

CITY OF SALINAS

PARK FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE UPDATE STUDY

ADMINISTRATIVE DRAFT

NOVEMBER 5, 2019



Oakland Office

1939 Harrison Street
Suite 430
Oakland, CA 94612
Tel: (510) 832-0899
Fax: (510) 832-0898

Corporate Office

27368 Via Industria
Suite 110
Temecula, CA 92590
Tel: (800) 755-MUNI (6864)
Fax: (909) 587-3510

Other Regional Offices

Lancaster, CA
Memphis, TN
Orlando, FL
Phoenix, AZ
Sacramento, CA
Seattle, WA

www.willdan.com

This page has been intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	3
Background and Study Objectives	3
Public Facilities Financing in California	3
Organization of the Report	4
Facility Standards and Cost Allocation Approach	4
2. LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS.....	5
Use of Growth Projections for Impact Fees	5
Land Use Types	5
Growth Projections for City of Salinas	5
Occupant Densities	6
3. PARKS & RECREATION FACILITIES	7
Existing Park and Recreation Facilities Inventory	7
Parkland Unit Costs	9
Improved Parkland Equivalent	9
Park Facility Standards	10
City of Salinas Park Facilities Standards	11
Facilities Needed to Accommodate New Development	11
Parks Cost per Capita	12
Use of Fee Revenue	13
Fee Schedule	13
4. WEST AREA PARK IMPROVEMENT FEE	15
Estimated Service Population	15
Planned Park Facilities	15
Park Cost Assumptions	16
Cost per Capita	17
West Area Park Improvement Fee Schedule	18
5. CENTRAL AREA PARK IMPROVEMENT FEE.....	19
Estimated Service Population	19
Planned Park Facilities	19
Park Cost Assumptions	21
Cost per Capita	22
Central Area Park Improvement Fee Schedule	22
6. IMPLEMENTATION	24
Impact Fee Program Adoption Process	24
Inflation Adjustment	24
Reporting Requirements	24
Fee Accounting	26
Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP	26
7. MITIGATION FEE ACT FINDINGS	27
Purpose of Fee	27
Use of Fee Revenues	27
Benefit Relationship	27
Burden Relationship	28

Proportionality	28
APPENDIX	29

DRAFT

1. Introduction

This report summarizes an analysis of the need for public facilities and capital improvements to support future development within the City of Salinas through 2040. It is the City'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 City's public facilities fee program all fall into the park facilities category.

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 create fees that incorporate current capital facility plans to serve a 2040 service population for the City of Salinas.

The City currently collects park facilities fees under the Quimby Act for development within its boundaries. This report will update the City's Quimby fees and propose two new impact fees to fund park facilities within the West Area and Central Area Specific Plans.

The City 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 fees presented in the fee schedules contained herein.

Depending on the characteristics of the development project, the City may use the Quimby Act to calculate impact fees. The Quimby Act allows a city to require developers to dedicate at least three acres and up to five acres per 1,000 residents, if the city's existing park standard as of the last Census justifies the higher level.

Public Facilities Financing in California

The changing fiscal landscape in California during the past 40 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 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.

Chapter 3 is devoted to documenting the maximum justified public facilities fee for park facilities.

Chapter 4 documents park impact fees for the West Area Specific Plan area.

Chapter 5 documents park impact fees for the Central Area Specific Plan area.

Chapter 6 describes the fee implementation process. 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 7.

Facility Standards and Cost Allocation 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 value of facilities per capita, or the value of improvements per acre or per capita. The adopted facility standard is a critical component in determining 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 the existing city infrastructure.

The park facilities fees calculated in this report use an existing inventory demand standard translated into facility costs per capita to determine new development's fair share of planned facility costs. A cost standard provides a reasonable method for converting disparate types of facilities, in this case parkland and special use recreational facilities, into a single measure of demand (capital cost per capita). The citywide fee cost standard is based on the **existing inventory** of park facilities. New development would fund the expansion of facilities at the same rate that existing development has provided facilities to date, thus by definition, there is no existing deficiency. Fees for the specific plan areas are based on achieving a 3.0-acre per 1,000 resident standard consistent with the minimum Quimby Act standard.

2. Land Use Assumptions

This chapter describes the projections of growth used in this study. The existing service population in 2019 is used as the base year of the study and the planning horizon is the year 2040. This chapter also describes the sources of the unit costs for land and buildings used in this study.

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 in 2040 are used to determine the total amount of public facilities required to accommodate the future service population.
- Estimates of existing and new development are used to allocate the fair share of total planned facility costs between existing and new development.

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:** Detached and attached one-family dwelling units.
- **Multi-family:** All attached multi-family dwellings such as duplexes, condominiums, plus mobile homes, apartments, and dormitories.

The City should have the discretion to impose the park 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. The fee imposed should be based on the land use type that most closely matches the probable occupant density of the development.

Growth Projections for City of Salinas

Park and recreation facilities in Salinas primarily serve residents in the City of Salinas. Therefore, residents comprise the park and recreation facilities service population.

The base year for this study is the year 2019. The planning horizon is 2040. Resident growth between 2019 and 2040 comprises the growth increment in this analysis. The City's population in 2010 is used to calculate the parkland standard under the *Quimby Act*. The AMBAG 2018 Regional Growth Forecast identified total projected residents in the City in 2040.

Table 2.1 shows estimates of the growth in terms of residents between 2019 and 2040. The table also shows the City's population in 2010.

**Table 2.1: Citywide Parks
Service Population**

	Residents
Census (2010)	150,441
Existing (2019)	160,555
Growth (2019 - 2040)	<u>24,044</u>
Total (2040)	184,599

Sources: US Census, 2010; CA Department of Finance, Table E-5, 2019; AMBAG 2018 Regional Growth Forecast.

Occupant Densities

Occupant densities ensure a reasonable relationship between the increase in service population and amount of the fee. Developers pay the fee based on the number of additional housing units for residential development. The fee schedule must convert service population estimates into these measures of housing units. This conversion is done with average occupant density factors by land use type, shown in **Table 2.2**. The residential occupant density factors for both the various types of dwelling units were derived from the most recently available data from US Census' American Community Survey.

Table 2.2: Occupant Density

All Dwelling Units Citywide	3.67	Residents Per Dwelling Unit
Single Family	3.90	Residents Per Dwelling Unit
Multifamily	3.32	Residents Per Dwelling Unit

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Tables B25024 and B25033.

3. Parks & Recreation Facilities

The following chapter documents the nexus analysis, demonstrating the need for new park and recreation facilities demanded by new development. This analysis documents two separate fees based on the Quimby Act and the Mitigation Fee Act. The City would collect the fee based a standard of 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents if the development was subject to the Quimby Act land dedication requirement. For all other development, the City would collect based on the existing standard through the Mitigation Fee Act. The City would only collect one of the two fees depending on which was appropriate. Fees for the West Area Specific Plan and the Central Area Specific Plan are calculated in Chapters 4 and 5.

Existing Park and Recreation Facilities Inventory

The City of Salinas maintains several park and recreation facilities throughout the city. **Table 3.1** summarizes the City's existing parkland inventory. All facilities are located within the City limits. The inventory distinguishes between developed and unimproved parkland. Developed parkland includes parks that are open for public use with typical park amenities. Undeveloped parkland represents land that the City owns but does not yet include any improvements or amenities.

Table 3.1: Existing Parkland Inventory

Park Name	Improved Park Acres	Unimproved Park Acres	Total
<u>Community Parks</u>			
Cesar Chavez Community Park	28.82	-	28.82
El Dorado Community Park	5.71	-	5.71
Gene Robinson Park	1.16	-	1.16
Monte Bella Community Park	18.53	-	18.53
Natividad Creek Community Park	55.25	-	55.25
Sherwood Park	25.64	-	25.64
Subtotal	135.11	-	135.11
<u>Neighborhood Parks</u>			
Claremont Manor Neighborhood Park	4.60	-	4.60
Creekbridge Neighborhood Park	1.82	-	1.82
Frank Paul School Park	4.23	-	4.23
Harden Neighborhood Park	4.95	-	4.95
Hartnell Neighborhood Park	4.22	-	4.22
La Paz Neighborhood Park	1.46	-	1.46
Laurel Heights Neighborhood Park	2.98	-	2.98
Laurel Neighborhood Park	3.70	-	3.70
Laurelwood Neighborhood Park	2.97	-	2.97
Los Padres Neighborhood Park	2.65	-	2.65
McKinnon Neighborhood Park	4.52	-	4.52
Mission Neighborhood Park	2.50	-	2.50
Natividad Neighborhood Park	1.80	-	1.80
Northgate Neighborhood Park	4.75	-	4.75
Rossi Rico Linear Parkway	10.78	-	10.78
Sanborn Neighborhood Park	4.54	-	4.54
Santa Rita Neighborhood Park	4.88	-	4.88
Soberanes Neighborhood Park	2.72	-	2.72
Steinbeck Neighborhood Park	3.12	-	3.12
Williams Ranch Neighborhood Park	4.58	-	4.58
Woodside Neighborhood Park	2.97	-	2.97
Subtotal	80.74	-	80.74
<u>Small Parks</u>			
Azahel Cruz Park	0.82	-	0.82
Bataan Memorial Park	0.71	-	0.71
Clay Street Play Lot	0.40	-	0.40
Gabilan Play Lot	0.46	-	0.46
Jaycee Tot Lot	0.65	-	0.65
Maple Play Lot	0.78	-	0.78
Myrtle Court Play Lot	0.68	-	0.68
Northgate Tot Lot	0.40	-	0.40
Santa Lucia Playground	0.49	-	0.49
Soto Square	0.70	-	0.70
Subtotal	6.09	-	6.09
<u>Special Use Recreation Facilities</u>			
Constitution Soccer Complex	19.34	-	19.34
Acacia Court	-	0.09	0.09
Carmel Corner	-	0.41	0.41
Cornell Corner	-	0.08	0.08
Veterans Memorial Park	3.48	-	3.48
Salinas Sports Complex	62.89	-	62.89
Subtotal	85.71	0.58	86.29
Total Park Acres	307.65	0.58	308.23

Source: City of Salinas.

Parkland Unit Costs

Table 3.2 shows the estimated cost per acre for developing parkland, including land acquisition. A land acquisition cost assumption \$250,000 per acre is used based on discussions with City staff and the development community.

The standard park improvement cost per acre is based on the assumed cost per acre for neighborhood parks based on Willdan's recent experience with other clients, and discussions with Salinas developers and City staff. Full line item cost estimates park improvement costs are included in the appendix of this report.

Table 3.2: Parkland Unit Costs

Item	Total Value
Standard Park Improvements Cost per Acre	\$ 610,500
Land Acquisition	250,000
Total Parkland Acquisition and Improvement Cost per Acre	\$ 860,500

Source: Appendix Table A.2.

Improved Parkland Equivalent

Before calculating the existing standards, unimproved parkland owned by the City must be converted to an equivalent amount of improved parkland. **Table 3.3** details this conversion. The conversion is based on the ratio of the cost of an unimproved acre of land relative to an acre of improved parkland. The assumptions for the value of unimproved and improved parkland are shown above in Table 3.2.

Table 3.3: Improved Parkland Equivalent

Type	Cost per Acre	Acres
Unimproved Parkland	\$ 250,000	
Improved Parkland	860,500	
Unimproved Parkland Land Costs as a Relative Percentage of Parkland Costs	29%	
Existing Unimproved Parkland		0.58
Improvement Factor	x 29%	
Equivalent Improved Acres		0.17

Note: Figures have been rounded.

Sources: Tables 3.1 and 3.2.

Park Facility Standards

Park facility standards establish a reasonable relationship between new development and the need for expanded park facilities. Information regarding the City's existing inventory of existing parks facilities was obtained from City staff.

The most common measure in calculating new development's demand for parks is the ratio of park acres per resident. In general, facility standards may be based on the Mitigation Fee Act (using a city's existing inventory of park facilities), or an adopted policy standard contained in a master facility plan or general plan. Facility standards may also be based on a land dedication standard established by the Quimby Act.¹ The land dedication standard refers to the number of acres per 1,000 residents that the required land dedication or a fee in-lieu of land dedication is based on. A typical Quimby Act standard for land dedication is 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents, though the standard can vary by jurisdiction. Another example of a land dedication standard can be found in a city that charges at 5.0 acres per 1,000 residents to meet its general plan goals. The standards used in this analysis are discussed in depth below.

Mitigation Fee Act

The Mitigation Fee Act does not dictate use of a particular type or level of facility standard for public facilities fees. To comply with the findings required under the law, facility standards must not burden new development with any cost associated with facility deficiencies attributable to existing development.² A simple and clearly defensible approach to calculating a facility standard is to use the city's existing ratio of park acreage per 1,000 residents. Under this approach, new development is required to fund new park facilities at the same level as existing residents have provided those same types of facilities to date.

Quimby Act

The Quimby Act does specify facility standards to use for parkland dedication. The Act only includes dedication of parkland and does not require construction of park improvements. The Act specifies that the dedication requirement must be a minimum of 3.0 acres and a maximum of 5.0 acres per 1,000 residents. Funds collected through the Quimby ordinance can only be used for purchasing land to create neighborhood and community parks, not open space. The city can require residential developers to dedicate above the three-acre minimum if the city's existing park standard as of the last Census justifies the higher level (up to five acres per 1,000 residents). The standard used must also conform to the City's adopted general or specific plan standards.

The Quimby Act only applies to land subdivisions. A city cannot apply the Quimby Act to development on land subdivided prior to adoption of a Quimby ordinance, such as development on infill lots. The Quimby Act also would not apply to residential development on future approved projects on single parcels, such as many types of multi-family development.

The Quimby Act allows payment of a fee in lieu of land dedication. The fee is calculated to fund acquisition of the same amount of land that would have been dedicated. The fee does not include the cost of park improvements because the land dedication requirement does not include improvements. Developments paying the Quimby Act fee in-lieu of dedication are also subject to a Mitigation Fee Act fee for park improvements, calculated at the existing standard.

The Quimby Act allows use of in-lieu fee revenue for developing new or rehabilitating existing neighborhood or community park or recreational facilities to serve the subdivision paying the fee, including land acquisition, unless certain conditions are met. The City can use Quimby fee

¹ California Government Code §66477.

² See the benefit and burden findings in Chapter 7, Mitigation Fee Act Findings.

revenue for purpose of developing new or rehabilitating existing park or recreational facilities in a neighborhood other than the neighborhood paying the fees if the following conditions are met:³

1. The neighborhood in which the fees are to be spent has a standard of less than 3.0 park area per 1,000 members of the neighborhood population.
2. The neighborhood paying the fees has park standard that meets or exceeds 3.0 acres per 1,000 persons.
3. The City Council holds a public hearing before using the fees.
4. The City Council makes a finding that it is reasonably foreseeable that future inhabitants of the subdivision paying the fees will use the proposed park and recreational facilities in the neighborhood where the fees are used.
5. The fees are used within a specified radius that complies with the city's Quimby ordinance and are consistent with the adopted general plan or specific plan of the city. "Specified radius" includes a planning area, zone of influence, or other geographic region designated by the city.

City of Salinas Park Facilities 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. **Table 3.4** shows the existing standard for improved park acreage per 1,000 residents and documents the City's standard as of the last Census for the Quimby Act standard.

Table 3.4: Level of Service Standards

	Mitigation Fee Act Standard (2019)	Quimby Act Standard (2010) ¹
Improved Park Acreage	307.65	307.65
Unimproved Park Acreage Equivalent	0.17	0.17
Total - Park Acres	307.82	307.82
Service Population (Residents)	160,555	150,441
Level of Service Standard (Acres per 1,000 Residents)	1.92	2.05

¹ The City can charge Quimby fees in-lieu of parkland dedication, or require parkland dedication at the 3.0 acre per 1,000 resident standard because its existing standard as of the last Federal Census in 2010 was less than 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents.

Sources: Tables 2.1, 3.1 and 3.3.

Facilities Needed to Accommodate New Development

Table 3.5 shows the park facilities needed to accommodate new development at the existing standard. To achieve the standard by the planning horizon, depending on the amount of

³ Conditions are paraphrased. Refer to *California Government Code* §66477(a)(3)(B) for full text.

development subject to the Quimby Act, new development must fund the purchase and improvement of between 46.16 and 72.13 parkland acres, at a total cost ranging between \$39.7 and \$46.2 million.

The facility standards and resulting fees under the Quimby Act are higher because development will be charged to provide 3.0 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, and 1.92 acres of improvements, whereas development not subject to the Quimby Act will be charged to provide only 1.92 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, and 1.92 acres of improvements. Since the exact amount of development that will be subject to the Quimby fees is unknown at this time, Table 3.5 presents the range of total facility costs that may be incurred depending on the amount of development subject to the Quimby Act.

Table 3.5: Park Facilities to Accommodate New Development

	Calculation	Parkland	Improvements	Total Range ¹
<i>Parkland (Quimby Act), Improvements (Mitigation Fee Act)²</i>				
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 residents)	A	3.00	1.92	
Resident Growth (2019-2040)	B	24,044	24,044	
Facility Needs (acres)	$C = (B / 1,000) \times A$	72.13	46.16	
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	D	\$ 250,000	610,500	
Total Cost of Parkland To Serve New Development	$E = C \times D$	\$ 18,032,500	\$ 28,180,680	\$ 46,213,180
<i>Parkland and Improvements - Mitigation Fee Act³</i>				
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 residents)	F	1.92	1.92	
Resident Growth (2019-2040)	G	24,044	24,044	
Facility Needs (acres)	$H = (G / 1,000) / F$	46.16	46.16	
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	D	\$ 250,000	610,500	
Total Cost of Parkland To Serve New Development	$I = H \times D$	\$ 11,540,000	\$ 28,180,680	\$ 39,720,680

Note: Totals rounded to the thousands.

¹ Values in this column show the range of the cost of parkland acquisition and development should all development be either subject to the Quimby Act, or to the Mitigation Fee Act, respectively.

² Cost of parkland to serve new development shown if all development is subject to the Quimby Act (subdivisions). Parkland charged at 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents; improvements charged at the existing standard.

³ Cost of parkland to serve new development shown if all development is subject to the Mitigation Fee Act. Parkland and improvements are charged at the existing standard.

Sources: Tables 2.1, 3.2 and 3.4.

Parks Cost per Capita

Table 3.6 shows the cost per capita of providing new park facilities at the Quimby standard, and the existing facility standard. The cost per capita is shown separately for land and improvements. The costs per capita in this table will serve as the basis of three fees:

- A Quimby Act Fee in-lieu of land dedication. This fee is payable by residential development occurring in subdivisions outside of the West Area and Central Area Specific Plans.
- A Mitigation Fee Act Fee for land acquisition. This fee is payable by residential development outside of the West Area and Central Area Specific Plans not occurring in subdivisions.

- A Mitigation Fee Act Fee for parkland improvements. This fee is payable by all residential development outside of the West Area and Central Area Specific Plans.

A development project outside of the West Area and Central Area Specific Plans pays either the Quimby Act Fee in-lieu of land dedication, or the Mitigation Fee Act Fee for land acquisition, not both. All development projects outside of the West Area and Central Area Specific Plans pay the Mitigation Fee Act Fee for park improvements.

Table 3.6: Cost per Capita

		<u>Land</u> ¹	Mitigation	
	Calculation	Quimby Act	OR	Fee Act
				AND
				Improvements
Parkland Investment (per acre)	A	\$ 250,000	\$	250,000
Level of Service (acres per 1,000 residents)	B	3.00		1.92
Total Cost Per 1,000 capita	$C = A \times B$	\$ 750,000	\$	480,000
Cost Per Resident	$D = C / 1,000$	\$ 750	\$	480
				\$ 1,172

¹ A development project pays either the Quimby Act Fee In-Lieu of land dedication, or the Mitigation Fee Act Fee for land acquisition, not both. All development projects pay the Mitigation Fee Act Fee for park improvements.

Sources: Tables 3.2, 3.4 and Appendix Table A.1.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City plans to use park facilities fee revenue to purchase parkland or construct improvements to add to the system of park facilities that serves new development. The City may only use impact fee revenue to provide facilities and intensify usage of existing facilities needed to serve new development. Depending on the amount of development subject to the Quimby Act, new development must fund the purchase and improvement of between 46.16 and 72.13 parkland acres through the planning horizon of 2040.

Fee Schedule

To calculate fees by land use type, the investment in park facilities is determined on a per resident basis for both land acquisition and improvement. These investment factors (shown in Table 3.6) are investment per capita based on the unit cost estimates and facility standards.

The City anticipates that the park fees would be the primary revenue source to fund new development's investment in park facilities. **Tables 3.7.a and 3.7.b** show the park facilities fee based on the existing standard and the minimum Quimby standard, respectively. The City would collect the fee based on only one of the two approaches as appropriate. Each fee includes a component for park improvements based on the City's existing standard. The investment per capita is converted to a fee per dwelling unit using the occupancy density assumptions from Table 2.2.

The total fee includes an administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Table 3.7a: Citywide Park and Recreation Facilities Fee Schedule - Mitigation Fee Act

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee ¹	D = C x 0.02 Admin Charge ^{1, 2}	E = C + D Total Fee ¹
<u>Single Family</u>					
Parkland	\$ 480	3.90	\$ 1,872	\$ 37	\$ 1,909
Improvements	1,172	3.90	4,571	91	4,662
Total	\$ 1,652		\$ 6,443		\$ 6,571
<u>Multifamily</u>					
Parkland	\$ 480	3.32	\$ 1,594	\$ 32	\$ 1,626
Improvements	1,172	3.32	3,891	78	3,969
Total	\$ 1,652		\$ 5,485		\$ 5,595

¹ Fee per dwelling unit.² Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 3.6.

Table 3.7b: Citywide Park and Recreation Facilities Fee Schedule - Quimby Act

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee ¹	D = C x 0.02 Admin Charge ^{1, 2}	E = C + D Total Fee ¹
<u>Single Family</u>					
Parkland	\$ 750	3.90	\$ 2,925	\$ 59	\$ 2,984
Improvements	1,172	3.90	4,571	91	4,662
Total	\$ 1,922		\$ 7,496		\$ 7,646
<u>Multifamily</u>					
Parkland	\$ 750	3.32	\$ 2,490	\$ 50	\$ 2,540
Improvements	1,172	3.32	3,891	78	3,969
Total	\$ 1,922		\$ 6,381		\$ 6,509

¹ Fee per dwelling unit.² Administrative charge of 2.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 3.6.

4. West Area Park Improvement Fee

The West Area Park Improvement Fee ("WAPIF") will fund park improvements within the West Area Specific Plan at a 3.0 acre per 1,000 resident standard. The fee was developed with the assistance of West Area Specific Plan developers in order to meet their park facilities dedication requirements and to facilitate the credits and reimbursements between developers within the Specific Plan.

Estimated Service Population

Table 4.1 estimates the potential West Area Specific Plan Service population. Based on discussions with West Area developers, it is reasonable to assume the construction of 4,150 dwelling units in the Specific Plan area. The estimated dwelling units is multiplied by the Citywide average residents per dwelling unit to estimate the future residents in the West Area Specific Plan. Note that these projections of dwelling units and residents do not drive the fee calculations. Rather, the fee calculations are based on ensuring that the Specific Plan area achieves a 3.0 park acre per residential standard.

Table 4.1: WASP Land Use Assumptions

Assumed Dwelling Units	4,150
Residents per Dwelling Unit ¹	3.67
Projected Residents - WASP	15,231

¹ See Table 2.2.

Sources: City of Salinas; Table 2.2, Willdan Financial Services.

Planned Park Facilities

Table 4.2 displays the planned West Area Specific Plan Parks. The table also displays the estimated amount of street frontage associated with each park. City engineering staff estimated the linear feet of street frontage. The Specific Plan includes one community park, four neighborhood parks and six small parks for a total of 49.76 park acres.

Table 4.2: Planned WASP Parks

Park Type	Approximate Acres	Estimated Linear Feet of Street Frontage
<i>Community Park</i>	30.83	3,940
<i>Neighborhood Parks</i>		
WA 1	3.54	1,560
WA 2	2.35	940
WA 3	3.00	1,320
WA 4	3.63	1,520
Subtotal	12.52	5,340
<i>Small Parks</i>		
WS 1	1.68	1,610
WS 2	1.86	1,620
WS 3	0.50	80
WS 4	0.50	-
WS 5	1.37	940
WS 6	0.50	-
Subtotal	6.41	4,250
Total	49.76	13,530

Source: Table 2-3: Park Type and Acreage Summary, Draft West Area Specific Plan; Willdan Financial Services.

Park Cost Assumptions

Table 4.3 calculates the total cost of the parks in the Specific Plan. The land acquisition cost per acre of \$250,000 is consistent with assumptions used in the other chapters of this report. The park improvement cost per acre assumptions for community, neighborhood and small parks respectively differs on the type of park and were developed based on Willdan's recent experience with other clients, and discussions with Salinas developers and City staff. Full line item cost estimates for each of the three types of parkland are included in the appendix of this report. In total, the West Area Specific Plan parks are estimated to cost \$39.9 million.

Table 4.3: WASP Park Cost Assumptions

	Land Acquisition Cost per Acre	Park Improvement Cost per Acre	Total Cost per Acre	Total Acres	Total Cost
Community Parks	\$ 250,000	\$ 497,000	\$ 747,000	30.83	\$23,030,010
Neighborhood Parks	250,000	610,500	860,500	12.52	10,773,460
Small Parks	250,000	637,200	887,200	6.41	5,686,952
Bathrooms ¹				-	400,000
Total				49.76	\$39,890,422

¹ Assumes two neighborhood park bathrooms per specific plan area.

Sources: Tables 3.2, A.1 A.2 and A.3; Willdan Financial Services.

The cost of street frontage associated with the West Area Specific Plan parks is estimated in **Table 4.4**. The analysis assumes that the linear cost per square foot of street frontage (including curb, gutter, sidewalk and one travel lane) is \$219, based on recent experience with other clients. In total the street frontage associated with the West Area Specific Plan parks is estimated to cost nearly \$3 million.

Table 4.4: WASP Street Frontage Costs

	Linear Feet of Frontage	Cost per Linear Foot ¹	Total Cost
Community Parks	3,940	\$ 219	\$ 862,860
Neighborhood Parks	5,340	219	1,169,460
Small Parks	4,250	219	930,750
Total			\$ 2,963,070

¹ Includes curb, gutter, sidewalk and one travel lane.

Sources: Table 4.2, Willdan Financial Services.

Cost per Capita

Table 4.5 shows the cost per capita of providing parks in the West Area Specific Plan at a 3.0 acre per 1,000 resident standard. The total cost of parks and street frontage is divided by the total park acreage in the Specific Plan to determine the average cost per park acre. This figure is then multiplied by the 3.0-acre standard to determine the cost to serve 1,000 residents. The cost per 1,000 residents is then divided by 1,000 to determine the cost per resident.

Table 4.5: WASP Park Cost per Capita

Cost of Parks	\$ 39,890,422
Cost of Street Frontage	2,963,070
Total	\$ 42,853,492
Total Park Acreage	49.76
Average Cost per Acre	\$ 861,204
Acreage Standard per 1,000 Residents	3.00
Cost per 1,000 Residents	\$ 2,583,612
Cost per Resident	\$ 2,584

Sources: Tables 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4.

West Area Park Improvement Fee Schedule

To calculate fees by land use type, the cost per capita from Table 4.5 is multiplied by the dwelling unit occupancy density assumptions from Table 2.2 to determine the base fee per dwelling unit. The base fee per dwelling unit is multiplied by two-percent to determine the administrative charge. The administrative charge funds costs that include: (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Table 4.6: WASP Park Facilities Impact Fee Schedule

	A	B	C = A x B		D = C x 0.02	E = C + D
Land Use	Cost Per Capita	Density	Base Fee ¹	Admin Charge ^{1, 2}	Total Fee ¹	
Single Family	\$ 2,584	3.90	\$ 10,078	\$ 202	\$ 10,280	
Multifamily	2,584	3.32	8,579	172	8,751	

¹ Fee per dwelling unit.

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

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 4.5.

5. Central Area Park Improvement Fee

The Central Area Park Improvement Fee ("CAPIF") will fund park improvements within the Central Area Specific Plan at a 3.0 acre per 1,000 resident standard. The fee was developed with the assistance of West Area Specific Plan developers in order to meet their park facilities dedication requirements and to facilitate the credits and reimbursements between developers within the Specific Plan.

Estimated Service Population

Table 5.1 estimates the potential Central Area Specific Plan Service population. Acres within the Specific Plan are multiplied by the minimum dwelling unit density allocated to estimate the potential dwelling units in the area. The estimated dwelling units is multiplied by the Citywide average residents per dwelling unit to estimate the future residents in the Central Area Specific Plan. Note that these projections of dwelling units and residents do not drive the fee calculations. Rather, the fee calculations are based on ensuring that the Specific Plan area achieves a 3.0 park acre per residential standard.

Table 5.1: CASP Land Use Assumptions

Zoning	Acres (Within City)	Acres (Unincorporated)	Total Acres	Dwelling Unit Density ¹	Potential Dwelling Units
NE-A	92.42	16.17	108.59	5	543
NE-B	71.15	18.18	89.33	7	625
NG-A	53.93	3.01	56.94	8	456
NG-B	31.46	-	31.46	9	283
NG-C	33.23	-	33.23	14	465
VC-A	27.35	-	27.35	18	492
VC-B	17.08	-	17.08	24	410
Total	326.62	37.36	363.98		3,274
Residents per Dwelling Unit ²					3.67
Total Residents - CASP					12,016

¹ Assumes minimum units per net acre allowed by CASP.

² See Table 1.2.

Sources: Appendix G, CASP; Table 2.2 Willdan Financial Services.

Planned Park Facilities

Table 5.2 displays the planned Central Area Specific Plan Parks. The table also displays the estimated amount of street frontage associated with each park. City engineering staff estimated

the linear feet of street frontage. The Specific Plan includes eight neighborhood parks and 17 small parks for a total of 44.06 park acres.

Table 5.2: Planned CASP Parks

	Acres	Estimated Linear Feet of Street Frontage
<u>Neighborhood Parks</u>		
CA 1 ¹	3.00	1,530
CA 2	5.38	1,450
CA 3	2.01	1,140
CA 4	3.75	1,150
CA 5	3.50	1,510
CA 6	3.50	1,710
CA 7	3.07	1,600
CA 8	3.47	700
Subtotal	27.68	10,790
<u>Small Parks</u>		
CS 1 ¹	1.62	1,070
CS 2	0.50	880
CS 3	1.04	510
CS 4	0.92	1,140
CS 5	2.05	3,030
CS 6	1.00	740
CS 7	0.40	510
CS 8	1.47	1,030
CS 9	1.00	120
CS 10	0.50	410
CS 11	1.76	1,150
CS 12	0.79	750
CS 13	0.50	300
CS 14	0.50	200
CS 15	0.50	330
CS 16	0.93	450
CS 17	0.90	1,050
Subtotal	16.38	13,670
Total	44.06	24,460

¹ These parks are currently in unincorporated areas.

Source: Table 4.01 Central Area Park Acreage, Sport Fields
And Courts; CASP.

Park Cost Assumptions

Table 5.3 calculates the total cost of the parks in the Specific Plan. The land acquisition cost per acre of \$250,000 is consistent with assumptions used in the other chapters of this report. The park improvement cost per acre assumptions for neighborhood and small parks, respectively, differs on the type of park and were developed based on Willdan's recent experience with other clients, and discussions with Salinas developers and City staff. Full line item cost estimates for each of the three types of parkland are included in the appendix of this report. In total, the Central Area Specific Plan parks are estimated to cost \$38.8 million.

Table 5.3: CASP Park Cost Assumptions

	Land Acquisition Cost per Acre	Park Improvement Cost per Acre	Total Cost per Acre	Total Acres	Total Cost
<u>CASP</u>					
Neighborhood Parks	\$ 250,000	\$ 610,500	\$ 860,500	27.68	\$23,818,640
Small Parks	250,000	637,200	887,200	16.38	14,532,336
Bathrooms ¹				-	400,000
Total				44.06	\$38,750,976

¹ Assumes two neighborhood park bathrooms per specific plan area.

Sources: Tables 3.2, A.2 and A.3; Willdan Financial Services.

The cost of street frontage associated with the Central Area Specific Plan parks is estimated in **Table 5.4**. The analysis assumes that the linear cost per square foot of street frontage (including curb, gutter, sidewalk and one travel lane) is \$219, based on recent experience with other clients. In total the street frontage associated with the Central Area Specific Plan parks is estimated to cost nearly \$5.4 million.

Table 5.4: CASP Street Frontage Costs

	Linear Feet of Frontage	Cost per Linear Foot ¹	Total Cost
<u>CASP</u>			
Neighborhood Parks	10,790	\$ 219	\$ 2,363,010
Small Parks	13,670	219	2,993,730
Total			\$ 5,356,740

¹ Includes curb, gutter, sidewalk and one travel lane.

Sources: Table 5.2, Willdan Financial Services.

Cost per Capita

Table 5.5 shows the cost per capita of providing parks in the Central Area Specific Plan at a 3.0 acre per 1,000 resident standard. The total cost of parks and street frontage is divided by the total park acreage in the Specific Plan to determine the average cost per park acre. This figure is then multiplied by the 3.0-acre standard to determine the cost to serve 1,000 residents. The cost per 1,000 residents is then divided by 1,000 to determine the cost per resident.

Table 5.5: CASP Park Cost per Capita

<u>CASP</u>	
Cost of Parks	\$38,750,976
Cost of Street Frontage	5,356,740
Total	\$44,107,716
Total Park Acreage	44.06
Average Cost per Acre	\$ 1,001,083
Acreage Standard per 1,000 Residents	3.00
Cost per 1,000 Residents	\$ 3,003,249
Cost per Resident	\$ 3,003

Sources: Tables 5.1, 5.3 and 5.4.

Central Area Park Improvement Fee Schedule

To calculate fees by land use type, the cost per capita from Table 5.5 is multiplied by the dwelling unit occupancy density assumptions from Table 2.2 to determine the base fee per dwelling unit. The base fee per dwelling unit is multiplied by two-percent to determine the administrative charge. The administrative charge funds costs that include: (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

Table 5.6: CASP Park Facilities Impact Fee Schedule

Land Use	A	B	$C = A \times B$		$D = C \times 0.02$	$E = C + D$
	Cost Per Capita	Density	Base Fee ¹	Admin Charge ^{1, 2}	Total Fee ¹	
<u>CASP</u>						
Single Family	\$ 3,003	3.90	\$ 11,712	\$ 234	\$ 11,946	
Multifamily	3,003	3.32	9,970	199	10,169	

¹ Fee per dwelling unit.

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

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 5.5.

6. Implementation

Impact Fee Program Adoption Process

Impact fee program adoption procedures are found in the *California Government Code Section 66016*. Adoption of an impact fee program requires the City Council to follow certain procedures including holding a public meeting. A fourteen-day mailed public notice is required for those registering for such notification. Data, such as an impact fee report, must be made available at least 10 days prior to the public meeting. The City's legal counsel should inform you of any other procedural requirements as well as advice regarding adoption of an enabling ordinance and/or a resolution. After adoption there is a mandatory 60-day waiting period before the fees go into effect. This procedure must also be followed for fee increases.

Inflation Adjustment

The City has kept its impact fee program up to date by periodically adjusting the fees for inflation. Such adjustments should be completed regularly to ensure that new development will fully fund its share of needed facilities. We recommend that the following indices be used for adjusting fees for inflation:

- ♦ Buildings – Engineering News-Record's Building Cost Index (BCI)
- ♦ Equipment – Consumer Price Index, All Items, 1982-84=100 for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U)

The indices recommended can be found for local jurisdictions (state, region), and for the nation. With the exception of land, we recommend that the national indices be used to adjust for inflation, as the national indices are not subject to frequent dramatic fluctuations that the localized indices are subject to.

Due to the highly variable nature of land costs, there is no particular index that captures fluctuations in land values. We recommend that the City adjust land values based on recent land purchases, sales or appraisals at the time of the update.

While fee updates using inflation indices are appropriate for periodic updates to ensure that fee revenues keep up with increases in the costs of public facilities, the City will also need to conduct more extensive updates of the fee documentation and calculation (such as this study) when significant new data on growth forecasts and/or facility plans become available.

Reporting Requirements

For fee revenue collected under the Mitigation Fee Act, The City should comply with the annual and five-year reporting requirements summarized below in Table 6.1. 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.

Table 6.1: Mitigation Fee Act - Annual and Five-year Administrative Requirements

CA Gov't Code Section	Timing	Reporting Requirements ¹	Recommended Fee Adjustment
66001.(d)	The fifth fiscal year following the first deposit into the account or fund, and every five years thereafter	(A) Identify the purpose to which the fee is to be put. (B) Demonstrate a reasonable relationship between the fee and the purpose for which it is charged. (C) Identify all sources and amounts of funding anticipated to complete financing in incomplete improvements. (D) Designate the approximate dates on which supplemental funding is expected to be deposited into the appropriate account or fund.	Comprehensive Update
66006. (b)	Within 180 days after the last day of each fiscal year	(A) A brief description of the type of fee in the account or fund. (B) The amount of the fee. (C) The beginning and ending balance of the account or fund. (D) The amount of the fees collected and the interest earned. (E) An identification of each public improvement on which fees were expended including share funded by fees. (F) An identification of an approximate date by which the construction of the public improvement will commence. (G) A description of any potential interfund transfers. (H) The amount of refunds made (if any).	Inflationary Adjustment

¹ Edited for brevity. Refer to the government code for full description.

Sources: CA Government Code sections 66001.(d) and 66006.(b).

Fee Accounting

The City should deposit fee revenues into separate restricted fee accounts for each of the fees identified in this report. Fees collected for a given facility category should only be expended on new facilities of that same category.

Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP

The City should commit all projected fee revenues and fund balances to specific projects in its Capital Improvements Program. These should represent the types of facilities needed to serve growth and described in this report. The use of the CIP in this manner documents a reasonable relationship between new development and the use of those revenues. The CIP also provides the documentation necessary for the City to hold funds in a project account for longer than five years if necessary to collect sufficient monies to complete a project.

The City 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 City's facilities. If the total cost of facilities varies from the total cost used as a basis for the fees, the City should consider revising the fees accordingly.

7. 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 *Mitigation Fee 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 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 City that new development will not burden the existing service population with the cost of facilities required to accommodate growth. Page LU-41 of the General Plan Land Use Element states: “The City will continue to collect and impose impact fees on new development to help pay for circulation improvements, sewer and storm drain infrastructure, parks and libraries.” The purpose of the fees proposed by this report is to implement this policy by providing a funding source from new development for park improvements to serve that development. The fees advance a legitimate City interest by enabling the City to provide park facilities 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 City, would be available to fund expanded facilities to serve new development. Facilities funded by these fees are designated to be located within the City. Fees addressed in this report have been identified by the City to be restricted to funding park facilities.

An estimate of the amount of parkland needed to serve new development is identified in *Chapter 3* 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 City planning documents or are available from City staff. The City may change the list of planned facilities to meet changing needs and circumstances of new development, 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.

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 City 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 as described above under the “Use of Fee Revenues” finding. The City should keep fees in segregated accounts. Facilities funded by the fees are expected to provide a citywide 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 living in Salinas. Service population correlates to the demand for park facilities.

For park facilities, demand is measured by a single facility standard (park acres per 1,000 residents) that can be applied across land use types to ensure a reasonable relationship to the type of development.

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

Chapter 2, Land Use Assumptions provides a description of how service population and growth projections are calculated. Facility standards are described in the *Facility Inventories, Plans & Standards* sections of in Chapter 3.

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

See *Chapter 2, Land Use Assumptions* for a description of how service population or dwelling unit occupancy factors are determined for different types of land uses. See the *Fee Schedule* section of *Chapters 3, 4 and 5* for a presentation of the proposed facilities fees.

Appendix

Appendix Table A.1: Community Park Prototypical Park Cost Estimate

Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost (10 Acre Park)	Multiplier	Total Cost for Community Park
MASS GRADING	10 Acres		\$ 50,000	\$ 500,000		
Subtotal				\$ 500,000	1	\$ 500,000
SITE PREPARATION						
Soil Testing	1 ALLOW		\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500		
Site Survey	1 ALLOW		25,000	25,000		
SWPPP	1 ALLOW		3,000	3,000		
Subtotal				\$ 31,500	3	\$ 94,500
SOCCER FIELD (225' x 360')						
Goals	2	EA	\$ 2,500	\$ 5,000		
(See "Landscape" for turf costs)				-		
Subtotal				\$ 5,000	6	\$ 30,000
BASEBALL (300' x 300')						
Skinned Infield	12,000	SF	\$ 2	\$ 18,000		
Backstop (Arch style with 10' extension)	1	EA	25,000	25,000		
6' Ht. Dugout fence	104	LF	18	1,872		
4' Ht. Foul line fence	600	LF	16	9,600		
Dugout Benches- 10' length	4	EA	1,500	6,000		
Alum. Bleachers - 3 Levels, 21' Length	2	EA	2,500	5,000		
Scoreboard	1	EA	6,000	6,000		
(See "Landscape" for turf costs)				-		
Subtotal				\$ 71,472	4	\$ 285,888
BASKETBALL COURT						
4" depth concrete	1 ALLOW		\$ 28,000	\$ 28,000		
Goal Posts, Backboards, Nets, Rims, Str	1 ALLOW		6,500	6,500		
Subtotal				\$ 34,500	4	\$ 138,000
FITNESS STATIONS						
Exercise Stations	6	EA	\$ 4,000	\$ 24,000		
Subtotal				\$ 24,000	1	\$ 24,000
SHADE STRUCTURES						
44' Pavilion	1	EA	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000		
24' Pavilion	1	EA	30,000	30,000		
Concrete Pads	1,600	SF	8	12,800		
Subtotal				\$ 82,800	2	\$ 165,600
TRASH RECEPTACLES						
Concrete	15	EA	\$ 800	\$ 12,000		
Subtotal				\$ 12,000	2	\$ 24,000

Source: County of San Diego Parks and Recreation; City of Salinas.

Appendix Table A.1: Community Park Prototypical Park Cost Estimate

Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost (10 Acre Park)	Multiplier	Total Cost for Community Park
PICNIC TABLES						
Concrete - ADA accessible 8' length	30	EA	\$ 1,700	\$ 51,000		
Subtotal				\$ 51,000	1	\$ 51,000
BENCHES						
Concrete	10	EA	\$ 1,250	\$ 12,500		
Subtotal				\$ 12,500	3	\$ 37,500
DRINKING FOUNTAINS						
Metal, 2 dish, ADA accessible	4	EA	\$ 4,000	\$ 16,000		
Concrete Pads w/ detection scoring	400	SF	8	3,200		
Subtotal				\$ 19,200	2	\$ 38,400
FLAGPOLE						
Aluminum - 35' height	1	EA	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000		
Subtotal				\$ 3,000	1	\$ 3,000
BARBECUES						
Single post - 36" square	3	EA	\$ 600	\$ 1,800		
Single post - 24" square	10	EA	500	5,000		
Concrete Pads	208	SF	8	1,664		
Subtotal				\$ 8,464	2	\$ 16,928
HOT ASH BINS						
Concrete	4	EA	\$ 550	\$ 2,200		
Subtotal				\$ 2,200	2	\$ 4,400
TRASH ENCLOSURE						
Split faced block, Gate, Bins	1	ALLOW	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000		
Vehicular Concrete Pad w/ curbing	715	SF	7	5,005		
Subtotal				\$ 20,005	2	\$ 40,010
PLAYGROUND (YOUTH-5-12 Y.O.)						
Equipment	1	ALLOW	\$ 115,000	\$ 115,000		
Rubber Surfacing (80%)	2,691	SF	25	67,275		
Concrete Pads (80%)	2,691	SF	8	21,528		
Conc. Curb @ Perimeter	230	LF	18	4,140		
Sand (20%)	673	SF	6	4,038		
Drain Inlet w/ filter fabric, connections	1	ALLOW	1,000	1,000		
Subtotal				\$ 212,981	1	\$ 212,981

Source: County of San Diego Parks and Recreation; City of Salinas.

Appendix Table A.1: Community Park Prototypical Park Cost Estimate

Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost (10 Acre Park)	Multiplier	Total Cost for Community Park
PLAYGROUND (TOTS 2-5 Y.O.)						
Equipment	1	ALLOW	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000		
Rubber Surfacing (80%)	1,885	SF	25	47,125		
Concrete Pad (80%)	1,885	SF	8	15,080		
Conc. Curb @ Perimeter	194	LF	18	3,492		
Sand (20%)	471	SF	6	2,826		
Drain Inlet w/ filter fabric, connections	1	ALLOW	1,000	1,000		
Subtotal				\$ 129,523	1	\$ 129,523
PARKING LOT						
4" Depth Asphalt, 4" Class B Aggregate	20,275	SF	\$ 16	\$ 324,400		
Striping (Includes 2 Handicap)	1	ALLOW	1,000	1,000		
Wheel Stops	37	EA	65	2,405		
Concrete Curb	755	LF	18	13,590		
Subtotal				\$ 341,395	3	\$ 1,024,185
RESTROOM						
4 Unisex, ADA accessible, Split face bloc	1	ALLOW	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000		
Subtotal				\$ 200,000	3	\$ 600,000
SIGNAGE						
Monument Entry Sign	1	EA	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000		
Kiosk Sign	2	EA	4,500	9,000		
Subtotal				\$ 39,000	1.5	\$ 58,500
BICYCLE RACKS						
Bicycle Racks	2	EA	\$ 850	\$ 1,700		
Subtotal				\$ 1,700	3	\$ 5,100
CONCRETE WALKS						
4" depth, natural color, broom finish	34,000	SF	\$ 8	\$ 272,000		
Subtotal				\$ 272,000	1	\$ 272,000
CONCRETE MOW CURBS						
	1475	L.F.	\$ 10	\$ 14,750		
Subtotal				\$ 14,750	2	\$ 29,500
PLASTIC HEADERS						
	1475	LF	\$ 4	\$ 5,900		
Subtotal				\$ 5,900	3	\$ 17,700
UTILITIES						
Potable Water	1	ALLOW	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000		
Sewer	1	ALLOW	25,000	25,000		
Electric	1	ALLOW	30,000	30,000		
Reclaimed Water	1	ALLOW	10,000	10,000		
Subtotal				\$ 125,000	2	\$ 250,000

Source: County of San Diego Parks and Recreation; City of Salinas.

Appendix Table A.1: Community Park Prototypical Park Cost Estimate

Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost (10 Acre Park)	Multiplier	Total Cost for Community Park
LANDSCAPING						
Grading	435,600	SF	\$ 0.50	\$ 217,800		
Soil Preparation	64	CY	10.00	640		
Planting	35,000	SF	4.00	140,000		
Mulch	503	CY	36.00	18,108		
Turf - hydroseed	279,924	SF	0.10	<u>27,992</u>		
Subtotal				\$ 404,540	3	\$ 1,213,620
IRRIGATION						
Turf area	279,924	SF	\$ 3.00	\$ 839,772		
Shrub Area	67,925	SF	3.50	<u>237,738</u>		
Subtotal				\$ 1,077,510	3	\$ 3,232,529
VOLUNTEER PAD						
Vehicular Concrete, fencing, shed, hook-up	1	ALLOW	\$ 100,000	<u>\$ 100,000</u>		
Subtotal				\$ 100,000	1	\$ 100,000
SECURITY LIGHTING						
Site Safety Lighting	5	EA	\$ 8,500	<u>\$ 42,500</u>		
Subtotal				\$ 42,500	3	\$ 127,500
ADDITIONAL FACILITIES						
Amphitheater	1	EA	\$ 97,308	\$ 97,308		
Field Lighting	3	Fields	454,103	1,362,309		
Dog Park	1	Dog Park	510,867	<u>510,867</u>		
Subtotal				\$ 1,970,484	1	\$ 1,970,484
TOTAL - Construction Costs				\$ 5,814,924		\$ 10,696,848
DPR ADMINISTRATION						
	10%	of Construction Costs				\$ 1,069,685
SURVEY AND DESIGN						
	7%	of Construction Costs				748,779
STORMWATER						
						30,000
CEQA						
						75,000
CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT						
	5%	of Construction Costs				534,842
CONTINGENCY						
	18%	of Construction Costs				1,925,433
PURCHASING AND CONTRACTING						
	1%	of Construction Costs				106,968
MOBILIZATION						
	1.26%	of Construction Costs				<u>134,780</u>
Total - Soft Costs						\$ 4,625,488
Grand Total - Community Park						
						\$ 15,322,335
Cost per Acre						
						\$ 497,000

Source: County of San Diego Parks and Recreation; City of Salinas; Willdan.

Appendix Table A.2: Neighborhood Park Cost Estimate - 3.13 Acre Prototype

Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost
MOBILIZATION				
Equipment, Trailers, Port-a-potties, etc.	1	ALLOW	\$ 18,467	\$ 18,467
Subtotal				\$ 18,467
MASS GRADING				
	3.13	Acre	\$ 50,000	\$ 156,500
Subtotal				\$ 156,500
SITE PREPARATION				
Soil Testing	1	ALLOW	\$ 1,096	\$ 1,096
Site Survey	1	ALLOW	7,825	7,825
SWPPP	1	ALLOW	939	939
Subtotal				\$ 9,860
SOCCER FIELD (225' x 360')				
Goals	2	EA	\$ 2,500	\$ 5,000
(See "Landscape" for turf costs)				-
Subtotal				\$ 5,000
BASEBALL (300' x 300')				
Skinned Infield	12,000	SF	\$ 2	\$ 18,000
Backstop (Arch style with 10' extension)	1	EA	25,000	25,000
6' Ht. Dugout fence	104	LF	18	1,872
4' Ht. Foul line fence	600	LF	16	9,600
Dugout Benches- 10' length	4	EA	1,500	6,000
Alum. Bleachers - 3 Levels, 21' Length	2	EA	2,500	5,000
Scoreboard	1	EA	6,000	6,000
(See "Landscape" for turf costs)				-
Subtotal				\$ 71,472
SHADE STRUCTURES				
24' Pavilion	1	EA	30,000	30,000
Concrete Pads	501	SF	8	4,006
Subtotal				\$ 34,006
TRASH RECEPTACLES				
Concrete	5	EA	\$ 800	\$ 4,000
Subtotal				\$ 4,000
PICNIC TABLES				
Concrete - ADA accessible 8' length	5	EA	\$ 1,700	\$ 8,500
Subtotal				\$ 8,500
BENCHES				
Concrete	3	EA	\$ 1,250	\$ 3,750
Subtotal				\$ 3,750

Source: County of San Diego Parks and Recreation.

Appendix Table A.2: Neighborhood Park Cost Estimate - 3.13 Acre Prototype

Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost
DRINKING FOUNTAINS				
Metal, 2 dish, ADA accessible, clean-out par	1	EA	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000
Concrete Pads w/ detection scoring	125	SF	8	<u>1,002</u>
Subtotal				\$ 5,002
FLAGPOLE				
Aluminum - 35' height	1	EA	\$ 3,000	<u>\$ 3,000</u>
Subtotal				\$ 3,000
BARBECUES				
Single post - 36" square	1	EA	\$ 600	\$ 600
Single post - 24" square	2	EA	500	<u>1,000</u>
Concrete Pads	665	SF	8	<u>5,316</u>
Subtotal				\$ 6,916
HOT ASH BINS				
Concrete	1	EA	\$ 550	<u>\$ 550</u>
Subtotal				\$ 550
PLAYGROUND (YOUTH-5-12 Y.O.)				
Equipment	1	ALLOW	\$ 115,000	\$ 115,000
Rubber Surfacing (80%)	2,691	SF	25	67,275
Concrete Pads (80%)	2,691	SF	8	21,528
Conc. Curb @ Perimeter	230	LF	18	4,140
Sand (20%)	673	SF	6	4,038
Drain Inlet w/ filter fabric, connections	1	ALLOW	1,000	<u>1,000</u>
Subtotal				\$ 212,981
PLAYGROUND (TOTS 2-5 Y.O.)				
Equipment	1	ALLOW	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000
Rubber Surfacing (80%)	1,885	SF	25	47,125
Concrete Pad (80%)	1,885	SF	8	15,080
Conc. Curb @ Perimeter	194	LF	18	3,492
Sand (20%)	471	SF	6	2,826
Drain Inlet w/ filter fabric, connections	1	ALLOW	1,000	<u>1,000</u>
Subtotal				\$ 129,523
SIGNAGE				
Monument Entry Sign	1	EA	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000
Kiosk Sign	1	EA	4,500	<u>4,500</u>
Subtotal				\$ 34,500
BICYCLE RACKS				
Bicycle Racks	1	EA	\$ 850	<u>\$ 850</u>
Subtotal				\$ 850
CONCRETE WALKS				
4" depth, natural color, broom finish	8,332	SF	\$ 8	<u>\$ 66,656</u>
Subtotal				\$ 66,656
CONCRETE MOW CURBS				
	461.675	L.F.	\$ 10	<u>\$ 4,617</u>
Subtotal				\$ 4,617

Source: County of San Diego Parks and Recreation.

Appendix Table A.2: Neighborhood Park Cost Estimate - 3.13 Acre Prototype

Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost
PLASTIC HEADERS	461.675	LF	\$ 4	\$ 1,847
Subtotal				\$ 1,847
UTILITIES				
Potable Water	1	ALLOW	\$ 18,780	\$ 18,780
Sewer	1	ALLOW	25,000	-
Electric	1	ALLOW	30,000	-
Reclaimed Water	1	ALLOW	3,130	3,130
Fire Hydrant	1	EA	30,000	-
Subtotal				\$ 21,910
LANDSCAPING				
Grading	136,343	SF	\$ 0.50	\$ 68,171
Soil Preparation	20	CY	10.00	200
Planting	10,955	SF	4.00	43,820
Mulch	157	CY	36.00	5,668
Turf - hydroseed	87,616	SF	0.10	8,762
Subtotal				\$ 126,621
IRRIGATION				
Turf area	87,616	SF	\$ 3.00	\$ 262,849
Shrub Area	21,261	SF	3.50	74,412
Subtotal				\$ 337,260
SECURITY LIGHTING				
Site Safety Lighting	2	EA	\$ 8,500	\$ 17,000
Subtotal				\$ 17,000
TOTAL - Construction Costs				\$ 1,280,788
DPR ADMINISTRATION	10% of Construction Costs			\$ 128,079
SURVEY AND DESIGN	7% of Construction Costs			89,655
STORMWATER				30,000
CEQA				75,000
CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT	5% of Construction Costs			64,039
CONTINGENCY	18% of Construction Costs			230,542
PURCHASING AND CONTRACTING	1% of Construction Costs			12,808
Total - Soft Costs				\$ 630,123
Grand Total -	Park Acres	3.13	\$	1,910,912
Cost per Acre			\$	610,500

Source: County of San Diego Parks and Recreation.

Appendix Table A.3: Small Park Cost Estimate - 1.07 Acre Prototype

Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost
MOBILIZATION				
Equipment, Trailers, Port-a-potties, etc.	1	ALLOW	\$ 6,303	\$ 6,303
Subtotal				\$ 6,303
MASS GRADING				
	1.068333	Acre	\$ 50,000	\$ 53,417
Subtotal				\$ 53,417
SITE PREPARATION				
Soil Testing	1	ALLOW	\$ 374	\$ 374
Site Survey	1	ALLOW	2,671	2,671
SWPPP	1	ALLOW	321	321
Subtotal				\$ 3,365
TRASH RECEPTACLES				
Concrete	2	EA	\$ 800	\$ 1,600
Subtotal				\$ 1,600
PICNIC TABLES				
Concrete - ADA accessible 8' length	2	EA	\$ 1,700	\$ 3,400
Subtotal				\$ 3,400
BENCHES				
Concrete	2	EA	\$ 1,250	\$ 2,500
Subtotal				\$ 2,500
DRINKING FOUNTAINS				
Metal, 2 dish, ADA accessible, clean-out pan	1	EA	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000
Concrete Pads w/ detection scoring	43	SF	8	342
Subtotal				\$ 4,342

Source: County of San Diego Parks and Recreation.

Appendix Table A.3: Small Park Cost Estimate - 1.07 Acre Prototype

Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost
PLAYGROUND (TOTS 2-5 Y.O.)				
Equipment	1	ALLOW	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000
Rubber Surfacing (80%)	1,885	SF	25	47,125
Concrete Pad (80%)	1,885	SF	8	15,080
Conc. Curb @ Perimeter	194	LF	18	3,492
Sand (20%)	471	SF	6	2,826
Drain Inlet w/ filter fabric, connections	1	ALLOW	1,000	1,000
Subtotal				\$ 129,523
SIGNAGE				
Monument Entry Sign	0	EA	\$ 30,000	\$ -
Kiosk Sign	1	EA	4,500	4,500
Subtotal				\$ 4,500
BICYCLE RACKS				
Bicycle Racks	1	EA	\$ 850	\$ 850
Subtotal				\$ 850
CONCRETE WALKS				
4" depth, natural color, broom finish	2,844	SF	\$ 8	\$ 22,751
Subtotal				\$ 22,751
CONCRETE MOW CURBS				
	157.5792	L.F.	\$ 10	\$ 1,576
Subtotal				\$ 1,576
PLASTIC HEADERS				
	157.5792	LF	\$ 4	\$ 630
Subtotal				\$ 630

Source: County of San Diego Parks and Recreation.

Appendix Table A.3: Small Park Cost Estimate - 1.07 Acre Prototype

Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost
UTILITIES				
Potable Water	1	ALLOW	\$ 6,410	\$ 6,410
Sewer	1	ALLOW	25,000	-
Electric	1	ALLOW	30,000	-
Reclaimed Water	1	ALLOW	1,068	1,068
Fire Hydrant	1	EA	30,000	-
Subtotal				\$ 7,478
LANDSCAPING				
Grading	46,537	SF	\$ 1	\$ 23,268
Soil Preparation	7	CY	10	68
Planting	3,739	SF	4	14,957
Mulch	54	CY	36	1,935
Turf - hydroseed	29,905	SF	0	2,991
Subtotal				\$ 43,218
IRRIGATION				
Turf area	29,905	SF	\$ 3	\$ 89,716
Shrub Area	7,257	SF	4	25,398
Subtotal				\$ 115,114
SECURITY LIGHTING				
Site Safety Lighting	1	EA	\$ 8,500	\$ 8,500
Subtotal				\$ 8,500
TOTAL - Construction Costs				\$ 409,068
DPR ADMINISTRATION				10% of Construction Costs \$ 40,907
SURVEY AND DESIGN				7% of Construction Costs 28,635
STORMWATER				30,000
CEQA				75,000
CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT				5% of Construction Costs 20,453
CONTINGENCY				18% of Construction Costs 73,632
PURCHASING AND CONTRACTING				1% of Construction Costs 4,091
Total - Soft Costs				\$ 272,718
Grand Total -				Park Acres 1.07 \$ 681,786
Cost per Acre				\$ 637,200

Source: County of San Diego Parks and Recreation.