CITY OF BEAUMONT

DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE NEXUS STUDY UPDATE

REVISED ~~FINAL~~DRAFT

~~MAY 31~~SEPTEMBER 6, 2024

Oakland Office
66 Franklin Street
Suite 300
Oakland, CA 94607
Tel: (510) 832-0899

Corporate Office
27368 Via Industria
Suite 200
Temecula, CA 92590
Tel: (800) 755-6864
Fax: (888) 326-6864

Other Regional Offices
Aurora, CO
Orlando, FL
Phoenix, AZ
Plano, TX
Seattle, WA
Washington, DC

www.willdan.com

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

This report summarizes an analysis of development impact fees needed to support future development in the City of Beaumont through ~~2040.~~buildout of the City's General Plan. It is the City's intent that the costs representing future development's share of public facilities and capital improvements be imposed on that development in the form of a development impact fee, also known as a public facilities fee. The public facilities and improvements included in this analysis are divided into the fee categories listed below:

- Parks
- Recreation Facilities
- Fire Protection Facilities
- Police Facilities
- Public Facilities
- Transportation Facilities
- Sewer Facilities
- Sewer Capacity
- Recycled Water
- General Plan
- Library District
- Emergency Preparedness Facilities
- Storm Drain
- Trails
- Maintenance Equipment

Background and Study Objectives

The primary policy objective of a development impact fee program is to ensure that new development pays the capital costs associated with growth. The primary purpose of this report is to calculate and present fees that will enable the City to expand its inventory of public facilities, as new development creates increases in service demands.

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

The *Mitigation Fee Act* findings required to implement impact fees in California demonstrate the *essential nexus* between new development and a fee to fund facilities needed to serve that development. The term *essential nexus* refers to the relationship between new development and the need for facilities (and corresponding impact fees) to serve that development. The findings also require that this study demonstrates *rough proportionality* of the fees- meaning that the amount of the exactions must roughly correspond to the burden placed on the government, resulting from the proposed development project. To ensure that fees are roughly proportional to demand for facilities from new development, this study first allocates facilities costs to new development using the allocation methods described below, then to individual units of new development based on the demand characteristics of each unit, by land use type. This is described in detail in each chapter and summarized in Chapter 20.

All development impact fee-funded capital projects should be programmed through the City's five-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Using a CIP can help the City identify and direct its fee revenue to public facilities projects that will accommodate future growth. By programming fee revenues to specific capital projects, the City can help ensure a reasonable relationship between new development and the use of fee revenues as required by the *Mitigation Fee Act*.

Facility Standards and Costs

There are several approaches typically used to calculate facilities standards and allocate the costs of planned facilities to accommodate growth in compliance with the *Mitigation Fee Act* requirements.

The **system plan** approach is based on a master facility plan in situations where the needed facilities serve both existing and new development. This approach allocates existing and planned facilities across existing and new development to determine new development's fair share of facility needs. This approach is used when it is not possible to differentiate the benefits of new facilities between new and existing development. Often the system plan is based on increasing facility standards, so the City must find non-impact fee revenue sources to fund existing development's fair share of planned facilities. This approach is used for the recreation, ~~fire,~~ police, recycled water, general plan, emergency preparedness, ~~maintenance equipment~~ and public facility fees in this report.

The **planned facilities** approach allocates costs based on the ratio of planned facilities that serve new development to the increase in demand associated with new development. This approach is appropriate when specific planned facilities that only benefit new development can be identified, or when the specific share of facilities benefiting new development can be identified. Examples include street improvements to avoid deficient levels of service or a sewer trunk line extension to a previously undeveloped area. This approach is used for the transportation-related, sewer facilities, fire facilities, maintenance equipment facilities and trails facility fees in this report.

The **existing inventory** approach is based on a facility standard derived from the City's existing level of facilities and existing demand for services. This approach results in no facility deficiencies attributable to existing development. This approach is often used when a long-range plan for new facilities is not available. Only the initial facilities to be funded with fees are identified in the fee study. Future facilities to serve growth will be identified through the City's annual capital improvement plan and budget process and/or completion of a new facility master plan. This approach is to calculate the parks, library, and storm drainage facilities fees in this report.

The **buy-in method** is typically used when the existing system has sufficient capacity to serve new development now and into the future. Under the buy-in methodology, new development "buys" a proportionate share of existing capacity at the current value of the existing facilities. This approach is typically used for utility fees, where existing facilities are built with excess capacity to serve future development. This approach is used for the sewer capacity fees in this report.

Use of Fee Revenues

The Mitigation Fee Act requires that this analysis "Identify the use to which the fee is to be put. If the use is financing public facilities, the facilities shall be identified. That identification may, but need not, be made by reference to a capital improvement plan as specified in Section 65403 or 66002, may be made in applicable general or specific plan requirements, or may be made in other public documents that identify the public facilities for which the fee is charged."[1] Each chapter in this report identifies the appropriate use of impact fee revenues for each particular impact fee category.

Impact fee revenue must be spent on new facilities or expansion of current facilities to serve new development. Facilities can be generally defined as capital acquisition items with a useful life greater than five years. Impact fee revenue can be spent on capital facilities to serve new development, including but not limited to land acquisition, construction of buildings, infrastructure,

[1] *California Government Code* §66001 (a) (2).

the acquisition of vehicles or equipment, information technology, software licenses and equipment.

Development Impact Fee Schedule Summary

Table E.1 summarizes the development impact fees that meet the City's identified needs and comply with the requirements of the *Mitigation Fee Act*.

E.1: Maximum Justified Development Impact Fee Schedule - per Square Foot

Land Use	Residential Dwelling Unit	Commercial	Industrial/ Business Park	Industrial/ High-Cube Warehouse
Park Land In Lieu (Subdivisions)[1]	$ 0.79	$ -	$ -	$ -
Park Land Acquisition (Non Subdivisions)[2]	0.77	-	-	-
Community Park Improvements	0.53	-	-	-
Neighborhood Park Improvements	0.59	-	-	-
Recreation Facilities	1.12	-	-	-
Fire Protection Facilities	0.38	0.47	0.68	0.19
Police Facilities	1.33	0.73	1.06	0.30
Public Facilities	0.60	0.33	0.48	0.14
Transportation Facilities	2.33	23.47	10.61	6.17
Sewer Facilities	2.57	1.34	0.99	2.06
~~Sewer Capacity[3]~~	~~4.72~~	~~1.80~~	~~3.33~~	~~2.29~~
Recycled Water	0.32	0.17	0.12	0.26
General Plan	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01
Library District	0.15	-	-	-
Emergency Preparedness Facilities	0.01	0.004	0.006	0.002
Storm Drain	0.92	0.97	0.75	0.97
Trails	0.02	-	-	-
Maintenance Equipment	0.02	0.010	0.010	0.004
Total (Subdivisions)	$ 16.42	$ 29.30	$ 18.06	$ 12.40
Total (Infill)	$ 16.40	$ 29.30	$ 18.06	$ 12.40

[1] Fee in lieu of parkland dedication charged under the Quimby Act.
[2] Fee for parkland acquisition charged under the Mitigation Fee Act.
[3] "Commercial medium strength" fee shown for commercial. "Industrial high strength" fee shown for industrial/business park. "Industrial low strength" fee shown for industrial/high cube warehouse. Refer to Table 10.5 for full sewer capacity nonresidential fee

Sources: Tables 3.8, 4.7, 5.7, 6.7, 7.7, 8.5, 9.5, 10.4, 10.5, 11.3, 12.5, 13.6, 14.5, 15.6, 16.7 and 17.7.

E.1: Maximum Justified Development Impact Fee Schedule - per Square Foot

Fee Category	Residential Dwelling Unit	Commercial	Industrial/ Business Park	Industrial/ High-Cube Warehouse
Park Land In Lieu (Subdivisions)[1]	$ 0.79	$ -	$ -	$ -
Park Land Acquisition (Non Subdivisions)[2]	0.77	-	-	-
Community Park Improvements	0.53	-	-	-
Neighborhood Park Improvements	0.59	-	-	-
Recreation Facilities	0.93	-	-	-
Fire Protection Facilities	0.28	0.34	0.50	0.14
Police Facilities	0.87	0.48	0.69	0.20
Public Facilities	0.28	0.15	0.22	0.06
Streets and Bridges	1.70	15.59	7.04	1.85
Railroad Crossings	0.52	4.78	2.16	0.57
Sewer Facilities	0.92	0.45	0.33	0.68
Sewer Capacity[3]	4.72	1.80	3.33	2.29
Recycled Water	0.29	0.14	0.10	0.21
General Plan	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.004
Library District	0.15	-	-	-
Emergency Preparedness Facilities	0.01	0.004	0.006	0.002
Storm Drain	1.10	0.97	0.75	0.97
Trails	0.01	-	-	-
Maintenance Equipment	0.01	0.01	0.010	0.003
Total (Subdivisions)	$ 13.72	$ 24.72	$ 15.16	$ 6.98
Total (Infill)	$ 13.70	$ 24.72	$ 15.16	$ 6.98

[1] Fee in lieu of parkland dedication charged under the Quimby Act.
[2] Fee for parkland acquisition charged under the Mitigation Fee Act.
[3] "Commercial medium strength" fee shown for commercial. "Industrial high strength" fee shown for industrial/business park. "Industrial low strength" fee shown for industrial/high cube warehouse. Refer to Table 10.5 for full sewer capacity nonresidential fee

Sources: Tables 3.8, 4.7, 5.6, 6.7, 7.7, 8.5, 9.5, 10.4, 10.5, 11.3, 12.5, 13.6, 14.5, 15.7, 16.6 and 17.6.

Other Funding Needed

Impact fees may only fund the share of public facilities related to new development in Beaumont. They may not be used to fund the share of facility needs generated by existing development or by development outside of the City. As shown in **Table E.2,** approximately $~~368.1~~319.9 million in additional funding will be needed to complete the facility projects the City currently plans to develop. The "Additional Funding Required" column shows non-impact fee funding required to fund a share of the improvements partially funded by impact fees. Non-fee funding is needed because these facilities are needed partially to remedy existing deficiencies and partly to accommodate new development.

The City will need to develop alternative funding sources to fund existing development's share of the planned facilities. Potential sources of revenue include but are not limited to existing or new general fund revenues, existing or new taxes, special assessments, and grants.

Table E.2: Non-Impact Fee Funding Required

Fee Category	Net Project Cost	Development Fee Revenue	Additional Funding Required
Park Land	$ 15,223,304	$ 15,223,304	$ -
Community Park Improvements	10,529,000	10,529,000	-
Neighborhood Park Improvements	11,636,000	11,636,000	-
Recreation Facilities	62,440,220	22,230,970	40,209,250
Fire Protection Facilities	12,965,326	11,179,035	1,786,291
Police Facilities	73,182,221	32,006,177	41,176,044
Public Facilities	23,345,367	14,386,762	8,958,605
Transportation Facilities	411,690,869	189,032,967	222,657,902
Sewer Facilities	99,764,464	68,858,364	30,906,100
Sewer Capacity[1]	-	-	-
Recycled Water	29,432,627	8,660,205	20,772,422
General Plan	1,722,271	582,460	1,139,811
Library District	3,383,765	3,383,765	-
Emergency Preparedness Facilities	695,153	232,984	462,169
Storm Drain	28,333,417	28,333,417	-
Trails	312,000	312,000	-
Maintenance Equipment	407,722	407,722	-
Total	$ 785,063,725	$ 416,995,132	$ 368,068,593

[1] No project costs shown. Capacity fee revenue is used to pay back City for excess capacity used to serve new development at WWTP.

Sources: Tables 3.5, 3.6, 4.6, 5.6, 6.6, 7.6, 8.3, 8.4, 9.3, 9.4, 11.2, 12.4, 13.5, 14.4, 15.6, 16.3 and 17.5.

Table E.2: Non-Impact Fee Funding Required

Fee Category	Net Project Cost	Development Fee Revenue	Additional Funding Required
Park Land	$ 26,127,072	$ 26,127,072	$ -
Community Park Improvements	18,072,000	18,072,000	-
Neighborhood Park Improvements	19,969,000	19,969,000	-
Recreation Facilities	62,440,220	31,421,365	31,018,855
Fire Protection Facilities	12,965,326	12,965,326	-
Police Facilities	73,182,221	34,267,352	38,914,869
Public Facilities	23,345,367	10,944,524	12,400,843
Streets and Bridges	304,533,272	159,527,369	145,005,902
Railroad Crossings	92,211,598	48,881,819	43,329,778
Sewer Facilities	70,382,100	39,532,250	30,849,850
Sewer Capacity[1]	-	-	-
Recycled Water	29,432,627	12,321,396	17,111,231
General Plan	1,722,271	764,683	957,588
Library District	5,807,961	5,807,961	-
Emergency Preparedness Facilities	695,153	334,549	360,604
Storm Drain	51,250,472	51,250,472	-
Trails	312,000	312,000	-
Maintenance Equipment	573,512	573,512	-
Total	$ 793,022,171	$ 473,072,650	$ 319,949,520

[1] No project costs shown. Capacity fee revenue is used to pay back City for excess capacity used to serve new development at WWTP.

Sources: Tables 3.5, 3.6, 4.6, 5.3, 6.6, 7.6, 8.3, 8.4, 9.4, 11.2, 12.4, 13.5, 14.4, 15.6, 16.3 and 17.3.

1. Introduction

This report presents an analysis of the need for public facilities to accommodate new development in the City of Beaumont. This chapter provides background for the study and explains the study approach under the following sections:

- Public Facilities Financing in California;
- Study Objectives;
- Fee Program Maintenance;
- Study Methodology; and,
- Organization of the Report.

Public Facilities Financing in California

The changing fiscal landscape in California during the past 45 years has steadily undercut the financial capacity of local governments to fund infrastructure. Four dominant trends stand out:

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

Faced with these trends, many cities and counties have had to adopt a policy of "growth pays its own way." This policy shifts the burden of funding infrastructure expansion from existing ratepayers and taxpayers onto new development. This funding shift has been accomplished primarily through the imposition of assessments, special taxes, and development impact fees also known as public facilities fees. Assessments and special taxes require the approval of property owners and are appropriate when the funded facilities are directly related to the developing property. Development impact fees, on the other hand, are an appropriate funding source for facilities that benefit all development jurisdiction-wide. Development impact fees need only a majority vote of the legislative body for adoption.

Study Objectives

The primary policy objective of a public facilities fee program is to ensure that new development pays the capital costs associated with growth. *Implementation Policy LUCD6* of the City's General Plan states "Development Fees. Update citywide development impact fees for infrastructure, affordable housing, other community benefits, and long range planning." The primary purpose of this report is to update the City's impact fees based on the most current available facility plans and growth projections. The proposed fees will enable the City to expand its inventory of public facilities as new development leads to increases in service demands. This report supports the General Plan policy stated above.

The City imposes public facilities fees under authority granted by the Mitigation Fee Act (the Act), contained in California Government Code Sections 66000 et seq. This report provides the necessary findings required by the Act to demonstrate the *essential nexus* between new development and the impact fees needed to support that development. The findings demonstrate

that the fees are proportional to demand for facilities from new development and are necessary to allow the City to adopt the fee schedules presented in this report.

Beaumont is forecast to have significant growth through this study's planning horizon of ~~2040.~~General Plan buildout, which is not assigned to a particular year. This growth will create an increase in demand for public services and the facilities required to deliver them. Given the revenue challenges described above, Beaumont has decided to use a development impact fee program to ensure that new development funds the share of facility costs associated with growth. This report makes use of the most current available growth forecasts and capital facilities planning documents to update the City's existing fee program to ensure that the fee program accurately represents the facility needs resulting from new development.

Fee Program Maintenance

Once a fee program has been adopted it must be properly maintained to ensure that the revenue collected adequately funds the facilities needed by new development. To avoid collecting inadequate revenue, the inventories of existing facilities and costs for planned facilities must be updated periodically for inflation, and the fees recalculated to reflect the higher costs. The use of established indices for each facility included in the inventories (land, buildings, and equipment), such as the *California Construction Cost Index*, is necessary to accurately adjust the impact fees.

While fee updates using inflation indices are appropriate for annual or periodic updates to ensure that fee revenues keep up with increases in the costs of public facilities, it is recommended to conduct more extensive updates of the fee documentation and calculation (such as this study) when significant new data on growth forecasts and/or facility plans become available. For further detail on fee program implementation, see Chapter 19.

Administrative Costs

Administration of an impact fee program to comply with the requirements of the Mitigation Fee Act imposes costs on the City for capital budgeting, fee adjustments, mandated annual reports and 5-year reviews of the impact fee program, as well as periodic impact fee update studies and legal review. It is common practice in California for cities to add a small administrative charge to impact fees to cover those costs.

This study uses an assumption of 1% of the maximum justified fee to estimate the administrative costs associated with the fee program, consistent with the last impact fee study. To validate this assumption, City staff prepared an analysis of the administrative costs of the fee program from FY 2022-23. These costs were conservatively estimated at $108,282 compared to fee revenue of $8,184,833, equal to 1.32% of collected revenue. Note that this analysis excluded the administrative costs (and corresponding revenues) of the recycled water and sewer-related fees, as the administrative costs of those fee components were not tracked separately.

Study Methodology

Development impact fees are calculated to fund the cost of facilities required to accommodate growth. The six steps followed in this development impact fee study include:

1. **Estimate existing development and future growth:** Identify a base year for existing development and a growth forecast that reflects increased demand for public facilities;
2. **Identify facility standards:** Determine the facility standards used to plan for new and expanded facilities;

3. **Determine facilities required to serve new development:** Estimate the total amount of planned facilities, and identify the share required to accommodate new development;
4. **Determine the cost of facilities required to serve new development:** Estimate the total amount and the share of the cost of planned facilities required to accommodate new development;
5. **Calculate fee schedule:** Allocate facilities costs per unit of new development to calculate the development impact fee schedule; and
6. **Identify alternative funding requirements:** Determine if any non-fee funding is required to complete projects.

The key public policy issue in development impact fee studies is the identification of facility standards (step #2, above). Facility standards document a reasonable relationship between new development and the need for new facilities. Standards ensure that new development does not fund deficiencies associated with existing development.

Types of Facility Standards

There are three separate components of facility standards:

- *Demand standards* determine the amount of facilities required to accommodate growth, for example, park acres per thousand residents, square feet of library space per capita, or gallons of water per day. Demand standards may also reflect a level of service such as the vehicle volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio used in traffic planning.
- *Design standards* determine how a facility should be designed to meet expected demand, for example, park improvement requirements and technology infrastructure for City office space. Design standards are typically not explicitly evaluated as part of an impact fee analysis but can have a significant impact on the cost of facilities. Our approach incorporates the cost of planned facilities built to satisfy the City's facility design standards.
- *Cost standards* are an alternate method for determining the amount of facilities required to accommodate growth based on facility costs per unit of demand. *Cost standards* are useful when demand standards were not explicitly developed for the facility planning process. *Cost standards* also enable different types of facilities to be analyzed based on a single measure (cost or value) and are useful when different facilities are funded by a single fee program. Examples include facility costs per capita, cost per vehicle trip, or cost per gallon of water per day.

New Development Facility Needs and Costs

A number of approaches are used to identify facility needs and costs to serve new development. This is often a two-step process: (1) identify total facility needs, and (2) allocate to new development its fair share of those needs.

There are three common methods for determining new development's fair share of planned facilities costs: the **system plan method**, the **planned facilities method,** and the **existing inventory method**. The formula used by each approach and the advantages and disadvantages of each method is summarized below:

System Plan Method

This method calculates the fee based on the value of existing facilities plus the cost of planned facilities, divided by demand from existing plus new development:

$$\frac{\text{Value of Existing Facilities + Cost of Planned Facilities}}{} = \$/\text{unit of demand}$$

Existing + New Development Demand

This method is useful when planned facilities need to be analyzed as part of a system that benefits both existing and new development. It is difficult, for example, to allocate a new fire station solely to new development when that station will operate as part of an integrated system of fire stations that together achieve the desired level of service.

The system plan method ensures that new development does not pay for existing deficiencies. Often facility standards based on policies such as those found in General Plans are higher than the existing facility standards. This method enables the calculation of the existing deficiency required to bring existing development up to the policy-based standard. The local agency must secure non-fee funding for that portion of planned facilities required to correct the deficiency to ensure that new development receives the level of service funded by the impact fee. This approach is used for the recreation, ~~fire,~~ police, recycled water, general plan, emergency preparedness, ~~maintenance equipment~~ and public facility fees in this report.

Existing Inventory Method

The existing inventory method allocates costs based on the ratio of existing facilities to demand from existing development as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Current Value of Existing Facilities}}{\text{Existing Development Demand}} = \$/\text{unit of demand}$$

Under this method new development will fund the expansion of facilities at the same standard currently serving existing development. By definition the existing inventory method results in no facility deficiencies attributable to existing development. This method is often used when a long-range plan for new facilities is not available. Only the initial facilities to be funded with fees are identified in the fee study. Future facilities to serve growth are identified through an annual capital improvement plan and budget process, possibly after completion of a new facility master plan. This approach is to calculate the parks, library, and storm drainage facilities fees in this report.

Planned Facilities Method

The planned facilities method allocates costs based on the ratio of planned facility costs to demand from new development as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Cost of Planned Facilities}}{\text{New Development Demand}} = \$/\text{unit of demand}$$

This method is appropriate when planned facilities will entirely serve new development, or when a fair share allocation of planned facilities to new development can be estimated. An example of the former is a Wastewater trunk line extension to a previously undeveloped area. An example of the latter is a portion of a roadway that has been identified as necessary to mitigate the impact from new development through traffic modeling analysis. Under this method new development will fund the expansion of facilities at the standards used in the applicable planning documents. This approach is used for the transportation-related, sewer facilities, fire facilities, maintenance equipment facilities and trails facility fees in this report.

Buy-In Method

The buy-in method is based on the value of the existing system's capacity. This method is typically used when the existing system has sufficient capacity to serve new development now and into the future. Under the buy-in methodology, new development "buys" a proportionate share of existing capacity at the current value of the existing facilities.

The buy-in fee is determined by taking the current value of assets (replacement cost new, less depreciation) divided by the current capacity provided by the system. Responsibility for new

capital improvements is then shared equally by all customers. A simplified version of the calculation equation is:

$$\frac{\text{Present Value of Existing Facilities}}{\text{Existing System Capacity}} = \text{cost per unit of demand}$$

This approach is typically used for utility fees, where existing facilities are built with excess capacity to serve future development. This approach is used for the sewer capacity fees in this report.

Organization of the Report

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

Chapters 3 through 17 identify facility standards and planned facilities, allocate the cost of planned facilities between new development and other development, and identify the appropriate development impact fee for each of the following facility categories:

- Parks
- Recreation Facilities
- Fire Protection Facilities
- Police Facilities
- Public Facilities
- Transportation Facilities
- Sewer Conveyance
- Sewer Capacity
- Recycled Water
- General Plan
- Library District
- Emergency Preparedness Facilities
- Storm Drain
- Trails
- Road Maintenance Equipment

Chapter 18 describes how this study complies with the requirements of AB 602.

Chapter 19 details the procedures that the City must follow when implementing a development impact fee program. Impact fee program adoption procedures are found in *California Government Code* Sections 66016 through 66018.

The five statutory findings required for adoption of the proposed public facilities fees in accordance with the Mitigation Fee Act are documented in Chapter 20.

2. Growth Forecasts

Growth projections are used as indicators of demand to determine facility needs and allocate those needs between existing and new development. This chapter explains the source for the growth projections used in this study based on a 2023 base year and a planning horizon of ~~2040~~General Plan buildout, which is not assigned a particular year.

Estimates of existing development and projections of future growth are critical assumptions used throughout this report. These estimates are used as follows:

- The estimate of existing development in 2023 is used as an indicator of existing facility demand and to determine existing facility standards.
- The estimate of total development at ~~the 2040 planning horizon~~buildout is used as an indicator of future demand to determine total facilities needed to accommodate growth and remedy existing facility deficiencies, if any.
- Estimates of growth from 2023 through ~~2040~~buildout are used to (1) allocate facility costs between new development and existing development, and (2) estimate total fee revenues.

The demand for public facilities is based on the service population, dwelling units or nonresidential development creating the need for the facilities.

Land Use Types

To ensure a reasonable relationship between each fee and the type of development paying the fee, growth projections distinguish between different land use types. The land use types that impact fees have been calculated for are defined below.

- **Residential:** All residential dwelling units. Fees charged per square foot of living space.
- **Commercial:** All commercial, retail, educational, and hotel/motel development.
- **Industrial/Business Park:** All manufacturing and other industrial development.
- **Industrial/High Cube Warehouse:** All warehouse and distribution center development

Some developments may include more than one land use type, such as a mixed-use development with both residential and commercial uses. Another similar situation would be a warehousing facility that contains office space. In those cases, the facilities fee would be calculated separately for each land use type included within the building.

The City has the discretion to determine which land use type best reflects a development project's characteristics for purposes of imposing an impact fee and may adjust fees for special or unique uses to reflect the impact characteristics of the use.

Existing and Future Development

Table 2.1 shows the estimated number of residents, dwelling units, employees, and building square feet in Beaumont, both in 2023 and ~~in 2040~~at buildout. The base year estimates of residents and dwelling units come from the California Department of Finance. The projection of ~~future residents in 2040 comes from Figure 5.2~~total dwelling units at buildout is identified in Table 3.2b of the City's General Plan. ~~The projection of total dwelling units in 2040 was estimated based on the increase in~~Total dwelling units ~~needed~~at buildout is then used to ~~accommodate~~

~~80,000 residents in 2040 at~~ estimate population at building by multiplying the count of units by the ~~current~~ occupant densities of 3.28 residents per single family unit and 2.70 residents per multifamily unit, based on data for Beaumont from the American Community Survey. ~~This assumes that approximately 74.4% of all units will be single family units based on ratio of single family to multifamily units at buildout identified in Table 3.2b of the General Plan.~~

Base year employees were estimated based on data obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau's ~~Antheap~~OnTheMap Application. Estimated building square feet in 2023 was calculated based on the current employment count and density factors in Table 2.2. Building square feet at buildout is identified in Table 3.2b of the General Plan.

~~Building square feet at buildout identified in Table 3.2b of the General Plan were reduced by approximately 17.6% corresponding with the proportion of dwelling unit growth needed to house 80,000 residents by 2040 compared to buildout dwelling units.~~

Table 2.1: Demographic Assumptions

	2023	2040	Increase
Residents [1]	56,070	80,000	23,930
Dwelling Units [2]			
Single Family	16,583	19,008	2,425
Multifamily	2,136	6,539	4,403
Total	18,719	25,547	6,828
Employment [3]			
Commercial	3,800	12,389	8,589
Industrial/Business Park	1,085	2,242	1,157
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	1,330	8,336	7,006
Total	6,215	22,968	16,753
Building Square Feet (000s) [4]			
Commercial	1,792	5,844	4,052
Industrial/Business Park	352	728	376
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	1,511	9,473	7,962
Total	3,656	16,045	12,389

[1] Current household population from California Department of Finance. Total population in 2040 identified in General Plan Figure 5.2.

[2] Current values from California Department of Finance. Projection of total dwelling units in 2040 estimated based on the increase in dwelling units needed to accommodate 80,000 residents in 2040 at the current occupant densities of 3.28 residents per single family unit and 2.70 residents per multifamily unit, based on data for Beaumont from the American Community Survey. Assumes that approximately 74.4% of all units will be single family units based on ratio of single family to multifamily units at buildout identified in Table 3.2b of the General Plan.

[3] Current estimates of primary jobs from the US Census' OnTheMap. Projection based on projected building square feet in 2040 below, multiplied by employment densities from Table 2.2.

[4] Estimated building square feet in 2023 calculated based on employment count and density factors in Table 2.2. Building square feet at buildout identified in Table 3.2b of the General Plan reduced by approximately 17.6% corresponding with the proportion of dwelling unit growth needed to house 80,000 residents by 2040.

Sources: California Department of Finance, Table E-5, 2023; City of Beaumont, California Final General Plan, 2020; OnTheMap Application, http://onthemap.ces.census.gov; Table 2.2, Willdan Financial Services.

	2023	Buildout	Increase
Residents [1]	56,070	97,144	41,074
Dwelling Units [2]			
Single Family	16,583	23,081	6,498
Multifamily	2,136	7,940	5,804
Total	18,719	31,021	12,302
Employment [3]			
Commercial	3,800	15,044	11,244
Industrial/Business Park	1,085	2,723	1,638
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	1,330	10,122	8,792
Total	6,215	27,890	21,675
Building Square Feet (000s) [4]			
Commercial	1,792	7,096	5,304
Industrial/Business Park	352	884	532
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	1,511	11,502	9,991
Total	3,656	19,483	15,827

[1] Current household population from California Department of Finance. Projection based on total dwelling units in City multiplied by assumption of residents per single family (3.28) and multifamily (2.70) unit calculated from American Community Survey data.
[2] Current values from California Department of Finance. Projection of total dwelling units at buildout identified in Table 3.2b of the General Plan.
[3] Current estimates of primary jobs from the US Census' OnTheMap. Projection based on total building square feet identified in Table 3.2b of the General Plan, multiplied by employment densities from Table 2.2.
[4] Estimated building square feet in 2023 calculated based on employment count and density factors in Table 2.2. Building square feet at buildout identified in Table 3.2b of the General Plan.

Sources: California Department of Finance, Table E-5, 2023; City of Beaumont, California Final General Plan, 2020; OnTheMap Application, http://onthemap.ces.census.gov; Table 2.2, Willdan Financial Services.

Occupant Densities

All fees in this report are calculated based on dwelling units or building square feet. Occupant density assumptions ensure a reasonable relationship between the size of a development project, the increase in service population associated with the project, and the amount of the fee. The densities ensure that the fee per unit of new development is roughly proportional to the demand for facilities from various types of development.

Occupant densities (residents per dwelling unit or workers per building square foot) are the most appropriate characteristics to use for most impact fees. The fee imposed should be based on the land use type that most closely represents the probable occupant density of the development.

The average occupant density factors used in this report are shown in **Table 2.2.** The residential density factor was calculated using the most recent data from the American Community Survey specifically for the City of Beaumont. The nonresidential occupancy factors are derived from data

from the Institute of Traffic Engineers Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition for commercial and industrial/business park land uses. The occupancy density factor for industrial/high0cube warehouse uses was calculated based on data provided by the City for use in this analysis.

Table 2.2: Occupant Density

Residential - All Units	3.22	Residents per dwelling unit
Nonresidential		
Commercial	2.12	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Industrial/Business Park	3.08	Employees per 1,000 square feet
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	0.88	Employees per 1,000 square feet

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2021 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Tables B25024 and B25033; ITE Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition; City of Beaumont; Willdan Financial Services.

3. Park Facilities

The purpose of the park facilities impact fee is to fund the park facilities needed to serve new development. The maximum justified impact fee is presented based on the existing standard of park facilities per capita. Fee revenue would be used to expand the provision of parks to meet demand from future development. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for City parks from the projected increase in residents and the additional parks needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development can maintain the City's existing ratio of park acres to residents, and the fees are scaled based on the number of residents occupying a new dwelling unit. A fee in-lieu of parkland dedication charged under the Quimby Act is also included in this chapter.

Service Population

Park and recreation facilities in Beaumont primarily serve residents. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities is based on the City's residential population. **Table 3.1** shows the existing and future projected service population for park facilities.

Table 3.1: Park Facilities Service Population

	Residents
Census (2020)	53,036
Existing (2023)	56,070
~~New Development~~	~~23,930~~
Total (2040)	80,000

Source: Table 2.1.

	Residents
Census (2020)	53,036
Existing (2023)	56,070
New Development	41,074
Total (Buildout)	97,144

Source: Table 2.1.

Existing Parkland and Park Facilities Inventory

The City of Beaumont maintains several parks throughout the city. **Table 3.2** summarizes the City's existing parkland inventory in 2023. All facilities are owned by the City. In total, the inventory includes a total of 154.27 acres of City-owned parkland.

Table 3.2: Park Land Inventory

Name	Developed Acres
Community Parks	
Beaumont Sports Park	22.66
Stewart Park	13.21
Subtotal	35.87
Neighborhood Parks	
Aspen Creek Park	1.18
De Forge Park	15.10
Fallen Heroes Park	16.61
Mickelson Park	6.68
Mountain View Park	5.00
Nicklaus Park	18.06
Palmer Park	3.62
Rangal Park	1.58
Seneca Springs Park	2.14
Shadow Hills Park	3.90
Stetson Park	11.82
Sundance Bowl	16.51
Sundance PA 51	1.40
Sunny Hills Park	0.32
Three Rings Ranch Park	6.02
Trevino Park	5.36
Veteran's Park	0.13
Wild Flower Park	2.97
Subtotal	118.40
Total	154.27

Source: City of Beaumont.

Parkland and Park Facilities Unit Costs

Table 3.3 displays the unit costs necessary to develop parkland in Beaumont. The cost of improving a acre of community and neighborhood parkland with standard park improvements is based on the assumed cost of park improvements from the City's prior impact fee study, adjusted for inflation into 2023 dollars. The assumed cost of land acquisition of $218,600 per acre is based on land sales comparisons from the previous two years, as reported by CoStar and is used consistently through this report to value land acquisition for each impact fee category. In total, this analysis assumes that it costs $847,200 to acquire and develop an acre of community parkland and $438,600 to acquire and develop an acre of neighborhood parkland, respectively, in Beaumont.

Table 3.3: Park Facilities Unit Costs

	Community Parks	Neighborhood Parks
Standard Park Improvements	$ 628,600	$ 220,000
Land Acquisition	218,600	218,600
Total Cost per Acre	$ 847,200	$ 438,600

Sources: City of Beaumont; CoStar; Willdan Financial Services.

Parkland and Park Facility Standards

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

The most common measure in calculating new development's demand for parks is the ratio of park acres per resident. In general, facility standards may be based on the Mitigation Fee Act (using a city's existing inventory of parkland and park facilities), or an adopted policy standard contained in a master facility plan or general plan. Facility standards may also be based on a land dedication standard established by the Quimby Act.[2] In this case, the City will use the Mitigation Fee Act to impose park impact fees for development not occurring in subdivisions and will use the Quimby Act for development occurring in subdivisions.

Mitigation Fee Act

The Mitigation Fee Act does not dictate use of a particular type or level of facility standard for public facilities fees. To comply with the findings required under the law, facility standards must not burden new development with any cost associated with facility deficiencies attributable to existing development.[3] In this case, the fees will be set to maintain the City's existing parkland standard of acres per 1,000 residents.

Quimby Act

The Quimby Act specifies that the dedication requirement must be a minimum of 3.0 acres and a maximum of 5.0 acres per 1,000 residents. A jurisdiction can require residential developers to dedicate above the three-acre minimum if the jurisdiction's existing park standard at the time it adopted its Quimby Act ordinance justifies the higher level (up to five acres per 1,000 residents). The standard used must also conform to the jurisdiction's adopted general or specific plan standards.

The Quimby Act only applies to land subdivisions. The Quimby Act would not apply to residential development on future approved projects on single parcels, such as apartment complexes and other multifamily development.

The Quimby Act allows payment of a fee in lieu of land dedication. The fee is calculated to fund the acquisition of the same amount of land that would have been dedicated.

[2] *California Government Code* §66477.

[3] See the *Benefit* and *Burden* findings in *Background Report*.

The Quimby Act allows use of in-lieu fee revenue for any park or recreation facility purpose. Allowable uses of this revenue include land acquisition, park improvements, and rehabilitation of existing parks.

City of Beaumont Parkland and Park Facilities Standards

Table 3.4 shows the existing standard for improved park acreage per 1,000 residents based on the type of parkland. Once accounting for impact fee fund balances, the City has an existing parkland standard of 2.91 acres per 1,000 residents, which is less than the minimum Quimby standard of 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents. The impact fee analysis in this report will be based on maintaining the City's 2.91 acre per 1,000 resident standard as new development adds demand for parks in Beaumont. Fees in-lieu of land dedication for subdivisions are calculated at the minimum *Quimby* standard of 3.0 acres of developed parkland per 1,000 residents. Note that the existing improvement standard is allocated to community and neighborhood parkland, respectively.

Table 3.4: Park Standards

	Community Parks	Neighborhood Parks	Total
Developed Park Acreage	35.87	118.40	154.27
Fund Balance Equivalent	3.52	5.57	
Total Park Acres	39.39	123.97	163.36
Existing Service Population (2023)	56,070	56,070	56,070
Existing Standard (Acres per 1,000 Residents)	0.70	2.21	2.91
Quimby Act Standard (Acres per 1,000 Residents)			3.00

[1] Existing community and neighborhood park fund balance divided by cost per acre from Table 3.3 to determine equivalent park acres, respectively.

Sources: Tables 3.1 and 3.2.

Facilities Needed to Accommodate New Development

Table 3.5 shows the park improvements needed to accommodate new development at the existing acre per 1,000 resident standard. To achieve the standard by the planning horizon, new residential development must fund the improvement of ~~16~~28.75 community park acres and ~~52.89~~90.77 neighborhood park acres, at a total cost of $~~22.2~~38 million.

Table 3.5: Park Improvements to Accommodate New Development

	Calculation	Community	Neighborhood	Total
Park Improvements (Mitigation Fee Act)				
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 capita)	*A*	0.70	2.21	2.91
Growth in Service Population (2023 to 2040)	*B*	23,930	23,930	
Facility Needs (acres)	*C = A x B/1000*	16.75	52.89	69.64
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	*D*	$ 628,600	$ 220,000	
Total	*E = C x D*	$ 10,529,000	$ 11,636,000	$ 22,165,000

Sources: Tables 3.1, 3.3, and 3.4.

	Calculation	Community	Neighborhood	Total
Park Improvements (Mitigation Fee Act)				
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 capita)	*A*	0.70	2.21	2.91
Growth in Service Population (2023 to Buildout)	*B*	41,074	41,074	
Facility Needs (acres)	*C = A x B/1000*	28.75	90.77	119.52
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	*D*	$ 628,600	$ 220,000	
Total	*E = C x D*	$ 18,072,000	$ 19,969,000	$ 38,041,000

Sources: Tables 3.1, 3.3, and 3.4.

Table 3.6 shows the park land needed to accommodate new development at the existing standard and Quimby standard. To achieve the standard by the planning horizon, depending on the amount of development subject to the Quimby Act, new development must fund the acquisition of between ~~69.64~~119.52 and ~~71.79~~123.22 parkland acres, at a total cost ranging between $~~15.2~~26.1 and $~~15.7~~26.9 million.

The facility standards and resulting fees under the Quimby Act are higher because development will be charged to provide 3.0 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, and 2.91 acres of improvements, whereas development not subject to the Quimby Act will be charged to provide only 2.91 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, and 2.91 acres of improvements. Since the exact amount of development that will be subject to the Quimby fees is unknown at this time, Table 3.6 presents the range of total land costs that may be incurred depending on the amount of development subject to the Quimby Act.

Table 3.6: Park Land to Accommodate New Development

	Calculation	Parkland	Total Range[1]
Subdivisions			
Parkland Dedication In-Lieu (Quimby Act)			
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 capita)	*A*	3.00	
Growth in Service Population (2023 to 2040)	*B*	23,930	
Facility Needs (acres)	*C = A x B/1000*	71.79	
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	*D*	$ 218,600	
Total - Subdivisions[2]	*E = C x D*		$ 15,693,294
Non-Subdivisions			
Parkland Acquisition (Mitigation Fee Act)			
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 capita)	*A*	2.91	
Growth in Service Population (2023 to 2040)	*B*	23,930	
Facility Needs (acres)	*C = A x B/1000*	69.64	
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	*D*	$ 218,600	
Total - Infill[3]	*E = C x D*		$ 15,223,304

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

[2] Cost of parkland to serve new development shown if all development is subject to the Quimby Act (Subdivisions of 50 units or more). Fee in-lieu of parkland dedication charged at 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents.

[3] Cost of parkland to serve new development shown if all development is subject to the Mitigation Fee Act. Acquisition fee charged at the existing standard.

Sources: Tables 3.1, 3.3, and 3.4.

	Calculation	Parkland	Total Range[1]
Subdivisions			
Parkland Dedication In-Lieu (Quimby Act)			
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 capita)	*A*	3.00	
Growth in Service Population (2023 to Buildout)	*B*	41,074	
Facility Needs (acres)	*C = A x B/1000*	123.22	
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	*D*	$ 218,600	
Total - Subdivisions[2]	*E = C x D*		$ 26,935,892
Non-Subdivisions			
Parkland Acquisition (Mitigation Fee Act)			
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 capita)	*A*	2.91	
Growth in Service Population (2023 to Buildout)	*B*	41,074	
Facility Needs (acres)	*C = A x B/1000*	119.52	
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	*D*	$ 218,600	
Total - Infill[3]	*E = C x D*		$ 26,127,072

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

[2] Cost of parkland to serve new development shown if all development is subject to the Quimby Act (Subdivisions of 50 units or more). Fee in-lieu of parkland dedication charged at 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents.

[3] Cost of parkland to serve new development shown if all development is subject to the Mitigation Fee Act. Acquisition fee charged at the existing standard.

Sources: Tables 3.1, 3.3, and 3.4.

Park Facilities Cost per Capita

Table 3.7 shows the cost per capita of providing new parkland and park facilities at the existing facility standard, and at the Quimby standard. The cost per capita is shown separately for land and improvements. The cost per capita is shown separately for land and improvements. The costs per capita in this table will serve as the basis of four fees:

- A Quimby Act Fee in-lieu of land dedication. This fee is payable by residential development occurring in subdivisions.
- A Mitigation Fee Act Fee for land acquisition. This fee is payable by residential and nonresidential development not occurring in subdivisions.
- A Mitigation Fee Act Fee for neighborhood park improvements. This fee is payable by all development.
- A Mitigation Fee Act Fee for community park improvements. This fee is payable by all development.

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

Table 3.7: Cost per Capita

		Land		Improvements	
	Calculation	Quimby Fee	Mitigation Fee Act Fee	Community Parks	Neighborhood Parks
		OR		AND	
Parkland Investment (per acre)	*A*	$ 218,600	$ 218,600	$ 628,600	$ 220,000
Existing Standard (acres per 1,000 capita)	*B*	3.00	2.91	0.70	2.21
Total Cost per 1,000 capita	*C = A x B*	$ 655,800	$ 636,126	$ 440,020	$ 486,200
Cost per Resident	*D = C / 1,000*	$ 656	$ 636	$ 440	$ 486

Sources: Tables 3.3 and 3.4.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City plans to use parkland and park facilities fee revenue to purchase parkland or construct improvements to add to the system of park facilities that serves new development. The City may only use impact fee revenue to provide facilities and intensify usage of existing facilities needed to serve new development.

Fee Schedule

To calculate fees by land use type, the investment in park facilities is determined on a per capita basis for both land acquisition and improvement. These cost factors (shown in Table 3.7) are cost per capita based on the unit cost estimates and facility standards. The fee per average sized dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit.

Table 3.8 shows the maximum justified park fees based on the Quimby Act standard and based on the existing park standards under the Mitigation Fee Act, respectively.

The total fee includes a one percent (1%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses. See the *Administrative Costs* section of Chapter 1 for a discussion of this assumption.

~~In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, one percent of the base fee adequately covers the cost of fee program administration. Impact fee program costs typically range from one percent to two percent of collected fee revenue. To be conservative, and to align with the City's current practice, this study uses one percent to calculate the administrative charge.~~

Table 3.8: Park Facilities Fee Schedule

	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.01 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.[3]
Subdivisions						
Parkland	$ 656	3.22	$ 2,112	$ 21	$ 2,133	$ 0.79
Community Park Improvements	440	3.22	1,417	14	1,431	0.53
Neighborhood Park Improvements	486	3.22	1,565	16	1,581	0.59
Total	$ 1,582		$ 5,094	$ 51	$ 5,145	$ 1.91
Non-Subdivisions						
Parkland	$ 636	3.22	$ 2,048	$ 20	$ 2,068	$ 0.77
Community Park Improvements	440	3.22	1,417	14	1,431	0.53
Neighborhood Park Improvements	486	3.22	1,565	16	1,581	0.59
Total	$ 1,562		$ 5,030	$ 50	$ 5,080	$ 1.89

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit.
[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.
[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 3.7.

	A	B	C = A x B	D = C x 0.01	E = C + D	F = E / Average
	Cost Per Capita	Density	Base Fee[1]	Admin Charge[1, 2]	Total Fee	Fee per Sq. Ft.[3]
Subdivisions						
Parkland	$ 656	3.22	$ 2,112	$ 21	$ 2,133	$ 0.79
Community Park Improvements	440	3.22	1,417	14	1,431	0.53
Neighborhood Park Improvements	486	3.22	1,565	16	1,581	0.59
Total	$ 1,582		$ 5,094	$ 51	$ 5,145	$ 1.91
Non-Subdivisions						
Parkland	$ 636	3.22	$ 2,048	$ 20	$ 2,068	$ 0.77
Community Park Improvements	440	3.22	1,417	14	1,431	0.53
Neighborhood Park Improvements	486	3.22	1,565	16	1,581	0.59
Total	$ 1,562		$ 5,030	$ 50	$ 5,080	$ 1.89

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit.

[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 3.7.

4. Recreation Facilities

The following chapter documents the nexus analysis, demonstrating the need for new recreation facilities demanded by new development. A maximum justified fee schedule is presented based on the system plan standard of recreation facilities per capita. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for new recreation facilities from the projected increase in residents and the additional recreation facilities needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the number of residents occupying a new dwelling unit.

Service Population

Park and recreation facilities in Beaumont primarily serve residents. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities is based on the City's residential population. **Table 4.1** shows the existing and future projected service population for recreation facilities.

Table 4.1: Recreation Facilities
Service Population

	Residents
Existing (2023)	56,070
New Development	23,930
Total (2040)	80,000

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

	Residents
Existing (2023)	56,070
New Development	41,074
Total (Buildout)	97,144

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Existing Recreation Facilities Inventory

The City of Beaumont owns a community recreation center. **Table 4.2** summarizes the City's existing recreation facilities inventory. The assumed cost of land acquisition of $218,600 per acre is based on land sales comparisons from the previous two years, as reported by CoStar and is used consistently through this report to value land acquisition for each impact fee category. In total, the City owns approximately $11.9 million in recreation facilities.

Table 4.2: Existing Recreation Facilities

	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Replacement Cost
Community Recreation Center - Land	3.20	acres	$ 218,600	$ 699,520
Community Recreation Center - Building	24,857	sq. ft.	450	11,185,650
Total Value - Existing Facilities				$ 11,885,170

Sources: City of Beaumont; Willdan Financial Services.

Planned Recreation Facilities

The City has planned several recreation facilities to serve new development. Included in the plans are both expansions to existing facilities and the new construction of facilities. In total, the City has identified $66.9 million worth of new recreation facilities to serve existing and new development, net of existing fund balances. **Table 4.3** details the City's planned recreation facilities.

Table 4.3: Planned Recreation Facilities

	Cost
Overflow Parking Lot Lighting at the CRC	$ 224,400
CRC Improvement Project	150,000
Community Center	48,439,900
Splash Pads (3)	4,450,000
Gym	11,676,400
Total	$ 64,940,700
Less Existing Fund Balance	2,500,480
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	$ 62,440,220

Source: City of Beaumont FY24 Capital Improvement Plan.

Cost Allocation

Existing Level of Service

Table 4.4 expresses the City's current recreation facilities level of service in terms of an existing cost per capita. This cost per capita is not used in the fee calculation, rather it is shown here for informational purposes only.

Once the planned facilities have been constructed and new development has increased the City's service population the resulting facility cost per capita will be higher than the cost per capita shown in Table 4.4. The increased facility standard is needed to ensure that the City can fund the planned recreation facilities identified in Table 4.3.

Table 4.4: Existing Level of Service

Value of Existing Facilities	$ 11,885,170
Existing Service Population	56,070
Cost per Resident	$ 212

Sources: Tables 4.1 and 4.3.

Future Level of Service

Table 4.5 shows new development's projected per capita investment in recreation facilities at the planning horizon. This level of service drives the fee calculation. This value is calculated by dividing cost of existing and planned facilities by the service population at the planning horizon.

Table 4.5: Recreation Facilities System Standard

Value of Existing Facilities	$ 11,885,170
Cost of Planned Facilities	62,440,220
Total System Value (2040)	$ 74,325,390
Future Service Population (2040)	80,000
Cost per Resident	$ 929

Sources: Tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3.

Value of Existing Facilities	$ 11,885,170
Cost of Planned Facilities	62,440,220
Total System Value (Buildout)	$ 74,325,390
Future Service Population (Buildout)	97,144
Cost per Resident	$ 765

Sources: Tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City can use recreation facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of buildings, land, vehicles and equipment that are part of the system of recreation facilities serving new development. A list of planned facilities is included in Table 4.3.

Non-Fee Funding Required

Completing the planned facilities will provide a higher value of facilities per capita than is currently provided in Beaumont. Impact fee revenue may not be used to increase the level of service provided to existing development. Therefore, impact fee revenue will not fully fund the planned recreation facilities and some non-fee funding will be required. **Table 4.6** shows the projected fee revenue and the non-fee funding required through ~~2040~~buildout. After accounting for the projected future impact fee revenue, approximately $~~40.2~~31 million in non-fee funding will be needed to complete the planned recreation facilities. The City will need to use alternative funding sources to fund existing development's share of the planned facilities. Potential sources of revenue include but are not limited to existing or new general fund revenues, existing or new taxes, special assessments, and grants.

Table 4.6: Revenue Projection - System Standard

Cost per Capita	$	929
Growth in Service Population (2023 to 2040)		23,930
Fee Revenue	$	22,230,970
Net Cost of Planned Facilities		62,440,220
Non-Fee Revenue To Be Identified	$	(40,209,250)

Sources: Tables 4.1, 4.3 and 4.4.

Cost per Capita	$	765
Growth in Service Population (2023 to Buildout)		41,074
Fee Revenue	$	31,421,365
Net Cost of Planned Facilities		62,440,220
Non-Fee Revenue To Be Identified	$	(31,018,855)

Sources: Tables 4.1, 4.3 and 4.4.

Fee Schedule

The total fee includes a one percent (1%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses. See the *Administrative Costs* section of Chapter 1 for a discussion of this assumption.

Table 4.7 shows the maximum justified recreation facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit densities (persons per

dwelling). The fee per average sized dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit.

The total fee includes a one percent (1%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: ~~a standard overhead charge applied to City programs for~~ (1) legal, accounting, and other ~~departmental and~~ administrative support~~,~~ and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

~~In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, one percent~~ See the *Administrative Costs* section of ~~the base fee adequately covers the cost~~Chapter 1 for a discussion of ~~fee program administration. Impact fee program costs typically range from one percent to two percent of collected fee revenue. To be conservative, and to align with the City's current practice,~~ this ~~study uses one percent to calculate the administrative charge~~assumption.

Table 4.7: Recreation Facilities Fee - System Standard

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.01 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 929	3.22	$ 2,991	$ 30	$ 3,021	$ 1.12

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit.

[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 4.5.

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.01 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 765	3.22	$ 2,463	$ 25	$ 2,488	$ 0.93

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit.

[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 4.5.

5. Fire Protection Facilities

The purpose of the fire impact fee is to fund the fire facilities needed to serve new development. A maximum justified fee schedule is presented based on the ~~system plan~~ planned facilities standard of fire facilities per capita. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for new fire protection facilities from the projected increase in service population and the additional fire protection facilities needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the number of residents occupying a new dwelling unit, or the number of jobs associated with nonresidential land uses.

Service Population

Fire facilities are used to provide services to both residents and businesses. The service population used to determine the demand for fire facilities includes both residents and workers. **Table 5.1** shows the current fire facilities service population and the estimated service population at the planning horizon of ~~2040.~~General Plan buildout.

To calculate service population for fire protection facilities, residents are weighted at 1.00. A worker is weighted at 0.69 of one resident to reflect the lower per capita need for fire services associated with businesses. The 0.69 factor is consistent with the factor used by Riverside County in its development impact fee study, as the City of Beaumont is part of the Riverside County fire protection service area. The worker weighting factor used in the Riverside County study was based on an analysis of call data response by land use type, which indicated varying levels of demand for fire protection services between residential and nonresidential land uses.

Table 5.1: Fire Facilities Service Population

	A Persons	B Weighting Factor	A x B = C Service Population
Residents			
Existing (2023)	56,070	1.00	56,070
New Development	23,930	1.00	23,930
Total (2040)	80,000		80,000
Workers			
Existing (2023)	6,215	0.69	4,288
New Development	16,753	0.69	11,559
Total (2040)	22,968		15,847
Combined Residents and Weighted Workers			
Existing (2023)			60,358
New Development			35,489
Total (2040)			95,847

[1] Workers are weighted at 0.69 of residents to be consistent with Riverside County's development impact fee analysis.

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

	A Persons	B Weighting Factor	A x B = C Service Population
Residents			
Existing (2023)	56,070	1.00	56,070
New Development	41,074	1.00	41,074
Total (Buildout)	97,144		97,144
Workers			
Existing (2023)	6,215	0.69	4,288
New Development	21,675	0.69	14,955
Total (Buildout)	27,890		19,243
Combined Residents and Weighted Workers			
Existing (2023)			60,358
New Development			56,029
Total (Buildout)			116,387

[1] Workers are weighted at 0.69 of residents to be consistent with Riverside County's development impact fee analysis.

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Inventories and Standards

This section describes the City's fire facility inventory and facility standards.

Existing Inventory

Table 5.2 summarizes the City's current inventory of land, apparatus and vehicles. Fire protection services are provided from two stations located throughout the City. The assumed cost of land acquisition of $218,600 per acre is based on land sales comparisons from the previous two years, as reported by CoStar and is used consistently through this report to value land acquisition for each impact fee category. The replacement cost for the station buildings is based on the City's recent fire station construction costs. The replacement costs of vehicles and apparatus were provided by the City for use in this analysis.

Table 5.2: Existing Fire Facilities Land and Building Inventory

	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Replacement Cost
Fire Station 66 - 628 Maple Avenue				
Land	0.36	acres	$ 218,600	$ 77,785
Station	6,425	sq. ft.	827	5,314,359
Subtotal				$ 5,392,144
Fire Station No. 106				
Land	1.59	acres	218,600	$ 347,574
Station	10,760	sq. ft.	827	8,900,000
Subtotal				$ 9,247,574
Vehicles				
2004 Ford F550				$ 65,000
2022 Hyundai Santa Fe				40,000
2023 SUBARU CROSSTEK				30,848
Spartan Quint TDA Truck				2,205,647
Squad				282,449
Subtotal				$ 2,623,944
Total Value - Existing Facilities				$ 17,263,662

Sources: City of Beaumont; Willdan Financial Services.

Planned Facilities

Table 5.3 summarizes the planned facilities needed to serve the City through ~~2040~~buildout, consistent with the City's prior development impact fee study. Primarily, the City plans to build two new fire stations. New facilities costs are estimated to total approximately $13 million through ~~2040~~buildout, net of existing impact fee fund balances.

Table 5.3: Planned Fire Facilities

	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Cost
Fire Station 66 Plumbing System Improvement Project				$ 108,000
Fire Station 66 Apparatus Bay Improvements				162,000
New Station: N of I-10/E of Beaumont Av				
Land	1.59	acres	$ 218,600	$ 347,574
Building	10,760	sq. ft.	827	8,900,000
Subtotal				$ 9,247,574
New Station: S of I-10/E of Beaumont Av				
Land	1.59	acres	$ 218,600	$ 347,574
Building	10,760	sq. ft.	827	8,900,000
Subtotal				$ 9,247,574
Total				$ 18,765,148
Less Existing Fund Balance				5,799,822
Net Cost of Planned Facilities				$ 12,965,326

Source: City of Beaumont FY24 Capital Improvement Plan.

Cost Allocation

Existing Level of Service

Table 5.4 expresses the City's current fire facilities level of service in terms of an existing cost per capita. This cost per capita is not used in the fee calculation, rather it is shown here for informational purposes only. ~~Once the planned facilities have been constructed and new development has increased the City's service population the resulting facility cost per capita will be higher than the cost per capita shown in Table 5.4. The increased facility standard is needed to ensure that the City has an adequate fire response time throughout the City.~~

Table 5.4: Existing Level of Service

Value of Existing Facilities	$	17,263,662
Existing Service Population		60,358
Cost per Capita	$	286
Facility Standard per Resident	$	286
Facility Standard per Worker[1]		197

[1] Based on the weighing factor of 0.65.

Sources: Tables 5.1 and 5.3.

Value of Existing Facilities	$	17,263,662
Existing Service Population		60,358
Cost per Capita	$	286
Facility Standard per Resident	$	286
Facility Standard per Worker[1]		197

[1] Based on the weighing factor of 0.69.

Sources: Tables 5.1 and 5.3.

Future Level of Service

Table 5.5 shows new development's ~~projected~~cost per capita ~~investment in fire protection facilities at~~needed to fully fund the ~~planning horizon.~~planned facilities. The level of service indicated by the planned facilities is lower than the existing standard. This level of service drives the fee calculation. This value is calculated by dividing the cost of ~~existing and~~ planned facilities by the increase in service population ~~at the planning horizon.~~. The ~~value~~resulting cost per capita ~~is multiplied by the worker weighting factor of 0.69 to determine the value per worker~~drives the fee calculation.

Table 5.5: Fire Protection Facilities ~~System~~Planned Facilities Standard

Value of Existing Facilities	$	17,263,662
Value of Planned Facilities		12,965,326
Total System Value (2040)	$	30,228,988
Future Service Population (2040)		95,847
Cost per Capita	$	315
Cost Allocation per Resident	$	315
Cost Allocation per Worker[1]		217

[1] Based on the weighing factor of 0.69.

Sources: Tables 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3.

Net Cost of Planned Facilities	$	12,965,326
Growth in Service Population (2023 to Buildout)		56,029
Cost per Capita	$	231
Cost Allocation per Resident	$	231
Cost Allocation per Worker[1]		160

[1] Based on the weighing factor of 0.69.

Sources: Tables 5.1 and 5.3.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City can use fire facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of buildings, land, vehicles, apparatus and fire protection equipment that are part of the system of fire facilities serving new development. A list of planned facilities is included in Table 5.3.

~~Non-~~Fee ~~Funding Required~~Revenue Projection

~~Completing the planned facilities will provide a higher value of facilities per capita than is currently provided in Beaumont. Impact fee revenue may not be used to increase the level of service provided to existing development. Therefore, impact fee revenue will not fully fund the planned fire protection facilities and some non-fee funding will be required. **Table 5.6** shows the projected fee revenue and the non-fee funding required through 2040. After accounting for the projected future impact fee revenue, approximately $1.8 million in non-fee funding will be needed to complete the planned fire protection facilities. The City will need to use alternative funding sources to fund existing development's share of the planned fire protection facilities. Potential sources of revenue include but are not limited to existing or new general fund revenues, existing or new taxes, special assessments, and grants.~~

~~Table 5.6: Revenue Projection - System Standard~~

Cost per Capita	$	315
Growth in Service Population (2023 to 2040)		35,489
Fee Revenue	$	11,179,035
Net Cost of Planned Facilities		12,965,326
Non-Fee Revenue To Be Identified	$	1,786,291

Sources: Tables 5.1, 5.3 and 5.5.

The City plans to use fire protection facilities fee revenue to construct improvements and acquire capital facilities and equipment to add to the system of fire protection facilities to serve new development. The City plans to acquire the facilities in Table 5.3. By using the planned facilities cost allocation method, the cost of the planned facilities is equal to the projected impact fee revenue for this facility category.

Fee Schedule

The total fee includes a one percent (1%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses. See the *Administrative Costs* section of Chapter 1 for a discussion of this assumption.

Table 5.6 shows the maximum justified fire facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space). The fee per dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit.

The total fee includes a one percent (1%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: ~~a standard overhead charge applied to all City programs for~~ (1) legal, accounting, and other ~~departmental and~~ administrative support~~,~~ and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

~~In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, one percent~~ See the *Administrative Costs* section of ~~the base fee adequately covers the cost~~Chapter 1 for a discussion of ~~fee program administration. Impact fee program costs typically range from one percent to two percent of collected fee revenue. To be conservative, and to align with the City's current practice,~~ this ~~study uses one percent to calculate the administrative charge~~assumption.

Table 5.6: Fire Protection Facilities Fee Schedule

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.01 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 315	3.22	$ 1,014	$ 10	$ 1,024	$ 0.38
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 217	2.12	$ 460	$ 5	$ 465	$ 0.47
Industrial/Business Park	217	3.08	668	7	675	0.68
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	217	0.88	191	2	193	0.19

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.

[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 5.5.

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.01 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 231	3.22	$ 745	$ 7	$ 752	$ 0.28
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 160	2.12	$ 339	$ 3	$ 342	$ 0.34
Industrial/Business Park	160	3.08	493	5	498	0.50
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	160	0.88	141	1	142	0.14

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.
[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.
[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 5.5.

6. Police Facilities

The purpose of the police impact fee is to fund the police facilities needed to serve new development. A maximum justified fee is presented based on the system plan standard of police facilities per capita. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for new police facilities from the projected increase in service population and the additional police facilities needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the number of residents occupying a new dwelling unit, or the number of jobs associated with nonresidential land uses.

Service Population

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

Table 6.1 shows the existing and future projected service population for police facilities. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one employee compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. This study makes use of a worker weighting factor to estimate different levels of demand between residential and nonresidential land uses. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units and consequently create a lesser demand for facilities.

Table 6.1: Police Facilities Service Population

	A Persons	B Weighting Factor	A x B = C Service Population
Residents			
Existing (2023)	56,070	1.00	56,070
New Development	23,930	1.00	23,930
Total (2040)	80,000		80,000
Workers			
Existing (2023)	6,215	0.31	1,927
New Development	16,753	0.31	5,193
Total (2040)	22,968		7,120
Combined Residents and Weighted Workers			
Existing (2023)			57,997
New Development			29,123
Total (2040)			87,120

[1] Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40 hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week (40/128 = 0.31)

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

	A Persons	B Weighting Factor	A x B = C Service Population
Residents			
Existing (2023)	56,070	1.00	56,070
New Development	41,074	1.00	41,074
Total (Buildout)	97,144		97,144
Workers			
Existing (2023)	6,215	0.31	1,927
New Development	21,675	0.31	6,719
Total (Buildout)	27,890		8,646
Combined Residents and Weighted Workers			
Existing (2023)			57,997
New Development			47,793
Total (Buildout)			105,790

[1] Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40 hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week (40/128 = 0.31)

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Inventories and Standards

This section describes the City's police facility inventory and facility standards.

Existing Inventory

This study uses the system plan methodology to calculate fees for police facilities. Police services in the City of Beaumont are presently based out of two facilities. **Table 6.2** summarizes the City's current inventory of police land, buildings and vehicles. The assumed cost of land acquisition of $218,600 per acre is based on land sales comparisons from the previous two years, as reported by CoStar and is used consistently through this report to value land acquisition for each impact fee category. The unit cost assumption for the replacement cost of buildings is based on a survey of recent police facility construction costs from several other jurisdictions in California 2023.

Table 6.2: Existing Police Facilities Inventory

	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Replacement Cost
Land				
Police Department - 660 Orange Avenue	1.94	acres	$ 218,600	$ 424,084
Police Department Annex Building - 1580 E. 8th Street	0.08	acres	218,600	16,837
Subtotal				$ 440,921
Buildings				
Police Department - 660 Orange Avenue	10,780	sq. ft.	$ 1,408	$ 15,178,240
Police Department Annex Building - 1580 E. 8th Street	3,355	sq. ft.	1,408	4,723,840
Subtotal				$ 19,902,080
Vehicles				
Explorer Interceptor	27	vehicles	$ 49,186	$ 1,328,022
Prius	1	vehicles	42,525	42,525
Fusion	1	vehicles	30,000	30,000
Tahoe	7	vehicles	44,922	314,454
Escape	2	vehicles	26,360	52,720
Model Y	1	vehicles	55,290	55,290
Model 3	1	vehicles	41,290	41,290
Rav 4	2	vehicles	32,526	65,052
Sienna	1	vehicles	50,800	50,800
M2	1	vehicles	52,500	52,500
F150	1	vehicles	50,427	50,427
Malibu	5	vehicles	21,051	105,255
Subtotal	50			$ 2,188,335
Total Value - Existing Facilities				$ 22,531,336

Sources: City of Beaumont; Willdan Financial Services.

	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Replacement Cost
Land				
Police Department - 660 Orange Avenue	1.94	acres	$218,600	$ 424,084
Police Department Annex Building - 1580 E. 8th Street	0.08	acres	218,600	16,837
Subtotal				$ 440,921
Buildings [1]				
Police Department - 660 Orange Avenue	10,780	sq. ft.	$ -	$ -
Police Department Annex Building - 1580 E. 8th Street	3,355	sq. ft.	-	-
Subtotal				$ -
Vehicles				
Explorer Interceptor	27	vehicles	$ 49,186	$ 1,328,022
Prius	1	vehicles	42,525	42,525
Fusion	1	vehicles	30,000	30,000
Tahoe	7	vehicles	44,922	314,454
Escape	2	vehicles	26,360	52,720
Model Y	1	vehicles	55,290	55,290
Model 3	1	vehicles	41,290	41,290
Rav 4	2	vehicles	32,526	65,052
Sienna	1	vehicles	50,800	50,800
M2	1	vehicles	52,500	52,500
F150	1	vehicles	50,427	50,427
Malibu	5	vehicles	21,051	105,255
Subtotal	50			$ 2,188,335
Total Value - Existing Facilities				$ 2,629,256

[1] No value is shown for these buildings because they will be replaced by the planned facility.

Sources: City of Beaumont; Willdan Financial Services.

Planned Facilities

Table 6.3 summarizes the planned police facilities needed to serve the City through ~~2040~~buildout. The City plans to design and construct a new police station, including land acquisition and radio upgrades. New facilities costs are estimated to total approximately $73.2 million through ~~2040~~buildout, net of existing impact fee fund balances.

Table 6.3: Planned Police Facilities

	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Cost
New Police Station Design				$ 1,500,000
New Police Station Construction	51,000	Sq. Ft.	$ 1,408	71,808,000
New Police Land Acquisition	8	Acres	218,600	1,748,800
Total Cost of Planned Facilities				$ 75,056,800
Less Existing Fund Balance				1,874,579
Net Cost of Planned Facilities				$ 73,182,221

Source: City of Beaumont FY24 Capital Improvement Plan; City of Beaumont Development Impact Fee Study, 2017; Willdan Financial Services.

Cost Allocation

Existing Level of Service

Table 6.4 expresses the City's current police facilities level of service in terms of an existing cost per capita. This cost per capita is not used in the fee calculation, rather it is shown here for informational purposes only.

Once the planned facilities have been constructed and new development has increased the City's service population the resulting facility cost per capita will be higher than the cost per capita shown in Table 6.4. The increased facility standard is needed to ensure that the City has adequate facilities to provide police services to the City.

Table 6.4: Existing Level of Service

Value of Existing Facilities	$	22,531,336
Existing Service Population		57,997
Cost per Capita	$	388
Facility Standard per Resident	$	388
Facility Standard per Worker[1]		120

[1] Based on a weighing factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 6.1 and 6.3.

Value of Existing Facilities	$	2,629,256
Existing Service Population		57,997
Cost per Capita	$	45
Facility Standard per Resident	$	45
Facility Standard per Worker[1]		14

[1] Based on a weighing factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 6.1 and 6.3.

Future Level of Service

Table 6.5 shows new development's projected per capita investment in police facilities at the planning horizon. This level of service drives the fee calculation. This value is calculated by dividing cost of existing and planned facilities by the service population at the planning horizon. The value per capita is multiplied by the worker weighting factor of 0.31 to determine the value per worker.

Table 6.5: Police Facilities System Standard

Value of Existing Facilities	$	22,531,336
Value of Planned Facilities		73,182,221
Total System Value (2040)	$	95,713,557
Future Service Population (2040)		87,120
Cost per Capita	$	1,099
Cost Allocation per Resident	$	1,099
Cost Allocation per Worker[1]		341

[1] Based on a weighting factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3.

Value of Existing Facilities	$	2,629,256
Value of Planned Facilities		73,182,221
Total System Value (Buildout)	$	75,811,477
Future Service Population (Buildout)		105,790
Cost per Capita	$	717
Cost Allocation per Resident	$	717
Cost Allocation per Worker[1]		222

[1] Based on a weighting factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City can use police facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of buildings, land, and equipment that are part of the system of police facilities serving new development. A list of planned facilities is included in Table 6.3.

Non-Fee Funding Required

Completing the planned facilities will provide a higher value of facilities per capita than is currently provided in Beaumont. Impact fee revenue may not be used to increase the level of service provided to existing development. Therefore, impact fee revenue will not fully fund the planned police facilities and some non-fee funding will be required. **Table 6.6** shows the projected fee revenue and the non-fee funding required through ~~2040~~buildout. After accounting for the projected future impact fee revenue, approximately $~~41.2~~38.9 million in non-fee funding will be needed to complete the planned police facilities.

The City will need to use alternative funding sources to fund existing development's share of the planned police facilities. Potential sources of revenue include but are not limited to existing or new general fund revenues, existing or new taxes, special assessments, and grants.

Table 6.6: Revenue Projection - System Standard

Cost per Capita	$	1,099
Growth in Service Population (2023 to 2040)		29,123
Fee Revenue	$	32,006,177
Net Cost of Planned Facilities		73,182,221
Non-Fee Revenue To Be Identified	$	(41,176,044)

Sources: Tables 6.1, 6.3 and 6.4.

Cost per Capita	$	717
Growth in Service Population (2023 to Buildout)		47,793
Fee Revenue	$	34,267,352
Net Cost of Planned Facilities		73,182,221
Non-Fee Revenue To Be Identified	$	(38,914,869)

Sources: Tables 6.1, 6.3 and 6.4.

Fee Schedule

The total fee includes a one percent (1%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses. See the *Administrative Costs* section of Chapter 1 for a discussion of this assumption.

Table 6.7 shows the maximum justified police facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space). The fee per average sized dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit.

The total fee includes a one percent (1%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: ~~a standard overhead charge applied to all City programs for~~ (1) legal, accounting, and other ~~departmental and~~ administrative support~~,~~ and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

~~In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, one percent~~ See the *Administrative Costs* section of ~~the base fee adequately covers the cost~~Chapter 1 for a discussion of ~~fee program~~

~~administration. Impact fee program costs typically range from one percent to two percent of collected fee revenue. To be conservative, and to align with the City's current practice,~~ this ~~study uses one percent to calculate the administrative charge~~assumption.

Table 6.7: Police Facilities Fee Schedule

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.01 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 1,099	3.22	$ 3,539	$ 35	$ 3,574	$ 1.33
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 341	2.12	$ 723	$ 7	$ 730	$ 0.73
Industrial/Business Park	341	3.08	1,050	11	1,061	1.06
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	341	0.88	300	3	303	0.30

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.

[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 6.5.

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.01 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 717	3.22	$ 2,309	$ 23	$ 2,332	$ 0.87
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 222	2.12	$ 471	$ 5	$ 476	$ 0.48
Industrial/Business Park	222	3.08	684	7	691	0.69
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	222	0.88	195	2	197	0.20

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.

[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 6.5.

7. Public Facilities

The purpose of the public facilities impact fee is to fund the public facilities needed to serve new development. A maximum justified fee is presented based on the system plan standard of public facilities per capita. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for new public facilities from the projected increase in service population and the additional public facilities needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the number of residents occupying a new dwelling unit, or the number of jobs associated with nonresidential land uses.

Service Population

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

Table 7.1 shows the existing and future projected service population for public facilities. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one employee compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. This study makes use of a worker weighting factor to estimate different levels of demand between residential and nonresidential land uses. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units and consequently create a lesser demand for facilities.

Table 7.1: Public Facilities Service Population

	A Persons	B Weighting Factor	A x B = C Service Population
Residents			
Existing (2023)	56,070	1.00	56,070
New Development	23,930	1.00	23,930
Total (2040)	80,000		80,000
Workers			
Existing (2023)	6,215	0.31	1,927
New Development	16,753	0.31	5,193
Total (2040)	22,968		7,120
Combined Residents and Weighted Workers			
Existing (2023)			57,997
New Development			29,123
Total (2040)			87,120

[1] Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40 hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week (40/128 = 0.31)

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

	A Persons	B Weighting Factor	A x B = C Service Population
Residents			
Existing (2023)	56,070	1.00	56,070
New Development	41,074	1.00	41,074
Total (Buildout)	97,144		97,144
Workers			
Existing (2023)	6,215	0.31	1,927
New Development	21,675	0.31	6,719
Total (Buildout)	27,890		8,646
Combined Residents and Weighted Workers			
Existing (2023)			57,997
New Development			47,793
Total (Buildout)			105,790

[1] Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40 hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week (40/128 = 0.31)

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Inventories and Standards

This section describes the City's public facility inventory and facility standards.

Existing Inventory

The City's public facility inventory consists of City Hall and its various auxiliary buildings and the grounds maintenance building. **Table 7.2** summarizes the City's current inventory of public land, buildings and vehicles. The assumed cost of land acquisition of $218,600 per acre is based on land sales comparisons from the previous two years, as reported by CoStar and is used consistently through this report to value land acquisition for each impact fee category. ~~Unit cost assumptions for the replacement cost of buildings are based on the cost estimate to build a new City Hall from the City's prior impact fee study, which has been adjusted for inflation to 2023 dollars.~~ No value is shown for the buildings, because they will be replaced by the planned facilities.

Table 7.2: Existing Public Facilities Inventory

	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Replacement Cost
Land (acres)				
City Hall - 550 E. Sixth Street	4.22	acres	$218,600	$ 922,492
Grounds Maintenance Building - 713 W Fourth Street	0.01	acres	218,600	1,626
Subtotal - Land	4.23			$ 924,118
Buildings (square feet) [1]				
City Hall - 550 E. Sixth Street	23,283	sq. ft.	$ 532	$ 12,386,556
~~Grounds Maintenance Building - 713 W Fourth Street~~	~~324~~	~~sq. ft.~~	~~150~~	~~48,600~~
City Hall Building D - 650 Magnolia Avenue	4,241	sq. ft.	532	2,256,212
City Hall Building G (Animal Control) - 650 Magnolia Avenue	3,606	sq. ft.	532	1,918,392
City Hall Building B - 650 Magnolia Avenue	1,750	sq. ft.	532	931,000
City Hall Building C - 650 Magnolia Avenue	2,240	sq. ft.	532	1,191,680
Subtotal - Buildings	35,444			$ 18,732,440
Total Value - Existing Facilities				$ 19,656,558

Sources: City of Beaumont; Willdan Financial Services.

	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Replacement Cost
Land (acres)				
City Hall - 550 E. Sixth Street	4.22	acres	$218,600	$ 922,492
Grounds Maintenance Building - 713 W Fourth Street	0.01	acres	218,600	2,186
Subtotal - Land	4.23			$ 924,678
Buildings (square feet) [1]				
City Hall - 550 E. Sixth Street	23,283	sq. ft.	$ -	$ -
Grounds Maintenance Building - 713 W Fourth Street	324	sq. ft.	-	-
City Hall Building D - 650 Magnolia Avenue	4,241	sq. ft.	-	-
City Hall Building G (Animal Control) - 650 Magnolia Avenue	3,606	sq. ft.	-	-
City Hall Building B - 650 Magnolia Avenue	1,750	sq. ft.	-	-
City Hall Building C - 650 Magnolia Avenue	2,240	sq. ft.	-	-
Subtotal - Buildings	35,444			$ -
Total Value - Existing Facilities				$ 924,678

[1] No value is shown for these buildings because they will be replaced by the planned facilities.

Sources: City of Beaumont; Willdan Financial Services.

Planned Facilities

Table 7.3 summarizes the planned public facilities needed to serve the City through ~~2040~~buildout. The City plans for a new City Hall and Corporate Yard, including land acquisition. New facilities costs are estimated to total approximately $23.3 million through ~~2040~~buildout, net of existing fund balances.

Table 7.3: Planned Public Facilities

	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Cost
New City Hall[1]	25,000	Sq. Ft.	$ 532	$ 13,300,000
Land for New City Hall	2	Acres	218,600	437,200
New Corporate Yard Building	20,000	Sq. Ft.	500	10,000,000
Land for Corporate Yard	6	Acres	218,600	1,311,600
Total				$ 25,048,800
Less Existing Fund Balance				1,703,433
Net Cost of Planned Facilities				$ 23,345,367

[1] Unit cost from 2017 Development Imapct Fee Study, adjusted for inflation using the Engineering News Record's Building Cost Index.

Source: City of Beaumont Development Impact Fee Study, 2017; Willdan Financial Services.

	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Cost
New City Hall[1]	25,000	Sq. Ft.	$ 532	$ 13,300,000
Land for New City Hall	2	Acres	218,600	437,200
New Corporate Yard Building	20,000	Sq. Ft.	500	10,000,000
Land for Corporate Yard	6	Acres	218,600	1,311,600
Total				$ 25,048,800
Less Existing Fund Balance				1,703,433
Net Cost of Planned Facilities				$ 23,345,367

[1] Unit cost from 2017 Development Imapct Fee Study, adjusted for inflation using the Engineering News Record's Building Cost Index.

Source: City of Beaumont Development Impact Fee Study, 2017; Willdan Financial Services.

Cost Allocation

Existing Level of Service

Table 7.4 expresses the City's current public facilities level of service in terms of an existing cost per capita. This cost per capita is not used in the fee calculation, rather it is shown here for informational purposes only. Once the planned facilities have been constructed and new development has increased the City's service population the resulting facility cost per capita will be higher than the cost per capita shown in Table 7.4. The increased facility standard is needed to ensure that the City has adequate facilities to provide public services to the City.

Table 7.4: Existing Level of Service

Value of Existing Facilities	$	19,656,558
Existing Service Population		57,997
Cost per Capita	$	339
Facility Standard per Resident	$	339
Facility Standard per Worker[1]		105

[1] Based on a weighing factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 7.1 and 7.3.

Value of Existing Facilities	$	924,678
Existing Service Population		57,997
Cost per Capita	$	16
Facility Standard per Resident	$	16
Facility Standard per Worker[1]		5

[1] Based on a weighing factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 7.1 and 7.3.

Future Level of Service

Table 7.5 shows new development's projected per capita investment in public facilities at the planning horizon. This level of service drives the fee calculation. This value is calculated by dividing cost of existing and planned facilities by the service population at the planning horizon. The value per capita is multiplied by the worker weighting factor of 0.31 to determine the value per worker.

Table 7.5: Public Facilities System Standard

Value of Existing Facilities	$	19,656,558
Value of Planned Facilities		23,345,367
Total System Value (2040)	$	43,001,925
Future Service Population (2040)		87,120
Cost per Capita	$	494
Cost Allocation per Resident	$	494
Cost Allocation per Worker[1]		153

[1] Based on a weighting factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3.

Value of Existing Facilities	$	924,678
Value of Planned Facilities		23,345,367
Total System Value (Buildout)	$	24,270,045
Future Service Population (Buildout)		105,790
Cost per Capita	$	229
Cost Allocation per Resident	$	229
Cost Allocation per Worker[1]		71

[1] Based on a weighting factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City can use public facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of buildings, land, and equipment that are part of the system of public facilities serving new development. A list of planned facilities is included in Table 7.3.

Non-Fee Funding Required

Completing the planned facilities will provide a higher value of facilities per capita than is currently provided in Beaumont. Impact fee revenue may not be used to increase the level of service provided to existing development. Therefore, impact fee revenue will not fully fund the planned public facilities and some non-fee funding will be required. **Table 7.6** shows the projected fee revenue and the non-fee funding required through ~~2040~~buildout. After accounting for the projected future impact fee revenue, approximately $~~9~~12.4 million in non-fee funding will be needed to complete the planned public facilities.

The City will need to use alternative funding sources to fund existing development's share of the planned public facilities. Potential sources of revenue include but are not limited to existing or new general fund revenues, existing or new taxes, special assessments, and grants.

Table 7.6: Revenue Projection - System Standard

Cost per Capita	$	494
Growth in Service Population (2023 to 2040)		29,123
Fee Revenue	$	14,386,762
Net Cost of Planned Facilities		23,345,367
Non-Fee Revenue to be Identified	$	(8,958,605)

Sources: Tables 7.1, 7.3 and 7.4.

Cost per Capita	$	229
Growth in Service Population (2023 to Buildout)		47,793
Fee Revenue	$	10,944,524
Net Cost of Planned Facilities		23,345,367
Non-Fee Revenue to be Identified	$	(12,400,843)

Sources: Tables 7.1, 7.3 and 7.4.

Fee Schedule

The total fee includes a one percent (1%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses. See the *Administrative Costs* section of Chapter 1 for a discussion of this assumption.

Table 7.7 shows the maximum justified public facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space). The fee per average sized dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit.

The total fee includes a one percent (1%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: ~~a standard overhead charge applied to all City programs for~~ (1) legal, accounting, and other ~~departmental and~~ administrative support~~,~~ and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

~~In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, one percent~~ See the *Administrative Costs* section of ~~the base fee adequately covers the cost~~Chapter 1 for a discussion of ~~fee program~~

~~administration. Impact fee program costs typically range from one percent to two percent of collected fee revenue. To be conservative, and to align with the City's current practice,~~ this ~~study uses one percent to calculate the administrative charge~~assumption.

Table 7.7: Public Facilities Fee Schedule

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.01 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 494	3.22	$ 1,591	$ 16	$ 1,607	$ 0.60
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 153	2.12	$ 324	$ 3	$ 327	$ 0.33
Industrial/Business Park	153	3.08	471	5	476	0.48
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	153	0.88	135	1	136	0.14

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.

[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 7.5.

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.01 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 229	3.22	$ 737	$ 7	$ 744	$ 0.28
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 71	2.12	$ 151	$ 2	$ 153	$ 0.15
Industrial/Business Park	71	3.08	219	2	221	0.22
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	71	0.88	62	1	63	0.06

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.

[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 7.5.

8. Transportation Facilities

This chapter summarizes an analysis of the need for various transportation improvements to accommodate new development. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for new transportation facilities from the projected increase in vehicle trips and the additional transportation facilities needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the number trips generated by residential and nonresidential land uses.

Fee Structure Changes

The City currently charges three transportation-related impact fees: streets and bridges, traffic signals and railroad crossings. Going forward this analysis will combine the streets and bridges fee and traffic signals fees into a single impact fee category, which will also be known as the streets and bridges impact fee. Existing fund balances in each of the existing three funds must be spent for the purpose they were collected. The City will establish a new streets and bridges fee fund that can be spent on any of the projects in the streets and bridges project list shown later in this chapter.

Trip Demand

The need for transportation facilities is based on the trip demand placed on the system by development. A reasonable measure of demand is the number of PM peak hour vehicle trips, adjusted for pass-by trips. Vehicle trip generation rates are a reasonable measure of demand on the City's system of transportation facilities across all modes because alternate modes (transit, bicycle, pedestrian) often substitute for vehicle trips. Pass-by trips are deducted from the trip generation rate. Pass-by trips are intermediates stops between an origin and a final destination that require no diversion from the route, such as stopping to get gas on the way to work.

Table 8.1 shows the calculation of trip demand factors by land use category based on the pass-by trip adjustment described above. The data for trip rates, and the pass-by trip assumption all come from the latest data available from the Institute of Traffic Engineers.

Table 8.1: Trip Demand Factors

	ITE Category	Pass-by Trips[1]	PM Peak Hour Trips[2]	Adjusted Trip Rate
		A	*B*	*C = (1 - A) x B*
Residential - per Dwelling Unit				
Single Family	Single Family Housing (210)	0%	0.99	0.99
Multifamily	Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) (220)	0%	0.57	0.57
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.				
Commercial	Shopping Center (820)	34%	4.09	2.70
Industrial/Business Park	Business Park (770)	0%	1.22	1.22
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	High-Cube Parcel Hub Warehouse (156)	0%	0.71	0.71

[1] Percent of total trips. A pass-by trip is made as an intermediate stop on the way from an origin to a primary trip destination without a route diversion. Pass-by trips are not considered to add traffic to the road network. Assumption based on ITE Trip Generation Handbook data.
[2] Trips per dwelling unit or per 1,000 building square feet.

Sources: Institute of Traffic Engineers, Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition; Institute of Traffic Engineers, Trip Generation Handbook 3rd Edition; Willdan Financial Services.

	ITE Category	Pass-by Trips[1]	PM Peak Hour Trips[2]	Adjusted Trip Rate
		A	*B*	*C = (1 - A) x B*
Residential - per Dwelling Unit				
Single Family	Single Family Housing (210)	0%	0.99	0.99
Multifamily	Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) (220)	0%	0.57	0.57
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.				
Commercial	Shopping Center (820)	34%	4.09	2.70
Industrial/Business Park	Business Park (770)	0%	1.22	1.22
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse[3]	High-Cube Transload, Fulfilment Center, Parcel Hub, Cold Storage Warehouse (154, 155, 156, 157)	0%	0.32	0.32

[1] Percent of total trips. A pass-by trip is made as an intermediate stop on the way from an origin to a primary trip destination without a route diversion. Pass-by trips are not considered to add traffic to the road network. Assumption based on ITE Trip Generation Handbook data.
[2] Trips per dwelling unit or per 1,000 building square feet.
[3] Average trip rate for all high-cube warehouse uses identified in ITE Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition.

Sources: Institute of Traffic Engineers, Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition; Institute of Traffic Engineers, Trip Generation Handbook 3rd Edition; Willdan Financial Services.

Trip Growth

The planning horizon for this analysis is ~~2040.~~General Plan buildout. **Table 8.2** lists the 2023 and ~~2040~~buildout land use assumptions used in this study. The trip demand factors calculated in Table 8.1 are multiplied by the existing and future dwelling units and building square feet to determine the increase in trips caused by new development.

Table 8.2: Land Use Scenario and Total Trips

Land Use	Trip Demand Factor	2023 Units / 1,000 SF	2023 Trips	Growth 2023 to 2040 Units / 1,000 SF	Growth 2023 to 2040 Trips	Total - 2040 Units / 1,000 SF	Total - 2040 Trips
Residential - per Dwelling Unit							
Single Family	0.99	16,583	16,417	2,425	2,401	19,008	18,818
Multifamily	0.57	2,136	1,218	4,403	2,509	6,539	3,727
Subtotal		18,719	17,635	6,828	4,910	25,547	22,545
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.							
Commercial	2.70	1,792	4,840	4,052	10,939	5,844	15,779
Office	1.22	352	430	376	458	728	888
Industrial	0.71	1,511	1,073	7,962	5,653	9,473	6,726
Subtotal		3,656	6,343	12,389	17,050	16,045	23,393
Total			23,978		21,960		45,938
			52.2%		47.8%		100%

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 8.1.

Land Use	Trip Demand Factor	2023 Units / 1,000 SF	2023 Trips	Buildout Units / 1,000 SF	Buildout Trips	Total - Buildout Units / 1,000 SF	Total - Buildout Trips
Residential - per Dwelling Unit							
Single Family	0.99	16,583	16,417	6,498	6,433	23,081	22,850
Multifamily	0.57	2,136	1,218	5,804	3,308	7,940	4,526
Subtotal		18,719	17,635	12,302	9,741	31,021	27,376
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.							
Commercial	2.70	1,792	4,840	5,304	14,320	7,096	19,160
Industrial/Business Park	1.22	352	430	532	649	884	1,079
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	0.32	1,511	484	9,991	3,197	11,502	3,681
Subtotal		3,656	5,754	15,827	18,166	19,483	23,920
Total			23,389		27,907		51,296
			45.6%		54.4%		100%

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 8.1.

Project Costs

Cost estimates are summarized in **Table 8.3** and were sourced from the City's CIP. Any funding that has been identified for these projects is netted out of the total cost. The net costs are allocated to new development proportionally to new development's share of trip demand at the planning horizon as calculated in Table 8.2 (~~47.8~~54.4%). Allocating this amount of costs to the impact fee ensures that new development will not fund more than its proportional share of transportation facilities demand.

Table 8.3: Planned Facilities

Project No.	Project Title	Total Project Cost	Less Alternative Funding	Net Project Cost	Allocation to New Development	Cost Allocated to New Development
Streets and Bridges						
2019-009	2nd Street Extension Feasibility / Design	$ 200,000	$ -	$ 200,000	47.8%	$ 95,600
R-01	Oak Valley Pkwy Expansion I10-Desert Lawn Phase 2	600,000	-	600,000	47.8%	286,800
R-12	2nd Street Extension Construction	4,800,000	-	4,800,000	47.8%	2,294,400
2016-003	Potrero Interchange- Phase II	72,546,000	54,000,000	18,546,000	47.8%	8,864,988
2017-027	Oak Valley/I-10 Interchange Design	85,000,000	11,660,000	73,340,000	47.8%	35,056,520
2017-001	Pennsylvania Interchange	85,000,000	-	85,000,000	47.8%	40,630,000
R-37	Beaumont Avenue/ I-10 Interchange Project	125,000,000	5,869,000	119,131,000	47.8%	56,944,618
	Highland Springs (Beaumont Share)	60,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	47.8%	14,340,000
Subtotal		$ 433,146,000	$ 101,529,000	$ 331,617,000		$ 158,512,926
Traffic Signals						
R-02	Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade & Capacity Improvement Phase 1	$ 150,000	$ -	$ 150,000	47.8%	$ 71,700
R-11	Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade & Capacity Improvement Phase 2	150,000	-	150,000	47.8%	71,700
R-13	Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade & Capacity Improvement Phase 3	274,400	-	274,400	47.8%	131,163
R25-03	Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade & Capacity Improvement FY25	150,000	-	150,000	47.8%	71,700
R26-03	Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade & Capacity Improvement FY26	150,000	-	150,000	47.8%	71,700
R27-03	Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade & Capacity Improvement FY27	150,000	-	150,000	47.8%	71,700
R28-03	Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade & Capacity Improvement FY28	150,000	-	150,000	47.8%	71,700
R-34	Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade & Capacity Improvement FY24	150,000	-	150,000	47.8%	71,700
Subtotal		$ 1,324,400	$ -	$ 1,324,400		$ 633,063
Railroad						
2017-012	Pennsylvania Ave/UPR Grade Separation	$ 73,700,000	$ 8,678,556	$ 65,021,444	47.8%	$ 31,080,250
	California URP Grade Separation[1]	100,000,000	70,000,000	30,000,000	47.8%	14,340,000
Subtotal		$ 173,700,000	$ 78,678,556	$ 95,021,444		$ 45,420,250

[1] Assumes 70% of this project will be funded with grants.

Source: City of Beaumont Master CIP; Table 8.2, Willdan Financial Services.

Project No.	Project Title	Total Project Cost	Less Alternative Funding	Net Project Cost	Allocation to New Development	Cost Allocated to New Development
Streets and Bridges						
R-01	Oak Valley Pkwy Expansion I10-Desert Lawn Phase 2	$ 600,000	$ -	$ 600,000	54.4%	$ 326,400
R-12	2nd Street Extension Construction	4,800,000	-	4,800,000	54.4%	2,611,200
2017-027	Oak Valley/I-10 Interchange Design	85,000,000	11,660,000	73,340,000	54.4%	39,896,960
2017-001	Pennsylvania Interchange	85,000,000	-	85,000,000	54.4%	46,240,000
R-37	Beaumont Avenue/ I-10 Interchange Project	125,000,000	5,869,000	119,131,000	54.4%	64,807,264
	Highland Springs (Beaumont Share)	60,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	54.4%	16,320,000
R-02	Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade & Capacity Improvement Phase 1	150,000	-	150,000	54.4%	81,600
R-11	Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade & Capacity Improvement Phase 2	150,000	-	150,000	54.4%	81,600
R-13	Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade & Capacity Improvement Phase 3	274,400	-	274,400	54.4%	149,274
R25-03	Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade & Capacity Improvement FY25	150,000	-	150,000	54.4%	81,600
R26-03	Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade & Capacity Improvement FY26	150,000	-	150,000	54.4%	81,600
R27-03	Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade & Capacity Improvement FY27	150,000	-	150,000	54.4%	81,600
R28-03	Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade & Capacity Improvement FY28	150,000	-	150,000	54.4%	81,600
R-34	Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade & Capacity Improvement FY24	150,000	-	150,000	54.4%	81,600
	Traffic Signal Installation at Future Location	600,000	-	600,000	54.4%	326,400
	Traffic Signal Installation at Future Location	600,000	-	600,000	54.4%	326,400
	Traffic Signal Installation at Future Location	600,000	-	600,000	54.4%	326,400
	Citywide Traffic Signal System Upgrade	2,000,000	-	2,000,000	54.4%	1,088,000
Subtotal		$ 365,524,400	$ 47,529,000	$ 317,995,400		$ 172,989,498
Railroad						
2017-012	Pennsylvania Ave/UPR Grade Separation	$ 73,700,000	$ 8,678,556	$ 65,021,444	54.4%	$ 35,371,666
	California URP Grade Separation[1]	100,000,000	70,000,000	30,000,000	54.4%	16,320,000
Subtotal		$ 173,700,000	$ 78,678,556	$ 95,021,444		$ 51,691,666

[1] Assumes 70% of this project will be funded with grants.

Source: City of Beaumont Master CIP; Table 8.2, Willdan Financial Services.

Fee per Trip Demand Unit

Every impact fee consists of a dollar amount, or the cost of projects that can be funded by a fee, divided by a measure of development. In this case, all fees are first calculated as a cost per trip demand unit. Then these amounts are translated into housing unit (cost per dwelling unit) and employment space (cost per 1,000 building square feet) by multiplying the cost per trip by the trip generation rate for each land use category. These amounts become the fee schedule.

Table 8.4 calculates the cost the cost per trip demand unit by dividing the total project costs attributable to new development by transportation fee category summarized in Table 8.3, by the total growth in trips calculated in Table 8.2. ~~Note that the traffic signals impact fee fund balances are sufficient to fund the allocated share of project costs. No fee is calculated for this category.~~

Table 8.4: Cost per Trip to Accommodate Growth

	Road and Bridge	Traffic Signals	Railroad Crossings
Costs Allocated to New Development	$ 158,512,926	$ 633,063	$ 45,420,250
Les Existing Fund Balance	12,090,363	1,371,766	2,809,846
Net Costs Allocated to New Development	$ 146,422,563	$ -	$ 42,610,404
Growth in Trip Demand (2023 to 2040)	21,960	21,960	21,960
Cost per Trip	$ 6,668	$ -	$ 1,940

Sources: Tables 8.2 and 8.3.

	Streets and Bridges	Railroad Crossings
Costs Allocated to New Development	$ 172,989,498	$ 51,691,666
Less Existing Fund Balance[1]	13,462,129	2,809,846
Net Costs Allocated to New Development	$ 159,527,369	$ 48,881,819
Growth in Trip Demand (2023 to Buildout)	27,907	27,907
Cost per Trip	$ 5,716	$ 1,752

[1] Fund balance shown for streets and bridges fee includes $12,090,363 from the streets and bridges impact fee fund and $1,371,766 from the traffic signals impact fee fund. These fund balances must be spent on the purpose they were collected for. Going forward a new streets and bridges fund will be established that will include traffic signals costs. Fee revenue deposited in that fund can be spent on the streets and bridges projects listed in Table 8.3.

Sources: Tables 8.2 and 8.3.

Fee Schedule

Table 8.5 shows the maximum justified transportation fee schedule, be fee component. The maximum justified fees are based on the costs per trip shown in Table 8.4. The cost per trip is multiplied by the trip demand factors in Table 8.1 to determine a fee per unit of new development. The fee per average sized dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit.

The total fee includes a one percent (1%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: ~~a standard overhead charge applied to all City programs for~~ (1) legal, accounting, and other ~~departmental and~~ administrative support~~,~~ and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue~~,~~ and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

~~In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, one percent~~ See the *Administrative Costs* section of ~~the base fee adequately covers the cost~~Chapter 1 for a discussion of ~~fee program administration. Impact fee program costs typically range from one percent to two percent of collected fee revenue. To be conservative, and to align with the City's current practice,~~ this ~~study uses one percent to calculate the administrative charge~~assumption.

Table 8.5: Transportation Facilities Impact Fee Schedule

Land Use	A Cost Per Trip	B Trip Demand Factor	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.01 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee[1]	E / 1,000 Fee per Sq. Ft.
Road and Bridge						
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 6,668	0.72	$ 4,801	$ 48	$ 4,849	$ 1.80
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 6,668	2.70	$ 18,004	$ 180	$ 18,184	$ 18.18
Industrial/Business Park	6,668	1.22	8,135	81	8,216	8.22
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	6,668	0.71	4,734	47	4,781	4.78
Railroad Crossings						
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 1,940	0.72	$ 1,397	$ 14	$ 1,411	$ 0.53
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 1,940	2.70	$ 5,238	$ 52	$ 5,290	$ 5.29
Industrial/Business Park	1,940	1.22	2,367	24	2,391	2.39
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	1,940	0.71	1,377	14	1,391	1.39

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential.

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

[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.

[4] Average trip demand factor per residential dwelling unit weighted by projected single family and multifamily development.

Sources: Tables 8.1 and 8.4.

Land Use	A Cost Per Trip	B Trip Demand Factor	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.01 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee[1]	E / 1,000 Fee per Sq. Ft.
Streets and Bridges						
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 5,716	0.79	$ 4,516	$ 45	$ 4,561	$ 1.70
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 5,716	2.70	$ 15,433	$ 154	$ 15,587	$ 15.59
Industrial/Business Park	5,716	1.22	6,974	70	7,044	7.04
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	5,716	0.32	1,829	18	1,847	1.85
Railroad Crossings						
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 1,752	0.79	$ 1,384	$ 14	$ 1,398	$ 0.52
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 1,752	2.70	$ 4,730	$ 47	$ 4,777	$ 4.78
Industrial/Business Park	1,752	1.22	2,137	21	2,158	2.16
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	1,752	0.32	561	6	567	0.57

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential.

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

[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.

[4] Average trip demand factor per residential dwelling unit weighted by projected single family and multifamily development.

Sources: Tables 8.1 and 8.4.

9. Sewer Facilities

This chapter details an analysis of the need for sewer facilities to accommodate growth within the City of Beaumont. The projects and associated costs in this chapter were identified in the City's Wastewater Master Plan (2021). The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for sewer facilities from the projected increase sewer flow and the additional sewer facilities needed to meet those convey that flow to the City's wastewater treatment plant. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the amount of wastewater flow generated by residential and nonresidential land uses.

Sewer Demand

Estimates of new development and its consequent increased sewer demand provide the basis for calculating the sewer facilities fee. The need for sewer facilities improvements is based on the sewer demand placed on the system by development. A typical measure of demand is a flow generation rate, expressed as the number of gallons per day generated by a specific type of land use. Flow generation rates are a reasonable measure of demand on the City's system of sewer improvements because they represent the average rate of demand that will be placed on the system per land use designation.

Table 9.1 shows the calculation of equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) demand factors based on flow generation by land use category. The flow generation estimates based on data from the City's Wastewater Master Plan. EDU factors express water flow from each land use in terms of the flow generated by a single family dwelling unit. Use of EDU factors to estimate demand and allocate fees ensures that the fees are roughly proportional to the sewer demand generated by each unit of new development.

Table 9.1: Sewer Demand by Land Use

Land Use Type	Flow Generation[1]	Density[2]	Average Flow Generation per DU or 1,000 Sq. Ft.	Equivalent Dwelling Unit (EDU)
Residential Dwelling Unit				
Single Family			235.00	1.00
Multifamily	2,609	17.00	153.47	0.65
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.				
Commercial	1,175	32.67	35.97	0.15
Industrial/Business Park	1,175	43.56	26.97	0.11
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	1,763	32.67	53.96	0.23

[1] Gallons per acre per day.

[2] Units per acre for residential or 1,000 square feet per acre for nonresidential. Residential and nonresidential densities are based on typical densities for each land use from the General Plan. Nonresidential densities are based on floor-area-ratios of 0.75 for commercial, 1.0 for industrial/business park and 0.75 for industrial/warehouse.

Sources: Beaumont Wastewater Master Plan, 2021; Willdan Financial Services.

EDU Generation by New Development

Table 9.2 shows the estimated EDU generation from new development through ~~2040~~buildout. The EDU factors from Table 9.1 are multiplied by the land use assumptions from Table 2.1 to estimate total EDUs in the base year, at the planning horizon and for new development. New development will generate approximately ~~7,767~~13,422 new EDUs through ~~2040~~buildout, comprising ~~29.4~~41.9% of sewer demand in the City at that time.

Table 9.2: Sewer Facilities Equivalent Dwelling Units

Land Use	EDU Factor	2023 Units / 1,000 SF	2023 EDUs	Growth 2023 to 2040 Units / 1,000 SF	Growth 2023 to 2040 EDUs	Total - 2040 Units / 1,000 SF	Total - 2040 EDUs
Residential - per Dwelling Unit							
Single Family	1.00	16,583	16,583	2,425	2,425	19,008	19,008
Multifamily	0.65	2,136	1,388	4,403	2,862	6,539	4,250
Subtotal		18,719	17,971	6,828	5,287	25,547	23,258
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.							
Commercial	0.15	1,792	269	4,052	608	5,844	877
Office	0.11	352	39	376	41	728	80
Industrial	0.23	1,511	348	7,962	1,831	9,473	2,179
Subtotal		3,656	656	12,389	2,480	16,045	3,136
Total			18,627		7,767		26,394
			70.6%		29.4%		100%

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 9.1.

Land Use	EDU Factor	2023 Units / 1,000 SF	2023 EDUs	Buildout Units / 1,000 SF	Buildout EDUs	Total - Buildout Units / 1,000 SF	Total - Buildout EDUs
Residential - per Dwelling Unit							
Single Family	1.00	16,583	16,583	6,498	6,498	23,081	23,081
Multifamily	0.65	2,136	1,388	5,804	3,773	7,940	5,161
Subtotal		18,719	17,971	12,302	10,271	31,021	28,242
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.							
Commercial	0.15	1,792	269	5,304	795	7,096	1,064
Office	0.11	352	39	532	58	884	97
Industrial	0.23	1,511	348	9,991	2,298	11,502	2,646
Subtotal		3,656	656	15,827	3,151	19,483	3,807
Total			18,627		13,422		32,049
			58.1%		41.9%		100%

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 9.1.

Facility Needs and Costs

Table 9.3 identifies the planned sewer facilities to be funded by the fee. The new sewer facilities were all identified in the City's 2021 Wastewater Master Plan. Since sewer facilities projects will benefit both existing development and new development, capacity expanding projects are allocated to new development based on new development's share of sewer demand at the planning horizon. Projects that do not expand capacity are not allocated to the impact fee.

Table 9.3: Sewer Facilities Allocation to New Development

Improv. No.	Type of Improvement	Existing Diameter (in)	New/ Replace	Capital Improvement Cost ($)	Allocation to Dew Development	Cost Allocated to Existing Development	Cost Allocated to New Development
Lower Oak Valley Lift Station Tributary Area							
LOV-P1	Future Capacity Increase	15	Replace	$ 202,500	100%	$ -	$ 202,500
LOV-LS	Lift Station Replacement	-	Replace	2,003,600	0%	2,003,600	-
Subtotal				$ 2,206,100		$ 2,003,600	$ 202,500
Tukwet Canyon (New) Lift Station Tributary Area							
TC-FM1	New Force Main	-	New	$ 2,578,300	100%	$ -	$ 2,578,300
TC-FM2	New Force Main	-	New	2,578,300	100%	-	2,578,300
TC-LS	New Lift Station	-	New	1,404,000	100%	-	1,404,000
Subtotal				$ 6,560,600		$ -	$ 6,560,600
Upper Oak Valley Lift Station Tributary Area							
UOV-P1	Future Capacity Increase	8	Replace	$ 109,200	100%	$ -	$ 109,200
~~UOV-P2~~	~~Existing Capacity Deficiency~~	~~8~~	~~Replace~~	~~97,400~~	~~0%~~	~~97,400~~	~~-~~
UOV-P3	Future Capacity Increase	12	Replace	898,300	100%	-	898,300
UOV-LS	Lift Station Replacement	-	Replace	5,449,800	0%	5,449,800	-
Subtotal				$ 6,554,700		$ 5,547,200	$ 1,007,500
Olivewood Lift Station Tributary Area							
O-P1	Future Capacity Increase	10	Replace	$ 170,300	100%	$ -	$ 170,300
O-LS	Lift Station Replacement	-	Replace	1,540,800	0%	1,540,800	-
FM-1	Oak ValleyBlvd Embankment Stabilization			780,000	0%	780,000	-
Subtotal				$ 2,491,100		$ 2,320,800	$ 170,300
Brookside Avenue (New) Lift Station Tributary Area							
BR-P1	New Capacity	-	New	$ 656,400	100%	$ -	$ 656,400
BR-FM1	New Force Main	-	New	951,500	100%	-	951,500
BR-LS	New Lift Station	-	New	1,005,300	100%	-	1,005,300
Subtotal				$ 2,613,200		$ -	$ 2,613,200

Sources: City of Beaumont Wastew ater Master Plan, 2021; City of Beaumont.

Table 9.3: Sewer Facilities Projects and Allocation to New Development Continued

Improv. No.	Type of Improvement	Existing Diameter (in)	New/ Replace	Capital Improvement Cost ($)	Allocation to Dew Development	Cost Allocated to Existing Development	Cost Allocated to New Development
Beaumont Mesa Lift Station Tributary Area							
BM-P1	New Capacity	-	New	$ 768,200	100%	$ -	$ 768,200
BM-P2	New Capacity	-	New	498,700	100%	-	498,700
BM-P3	New Capacity	-	New	844,400	100%	-	844,400
BM-FM1	Force Main Design and Pump Design	-	New	450,000	100%	-	450,000
BM-FM1	New Force Main	-	New	4,000,000	100%	-	4,000,000
BM-LS	Pump Replacement/Addition Construction	-	New	750,000	100%	-	750,000
BM-WW	Wet Well Design	-	New	400,000	100%	-	400,000
BM-WW	New Wet Well	-	New	4,000,000	100%	-	4,000,000
Subtotal				$ 11,711,300		$ -	$ 11,711,300
Beaumont Crossroads (New) Lift Station Tributary Area							
BC-P1	New Capacity	-	New	$ 1,122,900	100%	$ -	$ 1,122,900
BC-P2	New Capacity	-	New	680,900	100%	-	680,900
BC-P3	New Capacity	-	New	134,900	100%	-	134,900
BC-P4	New Capacity	-	New	558,800	100%	-	558,800
BC-P5	New Capacity	-	New	413,100	100%	-	413,100
BC-FM1	New Force Main	-	New	5,378,500	100%	-	5,378,500
BC-FM2	New Force Main	-	New	3,090,000	100%	-	3,090,000
BC-LS	New Lift Station	-	New	7,099,100	100%	-	7,099,100
Subtotal				$ 18,478,200		$ -	$ 18,478,200
Marshall Creek Lift Station Tributary Area							
MC-LS	Lift Station Replacement	-	Replace	$ 3,331,200	0%	$ 3,331,200	$ -
Industrial Park Lift Station Tributary Area							
IP-P1	Future Capacity Increase	8	Replace	$ 148,100	100%	$ -	$ 148,100
IP-P2	Future Capacity Increase	8	Replace	148,100	100%	-	148,100
IP-LS	Lift Station Replacement	-	Replace	1,005,300	0%	1,005,300	-
Subtotal				$ 1,301,500		$ 1,005,300	$ 296,200

Sources: City of Beaumont Wastew ater Master Plan, 2021; City of Beaumont.

Table 9.3: Sewer Facilities Projects and Allocation to New Development Continued

Improv. No.	Type of Improvement	Existing Diameter (in)	New/ Replace	Capital Improvement Cost ($)	Allocation to Dew Development	Cost Allocated to Existing Development	Cost Allocated to New Development
Wastewater Treatment Plant							
WWTP-P1	Future Capacity Increase	12	Replace	$ 138,000	100%	$ -	$ 138,000
WWTP-P2	Existing Capacity Deficiency	12	Replace	206,700	0%	206,700	-
WWTP-P3	Future Capacity Increase	12	Replace	138,000	100%	-	138,000
WWTP-P4	Future Capacity Increase	24	Replace	924,000	100%	-	924,000
WWTP-P5	Future Capacity Increase	30	Replace	992,500	100%	-	992,500
WWTP-P6	New Capacity	-	New	1,256,400	100%	-	1,256,400
WWTP-P7	Future Capacity Increase	-	New	467,100	100%	-	467,100
WWTP-P8	Future Capacity Increase	8	Replace	952,200	100%	-	952,200
WWTP-P9	Future Capacity Increase	8	Replace	970,100	100%	-	970,100
WWTP-P1-	Future Capacity Increase	8	Replace	952,200	100%	-	952,200
WWTP-P11	Future Capacity Increase	8	Replace	961,300	100%	-	961,300
WWTP-P12	Future Capacity Increase	10	Replace	611,000	100%	-	611,000
WWTP-P13	Future Capacity Increase	12	Replace	1,320,500	100%	-	1,320,500
WWTP-P14	Future Capacity Increase	12	Replace	422,300	100%	-	422,300
~~WWTP-P15~~	~~Future Capacity Increase~~	~~15~~	~~Replace~~	~~269,800~~	~~100%~~	~~-~~	~~269,800~~
WWTP-P16	Future Capacity Increase	18	Replace	602,100	100%	-	602,100
WWTP-P17	Future Capacity Increase	18	Replace	3,120,600	100%	-	3,120,600
WWTP-P18	Future Capacity Increase	10	Replace	39,000	100%	-	39,000
WWTP-P19	Future Capacity Increase	10	Replace	54,600	100%	-	54,600
WWTP-P2-	Future Capacity Increase	12	Replace	916,300	100%	-	916,300
WWTP-P21	Future Capacity Increase	24	Replace	1,314,100	100%	-	1,314,100
WWTP-P22	Future Capacity Increase	30	Replace	2,219,700	100%	-	2,219,700
WWTP-P23	Future Capacity Increase	30	Replace	600,600	100%	-	600,600
WWTP-P24	Future Capacity Increase	30	Replace	1,149,000	100%	-	1,149,000
WWTP-P25	New Capacity	-	New	1,277,300	100%	-	1,277,300
	Aeration Basin No. 5 Future Capacity Increase		New	1,400,000	100%	-	1,400,000
	Fine Screens Basin Facility Future Capacity Increase		New	600,000	100%	-	600,000
	Centrifuge Future Capacity Increase		New	1,500,000	100%	-	1,500,000
	Membrane Future Capacity Increase		New	1,500,000	100%	-	1,500,000
	R/O Rack Future Capacity Increase		New	1,500,000	100%	-	1,500,000
	OCSD Capacity Fee Increase		New	743,000	100%	-	743,000
	Future Storage Building		New	450,000	29.4%	317,700	132,300
Subtotal				$ 29,568,400		$ 524,400	$ 29,044,000

Sources: City of Beaumont Wastew ater Master Plan, 2021; City of Beaumont.

Table 9.3: Sewer Facilities Projects and Allocation to New Development Continued

Improv. No.	Type of Improvement	Existing Diameter (in)	New/ Replace	Capital Improvement Cost ($)	Allocation to Dew Development	Cost Allocated to Existing Development	Cost Allocated to New Development
Four Seasons Lift Station Tributary Area							
FS-P1	Future Capacity Increase	10	Replace	$ 397,300	100%	$ -	$ 397,300
FS-P2	Future Capacity Increase	10	Replace	210,900	100%	-	210,900
FS-P3	Future Capacity Increase	12	Replace	305,500	100%	-	305,500
FS-P4	Pipe Slope Reconstruction	12	Replace	32,500	0%	32,500	-
FS-P5	Future Capacity Increase	15	Replace	587,600	100%	-	587,600
FS-P6	Future Capacity Increase	10	Replace	23,400	100%	-	23,400
FS-LS	Lift Station Replacement	-	Replace	3,941,100	0%	3,941,100	-
Subtotal				$ 5,498,300		$ 3,973,600	$ 1,524,700
Gravity Portion of Wastewater Collection System							
	S. Beaumont Ave South Future Gravity Ma	21	New	$ 350,000	100%	$ -	$ 350,000
	S. California Ave South Future Gravity Mai	12	New	250,000	100%	-	250,000
	S. Veile Ave Future Gravity Main	12	New	150,000	100%	-	150,000
	S. Olive Ave Future Gravity Main	12	New	75,000	100%	-	75,000
	Oak Valley Parkway Gravity Main Capacit	12	Replace	100,000	100%	-	100,000
	Orange St Future Gravity Main	15	New	140,000	100%	-	140,000
	Brookside Ave Future Gravity Main	15	New	300,000	100%	-	300,000
	Oak Valley Pkwy (II-10 to Desert Lawn) Fu	12	New	150,000	100%	-	150,000
	E. Desert Lawn Future Gravity Main	8	New	50,000	100%	-	50,000
Subtotal				$ 1,565,000		$ -	$ 1,565,000
Mobile Equipment							
	Combination Vacuum Truck with Overhead Boom		New	$ 750,000	100%	$ -	$ 750,000
	Chase pickup truck outfitted with underground equipmer		New	60,000	100%	-	60,000
Subtotal				$ 810,000		$ -	$ 810,000
Other Wastewater System Improvements							
Lift Station Condition Assessment				$ 3,600,000	0%	$ 3,600,000	$ -
CCTV Program				300,000	0%	300,000	-
On-going Pipeline Replacement Program				4,800,000	0%	4,800,000	-
Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvements				2,000,000	0%	2,000,000	-
Future WWTP Energy Cost Reduction Program				1,500,000	0%	1,500,000	-
Subtotal				$ 12,200,000		$ 12,200,000	$ -
Total				$ 104,889,600		$ 30,906,100	$ 73,983,500

Sources: City of Beaumont Wastew ater Master Plan, 2021; City of Beaumont.

Improv. No.	Type of Improvement	Existing Diameter (in)	New/ Replace	Capital Improvement Cost ($)	Allocation to Dew Development	Cost Allocated to Existing Development	Cost Allocated to New Development
Lower Oak Valley Lift Station Tributary Area							
LOV-P1	Future Capacity Increase	15	Replace	$ 202,500	100%	$ -	$ 202,500
LOV-LS	Lift Station Replacement	-	Replace	2,003,600	0%	2,003,600	-
Subtotal				$ 2,206,100		$ 2,003,600	$ 202,500
Tukwet Canyon (New) Lift Station Tributary Area							
TC-FM1	New Force Main	-	New	$ 2,578,300	100%	$ -	$ 2,578,300
TC-FM2	New Force Main	-	New	2,578,300	100%	-	2,578,300
TC-LS	New Lift Station	-	New	1,404,000	100%	-	1,404,000
Subtotal				$ 6,560,600		$ -	$ 6,560,600
Upper Oak Valley Lift Station Tributary Area							
UOV-P1	Future Capacity Increase	8	Replace	$ 109,200	100%	$ -	$ 109,200
UOV-P2	Existing Capacity Deficiency	8	Replace	97,400	0%	97,400	-
UOV-P3	Future Capacity Increase	12	Replace	898,300	100%	-	898,300
UOV-LS	Lift Station Replacement	-	Replace	5,449,800	0%	5,449,800	-
Subtotal				$ 6,554,700		$ 5,547,200	$ 1,007,500
Olivewood Lift Station Tributary Area							
O-P1	Future Capacity Increase	10	Replace	$ 170,300	100%	$ -	$ 170,300
O-LS	Lift Station Replacement	-	Replace	1,540,800	0%	1,540,800	-
FM-1	Oak ValleyBlvd Embankment Stabilization			780,000	0%	780,000	-
Subtotal				$ 2,491,100		$ 2,320,800	$ 170,300
Brookside Avenue (New) Lift Station Tributary Area							
BR-P1	New Capacity	-	New	$ 656,400	100%	$ -	$ 656,400
BR-FM1	New Force Main	-	New	951,500	100%	-	951,500
BR-LS	New Lift Station	-	New	1,005,300	100%	-	1,005,300
Subtotal				$ 2,613,200		$ -	$ 2,613,200

Sources: City of Beaumont Wastew ater Master Plan, 2021; City of Beaumont.

Table 9.3: Sewer Facilities Projects and Allocation to New Development Continued

Improv. No.	Type of Improvement	Existing Diameter (in)	New/ Replace	Capital Improvement Cost ($)	Allocation to Dew Development	Cost Allocated to Existing Development	Cost Allocated to New Development
Beaumont Mesa Lift Station Tributary Area							
BM-P1	New Capacity	-	New	$ 768,200	100%	$ -	$ 768,200
BM-P2	New Capacity	-	New	498,700	100%	-	498,700
BM-P3	New Capacity	-	New	844,400	100%	-	844,400
BM-FM1	Force Main Design and Pump Design	-	New	450,000	100%	-	450,000
BM-FM1	New Force Main	-	New	4,000,000	100%	-	4,000,000
BM-LS	Pump Replacement/Addition Construction	-	New	750,000	100%	-	750,000
BM-WW	Wet Well Design	-	New	400,000	100%	-	400,000
BM-WW	New Wet Well	-	New	4,000,000	100%	-	4,000,000
Subtotal				$ 11,711,300		$ -	$ 11,711,300
Beaumont Crossroads (New) Lift Station Tributary Area							
BC-P1	New Capacity	-	New	$ 1,122,900	100%	$ -	$ 1,122,900
Subtotal				$ 1,122,900		$ -	$ 1,122,900
Marshall Creek Lift Station Tributary Area							
MC-LS	Lift Station Replacement	-	Replace	$ 3,331,200	0%	$ 3,331,200	$ -
Industrial Park Lift Station Tributary Area							
IP-P1	Future Capacity Increase	8	Replace	$ 148,100	100%	$ -	$ 148,100
IP-P2	Future Capacity Increase	8	Replace	148,100	100%	-	148,100
IP-LS	Lift Station Replacement	-	Replace	1,005,300	0%	1,005,300	-
Subtotal				$ 1,301,500		$ 1,005,300	$ 296,200

Sources: City of Beaumont Wastew ater Master Plan, 2021; City of Beaumont.

Table 9.3: Sewer Facilities Projects and Allocation to New Development Continued

Improv. No.	Type of Improvement	Existing Diameter (in)	New/ Replace	Capital Improvement Cost ($)	Allocation to Dew Development	Cost Allocated to Existing Development	Cost Allocated to New Development
Wastewater Treatment Plant							
WWTP-P1	Future Capacity Increase	12	Replace	$ 138,000	100%	$ -	$ 138,000
WWTP-P2	Existing Capacity Deficiency	12	Replace	206,700	0%	206,700	-
WWTP-P3	Future Capacity Increase	12	Replace	138,000	100%	-	138,000
WWTP-P4	Future Capacity Increase	24	Replace	924,000	100%	-	924,000
WWTP-P5	Future Capacity Increase	30	Replace	992,500	100%	-	992,500
WWTP-P18	Future Capacity Increase	10	Replace	39,000	100%	-	39,000
WWTP-P19	Future Capacity Increase	10	Replace	54,600	100%	-	54,600
WWTP-P2-	Future Capacity Increase	12	Replace	916,300	100%	-	916,300
WWTP-P21	Future Capacity Increase	24	Replace	1,314,100	100%	-	1,314,100
	Aeration Basin No. 5 Future Capacity Increase		New	1,400,000	100%	-	1,400,000
	Fine Screens Basin Facility Future Capacity Increase		New	600,000	100%	-	600,000
	Centrifuge Future Capacity Increase		New	1,500,000	100%	-	1,500,000
	Membrane Future Capacity Increase		New	1,500,000	100%	-	1,500,000
	R/O Rack Future Capacity Increase		New	1,500,000	100%	-	1,500,000
	OCSD Capacity Fee Increase		New	743,000	100%	-	743,000
	Future Storage Building		New	450,000	41.9%	261,450	188,550
Subtotal				$ 12,416,200		$ 468,150	$ 11,948,050
Four Seasons Lift Station Tributary Area							
FS-P1	Future Capacity Increase	10	Replace	$ 397,300	100%	$ -	$ 397,300
FS-P2	Future Capacity Increase	10	Replace	210,900	100%	-	210,900
FS-P3	Future Capacity Increase	12	Replace	305,500	100%	-	305,500
FS-P4	Pipe Slope Reconstruction	12	Replace	32,500	0%	32,500	-
FS-P5	Future Capacity Increase	15	Replace	587,600	100%	-	587,600
FS-P6	Future Capacity Increase	10	Replace	23,400	100%	-	23,400
FS-LS	Lift Station Replacement	-	Replace	3,941,100	0%	3,941,100	-
Subtotal				$ 5,498,300		$ 3,973,600	$ 1,524,700

Sources: City of Beaumont Wastew ater Master Plan, 2021; City of Beaumont.

Table 9.3: Sewer Facilities Projects and Allocation to New Development Continued

Improv. No.	Type of Improvement	Existing Diameter (in)	New/ Replace	Capital Improvement Cost ($)	Allocation to Dew Development	Cost Allocated to Existing Development	Cost Allocated to New Development
Gravity Portion of Wastewater Collection System							
	S. Beaumont Ave South Future Gravity Ma	21	New	$ 350,000	100%	$ -	$ 350,000
	S. California Ave South Future Gravity Mai	12	New	250,000	100%	-	250,000
	S. Veile Ave Future Gravity Main	12	New	150,000	100%	-	150,000
	S. Olive Ave Future Gravity Main	12	New	75,000	100%	-	75,000
	Oak Valley Parkway Gravity Main Capacit	12	Replace	100,000	100%	-	100,000
	Orange St Future Gravity Main	15	New	140,000	100%	-	140,000
	Brookside Ave Future Gravity Main	15	New	300,000	100%	-	300,000
	Oak Valley Pkwy (II-10 to Desert Lawn) Fu	12	New	150,000	100%	-	150,000
	E. Desert Lawn Future Gravity Main	8	New	50,000	100%	-	50,000
Subtotal				$ 1,565,000		$ -	$ 1,565,000
Mobile Equipment							
	Combination Vacuum Truck with Overhead Boom		New	$ 750,000	100%	$ -	$ 750,000
	Chase pickup truck outfitted with underground equipmer		New	60,000	100%	-	60,000
Subtotal				$ 810,000		$ -	$ 810,000
Other Wastewater System Improvements							
Lift Station Condition Assessment				$ 3,600,000	0%	$ 3,600,000	$ -
CCTV Program				300,000	0%	300,000	-
On-going Pipeline Replacement Program				4,800,000	0%	4,800,000	-
Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvements				2,000,000	0%	2,000,000	-
Future WWTP Energy Cost Reduction Program				1,500,000	0%	1,500,000	-
Subtotal				$ 12,200,000		$ 12,200,000	$ -
Total				**$ 70,382,100**		**$ 30,849,850**	**$ 39,532,250**

Sources: City of Beaumont Wastew ater Master Plan, 2021; City of Beaumont.

Cost per EDU

The cost of planned facilities allocated to new development in Table 9.3 is divided by the total growth in EDUs to determine a cost per EDU. **Table 9.4** displays this calculation.

Table 9.4: Cost per EDU

Cost Allocated to New Development	$	73,983,500
Less WWTP Upgrades Needed After 2040[1]		5,125,136
Net Cost Allocated to New Development	$	68,858,364
Growth in EDUs (2023 to 2040)		7,767
Cost per EDU	$	8,866

[1] Excludes approximately 17.6% of WWTP capacity expansion costs, to conform with 2040 planning horizon as opposed to buildout sewer demands.

Sources: Tables 9.2 and 9.3.

Cost Allocated to New Development	$	39,532,250
Growth in EDUs (2023 to Buildout)		13,422
Cost per EDU	$	2,945

Sources: Tables 9.2 and 9.3.

Fee Schedule

The maximum justified fee for sewer facilities is shown in **The total** fee includes a one percent (1%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses. See the *Administrative Costs* section of Chapter 1 for a discussion of this assumption.

Table 9.5. The cost per EDU is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on the EDU factors shown in Table 9.1. The fee per average dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit.

The total fee includes ~~an~~a one percent (1%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) ~~a standard overhead charge applied to all City programs for~~ legal, accounting, and other ~~departmental and~~ administrative support~~,~~ and (2) ~~capital planning, programming, project management costs associated with the share of projects funded by the facilities fee, and (3) fee~~ impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

~~In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, one percent~~ See the *Administrative Costs* section of Chapter 1 for a discussion of ~~the base fee adequately covers the cost of fee program administration. Impact fee program costs typically range from one percent to two percent of~~

~~collected fee revenue. To be conservative, and to align with the City's current practice,~~ this ~~study uses one percent to calculate the administrative charge~~assumption.

Table 9.5: Maximum Justified Sewer Facilities Fee Schedule

	A	B	C = A x B	D = C x 0.01	E = C + D	E / Average
	Cost Per EDU	EDU Factor	Base Fee[1]	Admin Charge[1, 2]	Total Fee[1]	Fee per Sq. Ft.[3]
Residential Dwelling Unit[4]	$ 8,866	0.77	$ 6,827	$ 68	$ 6,895	$ 2.57
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 8,866	0.15	$ 1,330	$ 13	$ 1,343	$ 1.34
Industrial/Business Park	8,866	0.11	975	10	985	0.99
Industrial/High-Cube Ware	8,866	0.23	2,039	20	2,059	2.06

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.
[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.
[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.
[4] Average EDU factor per residential dwelling unit weighted by projected single family and multifamily development.

Sources: Tables 9.1 and 9.4.

	A	B	C = A x B	D = C x 0.01	E = C + D	E / Average
	Cost Per EDU	EDU Factor	Base Fee[1]	Admin Charge[1, 2]	Total Fee[1]	Fee per Sq. Ft.[3]
Residential Dwelling Unit[4]	$ 2,945	0.83	$ 2,444	$ 24	$ 2,468	$ 0.92
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 2,945	0.15	$ 442	$ 4	$ 446	$ 0.45
Industrial/Business Park	2,945	0.11	324	3	327	0.33
Industrial/High-Cube Ware	2,945	0.23	677	7	684	0.68

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.
[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.
[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.
[4] Average EDU factor per residential dwelling unit weighted by projected single family and multifamily development.

Sources: Tables 9.1 and 9.4.

10. Sewer Capacity

This chapter documents a reasonable relationship between new development and a sewer capacity charge to fund sewer facilities that serve new development. It uses a buy-in approach to allocating the cost of excess capacity in the system to new development. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for wastewater treatment from the projected increase in sewer flow and the excess capacity to process wastewater flow available at the City's wastewater treatment plant. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will buy-in to the excess capacity of the wastewater treatment plant at no more than the estimated reasonable cost of providing the service for which the fees are imposed, and the fees are scaled based on the amount of flow generated by residential and nonresidential land uses.

Current Demand for Wastewater Treatment

Table 10.1 displays the City's historical wastewater flows treated by the wastewater treatment plan. These flows indicate current demand for wastewater treatment.

Table 10.1: Historical Wastewater Flows

Month	2020 Influent Flows (MG)	2021 Influent Flows (MG)	2022 Influent Flows (MG)	2023 Influent Flows (MG)
January	115.48	119.25	115.92	127.55
February	109.10	106.17	104.04	108.70
March	121.41	127.61	115.00	124.02
April	119.38	115.07	108.38	117.48
May	118.31	122.10	112.94	122.31
June	114.27	123.06	111.60	120.06
July	121.43	132.62	113.38	125.56
August	113.80	101.28	116.88	127.45
September	121.26	107.70	95.59	121.02
October	125.89	118.18	98.23	122.64
November	115.72	115.72	107.53	120.43
December	118.24	119.09	119.75	128.18
Total Annual	1,414.27	1,407.84	1,319.25	1,465.40
Average per Day (MG)	3.87	3.86	3.61	4.01

Source: City of Beaumont.

Current Sewer System Asset Valuation

In this case, Replacement New Cost Less Depreciation (RCNLD) is the appropriate method to determine the current value of the sewer systems. RCNLD is a commonly used method, and it is often preferred to alternative methods such as Original Cost Less Depreciation (OCLD), Original Cost (OC), and Replacement Cost (RC) because of its better reflection of the system's value in

today dollars. Unless the systems have depreciated significantly due to lack of replacement and repair, RCNLD is more defensible because the replacement cost is inflation-adjusted to recover the cost of replacing that capacity in current dollars. RCNLD also accounts for depreciation and consequently address the fact that the system reflects its current condition.

Table 10.2 summarizes the City's current sewer system asset valuation, consistent with the asset valuation assumptions from its recently adopted 2024 Sewer Rate Study.

Table 10.2: Current Sewer System Asset Valuation

Asset Function	Original Cost	Original Cost Less Depreciation	Replacement Cost	Replacement Cost Less Depreciation
Treatment	$ 254,104,711	$ 225,417,691	$ 294,170,308	$ 246,207,054
Lift Stations	34,241,213	17,840,374	49,299,280	24,539,591
General	28,690,611	23,118,124	36,007,492	24,906,543
Land	2,002,560	2,002,560	2,278,393	2,278,393
Collection and Conveyance	141,085,109	58,167,402	262,543,603	105,248,515
Total	$ 460,124,203	$ 326,546,152	$ 644,299,076	$ 403,180,096

Source: City of Beaumont 2024 Sewer Rate Study.

Adjusted System Valuation

The City's sewer enterprise has over $79 million in outstanding debt principal. This amount represents debt that ratepayers will pay back through monthly service charges on an ongoing basis, so this amount is subtracted from total asset value in calculating the total to be recovered as a buy-in component. Subtracting the outstanding debt principal from the current asset valuation yields the total adjusted system value. This calculation is shown below in **Table 10.3.**

Table 10.3: Adjusted System Valuation Calculation

Asset Valuation	$ 403,180,096
Outstanding Debt Principal	79,060,000
Net Valuation	$ 324,120,096

Sources: City of Beaumont; Table 10.2, Willdan Financial Services.

Fee per Gallon per Day

Every capacity fee consists of a dollar amount, representing the value of facilities, divided by a measure of demand. In this case, buy-in fees are first calculated as the adjusted system value per gallon per day (GPD). Then these amounts are translated into fees per housing unit (fee per unit) and employment space (fee per 1,000 square feet) by multiplying the cost per GPD by the flow generation rate for each land use category. These amounts become the fee schedule.

The calculation of the buy-in fee per GPD for sewer facilities is shown in **Table 10.4.** The City provided the sewer system's production capacity, which is six million gallons per day. The adjusted system value divided by the total capacity of the system yields the sewer capacity fee per gallon per day of $54.02. This amount is multiplied by the assumption of 235 gallons per day per EDU to determine the capacity fee per average sized unit, which is divided by the average square feet per unit to determine the capacity fee per residential square foot.

Table 10.4: Fee per GPD

Total Adjusted System Value	$	324,120,096
System Flow Capacity (Gallons per Day)		6,000,000
Fee per GPD	$	54.02
GPD per EDU		235
Capacity Fee per Average Sized Single Family Unit	$	12,695
Average Square Feet per Unit		2,687
Capacity Fee per Residential Square Foot	$	4.72

Sources: City of Beaumont; Table 10.3, Willdan Financial Services.

Nonresidential Fee Schedule

The sewer capacity fee for nonresidential land uses are calculated to reflect the individual flow and strength characteristics of various nonresidential uses relative to the flow characteristics of a typical EDU. Strength characteristics are based on the Revenue Program Guidelines of the State Water Resources Control Board, March 1998 Edition. The effluent values for the various nonresidential land uses are consistent with assumptions from the City's rate study.

Table 10.5: Nonresidential Sewer Capacity Fee Schedule

		$/EDU	Flow (gpd)	BOD (Mg/l)	TSS (Mg/l)	Fee per 1,000 Sq. Ft.
Capacity Fee per EDU	*A*	$ 12,695				
Standard EDU Effluent (per SFR)	*B*	235 gpd	235 gpd	250 Mg/l	250 Mg/l	
Commercial Low Strength						
Effluent Values	*C*		35.97 gpd	140 Mg/l	115 Mg/l	
Calculated Strength Factor (= C / B)	*D*		0.15	0.56	0.46	
Calculated Proportional EDU's	*E*	1.00	60%	20%	20%	
Calculated EDU's (= D x E x $D_{(Flow\ EDU)}$)	*F*		0.09	0.02	0.01	
Total Capacity Fee			$1,166	$218	$179	$1,562
Commercial Medium Strength						
Effluent Values	*C*		35.97 gpd	235 Mg/l	175 Mg/l	
Calculated Strength Factor (= C / B)	*D*		0.15	0.94	0.70	
Calculated Proportional EDU's	*E*	1.00	60%	20%	20%	
Calculated EDU's (= D x E x $D_{(Flow\ EDU)}$)	*F*		0.09	0.03	0.02	
Total Capacity Fee			$1,166	$365	$272	$1,803
Commercial High Strength						
Effluent Values	*C*		35.97 gpd	933 Mg/l	667 Mg/l	
Calculated Strength Factor (= C / B)	*D*		0.15	3.73	2.67	
Calculated Proportional EDU's	*E*	1.00	60%	20%	20%	
Calculated EDU's (= D x E x $D_{(Flow\ EDU)}$)	*F*		0.09	0.11	0.08	
Total Capacity Fee			$1,166	$1,450	$1,037	$3,653
Industrial Low Strength						
Effluent Values	*C*		53.96 gpd	106 Mg/l	127 Mg/l	
Calculated Strength Factor (= C / B)	*D*		0.23	0.42	0.51	
Calculated Proportional EDU's	*E*	1.00	60%	20%	20%	
Calculated EDU's (= D x E x $D_{(Flow\ EDU)}$)	*F*		0.14	0.02	0.02	
Total Capacity Fee			$1,749	$247	$296	$2,292
Industrial High Strength						
Effluent Values	*C*		26.97 gpd	1598 Mg/l	506 Mg/l	
Calculated Strength Factor (= C / B)	*D*		0.11	6.39	2.02	
Calculated Proportional EDU's	*E*	1.00	60%	20%	20%	
Calculated EDU's (= D x E x $D_{(Flow\ EDU)}$)	*F*		0.07	0.15	0.05	
Total Capacity Fee			$874	$1,863	$590	$3,327

Sources: Tables 9.1 and 10.4.

11. Recycled Water Facilities

This chapter details an analysis of the need for recycled water facilities to accommodate growth within the City of Beaumont. The projects and associated costs in this chapter were identified in various planning document and provided by City staff for use in this analysis. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for recycled water facilities from the projected increase in sewer flow that can be treated to produce recycled water and the additional facilities needed to treat the effluent from the City's wastewater treatment plant. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the amount of wastewater flow generated by residential and nonresidential land uses.

Recycled Water Demand

Wastewater treatment plants treat municipal wastewater to standards that protect the beneficial uses of the waters into which the treated wastewater is discharged. Recycled water facilities allow the treatment of wastewater to a level such that it can be used for irrigation and other purposes safely. Consequently, the need for treatment of recycled water is based on the wastewater that is treated at the wastewater treatment plan, so demand is equal to wastewater flows. This chapter uses the EDU factors and estimates of EDUs from Chapter 9 as measure of demand for recycled water facilities. Use of EDU factors to estimate demand and allocate fees ensures that the fees are roughly proportional to the demand generated by each unit of new development.

Planned Facilities

Table 11.1 details the City's planned recycled water facilities to be funded by the recycled water facilities impact fee. The identified facilities will cost $29.4 million, net of existing recycled water facilities impact fee fund balances.

Table 11.1: Planned Recycled Water Facilities

	Cost (2024)
Recycled Water Storage Basins (Alternative 3)	$ 6,483,100
Todd Groundwater Recycled Water	26,338,600
Adaptive Management and Mitigation Plan study (Phases 2 and 3)	730,000
Total	$ 33,551,700
Less Existing Fund Balance	4,119,073
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	$ 29,432,627

Sources: Draft Recycled Water Reuse Strategy Analysis Report, 2021; City of Beaumont – Recycled Water Storage Basin Engineering Feasibility Technical Memorandum, 2020; ENR CCI; Willdan Financial Services.

Cost per EDU

The cost of planned facilities in Table 11.1 is divided by the total EDUs ~~in 2040~~at buildout to determine a cost per EDU. **Table 11.2** displays this calculation. Total EDUs ~~in 2040 is~~at buildout

are used for this calculation because the recycled water facilities will benefit all development in the City, both existing and new. The cost per EDU is multiplied by the projected increase in EDUs to estimate the projected fee revenue.

Table 11.2: Cost per EDU

Total Cost of Recycled Water Projects	$	29,432,627
Total EDUs at Buildout		26,394
Cost per EDU	$	1,115
New Development EDUs		7,767
Projected Fee Revenue	$	8,660,205

Sources: Tables 9.2 and 11.1.

Total Cost of Recycled Water Projects	$	29,432,627
Total EDUs at Buildout		32,049
Cost per EDU	$	918
New Development EDUs		13,422
Projected Fee Revenue	$	12,321,396

Sources: Tables 9.2 and 11.1.

Fee Schedule

The maximum justified fee for recycled water facilities is shown in **Table 11.3.** The cost per EDU is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on the EDU factors shown in Table 9.1. The fee per average dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit.

The total fee includes ~~an~~a one percent (1%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) ~~a standard overhead charge applied to all City programs for~~ legal, accounting, and other ~~departmental and~~ administrative support~~,~~ and (2) ~~capital planning, programming, project management costs associated with the share of projects funded by the facilities fee, and (3) fee~~ impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

~~In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, one percent~~ See the *Administrative Costs* section of Chapter 1 for a discussion of ~~the base fee adequately covers the cost of fee program administration. Impact fee program costs typically range from one percent to two percent of collected fee revenue. To be conservative, and to align with the City's current practice,~~ this ~~study uses one percent to calculate the administrative charge~~assumption.

Table 11.3: Recycled Water Facilities Fee Schedule

	A	B	C = A x B	D = C x 0.01	E = C + D	E / Average
	Cost Per EDU	EDU Factor	Base Fee[1]	Admin Charge[1, 2]	Total Fee[1]	Fee per Sq. Ft.[3]
Residential Dwelling Unit[4]	$ 1,115	0.77	$ 859	$ 9	$ 868	$ 0.32
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 1,115	0.15	$ 167	$ 2	$ 169	$ 0.17
Industrial/Business Park	1,115	0.11	123	1	124	0.12
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	1,115	0.23	256	3	259	0.26

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.
[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.
[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.
[4] Average EDU factor per residential dwelling unit weighted by projected single family and multifamily development.

Sources: Tables 9.1 and 11.2.

	A	B	C = A x B	D = C x 0.01	E = C + D	E / Average
	Cost Per EDU	EDU Factor	Base Fee[1]	Admin Charge[1, 2]	Total Fee[1]	Fee per Sq. Ft.[3]
Residential Dwelling Unit[4]	$ 918	0.83	$ 762	$ 8	$ 770	$ 0.29
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 918	0.15	$ 138	$ 1	$ 139	$ 0.14
Industrial/Business Park	918	0.11	101	1	102	0.10
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	918	0.23	211	2	213	0.21

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.
[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.
[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.
[4] Average EDU factor per residential dwelling unit weighted by projected single family and multifamily development.

Sources: Tables 9.1 and 11.2.

12. General Plan

The purpose of this fee is to ensure that new development funds its fair share of future general plan updates and related studies. The City will undertake several planning studies through ~~2040.~~buildout of the City's General Plan. These studies will guide future facility planning needed to serve all development within the City. A fee schedule is presented based on the system plan standard of general plan studies in the City of Beaumont to ensure that new development funds its fair share of those analyses. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for updated planning documents from the projected increase in service population and the additional planning documents needed to meet those demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planning documents needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the number of residents occupying a new dwelling unit, or the number of jobs associated with nonresidential land uses.

Service Population

General plan updates serve both residents and businesses. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities are based on the City's service population including residents and workers. **Table 12.1** shows the existing and future projected service population for general plan updates. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one employee compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. This study makes use of a worker weighting factor to estimate different levels of demand between residential and nonresidential land uses. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units and consequently create a lesser demand for facilities.

Table 12.1: General Plan Service Population

	A Persons	B Weighting Factor	A x B = C Service Population
Residents			
Existing (2023)	56,070	1.00	56,070
New Development	23,930	1.00	23,930
Total (2040)	80,000		80,000
Workers			
Existing (2023)	6,215	0.31	1,927
New Development	16,753	0.31	5,193
Total (2040)	22,968		7,120
Combined Residents and Weighted Workers			
Existing (2023)			57,997
New Development			29,123
Total (2040)			87,120

[1] Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40 hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week (40/128 = 0.31)

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

	A Persons	B Weighting Factor	A x B = C Service Population
Residents			
Existing (2023)	56,070	1.00	56,070
New Development	41,074	1.00	41,074
Total (Buildout)	97,144		97,144
Workers			
Existing (2023)	6,215	0.31	1,927
New Development	21,675	0.31	6,719
Total (Buildout)	27,890		8,646
Combined Residents and Weighted Workers			
Existing (2023)			57,997
New Development			47,793
Total (Buildout)			105,790

[1] Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40 hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week (40/128 = 0.31)

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Planned Costs

Table 12.2 lists the City's anticipated General Plan updates and related study costs within the ~~2040~~ planning horizon. Estimated study costs were provided by City staff for use in this analysis. In total, the City has identified $1.7 million in advanced planning costs, net of the existing general plan impact fee fund balance.

Table 12.2: General Plan Costs

	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Cost
General Plan Update[1]	1	Update	$ 989,400	$ 989,400
Zoning Code Update[2]	1	Update	370,000	370,000
Housing Element Update[3]	2	Updates	297,000	594,000
Total				$ 1,953,400
Less Existing Fund Balance				231,129
Net Cost				$ 1,722,271

[1] Assumed cost based on cost of General Plan Update completed in 2020, adjusted for inflation using the CPI-U Index to December, 2023.
[2] Cost based on City contract awarded in 2023.
[3] Cost based on Housing Element contract from 2022, adjusted for inflation using the CPI-U Index to December, 2023.

Source: City of Beaumont; US BLS CPI-U; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Standard

Table 12.3 shows the calculation of the system plan facilities standard per capita for General Plan updates and related studies. The studies will identify facilities needed to serve both existing and new development, so the costs of the studies are allocated to both existing and new development using this methodology. The cost standard is calculated by dividing the total cost of all studies needed by ~~2040~~buildout by the total service population ~~in 2040~~at buildout. The value per capita is multiplied by the worker weighting factor of 0.31 to determine the value per worker.

Table 12.3: Advanced Planning – System Standard

Cost of Planning Studies	$ 1,722,271
Future Service Population (2040)	87,120
Cost per Capita	$ 20
Cost Allocation per Resident	$ 20
Cost Allocation per Worker[1]	6

[1] Based on a weighting factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 12.1 and 12.2.

Cost of Planning Studies	$	1,722,271
Future Service Population (Buildout)		105,790
Cost per Capita	$	16
Cost Allocation per Resident	$	16
Cost Allocation per Worker[1]		5

[1] Based on a weighting factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 12.1 and 12.2.

Fee Revenue Projection

The City plans to use fee revenue to complete the studies identified in Table 12.2. The studies will be used to identify facility needs to serve the City as it grows. **Table 12.4** details a projection of fee revenue, based on the service population growth increment identified in Table 12.1. The City should program fee revenue to specific projects annually through its CIP and budget process. After accounting for the projected future impact fee revenue ~~approximately $1.1 million~~$957,588 in non-fee funding will be needed to complete the studies.

The City will need to use alternative funding sources to fund existing development's share of the studies. Potential sources of revenue include but are not limited to existing or new general fund revenues, existing or new taxes, and grants.

Table 12.4: Revenue Projection - System Standard

Cost per Capita	$	20
Growth in Service Population (2023 to 2040)		29,123
Fee Revenue	$	582,460
Net Cost of Planned Facilities		1,722,271
Non-Fee Revenue To Be Identified	$	(1,139,811)

Sources: Tables 12.1, 12.2 and 12.3.

Cost per Capita	$	16
Growth in Service Population (2023 to Buildout)		47,793
Fee Revenue	$	764,683
Net Cost of Planned Facilities		1,722,271
Non-Fee Revenue To Be Identified	$	(957,588)

Sources: Tables 12.1, 12.2 and 12.3.

Fee Schedule

The total fee includes a one percent (1%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses. See the *Administrative Costs* section of Chapter 1 for a discussion of this assumption.

Table 12.5 shows the maximum justified advanced General Plan update schedule. The City can adopt any fee up to this amount. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space). The fee per average sized single family, and multifamily dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of each type of unit.

The total fee includes a one percent (1~~.0~~%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: ~~a standard overhead charge applied to City programs for~~ (1) legal, accounting, and other ~~departmental and~~ administrative support~~,~~ and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting ~~and~~, mandated public reporting~~.~~

~~In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, one percent~~, and fee justification analyses. See the *Administrative Costs* section of ~~the base fee adequately covers the cost~~Chapter 1 for a discussion of ~~fee program administration. Impact fee program costs typically range from one percent to two percent of collected fee revenue. To be conservative, and to align with the City's current practice,~~ this ~~study uses one percent to calculate the administrative charge~~assumption.

Table 12.5: Advanced Planning Maximum Justified Impact Fee Schedule

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.01 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 20	3.22	$ 64	$ 1	$ 65	$ 0.02
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 6	2.12	$ 13	$ -	$ 13	$ 0.01
Industrial/Business Park	6	3.08	18	-	18	0.02
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	6	0.88	5	-	5	0.01

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.

[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 12.3.

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.01 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 16	3.22	$ 52	$ 1	$ 53	$ 0.02
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 5	2.12	$ 11	$ -	$ 11	$ 0.01
Industrial/Business Park	5	3.08	15	-	15	0.02
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	5	0.88	4	-	4	0.004

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.

[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 12.3.

13. Library Facilities

The following chapter documents the nexus analysis, demonstrating the need for expanded library facilities to serve new development using the existing facility standard approach. The fees calculated in this chapter could be implemented within the City of Beaumont and within unincorporated areas of the Beaumont Library District (District). The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for libraries within the District from the projected increase in residents and the additional library space and collections needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development can maintain the District's existing ratio of library facilities to residents, and the fees are scaled based on the number of residents occupying a new dwelling unit.

Service Population

Library facilities in the District primarily serve residents. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities are based on the District's residential population. **Table 13.1** shows the existing and future projected service population for library facilities within the District, both inside the Beaumont City limits and in the surrounding unincorporated area.

Table 13.1: Library Facilities Service Population

	City of Beaumont Residents	Residents Outside of City Limits[1]	Library District Total
Existing (2023)	56,070	9,455	65,525
New Development	23,930	4,035	27,965
Total (2040)	80,000	13,490	93,490

[1] Residents outside of City Limits in District in 2023 is the difference between the total Library District population reported by the California State Library and the existing population within Beaumont City Limits. Projection assumes same ratio of residents within City Limits to Districtwide resident as the City grows.

Sources: Table 2.1; California State Library; Willdan Financial Services.

	City of Beaumont Residents	Residents Outside of City Limits[1]	Library District Total
Existing (2023)	56,070	9,455	65,525
New Development	41,074	6,926	48,000
Total (Buildout)	97,144	16,381	113,525

[1] Residents outside of City Limits in District in 2023 is the difference between the total Library District population reported by the California State Library and the existing population within Beaumont City Limits. Projection assumes same ratio of residents within City Limits to Districtwide resident as the City grows.

Sources: Table 2.1; California State Library; Willdan Financial Services.

Existing Library Facilities

The quantity of existing library facilities that the District owns will be used to inform the facility standards in this analysis. The District currently operates one 11,700 square foot library. The District also owns collections and public computer stations. **Table 13.2** summarizes the District's existing library facility inventory.

Table 13.2: Existing Library Facilities

	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Replacement Cost
Library Building[1]	11,700	Sq. ft.	$ 550	$ 6,435,000
Collections	58,460	Items	25	1,461,500
Public Computer Stations	15	Stations	2,000	30,000
Total Value - Existing Facilities				$ 7,926,500

[1] Unit cost includes assumed cost of construction and land acquisition, as reported by Beaumont Library District.

Sources: Beaumont Library District; Willdan Financial Services.

Planned Facilities

Table 13.3 summarizes the planned library facility needed to serve the City through ~~2040~~buildout. The projected increase in service population would require expanded facilities in order to maintain the same level of service as is currently provided. In all, the expanded facilities are estimated to cost approximately $~~3.4~~5.8 million.

Table 13.3: Planned Library Facilities

	Facility Standard per Resident	Increase in Residents	Facilities Demanded by New Development	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Library Building Square Feet	0.1786	27,965	4,993	$ 550	$ 2,746,150
Collections	0.8922	27,965	24,950	25	623,750
Public Computer Stations	0.0002	27,965	4	2,000	8,000
Total					$ 3,377,900

Sources: Tables 13.1 and 13.2.

	Facility Standard per Resident	Increase in Residents	Facilities Demanded by New Development	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Library Building Square Feet	0.1786	48,000	8,571	$ 550	$ 4,714,050
Collections	0.8922	48,000	42,824	25	1,070,600
Public Computer Stations	0.0001	48,000	6	2,000	12,000
Total					$ 5,796,650

Sources: Tables 13.1 and 13.2.

Cost Allocation

Existing Level of Service

Table 13.4 expresses the City's current recreation facilities level of service in terms of an existing cost per capita. This cost per capita drives the fee calculation. Fees implemented at this level would allow the District to maintain the existing level of service.

Table 13.4: Existing Level of Service

Value of Existing Facilities	$ 7,926,500
Existing Service Population	65,525
Cost per Resident	$ 121

Sources: Tables 13.1 and 13.3.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City can use library facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of buildings, land, vehicles and collections that are part of the system of library facilities serving new development. A list of planned facilities is included in Table 13.3.

Fee Revenue Projection

The City plans to use recreation and library facilities fee revenue to construct improvements to add to the system of library facilities that serves new development. The preliminary list of facilities to be funded by the fee is detailed above in Table 13.3. **Table 13.5** details a projection of fee revenue, based on the service population growth increment identified in Table 13.1.

Table 13.5: Library Impact Fee Revenue Projection

Cost per Capita	$	121
Growth in Service Population in District (2023 to 2040)		27,965
Projected Fee Revenue	$	3,383,765

Sources: Tables 13.1, 13.3 and 13.4.

Cost per Capita	$	121
Growth in Service Population in District (2023 to Buildout)		48,000
Projected Fee Revenue	$	5,807,961

Sources: Tables 13.1, 13.3 and 13.4.

Fee Schedule

Table 13.6 shows the maximum justified library facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit densities (persons per dwelling). The fee per average sized dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit.

The total fee includes a one percent (1%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: ~~a standard overhead charge applied to City programs for~~ (1) legal, accounting, and other ~~departmental and~~ administrative support~~,~~ and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

~~In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, one percent~~ See the *Administrative Costs* section of ~~the base fee adequately covers the cost~~Chapter 1 for a discussion of ~~fee program administration. Impact fee program costs typically range from one percent to two percent of collected fee revenue. To be conservative, and to align with the City's current practice,~~ this ~~study uses one percent to calculate the administrative charge~~assumption.

Table 13.6: Library Facilities Fee Schedule

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.01 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee[1]	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.[3]
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 121	3.22	$ 390	$ 4	$ 394	$ 0.15

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit.

[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 13.4.

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.01 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee[1]	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.[3]
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 121	3.22	$ 390	$ 4	$ 394	$ 0.15

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit.

[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 13.4.

14. Emergency Preparedness Facilities

The purpose of the emergency preparedness facilities impact fee is to fund the emergency preparedness facilities needed to serve new development. A maximum justified fee schedule is presented based on the system plan standard of emergency preparedness facilities per capita. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for new emergency preparedness facilities from the projected increase in service population and the additional emergency preparedness facilities needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the number of residents occupying a new dwelling unit, or the number of jobs associated with nonresidential land uses.

Service Population

Emergency preparedness facilities serve both residents and businesses. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities are based on the City's service population including residents and workers.

Table 14.1 shows the existing and future projected service population for emergency preparedness facilities. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one employee compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. This study makes use of a worker weighting factor to estimate different levels of demand between residential and nonresidential land uses. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units and consequently create a lesser demand for facilities.

Table 14.1: Emergency Preparedness Facilities Service Population

	A Persons	B Weighting Factor	A x B = C Service Population
Residents			
Existing (2023)	56,070	1.00	56,070
New Development	23,930	1.00	23,930
Total (2040)	80,000		80,000
Workers			
Existing (2023)	6,215	0.31	1,927
New Development	16,753	0.31	5,193
Total (2040)	22,968		7,120
Combined Residents and Weighted Workers			
Existing (2023)			57,997
New Development			29,123
Total (2040)			87,120

[1] Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40 hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week (40/128 = 0.31)

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

	A Persons	B Weighting Factor	A x B = C Service Population
Residents			
Existing (2023)	56,070	1.00	56,070
New Development	41,074	1.00	41,074
Total (Buildout)	97,144		97,144
Workers			
Existing (2023)	6,215	0.31	1,927
New Development	21,675	0.31	6,719
Total (Buildout)	27,890		8,646
Combined Residents and Weighted Workers			
Existing (2023)			57,997
New Development			47,793
Total (Buildout)			105,790

[1] Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40 hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week (40/128 = 0.31)

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Planned Facilities and Standards

Planned Facilities

Table 14.2 summarizes the planned facilities. The emergency operations center will be collocated with the planned police station and will serve both existing and new development. The cost of the emergency operations center is approximately $695,000 net of the existing fund balance.

Table 14.2: Planned Emergency Preparedness Facilities

	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Cost
Emergency Operations Center	1,930	Sq. Ft.	$ 778	$ 1,501,540
Total				$ 1,501,540
Less Existing Fund Balance				806,387
Net Cost of Planned Facilities				$ 695,153

Source: City of Beaumont.

	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Cost
Emergency Operations Center	1,930	Sq. Ft.	$ 778	$ 1,501,540
Total				$ 1,501,540
Less Existing Fund Balance				806,387
Net Cost of Planned Facilities				$ 695,153

Source: City of Beaumont.

Cost Allocation

Future Level of Service

Table 14.3 shows new development's projected per capita investment in emergency preparedness facilities at the planning horizon. This value is calculated by dividing cost of all planned facilities by the service population at the planning horizon. The value per capita is multiplied by the worker weighting factor of 0.31 to determine the value per worker.

Table 14.3: Emergency Preparedness Facilities – System Standard

Net Cost of Planned Facilities	$	695,153
Total System Value (2040)	$	695,153
Future Service Population (2040)		87,120
~~Cost per Capita~~	~~$~~	~~8~~
Cost Allocation per Resident	$	8
Cost Allocation per Worker[1]		2

[1] Based on a weighting factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 14.1 and 14.2.

Net Cost of Planned Facilities	$	695,153
Total System Value (Buildout)	$	695,153
Future Service Population (Buildout)		105,790
Cost per Capita	$	7
Cost Allocation per Resident	$	7
Cost Allocation per Worker[1]		2

[1] Based on a weighting factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 14.1 and 14.2.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City can use emergency preparedness facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of buildings, land, and equipment that are part of the system of emergency preparedness facilities serving new development. The City intends to build a new emergency operations center.

Non-Fee Funding Required

Completing the planned facilities will provide a higher value of facilities per capita than is currently provided in Beaumont. Impact fee revenue may not be used to increase the level of service provided to existing development. Therefore, impact fee revenue will not fully fund the planned emergency preparedness facilities and some non-fee funding will be required. **Table 14.4** shows the projected fee revenue and the non-fee funding required through ~~2040~~buildout. After accounting for the projected future impact fee revenue, ~~approximately $462,000~~$360,604 in non-fee funding will be needed to complete the planned emergency preparedness facilities.

The City will need to use alternative funding sources to fund existing development's share of the planned emergency preparedness facilities. Potential sources of revenue include but are not limited to existing or new general fund revenues, existing or new taxes, special assessments, and grants.

Table 14.4: Revenue Projection - System Standard

Cost per Capita	$	8
Growth in Service Population (2023 to 2040)		29,123
Fee Revenue	$	232,984
Net Cost of Planned Facilities		695,153
Non-Fee Revenue To Be Identified	$	(462,169)

Sources: Tables 14.1, 14.2 and 14.3.

Cost per Capita	$	7
Growth in Service Population (2023 to Buildout)		47,793
Fee Revenue	$	334,549
Net Cost of Planned Facilities		695,153
Non-Fee Revenue To Be Identified	$	(360,604)

Sources: Tables 14.1, 14.2 and 14.3.

Fee Schedule

The total fee includes a one percent (1%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses. See the *Administrative Costs* section of Chapter 1 for a discussion of this assumption.

Table 14.5 shows the maximum justified emergency preparedness facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space). The fee per average sized dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit.

The total fee includes a one percent (1%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: ~~a standard overhead charge applied to all City programs for~~ (1) legal, accounting, and other ~~departmental and~~ administrative support~~,~~ and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

~~In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, one percent~~ See the *Administrative Costs* section of ~~the base fee adequately covers the cost~~Chapter 1 for a discussion of ~~fee program administration. Impact fee program costs typically range from one percent to two percent of collected fee revenue. To be conservative, and to align with the City's current practice,~~ this ~~study uses one percent to calculate the administrative charge~~assumption.

Table 14.5: Emergency Preparedness Facilities Impact Fee Schedule

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.01 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 8	3.22	$ 26	$ -	$ 26	$ 0.01
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 2	2.12	$ 4	$ -	$ 4	0.004
Industrial/Business Park	2	3.08	6	-	6	0.006
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	2	0.88	2	-	2	0.002

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.

[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 14.3.

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.01 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 7	3.22	$ 23	$ -	$ 23	$ 0.01
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 2	2.12	$ 4	$ -	$ 4	0.004
Industrial/Business Park	2	3.08	6	-	6	0.006
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	2	0.88	2	-	2	0.002

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.

[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 14.3.

15. Storm Drainage Facilities

This chapter summarizes an analysis of the need for storm drain facilities to accommodate growth within the City of Beaumont. This chapter documents a reasonable relationship between new development and a storm drain fee calculated using the existing facilities standard approach to fund storm drain facilities that serve new development. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for storm drainage facilities from the projected increase in impervious surface generated by new development and the additional storm drains needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development can maintain the City's existing ratio of storm drainage facilities to impervious surface, and the fees are scaled based on the amount of impervious surface generated by different types of development.

Storm Drain Demand

Most new development generates storm water runoff that must be controlled through storm drain facilities by increasing the amount of land that is impervious to precipitation. **Table 15.1** shows the calculation of equivalent dwelling unit (EDU) demand factors based on impervious surface coefficient by land use category. The impervious surface coefficients are based on data from Riverside County Flood Control Hydrology Manual. EDU factors relate demand for storm drain facilities in terms of the demand created by a single-family dwelling unit. Use of EDU factors to estimate demand and allocate fees ensures that the fees are roughly proportional to the impervious surface generated by each unit of new development.

Table 15.1: Storm Drain Facilities Equivalent Dwelling Units

Land Use Type	DU or KSF per acre[1]	Impervious Surface Coefficient	Equivalent Dwelling Unit (EDU)
Residential Dwelling Unit			
Single Family	4.00	0.50	1.00
Multifamily	17.00	0.65	0.31
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.			
Commercial	32.67	0.90	0.22
Industrial/Business Park	43.56	0.90	0.17
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	32.67	0.90	0.22

[1] Units per acre for residential or 1,000 square feet per acre for nonresidential. Residential and nonresidential densities are based on typical densities for each land use from the General Plan. Nonresidential densities are based on floor-area-ratios of 0.75 for commercial, 1.0 for industrial/business park and 0.75 for industrial/w arehouse.

Sources: Table 3.3, Beaumont General Plan; Plate D-5.6 from the Riverside County Flood Control Hydrology Manual; Willdan Financial Services.

EDU Generation by New Development

Table 15.2 shows the estimated EDU generation from new development through ~~2040~~buildout. New development will generate approximately ~~6,497~~11,752 new EDUs, representing ~~26~~39.5 percent of total storm drain demand ~~in 2040~~at buildout.

Table 15.2: Storm Drain Demand Projections

Land Use	EDU Factor	2023 Units / 1,000 SF	2023 EDUs	Growth 2023 to 2040 Units / 1,000 SF	Growth 2023 to 2040 EDUs	Total - 2040 Units / 1,000 SF	Total - 2040 EDUs
Residential - per Dwelling Unit							
Single Family	1.00	16,583	16,583	2,425	2,425	19,008	19,008
Multifamily	0.31	2,136	662	4,403	1,365	6,539	2,027
Subtotal		18,719	17,245	6,828	3,790	25,547	21,035
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.							
Commercial	0.22	1,792	394	4,052	892	5,844	1,286
Office	0.17	352	60	376	64	728	124
Industrial	0.22	1,511	333	7,962	1,751	9,473	2,084
Subtotal		3,656	787	12,389	2,707	16,045	3,494
Total			18,032		6,497		24,529
			73.5%		26.5%		100%

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 15.1.

Land Use	EDU Factor	2023 Units / 1,000 SF	2023 EDUs	Buildout Units / 1,000 SF	Buildout EDUs	Total - Buildout Units / 1,000 SF	Total - Buildout EDUs
Residential - per Dwelling Unit							
Single Family	1.00	16,583	16,583	6,498	6,498	23,081	23,081
Multifamily	0.31	2,136	662	5,804	1,799	7,940	2,461
Subtotal		18,719	17,245	12,302	8,297	31,021	25,542
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.							
Commercial	0.22	1,792	394	5,304	1,167	7,096	1,561
Office	0.17	352	60	532	90	884	150
Industrial	0.22	1,511	333	9,991	2,198	11,502	2,531
Subtotal		3,656	787	15,827	3,455	19,483	4,242
Total			18,032		11,752		29,784
			60.5%		39.5%		100%

Sources: Tables 2.1 and 15.1.

Existing Inventory

Table 15.3 summarizes the replacement cost of the City's existing storm drain inventory. Quantities of the various types of facilities were identified from the City's GIS data. The replacement cost of the facilities was estimated using recent bid data from the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.

Table 15.3: Storm Drain Existing Inventory

Description	Replacement Cost
Structures	$ 1,574,027
Culverts	685,600
Pipes	76,369,032
Total	$ 78,628,659

Source: Appendix Table A.1.

Planned Facilities

Table 15.4 identify the preliminary planned storm drain facilities from the City's CIP. Note that additional facilities will have to be identified through the planning horizon to maintain the City's existing level of service.

Table 15.4: Preliminary Planned Storm Drain Facilities

CIP No.	Description	Total Project Cost
2019-019	Beaumont Master Drainage Plan - Line 2 Stage 1	$ 5,000,000
R-07	Cherry Channel Drainage Project (cougar to OV parkway)	750,000
R-25	3rd Street to California Ave Storm Drain	650,000
R-33	6th Street & Palm Storm Drain	113,000
Total		$ 6,513,000

Source: City of Beaumont Wastewater Master Plan, 2021.

Cost per Equivalent Dwelling Unit

This chapter uses the existing standard approach to calculate the storm drain facilities cost standard. The replacement cost of existing facilities is divided by the existing EDUs to determine a cost standard per EDU. **Table 15.5** shows the facility cost standard for storm drain facilities.

Table 15.5: Cost per Equivalent Dwelling Unit

Existing Inventory Replacement Cost	$ 78,628,659
Existing EDUs	18,032
Cost per EDU	$ 4,361

Sources: Tables 15.2 and 15.3.

Existing Inventory Replacement Cost	$	78,628,659
Existing EDUs		18,032
Cost per EDU	$	4,361

Sources: Tables 15.2 and 15.3.

Projected Fee Revenue

Table 15.6 displays a projection of fee revenue based on the cost per EDU from Table 15.5 and the increase in EDU from Table 15.2. The City will need to identify additional facilities to maintain its existing level of service as new development adds to demand for storm drainage facilities.

Table 15.6: Projected Fee Revenue

Cost per EDU	$	4,361
Projected Growth in EDUs		6,497
Projected Fee Revenue	$	28,333,417
Preliminary Planned Facility Costs	$	6,513,000
Additional Facilities To Be Identified	$	21,820,417

Sources: Tables 15.2 and 15.5.

Cost per EDU	$	4,361
Projected Growth in EDUs		11,752
Projected Fee Revenue	$	51,250,472
Preliminary Planned Facility Costs	$	6,513,000
Additional Facilities To Be Identified	$	44,737,472

Sources: Tables 15.2 and 15.5.

Fee Schedule

The maximum justified fee for storm drain facilities is shown in **The total** fee includes a one percent (1%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses. See the *Administrative Costs* section of Chapter 1 for a discussion of this assumption.

Table 15.7. The City can adopt any fee up to this amount. The cost per EDU from Table 15.5 is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on the EDU factors shown in Table 15.1.

The total fee includes a one percent (1.0%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: a standard overhead charge applied to all City programs for (1) legal, accounting, and other departmental and administrative support, and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting and, mandated public reporting.

In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, one percent, and fee justification analyses. See the *Administrative Costs* section of the base fee adequately covers the costChapter 1 for a discussion of fee program administration. Impact fee program costs typically range from one percent to two percent of collected fee revenue. To be conservative, and to align with the City's current practice, this study uses one percent to calculate the administrative chargeassumption.

Table 15.7: Storm Drain Facilities Impact Fee Schedule

	A Cost Per EDU	*B* EDU Factor	*C = A x B* Base Fee[1]	*D = C x 0.01* Admin Charge[1, 2]	*E = C + D* Total Fee[1]	*E / Average* Fee per Sq. Ft.[3]
Residential Dwelling Unit[4]	$ 4,361	0.56	$ 2,442	$ 24	$ 2,466	$ 0.92
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 4,361	0.22	$ 959	$ 10	$ 969	$ 0.97
Industrial/Business Park	4,361	0.17	741	7	748	0.75
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	4,361	0.22	959	10	969	0.97

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.

[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.

[4] Average EDU factor per residential dwelling unit weighted by projected single family and multifamily development.

Sources: Tables 15.1 and 15.4.

	A	B	C = A x B	D = C x 0.01	E = C + D	E / Average
	Cost Per EDU	EDU Factor	Base Fee[1]	Admin Charge[1, 2]	Total Fee[1]	Fee per Sq. Ft.[3]
Residential Dwelling Unit[4]	$ 4,361	0.67	$ 2,922	$ 29	$ 2,951	$ 1.10
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 4,361	0.22	$ 959	$ 10	$ 969	$ 0.97
Industrial/Business Park	4,361	0.17	741	7	748	0.75
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	4,361	0.22	959	10	969	0.97

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.

[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.

[4] Average EDU factor per residential dwelling unit weighted by projected single family and multifamily development.

Sources: Tables 15.1 and 15.4.

16. Trails

The following chapter documents the nexus analysis, demonstrating the need for new trails demanded by new development. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for new trails from the projected increase in residents and the additional trails needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the number of residents occupying a new dwelling unit.

Service Population

Trails in Beaumont primarily serve residents. Therefore, demand for these facilities is based on the residential population. **Table 16.1** shows the existing and future projected service population for trails.

Table 16.1: Trail Facilities
Service Population

	Residents
Existing (2023)	56,070
New Development	23,930
Total (2040)	80,000

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

	Residents
Existing (2023)	56,070
New Development	41,074
Total (Buildout)	97,144

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Existing Trails Inventory

The City of Beaumont owns several trails. **Table 16.2** summarizes the City's existing trails inventory. All facilities are located within the City limits. In total, the City owns approximately $3.1 million in trails.

Table 16.2: Existing Trails

	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost[1]	Total Cost
Existing Trails				
Sundance Bowl Walking Path	3,000	linear feet	$ 78	$ 234,000
Highland Springs Walking Path	7,400	linear feet	78	577,200
Noble Creek Walking Path	2,650	linear feet	78	206,700
Marshall Creek Walking Path	6,900	linear feet	78	538,200
Palm Islands Walking Path	6,800	linear feet	78	530,400
Crenshaw Walking Path	2,300	linear feet	78	179,400
Cherry Channel Walking Path	7,500	linear feet	78	585,000
Portero Walking Trail	3,300	linear feet	78	257,400
Total	39,850	linear feet		$ 3,108,300

[1] Cost per linear foot assumes $5.55 per square foot of decomposed granite trail, 14' wide.

Sources: City of Beaumont; Willdan Financial Services.

Planned Trails

The City has one unfunded trail planned to serve the City as it grows. **Table 16.3** details the City's planned trail.

Table 16.3: Planned Trails

	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost[1]	Total Cost
Future Trails				
Edison Easement Phase 2	4,000	linear feet	$ 78	$ 312,000

[1] Cost per linear foot assumes $5.55 per square foot of decomposed granite trail, 14' wide.

Sources: City of Beaumont; Willdan Financial Services.

Cost Allocation

Existing Level of Service

Table 16.4 expresses the City's current trails level of service in terms of an existing cost per resident. This cost per resident is not used in the fee calculation, rather it is shown here for informational purposes only.

Table 16.4: Existing Level of Service

Value of Existing Facilities	$ 3,108,300
Existing Service Population	56,070
Cost per Resident	$ 55

Sources: Tables 16.1 and 16.3.

Future Level of Service

Table 16.5 shows new development's cost per capita needed to fully fund the planned facilities. The level of service indicated by the planned facility is lower than the existing standard. This level of service drives the fee calculation. This value is calculated by dividing the cost of planned facilities by the increase in population.

Table 16.5: Trails Planned Facilities Standard

Cost of Planned Facilities	$ 312,000
Growth in Service Population (2023 to 2040)	23,930
Cost per Resident	$ 13

Sources: Tables 16.1 and 16.3.

Cost of Planned Facilities	$ 312,000
Growth in Service Population (2023 to Buildout)	41,074
Cost per Resident	$ 8

Sources: Tables 16.1 and 16.3.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City can use trails fee revenues for the construction or purchase of trails, buildings, land, vehicles and equipment that are part of the system of trails serving new development. A list of planned facilities is included in Table 16.3.

Fee Revenue Projection

The City plans to use trails fee revenue to construct improvements to add to the system of trails that serves existing and new development. The list of facilities to be funded by the fee is detailed above in Table 16.3. The projected fee revenue is equal to the cost of the planned facilities.

Fee Schedule

The total fee includes a one percent (1%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses. See the *Administrative Costs* section of Chapter 1 for a discussion of this assumption.

Table 16.6 shows the maximum justified trails fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit densities (persons per dwelling). The fee per average sized dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit.

The total fee includes a one percent (1%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: ~~a standard overhead charge applied to City programs for~~ (1) legal, accounting, and other ~~departmental and~~ administrative support~~,~~ and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

~~In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, one percent~~ See the *Administrative Costs* section of ~~the base fee adequately covers the cost~~Chapter 1 for a discussion of ~~fee program administration. Impact fee program costs typically range from one percent to two percent of collected fee revenue. To be conservative, and to align with the City's current practice,~~ this ~~study uses one percent to calculate the administrative charge~~assumption.

Table 16.6: Trails Fee ~~- System Standard~~

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.01 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 13	3.22	$ 42	$ -	$ 42	$ 0.02

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit.

[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 16.4.

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.01 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 8	3.22	$ 24	$ -	$ 24	$ 0.01

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit.

[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 16.4.

17. Maintenance Equipment Facilities

The purpose of the maintenance equipment impact fee is to fund the maintenance equipment needed to serve new development. A maximum justified fee is presented based on the ~~system plan~~planned facilities standard of maintenance equipment per capita. The *essential nexus* for this facility category is between the demand for new maintenance equipment facilities from the projected increase in service population and the additional maintenance equipment facilities needed to meet those service demands. The fees are roughly proportional to demand because they ensure that new development will pay no more than its proportionate share of the identified planned facilities needed to serve the City through the planning horizon, and the fees are scaled based on the number of residents occupying a new dwelling unit, or the number of jobs associated with nonresidential land uses.

Service Population

Maintenance equipment serves both residents and businesses. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities are based on the City's service population including residents and workers.

Table 17.1 shows the existing and future projected service population for maintenance equipment. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one employee compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. This study makes use of a worker weighting factor to estimate different levels of demand between residential and nonresidential land uses. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units and consequently create a lesser demand for facilities.

Table 17.1: Maintenance Equipment Service Population

	A Persons	B Weighting Factor	A x B = C Service Population
Residents			
Existing (2023)	56,070	1.00	56,070
New Development	23,930	1.00	23,930
Total (2040)	80,000		80,000
Workers			
Existing (2023)	6,215	0.31	1,927
New Development	16,753	0.31	5,193
Total (2040)	22,968		7,120
Combined Residents and Weighted Workers			
Existing (2023)			57,997
New Development			29,123
Total (2040)			87,120

[1] Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40 hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week (40/128 = 0.31)

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

	A Persons	B Weighting Factor	A x B = C Service Population
Residents			
Existing (2023)	56,070	1.00	56,070
New Development	41,074	1.00	41,074
Total (Buildout)	97,144		97,144
Workers			
Existing (2023)	6,215	0.31	1,927
New Development	21,675	0.31	6,719
Total (Buildout)	27,890		8,646
Combined Residents and Weighted Workers			
Existing (2023)			57,997
New Development			47,793
Total (Buildout)			105,790

[1] Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40 hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week (40/128 = 0.31)

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Inventories and Standards

This section describes the City's public facility inventory and facility standards.

Existing Inventory

This study uses the system plan methodology to calculate fees for maintenance equipment. **Table 17.2** summarizes the City's current inventory maintenance vehicles and equipment. These assets are used to maintain the City's existing infrastructure.

Table 17.2: Existing Maintenance Equipment Inventory

Unit No.	Description	Replacement Cost
1705	2017 FORD F150	$ 45,000
1810	2018 FORD F150	45,000
1919	2020 FORD FUSION	32,007
2002	2020 FORD F150	24,143
1811	2018 FORD F350	52,000
2220	2022 FORD F150	45,476
2221	2022 FORD F250 (Scelzi)	62,597
1812	2018 FREIGHTLINER PATCH TRUCK - M2 ASHPHALT RIG	170,514
2206	2022 FORD F550 - BUCKET TRUCK	137,219
2406	1983 FORD F700	75,000
1914	2018 FREIGHTLINER M2	70,000
Total Value - Existing Facilities		$ 758,957

Sources: City of Beaumont; Willdan Financial Services.

Planned Facilities

Table 17.3 summarizes the planned maintenance equipment identified in the City's CIP. New maintenance equipment costs are estimated to total $493,000.

Table 17.3: Planned Maintenance Equipment

Project No.	Description	Cost
R-27	Purchase Skid Steer Grader Attachment	$ 40,000
R-29	Purchase Tandem Vibratory Roller	58,000
R-30	Purchase Thermoplastic Equipment	195,000
R-31	Purchase 12-Yard Dump Truck	200,000
Total		$ 493,000

Source: City of Beaumont Development Master Capital Improvement Plan.

Cost Allocation

Existing Level of Service

Table 17.4 expresses the City's current maintenance equipment level of service in terms of an existing cost per capita. This cost per capita is not used in the fee calculation, rather it is shown here for informational purposes only.

~~Once the planned facilities have been constructed and new development has increased the City's service population the resulting facility cost per capita will be higher than the cost per capita shown in Table 17.4. The increased facility standard is needed to ensure that the City has adequate facilities to maintain the City's infrastructure. The planned facilities were identified in the City's most recent CIP.~~

Table 17.4: Existing Level of Service

Value of Existing Facilities	$	758,957
Existing Service Population		57,997
Cost per Capita	$	13
Facility Standard per Resident	$	13
Facility Standard per Worker[1]		4

[1] Based on a weighing factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 17.1 and 17.3.

Future Level of Service

Table 17.5 shows new development's ~~projected~~cost per capita ~~investment in maintenance equipment at~~needed to fully fund the ~~planning horizon.~~planned facilities. The level of service indicated by the planned facility is lower than the existing standard. This level of service drives the fee calculation. This value is calculated by dividing the cost of ~~existing and~~ planned facilities by the ~~service~~increase in population ~~at the planning horizon.~~. The ~~value~~resulting cost per capita ~~is multiplied by the worker weighting factor of 0.31 to determine the value per worker~~drives the fee calculation.

Table 17.5: Maintenance Equipment ~~System~~Planned Facility Standard

Value of Existing Facilities	$	758,957
Value of Planned Facilities		493,000
Total System Value (2040)	$	1,251,957
Future Service Population (2040)		87,120
Cost per Capita	$	14
Cost Allocation per Resident	$	14
Cost Allocation per Worker[1]		4

[1] Based on a weighting factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 17.1, 17.2 and 17.3.

Cost of Planned Facilities	$	493,000
Growth in Service Population (2023 to Buildout)		47,793
Cost per Capita	$	10
Cost Allocation per Resident	$	10
Cost Allocation per Worker[1]		3

[1] Based on a weighting factor of 0.31.

Sources: Tables 17.1 and 17.3.

Use of Fee Revenue

The City can use maintenance equipment fee revenues for the acquisition of vehicles and maintenance equipment that are part of the system of maintenance equipment serving new development. A list of planned facilities is included in **Table 17.3.**

~~Non-~~Fee ~~Funding Required~~Revenue Projection

~~Completing the planned facilities will provide a higher value of facilities per capita than is currently provided in Beaumont. Impact fee revenue may not be used to increase the level of service provided to existing development. Therefore, impact fee revenue will not fully fund the planned maintenance equipment and some non-fee funding will be required. **Table 17.6** shows the projected fee revenue and the non-fee funding required through 2040. After accounting for the projected future impact fee revenue, approximately $85,000 in non-fee funding will be needed to acquire the planned maintenance equipment.~~

~~The City will need to use alternative funding sources to fund existing development's share of the planned maintenance equipment. Potential sources of revenue include but are not limited to existing or new general fund revenues, existing or new taxes, special assessments, and grants.~~

~~Table 17.6: Revenue Projection - System Standard~~

Cost per Capita	$	14
Growth in Service Population (2023 to 2040)		29,123
Fee Revenue	$	407,722
Net Cost of Planned Facilities		493,000
Non-Fee Revenue to be Identified	$	(85,278)

Sources: Tables 17.1, 17.3 and 17.4.

The City plans to use maintenance equipment facilities fee revenue to construct improvements and acquire capital facilities and equipment to add to the system of maintenance equipment to serve new development. The City plans to acquire the facilities in Table 17.3. By using the planned facilities cost allocation method, the cost of the planned facilities is equal to the projected impact fee revenue for this facility category.

Fee Schedule

The total fee includes a one percent (1%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses. See the *Administrative Costs* section of Chapter 1 for a discussion of this assumption.

Table 17.6 shows the maximum justified maintenance equipment fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space). The fee per average sized dwelling unit is converted into a fee per square foot by dividing the fee per dwelling unit by the assumed average square footage of a dwelling unit.

The total fee includes a one percent (1%) administrative charge to fund costs that include: ~~a standard overhead charge applied to all City programs for~~ (1) legal, accounting, and other ~~departmental and~~ administrative support~~,~~ and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue, and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

~~In Willdan's experience with impact fee programs, one percent~~ See the *Administrative Costs* section of ~~the base fee adequately covers the cost~~Chapter 1 for a discussion of ~~fee program administration. Impact fee program costs typically range from one percent to two percent of collected fee revenue. To be conservative, and to align with the City's current practice,~~ this ~~study uses one percent to calculate the administrative charge~~assumption.

Table 17.6: Maintenance Equipment Fee Schedule

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.01 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 14	3.22	$ 45	$ -	$ 45	$ 0.02
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 4	2.12	$ 8	$ -	$ 8	$ 0.01
Industrial/Business Park	4	3.08	12	-	12	0.01
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	4	0.88	4	-	4	0.004

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.

[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 17.5.

Land Use	A Cost Per Capita	B Density	C = A x B Base Fee[1]	D = C x 0.01 Admin Charge[1, 2]	E = C + D Total Fee	F = E / Average Fee per Sq. Ft.
Residential Dwelling Unit	$ 10	3.22	$ 33	$ -	$ 33	$ 0.01
Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.						
Commercial	$ 3	2.12	$ 6	$ -	$ 6	$ 0.01
Industrial/Business Park	3	3.08	9	-	9	0.01
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	3	0.88	3	-	3	0.003

[1] Fee per average sized dwelling unit or per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space.

[2] Administrative charge of 1.0 percent for (1) legal, accounting, and other administrative support and (2) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses.

[3] Assumes an average of 2,687 square feet per dwelling unit based on an analysis of building permits issued in Beaumont from 2018 to 2023.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 17.4.

18. AB 602 Requirements

On January 1, 2022, new requirements went into effect for California jurisdictions implementing impact fees. Among other changes, AB 602 added Section 66016.5 to the Government Code, which set guidelines for impact fee nexus studies. Four key requirements from that section which concern the nexus study are reproduced here:

66016.5. (a) (2) When applicable, the nexus study shall identify the existing level of service for each public facility, identify the proposed new level of service, and include an explanation of why the new level of service is appropriate.

66016.5. (a) (4) If a nexus study supports the increase of an existing fee, the local agency shall review the assumptions of the nexus study supporting the original fee and evaluate the amount of fees collected under the original fee.

66016.5. (a) (5) A nexus study adopted after July 1, 2022, shall calculate a fee imposed on a housing development project proportionately to the square footage of proposed units of the development. A local agency that imposes a fee proportionately to the square footage of the proposed units of the development shall be deemed to have used a valid method to establish a reasonable relationship between the fee charged and the burden posed by the development.

66016.5. (a) (6) Large jurisdictions shall adopt a capital improvement plan as a part of the nexus study.

Compliance with AB 602

The following sections describe this study's compliance with the new requirements of AB 602.

66016.5. (a) (2) - Level of Service

1. For fees calculated under the existing standard methodology, the fees are calculated such that new development funds facilities at the existing level of service. These fee categories are: parks, library, and storm drainage facilities. The existing level service in terms of the existing facility investment per capita is shown in each corresponding chapter.

2. For fees calculated under the planned facilities methodology, the fees are calculated to ensure that the level of service does not fall to unacceptable levels. The fees calculated under this approach are the transportation-related, sewer facilities, fire facilities, maintenance facilities, and trails facility fees. ~~All~~Transportation projects included in these fees met the City's congestion level of service standards at the time they were added to the impact fee program. Impact fees charged under this program will serve to ensure that the LOS does not fall to unacceptable levels. For the fire, maintenance facilities and trails fees, the planned facilities represent a lower level of service than current exists, so new development can fully fund the identified facilities. The sewer facilities needed to serve new development were identified in the City's Wastewater Master Plan as necessary to serve new development at an acceptable level of service.

3. For the fees calculated under the system standard methodology, the maximum justified fees represent an increase in the facility level of service. The fees calculated under this methodology are the recreation, fire, police, recycled water, general plan, emergency preparedness, road maintenance and public facility fees. The increased level of service is required to fund new development's fair share of facilities identified either in the City's most recent CIP, or the City's prior development impact fee studies. New development will not fund the entirety of the increase in level of service, rather, it will fund a share of the increased level of service represented by the planned facilities. The City will have to

fund existing development's share of the increased level of service through any other funding source. Each chapter for facility fee categories that are increasing the level of service includes a table that shows the existing level of service and future level of service in terms of facility investment per capita.

66016.5. (a) (4) – Review of Original Fee Assumptions

Willdan extensively reviewed the City's prior impact fee studies while conducting this fee analysis. Notable this study differs from the 2017 study in several ways:

1. This study uses a planning horizon of ~~2040 as opposed to~~ General Plan Buildout~~. City staff felt that~~, which has been updated based on the ~~2040 projection from the~~City's 2020 General Plan ~~was more realistic than full buildout.~~.
2. Cost assumptions have been updated to current dollars. The costs in the 2017 study were considerably lower than current market costs for construction of new facilities and the acquisition of land.
3. This study made use of the most current project lists and inventories of existing facilities where relevant.

Table 18.1 displays an accounting of annual revenue collected over the last five fiscal years for the impact fees included in this analysis.

Table 18.1: Annual Collected Impact Fee Revenue

	FY 2023	FY 2022	FY 2021	FY 2020	FY 2019
Traffic Signal	$ 203,304	$ 179,998	$ 108,731	$ 410,093	$ 458,661
Railroad Crossing	285,267	242,393	118,918	116,231	2,046,624
Fire Facility	559,958	472,975	192,423	212,209	1,666,646
Public Facility	410,685	439,313	155,937	154,245	379,250
Emergency Prepardeness	883,168	831,471	277,521	272,086	1,056,153
General Plan	122,733	87,226	24,048	19,528	172,890
Recycled Water	989,499	1,382,581	278,089	305,184	675,314
Road and Bridge Benefit	2,372,543	2,411,075	994,344	990,955	5,070,240
Sewer Capacity	4,610,065	5,896,211	1,988,400	2,083,699	3,588,099
Recreational Facilities	533,042	847,938	243,318	259,139	459,551
Police Facilities	486,085	514,076	183,599	180,923	447,718
Community Park Development	1,041,296	968,166	480,154	311,733	1,788,402
Neighborhood Park Development	1,259,955	1,171,643	581,180	377,535	2,164,265
Total	$ 13,757,600	$ 15,445,066	$ 5,626,662	$ 5,693,561	$ 19,973,812

Source: City of Beaumont.

66016.5. (a) (5) – Residential Fees per Square Foot

Impact fees for residential land uses are calculated per square foot for all fee categories and comply with AB 602.

66016.5. (a) (6) – Capital Improvement Plan

The Capital Improvement Plan for this nexus study is comprised of the identified planned facilities within each facility fee chapter. Planned facilities identified in this document are sourced from the City's current adopted CIP, master plans and other relevant documents. Adoption of this nexus study would approve the planned facilities identified herein as the Capital Improvement Plan for this nexus study.

19. Implementation

Impact Fee Program Adoption Process

Impact fee program adoption procedures are found in the *California Government Code* section 66016. Adoption of an impact fee program requires the City Council to follow certain procedures including holding a public hearing. The impact fee nexus study must first be adopted at a public hearing to comply with AB 602. That public hearing must be noticed at least 30 days in advance. Data, such as an impact fee report, must be made available at least 10 days prior to the public hearing. The City's legal counsel should be consulted for any other procedural requirements as well as advice regarding adoption of an enabling ordinance and/or a resolution. After adoption there is a mandatory 60-day waiting period before the fees go into effect.

Inflation Adjustment

The City can keep its impact fee program up to date by periodically adjusting the fees for inflation. Such adjustments should be completed regularly to ensure that new development will fully fund its share of needed facilities. We recommend that the California Construction Cost Index (CCCI) be used for adjusting fees for inflation.

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

Reporting Requirements

The City complies with the annual and five-year reporting requirements of the *Mitigation Fee Act*. For facilities to be funded by a combination of public fees and other revenues, identification of the source and amount of these non-fee revenues is essential. Identification of the timing of receipt of other revenues to fund the facilities is also important.

Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP

The City maintains a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to plan for future infrastructure needs. The CIP identifies costs and phasing for specific capital projects. The use of the CIP in this manner documents a reasonable relationship between new development and the use of those revenues.

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

20. Mitigation Fee Act Findings

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

The *Mitigation Fee Act* findings required to implement impact fees in California demonstrate the *essential nexus* between new development and a fee to fund facilities needed to serve that development. The term *essential nexus* refers to the relationship between new development and the need for facilities (and corresponding impact fees) to serve that development. The findings also require that this study demonstrates *rough proportionality* of the fees- meaning that the amount of the exaction must roughly correspond to the burden placed on the government, resulting from the proposed development project. To ensure that fees are roughly proportional to from new development, this study first allocates facilities costs to new development using the allocation methods described in the preceding chapters, then to individual units of new development based on the demand characteristics of each unit.

The five statutory findings required for adoption of the public facilities fees documented in this report are presented in this chapter and supported in detail by the preceding chapters. All statutory references are to the *Act.*

Purpose of Fee

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

Development impact fees are designed to ensure 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 provide 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 public facilities to serve 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 used to fund expanded facilities to serve new development. Facilities funded by these fees are designated to be located within the City's sphere of influence. Fees addressed in this report have been identified by the City to be restricted to funding the following facility categories: parkland acquisition, neighborhood and community parks, storm drains, transportation facilities, sewer facilities, trails, recreation facilities, fire protection facilities, police facilities, public facilities, recycled water facilities, general plan updates, emergency preparedness facilities and maintenance equipment.

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).*

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. Facilities funded by the fees are expected to provide a citywide network of facilities accessible to the additional residents and workers associated with new development. Under *the Act*, fees are not intended to fund planned facilities needed to correct existing deficiencies. Thus, a reasonable relationship can be shown between the use of fee revenue and the new development residential and non-residential use classifications that will pay the fees.

Burden Relationship

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

Facilities need is based on a facility standard that represents the demand generated by new development for those facilities. 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. For most facility categories service population standards are calculated based upon the number of residents associated with residential development and the number of workers associated with non-residential development. To calculate a single, per capita standard, one worker is weighted less than one resident based on an analysis of the relative use demand between residential and non-residential development.

For transportation related facilities demand standards are based on trip generation by various categories of new development. For storm drainage facilities demand is based on impervious surface generated by development. For sewer and recycled water facilities demand is based on increased wastewater flow generated by new 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 Forecasts provides a description of how service population and growth forecasts are calculated. Facility standards are described in the *Facility Standards* sections of each facility category chapter.

Proportionality

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

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

See *Chapter 2, Growth Forecasts,* or the *Service Population* sections in each facility category chapter for a description of how service populations or other factors are determined for different types of land uses. See the *Fee Schedule* section of each facility category chapter for a presentation of the proposed facilities fees.

Appendix

Table A.1: Beaumont Storm Drain Facilities Inventory

	Material	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Replacement Cost
Structures				
Inlets		32	$ 7,263	$ 232,425
Outlets		18	4,675	84,157
Catch Basins		240	5,239	1,257,445
Structures Subtotal		290		$ 1,574,027
Culverts by Shape				
Arch	CMP	2	$ 4,300	$ 8,600
	CONC	2	35,100	70,200
Box	CONC	15	31,740	476,100
	RCP	1	21,100	21,100
Circular	CMP	7	1,914	13,400
	CONC	4	2,125	8,500
	RCP	28	1,814	50,800
Round	CONC	2	2,500	5,000
Misc.		6	5,317	31,900
Culverts Subtotal		67		$ 685,600
Pipes by Diameter				
4” – 12”		13,495	$ 118	$ 1,592,410
15”		3,114	150	467,100
18”		58,207	209	12,165,263
21” - 24”		58,266	227	13,226,382
27” – 30”		46,899	237	11,115,063
33” – 36”		58,798	250	14,699,500
42” - 48”		47,323	250	11,830,750
54”		11,242	250	2,810,500
60” - 66”		14,624	250	3,656,000
72”		5,425	374	2,028,950
>72”		6,326	439	2,777,114
Total		323,719		$ 76,369,032

Sources: Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (Bids); Willdan Financial Services.