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

**DEPT:** Chief Executive Office **BOARD AGENDA #** 9:05 A.M.

**Urgent** ☐ **Routine** ☒ **AGENDA DATE** March 30, 2010

**CEO Concurs with Recommendation YES** ☒ **NO** ☐ **(Information Attached)** **4/5 Vote Required YES** ☐ **NO** ☒

SUBJECT:

Public Hearing to Consider Adoption of Revised Public Facilities Impact Fees and Related Matters

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Conduct a Public Hearing to consider adoption of the revised Public Facility Impact Fee Schedule;

2. Accept the March 23, 2010 Public Facilities Impact Fee Study;

3. Approve and adopt the Findings set forth in the Public Facilities Impact Fee Study and in this item, and as required by Section 66001 of the California Government Code.

4. Approve the revised Public Facilities Impact Fees as recommended in the Study to be effective 60 days from date of adoption, Monday, May 31st, 2010.

(Continued on Page 2)

FISCAL IMPACT:

Since adoption of the program in 1990, Stanislaus County has collected over $161 million in Public Facilities Fees and over $28 million in interest. Over $104 million has been distributed to fund needed capital improvements including transportation infrastructure, jail expansion, library facilities and park improvements. The balance of these funds are dedicated to large, long term capital improvement projects including new jail construction and major road construction. The revised Public Facilities Impact Fee Study projects population and employment growth in Stanislaus County through the year 2030 and identifies needed capital facilities to service that growth.

(Continued on Page 2)

BOARD ACTION AS FOLLOWS:

No. 2010-173

**On motion of Supervisor** O'Brien, **Seconded by Supervisor** DeMartini
**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:**

Christine Ferraro

**ATTEST:** **CHRISTINE FERRARO TALLMAN, Clerk** **File No.** M-64-I-4

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS (Continued):**

5. Authorize staff to meet with all nine cities and the Stanislaus Council of Governments (StanCOG) to discuss the potential formation of an inclusive Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) program.

6. Direct staff to return to the Board within 90 Days with recommendations regarding the Regional Transportation Impact Fee component.

7. Authorize the Chief Executive Officer to enter into contract amendment with Willdan and Associates in an amount not to exceed $70,000 for additional traffic modeling, facilitation and fee development services to be funded through the use of PFF Administrative Funds.

8. Authorize the Auditor-Controller to increase appropriations and revenue per the attached budget journal to fund the additional contract services.

9. Approve revised Public Facility Fee Committee Administrative Guidelines consistent with the program update.

**FISCAL IMPACT (Continued):**

The roadway impact fee portion of the program continues to be developed, in an effort to reach regional consensus. Therefore, the transportation impact fee categories have not been revised as part of this update and will remain constant with current fee levels and project lists. As part of this blended approach, fees for 26 of the existing 31 land use categories will decrease. County staff has been working on the PFF Update for the past two years, and has employed the services of Willdan & Associates to assist in the preparation of the program. Over this two year period, approximately $150,000 has been expended with this firm to support this effort. As staff begins working with the Cities to develop a more inclusive RTIF program, it is anticipated that there will be a need to examine an increased number of regional projects and perhaps, multiple zones. This effort may require extensive traffic modeling. As such, staff is requesting authorization to amend the contract with Willdan for a not to exceed amount of $70,000.

**DISCUSSION:**

**<u>Program History:</u>**
The primary objective of the PFF program is to ensure that new development pays the capital costs associated with growth. Authority to impose the fees is granted by the Mitigation Fee Act contained in California Government Code Sections 66000 et seq.

Stanislaus County's Public Facility Fee Program (PFF) was developed in 1989. The multi-jurisdictional nature of the program was unique at the time of initial adoption and has served as a model for many other jurisdictions throughout the State. Currently, 19 California counties either have some form of an impact fee program or are in the process of developing one. Stanislaus County's program still remains one of the most comprehensive and well established programs in the State.

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 program includes two types of impact fees: Countywide fees which are collected from new development both in the cities and in the unincorporated area to fund public facilities for services provided to all county residents, and Unincorporated fees collected only from new development in the unincorporated area for facilities needed to serve those areas such as sheriff patrol and neighborhood park facilities.

The County has long standing agreements with each of the nine cities whereby cities collect PFF, or require vouchers confirming payment of the fees, on behalf of the County that apply to County-provided services within incorporated areas.

In exchange, within city spheres of influence, the County defers to the City on most land use decisions as well as requires the collection of city sphere impact fees where applicable upon the issuance of building permits.

Since the program's original adoption in 1990, it has undergone three updates. In 1992, in response to a severe recession, the fees were reduced by removing over $200 million of State highway projects with the expectation that the funding would be replaced "by new Federal and State gas tax revenues and project specific traffic mitigation fees."

In 2003, a comprehensive update was completed which included the addition of an Animal Services category, the inclusion of regional and neighborhood park lands and the reprogramming of the fire fee to a broader emergency services category. In 2005, the program experienced an inflationary update using five separate cost inflation indexes.

**Comprehensive Update:**

The March 23, 2010 Public Facilities Impact Fee Study is a comprehensive update of the PFF program. The fees proposed in the update represent decreases for 26 of the 31 land use categories, including office, commercial and small industrial categories.
(See attachment one for an all category fee comparison)

The County's facility inventory and service demand factors have been reviewed. All land values identified in the program update have been revised by an independent, third party analysis in light of the current economic environment (winter 2009 valuations) with the exception of transportation facilities which remain unchanged - linked with the currently approved program and based upon StanCOG traffic and General Plan Circulation Element data. The proposed update is based on growth projections to calendar year 2030 from StanCOG, and uses California Department of Finance data to establish the base year land use estimates. A new information technology fee category has been added to the program to fund large enterprise-wide applications which represent significant capital investments.

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 identifies the existing per capita investment in facilities for a given facility category (i.e. the facility standard), by dividing the current value of facilities by the current service population. That standard is then applied to projected population growth (over the 20 year program window) to determine a fee 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. Transportation fees are not being revised in this update, 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.

**Policy Amendments Proposed in the Update:**

Retaining the existing (2005) Transportation categories and project lists

During several of the 2010 Update revisions staff reviewed the transportation fee components through a multi-zone approach using north/central/south and north/south scenarios. These approaches did not resonate well with many of those who were participating in the development outreach and were ultimately abandoned. Staff also made an effort to develop the program to address regional projects only. This resulted in the recommended elimination of the City/County portion of the transportation fee program. In addition, projects were recommended for removal that staff identified as lacking in analysis to determine need, scope, cost and schedule. This process too, has been perceived as limiting to multiple city partners.

In light of city concerns regarding the transportation updates proposed in early drafts and requests from city partners to pursue an all inclusive regional transportation impact fee program, the existing (2005) transportation categories and project lists have been retained for the time being. This approach has been recommended to allow the program updates to occur that are not controversial while beginning the process of looking at long term regional approaches to transportation impact fees with our city partners.

<u>Independent land valuation analysis</u>.
A third party, independent consultant prepared detailed land value analysis on all existing facilities. The land value analysis was performed in late 2009 and reflects a current market valuation of all land included in the program. It will be important moving forward that this analysis occur annually at regular inflationary adjustment cycles in order to remain consistent with trend in market land values.

<u>The program administrative fee is reduced from 2.5% to 1%</u>
Based on a review of projected PFF administration costs, the administrative fee has been reduced from 2.5% of the total fee to 1% of the total fee. The County will review the adequacy of the administrative fee with each comprehensive fee program update.

**<u>Updating Fees in the Current Economy:</u>**
As we find ourselves mired in the worst economy in decades, a discussion is necessary as to the wisdom of revising fees in the current economic climate.

First, it is important to recognize that in the proposed program, 26 of the 31 program categories in the unincorporated area and 27 of the 31 program categories in the incorporated area <u>go down</u>. This includes land uses such as multi-family residential, general office, small and medium retail/commercial, small industrial, hospitals, nursing homes, and motels and hotels. The decrease in these fees is largely due to the update in population assumptions and the revised land valuations.

Secondly, the current program has not been updated since 2005, and modification of land values to reflect current market conditions lowers the fees for several land use categories, even after updating the Animal Services fee and the creation of an Information Technology component.

**<u>Public Outreach</u>**
Public outreach efforts regarding the proposed update have been considerable. In addition to conducting four public workshops (December 9, 2008, May 21, 2009, January 7 and January 21, 2010), staff has met on multiple occasions with representatives from the Manufacturing Council and Building Industry Association. Staff has made several presentations to city representatives, including a special workshop just for cities in March 2009 and again for City

Managers on February 4, 2010. In addition, a presentation to the Land Use & Transportation Committee of the Modesto Chamber of Commerce was made in the spring of 2009. The PFF program update team also met individually with several local developers and the City of Modesto to discuss the program. Based on feedback received from these outreach efforts, the program has undergone several major revisions.

**Program going forward**

On March 21, 2006, the Board of Supervisors approved entering into an Administrative Agreement with the Stanislaus Council of Governments (StanCOG) for the formal administration of the Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) portion of the County's Public Facilities Fees. Under this Agreement, StanCOG is tasked with establishing "priorities for funding and implementation of regional transportation projects identified in the County Capital Improvement Program; provided, however, funding and prioritization of projects already programmed by the County shall retain the priority existing on the date of this Agreement."

The Agreement further states that when the County updates its Capital Improvement Plan, that "StanCOG may recommend regional transportation projects that qualify for funding with RTIF to be included in the Capital Improvement Plan." Under the Agreement, final approval authority for the authorization of funds still resides with the Board of Supervisors.

Recently, the Chief Executive Officer was approached by the City Managers with a suggestion to broaden the scope of the agreement to include those regional transportation projects currently contained in the various City Capital Facilities Fees (CFF) programming. This recommendation from the cities also requested that final approval authority for the authorization of funds reside with StanCOG or a Joint Power Authority (JPA) to be developed.

With this in mind, it would be appropriate to evaluate the method to be used in levying the Regional Transportation Impact Fee as a regional development impact fee and that the current RTIF component ultimately may be removed from the County's Public Facility Fee program. It is recommended that staff be directed to work with the nine cities and StanCOG over the course of the next 90 days to further explore different concepts and delivery strategies.

If the recommendations contained in this report are adopted:

1. The revised fees will be effective beginning Monday, May 31, 2010.

2. Staff will begin work directly with our city partners toward the development of a Regional Transportation Impact Fee program for all communities.

3. Staff will return to the Board within 90 days to share a strategy and the status of this process.

4. Staff will bring a PFF program update report to the Board of Supervisors on an annual basis to adjust for inflation and land values to remain consistent with existing market conditions.

**Updated PFF Administrative Guidelines**

Following the adoption of the Public Facilities Fee program in 1990, a Public Facilities Fee Committee was formed to oversee the implementation of the program. Administrative guidelines were also developed to maintain consistency in the application of the fees. The administrative guidelines were originally adopted in 1990 and subsequently updated in 2003.

While undertaking the update of the Public Facility Fee Program, it became apparent that a corresponding review of the administrative guidelines was warranted. Although the previously adopted administrative guidelines are sound, improvements can be made that will provide the PFF Committee and other stakeholders additional beneficial information for administering the decision making process.

The guidelines are used as a resource by Stanislaus County and all city partners to determine the application of fees. A task group was formed in mid 2009 with the goal of revising the guidelines. The revisions were then presented to the PFF Committee for concurrence prior to being submitted as part of this report to the Board for adoption.

The guidelines are composed of an introduction and two major sections; Definitions and Administration. Within the definitions section "use categories" included in the Revised Public Facility Impact Fee Study are further defined. Examples are listed for many of the categories, providing additional guidance for those interested in determining the appropriate fee schedule to use.

Prior to beginning the revision of the guidelines, the task group assembled approved PFF related board agenda items. The information in the items were reviewed, and where appropriate, included in the updated guidelines. The primary focus includes issues of fee deferral, installment, and hardship situations. Information on these items is included in the Administration section of the guidelines. Also included in this section is information on the calculation, collection and application of fees, the timing and process for inflationary adjustments, and annual reporting requirements.

The roles and responsibilities of the Public Facility Fee Committee are also included in the guideline document. The original Committee, established in

1990, was tasked with providing oversight and administration of the PFF program.

The committee was comprised of representatives from the Chief Executive Office, Auditor-Controller, Public Works, Planning, County Counsel, and Planning- Building Division. The newly proposed guidelines add one additional member from Capital Projects to the Committee. Since the majority of requests for PFF funds are related to facilities, a Capital Projects member is a valuable addition to the committee.

The proposed revisions to the Public Facility Fee Committee Administrative Guidelines are consistent with the program update and will provide improved, comprehensive information to stakeholders of the Public Facility Fee Program.

**POLICY ISSUES:**

When adopting the fees, the Board is required to document five findings which are outlined and explained in Chapter 17 of the March 23, 2010 Public Facilities Impact Fee Study. Those findings are summarized below:

1. *Identify the purpose of the fee*: 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 services to new development.

2. *Identify the use to which the fees will be put:* The fees 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, and information technology.

3. *Determine the reasonable relationship between the fees' use and the type of development project on which the fees are imposed:* The County will restrict fee revenue to the acquisition of land, construction of facilities and buildings, and purchase of related equipment, furnishings, and vehicles 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.

4. *Determine the reasonable relationship between the need for the public facilities and the types of development on which the fees are imposed:* 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.

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

**STAFFING IMPACT:**

There are no new or additional staffing impacts associated with this item. Staff from a variety of County departments, including the Chief Executive Office, CEO Capital Projects Division, County Public Works, and County Counsel have assisted in the development of the fee study.

**CONTACT PERSON:**

Keith D. Boggs, Deputy Executive Officer – Economic Development
209.652.1514/boggsk@stancounty.com

Attachments:
1. Stanislaus County Public Facility Fee Schedule 2010 Comparative
2. PFF Administrative Guidelines Update 3.2010

ATTACHMENTS AVAILABLE
FROM YOUR CLERK

# County of Stanislaus: Auditor-Controller
# Legal Budget Journal

| | |
|---|---|
| Database | FMSDBPRD.CO.STANISLAUS.CA.US.PROD |
| Set of Books | County of Stanislaus |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Balance Type | | Budget |
| Category | * List - Text | Budget - Upload |
| Source | * List - Text | |
| Currency | * List - Text | USD |
| Budget Name | List - Text | LEGAL BUDGET |
| Batch Name | Text | |
| Journal Name | Text | PFF Update |
| Journal Description | Text | Willdan Financial Services |
| Journal Reference | Text | March 24, 2010 |
| Organization | List - Text | Stanislaus Budget Org |

| Upl | Fund 4 | Org 7 | Acc't 5 | GL Proj 7 | Loc 6 | Misc 6 | Other 5 | Debit incr appropriations decr est revenue (format > number > general) | Credit decr appropriations incr est revenue | Period Upper case MMM-YY List - Text | Line Description Text |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0100 | 0015210 | 63000 | | | | | 70,000 | | MAR-10 | Prof and Spec Services |
| | 0100 | 0015210 | 46615 | | | | | | 70,000 | MAR-10 | PFF Transfer |

**Totals:** 70000 70000

**Explanation:** Establish appropriations and estmated revenue in CEO ED for Willdan Financial Services for Pff Update.

| Requesting Department | CEO | Data Entry | Auditors Office Only | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Keith Boggs | | | | |
| Signature | Signature | Keyed by | Prepared By | Approved By |
| 3·24·10 | 3/26/10 | | | 3-24-10 |
| Date | Date | Date | Date | Date |

## Unincorporated Fee Comparison

3/5/2010

| Land Use | Current Fee | All Categories Except Transp. | Existing Inter-City Road Fee | Existing City-Co Road Fee | Total Blended Fee | Diff $ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Residential (Per Dwelling Unit)* | | | | | | |
| Single Family | $ 9,041 | $ 4,860 | $ 2,051 | $ 2,301 | $ 9,212 | $ 170 |
| Multi-Family | $ 7,584 | $ 3,394 | $ 1,374 | $ 1,542 | $ 6,310 | **$ (1,275)** |
| Senior Housing | $ 3,293 | $ 3,394 | $ 820 | $ 920 | $ 5,135 | $ 1,842 |
| *Non-residential (Per Thousand Square Feet)* | | | | | | |
| Office | | | | | | |
| General Office/Office Park | $ 7,393 | $ 1,019 | $ 2,252 | $ 2,527 | $ 5,797 | **$ (1,596)** |
| Medical Offices | $ 11,273 | $ 1,019 | $ 4,053 | $ 4,548 | $ 9,620 | **$ (1,653)** |
| Industrial | | | | | | |
| Industrial (Small) | $ 3,515 | $ 228 | $ 1,126 | $ 1,263 | $ 2,617 | **$ (898)** |
| Industrial (Large) * | | | | | | |
| Manufacturing | $ 703 | $ 328 | $ 225 | $ 253 | $ 806 | $ 103 |
| Distribution | $ 146 | $ 131 | $ 45 | $ 51 | $ 227 | $ 81 |
| Warehouse | $ 66 | $ 64 | $ 23 | $ 25 | $ 112 | $ 45 |
| Commercial | | | | | | |
| Small Retail (former Convenience) | $ 41,032 | $ 857 | $ 18,344 | $ 20,583 | $ 39,784 | **$ (1,248)** |
| Small Retail (former Retail <50K) | $ 10,891 | $ 857 | $ 4,349 | $ 4,879 | $ 10,085 | **$ (807)** |
| Medium Retail | $ 7,217 | $ 857 | $ 2,642 | $ 2,965 | $ 6,464 | **$ (753)** |
| Shopping Center | $ 4,686 | $ 857 | $ 1,467 | $ 1,646 | $ 3,970 | **$ (716)** |
| Shopping Mall | $ 4,133 | $ 857 | $ 1,210 | $ 1,358 | $ 3,425 | **$ (708)** |
| Restaurants | | | | | | |
| Fast Food | $ 27,773 | $ 857 | $ 12,187 | $ 13,675 | $ 26,719 | **$ (1,054)** |
| High Turnover | $ 16,627 | $ 857 | $ 7,012 | $ 7,868 | $ 15,737 | **$ (890)** |
| Sit Down | $ 8,851 | $ 857 | $ 3,401 | $ 3,816 | $ 8,074 | **$ (777)** |
| Financial | | | | | | |
| Banks | $ 16,074 | $ 857 | $ 6,755 | $ 7,580 | $ 15,192 | **$ (882)** |
| Savings and Loan | $ 7,073 | $ 857 | $ 2,575 | $ 2,890 | $ 6,322 | **$ (751)** |
| Miscellaneous | | | | | | |
| Manual Car Wash (per stall) | $ 5,163 | $ - | $ 1,689 | $ 1,895 | $ 3,584 | **$ (1,580)** |
| Church | $ 2,173 | $ 857 | $ 300 | $ 337 | $ 1,494 | **$ (679)** |
| Day Care Center | $ 5,254 | $ 857 | $ 1,731 | $ 1,942 | $ 4,530 | **$ (724)** |
| Hospital | $ 3,123 | $ 857 | $ 741 | $ 832 | $ 2,430 | **$ (693)** |
| Mini-Warehouse | $ 1,789 | $ 64 | $ 122 | $ 137 | $ 323 | **$ (1,466)** |
| Nursing Home | $ 1,799 | $ 857 | $ 127 | $ 142 | $ 1,126 | **$ (673)** |
| Gas Station (per pump) | $ 3,360 | $ - | $ 851 | $ 955 | $ 1,807 | **$ (1,553)** |
| Motel/Hotel (per room) | $ 2,173 | $ 857 | $ 300 | $ 337 | $ 1,494 | **$ (679)** |
| Golf Course (per acre) | $ 2,652 | $ - | $ 523 | $ 587 | $ 1,109 | **$ (1,543)** |
| Movie Theater | $ 19,249 | $ 857 | $ 8,229 | $ 9,234 | $ 18,320 | **$ (929)** |
| Racquet Club (per court) | $ 12,899 | $ - | $ 5,281 | $ 5,925 | $ 11,206 | **$ (1,693)** |
| Tennis (per court) | $ 11,427 | $ - | $ 4,597 | $ 5,158 | $ 9,755 | **$ (1,671)** |
| Drive Through | $ - | $ - | n/a | n/a | | |

* Methodology change - current program calculates small industrial fee for 1st 20,000sqft; will stay the same since this category is so transportation heavy.

## Incorporated Fee Comparison

3/5/2010

| Land Use | Current Fee | All Categories Except Transp. | Existing Inter-City Road Fee | Existing City-Co Road Fee | Total Blended Fee | Diff $ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Residential (Per Dwelling Unit)* | | | | | | |
| Single Family | $ 8,038 | $ 3,131 | $ 2,051 | $ 2,301 | $ 7,483 | $ **(555)** |
| Multi-Family | $ 6,580 | $ 2,187 | $ 1,374 | $ 1,542 | $ 5,103 | $ **(1,478)** |
| Senior Housing | $ 2,962 | $ 2,187 | $ 820 | $ 920 | $ 3,928 | $ 966 |
| *Non-residential (Per Thousand Square Feet)* | | | | | | |
| Office | | | | | | |
| General Office/Office Park | $ 6,841 | $ 677 | $ 2,252 | $ 2,527 | $ 5,455 | **$ (1,386)** |
| Medical Offices | $ 10,721 | $ 677 | $ 4,053 | $ 4,548 | $ 9,278 | **$ (1,443)** |
| Industrial | | | | | | |
| Industrial (Small) | $ 3,278 | $ 152 | $ 1,126 | $ 1,263 | $ 2,541 | **$ (737)** |
| Industrial (Large) * | | | | | | |
| Manufacturing | $ 656 | $ 218 | $ 225 | $ 253 | $ 696 | $ 40 |
| Distribution | $ 135 | $ 87 | $ 45 | $ 51 | $ 183 | $ 47 |
| Warehouse | $ 62 | $ 42 | $ 23 | $ 25 | $ 90 | $ 27 |
| Commercial | | | | | | |
| Small Retail (former Convenience) | $ 40,701 | $ 571 | $ 18,344 | $ 20,583 | $ 39,498 | **$ (1,202)** |
| Small Retail (former Retail <50K) | $ 10,560 | $ 571 | $ 4,349 | $ 4,879 | $ 9,799 | **$ (761)** |
| Medium Retail | $ 6,885 | $ 571 | $ 2,642 | $ 2,965 | $ 6,178 | **$ (708)** |
| Shopping Center | $ 4,355 | $ 571 | $ 1,467 | $ 1,646 | $ 3,684 | **$ (670)** |
| Shopping Mall | $ 3,802 | $ 571 | $ 1,210 | $ 1,358 | $ 3,139 | **$ (662)** |
| Restaurants | | | | | | |
| Fast Food | $ 27,441 | $ 571 | $ 12,187 | $ 13,675 | $ 26,433 | **$ (1,008)** |
| High Turnover | $ 16,296 | $ 571 | $ 7,012 | $ 7,868 | $ 15,451 | **$ (845)** |
| Sit Down | $ 8,519 | $ 571 | $ 3,401 | $ 3,816 | $ 7,788 | **$ (731)** |
| Financial | | | | | | |
| Banks | $ 15,743 | $ 571 | $ 6,755 | $ 7,580 | $ 14,906 | **$ (837)** |
| Savings and Loan | $ 6,741 | $ 571 | $ 2,575 | $ 2,890 | $ 6,036 | **$ (705)** |
| Miscellaneous | | | | | | |
| Manual Car Wash (per stall) | $ 4,832 | $ - | $ 1,689 | $ 1,895 | $ 3,584 | **$ (1,248)** |
| Church | $ 1,842 | $ 571 | $ 300 | $ 337 | $ 1,208 | **$ (634)** |
| Day Care Center | $ 4,923 | $ 571 | $ 1,731 | $ 1,942 | $ 4,244 | **$ (679)** |
| Hospital | $ 2,791 | $ 571 | $ 741 | $ 832 | $ 2,144 | **$ (648)** |
| Mini-Warehouse | $ 1,458 | $ 42 | $ 122 | $ 137 | $ 301 | **$ (1,157)** |
| Nursing Home | $ 1,468 | $ 571 | $ 127 | $ 142 | $ 840 | **$ (628)** |
| Gas Station (per pump) | $ 3,029 | $ - | $ 851 | $ 955 | $ 1,807 | **$ (1,222)** |
| Motel/Hotel (per room) | $ 1,842 | $ 571 | $ 300 | $ 337 | $ 1,208 | **$ (634)** |
| Golf Course (per acre) | $ 2,321 | $ - | $ 523 | $ 587 | $ 1,109 | **$ (1,212)** |
| Movie Theater | $ 18,918 | $ 571 | $ 8,229 | $ 9,234 | $ 18,034 | **$ (884)** |
| Racquet Club (per court) | $ 12,568 | $ - | $ 5,281 | $ 5,925 | $ 11,206 | **$ (1,362)** |
| Tennis (per court) | $ 11,096 | $ - | $ 4,597 | $ 5,158 | $ 9,755 | **$ (1,340)** |
| Drive Through | | $ - | n/a | n/a | | |

* Methodology change - current program calculates small industrial fee for 1st 20,000sqft; will stay the same since does not, and calculates everything based on category fee/thousand sqft.

# STANISLAUS COUNTY PUBLIC FACILITIES FEES

## ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDELINES

Revised March, 2010

# Table of Contents

# STANISLAUS COUNTY PUBLIC FACILITIES FEES ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDELINES

## I. INTRODUCTION

The County Public Facilities Fees (PFF) were first approved in late 1989, becoming operative in March 1990. During that time, agreements were reached with all nine incorporated Cities for the collection of the County PFF within their jurisdictions as well as in the unincorporated portion of the county. This program was designed to ensure that the need for expanded County facilities directly attributable to increased population be paid for by those creating the need.

The following Administrative Guidelines are for the administration of Public Facilities Fees established to mitigate the impacts of new development as outlined in Section 66000 of the California Government Code. These fees may be used for the purchase, construction, expansion, or acquisition of public facilities, and must be consistent with the adopted fee program, which shall be updated periodically as needed but at least every five years. These policies and procedures have been developed to govern the administration of the PFF Program.

## II. DEFINITIONS

The intent and meaning of the terms that are used shall be as defined in these Administrative Guidelines except as specifically noted, revised, or added. Where terms are not defined, such terms shall have ordinarily accepted meanings such as the context implies. <u>Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged</u>, shall be considered as providing ordinarily accepted meanings.

A. PFF Committee – shall mean a committee comprised of department heads or their designees from the following departments or divisions of Stanislaus County: Chief Executive Office, Auditor-Controller, Public Works, Planning, Building, County Counsel and Capital Projects.

B. Chief Building Official – The Chief Building Official of Stanislaus County

C. Chief Executive Officer – The Chief Executive Officer of Stanislaus County or his or her designee

D. County – Stanislaus County

E. County Counsel – The County Counsel of Stanislaus County or his or her designee

F. Development - the construction, alteration, addition, occupancy or use of any building or structure within Stanislaus County.

G. Dwelling Unit - a structure as defined in the California Building Code (CBC) as adopted by Stanislaus County: A single unit providing complete, independent living facilities for one (1) or more persons, including permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking and sanitation.

H. Facilities or Public Facilities – Fees have been identified by the County to fund facility categories which include, but are not limited to: animal services, behavioral health, criminal justice, detention, fire marshal, emergency services, health, libraries, other county, regional and neighborhood parks, sheriff, transportation, and information technology.

I. Fee – A monetary exaction other than a tax or special assessment that is charged by a local agency to the applicant in connection with approval of a development project for the purpose of defraying all or a portion of the cost of public facilities related to the development project.

J. Use Categories – The way land is developed and used in terms of the types of activities allowed. Where ambiguity exists, the California Building Code may be used as a reference document to identify the proper use category.

1) Commercial / Retail as used in this section includes a wide range of retail service uses, both free-standing and in shopping centers, including but not limited to: supermarkets, drug stores, department stores, general merchandise, building materials or lumber stores, specialty retail stores, discount stores, hardware/paint stores, video arcades, new and used car sales as well as auto repair shops, fast-food restaurants, sit-down restaurants, banks and Credit Unions, educational or vocational facilities, day care facilities, and gas stations.

2) Industrial – The manufacture, fabrication, reduction or destruction or processing of any article, substance or commodity or any other treatment thereof in such a manner as to change the form or character thereof. Uses include, but are not limited to, heavy and light industrial, warehousing, and industrial parks.

a) Small Industrial – less than or equal to 20,000 square feet

b) Large Industrial – greater than 20,000 square feet

- Manufacturing – The conversion of raw materials, components or parts into finished goods that meet a customer's expectations or specifications. Uses which are considered large industrial include, but are not limited to:

  - Bottling plant
  - Cabinet shop
  - Electronics assembly, paper products
  - Food processor, brewery, bakery
  - Machine shop
  - Printing plant
  - Manufacture, fabrication, processing, packaging and treatment of explosives, oil and great products, chemicals and chemical products
  - Metal fabricator
  - Pulp and paper mill
  - Reduction, processing and storage of offal, dead animals, bones or similar materials
  - Rock crushing
  - Sheet-metal shop
  - Welding shop

- Distribution – Entry, receiving, stocking, and shipping products on their way from supplier to customer. Uses which are considered distribution/ mixed use include but are not limited to:

    - ➢ Equipment rental yard
    - ➢ Freight
    - ➢ Junk handling, processing and storage
    - ➢ Landfill – waste products disposal or transfer station
    - ➢ Recycling facility
    - ➢ Septic tank, cesspool services
    - ➢ Wholesale nurseries
    - ➢ Distribution center (such as Longs, Wal-Mart, Coca-Cola)

- Warehouse – Facility where the primary activity is the storage of materials. Uses which are considered warehouse include, but are not limited to:

    - ➢ Bulk fee storage
    - ➢ Corporation yard, freight yard
    - ➢ Mini-warehouse
    - ➢ Moving and storage service
    - ➢ Warehousing

3) Office – Professional offices including, but not limited to, business parks, corporate headquarters, insurance sales and research centers

4) Residential as used in this section, shall mean any of the following uses

    a) "Single-family" is a detached home or duplex on an individual lot.

    b) "Multi-family" relates to dwelling units including triplexes, etc., high and low rise apartments, condominiums, and residential planned units developments. This category also applies to mobile home parks.

5) Other Uses

    a) "Churches" / "Hospitals" / "Nursing Homes"

        1. "Church" shall mean structures primarily designed or used as a place of public worship.

        2. "Hospital" shall mean a structure designed for health services both in-patient and out-patient that includes surgical care of the sick or injured or the physically ill and/or therapeutic treatment for the mentally ill. Included as an integral part of a hospital are laboratories, out-patient departments, training facilities, central service facilities, and hospital staff offices on the same site. The preceding ancillary uses are considered "office" if located off-site, unless a multi-site campus is covered by a P-D Zone for hospital uses. A separate set of offices on the same site for physicians is considered "Office."

        3. "Nursing Home" shall mean a structure designed for use as a convalescent hospital, retirement home, or a twenty-four hour care center for seven or more persons in addition to members of the family.

b) Gas "pumps" - For fee calculations, the number of "pumps" using this definition will be the maximum number of passenger cars which can be served at the fuel-dispensing island on the site at one time.

Note: Mixed Uses – when a development proposal contains more than an incidental mixture of use categories, the general type of uses should be segregated and treated separately for the purpose of calculating development fees.

K. Very Low, Low, and Moderate Incoming Housing – The income limits by income category and household size are provided annually by the Housing and Urban Development for Stanislaus County.

1) Very Low Income Housing shall mean housing at rents affordable to households earning fifty percent or less of the area median income as outlined in the Stanislaus County Housing Element.

2) Low Income Housing shall mean housing at rents affordable to households earning between 50% and 80% of the area median income as outlined in the Stanislaus County Housing Element.

3) Moderate Income Housing shall mean housing at rents affordable to households earning between 80% and 120% of the area median income as outlined in the Stanislaus County Housing Element.

## III. ADMINISTRATION

Overall administration and oversight of the PFF Program shall reside with the Public Facilities Fees Committee as determined by the Chief Executive Officer. The committee is comprised of the following department heads and/or their respective staffs:

- Chief Executive Officer
- Chief Building Official
- Auditor-Controller
- Public Works Director
- Planning Director
- County Counsel
- Capital Projects

The PFF Committee may meet monthly and has the responsibility of ensuring that all issues related to the PFF are managed in accordance with applicable rules and regulations. The committee was established to review policy matters related to the PFF Program in the event of appeals regarding fees, the administration of the PFF Program, and other issues that may arise as a result of the implementation of the PFF Program.

Additionally, the purpose of the Committee has further been defined as follows:

- Identify PFF issues for discussion and resolution
- Review and recommend establishment of fees not within the guidelines of the ordinance
- Recommend or revise administrative guidelines
- Adjust fees where appropriate

- Review and monitor city fee collection practices and report findings
- Monitor fees collected to date and provide periodic reports to the Board of Supervisors
- Serve as an administrative hearing body for appeals from applicants. Appeals not administratively resolved will be presented with a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for resolution.

A. Inflationary Adjustments

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 fund its share of needed facilities. The following indices shall be used for adjusting fees for inflation:

Buildings – Engineering News Record's Building Cost Index (BCI)

Equipment – Consumer Price Index, All Items, 1982-84=100 for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U)

1) Timing of Adjustments – In an effort to ensure that the fees collected are adequate for inflation, an annual inflation adjustment shall be applied each year to the PFF. The PFF rates for all use categories shall be administratively adjusted annually to account for inflation.

   While fee updates using inflation indices are appropriate for periodic updates to ensure that fee revenues keep up with increases in the costs of public facilities, the County will conduct more extensive updates of the fee documentation and calculation when significant new data on growth forecasts and/or facility plans become available. These updates are anticipated at 5 year intervals.

2) Notification of Inflationary Adjustment

   The County will provide at least one public meeting for stakeholders and other interested parties at least 60 days in advance of the effective date of the inflationary adjustment.

   Any fee adjustment will be presented to the Board of Supervisors prior to implementation. The item should be scheduled to allow for sufficient time for the increase to become effective at the beginning of the fiscal year.

B. Calculation and Collection of Fees

1) A Public Facilities Fee shall be charged and paid at the time of issuance of a building permit for development. The fee shall be determined by the fee schedule in effect on the date that the vesting tentative map or vesting parcel map is deemed complete. For projects that do not have a vested map, then the date used will be the date the building permit application is received or the date the development agreement was executed.

2) Use categories not specified on the Public Facilities Fees schedule (i.e. recreational) shall be charged at rates determined by the Chief Building Official in consultation with the Director of Public Works using trip generation estimates found in the most recent edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) manual. The formula used to derive the road fee portion of each category is as follows:

Regional Transportation Impact Fee – Peak hour trip end generation X diverted trip factor X causality adjustment factor X intercity cost per trip end of $2,525 (see 2005 PFF Inflationary Adjustments, page 26)

City/County Road Fee – Peak trip generation X diverted trip factor X causality adjustment factor X City/County cost per trip end of $1,403 (see 2005 PFF Inflationary Adjustment, page 25)

3) When application is made for a new building permit following the expiration of a previously issued building permit for which fees were paid, the fee payment shall not be required, unless the fee schedule has been amended after the expiration date. In this event, the appropriate increase or decrease shall be imposed prior to the issuance of a new building permit.

4) In the event that subsequent development occurs with respect to property for which fees have been paid, additional fees shall be required only for additional square footage or units of development that were not included in computing the prior fee or a change in use. (See exception #2)

5) When a fee is paid for a development project and that project is subsequently reduced and it is entitled to a lower fee, the County shall, upon request of the payor, issue a partial refund of the fee to the payor, less the administration portion in the amount of one percent (1%) of the former total.

6) When a fee is paid for a development project and the project is subsequently abandoned without any further action beyond obtaining the building permit, the payor shall be entitled to a refund of the fee paid, less the administrative portion of the fee.

7) A developer of any project subject to the fee may submit a request for consideration to the Public Facilities Fee Committee for reduction or adjustment to that fee, or a waiver of that fee, based upon the absence of any reasonable relationship or nexus between the impacts of the development and either the amount of the fee charged or the type of facilities to be financed. The application shall be made in writing and submitted to the Public Facilities Fees Committee. The request shall state in detail the factual basis for the claim, waiver or adjustment.

   If the conclusion of the committee is not satisfactory to the developer, the decision may be appealed to the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors shall consider the appeal at a public hearing held within sixty (60) days after the date the committee made its decision. The Public Facilities Fee Committee shall prepare a staff report and recommendation for Board of Supervisor's consideration. The decision of the Board of Supervisors shall be final. If a reduction, adjustment, or waiver is granted, any change in use within the project shall invalidate the waiver.

C. Fees Application

1) An existing building that was built without a building permit will be subject to the fees in place at the time of the estimated date of original construction.

2) Shell Buildings

b) Tenant improvement permits will be charged the incremental difference in fee between the actual use and the use that was given for the shell permit.

c) Tenant improvement permits within building shells will be charged the incremental difference between its previous use and the proposed use.

d) Stanislaus County's determination of fees is separate from and irrespective of the determination of other jurisdictions.

3) Detached garages and accessory structures that are converted to residential occupancy will be charged the fee for a single-family residential unit if greater than 800 square feet and the fee for multi family residential unit if less than 800 square feet and a primary residence already exists on the parcel. Any structure 800 square feet or larger in size is considered to be single family and any structure less than 800 square feet in size is considered to be multi-family.

4) Mobile Homes – Facilities in this category are unique and the application of fees should be referred to the Public Facilities Fees Committee for its consideration.

a) Mobile home parks will be charged the multi-family fee for each mobile home space.

b) Factory-built housing will be charged the single-family fee.

5) Modular Buildings – Modular buildings are part of a construction style of buildings that are prefabricated or manufactured at a central location and shipped/moved to another location.

a) Temporary modular buildings will be charged the fee for its intended use. When the coach is removed, the fee will be credited towards other permanent construction of that parcel.

b) Replacement of existing modular buildings with permanent construction will be charged the incremental difference in fee between the existing use and the new construction.

6) Seasonal Use – If it is determined that a use is conducted seasonally or less than a full year on a continued basis as per the use permit conditions, the fee shall be calculated using that fraction of a year as determined by the Chief Building Official.

D. Exemptions – Public Facilities Fees established by these policies shall not be imposed on any of the following:

1) Any alteration or addition to a residential structure, except to the extent that additional units are created.

2) Any alteration or addition to a specific non-residential structure if the square footage of the structure is increased less than ten percent, unless the alteration or addition changes the use of the structure to a higher density category or will result in the generation of additional peak hour trip ends. Structure is defined as a separate building which may or may not be part of a larger complex. When determining the 10%, only the individual structure and not the entire square footage of the complex will apply.

3) Any replacement or reconstruction of any residential, commercial or industrial development project that is damaged or destroyed as a result of a natural disaster as declared by the Governor.

4) Any replacement of a previously existing structure, in kind, if the applicant can prove, using County Tax Assessor's records, that the structure or facility legally existed in 1990 or later and no previous fee credit has been given.

5) Any replacement, in kind, of structures damaged by fire, flooding or earthquake.

6) Detached residential garages, carports and other accessory structures.

7) Public facilities, i.e. state agencies, utilities, fire districts, public schools, public housing agencies, community service districts, etc.

8) Mobile Homes

    a) Replacement of mobile homes in existing mobile home park spaces

    b) Replacement of an existing legally installed mobile home on private property.

    c) Any mobile home that is subject to a mobile home permit for temporary use, for example, for housing an ill or aged family member or farm worker housing.

9) Any agricultural building that is designed and constructed to house farm implements, hay, grain, poultry, livestock or other horticultural products. This structure shall not be a place of human habitation or a place of employment where agricultural products are processed, treated or packaged, nor shall it be a place used by the public.

E. Deferrals

1) Affordable Housing – Contingent upon the housing being developed with assistance from a public agency, fees would be deferred the entire time period that the income eligibility is maintained. (See attachment A for entire policy)

    a) Fees for housing developed for occupancy by moderate income households, defined as being between 80 to 120 percent of the area median income, shall be afforded the opportunity to defer the entire fee. Documentation shall be provided that confirms such occupancy and a contract will be executed and recorded that indicates the deferral with instructions regarding future payment.

    b) Housing developed for occupancy by low income households shall be afforded the opportunity to defer the entire fee. Low income is defined as being between 50 to 80 percent of the area median income. Documentation shall be provided that confirms such occupancy and a contract will be executed and recorded that indicates the deferral with instructions regarding future payment.

    c) Housing developed for occupancy by very low income households shall be afforded the opportunity to waive the entire fee. Very low income is defined as 50 percent or less of the area median income. Documentation shall be provided that confirms such occupancy. A contract will be executed and recorded that indicates the waiver status along with instructions regarding future payment should the very low income housing status not be maintained.

2) PFF Installment Payment Program for Qualifying Non-Residential Projects

In lieu of paying public facility fees for a project, a non-residential developer whose successful development activity will create at minimum 30 new jobs may elect to pay up to 80% of those fees in equal annual payments. The property owner/developer may enter into a Multi-year PFF Payment Agreement with Stanislaus County to pay an initial amount of 20% of the total fee due at building permitting with the balance to be paid in equal annual payments. In no case shall the payment period exceed four years.

Qualified projects must meet all of the following standards:

a) Project is of commercial, retail and/or industrial nature. Residential developments are NOT eligible for this fee deferment program

b) The development must create at minimum 30 new jobs at time of occupancy that pay at least one and a half times (1½) the minimum wage.

c) New jobs to be listed with the Stanislaus County Alliance Worknet

d) Job verification is required and will be conducted by the Stanislaus County Alliance Worknet.

3) PFF Deferral Payment Program for Residential Projects

Most residential construction lenders do not include the PFF amounts as a part of the construction loan and paying the fees at the issuance of a residential building permit creates a financial hardship on builders, especially those builders with multiple, concurrent projects. Therefore, payment of fees may be made at the issuance of the residential building permit or may be deferred until the close of escrow on the sale of the residential building for which the building permit was issued. Opting to defer payment of the fees requires the execution of a contract which shall be recorded as a lien, thus assuring that the County will receive the fees owed no later than the time of change of ownership of the property. This deferral option is available only for those builders with multiple, concurrent projects.

F. Hardship

The Public Facility Fee Committee has authority from the Board of Supervisors to exercise discretion in allowing an individual to pay the fee which was in effect at the time they commenced a project involving a single residential dwelling, in which the applicant either currently resides or intends to reside, if the individual was unable to proceed with the project to the point of paying the Public Facility Fee in effect at the commencement of the project due to the unanticipated onset of a serious and debilitating health condition or due to other changed circumstances which were beyond the control of the individual and which interrupted the progress of their project and which is determined by a majority of the members of the Public Facilities Fees Committee to constitute a "hardship".

G. Annual Report

As required by Subsection 66006 of the Government Code, each year an annual report will be prepared and made available to the public within 180 days after the last day of each fiscal year. The report shall be prepared by the Auditor-Controller and shall contain the following information:

1) A description of the type of fee in the account or fund

2) The amount of the fee.

3) The beginning and ending balance of the account or fund

4) The amount of the fees collected and the interest earned.

5) An identification of each public facility on which fees were expended and the amount of the expenditures on each improvement, including the total percentage of the cost of the public improvement that was funded with fees

6) An identification of an approximate date by which the construction of the public improvement will commence if the local agency determines that sufficient funds have been collected to complete financing on an incomplete public improvement, as identified in paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 66001, and the public improvement remains incomplete.

7) A description of each interfund transfer or loan made from the account or fund, including the public improvement on which the transferred or loaned fees will be expended, and, in the case of an interfund loan, the date on which the loan will be repaid, and the rate of interest that the account or fund will receive from the loan.

8) The amount of refunds made pursuant to subdivision (e) of Subsection 66001 of the Government Code and any allocations pursuant to subdivision (f) of Section 66001.

The following Board of Supervisors items were utilized in the creation of these guidelines:

- June 4, 1991 (B-11) – Appointment and Role of Public Facility Fee Committee
- July 21, 1992 (B-9) – Public Facilities Fee Committee – Proposed Policy Guidelines for Housing Affordability
- June 22, 1993 (B-12) – Public facility Fee Deferral on Public Assisted Housing
- October 3, 1995 (B-10) – Approval to Allow Deferred Option for Paying Public Facilities Fees for Residential Development and Adoption of a Resolution
- April 9, 2002 (B-3) – Approval of the Public Facilities Fees Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2001
- December 13, 2005 (B-13) – Introduction and Waiver of the First Reading of an Ordinance to Authorize the Establishment of a Public Facility Fee Installment Payment Program for Qualifying Non-Residential Projects and Conditional Approval to Establish such a Program
- September 12, 2006 (B-6) – Approval of an Amendment to the Guidelines for the Public Facility Fee Committee to include the Exercise of Discretion by the Public Facility Fee Committee in Cases Involving Hardship

Attachments:

Stanislaus County Public Facilities Fees Calculation Request
Policies and Procedures for City Collection of County Public Facilities Fees
Request for Use of Public Facilities Fee Funds
(All categories except for Roads and Other County Facilities)
Request for Use of Public Facilities Fee Funds
(Other County Facilities)
Memo to Department after PFF Committee Approval

## STANISLAUS COUNTY PUBLIC FACILITIES FEES CALCULATION REQUEST

APN:

City Building Permit Number:

Project Site Address:

Project Description:

Proposed Building Use:

Square Footage(s) & Use(s)
Of Existing Buildings

Square Footage(s) and Use(s)
Of Buildings to be Demolished:

Vesting Dates if Applicable:

Form Completed By:

| Print Name | Title | Date |
|---|---|---|

**Policies and Procedures for**
**City Collection of County Public Facilities Fees**

1. City Building Department completes Stanislaus County Public Facilities Fees Calculation Request and e-mails to Stanislaus County Building Department.

2. Fees will be calculated based on information provided to Stanislaus County by the City Building Department.

3. Stanislaus County creates impact fee case in Tidemark and scans and attaches documentation provided by City Building Department.

4. City charges and collects fees from customer based on spreadsheet provided by Stanislaus County Building Department.

5. Fees are collected by the Auditor Controller's office and a report is sent to the Building Department.

# Request for Use of Public Facilities Fees Funds

(All categories except for "Roads" and "Other County Facilities")

Department Name:

PFF Category:

Available funds:

Fund use approved to date (show future debt service payments separately):

**Prior to completing the request, please review your department's PFF section in the documents located at: (enter url). Those sections outline the original premise and scope of the program and will provide a better understanding of eligible expenditures.**

Project Description:

If the entire project is attributable to growth, the entire cost may be included in the request for use of PFF funds.

If only a portion of the project is attributable to growth, please complete the highlighted cells in the chart below to determine the PFF request amount.

| Year | Population | % of need attributable to growth | Total cost of project | PFF eligible |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1990 | 354,000 | | | |
| | | #DIV/0! | | #DIV/0! |
| | | | | |

Formulas used:

% attributable to growth= (current population-1990 population)/current population

PFF eligible = total cost of project * % attributable to growth

Note: Some categories include funds for the purchase of vehicles, library collections, technology, etc, in addition to facilities. In those instances, please refer to the PFF study to determine the percentage of collections available for non-facility items. Members of the PFF committee may also be contacted for guidance.

# Request for Use of Public Facilities Fees Funds

("Other County Facilities")

Department Name:

PFF Category:

Available funds (complete highlighted cells in tables below):

| Study Year | Dept Square Footage* | Total Category Square Footage | % of Dept Square Footage | PFF fees collected to date | Adjusted for Bldg/Veh | Dept allocation | Funds used to date | Available Dept Funds |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1990 | | 166,567 | 0.0% | | N/A | 0 | | 0 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Buildings | | | | | | | | |
| 2003 | | 740,057 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| 2009 | | 727,980 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Vehicles | Dept Vehicle Value | Total Category Vehicle Value | % of Dept Vehicle Value | | | | | |
| 2003 | GSA only | 4,151,000 | 100% | | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| 2009 | | 19,637,000 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| | | | | | | Total funds available | | |

* According to PFF study

Fund use approved to date (show future debt service payments separately):

**Prior to completing the request, please review your department's PFF section in the documents located at: (enter url). Those sections outline the original premise and scope of the program and will provide a better understanding of eligible expenditures. Information on Department's percentage can also be calculated based on information in the documents.**

Project Description:

If the entire project is attributable to growth, the entire cost may be included in the request for use of PFF funds.

If only a portion of the project is attributable to growth, please complete the highlighted cells in the chart below to determine the PFF request amount.

| Year | Population | % of need attributable to growth | Total cost of project | PFF eligible |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1990 | 354,000 | | | |
| | | #DIV/0! | | #DIV/0! |
| | | | | |

Formulas used:

% attributable to growth= (current population-1990 population)/current population

PFF eligible = total cost of project * % attributable to growth

To: Department Head
Dept

From: Dean Wright, Deputy County Counsel
Public Facilities Fees Committee Chair

Date:

Subject: **PFF Committee Approval**

The Public Facility Fee Committee has determined your department's request in the amount of (amount) for (project) to be a legitimate use of PFF funds.

The PFF committee provides oversight of the funds; however, the ultimate authority for use of the funds lies with the Board of Supervisors. It is the Department's responsibility to make the request of the Board of Supervisors for approval to use the funds. This can be done through either a stand-alone agenda item or inclusion in the quarterly budget process.

Thank you.

DW:bb

9:05 AM
Rec'd at
BOS meeting
3/30/2010

March 18, 2010

Mr. Richard W. Robinson
Chief Executive Officer
Stanislaus County
1010 Tenth Street, Suite 6800
Modesto, CA 95354

RE: County PFF, Development and Tax Sharing

Dear Rick:

As you are aware, the City Managers of our county have been discussing our concerns about the update to the county's Public Facilities Fee (PFF) program. Central to the issue is our collective county vision and the roles of the nine cities which contain the majority of the citizens within Stanislaus County. An outgrowth of those discussions has been the interrelationship between PFF, future development within our county, and tax sharing.

These difficult economic times have brought us to the realization that we must think differently than we have in the past. We must plan for our future with our eyes focused on efficiency and when appropriate, regionalism.

To that end, we will be discussing with our City Councils the need to have a single Regional Transportation Plan impact fee program, administered by StanCOG, with the inclusion of ALL regional countywide transportation facilities. SMART Growth, wise land use planning and the transportation arteries that connect our citizens and businesses must be done with all citizens of Stanislaus County in mind. While a considerable amount of work has been completed by the county for the PFF program, we are respectfully requesting that you delay approval of the PFF amendments and begin discussing a Regional Transportation Plan fee program that is truly regional in nature. If you feel you must approve a PFF amendment now, then we request that you remove the transportation element from the new fee. That will enable us time to establish a single, regional, major transportation plan with a fee that knows no boundaries within the County.

Further, we are also requesting that the county, in conjunction and cooperation with the cities, develop financial assumptions that are associated with the cost of services provided by all agencies to determine the most equitable revenue sharing approach between the county and its cities. Since financial issues are the primary obstacle associated with development, we are seeking a new resolution to our local problems and hope that you will join us in this quest.

Over the next several months, it is our intent to conduct a Fiscal Impact Analysis, research property tax allocations, and identify core services that affect the citizens of our communities. While this is no small endeavor, we commit to working together to come to agreeable terms that will benefit all citizens in both the incorporated and unincorporated areas of our great county.

For some time now, the Mayors of Stanislaus County have been meeting with several Supervisors to discuss initiatives for smart growth and regionalization; we are at the junction where changes to our current approach and a paradigm shift need to occur. We look forward to working with you to effect positive economic change in these very difficult and trying times for all of our citizens. Collaboratively, we believe we can strengthen our county.

Sincerely yours,

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Brad Kilger<br>City Manager<br>City of Ceres | Joe Donabed<br>City Manager<br>City of Hughson | Greg Nyhoff<br>City Manager<br>City of Modesto |
| Michael Holland<br>City Manager<br>City of Newman | Steve Hallam<br>City Manager<br>City of Oakdale | M. Cleve Morris<br>City Manager<br>City of Patterson |
| Richard Holmer<br>City Manager<br>City of Riverbank | Roy Wasden<br>City Manager<br>City of Turlock | Charles E. Deschenes<br>City Manager<br>City of Waterford |


9:05am

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
2010 MAR 29 A 11: 53

March 24, 2010

Stanislaus County Board of Supervisors
c/o Richard W. Robinson
1010 10th Street, Suite 6800
Modesto, CA. 95354

Dear Honorable Chairman and Members of the Board,

The City of Newman has completed a review of the Stanislaus County Public Facility Impact Fee Study dated March 2, 2010 and has found some issues we believe need to be addressed prior to adoption. The City appreciates the County's decision to postpone adoption of a portion of the new fee structure for a minimum of sixty (60) days to allow County staff sufficient time to address these concerns and develop a solution acceptable to the City.

There are two main concerns the City wants the County to address prior to adoption. The single largest issue for Newman is the Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF). First and foremost, the Study fails to establish a direct nexus between the identified transportation projects and the City of Newman. In fact, the RTIF fails to deliver any project(s) within six (6) miles of our Sphere of Influence and only one distinct project west of the San Joaquin River that <u>may</u> provide limited benefit to our residents.

In reviewing the RTIF, the Board will find that the RTIF fee covers three major categories of improvements; road projects, signal projects and State Highway projects. Newman is not comfortable collecting a RTIF fee that allots over 76% ($316MM of $412.4MM) of the road project funds to the North County Transportation Corridor project. Additionally, the RTIF proposes $132.8MM for two (2) State Highway 99 interchange projects that support north county projects, including the above-mentioned corridor. These three projects account for over 76% (448.8MM of 583.2MM) of the total RTIF program. While the City understands and supports a regional approach toward development of an efficient countywide transportation network, these projects will have minimal, if any, benefit to Newman businesses and residents.

The City also maintains that business development in Newman (commercial and industrial) actually reduces the impact upon the County's transportation network. As a small community with limited services, our residents are sometimes forced to travel outside Newman to obtain goods and services. However, as more businesses locate within our community our residents will no longer be required to travel outside our boundaries for said goods and services. Consequently, more commercial opportunities in Newman will reduce impact on infrastructure outside of our community.

Our second concern centers on remaining competitive with cities and counties throughout the state with respect to economic development and job creation. In this current economic environment, every agency is searching for a competitive advantage to secure precious jobs and revenues. If a potential business evaluates the costs involved with locating within our City and paying two sets of fees (both City and County) versus locating within a different community or within an unincorporated area and only paying a single set of fees, most businesses with choose the latter. We believe this will place our community at an economic disadvantage in attracting businesses and jobs.

In closing, the City of Newman is uncomfortable with the methodology used to establish a single, county-wide fee structure that supports projects with minimal or no benefit to Newman residents and businesses. As a result, the City can not support collection of these fees based upon the fact that no direct nexus has been established under §66001(a)(3) *Benefit Relationship,* §66001(a)(4) *Burden Relationship,* and §66001(b) *Proportionality* of the Mitigation Fee Act (Assembly Bill 1600). Should the County elect to move forward with adoption of the fee structure without modification, the City of Newman will have no choice but to invoke the termination clause (section 303) of our agreement to collect Public Facility Fees on behalf of Stanislaus County. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Michael Holland on behalf of Newman City Council
CITY MANAGER

# City of Patterson
# Office of the City Manager

1 Plaza
P.O. Box 667
Patterson, California 95363
Phone (209) 895-8015 Fax (209) 895-8016

March 18, 2010

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
2010 MAR 22 P 12: 26

Jeff Grover
Chairman
Stanislaus County Board of Supervisors
1010 10th St, Suite 6500
Modesto, Ca 95354

Dear Chairman Grover:

Over the past several months the City of Patterson has monitored and reviewed the progress of the County's Public Facility Fee (PFF) update. We have been kept apprised of the progress and the impacts the new fees and the current fees will have on development in the City of Patterson. On Tuesday, March 16, 2010, we discussed this item as a Council at our regular meeting. The purpose of this letter is to express our concern with the PFF and request further review and discussion before adoption.

I would like to point out three examples which we feel are clearly an inappropriate application of the PFF. First is the new Regional Transportation Impact Fee. Page 76 and 77 of the report show the RTIF projects and their costs allocated to the PFF. Total costs allocated to the PFF are $583,209,500. One project in the study, the North County Corridor, shows a PFF cost of $316,000,000, over 54% of the entire project list. We do not dispute the need for this project, just as we do not dispute the need for a South County Corridor. However, we do not see the relationship or nexus between this project and development in the City of Patterson. By the same token, someone from Oakdale could have the same argument regarding improvements on West Main. At one time the PFF Study included zones to recognize this issue, however these zones have since been eliminated.

The second issue involves the portion of the impact fee for Drive Through's. Recently the City of Patterson built a Taco Bell Restaurant in the middle of town. The total County Traffic Impact fee for this project was over $65,000 compared to the City Traffic Impact fee of under $43,000. It is difficult, at best, to imagine how this fast food restaurant in the middle of Patterson has had more of an impact on County Roads than on City roads.

Finally, since I have been involved with City of Patterson Government on the Planning Commission, on the City Council, and now as Mayor, it has been my understanding that the philosophy of the County is to promote urban growth in urban areas, Cities. The application of the PFF seems to counter that philosophy and promote commercial and industrial development in the County. This seems contrary to smart growth principles which encourage us to live, work and play in the same community thus eliminating the need for more roads and more traffic and also cutting down on green house gas emissions.

The City of Patterson has taken an aggressive approach to Industrial/Commercial development and job creation. We continue to actively promote our business park which has been very successful. We feel that the County PFF will encourage development outside of the Cities in order to avoid higher fees. This in turn will increase impacts to City roads as residents living in the cities are required to travel farther and outside the City limits to employment.

I encourage you to not adopt the proposed PFF as being presented to you on March 30, 2010. We are committed to working with you to find ways to improve job creation and promote industrial and commercial development. I would be happy to meet with you to discuss this further.

Sincerely,

Becky Campo
Mayor

cc. Jim DeMartini
Richard Robinson, CEO

**Stanislaus County**
**PUBLIC FACILITIES FEES**
**Comprehensive Program Update**
**2010**

Public Hearing
March 30, 2010

PowerPoint Presentation

# RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Conduct a Public Hearing to consider adoption of the revised Public Facility Impact Fee Schedule;

2. Accept the March 23, 2010 Public Facilities Fee Study;

3. Approve and adopt the findings set forth in the Public Facilities Impact Fee Study and in this item and as required by Section 66001 of the California Government Code;

4. Approve the revised Public Facilities Impact Fees as recommended in the Study to be effective 60 days from the date of adoption, Monday May 31, 2010;

**RECOMMENDATIONS: [continued]**

5. Authorize staff to meet with all nine cities and the Stanislaus Council of Governments (StanCOG) to discuss the potential formation of an inclusive Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) program;

6. Direct staff to return to the Board within 90 days with recommendations regarding the Regional Transportation Impact Fee component;

7. Authorize the Chief Executive Officer to enter into a contract amendment with Willdan and Associates in an amount not to exceed $70,000 for additional traffic modeling, facilitation and fee development services to be funded through the use of PFF Administrative Funds;

8. Authorize the Auditor-Controller to increase appropriations and revenue per budget journal to fund the additional contract services;

9. Approve revised Public Facility Fee Committee Administrative Guidelines consistent with the program update.

# Program History/Background

- **Primary objective:** New development pays the capital cost associated with its impact on growth

- Stanislaus County fee program developed in 1989

- Programmed in 1990

- 3 Updates over time:
    - 1992
    - 2003
    - 2005

- 2 Types of Impact Fee
    - Incorporated (within cities)
    - Unincorporated (county areas only)

# Outreach

A 2 year – Inclusive process:

- 4 Public Workshops;
- Multiple meetings with Manufacturing Council;
- Multiple meetings with BIACC;
- Several meetings with City representatives:
    - including special cities workshop in March 2009
    - again, February 2010
- Individual meetings with development community;
- All DRAFT ANALYSIS has been posted on County website on-going.

# Update Recommendations

- Reviewed TR projects to determine need, scope, cost and schedule. Recommended elimination of City-County road fee category;

- Using Third Party Land Value Analysis – Approve program updates in all non-transportation fee categories consistent with 2010 PFF Fee Program Update;

- Retain 2005 Transportation categories and project lists for time being – based upon City partner concerns and request to review/propose a collective RTIF program;

- Convene (over 90 day window) all cities and StanCOG to develop a strategy to develop a Regional Transportation Fee Program.

## Incorporated Fee Comparison

3/5/2010

| Land Use | Current Fee | | All Categories Except Transp. | | Existing Inter-City Road Fee | | Existing City-Co Road Fee | | Total Blended Fee | | Diff $ | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Residential (Per Dwelling Unit)* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Single Family | $ | 8,038 | $ | 3,131 | $ | 2,051 | $ | 2,301 | $ | 7,483 | $ | (555) |
| Multi-Family | $ | 6,580 | $ | 2,187 | $ | 1,374 | $ | 1,542 | $ | 5,103 | $ | (1,478) |
| Senior Housing | $ | 2,962 | $ | 2,187 | $ | 820 | $ | 920 | $ | 3,928 | $ | 966 |
| *Non-residential (Per Thousand Square Feet)* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Office | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General Office/Office Park | $ | 6,841 | $ | 677 | $ | 2,252 | $ | 2,527 | $ | 5,455 | $ | (1,386) |
| Medical Offices | $ | 10,721 | $ | 677 | $ | 4,053 | $ | 4,548 | $ | 9,278 | $ | (1,443) |
| Industrial | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Industrial (Small) | $ | 3,278 | $ | 152 | $ | 1,126 | $ | 1,263 | $ | 2,541 | $ | (737) |
| Industrial (Large) * | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Manufacturing | $ | 656 | $ | 218 | $ | 225 | $ | 253 | $ | 696 | $ | 40 |
| Distribution | $ | 135 | $ | 87 | $ | 45 | $ | 51 | $ | 183 | $ | 47 |
| Warehouse | $ | 62 | $ | 42 | $ | 23 | $ | 25 | $ | 90 | $ | 27 |
| Commercial | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Small Retail (former Convenience) | $ | 40,701 | $ | 571 | $ | 18,344 | $ | 20,583 | $ | 39,498 | $ | (1,202) |
| Small Retail (former Retail <50K) | $ | 10,560 | $ | 571 | $ | 4,349 | $ | 4,879 | $ | 9,799 | $ | (761) |
| Mediur | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | $ | 2,642 | $ | 2,965 | $ | 6,178 | $ | (708) |
| Shopp | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | $ | 1,467 | $ | 1,646 | $ | 3,684 | $ | (670) |
| Shopp | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | $ | 1,210 | $ | [illegible] | $ | 3,139 | $ | (662) |
| Restaurants | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fast F | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | $ | 12,187 | $ | 13,675 | $ | 26,433 | $ | (1,008) |
| High T | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | $ | 7,012 | $ | 7,868 | $ | 15,451 | $ | (845) |
| Sit Dov | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | $ | 3,401 | $ | 3,816 | $ | 7,788 | $ | (731) |
| Financial | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Banks | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | $ | 6,755 | $ | 7,580 | $ | 14,906 | $ | (837) |
| Saving | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | $ | 2,575 | $ | 2,890 | $ | 6,036 | $ | (705) |
| Miscellaneo | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Manual Car Wash (per stall) | $ | [illegible] | $ | [illegible] | $ | 1,689 | $ | 1,895 | $ | 3,584 | $ | (1,248) |
| Church | $ | 1,842 | $ | 571 | $ | 300 | $ | 337 | $ | 1,208 | $ | (634) |
| Day Care Center | $ | 4,923 | $ | 571 | $ | 1,731 | $ | 1,942 | $ | 4,244 | $ | (679) |
| Hospital | $ | 2,791 | $ | 571 | $ | 741 | $ | 832 | $ | 2,144 | $ | (648) |
| Mini-Warehouse | $ | 1,458 | $ | 42 | $ | 122 | $ | 137 | $ | 301 | $ | (1,157) |
| Nursing Home | $ | 1,468 | $ | 571 | $ | 127 | $ | 142 | $ | 840 | $ | (628) |
| Gas Station (per pump) | $ | 3,029 | $ | - | $ | 851 | $ | 955 | $ | 1,807 | $ | (1,222) |
| Motel/Hotel (per room) | $ | 1,842 | $ | 571 | $ | 300 | $ | 337 | $ | 1,208 | $ | (634) |
| Golf Course (per acre) | $ | 2,321 | $ | - | $ | 523 | $ | 587 | $ | 1,109 | $ | (1,212) |
| Movie Theater | $ | 18,918 | $ | 571 | $ | 8,229 | $ | 9,234 | $ | 18,034 | $ | (884) |
| Racquet Club (per court) | $ | 12,568 | $ | - | $ | 5,281 | $ | 5,925 | $ | 11,206 | $ | (1,362) |
| Tennis (per court) | $ | 11,096 | $ | - | $ | 4,597 | $ | 5,158 | $ | 9,755 | $ | (1,340) |
| Drive Through | | | $ | - | | n/a | | n/a | | | | |

# 27 of 31
# Land Use Categories Decreasing

# Fee Comparative

| Existing Fee 2005 | All Non TR | + | Existing ICR Fee | + | Existing CCR Fee | = | Blended Fee 2010 | Diff |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | |

## Incorporated Fee Comparison

3/5/2010

| Land Use | Current Fee | All Categories Except Transp. | Existing Inter-City Road Fee | Existing City-Co Road Fee | Total Blended Fee | Diff $ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Residential (Per Dwelling Unit)* | | | | | | |
| Single Family | $ 8,038 | $ 3,131 | $ 2,051 | $ 2,301 | $ 7,483 | $ (555) |
| Multi-Family | $ 6,580 | $ 2,187 | $ 1,374 | $ 1,542 | $ 5,103 | $ (1,478) |
| Senior Housing | $ 2,962 | $ 2,187 | $ 820 | $ 920 | $ 3,928 | $ 966 |
| | | | | | | |
| *Non-residential (Per Thousand Square Feet)* | | | | | | |
| Office | | | | | | |
| General Office/Office Park | $ 6,841 | $ 677 | $ 2,252 | $ 2,527 | $ 5,455 | $ (1,386) |
| Medical Offices | $ 10,721 | $ 677 | $ 4,053 | $ 4,548 | $ 9,278 | $ (1,443) |
| | | | | | | |
| Industrial | | | | | | |
| Industrial (Small) | $ 3,278 | $ 152 | $ 1,126 | $ 1,263 | $ 2,541 | $ (737) |
| Industrial (Large) * | | | | | | |
| Manufacturing | $ 656 | $ 218 | $ 225 | $ 253 | $ [illegible] | $ 40 |
| Distribution | $ 135 | $ 87 | $ 45 | $ 51 | $ 183 | $ 47 |
| Warehouse | $ 62 | $ 42 | $ 23 | $ 25 | $ 90 | $ 27 |
| | | | | | | |
| Commercial | | | | | | |
| Small Retail (former Convenience) | $ 40,701 | $ 571 | $ 18,344 | $ 20,583 | $ 39,498 | $ (1,202) |
| Small Retail (former Retail <50K) | $ 10,560 | $ 571 | $ 4,349 | $ 4,879 | $ 9,799 | $ (761) |
| Medium Retail | $ 6,885 | $ 571 | $ 2,642 | $ 2,965 | $ 6,178 | $ (708) |
| Shopping Center | $ 4,355 | $ 571 | $ 1,467 | $ 1,646 | $ 3,684 | $ (670) |
| Shopping Mall | $ 3,802 | $ 571 | $ 1,210 | $ 1,358 | $ 3,139 | $ (662) |

| Existing Fee 2005 | + | All Non TR | + | Existing ICR Fee | + | Existing CCR Fee | = | Blended Fee 2010 | | Diff |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

# Questions Raised

- Why not wait under 90 days before adopting?

- County Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) consistency?

- Several earlier Fee Study Drafts reflect even lower fee rates than the proposed blended fee program being proposes this morning.  Why is this?

- Why the large increase in unincorporated employment growth? [Table 2.1]

# Going Forward

- City Managers have requested that the County work with them to to entertain a Regional Transportation Impact Fee program that would be inclusive of all City/County (regional) project concerns;

- Staff is requesting a 90 day window to convene city representatives and to develop a strategy for reaching this objective;

- Staff will include StanCOG as participant in this outreach;

- Staff will include the Business sector – including the Development Community, Manufacturing Council, and BIACC;

- Staff is requesting to extend the existing Willdan Financial contract through this outreach process to assist with additional traffic modeling, facilitation and fee development services.

# PFF Administrative Guidelines

- PFF Administrative Guidelines maintain consistency in the application of the fee program;

- Updating Administrative Guidelines consistent with 2010 Program update;

- Guidelines are composed of 2 major sections:
    - Definitions
    - Administration

- Roles and responsibilities of the PFF Committee are also included in the Administrative Guidelines Document.

# Policy Issues: 5 Findings

1. Identify the Purpose of the Fee;

2. Identify the use to which the fees will be put;

3. Determine the reasonable relationship between the fees usage and the type of development project(s) on which the fees are imposed;

4. Determine the reasonable relationship between the need for the public facilities and the types of development on which the fees are imposed;

5. Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the fees amount and the cost of facilities or portion of the facilities attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed.

# Stanislaus County
# PUBLIC FACILITIES FEES
# Comprehensive Program Update
# 2010

Public Hearing
March 30, 2010