

CITY OF BEAUMONT

DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE NEXUS STUDY UPDATE

REVISED REPORT

OCTOBER 31, 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	5
Background and Study Objectives	5
Facility Standards and Costs	6
Use of Fee Revenues	6
Development Impact Fee Schedule Summary	7
Other Funding Needed	9
1. INTRODUCTION	10
Public Facilities Financing in California	10
Study Objectives	10
Fee Program Maintenance	11
Administrative Costs	11
Study Methodology	11
Types of Facility Standards	12
New Development Facility Needs and Costs	12
Organization of the Report	14
2. GROWTH FORECASTS	15
Land Use Types	15
Existing and Future Development	16
Occupant Densities	17
3. PARK FACILITIES.....	19
Service Population	19
Existing Parkland and Park Facilities Inventory	19
Parkland and Park Facilities Unit Costs	20
Parkland and Park Facility Standards	21
<i>Mitigation Fee Act</i>	21
<i>Quimby Act</i>	21
City of Beaumont Parkland and Park Facilities Standards	22
Facilities Needed to Accommodate New Development	22
Park Facilities Cost per Capita	24
Use of Fee Revenue	25
Fee Schedule	25
4. RECREATION FACILITIES.....	27
Service Population	27
Existing Recreation Facilities Inventory	27
Planned Recreation Facilities	28
Cost Allocation	28
Existing Level of Service	28
Future Level of Service	29
Use of Fee Revenue	29
Non-Fee Funding Required	29

Fee Schedule	30
5. FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES	31
Service Population	31
Facility Inventories and Standards	32
Existing Inventory	32
Planned Facilities	33
Cost Allocation	34
Existing Level of Service	34
Future Level of Service	34
Use of Fee Revenue	35
Non-Fee Funding Required	35
Fee Schedule	36
6. POLICE FACILITIES	37
Service Population	37
Facility Inventories and Standards	38
Existing Inventory	38
Planned Facilities	39
Cost Allocation	40
Existing Level of Service	40
Future Level of Service	40
Use of Fee Revenue	41
Non-Fee Funding Required	41
Fee Schedule	42
7. PUBLIC FACILITIES	43
Service Population	43
Facility Inventories and Standards	44
Existing Inventory	44
Planned Facilities	45
Cost Allocation	46
Existing Level of Service	46
Future Level of Service	46
Use of Fee Revenue	47
Non-Fee Funding Required	47
Fee Schedule	48
8. TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES	49
Fee Structure Changes	49
Trip Demand	49
Trip Growth	50
Project Costs	51
Fee per Trip Demand Unit	53
Fee Schedule	53
9. SEWER FACILITIES	55
Sewer Demand	55

EDU Generation by New Development	56
Facility Needs and Costs	56
Cost per EDU	61
Fee Schedule	61
10. SEWER CAPACITY	63
Current Demand for Wastewater Treatment	63
Current Sewer System Asset Valuation	63
Adjusted System Valuation	64
Fee per Gallon per Day	64
Nonresidential Fee Schedule	65
11. RECYCLED WATER FACILITIES	67
Recycled Water Demand	67
Planned Facilities	67
Cost per EDU	67
Fee Schedule	68
12. GENERAL PLAN	70
Service Population	70
Planned Costs	71
Facility Standard	72
Fee Revenue Projection	72
Fee Schedule	73
13. LIBRARY FACILITIES	74
Service Population	74
Existing Library Facilities	74
Planned Facilities	75
Cost Allocation	75
Existing Level of Service	75
Use of Fee Revenue	76
Fee Revenue Projection	76
Fee Schedule	76
14. EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FACILITIES	78
Service Population	78
Planned Facilities and Standards	79
Planned Facilities	79
Cost Allocation	80
Future Level of Service	80
Use of Fee Revenue	80
Non-Fee Funding Required	80
Fee Schedule	81
15. STORM DRAINAGE FACILITIES	82
Storm Drain Demand	82

EDU Generation by New Development	82
Existing Inventory	83
Planned Facilities	83
Cost per Equivalent Dwelling Unit	84
Planned Facilities Cost per EDU	84
Projected Fee Revenue	84
Fee Schedule	85
16. TRAILS.....	86
Service Population	86
Existing Trails Inventory	86
Planned Trails	87
Cost Allocation	87
Existing Level of Service	87
Future Level of Service	88
Use of Fee Revenue	88
Fee Revenue Projection	88
Fee Schedule	88
17. AB 602 REQUIREMENTS.....	90
Compliance with AB 602	90
66016.5. (a) (2) - Level of Service	90
66016.5. (a) (4) – Review of Original Fee Assumptions	91
66016.5. (a) (5) – Residential Fees per Square Foot	91
66016.5. (a) (6) – Capital Improvement Plan	91
18. IMPLEMENTATION.....	92
Impact Fee Program Adoption Process	92
Inflation Adjustment	92
Reporting Requirements	92
Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP	92
19. MITIGATION FEE ACT FINDINGS.....	93
Purpose of Fee	93
Use of Fee Revenues	93
Benefit Relationship	93
Burden Relationship	94
Proportionality	94
APPENDIX	A-1

Executive Summary

This report summarizes an analysis of development impact fees needed to support future development in the City of Beaumont through 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

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 19.

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 protection, police, recycled water, general plan, emergency preparedness, 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, 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

Fee Category	----- Industrial / High Cube Warehouse -----											
	Residential Dwelling Unit	Commercial	Industrial/ Business Park	Transload and Short-Term Storage Warehouse	Fulfillment Center Warehouse - Non-Sort	Parcel Hub Warehouse	Cold Storage Warehouse					
Park Land In Lieu (Subdivisions) ¹	\$ 0.79	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Park Land Acquisition (Non Subdivisions) ²	0.76	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Community Park Improvements	0.49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Neighborhood Park Improvements	0.60	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Recreation Facilities	0.93	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fire Protection Facilities	0.36	0.43	0.63	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18
Police Facilities	0.64	0.35	0.51	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15
Public Facilities	0.28	0.16	0.23	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07
Streets and Bridges	1.85	15.05	8.20	0.67	1.08	4.30	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81
Railroad Crossings	0.52	4.24	2.31	0.19	0.30	1.21	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23
Sewer Facilities	0.65	0.31	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.52
Sewer Capacity ³	2.83	1.08	4.28	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47
Recycled Water	0.30	0.14	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24
General Plan	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004
Library District	0.15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Emergency Preparedness Facilities	0.013	0.002	0.003	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
Storm Drain	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Trails	0.01	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total (Subdivisions)	\$ 10.45	\$ 21.79	\$ 16.96	\$ 3.52	\$ 4.04	\$ 8.17	\$ 3.70	\$ 3.70	\$ 3.70	\$ 3.70	\$ 3.70	\$ 3.70
Total (Infill)	\$ 10.42	\$ 21.79	\$ 16.96	\$ 3.52	\$ 4.04	\$ 8.17	\$ 3.70	\$ 3.70	\$ 3.70	\$ 3.70	\$ 3.70	\$ 3.70

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 schedule.

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 and 16.6.

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 \$321.7 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	\$ 25,858,194	\$ 25,858,194	\$ -
Community Park Improvements	16,526,000	16,526,000	-
Neighborhood Park Improvements	20,242,000	20,242,000	-
Recreation Facilities	62,506,334	31,462,439	31,043,895
Fire Protection Facilities	17,007,587	16,472,432	535,155
Police Facilities	52,292,457	25,282,328	27,010,129
Public Facilities	23,889,646	11,231,280	12,658,366
Streets and Bridges	308,153,612	161,004,317	147,149,296
Railroad Crossings	87,716,550	45,316,450	42,400,100
Sewer Facilities	70,382,100	28,337,773	42,044,327
Sewer Capacity ¹	-	-	-
Recycled Water	30,742,438	12,998,453	17,743,985
General Plan	1,691,250	764,683	926,567
Library District	5,807,961	5,807,961	-
Emergency Preparedness Facilities	372,411	191,171	181,240
Storm Drain	1,000,000	1,000,000	-
Trails	312,000	312,000	-
Total	\$ 724,500,541	\$ 402,807,480	\$ 321,693,061

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, 9.3, 9.4, 11.2, 12.4, 13.5, 14.4, 15.6 and 16.3.

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 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:

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

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 protection, police, recycled water, general plan, emergency preparedness, 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 conveyance 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 16 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

Chapter 17 describes how this study complies with the requirements of AB 602.

Chapter 18 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 19.

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 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 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 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:** A business park consists of a group of flex-type or incubator one- or two-story buildings served by a common roadway system. The space may include offices, retail and wholesale stores, restaurants, recreational areas and warehousing, manufacturing, light industrial, or scientific research functions.
- **Industrial/High Cube Warehouse (HCW):** All warehouse and distribution center development. Note that for the transportation facilities fee, this land-use category is further divided into subcategories as follows
 - *Transload and Short-Term Storage Warehouse:* A transload facility has the primary function of consolidation and distribution of pallet loads (or larger) for manufacturers, wholesalers, or retailers. A transload facility typically has little storage duration, high throughput, and its operations are high efficiency.
 - *Fulfillment Center Warehouse - Non-Sort:* A non-sort facility is a fulfillment center that ships large box items that are processed primarily with automation rather than through manual means.
 - *Parcel Hub Warehouse:* A high-cube parcel hub warehouse typically serves as a regional and local freight-forwarder facility for time sensitive shipments via airfreight and ground carriers.

- *Cold Storage Warehouse:* A high-cube cold store warehouse has substantial temperature-controlled environments for frozen food and other perishable products.

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 at buildout. The base year estimates of residents and dwelling units come from the California Department of Finance. The projection of total dwelling units at buildout is identified in Table 3.2b of the City's General Plan. Total dwelling units at buildout is then used to estimate population at building by multiplying the count of units by the 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.

Base year employees were estimated based on data obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau's 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.

Table 2.1: Demographic Assumptions

	2023	Buildout	Increase
<u>Residents</u> ¹	56,070	97,144	41,074
<u>Dwelling Units</u> ²			
Single Family	16,583	23,081	6,498
Multifamily	2,136	7,940	5,804
Total	18,719	31,021	12,302
<u>Employment</u> 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
<u>Building Square Feet (000s)</u> 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

<i>Residential - All Units</i>	3.22	Residents per dwelling unit
<i>Nonresidential</i>		
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	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
<i><u>Community Parks</u></i>	
Beaumont Sports Park	22.66
Stewart Park	13.21
Subtotal	35.87
<i><u>Neighborhood Parks</u></i>	
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	<u>218,600</u>	<u>218,600</u>
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 2.88 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 2.88 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 ¹	-	6.95	
Total Park Acres	35.87	125.35	161.22
Existing Service Population (2023)	56,070	56,070	56,070
Existing Standard (Acres per 1,000 Residents)	0.64	2.24	2.88
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 26.39 community park acres and 92.01 neighborhood park acres, at a total cost of \$36.8 million.

Table 3.5: Park Improvements to Accommodate New Development

	Calculation	Community	Neighborhood	Total
<i>Park Improvements (Mitigation Fee Act)</i>				
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 capita)	A	0.64	2.24	2.88
Growth in Service Population (2023 to Buildout)	B	41,074	41,074	
Facility Needs (acres)	$C = A \times B / 1000$	26.29	92.01	118.30
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	D	\$ 628,600	\$ 220,000	
Total	$E = C \times D$	\$ 16,526,000	\$ 20,242,000	\$ 36,768,000

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 118.29 and 123.22 parkland acres, at a total cost ranging between \$25.9 and \$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 2.88 acres of improvements, whereas development not subject to the Quimby Act will be charged to provide only 2.88 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, and 2.88 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			
<i>Parkland Dedication In-Lieu (Quimby Act)</i>			
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 capita)	A	3.00	
Growth in Service Population (2023 to Buildout)	B	41,074	
Facility Needs (acres)	$C = A \times B / 1000$	123.22	
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	D	\$ 218,600	
Total - Subdivisions ²	$E = C \times D$		\$ 26,935,892
Non-Subdivisions			
<i>Parkland Acquisition (Mitigation Fee Act)</i>			
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 capita)	A	2.88	
Growth in Service Population (2023 to Buildout)	B	41,074	
Facility Needs (acres)	$C = A \times B / 1000$	118.29	
Average Unit Cost (per acre)	D	\$ 218,600	
Total - Infill ³	$E = C \times D$		\$ 25,858,194

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

	Calculation	<u>Land</u>		<u>Improvements</u>	
		Quimby Fee	Mitigation OR Fee Act Fee	Community Parks	Neighborhood Parks
Parkland Investment (per acre)	A	\$ 218,600	\$ 218,600	\$ 628,600	\$ 220,000
Existing Standard (acres per 1,000 capita)	B	3.00	2.88	0.64	2.24
Total Cost per 1,000 capita	$C = A \times B$	\$ 655,800	\$ 629,568	\$ 402,304	\$ 492,800
Cost per Resident	$D = C / 1,000$	\$ 656	\$ 630	\$ 402	\$ 493

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.

Table 3.8: Park Facilities Fee Schedule

	A	B	C = A x B	D = C x 0.01	E = C + D	F = E / Average
	Cost Per	Density	Base	Admin	Total Fee	Fee per
	Capita		Fee ¹	Charge ^{1, 2}		Sq. Ft. ³
<i>Subdivisions</i>						
Parkland	\$ 656	3.22	\$ 2,112	\$ 21	\$ 2,133	\$ 0.79
Community Park Improvements	402	3.22	1,294	13	1,307	0.49
Neighborhood Park Improvements	493	3.22	1,587	16	1,603	0.60
Total	\$ 1,551		\$ 4,993	\$ 50	\$ 5,043	\$ 1.88
<i>Non-Subdivisions</i>						
Parkland	\$ 630	3.22	\$ 2,029	\$ 20	\$ 2,049	\$ 0.76
Community Park Improvements	402	3.22	1,294	13	1,307	0.49
Neighborhood Park Improvements	493	3.22	1,587	16	1,603	0.60
Total	\$ 1,525		\$ 4,910	\$ 49	\$ 4,959	\$ 1.85

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	<u>41,074</u>
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	<u>11,185,650</u>
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 \$62.5 million worth of new recreation facilities to serve existing and new development, net of existing unreserved fund balances. **Table 4.3** details the City's planned recreation facilities.

Table 4.3: Planned Recreation Facilities

CIP No.	Description	Cost
FUT02	Community Center	\$ 48,439,900
FUT03	Splash Pads (3)	4,450,000
FUT04	Gym	11,676,400
	Total	\$ 64,566,300
	Less Existing Fund Balance	2,059,966
	Net Cost of Planned Facilities	\$ 62,506,334

Source: City of Beaumont FY25 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	<u>62,506,334</u>
Total System Value (Buildout)	\$ 74,391,504
Future Service Population (Buildout)	<u>97,144</u>
Cost per Resident	\$ 766

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 buildout. After accounting for the projected future impact fee revenue, approximately \$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	\$	766
Growth in Service Population (2023 to Buildout)		<u>41,074</u>
Fee Revenue	\$	31,462,439
Net Cost of Planned Facilities		<u>62,506,334</u>
Non-Fee Revenue To Be Identified	\$	(31,043,895)

Sources: Tables 4.1, 4.3 and 4.4.

Fee Schedule

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: (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: Recreation Facilities Fee Schedule

Land Use	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.	
<i>Residential Dwelling Unit</i>	\$ 766	3.22	\$ 2,467	\$ 25	\$ 2,492	\$ 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 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 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
<u>Residents</u>			
Existing (2023)	56,070	1.00	56,070
New Development	41,074	1.00	41,074
Total (Buildout)	97,144		97,144
<u>Workers</u>			
Existing (2023)	6,215	0.69	4,288
New Development	21,675	0.69	14,955
Total (Buildout)	27,890		19,243
<u>Combined Residents and Weighted Workers</u>			
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
<u>Fire Station 66 - 628 Maple Avenue</u>				
Land	0.36	acres	\$ 218,600	\$ 77,785
Station	6,425	sq. ft.	827	<u>5,314,359</u>
Subtotal				\$ 5,392,144
<u>Fire Station No. 106</u>				
Land	1.59	acres	218,600	\$ 347,574
Station	10,760	sq. ft.	827	<u>8,900,000</u>
Subtotal				\$ 9,247,574
<u>Vehicles</u>				
2004 Ford F550				\$ 65,000
2022 Hyundai Santa Fe				40,000
2023 SUBARU CROSSTEK				30,848
Spartan Quint TDA Truck				2,205,647
Squad				<u>282,449</u>
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 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 \$17 million through buildout, net of existing unreserved impact fee fund balances.

Table 5.3: Planned Fire Facilities

	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Cost
<i>New Station: N of I-10/E of Beaumont Av</i>				
Land	1.59	acres	\$ 218,600	\$ 347,574
Building	10,760	sq. ft.	827	<u>8,900,000</u>
Subtotal				\$ 9,247,574
<i>New Station: S of I-10/E of Beaumont Av</i>				
Land	1.59	acres	\$ 218,600	\$ 347,574
Building	10,760	sq. ft.	827	<u>8,900,000</u>
Subtotal				\$ 9,247,574
Total				\$ 18,495,148
Less Existing Fund Balance				<u>1,487,561</u>
Net Cost of Planned Facilities				\$ 17,007,587

Source: City of Beaumont FY25 Capital Improvement Plan; City of Beaumont.

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.

Table 5.4: Existing Level of Service

Value of Existing Facilities	\$ 17,263,662
Existing Service Population	<u>60,358</u>
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 per capita investment in fire protection 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 5.5: Fire Protection Facilities System Plan Facilities Standard

Value of Existing Facilities	\$ 17,263,662
Value of Planned Facilities	<u>17,007,587</u>
Total System Value (Buildout)	\$ 34,271,249
Future Service Population (Buildout)	<u>116,387</u>
Cost per Capita	\$ 294
Cost Allocation per Resident	\$ 294
Cost Allocation per Worker ¹	203

¹ Based on the weighing factor of 0.69.

Sources: Tables 5.1, 5.2 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

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 buildout. After accounting for the projected future impact fee revenue, \$535,155 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 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 Plan Standard

Cost per Capita	\$	294
Growth in Service Population (2023 to Buildout)		<u>56,029</u>
Fee Revenue	\$	16,472,432
Net Cost of Planned Facilities		<u>17,007,587</u>
Non-Fee Revenue To Be Identified	\$	535,155

Sources: Tables 5.1, 5.3 and 5.5.

Fee Schedule

Table 5.7 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: (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 5.7: Fire Protection Facilities Fee Schedule

Land Use	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.	
<i>Residential Dwelling Unit</i>	\$ 294	3.22	\$ 947	\$ 9	\$ 956	\$ 0.36	
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.</i>							
Commercial	\$ 203	2.12	\$ 430	\$ 4	\$ 434	\$ 0.43	
Industrial/Business Park	203	3.08	625	6	631	0.63	
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	203	0.88	179	2	181	0.18	

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
<u>Residents</u>			
Existing (2023)	56,070	1.00	56,070
New Development	41,074	1.00	41,074
Total (Buildout)	97,144		97,144
<u>Workers</u>			
Existing (2023)	6,215	0.31	1,927
New Development	21,675	0.31	6,719
Total (Buildout)	27,890		8,646
<u>Combined Residents and Weighted Workers</u>			
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 City recently acquired 30 acres of land to be used for various City purposes. Eight acres of that parcel will be used to site the future police station. The unit cost for that parcel is based on the cost that the City paid for the parcel. For other City owned properties, 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
<u>Land</u>				
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
New Police Land Acquisition ¹	8.00	Acres	126,667	1,013,333
Subtotal				\$ 1,454,254
<u>Buildings</u> ²				
Police Department - 660 Orange Avenue	10,780	Sq. ft.	\$ -	\$ -
Police Department Annex Building - 1580 E. 8th Street	3,355	Sq. ft.	-	-
Subtotal				\$ -
<u>Vehicles</u>				
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				\$ 3,642,589

¹ Based on City purchase of 30 acres for \$3.8 million. Eight acres from this parcel will be used for the future police station.

² 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 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 \$52.3 million through buildout, net of existing unreserved impact fee fund balances.

Table 6.3: Planned Police Facilities

	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Cost
New Police Station Construction	51,000	Sq. Ft.	\$ 1,106	\$ 56,400,000
Total Cost of Planned Facilities				\$ 56,400,000
Less Prior Year(s) Funding				2,800,000
Less Existing Fund Balance				1,307,543
Net Cost of Planned Facilities				\$ 52,292,457

Source: City of Beaumont; 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	\$	3,642,589
Existing Service Population		57,997
Cost per Capita	\$	63
Facility Standard per Resident	\$	63
Facility Standard per Worker ¹		20

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	\$	3,642,589
Value of Planned Facilities		<u>52,292,457</u>
Total System Value (Buildout)	\$	55,935,046
Future Service Population (Buildout)		<u>105,790</u>
Cost per Capita	\$	529
Cost Allocation per Resident	\$	529
Cost Allocation per Worker ¹		164

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 buildout. After accounting for the projected future impact fee revenue, approximately \$27 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	\$	529
Growth in Service Population (2023 to Buildout)		<u>47,793</u>
Fee Revenue	\$	25,282,328
Net Cost of Planned Facilities		<u>52,292,457</u>
Non-Fee Revenue To Be Identified	\$	(27,010,129)

Sources: Tables 6.1, 6.3 and 6.4.

Fee Schedule

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: (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: Police Facilities Fee Schedule

Land Use	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.
<i>Residential Dwelling Unit</i>	\$ 529	3.22	\$ 1,703	\$ 17	\$ 1,720	\$ 0.64
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.</i>						
Commercial	\$ 164	2.12	\$ 348	\$ 3	\$ 351	\$ 0.35
Industrial/Business Park	164	3.08	505	5	510	0.51
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	164	0.88	144	1	145	0.15

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
<u>Residents</u>			
Existing (2023)	56,070	1.00	56,070
New Development	41,074	1.00	41,074
Total (Buildout)	97,144		97,144
<u>Workers</u>			
Existing (2023)	6,215	0.31	1,927
New Development	21,675	0.31	6,719
Total (Buildout)	27,890		8,646
<u>Combined Residents and Weighted Workers</u>			
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. 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
<i>Land (acres)</i>				
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
<i>Buildings (square feet)¹</i>				
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 buildout. The City plans for a new City Hall and Corporate Yard, including land acquisition. New facilities costs are estimated to total approximately \$23.9 million through buildout, net of existing unreserved 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				1,159,154
Net Cost of Planned Facilities				\$ 23,889,646

¹ Unit cost from 2017 Development Impact 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	\$ 924,678
Existing Service Population	<u>57,997</u>
Cost per Capita	\$ 16
Facility Standard per Resident	\$ 16
Facility Standard per Worker ¹	5

¹ Based on a weighting 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	\$ 924,678
Value of Planned Facilities	<u>23,889,646</u>
Total System Value (Buildout)	\$ 24,814,324
Future Service Population (Buildout)	<u>105,790</u>
Cost per Capita	\$ 235
Cost Allocation per Resident	\$ 235
Cost Allocation per Worker ¹	73

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 buildout. After accounting for the projected future impact fee revenue, approximately \$12.7 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	\$ 235
Growth in Service Population (2023 to Buildout)	<u>47,793</u>
Fee Revenue	\$ 11,231,280
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	<u>23,889,646</u>
Non-Fee Revenue to be Identified	\$ (12,658,366)

Sources: Tables 7.1, 7.3 and 7.4.

Fee Schedule

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: (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: Public Facilities Fee Schedule

Land Use	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.
<i>Residential Dwelling Unit</i>	\$ 235	3.22	\$ 757	\$ 8	\$ 765	\$ 0.28
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.</i>						
Commercial	\$ 73	2.12	\$ 155	\$ 2	\$ 157	\$ 0.16
Industrial/Business Park	73	3.08	225	2	227	0.23
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	73	0.88	64	1	65	0.07

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 intermediate 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.

Note that the average PM Peak hour trip rate across all high-cube warehouse land use categories found in the ITE Trip Generation Manual is used to estimate existing and future trips for the high-cube warehouse land use category. The fee schedule includes each of the land use categories separately, and new development will pay the fee based on whichever high-cube category most closely aligns with a given development project.

A development project that results in intensification of trip demand will be subject to the corresponding land use fee, and a credit will be provided for any previously paid fee.

Table 8.1: Trip Demand Factors

ITE Category	PM Peak		Adjusted Trip Rate	
	Pass-by Trips ¹	Hour Trips ²		
	A	B	$C = (1 - A) \times B$	
<i>Residential - per Dwelling Unit</i>				
Single Family	Single Family Housing (210)	0%	0.94	0.94
Multifamily	Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) (220)	0%	0.51	0.51
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.</i>				
Commercial	Shopping Center (820)	34%	3.40	2.24
Industrial/Business Park	Business Park (770)	0%	1.22	1.22
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse ³	Average	0%	0.26	0.26
Transload and Short-Term Storage Warehouse	High-Cube Transload and Short-Term Storage Warehouse (154)	0%	0.10	0.10
Fulfillment Center Warehouse - Non-Sort	High-Cube Fulfillment Center Warehouse - Non-Sort (155)	0%	0.16	0.16
Parcel Hub Warehouse	High-Cube Parcel Hub Warehouse (156)	0%	0.64	0.64
Cold Storage Warehouse	High-Cube Cold Storage Warehouse (157)	0%	0.12	0.12

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 Weekday Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic (One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.) 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 General Plan buildout. **Table 8.2** lists the 2023 and 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		Growth 2023 to Buildout		Total - Buildout	
		Units / 1,000 SF	Trips	Units / 1,000 SF	Trips	Units / 1,000 SF	Trips
<i>Residential - per Dwelling Unit</i>							
Single Family	0.94	16,583	15,588	6,498	6,108	23,081	21,696
Multifamily	0.51	2,136	1,089	5,804	2,960	7,940	4,049
Subtotal		18,719	16,677	12,302	9,068	31,021	25,745
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.</i>							
Commercial	2.24	1,792	4,015	5,304	11,881	7,096	15,896
Industrial/Business Park	1.22	352	430	532	649	884	1,079
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	0.26	1,511	393	9,991	2,598	11,502	2,991
Subtotal		3,656	4,838	15,827	15,128	19,483	19,966
Total			21,515		24,196		45,711
			47.1%		52.9%		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 (52.9%). 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
<i>Streets and Bridges</i>						
2017-027	Oak Valley/I-10 Interchange Design	\$ 85,000,000	\$ 6,412,113	\$ 78,587,887	52.9%	\$ 41,572,992
2017-001	Pennsylvania Interchange	80,000,000	-	80,000,000	52.9%	42,320,000
R-37	Beaumont Avenue/ I-10 Interchange Project	125,000,000	5,869,000	119,131,000	52.9%	63,020,299
FUT07	Highland Springs (Beaumont Share)	60,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	52.9%	15,870,000
R25-07	Traffic Signal at OVP and Palm Avenue ¹	600,000	300,000	300,000	52.9%	158,700
R26-03	Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade & Capacity Improvement FY26	150,000	-	150,000	52.9%	79,350
R27-03	Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade & Capacity Improvement FY27	150,000	-	150,000	52.9%	79,350
R28-03	Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade & Capacity Improvement FY28	150,000	-	150,000	52.9%	79,350
R29-03	Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade & Capacity Improvement FY29	150,000	-	150,000	52.9%	79,350
R26-04	Traffic Signal Installation at Future Location	600,000	-	600,000	52.9%	317,400
R27-04	Traffic Signal Installation at Future Location	600,000	-	600,000	52.9%	317,400
R28-04	Traffic Signal Installation at Future Location	600,000	-	600,000	52.9%	317,400
R26-05	Citywide Traffic Signal System Upgrade	2,000,000	-	2,000,000	52.9%	1,058,000
	Subtotal	\$ 355,000,000	\$ 42,581,113	\$ 312,418,887		\$ 165,269,591
<i>Railroad</i>						
2017-012	Pennsylvania Ave/UPR Grade Separation	\$ 73,700,000	\$ 13,678,556	\$ 60,021,444	52.9%	\$ 31,751,344
	California URP Grade Separation ²	100,000,000	70,000,000	30,000,000	52.9%	15,870,000
	Subtotal	\$ 173,700,000	\$ 83,678,556	\$ 90,021,444		\$ 47,621,344

¹ Alternative funding show n is \$300,000 of traffic signals DIF fund balances programmed to this project in 2025.

² Assumes 70% of this project will be funded with grants.

Source: City of Beaumont FY25 Capital Improvement Plan; City of Beaumont; 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 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.

Table 8.4: Cost per Trip to Accommodate Growth

	Streets and Bridges	Railroad Crossings
Costs Allocated to New Development	\$ 165,269,591	\$ 47,621,344
Less Existing Fund Balance ¹	<u>4,265,275</u>	<u>2,304,894</u>
Net Costs Allocated to New Development	\$ 161,004,317	\$ 45,316,450
Growth in Trip Demand (2023 to Buildout)	<u>24,196</u>	<u>24,196</u>
Cost per Trip	\$ 6,654	\$ 1,873

¹ Available fund balance shown for streets and bridges fee includes \$4,154,425 from the streets and bridges impact fee fund and \$110,849 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, by 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: (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 8.5: Transportation Facilities Impact Fee Schedule

Land Use	A	B	C = A x B		D = C x 0.01	E = C + D	E / 1,000
	Cost Per Trip	Trip Demand Factor	Base Fee ¹	Admin Charge ^{1, 2}	Total Fee ¹	Fee per Sq. Ft.	
Streets and Bridges							
<i>Residential Dwelling Unit</i> ⁴	\$ 6,654	0.74	\$ 4,924	\$ 49	\$ 4,973	\$ 1.85	
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.</i>							
Commercial	\$ 6,654	2.24	\$ 14,905	\$ 149	\$ 15,054	\$ 15.05	
Industrial/Business Park	6,654	1.22	8,118	81	8,199	8.20	
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse							
Transload and Short-Term Storage Warehouse	\$ 6,654	0.10	\$ 665	\$ 7	\$ 672	\$ 0.67	
Fulfillment Center Warehouse - Non-Sort	6,654	0.16	1,065	11	1,076	1.08	
Parcel Hub Warehouse	6,654	0.64	4,259	43	4,302	4.30	
Cold Storage Warehouse	6,654	0.12	798	8	806	0.81	
Railroad Crossings							
<i>Residential Dwelling Unit</i> ⁴	\$ 1,873	0.74	\$ 1,386	\$ 14	\$ 1,400	\$ 0.52	
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.</i>							
Commercial	\$ 1,873	2.24	\$ 4,196	\$ 42	\$ 4,238	\$ 4.24	
Industrial/Business Park	1,873	1.22	2,285	23	2,308	2.31	
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse							
Transload and Short-Term Storage Warehouse	\$ 1,873	0.10	\$ 187	\$ 2	\$ 189	\$ 0.19	
Fulfillment Center Warehouse - Non-Sort	1,873	0.16	300	3	303	0.30	
Parcel Hub Warehouse	1,873	0.64	1,199	12	1,211	1.21	
Cold Storage Warehouse	1,873	0.12	225	2	227	0.23	

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.

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)
<i>Residential Dwelling Unit</i>				
Single Family			235.00	1.00
Multifamily	2,609	17.00	153.47	0.65
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.</i>				
Commercial	1,175	32.67	35.97	0.15
Industrial/Business Park	1,763	30.49	57.82	0.25
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	1,763	30.49	57.82	0.25

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-ratio of 0.75 for commercial, and 0.7 for industrial/business park and industrial/warehouse uses.

Sources: Table 3.3, 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 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 13,697 new EDUs through buildout, comprising 42.3% of sewer demand in the City at that time.

Table 9.2: Sewer Facilities Equivalent Dwelling Units

Land Use	EDU Factor	2023		Growth 2023 to Buildout		Total - Buildout	
		Units / 1,000 SF	EDUs	Units / 1,000 SF	EDUs	Units / 1,000 SF	EDUs
<i>Residential - per Dwelling Unit</i>							
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
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.</i>							
Commercial	0.15	1,792	269	5,304	795	7,096	1,064
Office	0.25	352	88	532	133	884	221
Industrial	0.25	1,511	378	9,991	2,498	11,502	2,876
Subtotal		3,656	735	15,827	3,426	19,483	4,161
Total			18,706		13,697		32,403
			57.7%		42.3%		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 (WWMP). Note that the costs listed in this table reflect 2021 construction costs. The consultant who prepared the WWMP recommended escalating all the costs by a factor of 15% to reflect the ENR index escalation through October 2024. However, costs have not been adjusted in this analysis.

Projects that are needed to provide capacity to accommodate new development are allocated 100% to the fee. For those sewer facilities projects that benefit both existing development and new development, costs 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.

In circumstances when the sewer facilities impact fees alone will not be sufficient to cover a development project's impacts, project specific impacts will require the project applicant to make upgrades to address identified sewer impacts (via hydraulic and loading studies) through conditions of approval.

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
<u>Lower Oak Valley Lift Station Tributary Area</u>							
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
<u>Tukwet Canyon (New) Lift Station Tributary Area</u>							
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
<u>Upper Oak Valley Lift Station Tributary Area</u>							
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
<u>Olivewood Lift Station Tributary Area</u>							
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 Valley Blvd Embankment Stabilization			780,000	0%	780,000	-
Subtotal				\$ 2,491,100		\$ 2,320,800	\$ 170,300
<u>Brookside Avenue (New) Lift Station Tributary Area</u>							
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 Wastewater 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
<u>Beaumont Mesa Lift Station Tributary Area</u>							
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	Existing Capacity Deficiency	-	New	450,000	0%	450,000	-
BM-FM1	Existing Capacity Deficiency	-	New	4,000,000	0%	4,000,000	-
BM-LS	Existing Capacity Deficiency	-	New	750,000	0%	750,000	-
BM-WW	Existing Capacity Deficiency	-	New	400,000	0%	400,000	-
BM-WW	Existing Capacity Deficiency	-	New	4,000,000	0%	4,000,000	-
Subtotal				\$ 11,711,300		\$ 9,600,000	\$ 2,111,300
<u>Beaumont Crossroads (New) Lift Station Tributary Area</u>							
BC-P1	New Capacity	-	New	\$ 1,122,900	100%	\$ -	\$ 1,122,900
Subtotal				\$ 1,122,900		\$ -	\$ 1,122,900
<u>Marshall Creek Lift Station Tributary Area</u>							
MC-LS	Lift Station Replacement	-	Replace	\$ 3,331,200	0%	\$ 3,331,200	\$ -
<u>Industrial Park Lift Station Tributary Area</u>							
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 Wastewater 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 New Development	Cost Allocated to Existing Development	Cost Allocated to New Development
<i>Wastewater Treatment Plant</i>							
WWTP-P1	Existing Capacity Deficiency	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
	OCSO Capacity Fee Increase		New	743,000	100%	-	743,000
	Future Storage Building		New	450,000	42.3%	259,650	190,350
Subtotal				\$ 12,416,200		\$ 466,350	\$ 11,949,850
<i>Four Seasons Lift Station Tributary Area</i>							
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 Wastewater 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 New Development	Cost Allocated to Existing Development	Cost Allocated to New Development
<i>Gravity Portion of Wastewater Collection System</i>							
	S. Beaumont Ave South Future Gravity Main	21	New	\$ 350,000	100%	\$ -	\$ 350,000
	S. California Ave South Future Gravity Main	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 Capacity	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) Future Gravity Main	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
<i>Mobile Equipment</i>							
	Combination Vacuum Truck with Overhead Boom		New	\$ 750,000	100%	\$ -	\$ 750,000
	Chase pickup truck outfitted with underground equipment		New	60,000	100%	-	60,000
	Subtotal			\$ 810,000		\$ -	\$ 810,000
<i>Other Wastewater System Improvements</i>							
	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		\$ 40,448,050	\$ 29,934,050

Sources: City of Beaumont Wastewater Master Plan, 2021; City of Beaumont.

Cost per EDU

The cost of planned facilities allocated to new development, net of available fund balances, 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	\$ 29,934,050
Less Existing Fund Balances	<u>1,596,277</u>
Net Cost Allocated to New Development	\$ 28,337,773
Growth in EDUs (2023 to Buildout)	<u>13,697</u>
Cost per EDU	\$ 2,069

Sources: Tables 9.2 and 9.3.

Fee Schedule

The maximum justified fee for sewer facilities is shown in **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 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: Maximum Justified Sewer Facilities 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
<i>Residential Dwelling Unit⁴</i>	\$ 2,069	0.83	\$ 1,717	\$ 17	\$ 1,734	\$ 0.65
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.</i>						
Commercial	\$ 2,069	0.15	\$ 310	\$ 3	\$ 313	\$ 0.31
Industrial/Business Park	2,069	0.25	517	5	522	0.52
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	2,069	0.25	517	5	522	0.52

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	2021	2022	2023
	Influent Flows (MG)	Influent Flows (MG)	Influent Flows (MG)	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. Note that this excludes the replacement cost of conveyance facilities and lift stations, which are captured in the sewer facilities fee in the previous chapter.

Table 10.2: Current Sewer System Asset Valuation

Asset Function	Original Cost	Original Cost Less		Replacement Cost	Replacement Cost Less Depreciation
		Depreciation			
Treatment	\$ 254,104,711	\$ 225,417,691	\$ 294,170,308	\$ 246,207,054	
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	
Total	\$ 284,797,882	\$ 250,538,375	\$ 332,456,193	\$ 273,391,990	

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	\$ 273,391,990
Outstanding Debt Principal	<u>79,060,000</u>
Net Valuation	\$ 194,331,990

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 \$32.39. 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	\$	194,331,990
System Flow Capacity (Gallons per Day)		<u>6,000,000</u>
Fee per GPD	\$	32.39
GPD per EDU		235
Capacity Fee per Average Sized Single Family Unit	\$	7,612
Average Square Feet per Unit		<u>2,687</u>
Capacity Fee per Residential Square Foot	\$	2.83

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.

Note that if a development project results in the intensification of effluent strength, that project will be subject to the corresponding land use fee, and a credit will be provided for any previously paid fee.

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	\$ 7,612				
Standard EDU Effluent (per SFR)	B	235 gpd	235 gpd	250 Mg/l	250 Mg/l	
<u>Commercial Low Strength</u>						
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			\$699	\$130	\$107	\$937
<u>Commercial Medium Strength</u>						
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			\$699	\$219	\$163	\$1,081
<u>Commercial High Strength</u>						
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			\$699	\$870	\$622	\$2,190
<u>Industrial Low Strength</u>						
Effluent Values	C		57.82 gpd	106 Mg/l	127 Mg/l	
Calculated Strength Factor (= C / B)	D		0.25	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		0.15	0.02	0.02	
Total Capacity Fee			\$1,124	\$159	\$190	\$1,473
<u>Industrial High Strength</u>						
Effluent Values	C		57.82 gpd	1598 Mg/l	506 Mg/l	
Calculated Strength Factor (= C / B)	D		0.25	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		0.15	0.31	0.10	
Total Capacity Fee			\$1,124	\$2,394	\$758	\$4,276

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 \$30.7 million, net of existing unreserved 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)	<u>730,000</u>
Total	\$ 33,551,700
Less Existing Fund Balance	<u>2,809,262</u>
 Net Cost of Planned Facilities	 \$ 30,742,438

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 at buildout to determine a cost per EDU. **Table 11.2** displays this calculation. Total EDUs 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	\$	30,742,438
Total EDUs at Buildout		<u>32,403</u>
Cost per EDU	\$	949
New Development EDUs		13,697
Projected Fee Revenue	\$	12,998,453

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 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 11.3: Recycled Water Facilities 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
<i>Residential Dwelling Unit⁴</i>	\$ 949	0.83	\$ 788	\$ 8	\$ 796	\$ 0.30
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.</i>						
Commercial	\$ 949	0.15	\$ 142	\$ 1	\$ 143	\$ 0.14
Industrial/Business Park	949	0.25	237	2	239	0.24
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	949	0.25	237	2	239	0.24

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 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
<i><u>Residents</u></i>			
Existing (2023)	56,070	1.00	56,070
New Development	41,074	1.00	41,074
Total (Buildout)	97,144		97,144
<i><u>Workers</u></i>			
Existing (2023)	6,215	0.31	1,927
New Development	21,675	0.31	6,719
Total (Buildout)	27,890		8,646
<i><u>Combined Residents and Weighted Workers</u></i>			
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 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 unreserved 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				262,150
Net Cost				\$ 1,691,250

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 buildout by the total service population 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: General Plan – System Standard

Cost of Planning Studies	\$ 1,691,250
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 \$926,567 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	\$	16
Growth in Service Population (2023 to Buildout)		<u>47,793</u>
Fee Revenue	\$	764,683
Net Cost of Planned Facilities		<u>1,691,250</u>
Non-Fee Revenue To Be Identified	\$	(926,567)

Sources: Tables 12.1, 12.2 and 12.3.

Fee Schedule

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%) 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: General Plan Impact Fee Schedule

Land Use	A		B	C = A x B		D = C x 0.01	E = C + D	F = E / Average
	Cost Per	Density		Base Fee ¹	Admin Charge ^{1, 2}			
<i>Residential Dwelling Unit</i>	\$	16	3.22	\$ 52	\$ 1	\$ 53	\$ 0.02	
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.</i>								
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	<u>41,074</u>	<u>6,926</u>	<u>48,000</u>
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 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 \$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	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 library 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	<u>65,525</u>
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 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 Buildout)	<u>48,000</u>
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: (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 13.6: Library Facilities Fee Schedule

Land Use	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 ¹	Fee per Sq. Ft. ³
<i>Residential Dwelling Unit</i>	\$ 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
<u>Residents</u>			
Existing (2023)	56,070	1.00	56,070
New Development	41,074	1.00	41,074
Total (Buildout)	97,144		97,144
<u>Workers</u>			
Existing (2023)	6,215	0.31	1,927
New Development	21,675	0.31	6,719
Total (Buildout)	27,890		8,646
<u>Combined Residents and Weighted Workers</u>			
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 \$372,411 net of the existing unreserved 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				1,129,129
Net Cost of Planned Facilities				\$ 372,411

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	\$ 372,411
Total System Value (Buildout)	\$ 372,411
Future Service Population (Buildout)	105,790
Cost per Capita	\$ 4
Cost Allocation per Resident	\$ 4
Cost Allocation per Worker ¹	1

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 buildout. After accounting for the projected future impact fee revenue, \$181,240 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	\$	4
Growth in Service Population (2023 to Buildout)		<u>47,793</u>
Fee Revenue	\$	191,171
Net Cost of Planned Facilities		<u>372,411</u>
Non-Fee Revenue To Be Identified	\$	(181,240)

Sources: Tables 14.1, 14.2 and 14.3.

Fee Schedule

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: (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: Emergency Preparedness Facilities Fee Schedule

Land Use	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.	
<i>Residential Dwelling Unit</i>	\$ 4	3.22	\$ 13	\$ -	\$ 13	\$ 0.013	
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.</i>							
Commercial	\$ 1	2.12	\$ 2	\$ -	\$ 2	\$ 0.002	
Industrial/Business Park	1	3.08	3	-	3	0.003	
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	1	0.88	1	-	1	0.001	

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)
<i>Residential Dwelling Unit</i>			
Single Family	4.00	0.50	1.00
Multifamily	17.00	0.65	0.31
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.</i>			
Commercial	32.67	0.90	0.22
Industrial/Business Park	30.49	0.90	0.24
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	30.49	0.90	0.24

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-ratio of 0.75 for commercial, and 0.7 for industrial/business park and industrial/warehouse uses.

Sources: Plate D-5.6 from the Riverside County Flood Control Hydrology Manual; Table 9.1, Willdan Financial Services.

EDU Generation by New Development

Table 15.2 shows the estimated EDU generation from new development through buildout. New development will generate approximately 11,989 new EDUs, representing 39.9 percent of total storm drain demand at buildout.

Table 15.2: Storm Drain Demand Projections

Land Use	EDU Factor	2023		Growth 2023 to Buildout		Total - Buildout	
		Units / 1,000 SF	EDUs	Units / 1,000 SF	EDUs	Units / 1,000 SF	EDUs
<i>Residential - per Dwelling Unit</i>							
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
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.</i>							
Commercial	0.22	1,792	394	5,304	1,167	7,096	1,561
Office	0.24	352	85	532	127	884	212
Industrial	0.24	1,511	363	9,991	2,398	11,502	2,761
Subtotal		3,656	842	15,827	3,692	19,483	4,534
Total			18,087		11,989		30,076
			60.1%		39.9%		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 identifies the preliminary planned storm drain facilities. In this case the City plans to conduct a storm drain facilities master plan to identify future capacity-expanding storm drain facilities needed to serve the City.

Since the City does not have any unfunded storm drainage projects beyond the storm drain master plan, development is responsible for mitigating all storm drain impacts on a case-by-case basis. Once the storm drain master plan has been completed, the City plans to revise this fee to fund new development’s share of the identified projects. At that point in time, new development will be able to mitigate its impacts on storm drain facilities by paying that future impact fee.

Table 15.4: Planned Storm Drain Facilities

Description	Total Project Cost
Citywide Storm Drain Master Plan	\$ 1,000,000
Total	\$ 1,000,000

Source: City of Beaumont.

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 existing facility cost standard for storm drain facilities. This figure is shown for informational purposes only and does not drive the fee schedule.

Table 15.5: Existing Cost per Equivalent Dwelling Unit

Existing Inventory Replacement Cost	\$ 78,628,659
Existing EDUs	18,087
Cost per EDU	\$ 4,347

Sources: Tables 15.2 and 15.3.

Planned Facilities Cost per EDU

The planned facilities cost per EDU that drives the fee schedule is calculated by dividing the cost of the planned facilities from Table 15.4 by the projected increase in storm drain EDUs identified in Table 15.2. This cost per EDU drives the fee calculation.

Table 15.6: Planned Facilities Cost per EDU

Cost of Planned Facilities	\$ 1,000,000
Increase in EDUs	11,989
Cost per EDU	\$ 83

Sources: Tables 15.2 and 15.4.

Projected Fee Revenue

Under the planned facilities approach, the projected fee revenue is equal to the cost of the planned facilities identified in **Table 15.4**.

Fee Schedule

The maximum justified fee for storm drain facilities is shown in **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%) 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: Storm Drain Facilities Impact Fee Schedule

	A	B	C = A x B	D = C x 0.01	E = C + D	E / Average
	Cost Per	EDU	Base	Admin	Total Fee ¹	Fee per
	EDU	Factor	Fee ¹	Charge ^{1, 2}		Sq. Ft. ³
<i>Residential Dwelling Unit</i> ⁴	\$ 83	0.67	\$ 56	\$ 1	\$ 57	\$ 0.02
<i>Nonresidential - per 1,000 Sq. Ft.</i>						
Commercial	\$ 83	0.22	\$ 18	\$ -	\$ 18	\$ 0.02
Industrial/Business Park	83	0.24	20	-	20	0.02
Industrial/High-Cube Warehouse	83	0.24	20	-	20	0.02

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 15.6.

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

	<u>Residents</u>
Existing (2023)	56,070
New Development	<u>41,074</u>
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
<i>Existing Trails</i>				
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
<i>Future Trails</i>				
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	<u>56,070</u>
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 Buildout)	<u>41,074</u>
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

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: (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: Trail Facilities Fee Schedule

Land Use	A	B	$C = A \times B$	$D = C \times 0.01$	$E = C + D$	$F = E / \text{Average}$
	Cost Per Capita	Density	Base Fee ¹	Admin Charge ^{1, 2}	Total Fee	Fee per Sq. Ft.
<i>Residential Dwelling Unit</i>	\$ 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. 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, and library 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, storm drain facilities and trails facility fees. 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 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, 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 General Plan Buildout, which has been updated based on the City’s 2020 General Plan.
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 17.1 displays an accounting of annual revenue collected over the last five fiscal years for the impact fees included in this analysis.

Table 17.1: 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 Preparedness	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.

18. 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.

19. 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, and emergency preparedness facilities.

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
<u>Structures</u>				
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
<u>Culverts by Shape</u>				
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
<u>Pipes by Diameter</u>				
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.