

**DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE
JUSTIFICATION STUDY
CITY OF BRAWLEY**

September 20, 2010

Public Finance
Facilities Planning
Urban Economics

Newport Beach
Riverside
San Francisco

**DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE
JUSTIFICATION STUDY**

Prepared for

CITY OF BRAWLEY
400 Main Street
Brawley, California 92227
(760) 344-9111

Prepared by

DAVID TAUSSIG & ASSOCIATES, INC.
5000 Birch Street, Suite 6000
Newport Beach, California 92660
(949) 955-1500

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| SECTION | PAGE |
|---|-------------------------------|
| <hr/> | |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II. LEGAL REQUIREMENTS TO JUSTIFY DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES | 2 |
| III. DEMOGRAPHICS | 6 |
| IV. THE NEEDS LIST | 11 |
| V. METHODOLOGY USED TO CALCULATE FEES | 17 |
| A. GENERAL GOVERNMENT FACILITIES | 18 |
| B. LIBRARY FACILITIES | 21 |
| C. PARK FACILITIES | 24 |
| D. AIRPORT FACILITIES | 26 |
| E. POLICE FACILITIES | 29 |
| F. FIRE FACILITIES | 32 |
| G. ANIMAL CONTROL FACILITIES | 35 |
| H. TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES | 36 |
| I. STORMWATER FACILITIES | 39 |
| J. ADMINISTRATIVE COST COMPONENT | 41 |
| VI. SUMMARY OF FEES | 42 |
| APPENDIX A | FEE DERIVATION WORKSHEETS |

I. INTRODUCTION

The City of Brawley (the "City") is located in Imperial County, in the far southeastern corner of the State of California, in the lower Colorado desert and ten miles south of the Salton Sea. In order to adequately plan for new development through build out and identify the public facilities and costs associated with mitigating the direct and cumulative impacts of new development, David Taussig & Associates, Inc. ("DTA") was retained by the City to prepare a new AB 1600 Fee Justification Study (the "Fee Study").

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

The fees are calculated to fund the cost of facilities needed to meet the needs of new development through projected build out. The steps followed in the Fee Study include:

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

II. LEGAL REQUIREMENTS TO JUSTIFY DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

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

AB 1600, which created Section 66000 et. seq. of the Government Code, was enacted by the State of California in 1987.

In 2006, Government Code Section 66001 was amended to clarify that a fee cannot include costs attributable to existing deficiencies, but can fund costs used to maintain the existing level of service or meet an adopted level of service that is consistent with the general plan.

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

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

This section presents each of these items as they relate to the imposition of the proposed fees in the City of Brawley.

A. PURPOSE OF THE FEE (GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 66001(A)(1))

New residential and non-residential development within Brawley will generate additional residents and employees who will require additional public facilities. Land for these facilities will have to be acquired and public facilities and equipment will have to be expanded, constructed or purchased to meet this increased demand.

The Fee Study has been prepared in response to the projected direct and cumulative effect of future development. Each new development will contribute to the need for new public facilities. Without future development many of the new public facilities on the Needs List would not be necessary as the existing facilities are adequate for Brawley's present population. In instances where facilities would be built regardless of new development, the costs of such facilities have been allocated to new and existing development based on their respective level of benefit.

The proposed impact fee will be charged to all future development, irrespective of location, in Brawley. Even future "in-fill" development projects contribute to impacts on public facilities because they are an interactive component of a much greater universe of development located throughout Brawley. First, the property owners and/or the tenants associated with any new development in Brawley can be expected to place additional demands on Brawley facilities funded by the fee. Second, these property owners and tenants are dependent on and, in fact, may not have chosen to utilize their development, except for residential, retail, employment and recreational opportunities located nearby on other existing and future development. Third, the availability of residents, employees, and customers throughout Brawley has a growth-inducing impact without which some of the "in-fill" development would not occur. As a result, all development projects in Brawley contribute to the cumulative impacts of development.

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

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

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

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

As discussed in the Section A above, it is the projected direct and cumulative effect of future development that has prompted the preparation of the Fee Study. Each development will contribute to the need for new public facilities. Without future development, Brawley would have no need to construct many of the public facilities on the Needs List. For all other facilities, the costs have been allocated to both existing and new development based on their level of benefit. Even future "in-fill" development projects, which may be adjacent to existing facilities, further burden existing public facilities. Consequently, all new development within Brawley, irrespective of location, contributes to the direct and cumulative impacts of development on public facilities and creates the need for new facilities to accommodate growth.

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

For the foregoing reasons, new development benefits from the acquisition, construction, and installation of the facilities on the Needs Lists.

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

As previously stated, all new development within Brawley, irrespective of location, contributes to the direct and cumulative impacts of development on public facilities and creates the need for new facilities to accommodate growth. Without future development, many of the facilities on the Needs Lists would not be necessary. For certain other facilities, the costs have been allocated to both existing and new development based on their level of benefit.

For the reasons presented herein, there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facilities included on the Needs List and all new development within Brawley.

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

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

New development impacts facilities directly and cumulatively. In fact, without any future development, the acquisition, construction, and/or installation of many of the facilities on the Needs Lists would not be necessary as existing Brawley facilities are adequate. Even new development located adjacent to existing facilities will utilize and benefit from facilities on the Needs List.

The proposed fee amounts are roughly proportional to the impacts resulting from new development based on the analysis in Section V. Thus there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the facilities.

III. DEMOGRAPHICS

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

| Land Use Classification for Fee Study | Definition |
|--|--|
| Single Family | Includes single family detached homes |
| Multi Family | Includes buildings with attached residential units including apartments, town homes, condominiums, and all other residential units not classified as Single Family Detached |
| Commercial | Includes, but is not limited to, buildings used as the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail • Professional office • Service-oriented business activities • Department stores, discount stores, furniture/appliance outlets, home improvement centers • Entertainment centers • Subregional and regional shopping centers • Professional medical offices and hospitals |
| Industrial | Includes, but is not limited to, buildings used as the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business/professional offices • Light manufacturing, warehouse/distribution, wholesaling; • Large-scale warehouse retail • Service commercial activities • Public uses, arterial roadways and freeways providing automobile and public transit access • Automobile dealerships • Support commercial services |

The City of Brawley's 2008 General Plan¹ (the "General Plan") was used as an estimate of the number of housing units and non-residential building square feet to be built through build out. In addition, the General Plan Update was used to project the additional population generated from new development.

Future residents and employees will create additional demand for facilities that existing public facilities cannot accommodate. In order to accommodate new development in an orderly manner, while maintaining the current quality of life in Brawley, the facilities on the Needs List (Section IV) will need to be constructed.

¹ City of Brawley, General Plan. July, 2008.

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

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

1. EXISTING POPULATION FOR LAND USE CATEGORIES

According to the General Plan there were 5,668 existing Single Family units and 2,581 existing Multi Family units within Brawley.

DTA then estimated the number of existing residents assuming residents per unit factors of 3.74 and 2.80 per single family unit and multi family unit, respectively, based on data collected from the State of California Department of Finance as shown in Table B-2 in Appendix B. Therefore, as of January 2009, 28,416 residents lived in 8,249 Single Family and Multi Family homes.

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

TABLE 1

**CITY OF BRAWLEY
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
EXISTING RESIDENTS**

| Residential Land Use | Existing Residents | Existing Housing Units | Average Household Size |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Single Family Residential | 21,182 | 5,668 | 3.74 |
| Multi Family Residential | 7,234 | 2,581 | 2.80 |
| Total | 28,416 | 8,249 | 3.32 |

According to the General Plan there are 675 acres of existing Commercial development and 830 acres of existing Industrial development within Brawley.

DTA estimated the amount of existing building square feet using floor area ratios of 0.32 and 0.40 for Commercial and Industrial development, respectively based on data provided in the City of Brawley General Plan, July 2008. Therefore there are, 9,335,250 building square feet of existing Commercial development and 14,461,920 building square feet of existing Industrial development within Brawley.

DTA then estimated the number of existing employees in Brawley using factors of 3.92 and 1.01 employees per 1,000 building square feet of Commercial and Industrial, respectively, based on data provided by the Employment Density Summary Report of October 31, 2001 prepared by the Natelsen Company, Inc. for San Diego Association of Governments. This results in 2,381 existing Commercial employees and 14,375 existing Industrial employees, as shown in Table 2 below.

TABLE 2

**CITY OF BRAWLEY
NON-RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
EXISTING EMPLOYEES**

| Non-Residential Land Use | Existing Building SF | Employees per 1,000 BSF³ | Existing Employees |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| Commercial | 9,335,250 | 3.92 | 2,381 |
| Industrial | 14,461,920 | 1.01 | 14,375 |
| Total | 4,556,034 | NA | 4,007,459 |

2. FUTURE POPULATION FOR NEW LAND USE CATEGORIES

According to the General Plan there are projected to be 5,735 future Single Family units and 4,702 future Multi Family units developed within Brawley through build out.

DTA then estimated the number of future residents assuming the same residents per unit factors of 3.74 per Single Family unit and 2.80 per Multi Family unit utilized in estimating the current population. Therefore, it is projected that there will be an additional 34,611 residents living in 10,437 future Single Family and Multi Family units through build out.

Table 3 on the following page summarizes the future demographics for the residential land uses.

TABLE 3

**CITY OF BRAWLEY
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
ESTIMATED FUTURE RESIDENTS**

| Residential Land Use | Expected Residents | Expected Housing Units | Average Household Size |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Single Family Residential | 21,432 | 5,735 | 3.74 |
| Multi Family Residential | 13,179 | 4,702 | 2.80 |
| Total | 34,611 | 10,437 | 3.32 |

According to the General Plan there are 51 acres of future Commercial development and 221 acres of future Industrial development within Brawley.

DTA estimated the amount of future building square feet using the same per floor area ratios of 0.32 and 0.40 for Commercial and Industrial development, respectively, used in estimating the current number of building square feet. Therefore there are 705,330 building square feet of future Commercial development and 3,850,704 building square feet of future Industrial development within Brawley.

DTA then estimated the number of future employees in Brawley using the same factors of 3.92 and 1.01 employees per 1,000 building square feet of Commercial and Industrial, respectively, used in estimating the current number of employees. This results in 180 future Commercial employees and 3,827 future Industrial employees, as shown in Table 4 on the following page.

TABLE 4

**CITY OF BRAWLEY
NON-RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
ESTIMATED FUTURE EMPLOYEES**

| Non-Residential Land Use | Building Square Feet Estimated to be Developed | Employees per 1,000 BSF³ | Future Employees |
|---------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|
| Commercial | 705,330 SF | 3.92 | 180 |
| Industrial | 3,850,704 SF | 1.01 | 3,827 |
| Total | 4,556,034 SF | NA | 4,007,459 |

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

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

IV. THE NEEDS LIST

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

Government Code 66000 requires that if impact fees are going to be used to finance public facilities, those facilities must be identified. Identification of the facilities may be made in an applicable general or specific plan, other public documents, or by reference to a Capital Improvement Program ("CIP").

DTA worked closely with City staff to develop the list of facilities to be included in the Fee Study ("the Needs List"). For purposes of Brawley's fee program, the Needs List is intended to be the official public document identifying the facilities eligible to be financed, in whole or in part, through the levy of a development impact fee on new development in Brawley. The Needs List is organized by facility element (or type) and includes a cost section consisting of ten columns, which are listed in Table 5 below:

TABLE 5
CITY OF BRAWLEY
NEEDS LIST
EXPLANATION OF COST SECTION

| Column Title | Contents | Source |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Total Cost | The total estimated facility cost including engineering, design, construction, land acquisition, and equipment (as applicable) | City |
| Total Cost to Existing Development | The total estimated facility cost allocated to existing development based on the proportional impact of existing development on facility | Calculated by DTA based on input from City Staff |
| Total Cost to New Development | The total estimated facility cost allocated to new development based on the proportional impact of new development on facility | Calculated by DTA based on input from City Staff |

| Column Title | Contents | Source |
|--|---|--|
| Percent of Cost Allocated to New Development | Total Cost to New Development divided by Total Cost of Facility (column C divided by column A) | Calculated by DTA |
| Offsetting Revenues to Existing Development | Share of Total Offsetting Revenues allocated to existing development | Calculated by DTA based on input from City staff |
| Offsetting Revenues to New Development | Share of Total Offsetting Revenues allocated to new development | Calculated by DTA based on input from City staff |
| Total Offsetting Revenues | Any funds on hand that are allocated for a given facility. | City |
| Net Cost Allocated to Existing Development | The difference between the Total Cost to Existing Development and Offsetting Revenues to Existing Development (column B minus column E) | Calculated by DTA |
| Net Cost Allocated to New Development | The difference between the Total Cost to New Development and Offsetting Revenues to New Development (column C minus column F) | Calculated by DTA |
| Net Cost to City | The difference between the Total Cost and the Offsetting Revenues (column A minus column G) | Calculated by DTA |
| Percent of Cost Allocated to New Development | Net Cost Allocated to New Development divided by Net Cost of Facility (column I divided by column J) | Calculated by DTA |

DTA surveyed City staff on required facilities needed to serve new development as a starting point for its fee calculations. The survey included the project description, justification, public benefit, estimated costs, and project financing for each proposed facility. Through discussions between DTA and City staff, the Needs List has gone through a series of revisions to fine-tune the needs, costs, and methodologies used in allocating the costs for each facility.

The final Needs List is shown on the following page.

| CITY OF BRAWLEY NEEDS LIST THROUGH BUILDOUT | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------|---|--|----------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| FACILITY NAME | TOTAL COST OF FACILITY | TOTAL COST TO EXISTING DEVELOPMENT | TOTAL COST TO NEW DEVELOPMENT | % OF COST ALLOCATED TO NEW DEVELOPMENT | TOTAL OFFSETTING REVENUES | OFFSETTING REVENUES TO EXISTING DEVELOPMENT | OFFSETTING REVENUES TO NEW DEVELOPMENT | NET COST TO CITY | NET COST ALLOCATED TO EXISTING DEVELOPMENT | NET COST ALLOCATED TO NEW DEVELOPMENT | % OF TOTAL FACILITY COSTS FUNDED THROUGH FEES |
| A. GENERAL GOVERNMENT | | | | | | | | | | | |
| City Hall Expansion | \$ 750,000 | \$ - | \$ 750,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 750,000 | \$ - | \$ 750,000 | 100.00% |
| City Hall Computer System | \$ 60,000 | \$ 39,515 | \$ 20,485 | 34.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 60,000 | \$ 39,515 | \$ 20,485 | 34.14% |
| Public Works Parking Lot Paving | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 658,588 | \$ 341,412 | 34.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 658,588 | \$ 341,412 | 34.14% |
| New Public Works Building | \$ 5,000,000 | \$ 2,410,137 | \$ 2,589,863 | 51.80% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 5,000,000 | \$ 2,410,137 | \$ 2,589,863 | 51.80% |
| General Government - Split | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Radio System Acquisition | \$ 75,000 | \$ 49,394 | \$ 25,606 | 34.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 75,000 | \$ 49,394 | \$ 25,606 | 34.14% |
| Engineering GPS Acquisition | \$ 50,000 | \$ 32,929 | \$ 17,071 | 34.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 50,000 | \$ 32,929 | \$ 17,071 | 34.14% |
| Upgrade P.W. Building Fiber Optics | \$ 20,000 | \$ 13,172 | \$ 6,828 | 34.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 20,000 | \$ 13,172 | \$ 6,828 | 34.14% |
| Planning IT Equipment Acquisition | \$ 10,000 | \$ 6,586 | \$ 3,414 | 34.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 10,000 | \$ 6,586 | \$ 3,414 | 34.14% |
| Vehicle Maintenance Shop Scanner System | \$ 5,000 | \$ 3,293 | \$ 1,707 | 34.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 5,000 | \$ 3,293 | \$ 1,707 | 34.14% |
| Particulate Matter Trap for Diesel Engines | \$ 72,000 | \$ 47,418 | \$ 24,582 | 34.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 72,000 | \$ 47,418 | \$ 24,582 | 34.14% |
| Vehicle Maintenance Shop Computer Acquisition | \$ 10,000 | \$ 6,586 | \$ 3,414 | 34.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 10,000 | \$ 6,586 | \$ 3,414 | 34.14% |
| Shop Restroom Expansion | \$ 15,000 | \$ 9,879 | \$ 5,121 | 34.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 15,000 | \$ 9,879 | \$ 5,121 | 34.14% |
| Public Parking (Improvements) | \$ 4,000,000 | \$ 2,634,353 | \$ 1,365,647 | 34.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 4,000,000 | \$ 2,634,353 | \$ 1,365,647 | 34.14% |
| General Government - New | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Community Development Storage Room Construction | \$ 20,000 | \$ - | \$ 20,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 20,000 | \$ - | \$ 20,000 | 100.00% |
| Construction of a New Office in the Copper Room | \$ 100,000 | \$ - | \$ 100,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 100,000 | \$ - | \$ 100,000 | 100.00% |
| Engineering Vehicle Acquisition | \$ 25,000 | \$ - | \$ 25,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 25,000 | \$ - | \$ 25,000 | 100.00% |
| 2 Vehicles Acquisition (Vehicle Maintenance Shop) | \$ 80,000 | \$ - | \$ 80,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 80,000 | \$ - | \$ 80,000 | 100.00% |
| Public Works Office Expansion | \$ 150,000 | \$ - | \$ 150,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 150,000 | \$ - | \$ 150,000 | 100.00% |
| Public Parking (Land Acquisition) | \$ 500,000 | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | 100.00% |
| Existing Fund Balance | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | 0.00% | \$ (27,156) | \$ (27,156) | \$ - | \$ (27,156) | \$ (27,156) | \$ - | 0.00% |
| Total General Government | \$ 11,942,000 | \$ 5,911,851 | \$ 6,030,149 | 50.50% | \$ (27,156) | \$ (27,156) | \$ - | \$ 11,914,844 | \$ 5,884,695 | \$ 6,030,149 | 50.50% |
| B. LIBRARY SERVICES | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Library Expansion Phase I | \$ 336,000 | \$ - | \$ 336,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 336,000 | \$ - | \$ 336,000 | 100.00% |
| Library Expansion Phase II | \$ 3,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 3,000,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 3,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 3,000,000 | 100.00% |
| Bookmobile | \$ 200,000 | \$ - | \$ 200,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 200,000 | \$ - | \$ 200,000 | 100.00% |
| Library Books | \$ 4,153,335 | \$ - | \$ 4,153,335 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 4,153,335 | \$ - | \$ 4,153,335 | 100.00% |
| Misc. Library | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Library Public Access Computers | \$ 420,181 | \$ - | \$ 420,181 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 420,181 | \$ - | \$ 420,181 | 100.00% |
| Library Future Storage (Building Acquisition) | \$ 250,000 | \$ - | \$ 250,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 250,000 | \$ - | \$ 250,000 | 100.00% |
| Existing Fund Balance | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | 0.00% | \$ (447,242) | \$ - | \$ (447,242) | \$ (447,242) | \$ - | \$ (447,242) | 100.00% |
| Total Library Services | \$ 8,359,516 | \$ - | \$ 8,359,516 | 100.00% | \$ (447,242) | \$ - | \$ (447,242) | \$ 7,912,274 | \$ - | \$ 7,912,274 | 94.65% |

| FACILITY NAME | TOTAL COST OF FACILITY | TOTAL COST TO EXISTING DEVELOPMENT | TOTAL COST TO NEW DEVELOPMENT | % OF COST ALLOCATED TO NEW DEVELOPMENT | TOTAL OFFSETTING REVENUES | OFFSETTING REVENUES TO EXISTING DEVELOPMENT | OFFSETTING REVENUES TO NEW DEVELOPMENT | NET COST TO CITY | NET COST ALLOCATED TO EXISTING DEVELOPMENT | NET COST ALLOCATED TO NEW DEVELOPMENT | % OF TOTAL FACILITY COSTS FUNDED THROUGH FEES |
|--|------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------|---|--|----------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| C. PARKS AND RECREATION | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Park Acquisition/Development | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Neighborhood Park Development (Victoria, Gateway, La Paloma) | \$ 2,084,000 | \$ - | \$ 2,084,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 2,084,000 | \$ - | \$ 2,084,000 | 100.00% |
| Parkside Shared Use Park Development | \$ 645,000 | \$ - | \$ 645,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 645,000 | \$ - | \$ 645,000 | 100.00% |
| Mini Park Development (La Paloma) | \$ 474,000 | \$ - | \$ 474,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 474,000 | \$ - | \$ 474,000 | 100.00% |
| Pat Williams Park Development of Additional Area | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | 100.00% |
| Cattle Call Equestrian and Pedestrian Trail System | \$ 1,600,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,600,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,600,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,600,000 | 100.00% |
| Community Park Development (Mead/Panno and Luckey Ranch) | \$ 4,700,000 | \$ - | \$ 4,700,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 4,700,000 | \$ - | \$ 4,700,000 | 100.00% |
| South East Regional Park | \$ 8,250,000 | \$ - | \$ 8,250,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 8,250,000 | \$ - | \$ 8,250,000 | 100.00% |
| Park Improvements/Equipment | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Park and Facility Signs | \$ 90,000 | \$ - | \$ 90,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 90,000 | \$ - | \$ 90,000 | 100.00% |
| Trucks/Tractors/Mowers/Equipment | \$ 540,000 | \$ - | \$ 540,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 540,000 | \$ - | \$ 540,000 | 100.00% |
| Landscaping and Trees | \$ 135,000 | \$ - | \$ 135,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 135,000 | \$ - | \$ 135,000 | 100.00% |
| Del Rio Joint Use Soccer Field | \$ 100,000 | \$ - | \$ 100,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 100,000 | \$ - | \$ 100,000 | 100.00% |
| Meserve Park Softball Field Renovation and Construction | \$ 150,000 | \$ - | \$ 150,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 150,000 | \$ - | \$ 150,000 | 100.00% |
| Guadalupe Park Play Apparatus | \$ 75,000 | \$ - | \$ 75,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 75,000 | \$ - | \$ 75,000 | 100.00% |
| Guadalupe Park Purchase | \$ 200,000 | \$ - | \$ 200,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 200,000 | \$ - | \$ 200,000 | 100.00% |
| Gonzales Park Play Structure | \$ 50,000 | \$ - | \$ 50,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 50,000 | \$ - | \$ 50,000 | 100.00% |
| Volunteer Park Landscape and Play Area | \$ 125,000 | \$ - | \$ 125,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 125,000 | \$ - | \$ 125,000 | 100.00% |
| Pool Benches- Park Benches, Picnic Tables, etc. | \$ 120,000 | \$ - | \$ 120,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 120,000 | \$ - | \$ 120,000 | 100.00% |
| Lions Pool Splash Pad | \$ 550,000 | \$ - | \$ 550,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 550,000 | \$ - | \$ 550,000 | 100.00% |
| Plaza Park Lighting Project | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,500,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,500,000 | 100.00% |
| Rotary Park Security Lighting | \$ 50,000 | \$ - | \$ 50,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 50,000 | \$ - | \$ 50,000 | 100.00% |
| Gonzales Park Security Lighting | \$ 300,000 | \$ - | \$ 300,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 300,000 | \$ - | \$ 300,000 | 100.00% |
| Cattle Call Park Security Lighting and Electrical | \$ 125,000 | \$ - | \$ 125,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 125,000 | \$ - | \$ 125,000 | 100.00% |
| Brian Thomas Basketball Court Lights | \$ 120,000 | \$ - | \$ 120,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 120,000 | \$ - | \$ 120,000 | 100.00% |
| Thorton Park Security Lighting for Pathway/Park | \$ 550,000 | \$ - | \$ 550,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 550,000 | \$ - | \$ 550,000 | 100.00% |
| Cattle Call Park Sewer Lift Station | \$ 500,000 | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | 100.00% |
| Plaza Park Kiosk Improvement Project | \$ 200,000 | \$ - | \$ 200,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 200,000 | \$ - | \$ 200,000 | 100.00% |
| Pat Williams Park Play Equipment | \$ 200,000 | \$ - | \$ 200,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 200,000 | \$ - | \$ 200,000 | 100.00% |
| Pat Williams Park Pathway Security Lighting | \$ 550,000 | \$ - | \$ 550,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 550,000 | \$ - | \$ 550,000 | 100.00% |
| Alyce Gereaux Park Restroom Construction | \$ 125,000 | \$ - | \$ 125,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 125,000 | \$ - | \$ 125,000 | 100.00% |
| Citrus View Play Equipment | \$ 150,000 | \$ - | \$ 150,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 150,000 | \$ - | \$ 150,000 | 100.00% |
| Pat Williams Park Parking Area Paving | \$ 250,000 | \$ - | \$ 250,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 250,000 | \$ - | \$ 250,000 | 100.00% |
| Cattle Call Park Grandstand Upgrade | \$ 700,000 | \$ - | \$ 700,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 700,000 | \$ - | \$ 700,000 | 100.00% |
| Wiest Field Security Lighting | \$ 200,000 | \$ - | \$ 200,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 200,000 | \$ - | \$ 200,000 | 100.00% |
| Meserve Park Restroom Construction | \$ 125,000 | \$ - | \$ 125,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 125,000 | \$ - | \$ 125,000 | 100.00% |
| Pat Williams Park Shelter Project | \$ 100,000 | \$ - | \$ 100,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 100,000 | \$ - | \$ 100,000 | 100.00% |
| New Pool Construction | \$ 2,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 2,000,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 2,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 2,000,000 | 100.00% |
| Magnolia Street Security/Street Lighting | \$ 50,000 | \$ - | \$ 50,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 50,000 | \$ - | \$ 50,000 | 100.00% |
| Park Bleacher Upgrade Project | \$ 300,000 | \$ - | \$ 300,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 300,000 | \$ - | \$ 300,000 | 100.00% |
| Hinojosa Park Shelter Project | \$ 100,000 | \$ - | \$ 100,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 100,000 | \$ - | \$ 100,000 | 100.00% |
| Hinojosa Park Sidewalk Installation | \$ 500,000 | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | 100.00% |
| Alyce Gereaux Park Multi-Use Park Lighting Project | \$ 230,000 | \$ - | \$ 230,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 230,000 | \$ - | \$ 230,000 | 100.00% |
| Security Cameras Acquisition | \$ 25,000 | \$ - | \$ 25,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 25,000 | \$ - | \$ 25,000 | 100.00% |
| Copy Machine Acquisition | \$ 12,932 | \$ - | \$ 12,932 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 12,932 | \$ - | \$ 12,932 | 100.00% |
| Cattle Call Park Expansion | \$ 400,000 | \$ - | \$ 400,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 400,000 | \$ - | \$ 400,000 | 100.00% |
| Lions Center Expansion | \$ 620,000 | \$ - | \$ 620,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 620,000 | \$ - | \$ 620,000 | 100.00% |
| Existing Fund Balance | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | 0.00% | \$ (104,851) | \$ - | \$ (104,851) | \$ (104,851) | \$ - | \$ (104,851) | 100.00% |
| Total Parks and Recreation | \$ 30,870,932 | \$ - | \$ 30,870,932 | 100.00% | \$ (104,851) | \$ - | \$ (104,851) | \$ 30,766,081 | \$ - | \$ 30,766,081 | 99.66% |

| FACILITY NAME | TOTAL COST OF FACILITY | TOTAL COST TO EXISTING DEVELOPMENT | TOTAL COST TO NEW DEVELOPMENT | % OF COST ALLOCATED TO NEW DEVELOPMENT | TOTAL OFFSETTING REVENUES | OFFSETTING REVENUES TO EXISTING DEVELOPMENT | OFFSETTING REVENUES TO NEW DEVELOPMENT | NET COST TO CITY | NET COST ALLOCATED TO EXISTING DEVELOPMENT | NET COST ALLOCATED TO NEW DEVELOPMENT | % OF TOTAL FACILITY COSTS FUNDED THROUGH FEES |
|--|------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------|---|--|----------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| D. AIRPORT | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Airport Runway/Taxiway Extension | \$ 15,125,000 | \$ 4,214,087 | \$ 10,910,913 | 72.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 15,125,000 | \$ 4,214,087 | \$ 10,910,913 | 72.14% |
| Executive Hangers (7,000 - 10,000 SF each) | \$ 2,500,000 | \$ 696,543 | \$ 1,803,457 | 72.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 2,500,000 | \$ 696,543 | \$ 1,803,457 | 72.14% |
| Misc. Airport Facilities | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Navigational Lighting and Airfield Lighting Rehab | \$ 3,150,000 | \$ 877,644 | \$ 2,272,356 | 72.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 3,150,000 | \$ 877,644 | \$ 2,272,356 | 72.14% |
| Jet A Fuel Tank and Truck | \$ 500,000 | \$ 139,309 | \$ 360,691 | 72.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | \$ 139,309 | \$ 360,691 | 72.14% |
| Airport Master Plan | \$ 300,000 | \$ 83,585 | \$ 216,415 | 72.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 300,000 | \$ 83,585 | \$ 216,415 | 72.14% |
| Total Airport | \$ 21,575,000 | \$ 6,011,168 | \$ 15,563,832 | 72.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 21,575,000 | \$ 6,011,168 | \$ 15,563,832 | 72.14% |
| E. PUBLIC SAFETY - POLICE | | | | | | | | | | | |
| New Police Station | \$ 8,000,000 | \$ 5,268,707 | \$ 2,731,293 | 34.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 8,000,000 | \$ 5,268,707 | \$ 2,731,293 | 34.14% |
| Marked Patrol Cars | \$ 144,000 | \$ - | \$ 144,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 144,000 | \$ - | \$ 144,000 | 100.00% |
| Police Vehicle Mobile Radios | \$ 33,648 | \$ - | \$ 33,648 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 33,648 | \$ - | \$ 33,648 | 100.00% |
| Portable Officer Radios | \$ 66,500 | \$ - | \$ 66,500 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 66,500 | \$ - | \$ 66,500 | 100.00% |
| Police Substation | \$ 4,524,000 | \$ - | \$ 4,524,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 4,524,000 | \$ - | \$ 4,524,000 | 100.00% |
| Communications Center Working Console | \$ 106,000 | \$ 69,810 | \$ 36,190 | 34.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 106,000 | \$ 69,810 | \$ 36,190 | 34.14% |
| Communications Center Radio and Computer System Hardware | \$ 100,000 | \$ 65,859 | \$ 34,141 | 34.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 100,000 | \$ 65,859 | \$ 34,141 | 34.14% |
| Misc. Police Facilities | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Police Dept Vehicle Acquisition | \$ 180,000 | \$ 118,546 | \$ 61,454 | 34.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 180,000 | \$ 118,546 | \$ 61,454 | 34.14% |
| Anti-Graffiti Cameras Procurement and Installation | \$ 200,000 | \$ 131,718 | \$ 68,282 | 34.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 200,000 | \$ 131,718 | \$ 68,282 | 34.14% |
| Emergency Operations Center | \$ 500,000 | \$ 329,294 | \$ 170,706 | 34.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | \$ 329,294 | \$ 170,706 | 34.14% |
| Existing Fund Balance | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | 0.00% | \$ (149,054) | \$ (149,054) | \$ - | \$ (149,054) | \$ (149,054) | \$ - | 0.00% |
| Total Public Safety - Police | \$ 13,854,148 | \$ 5,983,934 | \$ 7,870,214 | 56.81% | \$ (149,054) | \$ (149,054) | \$ - | \$ 13,705,094 | \$ 5,834,880 | \$ 7,870,214 | 56.81% |
| F. PUBLIC SAFETY - FIRE | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Eastside Fire Station | \$ 3,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 3,000,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 3,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 3,000,000 | 100.00% |
| Main Fire Station | \$ 8,271,000 | \$ 5,447,184 | \$ 2,823,816 | 34.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 8,271,000 | \$ 5,447,184 | \$ 2,823,816 | 34.14% |
| Fire Engine | \$ 1,125,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,125,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,125,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,125,000 | 100.00% |
| Ladder Truck | \$ 425,000 | \$ - | \$ 425,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 425,000 | \$ - | \$ 425,000 | 100.00% |
| Rescue Vehicle | \$ 90,000 | \$ - | \$ 90,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 90,000 | \$ - | \$ 90,000 | 100.00% |
| Utility Pickup | \$ 40,000 | \$ - | \$ 40,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 40,000 | \$ - | \$ 40,000 | 100.00% |
| Existing Fund Balance | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | 0.00% | \$ (50,074) | \$ (50,074) | \$ - | \$ (50,074) | \$ (50,074) | \$ - | 0.00% |
| Total Public Safety - Fire | \$ 12,951,000 | \$ 5,447,184 | \$ 7,503,816 | 57.94% | \$ (50,074) | \$ (50,074) | \$ - | \$ 12,900,926 | \$ 5,397,110 | \$ 7,503,816 | 57.94% |
| G. PUBLIC SAFETY - ANIMAL CONTROL SERVICES | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Animal Control Vehicle Acq. | \$ 80,000 | \$ 52,687 | \$ 27,313 | 34.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 80,000 | \$ 52,687 | \$ 27,313 | 34.14% |
| Animal Holding Facility | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 658,588 | \$ 341,412 | 34.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 658,588 | \$ 341,412 | 34.14% |
| Total Public Safety - Animal Control Services | \$ 1,080,000 | \$ 711,275 | \$ 368,725 | 34.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,080,000 | \$ 711,275 | \$ 368,725 | 34.14% |

| FACILITY NAME | TOTAL COST OF FACILITY | TOTAL COST TO EXISTING DEVELOPMENT | TOTAL COST TO NEW DEVELOPMENT | % OF COST ALLOCATED TO NEW DEVELOPMENT | TOTAL OFFSETTING REVENUES | OFFSETTING REVENUES TO EXISTING DEVELOPMENT | OFFSETTING REVENUES TO NEW DEVELOPMENT | NET COST TO CITY | NET COST ALLOCATED TO EXISTING DEVELOPMENT | NET COST ALLOCATED TO NEW DEVELOPMENT | % OF TOTAL FACILITY COSTS FUNDED THROUGH FEES |
|---|------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------|---|--|-----------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| H. TRANSPORTATION | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Miscellaneous | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 Sweepers Acq | \$ 560,000 | \$ 430,028 | \$ 129,972 | 23.21% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 560,000 | \$ 430,028 | \$ 129,972 | 23.21% |
| Truck for Towing Acq | \$ 60,000 | \$ 46,074 | \$ 13,926 | 23.21% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 60,000 | \$ 46,074 | \$ 13,926 | 23.21% |
| Office Furniture Acq | \$ 10,000 | \$ 7,679 | \$ 2,321 | 23.21% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 10,000 | \$ 7,679 | \$ 2,321 | 23.21% |
| Cattle Call Park Class 1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Trails | \$ 1,148,000 | \$ 881,558 | \$ 266,442 | 23.21% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,148,000 | \$ 881,558 | \$ 266,442 | 23.21% |
| Transit Transfer Station | \$ 1,920,000 | \$ 1,474,382 | \$ 445,618 | 23.21% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,920,000 | \$ 1,474,382 | \$ 445,618 | 23.21% |
| Paving of South 9th Street | \$ 1,205,000 | \$ 925,328 | \$ 279,672 | 23.21% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,205,000 | \$ 925,328 | \$ 279,672 | 23.21% |
| Downtown Redevelopment Project | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 767,907 | \$ 232,093 | 23.21% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 767,907 | \$ 232,093 | 23.21% |
| Standard Drawing and Specifications | \$ 100,000 | \$ 76,791 | \$ 23,209 | 23.21% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 100,000 | \$ 76,791 | \$ 23,209 | 23.21% |
| Grapefruit Dr Paving (Malan St to 500 ft North) | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 767,907 | \$ 232,093 | 23.21% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 767,907 | \$ 232,093 | 23.21% |
| Streets: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wildcat Dr extension ROW acquisition (from S. Imperial Ave to S. 9th Street) | \$ 2,256,000 | \$ - | \$ 2,256,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 2,256,000 | \$ - | \$ 2,256,000 | 100.00% |
| Malan Street (from S. Imperial Ave. to S. Best Ave.) | \$ 3,200,000 | \$ - | \$ 3,200,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 3,200,000 | \$ - | \$ 3,200,000 | 100.00% |
| Dogwood Road (from Malan St. to Mead Rd) | \$ 2,200,000 | \$ - | \$ 2,200,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 2,200,000 | \$ - | \$ 2,200,000 | 100.00% |
| Duarte St (from North Eastern Ave to N. Palm Ave) | \$ 1,260,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,260,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,260,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,260,000 | 100.00% |
| B Street (from Eastern Ave to Best Rd) | \$ 1,560,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,560,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,560,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,560,000 | 100.00% |
| K Street (from Eastern Ave to Best Rd) | \$ 1,560,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,560,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,560,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,560,000 | 100.00% |
| Wildcat Dr (from State Hwy 86 to S. Best Ave) | \$ 11,620,000 | \$ - | \$ 11,620,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 11,620,000 | \$ - | \$ 11,620,000 | 100.00% |
| River Rd (from 7th to Cesar Chavez St) | \$ 1,300,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,300,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,300,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,300,000 | 100.00% |
| Best Rd (from Shank Rd to Malan St) | \$ 5,800,000 | \$ - | \$ 5,800,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 5,800,000 | \$ - | \$ 5,800,000 | 100.00% |
| Shank Rd (from State Route 111 (8th Street) to Eastern City limits (Luckey Ranch) | \$ 4,200,000 | \$ - | \$ 4,200,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 4,200,000 | \$ - | \$ 4,200,000 | 100.00% |
| North 8th St (from A St to Shank Rd) | \$ 3,400,000 | \$ - | \$ 3,400,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 3,400,000 | \$ - | \$ 3,400,000 | 100.00% |
| Magnolia St (Eastern Ave to Best Rd) | \$ 1,560,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,560,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,560,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,560,000 | 100.00% |
| Mead Rd (SR 86 to Best Rd) | \$ 11,520,000 | \$ - | \$ 11,520,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 11,520,000 | \$ - | \$ 11,520,000 | 100.00% |
| Palm Ave (River Dr to Duarte St) | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | 100.00% |
| Wilson St (Main St to C St) | \$ 750,000 | \$ - | \$ 750,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 750,000 | \$ - | \$ 750,000 | 100.00% |
| 18th St (Malan to Main St) | \$ 1,680,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,680,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,680,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,680,000 | 100.00% |
| Panno Rd Extension ROW Acquisition | \$ 500,000 | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | 100.00% |
| River Dr ROW Acquisition (from State Route 111 (8th Street) to Cesar Chavez Ave) | \$ 500,000 | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | 100.00% |
| Wildcat Dr Railroad Crossing Improvements | \$ 4,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 4,000,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 4,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 4,000,000 | 100.00% |
| 18th St ROW Acquisition (from Main St to Malan St) | \$ 500,000 | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | 100.00% |
| B St ROW Acquisition (from N. Eastern Ave to N. Best Ave) | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | 100.00% |
| K St ROW Acquisition (N. Eastern Ave to N. Best Ave) | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | 100.00% |
| Magnolia St ROW Acquisition (from N. Eastern Ave to N. Best Ave) | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | 100.00% |
| Mead Rd ROW Acquisition (from State Hwy 86 to N. Best Ave) | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | 100.00% |
| Mead Road Railroad Crossing Improvements | \$ 4,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 4,000,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 4,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 4,000,000 | 100.00% |
| River Dr Railroad Crossing Improvements | \$ 3,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 3,000,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 3,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 3,000,000 | 100.00% |
| Wilson St ROW Acquisition (from Main St to C St) | \$ 250,000 | \$ - | \$ 250,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 250,000 | \$ - | \$ 250,000 | 100.00% |
| Existing Fund Balance | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | 0.00% | \$ (1,499,950) | \$ (1,499,950) | \$ - | \$ (1,499,950) | \$ (1,499,950) | \$ - | 0.00% |
| Total Transportation | \$ 78,619,000 | \$ 5,377,655 | \$ 73,241,345 | 93.16% | \$ (1,499,950) | \$ (1,499,950) | \$ - | \$ 77,119,050 | \$ 3,877,705 | \$ 73,241,345 | 93.16% |
| I. STORMWATER CONTROL | | | | | | | | | | | |
| K Street Storm Drainage | \$ 500,000 | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | 100.00% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | 100.00% |
| N. Imperial Storm Drain Extension | \$ 250,000 | \$ 167,299 | \$ 82,701 | 33.08% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 250,000 | \$ 167,299 | \$ 82,701 | 33.08% |
| Pat Williams Storm Drain Extension | \$ 5,000,000 | \$ 3,345,972 | \$ 1,654,028 | 33.08% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 5,000,000 | \$ 3,345,972 | \$ 1,654,028 | 33.08% |
| Best Road Storm Drain North of Jones | \$ 500,000 | \$ 334,597 | \$ 165,403 | 33.08% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | \$ 334,597 | \$ 165,403 | 33.08% |
| Best Road Storm Drain from Malan to Main | \$ 2,000,000 | \$ 1,338,389 | \$ 661,611 | 33.08% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 2,000,000 | \$ 1,338,389 | \$ 661,611 | 33.08% |
| Total Stormwater Control | \$ 8,250,000 | \$ 5,186,257 | \$ 3,063,743 | 37.14% | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 8,250,000 | \$ 5,186,257 | \$ 3,063,743 | 37.14% |
| TOTAL: ALL FACILITIES | \$ 187,501,596 | \$ 34,629,324 | \$ 152,872,272 | 81.53% | \$ (2,278,327) | \$ (1,726,234) | \$ (552,093) | \$ 185,223,269 | \$ 32,903,090 | \$ 152,320,179 | 81.24% |

V. METHODOLOGY USED TO CALCULATE FEES

There are many methods or ways of calculating fees, but they are all based on determining the cost of needed improvements and assigning those costs equitably to various types of development. Each of the fee calculations employs the concept of an Equivalent Dwelling Unit ("EDU") or Equivalent Benefit Unit ("EBU") to allocate benefit among the four land use classes. EDUs are a means of quantifying different land uses in terms of their equivalence to a residential dwelling unit, where equivalence is measured in terms of potential infrastructure use or benefit for each type of public facility. For many of the facilities considered in this Fee Study, EDUs are calculated based on the number of residents or employees generated by each land use class. For other facilities, different measures, such as number of trips, more accurately represent the benefit provided to each land use class. Table 6 below shows total existing and projected EDUs or EBUs by facility type.

TABLE 6
CITY OF BRAWLEY
EQUIVALENT DWELLING UNITS

| Facility Type | Service Factor | Existing EDUs/EBUs | Projected EDUs/EBUs | Total |
|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| General Government Facilities | Residents and Employees | 21,293 | 11,038 | 32,331 |
| Library Facilities | Residents | 7,604 | 9,262 | 16,866 |
| Park Facilities | Potential Park Usage Hours | 7,604 | 9,262 | 16,866 |
| Airport Facilities | Residents and Employees | 21,293 | 11,038 | 32,331 |
| Police Facilities | Residents and Employees | 21,293 | 11,038 | 32,331 |
| Fire Facilities | Residents and Employees | 21,293 | 11,038 | 32,331 |
| Animal Control Facilities | Residents and Employees | 21,293 | 11,038 | 32,331 |
| Transportation Facilities | Average Number of Daily PM Peak Hour Trips | 43,542 | 13,160 | 56,702 |
| Storm Water Facilities | Run-Off | 21,878 | 10,815 | 32,693 |

The following sections present the reasonable relationship for benefit, impact, and rough proportionality tests for each fee element (i.e., fire facilities, police facilities, airport facilities, etc.) and the analysis undertaken to apportion costs for each type public facility on the Needs List. More detailed fee calculation worksheets for each type of facility are included in Appendix A.

A. GENERAL GOVERNMENT FACILITIES

The General Government Services Facilities Element includes those facilities used by the City to provide basic governmental services and public facilities maintenance services, exclusive of public safety.

**TABLE 7
GENERAL GOVERNMENT FACILITIES**

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

Table 8 below identifies the facilities proposed to be funded in whole or in part with the fees.

**TABLE 8
GENERAL GOVERNMENT FACILITIES
FACILITIES COST**

| Facility | Facility Unit | Quantity | Facility Cost |
|---|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| City Hall Expansion | SF | 2,500 | \$750,000 |
| City Hall Computer System | EA | 1 | \$60,000 |
| Public Works Parking Lot Paving | AC | 10 | \$1,000,000 |
| New Public Works Building | SF | 20,000 | \$5,000,000 |
| General Government - New ¹ | NA | NA | \$875,000 |
| General Government – Split ¹ | NA | NA | \$4,257,000 |
| Total Facilities Cost | NA | NA | \$11,942,000 |

¹ See Needs List for detail.

Calculation Methodology

Fee amounts for this element were calculated for both residential and non residential land uses as detailed in Appendix A-1. Each land use classification (i.e. SFR, MFR, C and I) was assigned an EDU factor derived from the number of persons per household (for residential units) or from the number of employees per 1,000 building square feet of non-residential development as presented in Table 11.

City Hall Expansion

The City currently has a City Hall totaling 7,364 square feet. According to the City, the current level of services is adequate to serve the existing development within Brawley. The City has determined that an additional 2,500 square feet will be needed as a result of new development. Therefore, 100% of the costs will be allocated to new development.

**TABLE 9
CITY HALL EXPANSION COST ALLOCATION**

| Development Type | EDUs | Percentage of Total EDUs | Total Building SF | Building SF Credit | Building SF Net of Credit | Percentage Allocated Net of Credit | Total Cost |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| Existing Development | 21,293 | 65.86% | 6,496 | (7,364) | (868) | 0.00% | \$0 |
| New Development | 11,038 | 34.14% | 3,368 | 0 | 3,368 | 100.00% | \$750,000 |
| Total | 32,331 | 100.00% | 9,864 | (7,364) | 2,500 | 100.00% | \$750,000 |

New Public Works Building

The City currently has a Public Works Building totaling 10,343 square feet. According to the City, the current level of services is less than the expected level at build out. The City has determined that 20,000 square feet is needed to adequately serve both existing and new development. Therefore, these costs of facilities have been allocated new development and existing development based on Table 10. Hence, 48.20% of the costs will be allocated to existing development and 51.80% will be allocated to new development.

**TABLE 10
NEW PUBLIC WORKS BUILDING COST ALLOCATION**

| Development Type | EDUs | Percentage of Total EDUs | Total Building SF | Building SF Credit | Building SF Net of Credit | Percentage Allocated Net of Credit | Total Cost |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--------------------|
| Existing Development | 21,293 | 65.86% | 19,984 | (10,343) | 9,641 | 48.20% | \$2,410,137 |
| New Development | 11,038 | 34.14% | 10,359 | 0 | 10,359 | 51.80% | \$2,589,863 |
| Total | 32,331 | 100.00% | 30,343 | (10,343) | 20,000 | 100.00% | \$5,000,000 |

City Hall Computer System, Public Work Parking Lot Paving, and General Government – Split²

According to the City, the current level of services is less than the expected level at build out. Therefore, these facilities have been allocated between existing development and new development based on their percentage of build out EDUs. Hence, 65.86% of the costs will be allocated to existing development and 34.14% of the costs will be allocated to new development.

General Government – New²

It has been determined that these facilities are needed to serve new development. Currently, these facilities are operating at an acceptable level of service; therefore, 100% of the costs will be allocated to new development.

Fee Amounts

Table 11 presents a summary of the derivation of EDUs, fee amounts and the costs financed by fees for the general government facilities on the Needs List. The details of the fee calculation are presented in Appendix A-1.

² See Needs List for details.

**TABLE 11
GENERAL GOVERNMENT FACILITIES
FEE DERIVATION SUMMARY**

| Land Use Type | Residents/ Employees per Unit or 1,000 BSF | EDUs per Unit or 1,000 BSF | Number of Future EDUs | Development Impact Fee per Unit or 1,000 BSF | Cost Financed by Fees |
|--|---|---|----------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Single Family | 3.74 | 1.00 | 5,735 | \$546 | \$3,133,002 |
| Multi Family | 2.80 | 0.75 | 3,526 | \$410 | \$1,926,509 |
| Commercial | 3.92 | 1.05 | 740 | \$573 | \$404,338 |
| Industrial | 1.01 | 0.27 | 1,037 | \$147 | \$566,300 |
| Total | | | 11,038 | | \$6,030,149 |
| Net Cost Allocated to Existing Development | | | | | \$5,911,851 |
| Total Net Cost of General Government Facilities | | | | | \$11,942,000 |

Based on the development projections in Appendix B, the fee amounts presented in Table 11 will finance 50.50% of the net costs of the general government facilities identified on the Needs List. The remaining 49.50% of the net costs of facilities will be funded through other sources, including \$27,156 in existing AB 1600 general government fund monies

B. Library Facilities

The Library Facilities will serve the residents of Brawley by promoting literacy and learning, as well as, providing an improved quality of life. The Fee Study includes a component for the expansion of existing library facilities and the acquisition of new library volumes. The cost of the Brawley library has been allocated to new development only. New library volumes are in addition to the City of Brawley's existing collection and includes volumes to bring the existing level of service up to a standard 2.0 volumes per capita and will be allocated to new development only.

**TABLE 12
LIBRARY FACILITIES**

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

Table 13 below identifies the facilities proposed to be funded in whole or in part with the fees. The size of the new 7,448 square foot library expansion and costs of construction and land acquisition are based on estimates provided by the City. The City has determined that a standard of 2.0 volumes per capita, is an appropriate standard for new development in Brawley. Therefore the number of books shown below is the amount needed to bring new development to the proposed standard. The cost per volume is based on an average cost per volume of \$60.00 as shown in the Bowker Annual 2005 Edition.

**TABLE 13
LIBRARY FACILITIES
FACILITY COSTS**

| Facility | Facility Unit | Quantity | Facility Cost |
|------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Library | SF | 7,448 | \$3,336,000 |
| Bookmobile | EA | 1 | \$200,000 |
| Library Books | EA | 69,222 | \$4,153,335 |
| Misc. Library ³ | NA | NA | \$670,181 |
| Total Facilities Cost | NA | NA | \$8,359,516 |

Calculation Methodology

Fee amounts for this element were calculated for residential land uses as detailed in Appendix A-2. Each of the land use categories was assigned an EDU factor derived from the number of persons per household as presented in Table 15.

³ See Needs List for detail.

Library

The City currently utilizes a 6,515 square foot building for the Brawley library. According to the City, the current level of services is adequate to serve the existing development within Brawley. The City has determined that an additional 7,448 square feet will be needed as a result of new development. Therefore, 100% of the costs will be allocated to new development.

**TABLE 14
LIBRARY COST ALLOCATION**

| Development Type | EDUs | Percentage of Total EDUs | Total Building SF | Building SF Credit | Building SF Net of Credit | Percentage Allocated Net of Credit | Total Cost |
|----------------------|---------------|--------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Existing Development | 7,604 | 45.09% | 6,295 | (6,515) | (220) | 0.00% | \$0 |
| New Development | 9,262 | 54.91% | 7,668 | 0 | 7,668 | 100.00% | \$7,912,274 |
| Total | 16,866 | 100.00% | 13,963 | (6,515) | 7,448 | 100.00% | \$7,912,274 |

Fee Amounts

Fee amounts to finance the library facilities on the Needs List are presented in Table 15. The amount needed to fund existing development's share of library facilities will be funded through other sources net of existing fund balance.

**TABLE 15
LIBRARY ELEMENT
FEE DERIVATION SUMMARY**

| Land Use Type | Residents per Unit | EDUs per Unit | Number of Future EDUs | Development Impact Fee per Unit | Cost Financed by Fees |
|---|--------------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Single Family | 3.74 | 1.00 | 5,735 | \$903 | \$4,899,519 |
| Multi Family | 2.80 | 0.75 | 3,527 | \$677 | \$3,012,755 |
| Total⁴ | | | 9,262 | | \$7,912,274 |
| Net Cost Allocated to Existing Development | | | | | \$0 |
| Total Net Cost of Library Facilities | | | | | \$7,912,274 |

⁴ Due to an existing fee balance of \$447,242, a credit was applied to the cost allocated to new development.

Based on the development projections in Appendix B, the fee amounts presented in Table 15 are expected to finance 100% of the library facilities on the Needs List.

C. PARK FACILITIES

The Parks Facilities will serve the residents of Brawley by providing facilities for recreation while enhancing the community’s appeal and quality of life. The Fee Study includes a component for the acquisition of new park facilities to serve new residential development through build out. In order to serve new and existing development, the City has identified the need to purchase 108.10 acres of park land that will be acquired by the City. Such acreage is expected to benefit both existing and new development in Brawley and the costs will be allocated based on total EDUs at build out.

**TABLE 16
PARK FACILITIES**

| | |
|--|--|
| Identify Purpose of Fee | Park Facilities |
| Identify Use of Fee | The acquisition and construction of park facilities. |
| Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility, the use of the fee, and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed | New residential development will generate additional residents who will increase the demand for park facilities. Land will have to be acquired and improved to meet this increased demand. Park fees collected from new development will be used exclusively for park facilities identified on the Needs List. |

Table 17 below identifies the facilities proposed to be funded in whole or in part with the fees. Costs are based on estimates provided by the City.

**TABLE 17
PARK FACILITIES
FACILITY COSTS**

| Facility | Facility Unit | Acres | Facility Cost |
|------------------------------|----------------------|---------------|----------------------|
| Park Acquisition/Development | Acre | 108.10 | \$18,753,000 |
| Park Improvements/Equipment | NA | NA | \$12,117,932 |
| Total Facilities Cost | Acre | 108.10 | \$30,870,932 |

Calculation Methodology

Fee amounts for this element were calculated for residential land uses as detailed in Appendix A-3. Since the use of park facilities is generally limited to daytime hours, it is reasonable to assume that a non-working resident has a greater number of available hours for potential use per week than either a working resident or employee.

In order to equitably allocate the costs between future residents, the Park Fee is calculated as a fee per Equivalent Benefit Unit ("EBU"), where one EBU is equal to the potential recreation usage hour of a single-family residential unit. The Parks Fee for a land use will then be calculated by multiplying the fee per EBU by the number of potential recreation usage hours generated by a particular land use, as determined by the U.S. Census Bureau, 2000: Table P27 "Place for Work for Workers 16 years and Over" and DP1 "Profile of General Demographic Characteristics".

Park Facilities

To serve new and existing development through build out, the City expects to acquire 108.10 acres of park land. In order to provide the same level of facilities for both existing and new development, the costs for the proposed park land and improvements have been allocated to both existing and new development based on total EBUs at build out as shown in the tables below. However, of the 232.40 acres of total park facilities at build out, 124.30 acres of parks are already complete. Therefore, a credit has been given to existing development for existing parks.

**TABLE 18
PARK FACILITY COST ALLOCATION**

| Development Type | EDUs | Percentage of Total EDUs | Total Park Acres | Park Acres Credit | Park Acres Net of Credit | Percentage Allocated Net of Credit | Total Cost |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| Existing Development | 7,604 | 45.09% | 104.78 | (124.30) | (19.52) | 0.00% | \$0 |
| New Development | 9,262 | 54.91% | 127.62 | 0 | 127.62 | 100.00% | \$30,766,081 |
| Total | 16,866 | 100.00% | 232.40 | (124.30) | 108.10 | 100.00% | \$30,766,081 |

Fee Amounts

Fee amounts to finance park improvements on the Needs List are presented in Table 19. Details regarding the analysis related to road facilities are included in Appendix A-3.

**TABLE 19
PARK FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS
FEE DERIVATION SUMMARY**

| Land Use Type | Potential Recreation Hour per Week per Unit | EBUs per Unit | Number of New EBUs | Development Impact Fee Per Unit | Cost Financed by Fees |
|--|--|----------------------|---------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| Single Family | 253 | 1.00 | 5,735 | \$3,333 | \$19,051,285 |
| Multi Family | 190 | 0.75 | 3,527 | \$2,500 | \$11,714,796 |
| Total⁵ | | | 9,262 | | \$30,766,081 |
| Net Cost Allocated to Existing Development | | | | | \$0 |
| Total Net Cost of Park Facilities | | | | | \$30,766,081 |

Based on the development projections in Appendix B, the fee amounts presented in Table 19 are expected to finance 100% of the net costs for all park facility improvements on the Needs List.

D. AIRPORT FACILITIES

The Airport Facilities element will serve the residents and employees of Brawley to provide basic airport facilities and services.

⁵ Due to an existing fee balance of \$104,851, a credit was applied to the cost allocated to new development

**TABLE 20
AIRPORT FACILITIES**

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

Table 21 below identifies the facilities proposed to be funded in whole or in part with the fees.

**TABLE 21
AIRPORT FACILITIES
FACILITY COSTS**

| Facility | Facility Unit | Quantity | Facility Cost |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Runway | LF | 1,100 | \$15,125,000 |
| Hangers | SF | 85,000 | \$2,500,000 |
| Misc. Airport Facilities ⁶ | NA | NA | \$3,950,000 |
| Total Facilities Cost | NA | NA | \$21,575,000 |

Calculation Methodology

Fee amounts for this element were calculated for both residential and non residential land uses as detailed in Appendix A-4. Each land use classification (i.e. SFR, MFR, C and I) was assigned an EDU factor derived from the number of persons per household (for residential units) or from the number of employees per 1,000 building square feet of non-residential development as presented in Table 24.

⁶ See Needs List for detail.

Hanger and Misc. Airport Facilities

The existing airport currently has hanger areas totaling 94,600 square feet. According to the City, the current level of services is less than the expected level of service at build out. The City has determined that an additional 85,000 square feet will be needed to adequately serve both existing and new development. Therefore, the cost of facilities have been allocated to new development and existing development based on Table 22 below.

**TABLE 22
HANGER AND MISCELLANEOUS AIRPORT FACILITIES COST ALLOCATION**

| Development Type | EDUs | Percentage of Total EDUs | Total Hanger SF | Hanger SF Credit | Hanger SF Net of Credit | Percentage Allocated Net of Credit | Total Cost |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| Existing Development | 21,293 | 65.86% | 118,282 | (94,600) | 23,682 | 27.86% | \$6,011,168 |
| New Development | 11,038 | 34.14% | 61,318 | 0 | 61,318 | 72.14% | \$4,652,918 |
| Total | 32,331 | 100.00% | 179,600 | (94,600) | 85,000 | 100.00% | \$10,664,086 |

Runway

The existing airport currently has a 4,500 lineal foot runway. According to the City, the current level of services is adequate to serve the existing development within Brawley. The City has determined that an additional 1,100 lineal feet will be needed as a result of new development. Therefore, 100% of the costs will be allocated to new development.

**TABLE 23
RUNWAY COST ALLOCATION**

| Development Type | EDUs | Percentage of Total EDUs | Total Runway LF | Runway LF Credit | Runway LF Net of Credit | Percentage Allocated Net of Credit | Total Cost |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| Existing Development | 21,293 | 65.86% | 3,688 | (4,500) | (812) | 0.00% | \$0 |
| New Development | 11,038 | 34.14% | 1,912 | 0 | 1,912 | 100.00% | \$15,125,000 |
| Total | 32,331 | 100.00% | 5,600 | (4,500) | 1,100 | 100.00% | \$15,125,000 |

Fee Amounts

Table 24 presents a summary of the derivation of EDUs, fee amounts and the costs financed by fees for the airport facilities on the Needs List. The details of the fee calculation are presented in Appendix A-4.

**TABLE 24
AIRPORT FACILITIES
FEE DERIVATION SUMMARY**

| Land Use Type | Residents per Unit/Employees per 1,000 BSF | EDUs per Unit or 1,000 BSF | Number of New EDUs | Development Impact Fee per Unit or 1,000 BSF | Cost Financed by Fees |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| Single Family | 3.74 | 1.00 | 5,735 | \$1,792 | \$10,275,742 |
| Multi Family | 2.80 | 0.75 | 3,527 | \$1,344 | \$6,318,641 |
| Commercial | 3.92 | 1.05 | 740 | \$1,880 | \$1,326,164 |
| Industrial | 1.01 | 0.27 | 1,037 | \$482 | \$1,857,372 |
| Total | | | 11,039 | | \$19,777,919 |
| Net Cost Allocated to Existing Development | | | | | \$1,797,082 |
| Total Net Cost of Airport Facilities | | | | | \$21,575,000 |

Based on the development projections in Appendix B, the fee amounts presented in Table 24 will finance 72.14% of the net costs of the airport facilities identified on the Needs List. The remaining 27.86% of the net costs of facilities will be funded through other sources.

E. POLICE FACILITIES

The Police Facilities element includes those facilities used by the City. In order to serve new development through build out, the City identified the need for one additional police station, one police substation, police vehicles, communication center and equipment, and police equipment. The police sub-station is sized to serve new development only, whereas the police station is a replacement facility and a portion of the costs will be allocated to existing development and funded through other sources.

**TABLE 25
POLICE FACILITIES ELEMENT**

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

Table 26 below identifies the facilities proposed to be funded in whole or in part with the fees. Costs are based on estimates provided by the City.

**TABLE 26
POLICE FACILITIES
FACILITY COSTS**

| Facility | Facility Unit | Quantity | Facility Cost |
|---|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| New Police Station | SF | 12,000 | \$8,000,000 |
| Marked Patrol Cars | Vehicles | 8 | \$144,000 |
| Police Vehicle Mobile Radios | Radios | 8 | \$33,648 |
| Portable Officer Radios | Radios | 14 | \$66,500 |
| Police Substation | NA | NA | \$4,524,000 |
| Communications Center Working Console | EA | 2 | \$106,000 |
| Communications Center Radio and Computer System Hardware | EA | 2 | \$100,000 |
| Misc. Police Facilities ⁷ | NA | NA | \$880,000 |
| Total Facilities Cost | NA | NA | \$13,854,148 |

⁷ See Needs List for detail.

Calculation Methodology

Fee amounts for this element were calculated for both residential and non residential land uses as detailed in Appendix A-5. Each land use classification (i.e. SFR, MFR, C and I) was assigned an EDU factor derived from the number of persons per household (for residential units) or from the number of employees per 1,000 building square feet of non-residential development as presented in Table 27.

New Police Station and Miscellaneous Police Facilities - Split⁸

According to the City, the current level of services is less than the expected level at build out. Therefore, the costs of facilities have been allocated to new development and existing development based on their percentage of build out EDUs. Hence, 65.86% of the costs will be allocated to existing development and 34.14% of the costs will be allocated to new development.

Marked Patrol Cars, Police Vehicle Mobile Radios, Portable Officer Radios, Police Substation, Communication Center Working Console, Communication Center Radio & Computer System Hardware

It has been determined that these facilities are needed to serve new development. Currently, these facilities are operating at an acceptable level of service; therefore, 100% of the costs will be allocated to new development.

Fee Amounts

Table 27 presents a summary of the derivation of EDUs, fee amounts and the costs financed by fees for the police facilities on the Needs List. The details of the fee calculation are presented in Appendix A-5.

⁸ See Needs List for details.

**TABLE 27
POLICE FACILITIES
FEE DERIVATION SUMMARY**

| Land Use Type | Residents per Unit/Employees per 1,000 BSF | EDUs per Unit or 1,000 BSF | Number of New EDUs | Development Impact Fee per Unit or 1,000 BSF | Cost Financed by Fees |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| Single Family | 3.74 | 1.00 | 5,735 | \$725 | \$4,159,507 |
| Multi Family | 2.80 | 0.75 | 3,527 | \$544 | \$2,557,716 |
| Commercial | 3.92 | 1.05 | 740 | \$761 | \$536,817 |
| Industrial | 1.01 | 0.27 | 1,037 | \$195 | \$751,844 |
| Total | | | 11,039 | | \$8,005,884 |
| Net Cost Allocated to Existing Development | | | | | \$5,848,265 |
| Total Net Cost of Police Facilities | | | | | \$13,854,148 |

Based on the development projections in Appendix B, the fee amounts presented in Table 27 will finance 56.81% of the net costs of the police facilities identified on the Needs List. The remaining 43.19% of the net costs of facilities will be funded through other sources.

F. FIRE FACILITIES

The Fire Facilities element includes those facilities used by the City to protect life and property. The City identifies the need for additional fire protection facilities, equipment, and fire fighters as build out of the community occurs. In order to serve new development through build out in Brawley, the City identified the need for one new fire station, one new fire substation, and fire vehicles. The fire sub-station is sized to serve new development only, whereas the main fire station is a replacement facility and a portion of the costs will be allocated to existing development and funded through other sources.

**TABLE 28
FIRE FACILITIES ELEMENT**

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

Table 29 below identifies the facilities proposed to be funded in whole or in part with the fees. Costs are based on estimates provided by the City.

**TABLE 29
FIRE FACILITIES
FACILITY COSTS**

| Facility | Facility Unit | Quantity | Facility Cost |
|------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Main Fire Station | SF | 21,484 | \$8,271,000 |
| Fire Substation | SF | 11,480 | \$3,000,000 |
| Fire Engines | Vehicle | 3 | \$1,125,000 |
| Ladder Truck | Vehicle | 1 | \$425,000 |
| Rescue Vehicle | Vehicle | 1 | \$90,000 |
| Utility Pickup | Vehicle | 2 | \$40,000 |
| Total Facilities Cost | NA | NA | \$12,951,000 |

Calculation Methodology

Fee amounts for this element were calculated for both residential and non residential land uses as detailed in Appendix A-6. Each land use classification (i.e. SFR, MFR, C and I) was assigned an EDU factor derived from the number of persons per household (for residential units) or from the number of employees per 1,000 building square feet of non-residential development as presented in Table 30.

Main Fire Station

According to the City, the current level of services is less than the expected level at build out. Therefore, the costs of these facilities have been allocated between existing development and new development based on their percentage of build out EDUs. Hence, 65.86% of the costs will be allocated to existing development and 34.14% of the costs will be allocated to new development.

Fire Substation, Fire Engines, Ladder Truck, Rescue Vehicle, and Utility Pickup

It has been determined that these facilities are needed to serve new development. Currently, these facilities are operating at an acceptable level of service; therefore, 100% of the costs will be allocated to new development.

Fee Amounts

Table 30 presents a summary of the derivation of EDUs, fee amounts and the costs financed by fees for the police facilities on the Needs List. The details of the fee calculation are presented in Appendix A-6.

**TABLE 30
FIRE FACILITIES
FEE DERIVATION SUMMARY**

| Land Use Type | Residents per Unit/Employees per 1,000 BSF | EDUs per Unit or 1,000 BSF | Number of New EDUs | Development Impact Fee per Unit or 1,000 BSF | Cost Financed by Fees |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| Single Family | 3.74 | 1.00 | 5,735 | \$680 | \$3,898,655 |
| Multi Family | 2,80 | 0.75 | 3,527 | \$510 | \$2,397,316 |
| Commercial | 3.92 | 1.05 | 740 | \$713 | \$503,152 |
| Industrial | 1.01 | 0.27 | 1,037 | \$183 | \$704,694 |
| Total | | | 11,039 | | \$7,503,817 |
| Net Cost Allocated to Existing Development | | | | | \$5,447,184 |
| Total Net Cost of Police Facilities | | | | | \$12,951,000 |

Based on the development projections in Appendix B, the fee amounts presented in Table 30 will finance 57.94% of the net costs of the fire facilities identified on the Needs List. The remaining 42.06% of the net costs of facilities will be funded through other sources.

G. Animal Control Facilities

The Animal Control Facilities Element includes those facilities used by the City to provide basic animal control services. In order to serve future development through build out the City identified the need for public works facilities.

**TABLE 31
ANIMAL CONTROL FACILITIES**

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

Table 32 below identifies the facilities proposed to be funded in whole or in part with the fees. Costs are based on estimates provided by the City.

**TABLE 32
ANIMAL CONTROL FACILITIES
FACILITY COSTS**

| Facility | Facility Unit | Quantity | Facility Cost |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Animal Control Vehicle Acquisition | EA | 2 | \$80,000 |
| Animal Holding Facility | SF | 1,500 | \$1,000,000 |
| Total Facilities Cost | NA | NA | \$1,080,000 |

Calculation Methodology

Fee amounts for this element were calculated for both residential and non residential land uses as detailed in Appendix A-7. Each land use classification (i.e. SFR, MFR, C and I) was assigned an EDU factor derived from the number of persons per household (for residential units) or from the number of employees per 1,000 building square feet of non-residential development as presented in Table 33.

According to the City, the current level of services is less than the expected level at build out. Therefore, the costs of these facilities have been allocated between existing development and new development based on their percentage of build out EDUs. Hence, 65.86% of the costs will be allocated to existing development and 34.14% of the costs will be allocated to new development.

Fee Amounts

Table 33 presents a summary of the derivation of EDUs, fee amounts and the costs financed by fees for the police facilities on the Needs List. The details of the fee calculation are presented in Appendix A-7.

**TABLE 33
ANIMAL CONTROL FACILITIES
FEE DERIVATION SUMMARY**

| Land Use Type | Residents per Unit/Employees per 1,000 BSF | EDUs per Unit or 1,000 BSF | Number of New EDUs | Development Impact Fee per Unit or 1,000 BSF | Cost Financed by Fees |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| Single Family | 3.74 | 1.00 | 5,735 | \$33 | \$191,573 |
| Multi Family | 2,80 | 0.75 | 3,527 | \$25 | \$117,800 |
| Commercial | 3.92 | 1.05 | 740 | \$35 | \$24,724 |
| Industrial | 1.01 | 0.27 | 1,037 | \$9 | \$34,627 |
| Total | | | 11,039 | | \$368,724 |
| Net Cost Allocated to Existing Development | | | | | \$711,275 |
| Total Net Cost of Animal Control Facilities | | | | | \$1,080,000 |

Based on the development projections in Appendix B, the fee amounts presented in Table 33 will finance 34.14% of the net costs of the animal control facilities identified on the Needs List. The remaining 65.86% of the net costs of facilities will be funded through other sources.

H. TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

Transportation facilities includes infrastructure necessary to provide safe and efficient vehicular access throughout the City. In order to meet the transportation demand of new development through build out, the City identified the need for new road construction and equipment as shown in the Needs List.

**TABLE 34
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES**

| | |
|--|---|
| Identify Purpose of Fee | Road Improvements |
| Identify Use of Fee | Various roadway improvements including rights of way, signals, paving, and bridges |
| Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility, the use of the fee, and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed | New residential and non-residential development will generate additional residents and employees who will create additional vehicular and non-vehicular traffic. Streets will have to be improved or extended to meet the increased demand. Traffic signals will have to be installed to efficiently direct increased traffic flow. Thus there is a relationship between new development and the need for new transportation facilities. Fees collected from new development will be used exclusively for roadway and transit facilities on the Needs List. |

Table 35 below identifies the facilities proposed to be funded in whole or in part with the fees. Costs are based on estimates provided by the City.

**TABLE 35
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES
FACILITY COSTS**

| Facility⁹ | Facility Unit | Quantity | Facility Cost |
|------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Streets | NA | NA | \$71,616,000 |
| Miscellaneous | NA | NA | \$7,003,000 |
| Total Facilities Cost | NA | NA | \$78,619,000 |

Calculation Methodology

Transportation improvements benefit residents and employees by providing safe and efficient vehicular access throughout Brawley. The Transportation Fee is calculated as a fee per EDU, where one EDU is equal to the average daily trips (ADTs) generated by a single family unit, or 10 ADTs, as indicated by the San Diego Association of Governments. The Transportation Fee for a given land use will then be calculated by multiplying the fee per EDU by the number of ADTs generated by a particular land use.

⁹ See Needs List for details

Miscellaneous¹⁰

According to the City, the current level of services is less than the expected level at build out. Therefore, the costs of these facilities have been allocated between existing development and new development based on their percentage of build out EDUs. Hence, 76.79% of the costs will be allocated to existing development and 23.21% of the costs will be allocated to new development.

Streets⁹

It has been determined that these facilities are needed to serve new development. Currently, these facilities are operating at an acceptable level of service; therefore, 100% of the costs will be allocated to new development.

Fee Amounts

Fee amounts to finance transportation improvements on the Needs List are presented in Table 36. Details regarding the analysis related to road facilities are included in Appendix A-8.

**TABLE 36
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES
FEE DERIVATION SUMMARY**

| Land Use Type | Trip Generation Rate per Unit or 1,000 BSF | EDUs per Unit or 1,000 BSF | Number of New EDUs | Development Impact Fee per Unit or 1,000 BSF | Cost Financed by Fees |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| Single Family | 10 | 1.00 | 5,735 | \$5,565 | \$31,917,162 |
| Multi Family | 7 | 0.70 | 3,291 | \$3,896 | \$18,317,724 |
| Commercial | 425 | 3.07 | 2,167 | \$17,098 | \$12,060,013 |
| Industrial | 89 | 0.51 | 1,967 | \$2,843 | \$10,946,446 |
| Total | | | 13,160 | | \$73,241,345 |
| Net Cost Allocated to Existing Development | | | | | \$5,377,655 |
| Total Net Cost of Transportation Facilities | | | | | \$78,619,000 |

Based on the development projections in Appendix B, the fee amounts presented in Table 36 will finance 93.16% of the net costs of the transportation facilities identified on the

¹⁰ See Needs List for details.

Needs List. The remaining 6.84% of the net costs of facilities will be funded through other sources.

I. STORM WATER FACILITIES

The Storm Water facilities include facilities necessary to ensure proper collection of storm water throughout the City. In order to meet the necessary protection levels from storm water runoff generated by new development through build out, the City identified the need for storm water facilities as shown in the Needs List

**TABLE 37
STORM WATER FACILITIES**

| | |
|--|---|
| Identify Purpose of Fee | Storm Water Protection |
| Identify Use of Fee | Construction of storm water facilities. |
| Demonstrate how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility, the use of the fee, and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed | <p>New residential and non-residential development will generate additional storm runoff, which will increase the demand for storm water services.</p> <p>New storm water facilities will need to be constructed to properly collect runoff in the City. Thus there is a relationship between new development and the need for new storm water facilities. Fees collected from new development will be used exclusively for storm water facilities on the Needs List.</p> |

Table 38 below identifies the facilities proposed to be funded in whole or in part with the fees. Costs are based on estimates provided by the City.

**TABLE 38
STORM WATER FACILITIES
FACILITY COSTS**

| Facility | Facility Unit | Quantity | Facility Cost |
|--|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| K Street Storm Drainage | NA | NA | \$500,000 |
| N. Imperial Storm Drain Extension | NA | NA | \$250,000 |
| Pat Williams Storm Drain Extension | NA | NA | \$5,000,000 |
| Best Road Storm Drain North of Jones | NA | NA | \$500,000 |
| Best Road Storm Drain from Malan to Main | NA | NA | \$2,000,000 |
| Total Facilities Cost | NA | NA | \$8,250,000 |

Calculation Methodology

Fee amounts for this element were calculated for both residential and non residential land uses as detailed in Appendix A-9.

Different land uses contribute to offsite runoff in proportion to the ratio of impervious ground and the ground area of the land use. A relative runoff methodology using "Rational Method" hydrology was used to apportion drainage facilities costs among the various land uses. The "Rational Method" uses the equation $Q=C \times I \times A$ where "Q" is runoff in cubic feet per second, "C" is the ratio of impervious ground area to total ground area for a given parcel (a "C" value of 1.00 indicates that due to roofs and paving, every drop of rain that falls on the given parcel finds its way to City streets as runoff), "I" is rainfall intensity over the given parcel, in inches per hour, and "A" is the ground area of the given parcel, in Acres. Since only the relative amount of runoff between parcels and land uses is needed to allocate costs, the "unit run-off," or run-off per storm intensity (Q/I) needs to be calculated. Therefore, the unit runoff for each land use and its corresponding acreage can be calculated.

The total facility cost is then divided by the total unit run-off to obtain a cost per unit run-off. This number is then multiplied by the various land use run-off factors to determine cost per dwelling unit or cost per 1,000 building square feet of development.

North Imperial Storm Drain Extension, Pat Williams Storm Drain Extension, Best Road Storm Drain (North of Jones), and Best Road Storm Drain (Malan to Main)

According to the City, the current level of protection is less than the expected level at build out. Therefore, the costs of these facilities have been allocated between existing development and new development based on their percentage of build out EDUs. Hence, 66.92% of the costs will be allocated to existing development and 33.08% of the costs will be allocated to new development.

K Street Storm Drain

It has been determined that these facilities are needed to serve new development. Currently, these facilities are operating at an acceptable level of service; therefore, 100% of the costs will be allocated to new development.

Fee Amounts

Fee amounts to finance storm water improvements on the Needs List are presented in Table 39. Details regarding the analysis related to road facilities are included in Appendix A-9

**TABLE 39
STORM WATER FACILITIES
FEE DERIVATION SUMMARY**

| Land Use Type | Run-off Factor | Run-off per Unit or 1,000 BSF | Number of New EDUs | Development Impact Fee per Unit or 1,000 BSF | Cost Financed by Fees |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| Single Family | 0.5 | 0.091 | 5,735 | \$283 | \$1,624,653 |
| Multi Family | 0.6 | 0.046 | 3,527 | \$144 | \$676,255 |
| Commercial | 0.9 | 0.065 | 740 | \$203 | \$143,032 |
| Industrial | 0.9 | 0.052 | 1,037 | \$161 | \$619,804 |
| Total | | | 11,039 | | \$3,063,744 |
| Net Cost Allocated to Existing Development | | | | | \$5,186,257 |
| Total Net Cost of Storm Water Facilities | | | | | \$8,250,000 |

Based on the development projections in Appendix B, the fee amounts presented in Table 39 will finance 37.14% of the net costs of the transportation facilities identified on the Needs List. The remaining 62.86% of the net costs of facilities will be funded through other sources.

J. ADMINISTRATIVE COST COMPONENT

The Administrative Cost component is intended to cover the City's cost associated with the administration of the development impact fee program. Administrative costs include staff time associated with fee collection, maintenance of trust funds into which the fees are deposited, and preparation of the annual reports as required per the Government Code. According to the City, the annual costs to implement the fee program is (in 2010 dollars) \$36,000. The work associated with administration of the fee program is a function of the amount of fee revenue collected; therefore, it is reasonable to compute the Administrative Cost component as a percentage of the "Percentage of Cost Allocated to New Development" as indicated in column 5 of the Needs List.

As discussed in Section IV, the Needs List identifies those facilities need to serve new development in the City through build out. The annual cost for administration was multiplied by fifteen to determine the costs for administering the fee program for a fifteen year period. The Administrative Costs are approximately 0.20 percent of the "Percentage of Cost Allocated to New Development".

VI. SUMMARY OF FEES

The total fee amounts to finance new development's share of the costs of facilities in the Needs Lists are summarized in Table 40.

**TABLE 40
DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE SUMMARY**

| Facility | Residential | | Non-Residential | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | Single Family | Multi Family | Commercial | Industrial |
| | Residential (\$ per unit) | Residential (\$ per unit) | Non-Residential (\$ per 1,000 BSF) | Non-Residential (\$ per 1,000 BSF) |
| A. Government Services Facilities | \$546 | \$410 | \$573 | \$147 |
| B. Library Facilities | \$854 | \$641 | NA | NA |
| C. Park and Recreation Facilities [1] | \$3,322 | \$2,491 | NA | NA |
| D. Airport | \$1,792 | \$1,344 | \$1,880 | \$482 |
| E. Public Safety Facilities | | | | |
| Police Facilities | \$725 | \$544 | \$761 | \$195 |
| Fire Facilities | \$680 | \$510 | \$713 | \$183 |
| Subtotal Public Safety Facilities | \$1,405 | \$1,054 | \$1,474 | \$378 |
| F. Animal Control Facilities | \$33 | \$25 | \$35 | \$9 |
| G. Transportation | \$5,565 | \$3,896 | \$17,098 | \$2,843 |
| H. Storm Water | \$283 | \$144 | \$203 | \$161 |
| I. Administration | \$49 | \$35 | \$75 | \$14 |
| Total | \$13,850 | \$10,039 | \$21,339 | \$4,035 |

[1] Projects that pay Quimby fees will receive a fee credit for park land acquisition to the extent applicable.

K:\CLIENTS2\Brawley\AB 1600 Study\Administrative Report 7\DIFReport_10 FINAL.doc

Appendix A

Fee Derivation Worksheets

Appendix A-1
City of Brawley
General Government
Fee Calculation

I. Inventory of Existing Facilities

| Facility | Facility Unit | Number |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|--------|
| City Hall | SF | 7,364 |
| Council Chamber | SF | 4,000 |
| Citywide Computer System | EA | 1 |
| Parking Lot | AC | 2.50 |
| Public Works/Engineering Building | SF | 10,343 |

II. Existing EDU Calculation

| Land Use Type | Number of Residents/ Employees | Residents/Unit or Employees/1,000 BSF | EDUs per Unit/ 1,000 BSF [1] | Number of Units/BSF [2] | Total Number of EDUs |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Single Family | 21,182 | 3.74 | 1.00 | 5,668 | 5,668 |
| Multi Family | 7,234 | 2.80 | 0.75 | 2,581 | 1,936 |
| Commercial/Office Uses | 2,380 | 3.92 | 1.05 | 9,335,250 | 9,796 |
| Industrial Uses | 14,375 | 1.01 | 0.27 | 14,461,920 | 3,893 |
| Total | NA | NA | NA | NA | 21,293 |

[1] EDU = Equivalent Dwelling Unit.

[2] BSF = Building Square Feet

III. Future EDU Calculation

| Land Use Type | Number of Residents/ Employees | Residents/Unit or Employees/1,000 BSF | EDUs per Unit/ 1,000 BSF | Number of Units/BSF | Total Number of EDUs |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Single Family | 21,432 | 3.74 | 1.00 | 5,735 | 5,735 |
| Multi Family | 13,179 | 2.80 | 0.75 | 4,702 | 3,527 |
| Commercial/Office Uses | 180 | 3.92 | 1.05 | 705,330 | 740 |
| Industrial Uses | 3,828 | 1.01 | 0.27 | 3,850,704 | 1,037 |
| Total | NA | NA | NA | NA | 11,038 |

IV. Proposed Facilities and Vehicles Inventory

| Facility | Facility Unit | Number | Facility Cost |
|---------------------------------|---------------|--------|------------------|
| City Hall Expansion | SF | 2,500 | \$ 750,000 |
| City Hall Computer System | EA | 1 | \$ 60,000 |
| Public Works Parking Lot Paving | AC | 10 | \$ 1,000,000 |
| New Public Works Building | SF | 20,000 | \$ 5,000,000 |
| General Government - New [3] | NA | 1 | \$ 875,000 |
| General Government - Split [3] | NA | 1 | \$ 4,257,000 |
| Total Facilities Cost | NA | NA | \$ 11,942,000 |

[3] See Need's List for details.

Appendix A-1
City of Brawley
General Government
Fee Calculation

V. Allocation to Existing & New Development (based on total EDUs)

A. City Hall Expansion (EDUs at build out with credit for existing)

| Type of Development | Total EDUs | Percentage of Total EDUs | Total Building Square Feet (BSF) | BSF Credit [4] | BSF Net of BSF Credit | Percentage Allocation of Net BSF | Facility Costs |
|----------------------|---------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|
| Existing Development | 21,293 | 65.86% | 6,496 | (7,364) | - | 0.00% | \$ - |
| New Development | 11,038 | 34.14% | 3,368 | - | 2,500 | 100.00% | \$ 750,000 |
| Total | 32,331 | 100.00% | 9,864 | (7,364) | 2,500 | 100.00% | \$ 750,000 |

[4] Existing Development has paid their fair share of city hall building SF, hence New Development will be paying for 100% of the new City Hall Expansion.

B. City Hall Computer System (EDUs at build out)

| Type of Development | Total EDUs | Each | Cost Per EDU | Facility Cost | Percentage of Cost Allocated |
|----------------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------------|
| Existing Development | 21,293 | 0.66 | \$ 1.86 | \$ 39,515 | 65.86% |
| New Development | 11,038 | 0.34 | \$ 1.86 | \$ 20,485 | 34.14% |
| Total | 32,331 | 1.00 | \$ 1.86 | \$ 60,000 | 100.00% |

C. Public Works Parking Lot Paving (EDUs at build out)

| Type of Development | Total EDUs | Acres | Cost Per EDU | Facility Cost | Percentage of Cost Allocated |
|----------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| Existing Development | 21,293 | 6.59 | \$ 30.93 | \$ 658,588 | 65.86% |
| New Development | 11,038 | 3.41 | \$ 30.93 | \$ 341,412 | 34.14% |
| Total | 32,331 | 10.00 | \$ 30.93 | \$ 1,000,000 | 100.00% |

D. New Public Works Building (EDUs at build out with credit for existing)

| Type of Development | Total EDUs | Percentage of Total EDUs | Total Building Square Feet (BSF) | BSF Credit [5] | BSF Net of BSF Credit | Percentage Allocation of Net BSF | Facility Cost |
|----------------------|---------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Existing Development | 21,293 | 65.86% | 19,984 | (10,343) | 9,641 | 48.20% | \$ 2,410,137 |
| New Development | 11,038 | 34.14% | 10,359 | - | 10,359 | 51.80% | \$ 2,589,863 |
| Total | 32,331 | 100.00% | 30,343 | (10,343) | 20,000 | 100.00% | \$ 5,000,000 |

[5] Existing Development has paid their fair share of public works building SF, hence New Development will be paying for 100% of the new Public Works Building.

E. General Government - New (100% of costs to new development)

| Type of Development | Total EDUs | Facility Unit | Cost Per EDU | Facility Cost | Percentage of Cost Allocated |
|----------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------------------|
| Existing Development | 21,293 | - | \$ - | \$ - | 0.00% |
| New Development | 11,038 | 1.00 | \$ 79.27 | \$ 875,000 | 100.00% |
| Total | 32,331 | 1.00 | \$ 79.27 | \$ 875,000 | 100.00% |

F. General Government - Split (EDUs at build out)

| Type of Development | Total EDUs | Facility Unit | Cost Per EDU | Facility Cost | Percentage of Cost Allocated |
|----------------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| Existing Development | 21,293 | 0.66 | \$ 131.67 | \$ 2,803,611 | 65.86% |
| New Development | 11,038 | 0.34 | \$ 131.67 | \$ 1,453,389 | 34.14% |
| Total | 32,331 | 1.00 | \$ 131.67 | \$ 4,257,000 | 100.00% |

Appendix A-1
City of Brawley
General Government
Fee Calculation

VI. Proposed Facilities and Cost Per EDU for New Development

| Facility | Facility Cost | Total EDUs | Cost per EDU |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|------------------|
| City Hall Expansion | \$ 750,000 | 11,038 | \$ 67.95 |
| City Hall Computer System | \$ 20,485 | 11,038 | \$ 1.86 |
| Public Works Parking Lot Paving | \$ 341,412 | 11,038 | \$ 30.93 |
| New Public Works Building | \$ 2,589,863 | 11,038 | \$ 234.63 |
| General Government - New | \$ 875,000 | 11,038 | \$ 79.27 |
| General Government - Split | \$ 1,453,389 | 11,038 | \$ 131.67 |
| Total | \$ 6,030,149 | 11,038 | \$ 546.30 |

VII. Development Impact Fee per Unit or 1,000 BSF

| Land Use Type | EDUs per Unit/1,000 BSF | Fees per Unit/1,000 BSF | Cost Financed by DIF |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Single Family | 1.00 | \$ 546 | \$ 3,133,002 |
| Multi Family | 0.75 | \$ 410 | \$ 1,926,509 |
| Commercial/Office Uses | 1.05 | \$ 573 | \$ 404,338 |
| Industrial Uses | 0.27 | \$ 147 | \$ 566,300 |
| Cost Allocated to New Development | NA | NA | \$ 6,030,149 |
| Cost Allocated to Existing Development | NA | NA | \$ 5,911,851 |
| Total Cost of General Government Facilities | NA | NA | \$ 11,942,000 |

K:\CLIENTS2\Brawley\AB 1600 Study\FeeStudy_38.xlsx\Govt

Appendix A-2
City of Brawley
Library Facilities
Fee Calculation

I. Inventory of Existing Facilities

| Facility | Facility Unit | Number |
|-------------------|---------------|--------|
| Library | SF | 6,515 |
| Bookmobile | EA | 1 |
| Library Books [1] | EA | 56,832 |

[1] Based on 2.0 volumes per capita.

II. Existing EDU Calculation

| Land Use Type | EDUs per Unit [2] | Number of Units | Total Number of EDUs |
|---------------|-------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Single Family | 1.00 | 5,668 | 5,668 |
| Multi Family | 0.75 | 2,581 | 1,936 |
| Total | NA | 8,249 | 7,604 |

[2] EDU = Equivalent Dwelling Unit.

III. Future EDU Calculation

| Land Use Type | EDUs per Unit | Number of Units | Total Number of EDUs |
|---------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Single Family | 1.00 | 5,735 | 5,735 |
| Multi Family | 0.75 | 4,702 | 3,527 |
| Total | NA | 10,437 | 9,262 |

IV. Proposed Facilities

| Facility | Facility Unit | Number | Facility Cost |
|-----------------------|---------------|--------|---------------|
| Library | SF | 7,448 | \$ 3,336,000 |
| Bookmobile | EA | 1 | \$ 200,000 |
| Library Books [3] | EA | 69,222 | \$ 4,153,335 |
| Misc. Library [4] | NA | 1 | \$ 670,181 |
| Existing Fund Balance | NA | 1 | \$ (447,242) |
| Total Facilities Cost | NA | NA | \$ 7,912,274 |

[3] Based on 2.0 volumes per capita. Based on \$60 per book per Bowker Annual.

[4] See Need's List for details.

Appendix A-2
City of Brawley
Library Facilities
Fee Calculation

V. Allocation to Existing and New Development (BSF at build out with credit for existing)

| Type of Development | Total EDUs | Percentage of Total EDUs | Total Building Square Feet (BSF) | BSF Credit [3] | BSF Net of BSF Credit | Percentage Allocation of Net BSF | Facility Costs |
|----------------------|---------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Existing Development | 7,604 | 45.09% | 6,295 | (6,515) | | 0.00% | \$ - |
| New Development | 9,262 | 54.91% | 7,668 | - | 7,448 | 100.00% | \$ 7,912,274 |
| Total | 16,865 | 100.00% | 13,963 | (6,515) | 7,448 | 100.00% | \$ 7,912,274 |

[3] Existing Development has paid their fair share of library facilities, hence New Development will be paying for 100% of the new Library Facilities.

VI. Proposed Facilities and Cost Per EDU for New Development

| Facility | Gross Facility Cost | Percentage of Facility Cost | Existing Fund Balance Credit | Net Facility Cost | Total EDUs | Cost per EDU |
|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|------------------|
| Library | \$ 3,336,000 | 39.91% | \$ (178,479) | \$ 3,157,521 | 9,262 | \$ 340.93 |
| Bookmobile | \$ 200,000 | 2.39% | \$ (10,700) | \$ 189,300 | 9,262 | \$ 20.44 |
| Library Books [3] | \$ 4,153,335 | 49.68% | \$ (222,207) | \$ 3,931,128 | 9,262 | \$ 424.46 |
| Misc. Library [4] | \$ 670,181 | 8.02% | \$ (35,855) | \$ 634,326 | 9,262 | \$ 68.49 |
| Total | \$ 8,359,516 | 100.00% | \$ (447,242) | \$ 7,912,274 | 9,262 | \$ 854.32 |

[3] Based on 2.0 volumes per capita. Based on \$60 per book per Bowker Annual.

[4] See Need's List for details.

VII. Development Impact Fee per Unit

| Land Use Type | EDUs per Unit | Fees per Unit | Cost Financed by DIF |
|---|---------------|---------------|----------------------|
| Single Family | 1.00 | \$ 854 | \$ 4,899,519 |
| Multi Family | 0.75 | \$ 641 | \$ 3,012,755 |
| Cost Allocated to New Development | NA | NA | \$ 7,912,274 |
| Cost Allocated to Existing Development | NA | NA | \$ - |
| Total Cost of Library Facilities | NA | NA | \$ 7,912,274 |

Appendix A-3
City of Brawley
Parkland Acquisition and Recreation Facilities
Fee Calculation

I. Inventory of Existing Facilities

| Facility | Facility Unit | Number |
|-----------------------|---------------|--------|
| Basketball Courts | EA | 1 |
| Barbecues | EA | 1 |
| Benches | EA | 40 |
| Maintenance Equipment | EA | 148 |
| Picnic Tables | EA | 60.00 |
| Trucks | EA | 6 |
| Parkland | AC | 124.3 |

II. Existing EDU Calculation

| Land Use Type | Population | Population per Household | Potential Park Hours/Week per DU [1] | EBU per Unit [2] | Number of Units | Total Number of EBUs |
|---------------|------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Single Family | 21,182 | 3.74 | 253 | 1.00 | 5,668 | 5,668 |
| Multi Family | 7,234 | 2.80 | 190 | 0.75 | 2,581 | 1,936 |
| Total | 28,416 | NA | 443 | NA | 8,249 | 7,604 |

[1] DU = Dwelling Unit.

[2] EBU = Equivalent Benefit Unit

III. Future EDU Calculation

| Land Use Type | Population | Population per Household | Potential Park Hours/Week per DU [1] | EBU per Unit [2] | Number of Units | Total Number of EBUs |
|---------------|------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Single Family | 21,432 | 3.74 | 253 | 1.00 | 5,735 | 5,735 |
| Multi Family | 13,179 | 2.80 | 190 | 0.75 | 4,702 | 3,527 |
| Total | 34,611 | NA | 443 | NA | 10,437 | 9,262 |

IV. Proposed Facilities

| Facility | Facility Unit | Number | Facility Cost |
|----------------------------------|---------------|--------|---------------|
| Park Acquisition/Development [3] | AC | 108.10 | \$ 18,753,000 |
| Improvements/Equipment [3] | NA | NA | \$ 12,117,932 |
| Existing Fund Balance | NA | NA | \$ (104,851) |
| Total Facilities Cost | NA | 108.10 | \$ 30,766,081 |

[3] See Need's List for details.

Appendix A-3
City of Brawley
Parkland Acquisition and Recreation Facilities
Fee Calculation

V. Allocation of Parks to Existing and New Development (based on park acres with credit for existing)

| Type of Development | EDUs | Percentage of Total EDUs | Total Park Acres | Park Acre Credit [2] | Park Acres Net of Park Acre Credit | Percentage Allocation of Net Park Acres | Total Costs |
|----------------------|--------|--------------------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|---|---------------|
| Existing Development | 7,604 | 45.09% | 104.78 | (124.30) | - | 0.00% | \$ - |
| New Development | 9,262 | 54.91% | 127.62 | - | 108.10 | 100.00% | \$ 30,766,081 |
| Total | 16,865 | 100.00% | 232.40 | (124.30) | 108.10 | 100.00% | \$ 30,766,081 |

[2] Existing Development has paid their fair share of park acres, hence New Development will be paying for 100% of the new park acres.

VI. Proposed Facilities and Cost Per EDU for New Development

| Facility | Gross Facility Cost | Percentage of Facility Cost | Existing Fund Balance Credit | Net Facility Cost | Total EDUs | Cost per EDU |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|------------|--------------|
| Park Acquisition/Development [3] | \$ 18,753,000 | 60.75% | \$ (63,693) | \$ 18,689,307 | 9,262 | \$ 2,017.96 |
| Improvements/Equipment [3] | \$ 12,117,932 | 39.25% | \$ (41,158) | \$ 12,076,774 | 9,262 | \$ 1,303.98 |
| Total | \$ 30,870,932 | 100.00% | \$ (104,851) | \$ 30,766,081 | 9,262 | \$ 3,321.93 |

[3] See Need's List for details.

VII. Development Impact Fee per Unit

| Land Use Type | EBUs per Unit | Fees per Unit | Cost Financed by DIF |
|--|---------------|---------------|----------------------|
| Single Family | 1.00 | \$ 3,322 | \$ 19,051,285 |
| Multi Family | 0.75 | \$ 2,491 | \$ 11,714,796 |
| Cost Allocated to New Development | NA | NA | \$ 30,766,081 |
| Cost Allocated to Existing Development | NA | NA | \$ - |
| Total Cost of Park Facilities | NA | NA | \$ 30,766,081 |

Appendix A-4
City of Brawley
Airport Facilities
Fee Calculation

I. Inventory of Existing Facilities

| Facility | Facility Unit | Number |
|--------------|---------------|--------|
| Runway | LF | 4,500 |
| Small Hanger | SF | 38,400 |
| Large Hanger | SF | 46,200 |
| Main Hanger | SF | 10,000 |
| Restrooms | EA | 2 |
| Loading Pads | EA | 4 |

II. Existing EDU Calculation

| Land Use Type | Number of Residents/ Employees | Residents/Unit or Employees/1,000 BSF | EDUs per Unit/ 1,000 BSF [1] | Number of Units/BSF [2] | Total Number of EDUs |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Single Family | 21,182 | 3.74 | 1.00 | 5,668 | 5,668 |
| Multi Family | 7,234 | 2.80 | 0.75 | 2,581 | 1,936 |
| Commercial Uses | 2,380 | 3.92 | 1.05 | 9,335,250 | 9,796 |
| Industrial Uses | 14,375 | 1.01 | 0.27 | 14,461,920 | 3,893 |
| Total | NA | NA | NA | NA | 21,293 |

[1] EDU = Equivalent Dwelling Unit.

III. Future EDU Calculation

| Land Use Type | Number of Residents/ Employees | Residents/Unit or Employees/1,000 BSF | EDUs per Unit/ 1,000 BSF [1] | Number of Units/BSF [2] | Total Number of EDUs |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Single Family | 21,432 | 3.74 | 1.00 | 5,735 | 5,735 |
| Multi Family | 13,179 | 2.80 | 0.75 | 4,702 | 3,527 |
| Commercial Uses | 180 | 3.92 | 1.05 | 705,330 | 740 |
| Industrial Uses | 3,828 | 1.01 | 0.27 | 3,850,704 | 1,037 |
| Total | NA | NA | NA | NA | 11,038 |

IV. Proposed Facilities

| Facility | Facility Unit | Number | Facility Cost |
|------------------------------|---------------|--------|------------------|
| Runway | LF | 1,100 | \$ 15,125,000 |
| Hangers | SF | 85,000 | \$ 2,500,000 |
| Misc. Airport Facilities [2] | NA | 1 | \$ 3,950,000 |
| Total Facilities Cost | NA | NA | \$ 21,575,000 |

[2] See Need's List for details.

Appendix A-4
City of Brawley
Airport Facilities
Fee Calculation

V. Allocation of Costs to Existing and New Development

A. Hanger and Misc. Airport Facilities (based on Hanger SF at buildout with credit for existing)

| Type of Development | EDUs | Percentage of Total EDUs | Total Hanger SF | Hanger SF Credit [2] | Hanger SF Net of Hanger SF Credit | Percentage Allocation of Net Hanger SF | Total Costs |
|----------------------|--------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--------------|
| Existing Development | 21,293 | 65.86% | 118,282 | (94,600) | 23,682 | 27.86% | \$ 1,797,082 |
| New Development | 11,038 | 34.14% | 61,318 | 0.00 | 61,318 | 72.14% | \$ 4,652,918 |
| Total | 32,331 | 100.00% | 179,600 | (94,600) | 85,000 | 100.00% | \$ 6,450,000 |

[2] Existing Development has paid their fair share of hanger and airport facilities, hence New Development will be paying for 100% of the new hanger and airport facilities.

B. Runway (based on Runway LF at buildout with credit for existing)

| Type of Development | EDUs | Percentage of Total EDUs | Total Runway LF | Runway LF Credit [3] | Runway LF Net of Hanger SF Credit | Percentage Allocation of Net Runway LF | Total Costs |
|----------------------|--------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---------------|
| Existing Development | 21,293 | 65.86% | 3,688 | (4,500) | - | 0.00% | \$ - |
| New Development | 11,038 | 34.14% | 1,912 | 0.00 | 1,100 | 100.00% | \$ 15,125,000 |
| Total | 32,331 | 100.00% | 5,600 | (4,500) | 1,100 | 100.00% | \$ 15,125,000 |

[3] Existing Development has paid their fair share of runway, hence New Development will be paying for 100% of the new runway.

VI. Proposed Facilities and Cost Per EDU for New Development

| Facility | Facility Cost | Total EDUs | Cost per EDU |
|------------------------------|---------------|------------|--------------|
| Runway | \$ 15,125,000 | 11,038 | \$ 1,370.23 |
| Hangers | \$ 1,803,457 | 11,038 | \$ 163.38 |
| Misc. Airport Facilities [2] | \$ 2,849,462 | 11,038 | \$ 258.14 |
| Total | \$ 19,777,918 | 11,038 | \$ 1,791.76 |

[2] See Need's List for details.

VII. Development Impact Fee per Unit

| Land Use Type | EDUs per Unit/1,000 BSF | Fees per Unit/1,000 BSF | Cost Financed by DIF |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Single Family | 1.00 | \$ 1,792 | \$ 10,275,742 |
| Multi Family | 0.75 | \$ 1,344 | \$ 6,318,641 |
| Commercial Uses | 1.05 | \$ 1,880 | \$ 1,326,164 |
| Industrial Uses | 0.27 | \$ 482 | \$ 1,857,372 |
| Cost Allocated to New Development | NA | NA | \$ 19,777,918 |
| Cost Allocated to Existing Development | NA | NA | \$ 1,797,082 |
| Total Cost of Airport Facilities | NA | NA | \$ 21,575,000 |

Appendix A-5
City of Brawley
Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment
Fee Calculation

I. Inventory of Existing Facilities

| Facility | Facility Unit | Number |
|--|---------------|--------|
| Police Station | SF | 11,800 |
| Marked Patrol Cars | Vehicles | 12 |
| Police Vehicle Mobile Radios | Radios | 12 |
| Portable Officer Radios | Radios | 34 |
| Communications Center Working Console | EA | 2 |
| Communications Center Radio and Computer System Hardware | EA | 2 |

II. Existing EDU Calculation

| Land Use Type | Number of Residents/ Employees | Residents/Unit or Employees/1,000 BSF | EDUs per Unit/ 1,000 BSF [1] | Number of Units/BSF [2] | Total Number of EDUs |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Single Family | 21,182 | 3.74 | 1.00 | 5,668 | 5,668 |
| Multi Family | 7,234 | 2.80 | 0.75 | 2,581 | 1,936 |
| Commercial Uses | 2,380 | 3.92 | 1.05 | 9,335,250 | 9,796 |
| Industrial Uses | 14,375 | 1.01 | 0.27 | 14,461,920 | 3,893 |
| Total | NA | NA | NA | NA | 21,293 |

[1] EDU = Equivalent Dwelling Unit.

[2] BSF = Building Square Feet

III. Future EDU Calculation

| Land Use Type | Number of Residents/ Employees | Residents/Unit or Employees/1,000 BSF | EDUs per Unit/ 1,000 BSF | Number of Units/BSF | Total Number of EDUs |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Single Family | 21,432 | 3.74 | 1.00 | 5,735 | 5,735 |
| Multi Family | 13,179 | 2.80 | 0.75 | 4,702 | 3,527 |
| Commercial Uses | 180 | 3.92 | 1.05 | 705,330 | 740 |
| Industrial Uses | 3,828 | 1.01 | 0.27 | 3,850,704 | 1,037 |
| Total | NA | NA | NA | NA | 11,038 |

IV. Proposed Facilities and Vehicles Inventory

| Facility | Facility Unit | Number | Facility Cost |
|--|---------------|--------|------------------|
| New Police Station | SF | 12,000 | \$ 8,000,000 |
| Marked Patrol Cars | Vehicles | 8 | \$ 144,000 |
| Police Vehicle Mobile Radios | Radios | 8 | \$ 33,648 |
| Portable Officer Radios | Radios | 14 | \$ 66,500 |
| Police Substation | NA | 1 | \$ 4,524,000 |
| Communications Center Working Console | EA | 2 | \$ 106,000 |
| Communications Center Radio and Computer System Hardware | EA | 2 | \$ 100,000 |
| Misc. Police Facilities [3] | NA | 1 | \$ 880,000 |
| Total Facilities Cost | NA | NA | \$ 13,854,148 |

[3] See Need's List for details.

Appendix A-5
City of Brawley
Law Enforcement Facilities, Vehicles, and Equipment
Fee Calculation

V. Allocation to Existing & New Development

A. Marked Patrol Cars/Police Vehicle Mobile Radios/Portable Officer Radios/Police Substation/Communication Center Working Console, Communication Center Radio & Computer System Hardware (100% of costs allocated to New Development)

| Type of Development | Total EDUs | Cost Per EDU | Facility Cost | Percentage of Cost Allocated |
|----------------------|---------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| Existing Development | 0 | \$ - | \$ - | 0.00% |
| New Development | 11,038 | \$ 450.63 | \$ 4,974,148 | 100.00% |
| Total | 11,038 | \$ 450.63 | \$ 4,974,148 | 100.00% |

B. New Police Station/Misc Police Facilities -Split (based on total EDUs)

| Type of Development | Total EDUs | Cost Per EDU | Facility Cost | Percentage of Cost Allocated |
|----------------------|---------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| Existing Development | 21,293 | \$ 274.66 | \$ 5,848,265 | 65.86% |
| New Development | 11,038 | \$ 274.66 | \$ 3,031,735 | 34.14% |
| Total | 32,331 | \$ 274.66 | \$ 8,880,000 | 100.00% |

VI. Proposed Facilities and Cost Per EDU to New Development

| Facility | Facility Cost | Total EDUs | Cost per EDU |
|--|---------------------|---------------|------------------|
| New Police Station | \$ 2,731,293 | 11,038 | \$ 247.44 |
| Marked Patrol Cars | \$ 144,000 | 11,038 | \$ 13.05 |
| Police Vehicle Mobile Radios | \$ 33,648 | 11,038 | \$ 3.05 |
| Portable Officer Radios | \$ 66,500 | 11,038 | \$ 6.02 |
| Police Substation | \$ 4,524,000 | 11,038 | \$ 409.85 |
| Communications Center Working Console | \$ 106,000 | 11,038 | \$ 9.60 |
| Communications Center Radio and Computer System Hardware | \$ 100,000 | 11,038 | \$ 9.06 |
| Misc. Police Facilities [3] | \$ 300,442 | 11,038 | \$ 27.22 |
| Total | \$ 8,005,883 | 11,038 | \$ 725.28 |

[3] See Need's List for details.

VII. Development Impact Fee per Unit or 1,000 BSF

| Land Use Type | EDUs per Unit/1,000 BSF | Fees per Unit/1,000 BSF | Cost Financed by DIF |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Single Family | 1.00 | \$ 725 | \$ 4,159,507 |
| Multi Family | 0.75 | \$ 544 | \$ 2,557,716 |
| Commercial Uses | 1.05 | \$ 761 | \$ 536,817 |
| Industrial Uses | 0.27 | \$ 195 | \$ 751,844 |
| Cost Allocated to New Development | NA | NA | \$ 8,005,883 |
| Cost Allocated to Existing Development | NA | NA | \$ 5,848,265 |
| Total Cost of Police Facilities | NA | NA | \$ 13,854,148 |

Appendix A-6
City of Brawley
Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles, & Equipment
Fee Calculation

I. Inventory of Existing Facilities

| Facility | Facility Unit | Number |
|-----------------|---------------|--------|
| Fire Stations | SF | 9,800 |
| Fire Engines | Vehicle | 3 |
| Ladder Truck | Vehicle | 1 |
| Rescue Vehicle | Vehicle | 1 |
| Utility Vehicle | Vehicle | 2 |

II. Existing EDU Calculation

| Land Use Type | Number of Residents/ Employees | Residents/Unit or Employees/1,000 BSF | EDUs per Unit/ 1,000 BSF [1] | Number of Units/BSF [2] | Total Number of EDUs |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Single Family | 21,182 | 3.74 | 1.00 | 5,668 | 5,668 |
| Multi Family | 7,234 | 2.80 | 0.75 | 2,581 | 1,936 |
| Commercial Uses | 2,380 | 3.92 | 1.05 | 9,335,250 | 9,796 |
| Industrial Uses | 14,375 | 1.01 | 0.27 | 14,461,920 | 3,893 |
| Total | NA | NA | NA | NA | 21,293 |

[1] EDU = Equivalent Dwelling Unit.

[2] BSF = Building Square Feet

III. Future EDU Calculation

| Land Use Type | Number of Residents/ Employees | Residents/Unit or Employees/1,000 BSF | EDUs per Unit/ 1,000 BSF | Number of Units/BSF | Total Number of EDUs |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Single Family | 21,432 | 3.74 | 1.00 | 5,735 | 5,735 |
| Multi Family | 13,179 | 2.80 | 0.75 | 4,702 | 3,527 |
| Commercial Uses | 180 | 3.92 | 1.05 | 705,330 | 740 |
| Industrial Uses | 3,828 | 1.01 | 0.27 | 3,850,704 | 1,037 |
| Total | NA | NA | NA | NA | 11,038 |

IV. Proposed Facilities and Vehicles Inventory

| Facility | Facility Unit | Number | Facility Cost |
|-----------------------|---------------|--------|------------------|
| Main Fire Station | SF | 21,484 | \$ 8,271,000 |
| Fire Substation | SF | 11,480 | \$ 3,000,000 |
| Fire Engines | Vehicle | 3 | \$ 1,125,000 |
| Ladder Truck | Vehicle | 1 | \$ 425,000 |
| Rescue Vehicle | Vehicle | 1 | \$ 90,000 |
| Utility Pickup | Vehicle | 2 | \$ 40,000 |
| Total Facilities Cost | NA | NA | \$ 12,951,000 |

Appendix A-6
City of Brawley
Fire Suppression Facilities, Vehicles, & Equipment
Fee Calculation

V. Allocation to Existing & New Development (based on total EDUs)

A. Fire Station Facilities (excluding Main Fire Station) (100% of costs allocated to New Development)

| Type of Development | EDUs | Percentage of Total EDUs | Facility Cost | Percentage of Cost Allocated |
|----------------------|--------|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------|
| Existing Development | 21,293 | 0.00% | \$ - | 0.00% |
| New Development | 11,038 | 34.14% | \$ 4,680,000 | 100.00% |
| Total | 32,331 | 34.14% | \$ 4,680,000 | 100.00% |

B. Main Fire Station

| Type of Development | Total EDUs | Cost Per EDU | Facility Cost | Percentage of Cost Allocated |
|----------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------------|
| Existing Development | 21,293 | \$ 255.82 | \$ 5,447,184 | 65.86% |
| New Development | 11,038 | \$ 255.82 | \$ 2,823,816 | 34.14% |
| Total | 32,331 | \$ 255.82 | \$ 8,271,000 | 100.00% |

VI. Proposed Facilities and Cost Per EDU for New Development

| Facility | Facility Cost | Total EDUs | Cost Per EDU |
|-------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Main Fire Station | \$ 2,823,816 | 11,038 | \$ 255.82 |
| Fire Substation | \$ 3,000,000 | 11,038 | \$ 271.78 |
| Fire Engines | \$ 1,125,000 | 11,038 | \$ 101.92 |
| Ladder Truck | \$ 425,000 | 11,038 | \$ 38.50 |
| Rescue Vehicle | \$ 90,000 | 11,038 | \$ 8.15 |
| Utility Pickup | \$ 40,000 | 11,038 | \$ 3.62 |
| Total | \$ 7,503,816 | 11,038 | \$ 679.80 |

VII. Development Impact Fee per Unit or 1,000 BSF

| Land Use Type | EDUs per Unit/1,000 BSF | Fees per Unit/1,000 BSF | Cost Financed by DIF |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Single Family | 1.00 | \$ 680 | \$ 3,898,655 |
| Multi Family | 0.75 | \$ 510 | \$ 2,397,316 |
| Commercial Uses | 1.05 | \$ 713 | \$ 503,152 |
| Industrial Uses | 0.27 | \$ 183 | \$ 704,694 |
| Cost Allocated to New Development | NA | NA | \$ 7,503,816 |
| Cost Allocated to Existing Development | NA | NA | \$ 5,447,184 |
| Total Cost of Fire Facilities | NA | NA | \$ 12,951,000 |

Appendix A-7
City of Brawley
Animal Control Services
Fee Calculation

I. Inventory of Existing Facilities

| Facility | Facility Unit | Number |
|----------|---------------|--------|
| NA | NA | NA |

II. Existing EDU Calculation

| Land Use Type | Number of Residents/ Employees | Residents/Unit or Employees/1,000 BSF | EDUs per Unit/ 1,000 BSF [1] | Number of Units/BSF [2] | Total Number of EDUs |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Single Family | 21,182 | 3.74 | 1.00 | 5,668 | 5,668 |
| Multi Family | 7,234 | 2.80 | 0.75 | 2,581 | 1,936 |
| Commercial Uses | 2,380 | 3.92 | 1.05 | 9,335,250 | 9,796 |
| Industrial Uses | 14,375 | 1.01 | 0.27 | 14,461,920 | 3,893 |
| Total | NA | NA | NA | NA | 21,293 |

[1] EDU = Equivalent Dwelling Unit.

[2] BSF = Building Square Feet.

III. Future EDU Calculation

| Land Use Type | Number of Residents/ Employees | Residents/Unit or Employees/1,000 BSF | EDUs per Unit/ 1,000 BSF | Number of Units/BSF | Total Number of EDUs |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Single Family | 21,432 | 3.74 | 1.00 | 5,735 | 5,735 |
| Multi Family | 13,179 | 2.80 | 0.75 | 4,702 | 3,527 |
| Commercial Uses | 180 | 3.92 | 1.05 | 705,330 | 740 |
| Industrial Uses | 3,828 | 1.01 | 0.27 | 3,850,704 | 1,037 |
| Total | NA | NA | NA | NA | 11,038 |

IV. Proposed Facilities and Vehicles Inventory

| Facility | Facility Unit | Number | Facility Cost |
|-----------------------------|---------------|--------|------------------|
| Animal Control Vehicle Acq. | EA | 2 | \$ 80,000 |
| Animal Holding Facility | SF | 1,500 | \$ 1,000,000 |
| Total Facilities Cost | NA | NA | \$ 1,080,000 |

Appendix A-7
City of Brawley
Animal Control Services
Fee Calculation

V. Allocation to Existing & New Development (100% of costs to new development)

| Type of Development | Total EDUs | Cost Per EDU | Facility Cost | Percentage of Cost Allocated |
|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| Existing Development | 21,293 | \$ 33.40 | \$ 711,275 | 65.86% |
| New Development | 11,038 | \$ 33.40 | \$ 368,725 | 34.14% |
| Total | 32,331 | \$ 33.40 | \$ 1,080,000 | 100.00% |

VI. Proposed Facilities and Cost Per EDU for New Development

| Facility | Facility Cost | Total EDUs | Cost Per EDU |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Animal Control Vehicle Acq. | \$ 27,313 | 11,038 | \$ 2.47 |
| Animal Holding Facility | \$ 341,412 | 11,038 | \$ 30.93 |
| Total | \$ 368,725 | 11,038 | \$ 33.40 |

VII. Development Impact Fee per Unit or 1,000 BSF

| Land Use Type | EDUs per Unit/1,000 BSF | Fees per Unit/1,000 BSF | Cost Financed by DIF |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Single Family | 1.00 | \$ 33 | \$ 191,573 |
| Multi Family | 0.75 | \$ 25 | \$ 117,800 |
| Commercial Uses | 1.05 | \$ 35 | \$ 24,724 |
| Industrial Uses | 0.27 | \$ 9 | \$ 34,627 |
| Cost Allocated to New Development | NA | NA | \$ 368,725 |
| Cost Allocated to Existing Development | NA | NA | \$ 711,275 |
| Total Cost of Animal Control Facilities | NA | NA | \$ 1,080,000 |

K:\CLIENTS2\Brawley\AB 1600 Study\Feestudy_38.xlsx\Animal Control

Appendix A-8
City of Brawley
Public Works - Transportation
Fee Calculation

I. Inventory of Existing Facilities

| Facility | Lane Miles |
|----------|------------|
| Streets | NA |

II. Existing EDU Calculation

| Land Use Type | Trip Generation Rate [1] | Diverted and Pass By Credit [2] | Net Trip Generation Rate | EDUs per Unit or Acre [3] | EDUs per Unit or 1,000 BSF [4] | Number of Units/BSF | Total Number of EDUs |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Single Family | 10 | 0 | 10 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 5,668 | 5,668 |
| Multi Family | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 2,581 | 1,807 |
| Commercial/Office Uses | 607 | 182 | 425 | 42.49 | 3.07 | 9,335,250 | 28,681 |
| Industrial Uses | 89 | 0 | 89 | 8.90 | 0.51 | 14,461,920 | 7,387 |
| Total | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 43,542 |

[1] Trip Generation Rates are taken from SANDAG, "Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates" and San Diego "Traffic Generators". Values given for residential land uses are per dwelling unit. Values given for non-residential categories are per gross acre. The value given for Commercial/Office Uses is a weighted average value based on various commercial and office subcategories reflecting a best guess expectation of future development.

[2] Assumes 30% credit for community commercial per SANDAG, "Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates".

[3] EDU = Equivalent Dwelling Unit.

[4] Per City of Brawly General Plan, July 2008, Table LUE-3, FAR is equal to 0.32 for Commercial/Office Uses and 0.40 for Industrial Uses.

III. Future EDU Calculation

| Land Use Type | Trip Generation Rate [1] | Diverted and Pass By Credit [2] | Net Trip Generation Rate | EDUs per Unit or Acre [3] | EDUs per Unit or 1,000 BSF [4] | Number of Units/BSF | Total Number of EDUs |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Single Family | 10.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 5,735 | 5,735 |
| Multi Family | 7.0 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 4,702 | 3,291 |
| Commercial/Office Uses | 607 | 182 | 425 | 42.49 | 3.07 | 705,330 | 2,167 |
| Industrial Uses | 89 | 0 | 89 | 8.90 | 0.51 | 3,850,704 | 1,967 |
| Total | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 13,160 |

[1] Trip Generation Rates are taken from SANDAG, "Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates" and San Diego "Traffic Generators". Values given for residential land uses are per dwelling unit. Values given for non-residential categories are per gross acre. The value given for Commercial/Office Uses is a weighted average value based on various commercial and office subcategories reflecting a best guess expectation of future development.

[2] Assumes 30% credit for community commercial per SANDAG, "Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates".

[3] EDU = Equivalent Dwelling Unit.

[4] Per City of Brawly General Plan, July 2008, Table LUE-3, FAR is equal to 0.32 for Commercial/Office Uses and 0.40 for Industrial Uses.

IV. Proposed Facilities

| Facility | Facility Unit | Number | Facility Cost |
|-----------------------|---------------|--------|---------------|
| Streets [5] | NA | NA | \$ 71,616,000 |
| Miscellaneous [5] | NA | NA | \$ 7,003,000 |
| Total Facilities Cost | NA | NA | \$ 78,619,000 |

[5] See Need's List for details.

Appendix A-8
City of Brawley
Public Works - Transportation
Fee Calculation

V. Allocation to Existing & New Development (based on total EDUs)

A. Streets (100% of costs to new development)

| Type of Development | EDUs | Percentage of Total EDUs | Facility Cost | Percentage of Cost Allocated |
|----------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Existing Development | 0 | 0.00% | \$ - | 0.00% |
| New Development | 13,160 | 100.00% | \$ 71,616,000 | 100.00% |
| Total | 13,160 | 100.00% | \$ 71,616,000 | 100.00% |

B. Misc. Streets (EDUs at build out)

| Type of Development | Total EDUs | Cost Per EDU | Facility Cost | Percentage of Cost Allocated |
|----------------------|---------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Existing Development | 43,542 | \$ 123.50 | \$ 5,377,655 | 76.79% |
| New Development | 13,160 | \$ 123.50 | \$ 1,625,345 | 23.21% |
| Total | 56,703 | \$ 123.50 | \$ 7,003,000 | 100.00% |

VI. Proposed Facilities and Cost Per EDU for New Development

| Facility | Facility Cost | Total EDUs | Cost Per EDU |
|-------------------|----------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| Streets [5] | \$ 71,616,000 | 13,160 | \$ 5,441.83 |
| Miscellaneous [5] | \$ 1,625,345 | 13,160 | \$ 123.50 |
| Total | \$ 73,241,345 | 13,160 | \$ 5,565.33 |

[5] See Need's List for details.

VII. Development Impact Fee per Unit or 1,000 BSF

| Land Use Type | EDUs per Unit/ 1,000 BSF | Fees per Unit/1,000 BSF | Cost Financed by DIF |
|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Single Family | 1.00 | \$ 5,565 | \$ 31,917,162 |
| Multi Family | 0.70 | \$ 3,896 | \$ 18,317,724 |
| Commercial/Office Uses | 3.07 | \$ 17,098 | \$ 12,060,013 |
| Industrial Uses | 0.51 | \$ 2,843 | \$ 10,946,446 |
| Cost Allocated to New Development | NA | NA | \$ 73,241,345 |
| Cost Allocated to Existing Development | NA | NA | \$ 5,377,655 |
| Total Cost of Transportation Facilities | NA | NA | \$ 78,619,000 |

K:\CLIENTS2\Brawley\AB 1600 Study\[Feestudy_38.xlsx]Transportation

Appendix A-9
City of Brawley
Stormwater Control Facilities
Fee Calculation

I. Inventory of Existing Facilities

| Facility | Facility Unit | Number |
|----------|---------------|--------|
| NA | NA | NA |

II. Existing EDU Calculation

| Land Use Type | Coefficient of Runoff Factor [1] | Density (DU/Acre) | Runoff [2] per DU or 1,000 BSF [3] | EDU Factor [4] | Dwelling Units or BSF | Total EDUs |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Single Family | 0.50 | 5.50 | 0.091 | 1.00 | 5,668 | 5,668 |
| Multi Family | 0.60 | 13.00 | 0.046 | 0.51 | 2,581 | 1,310 |
| Commercial Uses | 0.90 | NA | 0.065 | 0.72 | 9,335,250 | 6,683 |
| Industrial Uses | 0.90 | NA | 0.052 | 0.57 | 14,461,920 | 8,217 |
| Total | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 21,878 |

[1] Coefficient of Runoff is the ratio of impermeable area to gross developable area of a given land use, as represented by the factor "C" in the Rational Method Hydrology Runoff equation, $Q = C/A$.

[2] Runoff, Q, is calculated using the Rational Method, $Q = C/A$. Where "C" is the runoff co-efficient as explained in footnote [1] above. "I" is rainfall intensity and for the purposes of this allocation, is equal to unity, or 1 inch per hour. "A" is equal to the gross developable acres.

[3] Per City of Brawley General Plan, July 2008, Table LUE-3, FAR is equal to 0.32 for Commercial/Office Uses and 0.40 for Industrial Uses.

[4] EDU = Equivalent Dwelling Unit.

III. Future EDU Calculation

| Land Use Type | Coefficient of Runoff Factor [1] | Density (DU/Acre) | Runoff [2] per DU or 1,000 BSF [3] | EDU Factor [4] | Dwelling Units or BSF | Total EDUs |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Single Family | 0.50 | 5.50 | 0.091 | 1.00 | 5,735 | 5,735 |
| Multi Family | 0.60 | 13.00 | 0.046 | 0.51 | 4,702 | 2,387 |
| Commercial Uses | 0.90 | NA | 0.065 | 0.72 | 705,330 | 505 |
| Industrial Uses | 0.90 | NA | 0.052 | 0.57 | 3,850,704 | 2,188 |
| Total | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 10,815 |

[1] Coefficient of Runoff is the ratio of impermeable area to gross developable area of a given land use, as represented by the factor "C" in the Rational Method Hydrology Runoff equation, $Q = C/A$.

[2] Runoff, Q, is calculated using the Rational Method, $Q = C/A$. Where "C" is the runoff co-efficient as explained in footnote [1] above. "I" is rainfall intensity and for the purposes of this allocation, is equal to unity, or 1 inch per hour. "A" is equal to the gross developable acres.

[3] Per City of Brawley General Plan, July 2008, Table LUE-3, FAR is equal to 0.32 for Commercial/Office Uses and 0.40 for Industrial Uses.

[4] EDU = Equivalent Dwelling Unit.

IV. Proposed Facilities

| Facility | Facility Unit | Number | Facility Cost |
|--|---------------|--------|---------------|
| K Street Storm Drainage | EA | 1.00 | \$ 500,000 |
| N. Imperial Storm Drain Extension | EA | 1.00 | \$ 250,000 |
| Pat Williams Storm Drain Extension | EA | 1.00 | \$ 5,000,000 |
| Best Road Storm Drain North of Jones | EA | 1.00 | \$ 500,000 |
| Best Road Storm Drain from Malan to Main | EA | 1.00 | \$ 2,000,000 |
| Total Facilities Cost | NA | 5.00 | \$ 8,250,000 |

Appendix A-9
City of Brawley
Stormwater Control Facilities
Fee Calculation

V. Allocation to Existing & New Development (based on acres)

A. Stormwater Facilities (excluding K Street Storm Drain)

| Type of Development | EDU | Facility Unit | Cost Per EDU | Facility Cost | Percentage of Cost Allocated |
|----------------------|--------|---------------|--------------|---------------|------------------------------|
| Existing Development | 21,878 | 0.67 | \$ 237.06 | \$ 5,186,257 | 66.92% |
| New Development | 10,815 | 0.33 | \$ 237.06 | \$ 2,563,743 | 33.08% |
| Total | 32,693 | 1.00 | \$ 237.06 | \$ 7,750,000 | 100.00% |

B. K Street Storm Drain (100% of costs to new development)

| Type of Development | EDU | Facility Unit | Cost Per EDU | Facility Cost | Percentage of Cost Allocated |
|----------------------|--------|---------------|--------------|---------------|------------------------------|
| Existing Development | 0 | - | \$ - | \$ - | 0.00% |
| New Development | 10,815 | 1.00 | \$ 46.23 | \$ 500,000.00 | 100.00% |
| Total | 10,815 | 1.00 | \$ 46.23 | \$ 500,000.00 | 100.00% |

VI. Proposed Facilities and Cost Per EDU for New Development

| Facility | Facility Cost | Total EDUs | Cost Per EDU |
|--|---------------|------------|--------------|
| K Street Storm Drainage | \$ 500,000 | 10,815 | \$ 46.23 |
| N. Imperial Storm Drain Extension | \$ 82,701 | 10,815 | \$ 7.65 |
| Pat Williams Storm Drain Extension | \$ 1,654,028 | 10,815 | \$ 152.94 |
| Best Road Storm Drain North of Jones | \$ 165,403 | 10,815 | \$ 15.29 |
| Best Road Storm Drain from Malan to Main | \$ 661,611 | 10,815 | \$ 61.18 |
| Total | \$ 3,063,743 | 10,815 | \$ 283.29 |

VII. Development Impact Fee per Unit or 1,000 BSF

| Land Use Type | EDUs per Unit/1,000 BSF | Fees per Unit/1,000 BSF | Cost Financed by DIF |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Single Family | 1.00 | \$ 283 | \$ 1,624,653 |
| Multi Family | 0.51 | \$ 144 | \$ 676,255 |
| Commercial Uses | 0.72 | \$ 203 | \$ 143,032 |
| Industrial Uses | 0.57 | \$ 161 | \$ 619,804 |
| Cost Allocated to New Development | NA | NA | \$ 3,063,743 |
| Cost Allocated to Existing Development | NA | NA | \$ 5,186,257 |
| Total Cost of Stormwater Facilities | NA | NA | \$ 8,250,000 |