Development Services
Planning and Zoning
Building Inspection
Telephone (903)892-7229
Email: planning@cityofsherman.com

AGENDA

The Capital Improvements Advisory Committee (CIAC) of the City of Sherman will hold a regular meeting Tuesday, February 21, 2023 at 4:00 P.M. in the Council Chambers at 220 W. Mulberry to consider the following:

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

2. **APPROVE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 16, 2022 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

3. **REVIEW AND CONSIDER THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2023.**

4. **ADJOURNMENT**

By direction of the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee (CIAC) of the City of Sherman.

Clay Mahone, Chairman ATTEST: Rob Rae, Secretary

Meetings of this advisory board are open to the public.

Note: The above agenda schedule represents an estimate of the order for the indicated items and is subject to change at any time.

In accordance with the Texas Open Meetings Act, Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code, the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee (CIAC) may hold an executive session if the discussion of any of the items identified in this agenda, or any of the items identified below, concern one or more of the following:

Tex. Gov't Code § 551.071	Seeking the advice of its attorney about pending or contemplated litigation, settlement offers or any matter in which the duty of the attorney to the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee (CIAC) under the Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct of the State Bar of Texas clearly conflicts with the Texas Open Meetings Act.

Certification

I, the undersigned authority, do hereby certify that the above Agenda of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Adjustments and Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of Sherman is a true and correct copy of said Notice and that I posted a true and correct copy of said Notice on the bulletin board, at City Hall, of said City of Sherman, Texas, a place convenient to the public and said notice was posted on February 16, 2023 at 4:00 P.M. and said time of posting was 72 hours before said meeting was convened or called to order.

Dated this 16th day of February
City of Sherman, Texas

Kerri Turner,
Development Services Coordinator

Sherman
CLASSIC TOWN. BROAD HORIZON.

Sherman
CLASSIC TOWN. BROAD HORIZON.

Capital Improvements Advisory Committee (CIAC) **2.**

Meeting Date: 02/21/2023

Prepared By: Kerri Turner, Development Services Coordinator

Issue:

APPROVE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 16, 2022 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

List of Agenda Items:

Attachments

2022-08-16 Draft Minutes

STATE OF TEXAS §

COUNTY OF GRAYSON §

August 16, 2022

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT A Regular Meeting of the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee (CIAC) and Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of Sherman, was begun and held on August 16, 2022.

MEMBERS PRESENT:	CHAIRMAN MAHONE COMMISSION/COMMITTEE MEMBERS: DOWNTAIN, DAVIS, SIMS, MANLEY, WHITAKER, BLAGG AND BACA
MEMBERS ABSENT:	NONE
STAFF PRESENT:	ROB RAE, DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES, KERRI TURNER, DEVELOPMENT SERVICES COORDINATOR, WAYNE LEE, DIRECTOR OF ENGINEERING AND MARY LAWRENCE, DIRECTOR OF FINANCE.
CITY ATTORNEY:	ALICESON COTTON

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Mahone of the Capital Improvement Advisory Committee and Planning and Zoning Commission called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

APPROVE MINUTES

The Capital Improvements Advisory Committee reviewed the minutes of the December 14, 2021 meeting. Motion by Commission Member Manley to approve the Minutes as written. Second by Commission Member Blagg. All present voted AYE.

MOTION CARRIED.

APPROVE MINUTES

REVIEW AND CONSIDER THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2022

REVIEW & CONSIDER THE CIAC SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2022

Rob Rae, Director of Development Services provided an overview of the impact fee revenue year to date.

Mr. Rae explained, “We are required by state law to have a Capital Improvements Advisory Committee (CIAC) meeting every six months to go over finances and the revenue that has been generated through the impact fees and to review the study and see if any changes need to take place.

Mary Lawrence, Director of Finance, has put together a report since the last meeting to review the funds we have collected through impact fees. Since the impact fees have been introduced, we have collected $245,000.00, more or less, and of that $120,000.00 have been roadway impact fees

spread out between the four different zones, $80,000.00 have been for water impact fees and $43,000.00 to $44,000.00 have been for sewer impact fees."

Chairman Mahone asked, "Is the middle column nine months previous to July 31, 2022?"

Mary Lawrence replied, "Our fiscal year starts October 1, 2022, so the nine months is October 1, 2022 through July 31, 2022."

Commission Member Manley asked Mr. Rae, "Is that the developers portion? They have paid the City of Sherman for developments and permits that have been pulled. Do you have an estimate of what the City of Sherman's cost has been to date for infrastructure improvements required for those same projects?"

Mr. Rae replied, "That would be hard to calculate. The impact fees we are collecting is a small portion of the cost of the infrastructure. We calculate 100% of the infrastructure cost, then divide it in half. We start with that, by Texas state law. The collected rate verses that half is only a small portion.

The other factor is the grace period we had for the first year. The impact fee collection started on June 7, 2021, but developments that were platted before that date had a grace period until June 7, 2022. We have not been fully collecting impact fees until June 7, 2022. When looking at our monthly reports, our building permit numbers were incredibly high for May 2022. There were a lot of developers that got their permits in just before the deadline. Now all new construction pays impact fees. There is potential that there could be impact fees on commercial additions or remodels, for residential remodels, there are no impact fees."

RECEIVE PRESENTATION FROM KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC., ON THE MAXIMUM IMPACT FEE

KIMLEY-HORN & ASSOCIATES PRESENTATION

April Rose Escamilla, Kimley-Horn and Associates Engineer, 1010 Belknap, Ft. Worth, TX

Ms. Escamilla appeared to deliver the presentation on the Maximum impact fees and answer any questions.

Ms. Escamilla explained, "Today's presentation is on the impact fee minor update. The impact fee program was implemented in 2020 and today we are doing a minor update and have come with an analysis to present to you.

We will walk through the impact fee process, the role of the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee (CIAC), updates to the impact fee components and comparisons, today's actions and moving forward with some scheduled items.

When it comes to the impact fee process, we look at four different steps. The first is the planning step. We take into account all Land Use Assumptions and work with City Staff to look at the upcoming probable developments as well as those that are already in place and what that growth is going to look like and what exactly is coming forward in terms of growth that could be added to the Capital Improvements Impact Plan project list.

The next step is the analysis step. That is where we take all the Impact Fee Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) calculation of the maximum accessible impact fee. This is the maximum amount that one can implement as a city to be able to collect at that rate.

The next step is the policy step. That is establishing the impact fee, having that discussion in public hearings and move forward with the final step which is the adoption in terms of amending the impact fee ordinance based off the comments of the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee (CIAC) and their deliberation and discussion.

Your role as the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee (CIAC) is to review Land Use Assumptions and provide comments to the City Council and review the Impact Fee Capital Improvements Plan. Do these projects make sense for water, wastewater and roadway? Where exactly is the maximum accessible impact fee in comparison to other cities? What comments would you provide to City Council? In between future five-year updates, you are to monitor and evaluate the Impact Fee Capital Improvements Plan as well as file semi-annual reports, which you just went through and advise on needed updates and revisions.

Next are the impact fee components. We are going to walk through the Service Areas, Land Use Assumptions, Capital Improvements Plan, the maximum fee calculation and what exactly those results are for your city in comparison to local cities.

A service area for roadway, water and wastewater establishes the boundary to which funds can be collected and specify areas to be served by the Impact Fee Capital Improvements Plan. Those funds would be collected and must be spent on projects within the same service area within ten years. This ties back to our ten-year growth analysis as part of the study. For the roadway service area, you have a six-mile trip length limit which is why our service areas are divided in a strategic way that implements that limitation.

When it comes to the service area, it limits roadway within your corporate limits, and it cannot include the Extra Territorial Jurisdiction.

Water and wastewater can extend toward your Certificate of Convenience and Necessity (CCN) and throughout the Extra Territorial Jurisdiction (ETJ) per Chapter 395 of the Texas Local Government Code.

The CCN is what is registered by the Public Utility Commission and where we pulled the latest information to create this service area."

Mr. Rae stated, "One thing that has changed since the last meeting is we asked Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. to extend into our ETJ even though that does go into other people's CCN, such as Pink Hill and areas we do not serve. One of the reasons for that is the Manufactured Housing Park, Frontera. There was an agreement for them to switch from Pink Hill to Sherman. Since we cover the whole ETJ now, if there are any of those changes that happen between service areas, CCN, we are covered in our ETJ so that we don't have to pay again to do an update."

Chairman Mahone asked, "Who is defining the CCN and where it is?"

Ms. Escamilla replied, "It is registered by a city to the Public Utilities Commission, so you can go online and pull it."

Commission Member Manley stated, "If there was an instance where we accepted a proposal for a project but did not annex them from the ETJ into the city limits, we would be able to charge water and wastewater impact fees but not roadway impact fees, so it is in our best interest to annex if possible."

Mr. Rae replied, "yes, for roadway impact fees, that would be a benefit."

Commission Member Davis stated, "What do you do if there is an excess amount of money for a small amount of roadway?"

Mr. Rae said, "Ms. Escamilla, you may want to answer that when we get to the Capital Improvement Plan list of projects."

Ms. Escamilla explained, "There are a total of four service areas. We took into account all the areas that were to be annexed and we updated service areas three and four. We now use Post Creek to divide service areas three and four rather than FM 1417."

Mr. Rae stated, "Travis Heights was a development that came in just north of Bel Air Village. Area three is unique because we have that 75% reduction to help incentivize development in the older part of town. Staff's opinion was that Post Oak Creek was the natural dividing line between the new growing part of south Sherman and the area we want

to incentivize. If we didn't change that then Travis Heights would have a 75% reduction on their impact fees. There are close to 300 lots in Travis Heights. On one side of FM 1417 Bel Air would be paying full impact fees and on the other side of the road they would be paying the 75% reduction. I do not think that was the spirit of what the area three reduction was for."

Ms. Escamilla continued, "Moving forward with Land Use Assumptions, you can see that between 2020 and 2022 you have had a lot of growth.

There was an increase in water in the Capital Improvements Plan.

Looking at roadway service areas, we do have existing projects that are widening lanes and adding intersections."

Mr. Rae stated, "Going back to Commission Member Davis's question for roadway projects. When we collect fees for roadway in service area one, those funds can only be used for these projects. Heritage Ranch is a development and right now they would pay $1,000.00 per lot for roadway fees. That $1,000.00 would go to fund a six-mile radius."

Commission Member Davis stated, "No matter the service area, the roadway impact fee is getting spent right there in that six-mile radius."

Mr. Rae agreed.

Mr. Rae stated, "You can use impact fees for past funded projects for up to five years."

Commission Member Blagg asked, "Are all these projects being funded by the impact fees?"

Chairman Mahone replied and asked, "Only a portion is being funded by the impact fees and the rest is funded by what?"

Ms. Lawrence replied, "It is bond money. Generally, you just borrow it."

Chairman Mahone asked "When you pay for previous projects, are you paying down debt?"

Ms. Lawrence replied, "It just goes back into our debt proceeds account. It frees up money to pay for other projects."

Mr. Rae stated, "If we did not have impact fees, we would be paying for those projects 100% no matter what. Now, there is an offset to what we would have to be doing for a development."

Commission Member Sims stated, "If there are no permits pulled in service area three, there is no money to be made."

Mr. Rae agreed.

Chairman Mahone stated, "There are still roads that need to be kept up and projects that need to be done, it just all comes from the City of Sherman's budget."

Mr. Rae agreed, "right, this is just for increasing capacity. This isn't fixing potholes or sidewalk repairs; this is to add capacity to the network."

Ms. Escamilla explained, "Any building permit, any meter pulled within that service area can be used to pay for projects, different from the roadway service area that is limited by that six-mile radius, the water and sewer are for the entire area for growth related projects that have been identified on the Capital Improvement Plan list."

Commission Member Blagg asked, "Do the impact fees for a water meter increase cover everything such as tractor time, gravel and pipe?"

Ms. Escamilla replied, "You would take the total cost of the project and from there only look at the excess capacity, that would be your multiplier against the actual dollar amount. Hypothetically, out of a $1,000,000.00 project, only $200,000.00 would be recoverable.

The maximum fee calculation is the recoverable cost of a capital project over the new service units of demand. That is why it is key to understand how much growth is coming to the City of Sherman, it plays into that denominator."

Chairman Mahone asked, "Are service units existing within the service area?"

Ms. Escamilla replied, "Those are new service units over the next ten years."

Chairman Mahone clarified, "It is an expectation over the next decade."

Ms. Escamilla agreed.

Mr. Rae explained, "The service units relate to the demographics and Land Use Assumptions. If we increase the demographics and we have more growth, that number goes down if you keep the infrastructure the same. If you increase the infrastructure and you lower the demographics, that number is going to increase."

Chairman Mahone stated, "We had a lot more growth than we originally assumed, that actually helps because everyone has to pay less."

Mr. Rae responded, "but our infrastructure cost has gone up very high. What you will see is the change in the maximum amount we can collect. This means our cost are going up on our infrastructure, our demographics are going up too, but not at the same pace. Infrastructure is higher than the demographics, even with our tremendous amount of growth."

Ms. Escamilla stated, "The base 3/4" water meter would be about $6,807.00, that is what a single-family meter would be assessed at if the maximum impact fee were adopted. The wastewater maximum would be $2,149.00."

Vice Chairman Downtain asked, "Why are the water and wastewater so disproportionate?"

Mr. Rae stated, "City Council wanted to get to a set number and their number was $2,500.00 for total impact fees, that is $1,000.00 for roadway impact fees, they could go much higher than $500.00 for wastewater. The only impact fee that could come down significantly to get to that $2500.00 would be the water."

Ms. Escamilla continued, "We adopted certain collection rates that were reduced by 75% for specific cases: residential in service area three, recreational and religious institutes, nonprofits, dining uses and retail that generate sales tax. City Council could adopt this reduction or lay out certain groundwork for specific scenarios."

Commission Member Blagg asked, "I am a developer that pays for his own water and infrastructure. I am not used to paying for my off sites, so what is the $300,000,000.00 for, a couple of water towers. From a development mind, I do not understand that number?"

Mr. Lee responded, "That is past improvements at the water treatment plant and out at the lake pump station. It is a major water line all the way across town as well as a water tower."

Commission Member Blagg asked, "Do we have the velocity of keeping that up and improving our systems or is it an as needed basis?"

Mr. Lee replied, "That is what has evolved since the last study. We did not have $300,000,000.00 of water figured in. Putting in a major water line from the north to the south on the west side of town was in the impact fee study. That was a 24" and it has increased to 36" in a much shorter time frame. It is still within the ten years, but that project was five to eight years out, now it is two."

Mr. Rae stated, "Our process for helping Kimley-Horn and Associates is that we tell them all the projects that need to be done as a part of this development and then they plug the

numbers in to the formula. We are not backing into it; we are giving them all the projects that need to be done and using those to calculate the impact fees."

Ms. Escamilla stated, "The total project cost in 2020 for water was $150,600,000.00. In 2022 the total cost of the project is $402,000,000.00 and what is recoverable is $300,000,000.00. The recoverable cost in 2020 was $78,400,000.00. That is based off your growth.

What was adopted in 2020 was the $2,500.00 that Mr. Rae had mentioned, at maximum, that would be $11,311.00."

Ms. Escamilla presented a comparison sheet for actual collected rates for Sherman, Anna, Melissa, Princeton, Celina, McKinney and Prosper Texas.

Mr. Rae stated, "Those are the numbers those cities are collecting right now. That is not their maximum accessible. Their maximum accessible may be the same or higher."

Commission Member Davis stated, "It looks like Sherman is growing because we are the cheapest."

Commission Member Manley said, "In six weeks, we collected $245,000.00 in total impact fees in 2022."

Commission Member Sims replied, "Some of that was collected in 2021, but the majority was collected in 2022."

Mr. Rae agreed.

Commission Member Manley continued, "Extrapolate that out for twelve months, we would be collecting, at the same rate $2,000,000.00 to $3,000,000.00 in impact fees. We expect infrastructure costs for water alone to be over $300,000,000.00. Am I off-base in thinking that what we are collecting in impact fees is a drop in the bucket compared to the actual cost of the infrastructure?"

Commission Member Davis, "I would venture to say we have spent the $2,000,000.00 on Kimley-Horn and Associates and studies rather than tractors and pipe. We need Kimley-Horn, these studies have got to be done, but this amount has not cracked a shovel on the ground."

Commission Member Manley stated, "I feel like we have the worst of both worlds, when a developer asks us if we have impact fees, we have to say yes, they don't like it, but we say yes. We are not recouping much benefit from it. So, we are giving them the answer they don't like and we are not getting much benefit."

Mr. Rae replied, "We have a lot of development meetings with prospective developers and the questions they always ask is 'Do you have impact fees and what are they? Do you

have a tree preservation ordinance?'. Usually when we tell them what our impact fee is, they typically don't feel it is too bad."

Commission Member Blagg asked, "Is the waterline the Texas Instruments waterline?"

Mr. Lee replied, "It is a waterline that will help supply water to Texas Instruments as well as the whole west side of town. We were planning a 24" waterline before Texas Instruments. Shepherd's Place identified, with full build out, that the existing waterline would not serve them without putting in that additional capacity around town, Texas Instruments has just accelerated that."

Ms. Escamilla said, "Today's actions are to consider comments to pass to City Council related to the impact fee study, our analysis and consider comments on the impact fee itself, how you would like to set the impact fee compared to the maximum. When considering impact fee settings, what percent of the calculated fee should be set? Is it an average cost? Should the impact fees be similar to the adopted 2020 fees knowing the new information presented today? Should the impact fees all be the same in all roadway service areas? Should there be different fees for residential and non-residential developments?"

Mr. Rae clarified, "We would like to get guidance on whether you think the study is going in the right direction. Did we go in the right direction for the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)? Did we go in the right direction for Land Use Assumptions?

We need a motion on the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and the Land Use Assumptions.

We need a recommendation from the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee (CIAC) on what the collection rate should be for impact fees."

Committee Member Baca asked, "What did we recommend to City Council previously?"

Mr. Rae responded, "It was double what City Council approved."

Chairman Mahone stated, "I think most of us felt we wanted to move this way but did not want to take too big of a step as we want to encourage growth here. I believe our recommendation should be, at minimum, to double what we have here, back to our original recommendation. There is potential discussion for more than that."

Commission Member Sims agreed.

Committee Member Baca stated, "Just the water is a 50% increase from two years ago."

Commission Member Davis stated, "We are basing this on numbers from two years ago with this little bit of growth. You all are saying we are going to be doubling in five or ten years. My fear is that we are doing this again in five or ten years because everything is maxed out. We may need two 24" water lines running from north to south."

Chairman Mahone stated, "If we are charging that maximum of $11,000.00, there really aren't any houses being built around here for less than $300,000.00. That is a 3% increase in cost."

Commission Member Manley stated, "What if we said we want to at least match the next lowest city on this list?"

Commission Member Davis replied, "I think we should go higher than that. I think we are still looking too small."

Chairman Mahone agreed and said, "Even at the maximum, we are still playing catch-up"

Commission Member Manley stated, "At the maximum, we are still competitive."

Commission Member Davis agreed, "correct. The developer does not like the fee, but the guy that has lived here and paid whatever to get here his whole life should not now have to pay increased taxes on all this new construction and building of new roads."

Commission Member Whitaker, agreed, "That is true."

Mr. Rae stated, "One concern that we have is housing affordability, and this does apply to the Comprehensive Plan Committee as well. I felt that service area three with the reduction of 75% is a good thing for the City of Sherman to have the incentive for development for that part of town. Our price increase from inflation does not match our average income, and that is a concern in our Comprehensive Plan meetings. Homebuilders pass that fee onto the single-family home buyers. That is something from the Comprehensive Plan Committee standpoint that we need to be sensitive to."

Chairman Mahone agreed, "I think there is a good reason to incentivize certain sectors of town, but I do think the 75% reduction is a bit much. I think 50% is more than generous and would continue to draw people to continue to develop on that side of town."

Mr. Rae said, "If the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee (CIAC) recommended the maximum or even double, that would put it at $5,000.00 for a single-family equivalent. Service area three would be $2,500.00 with that recommendation. Service area three currently has the 75% reduction."

Chairman Mahone stated, "I think service area three can afford the $2,500.00"

Commission Member Blagg said, "At 75% of the maximum, that would put the impact fee at $8,500.00 for a single-family home. This would be for water, wastewater and roadway for all service areas."

Commission Member Davis stated, "We are calculating for single-family homes, there are a lot of apartments too."

Vice Chairman Downtain stated, "I do not understand why we would want to recommend doubling when that is what we recommended last time. It needs to be more than a 50% increase based on the new data. I am not talking about one particular area; I am talking about the overall increase in the fee."

Commission Member Sims stated, "At 75% of the maximum impact fee, the roadway would be going down."

Committee Member Baca replied, "but you would be picking up in the other areas.

Commission Member Manley said, "If we recommend a minimum of 75% of the maximum assessment based on the 2022 numbers, that would be more than doubling the fees."

Committee Member Baca replied, "At that 75%, we are still competitive with the other cities."

Mr. Rae stated, "Do you want to make a motion on the reductions that we currently have, such as the 75% reduction in service area three, retail use and non-profits?"

Commission Member Davis stated, "I don't think service area three has enough growth that 75% is enhancing it. I don't know that it needs to be that large of a reduction."

Commission Member Manley asked, "I don't understand the reduction for dining uses and other retail. Why were they included?"

Mr. Rae replied, "One of the City Council members did not want to double dip on businesses that are currently paying sales tax. We do not get a lot of commercial developments, so we are not seeing that the 75% reduction is impacting businesses one way or the other."

Commission Member Sims asked, "What is Staff's opinion on the 75% reduction?"

Mr. Rae replied, "I really like the reduction for service area three. I think it is good to promote development in that area.

I do not see a benefit for the other uses having the 75% reduction."

Commission Member Blagg stated, "A reduction for Nonprofits makes sense to me."

Chairman Mahone replied, "That makes sense to me too, I just think 75% is too much of a reduction."

ACTION TAKEN.
Motion by Commission Member Blagg to approve the Land Use Assumptions and the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) as presented. Second by Commission Member Davis.

VOTING AYE: DAVIS, MAHONE, DOWNTAIN, MANLEY, SIMS, BACA, BLAGG AND WHITAKER.
VOTING NAY: NONE.
MOTION CARRIED.

ACTION TAKEN.
Motion by Commission Member Manley to recommend to City Council that the minimum multiplier for impact fees be 75% of the maximum assessable for all categories. Second by Commission Member Whitaker.

VOTING AYE: DAVIS, MAHONE, DOWNTAIN, MANLEY, SIMS, BACA, BLAGG AND WHITAKER.
VOTING NAY: NONE.
MOTION CARRIED.

ACTION TAKEN.
Motion by Vice Chairman Downtain to recommend to City Council to adjust the adopted collection rate reduction from 75% to 50%. Second by Commission Member Davis.

VOTING AYE: DAVIS, MAHONE, DOWNTAIN, SIMS, BLAGG AND WHITAKER.
VOTING NAY: MANLEY AND BACA.
MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT
On Motion duly made and carried, the meeting adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

____
CHAIRMAN

SECRETARY

Capital Improvements Advisory Committee (CIAC)

3.

Meeting Date: 02/21/2023

Prepared By: Kerri Turner, Development Services Coordinator

Issue:

REVIEW AND CONSIDER THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2023.

List of Agenda Items:

Attachments

Impact Fee Revenue Summary

City of Sherman
Impact Fee Revenue
January 31, 2023

Fund Name	Account Name	YE 9/30/2021	YE 9/30/22	4 ME 1/31/2023	Total
Roadway Impact Fee Zone #1	Roadway Impact Fee	$ -	$ 5,725.60	$ 500.00	$ 6,225.60
Roadway Impact Fee Zone #2	Roadway Impact Fee	$ -	$ 90,743.00	$ 164,721.46	$ 255,464.46
Roadway Impact Fee Zone #3	Roadway Impact Fee	$ 1,056.00	$ 25,460.24	$ 15,660.61	$ 42,176.85
Roadway Impact Fee Zone #4	Roadway Impact Fee	$ -	$ 2,106,540.00	$ 24,000.00	$ 2,130,540.00
Total Roadway Impact Fees		$ 1,056.00	$ 2,228,468.84	$ 204,882.07	$ 2,434,406.91
Water Impact Fee Fund	Water Impact Fee	$ -	$ 703,708.06	$ 186,165.56	$ 889,873.62
Sewer Impact Fee Fund	Sewer Impact Fee	$ -	$ 356,076.00	$ 87,311.04	$ 443,387.04
Total Impact Fees		**$ 1,056.00**	**$ 3,288,252.90**	**$ 478,358.67**	**$ 3,767,667.57**