## ATTACHMENT 1

Public Finance and Urban Economics

## MEMORANDUM

October 20, 2017
TO: Brian Johnson, City of Hesperia
Nils Bentsen, City of Hesperia
FROM: Andrea Roess, Managing Director
Steve Runk, Vice President
Nehal Thumar, Vice President
SUBJECT: Draft DIF Technical Study

This memo serves as a brief description of the draft fee study analysis that David Taussig \& Associates, Inc. prepared for the City. DTA has had numerous meetings with City staff members and the Council subcommittee. The draft analysis is expected to be presented to the entire City Council at a Council meeting in the near future. Once the City Council has approved the proposed fee amounts in concept, we will begin preparing the full fee study report which will then come back to City Council for approval. This memo provides a summary of our analysis and a description of each of the fee categories. The detailed demographics and fee calculations are included as Exhibit A herein ("DTA's Current Fee Study Model").

Please see below for a summary of the proposed fee amounts for each fee category by land use.
City of Hesperia
Development Impact Fee Summary

| Development Impact Fee Category | Area to Which the Fee is Imposed | Single Family Residence (Per Unit) | Multi- <br> Family Residence (Per Unit) | Commercial/ Office/Retail <br> (Per 1,000 SF) | Industrial <br> (Per 1,000 <br> SF) | Hotel/Motel (per Room) [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fire Suppression Facilities | City-Wide (Does not Include Tapestry) | \$652 | \$494 | \$188 | \$915 | \$88 |
| Police Facilities | City-Wide <br> (Includes Tapestry) | \$10 | \$8 | \$4 | \$16 | \$2 |
| Animal Control Facilities | City-Wide (Includes Tapestry) | \$223 | \$179 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| City Hall Facilities | City-Wide (Includes Tapestry) | \$530 | \$426 | \$203 | \$837 | \$81 |
| Records Storage Facilities | City-Wide (Includes Tapestry) | \$26 | \$21 | \$10 | \$41 | \$4 |
| Drainage Facilities | City-Wide (Includes Tapestry) | \$963 | \$367 | \$300 | \$632 | \$213 |
| Transportation Facilities | City-Wide <br> (Does not Include Tapestry) | \$9,976 | \$6,911 | \$13,833 | \$7,266 | \$9,299 |
| Total |  | \$12,381 | \$8,407 | \$14,538 | \$9,707 | \$9,686 |
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## Demographics

In order to determine the public facilities needed to serve new development as well as establish proposed fee amounts to fund such facilities, DTA coordinated with the City's planning department to establish the existing and future demographics and development data used in our Fee Study Model. For purposes of the projection of future population and employment growth, the City categorizes developable land uses as residential and non-residential property. Residential property is further categorized into Single Family and Multi-family residences. Nonresidential property is further categorized into Commercial/Office/Retail, Industrial, and Hotel/Motel uses. Based on these designations, DTA established fees for these land use categorizes to acknowledge the difference in impacts resulting from various land uses and to make the resulting fee program implementable.

Data sources include California Department of Finance, the City of Hesperia's 2010 General Plan, the Environmental Impact Report for Tapestry Specific Plan, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), and other information provided by the City.

As shown on Page 1 of the Fee Study Model (Exhibit A), the total development expected at buildout (2040) (excluding the Tapestry Specific Plan) consists of 137,391 residents, 41,633 residential units, 28,344 employees, 605 Hotel/Motel rooms and 13.59 million SF of nonresidential buildings.

The total development expected at buildout (2040) (including the Tapestry Specific Plan) consists of 185,071 residents, 57,829 residential units, 30,094 employees, 605 Hotel/Motel rooms, and 14.29 million SF of non-residential buildings.

To ensure that a reasonable relationship is maintained within the proposed fee structure, our Fee Study Model uses an Equivalent Dwelling Unit ("EDU"), Equivalent Runoff Unit ("ERU"), or Average Daily Trip ("ADT") methodology. This approach uses, for given land uses, a method of comparison of that land use to a baseline land use, using a common demand variable. Each land use has different levels of demand for the new facilities depending upon the demand variable most closely related to the determination of the size, extent and cost of the facility in question.

Please see below for a brief summary of each fee category. Please note that all of the facilities needs and costs indicated herein were provided by the City.

## Fire Suppression Facilities

As shown on Page 2, Table 2 of Exhibit A, the total project cost for the proposed Fire Suppression Facilities is $\$ 19,173,000$, of which $47.06 \%$ of the costs will be allocated to existing development and $52.94 \%$ of the costs will be financed through the Fire Suppression Facilities Impact Fee. The Fire Suppression Fee will fund the construction of two new fire stations, as well as a 4,200 sq. ft. expansion of an existing fire station. The proposed fee is calculated based on a proportionate share of total Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDUs), with a credit applied to the existing development and excluding the Tapestry Specific Plan.

## Police Facilities

As shown on Page 3, Table 1 of Exhibit A, the total project cost needed for the proposed Police Facilities is $\$ 680,826$, of which $50.46 \%$ of the costs will be allocated to existing development and $49.54 \%$ of the costs will be financed through the Police Facilities Impact Fee. The Police

Facilities Fee will be used to fund new police cameras and equipment. The proposed fee is calculated based on a proportionate share of total EDUs and includes the Tapestry Specific Plan.

## Animal Control Facilities

As shown on Page 4, Table 2 of Exhibit A, the total project cost needed for the proposed Animal Control Facilities is $\$ 12,600,000$, of which $50.00 \%$ of the costs will be allocated to existing development and $50.00 \%$ of the costs will be financed through the Animal Control Facilities Impact Fee. The Animal Control Facilities Fee will be used to fund the construction of a new $36,000 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$. animal control facility. The proposed fee is calculated based on a proportionate share of total EDUs and includes the Tapestry Specific Plan.

## City Hall Facilities

As shown on Page 5, Table 2 of Exhibit A, the total project cost needed for the proposed City Hall Facilities is $\$ 19,782,375$, of which $87.25 \%$ of the costs will be financed through the City Hall Facilities Impact Fee and $12.75 \%$ of the costs will be financed through the City's General Fund. The City Hall Facilities Fee will be used to pay the outstanding debt service on the 2013 Civic Plaza Bonds. The proposed fee is calculated based on the expected total number of future EDUs and includes the Tapestry Specific Plan.

## Records Storage Facilities

As shown on Page 6, Table 2 of Exhibit A, the total project cost needed for the proposed Record Storage Facilities is $\$ 1,716,000$, of which $50.46 \%$ of the costs will be allocated to existing development and $49.54 \%$ will be financed through the Records Storage Facilities Impact Fee. The Records Storage Facilities Fee will be used to fund the construction of a new $6,000 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$. records storage facility. The proposed fee is calculated based on a proportionate share of total EDUs and includes the Tapestry Specific Plan.

## Drainage Facilities

As shown on Page 8, Table 4 of Exhibit A, the total project cost needed for the proposed Drainage Facilities is $\$ 57,700,000$, of which $50.25 \%$ of the costs will be allocated to existing development and $49.75 \%$ will be financed through the Drainage Facilities Impact Fee. The Drainage Facilities Fee will be used to fund $\$ 28,707,456$ of flood detention basins, storm drain lines, storm drain systems, and street crossings. This amount is allocated to the various land uses by relative runoff contribution using rational method hydrology analysis.

## Transportation Facilities

As shown on Page 9, Table T2 of Exhibit A, the total project cost needed for the proposed Transportation Facilities is $\$ 334,596,941$, of which $41.46 \%$ of the costs will be allocated to existing development and $58.54 \%$ will be financed through the Transportation Facilities Impact Fee. The Transportation Facilities Fee will be used to construct freeway exchanges, overpasses, arterials, intersection expansions, and a transit facility. The cost allocated to new development is shown in Table T2, "Transportation Needs List" and only includes the "Baseline Costs." The fee assigned to each land use is determined by first calculating the number of future average daily vehicular trips ("ADTs"), then calculating the cost per ADT, and finally multiplying the average daily trip rate by the cost per ADT for each land use, as shown on Tables 1 thru 4, Page 10. These calculations do not include the impacts from the Tapestry specific plan.
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If you have any questions or comments please do not hesitate to contact us at (949) 955-1500.

## Exhibit A

## DTA’s Current Fee Study Model

| Residential Property | Existing Development (2015) |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total } \\ \text { Existing EDUs } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Residents | Number of Residential Units | Residents per Residential Unit | EDUS per Residential Unit |  |
| Single Family | 83,974 [2] | 25,747 [1] | 3.26 | 1.00 | 25,747 |
| Muti-Family | 8,203 [2] | 3,320 [1] | 2.47 | 0.76 | 2,515 |
| Subtotal | 92,177 [1] | 29,067 [1] |  |  | 28,262 |
| Non-Residential Property | Number of Employees | Number of Non-Residential SF/Rooms | Employees per 1,000 Non-Res. SF/Room | $\begin{array}{r} \text { EDUs per } \\ 1,000 \text { Non-Res. SF } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total } \\ \text { Existing EDUs } \end{array}$ |
| Commercial/office | 6,157 [3, 10] | 5,790,617 [4, 10] | 1.06 | 0.33 | 1,888 |
| Industrial | 9,618 [3] | 1,853,804 [4] | 5.19 | 1.59 | 2,949 |
| Hotel/Motel | 197 [12] | 393 [11] | 0.50 | 0.15 | 60 |
| Subtotal | 15,971 [3] | 7,644,421 |  |  | 4,897 |
| Grand Total |  |  |  |  | 33,159 |


| Residential Property | Future Development (2016-2040) (Does not include Tapestry) |  |  |  | Total Future EDUs (w/out Tapestry) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Residents | Number of Residential Units | Residents per Residential Unit | EDUS per Residential Unit |  |
| Single Family | 41,190 [5] | 11,131 [6] | 3.70 | 1.00 | 11,131 |
| Multi-Family | 4,024 [5] | 1,435 [6] | 2.80 | 0.76 | 1,087 |
| Subtotal | 45,214 | 12,566 |  |  | 12,218 |
| Non-Residential Property | Number of Employees | Number of Non-Residential SF/Rooms | Employees per 1,000 Non-Res. SF/Room | EDUs per 1,000 Non-Res. SF/Room | Total Future EDUs (w/out Tapestry) |
| Commercia//office | 4,816 [3, 10] | 4,518,900 [7, 10] | 1.07 | 0.29 | 1,301 |
| Industrial | 7,451 [3] | 1,436,072 [7] | 5.19 | 1.40 | 2,014 |
| Hotel/Motel | 106 [12] | 212 [11] | 0.50 | 0.14 | $\underline{29}$ |
| Subtotal | 12,373 [3] | 5,954,972 |  |  | 3,344 |
| Grand Total |  |  |  |  | 15,562 |


| Residential Property | Future Development (2016-2040) (Including Tapestry) |  |  |  | Total Future EDUs (including Tapestry) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Residents | Number of Residential Units | Residents per Residential Unit | EDUS per Residential Unit |  |
| Single Family | 86,146 [8] | 26,207 [8] | 3.29 | 1.00 | 26,207 |
| Multi-Family | 6,748 [8] | 2,555 [8] | 2.64 | 0.80 | 2,053 |
| Subtotal | 92,894 [8] | 28,762 [8] |  |  | 28,260 |
| Non-Residential Property | Number of Employees | Number of Non-Residential SF | Employees per 1,000 Non-Res. SF/Room | $\begin{array}{r} \text { EDUs per } \\ 1,000 \text { Non-Res. } \mathrm{SF} / \text { Room } \end{array}$ | Total Future EDUs (including Tapestry) |
| Commercial/office | 6,566 [9, 10] | 5,218,900 [9, 10] | 1.26 | 0.38 | 1,997 |
| Industrial | 7,451 [3] | 1,436,072 [7] | 5.19 | 1.58 | 2,267 |
| Hotel/Motel | 106 [12] | 212 [11] | 0.50 | 0.15 | 32 |
| Subtotal | 14,123 | 6,654,972 |  |  | 4,296 |
| Grand Total |  |  |  |  | 32,556 |


| Residential Property | Total Development (2040) (Does not include Tapestry) |  |  |  | Total Future EDUs (w/out Tapestry) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Residents | Number of Residential Units | Residents per Residential Unit | EDUS per Residential Unit |  |
| Single Family | 125,164 | 36,878 | 3.39 | 0.92 | 36,878 |
| Multi-Family | 12,227 | 4,755 | 2.57 | $\underline{0.69}$ | 3,603 |
| Subtotal | 137,391 | 41,633 |  |  | 40,481 |
| Non-Residential Property | Number of Employees | Number of Non-Residential SF/Rooms | Employees per 1,000 Non-Res. SF/Room | EDUs per 1,000 Non-Res. SF/Room | Total Future EDUs (w/out Tapestry) |
| Commercia//office | 10,973 | 10,309,517 | 1.06 | 0.29 | 3,189 |
| Industrial | 17,069 | 3,289,876 | 5.19 | 1.40 | 4,962 |
| Hotel/Motel | 303 | 605 | 0.50 | $\underline{0.14}$ | 89 |
| Subtotal | 28,344 | 13,599,393 |  |  | 8,152 |
| Grand Total |  |  |  |  | 48,632 |


| Residential Property | Total Development (2040) (Including Tapestry) |  |  |  | Total Future EDUs (including Tapestry) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Residents | Number of Residential Units | Residents per Residential Unit | $\begin{array}{r} \text { EDUS per } \\ \text { Residential Unit } \end{array}$ |  |
| Single Family | 170,120 | 51,954 | 3.27 | 0.88 | 51,954 |
| Muti-Family | 14,951 | 5,875 | 2.54 | 0.69 | 4,568 |
| Subtotal | 185,071 | 57,829 |  |  | 56,522 |
| Non-Residential Property | Number of Employees | Number of Non-Residential SF/Rooms | Employees per 1,000 Non-Res. SF/Room | $\begin{array}{r} \text { EDUs per } \\ 1,000 \text { Non-Res. SF/Room } \end{array}$ | Total Future EDUs (including Tapestry) |
| Commercial/office | 12,723 | 11,009,517 | 1.16 | 0.31 | 3,885 |
| Industrial | 17,069 | 3,289,876 | 5.19 | 1.40 | 5,216 |
| Hotel/Motel | 303 | 605 | 0.50 | 0.14 | 92 |
| Subtotal | 30,094 | 14,299,393 |  |  | 9,193 |
| Grand Total |  |  |  |  | 65,715 |

11) Based on data provided by Califorinia Department of finance as of $1 / 1 / 15$.


15 Based on population per household factors ssed for existing development and increased such factors so that the werall persons per household is sequal to the werall rate of 3.60 persons per housemold provided by the city


19 Based on Exhbit $A$-3 of fiscal Impact Repont for the Tapesty Project dated $8 / 27 / 4$ p repared by DTA

12) Based on 0.50 emplopyes per roon.

| City of Hesperia Fire Suppression Facilities Fee Calculation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inventory of Existing Facilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Facility | Location | Description | Facility Unit | Square Feet |  |  |  |  |
| Fire Station 301 | 943011 th Ave. | Will be torn down and rebuilt | SF | 3,700 |  |  |  |  |
| Fire Station 302 | 17288 Olive St. | Will be torn down and rebuilt | SF | 3,435 |  |  |  |  |
| Fire Station 304 | 15660 Eucalyptus St. | Will be expanded | SF | 5,627 |  |  |  |  |
| Fire Station 305 | 8331 Caliente Rd. | No change | SF | 19,098 |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal for Facilities to remain at buildout |  |  |  | 24,725 |  |  |  |  |
| Total for all existing Facilities |  |  |  | 31,860 |  |  |  |  |
| Table 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposed Facilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Facility |  |  |  |  |
| Facility | Location | Facility Unit | Number | Cost |  |  |  |  |
| Tear Down and Rebuild Fire Station 301 | 9430 11th Ave. | SF | 15,200 | \$7,600,000 |  |  |  |  |
| Tear Down and Rebuild Fire Station 302 | 17288 Olive St. | SF | 18,200 | \$9,240,000 |  |  |  |  |
| Fire Station 304 Expansion | 15660 Eucalyptus St. | SF | 4,200 | \$2,333,000 |  |  |  |  |
| Total Facilities Cost |  | NA | 37,600 | \$19,173,000 |  |  |  |  |
| Table 3Allocation of Facilities to Existing and New Development (Does not inlude Tapestry Specific Plan) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Allocation of Facilities to Existing and New Development (Does not inlude Tapestry Specific Plan) Based on Total EDUs - Credit given to existing development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Percentage of | Total SF |  |  | Percentage of |  |  |
| Type of Development | EDUs | Total EDUs | in 2040 | SF Credit | Allocated SF | Costs Allocated | Total Cost |  |
| Existing Development | 33,159 | 68.06\% | 42,418 | $(24,725)$ | 17,693 | 47.06\% | \$9,021,857 |  |
| Future Development | 15,562 | 31.94\% | 19,907 | 0 | 19,907 | 52.94\% | \$10,151,143 |  |
| Total | 48,721 | 100.00\% | 62,325 | $(24,725)$ | 37,600 | 100.00\% | \$19,173,000 |  |
| Table 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposed Facilities and Cost Per EDU |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Number of | Cost |  |  |  |  |  |
| Facility | Cost | Future EDUs | Per EDU |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tear Down and Rebuild Fire Station 301 | \$4,023,819 | 15,562 | \$259 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tear Down and Rebuild Fire Station 302 | \$4,892,117 | 15,562 | \$314 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fire Station 304 Expansion | \$1,235,207 | 15,562 | \$79 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | \$10,151,143 | NA | \$652 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Table 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Development Impact Fee per Unit or 1,000 SF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | EDUs per | EDUs per | EDUs per | Fees per | Fees per | Fees per | Cost Financed |  |
| Land Use Type | Unit | $1,000 \mathrm{SF}$ | Room | Unit | 1,000 SF | Room | by DIF |  |
| Single Family | 1.00 | NA | NA | \$652 | NA | NA | \$7,260,764 |  |
| Multi-Family | 0.76 | NA | NA | \$494 | NA | NA | \$709,330 |  |
| Commercial/Office | NA | 0.29 | NA | NA | \$188 | NA | \$848,940 |  |
| Industrial | NA | 1.40 | NA | NA | \$915 | NA | \$1,313,424 |  |
| Hotel/Motel | NA | NA | 0.14 | NA | NA | \$88 | \$18,685 |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$10,151,143 | 52.94\% |
| Cost Allocated to Existing Development |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$9,021,857 | 47.06\% |
| Total Cost of Fire Suppression Facilities |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$19,173,000 |  |

Table 1
Proposed

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Facility | Location | Facility Unit | Number | Facility <br> Cost |
| Mobile Cameras |  |  |  |  |
| Mobile LPR 4 Camera Unit | NA | Units | 15 | \$190,500 |
| Fixed Cameras |  |  |  |  |
| ALPR Camera | Bear Valley Rd \& Mariposa Rd | Unit | 1 | \$86,532 |
| ALPR Camera | Bear Valley Rd \& Hesperia Rd | Unit | 1 | \$73,310 |
| ALPR Camera | Bear Valley Rd and I Ave | Unit | 1 | \$73,310 |
| ALPR Camera | Bear Valley Rd \& Jacaranda Ave | Unit | 1 | \$60,088 |
| ALPR Camera | Main St \& Rock Springs Rd | Unit | 1 | \$90,132 |
| ALPR Camera | Ranchero Rd \& Santa Fe Ave | Unit | 1 | \$106,954 |
| Total Facilities Cost |  | NA | 21 | \$680,826 |
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City of Hesperia
Animal Control Facilities
Fee Calculation
Table 4
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## Table 1

City of Hesperia
City Hall Facilities

[1] Based on information provided by City, all $\$ 17,260,122$ in debt service allocated to the DIF is for costs associated with the Civic Plaza Project needed for new development only.
Table 4


DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS

| Project Number | Location | Improvement Type |  | Cost | \% of Cost Allocated to New Development | Cost Allocated to New Development |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Escondido Ave. Basin, Revised <br> Line A-04 Drainage and Eucalyptus St. basin | Detention Basins and Storm Drain Lines | \$ | 21,120,000 | 49.75\% | \$10,507,824 |
| 2 | Sultana St. Storm Drain, Line H01 | Storm Drain Line | \$ | 9,190,000 | 49.75\% | \$4,572,297 |
| 3 | 3d Ave btwn Mauna Loa St. and Hercules St.- | Storm Drain System | \$ | 1,400,000 | 49.75\% | \$696,541 |
| 4 | Arrowhead Lake Rd. btwn Centennial St. and Sutter St. | Street Crossing / Culvert | \$ | 970,000 | 49.75\% | \$482,604 |
| 5 | Lemon St. btwn G Avenue and H Ave. | Street Crossing / Culvert | \$ | 800,000 | 49.75\% | \$398,024 |
| 6 | Lemon St. btwn C Avenue and E Ave. | Street Crossing / Culvert | \$ | 1,300,000 | 49.75\% | \$646,788 |
| 7 | E Avenue and G Avenue | Street Crossings and Trapeziodal Channel South and West of the Intersection of E Ave. and G Ave. | \$ | 2,320,000 | 49.75\% | \$1,154,269 |
| 8 | Orchard Ave. north of Lilac | Street Crossing | \$ | 660,000 | 49.75\% | \$328,370 |
| 9 | Talisman north of Valencia St. | Storm Drain System | \$ | 2,040,000 | 49.75\% | \$1,014,960 |
| 10 | Hesperia Masterplan of Drainage, Facility line \#H-01 Mojave River to 3rd Avenue | Storm Drain System | \$ | 9,900,000 | 49.75\% | \$4,925,543 |
| 11 | Local Retention Basins (city wide) | Flood control basins | \$ | 8,000,000 | 49.75\% | \$3,980,237 |
|  |  |  | \$ | 57,700,000 |  | \$28,707,456 |



Table 3


Table 4


TABLE T2
Transportation Needs List

| Facility/Location | Limits | Included in DIF Allocation? |  | Project Cost ${ }^{1}$ | \% Allocation to New Development ${ }^{2}$ | Cost to be Funded by DIF |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Freeway Exchanges \& Overpass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (All to be Federal Funds w/City Match) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baseline: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{l}-15$ at Mojave Interchange ${ }^{4}$ |  | $80^{0^{0 i n}}$ | \$ | 54,609,000 | 55.40\% | \$ | 30,253,386 |
| $\mathrm{l}-15$ at Muscatel Interchange ${ }^{4}$ |  |  | \$ | 38,059,000 | 58.70\% | \$ | 22,340,633 |
| $\mathrm{l}-15$ at Ranchero Interchange ${ }^{3}$ |  |  | \$ | 58,912,652 | 54.48\% | \$ | 32,096,529 |
| Lemon at Mauna Loa Grade Separation ${ }^{4}$ |  |  | \$ | 41,348,000 | 58.90\% | \$ | 24,353,972 |
| Sub total Baseline |  |  | \$ | 192,928,652 |  | \$ | 109,044,520 |
| Other Needed Projects: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{I}-15$ at Eucalyptus |  | no | \$ | - | 57.40\% | \$ | - |
| Eucalyptus Grade Separation |  | no | \$ | - | 58.90\% | \$ | - |
| Sultana Graded Separation |  | no | \$ | - | 65.00\% | \$ | - |
| Sub total Other Projects |  |  | \$ | - |  | \$ | - |
| Total Freeway Exchanges and Overpasses |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 109,044,520 |
| Major Arterials |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baseline |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bear Valley Road $\quad$ Interstate 15 to Bridge over Mojave River |  | $\beta^{\sigma^{0}}$ | \$ | 4,244,000 | 65.00\% | \$ | 2,758,600 |
| Main Street | US Highway 395 to Mesa Linda Rd |  | \$ | 1,592,000 | 65.00\% | \$ | 1,034,800 |
| Main Street | Escondido to 11th (Includes Aqueduct Crossing) |  | \$ | 27,875,000 | 58.70\% | \$ | 16,362,625 |
| Main Street | 11th to 9th |  | \$ | 2,899,000 | 58.70\% | \$ | 1,701,713 |
| Mojave/ Mauna Loa/ Lemon | 1-15 to Maple |  | \$ | 11,984,000 | 65.00\% | \$ | 7,789,600 |
| Mojave/ Mauna Loa/ Lemon | Maple to 7th |  | \$ | 8,812,000 | 65.00\% | \$ | 5,727,800 |
| Mojave/ Mauna Loa/ Lemon | 7th to I Ave |  | \$ | 4,760,000 | 65.00\% | \$ | 3,094,000 |
| Ranchero Road | Mariposa to UP RR X-ing |  | \$ | 2,766,000 | 58.70\% | \$ | 1,623,642 |
| Ranchero Road | Topaz to 7th (Includes Acqueduct Crossing) |  | \$ | 18,024,000 | 58.70\% | \$ | 10,580,088 |
| Ranchero Road ${ }^{5}$ | 7th to Danbury (includes RR Grade Sep) |  | \$ | 750,000 | 100.00\% | \$ | 750,000 |
| Sub total Baseline |  |  | \$ | 83,706,000 |  | \$ | 51,422,868 |
| Other Needed Projects: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Escondido AvenueMain Street | Mariposa to Main (Includes Aqueduct Crossing) | no | \$ | - | 65.00\% | \$ | - |
|  | 9th to I Ave. | no | \$ | - | 65.00\% | \$ | - |
| Sub total Other Projects |  |  | \$ | - |  | \$ | $-$ |
|  |  |  | \$ | 83,706,000 |  | \$ | 51,422,868 |
| Arterials |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baseline |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hesperia Road | Bear Valley Road to Yucca | $80^{0^{80}}$ | \$ | 5,465,757 | 65.00\% | \$ | 3,552,742 |
| Hesperia Road | Sultana to Main Street |  | \$ | 1,326,125 | 65.00\% | \$ | 861,981 |
| "I" Avenue | Bear Valley Road to Main Street |  | \$ | 7,347,793 | 65.00\% | \$ | 4,776,065 |
| "I" Avenue | Main Street to Ranchero Road |  | \$ | 6,993,453 | 65.00\% | \$ | 4,545,744 |
| 7th Avenue | Bear Valley Road to Ranchero Road |  | \$ | 14,474,920 | 65.00\% | \$ | 9,408,698 |
| Ranchero Road | Danbury to I Ave. |  | \$ | 3,130,000 | 65.00\% | \$ | 2,034,500 |
| Rock Springs Road | Glendale to east City Limits |  | \$ | 1,273,080 | 65.00\% | \$ | 827,502 |
| Sultana Street | Mariposa Avenue to Escondido Avenue |  | \$ | 636,540 | 65.00\% | \$ | 413,751 |
| Sub total Baseline |  |  | \$ | 40,647,668 |  | \$ | 26,420,984 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arrowhead Lake Road | Rock Springs to South of Hesperia Lakes | no | \$ | - | 65.00\% | \$ | - |
| "C" Avenue | RR Xing to Sultana | no | \$ | - | 65.00\% | \$ | - |
| Cottonwood Avenue | Bear Valley to Main | no | \$ | - | 65.00\% | \$ | - |
| "E" Avenue | "I" to Lime | no | \$ | - | 65.00\% | \$ | - |
| 11th Avenue | Bear Valley to Main | no | \$ | - | 65.00\% | \$ | - |
| Lassen Road | Sultana to Poplar | no | \$ | - | 65.00\% | \$ | - |
| Maple Avenue | Mariposa to Ranchero (Includes Aqueduct Crossing) | no | \$ | - | 65.00\% | \$ | - |
| Sub total Other Projects |  |  | \$ | - |  | \$ | $-$ |
| Total Arterials |  |  | \$ | 40,647,668 |  | \$ | 26,420,984 |
| Secondary Arterials |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baseline |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Danbury | Ranchero to Arrowhead Lake Road | $80^{0^{005}}$ | \$ | 7,062,411 | 65.00\% | \$ | 4,590,567 |
| Muscatel Street | Mariposa to Vincent |  | \$ | 1,166,990 | 65.00\% | \$ | 758,544 |
| Ranchero Road | "l" Avenue to Arrowhead Lake Road |  | \$ | 1,732,000 | 65.00\% | \$ | 1,125,800 |
| Sub total Baseline |  |  | \$ | 9,961,401 |  | \$ | 6,474,911 |
| Other Needed Projects: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Muscatel Street | Afton to Cottonwood (Includes Aqueduct Crossing) | no | \$ | - | 65.00\% | \$ | - |
| Sub total Other Projects |  |  | \$ | - |  | \$ | - - |
| Total Arterials |  |  | \$ | 9,961,401 |  | \$ | 6,474,911 |
| Intersection Expansion |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baseline |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| "C" Avenue | Intersection at Main Street | Baseline | \$ | 6,153,220 | 34.19\% | \$ | 2,103,806 |
| Sub total Baseline |  |  | \$ | 6,153,220 |  | \$ | 2,103,806 |
| Transit Facility |  | Baseline | \$ | 1,200,000 | 34.19\% | \$ | 410,284 |
| Sub total Baseline |  |  | \$ | 1,200,000 | 34.19\% | \$ | 410,284 |
| Total Baseline Facilities Cost |  |  | \$ | 334,596,941 |  | \$ | 195,877,372 |
| Total Other Facilities Cost |  |  | \$ | - |  | \$ | - - |
| Total Baseline Plus Other Facilities Cost |  |  | \$ | 334,596,941 |  | \$ | 195,877,372 |
| Superscripted Notes: |  |  |  | 100.00\% |  |  | 58.54\% |

Superscripted Notes:
1] Project costs are consistent with project costs presented in City's SBCTA submittal
[2] Allocations from SCBTA or 2001 Impact Fee Study
[3] Per City - SCBTA Agreement. Developer share as shown
[4] Total project estimated costs are reduced assuming a $\$ 10$ million grant is acquired for each project
[5] R/R grade separation is completed. $\$ 750,000$ to be repaid to other funding sources to complete new development's funding responsibility

City of Hesperia Transportation Facilities Fee Calculation

TABLE 1
Existing Average Daily Trips

| Land Use | Trip Rate | Res. Units / 1,000 S.F./ Rooms | units | ADT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Single Family | 9.57 | 25,747 | Res. Units | 246,399 |
| Multi Family | 6.63 | 3,320 | Res. Units | 22,012 |
| Commercial/Office | 13.27 | 5,791 | 1,000 square feet | 76,841 |
| Industrial | 6.97 | 1,854 | 1,000 square feet | 12,921 |
| Hotel/Motel | 8.92 | 393 | Rooms | 3,506 |
| Total Existing ADTs |  |  |  | 361,678 |

TABLE 2
Future Average Daily Trips (Does not include Tapestry Specific Plan)

| Land Use | Trip Rate | Res. Units / 1,000 S.F./ Rooms | units | ADT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Single Family | 9.57 | 11,131 | Res. Units | 106,524 |
| Multi Family | 6.63 | 1,435 | Res. Units | 9,514 |
| Commercial/Office | 13.27 | 4,519 | 1,000 square feet | 59,966 |
| Industrial | 6.97 | 1,436 | 1,000 square feet | 10,009 |
| Hotel/Motel | 8.92 | 212 | Rooms | 1,891 |
| Total Future ADTs |  |  |  | 187,904 |
|  |  |  | \% of total ADTs = Total ADTs = | 34.19\% |
|  |  |  |  | 549,582 |
| TABLE 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Cost per ADT |  |  |  |  |
| Total Transportation Costs Allocated to New Development | Total Future ADT's | Cost per future ADT |  |  |
| \$195,877,372 | 187,904 | \$1,042 |  |  |

TABLE 4
Fee Schedule

| Land Use | Average Daily Trip Rate | Cost per ADT | Units | DIF Fee per unit / 1,000 SF/ Room | Cost Financed by DIF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Single Family | 9.57 | \$1,042 | Res. Units | \$9,976 | \$111,043,822 |
| Multi Family | 6.63 | \$1,042 | Res. Units | \$6,911 | \$9,917,763 |
| Commercial/Office | 13.27 | \$1,042 | 1,000 square feet | \$13,833 | \$62,510,350 |
| Industrial | 6.97 | \$1,042 | 1,000 square feet | \$7,266 | \$10,434,155 |
| Hotel/Motel | 8.92 | \$1,042 | Rooms | \$9,299 | \$1,971,283 |

## Existing \& Proposed Hotel Information

| Hotel | Location | Existing or Future? | Number of Rooms | Number of Floors | Building Footprint Area (s.f.) | Building Footprint Area (acres) | Gross <br> Building Area | Gross Property Acreage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Holiday Inn | 9750 Key Pointe Avenue | Existing | 100 | 3 | 18,747 | 0.43 | 54,063 | 2.3 |
| Marriott Courtyard | 9619 Mariposa Road | Existing | 131 | 4 | 23,798 | 0.55 | 86,305 | 3.1 |
| Marriott Springhill | 9625 Mariposa Road | Existing | 63 | 3 | 18,747 | 0.43 | 54,063 | 2 |
| Motel 6 | 9757 Cataba Road | Existing | 99 | 3 | 16,834 | 0.39 | 48,503 | 4.1 |
| Total Existing |  |  | 393 |  | 78,126 | 1.79 | 242,934 | 11.5 |
| Embassy Suites (Primaco) | West side of Caliente Road \& north of Ranchero Road | Future | 84 | 4 | 39,894 | 0.92 | 72,720 | 3.7 |
| Residence Inn (Primaco) | West side of Caliente Road \& north of Ranchero Road | Future | 128 | 4 | 23,712 | 0.54 | 82,344 | 5.4 |
| Total Future |  |  | 212 |  | 63,606 | 1.46 | 155,064 | 9.1 |


[^0]:    [1] Drainage Fee for Hotel/Motel category is on a per gross acreage basis

[^1]:    Table 5
    

    IT
    [1] EDU = Equivalent Dwelling Unit.
    [2] City already owns site where building is to be constructed.

