

# PUBLIC FACILITIES IMPACT FEE REPORT

## CITY OF RIO VISTA

FINAL  
SEPTEMBER 11, 2014



### *Oakland Office*

1939 Harrison Street  
Suite 430  
Oakland, CA 94612  
Tel: (510) 832-0899  
Fax: (510) 832-0898

### *Corporate Office*

27368 Via Industria  
Suite 110  
Temecula, CA 92590  
Tel: (800) 755-MUNI (6864)  
Fax: (909) 587-3510

### *Other Regional Offices*

Lancaster, CA  
Memphis, TN  
Orlando, FL  
Phoenix, AZ  
Sacramento, CA  
Seattle, WA

[www.willdan.com](http://www.willdan.com)

# Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	III
Background and Study Objectives	iii
Facility Standards and Costs	iii
Public facilities Fee Schedule Summary	iv
Other Funding Needed	v
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Public Facilities Financing in California	1
Study Objectives	1
Rio Vista Impact Fee Program	2
Study Methodology	4
Organization of the Report	7
2. GROWTH PROJECTIONS.....	8
Land Use Types	8
Occupant Densities	9
Existing and Future Development	10
3. MUNICIPAL FACILITIES .....	15
Service Population	15
Facility Inventories and Standards	15
Fee Schedule	19
Use of Fee Revenue	20
Non-Fee Funding Required	20
4. FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES.....	23
Service Population	23
Facility Inventories and Standards	25
Fee Schedule	27
Use of Fee Revenue	28
5. POLICE FACILITIES .....	31
Service Population	31
Facility Inventories and Standards	32
Cost Allocation	38
Fee Schedule	39
Use of Fee Revenue	39
Non-Fee Funding Required	39
6. PARK FACILITIES .....	42
Service Population	42
Facility Inventories and Standards	42
Fee Schedule	47
Use of Fee Revenue	48
Facility Costs and Funding	48

<b>7. ROADWAY FACILITIES .....</b>	<b>53</b>
Rio Vista Traffic Study	53
Trip Demand	53
Facility Inventories and Standards	55
Fee Schedule	62
Use of Fee Revenue	62
Non-Fee Funding Required	62
<b>8. IMPLEMENTATION .....</b>	<b>66</b>
Impact Fee Program Adoption Process	66
Identify Non-Fee Revenue Sources	66
Inflation Adjustment	66
Reporting Requirements	67
Fee Accounting	67
Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP	67
Renovations and Changes in Use	67
<b>9. SOLANO COUNTY PUBLIC FACILITIES FEES .....</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>10. MITIGATION FEE ACT FINDINGS .....</b>	<b>69</b>
Purpose of Fee	69
Use of Fee Revenues	69
Benefit Relationship	70
Burden Relationship	70
Proportionality	71
<b>APPENDIX A: DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT ANALYSIS AND GROWTH PROJECTIONS.....</b>	<b>72</b>

# Executive Summary

---

This report summarizes an analysis of the need for public facilities and capital improvements to support future development in Rio Vista through 2030. It is the City's intent that the costs representing future development's share of these facilities and improvements be imposed on that development in the form of a development impact fee, also known as a public facilities fee. The public facilities and improvements included in this analysis are divided into the fee categories listed below:

- ◆ Municipal Facilities
- ◆ Fire Protection Facilities
- ◆ Police Facilities
- ◆ Park Facilities
- ◆ Roadway Facilities

## Background and Study Objectives

The primary policy objective of a public facilities fee program is to ensure that new development pays the capital costs associated with growth. The primary purpose of this report is to calculate and present fees that will enable the City to expand its inventory of public facilities, and therefore maintain its facilities standards, as new development leads to increases in service demands.

The City imposes public facilities fees under authority granted by the *Mitigation Fee Act (the Act)*, contained in *California Government Code* Sections 66000 *et seq.* This report provides the necessary findings required by the *Act* for adoption of the fees presented in the fee schedules contained herein.

All fee-funded capital projects should be programmed through the City's five-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Using a CIP can help the City identify and direct its fee revenue to public facilities projects that will accommodate future growth. By programming fee revenues to specific capital projects, the City can help ensure a reasonable relationship between new development and the use of fee revenues as required by the *Mitigation Fee Act*.

## Facility Standards and Costs

This fee analysis uses three approaches to calculate facilities standards and allocate the costs of planned facilities to accommodate growth in compliance with the *Mitigation Fee Act* requirements.

The **existing inventory** approach is based on a facility standard derived from the City's existing level of facilities and existing demand for services. This approach results in no facility deficiencies attributable to existing development. This approach is often used when a long-range plan for new facilities is not available. Only the initial facilities to be funded with fees are identified in the fee study. Future facilities to serve growth will be identified through the City's annual capital improvement plan and budget process and/or completion of a new facility master plan. In this study, this approach is used for the fire protection facilities impact fee because plans for the fire facilities needed to accommodate new development have not been fully developed.

The **planned facilities** approach is based on a master plan that uses standards applied to projected growth to estimate facility needs. This approach allocates costs based on the ratio of

planned facilities that serve new development to the increase in demand associated with new development. This approach is appropriate when specific planned facilities can be identified that only benefit new development. Examples include street improvements to avoid deficient levels of service or a sewer trunk line extension to a previously undeveloped area. This approach is appropriate when planned facilities would not serve existing development. This approach is only used for roadway facilities in this study.

The **system plan** approach is also based on a master facilities plan, but in this case the needed facilities serve both existing and new development. This approach allocates existing and planned facilities across existing and new development to determine new development's fair share of facility needs. This approach is used when it is not possible to differentiate the benefits of new facilities between new and existing development. Often the master plan is based on increasing facility standards, so the agency must find non-impact fee revenue sources to fund existing development's fair share of planned facilities. This approach is used for the municipal facilities, police, and parks fees in this study.

## Public facilities Fee Schedule Summary

**Table E.1** summarizes the maximum justified development impact fees based on the analysis contained in this report.

**Table E.1: Proposed Public Facilities Fee Summary**

Land Use	Municipal Facilities	Fire	Police	Parks	Roadway	Total
<i>Residential</i>						
<i>(Fee per Dwelling Unit)</i>						
Single Family	\$ 2,126	\$ 1,277	\$ 787	\$ 4,920	\$ 3,416	\$ 12,526
Senior Unit	1,289	774	477	2,984	884	6,408
Multi-family	1,289	774	477	2,984	2,104	7,628
<i>Nonresidential</i>						
<i>(Fee per 1,000 Building Square Feet)</i>						
Commercial	\$ 720	\$ 963	\$ 267	N/A	\$ 4,697	\$ 6,647
Office	548	731	203	N/A	5,551	7,033
Industrial	324	434	120	N/A	3,813	4,691

Note: Fees per dwelling unit for residential development, per 1,000 square feet for nonresidential development.

Sources: Tables 3.5, 4.4, 5.11, 6.7 and 7.9.

The City of Rio Vista has entered into development agreements that cover the Brann Ranch, Liberty, Trilogy, Riverwalk and Del Rio Hills developments. The development agreements specify the impact fees that may be charged to new development in these areas. Therefore, new fees adopted by the City Council would only apply to development in areas that do not currently have development agreements in place.

## Other Funding Needed

In addition to impact fees, other funding sources will be needed to fully fund the City's planned public facility improvements. Impact fees may only fund the share of public facilities related to new development in Rio Vista. They may not be used to fund the share of facility needs generated by existing development or by development outside of the City. In addition, the development agreements in place currently may limit fees charged to new development to a level that is lower than the development project's proportionate share of facility costs. Additional funding will be needed to compensate for this limitation in fee revenue charged in areas with development agreements.

As shown in **Table E.2**, approximately \$58.4 million in non-fee funding will be needed to complete the municipal facilities, police, park, and roadway projects included in the impact fee program. The fire facilities impact fee is based on the existing facility inventory. Therefore, it will fund facilities only at the existing standard of facilities per capita and will not raise the level of service provided to existing development, and no non-fee funding needs have been identified.

The City will need to develop alternative funding sources to complete the planned public facility improvements. Potential sources of revenue include existing or new general fund revenues, existing or new taxes, special assessments, and grants.

**Table E.2: Non-Fee Funding Needed**

Municipal Facilities	\$ 7,971,380
Police Facilities	3,371,660
Parks Facilities	22,415,900
Roadway Facilities <sup>1</sup>	<u>24,622,060</u>
Total	\$ 58,381,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not include cost of improvements needed to mitigate existing deficiencies.

Sources: Tables 3.7, 5.13, 6.11 and 7.12.

# 1. Introduction

---

This report presents an analysis of the need for public facilities to accommodate new development in Rio Vista. This chapter provides background for the study and explains the study approach under the following sections:

- ♦ Public Facilities Financing in California;
- ♦ Study Objectives;
- ♦ Rio Vista Impact Fee Program;
- ♦ Study Methodology; and
- ♦ Organization of the Report.

## Public Facilities Financing in California

The changing fiscal landscape in California during the past 30 years has steadily undercut the financial capacity of local governments to fund infrastructure. Three dominant trends stand out:

- ♦ The passage of a string of tax limitation measures, starting with Proposition 13 in 1978 and continuing through the passage of Proposition 218 in 1996;
- ♦ Declining popular support for bond measures to finance infrastructure for the next generation of residents and businesses; and,
- ♦ Steep reductions in federal and state assistance.

Faced with these trends, many cities and counties have had to adopt a policy of “growth pays its own way.” This policy shifts the burden of funding infrastructure expansion from existing rate and taxpayers onto new development. This funding shift has been accomplished primarily through the imposition of assessments, special taxes, and development impact fees. Assessments and special taxes require the approval of property owners and are appropriate when the funded facilities are directly related to the developing property. Development fees, on the other hand, are an appropriate funding source for facilities that benefit all development jurisdiction-wide. Development fees need only a majority vote of the legislative body for adoption.

## Study Objectives

The primary policy objective of a public facilities fee program is to ensure that new development pays the capital costs associated with growth. The Public Facilities and Services Element of the Rio Vista General Plan states that, “It is the City’s intent to update the [impact] fees citywide and ensure that all future development agreements and agreement amendments contain updated and adequate fees in order to fund the infrastructure needed to serve new growth.” The primary purpose of this report is to update the City’s impact fees based on the most current available facility plans and growth projections. The proposed fees will enable the City to expand its inventory of public facilities as new development leads to increases in service demands.

Impact fees must comply with the *Mitigation Fee Act* (the *Act*), contained in *California Government Code* Sections 66000 *et seq.* This report provides the necessary findings required by the *Act* for adoption of the fees presented in the fee schedules contained herein.

Rio Vista is forecast to experience substantial growth through this study's planning horizon of 2030. This growth will create an increase in demand for public services and the City facilities required to deliver them. Given the revenue challenges described above that are common to most cities in California, Rio Vista has decided to use a development impact fee program to ensure that new development funds the share of facility costs associated with growth. This report makes use of the most current available growth forecasts, facility plans, and engineering studies to update the City's fee program and ensure that it is representative of the facility needs resulting from new development. The planning documents and assumptions used to determine facility needs resulting from new development are detailed in the following chapters.

All fee-funded capital projects should be programmed through the City's five-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Using a CIP can help the City identify and direct its fee revenue to public facilities projects that will accommodate future growth. By programming fee revenues to specific capital projects, the City can help ensure a reasonable relationship between new development and the use of fee revenues as required by the *Mitigation Fee Act*.

## Rio Vista Impact Fee Program

Rio Vista currently charges impact fees to fund the expansion of roadways, park and recreation facilities, municipal facilities, water facilities, and sewer facilities to serve new development. These fees were last comprehensively updated in 2003, though they have since been updated for inflation.

It is recommended practice that agencies update impact fees annually for inflation in the cost of public facilities. It is also recommended that agencies conduct a comprehensive fee update at least every five years to incorporate changes in facility standards, facility costs, and development projections. This study provides the documentation needed for a comprehensive update of the City's impact fee program, with the exception of the water and sewer connection fees. The City is currently updating its sewer and water master plans; therefore, this study does not update the sewer and water connection fees. The City intends to update these fees after completing the master plans.

Development agreements currently in place for the Liberty, Trilogy, Brann Ranch, and Riverwalk developments specify the impact fee levels that may be charged to new development in these areas. The fees calculated in this study would only apply in areas not currently subject to a development agreement. (The development agreement for Riverwalk states that if the City adopts revised impact fees, the fees charged in Riverwalk will be the lesser of the fees specified in the development agreement or the new fees adopted by the City.)

**Table 1.1** shows the City's current impact fee fund balances.

**Table 1.1: Existing Impact Fee Balances**

Streets (Fund 53)	\$	-
Parks (Fund 54)		21,600
Municipal (Fund 56)		67,400

Note: Fund balances as of September 30, 2013. rounded to nearest \$100.

Source: City of Rio Vista.

This study separates the police and fire facilities that had previously been funded through the municipal facilities fee into separate fee categories. The facilities related to City administration and community centers remain in the municipal facilities fee. For the purposes of this study, it was assumed that the existing municipal facilities fund balance will be divided between police, fire, and municipal facilities in proportion to the value of planned facilities in each category. The study uses the same approach to estimate the funding for police, fire and municipal facilities that will be available from the municipal facilities and public facilities fees included in the development agreements. The estimate of total municipal facilities and public facilities fee revenue generated by development with active development agreements is shown in the Development Agreement Analysis memorandum included in Appendix A.

**Table 1.2** shows the assumed allocation of the municipal facilities fee fund balance, as well as projected future municipal facilities and public facilities fees collected under active development agreements. The City is not obligated to allocate the fund balance or future municipal and public facilities fees collected under development agreements in the manner shown; it is only required to spend the funds on municipal facilities needed to serve new development. There should be a reasonable relationship between the facilities funded and the types of municipal facilities upon which the fee was based.

**Table 1.2: Distribution of Municipal Facilities Fee Fund Balance**

Fee Category	Planned Facilities Cost	Percent	Allocation of Existing Fund Balance	Allocation of Future Municipal Facilities Fee from Development Agreement Projects
Municipal	\$ 17,445,000	61%	\$ 41,100	\$ 8,099,000
Fire	4,911,000	17%	11,500	2,257,100
Police	6,350,000	22%	14,800	2,920,900
Total	\$ 28,706,000		\$ 67,400	\$ 13,277,000

Sources: Tables 1.1, 3.3, 4.5, and 5.4; Table 12, Development Agreement Analysis and Growth Projections for Rio Vista Impact Fee Study, Willdan Financial Services.

## Study Methodology

Public facilities fees are calculated to fund the cost of facilities required to accommodate growth.

The four steps followed in a public facilities fee study include:

1. **Estimate existing development and future growth:** Identify a base year for existing development and a growth forecast that reflects increased demand for public facilities;
2. **Identify facility standards:** Determine the facility standards used to plan for new and expanded facilities;
3. **Determine facilities required to serve new development and their costs:** Estimate the total amount and cost of planned facilities, and identify the share required to accommodate new development; and
4. **Calculate fee schedule:** Allocate facilities costs per unit of new development to calculate the public facilities fee schedule.

The key public policy issue in development impact fee studies is the identification of facility standards (step #2, above). Facility standards document a reasonable relationship between new development and the need for new facilities. Standards ensure that new development does not fund deficiencies associated with existing development.

### Types of Facility Standards

There are three separate components of facility standards:

- ♦ *Demand standards* determine the amount of facilities required to accommodate growth, for example, park acres per thousand residents, square feet of library space per capita, or gallons of water per day. Demand standards may also reflect a level of service such as the vehicles-to-capacity (V/C) ratio used in traffic planning.
- ♦ *Design standards* determine how a facility should be designed to meet expected demand; for example, park improvement requirements and technology infrastructure for city office space. Design standards are typically not explicitly evaluated as part of an impact fee analysis but can have a significant impact on the cost of facilities. Our approach incorporates current facility design standards into the fee program to reflect the current construction cost of public facilities.
- ♦ *Cost standards* are an alternate method for determining the amount of facilities required to accommodate growth based on facility costs per unit of demand. *Cost*

*standards* are useful when demand standards were not explicitly developed for the facility planning process. *Cost standards* also enable different types of facilities to be analyzed based on a single measure (cost or value), useful when disparate facilities are funded by a single fee program. Examples include facility costs per capita, per vehicle trip, or cost per gallon of water per day.

This study is based on demand standards for parks, roadway, police, and fire. Park facility needs are based on the Rio Vista General Plan policies for park acres and trail miles per capita. Roadway facility needs are based on minimum level of service (LOS) standards adopted by the City. Police facilities are based on standards identified by the Rio Vista Police Department of officers needed per capita and station space per officer. Preliminary fire facilities planning has identified facilities needed to meet the City's response time and Insurance Services Office (ISO) rating standards.

The municipal facilities fee is based on a cost standard derived from the City's planned municipal facilities. For each of the other facility categories, the demand standards are used to determine facility needs, which are used to determine a cost standard and appropriate fee amount. The design standards used in estimating facility costs reflect the current cost of new facilities except when the value of the existing facilities is discounted to reflect renovation costs, as with the existing City Hall.

### New Development Facility Needs and Costs

A number of approaches are used to identify facility needs and costs to serve new development. Often there is a two step process: (1) identify total facility needs, and (2) allocate to new development its fair share of those needs.

Total facility needs are often identified through a master facility planning process that takes place prior to the impact fee study. Engineered facility plans are particularly important in the areas of traffic, water, sewer, and storm drainage because of the specialized technical analysis required to identify facility needs. If facility master plans do not exist, this study identifies a preliminary plan for the use of fee revenues based on interviews with staff.

There are three common methods for determining new development's fair share of planned facilities costs: the **existing inventory method**, the **system plan method**, and the **planned facilities method**. The method selected often depends on the degree to which the community has engaged in comprehensive facility master planning to identify facility needs.

The formula used by each approach and the advantages and disadvantages of each method is summarized below:

#### ***Existing Inventory Method***

The existing inventory method allocates costs based on the ratio of existing facilities to demand from existing development as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Current Value of Existing Facilities}}{\text{Existing Development Demand}} = \$/\text{unit of demand}$$

Under this method, new development funds the expansion of facilities at the same standard currently serving existing development. By definition, the existing inventory method results in no

facility deficiencies attributable to existing development. This method is often used when a long-range plan for new facilities is not available. Only the initial facilities to be funded with fees are identified in the fee study. Future facilities to serve growth are identified through an annual capital improvement plan and budget process, possibly after completion of a new facility master plan.

### **Planned Facilities Method**

The planned facilities method allocates costs based on the ratio of planned facility costs to demand from new development as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Cost of Planned Facilities}}{\text{New Development Demand}} = \$/\text{unit of demand}$$

This method is appropriate when specific planned facilities can be identified that only benefit new development. Examples include street improvements to avoid deficient levels of service or a sewer trunk line extension to a previously undeveloped area. This method is appropriate when planned facilities will not serve existing development. Under this method new development funds the expansion of facilities at the standards used for the master facility plan.

### **System Plan Method**

This method calculates the fee based on the value of existing facilities plus the cost of planned facilities, divided by demand from existing and new development:

$$\frac{\text{Value of Existing Facilities} + \text{Cost of Planned Facilities}}{\text{Existing} + \text{New Development Demand}} = \$/\text{unit of demand}$$

This method is useful when planned facilities need to be analyzed as part of a system that benefits both existing and new development. It is difficult, for example, to allocate a new fire station solely to new development when that station will operate as part of an integrated system of fire stations that together achieve the desired level of service. Police substations, civic centers, and regional parks provide examples of similar facilities.

The system plan method ensures that new development does not pay for existing deficiencies. Facility standards based on policies such as those found in General Plans are often higher than existing facility standards. This method enables the calculation of the existing deficiency required to bring existing development up to the policy-based standard. The local agency must secure non-fee funding for that portion of planned facilities required to correct the deficiency to ensure that new development receives the level of service funded by the impact fee.

## **Methodologies Used in This Study**

This study uses the existing inventory method to calculate the fire protection facilities fee. While some planned fire facilities have been identified, these do not include all facilities that will be needed through the 2030 planning horizon. For this reason, the proposed fire protection impact fee is based on the existing inventory cost standard, which will ensure that the City will be able to at least maintain its current level of fire protection facilities per capita as growth occurs. For all of the facility categories included in this study, the City should update the impact fee study when additional facility planning is conducted.

The system plan method is used for the municipal facilities, police, and parks fees. For these fee categories, the City has identified facility standards and plans for facilities needed to accommodate development through 2030. The facility plans involve increasing the level of facilities per capita, compared to what the City currently provides. Because impact fee revenue may not be used to increase the facility standard provided to existing development, some non-fee funding will be needed to complete the planned facilities upon which these impact fees are based.

The roadway impact fee is calculated using the planned facilities method. A traffic study was completed to identify the transportation improvements needed to maintain the City's adopted traffic level of service standards with the additional traffic generated by growth through the 2030 planning horizon. For road segments that will need improvements to mitigate the impacts of new development, the traffic study identified the fair share of improvement costs that should be allocated to development outside of Rio Vista. The remaining cost of the planned traffic improvements is allocated to new development in Rio Vista through the impact fee.

## Organization of the Report

The determination of a public facilities fee begins with the selection of a planning horizon and development of growth projections for population and employment. These projections are used throughout the analysis of different facility categories, and are summarized in Chapter 2.

Chapters 3 through 7 identify facility standards and planned facilities, allocate the cost of planned facilities between new development and other development, and identify the maximum justified development impact fee for each of the following facility categories:

- ◆ Municipal Facilities
- ◆ Fire Protection Facilities
- ◆ Police Facilities
- ◆ Park Facilities
- ◆ Roadway Facilities

Chapter 8 details the procedures that the City must follow when implementing a development impact fee program. Impact fee program adoption procedures are found in *California Government Code* Sections 66018 and 66019.

Chapter 9 presents Solano County's PFF and RTIF fees. Development within the City of Rio Vista is also responsible for paying these fees.

The five statutory findings required for adoption of the proposed public facilities fees in accordance with the Mitigation Fee Act are documented in Chapter 10.

## 2. Growth Projections

---

Growth projections are used as indicators of demand to determine facility needs and allocate those needs between existing and new development. This chapter explains the sources for the growth projections used in this study.

Estimates of existing development and projections of future growth are critical assumptions used throughout this report. These estimates are used as follows:

- ♦ The estimate of existing development in 2013 is used as an indicator of existing facility demand and to determine existing facility standards.
- ♦ The estimate of total development at the 2030 planning horizon is used as an indicator of future demand to determine total facilities needed to accommodate growth and remedy existing facility deficiencies, if any.
- ♦ Estimates of growth from 2013 through 2030 are used to (1) allocate facility costs between new development and existing development, and (2) estimate total fee revenues.

The demand for public facilities is based on the service population creating the need for the facilities, although indirectly for roadway facilities. The service population for parks includes only residents because residents, rather than workers, are the primary users of the facilities and planning for park facilities tends to focus only on population projections. The service population for municipal facilities, fire, and police includes residents and workers employed in Rio Vista. The demand for traffic and related transportation facilities is based on vehicle trips. Vehicle trips are based on average trip rates per dwelling unit and per thousand building square feet.

### Land Use Types

To ensure a reasonable relationship between each fee and the type of development paying the fee, growth projections distinguish between different land use types. The land use types used in this analysis are defined below.

- ♦ **Single family:** Attached and detached non-age restricted one-unit dwellings.
- ♦ **Senior units:** Attached and detached units with deed restrictions allowing occupancy only by senior citizens (at least one resident must be at least 55 years of age).
- ♦ **Multi-family:** All attached non-age restricted multi-family dwellings such as duplexes and condominiums.
- ♦ **Commercial:** All commercial, retail, educational, and hotel/motel development.
- ♦ **Office:** All general, professional, and medical office development.
- ♦ **Industrial:** All manufacturing and warehouse development.

Some developments may include more than one land use type, such as a residential development with both single and multi-family uses. In those cases the facilities fee would be calculated separately for each land use type.

The City should have the discretion to determine which land use type best reflects a development project's characteristics for the purposes of imposing an impact fee. The roadway impact fee

should be based on the trip generation rate of a proposed development. Occupant densities (residents per dwelling unit or workers per building square foot) are the most appropriate characteristics to use for the other impact fees. The fee imposed should be based on the land use type that most closely represents the probable occupant density or trip generation rate of the development.

The only senior units currently anticipated by City staff are in the Trilogy development. In Trilogy, fees are set by the Marks Ranch Development Agreement. However, senior unit fees are presented in this study in case senior units are developed that do not fall under the Marks Ranch Development Agreement.

## Occupant Densities

All fees in this report are calculated for a specific development project based on dwelling units or building square feet, while facility demand is based on the service population or trip generation data described above. Occupant density assumptions ensure a reasonable relationship between the size of a development project, the increase in service population associated with the project, and the amount of the fee.

The occupant density factors used in this report are shown in **Table 2.1**. The residential density factors are based on the most recent data for Rio Vista from the 2011 U.S. Census' American Community Survey and the California Department of Finance (2013). Consistent with the City's current impact fees, senior unit fees are calculated using the multi-family occupant density factor, reflecting lower average occupancy of senior units compared to unrestricted family units.

The nonresidential occupancy factors are based on occupancy factors found in the *Employment Density Study Summary Report*, prepared for the Southern California Association of Governments by The Natelson Company. Though not specific to Rio Vista, the Natelson study covered employment density over a wide array of land use and development types, making it reasonable to apply these factors to other areas. The specific factors used in this report are for developing suburban areas, as defined by the Natelson study.

**Table 2.1: Occupant Density**


---

<i>Residential</i>		
Single Family	1.83	Residents per dwelling unit
Multi-family	1.11	Residents per dwelling unit
Senior Units	1.11	Residents per dwelling unit
<i>Nonresidential</i>		
Commercial	2.00	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Office	1.52	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Industrial	0.90	Employees per 1,000 square feet

---

Sources: The Natelson Company, Inc. Employment Density Study Summary, October 31, 2001, Tables 8-A and 10-A (Developing suburban Riverside and San Bernardino Counties); U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2011 American Community Survey, Tables B25024 and B25033; Willdan Financial Services.

---

## Existing and Future Development

**Table 2.2** shows estimated number of residential units anticipated to be developed through buildout of the planned residential development projects in Rio Vista. It is assumed that buildout of these development projects will roughly coincide with the 2030 planning horizon for this study. The number of units expected in each project was identified by City staff. Units with and without active development agreements were identified so that fee revenue could be more accurately projected. Residential and nonresidential development projections are described in more detail in the “Development Agreement Analysis and Growth Projections for Rio Vista Impact Fee Study” memorandum, included in Appendix A of this study. Note that since the memorandum contained in the Appendix was written in 2010, it has been determined that the 1,680 single family units in Del Rio Hills will be covered by a development agreement by the time the fees contained in this are potentially adopted. Table 2.2 reflects this change.

**Table 2.2: Projected Residential Development by Area**

Project	Development Agreement	Single Family Units	Senior Units	Multi-family Units	Total Units
<i>Future Development with Development Agreements</i>					
Brann Ranch	Brann Ranch	855	-	-	855
Liberty	Gibbs Ranch	680	-	-	680
Marks Ranch	Marks Ranch	-	1,000	-	1,000
Riverwalk	Solano Properties, LLC	720	-	240	960
Del Rio Hills	Pending	1,680	-	720	2,400
Subtotal		3,935	1,000	960	5,895
<i>Future Development without Development Agreements</i>					
Waterfront Specific Plan	None	-	-	180	180
Subtotal		-	-	180	180
<b>Total Future Development (2013-2030)</b>		<b>3,935</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,140</b>	<b>6,075</b>

Sources: Table 1, Development Agreement Analysis and Growth Projections for Rio Vista Impact Fee Study.

**Table 2.3** shows projected nonresidential development by growth area, both in terms of jobs and building square feet. Employment growth projections in the City's industrial and service commercial zones were identified in the Municipal Services Review and Comprehensive Annexation Plan (MSR), prepared by Pacific Municipal Consultants in 2006. The MSR did not include projections of growth in the City's commercial areas. Therefore, Willdan Financial Services developed estimates of employment growth in commercial areas based on land use designations in the 2001 Rio Vista General Plan and the Waterfront Specific Plan, adopted in 2007.

**Table 2.3: Projected Nonresidential Development by Area**

Growth Area	Acres	Jobs				Building Square Feet (000s)			
		Comm.	Office	Industrial	Total	Comm.	Office	Industrial	Total
<i><u>Brann Ranch</u></i>									
Brann Ranch/Gibbs Ranch <sup>1</sup>	17	34	34	102	170	17.0	22.3	112.9	152.2
<i><u>Liberty/Gibbs Ranch</u></i>									
Brann Ranch/Gibbs Ranch <sup>1</sup>	33	66	66	198	330	33.0	43.3	219.2	295.5
<i><u>Marks Ranch</u></i>									
Neighborhood Core Commercial (Highway 12 & Chruch Road)	25	375	125	-	500	187.5	82.0	-	269.5
Commercial/Light Industrial	40	40	40	120	200	20.0	26.2	132.8	179.0
<b>Total - Marks Ranch</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>415</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>207.5</b>	<b>108.2</b>	<b>132.8</b>	<b>448.5</b>
<i><u>Riverwalk/Solano Properties, LLC</u></i>									
Neighborhood Core Commercial (Highway 12 & Chruch Road)	10	150	50	-	200	75.0	32.8	-	107.8
<i><u>Del Rio Hills</u></i>									
	16.7	450	114	-	564	225.0	75.0	-	300.0
<b>Total Growth with Development Agreements</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>1,115</b>	<b>429</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>1,964</b>	<b>557.5</b>	<b>281.6</b>	<b>464.9</b>	<b>1,304.0</b>
<b>Total Growth Not Subject to Development Agreements</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>423</b>	<b>378</b>	<b>2,340</b>	<b>3,141</b>	<b>211.5</b>	<b>247.6</b>	<b>2,590.3</b>	<b>3,049.4</b>
<b>Total Projected Growth</b>	<b>673</b>	<b>1,538</b>	<b>807</b>	<b>2,760</b>	<b>5,105</b>	<b>769.0</b>	<b>529.2</b>	<b>3,055.2</b>	<b>4,353.4</b>

Ranch Development Agreement states that Brann Ranch has a 17 acre commercial site. It is assumed that the remaining 33 acres of non-residential land is in Liberty/Gibbs Ranch.

Sources: Table 4; Brann Ranch Development Agreement; Solano Properties, LLC Development Agreement; Municipal Service Review and Comprehensive Annexation Plan, Pacific Municipal Consultants, October 2006; Willdan Financial Services.

**Table 2.4** shows the estimated number of residents, dwelling units, employees, and building square feet in Rio Vista, both at the present time and in 2030. The number of existing dwelling units and residents was based on 2013 data from the California Department of Finance.

Existing employment is based on employment by industry data in Rio Vista compiled by the California Employment Development Department. Existing building square footage is based on an analysis performed by Willdan in 2010.

As shown in Table 2.4, a large amount of development is projected to occur in Rio Vista through 2030. The population is expected to almost triple, while employment in 2030 is expected to be almost four times the current level.

**Table 2.4: Existing and New Development**

	2013	2030	Increase
<i>Residents</i> <sup>1</sup>	7,596	15,288	7,692
<i>Dwelling Units</i> <sup>1</sup>			
Single Family	1,766	5,701	3,935
Senior Units	1,889	2,889	1,000
Multi-family	345	1,485	1,140
Total	4,000	10,075	6,075
<i>Employment</i> <sup>2</sup>			
Commercial	566	2,092	1,526
Office	173	1,361	1,188
Industrial	416	3,632	3,216
Total	1,155	7,085	5,930
<i>Building Square Feet (000s)</i> <sup>3</sup>			
Commercial	277	1,046	769
Office	364	894	529
Industrial	969	4,024	3,055
Total	1,610	5,964	4,353

<sup>1</sup> Population based on housing unit totals and the dwelling unit density assumptions from Table 2.1.

<sup>2</sup> Base year estimates from EDD assume that confidential land use categories are spread evenly between commercial, office and industrial. Excludes government workers.

<sup>3</sup> Base year square footage matches 2008 impact fee analysis. No decrease in building square footage is assumed, despite decline in workers.

Sources: Tables 1 and 3, Development Agreement Analysis and Growth Projections for Rio Vista Impact Fee Study (2008); California Employment Development Department, 2013 (EDD); Municipal Service Review and Comprehensive Annexation Plan, Pacific Municipal Consultants, October 2006; Waterfront Specific Plan, November 15, 2007; Solano Properties, LLC Development Agreement; City of Rio Vista; Willdan Financial Services.

# 3. Municipal Facilities

This chapter documents the maximum defensible impact fee for general municipal facilities. The municipal facilities included in this fee category include the Rio Vista City Hall, the corporation yard and other public works facilities, the planned community centers, and a new aquatic center.

## Service Population

Municipal facilities are used to provide services to both residents and businesses. The service population used to determine the demand for municipal facilities includes both residents and workers with jobs located in Rio Vista. **Table 3.1** shows the current municipal facilities service population and the estimated service population at the planning horizon of 2030.

Both residents and businesses create demand for municipal facilities; however, residents and workers do not create demand for facilities at an equal rate. It is assumed that relative facility demand is proportional to the time people spend working compared to the time they spend not working. Thus, each worker is weighted at 0.31 and each resident is weighted at 1.00, based on the ratio of 40 working hours per week to 128 non-working hours per week. The weighting factor of 0.31 is based on an average 40-hour workweek. Some workers work more than 40 hours, while others work less.

**Table 3.1: Municipal Facilities Service Population**

	Residents	Workers	Total Service Population
Existing (2013)	7,596	1,155	
Weighting Factor	1.00	0.31	
Existing Service Population (2013)	7,596	358	7,954
New Development (2013-2030)	7,692	5,930	
Weighting Factor	1.00	0.31	
New Service Population (2013-2030)	7,692	1,838	9,530
Total Service Population (2030)	15,288	2,196	17,484

Note: Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on the ratio of 40 working hours per week to 128 non-working hours.

Sources: Table 2.4; Willdan Financial Services.

## Facility Inventories and Standards

The municipal facilities impact fee is based on the system plan facility standard, which includes the inventory of existing and planned facilities and the projected service population at the end of

the planning horizon. (See the Introduction for more information.) **Table 3.2** shows the existing inventory of municipal facilities, along with their estimated replacement value. The estimated land value is based on a review of recent listings for vacant parcels similar to those where the municipal facilities are located. The building value for the City Hall, which is in need of renovation or replacement, is based on the estimated cost of new community buildings reduced by the estimated cost of renovation. No value is shown for the existing senior center because the impact fee study assumes that this facility will be replaced by a new youth center. The value of the City Yard Maintenance Shop is based on the cost of facilities recently completed by other cities we have worked with. The value of furnishings and equipment per square foot is based on values per square foot for similar facilities planned or recently constructed in other cities.

**Table 3.2: Existing Municipal Facilities Inventory**

	Inventory	Unit Cost <sup>1</sup>	Value
<u>Land (acres)</u>			
City Hall	0.66 <sup>2</sup>	\$ 105,000	\$ 69,000
Senior Center	0.51 <sup>3</sup>	105,000	54,000
City Yard	5.00	105,000	525,000
Subtotal - Land	6.17		\$ 648,000
<u>Buildings (square feet)</u>			
City Hall <sup>2</sup>	7,000	\$ -	\$ -
Senior Center/45 Main <sup>3</sup>	6,000	-	-
City Yard - Maintenance Shop	4,200	100	420,000
Youth Center Building	-	100	-
Subtotal - Buildings	17,200		\$ 420,000
<u>Furnishings &amp; Equipment<sup>4</sup></u>			
City Hall	7,000	\$ 15	\$ 105,000
Senior Center	6,000	10	60,000
City Yard - Maintenance Shop	4,200	10	42,000
Subtotal - Fixtures, Furnishings & Equipment	17,200		\$ 207,000
<u>Special Use Facilities</u>			
Community Pool <sup>5</sup>			\$ 1,200,000
Total Value - Existing Facilities			\$ 2,475,000

<sup>1</sup> Unit costs based on estimated replacement value.

<sup>2</sup> City Hall is in need of renovation. Replacement value based on estimated cost of new facilities, reduced by the estimated cost of renovation (see Table 3.3).

<sup>3</sup> Senior center is planned to be replaced with a new youth center, which is included in the inventory of planned facilities (see Table 3.3).

<sup>4</sup> Value of furnishings and equipment based on estimated value per building square foot. Furnishings and equipment includes furniture, computer systems, and telephone systems.

<sup>5</sup> Pool renovated in 2010.

Note: Insurance costs reflect assessed valuation for fire protection versus replacement of existing buildings.

Sources: City of Rio Vista; Willdan Financial Services.

**Table 3.3** shows the additional municipal facilities the City plans to develop through the 2030 planning horizon. These facilities needs are identified in the City's General Plan, adopted in 2002, and the 2007 Parks Master Plan. City staff provided additional information about facility plans. The City identified facility needs in the General Plan based on average facility standards in other cities that are similar to Rio Vista's projected size at buildout.

The City plans to refurbish and expand the existing City Hall. The City also plans to build additional garage and office space at the Corporation Yard. The community/senior center is envisioned as a space that can house facilities such as a museum, performing arts, arts and crafts studios, kitchen, day care, and after-school activities. In addition to the community center, the City plans to develop a youth center. This facility will replace the existing senior center, which is currently in poor condition. It is assumed that the youth center can be developed on the existing senior center parcel, while the community center would be developed on a new two-acre parcel.

The Public Works Department identified equipment that will be needed to accommodate new development through 2030. The equipment needs include street and park maintenance equipment, tools, software, a fueling facility for City vehicles and equipment, and a truck lift for repairing Public Works vehicles.

Estimated building costs per square foot for the community centers and the aquatic center are based on estimates provided in the Parks Master Plan, and informed by City staff. These estimates have been updated for changes in construction costs using the *Engineering News-Record* Construction Cost Index. It is assumed that the addition to the City Hall would have the same cost per square foot as the community and youth centers. The estimated costs of the public works facility and refurbishing the existing City Hall are based on the costs of similar projects recently completed by other clients we have worked with.

**Table 3.3: Planned Municipal Facilities**

	Amount	Unit Cost <sup>1</sup>	Value
<u>Land</u>			
City Hall/Civic Center <sup>2</sup>	- acres	\$ 105,000	\$ -
Community/Senior Center	2.00 acres	105,000	210,000
Aquatic Center	2.00 acres	105,000	210,000
Subtotal - Land			\$ 420,000
<u>Buildings</u>			
Youth Center	5,000 sq. ft.	\$ 175	\$ 875,000
Community/Senior Center	30,000 sq. ft.	175	5,250,000
Corporation Yard and Public Works Facility	5,000 sq. ft.	100	500,000
City Hall Addition	16,000 sq. ft.	460	7,360,000
Refurbish Existing City Hall	7,000 sq. ft.	175	1,225,000
Aquatic Center - Enclosed <sup>3</sup>	N/A	N/A	-
Subtotal - Buildings			\$ 15,210,000
<u>Furnishings &amp; Equipment<sup>4</sup></u>			
Youth Center	5,000 sq. ft.	\$ 10	\$ 50,000
Community/Senior Center	30,000 sq. ft.	10	300,000
Corporation Yard and Public Works Facility	5,000 sq. ft.	10	50,000
City Hall Addition	16,000 sq. ft.	15	240,000
Subtotal - Fixtures, Furnishings & Equipment			\$ 640,000
<u>Public Works Equipment</u>			
Street Sweeper	1 each	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000
Vacuum Truck	1 each	240,000	240,000
Wood Chipper	1 each	13,000	13,000
Mowers	2 each	30,000	60,000
Backhoe	1 each	250,000	250,000
Utility Trucks	5 each	25,000	125,000
Miscellaneous Hand Tools		N/A	35,000
Pavement Management System Software		N/A	5,000
Upgrade Computers		N/A	20,000
Upgrade Software		N/A	10,000
Fueling Facility (Gasoline and Diesel)	1 each	34,000	34,000
Truck Lift	1 each	33,000	33,000
Dump Truck	1 each	90,000	90,000
Bucket Truck	1 each	60,000	60,000
Subtotal - Public Works Equipment			\$ 1,175,000
Total			\$ 17,445,000

<sup>1</sup> Unit costs based on estimated replacement value and include soft costs (design, administration, and contingency).

<sup>2</sup> The City Hall addition will be located on land currently owned by the City.

<sup>3</sup> Cost estimate from Parks Master Plan, updated for inflation. Construction cost assumed to include major equipment and fixtures.

<sup>4</sup> Value of furnishings and equipment based on estimated insurance replacement value per building square foot. Furnishings and equipment includes furniture, computer systems, and telephone systems.

Sources: City of Rio Vista General Plan; Rio Vista Parks Master Plan; Engineering News-Record; Willdan Financial Services.

**Table 3.4** shows the projected per capita investment in municipal facilities at the planning horizon. This value is calculated by adding the combined value of existing and planned municipal facilities and then dividing that sum by the future 2030 service population.

### **Table 3.4: Municipal Facilities System Standard**

Value of Existing Facilities	\$	2,475,000
Value of Planned Facilities		17,445,000
Total System Value (2030)	\$	19,920,000
Future Service Population (2030)		17,484
Cost per Capita	\$	1,139
Cost Allocation per Resident	\$	1,139
Cost Allocation per Worker <sup>1</sup>		353

<sup>1</sup> Based on a weighing factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3; City of Rio Vista; Willdan Financial Services.

## Fee Schedule

**Table 3.5** shows the proposed municipal facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space).

**Table 3.5: Municipal Facilities Fee**

Land Use	A	B	C = A x B		D	E = C + D
	Cost Per Capita	Density <sup>1</sup>	Base Fee <sup>2</sup>	Admin Charge <sup>2,3</sup>	Total Fee	
<i>Residential</i>						
Single Family	\$ 1,139	1.83	\$ 2,084	\$ 42	\$ 2,126	
Senior Units	1,139	1.11	1,264	25	1,289	
Multi-family	1,139	1.11	1,264	25	1,289	
<i>Nonresidential</i>						
Commercial	\$ 353	2.00	\$ 706	\$ 14	\$ 720	
Office	353	1.52	537	11	548	
Industrial	353	0.90	318	6	324	

<sup>1</sup> Persons per dwelling unit for residential development, workers per 1,000 square feet for nonresidential development.

<sup>2</sup> Fee per dwelling unit for residential development, per 1,000 square feet for nonresidential development.

<sup>3</sup> Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 3.2; Willdan Financial Services.

## Use of Fee Revenue

The City can use municipal facilities fee revenues for the refurbishment, construction or purchase of buildings and land that are part of the system of municipal facilities serving new development. The City plans to use the fee revenues to fund the facilities shown in Table 3.3.

## Non-Fee Funding Required

Completing the planned facilities will provide a higher value of facilities per capita than is currently provided in Rio Vista. Impact fee revenue may not be used to increase the level of service provided to existing development. In addition, development agreements that are currently in place include municipal and public facilities impact fees for municipal facilities, police facilities, and fire facilities at a lower level than the currently proposed fees. Therefore, impact fee revenue will not fully fund the planned municipal facilities and some non-fee funding will be required. This section estimates the impact fee funding that will be available to complete the planned municipal facilities, as well as the amount of non-fee funding that will be needed.

**Table 3.6** shows the projected fee revenue that would be generated by development that is not currently subject to a development agreement.

**Table 3.6: Estimated Municipal Facilities Fee Revenue from Development without Development Agreements**

Land Use	Units of Development (DU/1,000 sq. ft.)	Proposed Fee <sup>1</sup>	Fee Revenue
<i>Residential</i>			
Single Family	-	\$ 2,084	\$ -
Senior Units	-	1,264	-
Multi-family	180	1,264	227,520
<i>Nonresidential</i>			
Commercial	211.5	\$ 706	\$ 149,300
Office	247.6	537	133,000
Industrial	2,590.3	318	823,700
Total			\$ 1,333,520

<sup>1</sup> Base fee. Does not include administrative charge.

Sources: Tables 2.2, 2.3 and 3.6.

**Table 3.7** shows the estimated funding available for municipal facilities based on the proposed fees, the fees charged under development agreements, and projected development through 2030. A portion of the City's current municipal impact fee fund balance will also be used for the planned facilities identified in this study. (The existing municipal facilities fee fund balance may also be used for police and fire facilities. See Table 1.2.). After accounting for the current fund balance and the projected future impact fee revenue, approximately \$8 million in non-fee funding will be needed to complete the planned municipal facilities.

The City will need to use alternative funding sources to complete the planned municipal facilities. Potential sources of revenue include existing or new general fund revenues, existing or new taxes, and state, federal and private grants. Facility costs may be financed using general obligation bonds or other financing mechanisms.

**Table 3.7: Funding Sources for Planned Municipal Facilities**

Cost of Planned Municipal Facilities	\$	17,445,000
Less: Projected Fee Revenue from Development with Development Agreements <sup>1</sup>	\$	8,099,000
Less: Projected Fee Revenue from Development without Development Agreements		1,333,520
Less: Current Impact Fee Fund Balance <sup>1</sup>		<u>41,100</u>
Non-Fee Funding Required	\$	7,971,380

<sup>1</sup> See Table 1.2.

Sources: Tables 1.2, 3.3 and 3.6.

## 4. Fire Protection Facilities

---

The purpose of the fire protection impact fee is to fund the fire protection facilities needed to serve new development. A proposed fee is presented based on the existing standard of fire facilities per capita. While some planned fire facilities have been identified, these do not include all facilities that will be needed through the 2030 planning horizon. For this reason, the proposed fire protection impact fee is based on the existing standard. This will ensure that the City will be able to at least maintain its current level of fire protection facilities per capita as growth occurs.

### Service Population

The Rio Vista Fire Department provides fire protection and emergency response services to both residences and businesses in Rio Vista. Therefore, the demand for fire protection facilities is based on the service population of residents and workers with jobs located in Rio Vista. Demand for services is based on resident and worker service population, and not building size, because emergency medical calls typically make up the majority of responses provided by fire departments. As the number of residents and workers increases, the number of emergency medical calls and the need for fire protection and emergency response facilities is also expected to increase.

**Table 4.1** shows the estimated service population in 2013 and 2030. To calculate service population for fire protection facilities, residents are weighted at 1.00 and each worker is weighted at 0.69. The 0.69 per-worker weighting factor is based on an extensive study carried out by planning staff in the City of Phoenix.

Data on fire department service calls by land use type show that workers generate higher relative levels of demand for fire protection services than for police and municipal facilities. As a result, the 0.69 worker weighting factor used to estimate demand for fire services is higher than the 0.31 weighting factor used for municipal facilities and police facilities in this study. For most fire departments, a large portion of the calls for service are for emergency medical care. Nonresidential land uses generate a large number of emergency medical calls due to worker illnesses and injuries, as well as illnesses and injuries to customers at retail and office establishments.

Detailed data on fire department responses by land use in Rio Vista were not available. There are few studies we are aware of that attempt to compare the demand per resident for fire department services to the demand per worker. Willdan has analyzed service call data to estimate relative fire department service demand per resident and per worker for a small number of cities and fire districts in California. However, these studies may not be representative of call demand in Rio Vista because they covered fire districts with a relatively low population and idiosyncratic land uses. The results of these studies often show a large degree of variability when data from successive years is compared.

Therefore, data from the worker weighting study carried out by the City of Phoenix Planning Department were used to estimate the relative demand for services and facilities from residents

and workers for the Rio Vista impact fee study. The study considered the number of calls to residential and nonresidential land uses, and weighed calls to each land use category by the average time of each type of call. Willdan believes that the City of Phoenix study is the best available source for estimating the worker weighting factor for use in other cities for the following reasons:

- ♦ *Phoenix is a large city with a diverse array of commercial, office and industrial land uses.* Compared to studies of small fire departments, the results derived from a sample of service calls in Phoenix are less likely to be skewed by one or more major incidents that occurred during the period of analysis. In addition, the results derived from the Phoenix study are less likely to be skewed by a few unusually prevalent land uses than the results for a smaller city.
- ♦ *The Phoenix study was based on a large, random sample of fire and EMS calls.* The results of the study were based on a random sample of 816 calls for fire and emergency medical service calls.
- ♦ *Worker weighting factors should be fairly independent of the land use mix present in a specific city.* It is reasonable to use factors for the relative demand for fire and emergency medical services calls determined in the City of Phoenix to other areas. Emergency medical calls are the largest share of fire department service calls, and it is reasonable to assume that, across cities, residents and workers have similar rates of illnesses and injuries requiring emergency medical care. Weighting factors from the Phoenix study are estimated on a per-resident and per-worker basis, and are not tied to the specific mix of land uses present in a particular city.

**Table 4.1: Fire Protection Facilities Service Population**

	Residents	Workers	Total Service Population
Existing (2013)	7,596	1,155	
Weighting Factor	1.00	0.69	
Existing Service Population (2013)	7,596	797	8,393
New Development (2013-2030)	7,692	5,930	
Weighting Factor	1.00	0.69	
New Service Population (2013-2030)	7,692	4,092	11,784
Total Service Population (2030)	15,288	4,889	20,177

Note: Workers are weighted at 0.69 of residents based on City of Phoenix service data.

Sources: Table 2.4; Equivalent Dwelling Unit Derivation and Projection, City of Phoenix Planning Department, November 6, 1996; Willdan Financial Services.

## Facility Inventories and Standards

This section describes the City's fire protection facility inventory, standards, and associated costs.

### Response Time Standard

The Rio Vista General Plan identifies standards for fire response. The future targeted ISO rating is 3. The future targeted response time as the new areas are developed is four minutes 90 percent of the time. The Rio Vista Fire Department has identified facilities that will be needed to meet the target standards as development occurs. Impact fee revenue will be used to fund these facilities.

### Existing Inventory

**Table 4.2** summarizes the City's inventory of existing fire protection land, buildings, and firefighting equipment. The estimated land value is based on a review of recent listings for vacant parcels similar to those where the fire facilities are located. Estimated building, vehicle, and equipment values are based on information provided the Rio Vista Fire Department and the cost of recently developed facilities in other fire departments Willdan has worked with.

**Table 4.2: Existing Fire Protection Land, Buildings, Vehicles, & Firefighting Equipment**

	Inventory	Unit Cost	Value
<u>Land</u>			
Fire Station	0.45 acres	\$ 105,000	\$ 47,000
<u>Buildings</u>			
Fire Station	5,500 <sup>1</sup> sq. ft.	\$ 450	\$ 2,475,000
Storage Building / Shop	3,000 sq. ft.	150 <sup>1</sup>	450,000
Subtotal - Buildings			\$ 2,925,000
<u>Vehicles</u> <sup>1</sup>			
Engines	3 veh.	\$ 400,000	\$ 1,200,000
Ladder Truck <sup>2</sup>	1 veh.	100,000	100,000
Water Tender	1 veh.	550,000	550,000
Brush Unit	1 veh.	150,000	150,000
Rescue Vehicles	1 veh.	200,000	200,000
Marshal Car	1 veh.	35,000	35,000
Staff Utility Vehicle	1 veh.	30,000	30,000
Command Vehicle	1 veh.	40,000	40,000
Subtotal - Vehicles			\$ 2,305,000
<u>Equipment</u>			
Turnouts, Breathing Apparatus and Structural Gear	N/A	N/A	\$ 200,000
Fire Station Fixtures, Furnishings, and Equipment	5,500 sq. ft.	\$ 46	253,000
Subtotal - Equipment			\$ 453,000
Total Value - Existing Land, Buildings, Vehicles & Equip.			\$ 5,730,000

<sup>1</sup> Replacement values for vehicles include onboard equipment.

<sup>2</sup> Discounted by 50% from full replacement vehicle because vehicle is several years old.

Sources: Table 1.2; City of Rio Vista; Willdan Financial Services.

### Facility Standard

For the purposes of determining an impact fee, the different types of fire protection facilities are combined into a cost standard. **Table 4.3** shows the existing standard of fire protection facilities per capita in Rio Vista. By using the existing level of facilities per capita as the basis for the fire protection impact fee, the City will be able to at least maintain its current level of fire protection facilities per capita as growth occurs. In addition to the existing facilities shown in Table 4.2, a portion of the current municipal improvements impact fee fund balance is also included in the

existing inventory. These funds represent investment by existing development to fund fire facilities, even though those funds have not yet been expended.

**Table 4.3: Fire Protection Facilities Existing Standard**

Value of Existing Land, Buildings, Vehicles & Equip.	\$	5,730,000
Impact Fee Fund Balance <sup>1</sup>		11,500
Total Existing Fire Facilities Investment	\$	5,741,500
Existing Service Population		8,393
Cost per Capita	\$	684
Facility Standard per Resident	\$	684
Facility Standard per Worker <sup>2</sup>		472

<sup>1</sup> See Table 1.2.

<sup>2</sup> Based on a weighing factor of 0.69.

Sources: Tables 4.1 and 4.2; City of Rio Vista; Willdan Financial Services.

## Fee Schedule

**Table 4.4** shows the proposed fire protection facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space).

**Table 4.4: Fire Protection Facilities Fee**

Land Use	A	B	C = A x B		D	E = C + D
	Cost Per Capita	Density <sup>1</sup>	Base Fee <sup>2</sup>	Admin Charge <sup>2,3</sup>	Total Fee	
<i>Residential</i>						
Single Family	\$ 684	1.83	\$ 1,252	\$ 25	\$ 1,277	
Senior Units	684	1.11	759	15	774	
Multi-family	684	1.11	759	15	774	
<i>Nonresidential</i>						
Commercial	\$ 472	2.00	\$ 944	\$ 19	\$ 963	
Office	472	1.52	717	14	731	
Industrial	472	0.90	425	9	434	

<sup>1</sup> Persons per dwelling unit for residential development, workers per 1,000 square feet for nonresidential development.

<sup>2</sup> Fee per dwelling unit for residential development, per 1,000 square feet for nonresidential development.

<sup>3</sup> Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 4.3; Willdan Financial Services.

## Use of Fee Revenue

The City can use fire protection fee revenues for the construction or purchase of buildings, land and equipment that are part of the system of fire protection facilities serving new development.

**Table 4.5** shows the anticipated fire protection fee revenue that would be generated by development that is not currently subject to a development agreement.

**Table 4.5: Estimated Fire Protection Fee Revenue from Development without Development Agreements**

Land Use	Units of Development (DU/1,000 sq. ft.)	Proposed Fee <sup>1</sup>	Fee Revenue
<i>Residential</i>			
Single Family	-	\$ 1,277	\$ -
Senior Units	-	774	-
Multi-family	180	774	139,320
<i>Nonresidential</i>			
Commercial	211.5	\$ 963	\$ 203,700
Office	247.6	731	181,000
Industrial	2,590.3	434	1,124,200
Total			\$ 1,648,220

<sup>1</sup> Base fee. Does not include administrative charge.

Sources: Tables 2.2, 2.3 and 4.4.

**Table 4.6** shows the estimated funding available for fire protection facilities based on the proposed fees, the fees charged under development agreements, and projected development through 2030. A portion of the City’s current municipal impact fee fund balance may be used for the fire protection facilities. (The existing municipal facilities fee fund balance may also be used for police and fire facilities. See Table 1.2.). After accounting for the current fund balance and the projected future impact fee revenue, approximately \$3.9 million is projected to be available for fire protection facilities improvements to accommodate new development.

**Table 4.6: Projected Impact Fee Funding for Fire Protection Facilities**

Projected Fee Revenue from Development with Development Agreements <sup>1</sup>	\$ 2,257,100
Projected Fee Revenue from Development without Development Agreements	1,648,220
Current Impact Fee Fund Balance <sup>1</sup>	<u>11,500</u>
Total Projected Funding Available	\$ 3,916,820

<sup>1</sup> See Table 1.2.

Sources: Tables 1.2, 3.3 and 3.6.

The City has conducted preliminary planning for new fire station needs. This planning has identified the need for the facilities shown in **Table 4.7**. A second fire station is planned to be

developed adjacent to Airport Road near Church Road. This station would contain training rooms, sleeping quarters, and various equipment. This preliminary planning has not identified all of the facilities that will be needed to accommodate anticipated growth through 2030. Based on projected population growth, it is reasonable to assume that a third station will be needed, along with all associated apparatus and equipment. The location of an additional station will be determined based on the nature and location of future development.

**Table 4.7: Planned Fire Protection Facilities**

	Inventory	Unit	Unit Cost	Value
<u>New Fire Station</u>				
Building	8,000	sq. ft.	\$ 400	\$ 3,200,000
Land <sup>1</sup>	0.61	acres	-	-
Equipment & Furnishings <sup>2</sup>	8,000	sq. ft.	46	<u>368,000</u>
Subtotal - New Fire Station				\$ 3,568,000
<u>Vehicles</u>				
Engines	1	veh.	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000
Brush Unit	1	veh.	108,000	108,000
Staff/Utility Vehicle	1	veh.	35,000	<u>35,000</u>
Subtotal - Vehicles				\$ 643,000
<u>Equipment</u>				
Firefighting Equipment <sup>3</sup>				<u>\$ 700,000</u>
Subtotal - Equipment				\$ 700,000
Total Planned Facilities				\$ 4,911,000

<sup>1</sup> Facility currently planned to be located on land already owned by the City. No land costs are included.

<sup>2</sup> Equipment and furnishings cost per square foot based on cost per square foot of equipment and furnishings in existing station. See Table 4.2.

<sup>3</sup> Includes breathing apparatus, turnouts, and structural fire fighting gear.

Sources: Rio Vista Fire Department; Willdan Financial Services.

## 5. Police Facilities

The purpose of the police impact fee is to fund the police facilities needed to serve new development. A proposed fee is presented based on the planned level of police facilities per capita at the end of this study's planning horizon.

### Service Population

Police facilities are used to provide law enforcement and public safety services to both residents and businesses. The service population used to determine the demand for police facilities includes both residents and workers with jobs located in Rio Vista. **Table 5.1** shows the current police facilities service population and the estimated service population at the 2030 planning horizon.

Both residents and businesses create demand for police facilities; however, residents and workers do not create demand for facilities at an equal rate. It is assumed that relative facilities demand is proportional the time people spend working compared to the time they spend not working. Thus, each worker is weighted at 0.31 and each resident is weighted at 1.00, based on the ratio of 40 working hours per week to 128 non-working hours per week. The weighting factor of 0.31 is based on an average 40-hour workweek. Some workers work more than 40 hours, while others work less.

**Table 5.1: Police Facilities Service Population**

	Residents	Workers	Total Service Population
Existing (2013)	7,596	1,155	
Weighting Factor	1.00	0.31	
Existing Service Population (2013)	7,596	358	7,954
New Development (2013-2030)	7,692	5,930	
Weighting Factor	1.00	0.31	
New Service Population (2013-2030)	7,692	1,838	9,530
Total (2030)	15,288	2,196	17,484

Note: Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on the ratio of 40 working hours per week to 128 non-working hours.

Sources: Table 2.4; Willdan Financial Services.

## Facility Inventories and Standards

This section describes the City's police facility inventory, facility standards, and cost of planned facilities.

### Existing Inventory

**Table 5.2** summarizes the City's current inventory of police vehicles. The estimated values shown for police vehicles were provided by the Rio Vista Police Department. The Rio Vista Police Station is currently located in a modular building on Poppy Hill Road. The Department plans to construct a new police station and vacate the current facility. Because the current police station will be replaced by a new facility, the current station is not shown in the inventory of existing facilities.

**Table 5.2: Existing Police Vehicles**

	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Value
<i>Patrol Vehicles</i>			
Patrol Vehicles <sup>1</sup>	4	\$ 37,000	\$ 148,000
<i>Other Vehicles</i>			
Small Pickup	1	\$ 26,000	\$ 26,000
Unmarked Vehicles	2	29,000	58,000
Motorcycles	2	16,000	32,000
Total			\$ 116,000
Total - Existing Vehicles			\$ 264,000

<sup>1</sup> Estimated value includes cost of cage, light bar, signals, etc.

Source: Rio Vista Police Department.

**Table 5.3** shows the existing inventory of police equipment. The equipment inventory and estimated replacement costs were verified by the Rio Vista Police Department.

**Table 5.3: Existing Police Equipment**

	Inventory	Unit Cost	Value
Handguns with Holster and Light	12	\$ 1,073 <sup>▲</sup>	\$ 12,876
Protective Vests	12	1,900	22,800
Helmets - Ballistic Level III	12	407	4,884
Chemical Masks and Suits	12	1,095	13,140
Tasers with Camera and Holster	12	2,308	27,696
Mobile Data Computers	6	6,050	36,300
MDC Modems	6	2,750	16,500
MDC Air Cards	6	275	1,650
Shotguns	10	990	9,900
Rifles	10	1,210	12,100
Antennas (incl. Installation)	10	1,100	11,000
CSI Kits	9	459	4,131
Camera Digital D90 or higer	5	2,200	11,000
Handheld Radio	12	1,100	13,200
Traffic Message Boards	2	25,000	50,000
Total			\$ 247,000

Source: Rio Vista Police Department.

### Staffing and Facility Standards

The Rio Vista Police Department has determined that it needs approximately 1.5 officers per 1,000 residents to provide adequate public safety services. According to the Police Department, approximately 250 square feet of building space is needed per officer. This standard includes space for evidence storage and armories. **Table 5.4** shows these facility standards.

**Table 5.4: Police Facility Standards**

Officers per 1,000 Residents	1.5 <sup>▲</sup>
Station Square Feet per Officer	250 <sup>▲</sup>

Source: Rio Vista Police Department.

**Table 5.5** shows that approximately 23 officers will be needed in 2030, based on the standard of 1.5 officers per 1,000 residents and the projected future population.

**Table 5.5: Officers Needed in 2030**

2030 Rio Vista Population	15,288
Officers per 1,000 Residents	1.5
Number of Officers, 2030	23

Sources: Tables 5.1 and 5.4.

**Planned Police Facilities**

**Table 5.6** shows the police facilities needs through the 2030 planning horizon based on the facility standards shown above. Facilities needs include a new police station, land for that station, vehicles, and major equipment.

Police station space needs are based on the estimated number of officers and the standard of 250 square feet per officer. The estimated station cost is consistent with the estimated cost of community centers and the City Hall expansion used in Chapter 3. In addition to the police station, the City has identified the need for an Emergency Operations Center (EOC) from which to coordinate emergency response. Detailed planning for EOC needs has not been conducted at this time. The EOC is conservatively estimated to require 1,500 square feet of building space. Estimated equipment and furnishing costs for the EOC are based on costs for similar planned and recently constructed facilities in other cities.

The land needed for the police station and EOC is based on an estimated floor-area ratio (FAR) of 0.3, which is common for commercial and municipal buildings. The Department currently plans to construct the new station on land owned by the City near the Rio Vista Airport, so the City would not incur a cost for station land under the current plans. However, these plans are uncertain and there may be land costs incurred when the new police station is constructed. The land value is included in Table 5.6 so that the full value of planned police facilities is reflected in the impact fee calculation.

According to planning conducted by the Police Department, 13 additional patrol vehicles will be needed to accommodate anticipated new development. The Department has also identified the need for communications and dispatch equipment, conservatively estimated to cost \$3.0 million. This includes dispatch equipment, a computer aided dispatch system, a records management system, and radio transmitters and repeaters. The Department also plans to acquire an emergency response vehicle.

**Table 5.6: Planned Police Station, Vehicles, and Major Equipment**

<u>Police Station</u>		
Station Square Feet per Officer	250	
Number of Officers, 2030	<u>23</u>	
Station Square Feet Needed, 2030	5,750	
Station Building Cost per Square Foot	<u>\$ 312</u>	
Total Station Building Cost		\$ 1,794,000
<u>Emergency Operations Center</u>		
EOC Square Feet	1,500 <sup>1</sup>	
EOC Building Cost per Square Foot	<u>\$ 312</u>	
Total EOC Building Cost		\$ 468,000
EOC Square Feet	1,500	
EOC Furnishings & Equipment Cost per Square Foot	<u>\$ 50<sup>1</sup></u>	
Total EOC Furnishings & Equipment Cost		\$ 75,000
<u>Police Station/EOC Land</u>		
Police Station/EOC Building Square Feet	7,250	
Estimated FAR <sup>2</sup>	<u>0.30</u>	
Land Square Feet Needed, 2030 <sup>3</sup>	24,167	
Land Cost per Acre	<u>\$ 105,000</u>	
Total Land Cost		\$ 58,000
<u>Patrol Vehicles</u>		
Total Additional Patrol Vehicles	13 <sup>1</sup>	
Patrol Vehicle Cost	<u>\$ 35,000</u>	
Total Patrol Vehicle Cost		\$ 455,000
<u>Other Major Equipment</u>		
Emergency Response Vehicle	\$ 500,000	
Communications, Dispatch, and Records Management Equipment	<u>3,000,000</u>	
Total Other Equipment Cost		\$ 3,500,000
Total Planned Station, Vehicles, and Major Equipment		\$ 6,350,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes all furniture, computer systems and telephone systems.

<sup>2</sup> Floor area ratio.

<sup>3</sup> 33,333 square feet equals 0.77 acres.

Sources: Tables 5.2-5.5; City of Rio Vista; Willdan Financial Services.

**Table 5.7** shows the furnishings and equipment that will be needed to equip the new police station, as identified by the Rio Vista Police Department.

**Table 5.7: Planned Police Station Furnishings & Equipment**

	Inventory	Unit Cost	Value
Fireproof Records Storage Units	10	\$ 2,695	\$ 26,950
Evidence Room inclu. Refrigerator/Freezer	1	2,000 <sup>↗</sup>	2,000
Holding Cell Equipment (Bed, Toilet/Sink Combo)	3	14,720	44,160
Personal Lockers	28	150	4,200
Workstations with Computers	14	2,000 <sup>↗</sup>	28,000
Chief's Office with Computer	1	3,500 <sup>↗</sup>	3,500
Sergeant's Office with Computer	6	3,000 <sup>↗</sup>	18,000
Lieutenant's/Captain's Office with Computer	2	3,000 <sup>↗</sup>	6,000
Reception Area	1	3,349	3,349
Records Technician Office with Computer	1	3,000 <sup>↗</sup>	3,000
Training/Conference Room with A/V	1	7,695	7,695
Gun Lockers	7	590	4,130
Drop Safes	2 <sup>↗</sup>	600	1,200
Eye Wash Station	1	300 <sup>↗</sup>	300
Cash Register	1	500	500
Evidence Lockers	1	4,000	4,000
Total			\$ 157,000

Source: Rio Vista Police Department.

**Table 5.8** shows the inventory of additional police equipment that will be needed to equip the officers and vehicles that will be needed at the 2030 planning horizon of this study.

**Table 5.8: Planned Additional Police Equipment**

	Inventory	Unit Cost	Value
Handguns with Holster and Light	18	\$ 1,073	\$ 19,314
Protective Vests	18	1,900	34,200
Helmets - Ballistic Level III	18	407	7,326
Chemical Masks and Suits	18	1,095	19,710
Tasers with Camera and Holster	18	2,308	41,544
Mobile Data Computers	13	6,050	78,650
MDC Modems	13	2,750	35,750
MDC Air Cards	13	275	3,575
Shotguns	13	990	12,870
Rifles	13	1,210	15,730
Antennas (incl. Installation)	13	1,100	14,300
CSI Kits	13	459	5,967
Camera Digital D90 or higer	12	2,200	26,400
Stop Sticks	22	795	17,490
Handheld Radio	18	1,100	19,800
Total			\$ 353,000

Source: Rio Vista Police Department.

**Table 5.9** shows the total value of police facilities at the 2030 planning horizon. This value includes existing vehicles and equipment, as well as the planned new station, EOC, vehicles, and equipment identified in the tables above.

**Table 5.9: Total Police Facilities Value, 2030**

Existing Police Vehicles	\$ 264,000
Existing Equipment	247,000
Planned Station, Vehicles, Major Equipment	6,350,000
Planned Station Furnishings & Equipment	157,000
Planned Additional Equipment	353,000
Total Police Facilities Value	\$ 7,371,000

Source: Tables 5.2-5.8.

## Cost Allocation

**Table 5.10** shows the system plan cost per capita for police facilities, which is the projected per capita investment in police facilities at the planning horizon. This value is calculated by dividing the total value of police facilities at the 2030 planning horizon by the projected future service population.

**Table 5.10: Police Facilities Cost Allocation**

Total System Value (2030)	\$	7,371,000
Future Service Population (2030)		17,484
Cost per Capita	\$	422
Cost Allocation per Resident	\$	422
Cost Allocation per Worker <sup>1</sup>		131

<sup>1</sup> Based on a weighing factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 5.1 and 5.9; Willdan Financial Services.

## Fee Schedule

**Table 5.11** shows the proposed police facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space).

**Table 5.11: Police Facilities Fee**

Land Use	A	B	C = A x B		D	E = C + D
	Cost Per Capita	Density <sup>1</sup>	Base Fee <sup>2</sup>	Admin Charge <sup>2,3</sup>	Total Fee <sup>2</sup>	
<i>Residential</i>						
Single Family	\$ 422	1.83	\$ 772	\$ 15	\$ 787	
Senior Units	422	1.11	468	9	477	
Multi-family	422	1.11	468	9	477	
<i>Nonresidential</i>						
Commercial	\$ 131	2.00	\$ 262	\$ 5	\$ 267	
Office	131	1.52	199	4	203	
Industrial	131	0.90	118	2	120	

<sup>1</sup> Persons per dwelling unit for residential development, workers per 1,000 square feet for nonresidential development.

<sup>2</sup> Fee per dwelling unit for residential development, per 1,000 square feet for nonresidential development.

<sup>3</sup> Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 5.10; Willdan Financial Services.

## Use of Fee Revenue

The City can use police facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of buildings, land, and equipment that are part of the system of police facilities serving new development. The City plans to use the fee revenues to fund the facilities shown in Tables 5.6, 5.7, and 5.8.

## Non-Fee Funding Required

Completing the planned facilities will provide a higher value of facilities per capita than is currently provided in Rio Vista. Impact fee revenue may not be used to increase the level of service provided to existing development. In addition, development agreements that are currently in place include municipal and public facilities impact fees for municipal facilities, police facilities, and fire facilities at a lower level than the currently proposed fees. Therefore, impact fee revenue will not fully fund the planned police facilities and some non-fee funding will be required. This section estimates the impact fee funding that will be available to complete the planned police facilities, as well as the amount of non-fee funding that will be needed.

**Table 5.12** shows the projected fee revenue that would be generated by development that is not currently subject to a development agreement.

**Table 5.12: Estimated Police Facilities Fee Revenue from Development without Development Agreements**

Land Use	Units of Development (DU/1,000 sq. ft.)	Proposed Fee <sup>1</sup>	Fee Revenue
<i>Residential</i>			
Single Family	-	\$ 772	\$ -
Senior Units	-	468	-
Multi-family	180	468	84,240
<i>Nonresidential</i>			
Commercial	211.5	\$ 262	\$ 55,400
Office	247.6	199	49,300
Industrial	2,590.3	118	305,700
Total			\$ 494,640

<sup>1</sup> Base fee. Does not include administrative charge.

Sources: Tables 2.2, 2.3 and 5.11.

**Table 5.13** shows the estimated funding available for police facilities based on the proposed fees, the fees charged under development agreements, and projected development through 2030. A portion of the City's current municipal impact fee fund balance will also be used for the planned facilities identified in this study. (The existing municipal facilities fee fund balance may also be used for police and fire facilities. See Table 1.2.) After accounting for the current fund balance and the projected future impact fee revenue, approximately \$3.4 million in non-fee funding will be needed to complete the planned police facilities.

The City will need to use other funding sources to complete the planned police facilities. Potential sources of revenue include existing or new general fund revenues, existing or new taxes, and state and federal grants. Facility costs may be financed using general obligation bonds or other financing mechanisms.

**Table 5.13: Funding Sources for Planned Police Facilities**

Planned Police Station, Vehicles, and Major Equipment	\$ 6,350,000
Planned Police Station Furnishings & Equipment	157,000
Planned Additional Police Equipment	353,000
Less: Land Value for Planned Police Station <sup>1</sup>	<u>(58,000)</u>
Funding Needed for Planned Facilities	\$ 6,802,000
Less: Projected Fee Revenue from Development with Development Agreements <sup>2</sup>	\$ (2,920,900)
Less: Projected Fee Revenue from Development without Development Agreements	(494,640)
Less: Current Impact Fee Fund Balance <sup>2</sup>	<u>(14,800)</u>
Non-Fee Funding Required	\$ 3,371,660

<sup>1</sup> The planned police station will be built on land currently owned by the City. Thus, funding for the parcel is not needed.

<sup>2</sup> See Table 1.2.

Sources: Tables 1.2, 5.6-5.8, and 5.12.

## 6. Park Facilities

The purpose of this fee is to generate revenue to fund the park facilities needed to serve new development. The impact fee is based on the parkland and trails standards found in the Rio Vista General Plan. In addition, funding for new development's share of the waterfront promenade identified in the Waterfront Specific Plan is included in the impact fee.

### Service Population

Facility standards for parks are typically expressed as a ratio of park acres per 1,000 residents. Residents are considered to be the primary users of parks in the City of Rio Vista; therefore, demand for parks and associated facilities is based on the City's residential population, rather than a combined resident-worker service population. **Table 6.1** provides estimates of the City's current resident population and a projection for the year 2030.

The Trilogy senior unit development includes recreational facilities for the use of its residents. As a result, the City has determined that Trilogy will not create a significant increase in the demand for neighborhood park facilities. The resident population in unrestricted units is shown separately from the population in senior units to allow the Trilogy senior units to be excluded when determining the need for neighborhood park facilities.

**Table 6.1: Parks Service Population**

	Residents in Non-Age Restricted Single and Multi Family Units	Residents in Senior Units (Trilogy)	Total Service Population	Percent of Total Service Population
Existing (2013)	3,615	2,097	7,596	50%
New Development (2013-2030)	<u>8,466</u>	<u>1,110</u>	<u>7,692</u>	<u>50%</u>
Total (2030)	12,081	3,207	15,288	100%

Source: Tables 2.1 and 2.4.

### Facility Inventories and Standards

This section describes the City's park facility inventory, facility standards, and park facility costs.

#### Existing Inventory

**Table 6.2** summarizes the City's existing park inventory.

**Table 6.2: Existing Parkland Inventory**

	Acres
<i><u>Neighborhood Parkland</u></i>	
Rio Vista South	
Brunavista	2.0
Crescent	0.2
City Park	1.4
Drouin	1.1
Fishing Pier and Access Park	0.4
Sierra	0.1
Public Dock and Boat Ramp	3.5
Subtotal - Rio Vista South	8.7
Rio Vista North	
Val de Flores	3.2
D.H. White	0.7
Subtotal - Rio Vista North	3.9
Homecoming/Riverwalk	
Old Airport Runway Basketball Court	0.6
Homecoming	1.0
Subtotal - Homecoming/Riverwalk	1.6
Total - Neighborhood Parkland	14.2
<i><u>Community Parkland</u></i>	
Egbert Field	5.0
Total - Community Parkland	5.0

Source: City of Rio Vista Adopted Parks Master Plan, Revised 2013.

### Park Facility Standards

The Rio Vista General Plan sets forth park facility standards for the City. The General Plan park standards are:

- ◆ Neighborhood Parkland: 3.00 acres per 1,000 residents;
- ◆ Community Parkland: 2.00 acres per 1,000 residents; and
- ◆ Trails: 1.00 mile per 1,000 residents.

**Table 6.3** shows the General Plan standards outlined above and the City's current parkland standards. As shown, the City currently provides park facilities at levels below the General Plan standards, creating existing deficiencies. Impact fee revenue can be used to ensure that, as new development occurs, park facilities are added at a rate equal to the General Plan standard. Non-fee revenue must be used to correct the existing deficiencies.

**Table 6.3: Parkland Standards**

Type of Acreage	Existing Standard	General Plan Standards
<i>Parkland Standards (acres per 1,000 residents)</i>		
Neighborhood Parkland Acres	14.2	
Existing (2013) Service Population <sup>1</sup>	3,615	
Neighborhood Parkland Standard	3.93	3.00 <sup>¶</sup>
Community Parkland Acres	5.0	
Existing (2013) Service Population	7,596	
Community Parkland Standard	0.66	2.00 <sup>¶</sup>
<i>Trail Standards (miles per 1,000 residents)</i>		
	-	1.00 <sup>¶</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Population in Trilogy development not included in calculating existing standard for Neighborhood Parkland. According to Resolution 2003-04, the Trilogy project is developing all of the neighborhood parks facilities required to serve the development.

Sources: Tables 6.1 and 6.2; City of Rio Vista Parks Master Plan, Updated 2013; Willdan Financial Services.

### Parkland Unit Costs

**Table 6.4** shows the estimated cost per acre for neighborhood and community parks, as well as the cost per mile for trails. Land acquisition costs are based on a review of recent listings for vacant parcels in Rio Vista similar to those where the parks are located. The estimated land value for parks is lower than for other facilities considered in this report, such as the fire station and city hall, because parks tend to be located on larger parcels outside of the commercial district.

Improvement costs are based on cost estimates provided in the January, 2013 Draft Revision to the 2007 Parks Master Plan. The Parks Master Plan identifies plans for a sports complex and for standard community parks, both of which are included in the community parks category. The Master Plan estimated a higher cost per acre for sports complex improvements than for standard community parks. The average community park improvement cost is based on the average of the sports complex improvement cost and the standard community park improvement cost, weighted by the acreage of each type of park included in the Master Plan.

The trail improvement cost was provided in the Master Plan. The land cost for trails is based on the same cost per acre as for other types of park facilities and assumes that trails will have a 25-foot right-of-way.

**Table 6.4: Parkland Unit Costs**

	<b>Cost per Acre (per Mile for Trails)</b>
<i>Neighborhood Parks and Greens</i>	
Neighborhood Park Improvements <sup>1</sup>	\$ 281,000
Land Acquisition <sup>2</sup>	<u>90,000</u>
Total Cost per Acre	\$ 371,000
<i>Community Parks</i>	
Standard Community Park Improvements	\$ 250,000
Acres of Standard Community Parks in Master Plan	37
Sports Complex Improvements	\$ 292,500
Acres of Sports Complex in Master Plan	40
Average Community Park Improvements <sup>3</sup>	\$ 272,100
Land Acquisition <sup>2</sup>	<u>90,000</u>
Total Cost per Acre	\$ 362,100
<i>Trails</i>	
Standard Trail Improvements <sup>4</sup>	\$ 562,500
Land Acres Required per Mile of Trails <sup>5</sup>	3.03
Land Cost per Mile of Trails	<u>\$ 272,700</u>
Total Cost per Mile	\$ 835,200

<sup>1</sup> Improvement costs are site improvements (curbs, gutters, water, sewer, and electrical access), plus basic park and field amenities such as basketball or tennis court, restroom, parking, tot lot, irrigation, turf, open green space, pedestrian paths, and picnic tables. Excludes special use facilities such as recreation centers.

<sup>2</sup> Land value from the City of Rio Vista Parks Master Plan.

<sup>3</sup> Weighted average representing the average per acre improvement cost for standard community parks and the sports complex.

<sup>4</sup> Based on a 12-foot wide asphalt path within a 25-foot wide landscaped corridor.

<sup>5</sup> = (5,280 feet per mile \* 25 foot corridor) / 43,560 square feet per acre.

Sources: City of Rio Vista Parks Master Plan, 2013 Update; Willdan Financial Services.

## Waterfront Promenade

The Waterfront Specific Plan, prepared by SFE Urban Design and dated November 15, 2007, identifies the need for a waterfront promenade and park as part of a plan for redevelopment of the waterfront area between Main Street and Highway 12. The park facility can be funded with park impact fee revenue. The promenade is a special recreational facility that will be accessible to and will benefit all residents of Rio Vista, both existing and new development. New development's fair

share of costs for the waterfront promenade is included in the park impact fee as a special facility. Because the facility will also benefit existing development, only the portion of costs equal to new development’s share of the total projected population is included in the impact fee. The Specific Plan estimates the cost of the promenade to be approximately \$2.3 million. As shown in Table 6.1, new development is projected comprise 50 percent of the total projected park facility service population. **Table 6.5** shows the portion of costs for the waterfront promenade included in the park impact fee and the cost per resident, based on projected new development.

**Table 6.5: Waterfront Promenade Costs**

<u>Existing Development Share of Costs</u>		
Waterfront Promenade Cost	\$	2,250,000
Existing Development Fair Share		<u>50%</u>
Cost Allocated to Existing Development	\$	1,125,000
<u>New Development Share of Costs</u>		
Waterfront Promenade Cost	\$	2,250,000
New Development Fair Share		<u>50%</u>
Cost Allocated to New Development	\$	1,125,000
New Development Residents		<u>7,692</u>
Cost per Resident	\$	146

Sources: Table 6.1; Waterfront Specific Plan; Willdan Financial Services.

The Waterfront Specific Plan also indentifies the need for a vertical flood wall along the Waterfront District to prevent flooding. Development of the Waterfront District will have some benefits for development Citywide because it will allow new commercial development and community amenities. However, the flood wall will primarily benefit development in the Waterfront District, allowing new public and private development in that area. Thus, funding the floodwall through a Citywide impact fee would not be appropriate. Other funding sources, such as Redevelopment Agency funding, a special assessment district or community facilities district, or an impact fee charged in a zone of benefit limited to the Waterfront District, should be used for the flood wall.

### Parks Cost per Capita

**Table 6.6** shows the cost per capita of providing park facilities at the General Plan facility standards. The cost per capita is shown separately for land and improvements and for each type of park facility.

**Table 6.6: Park Facilities Investment Per Capita**

		Neighborhood Parks and Greens	Community Parks	Trails	Waterfront Promenade
Facility Standard (acres per 1,000 residents for parks, miles per 1,000 residents for trails, dollars per capita for Waterfront Promenade)	A	3.00	2.00	1.00	\$ 146
<u>Land to Accommodate New Development</u>					
Unit Cost for Land	B	\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000	N/A
Land Cost per 1,000 Residents	$C = A * B$	\$ 270,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 90,000	
Land Cost Per Resident	$D = C / 1,000$	\$ 270	\$ 180	\$ 90	
<u>Improvements to Accommodate New Development</u>					
Unit Cost for Improvements <sup>1</sup>	E	\$ 281,000	\$ 272,100	\$ 562,500	N/A
Improvement Cost per 1,000 Residents	$F = A * E$	\$ 843,000	\$ 544,200	\$ 562,500	
Improvement Cost Per Resident	$G = F / 1,000$	\$ 843	\$ 544	\$ 563	
<u>Total per Capita Cost</u>	$H = D + G$	\$ 1,113	\$ 724	\$ 653	

<sup>1</sup> Park improvement costs include site improvements (curbs, gutters, water, sewer, and electrical access), plus basic park and field amenities such as basketball or tennis court, restroom, parking, tot lot, irrigation, turf, open green space, pedestrian paths, and picnic tables. Excludes special use facilities such as recreation centers. Trail improvement cost based on a 12-foot wide asphalt path within a 25-foot wide landscaped corridor.

Sources: Tables 6.3, 6.4, and 6.5; Willdan Financial Services.

## Fee Schedule

Table 6.7 shows the proposed park facilities fee schedule. The proposed fees are based on the cost per capita shown in Table 6.6. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on the average number of residents per dwelling unit, as shown in Table 2.1.

The cost of land and improvements is shown separately for each category of park facilities, where applicable. By showing the cost components separately, the City can calculate the park fee credit that would be due if it negotiates with a developer to dedicate either improved or unimproved park facilities instead of paying the corresponding portion of the impact fee.

The proposed fee schedule includes neighborhood parks fee for senior units. Any senior developed in Trilogy under the Marks Ranch Development Agreement would pay the park fees specified in that agreement. If senior units are developed in areas not subject to a development agreement, they may be subject to the fees shown here. If City determines that any senior unit developments subject to the fees would not generate a need for neighborhood park facilities, this component of the fee may be waived.

**Table 6.7: Park Facilities Fee Schedule**

Land Use	A	B	C	D	E=A+B+C+D	F	G=E*F	H	I=G+H
	Neighborhood Parks Cost per Capita	Community Parks Cost per Capita	Trails Cost per Capita	Promenade Cost per Capita	Total Cost per Capita	Density <sup>1</sup>	Base Fee <sup>2</sup>	Admin Charge <sup>3</sup>	Total Fee <sup>2</sup>
<i>Single Family</i>									
Parkland	\$ 270	\$ 180	\$ 90	N/A	\$ 540	1.83	\$ 988	\$ 20	\$ 1,008
Improvements	843	544	563	146	2,096	1.83	3,835	77	3,912
Total							\$ 4,823	\$ 97	\$ 4,920
<i>Senior Units</i>									
Parkland	\$ 270	\$ 180	\$ 90	N/A	\$ 540	1.11	\$ 599	\$ 12	\$ 611
Improvements	843	544	563	146	2,096	1.11	2,326	47	2,373
Total							\$ 2,925	\$ 59	\$ 2,984
<i>Multi-family</i>									
Parkland	\$ 270	\$ 180	\$ 90	N/A	\$ 540	1.11	\$ 599	\$ 12	\$ 611
Improvements	843	544	563	146	2,096	1.11	2,326	47	2,373
Total							\$ 2,925	\$ 59	\$ 2,984

<sup>1</sup> Persons per dwelling unit.

<sup>2</sup> Per dwelling unit.

<sup>3</sup> Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 6.6; Willdan Financial Services.

## Use of Fee Revenue

The City plans to use park facilities fee revenue to purchase parkland or construct improvements to add to the system of park and recreation facilities that serves new development. The City may only use impact fee revenue to provide facilities needed to serve new development. The City may not use impact fee revenue for the portion of park facilities needed to meet the General Plan standards for existing development.

## Facility Costs and Funding

### Facilities Needed to Accommodate New Development

**Table 6.8** shows the park facilities needed to accommodate new development at the General Plan facility standards. New development will generate the need for approximately 25.4 acres of neighborhood parks, 15.38 acres of community parks, and 7.69 miles of trails. New development’s fair share of the waterfront promenade is estimated at 50 percent of the facility costs. The total value of these facilities is estimated at approximately \$22.5 million.

**Table 6.8: Park Facilities Needed to Accommodate New Development**

<i>Neighborhood Parks and Greens</i>		
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 residents)	3.00	
Service Population Growth (2010-2030) <sup>1</sup>	<u>8,466</u>	
Facility Needs (acres) <sup>2</sup>	25.40	
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	<u>\$ 371,000</u>	
Total Cost of Facilities		\$ 9,423,000
<i>Community Parks</i>		
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 residents)	2.00	
Resident Growth (2010-2030)	<u>7,692</u>	
Facility Needs (acres)	15.38	
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	<u>\$ 362,100</u>	
Total Cost of Facilities		\$ 5,569,000
<i>Trails</i>		
Facility Standard (miles/1,000 residents)	1.00	
Resident Growth (2010-2030)	<u>7,692</u>	
Facility Needs (miles)	7.69	
Average Unit Cost (per mile)	<u>\$ 835,200</u>	
Total Cost of Facilities		\$ 6,423,000
<i>Waterfront Promenade</i>		
New Development Share of Waterfront Promenade <sup>3</sup>		<u>\$ 1,125,000</u>
Total, All Parks and Trails to Accommodate New Development		\$ 22,540,000

<sup>1</sup> Senior unit population growth in Trilogy development not included in calculating future facility costs for Neighborhood Parks and Greens. According to Resolution 2003-04, the Trilogy project is developing all of the neighborhood parks facilities required to serve the development.

<sup>2</sup> Need for City owned and operated neighborhood may be reduced if some future developments provide their own park facilities.

<sup>3</sup> See Table 6.5.

Sources: Tables 6.1, 6.3, 6.4, and 6.5; Willdan Financial Services.

### Existing Park Facilities Deficiencies

As shown in Table 6.3, the City's current park system falls short of the General Plan standard. **Table 6.9** shows the park facilities that would be needed to eliminate the existing deficiencies in park facilities. The estimated cost of new development's share of the Waterfront Promenade and the cost of developing the park facilities currently needed to meet the General Plan standard is \$11.2 million.

**Table 6.9: Existing Park Facilities Deficiencies**

<u>Neighborhood Parks and Greens</u>			
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 residents)	3.00		
Existing Residents (2010)	<u>3,615</u>		
Facility Needs (acres) <sup>1</sup>	10.85		
Existing Neighborhood Parks Acreage	<u>14.20</u>		
Neighborhood Parks Shortfall (acres)	-		
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	<u>\$ 371,000</u>		
Total Cost of Facilities to Correct Deficiency		\$	-
<u>Community Parks</u>			
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 residents)	2.00		
Existing Residents (2010)	<u>7,596</u>		
Facility Needs (acres)	15.19		
Existing Community Parks Acreage	<u>5.00</u>		
Community Parks Shortfall (acres)	10.19		
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	<u>\$ 362,100</u>		
Total Cost of Facilities to Correct Deficiency		\$	3,690,000
<u>Trails</u>			
Facility Standard (miles/1,000 residents)	1.00		
Existing Residents (2010)	<u>7,596</u>		
Facility Needs (miles)	7.60		
Existing Trails (miles)	<u>-</u>		
Trails Shortfall (miles)	7.60		
Average Unit Cost (per mile)	<u>\$ 835,200</u>		
Total Cost of Facilities to Correct Deficiency		\$	6,348,000
<u>Waterfront Promenade</u>			
Existing Development Share of Waterfront Promenade		\$	<u>1,125,000</u>
Total Cost to Correct Existing Deficiencies		\$	11,163,000

<sup>1</sup> Population in Trilogy development not included in calculating existing facility needs for Neighborhood Parkland. According to Resolution 2003-04, the Trilogy project is developing all of the neighborhood parks facilities required to serve the development.

Sources: Tables 6.1-6.5; Willdan Financial Services.

**Park Facility Funding Sources**

**Table 6.10** shows the projected fee revenue that would be generated by development that is not currently subject to a development agreement.

**Table 6.10: Estimated Park Fee Revenue from Development without Development Agreements**

Land Use	Units of Development (DU/1,000 sq. ft.)	Proposed Fee <sup>1</sup>	Fee Revenue
Single Family	-	\$ 4,823	\$ -
Senior Units	-	2,925	-
Multi-family	180	2,925	<u>526,500</u>
Total			\$ 526,500

<sup>1</sup> Base fee. Does not include administrative charge.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 6.7.

**Table 6.11** shows the estimated funding available for parks facilities based on the proposed fees, the fees charged under development agreements, and projected development through 2030. The City’s park impact fee fund currently has a balance of approximately \$21,600. After accounting for the current fund balance and the projected future impact fee revenue, approximately \$22.4 million in non-fee funding will be needed to complete the planned park facilities.

The City will need to use alternative funding sources to develop park and recreation facilities at the standards called for in the General Plan. Potential sources of revenue include existing or new general fund revenues, existing or new taxes, and state, federal and private grants. Facility costs may be financed using general obligation bonds or other financing mechanisms.

**Table 6.11: Funding Sources for Park Facilities**

Facility Cost to Correct Existing Deficiencies	\$ 11,163,000
Facility Cost to Accommodate New Development	<u>22,540,000</u>
Total Facility Cost to Meet General Plan Standards	\$ 33,703,000
Less: Current Parks Impact Fee Balance	\$ (21,600)
Less: Impact Fee Funding from Projects with Development Agreements	(10,739,000)
Less: Impact Fee Funding from Projects without Development Agreements	<u>(526,500)</u>
Additional Funding Needed to Meet General Plan Standards	\$ 22,415,900

Sources: Tables 1.1, 6.8-6.10; Table 13, Development Agreement Analysis and Growth Projections for Rio Vista Impact Fee Study.

# 7. Roadway Facilities

---

The purpose of the roadway impact fee is to fund the improvements to the City's street network needed to maintain an acceptable level of service (LOS) as new development occurs. The need for traffic improvements through 2030 is caused by a combination of new development in Rio Vista, vehicle trips coming from outside the City, and existing deficiencies in level of service. The proposed roadway impact fee is based on a traffic study that isolates the share of traffic facilities costs that should be allocated to new development in Rio Vista. Only this share of costs is included in the proposed roadway impact fee.

## Rio Vista Traffic Study

The roadway impact fee is largely based on a traffic study prepared by traffic engineering firm Dowling Associates, Inc.<sup>1</sup> Dowling Associates created a computer traffic model for Rio Vista, which was largely based on the Solano Transportation Authority (STA) Travel Demand Model.

The Dowling Associates traffic study provided the following information for the roadway impact fee:

- ◆ Roadway and intersection improvements needed to maintain an acceptable level of service through 2030;
- ◆ Roadway and intersection improvements needed to mitigate current deficiencies in levels of service;
- ◆ Estimated costs for roadway and intersection improvements; and
- ◆ The fair share of costs for each improvement that should be allocated to new development and included in the impact fee.

## Trip Demand

The share of roadway improvement costs allocated to each unit of new development is based on the relative amount of new trip demand generated by that development. Trip demand during the afternoon peak hour of traffic is used because this is generally the busiest time of day for traffic, and road improvements are needed to provide capacity to accommodate peak levels of traffic. The traffic study used for this analysis identified improvements needed to mitigate deficiencies during the peak hour.

**Table 7.1** shows the relative trip demand from each unit of new development (dwelling unit or 1,000 square feet of nonresidential development). Trip demand is based on the number of non-pass-by trips generated by each type of development, adjusted for average trip length. Pass-by trips are links that do not add more than one mile to a trip that would already have taken place without the intermediate stop.

---

<sup>1</sup> *City of Rio Vista Capital Improvement Program Fair-Share Analysis Memorandum*; Dowling Associates, Inc.; December 31, 2008.

**Table 7.1: Trip Rate Adjustment Factor**

	Primary Trips <sup>1</sup>	Diverted Trips <sup>1</sup>	Total Excluding Pass-by <sup>1</sup>	Average Trip Length <sup>2</sup>	Adjustment Factor <sup>3</sup>	ITE Category	PM Peak Hour <sup>4</sup>	Trip Demand Factor <sup>5</sup>
	A	B	C = A + B	D	E = C x D		F	G = E x F
<i>Residential</i>								
Single Family	86%	11%	97%	7.9	1.11	Single Family Detached Housing (210)	1.01	1.12
Senior Unit	86%	11%	97%	7.9	1.11	Senior Adult Housing - Detached (251)	0.26	0.29
Multi-family	86%	11%	97%	7.9	1.11	Apartment (220)	0.62	0.69
<i>Nonresidential</i>								
Commercial	47%	31%	78%	3.6	0.41	Shopping Center (820)	3.75	1.54
Office	77%	19%	96%	8.8	1.22	General Office Building (710)	1.49	1.82
Industrial	79%	19%	98%	9.0	1.28	General Light Industrial (110)	0.98	1.25

<sup>1</sup> Percent of total trips. Primary trips are trips with no mid way stops, or "links". Diverted trips are linked trips whose distance adds at least one mile to the primary trip. Pass-by trips are links that do not add more than one mile to the total trip.

<sup>2</sup> In miles.

6.9 miles.

<sup>4</sup> Trips per dwelling unit or per 1,000 building square feet.

<sup>5</sup> The trip demand factor is the product of the trip adjustment factor and the average daily trips.

Sources: San Diego Association of Governments, *Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region*, July 1998; Institute of Traffic Engineers, *Trip Generation*, 7th Edition, 2003; Willdan Financial Services.

The peak hour trip demand generated by new development is a reasonable measure of new development's demand for traffic facilities. The need for new or expanded roads is typically determined based on peak-hour trip volumes because capacity needs are based on the busiest periods of the day. The trip demand rate from Table 7.1, multiplied by dwelling units for residential land use categories or by thousands of square feet of building space for nonresidential categories, equals the total peak hour trip demand generated by that land use type. **Table 7.2** shows the trip demand generated by existing development and anticipated new development in Rio Vista through the 2030 planning horizon.

**Table 7.2: Trip Demand From Existing and New Development**

	Trip Demand Factor	Existing (2013)	Growth (2013-2030)	Existing Trip Demand	Trip Demand From Growth	Total Trip Demand
<i>Residential (units)</i>						
Single Family	1.12	1,766	3,935	1,978	4,407	6,385
Senior Units	0.29	1,889	1,000	548	290	838
Multi-family	0.69	345	1,140	238	787	1,025
Subtotal		4,000	6,075	2,764	5,484	8,248
<i>Nonresidential (1,000 sq. ft.)</i>						
Commercial	1.54	277	769	427	1,184	1,611
Office	1.82	364	529	663	963	1,626
Industrial	1.25	969	3,055	1,211	3,819	5,030
Subtotal		1,610	4,353	2,301	5,966	8,267
Total				5,065	11,450	16,515

Source: Tables 2.4 and 7.1; Willdan Financial Services.

## Facility Inventories and Standards

### Level of Service Standards

The need for roadway improvements is based on maintaining an acceptable level of service (LOS) on City roadways and intersections. LOS is a scale, ranging from A through F, describing the severity of traffic congestion. For unsignalized intersections, LOS is based on the average delay experienced by a vehicle to travel through the intersection. For intersections with traffic signals, LOS is calculated based on the ratio of actual traffic volume to the capacity of the intersection to accommodate traffic. LOS A corresponds to very low delays, while LOS F is described as excessive delays, with the average delay over 60 seconds per vehicle at signalized intersections.

The City of Rio Vista has adopted minimum LOS standards for streets and intersections within the City. The LOS standard is D or better for most arterials and intersections. The minimum LOS is E for Main Street between Front Street and SR 12 and for Front Street between Main Street and SR 12. For intersections, the traffic model provided LOS estimates for the morning and afternoon peak hours. For roadway segments, the LOS is based on a comparison of average daily traffic with the roadway's capacity.

### Project Needs and Costs

#### **Existing Deficiencies**

The traffic study identified several roadways and intersections that currently operate below the minimum LOS standards. (See Tables 2 and 5 of the traffic study for the existing traffic conditions

as determined by the traffic model.) **Table 7.3** shows the improvements needed to mitigate these existing deficiencies.

To ensure that improvement costs needed to mitigate existing deficiencies are not charged to new development through the impact fee, the traffic model assumes that the mitigations for existing deficiencies have been completed when estimating LOS in 2030. Thus, any deficiencies that would occur by 2030 would be the result of future traffic growth. Accordingly, future impact fee revenue should not be used to fund those improvements.

**Table 7.3: Improvements Needed to Mitigate Existing Deficiencies**

Segment/Intersection	Base Year		Improved LOS <sup>1</sup>
	LOS <sup>1</sup>	Required Improvement	
<i>Intersections</i>			
SR 12 and Church Rd	F/F	Install and traffic signal. Provide EB and WB turn pockets on SR 12.	B/C
SR 12 and Drouin Dr	E/F	Install a traffic signal.	A/B
SR 12 and Gardiner Wy	C/E	Restrict left turn lanes from Gardiner Wy onto SR 12.	B/C
SR 12 and 5th St	E/F	Install a traffic signal.	B/C
SR 12 and Virginia Dr	F/F	Install a traffic signal.	B/C
SR 12 and River Rd	C/E	Install a traffic signal.	B/C
<i>Roadway Segments</i>			
SR 12: City Limits to Summerset <sup>2</sup>	F	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes.	A
SR 12: Summerset to Church	F	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes.	A
SR 12: Church to Main St	F	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes.	A
SR 12: Main to Gardiner Wy	F	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes.	A
SR 12: Gardiner Wy to City Limit	F	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes.	A

<sup>1</sup> AM peak hour/PM peak hour for intersections. LOS shown for most-delayed intersection maneuver. Generalized daily estimate for roadway segments.

<sup>2</sup> Roadway fair share analysis identified segment as Highway 113 to Summerset. Revised to include only the portion of the segment within City Limits.

Sources: Tables 2, 5 and 6, *City of Rio Vista Capital Improvement Program Fair-Share Analysis Memorandum*, Administrative Draft, Dowling Associates, Inc., December 31, 2008.

### **Projects Needed to Mitigate 2030 Deficiencies**

The traffic model was used to estimate traffic LOS in 2030 based on estimated future traffic volumes and the existing roadway network, with the addition of the improvements needed to mitigate existing deficiencies. The model results identified intersections and road segments that are projected to operate below the acceptable LOS thresholds. The traffic study identified the improvements that would be needed to restore traffic flow to an acceptable LOS. **Table 7.4** shows the improvements needed to accommodate projected 2030 traffic volumes. Project costs were estimated in the traffic study.

The traffic study determined that widening SR 12 to six lanes would be necessary to prevent traffic conditions on this segment from deteriorating to LOS F by 2030. However, this widening may not be feasible because of right-of-way constraints and the impacts of a six-lane arterial

running through the core of Rio Vista. In addition, widening SR 12 to six lanes is not consistent with the Rio Vista General Plan. Therefore, the impact fee study assumes that SR 12 will only be widened to four lanes and includes only the cost of widening SR 12 to four lanes.

Project costs for the improvements included in this report include the full cost of the improvement, including right of way, curb, gutter, and sidewalk. In many cases, developers will dedicate right of way and/or construct curb, gutter, sidewalks, and outer lanes. Costs were originally estimated in 2010 and were adjusted for inflation to August, 2013 using the *Engineering News Record's* Building Cost Index (BCI). Developer dedication of facilities included in the impact fee program would warrant impact fee credits. The amount of the fee credit should be based on the unit costs assumed in the Dowling Associates traffic study upon which the improvement cost estimates are based, rather than the actual costs incurred by the developer.

**Table 7.4: Traffic Improvements Needed through 2030**

Segment/Intersection	2030		Improved LOS <sup>1</sup>	Improvement Cost (2013) <sup>3</sup>
	Baseline LOS <sup>1,2</sup>	Required Improvement		
<i>Intersections</i>				
Church Road and Harris Road	F/F	Install a traffic signal and provide SB left-turn lane on Church St.	B/B	\$ 820,200
SR 12 and Church Road <sup>4</sup>	F/F	Provide following lane configuration - NB Approach = Dual left and one right turn lane. SB Approach = Dual left, and one right turn lane. EB Approach = One left, one through and one through-right. WB Approach = One left, one through and one right turn lane. Provide overlapping right turn lanes on SB approach.	C/D	8,892,000
SR 12 and Drouin Dr	F/F	Provide one additional through lane and one separate right turn lane on EB and WB approaches.	B/D	1,333,500
SR 12 and Main St/Hillside Tr	F/F	Provide separate through lanes on EB and WB approaches, separate left-turn lane on NB approach and a separate right turn lane on SB approach.	C/D	1,611,400
SR 12 and Gardiner Wy	F/F	Provide additional through lane on SR 12. Restrict left turns from Gardiner Wy onto SR 12.	C/D	897,200
SR 12 and 5th St	F/F	Provide additional through lane on SR 12 and right turn pocket on EB and NB approach.	B/D	884,900
SR 12 and Virginia Dr	F/F	Provide an additional through lane on EB and WB approach. Provide exclusive SB right turn lane.	B/D	1,115,400
SR 12 and River Road	F/F	Provide additional through lane and right turn lane on EB and WB approach.	B/D	1,333,500
St. Francis Wy and Poppy House Road	C/F	Convert two-way stop controlled intersection to a four way stop controlled intersection.	B/B	10,800
Subtotal - Intersections				\$ 16,898,900
<i>Roadway Segments</i>				
SR 12: City Limit-Summerset <sup>5, 6</sup>	F	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	F	\$ 3,124,700
SR 12: Summerset-Church <sup>6</sup>	F	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	F	6,667,600
SR 12: Church-Main St. <sup>6</sup>	F	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	F	5,624,500
SR 12: Main-Gardiner Way <sup>6</sup>	F	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	F	1,433,100
SR 12: Gardiner-City Limit <sup>6</sup>	F	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	F	2,220,200
Church: Airport-Harris	F	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	C	1,388,500
Church: Harris-SR 12	F	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes - Center Medians or Raise to Arterial Standards	A	4,757,600
Church: SR 12-City Limit	E	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	A	4,675,400
Liberty Island: B&R-McCormack	E	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	A	3,211,700
Liberty Island: McCormack-Airport	E	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	A	1,146,500
Airport: Liberty Island-Baumann	E	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	A	4,212,500
Airport: Baumann-Church	E	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	A	4,258,300
Poppy House: w/o St. Francis	E	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	A	2,237,800
St. Francis: Airport-SR 12	F	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	A	5,298,000
Subtotal Roadway Segments				\$ 50,256,400
<b>Total Cost</b>				<b>\$ 67,155,300</b>

<sup>1</sup> AM peak hour/PM peak hour for intersections. LOS shown for most-delayed intersection maneuver. Generalized daily estimate for roadway segments.

<sup>2</sup> For intersections with existing deficiencies, represents LOS with 2030 traffic volume assuming mitigation to correct existing deficiency has been completed.

<sup>3</sup> Costs adjusted from 2010 to 2013 based on the change in the Engineering News-Record's Building Cost Index (BCI).

<sup>4</sup> Total project costs identified in Solano County Regional Transportation Impact Fee Nexus Report (Draft), June 10, 2013.

<sup>5</sup> Roadway fair share analysis identified improvement cost for segment from Highway 113 to Summerset. Revised cost to include only the portion of the segment within City Limits.

<sup>6</sup> Roadway fair share analysis identified the need to expand SR 12 to six lanes due to projected deterioration in level of service to F. However, this widening may not be feasible and is not consistent with the Rio Vista General Plan. Therefore, the impact fee study assumes that SR 12 will only be widened to four lanes. New development's fair share of this widening cost is included in the impact fee program.

Sources: Tables 9, 12 and 13, *City of Rio Vista Capital Improvement Program Fair-Share Analysis Memorandum*, Dowling Associates, Inc., December 31, 2008; Solano County Regional Transportation Impact Fee Nexus Report (Draft), June 10, 2013; Engineering News-Record's Building Cost Index; Willdan Financial Services.

## Fair Share Allocation to New Development

The traffic study determined that SR 12 currently operates at a deficient LOS. Therefore, there is an existing deficiency and new development should not be allocated the entire cost of widening the roadway to four lanes. **Table 7.5** calculates the percentage of projected future trips in excess of the roadway's daily volume threshold for an acceptable LOS that are present in the base year. This percentage is used in **Table 7.6** to allocate the improvement costs for each segment between existing deficiencies and future trip growth.

**Table 7.5: Existing Development Share of SR 12 Improvement Demand**

Segment	Daily Volume Threshold	Average Daily Trips		ADT in Excess of Threshold		Deficiency Due to Base Year Trips <i>F = D / E</i>
		Base	2030	Base	2030	
		<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D = B - A</i>	
SR 12: City Limits to Summerset <sup>1</sup>	20,000	20,800	53,000	800	33,000	2.4%
SR 12: Summerset to Church	20,000	22,400	53,400	2,400	33,400	7.2%
SR 12: Church to Main St	18,000	23,500	53,000	5,500	35,000	15.7%
SR 12: Main to Gardiner Wy	18,000	20,300	47,100	2,300	29,100	7.9%
SR 12: Gardiner Wy to City Limit	20,000	20,100	50,000	100	30,000	0.3%

<sup>1</sup> Roadway fair share analysis identified segment as Highway 113 to Summerset. Revised to include only the portion of the segment within City Limits.

Sources: Tables 5 and 8, *City of Rio Vista Capital Improvement Program Fair-Share Analysis Memorandum*, Dowling Associates, Inc., December 31, 2008.

**Table 7.6: Allocation of SR 12 Costs to Existing Deficiencies and Future Growth**

Segment	Improvement Cost	Deficiency Due to Base Year Trips	Cost Allocation to Existing Deficiency	Cost Allocation to Trip Growth
	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C = A x B</i>	<i>D = A - C</i>
SR 12: City Limits to Summerset <sup>1</sup>	\$ 2,891,400	2.4%	\$ 69,400	\$ 2,822,000
SR 12: Summerset to Church	6,169,800	7.2%	444,200	5,725,600
SR 12: Church to Main St	5,204,600	15.7%	817,100	4,387,500
SR 12: Main to Gardiner Wy	1,326,100	7.9%	104,800	1,221,300
SR 12: Gardiner Wy to City Limit	2,054,400	0.3%	6,200	2,048,200

<sup>1</sup> Roadway fair share analysis identified segment as Highway 113 to Summerset. Revised to include only the portion of the segment within City Limits.

Sources: Tables 7.4 and 7.5; Willdan Financial Services.

The traffic study assumed that the intersection improvements identified in Table 7.3 to mitigate existing deficiencies would be completed without funding from future impact fee revenue. These improvements were assumed to already be completed when the additional improvements needed to accommodate trip growth through 2030 were identified. Therefore, other than the SR 12 widening, none of the additional improvements shown in Table 7.4 are needed to address existing deficiencies.

Using the Rio Vista traffic model, the traffic study identified the fair share of each improvement that should be allocated to new development within Rio Vista and included in the impact fee. The traffic model used a “select link” analysis that estimated the percentage of future trips at each intersection and road segment that are generated by new development in Rio Vista.

For each intersection or road segment, new trips are classified as follows:

- ♦ **Pass-through:** trip neither begins nor ends in Rio Vista. The share of project costs allocated to pass-through trips is not allocated to new development and is not included in the impact fee.
- ♦ **External:** trip begins outside of Rio Vista but ends in the City. These trips are considered to be generated by development outside of the City and are not included in the impact fee.
- ♦ **City:** trip begins inside Rio Vista. Destination may be either in the City or outside of Rio Vista. These trips are generated by new development. The share of project costs allocated to trips originating in Rio Vista is included in the impact fee.

**Table 7.7** shows the percentage of new trips in each category at each intersection and roadway segment. The percentage of the cost of each improvement allocated to new development is equal to the percentage of “City” trips at that intersection or roadway segment.

Note that the trip allocation between local, through, and regional trips for the SR-12 and Church intersection project comes from the Solano County Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) Nexus Report (Draft), June 10, 2013. This impact fee will recover the local cost share of the improvement, while the RTIF will recover the regional share of the improvement costs.

**Table 7.7: Allocation of Improvement Costs to Rio Vista New Development**

	New Trips				Percent Fair Share			Improvement Cost to	
	Total Trips	Pass-Through	External	City	Pass-Through	External	City	Accommodate Trip Growth	Cost to New Development
<i>Intersections</i>									
Church Road and Harris Road	1,512	0	427	1,085	0.00%	28.24%	71.76%	\$ 820,200	\$ 588,576
SR 12 and Church Road <sup>1</sup>	555	251	193	111	45.23%	34.77%	20.00%	8,892,000	1,778,400
SR 12 and Drouin Dr	2,804	893	762	1,149	31.85%	27.18%	40.98%	1,333,500	546,468
SR 12 and Main Street/Hillside Tr	2,267	893	711	663	39.39%	31.36%	29.25%	1,611,400	471,335
SR 12 and Gardiner Way	2,226	893	738	595	40.12%	33.15%	26.73%	897,200	239,822
SR 12 and 5th Street	2,514	893	877	744	35.52%	34.88%	29.59%	884,900	261,842
SR 12 and Virginia Dr	2,422	893	890	639	36.87%	36.75%	26.38%	1,115,400	294,243
SR 12 and River Road	2,619	893	943	783	34.10%	36.01%	29.90%	1,333,500	398,717
St Francis Wy and Poppy House Rd.	594	0	155	439	0.00%	26.09%	73.91%	10,800	7,982
Subtotal								\$ 16,898,900	\$ 4,587,383
<i>Roadway Segments</i>									
SR 12: City Limits to Summerset Rd. <sup>2</sup>	32,200	11,396	8,847	11,957	35.39%	27.48%	37.13%	\$ 3,124,700	\$ 1,160,201
SR 12: Summerset Rd. to Church Rd. <sup>2</sup>	31,000	11,396	8,472	11,132	36.76%	27.33%	35.91%	6,667,600	2,394,335
SR 12: Church Rd. to Main St. <sup>2</sup>	29,500	11,396	7,910	10,194	38.63%	26.81%	34.56%	5,624,500	1,943,827
SR 12: Main St. to Gardiner Way <sup>2</sup>	26,800	11,396	7,184	8,220	42.52%	26.81%	30.67%	1,433,100	439,532
SR 12: Gardiner Way to City Limit <sup>2</sup>	29,900	11,396	9,245	9,259	38.11%	30.92%	30.97%	2,220,200	687,596
Church: Airport to Harris	11,550	0	2,859	8,691	0.00%	24.75%	75.25%	1,388,500	1,044,846
Church: Harris to SR 12	15,950	0	4,417	11,533	0.00%	27.69%	72.31%	4,757,600	3,440,221
Church: SR 12 to City Limit	7,550	0	2,271	5,279	0.00%	30.08%	69.92%	4,675,400	3,269,040
Liberty Island: B&R-McCormack	3,650	0	532	3,118	0.00%	14.58%	85.42%	3,211,700	2,743,434
Liberty Island: McCormack-Airport	4,150	0	847	3,303	0.00%	20.41%	79.59%	1,146,500	912,499
Airport: Liberty Island-Baumann	5,300	0	1,225	4,075	0.00%	23.11%	76.89%	4,212,500	3,238,991
Airport: Baumann-Church	5,300	0	1,178	4,122	0.00%	22.23%	77.77%	4,258,300	3,311,680
Poppy House: w/o St. Francis	4,100	0	1,138	2,962	0.00%	27.76%	72.24%	2,237,800	1,616,587
St. Francis: Airport-SR 12	5,650	0	1,976	3,674	0.00%	34.97%	65.03%	5,298,000	3,445,289
Subtotal								\$ 50,256,400	\$ 29,648,078
Total Costs								\$ 67,155,300	\$ 34,235,462

<sup>1</sup> Trip allocation between local, thru, and regional trips provided in the Solano County Regional Transportation Impact Fee Nexus Report (Draft), June 10, 2013.

<sup>2</sup> See Table 7.6 for determination of improvement cost to accommodate trip growth.

Source: Table 7.6; Table 13, *City of Rio Vista Capital Improvement Program Fair-Share Analysis Memorandum*, Dowling Associates, Inc., December 31, 2008.

Based on the total improvement cost allocated to new development shown in Table 7.7 and the anticipated new trip demand shown in Table 7.2, **Table 7.8** shows new development's cost per trip demand unit.

**Table 7.8: Cost per Trip Demand Unit**

Improvement Cost Allocated to New Development	\$	34,235,462
PM Peak Hour Trip Demand From Growth (2013-2030)		11,450
Cost per Peak Hour Trip Demand Unit	\$	2,990

Sources: Tables 7.2 and 7.7; Willdan Financial Services.

## Fee Schedule

**Table 7.9** shows the proposed roadway impact fee schedule. The cost per trip demand unit is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on the trip demand factors shown in Table 7.1.

**Table 7.9: Roadway Facilities Fee**

Land Use	A	B	C = A x B		D	E = C + D
	Cost Per Trip	Trip Demand Factor	Base Fee <sup>1</sup>	Admin <sup>2</sup>	Total Fee <sup>1</sup>	
<i>Residential</i>						
Single Family	\$ 2,990	1.12	\$ 3,349	\$ 67	\$ 3,416	
Senior Units	2,990	0.29	867	17	884	
Multi-family	2,990	0.69	2,063	41	2,104	
<i>Nonresidential</i>						
Commercial	\$ 2,990	1.54	\$ 4,605	\$ 92	\$ 4,697	
Office	2,990	1.82	5,442	109	5,551	
Industrial	2,990	1.25	3,738	75	3,813	

<sup>1</sup> Fee per dwelling unit for residential land uses and per 1,000 square feet for nonresidential uses.

<sup>2</sup> Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Sources: Tables 7.2 and 7.8; Willdan Financial Services.

## Use of Fee Revenue

The City can use roadway fee revenues to develop the traffic improvements needed to accommodate new development. The City plans to use the fee revenues to fund the portion of the traffic improvements shown in Table 7.4 that is allocated to new development.

## Non-Fee Funding Required

The City will need to use non-fee funding sources for the portion of facility costs not allocated to growth within Rio Vista. In addition, in some cases, development agreements that are currently in place may limit the roadway fees to levels lower than the amounts justified in this study. Therefore, impact fee revenue will not fully fund the planned roadway improvements and some non-fee funding will be required. This section estimates the impact fee funding that will be available to complete the planned roadway facilities, as well as the amount of non-fee funding that will be needed.

**Table 7.10** shows the projected fee revenue that would be generated by development that is not currently subject to a development agreement.

**Table 7.10: Estimated Roadway Fee Revenue from Development without Development Agreements**

Land Use	Units of Development (DU/1,000 sq. ft.)	Proposed Fee <sup>1</sup>	Fee Revenue
<i>Residential</i>			
Single Family	-	\$ 3,379	\$ -
Senior Units	-	875	-
Multi-family	180	2,082	374,760
<i>Nonresidential</i>			
Commercial	211.5	\$ 4,646	\$ 982,600
Office	247.6	5,491	1,359,600
Industrial	2,590.3	3,771	9,768,000
Total			\$ 12,484,960

<sup>1</sup> Base fee. Does not include administrative charge.

Sources: Tables 2.2, 2.3 and 7.9.

**Table 7.11** shows the estimated roadway fee revenue that would be generated by development subject to development agreements. Future roadway fee revenue projections for Brann Ranch, Liberty and Trilogy are calculated in Table 11 of the Development Agreement Analysis Memorandum, included in Appendix A.

The development agreement for Riverwalk includes a provision that development will pay the lesser of the fees set forth under the development agreement and the updated fees adopted by the City. The proposed roadway fees for residential development determined in this study are lower than the fees included in the development agreement for Riverwalk. Therefore, these lower fees are used to estimate roadway fee revenue from residential development in Riverwalk.

**Table 7.11: Estimated Roadway Fee Revenue from Development with Development Agreements**

	Units of Development (DU/1,000 sq. ft.)	Proposed Fee <sup>1</sup>	Fee Revenue
Brann Ranch	See Table 11 of 2010 Development Agreement Analysis Memorandum.		\$ 6,057,900
Gibbs Ranch (Liberty)			5,677,100
Marks Ranch (Trilogy)			6,024,600
<i>Riverwalk</i>			
Single Family <sup>1</sup>	720	\$ 3,379	\$ 2,432,900
Multi-family <sup>1</sup>	240	2,082	499,680
Commercial <sup>2</sup>	107.80	1,750	188,700
Industrial/Service/Other <sup>2</sup>	-	850	-
Subtotal - Riverwalk			\$ 3,121,280
Total			\$ 20,880,880

<sup>1</sup> Reflects proposed updated traffic fee. Riverwalk Development Agreement states that development will pay the lesser of the fees set forth under the Development Agreement and the updated City impact fees. Proposed updated impact fees for single family and multi-family development are lower than fees identified in Development Agreement.

<sup>2</sup> Reflects fees identified in Development Agreement, as adjusted for inflation. For commercial and industrial development, Development Agreement fees are lower than proposed updated fees.

Sources: Table 7.9; Tables 1, 5 and 11, Development Agreement Analysis and Growth Projections for Rio Vista Impact Fee Study.

**Table 7.12** shows the estimated funding available for roadway facilities based on the proposed fees, the fees charged under development agreements, and projected development through 2030. As shown, approximately \$24.6 million in non-fee funding will be needed to complete the roadway facilities needed to accommodate projected development.

The City will need to use alternative funding sources to complete the planned roadway facilities. Potential sources of revenue include existing or new general fund revenues, existing or new taxes, RTIF revenues, and state and federal grants. Facility costs may be financed using general obligation bonds or other financing mechanisms.

**Table 7.12: Funding Sources for Roadway Facilities**

---

Cost of Roadway Improvements Needed through 2030 <sup>1</sup>	\$ 57,987,900
Less: Impact Fee Funding from Projects with Development Agreements	(20,880,880)
Less: Impact Fee Funding from Projects without Development Agreements	<u>(12,484,960)</u>
Non-Fee Funding Required	\$ 24,622,060

---

<sup>1</sup> Does not include cost of intersection improvements needed to address existing deficiencies shown in Table 7.3.

Sources: Tables 1.1, 7.4, 7.10 and 7.11.

---

# 8. Implementation

---

## Impact Fee Program Adoption Process

Subject to the advice of legal counsel, the City Council should hold a public hearing and adopt a resolution to implement the updated impact fees documented in this report. The resolution should be in accordance with the City's existing impact fee ordinance (Chapter 3.36 of the Rio Vista Municipal Code). The fee resolution could reference the ordinance, set the amount of the fees, and reference this report to justify the amount of the fees. The Council should make a finding that this action is consistent with both the ordinance and with *California Government Code* Sections 66018 and 66019, which establish requirements for the impact fee implementation process. The City should:

- ♦ At least 10 days prior, publish notice of a public hearing on the proposed impact fee.
- ♦ At least 10 days prior, send a notice of a public hearing to any party that has submitted a written request for such a notice.
- ♦ At least 10 days prior to the hearing, have this report and all supporting documentation such as the updated facility master plans available for review by the public.
- ♦ Hold the public hearing to consider a resolution adopting the updating impact fees.
- ♦ City Council should adopt a resolution establishing the updated impact fee amounts.

## Identify Non-Fee Revenue Sources

This fee study identified revenue deficiencies attributable to the existing service population, facility demand generated by development outside of Rio Vista, and fee limitations imposed by development agreements. As fees may only be imposed under the *Act* to fund new development's fair portion of facilities, the City should consider how deficiencies might be supplemented through the use of alternative funding sources. This issue applies to municipal facilities, police facilities, park, and roadway impact fees for the City of Rio Vista.

Potential sources of revenue include existing or new general fund revenues, the use of existing or new taxes, or grant funding from an outside agency. Any new special tax would require two-thirds voter approval, while new assessments or property-related charges would require majority property-owner approval.

## Inflation Adjustment

Fees should be updated annually for inflation in facilities costs. The impact fee ordinance specifies that the *Engineering News-Record* Construction Cost Index for San Francisco should be used for the roadway and park and recreation fees, while the Building Cost Index should be used for the municipal facilities fee. The City should consider including changes in land value when conducting annual inflation updates. Calculating the land cost index may require the periodic use of a property appraiser. To calculate prospective fee increases, each index should be weighed against the share of total planned facility costs represented by land or construction, as appropriate.

## Reporting Requirements

The City should comply with the annual and five-year reporting requirements of the *Act*. For facilities to be funded by a combination of public fees and other revenues, identification of the source and amount of these non-fee revenues is essential. Identification of the timing of receipt of other revenues to fund the facilities is also important.

## Fee Accounting

The City should deposit fee revenues into separate restricted fee accounts for each of the fee categories identified in this report. Fees collected for a given facility category should only be expended on new facilities of that same category.

## Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP

The City should maintain a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) to adequately plan for future infrastructure needs. The CIP should commit all projected fee revenues and fund balances to specific projects. These should represent the types of facilities needed to serve growth and described in this report. The use of the CIP in this manner documents a reasonable relationship between new development and the use of those revenues. The CIP also provides the documentation necessary for the City to hold funds in a project account for longer than five years if necessary to collect sufficient monies to complete a project.

With or without a CIP, the City may decide to alter the scope of the planned projects or to substitute new projects as long as those new projects continue to represent an expansion of the City's facilities. If the total cost of facilities varies from the total cost used as a basis for the fees, the City should consider revising the fees accordingly.

## Renovations and Changes in Use

Impact fees should be charged to new development projects that increase the demand for City facilities. In this study, service demand is allocated to development projects based on residential dwelling units or nonresidential building square footage. Accordingly, impact fees would generally not be charged for building renovations, unless new dwelling units or new nonresidential space is created.

If a renovation is associated with a change in use that results in increased public facilities demand, the difference between the fees that would have been charged for the prior use and the new use may be charged. For example, if commercial space is renovated and converted to offices, the City may charge the difference between the office impact fees and the commercial impact fees.

# 9. Solano County Public Facilities Fees

In addition to paying the City of Rio Vista's impact fees as presented herein, new development within the City of Rio Vista is also responsible for paying the County's Public Facilities Fees (PFF) and Regional Transportation Fees (RTIF). **Table 9.1** displays the County's impact fee schedules.

**Table 9.1: Solano County PFF and RTIF Fees**

Land Use Category	PFF	RTIF	Total
<i>Residential (Fee per dwelling unit)</i>			
Single Family Residential (SFR)	\$ 8,962	\$ 1,500	\$ 10,462
Multi-Family Residential (MFR)	6,726	930	7,656
Second I Accessory Unit	4,575	805	5,380
Multifamily Age-Restricted	4,348	585	4,933
<i>Nonresidential (fee per 1,000 sq. ft.)</i>			
Retail	\$ 859	\$ 382	\$ 1,241
Office	1,430	269	1,699
Service Commercial	1,927	980	2,907
Assembly Uses	471	75	546
Hotel/Motel	519	230	749
Industrial	601	110	711
Warehouse	181	36	217
Institutional			
Health Care Facility	946	180	1,126
Place of Worship	367	75	442
Congregate Care Facility	598	67	665
Private School	1,221	793	2,014
Child Day Care Facility	313	Exempt	313
Agricultural			
Riding Arena	363	47	410
Barn	125	27	152

Source: Solano County Public Facilities Fee Summary, February 3, 2014.

# 10. Mitigation Fee Act Findings

---

Fees are imposed on new development projects by local agencies responsible for regulating land use (cities and counties). To guide the imposition of facilities fees, the California State Legislature adopted the Act with Assembly Bill 1600 in 1987 and subsequent amendments. The *Mitigation Fee Act*, contained in *California Government Code* §§66000 – 66025, establishes requirements on local agencies for the imposition and administration of fees. The Act requires local agencies to document five statutory findings when adopting fees.

The five findings in the Act required for adoption of the maximum justified fees documented in this report are: 1) Purpose of Fee, 2) Use of Fee Revenues, 3) Benefit Relationship, 4) Burden Relationship, and 5) Proportionality. This chapter describes how this Impact Fee Report supports the findings that must be made by the City Council when establishing or increasing fees. The City Council may adopt these findings or other findings when adopting updated impact fees.

## Purpose of Fee

- ♦ *Identify the purpose of the fee (§66001(a)(1) of the Act).*

It is the policy of the City that new development will not burden the existing service population with the cost of facilities required to accommodate growth. The Public Facilities and Services Element of the Rio Vista General Plan states, “It is the City’s intent to update the [impact] fees citywide and ensure that all future development agreements and agreement amendments contain updated and adequate fees in order to fund the infrastructure needed to serve new growth.” The purpose of the fees proposed by this report is to implement this policy by providing a funding source from new development for capital improvements to serve that development. The fees advance a legitimate City interest by enabling the City to fund the facilities needed to provide municipal services to new development.

## Use of Fee Revenues

- ♦ *Identify the use to which the fees will be put. If the use is financing facilities, the facilities shall be identified. That identification may, but need not, be made by reference to a capital improvement plan as specified in §65403 or §66002, may be made in applicable general or specific plan requirements, or may be made in other public documents that identify the facilities for which the fees are charged (§66001(a)(2) of the Act).*

Fees proposed in this report, if enacted by the City, would be available to fund expanded facilities to serve new development. Facilities funded by these fees are designated to be located within the City. Fees addressed in this report will be restricted to funding the following facility categories: municipal facilities, fire facilities, police facilities, parks, and roadway improvements.

Summary descriptions of the planned facilities, such as size and cost estimates, were provided by the City and are included in Chapters 3 through 7 of this report. More thorough descriptions of certain planned facilities, including their specific location, if known at this time, are included in master plans, capital improvement plans, traffic studies, or other City planning documents or are

available from City staff. The City may change the list of planned facilities to meet changing needs and circumstances of new development, as it deems necessary. The fees should be updated if these amendments result in a significant change in the fair share cost allocated to new development.

Planned facilities to be funded by the fees are described in the “Use of Fee Revenues” section in each facility category chapter.

## Benefit Relationship

- ◆ *Determine the reasonable relationship between the fees' use and the type of development project on which the fees are imposed (§66001(a)(3) of the Act).*

The City will restrict fee revenue to the acquisition of land, construction of facilities and buildings, and purchase of related equipment, furnishings, and vehicles used to serve new development as described above under the “Use of Fee Revenues” finding. The City should keep fees in segregated accounts. Facilities funded by the fees are expected to provide a City-wide network of facilities accessible to the additional residents and workers associated with new development. Under the Act, fees are not intended to fund planned facilities needed to correct existing deficiencies. Thus, a reasonable relationship can be shown between the use of fee revenue and the new residential and non-residential development that will pay the fees.

## Burden Relationship

- ◆ *Determine the reasonable relationship between the need for the public facilities and the types of development on which the fees are imposed (§66001(a)(4) of the Act).*

The need for facilities is based on a facility standard that represents the demand generated by new development for those facilities. Facility demand is determined as follows:

- ◆ The demand for park facilities is based on residential population and a demand standard of 3.0 acres of neighborhood parks, 2.0 acres of community parks, and 1.0 miles of trails per 1,000 residents;
- ◆ The demand for municipal facilities, fire facilities, and police facilities is based on residential population and the number of workers in the City and a cost standard calculated for each facility type; and
- ◆ The number of vehicular trips generated per use classification and a demand standard of LOS D or LOS E, depending on the street, determines roadway facilities demand.

For each facility category, demand is measured by a single facility standard that can be applied across land use types to ensure a reasonable relationship to the type of development.

The standards used to identify growth needs are also used to determine if planned facilities will partially serve the existing service population by correcting existing deficiencies. This approach ensures that new development will only be responsible for its fair share of planned facilities and that the fees will not unfairly burden new development with the cost of facilities associated with serving the existing service population.

*Chapter 2, Growth Projections* provides a description of how service population and growth projections are calculated. Facility standards are described in the *Facility Standards* sections of in each facility category chapter.

## Proportionality

- ◆ *Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the fees amount and the cost of the facilities or portion of the facilities attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed (§66001(b) of the Act).*

The reasonable relationship between each facilities fee for a specific new development project and the cost of the facilities attributable to that project is based on the estimated new development growth the project will accommodate. Fees for a specific project are based on the project's generation of population, employment, or vehicle trips. Larger new development projects can result in a higher service population or a higher trip generation rate, resulting in higher fee revenue than smaller projects in the same land use classification. Thus, the fees can ensure a reasonable relationship between a specific new development project and the cost of the facilities attributable to that project.

See *Chapter 2, Growth Projections*, or the *Service Population* or *Trip Rate Demand* sections in each facility category chapter for a description of how population, employment, or Trip Rate Adjustment Factors are determined for different types of land uses. See the *Fee Schedule* section of each facility category chapter for a presentation of the proposed facilities fees.

# Appendix A: Development Agreement Analysis and Growth Projections

---

## Memorandum

**TO:** Emi Theriault and Hector De La Rosa, *City of Rio Vista*

**FROM:** Jonathan Young and Eric Nickell

**DATE:** February 23, 2010, revised May 28, 2010

**SUBJECT:** Development Agreement Analysis and Growth Projections for Rio Vista Impact Fee Study

This memorandum provides revised estimates of existing development and future growth for use in the Rio Vista Impact Fee Study. Estimates of existing development were revised based on the City's recent Wastewater Rate Study and the Municipal Services Review (MSR), prepared in 2006 by Pacific Municipal Consultants. Future development was estimated based on the capacity for new dwelling units and nonresidential development in the City's growth areas, as identified in the City's General Plan and the MSR.

This memorandum also provides estimates of impact fees that will be paid by remaining development in areas subject to development agreements. Provided that development of these areas occurs while the current terms of the development agreements are in effect, their impact fees will be limited to the levels established in the development agreements, rather than the levels established by the current impact fee update study.

### Existing Development and Projected Growth

#### *Residential*

**Table 1** shows estimates of existing residential development and projected residential growth. The numbers of existing single family, multifamily, and senior units were based on the City's Wastewater Rate Study, completed in 2008. With the exception of the Waterfront Specific Plan area, projected future residential development in each of the City's growth areas was provided by the City.

Willdan Financial Services estimated the number of units that will be developed in the Waterfront Specific Plan area based on the type of development planned for the area, as identified by the Specific Plan. Residential development in the Waterfront Specific Plan area will be relatively high density, including upper floor apartments over retail stores, multiplex buildings, townhouses, and live-work lofts. However, the Specific Plan area will include not only residential development, but also commercial, office, and civic uses. Also, some of the existing buildings in the Specific Plan area are likely to remain as development occurs. Therefore, it is assumed that there will be an average of 12 new units developed per acre in the Waterfront Specific Plan.

**Table 1: Existing and Projected Residential Development**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Development Agreement</b>	<b>Single Family Units</b>	<b>Senior Units</b>	<b>Multifamily Units</b>	<b>Total Units</b>
<b>Existing (2010)</b>		<b>1,604</b>	<b>1,889</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>3,772</b>
<i>Future Development with Development Agreements</i>					
Brann Ranch	Brann Ranch	855	-	-	855
Liberty	Gibbs Ranch	680	-	-	680
Trilogy	Marks Ranch	-	1,000	-	1,000
Riverwalk	Solano Properties, LLC	720	-	240	960
Subtotal		2,255	1,000	240	3,495
<i>Future Development without Development Agreements</i>					
Del Rio Hills	None	1,680	-	720	2,400
Waterfront Specific Plan <sup>1</sup>	None	-	-	180	180
Subtotal		1,680	-	900	2,580
<b>Total Future Development (2010-2030)</b>		<b>3,935</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,140</b>	<b>6,075</b>
<b>Total Units at Buildout (2030)</b>		<b>5,539</b>	<b>2,889</b>	<b>1,419</b>	<b>9,847</b>

<sup>1</sup> Number of units in Waterfront Specific Plan based on estimated average development of 12 units per acre in the 15 acre specific plan area. Residential development will be upper floor apartments, multiplexes, townhouses, and live-work units.

Sources: Waterfront Specific Plan, November 15, 2007; City of Rio Vista.

### **Nonresidential**

**Table 2** shows the projected employment growth in Rio Vista, based on estimated employment per acre and the acreage of the City's employment growth areas. Figures for existing employment and growth projections for the City's industrial and service commercial areas are from the Rio Vista MSR and the General Plan. The MSR and General Plan did not include estimates for employment growth in retail and commercial areas. Therefore, Willdan Financial Services developed employment growth estimates for the City's retail/commercial growth areas, including the Neighborhood Core area at the intersection of Highway 12 and Church Road, the Highway Commercial District, and the Waterfront Specific Plan. As a result, total employment growth shown in Table 2 is greater than the industrial and service commercial employment growth projected in the MSR and General Plan.

**Table 2: Employment Projections Based on Available Land**

Area	Acres	Jobs/Acre	Total Jobs
<b>Existing Job Base</b>			<b>1,980</b>
<b>Growth Areas</b>			
Light Industrial (Business Park and Surrounding) <sup>1</sup>	190	10	1,900
General Manufacturing (River to St. Francis) <sup>1</sup>	50	5	250
Service Commercial/Storage <sup>1</sup>	150	2	300
General Manufacturing (North of Airport Road) <sup>1</sup>	80	5	400
Airport <sup>1</sup>	15	10	150
Brann Ranch/Gibbs Ranch <sup>1</sup>	50	10	500
Trilogy Commercial/Light Industrial <sup>1</sup>	40	5	200
Neighborhood Core Commercial (Highway 12 & Chruuch Road) <sup>2</sup>	53	20	1,060
Highway Commercial <sup>3</sup>	30	5	150
Waterfront <sup>4</sup>	15	13	195
<b>Job Growth Capacity</b>	<b>673</b>		<b>5,105</b>
<b>Total Jobs at Buildout (2030)</b>			<b>7,085</b>

<sup>1</sup> Acreage and jobs per acre estimated in General Plan Table 7-4 and Table A-5 of the Municipal Services Review.

<sup>2</sup> Acreage based on figures in development agreements and Willdan Financial Services estimates. Jobs per acre estimated by Willdan Financial Services assuming 75 percent of the District will be developed, with the remaining 25 percent used as roads, parks, and other public uses. Assumes average floor-area ratio of 0.3 and average of 2.00 employees per 1,000 building square feet.

<sup>3</sup> Acreage based on Willdan Financial Services estimate. Jobs figure represents estimated *increase* in employment. Increase in jobs per acre estimated by Willdan Financial Services assuming 25 percent of the district will undergo future development or intensification, with average floor-area ratio of 0.25 and average of 2.00 employees per 1,000 building square feet.

<sup>4</sup> Acreage based on figures in Waterfront Specific Plan. Jobs per acre estimated by Willdan Financial Services assuming 75 percent of the District will be developed, with the remaining 25 percent used as roads, parks, and other public uses. Assumes average floor-area ratio of 0.2 for commercial uses and average of 2.00 employees per 1,000 building square feet.

Sources: Rio Vista General Plan 2001, Municipal Service Review and Comprehensive Annexation Plan, Pacific Municipal Consultants, October 2006; Waterfront Specific Plan, November 15, 2007; Solano Properties, LLC Development Agreement; Willdan Financial Services.

**Table 3** breaks the employment projections into commercial, office, and industrial land use categories. Estimates of employment by land use are needed to estimate the square footage of nonresidential development, which is used to estimate fee revenue from nonresidential development in each of the development agreement areas. Building square footage by land use category is also used to calculate the traffic fee, because different types of nonresidential development are associated with different rates of trip generation.

The distribution of existing employment by land use type was based on recent data on employment by industry for Rio Vista from the California Economic Development Department. For the growth areas, Willdan Financial Services estimated the distribution of employment by land use categories based on descriptions of the growth areas and land use districts in the Rio Vista General Plan.

**Table 3: Employment Projections by Land Use Category**

<b>Area</b>	<b>Total Jobs</b>	<b>Commercial</b>	<b>Office</b>	<b>Industrial</b>
		28%	28%	44%
<b>Existing Job Base</b>	1,980	554	554	872
<b>Growth Areas</b>				
Light Industrial (Business Park and	1,900	190	190	1,520
General Manufacturing (River to St. Francis)	250	25	25	200
Service Commercial/Storage	300	60	30	210
General Manufacturing (North of Airport Road)	400	40	40	320
Airport	150	30	30	90
Brann Ranch/Gibbs Ranch	500	100	100	300
Trilogy Commercial/Light Industrial	200	40	40	120
Neighborhood Core Commercial (Highway 12 & Chruuch Road)	1,060	795	265	-
Highway Commercial	150	113	38	-
Waterfront Specific Plan	195	145	49	-
<b>Job Growth Capacity</b>	<b>5,105</b>	<b>1,538</b>	<b>807</b>	<b>2,760</b>
<b>Total Jobs at Buildout (2030)</b>	<b>7,085</b>	<b>2,092</b>	<b>1,361</b>	<b>3,632</b>

Sources: Table 2; Rio Vista General Plan 2001; Willdan Financial Services.

**Table 4** converts projected employment growth to estimates of building square footage. Building square footage is estimated based on employment density factors found in the *Employment Density Study Summary Report*, prepared for the Southern California Association of Governments, by The Natelson Company. Though not specific to Rio Vista, the Natelson study covered employment density over a wide array of land use and development types, making it reasonable to apply these factors to other areas. The specific factors used in this report are for developing suburban areas, as defined by the Natelson study.

**Table 4: Building Square Footage Projections by Land Use**

Area	Jobs			Building Square Feet (000s)		
	Comm.	Office	Industrial	Comm.	Office	Industrial
<b>Building Square Feet per Employee</b>				<b>500</b>	<b>656</b>	<b>1,107</b>
<b>Existing Job Base</b>	<b>554</b>	<b>554</b>	<b>872</b>	<b>277.0</b>	<b>363.4</b>	<b>965.3</b>
Light Industrial (Business Park and Surrounding)	190	190	1,520	95.0	124.6	1,682.6
General Manufacturing (River to St. Francis)	25	25	200	12.5	16.4	221.4
Service Commercial/Storage	60	30	210	30.0	19.7	232.5
General Manufacturing (North of Airport Road)	40	40	320	20.0	26.2	354.2
Airport	30	30	90	15.0	19.7	99.6
Brann Ranch/Gibbs Ranch	100	100	300	50.0	65.6	332.1
Trilogy Commercial/Light Industrial	40	40	120	20.0	26.2	132.8
Neighborhood Core Commercial (Highway 12 & Chruch Road)	795	265	-	397.5	173.8	-
Highway Commercial	113	38	-	56.5	24.9	-
Waterfront Specific Plan	145	49	-	72.5	32.1	-
<b>Estimated Job/Square Footage Growth</b>	<b>1,538</b>	<b>807</b>	<b>2,760</b>	<b>769.0</b>	<b>529.2</b>	<b>3,055.2</b>
<b>Total Jobs/Square Footage at Buildout (2030)</b>	<b>2,092</b>	<b>1,361</b>	<b>3,632</b>	<b>1,046.0</b>	<b>892.6</b>	<b>4,020.5</b>

Sources: Table 3; The Natelson Company, Inc. Employment Density Study Summary, October 31, 2001, Tables 8-A and 10-A (Developing suburban Riverside and San Bernardino Counties).

**Table 5** shows the estimated acreage, employment, and building square footage for nonresidential development in areas covered by development agreements. Where a growth area is only partially covered by a development agreement, it is assumed that the jobs and building space in the development agreement area will be proportional to the acreage covered by the development agreement. For example, 10 acres of the 53 acre Neighborhood Core area is covered by the Solano Properties, LLC Development Agreement. Thus, it is assumed that 19 percent of the employment and building growth in the Neighborhood Core area will be covered by the Solano Properties, LLC Development Agreement (10 acres / 53 acres = 19 percent).

**Table 5: Nonresidential Development with Development Agreements**

Growth Area	Acres	Jobs				Building Square Feet (000s)			
		Comm.	Office	Industrial	Total	Comm.	Office	Industrial	Total
<i><u>Brann Ranch</u></i>									
Brann Ranch/Gibbs Ranch <sup>1</sup>	17	34	34	102	170	17.0	22.3	112.9	152.2
<i><u>Liberty/Gibbs Ranch</u></i>									
Brann Ranch/Gibbs Ranch <sup>1</sup>	33	66	66	198	330	33.0	43.3	219.2	295.5
<i><u>Trilogy/Marks Ranch</u></i>									
Neighborhood Core Commercial (Highway 12 & Chruch Road)	25	375	125	-	500	187.5	82.0	-	269.5
Trilogy Commercial/Light Industrial	40	40	40	120	200	20.0	26.2	132.8	179.0
Total - Trilogy/Marks Ranch	65	415	165	120	700	207.5	108.2	132.8	448.5
<i><u>Riverwalk/Solano Properties, LLC</u></i>									
Neighborhood Core Commercial (Highway 12 & Chruch Road)	10	150	50	-	200	75.0	32.8	-	107.8
<b>Total Growth with Development Agreements</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>665</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>1,400</b>	<b>332.5</b>	<b>206.6</b>	<b>464.9</b>	<b>1,004.0</b>
<b>Total Growth Not Subject to Development Agreements</b>	<b>548</b>	<b>873</b>	<b>492</b>	<b>2,340</b>	<b>3,705</b>	<b>436.5</b>	<b>322.6</b>	<b>2,590.3</b>	<b>3,349.4</b>
<b>Total Projected Growth</b>	<b>673</b>	<b>1,538</b>	<b>807</b>	<b>2,760</b>	<b>5,105</b>	<b>769.0</b>	<b>529.2</b>	<b>3,055.2</b>	<b>4,353.4</b>

<sup>1</sup> According to Municipal Services Review Table A-5, Brann Ranch and Gibbs Ranch have a total of 50 acres of industrial and neighborhood service land. The Brann Ranch Development Agreement states that Brann Ranch has a 17 acre commercial site. It is assumed that the remaining 33 acres of non-residential land is in Liberty/Gibbs Ranch.

## **Development Agreement Impact Fees**

Each of the development agreements currently in place in Rio Vista establishes the level of impact fees that will be paid by development subject to the agreement. The agreements set initial fee levels and specified how the fees may be updated for inflation.

As a result of staffing shortages and turnover, the inflation updates permitted under the development agreements have not been made every year. Impact fees may not be able to be updated retroactively for inflation that occurred in prior years during which staff did not calculate impact fee updates. When the City receives building permit applications for development in areas covered by development agreements, staff should consult the City Attorney to determine the maximum fees that may be legally charged under the development agreement.

This analysis provides a conservative estimate of the amount of revenue that may be generated by development under the development agreements. Current fee levels are based on the fee levels established by the last updates that were applied by City staff, if any. The analysis does not assume that fee adjustments may be made to account for inflation during prior years in which fee increases were not calculated. For Marks Ranch and Gibbs Ranch, fee revenue estimates were based on the levels last charged to development under the Marks Ranch Development Agreement. Because staff has not calculated inflation adjustments under the Brann Ranch or Solano Properties, LLC, Development Agreements, the current fee levels are assumed to be the levels identified in the agreements with no adjustments for inflation. The following tables show the estimated current fees established by the development agreements.

All fee amounts and revenue estimates are shown in 2010 dollars. Actual fee payments will be made at the future fee levels, as adjusted for inflation. Providing estimates in 2010 dollars shows the estimated value of public facilities at current prices that can be funded with future revenue from fee payments. Actual revenue from impact fees will depend on the amount of development activity that occurs and on the vigilance of City staff in the Finance and Community Development Departments to ensure that the inflation adjustments allowed under the development agreements are implemented annually.

**Table 6: Brann Ranch Development Agreement Impact Fees**

Land Use	Brann Ranch Amended Development Agreement Fee	
<i><u>Roadway</u></i>		
Single Family	\$	6,940 per unit
Multi-family		4,368 per unit
Retail & Office		1.32 per sq. ft.
Industrial/Service/Other		0.64 per sq. ft.
<i><u>Public Facilities Impact Fee</u></i>		
Single Family	\$	3,630 per unit
Multi-family		2,529 per unit
Nonresidential		0.70 per sq. ft.
<i><u>Neighborhood Parks</u></i>		
Single Family <sup>1</sup>	\$	1,536 per unit
Multi-family <sup>2</sup>		762 per unit
Nonresidential		0.27 per sq. ft.
<i><u>Community Parks</u></i>		
Single Family <sup>3</sup>	\$	2,203 per unit
Multi-family <sup>4</sup>		1,240 per unit

<sup>1</sup> Development Agreement requires dedication of 1 acre of developed neighborhood parkland per 100 lots. Maximum cost to the developer of not more than \$1,536 per unit.

<sup>2</sup> Development Agreement requires dedication of 1 acre of developed neighborhood parkland per 196 units. Maximum cost to the developer of not more than \$762 per unit.

<sup>3</sup> If City requires community park development on-site, dedication of 1 acre of developed community parkland per 156 units is required. Maximum cost to the developer of not more than \$2,203 per unit. If City does not require community parks on-site, fee not to exceed \$2,203 per unit.

<sup>4</sup> If City requires community park development on-site, dedication of 1 acre of developed community parkland per 294 units is required. Maximum cost to the developer of not more than \$1,240 per unit. If City does not require community parks on-site, fee not to exceed \$1,240 per unit.

Sources: Brann Ranch Development Agreement, November 18, 1993; Brann Ranch Amended Development Agreement, December 7, 2006.

**Table 7: Gibbs Ranch (Liberty) Development Agreement Impact Fees**

Land Use	Original Fee	Inflation Method	Inflation Amount	Current Fee (2010\$)
<u>Roadway</u>				
Senior Dwelling Unit	\$ 3,731 per unit	A	44%	\$ 5,378
Unrestricted DU	5,358 per unit	A	44%	7,723
Commercial	1.00 per sq. ft.	A	44%	1.44
<u>Public Facilities Impact Fee</u>				
Senior Dwelling Unit	\$ 1,828 per unit	A	44%	\$ 2,635
Unrestricted DU	2,625 per unit	A	44%	3,784
Commercial	0.50 per sq. ft.	A	44%	0.72
<u>Neighborhood Parks</u>				
Unrestricted Single Family <sup>1</sup>	\$ 1,239 per unit	B	18%	\$ 1,458
Unrestricted Apartment <sup>2</sup>	697 per unit	B	18%	819
Commercial	0.20 per sq. ft.	A	44%	0.29
<u>Community Parks</u>				
Unrestricted Single Family <sup>3</sup>	\$ 2,014 per unit	B	18%	\$ 2,368
Unrestricted Apartment <sup>2</sup>	1,133 per unit	B	18%	1,333

<sup>1</sup> Development Agreement requires dedication of 1 acre of developed neighborhood parkland per 104 units. Maximum cost to the developer of not more than \$1,239 per unit.

<sup>2</sup> Multifamily Neighborhood Parks Fee under Marks Ranch and Gibbs Ranch Development Agreements, as identified in City Council Resolution 2003-04, Exhibit A, page 14.

<sup>3</sup> If City requires community park development on-site, dedication of 1 acre of developed community parkland per 156 units is required. Maximum cost to the developer of not more than \$2,014 per unit. If City does not require community parks on-site, fee not to exceed \$2,014 per unit.

Inflation methods:

A: Applied inflation amount for fees charged under Marks Ranch Development Agreement because Marks Ranch and Gibbs Ranch Development Agreements were adopted at approximately the same time and included identical fees and inflation update procedure. Development Agreement stipulates that fees may be updated using the annual change in the Engineering News Record Building Cost Index for San Francisco, with the first adjustment on March 1, 1993. If all annual updates could be applied, fees would be increased by 66% from original fees (1992 BCI: 3,298.09. 2010 BCI: 5461.81. Increase: 66%).

B: Fees are updated to current Neighborhood and Community Park fee amounts charged to development without development agreements under Resolution 2003-04. These fees were originally based on the Marks Ranch and Gibbs Ranch Development Agreement fees, and the current citywide fees reflect inflation updates the City has applied to the Marks and Gibbs Ranch fees. Development Agreement stipulates that fees may be updated using the annual change in the Engineering News Record Building Cost Index for San Francisco, with the first adjustment on March 1, 2001. If all annual updates could be applied, fees would be increased by 35% from original fees (2000 BCI: 4,044.20. 2010 BCI: 5461.81. Increase: 35%).

Sources: Gibbs Ranch Development Agreement, August 1, 1991; First Amendment to Gibbs Ranch Development Agreement, 2000; 2009 Rio Vista Community Development Department Capital Impact Fee Schedule; Engineering News-Record; Willdan Financial Services.

**Table 8: Marks Ranch (Trilogy) Development Agreement Impact Fees**

Land Use	Original Fee	Inflation Amount <sup>1</sup>	Current Fee (2010\$)
<u>Roadway</u>			
Senior Dwelling Unit	\$ 3,731 per unit	44%	\$ 5,378
Unrestricted Dwelling Unit	5,358 per unit	44%	7,723
Commercial	1.00 per sq. ft.	44%	1.44
<u>Public Facilities Impact Fee</u>			
Senior Dwelling Unit	\$ 1,828 per unit	44%	\$ 2,635
Unrestricted Dwelling Unit	2,625 per unit	44%	3,784
Commercial	0.50 per sq. ft.	44%	0.72
<u>Parks</u>			
No park fees or park dedication requirements for development of the Senior Unit project.			
Commercial	\$ 0.20 per sq. ft.	44%	0.29

<sup>1</sup> Inflation amount based on actual fees charged for the most recent senior unit building permit issued in Trilogy. Development Agreement stipulates that fees may be updated using the annual change in the Engineering News Record Building Cost Index for San Francisco, with the first adjustment on March 1, 1993. If all annual updates could be applied, fees would be increased by 66% from original fees (1992 BCI: 3,298.09. 2010 BCI: 5461.81. Increase: 66%).

Development Agreement, January 9, 2001; Engineering News-Record; Willdan Financial Services.

The inflation adjustment procedure in the Solano Properties, LLC Development Agreement, which covers Riverwalk, is more complicated than the inflation adjustments in the other development agreements. The Solano Properties, LLC Development Agreement establishes the following inflation update procedure:

- Roadway and Park and Recreational Facilities Fees shall be adjusted annually based on the percentage change in the *Engineering News-Record* San Francisco Construction Cost Index (CCI) for the previous year. The Municipal Facilities Impact Fee shall be adjusted based on the *Engineering News-Record* San Francisco Building Cost Index (BCI).
- On the first anniversary of the effective date of the development agreement, the development fees (as adjusted for inflation) shall be increased by 25 percent.
- Thereafter, the development impact fees shall be increased annually by twice the change in the applicable cost index for the previous year.
- If the City adopts a new impact fee program and fees under the new program are lower than the current fees established by the development agreement, the developer shall pay the fees established by the new impact fee program.

To date, the City has not calculated the fee increases provided for under the Development Agreement. Therefore, it is assumed that the fee levels under the today are the levels identified in the Agreement, with no adjustments.

Because fees will increase at double the rate of inflation, the present value of fees that will be paid by development in Riverwalk depends on the rate of future increases in the applicable cost indexes and the year in which the development occurs. For the purposes of these projections, it is assumed that, on average, development subject to the agreement will occur at the midpoint of the period the development agreement is in effect, or 2018. It is also assumed that, in the future, the BCI and CCI will

increase at the average annual rate at which they increased over the past 10 years. Projected fee levels in 2018 are discounted to their present value in 2010 dollars based on the projected BCI and CCI inflation rates. **Table 9** shows the factors used to estimate the present value of future fees that will be paid by development in Riverwalk.

**Table 9: Solano Properties, LLC Development Agreement Inflation Adjustments**

		Roadway - CCI	Parks and Trails - CCI	Municipal Facilities - BCI
<i>Adjustment to Average Fees During Development Period</i>				
Average Annual Increase in Index, 2001-2010	A	2.70%	2.70%	3.05%
Double Annual Increase	$B = 2 * A$	5.40%	5.40%	6.10%
Fee Adjustment 2010 to 2018, Nominal Dollars	$C = (1 + B)^8$	152%	152%	161%
<b>Fee Adjustment 2010 to 2018, 2010 Dollars</b>	$D = C / (1 + A)^8$	<b>123%</b>	<b>123%</b>	<b>126%</b>

Sources: Solano Properties, LLC Development Agreement; Rio Vista Resolution 2003-04; Engineering News-Record; Willdan Financial Services.

**Table 10** shows the estimated current impact fees that would be charged under the Solano Properties, LLC Development Agreement, as well as the estimated present value of the average fees that will be charged during under the Development Agreement throughout the period the Agreement is in effect.

**Table 10: Solano Properties, LLC (Riverwalk) Development Agreement Impact Fees**

Land Use	Current Fee (2010)	Inflation Amount to Average Fee During DA Term	Projected Average Fee During DA Term (2010\$) <sup>3</sup>
<i>Roadway</i> <sup>1</sup>			
Single Family	\$ 7,828	23%	\$ 9,628
Multi-family	5,451	23%	6,705
Commercial	1.42	23%	1.75
Industrial/Service/Other	0.69	23%	0.85
<i>Municipal Facilities Impact Fee</i> <sup>1</sup>			
Single Family	\$ 3,782	26%	\$ 4,765
Multi-family	2,635	26%	3,320
Nonresidential (all)	0.70	26%	0.88
<i>Neighborhood Parks</i> <sup>2</sup>			
Single Family	\$ 1,458	23%	\$ 1,793
Multi-family	819	23%	1,007
Nonresidential (all)	0.29	23%	0.36
<i>Community Parks</i> <sup>2</sup>			
Single Family	\$ 2,368	23%	\$ 2,913
Multi-family	1,333	23%	1,640
<i>Trails</i> <sup>2</sup>			
Single Family	\$ 592	23%	\$ 728
Multi-family	333	23%	410

<sup>1</sup> Current fee shown is original fee level specified in Development Agreement. Development Agreement includes additional adjustments that were to be applied on the first anniversary of the effective date of the Agreement. If these adjustments are applied, fees will be at least 25% higher than identified here.

<sup>2</sup> Current park and trails fee amounts charged to development without development agreements under Resolution 2003-04. Development Agreement states that development will be subject to current fees set forth in Resolution 2003-04, subject to adjustments contained therein and in the Development Agreement. Development Agreement includes additional adjustments that were to be applied on the first anniversary of the effective date of the Agreement. If these adjustments are applied, fees will be at least 25% higher than identified here.

<sup>3</sup> Development agreement states that if City adopts new impact fees, developer will pay the lesser of (1) the fees set forth in the Development Agreement, including adjustments set forth in the Development Agreement, of (2) fees charged under the new impact fee program. The Development fees set forth in Development Agreement are shown here.

Sources: Table 9; Solano Properties, LLC Development Agreement; Willdan Financial Services.

As noted above, the actual present value of impact fees charged under the Solano Properties, LLC Development Agreement will depend on the year in which development occurs and the amount of inflation that has occurred. The present value of actual fee revenue could be approximately 30 percent higher or lower than the projected values, depending on when development occurs and how much

inflation occurs. For example, if development occurs, on average, in the fifteenth year of the development agreement term (2023) the present value of fee revenue would be approximately 15 percent higher than the estimates shown. If development occurs, on average, in 2023 and inflation averages one percentage point higher than the average rate over the past 10 years, the present value of fee revenue would be approximately 30 percent higher.

In addition to the impact fees established by the Development Agreement, the Development Agreement states that the developer will provide up to \$5 million to design and construct a new fire and police facility to mitigate the project's increased demand for fire protection services. The City will reimburse the developer for this funding, potentially by forming a Community Facilities District (CFD) in Riverwalk and other new development areas. The CFD would levy a special tax and issue bonds to reimburse the developer for their funding of the fire and police facility.

## **Revenue Projections**

**Tables 11 through 13** show the projected fee revenue from development in areas with development agreements, in current 2010 dollars. The revenue projections are based on the residential and nonresidential development projections shown in Tables 1 and 5 and the current development agreement fee levels shown in the tables above.

**Table 11: Roadway Fee Revenue from Growth Under Development Agreements (2010\$)**

	Fee per Unit	Units of Development	Fee Revenue
<b><i>Brann Ranch</i></b>			
Single Family	\$ 6,940 per unit	855	\$ 5,933,700
Multi-family	4,368 per unit	-	-
Retail & Office	1.32 per sq. ft.	39,300	51,900
Industrial/Service/Other	0.64 per sq. ft.	112,900	72,300
Subtotal			\$ 6,057,900
<b><i>Gibbs Ranch (Liberty)</i></b>			
Unrestricted DU	\$ 7,723 per unit	680	\$ 5,251,600
Commercial	1.44 per sq. ft.	295,500	425,500
Subtotal			\$ 5,677,100
<b><i>Marks Ranch (Trilogy)</i></b>			
Senior Dwelling Unit	\$ 5,378 per unit	1,000	\$ 5,378,100
Commercial	1.44 per sq. ft.	448,500	646,500
Subtotal			\$ 6,024,600
<b><i>Riverwalk<sup>1</sup></i></b>			
Single Family	\$ 9,628 per unit	720	\$ 6,932,500
Multi-family	6,705 per unit	240	1,609,100
Commercial	1.75 per sq. ft.	107,800	188,700
Industrial/Service/Other	0.85 per sq. ft.	-	-
Subtotal			\$ 8,730,300
<b>Total Roadway Fee Revenue</b>			<b>\$ 26,490,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> Development agreement states that if City adopts new impact fees, developer will pay the lesser of (1) the fees set forth in the Development Agreement, including adjustments set forth in the Development Agreement, of (2) fees charged under the new impact fee program. The Development fees set forth in Development Agreement are shown here.

**Table 12: Public/Municipal Facilities Fee Revenue from Growth Under Development Agreements (2010\$)**

	Fee per Unit	Units of Development	Fee Revenue
<i><u>Brann Ranch</u></i>			
Single Family	\$ 3,630 per unit	855	\$ 3,103,700
Multi-family	2,529 per unit	-	-
Nonresidential	0.70 per sq. ft.	152,200	<u>106,500</u>
Subtotal			\$ 3,210,200
<i><u>Gibbs Ranch (Liberty)</u></i>			
Unrestricted DU	\$ 3,784 per unit	680	\$ 2,573,100
Commercial	0.72 per sq. ft.	295,500	<u>212,800</u>
Subtotal			\$ 2,785,900
<i><u>Marks Ranch (Trilogy)</u></i>			
Senior Dwelling Unit	\$ 2,635 per unit	1,000	\$ 2,635,000
Commercial	0.72 per sq. ft.	448,500	<u>323,200</u>
Subtotal			\$ 2,958,200
<i><u>Riverwalk</u><sup>1</sup></i>			
Single Family	\$ 4,765 per unit	720	\$ 3,431,000
Multi-family	3,320 per unit	240	796,800
Nonresidential	0.88 per sq. ft.	107,800	<u>95,100</u>
Subtotal			\$ 4,322,900
<b>Total Public/Municipal Fee Revenue</b>			<b>\$ 13,277,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> Development agreement states that if City adopts new impact fees, developer will pay the lesser of (1) the fees set forth in the Development Agreement, including adjustments set forth in the Development Agreement, of (2) fees charged under the new impact fee program. The Development fees set forth in Development Agreement are shown here.

**Table 13: Parks and Trails Fee Revenue from Growth Under Development Agreements (2010\$)**

	Fee per Unit	Units of Development	Fee Revenue
<b>Neighborhood Parks</b>			
<i>Brann Ranch</i>			
Single Family	\$ 1,536 per unit	855	\$ 1,313,300
Multi-family	762 per unit	-	-
Nonresidential	0.27 per sq. ft.	152,200	41,100
Subtotal			\$ 1,354,400
<i>Gibbs Ranch (Liberty)</i>			
Single Family	\$ 1,458 per unit	680	\$ 991,400
Apartment	819 per unit	-	-
Commercial	0.29 per sq. ft.	295,500	85,700
Subtotal			\$ 1,077,100
<i>Marks Ranch (Trilogy)</i>			
No park fees or park dedication requirements for development of the Senior Unit project.			
Commercial	\$ 0.29 per sq. ft.	448,500	129,300
Subtotal			\$ 129,300
<i>Riverwalk<sup>1</sup></i>			
Single Family	\$ 1,793 per unit	720	\$ 1,291,200
Multi-family	1,007 per unit	240	241,800
Commercial	0.36 per sq. ft.	107,800	38,500
Subtotal			\$ 1,571,500
<b>Total Neighborhood Parks Revenue</b>			<b>\$ 4,132,300</b>
<b>Community Parks</b>			
<i>Brann Ranch</i>			
Single Family	\$ 2,203 per unit	855	\$ 1,883,600
Multi-family	1,240 per unit	-	-
Subtotal			\$ 1,883,600
<i>Gibbs Ranch (Liberty)</i>			
Single Family	\$ 2,368 per unit	680	\$ 1,610,200
Apartment	1,333 per unit	-	-
Subtotal			\$ 1,610,200
<i>Riverwalk<sup>1</sup></i>			
Single Family	\$ 2,913 per unit	720	\$ 2,097,100
Multi-family	1,640 per unit	240	393,500
Subtotal			\$ 2,490,600
<b>Total Community Parks Revenue</b>			<b>\$ 5,984,400</b>
<b>Trails</b>			
<i>Riverwalk<sup>1</sup></i>			
Single Family	\$ 728 per unit	720	\$ 524,300
Multi-family	410 per unit	240	98,300
Subtotal			\$ 622,600
<b>Total Parks and Trails Fee Revenue</b>			<b>\$ 10,739,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> Development agreement states that if City adopts new impact fees, developer will pay the lesser of (1) the fees set forth in the Development Agreement, including adjustments set forth in the Development Agreement, of (2) fees charged under the new impact fee program. The Development fees set forth in Development Agreement are shown here.