CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA

Development Impact Fee Study
Final Report

November 1, 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

The City of Rancho Cucamonga retained NBS Government Finance Group to prepare this study to analyze the impacts of new development on several types of capital facilities and to calculate impact fees based on that analysis.

The methods used in this study are consistent with those outlined in the *Impact Fee Nexus Study Templates* prepared for the California Department of Housing and Community Development by the Terner Center for Housing Innovation at UC Berkeley in fulfillment of AB 602. Those methods are designed to satisfy the legal requirements of the U. S. Constitution, and the California Mitigation Fee Act (Government Code Sections 66000 *et seq*.).

Organization of the Report

Chapter 1 of this report provides an overview of the legal requirements for establishing and imposing such fees, and methods that can be used to calculate impact fees.

Chapter 2 contains data on existing and future development used in this report.

Chapters 3 through 8 analyze the impacts of development on specific types of facilities and calculate impact fees for those facilities. The facilities addressed in this report are listed by chapter below:

Chapter 3. Park Land and Park Improvements
Chapter 4. Community and Recreation Center Facilities
Chapter 5. Library Facilities and Materials
Chapter 6. Animal Center Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment
Chapter 7. Police Department Facilities
Chapter 8. RCFPD Facilities, Apparatus and Equipment

Chapter 9 summarizes requirements for adopting and implementing impact fees.

Appendix A to this report contains a detailed inventory of park maintenance vehicles and equipment.

Development Data

Chapter 2 of this report presents estimates of existing development in Rancho Cucamonga and a forecast of future development in terms of units of development, population, police department calls for service per year and Rancho Cucamonga Fire Protection District (RCFPD) calls for service per year for each type of development defined in this study.

Chapter 2 also establishes values for factors such as population per unit, and police and fire calls per unit per year. Those factors are used to represent the impact of new development in the impact fee calculations.

It is important to note that because of amendments to the Mitigation Fee Act contained in AB 602 (2021) that were incorporated into California law effective in 2022, impact fee categories for residential development in this study are defined in terms of unit-size categories, broken down by square footage. Prior to the adoption of AB 602 it was common practice to base residential impact fees on unit type categories (e.g., single-family or multi-family units).

Impact Fee Analysis

The impact fee analysis for each type of facility addressed in this report is presented in a separate chapter. In each case, the relationship, or nexus, between development and the need for a particular type of facility is defined in a way that allows the impact of additional development on facility needs to be quantified.

The impact fees are based only on capital costs for facilities and other capital assets needed to mitigate the impacts of additional development. Impact fees may not be used to pay for maintenance or operations.

Impact fees calculated in this report are shown later in this Executive Summary.

The following paragraphs briefly discuss the methods used to calculate impact fees for each of the facility types addressed in this study.

Park Land and Park Improvements. Chapter 3 of this report calculates impact fees for park land acquisition and park improvements. The cost of park maintenance vehicles and equipment is included in the park improvement impact fees.

Impact Fees for Park Land Acquisition. The impact fees for park land acquisition calculated in Chapter 3 apply only to residential development and are based on the existing level of service which means the existing ratio of improved park acres to population in the City.

The park land impact fees calculated in Chapter 3 are based on the City's existing ratio of improved park land to population in acres per capita, and the land cost per acre used in those calculations is based on the estimated cost per acre to acquire additional park land in the City. Those factors are used to calculate a cost per capita, which is multiplied by the population per unit for each category of residential development to get a park land impact fee per unit for each category. Impact fees for park land do not apply to non-residential development.

Impact Fees for Park Improvements. The park improvement impact fees calculated in Chapter 3 are based on the City's existing ratio of improved park land to population in acres per capita, and the estimated cost per acre for park improvements. The cost of park maintenance vehicles and equipment is incorporated into the park improvement impact fees, but the vehicles and equipment component represents less than 1% of those fees.

Multiplying the acres per capita by the cost per acre results in a cost per capita which is multiplied by the population per unit for each category of residential development to get

a park improvement impact fee per unit for each category. Impact fees for park improvements do not apply to non-residential development.

The impact fees calculated in this report for park land and park improvements are shown in Table S.1 on page S-5.

Community and Recreation Center Facilities. Chapter 4 of this report calculates impact fees for community and recreation centers.

The impact fees for community and recreation center facilities are based on the City's existing level of service for these facilities, which is defined as the relationship between the existing population and the replacement cost of existing community and recreation center facilities. That relationship is stated as a cost per capita. The impact fees per unit for community and recreation center facilities are calculated as the cost per capita multiplied by the population per unit for each category of residential development. The impact fees for community and recreation center facilities do not apply to non-residential development.

The impact fees calculated in this report for community and recreation center facilities are shown in Table S.1 on page S-5.

Library Facilities and Materials. Chapter 5 of this report calculates impact fees for library facilities and materials.

The library impact fees are based on the City's existing level of service which is defined as the relationship between the existing population and the replacement cost of existing library facilities and materials. That relationship is stated as a cost per capita. The impact fees per unit are calculated as the cost per capita multiplied by the population per unit for each category of residential development. The impact fees for library facilities and materials do not apply to non-residential development.

The impact fees for Library facilities and Library materials are calculated separately in Chapter 5, but they are shown as a combined fee in Table S.1 on page S-5.

Animal Center Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment. Chapter 6 of this report calculates impact fees for animal center facilities, vehicles and equipment.

The impact fees are based on the City's existing level of service for these facilities which is defined as the relationship between the existing population and the replacement cost of the existing facilities, vehicles and equipment. That relationship is stated as a cost per capita. The impact fees per unit for the animal center are calculated as the cost per capita multiplied by the population per unit for each category of residential development. The impact fees for the animal center apply only to residential development.

The impact fees calculated in this report for Animal Center facilities are shown in Table S.1 on page S-5.

Police Department Facilities. Chapter 7 calculates impact fees for Police Department facilities based on the existing level of service in the City. The existing level of service is

defined as the relationship between the replacement cost of existing Police Department facilities and the number of calls for service per year received by the Department. That relationship is stated as a cost per call for service per year.

As part of this study, NBS analyzed the distribution of Police Department calls for service for a full year to determine the average number of calls per unit per year generated by each types of development defined in this study. The impact fee per unit for each type of development is calculated by multiplying the cost per call for service and the number of calls per unit per year for each type of development. Police impact fees are intended to apply to all types of new development in the City.

The impact fees calculated in this report for Police Department facilities are shown in Table S.1 on page S-5.

Fire Department Facilities, Apparatus and Equipment. Fire protection and emergency response services for the City of Rancho Cucamonga are provided by the Rancho Cucamonga Fire Protection District (RCFPD). Chapter 8 calculates fire impact fees for the City of Rancho Cucamonga, which occupies a large part of the RCFPD service area.

By law, fire districts are prohibited from imposing impact fees on their own, but they are allowed to receive funds from other entities for any legitimate purpose. So, the City can impose fire impact fees on new development in the City and provide the revenue from those fees to RCFPD to pay for capital facilities, apparatus and equipment needed to mitigate the impacts of new development in the City.

Unlike the other impact fees calculated in this study which are based on the existing level of service for the relevant facilities, the fire impact fees in Chapter 8 are calculated using the system plan method. That method bases the impact fees on future conditions, so the cost of both existing and future RCFPD assets serving the City are allocated to both existing and future development in the City. In this case, future development is projected out to 2040.

The impact of development on RCFPD facilities, apparatus and equipment is represented in this study by the number of calls for service per year generated by development in the City. As part of this study, NBS analyzed the distribution of RCFPD calls for service for a full year to determine the average number of calls per unit per year generated by different types of development.

A cost per call for service year is calculated by dividing estimated 2040 asset costs by the projected number of calls for service per year generated by development in the City is 2040. Then, an impact fee per unit is calculated by multiplying that cost per call by the number of calls for service per year generated by each category of development defined in this study.

The impact fees calculated in this report for Fire Department facilities are shown in Table S.1 below.

Impact Fee Summary

Table S.1 summarizes the impact fees calculated in this report.

Table S.1: Summary of Development Impact Fees per Unit Calculated in This Study

Development Type	Units [1]	Park Land	Park Imprvmts	Comm/Rec Centers	Libraries	Animal Center	Police	Fire	Total
Residential <600 Sq. Ft per Unit	DU	$ 2,557	$ 1,905	$ 702	$ 348	$ 72	$ 303	$ 674	**$ 6,562**
Residential >600 - 800 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$ 3,324	$ 2,476	$ 913	$ 452	$ 94	$ 322	$ 745	**$ 8,326**
Residential >800 - 1,200 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$ 4,602	$ 3,428	$ 1,264	$ 626	$ 130	$ 340	$ 816	**$ 11,207**
Residential <1,200 - 1,900 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$ 6,903	$ 5,142	$ 1,897	$ 939	$ 196	$ 358	$ 887	**$ 16,322**
Residential <1,900 - 2,300 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$ 8,949	$ 6,666	$ 2,458	$ 1,218	$ 254	$ 377	$ 958	**$ 20,879**
Residential > 2,300 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$ 11,250	$ 8,380	$ 3,091	$ 1,531	$ 319	$ 395	$ 1,029	**$ 25,994**
Senior/Assisted Living Facility	Beds						$ 909	$ 14,341	**$ 15,250**
Commercial/Retail	KSF						$ 1,029	$ 1,170	**$ 2,199**
Hotel/Motel	Rooms						$ 65	$ 582	**$ 648**
Office	KSF						$ 243	$ 619	**$ 862**
Industrial	KSF						$ 68	$ 88	**$ 156**

[1] DU = dwelling unit; KSF = 1,000 gross square feet of building area; Room = guest room or suite; Bed = one occupant

Table S.2 shows the City's existing impact fees. Because of the differences between the residential development categories used in this study and those used for the City's existing fees, impact fees for different categories of residential development cannot be compared directly. The impact fees shown in Table S.2 for the three smallest residential unit size categories are the existing multi-family unit impact fees, and the impact fees shown for the three largest unit size categories are the existing single-family unit impact fees.

Table S.2: Existing Impact Fees From City of Rancho Cucamonga 2024 Fee Schedule

Development Type	Units [1]	Park Land	Park Imprvmts	Comm/Rec Centers	Libraries	Animal Center	Police	Fire	Total
Residential <600 Sq. Ft per Unit	DU	$ 3,239	$ 3,129	$ 1,693	$ 608	$ 116	$ 297	$ 0	**$ 9,082**
Residential >600 - 800 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$ 3,239	$ 3,129	$ 1,693	$ 608	$ 116	$ 297	$ 0	**$ 9,082**
Residential >800 - 1,200 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$ 3,239	$ 3,129	$ 1,693	$ 608	$ 116	$ 297	$ 0	**$ 9,082**
Residential <1,200 - 1,900 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$ 4,744	$ 4,583	$ 2,481	$ 891	$ 169	$ 376	$ 0	**$ 13,244**
Residential <1,900 - 2,300 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$ 4,744	$ 4,583	$ 2,481	$ 891	$ 169	$ 376	$ 0	**$ 13,244**
Residential > 2,300 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$ 4,744	$ 4,583	$ 2,481	$ 891	$ 169	$ 376	$ 0	**$ 13,244**
Assisted Living Facilities	Bed	$ 1,576	$ 1,523	$ 825	$ 296	$ 56	$ 136	$ 0	**$ 4,412**
Commercial/Retail	KSF						$ 1,184	$ 0	**$ 1,184**
Hotel/Motel	Room						$ 182	$ 0	**$ 182**
Office	KSF						$ 371	$ 0	**$ 371**
Industrial	KSF						$ 54	$ 0	**$ 54**

[1] DU = dwelling unit; KSF = 1,000 gross square feet of building area; Room = guest room or suite; Bed = one occupant

Table S.3 shows the difference between the existing impact fees in Table S.2 and the proposed impact fees from Table S.1. Numbers in parentheses indicate that the proposed fees are lower than the existing fees.

Table S.3: Difference Between Existing Impact Fees and Impact Fees Calculated in This Study

Development Type	Units [1]	Park Land	Park Imprvmts	Comm/Rec Centers	Libraries	Animal Center	Police	Fire	**Total**
Residential <600 Sq. Ft per Unit	DU	$ (682)	$ (1,224)	$ (991)	$ (260)	$ (44)	$ 6	$ 674	**$ (2,520)**
Residential >600 - 800 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$ 85	$ (653)	$ (780)	$ (156)	$ (22)	$ 25	$ 745	**$ (756)**
Residential >800 - 1,200 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$ 1,363	$ 299	$ (429)	$ 18	$ 14	$ 43	$ 816	**$ 2,125**
Residential <1,200 - 1,900 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$ 2,159	$ 559	$ (584)	$ 48	$ 27	$ (18)	$ 887	**$ 3,078**
Residential <1,900 - 2,300 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$ 4,205	$ 2,083	$ (23)	$ 327	$ 85	$ 1	$ 958	**$ 7,635**
Residential > 2,300 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$ 6,506	$ 3,797	$ 610	$ 640	$ 150	$ 19	$ 1,029	**$ 12,750**
Assisted Living Facilities	Bed	$ (1,576)	$ (1,523)	$ (825)	$ (296)	$ (56)	$ 773	$ 14,341	**$ 10,838**
Commercial/Retail	KSF						$ (155)	$ 1,170	**$ 1,015**
Hotel/Motel	Room						$ (117)	$ 582	**$ 466**
Office	KSF						$ (128)	$ 619	**$ 491**
Industrial	KSF						$ 14	$ 88	**$ 102**

[1] DU = dwelling unit; KSF = 1,000 gross square feet of building area; Room = guest room or suite; Bed = one occupant

Interpreting the figures in Table S.3 is complicated by the fact that the categories used for the City's existing impact fees are different from those used in the current study. That is reflected in the negative numbers for the smallest residential unit-size categories for several of these impact fees and in the total column at the right of the table. So even though the cost per capita for several of these fees has increased from the 2020 impact fee study, some impact fees per unit for the smallest units are lower than the City's existing impact fees. The overall impact of the proposed new impact fees can best be assessed by focusing on the middle of the range of unit-size categories.

Chapter 1. Introduction

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to analyze the impacts of development on the need for certain capital facilities and other capital assets provided by the City of Rancho Cucamonga (City) and the Rancho Cucamonga Fire Protection District (RCFPD or District) and to calculate impact fees based on that analysis. This report documents the approach, data and methodology used in this study to calculate impact fees.

The City has previously enacted impact fees for the City facilities addressed in this report. The purpose of this study is to update those fees to reflect current costs and conditions in the City. See Rancho Cucamonga Municipal Code Chapters 3.52 (Community and Recreation Center Impact Fee), 3.56 (Library Impact Fee), 3.60 (Animal Center Impact Fee), 3.64, (Police Impact Fee), and 3.68 (Park In-lieu/Impact Fees). The impact fee calculated in this study for Rancho Cucamonga Fire Protection District facilities, apparatus and equipment would be a new fee.

The methods used to calculate impact fees in this report satisfy all legal requirements governing such fees, including provisions of the U. S. Constitution, the California Constitution and the California Mitigation Fee Act (Government Code Sections 66000-66025.

Legal Framework for Impact Fees

This brief summary of the legal framework for development fees is intended as a general overview. It was not prepared by an attorney and should not be treated as legal advice.

U. S. Constitution. Like all land use regulations, development exactions, including impact fees, are subject to the 5th Amendment prohibition on taking of private property for public use without just compensation. Both state and federal courts have recognized the imposition of impact fees on development as a legitimate form of land use regulation, provided the fees meet standards intended to protect against "regulatory takings." A regulatory taking occurs when regulations unreasonably deprive landowners of property rights protected by the Constitution.

In two cases dealing with exactions, the U. S. Supreme Court has held that when a government agency requires the dedication of land or an interest in land as a condition of development approval or imposes ad hoc exactions as a condition of approval on a single development project that do not apply to development generally, a higher standard of judicial scrutiny applies. To meet that standard, the agency must demonstrate an "essential nexus" between such exactions and the interest being protected (See *Nollan v. California Coastal Commission,* 1987) and make an "individualized determination" that the exaction imposed is "roughly proportional" to the burden created by development (See *Dolan v. City of Tigard,* 1994). In April 2024, the U. S. Supreme Court ruled that even legislatively adopted impact fees are subject to *Nollan* and *Dolan*.

Defining "Nexus." The nexus required to justify exactions and impact fees can be thought of as having the three elements discussed below. We think proportionality is logically included as one element of that nexus, even though it was discussed separately in *Dolan v. Tigard.* The elements of the nexus discussed below mirror the three "reasonable relationship" findings required by the Mitigation Fee Act for establishment and imposition of impact fees.

1. Need or Impact**.** An agency imposing impact fees must demonstrate that a development project subject to those fees will create a need for the facilities to be funded by the impact fees. All new development in a community creates additional demands on some or all public facilities provided by local government. If the capacity of facilities is not increased to satisfy the additional demand, the quality or availability of public services for the entire community will deteriorate. Impact fees may be used to recover the cost of development-related facilities, but only to the extent that the need for facilities is related to the development project subject to the fees.

The *Nollan* decision reinforced the principle that development exactions may be used only to mitigate impacts created by the development projects upon which they are imposed. In this study, the impact of development on facility needs is analyzed in terms of quantifiable relationships between various types of development and the demand for public facilities based on applicable level-of-service standards. This report contains all of the information needed to demonstrate compliance with this element of the nexus.

2. Benefit. An agency imposing impact fees must demonstrate that a development project subject to those fees will benefit from the facilities funded by the impact fees. With respect to the benefit relationship, the most basic requirement is that facilities funded by impact fees be available to serve the development paying the fees. A sufficient benefit relationship also requires that impact fee revenues be segregated from other funds and expended in a timely manner on the facilities for which the fees were charged. Nothing in the U.S. Constitution or California law requires that facilities paid for with impact fee revenues be available exclusively to development projects paying the fees.

Procedures for earmarking and expenditure of fee revenues are mandated by the Mitigation Fee Act, as are procedures to ensure that the fees are either expended in a timely manner or refunded. Those requirements are intended to ensure that developments benefit from the impact fees they are required to pay. Thus, over time, procedural issues as well as substantive issues can come into play with respect to the benefit element of the nexus.

3. Proportionality. An agency imposing impact fees must demonstrate that amount of those fees is proportional to the impact created by development projects subject to the fees. Proportionality in impact fees depends on properly identifying development-related facility costs and calculating the fees in such a way that those costs are allocated in proportion to the facility needs created by different types and amounts of development. The section on impact fee methodology, below, describes methods used to allocate facility costs and calculate impact fees that meet the proportionality standard.

California Constitution. The California Constitution grants broad police power to local governments, including the authority to regulate land use and development. That police power is the source of authority for local governments in California to impose impact fees on development. Some impact fees have been challenged on grounds that they are special taxes imposed without voter approval in violation of Article XIIIA. Impact fees calculated in this report do not exceed the cost of providing facilities needed to serve new development and, thus, are not special taxes requiring voter approval pursuant to Article XIIIA.

Articles XIIIC and XIIID, added to the California Constitution by Proposition 218 in 1996, require voter approval for some "property-related fees," but exempt "the imposition of fees or charges, as a condition of property development." Thus, impact fees are exempt from those requirements.

The Mitigation Fee Act. California's impact fee statute originated in Assembly Bill 1600 during the 1987 session of the Legislature and took effect in January 1989. AB 1600 added several sections to the Government Code, beginning with Section 66000. Since that time, the impact fee statute has been amended from time to time, and in 1997 was officially titled the "Mitigation Fee Act." Unless otherwise noted, code sections referenced in this report are from the Government Code.

The Mitigation Fee Act does not limit the types of capital improvements for which impact fees may be charged. It defines public facilities very broadly to include "public improvements, public services and community amenities." Although the issue is not specifically addressed in the Mitigation Fee Act both case law and statute (see Government Code Section 65913.8) clarify that impact fees may not be used to pay for ongoing maintenance or operating costs. Consequently, the fees calculated in this report are based on the cost of capital assets only.

The Mitigation Fee Act does not use the term "mitigation fee" except in its official title. Nor does it use the common term "impact fee." The Act simply uses the word "fee," which is defined as "a monetary exaction, other than a tax or special assessment…that is charged by a local agency to the applicant in connection with approval of a development project for the purpose of defraying all or a portion of the cost of public facilities related to the development project …."

To avoid confusion with other types of fees, this report uses the widely accepted term "impact fee" which should be understood to mean "fee" as defined in the Mitigation Fee Act.

The Mitigation Fee Act contains requirements for establishing, increasing and imposing impact fees. They are summarized below. It also contains provisions that govern the collection and expenditure of fees and requires annual reports and periodic re-evaluation of impact fee programs. Those administrative requirements are discussed in the implementation chapter of this report.

Required Findings**.** Section 66001 (a) requires that an agency establishing, increasing or imposing impact fees, must make findings to:

1. Identify the purpose of the fee
2. Identify the use of the fee; and
3. Determine that there is a reasonable relationship between the use of the fee and the development type on which it is imposed
4. Determine that there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the facility and the type of development on which the fee is imposed

In addition, Section 66001 (b) requires that in any action imposing a fee as a condition of approval of a development project by a local agency, the local agency shall determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facility or portion of the public facility attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed.

The requirements outlined above are discussed in more detail below.

Identifying the Purpose of the Fees. The broad purpose of impact fees is to protect public health, safety and general welfare by providing for adequate public facilities. The specific purpose of the fees calculated in this study is to fund acquisition or construction of certain capital assets that will be needed to mitigate the impacts of planned new development on City facilities, and to maintain an acceptable level of public services as the City grows.

This report recommends that findings regarding the purpose of an impact fee should define the purpose broadly, as providing for the funding of adequate public facilities to serve additional development.

Identifying the Use of the Fees. According to Section 66001(a)(2), if a fee is used to finance public facilities, those facilities must be identified. A capital improvement plan may be used for that purpose but is not mandatory if the facilities are identified in a General Plan, a Specific Plan, or in other public documents. Section 66002 (b) requires that if a capital improvement plan is used to identify the facilities, it must be updated annually.

However, a new provision in Section 66016.5(a)(6), which was added by AB 602 in 2021, requires that large jurisdictions adopt a capital improvement plan as part of an impact fee study. That requirement applies to impact fee nexus studies adopted after January 1, 2022. “Large jurisdiction” means a county of 250,000 or more or any city within that county. The statute does not provide any detail about what must be included in the capital improvement plan or how it should relate to the impact fee study. That new requirement appears to override the original language of Section 66001(a)(2), so that a capital improvement plan (CIP) is no longer optional. A CIP is now required for all new impact fee nexus studies. The annual update requirement remains in effect.

Reasonable Relationship Requirement. As discussed above, Section 66001 requires that, for fees subject to its provisions, a "reasonable relationship" must be demonstrated between:

1. the use of the fee and the type of development on which it is imposed;
2. the need for a public facility and the type of development on which a fee is imposed; and,
3. the amount of the fee and the facility cost attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed.

Development Agreements and Reimbursement Agreements. The requirements of the Mitigation Fee Act do not apply to fees collected under development agreements (see Govt. Code Section 66000) or reimbursement agreements (see Govt. Code Section 66003). The same is true of fees in lieu of park land dedication imposed under the Quimby Act (see Govt. Code Section 66477).

Existing Deficiencies. In 2006, Section 66001(g) was added to the Mitigation Fee Act (by AB 2751) to clarify that impact fees "shall not include costs attributable to existing deficiencies in public facilities…" The legislature's intent in adopting this amendment, as stated in the bill, was to codify the holdings of *Bixel v. City of Los Angeles* (1989), *Rohn v. City of Visalia* (1989), and *Shapell Industries Inc. v. Governing Board* (1991).

Section 66001(g) also states that impact fees "may include the costs attributable to the increased demand for public facilities reasonably related to the development project in order to *(1) refurbish existing facilities to maintain the existing level of service or (2) achieve an adopted level of service that is consistent with the general plan.*" (Emphasis added.)

Impact Fees for Existing Facilities. Impact fees may be used to recover costs for existing facilities to the extent that those facilities are needed to serve additional development and have the capacity to do so. In other words, it must be possible to show that fees used to pay for existing facilities meet the need and benefit elements of the nexus. As a practical matter, such fees are difficult to implement unless the fees can be used to repay outstanding debt related to the facilities in question.

Recent Legislation

Several new laws enacted by the State of California since 2019 to facilitate development of affordable housing bear on the implementation of impact fees calculated in this study. Below are brief overviews of some key bills passed since 2019.

SB 330 – The Housing Crisis Act of 2019. SB 330 (amended and clarified in 2021 by SB 8) contained a variety of amendments designed to promote affordable housing. Among them was a provision in Government Code Section 65589.5 that prohibits the imposition of new approval requirements on a housing development project once a preliminary application has been submitted. That provision applies to increases in impact fees except

when the resolution or ordinance establishing the fee authorizes automatic, inflationary adjustments to the fee or exaction. These provisions will remain in effect until January 1, 2030.

AB 1483 – Housing Data: Collection and Reporting (2019). AB 1483 added Section 65490.1 to the Government Code, and requires that a city, county or special district must post on its website a current schedule of its fees and exactions, as well as associated nexus studies and annual reports. Updates must be posted within 30 days.

SB 13 – Accessory Dwelling Units (2019). SB 13 amended Government Code Section 65852.2 to prohibit the imposition of impact fees on accessory dwelling units (ADUs) smaller than 750 square feet and to require that impact fees for ADUs of 750 square feet or more must be proportional to the square footage of the primary dwelling unit. The proportionality requirement means that impact fees for ADUs of 750 square feet or more must be calculated on a case-by-case basis during the approval process.

Existing law requires a water or sewer connection fee or capacity charge for an accessory dwelling unit requiring a new or separate utility connection to be based on either the accessory dwelling unit's size or the number of its plumbing fixtures. SB 13 revises the basis for calculating the connection fee or capacity charge to either the accessory dwelling unit's square feet or the number of its drainage fixture units.

AB 602 – Amendments to the Planning and Land Use Law and the Mitigation Fee Act (2021). AB 602 adds Section 65940.1 to the Planning and Land Use Law requiring cities, counties and special districts that have internet websites to post schedules of fees, exactions and affordability requirements, annual fee reports, and an archive of nexus studies on that website, and to update that information within 30 days after any changes.

AB 602 also adds Section 66016.5 to the Mitigation Fee Act imposing several new requirements for impact fees that went into effect in 2022, including:

- A nexus study must identify the existing level of service for each facility, identify the proposed new level of service (if any), and explain why the new level of service is appropriate.
- If a nexus study supports an increase in an existing fee the local agency shall review the assumptions of the nexus study supporting the original fee and evaluate the amount of the fees collected under the original fee.
- Large jurisdictions (counties over 250,000 and cities within those counties) must adopt a capital improvement plan as part of the nexus study.
- All impact fee nexus studies shall be adopted at a public hearing with at least 30 days' notice, and the local agency shall notify any member of the public that requests notice of intent to begin and impact fee nexus study of the date of the hearing.
- Nexus studies shall be updated at least every eight years, from the period beginning on January 1, 2022.

- 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 in the development. A nexus study is not required to comply with this requirement if the local agency makes certain findings specified in the law. A local agency that imposes a fee proportionately to the square footage of units in 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.
- Authorizes any member of the public, including an applicant for a development project, to submit evidence that impact fees proposed by an agency fail to comply with the Mitigation Fee Act, and requires the legislative body of the agency to consider such evidence and adjust the proposed fee if deemed necessary.

AB 516 – Amendments to the Mitigation Fee Act (2023). AB 516, which took effect on January 1, 2024, amends Government Code Section 66006 to add certain requirements to the annual reports mandated by that section. Specifically, Section 66006 now requires that:

- Annual reports indicate whether construction on public improvements identified in previous annual reports began on the approximate date shown in the previous annual report; and,
- If a project failed to start construction on schedule, the annual report must explain the reason for the delay and provide a revised approximate date when construction will begin.

AB 516 also amends Section 66023 to provide that when a person requests an audit of a fee or charge levied by a local agency, that audit may address when revenue generated by that fee or charge is scheduled to be expended, and when the public improvement to be funded by that fee or charge is scheduled to be completed. Prior to this amendment, the only stated purpose of such an audit was to determine whether such a fee or charge exceeds the amount reasonably necessary to cover the cost of any product, public facility or service provided by the local agency.

Impact Fee Calculation Methodology

The methods used to calculate impact fees in this study are designed to comply with all of the legal requirements discussed earlier in this chapter. Any one of several legitimate methods may be used to calculate impact fees. The choice of a particular method depends primarily on the service characteristics of, and planning requirements for, the type of facility being addressed. To some extent those methods are interchangeable, because they all allocate facility costs in proportion to the needs created by development.

Allocating facility costs to various types and amounts of development is central to all methods of impact fee calculation. Costs are allocated by means of formulas that quantify the relationship between development and the need for facilities. In a cost allocation

formula, the impact of development is represented by some attribute of development such as added population or added vehicle trips that represent the impacts created by different types and amounts of development.

Although it is not mandatory, this study adopts the nomenclature used in the Impact Fee Nexus Study Templates prepared by the Terner Center for Housing Innovation at UC Berkeley to describe impact fee calculation methods. Those templates were prepared for The California Department of Housing and Community Development pursuant to Section 50466.5 of the Health and Safety Code and are cited in AB 602.

Planned Facility Method. With this method, impact fees are calculated so that new development will pay for the planned expansion of facilities at the future standard attributable to new development. To calculate the cost per unit of demand, the cost of planned facilities is divided by the amount of demand that will be created by new development. The impact fees depend on the cost of planned future facilities and a plan for future development, so the fees should be recalculated if facility plans or development plans change.

Existing Inventory Method. With this method, impact fees are calculated so that new development will fund expansion of facilities at the same standard currently used to serve existing development. To calculate the cost per unit of demand, the value of existing facilities is divided by the amount of demand associated with existing development. This method allows impact fees to be calculated without a list of planned facilities, but such a list is required by AB 602 as part of a Capital Improvement Plan that must be adopted with any new impact fee nexus study. This approach can be used to calculate impact fees for many types of public facilities but is usually not appropriate for facilities such as transportation improvements or water, wastewater or drainage systems where improvement needs must be determined by engineering analysis.

System Plan Method. With this method, impact fees are calculated so that new development pays for its share of the cost of an integrated system of facilities at the future standard attributable to new development. To calculate the cost per unit of demand, the value of existing facilities plus the cost of planned facilities is divided by the combined demand associated with both existing development and planned development. This approach is especially appropriate for impact fees for fire protection and EMS facilities because new facilities must be planned to integrate geographically with existing facilities.

Impact Fees for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)

SB 477, enacted in 2024, relocated and consolidated California's ADU laws into a new Government Code Chapter (Chapter 13, Division 1, Title 7). As mentioned earlier, recent amendments to ADU law provide that impact fees may not be imposed on ADUs smaller than 750 square feet and establish the following requirement for impact fees imposed on ADUs of 750 square feet or more:

> "Any impact fees charged for an accessory dwelling unit of 750 square feet or more shall be charged proportionately in relation to the square footage of the primary dwelling unit."

The proportionality requirement depends on the square footage of both the primary unit and the ADU, which necessitates that impact fees for ADUs be calculated on a case-by-case basis. Consequently, this report does not calculate a schedule of impact fees for ADUs. The formula for calculating proportional ADU impact fees is:

Primary unit impact fee X (ADU square feet / Primary unit square feet)

Facilities Addressed in this Study

Impact fees for the following types of facilities are addressed in this report:

- Park Land and Park Improvements
- Community and Recreation Center Facilities
- Library Facilities and Materials
- Animal Center Facilities, Vehicles and Equipment
- Police Facilities
- Rancho Cucamonga Fire District Facilities, Apparatus and Equipment

Each of those facilities is addressed in a separate chapter of this report, beginning with Chapter 3. Chapter 2 contains data on existing and future development used in the impact fee analysis.

Chapter 2. Development Data

This chapter presents data on existing and future development that will be used to calculate impact fees in subsequent chapters of this report. The information in this chapter may be used to establish levels of service, analyze facility needs, and/or allocate the cost of capital facilities between existing and future development and among various types of new development.

Study Area

The study area for the City of Rancho Cucamonga (City) in this study is the planning area defined in the City's current General Plan which was adopted in 2021. That area encompasses both the existing City and the small Sphere of Influence (SOI) along the northern edge of the City above the Alta Loma neighborhood. Impact fees for City facilities are calculated in Chapters 3 through 7 of this report.

The study area for the Rancho Cucamonga Fire Protection District (RCFPD or District) is the entire area within the boundaries of the District, which includes the entire City and its SOI, as well as an area north of the City that is currently unincorporated and is not planned for annexation to the City. Impact fees for RCFPD facilities, apparatus and equipment are calculated in Chapter 8 of this report.

Time Frame

Planned future development in this study is forecasted out to 2040. However, the methods used to calculate impact fees in this study do not depend on the timing of future development.

Development Types

The development types for which impact fees are calculated in this report are discussed below. Impact fees calculated in this report are intended to be applied based on actual land uses rather than zoning or general plan land use designations. For mixed use development projects, impact fees should be applied to each type of development within the project, consistent with the number of units of development of each type within the project.

Residential Development. Traditionally, impact fees for residential development are based on the type of unit, e.g., single-family, multi-family or mobile home. However, Government Code Section 66016.5(a)(5)(A) which was added to the Mitigation Fee Act by AB 602 in 2021 contains the following requirement:

> "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"

But that requirement is not absolute. Section 66016.5(a)(5)(B) provides that a nexus study is not required to comply with Section 66016.5(a)(5)(A) if the local agency makes a finding that includes all of the following:

1. An explanation as to why square footage is not the appropriate metric to calculate fees imposed on a housing development project.
2. An explanation that an alternative basis of calculating the fee bears a reasonable relationship between the fee charged and the burden imposed by the development.
3. That other policies in the fee structure support smaller developments or otherwise ensure that smaller developments are not charged disproportionate fees

The proportionality requirement in Section 66016.5(a)(5)(A) is commonly interpreted to mean that impact fees must have a linear relationship to unit square footage. That means the fees must increase by the same amount for every added square foot of unit size. Such a fee structure results in impact fees that are necessarily five times as high for a 3,000 square-foot single-family unit as for a 600 square apartment. That type of fee structure is justified only if the actual impact of a 3,000 square-foot unit is five times greater than the impact of a 600 square-foot unit.

Otherwise, the impact fees could violate the "rough proportionality" requirement set forth in the U. S. Supreme Court in *Dolan v. Tigard* [512 U. S. 374 (1994)]. The recent U. S. Supreme Court decision in *Sheetz v. County of El Dorado* [601 U. S. __ (2024)] made clear that *Dolan* applies to all impact fees, whether they are applied ad hoc or legislatively adopted.

This study uses several attributes of development, including added population, added police calls for service per year and added fire calls for service per year, to represent the impact of new development on different types of City and RCFPD facilities. We use those attributes to represent the demand created by various types of development for public services and the capital facilities and other capital assets needed to support those services.

What we see in analyzing patterns of service demand is that the relationship between unit size and service demand doesn't conform to a linear model. While the potential for added population may be five times as great for the largest residential units compared with the smallest units, that increase is not linear. In the real world, population per unit does not increase in a tiny increment for each added square foot. It increases in a stairstep fashion, jumping from one person to two persons to three persons per unit and so on.

It is not feasible to get specific data on police and fire calls by unit size, but in our experience, there is typically not a large difference in the average number of police and

fire calls-per-unit-per-year generated by single-family as opposed to multi-family residential units. So, a fee structure that results in large units paying five times as much as small units would appear disproportionate to the actual demand created by units of different sizes.

This study breaks down residential development into tiered square-feet-per-unit ranges and calculates an impact fee for each range or category. That approach allows impact fees to be graduated by unit size while avoiding the distortions that result from a rigid, fixed fee per square foot approach, and while respecting the need for rough proportionality between the fees and the impact of development as set forth in *Dolan v. Tigard*.

Based on the foregoing discussion, we propose that the Rancho Cucamonga City Council adopt the following findings pursuant to Government Code Section 66016.5(a)(5)(B) to justify the use of tiered square footage ranges for residential development in this study rather than a fixed fee-per-square-foot approach:

1. A fixed fee-per-square-foot approach would not reflect the actual impact of different-sized residential units on the facilities addressed in this study and would not meet the rough proportionality standard set forth in *Dolan v. Tigard*.
2. The use of tiered square footage ranges rather than a fixed fee per square foot approach better reflects the relationship between the fees charged and the actual burden imposed by the development.
3. Calculating impact fees for tiered square footage ranges rather than a fixed fee per square foot still ensures that smaller developments are not charged disproportionate fees because that approach allows the impact fees to be tailored to the actual impacts created by smaller developments, while protecting larger units from excessive fees.

As discussed above, residential development categories are defined in this study by ranges of unit sizes rather than by unit types (e.g., single-family or multi-family) as is the case for the City's existing impact fees. Unit-size ranges used to define residential development in this study are listed below.

- Residential <600 Square Feet per Unit
- Residential >600-800 Square Feet per Unit
- Residential >800-1,200 Square Feet per Unit
- Residential <1,200-1,900 Square Feet per Unit
- Residential >1,900-2,300 Square Feet per Unit
- Residential >2,300 Square Feet per Unit

Each of these unit-size ranges is typical of units with a certain number of bedrooms, ranging from studio apartments up to single-family units with five or more bedrooms.

Senior/Assisted Living Facilities. While senior living and assisted living facilities, including rehabilitation and skilled nursing facilities have some of the characteristics of residential uses, their impact characteristics can be substantially different from most residential development, with less impact on transportation and parks and recreation facilities and greater impact on emergency medical services. Consequently senior/assisted living facilities are treated as a separate category in this study and are not considered a form of housing development subject to the requirements of Government Code Section 66016.5. Development in this category is measured in terms of beds, which is intended as a proxy for the number of occupants of a facility.

Non-Residential Development. Non-residential development types used in this study are:

- Commercial/Retail
- Hotel/Motel
- Office
- Industrial

The impact fees calculated in this report are intended to be applied to development projects, or portions of projects, based on the actual type of development being constructed. Except for the Hotel/Motel category, which is measured in terms of guest rooms, the non-residential development types listed above are measured in terms of gross leasable floor area in thousands of square feet (KSF).

In the Rancho Cucamonga Development Code (Title 17 of the Municipal Code), allowable uses are grouped into broad categories. In general, those categories correspond reasonably well with the development types listed above, except that in the Development Code, hotels and other lodging uses are included in a category called Service and Office Uses whereas this study breaks out hotels and motels as a separate category.

In cases where a proposed development project does not fit reasonably well into one of the development types defined in this study, the City has the option to calculate an impact fee that is tailored to that specific use. See the sub-section on Other Types of Development, below.

Public Facilities, Public Schools and Parks. In addition to the development types listed above, the development tables presented later in this chapter include public (government) facilities, public schools and parks. The City does not impose impact fees on those uses, either because of legal constraints or because it would be imposing the fees on itself, which serves no purpose. However, those uses do create measurable impacts on some services, including law enforcement and fire protection/emergency medical services, and they are included in the impact fee analysis so that the impacts associated with those exempt uses can be distinguished from demand associated with fee-paying development types.

Other types of Development. The development types for which impact fees are calculated in this study will encompass most new development in the City, but there may

be some development projects that don't fit very well within any of the established fee categories. In such cases, it is possible for City staff to calculate a customized impact fee at the time a project is approved.

For example, to calculate a customized police impact fee, it would be necessary to estimate the number of police calls for service per year that will be generated by the project, based on the number of calls generated by similar existing uses in the City. Then, that number would be multiplied by the cost per call calculated in this study to arrive at the police impact fee for the project. Customized impact fees for other facility types could be calculated in a similar manner.

Demand Variables

To calculate impact fees, the relationship between facility needs and development must be quantified in cost allocation formulas. Certain measurable attributes of development (for example, added population) are used as "demand variables" in those formulas to represent the impact of different types of development on various types of facilities.

Demand variables are selected either because they directly measure the service demand created by various types of development, or because they are reasonably correlated with that demand.

For example, the need for parks in a community is typically defined in terms of the relationship between population and acres of parks. As population grows, more parks are needed to maintain that relationship. Logically, then, the increase in population related to new residential development is an appropriate yardstick, or demand variable, for use in measuring the impact of development on the need for additional parks.

Demand variables have specific values for each type of development defined in this study. Those values may be referred to as "demand factors." So, if the demand variable used to calculate impact fees for a particular type of facility is added population, the demand factor for a specific category of residential development would be the population per dwelling unit for that category.

Demand variables used in this study are discussed below. Specific demand factors can be found in Table 2.2.

Population. Population is used in this study as the demand variable for parks, libraries, community and recreation centers and the animal center. The need for those facilities is driven largely by the added population associated with residential development. They are not impacted substantially by non-residential development. The specific population per unit factors used in this study are shown in Table 2.1, below and in Table 2.2

The purpose of Table 2.1 is to estimate the average population per unit for each residential unit-size category. The unit-size categories shown in Table 2.1 are based on the number of bedrooms per unit, as shown in American Community Survey (ACS) Table B25041, which also shows the number of units in each category. Average population per

unit is assumed to increase with unit size. The estimated population per unit factors are adjusted using the overall average population per unit and total population as controls. The results are also cross-checked against ACS Table B25001 which shows the mix of household sizes in the City.

Table 2.1: Population per Unit by Unit Size

Unit Size in Sq Ft [1]	No. of Bedrms	No. of Units [2]	% of Units	Est Pop per Unit [3]	Estimated Pop [4]
<600	0	1,726	2.7%	1.00	1,726
600-800	1	5,057	8.0%	1.30	6,574
>800 - 1,200	2	11,720	18.6%	1.80	21,096
>1,200 - 1,900	3	20,422	32.4%	2.70	55,139
>1,900 - 2,300	4	19,281	30.6%	3.50	67,484
>2,300	5+	4,841	7.7%	4.40	21,300
Total/Average		63,047	100.0%	2.75	173,319

[1] Estimated square-feet-per-unit ranges based on number of bedrooms

[2] Distribution of units by number of bedrooms from American Community Survey Table B25041, 2022, 1-Year Estimate

[3] Population for all units in each square-footage range if all units were occupied by the overall average of 2.75 persons per unit

[3] Estimated average population per unit by unit size category; estimates by NBS

[4] Estimated population = number of units X estimated population per unit

Police Department Calls for Service. Demand for police services is impacted by both residential and non-residential development in the City. In this study, the number of police calls for service per unit per year is used to represent the demand for police services by various types of development. The calls-for-service factors used in this study are based on analysis by NBS of a random sample of all calls for service received by the Rancho Cucamonga Police Department for a one-year period from May 2023 to May 2024.

During that period, the Rancho Cucamonga Police Department logged about 80,000 calls. A random sample of 648 calls was classified by development type based on address or location. Calls that could not be associated with a particular type of development were excluded from the analysis. The percentage of sampled calls associated with each type of development defined in this study was applied to the total number of 2023 calls to get the number of calls generated by each type of development for the year. The number of calls associated with each type of development was divided by the number of existing units for that type of development to arrive at the average number of calls per unit per year for that category.

Because it is not possible to determine individual call rates for different-sized residential units in the analysis of police calls for service, the overall average calls per unit per year for all residential units is used as the midpoint in estimating calls for service factors for the unit size categories used in this study and the factors are scaled up and down from

that midpoint relative to unit size. The overall range of call rates from the smallest to the largest units is adjusted for consistency with the extent of differences in call rates for single-family and multi-family units.

RCFPD Calls for Service per Year. Demand for fire protection, emergency medical response and other services provided in the City by RCFPD is impacted by both residential and non-residential development. In this study, the number of calls for service per unit per year to RCFPD is used to represent the demand for fire protection and emergency response services by various types of development in the City. The calls-for-service factors used in this study are based on analysis by NBS of a random sample of all 2023 calls for service to the Rancho Cucamonga Fire Protection District.

In 2023, RCFPD logged about 18,600 calls for service. As part of this study, NBS analyzed a random sample of 700 of those calls and classified them by development type based on address. Calls that could not be associated with a particular type of development were excluded from the analysis.

The percentage of sampled calls associated with each type of development defined in this study was applied to the total number of 2023 calls to get the full number of calls generated by that type of development for the year. Then, the number of calls per year was divided by the number of existing units for each type of development to arrive at the average number of calls per unit per year. Fire calls-per-unit-per-year factors used in this study are shown in Table 2.2, below.

Because it is not possible to determine individual call rates for different-sized residential units in the analysis of RCFPD calls for service, the overall average calls per unit per year for all residential units is used as the midpoint in estimating calls for service factors for the unit size categories used in this study and the factors are scaled up and down from that midpoint relative to unit size. The overall range of call rates from the smallest to the largest units is adjusted for consistency with the extent of differences in call rates for single-family and multi-family units.

Demand Factors

Table 2.2 shows the values of demand factors by development type used in this study. Factors for population per unit and Police Department calls for service per unit per year are for the City of Rancho Cucamonga. Factors for Rancho Cucamonga Fire Protection District calls for service per unit per year are for the area within the boundaries of the District. Calls from development within the City make up an estimated 99.6% of those calls.

Table 2.2: Demand Factors Used in This Study

Development Type	Dev Units [1]	Population per Unit [2]	RCPD Calls per Unit [3]	RCFPD Calls per Unit [4]
Residential <600 Sq. Ft per Unit	DU	1.00	0.580	0.133
Residential >600 - 800 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	1.30	0.615	0.147
Residential >800 - 1,200 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	1.80	0.650	0.161
Residential <1,200 - 1,900 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	2.70	0.685	0.175
Residential <1,900 - 2,300 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	3.50	0.720	0.189
Residential > 2,300 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	4.40	0.755	0.203
Senior/Assisted Living Facility	Beds		1.738	2.829
Commercial/Retail	KSF		1.966	0.231
Hotel/Motel	Rooms		0.125	0.115
Office	KSF		0.465	0.122
Industrial	KSF		0.129	0.017
Public Facilities	KSF		0.954	0.476
Public Schools	Students		0.118	0.015
Parks	Acres		3.474	0.213

[1] Units of development: DU = dwelling unit; KSF = 1,000 gross square feet of building area; Room = hotel/motel room or suite; Bed = accommodation for a single resident or patient

[2] See Table 2.1 for estimated average population per unit

[3] Estimated average Police Department calls for service per unit per year based on analysis of a random sample of calls for service for a one-year period from May 2023 to May 2024; see discussion in text

[4] Estimated average Rancho Cucamonga Fire Protection District calls for service per unit per year based on analysis of a random sample of 2023 calls for service by NBS; see discussion in text

Existing and Future Development

Tables 2.3 through 2.5, beginning on the next page, present summaries of existing and future development by development type in Rancho Cucamonga. The figures for units, population and police department calls for service shown in those tables are for the City only. The RCFPD calls for service shown in those tables are for the entire District, but, as noted earlier, development in the City accounts for more than 99% of those calls.

The portion of RCFPD outside the City is small and development in that area is constrained by topography. The only difference in existing and future development between the City and the District is that the District has an estimated 348 more existing residential units than the number of existing residential units in the City. The number of units does not enter directly into the impact fee calculations. Therefore, the fact that those 348 additional residential units are not shown in these tables has no effect on the fee calculations.

Table 2.3 shows estimated existing development as of January 1, 2024, in terms of units, population, police department calls for service and RCFPD calls for service.

Table 2.3: Existing Development - January, 2024

Development Types	Dev Units [1]	Existing Units [2]	Existing Population [2]	Existing RCPD Calls [3]	Existing RCFPD Calls [4]
All Residential	DU	67,062	192,017	46,663	11,748
Senior/Assisted Living Facility	Beds	709		1,232	2,006
Commercial/Retail	KSF	8,412		16,542	1,942
Hotel/Motel	Rooms	1,410		176	162
Office	KSF	5,300		2,464	647
Industrial	KSF	40,805		5,279	712
Public Facilities	KSF	1,292		1,232	615
Public Schools	Students	32,732		3,871	485
Parks	Acres	456		1,584	97
Total			**192,017**	**79,043**	**18,414**

[1] Units of development: DU = dwelling unit; KSF = 1,000 gross square feet of building area; Room = hotel/motel room or suite; Bed = accommodation for a single resident or patient

[2] Existing residential units and population based on travel demand model data provided by Fehr & Peers; non-residential units provided by the City of Rancho Cucamonga Planning Department

[3] Existing RCPD calls for service per year based on analysis of calls for service to the Rancho Cucamonga Police Department for a one-year period from May 2023 to May 2024

[4] Existing RCFPD calls for service per year based on analysis of 2023 calls for service to the Rancho Cucamonga Fire Protection District

Table 2.4 shows projected new development to 2040, in terms of units, population, police department calls for service and RCFPD calls for service.

Table 2.4: Projected New Development to 2040

Development Types	Dev Units [1]	Added Units [2]	Added Population [2]	Added RCPD Calls [3]	Added RCFPD Calls [4]
All Residential	DU	16,714	41,870	12,703	2,913
Senior/Assisted Living Facility	Beds	138		240	391
Commercial/Retail	KSF	700		1,377	162
Hotel/Motel	Rooms	275		34	32
Office	KSF	2,000		930	244
Industrial	KSF	5,800		750	101
Public Facilities	KSF	252		240	120
Public Schools	Students	6,383		755	95
Parks	Acres	89		309	19
Total			**41,870**	**17,338**	**4,076**

[1] Units of development: DU = dwelling unit; KSF = 1,000 gross square feet of building area; Room = hotel/motel room or suite; Bed = accommodation for a single resident or patient

[2] Added residential units and population based on travel demand model data provided by Fehr & Peers, added non-residential units based on conservative scenario projections by Strategic Economics; see Appendix 5.14-1 to the General Plan DEIR

[3] Added RCPD calls = added units X calls per unit per year from Table 2.2; average residential calls per unit per year based on the rate for >1,200 - 1,900 square foot units

[4] Added RCFPD calls = added units X calls per unit per year from Table 2.2; average residential calls per unit per year based on the rate for >1,200 - 1,900 square foot units

Table 2.5 shows projected total development in 2040 in terms of units, population, police department calls for service and RCFPD calls for service.

Table 2.5: Projected Total Development in 2040

Development Types	Dev Units [1]	2040 Units [2]	2040 Population [2]	2040 RCPD Calls [3]	2040 RCFPD Calls [4]
All Residential	DU	83,776	233,887	59,366	14,661
Senior/Assisted Living Facility	Beds	847		1,472	2,397
Commercial/Retail	KSF	9,112		17,919	2,104
Hotel/Motel	Rooms	1,685		210	194
Office	KSF	7,300		3,394	891
Industrial	KSF	46,605		6,029	813
Public Facilities	KSF	1,544		1,472	735
Public Schools	Students	39,115		4,626	580
Parks	Acres	545		1,893	116
Total			**233,887**	**96,381**	**22,490**

Note: The figures in Table 2.5 represent the sum of the corresponding figures in Table 2.3 and Table 2.4

The numbers presented in Tables 2.3 through 2.5 indicate that projected growth in the City and RCFPD between 2024 and 2040 will represent a 22% increase in population, police calls for service and calls for service to RCFPD.

Chapter 3. Park Impact Fees

This chapter calculates impact fees for park land acquisition and for park improvements. Chapter 3.68 of the Rancho Cucamonga Municipal Code established and governs impact fees for park land acquisition and park improvements.

At present, the City of Rancho Cucamonga has five community parks and 26 neighborhood parks. The City owns over 450 acres of park land, of which about 368 acres are currently developed as parks. The park impact fees calculated in this chapter are based on the relationship between the City's existing ratio of improved park acres to population.

Service Area

All park impact fees calculated in this chapter are intended to apply to the entire City.

Methodology

This chapter calculates impact fees using the existing inventory method discussed in Chapter 1. With that method, impact fees are based on the existing level of service so that the impact fees will provide the funding needed to maintain that level of service as the City grows.

Demand Variable

A "demand variable" is a quantifiable attribute of development that is used in impact fee calculation formulas to represent the impact of development. The demand variable used to calculate park impact fees in this chapter is population.

Population is used here because in Rancho Cucamonga, as in most cities, the need for parks is defined in terms of the relationship between park acreage and population.

Because added population is associated with residential development, the impact fees calculated in this chapter apply only to residential development.

The impact fees for each type of residential development depend on the average population per dwelling unit for that type of development. The individual population-per-unit factors used to calculate the park impact fees are from Table 2.2 in Chapter 2. See the discussion of population per unit factors and the use of residential unit square footage ranges in Chapter 2.

Level of Service

The level-of-service standard used to calculate park impact fees is based on the relationship between the City's existing park acreage and its existing population.

In 2021, Section 66016.5 was added to the Mitigation Fee by Act AB 602. Paragraph (a)(2) of that section requires that, after January 1, 2022, the level of service used to calculate impact fees in a nexus study must be compared with the existing level of service, and if the proposed new level of service is higher than the existing level of service, an explanation must be included Because the level of service used to calculate impact fees in this chapter is the same as the existing level of service, no explanation is required to satisfy the requirements of Section 66016.5(a)(2).

Existing Parks

Table 3.1 on the next page lists the City's existing parks and shows both total acres and improved acres of park land.

Table 3.1: Existing Parks

Park Name	Total Acres [1]	Improved Acres [4]
Community Parks		
Central Park	103.0	39.4
Etiwanda Creek Park	33.5	12.0
Heritage Community Park	40.0	40.0
Red Hill Community Park	44.0	44.0
Epicenter Adult Sports Complex	42.0	42.0
Subtotal Community Parks	262.5	177.4
Neighborhood Parks		
Bear Gulch Park	5.0	5.0
Beryl Park East	10.0	10.0
Beryl Park West	10.0	10.0
Church Street Park	6.5	6.5
Coyote Canyon Park	5.0	5.0
Day Creek Park	24.0	24.0
Ellena Park	6.5	6.5
Garcia Park	5.5	5.5
Golden Oak Park	9.0	9.0
Hermosa Park	10.0	10.0
Kenyon Park	6.5	6.5
Legacy Park	3.7	3.7
Lions Park	1.5	1.5
Los Amigos Park	3.3	3.3
Milliken Park	10.0	10.0
Mountain View Park	5.0	5.0
Old Town Park	5.0	5.0
Olive Grove Park	7.9	7.9
Ralph M. Lewis Park	9.5	9.5
Rancho Summit Park	6.9	6.9
Spruce Avenue Park	5.0	5.0
Tapia Park (Long Term Lease)	3.3	0.0
Victoria Arbors Park	9.1	9.1
Victoria Groves Park	6.5	6.5
Vintage Park	6.5	6.5
West Greenway Park	5.0	5.0
Windrows Park	8.0	8.0
Subtotal Neighborhood Parks	194.2	190.9
Total	**456.7**	**368.3**

[1] Source: City of Rancho Cucamonga Community Services Department

Existing Level of Service

Table 3.2 calculates existing levels of service in terms of acres per capita and acres per 1,000 population for total City-owned park land and for improved park land.

Table 3.2: Existing Level of Service - Park Land/Improved Park Land

Component	Existing Acres [1]	Existing Res Population [2]	Acres per Capita [3]	Acres per 1,000 [4]
Total Park Land	456.7	192,017	0.00238	2.38
Improved Park Land	368.3	192,017	0.00192	1.92

[1] See Table 3.1

[2] Existing residential population; see Table 2.3

[3] Acres per capita = existing acres / existing population

[4] Acres per 1,000 residents = acres per capita X 1,000

The level-of-service standard for parks contained in the 2021 Rancho Cucamonga General Plan, in terms of a ratio of acres to population, is five acres per 1,000 residents for neighborhood parks (see Table OS-2).

In 2019, the California Court of Appeal in *Boatworks, LLC vs. City of Alameda* held that parks not currently open to the public may not be used in calculating the existing level of service for purposes of establishing park impact fees. Impact fees calculated in this chapter are based on the existing level of service in terms of improved park acres per 1,000 population. Only park acreage that is improved and open to the public is counted in establishing the existing level of service for both park land acquisition and park improvement impact fees in this study.

In the following pages, the existing level of service is converted into a cost per capita for park land acquisition and park improvements using the existing level of service in acres per capita multiplied by the estimated cost per acre for park land acquisition and park improvements.

There is one additional cost component included in the park improvement impact fees. That is the capital cost of added park maintenance vehicles and equipment. Table 3.3 calculates the costs per capita for park maintenance vehicles and equipment based on the replacement cost of existing park maintenance vehicles and equipment divided by the existing population of the City. That cost per capita is added to the cost per capita for park improvements in Table 3.6 where the per-capita costs are converted into a cost per unit of development.

Table 3.3: Cost per Capita - Existing Park Maintenance Equipment

Total Cost [1]	Existing Population [2]	Cost per Capita [3]
$1,450,620	192,017	$7.55

[1] See Appendix A for a detailed listing of existing park maintenance vehicles and equipment

[2] Existing population; see Table 2.3

[3] Cost per capita = total cost / existing population

Cost Per Capita

Table 3.4 calculates the cost per capita for park land acquisition and for park improvements using the existing level of service in acres per capita and the cost-per-acre estimates for park land acquisition and park improvements. In both cases, the acres-per-capita standard is based on the existing level of service discussed previously in this chapter.

Table 3.4: Cost per Capita - Park Land Acquisition and Improvements

Cost Component	Acres per Capita [1]	Cost per Acre [2]	Cost per Capita [3]
Park Land Acquisition	0.00192	$ 1,333,000	$2,556.77
Park Improvements	0.00192	$ 989,000	$1,896.96

[1] Acres per capita for both park land acquisition and park improvements is based on the existing level of service for improved park land (see Table 3.2)

[2] Cost per acre for land acquisition based on recent sales data from the CoStar real estate database; cost per acre for park improvements is based on improvement costs for a recently completed 4.4-acre dog park in Central Park

[3] Cost per capita = acres per capita X cost per acre

In the next section, the per-capita costs from Table 3.4 are used to calculate impact fees per unit of development for park land acquisition and park improvements. The per-capita costs from Table 3.4 can also be used to customize impact fees for any project that does not reasonably fit within one of the development types identified in this report. Such a customized fee would be based on the estimated population per unit for the project, or a portion of the project, multiplied by the cost per capita from Table 3.4.

Impact Fees per Unit

Table 3.5 shows the calculation of park land impact fees per unit for each unit-size category defined in this study. Those fees are calculated using per-capita costs from Table 3.4 and population per dwelling unit factors from Table 2.2.

Table 3.5: Park Land Acquisition Impact Fee per Unit

Development Type	Unit Type [1]	Population per Unit [2]	Cost per Capita [3]	Impact Fee per Unit [4]
Residential <600 Sq. Ft per Unit	DU	1.00	$ 2,556.77	$ 2,556.77
Residential >600 - 800 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	1.30	$ 2,556.77	$ 3,323.81
Residential >800 - 1,200 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	1.80	$ 2,556.77	$ 4,602.19
Residential <1,200 - 1,900 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	2.70	$ 2,556.77	$ 6,903.29
Residential <1,900 - 2,300 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	3.50	$ 2,556.77	$ 8,948.71
Residential > 2,300 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	4.40	$ 2,556.77	$ 11,249.80

[1] DU = dwelling unit

[2] See Table 2.2

[3] See Table 3.4

[4] Impact fee per unit = population per unit X cost per capita

Table 3.6 shows the calculation of impact fees per unit for each unit-size category defined in this study, for park improvements and park maintenance vehicles and equipment. Those fees are calculated using the combined per-capita costs for park improvements from Table 3.4 and park maintenance vehicles and equipment from Table 3.3.

Table 3.6: Park Improvement Impact Fee per Unit (Incl. Maintenance Equipment)

Development Type	Units [1]	Population per Unit [2]	Cost per Capita [3]	Impact Fee per Unit [4]
Residential <600 Sq. Ft per Unit	DU	1.00	$1,904.52	$ 1,904.52
Residential >600 - 800 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	1.30	$1,904.52	$ 2,475.87
Residential >800 - 1,200 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	1.80	$1,904.52	$ 3,428.13
Residential <1,200 - 1,900 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	2.70	$1,904.52	$ 5,142.19
Residential <1,900 - 2,300 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	3.50	$1,904.52	$ 6,665.80
Residential > 2,300 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	4.40	$1,904.52	$ 8,379.87

[1] DU = dwelling unit

[2] See Table 2.2

[3] Includes cost per capita for park improvements from Table 3.4 and cost per capita for park maintenance vehicles and equipment from Table 3.3

[4] Impact fee per unit = population per unit X cost per capita

Projected Revenue

Because it is not possible to forecast the number of added residential units for each unit-size category, potential impact fee revenue is projected based on added population. Table 3.7 projects revenue from park land impact fees using the park land impact fee per capita from Table 3.5 and the added population from Table 2.4. This projection assumes that future development occurs as shown in Chapter 2.

Table 3.7: Projected Revenue - Park Land Impact Fees

Development Type	Impact Fee per Capita [1]	Added Res Population [2]	Projected Revenue [3]
All Residential	$2,556.77	41,870	$107,052,090

[1] Impact fee (cost) per capita; see Table 3.5

[2] Added residential population; see Table 2.4

[3] Projected revenue = impact fee per capita X added residential population

Table 3.8 calculates projected revenue from park land impact fees using the park land impact fee per capita from Table 3.6 and the added population from Table 2.4.

Table 3.8: Projected Revenue - Park Improvement Impact Fees

Development Type	Impact Fee per Capita [1]	Added Res Population [2]	Projected Revenue [3]
All Residential	$1,904.52	41,870	$79,742,057

[1] Impact fee (cost) per capita; see Table 3.6

[2] Added residential population; see Table 2.4

[3] Projected revenue = impact fee per capita X added residential population

Specific projects and costs to be funded by these impact fees can be found in the City's Capital Improvement Plan.

Updating the Fees

The impact fees calculated in this chapter are based on the current estimated cost of park land acquisition and park improvements. We recommend that the fees be reviewed annually and adjusted as needed using local cost data or an index such as the *Engineering News Record* Construction Cost Index (CCI) or the California Construction Cost Index. See the Implementation Chapter for more on indexing of fees.

Nexus Summary

As discussed in Chapter 1 of this report, Section 66001 of the Mitigation Fee Act requires that an agency establishing, increasing or imposing impact fees, must make findings to:

Identify the purpose of the fee;

Identify the use of the fee; and,

Determine that there is a reasonable relationship between:

a. The use of the fee and the development type on which it is imposed;

b. The need for the facility and the type of development on which the fee is imposed; and

c. The amount of the fee and the facility cost attributable to the development project.

Satisfying those requirements also ensures that the fees meet the "rational nexus" and "rough proportionality" standards enunciated in leading court decisions bearing on impact fees and other exactions. (For more detail, see "Legal Framework for Impact Fees" in Chapter 1.) The following paragraphs explain how the impact fees calculated in this chapter satisfy those requirements.

Purpose of the Fee: The purpose of the impact fees calculated in this chapter is to mitigate the impact of new development on the need for parks in Rancho Cucamonga and to prevent a reduction in the level of service provided to residents of the City as a result of new development.

Use of the Fee. Impact fees calculated in this chapter will be used to provide additional parks to mitigate the impacts of new development in the City. Specific projects and costs to be funded by these impact fees can be found in the City's Capital Improvement Program.

Reasonable Relationship between the Use of the Fee and the Development Type on Which It Is Imposed. The impact fees calculated in this chapter will be used to provide additional parks to serve the needs of added population associated with new residential development in Rancho Cucamonga.

Reasonable Relationship between the Need for the Facilities and the Type of Development on Which the Fee Is Imposed. New development increases the need for parks to maintain the existing level of service, as described earlier in this chapter. Without additional parks, the increase in population associated with new residential development would result in a reduction in the level of service provided to all residents of the City.

Reasonable Relationship between the Amount of the Fee and the Facility Cost Attributable to the Development Project. The amount of the park impact fees charged to a residential development project will depend on the increase in population associated with that project. The fees per unit of development calculated in this chapter for each type of residential development are based on the estimated average population per unit for that type of development in Rancho Cucamonga. Thus, the fee charged to a development project reflects the impact of that project on the need for parks in the City.

Chapter 4. Community and Recreation Center Impact Fee

This chapter calculates impact fees for community and recreation centers needed to serve future development in the City. Chapter 3.52 of the Rancho Cucamonga Municipal Code establishes and governs the Community and Recreation Center Impact Fee.

The City of Rancho Cucamonga has a number of existing community and recreation centers as well as the Victoria Gardens Cultural Center, which is included in this category. The Paul A. Biane Library, which is a part of the Victoria Gardens Cultural Center, is addressed separately in Chapter 5, Libraries.

The community and recreation center impact fees calculated in this chapter are based on the relationship between the City's existing population and the replacement cost of Rancho Cucamonga's existing community center and recreation center facilities.

Service Area

The community and recreation center impact fee is intended to apply to the entire City.

Methodology

This chapter calculates impact fees using the existing inventory method discussed in Chapter 1. With that method, impact fees are based on the existing level of service so that the impact fees will provide the funding needed to maintain that level of service as the City grows.

Demand Variable

A "demand variable" is a quantifiable attribute of development that is used in fee calculation formulas to represent the impact of development. The demand variable used to calculate impact fees for community and recreation centers is population. Since population is associated with residential development, these impact fees will apply only to residential development.

Population is used as the demand variable for these fees because the need for community and recreation centers is normally defined in terms of the size of the population to be served. Added population is used in this chapter to measure the impact of new development on the need for community and recreation center facilities.

Average population per unit is estimated for each category of residential development defined in this study. Individual population-per-unit factors for each category of residential development are shown in Table 2.2 in Chapter 2.

Level of Service

The City has not adopted a formal level of service standard for community and recreation centers. Since some existing facilities such as the Lewis Family Playhouse at the Victoria Gardens Cultural Center are one-of-a-kind, a ratio of facility square footage to population would not reflect differences in cost for different types of facilities. Consequently, the level-of-service standard used to calculate impact fees in this chapter is the existing relationship between the City's population and the replacement cost of existing community and recreation centers, stated as a cost per capita. See the Cost per Capita section below.

In 2021, Section 66016.5 was added to the Mitigation Fee by Act AB 602. Paragraph (a)(2) of that section requires that, after January 1, 2022, the level of service used to calculate impact fees in a nexus study must be compared with the existing level of service, and if the proposed new level of service is higher than the existing level of service, an explanation must be included. Because the level of service used to calculate impact fees in this chapter is the same as the existing level of service, no explanation is required to satisfy the requirements of Section 66016.5(a)(2).

Existing Facilities

Table 4.1 lists the City's existing community and recreation centers with their estimated replacement cost. Replacement cost is used in this analysis as an indicator of the cost of constructing additional facilities to serve future development. Table 4.1 also shows a credit for the current balance in the City's community and recreation center impact fee fund which can be used to construct additional facilities.

Table 4.1: Existing Community and Recreation Centers Estimated Replacement Cost

Facility Name	Site Acres [1]	Site Value [2]	Building Sq. Feet [3]	Building Repl Cost [4]	Impact Fee Cost Basis [5]
RC Family Resource Center	1.80	$ 2,399,400	11,800	$ 6,926,502	$ 9,325,902
RC Sports Center	1.47	$ 1,959,510	32,000	$ 18,783,734	$ 20,743,244
Lion's Center West	0.24	$ 319,920	11,400	$ 6,691,705	$ 7,011,625
Lion's Center East	0.37	$ 493,210	11,384	$ 6,682,313	$ 7,175,523
Lewis/Brulte Community/Sr. Ctr.	Located in Central Park		57,000	$ 33,458,527	$ 33,458,527
Heritage Park Equestrian Center	Located in Heritage Park		3,045	$ 1,787,390	$ 1,787,390
Victoria Gardens Cultural Center	1.80	$ 2,399,400	67,584	$ 49,005,658	$ 51,405,058
Impact Fee Fund Balance as of May 21, 2024					$ 3,967,950
Total		**$ 7,571,440**	**194,213**	**$ 123,335,829**	**$ 134,875,219**

[1] Site Acres provided by the City of Rancho Cucamonga Community Services Department

[2] Existing site value = site acres X estimated land value of $1,333,000 per acre

[3] Building square footage provided by the City of Rancho Cucamonga Community Services Department

[4] Building replacement cost based on estimated cost in 2020 impact fee study escalated to 2024 using the California Construction Cost Index

[5] Impact fee cost basis = site value + building replacement cost

Cost per Capita

Table 4.2 calculates the replacement cost per capita for community and recreation center facilities using the impact fee cost basis from Table 4.1 and the existing population from Table 2.3 in Chapter 2.

Table 4.2: Community and Rec Centers - Existing Level of Service

Impact Fee Cost Basis [1]	Existing Population [2]	Cost per Capita [3]
$134,875,219	192,017	$702.41

[1] See Table 4.1

[2] Existing population; see Table 2.3

[3] Cost per capita = impact fee cost basis / existing population

In the next section, the cost per capita from Table 4.2 is used to calculate community and recreation center impact fees per unit for each unit-size category defined in this study. The cost per capita from Table 4.2 can also be used to customize impact fees for any project that does not reasonably fit within one of the development types identified in this report. Such a customized fee would be based on the estimated population per unit for the project, or a portion of the project, multiplied by the cost per capita from Table 4.2.

Impact Fees per Unit

Table 4.3 shows the calculation of community and recreation center impact fees per unit of development, for each unit-size category defined in this study. Those fees are calculated using the cost per capita from Table 4.2 and average population per unit from Table 2.2.

Table 4.3: Community and Recreation Centers - Impact Fees per Unit

Development Type	Units [1]	Population per Unit [2]	Cost per Capita [3]	Impact Fee per Unit [4]
Residential <600 Sq. Ft per Unit	DU	1.00	$702.41	$ 702.41
Residential >600 - 800 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	1.30	$702.41	$ 913.14
Residential >800 - 1,200 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	1.80	$702.41	$ 1,264.34
Residential <1,200 - 1,900 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	2.70	$702.41	$ 1,896.51
Residential <1,900 - 2,300 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	3.50	$702.41	$ 2,458.45
Residential > 2,300 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	4.40	$702.41	$ 3,090.62

[1] Units of development; DU = dwelling unit

[2] See Table 2.2

[3] Cost per capita; see Table 4.2

[4] Impact fee per unit = population per unit X cost per capita

Projected Revenue

Since the community and recreation center impact fees apply only to residential development, potential revenue from those fees can be estimated by multiplying the cost per capita from Table 4.3 by the added population forecasted Table 2.4.

Table 4.4 shows the projected revenue to 2040 from the community and recreation center impact fees calculated in this chapter. This projection assumes that future development occurs as shown in Chapter 2.

Table 4.4: Projected Revenue - Community/Rec Center Impact Fees

Development Type	Impact Fee per Capita [1]	Added Population [2]	Projected Revenue [3]
All Residential	$702.41	41,870	$29,410,028

[1] See Table 4.2

[2] Added population; see Table 2.4

[3] Projected revenue = impact fee per capita X added residential population

Specific projects and costs to be funded by these impact fees can be found in the City's Capital Improvement Plan.

Updating the Fees

The impact fees calculated in this chapter are based on the current estimated replacement costs for community and recreation center facilities. We recommend that the fees be reviewed and adjusted annually using local cost data or an index such as the *Engineering News Record* Building Cost Index (BCI) or the Department of General Services California Construction Cost Index. See the Implementation Chapter for more on indexing of fees.

Nexus Summary

As discussed in Chapter 1 of this report, Section 66001 of the Mitigation Fee Act requires an agency establishing, increasing or imposing impact fees to make findings to:

Identify the purpose of the fee;

Identify the use of the fee; and,

Determine that there is a reasonable relationship between:

a. The use of the fee and the development type on which it is imposed;

b. The need for the facility and the type of development on which the fee is imposed; and

c. The amount of the fee and the facility cost attributable to the development project.

Satisfying those requirements also ensures that the fees meet the "rational nexus" and "rough proportionality" standards enunciated in the *Nollan* and *Dolan* decisions discussed in Chapter 1. (For more detail, see "Legal Framework for Impact Fees" in Chapter 1.) The following paragraphs explain how the impact fees calculated in this chapter satisfy those requirements.

Purpose of the Fee: The purpose of the impact fees calculated in this chapter is to prevent new residential development from reducing the quality and availability of public services provided to residents of the city by requiring new residential development to contribute to the cost of expanding the availability of community and recreation center assets in the city.

Use of the Fee. Impact fees calculated in this chapter will be used to provide additional community and recreation centers to mitigate the impact of new development on the need for those facilities in the City. Specific projects and costs to be funded by these impact fees can be found in the City's Capital Improvement Program.

Reasonable Relationship between the Use of the Fee and the Development Type on Which It Is Imposed. The impact fees calculated in this chapter will be used to provide additional community and recreation center facilities to mitigate the impact of added population associated with new residential development on the need for community and recreation centers in Rancho Cucamonga.

Reasonable Relationship between the Need for the Facilities and the Type of Development on Which the Fee Is Imposed. New residential development increases the need for community and recreation center facilities to maintain the existing level of service, as described earlier in this chapter. Without additional community and recreation center facilities, the increase in population associated with new residential development would result in a reduction in the level of service provided to all residents of the City.

Reasonable Relationship between the Amount of the Fee and the Facility Cost Attributable to the Development Project. The community and recreation center impact fees calculated in this chapter are proportional to the impact of the added population associated with various categories of residential development in the City. The fees per unit of development calculated in this chapter for each type of residential development are based on the estimated average population per unit for that type of development in Rancho Cucamonga. Thus, the fee charged to a development project reflects the impact of that project on the need for community and recreation center facilities in the City.

Chapter 5. Library Impact Fee

This chapter calculates impact fees for library facilities and materials needed to serve future development in the City. The City of Rancho Cucamonga has two existing libraries: the Paul A. Biane Library located in the Victoria Gardens Cultural Center and the Archibald Library on Archibald Avenue. Chapter 3.56 of the Rancho Cucamonga Municipal Code establishes and governs the Library Impact Fee.

Service Area

The library impact fee is intended to apply to the entire City.

Methodology

This chapter calculates impact fees using the existing inventory method discussed in Chapter 1. With that method, impact fees are based on the existing level of service so that the impact fees will provide the funding needed to maintain that existing level of service as the City grows.

Demand Variable

A "demand variable" is a quantifiable attribute of development that is used in fee calculation formulas to represent the impact of development. The demand variable used to calculate the library impact fee is population.

Population is used as the demand variable for these fees because the need for libraries is normally defined in terms of the size of the population to be served. Added population is used in this chapter to measure the impact of new development on the need for library facilities.

Because population per dwelling unit varies by development category, the average population per unit is estimated for each category of residential development defined in this study. Those individual population-per-unit factors are shown in Table 2.2 in Chapter 2.

Level of Service

The City has not adopted a formal level of service standard for libraries. The level-of-service standard used to calculate impact fees in this chapter is the existing relationship between the City's population and the replacement cost of library facilities and materials stated as a cost per capita. See the Cost per Capita section below.

In 2021, Section 66016.5 was added to the Mitigation Fee by Act AB 602. Paragraph (a)(2) of that section requires that, after January 1, 2022, the level of service used to calculate impact fees in a nexus study must be compared with the existing level of service, and if the proposed new level of service is higher than the existing level of service, an

explanation must be included. Because the level of service used to calculate impact fees in this chapter is the same as the existing level of service, no explanation is required to satisfy the requirements of Section 66016.5(a)(2).

Existing Facilities

Table 5.1 lists the City's existing libraries with their estimated replacement cost. Replacement cost is used in this analysis as an indicator of the cost of constructing additional facilities to serve future development. Cost for library furniture fixtures and equipment, and the contents of the museum at the Biane Library are listed separately. Table 5.1 also shows a credit for the current balance in the City's library impact fee fund, which can be used to construct additional facilities.

Table 5.1: Existing Library Facilities

Facility	Site Acres	Site Value [1]	Building Sq. Feet [2]	Building Repl Cost [3]	Impact Fee Cost Basis [4]
Paul A. Biane Library	1.35	$ 1,799,550	38,912	$ 26,298,402	$ 28,097,952
Museum Contents at Biane Library					$ 3,500,000
Archibald Library	1.67	$ 2,226,110	22,500	$ 11,964,272	$ 14,190,382
Library Furniture, Fixtures, Equipt.					$ 4,100,000
Library Kiosk (RC Resource Center)			199	$ 220,000	$ 220,000
Library Kiosk (Fire Station 178)			199	$ 220,000	$ 220,000
Impact Fee Fund Balance as of May 21, 2024					$ 1,728,778
Total		**$ 4,025,660**	**61,810**	**$ 38,702,674**	**$ 52,057,112**

[1] Site value based on $1,333,000 per acre

[2] Building square footage provided by the City of Rancho Cucamonga Library Services Department

[3] Building replacement cost based on the estimated cost in 2020 impact fee study escalated to 2024 using the California Construction Cost Index

[4] Impact fee cost basis = site value + building replacement cost

This analysis also includes the cost of library materials (books and electronic media). Table 5.2 shows the estimated replacement cost of the library system's existing materials.

Table 5.2: Existing Library Materials

Number of Items [1]	Avg Cost per Item [2]	Impact Fee Cost Basis [3]
269,559	$54.71	$14,747,573

[1] Number of items provided by the City of Rancho Cucamonga Library Services Department

[2] Cost per item estimated by the Library Services Department

[3] Impact fee cost basis = cost of existing library materials = number of items X average cost per item

Cost per Capita

Table 5.3 calculates the replacement cost per capita for library facilities and materials using the impact fee cost basis for library facilities from Table 5.1, and the impact fee cost basis for existing library materials from Table 5.2, both divided by the City's existing population from Table 2.3 in Chapter 2.

Table 5.3: Library Facilities and Materials - Cost per Capita

Component	Impact Fee Cost Basis [1]	Existing Population [2]	Cost per Capita [3]
Library Facilities	$ 52,057,112	192,017	$ 271.11
Library Materials	$ 14,747,573	192,017	$ 76.80
	$ 66,804,685	**192,017**	**$ 347.91**

[1] See Tables 5.1 and 5.2

[2] Existing population; see Table 2.3

[3] Cost per capita = impact fee cost basis / existing population

In the next section, the total cost per capita from Table 5.3 is used to calculate library impact fees per unit of development, for each unit-size category defined in this study. That cost per capita can also be used to customize impact fees for any project that does not reasonably fit within one of the development types identified in this report. Such a customized fee would be based on the estimated population per unit for the project, or a portion of the project, multiplied by the total cost per capita from Table 5.3

Impact Fees per Unit

Table 5.4 shows the calculation of library impact fees per unit of development for each unit-size category defined in this study. Those fees are calculated using the total cost per capita from Table 5.3 and population-per-unit factors from Table 2.2.

Table 5.4: Library Impact Fees per Unit of Development

Development Type	Dev Units [1]	Cost per Capita [2]	Population per Unit [3]	Impact Fee per Unit [4]
Residential <600 Sq. Ft per Unit	DU	$ 347.91	1.00	$ 347.91
Residential >600 - 800 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$ 347.91	1.30	$ 452.28
Residential >800 - 1,200 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$ 347.91	1.80	$ 626.24
Residential <1,200 - 1,900 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$ 347.91	2.70	$ 939.36
Residential <1,900 - 2,300 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$ 347.91	3.50	$ 1,217.69
Residential > 2,300 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$ 347.91	4.40	$ 1,530.81

[1] Units of development; DU = dwelling unit

[2] Cost per capita; see Table 5.3

[3] See Table 2.2

[4] Impact fee per unit = population per unit X cost per capita

Projected Revenue

Since the library impact fees apply only to residential development, potential revenue from those fees can be estimated by multiplying the total cost per capita from Table 5.3 by the added population forecasted Table 2.4.

Table 5.5 shows the projected revenue to 2040 from the library impact fees calculated in this chapter. This projection assumes that future development occurs as shown in Chapter 2.

Table 5.5: Projected Revenue - Library Impact Fees

Development Type	Impact Fee per Capita [1]	Added Population [2]	Projected Revenue [3]
All Residential	$347.91	41,870	$14,567,003

[1] Impact fee (cost) per capita; see Table 5.3

[2] Added population; see Table 2.4

[3] Projected revenue = impact fee per capita X added population

Specific projects and costs to be funded by these impact fees can be found in the City's Capital Improvement Plan.

Updating the Fees

The impact fees calculated in this chapter are based on the current estimated replacement costs for library facilities and materials. We recommend that the fees be reviewed and adjusted annually using local cost data or an index such as the *Engineering News Record* Building Cost Index (BCI) or the Department of General Services California Construction Cost Index. See the Implementation Chapter for more on indexing of fees.

Nexus Summary

As discussed in Chapter 1 of this report, Section 66001 of the Mitigation Fee Act requires an agency establishing, increasing or imposing impact fees to make findings to:

Identify the purpose of the fee;

Identify the use of the fee; and,

Determine that there is a reasonable relationship between:

a. The use of the fee and the development type on which it is imposed;

b. The need for the facility and the type of development on which the fee is imposed; and

c. The amount of the fee and the facility cost attributable to the development project.

Satisfying those requirements also ensures that the fees meet the "rational nexus" and "rough proportionality" standards enunciated in the *Nollan* and *Dolan* decisions discussed in Chapter 1. (For more detail, see "Legal Framework for Impact Fees" in Chapter 1.) The following paragraphs explain how the impact fees calculated in this chapter satisfy those requirements.

Purpose of the Fee: The purpose of the impact fees calculated in this chapter is to prevent new residential development from reducing the quality and availability of public services provided to residents of the city by requiring new residential development to contribute to the cost of expanding the availability of library and cultural center assets in the city.

Use of the Fee. Impact fees calculated in this chapter will be used to provide additional library facilities and materials to mitigate the impact of new development on the need for those facilities in the City. Specific projects and costs to be funded by these impact fees can be found in the City's Capital Improvement Program.

Reasonable Relationship between the Use of the Fee and the Development Type on Which It Is Imposed. The impact fees calculated in this chapter will be used to provide additional libraries facilities and materials to mitigate the impact of added population associated with new residential development on the need for library services in Rancho Cucamonga.

Reasonable Relationship between the Need for the Facilities and the Type of Development on Which the Fee Is Imposed. New residential development increases the need for libraries to maintain the existing level of service, as described earlier in this chapter. Without additional library facilities and materials, the increase in population associated with new residential development would result in a reduction in the level of service provided to all residents of the City.

Reasonable Relationship between the Amount of the Fee and the Facility Cost Attributable to the Development Project. The library impact fees calculated in this chapter are proportional to the impact of the added population associated with various categories of residential development in the City. The fees per unit of development calculated in this chapter for each category of residential development are based on the estimated average population per unit for that category of development in Rancho Cucamonga. Thus, the fee charged to a development project reflects the impact of that project on the need for library facilities and materials in the City.

Chapter 6. Animal Center Impact Fee

This chapter calculates impact fees for additional animal center facilities, vehicles and equipment needed to serve future development in the City. Chapter 3.60 of the Rancho Cucamonga Municipal Code establishes and governs the animal center impact fee.

The City's existing Animal Center is already over capacity and additional space will be needed to serve the growing demand imposed by future development. It should be noted that the impact fees calculated in this chapter will only maintain the existing level of service provided by the Animal Center and will not remedy any existing deficiencies in Animal Center facilities.

Service Area

The animal center impact fee is intended to apply to the entire City.

Demand Variable

It is reasonable to assume that the demand for Animal Center facilities depends on the number of pets kept by City residents, in which case the need for animal center facilities is reasonably related to population of the City. Consequently, added population will be used to represent the impact of development on the need for additional Animal Center facilities.

Because added population is a function of new residential development, the fees calculated in this chapter apply only to residential development.

Methodology

This chapter calculates impact fees using the existing inventory method discussed in Chapter 1. With that method, impact fees are based on the existing level of service so that the impact fees will provide the funding needed to maintain that existing level of service as the City grows.

Level of Service

The City has not adopted a formal level of service standard for animal center facilities. Consequently, the level-of-service standard used to calculate impact fees in this chapter is the existing relationship between the City's population and the replacement cost of existing animal center facilities, vehicles and equipment, stated as a cost per capita. See the Cost per Capita section below.

In 2021, Section 66016.5 was added to the Mitigation Fee by Act AB 602. Paragraph (a)(2) of that section requires that, after January 1, 2022, the level of service used to calculate impact fees in a nexus study must be compared with the existing level of service, and if the proposed new level of service is higher than the existing level of service, an

explanation must be included. Because the level of service used to calculate impact fees in this chapter is the same as the existing level of service, no explanation is required to satisfy the requirements of Section 66016.5(a)(2).

Existing Facilities

Table 6.1 shows the estimated replacement cost for the City's existing Animal Center and the value of a 1.92-acre site the City has acquired to expand that facility. Table 6.1 also shows a credit for the current balance in the City's Animal Center impact fee fund which is available to increase the existing level of service.

Table 6.1: Existing Animal Center Replacement Cost

Facility	Site Acres	Site Value [1]	Building Sq. Feet [2]	Building Repl Cost [3]	Impact Fee Cost Basis [4]
Existing Animal Center	1.60	$2,132,800	12,148	$ 8,305,256	$ 10,438,056
Animal Center Expansion Site	1.92	$2,559,360			$ 2,559,360
Impact Fee Fund Balance as of May 21, 2024					$ 349,089
Total					**$ 13,346,505**

[1] Existing site value = site acres X $1,333,000 per acre

[2] Building square footage provided by the City of Rancho Cucamonga Animal Services Department

[3] Building replacement cost based on estimated cost in 2020 impact fee study escalated to 2024 using the California Construction Cost Index

[4] Impact fee cost basis = site value + building replacement cost

Table 6.2 lists the Animal Services Department's existing vehicles and equipment with replacement costs.

Table 6.2: Animal Center Vehicles and Equipment

Manufacturer	Type	Description	Impact Fee Cost Basis [1]
Ford	F-250	Pickup Truck	$ 110,000
Ford	F-250	Pickup Truck	$ 110,000
Ford	Ranger	Pickup Truck	$ 40,000
Saturn	UT		$ 30,000
Chevrolet	SV	Cargo Van	$ 55,000
Chevrolet		Cargo Van	$ 55,000
Maverick		Horse Trailer	$ 15,000
Midmark		Dental X-Ray Machine	$ 22,970
Midmark		Mobile Dental Machine	$ 12,792
VMS	Plus	Anesthesia Machine (2)	$ 7,274
VMS		Anesthesia Machine (2)	$ 6,738
		LED Procedure Light - Dual	$ 7,851
		LED Procedure Light - Single (4)	$ 15,704
		LED Procedure Light - Mobile	$ 3,926
Cuattro	DR	X-Ray Machine	$ 52,000
Sound Imaging		Ultrasound Machine	$ 20,000
Total			**$ 564,255**

[1] Impact fee cost basis = replacement cost; replacement cost estimated by the Animal Services Department

Cost per Capita

Table 6.3 calculates the cost per capita for Animal Center facilities, vehicles and equipment using the impact fee cost basis from Tables 6.1 and 6.2 and the City's existing residential population from Table 2.3 in Chapter 2.

Table 6.3: Animal Shelter Facilities and Equipment - Cost per Capita

Cost Component	Impact Fee Cost Basis [1]	Existing Population [2]	Cost per Capita [3]
Facilities	$ 13,346,505	192,017	$ 69.51
Vehicles & Equipment	$ 564,255	192,017	$ 2.94
Total	**$ 13,910,760**	**192,017**	**$ 72.45**

[1] See Tables 6.1 and 6.2

[2] See Table 2.3

[3] Cost per capita = impact fee cost basis / existing population

In the next section, the cost per capita from Table 6.3 is used to calculate animal center impact fees per unit of development, for each unit-size category defined in this study. That cost per capita can also be used to customize impact fees for any project that does not reasonably fit within one of the development types identified in this report. Such a

customized fee would be based on the estimated population per unit for the project, or a portion of the project, multiplied by the cost per capita from Table 6.3.

Impact Fees per Unit

Table 6.4 shows the calculation of animal center impact fees per unit for each unit-size category defined in this study. Those fees are calculated using the total cost per capita from Table 6.3 and average population per dwelling unit from Table 2.2 in Chapter 2.

Table 6.4: Animal Shelter - Impact Fees per Unit

Development Type	Units [1]	Population per Unit [2]	Cost per Capita [3]	Impact Fee per Unit [4]
Residential <600 Sq. Ft per Unit	DU	1.00	$ 72.45	$ 72.45
Residential >600 - 800 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	1.30	$ 72.45	$ 94.18
Residential >800 - 1,200 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	1.80	$ 72.45	$ 130.40
Residential <1,200 - 1,900 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	2.70	$ 72.45	$ 195.60
Residential <1,900 - 2,300 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	3.50	$ 72.45	$ 253.56
Residential > 2,300 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	4.40	$ 72.45	$ 318.76

[1] Units of development; DU = dwelling unit

[2] See Table 2.2

[3] Cost per capita; see Table 6.3

[4] Impact fee per unit = population per unit X cost per capita

Projected Revenue

Potential revenue from the animal center impact fees can be estimated by applying the total cost per capita from Table 6.3 to added population from Table 2.4.

Table 6.5 shows the projected revenue to 2040 from the animal center impact fees calculated in this chapter. This projection assumes that future development occurs as shown in Chapter 2.

Table 6.5: Projected Revenue - Animal Center Impact Fees

Development Type	Impact Fee per Capita [1]	Added Population [2]	Projected Revenue [3]
All Residential	$72.45	41,870	$3,033,291

[1] See Table 6.3

[2] Added population; see Table 2.4

[3] Projected revenue = impact fee per capita X added residential population

Specific projects and costs to be funded by these impact fees can be found in the City's Capital Improvement Plan.

Updating the Fees

The impact fees calculated in this chapter are based the current estimated replacement costs for animal center facilities. We recommend that the fees be reviewed and adjusted annually using local cost data or an index such as the *Engineering News Record* Building Cost Index (BCI) or the General Services Department's California Construction Cost Index. See the Implementation Chapter for more on indexing of fees.

Nexus Summary

As discussed in Chapter 1 of this report, Section 66001 of the Mitigation Fee Act requires an agency establishing, increasing or imposing impact fees to make findings to:

Identify the purpose of the fee;

Identify the use of the fee; and,

Determine that there is a reasonable relationship between:

a. The use of the fee and the development type on which it is imposed;
b. The need for the facility and the type of development on which the fee is imposed; and
c. The amount of the fee and the facility cost attributable to the development project.

Satisfying those requirements also ensures that the fees meet the "rational nexus" and "rough proportionality" standards enunciated in the *Nollan* and *Dolan* decisions discussed in Chapter 1. (For more detail, see "Legal Framework for Impact Fees" in Chapter 1.) The following paragraphs explain how the impact fees calculated in this chapter satisfy those requirements.

Purpose of the Fee: The purpose of the impact fees calculated in this chapter is to prevent new residential development from reducing the quality and availability of public services provided to residents of the city by requiring new residential development to contribute to the cost of expanding the availability of animal center assets in the city.

Use of the Fee. Impact fees calculated in this chapter will be used to provide additional animal center facilities and equipment to mitigate the impact of new development on the need for those facilities in the City. Specific projects and costs to be funded by these impact fees can be found in the City's Capital Improvement Plan.

Reasonable Relationship between the Use of the Fee and the Development Type on Which It Is Imposed. The impact fees calculated in this chapter will be used to provide additional animal center facilities and equipment to mitigate the impact of added population associated with new residential development on the need for animal center facilities in Rancho Cucamonga.

Reasonable Relationship between the Need for the Facilities and the Type of Development on Which the Fee Is Imposed. New residential development increases the need for animal center facilities to maintain the existing level of service, as described earlier in this chapter. Without additional animal center facilities, additional residential development would further overburden the existing animal center.

Reasonable Relationship between the Amount of the Fee and the Facility Cost Attributable to the Development Project. This study assumes that the need for animal center facilities in the City is impacted by increasing population. The amounts of the animal center impact fees calculated in this chapter are proportional to the impact of the added population associated with various categories of residential development in the City. The fees per unit of development calculated in this chapter for each category of residential development are based on the estimated average population per unit for that category of development in Rancho Cucamonga. Thus, the fee charged to a development project reflects the impact of that project on the need for animal center facilities in the City.

Chapter 7. Police Impact Fee

This chapter calculates impact fees for police facilities needed to serve future development in the City. Chapter 3.64 of the Rancho Cucamonga Municipal Code establishes and governs the police impact fee.

The City's primary police facility is the Public Safety Building at the Rancho Cucamonga Civic Center. The other existing City-owned police facility is a satellite police station co-located with Fire Station 172 on San Bernardino Road in the western portion of the City. The department also has a substation in a leased space in the Victoria Gardens shopping mall and is planning to construct a permanent substation in that area in the future.

Service Area

The police impact fee is intended to apply to the entire City.

Methodology

This chapter calculates impact fees using the existing inventory method discussed in Chapter 1. With that method, impact fees are based on the existing level of service so that the impact fees will provide the funding needed to maintain that existing level of service as the City grows.

Demand Variable

A "demand variable" is a quantifiable attribute of development that is used in fee calculation formulas to represent the impact of development on a certain type of facilities. The demand variable used to calculate impact fees for police facilities is calls for service per year.

As part of this study, NBS analyzed a random sample of approximately 80,000 calls for service logged by the Rancho Cucamonga Police Department for a one-year period from May 2023 to May 2024 to estimate the number of calls per unit per year generated by each type of development defined in this study. Table 2.2 in Chapter 2 shows the calls-per-unit-per-year factors derived from that analysis. Those factors are used to calculate impact fees per unit later in this chapter. For a more detailed discussion of how calls for service were analyzed, see Chapter 2.

One of the findings from the calls-for-service analysis is that 8.4% of police calls for service in Rancho Cucamonga during the relevant period were generated by public facilities, public schools and parks. The police facility costs associated with those calls are not allocated to new private development in this study.

Level of Service

The City has not adopted a formal level of service standard for police facilities. The level of service used to calculate impact fees in this chapter is the existing level of service, which is defined as the relationship between the replacement cost of police facilities shown in Table 7.1 and the number of police calls for service per year received in the one-year period from May 2023 to May 2024.

In 2021, Section 66016.5 was added to the Mitigation Fee by Act AB 602. Paragraph (a)(2) of that section requires that, after January 1, 2022, the level of service used to calculate impact fees in a nexus study must be compared with the existing level of service, and if the proposed new level of service is higher than the existing level of service, an explanation must be included. Because the level of service used to calculate impact fees in this chapter is the same as the existing level of service, no explanation is required to satisfy the requirements of Section 66016.5(a)(2).

Existing Facilities

Table 7.1 lists the City's existing police facilities with their estimated replacement cost. Replacement cost is used in this analysis as an indicator of the cost of constructing additional facilities to serve future development. Table 7.1 also shows a credit for the current balance in the City's police impact fee fund which is an existing asset and will be used to fund additional police facilities.

Table 7.1: Existing Police Facilities

Facility Name	Building Square Feet [1]	Impact Fee Cost Basis [2]
Civic Center Public Safety Building	30,500	$ 30,454,510
Police Department Structure Parking - 62 spaces		$ 2,759,000
San Bernardino Road Satellite Station	5,673	$ 6,934,243
Impact Fee Fund Balance as of May 21, 2024		$ 1,198,554
Total		**$ 41,346,308**

[1] Building square feet provided by the Rancho Cucamonga Police Department

[2] Impact fee cost basis for Public Safety Building and Satellite Station = estimated building replacement cost from 2020 impact fee study escalated to 2024 using the California Construction Cost Index; impact fee cost basis for Police Department structure parking based on current estimated construction cost of $44,500 per space for structure parking

Cost per Call for Service

Table 7.2 calculates the facility cost per call for service for police facilities using the impact fee cost basis from Table 7.1 and the number of existing calls for service from Table 2.3 in Chapter 2.

Table 7.2: Facility Cost per Call for Service per Year

Impact Fee Cost Basis [1]	Existing Calls for Service [2]	Cost per Call for Service [3]
$41,346,308	79,043	$523.09

[1] See Table 7.1

[2] See Table 2.3

[3] Cost per call for service per year = impact fee cost share / existing calls for service

In the next section, the cost per call from Table 7.2 is used to calculate police impact fees per unit of development, for each category of development defined in this study. That cost per call can also be used to customize impact fees for any project that does not reasonably fit within one of the development types identified in this report. Such a customized fee would be based on the estimated number of police calls per year for the project, multiplied by the cost per call from Table 7.2. The number of police calls per year for a specific type of development project can be estimated by reviewing call records for similar existing projects in the City.

Impact Fees per Unit

Table 7.3 shows the calculation of police impact fees per unit of development, by for each category of development. Those fees are calculated using the cost per call for service from Table 7.2 and the calls-per-unit-per-year factors from Table 2.2 in Chapter 2.

Table 7.3: Police Impact Fees per Unit of Development

Development Type	Units [1]	Cost per Call for Service [2]	Calls per Unit [3]	Impact Fee per Unit [4]
Residential <600 Sq. Ft per Unit	DU	$523.09	0.580	$ 303.39
Residential >600 - 800 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$523.09	0.615	$ 321.70
Residential >800 - 1,200 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$523.09	0.650	$ 340.01
Residential <1,200 - 1,900 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$523.09	0.685	$ 358.31
Residential <1,900 - 2,300 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$523.09	0.720	$ 376.62
Residential > 2,300 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$523.09	0.755	$ 394.93
Senior/Assisted Living Facility	Beds	$523.09	1.738	$ 908.95
Commercial/Retail	KSF	$523.09	1.966	$ 1,028.64
Hotel/Motel	Rooms	$523.09	0.125	$ 65.29
Office	KSF	$523.09	0.465	$ 243.19
Industrial	KSF	$523.09	0.129	$ 67.67

[1] Units of development; DU = dwelling unit; KSF = 1,000 gross square feet of building area; Room = guest room or suite

[2] Cost per call for service per year; see Table 7.2

[3] See Table 2.2 and the discussion of calls for service in Chapter 2

[4] Impact fee per unit = cost per call for service X calls per unit

Projected Revenue

Potential revenue from the police impact fees can be estimated by applying the fees per unit from Table 7.3 to forecasted future units from Table 2.3. Table 7.4 shows the projected revenue to 2040 from the impact fees calculated in this chapter.

This projection assumes that future development occurs as shown in Chapter 2. Because there is no practical way of forecasting future units for each of the residential unit-size categories used in this study, the impact fee per unit for the >1,200 – 1,900 square foot category is used as an average rate to project revenue from all future residential development.

Table 7.4: Projected Revenue - Police Impact Fees

Development Type	Dev Units [1]	Impact Fee per Unit [2]	Future Units [3]	Projected Revenue [4]
All Residential	DU	$ 358.31	16,714	$ 5,988,862
Senior/Assisted Living Facility	DU	$ 908.95	138	$ 125,666
Commercial/Retail	KSF	$ 1,028.64	700	$ 720,050
Hotel/Motel	Rooom	$ 65.29	275	$ 17,952
Office	KSF	$ 243.19	2,000	$ 486,372
Industrial	KSF	$ 67.67	5,800	$ 392,500
Total				**$ 7,731,402**

[1] Units of development; DU = dwelling unit; KSF = 1,000 gross square feet of building area; Room = guest room or suite

[2] Impact fee per unit of development; see Table 7.3; impact fee for >1,200-1,900 square foot unit assumed to be average impact fee per unit for all residential development

[3] Future units; see Table 2.4

[4] Projected revenue = impact fee per unit X future units

Specific projects and costs to be funded by these impact fees can be found in the City's Capital Improvement Plan.

Updating the Fees

The impact fees calculated in this chapter are based on the current estimated replacement costs for police facilities. We recommend that the fees be reviewed and adjusted annually using local cost data or an index such as the *Engineering News Record* Building Cost Index or the General Services Department California Construction Cost Index. See the Implementation Chapter for more on indexing of fees.

Nexus Summary

As discussed in Chapter 1 of this report, Section 66001 of the Mitigation Fee Act requires an agency establishing, increasing or imposing impact fees to make findings to:

Identify the purpose of the fee;

Identify the use of the fee; and,

Determine that there is a reasonable relationship between:

a. The use of the fee and the development type on which it is imposed;

b. The need for the facility and the type of development on which the fee is imposed; and

c. The amount of the fee and the facility cost attributable to the development project.

Satisfying those requirements also ensures that the fees meet the "rational nexus" and "rough proportionality" standards enunciated in leading court decisions bearing on impact fees and other exactions. (For more detail, see "Legal Framework for Impact Fees" in Chapter 1.) The following paragraphs explain how the impact fees calculated in this chapter satisfy those requirements.

Purpose of the Fee: The purpose of the impact fees calculated in this chapter is to prevent new residential and commercial/industrial development from reducing the quality and availability of public services provided to residents of the city by requiring new residential and business development to contribute to the cost of expanding the availability of police assets in the city.

Use of the Fee. Impact fees calculated in this chapter will be used to provide additional police facilities to mitigate the impact of new development on the need for those facilities in the City. Specific projects and costs to be funded by these impact fees can be found in the City's Capital Improvement Plan.

Reasonable Relationship between the Use of the Fee and the Development Type on Which It Is Imposed. The impact fees calculated in this chapter will be used to provide additional police facilities to mitigate the impact of new development on the need for police facilities in Rancho Cucamonga.

Reasonable Relationship between the Need for the Facilities and the Type of Development on Which the Fee Is Imposed. New development increases the demand for law enforcement services, which impacts the need for police facilities to maintain the existing level of service, as described earlier in this chapter. Without additional police facilities, the increase in demand associated with new development would negatively impact the ability of the Rancho Cucamonga Police Department to provide services efficiently and effectively to all development in the City.

Reasonable Relationship between the Amount of the Fee and the Facility Cost Attributable to the Development Project. The amount of the police impact fees calculated in this chapter are proportional to the impact of the increased demand for law enforcement services associated with various types of development in the City. The fees per unit of development calculated in this chapter for each category of development are based on the estimated number of calls for service per unit per year for that category of development in Rancho Cucamonga. Thus, the fee charged to a development project reflects the impact of that project on the need for police facilities in the City.

Chapter 8. Fire Impact Fee

Rancho Cucamonga does not have an existing fire impact fee. This chapter calculates impact fees for fire protection and emergency response facilities, apparatus and equipment provided by the Rancho Cucamonga Fire Protection District (RCFPD or District) to all development in the City. The boundary of RCFPD encompasses the entire City as well as a small area to the north of the City that is planned to remain within the unincorporated territory of San Bernardino County.

As discussed in the next section, fire districts are prohibited by California law from imposing impact fees on their own. Impact fees calculated in this chapter will be adopted and imposed by the City and revenue from the impact fees will be transferred to RCFPD to pay for additional capital facilities and other capital assets serving new development in the City. These impact fees will apply only to the portion of RCFPD that is within the City.

Fire Protection District Law of 1987

California Health and Safety Code Section 13916, which is part of the Fire Protection District Law of 1987, states: "A (fire protection) district board shall not charge a fee on new construction or development for the construction of public improvements or facilities or the acquisition of equipment." However, although a district itself may not charge such fees, Health and Safety Code Section 13898 provides that a district may accept revenue from any federal, state, regional, or local agency or from any person for any lawful purpose of the district. That section allows the City to transfer impact fee revenue to RCFPD to pay for facilities, apparatus and equipment needed to serve the City.

Service Area

The impact fees calculated in this chapter are intended to apply to the entire City.

Methodology

This chapter calculates impact fees using the system plan method discussed in Chapter 1. With this method, impact fees are calculated so that new development pays for its share of the cost of an integrated system of facilities at the future standard attributable to new development.

To calculate the cost per unit of demand, the value of existing facilities plus the cost of planned facilities is divided by the combined demand associated with both existing development and planned development. (As discussed in the next section, demand for services provided by RCFPD is represented by calls for service per year.) This method ensures that costs for all existing and future RCFPD facilities, apparatus and equipment are allocated to all existing and future development, so that impact fees charged to future development will pay future development's proportionate share of the overall cost of those assets. With the system plan method, we depreciate the replacement cost of

existing assets because new development is effectively buying in to those assets. With the existing inventory method used elsewhere in this report, replacement costs for existing assets are not depreciated because they represent the cost to acquire additional assets needed to serve additional development.

Demand Variable

A "demand variable" is a quantifiable attribute of development that is used in fee calculation formulas to represent the impact of development on a certain type of capital facilities. The demand variable used to calculate impact fees for fire protection and emergency response facilities, apparatus and equipment in this report is calls for service per year.

As part of this study, NBS analyzed a random sample of all calls for service logged by RCFPD in 2023 to estimate the number of calls per unit per year generated by each type of development defined in this study. Chapter 2 discusses that analysis and Table 2.2 shows the calls per unit per year factors derived from that analysis. Those factors are used to calculate impact fees per unit later in this chapter.

Level of Service

The most important single factor in defining level of service for fire protection and emergency medical services agencies is response time to emergency calls. The 2024 Comprehensive Master Plan for RCFPD states that RCFPD's first due unit currently arrives within 9 minutes and 45 seconds, 90% of the time. The Master Plan makes recommendations to improve total response time, including reducing call processing time. The addition of one fire station will help RCFPD maintain and possibly improve its response time performance as future development occurs.

In 2021, Section 66016.5 was added to the Mitigation Fee by Act AB 602. That section requires that, after January 1, 2022, the level of service used in an impact fee study must be compared with the existing level of service. If new impact fees are based on a level of service that exceeds the existing level of service, an explanation is required.

For other types of impact fees calculated in this study, impact fee calculations are based on the cost of maintaining the existing level of service using the existing inventory method discussed in Chapter 1. That approach can be used for fire impact fees, but we believe the system plan method, discussed above and in Chapter 1, is more appropriate because geography and fire station location are so critical to response time across a fire agency's service area.

Fire protection and emergency response are provided by an integrated system of assets and the best time to assess the overall relationship between development and service demand is at the point when all of the assets and all of the development will be in place, which is what the system plan method is designed to do.

Facilities, Apparatus and Equipment

At present, RCFPD operates eight fire stations as well as an administrative facility, an all-risk training center (ARTC) and a shop facility. RCFPD is planning to construct one additional fire station and has acquired property on 8th Street as a site for that station.

Table 8.1 lists RCFPD's existing and planned fire stations as well as the administrative and training center buildings and the shop facility. Stations 171 through 178 currently exist. Station 179 is planned for future construction.

Table 8.1: Existing and Future Fire Stations

Facility	Location	Constr Date	Bldg Sq Ft	Site Acres	Building Repl Cost [1]	Useful Life [2]	Land Cost [3]	Depreciated Bldg Cost [4]	Impact Fee Cost Basis [5]
Station 171	Amethyst St	1974	4,480	0.99	$ 644,687	50	$ 1,319,670	$ 0	$ 1,319,670
Admin Bldg	Amethyst St	1977	2,754	Included	$ 1,755,420	50		$ 105,325	$ 105,325
Station 172	San B'dino Rd	2020	13,341	2.90	$ 14,053,099	50	$ 3,092,560	$ 12,928,851	$ 16,021,411
Station 173	Firehouse Ct	2005	12,000	2.36	$ 6,823,656	50	$ 3,145,880	$ 4,230,666	$ 7,376,546
Storage Bldg	Firehouse Ct	2005	2,500	Included	$ 234,078	50		$ 145,129	$ 145,129
Station 174	Jersey Blvd	1992	17,000	6.14	$ 8,984,714	50	$ 8,184,620	$ 3,234,497	$ 11,419,117
Shop/Garage	Jersey Blvd	2001	14,304	Included	$ 6,306,495	50		$ 3,405,507	$ 3,405,507
Trng Ctr Bldg A	Jersey Blvd	2016	7,000	Included	$ 3,588,740	50		$ 3,014,542	$ 3,014,542
Trng Ctr Bldg B	Jersey Blvd	2016	1,900	Included	$ 1,180,251	50		$ 991,411	$ 991,411
Trng Ctr Bldg C	Jersey Blvd	2016	2,455	Included	$ 1,064,350	50		$ 894,054	$ 894,054
Trng Ctr Bldg D	Jersey Blvd	2016	15,415	Included	$ 4,006,318	50		$ 3,365,307	$ 3,365,307
Trng Ctr Bldg E	Jersey Blvd	2016	3,064	Included	$ 894,974	50		$ 751,779	$ 751,779
Trng Ctr Bldg I	Jersey Blvd	2016	1,300	Included	$ 1,422,959	50		$ 1,195,286	$ 1,195,286
Station 175	Banyan St	1992	13,000	3.05	$ 7,304,058	50	$ 4,065,650	$ 2,629,461	$ 6,695,111
Station 176	East Av	2003	9,594	1.07	$ 4,297,952	50	$ 1,426,310	$ 2,492,812	$ 3,919,122
Station 177	Rancho St	2012	6,000	1.23	$ 4,025,220	50	$ 1,639,590	$ 3,059,167	$ 4,698,757
Station 178	Town Ctr Dr	2023	12,176	3.80	$ 16,389,052	50	$ 5,065,400	$ 16,061,271	$ 21,126,671
Station 179	8th St	Future	13,000	0.94	$ 15,600,000	50	$ 1,253,020	$ 15,600,000	$ 16,853,020
Total					**$ 98,576,024**		**$ 29,192,700**	**74,105,065**	**$ 103,297,765**

[1] Estimated replacement cost for existing buildings other than Station 178 are based on 2020 estimates, escalated by 38% to 2024 costs based on the California Construction Cost Index; cost for Station 178 is actual 2023 construction cost; cost for future Station 179 based on $1,200 per square foot, which is below the actual cost of the two most recently constructed fire stations; estimated costs include construction soft costs, utilities, site development, and furniture, fixtures and equipment

[2] Estimated useful life of buildings in years

[3] Estimated land value for existing fire stations or land cost for future fire stations = $1,333,000 per acre

[4] Depreciated building replacement cost for existing stations using straight-line depreciation over the useful life of the asset; no depreciation applies to future buiding costs

[5] Facility replacement cost = depreciated building replacement cost or new building cost + estimated land cost or value

The impact fee cost basis in the right-hand column of Table 8.1 includes the depreciated replacement cost for existing buildings plus the estimated site value for each building. Where multiple buildings are located on one site, the land cost is shown for the first building. For future Station 179, the cost shown is estimated based on recent construction costs.

Table 8.2 on page 8-5 lists RCFPD's existing firefighting apparatus and other vehicles and equipment. Costs for all vehicles and equipment shown in the far-right column of Table 8.2 are depreciated replacement costs based on the useful life shown in that table.

Vehicles and equipment are assumed to have a residual value of at least 15% of replacement cost, regardless of age. Assets with a value of less than $10,000 have been omitted from Table 8.2.

Table 8.2: Existing Fire Apparatus and Vehicles

Quantity	Model Year	Description	Useful Life (Yrs)	Unit Repl Cost [1]	Depr Unit Repl Cost [2]	Total Depr Repl Cost [3]
2	2013	Type 1 Engine (KME)	10	$ 1,200,000	$ 180,000	$ 360,000
2	2003	Type 1 Engine (KME Excel)	10	$ 1,200,000	$ 180,000	$ 360,000
1	2017	Type 1 Engine (KME)	10	$ 1,200,000	$ 360,000	$ 360,000
1	2008	KME Severe Duty Predator	10	$ 1,200,000	$ 180,000	$ 180,000
2	2005	Type 1 Engine (KME Excel)	10	$ 1,200,000	$ 180,000	$ 360,000
1	2018	Type 1 Engine (KME)	10	$ 1,200,000	$ 480,000	$ 480,000
1	2010	Type 1 Engine (KME)	10	$ 1,200,000	$ 180,000	$ 180,000
1	2006	Type 1 Engine (KME Predator)	10	$ 1,200,000	$ 180,000	$ 180,000
1	2020	Type 1 Engine (Rosenbauer)	10	$ 1,200,000	$ 720,000	$ 720,000
1	2023	Type 1 Engine (Rosenbauer Electric)	10	$ 2,200,000	$ 1,980,000	$ 1,980,000
1	2006	Type 3 Engine (West Mark)	10	$ 600,000	$ 90,000	$ 90,000
1	2008	Type 3 Engine	10	$ 600,000	$ 90,000	$ 90,000
1	2014	Type 3 Engine	10	$ 150,000	$ 22,500	$ 22,500
1	2020	Type 6 Engine	10	$ 150,000	$ 90,000	$ 90,000
1	2002	KME Aerial Ladder Truck--Tiller	10	$ 2,350,000	$ 352,500	$ 352,500
1	2008	KME Aerial Ladder Truck	10	$ 2,350,000	$ 352,500	$ 352,500
1	2015	Rosenbauer Aerial Ladder Truck	10	$ 2,350,000	$ 352,500	$ 352,500
1	2022	Rosenbauer Heavy Rescue Unit	10	$ 1,650,000	$ 1,320,000	$ 1,320,000
1	2006	KME Hazmat Unit	10	$ 1,650,000	$ 247,500	$ 247,500
1	2003	KME Water Tender	10	$ 550,000	$ 82,500	$ 82,500
3	2012	Dodge Ram 4WD	7	$ 110,000	$ 16,500	$ 49,500
1	2019	Dodge Ram 4WD V8 Hemi	7	$ 200,000	$ 57,143	$ 57,143
1	2024	Dodge Ram 4WD V8 Hemi	7	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	$ 200,000
1	2015	Ford F-450 Super Duty Stake Bed	7	$ 120,000	$ 18,000	$ 18,000
1	2008	Ford F-350 Medic Squad	10	$ 100,000	$ 15,000	$ 15,000
3	2019	Chevy Bolt EV	7	$ 35,000	$ 10,000	$ 30,000
3	2013	Ford C-Max Hybrid	7	$ 35,000	$ 5,250	$ 15,750
4	2012	Ford Escape Hybrid	7	$ 35,000	$ 5,250	$ 21,000
1	2023	Ford Lightning	7	$ 110,000	$ 94,286	$ 94,286
2	2009	Saturn Vue	7	$ 35,000	$ 5,250	$ 10,500
2	2020	Toyota RAV-4 Hybrid	7	$ 35,000	$ 15,000	$ 30,000
2	2023	Toyota RAV-4 Hybrid	7	$ 35,000	$ 30,000	$ 60,000
1	2024	Toyota RAV-4 Hybrid	7	$ 35,000	$ 35,000	$ 35,000
2	2016	Chevy Colorado 4WD	7	$ 110,000	$ 16,500	$ 33,000
2	2018	Chevy Colorado 4WD	7	$ 110,000	$ 16,500	$ 33,000
1	2017	Ford F-350	7	$ 200,000	$ 30,000	$ 30,000
1	2019	Ford F-350	7	$ 200,000	$ 57,143	$ 57,143
2	2016	Chevy Colorado 4WD	7	$ 110,000	$ 16,500	$ 33,000
2	2018	Chevy Colorado 4WD	7	$ 110,000	$ 16,500	$ 33,000
2	2008	Chevy F-2500 4WD	7	$ 110,000	$ 16,500	$ 33,000
1	2012	Chevy 3/4 Ton Suburban	7	$ 110,000	$ 16,500	$ 16,500
1	2005	GMC Yukon	7	$ 110,000	$ 16,500	$ 16,500
1	2002	Dodge Ram 2500 4WD	7	$ 110,000	$ 16,500	$ 16,500
1	2004	GMC 7500 Series w/ Equipment	7	$ 200,000	$ 30,000	$ 30,000
1	2008	Ford E-350 Van	7	$ 75,000	$ 11,250	$ 11,250
1	2021	Ford Transit-250 Van	7	$ 110,000	$ 62,857	$ 62,857
2	2020	Nissan NV200 Van	7	$ 30,000	$ 12,857	$ 25,714
1	2012	Ford 1-Ton 4x4 Long Bed	7	$ 110,000	$ 16,500	$ 16,500
1	2006	Freightliner Ambulance	10	$ 480,000	$ 72,000	$ 72,000
1	2024	Polaris ATV	10	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000
1	2001	Mitsubishi Forklift	10	$ 65,000	$ 9,750	$ 9,750
1	2011	JLG Telehandler	10	$ 100,000	$ 15,000	$ 15,000
1	2013	Griddle Trailer	10	$ 75,000	$ 11,250	$ 11,250
1	2020	Progressive Trailer	10	$ 25,000	$ 15,000	$ 15,000
Total				**$ 29,085,000**	**$ 8,652,286**	**$ 9,417,143**

[1] Replacement cost provided by the Rancho Cucamonga Fire District

[2] Depreciated replacement cost using straight-line depreciation over the useful life of the asset; minimum depreciated value = 15% of replacement cost

[3] Total depreciated replacement cost = depreciated unit replacement cost X number of units

Table 8.3 lists one Type I engine that will be needed for future Fire Station 179. The estimated cost of that engine is based on the current cost of similar equipment. Also shown in that table is the cost of personal protective equipment for nine firefighters that will be needed to staff Station 179.

Table 8.3: Future Fire Apparatus, Vehicles and Equipment

Description	No. of Units	Cost per Unit [1]	Total New Equipt Cost
New Type 1 Engine (Station 179)	1	$ 1,200,000	$ 1,200,000
Personal Protective Equipment [2]	9	$ 9,153	$ 82,377
Total			**$ 1,282,377**

[1] Cost per unit provided by the Rancho Cucamonga Fire District

[2] Personal protective equipment for future added firefighters; estimated cost includes uniforms and personal protective equipment for fire suppression, wild land firefighting and tactical response

Table 8.4 summarizes the costs from the preceding three tables.

Table 8.4: Impact Fee Cost Basis - Existing and Future Assets

Component	Impact Fee Cost Basis [1]
Existing and Future Fire Stations	$ 103,297,765
Existing - Fire Apparatus, Vehicles and Equipment	$ 9,417,143
Future - Fire Apparatus, Vehicles and Equipment	$ 1,282,377
Total	**$ 113,997,285**

[1] See Tables 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3

Cost per Call for Service

Table 8.5 calculates the cost per call for service for RCFPD facilities, apparatus and equipment using the total impact fee cost basis from Table 8.4 and the projected number of calls for service per year in 2040. In Table 8.5, the combined cost of existing and planned facilities, apparatus, vehicles and equipment is divided by total 2040 calls to both existing and future development served by RCFPD.

Table 8.5: Cost per Call for Service

Total Impact Fee Cost Basis [1]	2040 Calls for Service per Year [2]	Cost per Call for Service per Year [3]
$113,997,285	22,490	$5,068.80

[1] See Table 8.4

[2] Projected 2040 calls for service for the District; see Table 2.5

[3] Cost per call for service per year = total impact fee cost basis / 2040 calls for service per year

The number of calls for service per year shown for 2040 includes calls in the area served by RCFPD outside of the City, so that the cost of serving development in that area is not averaged into the cost per call for impact fees charged by the City. The impact fees calculated in this chapter are designed to recover new development's proportionate share of the cost of all of RCFPD's existing and planned facilities, apparatus and equipment our to 2040.

The cost per call for service per year in Table 8.5 can also be used to calculate customized impact fees for development projects that do not fit within the categories of development defined in this study. Customized impact fees can be calculated using the cost per call for service per year from Table 8.5 multiplied by the estimated number of calls per year that will be generated by a specific project.

Impact Fees per Unit

Table 8.6 shows the calculation of fire impact fees per unit of development for each category of development defined in this study. Those fees are calculated using the cost per call for service per year from Table 8.5 and the calls-per-unit-per-year factors from Table 2.2.

Table 8.6 Impact Fee per Unit

Development Type	Units [1]	Cost per Call [2]	Calls per Unit [3]	Impact Fee per Unit [4]
Residential <600 Sq. Ft per Unit	DU	$5,068.80	0.133	$ 674.15
Residential >600 - 800 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$5,068.80	0.147	$ 745.11
Residential >800 - 1,200 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$5,068.80	0.161	$ 816.08
Residential <1,200 - 1,900 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$5,068.80	0.175	$ 887.04
Residential <1,900 - 2,300 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$5,068.80	0.189	$ 958.00
Residential > 2,300 Sq. Ft. per Unit	DU	$5,068.80	0.203	$ 1,028.97
Senior/Assisted Living Facility	Bed	$5,068.80	2.829	$ 14,341.34
Commercial/Retail	KSF	$5,068.80	0.231	$ 1,170.19
Hotel/Motel	Room	$5,068.80	0.115	$ 582.37
Office	KSF	$5,068.80	0.122	$ 618.78
Industrial	KSF	$5,068.80	0.017	$ 88.44

[1] DU = dwelling unit; KSF = 1,000 gross square feet of building area; room = guest room or suite; Bed = accommodation for a single resident or patient

[2] Cost per call for service per year; see Table 8.5

[3] Calls for service per unit per year; see Table 2.2

[4] Cost per unit = cost per call for service X calls for service per unit

Projected Revenue

Potential revenue from the fire impact fees can be estimated by applying the fees per unit from Table 8.6 to forecasted future units from Table 2.3. Table 8.7 shows the projected revenue to 2040 from the impact fees calculated in this chapter.

This projection assumes that future development occurs as shown in Chapter 2. Because there is no practical way of forecasting the number of future units in each of the residential unit-size categories used in this study, the impact fee per unit for the >1,200 – 1,900 square feet per unit category is used as an average rate to project revenue from all future residential development.

Table 8.7 Projected Revenue

Development Type	Units [1]	Future Units [2]	Impact Fee per Unit [3]	Projected Revenue [4]
All Residential	DU	16,714	$ 887.04	$ 14,825,986
Senior/Assisted Living Facility	Bed	138	$ 14,341.34	$ 1,982,762
Commercial/Retail	KSF	700	$ 1,170.19	$ 819,135
Hotel/Motel	Room	275	$ 582.37	$ 160,123
Office	KSF	2,000	$ 618.78	$ 1,237,552
Industrial	KSF	5,800	$ 88.44	$ 512,979
Total				$ 19,538,539

[1] DU = dwelling unit; KSF = 1,000 gross square feet of building area; room = guest room or suite; Bed = accommodation for a single resident or patient

[2] Future units; see Table 2.3

[3] See Table 8.6; the average impact fee per unit shown in this table for all residential developmen is the impact fee for the t>1,200 - 1,900 sq. ft. per unit category

[4] Projected revenue = future units X impact fee per unit

The major facilities, apparatus and equipment to be funded by these impact fees is shown in Tables 8.1 and 8.3. Additional information is shown in the City's capital improvement plan.

Updating the Fees

The impact fees calculated in this chapter are based on the current estimated replacement costs for fire district facilities, apparatus and vehicles. We recommend that the fees be reviewed and adjusted annually using local cost data or an index such as the *Engineering News Record* Building Cost Index or the California Construction Cost Index. See the Implementation Chapter for more on indexing of fees.

Nexus Summary

As discussed in Chapter 1 of this report, Section 66001 of the Mitigation Fee Act requires an agency establishing, increasing or imposing impact fees to make findings to:

Identify the purpose of the fee;

Identify the use of the fee; and,

Determine that there is a reasonable relationship between:

a. The use of the fee and the development type on which it is imposed;

b. The need for the facility and the type of development on which the fee is imposed; and

c. The amount of the fee and the facility cost attributable to the development project.

Satisfying those requirements also ensures that the fees meet the "rational nexus" and "rough proportionality" standards enunciated in leading court decisions bearing on impact fees and other exactions. (For more detail, see "Legal Framework for Impact Fees" in Chapter 1.) The following paragraphs explain how the impact fees calculated in this chapter satisfy those requirements.

Purpose of the Fee: The purpose of the impact fees calculated in this chapter is to mitigate the impact of new development in the City on the need for facilities, apparatus and equipment provided by the Rancho Cucamonga Fire Protection District (RCFPD).

Use of the Fee. Impact fees calculated in this chapter will be used to provide additional facilities, apparatus and equipment to mitigate the impact of new development in the City on the need for those facilities.

Reasonable Relationship between the Use of the Fee and the Development Type on Which It Is Imposed. The impact fees calculated in this chapter will be used to provide additional facilities, apparatus and equipment to serve the added demand for fire protection and other emergency services associated with new development in the City of Rancho Cucamonga.

Reasonable Relationship between the Need for the Facilities and the Type of Development on Which the Fee Is Imposed. New development in the City increases the demand for fire protection and other emergency services provided by the Rancho Cucamonga Fire Protection District. Without additional facilities, apparatus and equipment, the increase in demand associated with new development would negatively impact the ability of RCFPD the to provide services efficiently and effectively to all development in the City.

Reasonable Relationship between the Amount of the Fee and the Facility Cost Attributable to the Development Project. The amount of the fire impact fees charged to a development project will depend on the increase in calls for service associated with that project. The fees per unit of development calculated in this chapter for each type of development are based on the estimated calls for service per unit per year associated with that type of development in the City. Thus, the fee charged to a development project reflects the impact of that project on the overall need for facilities, apparatus and equipment used by RCFPD to serve development in the City.

Chapter 9. Implementation

This chapter of the report summarizes requirements for adoption and administration of impact fees, calculated in this study. It was not prepared by an attorney and is not intended as legal advice. Additionally, the City intends to conduct an analysis of administrative costs and implement an administrative fee.

Statutory requirements for the adoption and administration of fees imposed as a condition of development approval (impact fees) are found in the Mitigation Fee Act (Government Code Sections 66000 *et seq.*).

Adoption

Procedures for adoption of fees subject to the Mitigation Fee Act, including notice and public-hearing requirements, are specified in Government Code Sections 66016 and 66018. It should be noted that Section 66018 refers to Government Code Section 6062a, which requires that the public hearing notice be published at least twice during the 10-day notice period. However, Section 66016.5 added by AB 602 in 2021 requires that impact fee nexus studies be adopted at a public hearing with at least a 30-day notice.

Government Code Section 66017 provides that fees subject to the Mitigation Fee Act do not become effective until 60 days after final action by the governing body.

Actions establishing or increasing fees subject to the Mitigation Act require certain findings, as set forth in Government Code Section 66001 and discussed in Chapter 1 of this report.

Examples of findings that could be used for impact fees calculated in this study are shown below. A nexus summary for each impact fee calculated in this report can be found in individual chapters of this report and those nexus summaries may be used to support the findings required by Section 66001.

Administration

The California Mitigation Fee Act (Government Code Sections 66000 et seq.) mandates procedures for administration of impact fee programs, including collection and accounting, reporting, and refunds. References to code sections in the following paragraphs pertain to the California Government Code.

Notices and Statute of Limitations. Section 66006 (f) provides that a local agency, at the time it imposes a fee for public improvements on a specific development project, "... shall identify the public improvement that the fee will be used to finance." The required notification could refer to the capital improvement plan that must now be adopted with each new impact fee nexus study.

Section 66020 (d) (1) requires that the agency, at the time it imposes an impact fee, provide a written statement of the amount of the fee and written notice of a 90-day

period during which the imposition of the fee can be protested. Failure to protest imposition of the fee during that period may deprive the fee payer of the right to subsequent legal challenge.

Section 66022 (a) provides a separate procedure for challenging the establishment of an impact fee. Such challenges must be filed within 120 days of enactment.

Collection of Fees. Section 66007, as amended by SB 937 in 2024, provides that, with some exceptions, a local agency shall not require payment of impact fees by developers of residential development projects prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy, or first temporary certificate of occupancy, whichever occurs first. That provision does not apply if construction of the residential development does not begin within five years of the date upon which the building permit is issued.

An exception that allows utility service fees to be collected when an application for service is received, is now limited to the cost of "connection activities."

Local agencies may require payment of fees prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy under certain conditions, including if the fees are to reimburse the agency for expenditures previously made, unless the project reserves at least 49% of residential units for occupancy by lower income households. For such projects, the local agency may require posting of a performance bond or letter of credit from a federally insured depository institution to guarantee payment when the fees are eligible for collection.

In cases where the fees are not collected upon issuance of building permits, Sections 66007 (d) (1) and (2) provide that the City may require the property owner to execute a contract to pay the fee, and to record that contract as a lien against the property until the fees are paid. The local agency may not charge interest or other fees on any amounts deferred pursuant to Section 66007.

If a residential development contains more than one dwelling, the local agency may determine whether the fees or charges described shall be paid on a pro rata basis for each dwelling when it receives its certificate of occupancy, on a pro rata basis when a certain percentage of the dwellings have received their certificate of occupancy, or on a lump-sum basis when all the dwellings in the development receive their certificate of occupancy.

Statutory restrictions on the time at which fees may be collected do not apply to non-residential development.

Earmarking and Expenditure of Fee Revenue. Section 66006 (a) mandates that fees be deposited "with other fees for the improvement in a separate capital facilities account or fund in a manner to avoid any commingling of the fees with other revenues and funds of the local agency, except for temporary investments, and expend those fees solely for the purpose for which the fee was collected." Section 66006 (a) also requires that interest earned on the fee revenues be placed in the capital account and used for the same purpose.

The language of the law is not clear as to whether depositing fees "with other fees for the improvement" refers to a specific capital improvement or a class of improvements (e.g., street improvements).

We are not aware of any municipality that has interpreted that language to mean that funds must be segregated by individual projects. As a practical matter, that approach would be unworkable because it would mean that no pay-as-you-go project could be constructed until all benefiting development had paid the fees. Common practice is to maintain separate funds or accounts for impact fee revenues by facility category (i.e., streets, park improvements), but not for individual projects.

Impact Fee Exemptions, Reductions, and Waivers. In the event that a development project is found to have no impact on facilities for which impact fees are charged, such project must be exempted from the fees.

If a project has characteristics that will make its impacts on a particular public facility or infrastructure system significantly and permanently smaller than the average impact used to calculate impact fees in this study, the fees should be reduced accordingly to meet the requirement that there must be a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facility attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed. The fee reduction is required if the fee is not proportional to the impact of the development on relevant public facilities.

In some cases, an agency may desire to voluntarily waive or reduce impact fees that would otherwise apply to a project as a way of promoting goals such as affordable housing or economic development. Such a waiver or reduction is within the discretion of the governing body but may not result in increased costs to other development projects. So, the effect of such policies is that the lost revenue must be made up from sources other than impact fees.

Credit for Improvements Provided by Developers. If the City requires a developer, as a condition of project approval, to dedicate land or construct facilities or improvements for which impact fees are charged, the City should ensure that the impact fees are adjusted so that the overall contribution by the developer does not exceed the impact created by the development.

In the event that a developer voluntarily offers to dedicate land, or construct facilities or improvements in lieu of paying impact fees, the City may accept or reject such offers and may negotiate the terms under which such an offer would be accepted. Excess contributions by a developer may be offset by reimbursement agreements.

Credit for Existing Development. If a project involves replacement, redevelopment or intensification of previously existing development, impact fees should be applied only to the portion of the project that represents a net increase in demand for relevant City facilities, applying the measure of demand used in this study to calculate that impact fee.

Annual Report. Section 66006 (b) (1) requires that once each year, within 180 days of the close of the fiscal year, the local agency must make available to the public the following information for each separate account established to receive impact fee revenues:

1. A brief description of the type of fee in the account or fund;
2. The amount of the fee;
3. The beginning and ending balance of the account or fund;
4. The amount of the fees collected and interest earned;
5. Identification of each public improvement on which fees were expended and the amount of the expenditures on each improvement, including the percentage of the cost of the public improvement that was funded with fees;
6. Identification of the approximate date by which the construction of a public improvement will commence, if the City determines sufficient funds have been collected to complete financing of an incomplete public improvement;
7. A description of each inter-fund transfer or loan made from the account or fund, including interest rates, repayment dates, and a description of the improvement on which the transfer or loan will be expended;
8. The amount of any refunds or allocations made pursuant to Section 66001, paragraphs (e) and (f).

The annual report must be reviewed by the City Council at its next regularly scheduled public meeting, but not less than 15 days after the statements are made public, per Section 66006 (b) (2).

Five-Year Findings and Refunds under the Mitigation Fee Act. Prior to 1996, The Mitigation Fee Act required that a local agency collecting impact fees was required to expend or commit impact fee revenue within five years or make findings to justify a continued need for the money. Otherwise, those funds had to be refunded. SB 1693, adopted in 1996 as an amendment to the Mitigation Fee Act, changed that requirement in material ways.

Now, Section 66001 (d) requires that, for the fifth fiscal year following the first deposit of any impact fee revenue into an account or fund as required by Section 66006 (b), and every five years thereafter, the local agency shall make all of the following findings for any fee revenue that remains unexpended, whether committed or uncommitted:

1. Identify the purpose to which the fee will be put;
2. Demonstrate the reasonable relationship between the fee and the purpose for which it is charged;

3. Identify all sources and amounts of funding anticipated to complete financing of incomplete improvements for which impact fees are to be used;
4. Designate the approximate dates on which the funding necessary to complete financing of those improvements will be deposited into the appropriate account or fund.

Those findings are to be made in conjunction with the annual reports discussed above. If such findings are not made as required by Section 66001, the local agency could be required to refund the moneys in the account or fund, per Section 66001 (d).

Once the agency determines that sufficient funds have been collected to complete financing on incomplete improvements for which impact fee revenue is to be used, it must, within 180 days of that determination, identify an approximate date by which construction of the public improvement will be commenced (Section 66001 (e)). If the agency fails to comply with that requirement, it must refund impact fee revenue in the account according to procedures specified in Section 66001 (d).

For a useful discussion of the foregoing requirements, see "The Mitigation Fee Act's Five-Year Findings Requirement: Beware Costly Pitfalls" by Glen Hansen, Senior Counsel, Abbott and Kindermann, and Rick Jarvis, Managing Partner, Jarvis, Fay and Gibson, presented at the 2022 League of California Cities City Attorneys Spring Conference.

Audit Requests. Section 66023 provides that any person may request an audit to determine whether any fee or charge levied by a local agency exceeds the amount reasonably necessary to cover the cost of any product, public facility, as defined in Section 66000, or service provided by the local agency. The legislative body of the local agency may retain an independent auditor to conduct the audit but is not required to conduct an audit if an audit has been performed for the same fee within the previous 12 months.

The agency shall retain an independent auditor to conduct an audit only if the person who requests the audit deposits with the local agency the amount of the local agency's reasonable estimate of the cost of the independent audit. At the conclusion of the audit, the local agency shall reimburse unused sums, if any, or the requesting person shall pay the local agency the excess of the actual cost of the audit over the amount that was deposited.

However, if the local agency fails to comply with the annual report requirement of Section 66006 following the establishment, increase or imposition of a fee, but requires payment of that fee in connection with the approval of a development project for three consecutive years, the agency shall not require a deposit for the independent audit and shall pay the cost of the audit.

Indexing of In-Lieu/Impact Fees. In-lieu fees and impact fees calculated in this report are based on current costs and should be adjusted periodically to account for changes in the cost of facilities or other capital assets that will be funded by those fees. That adjustment

is intended to account for escalation in costs for land, construction, vehicles and other relevant capital assets. The *Engineering News Record* Building Cost Index (BCI) and Construction Cost Index (CCI) are useful for indexing construction costs. Where land costs are covered by an impact fee or in-lieu fee, land costs should be adjusted based on changes in local land prices.

Requirements Imposed by AB 602

In 2021, the California Legislature passed AB 602 and the Governor signed it into law. AB 602 creates some new requirements for impact fees that went into effect in 2022. The new law amends Government Code Section 65940.1 and adds Section 66016.5 to impose the following requirements:

1) A city, county or special district that has an internet website shall post on its website:
    a) A current written schedule of fees, exactions and affordability requirements applicable to a proposed housing development project, and shall present that information in a manner that identifies the fees, exactions and affordability requirements that apply to each parcel and the fees that apply to each new water and sewer utility connection
    b) All zoning ordinances and development standards and specifying the zoning, design and development standards that apply to each parcel
    c) A list of the information that will be required from any applicant for a development project, as specified in Government Code Section 69540
    d) The current and five previous annual fee reports required by Government Code Section 66006 and Subsection 66013 (d).
    e) An archive of impact fee nexus studies, cost of service studies or equivalent conducted on or after January 1, 2018.
2) The above information shall be updated within 30 days of any changes
3) A City or County shall request from a development proponent, upon issuance of a certificate of occupancy or final inspection, the total amount of fees and exactions associated with the project for which the certificate is issued. That information must be posted on the website and updated at least twice a year.
4) Before adoption of an impact fee, an impact fee nexus study shall be adopted.
5) When applicable, the nexus study shall identify the existing level of service for each public facility, identify the proposed new level of service and explain why the new level of service is appropriate
6) 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 the fees collected under the original fee.

7) A nexus study adopted after July 1, 2022, shall calculate a fee imposed on a housing development project proportionately to the square footage of the proposed units of the development. A local agency that imposes a fee proportionately to the square footage if 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. A nexus study is not required to comply with this requirement if the agency makes certain findings outlined in the statute.

8) Large jurisdictions as defined in Section 53559.1 (d) of the Health and Safety Code (counties of 250,000 or more and cities in those counties) shall adopt a capital improvement plan as part of a nexus study.

9) All studies shall be adopted at a public hearing with at least 30-day's notice, and the local agency shall notify any member of the public that requests notice of intent to begin an impact fee nexus study of the date of the hearing.

10) Studies shall be updated at least every eight years, beginning on January 1, 2022.

Training and Public Information

Effective administration of an impact fee program requires considerable preparation and training. It is important that those responsible for collecting the fees, and for explaining them to the public, understand both the details of the fee program and its supporting rationale.

It is also useful to pay close attention to handouts that provide information to the public regarding impact fees. Impact fees should be clearly distinguished from other fees, such as user fees for application processing, and the purpose and use of particular impact fees should be made clear.

Finally, anyone responsible for accounting, capital budgeting, or project management for projects involving impact fees must be fully aware of the restrictions placed on the expenditure of impact fee revenues. Fees must be expended for the purposes identified in the impact fee nexus study in which they were calculated, and the City must be able to show that funds have been properly expended.

Appendix A

City of Rancho Cucamonga - Park Maintenance Vehicles and Equipment

ID	Description	Manufacturer	Year	Department	2020 Repl Cost
508T	Utility Trailer	John Deere	2004	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 679
0545T	Trailer	METAL FAB	1996	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 8,000
0546T	Trailer	METAL FAB	1997	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 8,000
0559T	Trailer	METAL FAB	1997	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 8,000
0570T	Trailer	METAL FAB	1999	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 7,898
10505	Chipper	BANDIT	2000	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 4,500
1527T	Trailer, Utility	DEERE	1999	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 679
1531T	Trailer, Dual-Axle Dump	APACHE	2008	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 8,757
1533T	Trailer	METAL FAB	1999	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 6,575
1536T	Trailer	METAL FAB	1997	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 8,000
1537T	Trailer	METAL FAB	2000	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 3,949
1561T	Trailer, Tilt Bed	METAL FAB	2000	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 6,788
1597T	Trailer	DEERE	2000	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 679
1598T	Trailer	DEERE	2000	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 679
1900T	Trailer	BIGTEX	2009	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 8,000
502T	Trailer	0000940	2000	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 8,000
547T	Trailer			PUBLIC WORKS	$ 8,000
0526	Cart, Utility	DEERE	2001	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 7,414
0538	Mower, 72"	EXMARK	2000	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 7,724
0546	Rake, Field	J-1941	1998	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 11,853
0552	Cart, Utility	CUSHMAN	1993	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 11,855
0556	Tri King Mower	J-1941	1999	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 22,951
0558	Mower, Reel	RANSOMES	1998	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 16,700
0560	Flail	VRISIMO	1988	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 3,800
0561	Aerator	GREENCARE	1992	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 8,950
0562	Spreader	VICON	1992	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 2,055
0563	Spreader	VICON	1989	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 1,998
0564	Turf Terra	LELY	1992	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 5,785
0566	Slit Seeder	LAND-PRIDE	1990	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 7,314
0568	Aerator	DEERE	1990	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 2,703
0574	Spray Rig	SDI	0	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 5,998
0579	Turf Vac	TORO	1987	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 10,918
0580	Aerator	TERRA	1985	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 3,000
0584	Mower, 48"	EXMARK	1999	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 5,274
0596	Cart, Electric	T-4114	1990	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 8,821
10502	Rake, Field	SMITHCO	1996	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 11,000
1527	Cart, Utility	DEERE	1999	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 6,699
1533	Bac-Vac	EXCEL	2000	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 22,373
1542	Mower, 72"	EXMARK	2000	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 7,724
1548	Sand Scorpian	JACOBSEN	2001	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 12,996
1549	Jacobsen	J-1941	2001	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 12,039
1551	Cart, Utility	DEERE	2000	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 16,130
1552	Cart, Utility	CUSHMAN	2000	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 19,918
E1555	Cart, Utility	John Deere	2008	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 7,100
1582	Chipper	V-3056	2002	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 4,500

Appendix A

City of Rancho Cucamonga - Park Maintenance Vehicles and Equipment

ID	Description	Manufacturer	Year	Department	2020 Repl Cost
1596	Cart, Utility	T-4114	2000	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 7,654
1598	1598	DEERE	2000	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 8,085
2540	Stump Grinder	VERMEER	2010	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 2,400
E1559	Electric Cart	John Deere	2008	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 7,100
E2550	Pro Gator	John Deere	2008	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 17,727
E2597	Electric Cart	John Deere	2011	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 10,212
E2598	Electric Cart	John Deere	2011	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 10,212
E503	Utility Cart	CUSHMAN	2002	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 16,835
E504	Utility Cart	CUSHMAN	2002	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 16,835
E5521	Multi-Vac	Billy Goat	2008	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 1,593
0539	Tractor	DEERE	1989	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 16,662
0586	Tractor	DEERE	1992	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 13,305
0587	Tractor	DEERE	1988	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 14,124
0588	Loader	DEERE	1990	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 19,387
1535	Tractor	DEERE	2000	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 28,909
1589	Tractor	KUBOTA	1996	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 34,000
2589	Tractor and Loader	KIOTI	2009	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 146,691
E0539	J.D. Tractor	DEERE	2002	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 29,000
E505	Turf Tractor	DEERE	2002	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 15,301
E0502	Mower	EXMARK	2002	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 5,800
E1578	Turf Sweeper	Harper Goosen	2008	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 19,501
E500	Mower, Lazer	EXMARK	2002	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 6,171
E5040	Compressor	SEARS		PUBLIC WORKS	$ 599
E5041	Compressor	SEARS		PUBLIC WORKS	$ 599
E505.1	Aeravator w/brush	First Products	2008	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 9,039
E5053	Mower	TORO		PUBLIC WORKS	$ 792
E5056	Motor, Trolling	EVINRUDE		PUBLIC WORKS	$ 1,225
E507	Mower, Lazer	EXMARK	2003	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 5,809
E511	Turf Truck	CUSHMAN	2005	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 15,000
E512	J.D. Tractor	John Deere	2005	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 26,852
E513	Utility Cart	John Deere	2006	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 16,848
E514	4720 Tractor	John Deere	2006	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 33,936
E516	Cart, Sprayer	CUSHMAN	2005	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 26,503
E519	4X Loader Tractor	John Deere	2006	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 28,606
E520	Mixer, Steel Drum Cement, 6 cubic ft. Steel	MULTIQUIP	2008	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 4,400
E558	Mower, Electric	JACOBSEN	2009	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 30,251
E5297	Sprayer, 30 Gallon	KISCO	1998	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 1,463
E5298	Trailer	RYAN	1998	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 943
E5309	Washer, Pressure	LANDA	0	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 2,979
E531	52" Zero Turn Mower	Grasshopper	2009	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 8,650
E5329	Hot Washer	Hydro Tek	2006	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 5,219
E5338	Sprayer, Skid	SDI	2000	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 3,643
E5390	Equip trailer		2001	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 7,000
E548	Pressure Washer	Hydro Tek	2008	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 8,188
E577	Zero Turn Mower	Exmark	2009	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 10,528

Appendix A

City of Rancho Cucamonga - Park Maintenance Vehicles and Equipment

ID	Description	Manufacturer	Year	Department	2020 Repl Cost
E6039	Generator	ONAN	1995	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 1,200
E6040	Root Cutter		1996	PUBLIC WORKS	
E6076	Generator			PUBLIC WORKS	$ 1,200
E6443	Generator	YAMAHA		PUBLIC WORKS	$ 1,200
E572	ATV	POLARIS	2010	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 11,269
572T	Flt Bd Trailer	Best Trailer	2010	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 6,438
2587T	2-axle Wht Tlt Trailer	Best Trailer	2010	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 6,438
E525	UTV Mule	KAWASAKI	2015	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 11,960
E1553	Utility Vehicle	John Deere	2018	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 25,859
E1529	Polaris Ranger	POLARIS	2013	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 12,018
E3544	Greens king Mower	JACOBSEN	2016	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 30,824
E6188	200 gal. Boom Sprayer	Smithco	2016	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 31,779
E6189	200 gal. Boom Sprayer	Smithco	2016	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 31,779
E6190	200 gal. Boom Sprayer	Smithco	2016	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 31,779
E1517	Field Rake	Smithco	2018	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 11,000
E2552	UTV Mule	KAWASAKI	2018	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 11,785
E2599	Turf Gator	John Deere	2016	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 12,777
E1515	Turf Gator	John Deere	2016	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 12,777
E1508	Turf Gator	John Deere	2016	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 12,777
E2587	Kubota Tractor	Kubota	2018	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 64,534
E3549	Field Groomer	Smithco	2018	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 879
E2504	ATV	Honda	2022	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 8,000
E1526	ATV	Honda	2022	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 8,000
E560	Skiploader	Bobcat	2023	PUBLIC WORKS	$ 45,000
Total					**$ 1,450,620**