

**ACTION ITEM  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

**DATE:** August 18, 2009

**TO:** Board of Supervisors

**FROM:** Anthony Romanello ICMA-CM  
County Administrator



**ISSUE:** Transportation Impact Fee Advisory Committee Report

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** N/A

**BUDGET IMPACT:** N/A

**ATTACHMENTS:** (2)

[1] Background Report [ ] Reso/Ord/Proc #

[2] Committee Report [ ] Reso/Ord/Proc #

[3] Presentation [ ] Reso/Ord/Proc #

**REVIEW:** [X] Public Works Keith C. Dayton  
[X] Legal Joseph L. Howard, Jr.

- [ ] Consent Agenda
- [ ] Discussion Item
- [ ] New Business
- [ ] Other Business
- [X] Presentation
- [ ] Public Hearing
- [X] Unfinished Business

**PRESENTATION BY:** Jon Riley, Committee Member

**ELECTION DISTRICT:** N/A

## **BACKGROUND REPORT**

In May 2008, the Board authorized the development of a County-wide Transportation Impact Fee Program with the stipulation that the impact to commercial properties be minimized. TischlerBise, a consulting firm with considerable experience in impact fees analysis, was hired by the County to assist the Transportation Impact Fee Advisory Committee with the analysis.

In 2007, the Virginia General Assembly revised the transportation impact fee legislation, but left in place the requirement to have a Transportation Impact Fee Advisory Committee (TIFAC). Section 15.2-2319 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, requires that this Committee consist of five to ten people and at least 40% of the members represent the development, building, or real estate industries. The TIFAC appointed by the Board in Fall 2008 consisted of the following members: James McMath, Patricia Kurpiel, Jon Riley, Samer Shalaby, and David Beiler. In February 2009, the Board referred the proposed County-wide transportation impact fee to the TIFAC with a charge to review the methodology and the roads list.

The Committee met more than a dozen times over a five month period. After lengthy consideration, the Committee offers its report regarding the methodology and credits as well as a road plan.

### **The Committee Report**

The Committee's recommendation supports the County-wide transportation impact fee and the limited roads list. The Committee suggests involving commercial properties with an expanded credit system. The Committee discussed at length options and has included the options with the greatest agreement.

The road list is similar to the list proposed in February 2009 by staff with a few changes. The proposed changes include aligning Plantation Drive and Enon Road as part of the new corridor connection with Centreport Parkway. The Committee supports reconstructing Deacon Road between Mintwood Drive (Stratford Place Subdivision) and Leeland Road and widening all of US-1 rather than the shorter sections proposed in the February 2009 road list.

### **Next Steps**

1. The Board determines a final roads list.
2. The Board authorizes the model rerun with desired methodology and/or road changes.
3. Staff returns with the transportation impact fee presentation.

4. The Board refers the changes to the Comprehensive Plan to the Planning Commission for adoption.
5. The transportation impact fee and the Comprehensive Plan amendments are adopted.
6. The transportation impact fee is implemented.

The transportation model run will be completed upon final approval of the road improvement list and methodology in order to minimize cost to the County. If the Board is satisfied with the methodology and the road improvement list presented herein, the Board should direct staff to run the model and amend the Comprehensive Plan. After the list of road improvements has been finalized, the numbers will be recalculated and the final transportation impact fee information will be presented to the Board.

At a future meeting, staff will be seeking the Board's authorization regarding next steps.

**TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE REPORT**  
**STAFFORD COUNTY**  
**TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Committee Members:**

**David Beiler**  
**Patricia Kurpiel**  
**James McMath**  
**Jon Riley**  
**Samer Shalaby**

**August 18, 2009**

## BACKGROUND

The Stafford County Transportation Impact Fee Advisory Committee was appointed by the Board of Supervisors in fall 2008, consisting of the following members: David Beiler, Patricia Kurpiel, James McMath, Jon Riley, Samer Shalaby. The committee met more than a dozen times over the course of five months.

The committee investigated various methodologies and road plans. The members explored road impact fees in regards to the transportation service districts, the difference between impact fees and proffers, and the ramifications of credit options. They considered at length the influence on development and the impact of development on the road network and the incentives that were inherent in the different options. After consideration the committee offers the following regarding the methodology and credits as well as a road plan.

## COMMITTEE METHODOLOGY

The committee explored the methodology as referred to it by the Board, the November 2008 TischlerBise methodology, and other alternatives and proposes the following:

1. **A committee majority recommends a county-wide transportation impact fee area with a limited list of roads. 3 / 5<sup>1</sup>**
2. **The committee recommends that the Board consider a Transportation Impact Fee Program with both new residential and non-residential paying transportation impact fee similar to the November 2008 proposal. 5 / 5**

Exemptions of commercial, universally, class by class, or case by case are unfair and result in a significant portion of users impacting roads, but not paying. In order to fully fund the roads and provide for fairness, county-wide transportation impact fees paid by both new residential and non-residential is suggested. The committee recommends this unanimously.

### **3. Credit options:**

- a. **The committee recommends that off-site improvements receive 100% credit if the improvements are part of the Transportation Impact Fee Program. 5 / 5**

The majority of the committee recommends the following credit options:

- b. **Explore the possibility of credits towards Transportation Plan failing roads in 20 years or new roads outside of the Transportation Impact Fee Program for a smaller proportion of credit. 4 / 5**

---

<sup>1</sup> Indicates the number of committee members out of 5 committee members that supported the idea.

- c. **Transfers of credits between developers and developments are allowed when the road project constructed is greater than the impact demanded by the Transportation Impact Fee Program. 4 / 5**
- d. **Residual transportation impact fee credits could be sold between developers or developments to create an incentive to build roads by developments. 4 / 5**
- e. **Credit transfers should be allowed only after proffers are satisfied and should not cross development classes. This will help insure timely fulfillment of proffers and the avoidance of temporal imbalances while executing the Transportation Impact Fee program. 4 / 5**
- f. **The value of off-site improvement credits should be based on developer expense, not what it would otherwise cost state/local government. 3 / 5**

Otherwise, it invites improvements undertaken more for profit than related need, leading to an ill-timed execution of the plan. This would also result in more adequate funding for transportation impact fee projects.

- g. **Explore technology zones as a method to provide credits for particularly desirable commercial enterprises or for a targeted exemption. 4 / 5 (See Appendix 1)**
- h. **Urban Development Areas may be 100% exempt from transportation impact fees by the Code of Virginia. 5 / 5**

In an effort to improve the roads while also enabling commercial developers to pay their share of the roads impact, the committee recommends providing for an expanded credit system. The modification of the transportation impact fee payment structure and the credits should help minimize the impact to commercial development while sharing the cost of new traffic demands. The recommendations regarding credits should be considered as key recommendations to the proposed methodology.

The committee also discussed a transfer program be created to allow for development to use credits and improve roads. The transfer program may expedite the building of roads. The selling of credits may further motivate development to improve the roads.

The committee also recognizes, however, that offsite credits for non-program projects would have the effect of diluting the Transportation Impact Fee Program by allocating "credit" for roads not on the Transportation Impact Fee Road List, thereby setting up a situation where roads on the Transportation Impact Fee Road List may not be fully funded. The credits suggested here would further meet the Board's objective to reduce the impact to the non-residential sector.

**4. Consider limiting the non-residential categories to four--Commercial, Industrial, Retail, and Other, rather than the many the TischlerBise study uses. 5 / 5**

By simplifying the number of non-residential categories to four, tied to the transportation demand model, it eliminates the extremes in the transportation impact fee levied on non-residential properties.

- 5. Within the Transportation Impact Fee Program List, the priority for road construction should be determined at the time of readiness to build. The committee selected the highest growth roads for inclusion and does not prioritize that list because development may affect the roads differently than expected over time. 5 / 5**
- 6. The methodology for trip generation factors discussed on page 26 of the TischlerBise Report includes data that is 15 years old. As soon as new data is available, the committee recommends new data be incorporated prior to re-running the model. 5 / 5**

#### ALTERNATIVE METHODOLOGIES CONSIDERED

Methodology alternatives were considered by the committee. A majority or consensus could not be mustered for any of the following four proposed alternatives:

1. The Board proposed a plan with no commercial transportation impact fee. 0 / 5

Advantage: May encourage commercial growth.

Disadvantage: Fairness as one group bears a disproportionate share of the cost. There may not be enough to fund the roads or existing taxpayers will have to pay for the infrastructure impacted by new commercial development. Off-site transportation improvements by developers will be discouraged, as credits toward transportation impact fees will no longer be possible.

2. Two impact areas would be used in Stafford County: (1) transportation impact fees (TIF) proposed by a majority of the committee or the Board which covers the entire County for payment but with a limited number of "system" roads, namely roads that are used by all Stafford residents and generally located in the Urban Services Area (USA) and (2) rural transportation impact fees (RTIF) which would be paid for by those who develop properties outside the USA and the USA 2019 extension. This is for roads that will fail 20 years out, but are located only in the agricultural area and generally only used by those who live in the rural area. Development outside the USA pays the "system" TIF and the RTIF. Development inside the transportation impact fee area pays the "system" TIF. The roads list for the RTIF is Appendix 2. 2 / 5

Advantage: The major advantage of this alternative is there is a good chance that all roads which will be failing 20 years out will be funded from one of four methods: the bond program, FAMPO CLRP, the system TIF, or the RTIF. Those users causing the impact pay for the impact. Payments by commercial would be substantially reduced from the TischlerBise original proposal through the use of credits and there is basically no commercial in the RTIF area. Finally, preservation of the rural area may actually occur since it will not be the cheapest place to develop as it is now. It should be determined if this needs to be one district or multiple districts.

Disadvantage: Portions of the County would have to pay two transportation impact fees.

3. A plan that would fund 20-year comprehensive plan growth, recognizing that few financial resources exist outside of those delineated by Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) plus the Stafford transportation bond program. This alternative proposed one county-wide transportation impact fee area with a roads list that included all roads failing at the end of 20 years which were not covered by FAMPO CLRP and the Stafford transportation bond program. The estimated roads list would total \$625 million. 0 / 5

Advantage: This is a comprehensive approach that funds the Comprehensive Plan growth through FAMPO CLRP, transportation bonds, or transportation impact fees.

Disadvantage: High transportation impact fees for both residential and commercial.

4. The USA is the TIF area and the roads list consists of system roads located inside the USA. 0 / 5

Advantage: It is consistent with an interpretation of the statute that all needed road improvements in the TIF area must be on the list. The USA would include high cost and most used "system" roads.

Disadvantage: The agricultural area benefits from "system" improvements but does not pay, and rural sprawl may be inadvertently encouraged because it will be less expensive to build in the agricultural area than in the USA.

COMMITTEE ROADS LIST

The committee considered all roads in the Stafford County Transportation Plan and the FAMPO CLRP as potential projects to include in the transportation impact fee program. The committee based its recommendations on those roads with the highest projected traffic growth. Safety was not a selection criterion. These are arterial and collector roads, which will fail without the improvements proposed. The order in which the road projects appear below does not imply a prioritized order. The majority of the committee recommends the following road improvement plan.

	<b>Road Name</b>	<b>Termini From</b>	<b>Termini To</b>	<b>Improvement Type</b>
A.	Shelton Shop Road	Garrisonville Road	Mountain View Road	4 lane
B.	Mountain View Road	Stefaniga Road	Choptank Road	4 lane
C.	Butler Road	Cambridge Street	Castle Rock Drive	4 lane
D.	White Oak Road	0.15 miles W of Northside Drive	Ferry Road	4 lane
E.	Mine Road extended	Courthouse Road	Ramoth Church Road	2 lane new
F.	Enon Rd / Centreport Pkwy Connection	Enon Road	Centreport Parkway	2 lane new

G.	Enon Road Reconstructed	Hulls Chapel Road	Truslow Road	2 lane reconstruction
H	Leeland Road	Julian Street	Primmer House Road	4 lane
I.	Deacon Road	Jett Street	Mintwood Drive	2 lane reconstruction
J.	Jefferson Davis Highway	Chopowamsic Creek	6 lanes at Potomac Creek	6 lane
K.	Cambridge Street	Enon Road	Falmouth Intersection	6 lane

The project descriptions are described below.

**Project A. Shelton Shop Road**—4 lanes; Shelton Shop Road is a 2 lane road that currently carries 11,000 vehicles per day (VPD). The current volume justifies a 4 lane road. It is expected to grow in volume to 17,600-28,900 VPD by 2028. This road project could be done today if funding were available due to the volume of traffic.

**Project B. Mountain View Road**—4 lanes from Stefaniga Road to Choptank Road. Mountain View Road in this section carries 5,200 VPD. The projected volumes are 12,000-13,300 VPD. This section of Mountain View Road serves to funnel and disperse the heavy volumes on Shelton Shop Road and so the committee recommends that Shelton Shop and Mountain View Roads both be improved if the other is improved as they are tied together.

**Project C. Butler Road**—4 lanes; Butler Road currently carries 19,000 VPD. It is projected to carry 29,800-35,800 VPD. Butler Road is currently a 3 lane road narrowing down to a 2 lane road. This volume justifies a four lane road today.

**Project D. White Oak Road**—4 lanes to Ferry Road. White Oak Road, from the improved section to Ferry Road, carries 9,100 VPD. It is projected to carry 19,000-36,300 VPD. The committee all agreed that it should be improved east to Ferry Road. In addition, some committee members recommend that the improvement should be made to Belle Plains Road or Newton Road. The highest volume of traffic is to Ferry Road although the volume is consistent as it is an arterial connection to King George County.

**Projects E. & F. Mine Road extension & New Enon Road / Centreport Parkway connection**— The committee recommends that at a minimum the 2 lane section be built with the right-of-way for 4 lanes for both projects. The projected volume for this proposed road is 10,900-24,000 VPD. The Mine Road Extension and New Enon Road / Centreport Parkway connections will fill in the planned north / south connection between Garrisonville Road and US-17 as a reliever to US-1. In addition, these two projects will provide the planned connection between Courthouse Road and Truslow Road and the Centreport Parkway interchange. The new Enon Road / Centerport Parkway expansion should also be completed jointly with Enon Road and the realignment with Plantation Drive.

**Project G. Enon Road**—reconstructed from Hulls Chapel Road to Truslow Road and aligned with Plantation Drive. Enon Road carries 4,400 VPD, but is expected to draw as much as 24,200-36,200 VPD by 2028, if the greater connection is made. This would improve approximately 1.5 miles of road between Enon Road and the new connection to the Centreport Parkway interchange. The Plantation Drive connection improvement is key to the functioning of the system and should be improved with the New Enon Road / Centreport Parkway connection. The improvement would remove the T intersection and create through movement removing the 3 way stop.

**Project H. Leeland Road**—4 lanes from Deacon Road to Primmer House Road—This road section currently carries 7,500 VPD and is projected to carry 11,900-19,600 VPD.

**Project I. Deacon Road**—a 2 lane reconstruction from the 4 lane section at Leeland Road up to the Stratford Place Subdivision entrance improvements. This section of road carries 6,400 VPD. It is projected to carry 14,900 VPD. The committee recommends the reconstruction only to the subdivision improvements so as to meet the needs of the local traffic, but not to induce traffic towards Brooke Road.

**Projects J. & K. Cambridge Street & Jefferson Davis Highway**—serves as a key arterial road through Stafford County. The road currently carries 14,000-19,000 VPD. It is expected to grow to 40,100-51,500 VPD. This tripling of volume will outstrip the capacity of a 4 lane road. The committee does not agree with the extent to which US-1 should be included in the program. Some members of the committee recommend partially funding US-1 with transportation impact fees and relying on other funding sources for the remainder of the project since it is part of the regional road network. Others feel that as the essential connector between the four redevelopment areas, it is imperative that the funding of US-1 to an adequate level of service (LOS) not be dependent on tentative sources of funding that may or may not materialize.

Another federal highway project that should be considered is the I-95 ramp northbound at Centerport Parkway. It is projected to be LOS F by 2028 and is a safety concern.

The report compares the committee's road list with the Board's February 2009 Road List. The committee recommends that the transportation bond projects not be included in the transportation impact fee program because this would allow fees collected to be used for the transportation bond instead of the Board list or the committee list. (See Appendix 3)

#### ALTERNATIVE ROADS LIST EXPLORED

The committee considered the entire Stafford County Transportation Plan. It also considered the FAMPO Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

#### OTHER ISSUES RAISED BY THE COMMITTEE

- By choosing a subset of roads, rather than the total roads that are failing by the end of the planning horizon, the committee recommended road plan does not support the projected growth of the Comprehensive Plan. These roads are forecasted to be failing at the end of

the planning horizon with no means of funding because they have been excluded from the transportation impact fee list and are not on the FAMPO CLRP.

- Examine the interface between proffers and transportation impact fees when credits are involved. This primarily affects residential development.
- Do current transportation impact fee roads need to be included on the list when terminating the existing transportation impact fee programs? They are: Poplar Road, Truslow Road, Forest Lane Road, Little Whim Road, and Colebrook Road.
- If credits are used, a method is needed to ensure the Transportation Impact Fee Program is not underfunded.
- In addition the committee calls attention to the fact that non-residential fees are approximately 30% lower in the initial TischlerBise (November 2008) study than the existing Southeast Transportation Impact Fee service area while providing for significantly greater improvements. (See the Commercial Memo in the November 20, 2008 Board package.) This is largely due to the method of calculating the transportation impact fee. Expanded credits will serve to further reduce the fees to non-residential.
- Transportation impact fee legislation contains an appeal process. Developers who believe they are being unfairly treated may use this mechanism to appeal.
- The committee recommends the Board consider transit and pedestrian improvements in the final program.
- The committee supports using transportation impact fees to expand bus service within Stafford County.

### LEGAL CONCERNS

A number of legal questions were discussed by the committee and discussed with the County Attorney. These questions will be brought forward by the County Attorney to the Board in a closed session. The committee would like to participate in the closed session as an opportunity to discuss these issues in the appropriate venue.

## Technology Zones

A Board subcommittee is currently studying technology zones. Does the technology zone legislation allow incentives for reduction or elimination of a transportation impact fee? If incentives are allowed, this could reduce fees charged to commercial and industrial development.

Code of Virginia § 58.1-3850. Creation of local technology zones.

A. Any city, county or town may establish, by ordinance, one or more technology zones. Each locality may grant tax incentives and provide certain regulatory flexibility in a technology zone.

B. The tax incentives may be provided for up to ten years and may include, but not be limited to: (i) reduction of permit fees; (ii) reduction of user fees; and (iii) reduction of any type of gross receipts tax. The extent and duration of such incentive proposals shall conform to the requirements of the Constitutions of Virginia and of the United States.

Even if the legal determination is that a transportation impact fees is not available for incentives, the Board subcommittee studying technology zones is considering substantive relief for various businesses. This relief, although perhaps not directly applied against a transportation impact fees is substantive relief from various charges that may make a transportation impact fee more palatable, (i.e., it's the whole package that is important.)

## Unfunded Roads

This is a list of Roads that would populate a Rural Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) (second alternative) endorsed by two committee members.

These roads are failing at the end of the 20 year comprehensive plan period if not funded by a proposal such as the second alternative because these roads are not funded by the bond program, the FAMPO CLRP or the Board or committee's road list.

Rockhill Church Road (SR-644)	Spotted Tavern Road (SR-614)
Forbes Street (SR-627)	Olde Concord Road (SR-721)
Sanford Drive (SR-670)	Richland Road (SR-649)
Morton Road (SR-624)/Forbes Street (SR-627)/Layhill Road (SR-624)	Storck Road (SR-691)
Widewater Road (SR-611)	Stony Hill Road (SR-662)
Hope Road (SR-687)	Bethel Church Road (SR-600)
Greenbank Road (SR-656/654)	Woodstock Lane (SR-639)
New road east of Telegraph Road (SR-637) connection	Chapel Green Road (SR-602)
Enon Road (SR-753)	Northampton Blvd extended
Hartwood Road (SR-612)	Holly Corner Lane (SR-655)
Potomac Run Road (SR-626)	Richards Ferry Road (SR-752)
American Legion Road/Ramoth Church Road (SR-628)	Cropp Road (SR-614)
Eskimo Hill Road (SR-628)	Dunbar Drive (SR-645)
Andrew Chapel Road (SR-629)	Hollywood Farm Road (SR-601)
Tacketts Mill Road (SR-646)	New Hope Church Road (SR-605)
Caisson Road (SR-603)	
Heflin Road (SR-612)	<u>Roads—portions are unfunded</u>
Belle Plains Road (SR-604)	Brooke Road (SR-608)
Ramoth Church Road (SR-628)	Mountain View Road (SR-627)
Mine Road (SR-684)	Onville Road (SR-641)
New road parallel to Warrenton Road (US-17) on the South	Poplar Road (SR-616)
Berea Church Road (SR-654)	Truslow Road (SR-652)
Barrett Heights Road (SR-642)	Leeland Road (SR-626)
Joshua Road (SR-643)	Mine Road (SR-684) extended
Stefaniga Road (SR-648)	White Oak Road (SR-218)
Kellogg Mill Road (SR-651)	
Harrell Road (SR-623)	
McCarty Road (SR-604)	
Winding Creek Road (SR-628)	
Bells Hill Road (SR-631)	
Colebrook Road (SR-682)	
Forest Lane Road (SR-601)	
Shackelford Well Road (SR-754)	
Mount Olive Road (SR-650)	

Proposed Transportation Impact Fee Road Improvement Plan - Transportation Impact Fee Advisory Committee - June 2009

Road Name	Termini From	Termini To	Improvement Type	Estimated Total Cost (in millions)	Cost Per Mile	Estimated Cost Methodology	Existing Length (Mi)	Proposed Improvement Length (Mi)	Existing Lane-Mi	Proposed Lane-Mi	Additional Lane-Mi
A Shelton Shop Road	Garrisonville Road	Mountain View Road	4 Lane	\$28.0	\$14.0	Medium Cost 4 Lane	2.00	2.00	4.00	8.00	4.00
B Mountain View Road	Stefaniga Road	Choptank Road	4 Lane	\$21.2	\$12.3	Some r/w in Place Along Road	1.72	1.72	3.44	6.88	3.44
B Butler Road	Cambridge Street	Castle Rock Drive	4 Lane	\$12.2	\$14.0	Medium Cost 4 Lane	0.87	0.87	1.98	3.48	1.50
D White Oak Road	0.15 miles W of Northside Drive	Ferry Road	4 Lane	\$28.6	\$14.0	Medium Cost 4 Lane	2.04	2.04	4.08	8.16	4.08
E Mine Road extended	Courthouse Road	Ramoth Church Road	2 Lane New	\$15.1	\$6.7	2 Lane Built on 4 Lane r/w (Cost Between & 4)	0.00	2.25	0.00	4.26	4.26
F Enon Road / Centreport Pkwy Connection	Enon Road	Centreport Parkway	2 Lane New	\$5.0	\$6.7	2 Lane Built on 4 Lane r/w (Cost Between & 4)	0.00	0.75	0.00	1.50	1.50
G Enon Road Reconstructed	Hulls Chapel Road	Truslow Road	2 Lane Reconstruction	\$2.5	\$4.8	Higher Estimate Due to Cost of Relocating Road & Realigning Intersection w/ Plantation	0.53	0.53	1.06	1.06	0.20
H Leeland Road	Julian Street	Walnut Drive	4 Lane	\$4.2	\$14.0	High Estimate Due to Houses Close to Road	0.30	0.30	0.60	1.20	0.60
I Deacon Road	Walnut Drive	Primmer House Road	4 Lane	\$9.2	\$11.0	Lower Cost for 4 Lanes Due to r/w in Place	0.84	0.84	1.68	3.36	1.68
	Jett Street	Mintwood Drive	2 Lane Reconstruction	\$2.1	\$3.6	Medium 2 Lane Reconstruction	0.57	0.57	1.14	1.14	0.00
Subtotal without US-1 (Projects 11& 12)				\$128.0							
J Jefferson Davis Highway	Chopowamsic Creek	6 Lanes at Potomac Creek	6 Lane	\$123.0	\$18.0	Medium Cost 6 Lane	12.02	8.84	27.34	41.01	13.67
K Cambridge Street	Enon Road	Falmouth Intersection	Total	\$251.0			2.83	11.87	0.00	0.00	21.26

Estimated Total Cost for US-1 assumes improving approximately half of the road length with transportation impact fee and the remainder with other sources of funds. Estimates are based on VDOT pre-scoping worksheet for planning and budgeting. Medium Cost is the default.

Proposed Transportation Impact Fee Road Improvement Plan - February 2009

Non-Bond Street Name	Termini From	Termini To	Type of Improvement	Estimated Total Cost (in millions)	Cost Per Mile	Estimated Cost Methodology	Existing Length (Mi)	Proposed Improvement Length (Mi)	Existing Lane-Mi	Proposed Lane-Mi	Additional Lane-Mi
1 Cambridge Street	Warrenton Road	Truslow Road	6 Lane	\$7.0	\$21.2	Higher Due to Falmouth Interchange & Bridge Constraints & Businesses Close to Roadway Low Cost for 6 Lane, but Some r/w has been Dedicated and Some Frontage is Still Undeveloped.	0.33	0.33	1.32	1.98	0.66
2 Jefferson Davis Highway	Garrisonville Road	Telegraph Road	6 Lane	\$15.0	\$15.0	Medium Cost 4 Lane	1.00	1.00	4.00	6.00	2.00
3 Shelton Shop Road	Garrisonville Road	Mountain View Road	4 Lane	\$28.0	\$14.0	Medium Cost 4 Lane	2.00	2.00	4.00	8.00	4.00
4 Butler Road	Cambridge Street	Castle Rock Drive	4 Lane	\$12.1	\$14.0	Medium Cost 4 Lane	0.87	0.87	1.73	3.46	1.73
5 White Oak Road	0.15 miles W of Northside Drive	Belle Plains Road	4 Lane	\$30.0	\$13.4	Lower than Medium Due to Length & Less Development Along Road	2.24	2.24	4.48	8.96	4.48
6 Enon Road / Centreport Pkwy Connection	Enon Road	Centreport Parkway	2 Lane New	\$5.0	\$6.7	2 Lane Built on 4 Lane r/w (Cost Between & 4)	0.00	0.75	0.00	1.50	1.50
7 Mine Road extended	Courthouse Road	Ramoth Church Road	2 Lane New	\$10.0	\$4.4	2 Lane Built on 4 Lane r/w (Cost Between & 4)	0.00	2.25	0.00	4.26	4.26
8 Leeland Road	Deacon Road	Primmer House Road	4 Lane	\$11.0	\$8.9	Some Length is Built & Some r/w in Place	1.24	1.24	2.48	4.96	2.48
9 Mountain View Road	Stefaniga Road	Choptank Road	4 Lane	\$15.0	\$12.3	Some r/w in Place Along Road	1.22	1.22	2.44	4.89	2.45
TOTAL				\$133.1			11.90	11.90			23.56

Information on improving the entire length of US-1

Street Name	Termini From	Termini To	Type of Improvement	Estimated Total Cost (in millions)	Cost Per Mile	Estimated Cost Methodology	Existing Length (Mi)	Proposed Improvement Length (Mi)	Existing Lane-Mi	Proposed Lane-Mi	Additional Lane-Mi
J Jefferson Davis Highway	Chopowamsic Creek	6 Lane at Potomac Creek	6 Lane	\$216.4	\$18.0	Medium Cost 6 Lane	12.02	12.02	48.08	72.12	24.04
K Cambridge Street	Enon Road	Falmouth Intersection	6 Lane	\$50.9	\$18.0	Medium Cost 6 Lane	2.83	2.83	11.32	16.98	5.66
TOTAL				\$267.3			14.85	14.85			29.70

## Transportation Impact Fees

By the Transportation Impact Fee  
Advisory Committee  
August 18, 2009

### The Committee

- James McMath  
(Chair)
  - Patricia Kurpiel
  - David Beiler
  - Samer Shalaby
  - Jon Riley (Presenter)
- 
- Appointed in Fall 2008
  - Charged with reviewing the methodology and road list for Transportation Impact Fees

## Methodologies Considered

- Board directed methodology—limited road list and no impact fee for non-residential
- A County-wide TIF + an additional area outside the USA creating an overlay TIF for the Agricultural areas.
- Comprehensive road list and all pay
- Limited area (USA) and comprehensive road list within the area—all pay

## Methodology the Committee Proposes

- County-wide impact fees
- Limited road list (target improvements)
- Limited non-residential impact fee with expanded credit options
  - Fairness
  - Improve the roads needed
  - Incentives to development community without stifling development

## Credit Options

- All off-site road improvements in the impact fee program receive 100% credit
- Road improvements outside the impact fee program in the Transportation Plan may receive credit or a portion of credit.
- Credits may be transferred between developments or developers
- Credits may be sold privately

## Credit Options and Other suggestions

- Credit transfers allowed only after proffers are satisfied (Improvements are made)
- Off-site improvements value is based on developer's cost of the improvement
- Technology Zones & UDA's offer exemption opportunities
- Limit the non-residential categories to four
- Data update needed for trip generation rates

## Road List

- Considered the road list referred by the board, all roads in the transportation plan, and FAMPO long-range plans
- Focused road improvements to areas of highest growth
- Roads are arterials and major collector roads
- Did not prioritize road list
- Do not include the bond program roads

## Road Improvement Plan

- Shelton Shop Road
- Mountain View Road
- Butler Road
- White Oak Road
- Mine Road extended
- US-1
- Enon Rd / Centreport Pkwy Connection
- Enon Road / Plantation Drive Reconstructed
- Deacon Road
- Leeland Road

## Other Issues

- Road subset rather than the full needs
- Interface between proffers and transportation impact fees
- The old program
- Credits and underfunding
- This program v. Central West district—the fees for non-residential are less
- Appeal process
- Transit and Pedestrian Improvements—still needed

## Legal Concerns

- Legal questions were forwarded to the County Attorney which will be addressed in closed session.
- The committee considers the legal questions paramount to the full discussion of the impact fees.

## Conclusion

- The committee supports the County taking an active role in road building through impact fees.
- The County-wide district with limited roads and all paying is the fairest and most effective approach.