



City of Keller

Capital Improvements Advisory Cmte.

Meeting Minutes

Keller Town Hall
1100 Bear Creek Parkway
Keller, TX 76248
817-743-4000
www.cityofkeller.com

Tuesday, August 10, 2021

REGULAR MEETING 5:15 P.M.

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Gary Ponder called the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee Meeting to order at 5:20 P.M.

The following Committee Members were present:

Committee Chairperson Gary Ponder
Committee Member Bob Apke
Committee Member Tom Thompson
Committee Member Paul Alvarado
Committee Member Leslie Sagar
Committee Vice Chairperson Ralph Osgood
Committee Member James Dawson
Committee Alternate Phillip Maxwell
Committee Alternate Logan McWhorter

The following staff from Kimley Horn were present: Jeff Whitacre, PE, AICP, PTP, Vice President, John Atkins, Vice, President/Project Manager/Engineer, April Escamilla, PE, Civil Engineer, and John K. Green, EIT, Transportation Analyst.

The following City staff members were present: Director of Public Works Alonzo Liñán, City Engineer Chad Bartee, Administrative Coordinator Argieree Potter, Director of Community Development Julie Smith, Planner III Patricia Sinel, Planning Technician Amy Botcher, and Planner I Katasha Smithers.

B. MINUTES

1. [Consider approval of the minutes of the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee meeting on July 27, 2021.](#)

A Motion made by Committee Member Tom Thompson, Seconded by Committee Member Bob Apke to approve the minutes for the Capital Improvement Advisory Committee meeting on July 27, 2021. The motion carried unanimously.

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. [Discuss and approve the semi-annual impact fee progress report as of September 30, 2020.](#)

Chairperson Gary Ponder turned it over to Director of Public Works Alonzo Liñán. Mr.

Liñán thanked Mr. Ponder, the committee and City Engineer Chad Bartee for covering in his absence. Mr. Liñán explained that what was presented last time was for your ability to digest over time, give comments and tonight go over those final comments and if there are changes, make those appropriately, and then act on this report. Mr. Liñán stated that it is required to submit a report of the status of the use of impact fees twice a year, per state statute. It is usually anywhere from 6 to 8 months from the actual period. Part of that is because of the necessary to do year-end audit before those get released and getting to it as quickly as we can. Mr. Liñán went on to thank Committee Member Bob Apke for sending in comments earlier about some math, Committee Member Leslie Sagar also sent it in. Mr. Liñán went into the questions submitted by Committee Members. The first question submitted was a recap of what we talked about last time. What we committed to last time we cannot deliver this time because it is not prepared, but I will do it for next. That is a list of projects that have received impact fees and have concluded construction. What the report has been saying is here are current project and here is what we are spending on this project from impact fees and all the numbers that go with that. What we have not done, is say, here are all the projects that have been cleared, using impact fees. That will be included next time. Next question is about tables. The table that is in question is on page 4. Mr. Liñán went on to explain that 4 maybe 5 different people create these reports over the years. At least 4 people create and modify the spreadsheet that comes out of the report. Anybody who tries to modify someone else spreadsheet know it is a different logic when someone else creates a spreadsheet. While that may give us a reason to why some of these errors happen, what I did was pull those numbers over. Committee Member Sagar comment of how we arrived at fund balances. Seems like we have a fund balance at the end of one year. We know what came out, we know what came out, you should have a fund balance afterwards. Mr. Liñán explained that it is not going to be a one to one but very close so to that point what Committee Member Sagar asked about was the 4.16 million starting balance should have been a 1.4 million starting balance, Mr. Liñán assured the committee that that error and others will be corrected in the final report. Ms. Sagar asked for a copy of the corrected report, Mr. Liñán will be happy to provide that copy of the corrected report with the numbers that will change. Committee Member Bob Apke asked about fiscal year 2019-20 October to March and then April to September on the collected, that October/September. Mr. Liñán stated that 528 should be 236 and agreed with Committee Member Apke stating that will be corrected. The last question was on table 2-4 which is on the street's roadway impact fees. The question is do we have a combined fund balance, or do we keep those fund balances separate between North and South? The simple answer is both, yes, it is combined but we keep separate in the ledger. Mr. Liñán followed up that yes, they know how much is in each but in this report, it is all in one. He can separate it if it is the committee's desire. Mr. Liñán reminded the committee that the colored sheet has yellow highlights, those yellow highlights are the numbers that have been updated and are a change from the previous report that you received a few months ago. Mr. Liñán asked if there are any other questions. Ms. Sagar asked Mr. Liñán about what was discussed a year ago was a list of impact fees with completed, underway, under design, and other status of each one. Ms. Sagar continued that she thought that was what

they agreed to last year and that was supposed to be in the Appendix. Ms. Sagar believes that would be helpful to know where you are with all those projects. Mr. Liñán explained that he attempted to explain that in the graphics throughout the report. Ms. Sagar continued that she is interested in projects that may not be done. Mr. Liñán agreed that and explain that he is going to talk about. He clarified that the question is if the projects will ever get done. Mr. Liñán explained the answer to those questions is on the second page with the graphics showing the blue line that was reflection what we presumed to be the growth rate and how the impact fee program was structured, the red line was what we are experiencing. But for the South Roadway you can see we are not meeting growth projections. To that point, those projects that were identified assume we are going to follow the blue line because we are following the red line some of those projects won't get kick off in the time. Ms. Sagar agreed with Mr. Liñán explanation but wanted to make it clear that it will be helpful to committee members to have a list of the status of all projects throughout the entire process. Mr. Liñán stated that he now has a better understanding of Ms. Sagar point.

Director of Community Development Julie Smith provided a suggestion of how to organize the report. Mr. Liñán thank Ms. Smith for her suggestion. He stated that he refrained from polishing the current report as well as it could be because the new report will be a complete revamp with a new impact fee rate, new list of projects. We are going to start with the fund balance but then start over with the collections fees that are different than before. It does not mean that money goes away but gives us and opportunity to reset how that report gets put together and what gets included.

Committee Member Tom Thompson went back to the red line, blue line, proposed and actual. He asked the question if our initial projections overly optimistic and if our is execution lacking or we lagging in production? Ms. Sagar stated that in 2015 the committee consensus was what the consultants gave us was overly optimistic and overly aggressive. Unfortunately, they gave us the projections and land use assumptions after they did all the work. They were supposed to get the committee approval first and then go forward, instead they did all the work and said we are going to go back and change it. Mr. Thompson brought up the question, if we as a city being as responsive to the needs of the community as we need to be or were the initial projections just flawed optimistically. Mr. Liñán does not believe it to be an error so much as it was not a consensus projection. Ms. Smith stated that it would be fair to say that the processes was flawed, it pre-dated us. The processes were lacking and that is why this team has done such and effort at coming to you early in the process and sharing with you the assumptions that they are making so we don't do that.

Committee Member Tom Thompson agreed that any projection is a best guess of what the future's going to hold, but, again, it begs the question are we responding to the needs of the community with approvals, zoning requests, infrastructures. Were the projections just outlandishly optimistic. Mr. Liñán stated that I think that's a good segway to the next part of

it, but I don't want to get to the next part until we wrap this up because right after this, right after the committee acts and either accepts this or not, then we're going to go into a presentation which is the next part of the impact fee update specifically talking about those growth projections. Ms. Sager mentioned that it has been quite a while since we had this report. Ms. Sager ask the questions of when we are going to do this. Mr. Liñán stated that he would like to say sooner than last time.

Ms. Sager understood that Mr. Liñán had his hands full, more than full, particularly back in the spring when we had the big chill. In addition, I recognize that, I know that, and I know there is only so many hours in the day to get things done. In theory, these reports are supposed to be done every 6 months and that has not happened in a long time.

Mr. Liñán agreed and shared that his goal, because we have numbers from September to April, we have those already; it is just a matter of going through and updating it now. I will commit that we will have that before the end of this year.

Chairperson Gary Ponder asked the committee members, if there were other questions before we ask for a motion?

A Motion was made by Committee Member Leslie Sagar, Seconded by Committee Member Paul Alvarado to approve the Semi-Annual Impact Fee Progress Report as of September 30, 2020, with the revision that were discussed tonight. The motion carried unanimously.

Chairperson Gary Ponder allowed Director of Public Works Alonzo Liñán to go right into an update that was a month ago, maybe a little bit more, that we gave you the first peak at the update and showing you what we are starting to tackle and the process we are going through. We have staff from Kimley Horn here tonight and April Escamilla, P.E., Civil Engineer will give the presentation. Mr. Liñán gave an overview of the presentation stating, that this presentation essentially says here is the status of our update, what we will see are insights into rational to the new land use categories that we so we're going to be recommending plus the discussion of how we're going to deal with medical and we'll talk about growth rates and percentages that we think are appropriate over the next 10 years. Not necessarily comparison from what we did before but might have a rational for that. Finally, we will have a brief discussion on some preliminary capital projects on the street site that we believe are worth investigating further but is by no means certain and with the assumption we have a master utilities plan for water and wastewater currently underway when a separate consultant finishes that, then that will just be rolled into this. Mr. Liñán headed to floor over to April Escamilla from Kimley-Horn to give the 2021 Impact Fee Update presentation to the committee. During the presentation, the committee members had various questions and comments. Kimley-Horn and City staff worked together to addresses questions and provide discussion. The following topics were included in the presentation:

-
- Land Use Assumptions
 - Historic Growth Trends
 - Current Land Use Vehicle-Mile Equivalency Table
 - Proposed Land Use Vehicle-Mile Equivalency Table: Medical-Dental Office, Retail/Commercial, Office
 - Impact Fee Process: Planning Step, Analysis Step, Policy Step, Adoption
 - Roadway Impact Fee Service Areas and CIP

Chairperson Gary Ponder thanked Kimley-Horn for the presentation.

D. ADJOURN

Chairperson Gary Ponder adjourned the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee meeting at 6:21 P.M.

Chairperson

Staff Liaison