

10. MITIGATION FEE ACT FINDINGS

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

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

PURPOSE OF FEE

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

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

USE OF FEE REVENUES

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

Fees proposed in this report, if enacted by the City, would be available to fund expanded facilities to serve new development. Facilities funded by these fees are designated to be located within the City. Fees addressed in this report have been identified by the City to be restricted to funding the following facility categories: general government, fire, police, parks, library, and streets.

Summary descriptions of the planned facilities such as size and cost estimates were provided by the City and are included in Chapters 3 through 8 of this report. More thorough descriptions of certain planned facilities, including their specific location, if known at this time, are included in master plans, capital improvement plans, traffic studies or other City planning documents or are available from City staff. The City may change the list of planned facilities to meet changing needs and circumstances of new development, as it deems

necessary. The fees should be updated if these amendments result in a significant change in the fair share cost allocated to new development.

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

BENEFIT RELATIONSHIP

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

We expect that the City will restrict fee revenue to the acquisition of land, construction of facilities and buildings, and purchase of related equipment, furnishings, vehicles, and services used to serve new development as described above under the "Use of Fee Revenues" finding. The City should keep fees in segregated accounts. Facilities funded by the fees are expected to provide a City-wide network of facilities accessible to the additional residents and workers associated with new development. Under the Act, fees are not intended to fund planned facilities needed to correct existing deficiencies. Thus, a reasonable relationship can be shown between the use of fee revenue and the new development residential and non-residential use types that will pay the fees.

BURDEN RELATIONSHIP

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

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

- ◆ The demand for general government, fire and police facilities is based on service populations that include both residents and workers, weighted to reflect their relative demand for public facilities;
- ◆ The demand for parks and library facilities is based on residential population;
- ◆ The number of vehicular trips generated per use classification determines streets and traffic signals facilities demand.

For each facility category, demand is measured by a single facility standard that can be applied across land use types to ensure a reasonable relationship to the type of development.

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

Chapter 2, Growth Projections provides a description of how service population and growth projections are calculated. Facility standards are described in the *Facility Inventories, Plans & Standards* sections of in each facility category chapter.

PROPORTIONALITY

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

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

See *Chapter 2, Growth Projections*, or the *Service Population or Trip Rate Adjustment Factor* sections in each facility category chapter for a description of how population, employment, or Trip Rate Adjustment Factors are determined for different types of land uses. See the *Fee Schedule* section in each facility category chapter for a presentation of the proposed facilities fees.

- \$55 per linear foot for 22-foot curbed medians (found on enhanced major arterials, major arterials, and primary arterials)
- \$45 per linear foot for 16-foot curbed medians (found on Avenue 48 from Van Buren Street to Grapefruit Boulevard)
- \$189 per linear foot for striped medians (found on secondary arterials and Van Buren Street)

RIGHT OF WAY COSTS

A “Right of Way Feasibility Report for the Proposed Widening of Avenue 52 Between Calle Empalme and Shady Lane” memo was completed on August 6, 2007. It was assumed that where existing development already existed, nonsymmetrical widening would occur to minimize number of lots affected. From this report the following acquisition costs were determined:

- ♦ Houses: \$290,000. Due to small lots, almost any impact would require the take of the whole house.
- ♦ Businesses Impacted: \$500,000 per business. In most cases, widening would impact but not require a full take of the affected property.
- ♦ Vacant land: \$10 per square foot. Where there was no existing development this value was used.

ROADWAY IMPROVEMENT COSTS

Tables A.1 through A.5 show the detailed derivation of the roadway improvement costs used in this report, based on the unit cost estimates described above. Table A.1 shows the estimated construction costs of projects included in the City fee program. The portion of the each planned improvement included in the fee program is based on the bifurcation policy.

Table A.2 shows estimated right of way costs of projects in the City fee program. Only the cost of right of way needed for the improvements to be funded with impact fee revenue under the proposed bifurcation policy is included. The remaining right of way will be provided by adjacent development and other sources.

Based on the proposed bifurcation policy, the City of Coachella General Plan roadway cross-sections, and the modified cross sections for Van Buren Street and for Avenue 48 from Van Buren Street to Grapefruit Boulevard, the following right-of-way acquisition is included in the impact fee program where the City does not currently own sufficient right-of-way:

- ♦ 8-Lane Enhanced Major Arterial: 98 feet;
- ♦ 6-Lane Major Arterial: 74 feet;
- ♦ 4-Lane Primary Arterial: 54 feet;
- ♦ 4-Lane Secondary Arterial: 44 feet; and
- ♦ 2-Lane Collector: 40 feet.

APPENDIX A – STREET IMPROVEMENT UNIT COSTS

This appendix provides more detail on the street improvement costs described in Chapter 8.

CONSTRUCTION UNIT COSTS

The following assumptions and data sources were used to develop unit cost estimates for the street improvements included in the impact fee program:

- ♦ City of Coachella General Plan typical street sections
- ♦ All segments except for 2-lane collectors include a median. Therefore, costs are based on complete new street section with no use of existing roadway. The fee program does not include improvements to any existing collector streets.
- ♦ Sources used for developing roadway construction cost estimates:
 - Caltrans PSR stage estimating
 - Roadway: \$18 to \$30 per square foot
 - Bridge: \$300 - \$500 per square foot
 - RACE Report – Table 2-1
 - WRCOG TUMF Nexus, 2005 Update: \$1,100,000 to \$1,900,000 per lane mile for arterials
 - Various Bid Summaries
 - Riverside County, Valley Way/Armstrong Rd, approximately \$1,300,000/lane mile with no curb, gutter, sidewalk, median, utilities (water, sewer, storm drain), traffic signals, street lighting.
 - Riverside County, Cajalco Road, approximately \$900,000/lane mile with no curb, gutter, sidewalk, median, utilities (water, sewer, storm drain), traffic signals, street lighting.
 - Riverside County – Miles Ave Bridge over Whitewater. \$10,000,000 for a 4-lane structure.
 - Traffic Signals – Various locations – approximately \$200,000 (no roadwork).
 - Various reports for construction of new interchanges - \$10,000,000 - \$30,000,000
- ♦ Conclusions:
 - Roadway construction costs of \$1,000,000 per lane mile + \$350 per linear foot + lump sum estimate for bridges/grade separations/interchanges

Table A.3 shows the overlap of TUMF-funded projects with projects included in the City fee program, and **Table A.4** shows the estimated construction cost of the portion of projects in the City's fee program that are also included in the TUMF project list. **Table A.5** shows the estimated right-of-way cost of the projects to be funded by the TUMF. For some segments, the TUMF includes road enhancement and rehabilitation, but no increase in the number of lanes. It is assumed that no right-of-way is needed for the TUMF improvement of those segments.

For some segments, the TUMF plans to fund the construction of more lanes than will be funded by the City's fee program under the proposed bifurcation policy. Only the cost of improvements and right-of-way acquisition that would otherwise be funded through the City's impact fee program is included in Tables A.4 and A.5.

Table A.1: Planned Road Segment Construction Cost Detail

Seg. No.	Total Length (ft.)	Fee Program Responsibility	Lane Construction		Median Type	Median Cost	Construct. Subtotal	Contingency (25%)	Support (30% of Constr. + Contingency)	TOTAL Construction Cost ¹
			(\$1M per lane mile)	Median						
1	2,250	Median + 2 Inside Lanes ²	\$ 852,273	16'		\$ 101,250	\$ 953,523	\$ 238,381	\$ 357,571	\$ 1,549,500
2	2,200	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	1,666,667	22'		121,000	1,787,667	446,917	670,375	2,905,000
3	5,500	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	4,166,667	22'		302,500	4,469,167	1,117,292	1,675,938	7,262,400
4	6,400	2 Inside Lanes	2,424,242	striped		1,212,121	3,636,364	909,091	1,363,636	5,909,100
5	900	Median + 2 Inside Lanes	340,909	22'		49,500	390,409	97,602	146,403	634,400
6	5,000	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	3,787,879	22'		275,000	4,062,879	1,015,720	1,523,580	6,602,200
7	11,000	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	8,333,333	22'		605,000	8,938,333	2,234,583	3,351,875	14,524,800
8	8,000	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	6,060,606	22'		440,000	6,500,606	1,625,152	2,437,727	10,563,500
9	1,320	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	1,000,000	22'		72,600	1,072,600	268,150	402,225	1,743,000
10	2,640	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	2,000,000	22'		145,200	2,145,200	536,300	804,450	3,486,000
11	2,640	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	2,000,000	22'		145,200	2,145,200	536,300	804,450	3,486,000
12	2,640	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	2,000,000	22'		145,200	2,145,200	536,300	804,450	3,486,000
13	2,000	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	1,515,152	22'		110,000	1,625,152	406,288	609,432	2,640,900
14	6,000	Median + 6 Inside Lanes	6,818,182	22'		330,000	7,148,182	1,787,045	2,680,568	11,615,800
15	6,200	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	4,696,970	22'		341,000	5,037,970	1,259,492	1,889,239	8,186,700
16	6,350	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	4,810,606	22'		349,250	5,159,856	1,289,964	1,934,946	8,384,800
17	5,280	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	4,000,000	22'		290,400	4,290,400	1,072,600	1,608,900	6,971,900
18	1,320	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	1,000,000	22'		72,600	1,072,600	268,150	402,225	1,743,000
19	3,600	2 Inside Lanes	1,363,636	striped		681,818	2,045,455	511,364	767,045	3,323,900
20	5,280	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	4,000,000	22'		290,400	4,290,400	1,072,600	1,608,900	6,971,900
21	1,340	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	1,015,152	22'		73,700	1,088,852	272,213	408,319	1,769,400
22	1,700	Median + 2 Inside Lanes	643,939	22'		93,500	737,439	184,360	276,540	1,198,300
23	5,280	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	4,000,000	22'		290,400	4,290,400	1,072,600	1,608,900	6,971,900
24	1,350	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	1,022,727	22'		74,250	1,096,977	274,244	411,366	1,782,600
25	5,300	Median + 2 Inside Lanes	2,007,576	22'		291,500	2,299,076	574,769	862,153	3,736,000
26	3,600	Median + 2 Inside Lanes	1,363,636	22'		198,000	1,561,636	390,409	585,614	2,537,700
27	10,700	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	8,106,061	striped		2,026,515	10,132,576	2,533,144	3,799,716	16,465,400
28	5,200	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	3,939,394	striped		984,848	4,924,242	1,231,061	1,846,591	8,001,900
29	2,640	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	2,000,000	striped		500,000	2,500,000	625,000	937,500	4,062,500
30	2,640	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	2,000,000	striped		500,000	2,500,000	625,000	937,500	4,062,500
31	6,500	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	4,924,242	22'		357,500	5,281,742	1,320,436	1,980,653	8,582,800
32	5,280	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	4,000,000	22'		290,400	4,290,400	1,072,600	1,608,900	6,971,900
33	5,280	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	4,000,000	22'		290,400	4,290,400	1,072,600	1,608,900	6,971,900
34	4,250	Median + 2 Inside Lanes	1,609,848	22'		233,750	1,843,598	460,900	691,349	2,995,800
35	5,280	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	4,000,000	22'		290,400	4,290,400	1,072,600	1,608,900	6,971,900
36	4,100	Travel Lanes	1,553,030	none		-	1,553,030	388,258	582,386	2,523,700
37	3,250	Travel Lanes	1,231,061	none		-	1,231,061	307,765	461,648	2,000,500
38	15,500	Travel Lanes	5,871,212	none		-	5,871,212	1,467,803	2,201,705	9,540,700
39	14,500	Travel Lanes	5,492,424	none		-	5,492,424	1,373,106	2,059,659	8,925,200
40	5,450	2 Inside Lanes	2,064,394	striped		1,032,197	3,096,591	774,148	1,161,222	5,032,000
41	5,280	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	4,000,000	22'		290,400	4,290,400	1,072,600	1,608,900	6,971,900
42	1,300	2 Inside Lanes	492,424	striped		246,212	738,636	184,659	276,989	1,200,300
43	1,400	Travel Lanes	530,303	none		-	530,303	132,576	198,864	861,700
Total			\$ 128,704,545			\$ 14,144,012	\$ 142,848,558	\$ 35,712,139	\$ 53,568,209	\$ 232,129,300

Notes: Construction costs include \$1 million per lane mile for roadway construction; \$55 per linear foot for full 22-foot curbed median, \$45 per linear foot for reduced 16' curbed median on Ave 48 from Van Buren St to Grapefruit Blvd, and \$189 per linear foot for striped median on Van Buren St and secondary arterials; and 25 percent contingency.

Support costs are estimated at 30 percent of construction costs.

¹ Rounded to the nearest hundred.

² Development impact fee to include median and two inside lanes, per Urban Crossroads. Remaining widening to six lanes to be funded by the TUMF.

Sources: Table B.3: Willdan Engineering; MuniFinancial.

Table A.2: Planned Road Segment Right-of-Way Cost Detail

Seg. No.	Total Length (ft.)	Existing Lanes	Fee Program Responsibility	A	B	C = B - A	D = C * \$10	E	F	G = D + E + F
				Existing Land R/W (sq. ft.)	Future Land R/W (sq. ft.)	Base R/W Needed (sq. ft.)	Base R/W Cost @ \$10/sf	Residential R/W Cost	Non-residential R/W Cost	TOTAL ROW Cost
1	2,250	2	Median + 2 Inside Lanes	117,000	121,500	4,500	\$ 45,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 45,000
2	2,200	4	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	162,800	162,800	-	-	-	-	-
3	5,500	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	407,000	407,000	-	-	-	-	-
4	6,400	0	2 Inside Lanes	-	281,600	281,600	2,816,000	-	-	2,816,000
5	900	2	Median + 2 Inside Lanes	46,800	48,600	1,800	18,000	-	-	18,000
6	5,000	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	260,000	370,000	110,000	1,100,000	-	-	1,100,000
7	11,000	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	572,000	814,000	242,000	2,420,000	-	-	2,420,000
8	8,000	0	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	-	592,000	592,000	5,920,000	-	-	5,920,000
9	1,320	0	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	-	97,680	97,680	976,800	-	-	976,800
10	2,640	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	137,280	195,360	58,080	580,800	-	-	580,800
11	2,640	4	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	221,760	221,760	-	-	2,320,000	1,500,000	3,820,000
12	2,640	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	137,280	195,360	58,080	580,800	4,930,000	2,000,000	7,510,800
13	2,000	4	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	168,000	168,000	-	-	-	-	-
14	6,000	4	Median + 6 Inside Lanes	504,000	588,000	84,000	840,000	-	1,000,000	1,840,000
15	6,200	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	322,400	458,800	136,400	1,364,000	-	-	1,364,000
16	6,350	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	330,200	469,900	139,700	1,397,000	-	-	1,397,000
17	5,280	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	274,560	390,720	116,160	1,161,600	-	-	1,161,600
18	1,320	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	68,640	97,680	29,040	290,400	-	-	290,400
19	3,600	2	2 Inside Lanes	-	187,200	-	-	-	-	-
20	5,280	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	274,560	390,720	116,160	1,161,600	-	-	1,161,600
21	1,340	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	69,680	99,160	29,480	294,800	-	-	294,800
22	1,700	2	Median + 2 Inside Lanes	88,400	91,800	3,400	34,000	-	-	34,000
23	5,280	4	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	443,520	443,520	-	-	-	-	-
24	1,350	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	70,200	99,900	29,700	297,000	-	-	297,000
25	5,300	2	Median + 2 Inside Lanes	275,600	286,200	10,600	106,000	-	-	106,000
26	3,600	2	Median + 2 Inside Lanes ¹	194,400	194,400	-	-	-	-	-
27	10,700	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes ¹	684,800	684,800	-	-	-	-	-
28	5,200	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	270,400	332,800	62,400	624,000	-	-	624,000
29	2,640	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes ¹	168,960	168,960	-	-	-	-	-
30	2,640	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	137,280	168,960	31,680	316,800	-	-	316,800
31	6,500	4	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	546,000	481,000	-	-	-	-	-
32	5,280	4	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	443,520	443,520	-	-	-	-	-
33	5,280	0	Median + 4 Inside Lanes ³	316,800	390,720	73,920	739,200	-	-	739,200
34	4,250	2	Median + 2 Inside Lanes	221,000	229,500	8,500	85,000	-	-	85,000
35	5,280	0	Median + 4 Inside Lanes ³	316,800	390,720	73,920	739,200	-	-	739,200
36	4,100	0	Travel Lanes ³	246,000	246,000	-	-	-	-	-
37	3,250	0	Travel Lanes ²	130,000	130,000	-	-	-	-	-
38	15,500	0	Travel Lanes	-	620,000	620,000	6,200,000	-	-	6,200,000
39	14,500	0	Travel Lanes	-	580,000	580,000	5,800,000	-	-	5,800,000
40	5,450	2	2 Inside Lanes	283,400	283,400	-	-	-	-	-
41	5,280	0	Median + 4 Inside Lanes	-	390,720	390,720	3,907,200	-	-	3,907,200
42	1,300	0	2 Inside Lanes	-	57,200	57,200	572,000	-	-	572,000
43	1,400	0	Travel Lanes	-	56,000	56,000	560,000	-	-	560,000
Total				9,098,240	13,127,960	4,094,720	\$ 40,947,200	\$ 7,250,000	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 52,697,200

Notes: Acquisition costs for existing houses estimated at \$290,000 per house.

Acquisition costs for existing businesses estimated at \$500,000 per business.

Land costs estimated at \$10 per square foot.

¹ City already owns right-of-way adjacent to the existing roadway. Additional acquisition assumed to be unnecessary.

² No existing roadway but City already owns right-of-way. Additional acquisition assumed to be unnecessary.

³ No existing roadway, but parcel map review indicates City already owns approximately 60 foot right-of-way.

Sources: Table 8.3; Willden Engineering; MuniFinancial.

Table A.3: Planned Improvements Included in TUMF

Seg. No.	Segment	Total Length (ft.)	TUMF Length	Remaining Length	Existing Lanes	TUMF Planned Lanes	TUMF Lane Increase	City Fee Program Responsibility
1	Ave 48	2,250	2,250	-	2	6	4	Median + 2 Inside Lanes
2	Dillon Rd	2,200	2,200	-	4	4	0	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
3	Dillon Rd	5,500	5,500	-	2	4	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
4	Shadow View Blvd	6,400	-	6,400	0	0	N/A	2 Inside Lanes
5	Ave 50	900	900	-	2	4	2	Median + 2 Inside Lanes
6	Ave 50	5,000	5,000	-	2	4	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
7	Ave 50	11,000	11,000	-	2	4	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
8	Ave 50	8,000	8,000	-	0	4	4	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
9	McNaughton Pkwy	1,320	-	1,320	0	0	N/A	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
10	Ave 52	2,640	2,640	-	2	4	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
11	Ave 52	2,640	2,640	-	4	4	0	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
12	Ave 52	2,640	2,640	-	2	4	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
13	Ave 52	2,000	2,000	-	4	4	0	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
14	Ave 52	6,000	6,000	-	4	4	0	Median + 6 Inside Lanes
15	Ave 52	6,200	-	6,200	2	0	N/A	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
16	Ave 52	6,350	-	6,350	2	0	N/A	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
17	Ave 54	5,280	5,280	-	2	4	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
18	Ave 54	1,320	1,320	-	2	4	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
19	Ave 54	3,600	3,600	-	2	4	2	2 Inside Lanes
20	Airport Blvd	5,280	5,280	-	2	4	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
21	Airport Blvd	1,340	1,340	-	2	4	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
22	Airport Blvd	1,700	-	1,700	2	0	N/A	Median + 2 Inside Lanes
23	Grapefruit Blvd	5,280	5,280	-	4	4	0	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
24	Grapefruit Blvd	1,350	1,350	-	2	4	2	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
25	Grapefruit Blvd	5,300	5,300	-	2	4	2	Median + 2 Inside Lanes
26	Grapefruit Blvd	3,600	3,600	-	2	4	2	Median + 2 Inside Lanes
27	Van Buren St	10,700	10,700	-	2	6	4	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
28	Van Buren St	5,200	-	5,200	2	0	N/A	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
29	Van Buren St	2,640	-	2,640	2	0	N/A	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
30	Van Buren St	2,640	-	2,640	2	0	N/A	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
31	Harrison St	6,500	6,500	-	4	4	0	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
32	Harrison St	5,280	5,280	-	4	4	0	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
33	Tyler St	5,280	-	5,280	0	0	N/A	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
34	Tyler St	4,250	-	4,250	2	0	N/A	Median + 2 Inside Lanes
35	Polk St	5,280	-	5,280	0	0	N/A	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
36	Polk St	4,100	-	4,100	0	0	N/A	Travel Lanes
37	Mitchell Dr	3,250	-	3,250	0	0	N/A	Travel Lanes
38	Vista del Norte	15,500	-	15,500	0	0	N/A	Travel Lanes
39	Vista del Sur	14,500	-	14,500	0	0	N/A	Travel Lanes
40	Ave 44	5,450	5,450	-	2	4	2	2 Inside Lanes
41	Ave 48	5,280	-	5,280	0	0	N/A	Median + 4 Inside Lanes
42	Frederick St	1,300	-	1,300	0	0	N/A	2 Inside Lanes
43	Vista Del Sur	1,400	-	1,400	0	0	N/A	Travel Lanes
Total								

Sources: Table 8.4: Coachella Valley Association of Governments, "Coachella Valley RACE Update 2005," Tables 2-5 and 2-6; Willdan; MuniFinancial.

Table A.4: Construction Cost of TUMF-Funded Improvements

Seg. No.	Segment	Lane		Construction Median Cost	Construction Subtotal	Contingency (25%)	Support (30% of Construction + Contingency)	TUMF Construction Cost
		Construction (\$1M per lane mile)	Median Type					
1	Ave 48	\$ 852,273	16'	\$ 101,250	\$ 953,523	\$ 238,381	\$ 357,571	\$ 1,549,500
2	Dillon Rd	1,666,667	22'	121,000	1,787,667	446,917	670,375	2,905,000
3	Dillon Rd	4,166,667	22'	302,500	4,469,167	1,117,292	1,675,938	7,262,400
4	Shadow View Blvd	-	striped	-	-	-	-	-
5	Ave 50	340,909	22'	49,500	390,409	97,602	146,403	634,400
6	Ave 50	3,787,879	22'	275,000	4,062,879	1,015,720	1,523,580	6,602,200
7	Ave 50	8,333,333	22'	605,000	8,938,333	2,234,583	3,351,875	14,524,800
8	Ave 50	6,060,606	22'	440,000	6,500,606	1,625,152	2,437,727	10,563,500
9	McNaughton Pkwy	-	22'	-	-	-	-	-
10	Ave 52	2,000,000	22'	145,200	2,145,200	536,300	804,450	3,486,000
11	Ave 52	2,000,000	22'	145,200	2,145,200	536,300	804,450	3,486,000
12	Ave 52	2,000,000	22'	145,200	2,145,200	536,300	804,450	3,486,000
13	Ave 52	1,515,152	22'	110,000	1,625,152	406,288	609,432	2,640,900
14	Ave 52	4,545,455	22'	330,000	4,875,455	1,218,864	1,828,295	7,922,600
15	Ave 52	-	22'	-	-	-	-	-
16	Ave 52	-	22'	-	-	-	-	-
17	Ave 54	4,000,000	22'	290,400	4,290,400	1,072,600	1,608,900	6,971,900
18	Ave 54	1,000,000	22'	72,600	1,072,600	268,150	402,225	1,743,000
19	Ave 54	1,363,636	striped	681,818	2,045,455	511,364	767,045	3,323,900
20	Airport Blvd	4,000,000	22'	290,400	4,290,400	1,072,600	1,608,900	6,971,900
21	Airport Blvd	1,015,152	22'	73,700	1,088,852	272,213	408,319	1,769,400
22	Airport Blvd	-	22'	-	-	-	-	-
23	Grapefruit Blvd	4,000,000	22'	290,400	4,290,400	1,072,600	1,608,900	6,971,900
24	Grapefruit Blvd	1,022,727	22'	74,250	1,096,977	274,244	411,366	1,782,600
25	Grapefruit Blvd	2,007,576	22'	291,500	2,299,076	574,769	862,153	3,736,000
26	Grapefruit Blvd	1,363,636	22'	198,000	1,561,636	390,409	585,614	2,537,700
27	Van Buren St	8,106,061	striped	2,026,515	10,132,576	2,533,144	3,799,716	16,465,400
28	Van Buren St	-	striped	-	-	-	-	-
29	Van Buren St	-	striped	-	-	-	-	-
30	Van Buren St	-	striped	-	-	-	-	-
31	Harrison St	4,924,242	22'	357,500	5,281,742	1,320,436	1,980,653	8,582,800
32	Harrison St	4,000,000	22'	290,400	4,290,400	1,072,600	1,608,900	6,971,900
33	Tyler St	-	22'	-	-	-	-	-
34	Tyler St	-	22'	-	-	-	-	-
35	Polk St	-	22'	-	-	-	-	-
36	Polk St	-	none	-	-	-	-	-
37	Mitchell Dr	-	none	-	-	-	-	-
38	Vista del Norte	-	none	-	-	-	-	-
39	Vista del Sur	-	none	-	-	-	-	-
40	Ave 44	2,064,394	striped	1,032,197	3,096,591	774,148	1,161,222	5,032,000
41	Ave 48	-	22'	-	-	-	-	-
42	Frederick St	-	striped	-	-	-	-	-
43	Vista Del Sur	-	none	-	-	-	-	-
Total		\$ 76,136,364		\$ 8,739,530	\$ 84,875,894	\$ 21,218,973	\$ 31,828,460	\$ 137,923,700

Notes: Construction costs include \$1 million per lane mile for roadway construction; \$55 per linear foot for full 22-foot curbed median, \$45 per linear foot for reduced 16' curbed median on Ave 48 from Van Buren St to Grapefruit Blvd, and \$189 per linear foot for striped median on Van Buren St and secondary arterials; and 25 percent contingency.

Support costs are estimated at 30 percent of construction costs.

Sources: Table B.4; Coachella Valley Association of Governments, "Coachella Valley RACE Update 2005," Tables 2-5 and 2-6; Willdan; MuniFinancial.

Table A.5: Planned Right-of-Way Cost Included in TUMF

Seg. No.		A	B	C = B - A	D = C * \$10	E	F	G = D + E + F
		Existing R/W for TUMF Segment (sq. ft.)	R/W Needed for DIF/TUMF Overlap (sq. ft.)	DIF R/W Provided by TUMF (sq. ft.)	Base R/W Cost @ \$10/sf	Residential R/W Cost	Non-residential R/W Cost	TOTAL ROW Cost
1	Ave 48	117,000	121,500	4,500	\$ 45,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 45,000
2	Dillon Rd	162,800	162,800	-	-	-	-	-
3	Dillon Rd	407,000	407,000	-	-	-	-	-
4	Shadow View Blvd	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	Ave 50	46,800	48,600	1,800	18,000	-	-	18,000
6	Ave 50	260,000	370,000	110,000	1,100,000	-	-	1,100,000
7	Ave 50	572,000	814,000	242,000	2,420,000	-	-	2,420,000
8	Ave 50	-	592,000	592,000	5,920,000	-	-	5,920,000
9	McNaughton Pkwy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	Ave 52	137,280	195,360	58,080	580,800	-	-	580,800
11	Ave 52	221,760	195,360	-	-	4,930,000	2,000,000	-
12	Ave 52	137,280	195,360	58,080	580,800	-	-	7,510,800
13	Ave 52	168,000	148,000	-	-	-	-	-
14	Ave 52	504,000	588,000	84,000	840,000	-	1,000,000	1,840,000
15	Ave 52	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	Ave 52	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	Ave 54	274,560	390,720	116,160	1,161,600	-	-	1,161,600
18	Ave 54	68,640	97,680	29,040	290,400	-	-	290,400
19	Ave 54	187,200	158,400	-	-	-	-	-
20	Airport Blvd	274,560	390,720	116,160	1,161,600	-	-	1,161,600
21	Airport Blvd	69,680	99,160	29,480	294,800	-	-	294,800
22	Airport Blvd	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
23	Grapefruit Blvd	443,520	390,720	-	-	-	-	-
24	Grapefruit Blvd	70,200	99,900	29,700	297,000	-	-	297,000
25	Grapefruit Blvd	275,600	286,200	10,600	106,000	-	-	106,000
26	Grapefruit Blvd ¹	194,400	194,400	-	-	-	-	-
27	Van Buren St ¹	684,800	684,800	-	-	-	-	-
28	Van Buren St	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
29	Van Buren St ¹	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
30	Van Buren St	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
31	Harrison St	546,000	481,000	-	-	-	-	-
32	Harrison St	443,520	390,720	-	-	-	-	-
33	Tyler St ³	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
34	Tyler St	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
35	Polk St ³	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
36	Polk St ²	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
37	Mitchell Dr ²	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
38	Vista del Norte	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
39	Vista del Sur	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
40	Ave 44	283,400	239,800	-	-	-	-	-
41	Ave 48	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
42	Frederick St	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
43	Vista Del Sur	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total				1,481,600	\$ 14,816,000	\$ 4,930,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 22,746,000

Notes: Acquisition costs for existing houses estimated at \$290,000 per house.
 Acquisition costs for existing businesses estimated at \$290,000 per business.
 Land costs estimated at \$10 per square foot.

- ¹ City already owns right-of-way adjacent to the existing roadway. Additional acquisition assumed to be unnecessary.
- ² No existing roadway but City already owns right-of-way. Additional acquisition assumed to be unnecessary.
- ³ No existing roadway, but parcel map review indicates City already owns approximately 60 foot right-of-way.

Source: Table 8.4 and A.2; Coachella Valley Association of Governments, "Coachella Valley RACE Update 2005," Tables 2-5 and 2-6; Willdan Engineering; MuniFinancial.

Bridge Costs

Table A.6 shows the estimated cost of the bridges on roadway segments included in the fee program. The table shows the cost of the structure planned by the City, as well as the structure to be funded with the TUMF fee if funding for the bridge is included in the TUMF

program. When segments are included in the TUMF, the TUMF program plans to fund construction of a smaller structure than the City's program plans.

Cost estimates for bridges are based on a cost estimate per linear foot for a given width of bridge, as well as the estimated length of the span. The unit cost estimates used in this study are from the Coachella Valley Regional Arterial Cost Estimate (RACE). The RACE was prepared in 2005, and the cost estimates shown have been updated for changes in highway construction costs using the Caltrans Cost Index.

Table A.6: Bridge Costs

	City Planned Structure				TUMF Planned Structure				
	Existing Structure	Planned Lanes	Length (feet)	Cost per	City Planned Bridge Cost	Planned Lanes	Length (feet)	Cost per	TUMF Planned Bridge Cost
				Linear Foot ¹				Linear Foot ¹	
Vista del Sur over Coachella Canal	None	2	110	12,059	\$ 1,326,460	None	N/A	N/A	N/A
Ave 50 over Coachella Canal	None	6	120	26,532	3,183,781	4 ²	120	19,301	2,316,107
Ave 50 over Whitewater River	2-Lane	6	120	26,532	3,183,781	4 ²	120	19,301	2,316,107
Ave 52 over Whitewater River	2-Lane	8	120	33,762	4,051,454	4 ²	120	19,301	2,316,107
Airport Blvd over Whitewater River	2-Lane	6	120	26,532	3,183,781	None	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total					\$ 14,929,256				\$ 6,948,321

¹ Based on costs per linear foot in RACE, updated for inflation using Caltrans cost index. Estimated cost adjusted for inflation based on change in Caltrans Transportation Cost Index from 2005 annual value of 268.3 to 3rd Quarter 2007 value of 309.9 average for last twelve months. Estimated costs (2007\$) are \$12,059 per linear foot for a two lane bridge, \$19,301 for four lanes, \$26,532 for six lanes, \$22,762 for eight lanes, and \$16,217 to add two lanes to an existing bridge.

² TUMF costs include new four-lane bridge.

³ TUMF costs include addition of two lanes to existing structure.

Sources: Coachella Valley Association of Governments, "Coachella Valley RACE Update 2005," Table 2-6; California Department of Transportation Cost Index for Selected Highway Construction Items; MuniFinancial.

APPENDIX B – BUS SHELTER FEE INFLATION UPDATE

This Appendix presents an updated fee schedule for the bus shelter impact fee. A bus shelter impact fee was calculated in the 2005 *City of Coachella Development Impact Fee and Special Tax Report* and adopted by the City. This report does not attempt to document the nexus between new development and the need for the facilities that will be funded by the bus shelter impact fee. Instead, the proposed fees are based on the nexus findings presented in the 2005 report.

The fees calculated in 2005 have been updated for changes in construction costs using the Construction Cost Index (CCI), published by *Engineering News-Record*. The CCI has increased ten percent since 2005. The proposed bus shelter impact fee schedule is shown in **Table B.1**.

Table B.1: Bus Shelter Fee Inflation Update

Land Use	Unit	Current Fee (2005)	Inflation Factor ¹	Proposed Fee
Residential	Dwelling Unit	\$ 77	10%	\$ 85
Hotel/Motel	Room	77	10%	85
Office	1,000 Gross Sq. Ft.	90	10%	99
Retail	1,000 Gross Sq. Ft.	77	10%	85
Restaurant/Gaming	1,000 Gross Sq. Ft.	96	10%	106
Gasoline	1,000 Gross Sq. Ft.	105	10%	116
Open Uses (e.g. Car Sales)	Acre	114	10%	126

¹ Based on change in *Engineering News-Record* Los Angeles Construction Cost Index from 2005 annual average of 8,334 to December 2007 value of 9,181.

Sources: City of Coachella Development Impact Fee and Special Tax Report; Construction Cost Index for Los Angeles, *Engineering News-Record*; MuniFinancial.

APPENDIX C – ROADWAY INFRASTRUCTURE COST BIFURCATION POLICY

The fee program is based on the following policy with respect to roadway improvement cost responsibility:

The fee program will include the travel lanes for the Collector roadways included in the fee program regionally significant roadway network. Other sources of funding (adjacent development, etc.) will be responsible for constructing the locally required (curb and gutter, sidewalk) improvements.

The fee program will include the two inside travel lanes for the 4-lane Secondary Arterial roadways included in the fee program regionally significant roadway network. Other sources of funding (adjacent development, etc.) will be responsible for constructing the locally required improvements, including the two outside travel lanes, curb and gutter, and sidewalks.

The fee program will include the two inside travel lanes and center median for the 4-lane Primary Arterial roadways included in the fee program regionally significant roadway network. Other sources of funding (adjacent development, etc.) will be responsible for constructing the locally required improvements, including the two outside travel lanes, curb and gutter, and sidewalks.

The fee program will include the four inside travel lanes and center median for the 6-lane Major Arterial roadways included in the fee program regionally significant roadway network. Other sources of funding (adjacent development, etc.) will be responsible for constructing the locally required improvements, including the two outside travel lanes, curb and gutter, and sidewalks.

The fee program will include the six inside travel lanes and center median for the 8-lane Enhanced Major Arterial roadways included in the fee program regionally significant roadway network. Other sources of funding (adjacent development, etc.) will be responsible for constructing the locally required improvements, including the two outside travel lanes, curb and gutter, and sidewalks.

This policy is intended to finance only that portion of the roadway that serves primarily regionally oriented traffic. The portion of the roadway that primarily serves local traffic is the outside travel lane (for roadways with more than two lanes) and associated curb, gutter, and sidewalk amenities. As noted previously, the City can expect / require adjacent development to construct the on-site locally required improvements. However, the City will in some cases need to identify other funding sources. For instance, if local development has already occurred and redevelopment is not anticipated in the near future, then adjacent development cannot be expected to construct such improvements. Similarly, if a roadway is adjacent to another public facility, such as a freeway or water drainage channel, then adjacent development cannot be expected to fund the adjacent improvements.

