TO: Lompoc Department Head Staff and Infrastructure Managers
FROM: Scott Thorpe, RCS, LLC
RE: Draft *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report*
DATE: February 3, 2020

Please find attached the Draft *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report* for your very important review. Please take the time to read, at a minimum, your portion(s) of the Report. I'd like to suggest that you might find it illuminating to read Chapters One and Two for a better understanding of DIFs and the total development impact fee cost for all infrastructure supporting City services, or more preferably, all of the Report to see all of the development related needs. Management Services Director, Dean Albro, will discuss a reasonable deadline but I am not available until after February 14th anyway.

The final product will come with a table of contents, cover letter and the appendices. The schedules are not numbered right now but will be.

Here is what I need. Review your portion of the Report or infrastructure and note anything said about Lompoc in the text (or your department/infrastructure) that is not quite correct. I have to make a few leaps in preparing the draft and now need you all to look for anything that could draw unnecessary attention to the Report at the Public Hearing. A simple example may be that I have referred to a specific street segment a *Boulevard* when it is actually a *Street*. Another one may be that that I refer to a particular park is a *Neighborhood Park* while it is actually an expanded use *Community Park*. Please note that I have read and edited this over three times and will be reviewing it at least one more time myself but I am probably at the point of reading over a textual error.

Written comments directly on the document are preferred, but please make them legible.

Overall, I think your new DIF schedule is very defendable and quite representative of the City's capital needs for accommodating continued new development. Developers and owners of vacant land will be getting quite a bargain when they wish to build as they inherit a great deal of existing assets. The downside is that we have also identified at least $1.2 billion (yeah with "b") in depreciating spine assets (the $1.2 billion excludes non-depreciating land owned by the City). This includes only the spine assets and excludes local assets such as all local streets, and pipes.

I am not looking for cost changes at this time. That should have occurred with the *MFP* review. Given the time constraints, keep the dollars as they are, unless you spot something major that absolutely HAS to be addressed, in that case let us discuss it. The Final Draft *Master Facilities Plan* project detail pages will be made available to you soon should you wish to review them one last time, however, each of them have been reviewed at least twice or more.

Call me if you have questions (after February 14th). Scott @ 714/305-2115 or Scott@revenuecost.com

Chapter 1
Background and Introduction

In 2002-03 the City of Lompoc retained consultants to undertake a comprehensive cost calculation of the future development impact costs for the City. The development impact cost calculations were intended to identify the cost of accommodating continued development in both areas in such a fashion as to not decrease the levels of service currently enjoyed by the City's existing residents and businesses. The development impact cost calculations were then formalized as a set of Development Impact Fee (henceforth referred to as DIF) schedules by City Council. However, a periodic review and adjustment of the City's DIFs is appropriate and warranted in order to continue to ensure that the City collects sufficient monies to construct the additional infrastructure needed to accommodate the anticipated growth of new residents and businesses expected to be developed in the City. Such has been completed with the submission of this *Development Impact Fee Report* and companion *Master Facilities Plan.* The resulting DIF schedules will need to be reviewed and amended periodically as estimated costs and capital needs have changed. As a result of this diligence, the prior DIF schedules may have served the City well for many years. However, after seventeen years of cumulative changes, the most significant being the inflation effect on the older cost estimates combined with General Plan amendments has combined to require a full update of all development assumptions, estimated demands and capital project costs was prudent. For this and other reasons, the City has entered into the exhaustive effort to recalculate the amount of the existing and new DIFs.

This *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report* effort remains consistent with the older report's intent to quantify development costs. This document includes a greater amount of detail such as a complete list of all 374 projects to be financed by the DIF schedules, by infrastructure as well as a comparison with the existing commitment of the existing community. Each project identified within the DIF report has a corresponding detail page in the supporting *Master Facilities Plan,* which in turn tells the reader where additional information can be found regarding that project.

The *Master Facilities Plan* is a separate and companion document which includes an expanded amount of information about each project for anyone wishing it, while allowing the *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report* to remain more focused on the allocation and distribution of capital costs to the remaining new development. A *Master Facilities Plan* with this level of detail is generally not offered by other DIF consultants and the City is to be commended for recognizing the importance of this information to the reader and committed the effort in generating it. The combined *Development Impact Fee Calculation and Nexus Report* and the *Master Facilities Plan* offer greater information for the Council to make policy decisions, greater understanding by the development community, and an easier tracking (and updating) system for the staff.

The *Master Facilities Plan* also serves to inform the users that collected DIFs are committed per §66000 of the Government Code. The DIF receipts that are collected over five years (and kept in fund balances during that period) may not necessarily reach the level necessary to construct a needed project per the *Master Facilities Plan.* This does not mean the projects are no longer needed. The inclusion of those projects in the *Master Facilities Plan* indicates the continued importance of that project over time, certainly over a five year period.

The Importance of Capital Infrastructure. The Levels of Service (LOS) of any one City infrastructure is based (or limited) upon the capacity of that infrastructure to support the users, residents or businesses. The design of any municipal project has a finite capacity, such as a four lane road, a 30" storm drainage pipe or a 10,000 square foot library. Each is designed to meet the needs of a defined number of users. A street segment can only handle so many vehicles per hour, especially at a speed that makes it worth using for driving over longer distances. A storm drainage pipe that is 30" cannot handle storm flows twice its capacity. A library can hold just so many collection items and serve only so many people, all the librarians in the world cannot make up for limited library space. A municipality with 0.40 square feet per resident of library space will be able to serve more residents than a municipality with only a 0.10 square feet standard per resident of library space. The following is a more precise example using law enforcement.

Consider the labor intensive service of law enforcement, regardless of the quality and capabilities of the City's sworn police officers, the Department remains highly dependent upon its infrastructure capacity. A police station of 11,250 square feet will have capacity to support roughly thirty sworn police officers at about 375 square feet per officer. If the station size remains the same at 11,250 square feet but the sworn compliment doubles to sixty police officers, the station will become exceedingly dysfunctional at 187.5 square feet per officer. The same holds true for police response vehicles and law enforcement specialty equipment. If a City adds thirty additional officers but cannot add station space, vehicles and specialty equipment, the City has dealt with only half of the service equation. They have achieved little.

Further, if you add 30 police officers:

- But the agency does not add police response vehicles, the calls-for-services responses will be very poor.
- But the agency does not additional station square footage, the calls-for-services responses will be dysfunctional, and unpredictable.
- But the agency does not provide the sworn officers with the required personal and specialty equipment; the calls-for-services responses will be dangerous, certainly for the new police officers.

On the opposite side, if you add all of the above capital needs, but do not add additional sworn officers, the result would probably be limited to a minor improvement in response times.

Good municipal service takes a balance of staff and infrastructure. However, make no mistake about it, the amount of and complexity of any infrastructure defines (in part or all) of the level of service (LOS). This makes the one-time DIF financing of any City's infrastructure that much more important. It takes a balance to accommodate development with the police responses within the desired standard. It will take additional properly equipped officers, law enforcement station space, response and support vehicles and specialty equipment. The importance of having a properly calculated and documented DIF schedule in order to accommodate development-related demands cannot be over-stated. The same concept holds true for the two labor-intensive public safety services and the infrastructure-intensive services such as circulation, storm drainage collection, potable and recycled water distribution and wastewater collection. Of course, the DIFs can only be used for the capital acquisitions, the ongoing labor staffing costs will need to come from other sources.

PROPORTIONAL ANALYSIS

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

The proportional analysis is important, if for no other reason, than for community inter-generational equity, i.e., fairness in the infrastructure investment that has been made by existing residents and businesses with those of new residents and businesses that wish to use the existing infrastructure. As an example, new development may be required to expand the number of arterial and collector lane miles in the City but new development also benefits from the immediate use of H Street constructed so many years ago just as an existing citizen can use a newly constructed arterial street segment. In short, previous generations of businesses and residents have contributed to the development of the City infrastructure and this fact should be recognized by future residents and businesses by contributing a similar amount of capacity towards completing the various infrastructure systems.

It is one thing to identify the many public improvement projects needed through build-out. It is an entirely different thing to assume that all of the identified improvements are required to meet the demands of the new development. Clearly, some projects will be *replacements* of the existing infrastructure while others will be *capacity increasing* projects. Within the category of the latter, they may also be further classified into two categories;

1. Projects dealing with existing deficiencies, i.e., projects required regardless of whether there is additional development or not. An example would be a traffic intersection currently controlled by stop signs that currently meets traffic warrants for a traffic signal.

2. Projects required as a result of the need to accommodate future development. An example of this would be a signal that is currently controlled quite adequately by stop signs, but because of development in the near and *downstream* areas will ultimately need to be signalized.

This Report provides the documentation of the City's costs which serve as the basis for calculating DIFs. The updated DIF Schedules and related information can be found in Chapters 3 through 14 and Appendices A, B and C of this Report.

RCS staff has worked with Management Services, Police, Fire, Planning/IT, Facilities, Fleet and Park Maintenance and the Utilities Department staff to generate and review the supporting data which forms the calculation of Development Impact Fee schedules. The results of this review can be found on the schedules located at the end of each Chapter.

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

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

CALCULATION OF DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

In California, State legislation sets certain legal and procedural parameters for the charging of these fees. This legislation was passed as AB1600 by the California Legislature and is now codified as California Government Code Sections 66000 through 66009. This State law went into effect on January 1, 1989.

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

1. Delineation of the purpose of the fee.

2. Determination of the use of the fee.

3. Determination of the relationship between the use of the fee and the type of development paying the fee.

4. Determination of the relationship between the need for the facility and the type of development project. **NOTE: Numbers 2 & 4 will be reversed throughout the chapters in this Report because it is apparent that *need* should be identified before *use*.**

5. Determination of the relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the portion of the facility attributed to the specific development project.

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

1. Define the level of service desired within the General Plan area for each project or acquisition identified as necessary. In some areas, certain statistical measures are commonly used to measure or define an acceptable level of service for a category of infrastructure. Street intersections, for instance, are commonly rated based on a Level of Service scale of "A" to "F" developed by transportation engineers. Most agencies adopt a LOS of "C".

2. Review the Land use map and determine the existing mix of land-uses and amount of undeveloped and developed land. The magnitude of growth and its impacts can thus be determined by considering this land use data when planning needed infrastructure. This inventory can be found in Table 2-1 in Chapter 2 and Appendix B.

3. Identify all additions to the capital facilities or equipment inventory necessary to maintain the identified levels of service in the area. Then, determine the cost of those additions. An infrastructure *Master Plan* is the highest form of data.

4. Identify a level of responsibility, identifying, as termed in this Report, the relative need (or as referred to in the accompanying schedules as "PERCENT NEED") for

the facility or equipment necessary to accommodate "growth" as defined, and as opposed to current needs.

5. Distribute the costs identified as a result of development growth on a basis of land use. Costs are distributed between each land use based on their relative use, or *nexus,* of the capital system. For example, future street costs were distributed to each land use based on their trip generation characteristics.

OTHER ASSUMPTIONS OF THE REPORT

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

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

Land Acquisition Costs. Land acquisition cost estimates have been developed after discussions with City officials over recent acquisitions, current negotiations or information about parcels similar to what is needed by the City. Arguments for higher or lower costs can be made; however, the herein contained per acre amounts appear to be the most appropriate current figure for the purposes of this study. However, City finance staff has indicated that land acquisition costs will be reviewed annually to adjust for the marked swings that can occur to land acquisition costs, as opposed to the more historically predictable construction costs.

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

The first argument for a gas tax credit supposes that the additional gas taxes created by residential development are used to pay for the maintenance of existing streets, which is the responsibility of existing development. Since the new streets constructed via DIFs will not require rehabilitation or reconstruction for another 10 to 20 years, the gas tax generated by new development is therefore a windfall to the City and should be credited against the DIF. What this argument fails to consider is that any new resident or business to the City will begin to contribute immediately to the use and deterioration of all City streets. A cursory review of City

finances will reveal that the portion of the State gas tax received by cities falls far short of meeting the City's needed street improvements and repairs in any given year. The gas taxes *generated* by new development simply cannot meet the maintenance costs of either the new streets associated with the development or the existing streets used on a daily basis.

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

For these reasons, credits of existing operational tax receipts are not considered for Circulation System DIFs in this Report. A similar discussion can be made for the other fees considered herein, and therefore no credits against any such fees are included in this calculation of development impact costs. Those annual operational tax receipts need to be dedicated to the maintenance of the existing system.

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

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

Financing Costs. Since financing costs reflect an actual, and generally significant, outlay of funds for an agency, they would be included in the project costs where debt financing was required due to the immediacy of the need for the facility or infrastructure to show the full costs of such facility or infrastructure and insure that new development also pays its "fair share" of these costs. These costs, if any, would be referenced in the *Master Facilities Plan* project detail page. Financing should only be included for facilities where, based upon staff's estimate, the immediacy of need for the facility requires debt financing. Or in the alternative, should financing be entered into on a facility, the impact fees should be recalculated to reflect those actual costs. In such cases, the debt service payments would be discounted to today's cost to account for the diminishing value of the dollar and would be in keeping with the cost methodology used in this study to show projects in current costs. To consider the face value of bond payments when determining costs, on the other hand, would be inaccurate as it would treat the value of a dollar today the same as the value of a dollar twenty years from now. Such an approach would tend to overvalue the costs of debt service requirements and therefore cause an agency to overcharge on its DIFs.

OTHER ISSUES

There are those who claim that the addition of DIFs unfairly creates an inflated resale price for existing residences. The argument is that if the public agency adopts a $20,000 to $25,000 development impact fee per detached dwelling, then the price for an existing dwelling is *artificially* increased by the same amount. We will use the example of a detached dwelling detached unit that cost the developer $200,000 to construct and complete to a point that the occupancy permit is approved.

Full Cost of a Residential Dwelling. The $200,000 represents only the above ground costs. The true and actual cost of a new dwelling is the cost of acquiring the parcel, necessary government approvals and permits, construction supplies, labor, debt service on the above, on-site [1] public improvements, and the cost of extending public services to that dwelling.

These public service extension costs include (but are not limited to [2]:

- The addition of law enforcement personnel requiring the expansion of the police station, response vehicles and specialty equipment.
- Additional fire stations, response vehicles and specialty rescue equipment.
- Widening of road segment of traffic arterials, collectors, bridge and additional signals.
- Additions to water delivery capability, including source, treatment, storage and delivery.

1. On-site improvements include local streets and medians, curbs and gutters, sewer lines, water lines, street lights, storm gutter or drainage pipes, electrical power lines and all of the other requirements of the City's development code on privately-held developments, hence the reference of "0n-site".
2. The City does not necessarily provide all of these services, they are only highlighted to make a point about the types of municipal services typically required to support a residential dwelling or business facility.

- Additions to the wastewater capability, including collection, treatment and disposal.
- Additions to the maintenance capabilities (i.e., municipal corporation yard and maintenance vehicles) necessary to maintain the above added infrastructure.
- Additional library, aquatics center, public meeting and developed park space for recreational/social purposes.

Thus while the cost of constructing the above ground portion of a detached dwelling unit may be $200,000, the previously identified "downstream" costs may be in the area of $20,000 to $25,000 per detached dwelling unit or in the area of 10% to 12% of the above ground cost.

If this argument is not clear, picture a 2,800 square foot detached dwelling, costing $200,000 to construct the above ground structure, located in the middle of an empty square mile, no roads, no utility service, no public safety response, no flood control and no recreational facilities. What is the market value of this detached dwelling? Probably not even the $200,000 that it cost to construct the structure. All of a sudden, the $20,000 impact fee for the infrastructure needed to support that one residential unit and this seems like a bargain. In short, new development needs an existing system of municipal infrastructure to hook up to.

Thus, the true and complete *cost* of a new detached dwelling unit is the cost of constructing the structure and the cost of extending the municipal services to the dwelling regardless of who pays for the actual costs of extending those services. To some degree these service-related infrastructure costs have been recognized, the only question remaining is who should for pay them, existing or new residents?

Effect on Market Price. Again, let us assume that a cumulative $20,000 to $25,000 impact fee imposed upon *new* detached dwelling construction increases the market price of an *existing* detached dwelling unit. Wouldn't this just be the recognition that the existing detached dwelling already has those physical links to the municipal services? A slightly different way of looking at this argument is that the existing family residences each have a "share" in a municipal corporation [3] and the share is valued at the cost of the connection to the various municipal utilities, transportation system, flood protection and public safety. It is a logical step then to require any newly constructed detached dwelling to purchase a "share" at an equal cost.

CHAPTER ORGANIZATION

Within each "hard infrastructure" Chapter (Chapters Three through Eight and Ten) there will be a minimum of three and a maximum of four cost/fee tables. They will be:

The first schedule, the ***Allocation of Project Cost Estimates*** identifies the projects, their costs and the relationship, in an allocation percentage, to future development. These schedules will begin with the number x.1 as in 3.1, 4.1, 5.1 etc.).

Minimum Needs-based Impact Fee - This schedule will calculate the DIF schedule that would need to be adopted to meet the minimum capital needs identified in the Report (on the second

3. Not unlike a private corporation.

schedule at the end of the Chapter, i.e., 3.2, 4.2, etc.) for that infrastructure but limited to the General City needs. Strictly speaking this schedule is a calculation of the development impact **costs**, suitable to be adopted as development impact **fees**, by the legislative body, in this case the Lompoc City Council.

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

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

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

Distribution of Existing Impact Fee Fund Balance. The existing City-wide DIFs have a combined Fund Balance of a negative $4.9 million (reserved separately by infrastructure) and each was created to finance various infrastructure needed as new residents and businesses locate in newly created residential dwellings and buildings. There are no specific restrictions on the monies, beyond the restriction that they be used on improvements within the Fund title and committed within a five-year time frame. The *Master Facilities Plan,* when adopted, suffices for that commitment.

Use of Textual Acronyms. *Development Impact Fees* will often be referred to as **DIFs** and the *Master Facilities Plan* will often be referred to as the **MFP**.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Chapter 2
Demographics and Findings

This Chapter represents the beginning and end of the DIF calculation process. It begins with an inventory of fully developed, undeveloped and under-developed units and acreage within the City and concludes with a summary of recommended DIF schedules with detailed infrastructure explanations in the following chapters of this Report.

LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS

This Report contains an inventory of fully developed, undeveloped and underdeveloped land within the City limits of Lompoc and is based upon the City's most recent General Plan update. The *Undeveloped* and the *Underdeveloped* delta land inventory, identified as *Potential Development,* combine to form the base for the distribution of the estimated costs of the service-expanding capital projects necessary to accommodate that same anticipated development. Without the expansion projects, the City would be unable to accommodate that new development, effectively halting it. The *developed* land inventory forms the base for distributing the replacement cost of the existing infrastructure. This action provides the basis for comparison with the proposed DIF schedules and for the *de facto* identification of the many existing Levels of Service (LOS) currently provided by the City's existing infrastructure which is conservatively valued at between $2.0 and $3.0 billion.

Table 2-1, is the resulting inventory of all private land-uses contained within the current City limits split by what are referred to as the **General City** and is based on the General Plan's land use inventory, a staff analysis of privately held parcels in General Plan area.

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

> ***Total - Land-use Database – Total of All Areas*** - This block of information identifies the amount of developed and undeveloped land in terms of acres and units for the City's entire City limits and is the sum of the two areas identified following.
>
> ***Land-use Database within the City's General City Area - Net*** - This block of information identifies the existing development and development opportunities within the General City area of the City in terms of acres and appropriate units. The information in the *Existing Development* column will be used to identify the current investment to compare the proportionality of the proposed DIFs as previously described in Chapter One. The *Potential Development* column will be used to distribute the cost of infrastructure improvements needed to accommodate development in the area to those generating the need for those same improvements. The area is the sum of three General City Sub-areas (detailed in Appendix B). The three sub areas include, *Existing Vacant*, *–Demolition* and *- Redeveloped* with the final two representing the demolition of existing private structure and the rebuilding of new private structure with a net increased amount of units or square feet.

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

Table 2-1
Detailed Land Use Inventory

A. Total - Land-use Database Total of all Areas (B + C)	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units	1,270.00	7,845	341.38	1,255	1,611.38	9,100
Attached Dwelling Units	247.00	5,666	55.32	993	302.32	6,659
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	69.00	980	1.00	14	70.00	994
Commercial Lodging Units	23.70	593	1.00	25	24.70	618
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	287.00	11,251,548	34.24	1,342,345	321.24	12,593,893
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	17.70	578,259	1.00	32,670	18.70	610,929
Business Park Uses (SF)	54.00	1,764,180	60.02	1,928,140	114.02	3,692,320
Industrial Uses (SF)	94.00	2,047,320	3.00	63,340	97.00	2,110,660
Institutional Use (SF)	4,243.00	120,136,302	1.00	28,314	4,244.00	120,164,616
Total - All City	**6,305.40**		**497.96**		**6,803.36**	
Private Residences	**1,586.00**	**14,491**	**397.70**	**2,262**	**1,983.70**	**16,753**
Commercial Lodging Rooms	**23.70**	**593**	**1.00**	**25**	**24.70**	**618**
Business Square Feet	**4,695.70**	**135,777,609**	**99.26**	**3,394,809**	**4,794.96**	**139,172,418**

B. Land-use Database within the Non-entitled Parcels within City (D+E)	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units	1,270.00	7,845	163.00	808	1,433.00	8,653
Attached Dwelling Units	247.00	5,666	33.00	674	280.00	6,340
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	69.00	980	1.00	14	70.00	994
Commercial Lodging Units	23.70	593	1.00	25	24.70	618
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	287.00	11,251,548	27.00	1,058,508	314.00	12,310,056
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	17.70	578,259	1.00	32,670	18.70	610,929
Business Park Uses (SF)	54.00	1,764,180	45.00	1,470,150	99.00	3,234,330
Industrial Uses (SF)	94.00	2,047,320	3.00	63,340	97.00	2,110,660
Institutional Use (SF)	4,243.00	120,136,302	1.00	28,314	4,244.00	120,164,616
Sub-total - Non-entitled Parcels	**6,305.40**		**275.00**		**6,580.40**	

C. Land-use Database Representing Entitled Development Projects (F+G)	Existing Development		Potential Development		Total General Plan Build-out	
	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units	Acres	# of Units
Detached Dwelling Units			178.38	447	178.38	447
Attached Dwelling Units			22.32	319	22.32	319
Mobile Home Dwelling Units			0.00	0	0.00	0
Commercial Lodging Units			0.00	0	0.00	0
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)			7.24	283,837	7.24	283,837
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)			0.00	0	0.00	0
Business Park Uses (SF)			15.02	457,990	15.02	457,990
Industrial Uses (SF)			0.00	0	0.00	0
Institutional Use (SF)			0.00	0	0.00	0
Sub-total - Entitled Parcels	**0.00**		**222.96**		**222.96**	

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

Residential Land-uses:

- **Detached Dwelling Units** - This DIF Land-use Type is generally defined as a detached unit and corresponds to an allowable use within the City's land-use designation of ***Rural Density Residential (RDR), Very Low Density Residential (VLDR)*** and ***Low Density Residential (LDR-2.5, LDR 4-6 and LDR 6.2).*** This category would include the construction of the unusual detached condominium or townhome and a manufactured unit on an individual lot.

- **Attached Dwelling Units** – This larger category consists of apartments, townhomes, condominiums or any other living unit that is attached to any other unit. It generally corresponds to an allowable land-use designation of ***Medium Density Residential (MDR)*** and ***High Density Residential (HDR).***

- **Mobile Home Dwelling Residential Units** - This DIF Land-use Type encompasses portions of ***Medium and perhaps High Density Residential*** land-use designation in the Zoning Code. No applications for this type is anticipated, but given the number of existing mobile home parks, the calculation was included for purposes of the proportional analysis.

  It is important to note that the removal of one existing manufactured unit (or existing mobile home dwelling) and the replacement with a similar dwelling does not constitute a DIF imposition event, it is merely a replacement of existing demand. The construction of the mobile unit pad is the DIF imposition event, not the placement of a mobile or modular residential dwelling.

Business/Commerce Land-uses:

- **Commercial Lodging** (keyed) **Units** - This *DIF Land-use Type* corresponds generally to business use designations as defined within the ***General Commercial (GC)*** designation.

- **Retail/Service/Office Uses** - As utilized in this Report, Commercial uses include the general type of retail services and thus includes outlets ranging from restaurants to auto repair shops to shopping centers. This category includes the ***Neighborhood Commercial (NC), Office Commercial (OC)*** and the ***General Commercial (GC)*** zones. The Old Town Commercial would also be within this DIF category.

- **Self Storage Facilities Uses** - As utilized in this Report, Self Storage uses would be included with in the general category of ***General Commercial (GC)*** or in some cases the ***Business Park (BP)*** zone.

- **Business Park Uses** - This *DIF Land-use Type* is largely limited to the single ***Business Park (BP)*** land-use zone.

- **Industrial/Manufacturing Uses** - This *DIF Land-use Type* contains all businesses engaged in heavy manufacturing or industrial development in the City's single ***Industrial (I)*** zone.

- **Institutional Uses** - This *DIF Land-use Type*, based upon the specific use, may be approved in just about any of the City's previously mentioned zones. It consists of private schools, private meeting places, places of worship and similar private facilities and could be located within many of the City's land use categories.

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

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

Development Opportunities Acres/Units - Refers to all non-public vacant acreage located within the City. This category also includes any fully vacant parcel and those that can be upsized in the future is it contains some remaining development potential on it.

POPULATION PROJECTIONS

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

There are at least two generally accepted methods for projecting future population levels in a City: (A) past growth trends projected forward and (B) population holding capacity based on the General Plan land-use element. Each of these methods can be useful even though both possess certain limitations.
There are several serious flaws in projecting the build-out population of a community using the past growth trends methodology. While this method is relatively simple and therefore easy for the general public to understand, it does not give consideration to when an area is actually built out. Eventually there comes a point in time where the amount of available land to build on is negligible. This technique does not help explain when that point is reached.

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

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

Holding Capacity Analysis. The methodology used in this Report to forecast the built-out population of Lompoc is the current holding capacity approach. This method calculates the sum of existing development and potential development allowable under current land use regulations, using average densities found in the City.

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

The number of persons per unit for new residential units is based on the 2000 U.S. Census and ranges from 3.025 and 2.876 persons for detached dwellings and attached dwelling respectively High density dwelling units have 2.876 persons per unit and there are 2.130 persons in each mobile home dwelling unit. The 2000 Census data was selected over the recently released 2010 Census due to a change in reporting the resulting data by eliminating the data.

Based on these 2000 Census dwelling density data, future residential development can be expected to generate somewhere from 6,435 and 6,682 additional residents[4] to the City of Lompoc, joining the 41,109 citizens already living in City, resulting in a total estimated population at build-out (based upon the inclusion of existing City limits) of approximately 47,668 residents. The higher number is based upon full occupancy of all new dwelling units and the lower figure is based upon the historical occupancy levels at the time of the census count. The 47,668 is the average of the two.

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

The estimated General Plan build-out population of 47,668 (average between high and low) or more residents using this holding capacity approach is typically lower than the population forecasts based on the mathematical models described previously. This implies that either the City's period of residential build-out will actually take 25 to 30 years or that the City's growth rate will increase from recent historical levels. As the residentially zoned land remaining to be developed continues to be built on during the next thirty years, the City is likely to see the number of new dwelling units developed decrease each year.

4 Depending upon the vacancy factor based upon the average of 96.05% for all residences.

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

Existing Residential	Total Units	Vacant Units	Occupied Units	Total Number of Occupants	Average Occupancy	Percentage Occupied
Detached Dwelling Units						
Detached Dwellings	7,211	171	7,040	21,299	3.025	97.63%
Attached Dwelling Units						
Attached Dwelling Units	1,044	24	1,020	3,007	2.948	97.70%
Duplex to Quadplex Units	1,860	80	1,780	5,167	2.903	95.70%
Five to Forty-nine Units	2,173	165	2,008	5,652	2.815	92.41%
Fifty or More Units	397	7	390	790	2.026	98.24%
Average	5,077	269	4,808	13,826	2.876	94.70%
Mobile Home Dwelling Units						
Mobile Home/Trailer	897	100	797	1,698	2.130	88.85%
Other Dwelling Units						
Other Dwelling Units	43	14	29	32	1.103	67.44%

Existing - State Department of Finance 01/01/19 Population, excludes prison population	43,649
Existing - State Department of Finance 01/01/19 Prison Population	(2,540)
Existing - State Department of Finance 01/01/19 Population, excludes prison population	41,109

G.P. Build-out Population At Historic Occupancy Rates	*Anticipated Units*	*Occupancy Rate*	*Probable Occupancy*	*Dwelling Density*	*Anticipated Population*
Potential Detached Dwellings	1,255	97.63%	1,225	3.025	3,706
Potential Attached Dwellings	993	94.70%	940	2.876	2,703
Potential Mobile Home Dwellings	14	88.85%	12	2.130	26

Population to be Added Via Development at Historic Occupancy Rates	6,435	6,435
Current State of California Department of Finance Population		41,109
Potential "Build-out" Population, at Historic Vacancy Rates.		47,544

G.P. Build-out Population At 100% Occupancy Rate	*Anticipated Units*	*Occupancy Rate*	*Probable Occupancy*	*Dwelling Density*	*Anticipated Population*
Potential Detached Dwellings	1,255	100.00%	1,255	3.025	3,796
Potential Attached Dwellings	993	100.00%	993	2.876	2,856
Potential Mobile Home Dwellings	14	100.00%	14	2.130	30

Population to be Added Via Development at 100% Occupancy	6,682	6,682
Current State of California Department of Finance Population		41,109
Potential Maximum "Build-out" Population.		47,791

Population at General Plan Build-out @ Low per Dwelling Resident Densities	47,544
Population at General Plan Build-out @ High per Dwelling Resident Densities	47,791
Average Population at General Plan Build-out	47,668

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

City staff and RCS have identified over $452.6 million in needed and Master Planned capital improvement projects required through the City's General Plan build-out including both projects related to existing deficiencies and those needed solely to support future growth. Roughly 19.47% of the total project list can be financed with DIF receipts imposed upon new development. The proposed impact fees will generate just under $63.0 million while application of the existing impact fee schedule upon entitled projects will generate approximately $26.7 million [5]. While most of the infrastructures have a positive but modest fund balance the water and wastewater utilities currently have negative fund balance and in the aggregates there is an all DIF funds of negative $4.9 million which adds to the unfunded project total of $358.0 million. Table 2-3 indicates the development fee-related capital project costs by area.

Table 2-3
Total City-wide General Plan Build-out
Capital Requirements

Infrastructure Type	Total - All DIF Projects
Law Enforcement, Vehicles and Equipment	$6,188,521
Fire Suppression, Vehicles and Equipment	$2,808,790
Circulation et. al System	$19,239,342
Electric Source and Distribution System	See Chapter
Water Treatment and Distribution System	$9,973,048
Wastewater Collection System and Treatment	$9,847,554
Refuse Collection Vehicles and Barrels	$1,379,103
General Government, Vehicles and Equipment	$1,303,116
Library Collection/Public Use Computers	$729,443
Public Meeting Facilities	$5,659,846
Aquatics Facilities	$3,385,836
Park Land Acquisition and Improvements et. al.	$34,116430
Sub-total DIF Related Project Costs	$94,631,028
Non-Development Generated Projects	$358,020,199
Total - Identified Projects	$452,651,228

The adoption of the recommended DIF schedule amounts supported by the calculations in this Report (Schedule 2.1) would finance a great deal of this areas development-generated capital facilities by raising upwards to $88,134,697 in new DIF revenues, $62,975,089 from these new calculated impact fees and $26,719,122 through application of the existing impact fees (and any new ones) upon previously entitled parcels. The difference between the $94,631,028 in Development related costs and the $88,134,697 in total potential development impact fee receipts is due to the amount of entitled parcels that would have the lower existing impact fee

[5] This figure excludes water and wastewater DIF collection from the entitled properties (outside of detached dwellings) until the meter sizes of the proposed private development applications are determined and calculated.

schedule imposed upon their building permit applications. In short, the cost of the impact remains regardless of any legal fee limitation such as entitlement to older fee calculations.

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

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

DIF Land Use Type	Recommended Development Impact Fees
Detached Dwelling Unit	$33,195/Unit
Attached Dwelling Unit	$29,650/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	$24,562/Unit
Commercial Lodging Keyed Unit	$8,685/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses Square Foot	$6.984/S.F.
Self Storage Uses Square Foot	$4.996/S.F
Business Park Uses Square Foot	$5.187/S.F.
Industrial Uses square Foot	$4.372/S.F.
Institutional Use Square Foot	$5.298/S.F.

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

Specific DIF schedule rates for each land use can be found at the end of each chapter relating to each infrastructure. Schedule 2.2 at the end of this Chapter identifies the probable impact fee revenue from the application of the existing development impact fee schedule upon previously approved and entitled private development projects.

Schedules 2.1 and 2.2 each require two pages to summarize the many infrastructures, identify the individual Infrastructure DIFs and combined DIFs by DIF Land-use Type and provide a calculation of the potential collection through build-out at the proposed *Minimum Needs*-based *DIF* schedules and the cost of the total infrastructure needs.

FORMAT OF THIS REPORT

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

CHAPTER 3 - Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment
CHAPTER 4 - Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment
CHAPTER 5 - Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System
CHAPTER 6 - Electrical Distribution System Facilities
CHAPTER 7 - Water Source, Storage and Distribution
CHAPTER 8 - Wastewater Collection System
CHAPTER 9 - Refuse Collection Facilities and Equipment
CHAPTER 10 - General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment
CHAPTER 11 - Library Facilities and Collection Items
CHAPTER 12 - Public Use (Community Center) Facilities
CHAPTER 13 - Aquatics Facilities
CHAPTER 14 - Park Land and Open Space Acquisition and Park Improvements

APPENDIX A - Summary of Recommendations.
APPENDIX B - Expanded Land-use Database.
APPENDIX C - Detailed Park Infrastructure Cost Schedule

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

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

DRAFT

Schedule 2.1

City of Lompoc General Plan Maintenance Costs (Non-entitled Parcels)
Summary of Development Impact Fees By Type of Fee (continued on next page)
(Costs/Fees per Residential Type Dwelling Unit, or Business Type Square Foot)

Land-use Category	Law Enforcement Facilities	Fire Protection Facilities	Streets, Signals and Bridges	Electric Interconnection Facilities	Water Distribution Facilities	Sewer Collection Facilities	Solid Waste Collection (Average)
	Schedule 3.2	Schedule 4.2	Schedule 5.2	See Chapter	Schedule 7.2	Schedule 8.2	Schedule 9.1
Calculated Development Impact Costs							
Detached Dwelling Units	$1,546	$1,245	$2,598	NA	$4,238	$3,768	$597
Attached Dwelling Units	$1,907	$979	$1,734	NA	$2,901	$3,301	$549
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$1,809	$1,360	$1,352	NA	$2,901	$3,299	$183
Commercial Lodging Units	$2,805	$769	$1,370	NA	$1,170	$2,202	$91
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	$0.575	$0.151	$5.249	NA	$0.438	$0.361	$0.023
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	$0.596	$0.151	$3.000	NA	$0.438	$0.578	$0.024
Business Park Uses (SF)	$0.711	$0.013	$3.121	NA	$0.525	$0.588	$0.020
Industrial Uses (SF)	$0.707	$0.013	$1.609	NA	$0.534	$1.191	$0.043
Institutional Use (SF)	$0.006	$0.038	$3.427	NA	$0.739	$0.831	$0.027
Potential Collection with Recommended Impact Fee Schedule							
Detached Dwelling Units	$1,249,168	$1,005,960	$2,099,184	NA	$3,424,304	$3,044,544	$482,376
Attached Dwelling Units	$1,285,318	$659,846	$1,168,716	NA	$1,955,274	$2,224,874	$370,026
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$25,326	$19,040	$18,928	NA	$40,614	$46,186	$2,562
Commercial Lodging Units	$70,125	$19,225	$34,250	NA	$29,250	$55,050	$2,275
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	$608,642	$159,835	$5,556,108	NA	$463,627	$382,121	$24,346
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	$19,471	$4,933	$98,010	NA	$14,309	$18,883	$784
Business Park Uses (SF)	$1,045,277	$19,112	$4,588,338	NA	$771,829	$864,448	$29,403
Industrial Uses (SF)	$44,781	$823	$101,914	NA	$33,824	$75,438	$2,724
Institutional Use (SF)	$170	$1,076	$97,032	NA	$20,924	$23,529	$764
Total	$4,348,278	$1,889,850	$13,762,480	NA	$6,753,955	$6,735,073	$915,260
Potential DIF Receipts	$4,348,278	$1,889,850	$13,762,480	NA	$6,753,955	$6,735,073	$915,260
Fund Balance and Other Revenues	$52,589	$41,680	$4,267,497	NA	($5,705,253)	($6,047,877)	$0
Entitled Parcels DIF Receipts (2.2)	$575,374	$237,828	$13,718,270	NA	$1,496,109	$0	$338,329
Required Capital Total	$6,188,521	$10,599,886	$308,778,588	NA	$39,571,502	$40,613,178	$1,379,103
Over or (Under) Collection	-$1,212,280	-$8,430,528	-$277,030,341	NA	-$37,026,691	-$39,925,982	-$125,514

Schedule 2.1

City of Lompoc General Plan Maintenance Costs (Non-entitled Parcels)
Summary of Development Impact Fees By Type of Fee
(Costs/Fees per Residential Type Dwelling Unit, or Business Type Square Foot)

Land-use Category	General Government Facilities	Library Expansion Facilities	Public Meeting Facilities	Aquatics Center Facilities	Parkland Facilities Development	Development Impact Fee Total Per Unit or Square Feet
	Schedule 9.2	Schedule 10.1	Schedule 11.1	Schedule 12.1	Schedule 13.1	
Calculated Development Impact Costs						
Detached Dwelling Units	$460	$228	$2,553	$1,533	$14,429	$33,195 per Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$460	$217	$2,427	$1,457	$13,718	$29,650 per Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$460	$161	$1,797	$1,080	$10,160	$24,562 per Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$105	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$173	$8,685 per Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	$0.077	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$0.110	$6.984 per S.F.
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	$0.077	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$0.132	$4.996 per S.F.
Business Park Uses (SF)	$0.077	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$0.132	$5.187 per S.F.
Industrial Uses (SF)	$0.077	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$0.198	$4.372 per S.F.
Institutional Use (SF)	$0.077	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$0.153	$5.298 per S.F.
Potential Collection with Recommended Impact Fee Schedule						
Detached Dwelling Units	$371,680	$184,224	$2,062,824	$1,238,664	$11,658,632	$26,821,560
Attached Dwelling Units	$310,040	$146,258	$1,635,798	$982,018	$9,245,932	$19,984,100
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$6,440	$2,254	$25,158	$15,120	$142,240	$343,868
Commercial Lodging Units	$2,625	$0	$0	$0	$4,325	$217,125
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	$81,505	$0	$0	$0	$116,436	$7,392,620
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	$2,516	$0	$0	$0	$4,312	$163,218
Business Park Uses (SF)	$113,202	$0	$0	$0	$194,060	$7,625,669
Industrial Uses (SF)	$4,877	$0	$0	$0	$12,541	$276,922
Institutional Use (SF)	$2,180	$0	$0	$0	$4,332	$150,007
Total	$895,065	$332,736	$3,723,780	$2,235,802	$21,382,810	$62,975,089
Probable DIF Receipts	$895,065	$332,736	$3,723,780	$2,235,802	$21,382,810	$62,975,089
Fund Balance/Other Revenues	$0	$225,568	$20,958	$0	$1,816,139	-$5,328,699
Potential Entitled DIF Receipts (2.2)	$409,480	$541,698	$891,254	$1,150,034	$7,360,746	$26,719,122
Required Capital Total	$1,628,895	$729,443	$5,659,846	$3,385,836	$34,116,430	$452,651,228
Over or (Under) Collection	-$324,350	$370,559	-$1,023,854	$0	-$3,556,735	-$368,285,715

Schedule 2.2

City of Lompoc for Currently Entitled Parcels
Summary of Existing Development Impact Fees By Type of Fee for Application upon Entitled Projects
(Costs/Fees per Residential Type Dwelling Unit, or Business Type Square Foot)

Land-use Category	Law Enforcement Facilities	Fire Protection Facilities	Streets, Bikeways and Traffic Signals	Electric Utility Facilities	Water Distribution Facilities	Sewer Collection Facilities	Solid Waste Collection Equipment
	Ordinance XXX	Ordinance XXX	Ordinance XXX	No Fee	Ordinance XXX	Ordinance XXX	Ordinance XXX
Calculated Development Impact Costs/Fees							
Detached Dwelling Units	$269	$244	$3,351	NA	$3,347	$2,876	$330
Attached Dwelling Units	$447	$99	$2,356	NA	Meter Size	Meter Size	$549
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$269	$114	$2,015	NA	Meter Size	Meter Size	$183
Commercial Lodging Units	$172	$82	$6,271	NA	Meter Size	Meter Size	$91
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	$0.659	$0.131	$27.856	NA	Meter Size	Meter Size	$0.023
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	$0.106	$0.095	$16.832	NA	Meter Size	Meter Size	$0.024
Business Park Uses (SF)	$0.274	$0.131	$7.778	NA	Meter Size	Meter Size	$0.020
Industrial Uses (SF)	$0.071	$0.095	$3.961	NA	Meter Size	Meter Size	$0.043
Potential Collection with Existing Impact Fee Schedule							
Detached Dwelling Units	$120,243	$109,068	$1,497,897	NA	$1,496,109	$1,285,572	$147,510
Attached Dwelling Units	$142,593	$31,581	$751,564	NA	Meter Size	Meter Size	$175,131
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$0	$0	$0	NA	Meter Size	Meter Size	$0
Commercial Lodging Units	$0	$0	$0	NA	Meter Size	Meter Size	$0
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	$187,049	$37,183	$7,906,563	NA	Meter Size	Meter Size	$6,528
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	$0	$0	$0	NA	Meter Size	Meter Size	$0
Business Park Uses (SF)	$125,489	$59,997	$3,562,246	NA	Meter Size	Meter Size	$9,160
Industrial Uses (SF)	$0	$0	$0	NA	Meter Size	Meter Size	$0
Total	$575,374	$237,828	$13,718,270	NA	$1,496,109	$0	$338,329
Potential Entitled Parcels DIF Collect	$575,374	$237,828	$13,718,270	NA	$1,496,109	$0	$338,329
Existing Fund Balance/Other	$52,589	$41,680	$4,267,497	NA	($5,705,253)	($6,047,877)	$0
Non-entitled Parcels DIF Receipts (2	$4,348,278	$1,889,850	$13,762,480	NA	$6,753,955	$6,735,073	$915,260
Required Capital Total	$6,188,521	$10,599,886	$308,778,588	NA	$39,571,502	$40,613,178	$1,379,103
Over or (Under) Collection	-$1,212,280	-$8,430,528	-$277,030,341	NA	-$37,026,691	-$39,925,982	-$125,514

Schedule 2.2

City of Lompoc for Entitled Parcels
Summary of Existing Development Impact Fees By Type of Fee for Application upon Entitled Projects
(Costs/Fees per Residential Type Dwelling Unit, or Business Type Square Foot)

Land-use Category	General Government Facilities	Library Expansion Facilities	Public Meeting Facilities	Aquatics Center Facilities	Parkland Facilities Development	Development Impact Cost Per Dwelling Unit or Business Square Feet
	New DIF	Ordinance XXX	Ordinance XXX	New DIF	Ordinance XXX	
Calculated Development Impact Costs/Fees						
Detached Dwelling Units	$460	$728	$1,196	$1,533	$9,920	$24,254 per Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$460	$678	$1,118	$1,457	$9,174	$16,338 per Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$460	$510	$837	$1,080	$6,880	$12,348 per Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$105	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$6,721 per Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	$0.077	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$28.746 per S.F.
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	$0.077	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$17.134 per S.F.
Business Park Uses (SF)	$0.077	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$8.280 per S.F.
Industrial Uses (SF)	$0.077	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee	$4.247 per S.F.
Potential Collection with Existing Impact Fee Schedule						
Detached Dwelling Units	$205,620	$325,416	$534,612	$685,251	$4,434,240	$10,841,538
Attached Dwelling Units	$146,740	$216,282	$356,642	$464,783	$2,926,506	$5,211,822
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Commercial Lodging Units	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	$21,855	$0	$0	$0	$0	$8,159,178
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Business Park Uses (SF)	$35,265	$0	$0	$0	$0	$3,792,156
Industrial Uses (SF)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total	$409,480	$541,698	$891,254	$1,150,034	$7,360,746	$26,719,122
Potential Entitled DIF Collection	$409,480	$541,698	$891,254	$1,150,034	$7,360,746	$26,719,122
Existing Fund Balance/Other	$0	$225,568	$20,958	$0	$627,821	-$6,517,017
Potential DIF Collection (2.1)	$895,065	$332,736	$3,723,780	$2,235,802	$21,382,810	$62,975,089
Required Capital Total	$1,628,895	$729,443	$5,659,846	$5,659,846	$34,116,430	$454,925,238
Over or (Under) Collection	-$324,350	$370,559	-$1,023,854	-$2,274,010	-$4,745,053	-$371,748,043

Chapter 3
Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment

The Existing System of Law Enforcement Assets or infrastructure. The Lompoc Police Department currently operates out of a 24,892 square foot facility on roughly three acres at 107 Civic Center Plaza.

The Department also has a significant inventory of:

- Vehicles (official and undercover) some with various added extra equipment;
- Assigned officer equipment such as various leathers, armament, clothing, and safety apparel;
- Communications equipment; and,
- Specialty and computer equipment.

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

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

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

The Purpose of the Fee. Additional law enforcement calls-for-service are expected, and the cost of adding sworn officers necessary to respond to those calls can be determined. Those

new costs can be translated to a fee, or an amount, necessary to be collected to offset the added costs of the required additional staffing. These costs include equipping and housing the additional officers. Providing that the fee is adopted and imposed, new development will finance its proportional capital costs of expansion of the Police Station. The continued costs of the annual salary and benefits for those additional officers will need to come from increases in property and sales tax generated by the new residences and businesses and their occupants.

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

LE-001, Additional Police Station Space/Upgrades - The existing station will need to be expanded by 4,240 to meet the space needs of the eight additional officers (at 530 square feet per officer) needed to meet the addition calls-for-service generated by new development.

LE-002, Additional Patrol/Detectives/Specialty/Staff Vehicles - This project is the acquisition of eight law enforcement vehicles to maintain the existing 0.936 vehicles/officer standard.

LE-003, Additional Police Officer Assigned Equipment - Officers in the field will require personally assigned equipment of a persona-assigned radios/electronic devices leathers, handgun, helmet, and assorted protection as well as the costly recruitment costs of a background check and other exams. These costs have been included at $17,838 per additional officer but are only included for successful candidates.

LE-004, Additional Specialty Equipment - This project is the acquisition of specialty equipment such as special weapons and tactics equipment, bicycles, and other unique equipment.

LE-005, Dispatch System - Due to the expected additional calls-for-service the department will pass the threshold of what the existing dispatch capacity can accommodate and need to acquire additional dispatch technology/equipment capacity for dealing for these anticipated additional calls-for-service.

LE-006, Advanced Technology Software and Equipment - This project is the acquisition of specialty equipment such as linked database systems and other cooperative law enforcement sharing systems.

The Relationship Between the Need for *The Fee* and *The Type* of Development Project. Department records were used to demonstrate that differing land-uses generate differing numbers of calls. Police staff provided extremely accurate calls-for-service data by over-laying the Department's computerized response records with the City's zoning map thus allowing 100% of the private sector calls-for-service to be categorized. Table 3-1, following, summarizes an analysis of the calls-for-service received by the Police Department over a recent twelve month period. The breakdown of calls into the land-uses that generated them, divided by the number of developed units (during the same period) generating a *calls-for-service* nexus.

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

DIF Land-use Type	Developed Dwellings or Square Feet	Actual Calls For Service Over 12 Months	Total Calls per Dwelling or 1,000 SF (KSF)
Detached Dwelling Units	7,845	6,231	0.794/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	5,666	5,549	0.979/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	980	879	0.897/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	593	863	1.455/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses	11,251,548	3,322	0.295/KSF
Self-storage Facilities Uses	578,259	171	0.295/KSF
Business Park Uses	1,764,180	644	0.365/KSF
Industrial Uses	2,047,320	747	0.365/KSF
Institutional Uses	120,136,302	327	0.003/KSF

As an example, there were approximately 6,231 calls-for-service that generated a response to one of the 7,845 detached dwelling units in the City. The result indicates that, on average, each dwelling will generate just over 0.794 calls per year. The same analysis was undertaken for most land-uses, with the limited exception that attached dwelling units and forty high density dwelling units were combined. Since these calls-for-service by land use are an average, they were used to project the number of additional calls that could be expected by multiplying the calls per residential unit or business acre by the number of anticipated number of new residential dwellings or business acres. To determine the number of additional officers necessary to meet this increase from future developments, the number of increased calls resulting from new development was then divided by the average number of calls that an officer responds to.

These calls-for-service rates are then applied to (multiplied by) the undeveloped land-use database anticipated units to determine the number of calls-for-service in the future. The additional calls-for-service, in this case 3,150 per year, were then divided by the number of calls-for-service that a single officer can absorb.

The existing complement of 47 sworn officers currently absorbs the 18,733 annual calls by responding to just over 399 calls-for-service each to privately-owned and developed parcels annually. Based upon the addition of 3,150 calls-for-service, the City will need to successfully recruit eight additional officers to maintain the same response capabilities that are currently provided by the existing 47 officers now. This is not to imply that the existing level of services or the ratio of officers to calls-for-service is the desired level of service, it merely is the ***current*** level of service. To adequately mobilize the eight new sworn officers, the City will need to add eight response vehicles at a total cost of $379,869 to maintain the existing ratio of 0.936

vehicles per sworn officer (44 vehicles divided by 47 officers) and for the personnel recruitment and officer-assigned equipment at a combined cost of $142,704 (47 officers X $17,838 in assigned equipment costs).

The Relationship Between the *Use of the Fee* and the *Type of Development* Paying the Fee. Again, *use of the fee* is a similar argument to the *need for the fee.* As the development occurs, the impact is generated and the impact fee would be collected as the development occurs. The collected DIF receipts would be put to use to acquire equipment for additional officers, vehicles and additional building space necessary to respond to those additional calls, *without reducing the capability of responding to calls from the existing community.*

The Relationship Between the *Amount of the Fee* and the *Cost of the Portion* of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. The building size at 24,892 square feet, along with the additional 4,240 additional square feet proposed in LE-001 will meet the needs for operations space (and location) through General Plan build-out and the land-use database depicted in Table 2-1. The build-out complement of 55 sworn officers, (47 current and eight projected) will allow for the maintenance of the average of about 532 square feet per officer.

Minimum Needs-based Fees. Table 3-2, following, summarizes the resulting DIFs (from Schedule 3.2) for development to contribute $6,135,932 towards the expansion of the Law Enforcement capabilities of the City in order to allow the City to extend the same level of service to the City's newest citizens and businesses.

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

DIF land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$1,940,071	$1,546/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$1,893,322	$1,907/Unit
Mobil Home Dwelling Units	$25,322	$1,809/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$70,123	$2,805/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses	$771,354	$0.575/S.F.
Self-storage Uses	$19,479	$0.596/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$1,371,295	$0.711/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$44,801	$0.707/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$165	$0.006/S.F.

Existing Financial Commitment Comparison Costs. The City invested, at current dollars, about $20.2 million in the existing police station, or stated a slightly different way, it would cost $20.2

million to replace the existing building. The Department staff uses 44 assorted vehicles with various added extra equipment costing a total of $2,387,748 for an average cost of about $54,267 per vehicle. The existing 47 sworn officers each have assigned equipment such as personally-assigned radio and communication equipment, various leathers, armament, clothing and safety apparel costing some $17,838 per sworn officer or a combined $891,950. The City's existing dispatch facilities have replacement value of $2,783,904. Lastly, there is $10,298,021 invested specialty equipment, computer capability and other electronic equipment. Combined, the City has invested, at current dollars, some $36,614,827 into the law enforcement services which includes the $52,589 existing Law Enforcement Impact Fee Fund balance.

When this combined replacement financial commitment cost figure is distributed over the entire current community (via Table 3-3 following and Schedule 3.3), we find that the existing financial commitment is quite similar to that of the calculated Law Enforcement Minimum Needs-based DIFs (or cost), indicating that the existing community has invested nearly what be required from future development.

.

Table 3-3
Existing Law Enforcement
Community Financial Commitment Comparison Data

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$12,178,881	$1,552/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$10,845,869	$1,914/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$1,718,061	$1,753/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$1,686,788	$2,844/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses	$6,493,560	$0.577/S.F.
Self-storage Facilities Uses	$333,728	$0.577/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$1,258,416	$0.713/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$1,460,382	$0.713/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$639,142	$0.005/S.F.

RECOMMENDED DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

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

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED LAW ENFORCEMENT DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

- **General City** - Adopt Schedule 3.2.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 3.1

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Percent Need	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Apportioned Dollar Cost	Construction Needs Generated by New Development: Percent Need	Construction Needs Generated by New Development: Apportioned Dollar Cost
LE-001	Additional Police Station Space/Upgrades	$3,472,832	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$3,472,832
LE-002	Additional Patrol/Detective/Specialty/Staff Vehicles	$379,869	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$379,869
LE-003	Additional Officer Assigned Equipment	$142,712	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$142,712
LE-004	Additional Specialty Equipment	$1,647,683	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,647,683
LE-005	Dispatch Expansion	$445,425	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$445,425
LE-006	Advanced Technology Software And Equipment	$100,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$100,000
	Sub-Total General Plan Total New Project Costs	$6,188,521	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$6,188,521
	LESS:					
	Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	$52,589	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$52,589
	Total General Plan Total New Project Costs	$6,135,932	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$6,135,932
						Forward to Schedule 3.2

NOTES:
1. Costs distributed based upon recent actual twelve month Lompoc Police Department "Calls-for-Service" statistics.

Schedule 3.2

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Minimum Needs-based Impact Costs
Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

DIF Land-use Type	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Call Generation Rate	Expected New Calls for Service	Percentage of Additional Service Calls	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	341.38	1,255	0.794	996	31.62%	$1,940,071	$5,683	3.68	*$1,546 per Unit*
Attached Dwelling Units	55.32	993	0.979	972	30.86%	$1,893,322	$34,225	17.95	*$1,907 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	1.00	14	0.897	13	0.41%	$25,322	$25,322	14.00	*$1,809 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	1.00	25	1.455	36	1.14%	$70,123	$70,123	25.00	*$2,805 per Unit*
Retail/Service/Office Uses (S	34.24	1,342,345	0.295	396	12.57%	$771,354	$22,528	39,204	*$0.575 per S.F.*
Self Storage Facilities Uses (	1.00	32,670	0.295	10	0.32%	$19,479	$19,479	32,670	*$0.596 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses (SF)	60.02	1,928,140	0.365	704	22.35%	$1,371,295	$22,847	32,125	*$0.711 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses (SF)	3.00	63,340	0.365	23	0.73%	$44,801	$14,934	21,113	*$0.707 per S.F.*
Institutional Use (SF)	1.00	28,314	0.003	0	0.00%	$165	$165	28,314	*$0.006 per S.F.*
TOTAL	**497.96**	--	--	**3,150**	**100.00%**	**$6,135,932 in Total Equity in Current Law Enforcement Assets**			

Schedule 3.3

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison
Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

DIF Land-use Type	Developed Acres	Developed Units	Call Generation Rate	Existing Calls for Service	Percentage of Existing Service Calls	Allocation of Infrastructure "Equity"	Distribution of "Equity" per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Current Financial Commitment per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	1,270.00	7,845	0.794	6,231	33.26%	$12,178,881	$9,590	6.18	*$1,552 per Unit*
Attached Dwelling Units	247.00	5,666	0.979	5,549	29.62%	$10,845,869	$43,910	22.94	*$1,914 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	69.00	980	0.897	879	4.69%	$1,718,061	$24,899	14.20	*$1,753 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	23.70	593	1.455	863	4.61%	$1,686,788	$71,172	25.02	*$2,844 per Unit*
Retail/Service/Office Uses (S	287.00	11,251,548	0.295	3,322	17.73%	$6,493,560	$22,626	39,204	*$0.577 per S.F.*
Self Storage Facilities Uses (	17.70	578,259	0.295	171	0.91%	$333,728	$18,855	32,670	*$0.577 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses (SF)	54.00	1,764,180	0.365	644	3.44%	$1,258,415	$23,304	32,670	*$0.713 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses (SF)	94.00	2,047,320	0.365	747	3.99%	$1,460,382	$15,536	21,780	*$0.713 per S.F.*
Institutional Use (SF)	4,243.00	120,136,302	0.003	327	1.75%	$639,142	$151	28,314	*$0.005 per S.F.*
TOTAL	**6,305.40**	–	–	**18,733**	**100.00%**	**$36,614,827**	**Total Law Enforcement System Capital Assets**		

$20,200,614	**in Law Enforcement Facility Assets**
$2,387,748	**in Law Enforcement Vehicles Assets**
$891,950	**in Law Enforcement Officer Equipment Assets**
$2,783,904	**in Dispatch Equipment/Improvements**
$10,298,021	**in Specialty Equipment Assets**
$52,589	**in Existing Law Enforcement DIF Fund Balance**

DIF Land-use Type	Units or Acres	Calls for Service	Annual Calls Per Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	11,251,548	3,322	0.295
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	578,259	171	0.295
Average Calls-for-Service	11,829,807	3,493	0.295

DIF Land-use Type	Units or Acres	Calls for Service	Annual Calls Per Unit
Business Park Uses (SF)	1,764,180	644	0.365
Industrial Uses (SF)	2,047,320	747	0.365
Average Calls-for-Service	3,811,500	1,391	0.365

Chapter 4
Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment

The Existing System. The City has invested in a system of fire facilities, response vehicles and specialty equipment. The Fire Department responds to calls-for-service from two existing stations. The Department has specific equipment and training to calls-for-service consisting fire suppression, emergency medical calls, vehicle extrication, high-angle rescue, trench and collapse rescue, swift water rescue, confined space rescue as well as and hazardous materials response. The Department is course available to handle other non-anticipated calls-for-service.

The fire station facilities are detailed as follows:

Fire Station #1/Headquarters is 9,200 square feet and is located on a 46,000 square foot parcel at 115 South G Street. There is also a 3,750 storage facility on a contiguous 4,500 square foot lot at this address.

Fire Station #2 is a 3,000 square foot residential style fire station on a 4,500 square foot parcel at 1100 North D Street.

The land and replacement construction costs of the existing stations and training facilities is approximately $15,050,839. Not surprisingly, the City also has a sizable fleet of equipped City-owned response and prevention units consisting of:

- Three Type I response engines;
- One aerial ladder vehicle;
- Three Command Vehicles (Chief, Battalion Chief and one back-up);
- Three general use vehicles;
- Three specific use trailers (HazMat/Mass Casualty, Risk Reduction and USAR);
- One all-terrain utility vehicle;
- Two Wildland Type III brush vehicles; and,
- One utility rescue vehicle.

The total investment in the vehicle compliment is about $6,582,312. State or County vehicles and equipment are not included in the financial commitment figure. The City's fire-fighter assigned equipment and successful psychological/back-ground checks, at $9,167 per fire-fighter, is approximately $201,663 total for the existing staff of 22 fire fighters. The specialty equipment made up of Urban Search and Rescue, hazardous materials/mass casualty, confined space equipment, as well as major communications equipment, reserve hose and appurtenances total some $2,694,828. Specialty tools, decontamination washer/dryers add an additional $282,513. Lastly, the Fire Suppression Facility, Vehicle and Equipment Impact Fee fund balance is $41,680.

The current financial commitment or investment, in fire stations, training facilities, response fleet, specialty and communications equipment and fund balance is a sizable $24,853,835. This figure represents what it would cost to establish the existing Department response capability at

current vehicle, equipment, land acquisition and construction costs. The relevance of this figure will be established later in this Chapter.

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Underdeveloped or Vacant Parcels. While it can be said that numerous factors are considered when determining the number and location of fire stations in any city, it can be stated without fear of contradiction that all new private development in the City will have an effect on the City's current ability to respond to fire, rescue and emergency calls-for-service. The affect, simplified but not trivialized, is twofold. Initially, each new residential and business development will create, on average, more calls-for-service increasing the likelihood of simultaneous (and thus competing) calls-for-service. Additionally, as development spreads further from any existing station or stations, as large-scale development is often likely to do, the distances (and thus response times) will increase, taking the existing fire companies out-of-service for greater periods of time.

The capacity of any fire station is finite and will reach practical limits (through call *frequency* and *total time*). When that capacity is exceeded, the level of service afforded to existing development will be greatly reduced. Or stated in another way, if development continues without the addition of fire station capacity to respond, the existing stations could be overwhelmed in terms of calls-for-service, making a timely response for emergency service a virtual coin flip. That is, will the existing fire companies be available to respond to your needs or will they possibly be out-of-service on a call in a different part of the community?

The Purpose of the Fee. In order to continue to be able to respond to an ever-increasing number of expected calls, now and in the future, the City staff has determined the need for the additional fire station to maximize coverage. Unfortunately the station will only be needed when the City's land use database is expanded via an annexation or major change in its existing General Plan as the current future demand generates the need for 25% of an additional station. Until that time, the City will have to continue to be creative in terms of dealing short-term increase in demand. Having the right type, size and number of fire stations in the right locations will enable policy makers, the Chief and City Council to house fire fighters, apparatus, and equipment in a rational way for maximum use of capital resources at the lowest annual operations cost.

Conversely, the penalties are high and extremely visible for poor fire station location or a lack of one. Adverse effects are felt by the City staff, the council, and possibly by the existing taxpayers. With poor location or no additional locations, response times via great distance or out-of-service due to a previous call can become excessive, and if a tragedy occurs, the incident would be well publicized.

Often, response time is mistakenly referred to for only the first-in unit, and this can be a grave error. Instead, response time must consider *all* the forces necessary to place the incident under control. If the first unit arrives within five minutes but cannot provide the necessary water flow, or perform the needed functions due to a lack of staffing, the five minute response becomes insignificant and irrelevant. Thus an increase in the number and type of response vehicles is also necessary to match and equip the needed additional staff. The following sections identify the manner in which the City plans to meet the demands of additional calls-for-service.

The Use of the Fee. The revenues generated from a properly calculated and legally-supported Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment Impact Fee would be limited to capital costs related to that growth. The fees would be used to construct new stations or expand existing stations (to increase the response capacity of that station) and increase the number of emergency response vehicles. Conversely, the Fire Suppression Facilities DIF receipts would not be used to repair any existing fire stations or replace any existing emergency response vehicles. Additional facilities are planned to come on-line, as needed, as development creates additional demands beyond the capability (volume or calls and distance) of the existing stations. The capital expansions include:

FS-001, Construct an 8,465 square foot, two-bay wide by two vehicle deep fire station in a location to be determined in the future. Only about 25% of the station's capacity is required at the completion of the existing development opportunities within the City's limits. The remaining 75% of the capacity of the station would not be needed until additional development opportunities outside of the existing City's limits become possible. It is recommended that the DIF receipts for this project be placed within a reserve until that time.

FS-002, The proposed station would need a basic fully-equipped response engine at $888,117. Again, the station and the engine will only be needed when additional development opportunities outside of the City's limits are possible.

FS-003, Fire Fighter Assigned Equipment - The additional 10 fire-fighters will be needed for the proposed station #3 and will require personally assigned equipment.

FS-004, Specialty Equipment And Station-Assigned Tools/Equipment - The list would include tools, expanded trench shoring devices, electronic and technological advancements, practice ladders and other similar costly items. Additional practice devices would be included.

FS-005, Traffic Signal Preemptions - This project consists of installing 12 traffic signal pre-emption capability to existing and future signals to allow the fire response vehicles to control the traffic signal technology (and thus safety) while approaching the traffic signal controlled intersection.

The proposed projects and costs of $10,599,886 are identified on Schedule 4.1. The total cost of completing the fire infrastructure system is a net $10,558,206 after subtracting the existing $41,680 in current Fire Suppression Facilities DIF Fund balance from the total capital needs.

The Relationship Between the Need for The Fee and The Type of Development Project. Fire service response standards extended to new development should be consistent with the fire response currently enjoyed by the City's existing citizens and business community by constructing new facilities, or else the result will be in the deterioration of the level of service (LOS) provided both to the existing residents and future citizens and businesses within the City of Lompoc. It follows that it is appropriate to assess future development to contribute additional fire facilities.

To project the impact of future development on fire services, it was first necessary to quantify the current impact on services from each of the City's land-uses. Then, a determination of the

costs of future capital facilities necessary to meet this increased demand was made. The following section illustrates the relative impact from each land use on fire services and facilities.

While the majority of these requests for service were made by Lompoc citizens from their residences, a large percentage of requests were generated from new commercial and industrial uses within the City. A survey of each land use and its existing effect on requests for calls-for-service was conducted to project the impact of future development on fire services. The calls-for-service survey was undertaken in a similar manner and concurrently with the process used to determine law enforcement demand (specifically described in Chapter 3, Law Enforcement et al.). Only requests for fire and medic/rescue services to privately held property were counted. Requests for service to public property, such as City parks and public right-of-way or intersections, were excluded thus distributing these calls pro-rata through the requests for service from privately held property. This is based upon the argument that all public land serves privately held land in some manner.

Table 4-1, following, identifies the number of calls-for-service received by the Fire Department during the past calendar year by the previously identified DIF categories. The number of requests for service received by the Department during the year was then divided by either the developed (1,000) square feet, the existing number of dwelling units to determine the number of requests generated per business square foot, per dwelling unit or commercial lodging unit.

Table 4-1
Fire Suppression Calls-for-Service Generated by Land Use
(Over a 12 Month Period)

DIF Land-use Type	Developed Dwellings or Square Feet	Actual Calls For Service Over 12 Months	Total Calls per Dwelling or 1,000 SF (KSF)
Detached Dwelling Units	7,845	1,534	0.196/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	5,666	872	0.154/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	980	210	0.214/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	593	72	0.121/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses	22,251,548	269	0.024/KSF
Self-storage Facilities Uses	578,259	14	0.024/KSF
Business Park Uses	1,764,180	4	0.002/KSF
Industrial Uses	2,047,320	5	0.002/KSF
Institutional Uses	120,136,302	698	0.006/KSF

Of residential land-uses, a detached dwelling unit is more likely to require an emergency fire service response at 0.196 annual responses *per unit* than an attached dwelling unit at 0.154 annual responses per unit. Retail use development is shown to generate the highest business use demand at 0.024 responses per 1,000 square foot of building space, while industrial

development generates the least demand at 0.006 calls per 1,000 square feet. The lower demand by industrial uses should be expected given the greater density of employees and patrons in an office use establishment when compared to an industrial business of similar square feet. However, it should be noted that while there are fewer calls for industrial properties, significant training is required to be prepared for industrial responses, (i.e., trenching response and hazardous materials training).

Based upon these calls-for-service and the anticipated development, future demands in General City will increase from the 3,678 annual calls-for-service to private development by 442 to 4,120 calls-for-service per year. Continued development will benefit from the existence of the current eight stations and the fact that they have some existing capacity.

Resulting General City Area DIF Schedule. The collection of the resulting DIFs through build-out would allow the City to acquire or construct almost all (97.3%) of the proposed expansions and required equipment. This generally indicates that the City's expansion of the Fire capital has maintained pace with the increases in calls-for-service from new development and that there are very few if any deficiencies in the infrastructure dedicated to fire suppression/medic services. Table 4-2, following, indicates the development impact fee necessary to finance the cost to the additional stations, response equipment and fire-fighter equipment.

Table 4-2
City of Lompoc's General City Area
Minimum Needs-based Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment Development Impact Costs by DIF Land-use Type

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$1,562,904	$1,245/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$972,050	$979/Unit
Mobil Home Dwelling Units	$19,034	$1,360/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$19,219	$769/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses	$203,305	$0.151/S.F.
Self Storage Facilities Uses	$4,981	$0.151/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$25,413	$0.013/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$805	$0.013/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$1,079	$0.038/S.F.

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. The *use of the fee* is similar to the *need for the fee*. The DIF would be collected as the development occurs (generally at building permit or some predetermined point in the process). As the development occurs, the impact is generated. The collected DIF receipts would be put to use to acquire additional fire-fighters assigned and specialty equipment, emergency response

vehicles and an additional fire station necessary to respond to those additional calls-for-service, without reducing the capability of responding to calls from the existing community.
The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. Detail regarding the full acquisition cost of the existing project is outlined in the *Master Facilities Project* detail page. The relationship for each project is identified on the individual detail project pages in the *MFP*.

The current community's commitment has been to establish the existing eight-station and training facility capability paid for via past General Fund receipts. To allow future residents to benefit by use of all of the capital needs without contributing additional assets, would be clearly unfair to the existing residents and would reduce their current level of service. Table 4-3, following, summarizes the distribution of the $24,853,835 in replacement costs to the existing residents and business owners (Schedule 4.3 details this distribution).

The replacement value of the existing fire infrastructure (stations, response fleet and related safety equipment) of $24,853,835 represents the current equity investment or community *financial commitment* towards fire suppression capability by the existing community. When this figure is distributed over the existing community in the same manner as the future costs, by the land use demands, an investment, or financial "commitment" (or equity for that matter) per unit can be determined. As an example, each attached dwelling unit has invested about $1,321 into fire suppression capital while the proposed DIF is lesser amount at $1,245 per attached dwelling.

Table 4-3
Existing Fire Suppression Community
Financial Commitment Comparison Data

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Asset/Equity Investment Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$10,365,901	$1,321/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$5,892,481	$1,040/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$1,419,061	$1,448/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$486,535	$820/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses	$1,818,775	$1.162/S.F.
Self Storage Facilities Uses	$93,479	$1.162/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$28,150	$0.016/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$32,667	$0.016/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$4,716,488	$0.039/S.F.

RECOMMENDED IMPACT FEES

The Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison (Schedule 4.3) is just slightly greater than the Minimum Needs-based Impact Costs (Schedule 4.2), which are necessary and sufficient to maintain the established fire suppressions system in that area. Schedule 4.2 would be a reasonable fee schedule to adopt.

OTHER RELATED NOTES AND ISSUES

1. Newly constructed industrial developments, initially charged the lower industrial use impact fee, often end up being Retail/Service/Office Uses and generate greater demands those of the industrial land-uses. If this trend is left unrecognized, the Department, as well as other City services, will be faced with the greater demand from commercial uses, but will be left only with the collection of the lower industrial impact fee rates. To avoid this under-collection, the City should impose an impact fee representing the difference between the retail/service DIF and the previously paid industrial land-use impact fee when a CUP is approved and tenant improvement plans are submitted indicating a commercial use in an industrial zone.

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED FIRE SUPPRESSION IMPACT FEES

- **General City Area**- Adopt Schedule 4.2.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 4.1

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Other Resources/Future: Percent Need	Construction Needs Supported by Other Other Resources/Future: Apportioned Dollar Cost	Construction Needs Generated by New Development: Percent Need	Construction Needs Generated by New Development: Apportioned Dollar Cost
FS-001	Fire Station #3 Land Acquisition And Construction	$8,777,104	75.96%	$6,667,059	24.04%	$2,110,045
FS-002	Fire Station #3 Response Engine - Fully Equipped	$888,117	75.96%	$674,611	24.04%	$213,506
FS-003	Fire Fighter Assigned Equipment (10)	$91,665	75.96%	$69,628	24.04%	$22,037
FS-004	Specialty Equipment And Station-Assigned Tools/Equipment	$500,000	75.96%	$379,798	24.04%	$120,202
FS-005	Traffic Signal Preemptions (12)	$343,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$343,000
	Sub-Total General Plan Total New Project Costs	$10,599,886	73.50%	$7,791,096	26.50%	$2,808,790
	LESS:					
	Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	$41,680	100.00%	$41,680	0.00%	$0
	Total General Plan Total New Project Costs	$10,558,206	73.40%	$7,749,416	26.60%	$2,808,790
					Forward to Schedule 4.4	

NOTES:
1. Costs distribution based upon the City of Lompoc Fire Department "Calls-for-Service" statistics.

Schedule 4.2

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs
Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Call Generation Rate	Anticipated New Calls for Service	Percentage of Additional Service Calls	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	341.38	1,255	0.196	246	55.64%	$1,562,904	$4,578	3.68	***$1,245*** ***per Unit***
Attached Dwelling Units	55.32	993	0.154	153	34.61%	$972,050	$17,571	17.95	***$979*** ***per Unit***
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	1.00	14	0.214	3	0.68%	$19,034	$19,034	14.00	***$1,360*** ***per Unit***
Commercial Lodging Units	1.00	25	0.121	3	0.68%	$19,219	$19,219	25.00	***$769*** ***per Unit***
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF	34.24	1,342,345	0.024	32	7.24%	$203,305	$5,938	39,204	***$0.151*** ***per S.F.***
Self Storage Facilities Uses (S	1.00	32,670	0.024	1	0.18%	$4,981	$4,981	32,670	***$0.151*** ***per S.F.***
Business Park Uses (SF)	60.02	1,928,140	0.002	4	0.90%	$25,413	$423	32,125	***$0.013*** ***per S.F.***
Industrial Uses (SF)	3.00	63,340	0.002	0	0.03%	$805	$268	21,113	***$0.013*** ***per S.F.***
Institutional Use (SF)	1.00	28,314	0.006	0	0.04%	$1,079	$1,079	28,314	***$0.038*** ***per S.F.***
TOTAL	497.96	--	--	442	100.00%	$2,808,790	in Total Equity in General City Area Capital Needs		

Schedule 4.3

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison
Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Proposed Land Use	Developed Acres	Developed Units	Call Generation Rate	Existing Calls for Service	Percentage of Existing Service Calls	Allocation of Infrastructure "Equity"	Distribution of "Equity" per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Current Financial Commitment per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	1,270.00	7,845	0.196	1,534	41.71%	$10,365,901	$8,162	6.18	*$1,321 per Unit*
Attached Dwelling Units	247.00	5,666	0.154	872	23.71%	$5,892,481	$23,856	22.94	*$1,040 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	69.00	980	0.214	210	5.71%	$1,419,061	$20,566	14.20	*$1,448 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	23.70	593	0.121	72	1.96%	$486,535	$20,529	25.02	*$820 per Unit*
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF	287.00	11,251,548	0.024	269	7.32%	$1,818,875	$6,338	39,204	*$0.162 per S.F.*
Self Storage Facilities Uses (S	17.70	578,259	0.024	14	0.38%	$93,479	$5,281	32,670	*$0.162 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses (SF)	54.00	1,764,180	0.002	4	0.11%	$28,150	$521	32,670	*$0.016 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses (SF)	94.00	2,047,320	0.002	5	0.13%	$32,667	$348	21,780	*$0.016 per S.F.*
Institutional Use (SF)	4,243.00	120,136,302	0.006	698	18.98%	$4,716,688	$1,112	28,314	*$0.039 per S.F.*
TOTAL	6,305.40	--	--	3,678	100.00%	$24,853,835	Total Existing Fire Suppression System Assets		
				1,839.00		$15,050,839	in Fire Suppression Facilities Assets		
						$6,582,312	in Fire Suppression Vehicles Assets		
						$201,663	in Fire Fighter Assigned Equipment Assets		
						$2,694,828	in Specialty Response Equipment Assets		
						$282,513	in Station-assigned Tools/Equipment		
						$41,680	in Fire Suppression et. al. DIF Fund Balance		

Land Use	Units or Acres	Calls for Service	Annual Calls Per Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	11,251,548	269	0.024
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	578,259	14	0.024
Average Calls-for-Service	11,829,807	283	0.024

Land Use	Units or Acres	Calls for Service	Annual Calls Per Unit
Business Park Uses (SF)	1,764,180	4	0.002
Industrial Uses (SF)	2,047,320	5	0.002
Average Calls-for-Service	3,811,500	9	0.002

Chapter 5
Circulation (Streets, Signals and Bridges) System

The following Chapter will discuss the Circulation System capital improvements consisting of major street segments, traffic signals and bridges required for the City through build-out of the existing City General Plan as identified in the Land-use Database Table in Chapter 2. Initially, RCS recommends continuation of the calculation of a comprehensive DIF schedule covering all components of the circulation system within the General Plan area, those three components consisting of major street segments, signals, bridge improvements and roadbed protecting drainage improvements. The reasons are practical in that combining this infrastructure will provide greater flexibility in establishing priorities in what is essentially a singular transportation issue with a common nexus, a combination of trip-end [5] generation and average trip distance. It is not uncommon that a single transportation capital project involves both a street improvement and signal improvement.

The Existing System. The City currently has and maintains an extensive system of roadways available for transportation of goods and services, as well as for educational, recreational, and social purposes. Streets that fall under the jurisdiction of the City of Lompoc are classified as one of four types of roadways for the purposes of this Report. The types of roadways are defined in The Lompoc General Plan Circulation Element.

Expressways provide for the highest proportion of regional travel by connecting urbanized areas with major activity and employment centers in the County. Expressways are described in the City's Circulation Element as high speed/high capacity roadways which have limited access and at-grade or grade-separated intersections. Expressways are divided roadways with a minimum right-of-way width of 110 feet and at least four auto-lanes.

Major Arterials provide for the highest proportion of travel within the various parts of Lompoc by linking Expressways to Minor Arterials, Collector Streets, and Local Streets. Major Arterials are described as medium speed/high capacity roadways with controlled access. Major Arterials are intended to be divided and undivided roadways with a right-of-way width of at least 100 feet and two or four auto-lanes.

Minor Arterial provide for travel between and within the communities of the Lompoc Valley by linking Major Arterials to Collector Streets and Local Streets. Arterials are medium and high speed, medium capacity roadways with controlled roadway access. Minor Arterials are undivided roadways with right-of-way width of at least 80 feet and two auto-lanes.

5. A *trip* is defined as a series of one or more trip-ends. A trip-end is a single stop in a trip. As an example, a drive from home to work is a trip. Each individual stop along the way along the way to drop children off at a school, buy gas, get a lunch, drop off laundry and the ultimate arrival at work or home is a trip-end. The term *trip* has no effect on the calculation and only means *a drive*.

Collector Street provide for relatively-short distance travel between and within neighborhoods by linking Major and Minor Arterials to Local Streets. Collector streets are low-speed/low volume, undivided, two-lane roadways. Driveway access from individual parcels may be discouraged. Collector Streets have a right-of-way width of at least 64 feet

Local Streets provide for short distance travel, to discourage through traffic, and to provide direct roadway access to abutting land-uses and driveways. Local streets are low speed/low volume, undivided, two-lane roadways. Driveway access from individual parcels is common. Local Streets have a right-of-way width of at least 60 feet. However, the right-of-way width may be reduced to 56 feet for cul-de-sacs less than 350 feet long.

In general, construction of local streets is the responsibility of the developer who then dedicates the completed street to the City. The City will accept these local street improvements and the responsibility to maintain them if they meet City's requirements. For these reasons and the fact that local streets do not exhibit City-wide benefits to all circulation system users, the cost of all "local" streets are not included in the Circulation System financial commitment calculation or the proportionality test.

GENERAL CITY DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Undeveloped Parcels. Undeveloped parcels create few trip-ends beyond an occasional visit to the site for weed abatement purposes, planning purposes or to consider a sale or development of the vacant parcel. None of these trip-ends are not on a routine basis. However, a developed parcel will generate a statistically predictable amount of trip-ends and trip-miles, depending upon the specific land use of the development. Thus it can be stated that a vacant parcel, when developed into a specific use, i.e., residential or business, will generate more traffic than it did when it was vacant. Similarly, a change in the use of the property may increase or decrease the number of trip-ends, i.e., the demolition of a low trip-generating insurance office into reconstruction as a new a high trip generating fast-food restaurant.

All new development contributes to cumulative traffic impacts, which are difficult to measure and mitigate on a project-by-project basis but which have significant and widespread cumulative impacts on the City's existing road system. Factors that will increase the competition for existing major street segment lane miles existing in General City area include the following:

- The construction of just under 3.4 million square feet of private business uses on the net 99 under or undeveloped acres will generate 177,896 additional daily trip-miles or about 72.6% of the total new trip-miles expected at General Plan build-out. This figure could vary significantly depending upon the type of commercial uses constructed and possible zoning changes or conditional use permits issued.

- An increase in the City's General Plan full-time population through the construction of about 2,262 additional dwelling units contributing approximately 66,993 new daily trip-miles or just 27.2% of the newly expected daily trip-miles.

- The addition of about 25 commercial lodging units will generate about 456 daily trip-miles, or about 0.2 percent of the total new trip-miles.

When all (or most) of the available vacant land within the City's limits is developed, the City can expect an additional 244,945 daily trip-miles. For perspective, the City currently experiences an estimated 6,893,597 daily trip-miles from/to the existing residences and businesses. The roughly 244,945 newly anticipated trip-miles represent about a 50% increase over the current 7,138,542 daily trip-miles.

The Purpose of the Fee. In the City, most of the planned arterials and collectors exist in some form, perhaps not yet fully widened to allow for the full number of lanes. Stated another way, there are few if any opportunities to construct any completely new arterial/collector lane miles. Thus the collection of Circulation System DIF receipts becomes imperative as a revenue source to finish off any existing, but, limited or incomplete, or not yet maximized roads. The same can be said for bridges, a number of them are included on the list to be completed to their maximum planned width, again maximizing the carrying capacity. Additionally, the fees would be used to complete the system of signals that insures the smooth movement of vehicles through intersections. Efficient signalization (i.e. turn pockets and fully actuated left-turn signals) are also important to keep vehicular traffic moving at the optimum efficiency through major intersections.

Included are transportation projects needed to alter existing arterials, connectors or collectors that currently exist, but due to additional trip-ends are becoming ineffective at moving vehicles.

Again, given the magnitude of growth projected in this Report, numerous intersection improvements and construction of new traffic signals will also be needed to avoid congestion and gridlock in the future. Traffic planners have long known that the critical constraint in a typical roadway network is the intersections. While the street capacity may be theoretically adequate to carry traffic volumes at build-out, motorists may experience congestion and even gridlock at the intersections of the street. While the City of Lompoc will certainly undertake any remaining major street widening projects, an equally important component of traffic circulation is the installation of traffic signals and lane reconfiguration at critical intersections in the City. However, as previously stated, there are extremely limited opportunities to expand major road lane miles.

The importance of traffic signals is two-fold. First, the City can build only so many major collector/arterial streets and there are limits as to how many extra lanes they will have. Second, north-south collectors will, by definition, intersect with east-west collectors assuring that *someone* will have to stop, either at a stop sign or a traffic signal. The traffic carrying capacity of each collector can only be maximized by assuring orderly flow of traffic by signalizing those intersecting collectors.

The collection of Circulation System DIFs is not intended to eliminate the time-honored practice of the developer constructing the full width roadway and being reimbursed for the portion greater than would otherwise be required of the developer. This impact fee calculation and resulting fee collection would simply improve the reimbursement capability.

The City's total MFP Circulation (streets, signals and bridges) System infrastructure section identifies thirty-eight circulation-related projects covering both the General City area. They have an estimated cost of $308,778,588. They consist of:

Twenty traffic signal or intersection improvement projects costing $14.9 million;

Three bridge projects amounting to $152.1 million;

Six Projects represent rehabilitation or rebuilding of the City's aging infrastructure costing some $137.6 million;

Three projects at $2.6 million that represent the City's extremely limited opportunities to widen a major roadway and create additional lane capacity an arterial or collector; and,

Two Master Plan Update projects cost that will cost some $275,000 to complete.

Roughly 6.2% of this amount or $19,239,342 has been identified as the responsibility of development as these projects will increase the capacity of the circulation system. The remainder, 93.8% or $289,539,247 are projects that are not development-generated and will require non-DIF revenue sources. The individual projects and costs are identified on Schedule 5.1 at the end of the Chapter and detailed in the MFP.

The Use of the Fee. The collection of Circulation System DIF schedule receipts would be used to construct the projects (or portions of projects) identified in Schedule 5.1 at the conclusion of this Chapter's text. The collected fees will be used to create additional lane miles, bridge lanes and signals with which to accommodate the additional 244,945 daily trip-miles expected from further development of General City.

The Relationship Between the Need for the Fee and The Type of Development Project. Schedule 5.1 identifies the additional traffic to be generated by new development, by type of development. The technical volume, *Trip Generation (Manual)* 7th Edition, produced by the Institute of Traffic Engineers, has been used to identify the *nexus*, or relationship between the type of development and the projected number of trips that development will generate.

A 158-unit detached dwelling specific plan would generate about 5,465 daily trip-miles and a two-acre retail/service development would generate a similar 5,480 daily trip-miles. Each would pay its proportionate share of the total 244,945 newly created daily trip-miles expected in the Ciy's limits at General Plan build-out. In the case of the detached dwelling residential development, the daily trip-miles generated by the 158 new residences represents about 2.3% of the total 244,945 new trip-miles anticipated at build-out, thus they would be required to pay or construct projects on the list to an amount equal to 2.3% of the total development-related project costs. The two acre retail/service/office development, also representing 2.3% of the total new daily trip-miles, would also finance 2.3% of the development-related project list.

Circulation System Cost Distribution by Average Land-use Trip Frequency/Distance

New Trip Adjustment for *Pass-by* or *Diverted* Trips. Schedule 5.2 contains a sub-schedule that identifies adjustments to new total ***trip-ends***. As an example, an acre of general retail/service

use would be expected, on average, to generate about 3,991 trip-ends daily. However, approximately 15% of those trip-ends, or about 599 trip-ends per day, are ***pass-by trip-ends.*** The ***trip-end*** is not truly an ***end*** but is actually one in a series of stops, i.e. at various commercial establishments, with a different location such as a residence as the final ***trip-end*** or destination of the series of ***trip-ends***. In order to be considered a pass-by trip, the location of the stop must be contiguous to the ***generator*** route [8], i.e. the route that would have been used even if the temporary stop had not been made. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) indicates that:

> Thus when forecasted trips based upon the trip generation rates are distributed to the adjacent streets, some reduction is made to account for those trips already there that will be attracted to the proposed development. [7]

Pass-by trip-ends are fully adjusted (reduced at 100%) from the average trip-ends (per day) generated by the nine land-uses identified in Schedules 5.2 and 5.3.

A *diverted* trip is similar to a *pass-by* trip-end in that it is an extra stop between, as an example, a motorists' work site and his or her residence. The *diverted* trip differs slightly from the *pass-by* trip in that it requires a minor deviation from the normal ***generator*** route and the temporary stop. In short, a *diverted* trip creates a separate side trip using additional (and different) lane miles from that of the normal route from the motorist's place of employment and his or her residence[6]. These trips increase the traffic volume from the generator route, but only for brief distances. The ITE states that diverted trips:

> are produced from traffic volume on roadways within the vicinity of the generator (route) and require a diversion from that roadway to another roadway with access to the site. These roadways could include streets or freeways adjacent to the generator but without access to the generator [8].

These *diverted* trips will be adjusted (reduced at 50%) from the full trip count for each of the land-uses identified in Chapter 2.

Again, the sub-schedule at the bottom of Schedule 5.2 indicates the total trip-ends and the reduction due to the number pass-by trips (at 100%) and diverted trips (at 50%). The trip pass-by and diversion percentages were generated and are supported by a study conducted by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) in conjunction with various U.S. and California government agencies [9].

---

6. An example of a diverted trip-end would be a single trip-end where along the way from work, a motorists evening drive deviates from the normal route taken home at perhaps a preferred grocery store, mail drop, or to pick up a child from a piano lesson before continuing home. Each of these three stops would be considered *diverted* trip-ends.
7. Trip generation, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 1099 14th Street, Suite 300 West, Washington D.C. 20005-3438. Definition of terms, page 147.
8. Institute of Transportation Engineers, 1099 14th Street NW, Suite 300 west, Washington D.C. 2005-3438, Definition of Terms, page 146.
9 *Traffic Generators*, San Diego Association of Governments, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101. Brief Guide to Traffic Generators Rates. Compiled in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. U.S. Department of Transportation, The California Department of Transportation and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, July 1995.

Additionally, the same SANDAG data schedule referenced above provides information for a trip distance factor component to the nexus. Based upon that data, a trip to an industrial work-site has the greatest distance at 9.0 miles. A trip to an office averages 8.8 miles, residential trips average 7.9 miles, a trip from a hotel or motel (once in residence) averages 7.6 miles, and an average trip to a retail/service site is the shortest at 4.3 miles. This indicates that drivers generally appear willing travel further distances to work and for treatment at medical offices than they are to shop. Both frequency (trip-ends) and distance (average miles per trip) have been combined into the nexus by multiplying average trip frequency by average trip distance. Trip-mile rates have been calculated for the nine DIF land-use categories. They are demonstrated at the bottom of schedule 5.2 at the end of the Chapter.

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. There is very little difference between this and the above category. The fee collected will be based on the projected number of trip-ends the proposed development will generate in relationship to the total 244,945 additional projected trip-miles at build-out. Any amount imposed as a Circulation System DIF will be placed in a separate fund (collecting interest), and is to be used only on the projects identified on Schedule 5.1 as development-related.

From time to time the City may require an applicant for a private project to construct a street or signal improvement (or portion thereof) that is on the list of required improvements at the end of this Chapter. This method is often undertaken to expedite the project at the request of the applicant/developer. The developer should receive a credit for any monies expended on this required improvement against their Circulation System DIF.

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. The calculation of the Circulation System DIFs is based upon the recognition that differing types of developments generate differing amounts of trip-miles. The fee is based upon the projected number of trips generated by the proposed private development project. Circulation DIF receipts will be accumulated until they reach the amount that could construct a meaningful project to alleviate or mitigate the demands of those new developments. Table 5-1 (summarized from Schedule 5.2) on the following page identifies the Minimum Needs-based Circulation System DIF schedule for General City.

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

Table 5-1
City of Lompoc's General City Area
Minimum Needs-based Circulation System
Development Impact Costs
by DIF Land-use Type

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$3,259,968	$2,598/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$1,722,283	$1,734/Unit
Mobil Home Dwelling Units	$18,925	$1,352/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$34,246	$1,370/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses	$7,045,490	$5.249/S.F.
Self-storage Facilities Uses	$98,006	$3.000/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$6,017,663	$3.121/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$101,912	$1.609/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$97,030	$3.427/S.F.

This set of proposed fees would generate the Minimum needs amount of revenue necessary to construct the needed street, signal and bridge construction projects. These figures then need to be compared to the financial commitment demonstrated by the existing community.

Alternative Cost Methodology. A more precise calculation of costs for specific types of land-uses (i.e., banks, hospitals, convalescent residences, etc.) can be determined by multiplying the average cost per trip of $75.10 by the applicable daily trip-mile rate. An example of this calculation can be found at the bottom of Schedule 5.2 and applied to Table 5-2, on the following page. These tables list trip rates and costs for various residential, resort, industrial and commercial developments. A fee system based on a lengthy schedule of trip rates theoretically provides more accuracy and therefore financial commitment in determining specific uses' impact on the City's circulation system, but at the same time may increase the City's costs to administer the fee. A more extensive listing of traffic generators by land use is available in *Trip Generation* as published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, New York, NY.

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

Table 5-2
Detail of Circulation System Minimum Needs-based Development (rounded) Impact Fees for Specific General City Area Commercial/Service/Office Uses

Land Use Category	Adjusted Trip-ends	Average Distance	Trip-end to Trip	Additional Trip-miles	Cost per Trip-mile	Cost per 1,000 Square Feet or Dwelling Unit
RESORT/TOURIST (per Unit or Entry Door):						
Hotel (multi-story)	6.29	7.6	0.5	23.9	$75.10	$1,794.89 /Room
All Suites Hotel	3.77	7.6	0.5	14.3	$75.10	$1,073.93 /Room
Motel	4.34	7.6	0.5	16.5	$75.10	$1,239.15 /Room
INDUSTRIAL (per 1,000 SF):						
General Light Industrial	6.17	9.0	0.5	27.8	$75.10	$2,087.78 /KSF
Heavy Industrial	5.97	9.0	0.5	26.9	$75.10	$2,020.19 /KSF
Manufacturing	2.73	9.0	0.5	12.3	$75.10	$923.73 /KSF
Warehousing	4.39	9.0	0.5	19.8	$75.10	$1,486.98 /KSF
MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS USES (per 1,000 SF):						
Office Park	9.08	8.8	0.5	40.0	$75.10	$3,004.00 /KSF
Research Park	7.18	8.8	0.5	31.6	$75.10	$2,373.16 /KSF
Business Park (Specific)	11.29	8.8	0.5	49.7	$75.10	$3,732.47 /KSF
RETAIL/SERVICE USES (per 1,000 SF):						
Building Material Store	29.35	4.3	0.5	63.1	$75.10	$4,738.81 /KSF
Garden Center	23.45	4.3	0.5	50.4	$75.10	$3,785.04 /KSF
Movie Theater	2.47	4.3	0.5	5.3	$75.10	$398.03 /KSF
Church	5.92	4.3	0.5	12.7	$75.10	$953.77 /KSF
Medical-Dental Office	22.21	8.8	0.5	97.7	$75.10	$7,337.27 /KSF
General Office Building	7.16	8.8	0.5	31.5	$75.10	$2,365.65 /KSF
Shopping Center	30.20	4.3	0.5	64.9	$75.10	$4,873.99 /KSF
Hospital	11.42	4.3	0.5	24.6	$75.10	$1,847.46 /KSF
Discount Center	62.93	4.3	0.5	135.3	$75.10	$10,161.03 /KSF
High-Turnover Restaurant	8.90	4.3	0.5	19.1	$75.10	$1,434.41 /KSF
Convenience Market	43.57	4.3	0.5	93.7	$75.10	$7,036.87 /KSF
Walk-in Bank	13.97	4.3	0.5	30.0	$75.10	$2,253.00 /KSF
Other: (not available "per KSF")						
Cemetary (per acre)	3.07	4.3	0.5	6.6	$75.10	$495.66 /Acre
Service Station/Market (avg	107.69	4.3	0.5	231.5	$75.10	$17,385.65 /FP/Day
Service Station/Car Wash	99.35	4.3	0.5	213.6	$75.10	$16,041.36 /FP/Day

Table 5-3 following, (and summarized from Schedule 5.3) identifies the assets of the existing system (at current construction and acquisition costs). The $517,399,824 of the existing circulation plan arterial and collector lanes at $226,123,824, $212,329,350 in major roadways right-of-way, curb, gutter and sidewalks at $33,918,570, street lights with a replacement value of $2,500,000, signalized intersections valued at $2,550,000 and a maintenance vehicle and equipment inventory of approximately $750,000. There are numerous existing bridges over creeks/washes and with an estimated replacement value of $38,210,000. There is also an existing fund balance of $4,267,497. When distributed over the existing community, using the same nexus factor (e.g. trip-miles) used for distribution of future costs, the existing community has contributed the following, on average, by land use:

Table 5-3
Existing Circulation System Community
Financial Commitment Comparison Data

DIF Land-use Category	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$20,526,679	$2,617/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$9,899,021	$1,747/Unit
Mobil Home Dwelling Units	$1,336,996	$1,364/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$818,205	$1,380/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses	$59,485,280	$5.287/S.F.
Self Storage Facilities Uses	$1,747,309	$3.022/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$5,546,280	$3.144/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$3,317,224	$1.620/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$414,722,423	$3.452/S.F.

It should be noted that the existing community has contributed, on average, slightly more than would be required of future development to meet the minimum needs for build-out and all users. While there is clearly excess capacity in the existing system, it is usually the result of the existing community absorbing the initial street construction costs including the costly right-of-way acquisition, the later part of the community often finances only the smaller segment length widening's which maximize the street segments capacity.

Recommended Circulation System DIF Schedule. The adoption of Schedule 5.2 at the end of the chapter (and as summarized in table 5-1), as the Circulation System DIF Schedule would generate enough capital to construct the facilities needed by the new development. In addition, the City should adopt the application of the *per trip-mile fee* from the bottom of Schedule 5.2 and multiplied by the specific use Table 5-2 or the more extensive listing of traffic generation by land use available in *Trip Generation* as published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, New York, N.Y.

The Use of The Fee. This fee will be primarily used to construct additional or "extra" lane miles. "Extra" lane miles are defined as the outside two lanes of a four-lane road, the outside four lanes on a six lane arterial, or the outside six lanes on an eight lane arterial. This calculation is intended to create greater equity among privately owned parcels with differing contiguous lane configurations. Consider that some private parcels will be contiguous to six lane streets and could be exacted to build one half of the six lanes, while other private parcels may be contiguous to a planned two lane avenue and would only be exacted to construct one half of the two lanes, or two lanes with a reimbursement for one of the lanes when the parcel on the opposite side is developed. The inequity is obvious; those contiguous to the larger capacity-carrying road types quite often pay a greater amount.

Construction Responsibility vs. DIF Payment. This DIF assumes that each developer, contiguous to a planned Major Street would:

- Dedicate the needed right-of-way and would be responsible for last lane of asphalt concrete or PCC;
- Construct the parkway landscaping; and,
- Construct the curb, gutter, sidewalk, striping and street lights.

However, construction of the extra lanes would be financed by the Circulation System DIF, contributed to by all development within the City limits, thereby leveling the playing field between privately held parcels contiguous to a four lane collector as opposed to those privately held parcels contiguous to a two lane minor arterial. A given developer may undertake the actual construction of the *extra* lanes at the same time that they construct the *first* lane, but they would receive a reimbursement for construction of those *extra* lanes. However, it is important to note that if the developer constructs all or a portion of a road, signal or other circulation system improvement, and that project is not listed on Schedule 5.1, that project is assumed to be a condition of approval and not subject to a reimbursement or credit from the City from this DIF Fund. In short, the City cannot give a credit for a project that is not partially financed through this calculation.

The DIF Adoption Ordinance should contain the necessary language for identifying the process for calculating the reimbursement amount for the construction of *extra* lanes.

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED CIRCULATION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

- **General City Area** - Adopt Schedule 5.2 for most land-uses and the $75.10 per trip-end rate on Schedule 5.2 to be used in conjunction with the most current edition of ITE manual (and the trip frequency/length figures (via SANDAG) at the bottom of Schedule 5.2) as well as Table 5-2 for unusual land-uses.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 5.1

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Circulation (Streets, Signals, Bridges and Drainage) System

Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources		Construction Needs Generated by New Development	
			Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost
ST-001	Class II Bikeways, In-fill	$506,000	90.00%	$455,400	10.00%	$50,600
ST-002	Bridge Evaluations	$110,000	90.00%	$99,000	10.00%	$11,000
ST-003	Bridge Rehabilitation/Improvement	$200,000	100.00%	$200,000	0.00%	$0
ST-004	Sidewalk and Pedestrian Ramp In-fill	$2,530,000	90.00%	$2,277,000	10.00%	$253,000
ST-005	Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk Repairs	$4,174,500	100.00%	$4,174,500	0.00%	$0
ST-006	Sidewalk/Pedestrian Ramp Construction	$2,846,250	90.00%	$2,561,625	10.00%	$284,625
ST-007	Street Maintenance Paving (25 Years)	$126,500,000	100.00%	$126,500,000	0.00%	$0
ST-008	Airport Avenue (D Street/D/E Alley)	$632,500	50.00%	$316,250	50.00%	$316,250
ST-009	O Street (Laurel/Oak) Widening	$1,505,350	50.00%	$752,675	50.00%	$752,675
ST-010	V Street, W/S Frontage Improvements	$442,750	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$442,750
ST-011	Paving of Unimproved Alleys	$1,012,000	100.00%	$1,012,000	0.00%	$0
ST-012	Central Avenue and H Street Intersection Improvements	$2,102,430	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$2,102,430
ST-013	Traffic Signal Video Detection	$423,775	50.00%	$211,887	50.00%	$211,888
ST-014	Relocate Traffic Signal Pole (L Street at Central)	$158,125	50.00%	$79,062	50.00%	$79,063
ST-015	Signalize Intersection - V/Ocean	$474,375	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$474,375
ST-016	Signalize Intersection - V/Laurel	$537,625	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$537,625
ST-017	Signalize Intersection And Restripe - V/North	$506,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$506,000
ST-018	Signalize Intersection - V/College	$474,375	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$474,375
ST-019	Signalize Intersection - D/North	$474,375	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$474,375
ST-020	Signalize Intersection - O/North	$474,375	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$474,375
ST-021	Signalize Intersection - O/Pine	$474,375	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$474,375
ST-022	Signalize Intersection - O/College	$474,375	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$474,375
ST-023	Signalize Intersection - O/Laurel	$474,375	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$474,375
ST-024	Signalize Intersection - A/Barton	$474,375	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$474,375
ST-025	Signalize Intersection - A/Laurel	$474,375	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$474,375
ST-026	Signalize Intersection - A/Pine	$474,375	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$474,375
ST-027	Signalize Intersection - A/College	$474,375	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$474,375
ST-028	Signalize Intersection - A/Central	$474,375	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$474,375
ST-029	Signalize/Improve Intersection - A/North Avenue	$474,375	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$474,375
ST-030	Intersection Improvement 12th Street/Ocean Avenue	$1,518,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,518,000
ST-031	Central Avenue Extension Bridge And Extension Road	$151,800,000	96.54%	$146,551,580	3.46%	$5,248,420
ST-032	Traffic Signal System Control and Operations Center	$3,550,000	90.00%	$3,195,000	10.00%	$355,000
ST-033	Full Trash Capture Coanda Screens	$60,720	90.00%	$54,648	10.00%	$6,072
ST-034	Full Trash Capture Connector Pipe Screens	$191,610	90.00%	$172,449	10.00%	$19,161

Schedule 5.1

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Circulation (Streets, Signals, Bridges and Drainage) System

Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Percent Need	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Apportioned Dollar Cost	Construction Needs Generated by New Development: Percent Need	Construction Needs Generated by New Development: Apportioned Dollar Cost
ST-035	Storm Drainage Improvements to Protect Major Roadbeds	$1,012,000	90.00%	$910,800	10.00%	$101,200
ST-036	Automatic Retractable Screens	$17,078	90.00%	$15,370	10.00%	$1,708
ST-037	Circulation Master Plan	$125,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$125,000
ST-038	Storm Drainage Master Plan	$150,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$150,000
	Sub-Total General Plan Total New Projects	$308,778,588	93.77%	$289,539,246	6.23%	$19,239,342
	LESS:					
	Streets Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	$2,552,630	100.00%	$2,552,630	0.00%	$0
	Traffic Signals Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	$1,687,637	50.00%	$843,819	50.00%	$843,819
	Bikeways Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	$27,230	100.00%	$27,230	0.00%	$0
	Development Impact Fee Fund Balance Total	$4,267,497	80.23%	$3,423,679	19.77%	$843,819
	Total Net General Plan Project Costs	$304,511,091	93.96%	$286,115,567	6.04%	$18,395,523
						Forward to Schedule 5.4

NOTES:
1. Costs distribution based upon a frequency and distance factor.

Schedule 5.2

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs
Circulation (Streets, Signals, Bridges and Drainage) System

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Trip-end and Length Factor	Total GC Additional Trip-miles	Percentage of Additional Trip-miles	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	341.38	1,255	34.588	43,408	17.72%	$3,259,968	$9,549	3.68	*$2,598 per Unit*
Attached Dwelling Units	55.32	993	23.095	22,933	9.36%	$1,722,283	$31,133	17.95	*$1,734 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	1.00	14	18.035	252	0.10%	$18,925	$18,925	14.00	*$1,352 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	1.00	25	18.239	456	0.19%	$34,246	$34,246	25.00	*$1,370 per Unit*
Retail/Service/Office Uses (S	34.24	1,342,345	69.888	93,814	38.30%	$7,045,490	$205,768	39,204	*$5.249 per S.F.*
Self Storage Facilities Uses (	1.00	32,670	39.944	1,305	0.53%	$98,006	$98,006	32,670	*$3.000 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses (SF)	60.02	1,928,140	41.557	80,128	32.71%	$6,017,663	$100,261	32,125	*$3.121 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses (SF)	3.00	63,340	21.419	1,357	0.55%	$101,912	$33,971	21,113	*$1.609 per S.F.*
Institutional Use (SF)	1.00	28,314	45.634	1,292	0.53%	$97,030	$97,030	28,314	*$3.427 per S.F.*
TOTAL	**497.96**	--	--	**244,945**	**100.00%**	**$18,395,523**	**in Total Circulation General Plan Projects**		
ALTERNATIVE FEE METHODOLOGY				*244,945*		*$18,395,523*	*$75.10 per Daily Trip-mile*		

Trip-ends Adjustment Calculation Land Use Title	Daily Total Trip-ends	Percent of Diverted Trips	Diverted Trip-end % Adjustment	Diverted Trip-end Percent	Percent of Pass-by Trips	Combined Diverted and Pass-by	Remaining Trip % as Adjustment %	Adjusted Trip Rate, Adjustment % X Total trips	*Average Trip Length*	*Trip-ends X Length X 50%*
Detached Dwelling Units	9.57	11	0.50	5.5	3.0	**8.5**	**91.5%**	8.76	***7.9***	***34.588***
Attached Dwelling Units	6.39	11	0.50	5.5	3.0	**8.5**	**91.5%**	5.85	***7.9***	***23.095***
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	4.99	11	0.50	5.5	3.0	**8.5**	**91.5%**	4.57	***7.9***	***18.035***
Commercial Lodging Units	6.23	38	0.50	19.0	4.0	**23.0**	**77.0%**	4.80	***7.6***	***18.239***
Retail/Service/Office Uses (S	50.01	40	0.50	20.0	15.0	**35.0**	**65.0%**	32.51	***4.3***	***69.888***
Self Storage Facilities Uses (	10.50	19	0.50	9.5	4.0	**13.5**	**86.5%**	9.08	***8.8***	***39.944***
Business Park Uses (SF)	10.44	19	0.50	9.5	2.0	**11.5**	**88.5%**	9.23	***9.0***	***41.557***
Industrial Uses (SF)	5.38	19	0.50	9.5	2.0	**11.5**	**88.5%**	4.76	***9.0***	***21.419***
Institutional Use (SF)	11.99	19	0.50	9.5	4.0	**13.5**	**86.5%**	10.37	***8.8***	***45.634***

Schedule 5.3

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison
Circulation (Streets, Signals, Bridges and Drainage) System

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Trip-end and Length Factor	Existing GC Trip-miles	Percentage of Additional Trip-miles	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	1,270.00	7,845	34.588	271,346	3.97%	$20,526,679	$16,163	6.18	*$2,617 per Unit*
Attached Dwelling Units	247.00	5,666	23.095	130,857	1.91%	$9,899,021	$40,077	22.94	*$1,747 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	69.00	980	18.035	17,674	0.26%	$1,336,996	$19,377	14.20	*$1,364 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	23.70	593	18.239	10,816	0.16%	$818,205	$34,523	25.02	*$1,380 per Unit*
Retail/Service/Office Uses (S	287.00	11,251,548	69.888	786,347	11.50%	$59,485,280	$207,266	39,204	*$5.287 per S.F.*
Self Storage Facilities Uses (	17.70	578,259	39.944	23,098	0.34%	$1,747,309	$98,718	32,670	*$3.022 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses (SF)	54.00	1,764,180	41.557	73,315	1.07%	$5,546,105	$102,706	32,670	*$3.144 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses (SF)	94.00	2,047,320	21.419	43,851	0.64%	$3,317,224	$35,290	21,780	*$1.620 per S.F.*
Institutional Use (SF)	4,243.00	120,136,302	45.634	5,482,293	80.16%	$414,722,423	$97,743	28,314	*$3.452 per S.F.*
TOTAL	**6,305.40**	--	--	**6,839,597**	**100.00%**	**$517,399,241**	**Total Circulation System Capital Assets**		

$226,123,824	**in General Plan Major Streets/Bike Paths Assets**
$212,329,350	**in General Plan Streets Rights of Way Assets**
$33,918,570	**in Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk Assets**
$38,210,000	**in General Plan Bridges Assets**
$2,550,000	**in General Plan Traffic Signalized Intersections**
$0	**in Street Maintenance Vehicle Assets**
$0	**in Street Light Assets**
$4,267,497	**in Circulation System Related DIF Fund Balance**

Chapter 6
Electric System Facilities

Due to the difficulties in determining average electrical demand for private development proposals, this infrastructure has not been included in this step. Instead, any development applicant will need to contact the electric utility management staff to determine the required additions necessary to the City's system in order to accommodate the electrical needs of the proposed development.

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED ELECTRICAL SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS DIFS

- **General City** – Contact the City's electrical system management staff.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Chapter 7
Water Source, Storage and Distribution Facilities

Assuming that an adequate water supply is available, the next critical components needed to accommodate development are treatment facilities, water storage and distribution system. The City's water source, as presently constituted, can be fully expected to completely support the City's existing and future population. However, in order to meet all future water demands, the City will need to collect sufficient monies to increase well capacity as well as new storage reservoirs capacity.

Existing System. In addition to the City's distribution system with a replacement value of $102,536,384 the City has well capacities with a replacement value of $35,000,000 and reservoirs at $24,000,000. The system also has altitude valves assets ($1,265,000), booster stations ($1,897,500), treatment facilities ($84,550,000) and a share of the utility maintenance vehicles ($x,xxx,xxx). However, there is a negative DIF fund balance of $5,705,253. The total net investment total $243,923,042.

The Purpose of the Fee. As additional businesses and residential structures are constructed, each one will generate a greater demand on the existing water system infrastructure. The existing system of distribution pipe, reservoirs, pumping stations and the source of water itself, will prove inadequate to meet all of the anticipated water demands. The impact fee is based upon the additional capital additions necessary to accommodate the water demands of individual units of development outlined on Table 7-1.

Impact fees are necessary for the construction of the remainder of the water system for one significant reason. Initially, the storage and delivery of water has, for many years, been recognized by most public agencies as a utility. Utilities differ from general tax-supported services in that they are similar to private sector utility businesses. Water rates are elastic, within reason, and can be set to meet water delivery costs whereas taxes cannot. Therefore, general taxes must be protected and reserved for services that do not have any such elastic revenue source. These services include public safety, park maintenance, storm drainage, and others.

The use of water (consumer benefit) can be measured, unlike many of the City's services, water rates can, and should be, set to meet the Council's priorities and policies in terms of water use. As a result of the above, the use of general taxes, where no relationship between the rate of taxation and benefit exists, in support of any utility service would be inappropriate.

The Use of the Fee. The revenues collected from the potentially adopted impact fees outlined and supported in this Chapter will be used to construct or acquire the list of projects identified on Schedule 7.1. A stronger statement would be that they are limited to the projects identified on that Schedule.

The Relationship Between the Need for the Fee and the Type of Development Project. Daily water demands will vary by category/type of development, however, use within a category/type tends to meet averages, thus making projection fairly accurate. The nine land-uses identified for separate impact fees are used along with averages for each of those types of land-uses.

The service to be provided to the new users will mirror that the existing level of service. Water use, for residential users was calculated (and planned for) on either a gallon per dwelling unit per day (GPD) basis for residential uses or gallons acre per day (GPAD) basis for business uses in the City's most recent Water Master Plan. Table 7-1 following, indicates the DIF Land-use Type averages that were used as the nexus in the DIF distribution model. Since the City does not have a regional recycled water program in the area for the watering of common areas, the capital-needs costs will be distributed over new development based upon potable water demands at the meter and will not include any distributed recycled water demands. The following water demands are from the Master Plan of a similar sized public agency.

Table 7-1
General City Water Demand by DIF Land Use Type
Demand in GPD or GPAD

DIF Land-use Type	Gallons (per Unit) per Day	Gallons per Acre per Day
Detached Dwelling Units	544	
Attached Dwelling Units	372	
Mobile Residences Dwelling Units	372	
Commercial Lodging Units	150	
Retail/Service/Office Uses		2,200
Self Storage Facilities Uses		2,200
Business Park Uses		2,200
Industrial Uses		2,000
Institutional Uses		2,200

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. The *use of the fee* is similar to the *need for the fee*. The impact fee would be collected as the development occurs. As the development occurs, the impact is generated. The collected fee would be put to use to acquire additional water generation, storage and distribution facilities, and additional equipment necessary to respond to those additional water demands, without reducing the capability of providing water to the existing community.

Based upon Table 7-2 and the land-use database, the City currently (on average) delivers about 12.8 million gallons/day to private water users. This does not include the water demands from public institutions, other non-private uses and system loss. Obviously this is an annual average and seasonal factors could be expected to affect use. Table 7-2, on the following page, indicates the demand for water (on average) for existing development within the City water delivery area.

Table 7-2
Existing Community Water Demand
in Gallons per Day (GPD rounded)

DIF Land-use Type	Potential Residential Units	Potential Business Acres	Water Demand in GPD or GPAD	Projected GPD Water Demand
Detached Dwellings	7,845		544/Unit	4,267,680
Attached Dwellings	5,666		372/Unit	2,107,752
Mobile Home Dwellings	980		372/Unit	364,560
Commercial Lodging Units	593		150/Unit	88,950
Retail/Service/Office Uses		287.00	2,200/Acre	631,400
Self Storage Facilities Uses		17.70	3,400/Acre	38,940
Business Park Uses		54.00	2,200/Acre	118,800
Industrial Uses		94.00	2,000/Acre	188,000
Institutional Uses		4,243.00	2,200/Acre	9,334,600
Total Gallons per Day	---	---	---	**17,140,682**

Again using the GPD demand data from Table 7-1 and the land-use database, the City will be asked to deliver an additional net 1.3 million gallons per day (average) to new users. Table 7-3, following, indicates the demand for water (on average) for future development within the City's water delivery boundaries. The 1.3 million gallons daily figure results in a slightly lower actual daily total water demand due to the use of Master Plan land-use demand averages applied to the narrower nine DIF Land-use Types as opposed to the actual broad variety of business uses. This will hold true for Tables 7-2, 7-3 and 7-4. Each of these tables **Total Gallons per Day** will be slightly understated when compared to the Master Plan totals.

[This space required to place the following table on a single page].

Table 7-3
Development-generated Additional Water Demand
in Gallons per Day (rounded)

DIF land-use Type	Potential Residential Units	Potential Business Acres	Water Demand in GPD of GPAD	Projected GPD Water Demand
Detached Dwellings	1,255		544/Unit	682,720
Attached Dwellings	993		372/Unit	369,396
Mobile Home Dwellings	14		372/Unit	5,208
Commercial Lodging Units	25		150/Unit	3,750
Retail/Service/Office Uses		34.2	2,200/Acre	75,328
Self Storage Facilities Uses		1.0	3,400/Acre	2,200
Business Park Uses		60.0	2,200/Acre	132,044
Industrial Uses		3.0	2,000/Acre	6,000
Institutional Uses		1.0	2,200/Acre	2,200
Total Gallons per Day	---	---	---	**1,278,846**

The total average daily need (existing and future) water demand is as follows:

Table 7-4
Total Average Day Water Demand at
General Plan Build-out (rounded)
in Gallons per Day (GPD rounded)

DIF Land-use Type	Potential Residential Units	Potential Business Acres	Water Demand in GPD or GPAD	Projected GPD Water Demand
Detached Dwellings	9,100		544/Unit	4,950,400
Attached Dwellings	6,659		372/Unit	2,477,148
Mobile Home Dwellings	994		372/Unit	369,768
Commercial Lodging Units	618		150/Unit	92,700
Retail/Service/Office Uses		321.24	2,200/Acre	706,728
Self Storage Facilities Uses		18.70	3,400/Acre	41,140
Business Park Uses		114.02	2,200/Acre	250,844
Industrial Uses		97.00	2,000/Acre	194,000
Institutional Uses		4,244	2,200/Acre	9,336,800
Total Gallons per Day	---	---	---	**18,419,528**

The total projected average daily demand from all Lompoc privately held acreage at General Plan build-out is about 18.4 million gallons daily. Although encouraged, widespread conservation efforts are not currently mandated in the City. The City, through past over-sizing of water treatment, wells and water storage infrastructure (via bonds) has the capacity to serve all new development. The expected increase in average daily demand may require the City to add a few amenities to its water system infrastructure. The bonds that created the excess capacity to serve will be retired in 2033-34

PROJECTS NEEDED FOR PROPER WATER DISTRIBUTION

Utility infrastructure such as water is unique among all City infrastructures. Water demand expansion simply cannot be ignored for long period of times as can be police, fire, streets and park levels of service (LOS). Residents could be asked to allow the number of officers to remain static, or wait a little longer for fire fighters, or even put up with the more congested traffic or more crowded parks. However, a delivered water supply must be in evidence to even *consider* additional growth. Even though Table 7-4 applies average daily use rates and creates a total demand difficult to imagine, it is apparent that additional water pumping and storage capability is necessary to allow for additional growth. Without adequate water distribution capabilities, development will grind to a stop. It is a prerequisite system.

Since a water distribution system is a prerequisite to development (i.e. there is no development without water), it tends to be a somewhat "front-ended" system, that is, the system develops earlier and the existing community tends to have built more of the system at any point in time than does the remainder of development. That is precisely the case with Lompoc's water utility, the water system appears to have been front-ended by the existing community.

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. Schedule 7.1 identifies the water distribution system improvements needed to insure the continued adequate flow of water as needed to proposed development projects. There are 16 capital projects necessary for extending service to new development or maintaining service to existing water users with a net total (after fund balance and reimbursement adjustments) of just over $39.6 million. Nine of the projects (or portions thereof) totaling some $29.6 million have been identified for funding by the existing water users as either replacements or benefitting only existing users. This figure is not included in any portion of the impact fee calculation.

There is approximately $10.0 million in projects identified as benefitting new development within the City. This figure was used to calculate the DIF schedule.

CALCULATION OF IMPACT COSTS

This Report identifies two methods of calculating potable water system delivery DIFs and imposing said fees. They are:

- *Standard (Average) DIF Land-use Type DIFs, similar to the other fees in this Report.*

- *An impact fee based upon the meter size needed to serve a development, if needed.*

Standard Use Category DIFs. Table 7-5, following, lists the nine major land-uses based upon average water usage statistics, (see Schedule 7.2). As stated earlier, some $39,571,502 in new or replacement water capital expansion is required in the City to properly accommodate the additional demand by new development. Approximately $9,973,048 of this cost has been identified for DIF funding. The negative fund balance has not been included in this figure. The $10.0 million is distributed pro-rata over the remaining under-built and totally vacant acreage in the City's General City area as demonstrated in Table 7-5 following.

Table 7-5
Minimum Needs-based Water Distribution System
Development Impact Costs
by DIF Land-use Type

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling	$5,324,174	$4,238/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$2,880,725	$2,901/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$40,614	$2,901/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$29,244	$1,170/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses	$587,443	$0.428/S.F.
Self Storage Facilities Uses	$17,157	$0.525/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$1,029,742	$0.534/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$46,791	$0.739/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$17,157	$0.606/S.F.

Cost and Financing of the Existing System. Typically a water system is the oldest service provided by any City. The City's engineering staff has identified the cost of the existing "spine" system, consisting of distribution pipe, wells, valves, reservoirs and shares of water rights to be $243,536,022. This figure does not include local (tract) lines and connections, estimated conservatively to be in the area of an additional $200,000. The system has been constructed from four sources, water user rates (more commonly known as monthly water bills), exactions, DIFs, and requirements of development approval. A portion of that nearly $243.5 million figure is the existing negative fund balance in the Water System DIF Fund of $5,705,253.

When this net $243.5 million in infrastructure contributions is distributed to the existing community based upon the same nexus used to distribute future costs by land use, (see Schedule 7.3) the results indicate that a detached dwelling has contributed, on average, an astounding $7,726 towards the water system. This distributed equity is clearly greater than the distributed - *Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs* exemplified in Table 7-5 (and Schedule 7.2) indicating there are no proportionality issues. Table 7-6 following demonstrates the distribution of existing assets.

Table 7-6
General Plan Build-out Proportional Water Distribution System
Development Impact Costs by DIF Land-use Type

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$60,637,394	$7,726/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$29,948,025	$5,285/Unit
Mobil Home Dwelling Units	$5,179,856	$5,287/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$1,263,847	$2,131/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses	$8,971,256	$0.797/S.F.
Self Storage Facilities Uses	$553,280	$0.957/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$1,687,972	$0.957/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$2,671,201	$1.305/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$132,630,801	$1.104/S.F.

Necessity of DIF Financing. DIFs are necessary for the construction of the remainder of the water system for one significant reason. Initially, the storage and delivery of water has, for many years, been recognized by most public agencies as a utility. Utilities differ from general tax-supported services in that they are similar to private sector utility businesses. Potable water rates are elastic, within reason, and can be set to meet water delivery costs whereas taxes cannot. Therefore, general taxes must be protected and reserved for services that do not have any such an elastic revenue source such as public safety, park maintenance, storm drainage, and others.

The use of water (consumer benefit) can be measured, unlike many of the City's other municipal services. Water rates can, and should be, set to meet the Council's priorities and policies in terms of water use. As a result of the above, the use of general taxes, where no relationship between the rate of taxation and benefit exists, in support of any utility service would be inappropriate.

Recommended DIF Schedule. The adoption of Table 7-5, based upon Schedule 7.2 at the end of the chapter, as the water distribution DIFs would generate enough capital to construct the facilities needed by the new development. The DIFs contained on Schedule 7.2 also contain amounts less than the *Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison* identified in Schedule 7.3 thus do not violate any proportionate requirements.

CREDITS AGAINST DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

The City does not charge *stand-by* water rates. Vacant parcels are not charged water rates and

therefore they have not contributed to the capital development of the water system. As a result there can be no credit for previous contributions to capital from vacant parcels, simply because there were none made. Additionally, there have been no General Fund expenditures on water projects.

Credit for Developer Constructed Improvements. Similar to roadway and storm drainage construction, it will likely be advantageous to have the developer construct certain public improvements contiguous to the private development. The adoption of the DIF schedules encourages such agreements. It is recommended that the City continue the process of agreeing to allow developers to construct water system capital improvements, identified within the DIF calculation and then calculating a credit for that project contribution amount. The net DIF would be the amount per the adopted schedules less the credit for the capital constructed by the developer. Credits can only be given for private construction of any project that is listed on Schedule 6.1. Thus any improvements that are project specific in nature and benefit will likely be imposed as conditions of approval.

ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE METHODOLOGIES

There are two alternatives to the nine Minimum Needs-based area DIF categories. They are primarily applicable to the more specific demands by the multitude of differing business uses.

Equivalent EDU Based on Meter Size. The standard detached dwelling residence has a 3/4" meter at 15 gallons per minute normal (minimum-maximum) flow [10] which is defined as the **E**quivalent **D**welling **U**nit, or EDU. Schedule 7.2 indicates that the smallest meter size at 3/4" would cost $4,238 per connection, at the Minimum Needs based DIF schedule rate. The following Table 7-7 indicates the cost for larger meters based upon the normal flow demands, with again, the detached dwelling (detached) residence as the standard. A one inch meter is rated at 25 gallons per minute, which is 1.67 times larger than the 15 gallons per minute than is afforded by a 3/4" meter. Thus the one inch meter fee would be 1.67 times higher ($8,620) than the $4,238 for the 3/4" meter. Other meter sizes are as follows:

[This space left blank to place the following table on a single page].

10 *Meter Flow Ranges,* based upon *Minimum Maximum Continuous Flow Rates*, American Water Works Association.

Table 7-7
Equivalent Water Meter Size Calculation
Based upon Minimum Needs-based Impact Fees

Water Meter Size	Normal Water Flow (GPM)	Water Demand Factor	Cost per E.D.U (3/4" Meter)	DIF Cost per Meter Size
¾" Meter	15	1.000	$4,238	$4,238
1' Meter	25	1.667	$4,238	$7,605
1 & ½" Meter	50	3.333	$4,238	$14,125
2" Meter	80	5.333	$4,238	$22,601
3" Meter	240	16.000	$4,238	$67,808
4" Meter	420	28.000	$4,238	$118,664
6" Meter	920	61.333	$4,238	$259,929
8" Meter	1,600	106.667	$4,238	$452,055
10" Meter	2,500	166.667	$4,238	$706,335
12" Meter	3,300	220.000	$4,238	$932,360

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED WATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS IMPACT FEES

- Adopt:

  A. Schedule 7.2 for the nine basic DIF categories,
  B. Table 7-7, Equivalent Water Meter Size Calculation Based upon *Minimum Needs-based Development Impact Fees.*

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 6.1

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Water Source, Storage and Distribution Facilities

Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Percent Need	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Apportioned Dollar Cost	Construction Needs Generated by New Development: Percent Need	Construction Needs Generated by New Development: Apportioned Dollar Cost
WT-001	Water Distribution Mains (Replacement Schedule)	$12,720,000	100.00%	$12,720,000	0.00%	$0
WT-002	Well #10	$1,700,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,700,000
WT-003	Meter Replacements	$460,000	100.00%	$460,000	0.00%	$0
WT-004	SCADA HMI Server Replacement	$42,500	93.06%	$39,549	6.94%	$2,951
WT-005	Basin Engineering Study	$50,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$50,000
WT-007	Well #12	$1,800,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$1,800,000
WT-009	Treatment Basin Upgrades	$1,000,000	93.06%	$930,571	6.94%	$69,429
WT-010	Filter Body Feed System Upgrade	$45,000	93.06%	$41,876	6.94%	$3,124
WT-011	Fricke Springs Vehicle Bridge	$320,000	100.00%	$320,000	0.00%	$0
WT-012	Reservoir Tank re-coating	$150,000	100.00%	$150,000	0.00%	$0
WT-013	Water Master Plan	$75,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$75,000
WT-014	Remaining Water System Debt Service	$8,584,002	61.70%	$5,296,333	38.30%	$3,287,669
WT-015	Reservor Capacity Expansion (5.5 MGD)	$12,375,000	77.90%	$9,640,125	22.10%	$2,734,875
WT-016	Water System Maintenance Vehicles	$250,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$250,000
	Sub-Total General Plan Total New Projects	$39,571,502	74.80%	$29,598,454	25.20%	$9,973,048
	LESS:					
	Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	($5,705,253.00)	100.00%	($5,705,253.00)	0.00%	$0
	Other Off-setting Revenues	$0.00	100.00%	$0	0.00%	$0
	Development Impact Fee Fund Balance Total	($5,705,253.00)	100.00%	-$5,705,253	0.00%	$0
	Total Net General Plan Project Costs	45,276,755.00	77.97%	$35,303,707	22.03%	$9,973,048
					Forward to Schedule 7.4	

NOTES:
1. Costs distribution based upon the water allocation factors from the Water Master Plan.

Schedule 6.2

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs
Water Source, Storage and Distribution Facilities

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Water Allocation Rate GPD (1)	Cumulative New Water Allocation	Percentage of Added Water Allocation	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	341.4	1,255	544	682,720	53.39%	$5,324,174	$15,596	3.68	*$4,238 per Unit*
Attached Dwelling Units	55.3	993	372	369,396	28.89%	$2,880,725	$52,074	17.95	*$2,901 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	1.0	14	372	5,208	0.41%	$40,614	$40,614	14.00	*$2,901 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	1.0	25	150	3,750	0.29%	$29,244	$29,244	25.00	*$1,170 per Unit*
Retail/Service/Office Uses (S	34.2	1,342,345	2,200	75,328	5.89%	$587,443	$17,157	39,204	*$0.438 per S.F.*
Self Storage Facilities Uses (	1.0	32,670	2,200	2,200	0.17%	$17,157	$17,157	32,670	*$0.525 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses (SF)	60.0	1,928,140	2,200	132,044	10.33%	$1,029,742	$17,157	32,125	*$0.534 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses (SF)	3.0	63,340	2,000	6,000	0.47%	$46,791	$15,597	21,113	*$0.739 per S.F.*
Institutional Use (SF)	1.0	28,314	2,200	2,200	0.17%	$17,157	$17,157	28,314	*$0.606 per S.F.*
TOTAL	497.96	--	--	1,278,846	100.00%	$9,973,048	in Total Water System General Plan Projects		
ALTERNATE FEE METHODOLOGY				1,278,846		$9,973,048	$7.798 Per Gallon Demand		

Schedule 6.3

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison
Water Source, Storage and Distribution Facilities

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	GC Water Allocation Rate GPD (1)	Cumulative Existing Water Allocation	Percentage of Existing Water Allocation	Allocation of Existing System Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	1,270.00	7,845	544	4,267,680	24.90%	$60,637,394	$47,746	6.18	***$7,726*** *per Unit*
Attached Dwelling Units	247.00	5,666	372	2,107,752	12.30%	$29,948,025	$121,247	22.94	***$5,285*** *per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	69.00	980	372	364,560	2.13%	$5,179,856	$75,070	14.20	***$5,287*** *per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	23.70	593	150	88,950	0.52%	$1,263,847	$53,327	25.02	***$2,131*** *per Unit*
Retail/Service/Office Uses (S	287.00	11,251,548	2,200	631,400	3.68%	$8,971,256	$31,259	39,204	***$0.797*** *per S.F.*
Self Storage Facilities Uses (	17.70	578,259	2,200	38,940	0.23%	$553,280	$31,259	32,670	***$0.957*** *per S.F.*
Business Park Uses (SF)	54.00	1,764,180	2,200	118,800	0.69%	$1,687,972	$31,259	32,670	***$0.957*** *per S.F.*
Industrial Uses (SF)	94.00	2,047,320	2,000	188,000	1.10%	$2,671,201	$28,417	21,780	***$1.305*** *per S.F.*
Institutional Use (SF)	4,243.00	120,136,302	2,200	9,334,600	54.46%	$132,630,801	$31,259	28,314	***$1.104*** *per S.F.*
TOTAL	**6,305.40**	--	--	**17,140,682**	**100.00%**	**$243,543,631**	**Total Existing Water System Inventory**		
						$102,536,384	**in Water Distribution System Assets**		
						$24,000,000	**in Water Storage Reservoir Assets**		
						$35,000,000	**In Water Well Assets**		
						$0	**in Water Shares Assets**		
						$1,265,000	**in Altitude Valves Assets**		
						$1,897,500	**In Booster Station Assets**		
						$84,550,000	**in Treatment Facilities Assets**		
						$0	**in Water Maintenance Vehicles/Equipment Assets**		
						($5,705,253)	**in Water System DIF Fund Balance**		

Chapter 8
Wastewater Collection Facilities

As was mentioned in the prior chapter and will be reiterated here, a city or public agency experiencing dramatic growth may put off the construction of needed parks, roads storm drainage projects and the like and still function, perhaps minimally. However, nothing stops development in its tracks any faster than the lack of a water distribution system and a sewage collection system. These two systems were some of the earliest calculated DIFs, although they were generally called "hook up" fees[11]. In short, a residence or business cannot exist without these important connections.

The Purpose of the Fee. The City has adequate wastewater treatment capacity, albeit with debt service attached. Additionally the spine (or major) collection system is also largely completed. However, some of the existing sewer pipes throughout the collection system will need to be upsized to accommodate the additional wastewater demands from new development. It is a commonly accepted principle in both water and wastewater expansion that DIF receipts can finance the expansions as needed and required. If a development wanted to connect and there were no close-by lines, the developer would finance the expansion with perhaps a reimbursement agreement if appropriate.

The principle remains the same with these DIFs. This Chapter will calculate a fee schedule that represents the proportional expense per unit of growth by DIF Land-use Type, i.e., a detached dwelling unit, a commercial lodging unit or 1,000 square feet of business space.

The Use of the Fee. The revenues generated from a properly calculated and legally-supported Wastewater Collection System Development Impact Fee would be limited to capital costs related to the additional residential and business-related growth anticipated in the City's General Plan as depicted in Schedule 6.1. The impact fees would be used to construct additional spine wastewater collection lines or upsize existing ones to provide collection capacity for the additional demands from development that exceeds the capacity of the existing system. Conversely, the Wastewater Collection system DIF receipts would not be used to repair or replace any existing line (unless up-sizing is required).

Similar to the circulation, storm drainage and water DIFs, wastewater collection infrastructure will require separate DIF schedules in order to insure that existing users are not placed in the position of subsidizing private development.

EXISTING WASTEWATER COLLECTION SYSTEM

The City's major line wastewater collection system currently consists of an identified 329,8725 linear feet of various sized (8" to 42") reinforced concrete pipe, over 330 junctions and various backfill, road base and asphalt. The current cost of duplicating the entire system of locals and collectors, would be approximately $158,885,153. There are also a number of pump stations with a replacement value $75,000. The wastewater treatment facility has areplacement value of

11. Not to be confused with a "connection" fee which is a reimbursement for the actual costs of having a city-worker either set the water meter or connect the privately owned sewer pipe from the home to the City's later sewer pipe.

about 275.0 million. There is unfortunately a negative existing DIF fund balance of $6,047,877. These individual assets create system equity of $428,587,275.

GENERAL CITY WASTEWATER COLLECTION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

The Relationship Between the Need for the Facility (improvement) and the Type of Development Project. Schedule 8.1 identifies thirteen capital projects costing $40,613,178. Seven of these projects are necessary to accommodate the remaining growth in the City and also maintain the existing system. Development will be responsible for some portion (or all) of these seven development-related projects. The thirteen projects have a combined estimated cost of $40,613,178 to design, construct and inspect, or acquire. Addition of the negative fund balance of $6,047,877 acts to reduce that $40,613,178 figure to a greater net $46,081,271. Howver, nonw of the existing negative fund balance has been attributed to new development.

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fees and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. The project costs related to growth needs were then distributed to the development categories within the system design flows, or gallons per day/acre flow rates (GPAD) for business development or gallons per day (GPD) for residential construction. The wastewater design flow rates are based upon general engineering standard flow rates from a similar public agency and are as follows in Table 8-1:

Table 8-1
General City Wastewater Flow Rate
Demand by Land Use
Demand in GPD or GPAD

DIF Land-use Type	Gallons (per Unit) per Day	Gallons per Acre per Day
Detached Dwelling Units	240	
Attached Dwelling Units	210	
Mobile Residences Dwelling Units	210	
Commercial Lodging Units	140	
Retail/Service/Office Uses		900
Self Storage Facilities Uses		1,200
Business Park Uses		1,200
Industrial Uses		1,600
Institutional Uses		1,500

DISTRIBUTION OF CAPTAL COSTS

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. Table 8-2, following, is extracted from Schedule 8.2 and demonstrates the results of distributing the $9,847,554 in wastewater system development-related expansion costs over the remaining private sector development opportunities.

Table 8-2
Minimum Needs-based Wastewater Collection System
Development Impact Costs
by DIF Land-use Type

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$4,734,310	$3,768/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$3,277,660	$3,301/Unit
Mobil Home Dwelling Units	$46,185	$3,299/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$55,048	$2,202/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses	$484,401	$0.361/S.F.
Self Storage Facilities Uses	$18,907	$0.579/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$1,132,075	$0.587/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$75,432	$1.191/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$23,536	$0.831/S.F.

The results indicate that the varying types of residential dwellings will need to contribute anywhere from a low of $3,301 for an attached dwelling unit to a high of $3,768 for a detached dwelling unit in either DIF payments or in contributed capital in the form of off-site wastewater lines (to the same amount).

Existing Contribution. Table 8-3, on the following page, distributes the current cost, or equity, of the existing system distributed over those who have contributed to the existing wastewater system, the current users and rate payers. This has been done in the same manner as the future costs were distributed against the future users, by the same average demand statistics used for modeling master plans. The results indicate that the average high density dwelling unit has contributed $10,059 per unit and a detached dwelling unit has contributed about $3,768 per unit.

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

Table 8-3
Existing Wastewater Collection System Community
Financial Commitment Comparison Data

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	$78,950,062	$10,059/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units	$49,896,131	$8,806/Unit
Mobil Home Dwelling Units	$8,631,748	$8,810/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$3,480,129	$5,869/Unit
Retail/Service/Office Uses	$10,830,400	$0.963/S.F.
Self Storage Facilities Uses	$891,462	$1.541/S.F.
Business Park Uses	$2,717,243	$1.541/S.F.
Industrial Uses	$6,308,805	$3.081/S.F.
Institutional Uses	$266,885,582	$2.222/S.F.

PROPORTIONATE SHARE ANALYSIS

Necessity for DIFs. DIFs are necessary and appropriate for the construction of the remainder of the wastewater collection system for one significant reason. Similar to the distribution of water, the collection and treatment of sewage has long since been recognized by most public agencies as a utility. Utilities differ from general tax-supported services in that they are similar to private sector utility businesses and are financed by utility rates. Wastewater collection rates are relatively elastic, within reason, and can be set to meet sewage collection costs whereas taxes for general municipal services cannot. As a result, general taxes must be protected and reserved for services that do not have any such an elastic revenue source such as public safety, park maintenance, storm drainage, and others. Additionally, as long as the existing wastewater users have an adequate system for their needs, they would have little interest in having wastewater rates rise for any reason other than operating costs as opposed to meeting the cost of adding new users. Clearly, the cost of adding to the system infrastructure to accommodate additional private development demands should be imposed upon that same private development.

The contribution to the wastewater collection system (benefit) can be measured, unlike many of the City's services. Wastewater rates can, and should be, set to meet the Council's priorities and policies in terms of the wastewater system use. The use of general taxes, where no relationship between the rate of taxation and benefit exists, in support of any utility service would be inappropriate.

Recommended DIF Schedule. The adoption of Schedule 8.2 at the end of the Chapter text (as summarized in table 8-2), as the Wastewater Collection Facilities DIF schedule is both reasonable and would generate enough capital to construct or pay for the infrastructure facilities needed by the new development. The DIFs contained in Schedules 8.2 also contain amounts lesser than the significant financial commitment costs identified in Schedule 8.3 thus Schedule 8.2 does not violate any proportionate requirements.

CREDITS AGAINST DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

Like the water utility, there are no *stand-by* wastewater collection rates. Vacant parcels are not charged wastewater rates and therefore they have not contributed to the capital development of the wastewater system. As a result there can be no credit for previous contributions to capital from vacant parcels, simply because there were none. Additionally, there has been no General Fund expenditures on wastewater projects.

Credit for Developer Constructed Improvements Contained Within the City's MFP and Impact Fee Calculation. Similar to other infrastructure construction, it may be advantageous to have the developer construct certain public improvements contiguous to the private development. The adoption of DIFs should not preclude such agreements. Thus it is recommended that the City continue the process of agreeing to allow developers to make wastewater system capital improvements that are identified within the City's MFP and that are part of the impact fee calculation, and receive a credit for that constructed amount. The net DIF would be the amount per the adopted schedules less the credit for the capital constructed by the developer.

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED WASTEWATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS IMPACT FEES

- **General City** - Adopt Schedule 8.2 for the nine basic land-uses.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 7.1

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
Wastewater Collection Facilities

Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Percent Need	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources: Apportioned Dollar Cost	Construction Needs Generated by New Development in OR: Percent Need	Construction Needs Generated by New Development in OR: Apportioned Dollar Cost
WW-001	Sewer Line Replacement/Upsizing	$12,600,000	50.00%	$6,300,000	50.00%	$6,300,000
WW-002	Influent Gate Replacement	$70,000	100.00%	$70,000	0.00%	$0
WW-003	Effluent Line Rebuild	$300,000	100.00%	$300,000	0.00%	$0
WW-004	Upgrade Flow Meters, In-fill and Seep Technology	$210,000	50.00%	$105,000	50.00%	$105,000
WW-005	Influent Screens Replacement	$380,000	100.00%	$380,000	0.00%	$0
WW-006	Caltrol Motorized Slide Gates	$43,500	100.00%	$43,500	0.00%	$0
WW-007	Drying Bed Paving	$285,000	94.22%	$268,539	5.78%	$16,461
WW-008	Replace Perimeter Fence Sections	$100,000	100.00%	$100,000	0.00%	$0
WW-009	Rehabilitate Secondary Clarifiers	$750,000	100.00%	$750,000	0.00%	$0
WW-010	Laboratory Upgrades	$250,000	75.00%	$187,500	25.00%	$62,500
WW-011	Remaining Wastewater System Debt Service	$24,515,678	89.80%	$22,015,085	10.20%	$2,500,593
WW-012	Wastewater System Maintenance Vehicles	$984,000	25.00%	$246,000	75.00%	$738,000
WW-013	Wastewater Collection System Master Plan	$125,000	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$125,000
	Sub-Total General Plan Total New Projects	$40,613,178	75.75%	$30,765,624	24.25%	$9,847,554
	LESS:					
	Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	($6,047,877.00)	100.00%	($6,047,877)	0.00%	$0
	Other Off-setting Revenues	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$0
	Development Impact Fee Fund Balance Total	($6,047,877)	0.00%	($6,047,877)	0.00%	$0
	Total Net General Plan Project Costs	$46,661,055	78.90%	$36,813,501	21.10%	$9,847,554
					Forward to Schedule 8.4	

NOTES:
1. Costs distribution based upon a demand rates.

Schedule 7.2

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Minimum Capital Needs-based Impact Costs
Wastewater Collection Facilities

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Gallons per Day Sewer Demand Rate	Cumulative New Sewer Demand	Percentage of Additional Sewer Demand	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	341.4	1,255	240	301,200	48.08%	$4,734,310	$13,868	3.68	*$3,768 per Unit*
Attached Dwelling Units	55.3	993	210	208,530	33.28%	$3,277,660	$59,249	17.95	*$3,301 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	1.0	14	210	2,940	0.47%	$46,185	$46,185	14.00	*$3,299 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	1.0	25	140	3,500	0.56%	$55,048	$55,048	25.00	*$2,202 per Unit*
Retail/Service/Office Uses (S	34.2	1,342,345	900	30,816	4.92%	$484,401	$14,147	39,204	*$0.361 per S.F.*
Self Storage Facilities Uses (	1.0	32,670	1,200	1,200	0.19%	$18,907	$18,907	32,670	*$0.578 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses (SF)	60.0	1,928,140	1,200	72,024	11.50%	$1,132,075	$18,862	32,125	*$0.588 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses (SF)	3.0	63,340	1,600	4,800	0.77%	$75,432	$25,144	21,113	*$1.191 per S.F.*
Institutional Use (SF)	1.0	28,314	1,500	1,500	0.24%	$23,536	$23,536	28,314	*$0.831 per S.F.*
TOTAL	**497.96**	–	–	**626,510**	**100.00%**	**$9,847,554**	**in Total Wastewater General Plan Projects**		

The demand characteristics have been taken from Table 3 from the June, 2011 Technical Memorandum from AKM Consulting Engineers.

Schedule 7.3

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison
Wastewater Collection Facilities

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Gallons per Day Sewer Demand Rate	Cumulative Existing Sewer Demand	Percentage of Existing Sewer Demand	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Detached Dwelling Units	1,270.00	7,845	240	1,882,800	18.42%	$78,950,062	$62,165	6.18	*$10,059 per Unit*
Attached Dwelling Units	247.00	5,666	210	1,189,860	11.64%	$49,896,131	$202,009	22.94	*$8,806 per Unit*
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	69.00	980	210	205,800	2.01%	$8,631,748	$125,098	14.20	*$8,810 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Units	23.70	593	140	83,020	0.81%	$3,480,129	$146,841	25.02	*$5,869 per Unit*
Retail/Service/Office Uses (S	287.00	11,251,548	900	258,300	2.53%	$10,830,400	$37,737	39,204	*$0.963 per S.F.*
Self Storage Facilities Uses (	17.70	578,259	1,200	21,240	0.21%	$891,462	$50,365	32,670	*$1.541 per S.F.*
Business Park Uses (SF)	54.00	1,764,180	1,200	64,800	0.63%	$2,717,243	$50,319	32,670	*$1.541 per S.F.*
Industrial Uses (SF)	94.00	2,047,320	1,600	150,400	1.47%	$6,308,805	$67,115	21,780	*$3.081 per S.F.*
Institutional Use (SF)	4,243.00	120,136,302	1,500	6,364,500	62.27%	$266,885,582	$62,900	28,314	*$2.222 per S.F.*
TOTAL	**6,305.40**	--	--	**10,220,720**	**100.00%**	**$428,587,275**	**Total Wastewater Capital Needs to Finish System**		

$158,885,152	**in Wastewater Collection System Assets**
$750,000	**in Wastewater Collection Pump Station Assets**
$275,000,000	**in Wastewater Treatment Capacity**
$0	**in Wastewater Maintenance Vehicle Assets**
-$6,047,877	**in Wastewater System DIF Fund Balance**

Chapter 11
Refuse Collection Vehicles/Barrels

This chapter contains a calculation of the demand from development upon the City's inventory of refuse collection equipment and barrel inventory. Staff has indicated that facility storage and maintenance facilities are more than adequate with which to meet future demands. Collection vehicles and refuse containers is a different story. The existing refuse capacity is the result of existing customer rate and fee payments. New refuse customers will impact the City by requiring new refuse vehicles and various types of collection containers which in turn will increase demand upon the refuse collection system facilities and maintenance capacity. It should be noted that the City currently charges new users for new barrels, but does not for additional collection vehicles.

Many cities simply include the cost of capital acquisition within their operating budget. Cities that choose to finance the expansion of their refuse fleet through monthly user charges, rather than DIFs, are in fact forcing the existing refuse customers to subsidize the costs of these new businesses and residences. However, these costs can legitimately be recovered through a DIF schedule in virtually the same manner as a circulation or wastewater DIF.

Table 9-1 identifies the cost calculation for the direct capital acquisition costs of the collection vehicles and the collection bins required by each DIF use category.

Table 9-1
Refuse Collection Vehicle Cost
per Daily Barrel Stop

	Total Cost
Collection Vehicle Barrel Stop Capacity per Day	500
Days of Collection	5
Weekly Barrel Collection Capacity	2,500
Cost per Collection Vehicle	$335,000
Weekly Barrel Collection Capacity	2,500
Total Cost for Vehicle & Bins	$134

Table 9-2, following, identifies the cost per barrel that should be a cost to the new residential and business customers.

Table 9-2
Refuse Collection Vehicles/Barrels
Development Impact Fee
for Detached Dwelling Units

	Total Cost
65/95 Gallon Collection Barrels	$65
300/450 Gallon Collection Barrels	$500

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED REFUSE COLLECTION VEHCICLES AND COLLECTION BARRELS DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

- **General City** - Adopt Schedule 9.1 for the all service collection types. However, the final Refuse Collection Vehicles/Barrels demand DIF to be imposed on any given private development will be based upon the submitted design drawings and proposed use. As an example, some attached dwelling units will have limited space for refuse collection barrels and may require common bin service, but other attached dwellings units may be better served by individual barrel collection service. This would be determined by the Solid Waste management staff at the time of the development review process or upon service application. The latter would probably more accurate.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 9.1

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Solid Waste Collection Vehicles and Barrels

Collection Vehicle Cost Calculation	
Daily Stops per Single Route	500 Barrel Stops per Day
Number of Days of Collection	5 Ten-hour Days per Week
Pick-up Capability of One Truck	2,500 Barrels per Week

Cost per Collection Vehicle	$335,000 per Collection Vehicle
Number of Days of Collection	2,500 Barrels per Week
Cost per Barrel per Pick-up Stop	$134 per Barrel per Stop

Collection Barrell Cost Calculation	
65/95 Gallon Collection Barrel	$65 per Collection Barrel
300/450 Gallon Collection Barrel	$500 per Collection Barrel

Chapter 10
General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

The Existing System. General Facilities are generally limited to general office or work buildings and equipment used by City staff to undertake their daily duties. The City possesses (i.e., owns outright) a significant amount of general facilities square footage however there is no existing General Facilities Development Impact Fee. The replacement costs totaling $28,572,360 are as follows:

City Hall Facilities	$25,297,360
Computer and Miscellaneous Electronic Equipment	$1,200,000
General Fund Pool Cars	$75,000
General Facilities Impact Fee Fund Balance (None)	$0

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Underdeveloped or Undeveloped Parcels. As the City increases in both population and additional business ventures, the City Hall will typically become overcrowded with a growing staff, even if major efforts are made to keep the number of municipal workers to a minimum. However, The Lompoc City Hall's existing 28,646 square feet will be able to absorb any additional needs from the existing General Plan build-out demands given a reconfiguration of the existing floor plan to make better use of all of the existing space.

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

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

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

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

- City Hall floor plan reconfiguration.
- Expansion of the administrative pool car fleet.
- Up-sizing of the existing centralized computer system capacity.

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

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

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

Resulting DIF Schedule. Table 10-1 following, summarizes the Minimum Needs-based General Facilities DIFs. The fees identified following represent the fees necessary to construct or acquire the facilities identified on Schedule 10.1.

Table 10-1
City of Lompoc's Entire City Area
Minimum Needs-based General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment
Development Impact Costs
by DIF Land-use Type

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Private Residential Units	$1,040,744	$460/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$2,617	$105/Unit
Business Uses	$259,754	$0.077/S.F.

It must be restated that the existing community has established the City Hall, General pool fleet, and inventory of computer/electronic equipment. In short, the current community has created more than adequate staff facilities. Table 10-2, following, identifies the average investment by residential dwelling units, commercial lodging units and business square feet.

Table 10-2
Existing General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment
Community Financial Commitment Comparison

DIF Land-use Type	Allocation of Development Costs	Development Impact Cost Per Unit or Square Foot
Residential Dwelling Units	$6,683,757	$461/Unit
Commercial Lodging Units	$99,877	$168/Unit
Business Uses	$19,788,726	$0.146/S.F.

RECOMMENDED IMPACT FEES

The *Minimum Needs-based Impact Costs* should be adopted for the two broad land-uses, per Schedule 10.2 and summarized in table 10-3. The *Existing Community Financial Commitment* indicates that the existing community has generated a great deal more infrastructure than will be asked of future development.

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED GENERAL FACILITIES ET. AL. IMPACT FEES

- **General Plan Area** - Adopt Schedule 10.3 for the three basic land-uses.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 10.1

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Allocation of Project Cost Estimates
General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Line #	Project Title	Estimated Cost	Construction Needs Supported by Other Resources		Construction Needs Generated by New Development	
			Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost	Percent Need	Apportioned Dollar Cost
GF-001	City Hall Reconfiguration/Expansion	$1,358,895	20.00%	$271,779	80.00%	$1,087,116
GF-002	Expansion Of Administrative Pool Car Fleet	$45,000	20.00%	$9,000	80.00%	$36,000
GF-003	Electronic Specialty Equipment/Computer Hardware/Software	$225,000	20.00%	$45,000	80.00%	$180,000
	Sub-Total General Plan Total New Project Costs	$1,628,895	20.00%	$325,779	80.00%	$1,303,116
	LESS:					
	Development Impact Fee Fund Balance	$0	0.00%	$0	100.00%	$0
	Total General Plan Total New Project Costs	$1,628,895	20.00%	$325,779	80.00%	$1,303,116
					Forward to Schedule 10.2	

Schedule 10.2

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Minimum Needs-based Impact Costs
General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Proposed Land Use	Undeveloped Acres	Undeveloped Units	Acre Distribution Factor	Acre Demand Factor	Percentage of Additional Demand	Allocation of Expansion Costs	Cost Distribution Per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Development Impact Fee per Unit or Square Foot
Private Residences	397.70	2,262	1.000	397.70	79.87%	$1,040,744	$2,617	5.69	*$460 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Room:	1.00	25	1.000	1.00	0.20%	$2,617	$2,617	25.00	*$105 per Unit*
Business Square Feet	99.26	3,394,809	1.000	99.26	19.93%	$259,754	$2,617	34,201	*$0.077 per S.F.*
TOTAL	497.96	--	--	497.96	100.00%	$1,303,116	in Total Equity in General Facilities Capital Needs		

Schedule 10.3

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Existing Community Financial Commitment Comparison
General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment

Proposed Land Use	Developed Acres	Developed Units	Acre Distribution Factor	Acre Demand Service	Percentage of Existing Service Calls	Allocation of Infrastructure "Equity"	Distribution of "Equity" per Acre	Average Units or Square Feet/Acre	Current Financial Commitment per Unit or Square Foot
Private Residences	1,586.00	14,491	1.000	1,586.00	25.15%	$6,683,757	$4,214	9.14	*$461 per Unit*
Commercial Lodging Rooms	23.70	593	1.000	23.70	0.38%	$99,877	$4,214	25.02	*$168 per Unit*
Business Square Feet	4,695.70	135,777,609	1.000	4,695.70	74.47%	$19,788,726	$4,214	28,915	*$0.146 per S.F.*
TOTAL	6,305.40	--	--	6,305.40	100.00%	$26,572,360	in Total Existing General Facilities Capital Assets		
						$25,297,360	in City Hall Land/Facilities		
						$1,200,000	in Equity in Existing Computer/Electronic Equipment		
						$75,000	in General Fund Pool Vehicles		
						$0	in Existing General Facilities Impact Fee Fund Balance.		

Chapter 11
Library Collection Items and Dedicated Public Use Computer Stations

The Existing System. The City's residents are served by the City-owned Lompoc Library. The facility provides access to a broad inventory of books, tapes, subscriptions called a *collection* of volumes and a number of dedicated public use computer stations available to the public. The City also has approximately $225,568 in existing Library DIF fund balance representing about 7,041 additional collection items and four dedicated public use computer stations. Table 11-1, following, identifies the current inventory of library offerings enjoyed by the City's residents.

Table 11-1
Identification of Current Library Inventories and Calculation of Collection Items and Computers Stations Standards per Resident

Facility	Library Collection Items	Library Computers
Existing Collection Items	92,359	44
Items Available Within Fund Balance	7,218	4
Total Items/Public Computers	99,577	48
Current City Population	41,109	41,109
Current Standard/Resident	2.422	0.0012

When the total 99,577 collection items are divided by the current net population of 41,109, a library collection standard of 4.422 collection items/person is established. When the 48 dedicated pubic use computer stations are divided by the current population of 41,109, a dedicated public use computer station standard of 0.0012 dedicated public use computer stations/person is established.

Why a General Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment DIF schedule is important. Stated simply, the 99,577 collection items will only be able to accommodate a finite number of patrons. Additional development will increase the demand on the existing collection items. The same will hold true for the 44 dedicated public use computer stations. Without additional computer stations, the 44 existing stations will become harder to access with the additional 6,682 new residents from the 2,262 new private residences.

The Purpose of the Fee. The purpose of the fee is to enable the City to add collection items and additional computer stations to ensure that the City's citizens have access to the collection items and computer stations. Table 11-2, following, indicates that the remaining residential development and typical number of persons per type of residential dwelling will generate a need for an additional 16,194 collection items in order to maintain the existing local library collection facility standard of 2.422 collection items per person and nine dedicated public use computer stations to maintain the existing standard of 0.0012 stations per resident.

Table 11-2
Collection Items Required to Maintain Existing
Library Collection Items Standard

Residential DIF Land Use Type	Number of Units Anticipated	Persons per Dwelling	Population Generated
Detached Dwelling Units	1,255	3.025	4,777
Attached Dwelling Units	993	2.876	3,349
Mobil Home Dwelling Units	14	2.130	44
Additional City Residents from Added Dwelling Units			6,682
Collection Items per Person Existing Standard			4.422
Collection Items Required to Maintain Standard			**19,780**

The County currently has 40 computer stations (and four additional stations represented in Library DIF Fund balance). Again, divided by the existing population of 41,109, the resulting standard is 0.0012 dedicated public use computer stations per person. Table 11-3, following, indicates the additional number of residents (6,682) to be served by the existing 44 computer stations and the number of computer stations required (eight) to maintain the existing standard of 0.0012 computer stations per person in light of the additional 6,682 additional residents at build-out.

Table 11-3
Collection Items Required to Maintain Existing
Library Dedicated Public use Computer Stations Standard

Residential DIF Land Use Type	Number of Units Anticipated	Persons per Dwelling	Population Generated
Detached Dwelling Units	1,255	3.025	4,777
Attached Dwelling Units	993	2.876	3,349
Mobil Home Dwelling Units	14	2.130	44
Additional City Residents from Added Dwelling Units			6,682
Existing Computer Stations per Person Standard			0.0012
Additional Computer Stations Required to Maintain Standard			**8**

The Use of the Fee. The fee, if adopted, imposed and collected would be limited to acquiring additional library collection items and dedicated public use computer stations, but not on the replacement of either. The preservation of the existing Library standards must be maintained.

The Relationship Between the Need for The Fee and The Type of Development Project. The development of any acreage zoned for residential uses, increases the demand on the finite amount of library collection items and dedicated public use computer stations. Thus, those residential land-uses that generate higher amounts of residents (i.e., detached dwelling unit) will be charged a proportionally higher amount. There is no information available demonstrating a significant link or nexus between library use by local businesses.

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. Additional square feet will be constructed with the fees collected from residential development and additional volumes will be acquired for the collection. The fees cannot be used for any other purpose.

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. The cost of acquiring additional volumes, called the accession process,[12] is $30.00 per item per Schedule 11.1. The accession process cost has been decreased steadily over recent years due to the contracting out this time-intensive process. When the 99,577 collection items inventory is divided by the 41,109 existing citizens establishes a standard of 4.422 collection items per resident. The standard of 4.422 collection items standard is multiplied by the $30.00 per item a charge of $72.76 per additional City resident is determined.

Table 11-4
Establishment of the Library Collection Standard and Cost per Person to Maintain the Standard

Library Collection Items	99,577
Current Population	41,109
Collection Items per Resident	4.422
Acquisition Cost of Collection Item	$30.00
Cost per Additional Resident	**$72.76**

The cost of acquiring a single computer station (per Schedule 11.1) is estimated to be $2,300 per computer, monitor, software license, work station and installation. The 44 existing computer stations used by Lompoc residents, when divided by the 41,109 existing citizens create a standard of 0.0012 library items per City resident. The standard of 4.422 collection items multiplied by the $2,130 per public computer station results in a cost of $2.69 per additional City resident, in order to maintain the existing standard. Table 11-5 identifies this:

[12] The accession process includes: need research, ordering, receipt, preparation, entering it into the computer and actual placement on the shelves.

Table 11-5
Establishment of the Library Dedicated Public Use Computer Station Standard and Cost per Person to Maintain the Standard

Dedicated Public Use Computer Stations	44
Current Population (State D.O.F.)	41,109
Collection Items per Resident	0.0012
Accessions Cost per Collection Item	$2,130
Cost per Additional Resident	**$2.69**

Library Collection Items and Computer Station DIF Schedule. The combined cost per new resident is $75.26 ($72.76 for 4.422 collection items and $2.69 for 0.0012 additional computer stations). Table 11-6, following, indicates the amount required for pro-rata expansion of the library space per Schedule 9.1. If adopted and imposed on the remaining development, it would collect enough to acquire an additional 16,194 library collection volumes and eight dedicated public use computer stations.

Table 11-6
Summary of Collection Items and Computer Stations Impact Costs

DIF Land Use Type	Residents Per Dwelling	Cost per Resident	Impact Cost per Dwelling
Detached Dwelling Units	3.025	$75.26	$228
Attached Dwelling Units	2.876	$75.26	$217
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	2.130	$75.26	$161

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED LIBRARY AND COLLECTION VOLUMES IMPACT FEES

- Adopt Schedule 11.1 for the three basic residential dwelling DIF types.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 11.1

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Library Collection Items and Dedicated Public Computer Stations

	Collection Items	Computer Stations	Total Resources
Existing Number of Collection Items	92,359		
Existing Number of Dedicated Public Computer Stations		44.00	
Library Assets Stations Represented by Existing Fund Balance	7,218	4.00	
Total Library Components Status	99,577	48.00	
Current City Population	41,109	41,109	
Collection Items per Resident	2.422		
Computer Stations per Resident		0.0012	
Accessions Cost per Collection Item	$30.00		
Cost per Computer Station with Licenses, Installed		$2,300.00	
Collection Item Cost per Resident	$72.67		
Collection Item Cost per Resident		$2.69	

Cost per Land Use Residential Dwelling Unit	Density per Dwelling Unit	Collection Items	Computer Stations	Total Resources
Detached Dwelling Unit	3.025	$220	$8	$228
Attached Dwelling Unit	2.876	$209	$8	$217
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	2.130	$155	$6	$161

Chapter 12
Public Use (Community Centers) Facilities

This important component of the City's offerings to its citizens is distinct from the Park Land and Park Improvements DIF as a separate DIF infrastructure category. The City of Lompoc was one of the earlier cities to undertake this process. This was undertaken for three probable reasons.

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

Lastly and perhaps most importantly, it has been the experience of RCS staff, that when the cost for public use facilities (community centers et. al.) is included as a cost of park development, these facilities simply do not get built as the park impact fee revenues get used on the costly demand for turfed park acres with sports or passive-use park improvements. The premise remains valid.

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

The City owns some facilities dedicated to a specific use, such as the Senior Center and one available for broader use such as the Anderson Recreation Center. Table 12-1 shows the City's existing public meeting facilities.

Table 12-1
Inventory of Existing (Owned) Public Meeting Facilities

Public Use Meeting Facility	Square Feet
Anderson Recreation Center	15,439
Art Gallery	1,200
Civic Center Auditorium	8,205
Museum	4,437
Public Library Building	19,710
Senior Center	15,500
Future Facilities in DIF Fund Balance	39
Total Public Use Square Feet	**64,530**

Based upon an existing net population of 41,109, the 64,530 square feet creates an impressive standard of 1.570 square feet per resident. This standard indicates that the City maintains a substantial commitment to providing a community center or recreation space for public groups and individuals. Table 12-2, following, demonstrates the calculation establishing the square foot standard:

Table 12-2
Calculation of Public Use Facilities
Square Foot Standard

Existing Public Meeting Space Square Feet	64,530
Current City Population	41,109
Square Foot per Resident Standard	1.570

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Underdeveloped or Undeveloped Parcels. Simply stated, additional residential dwelling units will increase the population, placing greater demands for use of the existing community centers. The construction of a detached dwelling unit will create, on average, 3.025 potential new community center users. The addition of a new attached dwelling will create on average 2.876 potential new users.

The Purpose of the Fee. The purpose of the fee is to determine the cost of expanding the community center and public use type facilities by some 12,876 square feet to meet the added demands created by the construction of additional residential dwelling units. It should be noted that 12,876 square feet of public use facilities may not fully meet the needs of the build-out community and that square feet may be desired by the community. The reference to the 12,876 square feet indicates that is the amount of additional public use facilities square feet that could be financed by DIFs. Table 12-3, following, demonstrates the calculation of the number of additional square feet required to maintain the existing Public Use facilities standard:

Table 12-3
Square Feet of Community Center Space
Required to Maintain Existing Standard

Residential DIF land-use Type	Number of Units Anticipated	Persons per Dwelling	Population Generated
Detached Dwelling Units	1,255	3.025	4,777
Attached Dwelling Units	993	2.876	3,349
Mobil Home Dwelling Units	14	2.130	44
Additional City Residents from Added Dwelling Units			6,682
Square Foot per Person Existing Standard			1.570
Public Use Facilities (SF) Required to Maintain Standard			**10,489**

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

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

Detached Dwelling Units.....3.025 Persons/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units.....2.876 Persons/Unit
Mobile Home Family Dwelling Units.....2.130 Persons/Unit

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

Detached Dwelling Unit..... 3.025 Persons per Unit X 1.570 Square Feet = 4.749 Square Feet
Attached Dwelling Unit ..... 2.876 Persons per Unit X 1.570 Square Feet = 4.515 Square Feet
H Mobile Home Dwelling Unit..... 2.130 Persons per Unit X 1.570 Square Feet = 3.134 Square Feet

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. The cost of adding 1.570 square feet of building space per person is roughly $843.89 based upon a $493.35 per square foot for construction, $13.50 for parcel hardscape improvements based upon a $4.50 per square foot cost and a floor area ratio of 0.333) and land acquisition and parcel site grading improvements of $30.75 ($10.25 per square foot, again with a 0.333 floor area ratio). A detached dwelling unit with 3.025 persons would require 4.749 square feet of public meeting space at a cost of $2,553 (4.749 square feet X $537.60 per square foot, rounded). An attached dwelling unit requires 4.515 square feet of public meeting space at a cost of about $2,427 (4.515 square feet X $537.60 per square foot).

Resulting DIFs. Table 12-4, following, indicates the proposed Public Meeting DIF.

Table 12-4
Summary of Public Use Facilities Impact Fee

DIF Land-use Type	Impact Fee Per Unit
Detached Dwelling Unit	$2,553
Attached Dwelling Unit	$2,427
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	$1,797

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED PUBLIC USE FACILITIES IMPACT FEES

- **General City** - Adopt Schedule 12.1 for the three basic residential dwelling categories.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 12.1

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Public Use (Community Center) Facilities

	Land and Building
Anderson Recreation Center	15,439
Art Gallery	1,200
Civic Center Auditorium	8,205
Museum	4,437
Public Library	19,710
Senior Center	15,500
Facilities Represented in Existing DIF Fund Balance	39
Existing City-owned Public Use Facilities Square Feet	64,530
Current Population	41,109
Square Foot per Resident Standard	1.570
Average Public Use Facility Construction Cost per Square Foot	$493.35
Parcel Hardscape Improvements, $4.50 S.F. and 0.333 Floor Area Ratio	$13.50
Land Acquisition/Grading Cost @ $10.25 per square foot X 0.333 FAR	$30.75
Total Cost for a Single Square Foot of Public Use Space	$537.60
Total Cost for one Square Foot of Public Use Space	$537.60
Square Foot per Resident Standard	1.570
Cost per New Resident	$843.89

Cost per Land Use Residential Dwelling Unit	Density per Dwelling Unit	Total Resources
Detached Dwelling Unit	3.025	$2,553
Attached Dwelling Unit	2.876	$2,427
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	2.130	$1,797

Chapter 13
Aquatics Facilities

This component of City infrastructure is also separated from the Park Land Acquisition and DIF for the same reasons described in the previous Chapter regarding Public Use (community center) Facilities.

The Existing System. The City owns and operates an impressive aquatics facility consisting of a total of 15,515 square feet of swimming pool surface and 42,392 square feet of combination locker/utilities/office buildings. The City's prior natatorium listed in the previous Report, has been dismantled and is no longer included in the calculation of the standard. The existing facilities are available to individuals and organized groups represented by the existing 41,109 residents for leisure, competition and general fitness uses. Table 13-1, following, details the four aquatics complexes and the existing fund balance.

Table 13-1
Existing City Pools/Utility Buildings

Pool Facility	Pool Surface Capacity	Pool Support Facilities
Competition Pool	6,382	
Play Area	7,448	
Therapy/Training Pool	1,685	
Aquatics Center Building		42,392
Fund Balance Square Feet	0	0
Total Square Feet	**15,515**	**42,392**

Demand Upon Infrastructure Created by the Development of Underdeveloped or Undeveloped Parcels. Simply stated, additional residential dwelling units will increase the population placing greater demands upon the City's existing aquatics centers. The construction of detached dwelling and attached dwellings will create, on average, 3.025 and 2.876 potential new potential pool users, respectively. The addition of mobile residences in the unlikely event that any mobile parks be applied for and approved) will create 2.130 potential new pool users each. The current *de-facto* standards are 1.0312 square feet of locker/office building per person and 0.3774 square feet of pool surface per person in the City.

The **Purpose** of the Fee. The purpose of the fee is to generate DIF revenue with which to expand the aquatics centers capacity to meet the added demands created by the construction of additional residential dwelling units.

The **Use** of the Fee. The fee, if adopted, would be imposed, collected, and spent on the construction of additional aquatics centers that would benefit City of Lompoc residents, but would not be spent on rehabilitation of the existing aquatic center.

The Relationship Between the Need for The Fee and The Type of Development Project. Different types of residential dwellings generally have differing numbers of people dwelling in them. United States Census 2000 data (see Table 2-2. page 23) was used to determine the occupancy density statistics for the City. They are summarized following:

Detached Dwelling Units ..... 3.025 Persons/Unit
Attached Dwelling Units..... 2.876 Persons/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Units..... 2.130 Persons/Unit

The Relationship Between the Use of the Fee and the Type of Development Paying the Fee. The fee will be used to expand the pool surface space and support building in proportions consistent with the average persons per dwelling. The aquatic center pools and locker/utility buildings would be expanded in the amounts on the following page, by type of residential dwelling:

Detached Dwelling Units ..... 3.119 S.F. of locker space and 1.142 S.F. of pool surface
Attached Dwelling Units..... 2.966 S.F. of locker space and 1.085 S.F. of pool surface
Mobile Home Dwelling Units..... 2.196 S.F. of locker space and 0.804 S.F. of pool surface

The Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Portion of the Facility Attributed to the Development Project. Schedule 13.1 indicates the pool and locker building cost calculations. The pool construction costs are also based upon past pool construction costs received from previous agencies.

The two separate square foot costs above total about $506.83 per person for the pool expansion ($250/S.F. X 0.3774 S.F per resident = $94.35 per person) about $412.48 per person for the locker building expansion ($400/S.F. X 1.0312 S.F. per resident = $412.48 per person) or $506.83 per person for both construction components. Thus a detached dwelling detached unit would incur impact costs of $1,533/dwelling, (3.025 persons X $412.48, rounded). An attached dwelling unit would generate impact costs of about $1,457/dwelling, (2.876 persons X $412.48, rounded).

Resulting DIF Schedule. Schedule 13.1, as summarized by Table 13-2 following, indicates the proposed Aquatics Facilities DIF schedule.

Table 13-2
Summary of Aquatics Facilities Impact Fee

DIF Land-use Type	Impact Fee Per Unit
Detached Dwelling Unit	$1,533
Attached Dwelling Unit	$1,457
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	$1,080

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED AQUATICS FACILITIES IMPACT FEES

- **General City** - Adopt Schedule 13.1 for the three basic residential land-uses.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 13.1

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Aquatics Facilities

	Pool Capacity in Surface Square Feet	Support Facilities in Square Feet
Competition Pool	6,382	
Play Area	7,448	
Therapy/Training Pool	1,685	
Aquatics Center Building		42,392
Facilities Represented in Existing DIF Fund Balance	0	0
Current Pool Size (Surface Square Feet):	15,515	
Current Aquatics Building (Square Feet):		42,392
Current Population (1)	41,109	41,109
Existing Standards:		
Square Feet of Surface /Resident	0.3774	
Square Foot of Locker Building/Person		1.0312
Construction Costs		
Pool Cost per Surface Square Foot	$250.00	
Facilities Construction/Square Foot		$400.00
Existing Standards per Resident	0.3774	1.0312
Adjusted Pool Cost per Resident	$94.35	
Adjusted Facilities Cost per Resident		$412.48

Cost per Land Use Residential Dwelling Unit	Density per Dwelling Unit	Pool Surface	Support Facilities	Total Cost
Total Cost per Added Resident		$94.35	$412.48	$506.84
Detached Dwelling Unit	3.025	$285	$1,248	**$1,533**
Attached Dwelling Unit	2.876	$271	$1,186	**$1,457**
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	2.130	$201	$879	**$1,080**

Chapter 14
Park Land Acquisition and Park Infrastructure Development

This Chapter summarizes the City's existing inventory of parks and identifies the ratio of park land per resident allowable under the Quimby Act (§66477 of the Government Code) [13] for residential developments involving the subdivision of land and the Mitigation Fee Act (§66000 of the Government Code) for the construction of residential developments not involving the subdivision of land. The existing per capita standard is then utilized to calculate the park dedication requirement for future residential development.

EXISTING PARKS AND RECREATION SYSTEM

Intensive parks and park recreational facilities constitute one of the City of Lompoc's greatest challenges both with respect to facilities for both current residents and future citizens. The provision of a well-planned park system, with a variation in the size and nature of facilities offered, is an important amenity to residents of any city, the City of Lompoc included. A mixture of passive and active uses and facilities and programs which appeal to a broad spectrum of potential park users is considered optimal in most urban cities. A city's park system and inventory of open space is often a major factor in selection of a place to live. The current acres dedicated to park use will serve well to meet the City's current needs. However if the number of improved active/passive park acres remains static at 148.50 acres, they will not continue to meet recreational demands in light of a potential near doubling of the City's population.

Future residential development, by increasing the City's population, will impact the City's park system by requiring additional baseball fields and adequate space for various athletic activities. Given the magnitude of growth projected in this and other reports, the challenge facing the City will be to provide new facilities and park land to serve the recreational needs of these new residents. Without additional park land acquisition and continued development of currently owned but underutilized park land during the next twenty to thirty years, the City's parks will become overcrowded and overused, with the ultimate result becoming a negative experience for park users.

Existing Parks. Currently, the City owns approximately 148.50 acres of park land, most of it developed. Beattie, Ken Adam, River (partial) and Riverbend (partial) and Ryon Memorial parks are the City's largest developed parks, representing over 80% of the park system acreage (when only traditional improved parks are considered) and provide the greatest variety of sports and passive uses.

Table 14-1, on the following page, is an inventory of the existing park acreage.

13 Adoption of a Quimby Act Fee requires a park "plan".

Table 14-1
Inventory of Owned and Developed Park Land

Park or Space Name	Owned Park Acres	Developed Park Acres	Open Space Acres
Barkin Park	0.68	0.68	4.72
Beattie Park	15.00	15.00	18.00
Briar Creek Park	3.49	3.49	3.30
Centennial Park	0.32	0.32	0.00
Johns-Manville Park	6.90	6.90	0.00
Ken Adam Park	10.00	10.00	83.96
Old Mission Park	0.62	0.62	0.00
Pioneer Park	4.71	4.71	0.00
Pocket Park	0.15	0.15	0.00
River Park/RV Park	36.47	36.47	168.66
Riverbend Park	40.80	40.80	138.42
Ryon Memorial Park	20.33	20.33	0.00
Skate Park	1.13	1.13	0.00
Thompson Park	4.34	4.34	0.00
Westvale Park	1.96	1.96	0.00
Park Equivalent in Fund Balance	1.60	1.60	0.00
Total Park Acres	**148.50**	**148.50**	**417.06**

City De Facto Park Standard. Table 14-2 following is a comparison of the acreage of parks to the City of Lompoc's current population and indicates that the City presently possesses a total standard of 3.612 acres of owned park land per 1,000 residents, (147.50 acres ÷ [41,109 residents ÷ 1,000], rounded). This is slightly above the benchmark of 3.0 acres per 1,000 persons contained in Section 66477 of the California Government Code relating to dedication of parks.

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

Table 14-2
Calculation of Actual City-owned Improved Park Acres Standard

	Owned Acres	Developed Acres
Total Park Acres	148.61	148.61
Current City Population	41,109	41,109
Population Divided by 1,000	41.06	41.06
Park Acres per 1,000 Population	3.612	3.162

However, the Quimby Act, to be discussed later, allows a minimum standard of 3.0 acres per thousand residents even if the City does not reach that standard. The Quimby minimum of 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents has been exceeded by the 3.162 acres per 1,000 residents and thus the Quimby allowable minimum of 3.0 acres per 1,000 will not be used in the remainder of the Chapter for park *construction*. The 3.612 acres pr 1,000 residents will be the standard used to calculate the park land acquisition and park improvements development impact fee. Though not relevant to the City of Lompoc, the Quimby Act has a cap of 5.0 acres per thousand residents (Government Code §66447 (a) (2).

Planned Park Improvements. In addition to the on-going improvement of the existing 454.62 acres [14], the City will need to acquire 24.14 park acres, per Table 14-3, and develop these new parks to serve the additional 6,682 residents anticipated to live in both the General City and

Table 14-3
Calculation of Required
Park Acres per Allowable Standard

General Plan Anticipated Population Increase	6,682
Additional Population Divided by 1,000	6.682
Allowable Standard in Acres/1,000	3.612
Park Acres required to Maintain Standard	24.14

These general improvements are outlined in the MFP. The 24.14 acres could be constructed in any of the following configurations:

Mini or "Pocket" Parks - This the smallest of the parks designations and though generally not planned due to higher maintenance costs, usually are the result of acquiring an unusual parcel

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

of land sometimes with historical significance. The City's Barkin, Centennial and Old Mission Parks as well as the fittingly named Pocket Park best demonstrate this category.
Local or Neighborhood Parks - These parks are generally five to ten acres and serve local (1/4 mile walk-in distance) users. Not surprisingly, the City has a number of these parks. Thompson Park, Pioneer Park and Johns-Manville Park are good examples of this category.

Community or Sport Parks - These parks are most functional when they are twenty acres or larger and are designed to meet the needs of the entire community. Often, ten to twenty acre parks are forced to act as community or sports parks. These needs include youth and adult sports organizations, clubs or associations and large scale community events such as 4th of July celebrations or festivals. Although on the small side, Johns-Manville, Pioneer and Parks are examples of parks that support sports needs. Ryon Memorial Park best depicts a broad-based use community park.

The park and recreation improvements that could be contained within the almost 24.14 needed acres and the existing standard (Table 14-1) are both consistent with the City's Park and Recreation Element of the General Plan. The City's 3.612 acres per 1,000 population standard speaks well for the City as a three acre per 1,000 population standard is a common minimum, but frequently unmet, target of municipalities and recreation/park special districts throughout Southern California.

CALCULATION OF PARK DEDICATION STANDARD

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

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

The law states that "if the amount of existing neighborhood and community park area ... exceeds the [3 acres of park area per 1,000 person] limit ... the legislative body may adopt the calculated amount as a higher standard not to exceed 5 acres per 1,000 persons" [15]. Park fees may be required by the City provided that the City meets certain conditions including:

15 California Government Code, Title 7, Division 2, Section 66447 (b).

- The amount and location of land to be dedicated or the fees to be paid shall bear a reasonable relationship to the use of the park by the future inhabitants of the subdivision.

- The legislative body has adopted a general plan containing a recreational element, and the park and recreational facilities are in accordance with definite principles and standards contained therein.

- The city ... shall develop a schedule specifying how, when, and where it will use the land or fees, or both, to develop park or recreational facilities ... Any fees collected under the ordinance shall be committed within five years after the payment of such fees.

Determination of a Park Standard. As previously identified, the City currently has 3.612 acres of owned and developed park acres/1,000 residents. The Quimby Act allows the City to adopt a standard of 3.0 acres per thousand as the low-end threshold. However, the 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents standard is the highest standard that can be adopted under the Quimby Act, without actually maintaining a standard higher than 3.0 acres/1,000.

CALCULATION OF IMPACT COSTS

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

Park Land Acquisition Costs. Land costs will vary significantly from one park to another. The park land to be acquired must be suitable for park construction and is conservatively estimated at approximately $690,900 per acre ($653,400/acre for the land purchase and $37,500/acre for rough grading and contiguous area public improvements) which is used in the park DIF calculation. However, the use of this figure could be criticized if a developer can show that the cost of the residential land they are developing is currently valued at less than the $653,400/acre acquisition figure. The fee recommendation at the end of the Chapter will recognize this challenge.

Park Improvements Construction Costs. Park improvement construction costs are based upon a schedule (Appendix C) of common park improvements by size of park and costs from various construction bids received by other clients as the City does not have any more recent full park construction history. Again public use facilities and aquatic centers were not included in the cost calculation (see Chapters 12 and 13).

Average Park Acquisition, Development and Maintenance Vehicles and Facilities Cost per Capita. The combined park land acquisition, park improvements development and support facilities cost is $1,137,058 per acre ($690,900/acre for land acquisition, $446,158 per acre for park improvements. If the City were to charge development for the maximum allowable amount of park acreage as allowed in the Quimby Act and as recommended here, then the City would need to acquire 3.00 acres of new park land for every potential 1,000 new residents to the City. The 3.612 acres of land acquisition and development per 1,000 persons would be $4,107,052 or

about $4,107 per new resident. Schedule 14.1 calculates the cost to develop 3.612 acres, which again represents the required park land cost for 1,000 persons.

Average Cost per Dwelling Unit. Schedule 14.1 further calculates the cost per dwelling unit based on the per person park land acquisition and improvement costs of $4,107 (Schedule 14.1) and the average number of persons per unit for each category of housing. Detached dwelling residential housing has the highest number of persons per dwelling unit (@ 3.025 per unit) and consequently carries the highest impact fee, $12,246 per unit ($4,107 X 3.025 persons per unit, rounded). Attached dwelling units have an average of 2.876 persons per unit and would need to be assessed $11,812 ($4,107 X 2.876, rounded). Table 14-4, following, summarizes the calculated and recommended fees for each of these three residential categories. Schedule 14.1 provides greater park calculation detail and a complete schedule of Park Land Acquisition and Park Improvements DIFs for each of the three dwelling unit types.

Table 14-4
Summary of Park Development Fees for Residential Dwelling Construction

DIF Land-use Type	Development Impact Cost
Detached Dwelling Unit	$12.426/Unit
Attached Dwelling Unit	$11,812/Unit
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	$8,748/Unit

The DIFs for detached dwelling residential development involving the subdivision of land, as identified in Table 14-6, should be adopted under the auspices of the Quimby Act. The Residential dwelling units not requiring the sub-division of a privately-owned parcel will need to be adopted as a Government Code § 66000 supported DIF [16].

Park Acquisition and DIF Calculation Example. Developers have been allowed to donate sites in the past and it is in the City's best interests to continue this practice. The size of the park needed to serve the proposed residential development is calculated by multiplying the number of single and detached residences to be developed by the average number of people living in the units. The example, demonstrated in Table 14-5, following, calculates the developed park size required for a 200 detached dwelling unit development:

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

16. This is required because the Quimby Act is referenced in the State Subdivision Code

Table 14-5
Example of Park Construction in-lieu of Fee
(rounded)

Park Development Requirement	Park Land	Park Improve-ments	Total Cost
Number of Detached Dwelling Units Approved	250	250	
Average Number of resident per Unit	3.025	3.025	
Total Number of New Residents	952	952	
Basis of Standard	1,000	1,000	
Added Population Divided by 1,000	0.952	0.952	
Acres Required per 1,000 Population	3.612	3.612	
Required Park Acquisition/Improvement Acres	2,730	3.730	
Cost of Park Development per Acre	$690,900	$446,158	$1,137,058
Total Park DIF Contribution	**$1,886,621**	**$1,218,310**	**$3,104,932**

Per the example above, the City and a developer could reach agreement on the park obligation in a number of ways. The following are a few examples. Note that each example requires the total $3,104,932 park obligation (in land/improvements or in-lieu payment) required of the 1,000 detached dwelling unit developments in any combination of land, improvements, or fee payment.

Option 1. The developer could make a $3,104,932 Park Land Acquisition and DIF payment and the City could use it (in combination with other parks fees) to construct the park elsewhere in the City. However, most large scale developers would probably prefer that the park be very near, if not within, the proposed subdivision.

Option 2. The developer could construct and donate a developed park smaller in size, say 1.5 acres and make a payment for the remaining 1.230 acres required of the developer. This option is generally only used when the proposed residential development is in excess of 1,000 residences.

Option 3. The developer could construct a 2.731 acre park and dedicate it to the City. A developed park this size would represent $3,195,326 total acquisition and DIF. This would not likely be an option for the smaller developments resulting in parks less than 2.0 acres in size. A small park of this size generates significant annual maintenance costs so they are not generally desired.

Option 4. The City could combine other DIFs to the developer's 2.731 acre contribution or actual park contribution to create a larger park, assuming the developer agrees to make the larger park parcel available.

Option 5. The developer could donate 4.494 acres of undeveloped land, ($3,104,932 total park fee requirement ÷ by $690,900/acre cost) and then the City could use other DIFs to develop it.

The key to understanding the flexibility of the options above is that each one represents the same amount in terms of a total contribution of DIF payment and/or dedicated park improvement to the City's park system with the result that the same amount has been contributed for each dwelling.

Land Acquisition Cost Adjustment Challenge. As mentioned previously, the use of $690,900 as the park land cost is based upon the assumption that park acreage would likely be close in proximity and thus similar in cost to residential land value of the project the park is intended to serve. However, if the developer or contractor of a dwelling can provide evidence (acceptable to the City) in the form of a recent appraisal of the property they will be developing that the current land value is worth less than the pre-graded $653,400/acre or $15/square foot cost, the DIF could be adjusted downward accordingly by placing the actual cost of land acquisition into the calculation identified in Schedule 14.1. Again, if the City wishes to adopt such an adjustment, the terms under which the challenge may be made and proved should be included in the Impact Fee Ordinance.

OPEN SPACE IMPACT FEE COMPONENT

Open Space Acquisition Standards and Costs. The City currently owns 417.06 acres of protected open space within the City's boundaries. Again, based upon the current population of 41,109, the standard is 10.145 acres per 1,000 population, (417.06 acres ÷ [41,109 ÷ 1,000]) = 10.145 acres per 1,000 residents). Table 14-6 following is summarized from Schedule 14.1.

Table 14-6
Inventory of Existing (Owned) Open Space

Open Space Area	Acres
Barkin Park	4.72
Beattie Park	18.00
Briar Creek Park	3.30
Ken Adam Park	83.96
River Park	168.66
Riverbend Park	138.42
Total Open Space Acres	**417.06**
City Population Divided by 1,000	**41.11**
Acres of Open Space per 1,000 Residents	**10.145**

Open Space Misconception. There is a significant amount of existing open space within the City's limits, some of it is publicly owned and will never be developed. However, a great deal of the "open space" is privately owned and simply has not yet been considered for development by the owners. Some City residents and businesses do not fully understand that owners of private land have development rights. These same residents and businesses expect that some or all of the currently privately owned open space will continue to exist as open space in perpetuity. This will not necessarily be the case unless the City maintains the active role that it has to date in acquiring some of the more critical open space parcels. The calculation recognizes that open space, often at a steep grade or slope presupposing development, will be available at far less a cost per acre than park land. The City certainly understands this concept and commitment better than most other cities given the City's open space inventory of 417.06 acres.

This Report uses a very nominal $1.50 per square foot for open space acquisition, which will be defined as the proper compensation for odd lots with little value other than as open space that are dedicated to the City. This assumes the City makes a determination that the parcel in question enhances the City's inventory of open space and is not merely an unusable lot that would be little more than a maintenance cost and liability on the owner of the private land. At $65,340 per acre and the 10.145 acres of open space per 1,000 residents standard, the cost of maintaining the currently met open space standard is 662.87 per new resident, (10.145 acres X $65,430/acre = $662,874 ÷ 1,000 = $662.87. Table 14-7, following, indicates the fee per type of residential dwelling.

Table 14-7
Summary of Open Space Development Impact Fees for Residential Dwelling Construction

Residential Land Use	Residents per Dwelling	Cost per Resident	Open Space Cost per Residential Dwelling
Detached Dwelling Units	3.025	$662.87	$2,005
Attached Dwelling Units	2.876	$662.87	$1,906
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	2.130	$662.87	$1,412

Table 14-8 following indicate the total residential dwelling cost necessary to maintain the City's actual park and open space standards.

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

Table 14-8
Summary of Open Space Development Impact Fees for Residential Dwelling Construction

Residential Land Use	Residential Park Impact Fee	Residential Open Space Fee	Total Residential Park and Open Space Impact Fee
Detached Dwelling Units	$12,424	$2,005	$14,429
Attached Dwelling Units	$11,812	$1,906	$13,718
Mobile Home Dwelling Units	$8,748	$1,412	$10,160

Business Use Open Space Impact Fees. The development of privately held parcels as business uses do not clearly generate demand for developed park facilities. Residents need park facilities, not businesses. However, the development of any currently vacant property or parcel reduces the amount of open space in the community, protected or otherwise. Thus the development of any parcel as a business use (retail/office or industrial) should have an open space impact fee imposed. Table 14-9, following, indicates the standard for open space per developed acre in the City.

Table 14-9
Establishment of Business Use Open Space Standard

Park Acres Owned (per Schedule 14.1)	417.06
Open Space (per Schedule 14.1)	148.50
Total Park and Open Space Acres	565.06
Total Privately-held Developed Acres (per Schedule 2.0)	6,305.4
Acres of Protected Space per Privately-held Developed Acre	0.0661
Cost of Open Space Land Acquisition per Acre	65,340
Cost of Open Space Land Acquisition per Acre to be Developed	$4,319

Any parcel developed as a business use should contribute approximately $4,319 per gross private acre of private development towards the acquisition and thus protection of open space. The Open Space DIF receipts would be used to acquire open space in the City in order to maintain that standard. Table 14-10, following, indicates the fee per type of business land-use.

Table 14-9
Open Space per Business use

Business Land Use	Impact Cost per Business Acre	Average Units/Acre	Impact Cost per Unit
Commercial Lodging Units per Acre	$4,319	25.02	$173/Unit
S.F. Pad per Retail/Service/Office Acre	$4,319	39,204	$0.110/SF
S.F. Pad per Self Storage Facility Acre	$4,319	32,670	$0.132/SF
S.F. Pad per Business Park Acre	$4,319	32,670	$0.132/SF
S.F. Pad per Industrial Acre	$4,319	21,780	$0.198/SF
S.F. Pad per Institutional Acre	$4,319	28,314	$0.153/SF

RECAP OF RECOMMENDED PARK LAND ACQUISITION AND PARK INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

- **Residential Housing** - Adopt Schedule 11.1 for Park Land and Park Improvements for the three basic residential land-uses.
- **Residential Housing** – Adopt Schedule 11.1 for Open Space Acquisition for the three basic residential land-uses.
- **Business Uses** – Adopt Schedule 11.2 for Open Space Acquisition for the six basic business land-uses.
- Consideration creation of a DIF Fund titled "Quality of Life Infrastructure" and deposit all revenues from the Library, Public Use Facilities, Aquatics, Park Land Acquisition and Park Improvements and Open Space Land Acquisition impact fees into this Development Impact Fee Fund.

END OF CHAPTER TEXT

Schedule 14.1

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Park Land Acquisition
(both Quimby and Mitigation Fee Act Calculations)

Park Name	Park Owned Acres	Developed/ Constructed Acres	Open Space Acres
Barkin Park	0.68	0.68	4.72
Beattie Park	15.00	15.00	18.00
Briar Creek Park	3.49	3.49	3.30
Centennial Park	0.32	0.32	0.00
Johns-Manville Park	6.90	6.90	0.00
Ken Adam Park	10.00	10.00	83.96
Old Mission Park	0.62	0.62	0.00
Pioneer Park	4.71	4.71	0.00
Pocket Park	0.15	0.15	0.00
River Park/RV Park	36.47	36.47	168.66
Riverbend Park	40.80	40.80	138.42
Ryon Memorial Park	20.33	20.33	0.00
Skate Park	1.13	1.13	0.00
Thompson Park	4.34	4.34	0.00
Westvale Park	1.96	1.96	0.00
Park Equivalent in Fund Balance	1.60	1.60	0.00
Total Acres (Owned/Developed)	148.50	148.50	417.06
Current Population	41,109	41,109	41,109
Population/1,000	41.11	41.11	41.11
Current Standard	3.612	3.612	10.145
Minimum Acres/1,000 Population Standard	3.612	3.612	10.145
Construction Cost per Acre		$446,158	$65,340
Land Acquisition Cost per Acre	$653,400		
Grading/Contiguous Infrastructure	$37,500		
City Yard Improvements per Acre (1)			
Additional Maintenance Fleet per Acre (2)			
Total Cost per Acre	$690,900	$446,158	$65,340
Cost X 3.0 Acre/1,000 Residents Standard	$2,495,531	$1,611,521	$662,874
Population Served by Standard	1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00
Acquisition/Construction Cost per Resident	$2,495.53	$1,611.52	$662.87

	Occupants/ Dwelling	Land Acquisition	Park Construction	Open Space Acquisition	Total Park Costs
Cost per Additional Resident		$2,495.53	$1,611.52	$662.87	$4,769.92
Detached Dwelling Unit	3.025	$7,549	$4,875	$2,005	$14,429
Attached Dwelling Unit	2.876	$7,177	$4,635	$1,906	$13,718
Mobile Home Dwelling Unit	2.13	$5,315	$3,433	$1,412	$10,160

Schedule 14.2

City of Lompoc
2019-20 Development Impact Cost Calculation
Open Space Land Acquisition (286)

Open Space Area	Open Space Acres
Barkin Park	4.72
Beattie Park	18.00
Briar Creek Park	3.30
Ken Adam	83.96
River Park/RV Park	168.66
Riverbend Park	138.42
Total Open Space Acres	417.06

Business Use Open Space

Total Acres of Open Space (See above)		417.06
Total Acres of Park Land (per Schedule 14.1)		148.50
Total City-wide Preserved Open Space/Park Acres		565.56
Total Privately-held Developed Acres (Schedule 2.0)		6,305.40
Acres of Open Space per Privately-held Developed Acre		0.0661
Cost of an Acre of Open Space at $1.00 per Square Foot		$65,340
Cost of Open Space per Developed Acre		$4,319
Commercial Lodging Units	25.02	$173
Retail/Service/Office Uses (SF)	39,204	$0.110
Self Storage Facilities Uses (SF)	32,670	$0.132
Business Park Uses (SF)	32,670	$0.132
Industrial Uses (SF)	21,780	$0.198
Institutional Use (SF)	28,314	$0.153