

Tom Kassmel

Public Comment A

From: Dominic Mauriello <dominic@mpgvail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2017 11:41 AM
To: Tom Kassmel
Cc: Matt Mire; George Ruther; Allison Kent; Greg Hall
Subject: Traffic Impact fees

Hi Tom:

I will not be able to attend your open house on traffic impact fees today. I have a cold I am dealing with and don't want to infect the world.

Here are some questions and comments that I think the Town should consider when deciding to adopt a new fee targeted to the last 5% of growth in Vail.

- Consider charging for parking in the summer and use the funds generated for these roadway improvements. There is a nexus in that those parking in Vail are impacting the entire roadway network. This would avoid imposing an additional fee on development that Vail needs and wants.
- There is a disconnect between the adoption of a traffic impact fee and the Town's other stated goals and incentives built into the Zoning Regulations. The Town wants additional employee housing and has an aggressive requirement already placed on development. Adding an impact fee on employee housing only exacerbates the problem and the ability to bring forward employee housing. The Town has incentivized the development of employee housing by not counting the GRFA and Density for this use in most zone districts. Employee housing units, in all of its forms, should be exempt from the impact fee.
- On this same disconnect, the Town has incentivized the development of hotel rooms/accommodation units by not counting hotel rooms against density. Additionally, every adopted master planning document discusses the importance of hotel rooms to the Town's vitality and especially the generation of revenues. Every hotel room created generates significant ongoing revenues to the Town, beyond that of just about any other use, including dwelling units. **However, the proposed impact fees are the same as applied to a dwelling unit.** This is a disincentive to creating hotel rooms within the Town. Another element that is also missing is the amount of hotel traffic that relies on the Town's bus system, hotel shuttles, and CME shuttles. It appears from the numbers that there is not enough credit being given to the reduction in traffic within hotel facilities versus dwelling units. Hotel rooms/accommodation units should be exempted from the Impact Fee.
- The Town has struggled for years with the loss of office space throughout the Town. Charging an impact fee on office or other commercial spaces, will further exacerbate this issue. It already does not make any financial sense to develop office space in the Town. This impact fee will add to that equation in a very negative way. Office space should also be exempt from the fee.

I believe there is a fundamental problem with adopting a traffic impact fee at this point in Vail's history. The fee makes it more difficult to attract and construct the kind of development projects the Town desires. The redevelopment of Lionshead is a great example of creating incentives to produce the type of development that will spin off huge revenues to the Town, way more revenues over the long haul than these upfront impact fees generate.

Does the Town have the right and the basis for adopting an impact fee? Of course it does. Is it the right thing to do or in the best interest of the Town's long term revenue goals? Absolutely not.

If the Town is short on cash related to road projects, think about: charging for summer parking; going to the voters to change how RETT funds can be used; and adopt a new property or sales tax dedicated road improvements.

Thank you for the opportunity to offer my thoughts.

Dominic F. Mauriello, AICP

Mauriello Planning Group, LLC

PO Box 4777

2205 Eagle Ranch Road

Eagle, Colorado 81631

970-376-3318 cell

www.mpgvail.com

Tom Kassmel

From: Tom Ruemmler <TRuemmler@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 5:45 PM
To: Tom Kassmel
Subject: Re: Transportation Impact Fee Update

I want to make sure you have my comments on "impact" fees or any other fees on new construction accurately provided to the Town Council.

Impact fees are spreading across American like a wildfire. They will destroy American because they make housing more non-affordable for all.

Builders will add a significant profit on top of the fee because these fees are expenses out of their pockets before they start construction and because of time cost of money.

When new home prices rise 98 existing home values also rise.

To collect significant revenue from roughly less than 1% of the population, the fee has to be very large.

By over taxing new construction, (the new construction purchaser) 98 owners of existing homes get a tax free income equal to about 130% of the fee charged. This is because existing home owners can borrow against the increase value of their home that results from all new costs added to new construction.

A better alternative is to spread taxes of more people. This will make the tax per person significantly smaller (over 100 times less per person) and thus the tax is palatable.

There is only a traffic problem in Vail when lots of tourists are in town. Shouldn't tourist be the ones that should pay for the infrastructure?

Vail has a affordable housing problem. Why make matters worst by placing more costs on new construction.

Eliminating all fee that have been placed on new construction should be a major focus of all Town Councils.

I have personally witnessed a city of 200,000 go into bankruptcy as a result of fees placed on new construction.

Employers have to pay significantly higher wages if the costs of housing is high.

I problem the Vail Valley has is low wages. A Aspen ski instructor makes over twice a Vail instructors rate of pay.

Existing home owners believe they benefit from the increase values of their homes that result from fees on new construction. The benefit they receive quickly evaporates when they need to loan each of their children between \$100,000 to \$200,000 so they can qualify to purchase their first home.

Staff has been briefed on the unforeseen consequences of fees on new construction. I can't believe staff would consider approaching the Town Council with any proposal to fund anything, including infrastructure, which is mainly needed for peak tourist load, with fees on new construction.

During meetings held by Vail Valley Partners each contractor or developer that spoke on the panels explained the number one problem is fees on new construction.

Impact fees on new construction was one of the major root causes of the Housing and Financial crisis.

Tom Ruemmler
719 293-0655

From: Tom Kassmel <TKassmel@vailgov.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 12:25 PM
To: Tom Kassmel
Subject: Transportation Impact Fee Update

All

The Transportation Impact Fee Study and Ordinance will be presented to the Town Council on June 6th (First reading).

Since Council's last review of the Study and the March public meeting some minor changes will be recommended to the Fee Schedule.

Attached is the updated Transportation Impact Fee Study for convenience, with the fee schedule shown on page 15.

Also, comments received to date will be submitted to the Town Council for review along with a staff memo.

The comments and staff memo will be available on-line on the Town Council Meeting Agenda page by June 2nd.

<http://www.vailgov.com/government/town-council/council-agendas-meeting-materials/online-agendas>

[Town of Vail > GOVERNMENT > TOWN COUNCIL > Council Agendas ...](#)

www.vailgov.com

TOWN COUNCIL. Council Members; Council Agendas & Meeting Materials; Council Minutes; Council Highlights; Council Meetings Online; Community Participation

If you would like to be removed from this email list please reply to this email.

Thank you.

Tom Kassmel

Town Engineer

Public Works Department



970.479.2235

vailgov.com

twitter.com/vailgov



Why is the U.S. in this economic crisis?

A major **ROOT cause of this declining economy is over-taxation and over regulation of new construction by government which escalated home prices to unaffordable levels.** Below is a detailed explanation of the unforeseen detrimental ramifications of huge fees & regulations on new construction, what happened to the economy and logical low cost solutions which could greatly accelerate economic recovery in the U.S.

AN EXAMPLE OF OVER TAXATION & REGULATION FOR STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA

Stockton is one of California's "affordable housing cities" and the **epicenter** of the housing crisis. Stockton's building permit fees increased about 300% between 2002 and 2010 and totaled about \$65,000 in 2010 for a 2000 sq. ft. home. There is another \$60,000 of additional costs associated with well-intentioned, but not thought-through regulatory requirements. Governmental induced costs exacerbated inflation. In 2002, a new 2000 sq. ft. home in Stockton cost \$255,000; in 2006 it cost \$440,000 (**of which approximately \$140,000 is from over-the-top regulatory fees**). Fees and regulations resulted in housing becoming unaffordable under the "old sound" borrowing requirements. Unfortunately government and private lenders responded to the unaffordability of homes by lowering borrowing requirements so people could buy homes to fulfill "the American Dream". Lower borrowing requirements resulted in many bad loans.

LENDING BLUNDER

Soaring new home prices drove up **existing** home values by approximately \$140,000. All housing became less affordable, especially to first time home buyers. Because federal government encourages the American dream of home ownership, borrowing requirements were reduced. There is a belief that better communities are achieved with pride of ownership. This results in reduced expense for police services. Borrowing standards were greatly reduced and home ownership increased from 67% to 69%; yes, only a difference of 2%! Subprime loans, which were in existence for many years, started being used more frequently. Borrowing qualifications and requirements on subprime loans were substantially reduced. In order to get under qualified clients to qualify, some loan officers committed fraud and then collected their commissions.

CALIFORNIA LEAD THE U.S. INTO THE NATIONAL FINANCIAL CRISIS

25% of all bad home loans are from California. The bad loans were bundled with other loans to form loan packages sold by Wall Street. Some loans in the packages went bad. Bad loan packages resulted in the potential collapse of financial institutions and AIG who insured the packages!

GOVERNMENT TREATED THE SYMPTOMS AND NOT THE CAUSE

The U.S. Government attempted to stop a financial collapse by bailing out AIG, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac and banks. Government tried to stimulate the housing economy with the \$8,000 home purchase tax credit. The government bailouts benefit a few people, but they are costly for all taxpayers and merely treat the symptoms and did not fix the **ROOT** cause of the financial and housing crisis.

Local and state government's over taxation and regulation resulted in 35% of the cost of a new home's construction. This is what made housing unaffordable in the first place. **Passing federal legislation to limit fees and regulations to no more than 3% of the costs of a new home would eliminate the ROOT cause.** This legislation will not add to federal costs, is easy to enact and administer - and benefits society and all states equally.

When new homes become affordable, jobs will be created resulting in stimulating the economy. Affordable housing will result in a sustainable housing economy and lead the U.S. out of the financial crisis. Warren Buffet stated the economy will improve when residential construction improves!

Both political parties should be able to wrap their arms around legislation that limits fees and regulation to 3% of the cost of a new home. This legislation will stimulate jobs. The proposed federal legislation will force state and local governments to use tax dollars more effectively. It will force them to find alternative revenue sources that spread taxes more evenly across society. Spreading taxes evenly results in a larger number of people paying taxes and lowers taxes for each individual. Lower taxes are more palatable. Hopefully politicians that do not back this logical solution for the housing and financial crisis will be voted out of office.

Details of the solution are explained below.

SOLUTIONS ARE EASILY IDENTIFIED IF YOU SOLVE THE PROBLEM BACKWARDS

WHAT CAN THE AVERAGE PERSON COMFORTABLY AFFORD TO BUY?

In order to have a sustainable economy, an average household income must be able to comfortably afford a house using the old lending standards and a 7.5% interest rate. The mean household income in Stockton California is about \$52,000. This income allows them to comfortably own a \$150,000 home with 20% down. They would have a \$120,000 fixed rate loan and would be paying 24% of their income for their principle, interest, taxes and insurance – their PITI payment.

WHAT A NEW HOME NEEDS TO SELL FOR: LESS THAN \$176,000

A new home can sell for \$176,000 if it can demand a 15% premium over an existing home. A contractor can **NOT** build a \$176,000 home if it costs **\$50,000 to \$140,000** for permits and regulations. In other states, fees and regulations are under \$4,000 and contractors can and do build the average house for under \$176,000 **Fees in California need to be under \$4,000 to compete with other states and to achieve a sustainable economy. Lodi and Lathrop fees are significantly less than Stockton fees.**

THE RESULTS OF OVER TAXATION AND REGULATION INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

“LEVERAGE EFFECT” THE HUGE UNFORSEEN DETRIMENTAL EFFECT

Governmental officials did not foresee the leverage effect of placing \$125,000 of fees and regulations on new homes. A 15% profit on the additional \$125,000 of costs, increased new home prices by \$144,000. There are at least 90 existing homes for every new home built. For every 1,000 homes built, there are 90,000 existing homes. These existing homes increased about **13 billion dollars** in value. Many existing homeowners used their homes like piggy banks by tapping into the increase home value. In addition, many people used subprime loans to refinance. **Records reveal the majority of subprime loans were refinances.** Many borrowers defaulted and walked from their loans after they “sold” their house to the lending institution. Foreclosures devastated the value of neighboring homes. Over **13 billion** dollars of additional buying power (demand) was created in Stockton and resulted in the unintended consequence of inflation, escalating housing prices even higher during boom times. Stockton has over 99,000 homes!

TAXES AND FEES ARE PALATBLE IF SPREAD ACROSS SOCIETY

If there are approximately 96 existing homes for every new home built (a 1.3% expansion rate). A better approach would be taxing **all** homeowners \$688. This would collect the same amount of dollars as taxing the new home buyer \$66,000 in fees. Since many of the regulations do more harm than good, the

government would only need to collect about \$300 in additional taxes on **all** houses (existing and new) to cover worthwhile expenses. Three hundred dollars is palatable; \$66,000 is not. Sixty six Thousand dollars (\$66,000) greatly alters the free market system that the United States economy is based upon. History has shown that government decisions can greatly affect a free market economy.

WHY WERE FEES PLACED ON CONSTRUCTION IN CALIFORNIA?

Fees escalated under the **incorrect** assumption that California's Prop 13 (which limited property tax increases to 2% per year) reduced government's income. Government used Nexus reports to justify fees on new construction. The 2010-2011 Stockton Nexus report, states *"Since the passage of Proposition 13, property tax revenues have been insufficient for capital funding..."* *"...Given these funding difficulties, the City requires new development to pay fees to fund the facilities necessary to accommodate growth."*

ANALYSIS REVEAL PROP 13 WAS NOT THE PROBLEM

If the property taxes collected in San Diego County in 2010 are divided by the property taxes collected in 1977 (the year before Prop 13), it is discovered that \$7.20 is collected now for every dollar collected back in 1977. Adjusting the dollar by 85% population growth and by 260% inflation reveals that we should be only collecting **\$4.80**. **Instead** we are collecting **\$7.20** – this is **1.5 times** what we need to collect. The foregoing figures should be further adjusted because worker productivity increases should result in fewer tax dollars needed. A mere 1% productivity increase per year reveals that we only need to collect **\$3.60**. However, government is collecting **\$7.20 in property taxes, plus government is collecting exorbitant impact fees**. California ranks 14 in the nation for property taxes! California has one of the highest sales and income taxes, plus it collects impact fees on new construction!

WHERE DID THE MONEY GO?

In the 1970's, governmental employees wages were lower than the private sector but they had good guaranteed retirement and benefit programs. Currently I would highly recommend employment in the governmental sector (especially the local government sector) because of the generous wage and benefit packages as opposed to the private sector. Is the Stockton following in Greece's foot steps?

REGULATIONS – WELL INTENTIONED BUT NOT THOUGHT THROUGH

An example of "focused thinking" and not considering the unforeseen consequences of regulations is reflected in the attached pictures of a rainwater treatment tank that is installed in a subdivision of 303 homes on 77 acres in Stockton, California. The cost of this tank was about 2 million dollars. The rainwater treatment tank which is made from lots of steel and concrete is about 400 feet long, 16 feet wide, 8 feet tall and is buried about 20 feet underground.

The tank caused more environmental harm than good. Rainwater tanks have the potential to be huge methane bombs as organic materials, such as leaves, decay. Other flammables such as solvents, diesel fuel, oil and leaks from natural gas lines, can accumulate in the tank. The tanks are breeding ponds for the mosquitoes carrying the West Nile Virus. Other significant negative environmental effects of these tanks include the air pollution created; from hydrocarbons burned to dig the hole, install the tank, fuel burnt when the sediment that collects in the tank is hauled off and from the methane gas produced by decaying matter in the tank. Air pollution is also created from the production of the steel, concrete, and materials used for tank construction and transportation of those materials to the job site. Other detrimental effects include \$50,000 in extra annual taxes collected from the 303 homeowners to maintain the tank. Additional taxes need to be collected to poison the water for mosquito prevention.

After 6 years the tank trapped four dump truck loads of sediment which was removed, dried and later placed in a landfill. Over \$300,000 in taxes was collected for 4 dump truck loads of dirt!

If future development projects in the United States are required to have rain water treatment facilities. Over the next 100 years, billions of dollars will be spent and less than 1/100 of a percent of the rainwater runoff will be treated. The decontamination of the rainwater runoff will be negligible for the billions of dollars that will be spent. There are less expensive alternatives which can help the environment.

The initial cost of the rain water tank, ongoing taxes and environmental harm is just one example of “not thought through” government regulations that add to building costs. There are numerous other regulations that are not needed and counterproductive. If drastic changes don’t occur to eliminate unnecessary regulations and dramatically reduce building permit fees and red tape, the future of the American economy will be affected for many many years.

There are many more “not thought through” government initiated programs that are mainly paid for by new construction. Examples are buying up developmental rights to leave land undeveloped and other regulations to protect the environment. These programs benefit everyone, but instead of spreading the cost over society and thus reducing the tax to a palatable figure, government placed the cost on one entity, the new home buyer. The cost of a mitigation measure that **benefits all** is not a fee. It is a tax because it benefits all. It is an **illegally** enacted tax. These taxes should not be added to new construction because it makes housing more unaffordable and adds to the ROOT cause of the housing crisis.

Government seems oblivious or unsympathetic to the fact that these costs accumulate and eventually overwhelm the new home buyer. Government did not understand that new construction pays its fair share. There are sales taxes on materials. Construction wages paid result in sales taxes when their families shop. A \$300,000 home generates in excess of \$13,000 in extra sales tax and another \$330 from a .11% transfer tax. Some cities impose transfer taxes that exceeded 1%. In perspective, the \$13,000 in extra taxes generated by a \$300,000 home may be more than the state and federal taxes paid by individuals who purchase the new homes.

TAXES ON PROPERTY ARE DETRIMENTAL

Sales taxes and income taxes have a direct relationship to a person’s ability to pay. Taxing property is a very poor choice because property taxes do not have a relationship to a person’s ability to pay and greatly distress and burden the young, old (retired) and average income earner.

Certain things are needed to survive on earth. Government made them more affordable to all, by not taxing Food, Water or Air. Why did government choose to tax Shelter? This was a mistake!

Construction is a major economic engine, creating jobs and significantly decreases unemployment costs. Government should stimulate, not overtax, this sector of the economy.

A conflict of interest exists for lobbyists, environmentalists, government employees and the elected officials who voted to place huge costs on new construction. Community development departments increased in size and their budgets swelled during flush times. Because more money was available for government employee wages, benefits, and retirement programs, unions bargained for higher wages. An even greater conflict of interest was their homes increasing \$115,000 in value for every \$100,000 of fees and regulations. (The extra \$15,000 represents the builder’s profit on the \$100,000 in extra costs).

Existing homeowners falsely believed they greatly benefited from the rising value of their home. Most homeowners did not realize the rapid price increases were in a large part due to fees and regulations. They borrowed against their increased equity and bought rental homes to get in on the rapid price increases. This led to the frenzied spiral of over-inflated home prices. However, even without the recession, the huge increase in equity in the existing homes evaporated when home owners had to lend their children money so their children could qualify and buy the higher priced homes.

SOLUTIONS

1. The key to a rejuvenated economy is addressing a **major ROOT** cause of the recession. One solution could be utilizing interstate commerce laws and passing federal legislation limiting total building permit fees and auxiliary costs to no more than 3 percent of construction costs. Passing such legislation will cost the federal government little, unlike the other bailouts the federal government has already authorized, such as the one time new homeowner's tax credit of \$8,000 as previously discussed. That \$8,000 tax credit benefited a select few at the cost of everyone. Passing legislation, as suggested, would help more people afford homes, be easier to administer, and greatly reduce the discrepancies in permit costs between cities, counties and states.

2. Another part of the solution is to pass legislation requiring studies of the unintended consequences of the mitigation measures recommended in the initial environmental impact reports, and that the proposed mitigation measures be required to: A) be reasonable; B) be the most cost effective solutions C) assess their economic impact, D) have a positive economic impact E) be paid for by all (all who benefit). Environmentalists do not want to do more harm to the environment and should not be opposed to the legislation suggested.

Government use to pay for infrastructure while collecting a lower sales and income tax

More effective use of tax dollars is needed.

California already collects some of the highest income, sales and property taxes in the United States. Additional taxes on new construction are not needed and should not be relied on because they have huge detrimental leverage effect and other effects that are the **ROOT** cause of the economic crisis.

The majority of tax dollars is spent on education. Schools have a **terrible business** plan. The United States spends more than other nations on education but we test **near the bottom**. Since 1971 educational spending per student has doubled (after adjusting for inflation) yet test scores have remained the same.

We could easily cut education expenses in **half** and also **raise test scores**. I encourage you to go to Khanacademy.org which is a free educational web site backed by the Melinda and Bill Gates foundation. I suggest you and all parents view the 60 Minute episode on Khan academy www.cbsnews.com/video/watch/?id=7401696n and the video at the Khanacademy.org web site that describes why this education technique is successful. <http://www.khanacademy.org/video/salman-khan-talk-at-ted-2011--from-ted-com?playlist=Khan+Academy-Related+Talks+and+Interviews>. Another interesting TED TALK video by Professor Robinson about education is http://www.ted.com/talks/ken_robinson_says_schools_kill_creativity.html

Los Altos School District has had great success using Khanacademy.org.

If half of the dollars spent on education (or prisons) could be used for paying off the national debt and doing comprehensive reevaluations of all existing governmental programs, we could get out of this financial crisis.

These suggestions will increase governmental income as construction resumes. More sales tax would be generated from building materials and from income taxes realized from jobs created. The governmental expense of unemployment will be greatly reduced. The expense of specialized stimulus packages will be eliminated.

The government has a relatively short window of time to rectify the problem of overtaxing one entity (new homes). If legislation reduced the price of a new home built in 2010 from \$350,000 to \$225,000 by reducing the taxes, fees and over regulations on construction, it would be seemingly unfair to those

people who bought the \$350,000 homes. However, the recession has already reduced the value of the \$350,000 houses purchased between 2005 and 2008 to \$200,000 and thus it will not affect these people.

Construction is a major economic engine. We have all witnessed the negative result of pushing the cost of housing beyond the grasp of the common citizen, the far-reaching effect on the entire economy and especially on those communities that overtaxed new construction. Many communities that did not overtax new construction did not have rapid inflation of home prices and thus home prices did not greatly decrease in this recession. The new legislation ACT suggests will not alter these markets. Our legislators must ACT now and if they don't, we must ACT now and vote them out of office.

A grass root organization called **ACT (Alliance for Controlling Taxes)** has been established by a group of citizens to educate politicians and the general population concerning the unforeseen consequences of putting fees and regulations on new construction. ACT intends to suggest solutions to stabilize and stimulate our failing economy. ACT welcomes all who would like to actively research and advocate for sound solutions, which may improve not only the local but the national economy. ACT will be funding the publication of the foregoing educational information in major newspapers, explaining why the U.S. is in the current recession and what citizens can do to counteract the continuing decline.

If you would like to join in this effort or to donate financially, contact ACT today. ACT anticipates support from Businesses and people from all walks of life, since nearly everyone is affected by this economic crisis. Your participation and or donation directly helps you. Also, people with a variety of skills are being sought to help with website development, identifying creative means of informing the public and access to public officials who have the ability to make the necessary changes.

Contact us at ACTforTaxChange @ gmail.com, or call 719 293-0655. Send donations to ACT, 2818 Golden Eagle Drive, Stockton, CA 95209

A Suggestion Made To ACT. ACT Welcomes Your Opinions & Suggestions

The mortgage crisis is created by what? People who cannot afford their mortgage payments. So we force them out of their homes. Banks go under, property values of nearby homes plummet, jobs are lost, and the American people get stuck with an \$700 billion bailout.

Why not let these people stay in their homes, and let them continue making whatever payments they were able to afford in the beginning? Yet, nobody should get a free lunch. The government (a.k.a. US taxpayers) can pay the difference of the mortgage, and take partial equity on the value of the house. In other words, if the Fed pays \$1000 of the mortgage payment, the Fed gets \$1000 of equity and collects that equity when the home sells. The banks will not have bad loans. Banks will become liquid again because there will be less defaults. The housing market becomes stable again because the glut of short sales and foreclosures disappears. Our own property values will increase because there won't be "Short Sale" and "Foreclosure" signs everywhere. When the houses are eventually sold, American taxpayers reap the rewards of shared equity, leading to the possibility of reducing taxes in the future.

Sufficient laws must be in place preventing **any** bank or agency from making the kinds of loans that are unsustainable – the kind that got us where we are today.

Tom Ruemmler

TRuemmler@hotmail.com

719 293-0655



An expensive 400 foot long, 16 foot wide, 8 foot tall storm drainage tank. \$50,000/year of taxes are collected from 303 houses to maintain the tank. Inside the tank are 3 foot tall dams about every 20 feet. The dams create many ponds. Fine dirt settles in the ponds. After many years, the sludge is removed, trucked to a site and dried. It is then trucked to a landfill. Billions of dollars will be spent on rainwater treatment, but very little water will be treated. Calculations reveal little if any improvement will be seen in the streams. The well intended Clean Water Act's implementation was not thought-through. Unintended consequences include air pollution and green houses gasses from the hydrocarbons burnt to manufacture, install the tank and haul off the sludge. The tanks can become huge bombs as a result of gases accumulating in the tank from the fermenting of organic matter such as leaves, or spillage of flammables, or from leaks in natural gas lines. The tanks are breeding pools for mosquitoes that can carry the West Nile Virus

Tom Kassmel

From: Bob Essin <vailbob@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 8:51 AM
To: Tom Kassmel
Cc: Suzanne Silverthorn; Greg Hall; Council Dist List
Subject: Re: "Vail Meeting to Focus on Transport Fee" March 15, 2017

March 27, 2017

Tom and Town Council,

Thank you for the information and follow up. I definitely agree that if an additional expense can be justified it should be covered in the increase in sales tax or even property tax that the Town receives from all people, property owners and visitors to TOV. The costs and delays in improving our properties is already significant and once done, the increase in property valuation provides additional taxes. The idea of a transport fee is bogus. How would we feel if the Federal Government decided it would increase I-70 traffic and pass a fee that would have to be paid by the landowner when they decided to build? Where does it stop? Nice try to create additional funds for all levels of government to collect additional funds without calling it a tax. Creative staff some times needs to be told NO. At least if you think it is justified, call it what it is, an increase in taxes and allow voters to vote on it. Town coffers may be down somewhat because of more expenses with items such as the underpass, but it is undeniable that TOV has more than enough money coming in from sales taxes and property taxes.

It's a beautiful day in Colorado,

Bob Essin

4264 Columbine Way #11

Vail, CO 81657

970-376-4484

Vailbob@comcast.net

Sent from my iPad

On Mar 22, 2017, at 08:37, Tom Kassmel <TKassmel@vailgov.com> wrote:

Bob

At the Vail Transportation Impact Fee meeting, staff received some comments regarding the proposed fee. Generally the comments were that this was an additional burden and targeted fee on new development, and that it is counter intuitive to some of the employee housing, Hotel, and commercial development goals the Town generally embraces, and that we would be better off dispersing the cost over a broader base with an increase in sales tax.

Attached is a copy of the latest Vail Transportation Impact Fee Study and proposal as well as a single page fee table summary.

Our next steps will be to review the fee with PEC in April and then return to Council in May for final review. We will provide all comments to Council for further discussion in May.

Tom Kassmel

Town Engineer

Public Works Department

<image001.jpg>
970.479.2235
vailgov.com
twitter.com/vailgov

<image002.jpg>

From: Suzanne Silverthorn
Sent: Sunday, March 19, 2017 8:28 AM
To: Tom Kassmel; Greg Hall
Subject: Fwd: "Vail Meeting to Focus on Transport Fee" March 15, 2017

Do you have an update for Bob?

Suzanne Silverthorn, APR
Director of Communications
Town of Vail
970-479-2115
970-471-1361 (cell)

Begin forwarded message:

From: Bob Essin <vailbob@comcast.net>
Date: March 19, 2017 at 8:24:31 AM MDT
To: Kevin Foley <kfoley@vailgov.com>, <towncouncil@vailgov.com>
Cc: <vailbob@comcast.net>
Subject: "Vail Meeting to Focus on Transport Fee" March 15, 2017

I was unable to attend the meeting. What happened, is happening??
It's a beautiful day in Colorado,
Bob

Bob Essin
4264 Columbine Way # 11
Vail, CO 81657
970.376.4484
Vailbob@comcast.net

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Bob Essin <vailbob@comcast.net>
Date: March 15, 2017 at 07:40:26 MDT
To: KFoley@vailgov.com, towncouncil@vailgov.com,
editor@vaildaily.com
Subject: Re: "Vail Meeting to Focus on
Transport Fee" March 16, 2017

3/15 not 3/16
Bob

Sent from my iPad

On Mar 15, 2017, at 07:19, Bob Essin <vailbob@comcast.net> wrote:

"Vail Meeting to Focus on Transport Fee" is the heading of an article in 3/15 Vail Daily about today's meeting at City Hall. Transport Fee migration from current traffic mitigation fee. 22% of \$95 Million. This sounds like a huge "tax" on any new development and/or replacement of existing residential and commercial square footage in Vail purportedly because it might somehow effect traffic. This is hardly a fee. This is a new tax and should be the subject of vote of town citizens.

It's a beautiful day in Colorado,

Bob Essin

4264 Columbine Way #11

Vail, CO

[Vailbob@comcast.net](mailto:vailbob@comcast.net)

970.376.4484

Sent from my iPad

<FeeScheduleBoard.pdf>

<2017-03-10 VailTranspImpactFeeDRAFT.pdf>