

## CITY OF HESPERIA

### DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE JUSTIFICATION STUDY

May 8, 2018

Prepared for

CITY OF HESPERIA  
9700 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Hesperia, CA 92345

Prepared by

DAVID TAUSSIG & ASSOCIATES, INC.  
5000 Birch Street, Suite 6000  
Newport Beach, California 92660  
(800) 969-4382

Newport Beach  
San Francisco  
San Jose  
Riverside  
Dallas  
Houston

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Section</b>	<b>Page</b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. LEGAL REQUIREMENTS .....	2
III. DEMOGRAPHICS .....	7
IV. FEE CALCULATIONS .....	17
A. FIRE FEE .....	17
B. POLICE FEE .....	22
C. ANIMAL CONTROL FEE.....	26
D. CITY HALL FEE.....	30
E. RECORDS STORAGE FACILITIES FEE.....	33
F. DRAINAGE FEE.....	37
G. TRANSPORTATION FEE .....	44
V. IMPLEMENTATION .....	50

### APPENDICES

- A. DEMOGRAPHICS SUMMARY
- B. DEMOGRAPHICS SUMMARY – NOT INCLUDING TAPESTRY & TAPESTRY ONLY
- C. TRANSPORTATION NEEDS LIST
- D. FEE MODELS

The City of Hesperia ("City") authorized David Taussig & Associates, Inc. ("DTA") to prepare a nexus study to justify proposed development impact fees to be imposed on new development within the City limits (the "Fee Study"). The fees to be collected will provide a source of revenue to fund public improvements that will mitigate the impacts of such new development. This Fee Study will meet the requirements of California Government Code Section 66000 et seq. known as the "Mitigation Fee Act" and will achieve the following goals related to said section:

- Ensure the development impact fees do not exceed the estimated reasonable cost of providing the service for which the fee is imposed
- Provide a clear and concise document that will serve as the basis for the proposed fee levels

A development impact fee ("Fee") is a one-time charge imposed by a local agency on new development to recover, or partially recover, the estimated reasonable cost of providing public facilities needed to mitigate the impacts of such new development. Further discussion on the legal limitations related to imposing development impact fees is discussed in Section II, "Legal Requirements."

This Fee Study and the resulting fee structure will focus on the justification for imposing impact fees to fund, or partially fund, fire, police, animal control, City Hall, records storage, drainage, and transportation facilities necessary to mitigate the impacts of new development.

This study uses a planning horizon of 2040 for all projections of demographic growth. To ensure the proposed fee structure meets the nexus requirements of Section 66001 and ensure the fees are proportionate to the impacts generated by the various land uses, this Fee Study uses an equivalent development unit ("EDU") method to fairly allocate costs to new development and determine the appropriate fee levels that will provide a source of funds to pay for the proposed facilities. A more detailed discussion regarding the EDU methodology can be found in Section III-4.

Section IV of this Fee Study provides detailed analyses of facility needs (the "Needs Lists") for each fee category, allocation of costs to new development and calculation of fee structures for fire, police, animal control, City Hall, records storage, drainage, and transportation facilities. For purposes of this Fee Study, the City categorizes developable land uses as residential property and non-residential property. Residential and non-residential property is further categorized into subclasses of single family, multi-family, commercial/office/retail, industrial, and hotel/motel. Section V also adds an administrative component of 1.0% of the individual fee amounts to pay for the City's overhead costs incurred in the administration of the Fee program.

The City has identified the need to levy impact fees to pay for fire, police, animal control, City Hall, records storage, drainage, and transportation facilities. These fees will finance facilities on the Needs Lists at levels identified by the City as appropriate for new development. Upon the adoption of the Fee Study and required legal documents by the City Council, all new development will be required to pay its “fair share” of the cost of facilities on the Needs Lists through these fees.

The fees are established pursuant to AB 1600 as described below.

### **AB 1600 LEGAL REQUIREMENTS**

Prior to World War II, development in California was held responsible for very little of the cost of public infrastructure. Public improvements were financed primarily through jurisdictional general funds and utility charges. It was not uncommon during this period for speculators to subdivide tracts of land without providing any public improvements, expecting the closest city to eventually annex a project and provide public improvements and services.

However, starting in the late 1940s, the use of impact fees grew with the increased planning and regulation of new development. During the 1960s and 1970s, the California Courts broadened the right of local government to impose fees on developers for public improvements that were not located on project sites. More recently, with the passage of Proposition 13, the limits on general revenues for new infrastructure have resulted in new development being held responsible for a greater share of public improvements, and both the use and levels of impact fees have grown substantially. Higher fee levels were undoubtedly driven in part by a need to offset the decline in funds for infrastructure development from other sources.

The levy of impact fees is one authorized method of financing the public facilities necessary to mitigate the impacts of new development, as the levy of such fees provides funding to maintain an agency's existing level of service for an increased service population. A fee is “a monetary exaction, other than a tax or special assessment, which is charged by a local agency to the applicant in connection with approval of a development project for the purpose of defraying all or a portion of the cost of public facilities related to the development project...” (California Government Code, Section 66000). A fee may be levied for each type of capital improvement required for new development, with the payment of the fee occurring prior to the beginning of construction of a dwelling unit or non-residential building (or prior to the expansion of existing buildings of these types). Fees are often levied at final map recordation, issuance of a certificate of occupancy, or more commonly, at building permit issuance.

Assembly Bill (“AB”) 1600, which created Section 66000 et. seq. of the Government Code, was enacted by the State of California in 1987. This Fee Study is intended to meet the nexus or benefit requirements of AB 1600, which mandates that there is a nexus between fees imposed, the use of the fees, and the development projects on which the fees are imposed.

In 2006, Government Code Section 66001 was amended to clarify that a fee cannot include costs attributable to existing deficiencies, but can fund costs used to maintain the existing level of service or meet an adopted level of service that is consistent with the general plan.

Section 66000 et seq. of the Government Code requires all public agencies to satisfy the following requirements when establishing, increasing or imposing a fee as a condition of new development:

1. Identify the purpose of the fee. (Government Code Section 66001(a)(1)).
2. Identify the use to which the fee will be put. (Government Code Section 66001(a)(2)).
3. Determine that there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development on which the fee is to be imposed. (Government Code Section 66001(a)(3)).
4. Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility and the type of development project on which the fee is to be imposed. (Government Code Section 66001(a)(4)).
5. Discuss how there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facility or portion of the public facility attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed.

The sections below present each of the five requirements listed above as they relate to the imposition of the proposed fees.

1. Purpose of the Fee (Government Code Section 66001(a)(1))

New residential and non-residential development within the City will generate additional residents and employees who will require additional public facilities. Land for these facilities will have to be acquired and public facilities and equipment will have to be expanded, constructed or purchased to meet this increased demand.

This Fee Study has been prepared in response to the projected direct and cumulative effect of future development. Each new development will contribute to the need for new public facilities. Without future development many of the new public facilities on the Needs Lists would not be necessary as the existing facilities are adequate for the City's present population. In instances where facilities would be built regardless of new development, the costs of such facilities have been allocated to new and existing development based on their respective level of benefit.

The proposed Fees, other than the fire Fee, will be charged to all future development, irrespective of location, in the City. The fire Fee will not be

charged in the Tapestry Specific Plan (“Tapestry”) as described further in Section III herein. Even future “in fill” development projects contribute to impacts on public facilities because they are an interactive component of a much greater universe of development located throughout the City. First, the property owners and/or the tenants associated with any new development in the City can be expected to place additional demands on City facilities funded by the fee. Second, these property owners and tenants are dependent on and, in fact, may not have chosen to utilize their development, except for residential, retail, employment and recreational opportunities located nearby on other existing and future development. Third, the availability of residents, employees, and customers throughout the City has a growth-inducing impact without which some of the “in-fill” development would not occur. As a result, all development projects in the City contribute to the cumulative impacts of development.

The proposed Fees will be used for the acquisition, installation, and construction of public facilities identified on the Needs Lists and appropriate administrative costs to mitigate the direct and cumulative impacts of new development in the City.

2. The Use to Which the Fee is to be Put (Government Code Section 66001(a)(2))

The proposed Fees will be used for the acquisition, installation, and construction of the public facilities identified on the Needs Lists, included in Section IV of the Fee Study and other appropriate costs to mitigate the direct and cumulative impacts of new development in the City. The Fee will provide a source of revenue to the City to allow for the acquisition, installation, and construction of public facilities, which in turn will maintain the current standard of service, preserve the quality of life in the City and protect the health, safety, and welfare of the existing and future residents, visitors, and employees.

3. Determine That There is a Reasonable Relationship Between the Fee’s Use and the Type of Development Project Upon Which the Fee is Imposed (Benefit Relationship) (Government Code Section 66001(a)(3))

It is the projected direct and cumulative effect of future development that has prompted the preparation of the Fee Study. Each development will contribute to the need for new public facilities. Without future development, the City would have no need to construct many of the public facilities on the Needs Lists. For all other facilities, the costs have been allocated to both existing and new development based on their level of benefit. Even future “in fill” development projects, which may be adjacent to existing facilities, further burden existing public facilities. Consequently, all new development within the City, irrespective of location, contributes to the direct and cumulative

impacts of development on public facilities and creates the need for new facilities to accommodate growth.

The Fees will be expended for the acquisition, installation, and construction of the public facilities identified on the Needs Lists and other authorized uses, as that is the purpose for which the Fee is collected. As previously stated, all new development creates either a direct impact on public facilities or contributes to the cumulative impact on public facilities. Moreover, this impact is generally equalized among all types of development because it is the increased demands for public facilities created by the future residents and employees that create the impact upon existing facilities.

For the foregoing reasons, new development benefits from the acquisition, construction, and installation of the facilities on the Needs Lists.

4. Determine How There is a Reasonable Relationship Between the Need for the Public Facility and the Type of Development Project Upon Which the Fee is Imposed (Impact Relationship) (Government Code Section 66001(a)(4))

As previously stated all new development within the City, irrespective of location, contributes to the direct and cumulative impacts of development on public facilities and creates the need for new facilities to accommodate growth. Please note that the fire facilities required to serve new development in Tapestry will be built and paid for under a separate agreement, as discussed in Section III. Without future development, many of the facilities on the Needs Lists would not be necessary. For certain other facilities, the costs have been allocated to both existing and new development based on their level of benefit.

For the reasons presented herein, there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facilities included on the Needs List and all new development within the City.

5. The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Public Facilities Attributable to the Development Upon Which the Fee is Imposed ("Rough Proportionality" Relationship) (Government Code 66001(a))

As set forth above, all new development in the City impacts public facilities. Moreover, each individual development project and its related increase in population and/or employment, along with the cumulative impacts of all development in the City, will adversely impact existing facilities. Thus, imposition of the Fees to finance the facilities on the Needs Lists is an efficient, practical, and equitable method of permitting development to proceed in a responsible manner.

New development impacts facilities directly and cumulatively. In fact, without any future development, the acquisition, construction, and/or installation of

many of the facilities on the Needs Lists would not be necessary as existing City facilities are adequate. Even new development located adjacent to existing facilities will utilize and benefit from facilities on the Needs List.

The proposed Fees are roughly proportional to the impacts resulting from new development based on the analysis in Section IV. Thus there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the Fee and the cost of the facilities.

Identifying these items will enable the Fees to meet the nexus and rough proportionality requirements established by previous court cases. These findings are discussed in the nexus test for each proposed Fee as presented in Section IV.A through Section IV.G. Current State financing and fee assessment requirements only allow new development to pay for its fair share of new facilities' costs. Any current deficiencies resulting from the needs of existing development must be funded through other sources. Therefore, a key element to establish legal impact fees is to determine what share of the benefit or cost of a particular improvement can be equitably assigned to existing development, even if that improvement has not yet been constructed. By removing this factor, the true impact of new development can be assessed and equitable fees assigned.



In order to determine the public facilities needed to serve new development as well as establish Fees to fund such facilities, the City provided DTA with existing development and projections of future population, employees and development within the City. For purposes of determining existing development and projecting future population and employment growth, the City categorizes developable land uses as residential property and non-residential property. Residential and non-residential property is further categorized into subclasses as shown in Table III-1. Based on these designations, DTA established Fees for these land use categories to acknowledge the difference in impacts resulting from various land uses and to make the resulting fee program implementable. A summary of the land use classes utilized in this Fee Study is included in Table III-1. However, not all Fees will apply to all land uses.

Table III-1

LAND USE CLASSIFICATION FOR FEE STUDY	DEFINITION	GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION
<b>Single Family Residential</b>	Includes, but is not limited to, buildings used as the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Single family detached homes</li> <li>• Single family attached homes</li> </ul>	R-1
<b>Multi-Family Residential</b>	Includes, but is not limited to, buildings used as the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buildings with attached residential units including apartments, town homes, condominiums</li> </ul>	R-3
<b>Commercial/Office/Retail</b>	Includes, but is not limited to, buildings used as the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department stores, discount stores, furniture/appliance outlets, home improvement centers</li> <li>• Neighborhood shopping center</li> <li>• Subregional and regional shopping centers</li> <li>• Automobile sales and services</li> <li>• Entertainment and cultural facilities</li> <li>• Business Parks</li> <li>• Service-oriented business activities unless specifically listed elsewhere</li> <li>• Business/professional office</li> <li>• Professional medical offices not located on the same property/development as a hospital</li> <li>• Service oriented business activities where the focus is on customer service delivery in an office environment.</li> </ul>	C-1, C-2, C-3
<b>Industrial</b>	Includes, but is not limited to, buildings used as the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manufacturing Facilities</li> <li>• Storage Facilities</li> <li>• Parking lots</li> <li>• Utility Facilities</li> </ul>	I-1, I-2

LAND USE CLASSIFICATION FOR FEE STUDY	DEFINITION	GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION
Hotel/Motel	Includes, but is not limited to, buildings used as the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Short term and intermediate term housing with room rental businesses defined as hotel or motel in the Hesperia Municipal Code</li></ul>	R-3

The time horizon used for all fees is through the year 2040. The City utilized data from the City's General Plan (the "General Plan"), California Department of Finance, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), and the City's Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") dated December 2010 to generate existing and future development projections through 2040.

All fees indicated herein are imposed on a city-wide basis except for the fire Fee which does not include the property in Tapestry. Tapestry, formerly known as the Rancho Las Floras Specific Plan, is located in the southern part of the City and is comprised of approximately 9,365 acres. Fire facilities required by Tapestry will be built and paid for under a separate agreement. Please refer to Appendix B which summarizes estimated future development for residential and non-residential property through the year 2040 not including Tapestry and for Tapestry only.

The following sections summarize the existing and future development figures used in calculating the Fees.

Section 1 below summarizes the existing development in the City.

Section 2 below summarizes the future development in the City through the year 2040.

Section 3 below summarizes the total development in the City in the year 2040.

Lastly, Section 4 below summarizes the EDU methodology used in all fee calculations.

**1. EXISTING DEVELOPMENT WITHIN CITY**

Work on the Fee Study began in 2015. Therefore, all existing development indicated herein starts with 2015 as the current year. Since then, there has not been any significant changes to the development information and the City believes that the demographics presented herein are still reasonable.

**A. Residential Development**

The City estimates there were 92,177 residents and 29,067 residential units within the City as of January 1, 2015. This is based on data provided by the California Department of Finance.

Table III-2 below summarizes the existing residential development within the City.

**TABLE III-2**  
**CITY OF HESPERIA**  
**ESTIMATED EXISTING RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

Residential Property	Existing Number of Residents (2015)	Existing Number of Residential Units (2015)
Single-Family	83,974	25,747
Multi-Family	8,203	3,320
<b>Total</b>	<b>92,177</b>	<b>29,067</b>

**B. Non-Residential Development**

In terms of non-residential development, the City estimates that there are approximately 393 Hotel/Motel rooms, 5.8 million square feet of Commercial/Office/Retail development, and 1.8 million square feet of Industrial development within the City as of January 1, 2015. The number of existing non-residential square feet is based on Tables 3 and 4 of the City's December 2010 EIR.

In terms of employees, the City estimates there are 16,758 existing employees within the City. Existing employees is based on Year 2012 figures and an annual growth rate of 2.32% as shown in Table 1 of SCAG 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Community Strategy ("RTP/SCS") dated May 14, 2014.

Table III-3 below summarizes the existing non-residential development within the City.

**TABLE III-3**  
**CITY OF HESPERIA**  
**ESTIMATED EXISTING NON-RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

Non-Residential Property	Number of Employees (2015)	Number of Non-Residential SF (2015)	Number of Rooms (2015)
Commercial/Office/Retail	6,157	5,790,617	NA
Industrial	9,618	1,853,804	NA
Hotel/Motel	983	NA	393
<b>Total</b>	<b>16,758</b>	<b>7,644,421</b>	<b>393</b>

## 2. FUTURE DEVELOPMENT WITHIN CITY (2016 – 2040)

### A. Residential Development

The City estimates there will be 182,732 residents residing in 57,296 residential units within the City in the year 2040. Therefore, the City will have a population increase of 90,556 new residents and growth in residential development of 28,229 new dwelling units from 2016 through 2040. Population and development growth is based on information provided by the City on January 30, 2018.

Table III-4 below summarizes the future demographics for residential property through the year 2040.

**TABLE III-4**  
**CITY OF HESPERIA**  
**ESTIMATED FUTURE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**  
**(2016 THROUGH 2040)**

Residential Property	Future Number of Residents (2016 – 2040)	Future Number of Residential Units (2016 - 2040)
Single-Family	80,495	24,312
Multi-Family	10,061	3,917
<b>Total</b>	<b>90,556</b>	<b>28,229</b>

### B. Non-Residential Development

In terms of non-residential development, it is estimated there will be approximately 212 new Hotel/Motel rooms, 5.2 million new square feet of

Commercial/Office/Retail development, and 1.4 million new square feet of Industrial development within the City from 2016 to 2040.

In terms of employees, it is estimated there will be 14,123 additional employees within the City through 2040.

Table III-5 below summarizes the future demographics for the non-residential land uses through the year 2040.

**TABLE III-5**  
**CITY OF HESPERIA**  
**ESTIMATED FUTURE NON-RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**  
**(2016 THROUGH 2040)**

Non-Residential Property	Number of Employees	Number of Non-Residential SF	Number of Rooms
Commercial/Office/Retail	6,142	5,218,900	NA
Industrial	7,451	1,436,072	NA
Hotel/Motel	530	0	212
<b>Total</b>	<b>14,123</b>	<b>6,654,972</b>	<b>212</b>

### 3. TOTAL DEVELOPMENT WITHIN CITY (2040)

Table III-6 below describes the total residential development in the City in the year 2040. This is based on the sum of Tables III-2 and III-4.

**TABLE III-6**  
**CITY OF HESPERIA**  
**ESTIMATED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**  
**(IN YEAR 2040)**

Residential Property	Description	Total Existing (2015) (From Table III-2)	Future Development (2016 to 2040) (From Table III-4)	Total Development (2040)
Single-Family	Residents	83,974	80,495	164,469
	Units	25,747	24,312	50,059
Multi-Family	Residents	8,203	10,061	18,264
	Units	3,320	3,917	7,237
Total	Residents	92,177	90,556	182,732
	Units	29,067	28,229	57,296

Table III-7 below describes the total non-residential development in the City in the year 2040. This is based on the sum of Tables III-3 and III-5.

**TABLE III-7**  
**CITY OF HESPERIA**  
**ESTIMATED NON-RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**  
**(IN YEAR 2040)**

Residential Property	Description	Total Existing (2015) (From Table III-3)	Future Development (2016 to 2040) (From Table III-5)	Total Development (2040)
Commercial/Office/Retail	Employees	6,157	6,142	12,299
	Non-Res. SF	5,790,617	5,218,900	11,009,517
Industrial	Employees	9,618	7,451	17,069
	Non-Res. SF	1,853,804	1,436,072	3,289,876
Hotel/Motel	Employees	983	530	1,513
	Rooms	393	212	605
Total	Employees	16,758	14,123	30,881
	Non-Res. SF	7,644,421	6,654,972	14,299,393
	Hotel Rooms	393	212	605

**4. EQUIVALENT DWELLING UNIT (EDU) PROJECTIONS**

California Government Code §66001(4)(b) requires there to be a "...reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facility, or portion of the public facility, attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed." To ensure a reasonable relationship is maintained within the proposed fee structure, this study uses an Equivalent Dwelling Unit ("EDU") methodology. This approach establishes, for given land uses, a method of comparison of that land use to a baseline land use, utilizing a common demand variable. A demand variable is a measurable factor directly related to the size of the public facility.

As stated earlier, Fees are calculated for various land use categories. 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. For instance, additional traffic generated by new development requires expansion of existing roadway systems, therefore vehicular trips generated by growth in the various land uses would be a reasonable variable to measure traffic demand. In this case the Average Daily Trips ("ADT") would be the common demand variable and the ADTs generated by a residential dwelling unit would be the baseline value to which the ADTs generated by the remaining land uses would be compared. Likewise, additional residents resulting from new residential development will generate demand for expanded police facilities in the existing police system, therefore population increase would be considered a reasonable common demand variable and the population growth from a new residence would be used as the baseline.

Table III-8 shows the facility type, service factor, and applicable land uses which are used in the Fee calculations.

**TABLE III-8**

Facility Type	Development Includes	Service Factor	Fee charged to Land Uses
Fire	Does Not Include Tapestry	Residents and Employees Served	Residential and Non-Residential
Police	City-wide	Residents and Employees Served	Residential and Non-Residential
Animal Control	City-wide	Residents Served	Residential Only
City Hall	City-wide	Residents and Employees Served	Residential and Non-Residential
Records Storage	City-wide	Residents and Employees Served	Residential and Non-Residential.
Drainage	City-wide	Equivalent Runoff Unit	Residential and Non-Residential
Transportation	City-wide	Average Daily Trips	Residential and Non-Residential

Table III-9 shows the existing EDUs for each land use. The EDU data is used for the police, City Hall, and records storage facilities fees. The EDUs for fire, which exclude Tapestry, are summarized Appendix B. The EDUs for drainage and transportation, which are based on equivalent runoff units (“ERU”) and ADTs, respectively, are described in Section IV.F and Section IV.G.

For Tables III-9 through III-11 below, the EDU factor is calculated based on the residents per unit (or employees per 1,000 SF/Room) for each land use divided by the residents per unit for Single Family units. For example, existing multi-family units has an EDU factor of 0.76, which is based on 2.47 divided by 3.26.



**TABLE III-9**  
**City of Hesperia**  
**Existing Equivalent Dwelling Units**  
**(In 2015)**

Residential Property	Number of Existing Residents	Number of Residential Units	Residents Per Unit	EDUs per Residential Unit	Total Existing EDUs
Single Family	83,974	25,747	3.26	1.000	25,747
<u>Multi-Family</u>	<u>8,203</u>	<u>3,320</u>	<u>2.47</u>	<u>0.76</u>	<u>2,515</u>
Subtotal	92,177	29,067			28,262
Non-Residential Property	Number of Existing Employees	Number of Non-Residential SF / Rooms	Employees per 1,000 Non-Res. SF / Room	EDUs per 1,000 Non-Res. SF / Room	Total Existing EDUs
Commercial/Office/Retail	6,157	5,790,617	1.06	0.33	1,888
Industrial	9,618	1,853,804	5.19	1.59	2,949
<u>Hotel/Motel Rooms</u>	<u>983</u>	<u>393</u>	<u>2.50</u>	<u>0.15</u>	<u>301</u>
Subtotal	16,758	7,644,421			5,138
<b>Grand Total</b>					<b>33,400</b>

Table III-10 shows the total number of future EDUs calculated for each land use for the time period from 2016 through 2040. Please note that the future EDU factors differ from the existing EDU factors due to various reasons including estimated changes in residents per unit and employees per square foot as provided by the City.

**TABLE III-10**  
**City of Hesperia**  
**Future Equivalent Dwelling Units**  
**(From 2016 to 2040)**

Residential Property	Number of Future Residents	Number of Residential Units	Residents Per Unit	EDUs per Residential Unit	Total Future EDUs
Single Family	80,495	24,312	3.31	1.000	24,312
<u>Multi-Family</u>	<u>10,061</u>	<u>3,917</u>	<u>2.57</u>	<u>0.80</u>	<u>3,039</u>
Subtotal	90,556	28,229			27,351
Non-Residential Property	Number of Future 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
Commercial/Office/Retail	6,142	5,218,900	1.18	0.38	1,855
Industrial	7,451	1,436,072	5.19	1.58	2,250
<u>Hotel/Motel Rooms</u>	<u>530</u>	<u>212</u>	<u>2.50</u>	<u>0.15</u>	<u>160</u>
Subtotal	14,123	6,654,972			4,266
<b>Grand Total</b>					<b>31,616</b>

Table III-11 shows the total number of EDUs calculated for each land use in the year 2040:

**TABLE III-11**  
**City of Hesperia**  
**Equivalent Dwelling Units**  
**(In 2040)**

Residential Property	Number of Future Residents	Number of Residential Units	Residents Per Unit	EDUs per Residential Unit	Total Future EDUs
Single Family	164,469	50,059	3.29	0.88	50,059
<u>Multi-Family</u>	<u>18,264</u>	<u>7,237</u>	<u>2.52</u>	<u>0.69</u>	<u>5,554</u>
Subtotal	182,732	57,296			55,613
Non-Residential Property	Number of Future 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
Commercial/Office/Retail	12,299	11,009,517	1.12	0.31	3,743
Industrial	17,069	3,289,876	5.19	1.40	5,199
<u>Hotel/Motel Rooms</u>	<u>1,513</u>	<u>605</u>	<u>2.50</u>	<u>0.14</u>	<u>461</u>
Subtotal	30,881	14,299,393			9,404
<b>Grand Total</b>					<b>65,016</b>

## SECTION IV: FEE CALCULATIONS - FIRE FEE

The following sections present the reasonable relationship for benefit, impact, and rough proportionality tests for each Fee element (i.e., fire facilities, police facilities, animal control facilities, etc.) and the analysis undertaken to apportion costs for each type of public facility on the Needs Lists. More detailed fee calculation worksheets for each type of facility are included in Appendix D.

### A. FIRE FACILITIES

The Fire Facilities will serve the residents and employees of the City by providing fire protection services. The Fee Study includes a component for new fire facilities and expansion to existing fire facilities. As mentioned previously, the fire Fee will not apply to Tapestry since the Fire Facilities needed for such development will be mitigated under a separate agreement. Table IV-A1 illustrates how the fire Fee will meet the requirements of AB 1600 with regard to use of the fee, the type of development funded or partially funded by the fee revenue, the reasonable relationship to the need for facilities, and the proportionality requirements.

**TABLE IV-A1**  
**FIRE FACILITIES**

AB 1600 Code Section	Description	Justification
66001(a)(1)	Identify the purpose of the Fee	Provide a revenue source that will provide funds to construct various new Fire facilities and expand existing Fire facilities that will mitigate the impacts of new residential and non-residential development to the City's Fire facilities.
66001(a)(2)	Identify the use to which the fee is to be put	Expansion/construction/acquisition of Fire facilities.
66001(a)(3)	Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed	New residential and non-residential development in the City will generate additional residents and employees increasing the need for trained Fire personnel. Buildings used to provide these services will have to be expanded, constructed or purchased to meet this increased demand.
66001(a)(4)	Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facilities and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed	The additional residents and employees from new development will impact demand for fire facilities. New Fire facilities are needed to mitigate the impacts of the additional residents and employees. If additional Fire facilities are not constructed and equipment and vehicles are not acquired, then overall public safety in the City will suffer.

## SECTION IV: FEE CALCULATIONS - FIRE FEE

66001(b)	Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facility	The Fire fee is based on the cost to provide new facilities and expand existing facilities.
----------	--	---

### EXISTING FACILITIES

The City of Hesperia currently has four fire stations totaling 31,860 building square feet. See Table IV-A2 for a summary of the existing inventory.

**TABLE IV-A2**  
**EXISTING FIRE FACILITIES**

Fire Facilities	Location	Facility Unit	Building Size
Fire Station 301	9430 11 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	SF	3,700
Fire Station 302	17288 Olive Street	SF	3,435
Fire Station 304	15660 Eucalyptus Street	SF	5,627
Fire Station 305	8331 Caliente Road	SF	19,098
Total Fire Stations			31,860

Please note that Fire Stations 301 and 302 will be torn down and rebuilt into larger facilities. This leaves a total of 24,725 square feet of existing facilities (Fire Stations 304 and 305) which will remain as is. The proposed rebuilt facilities are included in the section below.

### PROPOSED FACILITIES

In order to determine the proposed facilities, the City must determine the demand upon infrastructure created by new development. It is clear all new development in the City will impact the City's current ability to respond to fire, rescue, and medical calls-for-service. The effect is twofold. Initially, each new residence and business will create additional calls-for-service increasing the likelihood of simultaneous (and thus competing) calls-for-service. Additionally, as development spreads further from existing stations, the distances (and thus response times) will increase, taking the existing engine companies out-of-service for greater periods of time.

The capacity of any fire station is finite and will reach practical limits (through call frequency and total incident time). When capacity is exceeded, the level of service afforded to existing development will be reduced. In other words, if development continues without an increase in the number of fire stations, the existing stations would be overwhelmed in terms of calls-for-service, increasing the possibility of a greater number of simultaneous calls-for-service. Additional demands will be made

## SECTION IV: FEE CALCULATIONS - FIRE FEE

upon the previously listed assets in Table IV-A2 above and therefore, such assets would need to be expanded.

Table IV-A3 identifies the facilities proposed to be funded in whole or in part with the collection of Fire fees. Quantity and costs are based on estimates provided by the City.

**TABLE IV-A3**  
**NEEDS LIST**

Fire Facilities	Location	Facility Unit	Building Size	Facility Cost
Tear Down and Rebuild Fire Station 301	9430 11 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	SF	15,200	\$7,600,000
Tear Down and Rebuild Fire Station 302	17288 Olive Street	SF	18,200	\$9,240,000
Fire Station 304 Expansion	15660 Eucalyptus Street	SF	4,200	\$2,333,000
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>37,600</b>	<b>\$19,173,000</b>

### Equivalent Dwelling Units

For Fire facilities, the development of property into residential and non-residential uses generates residents and employees increasing the need for trained fire personnel. Buildings used to provide fire protection services will have to be expanded, constructed or purchased to meet this increased demand.

Since the facilities proposed to be financed by the impact fees will serve both residential and non-residential property, DTA projected the number of future EDUs based on the number of residents or employees generated by each land use class.

As shown in Section III.4 (Demographics - EDUs), there are 33,400 total existing EDUs and 15,677 future EDU's (which does not include the property in the Tapestry Specific Plan), bringing the total EDUs in 2040 to 49,077 EDUs.

As mentioned previously, the Fire Fee will not apply to property in the Tapestry Specific Plan since the specific Fire Facilities for such property will be built and paid for under a separate agreement.

### Allocation of Costs

The total cost of \$19,173,000, as shown in Table IV-A3 above, for fire facilities needed to serve existing and new development is allocated to existing and new development based on the share of total EDUs in 2040.

## SECTION IV: FEE CALCULATIONS - FIRE FEE

### Fire Stations

Table IV-A4 summarizes the allocation of fire station costs to existing and new development. The City currently has 24,725 square feet of existing fire station buildings that will remain at buildout. Based on the locations of existing and new development, two existing fire facilities will need to be torn down and rebuilt and one fire facility will need to be expanded. The City has determined that fire stations totaling 37,600 new building square feet are needed to adequately serve both existing and new development, bringing the total building square footage of the fire stations to 62,325 square feet. Therefore, after providing a credit to existing development for the existing 24,725 square feet, 47.05% of the costs will be allocated to existing development and 52.95% will be allocated to new development as shown below.

**TABLE IV-A4**  
**ALLOCATION OF FIRE FACILITIES COSTS**

Type of Development	EDUs	Percentage of Total EDUs	Total Facilities Sq. Ft. in 2040	Sq. Ft. Credit for Existing Development	Building Sq. Ft. Net of Credit	Percentage of Costs Allocated	Facility Costs Allocated
Existing Development	33,400	68.06%	42,417	(24,725)	17,692	47.05%	\$9,021,258
Future Development	15,677	31.94%	19,908	0	19,908	52.95%	\$10,151,742
Total	49,077	100.00%	62,325	(24,725)	37,600	100.00%	\$19,173,000

### **Proposed Fee Amount**

The Fee per EDU was calculated by dividing the costs allocated to future development by the number of future EDUs. See Table IV-A5 for the Fee for each land use.

## SECTION IV: FEE CALCULATIONS - FIRE FEE

**TABLE IV-A5  
PROPOSED FEES**

Land Use Type	EDUs per Unit/Room/1,000 Sq. Ft.	Development Impact Fee per Unit/Room/1,000 Sq. Ft.	Cost Financed by Fees
<u>Residential Property</u>			
Single Family	1.00	\$648	\$7,208,120
Multi-Family	0.76	\$491	\$704,187
<u>Non-Residential Property</u>			
Commercial/Office/Retail	0.29	\$187	\$842,785
Industrial	1.40	\$908	\$1,303,902
Hotel/Motel	0.68	\$437	\$92,748
Total			\$10,151,742
Cost Allocated to Existing Development			\$9,021,258
<b>Total Cost of Fire Facilities</b>			<b>\$19,173,000</b>

Based on the development projections in Section III, the fee amount presented in Table IV-A5 above is expected to finance approximately 52.95% of the facilities needed. The City will need to fund the remaining costs from other sources of funds.

## SECTION IV: FEE CALCULATIONS– POLICE FEE

### B. POLICE FACILITIES

The Police Facilities will serve the residents and employees of the City by providing law enforcement and public safety services. The Fee Study includes a component for new police cameras. Table IV-B1 illustrates how the police fee will meet the requirements of AB 1600 with regard to use of the fee, the type of equipment funded or partially funded by the fee revenue, the reasonable relationship to the need for equipment, and the proportionality requirements.

**TABLE IV-B1**  
**POLICE FACILITIES**

AB 1600 Code Section	Description	Justification
66001(a)(1)	Identify the purpose of the Fee	Provide a revenue source that will provide funds to acquire police cameras that will mitigate the impacts of new residential and non-residential development to the City's Police department.
66001(a)(2)	Identify the use to which the fee is to be put	Acquisition of fixed and mobile police cameras.
66001(a)(3)	Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed	New residential and non-residential development in the City will generate additional residents and employees increasing the need for trained police personnel. Fixed and mobile cameras used to provide police services will have to be purchased to meet this increased demand.
66001(a)(4)	Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facilities and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed	The additional residents and employees from new development will impact demand for police cameras. New police cameras are needed to mitigate the impacts of the additional residents and employees. If additional police cameras are not acquired, then overall public safety in the City will suffer.
66001(b)	Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facility	The police fee is based on the cost to provide new fixed and mobile police cameras.



**PROPOSED EQUIPMENT**

The addition of new residential units and new business will increase the demand upon enforcement service level, more areas requiring preventative patrol, and in general, will create more opportunities for crimes to be committed. The City has determined that a new camera system will be required in the future to serve both existing and new development.

Table IV-B2 identifies the police cameras proposed to be funded in whole or in part with the collection of Police fees. Quantity and costs are based on estimates provided by the City.

**TABLE IV-B2**  
**NEEDS LIST**

Police Equipment	Facility Unit	Number	Facility Cost
<u>Future Mobile Cameras</u>			
Mobile LPR 4 Camera Unit	Units	15	\$190,500
<u>Future Fixed Cameras</u>			
ALPR Camera	Units	1	\$86,532
ALPR Camera	Units	1	\$73,310
ALPR Camera	Units	1	\$73,310
ALPR Camera	Units	1	\$60,088
ALPR Camera	Units	1	\$90,132
<u>ALPR Camera</u>	Units	<u>1</u>	<u>\$106,954</u>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>21</b>	<b>\$680,826</b>

**Equivalent Dwelling Units**

For police equipment, the development of property into residential and non-residential uses generates residents and employees increasing the need for trained police personnel. Police cameras used to provide police services will have to be purchased to meet this increased demand.

Since the equipment proposed to be financed by the impact fees will serve both residential and non-residential property, DTA projected the number of future EDUs based on the number of residents or employees generated by each land use class.

As shown in Section III.4 (Demographics - EDUs), there are 33,400 total existing EDUs and 31,616 future EDUs (including the property in the Tapestry Specific Plan), bringing the total EDUs in 2040 to 65,016 EDUs.

### Allocation of Costs

The total cost of \$680,826, as shown in Table IV-B2 above, for police equipment needed to serve existing and new development is allocated to existing and new development based on the share of total EDUs in 2040.

### Total Equipment Costs

See Table IV-B3 for the total equipment costs allocated to new and existing development.

**TABLE IV-B3**  
**TOTAL COSTS**

Type of Development	EDUs	Percentage of Total EDUs	Allocated Units	Total Costs
Existing Development	33,400	51.37%	11	\$349,754
Future Development	31,616	48.63%	10	\$331,072
<b>Total</b>	<b>65,016</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>\$680,826</b>

### Proposed Fee Amount

The Fee per EDU was calculated by dividing the costs allocated to future development by the number of future EDUs. See Table IV-B4 for the fee amount for each land use.

## SECTION IV: FEE CALCULATIONS– POLICE FEE

**TABLE IV-B4  
PROPOSED FEES**

Land Use Type	EDUs per Unit/Room/1,000 Sq. Ft.	Development Impact Fee per Unit/Room/1,000 Sq. Ft.	Cost Financed by Fees
<u>Residential Property</u>			
Single Family	1.00	\$10	\$254,586
Multi-Family	0.78	\$8	\$31,819
<u>Non-Residential Property</u>			
Commercial/Office/Retail	0.36	\$4	\$19,426
Industrial	1.57	\$16	\$23,566
Hotel/Motel	0.76	\$8	\$1,676
Total			\$331,072
Cost Allocated to Existing Development			\$349,754
<b>Total Cost of Police Equipment</b>			<b>\$680,826</b>

Based on the development projections in Section III, the fee amount presented in Table IV-B4 above is expected to finance 48.63% of the equipment needed. The City will need to fund the remaining costs from other sources of funds.

## SECTION IV: FEE CALCULATIONS

### -ANIMAL CONTROL FEE

#### C. ANIMAL CONTROL FACILITIES

Animal control facilities play an important part in the health, safety, and overall quality of life for residents in the City of Hesperia. The Fee Study includes a component for a new animal control facility. Table IV-C1 illustrates how the animal control Fee will meet the requirements of AB 1600 with regard to use of the Fee, the type of development funded or partially funded by the Fee revenue, the reasonable relationship to the need for facilities and the proportionality requirements.

**TABLE IV-C1**  
**ANIMAL CONTROL FACILITIES**

AB 1600 Code Section	Description	Justification
66001(a)(1)	Identify the purpose of the Fee	Provide a revenue source that will provide funds to construct a new animal control facility that will mitigate the impacts of new residential development to the City's animal control facilities.
66001(a)(2)	Identify the use to which the fee is to be put	Construction and development of new animal control facility.
66001(a)(3)	Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed	New residential development in the City will generate additional residents increasing the need for animal control facilities. Animal control facilities used to provide these services will have to be expanded or constructed to meet this increased demand.
66001(a)(4)	Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facilities and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed	The additional residents from new development will impact demand for animal control facilities. New animal control facilities are needed to mitigate the impacts of the additional residents. If additional animal control facilities are not constructed, then the overall quality of life for residents in the City will suffer.
66001(b)	Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facility	The animal control facilities fee is based on the cost to construct and develop a new animal control facility.

## SECTION IV: FEE CALCULATIONS – ANIMAL CONTROL FEE

### EXISTING FACILITIES

See Table IV-C2 for a summary of the existing inventory of the City's animal control facilities.

**TABLE IV-C2**  
**EXISTING ANIMAL CONTROL FACILITIES**

Animal Control Facility	Units
Animal Control Facility	10,000 Sq. Ft.

It is expected that the existing Animal Control facility will be torn down and will be replaced by a larger facility as described in the section below.

### PROPOSED FACILITIES

In order to determine the proposed facilities, the City must determine the demand upon infrastructure created by new development. It is clear new residential development in the City will impact the City's current animal control system.

If development continues without an increase in facilities, the existing facility would be overwhelmed in terms of providing animal control services. Additional demands will be made upon the previously listed asset in Table IV-C2 above and therefore, such asset would need to be expanded.

Table IV-C3 identifies the animal control facility proposed to be funded in whole or in part with the collection of animal control fees. Quantity and costs are based on estimates provided by the City.

**TABLE IV-C3**  
**NEEDS LIST**

Animal Control Facilities	Facility Unit	Number	Facility Cost (2015)
New Animal Control Facility	SF	36,000	\$12,600,000

### Equivalent Dwelling Units

For Animal Control facilities, the development of property into residential uses generates residents increasing the need for Animal Control facilities. The developed animal control facility will have to be expanded to meet this increased demand.

City records do not indicate a significant link between the business community and animal control facilities use, therefore, no Fee is required from non-residential property. Therefore, the EDUs for existing and future development are based on the

## SECTION IV: FEE CALCULATIONS

### – ANIMAL CONTROL FEE

residents generated from existing and future residential units. There are no EDUs assigned to Non-Residential Property.

As shown in Section III.4 (Demographics - EDUs), there are 28,262 total existing residential EDUs and 27,351 future residential EDUs, bringing the total residential EDUs in 2040 to 55,613 EDUs.

#### Allocation of Costs

The total cost of \$12,600,000, as shown in Table IV-C3 above, for Animal Control facilities needed to serve existing and new development is allocated to existing and new development based on the share of total EDUs in 2040.

Table IV-C4 summarizes the allocation of the new animal control facility costs to existing and new development. The City currently has 10,000 sq. ft. existing animal control facilities which will be torn down and replaced by a larger facility. Based on the existing and new development within the City, a new animal control facility will be needed. The City has determined that a demolition of the existing animal control facility and construction a new 36,000 sq. ft. animal control facility is needed to adequately serve both existing and new development. Therefore, 50.82% of the costs will be allocated to existing development and 49.18% will be allocated to new development as shown below.

**TABLE IV-C4**  
**ALLOCATION OF NEW ANIMAL CONTROL FACILITY COSTS**

Type of Development	Residential EDUs	Percentage of Total EDUs	Total SF in 2040	Facility Costs Allocated
Existing Development	28,262	50.82%	18,295	\$6,403,263
Future Development	27,351	49.18%	17,705	\$6,196,737
<b>Total</b>	<b>55,613</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>36,000</b>	<b>\$12,600,000</b>

#### Proposed Fee Amount

The Fee per EDU was calculated by dividing the costs allocated to future development by the number of future EDUs. See Table IV-C5 for the Fee for each land use.

**SECTION IV: FEE CALCULATIONS  
– ANIMAL CONTROL FEE**

**TABLE IV-C5  
PROPOSED FEES**

Land Use Type	EDUs per Unit/Room/1,000 Sq. Ft.	Development Impact Fee per Unit/Room/1,000 Sq. Ft.	Cost Financed by Fees
<u>Residential Property</u>			
Single Family	1.00	\$227	\$5,508,291
Multi-Family	0.78	\$176	\$688,446
Total Cost Allocated to Existing Development			\$6,196,737 \$6,403,263
<b>Total Cost of Animal Control Facilities</b>			<b>\$12,600,000</b>

Based on the development projections in Section III, the Fee presented in Table IV-C5 above is expected to finance approximately 49.18% of the facilities needed. The City will need to fund the remaining costs from other sources of funds.

**D. CITY HALL FACILITIES**

The City Hall Facilities will serve the residents and businesses of the City by providing a range of administrative duties and public services. The Fee Study includes a component for paying the outstanding debt service on the 2013 Civic Plaza Bonds. Table IV-D1 illustrates how the City Hall Fee will meet the requirements of AB 1600 with regard to use of fees, the type of development on which the fee is imposed, the reasonable relationship to the need for collection items, and proportionality requirements.

**TABLE IV-D1**  
**CITY HALL FEE – AB 1600 COMPLIANCE**

AB 1600 Code Section	Description	Justification
66001(a)(1)	Identify the purpose of the Fee	Provide a revenue source that will provide funds to pay outstanding debt service on the 2013 Civic Plaza Bonds that will mitigate the impacts of new residential and non-residential development to the City's City Hall facilities.
66001(a)(2)	Identify the use to which the fee is to be put	Pay outstanding debt service on the 2013 Civic Plaza Bonds.
66001(a)(3)	Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed	New residential and non-residential development in the City will generate additional residents and employees who will use the City Hall facilities. Fees collected from new residential and non-residential development will be used to pay debt service on the 2013 Civic Plaza Bonds.
66001(a)(4)	Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facilities and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed	The additional residents and employees from new residential and non-residential development will impact demand for City Hall facilities. If new development is not subject to the Fee, the City will have insufficient funds to pay the outstanding debt on the 2013 Civic Plaza Bonds.
66001(b)	Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facility	The City Hall fee is based on the total 2013 Civic Plaza bonds outstanding which were used to pay for City Hall facilities.



**PROPOSED COSTS**

Table IV-D2 identifies the City Hall facilities costs proposed to be funded with the collection of City Hall fees. Quantity and costs are based on estimates provided by the City.

**TABLE IV-D2**  
**PROPOSED COSTS**

City Hall Facilities	Amount
Total Facilities Cost	\$19,782,375

**Allocation of Costs**

The total cost of \$19,782,375, as shown in Table IV-D2 above, is for the outstanding debt on the 2013 Civic Plaza Bonds. The City (existing development) directly funded a portion of the facility cost, outside of the bond issue. The amount indicated below is an allocation of only the debt service on the bonds to existing and new development. The share of the total facilities cost allocated to new development, when accounting for the City's prior contribution is approximately 64%. Table IV-D3 summarizes the allocation of the outstanding debt on the 2013 Civic Plaza Bonds.

**TABLE IV-D3**  
**ALLOCATION OF CITY HALL FACILITIES COSTS**

Type of Development	Percentage Allocation	Facility Costs Allocated
Existing Development	12.75%	\$2,522,253
Future Development	87.25%	\$17,260,122
Total	100.00%	\$19,782,375

**Proposed Fee Amount**

The Fee per EDU was calculated by dividing the costs allocated to future development by the number of future EDUs. See Table IV-D4 for the fee amount for each land use.

## SECTION IV: FEE CALCULATIONS – CITY HALL FEE

**TABLE IV-D4  
PROPOSED FEES**

Land Use Type	EDUs per Unit/Room/1,000 Sq. Ft.	Development Impact Fee per Unit/Room/1,000 Sq. Ft.	Cost Financed by Fees
<u>Residential Property</u>			
Single Family	1.00	\$546	\$13,272,575
Multi-Family	0.78	\$424	\$1,658,854
<u>Non-Residential Property</u>			
Commercial/Office/Retail	0.36	\$194	\$1,012,733
Industrial	1.57	\$856	\$1,228,570
Hotel/Motel	0.76	\$412	\$87,390
Total Cost Allocated to Existing Development			\$17,260,122 \$2,522,253
<b>Total Cost of City Hall Facilities</b>			<b>\$19,782,375</b>

Based on the development projections in Section III, the fee amount presented in Table IV-D4 above is expected to finance 87.25% of the facilities needed. The City will need to fund the remaining costs from other sources of funds.

## SECTION IV: FEE CALCULATIONS – RECORDS STORAGE FACILITIES FEE

### E. RECORDS STORAGE FACILITIES

The Records Storage Facilities will serve the residents and employees of the City by providing additional storage services. The Fee Study includes a component for a new records storage facility. Table IV-E1 illustrates how the records storage facilities Fee will meet the requirements of AB 1600 with regard to use of the Fee, the type of development funded or partially funded by the Fee revenue, the reasonable relationship to the need for facilities and the proportionality requirements.

**TABLE IV-E1**  
**RECORDS STORAGE FACILITIES**

AB 1600 Code Section	Description	Justification
66001(a)(1)	Identify the purpose of the Fee	Provide a revenue source that will provide funds to demolish the existing records facility and construct a new records storage facility that will mitigate the impacts of new residential and non-residential development to the City's record storage facilities.
66001(a)(2)	Identify the use to which the fee is to be put	Demolition of existing records storage facility and construction of new records storage facility.
66001(a)(3)	Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed	New residential and non-residential development in the City will generate additional residents and employees increasing the need for records storage facilities. Records storage facilities used to provide these services will have to be expanded, constructed or purchased to meet this increased demand.
66001(a)(4)	Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facilities and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed	The additional residents and employees from new development will impact demand for records storage facilities. A new records storage facility is needed to mitigate the impacts of the additional residents and employees. If new records storage facility is not constructed then overall records storage services provided to the residents and employees in the City will suffer.
66001(b)	Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facility	The records storage facilities fee is based on the cost to demolish the existing records storage facility and construct a new records storage facility.

**EXISTING RECORDS STORAGE FACILITY**

See Table IV-E2 for a summary of the existing inventory of the City's records storage facilities.

**TABLE IV-E2**  
**EXISTING RECORDS STORAGE FACILITY**

Records Storage Facility	Units
Records Storage Facility	3,000 Sq. Ft.

It is expected that the existing Records Storage facility will be torn down and will be replaced by a larger facility as described in the section below.

**PROPOSED FACILITIES**

In order to determine the proposed facilities, the City must determine the demand upon infrastructure created by new development. It is clear all new development in the City will impact the City's current ability to provide records storage services.

If development continues without an increase in the records storage facilities, the existing facilities would be overwhelmed in terms of providing records storage services. Additional demands will be made upon the previously listed asset in Table IV-E2 above and therefore, such assets would need to be expanded.

Table IV-E3 identifies the records storage facility proposed to be funded in whole or in part with the collection of Records Storage fees. Quantity and costs are based on estimates provided by the City.

**TABLE IV-E3**  
**NEEDS LIST**

Records Storage Facilities	Facility Unit	Number	Facility Cost
New Records Storage Facility	SF	6,000	\$1,716,000

**Equivalent Dwelling Units**

For records storage facilities, the development of property into residential and non-residential uses generates residents and employees increasing the need for records storage services. Existing records storage facilities used to provide these services will have to be expanded, constructed or purchased to meet this increased demand.

Since the facilities proposed to be financed by the impact fees will serve both residential and non-residential property, DTA projected the number of future EDUs based on the number of residents or employees generated by each land use class.

As shown in Section III.4 (Demographics - EDUs), there are 33,400 total existing EDUs and 31,616 future EDUs, bringing the total EDUs in 2040 to 65,016 EDUs.

#### **Allocation of Costs**

The total cost of \$1,716,000, as shown in Table IV-E3 above, for records storage facilities needed to serve existing and new development is allocated to existing and new development based on the share of total EDUs in 2040.

Table IV-E4 summarizes the allocation of the future records storage facilities costs to existing and new development. The City has determined that the existing records storage facility will need to be replaced with a new 6,000 square foot records storage facility in order to adequately serve both existing and new development. Therefore, 51.37% of the costs will be allocated to existing development and 48.63% will be allocated to new development as shown below.

**TABLE IV-E4**  
**ALLOCATION OF RECORDS STORAGE FACILITIES COSTS**

Type of Development	EDUs	Percentage of Total EDUs	Total SF in 2040	Facility Costs Allocated
Existing Development	33,400	51.37%	3,082	\$881,543
Future Development	31,616	48.63%	2,918	\$834,457
<b>Total</b>	<b>65,016</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>6,000</b>	<b>\$1,716,000</b>

#### **Proposed Fee Amount**

The Fee per EDU was calculated by dividing the costs allocated to future development by the number of future EDUs. See Table IV-E5 for the fee amount for each land use.

## SECTION IV: FEE CALCULATIONS – RECORDS STORAGE FACILITIES FEE

**TABLE IV-E5  
PROPOSED FEES**

Land Use Type	EDUs per Unit/Room/1,000 Sq. Ft.	Development Impact Fee per Unit/Room/1,000 Sq. Ft.	Cost Financed by Fees
<u>Residential Property</u>			
Single Family	1.00	\$26	\$641,675
Multi-Family	0.78	\$20	\$80,199
<u>Non-Residential Property</u>			
Commercial/Office/Retail	0.36	\$9	\$48,962
Industrial	1.57	\$41	\$59,396
Hotel/Motel	0.76	\$20	\$4,225
Total			\$834,457
Cost Allocated to Existing Development			\$881,543
<b>Total Cost of Records Storage Facilities</b>			<b>\$1,716,000</b>

Based on the development projections in Section III, the fee amount presented in Table IV-E5 above is expected to finance approximately 48.63% of the facilities needed. The City will need to fund the remaining costs from other sources of funds.

## SECTION IV: FEE CALCULATIONS - DRAINAGE FACILITIES FEE

### F. DRAINAGE FACILITIES

The Drainage Facilities will serve the residents and employees of the City by providing new drainage systems and improvements to existing drainage facilities in order to mitigate the impacts of new development on the existing drainage facilities. The drainage facilities to be financed include components for new detention basins, storm drain systems, street crossings, and flood control basins. Table IV-F1 illustrates how the drainage facilities Fee will meet the requirements of AB 1600 with regard to use of the fee, the type of development funded or partially funded by the fee revenue, the reasonable relationship to the need for facilities and the proportionality requirements.

**TABLE IV-F1**  
**DRAINAGE FACILITIES**

AB 1600 Code Section	Description	Justification
66001(a)(1)	Identify the purpose of the Fee	Provide a revenue source that will provide funds to construct various drainage projects that will mitigate the impacts of new development on the City's drainage and flood control facilities.
66001(a)(2)	Identify the use to which the fee is to be put	Fund or partially fund the construction of new storm drains, culverts, channels, and basins within the City limits. The drainage improvements to be funded or partially funded are summarized in Table IV-F2
66001(a)(3)	Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed	New residential and non-residential development in the City will generate additional run-off on City streets, where on-site retention is not conditioned as part of the permitting process. The fee revenue will be used to construct new drainage projects from which new residents and employees will benefit from flood protection related to property damage, health and safety and vehicular access on public streets. A fee imposed on new residential and nonresidential development is a reasonable method for mitigating the impacts of such new development.

## SECTION IV: FEE CALCULATIONS - DRAINAGE FACILITIES FEE

AB 1600 Code Section	Description	Justification
66001(a)(4)	Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facilities and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed	The additional run-off generated by new development will increase the risk of flood damage in proportion to the volume of run-off added to the system. New and enlarged facilities are needed to mitigate the impacts of the increased run-off volumes. If the proposed projects are not constructed in concert with new development the City's drainage system will experience a higher risk of i) flood damage to public and private improvements ii) impaired access on public streets, and iii) adverse conditions relating to public health safety
66001(b)	Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facility	Project costs are allocated to new development based on the percentage of run-off generated by new development to the total run-off at buildout. Run-off amounts are calculated based on Rational Method Hydrology principles. Specific fees calculated for various land uses are based on the relative run-off rates as compared to a residential unit (baseline rate or ERU factor, where ERU is the equivalent runoff unit)

### PROPOSED FACILITIES AND COSTS

In order to determine the proposed improvements, the City must determine the demand upon infrastructure created by new development. It is clear all new development in the City will impact the City's current ability to provide drainage systems and flood protection.

The discharge capacity of the existing drainage systems is determined by design and in many cases is at design capacity for the appropriate storm event. When capacity is exceeded due to the runoff impacts of new development, the level of flood protection afforded to existing development will be reduced. In other words, if development continues without new improvements to the drainage systems, the existing facilities would be unable to provide the level of flood protection consistent with City standards.

Table IV-F2 identifies the drainage improvements proposed to be funded in whole or in part with the collection of Drainage Facilities fees. Quantity and costs are based on estimates provided by the City. The proposed drainage improvements include culverts and basins that provide flood protection at key roadways within the City. These roadways are not only integral parts of the city-wide circulation system but also provide city-wide access for emergency vehicles during significant flood events. Therefore, these improvements have city-wide rather than local benefit, and the costs will be split



## SECTION IV: FEE CALCULATIONS - DRAINAGE FACILITIES FEE

between new and existing development in proportion to the contribution to total runoff from each.

**TABLE IV-F2**  
**DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS COST SUMMARY**

Improvement Type	Location	Total Project Cost	Cost Allocated to New Development
Storm Drainage System, Detention Basins	Escondido Ave. to Eucalyptus St./ Line A-04	\$21,120,000	\$10,258,228
Storm Drainage System	Muscotel Ave. to Main St. Line H-01	\$11,367,000	\$5,521,083
Storm Drainage System, Street Crossing / Culvert	4 <sup>th</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> , Line H-01	\$1,400,000	\$679,996
Street Crossing / Culvert	Arrowhead Lake Rd. between Centennial St. and Sutter St., Line D-01	\$970,000	\$471,140
Street Crossing / Culvert	Lemon Street between G Ave. and H Ave., Line H-02	\$800,000	\$388,569
Street Crossing / Culvert	Lemon Street between C Ave. and E Ave., Line H-01	\$1,300,000	\$631,425
Storm Drainage System, Street Crossing / Culvert	E Ave. to I Ave., Line H-01 and H-03	\$2,320,000	\$1,126,851
Street Crossing / Culvert	Orchard Ave., North of Lilac St., Line H-01	\$660,000	\$320,570
Storm Drainage System, Street Crossing / Culvert	I Ave. to Line H-01 (near Talisman), Line H-02	\$2,040,000	\$990,852
Storm Drainage System	Third Ave. to Railroad Tracks, Line H-01	\$9,900,000	\$4,808,544
Detention/Retention Basins	Local Flood Control Basins (City-wide)	\$8,000,000	\$3,980,237
Detention Basin	Walnut Basin, Line H-01	\$3,700,000	\$1,797,133
Detention Basin	Temecula Basin, Line C-01	\$3,900,000	\$1,894,275
Street Crossing / Culvert, Raise Road	Peach Ave. between Centennial St. and Hinton St., Line D-01	\$400,000	\$194,285
Storm Drainage System, Detention Basins	11 <sup>th</sup> Ave. at Elm St. to Hesperia Rd., Line H-02	\$13,300,000	\$6,459,963
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>\$81,177,000</b>	<b>\$39,428,606</b>

### Equivalent Runoff Units

For the purposes of allocating drainage costs to both total existing and total new development the demand variable chosen is the equivalent runoff unit (ERU). This is a metric that estimates the runoff ("Q", in cubic feet per second) per acre from the various land use types. The Rational Method Hydrology<sup>1</sup> ( $Q=CIA$ ) analysis was used because it is felt that this method is the most reasonable and accepted method for

<sup>1</sup> Rational Method Hydrology ( $Q=C * I * A$ ) is a widely accepted method of computing rainfall runoff for small drainage areas, where Q is the runoff rate in cubic feet per second, C is the percentage of site area that is impervious, I is rainfall intensity in inches per hour and A is parcel area in acres.

analyzing parcels of the size typically found in this study. For simplicity, the rainfall intensity, "I", is assumed to have a value of 1 (in inches of rainfall per acre). The total area, in acres, for residential parcels is determined by using the total residential units and average residential densities (units per acre) to determine site acreage. The total acreage for non-residential development is determined by dividing the building square feet identified in the Demographics section of this study by the industry standard floor area ratios ("FAR").

The ERU was chosen as the demand variable because it is a reliable industry standard and best relates the quantity of runoff generated by the various land uses to the costs associated with mitigating the effects of this runoff. In order to fairly allocate costs between existing and new development, total ERUs must be calculated for both cases. Tables IV-F3 and IV-F4 show the calculations for determining the total ERUs for existing and future development respectively. Further discussion on the application of the Rational Method as it relates to this Fee Study can be found in Appendix C.

ERUs are a fair and reasonable measure of the demand placed on the City's drainage system. When these factors are applied to the demographic data for existing and new development, total calculated ERUs for existing and new development as a percentage of total ERUs can be used in the allocation of facility costs to new development.

As discussed in Section III the land uses considered upon which development impact fees will be imposed include Residential, Commercial/Office/Retail, Industrial and Hotel/Motel, with their various sub categories. Within the Residential category are single family and multi-family. Existing and future ERUs from the above subcategories are calculated for the purposes of the allocation of drainage improvement costs to existing and new development.

The total ERUs for existing development as well as the percentage of total ERUs are shown in Table IV-F3 below.

## SECTION IV: FEE CALCULATIONS - DRAINAGE FACILITIES FEE

**TABLE IV-F3  
EXISTING ERUs**

Residential Property	Residential Units/1,000 SF/Rooms	Density (EDU/Acre)	FAR	Acres "A"	Runoff Coefficient "C"	Total ERUs
Single Family	25,747	4.0	N/A	6,436.8	0.70	4,505.7
Multi-Family	3,320	12.0	N/A	276.7	0.80	221.3
<b>Non-Residential Property</b>						
Commercial/Office/Retail	5,791	N/A	0.4	332.3	0.95	315.7
Industrial	1,853.8	N/A	0.2	212.8	1.00	212.8
Hotel/Motel	393	N/A	N/A	11.5	0.90	10.4
					Total Existing ERUs	5,265.9
					% of Total ERUs	51.43%

The total ERUs for future development as well as the percentage of total ERUs are shown in Table IV-F4:

**TABLE IV-F4  
FUTURE ERUs**

Residential Property	Residential Units/1,000 SF/Rooms	Density (EDU/Acre)	FAR	Acres "A"	Runoff Coefficient "C"	Total ERUs
Single Family	24,312	4.0	N/A	6,078.0	0.70	4,254.6
Multi-Family	3,917	12.0	N/A	326.4	0.80	261.1
<b>Non-Residential Property</b>						
Commercial/Office/Retail	5,219	N/A	0.4	299.5	0.95	284.5
Industrial	1,436	N/A	0.2	164.8	1.00	164.8
Hotel/Motel	212	N/A	N/A	9.1	0.90	8.2
				6,877.9	Total Existing ERUs	4,973.3
					% of Total ERUs	48.57%
					Total ERUs	10,239.2

### Allocation of Costs

The total cost of \$81,177,000, as shown in Table IV-F2 above, is needed for drainage improvements that have city-wide benefit. Of this total \$39,428,606 is needed to mitigate the impacts of new development based on the share of total ERUs in 2040.

Table IV-F5 below summarizes the allocation of the future drainage improvement costs to existing and new development. The City has determined that the existing drainage facilities will need to be improved in order to adequately serve both existing

and new development. Therefore, 51.43% of the costs will be allocated to existing development and 48.57% will be allocated to new development as shown above.

The drainage costs allocated to new development are then divided by total future ERUs to determine the cost per ERU. This is the baseline ERU used in calculating the various fees. See Table IV-F5 below for the calculation of the cost per baseline ERU.

**TABLE IV-F5**  
**COST PER ERU**

Total Drainage Costs Allocated to New Development	Total Future ERUs	Cost per ERU
\$39,428,606	4,973.3	\$7,928.04

#### **Proposed Fee Amount**

The fee amount for each unit of new residential development is determined by calculating the relative runoff per unit, using the Rational Runoff Method ( $Q=CIA$ ), and multiplying that amount by the cost per ERU found in Table IV-F5 above. Because the Rational Runoff Method ( $Q=CIA$ ), as used in this Study, calculates runoff on a per acre basis from a unit storm intensity (1 inch per hour) and a given percentage of impervious area depending on land use type, the resulting calculation must be divided by the various land use densities in order to determine the relative contributions of runoff. See Table IV-F6 for the fee amount for each land use.

The fee amounts for new non-residential development are based on the allocated cost per 1,000 square feet of building space for Commercial/Office/Retail and Industrial uses.

# SECTION IV: FEE CALCULATIONS - DRAINAGE FACILITIES FEE

**TABLE IV-F6  
PROPOSED FEES**

Land Use Type	Density (Units/ Acre)	Acres	Runoff Coefficient	Q = Runoff Density	Cost per ERU	Fee per Unit/ 1,000 SF/Room	Fee Units	Cost Financed by Fees
<u>Residential Property</u>								
Single Family	4.0	N/A	0.70	0.175	\$7,928	\$1,387.41	Residential Units	\$33,730,649
Multi-Family	12.0	N/A	0.80	0.067	\$7,928	\$528.54	Residential Units	\$2,070,276
<u>Non-Residential Property</u>								
Commercial/Office/Retail	N/A	0.4	0.95	0.055	\$7,928	\$432.26	Square Feet	\$2,255,904
Industrial	N/A	0.2	1.00	0.115	\$7,928	\$910.01	Square Feet	\$1,306,846
Hotel/Motel	N/A	N/A	0.90	0.900	\$7,928	\$306.28	Room	\$64,931
Total								\$39,428,606
Cost Allocated to Existing Development								\$41,748,394
<b>Total Cost of Drainage Facilities</b>								<b>\$81,177,000</b>

Based on the development projections in Section III, the fee amount presented in Table IV-F6 above are expected to finance approximately 48.57% of the facilities needed. The City will need to fund the remaining costs from other sources of funds.

**G. TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES**

The planning tool the City uses to identify current and future needs for an effective overall circulation system within the City is the Circulation Element of the General Plan. Mandated by State Law, the Circulation Element must be linked to the Land Use Element of the General Plan. In addition, the Circulation Element must be consistent with, and integrated with, the Riverside-San Bernardino Area Comprehensive Transportation Plan Model (CTP Model). Consistency is a requirement for eligibility for State and local transportation funds.

The Circulation Element of the City's General Plan serves as the City's Transportation Master Plan, which identifies future transportation facilities needed to mitigate the impacts of new development through build out conditions, beyond the year 2040. The City provided a listing of future transportation facilities needed to mitigate the impacts of new development through 2040. The facilities listed included freeway exchanges and overpasses, major arterials, arterials, secondary arterials, intersection expansions and a transit facility. Project limits and costs for the first three categories are consistent with San Bernardino County Transportation Authority ("SBCTA") Development Mitigation Nexus Study and the SBCTA Congestion Management Plan ("CMP"), with appropriate cost escalators.

City staff uses current traffic and land use data to update their traffic Circulation Element. Any significant changes to impacts resulting from new development are incorporated into the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) at regular intervals. Such changes are also incorporated into the Circulation Element at periodic intervals.

All projects to be funded or partially funded through this DIF will have city-wide benefit.

Table IV-G1 illustrates how the transportation Fee will meet the requirements of AB 1600 with regard to use of fees, the type of development funded or partially funded by the fee revenue, the reasonable relationship to the need for facilities, and the proportionality requirements.

**TABLE IV-G1**  
**TRANSPORTATION FEE – AB 1600 COMPLIANCE**

AB 1600 Code Section	Description	Justification
66001(a)(1)	Identify the purpose of the Fee	Provide a revenue source that will provide funds to construct various transportation projects that will mitigate the impacts of new development on the City's circulation system
66001(a)(2)	Identify the use to which the fee is to be put	Fund or partially fund the construction of new roadways and transit facility within the City limits. The roadway improvements to be funded or partially funded are summarized in Table IV-G2 further listed in Appendix C
66001(a)(3)	Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed	New residential and non-residential development will generate additional traffic on City streets. The fee revenue will be used to construct new transportation projects upon which new residents and employees will travel. A fee imposed on new residential and non-residential development is a reasonable method for mitigating the impacts of such new development
66001(a)(4)	Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facilities and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed	The additional traffic volumes generated by new development will impact current levels of congestion. New roadways and supplemental lanes are needed to mitigate the impacts of the increased traffic volumes. If the proposed projects are not constructed in concert with new development the City's circulation system will experience higher traffic volumes and increase the level of congestion to a condition well below City standards
66001(b)	Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facility	Project costs are allocated to new development based on the percentage of traffic volume generated by new development to the total traffic volume at build out. The specific fee imposed on the various land uses are based on the relative trip generation rate as compared to a residential unit (baseline rate or EDU factor)

#### PROPOSED FACILITIES AND COSTS

As mentioned above, City staff provided a detailed breakdown of the city-wide transportation projects needed to mitigate the impacts of new development through the year 2040. The projects consist of city-wide roadway improvements totaling nearly \$950 million, of which over \$670 million will be financed through transportation impact fee revenue. The Needs



## SECTION IV: FEE CALCULATIONS – TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES FEE

List includes improvements to freeway exchanges and overpasses, major arterials, arterials, secondary arterials, intersection expansions, and a transit facility. Roadway projects and intersection projects are part of the City's Circulation Element of the General Plan and the City's Capital Improvement Program. The interchange projects as well as the grade separations and regional arterial projects are part of the Riverside-San Bernardino Area CTP Model by SCAG and SBCTA Nexus Study and Congestion Management Plan. These projects are identified by these models and master plans as being needed solely or partially to mitigate the impacts of new development. Where projects are partially needed to cure existing deficiencies or otherwise benefit existing development, the proportionate share of the cost of those projects allocated to existing development would have to be funded by sources other than impact fees.

Major arterials, arterials, secondary arterials, freeway interchanges, and intersection expansions will be funded or partially funded by these impact fees. With regard to freeway interchanges, this Study uses the percentage allocations to new development for interchange projects that are identified in the SBCTA Nexus study. Where the benefits from local projects are shared between existing and new development the allocation to new development is based on the percentage of average daily trips ("ADTs") generated by new development to the total ADTs of the City's roadway network. Where projects are required solely to mitigate the impacts of new development, a 10% allocation to general benefit is assumed, with the remaining 90% allocated to new development. The City has indicated that four of the projects are required solely to mitigate the impacts of new development and will not be impacted by pass through traffic whose trips are originated and ended outside of the City limits. Therefore these projects receive 100% allocation to new development. The project categories, costs and allocations are shown in Table IV-G2, "Transportation Cost Summary":

**TABLE IV-G2**  
**TRANSPORTATION COST SUMMARY**

Component	Total Project Cost	Cost Allocated to New Development
Freeway Exchanges & Overpass	\$317,112,652	\$193,867,029
Major Arterials	\$298,338,093	\$227,695,435
Arterials	\$272,100,190	\$201,359,544
Secondary Arterials	\$54,958,260	\$41,195,371
Intersection Expansion	\$6,153,220	\$5,537,898
Transit Facility	\$1,200,000	\$1,080,000
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$949,862,415</b>	<b>\$670,735,278</b>

Please refer to Table C-1 of Appendix C for a list of projects to be funded, or partially funded by transportation facilities fee. The total project cost as well as the costs allocated to new development are also shown in the table.



### Equivalent Dwelling Units

For the purposes of allocating transportation costs to both existing and new development the demand variable is the average daily trip end. This is a metric that estimates the number of vehicular trips generated by a specific land use within a one hour period during that part of the day in which peak traffic volumes are observed. ADT was chosen as the demand variable because it is consistent with the metric used in the regional transportation plans mentioned at the beginning of this section and is an industry standard. Without question the design and cost estimates for new and expanded roadways are based on traffic volumes generated, congestion levels of service and standards adopted by the local agency. ADTs are a fair and reasonable measure of the demand placed on the City's roadway system. The ADTs generated by a residential dwelling, whose value is determined from the ITE<sup>1</sup> manual, is used as the baseline variable. Comparison of ADTs for the other land uses to the baseline ADT produces EDU factors for the various land uses. When these factors are applied to the demographic data for existing and new development, total calculated EDUs for existing and new development as a percentage of total EDUs can be used in the allocation of facility costs to new development.

### Trip Rates

As discussed in Section III the land uses considered upon which development impact fees will be imposed include Single Family Residential, Multi-Family Residential, Commercial/Office/Retail, Industrial, and Hotel/Motel, with their various sub categories. Within the Residential uses are single family and multi-family, which were chosen to best fit the type of residential development throughout the City, and for which the ITE manual has data and recommended trip rates. In a similar manner, the ITE trip rates for Commercial land use designation includes commercial, retail trade and food service sub categories. The Industrial category includes warehousing, manufacturing, general industrial and health care. Weighted average ADTs from the above subcategories are calculated for the purposes of determining existing and future ADTs and the allocation of transportation costs to existing and new development. Weighted average ADTs will also be used to determine EDU factors needed to calculate the various fee levels.

In order to fairly allocate costs between existing and new development, total ADTs must be calculated for both cases. The total ADTs for existing development as well as the percentage of total ADTs are shown in Table IV-G3 below.

---

<sup>1</sup> Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation, 8th Edition, Volumes 1,2 and 3

## SECTION IV: FEE CALCULATIONS – TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES FEE

**TABLE IV-G3  
EXISTING AVERAGE DAILY TRIPS**

Residential Property	Trip Rate	Residential Units/1,000 SF/Rooms	Units	ADTs
Single Family	9.57	25,747	Residential Units	246,399
Multi-Family	6.63	3,320	Residential Units	22,012
<b>Non-Residential Property</b>				
Commercial/Office/Retail	13.27	5,791	1,000 Sq. Ft.	76,841
Industrial	6.97	1,854	1,000 Sq. Ft.	12,921
Hotel/Motel	8.92	393	Rooms	3,506
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>% of Total ADTs</b>	<b>361,678 51.56%</b>

The total ADTs for future development as well as the percentage of total ADTs are shown in Table IV-G4:

**TABLE IV-G4  
FUTURE ADTs**

Residential Property	Trip Rate	Residential Units/1,000 SF/Rooms	Units	ADTs
Single Family	9.57	24,312	Residential Units	232,666
Multi-Family	6.63	3,917	Residential Units	25,970
<b>Non-Residential Property</b>				
Commercial/Office/Retail	13.27	5,219	1,000 Sq. Ft.	69,255
Industrial	6.97	1,436	1,000 Sq. Ft.	10,009
Hotel/Motel	8.92	212	Rooms	1,891
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>% of Total ADTs</b>	<b>339,791 48.44%</b>
			<b>Total ADTs</b>	<b>701,469</b>

The percentage of total ADTs for future development, as shown in the table above, is used in Table C-1 of Appendix C, "Transportation Needs List" to allocate to new development new transportation facilities that have citywide benefit.

### Allocation of Costs

The transportation costs allocated to new development are then divided by total new ADTs to determine the cost per ADT. The cost per ADT is then multiplied by the ADT rate for a single family unit. This is the baseline EDU used in calculating the various fees.

## SECTION IV: FEE CALCULATIONS – TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES FEE

See Table IV-G5 for the calculation of the cost per single family unit, or baseline EDU:

**TABLE IV-G5**  
**COST PER ADT**

Total Transportation Costs Allocated to New Development	Total Future ADTs	Cost per ADT
\$670,735,278	339,791	\$1,974

### Proposed Fee Amount

The EDU factors for the various land uses are determined by dividing the ADT rate for each corresponding land use by the ADT rate for the single family category (baseline rate). The EDU factor for each land use is multiplied by the cost per EDU calculated in the preceding table to determine the proposed fee. The proposed fee schedule for transportation is shown in Table IV-G6:

Table IV-G6 is a summary of the proposed transportation fees for the various land uses within the six facility categories.

**TABLE IV-G6**  
**TRANSPORTATION FEE SCHEDULE**

Residential Property	Average Daily Trip Rate	Cost per ADT	Units	DIF per Unit/1,000 SF/Room	Cost Financed by DIF
Single Family	9.57	\$1,974	Residential Units	\$18,891	\$459,274,295
Multi-Family	6.63	\$1,974	Residential Units	\$13,087	\$51,263,306
<b>Non-Residential Property</b>					
Commercial/Office/Retail	13.27	\$1,974	1,000 Sq. Ft.	\$26,195	\$136,706,578
Industrial	6.97	\$1,974	1,000 Sq. Ft.	\$13,759	\$19,758,251
Hotel/Motel	8.92	\$1,974	Rooms	\$17,608	\$3,732,847
<b>Total</b>					<b>\$670,735,278</b>

The calculated Fees shown in Table V-1 below represent the maximum Fee for each land use that can be charged. The City Council may decide to charge a lower amount than the maximum Fee. It must be pointed out that if lower fees are implemented, other funding sources will be needed to make up the shortfall if all projects are to be completed, or it is highly possible that not all of the projects listed will be completed at build out conditions.

In order to recover administrative costs incurred by the City in the administration of the fee program, an administrative component of 1.0% of each fee is added on to the proposed fees calculated for each land use category.

Table V-1 below summarizes the proposed Fee schedule including the administrative component:

**TABLE V-1**  
**CITY OF HESPERIA**  
**DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE SUMMARY**

Land Use	Residential (Fee per unit)		Non-Residential (Fee per 1,000 Sq. Ft.)		Fee per Room
	Single Family	Multi-Family	Commercial/ Office/Retail	Industrial	Hotel/Motel [1]
Fire Facilities [2]	\$648	\$491	\$187	\$908	\$437
Police Facilities	\$10	\$8	\$4	\$16	\$8
Animal Control Facilities	\$227	\$176	\$0	\$0	\$0
City Hall Facilities	\$546	\$424	\$194	\$856	\$412
Records Storage Facilities	\$26	\$20	\$9	\$41	\$20
Drainage Facilities	\$1,387	\$529	\$432	\$910	\$306
Transportation Facilities	\$18,891	\$13,087	\$26,195	\$13,759	\$17,608
Administrative Fee (1.00%)	\$217	\$147	\$270	\$165	\$188
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$21,953</b>	<b>\$14,882</b>	<b>\$27,291</b>	<b>\$16,655</b>	<b>\$18,980</b>

[1] Drainage fee for Hotel/Motel category is on a per gross acre basis.

[2] Not charged to property in Tapestry.

New development, at the time of permit issuance, or as prescribed by the City of Hesperia Municipal Code, shall pay the appropriate Fee for each facility category and the City shall deposit the funds in a separate account dedicated to the construction of the respective facilities proposed, in accordance with Government Code Section 66006(a).

For purposes of determining the impact fees due, any “second unit” or “accessory dwelling unit” (as determined pursuant to Section 65852.2 of the Government Code) shall be considered a separate residential unit and shall be subject to this Fee.

Every five years the City shall report the status of the funds in accordance with Government Code Section 66001(d) and shall i) identify the purpose to which the fee is put; ii) demonstrate a reasonable relationship between the fee and the purpose for which it is charged; iii) identify the sources and amounts of funding needed to complete the program; iv) list the facilities not yet completed; and v) identify, to the extent possible, the timing of when the remaining funds are expected to be received.

It is further recommended that the City update its Capital Improvement Plan annually, by resolution of the City Council, in accordance with Government Code Section 66002.

Finally, it is recommended that the City include in its Council Resolution to adopt the fees, a provision to automatically increase the fees annually tied to an inflation index, such as the Engineering News Record Construction Price Index, or some other reasonable measure of inflation.

## APPENDIX A

### Demographics Summary

## **Appendix A – Demographics Summary**

The purpose of this appendix is to document the methodology used to process raw data for residential and non-residential land uses provided by the City and other sources in order to prepare an estimate of the existing and future development data. This Study will project residential and non-residential development to a 2040 development horizon. This data will be used to calculate the Fees, as discussed in Section IV of this Study. This demographic data was calculated in order to recommend a Fee structure that will ensure that new development will pay its reasonable fair share of the total facilities costs.

### **A.1 Existing Development**

Existing number of residents and existing residential units as of January 1, 2015 are shown in Table III-2 of the Study. The number of residential units was provided by the California Department of Finance. The number of residents was estimated based on a population per household of 3.26 for Single Family units and 2.47 for Multi-Family units, as shown in Table LU-8 of the Land Use Element of the 2010 City General Plan included as backup herein. Existing number of employees and non-residential building square feet as of January 1, 2015 are shown in Table III-3 of the Study. The number of existing employees for commercial/office/retail, and industrial land uses is based on Year 2012 figures shown in Table 1 of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Community Strategy (RTP/SCS) included as backup herein and estimated to 2015 based on the annual growth rate of 2.32% indicated in the SCAG data. The number of existing employees for the hotel/motel land use is based on the City's estimate of 2.5 employees per room. Existing non-residential square feet is based on Tables 3 and 4 of the City's December 2010 EIR included as backup herein. Per the City, an additional 600,000 square feet of commercial/office/retail development was included to bring the 2010 development to 2015.

### **A.2 Future Residential and Non-Residential Development (City-wide)**

Section III.2 of this Study refers to development through 2040 including property located in the Tapestry Specific Plan. The future number of residents and existing residential units through 2040 are shown in Table III-4 of the Study. Future residents and residential units were based on information that was provided by the City. Future number of employees and non-residential building square feet through 2040 are shown in Table III-5 of the Study. Future employees for industrial property is based on Year 2012 figures shown in Table 1 of the SCAG 2016-2040 RTP/SCS and projected forward to 2015 based on the annual growth rate of 2.32% indicated in the SCAG data. The number of future hotel/motel rooms and future employees for the hotel/motel land use is based on the City's estimate of 2.5 employees per room. Future industrial square feet through 2040 is based on the existing 2015 employees per 1,000 square feet factor. Future commercial/office/retail square feet through 2040 is based on estimates provided by the City.

# LAND USE



**TABLE LU-8**  
**LAND USE DESIGNATIONS AND ACREAGE**

General Plan Land Use Designation	Description	Density/Intensity	Project Average DU/AC or FAR	Population per Household/ Employee per Acre	Total Acreage	Percent of Total City
<b>Residential</b>						
A2	General Agriculture	(0.0 - 0.2 du/ac)	0.1	3.3	2191.74	3.13%
A1-2 ½	Limited Agriculture-2 ½	(0.21 - 0.4 du/ac)	0.4	3.3	799.89	1.14%
A1	Limited Agriculture-1	(0.41 - 1.0 du/ac)	0.75	3.3	4163.96	5.95%
<b>Rural Residential</b>						
RR-2 ½	Rural Residential-2 ½	(0.0 - 0.4 du/ac)	0.4	3.3	13543.17	19.34%
RR(SD)	Rural Residential-Special Development	(0.0 - 0.4 du/ac)	0.25	3.3	11551.76	16.49%
RR-1	Rural Residential-1	(0.41 - 1.0 du/ac)	1.0	3.3	2762.89	3.94%
RR-20000	Rural Residential-20,000	(1.1 - 2.0 du/ac)	1.75	3.3	3210.77	4.58%
<b>Residential</b>						
R1-18000	Single-Family Residence-18,000	(2.1 - 2.4 du/ac)	2	3.3	4730.07	6.75%
R1	Single-Family Residence	(2.5 - 4.5 du/ac)	4	3.3	744.72	1.06%
R1-4500	Single Family Residence-4,500	(4.6 - 8.0 du/ac)	6.5	3.3	454.09	0.65%
R3	Multiple Family Residential	(8.1 - 15.0 du/ac)	12	2.5	140.77	0.20%
<b>Commercial</b>						
C1	Neighborhood Commercial	(0.0 - 0.5 FAR)	0.25	10.08	72.5	0.10%
C2	General Commercial	(0.0 - 1.0 FAR)	0.35	10.08	412.06	0.59%
C3	Service Commercial	(0.0 - 0.5 FAR)	0.35	7.83	61.74	0.09%
<b>Industrial</b>						
I1	Limited Manufacturing	(0.0 - 1.0 FAR)	0.4	7.83	274.92	0.39%
I2	General Manufacturing	(0.0 - 1.0 FAR)	0.25	7.83	496.41	0.71%
<b>Public</b>						
P-School	Public Schools	(0.0 - 1.0 FAR)	-	-	156.53	0.22%
P-Govt	Government Facilities	(0.0 - 1.0 FAR)	-	-	113	0.16%
P-Park/Rec	Park and Recreation Facilities	(0.0 - 1.0 FAR)	-	-	1876.35	2.68%
<b>Specific Plan</b>						
SP-89-01	Rancho Las Flores Specific Plan	-	-	-	9631.59	13.75%
SP-91-003	Summit Valley Ranch Specific Plan	-	-	-	786.21	1.12%
MSFC-SP	Main Street / Freeway Corridor Specific Plan	-	-	-	8859.89	12.65%
<b>Other</b>						
Airport	Airport Use	-	-	-	20.57	0.30%
Rec-Com	Recreation - Commercial	-	-	-	278.96	0.40%
RC	Resource Conservation	-	-	-	314.75	0.45%
RRC	Railroad Corridor	-	-	-	485.82	0.69%
AQ	Aqueduct	-	-	-	589.32	0.84%
TC	Transportation Corridor	-	-	-	398	0.57%
UC	Utilities Corridor	-	-	-	916.48	1.31%
<b>Totals</b>					<b>70,038.93</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Notes:**

- The total acreage for the Main Street Freeway Corridor Specific Plan (MSFC-SP) does not include the approximately 132 acres of aqueduct, 101 acres of railroad corridor, 301 acres of utility corridor, 398 acres of major transportation corridors, and 845 acres in roadways that is included in the total identified in Table LU-4 Main Street and Freeway Corridor Specific Plan Land Uses. The acreages for the aqueduct, railroad corridors, utilities, and major transportation corridors are identified under "Other" in this table; roadways were included with the adjacent land use designation. Therefore, the total acreage identified in Table LU-4 of 10,637 acres is consistent with the total of the MSFC-SP and the aqueduct, railroad, utility, and transportation corridors.
- The total acreage for the Rancho Las Flores Specific Plan (SP-89-01) does not include the approximately 236 acres of utility corridors that is included in the total identified in Table LU-5 Rancho Las Flores Specific Plan, May 2006, Land Uses. The acreage for the utility corridors is included under "Other" in this table. The total acreage identified in Table LU-5 of 9,867 acres is consistent with the total for SP-89-01 and 236 acres of utility corridor identified within this table.



TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF CITY-LEVEL GROWTH FORECASTS FOR THE SCAG 2016-2040 RTP/SCS - ORIGINAL SCAG DATA vs. LOCAL INPUT  
As of May 14, 2014

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y
	Original Draft SCAG City-Level Estimates									Revised Draft City-Level Estimates with Local Input															
										Households							Employment								
	Population			Households			Employment			Growth (2012-2040)			Total			Annual Growth Rate ('12 vs '40)		Growth (2012-2040)			Total			Annual Growth Rate ('12 vs '40)	
			Annual Growth Rate			Annual Growth Rate			Annual Growth Rate	SF	MF	Total				%	Change From SCAG	Retail	Non-Retail	Total	2020	2035	2040	%	Change From SCAG
	Jurisdiction	2012	2040	Annual Growth Rate	2012	2040	Annual Growth Rate	2012	2040	Annual Growth Rate	SF	MF	Total	2020	2035	2040	%	Change From SCAG	Retail	Non-Retail	Total	2020	2035	2040	%
Adelanto	31,146	80,390	3.44%	7,923	21,080	3.56%	3,885	11,500	3.95%	8,105	2,092	10,197	10,052	16,019	18,120	3.00%	-0.56%	886	2,982	3,868	5,213	7,545	7,753	2.50%	-1.45%
Apple Valley	70,162	113,150	1.72%	23,706	39,410	1.83%	15,417	30,570	2.47%	7,252	3,828	11,080	26,524	32,987	34,786	1.38%	-0.45%	8,596	3,551	12,147	19,588	26,530	27,564	2.10%	-0.38%
Barstow	23,070	33,940	1.39%	8,150	12,430	1.52%	8,135	12,860	1.65%	3,235	1,499	4,735	9,876	12,287	12,885	1.65%	0.13%	2,339	6,311	8,650	11,073	16,053	16,785	2.62%	0.97%
Big Bear Lake	5,095	6,520	0.88%	2,198	2,820	0.89%	3,840	5,060	0.99%	640	162	802	2,549	2,936	3,000	1.12%	0.22%	442	1,118	1,560	4,364	5,272	5,400	1.23%	0.23%
Chino	79,447	108,930	1.13%	20,997	30,130	1.30%	42,580	66,190	1.59%	6,974	5,979	12,953	24,462	32,234	33,950	1.73%	0.43%	3,811	4,177	7,988	45,493	49,989	50,568	0.62%	-0.97%
Chino Hills	75,765	88,600	0.56%	22,999	29,610	0.91%	11,471	18,580	1.74%	4,447	2,164	6,611	23,520	28,470	29,610	0.91%	0.00%	2,217	4,892	7,109	13,920	17,940	18,580	1.74%	0.00%
Colton	52,769	69,070	0.97%	14,993	20,810	1.18%	16,826	29,200	1.99%	2,329	3,488	5,817	17,570	20,370	20,810	1.18%	0.00%	2,026	10,348	12,374	21,140	28,100	29,200	1.99%	0.00%
Fontana	200,228	283,880	1.25%	49,646	74,870	1.48%	47,011	83,760	2.08%	10,599	13,789	24,388	53,537	70,041	74,034	1.44%	-0.04%	10,552	13,252	23,804	55,373	68,917	70,815	1.47%	-0.61%
Grand Terrace	12,201	13,340	0.32%	4,417	5,360	0.69%	2,153	3,690	1.94%	443	856	1,299	4,821	5,592	5,716	0.92%	0.23%	1,108	2,080	3,188	3,288	5,051	5,341	3.30%	1.36%
Hesperia	91,122	136,510	1.45%	26,436	41,440	1.62%	14,909	29,360	2.45%	11,740	881	12,621	30,427	37,593	39,057	1.40%	-0.21%	5,344	8,090	13,434	19,651	27,293	28,343	2.32%	-0.13%
Highland	53,740	67,090	0.80%	15,497	20,700	1.04%	5,532	10,500	2.32%	4,209	925	5,134	17,325	20,217	20,631	1.03%	-0.01%	1,734	2,939	4,674	7,205	9,829	10,206	2.21%	-0.10%
Loma Linda	23,409	31,310	1.04%	8,763	12,680	1.33%	16,665	31,900	2.35%	1,386	1,623	3,009	9,905	11,495	11,772	1.06%	-0.27%	1,047	3,435	4,482	18,161	20,662	21,147	0.85%	-1.49%
Montclair	37,199	43,230	0.54%	9,564	11,700	0.72%	16,523	24,550	1.42%	129	1,868	1,997	10,205	11,411	11,561	0.68%	-0.04%	803	1,691	2,494	17,411	18,790	19,017	0.50%	-0.92%
Needles	4,898	7,030	1.30%	1,920	2,820	1.38%	2,235	3,790	1.90%	458	442	900	2,300	2,720	2,820	1.38%	0.00%	295	1,260	1,555	2,750	3,640	3,790	1.90%	0.00%
Ontario	166,328	289,490	2.00%	45,112	84,030	2.25%	103,312	166,280	1.71%	7,343	22,112	29,455	58,257	71,585	74,567	1.81%	-0.44%	5,426	66,651	72,077	129,305	170,570	175,389	1.91%	0.19%
Rancho Cucamonga	170,105	180,630	0.21%	55,362	63,990	0.52%	69,901	104,620	1.45%	7,307	11,420	18,727	57,897	71,202	74,089	1.05%	0.53%	6,188	28,531	34,719	82,340	101,760	104,620	1.45%	0.00%
Redlands	69,586	85,540	0.74%	24,821	32,430	0.96%	31,732	53,400	1.88%	4,905	2,704	7,609	27,320	31,600	32,430	0.96%	0.00%	4,235	17,433	21,668	39,240	51,310	53,400	1.88%	0.00%
Rialto	100,836	122,010	0.68%	25,365	34,510	1.11%	21,076	36,080	1.94%	3,037	3,108	6,145	27,982	31,040	31,510	0.78%	-0.33%	2,097	7,356	9,453	24,430	29,767	30,529	1.33%	-0.61%
San Bernardino (City)	211,943	257,410	0.70%	59,321	77,110	0.94%	88,576	145,170	1.78%	11,336	6,453	17,789	68,900	76,610	77,110	0.94%	0.00%	10,102	29,946	40,048	102,151	124,902	128,624	1.34%	-0.44%
Twentynine Palms	25,876	43,760	1.89%	8,341	14,510	2.00%	4,336	8,510	2.44%	2,859	247	3,106	9,035	10,893	11,447	1.14%	-0.86%	724	3,450	4,174	5,760	8,130	8,510	2.44%	0.00%
Upland	74,661	88,860	0.62%	25,882	31,590	0.71%	31,684	51,790	1.77%	1,136	1,890	3,026	27,159	28,786	28,908	0.40%	-0.32%	3,736	8,051	11,787	35,897	42,345	43,471	1.14%	-0.63%
Victorville	119,596	209,370	2.02%	33,079	63,700	2.37%	29,794	55,700	2.26%	22,052	8,569	30,621	39,430	58,180	63,700	2.37%	0.00%	4,659	18,247	22,906	37,633	50,923	52,700	2.06%	-0.20%
Yucaipa	52,271	64,250	0.74%	18,365	25,040	1.11%	8,160	15,020	2.20%	3,903	2,364	6,267	19,740	23,759	24,632	1.05%	-0.06%	1,776	5,068	6,844	10,614	14,415	15,004	2.20%	0.00%
Yucca Valley	20,952	26,330	0.82%	8,289	12,160	1.38%	6,053	10,030	1.82%	2,978	893	3,870	9,370	11,620	12,159	1.38%	0.00%	638	3,339	3,977	7,450	9,670	10,030	1.82%	0.00%
Unincorporated County	295,588	340,360	0.50%	94,243	110,080	0.56%	57,357	96,870	1.89%	12,884	3,144	16,028	99,148	109,512	110,271	0.56%	0.01%	5,241	28,521	33,762	69,621	88,291	91,119	1.67%	-0.22%
Total	2,067,993	2,791,000	1.08%	615,389	875,010	1.27%	659,163	1,104,980	1.86%	141,686	102,500	244,186	687,311	829,159	859,575	1.20%	-0.06%	86,024	282,718	368,742	789,071	997,693	1,027,905	1,60%	-0.26%

Summary Stats - County and Regional Draft SCAG Estimate

	2012	2040 SCAG	2040 L.I.
Pop/HH County	3.36	3.19	3.19
Emp/HH County	1.07	1.26	1.20
Pop/HH Region	3.12	2.99	
Emp/HH Region	1.27	1.32	

Column Legend:

- A: SCAG draft 2012 city-level population estimate
- B: SCAG draft 2040 city-level population estimate
- C: Annual population growth rate from 2012 (Col A) to 2040 (Col B)
- D: SCAG draft 2012 city-level HH estimate
- E: SCAG draft 2040 city-level HH estimate
- F: Annual HH growth rate from 2012 (Col D) to 2040 (Col E)
- G: Original (Oct 2013) SCAG draft 2012 city-level employment estimate
- H: Original (Oct 2013) SCAG draft 2040 city-level employment estimate
- I: Annual employment growth rate from 2012 (Col G) to 2040 (Col H)
- J: Local input growth in single family HH from 2012 to 2040
- K: Local input growth in multi family HH from 2012 to 2040
- L: Local input growth in total HH from 2012 to 2040 (Col J + Col K)

- M: Revised 2020 total HH after consideration of local input (using SCAG original growth rate for 2012 to 2020)
- N: Revised 2035 total HH after consideration of local input (using SCAG original growth rate for 2012 to 2035)
- O: Revised 2040 total HH after consideration of local input
- P: Annual HH growth rate after local input from 2012 (Col D) to 2040 (Col O)
- Q: Annual HH growth rate change from SCAG draft annual growth rate (Col P - Col F)
- R: Local input growth in retail employment from 2012 to 2040
- S: Local input growth in non-retail employment from 2012 to 2040
- T: Local input growth in total employment from 2012 to 2040 (Col R + Col S)
- U: Revised 2020 total employment after consideration of local input (using SCAG original growth rate for 2012 to 2020)
- V: Revised 2035 total employment after consideration of local input (using SCAG original growth rate for 2012 to 2035)
- W: Revised 2040 total employment after consideration of local input
- X: Annual employment growth rate after local input from 2012 (Col G) to 2040 (Col W)
- Y: Annual employment growth rate change from SCAG draft annual growth rate (Col X - Col I)



**Table 3: Existing Building Areas (In Square Feet)<sup>1</sup>**

Planning Areas	Commercial	Industrial
1	1,957,547	325,798
2	210,861	39,232
3	787,128	0
4	1,218,541	0
5	966,022	1,437,712
6	80,122	6,328
7	187,484	44,734
8	9,916	0
9	11,000	0
10	3,588	0
11	1,342	0
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>5,433,551</b>	<b>1,853,804</b>

**Table 4: Current Population and Dwelling Unit Densities<sup>1</sup>**

PLANNING AREA	ACRES	POPULATION	PEOPLE/ACRE	DWELLING UNITS	DWELLING UNITS/ACRE
1	4,036	1,261	0.31	382	0.09
2	3,571	10,766	3.01	3,319	0.93
3	7,628	23,804	3.12	7,367	0.97
4	1,491	9,017	6.05	3,017	2.02
5	1,632	244	0.15	76	0.05
6	4,246	12,268	2.89	3,721	0.88
7	7,706	25,019	3.25	7,600	0.99
8	12,657	317	0.03	96	0.01
9	7,135	4,128	0.58	1,251	0.18
10	7,719	5,191	0.67	1,573	0.20
11	10,695	363	0.03	110	0.01
<b>Total</b>	<b>68,518</b>	<b>92,377</b>		<b>28,512</b>	
1. Building areas and population counts based on 2004-2005 Assessor's Parcel information.					

## **APPENDIX B**

Demographics Summary –  
Not Including Tapestry and Tapestry Only

(Applies to Fire Fee only)

# **1. FUTURE DEVELOPMENT WITHIN CITY (2016 – 2040) (TAPESTRY ONLY)**

The tables below reflect property located in Tapestry only. Tapestry is located in the southern part of the City and is comprised of approximately 9,365 acres. As previously mentioned, Fire facilities required by development in Tapestry will be built and paid for under a separate agreement.

Table B-1 below summarizes the future demographics for residential property through the year 2040 for Tapestry only.

**TABLE B-1**  
**CITY OF HESPERIA**  
**ESTIMATED FUTURE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**  
**(2016 THROUGH YEAR 2040)**  
**TAPESTRY ONLY**

Residential Property	Future Number of Residents (2016 – 2040)	Future Number of Residential Units (2016 - 2040)
Single-Family	39,305	13,181
Multi-Family	6,037	2,482
Total	45,342	15,663

Future residents and residential units by land use as shown above was based on information provided by the City on January 30, 2018.

Table B-2 below summarizes the future demographics for the non-residential land uses through the year 2040 for Tapestry only.

**TABLE B-2**  
**CITY OF HESPERIA**  
**ESTIMATED FUTURE NON-RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**  
**(2016 THROUGH 2040)**  
**TAPESTRY ONLY**

Non-Residential Property	Number of Employees	Number of Non-Residential SF
Commercial/Office/Retail	1,326	700,000
Industrial	0	0
Hotel/Motel	0	0
Total	1,326	700,000

Future employees and non-residential square feet by land use as shown above was based on information provided by the City.

**2. TOTAL DEVELOPMENT WITHIN CITY (2040) (DOES NOT INCLUDE PROPERTY IN TAPESTRY)**

Table B-3 below describes the total residential development in the City in the year 2040. This is based on the difference of Tables III-6 and B-1.

**TABLE B-3**  
**CITY OF HESPERIA**  
**ESTIMATED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**  
**(IN YEAR 2040)**  
**DOES NOT INCLUDE TAPESTRY**

Residential Property	Description	Total Development (2040) (From Table III-6)	Future Development in Tapestry (2016 to 2040) (From Table B-1)	Total Development (2040)
Single-Family	Residents	164,469	39,305	125,164
	Units	50,059	13,181	36,878
Multi-Family	Residents	18,264	6,037	12,227
	Units	7,237	2,482	4,755
Total	Residents	182,732	45,342	137,391
	Units	57,296	15,663	41,633

Table B-4 below describes the total non-residential development in the City in the year 2040. This is based on the difference of Tables III-7 and B-2.

**TABLE B-4**  
**CITY OF HESPERIA**  
**ESTIMATED NON-RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**  
**(IN YEAR 2040)**  
**DOES NOT INCLUDE TAPESTRY**

Residential Property	Description	Total Development (2040) (From Table III-7)	Future Development in Tapestry (2016 to 2040) (From Table B-2)	Total Development (2040)
Commercial/Office/Retail	Employees	12,299	1,326	10,973
	Non-Res. SF	11,009,517	700,000	10,309,517
Industrial	Employees	17,069	0	17,069
	Non-Res. SF	3,289,876	0	3,289,876
Hotel/Motel	Employees	1,513	0	1,513
	Rooms	605	0	605
Total	Employees	30,881	1,326	29,555
	Non-Res. SF	14,299,393	700,000	13,599,998
	Hotel Rooms	605	0	605

### 3. EQUIVALENT DWELLING UNIT (EDU) PROJECTIONS (DOES NOT INCLUDE TAPESTRY)

Table B-5 shows the total number of future EDUs calculated for each land use for the time period from 2016 through 2040 not including Tapestry. Please note that the future EDU factors differ from the existing EDU factors due to various reasons including estimated changes in residents per unit and employees per square foot as provided by the City.

**TABLE B-5**  
**City of Hesperia**  
**Future Equivalent Dwelling Units**  
**(From 2016 to 2040)**  
**Does Not Include Tapestry**

Residential Property	Number of Future Residents	Number of Residential Units	Residents Per Unit	EDUs per Residential Unit	Total Future EDUs
Single Family	41,190	11,131	3.70	1.000	11,131
<u>Multi-Family</u>	<u>4,024</u>	<u>1,435</u>	<u>2.80</u>	<u>0.76</u>	<u>1,087</u>
Subtotal	45,214	12,566			12,218
Non-Residential Property	Number of Future 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
Commercial/Office/Retail	4,816	4,518,900	1.07	0.29	1,301
Industrial	7,451	1,436,072	5.19	1.40	2,014
<u>Hotel/Motel Rooms</u>	<u>530</u>	<u>212</u>	<u>2.50</u>	<u>0.14</u>	<u>143</u>
Subtotal	12,797	5,954,972			3,458
Grand Total					15,677

Table B-6 shows the total number of EDUs calculated for each land use in the year 2040 not including Tapestry:

**TABLE B-6**  
**City of Hesperia**  
**Equivalent Dwelling Units**  
**(In 2040)**  
**Does Not Include Tapestry**

Residential Property	Number of Future Residents	Number of Residential Units	Residents Per Unit	EDUs per Residential Unit	Total Future EDUs
Single Family	125,164	36,878	3.39	0.92	36,878
<u>Multi-Family</u>	<u>12,227</u>	<u>4,755</u>	<u>2.57</u>	<u>0.69</u>	<u>3,603</u>
Subtotal	137,391	41,633			40,481
Non-Residential Property	Number of Future 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
Commercial/Office/Retail	10,973	10,309,517	1.06	0.29	3,189
Industrial	17,069	3,289,876	5.19	1.40	4,962
<u>Hotel/Motel Rooms</u>	<u>1,513</u>	<u>605</u>	<u>2.50</u>	<u>0.14</u>	<u>445</u>
Subtotal	29,555	13,599,998			8,596
Grand Total					49,077

## **APPENDIX C**

### Transportation Needs List



**TABLE C-1**  
**TRANSPORTATION NEEDS LIST**

Facility/Location	Limits	Project Cost	% Allocation to New Development [1]	Cost to be Funded by Development Impact Fee
<b>Freeway Interchanges/Overpass/Railroad Crossings</b>				
<b>(All to be Federal Funds w/City Match)</b>				
I-15 at Mojave/Mauna Loa Interchange		\$65,900,000	55.40%	\$36,508,600
I-15 at Muscatel Interchange		\$65,900,000	58.70%	\$38,683,300
I-15 at Ranchero Interchange		\$58,912,652	57.50%	\$32,096,529
Eucalyptus Grade Separation		\$39,000,000	58.90%	\$22,971,000
Lime Grade Separation		\$39,000,000	90.00%	\$35,100,000
Lemon/Mauna Loa Grade Separation		\$48,400,000	58.90%	\$28,507,600
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>\$317,112,652</b>		<b>\$193,867,029</b>
<b>Major Arterials</b>				
Bear Valley Road	I-15 to Bridge over Mojave River	\$4,463,813	48.44%	\$2,162,265
Main Street	Hwy 395 to Rock Springs Rd.	\$38,245,090	58.90%	\$22,526,358
Mojave/Mauna Loa/Lemon	I-15 to "I" Ave.	\$28,740,210	58.90%	\$16,927,984
Ranchero Road	Mariposa to UP RR X-ing	\$7,232,890	58.90%	\$4,260,172
Ranchero Road	Topaz to 7th (Includes Aqueduct Crossing)	\$36,068,020	58.90%	\$21,244,064
Ranchero Road2	7th to Danbury (Includes RR Grade Sep)	\$750,000	100.00%	\$750,000
Escondido Avenue	Mariposa to Main (Includes Aqueduct Crossing)	\$19,989,200	90.00%	\$17,990,280
Eucalyptus Street	I-15 to 11th Ave.	\$16,442,920	58.90%	\$9,684,880
Poplar St.	I-15 to Hwy 395	\$3,333,500	58.90%	\$1,963,432
Santa Fe Ave.	Ranchero to Summit Valley Road	\$6,944,340	90.00%	\$6,249,906
Main Street	Hwy 395 to Bellflower St.	\$3,125,500	90.00%	\$2,812,950
Caliente Road	Joshua to Oak Hill Road	\$25,067,920	90.00%	\$22,561,128
Ranchero Road	Caliente to West City Limits	\$4,184,700	90.00%	\$3,766,230
Mariposa Road	Bear Valley to Live Oak St.	\$21,534,410	90.00%	\$19,380,969
Mariposa Road	Sultana to City Limit near Forestry Rd	\$37,468,540	90.00%	\$33,721,686
Lemon Street	"I" Ave. to East City Limit	\$13,867,360	90.00%	\$12,480,624
Maple Avenue	Ranchero to City Limit near Summit Valley Rd.	\$9,738,040	90.00%	\$8,764,236
Summit Valley Road	Santa Fe to Tapestry Boundary	\$14,207,960	100.00%	\$14,207,960
Arrowhead Lake Road	Summit Valley to Southern City Limit	\$6,933,680	90.00%	\$6,240,312
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>\$298,338,093</b>		<b>\$227,695,435</b>
<b>Arterials</b>				
Hesperia Road	Bear Valley to Sultana	\$12,967,500	48.44%	\$6,281,440
"I" Avenue	Bear Valley to Ranchero (Includes RR X-ing)	\$21,145,500	90.00%	\$19,030,950
7th Avenue	Bear Valley to Ranchero	\$20,182,750	90.00%	\$18,164,475
Ranchero Road	Danbury to "I" Ave.	\$4,440,000	90.00%	\$3,996,000
Rock Springs Road	Glendale to East City Limits	\$1,333,400	48.44%	\$645,897
Sultana Street	Mariposa to Escondido	\$5,667,220	90.00%	\$5,100,498
Arrowhead Lake Road	Rock Springs to South of Hesperia Lakes	\$7,015,750	48.44%	\$3,398,420
"C" Avenue	RR Xng to Sultana	\$5,818,750	90.00%	\$5,236,875
Cottonwood Avenue	Bear Valley to Main	\$10,008,250	48.44%	\$4,847,983
"E" Avenue	"I" Ave. to Lime (Includes RR X-ing)	\$11,471,250	48.44%	\$5,556,659
11th Avenue	Bear Valley to Main	\$10,640,000	48.44%	\$5,154,002
Lassen Road	Sultana to Poplar	\$2,075,320	48.44%	\$1,005,282
Maple Avenue	Mariposa to Ranchero (Includes Aqueduct Crossing)	\$34,551,500	90.00%	\$31,096,350
Lime Street	Cottonwood to "I" Ave.	\$25,890,000	58.90%	\$15,249,210
Muscatel Street	Mariposa to Cottonwood (Includes Aqueduct Crossing)	\$25,120,000	58.90%	\$14,795,680
Cottonwood Avenue	Muscatel to Lime	\$950,000	58.90%	\$559,550
Main Street	"I" Ave. to Rock Springs	\$2,842,875	58.90%	\$1,674,453
Santa Fe Avenue	Spruce to Ranchero	\$9,808,750	90.00%	\$8,827,875
Eucalyptus Avenue	11th to Peach Ave.	\$11,970,000	58.90%	\$7,050,330
Sultana Street	Mesa Linda to Lassen Rd.	\$864,500	90.00%	\$778,050
Mesa Linda Street	Main to Sultana St.	\$1,729,000	90.00%	\$1,556,100
Smoke Tree Road	Hwy 395 to Merito Rd.	\$798,000	90.00%	\$718,200
Amargosa Road	Keypointe to Avenal St.	\$12,441,000	90.00%	\$11,196,900
Escondido Avenue	Palm to North of Sultana St.	\$1,330,000	48.44%	\$644,250
Third Avenue	Bear Valley to Main St.	\$11,238,500	90.00%	\$10,114,650
Sultana Street	7th Ave. to Hesperia Rd.	\$648,375	90.00%	\$583,538
Sultana Street	Santa Fe. To I Ave.	\$3,591,000	90.00%	\$3,231,900
Jacaranda Avenue	Bear Valley to Carob St.	\$798,000	90.00%	\$718,200
Rock Springs Road	Main to Glendale Ave.	\$1,197,000	48.44%	\$579,825
Summit Valley Road	Santa Fe westerly to City Limit	\$6,916,000	100.00%	\$6,916,000
Summit Valley Road	Tapestry Boundary to East City Limit	\$6,650,000	100.00%	\$6,650,000
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>\$272,100,190</b>		<b>\$201,359,544</b>

Facility/Location	Limits	Project Cost	% Allocation to New Development [1]	Cost to be Funded by Development Impact Fee
<b>Secondary Arterials</b>				
Danbury	Ranchero to Arrowhead Lake Rd.	\$11,172,000	48.44%	\$5,411,703
Ranchero Road	"I" Ave to Arrowhead Lake Rd.	\$5,552,750	48.44%	\$2,689,745
Joshua Street	Mariposa to Caliente Rd.	\$1,471,313	48.44%	\$712,702
Keypointe Avenue	Main to Amargosa	\$7,244,510	90.00%	\$6,520,059
Live Oak/Willow Street	Mariposa to Hesperia Rd.	\$1,695,750	48.44%	\$821,419
Fuente Avenue	Main to Live Oak St.	\$4,239,375	90.00%	\$3,815,438
Sultana Street	Maple to 7th Ave.	\$6,384,000	90.00%	\$5,745,600
Mesquite Street	Topaz to Hesperia Rd.	\$15,436,313	90.00%	\$13,892,681
Peach Avenue	Bear Valley to Ranchero Rd.	\$1,762,250	90.00%	\$1,586,025
Farmington Street	Topaz to Maple Ave.		90.00%	\$0
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>\$54,958,260</b>		<b>\$41,195,371</b>
<b>Intersection Expansion</b>				
"C" Avenue	Intersection at Main	\$6,153,220	90.00%	\$5,537,898
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>\$6,153,220</b>		<b>\$5,537,898</b>
<b>Transit Facility</b>		<b>\$1,200,000</b>	90.00%	<b>\$1,080,000</b>
<b>Totals</b>		<b>\$949,862,415</b>		<b>\$670,735,278</b>

## APPENDIX D

### Fee Models

## **FIRE FEE MODEL**



## **POLICE FEE MODEL**



## **ANIMAL CONTROL FEE MODEL**



**City of Hesperia  
Animal Control Facilities  
Fee Calculation**

**Table 1**

Inventory of Existing Facilities

Facility	Facility Unit	Number
Animal Control Facility	SF	10,000

*Note: Existing 10,000 square foot animal shelter facility will no longer be used and will be replaced with a new 36,000 square foot facility.*

**Table 2**

Proposed Facilities

New Animal Control Facility	Facility Unit	Number	Facility Cost (2015\$)
New Animal Control Facility	SF	36,000	\$12,600,000

**Table 3**

Allocation of Costs to Existing &amp; New Development (based on total EDUs - includes Tapestry)

Type of Development	Residential EDUs	Percentage of Total EDUs	Total SF	Total Cost
Existing Development	28,262	50.82%	18,295	\$6,403,263
Future Development	27,351	49.18%	17,705	\$6,196,737
<b>Total</b>	<b>55,613</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>36,000</b>	<b>\$12,600,000</b>

**Table 4**

Proposed Facilities and Cost Per EDU

Facility	Cost	Number of Future Residential EDUs	Cost Per EDU
New Animal Control Facility [2]	\$6,196,737	27,351	\$227
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$6,196,737</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$227</b>

**Table 5**

Development Impact Fee per Unit

Land Use Type	EDUs per Unit	Fees per Unit	Fees per 1,000 SF	Cost Financed by DIF
Single Family	1.00	\$227	NA	\$5,508,291
Multi-Family	0.78	\$176	NA	\$688,446
Commercial/Office	NA	NA	NA	\$0
Industrial	NA	NA	NA	\$0
Hotel/Motel	NA	NA	NA	\$0
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$6,196,737</b>
<b>Cost Allocated to Existing Development</b>				<b>\$6,403,263</b>
<b>Total Cost</b>				<b>\$12,600,000</b>

[1] EDU = Equivalent Dwelling Unit.

[2] City already owns site where building is to be constructed.

## **CITY HALL FEE MODEL**

**City of Hesperia  
City Hall Facilities  
Fee Calculation**

**Table 1****Proposed Costs**

Allocation of Debt Service of the 2013 Civic Plaza Bonds	Total Debt Service 2013 Civic Plaza Bond
Amount Funded by General Fund	\$2,522,253
Amount Funded by DIF	\$17,260,122
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$19,782,375</b>

**Table 2****Allocation of Costs to New Development (includes Tapestry)**

Debt Service	Percentage Allocation [1]	Total Cost
Existing Development	12.75%	\$2,522,253
Future Development	87.25%	\$17,260,122
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$19,782,375</b>

**Table 3****Proposed Cost Per EDU**

Costs	Cost	Number of Future EDUs	Cost Per EDU
Debt Service	\$17,260,122	31,616	\$546
<b>Total</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$546</b>

**Table 4****Development Impact Fee per Unit**

Land Use Type	EDUs per Unit	EDUs per 1,000 SF	EDUs per Room	Fees per Unit	Fees per 1,000 SF	Fees per Room	Cost Financed by DIF
Single Family	1.00	NA	NA	\$546	NA	NA	\$13,272,575
Multi-Family	0.78	NA	NA	\$424	NA	NA	\$1,658,854
Commercial/Office	NA	0.36	NA	NA	\$194	NA	\$1,012,733
Industrial	NA	1.57	NA	NA	\$856	NA	\$1,228,570
Hotel/Motel	NA	NA	0.76	NA	NA	\$412	\$87,390
<b>Total</b>							<b>\$17,260,122</b>
<b>Cost Allocated to Existing Development</b>							<b>\$2,522,253</b>
<b>Total Cost</b>							<b>\$19,782,375</b>

[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.

## **RECORDS STORAGE FEE MODEL**



## **DRAINAGE FEE MODEL**

## City of Hesperia Drainage Facilities Fee Calculation

**Table 1**  
**Existing ERUs**

Land Use	Residential Units/ Non Residential. KSF./hotel rooms	Density (EDU./acre)	FAR	Acres, "A"	Runoff Coefficient, "C"	ERU by acres
Single Family Residential	25,747	4.0		6,436.8	0.70	4,505.7
Multi Family Residential	3,320	12.0		276.7	0.80	221.3
Commercial/Office	5,791		0.4	332.3	0.95	315.7
Industrial	1,853.8		0.2	212.8	1.00	212.8
Hotel/Motel	393			11.5	0.90	10.4
				7,270.0	sub total	5,265.9
					% of Total =	51.43%

**Table 2**  
Future ERUs (2015 to buildout)

Land Use	Residential Units/ Non Residential. KSF./hotel rooms	Density (units/acre)	FAR	Acres, "A"	Runoff Coefficient, "C"	Runoff Q = C x A
Single Family Residential	24,312	4.0		6,078.0	0.70	4,254.6
Multi Family Residential	3,917	12.0		326.4	0.80	261.1
Commercial/Office	5,219		0.4	299.5	0.95	284.5
Industrial	1,436		0.2	164.8	1.00	164.8
Hotel/Motel	212			9.1	0.90	8.2
				6,877.9	sub total	4,973.3
					% of Total =	48.57%
					Total ERUs =	10,239.2

**Table 3**  
Cost per ERU

Cost per ERU	Total Cost Allocated to New Development	Cost per ERU
New ERUs		
4,973.3	\$39,428,606	\$7,928.04

#### Table 4

##### Fee Schedule

[illegible]

## **TRANSPORTATION FEE MODEL**



**City of Hesperia  
Transportation Facilities  
Fee Calculation**

**TABLE 1**

**Existing Average Daily Trips**

Land Use	Trip Rate (ADTs)	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
% of total ADTs =				51.56%

**TABLE 2**

**Future Average Daily Trips (Includes Tapestry Specific Plan)**

Land Use	Trip Rate (ADTs)	Res. Units / 1,000 S.F./ Rooms	units	ADT
Single Family	9.57	24,312	Res. Units	232,666
Multi Family	6.63	3,917	Res. Units	25,970
Commercial/Office	13.27	5,219	1,000 square feet	69,255
Industrial	6.97	1,436	1,000 square feet	10,009
Hotel/Motel	8.92	212	Rooms	1,891
Total Future ADTs				339,791
% of total ADTs =				48.44%
Total ADTs =				701,469

**TABLE 3**

**Cost per ADT**

Total Transportation Costs Allocated to New Development	Total Future ADT's	Cost per future ADT
\$670,735,278	339,791	\$1,974

**TABLE 4**

**Transportation Fee Schedule**

Land Use	Trip Rate (ADTs)	Cost per ADT	Units	DIF Fee per unit / 1,000 SF/ Room	Cost Financed by DIF
Single Family	9.57	\$1,974	Res. Units	<b>\$18,891</b>	\$459,274,295
Multi Family	6.63	\$1,974	Res. Units	<b>\$13,087</b>	\$51,263,306
Commercial/Office	13.27	\$1,974	1,000 square feet	<b>\$26,195</b>	\$136,706,578
Industrial	6.97	\$1,974	1,000 square feet	<b>\$13,759</b>	\$19,758,251
Hotel/Motel	8.92	\$1,974	Rooms	<b>\$17,608</b>	\$3,732,847
Total=					\$670,735,278