

RESOLUTION NO. 14-035

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES  
ADOPTING THE DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE CALCULATION AND JUSTIFICATION STUDY  
AND SUBSEQUENT DOCUMENTATION ACCOMPANYING SUCH REPORT AND  
ESTABLISHING DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES FOR ALL DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE CITY  
OF EL PASO DE ROBLES

---

WHEREAS, the Land Use Element of the City's General Plan has as a policy that new development mitigate its share of the impacts to the natural and built environment and to be fiscally neutral and not result in a net loss for the City; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with policies established in the 2003 General Plan update, the City Council has directed staff to conduct a comprehensive review of the City's development impact fees to determine whether those fees are adequate to defray the cost of public facilities related to the development project; and

WHEREAS, the City contracted with David Taussig & Associates, Inc to provide a comprehensive evaluation of the City's existing development impact fees; and

WHEREAS, David Taussig & Associates, Inc. prepared a report, entitled *Development Impact Fee Justification Study*, dated March 20, 2014, attached to this resolution as Exhibit "B", that establishes amounts of the City's development impact fees and explains the nexus between the imposition of the fee and the estimated reasonable cost of providing the service for which the fee is charged; and

WHEREAS, the *Development Impact Fee Justification Study* has been available for public review and comment; and

WHEREAS, the *Development Impact Fee Justification Study* substantiates the need for development impact fees amongst five different categories of services and facilities provided by the City; and

WHEREAS, the City has imposed development impact fees, including fees for transportation, park development, public safety, public facilities, and library since the adoption of Resolution 06-188; and

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to adopt new development impact fees, in accordance with the nexus calculations and recommendations in the *Development Impact Fee Justification Study* prepared by David Taussig & Associates, Inc. in March, 2014; and

WHEREAS, in compliance with the Mitigation Fee Act (Government Code section 66000 *et seq.*), the City Council held noticed public hearings on the proposed development impact fees on February 18, 2014, and March 18, 2014, and April 1, 2014 to solicit public input on the proposed development impact fees;

NOW, THEREFORE THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Findings pursuant to Government Code section 66001.

The City Council finds and determines that the *Development Impact Fee Justification Study* prepared by David Taussig & Associates, Inc. and dated March 20, 2014, complies with California Government Code section 66001 by establishing the basis for the imposition of fees on new development. This finding is based on the fact that the *Study*:

- (a) Identifies the purpose of the fee;
- (b) Identifies the use to which the fee will be put;
- (c) Shows a reasonable relationship between the use of the fee and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed;
- (d) Demonstrates a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facilities and the type of development projects on which the fee is imposed; and
- (e) Demonstrates a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facilities or portion of the public facilities attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed.

SECTION 2. Fees for Uses Consistent with the *Study*.

The City Council hereby determines that the fees collected pursuant to this resolution shall be used to finance the public facilities described or identified in the *Development Impact Fee Justification Study*, the Master Facilities Plan or other such facility master plans as may from time to time be adopted by the City Council.

SECTION 3. Approval of Items in *Development Impact Fee Justification Study*.

The City Council has considered the specific project descriptions and cost estimates identified in the *Development Impact Fee Justification Study* and hereby approves such project descriptions and cost estimates and finds them reasonable as the basis for calculating and imposing certain development impact fees.

SECTION 4. Consistency with General Plan.

The City Council finds that the projects and fee methodology identified in the *Development Impact Fee Justification Study* are consistent with the City's General Plan which calls for development to mitigate its share of the impacts to City infrastructure and to be fiscally neutral.

SECTION 5. Differentiation Among Fees.

The City Council finds that the fees recommended in the *Development Impact Fee Justification Study* are separate and different from other fees the City may impose through the implementation of a Specific Plan or as a condition of final map approval, building permit issuance or tentative or parcel map approval pursuant to its authority under the Subdivision Map Act, the Quimby Act, and the City's implementing ordinances, as may be amended from time to time. Specific Plan fees or fees imposed pursuant to the Subdivision Map Act and/or the Quimby Act and as determined by the environmental impacts of any given land development entitlement shall be credited for the deposit of Development Impact Fees as specified in Appendix A to the extent that the fees imposed are specifically identified to be used to fund the same project or facility as listed in Table 4-2 of the *Development Impact Fee Justification Study*.

In addition, this resolution shall not be deemed to affect the imposition or collection of the water and sewer connection fees authorized by section 14.04.020 and 14.16.020 of the Municipal Code.

#### SECTION 6. CEQA Finding.

The adoption of the *Development Impact Fee Justification Study* and the development impact fees are categorically exempt from environmental review pursuant to section 15061(b)(3) of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines. The intent of the *Study* and development impact fee is to provide one way to fund projects and services that have been identified in environmental analyses of other planning efforts, including the General Plan EIR, and various City master plans, among others.

#### SECTION 7. Adoption of Report.

The *Development Impact Fee Justification Study* is hereby adopted.

#### SECTION 8. Timing of Fee.

A development impact fee shall be imposed and paid upon occupancy of a building permit, or at such earlier time as permitted by law, as set forth in Government Code section 66007. A "development permit" means any permit or approval from the City including, but not limited to, subdivision map, revised final planned development, building permit or other permit for construction or reconstruction.

The fees as identified in attached Exhibit "A" shall take effect thirty (30) days following adoption of this resolution by the City Council with the following exceptions:

- (a) All residential building permit applications on properties west of the Salinas River that are, or were received by the City Building Division on or before September 1, 2014, and based upon the submissions made by that date have been deemed by the City to be accepted for review to determine their compliance with City requirements, shall be processed on a first-come, first-served basis, in accordance with the City's standard policies and practices shall be subject to the Transportation development impact fees that applied pursuant to Resolution No. 06-188, prior to adoption of this resolution;
- (b) All commercial building permit applications that are, or were received by the City Building Division on or before September 1, 2014, and based upon the submissions made by that date have been deemed by the City to be accepted for review to determine their compliance with City requirements, shall be processed on a first-come, first-served basis, in accordance with the City's standard policies and practices shall be subject to the development impact fees that applied pursuant to Resolution No. 06-188, prior to adoption of this resolution;
- (c) Except as provided in subparagraphs (a) and (b) above, the fees adopted by this resolution shall take effect on April 2, 2014.

#### SECTION 9. Amount of Fee.

The City Council hereby approves and adopts the development impact fees as set forth in Exhibit "A" to this resolution, attached hereto and incorporated herein. Exhibit "A" sets forth the aggregate amount imposed as a development impact fee for both residential and non-residential land uses and also sets forth the breakdown of each development impact fee by type of facility or service. The development impact fees set forth in Exhibit "A" are consistent with the Report. The amount of the development impact fees shall be modified annually each July 1 based on the change in the Engineering News Record's construction cost index as reported for the twelve month period ending in April of each year.

SECTION 10. Use of fee.

The development impact fees shall be solely used for (1) the purposes described in the *Development Impact Fee Justification Study*; (2) reimbursing the city for the development's fair share of those capital improvements already constructed by the City; or (3) reimbursing developers who have already constructed public facilities described in the *Development Impact Fee Justification Study* or the Master Facilities Plan or other facility master plans adopted from time to time by the City Council, where those facilities exceed mitigation of the impacts of the developers' project or projects.

A developer that has been required by the City to construct any facilities or improvements (or a portion thereof) described in Table 4-2 of the *Development Impact Fee Justification Study* as a condition of approval of a development entitlement may request an in-lieu credit from the Development Impact Fee fund. This credit may only be for the portion of the specific development impact fees attributable to the specific improvement project described in the *Study* and constructed in conjunction with the subject development. Upon request, an in-lieu credit of fees shall be granted for that portion of the facilities or improvements that exceed the mitigation of the need that is attributable to and reasonably related to the development as determined by the Community Development Director.

When an applicant is required, as a condition of approval of a development entitlement, to construct any facility or improvement listed in Table 4-2 of the *Development Impact Fee Justification Study*; which improvement is determined by the Community Development Director to exceed the need and mitigation of the development entitlement, the applicant may request in writing that a reimbursement agreement with the City be presented to the City Council for consideration. The amount reimbursed shall be that portion of the estimated cost of the improvement or facility that exceeds the need or mitigation attributable to the development.

Fees collected pursuant to Resolution 03-31 for Aquatic Facilities and for Public Meeting Facilities shall be used exclusively for those purposes and accounts for these fees shall remain in effect and shall be maintained by the Director of Administrative Services.

Fees collected under any of the five categories listed A through E in Table 4-2 of the *Development Impact Fee Justification Study* may be used to finance the construction or implementation of any project listed in those categories to the extent that use of the fees may not exceed the percentage allocated to new development of all of the projects listed in the category, or sub-category as shown on Table 4-2.

SECTION 11. Fee Determination by Type of Use.

A. Residential Development.

Development impact fees for residential development shall be based upon the type of unit constructed. The development impact fee categories as shown in Exhibit "A" generally correspond to the City's land use designations in the land use element of the City's general plan.

B. Nonresidential Land Uses.

Development impact fees for nonresidential land uses shall be based upon the square footage of the building. The development impact fee categories as shown in Exhibit "A" generally correspond to the City's land use designations in the land use element of the City's general plan.

C. Uses Not Specified.

In the event that there are land uses not specified in Exhibit "A", the development impact fee for such use shall be determined by the City's Community Development Director or his or her designee who shall determine such fee based on an analysis of the public service impacts of the proposed use in relation to other uses shown in Exhibit "A".

SECTION 12. Prior Resolutions and Ordinances Superseded.

The development impact fees approved and adopted by this resolution shall take effect in sixty (60) days and shall supersede previously adopted resolutions that set the amounts of development impact fees, including Resolution No. 06-188.

SECTION 13. Severability.

If any action, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase of this resolution or the imposition of a development impact fee for any project described in the Report or the application thereof to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this resolution or other fees levied by this resolution that can be given effect without the invalid provisions or application of fees.


SECTION 14. Effective Date.

Consistent with California Government Code section 66017(a), the fees as identified in attached Exhibit "A" adopted by this resolution shall take effect thirty (30) days following the adoption of this resolution by the City Council.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Paso Robles this 1<sup>st</sup> day of April 2014 by the following vote:

AYES: Hamon, Strong, Martin, Steinbeck, Picanco  
NOES:  
ABSENT:  
ABSTAIN:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Duane Picanco, Mayor

ATTEST:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Caryn Jackson, Deputy City Clerk

# Exhibit "A" - Resolution 14-035 Development Impact Fees Summary

Construction Type	Transportation	Police	Fire	General Governmental	Park and Recreation	Library	Total
Single Family per unit	\$11,653	\$74	\$1,008	\$2,920	\$2,855	\$942	\$19,452
Multiple Family per unit	\$8,031	\$87	\$1,008	\$2,920	\$2,855	\$942	\$15,843
Lodging Motel/Hotel per room	\$2,582	\$88	\$416	\$87	No Fee	No Fee	\$3,173
RV Parks & Campgrounds per site	\$2,153	\$88	\$416	\$87	No Fee	No Fee	\$2,744
Commercial per sq. ft.	\$10.54	\$0.11	\$0.37	\$1.06	NA	NA	\$12.08
Industrial per sq. ft.	\$2.96	\$0.03	\$0.20	\$0.58	NA	NA	\$3.77

**NOTES:**

**Single Family Residential:**

Includes single family detached homes, town homes, condominium units, mobile homes, and pre-fabricated homes

**Multi-Family Residential:**

Includes buildings comprised of two or more attached dwelling units under common ownership, including apartments

The following uses are allowed in commercial zones under Conditional Use Permits.

Buildings constructed for these uses shall be considered Industrial for the purposes of Development Impact Fees.

Recycling

Wholesale and Storage

Mini-Storage

Warehousing

Manufacturing and Processing, including:

Apparel, Chemical Products, Electrical Equipment, Food and Kindred Products, Furniture and Fixtures,

Glass Products, Cabinet Shops, Prefabricated Walls and Tusses, Machinery, Metal Fabrication, Mobile Home Manufacturing

Paper Products, Plastics, Fiberglass, Rubber, Jewelry, Stone, Structural Clay and Pottery, Testing Laboratories

**DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE  
JUSTIFICATION STUDY  
CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES**



MARCH 20, 2014

*Prepared by:*

DAVID TAUSSIG & ASSOCIATES, INC.  
5000 BIRCH STREET, SUITE 6000  
NEWPORT BEACH, CALIFORNIA 92660  
(800) 969-4382

Public Finance  
Public Private Partnerships  
Urban Economics

Newport Beach  
San Francisco  
Fresno  
Riverside  
Chicago, Illinois  
Dallas, Texas

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
<hr/>	
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	i
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. LEGAL REQUIREMENTS TO JUSTIFY DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES .....	3
III. DEMOGRAPHICS .....	10
IV. THE NEEDS LIST .....	14
V. METHODOLOGY UTILIZED TO CALCULATE FACILITIES IMPACT FEE .....	18
A. TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES .....	20
B. PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITIES .....	22
C. GENERAL GOVERNMENT FACILITIES.....	25
D. PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES.....	27
E. LIBRARY FACILITIES.....	31
VI. SUMMARY OF FEES.....	34
APPENDIX A FEE DERIVATION WORKSHEETS	
APPENDIX B EBU & EDU CALCULATION WORKSHEET	
APPENDIX C DEPARTMENT CONTACT LIST	



---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

In order to adequately plan for new development and identify the public facilities and costs associated with mitigating the direct and cumulative impacts of new development, David Taussig & Associates, Inc. ("DTA") was retained by the City of El Paso de Robles (the "City") to update the existing impact fee program by preparing a new AB 1600 Fee Justification Study (the "Fee Study"). The Fee Study is intended to comply with Section 66000 *et. seq.* of the Government Code, which was enacted by the State of California in 1987, by identifying additional public facilities required by new development ("Future Facilities") and determining the level of fees that may be imposed to pay the costs of the Future Facilities. Fee amounts have been determined that will finance transportation, police, fire, general government, park and recreation, and library facilities at levels identified by the various City departments as being necessary to meet the needs of new development through General Plan buildout in 2025. The Future Facilities and associated construction costs are identified in the Needs List, which is included in Section IV of the Fee Study. A description of the methodology used to calculate the fees is included in Section V. All new development may be required to pay its "fair share" of the cost of the new infrastructure through the development fee program.

### ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

Section I of this report provides an introduction to the study including a brief description of City surroundings, and background information on development fee financing. Section II provides an overview of the legal requirements for implementing and imposing the fee amounts identified in the Fee Study. Section III includes a discussion of projected new development and demand variables such as future population and employment, assuming current growth trends in housing, commercial, and industrial development extrapolated through General Plan buildout in 2025. Projections of future development are based on data provided by the City, the City's 2003 General Plan<sup>1</sup>, including the amendment to the Land Use Element adopted by City Council in October 2012 (together the "General Plan"). Section IV includes a description of the Needs List, which identifies the facilities needed to serve new development through General Plan buildout in 2025 that are eligible for funding by the impact fees. The Needs List provides the total estimated facilities costs, offsetting revenues, net costs to the City and costs allocated to new development for all facilities listed in the Needs List. This list is a compilation of projects and costs identified by various City departments. Section V discusses the findings required under the Mitigation Fee Act and requirements necessary to be satisfied when establishing, increasing or imposing a fee as a condition of new development, and satisfies the nexus requirements for each facility included as part of this study. Section V contains the description of the methodology used to determine the fees for all facility types. Section VI includes a summary of the proposed fees justified by this Fee Study. Appendix A includes the calculations used to determine the various fee levels. Appendix B includes the calculations used to determine the equivalent dwelling unit and equivalent benefit unit (both as defined in this Fee

---

<sup>1</sup> City of El Paso de Robles, General Plan. December 2003. Rincon Consultants, Inc.

Study) projections utilized in the fee derivation worksheets included as Appendix A. Appendix C provides a list of the City officials responsible for selecting the facilities on the Needs List, as well as contact information for these officials.

**IMPACT FEE SUMMARY**

The total fee amounts required to finance new development’s share of the costs of facilities identified in the Needs List are summarized in Table ES-1 below. Fees within this Fee Study reflect the maximum fee levels that may be imposed on new development.

**TABLE ES-1  
DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE SUMMARY**

Facility	Residential Development		Non-Residential Development	
	Single Family (\$ per unit)	Multi-Family (\$ per unit)	Commercial (\$ per 1,000 SF)	Industrial (\$ per 1,000 SF)
A. Transportation Facilities	\$11,653	\$8,031	\$10,543	\$2,959
B. Public Safety Facilities				
Police Facilities	\$74	\$87	\$112	\$28
<u>Fire Facilities</u>	<u>\$1,008</u>	<u>\$1,008</u>	<u>\$365</u>	<u>\$199</u>
Subtotal Public Safety Facilities	\$1,082	\$1,095	\$477	\$227
C. General Government Facilities	\$2,920	\$2,920	\$1,057	\$576
D. Park and Recreation Facilities	\$2,855	\$2,855	NA	NA
E. Library Facilities	\$942	\$942	NA	NA
<b>Total Impact Fees</b>	<b>\$19,452</b>	<b>\$15,843</b>	<b>\$12,077</b>	<b>\$3,762</b>
<i>(S per BSF for Non-Residential)</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>\$12.077</i>	<i>\$3.762</i>

---

## I. INTRODUCTION

---

As background, the City of El Paso de Robles (the “City”), or “Pass of the Oaks,” is situated at the Northern San Luis Obispo County–Southern Monterey County line. Approximately midway between Los Angeles and San Francisco, the City is nestled in the coastal mountain range of central California at the southern end of the fertile Salinas River Valley. With a population of over 31,000, the community makes excellent use of its close proximity to mountains, beaches, and deserts, as it boasts a unique climate suitable for growing a variety of crops. Previously known as the “Almond City,” the City has since reinvented itself by cultivating its own niche in the wine-growing industry. Offering the charm of a rural community with all the amenities of family life, including attractive and affordable housing, the City also understands the importance of staying relevant and has thus placed a high priority on maintaining ample City services, state-of-the-art recreational facilities, easy access retail shopping, excellent public schools, and safe neighborhoods.

In order to adequately plan for new development through General Plan buildout in 2025 and identify the public facilities and costs associated with mitigating the direct and cumulative impacts of new development, David Taussig & Associates, Inc. (“DTA”) was retained by the City to update the existing impact fee program by preparing a new AB 1600 Fee Justification Study (the “Fee Study”). The need for this Fee Study is driven by changes in demographics, facility requirements, and time inflated facility costs.

The Fee Study is intended to comply with Section 66000 *et. seq.* of the Government Code, which was enacted by the State of California in 1987, by identifying additional public facilities required by new development (“Future Facilities”) and determining the level of fees that may be imposed to pay the costs of the Future Facilities. Fee amounts have been determined that will finance facilities at levels identified by various City departments as being necessary to meet the needs of new development through General Plan buildout in 2025. The Future Facilities and associated construction costs are identified in the Needs List, which is included in Section IV of the Fee Study. All new development may be required to pay its “fair share” of the cost of the new infrastructure through the development fee program.

Currently the City expects to generate approximately 13,250 new residents within the City limits at General Plan buildout in 2025, representing an approximate 43% increase in the current population. The City will need to expand its services and facilities to accommodate this new growth. The levy of impact fees in conformance with AB 1600 legislation will help finance new projects, including transportation, public safety, general government, park and recreation, and library facilities, which are all needed to mitigate the impacts of this expected new growth. The steps followed in the Fee Study include:

1. **Demographic Assumptions:** Identify future growth that represents the increased demand for facilities.

2. **Facility Needs and Costs:** Identify the amount of public facilities required to support the new development and the costs of such facilities. Facilities costs and the Needs List are discussed in Section IV.
3. **Cost Allocation:** Allocate costs per equivalent dwelling unit.
4. **Fee Schedule:** Calculate the fee per residential unit or per non-residential square foot.

---

## II. LEGAL REQUIREMENTS TO JUSTIFY DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

---

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

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

The levy of impact fees is one authorized method of financing the public facilities necessary to mitigate the impacts of new development. A fee is “a monetary exaction, other than a tax or special assessment, which is charged by a local agency to the applicant in connection with approval of a development project for the purpose of defraying all or a portion of the cost of public facilities related to the development project...” (California Government Code, Section 66000). A fee may be levied for each type of capital improvement required for new development, with the payment of the fee typically occurring prior to the beginning of construction of a dwelling unit or non-residential building. Fees are often levied at final map recordation, issuance of a certificate of occupancy, or more commonly, at building permit issuance. However, Assembly Bill (“AB”) 2604 (Torrico) which was signed into law in August 2008, encourages public agencies to defer the collection of fees until close of escrow to an end user in an attempt to assist California’s troubled building industry.

The authority of local governments to impose impact fees on development is derived from their police power to protect the health and welfare of citizens under the California Constitution (Article 11, Section 7). Furthermore, the California Mitigation Fee Act provides a prescriptive guide to establishing and administering impact fees based on “constitutional and decisional law.” Development impact fees (“DIFs”) were enacted under Assembly Bill 1600 by the California Legislature in 1987 and codified under California Government Code §66000 *et. seq.*, also referred to as the Mitigation Fee Act (the “Act” or “AB 1600”).

AB 1600 defines local governments to include cities, counties, school districts, special districts, authorities, agencies, and other municipal corporations. Fees governed by the Act include development fees of general applicability, and fees negotiated for individual projects. The Act does not apply to user-fees for processing development applications or permits, fees governed by other statutes (e.g. the Quimby Act), developer agreements, or penalties, or fees specifically

excluded by the Act (e.g. fees collected pursuant to agreements with redevelopment agencies or various reimbursement agreements).

Public facilities that can be funded with impact fees are defined by the Act as “public improvements, public services, and community amenities.” Government Code, §65913.8 precludes the use of development fees to fund maintenance or services, with limited exceptions for very small improvements and certain temporary measures needed by certain special districts. In combination, these provisions effectively restrict the use of most impact fees to public capital improvements.

For general information, please see:

- ❖ “Exactions and Impact Fees in California: A Comprehensive Guide to Policy, Practice, and the Law,” edited by William Abbott, et al., Solano Press Books, 2012 Third Edition.

The City has identified the need to levy impact fees to pay for transportation, public safety, general government, park and recreation, and library facilities. The fees presented in this study will finance facilities on the Needs List at levels identified by the City as appropriate for new development. Upon the adoption of the Fee Study and required legal documents by the City Council, all new development will be required to pay its “fair share” of the cost of facilities on the Needs List through these fees.

In 2006, Government Code Section 66001 was amended to clarify that a fee cannot include costs attributable to existing deficiencies, but can fund costs used to maintain the existing level of service or meet an adopted level of service that is consistent with the general plan. This Fee Study for the City is intended to meet the nexus or benefit requirements of AB 1600, which mandates that there is a nexus between fees imposed, the use of the fees, and the development projects on which the fees are imposed.

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

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



5. Discuss how there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facility or portion of the public facility attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed.

Identifying these items will enable an impact fee to meet the nexus and rough proportionality requirements established by previous court cases. This section presents each of these items as they relate to the imposition of the proposed fees in the City. Current state financing and fee assessment requirements only allow new development to pay for its fair share of new facilities' costs. Any current deficiencies resulting from the needs of existing development must be funded through other sources. Therefore, a key element to establishing legal impact fees is to determine what share of the benefit or cost of a particular improvement can be equitably assigned to existing development, even if that improvement has not yet been constructed. By removing this factor, the true impact of new development can be assessed and equitable fees assigned.

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

Population, housing, and employment estimates prepared for the Fee Study project 13,252 new residents living in 4,982 new Single Family and Multi-Family units through General Plan buildout in 2025. During that same time period, approximately 4,394,000 building square feet of new commercial and industrial development are expected to generate approximately 7,152 employees.<sup>1</sup> The future residents and employees will create an additional demand for transportation, public safety, and general government facilities that existing public facilities cannot accommodate. In order to accommodate new development in an orderly manner, while maintaining the current quality of life in the City, the facilities on the Needs List (Section IV, Table 4-2) will need to be constructed.

It is the projected direct and cumulative effect of future development that has required an update to the City's existing fee program. Each new development will contribute to the need for new public facilities. Without future development, new public facilities would often not be necessary, as the existing facilities are adequate for the City's present population.

The proposed impact fee will be charged to all future development, irrespective of location, in the City. Even future "in fill" development projects contribute to impacts on public facilities because they are an interactive component of a much greater universe of development located throughout the City. First, the property owners and/or the tenants associated with any new development in the City regularly utilize and benefit from transportation, public safety, general government, park and recreation, and library facilities. Second, these property owners and tenants are dependent on and, in fact, may not have chosen to move into their new homes or new non-residential

---

<sup>1</sup> Reference is made to Section III for further information regarding the development projections.

development, except for residential, retail, employment and recreational opportunities located nearby on other existing and future development. Third, the availability of residents, employees and customers throughout the City has a growth-inducing impact without which some of the “in-fill” development would not occur. As a result, all development projects in the City contribute to the cumulative impacts of development.

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

The discussion in this section of the Fee Study sets forth the purpose of the impact fees as required by Section 66001(a)(1) of the California Government Code.

**B. THE USE TO WHICH THE FEE IS TO BE PUT (GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 66001(A)(2))**

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

The discussion presented in this section of the Fee Study identifies the use to which the fee is to be put as required by Section 66001(a)(2) of the California Government Code.

**C. DETERMINE THAT THERE IS A REASONABLE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FEE’S USE AND THE TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT UPON WHICH THE FEE IS IMPOSED (BENEFIT RELATIONSHIP) (GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 66001(A)(3))**

As discussed in Section A above, it is the projected direct and cumulative effect of future development that has prompted the update to the City’s impact fee program. Each development will contribute to the need for new public facilities. Without future development, the City would have no need to construct additional public facilities on the Needs List. For all other facilities, the costs have been allocated to both existing and new development based on their level of benefit. Even future “in fill” development projects, which may be adjacent to existing facilities, contribute to impacts on public facilities because they are an interactive component of a much greater universe of development located throughout the City. Consequently, all new development within the City, irrespective of location, contributes to the direct and cumulative impacts of development on public facilities and creates the need for new facilities to accommodate growth.



As set forth in Section V of the Fee Study, the fees will be expended for the acquisition, installation, and construction of the public facilities identified on the Needs List (included in Section IV), as that is the purpose for which the Fee is collected. As previously stated, all new development creates either a direct impact on public facilities or contributes to the cumulative impact on public facilities. Moreover, this impact is generally equalized among all types of development because it is the increased demands for public facilities created by the future residents and employees that create the impact upon existing facilities.

For the foregoing reasons, there is a reasonable relationship between the acquisition, construction, and installation of the facilities on the Needs Lists and new development as required under Section 66001(a)(3) of the Mitigation Fee Act.

D. **DETERMINE HOW THERE IS A REASONABLE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEED FOR THE PUBLIC FACILITY AND THE TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT UPON WHICH THE FEE IS IMPOSED (IMPACT RELATIONSHIP) (GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 66001(A)(4))**

As set forth in part F below, as well as throughout Section V, all new development contributes to the direct and cumulative impacts on public facilities and creates the need for new facilities to accommodate growth. As previously stated, all new development within the City, irrespective of location, contributes to the direct and cumulative impacts of development on public facilities and creates the need for new facilities to accommodate growth. Without future development, the facilities on the Needs Lists would not be necessary.

For the reasons presented herein and in Section V, there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facilities included on the Needs List and all new development within the City as required under Section 66001(a)(4) of the Mitigation Fee Act.

E. **THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE AMOUNT OF THE FEE AND THE COST OF THE PUBLIC FACILITIES ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE DEVELOPMENT UPON WHICH THE FEE IS IMPOSED ("ROUGH PROPORTIONALITY" RELATIONSHIP) (GOVERNMENT CODE 66001(A))**

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

New development impacts facilities directly and cumulatively. In fact, without any future development, the acquisition, construction, and/or installation of the public facilities on the Needs Lists would not be necessary as existing City facilities are

generally adequate. Even new development located adjacent to existing facilities will utilize and benefit from public facilities on the Needs List.

As set forth in part F below, as well as throughout Section V and Appendix A of the Fee Study, the proposed fee amounts are roughly proportional to the impacts resulting from new development. Thus there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the facilities.

**F. AB 1600 NEXUS TEST AND APPORTIONMENT OF FACILITIES COSTS**

Section 66000 of the Government Code requires that a reasonable relationship exist between the need for public facilities and the type of development on which a fee is imposed. The need for public facilities is related to the level of service demanded, which varies in proportion to the equivalent dwelling units (“EDUs”) generated by a particular land use type.

Based on the City’s zoning designations, and as further set forth in Section III, DTA established fees for the following four land use categories to acknowledge the difference in impacts resulting from various land uses and to make the resulting fee program easier to implement. The City will develop a table of general plan land use designations that link to the land use classifications used in this study for clarification and consistency with City zoning. This table will be made a part of the ordinance or resolution that will be adopted for the purpose of implementing this fee program.

**TABLE 2-1**

Land Use Classification for Fee Study
Single Family Residential (“SFR” or “Single Family”)
Multi-Family Residential (“MFR” or “Multi-Family”)
Commercial (“C” or “Commercial”)
Industrial (“I” or “Industrial”)

The EDU concept was utilized to determine whether there is a reasonable relationship between the need for a public facility and the land use type of the development on which a fee for an individual facility is imposed. The service factor utilized to determine the EDUs for a specific land use type varies depending upon the type of facility being analyzed. In general, while many EDUs are based on the population or the number of employees associated with a specific land use designation, other EDUs are based on service factors that reflect the nature of a particular type of public improvement, e.g. call generation. This report uses EBU (equivalent benefit unit), instead of EDU, for park and recreation facilities where the service factor is based on recreation hours.

The costs associated with facilities needed to serve new development are identified in the Needs Lists. The facilities cost per EDU/EBU is the total cost of the facility divided by the total number of EDU/EBUs. After the cost per EDU/EBU is determined, the facility fee amount for each land use category is the product of the EDU/EBU factor for each land use category and the cost per EDU/EBU. Transportation costs are allocated to the various land use groups by average daily trips (“ADTs”) generated. Section V presents the nexus test for each fee element (i.e. transportation, public safety, general government, park and recreation, and library facilities) and the analysis undertaken to apportion costs for each type of public facility on the Needs List.

### III. DEMOGRAPHICS

In order to determine the public facilities needed to serve new development as well as establish fee amounts to fund such facilities, the City provided DTA with projections of future population and development within the City through General Plan buildout in 2025. DTA categorized developable residential land uses as Single Family and Multi-Family. Developable non-residential land uses within the City's commercial and industrial zones are categorized as Commercial or Industrial respectively, details are included in the table below. Based on these designations, DTA established fees for the following four land use categories to acknowledge the difference in impacts resulting from various land uses and to make the resulting fee program implementable.

Land Use Classification for Fee Study	Definition
Single Family Residential	Includes single family detached homes, town homes, condominium units, mobile homes, and pre-fabricated homes.
Multi-Family Residential	Includes buildings comprised of two or more attached dwelling units under common ownership, including apartments.
Commercial	Includes, but is not limited to, buildings used as the following (each as further defined in Table LU-4 of the General Plan): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neighborhood Commercial</li> <li>• Office Professional</li> <li>• Community Commercial</li> <li>• Regional Commercial</li> <li>• Commercial Service</li> </ul>
Industrial	Includes, but is not limited to, buildings used as the following (each as further defined in Table LU-4 of the General Plan): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Business Parks,</li> <li>• Manufacturing, fabrication, assembly, research and development,</li> <li>• Industrial services, warehousing, wholesale distribution</li> <li>• Convenience commercial uses, particularly those supporting industrial uses</li> <li>• Outside storage and auto repair</li> </ul>

Information provided by the City, and generally confirmed by the City's 2003 General Plan<sup>1</sup>, including the amendment to the Land Use Element adopted by City Council in October 2012 (together the "General Plan"), was used to estimate the number of housing units and non-residential building square feet to be built through General Plan buildout in 2025.

Future residents and employees will create additional demand for facilities that existing public facilities cannot accommodate. In order to accommodate new development in an orderly

<sup>1</sup> City of El Paso de Robles, General Plan. December 2003. Rincon Consultants, Inc.

manner, while maintaining the current quality of life in the City, the public facilities on the Needs List (Section IV) will need to be constructed.

For those facilities that are needed to mitigate demand from new development, facility costs have been allocated to new development only. In those instances when it has been determined that the new facilities will serve both existing and new development, facility costs have been allocated based on proportionate benefit (see Equivalent Dwelling Unit discussion in Section V).

The following sections summarize the existing and future development figures that were used in calculating the impact fees.

**1. EXISTING POPULATION FOR LAND USE CATEGORIES**

According to information provided by City staff, and generally confirmed by the General Plan, there are 7,437 existing Single Family units and 4,274 existing Multi-Family units located within the City.

According to the U.S. Census, the household size has averaged 2.66 persons between 1980 and 2010. The General Plan now (2012) assumes that each dwelling unit will be occupied with an average 2.66 persons. DTA has used this demographic information and estimated the number of existing residents assuming a resident per unit factor of 2.66 per single family unit and multi-family unit. Therefore, the Citywide population is generally comprised of approximately 31,151 residents living in 11,711 Single Family and Multi-Family homes.

Table 3-1 below summarizes the existing demographics for the residential land uses.

**TABLE 3-1  
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT  
EXISTING RESIDENTS**

Residential Land Use	Existing Residents	Existing Housing Units	Average Household Size
Single Family Residential	19,782	7,437	2.66
Multi-Family Residential	11,369	4,274	2.66
<b>Total/Average</b>	<b>31,151</b>	<b>11,711</b>	<b>2.66</b>

For non-residential land uses, the General Plan was used to determine the existing building square footage for Commercial and Industrial areas within the City. DTA then estimated the number of existing employees in the City by multiplying the existing Commercial and Industrial building square footage by a factor of 1.927 employees per

1,000 BSF and 1.049 employees per 1,000 BSF, respectively.<sup>2</sup> The results of these projections are presented in Table 3-2.

**TABLE 3-2  
NON-RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT  
EXISTING EMPLOYEES**

Non-Residential Land Use	Existing Building Square Feet	Employees per 1,000 BSF	Existing Employees
Commercial	4,044,000 BSF	1.927	7,792
Industrial	2,093,000 BSF	1.049	2,196
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,137,000 BSF</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>9,988</b>

**2. FUTURE POPULATION FOR NEW LAND USE CATEGORIES**

According to information provided by City staff, and generally confirmed by the General Plan, there are projected to be 2,553 future Single Family units and 2,429 future Multi-Family units developed within the City through General Plan buildout in 2025.

DTA then projected the number of future residents assuming the same resident per unit factor of 2.66 per Single Family unit and Multi-Family unit utilized in estimating the current population. Therefore, it is projected that there will be an additional 13,252 residents living in 4,982 future Single Family and Multi-Family units through General Plan buildout in 2025.

Table 3-3 below summarizes the future demographics for the residential land uses.

**TABLE 3-3  
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT  
PROJECTED FUTURE RESIDENTS**

Residential Land Use	Expected Residents	Expected Housing Units	Average Household Size
Single Family Residential	6,791	2,553	2.66
Multi-Family Residential	6,461	2,429	2.66
<b>Total/Average</b>	<b>13,252</b>	<b>4,982</b>	<b>2.66</b>

For non-residential land uses, the General Plan was used to determine the potential building square footage for Commercial and Industrial areas within the City that will be

<sup>2</sup> Employees per 1,000 building square feet determined by David Taussig & Associates, Inc.

developed through General Plan buildout in 2025. DTA then projected the number of future employees in the City using the same factors of 1.927 and 1.049 employees per 1,000 building square feet of Commercial and Industrial, respectively, used in estimating the current number of employees. The results of these projections are presented in Table 3-4.

**TABLE 3-4  
NON-RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT  
PROJECTED FUTURE EMPLOYEES**

Non-Residential Land Use	Building Square Feet Projected to be Developed	Employees per 1,000 BSF	Future Employees
Commercial	2,896,000 BSF	1.927	5,580
Industrial	1,498,000 BSF	1.049	1,572
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,394,000 BSF</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>7,152</b>

**3. EQUIVALENT DWELLING UNIT (EDU) AND EQUIVALENT BENEFIT UNIT (EBU) PROJECTIONS**

Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDU) are a means of quantifying different land uses in terms of their equivalence to a residential dwelling unit, where equivalence is measured in terms of potential infrastructure use or benefit for each type of public facility. Since the facilities proposed to be financed by the levy of impact fees will serve both residential and non-residential property, DTA projected the number of future EDUs based on the number of residents or employees generated by each land use class. For other facilities, different measures, such as number of trips and/or potential hours available for recreation, more accurately represent the benefit provided to each land use type, in which case DTA projected the Equivalent Benefit Unit (EBU). The EDU/EBU projections for each facility are shown in the fee derivation worksheets in Appendix A (See Appendix B "EBU & EDU Calculation Worksheet" for further details of this data).



**IV. THE NEEDS LIST**

Identification of the facilities to be financed is a critical component of any development impact fee program. In the broadest sense the purpose of impact fees is to protect the public health, safety, and general welfare by providing for adequate public facilities. "Public Facilities" per Government Code 66000 includes "public improvements, public services, and community amenities."

Government Code 66000 requires that if impact fees are going to be used to finance public facilities, those facilities must be identified. Identification of the facilities may be made in an applicable general or specific plan, other public documents, or by reference to a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) or Capital Improvement Plan. DTA has worked closely with City staff to develop the list of facilities to be included in the Fee Study ("the Needs List"). For purposes of the City's fee program, the Needs List is intended to be the official public document identifying the facilities eligible to be financed, in whole or in part, through the levy of a development impact fee on new development in the City. The Needs List is organized by facility element (or type) and includes a cost section consisting of five columns, which are listed in Table 4-1 below:

**TABLE 4-1  
CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES NEEDS LIST  
EXPLANATION OF COST SECTION**

<b>Column Title</b>	<b>Contents</b>	<b>Source</b>
Facilities Costs to City	The total estimated facility cost including construction, land acquisition, and equipment (as applicable) allocable to City.	City Departments
Off-Setting Revenues	Any funds on hand that are allocated for a given facility, such as funds from previous DIF programs earmarked for facilities identified on this needs list. This column does not include potential funding from Federal & State sources that cannot be confirmed.	Calculated by DTA based on input from City staff
Net Costs to City	The difference between the Facilities Costs to City and the Off-Setting Revenues (column 1 minus column 2)	Calculated by DTA
Percent of Costs Allocated to New Development	Percentage of facility cost allocated to new development as calculated in Appendix A	Calculated by DTA
Costs Allocated to New Development	Dollar amount representing the roughly proportional impact of new development on the needed facilities.	Calculated by DTA



DTA surveyed City staff to determine what public facilities would be needed to meet increased demands resulting from new development in the City. The survey included the project description, justification, public benefit, estimated costs, and project financing for each proposed facility. Through discussions between DTA and City staff, the Needs List has gone through a series of revisions to fine-tune the needs, costs, and methodologies used in allocating the costs for each facility. For purposes of the fee program, it was determined that a planning horizon through 2025 would be appropriate. The Needs List (Table 4-2) identifies those facilities needed to serve future development through General Plan buildout in 2025.

City Council approved a similar version of the current Needs List at a public workshop on April 25, 2013 as a precursor to the preparation of this Fee Study. With the exception of a few changes in transportation facilities, an increase to the fire station facilities costs, and an increase to the city hall facilities costs, which were made based on input from the City Engineer and through discussions between DTA and City staff, the remainder of the facilities on the Needs List has been previously approved by the City Council. Furthermore, a modified version of the Needs List was reviewed and approved by City Council on February 18, 2014 at a public hearing.

**DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE PROGRAM TABLE 4-2**  
**CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES**  
**PUBLIC FACILITIES NEEDS LIST THROUGH 2025**

Facility Name	(1) Facilities Costs to City	(2) Off-Setting Revenues	(3) Net Costs to City	(4) Percent of Costs Allocated to New Development	(5) Costs Allocated to New Development	(6) Policy Background or Objective
<b>A. TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES</b>						
<u>CITY-WIDE FACILITIES</u>						
7 Highway 101/46East-Dual Left- 17th Street Ramps	\$12,440,000	\$0	\$12,440,000	33.15%	\$4,124,283	Circulation Element
2 Union Road - Highway 46E Interchange	\$30,000,000	\$0	\$30,000,000	33.15%	\$9,946,021	Circulation Element
3 Connection Road 46E to Airport Road, bridge over Huer Huero Road	\$25,005,917	\$0	\$25,005,917	33.15%	\$8,290,312	Circulation Element
4 Airport Road - Dry Creek Road Roundabout	\$2,976,962	\$0	\$2,976,962	33.15%	\$986,964	Circulation Element
5 Dry Creek Road - Airport Road to Aerotech Center Way	\$7,728,241	\$0	\$7,728,241	33.15%	\$2,562,175	Circulation Element
6 Huer Huero Bridge Dry Creek Road to Golden Hill Road	\$18,411,076	\$0	\$18,411,076	33.15%	\$6,103,898	Circulation Element
7 Connection Road - Mill Road to Union Road	\$2,812,872	\$0	\$2,812,872	33.15%	\$932,563	Updated SOI
8 River Oaks Drive - N. River Road	\$1,055,145	\$0	\$1,055,145	33.15%	\$349,816	Circulation Element
9 Buena Vista Drive - Cuesta College Frontage	\$1,316,341	\$0	\$1,316,341	33.15%	\$436,412	Circulation Element
10 Buena Vista Drive - Highway 46E	\$1,322,951	\$0	\$1,322,951	33.15%	\$438,603	Circulation Element
11 Creston Road - River Road to Rolling Hills Road	\$16,271,218	\$0	\$16,271,218	33.15%	\$5,394,462	Circulation Element
12 Creston Road - Lana Street	\$2,470,559	\$0	\$2,470,559	33.15%	\$819,074	Circulation Element
13 Creston Road - Niblick Road to Scott Street	\$5,704,224	\$0	\$5,704,224	33.15%	\$1,891,144	Circulation Element
14 Creston Road - Scott Street Roundabout	\$3,069,462	\$0	\$3,069,462	33.15%	\$1,017,631	Circulation Element
15 Creston Road - Meadowlark Road	\$3,675,194	\$0	\$3,675,194	33.15%	\$1,218,452	Circulation Element
16 Charolais Road - S. River Road Roundabout	\$6,223,415	\$0	\$6,223,415	33.15%	\$2,063,274	Circulation Element
17 Union Road - Kleck Road to Golden Hill Road	\$9,875,660	\$0	\$9,875,660	33.15%	\$3,274,117	Circulation Element
18 Union Road - Golden Hill Road Roundabout	\$6,502,163	\$0	\$6,502,163	33.15%	\$2,155,688	Circulation Element
19 Union Road - Golden Hill Road to East City Limits	\$5,239,735	\$0	\$5,239,735	33.15%	\$1,737,150	Circulation Element
20 Spring Street - 1st to 36th Streets	\$9,909,580	\$0	\$9,909,580	33.15%	\$3,285,363	Town Centre-Uptown Plan
21 Spring Street Traffic Signal Coordination	\$253,008	\$0	\$253,008	33.15%	\$83,881	Circulation Element
22 Vine Street - 32nd to 36th Streets	\$527,443	\$0	\$527,443	33.15%	\$174,865	Uptown Plan
23 24th Street - Mountain Springs Road	\$135,958	\$0	\$135,958	33.15%	\$45,075	Council Objective
24 Riverside Ave - 4th Street to Black Oak Drive	\$7,219,661	\$0	\$7,219,661	33.15%	\$2,393,563	Town Centre-Uptown Plan
25 24th Street - Ysabel Avenue to Riverside Avenue	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$1,000,000	33.15%	\$331,534	Council Objective
26 Railroad Street - 10th Street to 14th Street	\$2,340,988	\$0	\$2,340,988	33.15%	\$776,117	Town Centre Plan
27 4th Street - Pine Street to Riverside - 101 Ramps	\$16,325,665	\$0	\$16,325,665	33.15%	\$5,412,513	Circulation Element
28 Paso Robles Street Off-Ramp	\$4,835,961	\$0	\$4,835,961	33.15%	\$1,603,286	Circulation Element
29 Paso Robles Street	\$302,921	\$0	\$302,921	33.15%	\$100,429	Town Centre Plan
30 Highway 101/46W Interchange (City's Allocation)	\$23,816,000	\$0	\$23,816,000	33.15%	\$7,895,814	Circulation Element
31 Theatre Drive to South City Limits	\$2,050,400	\$0	\$2,050,400	33.15%	\$679,777	Circulation Element
32 Bike Master Plan Facilities	\$16,973,000	\$0	\$16,973,000	33.15%	\$5,627,127	Circulation Element
<u>SPECIFIC PLAN FACILITIES</u>						
33 Airport Road - Union Road to Linne Road	\$4,363,192	\$0	\$4,363,192	33.15%	\$1,446,547	Circulation Element
34 Chandler East - West Road	\$384,137	\$0	\$384,137	33.15%	\$127,355	Circulation Element
35 Airport Road - Meadowlark Road to Creston Road	\$1,500,000	\$0	\$1,500,000	33.15%	\$497,301	Circulation Element
36 Transportation Facilities Revenues/Grants Allocated to Existing Development	NA \$	(13,460,227)	(\$13,460,227)	0.00%	\$0	NA
<b>TOTAL - TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES</b>	<b>\$254,039,049</b>	<b>(\$13,460,227)</b>	<b>\$240,578,822</b>	<b>35.01%</b>	<b>\$84,222,588</b>	

**DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE PROGRAM TABLE 4-2**  
**CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES**  
**PUBLIC FACILITIES NEEDS LIST THROUGH 2025**

Facility Name	(1) Facilities Costs to City	(2) Off-Setting Revenues	(3) Net Costs to City	(4) Percent of Costs Allocated to New Development	(5) Costs Allocated to New Development	(6) Policy Background or Objective
<b>B. PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITIES</b>						
<b>1. Police Facilities</b>						
1 Patrol/Detective/Specialty Vehicles	\$420,900	\$0	\$420,900	100.00%	\$420,900	General Plan
2 Assigned (Additional) Officer Equipment	\$100,200	\$0	\$100,200	75.87%	\$76,023	General Plan
3 Computers and Communication Equipment	\$225,000	\$0	\$225,000	98.67%	\$222,018	General Plan
4 Multi-Channel Portable Radios	\$36,000	\$0	\$36,000	100.00%	\$36,000	General Plan
5 Shooting Range	\$416,240	\$0	\$416,240	34.83%	\$144,961	General Plan
6 Police Facilities Revenues Not Yet Committed	NA	\$ (132,539)	\$ (132,539)	100.00%	\$ (132,539)	NA
<i>subtotal</i>	<i>\$1,198,340</i>	<i>(\$132,539)</i>	<i>\$1,065,801</i>	<i>72.00%</i>	<i>\$767,363</i>	
<b>2. Fire Facilities</b>						
1 Station (3,200 SF Apparatus Bay/3,460 SF Living Quarters) & Equipment	\$6,408,790	\$0	\$6,408,790	100.00%	\$6,408,790	Growth Management Plan
2 Fire Training Facility	\$3,381,375	\$0	\$3,381,375	31.77%	\$1,074,161	Growth Management Plan
3 Type I Fire Engine	\$500,000	\$0	\$500,000	100.00%	\$500,000	Growth Management Plan
4 Fire Facilities Revenues Not Yet Committed	NA	\$ (1,606,538)	\$ (1,606,538)	100.00%	\$ (1,606,538)	NA
<i>subtotal</i>	<i>\$10,290,165</i>	<i>(\$1,606,538)</i>	<i>\$8,683,627</i>	<i>73.43%</i>	<i>\$6,376,413</i>	
<b>TOTAL PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITIES</b>	<b>\$11,488,505</b>	<b>(\$1,739,077)</b>	<b>\$9,749,428</b>	<b>73.27%</b>	<b>\$7,143,776</b>	
<b>C. GENERAL GOVERNMENT FACILITIES</b>						
1 City Hall - LEASE	\$14,250,000	\$0	\$14,250,000	31.77%	\$4,526,795	Council Objective
2 Public Meeting Facility	\$2,565,000	\$0	\$2,565,000	31.77%	\$814,823	Council Objective
3 Downtown Parking	\$14,800,000	\$0	\$14,800,000	31.77%	\$4,701,514	Council Objective
4 Consolidated Corporate Yard	\$8,428,045	\$0	\$8,428,045	100.00%	\$8,428,045	Council Objective
5 General Government Revenues Not Yet Committed	NA	\$ (4,619,206)	\$ (4,619,206)	0.00%	\$0	NA
<b>TOTAL GENERAL GOVERNMENT FACILITIES</b>	<b>\$40,043,045</b>	<b>(\$4,619,206)</b>	<b>\$35,423,839</b>	<b>52.14%</b>	<b>\$18,471,177</b>	
<b>D. PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES</b>						
1 Centennial Park Amphitheatre	\$300,000	\$0	\$300,000	29.84%	\$89,535	Parks and Recreation Element
2 Sherwood Park Land Improvements	\$10,009,600	\$0	\$10,009,600	29.84%	\$2,987,350	Parks and Recreation Element
3 Salinas River Land Acquisition	\$4,680,000	\$0	\$4,680,000	29.84%	\$1,396,739	Parks and Recreation Element
4 Uptown Park Development	\$8,748,495	\$0	\$8,748,495	29.84%	\$2,610,975	Uptown Plan, Parks and Recreation
5 Montebello Park Acquisition and Development	\$4,750,000	\$0	\$4,750,000	100.00%	\$4,750,000	Union-46 Specific Plan, Parks and Recreation
6 Town Centre Park Redevelopment	\$4,629,760	\$0	\$4,629,760	29.84%	\$1,381,745	Town Centre Plan
7 Aquatic Facility per Uptown Plan	\$5,000,000	\$ (391,479)	\$4,608,521	29.84%	\$1,375,406	Uptown Plan
8 Park and Recreation Revenues Not Yet Committed	NA	\$ (1,236,131)	\$ (1,236,131)	29.84%	\$ (368,921)	NA
<b>TOTAL PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES</b>	<b>\$38,117,855</b>	<b>(\$1,627,610)</b>	<b>\$36,490,245</b>	<b>38.98%</b>	<b>\$14,222,827</b>	
<b>E. LIBRARY FACILITIES</b>						
1 Remodel Existing Library Upstairs	\$4,200,000	\$0	\$4,200,000	100.00%	\$4,200,000	Council Objective
2 Library Resources	\$1,196,000	\$0	\$1,196,000	100.00%	\$1,196,000	Council Objective
3 Study Center and Branch Library	\$250,000	\$0	\$250,000	100.00%	\$250,000	Council Objective
4 Library Facilities Revenues not yet Committed	NA	\$ (950,893)	\$ (950,893)	NA	\$ (950,893)	NA
<b>TOTAL LIBRARY FACILITIES</b>	<b>\$5,646,000</b>	<b>(\$950,893)</b>	<b>\$4,695,107</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$4,695,107</b>	
<b>TOTAL ALL FACILITIES</b>	<b>\$349,334,454</b>	<b>(\$22,397,013)</b>	<b>\$326,937,441</b>	<b>39.38%</b>	<b>\$128,755,475</b>	

[a] April 25, 2013 Council Reviewed Needs List Working Document.

[b] City Council requests that all projects conceived should be reflected on the Needs List as actions associated with specific plans/goals adopted by Council.

---

**V. METHODOLOGY UTILIZED TO CALCULATE FACILITIES IMPACT FEE**

---

Pursuant to the nexus requirements of Government Code 66000, a local agency is required to “determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facility or portion of the public facility attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed.” It is impossible to accurately determine the impact that a specific new residential unit, commercial project, or industrial development will have on existing facilities. Predicting future residents’ or employees’ specific behavioral patterns, park and transportation, and health and welfare requirements is extremely difficult, and would involve numerous assumptions that are subject to substantial variances. Recognizing these limitations, the Legislature drafted AB 1600 to specifically require that a “reasonable” relationship be determined, not a direct cause and effect relationship.

There are many methods or ways of calculating fees, but they are all based on determining the cost of needed improvements and assigning those costs equitably to various types of development. Fees for the facilities analyzed in this study have been calculated utilizing the methodologies discussed below. The methodologies are similar in that they employ the concept of an Equivalent Dwelling Unit (“EDU”), or Equivalent Benefit Unit (“EBU”), to allocate benefit among the four land use classes. EDUs are a means of quantifying different land uses in terms of their equivalence to a residential dwelling unit, where equivalence is measured in terms of potential infrastructure use or benefit for each type of public facility. For many of the facilities considered in this Fee Study, EDUs are calculated based on the number of residents and/or employees (“Persons Served”) generated by each land use class. Notably, “Persons Served” equals residents plus 50% of employees, and is common customary industry practice designed to capture the reduced levels of service demanded by employees. For other facilities, different measures, such as number of service calls or potential hours available for park use, more accurately represent the benefit provided to each land use class. This type of benefit measure is expressed as EBU in this study as a means of quantifying different land uses in terms of their equivalence to a common benefit. Additionally, fees for transportation facilities have been calculated utilizing an average daily trip (“ADT”) methodology.

**Methodologies Used**

One global assumption utilized within this Fee Study for the allocation of costs between existing and new development relates to the allocation of costs based on service standards. For example, 100% of the costs of fire facilities and library facilities (other than the fire training facility which is inadequate in its current form and will be abandoned once the new fire training facility is in place) were allocated to new development because the levels of service requested by City staff for new development were below the existing service levels within the City. This assignment of all costs to new development makes sense because there is no existing deficiency in current service levels, and new development is paying for fewer facilities than could be justified based on existing services levels. In these cases, there is no reason for existing development to subsidize new development’s fair share of future facility costs. As for the fire training facility, applicable costs were allocated between existing and future development

based on their relative Equivalent Dwelling Units, as explained in Section V.B below and in Appendix A.

In a similar vein, when the level of service being requested for new development by City department heads was above the existing service level for a specific type of facility, the cost of the new facilities was carefully apportioned between existing and new development in the following manner:

1. New development was assigned 100% of the cost for a level of service that is equivalent to the existing level of service within the City.
2. The cost of the incremental difference between the new, higher level of service being requested by the City and the existing level of service was then allocated between existing development and new development, based on the relative number of equivalent dwelling units (“EDUs”) assigned to existing development and new development.

Table 5-1 below lists existing and projected EDU and EBU data, by facility type, used throughout Section V.

**TABLE 5-1  
CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES  
EQUIVALENT DWELLING UNITS**

Facility Type	Service Factor	Existing EDUs/EBUs	Projected EDUs/EBUs	Total*
Transportation Facilities	Average Daily Trips	110,171	54,641	164,811
Police Facilities	Residents and Employees	19,348	10,339	29,687
Fire Facilities	Persons Served	13,588	6,326	19,915
General Government Facilities	Persons Served	13,588	6,326	19,915
Park Facilities	Residential Park Usage Hours	11,711	4,982	16,693
Library Facilities	Residents	11,711	4,982	16,693

\* Totals may not sum due to rounding.

The following sections present the reasonable relationship for benefit, impact, and rough proportionality tests for each fee element (i.e., transportation, police, fire, general government, park and recreation, and library facilities) and the analysis undertaken to apportion costs for

each type public facility on the Needs List. More detailed fee calculation worksheets for each type of facility are included in Appendix A.

**A. TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES**

The Circulation Element of the General Plan includes facilities necessary to provide safe and efficient vehicular access throughout the City. In order to meet the transportation demands of new development through General Plan buildout in 2025, the City updated this list to include various roadway improvements including rights of way, signalization, widening of roads, paving, and bridges as shown in the Needs List.

**1. Nexus Requirement of AB 1600**

**TABLE 5-2  
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES  
AB 1600 NEXUS TEST**

Identify Purpose of Fee	Transportation Improvements
Identify Use of Fee	Various roadway improvements including rights of way, signalization, widening of roads, paving, and bridges
Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility, the use of the fee, and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed	New residential and non-residential development will generate additional residents and employees who will create additional vehicular and non-vehicular traffic. Bridges and interchanges will have to be constructed to meet the increased demand and provide for city-wide circulation. Traffic signals, interchanges, bridges and roads will have to be improved or extended to meet the increased demand resulting from new development. Thus there is a relationship between new development and the need for new transportation facilities. Fees collected from new development will be used exclusively for transportation facilities on the Needs List.

**2. Apportionment of Transportation Facilities Costs**

Roads, traffic signals and bridges will benefit residents and employees by providing safe and efficient vehicular access to properties. Road, traffic signals and bridge fees were calculated for each of the four land use categories based on the number of (“ADTs”) generated by each land use. Total average ADTs were calculated by applying these trip rates to the various dwelling unit counts and non-residential square feet identified in the demographics section of this report. The total facilities cost was then divided by the total number of ADTs to establish a uniform cost per ADT. This unit cost was then applied to the various land uses and their respective trip generation rates to determine the proposed fees. Expected revenue from new development was also calculated as a check,

insuring that collected fees match the calculated cost responsibility of new development.

All of the transportation facilities were sized to meet the needs of both existing and future residents and employees. Therefore, the costs of these facilities have been allocated between existing development and new development based on their percentage of build out EDUs. Hence, 66.85% of the costs will be allocated to existing development and 33.15% of the costs will be allocated to new development. In total, \$84,222,588 out of \$254,039,049 in gross transportation facilities costs would be covered by impact fees on new development (\$1,541.39 per ADT).

Fee amounts to finance the roads, traffic signals, and bridge facilities on the Needs List are presented in Table 5-3 below. Details regarding the analysis related to transportation facilities are included in Appendix A-1.

**TABLE 5-3  
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES  
FEE DERIVATION SUMMARY**

Land Use Type	Trip Generation Rate per Unit / per 1,000 Non-Res SF	Number of Future Units / Non-Res SF	Total Future ADTs	Development Impact Fee per Unit / per 1,000 Non-Res SF	Transportation Facilities Costs Financed by Fees
Single Family	7.56	2,553	19,301	\$11,653	\$29,749,932
Multi-Family	5.21	2,429	12,655	\$8,031	\$19,506,466
Commercial	6.84	2,896,000	19,809	\$10,543	\$30,532,898
Industrial	1.92	1,498,000	2,876	\$2,959	\$4,433,293
<b>Total</b>			<b>54,641</b>		<b>\$84,222,588</b>
Gross Costs Allocated to Existing Development					\$169,816,461
<b>Total Gross Transportation Facilities Costs</b>					<b>\$254,039,049</b>

The total expected revenues from development fees are \$84,222,588. If development takes place as projected in Section III, the fee amounts presented in Tables 5-3 are expected to finance 35.01% of the net costs of the transportation facilities identified on the Needs List. The remaining 64.99% of the net costs of transportation facilities will be funded through other sources.



**B. PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITIES**

The Public Safety element includes those facilities used by the City to protect life and property. In order to serve new development through General Plan buildout in 2025, the City identified the need for one new fire station. The fire station, and the equipment required to service this fire station, is needed to serve new development exclusively and will be funded 100% by new development. Additionally, there is a need for patrol/detective/specialty vehicles, officer equipment, computers and communication equipment and multi-channel portable radios, fire fighter equipment, and one fire engine which will be sized to serve projected new development only.

In addition, a police shooting range and a 7,200 square foot fire training facility has been identified and has been sized to serve projected new and existing development, as both the existing police shooting range and fire training facility within the City are inadequate in their current form and will be abandoned once the new aforementioned facilities are in place. Therefore, the costs of these facilities have been allocated between existing development and new development based on their percentage of build out EDUs.

Police facilities fee amounts for this element were calculated for both residential and non-residential land uses as detailed in Appendix A-2, and fire facilities fee amounts for this element were calculated for both residential and non-residential land uses as detailed in Appendix A-3. Each of the land use categories (Single Family, Multi-Family, Commercial, and Industrial) is assigned an EDU factor derived from (i) for police facilities - number of calls for police services generated by each of the land use categories, and (ii) for fire facilities - the number of persons per household (for residential units) or the number of employees per 1,000 Square Feet of non-residential development.

**1. NEXUS REQUIREMENT OF AB 1600**

**TABLE 5-4  
PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITIES  
AB 1600 NEXUS TEST**

Identify Purpose of Fee	Police and Fire Facilities
Identify Use of Fee	Construction and acquisition of public safety facilities and equipment including fire stations, vehicles, and equipment.
Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility, the use of the fee, and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed	New residential and non-residential development will generate additional residents and employees who will require additional service calls increasing the need for trained police and fire personnel. Buildings and vehicles used to provide these services will have to be expanded, constructed or purchased to meet this increased demand. Thus a reasonable relationship exists between the need for public safety facilities and the impact of residential and non-residential development. Fees collected from new development will be used exclusively for public safety purposes, as identified on the Needs List.



## 2. Apportionment of Public Safety Facilities Costs

### Calculation Methodology

As identified in the Police Facilities Fee Calculation worksheet included as Appendix A-2, 100% of the costs of patrol/detective/specialty vehicles and multi-channel portable radios were allocated to new development because the levels of service requested by City staff for new development for such facilities were below the existing service levels within the City. This assignment of all costs to new development makes sense because there is no existing deficiency in current service levels, and new development is paying for fewer facilities than could be justified based on existing services levels. In this case, there is no reason for existing development to subsidize new development's fair share of future patrol/detective/specialty vehicles and multi-channel portable radios costs. As for the other police facilities, applicable costs were allocated between existing and future development based on their relative Equivalent Dwelling Units, as detailed in Appendix A-2.

Fee amounts for police fees were calculated for both residential and non-residential land uses as detailed in Appendices A-2. Police fees were derived based on the number of calls for police services generated by each of the land use categories (Single Family, Multi-Family, Commercial, and Industrial) during a typical calendar year. Since these calls for service by land use are an average, they were used to project number of additional calls that could be expected by multiplying the calls per residential unit or per 1,000 square feet for non-residential development by the number of anticipated new residential dwelling units or non-residential building square footage. As an example, the data collected indicates that on average a Single Family unit will generate just over 1.40 calls per year, which equates to a total of 10,397 calls based on the existing Single Family development, and a total of 3,569 additional calls based on the projected Single Family development assumptions outlined in Section III.

As identified in the Fire Facilities Fee Calculation worksheet included as Appendix A-3, 100% of the costs of the new fire station, the equipment required to service this fire station, and one fire engine were allocated to new development because the levels of service requested by City staff for new development for such facilities were below the existing service levels within the City. This assignment of all costs to new development makes sense because there is no existing deficiency in current service levels, and new development is paying for fewer facilities than could be justified based on existing services levels. In this case, there is no reason for existing development to subsidize new development's fair share of the new fire station, the equipment required to service this fire station, and the fire engine costs. As for the fire training facility, applicable costs were

allocated between existing and future development based on their relative Equivalent Dwelling Units, as detailed in Appendix A-3.

Fee amounts for fire fees were calculated for both residential and non-residential land uses as detailed in Appendix A-3. Each land use classification (i.e. Single Family, Multi-Family, Commercial, and Industrial) was assigned an EDU factor which was derived from the number of Persons Served, which again is defined as the persons per household (for residential units) and 50% of the number of employees per 1,000 building square feet of each category of non-residential development as presented in Table 5-6.

### Fee Amounts

Tables 5-5 and 5-6 below present a summary of the derivation of EDUs, fee amounts and the costs financed by fees for police and fire facilities on the Needs List. Calculation details are presented in Appendices A-2 and A-3.

**TABLE 5-5  
POLICE FACILITIES  
FEE DERIVATION SUMMARY**

Land Use Type	Calls per Unit / per 1,000 Non-Res. SF	Number of Future Units / Non-Res SF	Total Future Calls	Development Impact Fee per Unit / per 1,000 Non-Res SF	Police Facilities Costs Financed by Fees
Single Family	1.40	2,553	3,569	\$74	\$189,489
Multi-Family	1.65	2,429	3,997	\$87	\$212,209
Commercial	2.11	2,896,000	6,108	\$112	\$324,255
Industrial	0.52	1,498,000	780	\$28	\$41,410
<b>Total</b>			<b>14,454</b>		<b>\$767,363</b>
Net Cost Allocated to Existing Development & Funded Through Other Sources					\$298,438
<b>Total Net Police Facilities Costs</b>					<b>\$1,065,801</b>

Based on the development projections in Section III, the fee amounts presented in Table 5-5 are expected to finance 72.00% of the net costs of the police facilities on the Needs List. The remaining 28.00% of the net costs of the police facilities will be funded through other sources on behalf of existing development.

**TABLE 5-6  
FIRE FACILITIES  
FEE DERIVATION SUMMARY**

Land Use Type	Residents/ Employees per Unit / per 1,000 Non-Res. SF	EDUs per per Unit / per 1,000 Non- Res. SF	Number of Future EDUs	Development Impact Fee per Unit / per 1,000 Non- Res SF	Fire Facilities Costs Financed by Fees
Single Family	2.66	1.00	2,553	\$1,008	\$2,573,211
Multi-Family	2.66	1.00	2,429	\$1,008	\$2,448,229
Commercial	0.96	0.36	1,049	\$365	\$1,057,168
Industrial	0.52	0.20	295	\$199	\$297,805
<b>Total</b>			<b>6,326</b>		<b>\$6,376,413</b>
Net Cost Allocated to Existing Development & Funded Through Other Sources					\$2,307,214
<b>Total Net Fire Facilities Costs</b>					<b>\$8,683,627</b>

Based on the development projections in Section III, the fee amounts presented in Table 5-6 are expected to finance 73.43% of the net costs of the fire facilities on the Needs List. The remaining 26.57% of the net costs of the fire facilities will be funded through other sources on behalf of existing development.

**C. GENERAL GOVERNMENT FACILITIES**

The general government facilities include those facilities used by the City to provide basic governmental services and public facilities maintenance services, exclusive of public safety services. In order to serve future development through General Plan buildout in 2025, the City identified the need for new public works and government facilities. The City Hall on the Needs List is a new facility that will replace the existing City Hall. The City has also identified a need for a public meeting facility (e.g., community center), a downtown parking structure and expansion of the City Yard. Such general government facilities, excluding the expansion of the City Yard that is needed to serve new development exclusively and will be funded 100% by new development, are expected to benefit both existing and new development in the City and the costs will be allocated based on total EDUs at General Plan buildout in 2025.

1. Nexus Requirement of AB 1600

TABLE 5-7  
GENERAL GOVERNMENT FACILITIES  
AB 1600 NEXUS TEST

Identify Purpose of Fee	General Government Facilities
Identify Use of Fee	Acquisition and construction of facilities used to provide general government and public maintenance services of City facilities.
Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility, the use of the fee, and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed	New residential and non-residential development in the City will generate additional residents and employees who will increase the demand for City services including public works and general government functions. Population and growth has a direct impact on the need for government services and facilities, thus a reasonable relationship exists between new development and the public works/general government facilities, which will have to be acquired to meet the increased demand. Fees collected from new development will be used exclusively for general government facilities on the Needs List.

2. Apportionment of General Government Facilities Costs

Calculation Methodology

As identified in the General Government Facilities Fee Calculation worksheet included as Appendix A-4, 100% of the costs of the consolidated City Yard were allocated to new development because the level of service requested by City staff for new development for such facility was below the existing service level within the City. This assignment of all costs to new development makes sense because there is no existing deficiency in the current service level, and new development is paying for fewer facilities than could be justified based on the existing service level. In this case, there is no reason for existing development to subsidize new development's fair share of the costs of the consolidated City Yard. As for the other general government facilities, applicable costs were allocated between existing and future development based on their relative Equivalent Dwelling Units, as detailed in Appendix A-4.

Fee amounts for this element were calculated for both residential and non-residential land uses as detailed in Appendix A-4. Each land use classification (i.e. Single Family, Multi-Family, Commercial, and Industrial) was assigned an EDU factor which was derived from the number of Persons Served, which again is defined as the persons per household (for residential units) and 50% of the number of employees per 1,000 building square feet of each category of non-residential development as presented in Table 5-8.

### Fee Amounts

Table 5-8 represents a summary of the derivation of EDUs, fee amounts and the costs financed by fees for the general government facilities. A total of \$18,471,177 is needed to fund new development's share of a new City Hall, public meeting facility (e.g., a community center), a downtown parking structure and expansion of the City Yard. The details of the fee calculation are presented in Appendix A-4.

**TABLE 5-8  
GENERAL GOVERNMENT FACILITIES  
FEE DERIVATION SUMMARY**

Land Use Type	Residents/ Employees per Unit / per 1,000 Non- Res. SF	EDUs per per Unit / per 1,000 Non-Res. SF	Number of Future EDUs	Development Impact Fee per Unit / per 1,000 Non- Res. SF	Government Facilities Costs Financed by Fees
Single Family	2.66	1.00	2,553	\$2,920	\$7,454,070
Multi-Family	2.66	1.00	2,429	\$2,920	\$7,092,024
Commercial	1.927	0.36	1,049	\$1,057	\$3,062,402
Industrial	1.049	0.20	295	\$576	\$862,680
<b>Total</b>					<b>\$18,471,177</b>
Net Cost Allocated to Existing Development & Funded Through Other Sources					\$16,952,662
<b>Total Net Government Facilities Costs</b>					<b>\$35,423,839</b>

Based on the development projections in Section III, the fee amounts presented in Table 5-8 will finance 52.14% of the net costs of the general government facilities identified on the Needs List. The remaining 47.86% of the net costs of general government facilities will be funded through other sources on behalf of existing development.

#### **D. PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES**

The Parks Facilities will serve the residents of the City by providing facilities for recreation while enhancing the community's appeal and quality of life. The Fee Study includes a component for the acquisition of approximately 117 acres for Salina River land acquisition, as well as new park facilities including an aquatic facility to serve new residential development through General Plan buildout in 2025. Such park facilities, excluding the Montebello Park facilities that are needed to serve new development exclusively and will be funded 100% by new development, are expected to benefit both existing and new development in the City and the costs will be allocated based on total EBUs at General Plan buildout in 2025.

Six park facilities are proposed in addition to the new aquatics facility. Salinas River, Centennial Park, Sherwood Park, Uptown Park, Town Centre Park and Montebello Park represent a mix and match of active and passive park usage, of new land acquisition, and expansion of City currently owned park acquisitions. Table 5-9 below identifies the facilities proposed to be funded in whole or in part with the fees. Acquisition costs and improvement costs were provided by City staff. City staff and the City Council are sensitive to the rising costs of both land acquisition and construction costs, supported by recent and ongoing right of way negotiations by the City, as well as construction inflation indices such as the Engineering News Record.

**TABLE 5-9  
PARK FACILITIES AND FACILITIES COSTS**

Facility	Facility Unit	Acres	Facilities Costs
Salinas River Land Acquisition	Acre	117	\$4,680,000
Centennial Park Amphitheatre	Acre	16	\$300,000
Sherwood Park Land Improvements	Acre	28	\$10,009,600
Uptown Park Development	Acre	10	\$8,748,495
Town Centre Park Redevelopment	NA	NA	\$4,629,760
Montebello Park Acquisition & Development	3	3	\$4,750,000
<b>Total Facilities Cost</b>			<b>\$33,117,855</b>

Land acquisition costs for Salinas Corridor and Montebello Park are dependent on the real estate market at the time of acquisition. Location, demand for land, encumbrances, comparable acquisitions, and construction costs are a few of the many variables that play into appraisals and negotiations. Each park has its own location and improvement requirements. For instance, Centennial Park is an expansion of existing City owned park land and will have passive uses such as paths and open space. It is reasonable that the total cost per acre would be the lower of the six parks. In Contrast, Montebello Park, though only 3 acres, will need to be acquired in an area of higher demand for land, and the improvements will be active in nature, such as lighted sports fields, community structures and parking facilities, all contributing to a higher cost per acre of the six parks.

Parks and recreation improvements have been further divided into three groups. The first group consists of the park facilities required to serve new and existing development through General Plan buildout in 2025 and include the facilities identified in Table 5-9 above, excluding the Montebello Park facilities. In order to provide the same level of facilities for both existing and new development, the costs for such proposed park land and improvements have been allocated to both existing and new development based on total EBUs at General Plan buildout in 2025 as shown in Tables V(A) through V(C) of Appendix A-5. New development is assigned 29.84% of these facilities costs, as shown in Appendix A-5.

The second group of park facilities consists of the Montebello Park facilities that are needed to serve new development exclusively and will be funded 100% by new development.



The third group consists solely of the new aquatic facility. As there is no existing facility, and therefore the existing level of service is zero, the new aquatic facility costs will be shared between existing and new development in proportion to the relative number of existing and future EBUs at General Plan buildout in 2025. New development is assigned 29.84% of this cost, as shown in Appendix A-5.

**1. NEXUS REQUIREMENT OF AB 1600**

**TABLE 5-10  
PARK AND RECREATION ELEMENT  
AB 1600 NEXUS TEST**

Identify Purpose of Fee	Park and Recreation Facilities
Identify Use of Fee	The construction and acquisition of parkland, open space, and aquatic facility.
Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility, the use of the fee, and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed	New residential development will generate additional residents and who will increase the demand for active and passive park and recreation facilities within the City. Land will have to be purchased and improved to meet this increased demand, thus a reasonable relationship exists between the need for park and open space facilities and the impact of residential development. Fees collected from new development will be used exclusively for park and open space facilities identified on the Needs List.

**2. APPORTIONMENT OF PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES COSTS**

**Calculation Methodology**

Since the use of park facilities is generally limited to daytime hours, it is reasonable to assume that a non-working resident has a greater number of available hours for potential use per week than either a working resident or employee. In order to equitably allocate the costs between future residents, availability of use is measured in term of equivalent benefit units or (EBUs) with one (1) EBU representing the potential recreation usage of a single-family residential unit.

**Equivalent Benefit Unit (EBU) Determination**

As previously stated, EBUs for park and open space facilities are a function of the number of hours potentially available for use of the park facilities. Table 5-11 presents the assumptions used to determine the potential usage for a typical week.

**TABLE 5-11  
PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES  
TOTAL HOURS OF POTENTIAL PARKS USAGE PER WEEK**

User of Facilities	Potential Recreation Hours Work Day	Number of Work Days per Week	Hours Per Weekend Day	Number of Weekend Days Per Week	Potential Recreation Hours Per Week Per Person
Resident, non-working	12	5	12	2	84
Resident, working	2	5	12	2	34

Tables 5-12 and 5-13 present the total potential hours available for recreation use for each residential land use classification (i.e. SFR, MFR). Fee amounts for park facilities were calculated for residential land uses as detailed in Appendix A-5.

**TABLE 5-12  
PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES  
TOTAL POTENTIAL RECREATION HOURS PER WEEK  
SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL**

Type of Resident	Residents Per Single Family Household	Potential Recreation Hours / Week per Person	Potential Recreation Hours / Week per Single Family Household
Resident, non-working	1.57	84	132
Resident, working	1.09	34	37
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.66</b>		<b>169</b>

**TABLE 5-13  
PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES  
TOTAL POTENTIAL RECREATION HOURS PER WEEK  
MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL**

Type of Resident	Residents Per Multi-Family Household	Potential Recreation Hours / Week per Person	Potential Recreation Hours/Week per Multi-Family Household
Resident, non-working	1.57	84	132
Resident, working	1.09	34	37
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.66</b>		<b>169</b>



**Fee Amounts**

Table 5-14 presents a summary of the derivation of equivalent benefit units (“EBUs”), fee amounts and costs to be financed by fees for park and recreation facilities. Appendix A-5 contains the fee derivation worksheet for park and recreation facilities (summarized in Table 5-14).

**TABLE 5-14  
PARK AND RECREATION FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS  
FEE DERIVATION SUMMARY**

Land Use Type	Potential Recreation Hour per Week per Unit	EBUs per Unit	Number of New EBUs	Development Impact Fee Per Unit	Park Facilities Costs Financed by Fees
Single Family	169	1.00	2,553	\$2,855	\$7,288,414
Multi-Family	169	1.00	2,429	\$2,855	\$6,934,413
<b>Total</b>	<b>338</b>				<b>\$14,222,827</b>
Cost Allocated to Existing Development & Funded Through Other Sources					\$22,267,418
<b>Total Net Park and Recreation Facilities Costs</b>					<b>\$36,490,245</b>

If development takes place as projected in Section III, the fee amounts presented in Table 5-14 are expected to finance 38.98% of the net costs of the park and recreation facilities on the Needs List. The remaining 61.02% of the net costs of the park and recreation facilities will be funded through other sources on behalf of existing development.

**E. LIBRARY FACILITIES**

The library facilities will serve the residents of the City by promoting literacy and learning, as well as, providing an improved quality of life. The Fee Study includes a component for expanding and remodeling the existing library facilities, including acquiring library books and materials for these facilities. The costs of the library facilities have been allocated to new residential development only.

1. Nexus Requirement of AB 1600

TABLE 5-15  
LIBRARY AMENITIES  
AB 1600 NEXUS TEST

Identify Purpose of Fee	Library Facilities
Identify Use of Fee	Expanding and remodeling of existing library facilities, including the acquisition of books and materials for these facilities
Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility, the use of the fee, and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed	New residential development will generate additional residents who will become library patrons that will demand increased library services, remodeling of the library and addition of a study center and branch library. Collections will have expanded and additional volumes acquired to meet this increased demand. Fees collected from new development will be used for the remodeling/expansion of the existing library facilities, and the acquisition of books and materials

2. Apportionment of Library Facilities Costs

**Calculation Methodology**

Fee amounts for this element were calculated for residential land uses as detailed in Appendix A-6. Each of the land use categories (Single Family and Multi-Family) is assigned an EDU factor derived from the number of persons per household as presented in Table 5-16.

The City currently utilizes an approximate 20,610 square foot building for the branch library and a separate 1,920 square foot study center located at 3600 Oak Street. According to the City, the current level of services is adequate to serve the existing development within the City. The City has determined that an expansion and remodel of the existing library facilities, including acquiring library books and materials for these facilities, will be needed as a result of new development. Therefore, 100% of the costs will be allocated to new development.

**TABLE 5-16  
LIBRARY FACILITIES  
FEE DERIVATION SUMMARY**

Land Use Type	Residents per Unit	EDUs per Unit	Number of Future EDUs	Development Impact Fee per Unit	Library Facilities Costs Financed by Fees
Single Family	2.66	1.00	2,553	\$942	\$2,405,983
Multi-Family	2.66	1.00	2,429	\$942	\$2,289,124
<b>Total</b>			<b>4,982</b>		<b>\$4,695,107</b>
Cost Allocated to Existing Development & Funded Through Other Sources					\$0
<b>Total Net Library Facilities Costs</b>					<b>\$4,695,107</b>

Based on the development projections in Section III, the fee amounts presented in Table 5-16 are expected to finance 100% of the net costs of the library facilities on the Needs List.

## VI. SUMMARY OF FEES

The total impact fee amounts to finance new development's share of the costs of facilities in the Needs Lists are summarized in Table 6-1.

**TABLE 6-1  
DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE SUMMARY**

Facility	Residential Development		Non-Residential Development	
	Single Family (\$ per unit)	Multi-Family (\$ per unit)	Commercial (\$ per 1,000 SF)	Industrial (\$ per 1,000 SF)
A. Transportation Facilities	\$11,653	\$8,031	\$10,543	\$2,959
B. Public Safety Facilities				
Police Facilities	\$74	\$87	\$112	\$28
<u>Fire Facilities</u>	<u>\$1,008</u>	<u>\$1,008</u>	<u>\$365</u>	<u>\$199</u>
Subtotal Public Safety Facilities	\$1,082	\$1,095	\$477	\$227
C. General Government Facilities	\$2,920	\$2,920	\$1,057	\$576
D. Park and Recreation Facilities	\$2,855	\$2,855	NA	NA
E. Library Facilities	\$942	\$942	NA	NA
<b>Total Impact Fees</b>	<b>\$19,452</b>	<b>\$15,843</b>	<b>\$12,077</b>	<b>\$3,762</b>
<i>(S per BSF for Non-Residential)</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>\$12.077</i>	<i>\$3.762</i>

**Appendix A**  
**Fee Derivation Worksheets**

# Appendix A-1

## City of El Paso de Robles

### Transportation Facilities Fee Calculation

#### I. Existing Daily Trips Calculation

Land Use Type	Trip Generation Rate per Unit / per Non-Res. 1,000 S.F. (commercial pass- throughs deducted)	Number of Units / Non- Res. SF	Total Daily Trips
Single Family Residential	7.56	7,437	56,224
Multi Family Residential	5.21	4,274	22,268
Commercial	6.84	4,044,000	27,661
Industrial	1.92	2,093,000	4,019
<b>Total Existing Daily Trips</b>			<b>110,171</b>

#### II. Projected Daily Trips Calculation

Land Use Type	Trip Generation Rate per Unit / per Non-Res. 1,000 S.F. (commercial pass- throughs deducted)	Number of Units / Non- Res. SF	Total Daily Trips
Single Family Residential	7.56	2,553	19,301
Multi Family Residential	5.21	2,429	12,655
Commercial	6.84	2,896,000	19,809
Industrial	1.92	1,498,000	2,876
<b>Total Projected Daily Trips</b>			<b>54,641</b>

#### III. Proposed Transportation Facilities Costs

Facilities Type	Facilities Costs
City-Wide Transportation Facilities Costs	\$247,791,720
Offsetting Revenues - Total	(\$13,460,227)
<b>Net City-Wide Transportation Facilities Costs</b>	<b>\$234,331,493</b>
Plus: Specific Plan Facilities	\$6,247,329
<b>Total Transportation Facilities Costs</b>	<b>\$240,578,822</b>

#### IV. Allocation of City-Wide Transportation Facilities Costs (based on Daily Trips)

Development Description	Total Daily Trips	Percentage of Costs Allocated	Facilities Costs
Existing Development	110,171	66.85%	\$165,640,334
New Development	54,641	33.15%	\$82,151,386
<b>Total City-Wide Transportation Facilities Costs</b>	<b>164,811</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$247,791,720</b>

# Appendix A-1

## City of El Paso de Robles

### Transportation Facilities Fee Calculation

**V. Allocation of Specific Plan Facilities Costs (based on Daily Trips)**

Development Description	Percentage of Costs Allocated	Facilities Costs
Specific Plan Development	66.85%	\$4,176,127
New Development (Outside of Specific Plan)	33.15%	\$2,071,202
<b>Total Specific Plan Facilities Costs</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$6,247,329</b>

**VI. Allocation of Transportation Facilities Costs to New Development (based on Projected Daily Trips)**

Facility Type	Projected Daily Trips	Facilities Costs Allocated to New Development	Facilities Cost Per Daily Trip
Transportation Facilities Costs	54,641	\$84,222,588	\$1,541.39
<b>Transportation Facilities Costs Summary</b>	<b>54,641</b>		<b>\$1,541.39</b>

**VII. Development Impact Fee per Residential Unit / per 1,000 Non-Residential Bldg. SF**

Land Use Type	Trip Generation Rate per Unit / per Non-Res. 1,000 S.F. (commercial pass- throughs deducted)	Transportation Facilities Cost per Unit / per Non- Res. 1,000 SF	Transportation Facilities Costs Financed by DIF
Single Family Residential	7.56	\$11,653	\$29,749,932
Multi Family Residential	5.21	\$8,031	\$19,506,466
Commercial	6.84	\$10,543	\$30,532,898
Industrial	1.92	\$2,959	\$4,433,293
<b>Gross Allocation to New Development</b>			<b>\$84,222,588</b>
<b>Gross Allocation to Existing Development</b>			<b>\$169,816,461</b>
<b>Total Transportation Facilities Costs</b>			<b>\$254,039,049</b>
<b>Offsetting Revenues Not Yet Committed - Allocated to Existing Development</b>			<b>\$ (13,460,227)</b>
<b>Net Transportation Facilities Costs</b>			<b>\$240,578,822</b>

Notes:

[1] Based on daily trip rates extrapolated from the Fehr & Peers Traffic Demand Forecast Model incorporated in the 2011 Circulation Element.

[2] Assumes allowance for diverted trips or pass-throughs: 75% for Commercial and 55% for Industrial. Based on direction received from Public Works Department.



**Appendix A-2  
City of El Paso de Robles  
Police Facilities Fee Calculation**

**I. Inventory of Existing Facilities**

Facility	Quantity	Facility Units
Patrol and Specialty Vehicles	25	Each
Assigned Officer Equipment	33	Each
Computers & Comm Equipment	33	Each
Multi-channel Portable Radios	41	Each
Shooting Range	0	Each

**II. Existing EDU Calculation**

Land Use Type	[a] Number of Units/ Non-Res 1,000 SF	[b] Total Calls <sup>11)</sup>	[c] Calls per Unit/ Employees per Non-Res. 1,000 SF <sup>11)</sup>	[d] EDU's per Unit/ Non-Res. 1,000 SF	[e] Total Number of EDU's [a]*[d]
Single Family	7,437	10,397	1.40	1.00	7,437
Multi-Family	4,274	7,033	1.65	1.18	5,031
Commercial	4,044	8,529	2.11	1.51	6,101
Industrial	2,093	1,090	0.52	0.37	780
<b>Total</b>					<b>19,348</b>

**III. Existing Service Standard**

Facility	Quantity	Facility Units	Quantity per 1,000 EDU's
Patrol and Specialty Vehicles	25	Each	1.29
Assigned Officer Equipment	33	Each	1.71
Computers & Comm Equipment	33	Each	1.71
Multi-channel Portable Radios	41	Each	2.12
Shooting Range	0	Each	0.00

**IV. Future EDU Calculations**

Land Use Type	[a] Number of Units/ Non-Res 1,000 SF <sup>12)</sup>	[b] Total Projected Calls	[c] Calls per Unit/ Employees per Non-Res. 1,000 SF <sup>11)</sup>	[d] EDU's per Unit/ Non-Res. 1,000 SF	[e] Total Number of EDU's [a]*[d]
Single Family	2,553	3,569	1.40	1.00	2,553
Multi-Family	2,429	3,997	1.65	1.18	2,859
Commercial	2,896	6,108	2.11	1.51	4,369
Industrial	1,498	780	0.52	0.37	558
<b>Total</b>					<b>10,339</b>

**V. Proposed Inventory, Cost, and Service Standard**

Facility	Quantity	Facility Units	Facility Cost	Quantity per 1,000 EDU's
Patrol and Specialty Vehicles	13	Each	\$420,900	1.26
Assigned Officer Equipment	28	Each	\$100,200	2.71
Computers & Comm Equipment	18	Each	\$225,000	1.74
Multi-channel Portable Radios	16	Each	\$36,000	1.55
Shooting Range	1	Each	\$416,240	0.10
<b>Offsetting Revenues</b>			<b>(\$132,539)</b>	
<b>Total Cost of Police Facilities</b>			<b>\$1,065,801</b>	

**VI. Allocation of Police Facilities to Existing & New Development (based on total EDUs)**

[a] Existing Facility Units Per 1,000 EDU's	[b] Total Future EDU's	[c] Facility Units Allocated 100% To New Development [3] [a]*[b]	[d] Proposed Service Standard Per 1,000 EDU's	[e] Facility Units per EDU Beyond Existing [d]-[a]	[f] Facility Units Beyond Existing Service Standard [4] [b]*[e]	[g] Total Proposed New Facility Units [c]+[f]
1.29	10,338.76	13.36	1.26	0.00	0.00	13.00

**A.2 Facility Units Beyond Existing Service Standard Split Between New and Existing, plus SF allocated 100% to New Development -- Not Applicable**

**A.3 Cost Allocated Between Existing and New Development**

Facility Type	Total Number of Vehicles	Percentage of Cost Allocated	Facility Cost
Existing	0.00	0.00%	\$0
New Development	13.00	100.00%	\$420,900
<b>Total</b>	<b>13.00</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$420,900</b>

**B.1 Assigned Officer Equipment**

[a] Existing Facility Units Per 1,000 EDU's	[b] Total Future EDU's	[c] Facility Units Allocated 100% To New Development [3] [a]*[b]	[d] Proposed Service Standard Per 1,000 EDU's	[e] Facility Units per EDU Beyond Existing [d]-[a]	[f] Facility Units Beyond Existing Service Standard [4] [b]*[e]	[g] Total Proposed New Facility Units [c]+[f]
1.71	10,338.76	17.63	2.71	1.00	10.37	28.00

**Appendix A-2  
City of El Paso de Robles  
Police Facilities Fee Calculation**

B.2 Facility Units Beyond Existing Service Standard Split Between New and Existing, plus SF allocated 100% to New Development					
Facility Type	Number of EDU's	Percentage of Total EDU's	Facility Units Split Between New and Existing Development	Facility Units Allocated 100% To New Development	Total Facility Units Allocated
Existing	19,348	65.17%	6.76	NA	6.76
New Development	10,339	34.83%	3.61	17.63	21.24
<b>Total</b>	<b>29,687</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>10.37</b>		<b>28.00</b>

B.3 Cost Allocated Between Existing and New Development			
Facility Type	Total Number of Facility Units	Percentage of Cost Allocated	Facility Cost
Existing	6.76	24.13%	\$24,177
New Development	21.24	75.87%	\$76,023
<b>Total</b>	<b>28.00</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$100,200</b>

C.1 Computers and Communication Equipment						
[a] Existing Facility Units Per 1,000 EDU's	[b] Total Future EDU's	[c] Facility Units Allocated 100% To New Development [3] [a]*[b]	[d] Proposed Service Standard Per 1,000 EDU's	[e] Facility Units per EDU Beyond Existing [d]-[a]	[f] Facility Units Beyond Existing Service Standard [4] [b]*[e]	[g] Total Proposed New Facility Units [c]+[f]
1.71	10,338.76	17.63	1.74	0.04	0.37	18.00

C.2 Facility Units Beyond Existing Service Standard Split Between New and Existing, plus SF allocated 100% to New Development						
Facility Type	Number of EDU's	Percentage of Total EDU's	Facility Units Split Between New and Existing Development	Facility Units Allocated 100% To New Development	Total Facility Units Allocated	
Existing	19,348	65.17%	0.24	NA	0.24	
New Development	10,339	34.83%	0.13	17.63	17.76	
<b>Total</b>	<b>29,687</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>0.37</b>		<b>18.00</b>	

C.3 Cost Allocated Between Existing and New Development			
Facility Type	Total Number of Facility Units	Percentage of Cost Allocated	Facility Cost
Existing	0.24	1.33%	\$2,982
New Development	17.76	98.67%	\$222,018
<b>Total</b>	<b>18.00</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$225,000</b>

D.1 Multi-Channel Portable Radios						
[a] Existing Facility Units Per 1,000 EDU's	[b] Total Future EDU's	[c] Facility Units Allocated 100% To New Development [3] [a]*[b]	[d] Proposed Service Standard Per 1,000 EDU's	[e] Facility Units per EBU Beyond Existing [d]-[a]	[f] Facility Units Beyond Existing Service Standard [4] [b]*[e]	[g] Total Proposed New Facility Units [c]+[f]
2.12	10,338.76	21.91	1.55	0.00	0.00	16.00

D.2 Facility Units Beyond Existing Service Standard Split Between New and Existing, plus SF allocated 100% to New Development - Not Applicable

D.3 Cost Allocated Between Existing and New Development			
Facility Type	Total Number of Facility Units	Percentage of Cost Allocated	Facility Cost
Existing	0.00	0.00%	\$0
New Development	16.00	100.00%	\$36,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>16.00</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$36,000</b>

E.1 Shooting Range						
[a] Existing Facility Units Per 1,000 EDU's	[b] Total Future EDU's	[c] Facility Units Allocated 100% To New Development [3] [a]*[b]	[d] Proposed Service Standard Per 1,000 EDU's	[e] Facility Units per EBU Beyond Existing [d]-[a]	[f] Facility Units Beyond Existing Service Standard [4] [b]*[e]	[g] Total Proposed New Facility Units [c]+[f]
0.00	10,338.76	0.00	0.10	0.10	1.00	1.00

E.2 Facility Units Beyond Existing Service Standard Split Between New and Existing, plus SF allocated 100% to New Development					
Facility Type	Number of EDU's	Percentage of Total EDU's	Facility Units Split Between New and Existing Development	Facility Units Allocated 100% To New Development	Total Facility Units Allocated
Existing	19,348	65.17%	0.65	NA	0.65
New Development	10,339	34.83%	0.35	NA	0.35
<b>Total</b>	<b>29,687</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1.00</b>		<b>1.00</b>

**Appendix A-2  
City of El Paso de Robles  
Police Facilities Fee Calculation**

E.3 Cost Allocated Between Existing and New Development			
Facility Type	Total Number of Facility Units	Percentage of Cost Allocated	Facility Cost
Existing	0.65	65.17%	\$271,279
New Development	0.35	34.83%	\$144,961
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$416,240</b>

**VII. Summary Cost Data**

Section VI	Facility Type	Cost Allocated to New Development	Total Future EDU's	Cost Per EDU
A.3	Patrol and Specialty Vehicles	\$420,900	10,339	\$40.71
B.3	Assigned Officer Equipment	\$76,023	10,339	\$7.35
C.3	Computers & Comm Equipment	\$222,018	10,339	\$21.47
D.3	Multi-channel Portable Radios	\$36,000	10,339	\$3.48
E.3	Shooting Range	\$144,961	10,339	\$14.02
	<b>Offsetting Revenues</b>	<b>(\$132,539)</b>	10,339	<b>(\$12.82)</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$767,363</b>		<b>\$74.22</b>

**VIII. Development Impact Fee per Unit or per 1,000 Non-Res. SF**

Land Use Type	EDUs Per Unit/1,000 Non-Res. SF	Fees Per Unit/1,000 Non-Res. SF	Number of Units/Non-Res. 1,000 SF	Cost Financed by DIF
Single Family	1.00	\$74	2,553	\$189,489
Multi-Family	1.18	\$87	2,429	\$212,209
Commercial	1.51	\$112	2,896	\$324,255
Industrial	0.37	\$28	1,498	\$41,410
Total Allocated to New Development				\$767,363
Outside Funding Responsibility				\$298,438
<b>Total Police Facilities Costs</b>				<b>\$1,065,801</b>

Notes:

[1] Estimated calendar year phone log, provided by City of El Paso de Robles.

[2] Potential Housing Units based on City of El Paso de Robles, Revised 2012 Land Use Element.

[3] Allocates 100% to new development square feet/equipment or vehicles necessary to fund existing service standard for new residents.

[4] Denotes proposed service standard in excess to that currently provided to existing residents.

Appendix A-3  
City of El Paso de Robles  
Fire Facilities Fee Calculation

I. Inventory of Existing Facilities

Facility Type	Quantity	Facility Units
Three Fire Stations	27,500	Square Feet
Rescue Unit	1	Each
Type I Fire Engine	3	Each
Aircraft Crash Response	1	Each
Staff Vehicle	4	Each

II. Existing EDU Calculation

Land Use Type	[a]	[b]	[c]	[d]
	Number of Units/ Non-Res. 1,000 SF	Residents per Unit/ Employees Per 1,000 Non-Res. SF	EDUs per Unit/ Per 1,000 Non-Res. SF	Total Number of EDUs [a]*[c]
Single Family	7,437	2.66	1.00	7,437
Multi-Family	4,274	2.66	1.00	4,274
Commercial	4,044	0.96	0.36	1,465
Industrial	2,093	0.52	0.20	413
<b>Total</b>				<b>13,588</b>

III. Existing Facility Standard

Facility Type	Quantity	Facility Units	Quantity per 1,000 EDU's
Three Fire Stations	27,500	Square Feet	2,023.77
Rescue Unit	1	Each	0.07
Type I Engine	4	Each	0.29
Aircraft Crash Response	1	Each	0.07
Staff Vehicle	4	Each	0.29

IV. Future EDU Calculation

Land Use Type	[a]	[b]	[c]	[d]
	Number of Units/ Non-Res. 1,000 SF <sup>(1)</sup>	Residents per Unit/ Employees per Non-Res. 1,000 SF <sup>(2)</sup>	EDUs per Unit/ per 1,000 Non-Res. SF	Total Number of EDUs [a]*[c]
Single Family	2,553	2.66	1.00	2,553
Multi Family	2,429	2.66	1.00	2,429
Commercial	2,896	0.96	0.36	1,049
Industrial	1,498	0.52	0.20	295
<b>Total</b>				<b>6,326</b>

V. Proposed Inventory, Cost, and Service Standard

Facility Type	Quantity	Facility Units	Facility Cost	Quantity per 1,000 EDU's
Fire Station	6,660	Square Feet	\$6,408,790	1,052.74
Type I Engine	1	Each	\$500,000	0.16
Fire Training Facility	7,200	Square Feet	\$3,381,375	1,138.10
Off-setting Revenues			(\$1,606,538)	
<b>Total Cost of Fire Facilities</b>			<b>\$8,683,627</b>	

VI. Allocation of Fire Facilities to Existing & New Development (based on total EDUs)

A.1 Fire Station	[a]	[b]	[c]	[d]	[e]	[f]	[g]
Existing SF Per 1,000 EDU's	Total Future EDU's	SF Allocated 100% To New Development <sup>(1)</sup>	Proposed Service Standard Per 1,000 EDU's	SF per EDU Beyond Existing [d]-[a]	SF Beyond Existing Service Standard <sup>(4)</sup> [b]*[e]	Total Proposed New SF [c]+[f]	
2,023.77	6,326.33	12,803.07	1,052.74	0.00	0.00	6,660.00	

A.2 SF Beyond Existing Service Standard Split Between New and Existing, plus SF allocated 100% to New Development -- Not Applicable

A.3 Cost Allocated Between Existing and New Development

Facility Type	Total Number of SF	Percentage of Cost Allocated	Facility Cost
Existing	0.00	0.00%	\$0
New Development	6,660.00	100.00%	\$6,408,790
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,660.00</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$6,408,790</b>

Appendix A-3  
City of El Paso de Robles  
Fire Facilities Fee Calculation

[a] Existing Facility Units Per 1,000 EDU's	[b] Total Future EDU's	[c] Facility Units Allocated 100% To New Development <sup>(b)</sup> [a] * [b]	[d] Proposed Service Standard Per 1,000 EDU's	[e] Facility Units per EBU Beyond Existing [d]-[a]	[f] Facility Units Beyond Existing Service Standard <sup>(a)</sup> [b] * [e]	[g] Total Proposed New Facility Units [c]+[f]
0.29	6,326.33	1.86	0.16	0.00	0.00	1.00

**B.2 Facility Units Beyond Existing Service Standard Split Between New and Existing, plus SF allocated 100% to New Development -- Not Applicable**

Facility Type	Total Number of Vehicles	Percentage of Cost Allocated	Facility Cost
Existing	0.00	0.00%	\$0
New Development	1.86	100.00%	\$500,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.86</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$500,000</b>

[a] Existing Facility Units Per 1,000 EDU's	[b] Total Future EDU's	[c] Facility Units Allocated 100% To New Development <sup>(b)</sup> [a] * [b]	[d] Proposed Service Standard Per 1,000 EDU's	[e] Facility Units per EBU Beyond Existing [d]-[a]	[f] Facility Units Beyond Existing Service Standard <sup>(a)</sup> [b] * [e]	[g] Total Proposed New Facility Units [c]+[f]
0.000	6,326.33	0.00	1,138.10	1138.10	7,200.00	7,200.00

Facility Type	Number of EDU's	Percentage of Total EDU's	Facility Units Split Between New and Existing Development	Facility Units Allocated 100% To New Development	Total Facility Units Allocated
Existing	13,588	68.23%	4,912.78	NA	4,912.78
New Development	6,326	31.77%	2,287.22	NA	2,287.22
<b>Total</b>	<b>19,915</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>7,200.00</b>		<b>7,200.00</b>

Facility Type	Total Number of Facility Units	Percentage of Cost Allocated	Facility Cost
Existing	4,912.78	68.23%	\$2,307,214
New Development	2,287.22	31.77%	\$1,074,161
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,200.00</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$3,381,375</b>

Appendix A-3  
City of El Paso de Robles  
Fire Facilities Fee Calculation

VII. Summary Cost Data

Section VI	Facility Type	Cost Allocated to New Development	Total Future EDU's	Cost Per EDU
A.3	Fire Station	\$6,408,790	6,326	\$1,013.03
B.3	Type I Engine	\$500,000	6,326	\$79.03
C.3	Fire Training Facility	\$1,074,161	6,326	\$169.79
	Offsetting Revenues	(\$1,606,538)	6,326	(\$253.94)
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$6,376,413</b>		<b>\$1,007.92</b>

VIII. Development Impact Fee per Unit or per 1,000 Non-Res. SF

Land Use Type	EDUs Per Unit/1,000 Non-Res. SF	Fees Per Unit/1,000 Non-Res. SF	Number of Units/ Non-Res. 1,000 SF	Cost Financed by DIF
Single Family	1.00	\$1,008	2,553	\$2,573,211
Multi-Family	1.00	\$1,008	2,429	\$2,448,229
Commercial	0.36	\$365	2,896	\$1,057,168
Industrial	0.20	\$199	1,498	\$297,805
Total Allocated to New Development				\$6,376,413
Outside Funding Responsibility				\$2,307,214
<b>Total Fire Facilities Costs</b>				<b>\$8,683,627</b>

Notes:

- [1] Potential Housing Units based on City of El Paso de Robles, Revised 2012 Land Use Element.
- [2] Average Household Size Based on information obtained from the 2012 Land Use Element.
- [3] Allocates 100% to new development square feet or vehicles necessary to fund existing service standard for new residents.
- [4] Denotes proposed service standard in excess to that currently provided to existing residents.

**Appendix A-4**  
**City of El Paso de Robles**  
**General Government Facilities Fee Calculation**

**I. Inventory of Existing Facilities**

Facility	Quantity	Facility Units
City Hall	14,815	Square Feet
Community Center	0	Square Feet
Performing Arts Center	0	Square Feet
Parking Structure	80,000	Square Feet
City Yard(s)	121,300	Square Feet

**II. Existing EDU Calculation**

Land Use Type	[a]	[b]	[c]	[d]
	Number of Units/ Non-Res. 1,000 SF	Residents per Unit/ Employees Per 1,000 Non-Res. SF	EDUs per Unit/ Per 1,000 Non-Res. SF	Total Number of EDUs [a]*[c]
Single Family	7,437	2.66	1.00	7,437
Multi-Family	4,274	2.66	1.00	4,274
Commercial	4,044	0.96	0.36	1,465
Industrial	2,093	0.52	0.20	413
<b>Total</b>				<b>13,588</b>

**III. Existing Service Standard**

Facility Type	Quantity	Facility Units	Quantity per 1,000 EDUs
City Hall	14,815	Square Feet	1,090.26
Community Center	0	Square Feet	0.00
Performing Arts Center	0	Square Feet	0.00
Parking Structure	80,000	Square Feet	5,887.35
City Yard(s)	121,300	Square Feet	8,926.69

**IV. Future EDU Calculation**

Land Use Type	[a]	[b]	[c]	[d]
	Number of Units/ Non-Res. 1,000 SF <sup>(1)</sup>	Residents per Unit/ Employees Per 1,000 Non-Res. SF <sup>(2)</sup>	EDUs per Unit/ Per 1,000 Non-Res. SF	Total Number of EDUs [a]*[c]
Single Family	2,553	2.66	1.00	2,553
Multi Family	2,429	2.66	1.00	2,429
Commercial	2,896	0.96	0.36	1,049
Industrial	1,498	0.52	0.20	295
<b>Total</b>				<b>6,326</b>

**V. Proposed Inventory, Cost, and Service Standard**

Facility	Quantity	Facility Units	Facility Cost	Quantity per 1,000 EDUs
City Hall	15,185	Square Feet	\$7,212,875	2,400.29
Public Meeting Facility	6,000	Square Feet	\$2,565,000	948.42
Downtown Parking	40,000	Square Feet	\$14,800,000	6,322.78
Consolidated Corporate Yard	46,000	Square Feet	\$8,428,045	7,271.20
<b>Offsetting Revenues</b>			<b>(\$4,619,206)</b>	
<b>Proposed New General Government Facilities Cost</b>			<b>\$28,386,714</b>	
<b>Plus: Proposed City Hall Facilities Costs Allocable to Existing Development</b>			<b>\$7,037,125</b>	
<b>Total General Government Facilities Costs</b>			<b>\$35,423,839</b>	

**VI. Allocation of General Government Facilities to Existing & New Development (based on total EDU's)**

A.1 City Hall							
[a]	[b]	[c]	[d]	[e]	[f]	[g]	
Existing SF Per 1,000 EDU's	Total Future EDU's	SF Allocated 100% To New Development <sup>(3)</sup>	Proposed Service Standard Per 1,000 EDU's	SF per EBU Beyond Existing	SF Beyond Existing Service Standard <sup>(4)</sup>	Total Proposed New SF	
		[a]*[b]		[d]-[a]	[b]*[e]	[c]+[f]	
1,090.26	6,326.33	6,897.36	2,400.29	1,310.02	8,287.64	15,185.00	



**Appendix A-4  
City of El Paso de Robles  
General Government Facilities Fee Calculation**

A.2 SF Beyond Existing Service Standard Split Between New and Existing, plus SF allocated 100% to New Development						
Facility Type	Number of EDU's	Percentage of Total EDU's	SF Split Between New and Existing Development	SF Allocated 100% To New Development	Total SF Allocated	
Existing	13,588	68.23%	5,654.91	NA	5,654.91	
New Development	6,326	31.77%	2,632.73	6,897.36	9,530.09	
<b>Total</b>	<b>19,915</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>8,287.64</b>		<b>15,185.00</b>	

A.3 Cost Allocated Between Existing and New Development			
Facility Type	Total Number of SF	Percentage of Cost Allocated	Facility Cost
Existing	5,654.91	37.24%	\$2,686,080
New Development	9,530.09	62.76%	\$4,526,795
<b>Total</b>	<b>15,185.00</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$7,212,875</b>

B.1 Public Meeting Facility							
[a] Existing SF Per 1,000 EDU's	[b] Total Future EDU's	[c] SF Allocated 100% To New Development <sup>(b)</sup>	[d] Proposed Service Standard Per 1,000 EDU's	[e] SF per EBU Beyond Existing	[f] SF Beyond Existing Service Standard <sup>(d)</sup>	[g] Total Proposed New SF	
		[a]*[b]		[d]-[a]	[b]*[e]	[c]+[f]	
0.00	6,326.33	0.00	948.42	948.42	6,000.00	6,000.00	

B.2 SF Beyond Existing Service Standard Split Between New and Existing, plus SF allocated 100% to New Development						
Facility Type	Number of EDU's	Percentage of Total EDU's	SF Split Between New and Existing Development	SF Allocated 100% To New Development	Total SF Allocated	
Existing	13,588	68.23%	4,093.98	NA	4,093.98	
New Development	6,326	31.77%	1,906.02	0.00	1,906.02	
<b>Total</b>	<b>19,915</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>6,000.00</b>		<b>6,000.00</b>	

B.3 Cost Allocated Between Existing and New Development			
Facility Type	Total Number of SF	Percentage of Cost Allocated	Facility Cost
Existing	4,093.98	68.23%	\$1,750,177
New Development	1,906.02	31.77%	\$814,823
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,000.00</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$2,565,000</b>

C.1 Allocation of Downtown Parking Facilities Costs (based on total EDUs)						
Facility Type	Number of EDU's	Percentage of Total EDU's	Facility Units Split Between New and Existing Development	Facility Units Allocated 100% To New Development	Total Facility Units Allocated	
Existing	13,588	68.23%	27,293.21	NA	27,293.21	
New Development	6,326	31.77%	12,706.79	0.00	12,706.79	
<b>Total</b>	<b>19,915</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>40,000.00</b>		<b>40,000.00</b>	

**Appendix A-4  
City of El Paso de Robles  
General Government Facilities Fee Calculation**

C.2 Cost Allocated Between Existing and New Development			
Facility Type	Total Number of SF	Percentage of Cost Allocated	Facility Cost
Existing	27,293.21	68.23%	\$10,098,486
New Development	12,706.79	31.77%	\$4,701,514
<b>Total</b>	<b>40,000.00</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$14,800,000</b>

D.1 Consolidated Corporate Yard							
[a] Existing SF Per 1,000 EDU's	[b] Total Future EDU's	[c] SF Allocated 100% To New Development <sup>(3)</sup> [a]*[b]	[d] Proposed Service Standard Per 1,000 EDU's	[e] SF per EBU Beyond Existing [d]-[a]	[f] SF Beyond Existing Service Standard <sup>(4)</sup> [b]*[e]	[g] Total Proposed New SF [c]+[f]	
8,926.69	6,326.33	56,473.17	7,271.20	0.00	0.00	46,000.00	

D.2 SF Beyond Existing Service Standard Split Between New and Existing, plus SF allocated 100% to New Development -- Not Applicable

D.3 Cost Allocated Between Existing and New Development			
Facility Type	Total Number of SF	Percentage of Cost Allocated	Facility Cost
Existing	0.00	0.00%	\$0
New Development	46,000.00	100.00%	\$8,428,045
<b>Total</b>	<b>46,000.00</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$8,428,045</b>

**VII. Summary Cost Data**

Section VI	Facility Type	Cost Allocated to New Development	Total Future EDU's	Cost Per EDU
A.3	City Hall	\$4,526,795	6,326	\$715.55
B.3	Public Meeting Facility	\$814,823	6,326	\$128.80
C.2	Downtown Parking	\$4,701,514	6,326	\$743.17
D.3	Consolidated Corporate Yard	\$8,428,045	6,326	\$1,332.22
	Offsetting Revenues	\$0	6,326	\$0.00
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$18,471,177</b>		<b>\$2,919.73</b>

**VIII. Development Impact Fee per Unit or per 1,000 Non-Res. SF**

Land Use Type	EDUs Per Unit/1,000 Non-Res. SF	Fees Per Unit/1,000 Non-Res. SF	Number of Units/ Non-Res. 1,000 SF	Cost Financed by DIF
Single Family	1.00	\$2,920	2,553	\$7,454,070
Multi-Family	1.00	\$2,920	2,429	\$7,092,024
Commercial	0.36	\$1,057	2,896	\$3,062,402
Industrial	0.20	\$576	1,498	\$862,680
Total Allocated to New Development				\$18,471,177
Outside Funding Responsibility				\$16,952,662
<b>Total General Government Facilities Costs</b>				<b>\$35,423,839</b>

Notes:

- [1] Potential Housing Units based on City of El Paso de Robles, Revised 2012 Land Use Element.
- [2] Average Household Size Based on information obtained from the 2012 Land Use Element.
- [3] Allocates 100% to new development square feet necessary to fund existing service standard for new residents.
- [4] Denotes proposed service standard in excess to that currently provided to existing residents.

**Appendix A-5**  
**City of El Paso de Robles**  
**Park and Recreation Facilities Fee Calculation**

**I. Inventory of Existing Facilities**

Facility	Size (Acre)
<b>Parks</b>	
Barney Schwartz Park	36.9
Casa Robles Park	0.36
Centennial Park	17.87
Creston Road Median	1.48
Downtown Civic Center Park	4.27
Family Park at 36th and Oak	1.00
Mandrella Park	0.65
Oak Creek Park	7.06
Pioneer Park	4.87
Robbins Baseball Field	2.50
Royal Oak Park	7.53
Scott Street Park	0.50
Sherwood Park	11.40
Sherwood Forest Playground	2.00
Turtle Creek Park	1.53
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>99.955</b>
<b>Recreation Amenities</b>	
Aquatic Facility	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>99.96</b>

**II. Existing EBU Calculation**

Land Use Type	Number of Residents	Residents Per Unit	Potential Recreation Hours/Week per Unit <sup>(1)</sup>	EBU per Unit	Number of Units	Total Number of EBUs
Single Family Residential	19,782	2.66	169	1.00	7,437	7,437
Multi Family Residential	11,369	2.66	169	1.00	4,274	4,274
<b>Total</b>	<b>31,151</b>					<b>11,711</b>

**III. Existing Facility Standard**

Facility Type	Facility Unit	Facility Units Per 1,000 Residents	Facility Units Per 1,000 EBUs
Parks	Acre	3.21	8.54

**IV. Future EBU Calculation**

Land Use Type	Number of Residents	Residents Per Unit	Potential Recreation Hours/Week per Unit <sup>(1)</sup>	EBU per Unit	Number of Units	Total Number of EBUs
Single Family Residential	6,791	2.66	169	1.00	2,553	2,553
Multi Family Residential	6,461	2.66	169	1.00	2,429	2,429
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,252</b>					<b>4,982</b>

**Appendix A-5**  
**City of El Paso de Robles**  
**Park and Recreation Facilities Fee Calculation**

**V (A). Inventory of Proposed Park Facilities (Land Acquisition)**

Facility	Total Acres	Facility Cost
Salinas River Land Acquisition	117	\$4,680,000
<b>Parks Subtotal V (A). Land Acquisition</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>\$4,680,000</b>

**V (B). Inventory of Proposed Park Facilities (Land Improvements)**

Facility	Total Acres	Facility Cost
Centennial Park Amphitheatre	16	\$300,000
Sherwood Park Land Improvements	28	\$10,009,600
Uptown Park Development	10	\$8,748,495
Town Centre Park Redevelopment	NA	\$4,629,760
<b>Parks Subtotal V (B). Land Improvements</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>\$23,687,855</b>
<b>Parks Total</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>\$28,367,855</b>

**V (C). Allocation of Park Facilities to Existing and New Development (based on total EBUs)**

Facility	Total Acres	Cost Per EBU	Facility Cost	Percentage of Cost Allocated
Existing Development	120	\$1,699.39	\$19,901,513	70.16%
New Development	51	\$1,699.39	\$8,466,342	29.84%
<b>Total Recreation Cost</b>	<b>171</b>		<b>\$28,367,855</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**VI. Inventory of Proposed Park Facilities Allocated to New Development**

Facility	Total Acres	Facility Cost
Montebello Park Acquisition and Development	3	\$4,750,000
<b>Parks Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>\$4,750,000</b>

**VII. Inventory of Proposed Recreation Facilities**

Facility	Total Acres	Facility Cost
Aquatic Facility	10	\$5,000,000
Offsetting Revenues		(\$391,479)
<b>Total Recreation Cost</b>		<b>\$4,608,521</b>

**VIII. Allocation of Recreation Facilities to Existing and New Development (based on total EBUs)**

Facility	Total Acres	Cost Per EBU	Facility Cost	Percentage of Cost Allocated
Existing Development	7	\$276.08	\$3,233,115	70.16%
New Development	3	\$276.08	\$1,375,406	29.84%
<b>Total Recreation Cost</b>	<b>10</b>		<b>\$4,608,521</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**IX. Costs allocated to New Development for Parks and Recreation Facilities**

Facility	Facility Unit	Cost Per Facility Unit	Facility Units Per 1,000 EBUs	Cost Per EBU
Parks	Acre	\$244,590	10.85	\$2,653
Recreation Facilities - (Aquatic Facility)	Acre	\$460,852.10	0.60	\$276
<b>Total Facility Cost per EBU</b>				<b>\$2,929</b>
<b>Total Facilities Costs Allocated to New Development</b>				<b>\$14,591,748</b>
<b>Offsetting Revenues Not Yet Committed - New Development</b>				<b>(\$368,921)</b>
<b>Net Facilities Costs Allocated to New Development</b>				<b>\$14,222,827</b>
<b>Net Facility Cost per EBU</b>				<b>\$2,855</b>

**X. Development Impact Fee per Unit**

Land Use Type	EBUs Per Unit	Fees Per Unit	Cost Financed by DIF
Single Family Residential	1.00	\$2,855	\$7,288,414
Multi Family Residential	1.00	\$2,855	\$6,934,413
<b>Net Allocation to New Development</b>			<b>\$14,222,827</b>
<b>Net Allocated to Existing Development</b>			<b>\$23,134,628</b>
<b>Offsetting Revenues Not Yet Committed - Existing Development</b>			<b>(\$867,210)</b>
<b>Total Park and Recreation Facilities Costs</b>			<b>\$36,490,245</b>

Notes:

[1] Please refer to "EBU & EDU Calculation Year to Build-Out" worksheet contained herein.

**Appendix A-6  
City of El Paso de Robles  
Library Facilities Fee Calculation**

**I. Inventory of Existing Facilities**

Facility	Quantity	Facility Units
Library & Other Improvements	22,530	Square Feet
Library Books/Materials	74,990	Each

**II. Existing EDU Calculation**

Land Use Type	[a]	[b]	[c]	[d]
	Number of Units/ Non-Res. 1,000 SF	Residents per Unit/ Employees Per 1,000 Non-Res. SF	EDUs per Unit/ Per 1,000 Non-Res. SF	Total Number of EDUs [a]*[c]
Single Family	7,437	2.66	1.00	7,437
Multi-Family	4,274	2.66	1.00	4,274
<b>Total</b>				<b>11,711</b>

**III. Existing Facility Standard**

Facility Type	Quantity	Facility Units	Quantity per 1,000 EDU's
Library & Other Improvements	22,530	Square Feet	1,923.83
Library Books/Materials	74,990	Each	6,403.38

**IV. Future EDU Calculation**

Land Use Type	[a]	[b]	[c]	[d]
	Number of Units/ Non-Res. 1,000 SF <sup>(1)</sup>	Residents per Unit/ Employees Per 1,000 Non-Res. SF <sup>(2)</sup>	EDUs per Unit/ Per 1,000 Non-Res. SF	Total Number of EDUs [a]*[c]
Single Family	2,553	2.66	1.00	2,553
Multi-Family	2,429	2.66	1.00	2,429
<b>Total</b>				<b>4,982</b>

**V. Proposed Inventory, Cost, and Service Standard**

Facility	Quantity	Facility Units	Facility Cost	Quantity per 1,000 EDUs
Library & Other Improvements	9,500	Square Feet	\$4,450,000	1,906.86
Library Books/Materials	11,530	Each	\$1,196,000	2,314.33
<b>Offsetting Revenues</b>			<b>(\$950,893)</b>	
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$4,695,107</b>	

**Appendix A-6  
City of El Paso de Robles  
Library Facilities Fee Calculation**

**VI. Allocation of General Government Facilities to Existing & New Development (based on total EDU's)**

A.1 Library Facility (Upstairs) and Study Center							
[a] Existing SF Per 1,000 EDU's	[b] Total Future EDU's	[c] SF Allocated 100% To New Development [a] * [b]	[d] Proposed Service Standard Per 1,000 EDU's	[e] SF per EDU Beyond Existing [d]-[a]	[f] SF Beyond Existing Service Standard <sup>[4]</sup> [b] * [e]	[g] Total Proposed New SF [c]+[f]	
1,923.83	4,982.00	9,584.53	1,906.86	0.00	0.00	9,500.00	

**A.2 SF Beyond Existing Service Standard Split Between New and Existing, plus SF allocated 100% to New Development - Not Applicable**

**A.3 Cost Allocated Between Existing and New Development**

Facility Type	Total Number of SF	Percentage of Cost Allocated	Facility Cost
Existing	0.00	0.00%	\$0
New Development	9,500.00	100.00%	\$4,450,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,500.00</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$4,450,000</b>

**B.1 Library Books/Materials**

[a] Existing Facility Units Per 1,000 EDU's	[b] Total Future EDU's	[c] Facility Units Allocated 100% To New Development <sup>[3]</sup> [a] * [b]	[d] Proposed Service Standard Per 1,000 EDU's	[e] Facility Units per EDU Beyond Existing [d]-[a]	[f] Facility Units Beyond Existing Service Standard <sup>[4]</sup> [b] * [e]	[g] Total Proposed New Facility Units [c]+[f]
6,403.38	4,982.00	31,901.65	2,314.33	0.00	0.00	11,530.00

**B.2 Facility Units Beyond Existing Service Standard Split Between New and Existing, plus SF allocated 100% to New Development -- Not Applicable**

**B.3 Cost Allocated Between Existing and New Development**

Facility Type	Total Number of Facility Units	Percentage of Cost Allocated	Facility Cost
Existing	0.00	0.00%	\$0
New Development	11,530.00	100.00%	\$1,196,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>11,530.00</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$1,196,000</b>

**VII. Summary Cost Data**

Section VII.	Facility Type	Cost Allocated to New Development	Total Future EDU's	Cost Per EDU
A.3	Library Facility/Study Center	\$4,450,000	4,982	\$893.22
B.3	Library Books/Materials	\$1,196,000	4,982	\$240.06
	Offsetting Revenues	(\$950,893)	4,982	(\$190.87)
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$4,695,107</b>		<b>\$942.41</b>

**VIII. Development Impact Fee per Unit**

Land Use Type	EDUs Per Unit/1,000 Non-Res. SF	Fees Per Unit/1,000 Non-Res. SF	Number of Units/Non-Res. 1,000 SF	Cost Financed by DIF
Single Family	1.00	\$942	2,553	\$2,405,983
Multi-Family	1.00	\$942	2,429	\$2,289,124
Total Allocated to New Development				\$4,695,107
Outside Funding Responsibility				\$0
<b>Total Cost of Library Facilities</b>				<b>\$4,695,107</b>

**Notes:**

- [1] Potential Housing Units based on City of El Paso de Robles, Revised 2012 Land Use Element
- [2] Average Household Size Based on information obtained from the 2012 Land Use Element
- [3] Allocates 100% to new development square feet or facility units necessary to fund existing service standard for new residents
- [4] Denotes proposed service standard in excess to that currently provided to existing residents

**Appendix B**  
**EBU & EDU Calculation Worksheet**



**Appendix B**  
**City of El Paso de Robles**  
**EBU & EDU Calculation Worksheet**

**Existing EDU Calculation [1]**

Service Factor (Residents and Employees)

Land Use Type	Number of Persons Served **	Residents per Unit/ Persons Served per 1,000 Non-Res. SF	EDUs per Unit/ per 1,000 Non-Res. SF	Number of Units/ Non-Res. SF	Total Number of EDUs
Single Family Residential	19,782	2.66	1.00	7,437	7,437
Multi Family Residential	11,369	2.66	1.00	4,274	4,274
Commercial	3,896	0.96	0.36	4,044,000	1,465
Industrial	1,098	0.52	0.20	2,093,000	413
<b>Total</b>	<b>36,145</b>				<b>13,588</b>

Source: David Taussig & Associates; City of El Paso de Robles, Revised 2012 Land Use Element.

\*\* Persons Served = Residents plus 50% of Employees, customary industry practice designed to capture the reduced levels of service demanded by employees.

**Future EDU Calculation [1]**

Service Factor (Future Residents and Employees)

Land Use Type	Number of Persons Served **	Residents per Unit/ Persons Served per 1,000 Non-Res. SF	EDUs per Unit/ per 1,000 Non-Res. SF	Number of Units/ Non-Res. SF	Total Number of EDUs
Single Family Residential	6,791	2.66	1.00	2,553	2,553
Multi Family Residential	6,461	2.66	1.00	2,429	2,429
Commercial	2,790	0.96	0.36	2,896,000	1,049
Industrial	786	0.52	0.20	1,498,000	295
<b>Total</b>	<b>16,828</b>				<b>6,326</b>

Source: David Taussig & Associates; City of El Paso de Robles, Revised 2012 Land Use Element.

\*\* Persons Served = Residents plus 50% of Employees, customary industry practice designed to capture the reduced levels of service demanded by employees.

**EBU Calculation**

I. Total Hours of Potential Parks Usage per Week.

User of Facilities	Potential Recreation Hours Work Day	Number of Work Days per Week	Hours Per Weekend Day	Number of Weekend Days Per Week	Potential Recreation Hours Per Week Per Person
Resident, non-working	12	5	12	2	84
Resident, working	2	5	12	2	34
Employee (comm/ind)	2	5	12	0	10

II a. Total Potential Recreation Hours per Week. (Single Family Residential)

Type Of Resident	Number Per Household	Potential Recreation Hours/ Week per Person	Potential Recreation Hours/ Week per Households
Resident, non-working	1.57	84	132
Resident, working	1.09	34	37
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.66</b>		<b>169</b>

II b. Total Potential Recreation Hours per Week. (Multi-Family Residential)

Type Of Resident	Number Per Household	Potential Recreation Hours/ Week per Person	Potential Recreation Hours/ Week per Household
Resident, non-working	1.57	84	132
Resident, working	1.09	34	37
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.66</b>		<b>169</b>

Assume the potential recreation hours per single family residential detached dwelling unit equals 1 EBU

Notes:

[1] Applies to Fire, General Government, Park and Recreation, and Library facilities apportionment.

**Appendix C**  
**Department Contact List**

## Department Contact List

### Transportation Facilities:

John Falkenstien, City Engineer  
Telephone: (805) 237-3970  
Email: [JFalkenstien@prcity.com](mailto:JFalkenstien@prcity.com)

### Police Facilities:

Robert Burton, Police Chief  
Telephone: (805) 237-6464  
Email: [PDChief@prcity.com](mailto:PDChief@prcity.com)

### Fire Facilities:

Ken Johnson, Fire Chief  
Telephone: (805) 227-7560  
Email: [KJohnson@prcity.com](mailto:KJohnson@prcity.com)

Doug Monn, Public Works Director  
Telephone: (805) 237-3861  
Email: [DMonn@prcity.com](mailto:DMonn@prcity.com)

### General Government Services Facilities:

Jim App, City Manager  
Telephone: (805) 237-3888  
Email: [JApp@prcity.com](mailto:JApp@prcity.com)

John Falkenstien, City Engineer  
Telephone: (805) 237-3970  
Email: [JFalkenstien@prcity.com](mailto:JFalkenstien@prcity.com)

### Park and Recreation Facilities:

John Falkenstien, City Engineer  
Telephone: (805) 237-3970  
Email: [JFalkenstien@prcity.com](mailto:JFalkenstien@prcity.com)

### Library Facilities:

Julie Dahlen, Recreation Director  
Telephone: (805) 237-3993  
Email: [LRSDDirector@prcity.com](mailto:LRSDDirector@prcity.com)