey, and engineering judgment. Travel characteristics were used to determine average trip lengths for common land use types.

Trip lengths summarized in Table 6-6 represent the average distance that a vehicle will travel between an origin and destination of which either the origin or destination contains the land-use category identified below. Data compiled represents the best available information on trip lengths for this area.

## Localized Trip Adjustment

Identified trip lengths represent the average distance that a vehicle will travel between an origin and destination of which either the origin or destination contains the land-use category identified below. A localization adjustment of was made to these to net out the portion of trip length on the federal highway system since the impact fee system does not include federal facilities in the Chapter 395 legislation. Based on the travel demand model output, an analysis revealed approximately $68 \%$ of vehicle-miles for trips were on the local network, with the remaining on the federal highway system.

## Origin and Destination Adjustments

The assessment of an individual development's impact fee is based on the premise that each vehicle-trip has an origin and a destination, and that the development end should pay for one-half of the cost necessary to complete each trip. To prevent the potential of double charging, trip lengths were divided by two to reflect half of the vehicle trip associated with development. Table 6-6 illustrates the adjusted trip length.

Table 6-6: Trip Lengths and Adjustments

| Land Use Category | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ITE } \\ & \text { Code } \end{aligned}$ | Localized Trip Length (mi) | O-D Adjusted Trip Length (mi) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RESIDENTIAL |  |  |  |
| Single-Family Detached Housing | 210 | 6.45 | 3.23 |
| Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) | 220 | 6.45 | 3.23 |
| Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) | 221 | 6.45 | 3.23 |
| Off-Campus Student Apartment | 225 | 1.94 | 0.97 |
| Mid-Rise Residential with 1st-Floor Commercial | 231 | 5.55 | 2.77 |
| Senior Adult Housing - Detached | 251 | 5.76 | 2.88 |
| Assisted Living | 254 | 2.97 | 1.48 |
| Continuing Care Retirement Community | 255 | 5.76 | 2.88 |
| OFFICE |  |  |  |
| General Office Building | 710 | 8.60 | 4.30 |
| Medical-Dental Office Building | 720 | 6.97 | 3.48 |
| COMMERCIAL/RETAIL |  |  |  |
| Hotel | 310 | 2.84 | 1.42 |
| Golf Course | 430 | 3.99 | 1.99 |
| Miniature Golf Course | 431 | 2.82 | 1.41 |
| Golf Driving Range | 432 | 2.82 | 1.41 |
| Movie Theater | 444 | 2.26 | 1.13 |
| Health/Fitness Club | 492 | 1.41 | 0.71 |
| Hospital | 610 | 3.55 | 1.77 |
| Nursing Home | 620 | 3.55 | 1.77 |
| Clinic | 630 | 3.55 | 1.77 |
| Shopping Center | 820 | 4.88 | 2.44 |
| Building Materials and Lumber Store | 812 | 2.44 | 1.22 |
| Free-Standing Discount Store | 815 | 4.88 | 2.44 |
| Hardware/Paint Store | 816 | 2.44 | 1.22 |
| Nursery (Garden Center) | 817 | 2.44 | 1.22 |
| Supermarket | 850 | 2.16 | 1.08 |
| Discount Club | 857 | 4.88 | 2.44 |
| Sporting Goods Superstore | 861 | 4.88 | 2.44 |
| Home Improvement Superstore | 862 | 4.88 | 2.44 |
| Electronic Superstore | 863 | 4.88 | 2.44 |
| Baby Superstore | 865 | 4.88 | 2.44 |
| Pet Supply Superstore | 866 | 4.88 | 2.44 |
| Department Store | 875 | 4.88 | 2.44 |
| Pharmacy/Drugstore w/ Drive-Through Window | 881 | 1.32 | 0.66 |
| Furniture Store | 890 | 4.88 | 2.44 |
| Walk-in Bank | 911 | 1.80 | 0.9 |
| Drive-in Bank | 912 | 1.80 | 0.9 |
| Quality Restaurant | 931 | 2.57 | 1.28 |
| High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurant | 932 | 2.66 | 1.33 |
| Fast-Food Restaurant w/ Drive-Through Window | 934 | 2.42 | 1.21 |
| Quick Lubrication Vehicle Shop | 941 | 1.96 | 0.98 |
| Automobile Parts Service Center | 943 | 1.96 | 0.98 |
| Gasoline/Service Station w/ Convenience Market | 945 | 0.82 | 0.41 |
| Car Wash and Detail Center | 949 | 1.37 | 0.69 |
| INDUSTRIAL |  |  |  |
| Manufacturing | 140 | 8.60 | 4.30 |
| Warehousing | 150 | 8.60 | 4.30 |
| Mini-Warehouse | 151 | 4.34 | 2.17 |
| INSTITUTIONAL |  |  |  |
| Private School (K-8) | 534 | 2.82 | 1.41 |
| Private School (K-12) | 536 | 2.82 | 1.41 |
| Charter Elementary School | 537 | 2.82 | 1.41 |
| Junior/Community College | 540 | 2.88 | 1.44 |
| University/College | 550 | 3.43 | 1.71 |
| Church | 560 | 1.70 | 0.85 |
| Day Care Center | 565 | 1.12 | 0.56 |

## Service Unit Equivalency Table

The result of combining the trip generation and trip length information is an equivalency table which establishes the service unit rate for various land uses. These service unit rates are based on an appropriate development unit for each land use. For example, a dwelling unit is the basis for residential uses, while 1,000 gross square feet of floor area is the basis for office, commercial, and industrial uses. Other less common land uses use appropriate independent variables.

Separate rates have been established for specific land uses within the broader categories of residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional to reflect the differences between land uses within the categories. However, even with these specific land use types, information is not available for every conceivable land use so limitations do exist. The equivalency table is illustrated in Table 6-7.

Table 6-7: Land Use Vehicle-Mile Equivalency

| Land Use Category | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ITE } \\ & \text { Code } \end{aligned}$ | Development Unit | Trip Rate w/ Reductions (PM Peak) | O-D Adjusted Trip Length (mi) | Service <br> Unit Equivalency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RESIDENTIAL |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-Family Detached Housing | 210 | Dwelling Units | 0.99 | 3.23 | 3.20 |
| Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) | 220 | Dwelling Units | 0.56 | 3.23 | 1.81 |
| Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) | 221 | Dwelling Units | 0.44 | 3.23 | 1.42 |
| Off-Campus Student Apartment | 225 | Bedrooms | 0.25 | 0.97 | 0.24 |
| Mid-Rise Residential with 1st-Floor Commercial | 231 | Dwelling Units | 0.36 | 2.77 | 1.00 |
| Senior Adult Housing - Detached | 251 | Dwelling Units | 0.30 | 2.88 | 0.86 |
| Assisted Living | 254 | Beds | 0.26 | 1.48 | 0.38 |
| Continuing Care Retirement Community | 255 | Dwelling Units | 0.16 | 2.88 | 0.46 |
| OFFICE |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Office Building | 710 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 1.15 | 4.30 | 4.95 |
| Medical-Dental Office Building | 720 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 3.46 | 3.48 | 12.04 |
| United States Post Office | 732 | $1,000 \mathrm{SqFt}$ GFA | 3.36 | 2.88 | 9.68 |
| Research and Development Center | 760 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 0.49 | 4.30 | 2.11 |
| COMMERCIAL/RETAIL |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hotel | 310 | Rooms | 0.60 | 1.42 | 0.85 |
| All Suites Hotel | 311 | Rooms | 0.36 | 1.42 | 0.51 |
| Golf Course | 430 | Holes | 2.91 | 1.99 | 5.79 |
| Miniature Golf Course | 431 | Holes | 0.33 | 1.41 | 0.47 |
| Golf Driving Range | 432 | Driving Positions | 1.25 | 1.41 | 1.76 |
| Multiplex Movie Theater | 445 | Screens | 13.73 | 1.13 | 15.51 |
| Health/Fitness Club | 492 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 3.45 | 0.71 | 2.45 |
| Hospital | 610 | $1,000 \mathrm{SqFt}$ GFA | 0.97 | 1.77 | 1.72 |
| Nursing Home | 620 | $1,000 \mathrm{SqFt}$ GFA | 0.59 | 1.77 | 1.04 |
| Clinic | 630 | $1,000 \mathrm{SqFt}$ GFA | 3.28 | 1.77 | 5.81 |
| Animal Hospital/Veterinary Clinic | 640 | $1,000 \mathrm{SqFt}$ GFA | 3.53 | 1.77 | 6.25 |
| Free-Standing Emergency Room | 650 | $1,000 \mathrm{SqFt}$ GFA | 1.52 | 1.77 | 2.69 |
| Shopping Center | 820 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GLA}$ | 1.52 | 2.44 | 3.71 |
| Building Materials and Lumber Store | 812 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 1.55 | 1.22 | 1.89 |
| Free-Standing Discount Superstore | 813 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 3.12 | 2.44 | 7.61 |
| Variety Store | 814 | $1,000 \mathrm{SqFt}$ GFA | 5.13 | 2.44 | 12.52 |
| Free-Standing Discount Store | 815 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 2.32 | 2.44 | 5.66 |
| Hardware/Paint Store | 816 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 1.23 | 1.22 | 1.50 |
| Nursery (Garden Center) | 817 | $1,000 \mathrm{SqFt}$ GFA | 5.21 | 1.22 | 6.36 |
| Supermarket | 850 | $1,000 \mathrm{SqFt}$ GFA | 2.40 | 1.08 | 2.59 |
| Convenience Market w/ Gasoline Pumps | 853 | Fueling Positions | 2.53 | 0.41 | 1.04 |
| Discount Club | 857 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 2.93 | 2.44 | 7.15 |
| Sporting Goods Superstore | 861 | $1,000 \mathrm{SqFt}$ GFA | 1.21 | 2.44 | 2.95 |
| Home Improvement Superstore | 862 | $1,000 \mathrm{SqFt}$ GFA | 0.65 | 2.44 | 1.59 |
| Electronic Superstore | 863 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 1.15 | 2.44 | 2.81 |
| Pet Supply Superstore | 866 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 2.49 | 2.44 | 6.08 |
| Office Supply Superstore | 867 | $1,000 \mathrm{SqFt}$ GFA | 1.94 | 2.44 | 4.73 |
| Discount Home Furnishing Superstore | 869 | $1,000 \mathrm{SqFt}$ GFA | 1.57 | 2.44 | 3.83 |
| Department Store | 875 | $1,000 \mathrm{SqFt}$ GFA | 1.37 | 2.44 | 3.34 |
| Arts and Crafts Store | 879 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 4.35 | 2.44 | 10.61 |
| Pharmacy/Drugstore w/o Drive-Through Window | 880 | $1,000 \mathrm{SqFt}$ GFA | 3.23 | 0.66 | 2.13 |
| Pharmacy/Drugstore w/ Drive-Through Window | 881 | $1,000 \mathrm{SqFt}$ GFA | 3.91 | 0.66 | 2.58 |
| Furniture Store | 890 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 0.08 | 2.44 | 0.20 |
| Walk-in Bank | 911 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 3.28 | 0.9 | 2.95 |
| Drive-in Bank | 912 | Drive-in Lanes | 7.33 | 0.9 | 6.60 |
| Quality Restaurant | 931 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 2.26 | 1.28 | 2.89 |
| High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurant | 932 | $1,000 \mathrm{SqFt}$ GFA | 3.03 | 1.33 | 4.03 |
| Fast-Food Restaurant w/ Drive-Through Window | 934 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 8.82 | 1.21 | 10.67 |
| Bread/Donut/Bagel Shop w/o Drive-Through Windoı | 939 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 7.56 | 0.41 | 3.10 |
| Quick Lubrication Vehicle Shop | 941 | Service Positions | 2.43 | 0.98 | 2.38 |
| Automobile Parts Service Center | 943 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 0.77 | 0.98 | 0.75 |
| Car Wash and Detail Center | 949 | Wash Stalls | 2.53 | 0.69 | 1.75 |
| INDUSTRIAL |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Light Industrial | 110 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 0.63 | 4.30 | 2.71 |
| Manufacturing | 140 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 0.67 | 4.30 | 2.88 |
| Warehousing | 150 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 0.19 | 4.30 | 0.82 |
| Mini-Warehouse | 151 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 0.17 | 2.17 | 0.37 |
| High-Cube Fulfillment Center Warehouse | 155 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 1.37 | 4.3 | 5.89 |
| Data Center | 160 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} \mathrm{Ft} \mathrm{GFA}$ | 0.09 | 4.3 | 0.39 |
| INSTITUTIONAL |  |  |  |  |  |
| Private School (K-8) | 534 | Students | 0.26 | 1.41 | 0.37 |
| Private School ( $\mathrm{K}-12$ ) | 536 | Students | 0.17 | 1.41 | 0.24 |
| Charter Elementary School | 537 | Students | 0.14 | 1.41 | 0.20 |
| Junior/Community College | 540 | Students | 0.11 | 1.44 | 0.16 |
| University/College | 550 | Students | 0.15 | 1.71 | 0.26 |
| Church | 560 | 1,000 Sq Ft GFA | 0.49 | 0.85 | 0.42 |
| Day Care Center | 565 | Students | 0.20 | 0.56 | 0.11 |

### 6.2.3 Service Units of Growth

Forecasted service units of growth by service area were calculated based on projected growth as described in the Land Use Assumptions (Chapter 3) and the associated service unit generation for each of the population and employment data components. The 10-year projected vehicle-miles of demand by service area were summarized in Section 5.4 and detailed in Appendix E.

### 6.2.4 Maximum Impact Fee Calculations

The impact fee determination method employed by NewGen Strategies and Solutions, LLC is developed through a financial based model, which fully recognizes the requirements of Chapter 395, including the recognition of cash and/or debt financing, interest earnings, fund balances, and applicable credits. In developing the components of the financial model, several assumptions must be made, including the following:

- Financing
- Method of financing (i.e. cash or debt financing)
- The level of financing (e.g. 100\% debt funding)
- Cost of financing
- Debt repayment structure
- Timing and Level of Expenditures and Revenues
- Interest Earnings
- Annual Service Unit Growth

The assumptions employed in the maximum assessable impact fee determination provide a reasonable basis for forecasting; however, it must be emphasized that these assumptions may not necessarily reflect actual future conditions. To address this, Chapter 395 requires the monitoring of impact fees through the Impact Fee Advisory Committee and allows for the option to update or revise impact fees to reflect the actual implementation of the impact fee program.

Once the cost of capacity added that is attributable to growth is determined, it must then be decided how the cost will be financed: cash and/or debt. For any previously funded projects, whether partially funded or in full, actual costs of capital have been included. Based on discussions with City staff, unless specific funding has already been determined, it is assumed that the City will debt finance $100 \%$ of the future impact fee eligible project costs. For debt financing, the cost of financing is based on the City's Financial

Advisor's estimates of future debt costs for bonds issued with 20-year terms. Debt service payments for each future debt issue are assumed to remain constant over the issue's term.

Currently, the exact timing and annual level of cash capital expenditures over the forecast period is indeterminate; therefore, it is assumed that capital expenditures will occur in equal amounts over the 10year program period. It is also assumed that for debt-financed capital projects, the City will expend debt proceeds over a 3-year timeframe. For the calculation of the maximum assessable impact fee, debt is assumed to be issued in equal amounts for each year. In order to recognize the full amount of debt to be issued for the cost of capacity added that is attributable to growth during the 10-year period, a portion of years 8,9 , and 10 are assumed to be spent in the final 3 years.

Because debt is issued over 20-year terms and impact fees developed herein are to be charged over a 10year period, sufficient fund balance must be generated to meet the future debt service obligations. There is no existing fund balance at the time because this is a new impact fee. Once collection begins, the generation of fund balances will be available for interest earnings.

Chapter 395 states that interest earnings are funds of the impact fee account and are to be held to the same restrictions as impact fee revenues. Therefore, in order to recognize that interest earnings are used to fund only these specific Roadway Impact Fee CIP projects, interest earnings are credited against the costs recoverable through impact fees. It should be noted that Chapter 395 does not require the upfront recognition of interest earnings in the impact fee determination; however, in an effort to acknowledge the time value of the impact fee payers' monies, interest earnings have been credited. Interest is assumed to be earned at an annual rate of $0.35 \%$ per City staff.

As with the timing and level of the capital expenditures over the 10-year forecast, the timing and annual level of vehicle mile growth over the 10-year program period is indeterminate at the present time. As such, it is assumed that vehicle mile growth will be consistent over the 10-year forecast.

Chapter 395 requires a plan for awarding either a credit for the portion of ad valorem tax revenues generated by new vehicle miles during the program period that are used for payment of improvements that are included in the Roadway Impact Fee CIP. As an alternative, a credit equal to $50 \%$ of the total cost of implementing the Roadway Impact Fee CIP may be used. The City has elected to calculate a credit that is equal to $50 \%$ of the total cost of implementing the Roadway Impact Fee CIP. The resulting maximum City of Waco
fee per vehicle mile is summarized in Table 6-8 below. The detailed financial calculations are provided in
Appendix E.

Table 6-8: Maximum Roadway Impact Fee Calculation

| Service Area: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Project Costs | \$204,914 | \$4,355,135 | \$16,064,507 | \$518,981 | \$ - | \$615,707 | \$14,769,596 | \$ - | \$8,783,276 | \$7,002,158 | \$10,515,854 |
| Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee Planning Period | \$66,333 | \$2,102,651 | \$3,604,402 | \$109,788 | \$ - | \$306,773 | \$2,393,745 | \$ - | \$4,391,638 | \$2,263,085 | \$1,588,886 |
| Financing Costs | \$39,657 | \$1,265,970 | \$2,167,182 | \$65,135 | \$ - | \$183,836 | \$1,435,329 | \$ - | \$2,645,980 | \$1,362,050 | \$953,433 |
| Interest <br> Earnings | \$(3,934) | \$(125,579) | \$ $(214,975)$ | \$(6,461) | \$ - | \$(18,236) | \$ (142,378) | \$ - | \$(262,470) | \$(135,109) | \$ (94,576) |
| Total Eligible Impact Fee Costs | \$102,056 | \$3,243,042 | \$5,556,609 | \$168,462 | \$ | \$472,373 | \$3,686,696 | \$ - | \$6,775,149 | \$3,490,026 | \$2,447,742 |
| Growth in Service Units | 15,947 | 4,650 | 4,293 | 650 | 1,650 | 2,002 | 3,879 | - | 10,967 | 2,636 | 2,094 |
| Maximum Assessable Fee | \$6 | \$697 | \$1,294 | \$259 | \$ - | \$236 | \$950 | \$ - | \$618 | \$1,324 | \$1,169 | City of Waco

## Appendix A

## Population \& Employment by TAZ

## Appendix A

Population and Employment by TAZ

| TAZ | Pop 2020 | Pop 2030 | Pop 2040 | Emp 2020 | Emp 2030 | Emp 2040 | Pop Change <br> 2020-2030 | Pop Change <br> 2020-2040 | Emp Change <br> 2020-2030 | Emp Change <br> 2020-2040 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix A

Population and Employment by TAZ
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## Appendix A

Population and Employment by TAZ

| TAZ | Pop 2020 | Pop 2030 | Pop 2040 | Emp 2020 | Emp 2030 | Emp 2040 | Pop Change 2020-2030 | Pop Change 2020-2040 | Emp Change \| 2020-2030 | Emp Change 2020-2040 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 168 | 0 | 0 | 332 | 30 | 82 | 194 | 0 | 332 | 52 | 164 |
| 169 | 0 | 0 | 387 | 0 | 29 | 97 | 0 | 387 | 29 | 97 |
| 170 | 41 | 49 | 66 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 25 | 0 | -7 |
| 171 | 702 | 1,063 | 1,327 | 428 | 515 | 616 | 361 | 625 | 87 | 188 |
| 172 | 1,863 | 1,937 | 2,046 | 358 | 384 | 417 | 74 | 183 | 26 | 59 |
| 173 | 1,253 | 1,332 | 1,383 | 86 | 91 | 97 | 79 | 130 | 6 | 11 |
| 174 | 215 | 308 | 398 | 1,079 | 1,123 | 1,193 | 93 | 183 | 44 | 114 |
| 175 | 41 | 242 | 442 | 121 | 140 | 165 | 201 | 401 | 19 | 44 |
| 176 | 76 | 120 | 300 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 44 | 224 | 2 | 2 |
| 177 | 0 | 287 | 288 | 37 | 68 | 89 | 287 | 288 | 31 | 52 |
| 178 | 65 | 166 | 442 | 7 | 30 | 39 | 101 | 378 | 22 | 31 |
| 179 | 65 | 72 | 77 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 13 | 1 | 1 |
| 180 | 864 | 995 | 1,383 | 47 | 62 | 126 | 131 | 519 | 15 | 79 |
| 181 | 53 | 54 | 133 | 28 | 34 | 49 | 1 | 80 | 6 | 21 |
| 182 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 240 | 259 | 291 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 51 |
| 183 | 108 | 112 | 133 | 9 | 12 | 15 | 4 | 25 | 2 | 5 |
| 184 | 459 | 538 | 719 | 349 | 420 | 582 | 79 | 260 | 71 | 233 |
| 185 | 551 | 564 | 575 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 13 | 24 | 1 | 2 |
| 192 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 186 | 480 | 2,030 | 0 | 0 | 294 | 1,844 |
| 193 | 8 | 8 | 111 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 4 |
| 208 | 0 | 295 | 332 | 0 | 150 | 291 | 295 | 332 | 150 | 291 |
| 214 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 26 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 15 |
| 215 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 814 | 854 | 863 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 50 |
| 216 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 873 | 1,390 | 1,528 | 0 | 0 | 517 | 654 |
| 217 | 825 | 864 | 885 | 1,082 | 1,159 | 1,214 | 39 | 60 | 77 | 133 |
| 218 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,267 | 1,365 | 1,455 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 188 |
| 219 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,721 | 1,882 | 1,940 | 0 | 0 | 161 | 220 |
| 221 | 224 | 309 | 389 | 84 | 86 | 87 | 86 | 166 | 3 | 4 |
| 222 | 2,908 | 3,174 | 3,373 | 142 | 178 | 218 | 265 | 465 | 35 | 76 |
| 226 | 540 | 1,658 | 2,212 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 1,118 | 1,672 | 3 | 9 |
| 228 | 283 | 335 | 385 | 1,035 | 1,040 | 1,163 | 52 | 102 | 5 | 128 |
| 229 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 597 | 869 | 960 | 0 | 0 | 272 | 363 |
| 230 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 265 | 428 | 526 | 0 | 0 | 163 | 261 |
| 235 | 446 | 1,425 | 1,659 | 67 | 211 | 247 | 979 | 1,213 | 144 | 180 |
| 236 | 24 | 66 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 48 | 0 | 0 |
| 237 | 3,888 | 4,199 | 4,424 | 209 | 264 | 310 | 311 | 536 | 55 | 101 |
| 238 | 513 | 674 | 824 | 18 | 26 | 97 | 161 | 311 | 8 | 79 |
| 239 | 56 | 221 | 553 | 2 | 14 | 29 | 165 | 497 | 13 | 27 |
| 240 | 133 | 287 | 288 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 154 | 155 | 0 | 0 |
| 241 | 54 | 138 | 221 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 167 | 0 | 0 |
| 242 | 659 | 801 | 912 | 7 | 9 | 15 | 142 | 254 | 2 | 8 |
| 247 | 324 | 663 | 1,106 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 339 | 782 | 0 | 5 |
| 252 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 29 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 253 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 651 | 672 | 689 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 38 |
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## Appendix A

Population and Employment by TAZ

| TAZ | Pop 2020 | Pop 2030 | Pop 2040 | Emp 2020 | Emp 2030 | Emp 2040 | Pop Change 2020-2030 | Pop Change 2020-2040 | Emp Change 2020-2030 | Emp Change 2020-2040 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 203 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 204 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 2 | 5 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 3 | 13 |
| 205 | 24 | 30 | 90 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 6 | 66 | 0 | 4 |
| 211 | 0 | 0 | 400 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 400 | 0 | 50 |
| 213 | 60 | 75 | 200 | 2 | 5 | 40 | 15 | 140 | 3 | 38 |
| 216 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 225 | 30 | 240 | 240 | 4 | 4 | 40 | 210 | 210 | 0 | 36 |
| 226 | 60 | 450 | 700 | 2 | 2 | 50 | 390 | 640 | 0 | 48 |
| 227 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 5 |
| 230 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 234 | 30 | 40 | 500 | 3 | 5 | 50 | 10 | 470 | 2 | 47 |
| 235 | 0 | 1,500 | 1,600 | 0 | 50 | 100 | 1,500 | 1,600 | 50 | 100 |
| 236 | 30 | 150 | 150 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 120 | 120 | 9 | 9 |
| 238 | 0 | 100 | 200 | 0 | 5 | 30 | 100 | 200 | 5 | 30 |
| 239 | 120 | 1,500 | 1,700 | 5 | 10 | 30 | 1,380 | 1,580 | 5 | 25 |
| 240 | 100 | 115 | 240 | 20 | 75 | 80 | 15 | 140 | 55 | 60 |
| 243 | 30 | 260 | 600 | 0 | 80 | 120 | 230 | 570 | 80 | 120 |
| 247 | 12 | 12 | 2,000 | 0 | 100 | 300 | 0 | 1,988 | 100 | 300 |
| 248 | 593 | 1,400 | 1,650 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 807 | 1,057 | 0 | 5 |
| 249 | 30 | 40 | 250 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 10 | 220 | 0 | 20 |
| 250 | 40 | 400 | 450 | 10 | 150 | 175 | 360 | 410 | 140 | 165 |
| 259 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 260 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 261 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 262 | 0 | 256 | 375 | 100 | 271 | 435 | 256 | 375 | 171 | 335 |
| 266 | 0 | 0 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 | 0 | 0 |
| 268 | 80 | 85 | 150 | 120 | 120 | 150 | 5 | 70 | 0 | 30 |
| 269 | 18 | 20 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 42 | 0 | 2 |
| 271 | 45 | 50 | 250 | 1 | 1 | 50 | 5 | 205 | 0 | 49 |
| 284 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 12 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 |
| 286 | 20 | 25 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5 | 100 | 0 | 15 |
| 295 | 75 | 80 | 160 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 85 | 0 | 20 |
| 296 | 200 | 400 | 800 | 25 | 70 | 100 | 200 | 600 | 45 | 75 |
| 298 | 100 | 130 | 430 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 30 | 330 | 3 | 8 |
| 299 | 200 | 250 | 550 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 50 | 350 | 0 | 8 |
| 300 | 80 | 100 | 200 | 120 | 122 | 145 | 20 | 120 | 2 | 25 |
| 301 | 120 | 150 | 300 | 2 | 5 | 15 | 30 | 180 | 3 | 13 |
| 302 | 100 | 110 | 430 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 330 | 0 | 3 |
| 303 | 250 | 260 | 320 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 10 | 70 | 1 | 8 |
| 304 | 500 | 550 | 850 | 160 | 220 | 275 | 50 | 350 | 60 | 115 |
| 305 | 300 | 330 | 630 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 30 | 330 | 5 | 10 |
| 306 | 250 | 275 | 350 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 25 | 100 | 2 | 8 |
| 307 | 700 | 800 | 1,100 | 50 | 55 | 70 | 100 | 400 | 5 | 20 |
| 308 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 65 | 100 | 110 | 0 | 100 | 35 | 45 |
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| TAZ | Pop 2020 | Pop 2030 | Pop 2040 | Emp 2020 | Emp 2030 | Emp 2040 | Pop Change 2020-2030 | Pop Change 2020-2040 | Emp Change 2020-2030 | Emp Change 2020-2040 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 311 | 24 | 30 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 15 |
| 318 | 400 | 410 | 850 | 50 | 55 | 95 | 10 | 450 | 5 | 45 |
| 319 | 33 | 35 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 87 | 0 | 0 |
| 323 | 180 | 190 | 300 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 10 | 120 | 5 | 10 |
| 324 | 300 | 400 | 600 | 30 | 35 | 100 | 100 | 300 | 5 | 70 |
| 327 | 30 | 35 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 20 | 0 | 10 |
| 328 | 20 | 25 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 80 | 0 | 5 |
| 339 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 342 | 150 | 200 | 330 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 50 | 180 | 0 | 5 |
| 343 | 40 | 45 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 369 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 10 |
| 370 | 12 | 12 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 15 |
| 384 | 140 | 170 | 200 | 20 | 25 | 45 | 30 | 60 | 5 | 25 |
| 385 | 200 | 220 | 230 | 170 | 250 | 270 | 20 | 30 | 80 | 100 |
| 391 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 40 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| 392 | 425 | 450 | 550 | 75 | 80 | 90 | 25 | 125 | 5 | 15 |
| 393 | 31 | 31 | 70 | 60 | 75 | 90 | 0 | 39 | 15 | 30 |
| 394 | 35 | 40 | 75 | 155 | 285 | 390 | 5 | 40 | 130 | 235 |
| 395 | 350 | 360 | 440 | 100 | 110 | 145 | 10 | 90 | 10 | 45 |
| 396 | 45 | 45 | 75 | 160 | 170 | 180 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 20 |
| 397 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 398 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 10 |
| 399 | 20 | 20 | 100 | 2 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 13 |
| 401 | 455 | 460 | 800 | 19 | 19 | 40 | 5 | 345 | 0 | 21 |
| 403 | 300 | 300 | 910 | 120 | 120 | 210 | 0 | 610 | 0 | 90 |
| 408 | 90 | 90 | 195 | 10 | 10 | 50 | 0 | 105 | 0 | 40 |
| 411 | 0 | 1,900 | 2,000 | 130 | 235 | 250 | 1,900 | 2,000 | 105 | 120 |
| 413 | 30 | 100 | 300 | 30 | 175 | 330 | 70 | 270 | 145 | 300 |
| 415 | 430 | 700 | 700 | 10 | 12 | 30 | 270 | 270 | 2 | 20 |
| 416 | 1,200 | 1,600 | 1,750 | 70 | 160 | 200 | 400 | 550 | 90 | 130 |
| 417 | 300 | 1,200 | 1,200 | 55 | 100 | 75 | 900 | 900 | 45 | 20 |
| 418 | 500 | 1,050 | 1,100 | 100 | 200 | 355 | 550 | 600 | 100 | 255 |
| 419 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 130 | 0 | 22 |
| 429 | 805 | 1,000 | 1,350 | 115 | 115 | 200 | 195 | 545 | 0 | 85 |
| 432 | 50 | 50 | 210 | 10 | 12 | 70 | 0 | 160 | 2 | 60 |
| Total | 159,497 | 188,433 | 226,443 | 71,669 | 82,132 | 98,329 | 28,936 | 66,946 | 10,463 | 26,660 |

## Appendix B

## Water and Wastewater Capital Improvements

Plans



## Appendix C

## Roadway Impact Fee Land Use Definitions

## Waco Roadway Impact Fee Equivalency Table

Land uses for the roadway impact fee service unit equivalency table have been grouped into the major categories of residential, office, commercial, industrial, and institutional uses. The following is a listing of land uses that apply within each category. The City Engineer's best judgment should be used for any land uses not specified herein.

## Residential

Single-Family Detached - Any single-family detached home on an individual lot is included in this category. A typical example of this land use is a home in a suburban subdivision. A range of densities, from low to high, may be comprised within this classification.

Apartment - This land use includes both low-rise ("walk-up" dwellings) and high-rise multi-family apartments. An apartment is defined as a dwelling unit that is located within the same building with three or more dwelling units. Also included in this land use are triplex and quadplex units.

Residential Condominium / Townhouse - Residential condominiums and townhomes are defined as single-family units that have at least one other single-family unit within the same building structure.

Senior Adult Housing - Detached - Senior adult housing consists of detached independent living developments, including retirement communities, age-restricted housing, and active adult communities. These developments may include amenities such as golf courses, swimming pools, 24-hour security, transportation, and common recreational facilities. However, they generally lack centralized dining and on-site health facilities. Detached senior adult housing communities may or may not be gated. Residents in these communities are typically active (requiring little to no medical supervision). The percentage of retired residents varies by development.

Retirement Community - restricted to adults or senior citizens - contain residential units similar to apartments or condominiums, and are usually self-contained villages. They may also contain special services such as medical facilities, dining facilities, and some limited supporting retail facilities.

Continuing Care Retirement Home - A continuing care retirement community (CCRC) is a land use that provides multiple elements of senior adult living. CCRCs combine aspects of independent living with increased care, as lifestyle needs change with time. Housing options may include various combinations of senior adult (detached), senior adult (attached), congregate care, assisted living, and skilled nursing care-aimed at allowing the residents to live in one community as their medical needs change. The communities may also contain special services such as medical, dining, recreational, and some limited, supporting retail facilities. CCRCs are usually self-contained villages.

City of Waco

## Office

General Office Building - A general office building houses one or more tenants and is the location where affairs of a business are conducted. The building or buildings may be limited to one tenant, either the owner or lessee, or contain a mixture of tenants including professional services, insurance companies, investment brokers, company headquarters, and services for the tenants such as a bank or savings and loan, a restaurant or cafeteria, and service retail facilities. Also included in this category are other office uses not specified above.

Corporate Headquarters Building - A building that houses corporate headquarters of a company or organization and consists of offices, meeting rooms, space for storage and data processing, a cafeteria and other service functions. Such buildings typically house a single tenant although some sub-area space may be leased out.

Medical-Dental Office - A medical office building is a facility that provides diagnosis and outpatient care but which is unable to provide prolonged in-house medical/surgical care. One or more private physicians generally operate this type of building. Also included in this category are dental facilities with one or more private dentists.
U.S. Post Office - A United States post office is a federal building that contains service windows for mailing packages and letters, post office boxes, offices, sorting and distributing facilities for mail, and vehicle storage areas.

Research and Development Center - A research and development center is a facility or group of facilities devoted almost exclusively to research and development activities. The range of specific types of businesses contained in this land use category varies significantly. Research and development centers may contain offices and light fabrication areas.

Business Park - Business parks consist of a group of one or multi-story buildings served by a common roadway system similar to an office or industrial park. The tenant space is flexible to house a variety of uses. Tenants may be start-up companies or fully matured relatively small companies that require a variety of space. Offices, retail and wholesale sales, restaurants, and recreation, as well as warehousing, manufacturing, light industrial, and scientific research uses are typical within this land use. Other similar uses include research and development centers, office parks, corporate headquarter buildings, singletenant buildings and other uses not specified above.

## Commercial

Hotel - A hotel is a place of lodging that provides sleeping accommodations and supporting facilities such as restaurants, cocktail lounges, meeting and banquet rooms or convention facilities, limited recreational facilities (pool, fitness room), and/or other retail and service shops.

All Suites Hotel - An all suites hotel is a place of lodging that provides sleeping accommodations, a small restaurant and lounge, and small amounts of meeting space. Each suite includes a sitting room and separate bedroom; limited kitchen facilities are provided within the suite.

Movie Theater with Matinee - This land use consists of a movie or live theater and contains audience seating, single or multiple auditoriums, lobby, offices and refreshment stands.

Building Materials and Lumber Store - A building materials and lumber store is a freestanding building that sells hardware, building materials, and lumber. The lumber may be stored in the main building, yard, or storage shed.

Free-Standing Discount Superstore - Discount superstore is similar to a free-standing discount store with the exception that it also contains a full-service grocery department under the same roof that shares entrances and exits with the discount store area. These stores usually offer a variety of customer services, centralized cashiering, and a wide range of products. They typically maintain long store hours 7 days a week. The stores included in this land use are often the only ones on the site, but they can also be found in mutual operation with a related or unrelated garden center and/or service station, or as a part of a shopping center, with or without their own dedicated parking area.

Variety Store - A variety store is a retail store that sells a broad range of inexpensive items often at a single price. These stores are typically referred to as "dollar stores." Items sold at these stores typically include kitchen supplies, cleaning products, home office supplies, food products, household goods, decorations, and toys. These stores are sometimes stand-alone sites, but they may also be located in small strip shopping centers.

Specialty Retail Center - Small strip shopping centers containing a variety of retail shops that typically specialize in apparel, hard goods, serves such as real estate, investment, dance studios, florists, and small restaurants.

Hardware/Paint Store - A hardware/paint store is a free-standing building that sells hardware and paint supplies.

Garden Center (Nursery) - A nursery or garden center is a free-standing building with an outside storage area for planting or landscape stock. The nurseries surveyed primarily serve the general public. Some have large greenhouses and offer landscaping services.

Most have office, storage, and shipping facilities. Nurseries are characterized by seasonal variations in trip characteristics.

Nursery (Wholesale) - A wholesale nursery is a free-standing building with an outside storage area for planting or landscape stock. The nurseries surveyed primarily serve contractors and suppliers. Some have large greenhouses and offer landscaping services. Most have office, storage, and shipping facilities. Nurseries are characterized by seasonal variations in trip characteristics.

Shopping Center - A shopping center is an integrated group of commercial establishments that is planned, developed, owned, and managed as a unit. A shopping center's composition is related to its market area in terms of size, location, and type of store. A shopping center also provides on-site parking facilities sufficient to serve its own parking demands.

Automobile Sales - An automobile sales dealership is typically located along a major street characterized by abundant commercial development. The sale or leasing of new or used cars is the primary business at these facilities; however, automobile services and parts sales may also be available. Some dealerships also include leasing options, truck sales, and servicing.

Auto Parts Sales - An automobile parts sales facility specializes in the sale of automobile parts for maintenance and repair. Items sold at these facilities include spark plugs, oil, batteries, and a wide range of automobile parts. These facilities are not equipped for on-site vehicle repair.

Tire Store - The primary business associated with a tire store is the sale and marketing of tires for automotive vehicles. Services offered by these stores usually include tire installation and repair, as well as other automotive maintenance or repair services and customer assistance. These stores generally do not contain large storage or warehouse areas.

Tire Superstore - A tire superstore is a warehouse-like facility with the primary function of selling and installing tires for automobiles and small trucks. Other services provided may include automotive maintenance functions, such as wheel alignment or shock and brake service, and customer services. A tire display, customer waiting lounge, restroom facilities, staff office space, and significant storage area are also provided. General mechanical repairs and bodywork are usually not conducted at these facilities.

Supermarket - A supermarket is a free-standing retail store selling a complete assortment of food, food preparation and wrapping materials, and household cleaning items. Supermarkets may also contain the following products and services: ATMs, automobile supplies, bakeries, books and magazines, dry cleaning, floral arrangements,
greeting cards, limited-service banks, photo centers, pharmacies, and video rental areas. Some facilities may be open 24 hours a day.

Convenience Market with Gasoline Pumps - This land use includes convenience markets with gasoline pumps where the primary business is the selling of convenience items, not the fueling of motor vehicles. The sites included in this land use category have the following two specific characteristics:

- The gross floor area of the convenience market is at least 2,000 gross square feet
- The number of vehicle fueling positions is less than 10

Discount Club - A discount club is a discount store or warehouse where shoppers pay a membership fee in order to take advantage of discounted prices on a wide variety of items such as food, clothing, tires, and appliances; many items are sold in large quantities or bulk. Some sites may include on-site fueling pumps.

Home Improvement Superstore - A home improvement superstore is a free-standing facility that specializes in the sale of home improvement merchandise. These stores generally offer a variety of customer services and centralized cashiering. Home improvement superstores typically maintain long store hours 7 days a week. Examples of items sold in these stores include lumber, tools, paint, lighting, wallpaper and paneling, kitchen and bathroom fixtures, lawn equipment, and plant and garden accessories. The stores included in this land use are often the only ones on the site, but they can also be found in mutual operation with a related or unrelated garden center. Home improvement superstores are sometimes found as separate parcels within a retail complex, with or without their own dedicated parking. The buildings contained in this land use usually range in size from 50,000 to 200,000 square feet gross floor area. This land use does not include interior design stores.

Electronic Superstore - An electronics superstore is a free-standing facility that specializes in the sale of electronic merchandise. These facilities generally offer a variety of customer services and centralized cashiering. Electronics superstores typically maintain long store hours 7 days a week. Examples of items sold in these stores include televisions, audio and video players and recorders, software, telephones, computers, and general electronic accessories. Major home appliances may also be sold at these facilities. Electronics superstores are sometimes found as separate parcels within a retail complex, with or without their own dedicated parking.

Apparel Store - An apparel store is an individual store specializing in the sale of clothing.
Arts and Crafts Store - An arts and crafts store is a free-standing facility that sells art, framing, wall décor, and seasonal merchandise. These stores may provide in-store arts
and crafts classes. Arts and crafts stores are sometimes found as separate parcels within a retail complex, with or without their own dedicated off-street parking.

Pharmacy with Drive Thru - A pharmacy/drugstore is a retail facility that primarily sells prescription and non-prescription drugs. These facilities may also sell cosmetics, toiletries, medications, stationery, personal care products, limited food products, and general merchandise. The drug stores in this category contain drive-through windows.

Furniture Store - A furniture store is a full-service retail facility that specializes in the sale of furniture and often carpeting. Furniture stores are generally large and may include storage areas. The sites surveyed included both traditional retail furniture stores and warehouse stores with showrooms. Although some home accessories may be sold, furniture stores primarily focus on the sale of pre-assembled furniture. A majority of items sold at these facilities must be ordered for delivery.

Bank with Drive Thru - A bank with drive-thru provides banking facilities for motorists who conduct financial transactions from their vehicles; many also serve patrons who walk into the building. The drive-in lanes may or may not provide automatic teller machines (ATMs).

Quality Restaurant - This land use consists of high quality, full-service eating establishments with a typical duration of stay of at least one hour. Quality restaurants generally do not serve breakfast; some do not serve lunch; all serve dinner. This type of restaurant often requests and sometimes requires reservations and is generally not part of a chain. Patrons commonly wait to be seated, are served by a waiter/waitress, order from menus and pay for meals after they eat. While some of the study sites have lounge or bar facilities (serving alcoholic beverages), they are ancillary to the restaurant.

Restaurant - This land use consists of sit-down, full-service eating establishments with typical duration of stay of approximately one hour. This type of restaurant is usually moderately priced and frequently belongs to a restaurant chain. Generally, these restaurants serve lunch and dinner; they may also be open for breakfast and are sometimes open 24 hours a day. These restaurants typically do not take reservations. Patrons commonly wait to be seated, are served by a waiter/waitress, order from menus and pay for their meal after they eat. Some facilities contained within this land use may also contain a bar area for serving food and alcoholic drinks.

Fast food with Drive Thru - This category includes fast-food restaurants with drivethrough windows. This type of restaurant is characterized by a large drive-through clientele, long hours of service (some are open for breakfast, all are open for lunch and dinner, some are open late at night or 24 hours a day) and high turnover rates for eat-in customers. These limited-service eating establishments do not provide table service. Non-drive-through patrons generally order at a cash register and pay before they eat.

Quick Lubrication Vehicle Stop - A quick lubrication vehicle shop is a business where the primary activity is to perform oil change services for vehicles. Other ancillary services provided may include preventative maintenance, such as fluid and filter changes. Automobile repair service is generally not provided.

Automotive Care Center - An automobile care center houses numerous businesses that provide automobile-related services, such as repair and servicing, stereo installation, and seat cover upholstering.

Gas/Service Station with Convenience Market - This land use includes gasoline/service stations with convenience markets where the primary business is the fueling of motor vehicles. These service stations may also have ancillary facilities for servicing and repairing motor vehicles and may have a car wash. Some commonly sold convenience items are newspapers, coffee or other beverages, and snack items that are usually consumed in the car. The sites included in this land use category have the following two specific characteristics:

- The gross floor area of the convenience market is between 2,000 and 3,000 gross square feet
- The number of vehicle fueling positions is at least 10


## Industrial

General Light Industrial - Light industrial facilities usually employ fewer than 500 persons and have an emphasis on activities other than manufacturing. Typical light industrial activities include printing plants, material testing laboratories, assemblers of data processing equipment, power stations and warehousing of less than 35,000 square feet; most facilities are freestanding and devoted to a single use.

Industrial Park - Industrial parks are areas containing a number of industrial or related facilities. They are characterized by a mix of manufacturing, service, and warehouse facilities with a wide variation in the proportion of each type of use from one location to another. Many industrial parks contain highly diversified facilities - some with a large number of small businesses and others with one or two dominant industries.

Manufacturing - Manufacturing facilities are sites where the primary activity is the conversion of raw materials or parts into finished products. Size and type of activity may vary from one site to another. In addition to actual production of goods, manufacturing facilities generally also have office, warehouse, research and associated functions.

Mini-warehouse (self-storage) - A mini-warehouse is a building in which a storage unit or vault is rented for the storage of goods. Each unit is physically separated from other units and access is usually provided through an overhead door or other common access point.

Utilities - A utility is a free-standing building that can house office space, a storage area, and electromechanical or industrial equipment that support a local electrical, communication, water supply or control, or sewage treatment utility.

## Institutional

Private School (K-8) - A private school (K-8) primarily serves students attending kindergarten through the eighth grade but may also include students beginning with preK classes. These schools may also offer extended care and day care. Students may travel a long distance to get to private schools.

Junior/Community College - This land use includes two-year junior colleges or community colleges. A number of two-year institutions have sizable evening programs.

Church - A church is a building in which public worship services are held. A church houses an assembly hall or sanctuary; it may also house meeting rooms, classrooms, and, occasionally, dining, catering, or party facilities.

Day Care Center - A day care center is a facility where care for pre-school age children is provided, normally during the daytime hours. Day care facilities generally include classrooms, offices, eating areas, and playgrounds. Some centers also provide afterschool care for older children including after school care.

Source: Trip Generation Manual $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers Freese and Nichols, Associates, Inc.

## Appendix D

## Roadway Existing Conditions Analysis

## DEFINITIONS

| LANES | The total number of lanes in both directions available for travel. |
| :--- | :--- |
| TYPE | The type of roadway (used in determining capacity): |
|  | DA = divided arterial |
|  | UA = undivided arterial |
|  | DC = divided collector |
|  | UC = undivided collector |
|  | SC = special collector (roadway with continuous left turn) |
|  | SA = special arterial (roadway with continuous left turn) |

PK-HR VOLUME The existing volume of cars on the roadway segment traveling during the afternoon (P.M.) peak hour of travel. A and B indicate the two directions of travel. Direction A is a northbound or eastbound and direction B is southbound or westbound. If only one half of the roadway is located within the service area (see $\%$ in service area), the opposing direction will have no volume in the service area.
\% IN SERVICE AREA If the roadway is located on the boundary of the service area (with the city limits running along the centerline of the roadway), then half of the roadway is inventoried in the service area and the other half is not. This value is either $50 \%$ or $100 \%$.

VEH-MI SUPPLY TOTAL The number of total service units (vehicle-miles) supplied within the service area, based on the length and established capacity of the roadway type.

VEH-MI TOTAL The total service unit (vehicle-mile) demand created by existing traffic on the DEMAND PK-HR roadway segment in the afternoon peak hour.

EXCESS CAPACITY The number of service units supplied but unused by existing traffic in the PK-HR VEH-MI afternoon peak hour.

EXISTING DEFICIENCIES The number of service units of demand in excess of the service units supplied.
PK-HR VEH-MI

NOTE: Excess capacity and existing deficiencies are calculated separately for each direction. It is possible to have excess capacity in one direction and an existing deficiency in the other. When both directions have excess capacity or deficiencies, the total for both directions are presented.

City of Waco

Waco Roadway Capital Recovery Fee Study
Existing Capital Improvements Analysis

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Serv } \\ & \text { Area } \end{aligned}$ | Shared Svc Area | Roadway | From | To | $\begin{gathered} \text { Length } \\ (\mathrm{mi}) \end{gathered}$ | No. of Lanes | Type | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pct. in } \\ & \text { Serv. Area } \end{aligned}$ | Peak Hour Volume |  |  | VMT Supply Pk Hr Total | VMT DemandPk Hr Total | Excess VMT Capacity | Exist. VMT Deficiency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A | B | Total |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 2 | Lake Shore Dr | Hillcrest Dr | Park Lake Dr | 1.05 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 537 | 0 | 537 | 1,397 | 564 | 833 | 0 |
| 1 | 2 | Lake Shore Dr | Park Lake Dr | Macarthur Dr | 0.40 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 629 | 0 | 629 | 536 | 254 | 283 | 0 |
| 1 | 2 | Lake Shore Dr | Macarthur Dr | 550 ' SE of Airport Rd | 0.56 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 700 | 0 | 700 | 741 | 390 | 351 | 0 |
| 1 | 6 | Lake Shore Dr | 550' SE of Airport Rd | Airport Rd | 0.10 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 710 | 0 | 710 | 139 | 74 | 65 | 0 |
| 1 | 6 | Lake Shore Dr | Airport Rd | N 19 th St | 0.60 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 720 | 0 | 720 | 803 | 435 | 368 | 0 |
| 1 | 6 | Lake Shore Dr | N 19 th St | College Dr | 0.65 | 4 | DA | 50\% | 479 | 0 | 479 | 871 | 314 | 557 | 0 |
| 1 | 6 | Lake Shore Dr | College Dr | Bosque River | 0.27 | 4 | DA | 50\% | 469 | 0 | 469 | 360 | 127 | 233 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Park Lake Dr | Lake Shore Dr | MacArthur Dr | 0.22 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 100 | 100 | 200 | 263 | 45 | 218 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Park Lake Dr | MacArthur Dr | 25th St | 0.55 | 3 | SA | 100\% | 100 | 100 | 200 | 738 | 111 | 627 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Park Lake Dr | 25th St | 19th St | 0.46 | 3 | SA | 100\% | 100 | 100 | 200 | 609 | 92 | 518 | 0 |
| 1 | 2 | Hillcrest Dr | Lake Shore Dr | Lake Air Dr | 0.31 | 2 | UA | 50\% | 0 | 400 | 400 | 182 | 123 | 59 | 0 |
| 1 | 2 | Hillcrest Dr | Lake Air Dr | Glendale Dr | 0.53 | 2 | UA | 50\% | 0 | 400 | 400 | 310 | 210 | 100 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Hillcrest Dr | Glendale Dr | 41st St | 0.06 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 400 | 400 | 800 | 68 | 46 | 22 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Hillcrest Dr | 41st St | Landon Branch Rd | 0.34 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 400 | 400 | 800 | 791 | 268 | 523 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Hillcrest Dr | Landon Branch Rd | MacArthur Dr | 0.20 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 400 | 400 | 800 | 525 | 158 | 367 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Hillcrest Dr | Macarthur dr | 31st St | 0.21 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 400 | 400 | 800 | 568 | 171 | 397 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Lyle/Herring | 31st St | 25th St | 0.47 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 400 | 400 | 800 | 1,249 | 376 | 873 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Lyle/Herring | 25th St | 18th St | 0.55 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 400 | 400 | 800 | 1,451 | 437 | 1,015 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Lyle/Herring | 18th St | 12th St | 0.42 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 450 | 450 | 900 | 1,107 | 375 | 733 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Herring | 12th St | 4th St | 0.41 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 450 | 450 | 900 | 1,086 | 368 | 719 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Herring | 4 th St | Brazos River | 0.31 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 450 | 450 | 900 | 813 | 275 | 538 | 0 |
| 1 | 6 | Herring | Brazos River | N Martin Luther King Jr. Blve | 0.13 | 4 | DA | 50\% | 450 | 0 | 450 | 178 | 60 | 118 | 0 |
| 1 | 6 | Herring | N Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd | JJ Flewellen Rd | 0.72 | 4 | DA | 50\% | 450 | 0 | 450 | 961 | 325 | 636 | 0 |
| 1 | 6 | Herring | נJ Flewellen Rd | 1035 ' SW of Gholson Rd | 0.49 | 4 | DA | 50\% | 450 | 0 | 450 | 649 | 219 | 429 | 0 |
| 1 | 6 | Herring | 1035 ' SW of Gholson Rd | Gholson Rd | 0.20 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 450 | 0 | 450 | 261 | 88 | 173 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Colcord Ave | 18 th St | 4 th St | 0.99 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 100 | 100 | 200 | 1,169 | 198 | 971 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Bosque Blva | N New Rd | 39th St | 0.21 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 804 | 670 | 1,474 | 559 | 310 | 249 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Bosque Blvd | 39th St | 34 th St | 0.45 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 804 | 670 | 1,474 | 1,206 | 668 | 538 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Bosque Blvd | 34th St | 31st St | 0.26 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 804 | 670 | 1,474 | 703 | 389 | 313 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Bosque/Homan | 31st St | 25th St | 0.45 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 804 | 670 | 1,474 | 1,185 | 657 | 529 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Bosque/Homan | 25th St | 17th St | 0.63 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 804 | 670 | 1,474 | 1,680 | 931 | 749 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Waco Dr | Valley Mills Dr | Austin Ave | 0.12 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 1,119 | 1,119 | 2,238 | 316 | 266 | 50 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Waco Dr | Austin Ave | 38th St | 0.28 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 1,119 | 1,119 | 2,238 | 735 | 618 | 117 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Waco Dr | 38th St | 25th St | 1.03 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 1,115 | 1,115 | 2,230 | 2,740 | 2,297 | 443 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Waco Dr | 25th St | 17 th St | 0.65 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 1,115 | 1,115 | 2,230 | 1,738 | 1,457 | 281 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Waco Dr | 17th St | 11th St | 0.49 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 1,115 | 1,115 | 2,230 | 1,291 | 1,082 | 209 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Waco Dr | 11th St | 4th St | 0.54 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 1,199 | 1,199 | 2,398 | 1,430 | 1,289 | 141 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Waco Dr | 4th St | Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd | 0.33 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 1,231 | 1,091 | 2,322 | 880 | 768 | 112 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Waco Dr | Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd | Dallas St | 0.28 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 1,231 | 1,091 | 2,322 | 745 | 650 | 95 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Waco Dr | Dallas St | Garrison St | 0.49 | 6 | DA | 100\% | 1,231 | 1,091 | 2,322 | 1,963 | 1,142 | 820 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Waco Dr | Garrison St | Clifton St | 0.43 | 6 | DA | 100\% | 1,231 | 1,091 | 2,322 | 1,700 | 989 | 711 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Waco Dr | Clifton St | BUS 77 | 0.35 | 6 | DA | 100\% | 756 | 756 | 1,512 | 1,384 | 524 | 859 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Waco Dr | BUS 77 | 1-35 | 0.36 | 6 | DA | 100\% | 756 | 756 | 1,512 | 1,456 | 552 | 904 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Washington Ave | 26th St | 18th St | 0.63 | 3 | SA | 100\% | 100 | 100 | 200 | 840 | 126 | 714 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Franklin Ave | Valley Mills Dr | 26th St | 1.07 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 857 | 792 | 1,649 | 2,846 | 1,764 | 1,082 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Franklin Ave | 26th St | 18th St | 0.63 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 857 | 792 | 1,649 | 1,663 | 1,031 | 632 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Franklin/Washington | 18 th St | 17 th St | 0.08 | 6 | DA | 100\% | 857 | 792 | 1,649 | 321 | 133 | 188 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Franklin/Washington | 17th St | 12th St | 0.39 | 6 | UA | 100\% | 857 | 792 | 1,649 | 1,393 | 649 | 744 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Franklin/Washington | 12th St | 4 th St | 0.61 | 6 | UA | 100\% | 857 | 792 | 1,649 | 2,154 | 1,003 | 1,151 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Washington Ave | 4th St | University Parks Dr | 0.24 | 3 | SA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 318 | 239 | 79 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Washington Ave | University Parks Dr | MLK J r Blva | 0.18 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 216 | 183 | 33 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Washington Ave | MLK J r Blvd | Garrison St | 0.73 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 864 | 732 | 132 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Washington Ave | Garrison St | $1-35$ SbFR | 0.38 | 3 | SA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 509 | 383 | 126 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Franklin Ave | 4th St | University Parks Dr | 0.24 | 3 | SA | 100\% | 857 | 792 | 1,649 | 317 | 394 | 0 | 76 |
| 1 |  | Franklin Ave | University Parks Dr | MLK J r Blva | 0.22 | 3 | SA | 100\% | 857 | 792 | 1,649 | 297 | 368 | 0 | 71 |
| 1 |  | Orchard Ln | MLK J r Blva | Garrison St | 0.30 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 250 | 250 | 500 | 357 | 151 | 206 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Orchard Ln | Garrison St | BUS 77 | 0.40 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 150 | 150 | 300 | 471 | 120 | 351 | 0 |
| 1 | x | Dutton Ave | Valley Mills Dr | 29th St | 0.39 | 4 | UA | 50\% | 0 | 500 | 500 | 456 | 193 | 263 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Dutton Ave | 29th St | 26th St | 0.25 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 582 | 247 | 335 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Dutton Ave | 26th St | 17th St | 0.66 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,547 | 655 | 891 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Dutton Ave | 17th St | Waco Creek | 0.35 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 416 | 352 | 63 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Dutton Ave | Waco Creek | 11th St | 0.12 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 139 | 118 | 21 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Speight Ave | Valley Mills Dr | 26th St | 0.37 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 439 | 372 | 67 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Speight Ave | 26th St | 18 th St | 0.57 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 676 | 573 | 103 | 0 |
| 1 | 2 | Valley Mills | N New Rd | Waco Dr | 0.21 | 6 | DA | 50\% | 0 | 821 | 821 | 412 | 169 | 242 | 0 |
| 1 | 9 | Valley Mills | Waco Dr | Railroad | 0.78 | 6 | DA | 50\% | 0 | 890 | 890 | 1,560 | 696 | 864 | 0 |
| 1 | 3 | Valley Mills | Bagby Ave | JHKultgen Expy | 0.23 | 8 | DA | 50\% | 0 | 709 | 709 | 622 | 166 | 456 | 0 |
| 1 | 3 | La Salle | 18th St | 12th St | 0.46 | 6 | DA | 50\% | 826 | 0 | 826 | 924 | 382 | 541 | 0 |
| 1 | 3 | La Salle | 12th St | University Parks Dr | 1.11 | 6 | DA | 50\% | 736 | 0 | 736 | 2,214 | 817 | 1,397 | 0 |
| 1 |  | N 41st St | Hillcrest Dr | Glendale Dr | 0.21 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 814 | 659 | 1,473 | 493 | 308 | 185 | 0 |
| 1 | 2 | N 41 st St | Glendale Dr | Cobbs Dr | 0.13 | 4 | UA | 50\% | 814 | 0 | 814 | 154 | 106 | 48 | 0 |
| 1 | 2 | N New Rd | Cobbs Dr | Bosque Blvd | 0.75 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 814 | 0 | 814 | 991 | 606 | 384 | 0 |
| 1 | 2 | N New Rd | Bosque Blva | Watt Ave | 0.70 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 814 | 0 | 814 | 925 | 566 | 359 | 0 |
| 1 | 2 | N New Rd | Watt Ave | $N$ Valley Mills Dr | 0.13 | 4 | DA | 50\% | 814 | 0 | 814 | 167 | 102 | 65 | 0 |
| 1 |  | MacArthur Dr | Lake Shore Dr | Park Lake Dr | 0.30 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 351 | 298 | 54 | 0 |
| 1 |  | MacArthur Dr | Park Lake Dr | McFerrin Ave | 0.58 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,361 | 577 | 784 | 0 |
| 1 |  | MacArthur Dr | McFerrin Ave | Hillcrest Dr | 0.63 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,475 | 625 | 850 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 34th St | Hillcrest Dr | Maple Ave | 0.44 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 514 | 174 | 340 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 34th St | Maple Ave | Bosque Blvd | 0.57 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 677 | 229 | 447 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 34th St | Bosque Blvd | Morrow Ave | 0.52 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 616 | 209 | 407 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 36th St | Morrow Ave | Waco Dr | 0.28 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 331 | 112 | 219 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 25th St | Park Lake Dr | McFerrin Ave | 0.58 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 686 | 233 | 453 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 25th St | McFerrin Ave | Herring Ave | 0.54 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 643 | 218 | 425 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 25th St | Herring Ave | Maple Ave | 0.47 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,117 | 473 | 644 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 25th/26th | Maple Ave | Bosque Blva | 0.57 | 6 | DA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 2,290 | 574 | 1,716 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 25th/26th | Bosque Blvd | Waco Dr | 0.64 | 6 | DA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 2,560 | 642 | 1,919 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 25th/26th | Waco Dr | Franklin Ave | 0.32 | 6 | DA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,286 | 322 | 964 | 0 |

City of Waco

| Waco Roadway Capital Recovery Fee Study Existing Capital Improvements Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Serv Area | Shared Svc Area | Roadway | From | To | $\begin{gathered} \text { Length } \\ \text { (mi) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. of } \\ & \text { Lanes } \end{aligned}$ | Type | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pct. in } \\ & \text { Serv. Area } \end{aligned}$ | $A^{\text {Peak }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { our Volun } \\ & \text { B } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Total | VMT Supply Pk Hr Total | VMT Demand Pk Hr Total | Excess VMT Capacity | Exist. VMT Deficiency |
| 1 |  | 26th St | Franklin Ave | Clay Ave | 0.33 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 780 | 330 | 449 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 26th St | Clay Ave | Dutton Ave | 0.36 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 849 | 360 | 489 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 26th St | Dutton Ave | Speight Ave | 0.35 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 824 | 349 | 475 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 26th St | Speight Ave | Bagby Ave | 0.18 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 430 | 182 | 248 | 0 |
| 1 |  | N 19 th St | Lake Shore Dr | College Dr | 0.55 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 702 | 402 | 1,104 | 1,472 | 611 | 861 | 0 |
| 1 |  | N 19th St | College Dr | Park Lake Dr | 0.59 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 702 | 402 | 1,104 | 1,557 | 646 | 911 | 0 |
| 1 |  | N 19th St | Park Lake Dr | 215' SE of Vivian Ave | 0.25 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 702 | 402 | 1,104 | 672 | 279 | 393 | 0 |
| 1 |  | N 19th St | 215' SE of Vivian Ave | Wilson Ave | 0.20 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 702 | 402 | 1,104 | 470 | 220 | 250 | 0 |
| 1 |  | N 18 th St | Wilson Ave | Herring Ave | 0.70 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 702 | 402 | 1,104 | 1,647 | 771 | 877 | 0 |
| 1 |  | N 18 th St | Herring Ave | Pine Ave | 0.16 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 702 | 402 | 1,104 | 366 | 171 | 195 | 0 |
| 1 |  | N 18 th St | Pine Ave | Maple Ave | 0.32 | 3 | SA | 100\% | 702 | 402 | 1,104 | 419 | 348 | 83 | 12 |
| 1 |  | N 18 th St | Maple Ave | Colcord Ave | 0.33 | 3 | SA | 100\% | 702 | 402 | 1,104 | 440 | 365 | 87 | 12 |
| 1 |  | N 18 th St | Colcord Ave | Homan Ave | 0.18 | 3 | SA | 100\% | 702 | 402 | 1,104 | 242 | 201 | 48 | 7 |
| 1 |  | 18th/17th | Homan Ave | Waco Dr | 0.51 | 6 | DA | 100\% | 702 | 402 | 1,104 | 2,036 | 563 | 1,473 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 18th/17th | Waco Dr | Washington Ave | 0.20 | 8 | DA | 100\% | 811 | 811 | 1,622 | 1,067 | 325 | 742 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 18th/17th | Washington Ave | Franklin Ave | 0.16 | 8 | DA | 100\% | 811 | 811 | 1,622 | 856 | 261 | 595 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 18th/17th | Franklin Ave | Clay Ave | 0.32 | 8 | DA | 100\% | 811 | 811 | 1,622 | 1,711 | 522 | 1,189 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 18th/17th | Clay Ave | Dutton Ave | 0.37 | 8 | DA | 100\% | 639 | 639 | 1,278 | 1,957 | 470 | 1,487 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 18th/17th | Dutton Ave | 1-35 | 0.37 | 8 | DA | 100\% | 639 | 639 | 1,278 | 1,977 | 475 | 1,502 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 18th/17th | 1-35 | Griffin Ave | 0.39 | 6 | DA | 100\% | 370 | 370 | 740 | 1,551 | 288 | 1,264 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 18th St | Griffin Ave | La Salle Ave | 0.07 | 6 | DA | 100\% | 370 | 370 | 740 | 272 | 50 | 222 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 12th St | Waco Dr | Washington Ave | 0.31 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 368 | 125 | 243 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 11th St | Waco Dr | Washington Ave | 0.31 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 369 | 125 | 244 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 11th St | Washington Ave | Franklin Ave | 0.16 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 192 | 65 | 127 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 11th St | Franklin Ave | Clay Ave | 0.32 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 381 | 129 | 252 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 11th St | Clay Ave | Dutton Ave | 0.37 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 434 | 147 | 287 | 0 |
| , |  | 11th St | Dutton Ave | Baylor Ave | 0.23 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 625 | 94 | 531 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 11th St | Baylor Ave | Bagby Ave | 0.28 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 335 | 113 | 221 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 11th St | Bagby Ave | La Salle Ave | 0.32 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 379 | 129 | 251 | 0 |
| , |  | 5th/4th St | Herring Ave | Colcord Ave | 0.68 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,807 | 679 | 1,128 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 5th/4th St | Colcord Ave | Waco Dr | 0.36 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 951 | 357 | 593 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 5th/4th St | Waco Dr | Washington Ave | 0.38 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,006 | 378 | 628 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 5th/4th St | Washington Ave | Franklin Ave | 0.16 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 428 | 161 | 267 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 5th/4th St | Franklin Ave | 1-35 | 0.61 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,612 | 606 | 1,006 | 0 |
| 1 |  | 5th/4th St | 1-35 | Dutton Ave | 0.08 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 214 | 80 | 134 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Dutton Ave | 4th St | University Parks Dr | 0.24 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 642 | 241 | 401 | 0 |
| 1 |  | University Parks Dr | Washington Ave | Franklin Ave | 0.17 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 441 | 166 | 275 | 0 |
| 1 |  | University Parks Dr | Franklin Ave | Jackson Ave | 0.24 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 635 | 239 | 396 | 0 |
| 1 |  | University Parks Dr | Jackson Ave | 1-35 | 0.27 | 6 | DA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,059 | 266 | 794 | 0 |
| 1 |  | University Parks Dr | 1-35 | Dutton Ave | 0.16 | 6 | DA | 100\% | 632 | 632 | 1,264 | 657 | 208 | 449 | 0 |
| 1 |  | University Parks Dr | Dutton Ave | Bagby Ave | 0.59 | 6 | DA | 100\% | 725 | 659 | 1,384 | 2,355 | 817 | 1,538 | 0 |
| 1 |  | University Parks Dr | Bagby Ave | La Salle | 0.33 | 6 | DA | 100\% | 725 | 659 | 1,384 | 1,322 | 459 | 864 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd | Herring Ave | Faulkner Ln | 0.39 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 606 | 436 | 1,042 | 1,045 | 409 | 636 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd | Faulkner Ln | Waco Dr | 0.64 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 606 | 436 | 1,042 | 1,706 | 668 | 1,038 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd | Waco Dr | Elm Ave | 0.43 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 606 | 436 | 1,042 | 1,152 | 451 | 701 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd | Elm Ave | Franklin Ave | 0.15 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 606 | 436 | 1,042 | 396 | 155 | 241 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd | Franklin Ave | 1-35 | 0.43 | 6 | DA | 100\% | 606 | 436 | 1,042 | 1,726 | 451 | 1,275 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd | 1-35 | Orchard Ln | 0.15 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 606 | 436 | 1,042 | 392 | 154 | 238 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd | Orchard Ln | E7th St | 0.36 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 273 | 173 | 446 | 970 | 163 | 808 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd | E7th St | BUS 77 | 0.44 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 273 | 173 | 446 | 1,181 | 198 | 983 | 0 |
| 1 | 6 | Gholson Rd | Herring Ave | 960 'S of Herring Ave | 0.18 | 2 | UA | 50\% | 0 | 283 | 283 | 107 | 51 | 56 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Gholson Rd | 960'S of Herring Ave | Faulkner Ln | 0.33 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 283 | 283 | 566 | 395 | 190 | 206 | 0 |
| 1 |  | Clifton St | Faulkner Ln | Waco Dr | 0.12 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 283 | 283 | 566 | 144 | 69 | 75 | 0 |
| 1 |  | BUS 77 | 700' NE of Saley Ave | Waco Dr | 0.46 | 6 | DA | 100\% | 474 | 474 | 948 | 1,830 | 435 | 1,395 | 0 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 1 |  |  |  |  | 56.06 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 127,576 | 55,849 | 71,905 | 178 |
| 2 | 1 | Hillcrest Dr | Lake Shore Dr | Lake Air Dr | 0.31 | 2 | UA | 50\% | 0 | 400 | 400 | 182 | 123 | 59 | 0 |
| 2 | 1 | Hillcrest Dr | Lake Air Dr | Glendale Dr | 0.53 | 2 | UA | 50\% | 0 | 400 | 400 | 310 | 210 | 100 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Cobbs Dr | Bosque Blva | Fish Pond Rd | 0.15 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 358 | 152 | 206 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Cobbs Dr | Fish Pond Rd | N Valley Mills Dr | 0.20 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 484 | 205 | 279 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Cobbs Dr | $N$ Valley Mills Dr | Wooded Acres Dr | 0.58 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,549 | 582 | 966 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Cobbs Dr | Wooded Acres Dr | Lake Air Dr | 0.46 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,222 | 459 | 762 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Cobbs Dr | Lake Air Dr | 41st St | 0.51 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,348 | 507 | 841 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Bosque Blvd | 325' NE of Southwood Dr | SH6 | 0.21 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 690 | 690 | 1,380 | 561 | 291 | 270 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Bosque Blva | SH6 | Ridge Oak Pkwy | 0.19 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 690 | 690 | 1,380 | 458 | 268 | 190 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Bosque Blvd | Ridge Oak Pkwy | Rambler Dr | 0.30 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 690 | 690 | 1,380 | 793 | 412 | 382 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Bosque Blvd | Rambler Dr | Cobb Dr | 0.29 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 690 | 690 | 1,380 | 676 | 395 | 281 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Bosque Blva | Cobb Dr | N Valley Mills Dr | 0.52 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 476 | 476 | 952 | 1,232 | 497 | 735 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Bosque Blvd | $N$ Valley Mills dr | Lake Air Dr | 0.55 | 7 | SA | 100\% | 804 | 670 | 1,474 | 2,175 | 803 | 1,371 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Bosque Blvd | Lake Air Dr | N New Rd | 0.52 | 7 | SA | 100\% | 804 | 670 | 1,474 | 2,070 | 765 | 1,305 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Sanger Ave | 200' NE or Cranbrook Dr | Londonberry Rd | 0.14 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 160 | 54 | 106 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Sanger Ave | Londonberry Rd | SH6 | 0.19 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 440 | 186 | 253 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Sanger Ave | SH6 | Melrose Dr | 0.24 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 570 | 241 | 328 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Sanger Ave | Melrose Dr | Richland Dr | 0.65 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,527 | 647 | 880 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Sanger Ave | Richland Dr | Lake Air Dr | 0.18 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 431 | 183 | 248 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Sanger Ave | Lake Air Dr | N Valley Mills Dr | 0.58 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,370 | 581 | 790 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Londonberry Dr | New Sanger Rd | McGregor Rd | 0.50 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,322 | 497 | 825 | 0 |
| 2 | 1 | Lake Shore Dr | 550' SE of Airport Rd | Macarthur Dr | 0.56 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 700 |  | 700 | 741 | 390 | 351 | 0 |
| 2 | 1 | Lake Shore Dr | Macarthur Dr | Park Lake Dr | 0.40 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 629 |  | 629 | 536 | 254 | 283 | 0 |
| 2 | 1 | Lake Shore Dr | Park Lake Dr | Hillcrest Dr | 1.05 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 537 |  | 537 | 1,397 | 564 | 833 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Lake Shore Dr | Hillcrest Dr | Wooded Acres Dr | 0.84 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 537 | 384 | 921 | 2,246 | 778 | 1,469 | 0 |


| Waco Roadway Capital Recovery Fee Study Existing Capital Improvements Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Serv } \\ & \text { Area } \end{aligned}$ | Shared Svc Area | Roadway | From | To | $\begin{gathered} \text { Length } \\ (\mathrm{mi}) \end{gathered}$ | No. of Lanes | Type | Pct. in Serv. Area | $\mathrm{A}^{\text {Peak } \mathrm{H}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { our Volum } \\ & \text { B } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Total | VMT Supply Pk Hr Total | VMT Demand Pk Hr Total | Excess VMT Capacity | Exist. VMT <br> Deficiency |
| 2 |  | Lake Shore Dr | Wooded Acres Dr | Mt Carmel Dr | 0.18 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 537 | 384 | 921 | 478 | 165 | 312 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Lake Shore Dr | Mt Carmel Dr | Koehne Park Dr | 0.62 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 537 | 384 | 921 | 735 | 574 | 161 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Valley Mills Dr | Koehne Park Dr | Hillandale Rd | 0.15 | 3 | SA | 100\% | 600 | 700 | 1,300 | 196 | 192 | 10 | 5 |
| 2 |  | Valley Mills Dr | Hillandale Rd | Ridgewood Dr | 0.26 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 600 | 700 | 1,300 | 309 | 341 | 0 | 31 |
| 2 |  | Valley Mills Dr | Ridgewood Dr | Bishop Dr | 0.18 | 3 | SA | 100\% | 700 | 800 | 1,500 | 235 | 265 | 0 | 30 |
| 2 |  | Valley Mills Dr | Bishop Dr | Huntington Dr | 0.24 | 3 | SA | 100\% | 700 | 800 | 1,500 | 318 | 359 | 0 | 41 |
| 2 |  | Valley Mills Dr | Huntington Dr | Cobbs Dr | 0.23 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 800 | 900 | 1,700 | 621 | 397 | 224 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Valley Mills Dr | Cobbs Dr | Bosque Blvd | 0.44 | 7 | SA | 100\% | 800 | 900 | 1,700 | 1,739 | 741 | 998 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Valley Mills Dr | Bosque Blvd | Lake Air Dr | 0.54 | 7 | SA | 100\% | 1,029 | 1,149 | 2,178 | 2,138 | 1,167 | 971 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Valley Mills Dr | Lake Air Dr | Sanger Ave | 0.46 | 7 | SA | 100\% | 1,029 | 1,149 | 2,178 | 1,822 | 995 | 827 | - |
| 2 |  | Valley Mills Dr | Sanger Ave | New Rd | 0.30 | 7 | SA | 100\% | 1,029 | 1,149 | 2,178 | 1,178 | 643 | 535 | 0 |
| 2 | 1 | Valley Mills Dr | New Rd | Waco Dr | 0.21 | 6 | DA | 50\% | 608 | 0 | 608 | 422 | 129 | 294 | 0 |
| 2 | \% 9 | Waco Dr | Franklin Ave | Lake Air Dr | 0.25 | 6 | DA | 50\% | 0 | 764 | 764 | 490 | 188 | 302 | 0 |
| 2 | $\checkmark 9$ | Waco Dr | Lake Air Dr | Valley Mills Dr | 0.81 | 6 | DA | 50\% | 0 | 764 | 764 | 1,618 | 619 | 998 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Lake Air Dr | Hillcrest | Wilford Dr | 0.60 | 3 | SA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 800 | 601 | 198 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Lake Air Dr | Wilford Dr | Cobbs Dr | 0.12 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 284 | 120 | 164 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Lake Air Dr | Cobbs Dr | Bosque Blva | 0.74 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,972 | 741 | 1,231 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Lake Air Dr | Bosque Blvd | N Valley Mills Dr | 0.38 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,010 | 380 | 630 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Lake Air Dr | N Valley Mills Dr | Sanger Ave | 0.33 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 891 | 335 | 556 | 0 |
| 2 |  | Lake Air Dr | Sanger Ave | Waco Dr | 0.58 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,532 | 576 | 956 | 0 |
| 2 | 1 | N 41st St | Glendale Dr | Cobbs Dr | 0.13 | 4 | UA | 50\% | 0 | 659 | 659 | 154 | 86 | 68 | 0 |
| 2 | 1 | N New Rd | Cobbs Dr | Bosque Blva | 0.75 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 0 | 659 | 659 | 991 | 491 | 500 | 0 |
| 2 | $\checkmark 1$ | N New Rd | Bosque Blva | Watt Ave | 0.70 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 0 | 659 | 659 | 925 | 458 | 467 | 0 |
| 2 | $\checkmark$ | N New Rd | Watt Ave | N Valley Mills dr | 0.13 | 4 | DA | 50\% | 0 | 659 | 659 | 167 | 83 | 84 | 0 |
| 2 |  | N New Rd | $N$ Valley Mills Dr | N New Rd | 0.18 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 814 | 659 | 1,473 | 476 | 264 | 212 | 0 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 2 |  |  |  |  | 20.12 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45,655 | 20,952 | 24,811 | 107 |
| 3 |  | Speight Ave | S New Rd | Richter Ave | 0.96 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 1,128 | 382 | 745 | 0 |
| 3 |  | Speight Ave | Richter Ave | Valley Vills Dr | 0.46 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 548 | 186 | 362 | 0 |
| 3 | 1 | Valley Mills | Bagby Ave | JHKultgen Expy | 0.23 | 8 | DA | 50\% | 709 | 0 | 709 | 622 | 166 | 456 | 0 |
| 3 |  | Valley Mills | JH Kultgen Expy | Traffic Circle | 0.13 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 709 | 0 | 709 | 167 | 89 | 78 | 0 |
| 3 |  | La Salle | The Cir | 18th St | 0.59 | 6 | DA | 100\% | 505 | 605 | 1,110 | 2,373 | 660 | 1,713 | 0 |
| 3 | 1 | La Salle | 18th St | 12th St | 0.47 | 6 | DA | 50\% | 826 |  | 826 | 929 | 385 | 544 | 0 |
| 3 | 1 | La Salle | 12th St | University Parks Dr | 1.11 | 6 | DA | 50\% | 736 |  | 736 | 2,214 | 817 | 1,397 | 0 |
| 3 | 9 | SNew Rd | Memorial Dr | Bagby Ave | 0.50 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 0 | 300 | 300 | 660 | 149 | 511 | 0 |
| 3 | 9 | SNew Rd | Bagby Ave | 1-35 | 0.80 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 0 | 300 | 300 | 1,070 | 241 | 828 | 0 |
| 3 | 9 | SNew Rd | 1-35 | Old Robinson Rd | 0.54 | 5 | SA | 50\% |  | 298 | 298 | 718 | 161 | 557 | 0 |
| 3 |  | Garden Dr | Old Robinson Rd | Robinson Rd | 0.44 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 363 | 298 | 661 | 1,176 | 292 | 884 | 0 |
| 3 |  | Garden Dr | 16th St | 12th St | 0.33 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 363 | 298 | 661 | 390 | 218 | 172 | 0 |
| 3 |  | Garden Dr | 12th St | University Parks Dr | 1.02 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 363 | 298 | 661 | 1,204 | 674 | 529 | 0 |
| 3 |  | Robinson | The Cir | Primrose Dr | 0.23 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 550 | 550 | 1,100 | 601 | 249 | 352 | 0 |
| 3 |  | Robinson | Primrose Dr | Garden Dr | 0.87 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 569 | 569 | 1,138 | 2,320 | 993 | 1,327 | 0 |
| 3 |  | Robinson | Garden Dr | Brewster St | 0.23 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 573 | 573 | 1,146 | 616 | 265 | 350 | 0 |
| 3 | $x$ | Robinson | Brewster St | Creek (516'S of Darden Dr) | 0.23 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 573 | 0 | 573 | 308 | 133 | 175 | 0 |
| 3 |  | 18th St | La Salle | Primrose Dr | 0.18 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 476 | 72 | 404 | 0 |
| 3 |  | 18th St | Primrose Dr | Gurley Ln | 0.27 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 630 | 107 | 523 | 0 |
| 3 |  | 16th | Gurley Ln | Garden Dr | 0.42 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 495 | 168 | 327 | 0 |
| 3 |  | 12th | Garden Dr | TX-340 | 1.08 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 1,274 | 432 | 842 | 0 |
| 3 |  | University Parks Dr | La Salle Ave | Gurley Ln | 0.46 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 707 | 665 | 1,372 | 548 | 637 | 0 | 89 |
| 3 |  | University Parks Dr | Gurley Ln | Garden Dr | 0.37 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 435 | 396 | 831 | 441 | 310 | 130 | 0 |
| 3 |  | University Parks Dr | Garden Dr | 3 rdSt | 0.93 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 209 | 169 | 378 | 1,099 | 352 | 747 | 0 |
| 3 |  | University Parks Dr | 3 rd St | TX-340 | 0.42 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 195 | 159 | 354 | 500 | 150 | 350 | 0 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 3 |  |  |  |  | 13.28 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22,504 | 8,286 | 14,307 | 89 |
| 4 |  | Orchard Ln | US 77 NBFR | Kendall Ln | 0.12 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 142 | 48 | 94 | 0 |
| 4 |  | Orchard Ln | Kendall Ln | Carl Dr | 1.62 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 1,912 | 648 | 1,264 | 0 |
| 4 |  | Orchard Ln | Carl Dr | SH 340 | 0.31 | 3 | SA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 414 | 124 | 289 | 0 |
| 4 |  | Kendall Ln | Orchard Ln | Railroad | 0.41 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 487 | 165 | 322 | 0 |
| 4 |  | Kendall Ln | Railroad | SH340 | 1.70 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 2,006 | 680 | 1,326 | 0 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 4 |  |  |  |  | 4.16 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4,960 | 1,666 | 3,295 | 0 |
| 5 | x | Crest Dr | Railroad | 722' NE of Railroad | 0.14 | 4 | DA | 50\% | 474 |  | 474 | 183 | 65 | 118 | 0 |
| 5 | x | Crest Dr | 722' NE of Railroad | Avenue C | 0.14 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 474 |  | 474 | 191 | 68 | 123 | 0 |
| 5 | x | Crest Dr | Avenue C | Mazanec Rd | 0.84 | 2 | UA | 50\% | 220 |  | 220 | 498 | 186 | 312 | 0 |
| 5 | x | Air Base Rd | 1250' S of Craven Ave | Craven Ave | 0.24 | 2 | UA | 50\% | 85 |  | 85 | 140 | 20 | 120 | 0 |
| 5 | x | Air Base Rd | Craven Ave | Bolling Dr | 0.49 | 4 | UA | 50\% | 153 |  | 153 | 582 | 76 | 507 | 0 |
| 5 | x | US 84 | Tirey Rd | Aviation Pkwy | 0.52 | 4 | DA | 50\% |  | 803 | 803 | 692 | 418 | 274 | 0 |
| 5 | x | US 84 | Aviation Pkwy | 1500 ' NE of Aviation | 0.28 | 4 | DA | 50\% |  | 588 | 588 | 378 | 167 | 211 | 0 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 5 |  |  |  |  | 2.66 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,664 | 999 | 1,664 | 0 |
| 6 |  | Steinbeck Bend Dr | China Spring Rd | Rock Creek Rd | 0.29 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 139 | 87 | 226 | 338 | 65 | 273 | 0 |
| 6 |  | Steinbeck Bend Dr | Rock Creek Rd | Lake Shore Dr | 2.50 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 408 | 468 | 876 | 2,950 | 2,190 | 760 | 0 |
| 6 |  | N Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd | Lake Shore Dr | 1050' NW of Herring Ave | 1.58 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 481 | 358 | 839 | 1,864 | 1,326 | 539 | 0 |
| 6 |  | N Martin Luther King Jr. Blva | 1050 ' NW of Herring Ave | Herring Ave | 0.20 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 501 | 388 | 889 | 529 | 177 | 352 | 0 |
| 6 | 7 | China Spring Rd | Pioneer Pkwy | Steinbeck Bend Dr | 1.17 | 2 | UA | 50\% | 415 | 0 | 415 | 690 | 486 | 205 | 0 |
| 6 |  | N 19 th St | N 19 th St | Lake Shore Dr | 1.39 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 268 | 528 | 796 | 3,697 | 1,106 | 2,591 | 0 |
| 6 | 1 | Lake Shore Dr | 550 ' SE of Airport Rd | N 19 th St | 0.72 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 720 | 0 | 720 | 959 | 519 | 440 | 0 |
| 6 | 1 | Lake Shore Dr | N 19 th St | College Dr | 0.65 | 4 | DA | 50\% | 479 | 0 | 479 | 871 | 314 | 557 | 0 |
| 6 | 1 | Lake Shore Dr | College Dr | Bosque River | 0.27 | 4 | DA | 50\% | 479 | 0 | 479 | 360 | 130 | 230 | 0 |
| 6 | , | Lake Shore Dr | Bosque River | N Martin Luther King Jr. Blve | 0.78 | 4 | DA | 50\% | 550 | 0 | 550 | 1,034 | 428 | 607 | 0 |
| 6 |  | Lake Shore Dr | N Martin Luther King Jr. Blva | 1200' NW of MLK Blvd | 0.23 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 760 | 786 | 1,546 | 536 | 351 | 185 | 0 |
| 6 |  | Lake Shore Dr | 1200 ' NW of MLK Blvd | Gholson Rd | 2.14 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 1,001 | 681 | 1,682 | 5,692 | 3,599 | 2,093 | 0 |
| 6 |  | Lake Shore Dr | Gholson Rd | Railroad Row | 0.30 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 1,350 | 850 | 2,200 | 798 | 660 | 144 | 6 | City of Waco


| Waco Roadway Capital Recovery Fee Study Existing Capital Improvements Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Serv Area | Shared Svc Area | Roadway | From | To | $\begin{gathered} \text { Length } \\ (\mathrm{mi}) \end{gathered}$ | No. of Lanes | Type | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pct. in } \\ & \text { Serv. Area } \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{A}^{\text {Peak }}$ | bur Volur B | Total | VMT Supply Pk Hr Total | VMT Demand Pk Hr Total | Excess VMT Capacity | Exist. VMT Deficiency |
| 6 | $\cdots$ | Herring | Brazos River | N Martin Luther King Jr. Blve | 0.13 | 4 | DA | 50\% | 450 | 0 | 450 | 178 | 60 | 118 | 0 |
| 6 | 1 | Herring | N Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd | J J Flewellen Rd | 0.72 | 4 | DA | 50\% | 450 | 0 | 450 | 961 | 325 | 636 | 0 |
| 6 | 1 | Herring | JJFlewellen Rd | 1035' SW of Gholson Rd | 0.49 | 4 | DA | 50\% | 450 | 0 | 450 | 649 | 219 | 429 | 0 |
| 6 | 1 | Herring | 1035' SW of Gholson Rd | Gholson Rd | 0.20 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 450 | 0 | 450 | 261 | 88 | 173 | 0 |
| 6 |  | Montrose | Gholson Rd | Railroad ROW | 0.22 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 255 | 86 | 169 | 0 |
| 6 | 1 | Gholson Rd | 960'S of Herring Ave | Herring Ave | 0.18 | 2 | UA | 50\% | 283 | 0 | 283 | 107 | 51 | 56 | 0 |
| 6 |  | Gholson Rd | Herring Ave | Montrose St | 0.53 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 283 | 283 | 566 | 626 | 300 | 326 | 0 |
| 6 |  | Gholson Rd | Montrose St | Lakeshore Dr | 0.82 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 311 | 311 | 622 | 966 | 509 | 457 | 0 |
| 6 |  | Gholson Rd | Lakeshore Dr | Old Fort Graham Rd | 0.40 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 527 | 527 | 1,054 | 1,051 | 417 | 635 | 0 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 6 |  |  |  |  | 15.90 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25,374 | 13,407 | 11,973 | 6 |
| 7 |  | North River Crossing | Beginning of bridge | 580' NE of Curry Ln | 2.25 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 461 | 231 | 692 | 2,655 | 1,557 | 1,098 | 0 |
| 7 |  | North River Crossing | $580^{\prime} \mathrm{NE}$ of Curry Ln | Yankie Rd | 0.47 | 3 | SA | 100\% | 696 | 359 | 1,055 | 628 | 499 | 145 | 15 |
| 7 |  | North River Crossing | Yankie Rd | 900' SW of China Spring Rd | 0.16 | 2 | uc | 100\% | 356 | 178 | 534 | 161 | 84 | 77 | 0 |
| 7 |  | North River Crossing | 900' SW of China Spring Rd | China Spring Rd | 0.17 | 3 | SA | 100\% | 356 | 178 | 534 | 227 | 91 | 136 | 0 |
| 7 |  | China Spring Rd | Yankie Rd | North River Crossing | 0.42 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 138 | 275 | 413 | 494 | 173 | 321 | 0 |
| 7 |  | China Spring Rd | North River Crossing | Old China Spring Rd | 0.17 | 3 | SA | 100\% | 138 | 275 | 413 | 220 | 68 | 151 | 0 |
| 7 |  | China Spring Rd | Old China Spring Rd | Wortham Bend | 1.88 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 256 | 512 | 768 | 2,218 | 1,444 | 775 | 0 |
| 7 |  | China Spring Rd | Wortham Bend | Flat Rock Rd | 1.10 | 3 | SA | 100\% | 365 | 729 | 1,094 | 1,463 | 1,203 | 330 | 70 |
| 7 |  | China Spring Rd | Flat Rock Rd | Pioneer Pkwy | 0.96 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 522 | 1,011 | 1,533 | 1,132 | 1,470 | 65 | 404 |
| 7 | 6 | China Spring Rd | Pioneer Pkwy | Steinbeck Bend Dr | 1.17 | 2 | UA | 50\% | 0 | 815 | 815 | 690 | 954 | 0 | 263 |
| 7 | x | Old China Spring Rd | $1350^{\prime} \mathrm{N}$ of Bb Burt | Bb Burt | 0.26 | 2 | uc | 50\% | 50 | 0 | 50 | 130 | 13 | 118 | 0 |
| 7 |  | Old China Spring Rd | Bb Burt | China Spring Rd | 0.41 | 2 | uc | 100\% | 50 | 50 | 100 | 419 | 41 | 378 | 0 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 7 |  |  |  |  | 9.41 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10,438 | 7,597 | 3,593 | 752 |
| 8 |  | FM 185 (Cedar Rock Pkwy) | Galaxy Rd | SH 6 | 1.32 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 100 | 100 | 200 | 1,558 | 264 | 1,294 | 0 |
| 8 |  | North River Crossing | SH6 | Dosher Ln | 0.61 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 100 | 100 | 200 | 720 | 122 | 598 | 0 |
| 8 |  | North River Crossing | Dosher Rd | End of Service Area | 0.93 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 100 | 100 | 200 | 1,096 | 186 | 910 | 0 |
| 8 |  | Sundown Dr | Dosher Rd | $N$ Speegleville Rd | 1.87 | 2 | uc | 100\% | 100 | 100 | 200 | 1,907 | 374 | 1,533 | 0 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 8 |  |  |  |  | 4.73 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5,281 | 946 | 4,335 | 0 |
| 9 | 2 | Waco Dr | Franklin Ave | Lake Air Dr | 0.25 | 6 | DA | 50\% | 1,420 | 0 | 1,420 | 490 | 349 | 141 | 0 |
| 9 | 2 | Waco Dr | Lake Air Dr | Valley Mills Dr | 0.81 | 6 | DA | 50\% | 893 | 0 | 893 | 1,618 | 724 | 893 | 0 |
| 9 |  | Franklin Ave | US 84 | New Rd | 0.90 | 7 | SA | 100\% | 730 | 730 | 1,460 | 3,606 | 1,320 | 2,287 | 0 |
| 9 |  | Franklin Ave | New Rd | Valley Mills Dr | 0.52 | 7 | SA | 100\% | 795 | 805 | 1,600 | 2,080 | 834 | 1,246 | 0 |
| 9 |  | Imperial Dr | Hewitt Dr | Texas Central Pkwy | 0.94 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 520 | 924 | 1,444 | 2,513 | 1,364 | 1,149 | 0 |
| 9 |  | Imperial Dr | Texas Central Pkwy | Jewell Dr | 0.39 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 607 | 842 | 1,449 | 1,037 | 565 | 472 | 0 |
| 9 |  | Imperial Dr | Jewell Dr | W Loop 340 | 0.86 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 726 | 746 | 1,472 | 2,284 | 1,264 | 1,020 | 0 |
| 9 |  | Beverly Dr | W Loop 340 | 4128 ' NE of Loop 340 | 0.78 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 50 | 50 | 100 | 923 | 78 | 844 | 0 |
| 9 | x | Beverly Dr | 4128 ' NE of Loop 340 | New Road | 0.31 | 2 | UA | 50\% | 50 | 0 | 50 | 182 | 15 | 167 | 0 |
| 9 |  | Bagby Ave | Flat Creek | Corporation Pkwy | 0.91 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 1,150 | 762 | 1,912 | 2,433 | 1,749 | 684 | 0 |
| 9 |  | Bagby Ave | Corporation Pkwy | EB Loop 340 | 0.31 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 1,146 | 746 | 1,892 | 829 | 589 | 239 | 0 |
| 9 |  | Bagby Ave | WB Loop 340 | New Rd | 0.83 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 1,008 | 608 | 1,616 | 1,954 | 1,338 | 616 | 0 |
| 9 | $x$ | Hewitt Dr | Woodway Dr | Old McGregor Dr | 0.19 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 1,116 | 0 | 1,116 | 250 | 210 | 40 | 0 |
| 9 | 10 | Hewitt Dr | Old McGregor Dr | Imperial Dr | 0.45 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 1,031 | 0 | 1,031 | 594 | 460 | 133 | 0 |
| 9 | 10 | Hewitt Dr | Imperial Dr | Mars Dr | 0.62 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 1,031 | 0 | 1,031 | 827 | 641 | 186 | 0 |
| 9 |  | Texas Central Pkwy | Woodway Dr | Railroad | 0.26 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 501 | 536 | 1,037 | 688 | 268 | 420 | 0 |
| 9 |  | Texas Central Pkwy | Railroad | Imperial Dr | 0.34 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 501 | 536 | 1,037 | 402 | 354 | 49 | 0 |
| 9 |  | Texas Central Pkwy | Imperial Dr | Mars Dr | 0.60 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 501 | 536 | 1,037 | 1,583 | 617 | 966 | 0 |
| 9 |  | Texas Central Pkwy | Mars Dr | Railroad | 0.33 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 501 | 536 | 1,037 | 872 | 340 | 532 | 0 |
| 9 |  | Texas Central Pkwy | Railroad | Bagby Ave | 1.48 | 4 | DC | 100\% | 501 | 536 | 1,037 | 3,345 | 1,535 | 1,810 | 0 |
| 9 |  | Lake Air Dr | Waco Dr | Franklin Ave | 0.17 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 500 | 500 | 1,000 | 395 | 167 | 227 | 0 |
| 9 |  | New Rd | Waco Dr | Franklin Ave | 0.32 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 756 | 764 | 1,520 | 843 | 482 | 361 | 0 |
| 9 |  | New Rd | Franklin Ave | Lower Railroad | 0.33 | 4 | UA | 100\% | 756 | 764 | 1,520 | 784 | 505 | 279 | 0 |
| 9 | x | New Rd | Beverly Dr | Memorial Dr | 0.14 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 0 | 500 | 500 | 184 | 69 | 115 | 0 |
| 9 | 3 | New Rd | Memorial Dr | Bagby Ave | 0.50 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 0 | 500 | 500 | 660 | 248 | 412 | 0 |
| 9 | 3 | New Rd | Bagby Ave | 1-35 | 0.80 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 0 | 500 | 500 | 1,070 | 402 | 668 | 0 |
| 9 | 3 | New Rd | 1-35 | Old Robinson Rd | 0.54 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 0 | 298 | 298 | 718 | 161 | 557 | 0 |
| 9 | 1 | Valley Mills | Waco Dr | Railroad | 0.78 | 6 | DA | 50\% | 1,014 | 0 | 1,014 | 1,560 | 793 | 767 | 0 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 9 |  |  |  |  | 15.66 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 34,723 | 17,441 | 17,281 | 0 |
| 10 | x | Chapel Rd | 1850' W of Ritchie Rd | Ritchie Rd | 0.35 | 2 | UA | 50\% | 286 | 0 | 286 | 207 | 100 | 107 | 0 |
| 10 |  | Chapel Rd | Ritchie Rd | 155' west of Meadow Moun | 0.65 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 295 | 916 | 1,211 | 767 | 788 | 192 | 212 |
| 10 |  | Chapel Rd | 155' W of Meadow Mountain | Hewitt Dr | 0.86 | 5 | SA | 100\% | 386 | 919 | 1,305 | 2,285 | 1,121 | 1,164 | 0 |
| 10 |  | Panther Way | Ritchie Rd | 3700 'east of Ritchie Rd | 0.70 | 3 | SA | 100\% | 200 | 200 | 400 | 932 | 280 | 652 | 0 |
| 10 | $x$ | Panther Way | $3700{ }^{\prime}$ E of Ritchie Rd | 900' west of Hewitt Dr | 0.62 | 3 | SA | 50\% | 0 | 200 | 200 | 412 | 124 | 288 | 0 |
| 10 |  | Ritchie Rd | Railroad | Chapel Rd | 0.18 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 173 | 244 | 417 | 216 | 76 | 140 | 0 |
| 10 |  | Ritchie Rd | Chapel Rd | Panther Rd | 0.64 | 4 | DA | 100\% | 173 | 244 | 417 | 1,714 | 269 | 1,446 | 0 |
| 10 |  | Ritchie Rd | Panther Rd | $1300 ' ~_{\text {' }}$ of Warren St | 0.76 | 2 | UA | 100\% | 173 | 244 | 417 | 894 | 316 | 578 | 0 |
| 10 | $x$ | Hewitt Dr | $1300 ' ~_{\text {' }}$ of Warren St | Warren St | 0.25 | 2 | UA | 50\% | 173 | 0 | 173 | 145 | 43 | 103 | 0 |
| 10 | 9 | Hewitt Dr | Woodway Dr | Old McGregor Dr | 0.19 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 0 | 1,216 | 1,216 | 250 | 229 | 21 | 0 |
| 10 | 9 | Hewitt Dr | Old McGregor Dr | Imperial Dr | 0.45 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 0 | 1,235 | 1,235 | 594 | 551 | 42 | 0 |
| 10 | 9 | Hewitt Dr | Imperial Dr | Mars Dr | 0.62 | 5 | SA | 50\% | 0 | 1,331 | 1,331 | 827 | 828 | 0 | 1 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 10 |  |  |  |  | 6.27 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,245 | 4,725 | 4,733 | 213 | City of Waco

 City of Waco

Appendix E

## Projected 10-Year Growth

(Vehicle Miles of New Demand)

Vehicle-Mile Trip Generation by Service Area, Waco Capital Recovery Fee
Based on 2020-2030 Land Use Assumptions dated June 2019

Service Unit Equivalency

| Residential | 3.20 | Service Emp | 4.95 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Basic Emp | 2.71 | Retail Emp | 3.71 |

Estimated Residential Growth Vehicle-Mile Trip Generation

| Conversion Factor: | 2.59 2010 persons/household |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Service Area | Added <br> Population | Added <br> Dwelling Units | Vehicle-Miles <br> per DU | Total <br> Vehicle-Miles |
| 1 | 5,874 | 2,268 | 3.20 | 7,258 |
| 2 | 1,140 | 440 | 3.20 | 1,408 |
| 3 | 2,274 | 878 | 3.20 | 2,810 |
| 4 | 425 | 164 | 3.20 | 525 |
| 5 | 94 | 17 | 3.20 | 54 |
| 6 | 2,157 | 384 | 3.20 | 1,229 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 3.20 | 2,666 |
| 8 | 1,543 | 1,839 | 710 | 3.20 |
| 9 | 1,224 | 473 | 3.20 | 0 |
| 10 | 17,514 | 6,763 | 3.20 | 2,272 |
| 11 |  |  |  | 3.20 |
| Total |  |  |  | 2,514 |

Estimated Basic Employment Growth Vehicle-Mile Trip Generation

| Conversion Factor: |  | 1,500 |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| square feet/employee |  |  |  |  |
| Service Area | Added <br> Employees | Total <br> Square Feet | Vehicle-Miles <br> per 1,000 Sq Ft | Total <br> Vehicle-Miles |
|  | 315 | 471,967 | 2.71 | 1,279 |
| 2 | 61 | 91,343 | 2.71 | 248 |
| 3 | 96 | 143,965 | 2.71 | 390 |
| 4 | 8 | 12,329 | 2.71 | 33 |
| 5 | 364 | 545,631 | 2.71 | 1,479 |
| 6 | 73 | 109,076 | 2.71 | 296 |
| 7 | 87 | 131,081 | 2.71 | 355 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 2.71 | 0 |
| 9 | 1,472 | $2,208,705$ | 2.71 | 5,986 |
| 10 | 30 | 44,384 | 2.71 | 120 |
| 11 | 88 | 131,370 | 2.71 | 356 |
| Total | 2,593 | $3,889,852$ |  | 10,542 |

Vehicle-Mile Trip Generation by Service Area, Waco Capital Recovery Fee
Based on 2020-2030 Land Use Assumptions dated June 2019
Service Unit Equivalency

| Residential | 3.20 | Service Emp | 4.95 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Basic Emp | 2.71 | Retail Emp | 3.71 |

Estimated Service Employment Growth Vehicle-Mile Trip Generation

| Conversion Factor: |  | 500 |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Squarefeet/employee |  |  |  |  |
| Service Area | Added <br> Employees | Total <br> Square Feet | Vehicle-Miles <br> per 1,000 SqFt | Total <br> Vehicle-Miles |
| 1 | 1,783 | 891,392 | 4.95 | 4,412 |
| 2 | 753 | 376,481 | 4.95 | 1,864 |
| 3 | 199 | 99,598 | 4.95 | 493 |
| 4 | 19 | 9,563 | 4.95 | 47 |
| 5 | 38 | 18,961 | 4.95 | 94 |
| 6 | 157 | 78,351 | 4.95 | 388 |
| 7 | 161 | 80,686 | 4.95 | 399 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 4.95 | 0 |
| 9 | 547 | 273,495 | 4.95 | 1,354 |
| 10 | 67 | 33,364 | 4.95 | 165 |
| 11 | 61 | 30,665 | 4.95 | 152 |
| Total | 3,785 | $1,892,557$ |  | 9,368 |

Estimated Retail Employment Growth Vehicle-Mile Trip Generation

| Conversion Factor: |  |  | 1,000 |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Square feet/employee |  |  |  |  |
| Service Area | Added <br> Employees | Total <br> Square Feet | Vehicle-Miles <br> per 1,000 SqFt | Total <br> Vehicle-Miles |
| 1 | 808 | 808,021 | 3.71 | 2,998 |
| 2 | 305 | 304,552 | 3.71 | 1,130 |
| 3 | 162 | 161,625 | 3.71 | 600 |
| 4 | 12 | 12,195 | 3.71 | 45 |
| 5 | 6 | 6,263 | 3.71 | 23 |
| 6 | 24 | 23,882 | 3.71 | 89 |
| 7 | 124 | 123,841 | 3.71 | 459 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 3.71 | 0 |
| 9 | 464 | 463,620 | 3.71 | 1,720 |
| 10 | 21 | 21,163 | 3.71 | 79 |
| 11 | 20 | 19,519 | 3.71 | 72 |
| Total | 1,945 | $1,944,679$ |  | 7,215 |

Total Vehicle-Mile Generation Summary

|  | Residential <br> Growth <br> Vehicle-Miles | Basic Emp <br> Growth <br> Vehicle-Miles | Service Emp <br> Growth <br> Vehicle-Miles | Retail Emp <br> Growth <br> Vehicle-Miles | Total Growth <br> Vehicte-Miles |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 7,258 | 1,279 | 4,412 | 2,998 | $\mathbf{1 5 , 9 4 7}$ |
| 2 | 1,408 | 248 | 1,864 | 1,130 | 4,650 |
| 3 | 2,810 | 390 | 493 | 600 | 4,293 |
| 4 | 525 | 33 | 47 | 45 | 650 |
| 5 | 54 | 1,479 | 94 | 23 | $\mathbf{1 , 6 5 0}$ |
| 6 | 1,229 | 296 | 388 | 89 | 2,002 |
| 7 | 2,666 | 355 | 399 | 459 | 3,879 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 1,907 | 5,986 | 1,354 | 1,720 | $\mathbf{1 0 , 9 6 7}$ |
| 10 | 2,272 | 120 | 165 | 79 | 2,636 |
| 11 | 1,514 | 356 | 152 | 72 | 2,094 |
| Total | 21,643 | 10,542 | 9,368 | 7,215 | 48,768 | City of Waco

## Appendix F

## Roadway Capital Improvements Plan

## ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS PLAN PROJECTS

| Definitions |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| LANES | The total number of lanes in both directions available for travel. |
| TYPE | The type of roadway (used in determining capacity): |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DA = divided arterial } \\ & \text { UA = undivided arterial } \\ & \text { SA = special arterial (arterial with continuous left turn) } \\ & \text { DC = divided collector } \\ & \text { SC = special collector (collector with continuous left turn) } \\ & \text { UC = undivided collector } \end{aligned}$ |
| PK-HR VOLUME | The existing volumes of cars on the roadway segment traveling during the afternoon (P.M.) peak hour of travel. |
| \% IN SERVICE AREA | If the roadway is located on the boundary of the service area (with the city limits running along the centerline of the roadway), then half of the roadway is inventoried in the service area and the other half is not. This value is either $50 \%$ or $100 \%$. |
| VEH-MI SUPPLY TOTAL | The number of total service units (vehicle-miles) supplied within the service area, based on the length and established capacity of the roadway type. |
| VEH-MI TOTAL DEMAND PK-HR | The total service unit (vehicle-mile) demand created by existing traffic on the roadway segment in the afternoon peak hour. |
| EXCESS CAPACITY <br> PK-HR VEH-MI | The number of service units supplied but unused by existing traffic in the afternoon peak hour. |

## Waco Roadway Impact Fee Study

## Roadway Capital Improvements Plan

|  | ServArea | Shared Svc Area | Roadway | From | To | $\begin{gathered} \text { Length } \\ \text { (mi) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | No. of Lanes | Type | Pct. in Serv. Area | Peak Hour Volume |  |  |  |  | VMT Supply Pk Hr Total | VMT Demand Pk Hr Total | Excess VMT Capacity | CIP VMT <br> Deficiency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A | A | B |  | Total |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | 6 | Gholson Rd | Herring Ave | 960' S of Herring Ave | 0.18 | 2 | UA | 50\% |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 107 | 0 | 107 | 0 |
| 2 | 1 |  | Gholson Rd | 960' S of Herring Ave | Waco Dr | 0.33 | 2 | UA | 100\% |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 395 | 0 | 395 | 0 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.52 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 502 | 0 | 502 | 0 |
| 3 | 2 |  | Lake Shore Dr | Mt Carmel Dr | Koehne Park Dr | 0.62 | 4 | DA | 100\% |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1,658 | 0 | 1,658 | 0 |
| 4 | 2 |  | Valley Mills Dr | Koehne Park Dr | Hillandale Rd | 0.15 | 4 | DA | 100\% |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 392 | 0 | 392 | 0 |
| 5 | 2 |  | Valley Mills Dr | Hillandale Rd | Ridgewood Dr | 0.26 | 4 | DA | 100\% |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 697 | 0 | 697 | 0 |
| 6 | 2 |  | Valley Mills Dr | Ridgewood Dr | Bishop Dr | 0.18 | 3 | DA | 100\% |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 358 | 0 | 358 | 0 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,105 | 0 | 3,105 | 0 |
| 7 | 3 |  | Bagby Ave | New Rd | Monte Vista St | 0.27 | 2 | DA | 100\% |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 360 | 0 | 360 | 0 |
| 8 | 3 |  | Bagby Ave | Monte Vista St | Richter Ave | 0.68 | 2 | DA | 100\% |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 901 | 0 | 901 | 0 |
| 9 | 3 |  | Bagby Ave | Richter Ave | Valley Mills Dr | 0.59 | 2 | DA | 100\% |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 778 | 0 | 778 | 0 |
| 10 | 3 | 9 | S New Rd | Bagby Ave | 1-35 | 0.80 | 1 | DA | 50\% |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 267 | 0 | 267 | 0 |
| 11 | 3 |  | Garden Dr | Robinson Rd | 16th St | 1.34 | 2 | UA | 100\% |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1,581 | 0 | 1,581 | 0 |
| 12 | 3 |  | 18th St | La Salle | Gurley Ln | 0.45 | 2 | DA | 100\% |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 593 | 0 | 593 | 0 |
| 13 | 3 |  | 16th | Gurley Ln | Garden Dr | 0.42 | 4 | DA | 100\% |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1,116 | 0 | 1,116 | 0 |
| 14 | 3 |  | 12th | Garden Dr | TX-340 | 1.08 | 4 | DA | 100\% |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 2,873 | 0 | 2,873 | 0 |
| 15 | 3 |  | University Parks Dr | La Salle Ave | Garden Dr | 0.84 | 2 | DA | 100\% |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1,114 | 0 | 1,114 | 0 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.46 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,583 | 0 | 9,584 | 0 |
| 16 | 4 |  | Martin Luther King Jr Blvd | BUS 77 | SH 484 | 0.39 | 6 | DA | 100\% |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1,551 | 0 | 1,551 | 0 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,551 | 0 | 1,551 | 0 |
|  |  |  | No Projects in Service Area |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-Total Service Area 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 6 | 1 | Gholson Rd | 960' S of Herring Ave | Herring Ave | 0.18 | 2 | UA | 50\% |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 107 | 0 | 107 | 0 |
| 17 | 6 |  | Gholson Rd | Herring Ave | Lakeshore Dr | 1.35 | 2 | UA | 100\% |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1,592 | 0 | 1,592 | 0 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 6 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.53 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,699 | 0 | 1,699 | 0 |
| 18 | 7 |  | North River Crossing | End of bridge | 580' NE of Curry Ln | 1.38 | 4 | DA | 100\% |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 3,671 | 0 | 3,671 | 0 |
| 19 | 7 |  | North River Crossing | 580' NE of Curry Ln | Yankie Rd | 0.47 | 4 | DA | 100\% |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1,257 | 0 | 1,257 | 0 |
| 20 | 7 |  | Flat Rock Rd | Yankie Rd | Tree Lake Rd | 1.01 | 2 | UC | 100\% |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1,030 | 0 | 1,030 | 0 |
| 21 | 7 |  | Flat Rock Rd | Tree Lake Rd | China Spring Rd | 1.66 | 2 | uc | 100\% |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1,693 | 0 | 1,693 | 0 |
| 22 | 7 |  | Yankie Rd | North River Crossing | Flat Rock Rd | 1.89 | 2 | uc | 100\% |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1,928 | 0 | 1,928 | 0 |
| 23 | 7 |  | Tree Lake Dr | China Spring Rd | Flat Rock Rd | 1.57 | 2 | uc | 100\% |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1,601 | 0 | 1,601 | 0 |
| 24 | 7 |  | Wortham Bend | North City Limit | China Spring Rd | 0.82 | 2 | UC | 100\% |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 834 | 0 | 834 | 0 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 8.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12,014 | 0 | 12,015 | 0 |
| No Projects in Service Area 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-Total Service Area 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Waco Roadway Impact Fee Study
Roadway Capital Improvements Plan

Notes:
SA - Special Arterial with two-way left turn lane (TWLTL)
DC - Divided collector
UC - Undivided Collector
SC - Special Collector with two-way left turn lane (TWLTL)

## Appendix G

## Roadway Capital Improvement Plan Cost Summary

Waco Roadway Impact Fee Study


Waco Roadway Impact Fee Study
Roadway Capital Improvements Plan

|  | Serv | Shared |  |  |  | Length | No. of |  | Pct. in |  |  | Roadway Costs |  |  |  | Study Update Cost |  | Total Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | Area | Svc Area | Roadway | From | To | (mi) | Lanes | Type | Serv. Area | Engineering |  |  | Row | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | 9 |  | Mars Dr | Hewitt Dr | Texas Central Pkwy | 0.94 | 2 | UA | 100\% | \$ | 210,200 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,335,450 |  | \$2,572 |  | \$2,548,222 |
| 26 | 9 |  | Beverly Dr | W Loop 340 | 4128 ' NE of Loop 340 | 0.78 | 2 | UA | 100\% | \$ | 121,200 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,346,300 |  | \$2,131 |  | \$1,469,631 |
| 27 | 9 | x | Beverly Dr | 4128' NE of Loop 340 | New Road | 0.31 | 2 | UA | 50\% | \$ | 22,550 | \$ | - | \$ | 250,500 |  | \$420 |  | \$273,470 |
| 28 | 9 | $x$ | Hewitt Dr | Woodway Dr | Old McGregor Dr | 0.19 | 1 | DA | 50\% | \$ | 2,650 | \$ | - | \$ | 29,700 |  | \$145 |  | \$32,495 |
| 29 | 9 | 10 | Hewitt Dr | Old McGregor Dr | Imperial Dr | 0.45 | 1 | DA | 50\% | \$ | 6,850 | \$ | - | \$ | 76,250 |  | \$342 |  | \$83,442 |
| 30 | 9 | 10 | Hewitt Dr | Imperial Dr | Mars Dr | 0.62 | 1 | DA | 50\% | \$ | 8,800 | \$ | - | \$ | 97,700 |  | \$478 |  | \$106,978 |
| 31 | 9 |  | Texas Central Pkwy | Railroad | Imperial Dr | 0.34 | 2 | UA | 100\% | \$ | 59,500 | \$ | - | \$ | 661,100 |  | \$928 |  | \$721,528 |
| 10 | 9 | 3 | S New Rd | Bagby Ave | 1-35 | 0.80 | 1 | UA | 50\% | \$ | 56,850 | \$ | 42,450 | \$ | 631,433 |  | \$547 |  | \$731,280 |
| 32 | 9 |  | Bagby Ave. | New Road | TX 340 | 0.83 | 1 | DA | 100\% | \$ | 232,400 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,582,560 |  | \$1,270 |  | \$2,816,230 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 9 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.26 |  |  |  | \$ | 721,000 | \$ | 42,450 | \$ | 8,010,993 | \$ | 8,833 | \$ | 8,783,276 |
| 33 | 10 |  | Warren Rd | City Limit | Ritchie Rd | 0.38 | 3 | sc | 100\% | \$ | 92,300 | \$ | 100,500 | \$ | 1,025,400 |  | \$993 |  | \$1,219,193 |
| 34 | 10 | x | Warren Rd | Ritchie Rd | 3700' east of Ritchie Rd | 0.70 | 2 | Sc | 50\% | \$ | 29,400 | \$ | - | \$ | 326,550 |  | \$457 |  | \$356,407 |
| 35 | 10 | x | Farmiller Rd | 1300' south of Chapel Rd | 2100 ' north of Warren Rd | 1.13 | 2 | SA | 50\% | \$ | 96,300 | \$ | 89,500 | \$ | 1,069,767 |  | \$868 |  | \$1,256,435 |
| 29 | 10 | 9 | Hewitt Dr | Old McGregor Dr | Imperial Dr | 0.45 | 1 | DA | 50\% | \$ | 6,850 | \$ | - | \$ | 76,250 |  | \$342 |  | \$83,442 |
| 30 | 10 | 9 | Hewitt Dr | Imperial Dr | Mars Dr | 0.62 | 1 | DA | 50\% | \$ | 8,800 | \$ | - | \$ | 97,700 |  | \$478 |  | \$106,978 |
| 36 | 10 |  | Chapel Rd | Meadow Mountain Dr | Ritchie Rd | 1.15 | 3 | SA | 100\% | \$ | 151,600 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,684,020 |  | \$3,532 |  | \$1,839,152 |
| 37 | 10 |  | Ritchie Rd | Panther Way | Warren St | 1.01 | 2 | UA | 100\% | \$ | 176,500 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,961,300 |  | \$2,752 |  | \$2,140,552 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 10 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.44 |  |  |  | \$ | 561,750 | \$ | 190,000 | \$ | 6,240,987 |  | \$9,422 |  | \$7,002,158 |
| 38 | 11 |  | Val Verde Rd | Fossil Rim Rd | US 84 | 0.89 | 2 | sc | 100\% | \$ | 78,900 | \$ | - | \$ | 877,133 |  | \$1,157 |  | \$957,190 |
| 39 | 11 |  | Harris Creek Rd | US 84 | Walking Horse Ln | 0.66 | 2 | sc | 100\% | \$ | 58,700 | \$ | - | \$ | 652,400 |  | \$859 |  | \$711,959 |
| 40 | 11 |  | Speegleville Rd | Pecan Creek | Oak Rd | 0.54 | 4 | DA | 100\% | \$ | 267,500 | \$ | 57,500 | \$ | 2,972,667 |  | \$3,345 |  | \$3,301,012 |
| 41 | 11 |  | Speegleville Rd | Oak Rd | US 84 | 0.85 | 4 | DA | 100\% | \$ | 221,800 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,464,467 |  | \$5,190 |  | \$2,691,457 |
| 42 | 11 |  | Old Lorena Rd | US 84 EBFR | South Bosque River | 0.90 | 4 | DA | 100\% | \$ | 235,200 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,613,533 |  | \$5,504 |  | \$2,854,237 |
| Sub-Total Service Area 11 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.83 |  |  |  | \$ | 862,100 | \$ | 57,500 | \$ | 9,580,200 | \$ | 16,054 | \$ | 10,515,854 |
| Totals: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4,997,560 |  | 2,203,920 | \$ | 5,528,650 |  | \$100,000 | \$ | 62,830,130 |
| Summary: |  |  | Engineering Cost |  | \$4,997,560 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Right-of-Way Cost |  | \$2,203,920 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Construction Cost |  | \$55,528,650 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | TOTAL PROJECT COST |  | \$62,830,130 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

SA - Special Arterial with two-way left turn lane (TWLTL)
DC- Divided collector
UC - Undivided Collector
SC - Special Collector with two-way left turn lane (TWLTL)

## Appendix H

## Roadway Capital Improvement Plan Cost Estimates

Gholson Rd
Herring Ave to 960' S of Herring Ave

| Roadway Information: |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification: | Minor Arterial No. of Lanes: 4 |
| Length (If): | 960 |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 100 |
| Median Type: | None |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 48 |
| Description: | Widen existing roadway to thoroughfare standard; TxDOT facility |


| Roadway Construction Cost Estimate: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I. Paving Construction Cost Estimate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item No. Item Description | Quantity | Unit |  | Cost |  | Cost |
| 1 Right of Way Preparation | 10 | STA | \$ | 2,000.00 | \$ | 20,000 |
| 2 Remove Existing Pavement | 10 | STA | \$ | 1,500.00 | \$ | 15,000 |
| 3 Unclassified Street Excavation | 1,900 | CY | \$ | 8.00 | \$ | 15,200 |
| 48 - Lime Stabilized Subgrade | 5,800 | SY | \$ | 4.00 | \$ | 23,200 |
| $5 \quad$ Lime for Stabilization ( $42 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{SY}$ ) | 130 | TON | \$ | 170.00 | \$ | 22,100 |
| 610 " Cement Treated Base | 5,200 | SY | \$ | 21.00 | \$ | 109,200 |
| 7 2" HMAC | 370 | TON | \$ | 110.00 | \$ | 40,700 |
| 8 Concrete Curb and Gutter | 2,000 | LF | \$ | 25.00 | \$ | 50,000 |
| 9 4" Concrete Sidewalk and Ramps | 11,520 | SF | \$ | 7.00 | \$ | 80,640 |
| 10 Hydromulching | 38,400 | SY | \$ | 2.00 | \$ | 76,800 |
| Paving Estimate Subtotal: |  |  |  |  | \$ | 452,840 |
| II. Non-Paving Construction Components |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item No. Item Description |  |  | Pct. Of Paving |  | Item Cost |  |
| Pavement Markings \& Signage |  |  |  | 2\% | \$ | 9,100 |
| Traffic Control |  |  |  | 4\% | \$ | 18,200 |
| Erosion Control |  |  |  | 3\% | \$ | 13,600 |
| Drainage Improvements (RCP, Inlets, MH, Outfalls) |  |  |  | 2\% | \$ | 90,600 |
| Utility Adjustments |  |  |  | 5\% | \$ | 22,700 |
|  | Other Components Estimate Subtotal: |  |  |  | \$ | 154,200 |
| III. Special Construction Components |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item No. Item Description Notes | Notes |  | Allowance |  | Item Cost |  |
| 16 Drainage Structures None |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 17 Bridge Structures None | None |  | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 18 Traffic Signals None |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  | Special Components Estimate Subtotal: |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  | I, II, \& III Construction Subtotal: |  |  |  | \$ | 607,040 |
|  | Mobilization |  |  | 8\% | \$ | 48,600 |
|  | Contingency |  |  | 10\% | \$ | 65,600 |
|  | Construction Cost Estimate Total: |  |  |  | \$ | 721,300 |
| Impact Fee Cost Estimate Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item Description Notes |  |  | Allowance |  | Item Cost |  |
| Construction | Cost of 2 new lanes only; City |  |  | - | \$ | 72,130 |
| Engineering/Survey/Testing partici | of 20\% |  |  | .0\% | \$ | 6,500 |
| Right-of-Way Acquisition | t per sq. ft | 1.0 | \$ | 19,200 | \$ | 3,840 |
| Impact Fee Project Cost Estimate Total: |  |  |  |  | \$ | 82,470 |
| Estimated Finance Cost (11.9\%; i.e. 3\% over 10 years) |  |  |  |  | \$ | 9,800 |

Gholson Rd
960' S of Herring Ave to Waco Dr

| Roadway Information: |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification: | Minor Arterial No. of Lanes: 4 |
| Length (If): | 1,768 |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 80 |
| Median Type: | None |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 48 |
| Description: | Widen existing roadway to thoroughfare standard; TxDOT facility |


| Roadway Construction Cost Estimate: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I. Paving Construction Cost Estimate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item No. Item Description |  |  | Quantity | Unit |  | Cost | Item Cost |  |
| 1 | Right of Way Preparation |  | 18 | STA | \$ | 2,000.00 | \$ | 36,000 |
| 2 | Remove Existing Pavement |  | 18 | STA | \$ | 1,500.00 | \$ | 27,000 |
| 3 | Unclassified Street Excavation |  | 3,500 | CY | \$ | 8.00 | \$ | 28,000 |
| 4 | 8" Lime Stabilized Subgrade |  | 9,900 | SY | \$ | 4.00 | \$ | 39,600 |
| 5 | Lime for Stabilization (42 lb/SY) |  | 210 | TON | \$ | 170.00 | \$ | 35,700 |
| 6 | 10" Cement Treated Base |  | 9,500 | SY | \$ | 21.00 | \$ | 199,500 |
| 7 | 2" HMAC |  | 680 | TON | \$ | 110.00 | \$ | 74,800 |
| 8 | Concrete Curb and Gutter |  | 3,600 | LF | \$ | 25.00 | \$ | 90,000 |
| 9 | 4" Concrete Sidewalk and Ramps |  | 21,220 | SF | \$ | 7.00 | \$ | 148,540 |
| 10 | Hydromulching |  | 35,400 | SY | \$ | 2.00 | \$ | 70,800 |
| Paving Estimate Subtotal: |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 749,940 |
| II. Non-Paving Construction Components |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item No. Item Description |  |  |  |  | Pct. Of Paving |  |  | Item Cost |
| 11 | Pavement Markings \& Signage |  |  |  |  | 2\% | \$ | 15,000 |
| 12 | Traffic Control |  |  |  |  | 4\% | \$ | 30,000 |
| 13 | Erosion Control |  |  |  |  | 3\% | \$ | 22,500 |
| 14 | Drainage Improvements (RCP, Inlets, MH, Outfalls) |  |  |  |  | 0\% | \$ | 150,000 |
| 15 | Utility Adjustments |  |  |  |  | 5\% | \$ | 37,500 |
|  |  |  | Other Components Estimate Subtotal: |  |  |  | \$ | 255,000 |
| III. Special Construction Components |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item No. | Item Description Drainage Structures | Notes |  |  | Allowance |  | Item Cost |  |
| 16 |  | None |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 17 | Bridge Structures | None |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 18 | Traffic Signals | Add sig | aulkner Ln |  | \$ | 250,000 | \$ | 250,000 |
|  |  |  | Special Components Estimate Subtotal: |  |  |  | \$ | 250,000 |
|  |  |  | I, II, \& III Construction Subtotal: |  |  |  | \$ | 1,254,940 |
|  |  |  | Mobilization |  |  | 8\% | \$ | 100,400 |
|  |  |  | Contingency |  |  | 0\% | \$ | 135,600 |
|  |  |  | Construction Cost Estimate Total: |  |  |  | \$ | 1,491,000 |



## Lake Shore Dr

Mt Carmel Dr to Koehne Park Dr

| Roadway Information: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification: | Major Arterial | No. of Lanes: | 6 |
| Length (If): | 3,291 |  |  |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 120 |  |  |
| Median Type: | Raised |  |  |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 72 |  |  |
| Description: | Widen existing | re standard |  |




Valley Mills Dr
Koehne Park Dr to Hillandale Rd

| Roadway Information: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Functional Classification: | Major Arterial |
| Length (If):  <br> Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): 178 <br> Median Type: <br> Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): <br> Description: Raised$\quad$ Widen existing roadway to thoroughfare standard |  |




## Valley Mills Dr

Hillandale Rd to Ridgewood Dr

| Roadway Information: |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification: | Major Arterial No. of Lanes: 6 |
| Length (If): | 1,384 |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 120 |
| Median Type: | Raised |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 72 |
| Description: | Widen existing roadway to thoroughfare standard |




## Valley Mills Dr

Ridgewood Dr to Bishop Dr

| Roadway Information: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Functional Classification: | Major Arterial |
| Length (If):  <br> Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): No. of Lanes: 6 <br> Median Type: <br> Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): <br> Description: Raised | Widen existing roadway to thoroughfare standard |



| Impact Fee Cost Estimate Summary |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item Description | Notes | Allowance |  | Cost |
| Construction | Cost of 3 new lanes only | - | \$ | 425,000 |
| Engineering/Survey/Testing |  | 9.0\% | \$ | 38,300 |
| Right-of-Way Acquisition | Cost per sq. ft.: \$ 1.00 | 18,900 | \$ | 18,900 |
|  | Impact Fee Project Cost Estimate Total: |  | \$ | 482,200 |
|  | Estimated Finance Cost (11.9\%; i.e. 3\% over 10 years) |  | \$ | 57,300 |

Bagby Ave
New Rd to Monte Vista St

| Roadway Information: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification: | Minor Arterial | No. of Lanes: | 4 |
| Length (If): | 1,430 |  |  |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 80 |  |  |
| Median Type: | Raised |  |  |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 48 |  |  |
| Description: | Widen existing | re standard |  |




## Impact Fee Engineer's Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Estimate

Bagby Ave
Monte Vista St to Richter Ave




Bagby Ave
Richter Ave to Valley Mills Dr

| Roadway Information: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification: | Minor Arterial | No. of Lanes: | 4 |
| Length (If): | 3,090 |  |  |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 80 |  |  |
| Median Type: | Raised |  |  |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 48 |  |  |
| Description: | Widen existing | re standard |  |




## S New Rd <br> Bagby Ave to I 35

| Roadway Information: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification: | Minor Arterial | No. of Lanes: | 6 |
| Length (If): | 4,247 |  |  |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 120 |  |  |
| Median Type: | Raised |  |  |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 72 |  |  |
| Description: | Widen existing | re standard |  |




## Impact Fee Engineer's Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Estimate

Garden Dr
Robinson Rd to 16th St

| Roadway Information: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification: | Minor Arterial | No. of Lanes: 2 |
| Length (If): | 7,076 |  |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 80 |  |
| Median Type: | None |  |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 24 |  |
| Description: | New Roadway Construction |  |




## 18th Street <br> La Salle to Gurley Ln

| Roadway Information: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification: | Major Arterial | No. of Lanes: | 6 |
| Length (If): | 2,355 |  |  |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 120 |  |  |
| Median Type: | Raised |  |  |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 72 |  |  |
| Description: | Widen existing | re standard |  |




## 16th Street

Gurley Ln to Garden Dr

## Roadway Information:

| Functional Classification: | Major Arterial | No. of Lanes: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Length (If): | 2,215 |  |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 120 |  |
| Median Type: | Raised |  |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 72 |  |
| Description: | Widen existing | re standard |


| Roadway Construction Cost Estimate: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I. Paving Construction Cost Estimate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item No. Item Description | Quantity | Unit |  | Cost |  | Item Cost |
| 1 Right of Way Preparation | 23 | STA | \$ | 2,000.00 | \$ | 46,000 |
| 2 Remove Existing Pavement | 23 | STA | \$ | 1,500.00 | \$ | 34,500 |
| 3 Unclassified Street Excavation | 6,500 | CY | \$ | 8.00 | \$ | 52,000 |
| 4 8" Lime Stabilized Subgrade | 18,800 | SY | \$ | 4.00 | \$ | 75,200 |
| $5 \quad$ Lime for Stabilization ( $42 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{SY}$ ) | 400 | TON | \$ | 170.00 | \$ | 68,000 |
| 6 10" Cement Treated Base | 17,800 | SY | \$ | 21.00 | \$ | 373,800 |
| 7 2" HMAC | 1,270 | TON | \$ | 110.00 | \$ | 139,700 |
| 8 Concrete Curb and Gutter | 4,500 | LF | \$ | 25.00 | \$ | 112,500 |
| 9 4" Concrete Sidewalk and Ramps | 26,580 | SF | \$ | 7.00 | \$ | 186,060 |
| 10 Hydromulching | 79,700 | SY | \$ | 2.00 | \$ | 159,400 |
| Paving Estimate Subtotal: \$ 1,247,160 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| II. Non-Paving Construction Components |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item No. Item Description |  |  | Pct. Of Paving |  |  | Item Cost |
| Pavement Markings \& Signage |  |  | 2\% |  | \$ | 25,000 |
| Traffic Control |  |  | 4\% |  | \$ | 49,900 |
| Erosion Control |  |  | 3\% |  | \$ | 37,500 |
| Drainage Improvements (RCP, Inlets, MH, Outfalls) |  |  | 20\% |  | \$ | 249,500 |
| Utility Adjustments |  |  | 5\% |  | \$ | 62,400 |
|  | Other Components Estimate Subtotal: |  |  |  | \$ | 424,300 |
| III. Special Construction Components |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item No. Item Description Notes |  |  | Allowance |  | Item Cost |  |
| 16 Drainage Structures None |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 17 Bridge Structures None |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 18 Traffic Signals None |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  | Special Components Estimate Subtotal: |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  | I, II, \& III Construction Subtotal: |  |  |  | \$ | 1,671,460 |
|  | Mobilization |  |  | 8\% | \$ | 133,800 |
|  | Contingency |  |  | 0\% | \$ | 180,600 |
|  | Construction Cost Estimate Total: |  |  |  | \$ | 1,985,900 |


| Impact Fee Cost Estimate Summary |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item Description | Notes | Allowance |  | Item Cost |
| Construction | Cost of 4 new lanes only | - | \$ | 1,323,933 |
| Engineering/Survey/Testing |  | 9.0\% | \$ | 119,200 |
| Right-of-Way Acquisition | Cost per sq. ft.: \$ 1.00 | 132,900 | \$ | 132,900 |
|  | Impact Fee Project Cost Estimate Total: |  | \$ | 1,576,033 |
|  | Estimated Finance Cost (11.9\%; i.e. 3 | over 10 years) | \$ | 187,500 |

## 12th Street

Garden Dr to TX-340

| Roadway Information: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification: | Major Arterial | No. of Lanes: | 6 |
| Length (If): | 5,702 |  |  |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 120 |  |  |
| Median Type: | Raised |  |  |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 72 |  |  |
| Description: | Widen existing | re standard |  |


| Roadway Construction Cost Estimate: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I. Paving Construction Cost Estimate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item No. Item Description |  |  | Quantity | Unit |  | t Cost |  | Item Cost |
| 1 | Right of Way Preparation |  | 58 | STA | \$ | 2,000.00 | \$ | 116,000 |
| 2 | Remove Existing Pavement |  | 58 | STA | \$ | 1,500.00 | \$ | 87,000 |
| 3 | Unclassified Street Excavation |  | 16,800 | CY | \$ | 8.00 | \$ | 134,400 |
| 4 | 8" Lime Stabilized Subgrade |  | 48,200 | SY | \$ | 4.00 | \$ | 192,800 |
| 5 | Lime for Stabilization (42 lb/SY) |  | 1,020 | TON | \$ | 170.00 | \$ | 173,400 |
| 6 | 10" Cement Treated Base |  | 45,700 | SY | \$ | 21.00 | \$ | 959,700 |
| 7 | 2" HMAC |  | 3,260 | TON | \$ | 110.00 | \$ | 358,600 |
| 8 | Concrete Curb and Gutter |  | 11,500 | LF | \$ | 25.00 | \$ | 287,500 |
| 9 | 4" Concrete Sidewalk and Ramps |  | 68,430 | SF | \$ | 7.00 | \$ | 479,010 |
| 10 | Hydromulching |  | 205,300 | SY | \$ | 2.00 | \$ | 410,600 |
|  | Paving Estimate Subtotal: |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 3,199,010 |
| II. Non-Paving Construction Components |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item No. Item Description |  |  |  |  | Pct. Of Paving |  |  | Item Cost |
| 11 | Pavement Markings \& Signage |  |  |  |  | 2\% | \$ | 64,000 |
| 12 | Traffic Control |  |  |  |  | 4\% | \$ | 128,000 |
| 13 | Erosion Control |  |  |  |  | 3\% | \$ | 96,000 |
| 14 | Drainage Improvements (RCP, Inlets, MH, Outfalls) |  |  |  |  | 2\% | \$ | 639,900 |
| 15 | Utility Adjustments |  |  |  |  | 5\% | \$ | 160,000 |
|  |  |  | Other Components Estimate Subtotal: |  |  |  | \$ | 1,087,900 |
| III. Special Construction Components |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item No. | Item Description Notes |  |  |  | Allowance |  |  | Item Cost |
| 16 | Drainage Structures | None |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 17 | Bridge Structures | None |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 18 | Traffic Signals | Add sig | X-340 |  | \$ | 250,000 | \$ | 250,000 |
|  |  |  | Special Components Estimate Subtotal: |  |  |  | \$ | 250,000 |
|  |  |  | I, II, \& III Construction Subtotal: |  |  |  | \$ | 4,536,910 |
|  |  |  | Mobilization |  |  | 8\% | \$ | 363,000 |
|  |  |  | Contingency |  |  | 0\% | \$ | 490,000 |
|  |  |  | Construction Cost Estimate Total: |  |  |  | \$ | 5,390,000 |



## University Parks Dr <br> Garden Dr to TX-340

| Roadway Information: |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification: | Minor Arterial No. of Lanes: 4 |
| Length (If): | 4,423 |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 110 |
| Median Type: | Raised |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 48 |
| Description: | Widen existing roadway to thoroughfare standard; TxDOT facility |



| Impact Fee Cost Estimate Summary |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item Description | Notes | Allowance | Item Cost |  |
| Construction | Cost of 2 new lanes only; City | - | \$ | 340,590 |
| Engineering/Survey/Testing | participation of 20\% | 9.0\% | \$ | 30,700 |
| Right-of-Way Acquisition | Cost per sq. ft.: \$ 1.00 | - | \$ | - |
|  | Impact Fee Project Cost | timate Total: | \$ | 371,290 |
|  | Estimated Finance Cost (11.9\%; i.e. 3 | over 10 years) | \$ | 44,100 |

## Martin Luther King Jr Blvd <br> BUS 77 to SH 484

| Roadway Information: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification: | Major Arterial | No. of Lanes: 6 |
| Length (If): | 2,053 |  |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 120 |  |
| Median Type: | Raised |  |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 72 |  |
| Description: | New Construction; TxDOT facility |  |



| Impact Fee Cost Estimate Summary |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item Description | Notes | Allowance | Item Cost |  |
| Construction | Cost of 2 new lanes only; City | - | \$ | 427,640 |
| Engineering/Survey/Testing | participation of 20\% | 9.0\% | \$ | 38,500 |
| Right-of-Way Acquisition (\$1/SF) | Cost per sq. ft.: \$ 1.00 | 246,400 | \$ | 49,280 |
|  | Impact Fee Project Cost E | timate Total: | \$ | 515,420 |
|  | Estimated Finance Cost (11.9\%; i.e. 3\% | over 10 years) | \$ | 61,300 |

Gholson Rd
Herring Ave to Lake Shore Dr

| Roadway Information: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Functional Classification:  <br> Length (If):  <br>  Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): <br>  $\frac{1,122}{100}$ <br> Median Type: <br> Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): <br> Description: $\frac{\text { None Lanes: } 4}{48}$ | Widen existing roadway to thoroughfare standard; TxDOT facility |



| Impact Fee Cost Estimate Summary |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item Description | Notes | Allowance |  | Cost |
| Construction | Cost of 2 new lanes only; City | - | \$ | 523,450 |
| Engineering/Survey/Testing | participation of 20\% | 9.0\% | \$ | 47,100 |
| Right-of-Way Acquisition | Cost per sq. ft.: \$ 1.00 | - | \$ | - |
|  | Impact Fee Project Cost Estimate Total: |  | \$ | 570,550 |
|  | Estimated Finance Cost (11.9\%; i.e. 3\% over 10 years) |  | \$ | 67,800 |

## North River Crossing

End of bridge to 580' NE of Curry Ln

| Roadway Information: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Functional Classification:  <br> Length (If):  <br>  Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): <br>  $\frac{7,286}{120}$ <br> Median Type: <br> Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): <br> Description: $\frac{\text { Raised Lanes: } 6}{72}$$\quad$ Widen existing roadway to thoroughfare standard; TxDOT facility |  |



| Impact Fee Cost Estimate Summary |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item Description | Notes | Allowance | Item Cost |  |
| Construction | Cost of 2 new lanes only; City | - | \$ | 865,800 |
| Engineering/Survey/Testing | participation of 20\% | 9.0\% | \$ | 77,900 |
| Right-of-Way Acquisition | Cost per sq. ft.: \$ 1.00 | - | \$ | - |
|  | Impact Fee Project Cost | timate Total: | \$ | 943,700 |
|  | Estimated Finance Cost (11.9\%; i.e. 3 | over 10 years) | \$ | 112,300 |

## North River Crossing

580' NE of Curry Ln to Yankie Rd

| Roadway Information: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification: | Minor Arterial | No. of Lanes: | 6 |
| Length (If): | 2,495 |  |  |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 120 |  |  |
| Median Type: | Raised |  |  |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 72 |  |  |
| Description: | Widen existing | re standard; | DOT facility |




## Flat Rock Rd

Yankie Rd to Tree Lake Rd

| Roadway Information: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification: | Major Collector | No. of Lanes: |  |
| Length (If): | 5,333 |  |  |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 80 |  |  |
| Median Type: | None |  |  |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 48 |  |  |
| Description: | Widen existing r | re standard |  |



| Impact Fee Cost Estimate Summary |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item Description | Notes | Allowance |  | Item Cost |
| Construction | Cost of 2 new lanes only | - | \$ | 1,940,250 |
| Engineering/Survey/Testing |  | 9.0\% | \$ | 174,600 |
| Right-of-Way Acquisition | Cost per sq. ft.: \$ 1.00 | 186,700 | \$ | 186,700 |
|  | Impact Fee Project Cost Estimate Total: |  | \$ | 2,301,550 |
|  | Estimated Finance Cost (11.9\%; i.e. 3 | over 10 years) | \$ | 273,800 |

## Flat Rock Rd

Tree Lake Rd to China Spring Rd

| Roadway Information: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification: | Major Collector | No. of Lanes: 4 |
| Length (If): | 8,765 |  |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 80 |  |
| Median Type: | None |  |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 48 |  |
| Description: | Widen existing r | re standard |




## Yankie Rd

North River Crossing to Flat Rock Rd


## Tree Lake Dr

China Spring Rd to Flat Rock Rd




## Impact Fee Engineer's Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Estimate

## Wortham Bend Rd

North City Limit to China Spring Rd

| Roadway Information: |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification: | Major Collector No. of Lanes: 4 |
| Length (If): | 4,319 |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 100 |
| Median Type: | None |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 48 |
| Description: | Widen existing roadway to thoroughfare standard; TxDOT facility |




# Mars Dr <br> Hewitt Dr to Texas Central Pkwy 

| Roadway Information: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification: | Minor Arterial | No. of Lanes: 4 |
| Length (If): | 4,984 |  |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 100 |  |
| Median Type: | None |  |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 48 |  |
| Description: | Widen existing | re standard |




# Beverly Dr <br> W Loop 340 to 4128 ' NE of Loop 340 

| Roadway Information: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification: | Minor Arterial | No. of Lanes: | 4 |
| Length (If): | 4,128 |  |  |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 60 |  |  |
| Median Type: | None |  |  |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 48 |  |  |
| Description: | Widen existing | re standard |  |




# Beverly Dr <br> 4128' NE of Loop 340 to New Road 

| Roadway Information: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification: | Minor Arterial | No. of Lanes: | 4 |
| Length (If): | 1,633 |  |  |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 60 |  |  |
| Median Type: | None |  |  |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 48 |  |  |
| Description: | Widen existing | re standard |  |




## Hewitt Dr

Woodway Dr to Old McGregor Dr

| Roadway Information: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Functional Classification:  <br> Length (If):  <br>  Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): <br>  $\frac{994}{120}$ <br> Median Type: <br> Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): <br> Description: $\frac{\text { Raised }}{72}$ | Widen existing roadway to thoroughfare standard; TxDOT facility |


| Roadway Construction Cost Estimate: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I. Paving Construction Cost Estimate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item No. Item Description |  |  | Quantity | Unit |  | Cost | Item Cost |  |
| 1 | Right of Way Preparation |  | 10 | STA | \$ | 2,000.00 | \$ 20,000 |  |
| 2 | Remove Existing Pavement |  | 10 | STA | \$ | 1,500.00 | \$ | 15,000 |
| 3 | Unclassified Street Excavation |  | 3,000 | CY | \$ | 8.00 | \$ | 24,000 |
| 4 | 8" Lime Stabilized Subgrade |  | 8,400 | SY | \$ | 4.00 | \$ 33,600 |  |
| 5 | Lime for Stabilization (42 lb/SY) |  | 180 | TON | \$ | 170.00 | \$ | 30,600 |
| 6 | 10" Cement Treated Base |  | 8,000 | SY | \$ | 21.00 | \$ | 168,00062,700 |
| 7 | 2" HMAC |  | 570 | TON | \$ | 110.00 | \$ |  |
| 8 | Concrete Curb and Gutter |  | 2,000 | LF | \$ | 25.00 | \$ | \$ 62,700 |
| 9 | 4" Concrete Sidewalk and Ramps |  | 11,930 | SF | \$ | 7.00 | \$ | 83,510 |
| 10 | Hydromulching |  | 35,800 | SY | \$ | 2.00 | \$ | \$ 71,600 |
|  |  |  |  | Paving Estimate Subtotal: |  |  | \$ | 559,010 |
| II. Non-Paving Construction Components |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item No. Item Description |  |  |  |  | Pct. Of Paving |  |  | Item Cost |
| 11 | Pavement Markings \& Signage |  |  |  |  | 2\% | \$ 11,200 |  |
| 12 | Traffic Control |  |  |  |  | \% | \$ 22,400 |  |
| 13 | Erosion Control |  |  |  |  | 3\% | \$ 16,800 |  |
| 14 | Drainage Improvements (RCP, Inlets, MH, Outfalls) |  |  |  |  | 0\% | \$ 111,900 |  |
| 15 | Utility Adjustments |  |  |  |  | 5\% | \$ | 28,000 |
|  |  |  | Other Components Estimate Subtotal: |  |  |  | \$ | 190,300 |
| III. Special Construction Components |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item No. Item Description <br> 16 Drainage Structures <br> 17 Bridge Structures <br> 18 Traffic Signals |  | Notes |  |  | Allowance |  | Item Cost |  |
|  |  | None |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  |  | None |  |  |  | - | \$ | - |
|  |  | None |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  |  |  | Special Components Estimate Subtotal: |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  |  |  | I, II, \& III Construction Subtotal: |  |  |  | \$ | 749,310 |
|  |  |  | Mobilization |  |  | 8\% | \$ | 60,000 |
|  |  |  | Contingency 10\% |  |  |  | \$ | 81,000 |
|  |  |  | Construction Cost Estimate Total: |  |  |  | \$ | 890,400 |


| Impact Fee Cost Estimate Summary |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item Description | Notes | Allowance | Item Cost |  |
| Construction | Cost of 2 new lanes only; City | - | \$ | 59,400 |
| Engineering/Survey/Testing | participation of 20\% | 9.0\% | \$ | 5,300 |
| Right-of-Way Acquisition | Cost per sq. ft.: \$ 1.00 | - | \$ | - |
|  | Impact Fee Project Cost | timate Total: | \$ | 64,700 |
|  | Estimated Finance Cost (11.9\%; i.e. 3 | over 10 years) | \$ | 7,600 |

## Hewitt Dr

Old McGregor Dr to Imperial Dr

| Roadway Information: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification: | Major Arterial | No. of Lanes: | 6 |
| Length (If): | 2,357 |  |  |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 120 |  |  |
| Median Type: | Raised |  |  |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 72 |  |  |
| Description: | Widen existing | re standard; TxD | DOT facility |




Hewitt Dr
Imperial Dr to Mars Dr

## Roadway Information:

| Functional Classification: | Major Arterial | No. of Lanes: 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Length (lf): | 3,283 |  |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 120 |  |
| Median Type: | Raised |  |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 72 |  |
| Description: | Widen existing | re standard; TxDOT facility |



| Impact Fee Cost Estimate Summary |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item Description | Notes | Allowance | Item Cost |  |
| Construction | Cost of 2 new lanes only; City | - | \$ | 195,400 |
| Engineering/Survey/Testing | participation of 20\% | 9.0\% | \$ | 17,600 |
| Right-of-Way Acquisition | Cost per sq. ft.: \$ 1.00 | - | \$ | - |
|  | Impact Fee Project Cost | timate Total: | \$ | 213,000 |
|  | Estimated Finance Cost (11.9\%; i.e. 3 | over 10 years) | \$ | 25,300 |

## Texas Central Pkwy <br> Railroad to Imperial Dr

| Roadway Information: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Functional Classification:  <br> Length (If):  <br> Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): Minor Arterial <br> Median Type: <br> Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): <br> Description: None Lanes: 4 | W8 |



| Impact Fee Cost Estimate Summary |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item Description | Notes | Allowance |  | Cost |
| Construction | Cost of 2 new lanes only | - | \$ | 661,100 |
| Engineering/Survey/Testing |  | 9.0\% | \$ | 59,500 |
| Right-of-Way Acquisition | Cost per sq. ft.: \$ 1.00 | - | \$ | - |
|  | Impact Fee Project Cost Estimate Total: |  | \$ | 720,600 |
|  | Estimated Finance Cost (11.9\%; i.e. 3\% over 10 years) |  | \$ | 85,700 |

## Impact Fee Engineer's Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Estimate

Bagby Ave
New Rd to TX 340

| Roadway Information: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Functional Classification:  <br> Length (If):  <br>  Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): <br>  $\frac{4,369}{100}$ <br> Median Type: <br> Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): <br> Description: $\frac{\text { Raised }}{48}$ | Widen existing roadway to thoroughfare standard 4 |




## Warren Rd

City Limit to Ritchie Rd


## Warren Rd

Ritchie Rd to 3700' east of Ritchie Rd


## Farmiller Rd

1300 ' south of Chapel Rd to 2100 north of Warren Rd


## Chapel Rd

Meadow Mountain Dr to Ritchie Rd

| Roadway Information: |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Functional Classification:  <br> Length (If):  <br>  Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): <br>  $\frac{3,600}{100}$ <br> Median Type: <br> Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): <br> Description: $\frac{\text { TWLTL }}{60}$ | Widen existing roadway to thoroughfare standard |  |




Ritchie Rd
Panther Way to Warren St

| Roadway Information: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Functional Classification:  <br> Length (If):  <br>  Minor Arterial <br> Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): <br> Median Type: <br> Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): <br> Description: $\frac{5,333}{}$ <br>  None Lanes: 4$\quad$ Widen existing roadway to thoroughfare standard |  |



| Impact Fee Cost Estimate Summary |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item Description | Notes | Allowance |  | Item Cost |
| Construction | Cost of 2 new lanes only | - | \$ | 1,961,300 |
| Engineering/Survey/Testing |  | 9.0\% | \$ | 176,500 |
| Right-of-Way Acquisition | Cost per sq. ft.: \$ 1.00 | - | \$ | - |
|  | Impact Fee Project Cost Estimate Total: |  | \$ | 2,137,800 |
|  | Estimated Finance Cost (11.9\%; i.e. 3\% over 10 years) |  | \$ | 254,300 |

Val Verde Rd
Fossil Rim Rd to US 84

| Roadway Information: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification: | Minor Collector | No. of Lanes: | 3 |
| Length (If): | 4,678 |  |  |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 60 |  |  |
| Median Type: | TWLTL |  |  |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 36 |  |  |
| Description: | Widen existing r | re standard |  |




## Harris Creek Rd

US 84 to Walking Horse Ln


## Speegleville Rd

Pecan Creek to Oak Rd

| Roadway Information: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification: | Major Arterial | No. of Lanes: | 6 |
| Length (If): | 2,876 |  |  |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 100 |  |  |
| Median Type: | Raised |  |  |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 72 |  |  |
| Description: | Widen existing | re standard |  |



| Impact Fee Cost Estimate Summary |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item Description | Notes | Allowance |  | Item Cost |
| Construction | Cost of 4 new lanes only | - | \$ | 2,972,667 |
| Engineering/Survey/Testing |  | 9.0\% | \$ | 267,500 |
| Right-of-Way Acquisition | Cost per sq. ft.: \$ 1.00 | 57,500 | \$ | 57,500 |
|  | Impact Fee Project Cost Estimate Total: |  | \$ | 3,297,667 |
|  | Estimated Finance Cost (11.9\%; i.e. 3 | over 10 years) | \$ | 392,400 |

Speegleville Rd
Oak Rd to US 84

| Roadway Information: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification: | Major Arterial | No. of Lanes: | 6 |
| Length (If): | 4,462 |  |  |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 100 |  |  |
| Median Type: | Raised |  |  |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 72 |  |  |
| Description: | Widen existing | re standard |  |




## Old Lorena Rd

US 84 EBFR to South Bosque River

| Roadway Information: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification: | Major Arterial | No. of Lanes: | 6 |
| Length (If): | 4,732 |  |  |
| Ultimate Right-of-Way Width (ft.): | 100 |  |  |
| Median Type: | Raised |  |  |
| Pavement Width (FOC to FOC): | 72 |  |  |
| Description: | Widen existing | re standard |  |


| Roadway Construction Cost Estimate: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I. Paving Construction Cost Estimate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item No. Item Description | Quantity | Unit |  | Cost |  | Item Cost |
| 1 Right of Way Preparation | 48 | STA | \$ | 2,000.00 | \$ | 96,000 |
| 2 Remove Existing Pavement | 48 | STA | \$ | 1,500.00 | \$ | 72,000 |
| 3 Unclassified Street Excavation | 13,900 | CY | \$ | 8.00 | \$ | 111,200 |
| 4 8" Lime Stabilized Subgrade | 40,000 | SY | \$ | 4.00 | \$ | 160,000 |
| $5 \quad$ Lime for Stabilization ( $42 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{SY}$ ) | 840 | TON | \$ | 170.00 | \$ | 142,800 |
| 6 10" Cement Treated Base | 37,900 | SY | \$ | 21.00 | \$ | 795,900 |
| 7 2" HMAC | 2,710 | TON | \$ | 110.00 | \$ | 298,100 |
| 8 Concrete Curb and Gutter | 9,500 | LF | \$ | 25.00 | \$ | 237,500 |
| 9 4" Concrete Sidewalk and Ramps | 56,790 | SF | \$ | 7.00 | \$ | 397,530 |
| 10 Hydromulching | 75,700 | SY | \$ | 2.00 | \$ | 151,400 |
| Paving Estimate Subtotal: |  |  |  |  | \$ | 2,462,430 |
| II. Non-Paving Construction Components |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item No. Item Description |  |  | Pct. Of Paving |  |  | Item Cost |
| Pavement Markings \& Signage |  |  | 2\% |  | \$ | 49,300 |
| Traffic Control |  |  |  | 4\% | \$ | 98,500 |
| Erosion Control |  |  |  | 3\% | \$ | 73,900 |
| Drainage Improvements (RCP, Inlets, MH, Outfalls) |  |  |  | 0\% | \$ | 492,500 |
| Utility Adjustments |  |  |  | 5\% | \$ | 123,200 |
|  | Other Components Estimate Subtotal: |  |  |  | \$ | 837,400 |
| III. Special Construction Components |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item No. Item Description Notes |  |  | Allowance |  |  | tem Cost |
| 16 Drainage Structures None |  |  | \$ | - | \$ |  |
| 17 Bridge Structures None |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 18 Traffic Signals None |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  | Special Components Estimate Subtotal: |  |  |  | \$ | - |
|  | I, II, \& III Construction Subtotal: |  |  |  | \$ | 3,299,830 |
|  | Mobilization |  |  | 8\% | \$ | 264,000 |
|  | Contingency |  |  | 0\% | \$ | 356,400 |
|  | Construction Cost Estimate Total: |  |  |  | \$ | 3,920,300 |

 City of Waco

## Appendix 1

## Impact Fee Financial Calculations

# SUMMARY OF WATER IMPACT FEE DETERMINATION 

## Water Service Area

| Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs | $\$$ | $17,023,355$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study |  |  |
| Financing Cost | $6,531,589$ | See Detail Below |
| Existing Fund Balance | - | Water Service Area - page 1 |
| Interest Earnings | $(541,910)$ | Water Service Area - page 3 |
| Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 , 0 1 3 , 0 3 4}$ |
| Sum of Above |  |  |
| Equivalent Connections | 12,753 | Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study |
| Maximum Assessable Impact Fee | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 0 5}$ |

## Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs:

Represents the portion of capital improvement costs that are eligible for funding through Impact fees after adjusting for the 50\% credit. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study. In 2001, the Impact Fee Statute was amended to include either a credit for ad valorem and utility revenues generated by new service units during the ten-year timeframe that are used to fund impact fee eligible projects for which the new service units were charged an impact fee or a credit equal to $50 \%$ of the total cost of implementing the impact fee capital improvement plan. The City has elected to use the $50 \%$ credit.

Financing Costs:
Represents the interest costs associated with debt financing the new Impact fee project costs. Interest costs are derived from the City's Financial Advisor and the City's existing debt service schedules.
New Annual Debt Service
Existing Annual Debt Service
Principal Component (New and Existing Debt)
Financing Costs

| $\$$ | $8,793,172$ | Water Service Area - page 2 |
| :---: | ---: | :--- |
|  | $14,491,312$ | Water Service Area - page 2 |
| $(16,752,895)$ |  |  |
|  | Water Service Area - page 1 |  |

## Existing Fund Balance:

Represents impact fee revenue collected but not yet expended. Because this impact fee is new, there is no existing fund balance. Reference is page 1 of Water Service Area.

## Interest Earnings

Represents the interest earned on cash flows and assumes a $0.35 \%$ annual interest rate per the most recent investment portfolio. The Impact Fee Statute states that interest earnings are funds of the Impact Fee account and are held to the same restrictions as Impact fee revenues. Therefore in order to recognize that interest earnings are used to fund capital improvements, interest earnings are credited against the recoverable costs. Reference is the sum of Accumulated Interest on page 3 of Water Service Area.

## Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee:

Represents the sum of Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs (after 50\% credit) and Financing Costs less Existing Fund Balance and Interest Earnings.

Equivalent Connections:
Represents the growth in equivalent water connections over the ten-year timeframe (i.e. service units). A service unit is a standardized measure of use attributable to an individual unit of development calculated in accordance with generally accepted engineering standards. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study.

Maximum Assessable Impact Fee:
Represents Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee divided by Equivalent Connections. This is the maximum impact fee that can be assessed by the City.

# City of Waco - 2020 Water Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Impact Fee Calculation Assumptions Water Service Area 

## I. General Assumptions

| Annual Interest Rate on Deposits ${ }^{(1)}$ | 0.35\% |
| :---: | :---: |
| Annual Service Unit Growth ${ }^{(2)}$ | 1,275 |
| Existing Fund Balance ${ }^{(3)}$ | - |
| Portion of Projects Funded by Existing Debt ${ }^{(4)}$ | \$ 11,267,826 |
| Non-debt Funded Project Cost ${ }^{(5)}$ | 270,460 |
| New Project Cost Funded Through New Debt ${ }^{(6)}$ | 5,485,069 |
| Total Recoverable Project Cost ${ }^{(7)}$ | \$ 17,023,355 |

II. New Debt Issues Assumptions

| Year | Principal ${ }^{(8)}$ |  | Interest ${ }^{(9)}$ | Term |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 548,507 | 3.25\% | 20 |
| 2 |  | 548,507 | 4.00\% | 20 |
| 3 |  | 548,507 | 4.50\% | 20 |
| 4 |  | 548,507 | 5.00\% | 20 |
| 5 |  | 548,507 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 6 |  | 548,507 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 7 |  | 548,507 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 8 |  | 548,507 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 9 |  | 548,507 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 10 |  | 548,507 | 5.50\% | 20 |

III. Capital Expenditure Assumptions

| Year | Annual Capital Expenditures ${ }^{(10)}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 27,046 |
| 2 | 209,882 |
| 3 | 392,717 |
| 4 | 575,553 |
| 5 | 575,553 |
| 6 | 575,553 |
| 7 | 575,553 |
| 8 | 575,553 |
| 9 | 575,553 |
| 10 | 575,553 |
| 11 | 548,507 |
| 12 | 365,671 |
| 13 | 182,836 |
| Total | 5,755,529 |

(1) Estimated Interest Rate per Staff as of May 2020
(2) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(3) There is no existing fund balance because this is a new water impact fee
(4) Per discussions with City Staff and City files, not applicable
(5) Per discussions with City Staff and City files, assumes 0\% of project costs are non-debt funded
(6) Per discussions with City Staff and City files, assumes $100 \%$ of project costs are new debt funded
(7) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(8) Assumes new debt issued in equal annual amounts
(9) Estimated interest on future debt from City's Financial Advisor May 2020
(10) Assumes new debt proceeds expended over a 3-year timeframe

Non-debt funded capital expenditures allocated is equal annual amounts

City of Waco-2020 Water Impact Fee Study
Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Debt Service and Expense Summary
Water Service Area

II. Summary of Annual Expenses


| \$ | 37,726 | \$ | 27,046 | \$ | $(548,507)$ | \$ | 708,120 | \$ | 224,384 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 78,086 |  | 209,882 |  | $(548,507)$ |  | 803,377 |  | 542,838 |
|  | 120,253 |  | 392,717 |  | $(548,507)$ |  | 797,619 |  | 762,082 |
|  | 164,266 |  | 575,553 |  | $(548,507)$ |  | 797,135 |  | 988,447 |
|  | 210,165 |  | 575,553 |  | $(548,507)$ |  | 795,920 |  | 1,033,131 |
|  | 256,064 |  | 575,553 |  | $(548,507)$ |  | 795,436 |  | 1,078,546 |
|  | 301,963 |  | 575,553 |  | $(548,507)$ |  | 793,275 |  | 1,122,284 |
|  | 347,861 |  | 575,553 |  | $(548,507)$ |  | 792,911 |  | 1,167,818 |
|  | 393,760 |  | 575,553 |  | $(548,507)$ |  | 791,847 |  | 1,212,653 |
|  | 439,659 |  | 575,553 |  | $(548,507)$ |  | 791,534 |  | 1,258,239 |
|  | 439,659 |  | 548,507 |  | - |  | 789,791 |  | 1,777,956 |
|  | 439,659 |  | 365,671 |  | - |  | 788,831 |  | 1,594,161 |
|  | 439,659 |  | 182,836 |  | - |  | 788,611 |  | 1,411,105 |
|  | 439,659 |  | - |  | - |  | 787,834 |  | 1,227,493 |
|  | 439,659 |  | - |  | - |  | 778,290 |  | 1,217,948 |
|  | 439,659 |  | - |  | - |  | 775,705 |  | 1,215,363 |
|  | 439,659 |  | - |  | - |  | 728,594 |  | 1,168,253 |
|  | 439,659 |  | - |  | - |  | 523,591 |  | 963,250 |
|  | 439,659 |  | - |  | - |  | 387,502 |  | 827,160 |
|  | 439,659 |  | - |  | - |  | 199,537 |  | 639,195 |
|  | 401,933 |  | - |  | - |  | 75,855 |  | 477,788 |
|  | 361,573 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 361,573 |
|  | 319,406 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 319,406 |
|  | 275,392 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 275,392 |
|  | 229,493 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 229,493 |
|  | 183,595 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 183,595 |
|  | 137,696 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 137,696 |
|  | 91,797 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 91,797 |
|  | 45,899 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 45,899 |
| \$ | 8,793,172 | \$ | ,755,529 | \$ | 5,485,069) | \$ | ,491,312 |  | 23,554,945 |

(1) Water Service Area - page 2 Section I
(2) Water Service Area - page 1 Section III
(3) Eligible debt funded projects as a percent of total principal ties original annual debt service; does not reflect current outstanding balances

## City of Waco - 2020 Water Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Revenue Test <br> Water Service Area

| Year |  | Impact <br> Fee | Service <br> Units |  | Impact Fee Revenue |  | Annual $\text { Expenses }{ }^{(1)}$ | Sub-Total |  | Accumulated Interest |  |  | Estimated Fund Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
| 1 | \$ | 1,805 | 1,275 | \$ | 2,301,303 | \$ | 224,384 | \$ | 2,076,919 | \$ | 3,635 |  | 2,080,554 |
| 2 |  | 1,805 | 1,275 |  | 2,301,303 |  | 542,838 |  | 1,758,466 |  | 10,359 |  | 3,849,379 |
| 3 |  | 1,805 | 1,275 |  | 2,301,303 |  | 762,082 |  | 1,539,221 |  | 16,166 |  | 5,404,766 |
| 4 |  | 1,805 | 1,275 |  | 2,301,303 |  | 988,447 |  | 1,312,856 |  | 21,214 |  | 6,738,837 |
| 5 |  | 1,805 | 1,275 |  | 2,301,303 |  | 1,033,131 |  | 1,268,173 |  | 25,805 |  | 8,032,814 |
| 6 |  | 1,805 | 1,275 |  | 2,301,303 |  | 1,078,546 |  | 1,222,758 |  | 30,255 |  | 9,285,827 |
| 7 |  | 1,805 | 1,275 |  | 2,301,303 |  | 1,122,284 |  | 1,179,020 |  | 34,564 |  | 10,499,410 |
| 8 |  | 1,805 | 1,275 |  | 2,301,303 |  | 1,167,818 |  | 1,133,485 |  | 38,732 |  | 11,671,627 |
| 9 |  | 1,805 | 1,275 |  | 2,301,303 |  | 1,212,653 |  | 1,088,651 |  | 42,756 |  | 12,803,034 |
| 10 |  | 1,805 | 1,275 |  | 2,301,303 |  | 1,258,239 |  | 1,043,065 |  | 46,636 |  | 13,892,735 |
| 11 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 1,777,956 |  | $(1,777,956)$ |  | 45,513 |  | 12,160,292 |
| 12 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 1,594,161 |  | $(1,594,161)$ |  | 39,771 |  | 10,605,902 |
| 13 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 1,411,105 |  | $(1,411,105)$ |  | 34,651 |  | 9,229,448 |
| 14 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 1,227,493 |  | $(1,227,493)$ |  | 30,155 |  | 8,032,111 |
| 15 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 1,217,948 |  | $(1,217,948)$ |  | 25,981 |  | 6,840,143 |
| 16 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 1,215,363 |  | $(1,215,363)$ |  | 21,814 |  | 5,646,594 |
| 17 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 1,168,253 |  | $(1,168,253)$ |  | 17,719 |  | 4,496,059 |
| 18 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 963,250 |  | $(963,250)$ |  | 14,051 |  | 3,546,860 |
| 19 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 827,160 |  | $(827,160)$ |  | 10,966 |  | 2,730,667 |
| 20 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 639,195 |  | $(639,195)$ |  | 8,439 |  | 2,099,910 |
| 21 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 477,788 |  | $(477,788)$ |  | 6,514 |  | 1,628,635 |
| 22 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 361,573 |  | $(361,573)$ |  | 5,067 |  | 1,272,130 |
| 23 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 319,406 |  | $(319,406)$ |  | 3,893 |  | 956,618 |
| 24 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 275,392 |  | $(275,392)$ |  | 2,866 |  | 684,092 |
| 25 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 229,493 |  | $(229,493)$ |  | 1,993 |  | 456,591 |
| 26 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 183,595 |  | $(183,595)$ |  | 1,277 |  | 274,273 |
| 27 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 137,696 |  | $(137,696)$ |  | 719 |  | 137,296 |
| 28 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 91,797 |  | $(91,797)$ |  | 320 |  | 45,819 |
| 29 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 45,899 |  | $(45,899)$ |  | 80 |  | - |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 23,013,034 | \$ | 23,554,945 |  |  | \$ | 541,910 |  |  |

(1) Water Service Area, Page 2 Section II

# City of Waco-2020 Water Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Impact Fee Calculation <br> Water Service Area 

| Year | Number of Years to End of Period | Future Value Escalation |  | Annual Service Units |  | Annual Expense |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Interest Rate <br> Factor | Recovery <br> Fee Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Actual | Escalated | Actual |  | Escalated |  |
| 1 | 29 | 1.1047 | 1.0000 | 1,275 | 1,409 | \$ | 224,384 | \$ | 247,878 |
| 2 | 28 | 1.1009 | 1.0000 | 1,275 | 1,404 |  | 542,838 |  | 597,584 |
| 3 | 27 | 1.0970 | 1.0000 | 1,275 | 1,399 |  | 762,082 |  | 836,013 |
| 4 | 26 | 1.0932 | 1.0000 | 1,275 | 1,394 |  | 988,447 |  | 1,080,556 |
| 5 | 25 | 1.0894 | 1.0000 | 1,275 | 1,389 |  | 1,033,131 |  | 1,125,464 |
| 6 | 24 | 1.0856 | 1.0000 | 1,275 | 1,384 |  | 1,078,546 |  | 1,170,840 |
| 7 | 23 | 1.0818 | 1.0000 | 1,275 | 1,380 |  | 1,122,284 |  | 1,214,072 |
| 8 | 22 | 1.0780 | 1.0000 | 1,275 | 1,375 |  | 1,167,818 |  | 1,258,924 |
| 9 | 21 | 1.0743 | 1.0000 | 1,275 | 1,370 |  | 1,212,653 |  | 1,302,697 |
| 10 | 20 | 1.0705 | 1.0000 | 1,275 | 1,365 |  | 1,258,239 |  | 1,346,953 |
| 11 | 19 | 1.0668 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 1,777,956 |  | 1,896,676 |
| 12 | 18 | 1.0631 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 1,594,161 |  | 1,694,677 |
| 13 | 17 | 1.0593 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 1,411,105 |  | 1,494,847 |
| 14 | 16 | 1.0557 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 1,227,493 |  | 1,295,803 |
| 15 | 15 | 1.0520 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 1,217,948 |  | 1,281,243 |
| 16 | 14 | 1.0483 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 1,215,363 |  | 1,274,064 |
| 17 | 13 | 1.0446 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 1,168,253 |  | 1,220,407 |
| 18 | 12 | 1.0410 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 963,250 |  | 1,002,742 |
| 19 | 11 | 1.0374 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 827,160 |  | 858,070 |
| 20 | 10 | 1.0338 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 639,195 |  | 660,768 |
| 21 | 9 | 1.0301 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 477,788 |  | 492,191 |
| 22 | 8 | 1.0266 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 361,573 |  | 371,173 |
| 23 | 7 | 1.0230 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 319,406 |  | 326,743 |
| 24 | 6 | 1.0194 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 275,392 |  | 280,736 |
| 25 | 5 | 1.0158 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 229,493 |  | 233,131 |
| 26 | 4 | 1.0123 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 183,595 |  | 185,854 |
| 27 | 3 | 1.0088 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 137,696 |  | 138,904 |
| 28 | 2 | 1.0053 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 91,797 |  | 92,280 |
| 29 | 1 | 1.0018 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 45,899 |  | 45,979 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 13,869 |  |  | \$ | 25,027,269 |

Annual Interest Rate:
0.35\%

| Present Value of Initial Impact Fee Fund Balance | $\$$ | - |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Total Escalated Expense for Entire Period | $\$$ | $25,027,269$ |
| Less Future Value of Initial Impact Fee Fund Balance <br> Sub-Total | $\$$ | $25,027,269$ |
| Total Escalated Service Units |  | 13,869 |
| Impact Fee for Water Service Area | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 0 5}$ |

## City of Waco - 2020 Water Impact Fee Study

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Impact Fee Project Funding
Water Service Area

| Impact Fee Project Name ${ }^{(1)}$ | Cost In Service Area ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Impact Fee Eligible Cost ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Impact Fee <br> Recoverable Cost $^{(2)}$ |  | Debt Funded ${ }^{(3)}$ |  |  |  | Non-Debt <br> Funded ${ }^{(3)}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Riverside to Gholson 30-inch Water Line | \$ | 12,242,880 | \$ | 3,060,720 | \$ | 1,530,360 | \$ | 1,530,360 | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Highway 84 Water Line Improvements |  | 1,442,652 |  | 432,796 |  | 216,398 |  | 216,398 |  | - |  | - |
| Spring Valley Water Lines |  | 3,848,268 |  | 2,693,787 |  | 1,346,894 |  | 1,346,894 |  | - |  | - |
| Owen Lane 2.0 MG Elevated Storage Tank |  | 3,858,015 |  | 771,603 |  | 385,802 |  | 385,802 |  | - |  | - |
| Hillcrest Pump Station Expansion |  | 12,902,096 |  | 645,105 |  | 322,552 |  | 322,552 |  | - |  | - |
| 16-inch Ritchie Road Water Line |  | 787,155 |  | 393,577 |  | 196,789 |  | 175,000 |  | - |  | 21,789 |
| China Spring Water Line |  | 16,199,650 |  | 4,049,913 |  | 2,024,956 |  | 1,838,321 |  | - |  | 186,635 |
| McGregor-Waco-Woodway Connection 16" Water Line |  | 1,500,000 |  | 450,000 |  | 225,000 |  | 225,000 |  | - |  |  |
| Water Transmission Improvements (project 8) |  | 8,000,000 |  | 800,000 |  | 400,000 |  | - |  | 400,000 |  |  |
| Peach Street 16-inch Water Line |  | 3,500,000 |  | 1,225,000 |  | 612,500 |  | 612,500 |  | - |  |  |
| Elm Street 12-inch Water Line |  | 1,800,000 |  | 630,000 |  | 315,000 |  | 315,000 |  | - |  |  |
| Riverside Water Treatment Plant Expansion |  | 10,363,510 |  | 2,072,702 |  | 1,036,351 |  | - |  | 1,036,351 |  | - |
| Riverside Pump Station Expansion |  | 11,000,000 |  | 2,200,000 |  | 1,100,000 |  | 1,100,000 |  | - |  | - |
| Downtown Mary Avenue to 5th Street |  | 3,000,000 |  | 900,000 |  | 450,000 |  | 450,000 |  | - |  | - |
| Pressure Plane 6 Water Storage |  | 5,000,000 |  | 2,500,000 |  | 1,250,000 |  | 1,250,000 |  |  |  | - |
| Chapel Road 16-inch Water Line |  | 5,000,000 |  | 2,250,000 |  | 1,125,000 |  | 1,125,000 |  | - |  | - |
| Old McGregor 3.0 MG Ground Storage Tank |  | 4,500,000 |  | 900,000 |  | 450,000 |  | - |  | 450,000 |  | - |
| Airport 1.0 MG Ground Storage Tank |  | 2,500,000 |  | 625,000 |  | 312,500 |  | - |  | 312,500 |  | - |
| 20/24-inch Water Line in Pressure Plane 1 |  | 14,000,000 |  | 4,200,000 |  | 2,100,000 |  | 375,000 |  | 1,725,000 |  | - |
| 72-inch Parallel Raw Water Line |  | 8,000,000 |  | 800,000 |  | 400,000 |  | - |  | 400,000 |  | - |
| 16/24-inch Water Line in Pressure Plane 3 |  | 7,289,740 |  | 1,822,435 |  | 911,218 |  | - |  | 911,218 |  | - |
| Low Head Pump Station at Mt. Carmel WTP |  | 5,000,000 |  | 500,000 |  | 250,000 |  | - |  | 250,000 |  | - |
| Water Impact Fee Study |  | 124,073 |  | 124,073 |  | 62,037 |  | - |  | - |  | 62,037 |
| Total | \$ | 141,858,038 | \$ | 34,046,711 | \$ | 17,023,355 | \$ | 11,267,826 | \$ | 5,485,069 | \$ | 270,460 |

(1) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(2) $50 \%$ of Eligible Costs
(3) Per discussions with City staff and City files

# SUMMARY OF WASTEWATER IMPACT FEE DETERMINATION 

Wastewater Service Area

| Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs | $\$$ | $31,867,209$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study |  |  |
| Financing Cost | $15,091,715$ | See Detail Below |
| Existing Fund Balance | - | Wastewater Service Area - page 1 |
| Interest Earnings | $(1,371,302)$ | Wastewater Service Area - page 3 |
| Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee | $\mathbf{4 5 , 5 8 7 , 6 2 2}$ | Sum of Above |
| Equivalent Connections | $\mathbf{1 2 , 7 5 3}$ | Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study |
| Maximum Assessable Impact Fee | $\mathbf{3 , 5 7 5}$ | Max. Recoverable Cost Divided by Equiv. Conn. |

## Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs:

Represents the portion of capital improvement costs that are eligible for funding through Impact fees after adjusting for the $50 \%$ credit. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study. In 2001, the Impact Fee Statute was amended to include either a credit for ad valorem and utility revenues generated by new service units during the ten-year timeframe that are used to fund impact fee eligible projects for which the new service units were charged an impact fee or a credit equal to $50 \%$ of the total cost of implementing the impact fee capital improvement plan. The City has elected to use the $50 \%$ credit.

## Financing Costs:

Represents the interest costs associated with debt financing the new Impact fee project costs. Interest costs are derived from the City's Financial Advisor and the City's existing debt service schedules.

| New Annual Debt Service | $\$$ | $30,899,959$ Wastewater Service Area - page 2 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Annual Debt Service |  | $15,763,501$ Wastewater Service Area - page 2 |
| Principal Component (New and Existing Debt) |  | $(31,571,745)$ Wastewater Service Area - page 1 1 |

## Existing Fund Balance:

Represents impact fee revenue collected but not yet expended. Because this impact fee is new, there is no existing fund balance. Reference is page 1 of Wastewater Service Area.

## Interest Earnings

Represents the interest earned on cash flows and assumes a $0.35 \%$ annual interest rate per the most recent investment portfolio. The Impact Fee Statute states that interest earnings are funds of the Impact Fee account and are held to the same restrictions as Impact fee revenues. Therefore in order to recognize that interest earnings are used to fund capital improvements, interest earnings are credited against the recoverable costs. Reference is the sum of Accumulated Interest on page 3 of Wastewater Service Area.

Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee:
Represents the sum of Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs (after 50\% credit) and Financing Costs less Existing Fund Balance and Interest Earnings.

## Equivalent Connections:

Represents the growth in equivalent wastewater connections over the ten-year timeframe (i.e. service units). A service unit is a standardized measure of use attributable to an individual unit of development calculated in accordance with generally accepted engineering standards. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study.

## Maximum Assessable Impact Fee:

Represents Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee divided by Equivalent Connections. This is the maximum impact fee that can be assessed by the City.

2020 Wastewater Impact Fee Study City of Waco, Texas

## Wastewater Service Area

## City of Waco - 2020 Wastewater Impact Fee Study

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Impact Fee Calculation Assumptions
Wastewater Service Area

## I. General Assumptions

| Annual Interest Rate on Deposits ${ }^{(1)}$ | 0.35\% |
| :---: | :---: |
| Annual Service Unit Growth ${ }^{(2)}$ | 1,275 |
| Existing Fund Balance ${ }^{(3)}$ | - |
| Portion of Projects Funded by Existing Debt ${ }^{(4)}$ | \$ 12,296,745 |
| Non-debt Funded New Project Cost ${ }^{(5)}$ | 295,464 |
| New Project Cost Funded Through New Debt ${ }^{(6)}$ | 19,275,000 |
| Total Recoverable Project Cost ${ }^{(7)}$ | \$ 31,867,209 |

II. New Debt Issues Assumptions

| Year | Principal ${ }^{(8)}$ | Interest ${ }^{(9)}$ | Term |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ 1,927,500 | 3.25\% | 20 |
| 2 | 1,927,500 | 4.00\% | 20 |
| 3 | 1,927,500 | 4.50\% | 20 |
| 4 | 1,927,500 | 5.00\% | 20 |
| 5 | 1,927,500 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 6 | 1,927,500 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 7 | 1,927,500 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 8 | 1,927,500 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 9 | 1,927,500 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 10 | 1,927,500 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| Total | \$ 19,275,000 |  |  |

III. Capital Expenditure Assumptions

| Year |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ 29,546 |
| 2 | 672,046 |
| 3 | 1,314,546 |
| 4 | 1,957,046 |
| 5 | 1,957,046 |
| 6 | 1,957,046 |
| 7 | 1,957,046 |
| 8 | 1,957,046 |
| 9 | 1,957,046 |
| 10 | 1,957,046 |
| 11 | 1,927,500 |
| 12 | 1,285,000 |
| 13 | 642,500 |
| Total | \$ 19,570,464 |

(1) Estimated Interest Rate per Staff as of May 2020
(2) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(3) There is no existing fund balance because this is a new wastewater impact fee
(4) Per discussions with City Staff and City files, not applicable
(5) Per discussions with City Staff and City files, assumes 0\% of project costs are non-debt funded
(6) Per discussions with City Staff and City files, assumes $100 \%$ of project costs are new debt funded
(7) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(8) Assumes new debt issued in equal annual amounts
(9) Estimated interest on future debt from City's Financial Advisor May 2020
(10) Assumes new debt proceeds expended over a 3-year timeframe

Non-debt funded capital expenditures allocated is equal annual amounts

City of Waco-2020 Wastewater Impact Fee Study<br>Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees<br>Debt Service and Expense Summary<br>Wastewater Service Area


II. Summary of Annual Expenses

| Year |  | New <br> Annual Debt Service ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Annual Capital <br> Expenditures ${ }^{(2)}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Annual } \\ \text { Bond } \\ \text { Proceeds }{ }^{(2)} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Existing <br> Annual Debt <br> Service ${ }^{(3)}$ |  | Total <br> Expense |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 132,571 | \$ | 29,546 | \$ (1,927,500) | \$ | 878,435 | \$ | $(886,948)$ |
| 2 |  | 274,400 |  | 672,046 | $(1,927,500)$ |  | 878,268 |  | $(102,786)$ |
| 3 |  | 422,579 |  | 1,314,546 | $(1,927,500)$ |  | 878,592 |  | 688,217 |
| 4 |  | 577,246 |  | 1,957,046 | $(1,927,500)$ |  | 878,297 |  | 1,485,090 |
| 5 |  | 738,538 |  | 1,957,046 | $(1,927,500)$ |  | 878,452 |  | 1,646,537 |
| 6 |  | 899,830 |  | 1,957,046 | $(1,927,500)$ |  | 878,469 |  | 1,807,846 |
| 7 |  | 1,061,122 |  | 1,957,046 | $(1,927,500)$ |  | 878,805 |  | 1,969,474 |
| 8 |  | 1,222,414 |  | 1,957,046 | $(1,927,500)$ |  | 878,881 |  | 2,130,842 |
| 9 |  | 1,383,706 |  | 1,957,046 | $(1,927,500)$ |  | 878,007 |  | 2,291,260 |
| 10 |  | 1,544,998 |  | 1,957,046 | $(1,927,500)$ |  | 879,364 |  | 2,453,909 |
| 11 |  | 1,544,998 |  | 1,927,500 | - |  | 878,985 |  | 4,351,483 |
| 12 |  | 1,544,998 |  | 1,285,000 | - |  | 878,995 |  | 3,708,993 |
| 13 |  | 1,544,998 |  | 642,500 | - |  | 878,425 |  | 3,065,923 |
| 14 |  | 1,544,998 |  | - | - |  | 878,392 |  | 2,423,390 |
| 15 |  | 1,544,998 |  | - | - |  | 878,524 |  | 2,423,522 |
| 16 |  | 1,544,998 |  | - | - |  | 869,186 |  | 2,414,184 |
| 17 |  | 1,544,998 |  | - | - |  | 852,778 |  | 2,397,776 |
| 18 |  | 1,544,998 |  | - | - |  | 340,940 |  | 1,885,938 |
| 19 |  | 1,544,998 |  | - | - |  | 302,419 |  | 1,847,417 |
| 20 |  | 1,544,998 |  | - | - |  | 219,286 |  | 1,764,284 |
| 21 |  | 1,412,427 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 1,412,427 |
| 22 |  | 1,270,598 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 1,270,598 |
| 23 |  | 1,122,419 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 1,122,419 |
| 24 |  | 967,751 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 967,751 |
| 25 |  | 806,460 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 806,460 |
| 26 |  | 645,168 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 645,168 |
| 27 |  | 483,876 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 483,876 |
| 28 |  | 322,584 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 322,584 |
| 29 |  | 161,292 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 161,292 |
|  | \$ | 30,899,959 | \$ | 19,570,464 | \$ (19,275,000) | \$ | 15,763,501 |  | 46,958,924 |

# City of Waco - 2020 Wastewater Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees

## Revenue Test <br> Wastewater Service Area

| Year |  | Impact <br> Fee | Service <br> Units |  | Impact Fee Revenue |  | Annual $\text { Expenses }{ }^{(1)}$ |  | Sub-Total | Accumulated Interest |  | Estimated Fund Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |
| 1 | \$ | 3,575 | 1,275 | \$ | 4,558,762 | \$ | $(886,948)$ | \$ | 5,445,710 | \$ | 9,530 | 5,455,240 |
| 2 |  | 3,575 | 1,275 |  | 4,558,762 |  | $(102,786)$ |  | 4,661,548 |  | 27,251 | 10,144,039 |
| 3 |  | 3,575 | 1,275 |  | 4,558,762 |  | 688,217 |  | 3,870,545 |  | 42,278 | 14,056,862 |
| 4 |  | 3,575 | 1,275 |  | 4,558,762 |  | 1,485,090 |  | 3,073,672 |  | 54,578 | 17,185,111 |
| 5 |  | 3,575 | 1,275 |  | 4,558,762 |  | 1,646,537 |  | 2,912,225 |  | 65,244 | 20,162,581 |
| 6 |  | 3,575 | 1,275 |  | 4,558,762 |  | 1,807,846 |  | 2,750,917 |  | 75,383 | 22,988,881 |
| 7 |  | 3,575 | 1,275 |  | 4,558,762 |  | 1,969,474 |  | 2,589,289 |  | 84,992 | 25,663,162 |
| 8 |  | 3,575 | 1,275 |  | 4,558,762 |  | 2,130,842 |  | 2,427,920 |  | 94,070 | 28,185,152 |
| 9 |  | 3,575 | 1,275 |  | 4,558,762 |  | 2,291,260 |  | 2,267,503 |  | 102,616 | 30,555,271 |
| 10 |  | 3,575 | 1,275 |  | 4,558,762 |  | 2,453,909 |  | 2,104,853 |  | 110,627 | 32,770,751 |
| 11 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 4,351,483 |  | $(4,351,483)$ |  | 107,083 | 28,526,351 |
| 12 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 3,708,993 |  | $(3,708,993)$ |  | 93,351 | 24,910,709 |
| 13 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 3,065,923 |  | $(3,065,923)$ |  | 81,822 | 21,926,608 |
| 14 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 2,423,390 |  | $(2,423,390)$ |  | 72,502 | 19,575,720 |
| 15 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 2,423,522 |  | $(2,423,522)$ |  | 64,274 | 17,216,472 |
| 16 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 2,414,184 |  | $(2,414,184)$ |  | 56,033 | 14,858,321 |
| 17 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 2,397,776 |  | $(2,397,776)$ |  | 47,808 | 12,508,353 |
| 18 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 1,885,938 |  | $(1,885,938)$ |  | 40,479 | 10,662,894 |
| 19 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 1,847,417 |  | $(1,847,417)$ |  | 34,087 | 8,849,564 |
| 20 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 1,764,284 |  | $(1,764,284)$ |  | 27,886 | 7,113,166 |
| 21 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 1,412,427 |  | $(1,412,427)$ |  | 22,424 | 5,723,164 |
| 22 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 1,270,598 |  | $(1,270,598)$ |  | 17,808 | 4,470,374 |
| 23 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 1,122,419 |  | $(1,122,419)$ |  | 13,682 | 3,361,637 |
| 24 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 967,751 |  | $(967,751)$ |  | 10,072 | 2,403,957 |
| 25 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 806,460 |  | $(806,460)$ |  | 7,003 | 1,604,500 |
| 26 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 645,168 |  | $(645,168)$ |  | 4,487 | 963,819 |
| 27 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 483,876 |  | $(483,876)$ |  | 2,527 | 482,470 |
| 28 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 322,584 |  | $(322,584)$ |  | 1,124 | 161,011 |
| 29 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 161,292 |  | $(161,292)$ |  | 281 | - |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 45,587,622 | \$ | 46,958,924 |  |  | \$ | 1,371,302 |  |

(1) Wastewater Service Area, Page 2 Section II

# City of Waco - 2020 Wastewater Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Impact Fee Calculation <br> Wastewater Service Area 

| Year | Number of Years to End of Period | Future Value Escalation |  | Annual Service Units |  | Annual Expense |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Interest Rate Factor | Recovery Fee Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Actual | Escalated | Actual |  | Escalated |  |
| 1 | 29 | 1.1047 | 1.0000 | 1,275 | 1,409 | \$ | $(886,948)$ | \$ | $(979,814)$ |
| 2 | 28 | 1.1009 | 1.0000 | 1,275 | 1,404 |  | $(102,786)$ |  | $(113,152)$ |
| 3 | 27 | 1.0970 | 1.0000 | 1,275 | 1,399 |  | 688,217 |  | 754,982 |
| 4 | 26 | 1.0932 | 1.0000 | 1,275 | 1,394 |  | 1,485,090 |  | 1,623,479 |
| 5 | 25 | 1.0894 | 1.0000 | 1,275 | 1,389 |  | 1,646,537 |  | 1,793,692 |
| 6 | 24 | 1.0856 | 1.0000 | 1,275 | 1,384 |  | 1,807,846 |  | 1,962,548 |
| 7 | 23 | 1.0818 | 1.0000 | 1,275 | 1,380 |  | 1,969,474 |  | 2,130,550 |
| 8 | 22 | 1.0780 | 1.0000 | 1,275 | 1,375 |  | 2,130,842 |  | 2,297,077 |
| 9 | 21 | 1.0743 | 1.0000 | 1,275 | 1,370 |  | 2,291,260 |  | 2,461,394 |
| 10 | 20 | 1.0705 | 1.0000 | 1,275 | 1,365 |  | 2,453,909 |  | 2,626,926 |
| 11 | 19 | 1.0668 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 4,351,483 |  | 4,642,046 |
| 12 | 18 | 1.0631 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 3,708,993 |  | 3,942,855 |
| 13 | 17 | 1.0593 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 3,065,923 |  | 3,247,870 |
| 14 | 16 | 1.0557 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 2,423,390 |  | 2,558,252 |
| 15 | 15 | 1.0520 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 2,423,522 |  | 2,549,468 |
| 16 | 14 | 1.0483 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 2,414,184 |  | 2,530,788 |
| 17 | 13 | 1.0446 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 2,397,776 |  | 2,504,820 |
| 18 | 12 | 1.0410 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 1,885,938 |  | 1,963,260 |
| 19 | 11 | 1.0374 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 1,847,417 |  | 1,916,453 |
| 20 | 10 | 1.0338 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 1,764,284 |  | 1,823,829 |
| 21 | 9 | 1.0301 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 1,412,427 |  | 1,455,004 |
| 22 | 8 | 1.0266 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 1,270,598 |  | 1,304,335 |
| 23 | 7 | 1.0230 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 1,122,419 |  | 1,148,203 |
| 24 | 6 | 1.0194 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 967,751 |  | 986,529 |
| 25 | 5 | 1.0158 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 806,460 |  | 819,241 |
| 26 | 4 | 1.0123 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 645,168 |  | 653,107 |
| 27 | 3 | 1.0088 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 483,876 |  | 488,122 |
| 28 | 2 | 1.0053 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 322,584 |  | 324,279 |
| 29 | 1 | 1.0018 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 161,292 |  | 161,574 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 13,869 |  |  | \$ | 49,577,716 |
|  | Annual Interest Rate: |  |  |  |  |  | 0.35\% |  |  |
|  | Present Value of Initial Impact Fee Fund Balance |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  |
|  | Total Escalated Expense for Entire Period |  |  |  |  | \$ | 49,577,716 |  |  |
|  | Less Future Value of Initial Impact Fee Fund Balance |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
|  | Sub-Total |  |  |  |  | \$ | 49,577,716 |  |  |
|  | Total Escalated Service Units |  |  |  |  |  | 13,869 |  |  |
| Impact Fee for Wastewater Service Area |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 3,575 |  |  |

City of Waco - 2020 Wastewater Impact Fee Study
Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Impact Fee Project Funding
Wastewater Service Area

## Impact Fee Project Name ${ }^{(1)}$

FM 1637 12/15/21/24-inch Wastewater Line
China Spring 24-inch Wastewater Line
Transfer Lift Station, Force Main, and 66-inch Gravity Line
Bull Hide Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion to 3.0 MGD
Brazos Basin: Gurley Ave
54-inch Wastewater Line at Lake Brazos Park
Belmead Interceptor / Lacy Lakeview Interceptor
TSTC Lift Station Expansion and Force Main
Cloice Creek and Church Road Lift Stations, Force Mains, and 21 -inch Gravity Line Highway 84 30-inch Wastewater Line
Highway 84 24-inch Wastewater Line
China Spring Wastewater Treatment Plant
Highway 84 Wastewater Treatment Plant
New Quest Wastewater Line
24-inch Wastewater Line
Bridge 18-inch Wastewater Line
Impact Fee Study
Total

| Cost In Service Area ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Impact Fee Eligible Cost ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Impact Fee Recoverable Cost ${ }^{(2)}$ |  | Debt Funded ${ }^{(3)}$ |  |  |  | Non-Debt Funded ${ }^{(3)}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Existing | Proposed |  |  |  |
| \$ | 5,773,963 |  |  | \$ | 1,443,491 | \$ | 721,745 | \$ | 721,745 | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  | 14,000,000 |  | 2,800,000 |  |  |  | 1,400,000 |  | - |  | 1,400,000 |  | - |
|  | 45,500,000 |  | 13,650,000 |  | 6,825,000 |  | 6,825,000 |  | - |  | - |
|  | 18,000,000 |  | 3,600,000 |  | 1,800,000 |  | - |  | 1,800,000 |  | - |
|  | 7,000,000 |  | 1,400,000 |  | 700,000 |  | 700,000 |  | - |  | - |
|  | 1,000,000 |  | 100,000 |  | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  | - |  | - |
|  | 16,000,000 |  | 2,400,000 |  | 1,200,000 |  | - |  | 1,200,000 |  | - |
|  | 8,000,000 |  | 1,600,000 |  | 800,000 |  | 800,000 |  | - |  | - |
|  | 10,000,000 |  | 3,000,000 |  | 1,500,000 |  | 1,500,000 |  | - |  | - |
|  | 6,000,000 |  | 1,800,000 |  | 900,000 |  | 900,000 |  | - |  | - |
|  | 4,000,000 |  | 1,600,000 |  | 800,000 |  | 800,000 |  | (0) |  | - |
|  | 35,000,000 |  | 15,750,000 |  | 7,875,000 |  | - |  | 7,875,000 |  | - |
|  | 35,000,000 |  | 14,000,000 |  | 7,000,000 |  | - |  | 7,000,000 |  | - |
|  | 600,000 |  | 150,000 |  | 75,000 |  | - |  | - |  | 75,000 |
|  | 934,274 |  | 186,855 |  | 93,427 |  | - |  | - |  | 93,427 |
|  | 650,000 |  | 130,000 |  | 65,000 |  | - |  | - |  | 65,000 |
|  | 124,073 |  | 124,073 |  | 62,037 |  | - |  | - |  | 62,037 |
| \$ | 207,582,310 | \$ | 63,734,419 | \$ | 31,867,209 | \$ | 12,296,745 | \$ | 19,275,000 | \$ | 295,464 |

(1) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(2) $50 \%$ of Eligible Costs
(3) Per discussions with City staff and City files

## SUMMARY OF ROADWAY IMPACT FEE DETERMINATION

Service Area 1

| Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs | $\$$ | 66,333 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
|  | Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study |  |
| Financing Costs | 39,657 | See Detail Below |
| Interest Earnings | $(3,934)$ | Page 3 of Service Area 1 |
| Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 2 , 0 5 6}$ |
| Sum of Above |  |  |
| Equivalent Connections | 15,947 | Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study |
| Maximum Assessable Impact Fee | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ |

## Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs:

Represents the portion of capital improvement costs that are eligible for funding through Impact fees after adjusting for the $50 \%$ credit. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study. In 2001, the Impact Fee Statute was amended to include either a credit for ad valorem and utility revenues generated by new service units during the ten-year timeframe that are used to fund impact fee eligible projects for which the new service units were charged an impact fee or a credit equal to $50 \%$ of the total cost of implementing the impact fee capital improvement plan. The City has elected to use the $50 \%$ credit.

## Financing Costs:

Represents the interest costs associated with debt financing the new Impact fee project costs. Interest costs are derived from the City's Financial Advisor.

| New Annual Debt Service | \$ | 105,410 | (Page 2 of Service Area 1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Annual Debt Service |  |  | (Page 2 of Service Area 1) |
| Principal Component |  | $(65,754)$ | (Page 5 of Service Area 1) |
| Financing Costs | \$ | 39,657 |  |

## Interest Earnings:

Represents the interest earned on cash flows and assumes a $0.35 \%$ annual interest rate per the most recent investment portfolio. The Impact Fee Statute states that interest earnings are funds of the impact fee account and are held to the same restrictions as impact fee revenues. Therefore, in order to recognize that interest earnings are used to fund capital improvements, interest earnings are credited against the recoverable costs. Reference is the sum of Accumulated Interest on page 3 of Service Area 1.

## Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee:

Represents the sum of Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs (after 50\% credit) plus Financing Costs less Interest Earnings.

## Equivalent Connections:

Represents the growth in equivalent vehicle-miles over the ten-year timeframe. A vehicle-mile is a standardized measure of use attributable to an individual unit of development calculated in accordance with generally accepted engineering standards. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study.

## Maximum Assessable Impact Fee:

Represents Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee divided by Equivalent Connections. This is the maximum impact fee that can be assessed by the City.

# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Impact Fee Calculation Assumptions
Service Area 1
I. General Assumptions
Annual Interest Rate on Deposits ${ }^{(1)}$
Annual Vehicle Mile Growth ${ }^{(2)}$
Existing Fund Balance ${ }^{(3)}$

|  |
| :---: |

Portion of Projects Funded by Existing Debt ${ }^{(4)}$
Non-debt Funded Project Cost ${ }^{(5)}$
New Project Cost Funded Through New Debt ${ }^{(6)}$
Total Recoverable Project Cost ${ }^{(7)}$

| $\$$ | - |
| :--- | ---: |
|  | 579 |
|  | 65,754 |
| $\$$ | 66,333 |

II. New Debt Issues Assumptions

| Year | Principal ${ }^{(8)}$ |  | Interest ${ }^{(9)}$ | Term |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 6,575 | 3.25\% | 20 |
| 2 |  | 6,575 | 4.00\% | 20 |
| 3 |  | 6,575 | 4.50\% | 20 |
| 4 |  | 6,575 | 5.00\% | 20 |
| 5 |  | 6,575 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 6 |  | 6,575 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 7 |  | 6,575 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 8 |  | 6,575 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 9 |  | 6,575 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 10 |  | 6,575 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| Total | \$ | 65,754 |  |  |

III. Capital Expenditure Assumptions

| Year | Annual Capital Expenditures ${ }^{(10)}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 58 |
| 2 |  | 2,250 |
| 3 |  | 4,442 |
| 4 |  | 6,633 |
| 5 |  | 6,633 |
| 6 |  | 6,633 |
| 7 |  | 6,633 |
| 8 |  | 6,633 |
| 9 |  | 6,633 |
| 10 |  | 6,633 |
| 11 |  | 6,575 |
| 12 |  | 4,384 |
| 13 |  | 2,192 |
| Total | \$ | 66,333 |

(1) Estimated Interest Rate per Staff as of May 2020
(2) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(3) There is no existing fund balance because this is a new roadway impact fee
(4) Per discussions with City Staff and City files
(5) This assumes $0 \%$ of new project costs funded through sources other than debt, unless specified otherwise
(6) This assumes $100 \%$ of new project costs funded through new debt issues, unless specified otherwise
(7) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(8) Assumes new debt issued in equal annual amounts
(9) Estimated interest on future debt from Financial Advisor as of May 2020
(10) Assumes new debt proceeds expended over a 3-year timeframe Non-debt funded capital expenditures allocated in equal annual amounts

# City of Waco-2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Debt Service and Expense Summary
Service Area 1

## I. New Debt Service Detai

| Year |  | Series $\underline{1}$ |  | Series $\underline{2}$ |  | Series $\underline{\mathbf{3}}$ |  | Series $\underline{4}$ |  | Series $\underline{5}$ |  | Series $\underline{6}$ |  | Series <br> 7 |  | Series $\underline{8}$ |  | Series $\underline{9}$ |  | Series $10$ | New Debt Service |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 452 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 452 |
| 2 |  | 452 |  | 484 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 936 |
| 3 |  | 452 |  | 484 |  | 505 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 1,442 |
| 4 |  | 452 |  | 484 |  | 505 |  | 528 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 1,969 |
| 5 |  | 452 |  | 484 |  | 505 |  | 528 |  | 550 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 2,519 |
| 6 |  | 452 |  | 484 |  | 505 |  | 528 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 3,070 |
| 7 |  | 452 |  | 484 |  | 505 |  | 528 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 3,620 |
| 8 |  | 452 |  | 484 |  | 505 |  | 528 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | - |  | - |  | 4,170 |
| 9 |  | 452 |  | 484 |  | 505 |  | 528 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | - |  | 4,720 |
| 10 |  | 452 |  | 484 |  | 505 |  | 528 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 5,271 |
| 11 |  | 452 |  | 484 |  | 505 |  | 528 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 5,271 |
| 12 |  | 452 |  | 484 |  | 505 |  | 528 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 5,271 |
| 13 |  | 452 |  | 484 |  | 505 |  | 528 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 5,271 |
| 14 |  | 452 |  | 484 |  | 505 |  | 528 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 5,271 |
| 15 |  | 452 |  | 484 |  | 505 |  | 528 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 5,271 |
| 16 |  | 452 |  | 484 |  | 505 |  | 528 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 5,271 |
| 17 |  | 452 |  | 484 |  | 505 |  | 528 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 5,271 |
| 18 |  | 452 |  | 484 |  | 505 |  | 528 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 5,271 |
| 19 |  | 452 |  | 484 |  | 505 |  | 528 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 5,271 |
| 20 |  | 452 |  | 484 |  | 505 |  | 528 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 5,271 |
| 21 |  | - |  | 484 |  | 505 |  | 528 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 4,818 |
| 22 |  | - |  | - |  | 505 |  | 528 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 4,334 |
| 23 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 528 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 3,829 |
| 24 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 3,301 |
| 25 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 2,751 |
| 26 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 2,201 |
| 27 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 1,651 |
| 28 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 550 |  | 550 |  | 1,100 |
| 29 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 550 |  | 550 |
|  | \$ | 9,045 | \$ | 9,677 | \$ | 10,110 | \$ | 10,552 | \$ | 11,004 | \$ | 11,004 | \$ | 11,004 | \$ | 11,004 | \$ | 11,004 | \$ | 11,004 | \$ | 55,410 |

II. Summary of Annual Expenses

| Year |  | New <br> Annual <br> Debt <br> Service ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Annual Capital Expenditures ${ }^{(2)}$ |  | Annual Bond Proceeds ${ }^{(2)}$ |  | Existing <br> Annual Debt $\qquad$ |  | Total Expense |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 452 | \$ | \$ 58 | \$ | $(6,575)$ | \$ | - | \$ | $(6,065)$ |
| 2 |  | 936 |  | 2,250 |  | $(6,575)$ |  | - |  | $(3,390)$ |
| 3 |  | 1,442 |  | 4,442 |  | $(6,575)$ |  | - |  | (692) |
| 4 |  | 1,969 |  | 6,633 |  | $(6,575)$ |  | - |  | 2,027 |
| 5 |  | 2,519 |  | 6,633 |  | $(6,575)$ |  | - |  | 2,577 |
| 6 |  | 3,070 |  | 6,633 |  | $(6,575)$ |  | - |  | 3,128 |
| 7 |  | 3,620 |  | 6,633 |  | $(6,575)$ |  | - |  | 3,678 |
| 8 |  | 4,170 |  | 6,633 |  | $(6,575)$ |  | - |  | 4,228 |
| 9 |  | 4,720 |  | 6,633 |  | $(6,575)$ |  | - |  | 4,778 |
| 10 |  | 5,271 |  | 6,633 |  | $(6,575)$ |  | - |  | 5,328 |
| 11 |  | 5,271 |  | 6,575 |  | - |  | - |  | 11,846 |
| 12 |  | 5,271 |  | 4,384 |  | - |  | - |  | 9,654 |
| 13 |  | 5,271 |  | 2,192 |  | - |  | - |  | 7,462 |
| 14 |  | 5,271 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 5,271 |
| 15 |  | 5,271 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 5,271 |
| 16 |  | 5,271 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 5,271 |
| 17 |  | 5,271 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 5,271 |
| 18 |  | 5,271 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 5,271 |
| 19 |  | 5,271 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 5,271 |
| 20 |  | 5,271 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 5,271 |
| 21 |  | 4,818 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 4,818 |
| 22 |  | 4,334 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 4,334 |
| 23 |  | 3,829 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 3,829 |
| 24 |  | 3,301 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 3,301 |
| 25 |  | 2,751 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 2,751 |
| 26 |  | 2,201 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 2,201 |
| 27 |  | 1,651 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 1,651 |
| 28 |  | 1,100 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 1,100 |
| 29 |  | 550 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 550 |
|  | \$ | 105,410 |  | \$ 66,333 | \$ | $(65,754)$ | \$ | - | \$ | 105,990 |

(1) Service Area 1, Page 2 Section
(2) Service Area 1, Page 1
(3) Eligible debt funded projects as a percent of total principal times original annual debt service; does not reflect current outstanding balances

# City of Waco-2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Revenue Test
Service Area 1

| Year |  | Impact <br> Fee | Vehicle <br> Miles |  | Impact Fee Revenue |  | Annual Expenses ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Sub-Total | Accumulated Interest |  | Estimated Fund Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ |
| 1 | \$ | 6 | 1,595 | \$ | 10,206 | \$ | $(6,065)$ | \$ | 16,271 | \$ | 28 | 16,299 |
| 2 |  | 6 | 1,595 |  | 10,206 |  | $(3,390)$ |  | 13,595 |  | 81 | 29,975 |
| 3 |  | 6 | 1,595 |  | 10,206 |  | (692) |  | 10,898 |  | 124 | 40,997 |
| 4 |  | 6 | 1,595 |  | 10,206 |  | 2,027 |  | 8,178 |  | 158 | 49,333 |
| 5 |  | 6 | 1,595 |  | 10,206 |  | 2,577 |  | 7,628 |  | 186 | 57,148 |
| 6 |  | 6 | 1,595 |  | 10,206 |  | 3,128 |  | 7,078 |  | 212 | 64,438 |
| 7 |  | 6 | 1,595 |  | 10,206 |  | 3,678 |  | 6,528 |  | 237 | 71,203 |
| 8 |  | 6 | 1,595 |  | 10,206 |  | 4,228 |  | 5,978 |  | 260 | 77,440 |
| 9 |  | 6 | 1,595 |  | 10,206 |  | 4,778 |  | 5,427 |  | 281 | 83,148 |
| 10 |  | 6 | 1,595 |  | 10,206 |  | 5,328 |  | 4,877 |  | 300 | 88,325 |
| 11 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 11,846 |  | $(11,846)$ |  | 288 | 76,767 |
| 12 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 9,654 |  | $(9,654)$ |  | 252 | 67,365 |
| 13 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 7,462 |  | $(7,462)$ |  | 223 | 60,125 |
| 14 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 5,271 |  | $(5,271)$ |  | 201 | 55,056 |
| 15 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 5,271 |  | $(5,271)$ |  | 183 | 49,969 |
| 16 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 5,271 |  | $(5,271)$ |  | 166 | 44,864 |
| 17 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 5,271 |  | $(5,271)$ |  | 148 | 39,741 |
| 18 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 5,271 |  | $(5,271)$ |  | 130 | 34,601 |
| 19 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 5,271 |  | $(5,271)$ |  | 112 | 29,442 |
| 20 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 5,271 |  | $(5,271)$ |  | 94 | 24,265 |
| 21 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 4,818 |  | $(4,818)$ |  | 76 | 19,524 |
| 22 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 4,334 |  | $(4,334)$ |  | 61 | 15,250 |
| 23 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 3,829 |  | $(3,829)$ |  | 47 | 11,468 |
| 24 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 3,301 |  | $(3,301)$ |  | 34 | 8,201 |
| 25 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 2,751 |  | $(2,751)$ |  | 24 | 5,473 |
| 26 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 2,201 |  | $(2,201)$ |  | 15 | 3,288 |
| 27 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 1,651 |  | $(1,651)$ |  | 9 | 1,646 |
| 28 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 1,100 |  | $(1,100)$ |  | 4 | 549 |
| 29 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 550 |  | (550) |  | 1 | - |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 102,056 | \$ | 105,990 |  |  | \$ | ,934 |  |

(1) Service Area 1, Page 2 Section II

# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Impact Fee Calculation <br> Service Area 1 



# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Impact Fee Project Funding
Service Area 1

(1) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(2) $50 \%$ of Eligible Costs

Service Area 1
Page 5 of 5
l-18

## SUMMARY OF ROADWAY IMPACT FEE DETERMINATION

Service Area 2

| Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs | $\$$ | $2,102,651$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
|  | Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study |  |
| Financing Costs | $1,265,970$ | See Detail Below |
| Interest Earnings | $(125,579)$ | Page 3 of Service Area 2 |
| Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 2 4 3 , 0 4 2}$ |
| Sum of Above |  |  |
| Equivalent Connections | 4,650 | Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study |
| Maximum Assessable Impact Fee | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{6 9 7}$ |

## Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs:

Represents the portion of capital improvement costs that are eligible for funding through Impact fees after adjusting for the $50 \%$ credit. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study. In 2001, the Impact Fee Statute was amended to include either a credit for ad valorem and utility revenues generated by new service units during the ten-year timeframe that are used to fund impact fee eligible projects for which the new service units were charged an impact fee or a credit equal to $50 \%$ of the total cost of implementing the impact fee capital improvement plan. The City has elected to use the $50 \%$ credit.

## Financing Costs:

Represents the interest costs associated with debt financing the new Impact fee project costs. Interest costs are derived from the City's Financial Advisor.

| New Annual Debt Service | \$ | 3,365,036 | (Page 2 of Service Area 2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Annual Debt Service |  |  | (Page 2 of Service Area 2) |
| Principal Component |  | $(2,099,067)$ | Page 5 of Service Area 2) |
| Financing Costs | \$ | 1,265,970 |  |

## Interest Earnings:

Represents the interest earned on cash flows and assumes a $0.35 \%$ annual interest rate per the most recent investment portfolio. The Impact Fee Statute states that interest earnings are funds of the impact fee account and are held to the same restrictions as impact fee revenues. Therefore, in order to recognize that interest earnings are used to fund capital improvements, interest earnings are credited against the recoverable costs. Reference is the sum of Accumulated Interest on page 3 of Service Area 2.

## Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee:

Represents the sum of Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs (after 50\% credit) plus Financing Costs less Interest Earnings.

## Equivalent Connections:

Represents the growth in equivalent vehicle-miles over the ten-year timeframe. A vehicle-mile is a standardized measure of use attributable to an individual unit of development calculated in accordance with generally accepted engineering standards. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study.

## Maximum Assessable Impact Fee:

Represents Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee divided by Equivalent Connections. This is the maximum impact fee that can be assessed by the City.

## City of Waco-2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Impact Fee Calculation Assumptions Service Area 2

I. General Assumptions

| Annual Interest Rate on Deposits ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | 0.35\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Annual Vehicle Mile Growth ${ }^{(2)}$ |  | 465 |
| Existing Fund Balance ${ }^{(3)}$ | \$ | - |
| Portion of Projects Funded by Existing Debt ${ }^{(4)}$ | \$ |  |
| Non-debt Funded Project Cost ${ }^{(5)}$ |  | 3,584 |
| New Project Cost Funded Through New Debt ${ }^{(6)}$ |  | 2,099,067 |
| Total Recoverable Project Cost ${ }^{(7)}$ | \$ | 2,102,651 |

II. New Debt Issues Assumptions

| Year | Principal ${ }^{(8)}$ | Interest ${ }^{(9)}$ | Term |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ 209,907 | 3.25\% | 20 |
| 2 | 209,907 | 4.00\% | 20 |
| 3 | 209,907 | 4.50\% | 20 |
| 4 | 209,907 | 5.00\% | 20 |
| 5 | 209,907 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 6 | 209,907 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 7 | 209,907 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 8 | 209,907 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 9 | 209,907 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 10 | 209,907 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| Total | \$ 2,099,067 |  |  |

III. Capital Expenditure Assumptions

| Year | Annual Capital <br> Expenditures ${ }^{(10)}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 358 |
| 2 |  | 70,327 |
| 3 |  | 140,296 |
| 4 |  | 210,265 |
| 5 |  | 210,265 |
| 6 |  | 210,265 |
| 7 |  | 210,265 |
| 8 |  | 210,265 |
| 9 |  | 210,265 |
| 10 |  | 210,265 |
| 11 |  | 209,907 |
| 12 |  | 139,938 |
| 13 |  | 69,969 |
| Total | \$ | 2,102,651 |

(1) Estimated Interest Rate per Staff as of May 2020
(2) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(3) There is no existing fund balance because this is a new roadway impact fee
(4) Per discussions with City Staff and City files
(5) This assumes $0 \%$ of new project costs funded through sources other than debt, unless specified otherwise
(6) This assumes $100 \%$ of new project costs funded through new debt issues, unless specified otherwise
(7) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(8) Assumes new debt issued in equal annual amounts
(9) Estimated interest on future debt from Financial Advisor as of May 2020
(10) Assumes new debt proceeds expended over a 3-year timeframe Non-debt funded capital expenditures allocated in equal annual amounts

# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Debt Service and Expense Summary
Service Area 2

## I. New Debt Service Detail

| Year |  | Series 1 |  | Series $\underline{2}$ |  | Series <br> 3 |  | Series $4$ |  | Series 5 |  | Series <br> $\underline{6}$ |  | Series <br> 7 |  | Series <br> 8 |  | Series $\underline{9}$ |  | Series 10 |  | w Debt ervice |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 14,437 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 14,437 |
| 2 |  | 14,437 |  | 15,445 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 29,882 |
| 3 |  | 14,437 |  | 15,445 |  | 16,137 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 46,019 |
| 4 |  | 14,437 |  | 15,445 |  | 16,137 |  | 16,843 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 62,863 |
| 5 |  | 14,437 |  | 15,445 |  | 16,137 |  | 16,843 |  | 17,565 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 80,428 |
| 6 |  | 14,437 |  | 15,445 |  | 16,137 |  | 16,843 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 97,992 |
| 7 |  | 14,437 |  | 15,445 |  | 16,137 |  | 16,843 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 115,557 |
| 8 |  | 14,437 |  | 15,445 |  | 16,137 |  | 16,843 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | - |  | - |  | 133,122 |
| 9 |  | 14,437 |  | 15,445 |  | 16,137 |  | 16,843 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | - |  | 150,687 |
| 10 |  | 14,437 |  | 15,445 |  | 16,137 |  | 16,843 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 168,252 |
| 11 |  | 14,437 |  | 15,445 |  | 16,137 |  | 16,843 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 168,252 |
| 12 |  | 14,437 |  | 15,445 |  | 16,137 |  | 16,843 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 168,252 |
| 13 |  | 14,437 |  | 15,445 |  | 16,137 |  | 16,843 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 168,252 |
| 14 |  | 14,437 |  | 15,445 |  | 16,137 |  | 16,843 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 168,252 |
| 15 |  | 14,437 |  | 15,445 |  | 16,137 |  | 16,843 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 168,252 |
| 16 |  | 14,437 |  | 15,445 |  | 16,137 |  | 16,843 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 168,252 |
| 17 |  | 14,437 |  | 15,445 |  | 16,137 |  | 16,843 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 168,252 |
| 18 |  | 14,437 |  | 15,445 |  | 16,137 |  | 16,843 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 168,252 |
| 19 |  | 14,437 |  | 15,445 |  | 16,137 |  | 16,843 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 168,252 |
| 20 |  | 14,437 |  | 15,445 |  | 16,137 |  | 16,843 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 168,252 |
| 21 |  | - |  | 15,445 |  | 16,137 |  | 16,843 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 153,815 |
| 22 |  | - |  | - |  | 16,137 |  | 16,843 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 138,369 |
| 23 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 16,843 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 122,233 |
| 24 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 105,389 |
| 25 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 87,824 |
| 26 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 70,259 |
| 27 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 52,695 |
| 28 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |  | 35,130 |
| 29 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 17,565 |  | 17,565 |
|  | \$ | 288,743 | \$ | 308,906 | \$ | 322,736 | \$ | 336,869 | \$ | 351,297 | \$ | 351,297 | \$ | 351,297 | \$ | 351,297 | \$ | 351,297 | \$ | 351,297 | \$ | 3,365,036 |

II. Summary of Annual Expenses

| Year |  | New Annual Debt Service ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Annual Capital xpenditures ${ }^{(2)}$ |  | Annual <br> Bond <br> Proceeds ${ }^{(2)}$ | Existing <br> Annual <br> Debt <br> Service ${ }^{(3)}$ |  | Total Expense |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 14,437 | \$ | 358 | \$ | $(209,907)$ | \$ | \$ | $(195,111)$ |
| 2 |  | 29,882 |  | 70,327 |  | $(209,907)$ | - |  | $(109,697)$ |
| 3 |  | 46,019 |  | 140,296 |  | $(209,907)$ | - |  | $(23,591)$ |
| 4 |  | 62,863 |  | 210,265 |  | $(209,907)$ | - |  | 63,221 |
| 5 |  | 80,428 |  | 210,265 |  | $(209,907)$ | - |  | 80,786 |
| 6 |  | 97,992 |  | 210,265 |  | $(209,907)$ | - |  | 98,351 |
| 7 |  | 115,557 |  | 210,265 |  | $(209,907)$ | - |  | 115,916 |
| 8 |  | 133,122 |  | 210,265 |  | $(209,907)$ | - |  | 133,481 |
| 9 |  | 150,687 |  | 210,265 |  | $(209,907)$ | - |  | 151,045 |
| 10 |  | 168,252 |  | 210,265 |  | $(209,907)$ |  |  | 168,610 |
| 11 |  | 168,252 |  | 209,907 |  | - | - |  | 378,158 |
| 12 |  | 168,252 |  | 139,938 |  | - | - |  | 308,190 |
| 13 |  | 168,252 |  | 69,969 |  | - |  |  | 238,221 |
| 14 |  | 168,252 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 168,252 |
| 15 |  | 168,252 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 168,252 |
| 16 |  | 168,252 |  | - |  | - |  |  | 168,252 |
| 17 |  | 168,252 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 168,252 |
| 18 |  | 168,252 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 168,252 |
| 19 |  | 168,252 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 168,252 |
| 20 |  | 168,252 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 168,252 |
| 21 |  | 153,815 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 153,815 |
| 22 |  | 138,369 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 138,369 |
| 23 |  | 122,233 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 122,233 |
| 24 |  | 105,389 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 105,389 |
| 25 |  | 87,824 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 87,824 |
| 26 |  | 70,259 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 70,259 |
| 27 |  | 52,695 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 52,695 |
| 28 |  | 35,130 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 35,130 |
| 29 |  | 17,565 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 17,565 |

(1) Service Area 2, Page 2 Section
(2) Service Area 2, Page 1
(3) Eligible debt funded projects as a percent of total principal times original annual debt service; does not reflect current outstanding balances

# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Revenue Test
Service Area 2

| Year |  | Impact <br> Fee | Vehicle <br> Miles |  | Impact Fee Revenue |  | Annual $\text { Expenses }^{(1)}$ | Sub-Total |  | Accumulated Interest |  |  | Estimated <br> Fund <br> Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
| 1 | \$ | 697 | 465 | \$ | 324,304 | \$ | $(195,111)$ | \$ | 519,415 | \$ | 909 |  | 520,324 |
| 2 |  | 697 | 465 |  | 324,304 |  | $(109,697)$ |  | 434,001 |  | 2,581 |  | 956,906 |
| 3 |  | 697 | 465 |  | 324,304 |  | $(23,591)$ |  | 347,895 |  | 3,958 |  | 1,308,759 |
| 4 |  | 697 | 465 |  | 324,304 |  | 63,221 |  | 261,083 |  | 5,038 |  | 1,574,880 |
| 5 |  | 697 | 465 |  | 324,304 |  | 80,786 |  | 243,518 |  | 5,938 |  | 1,824,336 |
| 6 |  | 697 | 465 |  | 324,304 |  | 98,351 |  | 225,953 |  | 6,781 |  | 2,057,070 |
| 7 |  | 697 | 465 |  | 324,304 |  | 115,916 |  | 208,389 |  | 7,564 |  | 2,273,023 |
| 8 |  | 697 | 465 |  | 324,304 |  | 133,481 |  | 190,824 |  | 8,290 |  | 2,472,136 |
| 9 |  | 697 | 465 |  | 324,304 |  | 151,045 |  | 173,259 |  | 8,956 |  | 2,654,351 |
| 10 |  | 697 | 465 |  | 324,304 |  | 168,610 |  | 155,694 |  | 9,563 |  | 2,819,608 |
| 11 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 378,158 |  | $(378,158)$ |  | 9,207 |  | 2,450,656 |
| 12 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 308,190 |  | $(308,190)$ |  | 8,038 |  | 2,150,504 |
| 13 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 238,221 |  | $(238,221)$ |  | 7,110 |  | 1,919,394 |
| 14 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 168,252 |  | $(168,252)$ |  | 6,423 |  | 1,757,565 |
| 15 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 168,252 |  | $(168,252)$ |  | 5,857 |  | 1,595,170 |
| 16 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 168,252 |  | $(168,252)$ |  | 5,289 |  | 1,432,207 |
| 17 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 168,252 |  | $(168,252)$ |  | 4,718 |  | 1,268,674 |
| 18 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 168,252 |  | $(168,252)$ |  | 4,146 |  | 1,104,568 |
| 19 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 168,252 |  | $(168,252)$ |  | 3,572 |  | 939,888 |
| 20 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 168,252 |  | $(168,252)$ |  | 2,995 |  | 774,631 |
| 21 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 153,815 |  | $(153,815)$ |  | 2,442 |  | 623,258 |
| 22 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 138,369 |  | $(138,369)$ |  | 1,939 |  | 486,828 |
| 23 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 122,233 |  | $(122,233)$ |  | 1,490 |  | 366,086 |
| 24 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 105,389 |  | $(105,389)$ |  | 1,097 |  | 261,793 |
| 25 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 87,824 |  | $(87,824)$ |  | 763 |  | 174,732 |
| 26 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 70,259 |  | $(70,259)$ |  | 489 |  | 104,961 |
| 27 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 52,695 |  | $(52,695)$ |  | 275 |  | 52,541 |
| 28 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 35,130 |  | $(35,130)$ |  | 122 |  | 17,534 |
| 29 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 17,565 |  | $(17,565)$ |  | 31 |  | - |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 3,243,042 | \$ | 3,368,620 |  |  | \$ | 25,579 |  |  |

(1) Service Area 2, Page 2 Section II

# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Impact Fee Calculation <br> Service Area 2 

| Year | Number of Years to End of Period | Interest Rate Factor | Impact Fee <br> Factor | Annual Vehicle Miles |  | Annual Expense |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Actual | Escalated |  | Actual |  | scalated |
| 1 | 29 | 1.1047 | 1.0000 | 465 | 514 | \$ | $(195,111)$ | \$ | $(215,540)$ |
| 2 | 28 | 1.1009 | 1.0000 | 465 | 512 |  | $(109,697)$ |  | $(120,760)$ |
| 3 | 27 | 1.0970 | 1.0000 | 465 | 510 |  | $(23,591)$ |  | $(25,880)$ |
| 4 | 26 | 1.0932 | 1.0000 | 465 | 508 |  | 63,221 |  | 69,112 |
| 5 | 25 | 1.0894 | 1.0000 | 465 | 507 |  | 80,786 |  | 88,006 |
| 6 | 24 | 1.0856 | 1.0000 | 465 | 505 |  | 98,351 |  | 106,767 |
| 7 | 23 | 1.0818 | 1.0000 | 465 | 503 |  | 115,916 |  | 125,396 |
| 8 | 22 | 1.0780 | 1.0000 | 465 | 501 |  | 133,481 |  | 143,894 |
| 9 | 21 | 1.0743 | 1.0000 | 465 | 500 |  | 151,045 |  | 162,261 |
| 10 | 20 | 1.0705 | 1.0000 | 465 | 498 |  | 168,610 |  | 180,498 |
| 11 | 19 | 1.0668 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 378,158 |  | 403,409 |
| 12 | 18 | 1.0631 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 308,190 |  | 327,622 |
| 13 | 17 | 1.0593 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 238,221 |  | 252,358 |
| 14 | 16 | 1.0557 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 168,252 |  | 177,615 |
| 15 | 15 | 1.0520 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 168,252 |  | 176,996 |
| 16 | 14 | 1.0483 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 168,252 |  | 176,378 |
| 17 | 13 | 1.0446 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 168,252 |  | 175,763 |
| 18 | 12 | 1.0410 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 168,252 |  | 175,150 |
| 19 | 11 | 1.0374 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 168,252 |  | 174,539 |
| 20 | 10 | 1.0338 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 168,252 |  | 173,930 |
| 21 | 9 | 1.0301 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 153,815 |  | 158,451 |
| 22 | 8 | 1.0266 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 138,369 |  | 142,043 |
| 23 | 7 | 1.0230 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 122,233 |  | 125,040 |
| 24 | 6 | 1.0194 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 105,389 |  | 107,434 |
| 25 | 5 | 1.0158 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 87,824 |  | 89,216 |
| 26 | 4 | 1.0123 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 70,259 |  | 71,124 |
| 27 | 3 | 1.0088 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 52,695 |  | 53,157 |
| 28 | 2 | 1.0053 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 35,130 |  | 35,314 |
| 29 | 1 | 1.0018 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 17,565 |  | 17,596 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 5,057 |  |  | \$ | 3,526,892 |
|  | Annual Interest Rate: |  |  |  |  | 0.35\% |  |  |  |
|  | Value of Initial Impact Fee Fund Balance |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  |
|  | Total Escalated Expense for Entire Period |  |  |  |  | \$ | 3,526,892 |  |  |
|  | Less Future Value of Initial Impact Fee Fund Balance |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
|  | Sub-Total |  |  |  |  | \$ | 3,526,892 |  |  |
|  | Total Escalated Vehicle Miles |  |  |  |  |  | 5,057 |  |  |
|  | Impact Fee For Service Area 2 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 697 |  |  |

# City of Waco-2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Impact Fee Project Funding
Service Area 2
Impact Fee Roadway ${ }^{(1)}$

Lake Shore Dr (From Mt Carmel Dr To Koehne Park Dr) Valley Mills Dr (From Koehne Park Dr To Hillandale Rd) Valley Mills Dr (From Hillandale Rd To Ridgewood Dr) Valley Mills Dr (From Ridgewood Dr To Bishop Dr) Impact Fee Study

Total

| Impact Fee Project No. ${ }^{(1)}$ | Cost In <br> Service Area ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Impact Fee Eligible Cost ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Impact Fee <br> Recoverable Cost |  | Debt Funded ${ }^{(3)}$ Proposed |  | Non-Debt Funded ${ }^{(3)}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | \$ | 2,456,367 | \$ | 2,371,719 | \$ | 1,185,859 | \$ | 1,185,859 | \$ | - |
| 4 |  | 508,867 |  | 491,331 |  | 245,665 |  | 245,665 |  | - |
| 5 |  | 900,533 |  | 869,500 |  | 434,750 |  | 434,750 |  | - |
| 6 |  | 482,200 |  | 465,583 |  | 232,792 |  | 232,792 |  | - |
|  |  | 7,168 |  | 7,168 |  | 3,584 |  | - |  | 3,584 |
|  | \$ | 4,355,135 | \$ | 4,205,302 | \$ | 2,102,651 | \$ | 2,099,067 | \$ | 3,584 |

(1) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(2) $50 \%$ of Eligible Costs

## SUMMARY OF ROADWAY IMPACT FEE DETERMINATION

Service Area 3

| Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs | $\$$ | $3,604,402$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
|  | Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study |  |
| Financing Costs | $2,167,182$ | See Detail Below |
| Interest Earnings | $(214,975)$ | Page 3 of Service Area 3 |
| Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee | $\mathbf{5 , 5 5 6 , 6 0 9}$ | Sum of Above |
| Equivalent Connections | 4,293 | Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study |
| Maximum Assessable Impact Fee | $\mathbf{1 , 2 9 4}$ |  |

## Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs:

Represents the portion of capital improvement costs that are eligible for funding through Impact fees after adjusting for the $50 \%$ credit. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study. In 2001, the Impact Fee Statute was amended to include either a credit for ad valorem and utility revenues generated by new service units during the ten-year timeframe that are used to fund impact fee eligible projects for which the new service units were charged an impact fee or a credit equal to $50 \%$ of the total cost of implementing the impact fee capital improvement plan. The City has elected to use the $50 \%$ credit.

## Financing Costs:

Represents the interest costs associated with debt financing the new Impact fee project costs. Interest costs are derived from the City's Financial Advisor.

| New Annual Debt Service | $\$$ | $5,760,522$ <br> Existing Annual Debt Service <br> (Page 2 of Service Area 3) <br> (Page 2 of Service Area 3) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Principal Component |  | $(3,593,340)$ <br> $\quad$ (Page 5 of Service Area 3) |
| $\quad$ Financing Costs | $\$ 167,182$ |  |

## Interest Earnings:

Represents the interest earned on cash flows and assumes a $0.35 \%$ annual interest rate per the most recent investment portfolio. The Impact Fee Statute states that interest earnings are funds of the impact fee account and are held to the same restrictions as impact fee revenues. Therefore, in order to recognize that interest earnings are used to fund capital improvements, interest earnings are credited against the recoverable costs. Reference is the sum of Accumulated Interest on page 3 of Service Area 3.

## Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee:

Represents the sum of Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs (after 50\% credit) plus Financing Costs less Interest Earnings.

## Equivalent Connections:

Represents the growth in equivalent vehicle-miles over the ten-year timeframe. A vehicle-mile is a standardized measure of use attributable to an individual unit of development calculated in accordance with generally accepted engineering standards. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study.

## Maximum Assessable Impact Fee:

Represents Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee divided by Equivalent Connections. This is the maximum impact fee that can be assessed by the City.

## City of Waco-2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Impact Fee Calculation Assumptions Service Area 3

## I. General Assumptions

| Annual Interest Rate on Deposits ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | 0.35\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Annual Vehicle Mile Growth ${ }^{(2)}$ |  | 429 |
| Existing Fund Balance ${ }^{(3)}$ | \$ |  |
| Portion of Projects Funded by Existing Debt ${ }^{(4)}$ | \$ |  |
| Non-debt Funded Project Cost ${ }^{(5)}$ |  | 11,062 |
| New Project Cost Funded Through New Debt ${ }^{(6)}$ |  | 3,593,340 |
| Total Recoverable Project Cost ${ }^{(7)}$ | \$ | 3,604,402 |

II. New Debt Issues Assumptions


## III. Capital Expenditure Assumptions

| Year | $\begin{gathered} \text { Annual } \\ \text { Capital } \\ \text { Expenditures }^{(10)} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 1,106 |
| 2 |  | 120,884 |
| 3 |  | 240,662 |
| 4 |  | 360,440 |
| 5 |  | 360,440 |
| 6 |  | 360,440 |
| 7 |  | 360,440 |
| 8 |  | 360,440 |
| 9 |  | 360,440 |
| 10 |  | 360,440 |
| 11 |  | 359,334 |
| 12 |  | 239,556 |
| 13 |  | 119,778 |
| Total | \$ | 3,604,402 |

(1) Estimated Interest Rate per Staff as of May 2020
(2) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(3) There is no existing fund balance because this is a new roadway impact fee
(4) Per discussions with City Staff and City files
(5) This assumes $0 \%$ of new project costs funded through sources other than debt, unless specified otherwise
(6) This assumes $100 \%$ of new project costs funded through new debt issues, unless specified otherwise
(7) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(8) Assumes new debt issued in equal annual amounts
(9) Estimated interest on future debt from Financial Advisor as of May 2020
(10) Assumes new debt proceeds expended over a 3-year timeframe Non-debt funded capital expenditures allocated in equal annual amounts

# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Debt Service and Expense Summary
Service Area 3

## I. New Debt Service Detail

| Year |  | Series 1 |  | Series 2 |  | Series <br> 3 |  | Series $4$ |  | Series 5 |  | Series <br> $\underline{6}$ |  | Series <br> 7 |  | Series <br> 8 |  | Series $\underline{9}$ |  | Series 10 |  | New Debt Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 24,715 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 24,715 |
| 2 |  | 24,715 |  | 26,440 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 51,155 |
| 3 |  | 24,715 |  | 26,440 |  | 27,624 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 78,779 |
| 4 |  | 24,715 |  | 26,440 |  | 27,624 |  | 28,834 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 107,613 |
| 5 |  | 24,715 |  | 26,440 |  | 27,624 |  | 28,834 |  | 30,069 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 137,682 |
| 6 |  | 24,715 |  | 26,440 |  | 27,624 |  | 28,834 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 167,751 |
| 7 |  | 24,715 |  | 26,440 |  | 27,624 |  | 28,834 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 197,820 |
| 8 |  | 24,715 |  | 26,440 |  | 27,624 |  | 28,834 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | - |  | - |  | 227,888 |
| 9 |  | 24,715 |  | 26,440 |  | 27,624 |  | 28,834 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | - |  | 257,957 |
| 10 |  | 24,715 |  | 26,440 |  | 27,624 |  | 28,834 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 288,026 |
| 11 |  | 24,715 |  | 26,440 |  | 27,624 |  | 28,834 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 288,026 |
| 12 |  | 24,715 |  | 26,440 |  | 27,624 |  | 28,834 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 288,026 |
| 13 |  | 24,715 |  | 26,440 |  | 27,624 |  | 28,834 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 288,026 |
| 14 |  | 24,715 |  | 26,440 |  | 27,624 |  | 28,834 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 288,026 |
| 15 |  | 24,715 |  | 26,440 |  | 27,624 |  | 28,834 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 288,026 |
| 16 |  | 24,715 |  | 26,440 |  | 27,624 |  | 28,834 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 288,026 |
| 17 |  | 24,715 |  | 26,440 |  | 27,624 |  | 28,834 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 288,026 |
| 18 |  | 24,715 |  | 26,440 |  | 27,624 |  | 28,834 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 288,026 |
| 19 |  | 24,715 |  | 26,440 |  | 27,624 |  | 28,834 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 288,026 |
| 20 |  | 24,715 |  | 26,440 |  | 27,624 |  | 28,834 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 288,026 |
| 21 |  | - |  | 26,440 |  | 27,624 |  | 28,834 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 263,311 |
| 22 |  | - |  | - |  | 27,624 |  | 28,834 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 236,871 |
| 23 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 28,834 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 209,247 |
| 24 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 180,413 |
| 25 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 150,344 |
| 26 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 120,275 |
| 27 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 90,206 |
| 28 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |  | 60,138 |
| 29 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 30,069 |  | 30,069 |
|  | \$ | 494,292 | \$ | 528,808 | \$ | 552,484 | \$ | 576,678 | \$ | 601,377 | \$ | 601,377 | \$ | 601,377 | \$ | 601,377 | \$ | 601,377 | \$ | 601,377 | \$ | 5,760,522 |

II. Summary of Annual Expenses

| Year |  | New <br> Annual Debt Service ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Annual Capital xpenditures ${ }^{(2)}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Annual } \\ \text { Bond } \\ \text { Proceeds }^{(2)} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Existing Annual Debt Service ${ }^{(3)}$ |  | Total Expense |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 24,715 | \$ | 1,106 | \$ $(359,334)$ | \$ | \$ | $(333,513)$ |
| 2 |  | 51,155 |  | 120,884 | $(359,334)$ | - |  | $(187,295)$ |
| 3 |  | 78,779 |  | 240,662 | $(359,334)$ | - |  | $(39,893)$ |
| 4 |  | 107,613 |  | 360,440 | $(359,334)$ | - |  | 108,719 |
| 5 |  | 137,682 |  | 360,440 | $(359,334)$ | - |  | 138,788 |
| 6 |  | 167,751 |  | 360,440 | $(359,334)$ | - |  | 168,857 |
| 7 |  | 197,820 |  | 360,440 | $(359,334)$ | - |  | 198,926 |
| 8 |  | 227,888 |  | 360,440 | $(359,334)$ | - |  | 228,995 |
| 9 |  | 257,957 |  | 360,440 | $(359,334)$ | - |  | 259,063 |
| 10 |  | 288,026 |  | 360,440 | $(359,334)$ | - |  | 289,132 |
| 11 |  | 288,026 |  | 359,334 | - | - |  | 647,360 |
| 12 |  | 288,026 |  | 239,556 | - | - |  | 527,582 |
| 13 |  | 288,026 |  | 119,778 | - | - |  | 407,804 |
| 14 |  | 288,026 |  | - | - | - |  | 288,026 |
| 15 |  | 288,026 |  | - | - | - |  | 288,026 |
| 16 |  | 288,026 |  | - | - | - |  | 288,026 |
| 17 |  | 288,026 |  | - | - | - |  | 288,026 |
| 18 |  | 288,026 |  | - | - | - |  | 288,026 |
| 19 |  | 288,026 |  | - | - | - |  | 288,026 |
| 20 |  | 288,026 |  | - | - | - |  | 288,026 |
| 21 |  | 263,311 |  | - | - | - |  | 263,311 |
| 22 |  | 236,871 |  | - | - | - |  | 236,871 |
| 23 |  | 209,247 |  | - | - | - |  | 209,247 |
| 24 |  | 180,413 |  | - | - | - |  | 180,413 |
| 25 |  | 150,344 |  | - | - | - |  | 150,344 |
| 26 |  | 120,275 |  | - | - | - |  | 120,275 |
| 27 |  | 90,206 |  | - | - | - |  | 90,206 |
| 28 |  | 60,138 |  | - | - | - |  | 60,138 |
| 29 |  | 30,069 |  | - | - | - |  | 30,069 |
|  | \$ | 5,760,522 | \$ | \$ 3,604,402 | \$ $(3,593,340)$ | \$ - | \$ | 5,771,584 |

(1) Service Area 3, Page 2 Section I
(2) Service Area 3, Page 1
(3) Eligible debt funded projects as a percent of total principal times original annual debt service; does not reflect current outstanding balances

# City of Waco-2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Revenue Test
Service Area 3

| Year | Impact <br> Fee |  | Vehicle <br> Miles | Impact Fee <br> Revenue |  | Annual Expenses ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Sub-Total |  | Accumulated Interest |  |  | Estimated Fund Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
| 1 | \$ | 1,294 | 429 | \$ | 555,661 | \$ | $(333,513)$ | \$ | 889,174 | \$ | 1,556 |  | 890,730 |
| 2 |  | 1,294 | 429 |  | 555,661 |  | $(187,295)$ |  | 742,956 |  | 4,418 |  | 1,638,103 |
| 3 |  | 1,294 | 429 |  | 555,661 |  | $(39,893)$ |  | 595,553 |  | 6,776 |  | 2,240,433 |
| 4 |  | 1,294 | 429 |  | 555,661 |  | 108,719 |  | 446,942 |  | 8,624 |  | 2,695,998 |
| 5 |  | 1,294 | 429 |  | 555,661 |  | 138,788 |  | 416,873 |  | 10,166 |  | 3,123,036 |
| 6 |  | 1,294 | 429 |  | 555,661 |  | 168,857 |  | 386,804 |  | 11,608 |  | 3,521,447 |
| 7 |  | 1,294 | 429 |  | 555,661 |  | 198,926 |  | 356,735 |  | 12,949 |  | 3,891,132 |
| 8 |  | 1,294 | 429 |  | 555,661 |  | 228,995 |  | 326,666 |  | 14,191 |  | 4,231,989 |
| 9 |  | 1,294 | 429 |  | 555,661 |  | 259,063 |  | 296,597 |  | 15,331 |  | 4,543,917 |
| 10 |  | 1,294 | 429 |  | 555,661 |  | 289,132 |  | 266,529 |  | 16,370 |  | 4,826,816 |
| 11 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 647,360 |  | $(647,360)$ |  | 15,761 |  | 4,195,217 |
| 12 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 527,582 |  | $(527,582)$ |  | 13,760 |  | 3,681,395 |
| 13 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 407,804 |  | $(407,804)$ |  | 12,171 |  | 3,285,762 |
| 14 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 288,026 |  | $(288,026)$ |  | 10,996 |  | 3,008,732 |
| 15 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 288,026 |  | $(288,026)$ |  | 10,027 |  | 2,730,732 |
| 16 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 288,026 |  | $(288,026)$ |  | 9,054 |  | 2,451,760 |
| 17 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 288,026 |  | $(288,026)$ |  | 8,077 |  | 2,171,811 |
| 18 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 288,026 |  | $(288,026)$ |  | 7,097 |  | 1,890,882 |
| 19 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 288,026 |  | $(288,026)$ |  | 6,114 |  | 1,608,970 |
| 20 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 288,026 |  | $(288,026)$ |  | 5,127 |  | 1,326,071 |
| 21 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 263,311 |  | $(263,311)$ |  | 4,180 |  | 1,066,940 |
| 22 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 236,871 |  | $(236,871)$ |  | 3,320 |  | 833,389 |
| 23 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 209,247 |  | $(209,247)$ |  | 2,551 |  | 626,693 |
| 24 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 180,413 |  | $(180,413)$ |  | 1,878 |  | 448,158 |
| 25 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 150,344 |  | $(150,344)$ |  | 1,305 |  | 299,119 |
| 26 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 120,275 |  | $(120,275)$ |  | 836 |  | 179,680 |
| 27 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 90,206 |  | $(90,206)$ |  | 471 |  | 89,944 |
| 28 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 60,138 |  | $(60,138)$ |  | 210 |  | 30,016 |
| 29 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 30,069 |  | $(30,069)$ |  | 52 |  | - |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 5,556,609 | \$ | 5,771,584 |  |  | \$ | 14,975 |  |  |

(1) Service Area 3, Page 2 Section II

# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Impact Fee Calculation <br> Service Area 3 

| Year | $\begin{gathered} \text { Number of } \\ \text { Years to } \\ \text { End of Period } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Interest <br> Rate <br> Factor | Impact <br> Fee <br> Factor | Annual Vehicle Miles |  | Annual Expense |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Actual | Escalated |  | Actual |  | calated |
| 1 | 29 | 1.1047 | 1.0000 | 429 | 474 | \$ | $(333,513)$ | \$ | $(368,433)$ |
| 2 | 28 | 1.1009 | 1.0000 | 429 | 473 |  | $(187,295)$ |  | $(206,184)$ |
| 3 | 27 | 1.0970 | 1.0000 | 429 | 471 |  | $(39,893)$ |  | $(43,763)$ |
| 4 | 26 | 1.0932 | 1.0000 | 429 | 469 |  | 108,719 |  | 118,850 |
| 5 | 25 | 1.0894 | 1.0000 | 429 | 468 |  | 138,788 |  | 151,192 |
| 6 | 24 | 1.0856 | 1.0000 | 429 | 466 |  | 168,857 |  | 183,307 |
| 7 | 23 | 1.0818 | 1.0000 | 429 | 464 |  | 198,926 |  | 215,195 |
| 8 | 22 | 1.0780 | 1.0000 | 429 | 463 |  | 228,995 |  | 246,859 |
| 9 | 21 | 1.0743 | 1.0000 | 429 | 461 |  | 259,063 |  | 278,300 |
| 10 | 20 | 1.0705 | 1.0000 | 429 | 460 |  | 289,132 |  | 309,518 |
| 11 | 19 | 1.0668 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 647,360 |  | 690,586 |
| 12 | 18 | 1.0631 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 527,582 |  | 560,847 |
| 13 | 17 | 1.0593 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 407,804 |  | 432,005 |
| 14 | 16 | 1.0557 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 288,026 |  | 304,055 |
| 15 | 15 | 1.0520 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 288,026 |  | 302,994 |
| 16 | 14 | 1.0483 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 288,026 |  | 301,938 |
| 17 | 13 | 1.0446 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 288,026 |  | 300,884 |
| 18 | 12 | 1.0410 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 288,026 |  | 299,835 |
| 19 | 11 | 1.0374 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 288,026 |  | 298,789 |
| 20 | 10 | 1.0338 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 288,026 |  | 297,747 |
| 21 | 9 | 1.0301 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 263,311 |  | 271,249 |
| 22 | 8 | 1.0266 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 236,871 |  | 243,160 |
| 23 | 7 | 1.0230 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 209,247 |  | 214,054 |
| 24 | 6 | 1.0194 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 180,413 |  | 183,914 |
| 25 | 5 | 1.0158 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 150,344 |  | 152,727 |
| 26 | 4 | 1.0123 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 120,275 |  | 121,755 |
| 27 | 3 | 1.0088 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 90,206 |  | 90,998 |
| 28 | 2 | 1.0053 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 60,138 |  | 60,454 |
| 29 | 1 | 1.0018 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 30,069 |  | 30,121 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4,669 |  |  | \$ | 6,042,955 |


| Annual Interest Rate: | 0.35\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Value of Initial Impact Fee Fund Balance | \$ |  |
| Total Escalated Expense for Entire Period | \$ | 6,042,955 |
| Less Future Value of Initial Impact Fee Fund Balance |  | - |
| Sub-Total | \$ | 6,042,955 |
| Total Escalated Vehicle Miles |  | 4,669 |
| Impact Fee For Service Area 3 | \$ | 1,294 |

# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Impact Fee Project Funding
Service Area 3
Impact Fee Roadway ${ }^{(1)}$
Bagby Ave (From New Rd To Monte Vist
Bagby Ave (From Monte Vista St To Ric
Bagby Ave (From Richter Ave To Valley
S New Rd (From Bagby Ave To I-35)
Garden Dr (From Robinson Rd To 16th
18th St (From La Salle To Gurley Ln)
16th (From Gurley Ln To Garden Dr)
12th (From Garden Dr To TX-340)
University Parks Dr (From La Salle Ave
Impact Fee Study
Total
(1) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(2) $50 \%$ of Eligible Costs

| Impact Fee <br> Project No. ${ }^{(1)}$ | Cost In <br> Service Area ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Impact Fee Eligible Cost ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Impact Fee <br> Recoverable Cost |  | Debt Funded ${ }^{(3)}$ Proposed |  | Non-Debt <br> Funded ${ }^{(3)}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | \$ | 530,200 | \$ | 237,519 | \$ | 118,760 | \$ | 118,760 | \$ | - |
| 8 |  | 1,547,900 |  | 693,429 |  | 346,715 |  | 346,715 |  | - |
| 9 |  | 1,196,800 |  | 536,143 |  | 268,072 |  | 268,072 |  | - |
| 10 |  | 730,733 |  | 327,355 |  | 163,677 |  | 163,677 |  | - |
| 11 |  | 5,041,200 |  | 2,258,361 |  | 1,129,180 |  | 1,129,180 |  | - |
| 12 |  | 789,433 |  | 353,651 |  | 176,825 |  | 176,825 |  | - |
| 13 |  | 1,576,033 |  | 706,033 |  | 353,016 |  | 353,016 |  | - |
| 14 |  | 4,258,833 |  | 1,907,876 |  | 953,938 |  | 953,938 |  | - |
| 15 |  | 371,250 |  | 166,313 |  | 83,156 |  | 83,156 |  | - |
|  |  | 22,124 |  | 22,124 |  | 11,062 |  | - |  | 11,062 |
|  | \$ | 16,064,507 | \$ | 7,208,804 | \$ | 3,604,402 | \$ | 3,593,340 | \$ | 11,062 |

(1) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(2) $50 \%$ of Eligible Costs

## SUMMARY OF ROADWAY IMPACT FEE DETERMINATION

Service Area 4

| Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs | $\$$ | 109,788 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
|  | Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study |  |
| Financing Costs | 65,135 | See Detail Below |
| Interest Earnings | $(6,461)$ | Page 3 of Service Area 4 |
| Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 8 , 4 6 2}$ |
| Sum of Above |  |  |
| Equivalent Connections | 650 | Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study |
| Maximum Assessable Impact Fee | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 9}$ |

## Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs:

Represents the portion of capital improvement costs that are eligible for funding through Impact fees after adjusting for the $50 \%$ credit. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study. In 2001, the Impact Fee Statute was amended to include either a credit for ad valorem and utility revenues generated by new service units during the ten-year timeframe that are used to fund impact fee eligible projects for which the new service units were charged an impact fee or a credit equal to $50 \%$ of the total cost of implementing the impact fee capital improvement plan. The City has elected to use the $50 \%$ credit.

## Financing Costs:

Represents the interest costs associated with debt financing the new Impact fee project costs. Interest costs are derived from the City's Financial Advisor.

| New Annual Debt Service | \$ | 173,133 | (Page 2 of Service Area 4) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Annual Debt Service |  | - | (Page 2 of Service Area 4) |
| Principal Component |  | $(107,998)$ | (Page 5 of Service Area 4) |
| Financing Costs | \$ | 65,135 |  |

## Interest Earnings:

Represents the interest earned on cash flows and assumes a $0.35 \%$ annual interest rate per the most recent investment portfolio. The Impact Fee Statute states that interest earnings are funds of the impact fee account and are held to the same restrictions as impact fee revenues. Therefore, in order to recognize that interest earnings are used to fund capital improvements, interest earnings are credited against the recoverable costs. Reference is the sum of Accumulated Interest on page 3 of Service Area 4.

## Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee:

Represents the sum of Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs (after 50\% credit) plus Financing Costs less Interest Earnings.

## Equivalent Connections:

Represents the growth in equivalent vehicle-miles over the ten-year timeframe. A vehicle-mile is a standardized measure of use attributable to an individual unit of development calculated in accordance with generally accepted engineering standards. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study.

## Maximum Assessable Impact Fee:

Represents Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee divided by Equivalent Connections. This is the maximum impact fee that can be assessed by the City.

## City of Waco-2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Impact Fee Calculation Assumptions Service Area 4

I. General Assumptions
Annual Interest Rate on Deposits ${ }^{(1)}$
Annual Vehicle Mile Growth ${ }^{(2)}$
Existing Fund Balance ${ }^{(3)}$
Portion of Projects Funded by Existing Debt ${ }^{(4)}$
Non-debt Funded Project Cost ${ }^{(5)}$
New Project Cost Funded Through New Debt ${ }^{(6)}$
Total Recoverable Project Cost ${ }^{(7)}$

| $\$$ | - |
| ---: | ---: |
|  | 1,790 |
|  | 107,998 |
| $\$$ | 109,788 |

II. New Debt Issues Assumptions

| Year | Principal ${ }^{(8)}$ |  | Interest ${ }^{(9)}$ | Term |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 10,800 | 3.25\% | 20 |
| 2 |  | 10,800 | 4.00\% | 20 |
| 3 |  | 10,800 | 4.50\% | 20 |
| 4 |  | 10,800 | 5.00\% | 20 |
| 5 |  | 10,800 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 6 |  | 10,800 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 7 |  | 10,800 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 8 |  | 10,800 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 9 |  | 10,800 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 10 |  | 10,800 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| Total | \$ | 07,998 |  |  |

## III. Capital Expenditure Assumptions

| Year | $\begin{gathered} \text { Annual } \\ \text { Capital } \\ \text { Expenditures }^{(10)} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 179 |
| 2 |  | 3,779 |
| 3 |  | 7,379 |
| 4 |  | 10,979 |
| 5 |  | 10,979 |
| 6 |  | 10,979 |
| 7 |  | 10,979 |
| 8 |  | 10,979 |
| 9 |  | 10,979 |
| 10 |  | 10,979 |
| 11 |  | 10,800 |
| 12 |  | 7,200 |
| 13 |  | 3,600 |
| Total | \$ | 109,788 |

(1) Estimated Interest Rate per Staff as of May 2020
(2) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(3) There is no existing fund balance because this is a new roadway impact fee
(4) Per discussions with City Staff and City files
(5) This assumes $0 \%$ of new project costs funded through sources other than debt, unless specified otherwise
(6) This assumes $100 \%$ of new project costs funded through new debt issues, unless specified otherwise
(7) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(8) Assumes new debt issued in equal annual amounts
(9) Estimated interest on future debt from Financial Advisor as of May 2020
(10) Assumes new debt proceeds expended over a 3-year timeframe Non-debt funded capital expenditures allocated in equal annual amounts

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Debt Service and Expense Summary
Service Area 4

## I. New Debt Service Detail

| Year |  | Series 1 |  | Series $\underline{2}$ |  | Series $\underline{3}$ |  | Series <br> 4 |  | Series $\underline{5}$ |  | Series $\underline{6}$ |  | Series <br> 7 |  | Series $\underline{8}$ |  | Series 9 |  | Series $\underline{10}$ | New Debt Service |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 743 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 743 |
| 2 |  | 743 |  | 795 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 1,537 |
| 3 |  | 743 |  | 795 |  | 830 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 2,368 |
| 4 |  | 743 |  | 795 |  | 830 |  | 867 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 3,234 |
| 5 |  | 743 |  | 795 |  | 830 |  | 867 |  | 904 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 4,138 |
| 6 |  | 743 |  | 795 |  | 830 |  | 867 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 5,042 |
| 7 |  | 743 |  | 795 |  | 830 |  | 867 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 5,945 |
| 8 |  | 743 |  | 795 |  | 830 |  | 867 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | - |  | - |  | 6,849 |
| 9 |  | 743 |  | 795 |  | 830 |  | 867 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | - |  | 7,753 |
| 10 |  | 743 |  | 795 |  | 830 |  | 867 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 8,657 |
| 11 |  | 743 |  | 795 |  | 830 |  | 867 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 8,657 |
| 12 |  | 743 |  | 795 |  | 830 |  | 867 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 8,657 |
| 13 |  | 743 |  | 795 |  | 830 |  | 867 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 8,657 |
| 14 |  | 743 |  | 795 |  | 830 |  | 867 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 8,657 |
| 15 |  | 743 |  | 795 |  | 830 |  | 867 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 8,657 |
| 16 |  | 743 |  | 795 |  | 830 |  | 867 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 8,657 |
| 17 |  | 743 |  | 795 |  | 830 |  | 867 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 8,657 |
| 18 |  | 743 |  | 795 |  | 830 |  | 867 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 8,657 |
| 19 |  | 743 |  | 795 |  | 830 |  | 867 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 8,657 |
| 20 |  | 743 |  | 795 |  | 830 |  | 867 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 8,657 |
| 21 |  | - |  | 795 |  | 830 |  | 867 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 7,914 |
| 22 |  | - |  | - |  | 830 |  | 867 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 7,119 |
| 23 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 867 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 6,289 |
| 24 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 5,422 |
| 25 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 4,519 |
| 26 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 3,615 |
| 27 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 2,711 |
| 28 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 904 |  | 904 |  | 1,807 |
| 29 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 904 |  | 904 |
|  | \$ | 14,856 |  | 15,893 |  | 16,605 | \$ | 17,332 | \$ | 18,074 | \$ | 18,074 | \$ | 18,074 | \$ | 18,074 | \$ | 18,074 | \$ | 18,074 | \$ | 3,133 |

II. Summary of Annual Expenses

| Year |  | New <br> Annual <br> Debt <br> Service ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Annual Capital Expenditures ${ }^{(2)}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Annual } \\ \text { Bond } \\ \text { Proceeds }^{(2)} \end{gathered}$ | Existing <br> Annual Debt Service ${ }^{(3)}$ |  | Total Expense |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 743 | \$ | \$ 179 | \$ $(10,800)$ | \$ | \$ | $(9,878)$ |
| 2 |  | 1,537 |  | 3,779 | $(10,800)$ |  |  | $(5,483)$ |
| 3 |  | 2,368 |  | 7,379 | $(10,800)$ | - |  | $(1,053)$ |
| 4 |  | 3,234 |  | 10,979 | $(10,800)$ | - |  | 3,413 |
| 5 |  | 4,138 |  | 10,979 | $(10,800)$ | - |  | 4,317 |
| 6 |  | 5,042 |  | 10,979 | $(10,800)$ | - |  | 5,221 |
| 7 |  | 5,945 |  | 10,979 | $(10,800)$ | - |  | 6,125 |
| 8 |  | 6,849 |  | 10,979 | $(10,800)$ | - |  | 7,028 |
| 9 |  | 7,753 |  | 10,979 | $(10,800)$ | - |  | 7,932 |
| 10 |  | 8,657 |  | 10,979 | $(10,800)$ | - |  | 8,836 |
| 11 |  | 8,657 |  | 10,800 |  | - |  | 19,456 |
| 12 |  | 8,657 |  | 7,200 | - | - |  | 15,857 |
| 13 |  | 8,657 |  | 3,600 | - | - |  | 12,257 |
| 14 |  | 8,657 |  | - | - | - |  | 8,657 |
| 15 |  | 8,657 |  | - | - | - |  | 8,657 |
| 16 |  | 8,657 |  | - | - | - |  | 8,657 |
| 17 |  | 8,657 |  | - | - | - |  | 8,657 |
| 18 |  | 8,657 |  | - | - | - |  | 8,657 |
| 19 |  | 8,657 |  | - | - | - |  | 8,657 |
| 20 |  | 8,657 |  | - | - | - |  | 8,657 |
| 21 |  | 7,914 |  | - | - | - |  | 7,914 |
| 22 |  | 7,119 |  | - | - | - |  | 7,119 |
| 23 |  | 6,289 |  | - | - | - |  | 6,289 |
| 24 |  | 5,422 |  | - | - | - |  | 5,422 |
| 25 |  | 4,519 |  | - | - | - |  | 4,519 |
| 26 |  | 3,615 |  | - | - | - |  | 3,615 |
| 27 |  | 2,711 |  | - | - | - |  | 2,711 |
| 28 |  | 1,807 |  | - | - | - |  | 1,807 |
| 29 |  | 904 |  | - | - | - |  | 904 |
|  | \$ | 173,133 | + | \$ 109,788 | \$ $(107,998)$ | \$ | \$ | 174,923 |

(1) Service Area 4, Page 2 Section I
(2) Service Area 4, Page 1
(3) Eligible debt funded projects as a percent of total principal times original annual debt service; does not reflect current outstanding balances

# City of Waco-2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Revenue Test
Service Area 4

| Year |  | Impact <br> Fee | Vehicle <br> Miles |  | Impact Fee Revenue |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Annual } \\ \text { Expenses }^{(1)} \end{gathered}$ | Sub-Total |  | Accumulated Interest |  | Estimated Fund Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ |
| 1 | \$ | 259 | 65 | \$ | 16,846 | \$ | $(9,878)$ | \$ | 26,724 | \$ | 47 | 26,771 |
| 2 |  | 259 | 65 |  | 16,846 |  | $(5,483)$ |  | 22,330 |  | 133 | 49,233 |
| 3 |  | 259 | 65 |  | 16,846 |  | $(1,053)$ |  | 17,899 |  | 204 | 67,336 |
| 4 |  | 259 | 65 |  | 16,846 |  | 3,413 |  | 13,433 |  | 259 | 81,028 |
| 5 |  | 259 | 65 |  | 16,846 |  | 4,317 |  | 12,529 |  | 306 | 93,863 |
| 6 |  | 259 | 65 |  | 16,846 |  | 5,221 |  | 11,625 |  | 349 | 105,837 |
| 7 |  | 259 | 65 |  | 16,846 |  | 6,125 |  | 10,722 |  | 389 | 116,948 |
| 8 |  | 259 | 65 |  | 16,846 |  | 7,028 |  | 9,818 |  | 427 | 127,193 |
| 9 |  | 259 | 65 |  | 16,846 |  | 7,932 |  | 8,914 |  | 461 | 136,568 |
| 10 |  | 259 | 65 |  | 16,846 |  | 8,836 |  | 8,011 |  | 492 | 145,070 |
| 11 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 19,456 |  | $(19,456)$ |  | 474 | 126,088 |
| 12 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 15,857 |  | $(15,857)$ |  | 414 | 110,645 |
| 13 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 12,257 |  | $(12,257)$ |  | 366 | 98,754 |
| 14 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 8,657 |  | $(8,657)$ |  | 330 | 90,428 |
| 15 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 8,657 |  | $(8,657)$ |  | 301 | 82,072 |
| 16 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 8,657 |  | $(8,657)$ |  | 272 | 73,688 |
| 17 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 8,657 |  | $(8,657)$ |  | 243 | 65,274 |
| 18 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 8,657 |  | $(8,657)$ |  | 213 | 56,831 |
| 19 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 8,657 |  | $(8,657)$ |  | 184 | 48,358 |
| 20 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 8,657 |  | $(8,657)$ |  | 154 | 39,855 |
| 21 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 7,914 |  | $(7,914)$ |  | 126 | 32,067 |
| 22 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 7,119 |  | $(7,119)$ |  | 100 | 25,048 |
| 23 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 6,289 |  | $(6,289)$ |  | 77 | 18,835 |
| 24 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 5,422 |  | $(5,422)$ |  | 56 | 13,469 |
| 25 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 4,519 |  | $(4,519)$ |  | 39 | 8,990 |
| 26 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 3,615 |  | $(3,615)$ |  | 25 | 5,400 |
| 27 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 2,711 |  | $(2,711)$ |  | 14 | 2,703 |
| 28 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 1,807 |  | $(1,807)$ |  | 6 | 902 |
| 29 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 904 |  | (904) |  | 2 | - |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 168,462 | \$ | 174,923 |  |  | \$ | ,461 |  |

(1) Service Area 4, Page 2 Section II

# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Impact Fee Calculation <br> Service Area 4 

| Year | Number of Years to End of Period | Interest Rate Factor | Impact Fee <br> Factor | Annual Vehicle Miles Actual Escalated |  | Annual Expense |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 29 | 1.1047 | 1.0000 | 65 | 72 | \$ | $(9,878)$ | \$ | $(10,912)$ |
| 2 | 28 | 1.1009 | 1.0000 | 65 | 72 |  | $(5,483)$ |  | $(6,036)$ |
| 3 | 27 | 1.0970 | 1.0000 | 65 | 71 |  | $(1,053)$ |  | $(1,155)$ |
| 4 | 26 | 1.0932 | 1.0000 | 65 | 71 |  | 3,413 |  | 3,731 |
| 5 | 25 | 1.0894 | 1.0000 | 65 | 71 |  | 4,317 |  | 4,703 |
| 6 | 24 | 1.0856 | 1.0000 | 65 | 71 |  | 5,221 |  | 5,668 |
| 7 | 23 | 1.0818 | 1.0000 | 65 | 70 |  | 6,125 |  | 6,625 |
| 8 | 22 | 1.0780 | 1.0000 | 65 | 70 |  | 7,028 |  | 7,577 |
| 9 | 21 | 1.0743 | 1.0000 | 65 | 70 |  | 7,932 |  | 8,521 |
| 10 | 20 | 1.0705 | 1.0000 | 65 | 70 |  | 8,836 |  | 9,459 |
| 11 | 19 | 1.0668 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 19,456 |  | 20,756 |
| 12 | 18 | 1.0631 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 15,857 |  | 16,856 |
| 13 | 17 | 1.0593 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 12,257 |  | 12,984 |
| 14 | 16 | 1.0557 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 8,657 |  | 9,138 |
| 15 | 15 | 1.0520 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 8,657 |  | 9,107 |
| 16 | 14 | 1.0483 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 8,657 |  | 9,075 |
| 17 | 13 | 1.0446 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 8,657 |  | 9,043 |
| 18 | 12 | 1.0410 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 8,657 |  | 9,012 |
| 19 | 11 | 1.0374 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 8,657 |  | 8,980 |
| 20 | 10 | 1.0338 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 8,657 |  | 8,949 |
| 21 | 9 | 1.0301 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 7,914 |  | 8,152 |
| 22 | 8 | 1.0266 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 7,119 |  | 7,308 |
| 23 | 7 | 1.0230 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 6,289 |  | 6,433 |
| 24 | 6 | 1.0194 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 5,422 |  | 5,528 |
| 25 | 5 | 1.0158 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 4,519 |  | 4,590 |
| 26 | 4 | 1.0123 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 3,615 |  | 3,659 |
| 27 | 3 | 1.0088 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 2,711 |  | 2,735 |
| 28 | 2 | 1.0053 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 1,807 |  | 1,817 |
| 29 | 1 | 1.0018 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 904 |  | 905 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 707 |  |  | \$ | 183,207 |


| Annual Interest Rate: |  | $0.35 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Value of Initial Impact Fee Fund Balance | $\$$ | - |
| Total Escalated Expense for Entire Period |  |  |
| Less Future Value of Initial Impact Fee Fund Balance | $\$$ | 183,207 |
| Sub-Total | $\$$ | 183,207 |
| Total Escalated Vehicle Miles |  | $\mathbf{7 0 7}$ |
| Impact Fee For Service Area 4 | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 9}$ |

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Impact Fee Project Funding
Service Area 4
Impact Fee Roadway ${ }^{(1)}$
Martin Luther King Jr Blvd (From BUS 77 To SH 484)
Impact Fee Study
Total

| (1) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study |
| :--- |
| (2) $50 \%$ of Eligible Costs |


| Impact Fee Project No. ${ }^{(1)}$ | Cost In <br> Service Area ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Impact Fee Eligible Cost ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Impact Fee <br> Recoverable Cost |  | Debt Funded ${ }^{(3)}$ Proposed |  | Non-Debt Funded ${ }^{(3)}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16 | \$ | 515,400 | \$ | 215,996 | \$ | 107,998 | \$ | 107,998 | \$ | - |
|  |  | 3,581 |  | 3,581 |  | 1,790 |  | - |  | 1,790 |
|  | \$ | 518,981 | \$ | 219,577 | \$ | 109,788 | \$ | 107,998 | \$ | 1,790 |

## SUMMARY OF ROADWAY IMPACT FEE DETERMINATION

Service Area 5

| Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs | $\$$ | - |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Financing Costs | Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study |  |
| Interest Earnings | - | See Detail Below |
| Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee | $\$$ | - |
| Page 3 of Service Area 5 |  |  |
| Maximum Assessable Impact Fee | - | Sum of Above |

## Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs:

Represents the portion of capital improvement costs that are eligible for funding through Impact fees after adjusting for the $50 \%$ credit. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study. In 2001, the Impact Fee Statute was amended to include either a credit for ad valorem and utility revenues generated by new service units during the ten-year timeframe that are used to fund impact fee eligible projects for which the new service units were charged an impact fee or a credit equal to $50 \%$ of the total cost of implementing the impact fee capital improvement plan. The City has elected to use the $50 \%$ credit.

## Financing Costs:

Represents the interest costs associated with debt financing the new Impact fee project costs. Interest costs are derived from the City's Financial Advisor.


## Interest Earnings:

Represents the interest earned on cash flows and assumes a $0.35 \%$ annual interest rate per the most recent investment portfolio. The Impact Fee Statute states that interest earnings are funds of the impact fee account and are held to the same restrictions as impact fee revenues. Therefore, in order to recognize that interest earnings are used to fund capital improvements, interest earnings are credited against the recoverable costs. Reference is the sum of Accumulated Interest on page 3 of Service Area 5.

## Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee:

Represents the sum of Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs (after 50\% credit) plus Financing Costs less Interest Earnings.

## Equivalent Connections:

Represents the growth in equivalent vehicle-miles over the ten-year timeframe. A vehicle-mile is a standardized measure of use attributable to an individual unit of development calculated in accordance with generally accepted engineering standards. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study.

## Maximum Assessable Impact Fee:

Represents Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee divided by Equivalent Connections. This is the maximum impact fee that can be assessed by the City.

## City of Waco-2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Impact Fee Calculation Assumptions Service Area 5

I. General Assumptions
Annual Interest Rate on Deposits ${ }^{(1)}$
Annual Vehicle Mile Growth ${ }^{(2)}$
Existing Fund Balance ${ }^{(3)}$

|  | $0.35 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: |
|  | 165 |
| $\$$ | - |

Portion of Projects Funded by Existing Debt ${ }^{(4)}$
Non-debt Funded Project Cost ${ }^{(5)}$
New Project Cost Funded Through New Debt ${ }^{(6)}$
Total Recoverable Project Cost ${ }^{(7)}$

II. New Debt Issues Assumptions

III. Capital Expenditure Assumptions

(1) Estimated Interest Rate per Staff as of May 2020
(2) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(3) There is no existing fund balance because this is a new roadway impact fee
(4) Per discussions with City Staff and City files
(5) This assumes $0 \%$ of new project costs funded through sources other than debt, unless specified otherwise
(6) This assumes $100 \%$ of new project costs funded through new debt issues, unless specified otherwise
(7) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(8) Assumes new debt issued in equal annual amounts
(9) Estimated interest on future debt from Financial Advisor as of May 2020
(10) Assumes new debt proceeds expended over a 3-year timeframe Non-debt funded capital expenditures allocated in equal annual amounts

# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Debt Service and Expense Summary
Service Area 5

II. Summary of Annual Expenses

(1) Service Area 5, Page 2 Section I
(2) Service Area 5, Page 1
(3) Eligible debt funded projects as a percent of total principal times original annual debt service; does not reflect current outstanding balances

## City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Revenue Test
Service Area 5

(1) Service Area 5, Page 2 Section II

# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Impact Fee Calculation <br> Service Area 5 

| Year | $\begin{gathered} \text { Number of } \\ \text { Years to } \\ \text { End of Period } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Interest <br> Rate <br> Factor | Impact Fee Factor | Annual Vehicle Miles |  | Annual Expense |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Actual | Escalated |  | Actual |  |  |
| 1 | 29 | 1.1047 | 1.0000 | 165 | 182 | \$ |  | \$ | - |
| 2 | 28 | 1.1009 | 1.0000 | 165 | 182 |  |  |  | - |
| 3 | 27 | 1.0970 | 1.0000 | 165 | 181 |  |  |  | - |
| 4 | 26 | 1.0932 | 1.0000 | 165 | 180 |  |  |  | - |
| 5 | 25 | 1.0894 | 1.0000 | 165 | 180 |  |  |  | - |
| 6 | 24 | 1.0856 | 1.0000 | 165 | 179 |  |  |  | - |
| 7 | 23 | 1.0818 | 1.0000 | 165 | 178 |  |  |  | - |
| 8 | 22 | 1.0780 | 1.0000 | 165 | 178 |  |  |  | - |
| 9 | 21 | 1.0743 | 1.0000 | 165 | 177 |  |  |  | - |
| 10 | 20 | 1.0705 | 1.0000 | 165 | 177 |  |  |  | - |
| 11 | 19 | 1.0668 | 1.0000 | - | - |  |  |  | - |
| 12 | 18 | 1.0631 | 1.0000 | - | - |  |  |  | - |
| 13 | 17 | 1.0593 | 1.0000 | - | - |  |  |  | - |
| 14 | 16 | 1.0557 | 1.0000 | - | - |  |  |  | - |
| 15 | 15 | 1.0520 | 1.0000 | - | - |  |  |  | - |
| 16 | 14 | 1.0483 | 1.0000 | - | - |  |  |  | - |
| 17 | 13 | 1.0446 | 1.0000 | - | - |  |  |  | - |
| 18 | 12 | 1.0410 | 1.0000 | - | - |  |  |  | - |
| 19 | 11 | 1.0374 | 1.0000 | - | - |  |  |  | - |
| 20 | 10 | 1.0338 | 1.0000 | - | - |  |  |  | - |
| 21 | 9 | 1.0301 | 1.0000 | - | - |  |  |  | - |
| 22 | 8 | 1.0266 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 23 | 7 | 1.0230 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 24 | 6 | 1.0194 | 1.0000 | - | - |  |  |  | - |
| 25 | 5 | 1.0158 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 26 | 4 | 1.0123 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 27 | 3 | 1.0088 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 28 | 2 | 1.0053 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 29 | 1 | 1.0018 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
|  |  |  |  |  | 1,794 |  |  | \$ | - |

Annual Interest Rate: $0.35 \%$

| Value of Initial Impact Fee Fund Balance | $\$$ | - |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total Escalated Expense for Entire Period | $\$$ | - |
| Less Future Value of Initial Impact Fee Fund Balance <br> Sub-Total | $\$$ | - |
| Total Escalated Vehicle Miles |  | 1,794 |

Impact Fee For Service Area 5
\$

City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study
Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Impact Fee Project Funding
Service Area 5

(1) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study (2) $50 \%$ of Eligible Costs

## SUMMARY OF ROADWAY IMPACT FEE DETERMINATION

Service Area 6

| Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs | $\$$ | 306,773 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
|  | Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study |  |
| Financing Costs | 183,836 | See Detail Below |
| Interest Earnings | $(18,236)$ | Page 3 of Service Area 6 |
| Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 2 , 3 7 3}$ |
| Sum of Above |  |  |
| Equivalent Connections | 2,002 | Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study |
| Maximum Assessable Impact Fee | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 6}$ |

## Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs:

Represents the portion of capital improvement costs that are eligible for funding through Impact fees after adjusting for the $50 \%$ credit. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study. In 2001, the Impact Fee Statute was amended to include either a credit for ad valorem and utility revenues generated by new service units during the ten-year timeframe that are used to fund impact fee eligible projects for which the new service units were charged an impact fee or a credit equal to $50 \%$ of the total cost of implementing the impact fee capital improvement plan. The City has elected to use the $50 \%$ credit.

## Financing Costs:

Represents the interest costs associated with debt financing the new Impact fee project costs. Interest costs are derived from the City's Financial Advisor.

| New Annual Debt Service | \$ | 488,648 | (Page 2 of Service Area 6) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Annual Debt Service |  |  | (Page 2 of Service Area 6) |
| Principal Component |  | $(304,812)$ | (Page 5 of Service Area 6) |
| Financing Costs | \$ | 183,836 |  |

## Interest Earnings:

Represents the interest earned on cash flows and assumes a $0.35 \%$ annual interest rate per the most recent investment portfolio. The Impact Fee Statute states that interest earnings are funds of the impact fee account and are held to the same restrictions as impact fee revenues. Therefore, in order to recognize that interest earnings are used to fund capital improvements, interest earnings are credited against the recoverable costs. Reference is the sum of Accumulated Interest on page 3 of Service Area 6.

## Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee:

Represents the sum of Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs (after 50\% credit) plus Financing Costs less Interest Earnings.

## Equivalent Connections:

Represents the growth in equivalent vehicle-miles over the ten-year timeframe. A vehicle-mile is a standardized measure of use attributable to an individual unit of development calculated in accordance with generally accepted engineering standards. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study.

## Maximum Assessable Impact Fee:

Represents Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee divided by Equivalent Connections. This is the maximum impact fee that can be assessed by the City.

## City of Waco-2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Impact Fee Calculation Assumptions Service Area 6

## I. General Assumptions

| Annual Interest Rate on Deposits ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | 0.35\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Annual Vehicle Mile Growth ${ }^{(2)}$ |  | 200 |
| Existing Fund Balance ${ }^{(3)}$ | \$ |  |
| Portion of Projects Funded by Existing Debt ${ }^{(4)}$ | \$ |  |
| Non-debt Funded Project Cost ${ }^{(5)}$ |  | 1,961 |
| New Project Cost Funded Through New Debt ${ }^{(6)}$ |  | 304,812 |
| Total Recoverable Project Cost ${ }^{(7)}$ | \$ | 306,773 |

II. New Debt Issues Assumptions

III. Capital Expenditure Assumptions

| Year | Annual Capital Expenditures ${ }^{(10)}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 196 |
| 2 |  | 10,357 |
| 3 |  | 20,517 |
| 4 |  | 30,677 |
| 5 |  | 30,677 |
| 6 |  | 30,677 |
| 7 |  | 30,677 |
| 8 |  | 30,677 |
| 9 |  | 30,677 |
| 10 |  | 30,677 |
| 11 |  | 30,481 |
| 12 |  | 20,321 |
| 13 |  | 10,160 |
| Total | \$ | 306,773 |

(1) Estimated Interest Rate per Staff as of May 2020
(2) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(3) There is no existing fund balance because this is a new roadway impact fee
(4) Per discussions with City Staff and City files
(5) This assumes $0 \%$ of new project costs funded through sources other than debt, unless specified otherwise
(6) This assumes $100 \%$ of new project costs funded through new debt issues, unless specified otherwise
(7) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(8) Assumes new debt issued in equal annual amounts
(9) Estimated interest on future debt from Financial Advisor as of May 2020
(10) Assumes new debt proceeds expended over a 3-year timeframe Non-debt funded capital expenditures allocated in equal annual amounts

# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Debt Service and Expense Summary
Service Area 6

## I. New Debt Service Detai

| Year |  | Series 1 |  | Series $\underline{2}$ |  | Series 3 |  | Series <br> 4 |  | Series 5 |  | Series $\underline{6}$ |  | Series 7 |  | Series <br> 8 |  | Series 9 |  | Series $\underline{10}$ | New Debt Service |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 2,096 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 2,096 |
| 2 |  | 2,096 |  | 2,243 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 4,339 |
| 3 |  | 2,096 |  | 2,243 |  | 2,343 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 6,683 |
| 4 |  | 2,096 |  | 2,243 |  | 2,343 |  | 2,446 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 9,128 |
| 5 |  | 2,096 |  | 2,243 |  | 2,343 |  | 2,446 |  | 2,551 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 11,679 |
| 6 |  | 2,096 |  | 2,243 |  | 2,343 |  | 2,446 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 14,230 |
| 7 |  | 2,096 |  | 2,243 |  | 2,343 |  | 2,446 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 16,780 |
| 8 |  | 2,096 |  | 2,243 |  | 2,343 |  | 2,446 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | - |  | - |  | 19,331 |
| 9 |  | 2,096 |  | 2,243 |  | 2,343 |  | 2,446 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | - |  | 21,882 |
| 10 |  | 2,096 |  | 2,243 |  | 2,343 |  | 2,446 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 24,432 |
| 11 |  | 2,096 |  | 2,243 |  | 2,343 |  | 2,446 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 24,432 |
| 12 |  | 2,096 |  | 2,243 |  | 2,343 |  | 2,446 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 24,432 |
| 13 |  | 2,096 |  | 2,243 |  | 2,343 |  | 2,446 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 24,432 |
| 14 |  | 2,096 |  | 2,243 |  | 2,343 |  | 2,446 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 24,432 |
| 15 |  | 2,096 |  | 2,243 |  | 2,343 |  | 2,446 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 24,432 |
| 16 |  | 2,096 |  | 2,243 |  | 2,343 |  | 2,446 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 24,432 |
| 17 |  | 2,096 |  | 2,243 |  | 2,343 |  | 2,446 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 24,432 |
| 18 |  | 2,096 |  | 2,243 |  | 2,343 |  | 2,446 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 24,432 |
| 19 |  | 2,096 |  | 2,243 |  | 2,343 |  | 2,446 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 24,432 |
| 20 |  | 2,096 |  | 2,243 |  | 2,343 |  | 2,446 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 24,432 |
| 21 |  | - |  | 2,243 |  | 2,343 |  | 2,446 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 22,336 |
| 22 |  | - |  | - |  | 2,343 |  | 2,446 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 20,093 |
| 23 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 2,446 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 17,750 |
| 24 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 15,304 |
| 25 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 12,753 |
| 26 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 10,203 |
| 27 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 7,652 |
| 28 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |  | 5,101 |
| 29 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 2,551 |  | 2,551 |
|  | \$ | 41,929 | \$ | 44,857 | \$ | 46,866 | \$ | 48,918 | \$ | 51,013 | \$ | 51,013 | \$ | 51,013 | \$ | 51,013 | \$ | 51,013 | \$ | 51,013 | \$ | 88,648 |

II. Summary of Annual Expenses

| Year |  | New <br> Annual <br> Debt <br> Service ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Annual Capital Expenditures ${ }^{(2)}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Annual } \\ \text { Bond } \\ \text { Proceeds }^{(2)} \end{gathered}$ |  | Existing Annual Debt $\qquad$ |  | Total Expense |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 2,096 |  | \$ 196 | \$ | $(30,481)$ | \$ | - | \$ | $(28,189)$ |
| 2 |  | 4,339 |  | 10,357 |  | $(30,481)$ |  | - |  | $(15,785)$ |
| 3 |  | 6,683 |  | 20,517 |  | $(30,481)$ |  | - |  | $(3,282)$ |
| 4 |  | 9,128 |  | 30,677 |  | $(30,481)$ |  | - |  | 9,325 |
| 5 |  | 11,679 |  | 30,677 |  | $(30,481)$ |  | - |  | 11,875 |
| 6 |  | 14,230 |  | 30,677 |  | $(30,481)$ |  | - |  | 14,426 |
| 7 |  | 16,780 |  | 30,677 |  | $(30,481)$ |  | - |  | 16,977 |
| 8 |  | 19,331 |  | 30,677 |  | $(30,481)$ |  | - |  | 19,527 |
| 9 |  | 21,882 |  | 30,677 |  | $(30,481)$ |  | - |  | 22,078 |
| 10 |  | 24,432 |  | 30,677 |  | $(30,481)$ |  | - |  | 24,629 |
| 11 |  | 24,432 |  | 30,481 |  | - |  | - |  | 54,914 |
| 12 |  | 24,432 |  | 20,321 |  | - |  | - |  | 44,753 |
| 13 |  | 24,432 |  | 10,160 |  | - |  | - |  | 34,593 |
| 14 |  | 24,432 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 24,432 |
| 15 |  | 24,432 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 24,432 |
| 16 |  | 24,432 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 24,432 |
| 17 |  | 24,432 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 24,432 |
| 18 |  | 24,432 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 24,432 |
| 19 |  | 24,432 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 24,432 |
| 20 |  | 24,432 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 24,432 |
| 21 |  | 22,336 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 22,336 |
| 22 |  | 20,093 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 20,093 |
| 23 |  | 17,750 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 17,750 |
| 24 |  | 15,304 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 15,304 |
| 25 |  | 12,753 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 12,753 |
| 26 |  | 10,203 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 10,203 |
| 27 |  | 7,652 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 7,652 |
| 28 |  | 5,101 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 5,101 |
| 29 |  | 2,551 |  |  |  | - |  | - |  | 2,551 |
|  | \$ | 488,648 |  | \$ 306,773 | \$ | $(304,812)$ |  | - | \$ | 490,609 |

(1) Service Area 6, Page 2 Section I
(2) Service Area 6, Page 1
(3) Eligible debt funded projects as a percent of total principal times original annual debt service; does not reflect current outstanding balances

# City of Waco-2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Revenue Test
Service Area 6

| Year |  | Impact <br> Fee | Vehicle <br> Miles |  | Impact Fee Revenue |  | Annual Expenses ${ }^{(1)}$ | Sub-Total |  | Accumulated Interest |  |  | Estimated Fund Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
| 1 | \$ | 236 | 200 | \$ | 47,237 | \$ | $(28,189)$ | \$ | 75,426 | \$ | 132 |  | 75,558 |
| 2 |  | 236 | 200 |  | 47,237 |  | $(15,785)$ |  | 63,023 |  | 375 |  | 138,955 |
| 3 |  | 236 | 200 |  | 47,237 |  | $(3,282)$ |  | 50,519 |  | 575 |  | 190,049 |
| 4 |  | 236 | 200 |  | 47,237 |  | 9,325 |  | 37,913 |  | 732 |  | 228,693 |
| 5 |  | 236 | 200 |  | 47,237 |  | 11,875 |  | 35,362 |  | 862 |  | 264,918 |
| 6 |  | 236 | 200 |  | 47,237 |  | 14,426 |  | 32,811 |  | 985 |  | 298,714 |
| 7 |  | 236 | 200 |  | 47,237 |  | 16,977 |  | 30,261 |  | 1,098 |  | 330,073 |
| 8 |  | 236 | 200 |  | 47,237 |  | 19,527 |  | 27,710 |  | 1,204 |  | 358,987 |
| 9 |  | 236 | 200 |  | 47,237 |  | 22,078 |  | 25,159 |  | 1,300 |  | 385,447 |
| 10 |  | 236 | 200 |  | 47,237 |  | 24,629 |  | 22,609 |  | 1,389 |  | 409,444 |
| 11 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 54,914 |  | $(54,914)$ |  | 1,337 |  | 355,868 |
| 12 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 44,753 |  | $(44,753)$ |  | 1,167 |  | 312,282 |
| 13 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 34,593 |  | $(34,593)$ |  | 1,032 |  | 278,721 |
| 14 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 24,432 |  | $(24,432)$ |  | 933 |  | 255,222 |
| 15 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 24,432 |  | $(24,432)$ |  | 851 |  | 231,640 |
| 16 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 24,432 |  | $(24,432)$ |  | 768 |  | 207,975 |
| 17 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 24,432 |  | $(24,432)$ |  | 685 |  | 184,228 |
| 18 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 24,432 |  | $(24,432)$ |  | 602 |  | 160,398 |
| 19 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 24,432 |  | $(24,432)$ |  | 519 |  | 136,484 |
| 20 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 24,432 |  | $(24,432)$ |  | 435 |  | 112,487 |
| 21 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 22,336 |  | $(22,336)$ |  | 355 |  | 90,505 |
| 22 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 20,093 |  | $(20,093)$ |  | 282 |  | 70,694 |
| 23 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 17,750 |  | $(17,750)$ |  | 216 |  | 53,160 |
| 24 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 15,304 |  | $(15,304)$ |  | 159 |  | 38,016 |
| 25 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 12,753 |  | $(12,753)$ |  | 111 |  | 25,373 |
| 26 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 10,203 |  | $(10,203)$ |  | 71 |  | 15,242 |
| 27 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 7,652 |  | $(7,652)$ |  | 40 |  | 7,630 |
| 28 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 5,101 |  | $(5,101)$ |  | 18 |  | 2,546 |
| 29 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 2,551 |  | $(2,551)$ |  | 4 |  | - |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 472,373 | \$ | 490,609 |  |  | \$ | 8,236 |  |  |

(1) Service Area 6, Page 2 Section II

# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Impact Fee Calculation <br> Service Area 6 

| Year | Number of Years to End of Period | Interest <br> Rate <br> Factor | Impact <br> Fee <br> Factor | Annual Vehicle Miles |  | Annual Expense |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Actual | Escalated |  | Actual |  | alated |
| 1 | 29 | 1.1047 | 1.0000 | 200 | 221 | \$ | $(28,189)$ | \$ | $(31,140)$ |
| 2 | 28 | 1.1009 | 1.0000 | 200 | 220 |  | $(15,785)$ |  | $(17,377)$ |
| 3 | 27 | 1.0970 | 1.0000 | 200 | 220 |  | $(3,282)$ |  | $(3,600)$ |
| 4 | 26 | 1.0932 | 1.0000 | 200 | 219 |  | 9,325 |  | 10,194 |
| 5 | 25 | 1.0894 | 1.0000 | 200 | 218 |  | 11,875 |  | 12,937 |
| 6 | 24 | 1.0856 | 1.0000 | 200 | 217 |  | 14,426 |  | 15,660 |
| 7 | 23 | 1.0818 | 1.0000 | 200 | 217 |  | 16,977 |  | 18,365 |
| 8 | 22 | 1.0780 | 1.0000 | 200 | 216 |  | 19,527 |  | 21,051 |
| 9 | 21 | 1.0743 | 1.0000 | 200 | 215 |  | 22,078 |  | 23,717 |
| 10 | 20 | 1.0705 | 1.0000 | 200 | 214 |  | 24,629 |  | 26,365 |
| 11 | 19 | 1.0668 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 54,914 |  | 58,580 |
| 12 | 18 | 1.0631 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 44,753 |  | 47,575 |
| 13 | 17 | 1.0593 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 34,593 |  | 36,646 |
| 14 | 16 | 1.0557 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 24,432 |  | 25,792 |
| 15 | 15 | 1.0520 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 24,432 |  | 25,702 |
| 16 | 14 | 1.0483 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 24,432 |  | 25,612 |
| 17 | 13 | 1.0446 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 24,432 |  | 25,523 |
| 18 | 12 | 1.0410 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 24,432 |  | 25,434 |
| 19 | 11 | 1.0374 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 24,432 |  | 25,345 |
| 20 | 10 | 1.0338 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 24,432 |  | 25,257 |
| 21 | 9 | 1.0301 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 22,336 |  | 23,009 |
| 22 | 8 | 1.0266 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 20,093 |  | 20,627 |
| 23 | 7 | 1.0230 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 17,750 |  | 18,158 |
| 24 | 6 | 1.0194 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 15,304 |  | 15,601 |
| 25 | 5 | 1.0158 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 12,753 |  | 12,955 |
| 26 | 4 | 1.0123 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 10,203 |  | 10,328 |
| 27 | 3 | 1.0088 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 7,652 |  | 7,719 |
| 28 | 2 | 1.0053 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 5,101 |  | 5,128 |
| 29 | 1 | 1.0018 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 2,551 |  | 2,555 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2,177 |  |  | \$ | 513,718 |


| Annual Interest Rate: |  | $0.35 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Value of Initial Impact Fee Fund Balance | $\$$ | - |
| Total Escalated Expense for Entire Period | $\$$ | 513,718 |
| Less Future Value of Initial Impact Fee Fund Balance | $\$$ | 513,718 |
| Sub-Total | $\$$ | 2,177 |
|  |  |  |
| Total Escalated Vehicle Miles | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 6}$ |

City of Waco-2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study
Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Impact Fee Project Funding
Service Area 6

| Impact Fee Roadway ${ }^{(1)}$ | Impact Fee Project No. ${ }^{(1)}$ | Cost In <br> Service Area ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Impact Fee } \\ \text { Eligible Cost }{ }^{(1)} \end{gathered}$ |  | Impact Fee <br> Recoverable Cost |  | Debt Funded ${ }^{(3)}$ Proposed |  | Non-Debt <br> Funded ${ }^{(3)}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gholson Rd (From 960' S of Herring Ave To Herring Ave) | 1 | \$ | 41,235 | \$ | 41,089 | \$ | 20,545 | \$ | 20,545 |  |  |
| Gholson Rd (From Herring Ave To Lakeshore Dr) | 17 |  | 570,550 |  | 568,535 |  | 284,268 |  | 284,268 |  | - |
| Impact Fee Study |  |  | 3,922 |  | 3,922 |  | 1,961 |  | - |  | 1,961 |
| Total |  | \$ | 615,707 | \$ | 613,547 | \$ | 306,773 | \$ | 304,812 |  | 1,961 |

(1) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(2) $50 \%$ of Eligible Costs

Service Area 6
Page 5 of 5

## SUMMARY OF ROADWAY IMPACT FEE DETERMINATION

Service Area 7

| Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs | $\$$ | $2,393,745$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
|  | Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study |  |
| Financing Costs | $1,435,329$ | See Detail Below |
| Interest Earnings | $(142,378)$ | Page 3 of Service Area 7 |
| Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 6 8 6 , 6 9 6}$ |
| Sum of Above |  |  |
| Equivalent Connections | 3,879 | Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study |
| Maximum Assessable Impact Fee | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{9 5 0}$ |

## Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs:

Represents the portion of capital improvement costs that are eligible for funding through Impact fees after adjusting for the $50 \%$ credit. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study. In 2001, the Impact Fee Statute was amended to include either a credit for ad valorem and utility revenues generated by new service units during the ten-year timeframe that are used to fund impact fee eligible projects for which the new service units were charged an impact fee or a credit equal to $50 \%$ of the total cost of implementing the impact fee capital improvement plan. The City has elected to use the $50 \%$ credit.

## Financing Costs:

Represents the interest costs associated with debt financing the new Impact fee project costs. Interest costs are derived from the City's Financial Advisor.

| New Annual Debt Service | \$ | 3,815,206 | (Page 2 of Service Area 7) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Annual Debt Service |  |  | (Page 2 of Service Area 7) |
| Principal Component |  | (2,379,877) | Page 5 of Service Area 7) |
| Financing Costs | \$ | 1,435,329 |  |

## Interest Earnings:

Represents the interest earned on cash flows and assumes a $0.35 \%$ annual interest rate per the most recent investment portfolio. The Impact Fee Statute states that interest earnings are funds of the impact fee account and are held to the same restrictions as impact fee revenues. Therefore, in order to recognize that interest earnings are used to fund capital improvements, interest earnings are credited against the recoverable costs. Reference is the sum of Accumulated Interest on page 3 of Service Area 7.

## Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee:

Represents the sum of Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs (after 50\% credit) plus Financing Costs less Interest Earnings.

## Equivalent Connections:

Represents the growth in equivalent vehicle-miles over the ten-year timeframe. A vehicle-mile is a standardized measure of use attributable to an individual unit of development calculated in accordance with generally accepted engineering standards. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study.

## Maximum Assessable Impact Fee:

Represents Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee divided by Equivalent Connections. This is the maximum impact fee that can be assessed by the City.

## City of Waco-2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Impact Fee Calculation Assumptions Service Area 7

I. General Assumptions

| Annual Interest Rate on Deposits ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | 0.35\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Annual Vehicle Mile Growth ${ }^{(2)}$ |  | 388 |
| Existing Fund Balance ${ }^{(3)}$ | \$ | - |
| Portion of Projects Funded by Existing Debt ${ }^{(4)}$ | \$ |  |
| Non-debt Funded Project Cost ${ }^{(5)}$ |  | 13,868 |
| New Project Cost Funded Through New Debt ${ }^{(6)}$ |  | 2,379,877 |
| Total Recoverable Project Cost ${ }^{(7)}$ | \$ | 2,393,745 |

II. New Debt Issues Assumptions

| Year | Principal ${ }^{(8)}$ | Interest ${ }^{(9)}$ | Term |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ 237,988 | 3.25\% | 20 |
| 2 | 237,988 | 4.00\% | 20 |
| 3 | 237,988 | 4.50\% | 20 |
| 4 | 237,988 | 5.00\% | 20 |
| 5 | 237,988 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 6 | 237,988 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 7 | 237,988 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 8 | 237,988 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 9 | 237,988 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 10 | 237,988 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| Total | \$ 2,379,877 |  |  |

## III. Capital Expenditure Assumptions

|  | Annual <br> Capital |
| :---: | :---: |
| Year |  |
| Expenditures ${ }^{(10)}$ |  |,

(1) Estimated Interest Rate per Staff as of May 2020
(2) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(3) There is no existing fund balance because this is a new roadway impact fee
(4) Per discussions with City Staff and City files
(5) This assumes $0 \%$ of new project costs funded through sources other than debt, unless specified otherwise
(6) This assumes $100 \%$ of new project costs funded through new debt issues, unless specified otherwise
(7) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(8) Assumes new debt issued in equal annual amounts
(9) Estimated interest on future debt from Financial Advisor as of May 2020
(10) Assumes new debt proceeds expended over a 3-year timeframe Non-debt funded capital expenditures allocated in equal annual amounts

# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Debt Service and Expense Summary
Service Area 7

## I. New Debt Service Detai

| Year |  | Series 1 |  | Series $\underline{2}$ |  | Series $\underline{\mathbf{3}}$ |  | Series $\underline{4}$ |  | Series $\underline{5}$ |  | Series $\underline{6}$ |  | Series 7 |  | Series $\underline{8}$ |  | Series $\underline{9}$ |  | Series $\underline{10}$ |  | New Debt Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 16,369 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 16,369 |
| 2 |  | 16,369 |  | 17,512 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 33,880 |
| 3 |  | 16,369 |  | 17,512 |  | 18,296 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 52,176 |
| 4 |  | 16,369 |  | 17,512 |  | 18,296 |  | 19,097 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 71,272 |
| 5 |  | 16,369 |  | 17,512 |  | 18,296 |  | 19,097 |  | 19,915 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 91,187 |
| 6 |  | 16,369 |  | 17,512 |  | 18,296 |  | 19,097 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 111,102 |
| 7 |  | 16,369 |  | 17,512 |  | 18,296 |  | 19,097 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 131,016 |
| 8 |  | 16,369 |  | 17,512 |  | 18,296 |  | 19,097 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | - |  | - |  | 150,931 |
| 9 |  | 16,369 |  | 17,512 |  | 18,296 |  | 19,097 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | - |  | 170,846 |
| 10 |  | 16,369 |  | 17,512 |  | 18,296 |  | 19,097 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 190,760 |
| 11 |  | 16,369 |  | 17,512 |  | 18,296 |  | 19,097 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 190,760 |
| 12 |  | 16,369 |  | 17,512 |  | 18,296 |  | 19,097 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 190,760 |
| 13 |  | 16,369 |  | 17,512 |  | 18,296 |  | 19,097 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 190,760 |
| 14 |  | 16,369 |  | 17,512 |  | 18,296 |  | 19,097 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 190,760 |
| 15 |  | 16,369 |  | 17,512 |  | 18,296 |  | 19,097 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 190,760 |
| 16 |  | 16,369 |  | 17,512 |  | 18,296 |  | 19,097 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 190,760 |
| 17 |  | 16,369 |  | 17,512 |  | 18,296 |  | 19,097 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 190,760 |
| 18 |  | 16,369 |  | 17,512 |  | 18,296 |  | 19,097 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 190,760 |
| 19 |  | 16,369 |  | 17,512 |  | 18,296 |  | 19,097 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 190,760 |
| 20 |  | 16,369 |  | 17,512 |  | 18,296 |  | 19,097 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 190,760 |
| 21 |  | - |  | 17,512 |  | 18,296 |  | 19,097 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 174,392 |
| 22 |  | - |  | - |  | 18,296 |  | 19,097 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 156,880 |
| 23 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 19,097 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 138,585 |
| 24 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 119,488 |
| 25 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 99,573 |
| 26 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 79,659 |
| 27 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 59,744 |
| 28 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |  | 39,829 |
| 29 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 19,915 |  | 19,915 |
|  | \$ | 327,371 | \$ | 350,231 | \$ | 365,911 | \$ | 381,935 | \$ | 398,293 | \$ | 398,293 | \$ | 398,293 | \$ | 398,293 | \$ | 398,293 | \$ | 398,293 | \$ | 3,815,206 |

II. Summary of Annual Expenses

| Year |  | New <br> Annual <br> Debt <br> Service ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Annual <br> Capital <br> xpenditures ${ }^{(2)}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Annual } \\ \text { Bond } \\ \text { Proceeds }^{(2)} \end{gathered}$ | Existing <br> Annual <br> Debt <br> Service ${ }^{(3)}$ |  | Total Expense |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 16,369 | \$ | 1,387 | \$ | $(237,988)$ | \$ | \$ | $(220,232)$ |
| 2 |  | 33,880 |  | 80,716 |  | $(237,988)$ | - |  | $(123,392)$ |
| 3 |  | 52,176 |  | 160,045 |  | $(237,988)$ | - |  | $(25,767)$ |
| 4 |  | 71,272 |  | 239,374 |  | $(237,988)$ | - |  | 72,659 |
| 5 |  | 91,187 |  | 239,374 |  | $(237,988)$ | - |  | 92,574 |
| 6 |  | 111,102 |  | 239,374 |  | $(237,988)$ | - |  | 112,489 |
| 7 |  | 131,016 |  | 239,374 |  | $(237,988)$ | - |  | 132,403 |
| 8 |  | 150,931 |  | 239,374 |  | $(237,988)$ | - |  | 152,318 |
| 9 |  | 170,846 |  | 239,374 |  | $(237,988)$ | - |  | 172,232 |
| 10 |  | 190,760 |  | 239,374 |  | $(237,988)$ | - |  | 192,147 |
| 11 |  | 190,760 |  | 237,988 |  | - | - |  | 428,748 |
| 12 |  | 190,760 |  | 158,658 |  | - | - |  | 349,419 |
| 13 |  | 190,760 |  | 79,329 |  | - | - |  | 270,090 |
| 14 |  | 190,760 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 190,760 |
| 15 |  | 190,760 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 190,760 |
| 16 |  | 190,760 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 190,760 |
| 17 |  | 190,760 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 190,760 |
| 18 |  | 190,760 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 190,760 |
| 19 |  | 190,760 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 190,760 |
| 20 |  | 190,760 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 190,760 |
| 21 |  | 174,392 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 174,392 |
| 22 |  | 156,880 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 156,880 |
| 23 |  | 138,585 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 138,585 |
| 24 |  | 119,488 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 119,488 |
| 25 |  | 99,573 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 99,573 |
| 26 |  | 79,659 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 79,659 |
| 27 |  | 59,744 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 59,744 |
| 28 |  | 39,829 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 39,829 |
| 29 |  | 19,915 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 19,915 |

(1) Service Area 7, Page 2 Section
(2) Service Area 7, Page 1
(3) Eligible debt funded projects as a percent of total principal times original annual debt service; does not reflect current outstanding balances

# City of Waco-2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Revenue Test
Service Area 7

| Year |  | Impact <br> Fee | Vehicle <br> Miles |  | Impact Fee Revenue |  | Annual xpenses ${ }^{(1)}$ | Sub-Total |  | Accumulated Interest |  |  | Estimated Fund Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
| 1 | \$ | 950 | 388 | \$ | 368,670 | \$ | $(220,232)$ | \$ | 588,902 | \$ | 1,031 |  | 589,932 |
| 2 |  | 950 | 388 |  | 368,670 |  | $(123,392)$ |  | 492,061 |  | 2,926 |  | 1,084,919 |
| 3 |  | 950 | 388 |  | 368,670 |  | $(25,767)$ |  | 394,436 |  | 4,487 |  | 1,483,843 |
| 4 |  | 950 | 388 |  | 368,670 |  | 72,659 |  | 296,010 |  | 5,711 |  | 1,785,565 |
| 5 |  | 950 | 388 |  | 368,670 |  | 92,574 |  | 276,096 |  | 6,733 |  | 2,068,393 |
| 6 |  | 950 | 388 |  | 368,670 |  | 112,489 |  | 256,181 |  | 7,688 |  | 2,332,262 |
| 7 |  | 950 | 388 |  | 368,670 |  | 132,403 |  | 236,266 |  | 8,576 |  | 2,577,105 |
| 8 |  | 950 | 388 |  | 368,670 |  | 152,318 |  | 216,352 |  | 9,398 |  | 2,802,855 |
| 9 |  | 950 | 388 |  | 368,670 |  | 172,232 |  | 196,437 |  | 10,154 |  | 3,009,446 |
| 10 |  | 950 | 388 |  | 368,670 |  | 192,147 |  | 176,522 |  | 10,842 |  | 3,196,810 |
| 11 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 428,748 |  | $(428,748)$ |  | 10,439 |  | 2,778,501 |
| 12 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 349,419 |  | $(349,419)$ |  | 9,113 |  | 2,438,196 |
| 13 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 270,090 |  | $(270,090)$ |  | 8,061 |  | 2,176,167 |
| 14 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 190,760 |  | $(190,760)$ |  | 7,283 |  | 1,992,690 |
| 15 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 190,760 |  | $(190,760)$ |  | 6,641 |  | 1,808,570 |
| 16 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 190,760 |  | $(190,760)$ |  | 5,996 |  | 1,623,806 |
| 17 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 190,760 |  | $(190,760)$ |  | 5,349 |  | 1,438,395 |
| 18 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 190,760 |  | $(190,760)$ |  | 4,701 |  | 1,252,335 |
| 19 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 190,760 |  | $(190,760)$ |  | 4,049 |  | 1,065,624 |
| 20 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 190,760 |  | $(190,760)$ |  | 3,396 |  | 878,260 |
| 21 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 174,392 |  | $(174,392)$ |  | 2,769 |  | 706,637 |
| 22 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 156,880 |  | $(156,880)$ |  | 2,199 |  | 551,955 |
| 23 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 138,585 |  | $(138,585)$ |  | 1,689 |  | 415,060 |
| 24 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 119,488 |  | $(119,488)$ |  | 1,244 |  | 296,816 |
| 25 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 99,573 |  | $(99,573)$ |  | 865 |  | 198,107 |
| 26 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 79,659 |  | $(79,659)$ |  | 554 |  | 119,002 |
| 27 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 59,744 |  | $(59,744)$ |  | 312 |  | 59,570 |
| 28 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 39,829 |  | $(39,829)$ |  | 139 |  | 19,880 |
| 29 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 19,915 |  | $(19,915)$ |  | 35 |  | - |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 3,686,696 | \$ | 3,829,074 |  |  | \$ | 42,378 |  |  |

(1) Service Area 7, Page 2 Section II

# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Impact Fee Calculation <br> Service Area 7 



# City of Waco-2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Impact Fee Project Funding
Service Area 7

| Impact Fee Roadway ${ }^{(1)}$ | Impact Fee Project No. ${ }^{(1)}$ | Cost In <br> Service Area ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Impact Fee } \\ \text { Eligible Cost }{ }^{(1)} \end{gathered}$ |  | Impact Fee <br> Recoverable Cost |  | Debt Funded ${ }^{(3)}$ Proposed |  | Non-Debt <br> Funded ${ }^{(3)}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North River Crossing (From End of bridge To 580' NE of Cu | 18 | \$ | 943,700 | \$ | 304,696 | \$ | 152,348 | \$ | 152,348 | \$ |  |
| North River Crossing (From 580' NE of Curry Ln To Yankie | 19 |  | 366,900 |  | 118,462 |  | 59,231 |  | 59,231 |  |  |
| Flat Rock Rd (From Yankie Rd To Tree Lake Rd) | 20 |  | 2,301,550 |  | 743,109 |  | 371,555 |  | 371,555 |  |  |
| Flat Rock Rd (From Tree Lake Rd To China Spring Rd) | 21 |  | 3,365,800 |  | 1,086,727 |  | 543,364 |  | 543,364 |  |  |
| Yankie Rd (From North River Crossing To Flat Rock Rd) | 22 |  | 4,041,100 |  | 1,304,763 |  | 652,382 |  | 652,382 |  |  |
| Tree Lake Dr (From China Spring Rd To Flat Rock Rd) | 23 |  | 3,356,800 |  | 1,083,821 |  | 541,911 |  | 541,911 |  |  |
| Wortham Bend (From North City Limit To China Spring Rd) | 24 |  | 366,010 |  | 118,175 |  | 59,087 |  | 59,087 |  | - |
| Impact Fee Study |  |  | 27,736 |  | 27,736 |  | 13,868 |  | - |  | 13,868 |
| Total |  | \$ | 14,769,596 | \$ | 4,787,490 | \$ | 2,393,745 | \$ | 2,379,877 | \$ | 13,868 |

[^0]Service Area 7
Page 5 of 5

## SUMMARY OF ROADWAY IMPACT FEE DETERMINATION

Service Area 8

| Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs | $\$$ | - |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Financing Costs |  | - |
| Interest Earnings | See Detail Below |  |
| Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee | $\$$ | - |
| Pqage 3 of Service Area 8 |  |  |
| Maximum Assessable Impact Fee |  | - |
| Sum of Above |  |  |

## Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs:

Represents the portion of capital improvement costs that are eligible for funding through Impact fees after adjusting for the $50 \%$ credit. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study. In 2001, the Impact Fee Statute was amended to include either a credit for ad valorem and utility revenues generated by new service units during the ten-year timeframe that are used to fund impact fee eligible projects for which the new service units were charged an impact fee or a credit equal to $50 \%$ of the total cost of implementing the impact fee capital improvement plan. The City has elected to use the $50 \%$ credit.

## Financing Costs:

Represents the interest costs associated with debt financing the new Impact fee project costs. Interest costs are derived from the City's Financial Advisor.

| New Annual Debt Service | \$ | (Page 2 of Service Area 8) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Annual Debt Service |  | (Page 2 of Service Area 8) |
| Principal Component |  | (Page 5 of Service Area 8) |
| Financing Costs | \$ |  |

## Interest Earnings:

Represents the interest earned on cash flows and assumes a $0.35 \%$ annual interest rate per the most recent investment portfolio. The Impact Fee Statute states that interest earnings are funds of the impact fee account and are held to the same restrictions as impact fee revenues. Therefore, in order to recognize that interest earnings are used to fund capital improvements, interest earnings are credited against the recoverable costs. Reference is the sum of Accumulated Interest on page 3 of Service Area 8.

## Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee:

Represents the sum of Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs (after 50\% credit) plus Financing Costs less Interest Earnings.

## Equivalent Connections:

Represents the growth in equivalent vehicle-miles over the ten-year timeframe. A vehicle-mile is a standardized measure of use attributable to an individual unit of development calculated in accordance with generally accepted engineering standards. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study.

## Maximum Assessable Impact Fee:

Represents Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee divided by Equivalent Connections. This is the maximum impact fee that can be assessed by the City.

## City of Waco-2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Impact Fee Calculation Assumptions Service Area 8

## I. General Assumptions


II. New Debt Issues Assumptions

| Year | Principal ${ }^{(8)}$ |  | Interest ${ }^{(9)}$ | Term |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | - | 3.25\% | 20 |
| 2 |  | - | 4.00\% | 20 |
| 3 |  | - | 4.50\% | 20 |
| 4 |  | - | 5.00\% | 20 |
| 5 |  | - | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 6 |  | - | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 7 |  | - | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 8 |  | - | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 9 |  | - | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 10 |  | - | 5.50\% | 20 |

III. Capital Expenditure Assumptions

(1) Estimated Interest Rate per Staff as of May 2020
(2) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(3) There is no existing fund balance because this is a new roadway impact fee
(4) Per discussions with City Staff and City files
(5) This assumes $0 \%$ of new project costs funded through sources other than debt, unless specified otherwise
(6) This assumes $100 \%$ of new project costs funded through new debt issues, unless specified otherwise
(7) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(8) Assumes new debt issued in equal annual amounts
(9) Estimated interest on future debt from Financial Advisor as of May 2020
(10) Assumes new debt proceeds expended over a 3-year timeframe Non-debt funded capital expenditures allocated in equal annual amounts

# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Debt Service and Expense Summary
Service Area 8

II. Summary of Annual Expenses

(1) Service Area 8, Page 2 Section I
(2) Service Area 8, Page 1
(3) Eligible debt funded projects as a percent of total principal times original annual debt service; does not reflect current outstanding balances

## City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Revenue Test
Service Area 8

| Year |  | Impact <br> Fee | Vehicle <br> Miles |  | Impact Fee <br> Revenue |  | Annual $\text { Expenses }{ }^{(1)}$ |  | Sub-Total |  | Accumulated Interest | Estimated Fund Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ |
| 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 |  | - | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - | - |
| 26 |  | - | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - | - |
| 27 |  | - | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - | - |
| 28 |  | - | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - | - |
| 29 |  | - | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - | - |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | - | \$ |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |

(1) Service Area 8, Page 2 Section II

# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Impact Fee Calculation <br> Service Area 8 

| Year | Number of Years to End of Period | Interest Rate Factor | Impact Fee <br> Factor | Annual Vehicle Miles |  | Annual Expense |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Escalated |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 29 | 1.1047 | 1.0000 | - | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 2 | 28 | 1.1009 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 3 | 27 | 1.0970 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 4 | 26 | 1.0932 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 5 | 25 | 1.0894 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 6 | 24 | 1.0856 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 7 | 23 | 1.0818 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 8 | 22 | 1.0780 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 9 | 21 | 1.0743 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 10 | 20 | 1.0705 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 11 | 19 | 1.0668 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 12 | 18 | 1.0631 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 13 | 17 | 1.0593 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 14 | 16 | 1.0557 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 15 | 15 | 1.0520 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 16 | 14 | 1.0483 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 17 | 13 | 1.0446 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 18 | 12 | 1.0410 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 19 | 11 | 1.0374 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 20 | 10 | 1.0338 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 21 | 9 | 1.0301 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 22 | 8 | 1.0266 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 23 | 7 | 1.0230 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 24 | 6 | 1.0194 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 25 | 5 | 1.0158 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 26 | 4 | 1.0123 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 27 | 3 | 1.0088 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 28 | 2 | 1.0053 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |
| 29 | 1 | 1.0018 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | - |  | - |

Annual Interest Rate:
Value of Initial Impact Fee Fund Balance
Total Escalated Expense for Entire Period
Less Future Value of Initial Impact Fee Fund Balance
Sub-Total
Total Escalated Vehicle Miles
Impact Fee For Service Area 8

City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study
Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Impact Fee Project Funding
Service Area 8

| Impact Fee Roadway ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Impact Fee <br> Project No. ${ }^{(1)}$ | Cost In Service Area ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Impact Fee Eligible Cost ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Impact Fee Recoverable Cost |  | Debt Funded ${ }^{(3)}$ Proposed |  | Non-Debt <br> Funded ${ }^{(3)}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Impact Fee Study |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  | - |  | - |
|  | Total |  | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  |

(1) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study (2) $50 \%$ of Eligible Costs

## SUMMARY OF ROADWAY IMPACT FEE DETERMINATION

Service Area 9

| Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs | $\$$ | $4,391,638$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
|  | Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study |  |
| Financing Costs | $2,645,980$ | See Detail Below |
| Interest Earnings | $(262,470)$ | Page 3 of Service Area 9 |
| Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{6 , 7 7 5 , 1 4 9}$ |
| Sum of Above |  |  |
| Equivalent Connections | 10,967 | Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study |
| Maximum Assessable Impact Fee | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 8}$ |

## Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs:

Represents the portion of capital improvement costs that are eligible for funding through Impact fees after adjusting for the $50 \%$ credit. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study. In 2001, the Impact Fee Statute was amended to include either a credit for ad valorem and utility revenues generated by new service units during the ten-year timeframe that are used to fund impact fee eligible projects for which the new service units were charged an impact fee or a credit equal to $50 \%$ of the total cost of implementing the impact fee capital improvement plan. The City has elected to use the $50 \%$ credit.

## Financing Costs:

Represents the interest costs associated with debt financing the new Impact fee project costs. Interest costs are derived from the City's Financial Advisor.

| New Annual Debt Service | \$ | 7,033,202 | (Page 2 of Service Area 9) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Annual Debt Service |  |  | (Page 2 of Service Area 9) |
| Principal Component |  | $(4,387,222)$ | (Page 5 of Service Area 9) |
| Financing Costs | \$ | 2,645,980 |  |

## Interest Earnings:

Represents the interest earned on cash flows and assumes a $0.35 \%$ annual interest rate per the most recent investment portfolio. The Impact Fee Statute states that interest earnings are funds of the impact fee account and are held to the same restrictions as impact fee revenues. Therefore, in order to recognize that interest earnings are used to fund capital improvements, interest earnings are credited against the recoverable costs. Reference is the sum of Accumulated Interest on page 3 of Service Area 9.

## Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee:

Represents the sum of Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs (after 50\% credit) plus Financing Costs less Interest Earnings.

## Equivalent Connections:

Represents the growth in equivalent vehicle-miles over the ten-year timeframe. A vehicle-mile is a standardized measure of use attributable to an individual unit of development calculated in accordance with generally accepted engineering standards. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study.

## Maximum Assessable Impact Fee:

Represents Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee divided by Equivalent Connections. This is the maximum impact fee that can be assessed by the City.

## City of Waco-2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Impact Fee Calculation Assumptions Service Area 9

I. General Assumptions

| Annual Interest Rate on Deposits ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | 0.35\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Annual Vehicle Mile Growth ${ }^{(2)}$ |  | 1,097 |
| Existing Fund Balance ${ }^{(3)}$ | \$ |  |
| Portion of Projects Funded by Existing Debt ${ }^{(4)}$ | \$ |  |
| Non-debt Funded Project Cost ${ }^{(5)}$ |  | 4,416 |
| New Project Cost Funded Through New Debt ${ }^{(6)}$ |  | 4,387,222 |
| Total Recoverable Project Cost ${ }^{(7)}$ | \$ | 4,391,638 |

II. New Debt Issues Assumptions

| Year | Principal ${ }^{(8)}$ | Interest ${ }^{(9)}$ | Term |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ 438,722 | 3.25\% | 20 |
| 2 | 438,722 | 4.00\% | 20 |
| 3 | 438,722 | 4.50\% | 20 |
| 4 | 438,722 | 5.00\% | 20 |
| 5 | 438,722 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 6 | 438,722 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 7 | 438,722 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 8 | 438,722 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 9 | 438,722 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 10 | 438,722 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| Total | \$ 4,387,222 |  |  |

III. Capital Expenditure Assumptions

| Year | Annual Capital <br> Expenditures ${ }^{(10)}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 442 |
| 2 |  | 146,682 |
| 3 |  | 292,923 |
| 4 |  | 439,164 |
| 5 |  | 439,164 |
| 6 |  | 439,164 |
| 7 |  | 439,164 |
| 8 |  | 439,164 |
| 9 |  | 439,164 |
| 10 |  | 439,164 |
| 11 |  | 438,722 |
| 12 |  | 292,481 |
| 13 |  | 146,241 |
| Total | \$ | 4,391,638 |

(1) Estimated Interest Rate per Staff as of May 2020
(2) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(3) There is no existing fund balance because this is a new roadway impact fee
(4) Per discussions with City Staff and City files
(5) This assumes $0 \%$ of new project costs funded through sources other than debt, unless specified otherwise
(6) This assumes $100 \%$ of new project costs funded through new debt issues, unless specified otherwise
(7) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(8) Assumes new debt issued in equal annual amounts
(9) Estimated interest on future debt from Financial Advisor as of May 2020
(10) Assumes new debt proceeds expended over a 3-year timeframe Non-debt funded capital expenditures allocated in equal annual amounts

# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Debt Service and Expense Summary
Service Area 9

## I. New Debt Service Detail

| Year |  | Series 1 |  | Series 2 |  | Series <br> 3 |  | Series 4 |  | Series 5 |  | Series <br> 6 |  | Series 7 |  | Series <br> 8 |  | Series 9 |  | Series $\underline{10}$ |  | w Debt ervice |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 30,175 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 30,175 |
| 2 |  | 30,175 |  | 32,282 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 62,457 |
| 3 |  | 30,175 |  | 32,282 |  | 33,727 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 96,184 |
| 4 |  | 30,175 |  | 32,282 |  | 33,727 |  | 35,204 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 131,388 |
| 5 |  | 30,175 |  | 32,282 |  | 33,727 |  | 35,204 |  | 36,712 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 168,100 |
| 6 |  | 30,175 |  | 32,282 |  | 33,727 |  | 35,204 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 204,812 |
| 7 |  | 30,175 |  | 32,282 |  | 33,727 |  | 35,204 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 241,524 |
| 8 |  | 30,175 |  | 32,282 |  | 33,727 |  | 35,204 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | - |  | - |  | 278,236 |
| 9 |  | 30,175 |  | 32,282 |  | 33,727 |  | 35,204 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | - |  | 314,948 |
| 10 |  | 30,175 |  | 32,282 |  | 33,727 |  | 35,204 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 351,660 |
| 11 |  | 30,175 |  | 32,282 |  | 33,727 |  | 35,204 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 351,660 |
| 12 |  | 30,175 |  | 32,282 |  | 33,727 |  | 35,204 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 351,660 |
| 13 |  | 30,175 |  | 32,282 |  | 33,727 |  | 35,204 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 351,660 |
| 14 |  | 30,175 |  | 32,282 |  | 33,727 |  | 35,204 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 351,660 |
| 15 |  | 30,175 |  | 32,282 |  | 33,727 |  | 35,204 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 351,660 |
| 16 |  | 30,175 |  | 32,282 |  | 33,727 |  | 35,204 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 351,660 |
| 17 |  | 30,175 |  | 32,282 |  | 33,727 |  | 35,204 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 351,660 |
| 18 |  | 30,175 |  | 32,282 |  | 33,727 |  | 35,204 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 351,660 |
| 19 |  | 30,175 |  | 32,282 |  | 33,727 |  | 35,204 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 351,660 |
| 20 |  | 30,175 |  | 32,282 |  | 33,727 |  | 35,204 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 351,660 |
| 21 |  | - |  | 32,282 |  | 33,727 |  | 35,204 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 321,485 |
| 22 |  | - |  | - |  | 33,727 |  | 35,204 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 289,203 |
| 23 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 35,204 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 255,476 |
| 24 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 220,272 |
| 25 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 183,560 |
| 26 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 146,848 |
| 27 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 110,136 |
| 28 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |  | 73,424 |
| 29 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 36,712 |  | 36,712 |
|  | \$ | 603,496 | \$ | 645,639 | \$ | 674,545 | \$ | 704,084 | \$ | 734,240 | \$ | 734,240 | \$ | 734,240 | \$ | 734,240 | \$ | 734,240 | \$ | 734,240 | \$ | 7,033,202 |

II. Summary of Annual Expenses

| Year |  | New <br> Annual Debt <br> Service ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Annual Capital xpenditures ${ }^{(2)}$ |  | Annual Bond Proceeds ${ }^{(2)}$ |  | Existing <br> Annual <br> Debt <br> Service ${ }^{(3)}$ |  | Total Expense |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 30,175 | \$ | 442 | \$ | $(438,722)$ | \$ | - | \$ | $(408,106)$ |
| 2 |  | 62,457 |  | 146,682 |  | $(438,722)$ |  | - |  | $(229,583)$ |
| 3 |  | 96,184 |  | 292,923 |  | $(438,722)$ |  | - |  | $(49,615)$ |
| 4 |  | 131,388 |  | 439,164 |  | $(438,722)$ |  | - |  | 131,830 |
| 5 |  | 168,100 |  | 439,164 |  | $(438,722)$ |  | - |  | 168,542 |
| 6 |  | 204,812 |  | 439,164 |  | $(438,722)$ |  | - |  | 205,254 |
| 7 |  | 241,524 |  | 439,164 |  | $(438,722)$ |  | - |  | 241,966 |
| 8 |  | 278,236 |  | 439,164 |  | $(438,722)$ |  | - |  | 278,678 |
| 9 |  | 314,948 |  | 439,164 |  | $(438,722)$ |  | - |  | 315,390 |
| 10 |  | 351,660 |  | 439,164 |  | $(438,722)$ |  | - |  | 352,102 |
| 11 |  | 351,660 |  | 438,722 |  | - |  | - |  | 790,382 |
| 12 |  | 351,660 |  | 292,481 |  | - |  | - |  | 644,142 |
| 13 |  | 351,660 |  | 146,241 |  | - |  |  |  | 497,901 |
| 14 |  | 351,660 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 351,660 |
| 15 |  | 351,660 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 351,660 |
| 16 |  | 351,660 |  | - |  | - |  |  |  | 351,660 |
| 17 |  | 351,660 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 351,660 |
| 18 |  | 351,660 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 351,660 |
| 19 |  | 351,660 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 351,660 |
| 20 |  | 351,660 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 351,660 |
| 21 |  | 321,485 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 321,485 |
| 22 |  | 289,203 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 289,203 |
| 23 |  | 255,476 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 255,476 |
| 24 |  | 220,272 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 220,272 |
| 25 |  | 183,560 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 183,560 |
| 26 |  | 146,848 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 146,848 |
| 27 |  | 110,136 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 110,136 |
| 28 |  | 73,424 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 73,424 |
| 29 |  | 36,712 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 36,712 |

(1) Service Area 9, Page 2 Section I
(2) Service Area 9, Page 1
(3) Eligible debt funded projects as a percent of total principal times original annual debt service; does not reflect current outstanding balances

# City of Waco-2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Revenue Test
Service Area 9

| Year |  | Impact <br> Fee | Vehicle Miles |  | Impact Fee Revenue |  | Annual $\text { Expenses }{ }^{(1)}$ | Sub-Total |  | Accumulated Interest |  |  | Estimated Fund Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
| 1 | \$ | 618 | 1,097 | \$ | 677,515 | \$ | $(408,106)$ | \$ | 1,085,621 | \$ | 1,900 |  | 1,087,520 |
| 2 |  | 618 | 1,097 |  | 677,515 |  | $(229,583)$ |  | 907,098 |  | 5,394 |  | 2,000,012 |
| 3 |  | 618 | 1,097 |  | 677,515 |  | $(49,615)$ |  | 727,130 |  | 8,273 |  | 2,735,415 |
| 4 |  | 618 | 1,097 |  | 677,515 |  | 131,830 |  | 545,685 |  | 10,529 |  | 3,291,628 |
| 5 |  | 618 | 1,097 |  | 677,515 |  | 168,542 |  | 508,973 |  | 12,411 |  | 3,813,013 |
| 6 |  | 618 | 1,097 |  | 677,515 |  | 205,254 |  | 472,261 |  | 14,172 |  | 4,299,446 |
| 7 |  | 618 | 1,097 |  | 677,515 |  | 241,966 |  | 435,549 |  | 15,810 |  | 4,750,805 |
| 8 |  | 618 | 1,097 |  | 677,515 |  | 278,678 |  | 398,837 |  | 17,326 |  | 5,166,968 |
| 9 |  | 618 | 1,097 |  | 677,515 |  | 315,390 |  | 362,125 |  | 18,718 |  | 5,547,811 |
| 10 |  | 618 | 1,097 |  | 677,515 |  | 352,102 |  | 325,413 |  | 19,987 |  | 5,893,211 |
| 11 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 790,382 |  | $(790,382)$ |  | 19,243 |  | 5,122,072 |
| 12 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 644,142 |  | $(644,142)$ |  | 16,800 |  | 4,494,731 |
| 13 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 497,901 |  | $(497,901)$ |  | 14,860 |  | 4,011,690 |
| 14 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 351,660 |  | $(351,660)$ |  | 13,426 |  | 3,673,455 |
| 15 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 351,660 |  | $(351,660)$ |  | 12,242 |  | 3,334,037 |
| 16 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 351,660 |  | $(351,660)$ |  | 11,054 |  | 2,993,431 |
| 17 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 351,660 |  | $(351,660)$ |  | 9,862 |  | 2,651,632 |
| 18 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 351,660 |  | $(351,660)$ |  | 8,665 |  | 2,308,637 |
| 19 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 351,660 |  | $(351,660)$ |  | 7,465 |  | 1,964,442 |
| 20 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 351,660 |  | $(351,660)$ |  | 6,260 |  | 1,619,042 |
| 21 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 321,485 |  | $(321,485)$ |  | 5,104 |  | 1,302,661 |
| 22 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 289,203 |  | $(289,203)$ |  | 4,053 |  | 1,017,511 |
| 23 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 255,476 |  | $(255,476)$ |  | 3,114 |  | 765,149 |
| 24 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 220,272 |  | $(220,272)$ |  | 2,293 |  | 547,170 |
| 25 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 183,560 |  | $(183,560)$ |  | 1,594 |  | 365,204 |
| 26 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 146,848 |  | $(146,848)$ |  | 1,021 |  | 219,377 |
| 27 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 110,136 |  | $(110,136)$ |  | 575 |  | 109,816 |
| 28 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 73,424 |  | $(73,424)$ |  | 256 |  | 36,648 |
| 29 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 36,712 |  | $(36,712)$ |  | 64 |  | - |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 6,775,149 | \$ | 7,037,618 |  |  | \$ | 62,470 |  |  |

(1) Service Area 9, Page 2 Section II

# City of Waco-2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Impact Fee Calculation <br> Service Area 9 

| Year | Number of Years to End of Period | Interest Rate Factor | Impact Fee <br> Factor | Annual Vehicle Miles |  | Annual Expense |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Escalated |  | Actual |  | calated |
| 1 | 29 | 1.1047 | 1.0000 | 1,097 | 1,212 | \$ | $(408,106)$ | \$ | $(450,836)$ |
| 2 | 28 | 1.1009 | 1.0000 | 1,097 | 1,207 |  | $(229,583)$ |  | $(252,737)$ |
| 3 | 27 | 1.0970 | 1.0000 | 1,097 | 1,203 |  | $(49,615)$ |  | $(54,428)$ |
| 4 | 26 | 1.0932 | 1.0000 | 1,097 | 1,199 |  | 131,830 |  | 144,114 |
| 5 | 25 | 1.0894 | 1.0000 | 1,097 | 1,195 |  | 168,542 |  | 183,605 |
| 6 | 24 | 1.0856 | 1.0000 | 1,097 | 1,191 |  | 205,254 |  | 222,818 |
| 7 | 23 | 1.0818 | 1.0000 | 1,097 | 1,186 |  | 241,966 |  | 261,755 |
| 8 | 22 | 1.0780 | 1.0000 | 1,097 | 1,182 |  | 278,678 |  | 300,418 |
| 9 | 21 | 1.0743 | 1.0000 | 1,097 | 1,178 |  | 315,390 |  | 338,809 |
| 10 | 20 | 1.0705 | 1.0000 | 1,097 | 1,174 |  | 352,102 |  | 376,927 |
| 11 | 19 | 1.0668 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 790,382 |  | 843,159 |
| 12 | 18 | 1.0631 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 644,142 |  | 684,756 |
| 13 | 17 | 1.0593 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 497,901 |  | 527,449 |
| 14 | 16 | 1.0557 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 351,660 |  | 371,230 |
| 15 | 15 | 1.0520 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 351,660 |  | 369,935 |
| 16 | 14 | 1.0483 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 351,660 |  | 368,645 |
| 17 | 13 | 1.0446 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 351,660 |  | 367,359 |
| 18 | 12 | 1.0410 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 351,660 |  | 366,078 |
| 19 | 11 | 1.0374 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 351,660 |  | 364,801 |
| 20 | 10 | 1.0338 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 351,660 |  | 363,529 |
| 21 | 9 | 1.0301 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 321,485 |  | 331,176 |
| 22 | 8 | 1.0266 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 289,203 |  | 296,882 |
| 23 | 7 | 1.0230 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 255,476 |  | 261,345 |
| 24 | 6 | 1.0194 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 220,272 |  | 224,546 |
| 25 | 5 | 1.0158 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 183,560 |  | 186,469 |
| 26 | 4 | 1.0123 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 146,848 |  | 148,655 |
| 27 | 3 | 1.0088 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 110,136 |  | 111,102 |
| 28 | 2 | 1.0053 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 73,424 |  | 73,810 |
| 29 | 1 | 1.0018 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 36,712 |  | 36,776 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 11,927 |  |  | \$ | 7,368,149 |
|  | Annual Interest Rate: |  |  |  |  | 0.35\% |  |  |  |
|  | Value of Initial Impact Fee Fund Balance |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  |
|  | Total Escalated Expense for Entire Period |  |  |  |  | \$ | 7,368,149 |  |  |
|  | Less Future Value of Initial Impact Fee Fund Balance |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
|  | Sub-Total |  |  |  |  | \$ | 7,368,149 |  |  |
|  | Total Escalated Vehicle Miles |  |  |  |  |  | 11,927 |  |  |
|  | Impact Fee For Service Area 9 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 618 |  |  |

# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Impact Fee Project Funding
Service Area 9

| Impact Fee Roadway ${ }^{(1)}$ | Impact Fee <br> Project No. ${ }^{(1)}$ | Cost In <br> Service Area ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Impact Fee <br> Eligible Cost ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Impact Fee Recoverable Cost |  | Debt Funded ${ }^{(3)}$ Proposed |  | Non-Debt <br> Funded ${ }^{(3)}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mars Dr (From Hewitt Dr To Texas Central Pkwy) | 25 | \$ | 2,545,650 | \$ | 2,545,650 | \$ | 1,272,825 | \$ | 1,272,825 | \$ | - |
| Beverly Dr (From W Loop 340 To 4128' NE of Loop 340) | 26 |  | 1,467,500 |  | 1,467,500 |  | 733,750 |  | 733,750 |  | - |
| Beverly Dr (From 4128' NE of Loop 340 To New Road) | 27 |  | 273,050 |  | 273,050 |  | 136,525 |  | 136,525 |  | - |
| Hewitt Dr (From Woodway Dr To Old McGregor Dr) | 28 |  | 32,350 |  | 32,350 |  | 16,175 |  | 16,175 |  | - |
| Hewitt Dr (From Old McGregor Dr To Imperial Dr) | 29 |  | 83,100 |  | 83,100 |  | 41,550 |  | 41,550 |  | - |
| Hewitt Dr (From Imperial Dr To Mars Dr) | 30 |  | 106,500 |  | 106,500 |  | 53,250 |  | 53,250 |  | - |
| Texas Central Pkwy (From Railroad To Imperial Dr) | 31 |  | 720,600 |  | 720,600 |  | 360,300 |  | 360,300 |  | - |
| S New Rd (From Bagby Ave To I-35) | 10 |  | 730,733 |  | 730,733 |  | 365,367 |  | 365,367 |  | - |
| Bagby Ave. (From New Road To TX 340) | 32 |  | 2,814,960 |  | 2,814,960 |  | 1,407,480 |  | 1,407,480 |  | - |
| Impact Fee Study |  |  | 8,833 |  | 8,833 |  | 4,416 |  | - |  | 4,416 |
| Total |  | \$ | 8,783,276 | \$ | 8,783,276 | \$ | 4,391,638 | \$ | 4,387,222 | \$ | 4,416 |

(1) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(2) $50 \%$ of Eligible Costs

# SUMMARY OF ROADWAY IMPACT FEE DETERMINATION 

Service Area 10

| Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs | $\$$ | $2,263,085$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
|  | Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study |  |
| Financing Costs | $1,362,050$ | See Detail Below |
| Interest Earnings | $(135,109)$ | Page 3 of Service Area 10 |
| Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee | $\mathbf{3 , 4 9 0 , 0 2 6}$ | Sum of Above |
| Equivalent Connections | 2,636 | Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study |
| Maximum Assessable Impact Fee | $\mathbf{1 , 3 2 4}$ |  |

## Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs:

Represents the portion of capital improvement costs that are eligible for funding through Impact fees after adjusting for the $50 \%$ credit. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study. In 2001, the Impact Fee Statute was amended to include either a credit for ad valorem and utility revenues generated by new service units during the ten-year timeframe that are used to fund impact fee eligible projects for which the new service units were charged an impact fee or a credit equal to $50 \%$ of the total cost of implementing the impact fee capital improvement plan. The City has elected to use the $50 \%$ credit.

## Financing Costs:

Represents the interest costs associated with debt financing the new Impact fee project costs. Interest costs are derived from the City's Financial Advisor.

| New Annual Debt Service | $\$$ | $3,620,425$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Annual Debt Service | $-\quad$(Page 2 of Service Area 10) <br> (Page 2 of Service Area 10) |  |
| Principal Component |  | $(2,258,375)$ |
| (Page 5 of Service Area 10) |  |  |
| Financing Costs | $\$ 1,362,050$ |  |

## Interest Earnings:

Represents the interest earned on cash flows and assumes a $0.35 \%$ annual interest rate per the most recent investment portfolio. The Impact Fee Statute states that interest earnings are funds of the impact fee account and are held to the same restrictions as impact fee revenues. Therefore, in order to recognize that interest earnings are used to fund capital improvements, interest earnings are credited against the recoverable costs. Reference is the sum of Accumulated Interest on page 3 of Service Area 10.

## Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee:

Represents the sum of Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs (after 50\% credit) plus Financing Costs less Interest Earnings.

## Equivalent Connections:

Represents the growth in equivalent vehicle-miles over the ten-year timeframe. A vehicle-mile is a standardized measure of use attributable to an individual unit of development calculated in accordance with generally accepted engineering standards. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study.

## Maximum Assessable Impact Fee:

Represents Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee divided by Equivalent Connections. This is the maximum impact fee that can be assessed by the City.

## City of Waco-2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Impact Fee Calculation Assumptions <br> Service Area 10

I. General Assumptions

| Annual Interest Rate on Deposits ${ }^{(1)}$ | $0.35 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
|  |  |
| Existing Fund Balance ${ }^{(3)}$ | 264 |
|  |  |
|  |  |

II. New Debt Issues Assumptions

| Year | Principal ${ }^{(8)}$ | Interest ${ }^{(9)}$ | Term |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ 225,837 | 3.25\% | 20 |
| 2 | 225,837 | 4.00\% | 20 |
| 3 | 225,837 | 4.50\% | 20 |
| 4 | 225,837 | 5.00\% | 20 |
| 5 | 225,837 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 6 | 225,837 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 7 | 225,837 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 8 | 225,837 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 9 | 225,837 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| 10 | 225,837 | 5.50\% | 20 |
| Total | \$ 2,258,375 |  |  |

## III. Capital Expenditure Assumptions

| Year | $\begin{gathered} \text { Annual } \\ \text { Capital } \\ \text { Expenditures }^{(10)} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 471 |
| 2 |  | 75,750 |
| 3 |  | 151,029 |
| 4 |  | 226,309 |
| 5 |  | 226,309 |
| 6 |  | 226,309 |
| 7 |  | 226,309 |
| 8 |  | 226,309 |
| 9 |  | 226,309 |
| 10 |  | 226,309 |
| 11 |  | 225,837 |
| 12 |  | 150,558 |
| 13 |  | 75,279 |
| Total | \$ | 2,263,085 |

(1) Estimated Interest Rate per Staff as of May 2020
(2) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(3) There is no existing fund balance because this is a new roadway impact fee
(4) Per discussions with City Staff and City files
(5) This assumes $0 \%$ of new project costs funded through sources other than debt, unless specified otherwise
(6) This assumes $100 \%$ of new project costs funded through new debt issues, unless specified otherwise
(7) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(8) Assumes new debt issued in equal annual amounts
(9) Estimated interest on future debt from Financial Advisor as of May 2020
(10) Assumes new debt proceeds expended over a 3-year timeframe Non-debt funded capital expenditures allocated in equal annual amounts

# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Debt Service and Expense Summary

| Year |  | Series 1 |  | Series $\underline{2}$ |  | Series $\underline{3}$ |  | Series <br> 4 |  | Series $\underline{5}$ |  | Series <br> 6 |  | Series 7 |  | Series $8$ |  | Series <br> 9 |  | Series <br> 10 | New Debt Service |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 15,533 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 15,533 |
| 2 |  | 15,533 |  | 16,618 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 32,150 |
| 3 |  | 15,533 |  | 16,618 |  | 17,362 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 49,512 |
| 4 |  | 15,533 |  | 16,618 |  | 17,362 |  | 18,122 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 67,634 |
| 5 |  | 15,533 |  | 16,618 |  | 17,362 |  | 18,122 |  | 18,898 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 86,532 |
| 6 |  | 15,533 |  | 16,618 |  | 17,362 |  | 18,122 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 105,430 |
| 7 |  | 15,533 |  | 16,618 |  | 17,362 |  | 18,122 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 124,327 |
| 8 |  | 15,533 |  | 16,618 |  | 17,362 |  | 18,122 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | - |  | - |  | 143,225 |
| 9 |  | 15,533 |  | 16,618 |  | 17,362 |  | 18,122 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | - |  | 162,123 |
| 10 |  | 15,533 |  | 16,618 |  | 17,362 |  | 18,122 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 181,021 |
| 11 |  | 15,533 |  | 16,618 |  | 17,362 |  | 18,122 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 181,021 |
| 12 |  | 15,533 |  | 16,618 |  | 17,362 |  | 18,122 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 181,021 |
| 13 |  | 15,533 |  | 16,618 |  | 17,362 |  | 18,122 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 181,021 |
| 14 |  | 15,533 |  | 16,618 |  | 17,362 |  | 18,122 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 181,021 |
| 15 |  | 15,533 |  | 16,618 |  | 17,362 |  | 18,122 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 181,021 |
| 16 |  | 15,533 |  | 16,618 |  | 17,362 |  | 18,122 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 181,021 |
| 17 |  | 15,533 |  | 16,618 |  | 17,362 |  | 18,122 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 181,021 |
| 18 |  | 15,533 |  | 16,618 |  | 17,362 |  | 18,122 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 181,021 |
| 19 |  | 15,533 |  | 16,618 |  | 17,362 |  | 18,122 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 181,021 |
| 20 |  | 15,533 |  | 16,618 |  | 17,362 |  | 18,122 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 181,021 |
| 21 |  | - |  | 16,618 |  | 17,362 |  | 18,122 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 165,488 |
| 22 |  | - |  | - |  | 17,362 |  | 18,122 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 148,871 |
| 23 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 18,122 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 131,509 |
| 24 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 113,388 |
| 25 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 94,490 |
| 26 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 75,592 |
| 27 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 56,694 |
| 28 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |  | 37,796 |
| 29 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 18,898 |  | 18,898 |
|  | \$ | 310,657 | \$ | 332,350 | \$ | 347,230 | \$ | 362,436 | \$ | 377,959 | \$ | 377,959 | \$ | 377,959 | \$ | 377,959 | \$ | 377,959 | \$ | 377,959 | \$ | 3,620,425 |

II. Summary of Annual Expenses

| Year |  | New Annual Debt Service ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Annual <br> Capital <br> xpenditures ${ }^{(2)}$ |  | Annual <br> Bond <br> Proceeds ${ }^{(2)}$ | Existing <br> Annual <br> Debt <br> Service ${ }^{(3)}$ |  | Total Expense |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 15,533 | \$ | 471 | \$ | $(225,837)$ | \$ | \$ | $(209,834)$ |
| 2 |  | 32,150 |  | 75,750 |  | $(225,837)$ | - |  | $(117,937)$ |
| 3 |  | 49,512 |  | 151,029 |  | $(225,837)$ | - |  | $(25,296)$ |
| 4 |  | 67,634 |  | 226,309 |  | $(225,837)$ | - |  | 68,105 |
| 5 |  | 86,532 |  | 226,309 |  | $(225,837)$ | - |  | 87,003 |
| 6 |  | 105,430 |  | 226,309 |  | $(225,837)$ | - |  | 105,901 |
| 7 |  | 124,327 |  | 226,309 |  | $(225,837)$ | - |  | 124,799 |
| 8 |  | 143,225 |  | 226,309 |  | $(225,837)$ | - |  | 143,696 |
| 9 |  | 162,123 |  | 226,309 |  | $(225,837)$ | - |  | 162,594 |
| 10 |  | 181,021 |  | 226,309 |  | $(225,837)$ | - |  | 181,492 |
| 11 |  | 181,021 |  | 225,837 |  | - | - |  | 406,859 |
| 12 |  | 181,021 |  | 150,558 |  | - | - |  | 331,580 |
| 13 |  | 181,021 |  | 75,279 |  | - |  |  | 256,300 |
| 14 |  | 181,021 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 181,021 |
| 15 |  | 181,021 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 181,021 |
| 16 |  | 181,021 |  | - |  | - |  |  | 181,021 |
| 17 |  | 181,021 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 181,021 |
| 18 |  | 181,021 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 181,021 |
| 19 |  | 181,021 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 181,021 |
| 20 |  | 181,021 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 181,021 |
| 21 |  | 165,488 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 165,488 |
| 22 |  | 148,871 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 148,871 |
| 23 |  | 131,509 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 131,509 |
| 24 |  | 113,388 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 113,388 |
| 25 |  | 94,490 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 94,490 |
| 26 |  | 75,592 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 75,592 |
| 27 |  | 56,694 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 56,694 |
| 28 |  | 37,796 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 37,796 |
| 29 |  | 18,898 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 18,898 |

(1) Service Area 10, Page 2 Section I
(2) Service Area 10, Page 1
(3) Eligible debt funded projects as a percent of total principal times original annual debt service; does not reflect current outstanding balances

# City of Waco-2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Revenue Test
Service Area 10

| Year |  | Impact <br> Fee | Vehicle <br> Miles |  | Impact Fee Revenue | Annual Expenses ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Sub-Total |  | Accumulated Interest |  |  | Estimated Fund Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
| 1 | \$ | 1,324 | 264 | \$ | 349,003 | \$ | $(209,834)$ | \$ | 558,836 | \$ | 978 |  | 559,814 |
| 2 |  | 1,324 | 264 |  | 349,003 |  | $(117,937)$ |  | 466,939 |  | 2,776 |  | 1,029,530 |
| 3 |  | 1,324 | 264 |  | 349,003 |  | $(25,296)$ |  | 374,299 |  | 4,258 |  | 1,408,087 |
| 4 |  | 1,324 | 264 |  | 349,003 |  | 68,105 |  | 280,898 |  | 5,420 |  | 1,694,405 |
| 5 |  | 1,324 | 264 |  | 349,003 |  | 87,003 |  | 262,000 |  | 6,389 |  | 1,962,794 |
| 6 |  | 1,324 | 264 |  | 349,003 |  | 105,901 |  | 243,102 |  | 7,295 |  | 2,213,191 |
| 7 |  | 1,324 | 264 |  | 349,003 |  | 124,799 |  | 224,204 |  | 8,139 |  | 2,445,534 |
| 8 |  | 1,324 | 264 |  | 349,003 |  | 143,696 |  | 205,306 |  | 8,919 |  | 2,659,758 |
| 9 |  | 1,324 | 264 |  | 349,003 |  | 162,594 |  | 186,408 |  | 9,635 |  | 2,855,802 |
| 10 |  | 1,324 | 264 |  | 349,003 |  | 181,492 |  | 167,510 |  | 10,288 |  | 3,033,601 |
| 11 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 406,859 |  | $(406,859)$ |  | 9,906 |  | 2,636,648 |
| 12 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 331,580 |  | $(331,580)$ |  | 8,648 |  | 2,313,716 |
| 13 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 256,300 |  | $(256,300)$ |  | 7,649 |  | 2,065,065 |
| 14 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 181,021 |  | $(181,021)$ |  | 6,911 |  | 1,890,955 |
| 15 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 181,021 |  | $(181,021)$ |  | 6,302 |  | 1,716,235 |
| 16 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 181,021 |  | $(181,021)$ |  | 5,690 |  | 1,540,904 |
| 17 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 181,021 |  | $(181,021)$ |  | 5,076 |  | 1,364,959 |
| 18 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 181,021 |  | $(181,021)$ |  | 4,461 |  | 1,188,399 |
| 19 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 181,021 |  | $(181,021)$ |  | 3,843 |  | 1,011,220 |
| 20 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 181,021 |  | $(181,021)$ |  | 3,222 |  | 833,421 |
| 21 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 165,488 |  | $(165,488)$ |  | 2,627 |  | 670,560 |
| 22 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 148,871 |  | $(148,871)$ |  | 2,086 |  | 523,776 |
| 23 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 131,509 |  | $(131,509)$ |  | 1,603 |  | 393,870 |
| 24 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 113,388 |  | $(113,388)$ |  | 1,180 |  | 281,662 |
| 25 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 94,490 |  | $(94,490)$ |  | 820 |  | 187,993 |
| 26 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 75,592 |  | $(75,592)$ |  | 526 |  | 112,927 |
| 27 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 56,694 |  | $(56,694)$ |  | 296 |  | 56,529 |
| 28 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 37,796 |  | $(37,796)$ |  | 132 |  | 18,865 |
| 29 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 18,898 |  | $(18,898)$ |  | 33 |  | - |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 3,490,026 | \$ | 3,625,135 |  |  | \$ | 35,109 |  |  |

(1) Service Area 10, Page 2 Section II

# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Impact Fee Calculation <br> Service Area 10 

| Year | Number of Years to End of Period | Interest <br> Rate <br> Factor | Impact Fee Factor | Annual Vehicle Miles |  | Annual Expense |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Actual | Escalated |  | Actual |  | calated |
| 1 | 29 | 1.1047 | 1.0000 | 264 | 291 | \$ | $(209,834)$ | \$ | $(231,804)$ |
| 2 | 28 | 1.1009 | 1.0000 | 264 | 290 |  | $(117,937)$ |  | $(129,831)$ |
| 3 | 27 | 1.0970 | 1.0000 | 264 | 289 |  | $(25,296)$ |  | $(27,750)$ |
| 4 | 26 | 1.0932 | 1.0000 | 264 | 288 |  | 68,105 |  | 74,451 |
| 5 | 25 | 1.0894 | 1.0000 | 264 | 287 |  | 87,003 |  | 94,778 |
| 6 | 24 | 1.0856 | 1.0000 | 264 | 286 |  | 105,901 |  | 114,963 |
| 7 | 23 | 1.0818 | 1.0000 | 264 | 285 |  | 124,799 |  | 135,005 |
| 8 | 22 | 1.0780 | 1.0000 | 264 | 284 |  | 143,696 |  | 154,907 |
| 9 | 21 | 1.0743 | 1.0000 | 264 | 283 |  | 162,594 |  | 174,668 |
| 10 | 20 | 1.0705 | 1.0000 | 264 | 282 |  | 181,492 |  | 194,289 |
| 11 | 19 | 1.0668 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 406,859 |  | 434,026 |
| 12 | 18 | 1.0631 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 331,580 |  | 352,486 |
| 13 | 17 | 1.0593 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 256,300 |  | 271,511 |
| 14 | 16 | 1.0557 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 181,021 |  | 191,095 |
| 15 | 15 | 1.0520 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 181,021 |  | 190,429 |
| 16 | 14 | 1.0483 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 181,021 |  | 189,764 |
| 17 | 13 | 1.0446 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 181,021 |  | 189,103 |
| 18 | 12 | 1.0410 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 181,021 |  | 188,443 |
| 19 | 11 | 1.0374 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 181,021 |  | 187,786 |
| 20 | 10 | 1.0338 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 181,021 |  | 187,131 |
| 21 | 9 | 1.0301 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 165,488 |  | 170,477 |
| 22 | 8 | 1.0266 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 148,871 |  | 152,824 |
| 23 | 7 | 1.0230 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 131,509 |  | 134,530 |
| 24 | 6 | 1.0194 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 113,388 |  | 115,588 |
| 25 | 5 | 1.0158 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 94,490 |  | 95,987 |
| 26 | 4 | 1.0123 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 75,592 |  | 76,522 |
| 27 | 3 | 1.0088 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 56,694 |  | 57,191 |
| 28 | 2 | 1.0053 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 37,796 |  | 37,995 |
| 29 | 1 | 1.0018 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 18,898 |  | 18,931 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2,867 |  |  | \$ | 3,795,493 |


| Annual Interest Rate: |  | $0.35 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Value of Initial Impact Fee Fund Balance | $\$$ | - |
| Total Escalated Expense for Entire Period | $\$$ | $3,795,493$ |
| Less Future Value of Initial Impact Fee Fund Balance <br> Sub-Total | $\$ 03,795,493$ |  |
| Total Escalated Vehicle Miles |  | 2,867 |
| Impact Fee For Service Area $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 3 2 4}$ |

# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Impact Fee Project Funding
Service Area 10

| Impact Fee Roadway ${ }^{(1)}$ | Impact Fee Project No. ${ }^{(1)}$ | Cost In <br> Service Area ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Impact Fee } \\ \text { Eligible Cost }{ }^{(1)} \end{gathered}$ |  | Impact Fee <br> Recoverable Cost |  | Debt Funded ${ }^{(3)}$ Proposed |  | Non-Debt <br> Funded ${ }^{(3)}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Warren Rd (From City Limit To Ritchie Rd) | 33 | \$ | 1,218,200 | \$ | 786,860 | \$ | 393,430 | \$ | 393,430 | \$ |  |
| Warren Rd (From Ritchie Rd To 3700' east of Ritchie Rd) | 34 |  | 355,950 |  | 229,915 |  | 114,958 |  | 114,958 |  |  |
| Farmiller Rd (From 1300' south of Chapel Rd To 2100' nortl | 35 |  | 1,255,567 |  | 810,996 |  | 405,498 |  | 405,498 |  |  |
| Hewitt Dr (From Old McGregor Dr To Imperial Dr) | 29 |  | 83,100 |  | 53,676 |  | 26,838 |  | 26,838 |  | - |
| Hewitt Dr (From Imperial Dr To Mars Dr) | 30 |  | 106,500 |  | 68,790 |  | 34,395 |  | 34,395 |  | - |
| Chapel Rd (From Meadow Mountain Dr To Ritchie Rd) | 36 |  | 1,835,620 |  | 1,185,664 |  | 592,832 |  | 592,832 |  |  |
| Ritchie Rd (From Panther Way To Warren St) | 37 |  | 2,137,800 |  | 1,380,848 |  | 690,424 |  | 690,424 |  | - |
| Impact Fee Study |  |  | 9,422 |  | 9,422 |  | 4,711 |  | - |  | 4,711 |
| Total |  | \$ | 7,002,158 | \$ | 4,526,171 | \$ | 2,263,085 | \$ | 2,258,375 | \$ | 4,711 |

(1) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(2) $50 \%$ of Eligible Costs

Service Area 10
Page 5 of 5
1-72

# SUMMARY OF ROADWAY IMPACT FEE DETERMINATION 

Service Area 11

| Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs | $\$$ | $\mathbf{1 , 5 8 8 , 8 8 6}$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study |  |  |
| Financing Costs | 953,433 | See Detail Below |
| Interest Earnings | $(94,576)$ | Page 3 of Service Area 11 |
| Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 4 4 7 , 7 4 2}$ |
| Sum of Above |  |  |
| Equivalent Connections | 2,094 | Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study |
| Maximum Assessable Impact Fee | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 1 6 9}$ |

## Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs:

Represents the portion of capital improvement costs that are eligible for funding through Impact fees after adjusting for the $50 \%$ credit. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study. In 2001, the Impact Fee Statute was amended to include either a credit for ad valorem and utility revenues generated by new service units during the ten-year timeframe that are used to fund impact fee eligible projects for which the new service units were charged an impact fee or a credit equal to $50 \%$ of the total cost of implementing the impact fee capital improvement plan. The City has elected to use the $50 \%$ credit.

## Financing Costs:

Represents the interest costs associated with debt financing the new Impact fee project costs. Interest costs are derived from the City's Financial Advisor.

| New Annual Debt Service | \$ | 2,534,291 | (Page 2 of Service Area 11) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Annual Debt Service |  | - | (Page 2 of Service Area 11) |
| Principal Component |  | $(1,580,859)$ | (Page 5 of Service Area 11) |
| Financing Costs | \$ | 953,433 |  |

## Interest Earnings:

Represents the interest earned on cash flows and assumes a $0.35 \%$ annual interest rate per the most recent investment portfolio. The Impact Fee Statute states that interest earnings are funds of the impact fee account and are held to the same restrictions as impact fee revenues. Therefore, in order to recognize that interest earnings are used to fund capital improvements, interest earnings are credited against the recoverable costs. Reference is the sum of Accumulated Interest on page 3 of Service Area 11.

## Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee:

Represents the sum of Recoverable Impact Fee CIP Costs (after 50\% credit) plus Financing Costs less Interest Earnings.

## Equivalent Connections:

Represents the growth in equivalent vehicle-miles over the ten-year timeframe. A vehicle-mile is a standardized measure of use attributable to an individual unit of development calculated in accordance with generally accepted engineering standards. Reference is Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study.

## Maximum Assessable Impact Fee:

Represents Maximum Recoverable Cost for Impact Fee divided by Equivalent Connections. This is the maximum impact fee that can be assessed by the City.

## City of Waco-2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Impact Fee Calculation Assumptions <br> Service Area 11

I. General Assumptions

| Annual Interest Rate on Deposits ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | 0.35\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Annual Vehicle Mile Growth ${ }^{(2)}$ |  | 209 |
| Existing Fund Balance ${ }^{(3)}$ | \$ |  |
| Portion of Projects Funded by Existing Debt ${ }^{(4)}$ | \$ |  |
| Non-debt Funded Project Cost ${ }^{(5)}$ |  | 8,027 |
| New Project Cost Funded Through New Debt ${ }^{(6)}$ |  | 1,580,859 |
| Total Recoverable Project Cost ${ }^{(7)}$ | \$ | 1,588,886 |

II. New Debt Issues Assumptions

III. Capital Expenditure Assumptions

| Year | $\begin{gathered} \text { Annual } \\ \text { Capital } \\ \text { Expenditures }^{(10)} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 803 |
| 2 |  | 53,498 |
| 3 |  | 106,193 |
| 4 |  | 158,889 |
| 5 |  | 158,889 |
| 6 |  | 158,889 |
| 7 |  | 158,889 |
| 8 |  | 158,889 |
| 9 |  | 158,889 |
| 10 |  | 158,889 |
| 11 |  | 158,086 |
| 12 |  | 105,391 |
| 13 |  | 52,695 |
| Total | \$ | 1,588,886 |

(1) Estimated Interest Rate per Staff as of May 2020
(2) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(3) There is no existing fund balance because this is a new roadway impact fee
(4) Per discussions with City Staff and City files
(5) This assumes $0 \%$ of new project costs funded through sources other than debt, unless specified otherwise
(6) This assumes $100 \%$ of new project costs funded through new debt issues, unless specified otherwise
(7) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(8) Assumes new debt issued in equal annual amounts
(9) Estimated interest on future debt from Financial Advisor as of May 2020
(10) Assumes new debt proceeds expended over a 3-year timeframe Non-debt funded capital expenditures allocated in equal annual amounts

# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Debt Service and Expense Summary

| Year |  | Series 1 |  | Series $\underline{2}$ |  | Series $\underline{3}$ |  | Series <br> 4 |  | Series $\underline{5}$ |  | Series <br> 6 |  | Series 7 |  | Series <br> 8 |  | Series <br> 9 |  | Series <br> 10 | New Debt Service |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 10,873 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 10,873 |
| 2 |  | 10,873 |  | 11,632 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 22,505 |
| 3 |  | 10,873 |  | 11,632 |  | 12,153 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 34,658 |
| 4 |  | 10,873 |  | 11,632 |  | 12,153 |  | 12,685 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 47,343 |
| 5 |  | 10,873 |  | 11,632 |  | 12,153 |  | 12,685 |  | 13,229 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 60,572 |
| 6 |  | 10,873 |  | 11,632 |  | 12,153 |  | 12,685 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 73,800 |
| 7 |  | 10,873 |  | 11,632 |  | 12,153 |  | 12,685 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 87,029 |
| 8 |  | 10,873 |  | 11,632 |  | 12,153 |  | 12,685 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | - |  | - |  | 100,258 |
| 9 |  | 10,873 |  | 11,632 |  | 12,153 |  | 12,685 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | - |  | 113,486 |
| 10 |  | 10,873 |  | 11,632 |  | 12,153 |  | 12,685 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 126,715 |
| 11 |  | 10,873 |  | 11,632 |  | 12,153 |  | 12,685 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 126,715 |
| 12 |  | 10,873 |  | 11,632 |  | 12,153 |  | 12,685 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 126,715 |
| 13 |  | 10,873 |  | 11,632 |  | 12,153 |  | 12,685 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 126,715 |
| 14 |  | 10,873 |  | 11,632 |  | 12,153 |  | 12,685 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 126,715 |
| 15 |  | 10,873 |  | 11,632 |  | 12,153 |  | 12,685 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 126,715 |
| 16 |  | 10,873 |  | 11,632 |  | 12,153 |  | 12,685 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 126,715 |
| 17 |  | 10,873 |  | 11,632 |  | 12,153 |  | 12,685 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 126,715 |
| 18 |  | 10,873 |  | 11,632 |  | 12,153 |  | 12,685 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 126,715 |
| 19 |  | 10,873 |  | 11,632 |  | 12,153 |  | 12,685 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 126,715 |
| 20 |  | 10,873 |  | 11,632 |  | 12,153 |  | 12,685 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 126,715 |
| 21 |  | - |  | 11,632 |  | 12,153 |  | 12,685 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 115,842 |
| 22 |  | - |  | - |  | 12,153 |  | 12,685 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 104,209 |
| 23 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 12,685 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 92,056 |
| 24 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 79,371 |
| 25 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 66,143 |
| 26 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 52,914 |
| 27 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 39,686 |
| 28 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |  | 26,457 |
| 29 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 13,229 |  | 13,229 |
|  | \$ | 217,459 | \$ | 232,645 | \$ | 243,061 | \$ | 253,704 | \$ | 264,570 | \$ | 264,570 | \$ | 264,570 | \$ | 264,570 | \$ | 264,570 | \$ | 264,570 | \$ | 2,534,291 |

II. Summary of Annual Expenses

| Year |  | New Annual Debt Service ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Annual <br> Capital <br> xpenditures ${ }^{(2)}$ |  | Annual <br> Bond <br> Proceeds ${ }^{(2)}$ | Existing <br> Annual <br> Debt <br> Service ${ }^{(3)}$ |  | Total Expense |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | 10,873 | \$ | 803 | \$ | $(158,086)$ | \$ | \$ | $(146,410)$ |
| 2 |  | 22,505 |  | 53,498 |  | $(158,086)$ | - |  | $(82,083)$ |
| 3 |  | 34,658 |  | 106,193 |  | $(158,086)$ | - |  | $(17,234)$ |
| 4 |  | 47,343 |  | 158,889 |  | $(158,086)$ | - |  | 48,146 |
| 5 |  | 60,572 |  | 158,889 |  | $(158,086)$ | - |  | 61,375 |
| 6 |  | 73,800 |  | 158,889 |  | $(158,086)$ | - |  | 74,603 |
| 7 |  | 87,029 |  | 158,889 |  | $(158,086)$ | - |  | 87,832 |
| 8 |  | 100,258 |  | 158,889 |  | $(158,086)$ | - |  | 101,060 |
| 9 |  | 113,486 |  | 158,889 |  | $(158,086)$ | - |  | 114,289 |
| 10 |  | 126,715 |  | 158,889 |  | $(158,086)$ | - |  | 127,517 |
| 11 |  | 126,715 |  | 158,086 |  | - | - |  | 284,800 |
| 12 |  | 126,715 |  | 105,391 |  | - | - |  | 232,105 |
| 13 |  | 126,715 |  | 52,695 |  | - |  |  | 179,410 |
| 14 |  | 126,715 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 126,715 |
| 15 |  | 126,715 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 126,715 |
| 16 |  | 126,715 |  | - |  | - |  |  | 126,715 |
| 17 |  | 126,715 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 126,715 |
| 18 |  | 126,715 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 126,715 |
| 19 |  | 126,715 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 126,715 |
| 20 |  | 126,715 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 126,715 |
| 21 |  | 115,842 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 115,842 |
| 22 |  | 104,209 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 104,209 |
| 23 |  | 92,056 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 92,056 |
| 24 |  | 79,371 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 79,371 |
| 25 |  | 66,143 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 66,143 |
| 26 |  | 52,914 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 52,914 |
| 27 |  | 39,686 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 39,686 |
| 28 |  | 26,457 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 26,457 |
| 29 |  | 13,229 |  | - |  | - | - |  | 13,229 |

(1) Service Area 11, Page 2 Section I
(2) Service Area 11, Page 1
(3) Eligible debt funded projects as a percent of total principal times original annual debt service; does not reflect current outstanding balances

# City of Waco-2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Revenue Test
Service Area 11

| Year | Impact <br> Fee |  | Vehicle <br> Miles | Impact Fee <br> Revenue |  | Annual Expenses ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Sub-Total |  | Accumulated Interest |  |  | Estimated Fund Balance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
| 1 | \$ | 1,169 | 209 | \$ | 244,774 | \$ | $(146,410)$ | \$ | 391,184 | \$ | 685 |  | 391,869 |
| 2 |  | 1,169 | 209 |  | 244,774 |  | $(82,083)$ |  | 326,857 |  | 1,944 |  | 720,669 |
| 3 |  | 1,169 | 209 |  | 244,774 |  | $(17,234)$ |  | 262,009 |  | 2,981 |  | 985,659 |
| 4 |  | 1,169 | 209 |  | 244,774 |  | 48,146 |  | 196,628 |  | 3,794 |  | 1,186,081 |
| 5 |  | 1,169 | 209 |  | 244,774 |  | 61,375 |  | 183,400 |  | 4,472 |  | 1,373,952 |
| 6 |  | 1,169 | 209 |  | 244,774 |  | 74,603 |  | 170,171 |  | 5,107 |  | 1,549,230 |
| 7 |  | 1,169 | 209 |  | 244,774 |  | 87,832 |  | 156,942 |  | 5,697 |  | 1,711,870 |
| 8 |  | 1,169 | 209 |  | 244,774 |  | 101,060 |  | 143,714 |  | 6,243 |  | 1,861,827 |
| 9 |  | 1,169 | 209 |  | 244,774 |  | 114,289 |  | 130,485 |  | 6,745 |  | 1,999,057 |
| 10 |  | 1,169 | 209 |  | 244,774 |  | 127,517 |  | 117,257 |  | 7,202 |  | 2,123,516 |
| 11 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 284,800 |  | $(284,800)$ |  | 6,934 |  | 1,845,649 |
| 12 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 232,105 |  | $(232,105)$ |  | 6,054 |  | 1,619,598 |
| 13 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 179,410 |  | $(179,410)$ |  | 5,355 |  | 1,445,542 |
| 14 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 126,715 |  | $(126,715)$ |  | 4,838 |  | 1,323,665 |
| 15 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 126,715 |  | $(126,715)$ |  | 4,411 |  | 1,201,362 |
| 16 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 126,715 |  | $(126,715)$ |  | 3,983 |  | 1,078,630 |
| 17 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 126,715 |  | $(126,715)$ |  | 3,553 |  | 955,469 |
| 18 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 126,715 |  | $(126,715)$ |  | 3,122 |  | 831,877 |
| 19 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 126,715 |  | $(126,715)$ |  | 2,690 |  | 707,852 |
| 20 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 126,715 |  | $(126,715)$ |  | 2,256 |  | 583,394 |
| 21 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 115,842 |  | $(115,842)$ |  | 1,839 |  | 469,391 |
| 22 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 104,209 |  | $(104,209)$ |  | 1,461 |  | 366,642 |
| 23 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 92,056 |  | $(92,056)$ |  | 1,122 |  | 275,708 |
| 24 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 79,371 |  | $(79,371)$ |  | 826 |  | 197,163 |
| 25 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 66,143 |  | $(66,143)$ |  | 574 |  | 131,595 |
| 26 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 52,914 |  | $(52,914)$ |  | 368 |  | 79,049 |
| 27 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 39,686 |  | $(39,686)$ |  | 207 |  | 39,570 |
| 28 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 26,457 |  | $(26,457)$ |  | 92 |  | 13,205 |
| 29 |  | - | - |  | - |  | 13,229 |  | $(13,229)$ |  | 23 |  | - |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 2,447,742 | \$ | 2,542,319 |  |  | \$ | 94,576 |  |  |

(1) Service Area 11, Page 2 Section II

# City of Waco-2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study <br> Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees <br> Impact Fee Calculation <br> Service Area 11 

| Year | Number of Years to End of Period | Interest <br> Rate <br> Factor | Impact Fee Factor | Annual Vehicle Miles |  | Annual Expense |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Actual | Escalated |  | Actual |  | calated |
| 1 | 29 | 1.1047 | 1.0000 | 209 | 231 | \$ | $(146,410)$ | \$ | $(161,740)$ |
| 2 | 28 | 1.1009 | 1.0000 | 209 | 231 |  | $(82,083)$ |  | $(90,361)$ |
| 3 | 27 | 1.0970 | 1.0000 | 209 | 230 |  | $(17,234)$ |  | $(18,906)$ |
| 4 | 26 | 1.0932 | 1.0000 | 209 | 229 |  | 48,146 |  | 52,633 |
| 5 | 25 | 1.0894 | 1.0000 | 209 | 228 |  | 61,375 |  | 66,860 |
| 6 | 24 | 1.0856 | 1.0000 | 209 | 227 |  | 74,603 |  | 80,987 |
| 7 | 23 | 1.0818 | 1.0000 | 209 | 227 |  | 87,832 |  | 95,015 |
| 8 | 22 | 1.0780 | 1.0000 | 209 | 226 |  | 101,060 |  | 108,944 |
| 9 | 21 | 1.0743 | 1.0000 | 209 | 225 |  | 114,289 |  | 122,775 |
| 10 | 20 | 1.0705 | 1.0000 | 209 | 224 |  | 127,517 |  | 136,508 |
| 11 | 19 | 1.0668 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 284,800 |  | 303,817 |
| 12 | 18 | 1.0631 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 232,105 |  | 246,740 |
| 13 | 17 | 1.0593 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 179,410 |  | 190,057 |
| 14 | 16 | 1.0557 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 126,715 |  | 133,766 |
| 15 | 15 | 1.0520 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 126,715 |  | 133,300 |
| 16 | 14 | 1.0483 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 126,715 |  | 132,835 |
| 17 | 13 | 1.0446 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 126,715 |  | 132,371 |
| 18 | 12 | 1.0410 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 126,715 |  | 131,910 |
| 19 | 11 | 1.0374 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 126,715 |  | 131,450 |
| 20 | 10 | 1.0338 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 126,715 |  | 130,991 |
| 21 | 9 | 1.0301 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 115,842 |  | 119,334 |
| 22 | 8 | 1.0266 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 104,209 |  | 106,976 |
| 23 | 7 | 1.0230 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 92,056 |  | 94,171 |
| 24 | 6 | 1.0194 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 79,371 |  | 80,911 |
| 25 | 5 | 1.0158 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 66,143 |  | 67,191 |
| 26 | 4 | 1.0123 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 52,914 |  | 53,565 |
| 27 | 3 | 1.0088 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 39,686 |  | 40,034 |
| 28 | 2 | 1.0053 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 26,457 |  | 26,596 |
| 29 | 1 | 1.0018 | 1.0000 | - | - |  | 13,229 |  | 13,252 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2,277 |  |  | \$ | 2,661,983 |


| Annual Interest Rate: | 0.35\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Value of Initial Impact Fee Fund Balance | \$ |  |
| Total Escalated Expense for Entire Period | \$ | 2,661,983 |
| Less Future Value of Initial Impact Fee Fund Balance |  | - |
| Sub-Total | \$ | 2,661,983 |
| Total Escalated Vehicle Miles |  | 2,277 |
| Impact Fee For Service Area 11 | \$ | 1,169 |

# City of Waco - 2020 Roadway Impact Fee Study 

Capital Improvement Plan for Impact Fees
Impact Fee Project Funding
Service Area 11

| Impact Fee Roadway ${ }^{(1)}$ | Impact Fee Project No. ${ }^{(1)}$ | Cost In Service Area ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Impact Fee <br> Eligible Cost ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | Impact Fee Recoverable Cost ${ }^{(2)}$ |  | Debt Funded Proposed |  | Non-Debt Funded |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Val Verde Rd (From Fossil Rim Rd To US 84) | 38 | \$ | 956,033 | \$ | 287,882 | \$ | 143,941 | \$ | 143,941 | \$ |  |
| Harris Creek Rd (From US 84 To Walking Horse Ln) | 39 |  | 711,100 |  | 214,128 |  | 107,064 |  | 107,064 |  |  |
| Speegleville Rd (From Pecan Creek To Oak Rd) | 40 |  | 3,297,667 |  | 992,999 |  | 496,499 |  | 496,499 |  |  |
| Speegleville Rd (From Oak Rd To US 84) | 41 |  | 2,686,267 |  | 808,893 |  | 404,447 |  | 404,447 |  |  |
| Old Lorena Rd (From US 84 EBFR To South Bosque River) | 42 |  | 2,848,733 |  | 857,815 |  | 428,908 |  | 428,908 |  | - |
| Impact Fee Study |  |  | 16,054 |  | 16,054 |  | 8,027 |  | - |  | 8,027 |
| Total |  | \$ | 10,515,854 | \$ | 3,177,772 | \$ | 1,588,886 | \$ | 1,580,859 | \$ | 8,027 |

(1) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
(2) $50 \%$ of Eligible Costs

## Appendix J

## Impact Fee Ordinance


#### Abstract

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WACO, TEXAS, AMENDING THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF WACO, TEXAS, BY ADDING APPENDIX C ENTITLED "IMPACT FEES"; PROVIDING FOR DEFINITIONS; ESTABLISHING ROADWAY IMPACT FEES WITHIN THE CITY LIMITS, AND WATER AND WASTEWATER IMPACT FEES IN THE CITY AND ITS EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION SERVICE AREA; PROVIDING FOR ASSESSMENT OF SAID IMPACT FEES; PROVIDING FOR THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION OF SAID IMPACT FEES; PROVIDING FOR THE ACCOUNTING OF THE COLLECTED FEES; PROVIDING FOR WAIVERS OF IMPACT FEES; PROVIDING FOR A FEE REFUND; PROVIDING FOR AN APPEAL PROCEDURE; ESTABLISHING AN EFFECTIVE DATE OF JUNE 1, 2021; REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES OR PARTS OF ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT HEREWITH; PROVIDING FOR PENALTIES; PROVIDING A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE; AND FINDING AND DETERMINING THAT THE MEETING AT WHICH THIS ORDINANCE IS PASSED IS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC AS REQUIRED BY LAW.


WHEREAS, Chapter 395 of the Texas Local Government Code (the "Statute") authorizes and provides the requirements for political subdivisions to impose impact fees on new developments in order to generate funding or recoup the costs of capital improvements or facility expansion necessitated by and attributable to the new development; and

WHEREAS, the Statute requires the City to conduct an impact fee study to determine the feasibility of adopting impact fees and the study includes development of the City's Land Use Assumptions (LUA) and Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) Report and the calculation of the maximum allowable impact fees; and

WHEREAS, on December 18, 2018, City Council approved a consulting contract with Freese and Nichols, Inc., to perform an impact fee study for Water, Wastewater, and Roadways and to develop the LUA and CIP Report; and

WHEREAS, in July 2019, pursuant to sec. 395.058 of the Statute, the City appointed the Capital Improvement Advisory Committee, which is composed of the Plan Commission and four members of the development community, to assist Freese and Nichols in adopting land use assumptions and reviewing the capital improvements plan; and

WHEREAS, after notice of a public hearing was given as required by the Statute, the City Council held a public hearing on March 17, 2020, and on April 7, 2020, by Resolution No. 2020-237, approved the land use assumptions and capital improvements plan; and

WHEREAS, the City Council held a public hearing on October 6, 2020, to consider the imposition of impact fees, and the Capital Improvement Advisory Committee of the City of Waco filed its written comments on the proposed impact fees before the fifth business day of the date of said public hearing; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that the City has fully complied with the Statute in adopting and imposing the impact fees in this ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds it to be in the best interest of the citizens of the City of Waco to adopt and approve the impact fees and related administrative processes described herein,

## NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WACO, TEXAS:

Section 1. That the recitals stated above are hereby adopted and approved and incorporated into the body of this ordinance as fully set forth herein, and the impact fees set forth in this ordinance are hereby approved.

Section 2. That the Code of Ordinances of the City of Waco, Texas, shall be amendedbyadding "APPENDIX C IMPACT FEES", which shallread as follows:

APPENDIX C. IMPACT FEES

## Part I. General Provisions

### 1.1 Purpose

This Chapter is intended to assure the provision of adequate public facilities to serve new development in the City by requiring each such development to pay its share of the costs of such improvements necessitated by and attributable to such new development.

### 1.2 Definitions

Terms defined herein are specific to this Chapter and shall not be construed as conflicting with similar terms in other parts of the Municipal Code.

Assessment means the determination of the amount of the maximum impact fee per service unit which can be imposed on new development pursuant to this Chapter.

Capital improvement means any of the following facilities with a life expectancy of three or more years and owned or operated by or on behalf of the City:
(1) water supply, treatment and distribution facilities; wastewater collection and treatment facilities; and storm water, drainage and flood control facilities; whether or not they are located within the service area; and roadway facilities.

Capital improvements plan means a plan approved by the City Council that identifies capital improvements or facility expansions for which impact fees may be assessed.

City means the City of Waco, Texas.
City core and traditional commercial corridors means a geographic location that encompasses the Image Waco master plan area and some additional area within Sanger Heights, University neighborhood and commercial corridors, as depicted in the map attached as "Map Exhibit 2," which have been collectively selected by the City Council to receive special consideration in order to encourage economic development.

City Council means the City Council of the City of Waco, Texas.
City Manager means the City Manager of the City of Waco, Texas, or his or her designee.
Change of Use means a new development involving a change in use or occupancy of any existing structure, with the exception of shell structures never previously occupied, that has the effect of increasing the number of service units beyond those attributable to the immediately preceding use, which requires the issuance of a new permit and which may include, but is not limited to, the reconstruction, redevelopment, conversion, structural alteration or enlargement of any structure.

Director means the Director of the Development Services Department of the City of Waco, Texas, or his or her designee.

Effective date means June 1, 2021.
Extraterritorial jurisdiction (ETJ) means the extraterritorial range of the City's authority outside corporate limits of the City.

Facility expansion means the expansion of the capacity of an existing facility that serves the same function as an otherwise necessary new capital improvement, in order that the existing facility may serve new development. The term does not include the repair, maintenance, modernization or expansion of an existing facility to better serve existing development.

Fee Phasing means upon adoption of this ordinance, developments with an approved preliminary plat or final plat will be assessed an impact fee according to the following schedule:
(1) June 2021: twenty (20) percent of maximum fee of impact fee after application of credits
(2) June 2022: forty (40) percent of maximum fee of impact fee after application of credits
(3) June 2023: sixty (60) percent of maximum fee of impact fee after application of credits
(4) June 2024: eighty (80) percent of maximum fee of impact fee after application of credits
(5) June 2024: one hundred (100) percent of maximum fee of impact fee after application of credits

Final Plat means the map of a subdivision (and any required accompanying material) which is presented to the City Plan Commission, the City Council or authorized City staff for approval, and which, if approved, is recorded in the Official Public Records of McLennan County.

Impact fee means a charge or assessment imposed as set forth in this Chapter against new development. The term does not include:
(1) dedication of land for public parks or payment in lieu of the dedication to serve park needs;
(2) dedication of rights-of-way or easements, or construction or dedication of on-site or off-site water distribution, wastewater collection or drainage facilities, or streets, sidewalks or curbs if the dedication or construction is required by a valid ordinance and is necessitated by and attributable to the new development;
(3) lot or acreage fees to be placed in trust funds for the purpose of reimbursing developers for oversizing or constructing water or sewer mains or lines; or
(4) other pro rata fees for reimbursement of water or sewer mains or lines extended by the City.

Land use assumptions means a description of the service area and projections of changes in land uses, densities, intensities and population in the service area over at least a ten (10) year period and approved by the City Council.

New development means the subdivision of land; the construction, reconstruction, redevelopment, conversion, structural alteration, relocation, or enlargement of any structure; or any use or extension of the use of land; any of which has the effect of increasing the requirements for capital improvements or facility expansions, measured by the number of service units to be generated by such activity, and which requires either the approval of a plat pursuant to the City's subdivision regulations, the issuance of a building permit or connection to the city's water or wastewater system, and which has not been exempted from these regulations by provisions herein or attached hereto. Installation of a larger water meter will constitute new development.

Owner means an owner of real property who is subject to this Chapter, or an agent, employee or representative thereof who is authorized to act on the real property owner's behalf or a person who has paid an impact fee under this Chapter.

Preliminary plat means the preliminary maps and plans approved by Plan Commission and City Council which indicate the proposed layout of the subdivision.

Roadway facilities means arterial or collector streets or roads which have been designated on an officially adopted thoroughfare plan of the City, together with all necessary appurtenances. The term includes the City's share of costs for roadways and associated improvements designated on the federal or Texas highway system, including, but not limited to, local matching funds and costs related to utility line relocation and the establishment of curbs, gutters, sidewalks, drainage appurtenances, and rights-of-way.

School District means a geographic area that contains public or private institutions for the teaching of students. This includes colleges and universities.

Service area means:
(1) for purposes of water (Map Exhibit 3) and wastewater (Map Exhibit 4), the area within the corporate boundaries of the City and ETJ to be served by the capital improvements or facilities expansions specified in the capital improvements plan; and
(2) for purposes of roadways (Map Exhibit 5), an area within the corporate boundaries of the City that does not exceed six miles within which roadway impact fees for capital improvements will be collected for new development, and within which fees so collected will be expended for those capital improvements identified in the capital improvements plan to be located therein. The roadway service areas are more fully described in the Study.

Service unit means a standardized measure of consumption, use, generation or discharge attributable to an individual unit of development calculated in accordance with generally accepted engineering or planning standards and based on historical data and trends applicable to the City during the previous ten (10) years. The service units for purposes of roadways, water, and wastewater are more fully described in the Study.

Site-related facility means an improvement or facility which is for the primary use or benefit of a new development and/or which is for the primary purpose of safe and adequate provision of roadway, water or wastewater facilities to serve the new development, and which is not included in the capital improvements plan and for which the owner is solely responsible under subdivision or other applicable regulations or which is located at least partially on the plat which is being considered for impact fee assessment. This term includes that portion of an off-site water or wastewater main, equivalent to a standard size water or wastewater main, which is necessary to connect any new development with the City's water or wastewater system, the cost of which has not been included in the City's impact fee capital improvements plan.

Study means, collectively, the roadway impact fee study and the water and wastewater impact fee study performed by Freese and Nichols, Inc., on file in the City's Development Services Department.

System-related facility means a capital improvement or facility expansion which is designated in the capital improvements plan and which is not a site-related facility. This term may include a capital improvement which is located off-site or within or on the perimeter of the development site.

Wastewater facility means a wastewater interceptor or main, lift station or other facility or improvement used for providing wastewater collection and treatment included within the City's collection system for wastewater. This term includes, but is not limited to, land, easements or structures associated with such facilities. This term excludes a site-related facility.

Water facility means a water interceptor or main, pump station, storage tank or other facility or improvement used for providing water supply, treatment and distribution service included within the City's water storage or distribution system. This term includes, but is not limited to, land, easements or structures associated with such facilities. This term excludes site-related facilities.

### 1.3 Study Adopted

The Study is hereby approved and adopted for all purposes consistent with this Chapter.

### 1.4 Applicability

The provisions of this Chapter apply to all new development within the corporate boundaries of the City for roadway fees and within the boundaries of the City and its extraterritorial jurisdiction for water and wastewater fees.

## Part II. Impact Fees

### 2.1 Impact Fees Adopted

(A) A pre-credit water impact fee of $\$ 1,804.00$ per service unit shall be assessed and charged against new development in the service area as set forth in Table 1.

For final plats approved before the effective date and final plats recorded on or after the effective date:

Table 1

| Water Meter <br> Size | Service Unit <br> Equivalents | Maximum <br> Assessed <br> Impact Fee | Maximum Impact Fee after <br> Application of General <br> Credit (see Section 2.4 A) |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| $5 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ | 1.0 | $\$ 1,804.00$ | $\$ 1,000.00$ |
| $1^{\prime \prime}$ | 2.67 | $\$ 4,817.00$ | $\$ 2,670.00$ |
| $1.5^{\prime \prime}$ | 6.67 | $\$ 12,033.00$ | $\$ 6,670.00$ |
| $2^{\prime \prime}$ | 10.67 | $\$ 19,249.00$ | $\$ 10,670.00$ |
| $3^{\prime \prime}$ | 23.3 | $\$ 42,087.00$ | $\$ 23,330.00$ |
| $4^{\prime \prime}$ | 42.00 | $\$ 75,768.00$ | $\$ 42,000.00$ |
| $6^{\prime \prime}$ | 93.33 | $\$ 168,367.00$ | $\$ 93,330.00$ |
| $8^{\prime \prime}$ | 160 | $\$ 288,640.00$ | $\$ 160,000.00$ |
| $10^{\prime \prime}$ | 253.33 | $\$ 457,007.00$ | $\$ 253,330.00$ |

(B) A pre-credit wastewater impact fee of $\$ 3,574.00$ per service unit shall be assessed and charged against new development in the service area as set forth in Table 2.

For final plats approved before the effective date and final plats recorded on or after the effective date:

Table 2

| Water Meter Size | Service Unit <br> Equivalents | Maximum Assessed <br> Impact Fee | Maximum Impact Fee after <br> Application of General <br> Credit (see Section 2.4 A) |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| $5 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ | 1.0 | $\$ 3,574.00$ | $\$ 2,000.00$ |
| $1 "$ | 2.67 | $\$ 9,543.00$ | $\$ 5,340.00$ |
| $1.5^{\prime \prime}$ | 6.67 | $\$ 23,839.00$ | $\$ 13,340.00$ |
| $2^{\prime \prime}$ | 10.67 | $\$ 38,135.00$ | $\$ 21,340.00$ |
| $3^{\prime \prime}$ | 23.3 | $\$ 83,381.00$ | $\$ 46,660.00$ |
| $4 "$ | 42.00 | $\$ 150,108.00$ | $\$ 84,000.00$ |
| $6^{\prime \prime}$ | 93.33 | $\$ 333,561.00$ | $\$ 186,660.00$ |
| $8^{\prime \prime}$ | 160 | $\$ 571,840.00$ | $\$ 320,000.00$ |
| $10^{\prime \prime}$ | 253.33 | $\$ 905,401.00$ | $\$ 506,660.00$ |

(C) A pre-credit roadway impact fee of:
(1) $\$ 6.00$ per service unit in Service Area 1;
(2) $\$ 697.00$ per service unit in Service Area 2;
(3) $\$ 1,294.00$ per service unit in Service Area 3;
(4) $\$ 259.00$ per service unit in Service Area 4;
(5) $\$ 0.00$ per service unit in Service Area 5;
(6) $\$ 236.00$ per service unit in Service Area 6;
(7) $\$ 950.00$ per service unit in Service Area 7;
(8) $\$ 0.00$ per service unit in Service Area 8;
(9) $\$ 618.00$ per service unit in Service Area 9;
(10) $\$ 1,324.00$ per service unit in Service Area 10; and
(11) $\$ 1,169.00$ per service unit in Service Area 11,
shall be assessed as shown in Table 3 and charged against new development in such service areas as set forth in Table 4.

For final plats approved before the effective date and for final plats recorded on or after the effective date:

Table 3 - Roadway Maximum Assessed Impact Fee

| Roadway Maximum Assessed Impact Fee |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use Category | Service <br> Area 1 | Service <br> Area 2 | Service <br> Area 3 | Service <br> Area 4 | Service <br> Area 5 | Service <br> Area 6 | Service Area 7 | Service <br> Area 8 | Service <br> Area 9 | Service <br> Area 10 | Service <br> Area 11 |
| Industrial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Light Industrial | \$16.26 | \$1,888.87 | \$3,506.74 | \$701.89 | 50.00 | S639.56 | \$2,574.50 | \$0.00 | \$1,674.78 | \$3,588.04 | \$3,167.99 |
| Manufacturing | \$17.28 | \$2,007,36 | \$3,726.72 | \$745.92 | \$0.00 | \$679.68 | \$2,736.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,779.84 | \$3,813.12 | \$3,366.72 |
| Warehousing | \$4.92 | \$571.54 | \$1,061.08 | \$212.38 | \$0.00 | \$193.52 | \$779.00 | \$0.00 | \$506.76 | \$1,085.68 | \$958.58 |
| Mini-Warehouse | \$2.22 | \$257.89 | \$478.78 | \$95.83 | \$0.00 | \$87.32 | \$351.50 | \$0.00 | \$228.66 | \$489.88 | \$432.53 |
| High-Cube Fulfillment Center |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Warehouse | \$35.34 | \$4,105.33 | \$7,621.66 | \$1,525.51 | \$0.00 | \$1,390.04 | \$5,595.50 | \$0.00 | \$3,640.02 | \$7,798.36 | \$6,885.41 |
| Data Center | \$2.34 | \$271.83 | \$504.66 | \$101.01 | \$0.00 | \$92.04 | \$370.50 | \$0.00 | \$241.02 | \$516.36 | \$455.91 |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-Family Detached Housing | \$19.20 | \$2,230.40 | \$4,140.80 | \$828.80 | \$0.00 | \$755.20 | \$3,040.00 | \$0.00 | 51,977.60 | \$4,236.80 | 53,740.80 |
| Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) | \$10.86 | \$1,261.57 | \$2,342.14 | \$468.79 | \$0.00 | \$427.16 | \$1,719.50 | \$0.00 | \$1,118.58 | \$2,396.44 | \$2,115.89 |
| Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) | 58.52 | \$989.74 | \$1,837.48 | \$367.78 | \$0.00 | S335.12 | \$1,349.00 | \$0.00 | \$877.56 | 51,880.08 | \$1,659.98 |
| Off-Campus Student Apartment | \$1.44 | \$167.28 | \$310.56 | \$62.16 | \$0.00 | \$56.64 | \$228.00 | \$0.00 | \$148.32 | \$317.76 | \$280.56 |
| Mid-Rise Residential with 1st-Floor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial | \$6.00 | \$697.00 | \$1,294.00 | \$259.00 | \$0.00 | \$236.00 | \$950.00 | \$0.00 | \$618.00 | \$1,324.00 | \$1,169.00 |
| Senior Adult Housing - Detached | \$5.16 | \$599.42 | \$1,112.84 | \$222.74 | \$0.00 | \$202.96 | \$817.00 | \$0.00 | \$531.48 | \$1,138.64 | \$1,005.34 |
| Assisted Living | \$2.28 | \$264.86 | \$491.72 | \$98.42 | \$0.00 | \$89.68 | \$361.00 | \$0.00 | \$234.84 | \$503.12 | \$444.22 |
| Continuing Care Retirement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Community | \$2.76 | \$320.62 | \$595.24 | \$119.14 | \$0.00 | \$108.56 | \$437.00 | \$0.00 | \$284.28 | \$609.04 | \$537.74 |
| Lodging |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hotel | \$5.10 | \$592.45 | \$1,099.90 | \$220.15 | \$0.00 | \$200.60 | \$807.50 | \$0.00 | \$525.30 | \$1,125.40 | \$993.65 |
| All Suites Hotel | \$3.06 | \$355.47 | \$659.94 | \$132.09 | \$0.00 | \$120.36 | \$484.50 | \$0.00 | \$315.18 | \$675.24 | \$596.19 |
| Recreational |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Golf Course | \$34.74 | \$4,035.63 | \$7,492.26 | \$1,499.61 | \$0.00 | \$1,366.44 | \$5,500.50 | \$0.00 | \$3,578.22 | \$7,665,96 | \$6,768.51 |
| Miniature Golf Course | \$2.82 | \$327.59 | \$608.18 | \$121.73 | \$0.00 | \$110.92 | \$446.50 | \$0.00 | \$290.46 | \$622.28 | \$549.43 |
| Golf Driving Range | \$10.56 | \$1,226.72 | \$2,277.44 | \$455.84 | \$0.00 | \$415.36 | \$1,672.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,087.68 | \$2,330.24 | \$2,057.44 |
| Multiplex Movie Theater | \$93.06 | \$10,810.47 | \$20,069.94 | \$4,017.09 | \$0.00 | \$3,660.36 | \$14,734.50 | \$0.00 | \$9,585.18 | \$20,535.24 | \$18,131.19 |
| Health/Fitness Club | \$14.70 | \$1,707.65 | \$3,170.30 | \$634.55 | \$0.00 | \$578.20 | \$2,327,50 | \$0.00 | \$1,514.10 | \$3,243.80 | \$2,864.05 |
| Institutional |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Private School ( $\mathrm{K}-8$ ) | \$2.22 | \$257.89 | S478.78 | 595.83 | \$0.00 | \$87.32 | \$351.50 | \$0.00 | \$228.66 | \$439.88 | \$432.53 |
| Private School (k-12) | \$1.44 | \$167.28 | \$310.56 | \$62.16 | \$0,00 | \$56.64 | \$228.00 | \$0.00 | \$148,32 | \$317.76 | \$280.56 |
| Charter Elementary School | \$1.20 | \$139.40 | \$258.80 | \$51.80 | \$0.00 | \$47.20 | \$190.00 | \$0.00 | \$123.60 | \$264.80 | \$233.80 |
| Junior/Community College | \$0.96 | \$111.52 | \$207.04 | \$41.44 | \$0.00 | \$37.76 | \$152.00 | \$0.00 | \$98.88 | \$211.84 | \$187.04 |
| University/College | \$1.56 | \$181.22 | \$336.44 | \$67.34 | \$0.00 | \$61.36 | \$247.00 | \$0.00 | \$160.68 | \$344.24 | \$303.94 |
| Church | \$2.52 | \$292.74 | \$543.48 | \$108.78 | \$0.00 | \$99.12 | \$399.00 | \$0.00 | \$259.56 | \$556.08 | \$490.98 |
| Day Care Center | \$0.66 | \$76.67 | \$142.34 | \$28.49 | \$0.00 | \$25.96 | \$104.50 | \$0.00 | \$67.98 | \$145.64 | \$128.59 |
| Medical |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hospital | \$10.32 | \$1,198.84 | \$2,225.68 | \$445.48 | \$0.00 | \$405.92 | \$1,634.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,062.96 | \$2,277.28 | 52,010.68 |
| Nursing Home | \$6.24 | \$724.88 | \$1,345,76 | \$269.36 | \$0.00 | \$245.44 | \$988.00 | \$0.00 | \$642.72 | \$1,376.96 | \$1,215.76 |
| Clinic | \$34.86 | \$4,049.57 | \$7,518.14 | \$1,504.79 | \$0.00 | \$1,371.16 | \$5,519.50 | \$0.00 | \$3,590.58 | \$7,692,44 | \$6,791.89 |
| Animal Hospital/Veterinary Clinic | \$37.50 | \$4,356.25 | \$8,087.50 | \$1,618.75 | \$0.00 | \$1,475.00 | \$5,937.50 | \$0.00 | \$3,862.50 | \$8,275.00 | \$7,306.25 |
| Free-Standing Emergency Room | \$16.14 | \$1,874.93 | \$3,480.86 | \$696.71 | \$0.00 | \$634.84 | \$2,555.50 | \$0.00 | \$1,662.42 | \$3,561,56 | 53,144.61 |
| Office |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Office Building | \$29.70 | \$3,450.15 | \$6,405.30 | \$1,282.05 | \$0.00 | \$1,168.20 | \$4,702.50 | \$0.00 | \$3,059.10 | \$6,553.80 | \$5,786.55 |
| Medical-Dental Office Building | \$72.24 | \$8,391.88 | \$15,579.76 | \$3,118.36 | \$0.00 | \$2,841.44 | \$11,438.00 | \$0.00 | \$7,440.72 | \$15,940.96 | \$14,074.76 |
| United States Post Office | \$58.08 | \$6,746.96 | \$12,525.92 | \$2,507.12 | \$0.00 | \$2,284.48 | \$9,196.00 | \$0.00 | \$5,982.24 | \$12,816.32 | \$11,315.92 |
| Research and Development Center | \$12.66 | \$1,470.67 | \$2,730,34 | \$546.49 | \$0.00 | \$497.96 | \$2,004.50 | \$0.00 | \$1,303.98 | \$2,793.64 | \$2,466.59 |
| Automotive |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quick Lubrication Vehicle Shop | \$14.28 | \$1,658.86 | \$3,079.72 | \$616.42 | \$0.00 | \$561.68 | \$2,261.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,470.84 | \$3,151.12 | \$2,782.22 |
| Automobile Parts Service Center | \$4.50 | \$522.75 | \$970.50 | \$194.25 | \$0.00 | \$177.00 | \$712.50 | \$0.00 | \$463.50 | \$993.00 | \$876.75 |
| Car Wash and Detail Center | \$10.50 | \$1,219.75 | \$2,264.50 | \$453.25 | \$0.00 | \$413.00 | \$1,662.50 | \$0.00 | \$1,081.50 | \$2,317,00 | \$2,045.75 |

Table 3 (cont.) - Roadway Maximum Assessed Impact Fee

| Roadway Maximum Assessed Impact Fee |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use Category | Service <br> Area 1 | Service <br> Area 2 | Service <br> Area 3 | Service <br> Area 4 | Service <br> Area 5 | Service <br> Area 6 | Service Area 7 | Service <br> Area 8 | Service Area 9 | Sarvice Area 10 | Service Area 11 |
| Dining |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quality Restaurant | \$17,34 | \$2,014.33 | \$3,739.66 | \$748.51 | \$0.00 | \$682.04 | \$2,745.50 | \$0.00 | \$1,786.02 | \$3,826.36 | \$3,378.41 |
| High-Turnover (Sit-Down) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Restaurant | \$24.18 | \$2,808.91 | \$5,214.82 | \$1,043.77 | \$0.00 | \$951.08 | \$3,828.50 | \$0.00 | \$2,490.54 | \$5,335.72 | \$4,711.07 |
| Fast-Food Restaurant w/ Drive- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Through Window | \$64.02 | \$7,436.99 | \$13,806.98 | \$2,763.53 | \$0.00 | \$2,518.12 | \$10,136.50 | \$0.00 | \$6,594.06 | \$14,127.08 | \$12,473.23 |
| Bread/Donut/Bagel Shop w/o Drive- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Retail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shopping Center | \$22.26 | \$2,585.87 | \$4,800.74 | \$960.89 | \$0.00 | \$875.56 | \$3,524.50 | 50.00 | \$2,292.78 | \$4,912.04 | \$4,336.99 |
| Building Materials and Lumber |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Store | \$11.34 | \$1,317.33 | \$2,445.66 | \$489.51 | \$0.00 | \$446.04 | \$1,795.50 | \$0.00 | \$1,168.02 | \$2,502.36 | \$2,209.41 |
| Free-Standing Discount Superstore | \$45.66 | \$5,304.17 | \$9,847,34 | \$1,970.99 | \$0.00 | \$1,795.96 | S7,229.50 | \$0.00 | \$4,702,98 | \$10,075.64 | \$8,896.09 |
| Variety Store | \$75.12 | \$8,726.44 | \$16,200.88 | \$3,242.68 | \$0.00 | \$2,954.72 | \$11,894.00 | \$0.00 | \$7,737,36 | \$16,576.48 | \$14,635.88 |
| Free-Standing Discount Store | \$33.96 | \$3,945.02 | \$7,324.04 | \$1,465.94 | \$0.00 | \$1,335.76 | \$5,377,00 | \$0.00 | \$3,497.88 | \$7,493.84 | \$6,616.54 |
| Hardware/Paint Store | \$9.00 | \$1,045.50 | \$1,941.00 | \$388.50 | \$0.00 | \$354.00 | \$1,425.00 | \$0.00 | \$927.00 | \$1,986.00 | \$1,753.50 |
| Nursery (Garden Center) | \$38.16 | \$4,432.92 | \$8,229.84 | \$1,647.24 | \$0.00 | \$1,500.96 | \$6,042.00 | \$0.00 | \$3,930.48 | \$8,420.64 | \$7,434.84 |
| Supermarket | \$15.54 | \$1,805.23 | \$3,351.46 | \$670.81 | \$0.00 | \$611.24 | \$2,460.50 | \$0.00 | \$1,600.62 | \$3,429.16 | \$3,027.71 |
| Convenience Market w/ Gasoline |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pumps | \$6.24 | \$724.88 | \$1,345.76 | \$269.36 | \$0.00 | \$245.44 | \$988.00 | \$0.00 | \$642.72 | \$1,376.96 | \$1,215.76 |
| Discount Club | \$42.90 | \$4,983.55 | \$9,252.10 | \$1,851.85 | \$0.00 | \$1,687.40 | \$6,792.50 | \$0.00 | \$4,418.70 | \$9,466.60 | \$8,358.35 |
| Sporting Goods Superstore | \$17.70 | \$2,056.15 | \$3,817.30 | \$764.05 | \$0.00 | \$696.20 | \$2,802.50 | \$0.00 | \$1,823.10 | \$3,905.80 | \$3,448.55 |
| Home Improvement Superstore | \$9.54 | \$1,108.23 | \$2,057.46 | \$411.81 | \$0.00 | \$375.24 | \$1,510.50 | \$0.00 | \$982.62 | \$2,105.16 | \$1,858.71 |
| Electronic Superstore | \$16.86 | \$1,958.57 | \$3,636.14 | \$727.79 | \$0.00 | \$663.16 | \$2,669.50 | \$0.00 | \$1,736.58 | \$3,720.44 | \$3,284.89 |
| Pet Supply Superstore | \$36.48 | \$4,237.76 | \$7,867.52 | \$1,574.72 | \$0.00 | \$1,434.88 | \$5,776.00 | \$0.00 | \$3,757.44 | \$8,049.92 | \$7,107.52 |
| Office Supply Superstore | \$28.38 | \$3,296.81 | \$6,120.62 | \$1,225.07 | \$0.00 | \$1,116.28 | \$4,493.50 | \$0.00 | \$2,923.14 | \$6,262.52 | \$5,529.37 |
| Discount Home Furnishing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Superstore | \$22.98 | \$2,669.51 | \$4,956.02 | \$991.97 | \$0.00 | \$903.88 | \$3,638.50 | \$0.00 | \$2,366.94 | \$5,070.92 | \$4,477.27 |
| Department Store | \$20.04 | \$2,327.98 | \$4,321.96 | \$865.06 | \$0.00 | \$788.24 | \$3,173.00 | \$0.00 | \$2,064.12 | \$4,422.16 | \$3,904.46 |
| Arts and Crafts Store | \$63.66 | \$7,395.17 | \$13,729,34 | \$2,747.99 | \$0.00 | \$2,503,96 | \$10,079.50 | \$0.00 | \$6,556,98 | \$14,047.64 | \$12,403.09 |
| Pharmacy/Drugstore w/o Drive- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Through Window | \$12.78 | \$1,484.61 | S2,756.22 | \$551.67 | \$0.00 | \$502.68 | \$2,023.50 | \$0.00 | \$1,316.34 | \$2,820.12 | \$2,489.97 |
| Pharmacy/Drugstore w/ Drive- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Through Window | \$15.48 | \$1,798.26 | \$3,338.52 | \$668.22 | \$0.00 | \$608.88 | \$2,451.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,594.44 | \$3,415.92 | \$3,016,02 |
| Furniture Store | \$1.20 | \$139.40 | \$258.80 | \$51.80 | \$0.00 | \$47.20 | \$190.00 | \$0.00 | \$123.60 | \$264.80 | \$233.80 |
| Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walk-in Bank | \$17.70 | \$2,056.15 | \$3,817.30 | \$764.05 | \$0.00 | \$696.20 | \$2,802.50 | 50.00 | \$1,823.10 | \$3,905.80 | \$3,448.55 |
| Drive-in Bank | \$39.60 | \$4,600.20 | \$8,540.40 | \$1,709.40 | \$0.00 | \$1,557.60 | \$6,270.00 | \$0.00 | \$4,078,80 | \$8,738.40 | \$7,715,40 |

Table 4 - Roadway Maximum Impact Fee after Application of General Credit

| Roadway Maximum Impact Fee after Application of General Credit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use Category | Service Area 1 | Service Area 2 | Service Area 3 | Service Area 4 | Service Area 5 | Service Area 6 | Service Area 7 | Service Area 8 | Service Area 9 | Service <br> Area 10 | Service <br> Area 11 |
| Industrial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Light Industrial | \$16.26 | \$1,270.31 | \$1,270.31 | \$701.89 | \$0.00 | \$639.56 | \$1,270.31 | \$0.00 | \$1,270.31 | \$1,270.31 | \$1,270.31 |
| Manufacturing | \$17.28 | \$1,350,00 | \$1,350.00 | \$745.92 | \$0.00 | \$679.68 | \$1,350.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,350,00 | \$1,350.00 | \$1,350.00 |
| Warehousing | \$4.92 | \$384.38 | \$384.38 | \$212.38 | \$0.00 | \$193.52 | \$384.38 | \$0.00 | \$384.38 | \$384.38 | \$384.38 |
| Mini-Warehouse | \$2.22 | \$173.44 | \$173.44 | \$95.83 | \$0.00 | \$87.32 | \$173.44 | \$0.00 | \$173.44 | \$173.44 | \$173.44 |
| High-Cube Fulfillment Center |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Warehouse | \$35.34 | \$2,760.94 | \$2,760.94 | \$1,525.51 | \$0.00 | \$1,390.04 | \$2,760.94 | \$0.00 | \$2,760.94 | \$2,760.94 | \$2,760.94 |
| Data Center | \$2.34 | \$182.81 | \$182.81 | \$101.01 | \$0.00 | \$92.04 | \$182.81 | \$0.00 | \$182.81 | \$182.81 | \$182.81 |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-Family Detached Housing | \$19.20 | \$1,500.00 | \$1,500.00 | \$828.80 | \$0.00 | \$755.20 | \$1,500.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,500.00 | \$1,500.00 | \$1,500.00 |
| Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) | \$10.86 | \$848.44 | \$848.44 | \$468.79 | \$0.00 | \$427.16 | \$848.44 | \$0.00 | \$848.44 | \$848.44 | \$848.44 |
| Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) | 58.52 | \$665.63 | \$665.63 | \$367.78 | \$0.00 | \$335.12 | \$665.63 | \$0.00 | \$665.63 | \$665.63 | S665.63 |
| Off-Campus Student Apartment | \$1.44 | \$112.50 | \$112.50 | \$62,16 | \$0.00 | \$56.64 | \$112.50 | \$0.00 | \$112.50 | \$112.50 | \$112.50 |
| Mid-Rise Residential with 1st-Floor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial | \$6.00 | \$468.75 | \$468.75 | \$259.00 | \$0.00 | \$236.00 | \$468.75 | \$0.00 | \$468.75 | \$468.75 | \$468.75 |
| Senior Adult Housing - Detached | \$5.16 | \$403.13 | \$403.13 | \$222.74 | \$0.00 | \$202.96 | \$403.13 | \$0.00 | \$403.13 | \$403.13 | \$403.13 |
| Assisted Living | \$2.28 | \$178.13 | \$178.13 | \$98.42 | \$0.00 | \$89.68 | \$178.13 | \$0.00 | \$178.13 | \$178.13 | \$178.13 |
| Continuing Care Retirement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Community | \$2.76 | \$215.63 | \$215.63 | \$119.14 | \$0.00 | \$108.56 | \$215.63 | \$0.00 | \$215.63 | \$215.63 | \$215.63 |
| Lodging |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hotel | \$5.10 | \$398.44 | \$398.44 | \$220.15 | \$0.00 | \$200.60 | \$398.44 | \$0.00 | \$398.44 | \$398.44 | \$398.44 |
| All Suites Hotel | \$3.06 | \$239.06 | \$239.06 | \$132.09 | \$0.00 | \$120.36 | \$239.06 | \$0.00 | \$239.06 | \$239.06 | \$239.06 |
| Recreational |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Golf Course | \$34.74 | \$2,714.06 | \$2,714.06 | \$1,499.61 | \$0.00 | \$1,366.44 | \$2,714.06 | \$0.00 | \$2,714.06 | \$2,714.06 | \$2,714.06 |
| Miniature Golf Course | \$2.82 | \$220.31 | \$220.31 | \$121.73 | \$0.00 | \$110.92 | \$220.31 | \$0.00 | \$220.31 | \$220.31 | \$220.31 |
| Golf Driving Range | \$10.56 | \$825.00 | \$825.00 | \$455.84 | \$0.00 | \$415.36 | \$825.00 | \$0.00 | \$825.00 | \$825.00 | \$825.00 |
| Multiplex Movie Theater | \$93.06 | \$7,270.31 | \$7,270.31 | \$4,017.09 | \$0,00 | \$3,660.36 | \$7,270.31 | \$0.00 | \$7,270.31 | \$7,270.31 | \$7,270.31 |
| Health/Fitness Club | \$14.70 | \$1,148.44 | \$1,148.44 | \$634.55 | \$0.00 | \$578.20 | \$1,148.44 | \$0.00 | \$1,148.44 | \$1,148.44 | \$1,148.44 |
| Institutional |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Private School ( $\mathrm{K}-8$ ) | \$2.22 | \$173.44 | \$173.44 | \$95.83 | \$0.00 | \$87.32 | \$173.44 | \$0.00 | \$173.44 | \$173.44 | \$173.44 |
| Private School ( K -12) | \$1.44 | \$112.50 | \$112.50 | \$62.16 | \$0.00 | \$ 56.64 | \$112.50 | \$0.00 | \$112.50 | \$112.50 | \$112.50 |
| Charter Elementary School | \$1.20 | \$93.75 | \$93.75 | \$51.80 | \$0.00 | \$47.20 | \$93.75 | \$0.00 | \$93.75 | \$93.75 | \$93.75 |
| Junior/Community College | \$0.96 | \$75.00 | \$75.00 | \$41,44 | \$0.00 | \$37.76 | \$75.00 | S0.00 | \$75.00 | \$75.00 | \$75,00 |
| University/College | \$1.56 | \$121.88 | \$121.88 | \$67.34 | \$0.00 | \$61.36 | \$121.88 | \$0.00 | \$121.88 | \$121.88 | \$121.88 |
| Church | \$2.52 | \$196.88 | \$196.88 | \$108.78 | \$0.00 | \$99.12 | \$196.88 | \$0.00 | \$196.88 | \$196.88 | \$196.88 |
| Day Care Center | \$0.66 | \$51.56 | \$52.56 | \$28.49 | \$0.00 | \$25.96 | \$51.56 | \$0.00 | \$51.56 | \$51.56 | \$51,56 |
| Medical |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hospital | \$10.32 | \$806.25 | \$806.25 | \$445.48 | \$0.00 | \$405.92 | \$806. 25 | \$0.00 | \$806.25 | \$806.25 | \$806.25 |
| Nursing Home | \$6.24 | \$487.50 | \$487.50 | \$269.36 | 50.00 | \$245.44 | \$487.50 | \$0.00 | \$487.50 | \$487.50 | \$487.50 |
| Clinic | \$34.86 | \$2,723.44 | \$2,723.44 | \$1,504.79 | \$0.00 | \$1,371.16 | \$2,723,44 | \$0.00 | \$2,723.44 | \$2,723.44 | \$2,723.44 |
| Animal Hospital/Veterinary Clinic | \$37.50 | \$2,929.69 | \$2,929,69 | \$1,618.75 | \$0.00 | \$1,475.00 | \$2,929.69 | \$0.00 | \$2,929,69 | \$2,929.69 | \$2,929.69 |
| Free-Standing Emergency Room | \$16.14 | \$1,260,94 | \$1,260.94 | \$696.71 | \$0.00 | \$634.84 | \$1,260.94 | \$0.00 | \$1,260.94 | \$1,260.94 | \$1,260,94 |
| Office |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Office Building | \$29.70 | \$2,320.31 | \$2,320.31 | \$1,282.05 | \$0.00 | \$1,168.20 | \$2,320.31 | \$0.00 | \$2,320.31 | \$2,320.31 | \$2,320.31 |
| Medical-Dental Office Building | \$72.24 | \$5,643.75 | \$5,643.75 | \$3,118.36 | \$0.00 | \$2,841.44 | \$5,643.75 | \$0.00 | \$5,643.75 | \$5,643.75 | \$5,643.75 |
| United States Post Office | \$58.08 | \$4,537.50 | \$4,537.50 | \$2,507.12 | \$0.00 | \$2,284.48 | \$4,537.50 | \$0.00 | \$4,537.50 | \$4,537.50 | \$4,537.50 |
| Research and Development Center | \$12.66 | \$989.06 | \$989,06 | \$546.49 | \$0.00 | \$497.96 | \$989.06 | \$0.00 | \$989.06 | \$989.06 | \$989.06 |
| Automotive |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quick Lubrication Vehicle Shop | \$14.28 | \$1,115.63 | \$1,115.63 | \$616.42 | \$0.00 | \$561.68 | \$1,115.63 | \$0.00 | \$1,115.63 | \$1,115.63 | \$1,115.63 |
| Automobile Parts Service Center | \$4.50 | \$351.56 | \$351.56 | \$194.25 | \$0.00 | \$177.00 | \$351.56 | \$0.00 | \$351.56 | \$351.56 | \$351.56 |
| Car Wash and Detail Center | \$10.50 | \$820.31 | \$820.31 | \$453.25 | 50.00 | \$413.00 | \$820.31 | \$0.00 | \$820.31 | \$820.31 | \$820.31 |

Table 4 (cont.)-Roadway Maximum Impact Fee after Application of General Credit

| Roadway Maximum Impact Fee after Application of General Credit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use Category | Service Area 1 | Service Area 2 | Service Area 3 | Service Area 4 | Service Area 5 | Service Area 6 | Service Area 7 | Service Area 8 | Service Area 9 | Service <br> Area 10 | Service <br> Area 11 |
| Dining |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quality Restaurant | \$17.34 | \$1,354.69 | \$1,354.69 | \$748.51 | \$0.00 | \$682.04 | \$1,354.69 | \$0.00 | \$1,354.69 | \$1,354.69 | \$1,354.69 |
| High-Turnover (Sit-Down) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Restaurant | \$24.18 | \$1,889.06 | \$1,889.06 | \$1,043.77 | \$0.00 | \$951.08 | \$1,889.06 | \$0.00 | \$1,889.06 | \$1,889.06 | \$1,889.06 |
| Fast-Food Restaurant w/ Drive- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Through Window | \$64.02 | \$5,001,56 | \$5,001.56 | \$2,763.53 | \$0,00 | \$2,518.12 | \$5,001.56 | \$0.00 | \$5,001.56 | \$5,001,56 | \$5,001.56 |
| Bread/Donut/Bagel Shop w/o Drive- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Retail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shopping Center | \$22.26 | \$1,739.06 | \$1,739.06 | \$960.89 | \$0.00 | \$875.56 | \$1,739.06 | \$0.00 | \$1,739.06 | \$1,739.06 | \$1,739.06 |
| Building Materials and Lumber |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Store | \$11.34 | \$885.94 | \$885.94 | \$489.51 | \$0.00 | \$446.04 | \$885.94 | \$0.00 | \$885.94 | \$885,94 | \$885.94 |
| Free-Standing Discount Superstore | \$45.66 | \$3,567.19 | \$3,567.19 | \$1,970.99 | \$0,00 | \$1,795.96 | \$3,567.19 | \$0.00 | \$3,567.19 | \$3,567.19 | \$3,567.19 |
| Variety Store | \$75.12 | \$5,868.75 | \$5,868.75 | \$3,242.68 | \$0.00 | \$2,954.72 | \$5,868.75 | \$0.00 | \$5,868.75 | \$5,868,75 | \$5,868.75 |
| Free-Standing Discount Store | \$33.96 | \$2,653.13 | \$2,653.13 | \$1,465.94 | \$0.00 | \$1,335.76 | \$2,653.13 | \$0.00 | \$2,653.13 | \$2,653.13 | \$2,653.13 |
| Hardware/Paint Store | \$9.00 | \$703.13 | \$703.13 | \$388.50 | \$0.00 | \$354.00 | \$703,13 | \$0.00 | \$703.13 | \$703.13 | \$703.13 |
| Nursery (Garden Center) | \$38.16 | \$2,981.25 | \$2,981.25 | \$1,647.24 | \$0.00 | \$1,500.96 | \$2,981.25 | \$0.00 | \$2,981.25 | \$2,981.25 | \$2,981.25 |
| Supermarket | \$15.54 | \$1,214,06 | \$1,214,06 | \$670.81 | \$0.00 | \$611.24 | \$1,214,06 | \$0.00 | \$1,214.06 | \$1,214.06 | \$1,214.06 |
| Convenience Market w/ Gasoline |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pumps | \$6.24 | \$487.50 | \$487.50 | \$269.36 | \$0.00 | \$245.44 | \$487.50 | \$0.00 | \$487.50 | \$487.50 | \$487.50 |
| Discount Club | \$42.90 | \$3,351,56 | \$3,351.56 | \$1,851.85 | \$0.00 | \$1,687.40 | \$3,351,56 | \$0.00 | \$3,351.56 | \$3,351.56 | \$3,351.56 |
| Sporting Goods Superstore | \$17.70 | \$1,382.81 | \$1,382,81 | \$764.05 | \$0.00 | \$696.20 | \$1,382.81 | \$0.00 | \$1,382.81 | \$1,382.81 | \$1,382.81 |
| Home Improvement Superstore | \$9.54 | \$745.31 | \$745.31 | \$411.81 | \$0.00 | \$375.24 | \$745.31 | \$0.00 | \$745.31 | \$745.31 | \$745.31 |
| Electronic Superstore | \$16.86 | \$1,317.19 | \$1,317.19 | \$727.79 | \$0.00 | \$663.16 | \$1,317.19 | \$0.00 | \$1,317.19 | \$1,317,19 | \$1,317.19 |
| Pet Supply Superstore | \$36.48 | \$2,850.00 | \$2,850.00 | \$1,574.72 | \$0.00 | \$1,434.88 | \$2,850.00 | \$0.00 | \$2,850.00 | \$2,850.00 | \$2,850.00 |
| Office Supply Superstore | \$28.38 | \$2,217-19 | \$2,217.19 | \$1,225.07 | \$0.00 | \$1,116.28 | \$2,217.19 | \$0.00 | \$2,217.19 | \$2,217.19 | \$2,217.19 |
| Discount Home Furnishing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Superstore | \$22.98 | \$1,795,31 | \$1,795.31 | \$991.97 | \$0.00 | \$903.88 | \$1,795.31 | \$0.00 | \$1,795.31 | \$1,795.31 | \$1,795.31 |
| Department Store | \$20.04 | \$1,565.63 | \$1,565.63 | \$865.06 | \$0.00 | \$788.24 | \$1,565.63 | \$0.00 | \$1,565.63 | \$1,565.63 | \$1,565.63 |
| Arts and Crafts Store | \$63.66 | \$4,973.44 | \$4,973.44 | \$2,747.99 | \$0.00 | \$2,503,96 | \$4,973.44 | \$0.00 | \$4,973.44 | \$4,973.44 | \$4,973.44 |
| Pharmacy/Drugstore w/o Drive- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Through Window | \$12.78 | \$998.44 | 5998.44 | \$551.67 | \$0,00 | \$502.68 | \$998.44 | \$0.00 | \$998,44 | \$998.44 | \$998.44 |
| Pharmacy/Drugstore w/ Drive- $\quad$ - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Through Window | \$15.48 | \$1,209.38 | \$1,209.38 | \$668.22 | \$0.00 | \$608.88 | \$1,209.38 | \$0.00 | \$1,209.38 | \$1,209.38 | \$1,209.38 |
| Furniture Store | \$1.20 | \$93,75 | \$93.75 | \$51.80 | \$0.00 | \$47.20 | \$93.75 | \$0.00 | \$93.75 | \$93.75 | \$93.75 |
| Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walk-in Bank | \$17.70 | \$1,382.81 | \$1,382.81 | \$764.05 | \$0.00 | \$696.20 | \$1,382.81 | \$0.00 | \$1,382.81 | \$1,382.81 | \$1,382,81 |
| Drive-in Bank | \$39.60 | \$3,093,75 | \$3,093.75 | \$1,709.40 | \$0.00 | \$1,557.60 | \$3,093.75 | \$0.00 | \$3,093.75 | \$3,093,75 | \$3,093.75 |

### 2.2 Assessment of Impact Fees as a Condition of Development

No final plat for new development shall be released for recordation, and no building permit and/or plumbing permit shall be issued, without the assessment of applicable impact fees pursuant to this Chapter. Except as otherwise provided in this Chapter, no building permit and/or plumbing permit shall be issued until the owner has paid the applicable impact fees or a contract for payment of the applicable impact fees has been approved by the City and executed by the parties.

### 2.3 Assessment of Impact Fees

(A) Assessment of the impact fees for any new development shall be based on the applicable impact fees per service unit and any fee phasing in effect at the time of assessment. No specific act by the City is required to assess impact fees.
(B) For a new development which has received final plat approval before the effective date, assessment of impact fees shall occur on the effective date.
(C) For a new development which has received final plat approval on or after the effective date, assessment of impact fees shall occur at the time of recordation of the final plat.
(D) After assessment of the impact fees attributable to a new development or execution of an agreement for payment of impact fees, additional impact fees or increases in fees may not be assessed against the tract unless the number of service units to be developed on the tract increases through a change of use. In the event of the increase in the number of service units, the impact fees to be imposed are limited to the amount attributable to the additional service units.
(E) A school district is not required to pay impact fees imposed under this article unless the board of trustees of the district consents to the payment of the fees by entering a contract with the city imposing the fees.

### 2.4 Credits Against Impact Fees

(A) General credit. The City shall apply against assessed impact fees a credit equal to a variable percentage of the total projected cost of implementing the capital improvements plan based on the type of impact fee. The maximum impact fees after application of this credit are identified in Section 2.1 (Tables 1 and 2). This general credit only applies to developments in the corporate limits of the City and not to those in the ETJ.
(B) Roadway credit. Any construction of, contributions to, or dedications of roadway facilities that are system-related facilities and are agreed to or required by the City as a condition of development approval shall be credited against assessed roadway impact fees. To the extent that a credit under this subsection exceeds the roadway impact fees for service units attributable to an owner's new development, the credit shall be applied against the roadway impact fees for service units attributable to each other new development of the owner located on a tract of land that was contained in the same preliminary plat of the new development for which the credit was granted.
(C) Water credit. Any construction of, contributions to or dedications of water facilities that are system-related facilities and agreed to or required by the City as a condition of development approval shall be credited against assessed water impact fees. To the extent that a credit under this subsection exceeds the water impact fees for service units attributable to an owner's new development, the credit shall be applied against the water impact fees for service units attributable to each other new development of the owner that is located on a tract of land that was contained in the same preliminary plat of the new development for which the credit was granted.
(D) Wastewater credit. Any construction of, contributions to or dedications of wastewater facilities that are system-related facilities and that are agreed to or required by the City as a condition of development approval shall be credited against assessed wastewater impact fees. To the extent that a credit under this subsection exceeds the wastewater impact fees for service units attributable to an owner's new development, the credit shall be applied against the wastewater impact fees for service units attributable to each other new development of the owner that is located on a tract of land that was contained in the same preliminary plat of the new development for which the credit was granted.
(E) Traditional commercial corridor and city core credit. Non-residential (includes multi-
family residential) will be credited by an additional fifty (50) percent of the general credit fee. (See Map Exhibit 2)
(F) Credit by agreement. The City and the owner of a new development may agree in writing that the owner may construct or finance system-related facilities and that the costs incurred or funds advanced will be credited against the impact fees otherwise due from the new development. The City Manager is authorized to negotiate and execute such an agreement.
(G) No credit for rights-of-way or easements. Rights-of-way and easements are not included in the Study, and no credit shall be granted for the dedication of rights-of-way or easements. Rights-of-way and easements are dedicated as required by the ordinances of the City, necessitated by and attributable to a new development and do not exceed the amount required for infrastructure improvements that are roughly proportionate to the new development.

### 2.5 Collection of Impact Fees

(A) Impact fees shall be collected at the time of issuance of a building permit.
(B) For a new development that received final plat approval before the effective date:

Impact fees may not be collected on any service unit for which a valid building permit is issued within two years after the effective date; provided, however, such a service unit shall be subject to the collection of impact fees upon the submission of a subsequent application for a building permit if the subsequent application is not submitted and approved within two years after the effective date.

### 2.6 Rebates

If the building permit has expired for a new development for which a roadway impact fee has been paid, and a modified or new application has not been filed within six months of such expiration, the City shall, upon written application, rebate the amount of the impact fee to the record owner of the property for which the impact fee was paid. If no application for rebate pursuant to this section has been filed within this period, no rebate shall become due.

### 2.7 Waivers

(A) Impact fees will be waived for single-family residential dwellings located in the residential infill area (See Map Exhibit 1).
(B) Impact fees will be waived for affordable housing (inside City limits only) subject to the following criteria:
(1) New development must include at least twenty-five (25) percent affordable housing units and an additional twenty-five (25) percent of units must either be affordable or workplace housing units. Affordable units and workplace units are defined as:
i. Affordable rentals units reserved for households earning at or below eighty
(80) percent of the Area Median Income (AMI) for the Waco metropolitan area using Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and/or Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs (TDHCA) income limits as applicable. To qualify under this waiver, rents charged for affordable units shall not exceed thirty (30) percent of the household's gross monthly income.
ii. Workforce rental units reserved for households earning between eighty (80) and one hundred twenty (120) percent of the Area Median Income (AMI) for the Waco metropolitan area using HUD and/or TDHCA income limits as applicable. To qualify under this waiver, rents charged for affordable units shall not exceed thirty (30) percent of the household's gross monthly income.
iii. For-sale units reserved for households earning at or below one hundred twenty (120) percent of the Area Median Income (AMI) for the Waco metropolitan area using HUD and/or TDHCA income limits as applicable. To qualify under this waiver, homes sold must be the owner's primary residence.
(C) Roadway Impact Fees will be waived for manufacturing, distribution, warehouse, logistics, assembly, processing, fabrication, value added processing, aviation/aerospace, research and development, advanced technology, information technology, information and data centers, corporate and regional offices, and similar facilities.
(D) Impact fees will be waived for existing business expansion or relocation subject to meeting all the following criteria:
(1) The existing business is located within the city limits of Waco.
(2) Business has been operating within the city limits of Waco for a period of at least 2 years.
(3) The expansion or relocation of the business is for the purpose of increasing production/ business capacity.
(4) The business is a manufacturing, distribution, warehouse, logistics, assembly, processing, fabrication, value added processing, aviation/aerospace, research and development, advanced technology, information technology, information and data centers, corporate and regional offices, or similar facilities.
(5) Documentation is provided verifying the total number of jobs and compensation per comparable positions at the new location is equal to or greater than the number of jobs and compensation per comparable positions at the original location.
(E) Roadway impact fees will be waived if the total water and wastewater impact fees exceeds seventy-five thousand $(\$ 75,000.00)$ dollars.
(F) Impact fees will be waived for developments that have been approved for impact fee waivers by City Council through the City Abatement Policy and/or a program under Chapter 380 of the Statute.
(G) Impact fees will be waived for the remaining lots in residential development that received final plat approval or final plat recordation before the effective date and at least eighty (80) percent of the lots have been issued building permits.

### 2.8 Impact Fee Cap

(A) The total impact fee for water, wastewater, and roadway will be capped at seventy-five thousand $(\$ 75,000.00)$ dollars if the total water and wastewater impact fees does not exceed seventy-five thousand $(\$ 75,000.00)$ dollars.

### 2.9 Accounting for Fees and Interest

(A) Deposit of funds. The City shall deposit all funds collected through the adoption of an impact fee in interest-bearing accounts clearly identifying the category of capital improvements or facility expansions within the service area for which the fee was adopted.
(B) Interest. Interest earned on impact fees is considered funds of the account on which it is earned and is subject to all restrictions placed on use of impact fees under Chapter 395 of the Statute.
(C) Expenditure of funds. The City shall establish adequate financial and accounting controls to ensure that impact fees disbursed from the account are utilized for the purposes for which the impact fee was imposed as shown by the capital improvements plan and as authorized by Chapter 395 of the Statute.
(D) The City shall maintain and keep financial records for impact fees, which shall show the source and disbursement of all fees collected in or expended within each service area. The records of the account into which impact fees are deposited shall be open for public inspection and copying during ordinary business hours.

## Part III. Appeals

### 3.1 Appeal Procedure; Remedies

(A) Decisions subject to appeal. An owner may, in accordance with this Section, appeal the following decisions:
(1) The applicability of an impact fee to the owner's new development;
(2) The amount of an impact fee due;
(3) The availability of, the application of, or the amount of a credit against an impact fee due;
(4) The amount of an impact fee due in proportion to the benefit of the services for which the impact fee was assessed that are received by the new development; or
(5) The amount of any refund due.
(B) Notice of appeal. Within thirty (30) days following the decision being appealed, the owner shall submit to the City Manager a written notice of appeal, by certified mail, return receipt requested or by e-mail, that states the basis for the appeal with particularity. Submitted means delivered to the City Secretary's Office of the City of Waco or certified mail postmarked within thirty (30) days of receipt of the decision. To the extent the owner relies on any studies or other documents as evidence that the owner is entitled to relief, the owner shall submit such studies and documents with the notice of appeal. If the notice of appeal is accompanied by cash or a letter of credit issued by a financial institution that
has an office for presentment located in Waco, Texas, in an amount equal to the original determination of the impact fee due, the building permit and/or plumbing permit associated with the matter being appealed may be issued while the appeal is pending.
(C) Burden of proof. The burden of proof shall be on the owner to demonstrate that the owner is entitled to relief.
(D) Resolution of appeal by the City Manager.
(1) Within ten (10) days of receipt of the notice of appeal, the City Manager shall issue a written decision granting relief, granting partial relief or denying relief and shall send the decision to the owner by certified mail, return receipt requested or by e-mail if the owner's e-mail address is provided on the notice of appeal or the building permit application that gave rise to the matter being appealed. The City Manager's written decision shall ask the owner to respond in writing within ten (10) days of the date of the written decision, by certified mail, return receipt requested or by e-mail, regarding whether the owner agrees or disagrees with the City Manager's decision.
(2) Upon issuing the written decision, the City Manager shall refer the appeal to the City Council for a hearing. The owner shall be provided written notice of the date, time and location of the hearing.
(3) If prior to the City Council hearing the owner agrees in writing with the City Manager's written decision:
i. the appeal shall be considered resolved;
ii. the City Manager's referral of the notice of appeal to the City Council for a hearing shall be withdrawn;
iii. to the extent that the City Manager's decision grants relief or partial relief to the owner, the City Manager shall ensure that the owner receives such relief or partial relief; and
iv. to the extent that the City Manager's decision requires the owner to pay an impact fee, the owner shall promptly pay the impact fee. The owner's failure to pay the impact fee within five business days after agreeing with the City Manager's decision shall serve as authority for the City to present the letter of credit to the financial institution for performance with no other or further notice or contact with the owner.

## (E) Consideration of appeal by City Council.

(1) If the owner disagrees in writing with the City Manager's written decision or otherwise fails to agree in writing with the City Manager's written decision, the City Council shall hold a public hearing to consider the appeal and shall act on the appeal within sixty (60) days of the City Manager's receipt of the notice of appeal.
(2) The City Council shall act on the appeal by granting relief, granting partial relief or denying relief.
(3) To the extent that the City Council grants relief or partial relief to the owner, the City Manager shall ensure that the owner receives such relief or partial relief.
(4) To the extent that the City Council's action on the appeal requires the owner to
pay an impact fee, the owner shall promptly pay the impact fee. The owner's failure to pay the impact fee within five business days after the date of the City Council's action on the appeal shall serve as authority for the City to present the letter of credit to the financial institution for performance with no other or further notice or contact with the owner.
(5) The City Council's action on the appeal shall constitute the City's final decision on the matter appealed.
(F) Costs. An owner shall bear all costs of the owner's appeal under this Section.

### 3.2. Other Relief; Variance; Waiver

(A) Failure to perform a duty.
(1) A person who has paid an impact fee or an owner of land on which an impact fee has been paid may submit to the City Manager a written request for the City Council to determine whether the City has failed to perform a duty imposed under Chapter 395 of the Statute within the prescribed period. The written request must state the nature of the unperformed duty and request that it be performed within sixty (60) days after the date of the request.
(2) The City Council shall consider the request, and if the City Council finds that the duty is required under Chapter 395 of the Statute and is late in being performed, it shall cause the duty to commence within sixty (60) days after the date of the request and continue until completion.
(B) Variance or waiver. The City Council may grant a variance or waiver from anyrequirement of this Chapter, upon written request by an owner, following a public hearing, and only upon finding that a strict application of such requirement would, when regarded as a whole, result in confiscation or an unconstitutional taking of the property.

Map Exhibit 1 - Waco Infill Areas


## Map Exhibit 2 - City Core and Traditional Commercial Corridors
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Map Exhibit 3 - Water Service Area
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## Map Exhibit 5 - Roadway Service Areas



Section 3. That all ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict with the provisions of this ordinance are hereby repealed.

Section 4. That the terms and provisions of this ordinance shall be deemed to be severable and that if any section, subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase of this ordinance shall be declared to be invalid or unconstitutional, the same shall not affect the validity of any other section, subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase of this ordinance and the remainder of such ordinance shall continue in full force and effect the same as if such invalid or unconstitutional provision had never been a part hereof.

Section 5. That it is the intention of the City Council and is hereby ordained that the provisions of this ordinance shall become and be a part of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Waco, Texas, and that sections of this ordinance may be renumbered or relettered to accomplish such intention.

Section 6. That a violation of this ordinance shall be a Class C misdemeanor and the penalty for violating this ordinance shall be as provided for in Sec. 1-14 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Waco, Texas, which shall be a fine of not less than $\$ 1.00$ and no more than $\$ 500.00$, and each day a violation exists shall be a separate offense.

Section 7. That it is hereby officially found and determined that the meeting at which this ordinance is passed is open to the public and that public notice of the time, place and purpose of said meeting was given as required by law.

## PASSED AND APPROVED:

First Reading: this 20th day of October, 2020.
Second Reading: this 3rd day of November, 2020.


Kyle Deaver, Mayor City of Waco, Texas

## ATTEST:

$\qquad$
Esmeralda Hudson, City Secretary

## APPROVED AS TO FORM \& LEGALITY:



Jennifer Richie, City Attorney


[^0]:    (1) Per Freese \& Nichols Impact Fee Study
    (2) $50 \%$ of Eligible Costs

