Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report

For The City of Hercules, California June 10, 2025





May 23, 2025

Mr. Dante Hall, City Manager, City of Hercules – City Hall 111 Civic Drive Hercules, CA 94547

RE: City of Hercules 2025-26 Development Impact Fee Calculation, and Nexus Report

City Manager Hall:

In 2024, Revenue and Cost Specialists, L.L.C., was contracted to undertake a comprehensive identification of the capital projects and capital acquisitions necessary to preserve the existing Levels of Service (LOS) that were then currently offered to and enjoyed by (after having been paid for by) the existing community. The construction of these additional projects is necessary to eliminate the eventual diminution of the existing *Levels of Service* due to the addition of new residential and business development in the City of Hercules. This Report also calculates the Development Impact Fees (DIFs) necessary to fund those projects.

City Council and staff, responsible for providing services to a continually expanding residential and business community, must recognize that the magnitude of the DIFs is a direct function of the nearly \$29.0 million cost of capital projects identified as development. Approximately \$28.37 million of the \$29.0 million will be financed by impact fees from future development.

The following DIF Report calculates DIFs for the City of Hercules, based on the aforementioned changes and their effect upon requirements for public safety, storm drainage collection, and the quality-of-life facilities (public use facilities, parks, etc.). The adoption of the updated DIFs will enable this City Council and succeeding Councils to continue to ensure that the City can meet the **basic** infrastructure needs of new growth without unduly burdening the existing population and business community for these development-generated capital costs. Adopting the maximum DIFs contained herein and imposing them upon the remaining development opportunities in Hercules would generate approximately \$28.37 million in a combination of public improvement dedications and revenues limited for use on the many development-generated capital expansion projects.

A significant element in this Report is the *proportional analysis*, or comparison of what is being asked of future residents and businesses, in the form of dedicated public improvements or in lieu of impact fee payments, with the replacement cost of the City's existing infrastructure (land, improvement, facilities, and equipment), contributed by the existing population and business community. The dedications, taxes, and assessments contributed to date by the existing community

Over numerous decades of development, it has generated just over \$152.83 billion in infrastructure assets or capital improvements for the City. Be advised that the \$152.83 billion is limited to spine infrastructure and does not include local infrastructure (e.g., storm pipes).

Revenue & Cost Specialists 1519 E. Chapman • Suite C • Fullerton, CA • 92831

The following table identifies the existing spine infrastructure capital improvement equity by infrastructure.

Infrastructure	Existing Spine Improvements
Law Enforcement, Vehicles, and Equipment	\$6,437,065
Storm Drainage Collection Facilities	\$81,180,845
General Government, Vehicles, and Equipment	\$10,070,963
Public Use Facilities	\$12,446,405
Park Land Acquisition and Improvements et al.	\$42,691,539
Total	\$152,826,817

The recommended DIF schedules will not address all of the City's capital needs, as identified in this Report's various schedules. As per Government Code §66000 et. seq. and fairness, DIFs cannot address existing capital deficiencies. The proposed DIFs will recognize and accommodate the needs generated by the City's growing population and business community. However, with the continued adoption of DIFs, other City discretionary revenue resources that may have been used to meet growth-generated needs for expanded services and facilities will remain available for those accumulating replacement and rehabilitation projects.

The DIFs contained herein calculate only the costs of infrastructure required to support services provided only by the City of Hercules. They do not include development impact fees imposed by the school district, any County agencies, or any other local government agency or district. The information required to develop the City's capital costs and equity data was generated by the Hercules staff; without their help and cooperation, this report would have been impossible to complete. In addition to your assistance in direction and in communicating to the staff the highest priority of this project, the following management and technical personnel were instrumental in working, in some cases on a near daily basis, with RCS to generate the information and data so critically necessary for the legal support of the DIFs.

Edwin Gato – Finance Director Mike Roberts – Public Works Director Timothy Rood – Community Development Director Joseph Vasquez – Chief of Police Christopher Roke - Recreation Director Seana Fields -Senior Planner

Without their hard work and willingness to provide the best data available, this Report could not have been completed to the degree of accuracy that it has. We would like to express our appreciation to the Planning staff for their diligent efforts to provide us with the most accurate land-use database possible. We would also like to highlight the assistance of Finance Director Edwin Gato for his timely responses to RCS's many requests for financial information and in coordinating the many meetings with the above-named staff.

His efforts directly improved the quality of information and the resulting calculation.

The *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report* and the *Master Facilities Plan* are submitted for your review and consideration. RCS is prepared to assist in increasing the Council's and community's understanding of this very significant part of the City's revenue structure.

Sincerely,

Gregory Brown Vice President

Dregory R. Ferr

Scott Thorpe Principal



CITY OF HERCULES

DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE

CALCULATION AND NEXUS REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTERS	PAGES
Chapter 1 – Background and Introduction	1
Chapter 2 – Demographics and Findings	9
Proposed Development Impact Fees/Summary Schedules	17
Chapter 3 – Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment	18
Chapter 4 - Storm Drainage Collections System Facilities	26
Chapter 5 - General Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment	34
Chapter 6 - Public Use Facilities	40
Chapter 7 - Parkland Acquisition, Facilities Improvements, and Open Space Land Acquisition	45
Appendix A - Summary of Recommendations	52
Appendix B - Detailed Land Use Database	54
Appendix C - Application of Accessory Dwelling Unit as a Function of Detached Dwelling	56
Appendix D - AB-602 Justification	58
Appendix E – Park Construction Cost Average	62
Appendix F – Comparison of Existing and New Development Impact Fees	64

Chapter 1 Background and Introduction

In 2024, the City of Hercules retained Revenue and Cost Specialists, LLC to comprehensively calculate the future development impact costs for the City. This report will address each of the City's five separate infrastructure systems. The development impact cost calculations are intended to identify the cost of additional infrastructure necessary to accommodate long-term continued development within the City's existing limits, not to decrease the levels of service currently enjoyed by the City's existing residents and businesses. If adopted, the development impact cost calculations can be formalized as a set of Development Impact Fees (henceforth referred to as DIFs) schedules by the City Council.

Given the impact of inflation, the requirements of Assembly Bill 602,¹ and other changing development factors, a periodic review and adjustment of the City's DIFs is not just appropriate but crucial. This process is necessary to ensure that the City collects sufficient monies to construct the additional infrastructure needed to accommodate the anticipated growth of new residents and businesses expected to be developed in the City. This has been completed with the submission of this Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report. The existing DIF schedules have served the City well for many years for those limited infrastructures. However, due to numerous changes in the DIF Factors, the most significant being the effect of inflation on project costs, a complete update of all development assumptions, estimated demands, and capital project costs is prudent. For this and other reasons, the City has entered into an exhaustive effort to recalculate the amount of the existing and new DIFs.

It should be noted that although the Sewer and Transportation Facilities DIFs are not included in this report, the City intends to update these two infrastructures in the near future.

<u>The Importance of Capital Infrastructure.</u> The Levels of Service (LOS) of any of the City's infrastructures are determined by and limited by the capacity of that infrastructure to cater to the users, residents, or businesses. The design of any municipal project, a decision that rests with the City Council, has a finite capacity, such as a four-lane road, a 30" storm drainage pipe, or a 10,000-square-foot library. Each can only meet the needs of a specific number of users. For instance, a four-lane street segment can only accommodate a certain number of vehicles per hour, especially at a speed that makes it viable for long-distance travel. A storm drainage pipe that is 30" cannot handle storm flows twice its capacity. A library can house a specific number of collection items and serve only a certain number of people. A municipality with 0.40 square feet per resident of library space will be able to serve more residents than a municipality with only 0.10 square feet standard per resident of library space. The following is a more detailed example using law enforcement as an illustration.

Considering the labor-intensive service of law enforcement, regardless of the quality and capabilities of the City's sworn police officers, the Department remains highly dependent upon its infrastructure capacity. A police station of 11,250 square feet will have the capacity to support roughly thirty sworn police officers at about 375 square feet per officer. If the station size remains the same at 11,250 square feet but the sworn complement doubles to sixty police officers, the station will become exceedingly dysfunctional at 187.5 square feet per officer. The same holds true for police response vehicles and law enforcement specialty equipment. If a City adds thirty

^{1.} Assembly Bill 602 requires all development impact fees to be updated every eight years.

additional officers but cannot add station space, vehicles, and specialty equipment, the City has dealt with only half of the service equation. They have achieved little. proportionality between the expansion of Dolan's store and the City of Tigard requiring Dolan to dedicate 10% of her land to a public greenway. Furthermore, the Supreme Court questioned the City's requirement for Dolan to construct a bike pathway to counteract increased traffic due to her store's expansion.

These cases combined resulted in the Nollan/Dolan Standards. The first part of the Standard is the "essential nexus." When applied to Impact Fees, this means that each fee must have a nexus directly related to that development's impact on a city's infrastructure. For example, it would make sense to have development contribute to increasing the capacity of the water conveyance system in the city since all new developments will increase the water demand. However, it would not make much sense to have development across the entire city contribute to a reverse osmosis plant that would only benefit a few industrial land uses.

The second part of the Standard is "rough proportionality." As it relates to Impact Fees, this means that the fee charged to new development must be proportional to the impact that the new development will make on the city's infrastructure. For example, the construction of one detached home would not result in that one home funding an entirely new water treatment plant. Instead, that one detached home would contribute to the funding of the water treatment plant based on a gallons per day nexus. This way, the detached home simply contributes to its impact on the city's water system and does not unfairly finance an entire water treatment plant.

Above all else, the intention of Impact Fees is to be fair while simultaneously ensuring the level of service in a city does not drop due to new development. The Nollan/Dolan Standards ensure that Impact Fees are fair to the city, the residents and businesses within the city, and the developer.

PROPORTIONAL ANALYSIS REGARDING NEW AND EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE

A helpful component of this Report is the proportional analysis of the infrastructure needs required to accommodate the City's continued development compared to the existing infrastructure generated through years of taxes and other contributions currently serving the existing community. This proportional analysis is intended to recognize and reconcile the difference between the City's desired level of service required for new development, per statements in the various General Plan elements, with that of the *de facto* or actual level of service provided to the existing community. Including the proportional analysis will assist the City Council in adopting a DIF structure that recognizes inter-generational equity and assists the Council in making difficult policy decisions regarding the required capital additions needed to accommodate new development by increasing the layperson's understanding of *fairness*.

Proportional analysis is essential, for community inter-generational equity, i.e., fairness in the infrastructure investment that existing residents and businesses have made compared to those of new residents and businesses that wish to use the existing infrastructure. For example, new development may be required to expand the number of arterial and collector lane miles in the City, but new development also benefits from the immediate use of Sycamore Avenue constructed so many years ago, just as an existing citizen can use a newly constructed arterial street segment. In short, previous generations of businesses and residents have contributed to the development of the City's infrastructure, and future residents and businesses should recognize this fact by contributing a similar capacity toward completing the various infrastructure systems.

Identifying the many public improvement projects needed through build-out is one thing. It is

entirely different to assume that all of the identified improvements are required to meet the demands of the new development. Clearly, some projects will *replace* the existing infrastructure, while others will be *capacity-increasing* projects. A more detailed explanation of each example is as follows;

- 1. Projects dealing with existing deficiencies, i.e., projects required, regardless of whether there is additional development or not. An example would be a traffic intersection currently controlled by stop signs that would meet demand warrants based upon continued development.
- 2. Projects are required to accommodate future development. An example of this would be a signal that is currently controlled quite adequately by stop signs but will ultimately need to be signalized because of development in the near and *downstream* areas.

This Report provides the documentation of the City's costs, which serve as the basis for calculating DIFs. The updated DIF Schedules and related information can be found in Chapters 3 through 8 and Appendices A, C, and E of this Report.

RCS staff has worked with Finance, Planning, Engineering, Law Enforcement and Quality of Life infrastructure management staff to generate and review the supporting data that form the Development Impact Fee schedules calculation. The results of this review can be found in the schedules at the end of each chapter.

<u>Development Impact Fee Structure</u>. The General Plan provides a range of potential densities for residential development; as such, the DIFs for residential uses need to be calculated on a perdwelling unit basis to reflect more accurately the impacts of a specific development.² For example, a property zoned as a detached dwelling residential development may contain from three to six units per acre. If fees are calculated on an acreage basis, the developer proposing three units per acre would pay the same amount as a developer constructing six units per acre. Similarly, fees are calculated on a square footage basis for business parcels (retail/service, office and industrial, etc.) to reflect the impacts of different building intensities for these types of development. Some of the infrastructures have optional fee structures recommended for unusual developments, such as a parking structure, which in itself does not create demand beyond additional storm drainage run-off, whereas the structure requiring additional parking does.

A second reason for the proposed DIF fee structure recommended in this Report involves the issue of building expansion or intensification in retail, office, and industrial areas. For example, if a commercial or industrial property owner proposes an expansion to their building, the question exists about how to charge for this proposed expansion's impact on the City's streets, storm drainage system, and other infrastructures. A fee calculated on a building square footage (and an average **F**loor **A**rea **R**atio) basis simplifies this calculation.

CALCULATION OF DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

In California, State legislation sets certain legal and procedural parameters for charging these fees. The California Legislature passed AB1600, which is now codified as California Government Code Sections 66000 through 66009. This State law went into effect on January 1, 1989. Government Code §66000 requires documentation of projects to be financed by Development

^{2.} Appendix E, AB-602 Justification, will address this topic in much more detail.

Impact Fees prior to their levy and collection and that the monies collected be committed within five years to a project of direct benefit to the development which paid the fees. Many states have such controlling statutes. Specifically, Government Code §66000 requires the following process:

- 1. Delineation of the purpose of the fee.
- 2. Determination of the use of the fee.
- 3. Determination of the relationship between the use of the fee and the type of development paying the fee.
- 4. Determination of the relationship between the need for the facility and the type of development project. NOTE: Numbers 2 & 4 will be reversed throughout the chapters in this Report because it is apparent that *need* should be identified before *use*.
- 5. Determination of the relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the portion of the facility attributed to the specific development project.

This Report, with some additions, utilizes the basic methodology consistent with the above requirements of Government Code §66000. Briefly, the following steps were undertaken in the calculation of DIFs for the City:

- <u>Define the level of service</u> desired within the General Plan area for each project or acquisition identified as necessary. In some areas, certain statistical measures are commonly used to measure or define an acceptable level of service for a category of infrastructure. Street intersections, for instance, are commonly rated based on a Level of Service scale of "A" to "F" developed by transportation engineers. Most agencies adopt a LOS of "C."
- 2. <u>Review the land use map</u> and determine the existing mix of land uses and the amount of undeveloped and developed land. This land use data can thus be considered when planning needed infrastructure, determining the magnitude of growth and its impacts. This inventory can be found in Table 2-1 in Chapter 2 and Appendix B.
- 3. <u>Identify all additions to the capital facilities</u> or equipment inventory necessary to maintain the identified levels of services in the City and determine the cost of those additions. An infrastructure *Master Plan* is the highest form of data.
- 4. <u>Identify a level of responsibility</u>, identifying, as termed in this Report, the relative need (or as referred to in the accompanying schedules as "PERCENT NEED") for the facility or equipment necessary to accommodate "growth" as defined and as opposed to current needs.
- 5. <u>Distribute the costs identified</u> as a result of development growth based on land use. Costs are distributed between each land use based on their relative use, or *nexus*, of the capital system. For example, future street costs were distributed to each land use based on their trip generation characteristics.

OTHER ASSUMPTIONS OF THE REPORT

In addition to the land use assumptions contained in the next Chapter of this Report, other important assumptions of this study include the following:

"Normal" Subdivision Improvements Omitted. "Local" public improvements generally associated with and identified as being the sole responsibility of the developer through the subdivision or development review process are not included in either the project lists or consequent calculations. This type of "on-site" and immediately adjacent improvement would include all such capital construction within the boundaries of any development, such as streetlights, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, neighborhood streets, and all local utility pipes. These improvements would continue to be the direct responsibility of the developer, with or without the addition of DIFs.

<u>Land Acquisition Costs.</u> Land acquisition cost estimates have been developed after discussions with City officials over recent acquisitions, current negotiations, or information about parcels similar to what the City needs. Arguments for higher or lower costs can be made; however, the per-acre amounts contained herein appear to be the most appropriate current figure for the purposes of this study.

<u>Exclusion/Rejection of Any Type of "Credit" for Undeveloped Land</u>. Some have argued that credit for capital-related revenues, such as gas taxes, should be made against the DIFs calculated or imposed by a city. Using the state gas tax as an example, proponents of a DIF credit argue that a city will receive increased annual gas taxes because of the additional population generated by future residential development. It is therefore argued that a developer should receive a credit for any associated gas tax revenues collected as a result of the residents or businesses that occupy the new dwellings against any Circulation DIF imposed by the City based on either of two separate arguments.

The first argument for a gas tax credit supposes that the additional gas taxes created by residential development are needed and dedicated to maintaining existing streets, which is the responsibility of existing development. Since the new streets constructed via DIFs will not require rehabilitation or reconstruction for another 10 to 20 years, the gas tax generated by new development is a windfall to the City and should be credited against the DIF. This argument fails to consider that any new resident or business in the City will begin to contribute immediately to the use and deterioration of all City streets. A cursory review of City finances will reveal that the amount of the State gas tax received by cities falls far short of meeting the City's needed street improvements and repairs in any given year. The gas taxes *generated* by new development or the existing streets used daily.

The second argument proposes that the developer pays his full share of constructing new roads when the developer pays the City's Circulation (streets, signals, bridges, and roadbed protection storm drainage) System Development Impact Fee and that the gas taxes generated by the additional residents in a development are unfairly used to make improvements to the existing street system. It is the experience of most cities that gas taxes are barely adequate to meet street-related operational costs, and if they are sufficient to meet these costs, the remainder is used for capital-related maintenance projects.

For these reasons, this Report does not consider credits of existing operational tax receipts for Circulation System DIFs. A similar discussion can be made for the other fees considered herein, and therefore, no credits against any such fees are included in this calculation of development

impact costs. Those annual operational tax receipts need to be dedicated to maintaining the existing system.

<u>Appropriate Expansion.</u> Debt service is a reasonable construction cost for many, but not all, public facilities and infrastructure. The following example illustrates this. DIFs are collected in incremental amounts, but facilities are not expanded in those same incremental amounts. As an example, a community center fee, based upon a standard of 1.2 square feet per detached dwelling residence, may be collected for each residential dwelling in the City, but after collecting the fee for a 100-unit subdivision, it would be impractical to expand the community center by 120 square feet. Fees are collected and placed in a separate fund, generating interest until such a time that a 2,000 to 3,000-square-foot expansion is possible. During that build-up time, the community center will experience temporary overcrowding as the standard drops from 1.2 square feet/dwelling to about 0.9 square feet/dwelling. This "temporary overcapacity" may be an inconvenience, bringing about crowding and increased unavailability for rental or reservation until enough DIFs have been collected for a practical expansion to bring the community center facility back up to the original standard. In short, a development of 120 residences may be occupancy approved and bring about a temporary reduction in community center facility standards without endangering the citizen's health and safety.

However, such a *temporary overcapacity* in stormwater roadbed protection is not possible without the potential for damage to both private and public property. Capacity for the collection/removal of storm water must be available prior to the construction, which increases the impervious surface (and thus storm water run-off) of the parcel. If the local storm collection line is currently at capacity (peak or otherwise), no additional units may be brought online until additional collection capacity can be created. Again, there is a practical size of an addition to construct, and it is not likely practical for developers to wait until there is enough added demand (and fees) to pay for the facility addition. As a result, financing through some type of debt instrument may be the only alternative. Circumstances vary from city to city as to what facility expansions are critical and which can absorb temporary overcapacity for limited periods of time.

OTHER ISSUES

There are those who claim that the addition of DIFs unfairly creates an inflated resale price for existing residences. The argument is that if the public agency adopts a \$35,000 to \$50,000 development impact fee per detached dwelling, the price for an existing dwelling is *artificially* increased by the same amount. We will use the example of a detached dwelling unit that cost the developer \$350,000 to construct and complete to the point that the occupancy permit is approved.

<u>Full Cost of a Residential Dwelling</u>. The \$350,000 represents only the above-ground costs. The true and actual cost of a new dwelling is the cost of acquiring the parcel, necessary government approvals and permits, construction supplies, labor, debt service on the above, on-site³ public improvements, and the cost of extending public services to that dwelling.

These public service extension costs include (but are not limited to):⁴

^{3.} On-site improvements include storm gutter or drainage pipes and all of the other requirements of the City's development code on privately-held developments, hence "On-site." These improvements are not of "General Benefit" to the entire community.

^{4.} The City does not necessarily provide all of these services, they are only highlighted to make a point about the types of municipal services typically required to support a residential dwelling or business facility.

CHAPTER ORGANIZATION

Within each "hard infrastructure" Chapter (Chapters Three and Four), there will be a minimum of three fee/cost comparison tables. They will be:

Allocation of Project Cost Estimates - identifies the projects, their costs, and their relationship to future development in an allocation percentage. These schedules will begin with the number x.1 as in 3.1 and 4.1).

Minimum Needs-based Impact Fee - This schedule will calculate the DIF schedule that would need to be adopted to meet the minimum capital needs identified in the Report (on the second schedule at the end of the Chapter, i.e., 3.2, 4.2, etc.) for that infrastructure but limited to the General City needs. Strictly speaking, this schedule calculates the development impact costs, which are suitable to be adopted as development impact fees by the legislative body, in this case, the Hercules City Council.

With the adoption of this level of DIFs, one could claim that new development is occurring without any additional cost to the existing residents and businesses. You could not, however, necessarily claim that new development is paying its fair share.

Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison This schedule, while not an impact fee calculation, identifies the cost (in current nominal replacement dollar value) of the existing infrastructure, including land, physical improvements, and capital equipment. The distribution of this replacement value equity total over the existing developed community is the average amount that has been invested by the current community of residents and businesses and is a good indication, or comparison, with what could be imposed upon new development. This financial commitment will be expressed in terms of the cost of constructing or acquiring the assets at current replacement costs. Significant differences between this schedule and the Minimum Needs-based DIF rate schedule would certainly be worth additional analysis. These Schedules would be numbered 3.3, 4.3, 5.3, etc.

If the average equity (for a detached dwelling, for example) on this *Existing Commitment Financial Commitment Comparison* Table is greater than the average cost on the previous *Minimum Needsbased* Table, then that infrastructure system is front-ended with more of the system, say 80% of it has been constructed while only at 50% of General Plan build-out, and it likely has excess capacity at that point in time. The excess capacity is the result of earlier residents and businesses of the community having put more of the system into place than will be necessary by the remaining un-built portions of the community. The existing community has advanced money to build capacity into the infrastructure system to meet the needs of residents and businesses not yet there. This table is intended to be instructive rather than legal.

<u>Distribution of Existing Impact Fee Fund Balance.</u> The existing City-wide DIFs have a combined Fund Balance of \$389,284, and each was created to finance various infrastructure needed by new residents and businesses located in newly created residential dwellings and buildings. There are no specific restrictions on the monies beyond the restriction that they can be used on improvements within the Fund title and committed within five years.

The Quality of Life Infrastructure Impact Fees (Chapters 6 through 7) are limited to a one-page calculation, and they are also at the end of each chapter.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Chapter 2 Demographics and Findings

This Chapter represents the beginning and end of the DIF calculation process. It begins with an inventory of fully developed, undeveloped, and underdeveloped units and acreage within the City and concludes with a summary of recommended DIF schedules with detailed infrastructure explanations in the following chapters of this Report. Hercules was incorporated in December 1900 and has seen significant development since then.

LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS

This Report contains an inventory of fully developed, undeveloped, and underdeveloped land within the City limits of Hercules and is based on the City's most recent General Plan update. The *Undeveloped* and the *Underdeveloped* delta land inventory, identified as *Potential Development*, combine to form the base for the distribution of the estimated costs of the service-expanding capital projects necessary to accommodate that same anticipated development. Without the expansion projects, the City would be unable to accommodate that new development, effectively halting it. The *developed* land inventory forms the base for distributing the replacement cost of the existing infrastructure. This action provides the basis for comparison with the proposed DIF schedules and for the *de facto* identification of the many existing Levels of Service (LOS) currently provided by the City's existing spine infrastructure, which is conservatively valued at approximately \$152.83 million.

Table 2-1 is the inventory of all private land used within the current City limits in what is referred to as the General City area. It is based on the General Plan's land use inventory and a planning staff analysis of privately held parcels in the General Plan area (which excludes the City's Sphere of Influence).

Table 2-1 consists of multiple horizontal blocks of information from the top to the bottom; they are:

Total – Land Use Database – Total of All Areas - This block of information identifies the amount of developed and undeveloped land in terms of acres and units for the City's entire City limits and is the sum of the two areas identified below.

Land Use Database within the City's General City Area - Net - This block of information identifies the existing development and development opportunities within the General City area of the City in terms of acres and appropriate units. The information in the *Existing Development* column will be used to identify the current investment and compare the proportionality of the proposed DIFs as previously described in Chapter One. The *Potential Development* column will be used as the denominator to distribute the cost of infrastructure improvements needed to accommodate development in the area to those generating the need for those same improvements. The area is the sum of four General City Sub-areas (Appendix B, LUDB - Sections A to D).

A greater level of detail is available in Appendix B – Expanded Land Use Database.

[This page was left vacant to place the following table on a single page].

Total – Land Use Database	Existing	Development	Potentia	al Development	Total General Plan Build-out	
Summary of A, B, and C Below	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units	930.30	5,795	8.18	40	991.48	5,835
Attached Dwelling Units	294.72	3,273	97.02	2,773	391.74	6,046
Commercial Lodging Units	0.00	0	163.72	360	163.72	360
Retail, Office & Service Uses (SF)	155.60	1,485,950	89.99	316,811	245.59	1,802,761
Industrial Uses (SF)	67.40	364,885	3.96	50,000	71.36	414,885
Institutional Use (SF)	119.56	385,085	1.00	3,221	120.56	388,306
Total - All City	1,620.58		363.87		1,984.45	

Table 2-1Detailed Land Use Inventory

<u>DIF Land Use Types Definitions</u>. This Report classifies private development into one of three residential *DIF Land Use Types* or one of four different business-based *DIF Land Use Types*. For purposes of the Report, the term *DIF Land Use Type* will refer to one of the seven broad types under which the City's specifically defined zoning code *land uses* will fall. These *DIF Land Use Types* are defined following:

Residential Land Uses:

- Detached Dwelling Units This DIF Land Use Type is generally defined as a detached unit and corresponds to an allowable use within the City's land use designation of *Residential Single-Family-Estate (RS-E) and Residential Single-Family Low Density (RS-L).* This category would include the construction of the unusual, detached condominium or townhome and a manufactured unit on an individual lot.
- Attached Dwelling Units This larger category consists of apartments, townhomes, condominiums, or any other living unit that is attached to any other unit. It generally corresponds to an allowable land use designation of *Residential Multifamily Low Density (RM-L), Residential Multifamily Medium Density (RM-M), and Residential Multifamily High Density (RM-H).*

Business/Commerce Land Uses:

- Commercial Lodging (keyed) Units This *DIF Land Use Type* is found in the General Commercial (CG).
- Retail/Service/Office Uses As utilized in this Report, Commercial uses include the general type of retail services and thus include outlets ranging from restaurants to auto repair shops to shopping centers. This category includes General Commercial (CG), Community Commercial (CC), Recreational Commercial (CR), Commercial Public (CP), Planned Commercial Industrial (PC-I), Planned Commercial Residential (PC-R), Planned Office/R&D (PO/RD), and Waterfront Commercial (WC).

- Industrial/Manufacturing Uses This *DIF Land Use Type* contains all businesses engaged in heavy to light manufacturing or industrial development. This category includes the Industrial (I), Industrial Residential (I-R), and Planned Commercial Industrial (PC-I).
- Institutional Uses This *DIF Land Use Type* consists of private schools, private meeting places, places of worship, and similar private facilities and could be located within many of the land use categories. The land use designation is **General Commercial (CG)**.

<u>Definitions of DIF Application Categories Status</u>. For each DIF land use category detailed in Table 2-1, acreage is categorized as either *Existing Development* or *Potential Development*. Definitions regarding the status of each land use are as follows:

Existing Development - Acres/Units - This column title reference identifies land in the City which is developed or land which has received a building permit but may not yet be constructed. Acreage in this category may include non-conforming use areas of the City that contain extensive development prior to annexation or before any changes to the General Plan.

Potential Development - Acres/Units - This category refers to all non-public vacant acreage located within the City. It also includes fully vacant parcels and those that can be upsized in the future if they contain some remaining development potential.

POPULATION PROJECTIONS

A realistic assessment of the build-out population of the City is a second component in determining the magnitude of the impact of future development and the necessary facilities needed to mitigate that impact. Many of the facilities in this Report are sized according to either the estimated population at theoretical "build-out" or service levels, which are based in part on an estimation of the population to be served. Library facilities, parks and recreation facilities, and community center facilities and equipment are examples of cost areas that rely heavily on population projections to determine space and facility needs. Park standards are usually stated in terms of the number of acres of parkland per 1,000 persons, for instance.

There are at least two generally accepted methods for projecting future population levels in a City: (A) past growth trends projected forward and (B) population holding capacity based on the General Plan land use element. Each of these methods can be useful even though both possess certain limitations.

There are several serious flaws in projecting the build-out population of a community using the past growth trends methodology. While this method is relatively simple and, therefore, easy for the general public to understand, it does not give consideration to when an area is actually built out. Eventually, there comes a point in time when the amount of available land to build on is negligible. This technique does not help explain when that point is reached.

Also, the past growth trends approach is not sensitive to policy changes made by Council or land use issues contained in the City's General Plan. For these reasons, this technique is more useful in projecting short-term population levels and should not be used to forecast the built-out population of an area.

This Report relies on the methodology of *holding capacity* (described in the following section) to project future service levels and facility requirements.

<u>Holding Capacity Analysis.</u> This report uses the current holding capacity approach to forecast the built-out population of Hercules. This method calculates the sum of existing development and potential development allowable under current land use regulations, using average densities found in the City.

The first step in projecting the City's population using the holding capacity approach is to inventory the remaining undeveloped acres within the City limits, which was previously accomplished in Tables 2-1 and 2-2 of this Chapter. The next step is to estimate the potential dwelling units allowed per acre and then multiply the potential number of units by the average number of residents per unit.

The number of persons per unit for new residential units is based on the 2000 U.S. Census and ranges from 3.501 and 2.265 persons for detached dwellings and attached dwellings, respectively. The 2000 Census data was selected over the recently released 2020 Census due to a change in reporting the resulting data by eliminating the data.

Based on these 2000 Census dwelling density data, future residential development can be expected to generate somewhere between 6,203 and 6,421 additional residents⁵ to the City of Hercules, joining the 26,063 citizens already living in the City, resulting in a total estimated population at build-out (based upon the inclusion of existing City limits) of approximately 32,484 residents. The higher number is based on the full occupancy of all new dwelling units, and the lower figure is based on the historical occupancy levels at the time of the census count. The 32,375 is the average of the two.

Table 2-2, following, uses the additional housing projection from the Land Use Database and estimates the additional potential population for the City of Hercules through build-out. The number of potential new dwelling units was calculated by multiplying the amount of vacant acreage for each land use zone by the average densities (i.e., number of units allowed per acre) indicated in the City's General Plan.

The estimated GP build-out population of 32,375 (average between high and low) or more residents using this holding capacity approach is typically lower than the population forecasts based on the mathematical models previously described. This implies that the City's residential build-out period will take 25 to 30 years or that the City's growth rate will increase from recent historical levels. As the residentially zoned land remaining to be developed continues to be built during the next thirty years, the City will likely see the number of new dwelling units developed decrease each year.

[This page was left vacant to place the following table on a single page].

^{5.} Depending upon the vacancy factor based upon the average of 96.54% for all residences.

Table 2-2City of HerculesAverage Dwelling Occupancy by Type
(2000 United States Census Data)

Existing Residential	Total Units	Vacant Units	Occupied Units	Total Number of Occupants	Average Occupancy	Percentage Occupied
Detached Dwelling Units]					
Detached Dwellings	4,004	40	3,964	13,879	3.501	99.00%
Attached Dwelling Units	1					
Attached Dwelling Units	1,606	69	1,537	3,597	2.340	95.70%
Duplex to Quadplex Units	292	8	284	704	2.479	97.26%
Five to Forty-nine Units	533	7	526	1,016	1.932	98.69%
Fifty or More Units	67	0	67	64	0.955	100.00%
Average	2,431	84	2,347	5,317	2.265	96.54%
Other Dwelling Units]					
Other Dwelling Units	0	0	0	0	0.000	#DIV/0!

Existing - State Department of Finance 01/01/24 Population

G.P. Build-out Population At Historic Occupancy Rates	Anticipated Units	Occupancy Rate	Probable Occupancy	Dwelling Density	Anticipated Population		
Potential Detached Dwellings	40	99.00%	40	3.501	140		
Potential Attached Dwellings	2,773	96.54%	2,677	2.265	6,063		
Population to be Added Via Development at Historic Occupancy Rates 6,203							
Current State of California Department of Finance Population							
Potential "Build-out" Population, at Historic Vacancy Rates.							

G.P. Build-out Population At 100% Occupancy Rate	Anticipated Units	Occupancy Rate	Probable Occupancy	Dwelling Density	Anticipated Population		
Potential Detached Dwellings	40	100.00%	40	3.501	140		
Potential Attached Dwellings	2,773	100.00%	2,773	2.265	6,281		
Population to be Added Via Development at 100% Occupancy 6,421							
Current State of California Department of Finance Population							
Potential Maximum "Build-out" Population.							

Population at General Plan Build-out @ Low per Dwelling Resident Densities	32,266
Population at General Plan Build-out @ High per Dwelling Resident Densities	32,484
Average Population at General Plan Build-out	32,375

26,063

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

City staff and RCS have identified over \$29.0 million in needed, identified, and planned capital improvement projects required through the City's General Plan build-out, including projects related to existing deficiencies and those needed solely to support future growth. Roughly 97.91% of the total project list can be financed with DIF receipts imposed upon new development. The proposed impact fees will generate just over \$28.37 million. Existing impact fee fund balances will provide \$252,324 or 0.89% of the total. The remaining \$354,051 does not qualify for impact fee financing and will need to come from other sources. Tables 2-3 indicate the development fee-related capital project costs by infrastructure.

Infrastructure Type	Total – All DIF Projects
Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment	\$1,748,789
Storm Drainage Collection Facilities	\$1,000,000
General Government, Vehicles, and Equipment	\$1,985,137
Public Use (Community Center) Facilities	\$10,103,332
Park Land Acquisition & Facilities Improvement	\$14,134,418
Sub-total DIF Related Project Costs	\$28,971,676
Non-Development Generated Projects	\$354,051
Total – Report Identified Projects	\$28,617,626

Table 2-3Total City-wide General Plan Build-outCapital Requirements

<u>DIFs for the General City Plan Area.</u> Based on these costs and the schedules found at the end of each of the remaining chapters of this Report, costs attributable to future development were derived on a per unit basis for residential land uses and on a per square foot of pad basis for business land uses. Schedule 2.1, found at the end of this Chapter, provides a summary of the recommended DIF schedules for each type of infrastructure and land use category. The total recommended maximum DIFs for each of the seven DIF Land Use Types within the General City area are summarized as follows.

[This page was left vacant to place the following table on a single page].

DIF Land Use Type	Recommended Development Impact Fees
Detached Dwelling Unit	\$14,101/Unit
Attached Dwelling Unit	\$9,040/Unit
Commercial Lodging (Keyed) Unit	\$3,295/Unit
Retail & Service Uses Square Foot	\$4.606/S.F.
Industrial Uses Square Foot	\$1.614/S.F.
Institutional Use Square Foot	\$2.238/S.F.

Table 2-4 Summary of Proposed Development Impact Fees for the City's Existing General Plan Area

Specific DIF schedule rates for each land use and infrastructure can be found at the end of each chapter. Schedule 2.1 at the end of this Chapter also identifies the probable development impact revenue of these proposed new development impact fees, the estimated capital cost total, and the difference by individual infrastructure type (e.g., wastewater).

Schedule 2.1 requires two pages to summarize the many infrastructures, identify the individual Infrastructure DIFs and combined DIFs by DIF Land Use Type, calculate the potential collection through build-out at the proposed *Minimum Needs*-based *DIF* schedules, and provide the cost of the total infrastructure needs.

FORMAT OF THIS REPORT

The following chapters of this Report contain detailed information relative to the calculation of DIFs recommended by RCS for the entire City. Appropriate textual explanations are contained in a specific chapter devoted to each of the eleven sets of differing infrastructure cost schedules for City boundaries. The infrastructure chapters are listed below, along with five appendices, one of which contains a summary of DIF recommendations.

CHAPTER 3 – Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment CHAPTER 4 - Storm Drainage Collection System CHAPTER 5 - General Facilities, Vehicles & Equipment CHAPTER 6 - Public Use (Community Center) Facilities CHAPTER 7 - Park Land Acquisition and Facilities Improvements
APPENDIX A - Summary of Recommendations. APPENDIX B - Expanded Land Use Database. APPENDIX C - Application of Accessory Dwelling Units as a Eurotion of a
Detached Dwelling
APPENDIX D - AB-602 Justification APPENDIX E - Detailed Park Infrastructure Cost Schedule

NOTE REGARDING TEXTUAL MATHEMATICS: It is important to note that the use of a computer provides calculations to a large number extending over a large number of decimal points. When included in the text and supporting textual tables, such data has often been rounded to usually no more than two or three decimals for clarity and thus may not be replicated to the necessary degree of accuracy as the spreadsheet schedules at the end of each chapter. If questions arise between the tables and schedules, the schedules at the end of each chapter will prevail as the more accurate. The schedules at the end of the chapter are instructive regarding the recommendations. The tables within the chapters are text summaries of the schedules at the end of the chapter are instructive regarding the schedules at the end of the chapters are text summaries of the schedules at the end of the chapters are text summaries of the schedules at the end of the chapter.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 2.1

City of Hercules

Summary of Development Impact Fees By Type of Fee (continued on next page) (Costs/Fees per Residential Type Dwelling Unit, or Business Type Square Foot)

Land-use Category	Law Enforcement Facilities Schedule 3.2	Storm Drainage Facilities Schedule 6.2	General Government Facilities Schedule 9.1	Land-use Category	Public Meeting Facilities Schedule 11.1	Parkland Facilities Development Schedule 13.1	Development Impact Fee Total Per Unit or Square Feet
Calculated Development Impact Costs				Calculated Development Impact Cost	s		
Detached Dwelling Units	\$234	\$504	\$148	Detached Dwelling Units	\$5,509	\$7,706	\$14,101 per Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	\$249	\$93	\$148	Attached Dwelling Units	\$3,564	\$4,986	\$9,040 per Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	\$160	\$1,332	\$1,803	Commercial Lodging Units	No Fee	No Fee	\$3,295 per Unit
Retail, Office & Service Uses (SF)	\$2.738	\$0.851	\$1.017	Retail, Office & Service Uses (SF)	No Fee	No Fee	\$4.606 per S.F.
Industrial Uses (SF)	\$0.347	\$0.250	\$1.017	Industrial Uses (SF)	No Fee	No Fee	\$1.614 per S.F.
Institutional Use (SF)	\$0.291	\$0.930	\$1.017	Institutional Use (SF)	No Fee	No Fee	\$2.238 per S.F.
Potential Collection with Recommended Im	pact Fee Schedule		Potential Collection with Recommended Impact Fee		ded Impact Fee Sci	nedule	
Detached Dwelling Units	\$9,360	\$20,160	\$5,920	Detached Dwelling Units	\$220,360	\$308,240	\$564,040
Attached Dwelling Units	\$690 <i>,</i> 477	\$257,889	\$410,404	Attached Dwelling Units	\$9,882,972	\$13,826,178	\$25,067,920
Commercial Lodging Units	\$57,600	\$479,520	\$649,080	Commercial Lodging Units	\$0	\$0	\$1,186,200
Retail, Office & Service Uses (SF)	\$867,429	\$269,606	\$322,197	Retail, Office & Service Uses (SF)	\$0	\$0	\$1,459,232
Industrial Uses (SF)	\$17,350	\$12,500	\$50,850	Industrial Uses (SF)	\$0	\$0	\$80,700
Institutional Use (SF)	\$938	\$2,995	\$3,276	Institutional Use (SF)	\$0	\$0	\$7,209
Total	\$1,643,154	\$1,042,671	\$1,441,727	Total	\$10,103,332	\$14,134,418	\$28,365,302
Potential DIF Receipts	\$1,643,154	\$1,042,671	\$1,441,727	Potential DIF Receipts	\$10,103,332	\$14,134,418	\$28,365,302
Fund Balance and Other Revenues	\$107,047	\$0	\$145,277	Fund Balance/Other Revenues	\$0	\$0	\$252,324
Total - Other Resources	\$1,750,201	\$1,042,671	\$1,587,004	Total - Other Resources	\$10,103,332	\$14,134,418	\$28,617,626
Required Capital Total	\$1,748,789	\$1,000,000	\$1,985,137	Required Capital Total	\$10,103,332.00	\$14,134,418.00	\$28,971,676
Over or (Under) Collection	-\$1,412	-\$42,671	\$398,133	Over or (Under) Collection	\$0	\$0	\$354,051

Chapter 3 Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment

<u>The Existing System of Law Enforcement Assets or Infrastructure.</u> The Hercules Police Department currently operates out of a 4,375-square-foot facility on roughly 0.15 acres at 111 Civic Drive.

The Department also has an inventory of:

- · Vehicles, some with various added extra equipment;
- Assigned officer equipment such as various leathers, armament, clothing, and safety apparel; and,
- Specialty and computer equipment.

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Underdeveloped or Vacant Parcels. Residents and businesses benefit from law enforcement services in three ways: directly, indirectly, and through standby availability. Direct services are those where a resident or business owner requires a direct response, usually as a result of being the victim of a crime. Direct service results in the form of a law enforcement officer contacting the victim. Indirect benefits, such as crime prevention programs, free patrol time, and other law enforcement services that serve all businesses, citizens, and visitors, are impossible to calculate for a specific beneficiary. An example of an indirect benefit would be the apprehension of a burglar in your neighbor's residence or business yesterday. Had the burglar not been arrested, he/she may have broken into your dwelling unit or business tomorrow. Most residents and businesses may go for many years before ever requiring a call-for-service. However, these fortunate residents and businesses still benefit from law enforcement services, if in no other way than by the knowledge that a law enforcement officer is available, through adequate planned stand-by, to respond if required. Lastly, residents and businesses also benefit from the stand-by capability, the ability to respond to a police officer should they need service.

The addition of new residential units and new businesses will increase the demand for law enforcement services by creating more direct calls for service, more areas requiring preventive patrol, and, in general, more opportunities for crimes to be committed.

Developing vacant or underutilized parcels into residential or business units will also generate more calls. The residents and business owners occupying those residences and businesses will increase law enforcement calls-for-service. More residences and businesses will mean more responses to burglaries, domestic disputes, noise complaints, shoplifting, and miscellaneous incidents in the new residences and businesses. Suppose the law enforcement force capabilities (the base) are not expanded. In that case, the increasing number of calls-for-service (the rate) will reduce the amount of "free" hours available for preventative patrol. This inability to expand the capabilities would ultimately drive the Department into a reactionary mode. The additional calls-for-service would limit the amount of time for training, planning, proactive crime prevention, and other non-direct services.

<u>The Purpose of the Fee</u>. Additional law enforcement calls-for-service are expected, and the cost of adding sworn officers necessary to respond to those calls can be determined. Those new costs can be translated to a fee or an amount necessary to be collected to offset the additional staffing costs. These costs include equipping and housing the additional officers. Providing that the fee is adopted and imposed, new development will finance its proportional capital costs of expansion of the Police Station. The continued costs of the annual salary and benefits for those additional officers will need to come from increases in property and sales tax generated by the new residences, businesses, and their occupants.

<u>The Use of the Fee.</u> The revenues raised from a properly calculated and legally supported Law Enforcement Impact Fee would be limited to capital costs related to that growth. The fees would be used to expand the law enforcement station, increase the number of responses and investigator's vehicles, and properly equip additional officers. Conversely, the Law Enforcement DIF receipts cannot be used to replace existing vehicles or replace normal vacancies. The required projects/capital includes:

LE-001, Additional Police Station Space/Upgrades - The existing station will need to be expanded by 1,176 to meet the space needs of the seven additional officers (at 168 square feet per officer) needed to meet the additional calls-for-service generated by new development.

LE-002, Additional Patrol/Detectives/Specialty/Staff Vehicles - This project is the acquisition of five law enforcement vehicles in order to maintain the existing 0.81 vehicles/officer standard.

LE-003, Additional Police Officer Assigned Equipment - Officers in the field will require personally assigned equipment of personal-assigned radios/electronic devices, leathers, handguns, helmets, and assorted protection, as well as the costly recruitment costs of a background check and other exams. These costs have been included at \$11,667 per additional officer but are only included for successful candidates.

LE-004, Additional Specialty Equipment - This project is the acquisition of specialty equipment such as advanced electronics, computer information sharing systems, special weapons and tactics equipment, and other unique equipment.

The Relationship Between the Need for the Fee and the Type of Development Project. Department records were used to demonstrate that differing land uses generate differing numbers of calls. Police staff provided calls-for-service data to RCS, which then used geo-location software to determine the land use of each call-for-service.⁶

Table 3-1 summarizes an analysis of the calls-for-service received by the Police Department over a recent twelve-month period. The breakdown of calls into the land uses that generated them, divided by the number of developed units (during the same period) generating a *calls-for-service* nexus.

[This space left vacant in order to place the following table on a single page].

^{6.} Since the City does not currently have any commercial lodgings, RCS used an average call generation rate from previous cities.

DIF Land-use Type	Developed Dwellings or Square Feet	Actual Calls For Service Over 12 Months	Total Calls per Dwelling or 1,000 SF (KSF)
Detached Dwelling Units	5,795	2,962	0.511/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	3,273	1,736	0.530/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	0	0	0.00/Unit
Retail & Service Uses	1,485,950	8,680	5.841/KSF
Industrial Uses	364,885	273	0.748/KSF
Institutional Uses	385,085	205	0.532/KSF

Table 3-1Law Enforcement Calls-for-Service Generated by DIF Land-use Type(Over a 12 Month Period)

As an example, there were approximately 2,962 calls-for-service that generated a response to one of the 5,795 detached dwelling units in the City. The result indicates that, on average, each dwelling will generate just over 0.511 calls per year. The same analysis was undertaken for most land uses. Since these calls-for-service by land use are an average, they were used to project the number of additional calls that could be expected by multiplying the calls per residential unit or business acre by the number of anticipated new residential dwellings or business acres. To determine the number of additional officers necessary to meet this increase from future developments, the number of increased calls resulting from new development was then divided by the average number of calls that an officer responds to.

These calls-for-service rates are then applied to (multiplied by) all of the anticipated land uses to determine the number of calls-for-service in the future. In this case, the additional calls-for-service, 3,502 per year, were divided by the number of calls-for-service that a single officer can absorb.

The existing complement of 26 sworn officers currently absorbs the 13,856 annual calls-forservice to privately held residences and businesses by responding to just over 533 calls-forservice each to privately owned and developed parcels annually. Based upon the addition of these calls-for-service, the City will need to successfully recruit seven additional officers to maintain the same response capabilities that the existing 26 officers currently provide. This is not to imply that the existing level of services or the ratio of officers to calls-for-service is the desired level of service; it merely is the *current* level of service. To adequately mobilize the seven new sworn officers, the City will need to add five response vehicles at a total cost of \$401,429 to maintain the existing ratio of 0.81 vehicles per sworn officer (21 vehicles divided by 26 officers) and for the personnel recruitment/officer-assigned equipment at a combined cost of \$105,886 (7 officers X \$15,127 in assigned equipment costs).

<u>The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee</u>. Again, the use of the fee is a similar argument to the need for the fee. As the development occurs, the impact is generated, and the impact fee would be collected as the development occurs. The collected DIF receipts would be put to use to acquire equipment for additional officers, vehicles, and additional building space necessary to respond to those additional calls without reducing the capability of responding to calls from the existing community. <u>The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility</u> <u>Attributed to the Development Project.</u> The Police Station size at 4,375 square feet, along with the 1,176 additional square feet proposed in LE-001, will meet the needs for operations space (and location) through General Plan build-out and the land-use database depicted in Table 2-1. The build-out complement of 33 sworn officers (26 current and seven projected) will allow for the maintenance of an average of about 168 square feet per officer.

<u>Minimum Needs-based Fees.</u> Table 3-2, following, summarizes the resulting DIFs (from Schedule 3.2) for development to contribute \$1,641,742 towards the expansion of the Law Enforcement capabilities of the City in order to allow the City to extend the same level of service to the City's newest citizens and businesses.

Table 3-2
Minimum Needs-based Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles
and Equipment Development Impact Costs
by DIF Land-use Type

DIF land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	\$9,376	\$234/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	\$689,138	\$249/Unit
Mobil Home Dwelling Units	\$57,663	\$160/Unit
Retail & Service Uses	\$867,283	\$2.738/S.F.
Industrial Uses	\$17,346	\$0.347/S.F.
Institutional Uses	\$938	\$0.291/S.F.

Existing Financial Commitment Comparison Costs. The City invested, at current dollars, about \$6.44 million in the existing police station, or stated a slightly different way; it would cost \$6.44 million to replace the existing building. The Department staff uses 21 assorted vehicles with various added extra equipment costing a total of \$1,405,000 for an average cost of about \$66,905 per vehicle. The existing 26 sworn officers each have assigned equipment such as personally assigned radio and communication equipment, various leathers, armament, clothing, and safety apparel, costing some \$11,667 per sworn officer or a combined \$303,330. Lastly, \$221,800 was invested in specialty equipment, computer capability, and other electronic equipment. There is also an existing positive Law Enforcement Impact Fee Fund balance of \$107,047. Combined, the City has invested, at current replacement costs, some \$6,437,065 into the law enforcement assets.

[This space left vacant in order to place the following table on a single page].

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	\$1,376,053	\$237/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	\$806,491	\$246/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	\$0	\$0.00/Unit
Retail & Service Uses	\$4,032,457	\$2.714/S.F.
Industrial Uses	\$126,827	\$0.348/S.F.
Institutional Uses	\$95,237	\$0.247/S.F.

Table 3-3Existing Law EnforcementCommunity Financial Commitment Comparison Data

RECOMMENDED DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

Since the *Minimum Needs-based Impact Costs* (necessary for expansion indicating the City's investment in law enforcement capabilities) are nearly the same as the *Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison*, the *Existing Community Financial Commitment Development Impact Fee* schedule identified in Table 3-2 and Schedule 3.2 would be the most equitable DIF schedule to adopt.

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED LAW ENFORCEMENT DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

- Create a DIF Fund titled Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment.
- Adopt Schedule 3.2 for the six land uses within the City.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 3.1

City of Hercules

2024-25 Development Impact Cost Calculation

Allocation of Project Cost Estimates Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

ocation of Pl w Enforceme	roject Cost Estimates ent Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment		Suppo Other R	orted by Resources	Gener New Dev	rated by velopment
Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost
LE-001	Additional Police Station Space/Upgrades	\$ 1,181,759.92	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$1,181,760
LE-002	Additional Patrol/Detective/Specialty/Staff Vehicles	\$ 401,428.57	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$401,429
LE-003	Additional Officer Assigned Equipment	\$ 81,666.00	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$81,666
LE-004	Additional Specialty Equipment	\$ 59,715.00	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$59,715
LE-005	Additional Recruitment Costs	\$ 24,220.00	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$24,220
	Sub-Total General Plan Total New Project Costs	\$1,748,789	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$1,748,789
	LESS:					
	Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	\$107,047	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$107,047
	Total General Plan Total New Project Costs	\$1,641,742	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$1,641,742

Construction Needs

Construction Needs

Schedule 3.2

City of Hercules 2024-25 Development Impact Cost Calculation Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

	Undev	reloped	Call	Expected	Percentage	Allocation of	Cost	Average Units	Development
	Acres	Units	Generation	New Calls	of Additional	Expansion	Distribution	or Square	Impact Fee per Unit
DIF Land-use Type			Rate	for Service	Service Calls	Costs	Per Acre	Feet/Acre	or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	8.18	40	0.511	20	0.57%	\$9,376	\$1,146	4.89	\$234 per Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	97.02	2,773	0.530	1,470	41.98%	\$689,138	\$7,103	28.58	\$249 per Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	163.72	360	0.341	123	3.51%	\$57,663	\$352	2	\$160 per Unit
Retail, Office & Service Uses (SF)	89.99	316,811	5.841	1,850	52.83%	\$867,283	\$9,638	3,521	\$2.738 per S.F.
Industrial Uses (SF)	3.96	50,000	0.748	37	1.06%	\$17,346	\$4,380	12,626	\$0.347 per S.F.
Institutional Use (SF)	1.00	3,221	0.532	2	0.06%	\$938	\$938	3220.85	\$0.291 per S.F.
TOTAL 363.87 3,502 100.00% \$1,641,742 in Law Enforcment Development-related GP Projects									

Schedule 3.3

City of Hercules 2024-25 Development Impact Cost Calculation Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

	Deve	loped	Call	Existing	Percentage	Allocation of	Distribution	ribution Average Units		inancial
	Acres	Units	Generation	Calls for	of Existing	Infrastructure	of "Equity"	or Square	Commitme	nt per Unit
DIF Land-use Type			Rate	Service	Service Calls	"Equity"	per Acre	Feet/Acre	or Squa	re Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	983.30	5,795	0.511	2,962	21.38%	\$1,376,053	\$1,399	5.89	\$237	per Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	294.72	3,273	0.530	1,736	12.53%	\$806,491	\$2,736	11.11	\$246	per Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	0.00	0	0.000	0	0.00%	\$0	\$0	0	\$0.000	per S.F.
Retail, Office & Service Uses (SF)	155.60	1,485,950	5.841	8,680	62.64%	\$4,032,457	\$25,916	9,550	\$2.714	per S.F.
Industrial Uses (SF)	67.40	364,885	0.748	273	1.97%	\$126,827	\$1,882	5,414	\$0.348	per S.F.
Institutional Use (SF)	119.56	385,085	0.532	205	1.48%	\$95,237	\$797	3,221	\$0.247	per S.F.
TOTAL	1,620.58			13,856	100.00%	\$6,437,065	65 Total Law Enforcement System Capital Assets			

\$ 4,396,428.26	in Law Enforcement Facility Assets
\$ 1,405,000.00	in Law Enforcement Vehicles Assets
\$ 303,330.00	in Law Enforcement Officer Equipment Assets
\$ 3,460.00	in Law Enforcement Recruitment Costs
\$ 221,800.00	in Specialty Equipment Assets
\$ 107,047.00	in Existing Law Enforcement DIF Fund Balance

Chapter 4 Storm Drainage Collection System

The City's existing storm drainage network comprises street gutter facilities, inlets, and a network of storm drain pipelines that convey runoff to larger pipelines, storm scepters, and the San Pablo Bay. However, as the City continues to develop vacant parcels with rooftops, parking lots, and driveways, the existing City-owned storm drainage lines will reach capacity, and the ability of the existing drainage lines to collect additional runoff from developing areas will diminish regardless of the availability of a good system of wash channels. Additionally, there are areas in the City near safety facilities such as the Police Station (existing and future) and numerous fire stations that require storm drainage improvements to ensure adequate public safety response times to a few large vacant areas to be developed.

City records indicate the existing system is comprised of roughly 262,875 linear feet of reinforced concrete pipe, averaging about 15" in diameter, including 263 inlet boxes and 657 manholes.

<u>Property-based Benefit Reasoning</u>. The use of separate zones has been considered for each section within the City because each area has its own capital needs for stormwater collection. Stormwater runoff from Willow Avenue may not directly impact the homeowner on Santa Fe Avenue; similarly, a small debris detention basin near San Pablo Avenue required to handle runoff from the businesses in that area may provide little direct benefit to a business on Willow Avenue. Each drainage area can have some distinct property-related areas of benefit in each case. However, the owners and users of all developed and undeveloped parcels benefit, directly and indirectly, from all City-wide existing and future storm drainage improvements. As the various systems within the greater community of the City of Hercules develop, concurrent with the development of private property, the benefits are generally recognized as:

- 1. Proposed development projects can only be approved by the City when precautions, generally in the form of infrastructure improvements, have been made that assure that developed and undeveloped downstream parcels will not be adversely affected (i.e., inundated, flooded, cut off from access in and out), by stormwater from the project being proposed. Avoiding downstream or down-zone damage from the development of an upstream parcel may not be a major concern to a developer, but the City must concern itself with such issues when approving private development proposals.
- 2. The private development being assessed a DIF will receive the same stormwater protection from other development projects upstream or up-zone from its own development.
- 3. Stormwater must be adequately controlled and conveyed to large-scale flood control channels or creeks to assure public safety vehicles access to all parts of the city, regardless of which area a call-for-service is in. Fire and other rescue calls and responses from law enforcement and public works cannot wait during heavy rainstorms. On the contrary, emergency calls-for-service will probably increase during such storm events, and the City's public safety and maintenance units must be able to respond to all zones.
- 4. The City of Hercules's citizens and business owners/employees must also be able to travel safely (and send/receive goods and services) in heavy rain from one area to another. An adequate and sufficient storm drainage system will provide such protection.

5. Storm drainage collection pipes protect the integrity of the roadbed of the very important arterials and collectors.

RCS recommends a single-area storm drainage fee.

<u>Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Underdeveloped or Undeveloped</u> <u>Parcels</u>. The construction of flood control and storm drainage facilities is essential to the preservation of private property, public streets, curbs, and other facilities. The county or a regional level of government is generally responsible for flood control.⁷

Cities are generally responsible for storm drainage. The building of new residences and businesses on presently undeveloped land will increase the amount of runoff and thus accelerate the need for additional storm drainage facilities to handle increased runoff from these developing areas. As the vacant land is developed and bare dirt or turf is replaced with impervious rooftops, parking lots, driveways, pools, and sidewalks, greater amounts of rainfall run off of the developed parcel.

The amount of the runoff varies with differing types of development (i.e., land use), and the varying amounts are referred to as the runoff coefficients. Approximately 0.775 (or 77.5%) of rainfall on a parcel developed with detached dwelling residence exits that developed parcel. The rate for an attached dwelling runoff is not much higher than a detached dwelling at 0.810 (81.0%). Most business uses, such as lodging, retail/service, industrial, and institutional, have a runoff coefficient in excess of 0.900 or 90.0%.

Clearly, rainfall-runoff increases with development. The cumulative effects of additional runoff must be managed with the appropriate capital facilities. These costs of the new storm drainage (and flood control revenue shortages) will be distributed by the coefficients of drainage, i.e., the percentage of property that will end up with impervious coverage such as asphalt or cement-based concrete drives or parking lots, rooftops, pools and any other hard surface that does not allow any absorption into the soil.

The Purpose of the Fee. The costs of extending the same level of storm drainage protection to the newly developing residences and businesses as is provided to the existing community (that has largely paid for the existing system) can be calculated, and a fee can be imposed and collected. The Fee revenues can then be used to expand the storm drainage facilities necessary to extend the same level of services. The City staff has identified a total of \$1,000,000 in storm drainage projects required to fully complete the City's network of pipes and small channels.

Of that figure, \$1,000,000, or 100% of the storm drainage projects, have been identified as being able to be funded by DIFs.

The Use of the Fee. The construction of flood and storm drainage facilities in the City of Hercules is essential to the preservation of public and private property. The building of new residences and businesses on presently undeveloped land will require the installation of additional storm drains of sufficient capacity with an adequate number of inlets to handle increased rainwater runoff from these areas where development reduces natural absorption opportunities. This Chapter reviews the costs of storm drainage and flood control facilities needed to serve future development.

^{7.} Projects of major importance generally involving the control of large quantities of flood water through numerous cities and unincorporated areas.

City of Hercules 2025-26 Update to the Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report

The revenues raised from a properly calculated and supported Storm Drainage Collection System DIF would be limited to the capitalized costs related to that growth. The fees would be used to construct the additional or parallel storm drainage lines necessary to increase the drainage capacity of the system and accommodate the additional rainwater runoff generated by the continued development. Conversely, the Storm Drainage Collection System DIF receipts would not be used to repair, replace, or rehabilitate any existing storm drainage lines. The limited exceptions would be if the replacement or rehabilitation project creates additional capacity, in which case that proportional amount of additional capacity could be included as a DIF cost.

SD-001, Storm Drainage Master Plan - Undertake a Storm Drainage Master Plan study to determine the effect of new and significant up-sizing development upon the City's existing circulation system and determine state-of-art solutions to the new demands. The result could alter many of the projects described herein.

The Relationship Between the Need for The Fee and The Type of Development Project. Upon identifying the costs of storm drainage facilities generated by future development, costs must be further distributed for each land use (i.e., business and residential) based on their estimated rainwater runoff. Residential-detached dwelling development leaves the greatest remaining turf percentage per parcel and thus the greatest percolation and, conversely, the least runoff of rainwater. As such, the detached dwelling residential land use should not bear the same cost as the institutional or industrial development, which generally has little or no turf area (or, stated another way, a higher percentage of impervious area) and therefore generates a higher amount of rainwater runoff. For this Report, costs were distributed between land uses on established runoff coefficients. A listing of these runoff coefficients is provided in Table 6-1⁸ following.

DIF Land-Use Type	Runoff Coefficient
Detached Dwelling Units	0.740
Attached Dwelling Units	0.800
Commercial Lodging Units	0.800
Retail/Service/Office Uses (in SF)	0.900
Industrial Uses (in SF)	0.950
Institutional Uses (in SF)	0.900

Table 4-1 Storm Drainage Runoff Coefficients (By Acre)

As stated earlier, the Hercules area requires \$1,000,000 in storm drainage projects. Table 4-2 demonstrates the DIF schedule that would need to be imposed to fully fund the completion of a Storm Drainage Master Plan. It would not be unreasonable to require the development of those generating greater amounts of rainwater runoff to finance some portion of the identified storm drainage needs, providing there is no violation of the proportionality requirement. Table 4-2 indicates the resulting fees required to fund DIF storm drainage projects fully. Please note that the DIF, by land use, is in terms of units such as residential dwellings or business square feet of building pad (adjusted for multiple floors).

^{8.} San Bernardino Hydrology Manual (1986). Williamson and Schmidt, Irvine, CA, Figure C-4.

City of Hercules 2025-26 Update to the Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report

DIF Land-Use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	\$20,147	\$504/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	\$258,475	\$93/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	\$436,164	\$1,332/Unit
Retail/Services/office Uses (in SF)	\$269,697	\$0.851/S.F.
Industrial Uses (in SF)	\$12,521	\$0.250/S.F.
Institutional Uses (in SF)	\$2,997	\$0.930/S.F.

Table 4-2Minimal Needs-based Storm Drainage SystemDevelopment Impact Costs by DIF Land-use Type

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee.

The Storm Drainage DIFs that are imposed and collected will be used to mitigate the stormwater runoff generated by the type of development. If the development is a commercial or industrial property generating a significant amount of runoff, the fee collected will be proportionally higher and will be enough to construct the required additions to the storm drainage system downstream from this development.

From time to time, the City may require an applicant for a private project to construct an improvement (or a portion thereof) that is on the list of required improvements at the end of this Chapter. This is often done to expedite the project for the applicant/developer. The developer should receive a credit for any money expended on this required improvement against their calculated storm drainage impact fee.

The City may also require a developer to construct and full fund offsite storm drainage improvements as a condition of approval for a development project.

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. Similar to the section above, the relationship is based on the projected amount of stormwater that will need to be collected and safely transported to flood control channels or rivers. The downstream collection lines (lines further down from the proposed project but prior to the outfall into a river or flood control channel) need to be sized to handle all the stormwater collected upstream. Stormwater that is collected in one location accumulates with feeder lines along the way, and thus, the downstream system must be built increasingly larger (at increasing higher material and construction costs) the farther it gets away from its source.

Table 4-3, following, distributes the total equity replacement value of the existing storm drainage system at \$81,180,845 over the existing developed community. The total consists of the actual existing storm drainage pipe and channel systems at \$81,180,845. The development impact costs figures represent the long-term financial commitment contributed by the existing community through dedications (from the developers of these established developments) and tax contributions.

DIF Land-Use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	\$48,227,135	\$8,327/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	\$29,444,646	\$8,993/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	\$0	\$0.00/Unit
Retail/Services/office Uses (in SF)	\$1,574,580	\$1.060/S.F.
Industrial Uses (in SF)	\$719,808	\$1.973/S.F.
Institutional Uses (in SF)	\$1,214,676	\$3.154/S.F.

Table 4-3Existing Storm Drainage CommunityFinancial Commitment Comparison Data

Of note is the fact that in Table 4-3, the investment "equity" of the current community is significantly less (by roughly 723%) than that of the previously exhibited Minimum Needs-based DIFs identified in Table 4-2 indicate that the existing community has invested \$80.6 million more than what is being asked of future development. As such, it would be appropriate to require the undeveloped parcels to finance (via Table 4-2 and Schedule 4.2) the remainder of the Storm Water Collection System needs for the City.

Recommended City Storm Drainage Development Impact Fee Schedule. The adoption of Schedule 4.2 summarized in Table 4-2 as the Storm Drainage Collection System DIF schedule would generate capital to construct approximately 100% of the facilities needed by the new development.

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED STORM DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS DIFS

- 1. Adopt Schedule 4.2 for the six land uses and the Cost Distribution per Acre figure (from the third column on the right side of Schedule 4.2) for developments that do not involve a building pad (e.g., additional asphalt parking area).
- 2. Create a DIF Fund titled Storm Drainage.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 4.1

City of Hercules 2024-25 Development Impact Cost Calculation Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities Allocation of Project Cost Estimates			Constru Supp Other	ction Needs orted by Resources	Construction Needs Generated by New City-wide Development	
Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost
SD-001	Storm Drainage Master Plan	\$1,000,000	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$1,000,000
	Sub-Total General Plan Total New Projects	\$1,000,000	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$1,000,000
	LESS:					
	Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	\$0	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$0
	Other Mitigating Revenue Sources	\$0	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$0
	Development Impact Fee Fund Balance Total	\$0	0.00%	\$0	0.00%	\$0
	Total Net General Plan Project Costs	\$1,000,000	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$1,000,000
Schedule 4.2

City of Hercules Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities 2024-25 Development Impact Cost Calculation Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs

	Undeveloped		Run-off	Total Future	Run-off	Allocation of	Cost	Average Units	Development
Proposed Land Use	Acres	Units	Coefficient	Impervious	Coefficient	Expansion	Distribution	or Square	Impact Fee per Unit
			Index Rate	Acres	Percentage	Costs	Per Acre	Feet/Acre	or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	8.2	40	0.740	6.05	2.01%	\$20,147	\$2,463	4.89	\$504 per Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	97.0	2,773	0.800	77.62	25.85%	\$258,475	\$2,664	28.58	\$93 per Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	163.7	360	0.800	130.98	43.62%	\$436,164	\$2,664	2	\$1,332 per Unit
Retail, Office & Service Uses (SF)	90.0	316,811	0.900	80.99	26.97%	\$269,697	\$2,997	3,521	\$0.851 per S.F.
Industrial Uses (SF)	4.0	50,000	0.950	3.76	1.25%	\$12,521	\$3,162	12,626	\$0.250 per S.F.
Institutional Use (SF)	1.0	3,221	0.900	0.90	0.30%	\$2,997	\$2,997	3,221	\$0.930 per S.F.
TOTAL	363.87			300.30	100.00%	100.00% \$1.000.000 in Total Storm Drainage Collection System General Plan Projects			
ALTERNATE FEE METHODOLOGY			300.30		\$1,000,000	\$3,330.003	Per Gallon Deman	d	

Schedule 4.3

City of Hercules 2024-25 Development Impact Cost Calculation Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison

	Devel	loped	Run-off	Total Existing	Run-off	Allocation of	Cost	Average Units		Development
Existing Land Use	Acres	Units	Coefficient	Impervious	Coefficient	ExistingSystem	Distribution	or Square	Imp	act Fee per Unit
			Index Rate	Acres	Percentage	Costs	Per Acre	Feet/Acre	0	r Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	983.30	5,795	0.740	4,288	59.41%	\$48,227,135	\$49,046	5.89	\$8,327	per Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	294.72	3,273	0.800	2,618	36.27%	\$29,444,646	\$99,907	11.11	\$8,993	per Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	0.00	0	0.800	0	0.00%	\$0	\$0	-	\$0.000	per S.F.
Retail, Office & Service Uses (SF)	155.60	1,485,950	0.900	140	1.94%	\$1,574,580	\$10,119	9,550	\$1.060	per S.F.
Industrial Uses (SF)	67.40	364,885	0.950	64	0.89%	\$719,808	\$10,680	5,414	\$1.973	per S.F.
Institutional Use (SF)	119.56	385,085	0.900	108	1.50%	\$1,214,676	\$10,160	3,221	\$3.154	per S.F.
TOTAL	TOTAL 1,620.58 7,218 100.00% \$81,180,845 Total Existing Electric Utility System Inventory									

 \$81,180,845
 in Storm Drainage Collection System Assets

 \$0
 in Storm Drainage System DIF Fund Balance (none)

Chapter 5 General Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment

<u>The Existing System.</u> General Facilities are generally limited to general office or work buildings and equipment used by City staff to undertake their daily duties. The replacement costs totaling \$21,398,200⁹ are as follows:

City Hall Facilities	\$8,177,266
Corporation Yard	\$1,018,647
Computer and Miscellaneous Electronic Equipment	\$81,773
General Fund Pool Cars	\$648,000
General Facilities Impact Fee Fund Balance (None)	\$145,277

<u>Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Underdeveloped or Undeveloped</u> <u>Parcels</u>. As the City increases in both population and additional business ventures, the City Hall will typically become overcrowded with a growing staff, even if major efforts are made to keep the number of municipal workers to a minimum. The City of Hercules' current City Hall is 22,020 square feet.

City pool vehicles are generally made available to general employees assigned with general code enforcement, intra-city mail delivery, planning and engineering field inspection projects and other issues. These tasks often require on-site inspection or review. Other demand upon pool cars is travel by employees that do not have assigned City vehicles, which will be checked-out on an increasing basis requiring a minor fleet addition.

Lastly, the greater amounts of data necessary to manage a larger city will also impact the City's centralized and personal desktop computer processing capability and storage space.

<u>The Purpose of the Fee.</u> The costs of extending the same level of service to the newly developing community as is provided to the existing community that has largely paid for the existing facilities can be calculated, a fee imposed and collected, and the fee used to expand the facilities necessary to extend that same level of services.

<u>The Use of the Fee.</u> The revenues that are raised from a properly calculated and supported General Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment Impact Fee would be limited to capitalized costs related to that growth. The fees would be used to construct additional general facilities. Conversely, the General Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment DIF receipts would not be used to repair any existing general building except remodeling City Hall to increase capability and capacity, which would be far less expensive than constructing a building addition. The improvements necessary to contend with increased demand resulting from additional residents and businesses would include the following:

- City Hall floor plan remodel.
- Expansion of the administrative pool car fleet.
- Upsizing of the existing centralized computer system capacity.

^{9.} The General Facilities replacement costs were gathered from the City's Insurance Property Schedule.

GF-001, City Hall Remodel for City Staff Use – Remodel excess City Hall complex space for use by City staff as the City's population and business community expands.

GF-002, Expansion of Administrative Pool Car Fleet - Some pool vehicle expansion is expected due to additional inspections, such as business license and code enforcement.

GF-003, General Use Computer Hardware/Software - This project involves minor computer and software expansions to accommodate new users.

GF-004, Expansion of the Corporation Yard – Expand the existing corporation yard to accommodate the increase in residential and commercial development.

<u>The Relationship Between the Need for The Fee and The Type of Development Project</u>. The need is based upon the recognition that additional developed parcels in the City will create the need for more building space and specialty equipment, largely within the arena of overhead space, i.e., administrative management, personnel, record keeping, financial accounting, etc. The costs are distributed on an equal acreage basis as the most direct index of demand relating to central management services.

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. General management of the City and General Plan issues transcend the type of land use and the use of the fee, as well as the need for the fee. The distribution of new demand will be based on an equal benefit in terms of the City's general management.

<u>Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed</u> to the Development Project. The fee would be based on the size of the development. A fee has been determined for individual units, either residential dwelling units or business square feet. A development of twelve residential units would have to pay a fee twelve times larger than a single unit. No developer will be required to construct any portion of any general facility as a condition of development.

<u>Resulting DIF Schedule</u>. Table 5-1 summarizes the Minimum Needs-Based General Facilities DIFs. The fees identified represent the fees necessary to construct or acquire the facilities identified in Schedule 5.1.

Table 5-1City of Hercules's Entire City AreaMinimum Needs-based General Facilities, Vehicles and EquipmentDevelopment Impact Costsby DIF Land-use Type

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot		
Private Residential Units	\$417,144	\$148/Unit		
Commercial Lodging Units	\$649,190	\$1,803/Unit		
Business Uses	\$376,500	\$1.017/S.F.		

It must be restated that the existing community has established the City Hall, general pool fleet, and inventory of computer/electronic equipment. In short, the current community has created

more than adequate staff facilities from which future development can attain immediate benefits. Table 5-2 identifies the average investment by residential dwelling units, commercial lodging units, and business square feet.

Table 5-2 Existing General Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment Community Financial Commitment Comparison

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot		
Residential Dwelling Units	\$7,942,152	\$876/Unit		
Commercial Lodging Units	\$0	\$0/Unit		
Business Uses	\$2,128,811	\$0.952/S.F.		

RECOMMENDED IMPACT FEES

The *Minimum Needs-based Impact Costs* should be adopted for the two broad land uses, per Schedule 5.2 and summarized in Table 5-3. The Existing Community Financial Commitment indicates that the existing community has generated a great deal more infrastructure than will be required for future development.

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED GENERAL FACILITIES ET. AL. IMPACT FEES

General Plan Area - Adopt Schedule 5.3 for the three basic land uses.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 5.1

City of Hercules 2024-25 Develop Allocation of Pro General Facilitie	oment Impact Cost Calculation oject Cost Estimates s, Vehicles and Equipment		Constru Supp Other	ction Needs ported by Resources	Construction Needs Generated by New Development	
Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost
GF-001	City Hall Reconfiguration/Expansion	\$1,635,453	20.00%	\$327,091	80.00%	\$1,308,363
GF-002	Expansion Of Administrative Pool Car Fleet	\$129,600	20.00%	\$25,920	80.00%	\$103,680
GF-003	Electronic Specialty Equipment/Computer Hardware/Software	\$16,355	20.00%	\$3,271	80.00%	\$13,084
GF-004	Expansion of the Corporation Yard	\$203,729	20.00%	\$40,746	80.00%	\$162,983
	Sub-Total General Plan Total New Project Costs	\$1,985,137	20.00%	\$397,028	80.00%	\$1,588,110
	LESS:					
	Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	\$145,277	0.00%	\$0	100.00%	\$145,277
	Total General Plan Total New Project Costs	\$1,839,860	21.58%	\$397,028	78.42%	\$1,442,833

Schedule 5.2

City of Hercules 2024-25 Development Impact Cost Calculation Minimum Needs-based Impact Costs General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

	Undev	eloped	Acre	Acre	Percentage	Allocation of	Cost	Average Units	Development
	Acres	Units	Distribution	Demand	of Additional	Expansion	Distribution	or Square	Impact Fee per Unit
Proposed Land Use			Factor	Factor	Demand	Costs	Per Acre	Feet/Acre	or Square Foot
Residential Dwelling Units	105.20	2,813	1.000	105.20	28.91%	\$417,144	\$3,965	26.74	\$148 per Unit
Commercial Lodging	163.72	360	1.000	163.72	44.99%	\$649,190	\$3,965	2.20	\$1,803 per Unit
Business Uses	94.95	370,032	1.000	94.95	26.09%	\$376,500	\$3,965	3,897	\$1.017 per S.F.
			-		-				
TOTAL	363.87			363.87	100.00%	\$1,442,833	in Total General Fa	acilities Developme	nt-related GP Projects

Schedule 5.3

City of Hercules 2024-25 Development Impact Cost Calculation Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

	Developed		Acre	Acre	Percentage	Allocation of	Distribution	Average Units	Current Financial
	Acres	Units	Distribution	Demand	of Existing	Infrastructure	of "Equity"	or Square	Commitment per Unit
Proposed Land Use			Factor	Service	Service Calls	"Equity"	per Acre	Feet/Acre	or Square Foot
Residential Dwelling Units	1,278.02	9,068	1.000	1,278.02	78.86%	\$7,942,152	\$6,214	7.10	\$876 per Unit
Commercial Lodging	0.00	0	1.000	0.00	0.00%	\$0	\$0	0.00	\$0 per Unit
Business Uses	342.56	2,235,920	1.000	342.56	21.14%	\$2,128,811	\$6,214	6,527	\$0.952 per S.F.
TOTAL 1,620.58 1,620.58 100.00% \$ 10,070,963 in Total Existing General Facilities Capital Assets							pital Assets		
						\$ 8.177.266	in City Hall Land/F	acilities	

\$ 1,018,647 in Corporation Yard
 \$ 81,773 in Equity in Existing Computer/Electronic Equipment

\$ 648,000 in General Fund Pool Vehicles
\$ 145,277 in Existing General Facilities Impact Fee Fund Balance

Chapter 6 Public Use (Community Center) Facilities

This important component of the City's offerings to its citizens is distinct from the Park Land and Park Improvements DIF as a separate DIF infrastructure category. This was undertaken for three reasons.

First, few parks contain a community public use center. Secondly, it is difficult to ensure that the cost for such a facility is properly included in the average park development cost per acre. Lastly and perhaps most importantly, it has been the experience of RCS staff that when the cost for community centers is included as a cost of park development, these facilities are not built. This is because the park impact fee revenues get used on the costly demand for turfed park acres with sports or passive-use park improvements.

<u>The Existing System.</u> The City has some facilities currently dedicated to public use; such facilities are available to community groups for meetings, classes, sports activities, and other civic functions. This category of buildings differs from General Facilities which are those used by the City staff to undertake their municipal service duties (City Hall and the City Corporation Yards as good examples).

The City owns some facilities dedicated to a specific use, such as the Ohlone Kidz Center and the Senior Center. Table 6-1 shows the City's existing public meeting facilities.

Public Use Meeting Facility	Square Feet
Hercules Public Library	21,500
Senior Center	4,052
Ohlone Community Center	1,810
Foxboro Community Center`	1,223
Ohlone Kidz Center	2,880
Lupine Kidz Center	4,320
Hercules Community Center	14,621
Teen Center	3,152
Hanna Ranch Kidz Center	4,320
Total Public Use Square Feet	57,878

Table 6-1Inventory of Existing (Owned) Public Meeting Facilities

Based on the net population of 26,063, the 57,878 square feet creates a standard of 1.394 square feet per resident. This standard indicates that the City is committed to providing a community center or recreation space for public groups and individuals. Table 6-2, following, demonstrates the calculation establishing the square foot standard:

[This space has been left vacant in order to place the following table on a single page]

Table 6-2
Calculation of Public Use Facilities
Square Foot Standard

Existing Public Meeting Space Square Feet	57,878
Current City Population	26,063
Square Foot per Resident Standard	2.221

<u>Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Underdeveloped or Undeveloped</u> <u>Parcels</u>. Additional residential dwelling units will increase the population, placing greater demands on the use of the existing community centers. The construction of a detached dwelling unit will create, on average, 3.501 potential new community center users. Adding a new attached dwelling will create, on average, 2.265 potential new users.

<u>The Purpose of the Fee</u>. The purpose of the fee is to determine the cost of expanding the community center and public-use type facilities by some 14,261 square feet to meet the added demands created by the construction of additional residential dwelling units. It should be noted that 14,261 square feet of public use facilities may not fully meet the needs of the build-out community and that the community may desire more square feet. The reference to the 14,261 square feet indicates the amount of additional public use facilities in square feet that DIFs could finance.

Table 6-3, following, demonstrates the calculation of the number of additional square feet required to maintain the existing Public Use facilities standard:

Residential DIF land-use Type	Number of Units Anticipated	Persons per Dwelling	Population Generated
Detached Dwelling Units	40	3.501	140
Attached Dwelling Units	2,773	2.265	6,281
Additional City Resi	6,421		
Square F	2.221		
Public Use Facilities (SF)	14,261		

Table 6-3Square Feet of Community Center SpaceRequired to Maintain Existing Standard

<u>The **Use** of the Fee</u>. The fee, if adopted, would be imposed, collected, and spent on the construction of additional community center space that benefits City of Hercules residents, not rehabilitation of any existing public use facility.

PF-001, Public Use Facilities Expansion – Construct up to 14,261 square feet of generalpurpose public use facilities. Public Use Facilities include, but are not limited to, gymnasiums, senior or teen centers, general-purpose community centers, libraries, galleries, etc. The 14,261 square foot figure is the amount of space that would need to be added to the City's public use inventory to maintain the existing standard of 2.221 square feet per resident at GP build-out. If the city could not expand the existing public use facility inventory, the standard would decrease from 2.221 square feet per city resident to 1.782 square feet per city resident.

<u>The Relationship Between the Need for The Fee and The Type of Development Project</u>. Different types of residential dwellings generally have differing amounts of people dwelling in them. Census data indicates the following occupancy statistics for the City:

<u>The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee</u>. The fee will be used to expand the community center's square feet in proportions consistent with the average number of persons per dwelling. Community centers would be expanded in the following amounts following, by type of residential dwelling:

Detached Dwelling Unit.......3.025 Persons per Unit X 1.394 Square Feet = 7.78 Square Feet Attached Dwelling Unit.......2.265 Persons per Unit X 1.394 Square Feet = 5.03 Square Feet

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility <u>Attributed to the Development Project</u>. The cost of adding 2.221 square feet of building space per person is roughly \$1,573.58 based upon a \$695 per square foot for construction and \$13.50 for parcel hardscape improvements based on a \$4.50 per square foot cost and a floor area ratio of 0.333). A detached dwelling unit with 3.501 persons would require 7.78 square feet of public meeting space at a cost of \$5,509 (7.78 square feet X \$708.50 per square foot, rounded). An attached dwelling unit requires 3.16 square feet of public meeting space at a cost of about \$3,564 (5.03 square feet X \$708.50 per square foot).

Resulting DIFs. Table 6-4 indicates the proposed Public Meeting Facilities DIF.

DIF Land-use Type	Impact Fee Per Unit
Detached Dwelling Unit	\$5,509
Attached Dwelling Unit	\$3,564

Table 11-4Summary of Public Use Facilities Impact Fee

[This space has been left vacant to place the Chapter recommendations on a single page]

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED PUBLIC USE FACILITIES IMPACT FEES

• **General City** - Adopt Schedule 6.1 for the two basic residential dwelling categories.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 6.1

City of Hercules 2024-25 Development Impact Cost Calculation Public Use Facilities

	Buidling Square Feet
Hercules Public Library	21,500
Senior Center	4,052
Ohlone Community Center	1,810
Foxboro Community Center	1,223
Ohlone Kidz Center	2,880
Lupine Kidz Center	4,320
Hercules Community Center	14,621
Teen Center	3,152
Hanna Ranch Kidz Center	4,320
Facilities Represented in Existing DIF Fund Balance (no existing DIF))	0
Existing City-owned Public Use Facilities Square Feet	57,878
Current Population	26,063
Square Foot per Resident Standard	2.221
Average Public Use Facility Construction Cost per Square Foot	\$695.00
Parcel Hardscape Improvements, \$4.50 S.F. and 0.333 Floor Area Ratio	\$13.50
Total Cost for a Single Square Foot of Public Use Space	\$708.50
Total Cost for one Square Foot of Public Use Space	\$708.50
Square Foot per Resident Standard	2.221
Cost per New Resident	\$1,573.58

Cost per Land Use Residential Dwelling Unit	Density per Dwelling Unit	Total Resources
Detached Dwelling Unit	3.501	\$5,509
Attached Dwelling Unit	2.265	\$3,564

Chapter 7 Parkland Acquisition and Park Infrastructure Development

This Chapter summarizes the City's existing inventory of parks and identifies the ratio of parkland per resident allowable under the Quimby Act (§66477 of the Government Code)¹⁰ for residential developments involving the subdivision of land and the Mitigation Fee Act (§66000 of the Government Code) for the construction of residential developments not involving the subdivision of land. The existing per capita standard is then utilized to calculate the park dedication requirement for future residential development.

EXISTING PARKS AND RECREATION SYSTEM

Intensive parks and park recreational facilities constitute one of the City of Hercules's greatest challenges with respect to facilities for both current residents and future citizens. The provision of a well-planned park system, with a variation in the size and nature of facilities offered, is an important amenity to residents of any city, including the City of Hercules. A mixture of passive and active uses and facilities and programs that appeal to a broad spectrum of potential park users is considered optimal in most urban cities. A city's park system and inventory of open space are often a major factor in the selection of a place to live. The current acres dedicated to park use will serve well to meet the City's current needs. However, if the number of improved active/passive park acres remains static at 59 acres, they will not continue to meet recreational demands in light of the increase in the City's population.

The anticipated increase in the City's population due to future residential development will significantly impact the City's park system. This growth will necessitate additional baseball fields and adequate space for various athletic activities. In light of this projected growth, the City's challenge will be to provide new facilities and parkland to meet the recreational needs of these new residents. Without proactive measures such as additional parkland acquisition and continued development of currently underutilized parkland, the City's parks will become overcrowded and overused, leading to a negative experience for park users.

<u>Existing Parks.</u> The City currently owns approximately 58.19 acres of parkland, most of it developed. Duck Pond, Refugio Valley, Ohlone, and Hanna Ranch are the City's largest developed parks, representing over 65% of the park system acreage (when only traditional improved parks are considered) and providing the greatest variety of sports and passive uses.

Table 7-1, on the following page, is an inventory of the existing park acreage.

[This space left vacant in order to place the following table on a single page].

^{10.} Adoption of a Quimby Act Fee requires a park "plan".

Park or Space Name	Owned Park Acres	Developed Park Acres
Bayside Park	0.70	0.70
Duck Pond Park	6.80	6.80
Foxboro Park	3.60	3.60
Frog Pad Park	1.00	1.00
Hanna Ranch Park	10.20	10.20
Ohlone Park	8.20	8.20
Railroad Park	0.60	0.60
Refugio Valley Park	12.70	12.70
Shoreline Park	2.60	2.60
Woodfield Park	6.00	6.00
Beechnut Park	4.70	4.70
Shasta Park	0.50	0.50
Sierra Park	0.40	0.40
Park/OS Equivalent in Fund Balance	0.19	0.19
Total Park Acres	58.19	58.19

 Table 7-1

 Inventory of Owned and Developed Parkland

<u>City De Facto Park Standard.</u> Table 7-2 compares the acreage of parks to the City of Hercules's current population. It indicates that the City presently possesses a total standard of 2.266 acres of owned parkland per 1,000 residents (58.19 acres \div [26,063 residents \div 1,000], rounded). This average is lower than the benchmark of 3.0 acres per 1,000 persons contained in Section 66477 of the California Government Code relating to the dedication of parks.

 Table 7-2

 Calculation of Actual City-owned Improved Park Acres Standard

	Owned Acres	Developed Acres
Total Park Acres	58.19	58.19
Current City Population	26,063	26,063
Population Divided by 1,000	26.063	26.063
Park Acres per 1,000 Population	2.233	2.233

The Quimby Act, to be discussed later, allows a minimum standard of 3.0 acres per thousand residents even if the City does not reach that standard. The Quimby minimum of 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents is greater than the current average of 2.233 acres per 1,000 residents. Thus, the Quimby allowable minimum of 3.0 acres per 1,000 will be used in the remainder of the Chapter for park *construction*. The 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents will be the standard used to calculate the parkland acquisition and park improvements development impact fee. Though not relevant to the City of Shafter, the Quimby Act has a cap of 5.0 acres per thousand residents (Government Code §66447 (a) (2).

<u>Planned Park Improvements</u>. In addition to the ongoing improvement of the existing 58.19 acres¹¹, the City will need to acquire 19.26 park acres, per Table 7-3, and develop these new parks to serve the additional 6,421 residents anticipated to live in the City.

Table 7-3Calculation of RequiredPark Acres per Allowable Standard

General Plan Anticipated Population Increase	6,421
Additional Population Divided by 1,000	6.421
Allowable Standard in Acres/1,000	3.00
Park Acres Required to Maintain Standard	19.26

These general improvements are outlined below:

PK-001 Parkland Acquisition and Improvements – Acquire land for and make improvements to a composite of 19.26 acres of parkland. The parkland could be any type of park, community, sports, neighborhood, historical, etc. Should the City be unable to finance any additional parkland by GP build-out of the 2,813 anticipated residential dwelling units, the standard would drop from 2.266 acres per 1,000 residents to 1.819 acres per 1,000 residents or a 20% decrease from the existing level of service (LOS).

PK-002, Existing Park Fund Balance Projects – This represents the use of the \$136,960 in the existing Park Fund Impact Fee balance.

The 19.26 acres could be constructed in any of the following configurations:

Mini or "Pocket" Parks - These are the smallest of the park designations and, though generally not planned due to higher maintenance costs, usually are the result of acquiring an unusual parcel of land, sometimes with historical significance. The City's Sierra, Beechnut, and Railroad parks best demonstrate this category.

Local or Neighborhood Parks - These parks are generally five to ten acres and serve local (1/4 mile walk-in distance) users. Not surprisingly, the City has a number of these parks. Woodfield, Ohlone, and Duck Pond Park are good examples of this category.

Community or Sports Parks - These parks are most functional when they are twenty acres or larger and are designed to meet the needs of the entire community. Often, ten-to-twenty-acre parks are forced to act as community or sports parks. These needs include youth and adult sports organizations, clubs or associations, and large-scale community events such as 4th of July celebrations or festivals. Refugio Valley and Hana Ranch Park are perfect examples of community or sports parks.

The park and recreation improvements that could be contained within the almost 19.26 needed acres and the existing standard (Table 7-1) are both consistent with the City's Park and Recreation Element of the General Plan.

^{11.} The Quimby Act does allow for the use of receipts raised by the adoption of a Quimby Act park Impact Fee to be used for rehabilitation of existing park configurations.

City of Hercules 2025-26 Update to the Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report

CALCULATION OF PARK DEDICATION STANDARD

Unlike the other facilities discussed in this Report, the California Government Code contains enabling legislation for the acquisition and development of community and neighborhood parks by a City. This legislation, codified as Section 66477 of the Government Code and known commonly as the "Quimby Act," establishes criteria for charging new development for park facilities based on specific park standards. This Report will recommend the adoption of Quimby-style park fees over an AB 1600-style DIF for developments requiring the subdivision of land and an AB 1600 fee for non-subdivided land.

<u>Allowable Park Standard</u> As stated earlier, under §66477 of the Government Code, the City may charge new residential development based on a standard of 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents even if the City does not presently possess a ratio of 3.0 acres per 1,000 for the existing population. The Government Code also enables a city to charge development based on a standard higher than 3.0 acres (to a maximum of 5.0 acres) if the City currently exceeds the minimum benchmark ratio of 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents.

The law states that "if the amount of existing neighborhood and community park area ... exceeds the [3 acres of park area per 1,000 people] limit ... the legislative body may adopt the calculated amount as a higher standard not to exceed 5 acres per 1,000 persons".¹² The City may require park fees provided that the City meets certain conditions, including:

- The amount and location of land to be dedicated or the fees to be paid shall bear a reasonable relationship to the use of the park by the future inhabitants of the subdivision.
- The legislative body has adopted a general plan containing a recreational element, and the park and recreational facilities are in accordance with definite principles and standards contained therein.
- The city ... shall develop a schedule specifying how, when, and where it will use the land or fees, or both, to develop park or recreational facilities ... Any fees collected under the ordinance shall be committed within five years after the payment of such fees.

<u>Determination of a Park Standard.</u> As previously identified, the City currently has 2.233 acres of owned and developed park acres/1,000 residents. The Quimby Act allows the City to adopt a standard of 3.0 acres per thousand as the low-end threshold. However, the 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents standard is the highest standard that can be adopted under the Quimby Act without actually maintaining a standard higher than 3.0 acres/1,000.

CALCULATION OF IMPACT COSTS

Once a per capita standard for parks is determined, the impact of residential development on the city's park system can be computed as follows:

<u>Parkland Acquisition Costs.</u> Land costs will vary significantly from one park to another. The parkland to be acquired must be suitable for park construction and is conservatively estimated at approximately \$250,000 per acre which is used in the park DIF calculation. However, the use of this figure could be criticized if a developer can show that the cost of the residential land they are

^{12.} California Government Code, Title 7, Division 2, Section 66447 (b).

City of Hercules 2025-26 Update to the Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report

developing is currently valued at less than the \$250,000/acre acquisition figure. The fee recommendation at the end of the Chapter will recognize this challenge.

<u>Park Improvements Construction Costs.</u> Park improvement construction costs are based upon a schedule (Appendix E) of common park improvements based on the size of the park and costs from various construction bids received by other clients, as the City does not have any more recent full park construction history. Public use facilities were not included in the cost calculation.

Average Park Acquisition, Development, and Maintenance Vehicles and Facilities Cost per Capita. The combined cost of parkland acquisition, park improvements development, and support facilities cost is \$287,500 per acre (\$250,000/acre for land acquisition, \$37,500 per acre for grading and contiguous infrastructure). If the City were to charge development for the maximum allowable amount of park acreage as allowed in the Quimby Act, then the City would need to acquire 3.0 acres of new parkland for every potential 1,000 new residents to the City. The 3.0 acres of land acquisition and development per 1,000 persons would be \$2,200,973 or about \$2,200.97 per new resident. Schedule 7.1 calculates the cost to develop 3.0 acres, again representing the required parkland cost for 1,000 persons.

Average Cost per Dwelling Unit. Schedule 7.1 further calculates the cost per dwelling unit based on the per-person parkland acquisition and improvement costs of \$2,200.97 (Schedule 7.1) and the average number of persons per unit for each housing category. Detached dwelling units have the highest number of persons per dwelling unit (@ 3.501 per unit) and consequently carry the highest impact fee, \$7,706 per unit (\$2,200.97 X 3.501 persons per unit, rounded). Attached dwelling units have an average of 2.265 persons per unit and need to be assessed at \$4,986 (\$2,200.97.47 X 2.265 rounded). Table 7-4 summarizes the calculated and recommended fees for each of these three residential categories. Schedule 8.1 provides greater park calculation detail and a complete schedule of Parkland Acquisition and Park Improvements DIFs for each of the three dwelling unit types.

DIF Land-use Type	Development Impact Cost		
Detached Dwelling Unit	\$7,706/Unit		
Attached Dwelling Unit	\$4,986/Unit		

Table 7-4Summary of Park Development Fees for
Residential Dwelling Construction

The DIFs for detached dwelling residential development involving the subdivision of land, as identified in Table 7-4, should be adopted under the auspices of the Quimby Act. The DIFs for residential dwelling units not requiring the sub-division of a privately owned parcel will need to be adopted as a Government Code § 66000 supported DIF.¹³

<u>Park Acquisition and DIF Calculation Example.</u> Developers have been allowed to donate sites in the past, and it is in the city's best interest to continue this practice. The size of the park needed to serve the proposed residential development is calculated by multiplying the number of single and detached residences to be developed by the average number of people living in the units.

^{13.} This is required because the Quimby Act is referenced in the State Subdivision Code

City of Hercules 2025-26 Update to the Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report

Land Acquisition Cost Adjustment Challenge. As mentioned previously, the use of \$250,000 as the parkland cost is based upon the assumption that park acreage would likely be close in proximity and thus similar in cost to residential land value of the project the park is intended to serve. However, if the developer or contractor of a dwelling can provide evidence (acceptable to the City) in the form of a recent appraisal of the property they will be developing that the current land value is worth less than the pre-graded \$250,000/acre or \$5.74/square foot cost, the DIF could be adjusted downward accordingly by placing the actual cost of land acquisition into the calculation identified in Schedule 8.1. Again, if the City wishes to adopt such an adjustment, the terms under which the challenge may be made and proved should be included in the Impact Fee Ordinance.

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED PARKLAND ACQUISITION AND PARK INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

• **Residential Housing** - Adopt Schedule 7.1 for Parkland and Park Improvements for the two basic residential land uses.

• Consideration creation of a DIF Fund titled "Quality of Life Infrastructure" and deposit of all revenues from the Library, Public Use Facilities, Parkland Acquisition, and Park Improvements impact fees into this Development Impact Fee Fund.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 7.1

City of Hercules 2024-25 Development Impact Cost Calculation Parkland and Open Space Acquisition and Park Improvements (both Quimby and Mitigation Fee Act Calculations)

	Existing	Improved/
Park Namo	Park	Constructed
	Acres	Faik Acies
Bayside Park	0.70	0.70
Duck Pond Park	6.80	6.80
Foxboro Park	3.60	3.60
Frog Pad Park	1.00	1.00
Hanna Ranch Park	10.20	10.20
Ohlone Park	8.20	8.20
Railroad Park	0.60	0.60
Refugio Valley Park	12.70	12.70
Shoreline Park	2.60	2.60
Woodfield Park	6.00	6.00
Beechnut Park	4.70	4.70
Shasta Park	0.50	0.50
Sierra Park	0.40	0.40
Park/OS Equivalent in Fund Balance	0.19	0.19
Total Acres (Owned/Developed)	58.19	58.19
Current Population	26,063	26,063
Population/1,000	26.06	26.06
Current Standard	2.233	2.233
Minimum Acres/1,000 Population Standard	3.000	3.000
Construction Cost per Acre		\$446,158
Land Acquisition Cost per Acre	\$250,000	
Grading/Contiguous Infrastructure	\$37,500	
Total Cost per Acre	\$287,500	\$446,158
Cost X 3.0 Acre/1,000 Residents Standard	\$862,500	\$1,338,473
Population Served by Standard	1,000.00	1,000.00
Acquisition/Construction Cost per Resident	\$862.50	\$1,338.47

	Occupants/ Dwelling	Land Acquisition	Park Construction	Total Park Costs
Cost per Additional Resident	Ŭ	\$862.50	\$1,338.47	\$2,200.97
Detached Dwelling Unit	3.501	\$3,020	\$4,686	\$7,706
Attached Dwelling Unit	2.265	\$1,954	\$3,032	\$4,986

Appendix A

Summary of Recommendations

Summary of Recommendations

Chapter 3 – Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment

- Create a DIF Fund titled Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment.
- Adopt Schedule 3.2 for the six land uses within the City.

Chapter 4 – Storm Drainage Collection System Facilities

- Create a DIF Fund titled *Storm Drainage Collection System*.
- Adopt Schedule 4.2 for the six land uses within the City.

Chapter 5 - General Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment

• City Wide - Adopt Schedule 5.2 for the six basic land uses.

Chapter 6 - Public Use (Community Center) Facilities

- Create a DIF Fund titled *Public Use Facilities*.
- Adopt Schedule 6.1 for the two differing residential land uses.

Chapter 7 - Park Land Acquisition and Park Infrastructure Development

- Residential Housing Adopt Schedule 7.1 for Park Land and Park Improvements for the two basic residential land uses.
- Consider creating a DIF Fund titled "Quality of Life Infrastructure" and depositing all revenues from the Public Use Facilities, Park Land Acquisition, and Park Improvements impact fees into this Development Impact Fee Fund.

Appendix B

Detailed Land Use Database

City of Hercules

Expanded Land-use Database

2025-26 Development Impact Cost Calculation

Total - Land-use Database	Existing Development			Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
Summary of A, B and C Below	Acres	# of Units		Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units	983.30	5,795	ÌΓ	8.18	40	991.48	5,835
Attached Dwelling Units	294.72	3,273		97.02	2,773	391.74	6,046
Commercial Lodging Units	0.00	0		163.72	360	163.72	360
Retail, Office & Service Uses (SF)	155.60	1,485,950		89.99	316,811	245.59	1,802,761
Industrial Uses (SF)	67.40	364,885		3.96	50,000	71.36	414,885
Institutional Use (SF)	119.56	385,085] [1.00	3,221	120.56	388,306
Total - All City	1,620.58			363.87		363.87	
Residential Dwelling Units	1,278.02	9,068.00	1 [105.20	2,813.00	1,383.22	11,881
Commercial Lodging	0.00	0.00		163.72	360.00	163.72	360
Business Uses	342.56	2,235,920.00		94.95	370,031.85	437.51	2,605,952
Summary Sub-Total	1,620.58	2,244,988	1 🗆	363.87	373,204.85	1,984.45	2,618,193

A. Existing Development	Existing De		
	Acres	# of Units	
Detached Dwelling Units	983.30	5,795	
Attached Dwelling Units	294.72	3,273	
Commercial Lodging Units	0.00	0	
Retail, Office & Service Uses (SF)	155.60	1,485,950	
Industrial Uses (SF)	67.40	364,885	
Institutional Use (SF)	119.56	385,085	
Sub-total - Vacant Land	1,620.58		

Potential Development				
Acres	# of Units			
0.00				

Total General Plan Build-out						
Acres	# of Units					
983.30	5,795					
294.72	3,273					
0.00	0					
155.60	1,485,950					
67.40	364,885					
119.56	385,085					
0.00						

Existing De	g Development Potential Development		velopment	Total General Plan Build-out		
Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	
		8.18	40	8.18	40	
		97.02	2,773	97.02	2,773	
		163.72	360	163.72	360	
		89.99	316,811	89.99	316,811	
		3.96	50,000	3.96	50,000	
		0.00	0	0.00	0	
0.00		362.87		362.87		
	Existing De Acres	Existing Development Acres # of Units	Existing DevelopmentPotential DecemponantAcres# of UnitsAcres8.1897.0297.02163.72163.7289.993.960.000.00362.87	Existing Development Potential Development Acres # of Units Acres # of Units 8.18 40 97.02 2,773 163.72 360 89.99 316,811 3.96 50,000 0.00 0 0.00 362.87 362.87 362.87	Existing Development Potential Development Total General Acres # of Units Acres # of Units Acres 8.18 40 8.18 8.18 8.18 8.18 8.18 8.18 8.18 8.18 97.02	

Appendix C Application of Development Impact Fees on Accessory Dwelling Units

Application of Development Impact Fees Upon Accessory Dwelling Units

Application of Development Impact Fee on Accessory Dwelling Units. The approach that is recommended for the calculation of DIFs for application to the construction of ADUs is to make it a function of the demand of one detached dwelling unit as is consistent with current State statutes. One can assume that the State identified them as function of a detached dwelling DIF as they more closely resemble detached dwellings, albeit smaller in size, as they are largely located within detached dwelling neighborhoods and will likely function as such.

The application of an ADU DIF as a function of a Detached Dwelling is consistent with the recently Chaptered Government Code, Title 7, Division 1, Chapter 13, Article 2 (attached as Attachments A to E).

Section 66324.

(3) (A) A local agency, special district, or water corporation shall not impose any impact fee upon the development of an accessory dwelling unit less than 750 square feet. *Any impact fees charged for an accessory dwelling unit of 750 square feet or more shall be charged proportionately in relation to the square footage of the primary dwelling unit.*

The following Table is an example of a proposed 750-square-foot accessory dwelling unit to be constructed behind a 3,000-square-foot primary dwelling unit. The 750 square feet ADU represents 25.0% of the 3,000 square foot primary unit (750 SF/3,000 SF= 25.0%). The City will also receive a spreadsheet application enabling staff to make other such calculations depending on the facts presented within the ADU application.

<u>Existing Mitigation Fee Act Findings.</u> The five required Government Code §66000 findings within each chapter would apply to the imposition/collection of ADU DIFs. The fees collected would be used to finance the same projects limited for use in that DIF-defined area in each corresponding infrastructure chapter in the 2025-26 Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report.

Square Feet of Attached Dwelling Unit (ADU)	750
Square Feet of Primary Dwelling Unit	3,000
Ratio of ADU to Primary Unit	25.0%
Detached Dwelling Unit Impact Fee	\$14,101
ADU Impact Fee	\$3,525

Appendix D AB-602 Justification

Findings in Support of Continuation of City Policy to Impose Residential Development Impact Fees on a Per Unit Basis

AB-602 (Gov't C. sections 66016.5(a)(5)(A) and (B)) states that if the City adopts a calculation and nexus study after July 1, 2022, it must *either* "calculate a fee imposed on a housing development project proportionately to the square footage of proposed units of the development" *or* make the following findings:

(i) An explanation as to why square footage is not an appropriate metric to calculate fees imposed on housing development projects.

(ii) An explanation that an alternative basis for calculating the fee bears a reasonable relationship between the fee charged and the burden posed by the development.

(iii) That other policies in the fee structure support smaller developments or otherwise ensure that smaller developments are not charged disproportionate fees.

The City is not required to have a financial element in the City's General Plan document. Thus, a properly calculated *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report* functions as the de-facto financial plan in support of the City's General Zoning Plan. It identifies the anticipated service demands by infrastructure based on averages and lays out a fair and reasonable method with which to finance the required capital projects and acquisitions necessary to accommodate those anticipated new service demands.

The City of Hercules has expressed that it will continue to impose residential development impact fees based upon the same manner that additional development service demands are calculated – by type of average unit. The City will not impose development impact fees based on residential development projects proportionate to the square footage of proposed units for completing the City's General Plan. The current set of fees fosters greater accuracy in planning and provides the City with the required level of certainty in impact fee collection.

The California Mitigation Fee Act (Government Code §66000, et. seq.), which was first established in 1987, specifies that every public agency that adopts development impact fees must provide the essential calculation and nexus report with fees calculated upon data that is as empirical as possible. AB-602's *Proportionate to Square Footage* is based upon a presumption that a smaller detached dwelling creates less local government service demands than a larger detached dwelling. AB-602 does not offer any peer-reviewed, third-party empirical data that substantiates that a smaller square foot detached dwelling. As such, the City has determined the best practices for both managing development and obtaining adequate impact fee financing for the development-generated infrastructure as identified in this Report.

The City's zoning code allows for identification of the use of privately held land and, in some cases, primarily business uses, provides for a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) that limits the amount of square feet that can be constructed on an acre of business space. No such limitation is placed upon the construction of a detached dwelling unit (AKA "single-family residence"). The detached dwellings can be a size that the developer determines to be a marketable product.

This Report indicates that the City (using recent GIS data) has 8.18 acres zoned for detached dwellings. Approximately 4.89 detached dwelling units per acre equates to an additional 40 detached dwellings to be constructed by General Plan build-out of the City. However, the City does not have any information on how many square feet any of these 40 detached dwelling units will be, that is, within applicable zoning, determined by the developers of the various parcels.

This Report employs the most defensible empirical sources appropriate to the demands of that particular infrastructure to determine the *average* demands of an *average* detached dwelling. These sources determine demand by an average detached dwelling but do produce this demand data for various-sized detached dwellings. Such data is not available.

The amount of and complexity of any City's infrastructure defines (in all or part) the Level of Service (LOS) of that infrastructure, not just currently but in perpetuity. This makes the one-time DIF financing of any City's infrastructure that much more important. It takes balance to accommodate development with the police responses within the desired standard. It will take a combination of additional law enforcement station space, response and support vehicles, and specialty equipment to support the required officers (non-impact supported). The importance of having a properly calculated and documented DIF schedule in order to accommodate development-related demands cannot be overstated. The same concept holds true for the two labor-intensive public safety services and the infrastructure-intensive services, such as storm drainage collection.

The collection of an impact fee to raise capital revenue for development-based demands is one-time but represents the municipal service needs of that dwelling unit as long as that structure exists. Thus, the argument that any new detached dwelling will generate less municipal service demand based on its smaller square footage is divorced from the reality that any particular residential dwelling may have different occupants over 50 years (e.g., a home for a family of four to a single resident).

Police Calls-for-Service (CFS) - For the calculation of Police demand data, RCS used Hercules- sourced GIS-based calls-for-service matched up with geolocation software. As an example, in 2023, there were 13,856 calls-for-service logged into the dispatch data to the 5,795 existing detached dwellings for an average of 0.511 calls-for-service to a single detached dwelling. Again, the City does not know what size these detached dwellings are, so could not possibly determine the total square feet of 5,795 detached dwellings or the individual square footage of each of those 5,795 dwellings. GIS data does not include the size of each residential dwelling in the City.

Storm Drainage - The storm runoff from a 1,800 square foot single-floor residence is the same as the storm runoff from a 3,600 square foot two-story building. Both have a 1,800-square-foot pad, so a 50% fee for the 1,800-square-foot home compared to the 3,600-square-foot home would be inequitable and unsupported by data. This Report utilizes rainfall runoff data from the *San Bernardino Hydrology Manual* (1986). Williamson and Schmidt, Irvine, CA, Figure C-4. The document indicates that the coefficient of drainage for a development of homes close to seven units per acre is 0.775. No such data is available for large versus small homes.

Quality of Life Infrastructure (parks, aquatic facilities, libraries, and community centers) - Quality of Life standards are based on current population numbers. As an example, there are 36,378 square feet of public use facilities (i.e., community centers). An existing population of 26,091 residents creates an existing standard of 1.394 square feet of public use facilities per resident. A fee for a new square foot of public use facility is determined and then multiplied by the empirically-based average number of persons per type of residential dwelling. These impact fees are generally based on census data that identifies an average number of persons per type of dwelling unit. In Hercules, those figures are 3.501 persons per detached dwelling and 2.265 per attached dwelling unit (see Table 2-4). The Census data does not determine these figures by the dwelling unit size, and thus, they represent the most empirically driven data. Anecdotally, there are likely 1,300 square foot dwellings with anywhere from one, two, or six residents, just as there can be in a 2,600 square foot home. Therefore, an average based on the type of dwelling is far more empirical than dividing the average cost by some unsubstantiated average dwelling size. By doing so, larger residential dwellings could be treated unfairly if they end up being assessed a greater amount in order to balance or subsidize the smaller detached dwelling units based upon the presumption (non-empirical data) that these smaller detached dwelling units somehow create lesser dwelling densities than would a larger unit. Such a subsidy flies in the face of The Mitigation Fee Act.

Importance of a Static or Average Development Impact Fee Schedule. The City must be able to depend on the collection of sufficient impact fee revenues with which to finance development-generated projects necessary to accommodate new development with adequate and sufficient service levels without decreasing the existing levels of service. This assurance will be diminished should the City choose a per residential square foot impact fee schedule. As an example, if a City has identified that a 3,850 square-foot basic 2X2 fire station is required to service an area with about 3,000 average detached dwellings. However, if a greater proportion of the 3,000 homes were far smaller than the City had anticipated, the City would not have adequate DIF revenue to construct that station. With a flat fee representing an average demand per unit, the City can have greater confidence in receiving the DIF revenue necessary to construct that station and thus respond to those 3,000 detached dwellings, regardless of the size of the detached dwellings.

The City's development practices neither favor nor penalize any one land use over another. Nor are the city's policies unfair regarding any one land use. For residential units based upon empirically based averages, all are assessed the same fee; no developer is charged disproportionately. The type of dwelling unit drives the fee, not the square footage. For residential units, all are assessed the same fee; none are charged disproportionately.

Since the City does not impose per square-foot-based impact fees, it also does not apply such fees on any room addition to a residential dwelling.

DIFs for non-residential uses (i.e., the variety of businesses) have always been calculated and imposed on a per-square-foot basis as empirical data is available for those uses. Additionally, each business use (see Table 2-1) has differing maximum allowable floor area ratio (FAR).

The City is mindful that the state is encouraging the construction of smaller detached dwellings and is assuming that these types of residential dwellings create lesser demand merely because they are smaller. However, given the lack of any empirical data supporting such an assumption, the City feels obligated to adopt residential impact fees that are fair to all developers of residential dwellings, regardless of size. In the end, the City has determined to err on the side of fair treatment of all residential development.

In conclusion, given the empirically-based and significant effort spent on identifying the number and capacity of increasing infrastructure projects needed to accommodate the planned-for and anticipated new development and the fair means demonstrated in the calculation and Report, the City has determined that the empirically driven per Unit residential fee is the most appropriate metric with which to calculate and fairly impose the City's schedule of impact fees.

Appendix E Park Construction Cost Average

	2024 Ui	nit ENR %	Current Cost	Unit	5 Acre Neighborhood		15 Acre Community Park		20 Acre Sports Park	
Debile losses Descriptions without the	Add Lines Fort	454.5%	\$400.00 L		1	0007.070	0.000	#045.055	0.700	\$000.0F0
Public Imps, Road/curb, gutter, etc.	\$121 Linear Foot	151.5%	\$183.32 L	Inear Foot	1,080	\$307,978	3,360	\$015,955 \$570,450	3,780	\$592,950
Small Park Grading/Irrigation/Turf	\$25,500 Acre	151.5%	\$36,030 A \$46,360 A	cre	5	\$231,800	13	\$379,430	20	\$772,000
Plant Material:	000,000 71010	101.070	\$10,000 /1			4201,000		00		\$0
Trees-5, 24 Gallon Box/Acre	\$200.00 Each	151.5%	\$303.01 E	ach	25	\$7,575	75	\$22,726	50	\$15,151
Trees-15, 15 Gallon/Acre	\$100.00 Each	151.5%	\$151.50 E	ach	75	\$11,363	225	\$34,088	300	\$45,450
Shrubs-10, Five Gallon	\$19.00 Each	151.5%	\$28.79 E	Each	50	\$1,440	150	\$4,319	100	\$2,879
Shrubs-30, One Gallon	\$7.00 Each	151.5%	\$10.61 E	Each	150	\$1,592	450	\$4,775	300	\$3,183
Play apparatus										
Play Apparatus - Large	\$120,000 Lot	151.5%	\$181,810 Lo	ot East	0	\$0	1	\$181,810	1	\$181,810
Large Apparatus Curbing, 450'	\$18.50 Linear Foot	151.5%	\$28.03 L	inear Foot	0	\$0	450	\$12,614	450	\$12,614
Play Apparatus - Medium	\$80,000 LOL	151.5%	\$121,200 L0	incer Feet	275	\$121,200	750	\$242,400	275	\$121,200
Play Apparatus - Small	\$40.000 Lot	151.5%	\$60,600 1	of	0	\$10,511	2	\$121,023	5/5	\$60,600
Small Aparatus Curbing, 225'	\$18.50 Linear Foot	151.5%	\$28.03 L	inear Foot	0	\$0	450	\$12.614	225	\$6.307
Apparatus Safety Surface	\$2.50 Square Fool	t 151.5%	\$3.79 \$	Square Foot	8.789	\$33.310	36.562	\$138.570	24.609	\$93.268
Buildings:					-,				- 1,000	+,
Restroom - Small	\$60,450 Each	151.5%	\$91,580 E	ach	0	\$0	1	\$91,580	1	\$91,580
Restroom - Large	\$102,300 Each	151.5%	\$154,990 E	ach	0	\$0	1	\$154,990	1	\$154,990
Electrical Service Extension	\$15,000 Each	151.5%	\$22,730 E	ach	0	\$0	2	\$45,460	2	\$45,460
Equipment Storage Facility	\$55,800 Each	151.5%	\$84,540 E	ach	0	\$0	0	\$0	1	\$84,540
Combined Restroom/Concession	\$167,400 Each	151.5%	\$253,620 E	ach	0	\$0	1	\$253,620	2	\$507,240
Parking Lot										
Parking Space 4" A.C. W/6" Rock base	\$1,627.50 Space	151.5%	\$2,465.74 Sc	quare foot	8	\$19,726	150	\$369,861	400	\$986,296
V-gutter	\$7.44 Linear Foot	151.5%	\$11.27 L	inear Foot	96	\$1,082	1,800	\$20,286	4,800	\$54,096
Drain Inlet	\$744 Each	151.5%	\$1,127.19 E	ach	1	\$1,127	8	\$8,454	20	\$22,544
Drain Inlet Connector	\$1,209 Each \$18.00 Linear Feet	151.5%	\$1,831.69 Ea	ach	1	\$1,832	2 700	\$13,738	20	\$36,634
Drive Approach	\$1674 Each	151.5%	\$2.536.00 E	ante rout	144	\$3,927	2,700	\$10,629	7,200	\$190,344
Perimeter Curbing	\$9.30 Linear Foot	151.5%	\$14.09.1	inear Foot	490	\$6 904	3,600	\$50,724	0 000	\$135,264
Parking Lot Striping	\$0.28 Linear Foot	151.5%	\$0.42 L	inear Foot	80	\$34	1,500	\$630	4.000	\$1.680
Exterior Street Lighting Standards	\$1,674 Each	151.5%	\$2,536.00 Ea	ach	4	\$10,144	18	\$45,648	20	\$50,720
Lot Signage	\$186 Lot	151.5%	\$281.80 L	ot	1	\$282	3	\$845	3	\$845
Storm Drainage Facilities (in park)									·	
Inlets	\$744 Each	151.5%	\$1,130 E	Each	2	\$2,260	30	\$33,900	40	\$45,200
Connections	\$1,209 Each	151.5%	\$1,830 E	lach	2	\$3,660	6	\$10,980	8	\$14,640
Lateral (to arterial)	\$18.00 Linear Foot	151.5%	\$27.27 L	inear Foot	1,050	\$28,634	4,725	\$128,851	6,300	\$171,801
Sewer Facilities										
Connection to Arterial	\$1,860 Lot	151.5%	\$2,820 L	.ot	0	\$0	2	\$5,640	2	\$5,640
Line in Street	\$14.50 Linear Foot	151.5%	\$21.97 L	inear Foot	0	\$0	120	\$2,636	120	\$2,636
Line in Faix	\$12.30 Lilleal Pool \$2.700 Each	151.5%	\$10.94 L	inear root	0	\$4.220	030	\$11,932	630	\$11,932
Park Lighting	\$2,750 EBUI	101.070	\$4,230 E	2001		ψ4,230	-	\$10,820	5	φ21,130
Walkway Lighting Standards	\$1.256 Each	151.5%	\$1.900 E	ach	0	\$0	252	\$478.800	235	\$446.880
Duct Work/Wiring	\$767 Each	151.5%	\$1,160 E	ach	3	\$3,480	12	\$13,920	5	\$5,800
Walkway Electical Wiring	\$15 Linear Foot	151.5%	\$20	Each	0	\$0	13,120	\$262,400	8,830	\$176,600
Water Facilities	·									
3" Meter	\$1,860 Each	151.5%	\$2,820 E	Each	1	\$2,820	1	\$2,820	1	\$2,820
#" Backflow Device	\$2,325 Each	151.5%	\$3,520 E	lach	1	\$3,520	1	\$3,520	1	\$3,520
Line in Street	\$11.16 Linear Foot	151.5%	\$20	Linear Foot	1,320	\$26,400	120	\$2,400	120	\$2,400
Water Fountains	\$651.00 Each	151.5%	\$990 8	Each	1	\$990	8	\$7,920	12	\$11,880
Fountain Lines in Park	\$11.16 Linear Foot	151.5%	\$20	Linear Foot	200	\$4,000	1,000	\$20,000	1,000	\$20,000
Concrete Picnic Tables	\$750 Each	151 5%	\$1.140 F	ach	4	\$4.560	60	\$68.400	30	\$34,200
7' x 10' Cement Table Pads	\$1.050 Each	151.5%	\$1,590 F	ach	4	\$6,360	60	\$95,400	30	\$47,200
Individual BBQ Grills	\$326 Each	151.5%	\$493.90 E	ach	2	\$988	30	\$14.817	10	\$4,939
Concrete Benches	\$325 Each	151.5%	\$492.39 E	ach	4	\$1,970	30	\$14,772	15	\$7,386
3' x 6' Concrete Bench Pads	\$270 Each	151.5%	\$409.06 E	ach	4	\$1,636	30	\$12,272	15	\$6,136
Bleachers	\$3,255 Each	151.5%	\$4,930 E	Each	0	\$0	0	\$0	14	\$69,020
Large Covered Picnic Ramada	\$57,660 Each	151.5%	\$87,360 E	ach	0	\$0	2	\$174,720	0	\$0
Individual Covered Picnic Pad	\$13,950 Each	151.5%	\$21,130 E	ach	4	\$84,520	20	\$422,600	4	\$84,520
User Electrical Service	\$9,300 Each	151.5%	\$14,090 E	ach	0	\$0	2	\$28,180	1	\$14,090
Elecancal Service per Group area	\$1,103 Each	151.5%	\$1,760 E	aut -	1	\$1,760	6	\$10,560	4	\$7,040
Basketball Courts	\$50.350 Each	151 5%	\$76 280	ach	· ·	\$0	2	\$152 560	A	\$305 120
Basketball Court Lighting	\$32,550 Each	151.5%	\$49.310 F	ach	0	04 80	0	\$0 \$0	4	\$197 240
Fenced Tennis Courts	\$55,800 Each	151.5%	\$84,540 E	ach	0	\$0	2	\$169,080	6	\$507,240
Tennis Court Lighting	\$32,550 Each	151.5%	\$49,310 E	ach	0	\$0	0	\$0	6	\$295,860
Baseball Field - Competitive	\$46,500 Each	151.5%	\$70,450 E	ach	0	\$0	0	\$0	6	\$422,700
Ballfield Lighting	\$186,000 Per two fields	5 151.5%	\$281,800 P	er two fields	0	\$0	0	\$0	4	\$1,127,200
Baseball Field - Recreational	\$13,950 Each	151.5%	\$21,130 E	ach	1	\$21,130	6	\$126,780	0	\$0
Soccer Field (crowned)	\$16,740 Each	151.5%	\$25,360 E	ach	0	\$0	0	\$0	4	\$101,440
Skatepark	\$17.50 Square Foot	151.5%	\$26.50 E	lach	0	\$0	14,400	\$381,600	21,600	\$572,400
Pedestrian Walkway			···· · · · · · ·							
5' Wide	\$75.00 Linear Foot	151.5%	\$113.63 L	inear Foot	1,680	\$190,898	1,680	\$190,898	1,050	\$119,312
0 wide	\$109.00 Linear Foot	151.5%	\$122.72 L	inear Foot	1,000	\$200,170	2,940	\$200,170	3 780	\$128,638
Miscellaneous Flatwork	\$15,00 Square Foot	151.5%	\$22.73.1	inear Foot	500	φυ \$11.365	2,040	\$193 205	4 000	\$90.920
Small Park Signage	\$4,650 Lot	151.5%	\$7.040 1		1	\$7.040	0,000	\$1.50,200	-,000	\$0
Large Park Signage	\$15,000 Lot	151.5%	\$22,730 L	ot	0	\$0	1	\$22,730	1	\$22,730
Bike Rack/Pad	\$1,395 Each	151.5%	\$2,110 E	ach	2	\$4,220	9	\$18,990	12	\$25,320
Natural Element Improvement (Lake, etc)	\$375,000 Each	151.5%	\$568,140 E	ach	0	\$0	1	\$568,140	0	\$0
Small concrete stage	\$29,060 Each	151.5%	\$44,030 E	ach	1	\$44,030	2	\$88,060	1	\$44,030
Medium Ampitheater/bandshell	\$139,500 Each	151.5%	\$211,350 E	ach	0	\$0	1	\$211,350	0	\$0
				Total Cost	1	\$1,441,004		\$7,786,119		\$10,198,752
			A	I otal Acres	4	5 6289-204		15		\$500.029
	Total Cost per Park		Average	oost per Acre	1	\$1,441 004		\$7,786 119		\$10,198,752
	Number of Parks			15.00	1	9		3		3
	Total Cost of Parks			\$66,923.649	1	\$12,969.036		\$23,358.357		\$30,596.256
	Total Improved Park Acres			150.00	1	45		45		60
					1	-				

\$446,157.66

Total Cost of Parks Total Improved Park Acres arage Construction Cost per Park Acre Appendix F Comparison of Existing and New Development Impact Fees

Development Impact Fees to be Updated								
Land	Law Enfo	rcement	General Go	vernment	Parkland			
Use	Current Fee	New Fee	Current Fee	New Fee	Current Fee	New Fee		
Detached Dwelling Unit								
(Single Family)	\$1,522.00	\$234.00	\$858.00	\$148.00	\$1,770.00	\$7,706.00		
Attached Dwelling Unit (Multi								
Family)	\$950.00	\$249.00	\$538.00	\$148.00	\$1,072.00	\$4,986.00		
Commercial Lodging (Hotel)								
Per Room	\$31.00	\$160.00	\$28.00	\$1,803.00	N/A	No Fee		
Retail, Office & Service Uses								
(Commercial Retail) Per SF	\$0.51	\$2.74	\$0.28	\$1.02	N/A	No Fee		
Industrial Uses Per SF	\$0.22	\$0.35	\$0.49	\$1.02	N/A	No Fee		
Institutional Uses Per SF	N/A	\$0.29	N/A	\$1.02	N/A	No Fee		

New Development Impact Fees					
Land	Storm	Public Use			
Use	Drainage	Facilities			
Detached Dwelling Unit					
(Single Family)	\$504.00	\$5,509.00			
Attached Dwelling Unit (Multi					
Family)	\$93.00	\$3,564.00			
Commercial Lodging (Hotel)					
Per Room	\$1,332.00	No Fee			
Retail, Office & Service Uses					
(Commercial Retail) Per SF	\$0.85	No Fee			
Industrial Uses Per SF	\$0.25	No Fee			
Institutional Uses Per SF	\$0.93	No Fee			

Unchanged Development I	mpact Fees				
Land	Public Benefit for the	Fire	Transportation	Sewer	West County Sub-Regional
Use	Bayfront Project	Facilities	Facilities	Facilities	Transportation Mitigation Fee
Single Family	\$4,000.00	\$1,886.00	\$6,204.00	\$4,857.00	\$6,964.00
		Apartment:			
Multi Family		\$1,163			
	\$2,350.00	ADU: \$881	\$3,511.00	\$4,857.00	\$3,431.00
Hotel Per Room	\$0.20	\$114.00	\$2,277.00	\$1,878.00	\$4,457.00
Commercial Retail Per SF	\$0.20	\$1.00	\$8.00	\$0.62	\$8.44
Office Per SF	\$0.20	\$1.00	\$6.00	\$1.00	\$11.17
Industrial Per SF	None	\$1.00	\$6.00	\$1.00	\$7.12

End of Report