TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

Purpose of Nexus Study

As the City of Vacaville continues to grow, new or additional capital facilities will be required to meet the service demands of future development. This study focuses on four types of facility categories: park and recreation, police, fire, and drainage facilities. A fair share portion of the cost of these facilities will be funded by future growth in the City through the City's Development Impact Fee Program ("DIF Program"), which contains a separate fee component for each facility category.

The City has recently updated the park and recreation, police, fire, and drainage facilities and costs that are required to serve future development in the City through the year 2010. The drainage detention component of the DIF Program has been updated to reflect current land and construction costs associated with drainage facilities required to serve all future development within each drainage detention zone (i.e., Zone 1 and Zone 2) until full buildout of the current City limits. It should be noted that the City's current drainage conveyance fee has not been updated in this study.

If adopted by the City Council, the updated impact fees in this study will apply to all future development within the City except for those projects with development agreements. The updated park and recreation, police, fire and drainage detention fees in this study comply with AB 1600 nexus requirements because the fees are set at the amount needed to mitigate the specific impacts that will result from new development in the City.

Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc. has prepared this *Update of Park and Recreation, Police, Fire, and Drainage Detention Development Impact Fees Nexus Study* ("Nexus Study") to update to the park and recreation, police, fire, and drainage detention fee components of the *City of Vacaville Development Impact Fee Update - 1992 Study* ("1992 Fee Study"). The Nexus Study complies with the regulations set forth in AB 1600 and ensures that a rational nexus exists between future development in the City and the use of the fees and need of the proposed facilities. This Nexus Study also demonstrates that a reasonable relationship exists between the development impact fee to be levied on each type of development and the cost of the facilities attributable to that development type.

CHANGES FROM THE 1992 FEE STUDY

This Nexus Study updates four fee components of the City's 1992 Fee Study. The 1992 Fee Study was comprised of several separate fee reports - one for each of the various fee components in the City's DIF Program. This Nexus Study updates only the park and recreation, police, fire, and drainage detention fees (not the conveyance portion of the drainage fee). The remaining capital facilities categories in the 1992 Fee Study will be updated at a later time.

In addition to updating the facilities and costs related to the park and recreation, police, fire and drainage detention fee components of the 1992 Fee Study, this Nexus Study contains the following changes to the City's existing DIF Program:

- Expansion of drainage detention facilities to serve future development within each drainage detention zone (i.e., Zone 1 and Zone 2) through buildout of the current City limits. The drainage detention fee component in the 1992 DIF incorporated only those facilities required to serve future development through 2010.

- Elimination of the 1992 DIF fee amount that is subject to contingent reimbursement for the park and recreation, police, and drainage detention fee components. This was done because the administration of this portion of the fee was complex and burdensome to the City and secondly, the contingent reimbursement fee funds were never sufficient to allow the City to reimburse a portion back to developers. As a result, the fee calculation methodology in this Nexus Study eliminates the contingent reimbursement amount in the calculation of the fees.

SUMMARY OF THE DIF

Table ES-1 summarizes the fee components of the DIF as calculated in this report.

Table ES-1
DIF Summary (1)

	Park & Recreation Fee	Police Fee	Fire Fee	Drainage Detention Fee Zone 1	Drainage Detention Fee Zone 2
Residential Land Uses	*per unit*	*per unit*	*per unit*	*per unit*	*per unit*
Single Family Residential	$8,120	$858	$867	$850	$1,978
Multifamily Residential	$5,579	$589	$596	$144	$447
Senior Residential	$4,715	$498	$503	(2)	(2)
Non Residential	*per Building Square Foot*	*per Building Square Foot*	*per Building Square Foot*	*Per Net Acre*	*Per Net Acre*
Commercial	N/A	$0.55	$0.56	$4,831	$14,993
Office	N/A	$0.79	$0.80	$4,831	$14,993
Industrial	N/A	$0.23	$0.23	$4,831	$14,993

(1) Fees include a 4.0% fee program administration charge.

(2) Senior single family units are subject to the single family rate; senior multifamily units are subject to the multifamily rate.

FEE ADJUSTMENTS

The DIF Program will be adjusted in future years to reflect revised facility standards, receipt of funding from alternative sources (i.e., state or federal grants), revised costs, or changes in demographics or the land use plan. In addition, the fees will be inflated each year by a construction cost inflation index selected by the City.

I. INTRODUCTION

The City of Vacaville (the "City") is located in northern portion of Solano County, along Interstate 80. The City is approximately 35 miles southwest of Sacramento and 54 miles northeast of San Francisco. The City was incorporated in 1892, and is comprised of approximately 27 square miles bordered by rolling hillsides, fruit orchards and fertile farmland.

In 1990, the City completed a comprehensive update of its General Plan that was adopted by the Vacaville City Council. The General Plan established a set of objectives related to future demand for public services resulting from growth in the City. Where capital facilities are inadequate, permitting development is contrary to the responsibility of local government to protect public health, safety, and welfare. As part of the City's responsibility to provide adequate public facilities to provide for the safety and welfare of its citizens, the City has deemed it necessary to expand and/or construct certain municipal facilities that will serve the City's current and future residents. Funding for these facilities will come from development impact fees and other City revenue sources. The Development Impact Fees ("DIF") discussed in this report will apply to all future development within the City except for those development projects that have development agreements, in which case, those developments will be subject to the conditions in their development agreements.

PURPOSE OF DIF STUDY

As the City of Vacaville continues to grow, new or additional capital facilities will be required to meet the service demands of future development. This study focuses on four types of facility categories: park and recreation, police, fire, and drainage facilities. A fair share portion of the cost of these facilities will be funded by future growth in the City through the City's Development Impact Fee Program ("DIF Program"), which contains a separate fee component for each facility category.

The City has recently updated the park and recreation, police, fire, and drainage facilities and costs that are required to serve future development in the City through the year 2010. The drainage detention component of the DIF Program has been updated to reflect current land and construction costs associated with drainage facilities required to serve all future development within each drainage detention zone (i.e., Zone 1 and Zone 2) until full buildout of the current City limits. It should be noted that the City's current drainage conveyance fee has not been updated in this study.

If adopted by the City Council, the updated impact fees in this study will apply to all future development within the City except for those projects with development agreements. The updated

park and recreation, police, fire and drainage detention fees in this study comply with AB 1600 nexus requirements because the fees are set at the amount needed to mitigate the specific impacts that will result from new development in the City.

Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc. has prepared this *Update of Park and Recreation, Police, Fire, and Drainage Detention Development Impact Fees Nexus Study* ("Nexus Study") to update to the park and recreation, police, fire, and drainage detention fee components of the *City of Vacaville Development Impact Fee Update - 1992 Study* ("1992 Fee Study"). The Nexus Study complies with the regulations set forth in AB 1600 and ensures that a rational nexus exists between future development in the City and the use of the fees and need of the proposed facilities. This Nexus Study also demonstrates that a reasonable relationship exists between the development impact fee to be levied on each type of development and the cost of the facilities attributable to that development type.

CHANGES FROM THE 1992 FEE STUDY

This Nexus Study updates four fee components of the City's 1992 Fee Study. The 1992 Fee Study was comprised of several separate fee reports - one for each of the various fee components in the City's DIF Program. This Nexus Study updates only the park and recreation, police, fire, and drainage detention fees (not the conveyance portion of the drainage fee). The remaining capital facilities categories in the 1992 Fee Study will be updated at a later time.

In addition to updating the facilities and costs related to the park and recreation, police, fire and drainage detention fee components of the 1992 Fee Study, this Nexus Study contains the following changes to the City's existing DIF Program:

- Expansion of drainage detention facilities to serve future development within each drainage detention zone (i.e., Zone 1 and Zone 2) through buildout of the current City limits. The drainage detention fee component in the 1992 DIF incorporated only those facilities required to serve future development through 2010.

- Elimination of the 1992 DIF fee amount that is subject to contingent reimbursement for the park and recreation, police, and drainage detention fee components. This was done because the administration of this portion of the fee was complex and burdensome to the City and secondly, the contingent reimbursement fee funds were never sufficient to allow the City to reimburse a portion back to developers. As a result, the fee calculation methodology in this Nexus Study eliminates the contingent reimbursement amount in the calculation of the fees.

- Elimination of the two-tier fee concept for park and recreation, police, and drainage detention fee (the fire fee in the City's current DIF Program does not include an amount subject to contingent reimbursement). Because annual fee increases have not kept pace with increases in facilities and land costs, and because of the complexity of administering the two-tier fee program, the City has decided to do away with the two-tier fee concept incorporated in the 1992 DIF. The two-tier fee concept, incorporated into some of the fees in the 1992 Fee Study, includes a portion that is equal to the fair-share amount for each land use that is not subject to contingent reimbursement. A second, smaller portion of the total fee amount is subject to contingent reimbursement and was established to provide sufficient funding for facilities that would be required in the early years of the DIF Program. If fee revenues would be adequate from the fair-share portion of the fee, the contingent reimbursement portion of the fee would eventually be reimbursed back to the developer. However, since fee revenues have never been sufficient, the contingent reimbursement portion of the fees has never been reimbursed.

IMPACT FEE NEXUS REQUIREMENTS (AB 1600)

Assembly Bill (AB) 1600, which was enacted by the State of California in 1987, created Section 66000 et. seq. of the Government Code. AB 1600, also referred to as the Mitigation Fee Act, requires that all public agencies satisfy the following requirements when establishing, increasing, or imposing a fee as a condition of approval for a development project:

1. Identify the purpose of the fee
2. Identify the use to which the fee will be put
3. Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between:
    A. The fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed
    B. The need for the public facility and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed
    C. 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

This Nexus Study will demonstrate how these requirements have been met so as to allow for an increase to the City's existing development impact fees.

ORGANIZATION OF REPORT

The remainder of this report has been organized into the following sections:

Section II	Defines the land use categories and future development to be used in the calculation of the park and recreation, police, fire, and drainage detention fee components.
Section III	Provides a detailed explanation of the methodologies used to calculate the park and recreation, police, fire, and the drainage detention fees.
Sections IV-VII	Provides the details of the calculations for the park and recreation, police, fire, and drainage detention fees.
Section VIII	Provides a summary of the DIF components calculated in this report and presents fees included in this Nexus Study as well as a comparison to similar fees for other cities in the region.
Section IX	Addresses future fee adjustments, fee implementation, annual and five-year administrative duties, and fee credits or reimbursements.

II. LAND USE

LAND USE CATEGORIES

The Mitigation Fee Act requires that a reasonable relationship exist between the need for public facilities and the type of development on which an impact fee is imposed. The need for public facilities is related to the level of service demanded, which may vary in proportion to the number of residents or employees generated by a particular land use type (for the park and recreation, police, and fire components) or the number of acres anticipated for each land use (for the drainage detention component). Therefore, land use categories have been defined in order to distinguish between relative impacts on facilities. All DIF fee components in this Nexus Study have been calculated on a per-dwelling unit basis for residential land use categories and on a per square foot of building space (for park and recreation, police, and fire fees) or per net acre (for drainage detention fees) for non-residential land use categories.

The following land use categories are identified for purposes of the DIF:

Single Family: includes all single family residential development categories, including duplex units

Multifamily: includes all multifamily residential development categories

Senior: includes all senior residential development categories

Commercial: retail and commercial service businesses, including, but not limited to, the following:

(a) apparel stores
(b) general merchandise stores
(c) drug stores
(d) food stores
(e) liquor stores
(f) eating and drinking places
(g) home furnishings and appliance stores
(h) building materials stores
(i) auto dealers and auto supply stores
(j) service stations

(k) personal care service businesses (e.g., barber shops, beauty parlors)
(l) apparel service businesses (e.g., cleaners, laundries)
(m) repair service businesses (e.g., auto repair, electrical repair)
(n) rental service businesses (e.g., small equipment rental, video rental)
(o) health/fitness service businesses (e.g., exercise, weight loss)
(p) hospitals and healthcare business

Office: includes, but is not limited to, buildings associated with the provision of finance, insurance, real estate, business, professional, or medical services. Office uses also include headquarters and administrative functions of manufacturing and other types of enterprises.

Industrial: includes, but is not limited to, buildings used for manufacturing, research and development, warehousing, distribution, and heavy equipment storage and repair activities. The industrial category also includes acreage associated with churches, which have similar building square feet per employee characteristics.

City staff will make the final determination as to which land use category a particular development type will be assigned. Staff will determine the land use category that corresponds most directly to the development or alternatively, can determine that none of the land use categories in this Nexus Study adequately correspond to the development and may determine an applicable ad hoc fee.

LAND USE QUANTITIES

The City's Planning Department maintains an inventory of existing development within the City as well as a projection of future development for various land use categories. As of January 1, 2007, the Planning Department has estimated that there are approximately 32,410 residential units and approximately 1,392 acres of commercial, office, and industrial zoned land in the City. Existing residential development is comprised of 23,784 single family units, 5,974 multifamily units, and 2,652 senior units.

Remaining Land Uses through 2010

The Planning Department provided a set of land use projections that were utilized to estimate remaining development in the City through 2010. The year 2010 is significant because it represents the planning period of the current General Plan. It also represents the end of the planning period for several of the capital improvement plans (park and recreation, police, and fire) included the 1992 Fee Study. The Planning Department projects that an additional 3,337 residential units and approximately 237 acres of commercial, office, and industrial land uses remain to be developed in

the City through 2010. Remaining land uses through 2010 are employed in the fee calculation for the park and recreation, police, and fire components.

In all, total development in the City is expected to grow to approximately 35,747 residential units and 1,629 acres of non-residential land uses through 2010. Existing and projected land uses through 2010 are shown in Table 1A in Appendix A of this report.

Remaining Land Uses within Zone 1 and Zone 2

In addition to providing a projection of future development through 2010, the Planning Department also provided a projection, through buildout of the current City limits, of future development within the City's two existing drainage zones. This set of land use projections is used in the drainage detention fee calculation, and as mentioned above, is delineated by drainage zone.

The Planning Department estimates 6,671 residential units and 1,035 non-residential acres remain to be developed within the City's two drainage zones. Based on average densities from the General Plan for each residential land use category, approximately 1,453 acres of future residential-zoned land remains. Future development within Zone 1 totals 1,208 residential units on 278 acres and 738 non-residential acres. Future development in Zone 2 totals 5,463 residential units on 1,175 acres and 297 non-residential acres.

III. FEE METHODOLOGY

When impact fees are calculated, an analysis must be presented in enough detail to demonstrate that a logical and thorough consideration was applied in the process of determining how the amount of the fee relates to the impacts from new development. Various findings must be made to ensure that there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the development on which that impact fee will be levied. The choice of the method used to allocate facilities costs and develop the fee depends on the type of facility for which an impact fee is being calculated. Following is a discussion of the two methods used in this Nexus Study to calculate the individual DIF components.

PLAN-BASED FEE METHODOLOGY

The plan-based fee methodology is used when the size and scope of the facilities is based on a plan. The plan may be a formal plan such as a specific plan, capital improvement plan, or a facilities master plan. Or, the facilities may be developed through an informal facilities plan, one developed by City staff or consultants through careful consideration of future facility needs based on growth in the City. The steps to calculate a DIF component under the plan-based fee methodology include the following general steps:

Step 1 Identify existing development in the City and estimate future growth projections (e.g., future development through 2010 for the police and fire, and future development within each drainage zone at buildout of the current City limits for the drainage detention component of the DIF Program).

Step 2 Determine facilities needed to serve anticipated growth and, if necessary, the existing development in the City.

Step 3 Estimate the cost of the facilities that will be needed by the development horizon selected in Step 1.

Step 4 Identify and subtract the cost of facilities, if any, that are included in the facilities plan to cure an existing deficiency in service. Fee revenue from future development cannot be used to correct existing deficiencies.

Step 5 Subtract revenues available from alternate funding sources, if any, to calculate a net facilities cost.

Step 6. Select the demand variable (e.g., persons served and percent imperviousness) that will be used to allocate the facility cost on a fair-share basis; also, calculate a dwelling unit equivalent (DUE) factor (based on persons served) and a residential-acre equivalent (RAE) factor (based on percent imperviousness) for each land use category.

Step 7. Estimate the total amount of DUEs or RAEs that will be generated by all future development within each land use category by multiplying each respective land use by its assigned DUE or RAE factor. Sum the total DUEs (for the police and fire components) and RAEs (for the drainage detention component) for all the land uses.

Step 8. Divide the net facilities cost allocated to future development by the total DUEs or RAEs calculated in Step 7 to determine a cost per DUE and a cost per RAE. and calculate that portion of the total cost for which future growth will be responsible.

Step 9. For the police and fire components, multiply the cost per DUE by the DUE factor assigned to each land use category in Step 6 and incorporate a 4.0% City administrative charge to determine the impact fee for that land use category.

For the drainage detention component, multiply the cost per RAE for each drainage zone by the RAE factor assigned to each land use category in Step 6 to derive a cost per gross acre. Divide the cost per gross acre by the average density for each drainage zone for residential land uses or by the gross-to-net acreage factor (95%) for non-residential land uses. Incorporate a 4.0% City administrative charge to determine the drainage detention impact fee for that land use category.

The plan-based fee methodology is used in the calculation of the police, fire, and drainage detention fee components. Additional details for the police, fire, and drainage detention fee components of the DIF Program are included in Sections IV-VII of this report.

STANDARD-BASED FEE METHODOLOGY

The standard-based fee methodology is used when a consistent facility service level standard is to be applied to each component of new development (i.e., residents) regardless of future demand

projections. The standard to be used in calculating impact fees under this method may be based on an existing City standard or a preferred standard (e.g., a General Plan standard) that the City wishes to attain. To the extent a preferred standard is used that is higher than the existing standard, the City will need to rely on sources other than impact fees from future development to mitigate the deficiency related to existing development that is created through the adoption of the higher standard. The steps to calculate a DIF component under the standard-based fee methodology include the following:

Step 1 Define the required facility standard (e.g., park acres per 1,000 residents, community center per 32,000 residents served, etc.) expressed in terms of residents, employees, or other standard appropriate for the type of facility for which a component of the DIF is being calculated.

Step 2 Identify estimate future growth projections (e.g., future development through 2010) and additional facilities by multiplying the standard from Step 1 by the future growth projection.

Step 3 Determine a cost for each incremental facility standard identified in Step 1 based on current replacement costs; reduce the facility costs by subtracting any existing fee fund revenue or alternative funding sources, if applicable. Calculate the total cost for the additional facilities.

Step 4 Apply demand variable rates to each of the land uses based on service demand (e.g. persons per household). Estimate the total amount of DUEs that will be generated by all future development within each land use category by multiplying each respective land use by its assigned DUE.

Step 5 Divide the net facilities cost from Step 3 by the total DUEs calculated in Step 4 to determine a cost per DUE.

Step 6 Multiply the cost per DUE by the DUE factor assigned to each land use category in Step 4 and incorporate a 4.0% City administrative charge to determine the impact fee for that land use category.

The standard-based fee methodology is used in the calculation of the park and recreation fee component of the DIF. Additional details for the park and recreation fee component of the DIF Program is included in Section IV of this report.

DWELLING UNIT EQUIVALENT (DUE) FACTORS

Future development will create demand for public facilities. For purposes of the park and recreation, police, and fire components of the DIF Program, demand for facilities and services are measured by the number of persons served that are anticipated in the City. By allocating facilities costs to each land use category based on the average number of residents or employees generated by the specific land use category, this Nexus Study ensures that each land use category will fund its fair-share of the required park and recreation, police, and fire facilities.

A Dwelling Unit Equivalent (DUE) is a factor that quantifies different land use types in terms of their equivalence to a single family unit. A single family unit is assigned a DUE factor of 1.0, and the DUE factor for each of the other land use categories is determined based on the persons served for park and recreation, police, and fire facilities that are expected for each land use category relative to the persons served for a single family unit. DUE factors are calculated for both residential and non-residential land uses for purposes of allocating police and fire costs because both residents and employees will benefit from these facilities. However, for allocating park and recreation facilities costs, DUE factors are calculated only for residential land uses because residents will be the primary users of these facilities.

The number of persons served is derived from an average number of persons per household factor for residential land uses and an average number of employees per 1,000 square feet of building space for non-residential land uses. For example, a single family unit is assumed to have 3.10 persons per household, whereby each person would represent one person served, for a total of 3.15 persons served. A multifamily unit with an average 2.13 persons per household would generate 2.13 persons served. By dividing 2.13 by 3.10, a DUE factor of approximately 0.69, is calculated for a multifamily residential unit. Table 2A in Appendix A shows the calculation of DUE factors for each land use type.

RESIDENTIAL ACRE EQUIVALENT (RAE) FACTORS

As mentioned above, future development will create demand for public facilities. For purposes of the drainage detention component of the DIF Program, demand is measured by the percent imperviousness for each land use category. By allocating drainage detention facility costs to each land use category based on its level of imperviousness, or in other words, the degree to which storm water will runoff from the developed land use, this Nexus Study ensures that each land use category will fund its fair-share of the required drainage detention facilities.

A Residential Acre Equivalent (RAE) is a factor that quantifies different land use types in terms of their equivalence to an acre of land on which single family units are anticipated ("a single family acre"). As such, a single family acre is assigned a RAE factor of 1.0, and the RAE factor for each of the other land use categories is determined based on the percent imperviousness that are expected for each land use category relative to the percent imperviousness for a single family acre.

IV. PARK AND RECREATION FEE COMPONENT OF THE DIF

The Vacaville General Plan and the *City of Vacaville Comprehensive Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Master Plan* ("Parks Master Plan") contain several goals and polices that generally set forth standards for assuring that adequate parks and recreation facilities are made available to all persons in the community. Specifically, the General Plan identifies a standard of 1.8 acres of neighborhood parks, 1.7 acres of community parks, and 1.0 acre of city parks per 1,000 residents. Recreational facility standards pursuant to the Parks Master Plan are identified in Table 4 of Appendix A.

This section of the report identifies those park and recreation facilities and DIF fees required to serve future development in the City through 2010. The park and recreation fee component of the DIF calculated in this section meets the AB 1600 nexus requirement, as discussed below.

Purpose of Fee

The purpose of the park and recreation fee is to fund land and improvement costs related to parks and recreation facilities needed to serve future development in the City.

Use of Fee

Park and recreation fee revenue will be used to acquire parkland and to fund the construction or purchase of park improvements and recreational facilities identified by the General Plan and Parks Master Plan as those necessary to serve new development. These facilities are identified in Table 4 of Appendix A.

Reasonable Relationship Between the Fee's Use and the Type of Development

The use of fee revenue collected from residential development to acquire parkland and purchase or construct park improvements and recreational facilities identified in the General Plan and the Parks Master Plan as necessary to serve new development ensures that such facilities will be available and sufficient to serve new residential development in the City through 2010.

Park and recreation facilities will primarily be used by residential development; therefore, the cost of these facilities is allocated to residential development only. Non-residential development will not be subject to the park and recreation fee.

Reasonable Relationship Between the Need for the Facility and the Type of Development

As residential land uses develop in the City, new residents will require park and recreation facilities. The City will need to accommodate this growth by providing adequate park and recreation facilities pursuant to the park and recreation facility standards established in the General Plan and the Parks Master Plan. The General Plan sets a level of service standard of 4.5 acres of improved parkland per 1,000 residents and the Parks Master Plan identifies level of service standards for provision of recreation facilities. These standards were used by the City to develop the list of facilities that have been incorporated in this Nexus Study. Park and recreation fee revenue from new residential development will be used to fund the acquisition and development of the necessary parklands and recreation facilities.

Reasonable Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Facility

The relationship between the amount of the park and recreation fee and the portion of the facilities cost attributable to the development type is based on park on persons served. The average residents generated by each residential land use type establishes the demand for parks and therefore, can be used to quantify the total amount of required park and recreation facilities and also be used to determine the park and recreation fee.

DEMAND VARIABLE: PERSONS SERVED

Facility costs for the park and recreation fee component of the DIF Program are allocated to development based on a persons served factor. Persons served are the residents from future residential developments. Residents are the primary beneficiaries of parks and recreation facilities, and therefore, the cost of these facilities is allocated in this Nexus Study to residential development through 2010. The persons served factors are converted to DUE factors to calculate the park and recreation fee. Table 2A in Appendix A presents the demand variable and DUE factor assigned to each land use. As mentioned above, non-residential development is not assigned a fee since residential development primarily benefits from park and recreation facilities.

Park Facilities and Costs

The City currently has approximately 300 acres of developed parkland, which is comprised of 119 acres of neighborhood parks, 140 acres of community parks, and 41 acres of the City Park. The City owns 138 acres of land that are designated as the City Park, of which only 41 acres have been developed to date. Compared to the estimated number of current residents of 91,229, the existing park standards are approximately 1.3 neighborhood park acres, 1.5 community park acres, and 0.5 City park acres per 1,000 residents, which are lower than the standards identified in the General Plan. As discussed below, this existing deficiency in the park level of service cannot be allocated to future development, and consequently, cannot be funded by future park and recreation fees. The

City will need to look to other revenue sources, possibly grants, developer contributions, or general fund revenues, to cure this deficiency.

The total parks needed to serve future residents through 2010 are derived using the General Plan park standards for neighborhood, community, and City parks and are shown in Table 4 of Appendix A. Based on an estimated 9,640 residents, an additional 43.4 acres of developed parks will be needed to serve future residents in the City through 2010. The total developed park acres include 17.4 community park acres, 16.4 neighborhood park acres, and 9.6 City Park acres. The City estimates the cost of land is approximately $250,000 per acre based on recent land sales. The City estimates the average cost to develop a park is $300,000 per acre. Based on these costs, the total park cost is approximately $21.5 million. Land costs associated with the 9.6 acres of future City Parks are excluded from the total cost because the City owns this land.

Recreation Facilities and Costs

Table 5C in Appendix A identifies the existing recreation facilities in the City, the facility level of service standards in the Parks Master Plan, and the amount of facilities required to serve future development through 2010 based on those standards. The number of additional facilities needed to serve future development is the proportionate share based on the service standard in the Master Plan and the estimated 9,640 residents.

For example, Table 5C shows that 0.30 community centers will be needed to serve remaining residents through 2010, based on a standard of one community center per 32,000 residents served. The City should have approximately 2.85 community centers to serve its current residents pursuant to the Park Master Plan standard; however, there are currently only 2.00 centers in the City. In 2010, the City will need a total of 3.10 community centers to serve its residents. As such, future development will only be required to fund 30% of a community center, which is the difference between the 3.10 centers required in 2010 and the 2.85 centers needed to serve existing development in 2007. The difference between the 2.85 centers needed to serve existing development and the 2.00 centers that are currently available to serve existing residents is a deficiency and therefore cannot be allocated to future development.

On the other hand, facilities, such as Neighborhood Centers, for which the current number exceeds the total number required to serve residents by 2010, are not included in the list of facilities needed by 2010 and therefore, the cost of this facility is not incorporated in the fee calculation.

The estimated cost of each recreation facility is based on its costs from the 1992 Fee Study and inflated by 46.3%, which is the percentage increase in the Engineering News Record Construction

Cost Index for San Francisco from December 1991 to March 2007. The estimated costs of the facilities from the 1992 Fee Study as well as the escalated cost in current dollars are presented in Table 5A of Appendix A.

The recreation facilities or portion of facilities needed to serve future residents through 2010 are shown in Table 4 of Appendix A. Approximately $2.8 million will be needed to fund a fair-share allocation of the recreation facilities serving future development through 2010. The total cost is derived by applying the cost for each facility by the number of recreation facilities needed to serve future through 2010. Since recreation facilities are expected to be located on park land, no land acquisition costs are included in the total recreation facilities costs.

Existing Deficiencies

An existing deficiency exists for neighborhood, community, and City parks as well as some of the recreation facilities (recreation facilities with an existing deficiency are identified in Table 5-B in Appendix A). For these park and recreation facilities, the existing standard is lower than the General Plan or Parks Master Plan level of service standard. The City must rely on a source other than future DIF revenues to mitigate this deficiency. Other sources of funding include state and federal grants, gifts or bequests from interested citizens, redevelopment agency, a debt issuance, developer contributions, or the City's General Fund.

PARK AND RECREATION FEE COMPONENT

Table 4 in Appendix A shows he total cost of park land, development, and recreation facilities required to serve future development by 2010 is approximately $24.2 million. Table 6 in Appendix A shows the calculation of the park and recreation fee component of the DIF. Dividing the $24.2 million cost by the 3,110 park and recreation DUEs from future development equals a cost of $7,795 per DUE. The park and recreation fee is calculated by applying the $7,795 cost per DUE to the DUE factor assigned to each of the residential land use categories. The resulting park and recreation fees, which include a 4.0% City administration charge, are as follows:

- $8,120 per Single Family unit
- $5,579 per Multifamily unit
- $4,715 per Senior Housing unit

V. *POLICE FEE COMPONENT OF THE DIF*

This section of the report identifies the police facilities, vehicles, and equipment costs, and the DIF fees for development in the City through 2010. The police fee component of the DIF calculated in this section meets the AB 1600 nexus requirement, as outlined below.

Purpose of Fee

The purpose of the police fee is to fund police-related capital facilities, vehicles, and equipment needed to serve new development in the City.

Use of Fee

Police fee revenue will be used to fund the fair-share portion of the construction or purchase of police facilities, vehicles, and equipment identified by the City as those necessary to serve new development through 2010. These facilities are identified in Table 7 of Appendix A.

Reasonable Relationship Between the Fee's Use and the Type of Development

The use of fee revenue collected from residential and non-residential development to purchase or construct the police facilities identified by the City as necessary to serve new development ensures that such facilities will be available and in sufficient capacity to serve new residential and non-residential development in the City through 2010.

Reasonable Relationship Between the Need for the Facility and the Type of Development

As residential and non-residential land uses develop in the City, residents and employees will require police service. The City will need to accommodate this growth by providing adequate police facilities. This will include funding to repay the cost of the existing police station and purchase of additional police vehicles and equipment.

Reasonable Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Facility

The police fee is set so that the fees collected offset the attributable portion of the cost of constructing or purchasing the facilities, vehicles, and equipment necessary to serve new development. Residential and non-residential development will be responsible for their fair-share portion of the total cost based on the increase in persons served generated by the development of residential and nonresidential land uses. The use of residents and employees to allocate the cost of police facilities is a reasonable relationship between the amount of facilities required by development types and the cost of facilities attributed to the development types, since residents and employees are the primary beneficiaries of police services. This can be a direct or an indirect benefit

from police services. A direct benefit results from an actual call for police service in which a person receives direct assistance from a police officer. Generally, only a small percentage of residents and employees get a direct benefit from police services since only a small portion will need police assistance. Most residents and employees however, receive a large indirect benefit from police services. The indirect benefit is constant and ongoing and is gained from the general safety, security, and lawful order that is provided by an adequate police force Table 8 in Appendix A of this report shows the calculation of the police fee.

DEMAND VARIABLE: PERSONS SERVED

Facility costs for the police fee component of the DIF Program are allocated to development based on persons served. Persons served are residents for residential land uses and employees for non-residential categories. The persons served are converted to DUE factors to calculate the police fee. Table 2A in Appendix A presents the demand variable and DUE factor assigned to each land use.

FUTURE FACILITY REQUIREMENTS AND COSTS

The total police facilities cost that is allocated to future development includes a fair-share portion of the existing police station, vehicles and equipment for new police officers, and a radio system expansion. The existing police station was included in the police capital improvement program that was incorporated in the 1992 Fee Study. This facility was built to serve development in the City through 2010. Construction of the police station, located at 660 Merchant Street, was completed in December 2005. The total construction cost for the 2-story, 39,000 square-foot structure is approximately $14.5 million; Table B-1 of Appendix B shows a detailed breakdown of the total cost of the station. This total cost includes construction, construction management, materials testing and inspections, architectural fees, dispatch equipment, FF&E (furniture, fixtures & equipment), City administration costs, and construction contingencies.

In addition to the police station, police vehicles and equipment are included for an estimated 14 additional officers that will be required by 2010, based on the police department's existing level of service of 108 sworn officers. Table B-2 in Appendix B shows details of the total cost of $56,035 per officer.

In addition, the police department has identified a need for an expansion of the existing police radio system. Although the existing system is adequate to serve the current development in the City, additional development by 2010 will require an expansion of this existing radio system. The total cost of the expansion is $1.5 million and is detailed in Table B-3 in Appendix B.

Based on the allocation of DUEs between existing development and future development in the City,

as presented on Table 2B in Appendix A, approximately $12.8 million, or 89%, of the police station cost is allocated to existing development, leaving future development responsible for the remaining $1.7 million. The City will also require an additional $0.8 million for police vehicles and equipment, and $1.5 million for the radio system expansion to serve future development through 2010. This brings the total cost of police facilities, vehicles, and equipment attributable to future development to approximately $4.0 million. Dividing the $4.0 million cost by the 4,812 police DUEs from future development equals a cost of $823 per DUE. The cost per police DUE is applied to the DUE factor assigned to each of the land use categories to arrive at a fee per unit for residential development or a fee per building square foot for non-residential development.

POLICE FEE COMPONENT

The bottom section of Table 8 in Appendix A shows the calculation of the police fee component of the DIF. The police fee is calculated by applying the $823 cost per DUE to the DUE factor assigned to each of the land use categories. The resulting police fees, which include a 4.0% City administration charge, are as follows:

- $858 per Single Family unit
- $589 per Multifamily unit
- $498 per Senior Housing unit
- $0.55 per Commercial building square foot
- $0.79 per Office building square foot
- $0.23 per Industrial building square foot

VI. FIRE FEE COMPONENT OF THE DIF

This section of the report identifies the portion of fire facilities, vehicles, and equipment costs, and DIF fees for development through 2010. The fire fee component of the DIF calculated in this section meets the AB 1600 nexus requirement, as outlined below.

Purpose of Fee

The purpose of the fire fee is to fund fire-related capital facilities, vehicles, and equipment needed to serve new development in the City.

Use of Fee

Fire fee revenue will be used to fund the construction or purchase of fire facilities, vehicles, and equipment identified by the City as those necessary to serve new development. These facilities are identified in Table 9 of Appendix A.

Reasonable Relationship Between the Fee's Use and the Type of Development

The use of fee revenue collected from residential and non-residential development to purchase or construct the fire facilities and equipment identified by the City as necessary to serve new development ensures that such facilities will be available and sufficient to serve new residential and non-residential development in the City through 2010.

Reasonable Relationship Between the Need for the Facility and the Type of Development

As residential and non-residential land uses develop in the City, residents and employees will require fire service. The City will need to accommodate this growth by providing additional fire facilities. This will include an additional fire station, fire vehicles, and fire personnel equipment.

Reasonable Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Facility

The fire fee is set so that the fees collected offset the attributable portion of the cost of constructing or purchasing the facilities, vehicles, and equipment necessary to serve new development. Residential and non-residential development will be responsible for their fair-share portion of the total cost based on the increase in persons served generated by the individual land uses. The use of residents and employees to allocate the cost of fire facilities is a reasonable relationship between the amount of facilities required by development types and the cost of facilities attributed to the development types, since residents and employees are the primary beneficiaries of fire services. Table 10 in Appendix A of this report shows the calculation of the fire fee component of the DIF.

DEMAND VARIABLE: PERSONS SERVED

Facility costs for the fire fee component of the DIF Program are allocated to development based on persons served. Persons served are residents for residential land uses and employees for non-residential categories. The persons served are converted to DUE factors to calculate the fire fee. Table 2A in Appendix A presents the demand variable and DUE factor assigned to each land use.

EXISTING FIRE FACILITIES

The City is currently served by four fire stations and assorted fire vehicles (see Table 9 in Appendix A). The fire stations provide an adequate level of service to existing development in the City, however, a report done by Citygate Associates, LLC in August 2003, *Standards of Response Cover Study*, found that additional development at the city edges will require the City to provide additional fire stations to maintain adequate response times. The total estimated cost of the City's fire stations, vehicles, and equipment, based on current replacement costs, is approximately $27.0 million

FUTURE FIRE FACILITIES REQUIREMENTS AND COSTS

The City estimated the impact on the fire department from future development in the City through 2010. Based on that assessment, the City will need one additional fire station, located on Orange Drive in the Northeastern portion of the City. Table B-4 of Appendix 4 shows a detailed breakdown of costs for this station. The total cost of the station is approximately $7.0 million, and includes the cost of 1.5 acres of land. The station will be 9,000 square feet in size and include an additional 2,250 square feet for a garage.

The fire station will require one ambulance, a brush unit, and a type 1 fire engine. Detailed costs of these vehicles are shown in Tables B-5 through B-7. In addition to vehicle costs, firefighter protective equipment costs are shown in Table B-8 and total $9,154 per firefighter. The fire department estimates an additional 15 firefighter will be required by 2010. The total cost of the additional fire facilities require by 2010, including the fire station, vehicles, and equipment is approximately $8.1 million.

FIRE FEE COMPONENT

Table 9 of Appendix A identifies all the fire facilities needed to serve the City through 2010. These include existing and future fire stations, vehicles, and equipment. The total cost of these facilities, which have been calculated based on the current estimated replacement value of existing and future fire stations, vehicles, and personnel equipment, is approximately $35.1 million.

All fire stations in the City have a primary area of service; however, each fire station also provides support, when required, on service calls outside its primary service area. In situations where mutual

support is required, fire crews and vehicles from different stations are moved throughout the City to provide mutual support on a service call or to provide service coverage to the primary area of the fire station that has responded to a service call. In essence, the fire stations are part of an integrated system and work in concert to provide coverage to the entire City. With this in mind, the total cost of the fire facilities, $35.1 million, is allocated uniformly throughout the City. Based on the allocation of DUEs between existing and future development in the City, as presented on Table 2B in Appendix A, approximately $31.1 million, or 89%, of the total fire facilities cost is allocated to existing development, leaving future development responsible for the remaining $4.0 million.

The bottom section of Table 10 in Appendix A shows the calculation of the fire fee component of the DIF. Dividing the total $4.0 million cost by the 4,812 DUEs from future development equals a cost of $832 per DUE. The fire fee is calculated by multiplying the $832 cost per DUE by the DUE factor assigned to each of the land use categories. The fire fees, which include a 4.0% administration charge, are as follows:

- $867 per Single Family unit
- $596 per Multifamily unit
- $503 per Senior Housing unit
- $0.56 per Commercial building square foot
- $0.80 per Office building square foot
- $0.23 per Industrial building square foot

VII. DRAINAGE DETENTION FEE COMPONENT OF THE DIF

The City has completed an update of its drainage capital improvement plan (CIP) that will serve all future development within Zone 1 and Zone 2 until buildout of the current City limits. The finalized drainage CIP contains updated cost estimates for both land acquisition and construction of drainage detention facilities identified in the 1992 Fee Study as well as cost estimates for land and construction of new drainage detention facilities required to serve future development in Zone 1 and Zone 2 through buildout of the City. This Nexus Study includes only an update of the drainage detention fee component for Zone 1 and Zone 2; it does not include an update of the City's drainage conveyance fee component of the DIF.

Purpose of Fee

The purpose of the drainage detention fee is to fund the construction of drainage detention basins and acquisition of the land on which those detention basins will be located, both of which are needed to serve new development in the City.

Use of Fee

Drainage detention fee revenue will be used to fund the expansion of existing drainage detention facilities and to construct new facilities identified by the City as necessary to serve new development. These facilities are identified in Table 11 of Appendix A.

Reasonable Relationship Between the Fee's Use and the Type of Development

Development will place increasing demand on the City's drainage detention facilities and create a need to expand the capacity of the City's drainage detention facilities. Drainage detention fees imposed on new residential and non-residential land uses will be used to fund the expansion and improvement of the City's drainage detention system and thereby meet the increased storm water runoff caused by these development types. Residential and non-residential land uses will impact the City's drainage detention facilities at different levels depending on the actual land use type. The Residential Acre Equivalent (RAE) factor, which is a measure of the runoff for each land use category, is shown in Table 3 of Appendix A.

Reasonable Relationship Between the Need for the Facility and the Type of Development

The loss of vacant and open space resulting from residential and nonresidential land development will reduce the capacity of the land to absorb storm runoff. Because the additional runoff will exceed the capacity of existing facilities, additional drainage facilities will be required to capture the additional runoff from development.

Reasonable Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Facility

The drainage detention fee is set so that the fees collected offset the attributable portion of the cost of acquiring land and constructing drainage detention facilities necessary to serve new development. The relationship between the amount of the fee and the portion of the facility and cost attributable to the development type is based on the percent imperviousness per acre assigned to each specific land use category, as shown in Table 3. The percent impervious factor establishes a reasonable relationship between the development type and its impact on drainage detention facilities and can therefore be used to quantify a proportionate drainage detention fee. Tables 12A and 12B in Appendix A of this report show the calculation of the drainage detention fee for Zone 1 and Zone 2, respectively.

DEMAND VARIABLE: PERCENT IMPERVIOUSNESS

Facility costs for the drainage detention fee component of the DIF Program are allocated to future development based on land use's percent imperviousness. The percent imperviousness is a measure of a land use's capacity to absorb storm runoff. For example, an acre containing single family units has more open, pervious areas for storm water to be absorbed than an acre containing commercial development. Therefore, an acre of single family development has a lower impervious percent than a commercially developed acre. The percent imperviousness for each land use type was obtained from the 1992 Fee Study and is converted to a corresponding RAE factor. These RAE factor are shown in Table 3 of Appendix A and are used to calculate the drainage detention fee.

FUTURE FACILITY REQUIREMENTS AND COSTS

Table 11 in Appendix A identifies the drainage detention facilities that will be required to serve future development in drainage detention Zones 1 and 2 until buildout of the current City limit. As shown in this table, approximately $17.0 million is required to acquire land and construct the required drainage facilities to serve future development. The total cost of facilities required to serve future development in Zone 1 is approximately $3.9 million and includes costs for land acquisition and/or construction of the North Horse Basin #2, Middle Horse Basin, Putah South Canal Basin, Gibson Canyon Creek Basin, Cheyenne Basin expansion, and the Brown Street Basin. The total cost of facilities to serve future development in Zone 2 is approximately $13.1 million and includes costs for land acquisition and/or construction of the Ulatis Creek Basin #1, Alamo Creek Basin #1, Alamo Creek Basin #3, Upper Alamo Creek Basin, and Upper Laguna Creek Basin. The drainage detention facilities identified in this report are required to serve future development in the City and do not include facilities to cure existing deficiencies within the drainage system.

DRAINAGE DETENTION FEE COMPONENT

Using the methodology described in Section III of this report, the following subsections detail the

steps applied to derive the drainage detention fees for Zone 1 and Zone 2. Note that Senior single family units are subject to the single family rate, and senior multifamily units are subject to the multifamily rate.

Zone 1

Table 12A presents the calculation of the Zone 1 drainage detention fee component of the DIF. Dividing the total $3.9 million cost by the 1,611 RAEs from future development equals a cost of $2,448 per RAE. The drainage detention fee in Zone 1 is calculated by first multiplying the $2,448 cost per RAE by the RAE factor assigned to each of the land use categories to determine a cost per acre for that land use category. The cost per acre is subsequently divided by either the average density for residential land uses anticipated in Zone 1 or the gross-to-net acreage factor (95%) for the non-residential land uses. The resulting per-unit drainage detention fee for residential land uses and per-net acre drainage detention fee for non-residential land uses in Zone 1, including a 4.0% administration charge, are as follows:

- $850 per Single Family unit
- $144 per Multifamily unit
- $4,831 per net acre for Commercial, Office, and Industrial development

Zone 2

Table 12B presents the calculation of the Zone 2 drainage detention fee component of the DIF. Dividing the total $13.1 million cost by the 1,721 RAEs from future development equals a cost of $7,596 per RAE. The resulting per-unit drainage detention fee for residential land uses and per-net acre drainage detention fee for non-residential land uses in Zone 2, including a 4.0% administration charge, are as follows:

- $1,978 per Single Family unit
- $447 per Multifamily unit
- $14,993 per net acre for Commercial, Office, and Industrial development

VIII. DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE SUMMARY

DIF SUMMARY

Table 1 below summarizes the fee components of the DIF as calculated in this report. A 4.0% administration charge for each fee component is included to provide funding for future DIF Program updates as well as the City's administrative duties associated with the DIF Program.

Table 1

DIF Summary (1)

	Park & Recreation Fee	Police Fee	Fire Fee	Drainage Detention Fee Zone 1	Drainage Detention Fee Zone 2
Residential Land Uses	*per unit*	*per unit*	*per unit*	*per unit*	*per unit*
Single Family Residential	$8,120	$858	$867	$850	$1,978
Multifamily Residential	$5,579	$589	$596	$144	$447
Senior Residential	$4,715	$498	$503	(2)	(2)
Non Residential	*per Building Square Foot*	*per Building Square Foot*	*per Building Square Foot*	*Per Net Acre*	*Per Net Acre*
Commercial	N/A	$0.55	$0.56	$4,831	$14,993
Office	N/A	$0.79	$0.80	$4,831	$14,993
Industrial	N/A	$0.23	$0.23	$4,831	$14,993

(1) Fees include a 4.0% administration charge.

(2) Senior single family units are subject to the single family rate; senior multifamily units are subject to the multifamily rate.

DIF COMPARISON

Table C-1 and Table C-2 in Appendix C provide a comparison of the park and recreation, police, fire, and drainage detention fees calculated in this Nexus Study to those in the cities of Elk Grove, Fairfield, Livermore, Napa, Pleasanton, Roseville, and Vallejo. For comparison purposes, a fee for capital/public facilities is also included in these tables because for some cities, this fee combines the police and/or fire fees. Table C-1 presents the fee comparison for a single family unit and Table C-2 presents the fee comparison per square foot of commercial building space.

ANNUAL ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES

The Government Code requires the City to report, every year and every fifth year, certain financial information regarding the impact fees. Within 180 days after the last day of each fiscal year the City must make the following information available for the past fiscal year:

(a) A brief description of the type of fee in the account or fund
(b) The amount of fee revenue
(c) The beginning and ending balance of the account or fund
(d) The amount of fee revenue collected and interest earned
(e) An identification of each public improvement on which fees were expended and the amount of expenditures on each improvement, including the total percentage of the cost of public improvement that was funded with fees
(f) An identification of an approximate date by which time construction on the improvement will commence if the local agency determines that sufficient funds have been collected to complete financing on an incomplete public improvement
(g) A description of each interfund transfer or loan made from the account or fund, when it will be repaid and at what interest rate
(h) The amount of any refunds made once it is determined that sufficient monies have been collected to fund all projects

The City must make this information available for public review and must also present it at the next regularly scheduled public meeting not less than 15 days after this information is made available to the public.

FIFTH-YEAR ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES

For the fifth year following the first deposit into the fee account and every five years thereafter, the City must make the following findings with respect to any remaining funds in the fee accounts:

(a) Identify the purpose to which the fee is to be put
(b) Demonstrate a reasonable relationship between the fee and the purpose for which it is charged
(c) Identify all sources and amounts of funding anticipated to complete financing incomplete improvements
(d) Designate the approximate dates on which funding is expected to be deposited into the appropriate accounts or funds

IX. ONGOING ADMINISTRATION OF THE DIF PROGRAM

FEE ADJUSTMENTS

The DIF may be adjusted in future years to reflect revised facility standards, receipt of funding from alternative sources (i.e., state or federal grants), revised costs, inclusion of additional capital improvements, or changes in demographics or the City's land use plan. The City should periodically review its capital improvement plans, development assumptions, as well as construction and land costs estimates. This process will ensure that fees will provide sufficient funding for capital facilities. If any of these assumptions or costs diverge materially from those included in this Nexus Study, the City should adjust its DIF Program to reflect such changes. In addition to such adjustments, the fees will be inflated each year by a predetermined construction cost index, such as the ENR index.

The fee categories summarized in this Nexus Study may not be applicable to specialized development projects in the City. For example, development of a cemetery, golf course, or stadium would not fall under any of the fee categories in this study. For specialized development projects, City staff will review the impacts and decide on an applicable ad hoc fee.

FEE CREDITS AND REIMBURSEMENTS

The City may enter into a fee credit or reimbursement agreement for facilities that are constructed or funded by private development as part of the DIF Program. Developers must enter into a credit/reimbursement agreement with the City prior to construction if they wish to be reimbursed for a facility. Developers will be responsible for complying with all applicable laws, codes, and regulations relating to contracting and construction procedures for publicly-funded public works projects. The priority of the reimbursement will be determined by the City and the reimbursement will only be paid after the City has accepted the developer-funded facility. All reimbursements will be an obligation of the DIF Program and not the City's General Fund.

FEE IMPLEMENTATION

According to the California Government Code, prior to levying a new fee or increasing an existing fee, an agency must hold at least one open and public meeting. At least ten days prior to this meeting, the agency must make data on infrastructure costs and funding sources available to the public. Notice of the time and place of the meeting, and a general explanation of the matter, are to be published in accordance with Section 6062a of the Government Code, which states that publication of notice shall occur twice, with at least five days intervening, commencing at least ten days before the hearing, in a newspaper regularly published once a week or more.

As with the annual report, the five-year report must be made public within 180 days after the end of the City's fiscal year and must be reviewed at the next regularly scheduled public meeting. The City must make these findings; otherwise the law states that the City must refund the fee revenue to the then current owners of the development project.

APPENDIX A

DIF Calculations

Table A
Fee Summary /1

	Park & Recreation	Police	Fire	Drainage Detention Fee Zone 1 /2	Drainage Detention Fee Zone 2 /2
Residential Land Uses	*per unit*	*per unit*	*per unit*	*per unit*	*per unit*
Single Family Residential	$8,120	$858	$867	$850	$1,978
Multifamily Residential	$5,579	$589	$596	$144	$447
Senior Residential	$4,715	$498	$503	/3	/3
Non Residential	*per Bldg. SF*	*per Bldg. SF*	*per Bldg. SF*	*per Net Acre*	*per Net Acre*
Commercial	N/A	$0.55	$0.56	$4,831	$14,993
Office	N/A	$0.79	$0.80	$4,831	$14,993
Industrial	N/A	$0.23	$0.23	$4,831	$14,993

/1 Includes a 4.0% administration component to fund the City's fee program administration costs and future DIF updates.
/2 Includes funding for land acquisition and construction costs related to additional drainage detention facilities that were not included in the 1992 DIF Update.
/3 Senior single family units are subject to the single family rate; senior multifamily units are subject to the multifamily rate.

Source: Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

Table 1A
Land Use Assumptions for Park & Recreation, Police, and Fire Fees

Existing Development (2007) /1

Residential	Units	PPH	Household Population
Single Family	23,784	3.10	73,730
Multifamily	5,974	2.13	12,725
Senior	2,652	1.80	4,774
Total	32,410		91,229

Non-Residential /2	Building Intensity (Avg FAR)	Gross Acres	Building Square Footage	Bldg. SF per Employee	Total Employees
Commercial /3	0.23	654.5	6,414,755	500	12,830
Office	0.30	103.0	1,346,004	350	3,846
Industrial /4	0.35	634.5	9,673,587	1,200	8,061
Total		1,392.0	17,434,346		24,737

Remaining Development through 2010

Residential	Units	PPH	Household Population
Single Family	2,663	3.10	8,255
Multifamily	521	2.13	1,110
Senior	153	1.80	275
Total	3,337		9,640

Non-Residential /2	Building Intensity (Avg FAR)	Gross Acres	Building Square Footage	Bldg. SF per Employee	Total Employees
Commercial /3	0.23	110.5	1,083,011	500	2,166
Office	0.30	61.0	797,148	350	2,278
Industrial /4	0.35	65.5	998,613	1,200	832
Total		237.0	2,878,772		5,276

Total Development through 2010

Residential	Units	Household Population
Single Family	26,447	81,985
Multifamily	6,495	13,835
Senior	2,805	5,049
Total	35,747	100,869

Non-Residential /2	Building Intensity (Avg FAR)	Gross Acres	Building Square Footage	Bldg. SF per Employee	Total Employees
Commercial /3	0.23	765.0	7,497,765	500	14,996
Office	0.30	164.0	2,143,152	350	6,123
Industrial /4	0.35	700.0	10,672,200	1,200	8,894
Total		1,629.0	20,313,117		30,012

/1 Existing land uses as of January 1, 2007.

/2 Assumes 50 percent of acres in the Hospital category are hospitals and the remainder are churches.

/3 Includes acreage associated with hospitals, which have similar building square feet per employee characteristics.

/4 Includes acreage associated with churches, which have similar building square feet per employee characteristics.

Source: City of Vacaville Planning Department; Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

Table 1B
Land Use Assumptions for Drainage Fee /1

Land Use	Zone 1			Zone 2			Total	
	Acres	*Density*	*Units*	*Acres*	*Density*	*Units*	*Acres*	*Units*
Residential								
Single Family	262.0	3	848	1,134.5	4	4,538	1,396.5	5,386
Multifamily	15.7	23	360	40.2	23	925	55.9	1,285
Subtotal	277.7		1,208	1,174.7		5,463	1,452.4	6,671
Non-Residential	*Acres*			*Acres*			*Acres*	
Commercial	87.0			200.0			287.0	
Office	58.0			42.0			100.0	
Industrial	593.0			55.0			648.0	
Subtotal	738.0			297.0			1,035.0	
Total	**1,015.7**			**1,471.7**			**2,487.4**	

/1 Remaining undeveloped land uses within current City limits as of January 2007.

Source: City of Vacaville Planning Department; Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

Table 2A

Park & Recreation, Police, and Fire Dwelling Unit Equivalent (DUE) Calculation /1

Land Use	Persons per Household (PPH)	Building Square Feet per Employee	Persons Served per Household or 1,000 SF	DUE Factor per Unit or per 1,000 SF
Residential			*per Household*	*per Unit*
Single Family	3.10	-	3.10	1.00
Multifamily	2.13	-	2.13	0.69
Senior	1.80	-	1.80	0.58
Non-Residential			*per 1,000 SF*	*per 1,000 SF*
Commercial	-	500	2.00	0.65
Office	-	350	2.86	0.92
Industrial	-	1200	0.83	0.27

/1 Park facilities will be primarily used by residential development; therefore, the cost of these facilities are allocated only to residential development. However, both residents and employees within the City will benefit from police and fire facilities, and as such, the cost of these facilities are allocated to both residential and non-residential development.

Source: Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

Table 2B
Police and Fire DUEs

Land Use	Existing Development /1		Remaining Development /2		Total Development	
	Units or SF	DUEs	Units or SF	DUEs	Units or SF	DUEs
Residential	Units		Units		Units	
Single Family	23,784	23,784	2,663	2,663	26,447	26,447
Multifamily	5,974	4,105	521	358	6,495	4,463
Senior	2,652	1,540	153	89	2,805	1,629
Subtotal Residential	**32,410**	**29,429**	**3,337**	**3,110**	**35,747**	**32,538**
Non-Residential	SF		SF		SF	
Commercial	6,414,755	4,139	1,083,011	699	7,497,765	4,837
Office	1,346,004	1,241	797,148	735	2,143,152	1,975
Industrial	9,673,587	2,600	998,613	268	10,672,200	2,869
Subtotal Non-Residential	**17,434,346**	**7,980**	**2,878,772**	**1,702**	**20,313,117**	**9,681**
Total		**37,408**		**4,812**		**42,220**
Percentage of Total		***89%***		***11%***		***100%***

/1 Estimated residential and non-residential development as of January 1, 2007.

/2 Remaining residential and non-residential development through 2010.

Source: Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

Table 3
Residential Acre Equivalent (RAE) Calculation

Land Use	Percent Impervious per Acre	Residential Acre Equivalent (RAE) Factor
Residential		
Single Family	50%	1.00
Multifamily	65%	1.30
Non-Residential		
Commercial	90%	1.80
Office	90%	1.80
Industrial	90%	1.80

Source: City of Vacaville; Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

Table 4

Park & Recreation Costs

Population Projections	*2007/1*	*2010*	*Additional Residents through 2010*
Population	91,229	100,869	9,640

Facilities Needs	*General Plan Park Standard (Acres per 1,000 residents)*	*Additional Required Park Acreage through 2010*
Park Facilities		
Future Neighborhood Park	1.80	17.4
Future Community Park	1.70	16.4
Future City Park	1.00	9.6
Total Additional Park Acres Required By 2010		**43.4**

Recreation Facilities (from Table 5C)	*Park Master Plan Recreation Facility Standard (Residents Served per Facility)*	*Additional Required Facilities through 2010*
Community Centers	32,000	0.30
Senior Centers	64,000	0.15
Neighborhood Centers	13,000	0.00
Gymnasiums	32,000	0.30
Pools	32,000	0.00
Baseball/Softball Fields	2,750	0.00
Football/Soccer Fields	4,000	2.41
Basketball Courts	5,000	1.92
Tennis Courts	5,000	1.92
Volleyball Courts	10,000	0.97

Facilities Cost	*Future Units*	*Cost per Unit: Land*	*Cost per Unit: Improvement*	*Total Cost*
Park Facilities				
Neighborhood Park	17.4 acres	$250,000	$300,000	$9,543,600
Community Park	16.4 acres	$250,000	$300,000	$9,013,400
City Park /2	9.6 acres	n/a	$300,000	$2,892,000
Subtotal - Park Cost	43.4 acres			$21,449,000
Recreation Facilities /3,4				
Community Centers	0.30 centers	n/a	$3,461,384	$1,038,415
Senior Centers /5	0.15 centers	n/a	$3,028,346	$181,701
Neighborhood Centers	0.00 centers	n/a	$665,651	$0
Gymnasiums	0.30 gyms	n/a	$3,061,994	$918,598
Pools	0.00 pools	n/a	$3,376,532	$0
Baseball/Softball Fields	0.00 fields	n/a	$555,928	$0
Football/Soccer Fields	2.41 fields	n/a	$169,704	$408,988
Basketball Courts	1.92 courts	n/a	$52,667	$101,120
Tennis Courts	1.92 courts	n/a	$61,445	$117,974
Volleyball Courts	0.97 courts	n/a	$26,333	$25,543
Subtotal - Recreation Cost				$2,792,339
Total Park and Recreation Cost				**$24,241,339**

/1 Estimated population as of January 1, 2007.

/2 The City owns 138 acres of land designated for the City Park; therefore, no land acquisition cost is included for the City Park.

/3 Estimated improvement costs for recreational facilities are calculated by applying the percentage increase in the Construction Cost Index from Engineering News-Record to the costs in the City's 1992 DIF Update.

/4 Assumes recreational facilities will be located on park land; therefore, no land acquisition cost is included for these facilities.

/5 Assumes 40% of the project cost will be funded by development impact fees; remaining costs will be funded by other sources (e.g., grants, bonds, or other non-DIF revenue).

Source: Vacaville Community Services Department; Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

Table 5A

Recreation Facilities Cost Calculation

Facility	Cost per Unit 1992$ /1	2007$ /2
Community Centers	$2,366,000	$3,461,384
Senior Centers	$2,070,000	$3,028,346
Neighborhood Centers	$455,000	$665,651
Gymnasiums	$2,093,000	$3,061,994
Pools	$2,308,000	$3,376,532
Baseball/Softball Fields /3	$380,000	$555,928
Football/Soccer Fields	$116,000	$169,704
Basketball Courts	$36,000	$52,667
Tennis Courts	$42,000	$61,445
Volleyball Courts	$18,000	$26,333

Engineering News Record - Construction Cost Index (ENR CCI)	
December 1991	6,222.06
March 2007	9,102.68
% Increase	**46.30%**

/1 Unit costs are in January 1, 1992 dollars and were obtained from 1992 Park and Recreation DIF Update.

/2 Unit costs are inflated to 2007 dollars based on the increase in the ENR CCI for San Francisco from December 1991 to March 2007.

/3 Average of lighted and non-lighted field cost.

Source: 1992 Park and Recreation DIF Update; Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc

Table 5B

Recreation Facilities Needs Comparison

(Existing Facilities vs. 2007 Needs)

Facility	Facility Standard (Residents Served per Facility)	Existing Facilities	Estimated Facility Need (based on 2007 Pop.)	Current # of Deficient Facilities
Community Centers	32,000	2.00	2.85	(0.85)
Senior Centers	64,000	1.00	1.43	(0.43)
Neighborhood Centers	13,000	11.00	7.02	0.00
Gymnasiums	32,000	1.30	2.85	(1.55)
Pools	32,000	3.15	2.85	0.00
Baseball/Softball Fields	2,750	55.00	33.17	0.00
Football/Soccer Fields	4,000	18.00	22.81	(4.81)
Basketball Courts	5,000	15.50	18.25	(2.75)
Tennis Courts	5,000	17.00	18.25	(1.25)
Volleyball Courts	10,000	2.00	9.12	(7.12)

/1 Estimated population, as of January 1, 2007, equals 91,229.

Source: 1992 Park and Recreation DIF Update; Vacaville Community Services Department; Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

Table 5C

Recreation Facilities Needed to Serve Future Development

Facility	Facility Standard (Residents Served per Facility)	Existing Facilities	Estimated Facility Need (based on 2007 Pop.) /1	Estimated Facility Need (based on 2010 Pop.) /2	Facilities Needed to Serve Future Development /3
Community Centers	32,000	2.00	2.85	3.15	0.30
Senior Centers	64,000	1.00	1.43	1.58	0.15
Neighborhood Centers	13,000	11.00	7.02	7.76	0.00
Gymnasiums	32,000	1.30	2.85	3.15	0.30
Pools	32,000	3.15	2.85	3.15	0.00
Baseball/Softball Fields	2,750	55.00	33.17	36.68	0.00
Football/Soccer Fields	4,000	18.00	22.81	25.22	2.41
Basketball Courts	5,000	15.50	18.25	20.17	1.92
Tennis Courts	5,000	17.00	18.25	20.17	1.92
Volleyball Courts	10,000	2.00	9.12	10.09	0.97

/1 Estimated population, as of January 1, 2007, equals 91,229.

/2 Projected population in 2010 equals 100,869.

/3 Difference between facilities required in 2010 and the greater of existing facilities or facilities required to serve residents in 2007.

Source: 1992 Park and Recreation DIF Update; Vacaville Community Services Department; Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

Table 6

Park & Recreation Fee Calculation

1. Total Park & Recreation Cost Allocated to Future Development			**$24,241,339**
2. Park & Recreation Facilities DUEs Calculation /1			
	DUE Factor	**Future Development**	**DUEs Generated by Future Development**
Residential	*per Unit*	*Units*	
Single Family	1.00	2,663	2,663
Multifamily	0.69	521	358
Senior	0.58	153	89
Subtotal Residential		**3,337**	**3,110**
Non-Residential	*per 1,000 SF*	*SF*	
Commercial	n/a	1,083,011	0
Office	n/a	797,148	0
Industrial	n/a	998,613	0
Subtotal Non-Residential		**2,878,772**	**0**
Total Future DUEs			**3,110**
Cost per DUE			**$7,795**

3. Park & Recreation Fee Calculation

	Cost per DUE	**DUE per Unit**	**Impact Fee /2**
Residential			
Single Family	$7,795	1.00	$8,120 per unit
Multifamily	$7,795	0.69	$5,579 per unit
Senior	$7,795	0.58	$4,715 per unit
	Cost per DUE	**DUE per 1,000 SF**	
Non-Residential			
Commercial	$7,795	n/a	$0.00 per sf
Office	$7,795	n/a	$0.00 per sf
Industrial	$7,795	n/a	$0.00 per sf

/1 Park and recreation facilities will be primarily used by residential development; therefore, the cost of these facilities are allocated only to residential development.

/2 A 4.0% mark-up is included to fund City administration costs and future DIF updates.

Source: Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

Table 7
Police Facilities Cost

Police Facilities		Unit Cost	Quantity	Total Cost
Facilities to Serve Existing and Future Development				
Cost of Police Station		$14,500,000	1	$14,500,000
Existing Development's Share based on Total DUEs				$12,847,474
Future Development's Share based on Total DUEs				**$1,652,526**
Facilities and Equipment to Serve Future Development Only				
Current Vacaville Police Staffing Standard				
Existing Sworn Officers	108			
Existing DUEs	37,408			
Sworn Officers per 1,000 DUEs	2.9			
Future DUEs	4,812			
Estimated Number of Sworn Officers Required	14			
New Sworn Officer Vehicle and Equipment Costs		$56,035	14	$784,490
Radio System Expansion		$1,524,908	1	$1,524,908
Subtotal Facilities Cost to Serve Future Development Only				**$2,309,398**
Total Facilities Cost				**$16,809,398**
Total Facilities Cost Allocated to Existing Development				**$12,847,474**
Total Facilities Cost Allocated to Future Development				**$3,961,924**

Source: Vacaville Police Department; Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

Table 8

Police Fee Calculation

1. Total Police Facilities Cost Allocated to Future Development **$3,961,924**

2. Police Facilities DUEs Calculation

	DUE Factor	Future Development	DUEs Generated by Future Development
Residential	*per Unit*	*Units*	
Single Family	1.00	2,663	2,663
Multifamily	0.69	521	358
Senior	0.58	153	89
Subtotal Residential		**3,337**	**3,110**
Non-Residential	*per 1,000 SF*	*SF*	
Commercial	0.65	1,083,011	699
Office	0.92	797,148	735
Industrial	0.27	998,613	268
Subtotal Non-Residential		**2,878,772**	**1,702**
Total Future DUEs			**4,812**
Cost per DUE			**$823**

3. Police Fee Calculation

	Cost per DUE	DUE per Unit	Impact Fee /1
Residential			
Single Family	$823	1.00	$858 per unit
Multifamily	$823	0.69	$589 per unit
Senior	$823	0.58	$498 per unit
Non-Residential	**Cost per DUE**	**DUE per 1,000 SF**	
Commercial	$823	0.65	$0.55 per sf
Office	$823	0.92	$0.79 per sf
Industrial	$823	0.27	$0.23 per sf

/1 A 4.0% mark-up is included to fund City administration costs and future DIF updates.

Source: Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

Table 9

Fire Facilities Cost

Fire Facilities	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Total Cost
Facilities to Serve Existing and Future Development (through 2010)				
New Facilities				
Fire Stations				
Orange Drive Station Main Building	SF	$687	9,000	$6,183,000
Orange Drive Station Garage	SF	$241	2,250	$541,500
Orange Drive Station Land	SF	$5	65,340 /2	$311,000
Subtotal - Fire Stations				$7,035,500
Fire Vehicles				
Ambulance	EA	$201,465	1	$201,465
Brush Unit	EA	$178,118	1	$178,118
Fire Engine, Type I	EA	$549,172	1	$549,172
Subtotal - Fire Vehicles				$928,755
Fire Personnel				
Protective Equipment	EA	$9,154	15	$137,310
Existing Facilities				
Fire Stations				
Station 71 Main Building	SF	$687 /1	10,400	$7,144,800
Station 71 Garage	SF	$241 /1	3,360	$808,700
Station 72 Main Building	SF	$687 /1	5,300	$3,641,100
Station 73 Main Building	SF	$687 /1	5,406	$3,713,922
Station 74 Main Building	SF	$687 /1	5,680	$3,902,160
Station 71 Land	SF	$11	59,242	$651,658
Station 72 Land	SF	$11	37,026	$407,286
Station 73 Land	SF	$11	74,052	$814,572
Station 74 Land	SF	$11	44,867	$493,535
Subtotal - Fire Stations				$21,577,732
Fire Vehicles				
Ambulance	EA	$201,465	4	$805,860
Brush Unit	EA	$178,118	4	$712,472
Fire Engine, Type I	EA	$549,172	4	$2,196,688
Aerial Ladder Truck	EA	$950,000	1	$950,000
Command Vehicle	EA	$75,000	1	$75,000
Subtotal- Fire Vehicles				$4,740,020
Fire Personnel				
Protective Equipment	EA	$9,154	79	$723,166
Estimated Cost for New Facilities				$8,101,565
Estimated Replacement Cost for Existing Facilities				$27,040,918
Total Facilities Cost				**$35,142,483**
Existing Development's Share based on Total DUEs				**$31,137,390**
Future Development's Share based on Total DUEs				**$4,005,093**

/1 Unit costs are based on an average cost per square foot of garage or main building for the new Orange Drive Extension fire station.

/2 Land cost for the new Orange Drive Extension fire station was negotiated and represents a highly discounted purchase price.

Source: Vacaville Police Department; Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

Table 10

Fire Fee Calculation

1. Total Fire Facilities Cost Allocated to Future Development **$4,005,093**

2. Fire Facilities DUEs Calculation

	DUE Factor	Future Development	DUEs Generated by Future Development
Residential	*per Unit*	*Units*	
Single Family	1.00	2,663	2,663
Multifamily	0.69	521	358
Senior	0.58	153	89
Subtotal Residential		**3,337**	**3,110**
Non-Residential	*per 1,000 SF*	*SF*	
Commercial	0.65	1,083,011	699
Office	0.92	797,148	735
Industrial	0.27	998,613	268
Subtotal Non-Residential		**2,878,772**	**1,702**
Total Future DUEs			**4,812**
Cost per DUE			**$832**

3. Fire Fee Calculation

	Cost per DUE	DUE Factor per Unit	Impact Fee /1
Residential			
Single Family	$832	1.00	$867 per unit
Multifamily	$832	0.69	$596 per unit
Senior	$832	0.58	$503 per unit
	Cost per DUE	**DUE Factor per 1,000 SF**	
Non-Residential			
Commercial	$832	0.65	$0.56 per sf
Office	$832	0.92	$0.80 per sf
Industrial	$832	0.27	$0.23 per sf

/1 A 4.0% mark-up is included to fund City administration costs and future DIF updates.

Source: Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

Table 11
Drainage Detention Facility Costs /1

Zone	Land Cost	Construction Cost	Total Cost
Zone 1			
North Horse Basin #2	N/A	$392,000	$392,000
Middle Horse Basin	N/A	$392,000	$392,000
Putah South Canal Basin	$91,000	$588,000	$679,000
Gibson Canyon Creek Basin /2	$1,400,000	N/A	$1,400,000
Cheyenne Basin Expansion /2	N/A	$250,000	$250,000
Brown Street Basin /2	$130,000	$700,000	$830,000
Subtotal Zone 1 Cost			**$3,943,000**
Zone 2			
Ulatis Creek Basin #1	$2,000,000	$490,000	$2,490,000
Alamo Creek Basin #1	$1,850,000	$2,450,000	$4,300,000
Alamo Creek Basin #3	N/A	$686,000	$686,000
Upper Alamo Creek Basin /2	$3,500,000	N/A	$3,500,000
Upper Laguna Creek Basin /2	$2,100,000	N/A	$2,100,000
Subtotal Zone 2 Cost			**$13,076,000**
Total Drainage Cost			**$17,019,000**

/1 Does not include drainage costs to mitigate existing deficiencies.

/2 New drainage facilities added since the 1992 DIF Update.

Source: Vacaville Public Works Department; Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

Table 12A
Zone 1 Drainage Detention Fee Calculation

1. Total Zone 1 Cost Allocated to Future Development — $3,943,000

2. Zone 1 Drainage Facilities RAEs Calculation

	RAE Factor	Future Development	RAEs Generated by Future Zone 1 Development
Residential	*per Acre*	*Acres*	
Single Family	1.00	262.0	262
Multifamily	1.30	15.7	20
Subtotal Residential		**277.7**	**282**
Non-Residential	*per Acre*	*Acres*	
Commercial	1.80	87.0	157
Office	1.80	58.0	104
Industrial	1.80	593.0	1,067
Subtotal Non-Residential		**738.0**	**1,328**
Total Future RAEs - Zone 1			**1,611**
Cost per RAE - Zone 1			**$2,448**

3. Zone 1 Drainage Detention Fee Calculation

	Cost per RAE	RAE Factor per Acre	Density	Units	Impact Fee /1
Residential					
Single Family	$2,448	1.00	3.0	Dwelling Unit	$850 per unit
Multifamily	$2,448	1.30	23.0	Dwelling Unit	$144 per unit

	Cost per RAE	RAE Factor per Acre	Gross to Net Acreage Factor	Units	
Non-Residential					
Commercial	$2,448	1.80	95.0%	Net Acre	$4,831 per Acre
Office	$2,448	1.80	95.0%	Net Acre	$4,831 per Acre
Industrial	$2,448	1.80	95.0%	Net Acre	$4,831 per Acre

/1 A 4.0% mark-up is included to fund City administration costs and future DIF updates.

Source: Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

Table 12B
Zone 2 Drainage Detention Fee Calculation

1. *Total Zone 2 Cost Allocated to Future Development* **$13,076,000**

2. *Zone 2 Drainage Facilities RAEs Calculation*

	RAE Factor	Future Development	RAEs Generated by Future Zone 2 Development
Residential	*per Acre*	*Acres*	
Single Family	1.00	1,134.5	1,135
Multifamily	1.30	40.2	52
Subtotal Residential		**1,174.7**	**1,187**
Non-Residential	*per Acre*	*Acres*	
Commercial	1.80	200.0	360
Office	1.80	42.0	76
Industrial	1.80	55.0	99
Subtotal Non-Residential		**297.0**	**535**
Total Future RAEs - Zone 2			**1,721**
Cost per RAE - Zone 2			**$7,596**

3. *Zone 2 Drainage Detention Fee Calculation*

	Cost per RAE	RAE Factor per Acre	Density	Units	Impact Fee /1
Residential					
Single Family	$7,596	1.00	4.0	Dwelling Unit	$1,978 per unit
Multifamily	$7,596	1.30	23.0	Dwelling Unit	$447 per unit
Non-Residential	Cost per RAE	RAE Factor per Acre	Net to Gross Acreage Factor	Units	
Commercial	$7,596	1.80	95.0%	Net Acre	$14,993 per Acre
Office	$7,596	1.80	95.0%	Net Acre	$14,993 per Acre
Industrial	$7,596	1.80	95.0%	Net Acre	$14,993 per Acre

/1 A 4.0% mark-up is included to fund City administration costs and future DIF updates.

Source: Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

APPENDIX B

Detailed Capital Facilities and Costs

Table B-1
Police Station Cost

ITEM	Cost
Construction Cost	$11,051,609
Construction Contingency	$520,000
Construction Mgt. Services (Consultant)	$500,000
Materials Testing & Special Inspections	$55,000
General Inspection Cost	$285,000
Architectural Fees:	
Space Planning	$38,500
Design	$923,800
Construction Admin Services	$266,300
Dispatch Equipment Cost	$380,000
FF&E	$335,000
City Administration	$170,000
Total Project Cost	**$14,500,000**

Source: City of Vacaville

Table B-2
Police Personnel Cost

CATEGORY: PERSONNEL COSTS

ITEM: NEW OFFICER EQUIPMENT

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
Equipment needed for new police officer hire

PROJECT COST **$56,035**

ITEM	Cost
Motorola MTS 2000 w/Charging System	$3,000
Ballistic Vest	$675
Sig Sauer P 226 (Duty Weapon)	$725
Sam Brown Duty Belt	$50
Holster SIII	$100
Stinger Rechargeable Flashlight	$100
Badge	$50
Magazine Holder, Cuff Case, Stinger Holder, Micro Cassette Holder, Mace Holder	$150
MK 3 or MK 4 Mace	$25
Handcuffs	$25
Micro Cassette	$40
Name Tag	$15
Hearing Protection/Shooting Glasses	$50
Gas Mask and Carrier	$375
Ambu BAG - CPR	$40
Riot Gear	$150
Ear Mold	$100
Gun Cleaning Kits	$50
Rain Gear	$160
Shot Gun	$425
First Aid Kits, Blankets, Flares	$100
Computer with Monitor	$1,500
Office Equipment/Phone	$400
Police Vehicle	$32,000
MDT and Supporting Software	$10,000
Rifle - AR15s	$700
Stop Sticks	$500
Hiring Cost	$1,950
Hiring Cost - Academy Training	$2,580
TOTAL	**$56,035**

Source: Vacaville Police Department

Table B-3
Police Radio System Expansion Cost

ITEM	Cost
MTC3600 Remote Site Controller (Browns Valley)	
Redundant -48 VDC Power Supplies	
Operations/Service Manual	
MTC3600 Remote Site Controller (Optional Butcher Hill upgrade)	
Redundant -48 VDC Power Supplies	
QUANTAR repeaters (Butcher Hill and Browns Valley)	
12 Quantar Repeaters (6 at each site)	
800 MHz Operation	
Trunking Capability	
-48 VDC Operation	
Test Microphone and Speaker	Included in Subtotal
Service Manual	
Radio Service Software and Cables	
48VDC Power Plant (Butcher Hill and Browns Valley)	
New 200AMP 48 VDC for Browns Valley	
Upgrade the 48 VDC power system at Butcher Hill	
Microwave connectivity from Fire Station 73 to Browns Valley site	
One hop of Harris TRuepoint Microwave equipment	
Antenna Modification to Fire Station 73	
Drive testing	
Antenna and Coax	
Antenna installation and system optimization	
Subtotal	$1,473,930
Optional: Butcher Hill Remote Site Controller upgrade to MTC3600	$50,978
Total Project Cost	**$1,524,908**

Source: City of Vacaville

Table B-4
Fire Station Cost

NEW FIRE STATION - ORANGE DRIVE EXTENSION

DIF BUDGET ESTIMATE
January 18, 2006

#	CONTRACT ITEMS	UNIT	QUANTITY	PRICE	AMOUNT
1	NEW BUILDING & GENERAL SITE IMPROVEMENTS	SF	9000	400.00	$3,600,000
2	ADDITIONAL GARAGE	SF	2250	150.00	$337,500
3	SEWER LINE EXTENSION	LF	335	100.00	$33,500
4	SEWER MANHOLE	EA	1	3,000.00	$3,000
5	IMPORT FILL	CY	4000	25.00	$100,000
6	8' HIGH MASONRY WALL	SF	3120	25.00	$78,000
7	RELOCATE STREET LIGHT	EA	1	8,000.00	$8,000
8	RELOCATE FIRE HYDRANT	EA	1	10,000.00	$10,000
	SUBTOTAL				$4,170,000
	SCOPE CONTINGENCY (5%)				$208,500
	SUBTOTAL				$4,378,500
	CONST. CONTINGENCY (10%)				$438,000
	TOTAL CONST COST				**$4,816,500**
	PRELIM ENG/CITY ADMIN. TIME @ 5%				$219,000
	ENVIR. CLEARANCE @ 1.0%				$44,000
	SURVEYING @ 1.0%				$44,000
	DESIGN @ 10%				$438,000
	INSPECTION/CONST. ADMIN. @ 10%				$438,000
	MAT.TEST/STAKING @ 3%				$131,000
	FF&E @ 5%				$219,000
	SYSTEM COSTS @				$180,000
	JOINT TRENCH EXTENSION 650' @ $300/LF				$195,000
	TOTAL SOFT COSTS				**$1,908,000**
	TOTAL PROJECT COST				**$6,724,500**
	PROPERTY AREA = 1.5 ACRE = 65,340 SF				
	PROPERTY ACQUISITION COSTS @ $ 4.76 /SF				$311,000
	TOTAL BUDGET				**$7,035,500**

COMMENTS:

1 See attached backup and articles for justification of per SF costs and overall project costs for new fire stations in the surrounding area. Construction costs have drastically increased in the past few years.

2 Costs are based on current dollars. Allow an increase of 4-5% per year due to inflation.

3 Cost per square foot for New Building and General Site Improvements is based on the "General Specifications and Program Requirements" provided by the Fire Department.

Source: City of Vacaville

Table B-5
Fire Station Vehicle Cost

CATEGORY: ROLLING STOCK

ITEM: AMBULANCE

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
Five-year lease purchase agreement, with tax and interest

PROJECT COST: **$201,465**

ITEM		Cost
Ambulance		$152,204
Monitor/Defibrillator		$16,106
Communication Equipment		$19,783
City Mobile Radio (1)	$3,543	
County Mobile Radio (1)	$3,651	
County Bendix King Pacset w/charger (1)	$886	
Mobile Data Terminal (1)	$10,737	
City Pac Set (1)	$859	
Cell Phone (1)	$107	
Other Equipment		$4,000
Stair Chair		$2,277
Gurney		$4,095
Supplies		$3,000
TOTAL		**$201,465**

Source: Vacaville Fire Department

Table B-6
Fire Station Vehicle Cost

CATEGORY: ROLLING STOCK

ITEM: BRUSH UNIT

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
Ford F550 crewcab 4x4 with tank and pump

PROJECT COST: **$178,118**

ITEM	COST
Brush Unit, Vehicle Cost	$150,290
Pump & Tank included	
Hose	
1200' of 1-1/2" wildland hose	$2,023
600' of 1" forestry line	$902
200' of 1" booster line	$397
Other Equipment	$4,616
Communication Equipment	
City Mobile Radio (1)	$3,543
County Mobile Radio (1)	$3,651
County Bendix King w/charger (1)	$993
City Pac Set (1)	$859
Cell Phone (1)	$107
Mobile Data Terminal (1)	$10,737
TOTAL	**$178,118**

Source: Vacaville Fire Department

Table B-7
Fire Station Vehicle Cost

CATEGORY: ROLLING STOCK

ITEM: FIRE ENGINE, Type I

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

PROJECT COST: **$549,172**

ITEM	COST
Lease or Purchase Price	$405,877
Monitor/Defibrillator (if ALS)	$16,106
Breathing Apparatus (5,000 x 4 seats)	$21,475
Communication Equipment	
City Mobile Radio (1)	$3,543
County Mobile Radio (1)	$3,651
County Bendix King w/charger (1)	$886
City Pac Set (1)	$859
Cell Phone (1)	$107
MDT (1)	$10,737
Hose	
600' of 5" supply	$3,537
600' of 2-1/2" attack hose	$1,971
750' of 1-3/4" attack hose	$3,382
700' of 1-1/2" wildland hose	$1,180
200' of 1" forestry hose	$301
200' of 1" booster line	$397
Other Tools & Equipment	$69,794
EMS Supplies & Equipment	$5,369
TOTAL	**$549,172**

Source: Vacaville Fire Department

Table B-8
Fire Personnel Cost

CATEGORY: DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL COSTS

ITEM: FIREFIGHTER'S PERSONAL PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
This project includes all individual equipment required by a firefighter.

COST PER FIREFIGHTER **$9,154**

ITEM	Cost
Turnout Coat (2)	$2,045
Suspenders	$55
Turnout Pants (2)	$1,445
Structure Helmet	$266
Structure Gloves	$47
Structure Boots	$283
Nomex Hood	$34
Goggles	$56
Wildland Jacket	$176
Wildland Pants	$142
Wildland Helmet	$58
Wildland Gloves	$21
Wildland Goggles	$35
Wildland Harness and Belt	$24
Shelter w/Case	$354
Canteen	$8
Leather Work Gloves	$10
Whiffs Wildland Filter	$57
Leather Duty Boots	$165
Wildland Boots	$177
Safety glasses	$9
Gear Bag	$42
Rope Bag w/60' Line	$60
Carabiner	$15
Hose Strap	$4
Shoulder Patches	$18
Badge	$101
Cap Badge	$37
Helmet Shield	$43
SCBA Mask	$1,181
Miscellaneous Shipping	$200
Hiring Cost	$1,986
TOTAL	**$9,154**

Source: Vacaville Fire Department

Table B-9
Drainage Land Costs Summary

Project No.	Project Description	Drainage Fee Zone	1992 Detention Volume Ac-Ft	1992 Land Requirement (Acres)	1992 Land Value per Acre	1992 Land Value Cost	2007 Detention Volume Ac-Ft	2007 Land Requirement (Acres)	2007 Land Value per Acre Residential	2007 Land Value Cost	Actual 2007 Land Requirement (Acres)	2007 Land Value per Acre of OS	2007 Construction Cost per Acre-Foot	Estimated or Actual Land Cost /1	Estimated Construction Cost	Year Acquired or Constructed (Est.)
								ZONE 1								
36	4 Ac-Ft North Horse Basin #2	1	4	0.57	$60,000	$34,286	5.60	1.87	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$70,000	N/A	$392,000	2007
53	4 Ac-Ft Middle Horse Basin	1	4	0.57	$60,000	$34,286	5.60	1.87	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$70,000	N/A	$392,000	2010
73	6 Ac-Ft Putah South Canal Basin Land Acquisition	1	6	0.86	$60,000	$51,429	8.40	2.80	N/A	N/A	2.80	$32,500	N/A	$91,000	N/A	2010
73	6 Ac-Ft Putah South Canal Basin Construction	1	6	0.86	N/A	N/A	8.40	2.80	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$70,000	N/A	$588,000	2010
23,42,& 61	14 Ac-Ft North Horse Basin #1	1	14	2.00	$60,000	$120,000	19.60	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	NA	N/A
New	Gibson Canyon Creek Detention Basin Land Acquisition	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	40	N/A	N/A	40	$35,000	N/A	$1,400,000	N/A	2008
New	Cheyenne Detention Basin Expansion	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$50,000	N/A	$250,000	2009
New	Brown Street Detention Basin Land Acquisition	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	N/A	N/A	4	$32,500	N/A	$130,000	N/A	2007
New	Brown Street Detention Basin Construction	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	14	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$50,000	N/A	$700,000	2008
	SUBTOTAL					$240,000								$1,621,000	$2,322,000	
								ZONE 2								
5	Ulatis Creek Basin #1Land Acquisition (1)	2	5	0.7	$60,000	$42,857	7.00	2.33	N/A	N/A	50	$40,000	N/A	$2,000,000	N/A	2007
5	Ulatis Creek Basin #1 Construction	2	5	0.7	N/A	N/A	7.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$70,000	N/A	$490,000	2010
31	35 Ac-Ft Alamo Creek Detention Basin #1 Land Acquisition (1)	2	35	4.8	$80,000	$385,000	49.00	16.33	$31,000	$506,333	60.39	$30,634	N/A	$1,850,000	N/A	2006
31	35 Ac-Ft Alamo Creek Detention Basin #1 Construction	2	35	4.8	N/A	N/A	49.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$50,000	N/A	$2,450,000	2007
48	7 Ac-Ft Alamo Cr. Basin # 3	2	7	1.0	$99,000	$95,000	9.80	3.27	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$70,000	N/A	$686,000	2008
New	Upper Alamo Creek Detention Basin Land Acquisition	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	67	N/A	N/A	70	$50,000	N/A	$3,500,000	N/A	2007
New	Upper Laguna Creek Detention Basin Land Acquisition	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	80	N/A	N/A	60	$35,000	N/A	$2,100,000	N/A	2010
	SUBTOTAL					$522,858								$9,450,000	$3,626,000	

Land Values per Acre					
OS at Pine and Horse Creeks	$32,500 per Acre	OS at Ulatis Creek	$40,000 per Acre	Residential	$250,000 per Acre
OS at Encinosa Creek	$30,634 per Acre	OS at Laguna Creek	$35,000 per Acre	Commercial/ Industrial	$300,000 per Acre
OS at Alamo Creek	$50,000 per Acre	OS at Gibson Canyon Creek	$35,000 per Acre		

(1) Residential land with the City Limits was not available, thus the need to acquire parcels outside the City Limits that are 40 acre minimums.

Source: Vacaville Public Works Department

APPENDIX C

DIF Comparison

Table C-1
Development Impact Fee Comparison
Fees per Single Family Unit

	Vacaville	Elk Grove	Fairfield	Livermore	Napa	Pleasanton	Roseville	Vallejo
Park and Recreation	$8,120	$4,039 /1,2	$10,239 /2	$13,315	$8,151 /1	$9,707	$3,239 /1,2	$9,983 /2,3
Police	$858	$855	*incl. CFF*	$0	$0	*incl. CFF*	*incl. CFF*	$0
Fire	$887	$1,676	$0	$0	$275	*incl. CFF*	$1,500	$134
Drainage	$1,645 /1,4	$3,949 /1	$56 /1	$1,872	$0	$1,412	$372 /1	$4,770
Capital Facilities Fee (CFF)	$634	$3,110	$3,345	$0	$0	$3,947	$1,860	$0
Total	**$12,144**	**$13,629**	**$13,640**	**$15,187**	**$8,426**	**$15,066**	**$6,970**	**$14,887**
Difference from Vacaville Fees	**N/A**	**$1,485**	**$1,496**	**$3,043**	**($3,718)**	**$2,922**	**($5,174)**	**$2,743**

/1 If a city lists fees by the area in which a unit is located, then the average fee for all areas is shown for purposes of comparison.
/2 Park and Recreation fee does not include park land acquisition costs/Quimby fees.
/3 The proposed park impact fee for the Greater Vallejo Recreation District.
/4 Includes the drainage conveyance fee.

Sources: Cities of Vacaville, Elk Grove, Fairfield, Livermore, Napa, Pleasanton, Roseville, and Vallejo; Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

Table C-2
Development Impact Fee Comparison
Fees per Commercial Square Foot

	Vacaville	Elk Grove	Fairfield	Livermore	Napa	Pleasanton	Roseville	Vallejo
Park and Recreation	$0	$0.43 /1,2	$0	$1.69	$0	$0	$0	$0
Police	$0.55	$0.13	*incl. CFF*	$0	$0	*incl. CFF*	*incl. CFF*	$0
Fire	$0.57	$1.33	$0	$0	$0.92	*incl. CFF*	$0.75	$0.15
Drainage	$1.07 /1,3	$2.22 /1	$0.02 /1	$0.94	$0	$0.71	$0.62 /1	$3.50
Capital Facilities Fee (CFF)	$0.36	$1.68	$2.44	$0	$0	$0.51	$0.45	$0
Total	**$2.55**	**$5.80**	**$2.46**	**$2.62**	**$0.92**	**$1.22**	**$1.82**	**$3.65**
Difference from Vacaville Fees	**N/A**	**$3.25**	**($0.08)**	**$0.08**	**($1.63)**	**($1.33)**	**($0.72)**	**$1.10**

/1 If a city lists fees by the area in which a unit is located, then the average fee for all areas is shown for purposes of comparison.
/2 Park and Recreation fee does not include park land acquisition costs/Quimby fees.
/3 Includes the drainage conveyance fee.

Sources: Cities of Vacaville, Elk Grove, Fairfield, Livermore, Napa, Pleasanton, Roseville, and Vallejo; Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

Angus McDonald & Associates

1950 Addison Street, Suite 107 Berkeley, California 94704-1102
Telephone (510) 548-5831 FAX (510) 548-7599

Our Telecopier No.: (510) 548-7599

Date: 2-26-93 Time: 4:05 AM ✓ PM

TO: City of Vacaville
ATTENTION: David Van Kirk
TELECOPIER NUMBER: (707) 449-5149
cc: Dale Pfeiffer (707) 449-5377

FROM: Geoff Reiman
OUR PROJECT: 1751.11 Vacaville Interfund
(No.) (Name)

SUBJECT: Interfund Borrowing Results

NOTES:

We are transmitting a total of 4 pages (including this transmittal memorandum). If there is a problem with the transmission or you do not receive all of the pages, please call us at (415) 548-5831.

The original ▒ will ☒ will not be sent by regular mail.

Thank you.

Angus McDonald & Associates

1950 Addison Street, Suite 107 Berkeley, California 94704 1102
Telephone (510) 548-5831 FAX (510) 548-7599

MEMORANDUM **Via FAX**

DATE: February 26, 1993

TO: David Van Kirk, City of Vacaville
Dale Pfeiffer, City of Vacaville

FROM: Geoffrey M. Richman and Angus N. McDonald

SUBJECT: Interfund Borrowing
Vacaville Fee Update — Interfund; 1751.11

RESULTS OF INTERFUND BORROWING

After David's direction that the Water COPs are the first priority for interfund borrowing a more extensive analysis of the benefits of interfund borrowing was prepared. The results are as follows:

(1) The requirement to use COPs as a means to finance several large projects in the Water CIP was eliminated. This step was successfully accomplished using interfund borrowing with a significantly positive cash flow among the fee funds still remaining.

(2) After (1) the second round of changes was to eliminate contingent reimbursements selectively. This was done by removing the contingent reimbursements one by one from the lowest to highest dollar amount per EDU. Here, the contingent reimbursement was eliminated from the following fees:

a. Police
b. Parks and Recreation
c. Drainage - Detention Zone 1
d. General City Facilities
e. Drainage - Detention Zone 2
f. Water

This leaves a contingent reimbursement only on the Sewer fee.

(3) The contingent reimbursement on Sewer could be reduced, but the amount would only be about 25% or about $320. Instead of reducing this amount, the borrowing from Redevelopment was targeted. Several functional areas have projects funded from loans from the Redevelopment Agency. They are General Facilities, Fire and Police. All the borrowing could be eliminated from General Facilities and Fire. In Police the borrowing could be eliminated with the sole exception of Phase I (94/95) of the Public Safety Building.

The above three changes can all be brought about using interfund borrowing. With these changes almost all the fees would change. Below is a summary of the changes as they would affect each fee:

1. Traffic - No changes

2. Drainage - Detention Zone 1 - No contingent reimbursement would be levied. Fee decrease of approximately $165.

3. Drainage - Detention Zone 2 - No contingent reimbursement would be levied. Fee decrease of approximately $725.

4. Drainage - Conveyance - No changes

5. Parks and Recreation - No contingent reimbursement would be levied. Fee decrease of approximately $155.

6. Police - No contingent reimbursement. The fee would decrease more than this reduction as there would be savings realized as the finance costs would decrease. The total decrease to the fee would be approximately $69.

7. Fire - The fee would decrease as there would be savings realized as the finance costs would decrease. The total decrease to the fee would be approximately $12.

8. General City Facilities - No contingent reimbursement. The fee would decrease more than this reduction as there would be savings realized as the finance costs would decrease. The total decrease to the fee would be approximately $203.

9. Water - This fee needs to be recalculated to make the time periods and the inflation assumption consistent with the first eight fees. No contingent reimbursement, the fee would decrease more than this reduction as there would be a large savings realized as the finance costs would decrease. The total decrease to the fee would be approximately $1,054.

10. Sewer - This fee needs to be recalculated to make the time periods and the inflation assumption consistent with the first eight fees. There would be a small decrease in the fee of approximately $8.

Across all the fees the estimated savings is $2,391 which is brought about through a combination of elimination of contingent reimbursements and a reduction in the base fee from a reduction in finance costs.

FEE REPORT LANGUAGE

A review of the development impact fee reports prepared to date indicates that no allowance has been made for interfund borrowing as a use of the fee. The following is suggested language for addition to each fee report.

Suggested language for "Purpose Of The Fee" section of the report:

> In addition to financing {Water, Sewer, Traffic, etc.} improvements, funds which are unencumbered in any given year may be loaned to any other fee fund in order to construct facilities listed in their Capital Improvement Plan. This approach is used whenever possible to relieve the burden of financing cash flow deficiencies through the use of a contingent reimbursement and/or debt financing. There is still a cost of borrowing from another fee fund as interest is paid, but the impact fee will be lower as this cost is much lower than the cost of debt financing or the use of a contingent reimbursement.

[A]D:\P\175\DVK0226.MEM

Agenda Item No. 6g
March 9, 1993

MEMO TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council

FROM: John P. Thompson, City Manager

SUBJECT: RESOLUTION APPROVING COLLECTION AGREEMENT - COUNTY OF SOLANO DEVELOPMENT FEE

DISCUSSION:
The City of Vacaville (along with all the other cities in the County), and the County, have been working for more than two years to analyze the cost implications to the County of growth in the incorporated areas. The result of this study has been the imposition, by the County, of a fee on new development to cover its cost to expand County facilities to deal with growth. The fee amount in Vacaville would be $1,100 on a single-family home and a square footage fee on industrial and commercial projects.

The Solano County Mayors and City Managers have been meeting during this time to consider having the cities be the collection agents for this fee on behalf of the County. This greatly simplifies the administration for the County and makes payment of the fee more convenient for the building permit applicant. An agreement has been drafted between the County and each of the cities describing each party's role in the collection process. Some important features in the agreement are:

1. Cities are indemnified by the County for any liability related to our collecting the County fee.

2. Cities make quarterly payments of the fees collected and receive the interest earnings during the quarter as compensation for our administrative costs.

3. County agrees to prepare detailed capital improvement plans documenting how the monies collected will be spent on new facilities.

4. County agrees to maintain the long-standing policy that urban growth should occur in the cities and not in the unincorporated areas.

5. Cities may cancel the agreement to collect this fee at any time upon giving the County one year's written notice to make other administrative arrangements.

It is important to note that the Council is not being asked to approve the County fee. The County has already taken that action and the fee is in place. The action being requested is simply to approve an agreement to have the City collect this fee under the terms described above. There are some additional procedural steps which the County must complete to enable the cities to collect the fee at building permit stage. Assuming these are completed this month, the collection agreement would become effective April 1, 1993.

RECOMMENDATION:
By simple motion, to adopt a resolution authorizing the subject agreement.

JPT:ka/cogfee.sum
Attachment

RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF VACAVILLE APPROVING AN AGREEMENT FOR AUTHORIZATION AND COLLECTION OF THE SOLANO COUNTY PUBLIC FACILITIES FEE

WHEREAS, the County of Solano provides to the citizens of Vacaville, public services including, but not limited to, health services and the administration of welfare benefits for indigent persons, mental health services, jail facilities for all persons arrested and incarcerated within Solano County, Courtrooms and other Court related facilities for the provision of civil, criminal and juvenile justice, and for other county-wide public services such as property tax collection and administration, property assessment and the general administration of County government; and

WHEREAS, adequate public facilities are required for the provision of said county public services, but existing financing mechanisms available to Solano County are inadequate to supply those public facilities necessary to serve new growth arising from development in Vacaville and throughout Solano County. Further, Solano County has commissioned a study entitled "Solano County: The Cost of Growth", demonstrating the impacts of new growth upon the public facility needs of Solano County; and

WHEREAS, both the County of Solano and the City of Vacaville have the authority to establish a fee to pay for the cost of public facilities to serve the citizens of the City of Vacaville, and the City of Vacaville may authorize and collect a County fee within the City of Vacaville, and

WHEREAS, Solano County has adopted a Public Facilities Fee Ordinance, applicable on a county-wide basis, which ordinance additionally provides that said fee will automatically terminate, and any fee based thereon will no longer be imposed nor collected, should any of the following events occur:

a. That a Solano County Public Facilities fee is not adopted, imposed and levied by the Solano County Board of Supervisors in accordance with the provisions Government Code Section 66,000 et. seq.

law and the provisions of this resolution, and execution of the agreement in Exhibit "A", which agreement is hereby approved, between the City of Vacaville and Solano County under which said County agrees to indemnify and hold harmless Vacaville from liability for performance of the collection function hereby approved, the City of Vacaville will authorize and collect, on behalf of the County of Solano, the public facilities fee prior to issuing a building permit for construction within said City of Vacaville. Fees so collected will be paid to the County on a quarterly basis.

2. The City Manager is authorized to execute on behalf of the City of Vacaville the agreement attached hereto as Exhibit "A".

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing resolution was introduced and passed at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Vacaville, held on the 9th day of March, 1993, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ATTEST:

_____

Kathleen M. Andronico, City Clerk

word55/CoFeeRes/ver3