

Interim Traffic and Park Impact Fee Study

City of West Sacramento

February 2010

Prepared by:

**City of West Sacramento Finance Department in collaboration with Public Works and
the Development Services Division of Community Development**

and

Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.

I. Purpose of Report

At the request of the West Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, the City agreed to examine its park and traffic nexus studies to identify if there were ways to reduce the impact fees from their current levels. The Chamber's request is based on a goal of achieving increased economic activity by lowering infrastructure costs for the West Sacramento development community in a severe real estate and economic downturn.

The City and the Chamber have been reviewing the impact fee programs since 2007 and the City has made modifications to the water connection fee, among other changes, at the request of the Chamber. In an effort to continue this collaborative process, the City agreed to conduct an Interim Impact Traffic and Parks Fee Study for the Council's consideration. The purpose of this study is to identify those traffic and park facilities that the City funded differently i.e. with less fee revenue than was originally projected when the nexus studies were prepared during the 2004 to 2006 time period.

The result of this analysis is the calculation of a set of Interim Impact Fees for traffic and parks. These Interim Fees will be considered by the City Council and if approved will be in effect for an interim period of time. The interim period of time is defined as the time the City deems it's appropriate to review the fees again. At a minimum, the city plans to review these fees 2.5 years from the date of adoption, if approved by Council. Alternatively, the City reserves the right to adjust the fees based on a complete update to the associated master plans.

II. Organization of Report

- This Interim Traffic and Parks Impact Fee Study (the Interim Fee Study) outlines the report's purpose, the key findings of the study, summarizes the methodology, describes the assumptions related to costs for each facility, and identifies the implementation goals associated with the Study.
- Appendix A is the memo and set of tables prepared by Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. (EPS) calculating the Interim Impact Fees for traffic and parks.
- Appendix B is the detailed cost tables showing the changes to each individual traffic and park facility. Due to the size of these tables, if they are not provided with this report, you can find them on file in the City's Finance Department.

III. Key Findings

The following summarizes the percent reduction to the traffic and parks fees as a result of this study.

- Traffic - Reduced by 22%
- Parks (Residential) - Reduced by 15%. This category is paid only by residential development.
- Parks (Community) - Reduced by 20%. This category is paid by both residential and non-residential development.

IV. Summary of Methodology

Staff and the consultant identified traffic and parks facilities that were funded differently, or are planned to be funded differently, than originally anticipated when the nexus studies were prepared. The revised amount of traffic and parks costs attributed to the fee program was compared to the amount of traffic and parks fee costs attributed to the fee programs in the original nexus studies. This comparison resulted in a ratio which was applied to the parks and traffic fees to recalculate those fees on an interim basis. The recommended fees as part of this study are less than the fully justifiable fees calculated as part of the previous traffic and park nexus studies.

The EPS memo in Appendix A provides a more detailed description of the methodology used in the Interim Fee Study.

V. Summary of Cost Assumptions - Traffic

1. Harbor Boulevard Interchange. The current traffic impact fee (TIF) nexus study assumed \$26.5 million in funds from the TIF, out of a total project cost of \$41.6 million. This interchange is currently under construction by Caltrans. Due to the award of State grants, the funding for project consists of \$32.8 million in state grants, \$2.5 million in RDA funding, and \$4.6 million in TIF. The Interim Fee Study assumes \$4.6 million in TIF funding for Harbor Boulevard Interchange.
2. SR 275 At-Grade Conversion (East and West Phase of the Tower Bridge Gateway, Garden 3rd, and 5th intersection project). The current TIF combines the east and west phase of the TBG projects into one line item. This makes it difficult to compare the current financing plan to the financing plan assumed when the TIF was adopted. As a result, some assumptions are required.
 - West Phase Assumptions – Staff utilized the City financial reporting system to identify the amount of the SACOG grant and the redevelopment share of the project. The residual amount was allocated to the TIF.
 - East Phase Assumptions – Currently the plan for the east phase of the TBG (3rd and 5th Street intersections) is being refined by staff pending the outcome of certain grant applications and the ultimate engineering of the projects. However, for purposes of the Interim Fee Study, it is assumed that this project will be funded by grants from Proposition 1C, SACOG, and/or tax increment from the redevelopment agency. The Interim Fee Study does not assign any costs to the fee program for this facility.

Should grants ultimately not materialize or should repayment for the Proposition 1C grant be required, the City reserves the right to include all or a portion of this facility in the TIF at a later date.

3. 5th Street (West Cap to 15th Street). The current TIF included costs for this facility in the fee program. However, costs for this facility will be primarily funded through the financing plan for the Bridge District, including revenue from CFD 27, tax increment, and/or grant funds. The Interim Fee Study assigns only a portion of the costs for this

facility to the fee program based on an estimate of the linear feet of the roadway south of Highway 50.

4. South River Road (Tower Bridge Gateway to 15th Street). The current TIF included costs for this facility in the fee program. However, costs for this facility will be primarily funded through the financing plan for the Bridge District, including revenue from CFD 27, tax increment, and/or grant funds. The Interim Fee Study assigns only a portion of the costs for this facility to the fee program based on an estimate of the linear feet of the roadway south of Highway 50.
5. Freeway Interchanges. Certain freeway interchanges assumed little to no grant funds from the state or federal government in the current TIF and the improvements to the interchanges were assumed for construction during the timeframe of the fee program. In thinking through the funding sources and the timing of these facilities, this report recommends the following adjustments to the certain interchanges for purposes of the Interim Fee Study.
 - a. **US 50 /Jefferson Boulevard Interchange**. This project can be done in phases. In particular, approximately \$10 million (out of \$25 million in the current TIF) can be done as a later phase of the project. The Interim Fee Study assigns \$15 million in costs to the fee program.
 - b. **US 50 / South River Road Interchange**. The current TIF includes \$10.6 million (the total project cost) in the fee program for this improvement. This improvement was originally envisioned to “straighten” out the ramp so that trucks can utilize it more effectively. However, the truck routing goals call for this interchange to be avoided by trucks and proceeding with this improvement in its current configuration may be counterproductive. Instead, the Interim Fee Study assumes that 15% of the costs remain in the fee program in order to continue the design of the project. The appropriate construction costs based on the correct design for the improvement may be added back in at later date when the master plan for roadways is revised.

VI. Summary of Cost Assumptions – Parks

1. Central Park Land Acquisition. The current PIF assumed \$21 million in land acquisition costs for the Central Park. To date, the redevelopment agency expended \$3.5 million for the purchase of this land from the Port. The Interim Fee Study assumes \$3.5 million for the purchase of the Central Park land as repayment to the redevelopment agency.
2. Lake Washington Open Space. The current PIF does not include costs for the purchase of land for Lake Washington open space from the Port. The Interim Fee Study assumes \$1.5 million for the purchase of Lake Washington open space as a substitution for a portion of the costs identified for the acquisition of the Central Park land in the current PIF.
3. Senior Center. The current PIF included \$3.9 million for the Senior Center. The Senior Center was replaced with what is now called the Multi-Generational Center and the

current CIP identifies \$3.0 million in PIF funds for this project. The Interim Fee Study assumes \$3.0 million for this facility.

4. Recreation Center and Special Facilities. The current PIF does not include a line item for the construction of the new Recreation Center. Instead, in 2006 the "Special Facility Implementation Plan" was prepared by the Parks Department identifying how the Recreation Center would consolidate many of the special facilities that were planned to be located throughout the City. This strategy was adopted in order to take advantage of the opportunity to develop a "joint use" facility with the Washington Unified School District. The Interim Fee Study includes the cost of \$16.5 million for the Recreation Center. The Recreation Center is included in the Community-All City at build out category because it benefits both existing and new residents and businesses. As a result, the cost is not attributed only to new development.

As a result of adding a line item for the new recreation center, the central park swim/gym, central park community center, and central park high school teen center were all eliminated because they became part of the or the recreation center per the Special Facility Implementation Strategy.

5. E Street to I Street Bridge Formal Promenade. The current PIF included costs for the formal promenade from E Street to the I Street Bridge in the fee program. This project was actually funded by the redevelopment agency and a grant received from the State River Parkways program (Proposition 50). As a result, these costs were removed from the Interim Fee Study.
6. Bridge District Promenade, Waterfront Features, and Piers. The current PIF included costs for the riverfront facilities in the Bridge District. The plan of funding for this project is now anticipated to occur in phases. The first phase of funding from redevelopment tax increment and a grant from the State River Parkways program (Proposition 50) will construct a recreational trail the length of the Bridge District. The second phase will be the construction of the ultimate promenade and will be funded by tax increment from the Bridge District, funds from the CFD 27 (currently being formed), and future grants. The Interim Fee Study does not include any costs from this facility.
7. Street Extensions to the Riverfront (E Street to the Riverfront and F Street to the Riverfront). The current PIF included costs for these facilities. However, these street extensions were funded through the Prop 50 grant, redevelopment, and the CalStrs project.
8. Riverfront Park Costs to Date. The costs in for the riverfront promenade from E Street to the Tower Bridge were funded by the redevelopment agency. The Interim Fee Study does not include costs to reimburse the agency for these costs.

VII. Implementation of the Interim Fee Study

1. Interim Fees Only. The fees proposed in this study are for an interim time period only. The city has the right to adjust the fees in the future at its discretion. In terms of a plan for future updates, this Interim Fee Study may be revisited in 2.5 years or when the City revises its traffic and parks master plan, whichever comes first.
2. Does Not Apply Retroactively. This report does not recommend applying any changes to the traffic and parks fee programs retroactively and no reimbursements will be provided. The current fee programs were prepared in accordance with AB 1600 and reflect a nexus between the impact of new development and the amount of the fee. The full traffic and parks fees are the amount justified by previous nexus studies. The Interim Fees reflect a fee amount less than the fully justifiable amount.
3. Interim Impact Fees Applicable to Vested Projects in Certain Circumstances. When a developer vests in a certain fee structure either through a vested tentative map or a development agreement, that project is protected from an increase in fees. Similarly, the developer typically is not allowed to take advantage of any fee reductions by vesting in a previous fee structure. This report recommends that vested projects receive the benefit of the reduced interim fees under the following conditions. This Interim Fee Study recommends that the City Manager be delegated the authority to determine whether a project meets the criteria listed below.
 1. The project meets the City's economic development goals as defined by the City's economic development strategy.
 2. The project will yield substantial property tax and/or sales tax revenue to assist in improving the City's financial position.
4. Community Facilities District (CFD) 27. Certain assumptions in the Interim Fee Study assume the successful formation of the CFD 27 in the Bridge District. If this CFD is not formed, the City reserves the right to adjust the Interim Fee Study appropriately.
5. Repayment of Proposition 1C. With regards to the Tower Bridge Gateway East project, Proposition 1C grant funds are currently assumed to fund this project. If the Proposition 1C grant has to be repaid due to nonperformance, then the City reserves the right to adjust the traffic fee in order to collect revenue from impact fees for the repayment of the grant. The repayment amount would be calculated proportional to new development's fair share of the improvement cost.
6. Levee Trail System. The City is undergoing a substantial levee improvement program. The City also has a goal of building multipurpose flood protection improvements that allow for recreational amenities for residents and businesses. Should PIF funds be needed to assist in the recreational trails associated with flood protection, this Interim Fee Study provides the administrative authority for the City Manager to make substitutions of certain PIF facilities for trails related to levee improvements. This administrative authority will give the City the opportunity to immediately respond to grant opportunities and provide matching funds for recreational trails related to flood control should these opportunities arise.

7. Specialty Park Fee Calculation for Industrial Uses. The current park impact fee for industrial land uses is based on a general industrial land use category that assumes 750 square feet per employee. The basis of the park fee is that the employees in the industrial business use the parks and should pay their fair share of the construction of park facilities. However, many industrial land uses have lower employment densities and the Chamber representatives requested a mechanism to adjust the parks fee appropriately. Attachment A of this study provides a table that identifies the parks fee for various industrial land use categories. An applicant who is developing a project that varies in its employment density from the general industrial category can request that staff conduct a specialty fee calculation utilizing the tables in the Interim Fee Study as the basis for the calculation.

8. Changes in the Indexing of the Traffic Fee. When the traffic impact fee was last updated in 2005, the City switched from the Engineering News Record (ENR) Twenty Cities Index to the American Road and Builders Transportation Association (ARTBA) index as the mechanism to calculate the annual inflationary adjustments. The thinking was that ARTBA more accurately reflected the cost of construction for roadways. However, the City has found the ARTBA index to be volatile, while the ENR index provides predictability. As a result, staff is recommending that the traffic fees be indexed using the ENR Twenty Cities index from now on.

Appendix A

Interim Traffic and Parks Fee Calculation

Prepared by

Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.

MEMORANDUM

To: Shanna Zuspan, City of West Sacramento
From: Jamie Gomes and Richard Davis
Subject: City of West Sacramento Interim Traffic and Park Impact Fee Study; EPS #19573
Date: February 11, 2010

This memorandum summarizes the methodology used to calculate the City of West Sacramento (City) Interim Traffic and Park fees. This work was completed at the request of the City.

The City has in place a set of traffic and park development impact fees that reflect facility Master Plans and a Capital Improvement Program (Capital Program) that were refined between 2002 and 2005 for various City infrastructure items. Since that time, reductions to the Capital Program have taken place, facilities have been funded by alternative funding sources and the pace of development has slowed. The City requested that traffic and park facilities impact fees be analyzed to account for several such facilities that have been funded through funding sources other than development impact fees.

Proposed Interim Traffic and Park Fees

The following sections summarize the proposed interim traffic and park fees. A description of the methodology to calculate interim fees is presented at the end of this memorandum.

Interim Traffic Impact Fees

Tables 1 through 3 show the proposed traffic impact fees (TIF) for TIF Districts 1 through 6. The interim TIF by land use type in each TIF District reflects a 22-percent reduction from 2010 TIF levels. As further described in the methodology section of this memorandum, the proposed 22-percent fee reduction applies to all land uses in all TIF Districts uniformly.

The Economics of Land Use



*Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.
2150 River Plaza Drive, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95833-3883
916-649-8010 tel
916-649-2070 fax*

*Berkeley
Sacramento
Denver*

www.epsys.com

P:\19000\19573 West Sac Traffic and Park Fees\Corresp\19573 M1 itrmmfes.doc

Interim Park Fees

Table 4 shows the proposed interim park impact fees (PIF) for each land use subject to the fee. The interim PIF for park improvements in the “residential facilities” category reflects a 15-percent decrease in the fee. The interim PIF for park improvements in the “community facilities” category reflects a 20-percent decrease in the fee. The methodology used to determine the interim PIF adjustment factors is described at the end of this memorandum.

Industrial Land Uses

In addition to the general industrial category included in the City’s current PIF structure, this analysis also considered alternative industrial land uses that may occur in the City. The City may consider permitting industrial land uses that would be subject to the PIF to request that their project attributes be reviewed and considered for an alternative PIF calculation. **Table 5** shows the general industrial fee, which is repeated from **Table 4**, along with other interim PIF that the City may consider applying to alternative industrial land uses.

The difference between alternative PIF for various industrial land uses is shown in **Table 6**. The general industrial land use category assumes one employee for every 750 building square feet. This assumption is from the City’s original PIF study completed by Angus McDonald & Associates in 1993. The park allocation factor for alternative industrial land uses can be computed from the general industrial category using a dwelling unit equivalent (DUE) factor methodology. Using this method, the standard of 1.0 applies to the general industrial category, and all other industrial land use categories are compared against the general industrial use. For example, the warehousing—high employment assumes 1,500 building square fee per employee. Consequently, the DUE factor for this category is 0.5 and the corresponding PIF would be 0.5 times the general industrial rate.

The alternative industrial land use categories and assumed building square feet per employee by land use type were derived from EPS and the Urban Land Institute Business Park and Industrial Development Handbook.

Interim Traffic and Park Fee Update Methodology

The interim traffic and park fee update was based on the following assumptions:

- Master Plans for the respective facilities would not be updated.
- Development projections would not require updating.
- The City traffic model would not be rerun.
- Traffic and parks Capital Program adjustments would be compared to original costs.
- For programs with fee zones, fee adjustments would be applied on a programwide (e.g., citywide) basis.

The interim Traffic and Park fee updates were computed using the following steps:

1. Identify updated Capital Program requirements.
2. Compare revised Capital Program with prior Capital Program.
3. Calculate percentage adjustment required from Step 2 (e.g., 2010 Adjusted Capital Program/2005 Capital Program - 1 = % change).
4. Apply percentage adjustment from Step 3 to 2010 fees.

The City provided EPS with the revised Capital Programs for traffic and park facilities. The detailed back up for the Capital Program adjustments are included as Appendix B of the City's report. For each facility, EPS compared the revised fee program funding requirement with the prior assumptions and adjusted the fees accordingly. Below is a brief summary of the updated Capital Programs.

Revised Capital Programs

TIF Capital Program

Table 7 shows the 2005 and 2010 TIF-funded projects from the citywide TIF. The revised TIF-funded amount of \$193.9 million is 22 percent lower than the prior \$248.7 million estimate.

Table 8 compares the entire roadway Capital Program and assumed funding sources from the prior TIF update with the present City assumptions. For convenience, the items where costs or funding sources have been updated are highlighted in yellow. Overall, TIF funding for traffic capital improvements has decreased from 54 percent to 44 percent of the total funding for all improvements.

PIF Capital Program

Table 9 compares the 2005 PIF update Capital Program with the 2010 Adjusted PIF. Based on a combination of adjustments, the residential improvements total decreased from \$58.3 million to \$49.2 million, representing a 15-percent decrease. As described earlier, this decrease was applied to the "residential improvements" category of the PIF to calculate the interim PIF.

The 2010 community improvements total of \$134.1 million is approximately 20 percent less than the 2005 community improvements estimates. Consequently, the community improvements category of the PIF was reduced by 20 percent. The residential and community improvements components of the PIF were adjusted based on their respective cost change because the benefiting land uses (e.g., land uses subject to the fee) differ between the two components. Nonresidential development is only subject to the community improvements component of the PIF.

Table 1
City of West Sacramento
Proposed Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) Update
Proposed Change in TIF - District 1

District 1

	Units [1]	DUE Factor [1]	Current Fee per Unit [2]	Proposed Fee per Unit [3]	Net Change in Fee per Unit
<i>Adjustment = (-22%)</i>					
Industrial					
Light Industry	1,000 s.f.	0.911	\$13,211	\$10,305	(\$2,907)
Heavy Industry	1,000 s.f.	0.177	\$2,562	\$1,998	(\$564)
Warehousing	1,000 s.f.	0.437	\$6,336	\$4,942	(\$1,394)
Residential					
700 s.f. or less	DU	0.196	\$2,844	\$2,219	(\$626)
701 to 1,100 s.f.	DU	0.614	\$8,907	\$6,947	(\$1,960)
1,101 to 2,500 s.f.	DU	0.772	\$11,206	\$8,741	(\$2,465)
Greater than 2,500 s.f.	DU	1.000	\$14,510	\$11,318	(\$3,192)
Lodging					
Hotel/Motel	Room	0.531	\$7,703	\$6,008	(\$1,695)
Recreational					
Movie theater	1,000 s.f.	1.471	\$21,346	\$16,650	(\$4,696)
Health Club	1,000 s.f.	0.830	\$12,044	\$9,394	(\$2,650)
Institutional					
Schools/Day Care	Student	0.048	\$692	\$539	(\$152)
Church	1,000 s.f.	0.459	\$6,656	\$5,191	(\$1,464)
Medical					
Hospital	1,000 s.f.	1.151	\$16,708	\$13,033	(\$3,676)
Nursing Home/Continuing Care	1,000 s.f.	0.175	\$2,534	\$1,977	(\$557)
Office					
150,000 s.f. or less	1,000 s.f.	0.870	\$12,622	\$9,845	(\$2,777)
150,001 to 300,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.071	\$15,544	\$12,124	(\$3,420)
Greater than 300,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.189	\$17,256	\$13,460	(\$3,796)
Retail					
100,000 s.f. or less	1,000 s.f.	0.837	\$12,141	\$9,470	(\$2,671)
Greater than 100,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.253	\$18,181	\$14,181	(\$4,000)
Heavy Commercial	1,000 s.f.	0.544	\$7,895	\$6,158	(\$1,737)
Furniture Store	1,000 s.f.	0.256	\$3,711	\$2,895	(\$817)
Restaurant	1,000 s.f.	0.890	\$12,912	\$10,072	(\$2,841)
Restaurant w/ Drive Thru	1,000 s.f.	3.601	\$52,253	\$40,757	(\$11,496)

"net_change_d1"

Source: City of West Sacramento.

[1] From 2005 Traffic Impact Fee Study prepared for the City of West Sacramento by DKS Associates.

[2] Effective January 1, 2010. Current fees are based on 2005 Traffic Impact Fee Study escalated to January 1, 2010. Fees do not include TIF for Interim Improvements to Harbor/US50 Interchange.

[3] Based on 22% adjustment to TIF funded project costs. See Table 7 for additional details.

Table 2
City of West Sacramento
Proposed Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) Update
Proposed Change in TIF - Districts 2, 3, 5 and 6

**Districts 2, 3
5, and 6**

	Units [1]	DUE Factor [1]	Current Fee per Unit [2]	Proposed Fee per Unit [3]	Net Change in Fee per Unit
<i>Adjustment = (-22%)</i>					
Industrial					
Light Industry	1,000 s.f.	0.911	\$9,812	\$7,653	(\$2,159)
Heavy Industry	1,000 s.f.	0.177	\$1,902	\$1,483	(\$418)
Warehousing	1,000 s.f.	0.437	\$4,706	\$3,671	(\$1,035)
Residential					
700 s.f. or less	DU	0.196	\$2,113	\$1,648	(\$465)
701 to 1,100 s.f.	DU	0.614	\$6,615	\$5,160	(\$1,455)
1,101 to 2,500 s.f.	DU	0.772	\$8,323	\$6,492	(\$1,831)
Greater than 2,500 s.f.	DU	1.000	\$10,776	\$8,405	(\$2,371)
Lodging					
Hotel/Motel	Room	0.531	\$5,720	\$4,462	(\$1,259)
Recreational					
Movie theater	1,000 s.f.	1.471	\$15,853	\$12,365	(\$3,488)
Health Club	1,000 s.f.	0.830	\$8,945	\$6,977	(\$1,968)
Institutional					
Schools/Day Care	Student	0.048	\$514	\$401	(\$113)
Church	1,000 s.f.	0.459	\$4,943	\$3,856	(\$1,087)
Medical					
Hospital	1,000 s.f.	1.151	\$12,409	\$9,679	(\$2,730)
Nursing Home/Continuing Care	1,000 s.f.	0.175	\$1,882	\$1,468	(\$414)
Office					
150,000 s.f. or less	1,000 s.f.	0.870	\$9,374	\$7,312	(\$2,062)
150,001 to 300,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.071	\$11,543	\$9,004	(\$2,539)
Greater than 300,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.189	\$12,815	\$9,996	(\$2,819)
Retail					
100,000 s.f. or less	1,000 s.f.	0.837	\$9,017	\$7,033	(\$1,984)
Greater than 100,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.253	\$13,503	\$10,532	(\$2,971)
Heavy Commercial	1,000 s.f.	0.544	\$5,864	\$4,574	(\$1,290)
Furniture Store	1,000 s.f.	0.256	\$2,756	\$2,150	(\$606)
Restaurant	1,000 s.f.	0.890	\$9,590	\$7,480	(\$2,110)
Restaurant w/ Drive Thru	1,000 s.f.	3.601	\$38,808	\$30,270	(\$8,538)

"net_change_d2_d3_d5_d6"

Source: City of West Sacramento.

[1] From 2005 Traffic Impact Fee Study prepared for the City of West Sacramento by DKS Associates.

[2] Effective January 1, 2010. Current fees are based on 2005 Traffic Impact Fee Study escalated to January 1, 2010. Fees do not include TIF for Interim Improvements to Harbor/US50 Interchange.

[3] Based on 22% adjustment to TIF funded project costs. See Table 7 for additional details.

Table 3
City of West Sacramento
Proposed Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) Update
Proposed Change in TIF - District 4

District 4

	Units [1]	DUE Factor [1]	Current Fee per Unit [2]	Proposed Fee per Unit [3]	Net Change in Fee per Unit
<i>Adjustment = (-22%)</i>					
Industrial					
Light Industry	1,000 s.f.	0.911	\$5,703	\$4,448	(\$1,255)
Heavy Industry	1,000 s.f.	0.177	\$1,105	\$862	(\$243)
Warehousing	1,000 s.f.	0.437	\$2,735	\$2,133	(\$602)
Residential					
700 s.f. or less	DU	0.196	\$1,228	\$958	(\$270)
701 to 1,100 s.f.	DU	0.614	\$3,845	\$2,999	(\$846)
1,101 to 2,500 s.f.	DU	0.772	\$4,837	\$3,773	(\$1,064)
Greater than 2,500 s.f.	DU	1.000	\$6,263	\$4,885	(\$1,378)
Lodging					
Hotel/Motel	Room	0.531	\$3,325	\$2,594	(\$732)
Recreational					
Movie theater	1,000 s.f.	1.471	\$9,214	\$7,187	(\$2,027)
Health Club	1,000 s.f.	0.830	\$5,199	\$4,055	(\$1,144)
Institutional					
Schools/Day Care	Student	0.048	\$299	\$233	(\$66)
Church	1,000 s.f.	0.459	\$2,873	\$2,241	(\$632)
Medical					
Hospital	1,000 s.f.	1.151	\$7,212	\$5,625	(\$1,587)
Nursing Home/Continuing Care	1,000 s.f.	0.175	\$1,094	\$853	(\$241)
Office					
150,000 s.f. or less	1,000 s.f.	0.870	\$5,448	\$4,249	(\$1,199)
150,001 to 300,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.071	\$6,709	\$5,233	(\$1,476)
Greater than 300,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.189	\$7,448	\$5,810	(\$1,639)
Retail					
100,000 s.f. or less	1,000 s.f.	0.837	\$5,241	\$4,088	(\$1,153)
Greater than 100,000 s.f.	1,000 s.f.	1.253	\$7,848	\$6,122	(\$1,727)
Heavy Commercial	1,000 s.f.	0.544	\$3,409	\$2,659	(\$750)
Furniture Store	1,000 s.f.	0.256	\$1,601	\$1,249	(\$352)
Restaurant	1,000 s.f.	0.890	\$5,574	\$4,348	(\$1,226)
Restaurant w/ Drive Thru	1,000 s.f.	3.601	\$22,555	\$17,593	(\$4,962)

"net_change_d4"

Source: City of West Sacramento.

[1] From 2005 Traffic Impact Fee Study prepared for the City of West Sacramento by DKS Associates.

[2] Effective January 1, 2010. Current fees are based on 2005 Traffic Impact Fee Study escalated to January 1, 2010. Fees do not include TIF for Interim Improvements to Harbor/US50 Interchange.

[3] Based on 22% adjustment to TIF funded project costs. See Table 7 for additional details.

Table 4
City of West Sacramento
Proposed Park Impact Fee (PIF) Update
Change in PIF by Land Use Category

Land Use Categories	Current Fee per Unit [1]	Proposed Fee per Unit [2]	Net Change in Fee per Unit
Residential Facilities			
		<i>Adjustment = (-15%)</i>	
<i>Single Family Fee (Per Dwelling Unit)</i>			
Land Acquisition	\$1,065	\$905	(\$160)
Facilities	\$3,205	\$2,724	(\$481)
Total	\$4,270	\$3,630	(\$640)
<i>Multi Family Fee (Per Dwelling Unit)</i>			
Land Acquisition	\$874	\$743	(\$131)
Facilities	\$2,628	\$2,234	(\$394)
Total	\$3,502	\$2,977	(\$525)
Community Facilities			
		<i>Adjustment = (-20%)</i>	
<i>Single Family Fee (Per Dwelling Unit)</i>			
Land Acquisition	\$3,230	\$2,584	(\$646)
Facilities	\$5,235	\$4,188	(\$1,047)
Total	\$8,465	\$6,772	(\$1,693)
<i>Multi Family Fee (Per Dwelling Unit)</i>			
Land Acquisition	\$2,648	\$2,118	(\$530)
Facilities	\$4,293	\$3,434	(\$859)
Total	\$6,941	\$5,553	(\$1,388)
<i>Commercial Fee (Per Building Square Foot)</i>			
Land Acquisition	\$0.42	\$0.34	(\$0.08)
Facilities	\$0.68	\$0.54	(\$0.14)
Total	\$1.10	\$0.88	(\$0.22)
<i>Office Fee (Per Building Square Foot)</i>			
Land Acquisition	\$0.68	\$0.54	(\$0.14)
Facilities	\$1.10	\$0.88	(\$0.22)
Total	\$1.78	\$1.42	(\$0.36)
<i>General Industrial Fee (Per Building Square Foot)</i>			
Land Acquisition	\$0.29	\$0.23	(\$0.06)
Facilities	\$0.47	\$0.38	(\$0.09)
Total	\$0.76	\$0.61	(\$0.15)

"pif_change_landuse"

Source: City of West Sacramento.

[1] Effective January 1, 2010. Current unit rates are based on Smith Group study entitled *Parks Master Plan* (dated September 2003), escalated to January 1, 2010.

[2] Based on 15% reduction for Residential Improvements and 20% reduction for Community Improvements. See **Table 7** for fee adjustment calculations. Fees are rounded to the nearest penny.

Table 5
City of West Sacramento
Proposed Park Impact Fee (PIF) Update
Potential Change in PIF by Industrial Land Use Category

Industrial Land Use Categories [3]	Current Fee per Unit [1]	Proposed Fee per Unit [2]	Net Change in Fee per Unit
Community Facilities		<i>Adjustment = (-20%)</i>	
<i>General Industrial Fee (Per Building Square Foot)</i>			
Land Acquisition	\$0.29	\$0.23	(\$0.06)
Facilities	\$0.47	\$0.38	(\$0.09)
Total	\$0.76	\$0.61	(\$0.15)
<i>Warehousing - High Employment Fee (Per Building Square Foot)</i>			
Land Acquisition		\$0.12	(\$0.17)
Facilities		\$0.19	(\$0.28)
Total		\$0.31	(\$0.45)
<i>Warehousing - Low Employment Fee (Per Building Square Foot)</i>			
Land Acquisition		\$0.02	(\$0.27)
Facilities		\$0.03	(\$0.44)
Total		\$0.05	(\$0.71)
<i>Manufacturing Fee (Per Building Square Foot)</i>			
Land Acquisition		\$0.35	\$0.06
Facilities		\$0.57	\$0.10
Total		\$0.92	\$0.16
<i>R&D/Flex/Light Manufacturing Fee (Per Building Square Foot)</i>			
Land Acquisition		\$0.23	(\$0.06)
Facilities		\$0.38	(\$0.09)
Total		\$0.61	(\$0.15)
<i>Other - Mini-Storage Fee (Per Building Square Foot)</i>			
Land Acquisition		\$0.02	(\$0.27)
Facilities		\$0.03	(\$0.44)
Total		\$0.05	(\$0.71)

"pif_change_industrial"

Source: City of West Sacramento.

[1] Effective January 1, 2010. Current unit rates are based on Smith Group study entitled *Parks Master Plan* (dated September 2003) for Industrial Land Uses, escalated to January 1, 2010.

[2] Based on 15% reduction for Residential Improvements and 20% reduction for Community Improvements. See **Table 9** for adjustment calculations. Fees are rounded to the nearest penny.

[3] See **Table 6** for Industrial Fee Square Foot per Employee Fee Adjustment Factors.

Table 6
City of West Sacramento
Proposed Park Impact Fee (PIF) Update
Industrial Land Use Dwelling Unit Equivalent (DUE) Factors

Industrial Land Use Categories [1]	Square Feet Per Employee	Park Allocation DUE Factor [2]
General Industrial [2]	750	1.00
Warehousing - High Employment	1,500	0.50
Warehousing - Low Employment	10,000	0.08
Manufacturing	500	1.50
R&D/Flex/Light Manufacturing	750	1.00
Other - Mini-Storage	10,000	0.08

"industrial_adj_factor"

Source: Angus McDonald & Associates, Urban Land Institute Business Park and Industrial Development Handbook and EPS.

- [1] General Industrial Square Feet Per Employee based on 1993 methodology developed by Angus McDonald & Associates for the City of West Sacramento. Square Feet Per Employee for all other industrial land use categories developed by EPS using data from Urban Land Institute Business Park and Industrial Development Handbook.
- [2] DUE Factor is shown as the change in Square Feet Per Employee from General Industrial (i.e. General Industrial = 100%).

Table 7
City of West Sacramento
Proposed Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) Update
TIF Funding for Roadway Capital Improvement Program (2005 \$)

Improvement	Project Cost Funded by TIF		Change	
	2005 TIF Update	2010 Adjusted TIF	Amount	%
Interchanges				
1) I-80/Enterprise Blvd				
a) I-80/Enterprise Blvd	\$2,134,248	\$2,134,248	\$0	0%
b) I-80/Enterprise Blvd Diagonal On-Ramp	\$4,177,000	\$4,177,000	\$0	0%
c) Subtotal I-80 Enterprise Blvd.	\$6,311,248	\$6,311,248	\$0	0%
2) I-80 / Reed Avenue	\$11,114,000	\$11,114,000	\$0	0%
3) US 50 / Harbor Blvd				
a) Interim Harbor	\$2,743,900	\$2,743,900	\$0	0%
b) Ultimate Harbor	\$26,527,600	\$4,640,853	(\$21,886,747)	-83%
c) Subtotal US 50 / Harbor	\$29,271,500	\$7,384,753	(\$21,886,747)	-75%
4) US 50 / Jefferson Blvd	\$25,259,000	\$15,259,000	(\$10,000,000)	-40%
5) US 50 / South River Road	\$10,647,000	\$1,597,050	(\$9,049,950)	-85%
6) SR 275 At-Grade Conversion (East and West Phase)	\$7,379,090	\$724,345	(\$6,654,745)	-90%
Subtotal Interchanges	\$89,981,838	\$42,390,396	(\$47,591,442)	-53%
Bridges				
7) Jefferson Bridge				
8) South River Road Bridge	\$10,911,000	\$10,911,000	\$0	0%
10) Palamidessi Bridge				
a) Initial Construction	\$2,442,408	\$2,442,408	\$0	0%
b) Palamidessi Bridge Widening	\$12,000,000	\$12,000,000	\$0	0%
c) Subtotal Palamidessi Bridge	\$14,442,408	\$14,442,408	\$0	0%
Subtotal Bridges	\$25,353,408	\$25,353,408	\$0	0%
Streets				
10) 5th Street (West Cap. to 15th St.)	\$6,362,000	\$1,693,435	(\$4,668,565)	-73%
11) Sac Ave. (Jefferson Blvd. to I St. Bridge)	\$10,634,000	\$10,634,000	\$0	0%
13) Harbor Blvd. (Industrial Blvd. to W. Cap.)	\$4,679,000	\$4,679,000	\$0	0%
14) Industrial Blvd. (Harbor Blvd. to Palamidessi Bridge)	\$15,690,000	\$15,690,000	\$0	0%
15) Jefferson Blvd. (Park to Marshall incl. Bridge)	\$23,060,365	\$23,060,365	\$0	0%
16) Southport Pkwy (Lake Washington to Barge Canal)	\$20,738,400	\$20,738,400	\$0	0%
17) South River Road (SR 275 to Barge Canal Bridge)	\$6,165,000	\$3,645,990	(\$2,519,010)	-41%
18) Lake Washington Blvd. (Jefferson Blvd. to Village Pkwy)	\$4,398,145	\$4,398,145	\$0	0%
19) West Cap. Ave. (Harbor Blvd. to Enterprise Blvd.)	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%
20) Promenade Way (Oates Dr. to Golden Gate Dr.)	\$2,832,000	\$2,832,000	\$0	0%
21) Sierra Northern RR Acquisition	\$2,360,000	\$2,360,000	\$0	0%
22) Reed Avenue (Harbor to I-80)	\$8,256,461	\$8,256,461	\$0	0%
23) Miscellaneous New Traffic Signals	\$12,000,000	\$12,000,000	\$0	0%
24) Jefferson Blvd. & Lake Washington Pkwy Ops. Impr.	\$3,111,000	\$3,111,000	\$0	0%
25) 3rd St. Intersection Improvements (C St. and TBG)	\$1,257,000	\$1,257,000	\$0	0%
Subtotal Streets	\$121,543,371	\$114,355,796	(\$7,187,575)	-6%
Other				
26) West Side Rail Relocation	\$8,000,000	\$8,000,000	\$0	0%
27) Administrative Costs	\$3,817,191	\$3,817,191	\$0	0%
Subtotal Other	\$11,817,191	\$11,817,191	\$0	0%
GRAND TOTAL	\$248,695,808	\$193,916,791	(\$54,779,017)	-22%

TIF Funding as a Percent of Total Project Funding

54%

44%

"proposed_tif_funding"

Source: City of West Sacramento.

Table 6
City of West Sacramento
Proposed Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) Update
Cost Estimates and Funding Sources for Roadway Capital Improvement Program (2005 \$)

Improvement	2005 TIF Update - Revenue Sources				2010 Adjusted TIF - Revenue Sources										
	2005 TIF Update Estimated Cost (2005 Dollars)	TIF [1]	Pioneer Develop.	Fronting Development	State/ Federal	RDA	City	PROPOSED TIF Estimated Cost (2005 Dollars)	TIF [1]	Pioneer Develop.	Fronting Development	State/ Federal	CFD 77 (Bridge District)	RDA	City
Interchanges															
1) I-80/Enterprise Blvd	\$14,358,069	\$2,134,248	\$0	\$0	\$12,223,821	\$0	\$0	\$14,358,069	\$2,134,248	\$0	\$0	\$12,223,821	\$0	\$0	\$0
a) I-80/Enterprise Blvd	\$4,177,000	\$4,177,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,177,000	\$4,177,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b) I-80/Enterprise Blvd Diagonal On-Ramp	\$18,535,069	\$6,311,248	\$0	\$0	\$12,223,821	\$0	\$0	\$18,535,069	\$6,311,248	\$0	\$0	\$12,223,821	\$0	\$0	\$0
c) Subtotal I-80 Enterprise Blvd	\$11,114,000	\$11,114,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$11,114,000	\$11,114,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2) I-80 / Reed Avenue	\$2,743,900	\$2,743,900	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,743,900	\$2,743,900	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
a) Ultimate Harbor	\$41,631,832	\$26,527,600	\$0	\$0	\$12,070,000	\$2,742,000	\$39,975,853	\$4,640,853	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$32,815,000	\$0	\$2,520,000	\$0
b) Ultimate Harbor	\$44,375,732	\$29,271,500	\$0	\$0	\$12,070,000	\$2,742,000	\$42,716,753	\$7,384,753	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$32,815,000	\$0	\$2,520,000	\$0
c) Subtotal US 50 / Harbor	\$25,259,000	\$25,259,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,259,000	\$25,259,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4) US 50 / Jefferson Blvd	\$10,647,000	\$10,647,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,647,000	\$10,647,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
5) US 50 / South River Road	\$14,535,000	\$7,379,090	\$0	\$0	\$3,000,000	\$4,155,970	\$15,454,345	\$7,24,345	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,970,000	\$0	\$5,760,000	\$0
6) SR 275 At-Grade Conversion (East and West Phase)	\$124,465,861	\$89,981,838	\$0	\$0	\$27,293,821	\$6,897,970	\$104,673,217	\$42,390,396	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$56,008,821	\$0	\$6,280,000	\$0
Subtotal Interchanges															
Bridges															
7) Jefferson Bridge	\$10,911,000	\$10,911,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,911,000	\$10,911,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
8) South River Road Bridge	\$18,401,408	\$2,442,408	\$7,236,000	\$0	\$8,725,000	\$0	\$18,401,408	\$2,442,408	\$7,236,000	\$0	\$8,725,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
10) Palamidesi Bridge	\$12,000,000	\$12,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$12,000,000	\$12,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
a) Initial Construction	\$30,407,408	\$14,442,408	\$7,236,000	\$0	\$8,725,000	\$0	\$30,407,408	\$14,442,408	\$7,236,000	\$0	\$8,725,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
b) Palamidesi Bridge Widening	\$41,372,408	\$25,353,408	\$7,236,000	\$0	\$8,725,000	\$0	\$41,372,408	\$25,353,408	\$7,236,000	\$0	\$8,725,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subtotal Bridges															
Streets															
11) 5th Street (West Cap. to 15th St.)	\$12,983,000	\$5,362,000	\$0	\$5,621,000	\$0	\$0	\$12,983,000	\$5,362,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$11,289,565	\$0	\$0	\$0
11) Sac Ave. (Jefferson Blvd. to St. Bridge)	\$10,634,000	\$10,634,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,634,000	\$10,634,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
13) Harbor Blvd. (Industrial Blvd. to VV. Crpt.)	\$4,979,000	\$4,979,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,979,000	\$4,979,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
14) Industrial Blvd. (Harbor Blvd. to Palamidesi Bridge)	\$15,650,000	\$15,650,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,650,000	\$15,650,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
15) Jefferson Blvd. (Park to Marshall Ind. Bridge)	\$10,347,535	\$25,060,365	\$0	\$0	\$19,380,000	\$0	\$10,347,535	\$25,060,365	\$0	\$0	\$19,380,000	\$0	\$0	\$4,907,170	\$0
16) Jefferson Blvd. (Park to Marshall Ind. Bridge)	\$10,055,000	\$25,738,400	\$7,613,549	\$71,653,260	\$0	\$0	\$10,055,000	\$25,738,400	\$7,613,549	\$71,653,260	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
17) Southport Pkwy (Lake Washington to Bridge Canal)	\$12,037,000	\$4,165,000	\$0	\$5,872,000	\$0	\$0	\$12,037,000	\$4,165,000	\$0	\$5,872,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
17) South River Road (SR 275 to Bridge Canal Bridge) (Pkw)	\$23,381,145	\$4,396,145	\$0	\$18,983,000	\$0	\$0	\$23,381,145	\$4,396,145	\$0	\$18,983,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
18) West Cap. Ave. (Harbor Blvd. to Enterprise Blvd.)	\$7,927,000	\$2,832,000	\$1,442,000	\$3,653,000	\$0	\$0	\$7,927,000	\$2,832,000	\$1,442,000	\$3,653,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
20) Promenade Way (West Cap. to Golden Gate Dr.)	\$2,360,000	\$2,360,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,360,000	\$2,360,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
21) Sierra Normandie Acquisition	\$8,256,461	\$8,256,461	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,256,461	\$8,256,461	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
22) Sierra Normandie Acquisition	\$12,000,000	\$12,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$12,000,000	\$12,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
23) Mission New Traffic Signals	\$3,111,000	\$3,111,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,111,000	\$3,111,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
24) Jefferson Blvd. & Lake Washington Pkwy Ops. Impr.	\$1,257,000	\$1,257,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,257,000	\$1,257,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
25) 3rd St. Intersection Improvements (C St. and TEG)	\$261,668,350	\$121,543,371	\$9,055,549	\$106,782,260	\$19,380,000	\$0	\$261,668,350	\$114,355,798	\$9,055,549	\$97,057,893	\$19,380,000	\$16,871,942	\$0	\$4,907,170	\$0
Subtotal Streets															
Other															
26) West Side Rail Relocation	\$30,000,000	\$8,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$22,000,000	\$0	\$30,000,000	\$8,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$22,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
27) Administrative Costs	\$3,817,191	\$3,817,191	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,817,191	\$3,817,191	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subtotal Streets															
GRAND TOTAL	\$461,263,810	\$248,695,808	\$16,291,549	\$106,782,260	\$77,396,821	\$6,897,970	\$441,477,165	\$193,916,791	\$16,291,549	\$97,057,893	\$106,111,821	\$16,871,942	\$6,280,000	\$4,907,170	\$0
<i>Percent of Total</i>	100%	54%	4%	23%	17%	1%	100%	44%	4%	22%	24%	4%	1%	1%	0%

Sources: 2005 Traffic Impact Fee Study, November 2005 and City of West Sacramento.
 [1] Based on changes to estimated TIF funding the Proposed TIF is 22% less than the TIF from the 2005 TIF Update. See Table 7 for additional details.
 %_cost_funding_changes

Appendix B

Backup Data

(This appendix is on file at the City's Finance Department)