



Memorandum

To: Julie Brenman
Wesley Parham, P.E.

From: Matt Noonkester, AICP

Date: February 18, 2008

Subject: City of Durham Transportation Impact Fee Study
Summary of Changes to Report Dated December 15, 2006

■
Suite 300
4651 Charlotte Park Drive
Charlotte, North Carolina
28217

On April 5, 2007, a representative of Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. presented the results of the transportation and parks, recreation, and open space impact fee study update reports to City Council. Following the presentation, members of City Council voted favorably to accept the methodologies used for the two studies, and directed City staff to hold a series of meetings with the development community and general public to solicit these groups' input. Comments from these meetings were generally positive; however, portions of the transportation impact fee study update report were revised in response to specific concerns raised by meeting participants. No changes were made to the parks, recreation, and open space impact fee study update report as a result of the public outreach meetings.

The previous transportation impact fee study update report presented to City Council was dated December 15, 2006. The revised report is dated February 6, 2008. A summary of major changes made to the transportation impact fee study update report since it was last presented to City Council is provided below.

Acknowledgements

The list of individuals included on the acknowledgements page of the report was revised to reflect the current list of Durham City Council members and recent changes within Durham City staff.

Roadway Analysis

Statistics in the narrative of the report and all accompanying summary tables were revised to reflect changes made in other sections of the report — including reassignment of roadway links between service zones and changes to the per lineal foot construction cost estimates. New column headings also were added to Tables 1 and 2 in the report to denote base year/future year condition lane miles and base year/future year recommended lane miles. Worksheets summarizing the roadway link analysis still are included in Appendix C of the report.



Roadway Improvement Costs

Sidewalks were removed from the list of items used to estimate the construction cost for each of the four types of roadway capacity improvements assumed for the study. Table 4 reflects the reduced per lineal foot construction cost estimates assumed for this study.

Cost Per Trip

The cost per trip statistics reported in the study were updated to reflect changes made in other sections of the report. Specifically, the cost per trip information for the three service zones was updated as follows: north — \$1,272 to \$1,051; south — \$2,930 to \$2,782; and downtown — \$1,179 to \$581.

Maximum Allowable Impact Fee Schedule

The maximum allowable impact fee schedule for all three service zones was updated to reflect changes made in other sections of the report.

Comparison Cities

Table 8 summarizes maximum allowable transportation impact fees for select land uses common to other cities in the Triangle Region. The proposed maximum allowable impact fees for Durham were revised to reflect changes made in other sections of the report.

Appendix C – Roadway Link Analysis Tables

A table was added to the Appendix that summarizes the results of the roadway link analysis. In addition, the following links were reassigned between the three service zones: Buchanan Boulevard between Chapel Hill Street and NC 147 (downtown to south), Buchanan Boulevard between NC 147 and Main Street (downtown to north), and Duke Street between NC 147 and Morehead Avenue (downtown to south).

Appendix E – Construction Cost Estimates

Appendix E provides a detailed summary of the construction cost estimates used in the study. Two of the items listed in Table E of the Appendix did not accurately represent average construction cost estimate information published by the North Carolina Department of Transportation (dated February 27, 2006). Both improvements relate to the construction of super street intersections, which are listed as items 15 and 16 in the supplemental costs section of the table.

Footnote E was deleted from the table to reflect the removal of sidewalks from the per lineal foot construction cost estimates used in the study.