

**Table 8.4** shows the resulting per capita standards of park acres and total estimated per capita value of park facilities for the service population of unincorporated area residents. The acres per capita are shown for information purposes. The per capita value is used in the impact fee calculations because many of the planned new park improvements involve improvements to existing regional park land and not necessarily the purchase of additional park acres. The value per capita is significantly higher in Western Riverside County compared to Eastern Riverside County, reflecting in part the many more natural acres of County parkland provided in Western Riverside County on a per capita basis.

**Table 8.4: Existing Regional Parks Facility Standards for Unincorporated Area**

Facility Inventory	A		B	C	D = A/(B/1,000)		E = B x C	
	Facility Inventory		Service Population	Total Value Allocated to Unincorporated Areas	Facility Standard		Cost Standard	
	Natural Parkland	Developed Parkland			Facility Units	Developed Park Acres Per 1,000 Capita	Natural Park Acres Per 1,000 Capita	Value per Capita
Eastern Riverside County	1,337	161	acres	89,000	\$ 8,812,521	1.81	15.02	\$ 99
Western Riverside County	24,628	672	acres	283,000	79,657,804	2.37	87.02	281

Sources: Tables 8.1 - 8.3; County of Riverside; Willdan Financial Services.

## Fee Schedule

**Table 8.5** shows the regional parks fee schedule. The cost per capita calculated for Eastern and Western Riverside County is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit densities (persons per dwelling unit).

The total fee includes a two percent (2%) percent administrative charge to fund costs that include: a standard overhead charge applied to all County programs for legal, accounting, and other departmental and Countywide administrative support, and fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, two percent of the base fee adequately covers the cost of fee program administration. The administrative charge is not an impact fee; rather, it is a user fee. It should be reviewed and adjusted during comprehensive impact fee updates to ensure that revenue generated from the charge sufficiently covers, but does not exceed, the administrative costs associated with the fee program.

**Table 8.5: Regional Parks Fee Schedule**

Land Use	A	B	C = A x B	D = C x 0.02	E = C + D
	Cost Per Capita	Density	Base Fee <sup>1</sup>	Admin Charge <sup>1, 2</sup>	Total Fee <sup>1</sup>
<i>Eastern Riverside County</i>					
<i>Residential</i>					
Single Family Unit	\$ 99	2.97	\$ 294	\$ 6	\$ 300
Multi-family Unit	99	2.06	204	4	208
<i>Western Riverside County</i>					
<i>Residential</i>					
Single Family Unit	\$ 281	2.97	\$ 835	\$ 17	\$ 852
Multi-family Unit	281	2.06	579	12	591

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

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

Sources: Tables 8.1 - 8.3; County of Riverside; Willdan Financial Services.

## Proposed Regional Park Facilities

Table 8.6 shows proposed regional park facilities submitted by Riverside County, along with projected costs for these facilities. Like existing facilities, park facilities are divided according to whether they are located in Eastern or Western Riverside County.

**Table 8.6: Proposed Regional Park Facilities**

Name	City/Unincorporated	Facilities (Acres) <sup>1</sup>	Total Value	Offsetting Revenues	Costs Allocated to New Unincorporated Growth
<i>Eastern Riverside County</i>					
Lake Cahuilla Recreation Area Improvements <sup>2</sup>	City of La Quinta	N/A	\$ 600,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 250,000
Mayflower Park Expansion & Improvements - Campsite <sup>3</sup>	Unincorporated	N/A	8,000,000	620,000	7,380,000
Mayflower Park Expansion & Improvements - Irrigation System <sup>4</sup>	Unincorporated	N/A	2,000,000	-	2,000,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$10,600,000</b>	<b>\$ 970,000</b>	<b>\$ 9,630,000</b>
<i>Western Riverside County</i>					
Louis Robidoux Nature Center Improvements <sup>5</sup>	Unincorporated	2.00	\$ 234,500	\$ 184,500	\$ 50,000
Rancho Jurupa Park/Headquarters Expansion & Improvements <sup>6</sup>	Unincorporated	45.00	12,000,000	-	12,000,000
Gilman Historic Ranch Expansion <sup>7</sup>	City of Banning	75.00	2,250,000	-	2,250,000
Lawler Lodge Expansion & Improvements <sup>8</sup>	Unincorporated	10.00	3,000,000	-	3,000,000
Lake Skinner Recreation Area Improvements, Temecula <sup>9</sup>	Unincorporated	20.00	4,000,000	150,000	3,850,000
Hurkey Creek Park Expansion - Water Playground <sup>10</sup>	Unincorporated	N/A	1,500,000	-	1,500,000
Jenson Alvarado Ranch Expansion - Visitor Center <sup>11</sup>	Unincorporated	20.00	6,000,000	-	6,000,000
Bogart Park Campground Expansion <sup>12</sup>	Unincorporated	60.00	3,000,000	2,000,000	1,000,000
Idyllwild Park <sup>13</sup>	Unincorporated	50.00	3,000,000	-	3,000,000
San Timoteo Regional Park - Campsite <sup>14</sup>	Unincorporated	N/A	1,500,000	-	1,500,000
<b>Total</b>		<b>232.00</b>	<b>\$36,484,500</b>	<b>\$ 2,334,500</b>	<b>\$ 34,150,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> Approximate size of facilities provided by Riverside County.

<sup>2</sup> Zero-depth water play facility.

<sup>3</sup> Project includes creation of an RV campground (80-100 sites), a camp store, a new boat dock (proper access to river due to river current issues), maintenance building for Park District staff, and nine (9) 400 square foot cabins with full utilities.

<sup>4</sup> Water system expansion through river, storm water, and runoff storage in a lagoon serving the dual purpose of recreation for small children (due to safety issues because of Colo River current) and using surplus water for irrigation of new campground minimizing demands on domestic water.

<sup>5</sup> Expansion to the entry and parking along Riverview Drive.

<sup>6</sup> Ph. 4 includes expansion of full hook-up campground services, RV dry storage, creation of 50-acre ft lake for water recreation using surplus water for irrigation through well & storm water (WQMD) storage.

<sup>7</sup> Expansion of parking for special events, re-creation of original barn for interpretive use and maintenance area.

<sup>8</sup> Facility improvements include expansion ADA accessibility within the Lodge Building. Expansion and rerouting of the existing on-site waste disposal system.

<sup>9</sup> 150 full hook-up campsites, new restroom facility (1800 sq ft), ADA shade shelters, and new maintenance facility (3000 sq ft).

<sup>10</sup> Zero-depth water play facility.

<sup>11</sup> Expansion of the Historic Ranch & Museum through property acquisition, Development of new visitors center for site orientation, artifact storage, support facilities, historic exhibits, restrooms. Redesign and expansion of primitive camp stalls (est. 50-100 sites); new 500 sq ft restroom; installation of City connected sewer system; redesign and expansion of road system needed as a result of Water District's construction.

<sup>12</sup> Installation of a new restroom (1000sqft), 30 new full hook-up campsites, expanding capacity of water and septic system.

<sup>13</sup> Phase 1: kiosk (875 sq ft) and campground (estimate 75-100 campsites) on new property next to existing Historic site.

Sources: County of Riverside; Willdan Financial Services.

## Projected Fee Revenue

**Table 8.7** shows estimated fee revenues generated by projected new development in Eastern and Western Riverside County by 2010. Regional county parks facilities impact fee revenue in Eastern Riverside County is anticipated to reach \$9.6 million. This is approximately \$1 million less than the planned facilities for submitted for Eastern Riverside County parks, and \$970,000 has already been identified by other non-fee funding sources. The remaining \$27,000 may be funded by other non-fee sources. In Western Riverside County, the regional county parks facilities impact fee is forecast to generate approximately \$4.4 million. Planned facilities submitted for Western Riverside County total an estimated \$36.5 million. Impact fees and identified offsetting revenues will fund \$26.8 million, leaving approximately \$9.7 million of planned park facilities and improvements that will either be unfunded or will need to be funded by non-impact fee sources.

**Table 8.7: Regional Parks Projected Fee Revenue and Other Funding Needed**

<i>Eastern Riverside County</i>	
Cost of Planned Park Improvements	\$ 10,600,000
Identified Offsetting Revenues	970,000
Remainder	\$ 9,630,000
Cost per Capita	\$ 99
Unincorporated Service Population Growth (2010-2020)	97,000
Estimated Fee Revenue	\$ 9,603,000
Other Funding Needed	\$ 27,000
<i>Western Riverside County</i>	
Cost of Planned Park Improvements	\$ 36,484,500
Identified Offsetting Revenues	2,334,500
Remainder	\$ 34,150,000
Cost per Capita	\$ 281
Unincorporated Service Population Growth (2010-2020)	87,000
Estimated Fee Revenue	\$ 24,447,000
Other Funding Needed	\$ 9,703,000

Note: Numbers may not sum due to rounding.

Sources: Tables 8.1 - 8.6; Willdan Financial Services.

# 9. Regional Trails

---

Much like the regional county parks system, the regional trail system includes trails that have a significant number of users coming from both the incorporated and unincorporated areas of the County. The purpose of this fee is to generate revenue to fund the share of planned improvements to these region-serving trails attributed to new development in unincorporated areas. This fee provides a revenue source to help fund facilities that will benefit development in unincorporated areas.

## Service Population

Residents are the primary users of trails. Therefore, demand for trail facilities is based on residential population and excludes workers. **Table 9.1** provides estimates of the current resident population in the unincorporated areas of Eastern and Western Riverside County, along with a projection for the year 2020. Table 9.1 also shows the relative percent of unincorporated area residents to total residents in Eastern and Western Riverside County.

## Facility Inventories & Standards

The regional trails impact fee is calculated using the existing inventory method for Western Riverside County and the planned facilities method for Eastern Riverside County. The reason for the use of the planned facilities method will be explained below. Under the existing inventory method, the total value of existing facilities is divided by the existing service population to determine a facility standard per capita. The total value of existing facilities is divided by the existing service population to determine a facility standard in terms of value per capita.

**Table 9.2** begins by dividing regional trail facilities according to their location. Because there are significant distances between Eastern and Western Riverside County, it is assumed that residents in Eastern Riverside County are on average more likely to access and use regional trails in the eastern portion of the county and that similarly Western Riverside County residents use regional trails in the western portion of the county.

## Regional Trail Cost Assumptions

Table 9.2 also shows the estimated value of regional trail facilities in Riverside County. These estimates, based on cost experience and provided by the Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District, assume that each developed mile of trail right of way is worth \$500,000 and each natural mile in Riverside County is worth \$300,000. The total value of regional trail facilities in Eastern Riverside County is approximately \$41.2 million. The total value of regional trail facilities in Western Riverside County is estimated to be approximately \$112.8 million.

**Table 9.1: Regional Trails Service Population**

	Residents	Percent of Total Service Population
<i>Population 2010</i>		
Eastern Riverside County		
Incorporated	417,000	82.4%
Unincorporated	89,000	17.6%
Subtotal	506,000	100.0%
Western Riverside County		
Incorporated	1,455,000	83.7%
Unincorporated	283,000	16.3%
Subtotal	1,738,000	100.0%
<i>New Development (2010-2020)</i>		
Eastern Riverside County		
Incorporated	106,000	52.2%
Unincorporated	97,000	47.8%
Subtotal	203,000	100.0%
Western Riverside County		
Incorporated	276,000	76.0%
Unincorporated	87,000	24.0%
Subtotal	363,000	100.0%
<i>Total (2020)</i>		
Eastern Riverside County		
Incorporated	523,000	73.8%
Unincorporated	186,000	26.2%
Subtotal	709,000	100%
Western Riverside County		
Incorporated	1,731,000	82.4%
Unincorporated	370,000	17.6%
Total	2,101,000	100.0%

Note: Numbers may not sum due to rounding.

Sources: Table 2.1; County of Riverside; Willdan Financial Services.

### Allocation to Unincorporated Area Service Populations

By the nature of the type of facility, trails are almost always located in unincorporated areas. However, trails are provided for and used by all County residents. Consequently trails have been allocated to unincorporated area residents based on the percentage of unincorporated area residents to total residents in Eastern and Western Riverside County, respectively. Table 9.2 also shows the allocation factors for regional trail facilities used by residents in unincorporated areas. Approximately \$7.3 million of regional trail value in Eastern Riverside County is allocated to existing unincorporated area development and almost \$18.5 million in regional trail value is allocated to unincorporated development in Western Riverside County.

**Table 9.2: Existing Inventory of Regional Trails As Of January 1, 2010**

Trail Facility	Developed Trail Miles		Facility Inventory		Total Trail Miles	Facility Units	Total Facility Value <sup>1</sup>	Allocation Factor	Value Allocated to Unincorporated Service Population
	Trail Miles	Natural Trail Miles	Natural Trail Miles	Total Trail Miles					
<i>Eastern Riverside County</i>									
Desert Hot Springs Trail	-	15.0	15.0	15.0	miles	\$ 4,500,000	17.6%	\$ 792,000	
Dillon Road Trail Development Project	-	35.0	35.0	35.0	miles	10,500,000	17.6%	1,848,000	
Vista Santa Rosa Trail	-	5.0	5.0	5.0	miles	1,500,000	17.6%	264,000	
Whitewater Trail	2.0	47.0	49.0	49.0	miles	15,100,000	17.6%	2,657,600	
All American Canal Trail	-	20.0	20.0	20.0	miles	6,000,000	17.6%	1,056,000	
Colorado River Trail	-	12.0	12.0	12.0	miles	3,600,000	17.6%	633,600	
Subtotal	2.0	134.0	136.0	136.0		\$ 41,200,000		\$ 7,251,200	
<i>Western Riverside County</i>									
Bain Street Trail	1.5	2.4	3.9	3.9	miles	\$ 1,470,000	16.3%	\$ 239,600	
Bogart Park Trail	1.5	-	1.5	1.5	miles	750,000	16.3%	122,300	
Box Springs Mountain Trails	17.0	-	17.0	17.0	miles	8,500,000	16.3%	1,385,500	
Harford Spring Trail	2.3	-	2.3	2.3	miles	1,150,000	16.3%	187,500	
Hidden Valley Trails	20.0	-	20.0	20.0	miles	10,000,000	16.3%	1,630,000	
Highgrove Trail	-	11.0	11.0	11.0	miles	3,300,000	16.3%	537,900	
Idyllwild Park Trails	3.0	-	3.0	3.0	miles	1,500,000	16.3%	244,500	
Lake Skinner Trails	1.5	-	1.5	1.5	miles	750,000	16.3%	122,300	
Louis Robidoux Nature Trail	-	2.0	2.0	2.0	miles	600,000	16.3%	97,800	
McCall Park Trails	40.0	-	40.0	40.0	miles	20,000,000	16.3%	3,260,000	
Mockingbird Canyon Trails	1.0	-	1.0	1.0	miles	500,000	16.3%	81,500	
Mockingbird Canyon-Harford Springs Trail	-	4.5	4.5	4.5	miles	1,350,000	16.3%	220,100	
Murrieta Creek Trail	5.5	-	5.5	5.5	miles	2,750,000	16.3%	448,300	
Salt Creek Trail	5.0	8.5	13.5	13.5	miles	5,050,000	16.3%	823,200	
San Jacinto River Trail	-	16.0	16.0	16.0	miles	4,800,000	16.3%	782,400	
Santa Ana River Trail Expansion & Development	19.0	4.4	23.4	23.4	miles	10,820,000	16.3%	1,763,700	
Santa Rosa Plateau Trails	50.0	-	50.0	50.0	miles	25,000,000	16.3%	4,075,000	
Temecula Creek Trail	3.0	3.5	6.5	6.5	miles	2,550,000	16.3%	415,700	
Temescal Canyon Trail Project	2.0	13.0	15.0	15.0	miles	4,900,000	16.3%	798,700	
Double Butte Trail	-	1.0	1.0	1.0	miles	300,000	16.3%	48,900	
Kabian Trail	-	1.0	1.0	1.0	miles	300,000	16.3%	48,900	
Wine Country Trails	-	15.0	15.0	15.0	miles	4,500,000	16.3%	733,500	
May Stone Trail	-	0.5	0.5	0.5	miles	150,000	16.3%	24,500	
San Timoteo Canyon Trail	-	6.0	6.0	6.0	miles	1,800,000	16.3%	293,400	
Subtotal	172.3	88.8	267.1	267.1		\$ 112,790,000		\$ 18,385,200	

<sup>1</sup>Facility values are estimated to be \$300,000 per mile of natural/multi-purpose trail and \$500,000 per mile for bike and other more highly developed trails.

<sup>2</sup>Allocation factor is based on the percent of unincorporated populations relative to total populations for Eastern and Western Riverside County.

Sources: Table 9.1, Riverside County; Willdan Financial Services.



## Cost of Proposed New Facilities

**Table 9.3** shows planned regional trail facilities submitted by Riverside County, along with projected costs for these facilities. Like existing facilities, planned facilities are divided according to whether they are located in Eastern or Western Riverside County. County staff has identified offsetting revenues for several projects.



**Table 9.3: Proposed Regional Trail Facilities**

Name	From	To	Facilities	Facility Units	Total Cost	Offsetting Revenues <sup>1</sup>	Costs Allocated to New Unincorporated Growth
<b>Eastern Riverside County</b>							
Desert Hot Springs Trail	City of Palm Springs	City of Desert Hot Springs	5-8	miles	\$ 3,500,000	\$ -	\$ 3,500,000
Dillon Road Trail Development Project <sup>2</sup>	Thousand Palms Rd	Desert Edge Community	8-10	miles	250,000	50,000	200,000
Vista Santa Rosa Trail	Avenue 66	Airport Blvd	5.00	miles	2,250,000	-	2,250,000
Subtotal					\$ 6,000,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 5,950,000
<b>Western Riverside County</b>							
Highgrove Trail Phase 2	City of Moreno Valley	Unincorporated Area of Highgrove	6.00	miles	\$ 4,800,000	\$ -	\$ 4,800,000
Santa Ana River Trail Expansion & Development Phase 7	City of Norco	City of Corona	6.00	miles	6,000,000	4,350,000	1,650,000
Santa Ana River Trail Expansion & Development Phase 8	Crestview	River Road	4.00	miles	8,500,000	3,650,000	4,850,000
Santa Ana River Trail Expansion & Development Phase 9	City of Norco	Hidden Valley Wildlife Area	2.00	miles	3,000,000	2,000,000	1,000,000
Harford Spring Trail <sup>3</sup>	Harford Springs Park	Mockingbird Archeological site	2.30	miles	1,000,000	-	1,000,000
Salt Creek Trail Phase 1	Canyon Lake	Murieta Rd	2.30	miles	2,300,000	1,300,000	1,000,000
Salt Creek Trail Phase 2	Murieta Rd	Menifee Lakes	2.60	miles	2,600,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
Salt Creek Trail Phase 3	Menifee Rd	Leon Rd	2.20	miles	2,350,000	1,000,000	1,350,000
San Jacinto River Trail Phase 1	Briggs Rd	Nuevo Rd	7.80	miles	3,963,500	2,663,500	1,300,000
San Jacinto River Trail Phase 2	Briggs Rd	San Jacinto River Park	5.50	miles	3,565,000	1,520,000	2,045,000
Subtotal			40.70		\$ 38,078,500	\$ 17,783,500	\$ 20,295,000

<sup>1</sup> Anticipated grant funding.  
<sup>2</sup> Existing commitment is for Coachella to Thousand Palms Road.  
<sup>3</sup> Existing commitment is for purchase of land.

Sources: County of Riverside; Willdan Financial Services.

## Per Capita Facility Standards

**Table 9.4** shows the cost per capita of existing and planned regional trail facilities included in this study. The value of total regional trail facilities over the total service population is anticipated to fall in Eastern Riverside County, and rise in Western Riverside County through 2020. Because the submitted planned facilities for trails in Eastern Riverside County actually yield a lower per capita amount than the existing standard, the fees are calculated based on the planned facilities standard rather than the existing inventory standard. Otherwise more money would be collected than needed to construct the identified planned trails.

**Table 9.4: Regional Trails Per Capita Cost of Facilities Comparison**

	A Facility Value	B Service Population	C = A/B Cost Per Capita	Percent Change
<i>Eastern Riverside County</i>				
2010 Existing Facilities	\$ 7,251,200	89,000	\$ 81	
Proposed Facilities	5,950,000	97,000	61	-24.69%
<i>Western Riverside County</i>				
2010 Existing Facilities	\$ 18,385,200	283,000	\$ 65	
Proposed Facilities	20,295,000	87,000	233	258.46%

Sources: Tables 9.1-9.3; Willdan Financial Services.

## Fee Schedule

**Table 9.5** shows the regional trails facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita applicable to Eastern and Western Riverside County is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit densities.

The total fee includes a two percent (2%) percent administrative charge to fund costs that include: a standard overhead charge applied to all County programs for legal, accounting, and other departmental and Countywide administrative support, and fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, two percent of the base fee adequately covers the cost of fee program administration. The administrative charge is not an impact fee; rather, it is a user fee. It should be reviewed and adjusted during comprehensive impact fee updates to ensure that revenue generated from the charge sufficiently covers, but does not exceed, the administrative costs associated with the fee program.

**Table 9.5: Regional Trails Fee Schedule**

Land Use	A	B	C = A x B	D = C x 0.02	E = C + D
	Cost Per Capita	Density	Base Fee <sup>1</sup>	Admin Charge <sup>1, 2</sup>	Total Fee <sup>1</sup>
<i>Eastern Riverside County</i>					
<i>Residential</i>					
Single Family Unit	\$ 61	2.97	\$ 181	\$ 4	\$ 185
Multi-family Unit	61	2.06	126	3	129
<i>Western Riverside County</i>					
<i>Residential</i>					
Single Family Unit	\$ 65	2.97	\$ 193	\$ 4	\$ 197
Multi-family Unit	65	2.06	134	3	137

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

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

Sources: Riverside County; Tables 2.4; 9.1 - 9.4 ; Willdan Financial Services.

## Projected Fee Revenue

Table 9.6 shows estimated fee revenues generated by projected new development in Eastern and Western Riverside County by 2010. Regional trails facilities impact fee revenue in Eastern Riverside County is anticipated to reach approximately \$5.9 million. This amount is expected to offset the total cost of planned facilities for this portion of the County, leaving no amount of planned facilities unfunded. Trail facilities impact fee revenue for Western Riverside County totals an estimated \$5.7 million, leaving approximately \$14.6 million worth of facilities costs to be funded by non-fee sources.

**Table 9.6: Regional Trails Projected Fee Revenue and Other Funding Needed**

<i>Eastern Riverside County</i>	
Cost of Regional Trails	\$ 6,000,000
Identified Offsetting Revenues	50,000
Remainder	\$ 5,950,000
Cost per Capita	\$ 61
Unincorporated Service Population Growth (2010-2020)	97,000
Estimated Fee Revenue	\$ 5,917,000
Other Funding Needed	\$ -
<i>Western Riverside County</i>	
Cost of Regional Trails	\$ 38,078,500
Identified Offsetting Revenues	17,783,500
Remainder	\$ 20,295,000
Cost per Capita	\$ 65
Unincorporated Service Population Growth (2010-2020)	87,000
Estimated Fee Revenue	\$ 5,655,000
Other Funding Needed	\$ 14,640,000

Note: Numbers may not sum due to rounding.

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 9.1 - 9.4; Willdan Financial Services.

# 10. Flood Control

---

The purpose of this fee is to generate revenue to fund flood control facilities in the Upper San Jacinto Valley and Mead Valley/Good Hope Area Plans. A fee that would enable Riverside County to construct flood control facilities needed to serve new development is presented in this chapter. This fee would be imposed in the unincorporated portions of the Upper San Jacinto Valley and Mead Valley/Good Hope Area Plans.

## Service Population

Flood control facilities are necessary to both residents and businesses. Therefore, demand for flood control facilities is based on the service population of both unincorporated residents and workers. Workers are weighted at a factor of 0.31 workers per resident based on a ratio of 40-hours per week employees spend at work to the 128 hours per week employees spend outside of work. The service population presented in **Table 10.1** below consists of residents and weighted workers in the Upper San Jacinto Valley and Mead Valley/Good Hope Area Plans. The total service population and the unincorporated only service populations is shown for each Area Plan.

**Table 10.1: Flood Control Service Population**

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D=A+BxC</b>
	<b>Residents</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Worker Demand Factor</b>	<b>Service Population</b>
<b><u>Population 2010</u></b>				
Upper San Jacinto Valley Area Plan (AP No. 10)	177,945	24,389	0.31	185,510
Mead Valley/Good Hope Area Plan (AP No. 13)	74,470	10,623	0.31	77,760
<b><u>New Development (2010-2020)</u></b>				
Upper San Jacinto Valley Area Plan (AP No. 10)	85,568	16,683	0.31	70,740
Mead Valley/Good Hope Area Plan (AP No. 13)	25,359	1,441	0.31	25,810
<b><u>Total (2020)</u></b>				
Upper San Jacinto Valley Area Plan (AP No. 10)	243,513	41,062	0.31	256,250
Mead Valley/Good Hope Area Plan (AP No. 13)	99,829	12,064	0.31	103,570
<b><u>Unincorporated Population 2010</u></b>				
Upper San Jacinto Valley Area Plan (AP No. 10)	41,003	24,389	0.31	48,570
Mead Valley/Good Hope Area Plan (AP No. 13)	16,602	10,623	0.31	22,100
<b><u>Unincorporated New Development (2010-2020)</u></b>				
Upper San Jacinto Valley Area Plan (AP No. 10)	14,222	16,683	0.31	19,360
Mead Valley/Good Hope Area Plan (AP No. 13)	9,716	612	0.31	9,900
<b><u>Total Unincorporated (2020)</u></b>				
Upper San Jacinto Valley Area Plan (AP No. 10)	55,225	41,062	0.31	67,980
Mead Valley/Good Hope Area Plan (AP No. 13)	28,518	11,235	0.31	32,000

Note: Numbers may not sum due to rounding.

Source: County of Riverside TLMA; Willdan Financial Services.

## Facility Inventories & Standards

This study uses the system plan method to calculate a fee schedule for flood control facilities (see *Introduction* for further information). Table 10.2 shows the planned flood control facility standard per capita in terms of cost. As the proposed new flood control facilities will benefit both existing and anticipated new development, the cost of planned flood control facilities in each area plan is divided by each area plan's respective total service population in 2020 to estimate this per capita cost standard.

**Table 10.2: Flood Control Cost per Capita Calculations**

Location	Service Population <sup>1</sup>	Total Facilities Costs	Cost Per Capita
Upper San Jacinto Valley Area Plan (AP No. 10)	256,250	\$ 24,200,000	\$ 94
Mead Valley/Good Hope Area Plan (AP No. 13)	103,570	\$ 1,300,000	\$ 13

<sup>1</sup> 2020 total (incorporated and unincorporated area) service population.

Sources: Table 10.1; County of Riverside; Willdan Financial Services.

## Fee Schedule

Table 10.3 shows the proposed flood control facilities fees. The cost per capita from Table 10.2 is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit densities (persons per dwelling unit) and occupant densities for non-residential land uses (employees per 1,000 square feet).

The total fee includes a two percent (2%) percent administrative charge to fund costs that include: a standard overhead charge applied to all County programs for legal, accounting, and other departmental and Countywide administrative support, and fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, two percent of the base fee adequately covers the cost of fee program administration. The administrative charge is not an impact fee; rather, it is a user fee. It should be reviewed and adjusted during comprehensive impact fee updates to ensure that revenue generated from the charge sufficiently covers, but does not exceed, the administrative costs associated with the fee program.

**Table 10.3 Flood Control Fee Schedule**

Land Use	A	B	C = A x B	D = C x 0.02	E = C + D
	Cost Per Capita <sup>1</sup>	Density	Base Fee <sup>2</sup>	Admin Charge <sup>2, 3</sup>	Total Fee <sup>2</sup>
<b>Upper San Jacinto Valley Area Plan (AP No. 10)</b>					
<i>Residential</i>					
Single Family Unit	\$ 94	2.97	\$ 279	\$ 6	\$ 285
Multi-family Unit	94	2.06	194	4	198
<i>Non-residential</i>					
Commerical	\$ 29	21.78	\$ 635	\$ 13	\$ 648
Industrial	29	11.04	322	6	328
Surface Mining	29	11.04	322	6	328
Wineries <sup>4</sup>	29	15.01	437	9	446
<b>Mead Valley/Good Hope Area Plan (AP No. 13)</b>					
<i>Residential</i>					
Single Family Unit	\$ 13	2.97	\$ 39	\$ 1	\$ 40
Multi-family Unit	13	2.06	27	1	28
<i>Non-residential</i>					
Commerical	\$ 4	21.78	\$ 88	\$ 2	\$ 90
Industrial	4	11.04	44	1	45
Surface Mining	4	11.04	44	1	45
Wineries <sup>4</sup>	4	15.01	60	1	61

<sup>1</sup> Non-residential costs per capita are residential costs per capita multiplied by the worker demand factor of 0.31.

<sup>2</sup> Fee per unit for single family and multi-family residential; fee per acre of commercial, industrial, per acre of intensive use areas for surface mining, and wineries.

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

<sup>4</sup> Winery employment density factor based on methodology adopted by WRCOG in December 2011.

Sources: Table 2.4; Tables 10.1 - 10.2; County of Riverside Development Impact Fee Justification Study Update, April 6, 2006, David Taussig & Associates, Inc.; Willdan Financial Services.

## Projected Fee Revenue

Table 10.4 shows estimated fee revenues generated by new development in unincorporated portions of the Upper San Jacinto Valley and Mead Valley/Good Hope Area Plans. Anticipated development in the Upper San Jacinto Valley Area Plan is forecast to generate close to \$1.8 million in impact fee revenue for flood facilities. As the cost of the facility needed to serve new development in this area plan is approximately \$24.2 million, \$22.4 million worth of the facility cost must be funded by non-fee sources. Similarly new development in the unincorporated portion of Mead Valley/Good Hope Area Plan is anticipated to generate approximately \$128,000 in flood control facility impact fee revenue. Since the cost of the facility needed to serve new development in that area plan is \$1.3 million, nearly \$1.2 million worth of the facility cost will require funding with non-development impact fee revenue sources.



**Table 10.4: Flood Control Facilities Projected Fee Revenue and Other Funding Needed**

<u>Upper San Jacinto Valley Area Plan (AP No. 10)</u>	
Cost of Flood Control Facility	\$ 24,200,000
Cost per Capita	\$ 94
Unincorporated Service Population Growth (2010-2020)	19,390
Estimated Fee Revenue	\$ 1,822,700
Other Funding Needed	\$ <u>22,377,300</u>
<u>Mead Valley/Good Hope Area Plan (AP No. 13)</u>	
Cost of Flood Control Facility	\$ 1,300,000
Cost per Capita	\$ 13
Unincorporated Service Population Growth (2010-2020)	9,900
Estimated Fee Revenue	\$ 128,700
Other Funding Needed	\$ <u>1,171,300</u>

Note: Numbers may not sum exactly due to rounding.

Sources: Tables 10.1- 10.3; Willdan Financial Services.

# 11. Library Books/Media

---

The purpose of this fee is to generate revenue to fund the library books and other materials (volumes) needed to serve new unincorporated area development in Riverside County. An impact fee that would enable the Riverside County Public Library System to maintain the current standard of books per capita is presented.

## Service Population

Residents are the primary users of libraries. Therefore, demand for library facilities is based on the residential population and excludes workers. The Riverside County Public Library System operates a countywide library system. There are currently 10 libraries in Eastern Riverside County and 25 libraries in Western Riverside County. The service population for library books consists of residents throughout the County.

**Table 11.1: Library Books Service Population**

<b>Countywide</b>	<b>Residents</b>
Population (2010)	2,244,000
New Development (2010 - 2020)	566,000
Total (2020)	2,810,000

Sources: Table 2.2; County of Riverside TLMA; Willdan Financial Services.

## Facility Inventories & Standards

This study uses the existing inventory method to calculate fee schedules for library volumes. Therefore, the library books/media impact fee calculated in this study is based on the existing inventory facilities standard of library books per capita. The impact fee calculated here will allow the Riverside Public Library System to acquire new volumes to maintain the current standard.

Table 11.2 presents an inventory of library volumes in the Riverside County Public Library System. The County owns an estimated 1.7 million volumes, distributed throughout County libraries.

**Table 11.2: Existing Inventory Of Library  
Books As of 2010**

<b>Library</b>	<b>Books</b>
<i>Eastern Riverside County</i>	
Cathedral City Library	92,912
Coachella Library	43,643
Coachella Valley Bookmobile	19,045
Desert Hot Springs Library	45,421
Indio Library	97,704
La Quinta Library	74,075
Lake Tamarisk Library	15,369
Mecca Library	35,261
Palm Desert Library	150,808
Thousand Palms Library	30,395
Subtotal	604,633
<i>Western Riverside County</i>	
Anza Library	13,472
Calimesa Library	14,561
Canyon Lake Library	27,810
Eastvale Library	23,360
El Cerrito Library	19,878
Glen Avon Library	82,786
Home Gardens Library	23,750
Highgrove Library	19,373
Idyllwild Library	27,466
Lakeside Library	28,586
Lake Elsinore Library	57,554
Mission Trail Library	33,332
Norco Library	41,362
Nuview Library	22,431
Perris Library	113,080
Paloma Valley Library	19,450
Rubidoux Library	52,710
Romoland Library	24,405
San Jacinto Library	48,987
Sun City Library	62,481
Temecula Public Library	119,902
Temecula County Library	102,213
Valley Vista Library	44,146
West County Bookmobile	6,656
Woodcrest Library	36,861
Subtotal	1,066,613
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,671,245</b>

Source: Riverside County.

**Table 11.3** shows the existing volumes per capita facility standard (see the *Introduction* for further description of the existing inventory methodology). The resulting standard is 0.74 volumes per capita. The projected growth in the 2020 service population correlates to the acquisition of 421,535 volumes to maintain the existing standards through 2020. This table does not necessarily imply that the County should, or is planning, to increase the inventories exactly as shown above. Rather, this table gives a rough indication of the amount of expansion that will be needed to serve new development. The estimated cost per volume of \$25 is based on recent cost experience provided by the Riverside County Librarian. The resulting library volume cost per capita is \$19.

**Table 11.3: Library Books Existing Standard and Cost Per Capita**

<i>Existing Facilities</i>		
Total Library Books	A	1,671,245
Existing Service Population <sup>1</sup>	B	2,244,000
Library Books Per Capita	$C = A / B$	0.74
Cost Per Book <sup>2</sup>	D	\$ 25
Cost Per Capita	$E = C \times D$	19

<sup>1</sup>Existing service population consists of countywide residents.

<sup>2</sup>Cost per book provided by Riverside County Library.

Sources: Tables 11.1-11.2; Willdan Financial Services.

## Fee Schedule

**Table 11.4** shows the proposed library volumes fees. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit densities (persons per dwelling unit).

The total fee includes a two percent (2%) percent administrative charge to fund costs that include: a standard overhead charge applied to all County programs for legal, accounting, and other departmental and Countywide administrative support, and fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, two percent of the base fee adequately covers the cost of fee program administration. The administrative charge is not an impact fee; rather, it is a user fee. It should be reviewed and adjusted during comprehensive impact fee updates to ensure that revenue generated from the charge sufficiently covers, but does not exceed, the administrative costs associated with the fee program.

**Table 11.4: Library Books Fee Schedule**

Land Use	A	B	C = A x B		D = C x 0.02	E = C + D
	Cost Per Capita	Density	Base Fee <sup>1</sup>		Admin Charge <sup>1, 2</sup>	Total Fee <sup>1</sup>
<i>Residential</i>						
Single Family Unit	\$ 19	2.97	\$	56	\$ 1	\$ 57
Multi-family Unit	19	2.06		39	1	40

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

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

Source: Table 2.4; Table 11.3; Willdan Financial Services.

## Projected Fee Revenue

Table 11.5 shows estimated fee revenues to be generated by anticipated new development in unincorporated areas of the County. The Riverside County library volume impact fee will only be imposed in unincorporated areas of the County. Since the library system serves growth Countywide, this generates a gap between the demand for library books in Riverside County and the fee revenue collected within the unincorporated areas of the County. This funding gap amounts to an estimated \$7.3 million.

**Table 11.5: Library Books Projected Fee Revenue and Other Funding Needed**

<u>Total Facilities Cost</u>	
Cost Per Capita	\$ 19
Countywide Growth (2010-2020)	566,000
Total Facilities Cost	\$ 10,754,000
<u>Unincorporated Facilities Costs</u>	
Cost Per Capita	\$ 19
Unincorporated Growth (2010-2020)	184,000
Estimated Fee Revenue	\$ 3,496,000
Other Funding Needed <sup>1</sup>	\$ 7,258,000

Note: numbers have been rounded.

<sup>1</sup> Additional funding needed to serve new incorporated residents at same facility standard.

Sources: Tables 11.1-11.3; Willdan Financial Services.

# 12. Regional Multi-Service Centers

---

The purpose of this fee is to generate revenue to fund the regional multi-service center facilities needed to serve new development. As the name implies, regional multi-service centers provide a variety of services including, family care centers, health care clinics, mental health services and public social services. A fee schedule is presented based on the existing value per capita of regional multi-service center facilities.

## Service Population

Regional multi-service center facilities serve both residents and businesses, and provide services to both incorporated and unincorporated portions of area plans within the County. Therefore, the demand for regional multi-service center facilities and services is based on the populations of residents and workers. Regional multi-service center facilities in Riverside County serve the Eastern and Western portions of the County. The Western portion of the County is more populated than the Eastern portion; as a result regional multi-service center facilities are among several categories of facilities with more facilities located in the western than in the eastern portion of the County.

**Table 12.1** shows the estimated service population for regional multi-service centers in 2010 and 2020. The demand for regional multi-service center facilities is primarily related to the demands that residents and businesses place on the County's facilities. A ratio of 0.31 employees to one resident is used to reflect the difference in demand for regional multi-service centers supplied by residents and employees of the Eastern and Western parts of the County.

**Table 12.1: Regional Multi-Service Centers Service Population**

	A	B	C	D = A + B x C
	Residents	Employment	Worker Demand Factor	Service Population
<i>Population 2010</i>				
Western Riverside County	1,738,000	272,000	-	1,738,000
<i>New Development (2010-2020)</i>				
Western Riverside County	363,000	111,000	-	363,000
<i>Total (2020)</i>				
Western Riverside County	2,101,000	383,000	-	2,101,000
<i>Unincorporated Population 2010</i>				
Western Riverside County	283,000	43,000	-	283,000
<i>Unincorporated New Development (2010-2020)</i>				
Western Riverside County	87,000	26,000	-	87,000
<i>Unincorporated Total (2020)</i>				
Western Riverside County	370,000	69,000	-	370,000

Note: Numbers may not sum due to rounding.

Sources: Table 2.1; County of Riverside; Willdan Financial Services.

## Facility Inventories & Standards

This study uses the existing inventory method to calculate fee schedules for regional multi service centers (see *Introduction* for further information). **Table 12.2** presents an inventory of regional multi-service centers in Eastern and Western Riverside County along the service population associated with each. Building and land square footage inventories are divided by the service population corresponding to the portion of the County served by those facilities in order to estimate existing per capita standards of service for regional multi-service centers.

**Table 12.2: Multi-Service Center Facilities Per Capita**

Existing Facilities	A		B	C = A / B	
	Facility Inventory		Existing Service Population	Facilities per Capita	
	Building Square Feet	Land Square Feet <sup>1</sup>		Building Sq. Ft. per Capita	Land Sq. Ft. per Capita
<i>Western Riverside County</i>					
Perris	24,870	99,480			
Rubidoux	25,600	102,400			
Temecula	6,167	24,668			
Corona	7,600	30,400			
Riverside Neighborhood	21,286	85,144			
Desert Hot Springs	20,000	174,240			
Subtotal Western County	105,523	516,332	1,738,000	0.06	0.30

<sup>1</sup> Land area estimated based on a Floor Area Ratio of 0.25 applied to building square feet.

Sources: Tables 2.1, 12.1, Appendix Table X; Willdan Financial Services.

**Table 12.3** translates the existing standards of regional multi-service centers in Riverside County into financial terms. Standards of building square feet are multiplied by the construction cost of \$350 per square foot in order to estimate total facility value per capita. Previously submitted estimates for proposed regional multi service centers in Hemet and Corona yielded an average of approximately \$ 425 per square foot. However, the cost per square foot has been decreased due to \$350 based on recent (July 2010) discussions with local Riverside County architects and on other recent Willdan client experience.

**Table 12.3: Regional Multi-Service Centers Per Capita Costs**

<i>Western Riverside County</i>		
Average Cost per Building Sq. Ft.	\$	350
Facility Standard (sq. ft. per capita)		0.06
Cost per Capita	\$	21
Average Cost per sq. ft. of Land	\$	12.82
Facility Standard (sq. ft. per capita)		0.30
Cost per Capita	\$	4

Note: Numbers may not sum due to rounding.

Sources: Table 2.1; County of Riverside; DataQuick; Willdan Financial Services.



## Fee Schedule

Table 12.4 shows the regional multi-service center fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit densities (persons per dwelling unit), and occupant densities for non-residential land uses (employees per 1,000 square feet). Fees vary between the Eastern and Western portions of Riverside County as a result of variation in the existing level of multi-service center facilities and regional differences in total service population.

The total fee includes a two percent (2%) percent administrative charge to fund costs that include: a standard overhead charge applied to all County programs for legal, accounting, and other departmental and Countywide administrative support, and fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, two percent of the base fee adequately covers the cost of fee program administration. The administrative charge is not an impact fee; rather, it is a user fee. It should be reviewed and adjusted during comprehensive impact fee updates to ensure that revenue generated from the charge sufficiently covers, but does not exceed, the administrative costs associated with the fee program.

**Table 12.4: Regional Multi-Service Center Fee Schedule**

Land Use	A	B	C = A x B	D = C x 0.02	E = C + D
	Cost Per Capita <sup>1</sup>	Density	Base Fee <sup>2</sup>	Admin Charge <sup>2, 3</sup>	Total Fee <sup>2</sup>
<i>Western Riverside County</i>					
<i>Residential</i>					
Single Family Unit	\$ 25	2.97	\$ 74	\$ 1	\$ 75
Multi-family Unit	25	2.06	52	1	53
<i>Non-residential</i>					
Commercial	\$ -	21.78	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Industrial	-	11.04	-	-	-
Surface Mining	-	11.04	-	-	-
Wineries <sup>4</sup>	-	15.01	-	-	-

<sup>1</sup> Non-residential costs per capita are residential costs per capita multiplied by the worker demand factor of 0.31.

<sup>2</sup> Fee per unit for single family and multi-family residential; fee per acre of commercial, industrial, per acre of intensive use areas for surface mining, and wineries.

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

<sup>4</sup> Winery employment density factor based on methodology adopted by WRCOG in December 2011.

Sources: Tables 2.1, 12.1, 12.2, and 12.3; County of Riverside Development Impact Fee Justification Study Update, April 6, 2006, David Taussig & Associates, Inc.; County of Riverside; Willdan Financial Services.

## Cost of Proposed New Facilities

Table 12.5 shows the two proposed new regional multi-service centers and the proposed sizes of the multi-service centers. No regional multi-service centers are proposed in Eastern Riverside County. Both are proposed for Western Riverside County. Costs are based on an assumption of \$350 per square foot for constructed space. No land costs are included, because the County already owns land on which to site the planned facilities.

**Table 12.5: Proposed Multi-Service Center Facilities**

Proposed Facilities	Station Size (Sq. Ft.)	Cost per Sq. Ft.	Estimated Building Cost	Estimated Land Sq. Ft.	Land		Estimated Land Cost	Total Cost With Land
					Cost Per Sq. Ft.			
<i>Western Riverside Plan Areas</i>								
Corona <sup>1</sup>	20,000	\$ 350	\$ 7,000,000	124,146	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,000,000
Hemet <sup>1</sup>	21,000	350	7,350,000	84,000	-	-	-	7,350,000
Total - Western Riverside	41,000		\$ 14,350,000	208,146		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,350,000

<sup>1</sup> Land for both Multi Service Centers land is already owned.

Sources: Table 1.1; County of Riverside; DataQuick; Willdan Financial Services.

## Projected Fee Revenue

Table 12.6 shows estimated fee revenues to be generated by projected new development in Western Riverside County by 2030. In Western Riverside County, the regional multi-service center facilities impact fee is forecast to generate approximately \$2.2 million. Submitted planned multi-service center facilities for Western Riverside County total an estimated \$14.4 million, leaving approximately \$12.2 million to be funded by non-fee sources.

**Table 12.6: Regional Multi-Service Centers Projected Fee**

<i>Western Riverside County</i>	
Cost of Regional Multi-Service Centers	\$ 14,350,000
Cost of Land	-
Total Cost	\$ 14,350,000
Cost per Capita	\$ 25
Unincorporated Service Population Growth (2010-2020)	87,000
Estimated Fee Revenue	\$ 2,175,000
Other Funding Needed	\$ 12,175,000

Note: Numbers may not sum due to rounding.

Sources: Tables 2.1, 12.1 - 12.4; Willdan Financial Services.

# 13. Implementation

---

## Impact Fee Program Adoption Process

Impact fee program adoption procedures are found in the *California Government Code* section 66016. Adoption of an impact fee program requires the Board of Supervisors to follow certain procedures including holding a public meeting. Fourteen day mailed public notice is required for those registering for such notification. Data, such as this impact fee report, must be made available at least 10 days prior to the public meeting. Legal counsel for the County may note any other procedural requirements or provide advice regarding adoption of an enabling ordinance and resolution. After adoption there is a mandatory 60-day waiting period before the fees go into effect.

## Fee Collection

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

- ◆ **Single family:** Detached one family residential dwelling unit and attached one family dwelling unit that is located on a separate lot such as duplexes and condominiums as defined in the California Civil Code; and
- ◆ **Multi-family:** All attached one family dwellings such as apartment houses, boarding, rooming and lodging houses, congregate care residential facilities and individual spaces within mobile parks and recreational vehicle parks.
- ◆ **Commercial:** All commercial, retail, educational, office and hotel/motel development.
- ◆ **Industrial:** All manufacturing and warehouse development.
- ◆ **Surface Mining:** The Intensive Use Area involved in the excavation, processing, storage, sales, and transportation of raw materials.
- ◆ **Wineries:** The intensive use area involved in the cultivation of grapes and/or production, storage, sales, transportation of wine and and appurtenant uses, including but not limited to hotels and outdoor special occasion facilities.

Some developments may include more than one land use type, such as an industrial warehouse with living quarters (a live-work designation) or a planned unit development with both single and multi-family uses. In these cases the fee would be calculated separately for each land use type.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> For example, for a mixed-use project the County could calculate the acreage allocable to each use by using the proportion of square feet of each type and applying it to the total acreage for the project to arrive at the acreage for each use type.

## Inflation Adjustment

Appropriate inflation indexes should be identified in a fee ordinance including an automatic adjustment to the fee annually. Separate indexes for land and construction costs should be used. Calculating the land cost index may require the periodic use of a property appraiser. The construction cost index can be based recent capital project experience or can be taken from any reputable source, such as the *Engineering News-Record* while the purchase of library books may use the *U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Price Index*. To calculate prospective fee increases, each index should be weighed against its share of total planned facility costs represented by land or construction, as appropriate. While fee updates using inflation indexes are appropriate for periodic updates to ensure that fee revenues keep up with increases in the costs of public facilities, the County will also need to conduct more extensive updates of the fee documentation and calculation when significant new data on growth projections and/or facility plans becomes available.

## Reporting Requirements

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

## Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP

The County should maintain a Capital Improvements Program (CIP) to adequately plan for future infrastructure needs. The CIP should also identify fee revenue with specific projects. The use of the CIP in this manner documents a reasonable relationship between new development and the use of those revenues.

The County may decide to alter the scope of the planned projects or to substitute new projects as long as those new projects continue to represent an expansion of facilities. If the total cost of facilities varies from the total cost used as a basis for the fees, the County should consider revising the fees accordingly.

For the five-year planning period of the fee program, the County should consider allocating existing fund balances and projected fee revenue to specific projects. Funds can be held in a project account for longer than five years if necessary to collect sufficient monies to complete a project.

# 14. Mitigation Fee Act Findings

Public facilities or development impact fees (DIF) are one time fees typically paid when a building permit is finalized or prior to occupancy whichever occurs first. Development impact fees are imposed on development projects by local agencies responsible for regulating land use (cities and counties). To guide the widespread imposition of public facilities fees the State Legislature adopted the *Mitigation Fee Act (MFA)* with Assembly Bill 1600 in 1987 and subsequent amendments. The *MFA*, contained in *California Government Code* Sections 66000 through 66025, establishes requirements on local agencies for the imposition and administration of fee programs. The *MFA* requires local agencies to document five findings when adopting a fee.

The four statutory findings required for adoption of the public facilities fees documented in this report are presented in this chapter and supported in detail by the report. All statutory references are to the *MFA*. The fifth finding below, Proportionality, is only required by the *MFA* if an agency imposes a fee as a condition of approval for a specific project.

## Purpose of Fee

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

Development impact fees are designed to ensure that new development will not burden the existing service population with the cost of facilities required to accommodate growth. The purpose of the fees proposed by this report is to implement this policy by providing a funding source from new development for capital improvements to serve that development. The fees advance a legitimate government interest by enabling the County to provide services to new development.

## Use of Fee Revenues

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

Fees proposed in this report, if enacted by the County, would be used to fund the expansion of facilities to serve new development. Facilities funded by these fees are designated to be located within the County. Fees addressed in this report have been identified by the County to be restricted to funding the following facility categories: criminal justice public facilities, library construction, fire protection facilities, traffic improvement facilities, traffic signals, regional parks, regional trails, community centers, flood control facilities, library volumes and regional multi – service centers.

The fees identified in this report should be updated if new needs assessment studies or new facility plans result in a significant change in the fair share cost allocated to new development.

The fees documented in this report are based at a minimum on the existing facilities standards being achieved and should yield revenues sufficient to maintain those standards and provide the fair share contribution from new development to planned facilities as new development occurs.

## Benefit Relationship

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

The County will restrict fee revenue to the acquisition of land, construction of facilities and buildings, and purchase of related equipment, furnishings, vehicles, and services required to serve new development. Facilities funded by the fees are expected to provide expansion to a network of facilities accessible to the projected additional residents and workers associated with new development. Under the *MFA*, fees are not intended to fund planned facilities needed to correct existing deficiencies. Thus, a reasonable relationship can be shown between the use of fee revenue and the new development residential and non-residential land use classifications that will pay the fees. Non-fee funding requirements have also been identified in this report.

## Burden Relationship

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

Facilities need is based on a facility standard that represents the demand generated by new development for those facilities. For most facility categories demand is measured by a single facility standard that can be applied across land use types to ensure a reasonable relationship to the type of development. Traffic facilities standards are based on traffic engineering analysis of Level of Service (LOS) provided by the Riverside County Transportation Land Management Agency (TLMA). Traffic signals are based on a geographical needs analysis.

Service population standards are calculated based upon the number of residents associated with residential development and the number of workers associated with non-residential development. To calculate a single, per capita standard, one worker is weighted less than one resident based on an analysis of the relative use demand between residential and non-residential development.

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

*Chapter 2, Facility Service Populations and Growth Projections* provides a description of how service population and growth projections are calculated. Facility standards are described in the *Facility Inventories and Standards* sections of each facility category chapter (or corresponding standards discussion sections for the Traffic Facilities and Traffic Signals chapters).

## Proportionality

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

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

See *Chapter 2, Growth Projections*, or the *Service Population* section in each facility category chapter (or trip demand sections in the Traffic Facilities and Traffic Signals chapters) for a description of how service populations or trip generation factors are determined for different types of land uses. See the *Fee Schedule* section of each facility category chapter for a presentation of the proposed facilities fees.