

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF STANISLAUS
ACTION AGENDA SUMMARY

DEPT: Chief Executive Office

BOARD AGENDA # *B-4

Urgent

Routine

AGENDA DATE March 9, 2010

CEO Concurs with Recommendation YES NO

4/5 Vote Required YES NO

(Information Attached)

SUBJECT:

Approval to Set a Public Hearing on March 30, 2010 at 9:05 A.M. to Consider the Adoption of Updated County Public Facility Fees Pursuant to Title 23 of Stanislaus County Ordinance Code

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Set a public hearing on March 30, 2010 at 9:05 A.M. to consider the adoption of Updated County Public Facility Fees pursuant to Title 23 of Stanislaus County Ordinance Code.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is a nominal fiscal impact associated with setting this Public Hearing which includes a mandatory publication expense. This will be absorbed as a function of the existing facilities fee administrative component. The total positive fiscal impact of the Updated Facility Fee Program over the 22 year program horizon has the estimated revenue generating potential of over \$970 million dollars for use in addressing capital facilities needs directly related to growth.

BOARD ACTION AS FOLLOWS:

No. 2010-112

On motion of Supervisor DeMartini, Seconded by Supervisor Chiesa
and approved by the following vote,

Ayes: Supervisors: O'Brien, Chiesa, Monteith, DeMartini, and Chairman Grover

Noes: Supervisors: None

Excused or Absent: Supervisors: None

Abstaining: Supervisor: None

1) X Approved as recommended

2) _____ Denied

3) _____ Approved as amended

4) _____ Other:

MOTION:

ATTEST:


CHRISTINE FERRARO TALLMAN, Clerk

File No. M-64-I-4

DISCUSSION:

The history of Public Facilities Fees in Stanislaus County is longstanding. As one of the first adopter Counties (Fall 1990) Stanislaus, to this day, has one of the most comprehensive facility fee programs in the State of California and has been benchmarked by other jurisdictions.

The 2010 County Public Facilities Fee (PFF) program update is a comprehensive review of the County's fee program. The process has been both detailed and inclusive offering multiple workshops and community stakeholder outreach sessions including meetings with the Building Industry Association (BIA), the Manufacturing Council, City Managers and staff, the Modesto Chamber of Commerce (Land Use Sub-Committee) and multiple local and regional developers.

All unit costs identified in the program update have been revised in light of the current economic environment (winter 2009 valuations) with transportation facilities based upon most recent StanCOG traffic and General Plan Circulation Element data. The update analyzes Department of Finance and StanCOG traffic model projections through calendar year 2030.

Over the evolution of the Stanislaus Facility Fee program fee, categories have been adapted to reflect the unique facility needs of our changing communities. In 1990 (program year one) there were eleven (11) categories. In 2003 these categories were modified to reflect community changes adding the Animal Services category. This structure remained consistent through the 2005 inflationary adjustment and has been modified in this update to include information technology as enterprise technology applications continue to become increasingly significant as a key infrastructure (See Attachment 1 – Comparison of Fee Categories).

Fee Methodologies

Fee calculation methodology remains consistent with past practice and is based on a current level of service approach called the "Existing Inventory Method". The Existing Inventory method places value on existing facilities and ratio to current population to identify a per capita facility standard. That standard is then applied to projected population growth to determine a fee basis that will maintain the existing level of service. The exceptions to this approach are:

- ◆ Transportation related fee category which is based on a "Planned Facilities Method" which allocates costs based on the ratio of planned facility costs to demand from new development, and;
- ◆ Animal Services fee category which is based on a "System Plan Method" that calculates the fee based on the value of existing facilities plus the cost of planned

facilities, divided by demand from existing plus new development. This approach creates an existing deficiency that must be met through non-fee funding.

Several policy amendments are proposed in the update, including:

- The elimination of the Medical Office category – suggesting that it be folded into the general office category.
- Identifies a drive through component. This would be fixed as a base rate addition for those developments that propose a drive through component. This fixed fee addition is charged per drive through lane.
- Elimination of the fast food component.
- Elimination of the City-County Road fee component.
- The addition of an Industrial Rail credit which adjusts each of the large industrial land use trip rates down to account for trips served by rail.
- Reduction of land use categories from 31 (current fee program) to 18. This streamlining of the land use categories provides a more functional approach for both the development community and building services staff at the fee calculation juncture.
- Independent third party land value analysis.
- The program administrative fee is reduced from 2.5% to 1%

The proposed fee program update reflects decreases in 13 of the 18 collection categories. In an attempt to bridge those categories that increase (in the industrial sector), staff will be recommending the implementation of an Industrial Incentive over the life cycle of the fee update period (five years) in attempt to transition the industrial sector through this difficult economic climate.

In addition, the County Public Facility Fee Committee has revised and updated the PFF Administrative Guidelines to better align and coordinate with the fee program update. These too, will be recommended for adoption.

The purpose of the Public Facility Fee program is to require new development to provide funding for impacts that it imposes on public facilities and infrastructure so that current levels of services can be maintained. The fee study is available for public review from the Clerk of the Board prior to the public hearing date and also available on the County's website at: <http://www.stancounty.com/CEO/econ-dev/pdf/county-impact-fee.pdf>

Approval to Set a Public Hearing on March 30, 2010 at 9:05 A.M. to Consider the Adoption of Updated County Public Facility Fees Pursuant to Title 23 of Stanislaus County Ordinance Code
Page 4

POLICY ISSUES:

The Board should consider whether the Updated Public Facility Fee Program is an effective aid in mitigating the impacts of new development on the County's on-going ability to maintain appropriate levels of service.

STAFFING ISSUES:

There are no additional staffing issues related to this item. County Chief Executive Office (Economic/Community Development, Capital Facilities), Public Works and Planning staff have participated in this fee update process.

CONTACT PERSON:

Keith D. Boggs
Deputy Executive Officer – Economic Development
209.652.1514

Attachment 1 – Comparison of Fee Categories

1990	2003	2005	2010
Public/Mental Health	Behavioral Health	Behavioral Health	Behavioral Health
Criminal Justice	Criminal Justice	Criminal Justice	Criminal Justice
Jails	Detention	Detention	Detention
Out Patient Care	Health	Health	Health
Libraries	Libraries	Libraries	Libraries
Other County Facilities	Other County Facilities	Other County Facilities	Other County Facilities
Parks	Regional Parks Neighborhood Parks	Regional Parks Neighborhood Parks	Regional Parks Neighborhood Parks
Roads Inter-City	Roads Inter-City	Roads Inter-City	Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF)
Roads City/County	Roads City/County	Roads City/County	-
Sheriff	Sheriff	Sheriff	Sheriff
-	Animal Services	Animal Services	Animal Services
Fire	-	-	-
-	Emergency Services	Emergency Services	Emergency Services
-	-	-	Countywide Info Technology

STANISLAUS COUNTY

PUBLIC FACILITIES IMPACT FEE STUDY

DRAFT REPORT

MARCH 2, 2010



Oakland Office

1700 Broadway
6th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612
Tel: (510) 832-0899
Fax: (510) 832-0898

Corporate Office

27368 Via Industria
Suite 110
Temecula, CA 92590
Tel: (800) 755-MUNI (6864)
Fax: (909) 587-3510

Other Regional Offices

Lancaster, CA
Memphis, TN
Orlando, FL
Phoenix, AZ
Sacramento, CA
Seattle, WA

www.willdan.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
Background and Study Objectives	4
Fee Categories	4
Use of Fee Revenues	5
Methodologies Used in This Study	5
Fee Schedules	5
1. INTRODUCTION	8
Public Facilities Financing In California	8
Study Objectives	8
Stanislaus County Public Facilities Fee Program	9
PFF Program Overview	9
1990 – Initial Adoption	10
1992 – Recession Adjustment	10
2003 – Comprehensive Update	10
2005 – Inflation Update	11
2008 – Comprehensive Update	11
Fee Program Maintenance	12
Study Methodology	13
Types of Facility Standards	13
New Development Facility Needs and Costs	14
Organization of the report	15
2. GROWTH FORECASTS AND UNIT COST ESTIMATES	17
Use of Growth Forecasts for Impact Fees	17
Service Population	17
Land Use Types	18
Growth Forecasts for Stanislaus County	18
Occupant Densities	20
Unit Costs	20
3. ANIMAL CONTROL FACILITIES	22
Service Population	22
Facility Standards and Planned Facilities	22
Use of Fee Revenues	24
Alternative Funding Sources	25
Fee Schedule	25
4. BEHAVIORAL HEALTH	26
Service Population	26
Facility Standards	27
Use of Fee Revenues	28
Fee Schedule	28
5. CRIMINAL JUSTICE	30

Service Population	30
Facility Standards	30
Use of Fee Revenues	32
Fee Schedule	32
6. DETENTION	34
Service Population	34
Facility Standards	35
Use of Fee Revenues	36
Fee Schedule	37
7. EMERGENCY SERVICES.....	38
Service Population	38
Facility Standards	38
Use of Fee Revenues	40
Fee Schedule	40
8. HEALTH FACILITIES.....	42
Service Population	42
Facility Standards	42
Use of Fee Revenues	44
Fee Schedule	44
9. LIBRARY FACILITIES	45
Service Population	45
Facility Standards	45
Use of Fee Revenues	47
Fee Schedule	47
10. OTHER COUNTY FACILITIES	48
Service Population	48
Facility Standards	49
Use of Fee Revenues	54
Fee Schedule	55
11. PARK FACILITIES	57
Service Population	57
Facility Standards	57
Unit Costs	60
Use of Fee Revenues	62
Fee Schedule	62
12. SHERIFF PATROL AND INVESTIGATION	64
Service Population	64
Facility Standards	64
Use of Fee Revenues	66

Fee Schedule	66
13. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE (RTIF).....	68
Growth Forecast	68
Trip Generation Rates	68
Trip Generation	70
Facilities Standards	72
Facility Costs to Accommodate Growth	73
Fee Schedule	77
14. COUNTYWIDE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	79
Service Population	79
Facility Standards	80
Use of Fee Revenues	81
Fee Schedule	81
15. ADMINISTRATIVE CHARGE	83
16. IMPLEMENTATION.....	86
Impact Fee Program Adoption Process	86
Inflation Adjustment	86
Reporting Requirements	88
Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP	88
17. MITIGATION FEE ACT FINDINGS	89
Purpose of Fee	89
Use of Fee Revenues	89
Benefit Relationship	89
Burden Relationship	90
Proportionality	90
APPENDIX A: VEHICLE AND EQUIPMENT INVENTORIES	A-1
APPENDIX B: INDUSTRIAL RAIL CREDIT	B-1

Executive Summary

This report summarizes an analysis of the need for public facilities and capital improvements to support future development within Stanislaus County through 2030. It is the County's intent that the costs representing future development's share of these facilities and improvements be imposed on that development in the form of a development impact fee, also known as a public facilities fee.

Background and Study Objectives

The primary policy objective of a public facilities fee program is to ensure that new development pays the capital costs associated with growth. The primary purpose of this report is to calculate and present fees that will enable the County to expand its inventory of public facilities – and therefore maintain its facilities standards – as new development leads to service population increases.

The County imposes public facilities fees in unincorporated areas under authority granted by the *Mitigation Fee Act* (the *Act*), contained in *California Government Code Sections 66000 et seq.* This report provides the necessary findings required by the Act for adoption of the fees presented in the fee schedules contained herein. The County has existing agreements with the incorporated cities in the County to implement the impact fees.

Fee Categories

The public facilities and improvements included in this analysis of the County's public facilities fee program are divided into the fee categories listed below:

- ◆ Animal Services
- ◆ Behavioral Health
- ◆ Criminal Justice
- ◆ Detention
- ◆ Emergency Services
- ◆ Health
- ◆ Libraries
- ◆ Other County Facilities
- ◆ Parks
- ◆ Sheriff
- ◆ Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF)
- ◆ Countywide Information Technology

Use of Fee Revenues

Impact fee revenue must be spent on new facilities or expansion of current facilities to serve new development. Facilities can be generally defined as capital acquisition items with a useful life greater than five years. Impact fee revenue can be spent on the following capital facilities to serve new development: land acquisition, construction of buildings, vehicles, information technology, library collections, software licenses and equipment.

The County has a 20-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), from which projects are prioritized with a subset of approved and funded projects in a more specific five-year CIP. The County also has master facilities planning documents as required by law and publishes an auditor's report.

Methodologies Used in This Study

This study uses the existing inventory method to calculate a cost standard for most of the public facility fees documented in this study. This methodology is not based on a master plan for facilities. Rather, this methodology uses the County's existing inventory of facilities as of 2008 (with the exception of PFF fund balances, current as of December, 2007) to calculate the existing facility standard serving existing development. A cost standard is used to combine disparate types of facilities, such as land, buildings, and vehicles, funded by the same public facility fee. By definition this methodology results in no facility deficiencies attributable to existing development.

The exceptions to the use of this methodology in this study are:

- ♦ Animal Control: The County has developed an estimate of facilities needed to accommodate the 2030 service population. Costs of planned facilities are allocated to new development based on the system plan method.
- ♦ The Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) is based on maintaining a specified facility standard on roadways. The costs of facilities associated with growth required to maintain that standard are allocated to new development using the planned facilities approach.

Fee Schedules

Tables E.1 and **E.2** summarize the schedules of maximum justified public facilities fees based on the analysis contained in this report.

Table E.1: Development Impact Fee Summary - Unincorporated

Land Use	Animal Services	Behavioral Health	Criminal Justice	Detention	Emergency Services	Health	Library	Other County Facilities	Regional Parks	Neighborhood Parks ¹	Sheriff ¹	RTIF	County-wide IT	Admin Charge	Total Fee
Residential (Per Dwelling Unit)															
Single Family	\$ 66	\$ 145	\$ 126	\$ 926	\$ 19	\$ 293	\$ 416	\$ 1,513	\$ 236	\$ 511	\$ 517	\$ 3,813	\$ 44	\$ 86	\$ 8,711
Multifamily	46	101	88	647	13	205	290	1,056	165	357	361	2,337	31	57	5,754
Nonresidential (Per Thousand Square Feet)															
Office	N/A	\$ 40	\$ 34	\$ 261	\$ 6	\$ 83	N/A	\$ 428	N/A	N/A	\$ 146	\$ 3,075	\$ 11	\$ 41	\$ 4,125
Industrial															
Industrial (Small)	N/A	\$ 9	\$ 8	\$ 58	\$ 1	\$ 19	N/A	\$ 95	N/A	N/A	\$ 33	\$ 1,402	\$ 3	\$ 16	\$ 1,644
Industrial (Large)															
Manufacturing	N/A	13	11	84	2	27	N/A	137	N/A	N/A	47	1,476	4	18	1,819
Distribution	N/A	5	4	34	1	11	N/A	55	N/A	N/A	19	1,722	1	19	1,871
Warehouse	N/A	3	2	16	0.40	5	N/A	27	N/A	N/A	9	910	1	10	983
Commercial²															
Small Retail	N/A	\$ 34	\$ 29	\$ 219	\$ 5	\$ 70	N/A	\$ 359	N/A	N/A	\$ 123	\$ 1,747	\$ 10	\$ 26	\$ 2,622
Medium Retail	N/A	34	29	219	5	70	N/A	359	N/A	N/A	123	2,608	10	35	3,492
Shopping Center	N/A	34	29	219	5	70	N/A	359	N/A	N/A	123	2,411	10	33	3,293
Shopping Mall	N/A	34	29	219	5	70	N/A	359	N/A	N/A	123	1,476	10	23	2,348
Church	N/A	\$ 34	\$ 29	\$ 219	\$ 5	\$ 70	N/A	\$ 359	N/A	N/A	\$ 123	\$ 566	\$ 10	\$ 14	\$ 1,429
Hospital	N/A	34	29	219	5	70	N/A	359	N/A	N/A	123	1,009	10	19	1,877
Nursing Home	N/A	34	29	219	5	70	N/A	359	N/A	N/A	123	369	10	12	1,230
Special Cases³															
Drive Through (per lane)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$ 15,326	N/A	\$ 153	\$ 15,479
Gas Station (per pump)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5,978	N/A	60	6,038
Motel/Hotel (per room)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	615	N/A	6	621
Golf Course (per acre)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	738	N/A	7	745

¹ Charged only in unincorporated areas.

² Small Retail is less than 50,000 sq. ft.; Medium Retail ranges from 50,000 -100,000 sq. ft.; Shopping Center ranges from 100,000 - 300,000 sq. ft.; Shopping Mall is greater than 300,000 sq. ft.

³ Charged as noted (per lane, per pump, per room or per acre), in addition to commercial fees (excluding RTIF).

Table E.2: Development Impact Fee Summary - Incorporated

Land Use	Animal Services	Behavioral Health	Criminal Justice	Detention	Emergency Services	Health	Library	Other County Facilities	Regional Parks	Neighborhood Parks ¹	Sheriff ¹	RTIF	County-wide IT	Admin Charge	Total Fee
<u>Residential (Per Dwelling Unit)</u>															
Single Family	\$ 66	\$ 145	\$ 126	\$ 926	\$ 19	\$ 293	\$ 416	\$ 829	\$ 236	N/A	N/A	\$ 3,813	\$ 44	\$ 69	\$ 6,982
Multifamily	46	101	88	647	13	205	290	579	165	N/A	N/A	2,337	31	45	4,547
<u>Nonresidential (Per Thousand Square Feet)</u>															
Office	N/A	\$ 40	\$ 34	\$ 261	\$ 6	\$ 83	N/A	\$ 235	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$ 3,075	\$ 11	\$ 37	\$ 3,782
<u>Industrial</u>															
Industrial (Small)	N/A	\$ 9	\$ 8	\$ 58	\$ 1	\$ 19	N/A	\$ 52	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$ 1,402	\$ 3	\$ 16	\$ 1,568
Industrial (Large)															
Manufacturing	N/A	13	11	84	2	27	N/A	75	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,476	4	17	1,709
Distribution	N/A	5	4	34	1	11	N/A	30	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,722	1	18	1,826
Warehouse	N/A	3	2	16	0.40	5	N/A	15	N/A	N/A	N/A	910	1	10	962
<u>Commercial²</u>															
Small Retail	N/A	\$ 34	\$ 29	\$ 219	\$ 5	\$ 70	N/A	\$ 198	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$ 1,747	\$ 10	\$ 23	\$ 2,335
Medium Retail	N/A	34	29	219	5	70	N/A	198	N/A	N/A	N/A	2,608	10	32	3,205
Shopping Center	N/A	34	29	219	5	70	N/A	198	N/A	N/A	N/A	2,411	10	30	3,006
Shopping Mall	N/A	34	29	219	5	70	N/A	198	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,476	10	20	2,061
Church	N/A	\$ 34	\$ 29	\$ 219	\$ 5	\$ 70	N/A	\$ 198	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$ 566	\$ 10	\$ 11	\$ 1,142
Hospital	N/A	34	29	219	5	70	N/A	198	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,009	10	16	1,590
Nursing Home	N/A	34	29	219	5	70	N/A	198	N/A	N/A	N/A	369	10	9	943
<u>Special Cases³</u>															
Drive Through (per lane)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$ 15,326	N/A	\$ 153	\$ 15,479
Gas Station (per pump)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5,978	N/A	60	6,038
Motel/Hotel (per room)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	615	N/A	6	621
Golf Course (per acre)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	738	N/A	7	745

¹ Charged only in unincorporated areas.² Small Retail is less than 50,000 sq. ft.; Medium Retail ranges from 50,000 -100,000 sq. ft.; Shopping Center ranges from 100,000 - 300,000 sq. ft.; Shopping Mall is greater than 300,000 sq. ft.³ Charged as noted (per lane, per pump, per room or per acre), in addition to commercial fees (excluding RTIF).

1. Introduction

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

- ♦ Public facilities financing in California;
- ♦ Study objectives;
- ♦ Stanislaus County public facilities fee program;
- ♦ Study Methodology;
- ♦ Fee Program Maintenance; and
- ♦ Organization of the report.

Public Facilities Financing In California

The changing fiscal landscape in California during the past 30 years has steadily undercut the financial capacity of local governments to fund infrastructure. Three dominant trends stand out:

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

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

Study Objectives

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

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

presented in the fee schedules contained herein. The County has agreements with the incorporated cities within the County to implement the County impact fees.

The County of Stanislaus is forecast to experience substantial growth in both incorporated cities and unincorporated areas through this study's planning horizon of 2030. This growth will create an increase in demand for public services and the County facilities required to deliver them. Given the revenue challenges described above that are common to most cities and counties in California; the County has decided to use a development impact fee program to ensure that new development funds the share of facility costs associated with growth. This report makes use of the most current available growth forecasts, facility plans, and engineering studies to ensure that the County's fee program is representative of the facility needs resulting from new development.

All fee-funded capital projects are programmed through the County's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Use of a CIP helps the County identify and direct its fee revenue to public facilities projects that will accommodate future growth. By programming fee revenues to specific capital projects, the County ensures a reasonable relationship between new development and the use of fee revenues as required by the *Mitigation Fee Act*.

Stanislaus County Public Facilities Fee Program

This section provides a history of the Stanislaus County Public Facilities Fee (PFF) program. The program provides a substantial share of the total funding for the County's CIP.

PFF Program Overview

The PFF program collects impact fees from new development throughout the County, both in cities and the unincorporated area, to fund the public facilities required to accommodate growth. The PFF program includes two types of impact fees:

- ♦ **Countywide fees** collected from new development both in cities and in the unincorporated area. Fee revenues fund public facilities that are the responsibility of the County to provide to all development countywide such as libraries and public health.
- ♦ **Unincorporated only fees** collected from new development only in the unincorporated area. Fee revenues fund public facilities that are the responsibility of the County to provide to development only in the unincorporated area such as sheriff patrol and neighborhood parks.

New development in cities only pays the countywide fees. New development in the unincorporated area pays both the countywide and unincorporated only fees.

The multi-jurisdictional strategy of the PFF program was unique at the time of initial adoption in 1990 and has served as a model for other counties throughout the State. The County's nine cities have agreements with the County to adopt, impose, collect and transfer to the County impact fees to fund facilities that are the responsibility of the County. These facilities include, for example, jails, libraries, regional parks, and regional roads. The County's PFF was the first impact fee program in California in which cities partnered with their county to fund the impact of new development on countywide public facilities. Since

Stanislaus County pioneered this public facility funding strategy a number of counties have adopted or are currently considering this type of multi-jurisdictional fee program.¹

Nearly all of the PFF program fees are based on a facility standard that represents the County's existing level of facilities and existing demand for services. Under this method new development funds the expansion of facilities at the same facility standard currently serving existing development. This method results in no facility deficiencies attributable to existing development. The specific methods used to calculate the PFF program fees are described later in this chapter.

1990 – Initial Adoption

The PFF program was initially developed in 1989. The *Mitigation Fee Act* was first adopted in 1987 (AB 1600) and became effective on January 1, 1989. The County retained Recht Hausrath & Associates (now called Hausrath Economics Group) to evaluate the public facilities impacts of new development and develop the PFF program. The County adopted the initial fee schedule in 1990 based on a detailed analysis prepared by Recht Hausrath & Associates regarding the reasonable relationship (“nexus”) between growth and the need for additional public facilities.

1992 – Recession Adjustment

In 1992 the County reduced the fees in an effort to stimulate economic development in response to the severe recession at that time. During the same period the State diverted substantial shares of the County's property tax to fund schools and reduce the impact of the recession on the State's budget. The effects of the recession remained with the County through 1996. The fiscal impacts of these actions significantly constrained the County's ability to fund expanded facilities to accommodate the rapid growth that returned by the end of the decade.

2003 – Comprehensive Update

In 2003 the County conducted a comprehensive update to the PFF program. The update included:

- ♦ Revising the facility inventory and service demand data to reflect existing facility standards as of 2003;
- ♦ Updating unit costs for public facilities to 2003;
- ♦ Adding a new public facility fee category for animal control, dividing the parks fee into regional parks and neighborhood parks categories, and re-programming the unincorporated area only fire fee to cover all emergency services countywide;

¹ Counties with similar adopted programs include Kings, Madera, Placer, Solano, and Yolo though participation by cities varies from county to county. Fresno, Kern, Shasta, and Tulare counties have initiated similar studies. A number of other counties such as Contra Costa, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, and San Joaquin and their constituent cities have adopted multijurisdictional impact fee programs focused solely on funding regional transportation improvements.

- ♦ In the fee schedules, disaggregating the Large Industrial land use type into more detailed land uses to more accurately reflect the lower employment densities of this type of development; and
- ♦ Adopting an automatic annual inflation adjustment to the fee schedules to reflect capital project cost inflation.

2005 – Inflation Update

The 2005 inflation update revised the 2003 PFF program fee schedules to 2005 using five separate cost inflation indexes depending on the type of public facility.

2008 – Comprehensive Update

The current study will provide a comprehensive update of the PFF program by:

- ♦ Revising the facility inventory and service demand data to reflect existing facility standards as of 2008;
- ♦ Updating unit costs for public facilities to 2008;
- ♦ Updating the Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) based on the most recent StanCOG traffic model analysis used for the County's General Plan update.
- ♦ Eliminating the City/County traffic fee; and,
- ♦ Adding a new facility fee category for information technology.

The projects included in the RTIF have been reduced in number and scope through the iterations of this report. When this comprehensive public facilities fee update project was initiated in 2006, County staff envisioned that funding from Measure "K", a self-help sales tax initiative on the November 2006 ballot would be used to supplement impact fee revenue needed to complete the transportation projects being considered at that time. Measure "K" would authorize the Stanislaus County Local Transportation Authority to impose a one-half cent Retail Transaction and Use tax for a maximum of 30 years to fund specific transportation, traffic relief, safety and road maintenance programs identified in the Stanislaus County Local Transportation Improvement Plan. Measure "K" failed to receive the two-thirds vote needed for approval. As a result, the comprehensive public facilities fee update process was postponed until other supplemental funding for transportation projects could be identified.

In November 2008 another self-help sales tax measure, Measure "S", was placed on the ballot in an attempt to provide a supplemental funding source for transportation facilities projects. The measure received 66.42% of the vote, just short of the two-thirds majority vote required for approval. From a facilities funding standpoint, the failure of the measure was unfortunate because revenue from the sales tax would have provided the needed matching funds for the County to obtain a much larger share of federal stimulus funding for road improvements, as well as limiting the funding that could be dedicated to the non-impact fee shares of RTIF projects.

Consequently, this comprehensive update to the County's public facilities fees has been affected by the failure to approve the self help sales tax measures. The project list for the RTIF has been greatly reduced, and the City/County Roads fee has been eliminated

completely, to ensure that sufficient non-fee funding is available to fund the non-impact fee shares of the transportation projects included in the program. The end result is that the County will not be able to provide all of the transportation facilities deemed necessary to serve the County's residents and businesses.

The changes in the PFF program categories since adoption of the program in 1990 are summarized in **Table 1.1**.

Table 1.1: PFF Program Revisions

1990	2003	2005	2008
<i>Countywide Facilities Fees</i>			
Public/Mental Health ¹	Behavioral Health	Behavioral Health	Behavioral Health
Criminal Justice	Criminal Justice	Criminal Justice	Criminal Justice
Jails ¹	Detention	Detention	Detention
Out Patient Care ¹	Health	Health	Health
Libraries	Libraries	Libraries	Libraries
Other County	Other County	Other County	Other County
Parks	Regional Parks ²	Regional Parks	Regional Parks
Roads Inter-City	Roads Inter-City	Roads Inter-City	Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) ¹
Roads City/County	Roads City/County	Roads City/County	NA ⁴
	Animal Services	Animal Services	Animal Services ³
	Emergency Services ⁵	Emergency Services	Emergency Services
			Countywide Information Technology
<i>Unincorporated Only Facilities Fees</i>			
Sheriff	Sheriff	Sheriff	Sheriff
Fire	NA ⁵	NA	NA
NA	Neighborhood Parks ²	Neighborhood Parks	Neighborhood Parks

¹ Facility fee category renamed.

² Parks fee category re-programmed to include regional and neighborhood parks categories.

³ Facility fee category does not apply to all parts of County because some cities provide their own animal services facilities.

⁴ City/County roads impact fee discontinued in 2008. Only the RTIF is included in this study.

⁵ Fire facilities fee re-programmed to the countywide emergency services facilities fee in 2003.

Source: Stanislaus County Public Facilities Inflationary Adjustments 2005; Willdan Financial Services.

Fee Program Maintenance

Once a fee program has been adopted it must be properly maintained to ensure that the revenue collected adequately funds the facilities needed by new development. Impact fee levels must be adjusted frequently to account for inflation. Should the cost of facilities rise more quickly than the fee amounts collected, the facilities needed to serve new development will be underfunded. To avoid collecting inadequate revenue, the inventories of existing facilities and costs for planned facilities must be updated periodically for inflation, and the fees recalculated to reflect the higher costs. The use of established indices for each facility included in the inventories (land, buildings, and equipment), such as the Engineering News

Record, is necessary to accurately adjust the impact fees. For a list of recommended indices, and step-by-step instructions for adjusting fees for inflation, see Chapter 16.

While fee updates using inflation indices are appropriate for periodic updates to ensure that fee revenues keep up with increases in the costs of public facilities, it is recommended to conduct more extensive updates of the fee documentation and calculation (such as this study) when significant new data on growth forecasts and/or facility plans become available. For further detail on fee program implementation, see Chapter 16.

Study Methodology

Public facilities fees are calculated to fund the cost of facilities required to accommodate growth. The five steps followed in a public facilities fee study include:

1. **Estimate existing development and future growth:** Identify a base year for existing development and a growth forecast that reflects increased demand for public facilities;
2. **Identify facility standards:** Determine the facility standards used to plan for new and expanded facilities;
3. **Determine facilities required to serve new development and their costs:** Estimate the total amount and cost of planned facilities, and identify the share required to accommodate new development;
4. **Calculate fee schedule:** Allocate facilities costs per unit of new development to calculate the public facilities fee schedule; and
5. **Identify alternative funding requirements:** Determine if any non-fee funding is required to complete projects.

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

Types of Facility Standards

There are three separate components of facility standards:

- *Demand standards* determine the amount of facilities required to accommodate growth, for example, park acres per thousand residents, square feet of library space per capita, or gallons of water per day. Demand standards may also reflect a level of service such as the vehicles-to-capacity (V/C) ratio used in traffic planning.
- *Design standards* determine how a facility should be designed to meet expected demand, for example, park improvement requirements and technology infrastructure for city office space. Design standards are typically not explicitly evaluated as part of an impact fee analysis but can have a significant impact on the cost of facilities. Our approach incorporates current facility design standards into the fee program to reflect the increasing construction cost of public facilities.

- * *Cost standards* are an alternate method for determining the amount of facilities required to accommodate growth based on facility costs per unit of demand. *Cost standards* are useful when demand standards were not explicitly developed for the facility planning process. *Cost standards* also enable different types of facilities to be analyzed based on a single measure (cost or value), useful when disparate facilities are funded by a single fee program. Examples include facility costs per capita, per vehicle trip, or cost per gallon of water per day.

New Development Facility Needs and Costs

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

There are three common methods for determining new development's fair share of planned facilities costs: the **existing inventory method**, the **system plan method**, and the **planned facilities method**. Often the method selected depends on the degree to which the community has engaged in comprehensive facility master planning to identify facility needs.

The formula used by each approach and the advantages and disadvantages of each method is summarized below: Stanislaus

Existing Inventory Method

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

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

Under this method new development funds the expansion of facilities at the same standard currently serving existing development. By definition the existing inventory method results in no facility deficiencies attributable to existing development. This method is often used when a long-range plan for new facilities is not available. Only the initial facilities to be funded with fees are identified in the fee study. Future facilities to serve growth are identified through an annual capital improvement plan and budget process, possibly after completion of a new facility master plan. This method is used for all facility categories in this report, with the exception of animal control facilities and the Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF). All inventories, included in this report are current as of 2008, with the exception of PFF fund balances, which are current as of December, 2007.

Planned Facilities Method

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

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

This method is appropriate when specific planned facilities can be identified that only benefit new development. Examples include street improvements to avoid deficient levels of

service or a sewer trunk line extension to a previously undeveloped area. This method is appropriate when planned facilities would not serve existing development. Under this method new development funds the expansion of facilities at the standards used for the master facility plan. This method is used to calculate the RTIF in this report.

System Plan Method

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

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

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

The system plan method ensures that new development does not pay for existing deficiencies. Often facility standards based on policies such as those found in General Plans are higher than existing facility standards. This method enables the calculation of the existing deficiency required to bring existing development up to the policy-based standard. The local agency must secure non-fee funding for that portion of planned facilities required to correct the deficiency to ensure that new development receives the level of service funded by the impact fee. This method is used to calculate the animal control facilities fees in this report.

Organization of the report

This report is organized as follows:

- ♦ Chapter 1, Introduction (this chapter): summarizes facilities financing in California, the history of the PFF in Stanislaus County, and the general approach;
- ♦ Chapter 2, Growth Forecasts and Unit Cost Estimates: describes the growth forecasts used to estimate future demand and the unit costs used to estimate total facility costs;
- ♦ Chapter 3, Animal Control: Charged countywide to residential development, except in the cities of Turlock, Oakdale, Newman and Riverbank. Fee revenue will fund the planned animal control building.
- ♦ Chapter 4, Behavioral Health: Charged countywide. Includes all behavioral health facilities in the County, including the teen center, prenatal programs and adult programs.
- ♦ Chapter 5, Criminal Justice: Charged countywide. Includes criminal justice training center, public defender, and district attorney office space.
- ♦ Chapter 6, Detention: Charged countywide. Includes juvenile and adult detention facilities. Fee revenue will fund the planned men's jail and juvenile hall expansion.

- ♦ Chapter 7, Emergency Services: Charged countywide. Includes emergency operations center, and dispatch.
- ♦ Chapter 8, Health: Charged countywide. Includes health related administrative offices, clinic space and workshop space.
- ♦ Chapter 9, Libraries: Charged countywide to residential development. Includes all libraries, collections and related equipment in the County.
- ♦ Chapter 10, Other County Facilities: Charged countywide. Includes all public facilities that do not fit into any other facility categories including facilities housing the Assessor, Auditor-Controller, Board of Supervisors, Central Services, Chief Executive Officer, Child Support Services, Clerk-Recorder, Community Services Agency, County Counsel, Fleet Services, General Services Agency, Planning, Public Works, Strategic Business Technology, and the Treasurer-Tax Collector.
- ♦ Chapter 11, Parks: Charged countywide to residential development. Fee will fund neighborhood parks in the unincorporated areas and regional parks countywide.
- ♦ Chapter 12, Sheriff Patrol and Investigation: Only charged in unincorporated areas. Will fund sheriff facilities, vehicles, and equipment.
- ♦ Chapter 13, Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF): Charged countywide. Fee revenue will fund list of planned road improvements detailed within chapter.
- ♦ Chapter 14, Countywide Information Technology: Charged countywide. Fee revenue will fund major information technology purchases.
- ♦ Chapter 15, Administrative Fee: Charged countywide to fund costs associated with the administration of the impact fee program.
- ♦ Chapter 16, Implementation: Provides guidelines for the implementation and ongoing maintenance of the public facilities fee program.
- ♦ Chapter 17, *Mitigation Fee Act* Findings: summarizes the five statutory findings required for adoption of the proposed public facilities fees in accordance with the *Mitigation Fee Act* (codified in *California Government Code* Sections 66000 through 66025).

2. Growth Forecasts and Unit Cost Estimates

Growth forecasts assist in estimating facility needs based on additional service demand. New development is estimated using a base year of 2008 and a planning horizon of 2030. The growth forecast is used throughout this study.

This chapter also presents the unit cost assumptions used throughout the study to estimate the total cost of planned facilities.

Use of Growth Forecasts for Impact Fees

Estimates of the existing service population and forecasts of growth are critical assumptions used throughout this report. These estimates are used as follows:

- ♦ Estimates of existing development in 2008 are used to determine the existing facility standards in the County.
- ♦ Estimates of total development at the 2030 planning horizon are used:
 - To determine the total amount of public facilities required to accommodate growth based on the existing facility standards (see Chapter 1), and
 - To estimate total fee revenues.

To measure existing service population and future growth, residential and worker population data are used for all facility categories, with the exception the road fee, which converts residential and employment growth into trip growth, and the parks and library fees, which only use population data. These measures are used because the amount of residents and workers is a reasonable indicator of the level of demand for public facilities. The County builds public facilities primarily to serve these populations and, typically, the greater the population the larger the facility required to provide a given level of service. Trips are used to measure demand for traffic facilities because need for these facilities results from the amount additional trips generated by new development.

Service Population

Different land use types use public facilities at different rates in relation to each other, depending on the services provided. In Chapters 3 through 12 and in Chapter 14 (all fee categories except for the traffic related fee), a specific service population is identified for each facility category to reflect total demand.

A service population is a measure of all residents and workers that rely on a given set of services. The service population weights residential land use types against nonresidential land uses based on the relative demand for services between residents and workers. As noted above, the need for traffic facilities is based on existing and projected trips that approximate changes in demand by new development.

Land Use Types

To ensure a reasonable relationship between each fee and the type of development paying the fee, growth forecasts distinguish between different land use types. The land use types used in this analysis are defined below.

- ♦ **Single family:** Attached and detached one-family dwelling units;
- ♦ **Multi-family:** All attached multi-family dwellings such as duplexes and condominiums, plus mobile homes, apartments, and dormitories;
- ♦ **Commercial:** All commercial, retail, educational, and hotel/motel development;
- ♦ **Office:** All general, professional, and medical office development;
- ♦ **Industrial (Small):** Manufacturing development less than 20,000 square feet;
- ♦ **Industrial (Large):** Industrial development larger than 20,000 square feet, further defined in three subcategories:
 - Manufacturing;
 - Distribution;
 - Warehouse.

Some developments may include more than one land use type, such as an industrial warehouse with living quarters (a live-work designation) or a planned unit development with both single and multi-family uses. In these cases the public facilities fee would be calculated separately for each land use type.

The County should have the discretion to impose the public facilities fee based on the specific aspects of a proposed development regardless of zoning. The guideline to use is the probable occupant density of the development, either residents per dwelling unit or workers per building square foot. The fee imposed should be based on the land use type that most closely represents the probable occupant density of the development.

Growth Forecasts for Stanislaus County

The base year for this study is the year 2008. Base year population estimates are from California Department of Finance (DOF) January 1, 2008 data. Base year countywide employment estimates are based on data from the California Employment Development Department's (EDD) February 2008 estimates. The countywide employment number was then allocated to each city based on the proportions of 2005 employment from the StanCOG traffic model. Future 2030 population and employment estimates are based on data from the StanCOG traffic model, and input from County staff. The 2030 nonresidential estimates have been adjusted to reflect a higher jobs-housing ratio than originally estimated by StanCOG, per County staff. Several proposed nonresidential developments not included in the StanCOG traffic model are expected to be built in the mid to long term and would increase the jobs-housing balance currently estimated at approximately 1:1 to 1.236:1 by 2030.

Local government employment is excluded from all current and future employment estimates presented here because local government facilities are typically added to serve new

development. Government facilities, therefore, are more likely to result from increased demand for public facilities than to cause that increased demand. Whereas non-government development creates an increased demand for public facilities, development of government facilities occurs to meet that demand. The residents and workers that comprise the service populations outlined in this report constitute only those individuals that create demand for public facilities.

Table 2.1 presents the current and future demographic estimates used in this study in terms of population and employment for residential and nonresidential development.

Table 2.1: Population and Employment Estimates and Projections

	2008	2030	Net Growth 2008-2030
<u>Countywide</u>			
Population ¹			
Ceres	42,700	80,300	37,600
Hughson	6,200	11,500	5,300
Modesto	206,700	323,300	116,600
Newman	10,500	37,900	27,400
Oakdale	19,200	56,900	37,700
Patterson	21,000	38,900	17,900
Riverbank	21,600	38,000	16,400
Turlock	67,800	105,900	38,100
Waterford	8,700	16,400	7,700
Unincorporated	113,700	146,900	33,200
Total	518,100	856,000	337,900
Employment ^{2, 3}			
Ceres	11,500	22,200	10,700
Hughson	1,800	6,600	4,800
Modesto	78,800	132,600	53,800
Newman	1,800	4,200	2,400
Oakdale	8,300	18,000	9,700
Patterson	3,800	6,400	2,600
Riverbank	3,200	7,300	4,100
Turlock	20,900	36,900	16,000
Waterford	1,800	3,200	1,400
Unincorporated	24,800	102,700	77,900
Total	156,700	340,100	183,400
<u>Unincorporated</u>			
Population ¹	113,700	146,900	33,200
Employment ^{2, 3}	24,800	102,700	77,900

¹ Excludes group quarters (i.e. jails) because group quarters residents do not contribute to demand for public facilities.

² Represents jobs located within the city/county (not employed residents).

³ Excludes local government employees.

Sources: Stanislaus County Traffic Model; California State Department of Finance E-5 report for Stanislaus County Jan. 1, 2008; California Employment Development Department; Willdan Financial Services.

Occupant Densities

Facility demand is estimated based on service population increases. Developers pay the public facilities fee based on the number of additional housing units or building square feet of nonresidential development, so the fee schedule must convert service population estimates to these measures of project size. This conversion is done with average occupant density factors by land use type, shown in **Table 2.2**.

Table 2.2: Occupancy Density Assumptions

Residential:		
Single Family Unit	3.15	Persons per dwelling unit
Multi-family Unit	2.20	Persons per dwelling unit
Nonresidential:		
Commercial (Retail)	2.41	Employees per 1,000 sq. ft.
Office	2.87	Employees per 1,000 sq. ft.
Industrial (Small)	0.64	Employees per 1,000 sq. ft.
Industrial (Large)		
Manufacturing	0.92	Employees per 1,000 sq. ft.
Distribution	0.37	Employees per 1,000 sq. ft.
Warehouse	0.18	Employees per 1,000 sq. ft.

Sources: United States 2000 Census (Tables H-31, H-32, H-33); California State Department of Finance E-5 report for Stanislaus County Jan. 1, 2008; Stanislaus Business Development and Workforce Alliance; Willdan Financial Services.

The residential occupant density factors are derived from the 2000 U.S. Census Bureau's Tables H-31 through H-33. Table H-31 provides vacant housing units data, while Table H-32 provides information relating to occupied housing. Table H-33 documents the total 2000 population residing in occupied housing. The U.S. Census numbers are adjusted by using the California Department of Finance (DOF) estimates for January 1, 2008², the most recent State of California data available. The non-residential density factors were developed based on data compiled by the Stanislaus Business Development and Workforce Alliance and the County.

Unit Costs

This study makes use of unit costs for land values and building construction. These costs are used to estimate the replacement value of existing facilities, as well as the construction or

² State of California, Department of Finance, *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001-2008, with 2000 Benchmark*. Sacramento, California, May 2008.

acquisition costs for planned facilities. Building costs are typically expressed in terms of cost per square foot while land costs are expressed in terms of cost per acre.

Table 2.3 lists the land and building values used in this study. Land values are listed in terms of cost per acre. The land values listed here were developed in October 2009 by a licensed real estate appraisal firm in Modesto, Cogdill & Giomi Inc., specifically for use in this public facilities fee study. Building values are listed per square foot and were informed by recent appraisals and projects in the County, and by County staff. Some public facilities, such as jails and landfills, are more likely to be located on land with limited development potential. Therefore this study uses a lower land value for less-desirable land.

Table 2.3: Unit Costs

Location / Facility Type	Value
<i>Land - Value per acre</i>	
Modesto Commercial Land Value	\$ 958,300
Suburban Commercial Land Value	435,600
Transitional Land Value	50,000
Business Park	50,000
Neighborhood Park	75,000
Regional Parks / Open Space	2,000
Landfill - Dry Ground	2,000
Landfill - Orchard Value	10,000
Honor Farm	10,000
<i>Buildings - Value per square foot</i>	
Jail / Detention Facilities	\$ 315
Clinic	300
Animal Services Shelter	200
All other (including office)	175

Sources: Cogdill & Giomi; Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

3. Animal Control Facilities

The purpose of this fee is to ensure that new development funds its fair share of animal control facilities. The fee will be charged countywide, except in the cities of Turlock, Oakdale, Newman and Riverbank which maintain municipal animal control facilities. The County will use fee revenues to fund the animal services shelter expansion project and any related vehicles and equipment.

Service Population

Animal control facilities serve both residents and businesses and provide services equally to both incorporated and unincorporated portions of the County, with the exception of the cities of Turlock, Oakdale, Newman and Riverbank, which maintain their own animal control facilities. The City of Modesto conducts its own fieldwork, but does not maintain its own building. Demand for services and associated facilities is based on the County's service population including residents, minus those from the cities of Turlock, Oakdale, Newman and Riverbank.

Table 3.1 shows the estimated service population in 2008 and 2030. The demand for countywide animal control facilities is primarily related to the demands that residents place on those facilities.

Table 3.1: Animal Services Service Population

	Residents
Existing (2008) ¹	399,000
New Development (2008-2030) ¹	<u>218,300</u>
Total - (2030) ¹	617,300

¹ The cities of Turlock, Oakdale, Riverbank and Newman are excluded from this analysis, as those cities have their own animal services facilities.

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Standards and Planned Facilities

This study uses the system plan method to determine facility standards for animal control facilities (see *Introduction* for further information). **Table 3.2** presents an inventory of animal control facilities in Stanislaus County along with an estimate of each facility's current value. The value for the planned animal control facility is based on preliminary cost estimates of the needed animal services shelter expansion, provided by the County. An inventory of

vehicles and equipment can be found in **Appendix Table A.1**, although that inventory is not used in the fee calculation.³ An inventory of technological assets can be found in **Appendix Table A.11**. The total value of existing and planned animal control facilities is approximately \$13 million.

Animal services are currently provided in three buildings as shown in Table 3.2. The sizes for the 10,700 square foot and the 1,800 square foot building are noted, but not included in the valuation because those facilities will be demolished to accommodate the planned animal shelter expansion. Additionally, only 9,800 square feet of the existing 14,040 square foot building will be used as part of the planned animal control facility expansion, so only that amount is included in the valuation calculation.

Table 3.2: Animal Services Facilities Existing and Planned Facilities

	Inventory	Unit Cost ¹	Value
<u>Land (acres)</u>			
Animal Services Shelter - 2846 Finch Road, Modesto	4.53	\$ 50,000	\$ 227,000
<u>Buildings (square feet)</u>			
Animal Services Shelter - 10,700 sq. ft. ²	-	\$ 200	\$ -
Animal Services Shelter - 14,040 sq. ft. ²	9,800	200	1,960,000
Animal Services Shelter - 1,800 sq. ft. ²	-	200	-
Subtotal - Buildings	9,800		\$ 1,960,000
Technology (from Table A.11)			\$ 107,860
Total Existing Facilities			\$ 2,294,860
<u>Planned Facilities</u>			
Animal Services Shelter Expansion	25,000	\$ 430	\$ 10,750,000
Total Value - Existing + Planned Facilities			\$ 13,044,860

¹ Unit costs based on market value.

² Inventory includes only portion of building that will remain in use. Total existing building size is noted, but not included in valuation.

Sources: Table A.1; Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services

Table 3.3 shows the projected per capita investment in animal control facilities at the planning horizon. These values were calculated by adding the combined value of existing and planned animal control facilities and then dividing that sum by the future 2030 service population. The resulting cost per capita is \$21.

³ Certain cities provide their own equipment and vehicles for animal control, but use the County's animal control facility. The impact fee will be used for the animal control facility expansion.

Table 3.3: Animal Services Facilities Per Capita Cost

Existing Animal Services Facilities	\$	2,294,860
Planned Animal Services Facilities		<u>10,750,000</u>
Total Animal Services Facilities	\$	13,044,860
Future Service Population		617,300
Facility Standard per Capita	\$	21
Cost per Resident	\$	21

Sources: Tables 3.1 and 3.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Use of Fee Revenues

The County can use animal control facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of new buildings and land that expands the capacity of the existing system to serve new development. The only planned facility at this time is the animal services shelter expansion. Approximately \$6 million will be needed from non-fee revenue sources to complete the shelter, or new development will have paid too high a fee. The inclusion of technology in the facilities inventory allows fee revenue to be spent on technological needs related to animal control services. **Table 3.4** displays projected fee revenue and non-fee funding required through 2030.

Table 3.4: Projected Revenue and Planned Facilities

Facility Standard (Value) per Capita	\$	21
Service Population Growth Within County (2008-2030)		<u>218,300</u>
Projected Fee Revenues	\$	4,584,300
Cost of Planned Facilities	\$	10,750,000
Existing Fund Balance		<u>211,863</u>
Net Cost of Planned Facilities	\$	10,538,137
Non-Fee Revenue to be Identified	\$	5,953,837

Sources: Tables 3.1 and 3.3; Willdan Financial Services.

Alternative Funding Sources

The County will need to develop alternative funding sources to fund existing development's share of the facility. Likely potential sources of revenue include existing or new general fund revenues or existing or new taxes. The County may ask participating cities to assist in funding the new animal control facility.

Fee Schedule

Table 3.5 shows the animal control facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit densities.

Table 3.5: Animal Services Facilities Impact Fee - System Plan Standard

Land Use	A	B	C=AxB	
	Cost Per Capita	Density	Fee ¹	
<i>Residential</i>				
Single Family	\$ 21	3.15	\$	66
Multifamily	21	2.20		46

¹ Fee per dwelling unit.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 3.3; Willdan Financial Services.

4. Behavioral Health

The purpose of this fee is to ensure that new development funds its fair share of behavioral health facilities. The fee will be charged countywide to both residential and nonresidential development. The County will use fee revenues to expand behavioral health facilities, including vehicles and equipment, to serve new development.

Service Population

Behavioral health facilities serve both residents and businesses and provide services equally to both incorporated and unincorporated portions of the County. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities are based on the County's service population including residents and workers.

Table 4.1 shows the estimated service population in 2008 and 2030. The demand for countywide behavioral health facilities is primarily related to the demands that residents and businesses place on those facilities. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one employee compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development yields a lesser demand for countywide behavioral health facilities.

Table 4.1: Behavioral Health Facilities Service Population

	Residents	Workers	Service Population
Existing (2008)	518,100	156,700	566,700
New Development (2008-2030)	337,900	183,400	394,800
Total (2030)	856,000	340,100	961,500
Weighting factor	1.00	0.31	

Note: Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40 hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week.

Sources: Table 2.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Standards

This study uses the existing inventory method to calculate fee schedules for behavioral health facilities (see *Introduction* for further information). **Table 4.2** presents an inventory of behavioral health facilities in Stanislaus County along with an estimated current replacement value. An inventory of vehicles and equipment can be found in **Appendix Table A.2**. An inventory of technological assets can be found in **Appendix Table A.11**. The total value of existing behavioral health facilities is approximately \$26.1 million.

Table 4.2: Behavioral Health Facilities Existing Inventory

	Inventory	Units	Unit Cost ¹	Value
<i>Land (acres)</i>				
800 Scenic Drive, Modesto	1.85	Acres	\$ 958,300	\$ 1,773,000
1501 Memorial Drive, Ceres	15.37	Acres	50,000	<u>769,000</u>
				\$ 2,542,000
<i>Buildings (square feet)</i>				
800 Scenic, Modesto				
Behavioral Health Share	26,414	Sq. Ft.	300	\$ 7,924,000
1904 Richland, Ceres				
SRC Teen Center	1,440	Sq. Ft.	300	432,000
SRC Perinatal Program	10,500	Sq. Ft.	300	3,150,000
SRC Adult Program	15,572	Sq. Ft.	300	4,672,000
SRC Reception/Annex	5,000	Sq. Ft.	300	1,500,000
SRC Office Bldg.	4,404	Sq. Ft.	300	1,321,000
2215 Blue Gum, Modesto				
Juvenile Justice	1,440	Sq. Ft.	300	432,000
Juvenile Justice	2,150	Sq. Ft.	300	645,000
CSA Bldg.-Hackett Rd.	<u>2,600</u>	Sq. Ft.	300	<u>780,000</u>
Total Building Square Feet	69,520	Sq. Ft.		\$ 20,856,000
Vehicles (from Table A.2)				\$ 1,154,000
Technology (from Table A.11)				\$ 225,427
Existing PFF Fund Balance				<u>\$ 1,297,689</u>
Total Value Existing Facilities				\$ 26,075,116

¹ Unit costs based on market value.

Sources: Table A.2; Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services

Table 4.3 shows the current per capita investment in behavioral health facilities. This value was calculated by dividing the existing investment in behavioral health facilities by the current service population. The cost per resident is \$46, and the cost per worker is \$14.

Table 4.3: Behavioral Health Facilities Existing Standard

Existing Behavioral Health Facilities	\$	26,075,116
Existing Service Population		<u>566,700</u>
Facility Standard per Capita	\$	46
Cost per Resident	\$	46
Cost per Worker ¹		14

¹ Worker weighting factor of 0.31 applied to cost per resident.

Sources: Tables 4.1 and 4.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Use of Fee Revenues

The County can use behavioral health facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of new buildings, land, vehicles, or equipment that expand the capacity of the existing system to serve new development. Fee revenues may not be used for replacement of aging facilities or equipment or to otherwise correct existing deficiencies unrelated to new development. The inclusion of technological assets in the facility inventory will allow fee revenue to be spent on technology related to behavioral health services. **Table 4.4** displays projected fee revenue through 2030.

Table 4.4: Projected Revenue - Existing Standard

Facility Standard per Capita	\$	46
Service Population Growth Within County (2008-2030)		<u>394,800</u>
New Development Contribution to Planned Facilities	\$	18,160,800

Sources: Tables 4.2 and 4.3; Willdan Financial Services.

Fee Schedule

Table 4.5 shows the behavioral health facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space).

Table 4.5: Behavioral Health Facilities Impact Fee - Existing Facilities Standard

Land Use	A	B	C=AxB	
	Cost Per Capita	Density	Fee ¹	Fee per Sq. Ft.
<i>Residential</i>				
Single Family	\$ 46	3.15	\$ 145	
Multifamily	46	2.20	101	
<i>Nonresidential</i>				
Commercial	\$ 14	2.41	\$ 34	\$ 0.034
Office	14	2.87	40	0.040
Industrial (Small)	14	0.64	9	0.009
Industrial (Large)				
Manufacturing	14	0.92	13	0.013
Distribution	14	0.37	5	0.005
Warehouse	14	0.18	3	0.003

¹ Fee per dwelling unit (residential) or per 1,000 square feet (nonresidential).

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 4.3; Willdan Financial Services.

5. Criminal Justice

The purpose of this fee is to ensure that new development funds its fair share of criminal justice facilities. The fee will be charged countywide to both residential and nonresidential development. The County will use fee revenues to expand criminal justice facilities, including vehicles and equipment, to serve new development.

Service Population

Criminal justice facilities serve both residents and businesses and provide services equally to both incorporated and unincorporated portions of the County. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities are based on the County's service population including residents and workers.

Table 5.1 shows the estimated service population in 2008 and 2030. The demand for countywide criminal justice facilities is primarily related to the demands that residents and businesses place on those facilities. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one employee compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development yields a lesser demand for criminal justice facilities.

Table 5.1: Criminal Justice Service Population

	Residents	Workers	Service Population
Existing - Countywide (2008)	518,100	156,700	566,700
New Development - Countywide (2008-2030)	<u>337,900</u>	<u>183,400</u>	<u>394,800</u>
Total - Countywide (2030)	856,000	340,100	961,500
Weighting factor	1.00	0.31	

Note: Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40 hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week.

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Standards

This study uses the existing inventory method to calculate fee schedules for criminal justice facilities (see *Introduction* for further information). **Table 5.2** presents an inventory of criminal justice facilities in Stanislaus County along with each facility's estimated replacement value. An inventory of vehicles can be found in **Appendix Table A.3**. An inventory of

technological assets can be found in **Appendix Table A.11**. The total value of criminal justice facilities is estimated at approximately \$22.5 million.

Table 5.2: Criminal Justice Existing Facilities

Facility	Inventory	Unit Cost ¹	Total Value
<u>Land</u>			
Former Bank of America Building, 1021 I Street, Modesto	0.28 acres	\$ 958,300	\$ 268,300
Ray Simon Reg Criminal Justice Trng Ctr, Modesto	13.69 acres	50,000	684,500
Former City Hall Building, 801 11th Street, Modesto ²	0.22 acres	958,300	210,800
832 12th Street Office Building	<u>0.20</u> acres	958,300	<u>191,660</u>
Subtotal - Land	14.39 acres		\$ 1,355,260
<u>Buildings</u>			
Ray Simon Regional Criminal Justice Training Center	22,615 sq. ft.	\$ 175	\$ 3,957,600
801 11th Street, Modesto - Probation	16,761 sq. ft.	\$ 175	\$ 2,933,200
Public Defender 1021 I Street (former Bank of America) I Street	14,177 sq. ft.	\$ 175	2,481,000
District Attorney 12th Street Office Building	<u>43,800</u> sq. ft.	\$ 175	<u>7,665,000</u>
Subtotal - Buildings	97,353 sq. ft.		\$ 17,036,800
Vehicles (from Table A.3)			\$ 602,000
Technology (from Table A.11)			\$ 2,869,076
Existing PFF Fund Balance			<u>\$ 598,393</u>
Total Existing Facilities			\$ 22,461,529

¹ Unit costs based on current construction cost and/or market value. Costs are per acre for land, per square foot for buildings.

² Total multi-tenant site acreage is 0.49 acres. Site shared with Sheriff, Other County Facilities and other functions.

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table 5.3 shows current per capita investment in criminal justice facilities. This value was calculated by dividing the existing investment in criminal justice facilities by the current service population. The cost per resident is \$40, and the cost per worker is \$12.

Table 5.3: Criminal Justice Facilities - Existing Standard

Total Value Existing Facilities	\$ 22,461,529
2008 Service Population	<u>566,700</u>
Cost Per Capita	\$ 40
Cost Per Resident	\$ 40
Cost Per Worker ¹	12

¹ Workers weighted at 0.31 of residents.

Sources: Tables 5.1 and 5.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Use of Fee Revenues

The County can use criminal justice facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of new buildings, land, vehicles, or equipment that expand the capacity of the existing system to serve new development. Fee revenues may not be used for replacement of aging facilities. The inclusion of technological assets in the facility inventory will allow fee revenue to be spent on technology related to criminal justice services. **Table 5.4** displays projected fee revenue through 2030.

Table 5.4: Allocation of Planned Criminal Justice Facility Costs To New Development - Existing Standard

Facility System Cost Per Capita	\$ 40
New Development Service Population (2008-2030)	<u>394,800</u>
New Development Contribution to Planned Facilities	\$ 15,792,000

Sources: Tables 5.1 and 5.3; Willdan Financial Services.

Fee Schedule

Table 5.5 shows the criminal justice facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space).

Table 5.5: Criminal Justice Facility Impact Fees - Existing Inventory Standard

Land Use	A	B	C=AxB	
	Cost Per Capita	Density	Fee ¹	Fee per Sq. Ft.
<i>Residential</i>				
Single Family Unit	\$ 40	3.15	\$ 126	
Multi-family Unit	40	2.20	88	
<i>Nonresidential</i>				
Commercial	\$ 12	2.41	\$ 29	\$ 0.029
Office	12	2.87	34	0.034
Industrial (Small)	12	0.64	8	0.008
Industrial (Large)				
Manufacturing	12	0.92	11	0.011
Distribution	12	0.37	4	0.004
Warehouse	12	0.18	2	0.002

¹ Fee per dwelling unit (residential) or per 1,000 square feet (nonresidential).

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 5.3; Willdan Financial Services.

6. Detention

The purpose of the fee is to ensure that new development funds its fair share of planned countywide detention facilities. Countywide detention refers to the adult and youth incarceration facilities and services provided by the County, in both incorporated and unincorporated areas. The fee will be charged countywide to both residential and nonresidential development. A fee schedule is presented based on the value of existing facilities to ensure that development provides funding to meet its needs. The County will use fee revenues to expand detention facilities, including vehicles and equipment, to serve new development.

Service Population

Public protection facilities serve both residents and businesses and provide services equally to both incorporated and unincorporated portions of the County. Therefore, the demand for services and associated facilities is based on the County's service population including residents and workers.

Table 6.1 shows the estimated service population in 2008 and 2030. The demand for countywide detention facilities is primarily related to the demands that residents and businesses place on the County's judicial system. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one employee compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development yields a lesser demand for countywide detention facilities.

Table 6.1: Detention Facilities Service Population

	Residents	Workers	Service Population
Existing - Countywide (2008)	518,100	156,700	566,700
New Development - Countywide (2008-2030)	<u>337,900</u>	<u>183,400</u>	<u>394,800</u>
Total - Countywide (2030)	856,000	340,100	961,500
Weighting factor	1.00	0.31	

Note: Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40 hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week.

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Standards

As noted in the *Introduction*, this study uses the existing inventory method to calculate facilities standards for countywide detention facilities. **Table 6.2** presents an inventory of detention facilities in Stanislaus County. An inventory of vehicles and equipment can be found in **Appendix Table A.4**. An inventory of technological assets can be found in **Appendix Table A.11**. Total value for all existing facilities is approximately \$166.8 million.

Table 6.2: Detention Facilities Existing Facilities

Facility	Inventory	Unit Cost ¹	Total Value
<i>Existing Facilities</i>			
Land			
Juvenile Justice Center, 2215 Blue Gum Road, Modesto	34.36 acres	\$ 50,000	\$ 1,718,000
Honor Farm, 8225 W Grayson Road, Grayson	97.00 acres	10,000	970,000
Downtown Jail, Modesto	0.86 acres	958,300	824,100
Public Safety Center 200-442 Hackett Road, Modesto	97.31 acres	50,000	4,865,500
Subtotal - Land	229.53 acres		\$ 8,377,600
Buildings			
Juv Justice Center, 2215 Blue Gum Avenue, Modesto	53,214 sq. ft.	175	\$ 9,312,500
Spcl Needs Housing Unit, 2215 Blue Gum Avenue, Modesto	12,790 sq. ft.	175	2,238,300
Units 5 & 6, 2215 Blue Gum Avenue, Modesto	16,358 sq. ft.	175	2,862,700
Barracks #4, 8224 W Grayson Road	8,500 sq. ft.	175	1,487,500
Barracks 1 & 2, 8224 W Grayson Road	7,836 sq. ft.	175	1,371,300
Barracks 3, 8224 W Grayson Road	4,198 sq. ft.	175	734,700
Building Maintenance Shop, 8224 W Grayson Road	853 sq. ft.	175	149,300
Clothing Room, 8224 W Grayson Road	800 sq. ft.	175	140,000
Green House, 8224 W Grayson Road	600 sq. ft.	175	105,000
Honor Farm, 8224 W Grayson Road	2,400 sq. ft.	175	420,000
Kitchen Laundry, 200 E Hackett Road	47,500 sq. ft.	175	8,312,500
Main Jail-Bldg 1, 200 E Hackett Road	135,523 sq. ft.	315	42,689,700
Main Jail-Bldg 2, 200 E Hackett Road	85,000 sq. ft.	315	26,775,000
Maintenance Building, 200 E Hackett Road	4,800 sq. ft.	175	840,000
Medical Modular, 8224 W Grayson Road	500 sq. ft.	175	87,500
Men's Jail, 1115 H Street, Modesto	53,208 sq. ft.	315	16,760,500
Mess Hall & Kitchen, 8224 W Grayson Road	4,800 sq. ft.	175	840,000
Minimum Security Housing, 200 E Hackett Road	35,600 sq. ft.	175	6,230,000
Modular Locker Rm, 8224 W Grayson Road	500 sq. ft.	175	87,500
Probation Modular, 8224 W Grayson Road	720 sq. ft.	175	126,000
Programs Modular, 8224 W Grayson Road	1,440 sq. ft.	175	252,000
Shop, 8224 W Grayson Road	4,800 sq. ft.	175	840,000
Staff Breakroom, 8224 W Grayson Road	720 sq. ft.	175	126,000
Staff Restroom, 8224 W Grayson Road	300 sq. ft.	175	52,500
Supply/Storage, 8224 W Grayson Road	1,600 sq. ft.	175	280,000
Visiting, 8224 W Grayson Road	100 sq. ft.	175	17,500
Walk-In Freezer, 8224 W Grayson Road	120 sq. ft.	175	21,000
Walk-In Refrigerator, 200 E Hackett Road	600 sq. ft.	175	105,000
Subtotal - Buildings	485,380 sq. ft.		\$ 123,264,000
Vehicles and Equipment (from Table A.4)			\$ 1,596,000
Technology (from Table A.11)			\$ 302,008
Existing PFF Fund Balance ²			\$ 33,274,896
Total Existing Facilities			\$ 166,814,504

¹ Unit costs based on current construction cost and/or market value. Costs are per acre for land, per square foot for buildings.

² Reserved for new jail.

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table 6.3 shows current per capita investment in detention facilities. This value was calculated by dividing the existing investment in detention facilities by the current service population. The cost per resident is \$294, and the cost per worker is \$91.

Table 6.3: Detention Facilities Cost Per Capita - Existing Inventory Standard

Total Value Existing Facilities	\$ 166,814,504
2008 Service Population	<u>566,700</u>
Cost Per Capita	\$ 294
Cost Per Resident	\$ 294
Cost Per Worker ¹	91

¹ Workers weighted at 0.31 of residents.

Sources: Tables 6.1 and 6.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Use of Fee Revenues

The County can use detention facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of new buildings, land, vehicles, or equipment that expand the capacity of the existing system to serve new development. Fee revenues may not be used for replacement of aging facilities. Projects currently being evaluated that would be eligible for funding include expansion of the Public Safety Center and/or expansion of the Juvenile Justice Detention facilities. The inclusion of technological assets in the facility inventory will allow fee revenue to be spent on technology related to detention facilities. **Table 6.4** displays projected fee revenue through 2030.

Table 6.4: Allocation of Planned Detention Facilities Costs To New Development - Existing Standard

Facility System Cost Per Capita	\$ 294
Service Population Growth Within County (2008-2030)	<u>394,800</u>
New Development Contribution to Planned Facilities	\$ 116,071,200

Sources: Tables 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3; Willdan Financial Services.

Fee Schedule

Table 6.5 shows the detention facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space).

Table 6.5: Detention Facilities Impact Fees - Existing Inventory Standard

Land Use	A	B	C=AxB	
	Cost Per Capita	Density	Fee ¹	Fee per Sq. Ft.
<i>Residential</i>				
Single Family Unit	\$ 294	3.15	\$ 926	
Multi-family Unit	294	2.20	647	
<i>Nonresidential</i>				
Commercial	\$ 91	2.41	\$ 219	\$ 0.22
Office	91	2.87	261	0.26
Industrial (Small)	91	0.64	58	0.06
Industrial (Large)				
Manufacturing	91	0.92	84	0.08
Distribution	91	0.37	34	0.03
Warehouse	91	0.18	16	0.02

¹ Fee per dwelling unit (residential) or per 1,000 square feet (nonresidential).

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 6.3; Willdan Financial Services.

7. Emergency Services

The purpose of this fee is to ensure that new development funds its fair share emergency service facilities. The fee will be charged countywide to both residential and nonresidential development. A fee schedule is presented based on the existing standard of emergency service facilities in Stanislaus County to ensure that new development provides adequate funding to meet its needs. The County will use fee revenues to expand emergency services facilities, including vehicles and equipment, to serve new development.

Service Population

Stanislaus County provides emergency services (dispatch, etc.) to both residents and businesses countywide. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities is based on a service population that includes residents and workers.

Table 7.1 shows the estimated service population in 2008 and 2030. The demand for emergency facilities is related to the demands that both residents and businesses place on the County's emergency response system. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one employee compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development yields a lesser demand for emergency services facilities.

Table 7.1: Emergency Services Facilities Service Population

	Residents	Workers	Service Population
Existing (2008)	518,100	156,700	566,700
New Development (2008-2030)	337,900	183,400	394,800
Total (2030)	856,000	340,100	961,500
Weighting factor	1.00	0.31	

Note: Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40 hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week.

Sources: Table 2.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Standards

This study uses the existing inventory standard to calculate fees for emergency services facilities. **Table 7.2** shows the existing inventory of emergency services facilities, including land, building, vehicles, equipment and technological assets. An inventory of vehicles and

equipment can be found in **Appendix Table A.5**. An inventory of technological assets can be found in **Appendix Table A.11**. The total value of all existing emergency services facilities is approximately \$3.6 million.

Regional 911 services are administered under a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA). The JPA began in 2000 and consolidated several dispatch centers in the County. The Oakdale City Fire Department joined the dispatch operation in 2001. At present all fire and law enforcement dispatches in the County are completed from the regional 911 center with the exception of dispatch for the City of Oakdale Police Department, the City of Ceres Police Department, and the City of Turlock Fire and Police Departments.

The Regional 911 program is housed at 3705 Oakdale Road. The building also houses the County's Office of Emergency Services, the City of Modesto Fire Department and a small number of City of Modesto Police Department employees. The building is half owned by the City of Modesto and half owned by the County. The building also serves as the County's Emergency Operations Center. Space for Regional 911 is the first priority and all other uses are based on space available.

Operational costs for Regional 911 are based on a population model that assigns 54 percent of costs to the City of Modesto and 46 percent of costs to the County (which represents the County and its contract cities of Hughson, Patterson, Riverbank, Waterford, and Newman).

Given the vast predominance of services offered countywide, with exceptions noted as above, the emergency services fee is a countywide fee. Mutual aid agreements between cities and the County result in emergency service facilities serving the entire County in many situations, further justifying a countywide emergency services impact fee.

Table 7.2: Emergency Services Facilities Existing Inventory

	Inventory	Unit Cost ¹	Value
<i>Land (acres)</i>			
3705 Oakdale Road	0.93	\$ 435,600	\$ 405,000
Subtotal - Land			\$ 405,000
<i>Buildings (square feet)</i>			
Office of Emergency Services	4,000	\$ 175	\$ 700,000
County Share of Emergency Dispatch (46%)	<u>3,680</u>	175	<u>644,000</u>
Subtotal - Buildings	7,680		\$ 1,344,000
Vehicles & Equipment (from Table A.5)			\$ 698,000
Technology (from Table A.11)			\$ 957,013
Existing PFF Fund Balance			<u>\$ 158,779</u>
Total Existing Facilities			\$ 3,562,791

¹ Unit costs based on market value.

Sources: Tables A.5, and Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Table 7.3 shows current per capita investment in emergency services facilities. This value was calculated by dividing the existing investment in emergency services facilities by the current service population. The cost per capita is \$6.

Table 7.3: Emergency Services Facilities - Existing Standard

Existing Emergency Services Facilities	\$	3,562,791
Existing Service Population		<u>566,700</u>
Facility Standard per Capita	\$	6
Cost per Resident	\$	6
Cost per Worker ¹		2

¹ Worker weighting factor of 0.31 applied to cost per resident.

Sources: Tables 7.1 and 7.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Use of Fee Revenues

The County can use emergency services facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of new buildings, land, vehicles, or equipment that expand the capacity of the existing system to serve new development. Fee revenues may not be used for replacement of aging facilities. The inclusion of technological assets in the facility inventory will allow fee revenue to be spent on technology related to emergency services. **Table 7.4** displays projected fee revenue through 2030.

Table 7.4: Allocation of Planned Emergency Services Facilities Costs to New Development

Facility Standard per Capita	\$	6
Service Population Growth Within County (2008-2030)		<u>394,800</u>
New Development Fair Share of Planned Facilities	\$	2,368,800

Sources: Tables 7.1 and 7.3; Willdan Financial Services.

Fee Schedule

Table 7.5 shows the emergency services facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space).

Table 7.5: Emergency Services Facilities Impact Fee - Existing Facilities Standard

Land Use	A		B	C=AxB	
	Cost Per Capita		Density	Fee ¹	Fee per Sq. Ft.
<i>Residential</i>					
Single Family	\$	6	3.15	\$	19
Multifamily		6	2.20		13
<i>Nonresidential</i>					
Commercial	\$	2	2.41	\$	5 \$ 0.005
Office		2	2.87		6 0.006
Industrial (Small)		2	0.64		1 0.001
Industrial (Large)					
Manufacturing		2	0.92		2 0.002
Distribution		2	0.37		1 0.001
Warehouse		2	0.18		0.40 0.000

¹ Fee per dwelling unit (residential) or per 1,000 square feet (nonresidential).

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 7.3; Willdan Financial Services.

8. Health Facilities

The purpose of this fee is to ensure that new development funds its fair share of health facilities. The fee will be charged countywide to both residential and nonresidential development. The County will use fee revenues to expand health facilities, including vehicles and equipment, to serve new development.

Service Population

Stanislaus County provides health services to both residents and businesses countywide. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities is based on a countywide service population that includes residents and workers.

Table 8.1 shows the estimated service population in 2008 and 2030. The demand for health facilities is related to the demands that both residents and businesses place on the County's healthcare system. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one employee compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development yields a lesser demand for health facilities.

Table 8.1: Health Facilities Service Population

	Residents	Workers	Service Population
Existing (2008)	518,100	156,700	566,700
New Development (2008-2030)	337,900	183,400	394,800
Total (2030)	856,000	340,100	961,500
Weighting factor	1.00	0.31	

Note: Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40 hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week.

Sources: Table 2.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Standards

This study uses the existing inventory method to calculate impact fees for health facilities (see *Introduction* for further information). **Table 8.2** shows the existing inventory of health facilities owned by Stanislaus County. An inventory of vehicles and equipment can be found

in **Appendix Table A.6**. An inventory of technological assets can be found in **Appendix Table A.11**. The total value of existing health facilities is approximately \$52.9 million.

Table 8.2: Health Facilities Existing Inventory

	Inventory	Unit	Unit Cost ¹	Value
<i>Land (acres)</i>				
County Center II, 700-1020 Scenic Dr	14.10	acres	\$ 958,300	\$ 13,512,000
Subtotal - Land	14.10	acres		\$ 13,512,000
<i>Buildings (square feet)</i>				
County Center II				
Administration Offices	35,570	sq. ft.	\$ 175	\$ 6,225,000
Clinic/Medical Offices	148,187	sq. ft.	175	25,933,000
Shop/Warehouse	17,320	sq. ft.	175	3,031,000
Subtotal - Buildings	201,077	sq. ft.		\$ 35,189,000
Vehicles & Equipment (from Table A.6)				\$ 388,000
Technology (from Table A.11)				\$ 1,776,454
Existing PFF Fund Balance				\$ 1,985,143
Total Facilities				\$ 52,850,597

¹ Unit costs based on market value.

Sources: Tables A.6, A.11; Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services

Table 8.3 shows current per capita investment in health facilities. This value was calculated by dividing the existing investment in emergency services facilities by the current service population. The cost per capita is \$93.

Table 8.3: Health Facilities - Existing Standard

Existing Health Facilities	\$ 52,850,597
Existing Service Population	566,700
Facility Standard per Capita	\$ 93
Cost per Resident	\$ 93
Cost per Worker ¹	29

¹ Worker weighting factor of 0.31 applied to cost per resident.

Sources: Tables 8.1 and 8.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Use of Fee Revenues

The County can use health facilities fee revenue for the construction or purchase of new buildings, land, vehicles, or equipment that expand the capacity of the existing system to serve new development. Fee revenues may not be used for replacement of aging facilities or equipment or to otherwise correct existing deficiencies unrelated to new development. The inclusion of technological assets in the facility inventory will allow fee revenue to be spent on technology related to health services. **Table 8.4** shows an estimate of health impact fee revenue through 2030.

Table 8.4: Allocation of Planned Health Facilities Costs to New Development

Facility Standard per Capita	\$ 93
Service Population Growth Within County (2008-2030)	<u>394,800</u>
New Development Fair Share of Planned Facilities	\$ 36,716,400

Sources: Tables 8.1 and 8.3; Willdan Financial Services.

Fee Schedule

Table 8.5 displays the health facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space).

Table 8.5: Health Facilities Impact Fee - Existing Facilities Standard

Land Use	A	B	C=AxB	
	Cost Per Capita	Density	Fee ¹	Fee per Sq. Ft.
<i>Residential</i>				
Single Family	\$ 93	3.15	\$ 293	
Multifamily	93	2.20	205	
<i>Nonresidential</i>				
Commercial	\$ 29	2.41	\$ 70	\$ 0.070
Office	29	2.87	83	0.083
Industrial (Small)	29	0.64	19	0.019
Industrial (Large)				
Manufacturing	29	0.92	27	0.027
Distribution	29	0.37	11	0.011
Warehouse	29	0.18	5	0.005

¹ Fee per dwelling unit (residential) or per 1,000 square feet (nonresidential).

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 8.3; Willdan Financial Services.

9. Library Facilities

The purpose of this fee is to ensure that new development funds its fair share of library facilities. The fee will be charged countywide to all new residential development. The County will use fee revenues to expand library facilities, including collections and equipment, to serve new development.

Service Population

Residents are the primary users of libraries. Therefore, demand for library facilities is based on the County's residential population and excludes workers. Stanislaus County provides library services countywide. Therefore the fee will be charged to new residential development countywide. **Table 9.1** shows the service population for library facilities for both 2008 and 2030.

Table 9.1: Library Service Population

	Residents
Existing (2008)	518,100
New Development (2008-2030)	<u>337,900</u>
Total - Countywide (2030)	856,000

Source: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Standards

This study uses the existing inventory method to calculate fee schedules for library facilities (see *Introduction* for further information). **Table 9.2** presents an inventory of existing library facilities, including land, buildings, vehicles, equipment and collections, in Stanislaus County. An inventory of collections can be found in **Appendix Table A.7**. An inventory of vehicles can be found in **Appendix Table A.8**. An inventory of technological assets can be found in **Appendix Table A.11**. The total existing value of library facilities is approximately \$68.6 million.

Table 9.2: Existing Library Facilities

	Inventory	Unit Cost ¹	Total Value
Existing Facilities			
Land			
1305 Kern Street, Newman Branch Library	0.29 acres	\$ 50,000	\$ 14,500
1500 I Street, Modesto Main Library	1.69 acres	958,300	1,619,500
151 South 1st Street, Oakdale Branch Library	0.23 acres	435,600	100,200
2250 Magnolia Street, Ceres Branch Library	0.12 acres	435,600	52,300
324 E Street, Waterford Branch Library	0.14 acres	50,000	7,000
3442 Santa Fe Avenue, Riverbank Branch Library	0.22 acres	435,600	95,800
46-48 West Salida, Patterson Branch Library	0.14 acres	50,000	7,000
4835 Sisk Road, Nick W. Blom Salida Regional Library	4.95 acres	958,300	4,743,600
550 Minaret Avenue, Turlock Branch Library	1.46 acres	435,600	636,000
18 South Abie Street, Empire Community Center	0.96 acres	50,000	48,000
Subtotal	10.20 acres		\$ 7,323,900
Buildings			
Ceres Branch Library, 2250 Magnolia Street, Ceres	4,200 sq. ft.	\$ 175	\$ 735,000
Empire Branch Library, 18 South Abie Street, Empire	4,300 sq. ft.	175	752,500
Keyes Branch Library, 5506 Jennie, Keyes	7,400 sq. ft.	175	1,295,000
Modesto Main Library, 1500 I Street, Modesto	62,000 sq. ft.	175	10,850,000
Newman Branch Library, 1305 Kern Street, Newman	2,613 sq. ft.	175	457,300
Oakdale Branch Library, 151 South 1st Street, Oakdale	6,500 sq. ft.	175	1,137,500
Patterson Branch Library, 46-48 West Salida, Patterson	6,800 sq. ft.	175	1,190,000
Riverbank Branch Library, 3442 Santa Fe Avenue, Riverbank	3,594 sq. ft.	175	629,000
Salida Branch Library, 4835 Sisk Road, Salida	61,000 sq. ft.	175	10,675,000
Turlock Branch Library, 550 Minaret Avenue, Turlock	10,000 sq. ft.	175	1,750,000
Waterford Branch Library, 324 E Street, Waterford	3,000 sq. ft.	175	525,000
West Modesto Literacy Office, 401 Paradise Road, Modesto	643 sq. ft.	175	112,500
Subtotal	172,050 sq. ft.		\$ 30,108,800
Collections			
Subtotal - Collections (from Table A.7)			\$ 22,457,700
Computer Equipment (from Table A.11)			
			\$ 1,485,232
Vehicles (from Table A.8)			
			\$ 53,000
Existing Library Impact Fee (PFF) Fund Balance			
			\$ 7,186,698
Total Value Existing Facilities			
			\$ 68,615,330

¹ Unit costs based on market value.

Source: Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Table 9.3 shows current per capita investment in library facilities. This value was calculated by dividing the existing investment in library facilities by the current service population. The cost per capita is \$132.

Table 9.3: Library Facilities Existing Standard

Existing Library Facilities	\$ 68,615,330
Existing Service Population	518,100
Facility Standard per Capita	\$ 132
Cost per Resident	\$ 132

Sources: Tables 9.1 and 9.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Use of Fee Revenues

The County can use library facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of new buildings, land, vehicles, volumes, or equipment that expand the capacity of the existing system to serve new development. Fee revenues may not be used for replacement of aging facilities or equipment or to otherwise correct existing deficiencies unrelated to new development. The inclusion of technological assets in the facility inventory will allow fee revenue to be spent on technology related to library services. **Table 9.4** shows an estimate of library impact fee revenue through 2030.

Table 9.4: Allocation of Planned Library Facility Costs to New Development

Facility Standard per Capita	\$ 132
Service Population Growth Within County (2008-2030)	<u>337,900</u>
New Development Fair Share of Planned Facilities	\$ 44,602,800

Sources: Tables 9.1 and 9.3; Willdan Financial Services.

Fee Schedule

Table 9.5 shows the library facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit densities (persons per dwelling unit).

Table 9.5: Library Facilities Impact Fee - Existing Facilities Standard

Land Use	A	B	C=AxB	
	Cost Per Capita	Density	Fee ¹	
<i>Residential</i>				
Single Family	\$ 132	3.15	\$	416
Multifamily	132	2.20		290

¹ Fee per dwelling unit.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 9.3; Willdan Financial Services.

10. Other County Facilities

This chapter addresses the need for other county facilities needed to serve projected development including office space, shop space, and related equipment. The majority of facilities included in this chapter benefit all of the unincorporated areas of Stanislaus County as well as the incorporated cities, resulting in a countywide service population. Some facilities serve either the unincorporated area almost exclusively (public works facilities) or have some functions that are countywide and others that exclusively serve the unincorporated area (e.g., some County planning functions). The County will use fee revenues to expand other county facilities, including vehicles and equipment, to serve new development.

Service Population

Table 10.1 shows the existing and future projected service population for other county facilities. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one employee compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development yields a lesser demand for other county facilities. Because some facilities exclusively serve the unincorporated area, the countywide and unincorporated-only service populations are both shown in Table 10.1.

Table 10.1: Other County Facilities Service Population

	Residents	Workers	Service Population
<i>Countywide</i>			
Existing (2008)	518,100	156,700	566,700
New Development (2008-2030)	337,900	183,400	394,800
Total (2030) - Countywide	856,000	340,100	961,500
<i>Unincorporated</i>			
Existing (2008)	113,700	24,800	121,400
New Development (2008-2030)	33,200	77,900	57,300
Total (2030) - Unincorporated	146,900	102,700	178,700
Weighting factor	1.00	0.31	

Note: Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40 hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week.

Sources: Table 2.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Standards

The County of Stanislaus owns a number of facilities that are classified as ‘other county facilities.’ The functions housed in these facilities include fleet services, central services, the Assessor, the Board of Supervisors, public works and other general government functions and support space.

In addition to office space, facilities included in this chapter include shop and warehouse facilities. **Tables 10.2a** and **10.2b** display the County’s existing inventory of ‘other county facilities.’

Tables 10.3a, 10.3b and **10.3c** show the allocation of the facilities from Tables 10.2a and 10.2b, and tables from the Appendix by service area. The “% Countywide” column estimates the proportion of each facility serving a countywide function. The “% Unincorporated Only” column estimates the proportion of each facility supporting a County of Stanislaus service that serves only the unincorporated areas of the County.

Inventory of vehicles and equipment can be found in **Appendix Tables A.9 and 10**. An inventory of technological assets can be found in **Appendix Table A.11**.

Table 10.2a: Other County Facilities Existing Inventory - Land

	Inventory	Unit	Unit Cost ¹	Value
<i>Land</i>				
Tenth Street Place, 1010 10th Street	0.08	acres	\$ 958,300	\$ 77,000
Tenth Street Place, 1010 10th Street	0.56	acres	958,300	537,000
Tenth Street Place, 1010 10th Street	0.73	acres	958,300	700,000
County Center II - Community Services Agency	0.07	acres	958,300	67,000
County Center II - General Services Agency - Print Shop	0.47	acres	958,300	450,000
Agricultural Center 3800 Cornucopia Way, Modesto	15.58	acres	50,000	779,000
Burbank-Paradise Hall, 1325 Beverly Drive	0.11	acres	75,000	8,000
Morgan Road - Public Works Yard, 1716 Morgan Road	14.96	acres	50,000	748,000
Public Works Yard, 301 South First Str	1.29	acres	50,000	65,000
Landfill, 400 Fink Road (Dry Land)	122.56	acres	2,000	245,000
Landfill, 400 Fink Road (Buffer/Orchard)	345.00	acres	10,000	3,450,000
Former City Hall Building - 801 11th Street, Modesto	0.11	acres	958,300	105,000
Fleet Services Facility, 448 East Hackett Road	10.00	acres	50,000	500,000
Public Works Yard, 551 South Center Str	2.00	acres	50,000	100,000
Geer Road Landfill, 751 Geer Road (Dry Land)	85.19	acres	2,000	170,000
Geer Road Landfill, 751 Geer Road (Buffer/Orchard)	345.00	acres	10,000	3,450,000
Community Services Facility 3800 Cornucopia Way, Modesto	26.45	acres	50,000	1,323,000
Vacant/future Development - 3800 Cornucopia Way, Modesto	27.33	acres	50,000	1,367,000
12th Street Parking Garage, 820 12th Street	0.89	acres	958,300	853,000
1021 I Street, Modesto	0.41	acres	958,300	393,000
County Center III - Other County Facilities Share (CEO, Clerk, GSA, COE)	8.47	acres	435,600	3,690,000
12th Street Office Building, 832 12th Street	0.07	acres	958,300	67,000
Subtotal - Land	1,007.33			\$ 19,144,000

¹ Unit costs based on market value.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Table 2.3; Willdan Financial Services.

Table 10.2.b: Other County Facilities Existing Inventory - Buildings

	Inventory	Unit	Unit Cost ¹	Value
Buildings				
Agriculture Commissioner - 3800 Cornucopia Way	50,783	sq. ft.	\$ 175	\$ 8,887,000
Area Agency on Aging/Vets, 718 Tuolumne, Modesto - Mancini Hall	6,000	sq. ft.	175	1,050,000
Assessor, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	18,861	sq. ft.	175	3,301,000
Auditor-Controller, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	14,158	sq. ft.	175	2,478,000
Board of Supervisors, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	10,899	sq. ft.	175	1,907,000
Central Services, 1018 Scenic Drive, Modesto - Central Services	7,752	sq. ft.	175	1,357,000
Central Services, 909 Oakdale Road, Modesto - Training Center	23,544	sq. ft.	175	4,120,000
Central Services, 909 Oakdale Road, Modesto - Warehouse #1	14,400	sq. ft.	175	2,520,000
Central Services, 909 Oakdale Road, Modesto - Warehouse #2	13,600	sq. ft.	175	2,380,000
Chief Executive Office, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	22,225	sq. ft.	175	3,889,000
County Center III - Other County Facilities Share (CEO, Clerk, GSA, COE)	51,544	sq. ft.	175	9,020,000
Capital Projects Office, 825 12th Street	2,100	sq. ft.	175	368,000
Child Support Services, 251 E Hackett Road, Ceres	53,693	sq. ft.	175	9,396,000
Child Support Services, 801 11th Street, Modesto (former City Hall)	1,267	sq. ft.	175	222,000
Guardian Ad Litem, 801 11th Street, Modesto (former City Hall)	373	sq. ft.	175	65,000
Clerk of the Board, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	2,127	sq. ft.	175	372,000
Clerk-Recorder, 1021 I Street (former Bank of America) I Street	21,516	sq. ft.	175	3,765,000
Community Services Agency, 251 E Hackett Road, Ceres	144,970	sq. ft.	175	25,370,000
Community Services Agency, 401 Paradise Road, West Modesto Office	1,781	sq. ft.	175	312,000
Community Services Agency, County Center II	1,000	sq. ft.	175	175,000
Cooperative Extension, 3800 Cornucopia Way	30,470	sq. ft.	175	5,332,000
County Counsel, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	9,053	sq. ft.	175	1,584,000
District Attorney, 832 12th Street	44,691	sq. ft.	175	7,821,000
Employment & Training, 251 E Hackett Road, Ceres	53,693	sq. ft.	175	9,396,000
Environmental Resources, 3800 Cornucopia Way - Environmental Resources	40,626	sq. ft.	175	7,110,000
Fleet Services, 442 E Hackett Road - Fleet Services Office/Shop	9,374	sq. ft.	175	1,640,000
Fleet Services, 442 E Hackett Road - Fleet Services Office/Shop	9,374	sq. ft.	175	1,640,000
General Services Agency Print Shop - County Center II	6,752	sq. ft.	175	1,182,000
Planning/Com. Dev., 1010 10th Street, Modesto	9,614	sq. ft.	175	1,682,000
Probation, 2215 Blue Gum Avenue, Modesto - Juv Justice Center	2,160	sq. ft.	175	378,000
Probation, 801 11th Street	22,482	sq. ft.	175	3,934,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Body Shop	6,000	sq. ft.	175	1,050,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Carpentry/Paint Shop	3,822	sq. ft.	175	669,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Main Bldg	9,504	sq. ft.	175	1,663,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Paint Storage	120	sq. ft.	175	21,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Parking Shed	8,000	sq. ft.	175	1,400,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Pole Barn	6,100	sq. ft.	175	1,068,000
Environmental Resources, 400 Fink Road	500	sq. ft.	175	88,000
Environmental Resources, 400 Fink Road	2,500	sq. ft.	175	438,000
Environmental Resources, 400 Fink Road	800	sq. ft.	175	140,000
Environmental Resources, 400 Fink Road	1,600	sq. ft.	175	280,000
Environmental Resources, 751 Geer Road	2,500	sq. ft.	175	438,000
Public Works, 551 South Center - Public Works Office	1,600	sq. ft.	175	280,000
Public Works, 551 South Center - Public Works Shop	8,000	sq. ft.	175	1,400,000
Public Works, 551 South Center - Public Works Shop	3,000	sq. ft.	175	525,000
Public Works, 301 South First Street - Roads Modular Unit	800	sq. ft.	175	140,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Shop	8,100	sq. ft.	175	1,418,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Soils Lab/Sign Shop	2,500	sq. ft.	175	438,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Storage Bldg	5,200	sq. ft.	175	910,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Storage Bldg	3,800	sq. ft.	175	665,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Storage Bldg #1	6,000	sq. ft.	175	1,050,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Storage Bldg #2	6,000	sq. ft.	175	1,050,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Weed Control Building	500	sq. ft.	175	88,000
Public Works, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	14,646	sq. ft.	175	2,563,000
Strategic Business Technology, 801 11th Street	5,068	sq. ft.	175	887,000
Strategic Business Technology, 1021 I Street (former Bank of America)	400	sq. ft.	175	70,000
Treasurer-Tax Collector, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	16,995	sq. ft.	175	2,974,000
Subtotal - Buildings	824,935			\$ 144,366,000

¹ Unit costs based on market value.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Table 2.3; Willdan Financial Services.

Table 10.3a.: Allocation of Other County Facilities Between Countywide and Unincorporated Service Populations

	Total Value	% County-wide ¹	Countywide Allocation	% Uninc. Only ¹	Uninc. Allocation
<u>Land</u>					
Tenth Street Place, 1010 10th Street	\$ 77,000	100%	\$ 77,000	0%	\$ -
Tenth Street Place, 1010 10th Street	537,000	100%	537,000	0%	-
Tenth Street Place, 1010 10th Street	700,000	100%	700,000	0%	-
County Center II - Community Services Agency	67,000	100%	67,000	0%	-
County Center II - General Services Agency - Print Shop	450,000	100%	450,000	0%	-
Agricultural Center 3800 Cornucopia Way, Modesto	779,000	75%	584,250	25%	194,750
Burbank-Paradise Hall, 1325 Beverly Drive	8,000	100%	8,000	0%	-
Morgan Road - Public Works Yard, 1716 Morgan Road	748,000	40%	299,200	60%	448,800
Public Works Yard, 301 South First Str	65,000	40%	26,000	60%	39,000
Landfill, 400 Fink Road	245,000	100%	245,000	0%	-
Former City Hall Building - 801 11th Street, Modesto	105,000	100%	105,000	0%	-
Fleet Services Facility, 448 East Hackett Road	500,000	80%	400,000	20%	100,000
Public Works Yard, 551 South Center Str	100,000	40%	40,000	60%	60,000
Geer Road Landfill, 751 Geer Road	170,000	100%	170,000	0%	-
Community Services Facility 3800 Cornucopia Way, Modesto	1,323,000	100%	1,323,000	0%	-
Vacant/future Development - 3800 Cornucopia Way, Modesto	1,367,000	100%	1,367,000	0%	-
12th Street Parking Garage, 820 12th Street	853,000	100%	853,000	0%	-
1021 I Street, Modesto	393,000	100%	393,000	0%	-
1022 I Street, Modesto	3,690,000	100%	3,690,000	0%	-
12th Street Office Building, 832 12th Street	67,000	100%	67,000	0%	-
Subtotal - Land	\$ 12,244,000		\$ 11,401,450		\$ 842,550

¹ Allocation of County services between countywide and unincorporated only is an estimate generated by Willdan Financial Services based on experience with other county governments in California.

Sources: Stanislaus County, Table 10.2, Willdan Financial Services.

Table 10.3b.: Allocation of Other County Facilities Between Countywide and Unincorporated Service Populations

	Total Value	% County-wide ¹	Countywide Allocation	% Uninc. Only ¹	Uninc. Allocation
Buildings					
Agriculture Commissioner - 3800 Cornucopia Way	\$ 8,887,000	100%	\$ 8,887,000	0%	\$ -
Area Agency on Aging/Vets, 718 Tuolumne, Modesto - Mancini Hall	1,050,000	100%	1,050,000	0%	-
Assessor, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	3,301,000	100%	3,301,000	0%	-
Auditor-Controller, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	2,478,000	100%	2,478,000	0%	-
Board of Supervisors, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	1,907,000	100%	1,907,000	0%	-
Central Services, 1018 Scenic Drive, Modesto	1,357,000	80%	1,085,600	20%	271,400
Central Services, 909 Oakdale Road, Modesto - Training Center	4,120,000	80%	3,296,000	20%	824,000
Central Services, 909 Oakdale Road, Modesto - Warehouse #1	2,520,000	80%	2,016,000	20%	504,000
Central Services, 909 Oakdale Road, Modesto - Warehouse #2	2,380,000	80%	1,904,000	20%	476,000
Chief Executive Office, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	3,889,000	75%	2,916,750	25%	972,250
Capital Projects Office, 825 12th Street	368,000	75%	276,000	25%	92,000
Child Support Services, 251 E Hackett Road, Ceres	9,396,000	100%	9,396,000	0%	-
Child Support Services, 801 11th Street, Modesto (former City Hall)	222,000	100%	222,000	0%	-
Guardian Ad Litem, 801 11th Street, Modesto (former City Hall)	65,000	100%	65,000	0%	-
Clerk of the Board, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	372,000	100%	372,000	0%	-
Clerk-Recorder, 1021 I Street (former Bank of America) I Street	3,765,000	100%	3,765,000	0%	-
Community Services Agency, 251 E Hackett Road, Ceres	25,370,000	100%	25,370,000	0%	-
Community Services Agency, 401 Paradise Road, West Modesto Office	312,000	100%	312,000	0%	-
Community Services Agency, County Center II	175,000	100%	175,000	0%	-
Cooperative Extension, 3800 Cornucopia Way	5,332,000	100%	5,332,000	0%	-
County Counsel, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	1,584,000	75%	1,188,000	25%	396,000
District Attorney, 832 12th Street	7,821,000	100%	7,821,000	0%	-
Employment & Training, 251 E Hackett Road, Ceres - Employment & Training	9,396,000	100%	9,396,000	0%	-
Environmental Resources, 3800 Cornucopia Way - Environmental Resources	7,110,000	100%	7,110,000	0%	-
Fleet Services, 442 E Hackett Road - Fleet Services Office/Shop	1,640,000	100%	1,640,000	0%	-
Fleet Services, 442 E Hackett Road - Fleet Services Office/Shop	1,640,000	100%	1,640,000	0%	-
General Services Agency Print Shop - County Center II	1,182,000	100%	1,182,000	0%	-
Planning/Com. Dev., 1010 10th Street, Modesto	1,682,000	0%	-	100%	1,682,000
Probation, 2215 Blue Gum Avenue, Modesto - Juv Justice Center	378,000	100%	378,000	0%	-
Probation, 801 11th Street	3,934,000	100%	3,934,000	0%	-
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Body Shop	1,050,000	40%	420,000	60%	630,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Carpentry/Paint Shop	669,000	40%	267,600	60%	401,400
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Main Bldg	1,663,000	40%	665,200	60%	997,800
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Paint Storage	21,000	40%	8,400	60%	12,600
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Parking Shed	1,400,000	40%	560,000	60%	840,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Pole Barn	1,068,000	40%	427,200	60%	640,800
DER, 400 Fink Road	88,000	40%	35,200	60%	52,800
DER, 400 Fink Road	438,000	40%	175,200	60%	262,800
DER, 400 Fink Road	140,000	40%	56,000	60%	84,000
DER, 400 Fink Road	280,000	40%	112,000	60%	168,000
DER, 751 Geer Road	438,000	40%	175,200	60%	262,800
Public Works, 551 South Center - Public Works Office	280,000	40%	112,000	60%	168,000
Public Works, 551 South Center - Public Works Shop	1,400,000	40%	560,000	60%	840,000
Public Works, 551 South Center - Public Works Shop	525,000	40%	210,000	60%	315,000
Public Works, 301 South First Street - Roads Modular Unit	140,000	40%	56,000	60%	84,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Shop	1,418,000	40%	567,200	60%	850,800
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Soils Lab/Sign Shop	438,000	40%	175,200	60%	262,800
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Storage Bldg	910,000	40%	364,000	60%	546,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Storage Bldg	665,000	40%	266,000	60%	399,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Storage Bldg #1	1,050,000	40%	420,000	60%	630,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Storage Bldg #2	1,050,000	40%	420,000	60%	630,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Weed Control Building	88,000	40%	35,200	60%	52,800
Public Works, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	2,563,000	40%	1,025,200	60%	1,537,800
Strategic Business Technology, 801 11th Street	887,000	80%	709,600	20%	177,400
Strategic Business Technology, 1021 I Street (former Bank of America)	70,000	80%	56,000	20%	14,000
Treasurer-Tax Collector, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	<u>2,974,000</u>	100%	<u>2,974,000</u>	0%	-
Subtotal - Buildings	\$135,346,000		\$119,267,750		\$16,078,250

¹ Allocation of County services between countywide and unincorporated only is an estimate generated by Willdan Financial Services based on experience with other county governments in California.

Sources: Stanislaus County, Table 10.2, Willdan Financial Services

Table 10.3c.: Allocation of Other County Facilities Between Countywide and Unincorporated Service Populations

	Countywide Allocation	Uninc. Allocation
<u>Land (from Table 10.3a)</u>	\$ 11,401,450	\$ 842,550
<u>Buildings (from Table 10.3b)</u>	119,267,750	16,078,250
<u>Vehicles & Equipment (from Table A.9)</u>	4,405,000	592,000
<u>Public Works Vehicles and Equipment (from Table A.10)</u>	5,856,000	8,784,000
<u>Technological Assets (from Table A.11)</u>		
Admin (Other County Facilities)	2,558,440	-
Existing PFF Fund Balance	<u>5,625,916</u>	<u>-</u>
Total Existing Investment in Other County Facilities	\$149,114,556	\$ 26,296,800

Sources: Stanislaus County; Tables 10.2a, 10.2b, 10.3a, 10.3b, A9, A10 and A.11; Willdan Financial Services.

The County's projected growth in service population will create a need for additional other county facilities. The County must expand its facilities to maintain existing facility standards as new development occurs in the County. **Table 10.4** shows the calculation of the existing value per capita standard for both unincorporated and incorporated areas of the County. The value per capita in the unincorporated areas is equal to the sum of the countywide and the unincorporated only value per capita.

Table 10.4: Other County Facilities Existing Standard

<u>Unincorporated Only</u>	
Existing Other County Facilities	\$ 26,296,800
Existing Service Population	<u>121,400</u>
Facility Standard per Capita	\$ 217
Cost per Resident	\$ 217
Cost per Worker ¹	67
<u>Countywide</u>	
Existing Other County Facilities	\$ 149,114,556
Existing Service Population	<u>566,700</u>
Facility Standard per Capita	\$ 263
Cost per Resident	\$ 263
Cost per Worker ¹	82

¹ Worker weighting factor of 0.31 applied to cost per resident.

Sources: Tables 10.1 and 10.3; Willdan Financial Services.

Use of Fee Revenues

The County can use other county facilities fee revenue for the construction or purchase of new buildings, land, vehicles, or equipment that expand the capacity of the existing system to serve new development. Fee revenue may not be used for replacement of aging facilities or equipment or to otherwise correct existing deficiencies unrelated to new development. The inclusion of technological assets in the facility inventory will allow fee revenue to be spent on technology related to other county services. **Table 10.5** shows the allocation of countywide and unincorporated-only County facility costs to new development based on the existing standards and the resulting cost per capita.

Table 10.5: Allocation of Planned Facilities to New Development

<u>Unincorporated</u>	
Facility Standard per Capita	\$ 217
Service Population Growth in Unincorporated (2008-2030)	<u>57,300</u>
New Development Fair Share of Planned Facilities	\$ 12,434,100
<u>Countywide</u>	
Facility Standard per Capita	\$ 263
Service Population Growth Within County (2008-2030)	<u>394,800</u>
New Development Fair Share of Planned Facilities	\$ 103,832,400

Sources: Tables 10.1 and 10.3; Willdan Financial Services.

Fee Schedule

Table 10.6 displays the other county facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space).

Table 10.6: Other County Facilities Impact Fee - Existing Facilities Standard

Land Use	A	B	C=AxB	
	Cost Per Capita	Density	Fee ¹	Fee per Sq. Ft.
Countywide				
<i>Residential</i>				
Single Family	263	3.15	\$ 829	
Multifamily	263	2.20	579	
<i>Nonresidential</i>				
Commercial	82	2.41	\$ 198	\$ 0.20
Office	82	2.87	235	0.24
Industrial (Small)	82	0.64	52	0.05
Industrial (Large)				
Manufacturing	82	0.92	75	0.08
Distribution	82	0.37	30	0.03
Warehouse	82	0.18	15	0.02
Unincorporated Only				
<i>Residential</i>				
Single Family	\$ 217	3.15	\$ 684	
Multifamily	217	2.20	477	
<i>Nonresidential</i>				
Commercial	\$ 67	2.41	\$ 161	\$ 0.16
Office	67	2.87	192	0.19
Industrial (Small)	67	0.64	43	0.04
Industrial (Large)				
Manufacturing	67	0.92	62	0.06
Distribution	67	0.37	25	0.03
Warehouse	67	0.18	12	0.01
Unincorporated Total				
<i>Residential</i>				
Single Family	\$ 480	3.15	\$ 1,513	
Multifamily	480	2.20	1,056	
<i>Nonresidential</i>				
Commercial	\$ 149	2.41	\$ 359	\$ 0.36
Office	149	2.87	428	0.43
Industrial (Small)	149	0.64	95	0.10
Industrial (Large)				
Manufacturing	149	0.92	137	0.14
Distribution	149	0.37	55	0.06
Warehouse	149	0.18	27	0.03

¹ Fee per dwelling unit (residential) or per 1,000 square feet (nonresidential).

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 10.3; Willdan Financial Services.

11. Park Facilities

The purpose of the park facilities fee is to ensure that new development funds its fair share of parks and open space facilities. The “Regional Parks / Open Space” component of the fee will be charged countywide. New development in the unincorporated area of the County will pay both the regional parks and open space component and the “Neighborhood Parks” component of the fee. The County will use fee revenues to expand park facilities, including vehicles and equipment, to serve new development.

Service Population

Residents are the primary users of parks and open space facilities. Therefore, demand for parks and associated facilities are based on the County’s residential population and exclude workers. **Table 11.1** provides estimates of the current resident population and a forecast for the year 2030. Because some neighborhood parks exclusively serve the unincorporated area, the countywide and unincorporated-only service populations are both shown in Table 11.1.

Table 11.1: Parks Service Population

	Residents
Existing - Countywide (2008)	518,100
New Development - Countywide (2008-2030)	<u>337,900</u>
Projected Total - Countywide (2030)	856,000
Existing - Unincorporated (2008)	113,700
New Development - Unincorporated (2008-2030)	<u>33,200</u>
Projected Total - Unincorporated (2030)	146,900

Source: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Standards

The County’s inventory of park facilities is summarized in **Table 11.2**. Parks are divided into two categories: 1) Neighborhood Parks and 2) Regional Parks / Open Space. The acreage for each park is differentiated into either improved or unimproved acreage, as the value of developed parkland is far greater than undeveloped parkland, as shown in Table 11.3.

Table 11.2: Existing Parkland Inventory

Park Category	Location	Improved Acres	Unimproved Acres
<i>Neighborhood Parks</i>			
Atlas Park	Oakdale	1.06	-
Basso Bridge	La Grange	-	10.59
Bonita Pool and Park	Crowslanding	0.98	-
Bonita Ranch Park	Keys	11.83	-
Burbank Park	West Modesto	0.74	-
Country Stone Park	Salida	2.47	-
Empire Park	Empire	1.72	-
Empire Tot Lot	Empire	0.16	-
Fairview Park	South Modesto	4.56	-
Mono Park	Airport District	2.21	-
Murphy Park	Salida	4.29	-
Oregon Park	Airport District	1.62	-
Parklawn	South Modesto MAC	3.94	-
Riverdale Park & Fishing Access	Riverdale	2.33	-
Salida (Broadway) Park	Salida	2.09	-
Segesta Park	Salida	9.35	-
Sterling Ranch	Denair	3.12	-
Undeveloped Salida Park	Salida	-	11.79
United Community Park	Grayson	4.93	-
Wincanton Park	Salida	2.27	-
Total Neighborhood Parks		59.67	22.38
<i>Regional Parks / Open Space</i>			
Frank Raines OHV Park	Patterson	764.90	1,121.55
Kawanis Youth Camp	La Grange	48.04	-
L. Fitzsimmons Park	Grayson	0.43	-
LaGrange OHV Park	La Grange	149.12	-
LaGrange Dredge	La Grange	-	15.33
La Grange Regional Park	La Grange	-	484.36
La Grange Historic Barn	La Grange	-	0.49
La Grange Jail and Museum	La Grange	-	0.85
La Grange School/Cemetery	La Grange	3.63	-
Laird Park	Honor Farm	98.96	-
Las Palmas Fishing Access	East Patterson	4.59	-
Minear Day Use Area	Patterson	-	937.83
Modesto Reservoir	Modesto Res.	-	382.07
Shiloh Fishing Access	Westside	-	1.43
Turlock Lake Fishing Access	Turlock Lake	-	-
Woodward Reservoir	Oakdale/Valley Home	-	2,982.03
Total Regional Parks / Open Space		1,069.67	5,925.94
Total		1,129.34	5,948.32

Sources: Stanislaus County.

To calculate new development's need for new parks, a ratio expressed in terms of developed park acres per 1,000 residents is used, known as a park standard. To compare all parkland in the system, the undeveloped park acres must be converted into an equivalent amount of improved acres. This conversion is based on the cost of an unimproved acre relative to an improved acre and is displayed in **Table 11.3**.

Table 11.3: Unimproved Acreage - Parkland Equivalent

Parkland Type	
<i>Neighborhood Parks - Unincorporated</i>	
Average Land Cost per Acre (A)	\$ 75,000
Improvements Cost per Acre	<u>200,000</u>
Total Cost per Acre (B)	\$ 275,000
Equivalent Improved Acres (C = A / B)	0.27
Number of Unimproved Acres (D)	22.38
Equivalent Improved Acres (E = D x C)	6.10
<i>Regional Parks / Open Space - Countywide</i>	
Average Land Cost per Acre (A)	\$ 2,000
Improvements Cost per Acre	<u>15,000</u>
Total Cost per Acre (B)	\$ 17,000
Equivalent Improved Acres (C = A / B)	0.12
Number of Unimproved Acres (D)	5,925.94
Equivalent Improved Acres (E = D x C)	697.17

Sources: Table 11.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Table 11.4 shows the existing equivalent park standard per 1,000 residents for the current service population. The standard for unincorporated area neighborhood parks is calculated separately from the countywide regional parks and open space standard.

Table 11.4: County Parks and Open Space Facility - Existing Standards

	Neighborhood Parks - Unincorporated	Regional Parks / Open Space - Countywide
Improved Park Acreage	59.67	1,069.67
Equivalent Improved Acres	<u>6.10</u>	<u>697.17</u>
Total Acres of Improved Parkland	65.77	1,766.84
Service Population (Residents)	113,700	518,100
Existing Standard (Acres per 1,000 Residents)	0.58	3.41

Sources: Tables 11.1 and 11.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Unit Costs

Unit costs represent the land costs and level of improvements that existing development has provided to date. Using unit costs to determine a facility standard ensures that the cost of facilities to serve new development is not artificially increased, and new development unfairly burdened, compared to existing development.

The unit costs used to estimate the total investment in parkland facilities are shown in **Table 11.5**. Land acquisition costs and improvement costs are based on the County's experience with park development. An inventory of vehicles and equipment can be found in **Appendix Table A.12**. An inventory of technological assets can be found in **Appendix Table A.11**.

Table 11.5: Parkland Unit Costs

	Building SF	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Cost Per Acre
<u>Regional / Open Space - Countywide Park Improvements</u>				
Buildings				
Fox Grove Regional Park, 1200 Geer Road	1,500	\$ 175	262,500	
Frank Raines Park, Del Puerto Canyon Road	13,573	175	2,375,300	
La Grange Regional Park, 161 South Old LaGrange Road	600	175	105,000	
Modesto Reservoir, 18143 Reservoir Road	9,203	175	1,610,500	
Parks Paint Storage Building, 1716 Morgan Road	180	175	31,500	
Parks Shop, 1716 Morgan Road	5,600	175	980,000	
Pesticide Storage Building, 1716 Morgan Road	200	175	35,000	
Woodward Reservoir, 14528 26 Mile Road	10,973	175	<u>1,920,300</u>	
				\$7,320,100
Vehicles & Equipment (from Table A.12)			\$1,740,000	
Technology (from Table A.11)			<u>\$ 323,580</u>	
Total Special Use Facilities			\$9,383,680	
Equivalent Improved Park Acres				1,766.84
Special Use Facilities Cost per Improved Acre				\$ 5,000
Regional Park Improvements				<u>\$ 15,000</u>
Regional Park Improvements Per Acre Subtotal				\$ 20,000
<u>Neighborhood - Unincorporated Park Improvements</u>				
Buildings				
Bonita Pool, Crows Landing	1,000	\$ 175	<u>\$ 175,000</u>	
Subtotal			\$ 175,000	
Equivalent Improved Park Acres				65.77
Special Use Facilities Cost per Improved Acre				\$ 3,000
Neighborhood Park Improvements				<u>\$ 200,000</u>
Park Improvements Per Acre Subtotal				\$ 203,000

Sources: Tables 11.2 and 11.3; Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services

Table 11.6 calculates cost of needed facilities to serve new development. This is done in two steps: first, the facility standard is multiplied by the projected growth to determine the acreage needed by 2030 to serve the projected growth; then the unit costs from Table 11.5 are multiplied by the needed acreage to determine the total cost of needed facilities to accommodate new development.

Table 11.6: Park Facilities to Accommodate New Development

	Neighborhood Parks	Regional Parks / Open Space
<i>Parkland and Improvements (Mitigation Fee Act)</i>		
Facility Standard (acres/1,000 residents)	0.58	3.41
Resident Growth (2008-2030)	33,200	337,900
Facility Needs (acres)	19.26	1,152.24
Average Land Cost (per acre)	\$ 75,000	\$ 2,000
Subtotal - Land Costs	1,445,000	2,304,000
Average Improvements Cost (per acre)	\$ 203,000	\$ 20,000
Subtotal - Improvements Costs	\$ 3,910,000	\$ 23,045,000
Total Cost of Facilities	\$ 5,355,000	\$ 25,349,000

Sources: Tables 11.1 and 11.5; Willdan Financial Services.

Table 11.7 shows current per capita costs for residents. These values were calculated by multiplying the value of existing parkland and park improvements by the current facility standard, and then dividing that figure by 1,000 to reach the existing cost per capita.

Table 11.7: Park Facilities Investment Per Capita

	Land Acquisition	Improvements
<i>Neighborhood Parks - Unincorporated</i>		
Parkland Investment (per acre) (A)	\$ 75,000	\$ 203,000
Facility Standard (acres per 1,000 residents) (B)	0.58	0.58
Total Cost Per 1,000 capita (C = A x B)	\$ 44,000	\$ 118,000
Cost Per Resident (D = C / 1000)	\$ 44	\$ 118
<i>Regional Parks / Open Space - Countywide</i>		
Parkland Investment (per acre) (A)	\$ 2,000	\$ 20,000
Facility Standard (acres per 1,000 residents) (B)	3.41	3.41
Total Cost Per 1,000 capita (C = A x B)	\$ 7,000	\$ 68,000
Cost Per Resident (D = C / 1000)		
Investment Per Resident	\$ 7	\$ 68

Sources: Tables 11.3, and 11.5; Willdan Financial Services.

Use of Fee Revenues

The County can use park facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of new buildings, land, land improvements, vehicles, or equipment that expand the capacity of the existing parks system to serve new development. Fee revenues may not be used for replacement of aging facilities or equipment or to otherwise correct existing deficiencies unrelated to new development. The inclusion of technological assets in the facility inventory will allow fee revenue to be spent on technology related to park services.

As shown in **Table 11.6** above, new development's fair share of planned parks facilities is \$5.4 million for neighborhood parks and \$25.3 million for regional parks and open space through 2030.

Fee Schedule

The park facilities fee schedule is displayed in **Table 11.8**. The cost per capita from table 11.7 is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit densities (persons per dwelling unit).

Table 11.8: Park Facilities Impact Fee

Land Use	A		B	C=AxB	
	Cost Per	Capita		Density	Fee ¹
<i>Neighborhood Parks - Unincorporated</i>					
Single Family					
Land Acquisition	\$	44	3.15	\$	139
Improvements		118	3.15		372
Total				\$	511
Multi-family					
Land Acquisition	\$	44	2.20	\$	97
Improvements		118	2.20		260
Total				\$	357
<i>Regional Parks / Open Space - Countywide</i>					
Single Family					
Land Acquisition	\$	7	3.15	\$	22
Improvements		68	3.15		214
Total				\$	236
Multi-family					
Land Acquisition	\$	7	2.20	\$	15
Improvements		68	2.20		150
Total				\$	165

¹ Fee per dwelling unit.

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 11.7; Willdan Financial Services.

12. Sheriff Patrol and investigation

This chapter documents a reasonable relationship between new development and the funding for proposed sheriff patrol and investigation facilities in the unincorporated areas of Stanislaus County. The sheriff patrol and fee will only be charged in the unincorporated areas of the County. Fee revenue will be spent on expanding facilities, including vehicles and equipment, to serve new development.

Service Population

Both residents and workers in unincorporated portions of Stanislaus County benefit from services provided by the sheriff department. Therefore, demand for sheriff patrol and investigation facilities is based on the County's combined unincorporated residential and worker populations. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one employee compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development yields a lesser demand for sheriff patrol and investigation facilities. **Table 12.1** provides estimates of the resident and worker populations in the unincorporated areas of the County with forecasts for the year 2030.

Table 12.1: Sheriff Patrol and Investigation Service Population

	Residents	Workers	Service Population
Existing - Unincorporated (2008)	113,700	24,800	121,400
New Development - Unincorporated (2008-2030)	<u>33,200</u>	<u>77,900</u>	<u>57,300</u>
Total - Unincorporated Countywide (2030)	146,900	102,700	178,700
Weighting factor	1.00	0.31	

Note: Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40 hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week.

Sources: Table 2.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Standards

The sheriff patrol and investigation fee uses the existing standard to calculate the impact fees for sheriff patrol and investigation facilities. This standard is based on the current investment per capita in sheriff patrol and investigation facilities in Stanislaus County. **Table 12.2** presents a complete inventory of existing facilities. Vehicles currently owned by

the Stanislaus County Sheriff Department are listed in **Appendix Table A.13**. An inventory of technological assets can be found in **Appendix Table A.11**.

Table 12.2: Sheriff Patrol and Investigation Existing Facility Inventory

	Inventory	Unit Cost ¹	Total Value
<u>Existing Facilities</u>			
Land			
Former City Hall Building (801 11th St)	0.10 acres	\$ 958,300	\$ 95,830
Public Safety Center (Sheriff Operations) - 200 - 442 Hackett	2.69 acres	50,000	134,500
County Center III - 909 - 939 County Center III Drive, Modesto	0.58 acres	435,600	<u>252,648</u>
Subtotal			\$ 482,978
Buildings			
AWP Office, 801 11th Street	2,288 sq. ft.	\$ 175	\$ 400,400
Civil Unit Office, 801 11th Street	5,039 sq. ft.	175	881,800
Command Modular, 200 E Hackett Road	400 sq. ft.	175	70,000
Courthouse, 1100 I Street	800 sq. ft.	175	140,000
Evidence Bunker, 200 E Hackett Road	988 sq. ft.	175	172,900
Generator Bldg, 200 E Hackett Road	1,500 sq. ft.	175	262,500
K-9/Equestrian Center, 200 E Hackett Road	755 sq. ft.	175	132,100
Programs Modular, 200 E Hackett Road	1,440 sq. ft.	175	252,000
Programs Modular, 200 E Hackett Road	1,440 sq. ft.	175	252,000
Public Safety Center Programs Modular, 200 E Hackett Road	1,800 sq. ft.	175	315,000
Sheriff: Coroner-Public Administrator	3,520 sq. ft.	175	616,000
Sheriff Admin Bldg, 250 E Hackett Road	41,616 sq. ft.	175	7,282,800
Storage Modular, 200 E Hackett Road	224 sq. ft.	175	39,200
Substation, 22113 Highway 33, Crows Landing	<u>1,800</u> sq. ft.	175	<u>315,000</u>
Subtotal	63,610 sq. ft.		\$ 11,131,700
<u>Vehicles & Equipment (from Table A.13)</u>			\$ 6,373,000
<u>Technology (from Table A.11)</u>			\$ 760,413
Existing PFF Fund Balance			<u>\$ 1,135,318</u>
Total Existing Facilities			\$ 19,883,409

¹ Unit costs based on current market value estimates provided by Madera County.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Table 12.3 shows per capita costs for sheriff patrol and investigation based on existing facilities for the 2008 service population. The value of all existing facilities is divided by the current service population to determine an existing cost per capita.

Table 12.3: Sheriff Patrol and Investigation Facilities Existing Standard

Existing Sheriff Patrol and Investigation Facilities	\$	19,883,409
Existing Service Population		<u>121,400</u>
Facility Standard per Capita	\$	164
Cost per Resident	\$	164
Cost per Worker ¹		51

¹ Worker weighting factor of 0.31 applied to cost per resident.

Sources: Tables 12.1 and 12.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Use of Fee Revenues

The County can use sheriff patrol and investigation facilities fee revenues for the construction or purchase of new buildings, land, land improvements, vehicles, or equipment that expand the capacity of the existing system to serve new development. Fee revenues may not be used for replacement of aging facilities or equipment or to otherwise correct existing deficiencies unrelated to new development. The inclusion of technological assets in the facility inventory will allow fee revenue to be spent on technology related to sheriff patrol and investigation services.

Table 12.4 shows an estimate of sheriff patrol and investigation impact fee revenue through 2030.

Table 12.4: Allocation of Planned Facilities to New Development

Facility Standard per Capita	\$	164
Service Population Growth in Unincorporated (2008-2030)		<u>57,300</u>
New Development Fair Share of Planned Facilities	\$	9,397,200

Sources: Tables 12.1, 12.2 and 12.3; Willdan Financial Services.

Fee Schedule

Table 12.5 displays the sheriff patrol and investigation facilities fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and employment densities (persons per dwelling unit or employees per 1,000 square feet of nonresidential building space).

Table 12.5: Sheriff Patrol and Investigation Facilities Impact Fee - Existing Facilities Standard

Land Use	A	B	C=AxB	
	Cost Per Capita	Density	Fee ¹	Fee per Sq. Ft.
<i>Residential</i>				
Single Family	\$ 164	3.15	\$ 517	
Multifamily	164	2.20	361	
<i>Nonresidential</i>				
Commercial	\$ 51	2.41	\$ 123	\$ 0.12
Office	51	2.87	146	0.15
Industrial (Small)	51	0.64	33	0.03
Industrial (Large)				
Manufacturing	51	0.92	47	0.05
Distribution	51	0.37	19	0.02
Warehouse	51	0.18	9	0.01

¹ Fee per dwelling unit (residential) or per 1,000 square feet (nonresidential).

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 12.3; Willdan Financial Services.

13. Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF)

This chapter summarizes an analysis of the need for regional traffic improvement facilities, including roadway and intersection improvements, to accommodate new development. In prior versions of the PFF program this fee was known as the “Inter-City Fee.” Inter-city traffic improvements are those improvements that enable transportation between cities in Stanislaus County, and are thus regional in nature. The chapter documents a reasonable relationship between new development and the impact fee for funding of these facilities.

Growth Forecast

Trip Generation Rates

Estimates of new development and its consequent increased trip demand provide the basis for calculating the traffic facilities fee. Using the planned facilities standard, the value of all planned traffic facilities is divided by the total number of trips generated by new development and then assigned to new development on a per trip basis. This approach allows the County to use fee revenues for projects that add to the transportation system’s ability to accommodate new development.

The need for street improvements is based on the trip demand placed on the system by development. A reasonable measure of demand is the number of peak hour vehicle trips associated with a development, adjusted for the type of trip. Vehicle trip generation rates are a reasonable measure of demand on the County’s system of transportation facilities across all modes because alternate modes (transit, bicycle, pedestrian) often substitute for vehicle trips.

The two types of trips adjustments made to all trip generation rates to calculate trip demand are described below. These adjustments are consistent with the approach used in the existing PFF program.

- ♦ Trip rates are adjusted for diverted trips. Depending on the land use, the trip rate is adjusted down by a certain percentage to allocate burden to other land uses to which trips were diverted.
- ♦ Causality adjustment factors incorporate trip lengths and location decisions to allocate burden by land use.

Table 13.1 shows the calculation of trip demand factors by land use category based on the adjustments described above. PM peak hour trip rates are based on data from the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ Trip Generation Manual, 7th Edition. The diverted trip factor and the causality adjustment factor were developed by Recht Hausrath & Associates for Stanislaus County’s initial 1990 development impact fee study.

Most projected development in Stanislaus County can be classified under one of the land uses in Table 13.1. Some agricultural land uses, particularly large commercial dairies, are classified as an industrial land use (warehouse) due to similarities in trip generation rates for the purposes of calculating a fee. Agricultural outbuildings that are not associated with an

increase of workers (i.e. pole barn, storage barn, etc.) are not charged an impact fee, as they do not increase trip generation. If a development project is expected to generate trips at a vastly different rate than those included in Table 13.1, a trip generation study performed for that specific project by a reputable engineering firm can be submitted to the County, and the fees can be recalculated based on the estimated PM peak hour trip generation rate for that project.

Trip rates for the large industrial land use categories (manufacturing, distribution, warehouse) have been discounted based on an analysis described in **Appendix B**. The adjustment discounts the trip rate for land uses that are served heavy rail because the rail service accounts for trips that would otherwise occur on the County's roads. All large industrial development will receive the rail discount.

Table 13.1: Trip Rate Adjustment Factor - PM Peak Hour Trip Rates

	PM Peak Hour Trip Rate ¹	Diverted Trip Factor	Causality Adjustment Factor ²	Trip Demand Factor ³
<i>Residential</i>				
Single Family	1.01	1.00	1.53	1.55
Multi-family	0.62	1.00	1.53	0.95
<i>Nonresidential</i>				
Office	1.49	1.00	0.84	1.25
<i>Industrial</i>				
Industrial (Small)	0.68	1.00	0.84	0.57
Industrial (Large)				
Manufacturing ⁴	0.74	1.00	0.84	0.60
Distribution ⁴	0.86	1.00	0.84	0.70
Warehouse ^{4, 5}	0.47	1.00	0.84	0.37
<i>Commercial</i>				
Small Retail (<50,000 sq. ft.)	2.71	0.75	0.35	0.71
Medium Retail (50-100,000 sq. ft.)	4.03	0.75	0.35	1.06
Shopping Center (100-300,000 sq. ft.)	3.75	0.75	0.35	0.98
Shopping Mall (>300,000 sq. ft.)	2.29	0.75	0.35	0.60
Church	0.66	1.00	0.35	0.23
Hospital	1.18	1.00	0.35	0.41
Nursing Home	0.42	1.00	0.35	0.15
<i>Special Cases</i>				
Drive Through (per lane)	23.72	0.75	0.35	6.23
Gas Station (per pump)	13.86	0.50	0.35	2.43
Motel/Hotel (per room)	0.70	1.00	0.35	0.25
Golf Course (per acre)	0.30	1.00	1.00	0.30

¹ Trips per dwelling unit or per 1,000 building square feet, unless otherwise noted.

² Adjustment factors are based on statistical analysis of trip lengths and location decisions for each of the types of land uses.

³ The trip demand factor is the product of the trip rate, diverted trip factor and the causality adjustment factor.

⁴ All large industrial trip demand factors have been adjusted down to account for rail service.

⁵ Commercial dairies will be charged at the warehouse rate, based on similarities in trip generation.

Sources: Recht Hausrath & Associates; Stanislaus County; ITE Trip Generation Manual, 7th Edition; Willdan Financial Services.

Trip Generation

The StanCOG traffic model is the basis for estimating future trips in this study. The base year (2008) estimates of existing development are based on data from DOF for residential development, and data from EDD for nonresidential development. Population from group quarters, and employees from local government jobs have been excluded from the estimates. The 2030 estimates for population, dwelling units and employees is based on data from the Stan COG traffic model.

Based on the best available determination from the County of Stanislaus, overall land use is projected to reach 80 percent of remaining build out through the year 2030. **Table 13.2** lists the existing and projected land uses in the County based on General Plan build out. **Table**

13.3 converts the growth projections from Table 13.2 into trips. The estimate of trip generation is calculated by multiplying the trip demand factors in Tables 13.1 by the land use estimates in 13.2 by land use for both existing and buildout conditions.

Table 13.2: Growth Projections

	2008	2030	Growth
<u>Residential Dwelling Units</u>			
Single Family	139,700	199,800	60,100
Multi Family	<u>36,900</u>	<u>75,400</u>	<u>38,500</u>
Total	176,600	275,200	98,600
<u>Population</u>			
	518,100	856,000	337,900
<u>Employees¹</u>			
Commercial	21,700	47,900	26,200
Office	77,300	172,600	95,300
Industrial	<u>57,700</u>	<u>119,600</u>	<u>61,900</u>
Total	156,700	340,100	183,400
<u>Building Square Feet (1,000)²</u>			
Commercial	9,000	19,900	10,900
Office	26,900	60,100	33,200
Industrial	<u>90,200</u>	<u>186,900</u>	<u>96,700</u>
Total	126,100	266,900	140,800

Note: 2030 Jobs\Housing Ratio: 1.236

¹ Employees used for impact fee purposes. Excludes government employees. Education employees grouped under office.

² Conversion from employees to building square feet based on occupancy density assumptions in Table 2.2.

Sources: Table 2.2; StanCOG Traffic Model; Willdan Financial Services.

Table 13.3: Land Use Scenario and Total Trips

Land Use	Trip Demand Factor	2008 Land Use		2030 Land Use		Growth	
		Units / 1,000 SF	Trips	Units / 1,000 SF	Trips	Units / 1,000 SF	Trips
<i>Residential (Units)</i>							
Single Family	1.55	139,700	216,535	199,800	309,690	60,100	93,155
Multi-family	0.95	36,900	35,055	75,400	71,630	38,500	36,575
Subtotal		176,600	251,590	275,200	381,320	98,600	129,730
<i>Nonresidential (1,000 Sq.Ft.)</i>							
Commercial	0.98	9,000	8,820	19,900	19,502	10,900	10,682
Office	1.25	26,900	33,625	60,100	75,125	33,200	41,500
Industrial/Other	0.57	90,200	51,414	186,900	106,533	96,700	55,119
Subtotal		126,100	93,859	266,900	201,160	140,800	107,301
Total			345,449	542,100	582,480	239,400	237,031

Sources: Tables 13.1 and 13.2; StanCOG; Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Facilities Standards

The key public policy issue in development impact fee studies is the identification of facility standards. Facility standards determine new development's total need for new facilities and each development project's fair share of those needs. Standards also ensure that new development does not fund deficiencies associated with existing development.

The County's traffic facility standards are based on a measure of congestion commonly used in traffic planning and known as level of service (LOS). LOS is calculated based on the volume of traffic on a roadway or at an intersection compared to the capacity of the roadway or intersection. LOS "A," "B," and "C" suggest that delays are insignificant to acceptable. LOS "D" suggests tolerable delays, though traffic is high and some short-term back-ups occur. LOS "E" and "F" suggest restricted speeds and significant delays as traffic volumes meet or exceed the capacity of the facility.

The following General Plan Circulation Element policies present the performance standards acceptable to the County of Stanislaus:

- ♦ The County shall maintain LOS "C" or better for all County roadways and intersections, except, within the sphere of influence of a city that has adopted a lower level of service standard, the city standard shall apply.
- ♦ The County may adopt either a higher or lower LOS standard for roadways and intersections within urban areas, but in no case shall the adopted LOS fall below LOS "D."

Prevailing traffic conditions in the County were analyzed in conjunction with an updated Circulation Element in October 2005. The study found that most roadways in the County operate at LOS "C" or better.

Existing roadways and intersections that do not meet County LOS standards are considered existing deficiencies. All of the projects included in this fee study occur on segments that operated at LOS "C" or better at the time they were added into the fee program, resulting in no existing deficiencies. Without the improvement projects included in the fee, these

segments would ultimately have an unacceptable LOS. Some projects that have been held over from the prior fee program currently operate a LOS lower than “C.” It is legitimate to include these in the fee program because at the time they were added to the program they operated at an acceptable level of service, and because fund balances from the prior program have been subtracted from the project cost to account for the deficiency caused by development since the last fee program update.

Facility Costs to Accommodate Growth

The StanCOG traffic model was used to identify the improvements that will be needed to accommodate growth. The traffic model was used to develop an approach for allocating traffic mitigation fee responsibility amongst future development. The “No Land Use Change” land use alternative was used, which reflects General Plan Build-out according to the land uses and Floor Area Ratios (FAR) allowed by current zoning. Only trips expected from future development in the County of Stanislaus will be subject to the fee program.

Select link runs of the model were conducted for each of the improvement projects included in the Fee Program. A select link run identifies where the traffic that will be using each roadway improvement is coming from. With this information, the fair share of the cost of the improvement can be allocated to new Stanislaus County development and included in the impact fee.

For fee assignment purposes, there are four types of trips identified through each select link process:

1. Trips that both start and end in the County of Stanislaus
2. Trips that have an origin in the County of Stanislaus, and a destination outside the County;
3. Trips that have an origin outside the County of Stanislaus, and a destination in the County;
4. Trips that have neither an origin nor a destination in the County of Stanislaus, but are using a County street to pass through the County.

Trip types that fall into Category 4 are “through” trips, and are not subject to the fee program. Although these through trips take up capacity on the roadway and thereby contribute to the need for the improvement, local development cannot be held responsible for the impact of through traffic on the transportation system.

The proportion of trips on the selected link that have neither an origin nor a destination in the County will be applied to the cost of the improvement, and that portion of the improvement cost will not be included in the impact fee program. The portion of the improvements that cannot be funded by local development will be the County’s responsibility, to be covered with other funding sources, such as local, state, and federal grants and local gas tax allocations.

All other trip types with an origin, destination or both in the County of Stanislaus are subject to the fee program as these trips are related to future development in the County. Output from the select link process was used to identify the proportion of each improvement that should be assigned to each fee zone, based on the number of trips from future development

in each zone that use the selected link. The final fee amount for each fee zone is based on the cost of the improvements allocated to each zone based on the Select Link analysis.

The base case traffic model was validated by traffic counts. The trip generation estimated by the model was compared to actual trip counts throughout the County to ensure consistency between the model and reality. Trip rates were then adjusted in the model to match the traffic counts. The process of validating the model through traffic counts enables the model to accurately quantify trip generation Countywide, across all existing land uses.

This update includes fifty-eight traffic related projects to accommodate development in Stanislaus County through 2030. These projects are listed in **Table 13.4**. The projects are also shown on a map in **Figure 13.1**. Project costs are shown net of other available funds and existing fund balances. Based on the methodology discussed above, costs associated with pass through trips (trips that neither have an origin or destination within the County) are identified using the traffic modeling, and are not funded through impact fees. The external trip share for each project is identified in Table 13.4. The last column in Table 13.4, "Cost Allocated to PFF" displays the cost of each project to be funded by impact fees, after other funding sources, and the external trip share have been subtracted from the total project cost. Existing PFF fund balances for transportation projects are subtracted from the total PFF costs at the bottom of Table 13.4 to determine the net cost of projects allocated to the PFF.

Table 13.4: RTIF Allocation of Internal Trips and Project Costs

PFF Project	PFF Description	PFF Cost	External Trip Share (Rounded)	Cost allocated to PFF
<i>RTIF Road Projects</i>				
Geer-Albers (Taylor to Santa Fe)	Widen to 3 lanes	\$ 3,700,000	15%	\$ 3,145,000
Geer-Albers (Santa Fe to Hatch)	Widen to 3 lanes	3,100,000	15%	2,635,000
Geer-Albers (Hatch to SR 132)	Widen to 3 lanes	2,700,000	15%	2,295,000
Geer-Albers (SR 132 to Milnes)	Widen to 3 lanes	6,100,000	15%	5,185,000
Geer-Albers (Milnes to Claribel)	Widen to 3 lanes	2,800,000	15%	2,380,000
Carpenter Rd (Whitmore to Keyes)	Widen to 3 lanes	4,500,000	2%	4,410,000
Carpenter Rd (Keyes to Monte Vista)	Widen to 3 lanes	2,900,000	2%	2,842,000
Carpenter Rd (Monte Vista to West Main)	Widen to 3 lanes	2,700,000	2%	2,646,000
Claribel Rd (McHenry to Oakdale Rd)	Widen to 5 lanes	14,105,000	4%	13,540,800
Claribel Rd Bike Path (McHenry to Oakdale Rd)	Add Class 1 Bike Path	1,700,000	4%	1,632,000
Claus Rd (Terminal Ave to Claribel Rd)	Widen to 3 lanes	1,700,000	0%	1,700,000
Crows Landing Rd (Keyes to Monte Vista)	Widen to 3 lanes	2,000,000	1%	1,980,000
Crows Landing Rd (Keyes Rd to West Main)	Widen to 3 lanes	2,000,000	1%	1,980,000
Crows Landing Rd (West Main to Harding)	Widen to 3 lanes	2,000,000	1%	1,980,000
Crows Landing Rd (Harding to Carpenter)	Widen to 3 lanes	2,300,000	1%	2,277,000
Crows Landing Rd (Carpenter to River)	Widen to 3 lanes	1,000,000	1%	990,000
Crows Landing Rd (River Rd/Marshall to SR 33)	Widen to 3 lanes	9,700,000	4%	9,312,000
Crows Landing Rd (Bridge over SJ River)	Widen Bridge to 3 lanes	440,000	1%	435,600
Hatch Road (Faith Home Rd to Clinton Rd)	Widen to 3 lanes	2,530,000	1%	2,504,700
McHenry Ave (Ladd to Hogue)	Widen to 5 lanes	4,100,000	7%	3,813,000
McHenry Ave (Hogue to San Joaquin County)	Widen to 5 lanes	7,900,000	7%	7,347,000
McHenry Ave (Bridge over Stanislaus River)	Widen Bridge to 5 Lanes	1,100,000	7%	1,023,000
N. County Transportation Corridor (Rt 99 to Rt 99)	4-lane Expwy from SR 99 to east	400,000,000	21%	316,000,000
Santa Fe Ave (Keyes to Geer)	Widen to 3 lanes	3,000,000	12%	2,640,000
Santa Fe Ave (Geer to Hatch)	Widen to 3 lanes	2,000,000	12%	1,760,000
Santa Fe Ave (Hatch to Tuolumne River)	Widen to 3 lanes	1,700,000	12%	1,496,000
Santa Fe Ave (Bridge over Tuolumne River)	Widen Bridge to 3 lanes	2,500,000	12%	2,200,000
West Main (San Joaquin River to Carpenter)	Widen to 3 lanes	3,900,000	12%	3,432,000
West Main (Carpenter to Crows Landing)	Widen to 3 lanes	2,800,000	9%	2,548,000
West Main (Crows Landing to Mitchell)	Widen to 3 lanes	4,300,000	12%	3,784,000
West Main (Mitchell to Washington)	Widen to 3 lanes	2,900,000	12%	2,552,000
Subtotal		\$ 504,175,000		\$ 412,465,100

¹ Allocations and trip shares based on traffic model output prepared by Dowling and Associates, November 2007.

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding.

Sources: Dowling Associates, Inc.; Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Table 13.4: RTIF Allocation of Internal Trips and Project Costs Continued

PFF Project	PFF Description	PFF Cost	External Trip Share (Rounded)	Cost allocated to PFF
<i>RTIF Signal Projects</i>				
Carpenter Rd at Crows Landing Rd	Signalize Intersection	\$ 1,800,000	1%	\$ 1,782,000
Carpenter Rd at Grayson Rd	Signalize Intersection	2,000,000	2%	1,960,000
Carpenter Rd at Hatch Rd	Signalize Intersection	750,000	2%	735,000
Carpenter Rd at Keyes Rd	Signalize Intersection	2,000,000	2%	1,960,000
Carpenter Rd at West Main	Signalize Intersection	1,800,000	7%	1,674,000
Carpenter Rd at Whitmore Ave	Signalize Intersection	2,500,000	2%	2,450,000
Central Ave at West Main St	Signalize Intersection	5,000,000	9%	4,550,000
Claribel Rd at Coffee Rd	Signalize Intersection	2,000,000	4%	1,920,000
Claribel Rd at Roselle Ave	Signalize Intersection	1,000,000	4%	960,000
Crows Landing Rd at Grayson Rd	Signalize Intersection	2,100,000	1%	2,079,000
Crows Landing Rd at Keyes Rd	Signalize Intersection	2,100,000	1%	2,079,000
Crows Landing Rd at Fulkerth Ave	Signalize Intersection	2,000,000	1%	1,980,000
Crows Landing Rd at West Main St	Signalize Intersection	2,900,000	8%	2,668,000
Faith Home Rd at West Main St	Signalize Intersection	2,100,000	11%	1,869,000
Geer Rd at Santa Fe Ave	Signalize Intersection	2,700,000	12%	2,376,000
Geer at Whitmore Ave	Signalize Intersection	2,500,000	18%	2,050,000
Golden State at Golf/Berkeley	Improve Intersection	2,000,000	1%	1,980,000
Las Palmas at Elm	Signalize Intersection	725,000	11%	645,000
Las Palmas at Sycamore	Signalize Intersection	920,000	0%	920,000
McHenry Ave at Ladd Rd	Signalize Intersection	3,300,000	5%	3,135,000
Santa Fe Ave at East Ave	Signalize Intersection	2,000,000	11%	1,780,000
Santa Fe Ave at Hatch Rd	Signalize Intersection	3,000,000	1%	2,970,000
Santa Fe Ave at Keyes Rd	Signalize Intersection	3,000,000	10%	2,700,000
Santa Fe Ave at Main St	Signalize Intersection	3,000,000	0%	3,000,000
Santa Fe Ave at Service Rd	Signalize Intersection	3,000,000	1%	2,970,000
Subtotal		\$ 56,195,000		\$ 53,192,000
<i>RTIF State Highway Projects</i>				
Route 99 (Kiernan Interchange)	Replace with 6-lane Structure	\$ 55,400,000	5%	\$ 52,630,000
Route 99 (Hammett Interchange)	Replace with 6-lane Structure	104,120,000	23%	80,172,400
Subtotal		\$ 159,520,000		\$ 132,802,400
Total		\$ 719,890,000		\$ 598,459,500
Less Existing Fund Balance ²				(15,250,000)
Net Cost Allocated to PFF				\$ 583,209,500

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding.

¹ Allocations and trip shares based on traffic model output prepared by Dowling and Associates, November 2007.

² Fund balance as of November 30, 2009.

Sources: Dowling Associates, Inc.; Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Fee Schedule

Table 13.5 shows the calculated cost per trip. For projects with a prepared traffic study and trip generation projections from an engineer, the fee can be calculated by multiplying the cost per trip by the number of PM peak hour trips that will be generated, adjusted by the applicable diverted trip and causality adjustment factors in Table 13.1.

Table 13.5: RTIF Cost Per Trip

Countywide	
Allocated Project Costs	\$ 583,209,500
Total New Trips	<u>237,031</u>
Cost per Trip	\$ 2,460

Sources: Tables 13.3 and 13.4; Willdan Financial Services.

Based on the cost per trip calculated above, Tables 13.6 shows the traffic impact fee schedule, by land use.

Table 13.6: RTIF Transportation Facilities Fee

Land Use	Cost Per Trip	Trip Demand Factor	Fee¹	Fee / Sq. Ft.
<i>Residential (per dwelling unit)</i>				
Single Family	\$ 2,460	1.55	\$ 3,813	
Multi-family	2,460	0.95	2,337	
<i>Nonresidential (per 1,000 square feet)</i>				
Office	2,460	1.25	3,075	3.08
<i>Industrial</i>				
Industrial (Small)	2,460	0.57	1,402	1.40
Industrial (Large)				
Manufacturing	2,460	0.60	1,476	1.48
Distribution	2,460	0.70	1,722	1.72
Warehouse	2,460	0.37	910	0.91
<i>Commercial</i>				
Small Retail (<50,000 sq. ft.)	2,460	0.71	1,747	1.75
Medium Retail (50-100,000 sq. ft.)	2,460	1.06	2,608	2.61
Shopping Center (100-300,000 sq. ft.)	2,460	0.98	2,411	2.41
Shopping Mall (>300,000 sq. ft.)	2,460	0.60	1,476	1.48
Church	2,460	0.23	566	0.57
Hospital	2,460	0.41	1,009	1.01
Nursing Home	2,460	0.15	369	0.37
<i>Special Cases</i>				
Drive Through (per lane)	2,460	6.23	15,326	N/A
Gas Station (per pump)	2,460	2.43	5,978	N/A
Motel/Hotel (per room)	2,460	0.25	615	N/A
Golf Course (per acre)	2,460	0.30	738	N/A

¹ Fee per dwelling unit or thousand square feet of building space unless otherwise noted

Sources: Tables 13.1 and 13.5; Willdan Financial Services.

14. Countywide Information Technology

The purpose of this fee is to ensure that new development funds its fair share of information technology needs. Information technology to be funded by this fee includes major software licenses and related items. The County would use fee revenues to expand information technology equipment to serve new development.

Service Population

Stanislaus County provides services to both residents and businesses countywide. Therefore, demand for services and associated facilities is based on a countywide service population that includes residents and workers.

Table 14.1 shows the estimated service population in 2008 and 2030. The demand for information technology equipment is related to the demands that both residents and businesses place on the County's information technology infrastructure. While specific data is not available to estimate the actual ratio of demand per resident to demand by businesses (per worker) for this service, it is reasonable to assume that demand for these services is less for one employee compared to one resident, because nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than dwelling units. The 0.31-weighting factor for workers is based on a 40-hour workweek divided by the total number of non-work hours in a week (128) and reflects the degree to which nonresidential development yields a lesser demand for information technology equipment.

Table 14.1: Countywide IT Service Population

	Residents	Workers	Service Population
Existing (2008)	518,100	156,700	566,700
New Development (2008-2030)	337,900	183,400	394,800
Total (2030)	856,000	340,100	961,500
Weighting factor	1.00	0.31	

Note: Workers are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on a 40 hour work week out of a possible 128 non-work hours in a week.

Sources: Table 2.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Facility Standards

This study uses the existing inventory method to calculate impact fees for Enterprise specific information technology equipment (see *Chapter 1: Introduction* for further information). Department specific IT is inventories in each category's impact fee (when appropriate) so that fee revenue from each category can be spent on IT to serve new development. **Table 14.2** shows the existing inventory of information technology assets owned by Stanislaus County. The total value of existing information technology assets is approximately \$7.8 million.

Table 14.2: Countywide IT Inventory¹

Item	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Function
PeopleSoft HRMS	1	\$ 2,471,000	\$ 2,471,000	HRMS
Oracle Financial Management	1	2,031,235	2,031,235	FMS
ICJIS application	1	3,227,442	3,227,442	ICJIS
ArcCad	4	6,500	26,000	GIS
Arccad Software	1	2,980	2,980	GIS
Arc-GIS Software	1	5,943	5,943	GIS
Arcview 9.1 Software	6	1,455	8,728	GIS
Arcview Software	2	2,689	5,378	GIS
Total Cost			\$ 7,778,706	

Note: HRMS = Human Resources Management System; FMS = Financial Management System; ICJIS = Integrated County Justice Information System; GIS = Geographic Information System.

¹ This inventory primarily contains software, although the net amounts listed may include some incidental non-depreciated hardware (hardware that does not meet the cost threshold of being considered an asset). The inventory only includes the initial purchase cost of the systems, and does not include license renewals.

Source: Stanislaus County.

Table 14.3 shows current per capita investment in information technology equipment. This value was calculated by dividing the existing investment in information technology assets by the current service population. The cost per capita is \$14.

Table 14.3: Countywide IT Existing Standard

Existing Value of Countywide IT	\$	7,778,706
Existing Service Population		<u>566,700</u>
Facility Standard per Capita	\$	14
Cost per Resident	\$	14
Cost per Worker ¹		4

¹ Worker weighting factor of 0.31 applied to cost per resident.

Sources: Tables 14.1 and 14.2; Willdan Financial Services.

Use of Fee Revenues

The County can use information technology equipment fee to purchase new information technology assets that expand the capacity of the existing system to serve new development. Fee revenues may not be used for replacement of aging facilities or equipment or to otherwise correct existing deficiencies unrelated to new development. **Table 14.4** shows an estimate of information technology impact fee revenue through 2030.

Table 14.4: New Development Fair Share - Existing Standard

Facility Standard per Capita	\$	14
Service Population Growth Within District (2008-2030)		<u>394,800</u>
New Development Fair Share of Planned Facilities	\$	5,527,200

Sources: Tables 14.1, 14.2 and 14.3; Willdan Financial Services.

Fee Schedule

Table 14.5 displays the information technology equipment fee schedule. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per unit of new development based on dwelling unit and building space densities (persons per dwelling unit for residential development and employees per 1,000 square feet of building space for non-residential development).

Table 14.5: Countywide IT Facilities Impact Fee - Existing Facilities Standard

Land Use	A	B	C=AxB	
	Cost Per Capita	Density	Fee ¹	Fee per Sq. Ft.
<i>Residential</i>				
Single Family	\$ 14	3.15	\$ 44	
Multifamily	14	2.20	31	
<i>Nonresidential</i>				
Commercial	\$ 4	2.41	\$ 10	\$ 0.010
Office	4	2.87	11	0.011
Industrial (Small)	4	0.64	3	0.003
Industrial (Large)				
Manufacturing	4	0.92	4	0.004
Distribution	4	0.37	1	0.001
Warehouse	4	0.18	1	0.001

¹ Fee per dwelling unit (residential) or per 1,000 square feet (nonresidential).

Sources: Tables 2.2 and 14.3; Willdan Financial Services.

15. Administrative Charge

An administrative charge of one percent of the total impact fee is calculated in this chapter. The administrative charge funds costs that include: (1) a standard overhead charge applied to all County programs for legal, accounting, and other departmental and Countywide administrative support, (2) capital planning and programming associated with the share of projects funded by the impact fee, and (3) impact fee program administrative costs including revenue collection, revenue and cost accounting, mandated public reporting, and fee justification analyses. The administrative charge can be used for costs related to the preparation and management of capital improvement project documents whose tasks clearly tie to facilities required to accommodate growth, including master facility planning documents.

Tables 15.1 and **15.2** show the total fee, including the administrative charge for each fee zone scenario, corresponding with Tables E.1 and E.2.

Table 15.1: Administrative Fee - Unincorporated

Land Use	Total Base Impact Fee	Admin Charge (1%)	Total Fee
<i>Residential (Per Dwelling Unit)</i>			
Single Family	\$ 8,625	\$ 86	\$ 8,711
Multifamily	5,697	57	5,754
<i>Nonresidential (Per Thousand Square Feet)</i>			
Office	\$ 4,084	\$ 41	\$ 4,125
Industrial			
Industrial (Small)	\$ 1,628	\$ 16	\$ 1,644
Industrial (Large)			
Manufacturing	1,801	18	1,819
Distribution	1,852	19	1,871
Warehouse	973	10	983
Commercial ¹			
Small Retail	\$ 2,596	\$ 26	\$ 2,622
Medium Retail	3,457	35	3,492
Shopping Center	3,260	33	3,293
Shopping Mall	2,325	23	2,348
Church	\$ 1,415	\$ 14	\$ 1,429
Hospital	1,858	19	1,877
Nursing Home	1,218	12	1,230
<i>Special Cases</i>			
Drive Through (per lane)	\$ 15,326	\$ 153	\$ 15,479
Gas Station (per pump)	5,978	60	6,038
Motel/Hotel (per room)	615	6	621
Golf Course (per acre)	738	7	745

¹ Small Retail is less than 50,000 sq. ft.; Medium Retail ranges from 50,000 -100,000 sq. ft.; Shopping Center ranges from 100,000 - 300,000 sq. ft.; Shopping Mall is greater than 300,000 sq. ft.

Source: Table E.1; Willdan Financial Services.

Table 15.2: Administrative Fee - Incorporated

Land Use	Total Base Impact Fee	Admin Charge (1%)	Total Fee
<i><u>Residential (Per Dwelling Unit)</u></i>			
Single Family	\$ 6,913	\$ 69	\$ 6,982
Multifamily	4,502	45	4,547
<i><u>Nonresidential (Per Thousand Square Feet)</u></i>			
Office	\$ 3,745	\$ 37	\$ 3,782
Industrial			
Industrial (Small)	\$ 1,552	\$ 16	\$ 1,568
Industrial (Large)			
Manufacturing	1,692	17	1,709
Distribution	1,808	18	1,826
Warehouse	952	10	962
Commercial ¹			
Small Retail	\$ 2,312	\$ 23	\$ 2,335
Medium Retail	3,173	32	3,205
Shopping Center	2,976	30	3,006
Shopping Mall	2,041	20	2,061
Church	\$ 1,131	\$ 11	\$ 1,142
Hospital	1,574	16	1,590
Nursing Home	934	9	943
<i><u>Special Cases</u></i>			
Drive Through (per lane)	\$ 15,326	\$ 153	\$ 15,479
Gas Station (per pump)	5,978	60	6,038
Motel/Hotel (per room)	615	6	621
Golf Course (per acre)	738	7	745

¹ Small Retail is less than 50,000 sq. ft.; Medium Retail ranges from 50,000 -100,000 sq. ft.; Shopping Center ranges from 100,000 - 300,000 sq. ft.; Shopping Mall is greater than 300,000 sq. ft.

Source: Table E.2; Willdan Financial Services.

16. Implementation

Impact Fee Program Adoption Process

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

Inflation Adjustment

The County has kept its impact fee program up to date by periodically adjusting the fees for inflation. Such adjustments should be completed regularly to ensure that new development will fully fund its share of needed facilities. To maintain consistency with other County documents, we recommend that the fees be adjusted for inflation annually, concurrent with the timeframe when County staff presents the preliminary CIP to the Board of Supervisors.

There are no inflation indices that are specific to Stanislaus County. We recommend that the following indices be used for adjusting fees for inflation:

- ♦ Buildings, Improvements – Engineering News Record's Building Cost Index (BCI) – San Francisco, CA
- ♦ Equipment – Consumer Price Index, All Items, 1982-84=100 for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) – for the West Urban Region, Size B/C

Due to the highly variable nature of land costs, there is no particular index that captures fluctuations in land values. We recommend that the County adjust land values based on an annual appraisal of each of the types of land included in Table 2.3.

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

The steps necessary to update fees for inflation are explained below:

For all of the fee categories except the park facilities fees and the Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF), the steps are as follows:

1. For each facility type (land, buildings, equipment), identify the percent change in facility value since the last update, based on changes in each inflation index or for each type of land.
2. Modify the value of each facility, existing and planned (if applicable) by the percent change identified in Step 1.

3. Depending on fee methodology for each particular fee category calculate the total value of existing facilities (existing inventory method), or the value of existing facilities plus planned facilities (system plan method) using the updated figures from Step 2.
4. Recalculate the cost per capita for each fee category by dividing the results of Step 3 by either the existing service population if the fee is calculated using the existing inventory method, or by the future service population if the fee is calculated using the system plan methodology. Both the existing and future service populations are identified in the first table of every chapter in this report.
5. Calculate the cost per worker (if applicable) for fee categories that are charged to nonresidential development. The cost per worker is equal to the cost per capita calculated in Step 4 multiplied by 0.31.
6. Update the fee schedule by multiplying the cost per capita and the cost per worker calculated in Step 5 by the density factors listed in Table 2.2 to determine the base fee for each land use.

To update the park facility fees for inflation, the steps are as follows:

1. For each facility type (land, improvements), identify the percent change in facility value since the last update, based on changes in each inflation index or for each type of land.
2. Modify the value of land acquisition and improvements shown in Table 11.7 by the percent change identified in Step 1.
3. Using Table 11.7 as a guide, recalculate the cost per resident using the adjusted values for land acquisition and improvements calculated in Step 2 for both neighborhood parks and regional parks/open space.
4. Update the fee schedule by multiplying the costs per capita calculated in Step 3 by the density factors listed in Table 2.2 to determine the base fee for each land use. The total fee for a given land use is equal to the cost per capita for land (from step three) multiplied by the occupant density, added to the cost per capita for improvements (also from step three) multiplied by the occupant density. See Table 11.8 for reference.

To update the RTIF for inflation, the steps are as follows:

1. Identify the percent change in planned facilities cost since last update based on changes in the Engineering News Record's Building Cost Index (BCI) for San Francisco, CA.
2. Modify the cost each planned facility (the cost allocated to the PFF in Table 13.4) by the percent change identified in Step 1.
3. Divide the total cost of projects allocated to the PFF calculated in Step 2, by the growth in trips identified in Table 13.3 to determine the updated cost per trip.
4. Multiply the cost per trip calculated in Step 3 by the trip demand factors identified in Table 13.1 to determine the fee for each land use.

Once all of the fees have been inflated, multiply the sum of all the fees, per land use, by one percent (1%) to determine the administrative charge. As part of this update the administrative fee is being reduced from two and a half percent (2.5%) to one percent (1%). Future updates to the fee program should review the administrative fee to ensure that it fully covers the cost of administering the fee program.

Reporting Requirements

The County complies with the annual and five-year reporting requirements of the *Mitigation Fee Act* found in Government Code Sections 66001 and 66006. For facilities to be funded by a combination of public fees and other revenues, identification of the source and amount of these non-fee revenues is essential. Identification of the timing of receipt of other revenues to fund the facilities is also important.

Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP

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

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

17. Mitigation Fee Act Findings

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

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

Purpose of Fee

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

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

Use of Fee Revenues

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

Fees proposed in this report, if enacted by the County, would be used to fund expanded facilities to serve new development. Facilities funded by these fees are designated to be located within the County. Fees addressed in this report have been identified by the County to be restricted to funding the following facility categories: animal services, behavioral health, criminal justice, detention, fire protection, emergency services, health, libraries, other county, regional and neighborhood parks, sheriff, transportation, and information technology.

Benefit Relationship

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

We expect that the County will restrict fee revenue to the acquisition of land, construction of facilities and buildings, and purchase of related equipment, furnishings, vehicles, and services used to serve new development. Facilities funded by the fees are expected to provide a countywide network of facilities accessible to the additional residents and workers associated with new development. Under *the Act*, fees are not intended to fund planned facilities needed to correct existing deficiencies. Thus, a reasonable relationship can be shown between the use of fee revenue and the new development residential and non-residential use classifications that will pay the fees.

Burden Relationship

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

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

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

Chapter 2, Growth Forecasts and Unit Cost Estimates provides a description of how service population and growth forecasts are calculated. Facility standards are described in the *Facility Standards* sections of each facility category chapter.

Proportionality

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

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

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

Appendix A: Vehicle and Equipment Inventories

All vehicle and equipment inventories in this appendix document replacement cost, as provided by Stanislaus County in 2008.

Table A.1: Animal Services Vehicle and Equipment Inventory

Year	Model and Make	ID	Value
2001	Ford F350 Supercab	01-37	\$ 27,066
2001	Ford F350 Supercab	01-38	44,844
2001	Ford F350 Supercab	01-39	44,844
2001	Ford F350 Supercab	01-40	39,149
2002	Ford F350 Supercab	02-42	43,731
2004	Ford F350 Supercab	04-29	36,290
2004	Chevrolet Venture	04-30	17,446
2004	Ford F250 XI Sd	04-56	16,422
2006	Chevrolet Silverado 3500	06-39	40,406
2008	Chevrolet Uplander	08-34	18,042
2001	Featherlite Trailer	0T-44	-
2000	Circle J Varied	0T-46	-
	Total		\$ 328,000

¹ Values may not total due to rounding.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Table A.2: Behavioral Health Vehicle Inventory

Year	Make and Model	ID	Value ¹
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-100	\$ 13,349
2000	Honda Civic EX	00-117	20,802
2000	Honda Civic EX	00-121	20,802
2000	Chevrolet 8-Pass Van	00-33	22,121
2000	Chevrolet 8-Pass Van	00-34	23,968
2000	Chevrolet 8-Pass Van	00-35	22,204
2000	Chevrolet Impala	00-45	18,157
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-46	14,533
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-47	14,533
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-49	14,533
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-50	14,533
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-78	14,333
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-79	14,333
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-80	14,333
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-81	13,349
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-82	13,349
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-83	13,349
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-85	13,349
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-94	13,349
2001	GMC Safari SLE	01-100	21,540
2001	GMC Safari SLE	01-101	21,540
2001	GMC Safari SLE	01-102	21,540
2001	GMC Safari SLE	01-103	21,540
2001	GMC Safari SLE	01-104	21,540
2001	GMC Safari SLE	01-105	21,540
2001	GMC Safari SLE	01-106	21,540
2001	GMC Safari SLE	01-107	21,540
2001	Gmc Safari	01-108	18,739
2001	Ford Police Int	01-124	23,556
2001	Ford Crown Victoria	01-125	26,556

Note: Values may not total due to rounding.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Table A.2: Behavioral Health Vehicle Inventory Cont.

Year	Make and Model	ID	Value
2001	Honda Civic Gx Cng	01-79	20,735
2001	GMC Safari SLE	01-98	21,540
2001	GMC Safari SLE	01-99	21,540
2002	Ford Taurus LX	02-71	17,680
2003	Ford Windstar	03-40	19,281
2003	Ford E250 Mobility	03-41	34,744
2005	Ford Taurus SE	05-40	14,494
2006	Ford E150 Cargo	06-41	13,436
2007	Ford Taurus SE	07-120	13,645
2007	Ford Freestar SE	07-24	18,681
2007	Ford Taurus SE	07-28	13,956
2007	Ford Taurus SE	07-29	13,956
2007	Ford Freestar SE	07-34	18,681
2007	Ford Taurus	07-35	13,956
2007	Ford Taurus	07-36	13,956
2007	Ford Taurus	07-37	15,436
2007	Chevrolet Uplander	07-55	18,805
2007	Chevrolet Uplander	07-56	16,047
1988	Dodge 12-Pass Van	88-30	14,106
1988	Dodge 12-Pass Van	88-31	14,106
1991	Ford Ranger	91-70	9,292
1991	Ford Ranger	91-71	9,292
1992	Chevrolet 12-Pass Van	92-35	12,000
1993	Ford Taurus	93-37	11,324
1995	Ford 3/4 T Crew Cab	95-20	18,910
1996	Ford E150 Club	96-24	16,958
1996	Oldsmobile Ciera SL	96-37	15,518
1996	Oldsmobile Ciera SL	96-38	15,518
1996	Oldsmobile Ciera SL	96-41	15,518
1996	Oldsmobile Ciera SL	96-42	15,518
1997	Dodge Ram 3500	97-51	20,907
1997	Ford Escort LX	97-64	10,899
1999	Chevrolet Malibu	99-13	14,983
1999	Ford Crown Victoria	99-35	22,386
1999	Chevrolet Astro	99-51	19,565
1999	Ford 1-Ton Hi-Cube	99-73	26,216
Total			\$ 1,154,000

Note: Values may not total due to rounding.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Table A.3: Criminal Justice Vehicle Inventory

Year	Make and Model	ID	Value
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-101	\$ 13,349
2000	Ford Crown Victoria	00-113	25,022
2000	Chevrolet Impala	00-70	20,267
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-96	13,349
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-97	13,349
2001	Dodge Intrepid	01-43	19,491
2001	Chevrolet Impala	01-44	17,372
2001	Honda Civic Gx Cng	01-75	20,735
2002	Dodge Intrepid Se	02-56	15,267
2002	Dodge Intrepid Se	02-57	15,267
2002	Dodge Intrepid Se	02-58	15,267
2002	Buick Century Custom	02-59	15,231
2002	Buick Century Custom	02-60	15,231
2002	Ford Taurus Se	02-67	17,628
2002	Dodge Intrepid Es	02-68	20,522
2002	Dodge Intrepid Es	02-69	20,522
2002	Dodge Intrepid Es	02-70	20,522
2006	Pontiac Grand Prix	06-61	16,286
2006	Pontiac Grand Prix	06-63	16,286
2007	Pontiac Grand Prix	07-47	15,553
1997	Ford Taurus	97-39	15,451
1997	Ford Taurus	97-40	15,451
1997	Ford Taurus	97-49	15,559
1997	Ford Aerostar	97-50	17,436
1997	Ford Aerostar	97-62	18,539
2001	Ford Crown Victoria	01-82	16,102
2001	Gmc Safari	01-45	20,892
2002	Chevrolet Impala	02-26	17,356
2002	Toyota Prius	02-55	21,853
2002	Ford E250 Mobility	02-76	30,871
2008	Chevrolet Impala	08-20	16,181
2008	Chevrolet Impala	08-21	16,181
1995	Ford Aerostar	95-30	16,873
1996	Ford Taurus	96-20	16,853
	Total		\$ 602,000

Note: Values may not total due to rounding.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Table A.4: Detention Vehicle Inventory

Year	Make and Model	ID	Value
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-108	\$ 13,349
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-109	13,349
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-110	13,349
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-111	13,349
2000	Ford Taurus Lx	00-43	18,691
2000	Ford Taurus Lx	00-44	18,691
2000	Ford Taurus Lx	00-51	17,162
2000	Ford Taurus Lx	00-52	17,162
2000	Ford Windstar	00-64	22,867
2001	Ford E350 15-Pass	01-109	29,507
2001	Ford Police Int	01-111	23,556
2001	Ford Police Int	01-112	23,556
2001	Ford Police Int	01-113	23,556
2001	Ford Police Int	01-115	23,556
2001	Ford Crown Victoria	01-70	20,639
2001	Ford Crown Victoria	01-71	20,633
2001	Ford Crown Victoria	01-72	20,639
2001	Ford Crown Victoria	01-73	20,639
2003	Ford Police Int	03-24	23,386
2003	Ford Police Int	03-25	23,386
2003	Ford Police Int	03-48	23,623
2005	Nissan Altima 2.5S	05-20	15,994
2005	Ford Police Int	05-33	23,899
2005	Ford Police Int	05-76	21,017
2006	Ford Police Int	06-65	23,201
2007	Ford Police Int	07-75	23,835
2007	Ford Police Int	07-76	23,835
1998	Dodge Stratus Es	98-47	15,888
1998	Plymouth Voyager	98-48	13,490
1999	Chevrolet Malibu	99-16	14,983
2000	Ford Taurus Lx	00-42	18,691
2001	Ford Police Int	01-114	23,556
2001	Ford F 150	01-91	18,785

Note: Values may not total due to rounding.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Table A.4: Detention Vehicle Inventory Cont.

Year	Make and Model	ID	Value
2002	Ford Police Int	02-53	23,542
2006	Chevrolet Express	06-47	23,281
2007	Ford Police Int	07-77	23,835
2007	Ford Police Int	07-78	23,835
2007	Ford Police Int	07-79	23,835
1994	Dodge 15-Pass. Van	94-62	20,532
1994	Dodge 15-Pass. Van	94-67	19,476
1996	Ford Econoline	96-53	18,650
1998	Ford Taurus Lx	98-44	15,878
1999	Gmc Savana SI	99-50	21,834
2000	Ford 4X4 Pickup	00-115	21,646
2000	Ford Police Int	00-24	22,959
2002	Gmc Savana SI	02-35	20,480
2005	Dodge Ram 2500 4X4 St	05-51	21,601
2006	Ford E350 15-Pass	06-23	20,465
2006	Chevrolet Silverado	06-62	26,133
2008	Ford E350 15-Pass	08-27	22,734
1986	Cal Trailer Utility	0T-33	644
2004	Pace Varied	0T-57	2,466
2004	Pace Varied	0T-58	2,837
1986	Gmc Dump Truck	86-01	23,289
1986	Ford 40 Pass Bu	86-20	7,001
1994	Dodge 15-Pass. Van	94-61	20,532
1999	Chevrolet Malibu	99-71	14,983
2000	Ford Police Int	00-08	22,648
2000	Ford Police Int	00-23	22,959
2003	Ford Police Int	03-04	23,386
2008	Ford E350 15-Pass	08-29	22,734
1999	Carson C-Van	0T-34	4,105
1993	Ford 3/4 T Crew Cab	93-06	17,026
1999	Gmc Savana SI	99-66	23,842
1999	Chevrolet Malibu	99-72	14,983
2004	Chevrolet Venture	04-31	22,412
2007	Ford Taurus Se	07-23	13,956
1995	Gmc Cargo Larg	95-54	16,980
1999	Ford Crown Victoria	99-07	21,135
1999	Ford Police Int	99-38	22,386
2000	Dodge Ram 3500	00-31	22,167
2003	Ford Police Int	03-02	23,386
2004	Ford Crown Victoria	04-44	24,915
2005	Chevrolet Impala	05-17	18,538
2006	Ford E350 15-Pass	06-22	20,465
2006	Ford E350 15-Pass	06-24	20,465
2006	Ford E350 15-Pass	06-25	20,465
2006	Ford Taurus	06-57	12,357
2008	Ford Expedition	08-19	24,075
2008	Ford E350 15-Pass	08-28	22,734
1990	Chevrolet Cheyenne C	90-42	12,249
1999	Ford Crown Victoria	99-03	21,135
	Total		\$ 1,596,000

Note: Values may not total due to rounding.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Table A.5: Emergency Services Vehicle Inventory

Year	Make and Model	ID	Value
2002	Chevrolet Tahoe Ls 4X4	02-36	\$ 33,892
2006	Ford E-450	06-28	104,073
2006	Chevrolet Kodiak C4500	06-46	55,623
2006	Chevrolet Silverado 1500	06-52	14,008
2007	Ford F150	07-31	15,444
2007	Ford F151	07-32	15,444
2007	Chevrolet Tahoe Ls 4X4	07-80	33,904
2007	Chevrolet Tahoe Ls 4X5	07-82	33,904
2007	Chevrolet Tahoe Ls 4X6	07-96	33,904
2005	Featherlite Varied	0T-61	58,277
1999	Gmc Yukon	99-20	35,448
2005	Ford 1 Ton Crew	05-21	37,293
2008	Ford Expedition	08-43	26,199
2005	Wells Cargo Express Wagon	0T-60	21,403
2005	Featherlite Trailer	0T-64	163,528
2006	Jeep Liberty Sport	06-29	16,131
	Total		\$ 698,000

Note: Values may not total due to rounding.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Table A.6: Health Services Vehicle Inventory

Year	Make and Model	ID	Value
1997	Ford 1/2 Ton Pickup	97-32	\$ 15,276
2000	Honda Civic Ex	00-118	20,802
2000	Honda Civic Ex	00-119	20,802
2000	Honda Civic Ex	00-122	20,802
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-86	13,349
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-89	13,349
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-90	13,349
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-91	13,349
2001	Honda Civic Gx Cng	01-74	20,735
2001	Honda Civic Gx Cng	01-77	20,735
2001	Honda Civic Gx Cng	01-80	20,753
2006	Ford Taurus	06-58	12,881
2007	Ford Taurus Se	07-117	13,833
2007	Ford Taurus Se	07-121	13,645
2007	Ford Taurus	07-38	15,436
2007	Pontiac Grand Prix	07-53	15,876
2007	Ford Taurus Se	07-69	12,616
1998	Pcms Varied	0T-29	20,921
1997	Mercury Tracer Ls	97-59	10,899
1999	Chevrolet Malibu	99-14	14,983
2000	Dodge Cargo Van	00-28	15,388
2002	Ford Windstar	02-77	19,179
2006	Ford E150 Cargo	06-20	13,581
2007	Chevy Uplander	08-44	15,925
	Total		\$ 388,000

Note: Values may not total due to rounding.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Table A.7: Stanislaus Library Collections by Branch

Branch	Volumes	Unit Cost	Total Value
<u>Volumes</u>			
Ceres	38,035	\$ 26	\$ 988,900
Denair	14,921	26	387,900
Empire	12,222	26	317,800
Hughson	12,667	26	329,300
Keyes	15,321	26	398,300
Modesto	415,804	26	10,810,900
Newman	19,456	26	505,900
Oakdale	49,133	26	1,277,500
Patterson	30,644	26	796,700
Riverbank	25,848	26	672,000
Salida	103,938	26	2,702,400
Turlock	99,981	26	2,599,500
Waterford	<u>22,662</u>	26	<u>589,200</u>
Subtotal - Volumes	860,632		\$ 22,376,300
<u>Magazines</u>			
Ceres	2,157	\$ 4	\$ 8,600
Denair	566	4	2,300
Empire	473	4	1,900
Hughson	468	4	1,900
Keyes	283	4	1,100
Modesto	4,380	4	17,500
Newman	572	4	2,300
Oakdale	3,391	4	13,600
Patterson	817	4	3,300
Riverbank	1,016	4	4,100
Salida	1,713	4	6,900
Turlock	3,102	4	12,400
Waterford	<u>1,377</u>	4	<u>5,500</u>
Subtotal - Magazines	20,315		\$ 81,400
Total - Collections			\$ 22,457,700

Source: Stanislaus County, June 4, 2007.

Table A.8: Library Vehicle Inventory

Year	Make and Model	ID	Value
2000	Dodge Cargo Van	00-27	\$ 15,388
2006	Ford E350 Cargo	06-53	18,689
2007	Ford E350 Cargo	07-50	<u>18,689</u>
	Total		\$ 53,000

Note: Values may not total due to rounding.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Table A.9: Other County Facilities Equipment Inventory

Year	Make and Model	ID	Value	% County-wide ¹	Countywide Allocation	% Uninc. Only ¹	Uninc. Allocation
Agriculture Commissioner							
2000	Dodge Dakota	00-38	\$ 12,735				
2000	Ford Ranger XI	00-71	15,000				
2000	Ford Ranger XI	00-72	15,000				
2000	Ford Ranger XI	00-73	14,811				
2000	Ford Ranger XI	00-74	14,811				
2000	Ford Ranger XI	00-75	14,811				
2000	Ford Ranger XI	00-76	14,811				
2001	Dodge 1/2 Ton Pickup	01-21	14,308				
2003	Ford Ranger	03-22	14,182				
2003	Ford Ranger	03-23	14,182				
2004	Chevrolet Silverado	04-32	15,177				
2004	Chevrolet Silverado	04-33	15,177				
2004	Chevrolet Silverado	04-34	15,896				
2004	Chevrolet Silverado	04-35	14,824				
2004	Chevrolet Silverado	04-36	15,537				
2004	Ford Ranger	04-37	14,168				
2004	Ford Ranger Xlt	04-38	14,617				
2004	Ford F150XI Heritage	04-39	15,587				
2004	Ford F150XI Heritage	04-40	16,291				
2004	Ford Ranger XI	04-41	16,725				
2004	Ford Taurus Lx	04-42	14,676				
2004	Ford Taurus Lx	04-43	14,676				
2005	Chevrolet Cargo Van	05-28	17,528				
2005	Ford Ranger XI	05-62	11,801				
2007	Ford F150 Supercab	07-100	19,288				
2007	Ford Ranger	07-73	13,565				
2007	Ford Ranger	07-74	13,565				
2007	Chevrolet Uplander	07-83	16,296				
2008	Ford Ranger Xlt	08-37	15,143				
2008	Ford Ranger Xlt	08-38	15,143				
2008	Ford Ranger Xlt	08-39	15,143				
2008	Ford Ranger Xlt	08-40	15,143				
2006	Pem/Fab Utility	0T-65	50,711				
2006	Pem/Fab Utility	0T-66	30,834				
1963	Hmde Trailer	0T-99	2,500				
2008	Peterbilt 365	08-45	171,680				
1983	Jeep Cj-5 4X4	83-26	7,612				
1990	Chevrolet 1/2 Ton Pickup	90-38	11,198				
1990	Chevrolet 1/2 Ton Pickup	90-39	11,198				
1993	Ford F 250	93-14	13,133				
1993	Ford F 250	93-15	13,133				
1993	Ford Ranger XI	93-23	9,752				
1995	Gmc Sonoma	95-43	13,029				
1999	Gmc Sonoma	99-18	12,936				
	Subtotal		\$ 828,000	100%	\$ 828,000	0%	\$ -

Note: Values may not total due to rounding.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Table A.9: Other County Facilities Equipment Inventory

Year	Make and Model	ID	Value	% County-wide ¹	Countywide Allocation	% Uninc. Only ¹	Uninc. Allocation
<i>County Assessor</i>							
	2005 Ford Ranger Xlt	05-53	\$ 14,634				
	2006 Dodge Stratus Sxt	06-21	12,194				
	2007 Ford Focus	07-105	12,125				
	2007 Ford Focus	07-106	12,125				
	2007 Ford Focus	07-107	12,125				
	2007 Ford Focus	07-108	12,125				
	Subtotal		\$ 75,000	100%	\$ 75,000	0%	\$ -
<i>Central Services</i>							
	2001 Gmc Safari	01-31	\$ 18,203				
	2001 Dodge Cargo Van	01-34	15,119				
	2005 Chevrolet Express	05-67	25,408				
	2008 Chevrolet Uplander	08-24	15,943				
	1996 Ford Windstargl	96-68	15,500				
	Subtotal		\$ 90,000	80%	\$ 72,000	20%	\$ 18,000.00
<i>Fleet Services</i>							
	2000 Chevrolet Malibu	00-102	\$ 13,349				
	2000 Chevrolet Malibu	00-104	13,349				
	2000 Chevrolet Malibu	00-106	13,349				
	2000 Chevrolet Malibu	00-112	13,349				
	2000 Honda Civic Ex	00-120	20,802				
	2000 Honda Civic Ex	00-123	20,802				
	2000 Chevrolet Malibu	00-95	13,349				
	2001 Dodge Ram 2500	01-84	22,753				
	2007 Ford Taurus Se	07-113	13,806				
	2007 Pontiac Grand Prix	07-40	15,553				
	2007 Dodge Caravan Se	07-65	16,080				
	2008 Chevrolet Impala	08-46	16,181				
	2008 Chevrolet Impala	08-47	16,181				
	1989 Gmc Blue Bird	89-79	6,000				
	1991 Ford Tow Truck	91-72	14,665				
	1991 Gmc 1/2 Ton Pickup	91-74	11,311				
	1992 Chevrolet High Cube	92-28	20,346				
	1994 Dodge 8-Pass Van	94-51	14,759				
	1994 Dodge 12-Pass Van	94-52	15,804				
	1995 Chevrolet Caprice	95-46	18,427				
	1997 Oldsmobile Ciera SI	96-46	15,518				
	1998 Ford Windstar	98-21	19,752				
	1998 Ford Taurus Lx	98-25	15,582				
	1998 Ford Windstar	98-45	18,678				
	1999 Dodge Ram B150	99-19	14,371				
	1999 Ford Taurus Lx	99-61	15,831				
	Subtotal		\$ 410,000	80%	\$ 328,000	20%	\$ 82,000.00
<i>Cooperative Extension</i>							
	2000 Chevrolet Malibu	00-98	\$ 13,349				
	2001 Dodge 1/2 Ton Pickup	01-26	14,308				
	2007 Ford Taurus Se	07-21	13,956				
	2007 Chevrolet Silverado	07-26	12,285				
	2007 Chevrolet Silverado	07-27	12,349				
	1993 Gmc 15-Pass. Van	93-02	17,905				
	1993 Ford Club Wagon	93-05	17,511				
	1993 Ford 3/4 Ton Pu	93-07	14,310				
	1995 Oldsmobile Ciera	95-27	13,222				
	1996 Dodge 1/2 Ton Pickup	96-21	14,455				
	1997 Ford 1/2 Ton Pickup	97-30	15,276				
	Subtotal		\$ 159,000	100%	\$ 159,000	0%	\$ -

Note: Values may not total due to rounding.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Table A.9: Other County Facilities Equipment Inventory

Year	Make and Model	ID	Value	% County-wide ¹	Countywide Allocation	% Uninc. Only ¹	Uninc. Allocation
Area Agency On Aging							
2002	Ford E250 Mobility	02-28	\$ 34,744				
2002	Chevrolet Express	02-29	-				
2002	Gmc Safari Sle	02-31	20,428				
2002	Gmc Safari Sle	02-32	20,428				
2006	Chevrolet Express	06-48	19,751				
2006	Chevrolet Express	06-49	18,114				
2006	Ford Taurus	06-60	13,409				
	Subtotal		\$ 127,000	100%	\$ 127,000	0%	\$ -
Alliance Worknet (Det)							
2001	Ford E150 Cargo	01-136	\$ 16,858				
	Subtotal		\$ 17,000	100%	\$ 17,000	0%	\$ -
Environmental Resources Administration							
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-66	\$ 14,333				
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-68	14,333				
2001	Ford F 350	01-110	28,023				
2001	Ford Focus	01-117	13,032				
2001	Ford Focus	01-118	13,032				
2001	Ford Focus	01-119	13,032				
2001	Ford Focus	01-120	13,032				
2001	Dodge Ram 1500	01-55	15,172				
2001	Dodge Ram 1500	01-56	15,172				
2001	Dodge Ram 1500	01-57	15,172				
2001	Dodge Ram 1500	01-58	14,636				
2001	Dodge Ram 1500	01-59	14,636				
2002	Dodge Dakota	02-37	13,147				
2002	Dodge Dakota	02-38	13,147				
2002	Dodge Dakota	02-39	13,147				
2002	Dodge Dakota	02-40	13,147				
2002	Dodge Dakota	02-41	13,147				
2002	Toyota Prius	02-54	21,549				
2002	Ford Flatbed Tr	02-65	57,714				
2003	Ford F550	03-47	80,776				
2003	Chevrolet S-10 Ext Cab Ls	03-49	15,491				
2003	Chevrolet S-10 Ext Cab Ls	03-50	15,491				
2003	Ford Taurus Lx	03-51	16,096				
2003	Ford Taurus Lx	03-52	16,096				
2004	Dodge Dakota Sxt	04-27	14,665				
2005	Ford Ranger Xlt	05-32	14,381				
2005	Toyota Prius	05-41	23,051				
2005	Toyota Prius	05-42	23,051				
2005	Toyota Prius	05-43	23,051				
2005	Toyota Prius	05-44	24,175				
2005	Chevrolet Silverado	05-52	35,970				
2005	Toyota Prius	05-57	24,395				
2005	Toyota Prius	05-58	24,395				
2005	Toyota Prius	05-59	24,395				
2005	Toyota Prius	05-60	24,395				
2005	Toyota Prius	05-61	24,395				
2007	Ford F150	07-81	16,366				
2007	Toyota Prius	07-84	23,381				
2007	Toyota Prius	07-85	23,381				
2007	Toyota Prius	07-86	23,381				
2007	Toyota Prius	07-87	23,381				
2007	Toyota Prius	07-88	23,381				
2007	Ford F150	07-95	20,131				
2008	Ford Escape	08-22	25,925				
2008	Ford Escape	08-23	24,260				
2004	Pace Varied	0T-55	4,510				
2004	Pace Varied	0T-56	4,510				
2006	Wells Cargo Tote Wagon	0T-62	4,197				
1995	Ford 3/4 Ton Pu	95-28	18,134				
1996	Oldsmobile Ciera Sl	96-44	15,518				
1999	Chevrolet Malibu	99-11	14,983				
1999	Chevrolet Astro	99-53	19,565				
	Subtotal		\$ 1,038,000	100%	\$ 1,038,000	0%	\$ -

Note: Values may not total due to rounding.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Table A.9: Other County Facilities Equipment Inventory

Year	Make and Model	ID	Value	% County-wide ¹	Countywide Allocation	% Uninc. Only ¹	Uninc. Allocation
Abandoned Vehicle							
	1999 Ford Taurus Se	99-74	\$ 12,956				
	Subtotal		\$ 13,000	100%	\$ 13,000	0%	\$ -
Public Works Survey Monument Preservation							
	1990 Ford Ranger	90-32	\$ 9,365				
	Subtotal		\$ 9,000	20%	\$ 1,800	80%	\$ 7,200.00
Bldg. Permits Division							
	2000 Dodge Dakota	00-40	\$ 15,110				
	2000 Dodge Dakota	00-41	15,110				
	2001 Dodge Dakota	01-29	16,237				
	2001 Dodge Dakota	01-30	16,237				
	2003 Chevrolet S-10	03-46	14,658				
	2004 Dodge Dakota Sxt	04-28	14,665				
	2005 Ford Ranger Xlt	05-54	13,693				
	2006 Chevrolet Colorado	06-44	13,464				
	2007 Ford Ranger Xi	07-25	13,957				
	2008 Ford Ranger Xi	08-32	14,129				
	2008 Ford Ranger Xi	08-33	14,129				
	1990 Ford Ranger	90-30	9,365				
	1999 Gmc Sonoma	99-28	15,933				
	1999 Gmc Sonoma	99-29	15,933				
	Subtotal		\$ 203,000	20%	\$ 40,600	80%	\$ 162,400.00
Facilities Maintenance							
	2000 Dodge Dakota	00-36	\$ 13,286				
	2000 Dodge Dakota	00-39	12,735				
	2001 Dodge 3/4 Ton Ut	01-20	17,369				
	2001 Dodge Ram 3500	01-35	18,300				
	2001 Ford Crown Victoria	01-81	24,666				
	2001 Dodge Ram 3500	01-85	21,471				
	2001 Dodge Ram 3500	01-86	21,471				
	2001 Ford F 150	01-89	18,785				
	2001 Ford F 150	01-90	18,785				
	2001 Ford F 150	01-94	18,785				
	2005 Ford Ranger Edge	05-63	13,966				
	2006 Ford Ranger Sport	06-42	15,256				
	2006 Ford Ranger Sport	06-43	15,041				
	2006 Ford F 150	06-54	15,906				
	2006 Ford F 150	06-55	15,906				
	2007 Chevrolet Silverado	07-119	19,919				
	1990 Ford Ranger	90-29	9,365				
	1991 Gmc 1/2 Ton Pickup	91-78	11,311				
	1991 Gmc 1/2 Ton Pickup	91-79	11,483				
	1993 Ford Ranger Xi	93-22	9,752				
	1995 Gmc Safari	95-32	15,245				
	1997 Ford 1/2 Ton Pickup	97-48	14,817				
	1997 Ford Aerostar	97-55	18,539				
	1997 Ford Ranger	97-56	12,839				
	Subtotal		\$ 385,000	20%	\$ 77,000	80%	\$ 308,000.00
Strategic Business Technology							
	2001 Gmc Safari	01-32	\$ 18,203				
	2001 Gmc Safari	01-33	18,203				
	2001 Dodge Ram 3500	01-88	20,043				
	1996 Ford Aerostar	96-57	17,071				
	Subtotal		\$ 74,000	80%	\$ 59,200	20%	\$ 14,800.00

Note: Values may not total due to rounding.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Table A.9: Other County Facilities Equipment Inventory

Year	Make and Model	ID	Value	% County-wide ¹	Countywide Allocation	% Uninc. Only ¹	Uninc. Allocation
CSA							
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-107	\$ 13,349				
2000	Ford Taurus Lx	00-55	17,162				
2000	Ford Taurus Lx	00-56	17,162				
2000	Ford Taurus Lx	00-58	17,162				
2000	Ford Windstar	00-59	22,867				
2000	Ford Windstar	00-60	22,867				
2000	Ford Windstar	00-61	22,867				
2000	Ford Windstar	00-62	22,867				
2000	Ford Windstar	00-63	22,867				
2001	Ford Windstar	01-60	18,987				
2001	Ford Windstar Lx	01-62	20,469				
2001	Ford Windstar Lx	01-63	20,469				
2001	Ford Windstar Lx	01-64	20,469				
2001	Ford Windstar Lx	01-65	20,474				
2001	Ford Taurus Lx	01-66	16,605				
2001	Ford Taurus Lx	01-67	16,605				
2001	Ford Taurus Lx	01-68	16,605				
2001	Ford Taurus Lx	01-69	16,605				
2002	Ford E250 Mobility	02-27	33,075				
2002	Ford Windstar Lx	02-33	22,763				
2002	Ford Taurus Se	02-43	17,904				
2002	Ford Taurus Lx	02-44	16,138				
2002	Ford Taurus Lx	02-45	16,138				
2002	Ford Taurus Lx	02-46	16,138				
2002	Ford Taurus Lx	02-48	16,138				
2002	Ford Taurus Lx	02-49	16,138				
2002	Ford Taurus Lx	02-50	16,138				
2002	Ford Taurus Lx	02-51	16,138				
2002	Ford Taurus Lx	02-52	16,138				
2003	Ford Taurus Lx	03-30	15,284				
2003	Ford Taurus Lx	03-31	15,284				
2003	Ford Taurus Lx	03-32	15,284				
2003	Ford Windstar	03-34	17,574				
2003	Ford Windstar	03-35	17,574				
2003	Ford E150 XI	03-36	17,478				
2003	Ford Windstar	03-37	19,281				
2003	Ford Windstar	03-38	19,281				
2003	Ford Windstar	03-39	19,281				
2005	Dodge Stratus Sxt	05-45	12,248				
2005	Dodge Stratus Sxt	05-46	12,248				
2005	Dodge Stratus Sxt	05-47	12,248				
2005	Dodge Grand Caravan	05-48	15,469				
2005	Dodge Grand Caravan	05-49	15,469				
2005	Dodge Grand Caravan	05-50	15,469				
2006	Ford Freestar Se	06-31	18,681				
2006	Ford Freestar Se	06-32	18,681				
2006	Ford Taurus Se	06-33	13,956				
2006	Ford Taurus Se	06-34	13,956				
2006	Ford Taurus Se	06-35	13,956				
2006	Ford Taurus Se	06-36	13,956				
2006	Ford Taurus Se	06-37	13,956				

Note: Values may not total due to rounding.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Table A.9: Other County Facilities Equipment Inventory

Year	Make and Model	ID	Value	% County-wide ¹	Countywide Allocation	% Uninc. Only ¹	Uninc. Allocation
2007	Ford E250 Cargo	07-103	74,083				
2007	Ford Taurus Se	07-20	13,956				
2007	Ford Freestar Se	07-48	16,113				
2007	Ford Freestar Se	07-49	16,113				
2007	Ford Freestyle	07-54	27,754				
2007	Ford Fusion	07-58	18,140				
2007	Ford Fusion	07-59	18,140				
2007	Ford Fusion	07-60	18,140				
2007	Ford Fusion	07-61	18,140				
2007	Ford Fusion	07-89	18,140				
2007	Ford Fusion	07-90	18,140				
2007	Ford Fusion	07-91	18,140				
2007	Ford Fusion	07-92	18,140				
2007	Ford Fusion	07-93	18,140				
2007	Ford Fusion	07-94	18,140				
2007	Ford E-350 12-Pass	07-97	22,919				
2007	Ford E350 Cargo	07-98	22,919				
2004	Club Car Cart	0C-01	8,734				
1995	Taylor/Dun R3-80	1A	16,432				
1994	Gmc Safari	94-54	13,717				
1995	Gmc 3/4 T Van	95-31	16,494				
1995	Ford Aerostar	95-48	16,873				
1998	Ford Windstar	98-20	19,752				
1998	Ford Windstar	98-22	19,752				
1998	Ford Taurus Lx	98-38	16,865				
1998	Ford Taurus Lx	98-40	16,865				
1998	Ford Windstar	98-41	20,233				
1999	Chevrolet Astro	99-52	19,565				
1999	Ford Windstar	99-54	19,854				
1999	Ford Windstar	99-55	19,854				
1999	Ford Windstar	99-56	19,854				
1999	Ford Windstar	99-58	19,854				
1999	Ford Taurus	99-59	17,293				
1999	Ford Taurus Lx	99-60	15,831				
	Subtotal		\$ 1,569,000	100%	\$ 1,569,000	0%	\$ -
	Total Other County Facilities		\$ 4,997,000	88%	\$ 4,405,000	12%	\$ 592,000

Note: Values may not total due to rounding.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Table A.10: Public Works Morgan Shop (Road & Bridge)

Asset #	Description	Current Replacement Cost	% County-wide ¹	Countywide Allocation	% Uninc. Only ¹	Uninc. Allocation
13251	68 Flatbed Trailer	\$ 14,000				
12902	Pickup 75 Ford-Cone Truck	45,000				
12903	Flat Bed Truck 72 Ford	45,000				
12952	Loader Backhoe JD500C 198419	95,000				
13021	Flat Bed Truck 74 Int	85,000				
16723	Tractor Trailer Model Stf 28-20-24	19,000				
12999	Loader Case W20B With 2.5 Yard Bucket	189,000				
12931	Inter Wheel Tractor	89,000				
12959	Ford F600 Flatbed	85,000				
12932	Spreader Box W/Spread King	350,000				
12980	Dump Truck 80 Ford	100,000				
12923	Tandem Roller Ferguson Sp-266 165	88,000				
12979	Dump Truck 81 Int	100,000				
12937	Morbark Ec346 Brush Chipper	35,000				
13041	Shop Oil Truck	166,000				
13000	Pickup 83 Chev C2500	37,000				
13003	Pickup 83 Chev C2500	38,000				
13029	Pickup 83 Gmc C2500	38,000				
13037	Trailenze Trailer	75,000				
13026	Flatbed Truck 83 Gmc C3500	95,000				
12976	Motor Grader Cat 140G 72V06169	300,000				
12987	83 Chev Truck With Sand Spreader	140,000				
12981	Dump Truck 1984 Gmc	95,000				
12985	GMC Stencil Truck	120,000				
12956	Clark Loader-125C 809A185Cb	250,000				
10858	Ford Truck-Mod L600 1Fdwng0H	110,000				
12896	69 Cook Belly Dumps	22,000				
12901	Cook 69 Belly Dumps	22,000				
13038	Gallaty Tran Trailer	20,000				
13042	Frtlnr Transfer Truck	180,000				
13043	Frtlnr Transfer Truck	180,000				
12933	Road Sweeper CmH-20	32,000				
12972	Motor Grader	300,000				
13034	Reliance 1986 Trailer	20,000				
13039	1987 Frtlnr Spray Rig	185,000				
12893	Trash Pump Honda Wt40X	5,000				
13005	Gmc Sierra 1500 P.U./6100Gww	30,000				
13006	Gmc Sierra 1500 P.U./6100Gww	30,000				
13007	Gmc Sierra 1500 P.U./6100Gww	30,000				
13008	Gmc Sierra 1500 P.U./6100Gww	30,000				
13047	Inter Water Truck	150,000				
13035	Murray Contractor Trailer - Lowbed '87	75,000				
12975	Freightliner Flc12064 3-Axle W/Transfers	180,000				
13031	3500Z Trojan Loader	300,000				
13045	88 White/Gmc Truck Tractor 52000 Gww	110,000				
13254	Portable Outhouse Trailer	3,000				
13022	1988 Gmc C-3500 Pickup Truck	38,000				
13023	1988 Gmc C-3500 Pickup Truck	38,000				
13024	1988 Gmc C-3500 Pickup Truck	38,000				
13025	1988 Gmc C-3500 Pickup Truck	38,000				
13046	89 Gmc Patch Truck	205,000				
12910	Ingerson - Rand 185 Cfm Air Compressor	40,000				

Table A.10: Public Works Morgan Shop (Road & Bridge)

Asset #	Description	Current Replacement Cost	% Countywide ¹	Countywide Allocation	% Uninc. Only ¹	Uninc. Allocation
13010	'89 Chevrolet C-20 Pickup	38,000				
13011	'89 Chevrolet C-20 Pickup	38,000				
13012	'89 Chevrolet C-20 Pickup	38,000				
13013	'89 Chevrolet C-20 Pickup	38,000				
13014	'89 Chevrolet C-20 Pickup	38,000				
13015	'89 Chevrolet C-20 Pickup	38,000				
12982	Komatsu Forklif Model Fd45T-4	44,000				
12944	Massey Fer With Tiger Mower	80,000				
12945	Massey Fer With Tiger Mower	80,000				
13030	John Deere 410CI B/H Tractor/Loader	65,000				
13032	Int S2554 With Vactor Assy	300,000				
12983	Chevy W/ Altec AI-650 Aerial Lift	81,000				
12946	Henderson Fsh 10' Sand-Spreader	22,000				
13050	'91 Dodge B-350 Van	25,000				
13036	Trailing TK70Sa Tiltbed Trailer	48,000				
13048	91 Ford Water Truck	148,000				
12911	Caterpillar 140G Motor Grader	300,000				
13245	91 Ferg Rt-1300 Roller	140,000				
13255	Portable Outhouse Trailer	3,000				
3274	Dump Trailer 14' Gooseneck Dualaxle	17,000				
12950	92 Ford Tempo	20,000				
13009	92 Ford Ranger PU	25,000				
12977	John Deere Model 670B Motor Grader	300,000				
12978	Cat 950F Wheel Loader	250,000				
13017	Ford F250, 8600 Gvw Pickup	38,000				
12986	4 Ton Ir Roller Dd-32	140,000				
13018	Ford F250 Pickup	39,000				
13019	Ford F250 Pickup	39,000				
12951	Bobcat Auger Assy Mounted On #1221	15,000				
12922	Hyster Model C530A Pneumatic Roller	160,000				
16725	Ingersoll Rand 185 Cfm Compressor Used	40,000				
12953	1986 Gallity S/A Hopper	20,000				
12954	1986 Gallity T/A Hopper	20,000				
12968	1982 Freightliner Flc12604T,Ntc300	180,000				
12969	1982 Freightliner Flc12604T,Ntc300	180,000				
12970	1982 Freightliner Flc12604T,Ntc300	180,000				
12989	Case 895 Utility Tractor W Rotary Mower	80,000				
13236	93 Ford F250 Pickup	38,000				
13257	Homemade Tilt Trailer	10,000				
13239	88 Frtlnr 2 Axle Power Unit	105,000				
13237	87 Frtlnr 2 Axle Power Unit	105,000				
13238	87 Frtlnr 2 Axle Power Unit	105,000				
12939	Tiger Flail Mower Head W/Modifications	25,000				
12940	Tiger Flail Mower Head W/Modifications	25,000				
12941	Tiger Flail Mower Head W/Modifications	25,000				
13020	1995 Ford F-150 Pickup	30,000				
12955	Bobcat Loader W/Accessories	37,000				
12934	Towable Sweepster H84 Road Sweeper	34,000				
13052	95 Ford E350 Passenger Van ,White	38,000				
12935	Self Propelled Road Sweeper, Model Rj3000	39,000				
13266	Etnyre 400 Gal Oil Pot Model Mu4Trl Serial M4268	26,000				
15081	Van Modified For Hanicapped	100,000				
12958	97 Ford F-800 Unitized Patch Truck	205,000				
12960	Bobcat Auger Assy On 1220	12,000				
13049	Ford Sign Truck	38,000				

Table A.10: Public Works Morgan Shop (Road & Bridge)

Asset #	Description	Current			
		Replacement Cost	% County-wide ¹	Countywide Allocation	% Uninc. Only ¹ Uninc. Allocation
12984	Sign Body On 1220	12,000			
13235	97 Ford F250 Survey Truck	48,000			
3442	Trailer Tsi Commercial Coach 8X20'	25,000			
13270	98 Bartell Line Eraser	100,000			
13259	88 Gallaty Transfer Trailer	20,000			
13262	Six Inch Crown Pump	20,000			
10846	98 Chevrolet C2500 Pickup	38,000			
10847	98 Chevrolet C2500 Pickup	38,000			
10849	98 Chevrolet C2500 Pickup	38,000			
10851	98 Chevrolet C2500 Pickup	38,000			
10852	98 Gmc Sierra 4-Wheel Drive Pickup	38,000			
10853	98 Gmc Sierra 4-Wheel Drive Pickup	38,000			
10854	98 Gmc Sierra 4-Wheel Drive Pickup	38,000			
10855	98 Gmc Sierra 4-Wheel Drive Pickup	38,000			
10856	98 Gmc Sierra 4-Wheel Drive Pickup	38,000			
10857	98 Gmc Sierra Crew Cab Pickup	40,000			
13252	Port Outhouse Trailer	3,000			
13253	Flatbed Utility Trailer	10,000			
13247	98 Wirtgen Grinder	340,000			
10827	1999 Ford F450 Chassis/Cab	80,000			
10832	1999 Ford F450 Chassis/Cab	80,000			
10833	1999 Ford F450 Chassis/Cab	80,000			
13268	Midland Shoulder Machine	140,000			
10861	New Rosco 1 Man Patch Truck	175,000			
13267	Grafco SS125 Crack Seal Pot	45,000			
13269	Homemade Paving Box	40,000			
13258	Homemade Pipe Trailer	12,000			
12430	2001 Tmt Thermo Plastic Unit	55,000			
12388	2001 Cng Honda Civic	25,000			
12425	2001 Cng Volvo Stripper	350,000			
12433	2001 Cng Ford F150	30,000			
12436	2001 Cng F150	30,000			
12438	2001 Cng F0Rd F150	30,000			
12441	2001 Cng Ford F150	30,000			
12443	2001 Cng Ford F150	30,000			
12446	2001 Cng Ford F150	30,000			
12449	2001 Cng Ford F150	30,000			
12450	2001 Cng Ford F150	30,000			
12453	2001 Cng Ford F150	30,000			
13248	62 Clark Pusher	17,000			
13260	76 Superior Tanker	17,000			

Table A.10: Public Works Morgan Shop (Road & Bridge)

Asset #	Description	Current				
		Replacement Cost	% County-wide ¹	Countywide Allocation	% Uninc. Only ¹	Uninc. Allocation
13244	88 Gmc C70 Patch Truck	205,000				
13276	Cr351 Cedar Rapids Paver	325,000				
13279	01 Cng Panel Truck	175,000				
13277	01 Cng Chipper Truck	140,000				
13278	01 Cng Flatbed Truck	140,000				
13243	02 Frlnr F170 Crew Cab Flatbed	83,000				
15079	2002 Cleasby Tar Pot	40,000				
15080	Morbark Chipper Model 13	35,000				
14626	1986 Cat Pr-105 Grinder	150,000				
14625	2002 Elgin Eagle Sweeper On Sterling Chassis	214,000				
16131	2004 Yamaha Yfm660Fsgr Grizzly Quad	8,000				
20425	2004 F170 Truck With Schwarze M6000 Sweeper	220,000				
20426	2005 Jd 6420 Tractor With Tiger Mower	80,000				
20427	2005 Jd 6420 Tractor With Tiger Mower	80,000				
20424	2005 Ford F650 Service Truck	110,000				
20384	2004 Cng Ford F150	30,000				
20385	2004 Cng Ford F150	30,000				
20386	2004 Cng Ford F150	30,000				
20387	2004 Cng Ford F150	30,000				
20404	2004 Cng Ford F150	30,000				
20405	2004 Cng Ford F150	30,000				
20406	2004 Cng Ford F150	30,000				
20407	2004 Cng Ford F150	30,000				
23100	2005 Jd 6420 With Tiger Mower	80,000				
23099	2005 Cat 430D Backhoe	95,000				
27264	2006 Autocar Wx64 Roll Off Truck	185,000				
29061	2006 Cng Autocar Wx42 Truck With Terex Man Lift	209,000				
29441	Wanco Message Board	18,000				
29463	Wanco Message Board	18,000				
29462	Wanco Message Board	18,000				
29461	Wanco Message Board	18,000				
	Total	\$14,640,000	40%	\$5,856,000	60%	\$8,784,000

² Allocation of County services between countywide and unincorporated only is an estimated generated by MuniFinancial based on experience with other county governments in California.

Table A.11 Technology Allocation

PFF Category	Network							
	Computers	Fileservers	Miscellaneous	Hardware	Printers	Software ¹	CAD - 911	Total
Detention	\$ 173,124	\$ 36,960	\$ 8,232	\$ 19,208	\$ 21,196	\$ 43,288	\$ -	\$ 302,008
RTIF	165,704	35,376	7,879	18,385	20,288	41,433	-	289,065
Criminal Justice	1,644,678	351,120	78,204	182,476	201,362	411,236	-	2,869,076
Library	851,399	181,764	40,484	94,462	104,239	212,884	-	1,485,232
Regional Parks	185,490	39,600	8,820	20,580	22,710	46,380	-	323,580
Health	1,018,340	217,404	48,422	112,984	124,678	254,626	-	1,776,454
Behavioral Health	129,225	27,588	6,145	14,337	15,821	32,311	-	225,427
Sheriff	435,902	93,060	20,727	48,363	53,369	108,993	-	760,413
Emergency Services	50,701	10,824	2,411	5,625	6,207	12,677	868,568	957,013
Animal Services	61,830	13,200	2,940	6,860	7,570	15,460	-	107,860
Admin (Other County)	1,466,608	313,104	69,737	162,719	179,560	366,712	-	2,558,440
Total	\$ 6,183,000	\$ 1,320,000	\$ 294,000	\$ 686,000	\$ 757,000	\$ 1,546,000	\$ 868,568	\$ 11,654,568

¹ Excludes enterprise IT software included in Table 15.2

Table A.12: Parks Equipment Inventory

Year	Make and Model	ID	Value
2001	Dodge 1/2 Ton Pickup	01-22	\$ 14,308
2001	Dodge 1/2 Ton Pickup	01-23	19,155
2001	Dodge 1/2 Ton Pickup	01-24	14,308
2001	Dodge 1/2 Ton Pickup	01-25	14,308
2001	Ford F250 Crewcab	01-48	23,116
2001	Ford F250 Crewcab	01-49	23,116
2001	Ford F250 Crewcab	01-50	23,111
2001	Ford F250 Crewcab	01-51	23,111
2001	Ford F250 Crewcab	01-52	23,111
2001	Dodge Ram 2500	01-53	18,888
2001	Dodge Ram 2501	01-54	18,888
2001	Honda Civic Gx Cng	01-78	20,735
2001	Dodge Ram 3500	01-87	21,471
2001	Ford F 150	01-92	18,785
2001	Ford F 151	01-93	18,785
2001	Ford F 152	01-95	18,785
2002	Gmc C7H042	02-20	54,845
2002	Gmc C7H042	02-21	54,845
2002	Gmc C7H042	02-22	54,845
2002	Ford F 750	02-73	100,898
2003	Ford F250 Crewcab	03-43	24,978
2003	Ford F250 Crewcab	03-44	24,978
2003	Ford F250 Crewcab	03-45	20,499
2004	Gmc Garbage Truck	03-55	70,532
2004	Gmc Garbage Truck	03-56	70,532
2004	Ford F250 XI Sd	04-47	16,422
2004	Ford F250 XI Sd	04-48	16,422
2004	Ford F250 XI Sd	04-49	16,422
2004	Ford F250 XI Sd	04-50	16,422
2004	Ford F250 XI Sd	04-51	16,422
2004	New Holland Lb75.B	04-52	54,220
2004	Chevrolet Silverado	04-55	24,865
2005	Ford F250 XI SD	05-56	17,189

Note: Values may not add due to rounding.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Table A.12: Parks Equipment Inventory cont.

Year	Make and Model	ID	Value
2006	Ford F550	06-51	88,262
2007	Dodge Ram 250o	07-115	20,229
2007	Ford F650	07-30	63,994
2007	Ford F651	07-33	63,994
2007	Chevrolet Silverado	07-51	25,298
2007	Ford F 350	07-52	17,504
2007	Ford E150 XI	07-66	17,589
2007	Ford E150 XI	07-67	17,589
2007	Ford E150 XI	07-68	17,589
1998	Barro Utility	0T-27	4,107
1998	Wayne Varied	0T-30	21,260
1998	Wayne Varied	0T-31	21,260
1998	Wayne Varied	0T-32	21,260
1999	Denair Fb	0T-40	11,995
2004	Dargo Varied	0T-49	6,045
2004	Dargo Varied	0T-50	6,045
2003	Tricker Carrier	0T-51	2,500
2003	Tricker Carrier	0T-52	2,500
2003	Jacobsen Utility	0T-53	5,744
2003	Jacobsen Utility	0T-54	5,744
1960	Selma Trailer	0T-63	175
2006	Jacobsen Utility	0T-71	5,483
1984	Gmc Flatbed Tr	84-15	34,986
1985	Ford Water Truc	85-44	22,264
1991	Chevrolet 3/4 T. Clu	91-73	10,000
1992	Gmc 3/4 Ton Pu	92-31	12,713
1992	Polaris 6 Wheeler	92-36	5,708
1992	Ford 3/4 Ton Ut	92-37	15,500
1993	Ford 3/4 Ton Pu	93-09	14,310
1994	Ford Dump Truck	94-68	28,500
1996	Dodge 1/2 Ton Pickup	96-22	14,455
1996	Ford F 250	96-55	22,130
1997	Ford F 150	97-31	15,276
1997	Ford 3/4 Ton Pu	97-52	19,666
1998	Ford 1/2 Ton Pickup	98-24	19,238
1999	Gmc 1 Ton Crew	99-24	25,750
1999	Gmc 1 Ton Crew	99-25	25,233
1999	Dodge 1/2 Ton Pickup	99-27	17,334
1999	Dodge 1/2 Ton Pickup	99-70	21,217
	Total		\$ 1,740,000

Note: Values may not add due to rounding.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Table A.13: Sheriff Vehicle Inventory

Year	Make and Model	ID	Value
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-103	\$ 13,349
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-105	13,349
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-87	13,349
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-88	13,349
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-92	13,349
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-99	13,349
2001	Ford Police Int	01-01	23,281
2001	Ford Taurus Lx	01-18	15,194
2001	Ford Escape Xlt	01-42	20,590
2001	Honda Civic Gx Cng	01-76	20,735
2001	Ford Crown Victoria	01-83	24,666
2002	Freightliner Motorhome	02-30	282,544
2003	Ford Police Int	03-03	23,386
2003	Chevrolet Tahoe Z71 4X4	03-21	29,884
2003	Ford Taurus Se	03-29	16,703
2004	Ford Police Int	04-20	23,645
2004	Dodge Intrepid Se	04-26	16,497
2004	Ford Crown Victoria	04-45	24,984
2005	Chevrolet Impala	05-16	18,538
2005	Ford Taurus Se	05-25	13,620
2007	Ford Taurus Se	07-118	13,941
2007	Pontiac Grand Prix	07-41	15,553
1996	Ford Crown Victoria	96-54	22,721
1996	Ford Explorer	96-69	12,563
1998	Ford Taurus Lx	98-29	15,582
1998	Ford Taurus Lx	98-30	15,582
1999	Ford Police Int	99-41	22,386
1999	Chevrolet Astro Carg	99-67	19,219
2000	Ford Police Int	00-04	22,648
2000	Ford Police Int	00-05	22,648
2000	Ford 4X4 Pickup	00-116	24,873
2000	Ford Expedition	00-19	28,635
2000	Ford Police Int	00-20	31,827
2000	Ford Police Int	00-21	22,959
2000	Dodge Ram B3500	00-29	18,959
2000	Ford E350 Cargo	00-30	25,165
2000	Ford Police Int	00-904	23,281
2000	Chevrolet Malibu	00-93	13,349
2001	Ford Taurus Lx	01-116	15,511
2001	Ford Police Int	01-12	25,267
2001	Ford Taurus Lx	01-121	15,194
2001	Ford Taurus Lx	01-122	16,075
2001	Ford F250 Crewcab	01-123	37,020
2001	Ford Police Int	01-131	23,335
2001	Ford Taurus Lx	01-16	15,319
2001	Ford E250 Cargo	01-28	85,270
2001	Dodge 3/4 Ton Ut	01-41	18,189
2001	Ford Ranger	01-96	13,233
2001	Ford Ranger	01-97	13,233
2002	Ford Police Int	02-06	23,386
2002	Ford Police Int	02-07	26,204
2002	Ford Police Int	02-10	23,386

Table A.13: Sheriff Vehicle Inventory continued

Year	Make and Model	ID	Value
2002	Ford Crown Victoria	02-11	23,075
2002	Ford Crown Victoria	02-12	23,015
2002	Ford Expedition	02-19	26,121
2002	Ford Police Int	02-23	23,464
2002	Ford Police Int	02-24	23,464
2002	Ford Police Int	02-25	23,105
2002	Chevrolet Express	02-34	18,503
2002	Ford Taurus Lx	02-61	16,675
2002	Ford Taurus Lx	02-62	17,680
2002	Arctic Cat Atv 400 4X4	02-63	5,353
2002	Arctic Cat Atv 400 4X4	02-64	5,353
2002	Chevrolet Express	02-72	20,365
2002	Chevrolet Express	02-75	21,208
2003	Ford Police Int	03-05	23,386
2003	Ford Police Int	03-06	23,386
2003	Ford Police Int	03-09	23,386
2003	Ford Police Int	03-10	23,386
2003	Ford Police Int	03-11	24,059
2003	Ford Police Int	03-12	23,386
2003	Ford Police Int	03-13	23,623
2003	Ford Police Int	03-15	23,623
2003	Ford Police Int	03-16	23,623
2003	Ford Police Int	03-17	23,623
2003	Ford Police Int	03-18	23,648
2003	Chevrolet Silverado	03-20	31,465
2003	Ford Taurus Se	03-28	16,703
2003	Chevrolet Silverado	03-42	30,704
2004	Ford Police Int	04-01	23,895
2004	Ford Police Int	04-02	23,895
2004	Ford Police Int	04-03	23,895
2004	Ford Police Int	04-04	25,316
2004	Ford Police Int	04-05	23,895
2004	Ford Police Int	04-07	25,316
2004	Ford Police Int	04-08	25,316
2004	Ford Crown Victoria	04-21	23,895
2004	Dodge Intrepid Se	04-22	16,497
2004	Dodge Intrepid Se	04-23	16,497
2004	Dodge Intrepid Se	04-24	16,497
2004	Dodge Intrepid Se	04-25	16,497
2005	Ford Police Int	05-01	23,358
2005	Ford Police Int	05-03	21,749
2005	Ford Police Int	05-04	23,169
2005	Ford Police Int	05-05	22,991
2005	Ford Police Int	05-06	23,895
2005	Ford Police Int	05-07	23,895
2005	Ford Police Int	05-08	23,899
2005	Ford Police Int	05-09	23,899
2005	Ford Police Int	05-10	23,899
2005	Ford Police Int	05-11	23,899
2005	Ford Police Int	05-12	23,899
2005	Ford Police Int	05-13	23,899
2005	Ford Police Int	05-14	23,899

Table A.13: Sheriff Vehicle Inventory continued

Year	Make and Model	ID	Value
2005	Ford Police Int	05-15	23,899
2005	Ford Police Int	05-18	23,899
2005	Ford Taurus Se	05-22	13,620
2005	Ford Taurus Se	05-23	13,620
2005	Ford Taurus Se	05-24	13,620
2005	Ford Taurus Se	05-26	13,620
2005	Ford Taurus Se	05-27	13,620
2005	Chevrolet Tahoe Ls 4X4	05-29	33,638
2005	Chevrolet Silverado	05-30	35,404
2005	Dodge Caravan	05-31	14,842
2005	Ford Police Int	05-34	23,899
2005	Ford Police Int	05-35	24,979
2005	Ford Police Int	05-36	23,899
2005	Ford Police Int	05-37	23,899
2005	Ford Police Int	05-38	23,899
2005	Ford Police Int	05-39	23,899
2005	Ford Taurus Se	05-64	14,494
2005	Chevrolet Impala	05-65	18,354
2005	Chevrolet Impala	05-66	18,354
2005	Ford Police Int	05-69	23,253
2005	Ford Police Int	05-71	19,136
2005	Ford Police Int	05-72	19,136
2005	Ford Police Int	05-74	19,136
2005	Ford Police Int	05-75	19,136
2005	Ford Police Int	05-77	18,201
2005	Ford Police Int	05-78	18,201
2005	Ford Police Int	05-79	18,201
2005	Ford Police Int	05-80	18,201
2005	Ford Police Int	05-81	18,201
2005	Ford Police Int	05-82	22,692
2006	Ford Police Int	06-02	23,899
2006	Ford Police Int	06-03	23,899
2006	Ford Police Int	06-04	22,682
2006	Ford Police Int	06-06	22,682
2006	Ford Police Int	06-07	22,682
2006	Ford Police Int	06-08	22,682
2006	Ford Police Int	06-10	22,716
2006	Ford Police Int	06-11	22,682
2006	Ford Police Int	06-12	22,682
2006	Ford Police Int	06-13	22,682
2006	Ford Police Int	06-14	22,682
2006	Ford Police Int	06-15	22,682
2006	Ford Police Int	06-16	23,899
2006	Ford Police Int	06-17	23,899
2006	Ford Police Int	06-18	23,899
2006	Ford Police Int	06-19	24,327
2006	Chevrolet Tahoe	06-26	29,278
2006	Chevrolet Tahoe	06-27	29,278
2006	Jeep Liberty Sport	06-30	16,131
2006	Ford Expedition	06-40	25,279
2006	Ford Taurus	06-56	12,357
2006	Ford Taurus	06-59	14,676

Table A.13: Sheriff Vehicle Inventory continued

Year	Make and Model	ID	Value
2006	Ford Freestar Se	06-64	14,483
2007	Ford Police Int	07-01	23,835
2007	Ford Police Int	07-02	23,835
2007	Ford Police Int	07-03	23,835
2007	Ford Police Int	07-04	23,835
2007	Ford Police Int	07-05	23,835
2007	Ford Police Int	07-06	23,835
2007	Ford Police Int	07-07	23,835
2007	Ford Police Int	07-08	23,835
2007	Ford Police Int	07-09	23,835
2007	Ford Police Int	07-10	23,835
2007	Pontiac Grand Prix	07-104	17,268
2007	Freightliner 1 Ton Truck	07-109	261,381
2007	Ford Police Int	07-11	23,255
2007	Ford Taurus Se	07-114	13,806
2007	Ford E250 Cargo	07-116	33,752
2007	Ford Taurus Se	07-22	13,956
2007	Pontiac Grand Prix	07-39	15,553
2007	Pontiac Grand Prix	07-42	15,553
2007	Pontiac Grand Prix	07-43	15,553
2007	Pontiac Grand Prix	07-44	15,553
2007	Dodge Ram 1500	07-45	24,407
2007	Dodge Ram 1500	07-46	24,407
2007	Pontiac Grand Prix	07-57	15,508
2007	Suzuki Dr-Z400Sk7	07-70	5,988
2007	Suzuki Dr-Z400Sk7	07-71	5,988
2007	Dodge Ram 1500	07-99	24,407
2008	Ford Police Int	08-18	23,815
2008	Ford Escape Xlt	08-30	18,503
2008	Ford Escape Xlt	08-31	18,503
2008	Ford Police Int	08-35	23,815
1998	Shorelandr Carrier	0T-28	574
2002	Dargo Varied	0T-47	5,940
2002	Jacobsen Utility	0T-48	4,798
2006	Vanson Trailer	0T-59	446
1988	Wooldridg Unk	2473XC	20,727
1979	Chevrolet Step Van	79-34	1,100
1990	Chevrolet Cheyenne C	90-41	12,882
1993	Ford F 250	93-20	13,133
1993	Ford Ranger XI	93-25	9,752
1994	Dodge 8-Pass Van	94-55	14,759
1996	Mercury Mystique	96-60	12,665
1998	Ford Taurus Lx	98-31	15,582
1999	Ford Crown Victoria	99-01	21,135
1999	Ford Crown Victoria	99-04	21,135
1999	Ford Crown Victoria	99-06	21,744
1999	Dodge 1/2 Ton Pickup	99-09	14,296
1999	Ford Police Int	99-30	22,386
1999	Ford Police Int	99-31	22,386
1999	Ford Police Int	99-32	22,521
1999	Ford Police Int	99-37	22,386
1999	Ford Police Int	99-40	22,386

Table A.13: Sheriff Vehicle Inventory continued

Year	Make and Model	ID	Value
1999	Ford Police Int	99-44	22,386
1999	Ford Police Int	99-45	22,386
1999	Chevrolet Malibu	99-65	14,983
1999	Ford Crown Victoria	99-75	12,675
2003	Rocky Mountain Luxor	CF 4575 XC	24,475
2003	Rocky Mountain Luxor	CF 4576 XC	24,475
2004	International 1-Ton Hi-Cube	04-46	79,947
1989	Gmc 16Ft Van T	89-72	9,800
1999	Chevrolet Cargo Van	99-69	19,219
2003	Ford Police Int	03-26	23,386
2003	Ford Police Int	03-27	23,386
2003	Ford E350 15-Pass	03-53	24,554
2005	Ford Police Int	05-19	23,899
2006	Chevrolet Suburban 2500	06-38	32,550
2006	Ford E350 Cargo	06-50	20,574
2007	Ford Police Int	07-18	23,899
2007	Ford Police Int	07-19	23,899
2007	Ford E350 15-Pass	07-72	20,574
2008	Ford Police Int	08-25	22,361
2008	Ford Police Int	08-26	22,361
2000	Ford 1 Ton Truck	00-126	23,740
1999	Chevrolet Cargo Larg	99-68	19,219
2000	Ford Police Int	00-02	22,648
2000	Ford Police Int	00-07	22,648
2000	Ford Police Int	00-22	22,959
2001	Ford Police Int	01-04	23,281
2001	Ford Police Int	01-06	23,281
2001	Ford Police Int	01-08	23,281
2001	Ford Police Int	01-10	23,281
2001	Ford Police Int	01-127	23,336
2001	Ford Police Int	01-128	23,336
2001	Ford Police Int	01-13	23,281
2001	Ford Police Int	01-130	23,335
2002	Ford Police Int	02-05	23,386
2002	Ford Police Int	02-09	23,386
2002	Ford Police Int	02-13	22,323
2003	Ford Police Int	03-01	23,386
2003	Ford Police Int	03-07	23,386
2003	Ford Police Int	03-08	23,386
2003	Ford Police Int	03-14	23,623
2005	Ford Police Int	05-73	19,136
2006	Ford Police Int	06-09	22,682
1995	Oldsmobile Ciera	95-39	13,221
1999	Ford Police Int	99-43	22,386
1999	Ford Police Int	99-46	22,386
1999	Ford Police Int	99-47	22,386
1999	Chevrolet Silverado	99-77	16,378
2000	Ford Explorer	00-114	25,246
2000	Buick Century Custom	00-127	11,130
2000	Chevrolet Cavalier	00-129	9,976
2000	Pontiac Grand Am	00-131	13,087
2000	Ford Explorer Xls	00-135	11,788
2000	Dodge Ram 3500	00-136	8,862
2001	Oldsmobile Intrique	01-133	14,180
2001	Pontiac Bonneville	01-134	16,320
2001	Pontiac Sunfire	01-135	9,714

Table A.13: Sheriff Vehicle Inventory continued

Year	Make and Model	ID	Value
2001	Ford E250 Cargo	01-137	18,146
2001	Pontiac Grand Prix	01-138	8,550
2003	Ford F350 Supercab	03-57	26,084
2003	Pontiac Grand Am	03-59	12,099
2003	Chevrolet Trailblazer	03-60	17,243
2003	Chevrolet Trailblazer	03-64	20,763
2004	Chevrolet Blazer	04-53	19,518
2004	Dodge Caravan 7	04-54	18,606
2004	Ford Freestar Se	04-57	14,023
2005	Chevrolet 1/2 Ton Pickup	05-68	22,242
2006	Dodge Caravan 7	06-45	16,445
2006	Chrysler Town & Country	06-68	16,336
2007	Dodge Charger	07-110	18,367
2003	Ford Ambul Van	03-54	122,421
2005	F350 Supercab	05-55	27,585
	Total		<u>\$6,373,000</u>

Note: Values may not total due to rounding.

Sources: Stanislaus County; Willdan Financial Services.

Appendix Table A.14: Existing County-Owned Land

Property	Department	Acreage
Animal Services Shelter - 2846 Finch Road, Modesto	Animal Services	4.53
County Center II, 700-1020 Scenic Dr	Behavioral Health	1.85
County Center II, 700-1020 Scenic Dr - CSA	Other County Facilities	0.07
County Center II, 700-1020 Scenic Dr - GSA Print Shop	Other County Facilities	0.47
County Center II, 700-1020 Scenic Dr	Health	<u>14.10</u>
Subtotal		16.49
1501 Memorial Drive, Ceres	Behavioral Health	15.37
Former Bank of America Building, 1021 I Street, Modesto	Criminal Justice	0.28
Former Bank of America Building, 1021 I Street, Modesto	Other County Facilities	<u>0.41</u>
Subtotal - Former Bank of America Building		0.69
Ray Simon Reg Criminal Justice Trng Ctr, Modesto	Criminal Justice	13.69
Former City Hall Building - 801 11th Street, Modesto	Criminal Justice	0.22
Former City Hall Building - 801 11th Street, Modesto	Other County Facilities	0.11
Former City Hall Building - 801 11th Street, Modesto	Sheriff	0.10
Former City Hall Building - 801 11th Street, Modesto - Sup Court	Non-County	<u>0.06</u>
Subtotal - Former City Hall Building		0.49
12th Street Office Building, 832 12th Street	Criminal Justice	0.20
12th Street Office Building, 832 12th Street	Other County Facilities	0.07
12th Street Office Building, 832 12th Street	Non-County	<u>0.13</u>
Subtotal - 12th Street Office Building		0.40
Juvenile Justice Center, 2215 Blue Gum Road, Modesto	Detention	34.36
Honor Farm, 8225 W Grayson Road, Grayson	Detention	97.00
Downtown Jail, Modesto	Detention	0.86
Public Safety Center 200-442 Hackett Road, Modesto	Detention	97.31
Public Safety Center (Sheriff Operations) - 200 - 442 Hackett	Sheriff	<u>2.69</u>
Subtotal - Public Safety Center		100.00
3705 Oakdale Road	Emergency Services	0.93
3705 Oakdale Road	Non-County	<u>1.26</u>
Subtotal - 3705 Oakdale Road		2.19

Note: This appendix does not include parkland.

Source: Stanislaus County.

Appendix Table A.14: Existing County-Owned Land Continued

Property	Department	Acreage
1305 Kern Street, Newman Branch Library	Library	0.29
1500 I Street, Modesto Main Library	Library	1.69
151 South 1st Street, Oakdale Branch Library	Library	0.23
2250 Magnolia Street, Ceres Branch Library	Library	0.12
324 E Street, Waterford Branch Library	Library	0.14
3442 Santa Fe Avenue, Riverbank Branch Library	Library	0.22
46-48 West Salida, Patterson Branch Library	Library	0.14
4835 Sisk Road, Nick W. Blom Salida Regional Library	Library	4.95
550 Minaret Avenue, Turlock Branch Library	Library	1.46
18 South Abie Street, Empire Community Center	Library	0.96
Tenth Street Place, 1010 10th Street	Other County Facilities	0.08
Tenth Street Place, 1010 10th Street	Other County Facilities	0.56
Tenth Street Place, 1010 10th Street	Other County Facilities	<u>0.73</u>
Subtotal - Tenth Street Place		1.37
Agricultural Center 3800 Cornucopia Way, Modesto	Other County Facilities	15.58
Community Services Facility 3800 Cornucopia Way, Modesto	Other County Facilities	26.45
Vacant/future Development - 3800 Cornucopia Way, Modesto	Other County Facilities	<u>27.33</u>
Subtotal - 3800 Cornucopia Way, Modesto		69.36
Landfill, 400 Fink Road	Other County Facilities	222.44
Landfill Buffer Area, 400 Fink Road	Other County Facilities	<u>2,230.72</u>
Subtotal - 400 Fink Road		2,453.16
Burbank-Paradise Hall, 1325 Beverly Drive	Other County Facilities	0.11
Morgan Road - Public Works Yard, 1716 Morgan Road	Other County Facilities	14.96
Public Works Yard, 301 South First Str	Other County Facilities	1.29
Fleet Services Facility, 448 East Hackett Road	Other County Facilities	10.00
Public Works Yard, 551 South Center Str	Other County Facilities	2.00
Geer Road Landfill, 751 Geer Road	Other County Facilities	85.19
12th Street Parking Garage, 820 12th Street	Other County Facilities	0.89
County Center III - 909 - 939 County Center III Drive, Modesto	Sheriff	0.58
County Center III - Chief Executive Office/CARE Unit	Other County Facilities	1.03
County Center III - Clerk Recorder	Other County Facilities	2.23
County Center III - General Services Agency	Other County Facilities	2.37
County Center III - County Office of Education	Other County Facilities	2.84
County Center III - USPS Remote Encoding Center	Non-County	<u>4.22</u>
Subtotal - County Center III		13.27

Note: This appendix does not include parkland.

Source: Stanislaus County.

Appendix Table A.15: Existing County-Owned Buildings

Property	Department	Square Feet
Animal Services Shelter	Animal Services	10,700
Animal Services Shelter	Animal Services	14,040
Animal Services Shelter	Animal Services	<u>1,800</u>
		26,540
800 Scenic, Modesto		
Behavioral Health Share	Behavioral Health	26,414
County Center II, 700-1020 Scenic Dr		
Administration Offices	Health	35,570
Clinic/Medical Offices	Health	148,187
Shop/Warehouse	Health	17,320
Central Services, 1018 Scenic Drive, Modesto - Central Services	Other County Facilities	7,752
Community Services Agency, County Center II	Other County Facilities	1,000
General Services Agency Print Shop - County Center II	Other County Facilities	<u>6,752</u>
Subtotal - County Center II		216,581
1904 Richland, Ceres		
SRC Teen Center	Behavioral Health	1,440
SRC Perinatal Program	Behavioral Health	10,500
SRC Adult Program	Behavioral Health	15,572
SRC Reception/Annex	Behavioral Health	5,000
SRC Office Bldg.	Behavioral Health	<u>4,404</u>
Subtotal - 1904 Richland, Ceres		36,916
CSA Bldg.-Hackett Rd.	Behavioral Health	2,600
Ray Simon Regional Criminal Justice Training Center	Criminal Justice	22,615
Child Support, Probation - 801 11th Street, Modesto	Criminal Justice	16,761
AWP Office, 801 11th Street	Sheriff	2,288
Civil Unit Office, 801 11th Street	Sheriff	5,039
Guardian Ad Litem, 801 11th Street, Modesto (former City Hall)	Other County Facilities	373
Child Support Services, 801 11th Street, Modesto (former City Hall)	Other County Facilities	1,267
Probation, 801 11th Street	Other County Facilities	22,482
Superior Court of California	NA	4,457
Strategic Business Technology, 801 11th Street	Other County Facilities	<u>5,068</u>
Subtotal - 810 11th Street, Modesto		57,735
Public Defender - 1021 I Street (former Bank of America) I Street	Criminal Justice	14,177
Clerk-Recorder, 1021 I Street (former Bank of America) I Street	Other County Facilities	21,516
Strategic Business Technology, 1021 I Street (former Bank of America)	Other County Facilities	<u>400</u>
Subtotal - 1021 I Street (former Bank of America)		36,093
12th Street Office Building	Criminal Justice	43,800
12th Street Office Building - Private	NA	29,200
12th Street Office Building - StanCera	NA	<u>14,600</u>
Subtotal - 12th Street Office Building		87,600
Juv Justice Center, 2215 Blue Gum Avenue, Modesto	Detention	53,214
Spcl Needs Housing Unit, 2215 Blue Gum Avenue, Modesto	Detention	12,790
Units 5 & 6, 2215 Blue Gum Avenue, Modesto	Detention	16,358
Juvenile Justice	Behavioral Health	1,440
Juvenile Justice	Behavioral Health	2,150
Probation, 2215 Blue Gum Avenue, Modesto - Juv Justice Center	Other County Facilities	<u>2,160</u>
Subtotal - 2215 Blue Gum Avenue		88,112

Source: Stanislaus County.

Appendix Table A.15: Existing County-Owned Buildings Continued

Property	Department	Square Feet
Barracks #4, 8224 W Grayson Road	Detention	8,500
Barracks 1 & 2, 8224 W Grayson Road	Detention	7,836
Barracks 3, 8224 W Grayson Road	Detention	4,198
Building Maintenance Shop, 8224 W Grayson Road	Detention	853
Clothing Room, 8224 W Grayson Road	Detention	800
Green House, 8224 W Grayson Road	Detention	600
Honor Farm, 8224 W Grayson Road	Detention	2,400
Medical Modular, 8224 W Grayson Road	Detention	500
Mess Hall & Kitchen, 8224 W Grayson Road	Detention	4,800
Modular Locker Rm, 8224 W Grayson Road	Detention	500
Probation Modular, 8224 W Grayson Road	Detention	720
Programs Modular, 8224 W Grayson Road	Detention	1,440
Shop, 8224 W Grayson Road	Detention	4,800
Staff Breakroom, 8224 W Grayson Road	Detention	720
Staff Restroom, 8224 W Grayson Road	Detention	300
Supply/Storage, 8224 W Grayson Road	Detention	1,600
Visiting, 8224 W Grayson Road	Detention	100
Walk-In Freezer, 8224 W Grayson Road	Detention	120
Subtotal - 8224 W. Grayson Road		40,787
Kitchen Laundry, 200 E Hackett Road	Detention	47,500
Main Jail-Bldg 1, 200 E Hackett Road	Detention	135,523
Main Jail-Bldg 2, 200 E Hackett Road	Detention	85,000
Maintenance Building, 200 E Hackett Road	Detention	4,800
Minimum Security Housing, 200 E Hackett Road	Detention	35,600
Walk-In Refrigerator, 200 E Hackett Road	Detention	600
Command Modular, 200 E Hackett Road	Sheriff	400
Evidence Bunker, 200 E Hackett Road	Sheriff	988
Generator Bldg, 200 E Hackett Road	Sheriff	1,500
K-9/Equestrian Center, 200 E Hackett Road	Sheriff	755
Programs Modular, 200 E Hackett Road	Sheriff	1,440
Programs Modular, 200 E Hackett Road	Sheriff	1,440
Public Safety Center Programs Modular, 200 E Hackett Road	Sheriff	1,800
Storage Modular, 200 E Hackett Road	Sheriff	224
Subtotal - 200 E. Hackett		317,570
Men's Jail, 1115 H Street, Modesto	Detention	53,208
Ceres Branch Library, 2250 Magnolia Street, Ceres	Library	4,200
Empire Branch Library, 18 South Abie Street, Empire	Library	4,300
Keyes Branch Library, 5506 Jennie, Keyes	Library	7,400
Modesto Main Library, 1500 I Street, Modesto	Library	62,000
Newman Branch Library, 1305 Kern Street, Newman	Library	2,613
Oakdale Branch Library, 151 South 1st Street, Oakdale	Library	6,500
Patterson Branch Library, 46-48 West Salida, Patterson	Library	6,800
Riverbank Branch Library, 3442 Santa Fe Avenue, Riverbank	Library	3,594
Salida Branch Library, 4835 Sisk Road, Salida	Library	61,000
Turlock Branch Library, 550 Minaret Avenue, Turlock	Library	10,000
Waterford Branch Library, 324 E Street, Waterford	Library	3,000
West Modesto Literacy Office, 401 Paradise Road, Modesto	Library	643

Source: Stanislaus County.

Appendix Table A.15: Existing County-Owned Buildings Continued

Property	Department	Square Feet
Office of Emergency Services - 3705 Oakdale Road	Emergency Services	4,000
County Share of Emergency Dispatch (46%) - 3705 Oakdale Road	Emergency Services	3,680
Non-County Share - 3705 Oakdale Road	NA	<u>10,320</u>
Subtotal - 3705 Oakdale Road		18,000
Area Agency on Aging/Vets, 718 Tuolumne, Modesto - Mancini Hall	Other County Facilities	6,000
Assessor, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	Other County Facilities	18,861
Auditor-Controller, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	Other County Facilities	14,158
Board of Supervisors, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	Other County Facilities	10,899
Chief Executive Office, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	Other County Facilities	22,225
Clerk of the Board, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	Other County Facilities	2,127
County Counsel, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	Other County Facilities	9,053
Planning/Com. Dev., 1010 10th Street, Modesto	Other County Facilities	9,614
Public Works, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	Other County Facilities	14,646
Treasurer-Tax Collector, 1010 10th Street, Modesto	Other County Facilities	<u>16,995</u>
Subtotal - 1010 10th Street, Modesto		118,576
Child Support Services, 251 E Hackett Road, Ceres	Other County Facilities	53,693
Community Services Agency, 251 E Hackett Road, Ceres	Other County Facilities	144,970
Employment & Training, 251 E Hackett Road, Ceres	Other County Facilities	<u>53,693</u>
Subtotal - 251 E Hackett Road, Ceres		252,356
Central Services, 909 Oakdale Road, Modesto - Training Center	Other County Facilities	23,544
Central Services, 909 Oakdale Road, Modesto - Warehouse #1	Other County Facilities	14,400
Central Services, 909 Oakdale Road, Modesto - Warehouse #2	Other County Facilities	<u>13,600</u>
Subtotal - Central Services		51,544
Capital Projects Office, 825 12th Street	Other County Facilities	2,100
Community Services Agency, 401 Paradise Road, West Modesto Office	Other County Facilities	1,781
Agriculture Commissioner - 3800 Cornucopia Way	Other County Facilities	50,783
Cooperative Extension, 3800 Cornucopia Way	Other County Facilities	30,470
Environmental Resources, 3800 Cornucopia Way - Environmental Resources	Other County Facilities	<u>40,626</u>
Subtotal - 3800 Cornucopia Way		121,879

Source: Stanislaus County.

Appendix Table A.15: Existing County-Owned Buildings Continued

Property	Department	Square Feet
District Attorney, 832 12th Street	Other County Facilities	44,691
Courthouse, 1100 I Street	Sheriff	800
Subtotal - 1100 I Street		45,491
Fleet Services, 442 E Hackett Road - Fleet Services Office/Shop	Other County Facilities	9,374
Fleet Services, 442 E Hackett Road - Fleet Services Office/Shop	Other County Facilities	9,374
Subtotal - 442 E Hackett Road - Fleet Services Office/Shop		18,748
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Body Shop	Other County Facilities	6,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Carpentry/Paint Shop	Other County Facilities	3,822
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Main Bldg	Other County Facilities	9,504
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Paint Storage	Other County Facilities	120
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Parking Shed	Other County Facilities	8,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Pole Barn	Other County Facilities	6,100
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Shop	Other County Facilities	8,100
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Soils Lab/Sign Shop	Other County Facilities	2,500
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Storage Bldg	Other County Facilities	5,200
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Storage Bldg	Other County Facilities	3,800
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Storage Bldg #1	Other County Facilities	6,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Storage Bldg #2	Other County Facilities	6,000
Public Works, 1716 Morgan Road - Weed Control Building	Other County Facilities	500
Subtotal - 1716 Morgan Road		65,646
Environmental Resources, 400 Fink Road	Other County Facilities	500
Environmental Resources, 400 Fink Road	Other County Facilities	2,500
Environmental Resources, 400 Fink Road	Other County Facilities	800
Environmental Resources, 400 Fink Road	Other County Facilities	1,600
Subtotal - 400 Fink Road		5,400
Environmental Resources, 751 Geer Road	Other County Facilities	2,500
Public Works, 551 South Center - Public Works Office	Other County Facilities	1,600
Public Works, 551 South Center - Public Works Shop	Other County Facilities	8,000
Public Works, 551 South Center - Public Works Shop	Other County Facilities	3,000
Subtotal - 551 South Center Center		12,600
Public Works, 301 South First Street - Roads Modular Unit	Other County Facilities	800
Sheriff: Coroner-Public Administrator - County Center III	Sheriff	3,520
Chief Executive Office/CARE Unit - County Center III	Other County Facilities	6,278
Clerk Recorder - County Center III	Other County Facilities	13,600
General Services Agency - County Center III	Other County Facilities	14,400
County Office of Education - County Center III	Other County Facilities	17,266
USPS Remote Encoding Center - County Center III	Non-County	25,720
Subtotal - County Center III		80,784
Sheriff Admin Bldg, 250 E Hackett Road	Sheriff	41,616
Substation, 22113 Highway 33, Crows Landing	Sheriff	1,800

Source: Stanislaus County.

Appendix B: Industrial Rail Credit

As a policy decision, Stanislaus County staff has decided to adjust each of the large industrial land use trip rates down to account for trips served by rail. **Appendix Table B.1** shows the calculation for industrial Trip Demand Factors, before an adjustment for rail served large industrial is made. The adjustments to the PM peak hour trip rate in this table are the same adjustments made for every other land use, as shown in Chapter 13 in Table 13.1.

The adjusted trip factor for the large industrial land use categories is calculated based on data provided by the Beard Industrial Tract (BIT), a large industrial complex in the City of Modesto's sphere of influence. BIT has approximately 10 million square feet of industrial space. The equivalent of approximately 120,000 truck trips that would have been made on the County's roads if not for rail service, are estimated to be served by rail annually. For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the 10 million square feet of industrial space are equally allocated between the manufacturing, distribution, and warehousing land uses. The calculation of the discounted trip factors to account for rail services is as follows:

- ♦ The assumed square footage for each land use category is multiplied by the non-discounted trip demand factor from Appendix Table B.1 to determine the daily PM peak hour trips generated by that land use.
- ♦ Daily PM peak hour trips are multiplied by the number of weekdays in a year (260) to determine the annual PM peak hour trips generated by a land use.
- ♦ The number of annual PM peak hour trips reduced by rail (estimated at half of the total rail trips) are subtracted from the total PM peak hour trips calculated in the previous step.
- ♦ The adjusted annual PM peak hour trips calculated in the previous step are divided by the number of weekdays in a year (260) to determine the daily adjusted PM peak hour trip demand factor.

Appendix Table B.2 details the calculation of the adjusted tip demand factor.

Appendix Table B.1: Trip Rate Adjustment Factor - PM Peak Hour Trip Rate

Land Use	PM Peak Hour Trip rate per 1,000 SF ¹ [A]	Diverted Trip Factor ² [B]	Causality Factor ² [C]	Trip Demand Factor (pre-rail service discount) [D = A x B x C]
<i>Large Industrial</i>				
Manufacturing	0.74	1.00	0.84	0.62
Distribution	0.86	1.00	0.84	0.72
Warehouse	0.47	1.00	0.84	0.39

¹ Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual, 7th Edition.

² Stanislaus County Public Facilities Fee Program, Recht Hausrath & Associates, 1990.

Sources: Recht Hausrath & Associates; Stanislaus County; ITE Trip Generation Manual, 7th Edition; Willdan Financial Services.

Appendix Table B.2: Rail Served Industrial Trip Demand Factor

Land Use	1,000 Square feet of Space ¹ [A]	Trip Demand Factor (PM Peak Hour) ² [B]	Daily PM Peak Hour Trips [C = A x B]	Yearly PM Peak Hour Trips ³ [D = C x 260]	Annual PM Peak Hour Trips Reduced by Rail ⁴ [E]	Total	
						Annual PM Peak Hour Trips (after Reduction) [F = D - E]	Adjusted Trip Factor [F / 260 / A]
Large Industrial							
Manufacturing	3,333	0.62	2,067	537,420	20,000	517,420	0.60
Distribution	3,333	0.72	2,400	624,000	20,000	604,000	0.70
Warehouse	3,333	0.39	1,300	338,000	20,000	318,000	0.37
Total	10,000		5,767	1,499,420	60,000	1,439,420	

¹ Based on data from the Beard Industrial Tract (BIT). Assumes that 10 million square feet of building space at BIT are divided evenly between manufacturing, distribution, and warehouse functions.

² See Appendix Table B.1.

³ Based on daily trips multiplied by the number of weekdays in a year (260).

⁴ Based on data from BIT. BIT estimates that rail serves 120,000 trips from BIT annually. Willdan conservatively estimates that half of those trips (60,000) occur in the PM peak hour.

Sources: Beard Industrial Tract; Appendix Table B.2, Willdan Financial Services.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on Tuesday, March 30, 2010, at the hour of 9:05 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, the Stanislaus County Board of Supervisors will meet in the Basement Chambers, 1010 10th Street, Modesto, CA to consider the adoption of a County Public Facilities Fee Program Update, adjusting the fees to be levied on new development in Stanislaus County, and to consider the adoption of the updated Public Facilities Fee Administrative Guidelines.

ADDITIONAL NOTICE IS GIVEN that the proposed Stanislaus County Public Facility Fee Program Update Fee schedule is available for review in the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors Office, 1010 10th Street, Suite 6700, Modesto, CA and also available on the County's website at:
<http://www.stancounty.com/CEO/econ-dev/pdf/county-impact-fee.pdf>

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that at the above noticed time and place, interested persons will be given an opportunity to be heard. Material submitted to the Board of Supervisors for consideration (i.e. photos, petitions, etc.) will be retained by the County. If a challenge to above proposal is made in court, persons may be limited to raising only those issues they or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Stanislaus County Board of Supervisors. For further information, call the Chief Executive Office at (209) 525-6333.

BY ORDER OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

DATED: March 9, 2010

ATTEST: CHRISTINE FERRARO TALLMAN, Clerk of
the Board of Supervisors
of the County of Stanislaus,
State of California.

BY: 
Assistant Clerk of the Board

**DECLARATION OF PUBLICATION
(C.C.P. S2015.5)**

**COUNTY OF STANISLAUS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident Of the County aforesaid; I am over the age of Eighteen years, and not a party to or interested In the above entitle matter. I am a printer and Principal clerk of the publisher of **THE MODESTO BEE**, printed in the City of **MODESTO**, County of **STANISLAUS**, State of California, daily, for which said newspaper has been adjudged a newspaper of general circulation by the Superior Court of the County of **STANISLAUS**, State of California, Under the date of **February 25, 1951, Action No. 46453**; that the notice of which the annexed is a printed copy, has been published in each issue there of on the following dates, to wit:

Mar 19, 2010, Mar 25, 2010

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on Tuesday, March 30, 2010, at the hour of 9:05 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, the Stanislaus County Board of Supervisors will meet in the Basement Chambers, 1010 10th Street, Modesto, CA to consider the adoption of a County Public Facilities Fee Program Update, adjusting the fees to be levied on new development in Stanislaus County, and to consider the adoption of the updated Public Facilities Fee Administrative Guidelines. ADDITIONAL NOTICE IS GIVEN that the proposed Stanislaus County Public Facility Fee Program Update Fee schedule is available for review in the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors Office, 1010 10th Street, Suite 6700, Modesto, CA and also available on the County's website at: <http://www.stancounty.com/CEO/econ-dev/pdf/county-impact-fee.pdf>. NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that at the above notified time and place, interested persons will be given an opportunity to be heard. Material submitted to the Board of Supervisors for consideration (i.e. photos, petitions, etc.) will be retained by the County. If a challenge to above proposal is made in court, persons may be limited to raising only those issues they or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Stanislaus County Board of Supervisors. For further information, call the Chief Executive Office at (209) 525-6333. BY ORDER OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. DATED: March 9, 2010. ATTEST: CHRISTINE FERRARO TALLMAN, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Stanislaus, State of California. BY: Elizabeth A. King, Assistant Clerk
Pub Dates Mar 19, 25, 2010

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury That the foregoing is true and correct and that This declaration was executed at

MODESTO, California on

March 25th, 2010

(Signature)

