

**CITY OF CHICO  
2008-09 UPDATE OF DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES  
ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS  
(NEXUS STUDY)**



**FINAL REPORT**

**Prepared by:**

**Capital Project Services**

**April 2009**

**CCI/CPI Update as Allowed for by the Chico Municipal Code  
Authorized by the City Manager and no Further Council Action Required**

**Fees Indicated as Recommended will be Effective on July 1, 2009**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..... ES-1**

**CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION ..... 1**

    Legal Constraints..... 1

    Methodology..... 2

    Assumptions ..... 2

    Projects Funded by Fees..... 10

    Summary - Current and Recommended Fees / Revenue Generation ..... 11

    Qualifications ..... 13

    Report Appendices ..... 14

**CHAPTER 2 - TRANSPORTATION FACILITY FEES ..... 15**

    Street Facility Improvement Fee (Fund 308) ..... 15

    Street Maintenance Equipment Fee (Fund 335)..... 17

    Bikeway Improvement Fee (Fund 305)..... 19

**CHAPTER 3 - PARK FACILITY FEES ..... 21**

    Community Park (Fund 330), Linear Parks / Greenways (Fund 333), and  
    Neighborhood Parks (Funds 341-348) Fee..... 21

    Bidwell Park Land Acquisition Fee (Fund 332)..... 24

**CHAPTER 4 - BUILDING AND EQUIPMENT FEES ..... 26**

    Administrative Building Fee (Fund 336) ..... 26

    Fire Protection Building and Equipment Fee (Fund 337) ..... 28

    Police Protection Building and Equipment Fee (Fund 338)..... 30

**CHAPTER 5 - SEWER FEES ..... 33**

    Sewer-Trunk Line Capacity Fee (Fund 320)..... 33

    Sewer-WPCP Capacity Fee (Fund 321)..... 35

**CHAPTER 6- STORM DRAIN FEES ..... 37**

    Storm Drainage Fee (Fund 309)..... 37

**BIBLIOGRAPHY ..... 41**

**GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND PHRASES ..... APPENDIX A**

**PROJECT LISTING ..... APPENDIX B**

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 A	Changes in Chico’s Population, 1992 to Buildout.....	4
Table 1.1 B	Workers to Population Ratio in the Chico Planning Area (CPA).....	5
Table 1.1 C	Changes in Chico’s Non-Residential Square Feet-1992 to Buildout.....	5
Table 1.2 A	Change in Chico’s Population Due to New Development – 1992 to Buildout.....	6
Table 1.2 B	Change in Chico’s Population Due to Annexation-1992 to Buildout.....	7
Table 1.3 A	Number of Non-Resident Workers in New Development .....	7
Table 1.3 B	Number of Non-Resident Workers in Annexed Areas .....	8
Table 1.4	Summary – Development Impact Fees Project / Equipment List.....	10
Table 1.5 A	Summary Recommendation of Development Impact Fees (Residential Land Uses).....	11
Table 1.5 B	Summary Recommendation of Development Impact Fees (Commercial / Industrial Land Uses).....	12
Table 1.5 C	Summary Recommendation of Development Impact Fees (Storm Drainage Facilities).....	13
Table 2.1	Street Facility Improvement Development Impact Fees (308).....	16
Table 2.2	Street Maintenance Equipment Development Impact Fees (335).....	18
Table 2.3 A	Cost Per Person of Bikeway Improvement Development Fees .....	19
Table 2.3 B	Bikeway Improvement Development Impact Fees (305) .....	20
Table 3.1 A	Comparison of Current and Proposed Fees.....	21
Table 3.1 B	Cost Estimate of Park Acres Allocated to New Service Population.....	22
Table 3.1 C	Cost Allocation to New Service Population – Estimated Cost Per User .....	23
Table 3.1 D	Recommended Development Impact Fees per Residential Unit.....	23
Table 3.2 A	Per Person Cost of Bidwell Park Land Acquisition Development Impact Fees ...	25
Table 3.2 B	Bidwell Park Land Acquisition Development Impact Fee (Fund 332).....	25
Table 4.1 A	Cost Per Person of Administrative Building Development Impact Fee .....	27
Table 4.1 B	Administrative Building Development Impact Fees (Fund 336).....	28
Table 4.2	Fire Protection Building and Equipment Development Impact Fees (Fund 337) .....	30
Table 4.3	Police Protection Building and Equipment Development Impact Fees (Fund 338) .....	32
Table 5.1 A	Sewer-Trunk Line Capacity Development Impact Fees (Fund 320) .....	34
Table 5.1 B	Sewer-Trunk Line Capacity Development Impact Fees (Fund 320) .....	34
Table 5.2 A	Sewer-WPCP Capacity Development Impact Fees (Fund 321) .....	36
Table 5.2 B	Sewer-WPCP Capacity Development Impact Fees (Fund 321) .....	36
Table 6.1 A	Storm Drainage Facility Development Impact Fees (Fund 309) .....	39
Table 6.1 B	Storm Drainage Facility Development Impact Fees (Fund 309) .....	40

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Nexus study, originally prepared in 1997 by the consulting firm of Regional and Economic Sciences (RES), entitled “Development Impact Fees Analysis and Recommendations,” is based on a 20-year planning period, beginning with the 1994 adoption of the Comprehensive Update of the Chico General Plan and ending in 2014. The Nexus study, as amended by the City of Chico on October 10, 1997, was approved by the City Council on November 4, 1997. The Nexus study has since been continually updated and adopted by the City Council.

A number of legal constraints, which affect the City’s development impact fees, have been enacted by the State of California and the City of Chico. These legal constraints, both substantive and procedural, are contained within the provisions of California State Assembly Bill 1600, “Fees for Development Projects” (AB 1600) and Chapters 3.85 “Development Impact Fees” and 15.36 “Sewer Services and Fees” of the Chico Municipal Code (CMC). The principal pertinent provisions of each of the foregoing are discussed below.

### **AB 1600 (Government Code Sections 66000 et. seq.)**

AB 1600 sets forth the ground rules for the enactment of fees by local public agencies in California upon development projects. It establishes the requirement that such fees meet the Nexus test relative to the relationship of the projects to be funded by them and the amount of the fees imposed. To enact impact fees, there must be a clear, demonstrable, and sustainable relationship between the fees and the project, supported by legislative body findings. In addition, the statute contains various procedures, accounting, and appeals requirements pertaining to the fees.

### **Chico Municipal Code (CMC)**

The provisions of Chapter 3.85 CMC entitled “Development Impact Fees” and Chapter 15.36 entitled “Sewer Services and Fees” also govern these fees. Chapter 3.85 establishes the underlying authority, requirements, and procedures for the enactment of the various City impact fees (excluding sewer-related impact fees), which have been adopted, while Chapter 15.36 addresses similar provisions relating to the several sewer fee categories. In addition, the provisions of these chapters authorize the City Manager to increase fees annually based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) or Construction Cost Index (CCI) as applicable.

### **Land Use**

The General Plan establishes and defines six broad land use classifications - Residential, Commercial, Office, Industrial, Public, and Parklands. Within the Residential, Commercial, Industrial, and Parklands classifications, there are a number of additional sub-classifications that have been created.

Based upon the land use and related assumptions of the General Plan, community residential growth patterns to buildout have been summarized below:

- |  |        |
|--|--------|
| 1. New Residential Development – Acres                         | 3,910  |
| 2. New Residential Development - Housing Units                 | 21,750 |
| 3. New Residential Development - Persons per Household         | Range* |
| 4. New Residential Development - Projected Population Increase | 51,804 |

\*General Plan Land Use Classifications range from 4.0 (Rural) to 1.8 (High Density)

Similarly, based upon the land use and related assumptions of the General Plan, community commercial / industrial growth patterns to buildout have been summarized below.

1. Commercial / Industrial Development - Increase in Workers	19,657
2. Commercial / Industrial Development - Increase in Square Footage	8,600,000
3. Commercial / Industrial Development - Workers/Square Foot	
a) Office and Medical	$9,033 / 2,500,000 = 0.0036$
b) Commercial and Services	$6,420 / 3,200,000 = 0.0020$
c) Industrial	$4,204 / 2,900,000 = 0.0014$

### Overview of Assumptions

The detailed fee tables shown in the Nexus Update are based upon the following assumptions:

1. The planning, land use, and population growth assumptions shown in the current Chico General Plan.
2. The data reflected in the Project / Equipment list shown in Appendix B was revised to include additional projects needed due to new development.
3. An additional 3,000,000 gallons per day capacity is in process for the Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP). A WPCP feasibility study has been conducted and has determined that additional facilities will be required for new development.
4. Owners of developed properties annexing to the city will pay only applicable sewer impact fees upon connection to the system. Owners of undeveloped properties will pay all of the City's development impact fees in effect at the time of their development.
5. Based on the General Plan projections, population growth will be allocated 41% to annexation and 59% to new development. It is assumed that new fire protection, police protection, and street maintenance facilities will also serve the existing unincorporated area as well as new development.
6. The addition of a 1% Administrative/GIS component to each fee.
7. The use of a 59% / 41% cost apportionment for uncompleted bikeway facilities.
8. The inclusion of State Highway projects identified as necessary to mitigate the traffic impacts from new development.
9. An offset to Street Facility Fees by the receipt of \$6.6 million in Congestion Management and Air Quality Act (CMAQ) funds, \$5.5 million in Transportation Equity Act (TEA) funds, and \$12.8 million in RDA funds, for a total credit of \$24.9 million. An additional \$10 million of RDA funds was applied to the Commercial and Services land use type's share of the total cost for the Street Facility Fees.
10. An update of Sewer Trunk Line fees in accordance with the recommendations from the 2003 Update to the Sanitary Sewer Master Plan (SSMP).
11. An update of Park Facility fees to account for increased land and infrastructure costs.

The recommended fees will produce the revenues required to fund the costs allocated to fee funding subject to the assumptions discussed above. The revenue generated from the fees will be determined by population growth from new development. In developing the fee recommendations, the growth rate assumptions of the General Plan were used. While the predicted revenue required would be generated by buildout, cash flow variations will occur throughout the planning period, since the level of development activity will vary on a year-to-year basis.

### **Projects Funded by Fees**

A detailed listing of the projects (on a project-by-project basis within each of the fee categories shown) is included in Appendix B, Project Listing - 1994 through 2014. The total cost for all projects is \$734,119,544 with \$522,091,970 being attributed to fees.

During the 2007-08 Nexus Update interest expenses to appropriate development impact fee funds were updated per Budget Policy G.3.d. Estimates for updating the Nexus Study on an annual basis were applied as appropriate. The Hegan Lane Reconstruction project was added to Street Facility Improvements. Basic Park Fees were updated based on increased park development and parkland acquisition costs. The construction estimate for the WPCP 12 MGD Expansion project was increased based upon the City's commitment to its State Revolving Fund (SRF) loan. The projects included in Appendix B for Police Protection Building and Equipment were also updated based on the space needs analysis for the new police facility.

For the 2008-09 Nexus Update, the Project List (included as Appendix B), has been increased by either the CPI or the CCI as appropriate, which was authorized by the City Manager as allowed for in the CMC.

## **CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION**

This chapter addresses a number of general considerations affecting the City’s development impact fees.

### **LEGAL CONSTRAINTS**

A number of legal constraints, which affect the City’s development impact fees, have been enacted by the State of California and the City of Chico. These legal constraints, both substantive and procedural, are contained within the provisions of California State Assembly Bill 1600, “Fees for Development Projects” (AB 1600) and Chapters 3.85 “Development Impact Fees” and 15.36 “Sewer Services and Fees” of the Chico Municipal Code (CMC). The principal pertinent provisions of each of the foregoing are discussed below.

#### **AB 1600 (Government Code Sections 66000 et. seq.)**

AB 1600 sets forth the ground rules for the enactment of fees by local public agencies in California upon development projects. It establishes the requirement that such fees meet the Nexus test relative to the relationship of the projects to be funded by them and the amount of the fees imposed. To enact impact fees, there must be a clear, demonstrable, and sustainable relationship between the fees and the project, supported by legislative body findings. In addition, the statute contains various procedures, accounting, and appeals requirements pertaining to the fees.

In order for a local agency to establish, increase or impose an impact fee as a condition of approval of a development on or after January 1, 1989, the agency is required by this measure to do the following:

1. Identify the purpose of the fee.
2. Identify the use to which the fee is to be put. If the fee is for the purpose of financing public facilities, the facilities must be identified, either specifically or by reference to a capital improvement plan that meets statutory requirements.
3. Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the fee’s use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.
4. Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.

Further, in any action imposing a fee as a condition of approval of a development project on or after January 1, 1989, the agency must 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 upon which the fee is levied.

#### **Chico Municipal Code (CMC)**

The provisions of Chapter 3.85 CMC entitled “Development Impact Fees” and Chapter 15.36 entitled “Sewer Services and Fees” also govern these fees. Chapter 3.85 establishes the underlying authority, requirements, and procedures for the enactment of the various City impact fees (excluding sewer-related impact fees), which have been adopted, while Chapter 15.36 addresses similar provisions relating to the several sewer fee categories. In addition, the

provisions of these chapters authorize the City Manager to increase fees annually based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) or Construction Cost Index (CCI) as applicable.

### **Fee Schedules**

Pursuant to the authority of the cited State statute and the referenced CMC chapters, the City Council has adopted fee schedules for the series of development impact fees currently in effect as identified in a prior section of the report. Fee schedule amendments are generally processed concurrently with updates to the Nexus study, including those years in which the City Manager authorizes the application of the CPI or CCI, as appropriate, pursuant to Chapters 3.85 and 15.36 of the CMC.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The methodology and related assumptions used in this update have been previously approved by the City Council by the approval of the 2005-06 Nexus Study Update. For the 2008-09 Nexus Update, the Project List (included as Appendix B), has been increased by either the CPI or the CCI as appropriate, which was authorized by the City Manager as allowed for in the CMC.

A wide variety of source materials has been used in developing this report regarding Chico's development impact fees including, but not limited to, the following:

1. The "Development Impact Fee and Nexus Report - November 1992" prepared by Konrad-Rae & Associates;
2. The Nexus study, prepared in 1997 by the consulting firm of Regional and Economic Sciences (RES), entitled "Development Impact Fees Analysis and Recommendations," as amended by the City of Chico on October 10, 1997;
3. The above noted statutory requirements;
4. The City of Chico General Plan - November 1994 and the 1999 Update;
5. A series of interviews with City staff involved in the City's development regulatory process; and
6. A variety of other source materials related to development impact fees.

A bibliography at the end of this report contains a complete listing. The information derived from these sources was then analyzed and recommendations were developed for the various development impact fee categories included in this report.

## **ASSUMPTIONS**

### **Overview of Assumptions**

The summary impact fee tables presented and discussed in a later section of this chapter, and the specific, detailed fee tables shown in later chapters are based upon the following assumptions:

1. The planning, land use, and population growth assumptions shown in the current Chico General Plan.
2. The data reflected in the Project / Equipment list shown in Appendix B was revised to include additional projects needed due to new development.
3. An additional 3,000,000 gallons per day capacity is in process for the Water Pollution Control Plant. A Water Pollution Control Plant feasibility study has been conducted and has determined that additional facilities will be required for new development.



4. Owners of developed properties annexing to the city will pay only applicable sewer impact fees upon connection to the system. Owners of undeveloped properties will pay all of the City's development impact fees in effect at the time of their development.
5. Based on the General Plan projections, population growth will be allocated 41% to annexation and 59% to new development. It is assumed that new fire protection, police protection, and street maintenance facilities will also serve the existing unincorporated area as well as new development.
6. The addition of a 1% Administrative/GIS component to each fee.
7. The use of a 59% / 41% cost apportionment for uncompleted bikeway facilities.
8. The inclusion of State Highway projects identified as necessary to mitigate the traffic impacts from new development.
9. An offset to Street Facility Fees by the receipt of \$6.6 million in Congestion Management and Air Quality Act (CMAQ) funds, \$5.5 million in Transportation Equity Act (TEA) funds, and \$12.8 million in RDA funds, for a total credit of \$24.9 million. An additional \$10 million of RDA funds was applied to the Commercial and Services land use type's share of the total cost for the Street Facility Fees.
10. An update of Sewer Trunk Line fees in accordance with the recommendations from the 2003 Update to the Sanitary Sewer Master Plan (SSMP).
11. An update of Park Facility fees to account for increased land and infrastructure costs.

## Population Changes - 1992 to Buildout

Detailed tables illustrating the forecasts for various sub-components of projected Chico growth follow. Each of the tables includes explanatory notes defining the key elements of the derivation methodology.

### Changes in Chico's Population and Workers - 1992 to Buildout

Table 1.1 A analyzes the projected changes in Chico's general population and worker population from 1992 to buildout. The population in 1992 (the base year for the General Plan) was 43,750. Similarly, the 1992 population for the Chico Planning Area (as delineated in the General Plan) was 80,580 and is projected to grow to 134,000 at buildout, an increase of 53,420. At buildout, the City of Chico city limits is assumed to be the same as the boundaries of the current Chico Planning Area (CPA). The total population increase projected to occur will be about 90,250 at buildout (buildout population (134,000) minus base year population of city (43,750) = 90,250). Of this increase, 52,707 (59 percent) is attributable to population growth in new development, while 37,543 (41 percent) will be the result of annexations of existing developed areas to the city.

Item	Time Period and Change	Population Within the 1992 Chico City Limits	Population Within the Chico Planning Area (CPA)	Chico Residents Working in City of Chico	Workers to Population Ratio in City of Chico	Total Workers Working in City of Chico	Non-Chico Residents Working in City of Chico	Percent Working in City of Chico that are Non-Chico Residents
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
1	1992	43,750	80,580	13,051	0.71	31,024	17,973	58%
2	Buildout	134,000	134,000	39,974	0.56	74,421	34,447	46%
3	<b>Change, 1992 to Buildout</b>	<b>90,250</b>	<b>53,420</b>	<b>26,923</b>	<b>-0.15</b>	<b>43,397</b>	<b>16,474</b>	<b>-12%</b>
<p><b>Note 1:</b> At buildout, the City of Chico limits are assumed to be the same as the boundaries of the current CPA.</p> <p><b>Note 2:</b> Figures are calculated using non-rounded data. Calculations using rounded data printed on these tables may result in differences.</p> <p><b>Note 3:</b> C1 = Column C, Row 1; D2 = Column D, Row 2, etc.</p> <p><b>Note 4:</b> 11,956 residents were employed in the City of Chico in 1990 (1990 US Census of Population, Summary Tape 3A). 1992 residents employed in Chico = (11,956/1990 population) x (11,956/40,079) x 43,750 = 13,051. Chico residents employed in the City of Chico at buildout = (11,956/40,079) x 134,000 = 39,974.</p>								

### The Workers to Population Ratio in the Chico Planning Area

The workers to population ratio will decline in absolute terms by -0.12 at buildout. Table 1.1 B shows the methodology for calculating these changes. It examines the projected changes in population ratios for workers in Chico between 1992 and buildout.

Table 1.1 B Workers to Population Ratio in the Chico Planning Area (CPA)						
Item	Object	1990 Census	1990 Butte	1992 Chico	1992 CPA - Chico	1992 CPA
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	Population	40,079	182,210	43,750	36,830	80,580
2	Workers	30,416	63,743	31,024	13,728	44,752
3	<b>Workers to Population Ratio</b>	<b>0.76</b>	<b>0.35</b>	<b>0.71</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>0.56</b>

**Note 1:** Figures are calculated using non-rounded data. Calculations using rounded data printed on these tables may result in differences.

**Note 2:** C1 = Column C, Row 1; D2 = Column D, Row 2, etc.

**Note 3:** The 30,416 workers in Chico include those who live outside as well as inside Butte County.

**Note 4:** The 63,743 workers in Butte County are only those that live inside Butte County.

**Note 5:** The 31,024 workers in Chico in 1992 = workers in 1990 + 2% = 30,416 x (1 + .02).

**Note 6:** Assumed (1) the ratio of workers living outside Chico but inside the CPA to the population outside Chico but inside the CPA was the same as the ratio of Butte County residents who work in the county to the population of the County (=D3), and (2) the percent of workers who commute into the CPA was the same as the percent of workers who commute into Chico in 1990 = 1,988 / 30,416 = 6.5%. Therefore, the workers living outside Chico but inside the CPA = (.35 x 36,830) + (.065 x 12,891) = 12,891 + 842 = F2.

### Changes in Chico's Non-Residential Square Feet - 1992 to Buildout

Table 1.1 C summarizes the projected changes in non-residential (commercial / office / industrial) square footage in Chico between 1992 and buildout, which is likely to occur in both new development areas as well as existing developed areas. An increase of approximately 8.6 million square feet of non-residential area is forecast between 1992 and buildout, based upon General Plan assumptions.

Table 1.1 C Changes in Chico's Non-Residential Square Feet - 1992 to Buildout			
Item	Time Period and Change	Square Feet of Non-Residential in New Development	Square Feet of Non-Residential in Annexed Area
A	B	C	D
1	1992	8,285,000	0
2	Buildout	16,885,000	3,489,308
3	<b>Change, 1992 to Buildout</b>	<b>8,600,000</b>	<b>3,489,308</b>

**Note 1:** At buildout, the City of Chico limits are assumed to be the same as the boundaries of the current CPA.

**Note 2:** Figures are calculated using non-rounded data. Calculations using rounded data printed on these tables may result in differences.

**Note 3:** Non-residential = Industrial, Commercial and Office. Non-residential square feet to be annexed = number of non-residential parcels in unincorporated area / total number of non-residential parcels in city x square feet non-residential in 1992 = 414 / 983 x 8,285,000 = 3,489,308. Number of firms from "Parcel Count by Land Use & Jurisdiction" by Heritage Partners, 8/25/95. See next footnote for calculation of total non-residential square feet in City.

**Note 4:** 1992 square feet from Chico Planning Division estimate 5-21-93. Change in square feet = the sum of Column 2 of Table 3.1-4 of the 1994 Chico General Plan x 1,000,000 = (2.5 + 3.2 + 2.9) x 1,000,000. Buildout square feet = 1992 square feet + change in square feet = 8,285,000 + 8,600,000.

**Change in Population - New Development - 1992 to Buildout**

Table 1.2 A analyzes the projected changes in Chico’s population resulting from new development between 1992 and buildout. An additional 21,750 housing units are predicted. New development will generate a population increase of 51,804.

Table 1.2 A Change in Chico's Population Due to New Development - 1992 to Buildout					
Item	Land Use Type	Development in Acres	Number of New Housing Units	Persons Per Household	Change in Chico's Population Due to New Development
A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Rural	320	30	4.0	120
2	Very Low	1,510	1,780	3.0	5,340
3	Low	1,290	9,200	2.5	22,540
4	Medium	460	4,460	2.4	10,704
5	Medium High	280	4,930	2.2	10,670
6	High	50	1,350	1.8	2,430
7	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,910</b>	<b>21,750</b>		<b>51,804</b>
<p><b>Note 1:</b> Figures are calculated using non-rounded data. Calculations using rounded data printed on these tables may result in differences.</p> <p><b>Note 2:</b> The first six rows in Column C are derived from the 1999 Chico General Plan Update, Table 3.1-2. Columns C and D include mobile homes.</p>					

**Change in Population - Annexation - 1992 to Buildout**

Table 1.2 B summarizes the projected changes in Chico’s population resulting from annexation between 1992 and buildout. An additional 14,578 housing units will be annexed and will generate a population increase of 34,699. However, growth projections from annexation of developed areas were not used in the fee calculations, except for those related to sewer fees. Under current City policy, only undeveloped areas annexed will pay non-sewer fees, and then only at time of development. However, both developed and undeveloped annexed areas will pay sewer impact fees upon connection to City sanitary sewer facilities.

Table 1.2 B Change in Chico's Population Due to Annexation - 1992 to Buildout						
Item	Land Use Type	Number of New Housing Units	Percent	Number of Units to be Annexed	Persons Per Household	Change in Population Due to Annexation
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	Rural	30	0.14%	20	4.0	80
2	Very Low	1,780	8.18%	1,193	3.0	3,579
3	Low	9,200	42.30%	6,166	2.5	15,107
4	Medium	4,460	20.51%	2,989	2.4	7,052
5	Medium High	4,930	22.67%	3,304	2.2	7,270
6	High	1,350	6.21%	905	1.8	1,611
7	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>21,750</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>14,578</b>		<b>34,699</b>

**Note 1:** Figures are calculated using non-rounded data. Calculations using rounded data printed on these tables may result in differences.

**Note 2:** The first six rows in Column C are derived from the 1999 Chico General Plan Update, Table 3.1-2. Columns C and D include mobile homes.

**Note 3:** Note that some of the percentages in Column D round to zero. Since the numbers are still positive, Column D x the total of Column E produces a positive number in Column G.

**Note 4:** In 1990 the total number of housing units in the unincorporated area was 13,768 according to the 1994 Chico General Plan. Since the growth rate of the population in the Chico Planning Area was 2.9% from 1980 to 1992 (1994 Chico General Plan), assumes that housing in the unincorporated area grew at 2.9% for 2 years to obtain a total of 14,578 housing units to be annexed. Then each of the 14,758 units were distributed to 1994 General Plan Housing Categories. The distribution is the same as that in the new planned housing for the 1994 Chico General Plan.

### Number of Non-Resident Workers in New Development

Table 1.3 A projects the number of non-resident workers in Chico that will result from new development. At buildout, the total number of non-residential workers for all Office / Medical, Commercial / Services, and Industrial Land Use types will be 9,099.

Table 1.3 A Number of Non-Resident Workers in New Development					
Item	Land Use Type	Increase in Workers	Projected Non-Residential Development in Square Feet	Increase in Non-Residential Workers	Number of Non-Resident Workers per Square Foot of New Non-Residential Development
A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Offices and Medical	9,033	2,500,000	4,181	0.00167
2	Commercial and Services	6,420	3,200,000	2,972	0.00093
3	Industrial	4,204	2,900,000	1,946	0.00067
4	<b>Total</b>	<b>19,657</b>	<b>8,600,000</b>	<b>9,099</b>	

**Note 1:** Figures are calculated using non-rounded data. Calculations using rounded data printed on these tables may result in differences.

**Note 2:** Percent non-resident equals non-residents working in Chico at buildout divided by all workers in Chico at buildout, from Table 1.1 A.

**Number of Non-Resident Workers in Annexed Areas**

Table 1.3 B shows the number of non-resident workers resulting from annexation of existing developed areas. At buildout, the total for all Office / Medical, Commercial / Services, and Industrial Land Use types will be 3,487.

Table 1.3 B Number of Non-Resident Workers in Annexed Areas				
Item	Land Use Type	Non-Resident Workers per Square Foot of Non-Residential Development	Square Foot Non-Residential in Annexed Areas	Increase in Non-Resident Workers
A	B	C	D	F
1	Office and Medical	0.00167	623,693	1,043
2	Commercial and Services	0.00093	2,022,787	1,878
3	Industrial	0.00067	842,828	566
4	<b>Total</b>		<b>3,489,308</b>	<b>3,487</b>
<p><b>Note 1:</b> Figures are calculated using non-rounded data. Calculations using rounded data printed on these tables may result in differences.</p> <p><b>Note 2:</b> Assumed that non-resident workers per square foot in annexed areas equal non-resident workers per square foot in new development.</p>				

The foregoing have been utilized in developing the tables, analyses, and recommendations in this report which are land use based.

**Land Use**

The General Plan establishes and defines six broad land use classifications - Residential, Commercial, Office, Industrial, Public, and Parklands. Within the Residential, Commercial, Industrial, and Parklands classifications, a number of additional sub-classifications were created. These classifications and their sub-classifications are reflected below.

**Residential**

1. Rural Residential
2. Very Low Density Residential
3. Low Density
4. Medium Density
5. Medium-High Density
6. High Density

**Commercial**

1. Community Commercial
2. Mixed-Use Neighborhood Core
3. Visitor Commercial
4. Commercial Services

**Industrial**

- 1. Manufacturing and Warehousing
- 2. Industrial Park

**Parklands**

- 1. Neighborhood Parks
- 2. Community Parks

**Residential Development Activity**

Based upon the land use and related assumptions of the General Plan, community residential growth patterns to buildout have been summarized below:

- 1. New Residential Development – Acres 3,910
- 2. New Residential Development - Housing Units 21,750
- 3. New Residential Development - Persons per Household Range\*
- 4. New Residential Development - Projected Population Increase 51,804

\*General Plan Land Use Classifications range from 4.0 (Rural) to 1.8 (High Density)

Table 1.2 A, Change in Chico’s Population - New Development - 1992 to Buildout, appearing previously, shows a more detailed projection by specific land use type (such as Rural, Very Low Density, etc.).

**Commercial / Industrial Development Activity**

Similarly, based upon the land use and related assumptions of the General Plan, community commercial / industrial growth patterns to buildout have been summarized below.

- 1. Commercial / Industrial Development - Increase in Workers 19,657
- 2. Commercial / Industrial Development - Increase in Square Footage 8,600,000
- 3. Commercial / Industrial Development - Workers/Square Foot
  - a. Office and Medical 9,033 / 2,500,000 = 0.0036
  - b. Commercial and Services 6,420 / 3,200,000 = 0.0020
  - c. Industrial 4,204 / 2,900,000 = 0.0014

Table 1.3 A, “Number of Non-Resident Workers in New Development at Buildout,” appearing earlier, also analyzes impact upon the above-noted land use classifications resulting from the impact of non-resident worker growth only.

## PROJECTS FUNDED BY FEES

Table 1.4 summarizes the projects funded by impact fees by fee category and source of funding. The total cost for all projects is \$745,297,568 with \$533,269,993 being attributed to fees.

<b>Table 1.4 Summary - Development Impact Fees Project / Equipment List</b>			
Description	Estimated Cost 2009	Allocation Impact Fees	Allocation Other Funding Sources
Street Facility Improvement (Fund 308)	\$289,441,835	\$145,666,609	\$143,775,225
Street Maintenance Equipment (Fund 335)	\$7,140,332	\$4,259,001	\$2,881,330
Bikeway Improvement (Fund 305)	\$16,000,032	\$9,519,256	\$6,480,776
Bidwell Park Land Acquisition (Fund 332)	\$3,926,013	\$3,926,013	\$0
Administrative Building (Fund 336)	\$11,741,263	\$4,543,751	\$7,197,512
Fire Protection Building and Equipment (Fund 337)	\$25,349,113	\$16,072,809	\$9,276,304
Police Protection Building and Equipment (Fund 338)	\$46,519,656	\$27,668,139	\$18,851,517
Storm Drain - Butte Creek Drainage Area Number 770 (Fund 309)	\$1,286,828	\$1,286,828	\$0
Storm Drain - Comanche Creek Drainage Area Number 771 (Fund 309)	\$25,626,601	\$25,626,601	\$0
Storm Drain - Little Chico Creek Drainage Area Number 772 (Fund 309)	\$44,726,175	\$44,726,175	\$0
Storm Drain - Big Chico Creek Drainage Area Number 773 (Fund 309)	\$11,372,827	\$11,372,827	\$0
Storm Drain - Lindo Channel Drainage Area Number 774 (Fund 309)	\$37,156,910	\$37,156,910	\$0
Storm Drain - S.U.D.A.D. Ditch Drainage Area Number 775 (Fund 309)	\$21,753,943	\$21,753,943	\$0
Storm Drain - Mud-Sycamore Creek Drainage Area Number 776 (Fund 309)	\$24,408,276	\$24,408,276	\$0
Storm Drain - Pleasant Valley Ditch Drainage Area Number 777 (Fund 309)	\$12,295,977	\$12,295,977	\$0
Storm Drain - Update Nexus Study (Fund 309)	\$183,000	\$183,000	\$0
Storm Drain - GIS Administrative Fee (Fund 309)	\$1,786,275	\$1,786,275	\$0
Sewer-WPCP Capacity (Fund 321)	\$114,666,432	\$91,101,522	\$23,564,910
Sewer-Trunk Line Capacity (Fund 320)	\$49,916,081	\$49,916,081	\$0
<b>Grand Totals - All Projects, Facilities, and Equipment</b>	<b>\$745,297,568</b>	<b>\$533,269,993</b>	<b>\$212,027,574</b>
<b>Note:</b> The Grand Total and the totals shown for Street Facility Improvement on this table are different than what is shown on Appendix B. This is a result of an additional \$10 million of RDA funds being applied to the Commercial and Services land use type's share of the total cost for the Street Facility Fees.			

The following comments apply to Table 1.4:

1. A detailed listing of the projects (on a project by project basis within each of the fee categories) is included as Appendix B - Project Listing and includes figure categories for Estimated Costs, Allocation to Development Impact Fees, and Allocation to Other Funding Sources. Appendix B was developed in close consultation with City staff and represents the best current assessment of the various capital projects and equipment needs



which are proposed to be funded in whole or in part by Chico development impact fees. The projects and cost estimates have been revised as appropriate for this update.

2. The general methodology used for estimating the cost of right-of-way or site acquisition (unless finite cost estimates are available) is to compare similar acquisitions completed on recent projects. Right-of-way may also be calculated at ten percent of project costs.
3. With a couple of exceptions, specifically, where the need for signalization and other improvements is attributed to new development, the costs of traffic signal projects at city street / state highway intersections will be shared between City and State in accordance with current State policy. All projects funded all or in part by development impact fees have been included in the project list.

**SUMMARY - CURRENT AND RECOMMENDED FEES / REVENUE GENERATION**

**Current and Recommended Fees**

Recommendations for the City of Chico’s development impact fees as updated by the City of Chico Capital Project Services Department are shown in Tables 1.5 A (Residential Land Uses), 1.5 B (Commercial / Industrial Land Uses), and 1.5 C (Storm Drainage Facilities). For each category of fee, the tables compare recommended and current fees by land use type. The fees shown on Table 1.5 A are based upon unit charges, while the fees shown on Table 1.5 B and Table 1.5 C are based upon square foot or per acre charges (as identified).

<b>Table 1.5 A Summary Recommendation of Development Impact Fees (Residential Land Uses)</b>			
<b>Impact Fee</b>	<b>Fee Status</b>	<b>Land Use Type</b>	
		<b>Single Family Per Unit Charge</b>	<b>Multiple Family Per Unit Charge</b>
Street Facility Improvement (Fund 308)	Current	\$3,687.15	\$2,549.99
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>\$3,973.05</b>	<b>\$2,747.72</b>
Street Maintenance Equipment (Fund 335)	Current	\$108.70	\$75.18
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>\$108.70</b>	<b>\$75.18</b>
Bikeway Improvement (Fund 305)	Current	\$432.05	\$373.19
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>\$474.99</b>	<b>\$410.28</b>
Community Park (Fund 330), Linear Parks/Greenways (Fund 333), & Neighborhood Parks (Funds 341-348)	Current	\$2,789	\$2,360
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>\$2,913</b>	<b>\$2,465</b>
Bidwell Park Land Acquisition (Fund 332)	Current	\$199	\$177
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>\$199</b>	<b>\$177</b>
Administrative Building (Fund 336)	Current	\$182	\$158
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>\$190</b>	<b>\$164</b>
Fire Protection Building and Equipment (Fund 337)	Current	\$699	\$554
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>\$732</b>	<b>\$581</b>
Police Protection Building and Equipment (Fund 338)	Current	\$789	\$889
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>\$834</b>	<b>\$940</b>
Sewer-WPCP Capacity (Fund 321)	Current	\$2,251	\$2,251
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>\$2,251</b>	<b>\$2,251</b>
Sewer-Trunk Line Capacity (Fund 320)	Current	\$1,693	\$1,693
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>\$1,693</b>	<b>\$1,693</b>
<b>Totals</b>	Current	\$12,830	\$11,080
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>\$13,369</b>	<b>\$11,504</b>

**Table 1.5 B  
Summary Recommendation of Development Impact Fees  
(Commercial / Industrial Land Uses)**

Impact Fee	Fee Status	Charge Basis	Land Use Type					
			Office and Medical		Commercial and Services		Industrial	
			Fee Charge	Fee Amount	Fee Charge	Fee Amount	Fee Charge	Fee Amount
Street Facility Improvement (Fund 308)	Current	Per SF	\$4.14	\$20,700	\$15.83	\$79,150	\$1.90	\$9,500
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>Per SF</b>	<b>\$4.46</b>	<b>\$22,300</b>	<b>\$17.30</b>	<b>\$86,500</b>	<b>\$2.04</b>	<b>\$10,200</b>
Street Maintenance Equipment (Fund 335)	Current	Per SF	\$0.12	\$600	\$0.56	\$2,800	\$0.06	\$300
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>Per SF</b>	<b>\$0.12</b>	<b>\$600</b>	<b>\$0.56</b>	<b>\$2,800</b>	<b>\$0.06</b>	<b>\$300</b>
Bikeway Improvement (Fund 308)	Current	Per SF	\$0.29	\$1,450	\$0.15	\$750	\$0.12	\$600
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>Per SF</b>	<b>\$0.32</b>	<b>\$1,600</b>	<b>\$0.17</b>	<b>\$850</b>	<b>\$0.13</b>	<b>\$650</b>
Administrative Building (Fund 336)	Current	Per SF	\$0.12	\$600	\$0.06	\$300	\$0.05	\$250
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>Per SF</b>	<b>\$0.13</b>	<b>\$650</b>	<b>\$0.07</b>	<b>\$350</b>	<b>\$0.05</b>	<b>\$250</b>
Fire Protection Building and Equipment (Fund 337)	Current	Per SF	\$0.20	\$1,000	\$0.33	\$1,650	\$0.05	\$250
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>Per SF</b>	<b>\$0.21</b>	<b>\$1,050</b>	<b>\$0.35</b>	<b>\$1,750</b>	<b>\$0.05</b>	<b>\$250</b>
Police Protection Building and Equipment (Fund 338)	Current	Per SF	\$1.49	\$7,450	\$1.20	\$6,000	\$0.13	\$650
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>Per SF</b>	<b>\$1.58</b>	<b>\$7,900</b>	<b>\$1.27</b>	<b>\$6,350</b>	<b>\$0.13</b>	<b>\$650</b>
Sewer-WPCP Capacity (Fund 321)	Current	Per AC	\$9,003	\$9,003	\$9,003	\$9,003	\$9,003	\$9,003
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>Per AC</b>	<b>\$9,003</b>	<b>\$9,003</b>	<b>\$9,003</b>	<b>\$9,003</b>	<b>\$9,003</b>	<b>\$9,003</b>
Sewer-Trunk Line Capacity (Fund 320)	Current	Per AC	\$6,773	\$6,773	\$6,773	\$6,773	\$6,773	\$6,773
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>Per AC</b>	<b>\$6,773</b>	<b>\$6,773</b>	<b>\$6,773</b>	<b>\$6,773</b>	<b>\$6,773</b>	<b>\$6,773</b>
<b>Totals</b>	Current			\$47,576		\$106,426		\$27,326
	<b>Recommended</b>			<b>\$49,876</b>		<b>\$114,376</b>		<b>\$28,076</b>

**Notes:**

"Fee Amounts" assume a 5,000 square foot building for all listed except WPCP and Trunk Line Capacity Fees which are based on one acre.  
Community Park (Fund 330), Linear Parks/Greenways (Fund 333), Neighborhood Parks (Funds 341-348), and Bidwell Park Land Acquisition (Fund 332) are not included as they only relate to Single Family and Multiple Family Land Use Types.  
Square Foot is abbreviated SF and Acre is abbreviated AC.

Table 1.5 C Summary Recommendation of Development Impact Fees (Storm Drainage Facilities)				
Impact Fee	Fee Status	Single Family Fee Per Acre Amount	Multiple Family Fee Per Acre Amount	Commercial and Industrial Fee Per Acre Amount
Butte Creek Drainage Area No. 770 (Fund 309)	Current	\$8,893	\$13,339	\$14,228
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>\$9,479</b>	<b>\$14,219</b>	<b>\$15,167</b>
Comanche Creek Drainage Area No. 771 (Fund 309)	Current	\$9,276	\$13,914	\$14,842
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>\$9,888</b>	<b>\$14,832</b>	<b>\$15,821</b>
Little Chico Creek Drainage Area No. 772 (Fund 309)	Current	\$10,107	\$15,160	\$16,171
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>\$10,774</b>	<b>\$16,160</b>	<b>\$17,238</b>
Big Chico Creek Drainage Area No. 773 (Fund 309)	Current	\$7,535	\$11,303	\$12,056
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>\$8,032</b>	<b>\$12,048</b>	<b>\$12,852</b>
Lindo Channel Drainage Area No. 774 (Fund 309)	Current	\$9,194	\$13,791	\$14,710
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>\$9,801</b>	<b>\$14,701</b>	<b>\$15,681</b>
S.U.D.A.D. Ditch Drainage Area No. 775 (Fund 309)	Current	\$8,019	\$12,029	\$12,830
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>\$8,548</b>	<b>\$12,822</b>	<b>\$13,677</b>
Mud-Sycamore Creek Drainage Area No. 776 (Fund 309)	Current	\$6,978	\$10,468	\$11,165
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>\$7,439</b>	<b>\$11,159</b>	<b>\$11,903</b>
Pleasant Valley Ditch Drainage Area No. 777 (Fund 309)	Current	\$9,890	\$14,834	\$15,823
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>\$10,542</b>	<b>\$15,813</b>	<b>\$16,868</b>
<b>Totals</b>	Current	\$69,892	\$104,837	\$111,825
	<b>Recommended</b>	<b>\$74,504</b>	<b>\$111,756</b>	<b>\$119,206</b>
<b>Notes:</b> Current Fees are from the updated Fee Schedule 50.020, September 4, 2008.				

## Revenue Generation

The recommended fees will produce the revenues to fund the costs allocated to fee-funded projects over the course of the planning period, subject to the assumptions discussed above. However, the foregoing statement is conditioned upon the qualifications set forth in this report.

## QUALIFICATIONS

The qualifications listed below affect the revenue generation predictions set forth in the preceding section:

1. Cash flow variations will occur throughout the planning period, dependent upon the level of development activity, which occurs on a year-to-year basis. In years of high activity, revenue will be higher than would be produced by a straight-line projection. However, in years of low activity, it will be lower;
2. The resulting fee calculations rely on funds from other sources including redevelopment and Federal street funds. In the event that such funds are not available, or priorities are changed, the affected fee categories will require revision; and

3. Revenue sources have not been specifically identified for those projects that will serve existing unincorporated areas and new development. Development impact fees are responsible for a portion of the total cost of certain projects, with the remaining portion unspecified.

### **REPORT APPENDICES**

Two appendices are included at the end of this report:

1. Appendix A contains definitions for the various specialized words and phrases used in the report; and
2. Appendix B catalogues proposed projects to be funded in whole or in part from development impact fees.

The fee recommendation tables included in subsequent chapters have been cross-referenced to Appendix B for the convenience of the reader.

## **CHAPTER 2 - TRANSPORTATION FACILITY FEES**

The City levies three types of transportation fees:

1. Street Facility Improvement Fee (Fund 308);
2. Street Maintenance Equipment Fee (Fund 335); and
3. Bikeway Improvement Fee (Fund 305)

Each of these fees is discussed below in the context of the provisions of AB 1600.

### **Street Facility Improvement Fee (Fund 308)**

#### **Purpose of Fee**

The purpose of this fee is to provide funding for the construction of those improvements to the street facilities as shown in Appendix B, which are required to augment the current street system to accommodate the needs of projected new growth and development in the community. Street projects totaling \$289,441,835 (\$155,666,609 allocated to fees) are listed.

#### **Use of Fee**

The revenue generated from this fee will be used to assist in funding the projects listed in Appendix B. Construction of these projects will be required to provide a community traffic circulation system to accommodate a population projected to be 134,000 within the Chico Planning Area at buildout.

#### **Relationship Between Use of Fee and Type of Development Project Upon Which Imposed**

The new residential, commercial, and industrial development, which is projected to occur to buildout, will generate significant additional traffic and the need to improve and expand the City's street facilities system. The fee will be used to provide for those capacity improvements required by growth projections to maintain existing levels of service.

#### **Relationship Between Need for Facility and Type of Project Upon Which Imposed**

As noted in the previous section, each type of new residential, commercial, and industrial development will generate additional traffic, which will create an incremental need to add roadway capacity. The General Plan projects a population increase by approximately 66 percent in the Chico Planning Area by buildout and that 8,600,000 square feet of commercial and industrial development will be constructed.

#### **Relationship Between Amount of Fee and Cost of Portion of Facility Attributed to New Development**

The recommended fee is demand based and was calculated to produce the fee revenue required to fund the street facility improvement projects identified in Appendix B. These facilities have been allocated by the City for partial or full impact fee financing in the following manner:

1. Daily trip generation rates (as published by the Institute of Traffic and Transportation Engineers) were allocated to the several land use types employed in the General Plan.
2. Next, the percent of total daily trips for each land use type was calculated.
3. The foregoing were then utilized to develop the proportionate share of the total cost of street facilities shown in Appendix B attributable to impact fee funding.
4. The result then was employed to compute the recommended fee.

**Recommended Fee**

Using the methodology outlined above, the City of Chico Capital Project Services Department developed the fees shown in Table 2.1. The table identifies the fees proposed for each land use type. Consolidated fees for all residential and multiple family land uses are provided at the end of the table.

<b>Table 2.1</b>								
<b>Street Facility Improvement Development Impact Fees (Fund 308)</b>								
<b>Street Facility Improvement Allocated To Fees =</b>							<b>\$155,666,609</b>	
Item	Land Use Type	Number of New Housing Units or Square Foot Commercial	Daily Trip Generation Rates Per Housing Unit or Per Square Foot Commercial	Total Trips Per Day for Each Land Use Type	Percent of Total Trips for Each Land Use Type	Share of Total Cost Allocated to Each Land Use Type	Recommended	Current Chico Fee
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
1	Rural	30	10.7000	321	0.08%	\$119,191	\$3,973.05	\$3,687.15
2	Very Low	1,780	10.7000	19,046	4.54%	\$7,072,025	\$3,973.05	\$3,687.15
3	Low	9,200	10.7000	98,440	23.48%	\$36,552,039	\$3,973.05	\$3,687.15
4	Medium	4,460	7.4000	33,004	7.87%	\$12,254,810	\$2,747.72	\$2,549.99
5	Medium High	4,930	7.4000	36,482	8.70%	\$13,546,236	\$2,747.72	\$2,549.99
6	High	1,350	7.4000	9,990	2.38%	\$3,709,416	\$2,747.72	\$2,549.99
7	Office and Medical	2,500,000	0.0120	30,000	7.16%	\$11,139,386	\$4.46	\$4.14
8	Commercial and Services	3,200,000	0.0550	176,000	41.98%	\$55,351,066	\$17.30	\$15.83
9	Industrial	2,900,000	0.0055	15,950	3.80%	\$5,922,440	\$2.04	\$1.90
<b>10</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>419,233</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$145,666,609</b>		

**Note 1:** Figures are calculated using non-rounded data. Calculations using rounded data printed on these tables may result in differences.

**Note 2:** C1 = Column C, Row 1; D2 = Column D, Row 2, etc.

**Note 3:** Fees are per housing unit for residential buildings and per square foot for non-residential buildings.

**Note 4:** The current fee schedule has only two residential categories. This table assumes Rural through Low Density dwellings are Single Family residential and the remaining categories are Multiple Family residential.

**Note 5:** An additional \$10 million of RDA funds was applied towards Commercial and Services land use type's share of the total cost.

**CONSOLIDATED SINGLE FAMILY FEE (WEIGHTED AVERAGE):**

Fees Generated	\$43,743,256	
SF Units Total	11,010	
Weighted Average	\$3,973.05	Current \$3,687.15

**CONSOLIDATED MULTIPLE FAMILY FEE (WEIGHTED AVERAGE):**

Fees Generated	\$29,510,462	
MF Units Total	10,740	
Weighted Average	\$2,747.72	Current \$2,549.99

## **Street Maintenance Equipment Fee (Fund 335)**

### **Purpose of Fee**

This fee has two purposes:

1. To provide funding for the acquisition of the street maintenance facilities / buildings and equipment necessary to maintain existing street maintenance service levels as future growth and development occurs; and
2. To provide funding for the improvement of existing street maintenance buildings / facilities and/or the construction of such new facilities required providing for the maintenance and storage of such equipment.

The needed street maintenance equipment and buildings / facilities are shown in Appendix B. Those projects total \$7,140,332, of which \$4,259,001 is allocated to fees.

### **Use of Fee**

The revenue generated from this fee will be used to improve or expand storage and maintenance facilities for the street maintenance equipment and to purchase additional street maintenance equipment. The new facilities and equipment are required to accommodate the projected increase in the city's population due to new development.

### **Relationship Between Use of Fee and Type of Development Project Upon Which Imposed**

The projected new residential, commercial, and industrial development will generate significant additional traffic and the need to improve and expand the City's street facilities system. Such improvements and expansion will be accompanied by increased roadway maintenance requirements, which will oblige the City to provide improved and/or additional storage and maintenance space and acquire additional heavy street maintenance equipment. This fee will be used to finance such improvements and additions.

### **Relationship Between Need for Facility and Type of Project Upon Which Imposed**

As noted in the previous section, each type of residential, commercial, and industrial development will generate additional traffic, which in turn will require additional improved and/or expanded storage and maintenance space and additional heavy street maintenance equipment in order to maintain existing service levels.

The General Plan indicates that 59% of the population growth is attributable to new development with the remaining 41% due to annexation of existing unincorporated areas. Based on this distribution, 59% of the total project cost is assigned to new development.

### **Relationship Between Amount of Fee and Cost of Portion of Facility Attributed to New Development**

The amount of the recommended fee is demand based and was calculated to produce the fee revenue required to fund the street maintenance equipment projects identified in Appendix B which have been allocated by the City for partial or full impact fee financing in the following manner:

1. Daily Trip Generation Rates (as published by the Institute of Traffic and Transportation Engineers) were allocated to the several land use types employed in the General Plan.
2. Next, the percent of daily trips for each land use type was calculated.

3. These were then used to develop the proportionate share of the cost of Appendix B street maintenance equipment related to impact fee funding.
4. The result was then employed to compute the recommended fee.

**Recommended Fee**

Using this methodology, the City of Chico developed the recommended fees shown in Table 2.2, which identifies the fees proposed for each land use type. Consolidated fees for all residential and multiple family land uses appear at the end of the table. **No change in fees is proposed with this update.**

<b>Table 2.2</b>								
<b>Street Maintenance Equipment Development Impact Fees (Fund 335)</b>								
<b>Street Maintenance Equipment Allocated to Fees =</b>							<b>\$4,259,001</b>	
Item	Land Use Type	Number of New Housing Units or Square Foot Commercial	Daily Trip Generation Rates Per Housing Unit or Per Square Foot Commercial	Total Trips Per Day for Each Land Use Type	Percent of Total Trips for Each Land Use Type	Share of Total Cost Allocated to Each Land Use Type	Recommended	Current Chico Fees
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
1	Rural	30	10.7000	321	0.08%	\$3,261	\$108.70	\$108.70
2	Very Low	1,780	10.7000	19,046	4.54%	\$193,489	\$108.70	\$108.70
3	Low	9,200	10.7000	98,440	23.48%	\$1,000,055	\$108.70	\$108.70
4	Medium	4,460	7.4000	33,004	7.87%	\$335,289	\$75.18	\$75.18
5	Medium High	4,930	7.4000	36,482	8.70%	\$370,622	\$75.18	\$75.18
6	High	1,350	7.4000	9,990	2.38%	\$101,489	\$75.18	\$75.18
7	Office and Medical	2,500,000	0.0120	30,000	7.16%	\$304,771	\$0.12	\$0.12
8	Commercial and Services	3,200,000	0.0550	176,000	41.98%	\$1,787,989	\$0.56	\$0.56
9	Industrial	2,900,000	0.0055	15,950	3.80%	\$162,037	\$0.06	\$0.06
10	<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>419,233</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$4,259,001</b>		

**Note 1:** Figures are calculated using non-rounded data. Calculations using rounded data printed on these tables may result in differences.

**Note 2:** C1 = Column C, Row 1; D2 = Column D, Row 2, etc.

**Note 3:** Fees are per housing unit for residential buildings and per square foot for non-residential buildings.

**Note 4:** The current fee schedule has only two residential categories. This table assumes Rural through Low Density dwellings are Single Family residential and the remaining categories are Multiple Family residential.

**CONSOLIDATED SINGLE FAMILY FEE (WEIGHTED AVERAGE):**

Fees Generated	\$1,196,805		
SF Units Total	11,010		
Weighted Average	\$108.70	Current	\$108.70

**CONSOLIDATED MULTIPLE FAMILY FEE (WEIGHTED AVERAGE):**

Fees Generated	\$807,399		
MF Units Total	10,740		
Weighted Average	\$75.18	Current	\$75.18



**Bikeway Improvement Fee (Fund 305)**

**Purpose of Fee**

The purpose of this fee is to provide funding for the construction of additional Class I Bicycle Paths shown in Appendix B. These paths are required to augment the current bikeway system to accommodate the needs of projected new growth in the community. The projects in Appendix B total \$16,000,032 of which \$9,519,256 is allocated to fees. Per City Council direction, forty-one percent (41%) of the cost of projects remaining to be constructed is allocated to grants.

**Use of Fee**

The revenue generated from this fee will be used to construct additional Class I Bicycle Paths at various locations within the Chico Planning Area to further encourage the use of this alternative transportation mode consistent with the General Plan’s stated goals and objectives. The added Class I Bicycle Paths will bring the total number of miles to approximately 35 at buildout.

**Relationship Between Use of Fee and Type of Development Project Upon Which Imposed**

The projected residential, commercial, and industrial development which is anticipated to occur during the planning period will generate significant additional bicycle traffic and the need to improve and expand the City’s bikeway system. This fee will be used to finance such improvements and additions. The additional miles of this type of bikeway will be needed in order to maintain existing levels of service.

**Relationship Between Need for Facility and Type of Project Upon Which Imposed**

As noted above, each type of new development generates additional bicycle traffic that will require improved and/or expanded bikeway facilities to maintain existing service levels.

**Relationship Between Amount of Fee and Cost of Portion of Facility Attributed to New Development**

Table 2.3 A illustrates how the relationship between this fee and the cost of new Class I Bicycle Paths attributable to new development was derived. The analysis included determining the cost per person of the additional planned bikeway miles at buildout, which is required to fund the improvement projects identified in Appendix B. These projects have been identified for impact fee financing. The data shown was then utilized to calculate the bikeway improvement fees recommended for the various land use types shown in Table 2.3 B.

Table 2.3 A Cost Per Person of Bikeway Improvement Development Impact Fees					
Item	Class 1 Bikeway Miles in 1992	Population Within 1992 City Limits + Non- Resident Workers	Bikeway Miles Per Person, 1992	Cost of Additional Bikeway Miles Allocated to Development Impact Fees	Cost Per Person of Bikeway Improvement
A	B	C	D	E	F
1	6.05	61,723	0.000098	\$9,519,256	\$183.75
<p><b>Note 1:</b> Figures are calculated using non-rounded data. Calculations using rounded data printed on these tables may result in differences.</p> <p><b>Note 2:</b> Bikeway mileage supplied by City traffic engineering staff.</p> <p><b>Note 3:</b> C1 = Column C, Row 1; D2 = Column D, Row 2, etc.</p>					

**Recommended Fee**

Using the above methodology and data, recommended Bikeway Improvement Fees were calculated for each of the land use types. Persons per household (residential uses) or cost per square foot (commercial and industrial uses) were multiplied by their projected respective growth factors to obtain the recommended fees by land use types as shown in Table 2.3 B.

<b>Table 2.3 B</b> <b>Bikeway Improvement Development Impact Fees (Fund 305)</b>																												
				<b>Cost Per Person = \$184</b> <b>Bikeway Improvement Allocated to Fees = \$9,519,256</b>																								
Item	Land Use Type	Persons per Household or Non-Resident Workers Per Square Foot	Recommended	Current Chico Fees																								
A	B	C	D	E																								
1	Rural	4.0	\$735.01	\$432.05																								
2	Very Low	3.0	\$551.26	\$432.05																								
3	Low	2.5	\$459.38	\$432.05																								
4	Medium	2.4	\$441.01	\$373.19																								
5	Medium High	2.2	\$404.26	\$373.19																								
6	High	1.8	\$330.76	\$373.19																								
7	Office and Medical	0.0017	\$0.32	\$0.29																								
8	Commercial and Services	0.0009	\$0.17	\$0.15																								
9	Industrial	0.0007	\$0.13	\$0.12																								
<p><b>Note 1:</b> Figures are calculated using non-rounded data. Calculations using the rounded data printed on these tables may result in differences.</p> <p><b>Note 2:</b> The current fee schedule has only two residential categories. In this table assumes that rural through low density dwellings are single-family residential and that the remaining categories are multiple family.</p> <p><b>CONSOLIDATED SINGLE FAMILY FEE (WEIGHTED AVERAGE):</b></p> <table> <tr> <td>Amount Generated</td> <td>\$5,229,624</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>SF Units Total</td> <td>11,010</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Weighted Average</td> <td>\$474.99</td> <td>Current</td> <td>\$432.05</td> </tr> </table> <p><b>CONSOLIDATED MULTIPLE FAMILY FEE (WEIGHTED AVERAGE):</b></p> <table> <tr> <td>Amount Generated</td> <td>\$4,406,408</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>MF Units Total</td> <td>10,740</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Weighted Average</td> <td>\$410.28</td> <td>Current</td> <td>\$373.19</td> </tr> </table>					Amount Generated	\$5,229,624			SF Units Total	11,010			Weighted Average	\$474.99	Current	\$432.05	Amount Generated	\$4,406,408			MF Units Total	10,740			Weighted Average	\$410.28	Current	\$373.19
Amount Generated	\$5,229,624																											
SF Units Total	11,010																											
Weighted Average	\$474.99	Current	\$432.05																									
Amount Generated	\$4,406,408																											
MF Units Total	10,740																											
Weighted Average	\$410.28	Current	\$373.19																									

### CHAPTER 3 - PARK FACILITY FEES

The City levies two types of park fees:

1. Community Park (Fund 330), Linear Parks/Greenways (Fund 333), and Neighborhood Parks (Funds 341-348) Fee; and
2. Bidwell Park Land Acquisition Fee (Fund 332)

Each of these fees is outlined below in the context of the provisions of the General Plan. Development of recommendations for each fee has been outlined.

#### **Community Park (Fund 330), Linear Parks/Greenways (Fund 333), and Neighborhood Parks (Funds 341-348) Fee**

The *Chico/CARD Area Park Fee Nexus Study - Revised Final Report*, adopted by the Chico City Council on December 2, 2003, provides a detailed discussion of development impact fees related to funding the acquisition, development, and construction of park facilities in the City of Chico and CARD service area. Nexus Study updates have provided modifications to the park impact fees described in that study by adjusting for current land and infrastructure costs.

1. Table 3.1 A compares current park impact fees and the proposed fees.
2. Table 3.1 B updates costs to current levels and identifies the total amount of park acquisitions and facilities to be funded by impact fees. Assumptions for this table are: land costs for neighborhood parks are \$250,000 per acre; the cost of infrastructure and other park facilities has continued to increase since the published 2003 costs; and parkland acquisition costs for community parks and linear parks/greenways are based on the best available data pertaining to increases in the price of land in the city.
3. Table 3.1 C calculates a per person cost of parks based on the potential population increase from 2003 (the base year) and General Plan buildout.
4. Table 3.1 D calculates the per unit impact fee for single and multiple family residential units, based on historic occupancy levels and per person cost from Table 3.1 C.

	<b>Adopted Fee</b>	<b>Proposed Fee</b>
<b>Single Family</b>	\$2,789	\$2,913
<b>Multiple Family</b>	\$2,360	\$2,465

**Table 3.1 B  
Cost Estimate of Park Acres Allocated to New Service Population**

Item	Cost Per Acre	Acres Allocated to New Service Population	Costs Allocated to New Service Population
<u>Neighborhood Parks (Funds 341-348)</u>			
Park Acquisition	\$250,000	17.1	\$4,275,000
Park Development	\$214,419 <sup>(2)</sup>	17.1	\$3,666,561
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$464,419</b>		<b>\$7,941,561</b>
<u>Community Park (Fund 330)</u>			
Park Acquisition	\$78,264 <sup>(4)</sup>	29.1	\$2,277,468
Park Development	\$478,301 <sup>(2)</sup>	29.1	\$14,234,546
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$556,564</b>		<b>\$16,512,013</b>
<u>Linear Parks/Greenways (Fund 333)</u>			
Park Acquisition	\$20,603 <sup>(4)</sup>	79.2	\$1,631,742
Park Development	\$8,505 <sup>(2)</sup>	79.2	\$673,631
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$29,108</b>		<b>\$2,305,372</b>
<b>Total Costs</b>			<b>\$26,758,947</b>

- (1) Future community park improvements designated by the Chico City Council on July 15, 2003, include the development of the 36.0 acre De Garmo park. No additional community park acquisition or development projects are included in the Nexus Study. Previously, 119.5 acres of community parks were acquired and developed, and park land for De Garmo was acquired. The park acquisition funded through the existing fee and existing City/CARD revenues was over and above the amount required to serve the existing population, as defined by the buildout standard. On December 2, 2003, the City Council adopted reduced development impact fees based on the assumption that new development would pay for community park acquisition on the basis of the actual price per acre of the park. As a result, \$1.9 million in community park acquisition impact fees should be collected as opposed to \$3.2 million shown in the Nexus Study.
- (2) Cost from 2003 plus CCI increases.
- (3) Figures are calculated using non-rounded data. Calculations using rounded data printed on these tables may result in differences.
- (4) Park Acquisition costs adjusted for the 2007-2008 Nexus Study Update.
- (5) Annual Nexus Update charges applied to Community Park Development only.

Table 3.1 C Cost Allocation to New Service Population - Estimated Cost Per User					
Item	Cost Allocated to New Development <sup>(1)</sup>	Service Population <sup>(2)</sup>	Cost Per Person	Admin Overhead (5%)	Fee Per Person
<u>Park Acquisition</u>					
Neighborhood	\$4,275,000	25,080	\$170	\$9	\$179
Community	\$2,277,468	25,080	\$91	\$5	\$95
Linear/Greenways	\$1,631,742	25,080	\$65	\$3	\$68
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$8,184,210</b>		<b>\$326</b>	<b>\$16</b>	<b>\$343</b>
<u>Park Development</u>					
Neighborhood	\$3,666,561	25,080	\$146	\$7	\$154
Community	\$14,234,546	25,080	\$568	\$28	\$596
Linear/Greenways	\$673,631	25,080	\$27	\$1	\$28
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$18,574,737</b>		<b>\$741</b>	<b>\$37</b>	<b>\$778</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$26,758,947</b>		<b>\$1,067</b>	<b>\$53</b>	<b>\$1,120</b>
<p>(1) From Table 3.1 B.</p> <p>(2) The service population is the anticipated growth in population between 2003 and buildout.</p> <p>(3) Figures are calculated using non-rounded data. Calculations using rounded data printed on these tables may result in differences.</p>					

Table 3.1 D Recommended Development Impact Fees per Residential Unit			
Item	Persons Per Unit <sup>(1)</sup>	Fee Per Person <sup>(2)</sup>	Development Impact Fee per Unit
<u>Single Family</u>			
Neighborhood Park	2.6	\$332	\$864
Community Park	2.6	\$691	\$1,797
Linear/Greenway	2.6	\$97	\$251
<b>Total Single Family</b>		<b>\$1,120</b>	<b>\$2,913</b>
<u>Multiple Family</u>			
Neighborhood Park	2.2	\$332	\$731
Community Park	2.2	\$691	\$1,521
Linear/Greenway	2.2	\$97	\$212
<b>Total Multiple Family</b>		<b>\$1,120</b>	<b>\$2,465</b>
<p>(1) From Department of Finance</p> <p>(2) From Table 3.1 C; the sum of acquisition and development costs for each park type.</p> <p>(3) Figures are calculated using non-rounded data. Calculations using rounded data printed on these tables may result in differences.</p>			

## **Bidwell Park Land Acquisition Fee (Fund 332)**

### **Purpose of Fee**

The purpose of this fee is to provide funding for the acquisition and development of an additional 1,554.86 acres of park lands adjacent to Bidwell Park per the General Plan standard of 29.5 acres of park facilities per 1,000 population growth over the project period. Of the additional 1,555 acres of parklands, 1,380 acres have been acquired. These additional lands are required to protect Bidwell Park from the potential of private development and to mitigate the adverse environmental impact of projected growth pressure upon the park during the planning period.

### **Use of Fee**

The revenue generated from this fee will be used to purchase additional private lands bordering on Bidwell Park to protect it from the potential of private development and to mitigate the adverse environmental impact of projected growth pursuant to the goals and objectives contained in the General Plan. This fee includes the repayment of \$3,887,141 for the acquisition of approximately 1,380 acres of parkland adjacent to Upper Bidwell Park.

### **Relationship Between Use of Fee and Type of Development Project Upon Which Imposed**

Each type of new development will generate growth pressures upon Bidwell Park and threaten the quality of its pristine environment. The General Plan assumes that the City of Chico will encompass the entire Chico Planning Area at buildout and that growth from new development will require additions to the Park to accommodate such growth, protect the Park from encroachment by adjacent private development, and mitigate the adverse environmental impact of such projected growth pressure upon it. Further, the new facilities will enhance the community's quality of life and living environment to the benefit of all its citizens.

### **Relationship Between Need for Facility and Type of Project Upon Which Imposed**

Each type of new development will place intensified environmental pressures on Bidwell Park as growth in the community occurs. The General Plan assumes that the City of Chico will encompass the entire Chico Planning Area at buildout. Growth from new development will require additions to the Park to accommodate such growth, protect the Park from encroachment by adjacent private development and mitigate the adverse environmental impact of such growth pressure.

### **Relationship Between Amount of Fee and Cost of Portion of Facility Attributed to New Development**

Table 3.2 A illustrates the manner in which the relationship between this fee and the cost of the Bidwell Park Land Acquisition attributable to new development was derived. First, the acquisitions identified in Appendix B allocated by the City for partial or full impact fee financing, were used to determine the cost per person of Bidwell Park Land Acquisition. The result was then employed to calculate the Bidwell Park Land Acquisition Fee recommended for the various land use types shown in the following section. As previously stated, the funds generated from these fees will be used to repay debt incurred when the property was acquired.

Table 3.2 A Per Person Cost of Bidwell Park Land Acquisition Development Impact Fees					
Item	Total Change in Population Due to New Development, 1992 to Buildout	Total Change in Population Due to New Development, 1992 to Buildout in 1000's	Total Acres Needed for Bidwell Park Land Acquisition Due to New Development	Cost of Additional Park Facilities for New Development	Cost Per Person of Bidwell Park Land Acquisition
A	B	C	D	E	F
1	51,804	51.8	1,528	\$3,926,013	\$75.79
<p><b>Note 1:</b> Figures are calculated using non-rounded data. Calculations using rounded data printed on these tables may result in differences.</p> <p><b>Note 2:</b> C1 = Column C, Row 1; D2 = Column D, Row 2, etc.</p> <p><b>Note 3:</b> Bidwell Park Land Acquisition need per 1,000 change in population established by City staff.</p>					

### Recommended Fee

Using the methodology and data developed in Table 3.2 A, the recommended Bidwell Park Land Acquisition Fee was calculated for each of the land use types. The product of the number of additional residents multiplied by cost per person equals the recommended fees shown in Table 3.2 B. **No change in fees is proposed with this update.**

Table 3.2 B Bidwell Park Land Acquisition Development Impact Fee (Fund 332)																																		
<b>Cost Per Person =</b>				<b>\$76</b>																														
Item	Land Use Type	Persons / Household or Non-Resident Workers / Square Foot	Recommended	Current Chico Fee																														
A	B	C	D	E																														
1	Rural	4.0000	\$303.14	\$199.00																														
2	Very Low	3.0000	\$227.36	\$199.00																														
3	Low	2.5000	\$189.46	\$199.00																														
4	Medium	2.4000	\$181.88	\$177.00																														
5	Medium High	2.2000	\$166.73	\$177.00																														
6	High	1.8000	\$136.41	\$177.00																														
<p><b>Note 1:</b> Figures are calculated using non-rounded data. Calculations using rounded data printed on these tables may result in differences.</p> <p><b>Note 2:</b> The current fee schedule has only two residential categories. This table assumes Rural through Low Density dwellings are Single Family residential and the remaining categories are Multiple Family residential.</p> <p><b>Note 3:</b> No Update of this Fee Proposed for the 2006-07 Nexus Study Update.</p> <p><b>CONSOLIDATED SINGLE FAMILY FEE (WEIGHTED AVERAGE):</b></p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Fees Generated</td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: right;">\$2,156,846</td> <td style="width: 10%;"></td> <td style="width: 10%;"></td> <td style="width: 10%;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>SF Units Total</td> <td style="text-align: right;">11,010</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Weighted Avg</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$199</td> <td>Current</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$199.00</td> </tr> </table> <p><b>CONSOLIDATED MULTIPLE FAMILY FEE (WEIGHTED AVERAGE):</b></p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Fees Generated</td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: right;">\$1,817,329</td> <td style="width: 10%;"></td> <td style="width: 10%;"></td> <td style="width: 10%;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>MF Units Total</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10,740</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Weighted Avg</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$177</td> <td>Current</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$177.00</td> </tr> </table>					Fees Generated	\$2,156,846				SF Units Total	11,010				Weighted Avg	\$199	Current		\$199.00	Fees Generated	\$1,817,329				MF Units Total	10,740				Weighted Avg	\$177	Current		\$177.00
Fees Generated	\$2,156,846																																	
SF Units Total	11,010																																	
Weighted Avg	\$199	Current		\$199.00																														
Fees Generated	\$1,817,329																																	
MF Units Total	10,740																																	
Weighted Avg	\$177	Current		\$177.00																														

## ***CHAPTER 4 - BUILDING AND EQUIPMENT FEES***

The City levies three types of building and equipment fees:

1. Administrative Building Fee (Fund 336);
2. Fire Protection Building and Equipment Fee (Fund 337); and
3. Police Protection Building and Equipment Fee (Fund 338).

In developing recommendations, each of these fees is discussed below in the context of the provisions of AB 1600 and the assumptions discussed in Chapter 1.

### **Administrative Building Fee (Fund 336)**

#### **Purpose of the Fee**

The purpose of this fee is to provide partial funding for the construction of the 45,000 square foot Municipal Center Building in the Chico Municipal Center and expansion of the existing City Council Chambers. The new building, which opened in the spring of 1995, houses the administrative offices of the City's several offices and departments (excluding Police, Fire, and Operations and Maintenance). Total cost of the Municipal Building allocated to this fee is \$2,399,171. The total Administrative Building cost was \$11,741,263 and the total cost allocated to fees is \$4,543,751 including interest.

The building replaced the prior obsolete and inadequate municipal building. It also permitted consolidating in one site several outlying departmental offices previously scattered in the adjacent area, thereby improving current public service levels and providing ample growth space to supply the future expansion needs of departmental administrative offices.

#### **Use of Fee**

The revenue generated from this fee will be used to furnish approximately one-third of the funding required to erect the new Municipal Building described in the foregoing section. It provides centralized, efficient, and expanded public service facilities to accommodate the projected increase in the city's population due to new development.

#### **Relationship Between Use of Fee and Type of Development Project Upon Which Imposed**

The new residential, commercial, and industrial development which is anticipated to occur during the planning period will generate significant additional demand for the administrative, management, professional, and technical services provided by the staff of the City's non-emergency services. This demand will occur among all components of the community and will require adequate provision for the expansion of the administrative offices to accommodate it. The recommended fee will apply to each of these community components, since all will contribute to the demand for new and expanded municipal services.

#### **Relationship Between Need for Facility and Type of Project Upon Which Imposed**

New development will require the services supplied by the administrative offices of the City's non-emergency services, (such as City Manager, Finance, Capital Project Services, Building and Development Services). These services will require adequate, convenient, and efficient workspace to fulfill their public service requirements.



**Relationship Between Amount of Fee and Cost of Portion of Facility Attributed to New Development**

Table 4.1 A illustrates how the relationship between this fee and the cost of the new Municipal Building attributable to new development was derived. The cost per person required to fund that portion of the facility allocated by the City for impact fee funding (as shown in Appendix B) was determined. This data was then employed to calculate the Administrative Building Fees recommended for the various land use types shown in the following section.

<b>Table 4.1 A</b>			
<b>Cost Per Person of Administrative Building Development Impact Fee</b>			
Item	Persons in Chico = Population + Non-Resident Workers (1992)	Cost of New Administration Building Allocated to Fees	Cost of New Administration Building Per Person
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
1	61,723	\$4,543,751	\$73.62
<p><b>Note 1:</b> Figures are calculated using non-rounded data. Calculations using rounded data printed on these tables may result in differences.</p> <p><b>Note 2:</b> C1 = Column C, Row 1; D2 = Column D, Row 2, etc.</p>			

**Recommended Fee**

Using the methodology outlined above, the recommended fees are shown in Table 4.1 B. It identifies the fees proposed for each land use type. Consolidated fees for residential and multiple family land uses appear at the end of the table.

**Table 4.1 B  
Administrative Building Development Impact Fees (Fund 336)**

**Cost Per Person = \$74  
Administrative Building Allocated to Fees = \$4,543,751**

Fee	Land Use Type	Persons Per Household or Non-Resident Workers Per Square Foot	Recommended	Current Chico Fee
A	B	C	D	E
1	Rural	4.0000	\$294	\$182
2	Very Low	3.0000	\$221	\$182
3	Low	2.5000	\$184	\$182
4	Medium	2.4000	\$177	\$158
5	Medium High	2.2000	\$162	\$158
6	High	1.8000	\$133	\$158
7	Office and Medical	0.0017	\$0.13	\$0.12
8	Commercial and Services	0.0009	\$0.07	\$0.06
9	Industrial	0.0007	\$0.05	\$0.05

**Note 1:** Figures are calculated using non-rounded data. Calculations using rounded data printed on these tables may result in differences.

**Note 2:** Fees are per housing unit for residential buildings and per square foot for non-residential buildings.

**Note 3:** The current fee schedule has only two residential categories. This table assumes Rural through Low Density dwellings are Single Family residential and the remaining categories are Multiple Family residential.

**CONSOLIDATED SINGLE FAMILY FEE (WEIGHTED AVERAGE):**

Fees Generated	\$2,095,092		
SF Units Total	11,010		
Weighted Average	\$190	Current	\$182

**CONSOLIDATED MULTIPLE FAMILY FEE (WEIGHTED AVERAGE):**

Fees Generated	\$1,765,295		
MF Units Total	10,740		
Weighted Average	\$164	Current	\$158

**Fire Protection Building and Equipment Fee (Fund 337)**

**Purpose of Fee**

The purpose of this fee is to provide funding for the acquisition and/or construction of those improvements to the fire protection buildings and equipment as shown in Appendix B. These improvements are required to augment current fire facilities and equipment needs to accommodate projected new growth and development in the community. The total project cost is \$25,349,113 of which \$16,072,809 is allocated to fees.

**Use of Fee**

The revenue generated from this fee will be used to fund the fire protection site acquisitions, buildings, and equipment projects listed in Appendix B. Acquisition of at least one additional fire station site, construction of a new fire station, and acquisition of related equipment will be

required to maintain the City's fire protection services at current levels and to serve a population projected to be 134,000 within the Chico Planning Area at buildout.

**Relationship Between Use of Fee and Type of Development Project Upon Which Imposed**

The new residential, commercial, and industrial development that is projected to occur to buildout will generate significant additional fire service, facilities, and equipment demands. The fee will be used to provide for these improvements to the City's fire services and facilities required to maintain existing levels of service.

The General Plan indicates that 59% of the population growth is attributable to new development with the remaining 41% due to annexation of existing unincorporated areas. Based on this distribution, 59% of the total project cost is assigned to new development.

**Relationship Between Need for Facility and Type of Project Upon Which Imposed**

As noted in the previous section, each type of residential, commercial, and industrial development will generate additional demands upon fire services and facilities. The General Plan projects that population will increase by approximately 66 percent within the Chico Planning Area by buildout and that an additional 8,600,000 square feet of commercial and industrial development will be constructed. Such growth and development will create the need to add facilities and equipment in order to maintain current service levels.

**Relationship Between Amount of Fee and Cost of Portion of Facility Attributed to New Development**

During the planning period, 60,903 persons (51,804 new growth and 9,099 non-resident worker population) will be added to the city by new growth and development. In addition, significant commercial and industrial development will occur. The projects listed in Appendix B will be required to accommodate this increase in population due to new development and the projected commercial and industrial development. All of the projects needed are related to this growth and development. The recommended fee will provide the necessary funding for them.

**Recommended Fee**

Table 4.2 illustrates the method used to derive proposed fees. The recommendations are based upon allocating the demand for fire services, measured by alarms per year, to the several General Plan land use types. The cost of the facilities and equipment needed at buildout was then apportioned to the land use types. Using this methodology, the recommended fees shown in Table 4.2 were derived. The table identifies the fees proposed for each type.

**Table 4.2  
Fire Protection Building and Equipment Development Impact Fees (Fund 337)**

**Fire Protection Building and Equipment Allocated to Fees = \$16,072,809**

Item	Land Use Type	Number of New Housing Units or Square Foot Non-Residential	Alarms Per Year Per Unit	Total Alarms Per Year Per Land Use Type	Percent of Total Alarms for Each Development	Recommended	Current Chico Fees
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1	Rural	30	0.14550	4.37	0.14%	\$732	\$699
2	Very Low	1,780	0.14550	259.00	8.11%	\$732	\$699
3	Low	9,200	0.14550	1338.64	41.91%	\$732	\$699
4	Medium	4,460	0.11543	514.82	16.12%	\$581	\$554
5	Medium High	4,930	0.11543	569.07	17.82%	\$581	\$554
6	High	1,350	0.11543	155.83	4.88%	\$581	\$554
7	Office and Medical	2,500,000	0.00004	102.50	3.21%	\$0.21	\$0.20
8	Commercial and Services	3,200,000	0.00007	220.80	6.91%	\$0.35	\$0.33
9	Industrial	2,900,000	0.00001	29.00	0.91%	\$0.05	\$0.05
10	<b>Total</b>			<b>3194.01</b>	<b>100.00%</b>		

**Note 1:** Figures are calculated using non-rounded data. Calculations using rounded data printed on these tables may result in differences.

**Note 2:** Fees are per housing unit for residential buildings and per square foot for non-residential buildings.

**Note 3:** Alarms per year per City of Chico Fire Department 2001 year ending.

**Note 4:** The current fee schedule has only two residential categories. This table assumes Rural through Low Density dwellings are Single Family residential and the remaining categories are Multiple Family residential.

**CONSOLIDATED SINGLE FAMILY FEE (WEIGHTED AVERAGE):**

Fees Generated	\$8,061,536		
SF Units Total	11,010		
Weighted Average	\$732	Current	\$699

**CONSOLIDATED MULTIPLE FAMILY FEE (WEIGHTED AVERAGE):**

Fees Generated	\$6,238,440		
MF Units Total	10,740		
Weighted Average	\$581	Current	\$554

**Police Protection Building and Equipment Fee (Fund 338)**

**Purpose of Fee**

The purpose of this fee is to fund the acquisition and/or expansion of additional police facilities and equipment shown in Appendix B. These projects are required to accommodate projected new growth and development in the community. Total cost of projects is \$46,519,656 of which \$27,668,139 is allocated to development fees.

**Use of Fee**

The revenue generated from this fee will be used to assist in funding the projects listed in Appendix B, which includes equipment and facilities required to maintain the police protection services at current levels and to serve a population projected to be 134,000 within the Chico Planning Area at buildout.

**Relationship Between Use of Fee and Type of Development Project Upon Which Imposed**

The new residential, commercial, and industrial development that is projected to occur to buildout will generate significant additional police service demands. The fee will be used to provide funds for the additional police facilities that will be required to maintain existing levels of service.

**Relationship Between Need for Facility and Type of Project Upon Which Imposed**

As noted in the previous section, each type of new residential, commercial, and industrial development will generate additional demands upon police services and facilities. The General Plan projects that population will increase by approximately 66% within the Chico Planning Area by buildout and that 8,600,000 square feet of commercial and industrial development will be constructed. Such growth and development will require new facilities and equipment in order to maintain current police service levels.

**Relationship Between Amount of Fee and Cost of Portion of Facility Attributed to New Development**

During the planning period, 60,903 persons (51,804 new growth and 9,099 non-resident worker population) will be added to the city's population by virtue of new growth and development. In addition, significant new commercial and industrial development will occur.

Fees for generalized police facilities have been reapportioned 59% to new development and 41% to annexed areas.

The projects listed in Appendix B will be required to accommodate the projected commercial and industrial development. The recommended fee will provide the necessary funding for that portion attributed to new development.

**Recommended Fee**

Table 4.3 illustrates the method used to derive its proposed fees. The recommendations are based upon allocating the demand for police services, measured by service calls per year, to the several General Plan land use types. The cost of the projects needed at buildout was then apportioned to the land use types. Table 4.3 shows the fees proposed for each land use type.

**Table 4.3  
Police Protection Building and Equipment Development Impact Fees (Fund 338)**

**Police Protection Building and Equipment Allocated to Fees = \$27,668,139**

Item	Land Use Type	Number of New Housing Units or Square Foot Non-Residential	Calls Per Year Per Unit	Total Calls Per Year Per Land Use Type	Percent of Total Calls for Each Land Use Type	Recommended	Current Chico Fees
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1	Rural	30	1.1900	35.70	0.09%	\$834	\$789
2	Very Low	1,780	1.1900	2,118.20	5.37%	\$834	\$789
3	Low	9,200	1.1900	10,948.00	27.74%	\$834	\$789
4	Medium	4,460	1.3400	5,976.40	15.14%	\$940	\$889
5	Medium High	4,930	1.3400	6,606.20	16.74%	\$940	\$889
6	High	1,350	1.3400	1,809.00	4.58%	\$940	\$889
7	Office and Medical	2,500,000	0.0023	5,625.00	14.25%	\$1.58	\$1.49
8	Commercial and Services	3,200,000	0.0018	5,792.00	14.68%	\$1.27	\$1.20
9	Industrial	2,900,000	0.0002	551.00	1.40%	\$0.13	\$0.13
10	<b>Total</b>			<b>39,461.50</b>	<b>100.00%</b>		

**Note 1:** Figures are calculated using non-rounded data. Calculations using rounded data printed on these tables may result in differences.

**Note 2:** Fees are per housing unit for residential buildings and per square foot for non-residential buildings.

**Note 3:** KR = Konrad-Rae & Associates, Development Impact Fee and Nexus Report for City of Chico, 11/10/92.

**Note 4:** The current fee schedule has only two residential categories. This table assumes Rural through Low Density dwellings are Single Family residential and the remaining categories are Multiple Family residential.

**CONSOLIDATED SINGLE FAMILY FEE (WEIGHTED AVERAGE):**

Fees Generated	\$9,186,300		
SF Units Total	11,010		
Weighted Average	\$834	Current	\$789

**CONSOLIDATED MULTIPLE FAMILY FEE (WEIGHTED AVERAGE):**

Fees Generated	\$10,090,564		
MF Units Total	10,740		
Weighted Average	\$940	Current	\$889

## **CHAPTER 5 - SEWER FEES**

The City levies two types of Development Impact Fees:

1. Sewer-Trunk Line Capacity Fee (Fund 320); and
2. Sewer-WPCP Capacity Fee (Fund 321)

Each of these fees is discussed below in the context of the provisions of AB 1600 and the assumptions previously presented.

### **Sewer-Trunk Line Capacity Fee (Fund 320)**

#### **Purpose of Fee**

The purpose of this fee is to provide funding for the expansion of the wastewater trunk line collection and outfall systems to accommodate the needs of projected new growth and development in the community.

#### **Use of Fee**

The revenue generated from this fee will be used to fund trunk line facilities required to accommodate new growth. Units built within the Northeast and Southeast Chico Sewer Assessment Districts (NECSAD and SECSAD) are not included in the development assumptions for these improvements, since the trunk lines required to service these Districts were funded with assessment improvement bonds.

#### **Relationship Between Use of Fee and Type of Development Project Upon Which Imposed**

The new residential, commercial, and industrial development which is projected to occur will generate significant additional wastewater flows which will need to be transmitted via pipelines of varying size and capacity to the Water Pollution Control Plant for treatment and discharge to the Sacramento River. The fee will be used to provide for those capacity improvements required by growth projections so existing levels of service can be maintained.

#### **Relationship Between Amount of Fee and Cost of Portion of Facility Attributed to New Development**

The purpose of the Sewer-Trunk Line Capacity Fee is to provide funding for the expansion of the City's wastewater trunk line collection and outfall to accommodate the needs of projected new growth and development in the community. Another purpose of this fee is to provide funding for trunk facilities required to accommodate new growth.

#### **Recommended Fee**

The City updated its Sanitary Sewer Master Plan (SSMP) in May 2003. The SSMP provides information on the capacity and deficiencies of the existing pipe network and upgrades that will be required, per the SSMP's own buildout projections, which differ from the projections in the General Plan. As part of this update, a Capital Improvement Plan was developed indicating which improvements are needed to correct current deficiencies related to existing uses and which improvements are required for new development. The cost of deficiencies attributable to new development was also analyzed at that time resulting in a recommended sewer trunk fee of \$1,400 per equivalent dwelling unit.

The Trunk Line Capacity Fee was updated by taking the Allocation to Development Impact Fees from Appendix B and dividing it amongst the applicable dwelling units by buildout as shown in Table 5.1 A. The recommended Trunk Line Capacity Fee per dwelling unit was then applied to non-residential premises by the factors given in Fee Schedule 50.050. Table 5.1 B reflects these calculations. **No change in fees is proposed with this update.**

<b>Table 5.1 A</b>	
<b>Sewer-Trunk Line Capacity Development Impact Fees (Fund 320)</b>	
<b>Sewer-Trunk Line Capacity Allocated to Fees =</b>	<b>\$49,916,081</b>
Criteria	Value
Average Wastewater Flow per Equivalent Dwelling Unit or EDU (gpd) <sup>(1)</sup>	260
Additional System Capacity Required (gpd) <sup>(2)</sup>	9,500,000
Additional Dwelling Units by Buildout	36,540
Dwelling Units in NECSAD and SECSAD <sup>(3)</sup>	7,060
Remaining Dwelling Units (rate payers)	29,480
Total Project Cost of CIP for Future Customers <sup>(4)</sup>	\$49,916,081
Trunk Line Capacity Fee per Dwelling Unit (Recommended Fee)	\$1,693
Current Fee	\$1,693
<b>Notes:</b>	
(1) Average wastewater flow per equivalent dwelling unit (EDU). EDU is a quantifying flow based unit which can change.	
(2) Buildout minus Existing Average Day (from Table 5.5 in the Sanitary Sewer Master Plan, May 2003).	
(3) Dwelling units within NECSAD and SECSAD are considered pre-paid.	
(4) Assumes pay-as-you-go.	
(5) This table is an updated version of Table 7.8 in the City of Chico Sanitary Sewer Master Plan, May 2003.	

<b>Table 5.1 B</b>			
<b>Sewer-Trunk Line Capacity Development Impact Fees (Fund 320)</b>			
<b>Trunk Line Capacity Fee per Dwelling Unit =</b>			<b>\$1,693</b>
Non-Residential Premises	Residential Equivalent	Recommended Fee	Current Fee
Commercial and Services	Per Acre = 4.00	\$6,773	\$6,773
Motel / Hotel With Restaurant	1 Room = 1.00	\$1,693	\$1,693
Motel / Hotel Without Restaurant	1 Room = 0.50	\$847	\$847
Convalescent Hospitals	1 Bed = 0.50	\$847	\$847
Hospitals	1 Bed = 0.75	\$1,270	\$1,270
Dormitory / Group Dwelling With Food	3 Occupants = 1.00	\$564	\$564
Dormitory / Group Dwelling Without Food	6 Occupants = 1.00	\$282	\$282
Industrial	Per Acre = 4.00	\$6,773	\$6,773
Schools (CUSD FTE)	9.2 FTE = 1.00	\$184	\$184
Park or Recreational Facility (restrooms)	20 FU = 1.00	\$85	\$85
All Other	Per Acre = 4.00	\$6,773	\$6,773



## **Sewer-WPCP Capacity Fee (Fund 321)**

### **Purpose of Fee**

The purpose of this fee is to provide funding for the capacity expansion of the Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP) from 6.5 million gallons per day in 1997 to the currently proposed 15 million gallons per day which is needed for buildout as shown in Appendix B. The initial project, from 6-9 million gallons per day, was completed in fiscal year 2000-01. The second phase, expansion from 9-12 million gallons per day, is currently in process.

### **Use of Fee**

The revenue generated from this fee will be used to assist in funding the above projects. Construction of the expanded plant will provide the wastewater treatment capacity to accommodate connections associated with the future buildout population within the Chico Planning Area.

### **Relationship Between Use of Fee and Type of Development Project Upon Which Imposed**

The new residential, commercial, and industrial development, which is projected to occur to buildout, will generate wastewater which will require treatment to Federal / State Clean Water standards prior to discharge to the Sacramento River. The fee will be used to provide for those capacity improvements that are required by growth so that existing levels of service can be maintained.

### **Relationship Between Amount of Fee and Cost of Portion of Facility Attributed to New Development**

The purpose of the Sewer-WPCP Capacity Fee is to provide funding for plant capacity.

### **Recommended Fee**

An updated Facilities Plan for the Water Pollution Control Plant was prepared in May 2005. This document provides planning information for the two anticipated WPCP expansion projects, the 9 to 12 million gallons per day and the 12 to 15 million gallons per day. It identifies the future facilities needed to accommodate the requirements of projected new growth and development in the community. These facilities have been added to the WPCP project list, which will result in a fee increase in excess of the yearly CCI update, at the time this analysis was made.

The WPCP Capacity Fee was updated by taking the Allocation to Development Impact Fees from Appendix B and dividing it amongst the applicable equivalent dwelling units per expansion capacity as shown in Table 5.2 A. The recommended WPCP Capacity Fee per equivalent dwelling unit was then applied to non-residential premises by the factors given in Fee Schedule 50.050. Table 5.2 B reflects these calculations. **No change in fees is proposed with this update.**

<b>Table 5.2 A</b>	
<b>Sewer-WPCP Capacity Development Impact Fees (Fund 321)</b>	
<b>Sewer-WPCP Capacity Allocated to Fees = \$91,101,522</b>	
Criteria	Value
Wastewater Flow per Equivalent Residential Unit or ERU (gpd) <sup>(1)</sup>	210
Additional Expansion Capacity (gpd) <sup>(2)</sup>	8,500,000
Expansion Capacity per ERU	40,476
Total Project Costs Allocated to Development Impact Fees <sup>(3)</sup>	\$91,101,522
WPCP Capacity Fee per Residential Unit (Recommended Fee)	\$2,251
Current Fee	\$2,251
<b>Notes:</b>	
(1) Wastewater flow per equivalent residential unit (ERU) per the Water Pollution Control Plant 1997 Expansion Final Revenue Program (July 1999). ERU is a qualifying term based on a quality and a flow of 210 gallons per day per connection.	
(2) Buildout minus original WPCP capacity in 1994 (6.5 mgd).	
(3) Reflects the costs shown in the City of Chico Water Pollution Control Plant Facility Plan Update Report Volume 1 prepared by Carollo Engineers and dated May 2005.	

<b>Table 5.2 B</b>			
<b>Sewer-WPCP Capacity Development Impact Fees (Fund 321)</b>			
<b>WPCP Capacity Fee per Residential Unit = \$2,251</b>			
Non-Residential Premises	Residential Equivalent (EDU)	Recommended Fee	Current Fee
Office and Medical	Per Acre = 4.00	\$9,003	\$9,003
Commercial and Services	Per Acre = 4.00	\$9,003	\$9,003
Motel / Hotel With Restaurant	1 Room = 1.00	\$2,251	\$2,251
Motel / Hotel Without Restaurant	1 Room = 0.50	\$1,125	\$1,125
Convalescent Hospitals	1 Bed = 0.50	\$1,125	\$1,125
Hospitals	1 Bed = 0.75	\$1,688	\$1,688
Dormitory / Group Dwelling With Food	3 Occupants = 1.00	\$750	\$750
Dormitory / Group Dwelling Without Food	6 Occupants = 1.00	\$375	\$375
Industrial	Per Acre = 4.00	\$9,003	\$9,003
Schools (CUSD FTE)	9.2 FTE = 1.00	\$245	\$245
Park or Recreational Facility (restrooms)	20 FU = 1.00	\$113	\$113
All Other	Per Acre = 4.00	\$9,003	\$9,003

## **CHAPTER 6 – STORM DRAIN FEES**

The City levies a Storm Drainage Fee (Fund 309) authorized by Chapter 3.85.405 of the Chico Municipal Code. Since these fees are development impact fees, they are subject to Assembly Bill 1600 and must be established by a Nexus report. The fee is discussed below in the context of the provisions of AB 1600.

### **Storm Drainage Fee (Fund 309)**

#### **Purpose of Fee**

The purpose of the fee is to provide funding for the construction and expansion of the storm drain system to accommodate the needs of projected new growth. It provides funding as indicated in the 2000 City of Chico Storm Drainage Master Plan Integrated Document.

#### **Use of Fee**

The revenue generated from this fee will be used to fund facilities required to accommodate new growth, such as collectors and outfalls, and construct peak attenuation facilities as well as water quality facilities.

#### **Relationship Between Use of Fee and Type of Development Project Upon Which Imposed**

The new residential, commercial, and industrial development projected to occur will generate significant additional storm water flows, which will need to be transmitted via pipelines of varying size and capacity to various creeks and channels. Storm water will also need to be treated for water quality and may need to be attenuated.

#### **Relationship Between Amount of Fee and Cost Portion of Facility Attributed to New Development**

The purpose of the Storm Drainage Fee is to provide funding for the expansion of the City's storm drain collection system needed to accommodate the projected new growth. The fee is based on the amount of increased runoff a development generates and to which creek or channel the storm water drains.

#### **Definitions**

Collector Pipe: Pipes greater than eighteen inches in diameter, but less than thirty inches.  
Outfall Pipe: Pipes thirty inches or greater in diameter.

#### **Methodology**

The fee is calculated based on information contained within the 2000 Storm Drain Master Plan Integrated Document as well as the Storm Drain Nexus spreadsheets, which were incorporated and adopted in the "2001 Development Impact Fee Analysis and Recommendations" (Nexus Study). The Storm Drain Master Plan methodology included the establishment of storm drain tributary areas based on the creek or channel watershed (Basin) within the City's sphere of influence. There are eight Basins within the City's sphere of influence, which are Butte Creek, Comanche Creek, Little Chico Creek, Big Chico Creek, Lindo Channel, Pleasant Valley Ditch, Shasta Union Drainage Assessment District Ditch (S.U.D.A.D.), and Mud / Sycamore Creeks. An inventory of existing storm drain facilities was then performed. The pipe sizes and lengths were calculated for each tributary area and the number of drop inlets and manholes were also

counted. The need for additional facilities came from the Brown and Caldwell study, "Preliminary Storm Drainage Master Plan", dated August 13, 1987, which was adopted by the Chico City Council (with the Master Plan's September 15, 1997 Addendum) by Resolution No. 31 00-01.

Once the existing and proposed facilities were determined, a total system value for each Basin was calculated. The total system value is based on pipe sizes greater than 18 inches in diameter. Comanche Creek, Little Chico Creek, and Big Chico Creek Basins had separate total system values based on two components, collectors and outfalls versus all other costs. This was a result of these Basins having tributary areas that are subject to fees only associated with water quality and attenuation facilities. This factor causes varying values for the Basin's CA, represented by the area (A) multiplied by the runoff coefficient (C). Simply stated, a CA is the runoff coefficient multiplied by the area. The runoff coefficient is a number that represents how much water will leave a developed site and drain into the storm drain system. A runoff coefficient of zero indicates that no water runoff will leave a given area, while a runoff coefficient of one means all the water will leave the area. The storm drain system is designed in part by knowing the area (A) that drains to the storm drain facility and the runoff coefficient (C) for that same area. Since the area (A) and the runoff coefficient (C) determine the size of the storm drain system required, it is therefore equitable to distribute the costs based on the CA.

The Storm Drainage Facility Fees are calculated by taking the cost of Allocation to Development Impact Fees per each Basin (shown in Appendix B), and applying the assumed one percent (1%) Administrative / GIS Fee proportionally to each tributary area within the Basin. This results in a total Basin cost which can then be equally allotted between the Basin's CA, creating a per acre cost for each Basin. The per acre cost can then be used to apply each land use's runoff coefficient (0.5 for Single Family, 0.75 for Multiple Family, and 0.8 for Commercial and Industrial) to calculate the recommended fee.

### **Recommended Fees**

Using the methodology described above, Table 6.1 A illustrates the method used to derive each Basin's per acre cost. Table 6.1 B shows the fees proposed for each land use type per each Storm Drainage Basin, using the Basin's per acre cost.

**Table 6.1 A  
Storm Drainage Facility Development Impact Fees (Fund 309)**

Storm Drainage Facility Administrative / GIS Fee = **\$1,786,275**  
 Storm Drainage Facility Update Nexus Study = **\$183,000**  
 Storm Drainage Facility Allocated to Fees = **\$180,596,812**

Drainage Area Number	Drainage Area	Admin / GIS Component Per Basin	Update Nexus Study	Total Basin Cost	Basin's CA	Per Acre Cost
770	Butte Creek Basin	\$12,868	\$1,318	\$1,301,014	68.62	\$18,959
771	<u>Comanche Creek Basin</u>					
	Collector and Outfalls =	\$149,091	\$15,278	\$15,073,424	1,287.99	\$11,703
	All Other Costs =	\$107,175	\$10,983	\$10,835,703	1,342.23	\$8,073
	<b>Total =</b>	<b>\$256,266</b>	<b>\$26,261</b>	<b>\$25,909,127</b>		<b>\$19,776</b>
772	<u>Little Chico Creek Basin</u>					
	Collector and Outfalls =	\$152,914	\$15,666	\$15,459,964	1,585.45	\$9,751
	All Other Costs =	\$294,348	\$30,157	\$29,759,296	2,522.88	\$11,796
	<b>Total =</b>	<b>\$447,262</b>	<b>\$45,823</b>	<b>\$45,219,260</b>		<b>\$21,547</b>
773	<u>Big Chico Creek Basin</u>					
	Collector and Outfalls =	\$80,214	\$8,222	\$8,109,786	709.52	\$11,430
	All Other Costs =	\$33,515	\$3,435	\$3,388,427	731.10	\$4,635
	<b>Total =</b>	<b>\$113,728</b>	<b>\$11,657</b>	<b>\$11,498,213</b>		<b>\$16,065</b>
774	Lindo Channel Basin	\$371,569	\$38,064	\$37,566,543	1,916.59	\$19,602
775	S.U.D.A.D. Ditch Basin	\$217,539	\$22,289	\$21,993,772	1,286.47	\$17,097
776	Mud-Sycamore Creek Basin	\$244,083	\$24,998	\$24,677,356	1,658.69	\$14,878
777	Pleasant Valley Ditch Basin	\$122,960	\$12,590	\$12,431,527	589.61	\$21,084
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$1,786,275</b>	<b>\$183,000</b>	<b>\$180,596,812</b>		

**Notes:**

Figures are calculated using non-rounded data. Calculations using rounded data printed on these tables may result in differences.

Comanche Creek, Little Chico Creek, and Big Chico Creek Basins have been separated into two components as these basins have tributary areas which will install outfalls or have overland flow and, therefore, are only subject to storm drain fees associated with water quality / attenuation facilities - this results in different CA values.

Each Basin's CA value originates from the Storm Drain Nexus spreadsheets, which was incorporated into the "2001 Development Impact Fee Analysis and Recommendations" (Nexus Study).

Administrative / GIS Fee Component is calculated at 1% of the Basin's Allocation to Development Impact Fees as shown on Appendix B.

Update Nexus Study Component is calculated using the Basin's proportion of the total Storm Drainage Facility Allocated to Fees and applying it towards the 20 year cost to annually update the Nexus Study.

**Table 6.1 B  
Storm Drainage Facility Development Impact Fees (Fund 309)**

<b>Drainage Area Number</b>	<b>Drainage Area</b>	<b>Per Acre Cost</b>	<b>Single Family Residential Per Acre Cost (0.5 runoff coefficient)</b>	<b>Multiple Family Residential Per Acre Cost (0.75 runoff coefficient)</b>	<b>Commercial and Industrial Per Acre Cost (0.8 runoff coefficient)</b>
770	Butte Creek	\$18,959	\$9,479	\$14,219	\$15,167
771	Comanche Creek	\$19,776	\$9,888	\$14,832	\$15,821
772	Little Chico Creek	\$21,547	\$10,774	\$16,160	\$17,238
773	Big Chico Creek	\$16,065	\$8,032	\$12,048	\$12,852
774	Lindo Channel	\$19,602	\$9,801	\$14,701	\$15,681
775	S. U. D. A. D. Ditch	\$17,097	\$8,548	\$12,822	\$13,677
776	Mud-Sycamore Creek	\$14,878	\$7,439	\$11,159	\$11,903
777	Pleasant Valley Ditch	\$21,084	\$10,542	\$15,813	\$16,868

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bartle Wells Associates, Independent Public Finance Advisors, "City of Chico Draft Wastewater Revenue Program", September 1996

Brown and Caldwell, Consulting Engineers, "Final Report - Sanitary Sewer Master Plan - City of Chico", December 20, 1985

Brown and Caldwell Storm Drain Master Plan 1986

Carollo Engineers, "City of Chico Sanitary Sewer Master Plan Update Report, Final Draft", March 2003

Carollo Engineers, "Water Pollution Control Plant Facilities Plan Update Report", May 2005

California Government Code, "Fees for Development Projects", Sections 66000 et. seq.

California Government Code, "Park and Recreational Purposes", Sections 66477 et. seq.

Chico Municipal Code: Title 3 Revenue and Finance, and Title 15 Water and Sewers

City of Chico, "2000 City of Chico Storm Drainage Master Plan Integrated Document"

Dyett, Blayney, Urban and Regional Planners, et. al., "City of Chico General Plan", Nov. 1994

Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. (EPS), "Revised Final Report – Chico/CARD Area Park Fee Nexus Study", Adopted by Chico City Council on December 2, 2003

Konrad-Rae & Associates, "Final Report - Development Impact Fee and Nexus Report - City of Chico", November 10, 1993

Nicholas, James C., "The Calculation of Proportionate-Share Impact Fees", Planning Advisory Service, American Planning Association, July 1988

Regional and Economic Sciences, "Development Impact Fees Analysis and Recommendations," January 27, 1997

Various City of Chico File Materials

### Various Interviews with City of Chico staff:

David Burkland, City Manager; John Rucker, Assistant City Manager;

Fritz McKinley, Building and Development Services Director;

Tom Varga, Capital Project Services Director; Bob Greenlaw, Senior Civil Engineer;

Quené Hansen, Projects Manager

## APPENDIX A - GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND PHRASES

The terms and phrases used in this report have the following meanings related to its context. Where appropriate, cross-references to other sources are included.

### **AB 1600**

Section 66000 et. seq. (“Fees for Development Projects”) of the California Government Code. AB 1600 sets the “ground rules” for the adoption of fees (including development impact fees) by California local agencies.

### **Administrative (Municipal) Building**

The structure housing the principal headquarters for the city’s administrative offices and departments located at 411 Main Street in the Chico Municipal Center.

### **Average Daily Water Flow (ADWF)**

The generally accepted (based on engineering analysis) discharge rates of wastewater from various Land Use Type premises.

### **Basic Park Facilities**

As used in the context of this report, Neighborhood Parks, Community Parks and related Specialized Parks.

### **Bidwell Park**

The 3,600-acre regional park owned and operated by the city of Chico.

### **Bikeway Improvements**

Various bicycle facilities including bicycle routes, lanes and paths. As used in the context of this report, Bikeway Improvements refer to Class I Bicycle Paths, defined below.

### **Buildout**

The ultimate stage of development of the Chico Planning Area as contemplated in the Chico General Plan. The Plan’s base year is 1992. Rather than specifying a fixed date for buildout, the Plan assumes a ten-year range from 2007 to 2017. For the purposes of this report, RES assumed that buildout will occur in twenty years in 2012.

### **Chico Municipal Code (CMC)**

The codified ordinances and resolutions of the city of Chico as previously published by Book Publishing Company and currently published by the City Attorney.

### **Chico Planning Area (CPA)**

The planning boundaries established for the city in the Chico General Plan.

### **Class I Bicycle Path**

An improved path physically separated from a roadway and restricted to use by bicycles and pedestrians.



**Collector Pipes**

Storm drain pipes greater than 18” in diameter, but less than 30” in diameter.

**Community Parks**

Parks which serve an area of the community or the entire community greater than a localized neighborhood park and providing a broad range of park and recreational facilities.

**Development Impact Fees**

A monetary exaction, other than a tax or special assessment, which is charged by a local agency to the applicant in connection with approval of a development project. (**Government Code 66000 (b)**)

**Development Project**

Any project undertaken for the purpose of development (**Government Code 66000 (a)**).

**Floor Area Ratio (FAR)**

The ratio between gross floor area of structures on a site and gross site area. (**General Plan**)

**General Plan**

The General Plan of the City of Chico as adopted by “Resolution No. 82 94-95 Resolution of the City Council of the City of Chico Adopting the Comprehensive Update of the General Plan of November 16, 1994 and Repealing the Existing City of Chico General Plan Adopted on July 6, 1976 adopted November 16, 1994”

**Infrastructure**

Permanent utility (**public facility**) installations, including (**but not limited to**) roads, water supply lines, sewage collection pipes, and power and communications lines. (**General Plan - bold-face annotations by RES**)

**Land Use Types**

The several classifications and sub-classifications of land use shown in the General Plan.

**Local Agency**

A county, city, whether general law or chartered, city and county, school district, special district, authority, agency, any other municipal public corporation or district, or other political subdivision of the state. (**Government Code 66000 (c)**)

**Neighborhood Parks**

A limited park and/or recreational facility serving a localized neighborhood area.

**Nexus**

In the context of this report, the establishment of a rational and demonstrable relationship between a development impact fee and the projects proposed to be funded by it.

**Outfall Pipe**

Storm drain pipes 30” or greater in diameter.

**Planning Period**

The time span (fifteen to twenty-five years) contemplated by the General Plan from its base year of 1992. As noted above (See “Buildout”), RES used a twenty year period (1992 to 2012) for the purposes of this report.

**Public Facilities**

Public improvements, public services and community amenities. **(Government Code 66000 (d))**

**Regional Parks**

A large park and/or recreational facility containing diverse facilities serving an area significantly larger than those served by neighborhood or community parks.

**Specialized Parks**

A park and/or recreational facility containing limited or specialized facilities such as a seniors’ complex, a swimming facility, tennis courts, etc.

**Street Facilities**

Streets, street lighting systems, traffic signals, drainage facilities, appurtenant street furnishings, landscaping, etc.

**Street Maintenance Equipment**

Heavy motorized street construction and/or maintenance equipment such as rollers, graders, earthmoving equipment, underground facilities maintenance equipment, etc.

**Transportation Facilities**

The components of the jurisdiction’s transportation system such as street facilities, bicycle facilities, etc.

**Trunk Line (Sewer) Collection System**

The system of major sewer lines which serves as the transmission system for wastewater from local area sewer mains to a wastewater treatment facility. As used in this report, trunk line sewers are those in excess of ten inches diameter.

**Water Pollution Control Plant**

The city’s wastewater treatment facility located on River Road approximately five miles westerly of Chico. The Plant is designated as a “centralized treatment facility” for the Chico Urban Area under the provisions of Federal/State Clean Water Laws.

APPENDIX B

PROJECT LISTING - 1994 through 2014

Project Description	Estimated Cost	Allocation Factor Development Impact Fees	Allocation Development Impact Fees Cost	Allocation Factor Other Funding	Allocation Other Funding Sources Cost	Comments
<b>Street Facility Improvement</b>						
1996-97 Interest Expense to Fund 308	96,043	1.00	96,043	0.00	0	Interest expense added to fund balance
20th Street - Forest to Bruce	1,498,917	0.42	629,545	0.58	869,372	Widen roadway to 4 lanes with landscaped median, extra depth.
20th St/Notre Dame Traffic Signal	247,766	1.00	247,766	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
Annual Nexus Update	540,000	1.00	540,000	0.00	0	Update Nexus Study Annually for 20 Years
Bruce/Humboldt Roads Traffic Signal	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
Bruce/Lakewest Dr Traffic Signal	149,852	1.00	149,852	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation. Completed.
Bruce/Sierra Sunrise Terrace TS	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
Bruce Rd - Skyway to SHR 32	16,418,523	0.41	6,731,594	0.59	9,686,928	ROW/Widen roadway and bridge to 4 lanes, landscaped median.
Ceanothus - East to Eaton	2,740,763	0.20	548,153	0.80	2,192,611	Reconstruction.
Center Street, Esplanade to Powerline	2,369,203	1.00	2,369,203	0.00	0	Construction of roadway per the North West Chico Specific Plan (NWCSP).
Center St / Esplanade Traffic Signal	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
CMA West Side Access	9,624,849	0.70	6,737,394	0.30	2,887,455	New street, bridges and access to airport. EDA grant funds.
Cohasset / Parmac Traffic Signal	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
Cohasset Road Sidewalk	53,700	1.00	53,700	0.00	0	Extend sidewalk from East Avenue to Oakmont Retirement Home. Completed
Cohasset Road Widening	8,340,512	0.60	5,004,307	0.40	3,336,205	Reconstruct Cohasset Rd from Sycamore Creek to Ryan Ave including the intersections at Airpark Blvd., the compost facility, and Boeing Ave. CP 12066.
E 1st/Mangrove Intersection Improvements	945,903	0.37	349,984	0.63	595,919	ROW/Intersection improvements. CMAQ. CP11057.
E 1st Avenue Pedestrian Refuge	29,840	1.00	29,840	0.00	0	Install pedestrian refuge at E 1st Ave-part of reconstruction. Completed.
East Fifth Avenue Reconstruction	5,824,721	0.16	931,955	0.84	4,892,766	Roadway reconstruction/storm drainage installation from Esplanade to SHR 99.
East - SHR 32 to Cussick	5,760,825	0.61	3,514,103	0.39	2,246,722	Reconstruct roadway and widen to 4 lanes. CP90098.
East-W of Cussick to Esplanade	2,820,498	0.72	2,030,758	0.28	789,739	Reconstruction.
	100,815	1.00	100,815	0.00	0	CP00851 design reconstruction of curb gutter and sidewalk. Completed.
East / Guynn Ave Traffic Signal	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
East / Alamo Ave Traffic Signal	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
East / Albertson's Traffic Signal	164,278	1.00	164,278	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation. (Reimbursement Agreement) Completed.
East Ave / Cactus Ave Traffic Signal	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
East Ave Intersection Realignment	104,656	1.00	104,656	0.00	0	Study for realignment of East and/Eaton/Manzanita. Completed.
East Avenue -Esplanade to SHR 99	983,687	0.79	777,113	0.21	206,574	Design and construct 2 way left turn lane and install sanitary sewer. Completed.
East - Cohasset to Ceanothus	5,794,427	0.58	3,360,768	0.42	2,433,660	Reconstruct roadway.
East - SHR 99 to Cohasset	2,515,501	0.84	2,113,021	0.16	402,480	Reconstruct roadway.

APPENDIX B

PROJECT LISTING - 1994 through 2014

Project Description	Estimated Cost	Allocation Factor Development Impact Fees	Allocation Development Impact Fees Cost	Allocation Factor Other Funding	Allocation Other Funding Sources Cost	Comments
East Ave/Cohasset Rd Intersection	2,037,107	0.56	1,140,780	0.44	896,327	ROW/Intersection improvements. CMAQ CP10113
East Ave Recon - Ceanothus to Bidwell Vista	5,941,838	0.64	3,802,776	0.36	2,139,062	ROW, reconstruction of East Ave. SB 45 (STIP) CP 18041
East Ave Pedestrian Improvements	77,187	1.00	77,187	0.00	0	Complete urban improvements. Completed.
East Park - Midway to Whitman	1,777,398	0.72	1,279,727	0.28	497,672	Widen East Park Ave to provide four lanes.
East Park Avenue and SHR 99	414,374	1.00	414,374	0.00	0	Acquire ROW for future interchange. Completed.
East Park Avenue Reconstruction	378,193	1.00	378,193	0.00	0	Reconstruct from Carmichael to The Skyway interchange bridge.
E. 20th Street / Forest Avenue	1,355,333	1.00	1,355,333	0.00	0	Reconfigure and add lanes.
Eaton Rd Widening & Recon.	888,451	1.00	888,451	0.00	0	PSE.
Eaton - SHR 32 to 99	39,731,527	0.50	19,865,763	0.50	19,865,763	Design and construct 2 lane expressway with median.
Eaton - Hicks Lane to PV Ditch	6,229,772	0.41	2,554,206	0.59	3,675,565	Design and construction, 4 lanes and median.
Eaton-Foothill Park Subdivision-Cohasset	17,075,164	0.52	8,879,085	0.48	8,196,079	ROW/Construct 4 lane roadway with landscaped median.
Eaton Road Extension	4,290,578	0.53	2,274,007	0.47	2,016,572	From realigned East/Manzanita/Wildwood/Eaton intersection to Foothill Park East Subdivision.
Eaton / Burnap Ave Traffic Signal	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
Eaton / Ceanothus Traffic Signal	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
Eaton / Floral Ave Traffic Signal	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
Eaton / Lexington Traffic Signal	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
Eaton / Marigold Traffic Signal	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
Eaton / Mariposa Traffic Signal	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
El Monte / Humboldt Traffic Signal	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
Esplanade-Shasta to 1.5 Miles North	7,901,876	0.30	2,370,563	0.70	5,531,313	Design and construction, widen roadway.
Esplanade / Henshaw Traffic Signal	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
Esplanade / Rio Lindo TS	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
Esplanade / Shasta Traffic Signal	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation. Development/reimbursement agreement.
Esplanade and East Avenue Intersection Reconstruction	2,471,239	0.58	1,433,319	0.42	1,037,921	Reconstruction of intersection to increase capacity. CMAQ CP10148.
Esplanade Widening - Aspen Glen Subdivision to Commercial St	69,751	1.00	69,751	0.00	0	Widen east side between Aspen Glen Subdivision. and Commercial Avenue. Completed.
Floral - Lassen to East Avenues	1,874,986	0.74	1,387,489	0.26	487,496	Construct landscaped median.
Forest - SHR 32 to E 8th Street	383,519	1.00	383,519	0.00	0	Two-lane street with curbs, gutters, sidewalks and storm drain.
Forest Avenue / Humboldt Road TS	295,892	1.00	295,892	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation. CP12047.
Forest Ave / Springfield Dr Traffic Signal	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
Forest Widening-Humboldt to SR32	457,037	1.00	457,037	0.00	0	Widen and reconstruct west side of Forest Avenue. CP19030
Garner - Esplanade to Urban Limits	5,044,388	0.60	3,026,633	0.40	2,017,755	Reconstruct with bicycle lanes. Developers or CSA 87.

APPENDIX B

PROJECT LISTING - 1994 through 2014

Project Description	Estimated Cost	Allocation Factor Development Impact Fees	Allocation Development Impact Fees Cost	Allocation Factor Other Funding	Allocation Other Funding Sources Cost	Comments
Hegan Lane - Otterson Intersection	177,690	1.00	177,690	0.00	0	Otterson Dr "No Project" alternative.
Hegan Lane Reconstruction	733,400	1.00	733,400	0.00	0	Reconstruct from Midway to UPRR tracks. City & County project.
Hicks - Eaton to Keefer Rd	6,173,265	0.69	4,259,553	0.31	1,913,712	Reconstruct 2 lanes with bicycle lanes. Developers or CSA 87.
Holly Ave - W 11th to Sequoyah	674,326	0.30	202,298	0.70	472,028	Reconstruction.
Holly/Warner - 6th to 11th Ave	1,562,535	0.14	218,755	0.86	1,343,780	Reconstruction.
Humboldt -Forest to Bruce	1,611,058	0.35	563,870	0.65	1,047,188	Widen and reconstruct, new bridge.
Humboldt - Bruce to Power Lines	5,804,076	0.23	1,334,937	0.77	4,469,139	
Industrial Park Connection SW Chico	1,785,194	1.00	1,785,194	0.00	0	Intersection reconstruction.
	255,663	1.00	255,663	0.00	0	EIR for Otterson Drive extension. Completed.
Ivy Street	11,846	1.00	11,846	0.00	0	Reconstruction. (Hayes Reimbursement, not to exceed \$10,000) Completed.
Lassen / Eaton Ave Traffic Signal	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
Lassen / Floral Ave Traffic Signal	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
Manzanita Ave Corridor Reconstruction	7,304,992	0.58	4,236,895	0.42	3,068,097	Reconstruct. CP19012.
Manzanita / Floral Traffic Signal	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
Manzanita / Hooker Oak Aver Traffic Signal	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
Manzanita / Mariposa TS	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
Manzanita / Vallombrosa Ave TS	388,114	1.00	388,114	0.00	0	Includes intersection improvements, ROW not included.
Marigold - East to Eaton	2,252,679	0.69	1,554,349	0.31	698,331	Reconstruction.
Marigold - East 270' north	195,978	1.00	195,978	0.00	0	Reconstruction. CP13007.
Mariposa - East to Eaton	153,110	1.00	153,110	0.00	0	Reconstruction.
Midway - Hegan to Park Avenue	17,198	1.00	17,198	0.00	0	CP 00853 1999/00 Completed.
	2,107,406	1.00	2,107,406	0.00	0	Reconstruct Midway between E Park Ave and Hegan Lane including installation of remaining curb, gutter, sidewalk, storm drain, sanitary sewer, street lights, and landscaping.
Notre Dame Median-Forest to E 20	851,115	1.00	851,115	0.00	0	Landscaped median design and construction.
Notre Dame-LCC to E 20th Street	3,145,631	0.00	0	1.00	3,145,631	New street and bridge - Little Chico Creek.
Notre Dame-Humboldt to LCC	2,156,939	0.66	1,423,579	0.34	733,359	Construct to bridge. CP 00813. Other Funding Source: CUSD.
Potter - Diversion Channel/ LCC	1,901,159	1.00	1,901,159	0.00	0	Construct bridges at Diversion Channel and Little Chico Creek
Sacramento / Columbus Ave TS	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
Salem / W 5th Street Traffic Signal	273,828	1.00	273,828	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
Sheridan - E 1st to Vallombrosa	2,191,556	1.00	2,191,556	0.00	0	Reconstruct/Storm drainage installation.
Skyway / Potter Rd Traffic Signal	412,707	1.00	412,707	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
Skyway / Zanella Avenue TS	412,707	1.00	412,707	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
Traffic Counters	5,800	1.00	5,800	0.00	0	Purchase four traffic counters. Completed.
Update Traffic Model	296,150	1.00	296,150	0.00	0	

**APPENDIX B**

**PROJECT LISTING - 1994 through 2014**

Project Description	Estimated Cost	Allocation Factor Development Impact Fees	Allocation Development Impact Fees Cost	Allocation Factor Other Funding	Allocation Other Funding Sources Cost	Comments
Vallombrosa Avenue Design	25,356	1.00	25,356	0.00	0	Professional services to provide scenic road standards. CP21169.
Vallombrosa Ave Reconstruction	888,451	0.59	524,186	0.41	364,265	PSE.
W 8th Avenue/ Esplanade - SHR 32	5,834,665	0.64	3,734,185	0.36	2,100,479	Reconstruct, widen. CP10011.
W 11th Avenue - Holly to Ramsey	265,255	1.00	265,255	0.00	0	Reconstruction.
West Lassen - Esplanade to Cussick	580,342	0.48	278,564	0.52	301,778	Reconstruction.
Warfield Bridge-Little Chico Creek	888,451	1.00	888,451	0.00	0	Reconstruct bridge over diversion channel.
Whitney / Cohasset Road TS	247,766	1.00	247,766	0.00	0	Traffic signal installation.
<b>STATE HIGHWAY PROJECTS</b>						
SHR 32 - Glenwood Traffic Signal	348,270	0.50	174,135	0.50	174,135	Traffic Signal Installation. State Highway Funding CP13043.
SHR 32 - Oak Way Traffic Signal	348,270	0.50	174,135	0.50	174,135	Traffic Signal Installation. State Highway Funding. CP13042.
SHR 32 / W 8th and 9th at Walnut	495,534	0.50	247,767	0.50	247,767	Traffic signal installation. State Highway Funding.
SHR 32 / W 8th and 9th at Ivy	495,534	0.50	247,767	0.50	247,767	Traffic signal installation. State Highway Funding.
SHR 32 Widening	15,873,657	1.00	15,873,657	0.00	0	Widen SHR 32 to four (4) lanes from Fir Street to Yosemite Drive.
SHR 32 / Yosemite Traffic Signal	273,828	0.50	136,914	0.50	136,914	Traffic signal installation. State Highway Funding.
SHR 99 / Estates Drive Intersection	412,707	0.00	0	1.00	412,707	Traffic signal installation. State Highway Funding. Completed.
SHR 99 / Southgate Ave Intersection	284,304	0.31	88,845	0.69	195,459	Traffic signal installation. State Highway Funding and Butte Co. Completed.
SHR 99 Frontage Roads - Southgate Ave. to Skyway	4,191,138	1.00	4,191,138	0.00	0	Construct frontage roads (East and West Sides) and Edgar Slough Bridges.
SHR 99 / Skyway Interchange	3,041,642	1.00	3,041,642	0.00	0	Reconfigure ramps to increase capacity and reconstruct west side.
SHR 99 / Skyway Interchange Design	458,807	1.00	458,807	0.00	0	Completion of plans, specifications, and estimate for the interchange modifications to create four lanes crossing SHR 99 at Skyway. CP00106
SHR 99 Auxiliary Lanes - Park/Skyway to East 20th St.	3,316,884	1.00	3,316,884	0.00	0	Construct auxiliary lanes to the outside.
SHR 99 Auxiliary Lanes - East 20th St. to SHR 32	7,344,528	1.00	7,344,528	0.00	0	Construct auxiliary lanes to the outside.
SHR 99 Auxiliary Lanes - SHR 32 to East 1st Ave.	10,726,600	0.00	0	1.00	10,726,600	Funded by BCAG - Widening to the inside.
SHR 99 Auxiliary Lanes - East 1st Ave. to Cohasset Rd.	0	1.00	0	0.00	0	Placeholder; construct auxiliary lanes to the outside
SHR 99 / 20th Street Interchange	5,923,006	1.00	5,923,006	0.00	0	Reconfigure / reconstruct ramps to increase capacity. Includes roadway improvements on East 20th Street from Whitman Avenue to the entrance of Chico Mall; additional estimate pending appropriate analysis.
SHR 99 / Cohasset Rd Interchange	1,954,592	1.00	1,954,592	0.00	0	PSE.
SHR 99 - East Avenue Interchange	0	1.00	0	0.00	0	Placeholder;construct additional off-ramp left turn lanes (midterm)
SHR 99 - Eaton Interchange (Short Term)	1,421,522	1.00	1,421,522	0.00	0	Install signals at ramp intersections.

APPENDIX B

PROJECT LISTING - 1994 through 2014

Project Description	Estimated Cost	Allocation Factor Development Impact Fees	Allocation Development Impact Fees Cost	Allocation Factor Other Funding	Allocation Other Funding Sources Cost	Comments
SHR 99 - Eaton Interchange (Long Term)	3,553,804	1.00	3,553,804	0.00	0	PSE.
SHR 99 - Eaton Interchange (Long Term - Construction)	2,132,282	1.00	2,132,282	0.00	0	Replace overcrossing with a 5-lane structure, construct new on-ramps, reconstruct off-ramps, re-align Hicks Lane with Silverbell Rd.
SHR 99 - Garner Lane	0	1.00	0	0.00	0	Placeholder; extend 4 lanes from Mud Creek to Garner Lane. Construct additional lanes at intersection.
SHR 99 - Garner Lane Interchange	0	1.00	0	0.00	0	Placeholder; prepare Project Study Report/Project Report
Administrative / GIS Fee	2,865,761	1.00	2,865,761	0.00	0	GIS costs as well as Building & Finance admin costs.
<b>Subtotal - Street Facility Improvement</b>	<b>289,441,835</b>		<b>180,566,609</b>		<b>108,875,225</b>	
<b>Adjustment - TEA Funding</b>			<b>(5,500,000)</b>		<b>5,500,000</b>	Credit for receipt of Federal Transportation Enhancement Act funding from County of Butte Per Agreement.
<b>Adjustment - RDA Funding</b>			<b>(12,800,000)</b>		<b>12,800,000</b>	Assume approx. 1/3 of Merged RDA funds available for capital projects (\$8 million) and previously allocated \$3.3 million for CMA Westside Development. \$1.5 million for SHR 32 Widening from Fir Street to Yosemite Drive.
<b>Adjustment - CMAQ Funding</b>			<b>(6,600,000)</b>		<b>6,600,000</b>	Credit for receipt Federal Congestion Management and Air Quality program funding for intersection operational improvements.
<b>Grand Total - Street Facility Improvement</b>	<b>289,441,835</b>		<b>155,666,609</b>		<b>133,775,225</b>	
<b>Street Maintenance Equipment</b>						
Aerial Lift #2	82,885	0.59	48,902	0.41	33,983	Purchase completed in 2003-04.
Aerial Lift Signal Maintenance	68,489	0.59	40,409	0.41	28,081	Completed in 1996-97.
Annual Nexus Update	42,000	1.00	42,000	0.00	0	Update Nexus Study Annually for 20 Years
Collection Sys TV Inspection Van	117,946	0.59	69,588	0.41	48,358	
3-Ton Dump Trucks (2)	221,026	0.59	130,405	0.41	90,621	
Jet Rodder #2	241,228	0.59	142,325	0.41	98,904	Purchase completed in 2003-04.
Jet Rodder #3	215,501	0.59	127,145	0.41	88,355	
Loader #5	116,627	0.59	68,810	0.41	47,817	
MSC - Building 400 Storage Area	310,343	0.59	183,102	0.41	127,241	Structure.
MSC-Covered Material Storage	124,364	0.59	73,375	0.41	50,989	Structure.
MSC - Heavy Equipment Storage	521,374	0.59	307,611	0.41	213,764	Structure.
MSC - Light Equipment Storage	639,305	0.59	377,190	0.41	262,115	Structure.
MSC - Wash Rack	124,137	0.59	73,241	0.41	50,896	Structure.
MSC Bldg Expansion/Remodel #1	608,252	0.59	358,869	0.41	249,383	Add 2,500 sq. ft. to bldg. 100
MSC Bldg Expansion/Remodel #2	301,853	0.59	178,093	0.41	123,760	Add 5,000 sq. ft. to bldg. 200 and 300.

**APPENDIX B**

**PROJECT LISTING - 1994 through 2014**

Project Description	Estimated Cost	Allocation Factor Development Impact Fees	Allocation Development Impact Fees Cost	Allocation Factor Other Funding	Allocation Other Funding Sources Cost	Comments
MSC Bldg Expansion/Remodel #3	603,707	0.59	356,187	0.41	247,520	Add 5,000 sq. ft. to bldg. 200 and 300.
NV - Packer Trucks	44,205	0.59	26,081	0.41	18,124	Purchase completed in 1996-97
Patch Truck #3	120,517	0.59	71,105	0.41	49,412	Purchase completed in 2001-02.
Street Sweepers (3)	414,424	0.59	244,510	0.41	169,914	Purchase 3 street sweepers (2003-04, 2006-07, & 2007-08).
Site Acquisition-Expansion of MSC	2,050,000	0.59	1,209,500	0.41	840,500	Acquire property. Expand MSC at existing site.
Water Truck	101,451	0.59	59,856	0.41	41,595	To be used for public right-of-way maintenance. CP #28018
Administrative / GIS Fee	70,696	1.00	70,696	0.00	0	GIS costs as well as Building & Finance admin costs.
<b>Grand Total - Street Maintenance Equipment</b>	<b>7,140,332</b>		<b>4,259,001</b>		<b>2,881,330</b>	
<b>Bikeway Improvement</b>						
<b>COMPLETED PROJECTS</b>						
1997-98 Interest Expense to Fund 305	12,188	1.00	12,188	0.00	0	Interest expense added to fund balance.
1998-99 Interest Expense to Fund 305	12,624	1.00	12,624	0.00	0	Interest expense added to fund balance.
Annual Nexus Update	80,000	1.00	80,000	0.00	0	Update Nexus Study Annually for 20 Years
Bridge across Lindo Channel/Ceres	774,248	0.29	224,532	0.71	549,716	Bike bridge at Ceres Ave. Prop. 116. Completed.
Bicycle Path - Springfield to LCC	65,064	0.00	0	1.00	65,064	Bike path from E 20th to Little Chico Creek. Transit, Fund 859. Completed.
California Park Bike Path	83,922	0.10	8,392	0.90	75,530	Completed.
Chico High Bike Path	22,377	1.00	22,377	0.00	0	Construct path across High School. Completed.
LCC to 20th St Park	434,784	1.00	434,784	0.00	0	Construct Class 1 bike path. CP 12058. Completed.
Little Chico Creek Bike Path	575,854	0.17	97,895	0.83	477,959	Construct Class 1 bike path. Completed.
Madrone Bridge at Lindo Channel	585,062	0.00	0	1.00	585,062	Construct Class 1 bike path. Completed.
Midway -E Park Ave to Hegan Lane	580,932	0.45	261,419	0.55	319,513	Connect to existing Butte County path. RDA, Transit. Completed
Sheridan/ Madrone Ave-Bidwell Park	182,161	1.00	182,161	0.00	0	Construct in Bidwell Park to connect to sts and Forest Ave. Completed.
South Park Drive Bike Path	24,441	1.00	24,441	0.00	0	Construct path along South Park Drive. Completed.
<b>UNCOMPLETED PROJECTS</b>						
8th Avenue - 6th Avenue	264,758	1.00	264,758	0.00	0	Class 1 bike path connecting Warner and Holly.
Annie's Glen Tunnel	693,939	1.00	693,939	0.00	0	Undercrossing at Pine and Cypress Streets. This project has the potential to be phased.
Esplanade - SHR 32 Bike Path	1,776,902	1.00	1,776,902	0.00	0	Construct Class 1 path adjacent to new arterial street.
Humboldt, Bruce Rd. to SHR 32	748,579	1.00	748,579	0.00	0	Construct Class 1 path next to Humboldt Road.
Lombard Lane Access	193,090	1.00	193,090	0.00	0	Construct bike path from SHR 99 to Lombard Lane. Project will require Caltrans Encroachment Permit.
One Mile Rec Area - New Bridge	364,857	1.00	364,857	0.00	0	Install new bridge down stream from existing bridge.



**APPENDIX B**

**PROJECT LISTING - 1994 through 2014**

Project Description	Estimated Cost	Allocation Factor Development Impact Fees	Allocation Development Impact Fees Cost	Allocation Factor Other Funding	Allocation Other Funding Sources Cost	Comments
Potter Road Bike Path	453,750	1.00	453,750	0.00	0	Construct Class 1 bike path along Potter Road alignment, Warfield to the Skyway.
SHR 99 - Garner to Panama	1,373,326	1.00	1,373,326	0.00	0	Requires crossing of Eaton Rd.
SHR 99 - Humboldt to Skyway	251,502	1.00	251,502	0.00	0	ROW may be required.
SHR 99 Path - Little Chico Creek to Community Park	733,594	1.00	733,594	0.00	0	Construct Class I path, connecting existing undercrossing of SHR 99.
Skyway - SPRR ROW Class I Path	306,516	1.00	306,516	0.00	0	Construct Class I path on existing levee.
Sycamore Creek Path 1	521,225	1.00	521,225	0.00	0	Construct Class 1 bike path. CP 13046. Wildwood to Marigold.
Sycamore Creek Path 2	485,687	1.00	485,687	0.00	0	Construct Class 1 bike path. CP 14014 Marigold to Cohasset.
Sycamore Creek Path - Cohasset Road to Muir Avenue	1,842,840	1.00	1,842,840	0.00	0	Construct Class I bike path. Cohasset to Muir.
20th Street to Chapman School Bike Path	112,294	1.00	112,294	0.00	0	Construct path connecting to SHR 99 Bike Path.
UPRR (east side) - East Avenue to Mud Creek	1,190,643	1.00	1,190,643	0.00	0	
UPRR - 9th Street to Hegan	809,568	1.00	809,568	0.00	0	
Wildwood-Golf Course to Upper Bidwell Park Road	284,890	1.00	284,890	0.00	0	Class 1 path adjacent to Wildwood, connecting to existing path.
Administrative / GIS Fee	158,416	1.00	158,416	0.00	0	GIS costs as well as Building & Finance admin costs.
<b>Subtotal - Bikeway Improvement</b>	<b>16,000,032</b>		<b>13,927,189</b>		<b>2,072,843</b>	
<b>Adjustment - Grant Funds</b>			<b>(4,407,933)</b>		<b>4,407,933</b>	Per Council Direction - Assumes that 41% of the cost of uncompleted projects will be covered from grant funds or other sources.
<b>Grand Total Bikeway Improvement</b>	<b>16,000,032</b>		<b>9,519,256</b>		<b>6,480,776</b>	
<b>Bidwell Park Land Acquisition</b>						
Upper Bidwell Park Land Acquisition	3,887,141	1.00	3,887,141	0.00	0	(1) Proj Need- 29.5 Ac/1K Pop X proj pop increase (to bldout-52,707). (2) '96 Cost- park est acq costs (\$2,500/Ac) X 1554.65 Ac. (per Fee Schedule 50.030).
Administrative / GIS Fee	38,871	1.00	38,871	0.00	0	GIS costs as well as Building & Finance admin costs.
<b>Grand Total - Bidwell Park Land Acquisition</b>	<b>3,926,013</b>		<b>3,926,013</b>		<b>0</b>	

**APPENDIX B**

**PROJECT LISTING - 1994 through 2014**

<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<b>Allocation Factor Development Impact Fees</b>	<b>Allocation Development Impact Fees Cost</b>	<b>Allocation Factor Other Funding</b>	<b>Allocation Other Funding Sources Cost</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Administrative Building</b>						
ADA Improvements	186,575	1.00	186,575	0.00	0	Retrofit and building repair.
Administrative Building - Chico Municipal Center	9,596,682	0.25	2,399,171	0.75	7,197,512	Existing Funding-Buildings & Facilities Capital Improvement Fund; OTHER FUNDING SOURCE: Chico Merged Redevelopment Project Area. \$4,101,192 paid from existing funds. Completed.
Interest Cost (5.2%)	1,065,795	1.00	1,065,795	0.00	0	Amortization over 20 years to pay off debt.
1996-97 Interest Expense to Fund 336	20,381	1.00	20,381	0.00	0	Interest expense added to fund balance.
1999-00 Interest Expense to Fund 336	23,416	1.00	23,416	0.00	0	Interest expense added to fund balance.
2000-01 Interest Expense to Fund 336	110,644	1.00	110,644	0.00	0	Interest expense added to fund balance.
2001-02 Interest Expense to Fund 336	72,281	1.00	72,281	0.00	0	Interest expense added to fund balance.
2002-03 Interest Expense to Fund 336	45,780	1.00	45,780	0.00	0	Interest expense added to fund balance.
2003-04 Interest Expense to Fund 336	28,095	1.00	28,095	0.00	0	Interest expense added to fund balance.
2004-05 Interest Expense to Fund 336	29,632	1.00	29,632	0.00	0	Interest expense added to fund balance.
2005-06 Interest Expense to Fund 336	47,301	1.00	47,301	0.00	0	Interest expense added to fund balance.
2006-07 Interest Expense to Fund 336	62,479	1.00	62,479	0.00	0	Interest expense added to fund balance.
Council Chamber Improvements	49,201	1.00	49,201	0.00	0	HVAC and furniture for Council Chamber. Completed.
Expansion of Conference Rm. 1	286,751	1.00	286,751	0.00	0	Additional room to accommodate media. Completed.
Administrative / GIS Fee	116,250	1.00	116,250	0.00	0	GIS costs as well as Building & Finance admin costs.
<b>Grand Total - Administrative Building</b>	<b>11,741,263</b>		<b>4,543,751</b>		<b>7,197,512</b>	
<b>Fire Protection Building and Equipment</b>						
Annual Nexus Update	58,000	1.00	58,000	0.00	0	Update Nexus Study Annually for 20 Years
Interest Cost (5.2%)	1,662,146	1.00	1,662,146	0.00	0	Amortization over 20 years to pay off debt.
Automatic Gate-Fire Training Tower	139,846	0.59	82,509	0.41	57,337	Install automatic gate. Completed.
Automatic Gate at Police Facilities	81,209	0.59	47,913	0.41	33,296	CP 10020. Completed.
1996-97 Interest Expense to Fund 337	3,953	1.00	3,953	0.00	0	Interest expense added to fund balance.
1997-98 Interest Expense to Fund 337	307	1.00	307	0.00	0	Interest expense added to fund balance.
1999-00 Interest Expense to Fund 337	37,431	1.00	37,431	0.00	0	Interest expense added to fund balance.
2000-01 Interest Expense to Fund 337	180,487	1.00	180,487	0.00	0	Interest expense added to fund balance.
2001-02 Interest Expense to Fund 337	122,015	1.00	122,015	0.00	0	Interest expense added to fund balance.
2002-03 Interest Expense to Fund 337	79,368	1.00	79,368	0.00	0	Interest expense added to fund balance.
2003-04 Interest Expense to Fund 337	53,263	1.00	53,263	0.00	0	Interest expense added to fund balance.
2004-05 Interest Expense to Fund 337	58,077	1.00	58,077	0.00	0	Interest expense added to fund balance.

APPENDIX B

PROJECT LISTING - 1994 through 2014

Project Description	Estimated Cost	Allocation Factor Development Impact Fees	Allocation Development Impact Fees Cost	Allocation Factor Other Funding	Allocation Other Funding Sources Cost	Comments
2005-06 Interest Expense to Fund 337	94,321	1.00	94,321	0.00	0	Interest expense added to fund balance.
2006-07 Interest Expense to Fund 337	123,632	1.00	123,632	0.00	0	Interest expense added to fund balance.
Fire Station No. 2	4,649,199	0.59	2,743,027	0.41	1,906,171	Replace and relocate undersized 50 year old station.
Fire Station No. 5	2,335,271	0.59	1,377,810	0.41	957,461	Construction of station and fire pumper truck. CP45032
Fire Station No. 6 Start-up	163,013	0.59	96,178	0.41	66,835	CP 11040. Completed.
Fire Station No. 6 Construction	4,649,199	0.59	2,743,027	0.41	1,906,171	CP 16025
Fire Station No. 7	6,207,431	0.59	3,662,384	0.41	2,545,047	Construction and equipment.
Fire Engine - Station 7	480,732	0.59	283,632	0.41	197,100	Purchase one fire engine.
Fire Engine - Station 7	480,732	0.59	283,632	0.41	197,100	Purchase one fire engine.
Aerial Ladder Truck - Station 7	731,597	0.59	431,642	0.41	299,955	Purchase aerial ladder truck.
Utility Vehicle - Fire Station 7	49,731	0.59	29,341	0.41	20,390	Purchase utility vehicle.
Fire Training Tower	1,881,912	0.59	1,110,328	0.41	771,584	Construct fire training tower and classroom. Completed.
Fire Training Center Improvements	64,083	0.59	37,809	0.41	26,274	Construct improvements to FTC located at 1466 Humboldt Rd. CP 17015
Fire Engine - Station 6	326,014	0.59	192,348	0.41	133,666	Purchase one fire engine.
Fire Engine - Station 6	385,163	0.59	227,246	0.41	157,917	Purchase one fire engine. CP 22101. Completed.
Administrative / GIS Fee	250,981	1.00	250,981	0.00	0	GIS costs as well as Building & Finance admin costs.
<b>Grand Total - Fire Protection Building and Equipment</b>	<b>25,349,113</b>		<b>16,072,809</b>		<b>9,276,304</b>	
<b>Police Protection Building and Equipment</b>						
2001-02 Interest Expense to Fund 338	7,514	1.00	7,514	0.00	0	Interest expense added to fund balance.
2002-03 Interest Expense to Fund 338	2,241	1.00	2,241	0.00	0	Interest expense added to fund balance.
Animal Shelter Expansion	1,946,146	0.59	1,148,226	0.41	797,920	Construction of expansion to Animal Shelter.
Animal Shelter - New	1,895,362	0.59	1,118,264	0.41	777,098	New Animal Shelter.
Annual Nexus Update	70,000	1.00	70,000	0.00	0	Update Nexus Study Annually for 20 Years
Communications radio console	55,257	0.59	32,601	0.41	22,655	Add 4th position in Public Safety Dispatch Center. Completed.
Dispatch Console	276,283	0.59	163,007	0.41	113,276	Acquire additional console for Communications Center. Completed.
Dispatch Center Upgrades	1,215,644	0.59	717,230	0.41	498,414	CP 16032.
New Police Building Site Acquisition and Construction	1,240,195	0.59	731,715	0.41	508,480	Acquisition of 1500 Humboldt for future police expansion CP 11047. Completed.
New Police Building Remodel	236,920	0.59	139,783	0.41	97,137	Funds to remodel 1500 Humboldt.
New Police Facility - Relocation - Acquisition	3,300,000	0.59	1,947,000	0.41	1,353,000	Land acquisition needed to expand ex. facility or relocate to new location.
New Police Facility - Relocation - Design	2,665,980	0.59	1,572,928	0.41	1,093,052	Planning, design, & PSE to expand ex. facility or relocate to new location.
New Police Facility - Construction	31,991,760	0.59	18,875,138	0.41	13,116,622	Construction of new facility at existing site or relocated to new location.

APPENDIX B

PROJECT LISTING - 1994 through 2014

Project Description	Estimated Cost	Allocation Factor Development Impact Fees	Allocation Development Impact Fees Cost	Allocation Factor Other Funding	Allocation Other Funding Sources Cost	Comments
Optical imaging system	143,979	0.59	84,947	0.41	59,031	Document imaging system.
Update and re-model 911 system	1,011,785	0.59	596,953	0.41	414,832	Update emergency 911 system. Completed.
Administrative / GIS Fee	460,591	1.00	460,591	0.00	0	GIS costs as well as Building & Finance admin costs.
<b>Grand Total - Police Protection Building and Equipment</b>	<b>46,519,656</b>		<b>27,668,139</b>		<b>18,851,517</b>	
<b>Sewer-WPCP Capacity</b>						
Annual Nexus Update	157,000	1.00	157,000	0.00	0	Update Nexus Study Annually for 20 Years
Outfall - WPCP	4,278,053	1.00	4,278,053	0.00	0	WPCP Expansion Outfall. Completed.
Ultra Low Flow Program - 2000-01	5,656	1.00	5,656	0.00	0	Install ultra low flow fixtures to reduce flow to plant. Completed.
Ultra Low Flow Program - 2001-02	39,025	1.00	39,025	0.00	0	Install ultra low flow fixtures to reduce flow to plant. Completed.
Ultra Low Flow Program	248,992	1.00	248,992	0.00	0	Install ultra low flow fixtures to reduce flow to plant. Completed.
Facility Expansion to 9 mgd	45,110,768	0.76	34,284,184	0.24	10,826,584	Completed.
Facility Expansion to 12 mgd	49,406,699	0.80	39,525,359	0.20	9,881,340	Interim Capacity Project
Facility Expansion to 15 mgd	14,284,927	0.80	11,427,942	0.20	2,856,985	Buildout Capacity Expansion (in year 2016 dollars)
Administrative / GIS Fee	1,135,311	1.00	1,135,311	0.00	0	GIS costs as well as Building & Finance admin costs.
<b>Grand Total - Sewer-WPCP Capacity</b>	<b>114,666,432</b>		<b>91,101,522</b>		<b>23,564,910</b>	
<b>Sewer-Trunk Line Capacity</b>						
Annual Nexus Update	80,000	1.00	80,000	0.00	0	Update Nexus Study Annually for 20 Years
Bidwell Ranch Acquisition	0		0		0	Removed from Nexus - funded through Northeast Chico Sewer Assessment District (NECSAD).
Bidwell Ranch Property Use Study	4,856	1.00	4,856	0.00	0	Property use study of the Bidwell Ranch property. CP29152. Completed.
Foothill Park East Wetlands Acquisition	500,349	1.00	500,349	0.00	0	Acquisition of 292 acres.
Sanitary Sewer Extension Lassen Avenue	807,536	1.00	807,536	0.00	0	Lassen Avenue sanitary sewer extension from SHR99 to east of Burnap Avenue.
Cohasset Road	703,583	1.00	703,583	0.00	0	
E 9th Street	502,236	1.00	502,236	0.00	0	
Humboldt	3,299,598	1.00	3,299,598	0.00	0	
Filbert Avenue	754,485	1.00	754,485	0.00	0	
Chico Cemetery / CSUC	2,118,666	1.00	2,118,666	0.00	0	
California Park Lake	1,818,908	1.00	1,818,908	0.00	0	
Bruce Road and E 20th Street	1,139,080	1.00	1,139,080	0.00	0	

**APPENDIX B**

**PROJECT LISTING - 1994 through 2014**

<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<b>Allocation Factor Development Impact Fees</b>	<b>Allocation Development Impact Fees Cost</b>	<b>Allocation Factor Other Funding</b>	<b>Allocation Other Funding Sources Cost</b>	<b>Comments</b>
E 21st Street	269,216	1.00	269,216	0.00	0	
Fair Street	104,067	1.00	104,067	0.00	0	
Filbert Avenue Trunk Sewer	23,754	1.00	23,754	0.00	0	Estimated cost is for future customers only.
Northwest Trunk	28,950,950	1.00	28,950,950	0.00	0	
Humboldt Trunk	868,732	1.00	868,732	0.00	0	
River Road Trunk Line	876,650	1.00	876,650	0.00	0	Estimated cost is for future customers only.
Southeast Trunk	3,128,793	1.00	3,128,793	0.00	0	
Warner St and Brice Ave Trunk Sewer	217,183	1.00	217,183	0.00	0	Estimated cost is for future customers only.
W 11th Avenue Trunk	461,514	1.00	461,514	0.00	0	
West 11th Street Trunk Sewer	611,958	1.00	611,958	0.00	0	Estimated cost is for future customers only.
Nob Hill Trunk	490,924	1.00	490,924	0.00	0	
W 8th Avenue	1,349,476	1.00	1,349,476	0.00	0	
Enlarge Junction Box	339,348	1.00	339,348	0.00	0	
Administrative / GIS Fee	494,219	1.00	494,219	0.00	0	GIS costs as well as Building & Finance admin costs.
<b>Grand Total - Sewer-Trunk Line Capacity</b>	<b>49,916,081</b>		<b>49,916,081</b>		<b>0</b>	
<b>Storm Drainage Facility</b>						
Butte Creek Basin - 770	1,286,828	1.00	1,286,828	0.00	0	Drainage basin established 2001-02; see Chapter 6 of Nexus Study.
Comanche Creek Basin - 771	25,626,601	1.00	25,626,601	0.00	0	Drainage basin established 2001-02; see Chapter 6 of Nexus Study.
Little Chico Creek Basin - 772	44,726,175	1.00	44,726,175	0.00	0	Drainage basin established 2001-02; see Chapter 6 of Nexus Study.
Big Chico Creek Basin - 773	11,372,827	1.00	11,372,827	0.00	0	Drainage basin established 2001-02; see Chapter 6 of Nexus Study.
Lindo Channel Basin - 774	37,156,910	1.00	37,156,910	0.00	0	Drainage basin established 2001-02; see Chapter 6 of Nexus Study.
S.U.D.A.D. Ditch Basin - 775	21,753,943	1.00	21,753,943	0.00	0	Drainage basin established 2001-02; see Chapter 6 of Nexus Study.
Mud-Sycamore Creek Basin - 776	24,408,276	1.00	24,408,276	0.00	0	Drainage basin established 2001-02; see Chapter 6 of Nexus Study.
Pleasant Valley Ditch Basin - 777	12,295,977	1.00	12,295,977	0.00	0	Drainage basin established 2001-02; see Chapter 6 of Nexus Study.
Update Nexus Study	183,000	1.00	183,000	0.00	0	Update Nexus Study Annually for 20 Years
Administrative / GIS Fee	1,786,275	1.00	1,786,275	0.00	0	GIS costs as well as Building & Finance admin costs.
<b>Grand Total - Storm Drainage Facility</b>	<b>180,596,812</b>		<b>180,596,812</b>		<b>0</b>	
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>745,297,568</b>		<b>543,269,993</b>		<b>202,027,574</b>	
Note: Nitrate compliance projects have not been included in this report.						