

FORT WORTH LEAGUE OF NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS  
STATEMENT TO CITY COUNCIL'S WORKSHOP ON  
TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEES  
MAY 13, 2008

The City of Fort Worth has studied Transportation Impact Fees for almost two and a half years. However, we believe that a key element in this partial remedy to address the serious lack of roads in newly developed areas has been omitted.

How did the City of Fort Worth get into this downward spiral of an inadequate and crumbling infrastructure? Did any of you, when you originally ran for election to the seat you now hold, have **any** idea of the DEPTH of the infrastructure problems facing Fort Worth?

Consider the difference between **symptoms** and **causes**. If you break your leg and your doctor tells you to take two aspirin and get plenty of bed rest, that is treating the symptom. The cause, the broken leg, is still there.

The League of Neighborhoods believes there are several causes for the infrastructure crisis, one of which can be directly addressed by Transportation Impact Fees. By indirectly encouraging leap frog residential construction, developments in the fastest growing parts of our city have generated an unreasonable demand on the City to build arterials and streets. Not only have there been no provisions in place to address this kind of "random" development, but there have been no controls in place to address the

construction of streets within these developments, with the result that the City is now faced with the cost of repairs for miles and miles of streets with premature road failure.

The City has since enacted inspection for local streets, but the problem is still evident – the City takes action only AFTER the problem has reached unreasonable proportions.

If enacted, what is referred to as “geographic smoothing” would compromise the ability of the City to DIRECT the housing development where it is needed and wanted; and where one hopes there are arterials to support the increased traffic and, therefore, decrease the infrastructure construction demands. Folks, here is an opportunity for you to address a CAUSE instead of a Symptom. A flat rate of any kind is a band aid, a “take two aspirin” approach.

Another point is the need to encourage non-residential development needed to support the residential development currently in existence. These areas NEED retail, commercial, industrial, and medical developments. For example, the closest hospital to those who live in Far North Fort Worth is 20 miles away -- in Grapevine. The closest!

The residential property owners in that area want and need all kinds of non-residential development. People do **not** want to have to drive one to two hours each way just to get to work. People do **not** want to have to drive 20 to 30 minutes to get to a grocery store, a general retail store, or a drug store. The problem is not unique in just Far North Fort Worth. Look at the other rapidly developing areas such as in far South Fort Worth – they have the same problems, and the same situations are occurring.

- Option 6, offered by the League of Neighborhoods, (which would provide for **no** geographic smoothing and a rate of 50% impact fee assessment on residential development and a rate of 25% impact fee assessment on non-residential development) addresses leap frog development.
  - “Geographic smoothing” should be eliminated from consideration and the term should be placed in the dustbin of our municipal history.
- \* Option 6 **encourages** non-residential development.

The Fort Worth League of Neighborhoods would like each of you to look carefully at your district, to look at its roads, its curbs, the potholes, your district’s accessibility, and then ask yourself, “What actually has been done to improve these situations?”

Look at the 2004 Bond package and ask yourself “What actual improvement work has been done in my district as a result of that package?” What **still** has not been addressed? Keep in mind that **that** Bond Proposition was passed over FOUR years ago!

What improvements have been made since passage of the Critical Capital Needs package? We are not talking here about promises or items “**on the schedule.**” We **are** talking about what has actually been accomplished on the ground to improve the infrastructure situation in your individual districts and across the entire City.

Of course, the 2008 Bond package passed. But, how LONG will it be before any improvements will actually appear ON THE STREETS? Transportation Impact Fee Option 6 is part of a positive, workable solution.

We ask you to look deeply into the reasons for how you will vote on Transportation Impact Fees.

Will you vote to address a CAUSE -- or will you vote for a bandage that will hide the broken leg?