RESOLUTION NO. 11-46

A RESOLUTION OF THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF YUCCA VALLEY, CALIFORNIA AMENDING AND ADOPTING AND ESTABLISHING DEVELOPMENT IMAPCT FEES RELATING TO THE TOWN OF YUCCA VALLEY DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE SCHEDULE

WHEREAS, a duly noticed public hearing was conducted on October 18, 2011, at which time the public was invited to make oral and written presentations as part of the regularly scheduled meeting prior to the adoption of this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, at least ten (10) days prior to the public hearings, the Town Clerk made available for public inspection the Study and supporting documentation and data including the services and estimated costs of providing said services and sources of revenues required to defray those costs as well as a proposed form of ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the Town published notice of the public hearing as described above in accordance with Government Code Sections 6062(a) and 66018; and

WHEREAS, the Town Council approved the Public Facilities Development Impact Fee Study on October 27, 2005; and

WHEREAS, the Town Council adopted Ordinance No. 173, implementing Public Facilities Development Impact Fee authorization; and

WHEREAS, the Town Council adopted Resolution No. 05-59, implementing Public Facility Development Impact Fee charges; and

WHEREAS, the Town Council adopted Resolution No. 10-26, reducing the maximum legally defensible Public Facility Development Impact Fees; and

WHEREAS, the Public Facilities Development Impact Fee Study (Study) identifies the maximum legally defensible fees that the Town may impose upon new development; and

WHEREAS, the Study as amended supports the implementation of fees as contained in this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, Public Facility Development Impact Fees imposed by the Town may be modified by Resolution of the Town Council; and

WHEREAS, the Town Council desires to modify, in accordance, the Public Facility Development Impact Fees imposed upon new development.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF YUCCA VALLEY RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS.

SECTION 1. The Town Council hereby adopts the findings set forth in the above Recitals.

SECTION 2. The Town Council hereby adopts the "Town of Yucca Valley Development Impact Fee Schedule" as set forth in attachment "C", attached hereto. Unless otherwise stated in the Fee Schedule, all Development Impact Fees shall be paid to the Town prior to the Town's issuance of a final inspection or Certificate of Occupancy for any phase of a development project. The Fee Schedule may be amended from time to time by resolution of the Town Council, in compliance with the Mitigation Fee Act, Government Code, Section 66000.

SECTION 3. The Development Impact Fees imposed by this Resolution shall only apply to those Development Impact Fees described in the above-referenced Development Impact Fee Schedule. All other community or development or other impact fees and user fees and charges adopted by the Town Council by prior Town ordinances or resolutions or other prior actions, as may have been amended from time to time, or as may be adopted or amended in the future, shall remain and be in full force and effect, unless expressly or by the terms and provisions herein are amended hereby.

SECTION 4: Where the Town Manager determines that the public interest would be served by such an agreement, he or she is hereby authorized to execute agreements on behalf of the Town with Applicants in order to provide a credit to the Applicant against certain Development Impact Fees in exchange for the Applicant's construction and dedication of oversized Public Improvements, on those reasonable terms and conditions as the Town Manager may determine on a case-by-case basis, subject to approval by the Town Council.

SECTION 5. The Town Manager is empowered to negotiate and execute agreements to defer, waive or reduce any Development Impact Fees upon an Applicant for a particular development project, but only if the Town Manager determines upon evidence presented by the Applicant, that (i) the development project will provide a general benefit to the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of the Town of Yucca Valley, and will not be of special benefit only to an Applicant, or (ii) other properties to be benefited by any Development Impact Fee will not be unfairly burdened by the delay, reduction or waiver of said Development Impact Fee, or (iii) deferral, waiver or reduction in Development Impact Fees will result in a more fair funding arrangement, and, in the case of waiver or reduction, the owner will receive insufficient or

no benefit from the Development Impact Fee imposed and would therefore be required, if the Fee were imposed in full, to pay more than his fair share for the benefit received. Such findings and the resulting agreement(s) to defer, waive or reduce any Development Impact Fee shall be subject to approval by the Town Council.

SECTION 6. The Town Council is hereby authorized to make inter-fund transfers and loans between capital facilities accounts into which are deposited Development Impact Fees upon those reasonable terms of repayment and interest rates as determined by the Town Council.

SECTION 7. The Town Council hereby approves the allocation of the Public Facility Development Impact Fees contained in Attachment D to this Resolution to be allocated by the Director of Administrative Services to all five categories of public infrastructure contained within the 2005 study as amended.

SECTION 8: The Town Council approves the public facility development impact fee levels through December 2013 or until thereafter as modified and amended by the Town Council.

SECTION 9. Town staff are hereby directed to prepare and file a Notice of Exemption, under the California Environmental Quality Act, within five (5) working days of adoption of this Resolution.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED THIS 18th[th] day of October 2011.

MAYOR

ATTEST:

TOWN CLERK

ATTACHMENT "A"
PUBLIC FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE STUDY
PREPARED BY MUNIFINANCIAL
MAY 2, 2005

TOWN OF YUCCA VALLEY

PUBLIC FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE STUDY

MAY 2, 2005

Final

Oakland Office

1700 Broadway
6th Floor
Oakland, California 94612
Tel: (510) 832-0899
Fax. (510) 832-0898

Anaheim, CA
Industry, CA
Jacksonville, FL
Lancaster, CA
Oakland, CA
Phoenix, AZ
Washington, DC
Seattle, WA
Temecula, CA

www.muni.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes an analysis of the need for public facilities and capital improvements to support future development within the Town of Yucca Valley through 2025. It is the Town's intent that the costs representing future development's share of these facilities and improvements be imposed on that development in the form of a development impact fee, also known as a public facilities fee. The public facilities and improvements included in this analysis of the Town's public facilities fee program are divided into the fee categories listed below.

- General
- Parks
- Trails
- Storm Drains
- Streets and Traffic

Background and Study Objectives

The primary policy objective of a public facilities fee program is to ensure that new development pays the capital costs associated with growth. To fulfill this objective public agencies should review and update their fee programs periodically to incorporate the best available information. The primary purpose of this report is to adjust fees to incorporate current facility plans to serve a 2025 service population.

The Town imposes public facilities fees under authority granted by the *Mitigation Fee Act*, contained in *California Government Code* Sections 66000 *et seq.* This report provides the necessary findings required by the *Act* for adoption of the revised fees presented in the fee schedules contained herein.

Development Projections

To estimate facility needs, this study uses residential and household population data provided by the California Department of Finance and internal projections developed for the Town of Yucca Valley by Stan Hoffman and Associates. Current and projected employment figures were based on data provided by Claritas and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). The development projections used in this analysis are summarized in Table E.0.

Table E.0: Demographic Assumptions

	2004	2025	Increase
Residents[1]	18,410	33,880	15,470
Dwelling Units[1]			
Single Family	6,710	11,230	4,520
Multi-family	1,730	2,900	1,170
Total	8,440	14,130	5,690
Employment[2,3]			
Commercial	3,040	5,090	2,050
Office	660	1,100	440
Industrial	600	1,000	400
Subtotal	4,300	7,190	2,890
Other[4]	1,640	2,750	1,110
Total	5,940	9,940	4,000
Building Square Feet (000s)[5]			
Commercial	7,600	12,730	5,130
Office	2,200	3,670	1,470
Industrial	1,000	1,670	670
Total	10,800	18,070	7,270

[1] California Department of Finance (DOF), Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), Data from Town of Yucca - Stan Hoffman and Associates Population Projections, March, 2005.

[2] Assumes percentage of employees by land use remains constant to total from 2004 to 2025.

[3] Estimates by land use type based a Claritas report prepared for the Town of Yucca Valley, February 2004. Projected employment figures derived by assuming a constant ratio of jobs to housing.

[4] Represents government and other institutional.

[5] Based on employment by land use and occupant density shown in Table 2.0.

Sources: Table 2.0; California Department of Finance (DOF), Table E-5, 2004; Town of Yucca Valley; Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG); Claritas 2004; MuniFinancial.

Facility Standards and Costs of Growth

This fee analysis uses standards based on the Town's policy to determine the cost of facilities required to accommodate growth for public facilities. A standard for each facility category considered in this study is derived from the Town's facility plans for 2025. Depending on the facility standard, the Town currently may or may not have sufficient facilities to serve existing development. If the Town's existing facilities are below standard, then a deficiency exists. In this case, the portion of the cost of planned

facilities associated with correcting the deficiency must be allocated to funding sources other than the fee. Public facilities fees can only fund planned facilities needed to accommodate new development at the adopted standard.

Therefore, this study distinguishes between the share of planned facilities needed to accommodate growth and the share that serves existing residents and businesses. New development can only fund its fair share of planned facilities. To ensure compliance with the law, this study ensures that there is a reasonable relationship between new development, the amount of the fee, and facilities funded by the fee.

Fee Schedules and Revenues

Table E.1 summarizes the schedule of maximum justified public facilities fees based on the analysis contained in this report.

Table E.1: Proposed Facilities Fee Summary

Land Use	General Facilities	Parks	Trails	Storm Drains	Streets & Traffic	Total
Residential		*(Fee per Dwelling Unit)*				
Single Family Unit	$ 1,290	$ 2,568	$ 458	$ 5,161	$ 6,137	$ 15,815
Multi-family Unit	896	1,980	354	2,581	4,909	10,820
Non-residential		*(Fee per 1,000 Building Square Feet)*				
Commercial	$ 340	N/A	N/A	$ 3,407	$ 15,741	$ 19,488
Office	452	N/A	N/A	3,560	13,531	17,543
Industrial	226	N/A	N/A	2,377	4,894	7,497

Source: MuniFinancial

1. INTRODUCTION

This report presents an analysis of the need for public facilities to accommodate new development in the Town of Yucca Valley. This chapter explains the study approach and summarizes results under the following sections:

- Background and study objectives;
- Public facilities financing in California;
- Organization of the report; and
- Facility standards approach.

Background and Study Objectives

The primary policy objective of a public facilities fee program is to ensure that new development pays the capital costs associated with growth. To fulfill this objective public agencies should review and update their fee programs periodically to incorporate the best available information. The primary purpose of this report is to adjust fees to incorporate current facility plans to serve a 2025 service population for the Town of Yucca Valley.

The Town imposes public facilities fees under authority granted by the *Mitigation Fee Act*, contained in *California Government Code* Sections 66000 *et seq.* This report provides the necessary findings required by the *Act* for adoption of the revised fees presented in the fee schedules contained herein.

Public Facilities Financing In California

The changing fiscal landscape in California during the past 30 years has steadily undercut the financial capacity of local governments to fund infrastructure. Three dominant trends stand out:

- The passage of a string of tax limitation measures, starting with Proposition 13 in 1978 and continuing through the passage of Proposition 218 in 1996;
- Declining popular support for bond measures to finance infrastructure for the next generation of residents and businesses; and
- Steep reductions in federal and state assistance.

Faced with these trends, many cities and counties have had to adopt a policy of "growth pays its own way". This policy shifts the burden of funding infrastructure expansion from existing rate and taxpayers onto new development. This funding shift has been accomplished primarily through the imposition of assessments, special taxes, and

development impact fees also known as public facilities fees. Assessments and special taxes require approval of property owners and are appropriate when the funded facilities are directly related to the developing property. Development fees, on the other hand, are an appropriate funding source for facilities that benefit all development jurisdiction-wide. Development fees need only a majority vote of the legislative body for adoption.

Organization of the report

The determination of a public facilities fee begins with the selection of a planning horizon and development of projections for population and employment. These projections are used throughout the analysis of different facility categories, and are summarized in Chapter 2.

Chapters 3 through 7 are devoted to documenting the maximum justified public facilities fee for each of the following five facility categories:

- General
- Parks
- Trails
- Storm Drains
- Streets and Traffic

The five statutory findings required for adoption of the proposed public facilities fees in accordance with the *Mitigation Fee Act* (codified in *California Government Code* Sections 66000 through 66025) are summarized in Chapter 12.

Facility Standards Approach

A facility standard is a policy that indicates the amount of facilities required to accommodate service demand. Examples of facility standards include building square feet per capita and park acres per capita. Standards also may be expressed in monetary terms such as the replacement value of facilities per capita. The adopted facility standard is a critical component in determining new development's need for new facilities and the amount of the fee. Standards determine new development's fair share of planned facilities and ensure that new development does not fund deficiencies associated with existing development.

The most commonly accepted approaches to determining a facility standard are described below.

- The **existing inventory method** uses a facility standard based on the ratio of existing facilities to the existing development. Under this approach new development funds the expansion of facilities at the same rate that existing development has provided facilities to date. By definition, the existing inventory method does not consider facility deficiencies attributable to existing development. To increase facility standards the jurisdiction must secure funding in addition to development fees.

- The **system plan method** calculates the standard based on the ratio of all existing plus planned facilities to total future demand (existing and new development). This method is used when (1) the local agency anticipates increasing its facility standard above the existing inventory standard discussed above, and (2) planned facilities are part of a system that benefit both existing and new development. Using a facility standard that is higher than the existing inventory standard creates a deficiency for existing development. The jurisdiction must secure non-fee funding for that portion of planned facilities required to correct the deficiency.
- The **planned facilities method** calculates the standard solely based on the ratio of planned facilities to the increase in demand associated with new development. This method is appropriate when planned facilities only benefit new development, such as a sewer trunk line extension to a previously undeveloped area. This method also may be used when there is excess capacity in existing facilities that can accommodate new development. In that case new development can fund facilities at a standard lower than the existing inventory standard and still provide an acceptable level of facilities.

This study uses the existing inventory approach to determine facility standards for general facilities. Fees for parks, trails, and storm drains are based on the system plan method. Finally, streets and traffic fees are based on the planned facilities standard.

2. GROWTH PROJECTIONS

To assist in determining the appropriate fee structure, new development growth projections are used. Projected new development is estimated using the existing service population in 2004 as a base year with a Planning Horizon through the year 2025.

Use of Growth Projections for Impact Fees

Estimates of the existing service population and projections of growth are critical assumptions used throughout this report. These estimates are used as follows:

- Estimates of total development at the 2025 Planning Horizon are used to determine the total amount of public facilities required to accommodate growth and to allocate those costs on a per unit basis (for example, costs per capita or per EDU).
- Estimates of service population growth from 2004 to 2025 are used to allocate to new development its fair share of total planned facility needs.

To measure the existing service population and future growth, population and worker data, also identified as residents and workers, respectively, are used for the General and Parks and Trails facilities. These measures are used because numbers of residents and workers are reasonable indicators of the level of demand for public facilities. The Town builds public facilities primarily to serve these populations and, typically, the greater the population the larger the facility required to provide a given level of service. To measure growth for storm drains, the impervious surface area of a new development is linked to EDUs, while trip generation by use classification is used for streets and traffic signals.

Service Population, Equivalent Dwelling Units, and Trips

Different types of new development use public facilities at different rates in relation to each other, depending on the services provided. In Chapters 3 through 5, a specific service population is identified for each facility category to reflect total demand. The service population weights residential land use types against non-residential land uses based on the relative demand for services between residents and workers. Chapter 6 uses an impervious surface area linked to an EDU factor that weights each land use type against one single-family unit's demand for services. Chapter 7 uses trip generation by use classification to determine the fees.

Land Use Types

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

- **Single family:** Attached and detached one-family dwelling units; and
- **Multi-family:** All attached single family dwellings such as duplexes and condominiums, plus mobile homes, apartments, and dormitories.
- **Commercial:** All commercial, retail, educational, and hotel/motel development.
- **Office:** All general, professional, and medical office development.
- **Industrial:** All manufacturing and warehouse development.

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

The Town should have the discretion to impose the public facilities fee based on the specific aspects of a proposed development regardless of zoning. The guideline to use is the probable occupant density of the development, either residents per dwelling unit or workers per building square foot. The fee imposed should be based on the land use type that most closely represents the probable occupant density of the development.

Occupant Densities

Occupant densities ensure a reasonable relationship between the increase in service population and amount of the fee. To do this, they must vary by the estimated service population generated by a particular development project. Developers pay the fee based on the number of additional housing units or building square feet of nonresidential development, so the fee schedule must convert service population estimates to these measures of project size. This conversion is done with average occupant density factors by land use type, shown in **Table 2.0**.

The residential occupant density factors are derived from the 2000 U.S. Census Bureau's Tables H-31 through H-33. Table H-31 provides vacant housing units data, while Table H-32 provides information relating to occupied housing. Table H-33 documents the total 2000 population residing in occupied housing. The US Census numbers are adjusted by using the California Department of Finance ("DOF") estimates for January 1, 2004 found on Table E-5, and the most recent State of California data available. The non-residential density factors are based on *Employment Density Study Summary report*, prepared for the Southern California Association of Governments, October 2001 by The Natelson Company. For example, the industrial density factor represents an average for light industrial, heavy industrial, and warehouse uses likely to occur in the Town.

Table 2.0: Density Assumptions

Land Use	Density	
Residential		
Single Family	2.29	Residents per Dwelling Unit
Multifamily	1.77	Residents per Dwelling Unit
Non-residential		
Commercial	2.50	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Office	3.33	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Industrial	1.67	Employees per 1,000 square feet

Source: 2000 Census, Tables H31-H33; California Department of Finance (DOF), Table E-5, 2004; Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG); MuniFinancial.

Growth Projections for Yucca Valley

The base year for this study is the year 2004. The existing facilities in 2004 combined with the planned facilities in 2025 will make up the system plan standard in our study.

Base year residential estimate is calculated using the California Department of Finance (DOF) January 1, 2004 estimates and information provided by Town staff. Base year employment estimates are based on data from the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and the California Employment Development Department (EDD). Future 2025 population and dwelling units were provided by the Town of Yucca Valley. Employment projections were interpolated from the current employment estimates (provided by Claritas) by maintaining the jobs-housing ratio. Building square footage was computed by MuniFinancial using the density assumptions shown in Table 2.0.

Table 2.1 shows estimates of the growth in terms of residents and workers.

Table 2.1: Demographic Assumptions

	2004	2025	Increase
Residents[1]	18,410	33,880	15,470
Dwelling Units[1]			
Single Family	6,710	11,230	4,520
Multi-family	1,730	2,900	1,170
Total	8,440	14,130	5,690
Employment[2,3]			
Commercial	3,040	5,090	2,050
Office	660	1,100	440
Industrial	600	1,000	400
Subtotal	4,300	7,190	2,890
Other[4]	1,640	2,750	1,110
Total	5,940	9,940	4,000
Building Square Feet (000s)[5]			
Commercial	7,660	12,730	5,130
Office	2,200	3,670	1,470
Industrial	1,000	1,670	670
Total	10,800	18,070	7,270

[1] California Department of Finance (DOF), Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), Data from Town of Yucca - Stan Hoffman and Associates Population Projections, March, 2005.

[2] Assumes percentage of employees by land use remains constant to total from 2004 to 2025.

[3] Estimates by land use type based a Claritas report prepared for the Town of Yucca Valley, February 2004. Projected employment figures derived by assuming a constant ratio of jobs to housing.

[4] Represents government and other institutional.

[5] Based on employment by land use and occupant density shown in Table 2.0.

Sources: Table 2.0; California Department of Finance (DOF), Table E-5, 2004; Town of Yucca Valley; Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG); Claritas 2004; MuniFinancial.

3. GENERAL FACILITIES

The purpose of the fee is to ensure that new development funds its fair share of general public facilities. A fee schedule is presented based on the cost of these facilities to ensure that new development provides adequate funding to meet its needs.

Service Population

General public facilities serve both residents and businesses. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities are based on the Town's service population including residents and workers.

Table 3.0 shows the estimated service population in 2004 and 2025. In calculating the service population, workers are weighted less than residents to reflect lower per capita service demand. Nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units, so it is reasonable to assume that average per-worker demand for services is less than average per-resident demand. The 0.24-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of hours in a week (168).

Table 3.0: General Facilities Service Population

	Residents	Workers	Service Population
Existing (2004)	18,410	5,940	19,840
New Development (2004-2025)	15,470	4,000	16,430
Total (2025)	33,880	9,940	36,270
Weighting factor	1.00	0.24	

Sources: Table 2.1; MuniFinancial

Facility Inventories, Plans & Standards

Existing Town facilities house the Town Council chambers, the Town Manager and Town Clerk's offices and other governance and administrative functions. These existing facilities, as well as, the current facility standard are noted in Table 3.1

Table 3.1: General Facilities Existing Standard

	Inventory	Cost/Unit	Total Value
Existing Facilities			
Land (acres)			
Town Hall Complex	9.27	$ 20,000	$ 185,000
California Welcome Center	1.75	20,000	35,000
Public Works Complex	1.60	20,000	32,000
Subtotal Land			$ 252,000
Buildings (sq. ft.)			
Town Hall Complex			
Town Hall/Library	12,640	$ 200	$ 2,528,000
Community Center	11,922	250	2,981,000
Museum	5,108	200	1,022,000
California Welcome Center	4,400	200	880,000
Subtotal Town Hall Complex	34,070		$ 7,411,000
Corporation Yard			
Admin. Building	6,897	$ 200	$ 1,379,000
Operations Building	9,623	200	1,925,000
Subtotal Corporate Yard	16,520		$ 3,304,000
Total Facilities			$ 10,967,000
Existing Service Population (2004)			19,840
Cost per Capita			$ 553
Facility Standard per Resident			$ 553
Facility Standard per Worker			133

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 3.0; Town of Yucca Valley; MuniFinancial

The contribution of new development towards future general facilities expenditures is captured in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2: New Development Development Contribution

Facility Standard Per Capita	$	553
Growth in Service Population (2004-2025)		16,430
New Development Contribution	$	9,082,000

Sources: Tables 3.0 and 3.1, MuniFinancial

Fee Schedule

Table 3.3 shows the proposed general facilities fees based on the existing inventory standard shown in Table 3.1. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and building space densities (persons per dwelling unit ("DU") for residential development and workers per 1,000 square feet ("KSF") of building space for non-residential development).

Table 3.3: General Facilities - Proposed Fee Schedule

Land Use	Costs per Capita	Density	Fee	Admin[1]	Total Fee	Fee / Sq. Ft.
Residential						
Single Family	$ 553	2.29	$ 1,265	$ 25	$ 1,290	
Multi-family	553	1.77	976	20	996	
Non-residential						
Commercial	$ 133	2.50	$ 333	$ 7	$ 340	$ 0.34
Office	133	3.33	443	9	452	0.45
Industrial	133	1.67	222	4	226	0.23

[1] Administration fee of 2.0 percent

Sources: Tables 2.0 and 3.1; MuniFinancial

4. PARK FACILITIES

The purpose of the fee is to ensure that new development funds its fair share of park facilities. The Town would use fee revenues to expand park facilities to serve new development.

Service Population

Residents are the primary users of parkland. Therefore, demand for parks and associated facilities are based on the Town's residential population. **Table 4.0** provides estimates of the resident population with a projection for the year 2025.

Table 4.0: Parks Facilities Service Population

	Residents
Existing (2004)	18,410
New Development (2004-2025)	15,470
Total (2025)	33,880

Source: Table 2.1

Facility Inventories, Plans & Standards

This section describes the Town's existing facility inventory, standards, and Planned Park facilities.

Existing Inventory

The Town owns and operates, or has agreements with other agencies to use various park facilities. The Town's inventory of improved park facilities includes approximately a total of 37.67 acres summarized in **Table 4.1**

Table 4.1: Existing and Planned Park Facilities

Facility	Improved Acres	Unimproved Acres	Total Acres
Existing Parks			
Community Center Park	12.94		12.94
Jacobs Park	5.00		5.00
Machris Park	12.00		12.00
Remembrance Park	0.20		0.20
Sunnyslope Park	2.53	8.00	10.53
Paradise Valley Park	5.00		5.00
South Side Park		80.00	80.00
Planned Parks			
West End Park		10.00	10.00
East End Park		15.00	15.00
North End Park		10.00	10.00
Total Acres	37.67	123.00	160.67

Note: Excludes BLM patented open space lands

Sources: Town Parks Master Plan by Purkiss Rose-RSI, Dec. 16, 1999; Town of Yucca Valley; MuniFinancial

Park Facility Standards

To calculate new development's need for new parks, municipalities commonly use a ratio expressed in terms of developed park acres per 1,000 residents. The current Town General Plan policy standard for parks is 5.0 acres per 1,000 residents. Additional information included in this report was taken from the Town Parks Master plan completed for the Town by *Purkiss Rose-RSI* in December 1999. According to the provided information, The Town currently has 37.67 acres of improved parkland. To reach the Town's planning standard of 5.0 acres per 1,000 residents, the acquisition and improvement of an additional 8.33 acres and 131.33 acres, respectively, by 2025 is required (as shown in Table 4.2).

Table 4.2: Parks Facilities General Plan Standard

General Plan Standard (developed acres per 1,000 residents)	5.00
2025 Service Population	33,880
Total Facilities Needs (acres)	169.00
Total Land Acquired	160.67
Deficit	(8.33)
Total Improved Acreage	37.67
Deficit	(131.33)

Sources: Table 4.0; Town of Yucca Valley Comprehensive General Plan, Prepared by Town of Yucca Valley Community Development Department, Dec. 14, 1995; MuniFinancial

Unit Costs for Land Acquisition and Improvement

Unit costs represent the current cost of park acquisition and improvement. This approach represents the land costs and level of improvements that existing development have provided to date. This approach ensures that the cost of facilities to serve new development is not artificially increased, and new development unfairly burdened, compared to existing development.

The unit costs used to estimate the total cost of parkland facility needs are shown in Table 6.4. All costs are expressed in 2004 dollars. Land acquisition costs and improvement costs are based on the Town's experience with park development.

Table 4.3: Park Facilities Unit Costs

	Average Cost
Per Acre	
Land Acquisition	$ 20,000
Park Improvement	200,000
Total	$ 220,000

Source: Town of Yucca Valley; MuniFinancial

Total Needs and Costs

The total amount of park facilities to serve growth is calculated by multiplying the facility standards developed in Table 4.2 by the growth in residents. The total cost of these needs for park facilities is based on the average unit costs for land acquisition and improvements shown in Table 4.3. To accommodate the increase in service population through 2025 new development or alternative sources would need to fund facilities estimated to cost approximately $17 million as shown in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Park Facilities to Accommodate Growth

Land Acquisition		
General Plan Standard (acres/1,000 residents)	5.00	
Resident Growth (2004-2025)	15,470	
Facility Needs (acres)	77.35	
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	$ 20,000	
Total Cost of Facilities		$ 1,547,000
Land Improvement		
General Plan Standard (acres/1,000 residents)	5.00	
Resident Growth (2004-2025)	15,470	
Facility Needs (acres)	77.35	
Average Improvement Cost (per acre)	$ 200,000	
Total Cost of Facilities		$ 15,470,000
Total		$ 17,017,000

Sources: Tables 4.0, 4.1, and 4.3; MuniFinancial

If the Town cannot acquire all 77.35 acres calculated in Table 4.4 because of land constraints, the Town may apply the same funds to rehabilitating, renovating, or rebuilding facilities in existing parks. The $15.47 million in improvement facilities must be used for enhancing, upgrading, adding, or expanding new park facilities. Renovating and intensifying development of existing parks is another reasonable method for accommodating growth that could be used in conjunction with expanding improved park acreage. The use of fee revenues would be identified through planned parkland acquisition and improvement projects described in the most recently adopted version of annual capital improvement budget.

The Town anticipates that the park fees would be the primary revenue source to fund the planned facilities required to serve new development. Table 4.5 shows the share of

costs that could be attributed to new development. This amount represents the balance after allocating to new development its share of those planned Park facilities.

Table 4.5: Parks Facilities Costs per Capita for New Development

	Land Acquisition	Land Improvement
Cost Per Acre	$ 20,000	$ 200,000
Facility Standard (acres per 1,000 residents)	5.00	5.00
Cost Per 1,000 capita	100,000	1,000,000
	1,000	1,000
Cost Per Resident	$ 100	$ 1,000

Sources: Tables 4.3 and 4.4; MuniFinancial

Alternative Funding Sources

The Town can obtain the funding needed to complement facilities fee revenues over the Planning Horizon through non-fee revenue sources. This funding is necessary to justify the fee imposed on new development using the standard shown here. If this funding is not obtained, the new development will have paid too high a fee by the end of the Planning Horizon.

Fee Schedule

Park facility cost per resident is shown in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Parks Facilities Fees

Land Use	Cost per Capita	Density	Fee	Admin[1]	Total Fee
Residential					
Single Family					
Land Acquisition	$ 100	2.29	$ 229	$ 5	$ 233
Park Improvement	1,000	2.29	2,289	46	2,335
Total					$ 2,568
Multi-family					
Land Acquisition	$ 100	1.77	$ 177	$ 4	$ 180
Park Improvement	1,000	1.77	1,765	35	1,800
Total					$ 1,980

[1] Administration fee of 2.0 percent

Sources: Tables 2.0 and 4.5, MuniFinancial

Fee Credits

The fee schedule in Table 4.6 includes separate components for land acquisition and improvement so that the Town can calculate a credit if a developer dedicates parkland or provides improvements. An average per-acre reimbursement is reasonable because the fees collected may not be used in the same area from which they were collected. The costs provided in this report represent the current Town-wide value.

6. TRAILS

The purpose of the fee is to ensure that new development funds its fair share of trails. The Town would use fee revenues to expand the town's network of trails to serve new development.

Service Population

Residents are the primary users of Yucca Valley's trails. Therefore, demand for hiking and bike trails, and their associated facilities, are based on the Town's residential population. Table 5.0 provides estimates of the resident population with a projection for the year 2025.

Table 5.0: Trails Facilities Service Population

	Residents
Existing (2004)	18,410
New Development (2004-2025)	15,470
Total (2025)	33,880

Source: Table 2.1

Facility Inventories, Plans & Standards

This section describes the Town's existing facility inventory, standards, and planned Trails facilities.

Proposed Inventory

The Town has a comprehensive Trail Master plan completed by RHA Landscape Architects – Planners, Inc. The Trails Master Plan was completed in June 2002. The Town has since made amendments to this Trails Master Plan and the information in this report reflects those changes. The proposed Trails facilities are summarized in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1: Trail Inventory (Proposed)

	Estimated Construction Cost	Estimated Easement Cost[1]	Estimated Total Cost
Yucca Wash Trail - Reach 1	$ 216,000	$ -	$ 216,000
Yucca Wash Trail - Reach 2	310,500	-	310,500
Yucca Wash Trail - Reach 3	234,000	990	234,990
California Riding & Hiking Trail - Yucca Wash - Reach 4	214,500	-	214,500
California Riding & Hiking Trail - Marvin Drive	85,800	3,300	89,100
California Riding & Hiking Trail - Hacienda Drive - Reach 1	276,900	1,320	278,220
California Riding & Hiking Trail - Hacienda Drive - Reach 2	191,100	4,290	195,390
California Riding & Hiking Trail - Chipmunk Trail	218,400	6,600	225,000
California Riding & Hiking Tr - Skyline Ranch Rd - Reach 1	280,800	2,310	283,110
California Riding & Hiking Tr - Skyline Ranch Rd - Reach 2	93,600	2,640	96,240
California Riding & Hiking Tr - Skyline Ranch Rd - Reach 3	189,000	4,290	193,290
Kickapoo Trail	144,300	2,640	146,940
Little Morongo Canyon Road - Reach 1	187,200	1,320	188,520
Little Morongo Canyon Road - Reach 2	136,500	660	137,160
Royal Springs Wash Trail	280,800	1,650	282,450
Black Rock Canyon Trail	148,200	10,230	158,430
East Burnt Mountain Wash Trail - Reach 1	144,300	2,640	146,940
East Burnt Mountain Wash Trail - Reach 2	226,200	8,250	234,450
East Burnt Mountain Wash Trail - Reach 3	261,300	-	261,300
San Andreas Road Trail - Reach 1	499,520	8,250	507,770
San Andreas Road Trail - Reach 2	472,760	3,960	476,720
San Andreas Road Trail - Reach 3	472,760	5,610	478,370
San Andreas Road Trail - Reach 4	148,200	990	149,190
Carmelita Wash Trail	202,800	-	202,800
Black Rock Wash Trail	148,200	-	148,200
Covington Wash Trail - Reach 1	183,800	1,650	185,450
Covington Wash Trail - Reach 2	226,200	3,960	230,160
Covington Wash Trail - Reach 3	265,200	3,960	269,160
Covington Wash Trail - Reach 4	214,500	4,290	218,790
Totals:	$ 6,653,340	$ 85,800	$ 6,739,140
Total Trail Miles:	27.75		
Estimated Cost/Mile:	$ 239,793	$ 3,092	$ 242,604

[1] Easement Costs inflated by 10 percent over costs provided in the Town of Yucca Valley Trails Bike Route Master Plan.

Sources: Town of Yucca Valley Adopted Trails/Bike Route Master Plan, March 10, 2005; Town of Yucca Valley Planning Department; MuniFinancial

Unit Costs for Land Acquisition and Improvement

Unit costs represent the current cost of construction and easement acquisition. By dividing the total costs over the 2025 service population, this approach ensures that there is an equitable distribution of costs between new and existing development.

Table 5.2 summarizes the per capita cost for completion of the Trails System facilities. All costs are expressed in 2004 dollars.

Table 5.2: Trails Facilities Cost per Capita

	Construction Costs	Easement Acquisition Costs[1]
Cost	$ 6,653,340	$ 85,800
2025 Service Population	33,880	33,880
Cost Per Resident	$ 196	$ 3
Total Cost per Resident		$ 199

Sources: Tables 5.0 and 5.1; MuniFinancial

Allocation of Facilities Costs to New Development

The Town anticipates that the trail fees would be the primary revenue source to fund the planned facilities required to serve new development. The allocation of costs for trails facilities between the existing service population and new development is shown in Table 5.3. The trails impact fee would be used in conjunction with alternative funding sources to close the deficiency.

Table 5.3: Costs Attributable to New Development

	New Development Contribution	Total Planned Facilities	Deficiency To Be Funded By Non-Fee Revenue Sources
Cost per Resident	$ 199		
New Development (2004-2025)	15,470		
New Development Contribution	$ 3,077,169		
	$ 3,077,169	$ 6,739,140	$ (3,661,971)

Sources: Tables 5.0 and 5.2; MuniFinancial

Fee Schedule

Table 5.4 shows the maximum allowable trails facilities fees based on the Master Plan standard. These cost factors are based on the cost per capita derived from the unit cost estimates and facility standards..

Table 5.4: Trails Facilities Fee

Land Use	Cost per Capita[1]	Density	Fee	Admin[1]	Total Fee
Residential					
Single Family					
Construction	$ 196	2.29	$ 449	$ 9	$ 458
Easement	3	2.29	6	0	6
Subtotal					$ 464
Multi-family					
Construction	$ 196	1.77	$ 347	$ 7	$ 354
Easement	3	1.77	4	0	5
Subtotal					$ 358

[1] Administration fee of 2.0 percent

Sources: Tables 2.0 and 5.2; MuniFinancial

Fee Credits

The fee schedule in Table 5.4 includes separate components for construction and easement acquisition so that the Town can calculate a credit if a developer dedicates trail easements or other improvements. This fee credit plan could be structured similar to the one discussed for Parks facilities in the previous chapter.

6. STORM DRAIN FACILITIES

This chapter documents a reasonable relationship between new development and the funding for proposed Storm Drain facilities. Information included in this chapter comes from the Yucca Valley Master Plan of Drainage (the "Storm Drain Study") completed in June 1999 by John M. Tettemer & Associates, Inc.

Equivalent Dwelling Units

Table 6.0 calculates the equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) for each land use using average densities shown in the December 1995 Yucca Valley General Plan and impervious surface values derived from United States Department of Agriculture. **Table 6.1** shows the total existing and future EDUs for storm drainage facilities by land use.

Table 6.0: Storm Drains - Impervious Surface

	DU/Acre or Acre[1]	Average Percent Impervious[2]	Equivalent Dwelling Unit (EDU)[3]	Acres/ KSF[3]	EDU/ KSF[3]
Residential (dwelling units)					
Single Family	2.78	35%	1.00		
Multi-Family	10.85	68%	0.50		
Non-residential					
Commercial Space	1.00	90%	7.15	0.09	0.66
Office Space	1.00	95%	7.55	0.09	0.69
Industrial	1.00	75%	5.96	0.08	0.46

[1] Dwelling units per acre for residential usage and acres for Non-residential usage. Residential average based on midpoint of dwelling units per acre - Yucca Valley General Plan, December 1995.

[2] Percent Impervious Service derived from USDA data.

[3] *Floor Area Ratio* ("FAR") per acre based upon Non-residential space classification .25 for Office, Retail & Service and .30 for Industrial space and derived by the following formula: 1/([43560*.25)/1,000) for Commercial and Office Space and 1/([43560*.30)/1,000 for Industrial and listed in KSF.

Sources: Yucca Valley General Plan, December 1995; MuniFinancial

Table 6.1: Storm Drain Facilities Total Equivalent Dwelling Units

	EDU Factor	Existing (DU/KSF)	Projected Growth (DU/KSF)	Existing EDUs	Growth in EDUs	Total
Residential						
Single Family	1.00	6,710	4,520	6,710	4,520	11,230
Multi-Family	0.50	1,730	1,170	865	585	1,450
Total Dwelling Units		8,440	5,690	7,575	5,105	12,680
Non-residential						
Commercial Space	0.66	7,600	5,130	5,016	3,386	8,402
Office Space	0.69	2,200	1,470	1,518	1,014	2,532
Industrial	0.46	1,000	670	460	308	768
Total KSF Commercial		10,800	7,270	6,994	4,708	11,702
Total				14,569	9,813	24,382
Percent of Total				59.8%	40.2%	100.0%

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 8.0; MuniFinancial

Facility Inventories, Plans & Standards

Hydrologic modeling uses a "design storm" to estimate the rainfall runoff needing to be accommodated by Storm Drain facilities. The measure of a design storm is typically expressed in terms of the probability of a particular storm in any one year. For example, a 100-year storm is the storm that would occur on average once during 100 years. Facilities designed to accommodate runoff from this type of storm provide 100-year flood protection.

The modeling completed for the Storm Drain Study was based on 100 year-and 25-year peak discharges using an approved watershed sub-area delineation map with defined flow paths. Selected peak discharges resulting from the computations were used in sizing the drainage facilities.

The Yucca Valley Master Plan of Drainage developed two different types of storm drain systems, a non-detained system, with an estimated cost of $121,303,000, and a detained system with an estimated cost of $102,016,000. Based upon information provided by the Town, the detained system was selected as the preferred system.

The storm drainage facilities fee uses a facility standard (Table 6.2) to demonstrate a reasonable relationship between new development and the need for new facilities. The facility standard is based on the planned facilities investment into the Town's system of storm drainage facilities on a per EDU basis. The need for new storm drainage facilities is determined by maintaining the same investment on a per EDU basis as new development occurs.

Table 6.2: Storm Drain Facilities Standard

		Cost (2004)
Detained Flood Control System Projected Cost[1]	$	102,016,000
Cost Escalator[2]		1.21
Escalated Detained Flood Control System Cost	$	123,439,360
Total EDUs (2025)		24,382
Equity per EDU	$	5,063

[1] Town of Yucca Valley Master Plan of Drainage - Final Report Prepared by John M. Tettemer & Associates, Inc. A Division of Keith Companies, Inc. June 1999.
[2] Engineering News Record Construction Cost Index - June 1999 to November 2004.

Sources: Table 8.1; Town of Yucca Valley; MuniFinancial

Table 6.3 presents the cost of upgraded, expanded, or new storm drainage improvements needed to accommodate new development. The new development contribution shown in the table represents the total revenue that the storm drain facilities fee would generate.

Table 6.3: Storm Drain Facilities to Accommodate Growth

		Total
Facility Standard Per EDU	$	5,063
Growth in EDUs (2005-2025)		9,813
New Development Contribution	$	49,681,428

Sources: Tables 6.2 and 6.3; MuniFinancial

Fee Schedule

Table 6.4 shows the sewer facilities fee based on the cost per EDU shown in Table 6.2. The cost per EDU is converted to a fee per unit of development based on dwelling units for residential and 1,000 building square feet for nonresidential development.

Table 6.4: Storm Drain Facilities Fee

Land Use	Cost per EDU	EDU	Fee	Admin[1]	Total Fee	Fee / Sq. Ft.
Residential						
Single Family	$ 5,063	1.00	$ 5,060	$ 101	$ 5,161	
Multi-Family	5,063	0.50	2,530	51	2,581	
Non-residential						
Commercial	$ 5,063	0.66	$ 3,340	$ 67	$ 3,407	$ 3.41
Office	5,063	0.69	3,490	70	3,560	3.56
Industrial	5,063	0.46	2,330	47	2,377	2.38

[1] Administration fee of 2.0 percent

Sources: Tables 6.0 and 6.2; MuniFinancial

7. STREETS AND TRAFFIC

This chapter summarizes an analysis of the need for streets and related transportation facilities to accommodate growth within the Town of Yucca Valley. It documents a reasonable relationship between new development and a traffic fee to fund streets and related transportation facilities that serve new development.

Trip Demand

Estimates of existing and new development provide the basis for calculating the traffic facilities fee. Estimates of existing development provide the basis for the facility standard. The facility standard is used to determine the rate at which new development must increase the value of the Town's equity in its system of street improvements. Estimates of new development are used to calculate the total amount of fee revenues that would be generated.

The need for street improvements is based on the trip demand placed on the system by development. A reasonable measure of demand is the number of average daily vehicle trips, adjusted for the type of trip. Vehicle trip generation rates are a reasonable measure of demand on the Town's system of street improvements across all modes because alternate modes (transit, bicycle, pedestrian) often substitute for vehicle trips.

The two types of trips adjustments made to trip generation rates to calculate trip demand are described below:

- Pass-by trips are deducted from the trip generation rate. Pass-by trips are intermediates stops between an origin and a final destination that require no diversion from the route, such as stopping to get gas on the way to work.
- The trip generation rate is adjusted by the average length of trips for a specific land use category compared to the average length of all trips on the street system.

Table 7.0 shows the calculation of trip demand factors by land use category based on the adjustments described above. Data is based on extensive and detailed trip surveys conducted in the San Diego region by the San Diego Association of Governments. The surveys provide one of the most comprehensive databases available of trip generation rates, pass-by trips factors, and average trip length for a wide range of land uses. Urban development patterns are similar enough among the San Diego and Southern California/Los Angeles regions to make the use of the San Diego data applicable to the Town of Yucca Valley.

Table 7.0: Trip Rate Adjustment Factor

	Non-Pass-by Trips						
	Primary Trips[1]	Diverted Trips[1]	Total Excluding Pass-by[1]	Average Trip Length[2]	Adjustment Factor[3]	Average Daily Trips[4]	Trip Demand Factor[5]
Residential[6]							
Single Family	86%	11%	97%	7.9	1.04	10	10.4
Multi-family	86%	11%	97%	7.9	1.04	8	8.3
Nonresidential[7]							
Commercial	47%	31%	78%	3.6	0.38	70	26.6
Office	77%	19%	96%	6.8	1.14	20	22.8
Industrial	92%	5%	97%	9.0	1.18	7	8.3

[1] Percent of total trips. Primary trips are trips with no midway stops, or "links". Diverted trips are linked trips whose distance adds at least one mile to the primary trip. Pass-by trips are links that do not add more than one mile to the total trip and therefore place little additional burden on the street system. As a result the trip adjustment factor includes a reduction for the share of pass-by trips.

[2] In miles.

[3] The trip adjustment factor equals the percent of non-pass-by trips multiplied by the average trip length and divided by the systemwide average trip length of 6.9 miles.

[4] Trips per dwelling unit or per 1,000 building square feet.

[5] The trip demand factor is the product of the trip adjustment factor and the average daily trips.

[6] Trip percentages, average trip lengths, and average daily trips based on "residential" category. See SANDAG for source, below.

[7] Trip percentages, average trip lengths, and average daily trips for commercial based on "community shopping center" category, for office based on "standard commercial office" category, and for industrial based on "industrial park (no commercial)" category. See

Sources: San Diego Association of Governments, *Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region*, July 1998; MuniFinancial.

Table 7.1 estimates the trip demand for existing and new development on the Town's system of street improvements. Total trip demand is based on the trip demand factors calculated in Table 7.0 and the growth estimates in Table 2.1. As shown in the table, new development would represent about 40.5 percent of total trip demand.

Table 7.1: Trip Demand From Existing and New Development

	Trip Demand Factor	Existing	Growth	Existing Trip Demand	Trip Demand From Growth	Total Trip Demand
Residential						
Single Family	10.36	6,710	4,520	69,485	46,808	116,291
Multi-family	8.28	1,730	1,170	14,332	9,693	24,025
Subtotal		8,440	5,690	83,817	56,499	140,316
Nonresidential						
Commercial	26.56	7,600	5,130	201,872	136,264	338,136
Office	22.83	2,200	1,470	50,231	33,564	83,795
Industrial	8.26	1,000	670	8,258	5,533	13,791
Subtotal		10,800	7,270	260,362	175,361	435,722
Total				344,179	231,860	576,038
Percent of Total				59.7%	40.3%	100%

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 7.0; MuniFinancial

Facility Inventories, Plans & Standards

The cost of streets and traffic facilities attributed to new development (Table 7.2) are used to develop a Streets and Traffic Signals facility standard in Table 7.3. This approach allows the town to use fee revenues only to those projects that add new facilities and otherwise expand capacities for new development and exclude projects that upgrade existing facilities. This standard calculates and existing equity per trip that becomes the standard used in fee determination.

Table 7.2: Streets & Traffic Facilities Master Plan Cost Summary for New Development

		Cost
Streets		
ROW Costs to widen SR 62 - West Town Boundary to Kickapoo Trail, 2.89 AC	$	1,346,408
Widen SR 62 to 6 Lanes - West Town Boundary to Kickapoo Trail, 1.42 miles		2,227,500
ROW Costs to widen SR 62 - Kickapoo Trail to Acoma/Mohawk Trail, 1.32 AC		1,033,511
Widen SR 62 to 6 Lanes - Kickapoo Trail to Acoma/Mohawk Trail, 1.09 miles		1,707,750
ROW Costs to widen SR 62 - Acoma/Mohawk Trail to SR 247, 1.83 AC		1,427,190
Widen SR 62 to 6 Lanes - Acoma/Mohawk Trail to SR 247, 1.51 miles		2,361,150
ROW Costs to widen SR 62 - SR 247 to Hilton Avenue, 1.03 AC		802,775
Widen SR 62 to 6 Lanes - SR 247 to Hilton Avenue, 0.85 miles		1,336,500
ROW Costs to widen SR 62 - Hilton Avenue to Avalon Avenue, 1.03 AC		806,575
Widen SR 62 to 6 Lanes - Hilton Avenue to Avalon Avenue, 0.85 miles		1,336,500
ROW Costs to widen SR 62 - Avalon Avenue to Yucca Mesa Road, 1.26 AC		984,829
Widen SR 62 to 6 Lanes - Avalon Avenue to Yucca Mesa Road, 1.04 miles		1,633,500
ROW Costs to widen SR 247 - State Route 62 to San Juan Road, 12.19 AC		2,804,775
Widen SR 247 to 4 Divided Lanes - State Rte. 62 to San Juan Rd, 1.57 miles		12,322,412
ROW Costs to widen SR 247 - San Juan Rd. to Buena Vista Dr., 12.19 AC		2,804,775
Widen SR 247 to 4 Divided Lanes - San Juan Rd. to Buena Vista Dr., 1.57 miles		12,322,412
ROW Cost to widen SR 247 - Buena Vista Dr. to N. Town Boundary, 17.80 AC		4,093,113
Widen SR 247 to 4 Divided Lanes - Buena Vista Dr. to N. Town Bndry., 2.16 mi.		13,543,200
Widen Onaga Trail, 4 Lane Arterial Divided - Kickapoo Tr. to Joshua Lane		7,437,150
Widen Yucca Trail, 4 Lane Arterial Divided - Sage Ave. to Avalon Avenue		5,883,584
Widen Joshua Lane, 4 Lane Arterial Divided - Onaga Tr. to State Route 62		2,621,399
Widen/Construct Camino del Cielo, 4 Lane Collector - Onaga Tr. to Sunnyslope (2 Lanes)		851,941
Widen/Construct Sunnyslope Dr., 4 Lane Collector - Camino del Cielo to Pioneertown (2 L		1,196,400
Widen Kickapoo Trail, 4 Lane Collector - Onaga Trail to State Route 62		387,318
Widen Pioneertown Road, 4 Lane Collector - State Rte. 62 to Sunnyslope Drive		1,402,235
Widen Acoma Trail, 4 Lane Collector - Golden Bee Drive to State Rte. 62		3,327,726
Widen Sage Avenue, 4 Lane Collector - Golden Bee Drive to State Route 62		3,327,726
Widen Joshua Lane, 4 Lane Collector - Golden Bee Drive to Onaga Trail		2,065,485
Widen La Contenta Road, 4 Lane Collector - Yucca Trail to State Route 62		3,174,245
Widen Palomar Avenue, 4 Lane Collector - Joshua Lane to Yucca Trail		3,977,971
Widen Avalon Avenue, 4 Lane Collector - Yucca Trail to State Route 62		2,930,329
Widen Yucca Trail, 4 Lane Collector - Avalon Avenue to Yucca Mesa Road		4,037,342
Widen Onaga Trail, 4 Lane Collector - Joshua Lane to Palomar Avenue		2,983,479
Construct Onaga Trail, 4 Lane Collector - Camino del Cielo to Kickapoo Trail		1,703,882
Widen Joshua Drive, 4 Lane Collector - Acoma Trail to Joshua Lane		2,486,232
Widen Warren Vista Avenue, 2 Lane Collector - Yucca Trail to State Rte. 62		474,964
Widen Golden Bee, 2 Lane Collector - Acoma Trail to Joshua Lane		1,597,605
Widen Joshua Lane, 2 Lane Collector - Golden Bee Drive to Warren Vista		793,406
Subtotal - Streets	$	117,555,292

Table 7.2: Streets & Traffic Facilities Master Plan Cost Summary for New Development

		Cost
Traffic Safety		
Raised Medians on SR 62 - West Town Boundary to Fairway Drive	$	810,000
Raised Medians on SR 62 - Fairway Drive to Camino del Cielo		1,114,000
Raised Medians on SR 62 - Camino del Cielo to Kickapoo Trail		1,114,000
Raised Medians on SR 62 - Kickapoo Trail to Elk Trail		1,336,000
Raised Medians on SR 62 - Cherokee Trail to Acoma/Mohawk Trail		616,000
Raised Medians on SR 62 - Acoma/Mohawk Trail to Palm Avenue		1,025,000
Raised Medians on SR 62 - Palm Avenue to Sage Avenue		794,000
Raised Medians on SR 62 - SR 247 to Warren Vista Avenue		1,198,000
Raised Medians on SR 62 - Warren Vista Avenue to Hilton Avenue		608,000
Raised Medians on SR 62 - Hilton Avenue to Balsa Avenue		640,000
Raised Medians on SR 62 - Balsa Avenue to Avalon Avenue		1,178,000
Raised Medians on SR 62 - Avalon Avenue to Indio Avenue		1,094,000
Raised Medians on SR 62 - Indio Avenue to Yucca Mesa Road		1,126,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - West Town Boundary to Fairway Dr.		276,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Fairway Drive to Camino del Cielo		380,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Camino del Cielo to Kickapoo Trail		380,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Kickapoo Trail to Elk Trail		456,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Elk Trail to Cherokee Trail		130,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Cherokee Trail to Acoma/Mohawk Trail		210,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Acoma/Mohawk Trail to Palm Avenue		350,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Palm Avenue to Sage Avenue		378,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Sage Avenue to SR 247		370,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - SR 247 to Warren Vista Avenue		408,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Warren Vista Avenue to Hilton Avenue		208,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Hilton Avenue to Balsa Avenue		218,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Balsa Avenue to Avalon Avenue		402,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Avalon Avenue to Indio Avenue		373,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Indio Avenue to Yucca Mesa Road		384,000
Subtotal - Traffic Safety	$	17,576,000
Traffic Signals		
Yucca Trail @ Joshua Lane	$	500,000
Hwy62/Camino Cielo		500,000
Hwy 62/Sage Avenue		500,000
Hwy 62/Joshua Lane		500,000
Hwy 62/Yucca Mesa Road/La Contenta Road		500,000
Yucca Trail/Avalon Avenue/Palomar Avenue		500,000
Onaga Trail/Acoma Trail		500,000
Subtotal - Traffic Signals	$	3,500,000
Total	$	138,631,292

Sources: Town of Yucca Valley; Exhibit T, of the General Plan EIR Traffic Study prepared by Robert Kahn, John Kain & Associates, 8/3/95

Table 7.3: Streets & Traffic Facilities Standard

	Cost
Planned Projects	
Street Improvements	$ 117,555,292
Traffic Safety	17,576,000
Traffic Signals	3,500,000
Total Streets & Traffic Facilities	$ 138,631,292
Less: Other Funding Sources (2004-2025)[1]	4,015,000
Net Facility Needs	$ 134,616,292
Projected Trip Demand for Future Growth (2004-2025)	231,860
Standard Per Trip	$ 581

[1] Represents portion of Measure I funding available for regional traffic projects. Estimated at $182,500 per year.

Sources: Town of Yucca Valley; Tables 7.1 and 7.2; MuniFinancial

Fee and Revenue Schedules

The maximum justified fee for traffic facilities is shown in **Table 7.4**. The Town may adopt any fee up to that shown in the table. If the Town adopts a lower fee then it should consider reducing the fee for each land use by the same percentage. This approach would ensure that each new development project funds the same fair share of costs to improve the Town's system of street improvements.

Table 7.4: Streets & Traffic Facilities Fees

Land Use	Standard Per Trip	Trip Demand Factor	Fee	Admin[1]	Total Fee	Fee / Sq. Ft.
Residential						
Single Family	$ 581	10.4	$ 6,016	$ 120	$ 6,137	
Multi-family	581	8.3	4,813	96	4,909	
Non-residential						
Commercial	$ 581	26.6	$ 15,433	$ 309	$ 15,741	$ 15.74
Office	581	22.8	13,266	265	13,531	13.53
Industrial	581	8.3	4,798	96	4,894	4.89

[1] Administration fee of 2.0 percent

Sources: Tables 7.0 and 7.3; MuniFinancial

8. IMPLEMENTATION

Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP

The Town CIP should be amended to identify fee revenue with specific projects. The use of the CIP in this manner documents a reasonable relationship between new development and the use of those revenues.

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

For the five-year planning period of the CIP, the Town should consider allocating existing fund balances and projected fee revenue to specific projects. The Town can hold funds in a project account for longer than five years if necessary to collect sufficient monies to complete a project.

Identify Non-Fee Revenue Sources

The use of the method for calculating facility standards can identify revenue Deficiencies attributable to the existing service population. As fees are only imposed under the Act to fund new development's fair portion of facilities, the Town should consider how Deficiencies might be supplemented through the use of alternative funding sources. Potential sources of revenue include existing or new general fund revenues or the use of existing or new taxes. Any new tax would require two-thirds voter approval, while new assessments or property-related charges would require majority property-owner approval.

Inflation Adjustment

Appropriate inflation indexes should be identified in a fee ordinance including an automatic adjustment to the fee annually. Separate indexes for land and construction costs should be used. Calculating the land cost index may require the periodic use of a property appraiser. The construction cost index can be based on the Town's recent capital project experience or can be taken from any reputable source, such as the *Engineering news Record*. To calculate prospective fee increases, each index should be weighed against its share of total planned facility costs represented by land or construction, as appropriate.

Reporting Requirements

The Town should comply with the annual and five-year reporting requirements of the Act. For facilities to be funded by a combination of public fees and other revenues, identification of the source and amount of these non-fee revenues is essential.

Identification of the timing of receipt of other revenues to fund the facilities is also important.

9. MITIGATION FEE ACT FINDINGS

Fees are assessed and typically paid when a building permit is issued and imposed on new development projects by local agencies responsible for regulating land use (cities and counties). To guide the imposition of facilities fees, the California State Legislature adopted the Act with Assembly Bill 1600 in 1987 and subsequent amendments. The Act, contained in *California Government Code* §§66000 – 66025, establishes requirements on local agencies for the imposition and administration of fees. The Act requires local agencies to document five statutory findings when adopting fees.

The five findings in the Act required for adoption of the maximum justified fees documented in this report are: 1) Purpose of fee, 2) Use of fee Revenues, 3) Benefit Relationship, 4) Burden Relationship, and 5) Proportionality. They are each discussed below and are supported throughout the rest of this report.

Purpose of Fee

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

We understand that it is the policy of the Town that new development will not burden the existing service population with the cost of facilities required to accommodate growth. The purpose of the fees proposed by this report is to implement this policy by providing a funding source from new development for capital improvements to serve that development. The fees advance a legitimate Town interest by enabling the Town to provide municipal services to new development.

Use of Fee Revenues

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

Fees proposed in this report, if enacted by the Town, would be available to fund expanded facilities to serve new development. Facilities funded by these fees are designated to be located within the Town. Fees addressed in this report have been identified by the Town to be restricted to funding the following facility categories: General facilities, Park facilities, Trails facilities, Storm Drain facilities, and Streets and Traffic Signals.

Summary descriptions of the planned facilities such as size and cost estimates were provided by the Town and are included in Chapters 4 through 8 of this report. More thorough descriptions of certain planned facilities, including their specific location, if known at this time, are included in master plans, capital improvement plans, or other Town planning documents or are available from Town staff. The Town may change the list of planned facilities to meet changing needs and circumstances, as it deems necessary. The fees should be updated if these amendments result in a significant change in the fair share cost allocated to new development.

Planned facilities to be funded by the fees are described in the *Facilities, Inventories, Plans and Standards* sections in each facility category chapter.

Benefit Relationship

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

We expect that the Town will restrict fee revenue to the acquisition of land, construction of facilities and buildings, and purchase of related equipment, furnishings, vehicles, and services used to serve new development. Facilities funded by the fees are expected to provide a Town-wide network of facilities accessible to the additional residents and workers associated with new development. Under the Act, fees are not intended to fund planned facilities needed to correct existing Deficiencies. Thus, a reasonable relationship can be shown between the use of fee revenue and the new development residential and non-residential use classifications that will pay the fees.

Burden Relationship

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

Facilities need is based on a facility standard that represents the demand generated by new development for those facilities. Facilities demand is determined as follows:

- The service population is established based upon the number of residents and workers, which correlates to the demand for General facilities, Park facilities and Trails facilities;
- Storm water generation is directly related to the impervious surface area of a new development and is linked to the number of EDUs and corresponds to an increased demand for Storm Drain facilities;
- The number of vehicular trips generated per use classification determines Streets and Traffic Signals facilities demand.

For each facility category, demand is measured by a single facility standard that can be applied across land use types to ensure a reasonable relationship to the type of development. Service population standards are calculated based upon the number of residents associated with residential development and the number of workers associated with non-residential development. To calculate a single, per capita standard, one worker is weighted less than one resident based on an analysis of the relative use demand between residential and non-residential development. For Storm Drain facilities, facility standards are based on the impervious surface area of a development and linked to the number of EDUs as compared to one single-family dwelling unit.

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

Chapter 3 Growth Projections provides a description of how service population and growth projections are calculated. Facility standards are described in the *Facilities, Inventories, Plans and standards* sections of in each facility category chapter.

Proportionality

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

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

See *Chapter 3, Growth Projections,* or the *service population, Equivalent Dwelling Unit or Trip Rate Adjustment Factor* sections in each facility category chapter for a description of how service population, EDUs or Trip Rate Adjustment Factors are determined for different types of land uses. See the *Fee Schedule* section of each facility category chapter for a presentation of the proposed facilities fees.

ATTACHMENT "B"
ADDITIONAL FINDINGS

GENERAL FACILITIES: Additional Findings

Purpose:
The purpose of the general facilities fee is to provide funding for the construction and or expansions of existing general facilities within the Town. These include the Town Hall Complex, the California Welcome Center, and the Community Development/Public Works Complex. Specifically, these include the areas of Town Hall, Library, Community Center, Museum, California Welcome Center, the Community Development Administration Building, the Public Works Operations Building, and the future Animal Shelter. These facilities and their specifics are identified in Table 3.1 of the Study.

Use of Fee Revenues:
The revenue generated from this fee will be used to furnish the funding required to erect new municipal buildings or expand existing municipal buildings as described in the foregoing section. These facilities will provide centralized, efficient, and expanded public service facilities to accommodate the projected increase in the Town's population due to new development.

Benefit Relationship:
The new residential, commercial, office, and industrial development which are anticipated to occur during the planning period will generate significant additional demand for the administrative, management, professional, technical and para-professional services provided by the staffs of the Town's non-emergency services. This demand will occur among all components of the community and will require adequate provision for office expansion to accommodate the new growth. The fee recommended will apply to each of these community components, since all will contribute to the demand for new and expanded municipal services.

Burden Relationship:
New development will require the services supplied by the administrative offices of the Town's non-emergency services. These services will require adequate, convenient and efficient workspace to fulfill their public service requirements. Chapter 3 of the Study addresses General Facilities. Specifically, Tables 3.0, 3.1, and 3.2 establish the rational and methodology for determining the fee for new development, as identified in Table 3.3.

Proportionality:
Chapter 3 of the Study addresses General Facilities. Specifically, Tables 3.0, 3.1, and 3.2 establish the rational and methodology for determining the fee for new development, as identified in Table 3.3.

PARK FACILITIES: Additional Findings

Purpose:
The purpose of this fee is to provide funding for the acquisition and improvement of those park facilities and projects identified in the Parks Master Plan, and that are required to augment the Town's current park system to accommodate the needs of projected new growth and development in the Town.

Use of Fee Revenues:
The revenue generated from this fee will be used to purchase land and develop new community, neighborhood and specialized parks within the Town of Yucca Valley pursuant to the goals and objectives of such facilities contained in the General Plan and the Parks Master Plan.

Benefit Relationship:
The new residential development which is anticipated to occur during the planning period will generate significant need to improve and expand the Town's basic park facilities. This fee will be used to finance such improvements and additions. These new park facilities will be needed in order to accommodate the projected growth from new development which will be occurring during the planning period as well as maintain existing service levels.

Burden Relationship:
As noted previously, new development will require additional, improved or expanded park facilities to maintain existing service levels. Growth from new development will require adding five acres of new park facilities per 1,000 population to accommodate such growth and to maintain current service levels. Further, the new facilities will enhance the community's quality of live and living environment to the benefit of all its citizens.

Proportionality:
Chapter 4 of the Draft Study, including Tables 4.0, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, and 4.5, identify the methodology and basis for calculating the maximum fees that may be imposed for park facilities as identified in Table 4.6. No fees are recommended for commercial, office or industrial type development.

TRAILS FACILITIES: Additional Findings

Purpose:
Chapter 5 addresses the Town's trails system as identified in the Master Plan of Trails. The purpose of the fee is to ensure that development funds its fair share of the trails system.

Use of Fee Revenues:
The Town will use fee revenues to expand the Town's network of trails to serve new development. The continued implementation of the trails system will further encourage the use of this alternative transportation mode consistent with the General Plan's stated goals and objectives.

Benefit Relationship:
The projected residential development which is anticipated to occur during the planning period will generate significant additional demand and need for the trails network. The fee will be used to finance such improvements and additions that are necessary to serve new development that is projected to occur during the planning period.

Burden Relationship:
As noted above, new residential development generates additional pedestrian and multi-use traffic which will require additional or improved and/or expanded trail facilities to maintain existing service levels as new growth occurs.

Proportionality:
Chapter 5, specifically Tables 5.0, 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3, identify the methodology and basis for calculating the fee level identified in Table 5.4.

STORM DRAIN FACILITIES: Additional Findings

Purpose:
The purpose of this fee is to provide funding for the acquisition and improvement of those storm drain facilities and projects identified in the Master Plan of Drainage, and that are required to augment the Town's current flood control system to accommodate the needs of projected new growth and development in the Town.

Use of Fee Revenues:
The revenue generated from this fee will be used to purchase land and develop new storm drain facilities within the Town of Yucca Valley pursuant to the goals and objectives of such facilities contained in the General Plan and as identified in the Master Plan of Drainage, as well as within Chapter 6 of the Study.

Benefit Relationship:
The new residential, commercial, office and industrial development which are anticipated to occur during the planning period will generate significant need to improve and expand the Town's storm drain office. This fee will be used to finance such improvements and additions. These new storm drain facilities will be needed in order to accommodate the projected growth from new development which will be occurring during the planning period as well as maintain existing service levels.

Burden Relationship:
Chapter 6, specifically Table 6.2, establishes and demonstrates a reasonable relationship between new development and the need for new facilities. The facility standard is based on the planned facilities investment into the Town's system of storm drainage facilities on a per EDU basis.

Proportionality:
Chapter 6 of the Draft Study, including Tables 6.0, 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3, identify the methodology and basis for calculating the maximum fees that may be imposed for storm drain facilities as identified in Table 6.4

STREETS AND TRAFFIC: Additional Findings

Purpose:
Chapter 7 summarizes an analysis of the need for streets and related transportation facilities to accommodate growth within the Town of Yucca Valley. It documents a reasonable relationship between new development and a traffic fee to fund street and related transportation facilities that serve new development. The purpose of this fee is to provide funding for the construction of those improvements to the Town's street facilities as identified in Chapter 7.

Use of Fee Revenues:
The revenue generated from this fee is to provide funding for the construction of those improvements to the Town's street facilities as identified in Chapter 7, which are required to augment the Town's current street system to accommodate the needs of projected new growth and development in the Town.

Benefit Relationship:
The new residential, commercial and industrial development which is projected to occur during the planning period and to build out will generate significant additional traffic and the need to improve and expand the Town's street facility system. The fee will be used to provide for those capacity improvements and traffic and pedestrian safety improvements required by growth projections to maintain existing levels of service and to accommodate new growth and development.

Burden Relationship:
As noted in the previous section, each type of new residential, commercial, office and industrial development will generate additional traffic, which will create an incremental need to add to roadway capacity, and to improve traffic and pedestrian safety. Specifically in Chapter 7, Tables 7.0, 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3 establish the methodology and basis for the fees identified in Table 7.2

Proportionality:
The recommended fee is demand or trip generation based. Based upon trip generation rates, Chapter 7 identifies the costs attributable to new development including residential, commercial, office, and industrial. Specifically in Chapter 7, Tables 7.0, 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3 establish the methodology and basis for the fees identified in Table 7.2

ATTACHMENT "C"
DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE SCHEDULE

Subdivision, single family residential development:	$9,081 Per Unit	
Infill, single family residential development:	$2,568 Per Unit allocated to Park Facilities	
Multi-Family residential development:	$3,600 Per Unit	
Commercial, Office and Industrial development:	Up to 3,000 sq. ft.	$1.00 Per Sq. Ft.
	3,001 to 5,000 sq. ft.	$2.00 Per Sq. Ft.
	5,001 to 10,000 sq. ft	$4.00 Per Sq Ft.*
	Over 10,000 sq. ft.	$7.74 Per Sq. Ft.**
*Industrial Development is capped at:	$3.18 Per Sq. Ft.	
**Office Development is capped at:	$7.08 Per Sq. Ft.	

ATTACHMENT A
GENERAL FACILITIES

Table 3.1 General Facilities Existing Standard

Existing Facilities	Inventory		Cost / Unit		Total Value
Land (Acres)					
Public Works Complex	1.6		20,000	$	32,000
Buildings (sq-ft)					
Town Hall/Library	12,640	$	200	$	2,528,000
Community Center	11,922		250	$	2,980,500
Museum	5,108		200	$	1,021,600
Corp. Yard Operations	9,623		200	$	1,924,600
Animal Shelter (Future)**	10,000		150	$	1,500,000
Total Facilities				$	9,986,700
Existing Service Population					19,840
Cost Per Capita				$	503
Facility Standard per Resident				$	503
Facility Standard per Worker					103

*** Animal Shelter costs applied to residential users only*

Table 3.2: New Development Contribution

Facility Standard per Resident	$	503
Growth in Residents (2005-2025)		15,470
Facility Standard per Worker		103
Growth in Workers (2005-2025)		4,000
New Development Contribution	$	8,199,009

Table 3.3: General Facilities Fee

Land Use	Standard Per EDU	Density	Fee	Admin	Total Fee	Fee/ Sq-ft
RESIDENTIAL		(per dwelling unit)				
Single Family	$ 503	2.29	$ 1,152	$ 29	$ 1,181	
Multi Family	503	1.77	890	22	913	
NON-RESIDENTIAL		(per 1,000 square feet building area)				
Commercial	$ 103	2.50	$ 258	$ 6	$ 264	$ 0.26
Office	103	3.33	343	9	352	0.35
Industrial	103	1.67	172	4	176	0.18

ATTACHMENT B
STORM DRAIN FACILITIES

Table 6.2: Storm Drain Facilities Standard

			(2004 Costs)
Detained Flood Control System Projected Cost		$	102,016,000
Cost Escalator			121%
Escalated Detained Flood Control System Cost			123,439,360
Facilities Standard Cost Allocation:	50%	$	61,719,680
Total EDUs (2025)			24,382
Equity Per EDU		$	2,531

Table 6.3: Development Share of Storm Drain Facilities

Facility Standard Per EDU	$	2,531
Growth in EDUs (2005-2025)		9,813
New Development Contribution	$	24,840,260

Table 6.4: Storm Drain Facility Fees

Land Use	Standard Per EDU	EDU Factor	Fee	Admin	Total Fee	Fee/ Sq-ft
RESIDENTIAL		(per dwelling unit)				
Single Family	$ 2,531	1.00	$ 2,531	$ 101	$ 2,632	
Multi Family	2,531	0.50	1,266	51	1,316	
NON-RESIDENTIAL		(per 1,000 square feet building area)				
Commercial	$ 2,531	0.66	$ 1,670	$ 67	$ 1,737	$ 1.74
Office	2,531	0.69	1,746	70	1,816	1.82
Industrial	2,531	0.46	1,164	47	1,211	1.21

ATTACHMENT C
STREETS AND TRAFFIC

Table 7.2: Streets & Traffic Facilities Master Plan Cost Summary for New Development

Streets	*Cost*
ROW Costs to widen SR 62 - West Town Boundary to Kickapoo Trail, 2.89 AC	$ 1,346,406
Widen SR 62 to 6 Lanes - West Town Boundary to Kickapoo Trail, 1.42 miles	2,227,500
ROW Costs to widen SR 62 - Kickapoo Trail to Acoma/Mohawk Trail, 1.32 AC	1,033,511
Widen SR 62 to 6 Lanes - Kickapoo Trail to Acoma/Mohawk Trail, 1.09 miles	1,707,750
ROW Costs to widen SR 62 - Acoma/Mohawk Trail to SR 247, 1.83 AC	1,427,190
Widen SR 62 to 6 Lanes - Acoma/Mohawk Trail to SR 247, 1.51 miles	2,361,150
ROW Costs to widen SR 62 - SR 247 to Hilton Avenue, 1.03 AC	802,775
Widen SR 62 to 6 Lanes - SR 247 to Hilton Avenue, 0.85 miles	1,336,500
ROW Costs to widen SR 62 - Hilton Avenue to Avalon Avenue, 1.03 AC	806,575
Widen SR 62 to 6 Lanes - Hilton Avenue to Avalon Avenue, 0.85 miles	1,336,500
ROW Costs to widen SR 62 - Avalon Avenue to Yucca Mesa Road, 1.26 AC	984,829
Widen SR 62 to 6 Lanes - Avalon Avenue to Yucca Mesa Road, 1.04 miles	1,633,500
ROW Costs to widen SR 247 - SR 62 to San Juan Road, 12.19 AC	2,804,775
Widen SR 247 to 4 Divided Lanes - SR 62 to San Juan Road, 1.57 miles	3,140,000
ROW Costs to widen SR 247 - San Juan Road to Buena Vista Drive, 12.19 AC	2,804,775
Widen SR 247 to 4 Divided Lanes - San Juan Road to Buena Vista Drive, 1.57 miles	3,140,000
ROW Cost to widen SR 247 - Buena Vista Drive to N. Town Boundary, 17.80 AC	4,093,113
Widen SR 247 to 4 Divided Lanes - Buena Vista Drive to N. Town Boundary, 2.16 miles	4,320,000
Widen Onaga Trail, 4 Lane Arterial Divided - Kickapoo Trail to Joshua Lane	7,437,150
Widen Yucca Trail, 4 Lane Arterial Divided - Sage Avenue to Avalon Avenue	5,883,584
Widen Joshua Lane, 4 Lane Arterial Divided - Onaga Trail to SR 62	2,621,399
Widen Kickapoo Trail, 4 Lane Collector - Onaga Trail to SR 62	387,318
Widen Acoma Trail, 4 Lane Collector - Golden Bee Drive to SR 62	3,327,726
Widen Sage Avenue, 4 Lane Collector - Golden Bee Drive to SR 62	3,327,726
Widen Joshua Lane, 4 Lane Collector - Golden Bee Drive to Onaga Trail	2,065,485
Widen La Contenta Road, 4 Lane Collector - Yucca Trail to SR 62	3,174,245
Widen Palomar Avenue, 4 Lane Collector - Joshua Lane to Yucca Trail	3,977,971
Widen Avalon Avenue, 4 Lane Collector - Yucca Trail to SR 62	2,930,329
Widen Yucca Trail, 4 Lane Collector - Avalon Avenue to Yucca Mesa Road	4,037,342
Widen Onaga Trail, 4 Lane Collector - Joshua Lane to Palomar Avenue	2,983,479
Widen Joshua Drive, 4 Lane Collector - Acoma Trail to Joshua Lane	2,486,232
Widen Warren Vista Avenue, 2 Lane Collector - Yucca Trail to SR 62	474,964
Widen Joshua Lane, 2 Lane Collector - Golden Bee Drive to Warren Vista Drive	793,406
Widen Sage Avenue, 4 Lane Collector - SR 62 to Sunnyslope Drive	1,147,492
Widen Deer Trail, 4 Lane Collector - Onaga Trail to SR 62	1,032,743
Widen Balsa Avenue, 4 Lane Collector - Yucca Trail to SR 62	1,338,740
Widen Yucca Mesa Road, 4 Lane Collector - SR 62 to N. Town Boundary	4,360,469
Widen Buena Vista Drive, 4 Lane Collector - SR 247 to Yucca Mesa Road	6,196,455
Construct Sunnyslope Drive, 4 Lane Collector - Balsa Avenue to La Contenta Road	3,858,874
Construct Indio Avenue, 2 Lane Industrial - Yucca Trail to SR 62	4,879,468
Total:	**$ 106,029,446**

Table 7.2: Streets & Traffic Facilities Master Plan Cost Summary for New Development

Traffic Safety	*Cost*
Raised Medians on SR 62 - West Town Boundary to Fairway Drive	$ 810,000
Raised Medians on SR 62 - Camino del Cielo to Kickapoo Trail	$ 1,114,000
Raised Medians on SR 62 - Cherokee Trail to Acoma/Mohawk Trail	$ 616,000
Raised Medians on SR 62 - Palm Avenue to Sage Avenue	$ 794,000
Raised Medians on SR 62 - SR 247 to Warren Vista Avenue	$ 1,198,000
Raised Medians on SR 62 - Warren Vista Avenue to Hilton Avenue	$ 608,000
Raised Medins on SR 62 - Hilton Avenue to Balsa Avenue	$ 640,000
Raised Medians on SR 62 - Balsa Avenue to Avalon Avenue	$ 1,178,000
Raised Medians on SR 62 - Indio Avenue to Yucca Mesa Road	$ 1,126,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - West Town boundary to Fairway Drive	$ 276,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Fairway Drive to Camino del Cielo	$ 380,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Camino del Cielo to Kickapoo Trail	$ 380,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Kickapoo Trail to Elk Trail	$ 456,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Elk Trail to Cherokee Trail	$ 130,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Cherokee Trail to Acoma/Mohawk Trail	$ 210,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Acoma/Mohawk Trail to Palm Avenue	$ 350,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Palm Avenue to Sage Avenue	$ 378,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Sage Avenue to SR 247	$ 370,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - SR 247 to Warren Vista Avenue	$ 408,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Warren Vista Avenue to Hilton Avenue	$ 208,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Hilton Avenue to Balsa Avenue	$ 218,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Balsa Avenue to Avalon Avenue	$ 402,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Avalon Avenue to Indio Avenue	$ 373,000
Sidewalks on both sides SR 62 - Indio Avenue to Yucca Mesa Road	$ 384,000
Subtotal - Traffic Safety	$13,007,000

Traffic Signals	*Cost*
Yucca Trail @ Joshua Lane	$ 500,000
SR 62/Camino del Cielo	$ 500,000
SR 62/Sage Avenue	$ 500,000
SR 62/Joshua Lane	$ 500,000
SR 62/Yucca Mesa Road/La Contenta Road	$ 500,000
Yucca Trail/Avalon Avenue/Palomar Avenue	$ 500,000
Onaga Trail/Acoma Trail	$ 500,000
Subtotal - Traffic Signals	$ 3,500,000

TOTAL: $16,507,000

Table 7.3: Streets & Traffic Facilities Standard

Planned Projects		
Street Improvements	$	106,029,446
Traffic Safety		13,007,000
Traffic Signals		3,500,000
Total Streets & Traffic Facilities	$	122,536,446
Less: Other Funding Sources 2004-2025		(4,015,000)
Net Facility Needs	$	118,521,446
Development Share: 40%		47,408,578
Projected Trips Demand for Future Growth		231,860
Standard Per Trip	$	204

Table 7.4: Streets & Traffic Facility Fees

Land Use	Standard Per Trip	Trip Demand Factor	Fee	Admin	Total Fee	Fee/ Sq-ft
RESIDENTIAL		(per dwelling unit)				
Single Family	$ 204	10.4	$ 2,122	$ 120	$ 2,242	
Multi Family	204	8.3	1,693	96	1,789	
NON-RESIDENTIAL		(per 1,000 square feet building area)				
Commercial	$ 204	26.6	$ 5,426	$ 308	$ 5,734	$ 5.73
Office	204	22.8	4,651	264	4,915	4.91
Industrial	204	8.3	1,693	96	1,789	1.79

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

TOWN OF YUCCA VALLEY

I, Janet M. Anderson, Town Clerk of the Town of Yucca Valley, California do hereby certify that Resolution No. 11-46 was duly and regularly adopted by the Town Council of the Town of Yucca Valley, California, at a meeting thereof held on the 18th day of October, 2011, by the following vote:

AYES:	Council Members Abel, Lombardo, and Mayor Huntington
NOES:	Council Member Hagerman and Rowe
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	None

TOWN CLERK